CAMBRIDGE CLASSICAL STUDIES

Markers of Allusion in Archaic Greek Poetry

THOMAS J. NELSON

MARKERS OF ALLUSION IN ARCHAIC GREEK POETRY

Challenging many established narratives of literary history, this book investigates how the earliest known Greek poets (seventh to fifth centuries BCE) signposted their debts to their predecessors and prior traditions – placing markers in their works for audiences to recognise (much like the 'Easter eggs' of modern cinema). Within antiquity, such signposting has often been considered the preserve of later literary cultures, closely linked with the development of libraries, literacy and writing. In this wide-ranging new study, Thomas Nelson shows that these devices were already deeply ingrained in oral archaic Greek poetry, deconstructing the artificial boundary between a supposedly 'primal' archaic literature and a supposedly 'sophisticated' book culture of Hellenistic Alexandria and Rome. In three interlocking case studies, he highlights how poets from Homer to Pindar employed the language of hearsay, memory and time to index their allusive relationships, as they variously embraced, reworked and challenged their inherited tradition.

THOMAS J. NELSON is a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellow in the Faculty of Classics, University of Oxford and Junior Research Fellow in Classics at Wolfson College, Oxford. He has published widely on archaic, classical and Hellenistic Greek literature.

CAMBRIDGE CLASSICAL STUDIES

General editors

J. P. T. CLACKSON, W. M. BEARD, G. BETEGH,
R. L. HUNTER, M. J. MILLETT, S. P. OAKLEY,
R. G. OSBORNE, C. VOUT, T. J. G. WHITMARSH

MARKERS OF ALLUSION IN ARCHAIC GREEK POETRY

THOMAS J. NELSON
University of Oxford

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

For my parents, Jacky and Mark

CONTENTS

Contents

viii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book is a revised and expanded version of my PhD thesis, submitted to the University of Cambridge in 2018. Neither this book nor the original thesis would have been possible without the help and support of many individuals and institutions.

I have been very fortunate to benefit from the insights, guidance and generosity of many mentors. Foremost among them is Richard Hunter, my doctoral supervisor, to whom I owe more than any words could express. He has been unfailingly generous with his time, advice and assistance and is an inspiring exemplar of scholarship. I am also very grateful to Tim Whitmarsh, who has offered sound and valuable advice at many stages; during the PhD and beyond, his sharp questions have invariably helped me clarify my thinking. Felix Budelmann and Renaud Gagné, the examiners of the thesis, were also rigorous and generous readers; I am indebted to both of them for their suggestions and feedback, which were

ix

instrumental in my further development of the project. And I would also like to thank James Clackson, chief editor of Cambridge Classical Studies, who has been an extremely shrewd and humane mentor during my postdoctoral work; I will be forever grateful for his advice, kindness and generosity.

Over the years, I have also benefitted from the support of many other teachers, interlocutors and mentors who have influenced my thinking on classical literature and scholarship, often in foundational ways. They include Bill Allan, Justin Arft, Elton Barker, Jonathan Burgess, Bruno Currie, Olivia Elder, Alex Forte, Stephen Heyworth, Gregory Hutchinson, Talitha Kearey, Adrian Kelly, Max Leventhal, Jane Lightfoot, Neil McLynn, Henry Spelman, Matthew Ward and Alan Woolley. I would also like to make particular mention of two former teachers and mentors who passed away far too soon at the start of 2021: Neil Hopkinson, with whose Green and Yellow commentary I first read Callimachus, and Martin Drury, with whom I first read Homer. Both made a lasting impact on my approach to Greek poetry.

When it comes to this book specifically, a number of friends and colleagues generously read and improved specific sections, including Bernardo Ballesteros, Elton Barker, Olivia Elder, Talitha Kearey, Max Leventhal, Henry Tang, Matthew Ward and Alan Woolley. I am grateful to them all, alongside seminar and conference audiences in Cambridge, Edinburgh, Oxford and various Zoom 'rooms' for their improving feedback. I am also greatly indebted to the two readers for Cambridge Classical Studies, whose instructive suggestions and criticism have very much improved the final product. Of course, I remain solely responsible for any shortcomings that remain. I would also like to thank Michael Sharp and his team at Cambridge University Press for all their assistance throughout the editorial process. I am particularly grateful to my content manager, Bethany Johnson; production manager, Raghavi Govindane; and copy editor, Kathleen Fearn.

My thanks are also due to those who kindly shared unpublished work with me, including Péter Agócs, Justin Arft, Elton Barker, Giambattista D'Alessio, Anne Harreau (née Clerc), Stephen Heyworth, Regina Höschele, Richard Hunter, Adrian Kelly,

CONVENTIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Translations

Unless otherwise indicated, translations are my own. I have generally preferred to use the Latinised form of Greek names.

Conventions

I employ the following conventions within the text:

Boldface type highlights indices of allusion.

<u>Underlining</u> indicates words of interest, especially verbal parallels. Where multiple parallels are indicated simultaneously, I employ a different form of underlining for each parallel.

The grapheme ~ marks a verbal/thematic parallel and/or an intertextual relation between different passages.

I use 'Homer' to refer to the constructed author of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, even if there are grave uncertainties regarding the historicity of this figure, and I refer to the *Theognidea* without taking a position on authenticity (thus 'Thgn.', never '[Thgn.]').

In the main text, I include scholars' first names only on their first mention. In citations, I provide scholars' initials only where the date of a publication would otherwise cause ambiguity, for example to distinguish M. L. West (2012) and S. R. West (2012).

Abbreviations

Abbreviations of journals generally follow *L'Année Philologique*, except for the occasional shortening (*AJP* not *AJPh*, *BMCR* not *BMCRev* etc.) and the following additions:

xii

CSCA	*California Studies in Classical Antiquity*
TC	*Trends in Classics*
YAGE	*Yearbook of Ancient Greek Epic*

Abbreviations of ancient authors and texts generally follow *OCD*[5] (Online: https://oxfordre.com/classics/page/ocdabbreviations), except for:

AP	*Palatine Anthology* (*Anthologia Palatina*)
Σ	Scholion/Scholia

In the case of the *Homeric Hymns* and Callimachus' *Hymns*, I follow the practice of Stephens (2015) xiv: *HhDion.*; *HhDem.*; *HhAp.*; *HhHerm.*; *HhAphr.* for the major *Homeric Hymns* (otherwise *Hh.* 6 etc.); *hZeus*, *hAp.*, *hArt.*, *hDelos*, *hAth.*, *hDem.* for the Callimachean. I cite the Homeric scholia following the system outlined at Beck et al. (2021) 4–5.

I also employ the following bibliographical abbreviations (a full list of texts and editions used can be found at the start of the bibliography):

BNJ	Worthington, I. (ed.) (2006–21) *Brill's New Jacoby* (Online: https://scholarlyeditions.brill.com/bnjo/)
CEG	Hansen, P. A. (1983–89) *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca* (Berlin)
CGL	Diggle, J. et al. (2021) *The Cambridge Greek Lexicon* (2 vols.) (Cambridge)
D–K	Diels, H. and Kranz, W. (1951–52[6] [1903[1]]) *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (3 vols.) (Berlin)
Davies	Davies, M. (2020) *Lesser and Anonymous Fragments of Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary* (Oxford)
EGEF	Tsagalis, C. C. (2017) *Early Greek Epic Fragments* I: *Antiquarian and Genealogical Epic* (*TC* Suppl. 47) (Berlin)
EGF	Davies, M. (1988) *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta* (Göttingen)
EGM	Fowler, R. L. (2000–13) *Early Greek Mythography* (2 vols.) (Oxford)

xiii

GDRK	Heitsch, E. (1961–64) *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit* (2 vols.) (Göttingen)
GEF	West, M. L. (2003) *Greek Epic Fragments from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries* BC (Loeb Classical Library 497) (Cambridge, MA)
GP	Gow, A. S. F. and Page, D. L. (1968) *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams* (2 vols.) (Cambridge)
HE	Gow, A. S. F. and Page, D. L. (1965) *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigram* (2 vols.) (Cambridge)
HNP	Marjanović, L. (1898) *Hrvatske narodne pjesme* III: *Junačke pjesme (Muhamedovske)* (Zagreb)
IEG	West, M. L. (1989–92² [1971–72¹]) *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati* (2 vols.) (Oxford)
K–A	Kassel, R. and Austin, C. (1983–) *Poetae Comici Graeci* (8 vols.) (Berlin)
Leurini	Leurini, L. (2000² [1992¹]) *Ionis Chii Testimonia et Fragmenta* (Classical and Byzantine Monographs 23) (Amsterdam)
LfgrE	Snell, B. et al. (1955–2010) *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (4 vols.) (Göttingen)
LIMC	(1981–99) *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (16 vols.) (Zurich)
L–M	Laks, A. and Most, G. W. (2016) *Early Greek Philosophy* (9 vols.) (Loeb Classical Library 524–32) (Cambridge, MA)
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., Scott, R. and Jones, H. S. (1996⁹) *A Greek–English Lexicon* (with Revised Supplement by P. G. W. Glare) (Oxford)
M–W	Merkelbach, R. and West, M. L. (1967) *Fragmenta Hesiodea* (Oxford)
*OCD*⁵	Whitmarsh, T. J. G. (ed.) *Oxford Classical Dictionary*⁵ (Online: https://oxfordre.com/classics)

xiv

PEG	Bernabé, A. (1987–2007) *Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum. Testimonia et Fragmenta* (4 vols.) (Stuttgart, Munich and Berlin)
Perry	Perry, B. E. (1952) *Aesopica: A Series of Texts relating to Aesop or Ascribed to Him or Closely Connected with the Literary Tradition That Bears His Name*. Vol. 1: *Greek and Latin Texts* (Urbana)
PLLS	Cairns, F. (ed.) *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* (Vols. 1–5, 1975–85); *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* (Vols. 6–10, 1988–98); *Papers of the Langford Latin Seminar* (Vols. 11–, 2003–)
Pf.	Pfeiffer, R. (1949–53) *Callimachus* (2 vols.) (Oxford)
PMG	Page, D. L. (1962) *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford)
PMGF	Davies, M. (1991) *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Oxford)
Poltera	Poltera, O. (2008) *Simonides lyricus: Testimonia und Fragmente. Einleitung, kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Basel)
Rose	Rose, V. (1886) *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta* (Leipzig)
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*
SH	Lloyd-Jones, H. and Parsons, P. (1983) *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Texte und Kommentare 11) (Berlin)
SLG	Page, D. L. (1974) *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis: Poetarum Lyricorum Graecorum fragmenta quae recens innotuerunt* (Oxford)
Stallbaum	Stallbaum, J. G. (1825–26) *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam* (2 vols.) (Leipzig)
TrGF	Snell, B., Kannicht. R. and Radt, S. L. (1971–2004) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (5 vols.) (Göttingen)

van der Valk	van der Valk, M. (1971–87) *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem Pertinentes* (4 vols.) (Leiden)
West	West, M. L. (2003) *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer* (Loeb Classical Library 496) (Cambridge, MA)

xvi

INTRODUCTION

In the Iliadic embassy to Achilles, Phoenix prefaces his account of Meleager with an elaborate outline of its origins (*Il.* 9.524–8):

οὕτω καὶ **τῶν πρόσθεν ἐπευθόμεθα κλέα ἀνδρῶν**
ἡρώων, ὅτε κέν τιν' ἐπιζάφελος χόλος ἵκοι·
δωρητοί τε πέλοντο παράρρητοί τ' ἐπέεσσι.
μέμνημαι τόδε ἔργον ἐγὼ **πάλαι, οὔ τι νέον γε,**
ὡς ἦν· ἐν δ' ὑμῖν ἐρέω πάντεσσι φίλοισι.

So too **we have heard the famous stories of the heroic men of the past**, whenever furious anger came on one of them: they used to be won over by gifts and persuaded with words. I myself **remember** this deed **of long ago – it is not at all recent** – I remember how it happened; and I will tell it among you who are all my friends.

Phoenix underscores the authority of his ensuing tale by emphasising that it is grounded in both direct and indirect experience.[1] He and Achilles have 'heard about' past heroes' propensity for anger (ἐπευθόμεθα, 524), but he will offer one specific instance of this scenario which he himself 'remembers' (μέμνημαι, 527). In addition, he foregrounds the antiquity of the story, reinforcing its instructive value: it is a deed 'of long ago, not at all recent' (πάλαι, οὔ τι νέον γε, 527) and one which concerns the 'famous stories of the heroic men of the past' (τῶν πρόσθεν ... κλέα ἀνδρῶν | ἡρώων, 524–5) – the very kind of material from which *exempla* should be drawn. In these five verses, Phoenix pulls out all the stops to legitimise the lengthy Meleager story that follows (529–99).

These verses do more than assert Phoenix's narratorial authority, however. They also mark the coming narrative as a citation of song. Outside the *Iliad*, the 'famous stories of men' (κλέα ἀνδρῶν)

---

[1] For such authorisation of Homeric character speech, see de Jong (2004) 160–2.

1

always refer to poetry sung by Muse-inspired bards.[2] And the only other Iliadic appearance of the phrase comes a few hundred lines earlier, when Achilles himself had been 'singing the famous stories of men' to the accompaniment of his lyre before the embassy's arrival (ἄειδε ... κλέα ἀνδρῶν, 9.189; cf. ἀείδων, 9.191). By classing his tale among such κλέα ἀνδρῶν, Phoenix signposts his debts to tradition, while also tailoring his language to his immediate audience, invoking similar material to that which Achilles was singing on his arrival. Both he and Achilles have heard this story from a pre-existing canon of song; indeed, Achilles may have even sung it himself.[3]

Phoenix's introduction thus builds on his addressee's demonstrated familiarity with κλέα ἀνδρῶν. But we should also consider how Homer's audiences might respond to these words. Phoenix's following narrative has long been read on multiple levels, conveying messages to both the poem's internal and external audiences.[4] Internally, it aims to exhort Achilles back to the battlefield; but externally, it offers an authorial nod to Achilles' future fate: Meleager stubbornly refuses multiple rounds of entreaty (573–89), just as Achilles will in the present; and he is killed by Apollo in the wider mythical tradition (Hes. frr. 25.12–13, 280.2; *Minyas*, fr. 5 *GEF*), the same fate that lies in store for Achilles (*Il*. 22.359–60; *Aeth*. arg. 3a *GEF*).[5] The story speaks simultaneously to Phoenix's immediate addressee Achilles and – with considerable dramatic irony – to Homer's external audience.

Such a bifurcated mode of reading can also be extended to Phoenix's introductory lines. His emphasis on the antiquity of the tale (πάλαι, οὔ τι νέον γε, 527) hints at his own age and

---

[2] *Od*. 8.73 (κλέα ἀνδρῶν); *Theog*. 100 (κλεῖα προτέρων ἀνθρώπων); *Hh*. 32.18–19 (κλέα φωτῶν | ... ἡμιθέων).

[3] Cf. H. S. Mackie (1997) 79 n. 6; Dowden (2004) 197; Currie (2016) 142, 214; Rawles (2018) 43. Contrast Ford (1992) 59–60. In encouraging Achilles to be persuaded by ἐπέεσσι like former heroes, Phoenix may even hint at an epic source for the tale: see §IV.3.1 n. 161 for the generic association of ἔπος/ἔπεα. ἡρώων (525) is also evocative of epic myth: cf. Hes. *Op*. 156–73 on the race of heroes who died at Thebes and Troy.

[4] Nagy (1979) 102–11; Brenk (1986) 83, 85; Andersen (1987) 3–7; Gwara (2007) 319–33; Burgess (2017a) 62; Primavesi (2018).

[5] For the numerous parallels between Achilles and Meleager, see Σ bT *Il*. 9.527a *ex*. (with Nünlist (2009) 262–3); Rosner (1976) 323–7; Morrison (1992a) 119–24; Alden (2000) 179–290.

2

experience, but it also seems to reflect the perspective of Homer's external audience more than that of Phoenix or Achilles. Meleager's life belongs only to the previous generation of heroes within mythical chronology: his death is mentioned in the Catalogue of Ships as a recent event that explains Thoas' command of the Aetolians (*Il*. 2.641–4).[6] Moreover, Phoenix's recollection of the story (μέμνημαι, 527) suggests that he has direct experience of the episode, again implying its temporal proximity for the characters within the epic.[7] The Meleager story is only truly πάλαι from the perspective of Homer's external audience, 'the mortals of today' who belong to a later age.[8] In addition, the ensuing tale draws on epic motifs and tales that would have been familiar to at least some of Homer's audience. The story pattern of wrathful withdrawal and subsequent reconciliation (525–6) is a common theme found elsewhere in the *Iliad* and archaic epic,[9] and the story of Meleager was a well-established episode of the mythical tradition, however adapted it may be to Phoenix's specific rhetorical goals here.[10] No less than Achilles, Homer's external audiences would have been familiar with these κλέα ἀνδρῶν too.[11]

---

[6] Zenodotus athetised the lines that mention Meleager (641–2: so Σ A *Il*. 2.641 *Ariston.*), but the alleged grounds for doing so are very weak: Brügger et al. (2010) 207.

[7] Thus Scodel (2002) 71. All three other instances of μέμνημαι in Homer refer to direct, personal memory: *Il*. 5.818, 6.222; *Od*. 24.122. Contrast Moran (1975) 204 and O'Maley (2011) 4, for whom Phoenix's memory is simply of heard stories. In later tradition, Phoenix features among the hunters of the Calydonian boar (Ov. *Met*. 8.307) alongside Meleager (8.299). For an overview of Meleager's relative chronology, see Petzold (1976) 151.

[8] Mortals of today: οἷοι νῦν βροτοί εἰσ', *Il*. 5.304, 12.383, 449, 20.287; §IV.2.3. Cf. Hesiod's distinction between the age of heroes (*Op*. 156–73) and his contemporary age of iron (*Op*. 174–201).

[9] Cf. Kelly (2007a) 97–8; Scodel (2008) 49–58. E.g. Achilles, *Il. passim* (Muellner (1996) esp. 94–175); Paris, *Il*. 6.326–41 (Collins (1987)); Aeneas, *Il*. 13.458–69 (Fenno (2008)); Demeter, *HhDem*. (Lord (1967); Nickel (2003)).

[10] Traditional story: Howald (1924); Sachs (1933); Kakridis (1949) 11–42; Swain (1988); Grossardt (2002); West (2010), (2011a) 226–7; Burgess (2017a). Homer's possible adaptations: Willcock (1964) 141–54; Lohmann (1970) 254–63; March (1987) 29–42; Bremmer (1988). Note too the misdirection in 525–6 (Meleager was not in fact persuaded by gifts): Morrison (1992a) 120–1. On the Meleager myth more generally, see Grossardt (2001).

[11] Phoenix's words may even echo language traditionally associated with Meleager's story: Phoenix's ἀνδρῶν | ἡρώων (*Il*. 9.524–5) is paralleled in the Hesiodic *Catalogue*'s mention of Meleager (| ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων, fr. 25.11), though the phrase is an established formula (e.g. *Il*. 5.746–7; *Od*. 1.100–1; Hes. *Scut*. 19, etc.).

3

Most significant, however, are the emphatic assertions of Phoenix's reliance on hearsay (ἐπευθόμεθα, 524) and memory (μέμνημαι, 527), which together frame this introduction. Both assertions foreground the transmission and reception of the myth, and both are combined with an affirmation of the tale's antiquity (πρόσθεν, 524; πάλαι, 527). The overall impact feels strikingly similar to the referential 'footnoting' of later literary traditions. Compare, for example, Latinus' words in *Aeneid* 7 (205–8):

> atque equidem **memini** (**fama** est obscurior **annis**)
> Auruncos ita **ferre** senes, his ortus ut agris
> Dardanus Idaeas Phrygiae penetrarit ad urbes
> Threiciamque Samum, quae nunc Samothracia **fertur**.

> And indeed **I remember** (the **story** has become rather obscure **over the years**) that the Auruncan elders **used to say** how Dardanus, though raised in these lands, reached the cities of Ida in Phrygia and Thracian Samos, which now **is called** Samothrace.

Just like Phoenix, Latinus introduces his account by appealing to hearsay (*fama*, 205; *ferre*, 206; *fertur*, 208), memory (*memini*, 205) and antiquity (*annis*, 205), footnoting Virgil's debts to what seems to have been a 'recent and obscure' tradition concerning Dardanus' Italian origins.[12] In both these passages, we find a similar accumulation of references to the transmission, preservation and age of the story. But what should we make of this similarity? Is Virgil adapting and appropriating the Homeric language to new allusive ends? Or does the similarity of form also betray a similarity of allusive function? Might Phoenix's ostentatious source citation signpost not only Achilles' but also the external audience's prior familiarity with Meleager's story? Should we see here a knowing authorial reference to a pre-existing tradition or even poem about Meleager?

---

[12] Thus Horsfall (2016) 125–6, who lists this example among 'footnotes' where Virgil 'seems to follow scrupulously a known literary source' (122); cf. Horsfall (2000) 164–8. Contrast Buchheit (1963) 165, who suggests Virgilian innovation, but this possibility is equally suggestive for our *Iliad* 9 passage: Phoenix's emphasis on the antiquity of his tale (πάλαι, οὔ τι νέον, 527) could also conceal Homer's adaptations of the traditional myth (see n. 10 above), insisting that they are not in fact 'new'.

4

Scholars are generally averse to reading archaic Greek poetry in this way. Indeed, such 'metapoetic' signalling has often been considered the preserve of Hellenistic and Roman literary cultures.[13] It is the contention of this book, however, that such signposting was already a well-established feature of archaic poetry, and not simply a later Hellenistic or Latin innovation. The grounds for such an interpretation are particularly compelling in *Iliad* 9: poet and speaker seem to tap self-consciously into an encyclopaedic network of myths and traditions. But Phoenix's words are not an isolated incident. They form part of a far more pervasive pattern of allusive marking throughout archaic Greek poetry. Homer himself – and archaic poets more generally – frequently engage in this kind of signposting, both in their own and in their characters' voices: a phenomenon which I call 'indexicality' (see §1.1.3 below). My argument, *in nuce*, is that this phenomenon was deeply embedded in our earliest extant Greek poetry: from Homer onwards, archaic Greek poets signposted their allusions, signalling both their debts to and departures from tradition.

This book is thus a contribution to ongoing debates about the nature, extent and development of allusion and intertextuality in archaic Greek poetry.[14] Most recent work on this topic revolves around one central question: how similar were the allusive practices of archaic Greece and the Hellenistic/Roman worlds? While some scholars argue that Homer can be read and interpreted much like Callimachus or Ovid, others warn that the oral environment of early Greek poetry precludes the interpretative strategies available to readers of Hellenistic and Latin literature.[15] This debate is a complex one and largely stems from scholars' differing theoretical preconceptions. But it is further hindered by scholars' tendency to examine archaic Greek poetry in a compartmentalised fashion. Most studies of early Greek allusion focus on a single

---

[13] See §1.1.3 below. For rare exceptions to this point of view (including most recently Currie (2016) 26–7, 139–44), see §1.1.4 below.

[14] A blooming field: recent book-length contributions include Currie (2016); Rawles (2018); Spelman (2018a); Ready (2019); Barker and Christensen (2020); Price and Zelnick-Abramovitz (2020); Kelly and Spelman (forthcoming).

[15] Voices of optimism: Fowler (1997) 31; Currie (2016) 38. Voices of caution: Fowler (1987) 39; Kelly (2015a), (2020), (forthcoming a); Barker and Christensen (2020); Barker (2022). For discussion, see §1.2 below.

author or – at best – a single genre, which limits our ability to chart diachronic developments or investigate similarities and differences in depth. Moreover, the insistent emphasis on the 'if' of early Greek allusion overrides an exploration of the 'why'. Scholars' fixation on proving or denying a case of allusion often usurps consideration of an allusion's interpretative significance, short-circuiting an exploration of how individual texts construct and contest their inherited tradition. When it comes to understanding the scope, quality and significance of early Greek allusion, there is still much work to be done.

In this book, I will tackle these issues by embarking on a track that is both broader and narrower than the usual path. On the one hand, I will explore the development of allusive practices in archaic Greece from Homer to Pindar, offering a broader diachronic perspective than many other studies. But to do so, I will focus on one particular feature of this allusive system: the marking and signposting of allusion. What I present here is essentially an argument for continuity: 'indexicality' was an integral feature of the Graeco-Roman literary tradition as far back as we can see. But this should not be mistaken as an argument for uniformity. There are important differences between the broader allusive practices of archaic Greek and Roman poets (cf. §I.2 below), and I shall remain attuned throughout to the developments and changes in these allusive techniques over time. The result, I hope, will be a new and more nuanced understanding of ancient literary history and the scope of archaic Greek poetics.

In the remainder of this Introduction, I will survey the recent developments and limitations of scholarship on allusive marking (§I.1), before turning to outline my methodological approach to early Greek allusion (§I.2).

I.1 Indexicality: Marking Allusion

Critical discussions of ancient literature are constantly mediated by an awareness of a text's various interrelationships – its connections with other non-literary media (such as vase paintings and sculpture), with other contexts (social, cultural and political) and above all with other literary texts (past, contemporary and even future).

6

Classicists habitually frame these connections in terms of 'allusion' and 'intertextuality', two terms that are loaded with considerable theoretical baggage.[16] The paradigm of allusion necessarily foregrounds the idea of intentionality, but we need not reduce this 'intention' to the consciousness of an individual author. Rather, allusion presumes a sense of design in a text and presupposes a reading strategy which seeks to interpret such design. Intertextuality, meanwhile, prioritises the generation of meaning in the act of reception, enabling readers and audiences to unearth an array of interconnections between all cultural products that defy chronology, hierarchy or unidirectionality.[17] These remain important theoretical distinctions, although in practice scholarship is not consistent in the use of either term, and for many decades the two labels have been employed interchangeably as near synonyms to describe the same underlying phenomenon.[18]

I will outline my understanding of these terms in the context of early Greek poetry below (§1.2.1). For now, it suffices to note that I will follow the established practice of employing both terms in this book, since they are each useful in different but overlapping ways. I prefer to use the language of allusion: I do not shrink from talking of a poet's or text's 'intentions' as a valuable heuristic tool.[19] As for 'intertextuality', I employ it in two main senses: first, as a general umbrella term to describe interactions between texts

---

[16] Discussion among Classicists has traditionally centred on Latin poetry: Pasquali (1942); Conte (1986), (2017); Thomas (1986); Farrell (1991); Lyne (1994); Fowler (1997); Hinds (1998); Pucci (1998); Edmunds (2001). And more recently Latin prose: G. Kelly (2008); Levene (2010); Whitton (2019). Cf. too Baraz and van den Berg (2013); Hutchinson (2013); and Coffee (2013) for a helpful annotated bibliography.

[17] In its original Kristevan sense, intertextuality is a 'designation of [a text's] participation in the discursive space of a culture' rather than 'a name for a work's relation to particular prior texts' (Culler (2001) 114), where even the reader is a 'plurality of other texts' (Barthes (1990) 10). On the origins and intellectual background of Kristeva's coinage, see Clayton and Rothstein (1991); Orr (2003) 20–32; Allen (2011) 8–58. Most Classicists employ 'intertextuality' with a far more restricted sense of 'text', though see Edmunds (2001).

[18] Cf. Machacek (2007) 523. Many scholars slip seamlessly between the two without comment, but it is refreshing to see some explicitly acknowledge their conscious *variatio*: e.g. Levene (2010) 84; Hall (2011) 615 n. 1; Whitton (2019) 51 n. 173, 59. See too Lyne (2016) 21–41, who argues for 'allusion' and 'intertextuality' as constituent elements of a single system, with a helpful analogy from cognitive science.

[19] See Hinds (1998) 50 on the 'intention-bearing author' as 'a discourse which is good to think with' (cf. Hermerén (1992); Heath (2002) 59–97). See too Farrell (2005)'s convincing case for a middle ground between authorial intent and reader response.

7

and traditions, without necessarily claiming any form of intentionality; and second, as part of a paired opposition with 'intratextuality' to distinguish connections between (*inter-*) and within (*intra-*) texts.[20] A further advantage of embracing both terms is the broader lexical framework that they provide: the verb 'allude' (to describe the process of reference) and the noun 'intertext' (to designate the target of reference). Ultimately, however, these all remain imperfect labels and tools to help describe, analyse and interpret my main focus: the network of connections between poetic texts and traditions, how these connections function, how they generate meaning and how they are signposted.

When approaching this network of connections, one crucial question is how we may identify allusions and justify intertextual readings. To this end, literary scholars have attempted to catalogue and categorise the means by which authors may mark – and readers recognise – allusions. In the words of Jeffrey Wills, we are all deeply immersed and trained in a 'grammar of allusion', by which we read and interpret allusive references.[21] For ancient Greek and Roman poetry, we can pick out five overarching strands of this 'grammar': (i) verbal allusion, the repetition of specific words or phrases, especially if they are distinctive or unusual, for example, dialectally charged or rarely used (like Homeric *hapax legomena*); (ii) aural allusion, the repetition of specific sonic, rhythmic or metrical patterns; (iii) structural allusion, the use of a similar word order or similar placement of a word or phrase within a line or whole poem; (iv) thematic allusion, the exploitation of similar themes, contexts or content; and (v) visual allusion, the repetition of gestures, actions and staging, especially in performed genres such as Attic drama. Most cases of ancient allusion derive their power from some combination of these five categories, although such a simple, formal list will undoubtedly prove unsatisfactory in some cases, given the varied and nuanced application of allusion.

[20] Cf. Currie (2016) 34. On 'intratextuality', see e.g. Sharrock and Morales (2000); Harrison et al. (2018).
[21] Wills (1996) 15–41; cf. Wills (1998) 277 on 'formal' and 'thematic' approaches to recognising allusion. In general: Broich (1985); Helbig (1996).

8

In addition to these broad overarching categories, however, scholars in the past few decades have begun to dwell increasingly on a range of more self-reflexive techniques by which ancient and modern poets have signposted their allusive engagements. In the field of English literature, John Hollander has examined echo as a 'mode of allusion' in Milton and Romantic poetry, David Quint has explored rivers' sources as a *topos* of literary debt, and Christopher Ricks has probed the range of motifs by which English poets self-consciously figured themselves as heirs to tradition, exploiting tropes of paternity, inheritance and succession.[22] Inspired by such studies, classical scholars have noted a similarly sophisticated array of allusive markers, primarily in Latin literature. I will now introduce them, focusing first on the 'Alexandrian footnote' (§1.1.1), and then on other tropes of allusion (§1.1.2).

1.1.1 The Alexandrian Footnote

By far the most commonly attested marker of allusion in Latin poetry is the so-called 'Alexandrian footnote', a device which assimilates literary allusion to the transmission of talk and hearsay. General appeals to tradition (such as **ferunt**, 'they say', **audivi**, 'I've heard', or **ut fama est**, 'so the story goes') frequently signal an allusion to specific literary predecessors, despite their apparent vagueness and generality. A famous example of this device occurs in the opening of Catullus' epyllion, *Carmen* 64, where the **dicuntur** ('they are said') in the second line flags the poem's polemical interaction with numerous other treatments of the Argonautic voyage.[23] A simpler example, however, is that of **fertur** in Virgil's description of the two gates of horn and ivory in *Aeneid* 6, which points back to Penelope's famous description of these very same gates in the *Odyssey* (*Aen.* 6.893–6 ~ *Od.* 19.562–7). In addition to the verbal and thematic echoes of the Odyssean

---

[22] Hollander (1981); Quint (1983); Ricks (1976), (2002); cf. too Pigman (1979), (1980); Burrow (2019). For Echo in European literature generally: Gély-Ghedira (2000).

[23] On Catullus 64's extensive allusivity: Thomas (1982). On this 'Alexandrian footnote': Hinds (1995) 41–2, (1998) 1–2; Gaisser (1995) 582–5; DeBrohun (2007) 296; Fernandelli (2012) 20 with n. 72.

passage,[24] Virgil's vague appeal to tradition invites his audience to ask where these details have been 'reported' before, an extra spur to recall the legitimising authority of Homer.[25]

For Stephen Hinds, who has done more than any other to publicise this phenomenon,[26] such 'footnotes' are 'a kind of built-in commentary, a kind of reflexive annotation, which underlines or intensifies their demand to be interpreted *as* allusions': *dicuntur* and similar expressions can mean not only '"are said [in tradition]", but also, more specifically, "are said [in my literary predecessors]".'[27] But it is also worth stressing the variety of nuances that the device can bear in Latin texts. Far from simply marking an allusive debt, it can also highlight a particularly contentious point of tradition. When Virgil claims that Enceladus allegedly lies beneath Etna (**fama est**, *Aen*. 3.578), he acknowledges a literary debate about the precise identity of the giant beneath the mountain. In Pindar's *Pythian* 1, Virgil's main model for this passage (*Aen*. 3.570–87 ~ *Pyth*. 1.13–28), the giant was Typhon, but in Callimachus' *Aetia* Prologue, Enceladus took his place (*Aet*. fr. 1.36) – an inconsistency that was already noted by the Pindaric scholia.[28] In this case, Virgil's **fama est** gestures not only to a single literary source, but rather to a plurality of competing alternatives, highlighting the contestability of tradition.[29]

---

[24] Of the 'twin gates' (*geminae . . . portae* ~ δοιαὶ . . . πύλαι), the one constructed (*perfecta* ~ τετεύχαται) of ivory (*elephanto* ~ ἐλέφαντι, ἐλέφαντος) is associated with deceit (*falsa* ~ ἐλεφαίρονται), that of horn (*cornea* ~ κεράεσσι, κεράων) with truth (*veris . . . umbris* ~ οἵ ῥ' ἔτυμα κραίνουσι).

[25] Horsfall (1990) 50, (2016) 114; cf. Pollmann (1993). Horsfall (2016) 111–34 offers a thorough treatment of Virgilian 'footnotes'.

[26] The phrase 'Alexandrian footnote' is usually attributed to Ross (1975) 68, although he only uses it in passing when describing the 'neoteric' nature of Prop. 1.20.17's *namque ferunt olim* (with a cross reference to Norden (1957) 123–4). The phrase was later brought to prominence and invested with its current intertextual associations by Hinds (1987a) 58 with n. 22, (1998) 1–3.

[27] Hinds (1998) 1–2. On *fama* generally: Clément-Tarantino (2006a); Hardie (2012); Guastella (2017).

[28] Cf. Σ *Ol*. 4.11c; Heyworth and Morwood (2017) 231; Hunter and Laemmle (2019). It is unsurprising that Virgil's *Fama* prefers the tradition about her own brother (cf. *Enceladoque sororem*, *Aen*. 4.179): Clément-Tarantino (2006a) 585.

[29] Cf. Thomas (1993) 80, (1998) 116–20, though I do not agree that Virgil comes down decisively on the side of Enceladus. Rather, he acknowledges the ongoing debate, without settling it.

10

In other cases, meanwhile, hearsay is invoked at points of apparent innovation, where inherited tradition is creatively reworked or completely rewritten. When Virgil claims in the *Georgics* that Aristaeus' bees were lost through sickness and hunger (*amissis,* **ut fama**, *apibus morboque fameque*, *G.* 4.318), he seems to be lending the authority of tradition to what is in all likelihood his own invention, further reinforced by the aural jingle of *fama* and *fame*.[30] In the *Aeneid*, meanwhile, Sinon prefaces an untraditional account of Palamedes' genealogy and pacifism with an emphatic assertion of the hero's famous reputation (*Aen.* 2.81–3):

> **fando** aliquod si **forte tuas pervenit ad**
>   **auris**
> Belidae **nomen** Palamedis et **incluta fama**
> **gloria**

> If **in report** something of **the name** of Palamedes, son of Belus, **has happened to reach your ears**, and **his glory, famous in renown**.

This insistence on Palamedes' fame lends a legitimising veneer to Sinon's (and Virgil's) untraditional account, but it also invites an audience to challenge the claims that follow, to zero in on their innovations and to dwell on their significance.[31] Such 'faux footnotes' as these are 'a kind of poetic smoke and mirrors',[32] a means for a poet to mark his own creative ability and unique place in tradition. By presenting such innovations as 'traditional', the poet implies that his work is coextensive with the literary tradition: any word he utters is immediately incorporated into the larger web of authoritative *fama*.

The 'Alexandrian footnote', then, is not simply a shortcut to mark literary debts and sources. It is also a polemical signpost of contested tradition and an authorising signal of literary innovation. At its heart, it is a tool of literary self-representation, a means for

---

[30] Thomas (1988) II 203; Horsfall (2016) 130.
[31] Townshend (2015) 78–87. Cf. Adkin (2011) on Virgil's etymological play (*fari*/*fama*/ *falsus*/*infandum*).
[32] Townshend (2015) 94.

11

a poet to position himself against what his predecessors have said and what his audiences have heard – a valuable feature of any Roman poet's allusive repertoire.

I.I.2 Troping Allusion

Besides the 'Alexandrian footnote', Latin scholars have also identified a host of other tropes which figure, model and mark allusive interactions. Foremost among these are embedded references to memory, repetition and echo. Ovid's Mars, for example, reminds Jupiter in the *Metamorphoses* of a prophecy he had previously made in Ennius' *Annals* (*Met*. 14.812–15):

> tu mihi concilio **quondam** praesente deorum
> (nam **memoro memori**que animo pia verba notavi).
> 'unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli';
> dixisti: rata sit verborum summa tuorum!

> You **once** said to me in the presence of the gods' council (for I recorded your pious words in my **remembering** mind and now **recall** them): 'There shall be one whom you'll raise to the azure blue of the sky.' So you spoke: now let the essence of your words be ratified!

The war god's emphatic juxtaposition of ***memoro memori*** and his overt appeal to the past in ***quondam*** signal the verbatim quotation of Jupiter's former words: the god explicitly recalls the earlier Ennian poem (*Met*. 14.814 = *Ann*. 54 Skutsch).[33] Similar, if a little more implicit, is Ovid's description of Narcissus' death in the *Metamorphoses*: Echo's repetition of the egotist's words (*dictoque* '*vale*' '*vale*' *inquit **et Echo***, *Met*. 3.501) self-consciously highlights Ovid's own 'echoing' of Virgil's 'fading doubled *vale*' in the *Eclogues* (*'vale, vale' inquit, 'Iolla'*, *Ecl*. 3.79).[34] The inconspicuous ***et*** further reinforces the echoing effect: Echo speaks these words 'as well' as Virgil, Menalcas and Phyllis.

---

[33] Conte (1986) 57–9; Solodow (1988) 227; Spielberg (2020) 151–2. More on indexical memory: J. F. Miller (1993), (1994); Sens (2003) 306–8, (2006) 157; Fontaine (2014) 183–6; Currie (2016) 138; McNelis and Sens (2016) 57; Faber (2017); Whitton (2019) 349–51; Greensmith (2020) 189–225; Iff-Noël (forthcoming).

[34] Hinds (1995) 44 = (1998) 5–6. There may also be a subtler echoing of the repetition καλὸς καλός in Callimachus' own 'Echo' epigram (28.5 Pf. = *AP* 12.43.5). Other cases of allusive echo: Barchiesi (2001) 139–40; Heerink (2015) 6–9, 63–5; Paraskeviotis (2016), (2017); Cowan (2017) 13–17; Laird (2020); Nethercut (2020).

12

The most famous example of this phenomenon in modern scholarship, however, is the speech of Ariadne in the *Fasti* (*Fast.* 3.471–6):

> **en iterum**, fluctus, **similes** audite querellas.
>   **en iterum** lacrimas accipe, harena, meas.
> **dicebam**, **memini**, 'periure et perfide Theseu!'
>   ille abiit, **eadem** crimina Bacchus habet.
> **nunc quoque** 'nulla viro' clamabo 'femina credat';
>   nomine mutato causa **relata** mea **est**.

> **Again**, waves, listen to my **similar** complaints! **Again**, sand, receive my tears! **I used to say**, **I remember**, 'Perjured and perfidious Theseus!' He deserted me, and now Bacchus incurs the **same** charge. **Now too** I will shout, 'Let no woman trust a man!' My case **has been repeated**, just with a change of name.

Ariadne's words here assert a strong sense of literary déjà vu.[35] Abandoned by Ovid's Bacchus, she recalls the similar mistreatment she received from Catullus' Theseus (64.116–206) – a short time previously in her fictional timeline, but several decades ago in terms of Roman literary history. She even quotes her former literary self directly: *periure et perfide Theseu* (*Fast.* 3.473) draws on Catullus' *perfide . . . perfide . . . Theseu* (64.132–3) and *periuria* (64.135), while *nunc quoque 'nulla viro . . . femina credat'* (*Fast.* 3.475) is lifted largely verbatim from Catull. 64.143 (*nunc iam nulla viro . . . femina credat*). Together, these repetitions strengthen Ariadne's and our own sense of déjà vu: 'how often', she goes on to ask, 'must I speak these very words?' (*quotiens haec ego verba loquar?*', *Fast.* 3.486). Yet besides these verbal reminiscences, it is the accumulation of temporal markers (**en iterum**, **en iterum**, **nunc quoque**) and the language of repetition and similarity (**similes**, **eadem**, **relata . . . est**) which cue us to see this scene as a self-conscious repeat, alongside the pointed **memini** that precedes her self-quotation: she actually 'remembers' her earlier literary appearance.[36]

---

[35] Conte (1986) 60–2; Hinds (1995) 42–3, (1998) 3–4; Van Tress (2004) 17–19; Armstrong (2006) 48–51; Nauta (2013) 223–5; Heyworth (2019) 173–4.

[36] Note too the retrospective *dicebam*: cf. Prop. 1.9.1 (*dicebam tibi venturos, irrisor, Amores*), which looks back to Prop. 1.7: Zetzel (1996) 75. Wills (1996) 438 n. 8 attractively suggests that Ovid's *memini* not only 'signals the allusion' but also '(as if excusing inexactness) authorizes the variation in the quotation'. Memory, like *Fama*, can be distorting: cf. Musgrove (1998).

There is, of course, considerable irony in this remembrance. As Hinds notes, Ariadne has 'the very quality of mindfulness (*memini*) so signally lacking in her earlier lover at his moment of perjury' (*immemor*, 64.135, cf. *oblito*, 64.208),[37] and – we might add – the same quality allegedly lacking in all men (*dicta nihil meminere*, 64.148).[38] Yet in addition to this reversal, Ovid also manipulates the temporality of the scene, undermining the Catullan narrator's authority by ironically challenging his version of events. The Catullan poem, it turns out, did not present her final lament after all (*extremis ... querellis*, 64.130), since she repeats similar complaints now (*similes ... querellas*, *Fast.* 3.471). This temporal paradox becomes even more acute when we add several earlier Ovidian scenes into the mix: in the *Ars Amatoria*, Ariadne is also pictured bewailing her abandonment on Dia and accusing Theseus of being faithless (*perfidus*, 1.536). There too she beats her breast '**again**' (***iterum***, 1.535), yet she also speaks '**brand new** words' (***novissima*** *verba*, 1.539) – a claim that already undermines the truth of Catullus' 'final' lament and plays provocatively with tradition. Ovid's retelling is a peculiar mix of tradition (***iterum***) and innovation (***novissima***).[39] In *Heroides* 10, Ariadne again laments her lot, appeals to her memory (***memini***, 10.92) and accuses Theseus of perjury (*periuri*, 10.76, cf. *perfide ... lectule*, 10.58), while the rocks echo back the name of Theseus (*'Theseu!'* | ***reddebant***, 10.21–2), troping the poet's repeated 'echoing' of the literary tradition (~ *Theseu*, Catull. 64.133; *Thesea clamabat*, *A. A.* 1.531; *Theseu*, *Fast.* 3.473).[40] These Ovidian lines, in the *Fasti*, *Ars Amatoria* and *Heroides*, self-consciously highlight their interaction with Catullus and each other by envisaging this engagement through a series of intertextual metaphors: allusion keyed as memory, echo, iteration, similarity and novelty. Amassed together, these motifs proclaim Ovid's allusive debts and departures. Like the

---

[37] Hinds (1998) 4 n. 10.

[38] Reading Czwalina's conjecture *meminere* for V's *metuere*, *contra* Mynors: see Goold (1958) 105; Trimble (forthcoming) ad loc.

[39] Note too the irony of her treading 'on unfamiliar sands' (*in ignotis ... harenis*, *A. A.* 1.527) – they are all too familiar for a reader!

[40] On *Her.* 10's manipulation of time, cf. Barchiesi (1986) 93–102; Lively (2008). Cf. too Ovid's brief description of Ariadne at *Met.* 8.176: *desertae et multa querenti*, 'deserted and complaining greatly'.

14

Alexandrian footnote, they are a crucial tool of literary self-representation.

We could spend much time surveying further examples of such self-consciously figured allusions in Roman poetry – indeed, a comprehensive catalogue of the phenomenon, though a Herculean enterprise, would be an extremely useful resource.[41] For now, however, it suffices to note that a range of other self-reflexive tropes have been read in a similar manner in Latin literature.[42] Besides report, echo and memory, scholars have explored the allusive potential of other metaphors, including footsteps, grafting, prophecy, recognition, succession and theft.[43] Any trope, in short, which suggests a relation of dependence or the voice of authority can easily be co-opted as a metaphor of allusive relationships. And even mere temporal adverbs can evoke diachronic literary relationships, as when Ovid's Achaemenides is '**no longer**' roughly clad, as he had been in Virgil's *Aeneid* (***iam non** hirsutus amictu*, *Met.* 14.165 ~ *Aen.* 3.590–4),[44] or when Statius' Achelous '**still**' behaves as he had in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, hiding his mutilated forehead (***adhuc***, *Theb.* 4.106–9 ~ *Met.* 9.96–7).[45]

Taken together, these phenomena form a nexus of interrelated tropes for figuring and marking allusion. In general terms, they fit into a broader category of metaliterary 'marking', standing alongside signals of generic affiliation, etymological play, acrostics and anagrams.[46] But in their range, variety and adaptability, they stand

---

[41] As far as I am aware, the work that comes closest to fulfilling this need is Guez et al. (forthcoming), an extensive 'dictionary' of metapoetic images in Graeco-Roman antiquity. Although it does not focus on allusive signposting specifically, many entries address the phenomenon.

[42] Generally, see Hinds (1987b) 17–23, (1995), (1998) 3–16; Barchiesi (1995); Wills (1996) index s.v. 'external markers (of allusion)'; O'Neill (1999) 288–9; Clerc (2007) 24–7.

[43] Footsteps: Nelson (forthcoming a). Grafting: Pucci (1998) 99–106; Clément-Tarantino (2006b); Henkel (2014a). Prophecy: Barchiesi (2001) 133–5. Recognition: Hinds (1998) 8–10; Nethercut (2018) 78 n. 12. Succession: Ingleheart (2010); Hardie (1993) 88–119; Parkes (2009); Boyd (2018) 75–146. Theft: Nelson (forthcoming c). Cf. Nethercut (2017) on Lucretius' use of *radices* and *stirpes* to signpost his Empedoclean 'roots' and Burrow (2019) 106–35 on the metaphors of *simulacra* and dreams.

[44] Solodow (1988) 227; Hinds (1998) 113.   [45] Micozzi (2015) 340–1.

[46] 'Metageneric signals': Harrison (2007) 27–33; cf. Henkel (2014b) on the generic associations of foot puns. Etymological markers: Cairns (1997); Michalopoulos

15

apart. They may not be as explicit as a modern philologist's footnotes, but as Jeffrey Wills notes, they 'function much as quotation-marks do in modern scripts, alerting the reader that some reference is being made, the specific source of which must be deduced in other words'.[47] They offer a useful supplement to the 'grammar' of ancient allusion, boosting the intertextual signal. It is thus no wonder that they have been taken up with such scholarly vigour in recent decades.

1.1.3 *Problems and Limitations: Terminology and Assumptions*

For all this vigour, modern scholarship's engagement with the phenomenon of allusive marking is not without its problems. First among these is the indiscriminate and uncritical labelling of examples. Ever since Hinds opened his seminal *Allusion and Intertext* with these devices, the 'Alexandrian footnote' and other allusive markers have become a familiar concept in classical scholarship. They now proliferate in discussions of not just Latin, but also later Greek authors.[48] Yet like a commentary's 'cf.', the identification of footnotes and markers can all too often mark the end of the interpretative process, rather than its beginning. These terms have become a convenient shorthand, avoiding the need for closer engagement with the details of a specific allusion. What was once an exciting and liberating insight into the self-consciousness and reflexivity of Latin poets now seems a banal cliché.

The uncritical acceptance of these allusive markers is also visible in the very sobriquet which the 'Alexandrian footnote' has received. Given the apparent intellectual demands triggered by such tags, one can understand why Hinds adopted David Ross' 'Alexandrian footnote' to describe the phenomenon. As he argues,

---

(2001) 4–5; O'Hara (2017) 75–9. Acrostic markers: Bing (1990) 281 n. 1; Feeney and Nelis (2005); Giusti (2015) 893; Robinson (2019) 36–9. Anagrammatic signposts: Cameron (1995) 479–80; Cowan (2019) 344–6.

[47] Wills (1996) 31. On the broader history of the scholarly footnote, see Grafton (1997).

[48] E.g. Lucretius: Nethercut (2018). Catullus: Skinner (2003) 162; Gale (2012) 200. Propertius: Heslin (2018) 38–9. Horace: Heslin (2018) 44. Ovid: Curley (2013) 184, 187; Ziogas (2013) index s.v. 'Alexandrian footnote'. Statius: Kozák (2012) 84. Livy: Marincola (2005) 227–8. Philostratus: Whitmarsh (2004) 240, 242. Lucian: ní Mheallaigh (2014) 46–7. Quintus Smyrnaeus: Bär (2009) 12, 57, 77; Maciver (2012) 54–7, 64–6; Greensmith (2020) 186.

16

the footnoting which we find in Catullus and elsewhere figuratively portrays the poet 'as a kind of scholar, and portrays his allusion as a kind of learned citation', 'encod[ing] a statement of alignment with the academic-poet traditions of Callimachus and the Alexandrian library'.[49] In this, he resembles the views of earlier and later scholars: Geoffrey Kirk argues that φασίν in the Michigan Alcidamas papyrus 'smacks of post-Alexandrian scholarship'; Adrian Hollis regards *fama est* as 'an indication that we are in the world of learned poetry'; Andrew Morrison explores how 'they say' statements in Hellenistic poetry form part of the creation of a scholarly and learned narratorial persona; and Jason Nethercut treats Lucretius' use of the device as evidence of his neo-Callimacheanism.[50] Eduard Norden, moreover, distinguishes between earlier Greek and later Hellenistic/Latin appeals to tradition, arguing that only the latter suggest a reliance on a source, whereas the former are simply earnest assertions of the truth of tradition.[51] And Gian Biagio Conte, last of all, has seen in Ovid's allusive signposting the 'capacity of Alexandrianism to mirror its art in itself and to revel in its skill', a means for the poet to highlight 'the artifice and the fictional devices underlying his own poetic world'.[52] Allusive 'footnoting' is regarded as something distinctively Hellenistic, learned and artificial.

Indeed, such a view can be traced back at least as far as the Homeric scholia. When Achilles' horse Xanthus claims that he and Balius 'could run swift as the West wind's blast, which **they say** [**φασ'**] is the fleetest of all winds' (*Il.* 19.415–16), the A-scholia complain that it is 'not believable that a horse would say φασίν as if he were a man of much learning' (ἀπίθανον ἵππον λέγειν φασίν ὥσπερ ἄνδρα πολυίστορα, Σ A *Il.* 19.416–17 *Ariston.*). The underlying assumption is that this footnoting tag only befits an erudite scholar, such as Callimachus himself, who is elsewhere described with the very same adjective by Strabo (πολυίστωρ, 9.5.17 = *test.* 68 Pf.) and in a *Life of Aratus*

[49] Hinds (1998) 2.
[50] Kirk (1950) 154 (challenged by Renehan (1971) 87–9); Hollis (1992) 273; Morrison (2007a) 122, 274–5; Nethercut (2018). Cf. Faber (2017)'s argument for the Hellenistic origins of indexical memory.
[51] Norden (1957) 123–4.   [52] Conte (1986) 62.

17

(Καλλιμάχου <u>πολυίστορος</u> ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἀξιοπίστου, Achill. *vit. Arat.* 1 = *test.* 79 Pf.). Such scholarly baggage is also apparent in another scholiastic note, when the Homeric narrator claims that the eagle, '**they say**' (**φασίν**), 'has the keenest sight of all winged things under heaven' (Σ *Il.* 17.674–5 *ex.*|*D*):

> ἀξιοπίστως τὸ φασί προσέθηκεν ὡς πρὸ τοῦ ἐπιβαλέσθαι τῇ ποιήσει ἐξητακὼς ἀκριβῶς ἅπαντα. **bT** | φησὶ γὰρ Ἀριστοτέλης, ὡς ἵστησιν τοὺς νεοσσοὺς πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον ἀναγκάζων βλέπειν, καὶ ὁ δυνηθεὶς ὁρᾶν τοῦ ἀετοῦ ἐστιν υἱός, ὁ δὲ μή, ἐκβέβληται καὶ γέγονεν ἁλιαίετος. **AbT**

> It is to give a guarantee that he has added the 'they say', like someone who has verified everything in a very precise manner before introducing it in his poetry. **bT** | Aristotle also says that the eagle places its children facing the sun and makes them look at it. The one which can sustain its view is raised as a son of the eagle, but that which cannot is removed and becomes a sea-eagle. **AbT**

Here, too, the scholiast associates the use of φασί with erudite, scholarly activity, in this case the careful and precise checking of one's facts and references (ἀξιοπίστως – the other quality of the Aratean *Vita*'s Callimachus: ἀξιοπίστου, *test.* 79 Pf.). Yet it is the following citation which is especially illuminating: the scholiast refers to a passage from Aristotle's *History of Animals* to corroborate Homer's statement on the eagle's sharp-sightedness (*Hist. an.* 9.34.620a1–5). Séverine Clément-Tarantino has read this under-appreciated passage as the scholiast's appropriation of Homer's generalised φασί 'to transform it into a "reference" to a precise observation of Aristotle'.[53] Of course, this does not mean that the scholiast would have interpreted Homer as himself having intended this Aristotelian link: any ancient scholar would have been well aware of the chronological impossibilities of such a view, and we know of other cases where scholiasts provide cross references to later parallels of a specific detail, rather than to earlier sources.[54] Rather than showing that the Alexandrians regarded Homer as a scholiast *avant la lettre*, it is better to see this scholiastic comment as a reflection of Alexandrian reading practices. When coming across a φασί in a text, the scholiast's first

---

[53] Clément-Tarantino (2006a) 576 : 'pour le transformer en "référence" à une observation précise d'Aristote'.
[54] Harder (2013) 104.

18

inclination was to ask 'who says?' and find an appropriate source for the fact under discussion – not necessarily Homer's original 'source', but another piece of external evidence to confirm that this is indeed what 'people say'. The evidence of the Homeric scholia, therefore, suggests that already in antiquity φασί was considered an emblem of erudite scholarship and a spur for readers to go source-hunting. The concept of the 'Alexandrian footnote' has a considerable pedigree.

However, this lingering perception of the 'Alexandrian' nature of such 'footnoting' relies on engrained assumptions about a dichotomy between archaic/classical and Hellenistic/Roman literary cultures.[55] Yet as we noted at the outset, this is an area of considerable contestation, and any literary history (of continuity or change) must be argued for, not assumed. In the case of allusive markers, there is little evidence or argument to restrict the phenomenon a priori to Alexandria and Rome. To support the Hellenistic connection, Hinds notes how an 'Alexandrian footnote' mimics 'very precisely ... the citation style of a learned Latin commentary'. But the example he cites (Servius on *Aen*. 1.242) differs significantly from the 'Alexandrian footnote': Servius explicitly names his source (Livy), whereas poetic 'footnotes' do not.[56] Despite highlighting the presence of an allusion, they do not point to the specific source – they leave the audience to fill in the gaps themselves. Other Latinists, meanwhile, cite individual lines of Callimachus to prove the 'Alexandrian' nature of Roman 'footnoting', including the famous μῦθος δ' οὐκ ἐμός, ἀλλ' ἑτέρων ('the tale is not mine, but comes from others', *hAth*. 56) or the fragmentary τὼς ὁ γέγειος ἔχει λόγος ('so the ancient tale has it', fr. 510 Pf.) and ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν ἀείδω ('I sing nothing unattested', fr. 612 Pf.).[57] When they are taken out of context, however, it is unclear whether these lines function in the same allusive manner as Hinds' 'footnotes'. Nor is it clear why scholars should not cite earlier *comparanda*: the famous remark from

---

[55] Cf. Feeney (2021) 1 11–12 on the 'depth and rigidity of the divide' between the 'two halves of the contemporary Classics brain' (Greek and Latin).
[56] Serv. *ad Aen*. 1.242: *hi enim duo Troiam prodidisse **dicuntur** <u>secundum Livium</u>*, 'for these two [Aeneas and Antenor] **are said** to have betrayed Troy, <u>according to Livy</u>'.
[57] Fordyce (1990) 276.

Callimachus' fifth *Hymn* is closely modelled on a line from Euripides' *Melanippe the Wise* (κοὐκ ἐμὸς ὁ μῦθος, ἀλλ' ἐμῆς μητρὸς πάρα, 'the tale is not mine, but comes from my mother', fr. 484 *TrGF*),[58] and we can already find similar sentiments elsewhere in fifth-century Greece, such as Pindar's φαντὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων παλαιαί | ῥήσιες ('Ancient tales of men say', *Ol.* 7.54–5) or Euripides' παρὰ σοφῶν ἔκλυον λόγο[υ]ς ('I have heard stories from wise men', *Hypsipyle*, fr. 752g.18 *TrGF*). These phrases appear to gesture to tradition in a similar manner to Latinists' Hellenistic and Roman examples, but it would be anachronistic to call them 'Alexandrian' or to treat them as scholarly 'footnotes'. Without further investigation, there seems little immediate justification for considering these markers to be distinctively scholarly, post-classical or (just) self-consciously fictionalising.

Yet this is precisely how the phenomenon is constantly presented. Numerous scholars frame the device in terms that stress its apparent artificiality and self-consciousness: Conte's 'reflective allusion', Hinds' 'reflexive annotation', Alessandro Barchiesi's self-reflexive 'tropes of intertextuality' and Christos Tsagalis' 'meta-traditionality'.[59] Others, meanwhile, use the term 'Alexandrian footnote' as a catch-all title for every case of allusive signalling, even beyond plain appeals to tradition, making the whole process an archetype of learned and scholarly behaviour.[60] And Matthew Wright has coined 'metamythology' as an umbrella term to define 'a type of discourse which arises when mythical characters are made to talk about themselves and their own myths, or where myths are otherwise presented, in a deliberately self-conscious manner', a phenomenon which he considers specifically intellectual and destabilising, emphasising

---

[58] Cf. Stinton (1976) 66; Pironti (2009); Ypsilanti (2009). Cf. too Eur. *Hel.* 513; Pl. *Symp.* 177a4; and for other later imitations of this phrase, see Kannicht (2004) 533–4.

[59] Conte (1986) 67; Hinds (1995), cf. Whitton (2019) 8 n. 23 and *passim* ('imitative annotation'); Barchiesi (2001) 129–40; Tsagalis (2011) 221–2, followed by Spelman (2018a) 93 n. 33.

[60] E.g. Reeson (2001) 40 n. 1: he so classes *Aeolis Aeolidae* (*Her.* 11.1 ~ Eur. *Aeolus,* p. 40); and *Troasin* (*Her.* 13.135 ~ Eur. *Troades,* p. 192). Littlewood does the same for cases of poetic memory ((2006) 26, 86), appeals to ancestors ((2011) 100) and even a metapoetically loaded use of the demonstrative *ista* ((2011) 116). Cf. too Michalopoulos (2006) 34–5.

20

'the fictionality of myth'.[61] The most neutral term that I have encountered is Wills' 'external markers' of allusion,[62] but even this risks making these markers sound too detached, undermining how integral they are to the process of poetic interpretation.

In the face of such terminology, bound up with anachronistic or misleading associations, I will use a new term in this study to describe allusive signposting, namely 'indexicality'. Amid the mass of pre-existing terms, this is not a gratuitous neologism, but rather a means for us to focus on the essence of this signposting phenomenon: by looking back to the original associations of the Latin *index* ('pointer, indicator'), it foregrounds the device's signposting role.[63] Rather than seeing such marking as the self-aware technique of a terribly clever and bookish poet, this term instead focuses on the 'pointing' function of allusive markers: 'what's the point?', we are invited to ask, and 'what are we being pointed to?'

Of course, 'indexicality' itself is not a new term. It is commonly used in linguistics and the philosophy of language to refer to the manner in which linguistic and non-linguistic signs point to aspects of context (an overarching category that embraces 'deixis', a concept more familiar to Classicists).[64] The term is ultimately derived from the American philosopher Charles Peirce's trichotomy of signs, in which the 'index' is a sensory feature that denotes and draws attention to another object with which it regularly co-occurs: smoke indexes the presence of fire, dark clouds

---

[61] Wright (2005) 133–57 (quotation p. 135). Wright is keen to present this phenomenon as distinctive of Euripides' escape-tragedies, but – as he acknowledges – it is not restricted to them: he finds examples elsewhere in Euripides (Wright (2006a) 31–40, (2006b)) and already in Homer (Wright (2006b) 38 n. 35).

[62] Wills (1996) 30–1.

[63] Latin *index* derives, like *dico* ('I say'), from the proto-Indo-European root *deik-* ('show'): de Vaan (2008) 169–70. Cf. Varro *L.L.* 61 who already associated *dico* with the Greek δεικνύω, 'I show' (Keith (1992) 105–6, noting the *figura etymologica* of *dicitur index* at Ov. *Met.* 2.706).

[64] Hughes and Tracy (2015). Deixis as 'referential indexicality': Williams (2021). For applications of 'indexicality' in a Classics context, see Felson (1999a) esp. 2, (2004a) 253–4, (2004b) 368 n. 10; Bakker (2009) 122–5 ('projected indexicality'), (2017a) 103–5 ('prospective indexicality'); Felson and Parmentier (2015). Admittedly, 'indexicality' is a malformation from the Latin: 'indicality' would be more accurate, but I retain 'indexicality' given its pre-existing currency.

index impending rain and a weather vane indexes the direction of the wind.[65]

Given the term's prior usage, some caution is required before introducing it into a new field of study, but I believe that doing so here has numerous advantages. First, Peirce's index offers an apt analogy and broader context for allusive indexicality: an allusive marker signals the presence of allusion, just as smoke signals the presence of fire. In both cases, it is the frequent co-occurrence of signified and signifier which allows the connection to be perceived and understood.[66] Besides this theoretical background, the term also has valuable thematic and semantic associations in its own right. We have already noted its core etymological connection with 'pointing', but there is a further association of 'index' which makes it particularly fruitful for this study. In modern English, an 'index' most often refers to the catalogue at the back of a book which lists specific words or phrases alongside the page numbers where they can be located (as in this very monograph). Such literary road maps are an apt analogy for allusive marking: an allusive 'index' similarly points to a specific element of a larger mythical and literary whole, moving from a single passage back to the larger pathways of myth.[67]

Finally, the term 'indexicality' also has a practical benefit. It is a convenient and flexible term that can be readily adapted to different parts of speech: the noun 'index' (pl. 'indices'), adjective 'indexical', adverb 'indexically' and verb 'to index'. No other neutral word (marker, pointer, annotation, signpost) has such a degree of flexibility. The term thus allows us to discuss

---

[65] Peirce (1998) 13–17, 163–4, 291–2. For an overview and assessment of Peirce's semiotics, see Parmentier (1994) 3–22, (2016) 3–79. On his 'index': Atkin (2005); cf. Gell (1998)'s adoption of the term (esp. 13–14). Peirce's other 'signs' are the 'icon' (which formally resembles or imitates its signified object, e.g. a statue or portrait) and the 'symbol' (which represents its signified object through conventions or habits that must be culturally learned, e.g. traffic signs or punctuation marks).

[66] Strictly speaking, it might be better to regard allusive markers in Peirce's division as 'symbols' (see previous note), given their lack of a specific factual or physical connection with the objects to which they refer; the denotation is rather based on interpretation, habit and convention. But the signalling focus of Peirce's 'index' is still a useful analogy for the present study.

[67] Cf. Skempis (2016) 224 and (2017), who similarly talks of 'indexing' in relation to Greek catalogue poetry; and Burgess (2010) 212 n. 5 on the 'indexing' of epic 'paths'.

22

this phenomenon with greater nuance and precision. In what follows, I will be studying the allusive 'indexicality' of early Greek poets.

1.1.4 *The Path Ahead*

As we have seen, the 'Alexandrian footnote' and other indices of allusion are frequently considered the preserve of Hellenistic and Roman poetic cultures, one of the key attributes that distinguish archaic Greece from later centuries. But a close inspection of many early Greek examples reveals a more complex picture. From Homer onwards, indices were already employed to signpost allusion and to position a poet against their larger tradition. From the very start of the (visible) Greek tradition, indexicality was a well-established phenomenon.

Thankfully, this argument is supported by recent scholarship on early Greek poetry which has already begun to take significant steps in this direction. Archaic epic and lyric have long been read in self-conscious and metapoetic terms.[68] But in more recent years, several scholars have already suggested specific moments in these texts that can be read as knowing indices of allusion, especially in epic. A selective review of examples may help set the scene: stories are explicitly acknowledged as familiar to an audience, as when Circe advises Odysseus in the *Odyssey* to avoid the path of the 'Argo **known to all**' (Ἀργὼ **πᾶσι μέλουσα**, *Od*. 12.70), highlighting Homer's debts to, and divergences from, the Argonautic saga,[69] or when Odysseus similarly designates Oedipus' woes and crimes as '**known to men**' (ἀνάπυστα . . . ἀνθρώποισιν, *Od*. 11.274).[70] The transfer of specific individuals' property appears to signal cases of allusive role-playing: 'in borrowing Aphrodite's girdle' to seduce Zeus in *Iliad* 14, Hera

---

[68] Homer: Macleod (1983); Thalmann (1984) 157–84; Richardson (1990) 167–96; Goldhill (1991) 1–68; Ford (1992); Segal (1994) 85–183; H. S. Mackie (1997); Saïd (1998) 95–131; de Jong (2006). Lyric (esp. Pindar): Pavlou (2008); Maslov (2015); Phillips (2016); Spelman (2018a). Generally, see Nünlist (1998); Guez et al. (forthcoming).

[69] Currie (2016) 143. On *the Odyssey* and Argonautic traditions: Meuli (1921); Crane (1987); Danek (1998) 252–7; West (2005b); Alden (2017) 36–7 n. 93.

[70] Barker and Christensen (2008) 24, (2020) 165.

23

'metapoetically dons Aphrodite's mantle', replaying the love goddess' seduction of Paris and Anchises (*Il.* 14.188–223),[71] while Patroclus adopts both Achilles' armour and persona in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 16.130–44),[72] just as the hero's son Neoptolemus symbolically succeeds his father by taking his armour in the *Little Iliad*.[73] Epic characters' tears have also been read as presaging future woes which only an audience could know from the larger literary tradition,[74] while catalogues too appear to have been loaded sites for incorporating and contesting other traditions.[75] Even the whole divine framework of Greek literature seems to involve a significant indexical element: what is 'fated' is often shorthand for what is (or is at least claimed to be) traditional; counterfactuals explore narrative alternatives that go against tradition; major gods act as figures for the poet; and heroes are often saved because they are 'destined' to play a role in future episodes of the tradition.[76]

In addition, other specific indices have been identified in these early texts, including cases of echo and family relations. For the former, we could cite the *Homeric Hymn to Pan*, which pointedly 'echoes' a famous nightingale simile from the *Odyssey* (*Hh.* 19.16–18 ~ *Od.* 19.518–21);[77] the 'echoing cicada' of the Hesiodic *Aspis*, which recalls its earlier appearance in Hesiod's *Works and Days* (ἠχέτα τέττιξ, *Scut.* 393 ~ *Op.* 582);[78] and the presence of 'Echo' in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae*, which self-consciously tropes the dramatist's extensive rewriting of

---

[71] Currie (2016) 152. Cf. Faulkner (2008) 33; Brillet-Dubois (2011) 111; Currie (2012) 556.

[72] Currie (2012) 556, (2016) 27 n. 167. Patroclus' Achillean role-playing: Burgess (2009) 75–83.

[73] Anderson (1997) 38–48; §iv.2.3 below.   [74] Currie (2016) 105–46.

[75] Sammons (2010). Cf. Skempis (2016) 224; Barker and Christensen (2020) 131–71.

[76] Fate in epic: Eberhard (1923); Pestalozzi (1945) 40; Nagy (1979) 40 §17 n. 2, 81–2 §25 n. 2; Schein (1984) 62–4; Janko (1992) 6, 371; Morrison (1997) 283–5; Wong (2002); Currie (2006) 7, (2016) 66; Marks (2008) 6–7; Sarischoulis (2008); Tsagalis (2011) 226; Scodel (2017); in tragedy: e.g. Eur. *Hel.* 1676–7 (μόρσιμον, ~ *Od.* 4.563–9); Eur. *Or.* 1656–7 (μοῖρα, ~ Pind. *Nem.* 7.40–7, *Pae.* 6.110–20). Of course, fate is not solely a metapoetic/indexical phenomenon: e.g. Dietrich (1965); Flores (2015). Counterfactuals: Morrison (1992b), (1992a); Louden (1993); Grethlein (2006a) 269–83; Bouxsein (2020). Gods as figures for the poet in epic: Marks (2008) 132–46; Ready (2012) esp. 74–81; Russell (2013) 140–252; Loney (2014); Currie (2016) 117; in tragedy: Easterling (1993). Divine rescue: Marks (2010).

[77] Thomas (2011) 169; cf. Germany (2005) 199–203.   [78] Bing (2012) 186–7.

24

Euripides' *Andromeda* (*Thesm.* 1056–97).[79] As for family relations, we may note the intertextual relationship between specific *Homeric Hymns* (the sibling rivalry of Hermes and Apollo in *HhHerm.*; the father–son relation of Pan and Hermes in *Hh.* 19);[80] Aristophanes' figuring of Philocles' *Pandionis* tetralogy as a derivative 'descendant' of Sophocles' *Tereus* (Ar. *Av.* 281–3);[81] and Theognis' substitution of the Hesiodic Αἰδώς ('Respect') with her daughter Σωφροσύνη ('Restraint'), marking his debts to his Hesiodic 'parent text' (Thgn. 1135–50 ~ *Op.* 200).[82] In Attic tragedy more generally, Isabelle Torrance has also argued for a wide range of 'metapoetically loaded terms' which are 'used as triggers for audience recognition of novelties or continuations in relation to earlier sources': δεύτερος ('second'), δισσός ('double'), καινός ('new') and μῦθος ('myth'/'story').[83]

These recent approaches give an idea of how fruitful a fuller exploration of allusive marking in early Greek poetry may prove to be. Yet despite these first steps, no previous scholar has offered a comprehensive study of allusive marking in any period, let alone early Greek poetry. Individual examples are normally adduced in support of a specific argument for a specific allusion, which leaves the larger picture remarkably hazy. The scholar who has offered the fullest catalogue to date is Bruno Currie, who concludes his discussion of 'pregnant tears' with a list of some allusive markers in Homer and Attic tragedy, focused primarily on 'poetic memory'.[84] This forms part of his broader argument for continuities in allusive practice across Mesopotamian, Greek and Roman literature.[85]

In this book, I intend to provide a more holistic and analytical study of these allusive markers across archaic Greek poetry: I will

---

[79] Cf. Austin and Olson (2004) 321–6; Phillips (2015).
[80] Thomas (2011) 168, (2017) 78–81, (2020) 13–20.
[81] Sommerstein (1987) 215; Wright (2016) 99–100. [82] Hunter (2014) 138–9.
[83] Torrance (2013) 183. On the marking of novelty in tragedy, cf. McDermott (1987), (1991); Cole (2008); Torrance (2013) 222–7.
[84] Currie (2016) 139–44, cf. 26–7. Spelman (2018a) also offers a few hints for Pindar and lyric (general index, s.vv. '*dicitur* motif', 'metatraditionality'); cf. too Rawles (2018) 43, 56–8; Feeney (2021) 1 11–12.
[85] Currie (2016) 25, 38, 188. My arguments complement Currie's own on allusive marking, although I see more diachronic development in early Greek allusion generally (§1.2) and I am not interested here in allusion to Near Eastern traditions (§1.2.2).

25

explore a wider range of examples, incorporating both hexameter and lyric traditions, and I will study them in greater depth, examining their purpose and function, as well as their development across time. I have chosen to focus on the development of three specific indices of allusion in archaic epic and lyric poetry (including iambus, elegy and *melos*), from Homer to Pindar.[86] The three I have selected represent the indices most commonly identified in literature of later times: first, appeals to tradition and report (the 'Alexandrian footnote' proper); second, the allusive force of characters', narrators' and audiences' memories and knowledge; and third, the manipulation of temporality to evoke both former and future literary events. We have already seen all three in Phoenix's introduction to his Meleager exemplum, but I will demonstrate that they are all deeply embedded in our earliest archaic Greek poetry.

In each chapter, I will explore these indices' comparable and complementary usages. Due to limitations of space, I cannot cover every example, but the impression I have gained is that a very high percentage of examples of the language of hearsay, memory and time are indexical – a far higher percentage than one might initially suspect.[87] Rather than offer a dry catalogue, I will focus on a selection that illuminates the range of ways in which each index was used in archaic epic and lyric. Every reader will no doubt find some examples more compelling than others. Indeed, we may think of indexicality as a scalar issue – some cases seem to me undeniable, while others may be more open to debate – but the latter are still worth exploring since they open up a range of interesting further possibilities (an issue to which I will return: §III.3). Nevertheless, taken as a whole, the evidence and interpretations that I advance here will show that all three of these indices were an integral part of the literary tradition from the very start.

---

[86] I use 'lyric' throughout in its broad sense: Campbell (1982a) xiv–xxix; Budelmann (2009a) 2–7. I recognise the anachronism of this usage and that it risks blurring the significant differences between these different genres, but it remains a convenient catch-all category, especially to oppose this material to 'epic'.

[87] Of course, there are limit cases that we can certainly rule out: e.g. when epic characters simply 'remember' general nouns like 'food' or 'sleep' (cf. §III.2.5) or when φασί is used to report the speech of a specific named subject like the Trojans and their allies (*Il.* 9.234; cf. §II.2.4). I do not consider such cases to be indexical.

26

Before we turn to each index in turn, I will first outline my methodological approach to allusion in archaic Greek poetry as a framework for this study. This is a controversial topic, and one that raises some different questions to those which face scholars of Hellenistic and Roman texts. It is thus worth spending some time addressing the issues involved.

I.2 Frameworks for Allusion in Archaic Greek Poetry

The earliest extant Greek texts drew on a rich tradition of prior poetry and myth. Already in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, we find a keen awareness of numerous mythological traditions that lie beyond the scope of their immediate narratives. The exploits of former heroes, the wider Trojan war tradition and the events of other mythical sagas repeatedly punctuate both Homeric poems, as the narrator and his characters recall past and future events, often very obliquely.[88] Lyric poets, too, frequently mention and narrate a whole host of myths, many of which – we know – had already been treated by their peers and epic forebears. As far back as our evidence lets us see, Greek poets were deeply immersed in a larger tradition of poetry and myth.

How we account for, describe and analyse early Greek poetry's engagement with this tradition, however, is a matter of considerable debate, centred around a number of key theoretical questions: How 'oral' was archaic Greek epic and lyric poetry, and what do we even mean by this word? To what extent could 'oral' works refer (or be understood to refer) to other specific 'texts' (be they 'oral' or 'written'), as opposed to the larger trappings of the poetic tradition: *topoi*, formulae and generic features? How and when did poems become fixed enough (in memory or in writing) to be recognisable entities in their own right, rather than just evanescent instantiations of tradition? To what extent can we chart a development from a primarily 'oral' to an increasingly 'literate' poetic culture between the eighth and fifth centuries BCE? And finally, how should we deal with the fact that we have such limited access to the whole range of

---

[88] The bibliography is vast. E.g. *Iliad*: Kullmann (1960); Alden (2000); Radif (2002); Grethlein (2006a) 334–40. *Odyssey*: Danek (1998); Alden (2017). The developed formulaic systems on display in many passing references imply well-established traditions: Schein (2002) 88.

poetic texts and traditions that once populated the literary map of archaic and classical Greece?

These are complex questions, with no easy answers. Yet how we address them is of crucial importance for any study of early Greek allusion, especially when dealing with the earliest and most controversial case of all: Homeric epic.[89] The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are products of a long-established oral tradition, comparable to those found in many other parts of the world, but we encounter them today in a fixed, written form. How we reconcile these two facts is a constant scholarly dilemma. To make matters worse, we do not even know when or how these texts became fixed in a form similar to that in which we read them today: were they dictated by an oral bard, gradually crystallised through centuries of (re-) performance or carefully crafted by an oral poet who was able to take full advantage of the nascent technology of writing?[90] Certainty is impossible, but I am inclined to suppose an early recording of both Homeric poems by either dictation or a writing poet; I conceive of each as a poetically designed unity; and I use 'Homer' to refer to the constructed author of each poem, even if there are grave uncertainties regarding the historicity of this figure.

In the face of these challenges, two major approaches have emerged in modern scholarship that offer alternative (but not

---

[89] The clearest discussions of these issues are Burgess (2009) 56–71, a revised version of Burgess (2006), and Currie (2016) 1–38, 259–62. Other helpful discussions of allusion and intertextuality in archaic epic include Janko (1982) 225–8; Edwards (1985a) 5–9; Pucci (1987) 26–30; Cairns (2001a) 35–48; Currie (2006); Tsagalis (2011), (2014a) 240–4; Bakker (2013) 157–69, with Kelly (2015c) 679–81; Ormand (2014) 11–15; Edmunds (2016); Stocking (2017) 19–22; Ready (2019) 13–97; Barker and Christensen (2020) 11–43; Stelow (2020) 3–13; Thomas (2020) 8–20.

[90] Useful overviews: Ford (1997); Saïd (1998) 39–44; Foley (2011) 848–50; Tsagalis (2020). The major theories, none without problems, are: (1) Dictation (variously from the eighth to sixth centuries): Lord (1953); Janko (1992) 37–8, (1998); Reece (2005); Teodorsson (2006); Foley (2011); Jensen (2011); Ready (2015). (2) Gradual crystallisation through performance, resulting in performance multiforms: Nagy (1996a) 107–52, (1996b) 29–112, (2014), (2020); González (2013) 15–175. (3) A poet who exploits the new technology of writing to develop a text of extraordinary length: Parry (1966); Lohmann (1970) 211–12, (1988) 76–7; Lloyd-Jones (1981); Garvie (1994) 16 with n. 51; Pöhlmann (1994) 11; Reichel (1998); Fowler (2004a) 230–1; Rösler (2011); West (2011a) 10–14; Rutherford (2013) 32 with n. 104; Kullmann (2015) 105; Friedrich (2019). For criticism of Nagy's evolutionary model: Finkelberg (2000); Pelliccia (2003); Graziosi (2010) esp. 23; Currie (2016) 15–16.

28

incompatible) frameworks for understanding Homer's engagement with the wider poetic tradition: 'traditional referentiality' and 'neoanalysis'. Since I will exploit elements of both in this study, it is worth touching on each before I go on to outline my own approach to early Greek allusion.

The first, traditional referentiality, foregrounds the oral background of the Homeric poems and the larger 'resonance' embedded in their structural elements.[91] Scholars who favour this approach interpret individual formulae, type scenes and story patterns against all their other appearances in the tradition, unearthing a further connotative or immanent meaning which would have been familiar to attuned ancient audiences.[92] In every instance, this immanent meaning raises expectations in an audience that can be fulfilled or thwarted, and departures from the norm are poetically meaningful. For example, when Aeneas lifts a stone to throw at Achilles in *Iliad* 20.285–6, he performs an act that usually leads to a decisive victory. For a brief and transitory moment, Homer raises the possibility that the Trojan might defeat the Greek hero.[93] Even a single word can bear such an associative resonance: μῆνις, the opening word of the *Iliad*, is traditionally restricted to gods in early Greek epic, except for four Iliadic occasions on which it refers to Achilles' wrath. For an audience familiar with this traditional usage, the poem's very first word marks the hero's superhuman status and special connection with the divine.[94] On a larger scale, too, words and motifs can be packed with a specifically generic resonance, evoking the traditional trappings of one particular genre (such as choral lyric, epigram, hymn, iambus, lament or wedding song), which can

---

[91] Foley (1991), (1999), (2002); Graziosi and Haubold (2005) 48–56; Kelly (2007a); Barker and Christensen (2008), (2020); Barker (2011); Foley and Arft (2015); Aluja (2018); Ward (2019); Arft (2021), (2022).

[92] Cf. Lord (1960) 148 on 'supra-meaning': an 'aura of meaning which has been put there by all the contexts in which it has occurred in the past'.

[93] Kelly (2007a) 4, 294–5; cf. Anderson (1997) 70 n. 17. Compare too Purves (2019) on gestural repetition and variation in Homer.

[94] Sacks (1987) 3–4. Achilles frequently disrupts traditional referential patterns: cf. *Il.* 1.7, where Achilles dislodges ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Agamemnon from his usual verse-end position, reflecting 'the political, hierarchic and conceptual struggle' between the pair: Ward (2021) 234–5 n. 58.

then be manipulated and redeployed in other contexts.[95] By focusing on the rich pool of tradition, this 'algorithm of *pars pro toto*' downplays the possibility of specific referentiality in early Greek poetry, instead favouring typological 'recurrence' over pointed 'repetition'.[96] In its most extreme form, it can even deny the possibility of direct and specific allusion outright, although this – as we shall see – is a step too far.[97] Nevertheless, traditional referentiality is an extremely useful framework, which rescues the formula from accusations of dry banality and highlights the rich associative depths of the epic language.

The second dominant approach of contemporary Homeric criticism, neoanalysis, foregrounds the textuality of the Homeric poems and postulates other fixed 'texts' as specific sources for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.[98] Scholars of this approach reconstruct these lost texts on the basis of internal evidence within each poem, as well as later external sources, such as the Homeric scholia, prose mythographers and surviving information about the Epic Cycle. In the past, these putative 'texts' were considered to be written works,[99] but more recent neoanalysts have revised this view to embrace the idea of the poet interacting with 'fixed' oral texts.[100] A common argumentative strategy is that of 'motif transference': neoanalysts identify a motif known from later sources whose employment appears better suited and contextualised than its application in Homer, concluding that the Homeric instance is secondary, while the other account is primary and reflects a pre-Homeric source. For example, when

[95] Homer and choral lyric: Richardson (2011); Steiner (2017); Murnaghan (2018). Homer and epigram: Elmer (2005). Homer and hymn: Hunter (2012) 91–7. Homer and iambus: Suter (1993); Steinrück (2008); Lavigne (2017). Homer and lament: Tsagalis (2004). Homer and wedding song: Karanika (2013).

[96] Foley and Arft (2015) 82–5; cf. Arft (2021).

[97] Foley and Arft (2015) 83–4, 95. Cf. already Nagy (1979) 42: 'when we are dealing with the traditional poetry of the Homeric (and Hesiodic) compositions, it is not justifiable to claim that a passage in any text can refer to another passage in another text'. For discussion, see §1.2.1 below.

[98] Useful surveys: Clark (1986); Kullmann (1991), (2015); Willcock (1997); Davies (2016) 3–24; Gainsford (2016) 104–9; Rengakos (forthcoming).

[99] An extreme case is Schadewaldt's reconstruction of a hypothetical pre-Homeric *Memnonis* written in four books of twenty scenes ((1965) 155–202), a reconstruction treated as fact by Kullmann (1984) 316.

[100] Edwards (1985b) 219–20; Torres-Guerra (1995) 13–14; Dowden (1996) 47–8; Currie (2016) 12–22.

30

Thetis laments over Achilles after Patroclus' death in *Iliad* 18 (*Il.* 18.1–147), many scholars discern a proleptic foreshadowing of Achilles' own funeral, an episode familiar to us from the *Odyssey* (24.43–64), Cyclic *Aethiopis* (arg. 3a, 4a *GEF*) and other later sources (e.g. Pind. *Isth.* 8.57–8; Quint. Smyrn. 3.525–787), but which they suppose was already established in pre-Homeric poetry; Homer's evocation of this scene reinforces the impression of Achilles' impending demise.[101] Through such arguments as these, neoanalysts enrich our appreciation of Homeric poetry and the creative and allusive uses that Homer made of his poetic tradition.[102]

These two approaches are often set in opposition,[103] but they are far from incompatible in practice: typical motifs and transferred motifs are not mutually exclusive. Scholars of both camps readily acknowledge this compatibility, even if they largely refrain from pursuing it themselves.[104] In many ways, the theoretical debates that arise between these two 'schools' are akin to those found in later Latin literature, as to whether one should prioritise allusion to specific texts or evocation of generic *topoi*.[105] And as in Roman poetry, so too here, we can gain a fuller picture of Homer's 'allusive art' by focusing on his evocation of both the typological and the specific. In this study, I thus draw on both of these approaches,

[101] Pestalozzi (1945) 26, 32, 42; Kakridis (1949) 65–75; Burgess (2009) 83–5; Currie (2016) 119–26; Horn (2021). Cf. Lowenstam (2008) 33–5 for the same parallel in vase painting. The Iliadic motif transference may be signposted by Achilles' claim that he honours Patroclus 'equal to my own life' (ἶσον ἐμῇ κεφαλῇ, 18.82).

[102] Such neoanalytical readings can already be found among ancient readers of Homer: see e.g. Hdt. 2.116.1 (Homer rejects an alternative tradition about Helen as less fitting but shows he knows it: Currie (2020), (2021b)) and Strabo 1.2.40 (Homer gave Circe magical powers on the model of Medea, παρὰ τὴν Μήδειαν: Hunter (2015) 15–16 n. 47).

[103] E.g. differing interpretations of Διὸς ... βουλή (*Il.* 1.5): Kullmann (1955), (1956a); Allan (2008a); Currie (2016) 1–3; Edmunds (2016). The debate is especially visible between two Oxford scholars, Adrian Kelly and Bruno Currie: e.g. on *Il.* 8.78–112 (Kelly (2006); Currie (2016) 247–53) and *Il.* 18.1–147 (Kelly (2012); Currie (2016) 255–8).

[104] Kelly (2007a) 12; Currie (2016) 8. Kullmann (1984) offers an early and limited attempt at reconciliation; cf. too Willcock (1997) 175; Barker and Christensen (2020) 43; Rengakos (2020).

[105] Cf. Currie (2016) 9, citing Hinds (1998) 34–47. Compare too Latinists' distinction of a 'code/genre-model' (*modello-codice/genere*) and 'example-model' (*modello-esemplare*): Conte (1981), (1986) 31; Conte and Barchiesi (1989) 93–6; Barchiesi (2015) xvi, 69–93.

taking account of archaic poetry's oral, typological background as well as its potential for more specific, pointed reference. In this, I am indebted above all to Jonathan Burgess' framework of 'oral, intertextual neoanalysis', a sophisticated remodelling of neoanalysis within an oralist frame.[106] When dealing with the lost pre-Homeric poetic context, Burgess detects allusion not to specific pre-Homeric poems, but rather to pre-existing mythological traditions, the core elements of a story that would be familiar from every telling.[107] This is a small, but significant difference. Not only does it avoid the implausibility of reconstructing specific fluid-yet-fixed oral poems,[108] but it also fits with the Homeric poems' own presentation of the fluidity of epic song as a series of interconnected paths (οἶμαι), from which one can start at any point (ἁμόθεν, *Od*. 1.10).[109] The internal songs of the *Odyssey*, after all, are defined not as discrete poems but rather in terms of their mythological content: the woeful return of the Achaeans (Ἀχαιῶν νόστον | λυγρόν, *Od*. 1.326–7), the quarrel of Odysseus and Achilles (νεῖκος Ὀδυσσῆος καὶ Πηλεΐδεω Ἀχιλῆος, *Od*. 8.75), and the construction of the wooden horse (ἵππου κόσμον . . . δουρατέου, *Od*. 8.492–3). Given that we lack any direct access to the host of earlier pre-Homeric stories, it is methodologically far more responsible to follow Burgess in talking of Homer's engagement with such mythological traditions, rather than putative,

---

[106] Burgess (2006), (2009); cf. Reece (2011)'s 'neoanalytic approach with an oral twist'; Danek (2016)'s 'oral traditional intertextuality'. Nagy's concept of 'cross-referencing' between 'traditions of composition-in-performance' (e.g. (2003) 7–19; (2015)) is vaguely comparable but lacks the theoretical sophistication of Burgess' approach.

[107] See already Willcock (1983) 485 n. 8 ('mythological material'). Comparable are discussions of 'song traditions' rather than specific 'poems': Nagy (1990a) 79; Tsagalis (2008) 67–8.

[108] Currie's example of this phenomenon is unconvincing: he cites the first nine lines of the fourth and eighteenth *Homeric Hymns* (both to Hermes) as independent instantiations of the very same poem (Currie (2006) 2, (2016) 14). But it is not really fair to describe them as such, given the huge disparity in their lengths (580 and 12 lines respectively), and the complete lack of a narrative in the shorter poem. Nor do we have any reason to suppose that the verbal similarity is the result of oral recomposition, rather than later written excerption (cf. West (2003a) 4–5, 18). Even more implausible is the idea of poets recycling 'stable' and static poems that have been memorised word-for-word (e.g. Montanari (2012) 6), an approach which is difficult to reconcile with comparative evidence of other oral traditions, where even 'memorised' or 'reperformed' songs are not repeated verbatim (Finnegan (1977) 76–7); cf. Martin (2013).

[109] Ford (1992) 40–8, 67–72. Cf. ἐξ οὗ, *Il*. 1.6; τῶν ἔν γε . . . ἄειδε, *Od*. 1.339; ἔνθεν ἑλών, *Od*. 8.500.

32

isolated and specific poems.[110] I shall outline and exemplify this approach below (§1.2.1), before addressing the further issues of our limited evidence (§1.2.2), the transition from such 'mythological' to full 'textual' intertextuality (§1.2.3) and broader questions of audience and context (§1.2.4).

1.2.1 *Mythological Intertextuality*

Crucial to Burgess' case for an 'oral, intertextual neoanalysis' is the recognition that there are limits to the formulaic nature of early Greek poetry. As he remarks, 'typology does not overwhelm the distinctiveness of individual characters and their stories'; otherwise, 'a myth-teller would be free to gather together a new collocation of motifs every time the story is told. Achilles could wear a lion skin and brandish a club, Odysseus could command the Argo, and Agamemnon could put out his eyes after marrying his mother.'[111] Such a humorous counterfactual highlights the limits of typology, limits which were already recognised in antiquity. Aristotle remarks in the *Poetics* that one cannot break up 'transmitted stories' (παρειλημμένους μύθους), such as Clytemnestra's death at Orestes' hands or Eriphyle's at Alcmaeon's (Arist. *Poet.* 14.1453b.22–6). Individual myths and stories clearly contained a steady core of specific elements which did not depend on any particular instantiation. It is to specific motifs of this 'stable skeleton of narrative',[112] Burgess contends, that other songs and performances could allude, even within the traditional and typological context of early Greek epic. For archaic epic, some of these mythological traditions would have doubtless been epic in form;

---

[110] Even hardcore neoanalysts occasionally slip into this mode of discourse: Currie (2012) 574–5 n. 163 claims that a 'Prometheus narrative [not 'poem'!] of some textual fixity seems to lie behind Hes. *Th.* and *WD*'. His earlier claim that 'it does not matter that there is no single definitive narration within the Dumuzi-Inana corpus' ((2012) 559 n. 90) might also make us question the need to reconstruct individual Greek epics.

[111] Burgess (2006) 155–8 (quotation p. 156); cf. Scodel (2002) 24: 'The most famous events associated with a hero . . . create a core heroic personality', which 'bards could reduplicate . . . in different situations'. As M. Ward notes (*per litteras*), these limits are also apparent in characters' epithets. The names of Achilles and Odysseus are metrically identical, but each character has his own distinctive formular system: 'Odysseus is never πόδας ὠκύς, and Achilles is never πολύμητις.'

[112] Lord (1960) 99.

33

indeed, as Tsagalis notes, the shared performance context 'would have channelled mythical allusion towards other epic songs performed *under similar conditions*'.[113] Yet they would have also embraced other media, including non-epic storytelling, other kinds of poetry and artistic representations.[114] The plausibility of this model is reinforced by comparative oral traditions in which we can identify similar allusions to other stories.[115]

Of course, despite the limits of typology, mythological traditions were never entirely static and unchanging, and some have questioned whether any definitive and stable version of past myths ever existed.[116] If multiple conflicting versions were in circulation, even within the very same poem, and if poets were free to add innovative elements to mythical *paradeigmata* to fit their immediate contexts, how can we determine to which version of a myth poets might be alluding in any given case, or even which of many potential versions their original audiences might have been familiar with or considered 'canonical'?[117] This is a pressing concern, and one which is too often glossed over by neoanalysts. Yet one must equally be wary of exaggerating the significance of such discrepancies in the archaic mythological record. Where differences occur, they tend to be minor and superficial for the overall narrative trajectory, and it is often only the instigator of an action which changes, not the action itself: Thetis is still given to Peleus, whether by the gods (*Il.* 18.84–5), Zeus (*Il.* 18.432) or Hera (*Il.* 24.60); Coroebus, a suitor of Cassandra, is still killed, whether by Neoptolemus (in the 'majority version', ὁ πλείων λόγος) or Diomedes (according to the poet 'Lescheos', Λέσχεως: Paus. 10.27.1 = *Il. Parv.* fr. 24 *GEF*); Polyxena still dies, whether

---

[113] Tsagalis (2011) 232 (original emphasis).

[114] Cf. Gainsford (2016) 57–63. See e.g. Ready (2014) on Homeric allusion to folktale and Finkelberg (2014) on the multichannel transmission of myth.

[115] Allusion in Serbian Christian epics: Danek (2002) 13–15, (2010) 230–3, (2016); Currie (2016) 5–6. Cf. §1.2.4 n. 243.

[116] E.g. Andersen (1990), who contends that 'even basic mythological facts are represented differently by different characters according to context' in the *Iliad* (p. 40) and argues from this that 'there never was a "standard" version that the poet could rely on and the audience keep in mind. Inside as well as outside of the *Iliad*, "facts" seem to have been rather fluctuating' (p. 41). Cf. Andersen (1998). For such fluidity in vase depictions: Lowenstam (1992) 189–91.

[117] On Homeric innovation: Willcock (1964), (1977); Braswell (1971). Contrast Combellack (1950), (1976); Slatkin (1991) 115–22; Nagy (1996b) 113–46; Dué (2002) 83–9. Holoka (1973) offers a useful survey of earlier scholarship.

34

through wounds inflicted by Odysseus and Diomedes in the sack of Troy (*Cypria* fr. 34 *PEG*) or as a sacrifice on Achilles' tomb (*Il. Pers.* arg. 4c *GEF*); and Astyanax is still thrown from the city walls, whether by Neoptolemus (*Il. Parv.* fr. 29 *GEF*) or Odysseus (*Il. Pers.* arg. 4a *GEF*).[118] In all four of these cases (Thetis' marriage and the deaths of Coroebus, Polyxena and Astyanax), we have a fixed, unalterable event of the Trojan war narrative, even if its precise details varied. As Burgess has remarked, 'While it would be mistaken to insist that the details of any one manifestation of a myth were always present in every telling of that myth, it is also clear that Greek myth was remarkably stable in the presentation of the sequences of major actions that constituted any given story.'[119] The same view was also apparently dominant in antiquity. When Sophocles has Agamemnon die in the bath (*El.* 445) rather than at the table as in Homer (*Od.* 4.535), the scholia dismiss the inconsistency (Σ S. *El.* 446):

ἤρκει γὰρ τὰ ὅλα συμφωνεῖν τῷ πράγματι· τὰ γὰρ κατὰ μέρος ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ἕκαστος ὡς βούλεται πραγματεύσασθαι, εἰ μὴ τὸ πᾶν βλάπτῃ τῆς ὑποθέσεως.

For it is enough if the general lines of the stories agree. As for the details, each <poet> has the licence to treat them as he likes, provided he does not do damage to the story at large.[120]

Whether Agamemnon was killed in the bath or at a feast, it ultimately does not matter: he died either way, and that is the fixed element of the myth.[121] It is thus possible, with appropriate care and caution, to reconstruct the core details of a mythological narrative, what Kullmann would call a *Faktenkanon* or Burgess

---

[118] On the Astyanax myth and its reception: Kern (1918); Phillippo (2007). Some later accounts have Scamandrius (= Astyanax?) survive and found a new Troy or other settlements, sometimes alongside Aeneas' son Ascanius, but this version may simply reflect later epichoric foundation narratives (Andersen (1998) 139 n. 6; Erskine (2001) 102) or echo an earlier tradition in which Hector had two separate sons, Astyanax (who was killed) and Scamandrius (who survived): Smith (1981) 53–8; cf. Anaxicrates *BNJ* 307 F1. In that case, *Il.* 6.402–3 would acknowledge and smooth over Homer's assimilation of the pair.

[119] Burgess (2009) 5; cf. Ford (1992) 40.   [120] Tr. Nünlist (2009) 179.

[121] On questions of poetic licence: Nünlist (2009) 174–84. For an alternative view: Σ *Ol.* 4.31b; Σ *Isth.* 1.15b; Eratosthenes (fr. 1 A, 19). But as Nünlist remarks (p. 180), Strabo's polemic against Eratosthenes (1.2.3) is 'more representative of the ancient outlook'.

35

a *fabula*, a constellation of fixed narrative events with which the Homeric and other later poems could allusively engage.[122]

Given the typological oral environment of early Greek epic, we should largely expect allusions to such *fabulae* to be based around repeated key themes and motifs, rather than extensive verbal repetition. The foremost example of such motif-based allusion is the *Iliad*'s evocation of the 'death of Achilles' *fabula*, which lies at the heart of the second half of the poem and has been extensively studied by numerous scholars. The allusion is not based primarily on verbal correspondence, but rather on large-scale motif transference, as a whole series of episodes from the *fabula* of Achilles' death are redeployed in another context.[123] On a larger scale, moreover, the whole myth of the Trojan war appears to be constructed around an extensive chain of such interlocking *fabulae*: the sack of Andromache's Thebe foreshadows and parallels that of Troy; Paris' return from Sparta to Troy with Helen is mirrored by the itinerary of Menelaus' own *nostos* after reclaiming his wife; and the whole war is framed by a chilling pair of human sacrifices, Iphigenia's sacrifice at Aulis (*Cypr.* arg. 8 *GEF*) paralleling Polyxena's at Troy (*Il. Pers.* arg. 4c *GEF*): in both cases, a king's unmarried daughter is sacrificed as the prelude to the Greek fleet's departure.[124]

As another example of how to conceive of such *fabula*-based allusion, we could cite the famous 'Nestor's cup' inscription, our earliest known case of Greek intertextuality. A Rhodian *kotyle*, discovered in a late eighth-century Ischian cremation burial, bears the following inscription in Euboean script (*SEG* 26.1114 = *CEG* 454):

---

[122] *Faktenkanon*: Kullmann (1960) 12–13; Dowden (1996) 51–2. *Fabula*: Burgess (2005) 119, (2006) 160, (2009) 27, (2017a) 53–5, drawing on a term from narratology: de Jong (2004) 31–2, (2014) 38–9, 76–7; Bal (2017) 154–87. Cf. too Lévi-Strauss (1955), (1958) 233–6: 'mythemes', the 'constituent units' of a mythic narrative; Marks (2008) 6: 'certain broad "facts"'; Lamari (2010) 135–6: 'mythical megatext'; Barker and Christensen (2020) 38: 'more-or-less fixed ideas'. Even those sceptical of the extent of allusion in Homeric poetry accept that 'there were elements in the tradition which could not be tampered with, and that would constitute a frame of reference for poet and audience alike' (Andersen (1998) 141).

[123] See Burgess (2009) 72–97 and Horn (2021), both with earlier bibliography. Compare too *Iliad* 1's redeployment of the Iphigenia *fabula*: Nelson (2022).

[124] Thebe/Troy: Zarker (1965); Anderson (1997) 56–7. Paris/Menelaus: Solez (2019). Iphigenia/Polyxena: Anderson (1990) 59–61. Cf. too the parallel between the Trojan horse and the ships with which Paris first sailed to Sparta: Anderson (1990) 20–6.

36

Νέστορός : ἐ[ἔν τ]ι :[125] εὔποτ[ον] : ποτέριον.
hὸς δ᾽ ἂν τõδε πίἔσι : ποτἔρί[õ] : αὐτίκα κἔνον
híμερος hαιρἔσει : καλλιστἔ[φά]νõ : Ἀφροδίτἔς.

Nestor had a cup that was good to drink from; but the desire of fair-crowned Aphrodite will immediately seize whoever drinks from *this* cup.

These verses, composed of a likely iambic trimeter and two dactylic hexameters (a metrical mixture typical of parody),[126] set up a humorous and pointed opposition between archaic epic and the world of the symposium.[127] The humble, small clay *kotyle* that bears the inscription is contrasted with the epic Nestor's large and elaborately wrought drinking vessel familiar to us from the *Iliad* (*Il.* 11.632–7). The precise nature of the contrast depends on how we supplement the first line, a lacuna which continues to vex scholars. With ε[ἰμ]ί ('I am the cup of Nestor'), the *kotyle* identifies itself as Nestor's cup, a humorous incongruity given its small scale and modest nature.[128] With ἐ[ἔν τ]ι ('Nestor had a cup'), the *kotyle* explicitly differentiates itself from its epic predecessor, self-consciously aligning

---

[125] I follow Wachter (2006) in printing Heubeck's imperfect ἐ[ἔν τ]ι (Heubeck (1979) 113–14, *iam* ἐ[ν τ]ι Page (1956) 96) in place of ε[ἰμ]ί. The latter has the best epigraphic parallels (e.g. Hansen (1976) 30) but has been forcefully challenged (e.g. Watkins (1976) 38–9; Wachter (2006), (2010) 253 n. 18). Some argue that we should expect the dative of possession with ἐ[ἔν τ]ι (*Νέστορι: Watkins (1976) 37 n. 19, following Dihle (1969) 258), but a simple predicative use of the possessive genitive is unobjectionable: 'the cup was Nestor's' (cf. Smyth (1956) 315, §1303). The genitive of possession also lays greater stress on Nestor as the owner of the object (in comparison to the dative which focuses on the object possessed: cf. Smyth (1956) 342, §1480), complementing the noun's emphatic verse-initial position to reinforce the epic allusion (discussed immediately below).

[126] I follow most commentators in regarding the first line as an iambic trimeter (with ε[ἰμ]ί, it would be a choriamb and two iambic metra) (e.g. Watkins (1976) 33–7; West (1982) 40 n. 27; Pavese (1996) 9–10) rather than plain prose (contrast Hansen (1976) 35–40; Powell (1991) 165 n. 116). This metrical mixture is elsewhere found in the pseudo-Homeric *Margites*, Hipponax frr. 23, 35 *IEG* and Xenophanes D12 L–M: West (1970) 172; Gostoli (2007) 9.

[127] For the cup's sympotic affinities: Latacz (1990) 233–5; Powell (1991) 165; Murray (1994); Cazzato and Prodi (2016) 3–4. As Gerhard (2011) 9 notes, the opposition is reinforced by 'un jeu métrique': the grand Homeric cup is evoked in a single, lowly iambic verse, whereas the modest *kotyle* is described in a pair of lofty hexameters. Cf. Węcowski (2017) on the playfulness of early Greek vase inscriptions.

[128] ε[ἰμ]ί was proposed but not accepted by the original editors (Buchner and Russo (1955) 226 n. 2), but it has since proved the most popular restoration: e.g. Schadewaldt (1965) 488; Rüter and Matthiessen (1968) 241–6; Dihle (1969) 258; Hansen (1976) 29–32. The same effect would be achieved with ἐ[γώμ]ι: Risch (1987).

37

itself with sympotic erotics in place of epic heroics.[129] In either case, however, humour emerges from the disparity between the humble Ischian cup and the epic Nestor's grand goblet, which only he had the strength to lift (*Il.* 11.632–7):[130]

πὰρ δὲ δέπας περικαλλές, ὃ οἴκοθεν ἦγ' ὁ γεραιός,
χρυσείοις ἥλοισι πεπαρμένον· οὔατα δ' αὐτοῦ
τέσσαρ' ἔσαν, δοιαὶ δὲ πελειάδες ἀμφὶς ἕκαστον
χρύσειαι νεμέθοντο, δύω δ' ὑπὸ πυθμένες ἦσαν.
ἄλλος μὲν μογέων ἀποκινήσασκε τραπέζης
πλεῖον ἐόν, Νέστωρ δ' ὁ γέρων ἀμογητὶ ἄειρεν.

And besides them a cup of exquisite beauty, which the old man had brought from home, studded with golden rivets. It had four handles, around each of which two golden doves were feeding, and there were two supports below. Another man would struggle to move it from the table when it was full, but aged Nestor could lift it with ease.

Many scholars have suspected a precise allusion to this Iliadic scene in the Ischian inscription, taking it as evidence that our version of the *Iliad* was already well known in the Greek world of Euboea and its colonies in the late eighth century.[131] Given our limited evidence for eighth-century literary culture, such a direct intertextual relationship cannot be ruled out, but it should be stressed that the cup's allusion is not based on any verbal correspondences with our Iliadic passage,

---

[129] The same opposition emerges from most other proposals: e.g. ἔ[ασον] Gerhard (2011) 7–9 ('Leave aside Nestor's cup'); ἔ[ρρο]ι̣ Buchner and Russo (1955) 225–7 ('Away with Nestor's cup'); ἐ[στ]ι̣ Buchner and Russo (1955) 226 n. 2 ('Nestor's cup is good to drink from, but. . .'; cf. Watkins (1976) 37–9); μ[έ]ν Guarducci (1967) 226–7 (balancing the δ' in v. 2). For a fuller list of proposed supplements, see Pavese (1996) 8.

[130] Some scholars are sceptical of this allusive interpretation, but their alternative analyses are in no way incompatible with it. Some suggest that the cup is simply the property of an ordinary Pithecusan who just happens to be called Nestor (Dihle (1969) 258–9; Durante (1971) 143 n. 14; Gallavotti (1976) 216; Fehling (1991) 41; Pavese (1996) 10–13). This possibility cannot be denied (epic names appear to have been rarely used in Greece before the Hellenistic period, but were not completely absent: Hansen (1976) 33–5), but even if the cup were the property of a historical 'Nestor', that does not rule out a possible allusion to the Pithecusan's legendary namesake, and would in fact make any such allusion more pointed, given the closer connection between man and hero. Similarly, Faraone's interpretation of the inscription as a magical aphrodisiac spell ((1996); cf. Dihle (1969) 261) does not oppose, but rather complements, any literary interpretation (cf. Lamboley (2001) 36).

[131] E.g. Rüter and Matthiessen (1968) 249–54; Snodgrass (1971) 431; Heubeck (1979) 114; Kirk (1985) 4; Powell (1991) 163–7, 208–9; Murray (1994) 51; Graham (1995) 6–7; Latacz (1996) 61–3; Malkin (1998) 156–60; Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 286–7; Bing (2009) 151–5; Kahane (2016) §7.3–12.

and its diction departs significantly from Homeric usage.[132] In reality, the parallel depends only on similarities of theme and topic: the knowledge required for the allusion to work is simply that Nestor possessed a large and ornate cup, awareness of which could derive from many other sources besides our *Iliad*.[133]

Indeed, scholars have not refrained from proposing other potential epic 'sources' for the cup's allusion: Stephanie West suggests epic poetry on the exploits of Nestor's youth,[134] while Georg Danek proposes the scene from the *Cypria* in which Nestor hosted Menelaus (*Cypr.* arg. 4b *GEF*) and apparently encouraged him to drink wine to scatter his 'cares' (*Cypr.* fr. 18 *GEF*).[135] It would be misleading, however, to pinpoint any of these as the specific 'source' of the cup's allusion, given that Nestor appears to have been associated with lavish hospitality, plentiful drinking and a large, ornate cup in many texts and traditions, especially in his capacity as an adviser and strategist. Of course, drinking vessels, like many other material objects, were highly prized in the world of Greek epic as a source of prestige and authority,[136] and elaborate descriptions of them were a traditional feature of not just Greek, but also Near Eastern poetic traditions.[137] Yet Nestor's association with drinking ware transcends such typological norms. In addition to the *Iliad* and *Cypria*, we could cite *Odyssey* 3, where Pylos is presented as a place of feasting and merriment (*Od.* 3.32–66). Nestor's son Peisistratus presents Telemachus and Athena-Mentor with a beautiful golden cup for prayer (χρυσείῳ δέπαϊ, *Od.* 3.41; χρύσειον ἄλεισον, 3.50, 53; καλὸν δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον, 3.63), a cup which Peter Bing has suggested could be the very same as in the *Iliad*, given that the goblet there is

---

[132] West (1994) 14; Peters (1998); González (2013) 129–41; contrast Cassio (1994). On our early epigraphic evidence, see Janko (2015).

[133] Cf. Buchner and Russo (1955) 233–4; Schadewaldt (1965) 413–16; Burkert (1976) 19–20; Watkins (1976) 37–8; Taplin (1992) 33 n.39; West (1995) 205; Osborne (1996) 109; Lowenstam (1997) 48–9; Snodgrass (1998) 52–3; Burgess (2001a) 114; Wachter (2006) col. 84.

[134] West (1994) 14.

[135] Danek (1994/95); cf. Kullmann (1960) 257 n. 2; Hansen (1976) 43; Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 287.

[136] Cook (2000), citing *Il.* 11.774, 16.220–32, 24.234–5; *Od.* 4.614–9. Cf. Lowenstam (1997) 48–9.

[137] West (1995) 205 with n. 13.

said to have been brought from home (ὃ οἴκοθεν ἦγ᾽ ὁ γεραιός, *Il.* 11.632).[138] Athenaeus' later mention of a 'cup of Nestor' dedicated to Artemis in Capua, not far from Ischia, might also suggest a local tradition surrounding the heroic Nestor's cup which could have already been circulating in the region in archaic times.[139] Nestor was thus closely associated with a large, ornate cup throughout early Greek epic, symbolising his panache for hospitality, storytelling and advice-giving – a traditional association that *Iliad* 11 itself presupposes.

Rather than detecting a precise engagement with the *Iliad* or any other specific text in the Pithecusan inscription, it is thus better to see an allusion to an established feature of the *fabula* of the hero's life.[140] The inscription evokes not the specific Nestor of the *Iliad*, but rather the Nestor of tradition at large, known for his many instances of hospitality and feasting. In so doing, it situates its humbler self within the literary tradition, setting its brief epigrammatic form against the grandeur of epic.[141] This allusion can be taken as an archetype of what we might usually expect in archaic Greek epic itself: an engagement with the themes, motifs and narrative events of other mythological traditions (*fabulae*), rather than precise verbal echoes of another specific poem.

Nevertheless, although the majority of archaic mythological allusions would function in this manner, an oral poetic environment does not entirely preclude the possibility of verbal allusion and quotation, even when we are talking of mythological traditions, not fixed poems. As Burgess has again demonstrated, certain phraseology could become associated with specific *fabulae*, characters or narrative contexts and then be allusively redeployed in other settings. As Homeric examples, he offers the

---

[138] Bing (2009) 152; cf. Ridgway (1992) 56; Malkin (1998) 157. Notably, both cups are golden or decorated with gold (χρυσείοις ἥλοισι, *Il.* 11.633; πελειάδες . . . χρύσειαι, *Il.* 11.634–5 ~ χρυσείῳ δέπαϊ, *Od.* 3.41; χρύσειον ἄλεισον, *Od.* 3.50, 53) and beautiful (δέπας περικαλλές, *Il.* 11.632 ~ καλὸν δέπας, *Od.* 3.63), although they are not completely identical: the Iliadic cup has four handles (οὔατα . . . τέσσαρ᾽ *Il.* 11.633–4), whereas the Odyssean cup only has two (ἀμφικύπελλον, *Od.* 3.63).

[139] Ath. *Deipn.* 11.466e, 489b–c; Faraone (1996) 106–7; Lamboley (2001) 34–6.

[140] Cf. von Möllendorff (2011) 425; Swift (2012) 141–2.

[141] Cf. Dell'Oro (2013) for other early inscriptions' tendency to situate themselves in and against the literary tradition.

40

phrase μέγας μεγαλωστί, which appears to be connected with the *fabula* of Achilles' death (*Od.* 24.40, *Il.* 18.26), and the language associated with Astyanax's fate, which is proleptically evoked in the *Iliad* (*Il. Parv.* fr. 29.3–5 *GEF*; *Il.* 6.467–70, 24.735).[142] As a further example, we could cite the Iliadic description of the hundred-hander Briareus as 'greater in strength than his father' (ὁ γὰρ αὖτε βίη οὗ πατρὸς ἀμείνων, *Il.* 1.404), a phrase which seems to allude to the *fabula* of Achilles' birth and the prophesied supremacy of Thetis' offspring.[143] These are not cases of one text quoting another, but rather instances in which the use of certain phrases and language may evoke specific episodes and characters from the fixed *fabulae* of the mythological tradition.[144] Such examples still face the usual challenges encountered by any neoanalytical interpretation (especially the questions of priority and direction of influence: see §1.2.2 below),[145] but Burgess' arguments offer an attractive framework for exposing the allusive potential of some early epic repetitions. Most repetitions in epic poetry are, of course, likely to be typological in character, so most of these cases of pointed repetition will involve rarely attested phrases which have come to be associated with specific and identifiable contexts or individuals.[146]

Early Greek poetry, therefore, should be regarded as able to engage allusively with specific mythological traditions on the levels of both motif and phraseology. In a fluid oral poetic

---

[142] Burgess (2009) 61, (2012a); cf. Danek (2002) 17. Barnes (2011) 2–3 similarly suggests that the phrase ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην (*Il.* 16.857 = 22.363) is 'traceable to a single source within the epic tradition: the death of Achilles'.

[143] Willcock (1964) 144; Schein (1984) 91–2; Slatkin (1991) 69–77; Scodel (2002) 140–2; cf. Pind. *Isth.* 8.32–4.

[144] Cf. Mueller (2009) 172 on Iliadic repetition: 'particular phrases are much more tightly coupled with particular names than one would expect in a mix-and-match mode of composition'.

[145] Especially problematic is the fact that the phrase μέγας μεγαλωστί also occurs in the *Iliad* of the horseman Cebriones (*Il.* 16.776), which might suggest that it is merely context-specific (describing a fallen warrior), rather than character-specific (evocative of Achilles' death). Burgess (2012a) 172–6 offers sensible discussion.

[146] Cf. Bakker (2013) 157–69 on his 'scale of interformularity': 'the more specific a formula and/or the more restricted its distribution, the greater the possible awareness of its recurrence and of its potential for signalling meaningful repetition'. Of course, any rare phrase could simply be an under-attested formula, so caution is still necessary.

environment, where specific episodes would have been repeatedly re-performed, such engagements were likely multidirectional, as various traditions and story patterns came to influence one another,[147] but we are no longer in a position to discern such intricacies. Currie has objected that this model restricts us to 'an impersonal and anonymous model of allusion', in which we cannot conceive of 'individually authored compositions' setting themselves apart from others.[148] But this is far from the case. Many of the interpretations that follow will show just how sophisticated and agonistic the Homeric poems were in setting themselves apart from the whole tradition.[149] Even if they are not always alluding to a specific poem, this does not deny their own poetic integrity. Nor is this approach designed in principle to rule out the possibility of direct interaction between texts at an early date (see further §I.2.3 below). Rather, it prevents us from thinking anachronistically of a mass of neat, self-contained, easily distinguishable epics interacting with each other as the norm in the archaic period.[150] Instead, when dealing with the lost poetic traditions of early Greek poetry, the framework of *fabula*-based allusion and mythological intertextuality best accounts for the fluid and flexible nature of oral traditions. It is the default paradigm that I will apply in this study.

In what follows, I will employ the language of both allusion and intertextuality to describe this phenomenon, following the flexible practice I outlined above (§I.1). This is not unusual,[151] but some scholars will doubtless object to one or both of these terms. Some would prefer to restrict 'allusion' to precise connections between

---

[147] Cf. Marks (2005) 13–14, (2008) 9–11 on mutual referentiality, citing Pucci's 'specular' readings of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (1987) and Slatkin's concept of 'reverberation' (1991), a term borrowed from Lang (1983).

[148] Currie (2016) 102.

[149] Such agonistic posturing is most prevalent in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but not unique to them: cf. §II.2.4 on the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* and Hesiod's *Theogony*; and §IV.2.1 on Hesiod's *Nautilia* (esp. *Op*. 650–3). On the agonistic aspect of early Greek poetry, see §I.2.4.

[150] Cf. Louden (2018a)'s criticism of Currie: 'For his arguments to work, we have to assume no other epics existed, save those we have.'

[151] See e.g. Burgess (2009) 70–1, who describes Homeric motif transference in terms of both 'intertextuality' and 'allusion'; cf. Tsagalis (2008), who employs the language of 'allusion' within his intertextual framework (e.g. xii, 'alludes to'; xvi, 'mythical allusion').

42

fixed poems; while for others even 'mythological intertextuality' may sound a little misleading or paradoxical, especially since we are not talking here about interaction with specific 'texts'. Nevertheless, I believe there are good reasons for retaining these familiar nouns. First, 'allusion' foregrounds the design that I see and interpret in early Greek poetry's engagements with traditional *fabulae*.[152] Second, the idea of 'mythological intertextuality' is in many respects closer to and thus authorised by Julia Kristeva's original conception of 'intertextuality', in which any cultural product, and not just a literary work, could be considered a 'text'.[153] And third, this familiar nomenclature is extremely useful, since it highlights the considerable similarity between this kind of *fabula*-based allusion and the text-based allusion with which Classicists are more familiar. Both involve a reference to another external source (in contrast to intratextuality: allusion within the bounds of a specific poem or corpus). By employing the terms here, I thus acknowledge this essential continuity: in both 'mythological' and 'textual' intertextuality, the underlying allusive process is the same, even if the target of the allusion is different in each case.[154]

I.2.2 *Reconstructing Lost Traditions*

Despite its methodological advantages, this framework of mythological intertextuality still has to deal with one crucial obstacle that faces any neoanalytical undertaking: namely, our limited access to the rich range of traditions and poems that once populated archaic Greece. Given how little we now have, either in full or in

---

[152] On allusion, design and intention, see §1.1 n. 19 above. For the idea of 'mythological allusion', cf. Slatkin (1991); Schein (2002); Nelson (2022). I thus use the term with a broader scope than e.g. Currie (2016); Barker and Christensen (2020) 13–15.

[153] Kristeva (1980) 36–91; §1.1 n. 17 above; cf. Burgess (2006) 162. See too Ready (2019) 15–74 for the concept of 'oral texts'.

[154] I thus prefer this terminology to other recent coinages, such as 'interformularity' (Bakker (2013)) and 'intertraditionality' (Tsagalis (2014b)); but I retain 'traditional referentiality' to describe the connotative resonance of verbal and structural patterns detached from specific *fabulae*. Nevertheless, as Barker and Christensen (2020) 18 rightly note, 'Homerists will frequently refer to the same phenomena with different language'. In this case, I suspect that my arguments and conclusions are compatible with most methodological and terminological frameworks. My primary focus is on the indexing of these connections, not the precise labels applied to them.

fragments, our gaze is extremely blinkered. In the case of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, our earliest extant Greek texts, this limitation is particularly pressing: how can we talk of allusion in these poems if we have no clear window onto what came before them?[155]

To escape this paucity of evidence, some scholars have recently looked beyond the Greek canon to Near Eastern (and especially Mesopotamian) narratives as a possible 'source' of interaction. Numerous parallels of technique, motif and theme have long suggested some kind of connection between Greek and Near Eastern texts, but it remains hotly debated how best to frame the relationship.[156] A growing recent trend, however, is to see Homer and Hesiod 'directly' and 'intentionally' alluding to the likes of *Gilgameš* and the *Enuma Eliš*.[157] This is an exciting possibility, but there is need for caution at the very least. Archaic epic is attentive to non-Greek cultures and foreign languages (e.g. *Il.* 2.803–4, 4.433–8; *Od.* 1.183; *HhAphr.* 113–16), but as Johannes Haubold has noted, the genre (unlike fable) does not advertise itself as engaging with Near Eastern traditions – indeed, the Homeric conception of the world mentions no human society east of Cilicia and the Phoenicians[158] – and historical Greeks, even if they were aware of such traditions, were apparently not concerned with spotting references to them.[159] Nor, we might add, were they even interested in mentioning them: Γίλγαμος appears only once in extant Greek

[155] This problem is equally alive for any attempt to situate Homeric poetry against its larger tradition: e.g. in the case of traditional referentiality, the 'totality of tradition' visible to us often only amounts to extant Homeric examples, which makes it difficult to determine whether the associations scholars construct are truly pan-traditional, or merely intratextual, an idiosyncratic system of a specific text: cf. Kelly (2007a) 9–10; Cook (2009a) 15.

[156] Fundamental are Burkert (1992) and West (1997). Recent key contributions include López-Ruiz (2010), (2014); Louden (2011); Bachvarova (2016); Clarke (2019); Kelly and Metcalf (2021). R. B. Rutherford (2019) 231–6 offers a judicious overview.

[157] Currie (2012), (2016) 160–222; Eisenfeld (2015); Kozlowski (2018); Lardinois (2018a), (2021a); Clarke (2019); Ziemann (2020).

[158] Haubold (2011).

[159] Haubold (2013) 20–33. Currie (2016) 200 n. 283 dismisses the silence of ancient reception as the result of the Homeric scholia's 'Greek chauvinism' and argues instead (pp. 200–8) that the *Iliad* shows some interest in the Near Eastern provenance of myths and names, its 'non-assimilation of origins' acting as a 'signal' of the poet's debt (p. 203). This, however, is difficult to square with Currie's alleged major cases of allusion (Achilles ~ Gilgamesh, Aphrodite ~ Ishtar), which lack such 'non-assimilation' and instead seem to involve a 'neutralising' and 'assimilative' 'refiguration'; precisely where we would want a 'signal' to these Near Eastern traditions, we do not find one.

literature, and only then nearly a millennium after Homer at the turn of the second/third centuries CE, in a context divorced from his Mesopotamian epic adventures.[160] Despite the broad cultural influence of the Near East on archaic Greece, it is very difficult not to take the general silence of Greek audiences and writers as a sign of disinterest in (or ignorance of) these foreign myths. Moreover, many of the underlying Greek–Mesopotamian literary parallels are often not 'sufficiently compelling' (Currie's own criterion: (2016) 174) or close enough to necessitate or even encourage a direct and/or allusive connection. Although it is ultimately a subjective matter, alternative explanations for similarity often seem more plausible, usually involving closer and more meaningful parallels within a Greek context.[161] The converted would of course respond that allusion always works through creative adaptation and reworking, so we should not expect precise similarity.[162] But differences can eventually become so overwhelming that it simply becomes misleading to continue postulating direct allusion.[163]

More fundamentally, however, this allusive model struggles to give a convincing account for such direct reception of the Mesopotamian poems across time and space. Undoubtedly, 'historical connections and cultural influence are abundantly attested between archaic Greece and the ancient Near East', visible in the archaeological, iconographic and inscriptional records, as well as in the Semitic origins of the Greek alphabet.[164] And within these

---

[160] Ael. *NA* 12.21. Henkelman (2006) 816–49 adduces this passage as evidence for long-lasting oral traditions on Gilgamesh. But he acknowledges the lack of fit with the Mesopotamian epic and pursues connections with Sargon and Etana instead; cf. Smith (2020). Tigay (1982) argues that 'an assumption of ultimate dependence on a Mesopotamian original does not seem compelling' (p. 253) and sees the 'confusion' with the story of Sargon as 'symptomatic of Gilgamesh's gradual disappearance into literary oblivion' (p. 255). He also notes that there is some doubt as to whether this Γίλγαμος is even really *the* Mesopotamian Gilgamesh (p. 253 n. 9).

[161] E.g. Most (1998); Kelly (2008a); Metcalf (2015), (2017); Ballesteros (2021a), (2021b); Forte (2021). Cf. too Matijević (2018), who further notes that some arguments for similarity are based on outdated editions of *Gilgameš*.

[162] Rollinger (2015) 19 n. 28; Currie (2016) 174.

[163] Cf. already Gressmann in Ungnad and Gressmann (1911) 189: 'Was nützt alle Ähnlichkeit, wenn die Unähnlichkeiten so groß sind, daß keine Brücke die Kluft überspannen kann?' ('What use is all the similarity if the dissimilarities are so great that no bridge can span the gap?').

[164] Currie (2016) 215, citing Burkert (1992); Morris (1992); Dalley and Reyes (1998); Rollinger (2001). Cf. too West (1997) 1–60.

broader channels of interaction, it is inevitable that Near Eastern stories would have had some influence on Greek narratives and thought over centuries of contact.[165] But the 'Near East' is not one monolithic whole: it is a conventional term to describe a wide range of different cultures, languages and traditions, with varying proximity to the Greek-speaking world. Given the vast distance between Mesopotamia and the Greek-speaking world, I consider it implausible that Greek audiences would have been directly and intimately familiar with Mesopotamian texts such as *Gilgameš* and able to recognise and detect allusive reworkings of them in performance.[166] Scholars have hypothesised the schooling of Greek poets in the East, the arrival of bilingual bards to Greece, interactions in a festival context and even Greek translations of Mesopotamian poetry, all of which are certainly not impossible.[167] But given the silence of our epic sources, any of these 'solutions' requires a rather large leap of faith – one which I am not currently prepared to take. I thus side with those who view parallels with Mesopotamian texts as the result of long-term interaction and evolution,[168] extremely valuable for tracing the distant prehistory of Greek poetic motifs – and for identifying the distinctive and unique 'narrative choices' made by each individual text or tradition[169] – but less so for those interested in allusion and intertextuality as a phenomenon of performance and reception.[170]

[165] Such indirect influence would have most likely occurred through oral transmission: e.g. West (1997) 593–606; Henkelman (2006); Steymans (2010) 335; Ballesteros (2021a) 15–21.

[166] Direct interaction is more plausible within the more 'western' region of the 'Near East', i.e. 'within the local (and interconnected) contexts of Hurro-Hittite and West-Semitic literatures': Ballesteros (2021a) 19.

[167] Currie (2016) 218–20 with further bibliography. What would a Greek 'translation' look like? West (2014a) 32 imagines a bilingual poet introducing 'a whole series of *Gilgāmesh* motifs into an epic on a *Greek* mythical theme', such as Heracles' labours (cf. West (2018)), but it would be a stretch to call this a 'translation'.

[168] George (2003) 157; Allan (2006) 30 n. 139; Kelly (2008a), (2021a) 276–7; Ballesteros (2021a).

[169] E.g. Haubold (2002) 11–18, (2013) 44–71 on Greek and Akkadian traditions' different approaches to mortality; Kelly (2014) on Greek epics' distinctive aestheticisation of battle descriptions; and Metcalf (2015) 137–50 on differing conceptions of poetic transmission (Greek recall vs. Sumerian and Akkadian writing). Cf. Haubold (2017); Kelly (2021a).

[170] Passivity of Near Eastern influence: Andersen (1998) 139–40; Most (2003) 385; Burgess (2006) 151, (2015a) 78–9; Haubold (2013) 11.

46

In that case, our evidence for the earlier traditions with which Homer and Hesiod were engaging remains severely restricted. We have no definite knowledge of what tales pre-existed them, or of what specific versions of these tales were in circulation. We are thus compelled to follow the common neoanalytical approach of reconstructing the contours of pre-existing myths and traditions (but not poems, cf. §1.2.1 above) from the scraps we have: internal evidence within our extant poems, alongside later artistic, poetic and prose sources. Considerable caution is required in this endeavour, however – and much more than most neoanalytical scholars acknowledge. In particular, we should note two significant caveats.

The first is the post-Homeric date of our evidence, which raises the possibility that these later texts are simply reacting to and shaping their narratives against the Homeric poems themselves. Later poems may allusively rework a Homeric motif or simply add meat to the narrative bones of a passing Homeric reference – in which case, they cannot reliably provide us with secure, unmediated access to the coveted pre-Homeric tradition.[171] This is especially true of the Epic Cycle, our evidence for which is late and limited, based on scattered fragments and the summaries of Proclus from the second or fifth century CE.[172] It is striking how much early Homeric neoanalysis failed to acknowledge this problem and simply assumed as 'fact' that the poems of the Epic Cycle reflect pre-Homeric tradition.[173] Recent attempts to treat evidence of any date as an authentic 'multiform' are equally problematic, since they collapse chronology and impugn later storytellers' potential for invention.[174] In reality, the later our sources date in time, the greater

---

[171] Heslin (2011) 356; West (2013) 18–20. Cf. Aristarchus, who supposed that Cyclic poets expanded on passing references in Homeric character-text: Currie (2016) 124–5 with n. 115; Schironi (2018) 679–86.

[172] On the Cycle: Davies (1989); Burgess (2001a) 7–46, (2016), (2019a); Barker (2008); Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (2015); Sammons (2017); Porter (2022).

[173] E.g. Kullmann (1984) 310–11: 'it is considered to be fact that what is narrated in the *Aethiopis* must have been narrated before Homer'. Some neoanalysts have even argued (implausibly) that the Cyclic epics pre-dated the Homeric poems: cf. Jouan (1980) 96–8; Kullmann (1991) 429–30.

[174] E.g. Alwine (2009); Burgess (2017a). Others gloss over the problem entirely, e.g. Loney (2014), who employs Apollodorus, Hyginus and scholia for evidence of Promethean traditions suppressed by Hesiod without any acknowledgement of the chronological difficulties.

47

our problems become. Attempts to reconstruct the traces of a pre-Odyssean Argonautic tradition from Apollonius' *Argonautica* are extremely problematic given how heavily steeped that epic is in the reception and study of both Homeric poems,[175] while the content and attributions of prose mythographers cannot always be taken at face value.[176] Similar difficulties arise, moreover, when the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are mined for evidence of earlier traditions with which they might interact, where there is a latent danger of circularity.[177] The chronological limitations of our evidence are thus a major obstacle, and one which must be taken seriously.

The other major challenge faced by neoanalysts is the subjectivity of their arguments for motival priority: the claim that the non-Homeric instance of a motif must be the original and primary one because it is more natural, suitable and appropriate than its Homeric counterpart.[178] Not only must the parallel motif in question prove to be more than just typological, but these arguments for fittingness frequently lack any objective, clearly defined criteria. In particular, are we justified in assuming that a motif's original use will be more suitable and better-fitting than later adaptations, or could a later poet not adapt and improve the application of a pre-existing motif in a new context?[179] Arguments for a motif originally 'belonging' to one specific myth or story must thus be treated with considerable circumspection.

Neither of these issues is insurmountable, however, especially when handled with due caution. In the case of using post-Homeric evidence, we should be wary of unduly exaggerating the primacy of Homer, at least at an early date. Among many scholars, Burgess has noted that early Greek artists reflected non-Homeric cyclic

---

[175] E.g. West (2005b). Apollonius and Homer: Campbell (1981); Knight (1995). The same can be said of Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*: Currie (2016) 123–4.

[176] Van der Valk (1958); Davies (1986a) 104–9; Cameron (2004) 89–163; Kenens (2011). Though note Dräger (2011)'s argument that Apollodorus' *Library* goes back to a mythographical handbook of the fifth century BCE and faithfully preserves pre-Homeric mythological traditions.

[177] See e.g. Kopff (1983)'s attempt to reconstruct from the *Iliad* an *Aethiopis* that he then holds to be the source for our *Iliad*. Goldhill (2007) critiques the 'grotesque circularity' of such arguments.

[178] This assessment of relative 'suitability' can be traced back as far as the work of Zenodotus, who identified the less suitable instances of repeated lines or phrases to excise them as derivative interpolations: Sittl (1882) 1–2.

[179] Page (1961) 206, (1963) 22.

48

themes 'much earlier and much more often than they reflected Homeric themes', suggesting that it was not until the late sixth century that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* came to dominate the tradition. In that case, 'post-Homeric evidence for the pre-Homeric tradition is not necessarily contaminated by Homeric influence, at least not at an early date'.[180] Of course, early epic chronology is a disputed field of research, but this observation at least offers the opportunity for us to see in other sources evidence of traditions that may well have developed before the Homeric poems rose to pre-eminence.[181] More generally, given the limited possibilities for the diffusion of epics at an early date, both through performance and literary circulation, Burgess has also noted that 'relatively late poems are not necessarily influenced by relatively early poems' and that chronologically '"late" poems may well represent mythological traditions that precede "early" poems'.[182] Given this situation, it would be overly reductive and dogmatic to preclude the possibility that some post-Homeric evidence might reflect pre-Homeric traditions.

In that case, neoanalytical arguments of priority remain our best tool for identifying such potential pre-Homeric traditions. A degree of subjectivity is impossible to escape (as indeed it is in any allusive interpretation of poetry), but there are some cases in which it would be difficult to deny the transfer of motifs from one character or situation to another. This is especially the case when a motif is particularly rare, or when we encounter a uniquely shared combination of motifs which we can plausibly argue is more appropriate in one context than another. A commonly cited intratextual example within the *Iliad* is the relationship of Diomedes and Achilles. The pair share numerous similarities, from their Hephaestan armour (*Il.* 8.195 ~ *Il.* 18.369–617, 19.10–23) and the supernatural fire that surrounds their heads (*Il.* 5.4–8 ~ 18.205–14, 225–7) to their theomachic pretensions (*Il.* 5.330–54, 841–63 ~ *Il.* 21.212–382) and support from Athena during their respective *aristeiai* (*Il.* 5.121–33,

---

[180] Burgess (2006) 150 = (2009) 2, citing his important (2001a) study, esp. 35–44. Cf. Lowenstram (1993), (1997); Snodgrass (1998); Cairns (2001a) 6–7.

[181] Early Greek hexameter chronology: Janko (1982), (2012); Blößner (2006); B. Jones (2010); M. L. West (2012); McConnell (2019).

[182] Burgess (2009) 3, cf. (2006) 153, (2019b) 138.

49

290–1, 793–859 ~ *Il.* 20.438–40, 21.304, 22.214–99).[183] All these traits 'fit' Achilles better, relating to the poem's central protagonist at the climax of the narrative. And such connections even extend beyond the strict narrative confines of the *Iliad*, since Diomedes also appears to foreshadow Achilles' impending death: the Trojan women pray that he might die at the Scaean gates (*Il.* 6.305–7), the site of Achilles' future demise (§III.2.4), and he is injured in the foot by Paris (*Il.* 11.369–83), suffering the same injury from the same Trojan that would eventually prove Achilles' undoing (*Il.* 22.359–60; §II.2.4).[184] Diomedes is thus an 'anticipatory doublet', or *altera persona*, of Achilles, displaying elements that 'belong' primarily to the Phthian hero. In a case such as this, arguments for priority are extremely plausible and enrich our interpretation of the poem. Diomedes exhibits these traits in the *Iliad* first, but they prove more at home when later repeated of Achilles. In the same way, we can detect cases of motival priority between texts: instances of a motif that appear to us first in Homer may rework other pre-existing traditions or *fabulae*, even if they are only attested for us at a later date.

Of course, each individual case of such motif transference will have to be assessed on its own merits and treated with extreme care. In some cases, priority might not always be discernible, and we may sometimes suppose that different examples of a motif developed simultaneously through mutual interaction. But in at least some instances, this approach will help us exploit later evidence as a guide for potential earlier literary traditions with which Homer and later poets could interact. After all, as Jim Marks has observed, 'even if the non-canonical evidence … is "post-Homeric," it still offers our best approximation of the kinds of stories that would have been known to poets … and to their audiences'.[185] Certainty is impossible, but it would be overly

---

[183] Schoeck (1961) 75–80; Alden (2000) 169–75; Louden (2006) 14–34. Both also fantasise about sacking Troy alone with their closest companion (*Il.* 9.46–9 ~ 16.97–100: Macleod (1982) 25 n. 1).

[184] Cf. Kullmann (1984) 313–5; Burgess (1995) 217 with n. 1, 239–40; Christensen (2015a). Notably, this is the only foot wound narrated in the whole of the *Iliad*.

[185] Marks (2003) 223. Ultimately, this practice is not limited to Homeric studies: cf. e.g. the use of Livy as a guide for lost sections of Polybius, or of Plautus and Terence for Greek New Comedy.

50

defeatist and far less interesting to ignore categorically the hints and clues we have from later sources.

I.2.3 From Myth to Text

The question remains, however, when and how we should transition from this framework of mythological intertextuality to one of full *textual* intertextuality. And more generally, to what extent can we detect a development in allusive practices between the eighth and fifth centuries BCE?

Again, there are no simple answers to this question. But when we turn to Greek lyric poetry of the seventh to fifth centuries BCE, we find an increasingly clear sense of authorship, literary history and engagement with specific texts and authors over time.[186] This is manifested above all in poets' direct naming of themselves and their predecessors.[187] Numerous testimonia attest to a growing phenomenon of citing other poets by name. Already in the mid-seventh century, Archilochus (fr. dub. 303) and Callinus (fr. 6) are said to have ascribed the *Margites* and *Thebais* respectively to Homer, while we are told that Alcman in the late seventh century made explicit mention of the poet Polymnestus of Colophon (fr. 145). In the sixth century, a poem of Sappho was apparently composed in response to Alcaeus (fr. 137), while Stesichorus is said to have blamed Hesiod and Homer (fr. 90.1–6), attested that Xanthus predated him (fr. 281) and ascribed the *Shield of Heracles* to Hesiod (fr. 168). At the dawn of the fifth century, Bacchylides apparently called Homer a native of Ios (fr. 48); Simonides is said to have compared Hesiod to a gardener and Homer to a garland-weaver (*Gnomol. Vatic. Gr.* 1144 = T91b Poltera) and to have mentioned a Corinthian poet called Aeson (fr. 609 *PMG*);[188] Timocreon of Rhodes allegedly composed a lyric poem of abuse against Simonides (Suda τ 625 = T1 Davies); and Pratinas reputedly made direct mention of

---

[186] Allusion in Greek lyric: Fowler (1987) 3–52; Garner (1990) 1–18; Irwin (2005) (general index, s.vv. 'allusion', 'intertextuality'); Kelly (2015a); Budelmann (2018a) 16–18; Rawles (2018) 8–12; Spelman (2018a) 177–82; Swift (2019) 18–24; Bernsdorff (2020) I 16–18, with Phillips (2022); Currie (2021c); Nelson (2021b).

[187] Cf. Martin (2021).

[188] Aeson (Αἴσων) has been emended to more familiar names, e.g. Cinaethon (Κιναίθων) and Arion (Ἀρίων): see Poltera (2008) 572.

51

a number of his musical predecessors: Olympus, Thaletas and Xenodamus (713 *PMG*). Olympus apparently featured again in Pindar (fr. 157), who is also said to have mentioned Sacadas of Argos (fr. 269), called Homer a Chian and Smyrnaean (fr. 264) and ascribed the *Cypria* to him (fr. 265). Alongside literary critics' and philosophers' engagement with Homer from the late sixth century onwards (e.g. Theagenes of Rhegium, Xenophanes, Heraclitus), this evidence suggests an increasingly strong awareness of distinct and recognisable poetic predecessors.[189]

Of course, these examples are largely based on indirect testimonia and may thus only reflect the inferences and biographical fantasies of later readers.[190] Chamaeleon's claim that Stesichorus 'blamed' both Homer and Hesiod (fr. 90.1–6), for example, could have simply been extrapolated from the poet's general criticism of the epic tradition and its myths (e.g. fr. 91a), rather than being based on any direct naming of either poet in Stesichorus' poetry.[191] In some cases, too, potential textual corruption complicates our assessment of the evidence.[192] Yet despite these problems, it would be excessively sceptical to dismiss every single one of these testimonia. Not only are some independently confirmed by other evidence,[193] but the general picture they paint is reinforced by numerous examples from our extant texts and fragments in which poets do directly name their forebears.

---

[189] Theagenes 8 D–K (cf. Biondi (2015)); Xenophanes D8–10 L–M; Heraclitus D23–4 L–M. On early literary criticism: Pfeiffer (1968) 8–11; Cassio (2002); Nelson (2021d) 122–4.

[190] Cf. Davison (1955a) esp. 132–8; Rawles (2018) 24–6. Contrast Janko (1986) 40–2.

[191] E.g. West (1985) 134; Davies and Finglass (2014) 311; Rawles (2018) 24.

[192] E.g. 'Archilochus' in Archil. fr. dub. 303 may be an error for Cratinus' *Archilochoi* or for 'Aristophanes', who quotes a phrase from the *Margites* as 'Homeric' (Μουσάων θεράπων, *Av.* 909–10 ~ *Marg.* fr. 1.2 West): Davison (1955a) 134–6. Or it may only reflect the fact that the same proverbial line featured in both the *Margites* (fr. 5 West) and Archilochus (fr. 201): West (1999) 376–7. Similarly, the Callinus passage depends on emendation of Paus. 9.9.5: Θηβαῖς for Θηβαίοις; Καλλῖνος/Καλλίνῳ for Καλαῖνος/Καλαίνῳ: Davison (1955a) 136–7.

[193] Alcman's mention of Polymnestus is rendered more plausible by the fact that the same source ([Plut.] *de mus.* 1133a–b) also claims that Pindar mentioned Polymnestus, an assertion that can be verified by an independent quotation (Pind. fr. 188). Similarly, Pindar's claims about Homer's hometown (fr. 264) are coupled with an assertion that Simonides called him a Chian ([Plut.] *vit. Hom.* 2.2), which is independently confirmed by fr. *eleg.* 19.1–2.

52

Alcman may again offer an early example from the seventh century: his description of apparent poetic novelties ([σαυ]μαστὰ δ' ἀνθ[ρώποισ(ι) . . .] | γαρύματα μαλσακὰ [. . .] | νεόχμ' ἔδειξαν τερπ[, Alcm. 4 fr. 1.4–6) has plausibly been interpreted as a reference to poetic predecessors, potentially including Terpander (τερπ[, 4 fr. 1.6) and Polymnestus (cf. Alcm. fr. 145).[194] Yet it is in the sixth and fifth centuries that extant examples proliferate: Alcaeus explicitly attributes the maxim that 'property makes the man' to Aristodemus, one of the seven sages (Ἀριστόδαμον, fr. 360) and seems to have addressed Sappho directly (ἰόπλοκ' ἄγνα μελλιχόμειδε Σάπφοι, fr. 384).[195] Solon explicitly quotes and criticises a verse of Mimnermus, whom he identifies directly by his patronymic (Λιγιαστάδη, fr. 20).[196] Hipponax directly names Bias of Priene, another of the seven sages (Βίαντος τοὺ Πριηνέως, fr. 123). Xenophanes criticises Homer and Hesiod by name for their portrayal of the gods (Ὅμηρός θ' Ἡσίοδός τε, D8 L–M; cf. Ὅμηρον, D10). Epicharmus quotes Ananius (fr. 51 K–A) and names Aristoxenus of Selinus as the first to introduce a certain type of iambus (fr. 77 K–A). Bacchylides cites a saying of Hesiod (Βοιωτὸς ἀνὴρ . . . Ἡσίοδος, Bacchyl. 5.191–4). Corinna explicitly finds fault with Myrtis for competing with Pindar (Μουρτίδ' . . . Πινδάροι, fr. 664a).[197]

---

[194] Lobel (1957a) 23; Davies (1986b); Spelman (2018a) 153 with n. 62; contrast Calame (1983) 424–5. Terpander is also cited by Pindar (fr. 125) and Timotheus (fr. 791.225–8 *PMG*).

[195] Yatromanolakis (2007) 169–71. ἰόπλοκ' evokes a common Sapphic suffix (δολόπλοκε, fr. 1.2; μυθόπλοκος, fr. 188: Robbins (1995) 231) and metathetically recalls another favourite compound (ἰόκολπος: frr. 21.13, 58.1, 103.3, 103.4), while μελλιχόμειδε echoes Sappho's μέλλιχος (frr. 2.11, 71.6, 112.4): Gentili (1988) 222. Sappho's name is elsewhere spelled Ψάπφω in Lesbian (i.e. Sapphic) poetry, which prompted Voigt to follow Maas in printing a different word division (μελλιχόμειδες ἄπφοι, 'sweet-smiling darling', cf. ἀπφῦς, Theoc. *Id*. 15.13–15). Even with this reading, however, there would be a clear aural allusion to Sappho's name (thus Yatromanolakis (2007) 171); cf. Nagy (2016) 489–92, who suggests that Sappho's name is derived from ἀπφώ ('sister'). West (1966) 87–8 n. 3 speculates that Alcaeus may have also named Hesiod in a lost fragment (accounting for the spelling Αἰσίοδος in *Etymologica*).

[196] Cf. Burton (2011) 69–71; Möller (2014) 42–50. Λιγιαστάδη is Bergk's emendation, but given the quotation and context, a reference to Mimnermus is beyond doubt: West (1974) 182. For Simonides' subsequent and more implicit critique of Mimnermus, see Sider (2020) 298–9.

[197] Cf. Clayman (1993), although I prefer a pre-Hellenistic dating of the poetess: Silanion's statue provides a *terminus ante quem* of the late fourth century (Stewart (1998) 278–81; cf. Collins (2006) 19–20). This poetic instance of 'blaming' (μέμφομη,

53

Simonides quotes Pittacus' saying that it is difficult to be good (τὸ Πιττάκειον, fr. 542), critiques Cleobulus' epigram on Midas' tomb (Κλεόβουλον, fr. 581), acknowledges Homer and Stesichorus as sources for his account of Meleager (Ὅμηρος ἠδὲ Στασίχορος, fr. 564) and even attributes to the 'man from Chios' a hexameter line from the famous leaves simile of *Iliad* 6.146–9 (Χῖος . . . ἀνήρ, fr. *eleg.* 19.1–2, cf. ἀν[δρός], 11.15–18; Ὅμηρ[ος], 20.14).[198] Yet it is Pindar who refers to the greatest range of predecessors, including Archilochus (*Ol.* 9.1–2, *Pyth.* 2.54–6), Hesiod (*Isth.* 6.66–8), Homer (e.g. *Pyth.* 4.277–8, *Nem.* 7.20–1, *Isth.* 4.37–9, *Pae.* 7b.11–12), Polymnestus of Colophon (fr. 188), Terpander (fr. 125)[199] and perhaps also Alcman,[200] Arion (*Ol.* 13.18–19) and Xenocritus of Locri ([Λο]κρῶν τις, fr. 140b.4).[201] In some cases, these Pindaric references can even be traced to specific lines of other extant poems (e.g. *Isth.* 6.66–8 ~ *Op.* 412; *Pyth.* 4.277–8 ~ *Il.* 15.207; *Nem.* 7.20–1 ~ *Od.* 1.4).[202] And to all these examples we could also add instances of poets' self-naming (e.g. Ἡσίοδον, *Theog.* 22; Ἀλκμάν/Ἀλκμάων, Alcm. frr. 17.4, 39.1, 95b; Ψάπφ'/ Ψάπφοι, Sapph. frr. 1.20, 65.5, 94.5, 133.2; Ἱππῶναξ etc., Hipponax frr. 32.4, 36.2, 37, 79.9, 117.4) and especially Theognis' assertion of his personal ownership of his collection of verses in his seal poem (Θεύγνιδός ἐστιν ἔπη | τοῦ Μεγαρέως, Thgn. 22–3).[203] Alongside the increasing evidence for the use of

---

fr. 664a.1) may strengthen the possibility that Stesichorus did indeed 'blame' Homer and Hesiod explicitly in his poetry (μέμφεται, fr. 90.1–6).

[198] Rawles (2018) 28–48 (fr. 564), 77–129 (fr. *eleg.* 11, 19, 20), 145–9 (frr. 542, 581). Cf. Burton (2011) 63–6.

[199] Cf. the ethnic Αἰολεύς (Pind. fr. 191), which has been interpreted as another reference to Terpander: Nagy (1990b) 93 n. 57; Prauscello (2012) 75–6.

[200] Ἀλκμᾶ[νι], *P. Oxy.* 2389 fr. 9, col. i.9–10 (= Alcman TA1a = fr. 13a), plausibly ascribed to Pindar: Lobel (1957b) 41; Carey (2011) 445–6; Römer (2013) 32; Recchia (2017); Spelman (2018a) 258–60.

[201] West (1992) 345 n. 73, (2011b). Cf. Spelman (2018a) esp. 177–278 on Pindar's strong sense of literary history.

[202] Even quotations of mythological personages may point to specific texts, e.g. Adrastus (*Ol.* 6.12–17 ~ *Theb.* fr. 6 *GEF*): §IV.3.1. On Pindar and Homer, see Pelliccia (1987); Nagy (1990b); Mann (1994); Sotiriou (1998); Aubriot (2003); Renaud (2007); Spelman (2018c).

[203] Cf. too the self-naming of Phocylides and Demodocus of Leros: West (1978b) 164–5. The textuality of Theognis' claim is reinforced by a 'stichometric allusion' to Hesiod's *Theogony*: in both poems, the poet's name appears in verse 22: Renehan (1980) 339–40; Hubbard (2007) 206. Such precise textual imitation seems to presuppose the

54

writing and literacy throughout the sixth and fifth centuries,[204] all these examples suggest that we are very much justified in seeing increasingly greater intertextual engagement with specific texts in lyric poetry.[205]

In practice, however, any discussion of allusion in Greek lyric still faces many of the same issues that we have already encountered above, not least whether to prioritise engagement with the limited range of texts we have access to, and how we should negotiate the boundaries of the typological and the specific.[206] When Archilochus describes his seduction of Neoboule in the first Cologne epode (fr. 196a), for example, should we conceive of this as a pointed rewriting of Hera's seduction of Zeus in *Iliad* 14 or a broader engagement with the epic type-scene of seduction?[207] Similarly, does Mimnermus fr. 2 allude to the leaves simile of *Il.* 6.146–9 or to a traditional analogy that is found frequently elsewhere, both in Homer and later texts?[208] So too with the Lesbian poets: does Sappho fr. 44 evoke a patchwork of Iliadic passages or a wider range of Trojan traditions, including not just Hector and Andromache's wedding, but also that of Paris and Helen?[209] And

---

existence of fixed written texts: cf. Pratt (1995). On stichometric allusion in later poetry: Hinds (1998) 92 n. 80; Morgan (1999) 223–9; Lowe (2013), (2014).

[204] Ancient literacy: Knox (1985); Harris (1989) esp. 45–115; R. Thomas (1992), (2009); Yunis (2003); Missiou (2011). Cf. Rösler (1980) 45–6; Slater (1996); Hubbard (2004); Wright (2012) 141–71; Spelman (2018a) 39–43, (2019); Hadjimichael (2019) 171–211. See too Langdon (2015) on a corpus of over 1,200 sixth-century verbal graffiti by Attic herders, which encourages us to reconsider the 'prevalence' of literacy 'in sub-aristocratic society' (p. 57). On the reception of ancient texts as material entities: Phillips (2016) esp. 9–26.

[205] Cf. too intratextuality within individual poets' oeuvres, especially centred around sequences and cycles of songs, e.g. Archilochus on Lycambes, Alcaeus on his exile, Sappho on her family: Budelmann and Phillips (2018a) 18–19; Swift (forthcoming). See §III.3.3 and IV.3.1.

[206] Some are generally sceptical of the extent of allusion in early Greek lyric: Fowler (1987) 3–52; Kelly (2015a), (forthcoming a). In any case, traditional referentiality can still be fruitfully applied to Greek lyric: e.g. Barker and Christensen (2006). Cf. Nicholson (2013), (2016) on Pindaric intertextuality with oral traditions.

[207] *Iliad*: Bossi (1973/4) 14–15; Van Sickle (1975) 126–9; Henderson (1976) 165–7. Seduction type-scene: Swift (2015b). Fowler (1987) 28–9 remains cautious. I leave both possibilities open in Nelson (2021b).

[208] Cf. *Il.* 2.467–8, 2.800, 21.464–6; *Od.* 7.106, 9.51; Musaeus fr. 97 *PEG*; Bacchyl. 5.63–7; Ar. *Av.* 685–7. Allusion: Griffith (1975); Fowler (1987) 32; Garner (1990) 3–8; Sider (1996); Rangos (2009) 77–8. Scepticism: Burgess (2001a) 117–22.

[209] *Iliad*: Rissman (1983) 119–48; Meyerhoff (1984) 118–39; Schrenk (1994); Bowie (2010a) 71–4; Xian (2019). Trojan traditions: Suárez de la Torre (2008); Spelman

does Alcaeus fr. 347 closely rework Hesiod's description of sum-
mer in the *Works and Days* (*Op.* 582–96) or draw independently
on a traditional body of seasonal song, attested elsewhere by
a parallel description in the Hesiodic *Aspis* (*Scut.* 393–7)?[210] In
all these and other cases, we should be wary of unduly privileging
the few texts that we still possess over the broader tradition, but
this should not stop us from arguing for direct allusion when the
context and content of the passages justify it. In the case of
Alcaeus' summer scene, for example, the parallels between the
Alcaean and Hesiodic passages are so numerous and precise that
a merely indirect connection seems improbable. On closer examin-
ation, the arguments for a traditional motif are also not particularly
compelling: the *Aspis* parallel passage is more likely another 'echo'
of the *Works and Days* (even self-consciously marked as such
through the recurrence of the 'echoing' cicada: ἠχέτα τέττιξ, *Scut.*
393),[211] a means to increase its own 'Hesiodic' texture, rather than
an independent manifestation of a recurring motif. In this case, it is
plausible to read Alcaeus' fragment as a pointed appropriation of
Hesiod's paraenetic posturing, marking his generic difference to
and distance from Hesiod's far longer didactic epic.

In recent years, however, several scholars have attempted to
restrict the origins of extensive textual intertextuality to the time
of Stesichorus in the sixth century, a poet whom they perceive as
marking a particularly significant watershed in the development of
poetic allusion.[212] It is true that Stesichorus does offer us several
plausible cases of precise engagement with Homeric epic, often
with apparently rarer moments of Homeric narrative: the compari-
son of Geryon's drooping head to a poppy echoes the *Iliad*'s
similarly poignant description of Gorgythion's head (*Geryoneis*
fr. 19.44–7 ~ *Il.* 8.306–8); Geryon's mother baring her breast

---

[2017]; Kelly (2020) 283–7, (2021b) 62–4; Scodel (2020) 15–18; cf. Steinrück (1999).
See §II.3.3.

[210] Allusion: Page (1955a) 306; West (1978a) 61 with n. 2; Rösler (1980) 256–64; Fowler
(1987) 37–8; Tsomis (2001) 151–4; Bing (2009) 154 n. 12; Hunter (2014) 123–5;
Budelmann (2018a) 110–11. Popular tradition: Hooker (1977) 80–1; Nagy (1990b)
462–3 n. 121; Martin (1992) 22–3; Jocelyn (1993); Petropoulos (1994) 17, 81–2;
Bershadsky (2011) 11–13 (who compares Ar. *Pax* 1159–71, *Av.* 1088–1100).

[211] Bing (2012) 186–7. Cf. Stamatopoulou (2013) 283–4.

[212] Kelly (2015a), cited approvingly by Ormand (2017); Barker (2022).

56

recalls Hecuba's same action before Hector (*Geryoneis* fr. 17 ~ *Il.* 22.79–83); and Telemachus' departure from Sparta replays events from the *Odyssey* (*Nostoi* fr. 170.1–11 ~ *Od.* 15.1–184).[213] Such precise engagement can also be traced in Stesichorus' successors, not only in the three famous epinician poets (Simonides, Bacchylides and Pindar), but also Ibycus, whose Polycrates Ode (S151) plausibly makes sophisticated use of the Iliadic Catalogue of Ships and Hesiod's *Works and Days*.[214]

However, to posit Stesichorus as a dramatic point of change overplays the novelty of such precise references and underplays the significance of earlier Stesichorean predecessors such as Alcaeus.[215] We have already noted his precise verbal engagement with Hesiod, but we could also cite his fr. 44, which appears to evoke the key theme of the *Iliad*: in its fragmentary state, we see a son call to his Naiad mother, who then supplicates Zeus on the subject of her son's wrath (μᾶνιν, fr. 44.8 ~ μῆνιν, *Il.* 1.1). It is difficult to deny a reference to our *Iliad* or at least an Iliadic tradition here, especially given that poem's unusual and loaded use of the noun μῆνις (cf. §1.2).[216]

Moreover, scholars' sceptical arguments about earlier texts can also be turned against their own Stesichorean examples. In the case of *Geryoneis* fr. 19, for example, Adrian Kelly himself notes that flower similes are common in early Greek epic, while the image of each poppy simile is considerably different: in Stesichorus, the flower sheds its leaves; while in Homer, it is weighed down by the weight of fruit and rain.[217] In addition, we could add that arrows likely played a larger role in other epic material, especially in traditions featuring Philoctetes and

[213] Kelly (2015a) 34–42. Fr. 19: Fowler (1987) 35–6; Garner (1990) 14–18; Lazzeri (2008) 254–68; Eisenfeld (2018) 91–2. Fr. 17: Castellaneta (2013) 49–59; Eisenfeld (2018) 92–3. Fr. 170: Reece (1988); Carvalho (2022) 99–104.
[214] Barron (1969); Steiner (2005); Stamatopoulou (2016) 49–51.
[215] Cf. the caution of Currie (2021c) 347–9.
[216] Page (1955a) 281–3; Meyerhoff (1984) 46–53; Fowler (1987) 37; West (1995) 206–7, (2002) 209. Contrast Kelly (2015a) 25–7, who acknowledges his 'excessive or even mischievous scepticism'. Bacchylides also reuses the *Iliad*'s incipit at the start of his extensive reworking of the poem (Πη[λεΐδας . . . μ]ᾶνιν, Bacchyl. 13.110–11). Such allusions to incipits became increasingly common in later poetry: Nelson (2019a) §65 n. 94.
[217] Kelly (2015a) 36. Epic flower similes: Kelly (2007a) 289–90.

57

Heracles, so the shared instrument of death in these two scenes need not be particularly distinctive or marked. And Kelly's argument that the Iliadic model is a rare and obscure episode, in comparison to earlier lyric poets' engagement with more mainstream, marquee episodes, is undermined by its simile form – it is a far more vivid and memorable moment than Kelly supposes. All this is not enough, I believe, to dismiss this Stesichorean allusion, but it goes some way to highlighting the subjectivity inherent in any argument for or against allusion in early Greek poetry.

It is not possible, therefore, to pinpoint a specific watershed moment at which we can start talking of precise intertextual engagements rather than allusion to more general mythological traditions. We may be able to discern a gradual increase in the quantity and verbal specificity of allusions over time, but there is no sudden step change. Indeed, returning to the world of archaic epic, we should perhaps not entirely rule out the possibility of direct textual intertextuality even in our earliest extant texts. Scholars have long noted the elaborate intratextual connections within individual epic poems, especially in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*'s large-scale repetitions of speeches and similes, even over vast distances (*Il*. 15.263–8 = 6.506–11; *Od*. 17.124–46 ~ 4.333–50, 4.556–60; *Od*. 23.157–61 = 6.230–4).[218] It is difficult to deny Currie's conclusion that 'each poet knows his own poem as a fixed text, and recalls part of it by quoting specific lines'.[219] And if such fixity and 'sense of text' is possible within an individual work, it is indeed hard to resist extending it to a poet's 'engagement with other poems'.[220] This alone does not permit us to reconstruct a host of lost 'fixed' archaic epics, for the reasons we have discussed above (§I.2.1). But when exploring the relationships of our extant texts, it would be overly restrictive to deny the possibility of direct contact at some points. And this, indeed, is what a number of scholars have found. The Hesiodic corpus, for

---

[218] See e.g. Lohmann (1970); Bannert (1988); Di Benedetto (1994) 177–238; Reichel (1994); Bakker (2017b); Hutcheson (2018); Cesca (2022). Note too the unique repetition of three lines to describe the deaths of Patroclus and Hector (*Il*. 16.855–7 = 22.361–3), connecting these heroes' fates in sequence (alongside that of Sarpedon: *Il*. 16.502 = 16.855 = 22.361): de Jong (2012) 13–15, 140–1, 151.

[219] Currie (2016) 17.

[220] Currie (2016) 17–18, citing Dowden (1996) for Homer's 'sense of text'.

58

example, is marked by a number of close connections, especially between the *Theogony* and *Works and Days*, whose relationship borders on 'deliberate cross-referencing':[221] not only do both poems feature autobiographical accounts of Hesiod's relationship to the Muses from Mount Helicon (*Theog.* 22–35, *Op.* 654–9) and both treat the myths of Prometheus and Pandora in a complementary diptych with numerous verbal parallels (*Theog.* 507–616, *Op.* 47–105),[222] but the beginning of the *Works and Days* also appears to self-consciously 'correct' the *Theogony*'s claim that there was only one Strife (*Op.* 11–26 ~ *Theog.* 225–6).[223] Similar intertextual links have also been identified in the wider canon of archaic Greek epic, both between the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* and Homer and between the *Homeric Hymns* and a number of other early Greek hexameter poems.[224] Admittedly, in some cases, these connections may still be better explained as instances of mythological intertextuality or traditional referentiality.[225] Yet these examples – especially Hesiod's intertextual diptych – are extremely suggestive for an early sense of (relatively) fixed textuality in the poetic world of archaic Greece.

The most controversial case, however, remains the relationship of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. There are many parallel passages between the two epics,[226] and a number of scholars have made plausible cases for seeing allusive connections between their structure, language and motifs.[227] In particular, it has often been argued that the fraught

---

[221] Nelson (2005) 333; cf. Blümer (2001) I 93–106, II 63–4, 137–200; Clay (2003) 6–8.

[222] E.g. *Op.* 48 ~ *Theog.* 546, 565; *Op.* 70–2 ~ *Theog.* 570–3. See Vernant (1974) 177–94 = (1980) 168–85; Clay (2003) 100–28; cf. Σ Hes. *Op.* 48.

[223] Self-correction signalled by οὐκ ἄρα: Most (1993) 77–82 (suspecting the use of writing: cf. Pucci (1977) 140–1); Scodel (1996) 72–7 (suspecting a further reference to *Op.* 656–9), (2001) 122; Blümer (2001) II 35–8; Barker and Christensen (2020) 177–85; cf. Σ Hes. *Op.* 11, 11a. Contrast Sinclair (1932) 3; Rowe (1978) 104; Hooker (1992) 50–1; Zarecki (2007) 11–14, who, however, sees in ἐτήτυμα μυθησαίμην (*Op.* 10) a further allusion to *Theog.* 27–8.

[224] *Catalogue*: Ormand (2014) 119–80. *Hymns*: Faulkner (2008) 31–40; Brillet-Dubois (2011); Thomas (2011) 168, (2017) 77–81; Baumbach (2012) 137–8; Hunter (2012) 94; Olson (2012) 16–24, 279–81; Maravela (2015).

[225] E.g. Aphrodite's bathing at Paphos (*HhAphr.* 58–63) – perhaps directly lifted from *Od.* 8.362–6 (e.g. Baumbach (2012) 137–8), but more likely an independent manifestation of an 'allurement scene' (Forsyth (1979)) or an evocation of the *fabula* of Aphrodite's seduction of Anchises and her pseudo-seduction of Paris (cf. Currie (2016) 147–60).

[226] Sittl (1882) 9–61; Gemoll (1883); Usener (1990); Keil (1998) 123–74; West (2014a) 70–7.

[227] Heubeck (1954); Burkert (1960); Pucci (1979), (1987) esp. 17–18; Goldhill (1991) 93–108; Rutherford (1991–93); Korenjak (1998); Schein (1999); Di Benedetto (2001); Currie (2006) 7–15, (2016) 39–47, (2019); West (2014a) 25–7; Minchin (2018);

59

relationship of Achilles and Odysseus in both poems self-consciously reflects the competition between their respective epics, as each hero is defined against the other: the figure of βίη against that of μῆτις – certainly an attractive, if at times reductive, hypothesis.[228] It is understandable that some might shrink from arguing for direct allusion between these poems, given the apparently oral setting of archaic epic. And there is, after all, no smoking gun. Yet by reading the pair in dialogue, I believe that already here we can gain a richer understanding of both poems.

To contemplate such a relationship, however, we must tackle the remarkable fact that neither poem directly mentions any event from the other, a phenomenon customarily known as 'Monro's Law'.[229] Only the mixing of Achilles' and Patroclus' bones may offer an exception to this phenomenon (requested by Patroclus' shade at *Il.* 23.82–92 and recalled by Agamemnon's at *Od.* 24.73–84), but even this is an event that strictly lies outside the main narrative of both poems.[230] Denys Page once concluded from this absence that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* developed in complete isolation from each other,[231] but given the length and similar subject matter of both, it is difficult not to interpret the complete avoidance of each other's narrative content as deliberate.[232] After all, the monumental scale of both poems sets them apart from all other known

Ballesteros (2020). Occasionally, the *Odyssey* is thought to have priority: Scott (1911); Shewan (1913); Borthwick (1985); Pucci (1987) 42 n. 23; Blößner (2006) 35–46; Tsagalis (2008) 135–49. Others see a continuous agonistic dialogue between both poems: Wilson (2002); Lentini (2006); Mazur (2010). For caution, see Kelly (forthcoming b).

[228] Nagy (1979) 42–58; Thalmann (1984) 181–3; Edwards (1985a); Cook (1995) esp. 28–32; King (1999); Wilson (2005); Barker (2009) 58–9, 89–134; Mitsis (2010); Currie (2016) 46 with n. 46; Grethlein (2017). Cf. too Lesser (2019) for a comparable rivalry between the Iliadic Helen and Odyssean Penelope.

[229] Monro (1901) 325. 'Monro's Law' is a misnomer: it is an 'observation', rather than a 'law', and Monro himself cites earlier scholarship: Niese (1882) 43–5.

[230] Nagy (1979) 21. Ford (1992) 158–60 argues that the *Odyssey*'s exclusion of Antilochus from this mingled burial (*Od.* 24.78–9) marks a dismissal of *Aethiopis* traditions and pinpoints the *Iliad*, but we have no more evidence that Antilochus was more closely buried with Achilles in another tradition. In Proclus' summary of the *Aethiopis* (*Aeth.* arg. 4a *GEF*), the Achaeans treat each corpse separately, burying Antilochus (θάπτουσι) and laying out Achilles' body (προτίθενται).

[231] Page (1955b).

[232] E.g. Kirk (1962) 299–300; Nagy (1979) 20–1; Pucci (1987) 17–18. For later cases of such 'negative intertextuality', cf. Spelman (2018a) 102 n. 59 on the general avoidance of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in the Epic Cycle, Stesichorus, Pindar and Bacchylides.

60

early Greek epics.[233] In addition, the pair display an unusually high degree of complementarity: we can trace numerous contradictions and differences of detail between the Cyclic epics and Homer, but the contents of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are strikingly consistent and compatible.[234] Indeed, Foley and Arft have argued that 'overlap and even contradiction' are 'natural and expectable' in a multiform, pre-textual tradition.[235] The absence of both in this case is extremely telling. Moreover, when taken as a pair, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* appear to offer an extremely convenient survey of the whole Trojan war: in its main narrative and cross references, the *Iliad* treats the first sack of Troy to the death of Achilles, while the *Odyssey* picks up from that point until the end of Odysseus' story. This complementarity was already recognised in antiquity: Homer in the *Odyssey* was said to have filled out what was left out of the *Iliad* (τὰ λελειμμένα).[236] But given how seamlessly and coherently the two epics cover the whole Trojan war narrative, this unity certainly seems intentional and premeditated.

Of course, those who remain sceptical could still argue that the *Odyssey* is merely familiar with many episodes of the *fabula* of Achilles and the Trojan war, and the *Iliad* similarly with the *fabula* of Odysseus' return,[237] but – in my view – the extent of the connections encourages something greater in this case: that the poet of the *Odyssey* was familiar with the *Iliad* as a distinctive text, or at least with the distinctive contours of

---

[233] According to Proclus' summaries, most Cyclic poems were divided into two to five books (two: *Sack of Ilion*, *Telegony*; four: *Little Iliad*; five: *Aethiopis*, *Nostoi*). Even the longest, the *Cypria*, comprised only eleven books. On the 'uniqueness of Homer', see Griffin (1977).

[234] Cycle and Homer: Both the *Cypria* and *Iliad* contain catalogues of Trojan allies (*Il.* 2.816–77; *Cypr.* arg. 12c *GEF*); they disagree on where Chryseis was captured (Lyrnessus: *Il.* 2.688–93, 19.59–60, 295–6; Pedasus: *Cypr.* fr. 23 *GEF*) and on the itinerary of Paris' voyage from Sparta to Troy (*Il.* 6.289–92; *Cypr.* fr. 14 *GEF*: cf. Hdt. 2.116–17). Cf. inconsistencies and overlaps in the Cyclic poems: Ajax's suicide features in both the *Little Iliad* (arg. 1b *GEF*) and *Aethiopis* (fr. 6 *GEF*); Astyanax is killed by Odysseus in the *Sack of Ilion* (arg. 4a *GEF*) but by Neoptolemus in the *Little Iliad* (fr. 29 *GEF*); Aeneas flees Troy in the *Sack of Ilion* (arg. 1d *GEF*) but is captured as a war prize in the *Little Iliad* (fr. 30 *GEF*). Cf. Marks (2017), (2020) 56–9.

[235] Foley and Arft (2015) 78; cf. Burgess (2019a) 12.

[236] Σ HMᵃ *Od.* 3.103a *ex.*; Hunter (2018) 190. Cf. Σ E *Od.* 3.248a *ex.*: the *Odyssey* 'fills in the gaps' of the *Iliad* (ἀναπλήρωσις τῆς Ἰλιάδος); ps.-Long. *Subl.* 9.12: the *Odyssey* is the 'epilogue of the *Iliad*' (τῆς Ἰλιάδος ἐπίλογος).

[237] Edwards (1985a) 8–9 considers such a stance 'the most skeptical view'.

an Iliadic tradition.[238] Such fixity would not necessarily depend on writing, but it would equally not preclude it: the excavation of the cup of Acesander at Methone has recently provided further evidence that poetry was recorded in writing by the mid-eighth century BCE.[239] We should not, however, take this relationship as the norm for the Homeric texts' engagement with other material, or as sufficient justification to reconstruct a host of distinctive, now lost poems as sources for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: indeed, our foregoing discussion has highlighted the limitations of that approach. In their shared length and scope, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* clearly stand apart from the larger epic tradition. The strong links between them show that both mythological and textual intertextuality could coexist at an early date – much as specific and generic allusion coexist in later Latin poetry.

In my discussion of Greek epic and lyric that follows, therefore, I will be exploring cases of both mythological and textual intertextuality. My instinct is to assume engagement with mythical *fabulae*, rather than texts, especially when dealing with the lost traditions underpinning both Homeric poems, unless a particularly strong case can be made for direct textual interaction. But as we proceed to Greek lyric, potential cases of direct allusion will become more numerous. The indexing of such allusions (to *fabulae* and/or texts) will be the main focus of this study, but I will also stay attuned throughout to the traditional referentiality of individual words and phrases (cf. §I.2). In this way, we will best be able to appreciate the rich texture of archaic Greek allusion.

---

[238] I remain agnostic about the possibility of the *Iliad* being familiar with the *Odyssey* or an Odyssean tradition. Arguments are generally less compelling (cf. Currie (2016) 39–40). The most convincing case can be made by exploring how the Iliadic Odysseus almost 'threatens to hijack' Achilles' narrative at key moments: e.g. Barker (2009) 58–9.

[239] Janko (2015) 23–7, comparing the Dipylon oenochoe, Nestor's Cup and a cup with three hexameters from Eretria. He concludes that 'by this time, alphabetic writing could be used to record poetry on more serious occasions and at far greater length'. On the vexed question of Homer and writing, see e.g. Powell (1997); Clay (2016).

1.2.4 *Agents and Audiences*

The foregoing discussion has been rather abstract, focused on the interrelations of texts and traditions, with little focus on the people behind the process – the poets and audiences who comprise the agents of literary interaction. Indeed, this study fits into a growing trend of modern scholarship which focuses on the literary aspects of archaic Greek poetry.[240] But such a focus should not ignore the excellent progress that has been made in understanding the cultural and social contexts of archaic literature, especially in the lyric tradition.[241] I will thus close this Introduction by addressing three issues of context which are all central to this book: audiences and performance, poetic agonism, and authorial self-consciousness.

Contexts of Reception: Audiences and Performance

Throughout this study, I will follow the practice of many modern scholars in supposing an ideally competent audience whose previous exposure to tradition has equipped them with the prior knowledge necessary to appreciate poets' allusive interactions.[242] Of course, ancient audiences – like those today – would have varied widely in capabilities and interests, but this should not limit us to pursuing the lowest common denominator of interpretation. And nor does an oral context of performance preclude the reception and appreciation of such allusions: cases of indexicality can be detected in modern oral traditions,[243] while contemporary music,

---

[240] See e.g. Rudolph (2009); Peponi (2012); Budelmann and Phillips (2018b).
[241] See e.g. Gentili (1988); Dougherty and Kurke (1993); Stehle (1997); Kowalzig (2007); Kurke (2013); Morgan (2015).
[242] Danek (2002) 4, 19; Kelly (2007a) 12–13; Currie (2016) 29–30; Spelman (2018a) 182. Cf. Revermann (2006) on dramatic audiences. This practice has a long critical tradition: cf. Fish's 'informed reader' (1970); Iser's 'implied reader' (1974); Eco's 'model reader' (1979); and Culler's 'competent reader' (2002).
[243] E.g. Mehmed Kolaković's *Janković Stojan i Hodžić Husein*: the hero Stojan Janković reminisces about his past (*HNP*III.18.52–122), epitomising one of the most famous and popular stories of the South-Slavic epic tradition, *The Captivity of Stojan Janković*. His opening appeal to his internal audience's knowledge ('**You, too, know** [it], you sirdars of Kotar', '**I vi znate**, kotarski serdari', *HNP*III.18.44) signposts the external audience's familiarity with the tale, reinforced by a further temporal index ('I **once** summoned an army', 'Ja sam **jednoč** vojsku podignuo', *HNP*III.18.61). Cf. Danek (2016) 133 with n. 24, 138–42.

theatre and film offer many examples of clearly detectable allusions mid-performance.[244]

In fact, many ancient contexts of performance would have proved ideal channels to encourage allusive and indexical activity, involving as they did the creative and competitive juxtaposition of poems.[245] Festival contests, for example, would have provided regular occasions for poets to look back to past performances and to respond to their contemporary rivals, as we see in the tradition of the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*.[246] In this regard, scholars frequently point to the so-called 'Panathenaic Rule': the requirement that one rhapsode at the Athenian Panathenaea pick up a narrative where the previous rhapsode left off – a process that is both collaborative and competitive (Diog. Laert. 1.57; [Pl.] *Hipparch*. 228b7–c1).[247] The relative antiquity of this practice is unclear – the testimonia are late and specify different instigators – but Andrew Ford has attractively suggested that a similar procedure is already reflected in *Odyssey* 8: Demodocus' sequences of songs resemble a succession of rhapsodic performances, while Odysseus' *Apologoi* pick up and continue from Demodocus' final song on the fall of Troy.[248] More generally, this same kind of capping and exchange is also visible in the battlefield boasting of Homeric heroes[249] and has plausibly been thought to underlie aspects of Homeric plot construction and allusive motif

---

[244] See e.g. the musical *Hamilton* (by Lin-Manuel Miranda, 2015), which combines allusions to Shakespeare, Gilbert and Sullivan, and contemporary hip hop; or *Wicked* (by Stephen Schwartz, 2003), a self-conscious 'prequel' to the *Wizard of Oz*, with numerous foreshadowings of 'later' events within the play's fictional world. Cf. too the so-called 'Easter eggs' of the Marvel Cinematic Universe, the knowing cross references of Quentin Tarantino's movies and the 'sampling' of rap music: Steiner (2010) 7–8, 84–5; Zabel (2021) 545–8.

[245] On performance contexts in general, see Bowie (1986); Henderson (1989); Rotstein (2012); Martin (2015); Tsagalis (2018); Scodel (2021a). On the intertextual possibilities of re-performance, see e.g. Morrison (2007b), (2011a), (2011b); and on competitive performance contexts as conducive to intertextuality, cf. Currie (2021c) esp. 346–7.

[246] See Graziosi (2001); Bassino (2019). The dramatic festivals of fifth-century Athens offer a further well-evidenced analogy for this process: see e.g. Rau (1967); Garner (1990); Bakola (2008); Biles (2011); Torrance (2013); Farmer (2017); Jendza (2020).

[247] Davison (1955b); Nagy (2002) 9–69; Burgess (2004b) 7–16; Collins (2004) 192–202.

[248] Ford (1992) 110–18. For other possible reflections of rhapsodic performance in Homer: Pagliaro (1951) esp. 39–46; Tarditi (1968) 140–1; Nagy (1996a) 71–3, (2003) 43–4; Burgess (2004b) 16–20; Collins (2004) 167–75; Martin (2020) 11.

[249] Martin (1989) 67–88; Griffith (1990) 192; Parks (1990).

64

transference.[250] Such a climate of responsive and interactive per-
formance would have been a natural venue for indexed cross-
references between songs and traditions.

The same conclusion could also be drawn from the other major
archaic context for the performance of poetry, the symposium.[251]
This too involved a competitive and collaborative culture: sympo-
siasts took turns singing and speaking and incited each other
through teasing taunts (*HhHerm.* 54–6).[252] In this case, the process
is best epitomised by *skolia*, short lyric poems which were sung in
succession, each singer trying to cap and respond to the previous
song.[253] In many ways, this offers a miniaturised version of the
same process that we have seen in a festival context.[254] Whether
reciting memorised poems or composing improvised pieces, sym-
posiasts were trained to think about and respond to connections
between poems. More generally, the symposium also seems to have
been a key site for literary education and learning from an early
date, which would have made it an even more productive venue for
intertextual reference. Attic comedy frequently depicts characters
requesting and singing extracts from their favourite poets in
a sympotic setting,[255] while Ion of Chios preserves an anecdote of
a symposium at which Sophocles spontaneously cites excerpts from
Simonides, Phrynichus and others, attesting to the *sophia* on display

---

[250] Plot construction: Bachvarova (2018); cf. Collins (2001). Motif transference: Burgess
(2005) 124–7.
[251] On the archaic symposium: Vetta (1983c); Murray (1990), (2018); Bowie (1993a);
Collins (2004) 61–163; Hobden (2013); Węcowski (2014); Cazzato et al. (2016). It is
especially associated with lyric poetry, but see e.g. Ford (1999) and Murray (2008) on
the *Odyssey*'s sympotic affinities.
[252] Turn-taking: fr. *adesp. eleg.* 27.7–8 *IEG* (ἀκούωμέν [τε λ]εγόντων | ἐν μέρει, 'let us listen
to those speaking in turn'); Pl. *Leg.* 2.671c, *Prt.* 347d; cf. Polyb. 4.20.10 (ἀνὰ μέρος
ᾄδειν ἀλλήλοις προστάττοντες, 'requiring one another to sing in turn').
[253] See e.g. Reitzenstein (1893) 3–44; Collins (2004) 84–134; Jones (2008);
Yatromanolakis (2009) 271–5; Martin (2017). Aristophanes *Wasps* offers the earliest
representation of the process (*Vesp.* 1222–49): Vetta (1983b). See too §II.3.1 for
discussion of 898–9 *PMG*.
[254] Cf. Collins (2004) 84–98, 194–9; Martin (2015) 25.
[255] Ar. *Banqueters*, fr. 235 K–A (Alcaeus, Anacreon), *Eq.* 529–30 (Cratinus), *Nub.*
1354–72 (Simonides, Euripides), *Vesp.* 1233–35 (~ Alcaeus fr. 141), *Pax* 1265–
1304 (epic, Archilochus); Eup. fr. 260.23–26 K–A (~ Soph. *Ant.* 712–15, cf.
Antiphanes fr. 228.3–7 K–A); Eup. fr. 395 K–A (Stesichorus). Cf. Diphilus'
Synoris (fr. 74.7–9 K–A), in which a parasite quotes three Euripidean lines, two of
which are authentic (7 = *Antiope* fr. 187.1 *TrGF*; 9 = *IT* 535), but the third recognis-
ably fabricated: cf. Wright (2022).

65

in such a context (fr. 104 Leurini = *BNJ* 392 F6).[256] Most pointedly, however, later anecdotes attest to the range of literary sympotic games that centred on precise knowledge of the Homeric poems: symposiasts recited lines with specific numbers of syllables or combinations of letters, were asked to name specific Greek or Trojan commanders and cities, and extracted hidden names by combining the first and last syllables of a verse.[257] Such precise textual play cannot necessarily be traced back to the archaic period, but our earliest epigraphic evidence – such as Nestor's cup (§1.2.1) and the recent finds from Methone – suggest that already in the eighth century the symposium was a site for cultural display and literary games.[258] The symposium thus offers another plausible context for archaic poets' allusive practice.

Far from being an impediment to the kind of intertextual cross references explored here, therefore, archaic poetry's culture of oral performance will have facilitated them, allowing for the creative collocation of numerous poems on both a large and small scale. Allusion and indexicality would be very much at home within such a climate of song exchange.

Poetic Agonism

Many of the interpretations that I pursue below also involve an agonistic edge: a poet competitively positioning their poem against another text or tradition. In this, I am responding to the agonistic nature of archaic Greek society. Contests dominated many aspects of archaic Greek life, including war, athletics and craftsmanship; but it is in the poetic sphere where this competitive impulse is felt most strongly.[259] We have already noted the competitive atmosphere of festival contests and sympotic

---

[256] See e.g. Leurini (1987); Ford (2002) 190–3; Grand-Clément (2009); Federico (2015) 209–22.
[257] Ath. *Deipn.* 10.457e–59a (including citation of Clearchus of Soli, fr. 63 Wehrli).
[258] Cf. Węcowski (2017) 323: 'already in the second half of the eighth century BCE the symposion deserves to be identified with a culture-oriented banquet testing the cultural skills and competences of its participants'.
[259] Griffith (1990); Ford (2002) 272–93; Collins (2004); Barker (2009); Gostoli et al. (2017); Damon and Pieper (2019); Martin (2020) 24–6. On the competitive world of archaic epic, see Martin (1989); van Wees (1992); Scodel (2008); Allan and Cairns (2011); Bassino et al. (2017). On *Eris* in epic: Christensen (2018).

66

performances, but our archaic texts also provide further evidence of this overarching agonism. In the *Works and Days*, Hesiod famously describes Strife spurring on poets as it does craftsmen and potters (Hes. *Op.* 24–6), and he later recounts his own poetic victory at a contest held during the funeral games for Amphidamas (*Op.* 654–9).[260] The Homeric poems are less explicit in this regard, but they still picture the bard Thamyris vying to compete against the Muses (*Il.* 2.594–600) and Telemachus' claim that 'audiences celebrate more the song which is newest to their ears', a self-reflexive comment on the *Odyssey*'s own drive for novelty and success (*Od.* 1.351–2).[261] The *Homeric Hymns*, too, exhibit a similarly eristic underbelly: the sixth *Homeric Hymn* (to Aphrodite) ends by asking the goddess to 'grant me victory in this competition' (δὸς δ' ἐν ἀγῶνι | νίκην τῷδε φέρεσθαι, *Hh.* 6.19–20), while the narrator of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* pictures the Ionians gathering for a festival 'assembly' (or 'contest': ἀγῶνα) with boxing, dancing and singing (*HhAp.* 146–50) and shortly thereafter asks the Delian maidens to remember him as the 'most pleasurable of poets' whom they 'enjoy the most' and 'all of whose songs are the best hereafter' (ἥδιστος ἀοιδῶν ... τέῳ τέρπεσθε μάλιστα ... τοῦ πᾶσαι μετόπισθεν ἀριστεύουσιν ἀοιδαί, *HhAp.* 169–73).[262] Such assertions reflect a clear competitive spirit, a drive to be superlative and pre-eminent.[263]

This agonistic drive is equally manifest in the archaic lyric tradition. Theognis imagines competing in a song contest against Academus which has a beautiful boy as its prize ('the pair of us competing in skill', σοφίης πέρι δηρισάντοιν, Thgn. 993–6), while a fragment of Bacchylides refers to the exclusivity of 'keenly

---

[260] Notably, ps.-Longinus explicitly redeploys Hesiod's words on Strife to justify literary *aemulatio* (*Subl.* 13.4). For the *Works and Days* itself as a contest song, see Peabody (1975) 268–72.

[261] Thamyris: Maehler (1963) 16–17; Brillante (1992); Wilson (2006). For Telemachus' claim as a self-reflexive comment on the *Odyssey*, see Danek (1998) 60; de Jong (2001) 38; Scodel (2002) 53–4.

[262] The language of the festival contest (146–50) reverberates in the narrator's boast, strengthening the agonism of his claims: ἀοιδῇ | μνησάμενοι τέρπουσιν, 149–50 ~ μνήσασθ', 167; τέρπεσθε, 170; ἀοιδαί, 173.

[263] Such a spirit is also attested in contemporary oral traditions: Steiner (2010) 8 n. 20 cites 'the remark of a Bosnian poet concerning a fellow singer' from Murko (1929) 21: 'We are enemies of one another. It is torture for me when I see another singer who knows more than I.'

contested gifts of the Muses' (δῶρα δυσμάχητα Μοισᾶν, fr. 55.2).[264] This competitive impulse is most keenly felt, however, in epinician poetry, a genre which establishes a close connection between singing poets and victorious athletes. On a number of occasions, Pindar stresses his superiority to his competitors: he competes with many (δηρίομαι πολέσιν, *Ol.* 13.44), outstrips his rivals (ἀμεύσασθ' ἀντίους, *Pyth.* 1.45), surpasses many by casting his javelin closest to the target of the Muses (ὕπερ πολλῶν, *Nem.* 9.54–5) and leads many others in his skill (πολλοῖσι δ' ἅγημαι σοφίας ἑτέροις, *Pyth.* 4.248).[265] Lyric poetry too foregrounds its agonistic setting.

Despite this explicit context, however, some scholars have questioned the degree of intertextual agonism in early Greek poetry and have argued that reading competitive allusivity into our archaic texts is out of line with the original contexts of their performance and goes against the rhetoric of the ancient poems themselves. Ruth Scodel, in particular, has sounded the most significant note of caution in relation to archaic epic, arguing that the internal evidence of the Homeric texts provides little support for such readings. She argues that Homeric heroes are generally respectful of earlier generations, refraining from challenging or competing with them. Heroic glory, she insists, is not a zero-sum contest, allowing the Homeric poems to position their heroes within a traditional canon that has room for them all. The overall ethos is one of deference to tradition, not dominance.[266] In addition, Scodel has argued that such agonistic readings misrepresent the competitive context of archaic performance: 'the poet's real rival', she suggests, 'is the poet against whom he is competing here and now, or the poet from down the road who may be hired in

---

[264] This use of the μάχ- stem in the context of poetic competition may add some support to interpretations of Alcman 1.60–3 which take the 'fighting' Pleiades as a rival choir (μάχονται, 63), although this is not the most plausible explanation: Segal (1983); Hutchinson (2001) 90–3; Budelmann (2018a) 75–6.

[265] He also compares himself to an eagle, opposed to lesser birds (crows: *Ol.* 2.86–8; jackdaws: *Nem.* 3.80–2); see Spelman (2018a) 237–43. Cf. too Pindar's agonistic relationship with victory statues: O'Sullivan (2003). On agonistic composition in archaic lyric generally, see Burton (2011).

[266] Scodel (2004).

68

his place'.[267] In her view, it is misguided to explore epic engagement with woolly, vacuous traditions, detached from specific real-world contexts.

These are significant criticisms of a major approach to Homeric studies – and they have not, as far as I am aware, been tackled directly. The issue inevitably engages with larger questions about the development of the Homeric texts and how they come to us in the form they do today. But even without getting drawn into such familiar and irresolvable questions, I feel that Scodel's argumentation can and should be reassessed. As we shall see in due course (§IV.2.3), epic heroes are not always content to play the meek, submissive epigone; the internal evidence of the poems is not as consistent as Scodel makes out. More significantly, however, Scodel does not justify why we should only prioritise the initial hypothesised performance context of bard against bard rather than later receptions of these works. If we imagine these poems as transient one-off performances focused on the present, her emphasis on the poet's real-world rivals makes sense. But this seems a reductive reading of the carefully crafted poems as we have them today, which are clearly invested in their own monumentality and the fame of their characters and stories. Most famously in Homer, Helen in *Iliad* 6 pictures herself and Paris as the subject of song in future generations (*Il.* 6.357–8), self-consciously acknowledging the *Iliad*'s own role in preserving these events, while Odysseus too claims to the Phaeacians that his *kleos* ('fame') reaches the heavens – thanks in large part to this very poem which preserves his deeds (*Od.* 9.19–20). Such self-conscious reflection on poetic permanence proved a recurring aspect of the Greek literary tradition, as Henry Spelman has recently reminded us in the case of Greek lyric and the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*.[268] These poems were not just ephemeral events, but enduring artefacts which envisaged their future fame beyond the present. Poets were aware of this later reception, and thus not only competed in a one-off contest with

---

[267] Scodel (2012) 501, cf. (2004) esp. 17. For similar scepticism, see too Burgess (2006) 165 with n. 43, (2017b) 116, (2019b) 138.

[268] See Spelman (2018a) *passim* for Pindar and esp. 146–73 for other lyric poets; Spelman (2018b) for the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*.

69

immediate rivals in the present, but also against an entire and increasingly concrete canon of tradition to which they aspired to belong. Within such a broader perspective of literary tradition, an agonistic aspect to archaic Greek allusion is natural, even expected.[269]

Self-Consciousness

Finally, I will also be imputing a significant degree of self-reflexivity into these archaic texts, often going beyond a naturalistic reading of scenes to detect an additional layer of self-consciousness. In particular, I will often read the poet's external motivation into the words of his characters, an approach that blurs the narratological distinction between primary (extradiegetic) and secondary (intradiegetic) narrators.[270] Some might challenge such a reading and object that a character's words are 'just' directed to their internal audience, and that it is unwarranted to jump from an internal character's speech to what the poet implicitly 'says' to his external audience. Yet this relies on a false dichotomy between 'naturalistic' and 'self-conscious' interpretations of poetry, a distinction that is often mapped onto that of 'archaic' and 'modern' literature. On closer inspection, however, ancient Greek texts, from Homer onwards, are manifestly self-conscious: scholars have long admired the embedded songs of the *Odyssey*, the meditation on artistic creation in the Homeric shield ecphrasis and the self-reflexive figuring of the Homeric poet in his characters, including Odysseus, Calchas and Nestor.[271] In the case of embedded speeches, too, there is no reason to deny such self-conscious interpretations. Characters' words are, after all, still the product of – and shaped by – their narrator, and so they can always be interpreted on multiple levels: both internally (as an address within the story world of a poem) and externally (as an

---

[269] For previous agonistic readings of Homer, see e.g. Edwards (1985a) esp. 11–13; Martin (1989) 227–30, 238–9; Finkelberg (2003) 75, 78–9, (2011a), (2015), (2018) 29–34; Barker and Christensen (2008) 9, (2020); Kelly (2008b), (2018); Lambrou (2015), (2020).

[270] Intra-/extradiegetic narrators: de Jong (2014) 20.

[271] Cf. §1.1.4 n. 68. Embedded song: Rinon (2006b). Ecphrasis: de Jong (2011). Odysseus: Moulton (1977) 145–53; Thalmann (1984) 170–84; Wyatt (1989); Kelly (2008b) 178; contrast Beck (2005b). Calchas/Nestor: Dickson (1992).

70

address to audiences beyond it). Nor does this suggestion radically depart from modern interpretative norms. As we have already seen, Phoenix's Meleager exemplum in *Iliad* 9 has long been interpreted on a double level: internally, as a speech that aims to exhort Achilles back to the battlefield, and externally, as an authorial nod to Achilles' future (§1).[272] Such multilevelled interpretations are equally open to lyric poets: Sappho's words have meaning not only for their internal addressee (e.g. Atthis), but also for the broader audiences who hear (or even read) her poetry in Lesbos and beyond.[273]

Moreover, this way of reading also aligns with the dominant mode of literary interpretation in antiquity. As Jonas Grethlein has recently highlighted, ancient critics did not differentiate an author from their characters in the same strict manner as modern narratologists.[274] Instead, they imagined that authors impersonated their characters: Homer speaks 'as if he were Chryses' (ὥσπερ αὐτὸς ὢν ὁ Χρύσης, Pl. *Resp.* 3.393a8), the poet 'becomes another' (ἕτερόν τι γιγνόμενον, Arist. *Poet.* 3.1448a21–2) and Euripides talks 'in the disguise of Andromache' (ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀνδρομάχης προσχήματι, Σ *Andr.* 445). When a character speaks, the poet-narrator does not give way but simply hides behind the mask of their character. Grethlein plausibly roots this understanding in the oral culture of ancient literary reception: audiences were accustomed to a performer's voice modulating into that of an author and their characters mid-performance.[275] This would be especially true of choral lyric, a genre in which the speaking voice fluctuates considerably, but equally applies to monodic and rhapsodic contexts.[276] Of course, this evidence for the idea of poetic impersonation is attested among highly attuned literary critics, and we cannot assume that it was shared by wider audiences, but the consistency of the idea suggests it may well have been. In any case, what matters crucially for us here is the fact that already in antiquity character speech in poetic texts could be understood at least by some audiences on two

---

[272] Cf. Fredricksmeyer (1997) for a similar multilevel reading of *Od.* 23.218–24.
[273] Cf. §III.3: Sappho expects the memory of herself and her addressees to endure; she is very aware of future, external audiences for her songs.
[274] Grethlein (2021). Cf. already Bakker (2009) 126–7.   [275] Grethlein (2021) 219–24.
[276] Choral: Currie (2013). Monodic: Budelmann (2018b). Rhapsodic: cf. Pl. *Ion* 535b2–c8.

levels: that of the impersonated character and that of the imperson-
ating author. In what follows, I will exploit this multilevel perspec-
tive, exploring how characters' (and narrators') words reach beyond
their immediate context. By doing so, we will be able to gain
a richer appreciation of archaic Greek poetics.

* * *

With this framework and these considerations in mind, then, it is
time to turn from theory to practice. In each of the chapters that
follow, we will explore the various ways in which archaic Greek
poets indexed their allusions to both traditions and texts.
Indexicality, we will see, was already a deep-rooted and dynamic
feature of our earliest surviving Greek poetry.

THE PRE-ALEXANDRIAN FOOTNOTE

II.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will explore the early Greek precedent for the most famous and frequent index of allusion in Roman poetry, the 'Alexandrian footnote'. As we have seen, Latin poets often signposted their allusions to and departures from tradition through vague appeals to the transmission of talk and hearsay (§I.1.1). By prefacing their allusive references with vague gestures to others' words, they signposted their intertextual gestures, appropriating, challenging and creatively reworking the authority of tradition.

In the sections that follow, I argue that this same indexical potential is already manifest in archaic Greek poetry's engagement with hearsay and its transmission. From Homer onwards, archaic poets evoke, confront and revise what others have previously 'said'.

II.2 Epic *Fama*

In the world of archaic epic, fame and renown play a prominent role. Both Homeric poems convey a strong impression of tales and traditions circulating between individuals and communities. This is especially visible in the *Odyssey*, where we witness the stories of the Achaeans' returns recounted by Phemius, Nestor and others, as well as Telemachus' active quest to seek news (ἀκουήν, *Od.* 14.179) of his father's fortunes. Yet even in the *Iliad*, stories of the past circulate continuously, as characters repeatedly appeal to a range of past tales as paradigms for their own circumstances (e.g. Bellerophon, Meleager and Niobe). Nor is this concern with the telling of tales limited to a retrospective concern with the past; it also looks to the present and future. In both epics, Homer's

73

characters are intimately concerned to preserve their own κλέος, a word which is often translated as 'fame', 'renown' or 'legacy', but which etymologically means 'that which is heard' (cf. κλύω, 'I hear'). Heroes may win κλέος on the battlefield (*Il.* 5.3, 18.121), in athletic contests (*Od.* 8.147–8) or even for fine words in council (*Od.* 16.241–2). And throughout Homeric society, there is a recurring concern with how future generations will hear of and judge their actions.[1] Even objects can enjoy a κλέος of their own, often through elaborate stories attached to them, such as Agamemnon's sceptre (*Il.* 1.234–9) and Meriones' boar-tusk helmet (*Il.* 10.261–71).[2] In the words of one critic, the Homeric universe is bound together by 'an elaborate network of gossip, rumor, and reputation'.[3] It is κλέος which drives heroic activity. And it is κλέος which eventually becomes memorialised in song.[4]

Throughout both Homeric poems and archaic Greek epic more generally, characters often appeal to these circulating traditions in vague and generalised terms through verbs of hearing and speaking, especially the third-person plural φασί ('they say').[5] In current scholarship, such gestures are frequently interpreted as part of a larger epic contrast between reliable first-hand experience and the indirect transmission of hearsay.[6] Since these appeals to tradition are primarily found in the mouths of mortal characters, who sometimes acknowledge their lack of direct autopsy, they are thought to reflect the limitations and fallibility of human knowledge, a foil to the omniscient and divinely authorised perspective of the epic narrator.[7] In the invocation of the Muses in *Iliad* 2, the

---

[1] Note especially the repeated verse-end phrase ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι, 'for future generations to hear': *Il.* 2.119, 22.305; *Od.* 11.76, 21.255, 24.433. Cf. *Il.* 3.287, 353–4, 460, 6.357–8; *Od.* 8.579–80, 24.196–202.

[2] Cf. Griffin (1980) 1–49; Grethlein (2008) 35–43.   [3] Olson (1995) 2.

[4] Cf. Achilles singing the 'famous stories of men' (κλέα ἀνδρῶν, *Il.* 9.189: §1). On epic κλέος: Nagy (1974) 244–55; Redfield (1975) 31–5; Olson (1995) 1–23; Petropoulos (2011) 1–89; Burgess (2012b) 283–7; Hardie (2012) 48–67; González (2015a) 117–72; Li (2022).

[5] φασί(ν) appears in the *Iliad* (21×), *Odyssey* (21×), *Theogony* (1×), *Works and Days* (1×), *Homeric Hymns* (3×) and at least one epic fragment. De Jong (2004) 237–8 offers a useful list of the Homeric examples, grouped into four main categories that reflect her narratological priorities.

[6] E.g. Ford (1992) 57–67; Mackie (2003) 68–9.

[7] See e.g. Ford (1992) 57–89; and O'Maley (2011), who contrasts contestable hearsay with reliable memory. Cf. de Jong's category B1: (2004) 237–8.

74

poet famously remarks that 'you are goddesses and are present and know all things, whereas we hear only a rumour and know nothing' (ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε, πάρεστέ τε, ἴστέ τε πάντα, | ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν, *Il.* 2.485–6). As Ford has argued from this and other such passages, the 'fiction' of the Muses conceals the reality of bardic education and transmission, freeing the Homeric narrator – unlike his characters – from needing to rely on 'mere' κλέος.[8] By presenting matters in this way, Homer is said to establish his own poetry's κλέος as superior to other socially embedded, self-interested forms of oral report.[9]

There is certainly an element of truth to this opposition, but it is overly reductive to restrict every instance of φασί to such rhetorical posturing. After all, the same idiom also appears in the mouths of epic narrators (*Il.* 2.783, 17.674; *Od.* 6.42; *Theog.* 306; *Op.* 803),[10] alongside a number of other remarks which acknowledge the limitations of their knowledge (*Il.* 12.176, 17.260–1; *Theog.* 369).[11] A straight dichotomy between mortal ignorance and poetic omniscience simply cannot hold. Nor does inspiration from the Muses deny poets' independence: it is clear from the *Odyssey* that this is conceived as a familiar instance of 'double determination', involving both divine and human agency.[12] Phemius famously declares that he is both self-taught and the recipient of divine aid (αὐτοδίδακτος δ' εἰμί, θεὸς δέ μοι ἐν φρεσὶν οἴμας | παντοίας ἐνέφυσεν, *Od.* 22.347–8), while Alcinous' description of Demodocus makes it clear that his poetry is both god-given and the product of his own *thumos*, 'spirit' (τῷ γάρ ῥα θεὸς περὶ δῶκεν ἀοιδὴν | τέρπειν, ὅππῃ θυμὸς ἐποτρύνῃσιν ἀείδειν, *Od.* 8.44–5). The poet's divinely inspired status is not opposed to but

---

[8] Ford (1992) 61–3, 90–130; cf. Scodel (1998).

[9] E.g. Ford (1992) 57–67, 91–2; Scodel (2001) 110–12. Cf. Kelly (2008b), (2018).

[10] A fact ignored by Mackie (2003) 69, who claims that 'the primary narrator, the Homeric poet himself, never does, and never would, legitimate his own narrative in this way' (sc. by grounding 'the validity of his tale in its traditional character').

[11] Cf. de Jong (2004) 47–9; Purves (2010) 6–10. The Homeric passages (*Il.* 12.175–81, 17.260–1) have been suspected by ancient and modern scholars. But it is a *petitio principii* to claim that Homer does not indulge in any self-reference and then remove all lines which do not fit this view. Both passages can be amply defended: the scholia identify 'Homeric vividness' in *Il.* 12.175–81 (Ὁμηρικὴ ἐνάργεια, Σ T *Il.* 17.175–81b *ex.*); Edwards (1991) 88 notes poetic expansion in *Il.* 17.260–1.

[12] Murray (1981) 96–7; Verdenius (1983) 37–40; de Jong (2004) 52, (2006) 191–3; Ritoók (1989) 342–4; Kelly (2008b) 194 n. 48. On double determination: Lesky (1961); Pelliccia (2011).

rather complements his own poetic craftsmanship on the mortal plane. In the words of Jonathan Ready, the poet has 'agency as a mediating performer' and is not simply a 'mere instrument' of the Muse.[13] However hard Homer tries to conceal his fallibilities behind the smokescreen of the Muses, he ultimately cannot avoid embracing and engaging with other traditions and 'what people say'.

In fact, on closer examination, Homeric uses of φασί and other related expressions, in both the narrator's and characters' mouths, often highlight connections with other traditions and stories, playing an important role in situating each epic within the larger mythical traditions of archaic Greece. Far from simply downgrading other forms of speech, appeals to rumour and hearsay mark an engagement with broader traditions of myth and poetry. In this section, I will explore the indexical potential of these appeals. I argue that scenes in which characters talk of receiving and transmitting news serve as a model for how we conceive of epic poets' own intertextual relationships, as they gesture to and incorporate other traditions.

We shall begin with the first φασί of the *Iliad*, a rare instance of the device in the narrator's own voice, but one which already exhibits all the hallmarks of the 'Alexandrian footnote' (§II.2.1). We will then turn to consider one further paradigmatic case in character speech (§II.2.2), before broadening out to examine the particular prevalence of appeals to hearsay focused on the Trojan war tradition (§II.2.3). In these sections, we will see how Homer deploys indexical hearsay to acknowledge his own encyclopaedic mastery of tradition. In the following section, by contrast, we will explore more agonistic gestures to suppressed narrative alternatives and rival traditions (§II.2.4). To close, we will look beyond the Homeric poems to the use of this device in the wider corpus of archaic Greek epic (§II.2.5).

II.2.1 *The* Iliad*'s First φασί and Theogonic Myth*

The first instance of **φασί** in the *Iliad*, and one of the few in the narrator's voice, is a prime example of the verb's indexical function. It occurs at the end of the Catalogue of Ships in *Iliad* 2, within

---

[13] Ready (2019) 97.

a pair of climactic similes that connect the events unfolding on earth with the supernatural strife of Zeus and Typhoeus (*Il.* 2.780–5):

οἳ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἴσαν ὡς εἴ τε πυρὶ χθὼν πᾶσα νέμοιτο·
γαῖα δ᾽ ὑπεστενάχιζε Διὶ ὣς τερπικεραύνῳ
χωομένῳ, ὅτε τ᾽ ἀμφὶ Τυφωέϊ γαῖαν ἱμάσσῃ
εἰν Ἀρίμοις, ὅθι **φασὶ** Τυφωέος ἔμμεναι εὐνάς·
ὣς ἄρα τῶν ὑπὸ ποσσὶ μέγα στεναχίζετο γαῖα
ἐρχομένων·

So they [the Greeks] went as if the whole earth was being devoured by fire; and the earth groaned beneath them, just as beneath Zeus who delights in thunder, when in anger he lashes the earth around Typhoeus in the land of the Arimoi, where **they say** Typhoeus has his resting place. So then the earth groaned greatly beneath their feet as they went.

Scholars have long admired the artistry of these lines, which close the Greek catalogue with an elaborate ring composition, echoing the series of similes with which it opened: the scorched land of verse 780 generalises and extends the devastation of the forest fire at 2.455–8, while the earth groaning beneath the Greeks' feet (784) recalls the earlier emphasis on the din of their steps (αὐτὰρ ὑπὸ χθὼν | σμερδαλέον κονάβιζε ποδῶν αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἵππων, 2.465–6).[14] Yet these lines themselves also offer a miniature ring composition of their own: the chiastic arrangement of γαῖα δ᾽ ὑπεστενάχιζε (781) . . . στεναχίζετο γαῖα (784) is framed in turn by two verbs describing the Greeks' advance (ἴσαν, 780; ἐρχμομένων, 785).[15] Less attention has been paid, however, to the unobtrusive **φασί** clause in verse 783, an aside which attributes part of the Typhoeus tale to the anonymous talk of men.

Eustathius interpreted this appeal to hearsay as a distancing device (Eust. 347.8–9 ad *Il.* 2.783 = 1.544.6–7 van der Valk):

τὸ δέ "**φασίν**" εἶπε κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς ὁ ποιητής, ἵνα μὴ προσκρούοιμεν ὡς Ὁμηρικῷ ὄντι διὰ τὸ μυθῶδες.

---

[14] Cf. too the earlier din as the Greeks first sat down to assembly: ὑπὸ δὲ στεναχίζετο γαῖα, 2.95.

[15] Cf. Watkins (1995) 451–2; Lovell (2011) 18–20.

> According to older critics,[16] the poet said '**they say**' so that we do not disapprove of the passage in seeing it as a strictly Homeric tale, on account of its fabulous character.

Building on a remark of the Homeric scholia (Σ b *Il.* 2.783a *ex.*), the Byzantine scholar constructs Homer in his own rationalistic image, distancing himself from an implausible, legendary myth. Such an apologetic interpretation may misconstrue the full significance of **φασί** here. The verb certainly acknowledges the narrator's distance in space and time from the events he describes, but that alone does not necessarily imply doubt, especially given the absence of any further hints of hesitation or qualification.[17] Yet even so, Eustathius is right to note how the verb acknowledges Homer's debts: the poet gestures to an independent pre-existing tradition.[18] Eustathius does not take this point further and nor – as far as I am aware – have modern scholars. But his remark demands further consideration. Who are the anonymous 'they' who claim that Typhoeus' bed is among the Arimoi?

For scholars who regard Homer as engaging allusively with Near Eastern sources, one possible answer to this question might be that **φασί** points to the poetic traditions of the Near East. Typhoeus appears to have a Semitic pedigree (compare the alternative spelling of his name 'Typhon' with the Canaanite-Phoenician name *ṣāpōn*), and Homer's placement of him here among the Arimoi (= Aramaeans?) has been interpreted as a self-conscious acknowledgement of the myth's eastern origins.[19] However, as I argued in Chapter I (§1.2.2), we should be cautious of this approach which assumes an active and interpretable

---

[16] It is tempting to render κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς as 'in the manner of' or even 'in reference to' 'the ancients' (i.e. 'the ancient poets'), but Eustathius' practice elsewhere suggests that he is primarily acknowledging his debt to earlier scholarship (cf. e.g. Eust. *Il.* 692.21 ad *Il.* 7.475 = II.504.4–5 van der Valk ~ Σ A *Il.* 7.475a *Ariston.*, Σ T *Il.* 7.475c *Ariston.*); cf. Triclinius' use of παλαιόν/παλαιά to refer to older scholiastic material: Dickey (2007) 37 n. 22.

[17] Cf. Fontenrose (1966) 67: 'In the Homeric and Hesiodic poems φασί without subject does not suggest the speaker's doubt about the truth of the statement, but just about the opposite, complete confidence in it'; cf. Stinton (1976).

[18] Cf. Σ EHP¹X *Od.* 6.42b *Ariston.*, where Homer's use of **φασί** is thought to 'indicate the tradition transmitted from his ancestors' (διὰ τοῦ "**φασί**" τὴν ἐκ προγόνων παράδοσιν ἐμφαίνει).

[19] Currie (2016) 201, 203–4, with further bibliography. On the 'Arimoi', see Fontenrose (1966).

78

engagement with Near Eastern myth. Here in particular, the Aramaean location appears to be a traditional feature engrained in the Greek tradition (cf. Hes. *Theog.* 304; Pind. fr. 93), and it is far more easily explained as the passive trace of a more distant literary genealogy, rather than a self-conscious nod to an earlier Near Eastern tradition. It is unlikely that **φασί** would direct any audience member to Near Eastern myth, a distant 'source' which would add little to our immediate appreciation of this simile.

Instead, a more likely answer to the significance of Homer's **φασί** may be found in the numerous similarities shared by these Iliadic verses and Hesiod's description of Typhoeus' defeat in the *Theogony* (843–7, 857–9):

> ἐπεστενάχιζε δὲ γαῖα.
> καῦμα δ' ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων κάτεχεν ἰοειδέα πόντον
> βροντῆς τε στεροπῆς τε πυρός τ' ἀπὸ τοῖο πελώρου
> πρηστήρων ἀνέμων τε κεραυνοῦ τε φλεγέθοντος,
> ἔζεε δὲ χθὼν πᾶσα καὶ οὐρανὸς ἠδὲ θάλασσα·
> . . .
> αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δή μιν δάμασε πληγῆσιν ἱμάσσας,
> ἤριπε γυιωθείς, στενάχιζε δὲ γαῖα πελώρη.
> φλὸξ δὲ κεραυνωθέντος ἀπέσσυτο τοῖο ἄνακτος

and the earth groaned in response. A conflagration from them both engulfed the violet-dark sea, a conflagration of thunder and lightning and fire from the monster, of tornado winds and the blazing thunderbolt. The whole earth seethed, and the sky and sea … but when he [Zeus] had overpowered him, lashing him with blows, he [Typhoeus] fell down wounded, and the monstrous earth groaned; a flame darted forth from the thunderstruck lord.

In this climactic passage, Zeus secures his control over the universe by conquering Typhoeus, his last major adversary, just as he had earlier defeated the Titans.[20] There are a number of significant parallels between this narrative and Homer's simile.[21] In both accounts, Zeus lashes the ground (ἱμάσσῃ, *Il.* 2.782) or his foe (ἱμάσσας, *Theog.* 857), and the earth groans under the weight of these blows (γαῖα δ' ὑπεστενάχιζε, *Il.* 2.781; στεναχίζετο γαῖα, *Il.*

---

[20] For the structural, verbal and thematic relationship between the Titanomachy and Typhonomachy, see e.g. Saïd (1977); Blaise (1992). The repetition serves as a 'decreasing doublet', a common strategy for concluding an orally derived poem: Kelly (2007b) 389–90.

[21] Cf. Nimis (1987) 75–7; Lovell (2011) 20–31; West (2011c) 214.

2.784) or the warring participants themselves (Typhoeus: στενάχιζε δὲ γαῖα, *Theog.* 858; Zeus: ἐπεστενάχιζε δὲ γαῖα, *Theog.* 843). In the wider context of both passages, emphasis is laid on Zeus's thunder as the weapon which vanquishes Typhoeus (Διὶ ὣς τερπι<u>κεραύνῳ</u>, *Il.* 2.781 ~ κεραυνοῦ, *Theog.* 846; κεραυνόν, *Theog.* 854; <u>κεραυνω</u>θέντος, *Theog.* 859) and the blazing destruction of the whole earth (πυρὶ χθὼν πᾶσα *νέμοιτο, Il.* 2.780 ~ καῦμα . . . πυρός, *Theog.* 844–5, χθὼν πᾶσα, *Theog.* 847). Within a handful of Iliadic lines, there are numerous verbal connections with Hesiod's account of Typhoeus' defeat, connections which again reinforce the closural ring composition of this simile: already before the Catalogue, the earth had thundered terribly beneath the Achaeans' feet (χθὼν | σμερδαλέον κονάβιζε, *Il.* 2.465–6), just as it did in Hesiod's Typhonomachy (σμερδαλέον κονάβησε, *Theog.* 840).

Of course, the relationship between Homer and Hesiod is a matter of much debate. Most today would take Homer to be prior, but a number of eminent scholars have argued for the opposite conclusion.[22] If we tentatively accept this latter hypothesis, we could see a direct Iliadic allusion here to Hesiod's *Theogony*, signposted through a footnoting **φασί**. The *Iliad*'s Typhoeus simile appears to offer a compact and miniature postscript to a major episode of Hesiod's poem, highlighting how the defeated Typhoeus continues to be punished in terms precisely comparable to his initial defeat (note the subjunctive ἱμάσσῃ in 782, indicating a recurring action). The effect is very similar to that later found in Pindar's first *Pythian* (1.13–28), where Typhoeus' ongoing imprisonment is presented in language reminiscent of his original defeat. As Tom Phillips remarks, 'even as Pindar's narrative positions Zeus's battle with Typhon in the past, echoes of the *Th*[*eogony*] replay it'.[23] The same dynamics of recollection and replay are at work in Homer's simile, which depicts the aftermath

---

[22] Hesiodic priority: West (1966) 40–8, (2012); Burkert (1976); Blümer (2001) I 107–260. Contrast: Heubeck (1979) 109–16, (1982) 442–3; Janko (1982) esp. 94–8, 188–99, (2012).

[23] Phillips (2018) 270–4 (quotation p. 274). E.g. κυλινδομένα φλόξ, *Pyth.* 1.24 ~ φλὸξ δὲ κεραυνωθέντος ἀπέσσυτο, *Theog.* 859. On Pindar's Hesiodic allusion here, cf. Morgan (2015) 314–16; Passmore (2018).

of the conflict while echoing the language of its climax. Within a handful of verses, Homer appears to invoke and epitomise a central episode of another poem, indexed through **φασί**.

We might be able to extend this conclusion further. The precise detail that Homer attributes to hearsay is that the resting place of Typhoeus is among the Arimoi, a detail which again finds close parallel in the *Theogony* (304–8):

> ἣ δ' ἔρυτ' εἰν Ἀρίμοισιν ὑπὸ χθόνα λυγρὴ Ἔχιδνα,
> ἀθάνατος νύμφη καὶ ἀγήραος ἤματα πάντα.
> τῇ δὲ Τυφάονά **φασι** μιγήμεναι ἐν φιλότητι
> δεινόν θ' ὑβριστήν τ' ἄνομόν θ' ἑλικώπιδι κούρῃ·
> ἣ δ ὑποκυσαμένη τέκετο κρατερόφρονα τέκνα.

> Baneful Echidna keeps guard among the Arimoi under the earth, an immortal nymph, unageing through all her days. **They say** that Typhon – terrible, insolent and lawless – mingled in love with her, a glancing-eyed girl; and she became pregnant and bore mighty-hearted children.

Just as Homer places Typhoeus' bed 'among the Arimoi' (εἰν Ἀρίμοις, *Il.* 2.783), Hesiod claims that Typhoeus slept with Echidna εἰν Ἀρίμοισιν.[24] Here too, we could see Homer allusively reshaping the Hesiodic narrative. The noun εὐνάς (*Il.* 2.783) is pointedly ambiguous. It could at a push refer to the 'bed' where Typhoeus once slept with Echidna (as in *Theog.* 304–6), but this makes little sense in the context of Zeus's ongoing punishment of the monster in the present. More plausibly, it can be taken euphemistically to refer to the 'tomb' that became his final resting place.[25] But in that case, this detail departs from the Hesiodic conclusion, in which Typhoeus was ultimately dispatched to Tartarus (*Theog.* 868). Homer's **φασί** appears to index tradition precisely at the point where it is most contestable.[26]

It is thus possible to discern a remarkably intricate intertextual relationship between this Iliadic simile and the *Theogony*. If we

---

[24] Σ *Theog.* 304 notes the parallel.
[25] Cf. Σ b *Il.* 2.783a *ex.*: εὐφήμως δὲ τὸν τάφον εὐνὰς ἐκάλεσεν ('he euphemistically called the tomb a bed').
[26] Cf. Homeric θέμις-claims, which are often made where the practice so described is not so settled: Scodel (1999) 49–50. For the wider debate and disagreement in antiquity concerning Typhoeus' final resting place, see Ballabriga (1990) 23–6; Fowler (2000–13) II 28–9; Ogden (2013) 76.

accept Hesiod's priority, Homer can be seen to replay, revise and epitomise key aspects of the original Hesiodic conflict. However, as I outlined in Chapter I (§I.2), such a direct connection between two 'texts' is difficult to reconcile with the oral environment of early Greek epic, not to mention with the uncertainties over the relative dates of our *Iliad* and *Theogony*. I thus prefer to see Homer here evoking a more general Typhoean and theogonic tradition, rather than a specific text. The contours of such a Typhoeus tradition were evidently well established already in the archaic age. The *Iliad* assumes its audience's familiarity with a version of theogonic narrative very similar to that preserved in our *Theogony* and readily evokes key features of the succession myth elsewhere (e.g. in Thetis' rescue of Zeus, *Il.* 1.396–406).[27] Moreover, the fact that the Homeric mention of Typhoeus occurs in a simile (a narrative device which frequently introduces familiar and relatable material) raises the expectation that Homer's audience would be acquainted with the myth.[28]

In any case, Homer's account certainly appears to reflect core features of the *fabula* of Zeus's fight with Typhoeus that transcend Hesiod's specific telling. These include the presence of fire, lashing, thunder and the groaning earth. Such elements are familiar to modern readers from Hesiod's poem, but they evidently pre-dated it. Watkins has argued that the lashing/binding motif is a very old element of the tradition, originally deriving from earlier Hittite versions of the tale.[29] Even if we do not follow his broader conclusions, the Near Eastern parallels for the myth certainly suggest that the episode had a considerably ancient pedigree.[30] Within the Greek tradition alone, moreover, the lashing motif appears to have been an integral feature of the myth: in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, Typhoeus' mother Hera similarly whips the earth before giving birth to the monster (ἵμασε χθόνα,

---

[27] Slatkin (1991) 66–9, noting especially in *Il.* 1.396–406 the threat of binding and the presence and role of Briareus. For further possible connections between the *Iliad* and Hesiod's Titanomachy/Typhonomachy, see M. L. West (2012) 226 n. 3.

[28] Cf. Watkins (1995) 452; Lovell (2011) 21–2; and generally, Minchin (2001b) 42–3. On similes as signposts of allusion in their own right, see Currie (2016) 261 with n. 20.

[29] Watkins (1992), (1995) 448–59.

[30] See e.g. Porzig (1930); Vian (1960); Penglase (1994) 189–96; West (1997) 303–4; Lane Fox (2008) 304–15.

82

HhAp. 340). The key moments of Typhoeus' life (his birth and defeat) are both marked by the same violent act.[31]

Moreover, it is notable that Hesiod's own mention of Typhoeus' mingling with Echidna among the Arimoi is also indexed with a **φασί** – the sole use of the device in the whole poem (*Theog.* 306).[32] If Homer and Hesiod were contemporaneous Hellenistic poets, scholars might argue that this pair of indices marks a reciprocal relationship between these two passages – a self-reflexive cycle of cross referencing, in which each author knowingly nods to the 'talk' of their poetic peer. In the context of archaic epic, however, it is likely that each **φασί** rather points to a pre-existing Typhoean tradition with which each poet is engaged.[33]

In both *Iliad* 2 and the *Theogony*, therefore, **φασί** signposts engagement with traditional theogonic narratives. In both cases, the index acknowledges the authority (and contestability) of tradition, marking each poet's encyclopaedic control of their poetic heritage. For Hesiod, the device authorises his primary narrative; but for Homer, it is also a means to introduce another mythical tradition as a foil for his own. Through his simile, the pending conflict between the Greeks and Trojans becomes a replay of the cosmic struggle between Zeus and Typhoeus, between the defender of civilisation and the threat of chaos.[34] Homer signals his appropriation of theogonic myth as he encapsulates it and subsumes it within a handful of verses. The mortal conflict of Greece and Troy is established as a fair match for the divine and primeval discord of theogonic myth.

The first Iliadic **φασί** thus has a strong claim to act as a 'pre-Alexandrian footnote', indexing Homer's allusion to theogonic

---

[31] The *Hymn*'s Typhoeus also parallels his Hesiodic wife, Echidna, in resembling neither mortals nor gods (ἣ δ' ἔτεκ' οὔτε θεοῖς ἐναλίγκιον οὔτε βροτοῖσιν, *HhAp.* 351 ~ ἣ δ' ἔτεκ' ἄλλο πέλωρον ἀμήχανον, οὐδὲν ἐοικὸς | θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὐδ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν, *Theog.* 295–6): Yasumura (2011) 122.

[32] Cf. Stoddard (2004) 49–54.

[33] Cf. Fontenrose (1966) 68: 'Hesiod's φασί indicates that the information is traditional.' For the *Theogony*'s presupposing of earlier Typhonomachic narratives, cf. Tsagalis (2013) 21 n. 11; Currie (2021c) 323, (2021d) 91–7.

[34] Though see Lovell (2011) 56–62 on the instability of this parallel: the Greek army can be aligned with both Zeus and Typhoeus, foregrounding the moral ambiguities of the Trojan war. Cf. too Brockliss (2017–18) 142–4 for the blurred opposition between Zeus and Typhoeus in the *Theogony*.

tradition. It is worth noting, however, that this indexed allusion introduces a parallel which continues to underlie much of the remainder of the poem. Typhonomachic imagery recurs throughout the epic in various forms. Similes repeatedly compare the action of the poem to the desolation of the natural world, recalling the elemental disruption of the Typhonomachy.[35] The threats which the other gods pose to Zeus's rule echo the past dangers of both the Titans and Typhoeus: Zeus threatens to hurl them to Tartarus like his previous adversaries (*Il.* 8.13–16 ~ *Theog.* 717–20, 868),[36] and in anger at Hera and Athena, he causes Olympus to shake beneath his feet, just as when he faced Typhoeus.[37] More specifically, the clash of the gods in *Iliad* 20 (*Il.* 20.54–75) is introduced with imagery that evokes the environmental upheaval of both theogonic episodes: Zeus thunders terribly (*Il.* 20.56 ~ *Theog.* 839), the world trembles (*Il.* 20.57–60 ~ *Theog.* 680–2) and Hades is terrified by the immense shaking above (*Il.* 20.61–5 ~ *Theog.* 850–2).[38] In addition, Achilles' theomachic fight with the river Scamander in *Iliad* 21 is similarly bestowed with a cosmic, Typhonomachic grandeur, replete with tumultuous waves, blasts of wind, scorched earth and boiling water (*Il.* 21.212–382).[39] The net result of these recurring theogonic resonances is to elevate the events of the Trojan war to the cosmic plane; they become as

---

[35] E.g. fire (*Il.* 11.155–7, 17.737–9, 20.490–2 ~ καῦμα . . . πυρός, *Theog.* 844–5); waves (*Il.* 4.422–6, 11.305–8, 15.381–3 ~ κύματα μακρά, *Theog.* 848); winds (*Il.* 13.795–9, 16.765–9 ~ πρηστήρων ἀνέμων τε, *Theog.* 846); cf. too Typhoeus' more general association with winds (esp. *Theog.* 869–80), presumably aided by a folk etymology (cf. τυφώς/τυφῶν, 'typhoon'): West (1966) 390.

[36] Zeus's threat verbally parallels various Hesiodic verses, e.g. *Il.* 8.13 (ῥίψω ἐς Τάρταρον) ~ *Theog.* 868 (ῥίψε . . . ἐς Τάρταρον); *Il.* 8.15 ~ *Theog.* 811; *Il.* 8.16 ~ *Theog.* 720. For the gods' ten-year punishment (*Il.* 8.404), cf. too *Theog.* 801–4.

[37] ἕζετο, τῷ δ' ὑπὸ ποσσὶ μέγας πελεμίζετ' Ὄλυμπος, *Il.* 8.443 ~ ποσσὶ δ' ὑπ' ἀθανάτοισι μέγας πελεμίζετ' Ὄλυμπος, *Theog.* 842; cf. too *Theog.* 680–1 (Olympus shaken during the Titanomachy). For this motif's association with divine *stasis*, see Kelly (2007a) 216–17 (although his other examples are not as close verbally).

[38] Note too the description of dank Tartarus at *Il.* 20.65, which resembles *Theog.* 739 = 810. The mention of Titans and Cronus in the underworld at *Theog.* 851 also resonates with *Il.* 14.273–4, 278–9, 15.224–5.

[39] Waves (κύκωμενον . . . κῦμα, *Il.* 21.240); wind (χαλεπὴν . . . θύελλαν, *Il.* 21.335); fire (πῦρ . . . πῦρ . . . πῦρ, *Il.* 21.341–3); boiling water (ἔφλυε . . . ῥέεθρα, 21.361; ξέε δ' ὕδωρ, 21.365 ~ ἔξεε . . . ῥέεθρα, *Theog.* 695). For Achilles' assimilation to Zeus in *Iliad* 21, cf. Nagler (1974) 147–66; Cook (2020) 65.

84

devastating and momentous as the establishment of Zeus's rule in heaven.[40]

Significantly, this major and insistent theogonic pattern is inaugurated by Homer's indexed simile in Book 2. The **φασί** which accompanies Homer's Typhoeus simile does not just sign-post a passing allusion to another mythical tradition but rather keys the audience into a recurring mythological paradigm that underpins the whole *Iliad*. This inceptive function of the index is something that we will see on a number of other occasions in Greek epic and lyric. The appeal to 'what people say' establishes a link to another myth which remains active for the remainder of the poem.

In its very first appearance in the *Iliad*, therefore, **φασί** already exhibits many of the key features associated with the footnoting of Alexandrian and Roman poets. It signposts allusion to another tradition (theogonic myth), if not text (Hesiod's *Theogony*), acknowledges competing traditions surrounding Typhoeus' final resting place and initiates an ongoing allusive dialogue with Typhoean tradition, aligning the war at Troy with the cosmic upheaval of the heavens. In his own voice, the poet indexes a major myth that serves as both a model and a foil.

II.2.2 *Other Worlds and Others' Words: Tydeus and Theban Myth*

More frequently in both Homeric poems, **φασί** appears in the mouth of internal characters. Within the internal story world, their gestures to hearsay reflect their limited first-hand knowledge and reliance on external sources. But these same gestures can also be interpreted on an extradiegetic level as the poet's invocation of a wider canon of tradition, triggering links with other myths and other domains of knowledge. As I have already noted, such a shift from the perspective of the character to the narrator is assisted by ancient literary critics' conception of poetic impersonation: at any moment, a character's words are simultaneously the poet's

---

[40] Cf. Nimis (1987) 75 for the significance of this parallelism: Zeus's acquisition of τιμή in the *Theogony* mirrors Achilles' re-establishment of τιμή in the *Iliad*.

(§1.2.4). When Homer's characters indicate their debt to the words of others, the poet simultaneously indexes other familiar traditions, marking his own encyclopaedic mastery of them.

This indexical aspect of characters' appeals to hearsay is best exemplified by the second **φασί** of the *Iliad*, when Agamemnon recalls the exploits of Diomedes' father Tydeus (*Il.* 4.370–5):

> ὤ μοι, Τυδέος υἱὲ δαΐφρονος ἱπποδάμοιο,
> τί πτώσσεις, τί δ' ὀπιπεύεις πολέμοιο γεφύρας;
> οὐ μὲν Τυδέϊ γ' ὧδε φίλον πτωσκαζέμεν ἦεν,
> ἀλλὰ πολὺ πρὸ φίλων ἑτάρων δηΐοισι μάχεσθαι,
> ὡς **φάσαν** οἵ μιν ἴδοντο πονεύμενον· οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε
> ἤντησ' οὐδὲ ἴδον· περὶ δ' ἄλλων **φασὶ** γενέσθαι.

> Ah me, son of battle-minded, horse-taming Tydeus, why are you cowering and gazing on the lines of battle? It was not Tydeus' habit to cower away like this, but to fight the enemy far ahead of his own companions; that's what those who saw him in action **used to say**. I myself never met him or saw him, but **they say** that he surpassed all others.

This elaborate source-attribution serves as a springboard into a miniature narrative on Tydeus' adventures in the build-up to the Theban war (*Il.* 4.376–400). Agamemnon recounts how Diomedes' father visited Mycenae alongside Polynices to recruit 'famed allies' (κλειτοὺς ἐπικούρους, 4.379) for their expedition against Thebes; and although the Mycenaeans were initially willing, Zeus discouraged their involvement by displaying signs of ill omen (παραίσια σήματα, 4.381). At a later time, Tydeus was sent on a solo mission to Thebes itself, where he challenged the Thebans to athletic contests and won everything easily with Athena's help (ἐπίρροθος ἦεν Ἀθήνη, 4.390). Angered by his success, the Thebans ambushed him with fifty men, but Tydeus again emerged victorious, sparing only Maeon, whom he sent back to Thebes in obedience to the portents of the gods (θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήσας, 4.398). Such extraordinary achievements, Agamemnon suggests, are beyond the reach of Tydeus' son Diomedes, who is inferior to his father in battle (4.399–400), seeing how he now cowers apart from the battle lines (4.371).[41]

---

[41] Cf. Beck (2005a) 160–1, who notes how in 4.370 Homer alters the usual friendly full-verse vocative addressed to Diomedes (Τυδεΐδη Διόμηδες, ἐμῷ κεχαρισμένε θυμῷ), transforming 'the patronymic into a term of abuse rather than respect'.

86

Agamemnon thus introduces the tale of Tydeus as a hortatory paradigm to provoke Diomedes to action.[42] Within the context of the narrative, his appeal to the talk of others, particularly those who witnessed these events first-hand, authorises the validity of his account; it is grounded in a reliable tradition and foregrounds the fact that neither Agamemnon nor Diomedes witnessed these events at first hand. After all, Diomedes stresses elsewhere that he has no direct memory of his father, who left while he was still young (*Il.* 6.222–3); he has to rely on the report of others to know anything of his father.[43] Nevertheless, the vagueness of Agamemnon's attribution encourages us to ask what the 'tradition' invoked here actually is, especially since the second φασί seems to be more general in scope than the first φάσαν: Agamemnon has heard this tale not just from those who saw Tydeus at first hand (a phrase which itself evokes the Homeric fiction of bardic autopsy), but also from 'people' in general. As in Book 2's Typhoeus simile, this generalised appeal to hearsay invites Homer's audience to recall other tales and traditions, in this case those surrounding Theban myth and Tydeus' exploits.[44]

Unlike in the case of theogonic myth, we are less well furnished with the early epic treatments of the Theban cycle, possessing only a handful of fragments, none of which refer directly to this episode.[45] Yet there are still good grounds for seeing a pre-existing Theban tradition behind Agamemnon's account. For a start, the brevity and concision of his narrative suggest a miniaturised version of a larger story, especially when we note its underlying doublet structure. As Benjamin Sammons has highlighted, the tale

---

[42] For this episode and the exemplum of Tydeus in the *Iliad* more generally, see Andersen (1978) esp. 33–46; Alden (2000) 112–52; Pratt (2009); Barker and Christensen (2011), (2020) 47–89; Davies (2014) 33–8; Sammons (2014); O'Maley (2018).

[43] Cf. O'Maley (2018) 284–5, who notes how Diomedes' later references to his father may be indebted to Agamemnon's account here. Σ D *Il.* 4.376 implies that Agamemnon only heard the tale because Tydeus had appealed directly to Thyestes.

[44] Cf. already Torres-Guerra (1995) 33, who contends that these verses 'imply the pre-existence of epic stories about the Theban exploits of Tydeus' ('implican la preexistencia de relatos épicos sobre las gestas tebanas de Tideo'); cf. Barker and Christensen (2020) 43, 48; contrast Vergados (2014) 438–9, who suggests that Homer distances himself from Theban tradition by limiting it to hearsay, with 'no divine, transcendental source of inspiration'.

[45] For the extant fragments of Theban epic, see Torres-Guerra (1995); West (2003b) 38–63; Davies (2014).

is shaped by anticipatory doublets, the typical building blocks of large-scale epic narrative: Tydeus' initial embassy to Mycenae prepares for his more involved and dangerous embassy to Thebes, where we also find paired scenes of conflict, the hero's victory in the athletic contest paving the way for his defeat of the ambush.[46] As Sammons notes, 'anticipatory doublets underlie relatively large-scale narrative structures and development of themes across passages; these functions are not relevant or even particularly desirable in such small-scale narratives'.[47] The structure and detail of Agamemnon's account go considerably beyond the ruler's immediate rhetorical purposes and betray a larger underlying narrative (i.e. *fabula*) which Homer has miniaturised.[48]

This same episode is also recalled several other times in the *Iliad* with considerable consistency, further suggesting that it is not solely an ad hoc invention for this moment: Athena summarises the same events when spurring Diomedes to action in the next book (*Il.* 5.800–13), while Diomedes cites Athena's former support of his father on this occasion as precedent to ask for her continuing help during the *Doloneia* (*Il.* 10.284–90).[49] There are many verbal and thematic overlaps between these accounts,[50] which seem to reflect a consistent *fabula* whose traces we can reconstruct: Tydeus set out alone and displayed his strength in the Theban heartland, before facing and overcoming an ambush on his return.[51] Of course, many

---

[46] Sammons (2014) 301–4, further noting thematic links between the doublets, e.g. the contrast of peace and war, and the obedience of both the Mycenaeans and Tydeus to divine signs (*Il.* 4.381, 4.398).

[47] Sammons (2014) 310.

[48] We could also, if so inclined, apply the neoanalytic argument of suitability: as West (2011a) 147 remarks of the athletic contests, 'such an inorganic episode implies an epic narrative on an ample scale'.

[49] Cf. too the passing mentions of Tydeus' feats at *Il.* 6.222–3, 14.113–27 and of Athena's support for Tydeus at *Il.* 5.115–20.

[50] E.g. Ἀσωπόν (4.383) ~ Ἀσωπῷ (10.287); ἀγγελίην (4.384) ~ ἄγγελος (5.804, 10.286); ἐς Θήβας (5.804, 10.286); δαινυμένους (4.386) ~ δαίνυσθαι (5.805); μοῦνος ἐών (4.388) ~ νόσφιν Ἀχαιῶν (5.803); πολέσιν μετὰ Καδμείοισιν (4.388) ~ πολέας μετὰ Καδμείωνας (5.804); ἀεθλεύειν προκαλίζετο (4.389) ~ προκαλίζετο (5.807); πάντα δ' ἐνίκα | ῥηϊδίως (4.389–90 = 5.807–8); τοίη οἱ ἐπίρροθος ἦεν Ἀθήνη (4.390) ~ τοίη οἱ ἐγὼν ἐπιτάρροθος ἦα (5.808) ~ σὺν σοί, δῖα θεά, ὅτε οἱ πρόφρασσα παρέστης (10.290); ἀεικέα πότμον ἐφῆκε (4.396) ~ μέρμερα μήσατο ἔργα (10.289).

[51] Cf. Gantz (1993) 513: 'Likely enough the adventure played a major role in the epic *Thebais* or some other early narrative as a foretale to the actual assault; Statius' lengthy treatment well shows how easily the story lends itself to elaboration.'

88

elements of such a narrative would have been composed of familiar type scenes, including the embassy, the challenge of a guest and the ambush.[52] Yet the specific combination of elements in this case would have produced a distinctive Tydean *fabula* to which the *Iliad* poet could allude. In particular, Tydeus' emphatically solo mission to the Cadmeans (μοῦνος ἐών, 4.388) alters the traditional pattern in which at least two individuals are normally sent on an embassy, thereby emphasising his exceptionality.[53]

The possibility of an underlying Tydean *fabula* is further strengthened by the correspondence between Agamemnon's tale and the details in later accounts of the war, many of which may look back to earlier features of the archaic Theban tradition. Tydeus was always a central figure of the Seven narrative: as son-in-law of Adrastus, he was an early recruit to Polynices' cause and a quasi-doublet to the Theban, since he too was an exile.[54] Athena's support of Tydeus was a mainstay of the myth and crucial for her later abandonment of the hero,[55] while Apollodorus' extensive focus on Tydeus' lineage (*Bibl.* 1.8.3–4) may reflect a similar concern with the hero's ancestry in earlier cyclic tradition, as George Huxley has suggested.[56] Divine disapproval of the whole expedition was also an integral element of

---

[52] Embassy: e.g. *Il.* 3.205–24, 9.173–668, 11.765–90; *Od.* 24.115–19 (cf. §III.2.3). Guest's challenge: e.g. *Od.* 8.133–240. Ambush: e.g. *Il.* 6.187–90, 10.254–579, 18.513–29; cf. Dué and Ebbott (2010) esp. 31–87; Dué (2012). See too Ebbott (2014) more generally on traditional themes shared by this episode and the *Iliad*. These traditional motifs account for the story's similarities to the tale of Bellerophon in *Iliad* 6; *pace* Niese (1882) 129, who believed that the whole scene was derived directly from the Bellerophon account (for the similarities, cf. Andersen (1978) 38; Vergados (2014) 440–1).

[53] E.g. Odysseus and Menelaus to Troy (*Il.* 3.205–24); Agamemnon and Menelaus to Odysseus (*Od.* 24.115–19; cf. §III.2.3); Odysseus and Talthybius to Clytemnestra (*Cypria*, arg. 8 *GEF*). On heroic isolation in Homer, see Kahane (1997) 118–34; Barker and Christensen (2011) 12–23.

[54] Sammons (2014) 310–11 n. 42.

[55] Athena's support of Tydeus and her intention to immortalise him were famously rescinded upon his barbaric consumption of Melanippus' brains, a macabre episode narrated in the *Thebaid* (fr. 9 *GEF*) and represented on vases by at least the fifth century (cf. Beazley (1947) 1–7). If pre-Homeric, the *Iliad*'s suppression of this grisly detail fits with the poem's general avoidance of the grotesque and supernatural (cf. Griffin (1977) 46–7), while also rendering Tydeus a more positive exemplum (Vergados (2014) 440). Though see Goode (2012), who highlights how this later episode chimes with (and is perhaps even alluded to by) Tydeus' headstrong disregard of Athena's advice at *Il.* 5.802–8: note especially θυμὸν ἔχων ὃν καρτερόν (*Il.* 5.806, cf. ὑπέρθυμον Διομήδεα, 4.365) ~ ἀπὸ θυμοῦ (*Theb.* fr. 9 *GEF*); cf. Torres-Guerra (1995) 43, 59–61.

[56] Huxley (1969) 45.

the legend.[57] Indeed, the phrase used to describe this supernatural ill will (παραίσια σήματα, 4.381) is a Homeric *hapax legomenon*, which has prompted Øivind Andersen to suggest that it 'perhaps derives from the Theban tradition, where it plays such a large role'.[58] As for Tydeus' exploits, later treatments of them by Antimachus and Statius indicate the lengths to which the narrative could be spun.[59] The sole survivor of Tydeus' onslaught, Maeon, also seems to have played a significant part in later tradition: in Statius, he is a priest of Apollo (e.g. *Theb.* 3.104–5, 4.598), a status to which the elliptical θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήσας of 4.398 could well allude,[60] while Pausanias (9.18.2) records a Theban tradition that Maeon buried Tydeus in Thebes, matching Diomedes' later claim that Tydeus lies buried in the city (*Il.* 14.114).[61] The authentic Theban name of Maeon's father (Haemon) may also suggest that he is a pre-existing character of Theban myth,[62] unlike his co-leader Polyphontes, whose speaking name ('Much-slaying'), alongside that of his father Autophonus ('One who slays with his own hands'), rather implies a figure invented for this specific context.[63] And last but not least, Maeon's very survival has led some to suggest that tradition demanded he remain available for future deeds.[64] Of course, later narratives could simply offer expansions and elaborations of this terse Homeric reference,[65]

---

[57] E.g. Pind. *Nem.* 9.18–20; Aesch. *Sept.* 379; Eur. *Supp.* 155–60; cf. Davies (2014) 34–5.

[58] Andersen (1978) 36: 'entstammt vielleicht der thebanischen Tradition, wo solches eine grosse Rolle spielt'.

[59] Tydeus' embassy may have filled a whole book of Antimachus' *Thebaid* (Book 3: Matthews (1996) 23); Statius' *Thebaid* treats both the embassy to Thebes and the ambush at considerable length (*Theb.* 2.370–703).

[60] Cf. Leaf (1886–88) I 138 ad *Il.* 4.394.

[61] This line (*Il.* 14.114) was considered suspect by ancient scholars (Σ AT *Il.* 14.114a *Did.*), presumably because it disagreed with the Attic tradition that Tydeus was buried at Eleusis, first found in Aeschylus' *Eleusinians* (Σ T *Il.* 14.114b *ex.*; Higbie (2002a)): see Alden (2000) 141 n. 58, who notes that 'there is no reason to prefer the Attic tradition'.

[62] Cf. Creon's son in *Oedipodeia* fr. 3 *GEF*: thus Robert (1915) I 192; Willcock (1964) 145; Davies (2014) 35. Contrast Torres-Guerra (1995) 47, who suspects another stock speaking name (cf. αἷμα, 'blood'), especially given other appearances of the name elsewhere in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 4.296, 17.467).

[63] Cf. φόνος ('slaughter'): thus Willcock (1964) 145; Andersen (1978) 44 n. 11; von Kamptz (1982) 26; Torres-Guerra (1995) 46; Scodel (2002) 134.

[64] E.g. Andersen (1978) 44 n. 11. Tsagalis (2012a) 222 n. 174 even argues that Maeon 'belongs to the older phase of Theban myth, before the advent of Oedipus and certainly long before the expedition of the Seven'.

[65] Thus e.g. Andersen (1978) 38. For later accounts of Tydeus' embassy and ambush, see Diod. Sic. 4.65.4 (in which all ambushers are killed); Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.6.5 and Stat. *Theb.* 2.370–703 (in which Maeon survives).

and at least one ancient scholiast seemed unfamiliar with Maeon's identity,[66] so we should remain cautious, but given the intratextual and intertextual congruity of the episode, its underpinning doublet structure, and the repeatedly brief nature of its telling, it is plausible to see a coherent Theban *fabula* underlying Agamemnon's account.[67]

Agamemnon's opening appeal to hearsay can thus be interpreted as a cue for Homer's audience to focus on his appropriation of this *fabula*: it is not just those who saw him, but also epic singers of the Theban war who say that Tydeus was pre-eminent. **φασί** here is not merely a means to legitimise and authorise Agamemnon's statements within the narrative, but also an external pointer for Homer's audience, indexing the poet's engagement with the Theban tradition. When Kirk claims that 'the stress on Agamemnon's reliance on hearsay' in *Iliad* 4 'seems unnecessary',[68] he crucially misses the indexical significance of the gesture. It is no simple deference to hearsay and transmitted tradition, nor a simple badge of authority, but a marker of allusive engagement with other mythical traditions. When Diomedes later claims that his fellow Greeks must have previously '**heard**' of his father Tydeus (τὰ δὲ μέλλετ' **ἀκουέμεν**, *Il.* 14.125), we have a further example of the same phenomenon: as Diomedes perpetuates his ancestral fame, Homer flags his external audience's familiarity with the hero's Theban genealogy, whether from previous tellings of the myth or – for a newcomer to the epic tradition – from the earlier Iliadic accounts of Diomedes' ancestry.

In a character's voice, as much as the narrator's, therefore, **φασί** can index other mythical traditions. Agamemnon's appeal to hearsay signposts the ruler's ensuing miniaturisation of Theban myth. And as with the theogonic allusion of *Iliad* 2, so too here we can identify a

---

[66] See Σ D *Il.* 4.394: 'some guess that Maeon was a herald, and for that reason he alone was saved; for the race of heralds is holy' (τὸν δὲ "Μαίονα" τινὲς στοχάζονται κήρυκα γεγονέναι, διὰ τὸ μόνον αὐτὸν σωθῆναι. ἱερὸν γὰρ ἦν τὸ γένος τῶν κηρύκων) – perhaps extrapolating from Odysseus' sparing of the herald Medon in the *Odyssey* (*Od.* 22.355–80)?

[67] Cf. e.g. Scodel (2002) 132–4; Ebbott (2010). Older scholars tended to imagine that the passage 'derived' from a specific Theban poem (e.g. Friedländer (1914) 321; Kirk (1985) 368; Torres-Guerra (1995); West (2011a) 146), but scholars have more recently highlighted how the tale is suited to its immediate rhetorical context and cannot simply be used as a faithful template to reconstruct an actual part of an earlier *Thebaid*: e.g. Andersen (1978); Barker and Christensen (2011); Davies (2014) 34–8; Sammons (2014) 310–11.

[68] Kirk (1985) 369.

91

significant inceptive function. Not only does the index introduce Agamemnon's ensuing mythical narrative, but it also establishes a pattern of Theban allusion that continues to resonate throughout the epic. We have already noted how Tydeus' past exploits recur as a paradigm later in the poem, establishing an ongoing *synkrisis* between father and son. But the frequency with which Diomedes continues to be identified by his patronymic throughout the epic ensures that he can never escape his father's shadow, even when his deeds are not directly recalled.[69] We shall see later how Sthenelus' response to Agamemnon in Book 4 reframes this intergenerational relationship in agonistic terms, with possible repercussions for our understanding of the *Iliad*'s relationship to Theban myth (§IV.2.3). But for now, we can also observe how the Theban tradition rears its head in many other parts of the *Iliad*: the walls of both Troy and the Achaean camp echo those of seven-gated Thebes; the Trojans are aligned with the defeated Seven through the epithet 'famed allies' (κλειτοὺς ἐπικούρους); and Diomedes' retreat at the threat of Zeus's thunderbolt (*Il.* 8.133–6) echoes and rewrites the unhappy fate of Sthenelus' father Capaneus, who was killed by this very divine instrument.[70] Just as the indexed Typhoeus simile in *Iliad* 2 establishes an ongoing dialogue with theogonic myth, Agamemnon's story introduces an enduring inter-textual foil for Homer's narrative, centred on (but by no means restricted to) the figure of Diomedes.

A number of indexical appeals to hearsay thus gravitate towards those myths which are of most significance for the poem as a whole, especially those which feature near the outset of the poem, serving as paradigmatic models and foils. On a micro-level, **φασί** marks allusion, but on a macro-level, it foregrounds some of the most important mythical intertexts for an entire work.[71]

---

[69] Diomedes is the hero most often named by his patronymic in the *Iliad*; he is so identified more often than by his actual name: see Tsirpanlis (1966) 248–53; Schnapp-Gourbeillon (1981) 96; Higbie (1995) 87–100; Pratt (2009) 147 n. 24, 149–50 with n. 28; Slatkin (2011a) 101.

[70] Walls: Pache (2014). 'Famed allies': Ebbott (2014) 330–2. Zeus's thunderbolt: Slatkin (2011a) 111–12. Cf. too Johnston (1992) 95–7 on the connection between Achilles' horse Xanthus and Adrastus' Arion. For the Theban background of Homeric epic generally, see esp. Torres-Guerra (1995); Cingano (2002–3); Tsagalis (2014c); Barker and Christensen (2020).

[71] Cf. too *Il.* 5.638 (**φασί**), introducing the recurring paradigm of Heracles' previous sack of Troy (cf. §III.2.1); *Od.* 2.118 (**ἀκούομεν**), introducing the *Odyssey*'s ongoing engagement with *Catalogue of Women* traditions (§II.2.4).

II.2.3 *The Trojan War Tradition*

Given this foregrounding function of **φασί**, it is perhaps unsurprising that the majority of Homeric appeals to hearsay cluster around the Trojan war tradition itself, the primary mythological context in which both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* situate their narratives. Homer's characters often cite hearsay when referring to different episodes or characters of the war. In part, this reflects the chaotic workings of rumour and hearsay during the Trojan war and its aftermath, as heroes rely on word of mouth for information about both their enemies and their friends. But these gestures to tradition also acknowledge the traditionality of the events narrated, while also hinting that a newly developing tradition is emerging surrounding the war: before our very eyes (and ears), these events are transcending into the world of legend.

Myth in the Making

In the *Iliad*, Achilles attributes his knowledge of both Ilion and Priam to hearsay. He refers to all the wealth which '**they say**' (**φασίν**) Ilion once possessed 'in **previous** times of peace' (**τὸ πρὶν** ἐπ᾽ εἰρήνης, *Il*. 9.401–3), and similarly claims that '**we hear**' Priam 'was **previously** happy' (**τὸ πρὶν** μὲν **ἀκούομεν** ὄλβιον εἶναι, *Il*. 24.543), since '**they say**' that he surpassed all his neighbours in wealth and sons (πλούτῳ τε καὶ υἱάσι **φασὶ** κεκάσθαι, *Il*. 24.546). Knowledge of a distant people naturally relies on information from others, and such rumours of Trojan affluence doubtless circulated in the build-up to the expedition as a further incentive to join Agamemnon's force.[72] After all, Hector himself claims that '**previously** all mortal men **used to talk** of Priam's city as rich in gold and bronze' (**πρὶν** μὲν γὰρ Πριάμοιο πόλιν μέροπες ἄνθρωποι | πάντες **μυθέσκοντο** πολύχρυσον πολύχαλκον, *Il*. 18.288–9). Besides this practical reality, however, these statements can also be taken more broadly to imply that Troy and its ruler have already become figures of legend. Even as the events of the war are unfolding, they have gained a traditional status in the talk of men.

---

[72] Cf. e.g. Stat. *Achil*. 1.959, where Achilles has his mind on 'gifts of Phrygian treasure' (*Phrygiae . . . munera gazae*) soon after being discovered by Ulysses.

Such a conception of a pre-existing and developing tradition surrounding Troy is felt even more clearly in the *Odyssey*.[73] Even before his departure for the war, Penelope remembers how Odysseus had attributed the Trojans' reputation of military might to hearsay (**φασί**, *Od*. 18.261), pointing to the pre-existing traditionality of their valour in martial epic. In context, we would have to imagine that Odysseus was thinking of Troy's earlier war against Heracles, a core feature of tradition that is mentioned repeatedly in the *Iliad* (§III.2.1), but an audience of the *Odyssey* itself may also anachronistically recall the very war at Troy in which Odysseus himself had since fought, the subject of the *Iliad* and other cyclic poems. The ten-year duration of that war attests to the fact that the Trojans are indeed formidable 'fighting men' (μαχητὰς … ἄνδρας, *Od*. 18.261). But it also renders ironic Odysseus' following claim that they are the kind who 'very quickly decide the great strife of equal war' (οἵ τε τάχιστα | ἔκριναν μέγα νεῖκος ὁμοιΐου πτολέμοιο, *Od*. 18.263–4); in reality, there was nothing ταχύς ('quick'), let alone τάχιστος ('very quick'), about the war over Helen. Crucial for our current discussion, however, is the fact that the Trojans are once more represented as figures of legend. They are invoked in the same manner as heroes of the past: they have already joined the annals of tradition, alongside the likes of Typhoeus and Tydeus.

Elsewhere in the *Odyssey*, other recent events are similarly presented as established features of hearsay. When Telemachus first arrives in Pylos, he asks his host Nestor for news of his father, contrasting Odysseus' unknown fate (ἀπευθέα) with what '**we have heard**' about all the others (**πευθόμεθ'**, *Od*. 3.86–8):[74]

ἄλλους μὲν γὰρ πάντας, ὅσοι Τρωσὶν πολέμιξον,
πευθόμεθ', ᾗχι ἕκαστος ἀπώλετο λυγρῷ ὀλέθρῳ·
κείνου δ᾽ αὖ καὶ ὄλεθρον ἀπευθέα θῆκε Κρονίων.

Now for all the others who warred with the Trojans, **we have heard** where each of them died a woeful death; but as for that man [Odysseus], the son of Cronus has put even his death beyond men's hearing.

---

[73] On the development of nascent song traditions within the *Odyssey*, see e.g. Ford (1992) 101–10; Biles (2003) 194–8.

[74] πεύθομαι/πυνθάνομαι is closely linked with hearing: cf. Ford (1992) 62 n. 11; Hsch. ε 4493 (ἐπευθόμεθα· ἠκούομεν).

This rhetoric of Odyssean exceptionality echoes that of the narrator at the outset of the *Odyssey* (1.11–15), who similarly claims that 'all the others who had escaped sheer destruction' were already home (ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες, ὅσοι φύγον αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον, 1.11 ~ ἄλλους μὲν γὰρ πάντας, ὅσοι, 3.86), whereas Odysseus alone (τὸν δ' οἶον, 1.13) was still stuck mid-journey.[75] By referring to these other returns through the language of hearsay, however, Telemachus acknowledges that they are already developing into an independent tradition in their own right. After all, we know that Telemachus has indeed heard about such *nostoi* from the poet Phemius on Ithaca, who sang in Book 1 'of the return of the Achaeans, the woeful return which Pallas Athena laid upon them from Troy' (ὁ δ' Ἀχαιῶν νόστον ἄειδε | λυγρόν, ὃν ἐκ Τροίης ἐπετείλατο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη, *Od.* 1.326–7, cf. λυγρῷ, 3.87).[76] In appealing to what he has heard, Telemachus practically cites other poetic and mythical traditions about the aftermath of the war.

In response, Nestor embarks on a summary of the whole Trojan war and its aftermath (*Od.* 3.103–200, 254–316), offering a miniature overview of cyclic tradition from the events of the *Cypria* down to those of the *Nostoi*.[77] He first recounts the events at Troy, introducing them with the language of memory, a reflection of his first-hand experience (ἔμνησας, *Od.* 3.103, cf. μνῆσαι, *Od.* 3.101: §III.2). But when he reaches the final part of the 'Returns', he invokes the authority of hearsay (*Od.* 3.186–94):

> ὅσσα δ' ἐνὶ μεγάροισι καθήμενος ἡμετέροισι
> **πεύθομαι**, ἣ θέμις ἐστί, **δαήσεαι**, οὐδέ σε δεύσω.
> εὖ μὲν Μυρμιδόνας **φάσ**' ἐλθέμεν ἐγχεσιμώρους,
> οὓς ἄγ' Ἀχιλλῆος μεγαθύμου φαίδιμος υἱός,
> εὖ δὲ Φιλοκτήτην, Ποιάντιον ἀγλαὸν υἱόν.
> πάντας δ' Ἰδομενεὺς Κρήτην εἰσήγαγ' ἑταίρους,
> οἳ φύγον ἐκ πολέμου, πόντος δέ οἱ οὔ τιν' ἀπηύρα.
> Ἀτρεΐδην δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ **ἀκούετε** νόσφιν ἐόντες,
> ὥς τ' ἦλθ' ὥς τ' Αἴγισθος ἐμήσατο λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον.

---

[75] Telemachus' pessimism may be reflected in the fact that he focuses on 'all those who died', in contrast to the narrator's focus on 'all those who survived'. The narrator knows that Odysseus will join the latter group, whereas Telemachus assumes he must be classed among the former.

[76] Thomas (2014) esp. 94; Barker and Christensen (2015) 93–6. Cf. too Aeolus questioning Odysseus about the νόστον Ἀχαιῶν (*Od.* 10.14–15).

[77] Cf. Marks (2008) 103–22. On Nestor's rendition and its structural and thematic proximity to a self-standing song, see Dickson (1995) 75–82.

95

> But as for the news **I hear** as I sit in my halls, **you shall learn** it all, as is right – and I won't hide anything. **They say** that the Myrmidon spearmen came home safely, those whom the glorious son of great-hearted Achilles led; safe too was Philoctetes, Poias' brilliant son. And Idomeneus brought all his companions to Crete, all those who escaped the war; the sea robbed him of none of them. But as for the son of Atreus, even you yourselves **hear** – though you live far away – how he came home and how Aegisthus devised his woeful death.

Within the immediate context, Nestor's repeated invocations of others' talk suggests his incomplete knowledge and reliance on external sources, since he did not witness these events directly: after reaching safety himself, he does not know for certain who died or was saved (3.184–5). But the emphasis on verbal transmission also figures the traditionality of these events, pointing to the numerous traditions of other heroes' homecomings which were later crystallised in the *Nostoi* and which here serve as foils and paradigms for Odysseus' ongoing return.[78] In particular, Nestor claims that 'even you yourselves **hear**' of Agamemnon's death (καὶ αὐτοὶ **ἀκούετε**, *Od*. 3.193), nodding to the centrality of this specific narrative as a foil for Odysseus' return, while also acknowledging the frequency with which it recurs in the *Odyssey*, from Zeus's opening speech onwards (see §III.2.1 n. 38). After all, Telemachus has indeed already heard of it from the disguised Athena (*Od*. 1.298–300).[79] Besides signposting the allusive density of Nestor's speech, however, this emphasis on hearsay also reflects the mechanics of tradition: Nestor claims that Telemachus will '**learn**' all that he knows (**δαήσεαι**, *Od*. 3.187), figuring his speech as an act of transmission. His speech represents the dispersion of tradition, the gradual spread of 'what people say'. In this scene between Telemachus and Nestor, the poet not only indexes

---

[78] Cf. Danek (1998) 79–86; Kahane (2019) 249. It is especially appropriate for Nestor to recount such *nostoi*, given the etymological connection of his name with the root *nes-*, 'to return' (Frame (1978) 82–5, (2009) 28–9; Kanavou (2015) 63–7). On these *nostoi* traditions, see too Malkin (1998) 210–57.

[79] Note esp. the indexically charged *Od*. 1.298 (ἦ οὐκ **ἀΐεις** οἷον **κλέος** ἔλλαβε δῖος Ὀρέστης, 'or do you not **hear** what kind of **fame** godlike Orestes won?'); cf. *Od*. 2.314–16: Telemachus vows to kill the suitors after '**learning** from the **tale he hears** from [or 'about'] others' (ἄλλων **μῦθον ἀκούων** | **πυνθάνομαι**) – an implicit reference to Orestes? Cf. too *Od*. 3.203–4: Telemachus claims that Orestes' fame will spread such that it is heard by future men (ἐσσομένοισι **πυθέσθαι**).

96

his engagement with a host of other *Nostoi* traditions, but simultaneously depicts the development of his own tradition.

This self-reflexivity is even more visible in the way that events more contemporary with the *Odyssey* are represented as the object of hearsay. Shortly after his first Trojan war summary, Nestor notes that he has also heard talk of how Penelope's many suitors devise evil in Telemachus' halls (**φασὶ** μνηστῆρας σῆς μητέρος εἴνεκα πολλοὺς | ἐν μεγάροις ἀέκητι σέθεν κακὰ μηχανάασθαι, *Od.* 3.212–13).[80] Again, at one level this **φασί** acknowledges Nestor's reliance on reports from afar; but for Homer's audience, this is a situation which we have seen all too clearly in the first two books of the poem. Indeed, we might suspect that Homer here advertises the budding fame of his own version of events even as they unfold: the suitors' wrongdoing, like the Trojans' wealth, are solidifying into elements of tradition as the epic progresses.[81] Besides this interpretation, however, the reference may also bear an additional significance, pointing beyond Homer's narrative to other pre-existing traditions of Odysseus' homecoming. Many scholars have suspected that our *Odyssey* repeatedly alludes to alternative and competing versions of Odysseus' *nostos*, including one version which involved a more 'realistic' itinerary that took the hero to real-world locations such as Crete and Thesprotia.[82] The contents of any such alternative traditions are extremely conjectural and often based on little more than late sources and the internal evidence of the *Odyssey* itself,[83] but they are at least partly presupposed by the Odyssean proem, in which Homer asks the Muse

---

[80] This reference is also signposted through the language of recollection (ταῦτα μ' ἀνέμνησας, *Od.* 3.211); cf. §III.

[81] Cf. Burgess (2012b) 283, in relation to Odysseus' *Apologoi*: 'it would not at all be unlike the *Odyssey* to suggest that events are already famous as they are unfolding'.

[82] E.g. Merkelbach (1969) 199–236; West (1981); van Thiel (1988); Schwinge (1993); Reece (1994); Danek (1998) 1–7 and *passim*; Malkin (1998) 120–55; Marks (2003), (2008) 62–82; Currie (2006) 15–23, (2016) 47–55; Steiner (2010) 84–5; Tsagalis (2011) 220–1, (2012b); Haller (2013). Though note the caution of Burgess (2017b).

[83] The slim external evidence includes the Zenodotean readings at 1.93 and 1.285–6, which apparently had Telemachus (planning to) visit Idomeneus on Crete rather than Menelaus at Sparta (although Zenodotus' text still included the Spartan episode: West (2014a) 107–10; cf. Beck (2020)); and Dictys of Crete's late account that Odysseus visited Crete (6.5), although this is most likely a refashioning of Homer to suit later Greek and local Cretan tastes, rather than an independent manifestation of non-Homeric tradition (contrast Allen (1924) 149–69, esp. 166–8; Reece (1994) 168–9).

to 'speak <u>to us</u> **too** from some point in the story' (τῶν ἁμόθεν γε . . . εἰπὲ **καὶ** <u>ἡμῖν</u>, *Od.* 1.10), an expression that seems to acknowledge bardic predecessors to whom the Muse has previously told the same Odyssean tale.[84] If we accept the possibility of other Odyssean traditions underlying our poem, then Nestor's words gain further resonance: the suitors' misbehaviour is indeed part of what 'they talk about' in the wider mythical tradition. The situation of Penelope and her suitors was already a well-known and established part of the *fabula*.[85]

Character (Por)traits

Besides such general evocations of broad events from the Trojan war tradition, Homer's characters also appeal to hearsay when referring to more precise and detailed traits of specific characters. In such cases, we find fine-grained indexing of particular details from individual heroes' biographies, not just allusion to the general contours of tradition in broad brushstrokes.

In *Odyssey* 4, for example, Peisistratus reminisces about his dead brother Antilochus, whom '**they say** excelled all others, pre-eminent in speed of foot and as a fighter' (περὶ δ' ἄλλων **φασὶ** γενέσθαι | Ἀντίλοχον, περὶ μὲν θείειν ταχὺν ἠδὲ μαχητήν, *Od.* 4.201–2). Within the internal story world, this remark reflects Peisistratus' lack of direct acquaintance with his brother's exploits, given that he was not himself present at Troy to see them (οὐ γὰρ ἐγώ γε | ἤντησ' οὐδὲ ἴδον, *Od.* 4.200–1), but it also evokes the Trojan war traditions through which Antilochus' fame has reached him and with which Homer's audience would have been familiar. The Pylian youth played a significant part in the war as a close friend of Achilles, especially after Hector's killing of Patroclus. In particular, his death at the hands of the Ethiopian Memnon was a prominent feature of the larger tradition, a key

---

[84] 'Tell us as you have already told others': Allen (1924) 139 n. 1; Danek (1998) 36–7; Scodel (2002) 67–8; Tsagalis (2011) 225; Σ O *Od.* 1.10g. Contrast: 'tell us too, share your knowledge with us': S. R. West (1988) 73; Pulleyn (2019) 102; Σ V *Od.* 1.10f. 'Tell us in addition to Odysseus': Bakker (2009) 134. On the indexical significance of καί: §IV.2.2.

[85] Cf. Martin (1993) 237–9, who notes how the suitors are only vaguely introduced at the start of the *Odyssey*; knowledge of their identity and situation is taken for granted, presumably because Homer's audiences were already familiar with them.

episode in the later Cyclic *Aethiopis* (*Aeth*. arg. 2c *GEF*) and one which the Homeric narrator has just recalled with the loaded language of memory (**μνήσατο**, **ἐπιμνησθείς**, *Od*. 4.187–9: §III.2.1). Peisistratus' appeal to hearsay acknowledges the central role that his brother played in the Trojan war *fabula*.

The emphasis on Antilochus' speed, however, points not so much to the hero's duel with Memnon as to his more general reputation as a runner in the wider tradition. In the *Iliad*'s footrace, he is introduced as the fastest of all the Achaean youths (ὃ γὰρ αὖτε νέους ποσὶ πάντας ἐνίκα, *Il*. 23.756), while Menelaus earlier claims that he is unmatched in his youth, speed and valour, paralleling Peisistratus' description of his brother's key traits (οὔ τις σεῖο νεώτερος ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν, | οὔτε ποσὶν θάσσων, οὔτ' ἄλκιμος ὡς σὺ μάχεσθαι, *Il*. 15.569–70). Elsewhere in the *Iliad*, moreover, Antilochus is called a 'swift warrior' (θοὸς ... πολεμιστής, *Il*. 15.585) – a phrase used only once elsewhere in Homer of Aeneas, another hero renowned for his speed[86] – and his agility is repeatedly stressed in his key contribution to the Iliadic narrative: his delivery of the news of Patroclus' death to Achilles (θᾶσσον ἰόντα, *Il*. 17.654; βῆ δὲ θέειν, 17.698; πόδες φέρον, 17.700; πόδας ταχὺς ἄγγελος, 18.2).[87] Although we do not have other evidence for his depiction elsewhere in archaic Greek epic, such a character trait was presumably an established feature of Antilochus in the Trojan war myth, not just limited to the *Iliad*. Indeed, earlier in the *Odyssey*, Nestor has already described his son in precisely the same terms as Peisistratus does here, suggesting that the attributes are formulaic and traditional (Ἀντίλοχος, περὶ μὲν θείειν ταχὺς ἠδὲ μαχητής, *Od*. 3.112 ~ *Od*. 4.202). After all, it is especially appropriate for Antilochus to share a major attribute of his companion, 'swift-footed' Achilles (e.g. Ἀχιλῆα πόδας ταχύν, *Il*. 13.348).[88] Peisistratus' appeal to hearsay in *Odyssey* 4 thus looks beyond the immediate narrative to point to Antilochus' pre-eminence as a runner in the wider Trojan tradition. By indexing another element of cyclic epic, Homer signals not just his allusion to other features of the Trojan war

---

[86] Notably, as he flees from Antilochus: *Il*. 5.571. 'Swift-footed Aeneas': Fenno (2008) 158.
[87] Cf. too *Il*. 17.676, where a simile associates Antilochus with a 'swift-footed' hare (πόδας ταχὺς ... πτώξ).
[88] Cf. Dunkle (1997) 231.

99

narrative, but also his mastery over the mass of mythical material at his disposal.

In the *Iliad*, meanwhile, Antilochus himself appeals to hearsay when talking of Odysseus' 'raw old age' during the funeral games for Patroclus (ὠμογέροντα δέ μίν **φασ'** ἔμμεναι, *Il*. 23.791). On one level, this index simply reflects Odysseus' traditional seniority within the Greek camp (especially when viewed from Antilochus' youthful perspective).[89] But as de Jong notes, **φασί** seems to place a particular emphasis on the preceding adjective ὠμογέροντα, making it 'a kind of quotation, a nickname of Odysseus'.[90] The word is a Homeric *hapax legomenon*, which was variously interpreted in antiquity as referring either to 'early' or to 'premature' old age.[91] But if it is a 'quotation' of sorts, from what kind of tradition does it derive? Given the generally proleptic flavour of the funeral games, which fore-shadow many later events of the Trojan cycle (§IV.2), I would suggest that this reference also looks forward: in this case, to the wider *fabula* of Odysseus' later life, as known from the *Odyssey* and *Telegony*. Unlike the 'swift-fated' Achilles, destined to die young at Troy, Odysseus was traditionally associated with a long and prosperous old age.[92] The hero spends much of the second half of the *Odyssey* disguised as an old man (παλαιοῦ . . . γέροντος, *Od*. 13.432) and is repeatedly addressed as a γέρων (e.g. *Od*. 14.37, 45, 122, etc.).[93] But this deceptive role-playing only foreshadows his future old age beyond the bounds of the poem, as reflected in Teiresias' prophecy (*Od*. 11.100–37) and as subsequently narrated in the *Telegony* (arg. 1–3 *GEF*).[94] More generally, the centrality of old age to the

---

[89] Cf. e.g. *Il*. 2.404–7, where Odysseus is grouped among the γέροντας ἀριστῆας Παναχαιῶν ('the elders, the chiefs of all the Achaeans', 404).

[90] de Jong (2004) 238.

[91] See Richardson (1993) 257; Harder (2012) II 242–3. The former sense seems likely here: cf. e.g. Σ D *Il*. 23.791: τοὺς ἔτι συνεστῶτας καὶ μήπω πάνυ γέροντας, ἀλλὰ πλησίον τοῦ γήρως ('those who are still firm and not yet exceedingly old, but near old age'); Hsch. ω 196 (ὠμογέρων· τὸν ἀρξάμενον γηράσκειν, ἔτι δὲ ἰσχύοντα, 'a man who is beginning to grow old, but is still strong'). Callimachus reuses the *hapax* in this sense to describe the elderly farmer Theiodamas, who is 'still a mighty man' (ἔτι πουλὺς ἀνήρ) despite his old age (ὠμογέρων: *Aet*. fr. 24.5, cf. Philostr. mai. *Imag*. 2.24).

[92] ὠκύμορος Achilles: *Il*. 1.417, 1.505, 18.95, 18.458; cf. 1.352 (μινυνθάδιος, 'short-lived'); Burgess (2009) 54.

[93] Cf. Falkner (1989) 51 with 62 n. 82.

[94] On Odysseus' death and the relationship of the *Odyssey* and *Telegony* narratives, see Hansen (1977); Peradotto (1985); Ballabriga (1989); Burgess (2015b), (2019b); Arft (2019).

Odyssean tradition is further reflected in the figure of the hero's father, Laertes, who is in many ways a doublet of his son;[95] indeed, he is explicitly described as being beset by a 'raw old age', just like the Iliadic Odysseus (ἐν ὠμῷ γήραϊ, *Od.* 15.357).[96] Senectitude, therefore, is a prominent feature of Odysseus' *fabula*; it was perhaps this very association which encouraged pseudo-Longinus to conceive of the *Odyssey* as the product of Homer's old age (*Subl.* 9.11–14).[97]

Antilochus' description of ὠμογέρων Odysseus thus taps into a wider tradition of Odyssean old age. The adjective ὠμογέρων parallels the situation of the Odyssean Laertes (ἐν ὠμῷ γήραϊ, *Od.* 15.357), but it also resonates with Teiresias' prophetic mention of Odysseus' sleek old age (γήρᾳ … λιπαρῷ, *Od.* 11.136), another rare phrase which seems to have been particularly associated with Odysseus (cf. *Od.* 19.368, 23.283). The only other epic instance of a similar idiom relates to Nestor (λιπαρῶς γηρασκέμεν, *Od.* 4.210) in a context celebrating his fortunate long life (perhaps as a model for Odysseus?), while its two other pre-Hellenistic appearances both evoke Odysseus as a model of long life and continued familial prosperity.[98] The hero was the archetype of a full and gentle old age, ensuring a prosperous stability for his people (λαοὶ | ὄλβιοι, *Od.* 11.136–7). In describing the hero as ὠμογέρων, Homer thus appears to disrupt linear time by looking forward to these events that lie strictly beyond the *Iliad*. Within the wider proleptic context of the funeral games, Antilochus' reference to Odysseus' old age alludes to yet another later episode of the Trojan war tradition, signposted through **φασί**.

Such self-aware citation of tradition may even extend to direct textual allusion. The strongest case for this comes from the

---

[95] Laertes as doublet: Falkner (1989) 51–2. E.g. Odysseus is bathed by Eurynome, Laertes by the Sicilian maidservant (*Od.* 23.153–63 ~ 24.365–71); Athena beautifies Odysseus and Laertes (*Od.* 18.69–70, 23.156–7 ~ 24.367–9); both are described as a ποιμὴν λαῶν (*Od.* 18.70, 20.106, 24.368); and Laertes kills Eupeithes, Antinous' father (*Od.* 24.520–5), just as Odysseus slaughters Antinous (*Od.* 22.8–21).

[96] For the expression, cf. too Hes. *Op.* 705 (ὠμῷ γήραϊ), of a man reduced to old age by a 'bad wife'.

[97] Cf. Hunter (2018) 186–90 on ps.-Longinus' specification of τὸ φιλόμυθον ('love of stories') as a characteristic of both old age and the *Odyssey*.

[98] λιπαρὸν γῆρας, Cratinus fr. 1.4 K–A; λιπαρῷ τε γήραϊ, Pind. *Nem.* 7.98–101.

Odyssey, when Telemachus reports to Mentor-Athena that Nestor has been king for three generations of men (*Od*. 3.243–5):

> νῦν δ᾽ ἐθέλω **ἔπος** ἄλλο μεταλλῆσαι καὶ ἐρέσθαι
> Νέστορ᾽, ἐπεὶ περὶ οἶδε δίκας ἠδὲ φρόνιν ἄλλων·
> τρὶς γὰρ δή μίν **φασιν** ἀνάξασθαι γένε᾽ ἀνδρῶν·

> But now I want to enquire and ask Nestor about another **story**, since he knows what is right and wise beyond all others. For **they say** that he has ruled over three generations of men.

On an internal level, this reference to Nestor's age emphasises his wisdom and authority. He is a reliable source of information for Telemachus to consult. Such fabled seniority is the very kind of thing that Telemachus would have heard stories about as he was growing up on Ithaca, so **φασίν** makes natural sense within the story world: this is precisely the kind of tale that people tell, and the very kind of detail for which Telemachus would have to rely on the experience of others. As scholars have long recognised, however, this description of the Pylian king also closely resembles his opening description in the *Iliad* (*Il*. 1.247–52):

> <div align="center">τοῖσι δὲ Νέστωρ</div>
>
> ἡδυεπὴς ἀνόρουσε, λιγὺς Πυλίων ἀγορητής,
> τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν αὐδή.
> τῷ δ᾽ ἤδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
> ἐφθίαθ᾽, οἵ οἱ πρόσθεν ἅμα τράφεν ἠδ᾽ ἐγένοντο
> ἐν Πύλῳ ἠγαθέῃ, <u>μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἄνασσεν</u>.

> Among them rose up sweetly spoken Nestor, the clear-voiced speaker of the Pylians, from whose tongue speech flowed sweeter than honey. He had already seen two generations of mortal men pass away, those who had previously been born and reared with him in holy Pylos, <u>and now he ruled over the third</u>.

This connection was already noted by ancient and Byzantine scholars. The Odyssean scholia remark that Telemachus' sentiment 'has been adapted from the phrase in the *Iliad*' (παρὰ τὸ ἐν Ἰλιάδι πεποίηται "μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἄνασσεν", Σ ΕΗΜᵃΤ *Od*. 3.245a *Ariston.*), while Eustathius comments that 'the poet succinctly paraphrases what was said about Nestor at more length in the *Iliad*' (παραφράζων συντόμως ὁ ποιητὴς τὸ ἐν Ἰλιάδι περὶ Νέστορος πλατύτερον ἱστορηθέν, Eust. 1465.46–7 ad *Od*.

3.245–6 = 1 124.5–6 Stallbaum). Of course, the two passages are not identical, and scholars have long been vexed by a slight discrepancy between them: on a literal reading, Nestor appears to have only ruled for one generation in the *Iliad*, but three in the *Odyssey*.[99] Martin West's assessment is not atypical: he describes the Odyssean line as 'an egregiously unsuccessful attempt to reproduce the sense of A 250–2'.[100] However, Grethlein has highlighted the essential consistency between both passages: in each case, Nestor is pictured as having ruled over his own generation, as well as those of his children and grandchildren. As he acknowledges, the resulting timeframe skews both epics' implicit chronology (seemingly inter-posing another generation between Nestor and his sons), but in both passages this can be explained as an exaggeration to reinforce Nestor's authority.[101] Given the similar hyperbole and the shared emphasis on Nestor's age, experience and wisdom, this thus remains a strikingly close parallel.

For scholars who are prepared to see a direct intertextual con-nection between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, this is certainly an attract-ive case for a direct, indexed allusion in archaic Greek epic: beneath Telemachus' vague, pluralised **φασίν**, we may detect a specific reference to the *Iliad*. After all, the Iliadic passage derives from Nestor's very first appearance in that poem, part of a mem-orable description of the Pylian king's mellifluous speech (*Il.* 1.248–9).[102] It is – to use a phrase familiar from later periods – a 'purple patch' that could easily stick in an audience's mind. By evoking it here, Homer and Telemachus would draw on literary precedent to authorise their exaggerated claim about Nestor's age, gesturing to the fuller prior account of the *Iliad*, a truly 'brief paraphrase' as Eustathius claimed. Indeed, we could even see this allusion pre-empted in Telemachus' wish to **ἔπος** ἄλλο μεταλλῆσαι (*Od.* 3.243), literally 'enquire about another story', but perhaps also 'search after another epic' (i.e. the *Iliad*).[103]

---

[99] E.g. Σ EHMᵃT *Od.* 3.245a *Ariston.*; Leaf (1886–88) 1 16; Kirk (1985) 79.
[100] West (2014a) 71.   [101] Grethlein (2006b).
[102] Alden (2000) 74 stresses the unusualness of this character introduction. The description remained famous in antiquity: see Hor. *Carm.* 2.9.13; [Tib.] 3.7.50–1; Juv. 10.246–7 (with explicit attribution to *Homerus*); *Laus Pisonis* 64 (indexed with ***inclita***); *AP* 15.9.6–8.
[103] On ἔπος and ἔπεα as signposts of specifically hexameter tradition, cf. §IV.3.1 n. 161.

Such a direct connection is certainly possible, and one that I would not want to rule out. It is likely, however, that such a characterisation of Nestor's seniority and triple-rule would not have been restricted to these two places in the archaic epic tradition. Nestor is a mainstay of the Trojan war story (cf. §I.2.1), who features across the Epic Cycle from the *Cypria* to the *Nostoi*, with a series of old and only partially understood epithets which indicate a character of considerable antiquity. His seniority and experience are essential parts of his mythical *fabula*; throughout the *Iliad*, his exceptional age is a recurring characteristic, already fixed in tradition (cf. *Il.* 2.555; §IV.2.1). In that case, we may suspect here engagement with the larger tradition surrounding Nestor, not restricted to a single source.[104] This detail of his age and triple-rule is indeed what epic bards repeatedly 'tell of'; the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are simply two instantiations of what was most likely a common motif. It is significant, however, that this index comes in the voice of Telemachus, a figure who is no stranger to song (*Od.* 1.325–59). Once more, the distinction between song within and outside the story world begins to break down.

Regardless of one's stance on the precise 'target' of this allusion, therefore, what is clear is that this **φασίν** – embedded in the voice of an internal character – already points to poetry beyond the *Odyssey*. Like the previous indices we have examined in this section, the device situates Homer's poetry within a larger road map of myth, highlighting the poet's detailed and encyclopaedic mastery of his mythical repertoire – not only on the level of plot and action, but also in the construction and articulation of individual characters.

Prominent Protagonists

Such indexed allusions to specific characters gravitate most towards the major protagonist of each Homeric epic: Achilles in the *Iliad* and Odysseus in the *Odyssey*. By concentrating on the talk swirling around each hero, Homer signposts his engagement

---

[104] Cf. Danek (1998) 90–1. To push for a direct connection with the *Iliad* may fall foul of the documentary fallacy which Kelly has cautioned against: the natural desire to connect our surviving material at the expense of the wider mass of texts and traditions now lost to us: Kelly (2015a) 22, (forthcoming a), (forthcoming b).

104

and adaptation of prior traditions, while also acknowledging the key role which his own poetry plays in shaping the mythological record.

In the case of Achilles, these indices centre especially around the hero's mixed parentage and ambiguous position between the mortal and divine worlds. We will consider Agenor's indexed assertion of Achilles' mortality below (*Il.* 21.568–70: §II.2.4), but for now we can cite other cases in which internal characters comment on Achilles' status. In *Iliad* 6, the Trojan augur Helenus introduces Achilles' descent from a goddess with **φασί** (ὅν πέρ **φασι** θεᾶς ἐξ ἔμμεναι, *Il.* 6.100), marking the traditional and central role of Thetis in the hero's biography. Similarly, when Aeneas later faces Achilles, he emphasises that they are both familiar with each other's ancestry: they '**know**' it from '**hearing the ancient legends** told by [or 'about'] mortal men' (ἴδμεν . . . | **πρόκλυτ' ἀκούοντες ἔπεα** θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων, *Il.* 20.203–4). As Edwards notes, this comment can easily be taken as a reference 'to epic poetry celebrating the exploits of the two heroes',[105] a reference which is reinforced by the use of the noun **ἔπεα**: not just 'words' in general, but also 'poetic' or even 'epic utterances'.[106] Alongside the mention of ἄνθρωποι ('people'), commonly singled out as the audience and propagators of epic poetry elsewhere,[107] Aeneas' emphasis on the fame and antiquity of these **ἔπεα** highlights the epic traditionality of both his and Achilles' lineage.[108] In his following words (206–7), Aeneas proves the accuracy of his knowledge, claiming that '**they say**' that Achilles is the offspring of Peleus and Thetis (**φασί**, *Il.* 20.206). Once more, Achilles' divine ancestry is pinpointed as a key feature of tradition.

In the *Odyssey*, meanwhile, Odysseus' mythical career and accomplishments are similarly marked through the language of

---

[105] Edwards (1991) 315.
[106] Thus Nagy (1979) 271, chap. 15 §7. On this association of ἔπος/ἔπεα, cf. §IV.3.1 n. 161. Cf. Martin (1989) 16 who highlights the close connection of ἔπος with the audition and transmission of words.
[107] Cf. §II.2.4 n. 127.
[108] On Aeneas' famous ancestry, cf. too *Il.* 20.105–6, where the disguised Apollo similarly tells Aeneas that 'they say that you were born from Aphrodite, the daughter of Zeus' (σέ **φασι** Διὸς κούρης Ἀφροδίτης | ἐκγεγάμεν). The inset narrative of the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* evidences the fame of this genealogy.

hearsay. When addressing Nestor in Book 3, Odysseus' son Telemachus claims that his father '**once**, **they say**, fought by your side and sacked the city of the Trojans' (ὅν **ποτέ φασι** | σὺν σοὶ μαρνάμενον Τρώων πόλιν ἐξαλαπάξαι, *Od*. 3.84–5), while when reunited with his father, he remarks that '**I have always heard of your great fame**, that you were a spearman in strength of hand and wise in counsel' (ἦ τοι **σεῖο μέγα κλέος αἰὲν ἄκουον,** | χεῖράς τ' αἰχμητὴν ἔμεναι καὶ ἐπίφρονα βουλήν, *Od*. 16.241–2). Although these cases may simply reflect Telemachus' limited direct knowledge about his own father and thus inevitable resort to indirect hearsay (cf. *Od*. 1.215–16), they nevertheless suggest that both the events of the Trojan War and Odysseus' exploits in them have already become established (and frequent, **αἰέν**) in the talk of men, as indeed they had: we can readily compare Demodocus' first and third songs in *Odyssey* 8, or Menelaus' and Helen's competing accounts in *Odyssey* 4, which together emphasise the centrality of Odysseus as both warrior and schemer.[109]

It is particularly Odysseus' resourcefulness, however, that is acknowledged as an established feature of tradition. Later in the poem, Telemachus again attributes his father's reputation to hearsay, now with a focus on his cunning (*Od*. 23.124–6): '**they say**' (**φάσ'**) Odysseus is pre-eminent in wiles (μῆτιν, 23.125). Similarly, when Odysseus himself reveals his identity in Scheria, he asserts that he is '**an object of concern to all men**' for his tricks (δόλοι) and that his '**fame** reaches the heavens', employing language that mirrors Circe's allusive nod to Argonautic myth (ὃς **πᾶσι** δόλοισιν | **ἀνθρώποισι μέλω**, καί μευ **κλέος** οὐρανὸν ἵκει, *Od*. 9.19–20; cf. Ἀργὼ **πᾶσι μέλουσα**, *Od*. 12.70).[110] These comments point to the well-established tradition of Odysseus as the arch-deviser of the Trojan war myth, a reputation reflected in his formulaic epithet

---

[109] Odysseus' achievement of κλέος is a central theme of the poem. Cf. too Penelope's claim that his '**fame** is spread wide throughout Greece and mid-Argos' (**κλέος**, *Od*. 1.344) and Telemachus' concern that he is ἄϊστος ἄπυστος ('beyond sight and hearing', *Od*. 1.242); also *Od*. 19.267, where the disguised Odysseus claims that '**they say**' (**φασί**) that Odysseus is like the gods (θεοῖσ' ἐναλίγκιον).

[110] For the Argonautic allusion: §I.1.4. For μέλω of literary concern, cf. Thgn. 245–6 (**μελήσεις** | ... ἀνθρώποισ'); Thgn. 1058 (<**μέλο**>μεν δ' ἀμφιπερικτίοσιν). The noun ἀνθρώποισι also points to poetic audiences: §II.2.4 n. 127; cf. ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, *Od*. 23.125.

πολύμητις ('of many wiles'), and more than deserved by his role in such episodes as the ambushes of Dolon, Rhesus and Helenus, as well as his various spying missions in Troy and the mobilisation of the Wooden Horse (*Il.* 10.338–579; *Il. Parv.* arg. 2a, 4b–d *GEF*; *Od.* 8.500–20). These indices highlight the traditionality of Odysseus' cunning, while also acknowledging the *Odyssey*'s role in cementing it.[111] Like Achilles, Odysseus emerges from his epic as a figure who is much talked of – and even more so, given his absence from Ithaca for the majority of the poem.

Homer thus indexes allusions to familiar aspects of the Trojan war tradition through the words of his characters. In some cases, he gestures to general events and broader elements of the mythical story: the Trojans' might, the suitors' insolence and the returns of the Greeks from Troy. But he also indexes specific characteristics of individual heroes: Antilochus' speed, Odysseus' old age and Nestor's experience, as well as Achilles' divine parentage and Odysseus' cunning guile. In so doing, the poet emphasises the traditionality of his material, while also foregrounding his mastery over the larger mythical canon: in gesturing to what 'others say', he highlights his selective control of his inherited tradition.

In many respects, these examples support Scodel's concept of Homer's 'rhetoric of traditionality'. As she has argued, the poet presents his material as traditional and familiar, eliding his own authorial presence and effacing any hint of originality.[112] By presenting these events and details as what 'they say', Homer does indeed position them within a pre-existing canon of tradition and distances them from his own creativity. The Homeric epics are a retelling of what has been said before. However, Scodel's theory does not work for all cases of indexical hearsay. On some occasions, indexed allusions involve a more competitive engagement with tradition. We have already noted Homer's possible nod to competing traditions over Typhoeus' final resting place (§II.2.1), while Telemachus' indexing of Odysseus' μῆτις includes an assertion that no one could contend with his father's guile (ἐρίσειε, *Od.* 23.126) – a statement that suggests the pre-eminence of not only Odysseus, but also the very poem which

---

[111] Cf. e.g. the verbal play with Οὖτις / μή τις ('nobody') and μῆτις ('cunning') in Odysseus' encounter with Polyphemus, esp. *Od.* 9.405–14: Austin (1972) 13–19.

[112] Scodel (2002) esp. 65–89.

preserves his deeds.[113] In the following section, we will consider further appeals to hearsay which foreground a more competitive engagement with the mythic tradition.

II.2.4 Contesting Tradition

Far from always asserting the authority of tradition, some characters' appeals to hearsay bear a far more agonistic edge, not just acknowledging the wider mythical canon, but directing an audience to specific elements of it which Homer has pointedly suppressed or diverged from. What 'people say' can prove a distancing foil as much as a legitimising badge of authority.

Lies, Lies

On some occasions, the talk of others is explicitly branded as deceitful lies. In *Iliad* 5, for example, the Greek Tlepolemus accuses Lycian Sarpedon (Zeus's son) of failing to live up to the standards of his own father Heracles, another son of Zeus (*Il.* 5.633–7):[114]

Σαρπῆδον, Λυκίων βουληφόρε, τίς τοι ἀνάγκη
πτώσσειν ἐνθάδ' ἐόντι μάχης ἀδαήμονι φωτί;
ψευδόμενοι δέ σέ **φασι** Διὸς γόνον αἰγιόχοιο
εἶναι, ἐπεὶ πολλὸν κείνων ἐπιδεύεαι ἀνδρῶν
οἳ Διὸς ἐξεγένοντο **ἐπὶ προτέρων ἀνθρώπων·**

Sarpedon, counsellor of the Lycians, why must you cower here, being a man unskilled in battle? **They lie** when **they say** that you are the offspring of aegis-bearing Zeus, since you fall far short of those men who were born to Zeus **in previous generations of men**.

Tlepolemus accuses Sarpedon of cowering from battle as Agamemnon criticised Diomedes in Book 4 (τίς τοι ἀνάγκη | πτώσσειν, 5.633–4 ~ τί πτώσσεις, 4.371: §II.2.2),[115] but here he goes even further than the Greek general by actively challenging

---

[113] Cf. *Od.* 3.120–1, where Nestor similarly recalls that no other was willing to vie (ὁμοιωθήμεναι ἄντην) with Odysseus in terms of μῆτις.
[114] For this scene of flyting, see e.g. Drerup (1913) 251–3; Grethlein (2006a) 76–7; Aceti (2008) 22–33; Kelly (2010). This is not the first time that Tlepolemus has had an antagonistic run-in with relatives: cf. *Il.* 2.665–6.
[115] Such rebukes are usually made among allies; its use here between enemies may point to the genealogical connection between Sarpedon and Tlepolemus: Fenik (1968) 66–7; Aceti (2008) 27–9; Kelly (2010) 266–7.

the tradition of Sarpedon's divine parentage.[116] Of course, in this case his assertions prove misguided: Homer has already introduced the pair as a son and grandson of Zeus (5.631), while Tlepolemus' swift death and Zeus's later support of Sarpedon demonstrate through action that what 'they say' about the Lycian is indeed correct. But the hero's countering of hearsay serves as a model for the poet's own conduct elsewhere. Like Tlepolemus, Homer attempts to substitute tradition with a replacement narrative. But unlike his characters, the poet's divine support and broader vantage point allows him to sift through the realms of hearsay with much more authority – and success.

Looking beyond the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* for a moment, the fragmentary *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* opens with an extended instance of such contestation (*HhDion.* A.2–8):[117]

> οἳ μὲν γὰρ Δρακάνῳ σ᾽, οἳ δ᾽ Ἰκάρῳ ἠνεμοέσσῃ
> **φᾶσ᾽**, οἳ δ᾽ ἐν Νάξῳ, δῖον γένος Εἰραφιῶτα,
> οἳ δέ σ᾽ ἐπ᾽ Ἀλφειῷ ποταμῷ βαθυδινήεντι
> {κυσαμένην Σεμέλην τεκέειν Διὶ τερπικεραύνῳ},
> ἄλλοι δ᾽ ἐν Θήβῃσιν ἄναξ σε **λέγουσι** γενέσθαι,
> **ψευδόμενοι**· σὲ δ᾽ ἔτικτε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε
> πολλὸν ἀπ᾽ ἀνθρώπων, κρύπτων λευκώλενον Ἥρην.

> For some **say** it was at Dracanum, some on windy Icarus, some on Naxos, O Zeus-born Bull god, and some by the Alpheius, the deep-eddying river, {that Semele conceived and bore you to Zeus who delights in thunder}; and others, lord, **say** that you were born at Thebes. **But they are all liars.** The father of gods and men begot you far from humankind, in secret from white-armed Hera.

The poet begins by canvassing a range of locations for Dionysus' birthplace, all of which are attributed to the common talk of men (**φάσ᾽**, 3; **λέγουσι**, 6). But the poet – like Tlepolemus – dismisses such traditions as lies (**ψευδόμενοι**, 7), in favour of his own alternative explanation (Nysa, 9). In some respects, this opening priamel fits into the common hymnic motif of *aporia*, in which a poet expresses his hesitation about where or how to begin (e.g. πῶς

---

[116] Homeric mentions of ancestry are frequently combined with an appeal to hearsay: e.g. Asteropaeus (**φασί**, *Il.* 21.159), Telemachus (**φασί**, *Od.* 1.220), Eidothea (**φασίν**, *Od.* 4.387). As Telemachus acknowledges, one can never be certain of one's own parentage (*Od.* 1.215–16), but these appeals also acknowledge the developing tradition of Trojan myth.

[117] On this poem, see the discussion and reconstruction by West (2001b).

109

τάρ σ᾽ ὑμνήσω, *HhAp.* 19).[118] But here, there is in fact no uncertainty about where or how the poet is starting: he is set on the god's birthplace from the start, and the only question is which tradition is correct.[119] We are no longer in a position to determine whether the dismissed locations represent pre-existing alternative traditions which the poet counters, or simply foils that he has invented for rhetorical effect. But what is crucial for us here is the fact that the poet represents these dismissed alternatives as belonging to the domain of hearsay: it is what others say – and they are explicitly wrong.

This discourse of poetic lies has a wider currency in archaic Greek epic, especially as refracted through the voices of internal figures.[120] At the outset of the *Theogony*, the Muses claim that they can speak 'lies that seem like the truth' (*Theog.* 27–8):

> ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα,
> ἴδμεν δ᾽, εὖτ᾽ ἐθέλωμεν, ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι.

> We know how to speak many lies that seem like the truth, and we know – when we wish – how to sing truth.

This statement has often been interpreted as a polemical dig against the falsities of Homeric epic, especially given the verbal parallel with *Od.* 19.203 (ἴσκε ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα).[121] Even if we do not accept such a precise intertextual connection, however, it is likely that Hesiod here distances himself from the 'falsehoods' of other (epic?) poetic traditions in favour of his own truth-speaking poetry. Elsewhere in his works, he presents ψεύδεα in a pejorative light: Falsehoods are the children of Eris

---

[118] Race (1982) 5–8.

[119] This opening foreshadows Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*, which similarly negotiates between competing traditions about Zeus's birthplace (σέ . . . **φασι** γενέσθαι, *hZeus* 6 ~ σε **λέγουσι** γενέσθαι, *HhDion.* A.6) and dismisses some versions as lies (**ἐψεύσαντο**, *hZeus* 7; **ψεῦσται**, *hZeus* 8 ~ **ψευδόμενοι**, *HhDion.* A.7). Goldhill (1986) 27 remarks that Callimachus 'converts the *topos*' of hymnic *aporia* 'into an academic question about the birth-place of Zeus', but something similar could already be said of the archaic hymnist.

[120] On lying in archaic Greek poetry, see Luther (1935); Bowie (1993b); Pratt (1993).

[121] See e.g. Kambylis (1965) 63; Puelma (1989) 75; Arrighetti (1996); Kelly (2008b) 196, 199. Contrast e.g. Nagy (1990a) 45–7; Scodel (2001) 112–21. For the ancient tradition of Homer as liar, cf. Pind. *Nem.* 7.22–3; Pl. *Resp.* 2.377d; Arist. *Poet.* 24.1460a18–19. For other interpretations of *Theog.* 27–8, see Collins (1999); González (2013) 235–66; Tor (2017) 61–103; Brockliss (2017–18) 130 n. 5.

('Strife') alongside a host of horrific siblings like Famine and Ruin (*Theog.* 226–32), while in the *Works and Days* they are among Hermes' gifts to the destructive Pandora (*Op.* 78).[122] Unlike the deceptive falsities of other poetry, Hesiod implies that his own Muses do want to speak ἀληθέα, 'true things'. Like the narrator of the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*, he opens by dismissing prior traditions as 'false' to carve out his own space in the tradition.

This pejorative rejection of 'false' alternative traditions also lends some support to those scholars who have seen an allusive polemic underlying the 'lying tales' of the *Odyssey*. In the second half of the epic, the disguised hero utters five false tales about his own *nostos*, all of which are patently false within Homer's narrative world (cf. *Od.* 13.254–5, 19.203).[123] Many scholars suspect that these tales reflect pre-existing alternative traditions of Odysseus' return which the poet has incorporated into his epic but de-authorised by recasting them as lies.[124] This is an attractive, if speculative suggestion. But it may be strengthened by the fact that Odysseus also presents parts of his tales as the object of hearsay. In his fictional tales to Eumaeus and Penelope, the hero claims that he has '**learned**' of Odysseus (Ὀδυσῆος ἐγὼ **πυθόμην**, *Od.* 14.321) and '**recently heard**' of his return from Pheidon, the king of the Thesprotians (**ἤδη** Ὀδυσῆος ἐγὼ περὶ νόστου **ἄκουσα** | ἀγχοῦ, *Od.* 19.270–1, cf. **ἀκοῦσαι**, *Od.* 17.525) – just as Nestor has '**learned**' of the Achaeans' returns and Telemachus has heard of Agamemnon's death (**πεύθομαι**, *Od.* 3.187; **ἀκούετε**, *Od.* 3.193). It is thus very possible that Homer – more implicitly than the poet of the *Homeric Hymn* – is downgrading other Odyssean traditions as mere lies, asserting the primacy and authority of his own version of events over the talk of others. While exploiting the language of hearsay to evoke the larger oral tradition within which

---

[122] Cf. Scodel (2001) 113–14.
[123] On Odysseus' lying tales, see Walcot (1977); Maronitis (1981); Haft (1984); Emlyn-Jones (1986); Hölscher (1989) 210–34; de Jong (2001) 326–8.
[124] See e.g. Schwartz (1924) 66–70; Woodhouse (1930) 126–57; Merkelbach (1969) 224; Reece (1994); Danek (1998) 216, 269, 285; Tsagalis (2012b); Finkelberg (2015) 130–1, (2016) 39; Stripeikis (2018). For comparison with South Slavic oral poetry, cf. Coote (1981) esp. 8: 'what is told to deceive in one story can be told to be believed in another'. For a tragic example of an allusive lying tale, see Soph. *Phil.* 591–7, 603–21: R. B. Rutherford (2012) 360; Currie (2016) 151 n. 20.

he works, Homer would then be highlighting his own superiority by discounting the truth value of rival and alternative traditions. Like Tlepolemus, Hesiod, and the poet of the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*, here too, the circulating stories of others would be dismissed as lies.

Achillean (Im)mortality: Suppressing Alternatives

Presenting alternative versions of myth as 'false words' thus seems to have been an established mode for delegitimising rival traditions. But mere appeals to hearsay could also carry the same polemical charge, even without an explicit comment on a specific claim's truth value. When Homer's characters report what 'they say', we are invited to reconsider the details under discussion and ask whether others or indeed Homer himself would report things differently.

In the *Iliad*, such combative positioning is especially centred around the figure of Achilles. When Eurypylus claims that '**they say**' (**φασίν**) Patroclus learnt his knowledge of healing herbs from Achilles, who in turn learnt it from Cheiron (*Il.* 11.830–2), the poet gestures to the tradition of Achilles' tuition by Cheiron, a fantastical version of the hero's upbringing which Homer tends to downplay elsewhere.[125] More polemical, however, is Agenor's assertion of Achilles' mortality, that '**people say** he is mortal' (*Il.* 21.568–70):

> καὶ γάρ θην τούτῳ τρωτὸς χρὼς ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ,
> ἐν δὲ ἴα ψυχή, θνητὸν δέ ἕ **φασ' ἄνθρωποι**
> ἔμμεναι· αὐτάρ οἱ Κρονίδης Ζεὺς κῦδος ὀπάζει.

> His flesh, too, I suspect, can be pierced with sharp bronze; there is only one life in him, and **people say** he is mortal. But Zeus the son of Cronus is granting him glory.

Unlike all the other examples of **φασί** I have discussed so far, this example is unusual since it does not lack a nominative agent, prompting de Jong to group it under her category (A) of φασί-utterances, those 'with definite subject'.[126] Yet the noun ἄνθρωποι

---

[125] Cf. Hainsworth (1993) 310; Robbins (1993); C. J. Mackie (1997); Cairns (2001a) 39–41; Gregory (2018) 87–90.
[126] de Jong (2004) 237–8.

112

('mankind') hardly provides much more precise specification than the usual anonymous use of φασί; it is an ill fit when grouped alongside other specified subjects such as the Trojans and their allies (*Il.* 9.234), Ajax's comrades (*Il.* 17.637), the suitors (*Od.* 2.238), the Phaeacians (*Od.* 7.322) or Odysseus' father and son (*Od.* 11.176). The apparently superfluous ἄνθρωποι thus lays unusual stress on the phrase. On the one hand, this may play on the subject of the talk: 'mortals' claim that Achilles is 'mortal'. But it is also significant that the noun ἄνθρωποι indicates the audience or propagators of poetry elsewhere in early Greek epic: Helen and Paris will be the subject of song for men of future generations (καὶ ὀπίσσω | ἀνθρώποισι ... ἀοίδιμοι ἐσσομένοισι, *Il.* 6.357–8); Odysseus claims that he is the subject of song among men because of his trickery (πᾶσι δόλοισιν | ἀνθρώποισι **μέλω**, *Od.* 9.19–20); and Agamemnon's shade claims that Clytemnestra will be the subject of a hateful song among men (στυγερὴ δέ τ' ἀοιδὴ | ἔσσετ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, *Od.* 24.200–1).[127] It is thus tempting to treat this **φασί** as an invitation for Homer's audience to consider other poetic traditions surrounding Achilles and questions of his (im)mortality: 'people say' that Achilles is mortal, but are they right?[128] As with Achilles' tuition from Cheiron, **φασί** here allusively acknowledges but simultaneously rejects an alternative tradition in which Achilles was more than mortal.

Of course, direct evidence for the tradition of Achilles' immortality is attested only far later. The first extant instances of Thetis'

---

[127] Cf. Nagy (1979) 37, §13 n. 4 on epic's conventional link between ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους and κλέος (e.g. *Il.* 10.212–3). Admittedly, ἄνθρωπος is a common noun in Homer, but it usually occurs in an explicit contrast between mortals and gods, a contrast which is lacking in all these metapoetic cases. Cf. too *Il.* 20.204 (**ἔπεα** θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων: §II.2.3); *Od.* 11.274 (**ἀνάπυστα** ... ἀνθρώποισιν: Barker and Christensen (2008) 24: §I.1.4); *Od.* 24.197–8 (ἐπιχθονίοισιν). Later lyric examples include Thgn. 245–6 (**μελήσεις** | ἄφθιτον ἀνθρώποις **αἰὲν** ἔχων **ὄνομα**); Pind. *Pyth.* 3.112 (ἀνθρώπων **φάτις**: §II.3.1), fr. 70a.15 (**λέγοντι** ... βροτοί: §II.3.1); Ibyc. fr. 303a (**φᾶμις** ... βροτῶν: §II.3.3). In tragedy, cf. too e.g. Soph. *Trach.* 1 (**λόγος** ... **ἀρχαῖος** ἀνθρώπων ~ Hdt. 1.32(?)); Theodectes fr. 1a.1 *TrGF* (ἐν βροτοῖσιν **ὑμνεῖται λόγος** ~ Eur. *Med.* 231): Nelson (forthcoming b).

[128] Note too the hesitation implied by θήν (equivalent to the particle δή: Denniston (1954) 288), conveying a sceptical or ironical tone. Cf. Denniston (1954) 229–36, esp. 234: it 'often denotes that words are not to be taken at their face value ... δή often gives the effect of inverted commas'.

attempts to immortalise Achilles occur in the Hellenistic period, with passing references in Dosiadas' *Altar* (σποδεύνας ἶνις Ἐμπούσας, *AP* 15.26.3) and Lycophron's *Alexandra* (178–9, with Tzetz. *ad Alex.* 178). Apollonius of Rhodes offers a fuller account in his *Argonautica* (4.869–79), but this seems to draw heavily on Demeter's similar treatment of Demophon in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (231–91), which complicates any attempt to trace the myth's earlier history.[129] Moreover, the Styx-dipping tradition, the most famous aspect of the myth in modern popular culture, is only securely attested even later: besides a possible passing allusion in the *Batrachomyomachia* (233), this detail of the myth appears first in literature only in Statius' *Achilleid* (*Achil.* 1.133–4, 268–70, 480–1), and even later in art.[130] It is thus possible that traditions of Achilles' immortality are a post-Homeric invention. Indeed, some scholars suspect a Hellenistic origin for the myth.[131]

Despite our late and limited evidence, however, it is likely that earlier traditions did exist surrounding Thetis' concern over Achilles' mortality and the hero's subsequent invulnerability.[132] The obliqueness and brevity of Statius' triple allusion to the Styx story suggest that the poet is drawing on an already familiar tradition, which he even indexes through temporal adverbs (**saepe**, **iterum**, *Achil.* 1.133–4). This alone would not rule out a Hellenistic origin for the myth, but there are strong grounds for tracing it back earlier. Invulnerability was a common attribute of other heroes in archaic myth,[133] and we can find a number of hints that it was also applied to Achilles at an early date. The Hesiodic *Aegimius* already recounted Thetis' attempts to test the immortality of her children by Peleus, here too by dipping them in water

---

[129] For Apollonius' linguistic and thematic debts to the *Hymn*: Richardson (1974) 237–8; Vian (1976–81) III 178; Hunter (2015) 202–4. Cf. too Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.13.6.

[130] Cf. Burgess (2009) 9 with n. 9, citing *LIMC*, s.v. 'Achilleus', nos. 5–18. For the possible reference in the *Batrachomyomachia*, see Hosty (2017) 138, (2020) 228.

[131] Robert (1920–26) 67–8, 1187; Burgess (1995) 222; Heslin (2005) 167, (2016) 94–6. Weitzmann (1959) 54–9 even hypothesised a lost Alexandrian *Achilleis* as Statius' source.

[132] Cf. Davies (2016) 67–71; Nelson (2021a). See too Paton (1912)'s proposal that the *Iliad* suppresses a tradition surrounding the invulnerability of Achilles' armour.

[133] Burgess (1995) 219 n. 6 lists Ajax, Asterus, Caeneus, Cycnus, the Nemean lion, Talos and possibly Meleager; cf. Bocksberger (2021) 34–47 on Ajax.

114

(Hes. fr. 300); we know that Achilles already enjoyed quasi-immortality in the *Aethiopis* with his afterlife on the White Isle – thanks again to Thetis' intervention (*Aeth.* arg. 4b *GEF*); and the *Iliad* itself also conceals a veiled allusion to Achilles' heel and associated invulnerability in Homer's treatment of Diomedes' foot-wound from Paris (*Il.* 11.369–83), part of Diomedes' larger adoption of Achillean traits in the first half of the poem (§1.2.2).[134] Various hints in archaic poetry thus suggest that the myth was of considerable antiquity.

Such a conclusion can be bolstered further by a neoanalytical case of motival priority. A number of scholars have argued that the Apollonian 'immortalisation by fire' is more appropriate to Achilles than Demophon, and thus cannot be wholly derived from the *Homeric Hymn*.[135] The logic of the myth appears to be that fire burns off the infant's mortal half, leaving only his immortal nature.[136] And as Burgess notes, it is Achilles, not Demophon, who 'is semidivine, and so could logically become immortalised if his mortality were burned away'.[137]

It is thus plausible that traditions about Thetis' attempted immortalisation of her son existed already in the archaic period and that Homer's original audiences may well have been aware of them.[138] The *Iliad*'s general silence on this specific tradition would be in keeping with its suppression of immortality elsewhere, so as to emphasise the stark dichotomy between short-lived mortals and the immortal gods.[139] Yet by having a character

---

[134] Mackie (1998) 330 further notes that Achilles is 'the only Achaean prince' to be immersed in the cauldron-like river Scamander in the *Iliad* (ὡς δὲ λέβης ζεῖ, *Il.* 21.362), which thematically recalls the *Aegimius* story (the children are dipped into a cauldron of water: εἰς λέβητα ὕδατος, fr. 300).

[135] Burgess (1995) 221 with n. 13, (2001b) 216 with n. 9, (2009) 102; Mackie (1998).

[136] Cf. Heracles: Theoc. *Id.* 24.83; Ov. *Met.* 9.251–3, 262–70. For fire's deifying power: Edsman (1949).

[137] Burgess (2009) 102; cf. Mackie (1998) 337.

[138] Some suspect that the story could have featured in the *Cypria*: Severyns (1928) 258; Mackie (1998) 331 n. 9. It may be a step too far to argue that Agenor even echoes language traditionally attached to this *fabula*: *Il.* 21.568 (τρωτὸς χρὼς ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ) closely parallels and inverts *Achil.* 1.481 (*pulchros ferro praestruxerit artus*), but it cannot be proved that Statius' phrasing derives from earlier tradition, rather than from this very Homeric passage (the following line's ***iterant*** and ***tradunt*** certainly seem to index some prior tradition, *Achil.* 1.482).

[139] Cf. Nelson (2021a). See e.g. *Il.* 3.243–4 on the Dioscuri (contrast *Od.* 11.299–304); *Il.* 18.117–19 on Heracles (contrast *Od.* 11.601–4; Hes. *Theog.* 950–5, fr. 25.25–33, fr.

insist on the hero's mortality with an indexical **φασί**, the poet acknowledges this alternative tradition, while pointedly highlighting his denial and divergence from it. In this case, Homer's perspective coheres with what Agenor claims 'people say', but it is implicitly set against a major narrative variant.[140]

Competing Traditions: Penelope versus the Women of the Catalogue

The same agonistic strategy is also in play when Homer situates his own epic against other traditions of poetry and myth beyond those of the Trojan war. In such cases, the poet does not so much deny the truth value of other traditions, but rather uses them as a foil to assert the supremacy of his own narrative. A prime example is the relationship of the *Odyssey* to female catalogue poetry. Scholars have long recognised that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* presuppose earlier traditions of female catalogue poetry familiar to us from the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*. Margalit Finkelberg has argued that Ajax's appearance in the list of Helen's suitors (Hes. fr. 204.44–51) lies behind his entry in the Homeric Catalogue of Ships (*Il.* 2.557–8),[141] while Ian Rutherford has highlighted various correspondences between the *Catalogue of Women* and other poems in the early epic tradition.[142] In particular, Odysseus' catalogue of heroines in the *Nekyia* (*Od.* 11.225–329) displays considerable overlap with the Hesiodic poem, especially visible in the case of its first heroine, Tyro, and her liaison with Poseidon (*Od.* 11.235–59): the preserved words of several Hesiodic lines precisely parallel Odysseus' account of the episode,[143] while the *Odyssey*'s comparison of surging water to a mountain when Poseidon conceals their lovemaking is also said to have

---

229.6–13; *Hh.* 15.7–8: Barker and Christensen (2014); R. B. Rutherford (2019) 120–2. For the *Iliad*'s emphasis on mortality and death: Griffin (1977) 42–3; Schein (1984) 67–88; Edwards (1985b) 215–18; Burgess (2009) 102–3.

[140] Later poets reassert the immortality tradition: see Heslin (2016) on Ovid's polemical 'correction' of Homer.

[141] Finkelberg (1988), though note the caution of Cingano (1990), (2005) 143–51.

[142] Rutherford (2000) 93–6, (2012); cf. too Zutt (1894) 13–23; Gazis (2018) 125–56.

[143] καλὰ ῥέεθρα (fr. 30.35, cf. *Od.* 11.240); [τέξεις δ᾽ ἀγλαὰ τέκ]να, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἀποφώ[λιοι εὐναὶ | ἀθανάτων· σὺ δὲ τ]οὺς κομέειν ἀτιτα[λλέμεναί τε] (fr. 31.2–3, cf. *Od.* 11.249–50). Cf. too the presence of Chloris and her children to Neleus in both poems (esp. fr. 33a.12 = *Od.* 11.286).

116

occurred in the *Catalogue* (*Od.* 11.243–4, Hes. fr. 32).[144]
Despite the fragmentary state of the Hesiodic poem, there is a
clear and strikingly close connection between these two
passages.

What we make of these parallels depends in part on our
theoretical preconceptions, but I am inclined to accept the
conclusion of Rutherford that the *Catalogue* narrative likely
pre-dated the *Odyssey*, even if the *Catalogue* as we have it is
of a later date – a similar conclusion to that regularly drawn
concerning the Epic Cycle.[145] In that case, the surviving
fragments of the *Catalogue* offer potential evidence for the
kind of pre-Homeric traditions with which the *Odyssey* may
have engaged. Of course, we must handle this evidence with
considerable care and caution, since parts of the *Catalogue* as
we have it may display some Homeric influence,[146] but even
so, our surviving fragments still provide the best window onto
the possible contours of lost pre-Homeric traditions. In the
immediate context of *Odyssey* 11, I thus consider it plausible
that Homer is evoking earlier female catalogue traditions that
would later coalesce into our Hesiodic *Catalogue of
Women*.[147] As in later literature, so already in the *Odyssey*,
the Underworld is a natural site for direct engagement with
the literary past.[148]

However, the *Odyssey*'s engagement with catalogue traditions is
first signalled far earlier in the poem and in a far more overtly
agonistic manner, during the Ithacan assembly of Book 2.
Antinous, in his frustration at Penelope's devious tricks for delaying

---

[144] Note also the line following Poseidon's speech (*Od.* 11.253), which resembles Hes. fr.
31.6. For the story, see also Sophocles' *Tyro* (frr. 648–69a *TrGF*); Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.9.8.

[145] I. C. Rutherford (2012) esp. 163. Cf. West (1985) 164: most genealogies in our
Catalogue were 'constructed not later than the eighth century'. On the Epic Cycle as
both a source for pre-Homeric myth and an assemblage of post-Homeric receptions, see
Burgess (2001a), (2019a) 18–26; cf. §1.2.2.

[146] See Ormand (2014) esp. 119–51 (on Atalanta and Achilles; contrast Laser (1952)),
152–80 (Amphitryon and Odysseus).

[147] Thus I. C. Rutherford (2012) 161–4. On the *Nekyia* more generally as a literary-
historical catalogue of the subspecies of *epos*, see Most (1992).

[148] Cf. Ar. *Frogs*, *Gerytades* (frr. 156–90 K–A); Callim. *Ia.* 1 (fr. 191 Pf.); Currie (2016)
26–7 n. 166. For Roman and later continuations of this tradition, see Hardie (2004);
Deremetz (2005); Parkes (2010).

the suitors' advances, claims that she is unrivalled, even among women of a former age (*Od.* 2.115–22):

εἰ δ' ἔτ' ἀνιήσει γε πολὺν χρόνον υἷας Ἀχαιῶν,
τὰ φρονέουσ' ἀνὰ θυμόν, ἅ οἱ περὶ δῶκεν Ἀθήνη,
ἔργα τ' ἐπίστασθαι περικαλλέα καὶ φρένας ἐσθλὰς
κέρδεά θ', οἷ' οὔ πώ τιν' **ἀκούομεν** οὐδὲ **παλαιῶν**,
τάων αἳ **πάρος** ἦσαν ἐϋπλοκαμῖδες Ἀχαιαί,
Τυρώ τ' Ἀλκμήνη τε ἐϋστέφανός τε Μυκήνη·
τάων οὔ τις ὁμοῖα νοήματα Πηνελοπείη
ᾔδη· ἀτὰρ μὲν τοῦτό γ' ἐναίσιμον οὐκ ἐνόησε.

But if she will continue to vex the sons of the Achaeans for a long time, mindful in her heart of the things which Athena has granted her above other women: knowledge of most beautiful handiwork, good sense, and cunning – such as we have never yet **heard** that any of the women **of old** knew, those lovely-haired women who lived **long ago**: Tyro, Alcmene and Mycene of the lovely garland – not one of them had thoughts similar to Penelope's. But this at any rate she has devised improperly.

Antinous here compares Penelope with three women of the distant past: Tyro, Alcmene and Mycene, all of whom occupy prominent positions in Greek myth as the ancestors of many of its most famous heroes. In giving birth to Aeson, Pheres, Amythaon, Pelias and Neleus (*Od.* 11.254–9), Tyro in particular counts numerous heroes from the Trojan, Theban and Argonautic sagas in her lineage, including Melampus, Jason, Admetus, Adrastus and Nestor; Alcmene was the mother of Heracles, whose numerous affairs ensured a plentiful progeny; and Mycene, the eponymous heroine of Mycenae, was a significant ancestor in the Argive family tree as the mother of Argus, guardian of Io. By claiming that Penelope surpasses such eminent figures of the distant past, Antinous aims to criticise her unconventional 'cunning' (κέρδεα, 118), a trait that he has already blamed for the current impasse on Ithaca (2.88).[149] But in so doing, he inadvertently praises Penelope's exceptionality and highlights her obvious appeal: on this logic, whoever succeeds in wooing her will enjoy an

---

[149] This unconventionality is reflected in Homer's language: *Od.* 2.117 seems to be a formulaic verse celebrating traditional female virtues (it reappears at *Od.* 7.111 of the Phaeacian women), but the enjambed κέρδεα are a unique addition: Katz (1991) 4; Sammons (2010) 60–1. On Penelope's intelligence in general, see Marquardt (1985); Murnaghan (1986).

118

illustrious and unsurpassed progeny – though as Danek notes, this comparison also exposes the suitors' *hybris*: all three of these mythical women had divine lovers, so if Penelope is superior to them, she is completely out of the suitors' league.[150]

Besides this ironic reflection on the suitors' situation, Antinous' direct contrast between Penelope and these other mythical women also activates a more allusive contrast between the *Odyssey* and female genealogical poetry. All three of Antinous' *comparanda* also feature prominently in Hesiodic catalogue poetry: we have already encountered Tyro's presence in both the Hesiodic *Catalogue* and the Odyssean *Nekyia* (*Od.* 11.235–59; Hes. frr. 30–2), while we can find Alcmene in both lists (*Od.* 11.266–8; Hes. fr. 193.19–20, fr. 195.8–63 = *Scut.* 1–56), as well as in the *Great Ehoiai* (frr. 248–9), where Mycene is also said to have featured (fr. 246).[151] Given the close combination of these women here, Antinous' words point towards pre-existing female catalogue traditions, just as Odysseus' do in the *Nekyia*. The likelihood of a reference to such traditions is further reinforced by the very nature of these lines: by listing the women in a miniature catalogue, Antinous repeats the compositional technique of *Ehoiai* poetry itself, while the word with which he introduces them, the relative pronoun οἵα (*Od.* 2.118), acts as a generic signpost, echoing the common introductory formula of such poetry (ἢ οἵη).[152] Antinous' comparison thus imitates the key features of Hesiodic catalogue poetry at the same time as he evokes some of its principal protagonists.[153]

The allusive nature of these verses is sealed, however, by their indexical framing: Antinous introduces these women by appealing to hearsay (ἀκούομεν, 118) and antiquity (παλαιῶν, 118; πάρος, 119).

---

[150] Danek (1998) 74. The irony is even stronger when we recall that Tyro was famous for warning her father not to contend with the gods ([οὐ]δ᾽ εἴασκε θεοῖς [βροτὸν ἰσ]οφαρίζειν, Hes. fr. 30.27); Antinous too should heed this advice.

[151] On the *Great Ehoiai* and its relationship to the *Ehoiai*: Hirschberger (2004) 81–6; D'Alessio (2005a).

[152] Skempis and Ziogas (2009) 234. The listing of three names in a single verse as in *Od.* 2.120 (an 'augmented triad': West (2004)) is also typical of hexameter catalogues: cf. Hes. *Theog.* 338–45, fr. 33a.9–12; West (2007) 117–19.

[153] Compare also οὔ πώ τιν᾽ (*Od.* 2.118) ~ οὔ πώ τις (Hes. fr. 195.17), a parallel that further highlights the degree to which Alcinous appropriates the rhetoric of female catalogue poetry.

The names of these women have reached him through transmitted tales, while their age marks the venerability of these traditions and heightens the contrast with the present. Stephanie West remarks that 'the antiquarian note' of these lines 'is slightly strange',[154] yet viewed as indices of allusion, their function is clear: once more, appeal to hearsay signposts allusive interactions.[155] After all, as regular 'auditors' of Phemius' songs (ἀκούοντες, *Od.* 1.325–7), the suitors are themselves 'aficionados of epic poetry'; it is no surprise if they derive their knowledge from older song traditions.[156]

Given this evocation of Hesiodic Catalogue poetry, Antinous' comparison thus does much more than simply highlight Penelope's desirability and objectionable craftiness. It also sets her Odyssean self against representatives of another rival poetic tradition. Despite Antinous' attempts to criticise her κέρδεα, this comparison is in fact very favourable when viewed against the poem's broader ideological framework. Penelope's exceptional κέρδεα make her a prime match for Odysseus, whose own unrivalled κερδοσύνη ('cunning') is repeatedly highlighted in the epic (esp. *Od.* 19.285–6; cf. 4.251, 13.297, 14.31; cf. *Il.* 23.709). In addition, the only other specific figures whose κέρδεα are mentioned in the *Odyssey* are the couple's son, Telemachus (18.216, 20.257), and Odysseus' divine patron, Athena (13.297, 299). Within the broader context of the poem, κέρδεα are valorised as the emblematic and unifying trait of Odysseus' household: κέρδεα are 'arguably a defining theme of the *Odyssey* itself'.[157] By having Antinous assert Penelope's superiority to catalogic women in these terms, Homer thus agonistically

---

[154] S. R. West (1988) 139 on *Od.* 2.120.

[155] In this regard, one might wonder whether the frequent use of **φασί** in discussions of ancestry in early Greek epic could point to larger traditions about heroic genealogies, as exemplified by the *Catalogue*: e.g. *Il.* 5.635, 6.100, 20.105, 20.206, 21.159; *Od.* 1.220, 4.387, 18.128; cf. §II.2.4 n. 116.

[156] Thus Sammons (2010) 61 n. 8. The suitors also have a particularly strong association with catalogic poetry themselves: they woo Penelope like the *Catalogue*'s suitors of Helen (Hes. frr. 196–204) and are themselves frequently presented in list-form (*Od.* 16.245–53, 18.291–301, 22.241–3, 265–8, 283–4): cf. Sammons (2010) 197–204.

[157] Sammons (2010) 61. Notably, this positive Odyssean assessment of κέρδεα contrasts with a largely critical evaluation elsewhere in early Greek epic: e.g. Hesiod's warning about the dangerous pursuit of profit (κέρδος, *Op.* 323; κερδαίνειν, κακὰ κέρδεα, 352), and Antilochus' reckless behaviour in the chariot race of *Iliad* 23 (κέρδεσιν, 515), an act of 'deception', 'guile' and 'cheating' (ψεύδεσσι, 576; δόλῳ, 585; ἠπεροπεύειν, 605). Cf. Roisman (1994); Dougherty (2001) 38–60; Tsagalis (2009) 152–4.

120

hints at the superiority of the tale in which she features: just as Penelope surpasses these women of the past, so too does the *Odyssey* trump the Hesiodic tradition of female catalogues. Antinous' ensuing claim seals this agonistic one-upmanship: Penelope is winning great **κλέος** for herself – not just a 'notorious reputation', but also 'epic fame' (μέγα μὲν **κλέος** αὐτῇ | ποιεῖτ', 2.125–6).[158] As she surpasses the likes of Tyro and Alcmene, she too joins the ranks of those who are the subject of song in their own right.[159]

The polemic of this comparison is heightened when we consider how these Hesiodic women were themselves presented as unrivalled paragons of womanhood. The Hesiodic *Catalogue* explicitly sets out to list those women who were 'the best at that time [and the most beautiful on the earth]' (αἳ τότ' ἄρισται ἔσαν [καὶ κάλλισται κατὰ γαῖαν], Hes. fr. 1.3),[160] and both Tyro and Alcmene are further celebrated as flawless models of femininity in their entries in the *Catalogue*: Tyro surpasses all female women in beauty (εἶδος | [πασάων προὔχεσκε γυναι]κῶν θηλυτεράων, fr. 30.33–4) and is praised for her beautiful hair ([ἐϋπ]λόκαμος, fr. 30.25, notably the same epithet that Antinous uses of the Achaean women of the past: ἐϋπλοκαμῖδες Ἀχαιαί, *Od.* 2.119). Alcmene, meanwhile, receives a particularly lavish encomium (fr. 195.11–17 = *Scut.* 4–10):

> ἥ ῥα γυναικῶν φῦλον ἐκαίνυτο θηλυτεράων
> εἴδεΐ τε μεγέθει τε· νόον γε μὲν οὔ τις ἔριζε
> τάων ἃς θνηταὶ θνητοῖς τέκον εὐνηθεῖσαι.
> τῆς καὶ ἀπὸ κρῆθεν βλεφάρων τ' ἄπο κυανεάων
> τοῖον ἄηθ' οἷόν τε πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης.
> ἣ δὲ καὶ ὡς κατὰ θυμὸν ἑὸν τίεσκεν ἀκοίτην,
> ὡς οὔ πώ τις ἔτισε γυναικῶν θηλυτεράων·

> She surpassed the tribe of female women in beauty and stature; and as for her mind, no woman could rival her, out of all those whom mortal women bore after sleeping with mortal men. Such charm wafted from her head and dark eyelids as comes from golden Aphrodite. And she honoured her husband in her heart as no other female woman has ever yet honoured hers.

---

[158] Thus Sammons (2010) 61; cf. Clayton (2004) 34.
[159] Compare Agamemnon on Penelope's enduring κλέος and future song: *Od.* 24.196–8.
[160] Merkelbach's plausible supplements here and in fr. 30.34 reinforce my argument. But even if we leave the lacunae unsupplemented, these verses still display an emphasis on pre-eminence (ἄρισται, fr. 1.3) and physical appearance (εἶδος, fr. 30.33).

In part, these verses draw on traditional elements of epic encomium: εἶδος ('beauty') and μέγεθος ('stature') are frequently combined in the praise, criticism or description of an individual's physique, alongside other nouns such as δέμας ('body') and φυή ('form').[161] The image of wafting beauty is paralleled elsewhere in the *Catalogue* (fr. 43a.73–4) and the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (276). Yet the larger focus here on Alcmene's νόος ('mind') and marital fidelity are uncommon in such descriptions. Somebody's φρένες ('wits') are sometimes picked out for comment,[162] yet the only other mention of νόος in such contexts is Odysseus' negative dismissal of Euryalus' 'stunted mind' during the Phaeacian games of *Odyssey* 8, in comparison to his outstanding looks (εἶδος μὲν ἀριπρεπές, . . . νόον δ' ἀποφώλιός ἐσσι, *Od*. 8.176–7). The Hesiodic poet's emphasis on this attribute here, then, in notably combative terms (οὔ τις ἔριζε, fr. 195.12), highlights Alcmene's exceptionality. So too does the 'honour' which she pays to her husband (fr. 195.16–17), an expression which finds no direct parallel in the early Greek tradition,[163] although there is perhaps an underlying touch of irony given her coming 'affair' with Zeus during Amphitryon's absence.[164] In any case, if these two traits (intelligence and fidelity) were particularly associated with Alcmene in early genealogical traditions, as the uniqueness of these lines may suggest, Antinous' use of her in the *Odyssey* as a foil to Penelope is even more pointed. Not only does Penelope surpass the best women of the past, but she eclipses even her closest rival in wit and marital loyalty.[165] She remains faithful to her husband,[166] and displays an unparalleled facility with κέρδεα (2.118). Penelope's

---

[161] *Il*. 2.58; *Od*. 5.217, 6.152, 14.177, 24.253, 24.374; *HhDem*. 275; *HhAphr*. 85. Cf. *Il*. 23.66–7, where tradition is adapted to describe Patroclus' ghost (μέγεθος, ὄμματα, φωνή). See Shakeshaft (2019) on Homeric terminology for beauty.

[162] *Il*. 1.115; *Od*. 4.264, 11.337, 14.178, 17.454, 18.249.

[163] The only close parallel is the honour Alcinous shows to his wife Arete in Scheria (*Od*. 7.66–70), although here the genders are reversed.

[164] Hes. fr. 195.34–63 = *Scut*. 27–56; cf. Diod. Sic. 4.9, Apollod. *Bibl*. 2.4.8. An erotic context is evoked by the comparison to Aphrodite (fr. 195.15) and the mention of Alcmene's 'dark eyelids' (βλεφάρων . . . κυανεάων, fr. 195.14): cf. Ibycus' description of Eros (κυανέοισιν . . . βλεφάροις, fr. 287.1–2).

[165] This direct rivalry may even be asserted on a verbal level: note the similar phrasing of *Od*. 2.121–2 (τάων οὔ τις ὁμοῖα νοήματα Πηνελοπείη | ᾔδη) and fr. 195.12–13 (νόον γε μὲν οὔ τις ἔριζε | τάων).

[166] Cf. Winkler (1990) 151: Penelope's 'superiority lies precisely in her unwillingness to be taken in by what might be merely a convincing replica, whether mortal or immortal, of her husband' (Poseidon disguises himself as Tyro's beloved Enipeus, and Zeus as

intelligence is unsurpassed, which makes her the perfect match for Odysseus and – ironically – completely unsuitable for Antinous, whose very name betrays his hostility to sensible thought (ἀντί + νόος: 'enemy of discernment').[167]

Antinous' words in *Odyssey* 2 thus position Penelope against key representatives of female catalogue poetry. Penelope proves superior even to the most intelligent and loyal women of this rival poetic tradition, a pre-eminence which reflects positively on the Homeric poet: his subject matter surpasses that of his predecessors. Near the start of the whole epic, Homer asserts the pre-eminence of his female protagonist and his own poetry, and he does so – rather ironically – through the ambivalent voice of a suitor. Although Antinous may attempt to criticise Penelope's cunning, his *synkrisis* in fact foregrounds her exceptionality and unwittingly proves how suitable she is not only as a match for Odysseus but also as an emblem for the poem itself.

This emphasis on Penelope's incomparability recurs several times later in the *Odyssey* with a similarly agonistic point.[168] When Penelope speaks to the disguised Odysseus on his return to Ithaca, she wants him to learn whether she is 'pre-eminent among other women' for her 'intelligence and prudent cunning' (δαήσεαι εἴ τι γυναικῶν | ἀλλάων περίειμι νόον καὶ ἐπίφρονα μῆτιν, *Od.* 19.325–6), while in the second *Nekyia* (*Od.* 24.192–202), Agamemnon compares her favourably with Clytemnestra (who also features in the *Catalogue*: frr. 23a.13–30, 176.5–6). However, it is especially Telemachus' compliments before the bow contest in *Odyssey* 21 which resonate with Antinous' earlier words (*Od.* 21.106–10):

ἀλλ' ἄγετε, μνηστῆρες, ἐπεὶ τόδε φαίνετ' ἄεθλον,
οἵη νῦν οὐκ ἔστι γυνὴ κατ' Ἀχαιΐδα γαῖαν,
οὔτε Πύλου ἱερῆς οὔτ' Ἄργεος οὔτε Μυκήνης·
[οὔτ' αὐτῆς Ἰθάκης οὔτ' ἠπείροιο μελαίνης]
καὶ δ' αὐτοὶ τόδε γ' **ἴστε**· τί με χρὴ μητέρος αἴνου;

Alcmene's husband Amphitryon). On Penelope's fidelity, cf. Foley (1995) esp. 103; Zeitlin (1995); Lesser (2017).

[167] For this etymology: Peradotto (1990) 107; Kanavou (2015) 132. Cf. the opposition between Antinous and Noemon, son of Phronis ('Intelligence, son of Mind', *Od.* 2.386, 4.630, 648): Austin (1972) 1.

[168] For a fuller exploration of these reverberations, see Nelson (2021c) 37–42.

123

> But come now, you suitors, since this here is your prize before you: a woman who has no peer today throughout the Achaean land, neither in holy Pylos, nor in Argos, nor in Mycenae. [Nor in Ithaca itself, nor on the dark mainland.] But **you know** this yourselves – why do I need to praise my mother?

Like Antinous' former praise, these verses evoke key features of the Hesiodic catalogue tradition: the οἴη (*Od.* 21.107) nods to the formula of catalogue poetry, like οἵα in Book 2,[169] while the very context of these lines – the wooing of a woman and the idea of a woman as a prize (ἄεθλον) – resonates with many of the common themes of the catalogic genre.[170] Here too, Penelope is set against the traditions of the *Catalogue* and comes out on top. Yet these lines also have a closer connection with Antinous' earlier words than has been observed before. The initial trio of cities which Telemachus lists are all intimately linked with Antinous' exempla: Tyro's descendants ruled Pylos (Neleus/Nestor); Alcmene was from Argos, while her son Heracles was frequently imagined as the ruler of the locality (cf. *Il.* 15.29–30); and the city of Mycenae drew its name from Mycene herself.[171] Telemachus' words thus not only evoke traditions of female catalogue poetry but also recall the implicitly agonistic intertextuality of the earlier episode. After all, he ends by claiming that the suitors themselves '**know**' of Penelope's incomparability (καὶ δ' αὐτοὶ τόδε γ' **ἴστε**, *Od.* 21.110), a remark that acknowledges their (and the external audience's) familiarity with Antinous' earlier words. Like the Iliadic allusions to Typhoeus and Tydeus, the indexed allusion in *Odyssey* 2 thus continues to resonate throughout the remainder of the poem, establishing an enduring contrast with another literary tradition and its paradigmatic representatives.[172]

Indexical appeals to hearsay in Homer, therefore, not only flag and signpost allusion but also mark a deeply agonistic engagement with other traditions. As in later Latin poetry, the device is used to mark out

---

[169] Nasta (2006) 63–4; Skempis and Ziogas (2009) 233–4.

[170] Cf. Skempis and Ziogas (2009) 234 n. 59, whose examples include Atalanta (Hes. frr. 72–6), Mestra (fr. 43a.21) and Helen (frr. 196–204).

[171] This interpretation may lend additional support to the deletion of *Od.* 21.109, which introduces Ithaca and the mainland, places which are unnecessary for the allusive back-reference. The line appears to be a 'concordance interpolation': it is absent in many manuscripts, seems to have been adapted from *Od.* 14.97–8 and is 'out of place' after the mention of 'the Achaean land' in 107 (Fernández-Galiano (1992) 158 on 21.107).

[172] This ongoing agonism may also suppress alternative traditions of Penelopean infidelity: Nelson (2021c) 42–3.

124

a larger map of poetic territories within and against which a poet defines himself. The device exhibits not only an encyclopaedic but also an agonistic drive. In the following section, we shall see how this same combination of nuances co-exists in our wider corpus of archaic Greek epic.

II.2.5 *Beyond Homer*

As we have seen, Homeric appeals to hearsay in both the characters' and narrator's voice highlight the poet's mastery of his mythical repertoire, within which he selects and builds his own narrative, following some paths of song while pointedly suppressing others. These indices exhibit an array of functions: most fundamentally, they signpost allusion to other traditions (if not texts), but they can also initiate an allusive dialogue that continues to resonate throughout a poem, or polemically challenge pre-existing and alternative strands of myth. Yet in all these cases, Homer uses such indices to position his poem against the larger store of traditional tales from which he draws his material, gesturing to an archive of epic song.

However, the Homeric epics were not unique in such applications of indexical hearsay. The broader corpus of archaic Greek epic displays many comparable instances of such encyclopaedic and agonistic engagement with tradition. We have already noted several possible examples: the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*' dismissal of competing talk surrounding the god's birthplace, Hesiod's footnoting of Typhoeus' sex life and his potential downgrading of other poetic traditions as 'lies that seem like the truth'. But we can also cite a range of other cases in which archaic Greek epic poets indexed other traditions – or perhaps even other texts – through appeal to hearsay.

Take, for example, a papyrus fragment (ascribed to Hesiod or the epic *Minyas*) which draws on the authority of tradition with a character's indexing φασί (*P. Ibscher* col. i; *Minyas* fr. 7* *GEF* = fr. *6 *EGEF* = Hes. fr. 280).[173] After encountering Meleager in the Underworld, Theseus justifies his and Peirithous' *katabasis* in search of Persephone by arguing that Peirithous is merely following the example of the gods in desiring to marry a relative: 'for **they say**

---

[173] On the poem's ascription: Álvarez (2016) 48–51.

that they too [sc. the gods] woo their glorious sisters and marry without the knowledge of their dear parents' ([καὶ γὰρ] ἐκείνους **φασὶ** κασιγνήτας μεγ[ακ]υδεῖς | [μνησ]τεύειν, γαμέειν δὲ φίλων ἀπάν[ευθε τοκήων], 15–16). On one level, this index points to the traditional incest of the Olympian pantheon, an established feature of myth. But the phrase φίλων ἀπάν[ευθε τοκήων] may also invite us to recall the most famous divine union of all, that of Zeus and Hera. In the Iliadic Διὸς Ἀπάτη, Zeus is famously struck by a passion equal to that when he and his sister first furtively slept together 'without their parents' knowledge' (φίλους λήθοντε τοκῆας, *Il*. 14.296), a phrase that closely parallels the sense and structure of the papyrus in the very same metrical *sedes*. Some caution is required, given the fragmentary nature of the papyrus, and the frequency with which 'parents' (τοκῆες) are 'dear' (φίλοι) throughout early Greek poetry.[174] But if Peirithous were indeed modelling his behaviour on that of Zeus (either as a reference to the *Iliad* or to the *fabula* of the divine marriage), it would reinforce the brazenness (and ultimate futility) of his already hybristic mission: Meleager is right to shudder at what he hears (Οἰνείδης δὲ κατέστυγε **μῦθον** ἀκούσας, v. 24).[175]

A stronger case for a direct textual echo can be made for the sole instance of **φασί** in the *Works and Days*, a case that parallels Telemachus' potentially textual evocation of the Iliadic Nestor in the *Odyssey*. In the closing catalogue of 'Days', Hesiod claims that 'on the fifth day, **they say** the Erinyes attended the birth of Oath, whom Eris bore as a bane for perjurers' (ἐν πέμπτῃ γάρ **φασιν** Ἐρινύας ἀμφιπολεύειν | Ὅρκον γεινόμενον, τὸν Ἔρις τέκε πῆμ᾿ ἐπιόρκοις, *Op*. 803–4). We do not find this precise detail of the Erinyes attending Oath's birth elsewhere, but this index attests to the traditional association that personified Oath (*Op*. 219) and the Erinyes (*Il*. 19.259–60, cf. 3.278–9) had with the punishment of perjurers, while also providing an aetiological explanation for the dangers that the fifth day of each month presented to those who were forsworn.[176] Most significantly,

---

[174] E.g. *Il*. 4.477–8; Hes. *Theog*. 469; Sapph. fr. 16.10; Thgn. 263; Aesch. *Eum*. 271. The common formula strengthens the supplement τοκήων, which is also plausible given the apparently formulaic nature of the clausula ἀπάνευθε τοκήων (*Il*. 24.211; *Od*. 9.36).

[175] **μῦθον** may further index this allusion, suggesting not just 'word'/'speech', but also 'myth'/'story'.

[176] West (1978a) 359. In addition, there may be some play with a dim tradition of the Erinyes as 'attendants': cf. *Od*. 20.78, where the Harpies gave the daughters of

however, the detail of Oath's birth looks back to its similar description in the *Theogony*, where the catalogue of Eris' fourteen offspring (including Ψεύδεα: cf. §II.2.4 above) reaches a climactic conclusion with Oath (*Theog.* 231–2):[177]

> Ὅρκόν θ᾽, ὃς δὴ πλεῖστον ἐπιχθονίους ἀνθρώπους
> πημαίνει, ὅτε κέν τις ἑκὼν ἐπίορκον ὀμόσσῃ·

and Oath, who is truly the greatest <u>bane</u> for humans on the earth, whenever someone deliberately swears <u>a false oath</u>.

Besides the general thematic link, the *Works and Days* echoes this passage verbally, ἐπιόρκοις and πῆμ᾽ picking up on the *Theogony*'s πημαίνει and ἐπίορκον – a rare verbal combination which only appears once elsewhere in extant Greek literature: of the river Styx in the *Theogony*, the divine equivalent of Oath, who is a 'great bane' for any divinity who swears a false oath (μέγα <u>πῆμα</u> θεοῖσιν. | ὅς κεν τῆς ἐπίορκον ἀπολλείψας ἐπομόσσῃ | ἀθανάτων κτλ., *Theog.* 792–4). Given the numerous close connections between the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* (§I.2.3), it is very possible that, here too, we should see a specific cross reference to Hesiod's earlier poem, drawing on its established authority. Of course, the *Theogony* did not specify the date of Oath's birth or the presence of the Erinyes, but its precedent nevertheless buttresses the addition of these new details. In gesturing to hearsay, Hesiod expands and develops a pre-existing strand from his own poetry.

A more agonistic appeal to hearsay is offered by the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, in which the eponymous god attributes Apollo's art of prophecy to tradition (*HhHerm.* 471–2):[178]

> σέ γέ **φασι** δαήμεναι ἐκ Διὸς ὀμφῆς
> μαντείας, Ἑκάεργε (Διὸς πάρα θέσφατα πάντα)

They say that you learned prophecies from Zeus's utterance, Far-worker (all divine decrees come from Zeus).

Pandareus στυγερῇσιν Ἐρινύσιν ἀμφιπολεύειν – 'to serve the hateful Erinyes' or 'for the hateful Erinyes to attend'? Cf. Rutherford (1992) 212–13.

[177] Thus West (1978a) 360.

[178] For the punctuation of the Greek text, I follow Thomas (2020) 407; cf. Vergados (2013) 533; Schenck zu Schweinsberg (2017) 264–5. Contrast West (2003a) 150; Richardson (2010) 211.

127

Besides the irony that the newborn Hermes is already somehow immersed in the currents of hearsay, this phrase is a clear reference to the traditional association of Apollo with prophecy, an association already attested in the *Iliad* by his patronage of the prophet Calchas (*Il.* 1.72). Beyond this general association, however, it is notable that Hermes' words here are repeated by Apollo later in the same poem (ὅσα φημὶ δαήμεναι ἐκ Διὸς ὀμφῆς. | μαντείην, *HhHerm.* 532–3). The verbal repetition may suggest an independent formulaic phrase to which Hermes' earlier **φασί** could allude, but the repetition may also add a touch of humorous irony: Hermes has prophetically pre-empted Apollo's own claim to prophecy. It is as if he has proleptically heard and quoted Apollo's sentiments, beating him at his own game of prophetic prediction. This agonistic one-upmanship would fit into the *Hymn*'s larger intertextual engagement with the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, a 'sibling' hymn with which it has been seen to compete agonistically elsewhere.[179] In the Apolline poem, Apollo's oracular ability also plays a central role: indeed, the god's opening words prophetically predict his future occupation (χρήσω τ' ἀνθρώποισι Διὸς νημερτέα βουλήν, 'I shall prophesy Zeus's unerring plan to mortals', *HhAp.* 132), a phrase that matches the sense, if not the vocabulary, of Hermes' sentiment. Hermes' appeal to hearsay in his own *Hymn* could thus point not only to Apollo's established role as an oracular deity, but also to his particular establishment as such in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*.[180] By co-opting the prophetic voice himself, Hermes positions his own poem against that of his sibling rival, just as Antinous' words in *Odyssey* 2 set Homer's poem against female catalogue poetry.

To close this section, however, let us turn to an example which appears to be doing something a little different to what we have seen so far: not simply invoking or contesting the authority of tradition, but openly reworking it. In the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, the disguised goddess of love fabricates a patently

---

[179] *HhAp.* and *HhHerm.*: Radermacher (1931) 110–11, 229; Abramowicz (1937) 72; Dornseiff (1938); Richardson (2007) 89–91, (2010) 20–1; Vergados (2013) 70–3; Thomas (2017) 77–80, esp. 79 on prophecy, (2020) 13–20.

[180] Cf. Dornseiff (1938) 83.

128

false genealogy during her seduction of Anchises, which she legitimises through appeal to hearsay (*HhAphr.* 111–12):

Ὀτρεὺς δ' ἐστὶ πατὴρ **ὀνομάκλυτος, εἴ που ἀκούεις**,
ὃς πάσης Φρυγίης εὐτειχήτοιο ἀνάσσει.

My father is Otreus, **whose name is famous – if you've perhaps heard of him**; he rules over the whole of well-walled Phrygia.

Aphrodite conceals her fabrications with the veneer of hearsay, appropriating the authority of tradition. Indeed, her language is very similar to that of Sinon in *Aeneid* 2, in a comparable case of disguised invention (**εἴ που ἀκούεις** ~ *si forte tuas pervenit ad auris*, *Aen.* 2.81; **ὀνομάκλυτος** ~ *incluta fama | gloria*, *Aen.* 2.82–3: §1.1.1). In context, this is a patent lie. Aphrodite is not the son of a mortal, but of Zeus, king of the gods, as the narrator has just reminded us (Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη, *HhAphr.* 107). But her fictitious cover story is not an outright invention. It rather builds on and adapts tradition. We know barely anything else about Otreus, the man whom she co-opts as her father, but he is mentioned once elsewhere in archaic Greek literature, as one of two Phrygian rulers whom Priam assisted during an Amazon invasion (*Il.* 3.186). In later sources, he was considered Priam's maternal grandfather (Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.12.3) or Dymas' son, and so Hecuba's brother (Σ T *Il.* 3.189 *ex.*). He may thus belong to lost traditions of Trojan and Phrygian conflicts against the Amazons, perhaps part of the larger background of Penthesilea's involvement in the later stages of the Trojan war. But this alone hardly warrants his description as **ὀνομάκλυτος** ('**of famous name**').

There is thus considerable irony in the obscurity of this allegedly 'famous' father. If the *Hymn*'s audiences were familiar with the *Iliad*, Aphrodite's **εἴ που ἀκούεις** ('**if you've perhaps heard of him**') could even playfully index Otreus' sole Iliadic mention, inviting them to test their knowledge of the literary tradition: can they remember 'hearing' this name before?[181] Further encouragement to recall this specific Iliadic scene could also be found in Aphrodite's later mention of the 'Phrygians with

---

[181] For the relationship between the *Hymn* and *Iliad*, see Faulkner (2008) 26–34; Richardson (2010) 29–30; Olson (2012) 16–20.

darting steeds' (Φρύγας αἰολοπώλους, *HhAphr.* 137), which picks up unique language from the same Iliadic passage (Φρύγας ἀνέρας αἰολοπώλους, *Il.* 3.185).[182] Douglas Olson has pursued such an Iliadic allusion even further, however. He notes that Otreus' sole mention in the *Iliad* occurs during the *Teichoscopia* and suggests that the hymnist's unique εὐτειχήτοιο ('well-walled') could gesture to this context. Similarly, the adjective used to describe Otreus in the *Hymn* (ὀνομάκλυτος) is a Homeric *hapax legomenon* that appears in *Iliad* 22, when Priam appeals to Hector, again from the vantage point of the Trojan walls (*Il.* 22.51).[183] Combining this evidence, Olson has proposed that 'Aphrodite's lying tale – which leads directly to the birth of Aeneas, who escaped the destruction of Troy – thus engages pointedly with the story of the ruin of Priam and his branch of the royal family'.[184] Through a strong emphasis on hearsay, her audience would then be invited both to see through her fiction and to ask where they have heard these words before.

This is an attractive reading, but the intricate verbal precision may go a little too far. After all, although the adjective ὀνομάκλυτος is strictly a Homeric *hapax legomenon*, it does occur again in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* (*HhHerm.* 59), and – in divided form as a noun and adjective – twice in the *Odyssey* (ὄνομα κλυτόν, *Od.* 9.364; 19.183).[185] In both Odyssean instances, the phrase refers to two of Odysseus' false names (Outis and Aethon), suggesting that it may well have had a traditional association with fabricated identities, an association that would be particularly apt for Aphrodite's lying tale here. A precise link to *Iliad* 22 thus seems implausible, especially given the absence of any real thematic connection. As for εὐτείχητος, the adjective may be unique, but the comparable εὐτείχεος occurs seven times in the *Iliad*, which suggests that describing something as 'well-walled' carries a generic force; it is a stretch to see a direct link to the Iliadic *Teichoscopia*. Even so, however, the traditional resonance of the epithet may still lend a

---

[182] Though cf. *Il.* 19.404 (πόδας αἰόλος ἵππος). Φρύγας ... αἰολοπώλους could be an underattested formula: the Phrygians are only mentioned twice elsewhere in extant archaic epic (*Il.* 2.862 and 10.431, where they are again linked with horses: ἱππόμαχοι).

[183] Olson (2012) 196–7.   [184] Olson (2012) 196.

[185] Cf. too ὀνομακλήδην (*Od.* 4.278); later lyric appearances: Semon. fr. 7.87; Ibyc. fr. 306; Pind. *Pae.* 6.123.

130

note of foreboding to Aphrodite's words: every Homeric instance of εὐτείχεος appears in the context of city-sacking, six times of Troy (*Il.* 1.129, 2.113, 2.288, 5.716, 8.241, 9.20) and once of Briseis' hometown (*Il.* 16.57).[186] When used of Phrygia in the *Hymn*, the epithet may thus look ahead to the future defeat of the Trojans and Phrygians in the coming war, even if not to the specific fate of Priam.

Once again, a character's emphasis on hearsay invites an audience to situate her words against the larger epic tradition. But in this case, the index plays a further role: marking and authorising the poet's openly creative reworking of tradition. In this regard, the hymnic poet appears to pre-empt an aspect of indexical hearsay which is more familiar from later literature: 'faux footnoting'. We have not seen a clear instance of such indexed innovation in the Homeric poems, although we can identify potential candidates. For example, the Odyssean narrator indexes his elaborate description of stable Olympus (*Od.* 6.41–6: **φασί**, 42) whose snowless state appears to contradict two traditional epithets of 'snowy' Olympus elsewhere (οὔτε χιὼν ἐπιπίλναται, 6.44),[187] while Achilles employs **φασί** in his description of Mount Sipylus after his patent adaptation of the Niobe myth (*Il.* 24.614–17).[188] In neither of these cases, however, is the apparent innovation as directly connected to the appeal to hearsay as in the *Homeric Hymn*. We shall see later how this aspect of the index is further developed in lyric poetry, especially Pindaric epinician (§II.3.4). But we can conclude here that it is an element which possesses at least some epic pedigree. Even if we cannot identify a clear case in

---

[186] Cf. too Thgn. 1209 (εὐτείχεα of Thebes, another city known for being sacked); Eur. *Andr.* 1009 (εὐτειχῆ of the 'rock of Troy'). On Troy's Homeric epithets: Scully (1990) 69–80.

[187] Contrast νιφόεις ('snowy', *Il.* 18.616; *Theog.* 42, 62, 118, etc.; *Hh.* 15.7) and ἀγάννιφος ('snow-capped', *Il.* 1.420, 18.186; Hes. fr. 229.6, 15; *HhHerm.* 325, 505), cf. S. R. West (1988) 296. For this passage's more general engagement with key features of the mythological Olympian gods and their distance from mortality, see Spieker (1969).

[188] Niobe mythological innovation: e.g. Kakridis (1949) 96–105; Willcock (1964) 141–2; Richardson (1993) 340. The authenticity of *Il.* 24.614–17 has been challenged since antiquity (see Pearce (2008), with further bibliography), but I follow those who are inclined to accept these lines (e.g. von der Mühll (1952) 384–5; Sano (1993); Schmitz (2001); West (2011a) 423).

the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*, we can in the larger corpus of archaic Greek epic.[189]

Throughout early Greek epic, therefore, hearsay was already a well-established motif for the transmission and interaction of songs and stories. Characters' and narrators' appeals to what 'people say' and what their audiences have heard frequently signalled references to other traditions or even – on occasion – specific texts. These indices variously flag a poet's encyclopaedic control of his material, an agonistic urge to suppress alternative accounts and even – on at least one occasion – the creative reworking of tradition. The various functions of the 'Alexandrian footnote' that I traced in Chapter I (§I.I.I) are thus already deeply engrained in the allusive system of our earliest Greek poetry. From the very start, Greek poets could self-consciously index other myths to carve out their space in the broader tradition. Both halves of the 'Alexandrian' 'footnote' are a misnomer: it is not intrinsically tied to the scholarly interests and pedantic learning of the Alexandrian library.

As we turn now to lyric poets' use of indexical hearsay, we shall see that this allusive device remained an integral feature of early Greek intertextual practice throughout the archaic age. It was not just limited to the epic genre.

II.3 Lyric *Fama*

Like their epic peers, lyric poets display a strong interest in the circulation of news and stories. In the present, they are concerned with the preservation and memorialisation of their own subject matter, setting it on a par with the poetry of the past. Epinician poets, in particular, repeatedly stress the importance of the report of victory and the enduring fame it will provide for their *laudandi*, as well as their family and homelands. But they are far from alone

---

[189] I leave aside here a fragment of Aristeas' *Arimaspea* (fr. 5 *PEG*) which appears to authorise its fabulous legends of the north through appeal to hearsay (**φασ'**, Hubmann's proposal for the manuscripts' corrupt σφᾶς), since this verb (if the correct emendation) was likely attached to a specific subject, the Issedonians (Ἰσσηδοί, fr. 4 *PEG*; cf. Hdt. 4.16.1: τὰ κατύπερθε ἔλεγε ἀκοῇ, φὰς Ἰσσηδόνας εἶναι τοὺς ταῦτα λέγοντας, 'he spoke of what lay to the north through hearsay, reporting what the Issedonians had told him'); see Bolton (1962) 8–9.

132

in doing so: Sappho is concerned with the immortalising power of poetry (fr. 55, Aristid. *Or.* 28.51 = fr. 193), Theognis claims that Cyrnus' name and fame will never die (Thgn. 245–6) and Ibycus even promises Polycrates κλέος ἄφθιτον ('undying fame'), that prized goal of epic heroes (S151.47, cf. *Il.* 9.413). Lyric poets are deeply committed to the propagation of renown.

In addition, lyric poets are equally concerned with stories and myths of the past, which they commonly cite as exempla. Here too, these myths are regularly marked by the language of hearsay and rumour. φασί and similar forms occur frequently across the extant canon of early Greek lyric poetry, now accompanied by a string of abstract nouns which refer to self-standing stories without mention of a speaking agent (e.g. λόγος). Such language is occasionally used in gnomic contexts, appealing to the authority of anonymous wisdom,[190] but it is more frequently used to introduce specific mythological tales. As in epic, these appeals to tradition can be interpreted as having a strong indexical force, flagging engagement with and departure from the literary tradition. In contrast to epic, however, we can more frequently make a stronger case for the indexing of precise sources, rather than the indexing of traditions in general.

In the sections that follow, we will first explore how indexical hearsay performs the same functions as we have seen in epic: it may gesture to the authority of tradition (§II.3.1) or mark agonistic engagement with rival or suppressed narrative alternatives (§II.3.2). In addition, however, it also develops aspects which we saw only rarely in epic: inviting audiences to supplement a tale with their larger knowledge of tradition (§II.3.3) or legitimising a poet's creative reworking of their mythical inheritance (§II.3.4).

II.3.1 Indexing Authority: Traditions and Texts

Archaic lyric poets frequently invoke hearsay when mentioning and narrating myths, imbuing their accounts with the authority of tradition. Due to our limited extant evidence and the fragmentary

---

[190] Esp. in Pindar: e.g. φαντί, *Pyth.* 4.287; φαντί, *Pyth.* 7.19; λέγεται, *Nem.* 6.56; ἔστι δέ τις λόγος ἀνθρώπων, *Nem.* 9.6.

133

state of many of these poems, it is often difficult to situate cases of indexical hearsay within the larger traditions surrounding a given myth.[191] But even from what we have, we can identify numerous plausible cases from the seventh century onwards. We shall begin here by exploring the phenomenon in general, before turning to further nuances of its use in the following sections.

Early Indices: Archilochus, Sappho, Alcaeus

Our earliest lyric cases of indexical hearsay look not to the lofty traditions of epic, but to the far humbler genre of fable. On several occasions in his surviving iambic fragments, Archilochus explicitly introduces his fables as αἶνοι – a word which not only signals his generic consciousness, but also his debt to pre-existing traditions.[192] He begins his account of 'the fox and the monkey' by claiming that he will tell his addressee Cerycides an αἶνος (ἐρέω **τιν'** ὔμιν **αἶνον**, ὦ Κηρυκίδη, fr. 185.1) and similarly introduces his tale of the fox and eagle as 'a fable told among men' (fr. 174):

> **αἶνός τις ἀνθρώπων** ὅδε,
> ὡς ἄρ' ἀλώπηξ καἰετὸς ξυνεωνίην
>   ἔμειξαν

> This is **a fable told among men**, how a fox and an eagle joined in partnership.

The specification here of an audience of ἄνθρωποι (a noun which we have already seen combined with allusive indices in epic)[193] emphasises the traditionality of the tale and the authority of its moral message.[194] Such explicit citations of αἶνοι appear to have been an established part of the handling of fable from Hesiod

---

[191] See e.g. Xenophanes fr. 7 *IEG*, which indexes an otherwise unknown fable: the poet moves on to '**another account**' (ἄλλον ἔπειμι **λόγον**) and reports a story about Pythagoras (fr. 7a): 'they say' (**φασίν**) that he '**once**' (**ποτέ**) took pity on a maltreated puppy, recognising the soul of a dear friend just from its voice. The satirical allusion to Pythagorean metempsychosis is obvious, but it is unclear whether this is an isolated invention of Xenophanes or part of a wider tradition of Pythagorean parody.

[192] For the meaning of αἶνος, a term restricted to the archaic period, cf. Nøjgaard (1964–67) I 123–5; van Dijk (1997) 79–82. On Archilochus' allusive use of αἶνοι: Swift (2014a); Brown (2018) 31–41; Carey (2018) 22–5.

[193] ἄνθρωποι: §II.2.4 n. 127. The genitive ἀνθρώπων is intentionally ambiguous (subjective: 'told by men' vs. objective: 'told about men'): Corrêa (2007) 103–4; Swift (2014a) 70.

[194] Cf. Rawles (2018) 57. On Archilochus' handling of the fox/eagle fable: van Dijk (1997) 138–44; Irwin (1998); Hawkins (2008) 93–101; Gagné (2009).

134

onwards,[195] and the repeated use of the indefinite article τις retains the vagueness of reference that we have seen with other verbal indices. In this second Archilochean case, however, we have some evidence that the poet is indeed following an established *fabula*. The remaining words of Archilochus' fragment closely resemble the beginning of the later Aesopic version of the same fable, centred on the friendship and union of the two animals (ὡς ἄρ' ἀλώπηξ καἰετὸς ξυνεωνίην | ἔμειξαν, fr. 174.2–3 ~ ἀετὸς καὶ ἀλώπηξ φιλίαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ποιησάμενοι, *fab*. 1 Perry).[196] Admittedly, the text of this version is late, written probably between the first and third centuries CE, but it must derive from an older tradition, since Aristophanes' Peisetaerus too refers to the same Aesopic fable with similar phrasing and indexing (*Av.* 651–3):[197]

> ὅρα νυν, ὡς ἐν Αἰσώπου **λόγοις**
> ἐστὶν **λεγόμενον** δή **τι**, τὴν ἀλώπεχ', ὡς
> φλαύρως ἐκοινώνησεν αἰετῷ **ποτέ**.

> Watch out now, because in Aesop's **fables** there's **some story told** about the fox, how she **once** fared wretchedly in her partnership with an eagle.

Like Archilochus, Aristophanes introduces the fable by foregrounding the coming together of bird and beast (ἐκοινώνησεν, 653), while also employing the indefinite τι (652). But he attributes the tale not to Archilochus, but to the λόγοι of Aesop (651). Given the consistency of the fable in these later parallels, as well as Archilochus' own gestures to independent, pre-existing αἶνοι, it is likely that such a fabular tradition already circulated in the mid-seventh century.[198] Through such a self-conscious citation (**αἶνός τις ἀνθρώπων**), Archilochus signposts his allusive adoption of

---

[195] Cf. **αἶνον** . . . ἐρέω, Hes. *Op*. 202; ἐρέω **τιν'** ὔμιν **αἶνον**, ὦ Κηρυκίδη, Archil. fr. 185.1; **αἶνός τίς** ἐστιν, Panarc. fr. 1(a) *IEG*; ἦν ἄρα τρανὸς **αἶνος ἀνθρώπων** ὅδε, Moschion, fr. 8.1 *TrGF*. Cf. too Archil. fr. 23.16 (**λόγῳ**, indexing the fable of the ant and dove?); Archil. fr. 168.2–3 (χρῆμά τοι γελοῖον | ἐρέω).

[196] Cf. Nelson (2019b).

[197] Cf. West (1984a); Dunbar (1995) 417–18; Corrêa (2007) 103.

[198] The general antiquity of the tale is also supported by its well-known connections with Near Eastern myth, especially that of Etana: Williams (1956); Trencsényi-Waldapfel (1959); Baldi (1961); Adrados (1964); La Penna (1964) 24–36; Burkert (1992) 122–3; Corrêa (2007) 105–8; Currie (2021a).

another tradition, just as Homer indexed his engagement with other myths.[199]

The melic poetry of Sappho and Alcaeus, by contrast, indexes epic myth on a number of occasions. In a small fragment of Sappho, we find an indexed allusion to traditions about Helen's birth (fr. 166):

φαῖσι δή **ποτα** Λήδαν ὐακίνθινον
< . . . > ὢϊον εὔρην πεπυκάδμενον

they say that Leda **once** found a hyacinth-coloured egg, covered . . .

The wider context of this fragment is lost, but what we have corresponds to the version of the myth in which Helen was not the daughter of Zeus (or Tyndareus) and Leda, but rather the product of a liaison between Zeus and Nemesis – born from an egg that Leda received from a wandering shepherd or Hermes.[200] The story was a popular subject of fifth-century vase painting and also featured in Cratinus' *Nemesis*,[201] but it was already well established before the fifth century: elements of the myth suggest a primal and even pre-Homeric pedigree,[202] and it certainly featured already in the Cyclic *Cypria* (frr. 10–11 *GEF*). Sappho may or may not have known the story from this specific poem, but her broad engagement with Trojan themes elsewhere attests to her familiarity with cyclic myth, which she must have known at least in part through epic poetry.[203] Her opening **φαῖσι** (alongside a

---

[199] Archilochus' Telephus elegy may also offer an early example of elegiac indexing, but only if we accept Bowie's proposed reconstruction of the fragment: ἤ[ρω' **ἐδεξά]μεθ'** ἄ[νδρ]α φυγεῖν ('**we have heard** that a man who was a hero fled', fr. 17a.4: Bowie (2010b) 151 with 163 n. 22, (2016a) 19–20 with n. 12), marking engagement with the myth of the 'Teuthranian Expedition', an episode familiar to us from the *Cypria* and elsewhere (*Cypr.* arg. 7 *GEF*; §III.2.3). However, few scholars accept Bowie's interpretation of the elegy as a self-standing narrative, since the fragment gives signs of being a paradigmatic exemplum that does not extend far beyond the surviving portion of text (Swift (2019) 231; cf. Lulli (2011) 100–4). A more dynamic first-person verb is more likely, e.g. [εἴμ]εθ' ἄρ[η]α φυγεῖν ('we sped to flee the battle': West (2006) 12–13).

[200] Shepherd: Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.10.7; Hermes: Hyg. *Astr.* 2.8. In Etruscan iconography, Hermes or one of the Dioscuri deliver the egg: Carpino (1996).

[201] Vase painting: Chapouthier (1942). Cratinus' *Nemesis*: Bakola (2010) 168–73, 220–4.

[202] Kerényi (1939). If the myth pre-dates the *Iliad*, there may be some irony in the Trojan elders' claim on the walls of Troy that there need be 'no nemesis' for the Greeks and Trojans to be fighting over Helen (οὐ νέμεσις, *Il.* 3.156); cf. Kullmann (1960) 255.

[203] E.g. fr. 16 (§III.3.1 n.132); fr. 17 (~ *Od.* 3.168–75, *Nostoi* arg. 1 *GEF*: Burris et al. (2014)); fr. 44 (§II.3.3); fr. 58c (§II.3.3). On Sappho and epic traditions: West (2002);

136

temporal **ποτά**) signposts her introduction of a familiar mythical episode, cueing her audience's knowledge of this cyclic tradition.[204]

A comparable engagement with epic myth can also be found in Alcaeus, who appeals to hearsay when discussing Priam's grief and the destruction of Troy 'because of Helen' (fr. 42.1–4, suppl. Page):

ὼς λόγος, κάκων ἄ[χος ἔννεκ' ἔργων
Περράμῳ καὶ παῖσ[ί **ποτ'**, Ὤλεν', ἦλθεν
ἐκ σέθεν πίκρον, π[ύρι δ' ὤλεσε Ζεῦς
    Ἴλιον ἴραν.

As the story goes, because of wicked deeds bitter grief **once** came to Priam and his sons from you, Helen, and Zeus destroyed sacred Ilion with fire.

Alcaeus' index points to the ruin and destruction at the heart of the Trojan war tradition. But within this, it also evokes a larger epic discourse surrounding Helen's responsibility for the conflict: the phrase ἀμφ' Ἐ[λένᾳ] in the fragment's penultimate verse (v. 15) appears to have been a set formula associated with the war,[205] while ἐκ σέθεν (v. 3) similarly recalls other formulaic phrases attributing blame to Helen (e.g. Ἑλένης εἵνεκα).[206] Besides the general Trojan myth, the poem fits into a larger tradition of Helen *kakegoria*, to which Stesichorus' *Palinode* (esp. οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος **λόγος** οὗτος, fr. 91a) and the incipit of an anonymous lyric poem also gesture ([Ἑ]λένην **ποτὲ λόγος**, *P. Mich.* 3250c recto col. i.5): all three index pre-existing stories (λόγοι) about the Spartan princess.[207]

Spelman (2017) 743–7; Sironi (2018); Kelly (2020), (2021b); Scodel (2021b). The ascription of the *Little Iliad* to the Lesbian poet Lesches offers a glimpse of epic traditions on Lesbos: West (2013) 35–7; Kelly (2015b) 318–19. The *Cypria* is variously dated to the seventh or sixth century (Currie (2015) 281), but episodes from it feature on an Olympian bronze tripod leg from the late seventh century, indicating the pre-Sapphic date of much of its mythological content: West (2013) 42, 63–5.

[204] Cf. too **κλέος** (Sapph. fr. 44.4, §II.3.3); **ἔφαντο** (Sapph. fr. 58c.9, §II.3.3).

[205] Blondell (2010) 359 argues for a specific allusion to *Il.* 3.70, but the other appearances of the word suggest a more general, traditional resonance: *Il.* 3.91; *Od.* 22.227; Pind. *Pyth.* 11.33 (see Edmunds (2019) 155–6 for a fuller list).

[206] Cf. Davies (1986c) 260 n. 15; Blondell (2010) 351–9; contrast Pallantza (2005) 28–34.

[207] Cf. Page (1955a) 281. Stesichorus: §IV.3.2; *P. Mich.*3250c: Borges and Sampson (2012) 27; Bernsdorff (2014) 6–7. For other Alcaean indices, cf. fr. 339 (ὼς **λόγος** ἐκ πατέρων ὄρωρε, 'as the **story** has come down from our fathers'); fr. 343 = S264.21–2

It was not only traditional myths that were the subject of the Lesbian poets' indexical references, however. In a more self-reflexive move, a poet could also signpost engagement with the traditions of their own poetry. Take, for example, Sappho's (unprovenanced) *Brothers Poem*, the first extant quatrain of which reads as follows (fr. 10.5–8):[208]

ἀλλ᾿ **ἄϊ θρύλησθα** Χάραξον ἔλθην
νᾶϊ σὺν πλήαι. τὰ μὲν οἴομαι Ζεῦς
οἶδε σύμπαντές τε θέοι· σὲ δ᾿ οὐ χρῆ
    ταῦτα νόησθαι

But you're **always chattering** that Charaxus came with a full ship. Zeus knows these things, I imagine, and all the gods; but you shouldn't think about them.

Both the speaker and the addressee of these verses are unknown. A common interpretation is that Sappho addresses her mother or another family member, but alternatively Sappho herself might be the chatterer, critiqued by another speaker or addressing herself in a soliloquy.[209] In any case, the description of the addressee's 'chatter' has a derogatory flavour: θρυλέω is a relatively rare verb, primarily found in prose and used of both repetitive and grating talk in a private or public setting.[210] If it is used here of Sappho or another female family member, it likely implies a

---

SLG (**φαῖσι**, invoking tradition to authorise the Nymphs' creation from Zeus); fr. 360 (**φαῖσ᾿**, introducing a quotation from Aristodemus). In these cases, interpretation is limited by the fragmentary state of our evidence.

[208] The papyrus transmitting this poem (*P. Sapph. Obbink*) has no established provenance. I engage with the text here, but the circumstances around its acquisition and publication are extremely problematic and troubling: see Mazza (2020), (forthcoming); Sampson (2020); Hyland (2021); Schultz (2021) 113. In printing the text, I follow the enumeration of Obbink (2015). It is likely that at least one stanza is missing at the start of the papyrus (Obbink (2014) 34, (2016b) 53; West (2014b) 7–8; contrast Bär (2016) 27–31, who argues for an inceptive use of ἀλλά.

[209] Mother addressed: Ferrari (2014) 4; Obbink (2014) 41–2; West (2014b) 7–8; Neri (2015) 58–60; Kurke (2016) 240, 251 n. 38. Sappho addressed: Obbink (2014) 41. Soliloquy: Bär (2016) 15–23. Other suggested addressees include another brother, Larichus (Stehle (2016) 268–70) or Erigyius/Eurygius (Lardinois (2016) 183–4; cf. *test*. 252–3), the absent Doricha (Bowie (2016b) 159–63) or various figures who are otherwise unmentioned in Sappho's extant poetry and testimonia: a nurse (Bettenworth (2014); Sironi (2015); Bär (2016) 16–17), uncle (Bierl (2016) 330) or sister (Bär (2016) 17–18; Gribble (2016) 50–1). A female addressee is most plausible since 'except in wedding songs, Sappho never addresses a man' (Schultz (2021) 132).

[210] Obbink (2014) 41; Kurke (2016) 239; Benelli (2017) I 95–6; O'Connell (2018) 244.

gendered dismissal of 'women's prattle', in contrast to the socially sanctioned speech act of prayer (λίσσεσθαι, fr.10.10).[211]

In addition to this gendered resonance, however, it is also possible to take this initial 'chatter' as a reference to Sappho's own poetry. As Dirk Obbink has highlighted, Sappho's poems repeatedly refer to Charaxus in terms of his movement and travels: he is always said to have 'come' or be 'coming' somewhere or other.[212] Obbink thus suggests that these verses act as a kind of 'intertextual reference or self-citation', acknowledging the frequency with which Sappho's poetry chatters about Charaxus in this way.[213] Peter O'Connell has taken this argument even further by speculating that a real or notional 'welcome song' for Charaxus might underlie these words, given the lexical parallels shared with other archaic songs of that subgenre.[214] Sappho's words would then be evoking and critiquing a specific song from her larger repertoire – an attractive, if ultimately unprovable, conjecture.

Given the various ways in which these verses seem to recall Sappho's broader corpus, it may thus be possible to see a further indexical edge to **θρύλησθα**, especially if we take Sappho as the addressee ('You, Sappho, are always chattering in your poetry . . .').[215] The flexibility of the Sapphic speaking 'I' and the fact that Sappho is frequently addressed elsewhere in her extant corpus make this a plausible hypothesis.[216] As does the fact that later authors also employ the verb θρυλέω to refer to poetry and to index literary quotation: Plato and Polybius explicitly apply it to poetic chatter,[217] and Euripides'

---

[211] Cf. Kurke (2016) 239–40; Swift (2018) 83–4. 'Women's prattle': cf. e.g. Theoc. *Id*. 2.142: Simaetha does not want to 'chatter' at length (θρυλέοιμι); *Id*. 15.87–8: a stranger criticises Gorgo and Praxinoa for their endless chattering (ἀνάνυτα κωτίλλοισαι).

[212] E.g. fr. 5.2 (ἵκεσθα[ι]), fr. 10.5 (ἔλθην), fr. 10.11 (ἐξίκεσθαι), fr. 15.12 (ἦλθε); cf. too Hdt. 2.135.6 (ἀπενόστησε ἐς Μυτιλήνην); Strabo 17.1.33 (κατάγοντος εἰς Ναύκρατιν); Ath. *Deipn*. 13.596b–c (εἰς τὴν Ναύκρατιν ἀπαίροντος); Ov. *Her*. 15.117–18 (*itque reditque*). For the possible Odyssean resonances here, see e.g. Nünlist (2014); Bär (2016) 23–7; Mueller (2016); Schultz (2021) 135–7.

[213] Obbink (2016c) 210; cf. already Obbink (2014) 41: a 'reflexive self-address on her own poetic discourse'.

[214] O'Connell (2018) 250–8 (cf. esp. νηὶ σὺν σ[μ]ικρῇ . . . ἦλθες, Archil. fr. 24.1–2).

[215] A suggestion already made by O'Connell (2018) 254–6, on whose arguments this paragraph builds; he describes θρύλησθα as an 'Alexandrian footnote'.

[216] Flexibility: e.g. fr. 102 (a young girl addressing her mother). Sappho addressed: e.g. by Aphrodite (fr. 1.15–24, fr. 65.5, fr. 133.2, fr. 159); by a departing friend (fr. 94.5).

[217] οἱ ποιηταὶ ἡμῖν **ἀεὶ θρυλοῦσιν**, Pl. *Phd*. 65b3; ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν ποιητῶν . . . **θρυλούμενος**, Polyb. 2.16.6; cf. O'Connell (2018) 244.

Bellerophon uses it to introduce a quotation of a *gnome* that is
'**chattered about** everywhere'.[218] Epicurus, meanwhile, uses the
verb to mark a cross reference within his own work: φον[ὴ] μόνον
ἀμ[ίβε]ται, καθάπερ **πάλαι θρυ[λῶ]** ('only the sound is changed, as **I
have long been chattering**', fr. 34.30.5–7).[219] In a similar manner,
Sappho's **θρύλησθα** may thus not only dismiss excessive female
prattling, but also look back to her previous songs about Charaxus'
travels, which are here revised and corrected in the face of fresh news.

Of course, the fragmentary opening of the poem resists absolute
conclusions, but on available evidence it is plausible to see θρυλέω
as a more colourful alternative to the likes of λέγω and φημί,
indexing prior poetic speech. If so, this example is more direct
and explicit than the other indices we have explored. In compari-
son to the third-person forms of φημί and the abstract nouns λόγος
and αἶνος, the second-person **θρύλησθα** points to speech within a
specific context – which is apt for the more self-reflexive nature of
the index, within Sappho's own speech world. Yet this is not an
isolated moment: in later chapters, we will see how Sappho simi-
larly indexes engagement with her wider poetic traditions through
appeals to memory (§III.3.3) and temporality (§IV.3.1 and IV.3.2).
Her repeatedly indexed self-references contribute to her creation
of a consistent story world and of distinctive song cycles.

Fifth-Century Footnotes: Pindar, Bacchylides, Skolia

It is in the fifth century, however, that indexical hearsay is particu-
larly prominent. Bacchylides indexes his account of Heracles'
katabasis in pursuit of Cerberus (**[π]οτ'**, 5.56; **λέγουσιν**, 5.57),[220]
as well as his treatment of Euenus' harsh treatment of his daughter

---

[218] τὸ . . . πανταχοῦ **θρυλούμενον**, *Bellerophon*, fr. 285.1–2 *TrGF*. Bellerophon's *gnome*
(that it is best for a mortal not to be born, fr. 285.2) is traditional: see e.g. Thgn. 425–6;
Bacchyl. 5.160–2; Soph. *OC* 1224–5; Eur. fr. 908 *TrGF*; Arist. fr. 44 Rose; *Cert. Hom.
et Hes.* 7.

[219] Thus O'Connell (2018) 244 n. 40. Laursen (1997) 71 (ad *P. Herc.* 1191 -6 sup. 5/
1056,7,4,2) lists Epicurus' internal cross references; cf. Long and Sedley (1987) II 108.
Cf. too Antig. Car. 25a.2 (ὁ ποιητὴς τὸ **θρυλούμενον** ἔγραψεν, citing a variant of *Thebaid*
fr. 8.1–2 *GEF*); Plut. *Quomodo adul.* 36b (τὸ παρ' Ἐπικούρου **θρυλούμενον ἀεί**, citing
Epicurus fr. 204: cf. Hunter and Russell (2011) 203).

[220] Cf. *Il.* 8.367–9; *Od.* 11.623–6; Hes. *Theog.* 310–12. Burnett (1985) 198 n. 7 notes other
possible links with the epic *Minyas*, Stesichorus' *Cerberus* (frr. 165a–b) and Cercops of
Miletus' *Aegimius* (Robertson (1980)).

140

Marpessa (**λέγουσι**, fr. 20a.14).[221] Yet it is Pindar who is the most intense and frequent footnoter of tradition. He indexically marks a wide range of myths, including Zeus's flooding of the earth and the story of Deucalion and Pyrrha (**λέγοντι** μάν, *Ol.* 9.49);[222] the deaths of Otus and Ephialtes, the theomachic sons of Iphimedeia and Aloeus (**φαντί**, *Pyth.* 4.88);[223] Ixion's words as he is turned on the wheel (**φαντί**, *Pyth.* 2.21);[224] Antaeus' audition of how Danaus once devised a way for his daughters to marry in Argos (**ἄκουσεν**, **ποτ'**, *Pyth.* 9.112);[225] Zeus's rape of Danae as a shower of gold (**φαμέν**, *Pyth.* 12.17);[226] Perseus' flight from the Gorgons (**λέγοντι** δὲ **βροτοί**, fr. 70a.15);[227] Zeus's keeping watch over Leto's birth pains (**λέγο[ντι]**, *Pae.* 12.9);[228] Cadmus' marriage of Harmonia (**ποθ'** ... **[φ]άμα**, fr. 70b.27);[229] Zeus's fathering of Aeacus and Heracles (**λέγοντι**, *Nem.* 7.84); and the fame of Aeacus (**κλεινὸς** Αἰακοῦ **λόγος**, *Isth.* 9.1).[230] In many of these cases, we do not possess full earlier accounts of the myth in question, but from the limited picture we have, these indices seem to mark references to established and familiar traditions.

This impression is reinforced when we consider Pindar's indexical treatment of Trojan myth, where we have a clearer view of the traditions with which he could engage. In *Isthmian* 8, Zeus's assent to the marriage of Peleus and Thetis is signposted with **φαντί** (*Isth.* 8.46a); the poet signals his engagement with the larger

---

[221] Cf. *Il.* 9.555–64; Simon. fr. 563; the chest of Cypselus (Paus. 5.18.2); Bacchyl. 20 (esp. χρυσάσπιδος υἱὸ[ν Ἄρηος], 20.11 ~ [Ἄρ]εος χρυσολόφου παῖ[δα], fr. 20a.13–14).

[222] Cf. Hes. frr. 2–7, fr. 234; Epicharmus, *Pyrrha* (frr. 113–120 K–A); Gantz (1993) 164–6. D'Alessio (2005b) 220–8 and Pavlou (2008) 555 argue for a precise reference to the Hesiodic *Catalogue* here, but our limited knowledge from scanty fragments does not permit such a firm conclusion.

[223] Cf. *Il.* 5.385–91; *Od.* 11.305–20; Hes. fr. 19; Gantz (1993) 170–1.

[224] Cf. *Il.* 14.317–18; Aesch. *Ixion* (frr. 89–93 *TrGF*), *Perrhaebides* (frr. 184–6a *TrGF*); Soph. *Phil.* 676–9; Gantz (1993) 718–21.

[225] Cf. Hes. frr. 127–9; Phrynichus, *Aegyptoi* (fr. 1 *TrGF*), *Danaides* (fr. 4 *TrGF*); Aesch. *Danaid* trilogy, *PV* 853–69; Pind. *Nem.* 10.1–6; Gantz (1993) 203–8.

[226] Cf. Hes. fr. 135.4 (Διὶ χρυσει[); Pherec. fr. 10 *EGM*; Simon. fr. 543; Pind. *Nem.* 10.11; Soph. *Ant.* 944–50; Gantz (1993) 300–3.

[227] Cf. Hes. *Theog.* 270–81; *Scut.* 216–37; Pherec. fr. 11 *EGM*; Pind. *Pyth.* 12.11–12; Aesch. *Phorcides* (frr. 261–2 *TrGF*); Gantz (1993) 304–7.

[228] *HhAp.* 30–119; Thgn. 5–10; *Carm. Conv.* 886 *PMG* (N.B. **ποτ'**); Gantz (1993) 37–8.

[229] Hes. *Theog.* 937, 975; Thgn. 15–18; Pind. *Pyth.* 3.86–96; Gantz (1993) 471–2.

[230] *Il.* 21.189; Hes. fr. 205; Pind. *Nem.* 8.6–12, *Isth.* 8.17–23, *Pae.* 6.134–40; Gantz (1993) 219–21.

tradition of the pair's wedding and the threatening power of Thetis' offspring (§III.3.1). In *Pythian* 3, Nestor and Sarpedon are singled out as '**the talk of men**' (ἀνθρώπων φάτις, *Pyth.* 3.112), known to later generations from 'such resounding verses as wise craftsmen constructed' (*Pyth.* 3.113–14); we are invited to recall the pair's prominent role in early Greek epic, perhaps especially in the *Iliad*.[231] In *Olympian* 2, meanwhile, the poet indexes Ino's immortal life among the Nereids (λέγοντι, *Ol.* 2.28–30), an account which might look to the *Odyssey*'s specific description of her immortalisation and new life in the sea (*Od.* 5.333–5: cf. Σ *Ol.* 2.51d).[232] Given Ino's mentions elsewhere in archaic literature, a more general nod to her mythical *fabula* is more likely,[233] although an Odyssean reference would fit with the poem's larger appropriation of Homeric passages to construct a particular view of the afterlife.[234] Alongside his frequent indexing of non-Trojan myth, therefore, it is clear that Pindar frequently marked his mythical allusions through the language of hearsay, authorising his account with the backing of tradition.

Such appeals to hearsay are not restricted to the epinician genre in the fifth century, however. A similar indexical appeal to epic traditions is also visible in a pair of Attic *skolia* preserved by Athenaeus (15.695c = *Carm. Conv.* 898–9 *PMG*):

> παῖ Τελαμῶνος, Αἶαν αἰχμητά, **λέγουσί** σε
> ἐς Τροῖαν ἄριστον ἐλθεῖν Δαναῶν μετ' Ἀχιλλέα.

Son of Telamon, spearman Ajax, **they say** that you were the best of the Danaans to come to Troy after Achilles.

> τὸν Τελαμῶνα πρῶτον, Αἴαντα δὲ **δεύτερον**
> ἐς Τροῖαν **λέγουσιν** ἐλθεῖν Δαναῶν καὶ Ἀχιλλέα.

Telamon, **they say**, was first among the Danaans to come to Troy, Ajax **second** alongside Achilles.

---

[231] Spelman (2018a) 106–9; cf. §III.3.4. Though see §I.2.1 for the wider traditionality of Nestor. On the significance of this allusion: Sider (1991); A. M. Miller (1994).

[232] Esp. ἐν καὶ θαλάσσᾳ, *Ol.* 2.28, ἁλίαις, *Ol.* 2.29 ~ ἁλὸς ἐν πελάγεσσι, *Od.* 5.335.

[233] Cf. Hes. *Theog.* 976, fr. 70.1–7 (nursing of Dionysus: N.B. **κλέος**, fr. 70.5, 7), fr. 91 (apotheosis?: Hirschberger (2004) 79); Alcm. fr. 50b ('Ἰνὼ σαλασσομέδοισ': Calame (1983) 518–19): Nelson (forthcoming) b).

[234] Cf. Hurst (2020).

142

The first *skolion* focuses on the credentials of the Greek hero Ajax, gesturing to a well-established tradition of this hero as the second-best of the Achaeans. The sentiment recurs repeatedly in Homer and a variety of later authors, suggesting that it was a fixed part of Ajax's *fabula*.[235] Indeed, it is a crucial element of the hero's mythical biography, since it explains the great shame and anger he feels after he fails to beat Odysseus in the contest for Achilles' arms. The arms were a 'victory prize for the best' (τῷ ἀρίστῳ νικητήριον, Apollod. *Epit.* 5.6). Based on the form of tradition, Ajax should have been their rightful heir. Aided by the indexical **λέγουσι**, these verses thus evoke an established element at the heart of Ajax's mythical *fabula*.

The second *skolion*, however, builds on and caps the first by imitating its allusive strategy while simultaneously shifting its point of comparison from heroic excellence to temporal priority.[236] Ajax is now a peer of Achilles, but still in second place because his father Telamon beat him to Troy by a whole generation. The *skolion* picks up on and reworks the earlier poem's patronymic (παῖ Τελαμῶνος), as well as its concern with Ajax's status. Indeed, the hero is explicitly marked as **δεύτερος** here (in comparison to the first poem's ἄριστος), an adjective which may itself reflect this *skolion*'s secondary and epigonal status in relation to its predecessor.[237] Crucially, however, this poem clinches its argument through another appeal to hearsay, marking its allusion to another well-established element of Trojan myth: the tradition of Heracles' earlier expedition against Troy, in which Telamon played a key role.[238] Like its predecessor,

---

[235] *Il.* 2.768–70, 13.321–5; *Il.* 17.279–80 = *Od.* 11.550–1; *Od.* 11.469–70 = *Od.* 24.17–18; Alc. fr. 387; Pind. *Nem.* 7.27–30; Soph. *Aj.* 1338–41; Eur. *Rhes.* 497. Cf. Ibyc. S151.32–4. At Troy, Achilles and Ajax were stationed at opposite ends of the Greek camp (*Il.* 11.7–9), 'the best fighters securing the army's flank' (Heath and Okell (2007) 365). The pair are also frequently associated in art (Brommer (1973) 334–9, 373–7; Brunori (2011)), e.g. the board-game scene on the Vatican amphora by Exekias, where the two warriors are presented symmetrically as near equals, but Achilles' helmeted head, higher stool and higher roll mark his superiority: Mommsen (1988) 447; Lowenstam (2008) 39–43; Mackay (2010) 327–51, (2019) 49–52.

[236] Cf. Reitzenstein (1893) 21; Davies (2020) 234. With this interpretation, the transmitted καί of 899.2 *PMG* makes perfect sense, and we have no need to accept Casaubon's μετ': cf. Fabbro (1995) 165–6.

[237] For this epigonal resonance of **δεύτερος**, cf. *Ol.* 1.43 (§iv.3.3 n. 253 below); Torrance (2013) 194–7.

[238] Heracles' expedition: *Il.* 5.638–42 (N.B. **φασί, ποτέ**); Hes. fr. 43a.63–4, fr. 165.10–14; Gantz (1993) 442–4. Telamon's involvement: Peisander fr. 10 *GEF*; Pind. *Nem.*

this *skolion* thus alludes to an established feature of the Trojan war *fabula* and legitimises its claim with an indexing **λέγουσιν**. As a pair, they both invoke familiar features of tradition to justify their competing perspectives on Ajax. As generically 'low' sympotic song, they invoke the lustre of epic to authorise their own status as literature.

Besides gesturing to the authority of tradition at large, however, the first *skolion* may also look back to a specific, famous instantiation of the Ajax-as-second-best motif. In *Odyssey* 11, when Odysseus encounters his adversary's shade, he not only recalls the arms contest (*Od.* 11.544–9) and twice expresses the second-best motif (*Od.* 11.469–70, 550–1) but also addresses the hero as παῖ Τελαμῶνος (*Od.* 11.553), the same apostrophe that we find in the *skolion*. This is a notably rare collocation that appears elsewhere only in Sophocles' *Ajax* (*Aj.* 183) and an anonymous epigram in the *Palatine Anthology* (*AP* 9.116.3), both in the context of the arms contest and its aftermath.[239] Given the unique combination of the motif with this rare vocative address, the *skolion* may thus look back to Odysseus' account of the Underworld encounter, an episode in which Ajax's status played an important role. Behind the vague **λέγουσι**, we could see a specific reference to Homer and Odysseus as the key authorities for this claim. Even in this case, however, we should be wary of overplaying the evidence, especially given the frequency with which Ajax is defined by his patronymic elsewhere in early Greek poetry (Τελαμωνιάδης, e.g. *Il.* 9.623, *Od.* 11.543, Pind. *Nem.* 4.47; υἱὸς Τελαμῶνος, *Il.* 13.177, 17.284, 17.293, Pind. *Nem.* 8.23). The collocation παῖ Τελαμῶνος is ultimately not as distinctive as it first seems. Alongside the numerous other evocations of the second-best motif, and further echoes of epic phraseology in the *skolion* itself,[240] it is thus more plausible to see here an

---

3.36–7, 4.25, *Isth.* 5.36–7, 6.27–30; Soph. *Aj.* 434–6; Eur. *Tro.* 799–819; Hellanicus fr. 109 *EGM*.

[239] In Sophocles' drama, the phrase appears in the context of Ajax's frenzied revenge attempt on the Greek chieftains (with a potential echo of the *skolion* itself: G. S. Jones (2010)). In the epigram, Achilles' shield summons Ajax as its 'worthy bearer' (ἄξιον ἀσπιδιώτην).

[240] Ajax is classed as an αἰχμητής in his Iliadic duel with Hector: ἄμφω δ' αἰχμητά, *Il.* 7.281 (~ αἰχμητά, 898.1 *PMG*).

144

evocation of a more general motif of the epic tradition, rather than one specific instantiation. The *skolion* poet musters the support of tradition to prove his point, invoking a familiar and well-established feature of Ajax's mythical *fabula*.

Indexing Texts: Pindar and Simonides on Hesiod

So far, we have seen that lyric poets frequently indexed their mythical references by appealing to hearsay, signposting and authorising their engagement with other traditions (or even perhaps specific texts: the *Cypria*, *Iliad* and *Odyssey*). In two further cases, however, we can be very confident that an index points to a precise text even in spite of the appeal to anonymous hearsay.

The first of these is found in Pindar's sixth *Pythian*, a poem which celebrates a Pythian chariot victory by Xenocrates of Akragas and dwells on the filial piety of his son Thrasybulus. The youth, Pindar claims, follows the advice which the centaur Cheiron once gave to the young Achilles (*Pyth.* 6.19–27):

σύ τοι σχεθών νιν ἐπὶ δεξιὰ χειρός, ὀρθὰν
ἄγεις ἐφημοσύναν,
τά **ποτ**᾽ ἐν οὔρεσι **φαντὶ** μεγαλοσθενεῖ
Φιλύρας υἱὸν ὀρφανιζομένῳ
Πηλεΐδᾳ παραινεῖν· μάλιστα μὲν Κρονίδαν,
βαρυόπαν στεροπᾶν κεραυνῶν τε πρύτανιν,
θεῶν σέβεσθαι·
ταύτας δὲ μή ποτε τιμᾶς
ἀμείρειν γονέων βίον πεπρωμένον.

Indeed, by keeping it at your right hand, you correctly follow the precept which **they say** Philyra's son **once** commended to the mighty son of Peleus in the mountains, when he was separated from his parents: above all gods to worship Cronus' son, deep-voiced lord of thunder and lightning; and never to deprive his parents of the same honour during their destined lifespan.

These instructions, to revere both the gods and one's parents, form a stock part of Greek moral didacticism.[241] But the scholia note a possible source for this maxim, the *Precepts of Cheiron*

---

[241] E.g. Hes. *Op.* 331–2, 336–41; Aesch. *Eum.* 269–71, 538–49; Eur. fr. 853 *TrGF*; Gorg. *Epitaph.* fr. 6.4; Or. Sib. 2.59–60. Cf. Dihle (1968); West (1978a) 240; Kurke (1990) 89–90 n. 20.

(αἱ Χείρωνος Ὑποθῆκαι), a work attributed in antiquity to Hesiod (Σ *Pyth*. 6.22, quoting Hes. fr. 283):

> τὰς δὲ Χείρωνος ὑποθήκας Ἡσιόδῳ ἀνατιθέασιν, ὧν ἡ ἀρχή·
>   εὖ νῦν μοι τάδ' ἕκαστα μετὰ φρεσὶ πευκαλίμῃσι
>   φράζεσθαι· πρῶτον μέν, ὅτ' ἂν δόμον εἰσαφίκηαι,
>   ἔρδειν ἱερὰ καλὰ θεοῖς αἰειγενέτῃσιν.

They attribute to Hesiod *The Precepts of Cheiron*, which begin as follows:

> Now consider well each of these things in your prudent mind: first, whenever you arrive home, perform a beautiful sacrifice to the immortal gods.

Scholars have often taken this scholiastic note as evidence that the maxim in *Pyth*. 6.23–7 derives directly from this Hesiodic poem,[242] although the scholia do not quite say as much: all they actually claim is that Hesiod was attributed a poem on the same topic. Yet it is a plausible inference that Pindar had this specific poem in mind.[243] Both Pindar and Bacchylides appear to have alluded to the work elsewhere,[244] and the reverent and religious sensibility of the advice in *Pythian* 6 closely parallels the Hesiodic fragment's injunction to sacrifice to the gods. There are thus strong grounds for seeing **φασί** here directing Pindar's audience to a specific didactic predecessor. Given the fragmentary state of the Hesiodic poem, we cannot determine how Pindar manipulated his model, beyond his exploitation of Cheiron as an authorising figure of paraenetic authority.[245] But even from what remains, we can see that Pindar here indexed a precise citation through a vague appeal to hearsay.

Our second example offers an even stronger case for a direct citation of a specific poetic predecessor. It is a particularly

---

[242] Kurke (1990) 90; West (2011b) 62; Pavlou (2012) 107. Lowrie (1992) 420 n. 21 even supposes that 'honour your parents' immediately followed fr. 283's 'honour the gods' to match the sequence of thought in *Pythian* 6. Hutchinson (2001) 381 is more cautious.

[243] Cf. Spelman (2018a) 99.

[244] E.g. διδασκαλίαν Χείρωνος, *Pyth*. 4.102 (Braswell (1988) 192–3); *Pyth*. 9.29–65; *Nem*. 3.43–63 (D'Alessio (2005b) 232); <τ>αὶ δὲ Χίρωνος ἐντολαί, fr. 177c; Bacchyl. 27.34–8 (Merkelbach and West (1967) 143). Bacchylides' quotation of an otherwise unknown Hesiodic *gnome* (Bacchyl. 5.191–4 = Hes. fr. dub. 344) may derive from the Ὑποθῆκαι (Maehler (2004) 128; Cingano (2009) 100), although it may instead paraphrase *Theog*. 81–97 (Merkelbach and West (1967) 172). For the poem's broader reception and popularity in the fifth century BCE: Kurke (1990).

[245] Cf. *Pyth*. 9.29–65, *Nem*. 3.53–8; Halliwell (2009).

146

well-known case of early Greek allusion, Simonides' fragment on the mountain of Arete (fr. 579):[246]

ἐστί τις λόγος
τὰν Ἀρετὰν ναίειν δυσαμβάτοις᾽ ἐπὶ πέτραις,
†νῦν δέ μιν θοαν†[247] χῶρον ἁγνὸν ἀμφέπειν·
οὐδὲ πάντων βλεφάροισι θνατῶν
ἔσοπτος, ᾧ μὴ δακέθυμος ἱδρὼς
ἔνδοθεν μόλῃ,
ἵκῃ τ᾽ ἐς ἄκρον ἀνδρείας.

There is a certain tale that Arete dwells among rocks which are difficult to ascend … and occupies a holy place. She is not visible to the eyes of all mortals, but only to the one upon whom heart-biting sweat comes from within and who reaches the peak of manliness.

These lines are a clear adaptation of a passage from Hesiod's *Works and Days* on the diverging paths of ἀρετή and κακότης (*Op.* 287–92):

τὴν μέν τοι Κακότητα καὶ ἰλαδὸν ἔστιν ἑλέσθαι
ῥηιδίως· λείη μὲν ὁδός, μάλα δ᾽ ἐγγύθι ναίει·
τῆς δ᾽ Ἀρετῆς ἱδρῶτα θεοὶ προπάροιθεν ἔθηκαν
ἀθάνατοι· μακρὸς δὲ καὶ ὄρθιος οἶμος ἐς αὐτὴν
καὶ τρηχὺς τὸ πρῶτον· ἐπὴν δ᾽ εἰς ἄκρον ἵκηται,
ῥηιδίη δὴ ἔπειτα πέλει, χαλεπή περ ἐοῦσα.

It is easy to seize Kakotes (Wretchedness) even in droves; the road is smooth, and she dwells very near. But the immortal gods have set sweat before Arete (Success/Virtue); the path to her is long and steep, and rugged at first. But when one reaches the peak, then the path is easy, difficult though it was.

Simonides' evocation of this passage is secured by a number of verbal and thematic parallels: in Simonides' fragment, Arete dwells (ναίειν, fr. 579.2 ~ ναίει, *Op.* 288 of Κακότης) among rocks which are 'difficult to ascend' (δυσαμβάτοις᾽, fr. 579.2), just as the Hesiodic path to Arete is 'long, steep and rough' (μακρὸς δὲ καὶ ὄρθιος . . . | καὶ τρηχύς, *Op.* 290–1); and both passages focus on reaching the pinnacle (ἵκῃ τ᾽ἐς ἄκρον, fr. 579.7 ~ εἰς ἄκρον ἵκηται, *Op.* 291), an endeavour which requires much sweat (ἱδρώς, fr. 579.5 ~ ἱδρῶτα,

---

[246] On the fragment's possible context (an encomiastic poem?): Rawles (2018) 64–8.
[247] For discussions of this notorious crux, see e.g. Giangrande (1971) 114–18; Poltera (1997) 557–61; Rawles (2018) 50–6.

Op. 289).[248] Although Simonides attributes this image to a mere, indefinite **λόγος**, there is thus a clear connection to the *Works and Days* passage, a connection which is further reinforced by the personification of Arete: as Richard Hunter notes, personification is a typically Hesiodic trope, through which Simonides 'leaves little doubt stylistically as to which poet he is following'.[249] Behind its vague and riddling anonymity, the opening phrase **ἐστί τις λόγος** points not only to a familiar commonplace, but also to a specific literary predecessor.[250]

This anonymity also conceals Simonides' selective adaptation of his source. As scholars have highlighted, Simonides updates and rebrands Hesiod's original image, eliding all mention of Κακότης and injecting Ἀρετή with a more moral aspect. Whereas in Hesiod the noun stood largely for agricultural success and material prosperity, Simonides restricts it to those who exhibit manly virtue (ἀνδρεία), internalising the toil and struggle required to achieve it (cf. ἔνδοθεν, v. 6).[251] As Daniel Babut remarks, Simonides has 'profoundly modified the structure and significance' of Hesiod's parable, rebranding it into a moral object lesson.[252] Simonides' opening appeal to hearsay thus not only points to a precise literary predecessor, but also appropriates Hesiod's authority to legitimise his new moral outlook. Simonides presents a pointedly appropriative intertextuality, sign-posted through the indexical introduction: **ἐστί τις λόγος**.

In a host of lyric poets, therefore, indexical hearsay functioned as a way of marking allusion to other texts and traditions, appropriating their authority and signalling the poet's command of their sources. The phenomenon is very similar to what we saw in epic, but here we are often on far stronger ground when arguing for the precise citation

---

[248] Cf. Poltera (2008) 445; Koning (2010) 147 n. 87; Hunter (2014) 142–3; Rawles (2018) 56–8.

[249] Hunter (2014) 143.

[250] In contrast to the verbal indices that we have encountered previously (φασί, λέγοντι, etc.), the noun λόγος may imply a greater level of specificity in its reference, but the indefinite τις pointedly avoids precision: cf. Alcaeus fr. 42.1 (ὡς **λόγος**: see above, 'Early Indices'); contrast Stesichorus, fr. 91a.1 (οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος **λόγος οὗτος**: §IV.3.2), where the deictic οὗτος is more direct.

[251] Babut (1975) 59–61; Canevaro (2015) 9.

[252] Babut (1975) 61: 'il en modifie profondément la structure et la signification', comparing his treatment of a saying of Pittacus: fr. 542.

148

of earlier texts. As Scodel once claimed for Pindar, 'What "they say" here may be what earlier canonical poetry said.'[253] But, as we have seen, this is not solely a Pindaric phenomenon. If we had more texts surviving from antiquity, it is plausible that we could identify further precise references in many of the other cases we have explored. As things stand, however, we are simply no longer in a position to track their precise contours.

II.*3.2* *Suppression and Contestation*

In other lyric cases, we find more agonistic and polemical invocations of alternative details of myth, a phenomenon we have already seen in epic with Homer's allusion to Achilles' immortality (§II.2.4). In lyric poetry, too, we find instances where poets employ the language of hearsay to highlight their suppression of further details of a myth or their engagement with a particularly contestable point of tradition.

Suppressed Alternatives: Theognis on Atalanta

In Theognis' elegy on Atalanta, the footnoting **φασίν** invites an audience to situate a specific telling of a myth within its wider mythological context (Thgn. 1283–94):

ὦ παῖ, μή μ' ἀδίκει· ἔτι σοι κα<τα>θύμιος εἶναι
   βούλομαι, εὐφροσύνῃ τοῦτο συνεὶς ἀγαθῇ.
οὐ γάρ τοί με δόλῳ παρελεύσεαι οὐδ' ἀπατήσεις·
   νικήσας γὰρ ἔχεις τὸ πλέον ἐξοπίσω,
ἀλλά σ' ἐγὼ τρώσω φεύγοντά με, **ὥς ποτέ φασιν**
   Ἰασίου κούρην παρθένον Ἰασίην
ὡραίην περ ἐοῦσαν ἀναινομένην γάμον ἀνδρῶν
   φεύγειν. ζωσαμένη δ' ἔργ' ἀτέλεστα τέλει,
πατρὸς νοσφισθεῖσα δόμων ξανθὴ Ἀταλάντη·
   ᾤχετο δ' ὑψηλὰς ἐς κορυφὰς ὀρέων
φεύγουσ' ἱμερόεντα γάμον, χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης
   δῶρα· τέλος δ' ἔγνω καὶ μάλ' ἀναινομένη.

Boy, don't wrong me. I still want to be dear to your heart, understanding this with good cheer. You won't pass by me with a trick, nor will you cheat me. For though you have been victorious and have an advantage in the future, yet I will wound you as you flee from me, **as once**, **they say**, the daughter of Iasius, the Iasian

---

[253] Scodel (2001) 124.

maiden, refused marriage with men and fled, though she was in her prime. Blonde Atalanta girded herself and accomplished fruitless deeds, after leaving her father's home. She went off to the lofty peaks of the mountains, fleeing lovely marriage, the gift of golden Aphrodite. But in the end she came to know it, despite her staunch refusal.

In these verses, the spurned speaker uses the exemplum of Atalanta to show that his addressee cannot run from him forever: just as Atalanta fled from marriage (γάμον . . . | φεύγειν, 1289–90; φεύγουσ᾿ . . . γάμον, 1293), but eventually and unwillingly succumbed to its τέλος (1294), so too will the addressee, despite spurning love now (φεύγοντα, 1287), eventually feel the 'wound' of love (the speaker's τέλος).[254] Scholars have recently suggested that the introductory phrase **ὥς ποτέ φασιν** is 'a reference to poetic tradition'.[255] But more than that, I contend, it also encourages an audience to look beyond the bare details of Theognis' account to what the poet has left untold.

Kirk Ormand has noted that the opening verses of the poem, directed to the addressee, are larded with imagery evocative of racing and competition: the boy will not pass the speaker by (παρελεύσεαι, 1285 – a verb commonly used in agonistic contexts), the boy has been victorious (νικήσας, 1286) and the speaker will 'wound' his fleeing beloved (1287, evoking a scene of hunting or battle).[256] Given such preparatory clues, Theognis leads his audience to expect that the ensuing Atalanta exemplum will narrate the maiden's footrace against her suitors, known from the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* and several other later sources.[257]

---

[254] Some suspect the unity of this poem and see the remnants of a sloppy join in 1288's 'extraordinary tautology' (West (1974) 166–7; cf. Vetta (1975), (1980) 80–2), but Renehan (1983) 24–7 has convincingly refuted this view (cf. Carey (1984); Koniaris (1984) 104–6; Ferrari (1989) 316–20). To further support 1288, we could note the common apposition of παρθένος and κόρη in Greek poetry (Bacchyl. 16.20–1; Eur. *Tro.* 553–4, *Hel.* 168; Ar. *Thesm.* 1138–9; Antiphanes fr. 55.9 K–A; Autocrates fr. 1.2 K–A; Callim. fr. 782 Pf., etc.), itself part of a widespread Greek tendency to juxtapose *genus* and *species* (e.g. βοῦς . . . ταῦρος, *Il.* 2.480–1: Dodds (1960) 206; Renehan (1980) 348, (1985) 148). Those still unsatisfied may find inspiration for emendation in other full-verse descriptions of Atalanta: Callim. *hArt.* 216; ps.-Aristot. *Pepl.* 44.

[255] Ziogas (2013) 178. Roman poets indexed the myth similarly: *ferunt* (Catull. 2b.1); *forsitan* **audieris** (Ov. *Met.* 10.560). For the indexical significance of **ποτέ**: §IV.

[256] Ormand (2013) 141–2.

[257] There is some confusion about the presence of two Atalantas in the mythological tradition: one Boeotian, the daughter of Schoeneus and future wife of Hippomenes, involved in the footrace; the other Arcadian, the daughter of Iasius and future wife of Melanion, abandoned by her father and later a hunter: Gantz (1993) 335–9; Barringer

But this expectation is frustrated. Instead of the race, we are simply told that Atalanta retreated into the lonely mountains (1292).

This omission is particularly striking since in some versions of the tale (most probably including the *Catalogue*), Atalanta was said to have raced after her suitors fully armed, imitating a hunt, and to have killed them if she overtook them.[258] Such a narrative of violence would more appropriately parallel the speaker's desire to 'wound' his fleeing beloved here (σ' ἐγὼ τρώσω φεύγοντά με, 1287). Theognis' avoidance of this version is thus particularly surprising, all the more so since his ensuing narrative shares a number of phrases with the *Catalogue*'s treatment of the episode, especially fr. 73.4–5 and fr. 76.6:[259]

> πρὸς ἀνθρώπων ἀ]παναίνετο φῦλον ὁμιλ[εῖν
> ἀνδρῶν ἐλπομένη φεύγ]ειν γάμον ἀλφηστάων[.

She <u>refused</u> to keep company with the tribe [of humans, hoping to <u>flee</u>] marriage [with men] who eat bread.

> ἵετ' ἀναινομένη δῶρα [χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης]

She raced on, <u>refusing the gifts [of golden Aphrodite]</u>.

Just as in Theognis, so too in the *Catalogue*, Atalanta flees from marriage and the gifts of Aphrodite (~ <u>ἀναινομένην γάμον ἀνδρῶν</u> | <u>φεύγειν</u>, Thgn. 1289–90; <u>φεύγουσ' ἱμερόεντα γάμον</u>, <u>χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης</u> | <u>δῶρα</u>, Thgn. 1293–4).[260] Admittedly, these parallels rely partly on reconstructions of the *Catalogue* which may be inspired by Theognis' verses. But these reconstructions are very plausible in their own right,[261] and even without any supplementation the

(1996) 48–9; Fratantuono (2008) 346–52; Σ Eur. *Phoen.* 150; Σ Theoc. *Id.* 3.40–42d. I follow Ormand (2013) 139 in seeing these doublets as deriving from an originally single mythical figure, sharing 'the significant attributes of aversion to marriage and swiftness of foot' and reflecting the same basic trope of a woman paradoxically inhabiting a liminal, male, ephebic state (cf. Detienne (1979) 30–2; Ormand (2014) 121–2).

258 Ormand (2014) 132–3. Cf. Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.9.2; Hyg. *Fab.* 185.

259 Cf. West (1974) 166; Ziogas (2013) 177–8.

260 Cf. too fr. 76.10 δῶρα θε[ᾶς χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης].

261 ἀνδρῶν is highly likely in fr. 73.5, since the adjective ἀλφηστής is always paired with ἀνήρ elsewhere in archaic epic (a combination also found in Attic tragedy: Aesch. *Sept.* 770, Soph. *Phil.* 708); the noun φῦλον is very frequently paired with a genitive plural

fragments still exhibit a clear emphasis on marriage and its refusal. Indeed, φεύγειν γάμον appears to have been a formula particularly associated with Atalanta's *fabula*. Besides its use in a misogynistic *gnome* by Hesiod (*Theog*. 603), it appears nowhere else in extant archaic literature, while Aristophanes' later use of the phrase for Atalanta's lover Melanion offers a playfully comic distortion of the same myth, as he – rather than Atalanta – runs in flight (*Lys*. 781–96).[262]

In Theognis' elegy, it is thus attractive to see the poet drawing on key vocabulary attached to the *fabula* of Atalanta's race, or even the *Catalogue*'s specific instantiation of it, reapplying this traditional phrasing to a different context: the mountains rather than the racetrack. Theognis elides the expected tale of the footrace, while still evoking it through the opening language of violent competition and several verbal echoes of its traditional *fabula*.[263] The effect is to maintain a more direct analogy between Atalanta and the recalcitrant παῖς as passive fleers of love. But the lingering echoes of the *Catalogue* tradition also align the speaker with the pursuing and violent Atalanta of the race story, destabilising any neat mapping. There may even be some irony in the sympotic speaker's failure to control the full meaning of his exemplum.

The introductory **ὥς ποτέ φασιν** thus invites an audience to integrate this particular version of the tale within their wider knowledge of the myth, to appreciate the poet's subtle appropriation and refashioning of a conflicted tradition. The phrase is not simply a mark of authority, but also a cue for the poet's audience to incorporate their broader knowledge of the myth and to consider the significance of what 'others say' about Atalanta, including – at least from our perspective – the poet of the Hesiodic *Catalogue*.

---

noun, e.g. θεῶν, γυναικῶν and esp. ἀνθρώπων (e.g. *Il.* 14.361; *Od.* 15.409; Hes. *Theog.* 556, *Op.* 90; *HhDem.* 352); and 'the gifts of (golden) Aphrodite' are a common epicism (*Il.* 3.54, 3.64; Hes. fr. 195.54 = *Scut.* 47; *HhDem.* 102).

[262] Note Aristophanes' indexical opening: **μῦθον** . . . ὅν **ποτ' ἤκουσ'** ('the **tale** which **I once heard**', *Lys.* 781). For Aristophanes' Melanion: Hawkins (2001) 143–7. Σ *Lys.* 785a notes the motif transference: μήποτε παρὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν εἴρηκεν. οὐ γὰρ Μειλανίων ἔφευγε μᾶλλον, ἀλλ' ἡ Ἀταλάντη.

[263] For similar nods to alternative versions of the Atalanta myth by later authors, see Heslin (2018) 59–72 on Callim. *hArt.* 215–24 and Prop. 1.1.

Is That So? Bacchylides on Heracles' Tears

An even more knowing gesture to contestable tradition comes in Bacchylides' fifth epinician, a poem whose embedded myth of Heracles' katabatic encounter with Meleager is introduced – as we have already noted – with a footnoting **λέγουϲιν** (Bacchyl. 5.57: §II.3.1). Over 100 lines later, however, the narrative closes with a further index, framing Bacchylides' whole account in an allusive ring composition and placing additional weight on the poet's final claim (Bacchyl. 5.155–8):

> **φαϲὶν** ἀδειϲιβόαν
>   Ἀμφιτρύωνοϲ παῖδα μοῦνον δὴ τότε
> τέγξαι βλέφαρον, ταλαπενθέοϲ
> πότμον οἰκτίροντα φωτόϲ·

> **They say** that the son of Amphitryon, undaunted by the battle-cry, wetted his eyelids then and only then, pitying the fate of a man who has endured sorrow.

Such an indexical frame may mark the general traditionality of this episode: after all, Heracles' katabatic encounter with Meleager was also narrated by Pindar (fr. 70b, 249a, fr. dub. 346c). But in addition, Bacchylides' **φαϲίν** encourages an audience to recall other aspects of the myth beyond those directly relayed here. In claiming that Heracles shed tears in his life 'then and only then' (μοῦνον δὴ τότε, 5.156), the poet appears to be protesting a little too much, and his indexical appeal to hearsay invites his audience to recall another later occasion on which Heracles was also said to cry: his death by the poisoned robe he had received from his wife Deianeira.[264]

In Sophocles' later tragic account of that myth, the hero's tears are a prominent motif: Heracles seeks pity for his pitiable self (οἴκτιρόν τέ με | πολλοῖϲιν οἰκτρόν, *Trach.* 1070–1; contrast his pitying of Meleager in Bacchylides: οἰκτίροντα, 5.158) and claims that he has never cried before (καὶ τόδ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ἂν εἷϲ ποτε | τόνδ᾽ ἄνδρα φαίη πρόϲθ᾽ ἰδεῖν δεδρακότα, | ἀλλ᾽ ἀϲτένακτοϲ αἰὲν εἰχόμην κακοῖϲ, *Trach.* 1072–4). Sophocles' treatment post-dates Bacchylides'

---

[264] On the myth: March (1987) 49–77; Gantz (1993) 431–4, 457–60; Romero-González (2021). Deianeira was an established part of tradition from at least the seventh century (Archil. frr. 286–8: cf. §III.3.1).

Ode,[265] so it cannot be a specific intertext for his epinician, but it is plausible that similar sentiments would have been expressed already in one of the many earlier treatments of the Heracles myth, especially given the hero's broader tearless reputation in antiquity.[266] After all, in Bacchylides' own dithyrambic treatment of the hero's demise, Fate is said to 'weave a shrewd, <u>tear-filled</u> plan' for Deianeira, a phrase that suggestively alludes to the tears that result from her jealous attempts to regain Heracles' love (ἄμαχος δαίμων | Δαϊανείρᾳ <u>πολύδακρυν</u> ὕφανε | μῆτιν ἐπίφρον', Bacchyl. 16.23–5). And already in the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, the narrative of Heracles' death (fr. 25.20–5) closes with the hero going down to the '<u>much-lamenting</u> house of Hades' (Ἀΐδ[αο <u>πολύστονον</u> ἵκε]το δῶμα, fr. 25.25), a phrase which – if we accept Merkelbach's plausible supplement – may not only evoke the generic doom and despair of the Underworld, but also the specific tears and lamentation of Heracles' end, a contrast to his previously ἀστένακτος existence.[267]

It is likely, therefore, that Heracles would have traditionally broken his tearless reputation only at the very end of his life, rather than in one chance encounter with a deceased hero in the middle of his labours. By importing the motif into Heracles' *katabasis* (an adventure that itself imitates the end of life), Bacchylides is thus self-consciously innovating, introducing an ominous allusion to the hero's future fate by means of 'motif transference'.[268] For a knowing audience, Bacchylides' claim that this was the only occasion on which Heracles cried would be transparently untraditional and open to question. The claim is supposed to be challenged, and **φασίν** marks it as such: 'who else has said this?' we are invited to ask. The answer? 'Nobody.' Just as in Agenor's Iliadic

---

[265] The dating of *Trachiniae* is uncertain, but it almost certainly post-dates Aeschylus' *Oresteia* (458 BCE: Easterling (1982) 19–23). In any case, Sophocles' first production was only in 468 BCE, considerably after the date of Bacchylides' *Ode* 5 (476 BCE: Cairns (2010) 75–6). The story is different for Bacchylides' later *Ode* 16, which seems indebted to Sophocles' tragedy: Hoey (1979) 214–15; Riemer (2000); Foster (2019) 217–21; Hadjimichael (2021).

[266] E.g. Soph. *Trach.* 1199–1201; Theoc. *Id.* 24.31 (αἰὲν ἄδακρυν, 'always unweeping').

[267] Merkelbach's supplement is extremely plausible: cf. Soph. *OT* 29–30 for Hades' association with lamentation. πολύστονος is not used of the 'house of Hades' elsewhere, but other attested adjectives do not fit the remaining space: εὐρυπυλές (*Il.* 23.74; *Od.* 11.571), μέλαν (Thgn. 1014), μέγα (Thgn. 1124).

[268] Motif transference: §1.2.1–2; Burgess (2006). Currie (2016) 129 also suspects Bacchylidean invention.

evocation of Achilles' mortality, the indexical **φασίν** highlights a point of tradition at the point where it is most contestable.[269]

An audience member who makes such a connection with Heracles' future death, moreover, would find great irony in the fact that this Underworld encounter with Meleager is also the very moment that precipitates Heracles' future tears. It is in this meeting that the Theban hero first hears of his future wife Deianeira, Meleager's sister (Δαϊάνειραν, 5.173). The closing reference to Deianeira as 'still without experience of golden Cypris, that enchantress of men' (νῆϊν ἔτι χρυσέας | Κύπριδος θελξιμβρότου, 5.174–5) is especially pointed, since Deianeira will kill Heracles precisely when she resorts to magic and θέλξις in an attempt to regain his love, the domain of Cyprian Aphrodite.[270] Bacchylides' **φασίν** is thus extremely loaded, inviting his audience to challenge his assertion and recall another occasion on which Heracles was traditionally thought to have cried. Indeed, Heracles' Underworld tears proleptically foreshadow those which are still to come.[271] Ultimately, Heracles' fate is not very dissimilar to Meleager's own, and Heracles is not far from the truth when he suspects that he will be killed by Meleager's murderer (5.89–91). Their killers are not the same, but still very similar: close female relatives, δαΐφρων Althaea (5.137) and Deianeira (Δαϊάνειραν, 'man-destroyer', 5.173).[272] Both heroes thus prove to be archetypal embodiments of the maxim which introduced Bacchylides' extended narrative: 'no man is fortunate in all things' (οὐ | γά⌊ρ τις⌋ ἐπιχθονίων | π⌊άντ⌋α γ' εὐδαίμων ἔφυ, 5.53–5). Far from simply highlighting the traditionality of Bacchylides' account,

---

[269] Later authors continue to adapt the 'first tears' motif: cf. Maehler (2004) 125. Notably, Euripides playfully inverts Sophoclean temporality in *Hercules furens*: the hero weeps after slaughtering his children (*HF* 1353–6), 'earlier' in literary time, but 'later' from the perspective of literary history: Suter (2009) 67.

[270] Thus Campbell (1982a) 432, comparing the θελκτήρια of Aphrodite's girdle (*Il.* 14.215). Cf. Lefkowitz (1969) 86–7; Cairns (2010) 243–4; Willigers (2017) 116–17. Some also see a further positive allusion to Heracles' subsequent apotheosis: Goldhill (1983) 78 n. 31; Stenger (2004) 154–7.

[271] Burnett (1985) 146; Currie (2016) 129.

[272] For the acoustic jingle, see Lefkowitz (1969) 86; cf. too δαΐφρων of Artemis (Bacchyl. 5.122), another destructive female in the poem. All three are also presented as daughters: Artemis: κούρα, 104; θυγάτηρ, 124; Althaea: κούρα, 137; Deianeira: θυγάτρων, 167. The epithet δαΐφρων may also evoke the firebrand of the Meleager myth: Cairns (2010) 89.

155

this concluding index encourages an audience to situate this spe-
cific version within their wider knowledge of the myth, emphasis-
ing the contestability of tradition and looking forward to Heracles'
traditional tears that are still to come.

As in Theognis, Bacchylides' use of indexical hearsay thus
has an agonistic edge. The index encourages an audience to set
rival and competing alternatives against each other. Theognis
relocates Atalanta's asceticism from the racecourse to the moun-
tains, and Bacchylides invites his audience to challenge the
assertion that Heracles cried only in his meeting with
Meleager, rather than at the traditional moment of his death.
As in epic, so too in lyric: indexical appeals to hearsay fre-
quently emphasise the flexibility and fierce contestability of
the mythical tradition.

II.*3.3 The Poetics of Supplementation*

These last examples, those of Theognis and Bacchylides, also
exhibit an aspect of indexical hearsay that is considerably wide-
spread in lyric – indices which invite an audience to supplement
the immediate narrative at hand with their larger knowledge of
tradition. Just as Bacchylides invites audiences to recall
Heracles' future demise at the hands of Deianeira, so too do
other lyric poets frequently prompt an audience to supplement
their sparse telling of a myth with further details. Such an invita-
tion to 'fill in the gaps' was less common in epic. It presumably
stems from lyric poetry's briefer and more self-contained treat-
ment of myth, with very few extensive narrations. Within lyric
poets' selective treatments of a story, indexical appeals to hear-
say evoke other untold details that complicate, ironise and enrich
the present telling.

A familiar case of such signposted supplementation is
Sappho fr. 44, an epicising fragment on the wedding of Hector
and Andromache. When the Trojan herald Idaeus predicts future
κλέος ἄφθιτον ('undying **fame**') as a result of the marriage (fr.
44.4), the audience are invited to supplement Sappho's selective
treatment of the myth with their wider knowledge of the
couple's famous but unhappy future: Hector's death,

156

Andromache's enslavement and their son's brutal murder.[273] Even at this joyous moment of marriage, Sappho's invocation of the pair's 'undying fame' invites her audience to incorporate their awareness of the larger Trojan war tradition or even the *Iliad* specifically, looking forward to the end of their marriage, just as Homer, at Hector's death, looks back to its very start (*Il.* 22.466–72).[274] In this case, the spur to supplement is particularly strong given the emphatically epic resonance of the phrase **κλέος** ἄφθιτον (cf. *Il.* 9.413, Hes. fr. 70.5). But other appeals to hearsay can also encourage audiences to draw on their broader knowledge of tradition.

Ibycus and Cassandra's Fame

A less well-known invitation to 'fill in the gaps' occurs in a short fragment of Ibycus, whose context is now lost (fr. 303a):

> γλαυκώπιδα Κασσάνδραν
> ἐρασιπλόκαμον Πριάμοιο κόραν
> **φᾶμις ἔχηισι βροτῶν**.

> **The talk of mortals** keeps hold of grey-eyed Cassandra, Priam's daughter with lovely locks.

Cassandra is here presented as a traditional figure of myth, within the grip of *fama* itself, as indeed she was. She appears in a number of archaic epic poems, where her beauty is similarly highlighted (cf. ἐρασιπλόκαμον, v. 2): in the *Iliad*, she is the most beautiful of Priam's daughters (13.365–6) and directly likened to Aphrodite (24.699). Yet besides her epic appearances, she also features in Alcaeus, Bacchylides and Pindar, as well as

---

[273] Similarly, Spelman (2017) 753. The phrase also acknowledges Sappho's role in preserving this κλέος (Budelmann (2018a) 141) and may look back to the Iliadic Hector's hope for future κλέος (*Il.* 7.86–91: Xian (2019)). Cf. **ὔμνην** in the final verse (fr. 44.34), a self-reflexive nod to the songs produced about the couple. Other lyric instances of κλέος similarly index tradition: Stesichorus' *Sack of Troy* (**κλέος**, fr. 100.14; **[ἀ]νθρώπους κλέο[ς]**, fr. 117.9; [Τ]ροΐας **κλεεννό[ν]**, fr. 117.6); Simon. fr. *eleg.* 11.13–15 (ἀοίδιμον, **κλέος**; cf. ἀγλαόφη[με], fr. *eleg.* 10.5); Ibyc. S151 (see immediately below).

[274] Kakridis (1966); Rissman (1983) 119–48; Meyerhoff (1984) 118–39; Schrenk (1994); Pallantza (2005) 79–88. Even if one is wary of accepting specific allusions to the *Iliad* here (e.g. Kelly (2015a) 28–9), the traditional *fabula* of the couple's impending fate will still hover in the background.

frequently in archaic art.[275] In Ibycus' own Polycrates Ode, she appears again as the subject of song (**[ὑμ]νῆν** Κασσάνδραν, S151.12) in a poem that similarly emphasises her physical attractiveness ('slender-ankled', τανί[σφ]υρ[ον], S151.11), as well as the traditionality of the Trojan war myth: 'the **much-sung** strife' ([δῆ]ριν **πολύυμνον**, S151.6) around the '**most renowned**' city of Troy (**περικλεές**, S151.2). The short Ibycan fragment in question here, however, lacks a clear context. It is unlikely to be a complete poem, given the subjunctive ἔχησι, but we do not know what came before or after it. Even so, the extant verses exhibit a strong epic flavour, akin to Sappho fr. 44 with their epic-style compound adjectives and -οιο genitive ending. As in Sappho's fragment, we are thus encouraged to think of this φᾶμις as taking a specifically epic form.

But more than this, given the traditional resonance of the fragment's epithets, the indexical **φᾶμις** may also point to a specific moment in Cassandra's mythical biography. The adjective γλαυκῶπις is a notably unusual choice for Cassandra: besides its appearance here, it is only ever used of Athena in archaic epic and lyric. Indeed, it is a stock epithet of the goddess, used over ninety times of her in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* alone.[276] Given its traditional association, Ibycus' innovative redeployment of the epithet for Cassandra suggests a close association between the goddess and the Trojan princess.[277] As Claire Wilkinson has suggested, the resulting link may parallel the beauty of both figures, but it also evokes the story of Cassandra's rape by Locrian Ajax, an episode in which Athena played a central role. Not only did the rape take place in her temple at Troy, violating the goddess' cult statue, but Athena was also the one to punish Ajax with death at sea and the rest of the

---

[275] Epic: *Il*. 13.365–6, 24.699–706; *Od*. 11.421–3; *Cypr*. arg. 1d *GEF*. Lyric: Alc. fr. 298; Bacchyl. 23; Pind. *Pyth*. 11.33, *Pae*. 8a. Art: *LIMC* s.v. 'Aias II'.

[276] *Iliad* (36×), *Odyssey* (57×), *Homeric Hymns* (7×), Hesiod (12×); cf. Tyrtaeus fr. 2.16; Stesichorus fr. 18.3; Peisander fr. 7.1 *GEF*; Pind. *Ol*. 7.51, *Nem*. 7.96, 10.7, fr. 70d.38–9. Empedocles applies the epithet to the moon (D132.3 L–M), followed by Euripides (fr. 1009 *TrGF*) and Nonnus (*Dion*. 5.70).

[277] Cf. *Thebaid* fr. 11 *GEF*, where Adrastus' horse Arion is called κυανοχαίτης, a traditional epithet of Poseidon: Paus. 8.25.7–8 reports that the verse was understood to hint (αἰνίσσεσθαι) at Arion's descent from Poseidon.

158

Greeks with a stormy *nostos*.[278] Through the unusual adjective, Ibycus gestures to this specific aspect of Cassandra's mythical *fabula*, supported by the indexical force of φᾶμις.

This allusion is reinforced further by the other adjective used to describe Cassandra in these verses, ἐρασιπλόκαμος ('lovely-locked'). This is a very rare epithet, used elsewhere in extant Greek literature before late antiquity only twice of other mythical rape victims: of Tyro, who was raped by Poseidon (Τυροῦς ἐρασιπλοκάμου γενεά, *Pyth*. 4.136; cf. παῖ Ποσειδᾶνος, 4.138), and of the Muse Calliope, who gave birth to Orpheus after being raped by Oeagrus or Apollo (Μούσας ἐρασιπ[λοκάμου], Bacchyl. 29d.9).[279] It thus appears to have been an epithet especially used to describe victims of male sexual violence. Its use here would further encourage the recall of Cassandra as Ajax's victim, just as γλαυκῶπις evokes Cassandra as a favourite of Athena.[280] Given these hints, it would be unsurprising if these Ibycan verses were originally followed by a narrative account of the rape, similar to that we find in Alcaeus fr. 298; the allusive hints in Ibycus' language would then set the course for the ensuing narrative. But even if the original poem contained nothing more than a passing reference to Cassandra, its vocabulary, alongside the indexical **φᾶμις**, still points to a specific moment in the heroine's *fabula*. Ibycus' allusive index invites an audience to look beyond (and through) his immediate words to harness the larger, unexpressed tradition that lies beyond them.

Sappho and the Tithonus Myth

As a final example, we may turn to a particularly rich instance of such signposted supplementation: the recently reconstituted Sapphic poem on Tithonus and old age. In this poem, the poet's persona laments her ageing physique before ending with a

---

[278] Cf. Wilkinson (2013) 277. Cf. *Il. Pers.* arg. 3 *GEF*; Alc. fr. 298. Art: Gantz (1993) 655.
[279] Tyro: §II.2.4. Calliope: Prop. 2.30.35–6; Fedeli (2005) 865–6. On this epithet, see Braswell (1977).
[280] For the allusive potential of Ibycus' epithets elsewhere, cf. Barron (1969) 133–4; Steiner (2005).

mythical exemplum that proves mortals' inability to escape senile decrepitude (Sapph. fr. 58c.8–12):[281]

ἀγήραον, ἄνθρωπον ἔοντ᾽, οὐ δύνατον γένεσθαι.
καὶ γάρ **π[ο]τα** Τίθωνον **ἔφαντο** βροδόπαχυν Αὔων,
ἔρῳ δεδάθεισαν, βάμεν᾽ εἰς ἔσχατα γᾶς φέροισα[ν,
ἔοντα [κ]άλον καὶ νέον, ἀλλ᾽ αὖτον ὔμως ἔμαρψε
χρόνῳ πόλιον γῆρας, ἔχ[ο]ντ᾽ ἀθανάταν ἄκοιτιν.

It is not possible for a human to become ageless. Yes, for **they used to say** that **once** rose-armed Dawn, schooled by love, went to the ends of the earth carrying away Tithonus since he was young and beautiful; but even still, grey old age eventually grasped hold of him, even though he had an immortal wife.

Tithonus, the mortal husband of Dawn, is introduced to prove that even those intimately connected with the gods cannot escape old age: γῆρας still seized him, just as it did frail Laertes in the *Odyssey* (κατὰ γῆρας ἔμαρψεν, *Od.* 24.390, cf. fr. 58c.11–12). At the outset, this tale is indexically marked as the subject of hearsay and a familiar part of tradition (**ἔφαντο**, fr. 58c.9). Indeed, Tithonus was a well-known mythical character from Homer onwards. In both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, he is already the spouse of Dawn, lying in her bed as she rises to inaugurate the day (*Il.* 11.1–2, *Od.* 5.1–2), while in Hesiod, he and Dawn are named as the parents of Memnon and Emathion (*Theog.* 984–5). He may also, moreover, have made an appearance in the *Aethiopis* and its associated traditions, in which his son Memnon also receives immortality thanks to the intervention of Dawn (*Aeth.* arg. 2e *GEF*).[282] However, it is only a little later that we first encounter clear evidence for the tradition of his flawed immortality, as evoked here by Sappho: he was granted exemption from death, but he could not stop the process of ageing and gradually withered away. In addition to Sappho fr. 58c, this tradition of

---

[281] The text was first published by Gronewald and Daniel (2004a), (2004b) and has since received a flurry of scholarly attention, although the papyrus' provenance is as insecure as that of *P. Sapph. Obbink*: Nash (2020); Mazza (forthcoming). On the poem, see esp. West (2005a); Greene and Skinner (2009); Budelmann (2018a) 146–52. Here, I follow the text of Janko (2017), especially for v. 10 δεδάθεισαν; on this textual crux, cf. Benelli (2017) II 288–93; Budelmann (2018a) 151–2; Neri (2021) 672.

[282] Brown (2011) 24 with n. 17. In their immortality, father and son form a narrative doublet, a common feature of early Greek epic: cf. Fenik (1974) 131–232; Kelly (2007b); Sammons (2013), (2017) 101–25.

160

Tithonus' unavoidable ageing appears in the work of Sappho's contemporary Mimnermus (fr. 4), as well as more extensively in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, when Aphrodite introduces Tithonus' plight as an exemplum for Anchises of the dangers of divine–mortal relations (*HhAphr.* 218–38).[283] Sappho's ἔφαντο thus points to a well-established tradition of Tithonus as Dawn's spouse and a figure of perpetual ageing.[284] Indeed, it may even point to our *Homeric Hymn* as a privileged intertext.[285]

Besides invoking a specific tradition or text, however, Sappho's ἔφαντο also prompts her audience to recollect an aspect of the myth about which others have previously 'talked', but which she leaves unmentioned here: Tithonus' subsequent transformation into a cicada. The Trojan prince wasted away to such an extent that he eventually became a tiny insect that feeds only on dew, left with nothing more than his own beautiful voice – an *aetion* to explain the fact that cicadas start chirping around dawn. The earliest explicit mention of this metamorphosis comes from Hellanicus of Lesbos in the fifth century – notably, a compatriot of Sappho, perhaps suggesting a particularly Lesbian or Aeolic interest in this myth (fr. 140 *EGM*).[286] Yet earlier texts already hint at this tradition, especially the *Homeric Hymn*. As Johannes Kakridis has argued, the description of Tithonus' ceaselessly flowing voice matches the constant chirping of the cicada (φωνὴ ῥέει ἄσπετος, *HhAphr.* 237), and he is locked away in his chamber like a cicada in a basket (*HhAphr.* 236).[287] More significantly, Richard Janko notes that the description of 'shedding old age' (ξῦσαί τ' ἄπο γῆρας, *HhAphr.* 224) evokes the tradition of cicadas shedding their skin, playing on the polyvalent potential of γῆρας to

---

[283] Mimnermus: Janko (1990). Tithonus also appears in Tyrtaeus as an example of great beauty (fr. 12.5); there is no direct mention of his aged wasting, but if an audience recalled it, it would add a poignant note, acknowledging the transitory nature of this beauty: cf. Shey (1976) 9; §III.3.2.

[284] Cf. Hardie (2005) 28; Rawles (2006) 3. For other nuances: Janko (2017) 275–6.

[285] Rawles (2006) 1–4; de Jong (2010) 156–60. Note ἐπὶ πείρασι γαίης (*HhAphr.* 227) ~ εἰς ἔσχατα γᾶς (fr. 58c.10); ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήρως (*HhAphr.* 214) ~ ἀγήραον (fr. 58c.8), ἀθανάταν (fr. 58c.12). Faulkner (2008) 270 lists further verbal parallels but suspects a 'common model'. Sapph. fr. 44 may also show awareness of the *Hymn*: Janko (1982) 169–70; Faulkner (2008) 45–7.

[286] Cf. Janko (2017) 285–6.

[287] Kakridis (1930a); cf. West (2003a) 177. Faulkner (2008) 276 and Carrara (2011) 103–9 remain sceptical.

161

mean both 'old age' and 'exuvia',[288] while Richard Rawles has suggested that the rare noun κῖκυς ('strength', *HhAphr.* 237) puns on the 'kik' sound of the insect (a sound also reflected in the insect's Latin name, *cicada*, and in Greek vocabulary: κίκους· ὁ νέος τέττιξ, '*kikous*: the young cicada', Hsch. κ 2662).[289]

Despite no explicit mention, therefore, the hymnic poet leaves a number of traces that hint at the cicada metamorphosis, suggesting that this feature of the myth may have also been in the background of Sappho's fragment.[290] Indeed, the metamorphic myth could even be traced back to the *Iliad*, with its famous comparison of Trojan elders to cicadas (*Il.* 3.149–53). Just like their relative Tithonus, these aged men are worn down by old age (γήραϊ, 150), and though no longer fit for battle, they remain good speakers (ἀγορηταὶ | ἐσθλοί, 150–1).[291] The simile encapsulates the core elements of Tithonus' transformation: the physical decay of the body, but the enduring power of the voice. It is thus certainly possible that this metamorphosis already formed an established part of the literary tradition with which Sappho worked. And indeed, Helen King has argued that another Sapphic fragment may even allude to the myth directly.[292] We could thus interpret **ἔφαντο** here as another act of signposted supplementation, prompting audiences to consider the larger tradition of the story with which they are familiar. As Rawles notes, such a reference would certainly resonate against the poem's larger concerns, adding a note of consolation to the dreary inevitability of old age. The insect's enduring voice parallels the poetess' immortal song: although Sappho's body cannot conquer death, her poetry certainly can.[293]

Sappho's **ἔφαντο**, like her **κλέος** in fr. 44, thus gestures to larger Trojan traditions: Tithonus' marriage to the immortal Dawn, his inescapable ageing and his eventual transformation into a cicada. In our discussion so far, however, I have avoided commenting on

---

[288] Janko (2017) 288; cf. Brown (2014). [289] Rawles (2006) 6.

[290] Cf. Pataki (2015). The overall muting of the metamorphosis fits Aphrodite's rhetorical strategy in the *Hymn*: King (1986) 27–30.

[291] Cf. Σ D *Il.* 3.151; Janko (2017) 286.

[292] King (1986) 27 n. 22: χρόα γῆρας ἤδη, Sapph. fr. 21.6 (cf. fr. 58c.3).

[293] Rawles (2006) 6–7; cf. Janko (2017) 288–9.

162

one feature of Sappho's 'footnote' that has caused a great deal of scholarly consternation: its unusual past tense. Instead of the usual φασί, we have the imperfect ἔφαντο, a form elsewhere found predominantly in epic.[294] There have been many attempts to explain the apparent anomaly,[295] but one particularly intriguing suggestion is that of Luca Bettarini, who has argued that the verb's tense establishes a contrast between two different versions of the Tithonus myth, one old and outdated, the other new and current.[296] According to his argument, Sappho's predecessors 'used to say' that Tithonus became immortal *and* ageless, remaining both young and beautiful ([κ]άλον καὶ νέον, v. 11), with no negative complications. Such a tradition, he argues, is reflected in Homeric dawn periphrases (*Il.* 11.1–2, *Od.* 5.1–2), where Eos is pictured rising from the side of Tithonus, a detail that others too have taken to imply that – in Homer at least – 'he was immortal and ageless like her'.[297] In Sappho's day, by contrast, following Bettarini's argument, Tithonus is said to be immortal *but* still ageing: in this newer and still current version, even he could not escape the onset of γῆρας. For Bettarini, Sappho's ἔφαντο thus points to a former tradition that is no longer active, contrasting it with the more recent and complicated instantiation of the myth with which she is concerned. If true, Sappho's index here would not only point to other texts and traditions but also exhibit an intense literary historical awareness, reflecting on the diachronic development of a specific myth.

Some support for this reading may be found in Pindar, who elsewhere similarly distinguishes different versions of a single myth. Christopher Brown compares Pindar's first *Olympian*, where the envious gossip of Pelops' neighbour (also expressed with the imperfect: ἔννεπε, *Ol.* 1.47) is set against Pindar's more

---

[294] *Il.* 6.501, 12.106, 12.125, 17.379; *Od.* 1.194, 4.638, 13.211; *Hh.* 7.11.

[295] Edmunds (2006) 24 sees a contrast between what Sappho used to hear and think about old age, and what she understands now; Lardinois (2009) 47 sees a hint that the story dates back to a time before Sappho's addressees were born.

[296] Bettarini (2007) 1–5. Cf. Brown (2011) 22: 'the imperfect seems to suggest something that is no longer true, although once asserted', although he goes on to see this contrast in the mythical world of the story, rather than as a fact of literary history.

[297] Janko (2017) 280; cf. Meyerhoff (1984) 190; Bettarini (2007) 2–4; Brown (2011) 24; Carrara (2011) 92–3.

163

'recent' version of the myth (*Ol.* 1.35–52: §IV.3.3).[298] An even closer parallel, however, can be found in Pindar's first *Nemean*, where the poet claims that he is rousing up an '**old tale**' (**ἀρχαῖον** ὀτρύνων **λόγον**, *Nem.* 1.34). This appears to contrast his traditional account of Heracles' infancy (possibly derived from Peisander's epic *Heraclea*)[299] with a more recent version, perhaps Pherecydes' near-contemporary rationalisation of the myth (in which Amphitryon, not Hera, sent the snakes: frr. 69a–b *EGM*).[300] If Pindar could draw such a distinction between different versions of the same myth, we may indeed wonder whether Sappho could do the same a century earlier.[301]

However, I am sceptical whether **ἔφαντο** alone can mark the differentiation that Bettarini requires of it. At first, his argument appears to be supported by the syntax of these verses: only the claim that Eos 'went' to the ends of the earth with Tithonus is strictly part of the indirect speech introduced by **ἔφαντο**, whereas the onset of old age is described by the poet herself with the indicative ἔμαρψε. The hearsay is thus strictly restricted to Tithonus' alleged immortality. However, such a transition from *oratio obliqua* to direct speech can be paralleled elsewhere without implying any significant shift in the truth value of the content: for example, Simonides' Arete fragment (fr. 579: §II.3.1) moves from an accusative and infinitive construction (τὰν Ἀρετὰν ναίειν, v.2; ἀμφέπειν, v. 3) to the nominative ἔσοπτος (v. 5, with ἔστί understood) without any clear change in meaning.[302] Stronger support for Bettarini's case may still

---

[298] Brown (2011) 25. For such change in tradition over time, cf. too Hes. fr. 296 on the island of Euboea: the gods previously called it Abantis (πρὶν . . . κίκλησκον), but Zeus changed its name to Euboea.

[299] Peisander: Braswell (1992) 57.

[300] For the different versions: Rosenmeyer (1969) 243; Braswell (1992) 54–5. Contrast Loscalzo (1988) 72. Cf. Eur. *IA* 78, where **παλαιούς** similarly appears to restate tradition against Thucydides' recent rationalisation of the Tyndarid oath (Willink (1971) 347–8). Such polemic fits the authors' chronology: Pherecydes' *Historiai* have been dated between 508/7 and 476/5 BCE (Jacoby (1947) 33), although a date in the early 470s seems most plausible (Huxley (1973) 140–1). *Nemean* 1 is dated after the foundation of Aetna in 476/5 BCE; Braswell (1992) 25–7 suggests 469 BCE.

[301] For a later parallel, cf. e.g. *Batrach.* 8 (ὡς **λόγος** ἐν **θνητοῖσιν** ἔην), which seems to contrast the past popularity of the Gigantomachy myth with the present *Batrachomyomachia*: Hosty (2020) 128.

[302] Cf. Rawles (2018) 51–6.

164

perhaps be found in the verb ἔφαντο, which often appears else-where in epic contexts 'of false hopes or promises',[303] a trad-itional reference that would resonate effectively here: they said (or 'thought') that Tithonus was immortal, free from the usual handicaps of mortality, but this was ultimately not true. However, in spite of these supporting arguments, we should question Bettarini's neat notion of a continuous development from one version of the Tithonus myth to another, an evolutionary model which fails to account for the potential of an ongoing interchange and dialogue between different versions in different contexts. We have, after all, already seen potential hints of Tithonus' cicada transformation in the *Iliad*, while even the Homeric dawn peri-phrases do not explicitly contradict the version of Tithonus' continuous ageing. Elsewhere in the *Iliad*, Tithonus is named as a son of Laomedon, a brother of Priam and cousin of Anchises (*Il.* 20.237). Even if he had not achieved eternal youth, therefore, he would still have been within the usual life cycle of a human being during the events of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.[304] There is, in short, no reason for seeing the Homeric formula as evidence for an earlier, more primitive version of the myth in which Tithonus enjoyed an unblemished immortality.

The anomaly of the past tense has also been considerably overplayed; it is not in fact without parallel. Besides the archaic and classical examples cited by other scholars,[305] it is particularly worth comparing Aratus' Hellenistic account of Orion's rape of Artemis and the huntsman's subsequent death from a scorpion sting (*Phaen.* 634–46). Just as in Sappho, this tale is attributed to the talk of the poet's predecessors with the imperfect ἔφαντο (προτέρων λόγος, οἵ μιν ἔφαντο, *Phaen.* 637), and it also transitions from an infinitive to a simple

---

[303] Graziosi and Haubold (2010) 225.

[304] Carrara (2011) 93 notes that in the *Hymn*, Aphrodite claims that Dawn stayed away from Tithonus' bed as soon as his first grey hairs appeared (*HhAphr.* 228–30), but this may be rhetorical exaggeration to suit her immediate argument.

[305] E.g. Edmunds (2006) 24 n.10: ἐπευθόμεθα (*Il.* 9.524); μῦθον . . . ὅν ποτ' ἤκουσ' . . . ἔτι παῖς ὤν (Ar. *Lys.* 781–2); de Jong (2010) 159–60: Ἑλλήνων μέν τινες . . . ἔλεξαν (Hdt. 2.20.1 ~ Thales of Miletus); Willigers (2017) 122: ὡς φάσαν (*Il.* 4.374). Cf. Westlake (1977) 349 on Thucydides: 'there does not, however, seem to be much significance in his choice of tense, and it is seldom clear why he prefers the present to the past or vice versa'.

indicative during the course of its narration (ἑλκῆσαι, *Phaen.* 638; ἡ δὲ ... ἐπετείλατο, *Phaen.* 641). Yet it ends with a present **φασί** in a kind of ring composition (*Phaen.* 645), marking the complementarity of past and present speech. Both φασί and ἔφαντο can thus be used to gesture to other traditions, even within a single passage. Despite its attractions, therefore, we cannot maintain the distinction which Bettarini draws between the two versions of the Tithonus myth, or the significance he places on Sappho's imperfect. Rather, I contend, **ἔφαντο** functions like any other index of hearsay, whether in the present or a past tense, alerting an audience member to other tellings of this myth and inviting them to supplement it with their wider knowledge. Indeed, if anything, the rare epic imperfect adds to the Homeric flavour of these lines, reinforcing the potential connection with the hexametric *Homeric Hymn*. As in Ibycus, Bacchylides and Theognis, Sappho's appeal to hearsay indexes her engagement with wider traditions and texts surrounding Tithonus, inviting her audience to supplement unmentioned details of the myth.

II.3.4 *Lyric Innovation: Faux Footnoting?*

So far, we have encountered numerous cases where lyric poets' appeals to hearsay footnote and signal interactions with other texts and traditions. But it is worth asking whether such indexical appeals to hearsay are always so 'straight', or whether they may sometimes conceal a degree of literary innovation. We have already seen the disguised Aphrodite bend the truth of tradition to fit her immediate context in her eponymous *Homeric Hymn*. And when we turn to lyric poetry, we can identify a number of similar cases where tradition is invoked precisely at points where it is creatively refashioned. Naturally, such an examination is severely hampered by our limited evidence for earlier traditions and literature, and it is often impossible to determine whether some specific element in a narrative is an innovation or a traditional element. Yet despite this degree of uncertainty, we can still explore at least a few possible cases of indexed innovation, especially in the work of Pindar.

166

Pindar's Flexible Mythology

On a number of occasions, Pindar alters the literary tradition to heighten the parallelism between a myth and his contemporary present, or to incorporate a primarily local myth into the Panhellenic traditional canon. In such cases, he often appeals to hearsay to embellish his account with the veneer of traditional authority. In *Pythian* 1, for example, the Theban poet introduces Philoctetes as a parallel for the Sicilian tyrant Hieron, recalling the Greek hero's physical infirmity, rescue from Lemnos and key role in the sack of Troy (*Pyth.* 1.50–5). The introductory **φαντί** (*Pyth.* 1.52) marks the general traditionality of this myth, nodding to the hero's gruesome snake wound and Helenus' prophecy that Troy could not be taken without Philoctetes and Heracles' bow, familiar from the Epic Cycle and elsewhere.[306] But it also authorises a patently untraditional element: in other versions of the myth, Philoctetes was cured of his wounds before he entered battle.[307] In Pindar, by contrast, he continues to 'walk with a weak body' (ἀσθενεῖ . . . χρωτὶ βαίνων, *Pyth.* 1.55), a detail that renders him a closer parallel for the poet's sickly patron.[308] Through the indexical **φαντί**, Pindar invokes tradition to legitimise this revamped version of the myth.[309]

However, Pindar does not only rewrite tradition to enhance his victors' glory. At other points, he adapts the mythical past to reflect the contemporary political realities of a victor's hometown. In *Olympian* 6, for example, Evadna, the mother of Iamus and the Iamid line, is introduced not as the true biological daughter of Aepytus, the king of Arcadia (as was traditional), but rather as his

---

[306] Snake wound: *Il.* 2.721–5 (esp. ἕλκεϊ μοχθίζοντα, *Il.* 2.723 ~ ἕλκεϊ τειρόμενον, *Pyth.* 1.52); cf. *Cypr.* arg. 9b *GEF*; Quint. Smyrn. 9.461 (cf. Quintus' own indexing: **φασίν**, 9.385; **ἀνθρώποισι καὶ ὕστερον ἐσσομένοισι**, 9.391). Prophecy: *Il. Parv.* arg. 2b *GEF*; Σ Pind. *Pyth.* 1.100 (with a likely reference to Bacchyl. 23: Maehler (1997) 271); cf. **μοιρίδιον** ἦν, *Pyth.* 1.55.

[307] *Il. Parv.* arg. 2c *GEF*; cf. Quint. Smyrn. 9.459–79.

[308] Cf. Gentili et al. (1995) 347. Hieron's sickness: *Pyth.* 3, esp. 63–76.

[309] Cf. Spelman (2018c) 189. Cf. too *Nem.* 9.39–40: the indexed assertion that Hector fought by the river Scamander (**λέγεται, κλέος**) is not paralleled by extant literature (von Leutsch (1859) 68 suggests a reference to Hector's slaying of Protesilaus, but this is located at the seashore, not the river: *Cypr.* arg. 10a, fr. 22 *GEF*). However, this detail enhances the parallel with Pindar's *laudandus* Chromius, who is praised for fighting successfully by the Sicilian river Helorus (*Nem.* 9.40–2): Braswell (1998) 121–3.

167

foster daughter. Instead, her true parents are said (**λέγεται**, *Ol.* 6.29) to have been Poseidon and Pitana, the homonymous heroine of a Spartan city. This genealogy appears to reflect the contemporary politics of Pindar's own day, in which the most famous Iamid prophet, Teisamenus of Elis, had been granted Spartan citizenship.[310] By incorporating the Spartan Pitana into Iamus' genealogy, Pindar integrates his contemporary reality into the mythical past. And by appealing to hearsay at this moment, he legitimises this addition with a veneer of traditional authority. In the words of Pavlou, he 'manages to present the recent insertion into the Iamid genealogy as already traditional and socially authoritative'.[311]

Pindar also appeals to the authority of hearsay when imbuing local, epichoric traditions with a Panhellenic pedigree, as in the mythical *aetion* of Rhodes in *Olympian* 7. The poet introduces the emergence of the island from the sea as the 'ancient talk of men' (*Ol.* 7.54–7):

> **φαντὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων παλαιαί**
> **ῥήσιες**, οὔπω, ὅτε χθόνα δατέοντο Ζεύς τε καὶ ἀθάνατοι,
> φανερὰν ἐν πελάγει Ῥόδον ἔμμεν ποντίῳ,
> ἁλμυροῖς δ' ἐν βένθεσιν νᾶσον κεκρύφθαι.

> **Ancient tales of men say** that when Zeus and the immortals were dividing the earth, Rhodes was not yet visible in the vast sea, but the island lay hidden in its salty depths.

The narrative continues with Helios, the sun god, failing to gain a share of land because of his absence during the lot-taking; but he sees Rhodes below the sea and requests it as his future domain when it rises (*Ol.* 7.58–71). Here, once more, the language of hearsay and antiquity combine to index a mythical reference, alongside the specification of a community of **ἄνθρωποι**.[312] However, as the Pindaric scholia note, this tradition of Rhodes' submergence is not attested in literary sources before

---

[310] Hdt. 9.33–5; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1886) 162–85; Huxley (1975) 28–30.
[311] Pavlou (2012) 108. Cf. *Ol.* 9.49 (**λέγοντι**), authorising Pindar's adaptation of the history of Opous to foreshadow Epharmostus' victories, perhaps alongside an echo of the Hesiodic *Catalogue*: D'Alessio (2005b) 220–6; Pavlou (2008) 554–60.
[312] Cf. §II.2.4 n. 127 above.

168

Pindar (Σ *Ol.* 7.101). Rather, the scholia suggest that the poet is drawing on ancient local traditions, a plausible suggestion (Σ *Ol.* 7.100a, 101). As Barbara Kowalzig has demonstrated, 'the presence' of Helios 'and the importance of his legends on Rhodes at an early time . . . are undeniable'.[313] Yet the divine division of lots also has a significant literary heritage of its own, going back at least to Poseidon's account of the three-way division of the world in the *Iliad* (15.187–93). Kowalzig has highlighted Pindar's numerous verbal connections with the Homeric passage[314] but also notes that the Pindaric scene exhibits a significant discrepancy with its epic forebear: in Homer, the earth remained common to all (γαῖα δ' ἔτι ξυνὴ πάντων, *Il.* 15.193), while in Pindar it is precisely the earth that is divided up (ὅτε χθόνα δατέοντο, 55; χώρας ἀκλάρωτον, 59).[315] Pindar thus appropriates and adapts the authority of the literary tradition to bolster local myth. The introduction of the story with a gesture to ancient hearsay does not so much paper over Pindar's innovations as much as it endows a local and little-known story with the prestige of canonicity.

The Tyrant Slayers: Inventing Tradition

In lyric poetry, we thus do not find out-and-out mythological inventions disguised as traditional tales, but rather slight adaptations of pre-existing myths to reflect and enhance contemporary circumstances. In such cases, appeals to tradition bestow an element of canonicity on contemporary and epichoric traditions, inscribing them into the wider storehouse of communal song.[316] This perfectly fits the more general practice of epinician, which often juxtaposes local figures and traditions with the major Panhellenic myths of the Greek world. But it is worth stressing that this is not solely a Pindaric or even epinician phenomenon. We can identify a comparable instance of authorised 'innovation' in an

---

[313] Kowalzig (2007) 243–4.
[314] Kowalzig (2007) 243: 'the division (δέδασται 189—δατέοντο 55) of earth is performed by mixing (παλλομένων 191—ἄμπαλον 61) and drawing lots (ἔλαχον/ἔλαχε/ἔλαχ' 190/1/2—ἔνδειξεν λάχος 58)'.
[315] Kowalzig (2007) 243 n. 58; cf. Gentili et al. (2013) 492.
[316] Cf. Pavlou (2012) 108–9.

169

Attic *skolion* on the immortality of the Athenian tyrant slayer Harmodius (*Carm. Conv.* 894 *PMG*):

φίλταθ' Ἀρμόδι', οὔ τί που τέθνηκας,
νήσοις δ' ἐν μακάρων σέ **φασιν** εἶναι,
ἵνα περ ποδώκης Ἀχιλεὺς
Τυδεΐδην τέ **φασιν** Διομήδεα.

Dearest Harmodius, you are surely not dead: **they say** that you are alive in the Isles of the Blessed, where swift-footed Achilles is and, **they say**, Tydeus' son Diomedes.

This text, as transmitted, contains two indexical appeals to tradition within the space of four lines. The second, if retained,[317] is the more straightforward and evokes wider traditions surrounding Achilles' and Diomedes' immortalisation, here expressed through traditionally epic language.[318] Achilles, in particular, was associated with a range of afterlife locations after his death: besides the Odyssean Underworld (*Od.* 11.471–540), he was also situated on the White Isle (*Aeth.* arg. 4b *GEF*; Pind. *Nem.* 4.49–50), the Elysian fields (Ibyc. fr. 291; Simon. fr. 558) and – as here – the isles of the Blessed (Pind. *Ol.* 2.70–80; Pl. *Symp.* 179e–180b). Diomedes, meanwhile, was immortalised by Athena, at least according to Pindar (*Nem.* 10.7) and apparently also Ibycus (fr. 294 = Σ Pind. *Nem.* 10.12). The second **φασί** thus marks the traditionality of these heroes' afterlives, while also perhaps acknowledging the competing alternatives for Achilles' final resting place.[319]

The first **φασίν**, however, is more arresting, since it attributes the same immortal status to a historical individual, the Athenian tyrant slayer Harmodius. This youth famously lost his life alongside his adult lover Aristogeiton in their attempt to kill the

---

[317] The transmitted final verse is unmetrical: Τυδεΐδην τέ φασι τὸν ἐσθλὸν Διομήδεα. I print Lowth's popular emendation. Other options include excising φασί or Διομήδεα: see Fabbro (1995) 32, 151–2. Even if this second φασί is excised, this has no bearing on the first φασίν, which is the key to my argument here.

[318] Cf. ποδώκης . . . Ἀχιλλεύς (*Il.* 18.234); Τυδεΐδην Διομήδεα (*Il.* 6.235, 10.150). If we retain φασί, we could also consider putting Achilles in the accusative, so that he is explicitly part of the indirect speech (ποδώκε' Ἀχιλέα Ilgen; ποδώκη τ' Ἀχιλέα Edmonds).

[319] Barker and Christensen (2020) 42 further suggest that Achilles and Ajax are introduced here as mythical analogues for the tyrant slayers, since they are 'heroes who are recognized for standing up to authority'.

170

Athenian tyrant Hippias and his brother Hipparchus in 514 BCE. In the grim light of history, their behaviour does not seem equal to that of Homer's greatest heroes: it was an act of revenge, motivated by a personal slight, and only partially successful. The pair managed to kill Hipparchus but not Hippias, who responded to their plot with a harsher and more repressive rule. Despite these realities, however, Harmodius and Aristogeiton became lauded as 'tyrant slayers' in the popular imagination and were refashioned as the poster boys of Athenian democracy, celebrated with statues, song and hero cult.[320] This *skolion*, alongside others on the same theme (893, 895–6 *PMG*), forms part of the larger ideological development of the Harmodius myth, setting the hero on a par with the greatest warriors from the Trojan war. After all, we have already seen in other *skolia* how one of the heroes mentioned here, Achilles, was singled out as the greatest warrior who went to Troy (898–9 *PMG*: §II.3.1). In this context, the poet's initial **φασίν** is extremely loaded, drawing on the authority of tradition to authorise this local Athenian legend.

As in Pindar, this innovation is achieved through a creative reworking of tradition. Already in Hesiod's *Works and Days*, the Isles of the Blessed were the home of the prosperous heroes (καὶ τοὶ μὲν ναίουσιν … | ἐν μακάρων νήσοισι … | ὄλβιοι ἥρωες, Hes. *Op.* 170–2). But the *skolion* appropriates this long-standing epic tradition of heroic immortality for a specifically Athenian purpose, aligning a local hero with the Panhellenic greats.[321] In so doing, it may also evoke Achilles as a prime model for Harmodius' pederastic relationship with Aristogeiton. Elsewhere in Attic literature, Achilles and Patroclus are mentioned as ancient analogues for the tyrant slayers (Aeschin. *In Tim.* 132–3, 140–2; Pl. *Symp.* 179e–180b, 182c),[322] and in Plato's *Symposium* Phaedrus claims that it is precisely Achilles' love for his friend which guaranteed his immortalisation on the Isles of the Blessed (179e–180b).

---

[320] Hdt. 5.55–6, 6.123; Thuc. 6.54.1–59.1; Arist. *Resp. Ath.* 18.3–6; Taylor (1981); Lavelle (1993) 50–8; Monoson (2000) 21–50; Azoulay (2014); Budelmann (2018a) 265–7.

[321] Similarly, the bronze statues of the tyrannicides by Critius and Nesiotes exploited gigantomachic iconography to align Harmodius with Apollo: Carpenter (2021). On the Harmodius *skolia*'s general appropriation of the epic tradition: Taylor (1981) 66–9.

[322] Cf. Fantuzzi (2012) 225.

Achilles here is thus an exemplar not only of heroic immortality, but also of someone who has achieved it through pederastic devotion. As in Pindar, a local tradition is incorporated into the annals of song and bolstered by the authority of the mythical past. The indexical φασίν both authorises and cements the traditionality of the Harmodius myth.[323]

Appeals to hearsay in lyric, therefore, not only signpost allusions to pre-existing traditions and texts, but also mark and authorise the creative reworking of tradition, building on the epic example we have already seen in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*. These are not so much cases of pure invention and fabrication, as occasions on which poets rework and revise traditional material. Our limited access to the whole range of lyric poetry inhibits a fuller perspective on such practice, but even from these glimpses, we see that lyric poets exploited the indexical potential of hearsay not only to mark and supplement their allusions to pre-existing texts and traditions, but also to authorise their innovative departures from the trodden path.

II.4 Conclusions

The 'Alexandrian footnote' has a long history before Alexandria. The various examples treated above demonstrate that this indexing of allusion was not a novelty of the Hellenistic age – it already has considerable archaic precedent.

As we have seen, archaic epic and lyric poets employ this device to signal their mastery and control over the many strands of song. They variously invoke and challenge the authority of prior traditions and texts, but this phenomenon also involves a number of more specific nuances: Homer sometimes appeals to hearsay when foregrounding a major mythical model that continues to underlie his whole poem, while lyric poets frequently invoke tradition at moments of narrative ellipsis, inviting audiences to fill in the blanks of what a poet has left unsaid – a process of signposted supplementation which reflects the lyric genre's predilection for

---

[323] Cf. another *skolion* in which both tyrant slayers are promised everlasting κλέος in similarly epic language (αἰεὶ σφῷν **κλέος** ἔσσεται κατ' αἶαν, 896.1 *PMG*).

172

brief exempla over extensive narrative. Over time, we can also identify an increasing number of indexed innovations, instances where tradition is creatively reworked, but legitimised through appeal to hearsay.

It is worth noting that at least some ancient readers seem to have been attuned to the indexical demands of this poetic language. In many examples where we have accompanying scholia or ancient commentary, these ancient scholars cite a source or parallel for the passage in question, or comment on the significance of **φασί** as an attribution to another source.[324] Of course, this inevitably tells us more about the maximally intertextual reading practices of the post-classical age, which cannot necessarily be mapped back directly onto archaic audiences (cf. §I.1.3). Yet even so, these later receptions suggest that Hellenistic and later poets recognised the archaic and classical precedent for their footnoting strategies. In continuing this practice, they were following tradition, not radically innovating on it.

Within the archaic period alone, however, it is also possible to trace some broader developments in the use of this device. In Homeric epic, the 'pre-Alexandrian footnote' does largely seem to do what it says on the tin, appealing to the traditions of 'what people say' at large, rather than to specific texts. The strongest cases for direct reference can be made for the Hesiodic echoes in *Iliad* 2 and Telemachus' reporting of Nestor's age in *Odyssey* 3, but even here we have noted reasons for preferring engagement with broader traditions. As we progress to later epic and lyric examples, however, it seems that the likelihood of a direct textual reference becomes greater. In part, this may simply reflect our own improved access to a wider range of possible sources as we move to study increasingly later texts, but it also suggests a gradual shift in ancient poets' understanding of the literary tradition: from an amorphous mass of tales to a canon of individual, identifiable texts. This transition also seems to be reflected in the expanding

---

[324] Cf. Σ D *Il*. 17.674–5 (§I.1.3); Σ EHMᵃT *Od*. 3.245a *Ariston.* (§II.2.3); Eust. 347.8–9 ad *Il*. 2.783 (§II.2.1); Σ Hes. *Theog*. 304 (§II.2.1); Σ Pind. *Ol*. 2.51d (§II.3.1); Σ Pind. *Pyth*. 6.22 (§II.3.1). The same tendency is also apparent in responses to the device in tragedy: e.g. Σ Soph. *Trach*. 1a; Σ *Phil*. 94; Σ Eur. *Rhes*. 185; Eusebius *Praep. Ev*. 10.3.19 (on Theodectes, fr. 1a *TrGF*: see Nelson (forthcoming) b).

173

range of linguistic manifestations of this device. The initial concentration on verbal forms (such as φασί, πυνθάνομαι and λέγω) gradually expands to incorporate concrete nouns like λόγος, a word which in itself hints at a greater specificity of reference. In addition, these changes may also result from variation by genre. We have already noted lyric poets' ready use of other poets' names, in comparison to the silence of Homeric epic (§1.2.3), and it seems likely that the more flexible narrator of lyric poetry would have been more amenable to direct and explicit indexical references.

Despite these changes, however, it is striking that the rhetoric of the device remains permanently attached to the anonymous and the general, even when it becomes directed to individual texts. Even as literacy and writing began to play an increasingly important role in the preservation and commemoration of literature and as poets began to name their contemporaries and predecessors directly, they still regularly employed the vague anonymity of hearsay to signpost their allusions.[325] In part, this could reflect the conservatism of the Greek poetic tradition: literal appeals to tradition in archaic poetry were adopted into later poets' repertoire as a stylised rhetorical device, even as the source of their allusive gestures changed – from traditions to texts. But this alone cannot be the whole story. I suspect the anonymity of the device also encouraged its continuing use. On the one hand, it allowed poets to bolster their claims through the abstract authority of the poetic and mythical past, deriving legitimacy from a monolithic and uncontestable 'tradition'. Yet on the other, it proved a way for them to distinguish themselves and their own individual treatments from this larger tradition, subsuming other past and contemporary poets into a vague and faceless mass of transmitted words. Most importantly, however, the device was also a means of fostering a special and direct connection with (especially elite)

---

[325] This phenomenon continues into fifth-century prose and drama. Drama: e.g. Soph. *Phil*. 335 (ὡς λέγουσιν ~ *Il*. 21.278; *Aeth*. arg. 3a *GEF*; Aesch. fr. 350.8–9 *TrGF*); Nelson (forthcoming) b). Thucydides: Westlake (1977); Gray (2011). Herodotus: Fehling (1989); Török (2014) 54–117. Philosophers: e.g. Pl. *Phd*. 69c8–d1 (φασίν ~ Orph. 576 *PEG*; Cristóbal (2009) 47–50). Cf. too Schenkeveld (1992) on the prose uses of ἀκούω to mean 'I read'.

174

members of an audience, flattering them as part of an in-crowd who were already familiar with other texts and traditions, with all that people say and tell.

In whatever way we ultimately account for the device's enduring appeal, however, one thing should be clear: there was nothing distinctively Alexandrian or scholarly about indexical appeals to hearsay. This was a key intertextual tool from the very start of the Greek poetic tradition.

POETIC MEMORY

III.1 Introduction

In this chapter, our focus is the indexical potential of memory, occasions where the reminiscences of narrators or characters in the fictional world coincide with those of a poet's audience. In later Hellenistic and Roman poetry, this frequently involves an alignment between characters' autobiographical memories and the external audience's knowledge of the literary tradition, as when Ovid's Ariadne recalls her Catullan past (*Fast*. 3.471–6) or Mars quotes his Ennian self (*Met*. 14.812–15).[1] But it can also extend beyond the purely autobiographical to embrace the recollection of more distant literary passages beyond an individual character's fictional life: in Apollonius' *Argonautica*, Medea's recollection of the pleasures of life simultaneously recalls Asclepiades' epigrammatic description of them (μνήσατο μὲν τερπνῶν ὅσ᾽ ἐνὶ ζωοῖσι, Ap. Rhod. 3.813 ~ ἐν ζωοῖσι τὰ τερπνά, 2.3 *HE* = *AP* 5.85.3). Her memory does not index an earlier literary treatment of her own life, but rather an unrelated text on a similar theme.[2]

To this indexical potential of memory, we can also add another sphere of personal cognition: knowledge. Just as characters recall events from the literary tradition, so too do they often 'know' or 'recognise' things that would strike an audience as familiar from the literary past. In Lucan's *De Bello Civili*, a frenzied matron prophetically '**recognises**' the disfigured trunk of Pompey at the very same time that an audience recognises the echo of Priam's own Pompey-like 'nameless corpse'

---

[1] See §1.1.2. Cf. Ov. *Fast*. 3.553 (*memor*) ~ *Aen*. 4.36 (R. F. Thomas (1992) 46 n. 34); Sen. *Med*. 48 (*memoravi*) ~ Ov. *Her*. 12 (Trinacty (2014) 100).

[2] Sens (2003) 305–6. Cf. e.g. Callim. *Hecale* fr. 42.4 (μέμνημαι) ~ *Il*. 14.180 (Faber (2017) 83–4), *Od*. 19.225–35 (Hunter (2018) 179 n. 106); Ov. *Her*. 18.55 (*meminisse voluptas*) ~ Prop. 1.10.3.

from the *Aeneid* (**agnosco**, 1.685–6 ~ *Aen.* 2.557–8).[3] And in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Ulysses' complaint that Ajax does not '**know**' the relief work of Achilles' shield (*neque . . . **novit**, Met.* 13.291) immediately precedes his near-quotation of the Homeric shield ecphrasis – there is no doubt where Ulysses and Ovid 'know' these details from (*Met.* 13.292–4 ~ *Il.* 18.483–9).[4]

In comparison to the indexical hearsay of the last chapter, these allusive gestures are dependent not on the external and circulating news of others, but rather on the first-hand, embedded experiences of literary characters. Yet they function in a similar manner, prompting an audience to recall and recognise their own 'memories' of the literary tradition. In the sections that follow, I will explore how these allusive tropes are already manifest in our earliest Greek poetry.

Before turning to archaic poetry, however, it is worth acknowledging that later Greek writers often employ the language of memory and knowledge when quoting other works, a practice which demonstrates their strong indexical potential, at least by the classical period. In a fragment of Philippides, a poet of New Comedy, a quotation of Euripides' *Stheneboea* is preceded by the instruction to '**remember** Euripides' (Εὐριπίδου **μνήσθητι**, fr. 18.2 K–A), while in Aristophanes' *Frogs*, Dionysus explicitly claims that he is '**recollecting**' an iambic verse of Hipponax (ἴαμβον Ἱππώνακτος **ἀνεμιμνησκόμην**, *Ran.* 661).[5] The same phenomenon is also visible in prose works: in Plato's *Meno*, Socrates precedes his quotation of Theognis by asking his interlocutor whether he '**knows**' what the poet says (**οἶσθ'**, *Meno* 95c9–e2), while elsewhere memories are invoked at points of intratextual back reference, inviting audiences to recall earlier material from the same text (**ἀναμνήσθητι, ἀναμνήσω**, *Symp.* 201a2–3 ~ 197b3–9;

[3] Hinds (1998) 8–10.

[4] Hopkinson (2000) 142–5. Cf. too *Met.* 9.508 (***novi***) ~ *Od.* 10.7, Eur. *Aeolus*; *Met.* 15.365 (***cognita***) ~ Virg. *G.* 4.538–47 (Solodow (1988) 228); *Am.* 2.11.7 (***notum***) ~ *Aen.* 4.648 (Diggle (1983)); and Fantuzzi (2004) 217–18 on ***novi*/γιγνώσκω** marking engagement with the bucolic Cyclops.

[5] Dionysus' memory may be humorously faulty: Σ *Ran.* 661 ascribes the quoted verse to Ananius (fr. 1 *IEG*), not Hipponax: Rotstein (2010) 201–4. Cf. *Thesm.* 275–6 where the 'In-law' similarly presents a comically distorted quotation of *Hipp.* 612 as an act of memory (**μέμνησο**).

ἀναμιμνῃσκόμενος, Lysias 1.17 ~ 1.14).[6] Most significant of all, however, is the famous fragment of Antiphanes' *Poiesis* (fr. 189 K–A), which thematises the activation of memory and knowledge in a literary context. The speaker claims that the '**stories**' of tragedy are so '**familiar**' to the audience (οἱ **λόγοι** | ὑπὸ τῶν θεατῶν εἰσιν **ἐγνωρισμένοι**, 2–3), that a poet need only '**remind**' them of each tale (ὥσθ' **ὑπομνῆσαι** μόνον | δεῖ τὸν ποιητήν, 4–5), and that as soon as someone says 'Oedipus', 'they **know** all the rest' (τὰ δ' ἄλλα πάντ' **ἴσασιν**, 6). By the classical period, the discourse of recollection and knowledge was intimately integrated into the practice of literary citation and referencing. In the sections that follow, I will argue that we can trace this discourse even further back in time to the poetry of the archaic period.

III.2 Epic Recall

Memory is central to early Greek poetics, both as a prerequisite for its production and as a primary function of its performance.[7] Oral poets' ability to recall, embellish and creatively retell their inherited tradition is heavily reliant on their own powers of memory,[8] while a key goal of the epic genre itself is to preserve the memory of the heroic exploits of a bygone era, acting as a community's storehouse for past deeds which articulate shared values and ethics.[9] In a primarily oral society, where such a past could not easily be recorded, preserved and consulted through writing, epic song was a major vehicle for the transmission of a society's (ever-changing) heritage, values and identity: a vehicle for the transmission and preservation of cultural memory.

The centrality of memory to early Greek epic is readily apparent from our extant texts, especially in the prominent position they

---

[6] This tendency continued with the scholars of Athenaeus and the ancient scholia, who frequently introduce texts, cross references and mythical figures with the language of memory: e.g. Σ Ar. *Eq.* 762a(1) (**μέμνηται**); Σ Ap. Rhod. 1.996–7 (**μέμνηται**); Ath. *Deipn.* 1.5b (**μέμνηται**), 7.309e (**μνημονεύει**). Cf. too the device of 'fictive memory' in Latin prose: e.g. Lockyer (1971).

[7] Memory in early Greek poetry and thought: Detienne (1967) 9–27 = (1996) 39–52; Vernant (1969) 49–94 = (1983) 73–123; Simondon (1982); Bouvier (1997), (2002); Bakker (2002), (2008); Clay (2011a) 109–19; Castagnoli and Ceccarelli (2019).

[8] Notopoulos (1938) 465–73; Calame (2011) 356; Minchin (2017).

[9] Havelock (1963) esp. 61–84, 186–7, (1982) 122–49; Bouvier (2002) 173–4.

178

attribute to the Muses as inspirers of epic song, the daughters of
'Memory' (Mnemosyne) herself. In the famous invocation at the start
of the Catalogue of Ships in *Iliad* 2, the narrator admits that he could
not name all those who came to Troy unless the Muses were to
'recall' them for him (μνησαίαθ', *Il*. 2.492), while Hesiod's
Theogony begins with a miniature Hymn to the Muses which
includes a prominent description of their birth from Mnemosyne
(*Theog*. 53–62), as well as an emphasis on their powers of knowledge
(ἴδμεν . . . ἴδμεν, *Theog*. 27–8).[10] Crucially, the Muses are a distinctive
feature of Greek poetry, with no parallel in Near Eastern traditions,
where literary creation and preservation were instead associated with
writing.[11] Their prominence from Homer onwards highlights the
core and unique role of memory in early Greek poetics.

This emphasis on recollection is further reflected in epic's
concern to preserve κλέα ἀνδρῶν, as well as epic characters' own
interest in their future renown and immortality (§II.2). Heroes
aspire to be remembered for all posterity, especially by means of
a prominent tomb[12] or by the report of others (*Od*. 8.241–5). And
even poets themselves wish to be 'remembered', like the narrator
of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (μνήσασθ', *HhAp*. 167). Yet it is
especially in the wider corpus of the *Homeric Hymns* that mem-
ory's close connection with song emerges.[13] At the start and end of
many *Hymns*, the narrator foregrounds his powers of recollection
(μνήσομαι),[14] while elsewhere in the *Hymn to Apollo*, the Delian
maidens are said to 'recall' the men and women of old by singing
(μνησάμεναι ἀνδρῶν τε παλαιῶν ἠδὲ γυναικῶν, *HhAp*. 160; cf.
μνησάμενοι, 150); song is figured as an act of both recollection

---

[10] Cf. too *HhHerm*. 429–30, where the new-born god's theogonic song honours
Μνημοσύνη first out of all the gods: Richardson (2010) 207; Schenck zu Schweinsberg
(2017) 254; Thomas (2020) 381–3. Cf. Paus. 9.26.2 for a tradition that 'Memory'
(Μνήμη) was one of three Muses.

[11] West (1997) 170; Metcalf (2015) 137–50. The Muses reflect a broader Indo-European
tradition of poetry as recall: West (2007) 33.

[12] *Il*. 7.84–91; *Od*. 1.239–41 = 14.369–71, 11.75–6, 24.32–4, 24.80–4.

[13] For memory in the *Hymns*, see Bakker (2002) who emphasises its enactive, perceptual
role.

[14] Start: μνήσομαι οὐδὲ λάθωμαι (*HhAp*.1); μνήσομαι (*Hh*. 7.2). End: μεμνῆσθαι ἀοιδῆς
(*HhDion*. D.10); καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ' ἀοιδῆς (*HhDem*. 495; *HhAp*. 546;
HhHerm. 580; *Hh*. 6.21, 10.6, 19.49, 28.18, 30.19); ὑμέων τε καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ' ἀοιδῆς
(*Hh*. 25.7, 27.22, 29.14, 33.19). Note the likely etymological pun in *Hh*. 25 (addressed to
the Muses and Apollo): Calame (2011) 346.

and commemoration. In these and many other cases throughout archaic epic, 'remembering' comes to stand as a near-synonym for 'singing' itself.[15]

Set against this emphasis on memory, early Greek poetry also displays a reciprocal concern and almost perverse fascination with its opposite: forgetfulness. Material sites of memory repeatedly fail to preserve an individual's *kleos* for long,[16] and Homer's heroes constantly fight against the overbearing threat of oblivion. In the *Iliad*, Achilles has a famous choice between an anonymous long life and the renown of a heroic, premature death (*Il.* 9.410–16), while in the *Odyssey*, Odysseus' fame is reliant on his safe *nostos* ('homecoming'), which is repeatedly threatened during his adventures. He is repeatedly 'recalled' by other characters, almost in an attempt to keep him and his story 'alive',[17] but numerous obstacles raise the threat of forgetfulness, including the Lotus-Eaters (*Od.* 9.94–7), Circe (*Od.* 10.235–6) and especially the Sirens, whose ability to enchant passers-by mirrors the power of song (*Od.* 12.39–46).[18] In the Greek world, moreover, Helen's Egyptian drugs in Sparta threaten obscurity, bringing a 'forgetfulness of every ill' (κακῶν ἐπίληθον ἁπάντων, *Od.* 4.219–30),[19] while even the Muses are agents of oblivion as much as recall. In the *Theogony*, Mnemosyne is said to have given birth to them specifically as 'forgetfulness of ills and relief from cares' (λησμοσύνην τε κακῶν ἄμπαυμά τε μερμηράων, *Theog.* 55), while a poet who sings 'quickly forgets his anxieties and does not remember his sorrows at all' (αἶψ' ὅ γε δυσφροσυνέων ἐπιλήθεται οὐδέ τι κηδέων | μέμνηται, *Theog.*

---

[15] See esp. Moran (1975); cf. Richardson (1974) 325; Metcalf (2015) 142. On the semantic range of μιμνήσκομαι, see Bader (1968), alongside *CGL*, LSJ and *LfgrE* s.v. The verb variously means 'remember', 'be mindful of', 'make mention of'. I follow Moran (1975) 197 in taking 'these all to be functional equivalents in some way referring to a common notion of memory or remembering'; cf. §III.2.5.

[16] *Il.* 2.813–14, 23.326–33; Lynn-George (1988) 252–76; Ford (1992) 131–71; Grethlein (2008) 28–35. The impermanence of physical sites of memory is an implicit foil to the immortalising power of song: Ford (1992) 146; Grethlein (2008) 32; Garcia (2013); Canevaro (2018) 181–201.

[17] Penelope (μεμνημένη, *Od.* 1.343; μέμνητ', *Od.* 24.195; Mueller (2007)); Nestor (μνῆσαι, *Od.* 3.101); Telemachus (μνησθῆναι, *Od.* 4.118); Menelaus (μεμνημένος, *Od.* 4.151); Philoetius (μνησαμένῳ, *Od.* 20.205); Antinous (μνήμων, *Od.* 21.95).

[18] Pucci (1979) 126–8.   [19] Bergren (1981); Mueller (2007) 355–6.

180

102–3).[20] This reflects a key ambivalence surrounding ancient perceptions of the power of song: it could commemorate and memorialise some deeds but also omit others, consigning them to oblivion.

Memory and its opposite, therefore, were of central importance for early Greek poetry. Modern scholars, too, have been no less interested in exploring the power and significance of memory's various facets in these poems, bolstered by the recent explosion of interest in memory studies in the humanities more generally. Especially productive has been the application of concepts from cognitive psychology to both Homeric epics,[21] alongside the fruitful examination of the social and cultural features of remembrance.[22] Yet more can still be said on the self-reflexive and indexical character of memory in early Greek epic. Already in these texts, as in later Graeco-Roman literature, memory and knowledge play an important indexical role, a means of both gesturing to and incorporating other traditions.[23]

In the sections that follow, we shall begin once more with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, exploring how the language of memory, forgetting and knowledge serves to signpost both inter- and intratextual references within each poem (§III.2.1–2). After establishing the general contours of this pattern, we shall turn to cases in which characters' reminiscences appear to involve tendentious and partial misrememberings of tradition (§III.2.3), as well as those in which characters exhibit an uncanny and proleptic knowledge of future events (§III.2.4). We shall close by exploring some larger questions, as well as the evidence for indexical memory elsewhere in archaic Greek epic (§III.2.5).

III.2.1 Intertextual Memories

In both Homeric poems, characters repeatedly recall events from their own past which were also familiar from the larger mythical tradition. Whenever a character remembers or reminds another of

---

[20] Walsh (1984) 22–4.

[21] Minchin (2001a), (2005), (2006), (2007). More generally, Rubin (1995).

[22] Martin (1989) 77–88; Grethlein (2008); Nikkanen (2012).

[23] In arguing this, I build on Moran (1975), who observes that Homeric characters' memories 'refer to extra-Homeric stories' (quotation p. 199), and Currie (2016) 140–3, who compares these Homeric passages with Latinists' discussions of poetic memory.

181

an earlier experience, the audience are similarly invited to recall their own knowledge of this episode. Such cases of indexical memory are generally less agonistic than the appeals to hearsay we encountered in the previous chapter, but they nevertheless serve an encyclopaedic and incorporative function: through characters' reminiscences, the poet gestures to the broader web of tradition within which he situates his own work.

Mortal Memories

On the human plane, such cases of indexical memory point to recent episodes of the Trojan war expedition or the heroes' own lives. On some occasions, such memories are reported indirectly by the narrator. When Peisistratus reminisces about his brother Antilochus in *Odyssey* 4, for example, his speech is indexed not only by an appeal to anonymous hearsay (**φασί**, *Od.* 4.201: §II.2.3), but also by the narrator's introductory emphasis on his act of memory (*Od.* 4.187–9):

> **μνήσατο** γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀμύμονος Ἀντιλόχοιο,
> τόν ῥ' Ἠοῦς ἔκτεινε φαεινῆς ἀγλαὸς υἱός.
> τοῦ ὅ γ' **ἐπιμνησθεὶς** ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευεν·

> **He recalled** to his mind excellent Antilochus, whom the splendid son of bright Dawn had killed. **Remembering** him, he spoke winged words.

Peisistratus' recollection of past events within the fictional world of the narrative precipitates and coincides with the audience's own recall of a familiar episode from the Trojan war tradition. As we have noted before (§II.2.3), Antilochus' death was narrated in the *Aethiopis* of the Epic Cycle (*Aeth.* arg. 2c *GEF*). But the tradition evidently pre-dated it: Memnon's periphrastic introduction here by the matronymic 'son of Dawn' (Ἠοῦς . . . υἱός) suggests that he was a familiar figure of myth,[24] while the traditionality of the whole *fabula* is also presupposed by Iliadic allusions to it.[25]

---

[24] Cf. *Od.* 11.522; Hes. *Theog.* 984–5; Alcm. fr. 68.

[25] For the relationship between the *Aethiopis*/*Memnonis* tradition and the *Iliad*: Bouvier (2002) 379–401; Heitsch (2005), (2008); Currie (2006) 23–41, (2016) 55–72; Burgess (2009) esp. 72–92; Rengakos (2015) 315–17. Conversely, West (2003c) argues that Memnon and the plot of the *Aethiopis* are post-Iliadic, but see Kullmann (2005); Currie (2006) 27–8; Burgess (2009) 28–9.

182

Indeed, when Peisistratus goes on to note that Menelaus surely knew Antilochus (**ἴδμεναι**, *Od.* 4.200), the overall message is reinforced: Antilochus was a familiar and memorable figure of myth.[26]

More often in Homer, however, such instances of indexical memory occur in character speech, especially in two-person dialogues where one individual challenges another's memory of the past. When Achilles encounters Aeneas in *Iliad* 20, for example, he asks his adversary whether he remembers the previous time (**ἤδη** . . . **καὶ ἄλλοτε**) he was routed from the foothills of Mount Ida (*Il.* 20.187–96):

ἤδη μὲν σέ γέ φημι **καὶ ἄλλοτε** δουρὶ φοβῆσαι.
ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ ὅτε πέρ σε βοῶν ἄπο μοῦνον ἐόντα
σεῦα κατ᾽ Ἰδαίων ὀρέων ταχέεσσι πόδεσσι
καρπαλίμως; **τότε** δ᾽ οὔ τι μετατροπαλίζεο φεύγων.
ἔνθεν δ᾽ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν
πέρσα μεθορμηθεὶς σὺν Ἀθήνῃ καὶ Διὶ πατρί,
ληϊάδας δὲ γυναῖκας ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ ἀπούρας
ἦγον· ἀτὰρ σὲ Ζεὺς ἐρρύσατο καὶ θεοὶ ἄλλοι.
ἀλλ᾽ οὐ **νῦν** ἐρύεσθαι ὀΐομαι, ὡς ἐνὶ θυμῷ
βάλλεαι·

I claim that I put you to flight with my spear **at another time before now too**. **Don't you remember when** I drove you away from your cattle when you were all alone, sending you hurrying down the hills of Ida with your swift feet? You did not look back at all **then** as you fled. From there you escaped to Lyrnessus, but I sacked it, rushing in pursuit with the help of Athena and father Zeus, and I led the women away as captives, robbing their day of freedom from them – though Zeus and the other gods saved you. But I do not think they will save you **now**, as you imagine in your heart.

Achilles invites Aeneas to recall their previous encounter as a parallel for the present, establishing expectations about the outcome of this latest meeting. Besides its paradigmatic force, Achilles' recollection also invites Homer's audience to recall their own memory of this episode from the larger epic tradition.[27] According to Proclus' summary, this encounter

---

[26] The narrator also refers to future memories to recall future events of tradition: cf. *Il.* 2.724, where we are told the Greeks would soon '**remember**' (**μνήσεσθαι**) Philoctetes (cf. *Il. Parv.* arg. 2b *GEF*).

[27] Cf. Moran (1975) 201–2; Currie (2016) 141.

featured in the *Cypria*, alongside Achilles' sacking of Lyrnessus, Pedasus and other surrounding settlements (*Cypr.* arg. 11c–d *GEF*).[28] And here too, there are good grounds for supposing that this encounter, like much else in the *Cypria*, pre-existed the *Iliad*. Achilles' raids appear early in art[29] and were a crucial element in the larger *fabula* of the Trojan war, as the occasion for Achilles' acquisition of Briseis as his war prize. Within the *Iliad*, too, they are a recurring point of reference. The narrator mentions how Achilles had previously captured two sons of Priam, Isus and Antiphus, while they were out herding their sheep (*Il.* 11.104–12: note **ποτ'**, 104; **πάρος**, 111), a prior history which prompted Agamemnon to recognise them (**γιγνώσκων**, 111). Within *Iliad* 20 itself, moreover, Aeneas has already offered his own summary of the episode (*Il.* 20.89–96):

> **οὐ** μὲν γὰρ **νῦν πρῶτα** ποδώκεος ἄντ' Ἀχιλῆος
> στήσομαι, ἀλλ' **ἤδη** με **καὶ ἄλλοτε** δουρὶ φόβησεν
> ἐξ Ἴδης, **ὅτε** βουσὶν ἐπήλυθεν ἡμετέρῃσι,
> πέρσε δὲ Λυρνησσὸν καὶ Πήδασον· αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ Ζεὺς
> εἰρύσαθ', ὅς μοι ἐπῶρσε μένος λαιψηρά τε γοῦνα.
> ἦ κε δάμην ὑπὸ χερσὶν Ἀχιλλῆος καὶ Ἀθήνης,
> ἥ οἱ πρόσθεν ἰοῦσα τίθει φάος ἠδ' ἐκέλευεν
> ἔγχεϊ χαλκείῳ Λέλεγας καὶ Τρῶας ἐναίρειν.

> **Not now for the first time** shall I stand against swift-footed Achilles, but **at another time before now too** he put me to flight with his spear from Ida, **when** he came after our cattle and sacked Lyrnessus and Pedasus. But Zeus saved me, rousing my spirit and swift knees. Otherwise I would have been slain at the hands of Achilles and Athena, who went ahead to protect him and urged him to kill the Leleges and Trojans with his bronze spear.

Despite Achilles' polemical suggestion that Aeneas may have forgotten the event, the Trojan is all too mindful of it. Indeed, his account overlaps with that of Achilles in many details (underlined above), even down to his speedy flight (λαιψηρά τε γοῦνα, 20.93 ~ ταχέεσσι πόδεσσι | καρπαλίμως, 20.189–90), and it too is indexed in temporal terms (**οὐ** . . . **νῦν πρῶτα** . . ., ἀλλ' **ἤδη** . . . **καὶ ἄλλοτε**, 20.89–90). Given the 'cursory manner' of Aeneas' account,

---

[28] Achilles' raids: Leaf (1912) 242–52; Kullmann (1960) 284–91; Taplin (1986b).
[29] A relief amphora from *c.* 650 BCE appears to show Achilles raiding Aeneas' cattle: Burgess (1996) 83 n. 29 = (2001a) 247 n. 70.

184

Anderson has argued that 'the Iliadic allusions derive from an earlier tradition which was ultimately codified in the *Kypria*'.[30] He takes this argument no further, but additional support for his case can be found in the verbal echoes between Aeneas' and Achilles' narratives, which suggest a consistent and uniform *fabula* underlying both passages. The Trojan prince is driven to Mount Lyrnessus (Λυρνησσόν, 20.92 ~ 20.191, same *sedes*), which Achilles sacks (| πέρσε, 20.92 ~ | πέρσα, 20.192), and he is saved only by Zeus (Ζεὺς | εἰρύσαθ', 20.92–3 ~ Ζεὺς ἐρρύσατο, 20.194). Especially significant, however, is the repeated emphasis on Achilles' routing of Aeneas with his spear (δουρὶ φόβησεν, 20.90 ~ δουρὶ φοβῆσαι, 20.187, same *sedes*). These are the only two appearances of this phrase in extant Greek literature before the Imperial period (Quint. Smyrn. 8.151), a fact which suggests that the formula could have been specifically associated with the *fabula* of this episode. By redeploying the phrase twice here, Homer alludes to an established tradition surrounding the early years of the Trojan war and marks the parallel between the two heroes' present (**νῦν**, 195) and previous (**τότε**, 190) encounters. Indeed, this current confrontation proves to be a close replay – or 'doublet' – of the earlier meeting.[31] Although Achilles hopes that the gods will not save Aeneas this time (195–6), Poseidon ultimately intervenes to ensure that the Trojan hero escapes alive once more (*Il.* 20.288–339, cf. 20.194).[32]

When Achilles asks Aeneas whether he can remember this event, therefore, Homer's audience are invited to draw on their own knowledge of the larger Trojan war tradition. By having the heroes recall their earlier encounter, Homer effectively cites his model for the present scene: Aeneas and Achilles meet again, as they previously had on Mount Ida. Through the language of

---

[30] Anderson (1997) 63. Nagy (1979) 265–75 sees a confrontation between the *Iliad* and an *Aeneid* tradition.

[31] Cf. earlier (neo)analytical arguments that Achilles' 'oddly gentle' mood in this scene is out of place in his bloodthirsty killing spree of Books 20 to 22 and likely draws on a traditional episode from earlier in the war: Combellack (1976) 49–52; cf. Leaf (1886–88) II 348–9.

[32] This episode is also replayed at *Il.* 5.311–17: Aeneas only escapes Diomedes after the intervention of his divine mother, Aphrodite. For Diomedes as an *altera persona* of Achilles: §1.2.2.

185

memory, Homer gestures to his encyclopaedic control of the whole tradition, replaying an earlier episode with a self-conscious sense of déjà vu.

Such recall of past events can also be activated through the language of knowledge and forgetting. In the *Odyssey*, Penelope asks Antinous whether he is unfamiliar with a past occasion when Odysseus saved his father Eupeithes, after he had joined Taphian pirates (**ἦ οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅτε**, *Od*. 16.424). Scholars suspect that this episode may have been invented for its immediate context,[33] but even if that were true, it builds on the traditional associations of the Taphians as pirates and Odysseus' allies, details with which not only Antinous but also Homer's audience would have been familiar.[34] Similarly, in the Odyssean Underworld, Odysseus realises that Ajax has not forgotten the anger he felt because of his defeat in the contest for Achilles' arms (οὐδὲ θανὼν **λήσεσθαι** ἐμοὶ χόλου εἵνεκα τευχέων | οὐλομένων, *Od*. 11.554–5), an event that was a central part of his mythical *fabula* (§II.3.1), and again familiar to us from the cyclic tradition (*Aeth*. arg. 4d; *Il. Parv.* arg. 1a, fr. 2 *GEF*).[35] In the *Iliad*, meanwhile, Glaucus opens his account of Bellerophon's exploits by claiming that 'many men **know** his ancestry' (πολλοὶ δέ μιν ἄνδρες **ἴσασιν**, 6.151), marking the familiarity of the tale that follows,[36] and both Achilles and Patroclus are criticised for forgetting the advice they received from their fathers before departing to Troy (σὺ δὲ **λήθεαι**, *Il*. 9.259 = 11.790), nodding to the traditions of pre-war recruitment as attested in the *Cypria* (arg. 5 *GEF*) and elsewhere.[37] Through the language of forgetting, memory and knowledge, the Homeric

---

[33] Danek (1998) 326; West (2014a) 251; Currie (2016) 143.

[34] Cf. Jones (1992) 79–80. Rohdenberg and Marks (2012) explore the larger Odyssean opposition of Taphians and Thesprotians.

[35] Cf. Sbardella (1998).

[36] Martin (1989) 128 notes the 'veiled insult' here: Diomedes is remarkably ignorant if he has had to ask Glaucus for this well-known information! Homer's audience might also be invited to recall details they know which Glaucus omits, such as the supernatural Pegasus: cf. Hes. *Theog*. 325; Pind. *Ol*. 13.60–92; *Isth*. 7.44–7.

[37] For the Phthian embassy, cf. too *Il*. 7.127–8, 9.438–41. The specific details in these recollections of paternal advice are often considered the invention of the poet, specifically tailored to the speaker's immediate context: Willcock (1977) 46–7; West (2011a) 33. Hunter (2018) 146 attractively remarks that the accusation of forgetfulness may then index this invention: 'you do not remember, because this never happened'.

186

poet indexes a range of episodes from the wider Trojan war cycle, marking his control of his mythical repertoire.

Divine Memories

It is especially on the divine plane that we encounter such cases of indexical memory. Gods, too, can recall recent mythical events, as when Zeus opens the *Odyssey* by remembering the revenge of '**far-famed**' Orestes (**τηλεκλυτός**), introducing an analogy that will underlie the whole poem (**μνήσατο, ἐπιμνησθείς**, *Od.* 1.29–31).[38] But more regularly, the gods look back to a more distant age, reflecting their more enduring powers of memory.[39] Such access to the distant past renders them apt models for the poet who similarly recalls remote myths and legends through the patronage of the Muses.

A favourite subject of divine recollection is the Greek hero Heracles, whose exploits are a recurring presence in Homer, Hesiod and archaic Greek poetry more generally.[40] Indeed, the frequency and consistency of his appearances, alongside the developed formulaic system attached to his name, suggest a well-established tradition surrounding the hero,[41] much of which likely went on to shape or influence the later Heracles epics that we know

---

[38] Cf. Hes. fr. 23a.27–30; *Nostoi* arg. 5 *GEF*. Note ἔκτανε πατροφονῆα | (*Od.* 1.299, 3.307), ἐτείσατο πατροφονῆα | (3.197) ~ ἀπε[τείσατο π]ατροφο[ν]ῆα | (Hes. fr. 23a.29). For the 'Oresteia' as an underlying paradigm and foil in the *Odyssey*: D'Arms and Hulley (1946); Hölscher (1967); Olson (1990), (1995) 24–42; Katz (1991) 29–53; Felson (1997) 93–107; Marks (2008) 17–35; Tsitsibakou-Vasalos (2009); Alden (2017) 77–100.

[39] Cf. *Il*. 2.811–14: they still recognise Myrine's tomb, which humans merely believe to be a hill.

[40] *Iliad*: Alden (2000) 38–42; Kelly (2010); West (2011a) 30–1; Barker and Christensen (2014); Bär (2018) 33–44, (2019) 110–14. *Odyssey*: Schein (2002); Andersen (2012); Alden (2017) 173–84; Bär (2018) 44–52, (2019) 114–16. Hesiodic *Catalogue*: Haubold (2005), Bär (2018) 62–8. *Aspis*: Mason (2015) 143–53; Bär (2018) 68–72. Archilochus: fr. 17a.22, 25 (Swift (2014b) 440–2), frr. 286–8; Alcman: fr. 1 (Davison (1938)). Stesichorus: *Geryoneis* (frr. 5–83), *Cerberus* (fr. 165a–b), *Cycnus* (frr. 166–8); Ibycus fr. 285, fr. 298–300.

[41] Cf. Nilsson (1932) 199; Lang (1983) 149–50; Cairns (2001a) 36; Barker and Christensen (2021). Formulaic system: Burkert (1979) 177 n. 4; cf. Burkert (1972) 81. Some scholars reconstruct specific (oral or written) poems on Heracles as the source of these allusions (e.g. Mülder (1910) 117–41; Kullmann (1956b) 25–35; Baurain (1992); Sbardella (1994); West (2003b) 19–20, (2018); Pucci (2018) 143–7), but I shall stick here with traditions and *fabulae*.

187

of.[42] The gods' frequent recollections of this former age set the current events at Troy in a broader mythological perspective.

In *Iliad* 8, Athena is frustrated by Zeus's support of the Trojans and complains that he no longer remembers her previous support of his son Heracles (*Il.* 8.362–9):

> **οὐδέ τι τῶν μέμνηται**, ὅ οἱ μάλα **πολλάκις** υἱὸν
> τειρόμενον σώεσκον ὑπ' Εὐρυσθῆος ἀέθλων.
> ἤτοι ὃ μὲν κλαίεσκε πρὸς οὐρανόν, αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ Ζεὺς
> τῷ ἐπαλεξήσουσαν ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν προΐαλλεν.
> εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ τάδε ᾔδε' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πευκαλίμῃσιν,
> εὖτέ μιν εἰς Ἀΐδαο πυλάρταο προὔπεμψεν
> ἐξ Ἐρέβευς ἄξοντα κύνα στυγεροῦ Ἀΐδαο,
> οὐκ ἂν ὑπεξέφυγε Στυγὸς ὕδατος αἰπὰ ῥέεθρα.

> **He has no memory at all of** the fact that I very **often** saved his son when he was worn down beneath Eurystheus' tasks. Time and again, he would cry aloud to heaven, and Zeus sent me from heaven to help him. If only I'd known all this in my wise mind when Eurystheus sent him to the house of Hades the Gatekeeper to bring the hound of hateful Hades up from Erebus, then he would not have escaped the steep streams of the Stygian water.

Athena recalls how frequently she stood by Heracles' side: the emphatic adverb combination (μάλα πολλάκις, 362) and the pair of iterative verbs (σώεσκον, 363; κλαίεσκε, 364) combine to render Zeus's ingratitude all the more alarming. But the emphasis on frequency also highlights how traditional an element this is of Heracles' *fabula*. Athena's patronage of the hero and his labours are attested throughout archaic Greek epic,[43] while the specific exploit she recalls here, the theft of the dog Cerberus from the Underworld, was also traditional at an early date (*Od.* 11.623–6, Hes. *Theog.* 310–12).[44] When Athena recalls this episode, she refers to an incident that not only Zeus should remember, but also Homer's external audience, from frequent (**πολλάκις**) tellings.

---

[42] Heracles epics: Huxley (1969) 99–112; Tsagalis (2022). The tradition that Creophylus was Homer's teacher (Strabo 14.1.18) may well attest to a perception in antiquity that the sack of Troy imitated Heracles' sack of Oechalia.

[43] Athena's patronage: *Il.* 20.145–8; *Od.* 11.626; Hes. *Theog.* 318, fr. 33a; Peisander fr. 7 *GEF*. Labours: *Il.* 8.363, 15.30, 19.133; *Od.* 11.622, 624; Hes. *Theog.* 951, fr. 190.12, fr. 248.

[44] Note esp. ἐξ Ἐρέβευς ἄξοντα (*Il.* 8.368) ~ ἤγαγον ἐξ Ἀΐδαο (*Od.* 11.625).

188

Recollection of the wider contours of this myth, however, complicates the immediate context of Athena's speech. The goddess does not utter her complaint directly to Zeus, but rather to his wife Hera. An audience spurred to 'recall' the Heracles tradition would be all too aware that Hera was Heracles' persistent enemy throughout his life, a consistent feature of the mythic *fabula*.[45] As the exegetical scholia note, Hera kept opposing Athena's attempts to save him (ἠναντιοῦτο αὐτῇ σῳζούσῃ τὸν Ἡρακλέα, Σ bT *Il.* 8.362 *ex.*), which makes Athena's recollection particularly ill judged (εὐπρεπὴς . . . οὐκέτι). In the wider context of Book 8, as Hera attempts to recruit Athena in a plot to thwart Zeus's control of the war, this reminder is – as Kelly remarks – 'neither tactful nor predictive of a successful alliance'.[46] It foreshadows the pair's ensuing failure: as soon as they set out towards Troy, Zeus spots them, sends Iris to intercept their chariot and threatens dire punishment (8.397–483), sticking to the threat that he made at the start of the book (8.1–40). Athena's recollection thus not only acknowledges the familiarity of the Heracles myth but also invites an audience to supplement their broader knowledge of it, adding a further resonance to the goddesses' scheming.

Such indexical gestures to established tradition are also apparent in other divine recollections of events from this earlier generation. In the Iliadic theomachy, Poseidon complains that Apollo no longer remembers the woes that the pair endured in their year-long service to Laomedon (**οὐδέ νυ τῶν περ | μέμνηαι**, *Il.* 21.441–2), referring to the story of Laomedon's deceit, which precipitated Heracles' campaign against Troy.[47] Earlier in the poem, meanwhile, Zeus awakes after the Διὸς Ἀπάτη and accuses Hera of failing to remember their past conflict: he hung her up in the air by her feet and bound her wrists with an unbreakable gold band in punishment for her treatment of Heracles (*Il.* 15.18–33).

---

[45] Hera's hostility: *Il.* 5.392–4, 14.249–66, 15.18–30 (cf. immediately below), 18.117–19, 19.95–133; Hes. *Theog.* 313–18, 327–32, fr. 25.30–1.

[46] Kelly (2010) 275; cf. (2007a) 60 n. 245, 422–5; Barker and Christensen (2020) 103.

[47] Cf. *Il.* 5.638–51, 7.451–3, 20.145–8; Hellanicus fr. 26 *EGM*; Metrodorus fr. 2 *EGM*; Moran (1975) 202–3; West (2011a) 32; Porter (2014). As Currie (2016) 141 n. 188 notes, 'the article, τὸ κῆτος (*Il.* 20.147), implies a familiar episode'; cf. Edwards (1991) 307. On parallels between the first and second sacking of Troy: Anderson (1997) 92–7. The myth reinforces the impression of Trojan culpability: Allan (2006) 6.

189

Hera's enmity against the hero is a well-established feature of myth, as we have already noted, but Zeus's passing reference to Heracles' visit to Cos (Κόωνδ᾿ εὖ ναιομένην, 15.28) evokes a whole further episode of that hero's adventures, in which he almost lost his life against the Meropes, the local inhabitants of the island.[48] Hera's hanging, meanwhile, fits into a larger tradition of the succession myth and potential threats to Zeus's rule, a major narrative thread that underlies the *Iliad*.[49] In the first book of the poem, we have already heard of Hephaestus' punishment for attempting to help his mother in the past (*Il*. 1.590–4: note **ἤδη . . . καὶ ἄλλοτ᾿**, 590), as well as Achilles' instruction to his mother Thetis to remind Zeus (**μνήσασα**, *Il*. 1.407) of the time when she freed him from the bonds devised by the other Olympians (*Il*. 1.396–406), a story that he has '**often heard**' her tell before (**πολλάκι . . . ἄκουσα**, 396).[50] When Zeus frames his criticism of Hera with references to memory (**ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ ὅτε**, 15.18; τῶν σ᾿ **αὖτις μνήσω**, 15.31), Homer thus indexes tradition once more: not only the *fabula* of Heracles, but also the wider myth of divine discord and past threats to Zeus's dominion.

There is more at stake in this final reminiscence, however. As with the encounter of Aeneas and Achilles in *Iliad* 20, we know that Zeus's addressee Hera is all too mindful of these past events. Hypnos had already reminded her of the Heracles story in the previous book, citing Zeus's extreme anger on that occasion as a reason to avoid lulling him to sleep again in the present (*Il*. 14.249–62).[51] Hera's response is telling: she asks if Hypnos really thinks that Zeus would help the Trojans just as he grew angry for his son (ἦ φῂς ὣς Τρώεσσιν ἀρηξέμεν εὐρύοπα Ζῆν | ὣς Ἡρακλῆος περιχώσατο παῖδος ἑοῖο; 14.265–6). Her rhetorical question implies the answer 'no', but as the audience listen on, they are invited to

---

[48] Already recalled earlier by Hera (*Il*. 14.255 = 15.28). Cf. too Apollod. *Bibl*. 2.7.1; Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 304c–e; Janko (1992) 191–2; Yasumura (2011) 49–51. The myth is also presupposed at *Il*. 2.676–9; *HhAp*. 42; Hes. fr. 43a.55–65 (cf. Pind. *Nem*. 4.25–30, *Isth*. 6.31–5), and the archaic *Meropis* (*P. Köln* III 126 = *SH* 903A; Lloyd-Jones (1984); Henrichs (1993) 187–95).

[49] Cf. Slatkin (1991); Yasumura (2011) 39–57. On the larger significance of this hanging (= 'almost-falling'), see Purves (2019) 63–4.

[50] Cf. Moran (1975) 205 with n. 24; Slatkin (1991) 60–2 with n. 6; Currie (2016) 142.

[51] Note the indexical introduction: **ἤδη . . . καὶ ἄλλο . . . ἤματι τῷ ὅτε**, *Il*. 14.249–50; cf. §IV.2.1.

note the similarities between Hera's present and past tussles with Zeus. By the time we reach Zeus's recollection in Book 15, we have witnessed a close replay of the Heraclean episode, as Hera tricks Zeus again and he now responds with similar rage.[52] The Διὸς Ἀπάτη is thus framed by two separate accounts of the Heracles narrative which together represent her present deception of Zeus as a replay of her earlier resistance over Heracles. Zeus's repeated language of memory not only signals an allusion to the Heracles *fabula* but also introduces it as a narrative doublet for the immediate action.

Characters' recollections of their past, therefore, coincide with and precipitate the audience's own recall of the same episodes from the larger mythical and literary tradition. Through such acts of recall, the poet maps out the larger contours of myth against which he situates his poem. In particular, he frequently gestures to earlier moments that act as models or doublets for the present myth, including Achilles and Aeneas' previous encounter, Orestes' revenge and Heracles' sack of Troy. Through such an encyclopaedic vista, these recollections emphasise the interconnected strands of myth.

III.2.2 Intratextual Memories

In all of the foregoing cases, we have been dealing with an inevitable degree of speculation, tracing the contours of potential pre-Homeric traditions from internal and post-Homeric evidence. Many of our examples seem very plausible, but given the state of our evidence, absolute certainty is impossible. Nevertheless, these cases of intertextual 'poetic memory' in Homer are supported by instances where memory and knowledge function similarly to index intratextual connections within each poem.

Remembering Diomedes

Most striking of all is another divine recollection, in this case from the Iliadic theomachy. Ares asks Athena whether she remembers

---

[52] Notably, Hypnos' and Zeus's Heraclean accounts complement each other by avoiding direct overlap; cf. Σ. bT *Il.* 15.18b.

the time when she supported Diomedes as he fought against the war-god (*Il*. 21.394–9):

τίπτ' **αὖτ'**, ὦ κυνάμυια, θεοὺς ἔριδι ξυνελαύνεις
θάρσος ἄητον ἔχουσα, μέγας δέ σε θυμὸς ἀνῆκεν;
ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ ὅτε Τυδεΐδην Διομήδε' ἀνῆκας
<u>οὐτάμεναι</u>, αὐτὴ δὲ πανόψιον ἔγχος ἑλοῦσα
ἰθὺς ἐμεῦ ὦσας, <u>διὰ δὲ χρόα καλὸν ἔδαψας</u>;
τῶ σ' αὖ νῦν ὀΐω ἀποτεισέμεν ὅσσα ἔοργας.

Why are you driving the gods together **again** in strife, you dogfly, with your fierce daring, and why has your great heart sent you forth this time? **Don't you remember when** you sent Diomedes the son of Tydeus <u>to wound me</u>, and openly grasped his spear yourself, driving it straight at me and <u>tearing my beautiful skin</u>? So now I think you will pay for all you did then.

With a formula that we have repeatedly encountered as an index of intertextual connections beyond both Homeric poems (**ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ ὅτε**), Ares invites Athena (and the audience) to 'recall' an episode from earlier within the very same poem: Diomedes' *aristeia* in *Iliad* 5.[53] In that episode, Diomedes had been advised by Athena only to fight Aphrodite among the immortals (*Il*. 5.124–32), an injunction which he claimed he was still mindful of when later reproached by the same goddess (**μέμνημαι**, *Il*. 5.818). Despite his recollection of these instructions, however, both he and Athena soon disregarded them as Diomedes went on to attack Ares, the god of war himself, and wounded him with Athena's help (*Il*. 5.855–9):

δεύτερος αὖθ' ὡρμᾶτο βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης
ἔγχεϊ χαλκείῳ· ἐπέρεισε δὲ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη
νείατον ἐς κενεῶνα, ὅθι ζωννύσκετο μίτρῃ·
τῇ ῥά μιν <u>οὖτα</u> τυχών, <u>διὰ δὲ χρόα καλὸν ἔδαψεν</u>,
ἐκ δὲ δόρυ σπάσεν αὖτις·

Then Diomedes, good at the war-cry, charged at Ares with his bronze spear; and Pallas Athena leaned on the spear, driving it into the bottom of Ares' belly, where the skirt-piece was belted. There he struck and <u>wounded</u> him, <u>tearing his beautiful skin</u>, and he drew the spear out again.

In *Iliad* 21, Ares explicitly invites Athena to recall this episode. The recollection is reinforced verbally by the repetition of οὖτα

---

[53] Cf. Moran (1975) 202; Andersen (1990) 26; Richardson (1993) 88; Chaudhuri (2014) 28; Currie (2016) 140.

192

(5.858) in οὐτάμεναι (21.397) as well as the more pointed repetition of the whole phrase διὰ δὲ χρόα καλὸν ἔδαψεν/ἔδαψας (5.858 ~ 21.398), an expression which is found nowhere else in extant Greek literature.[54] The uniqueness of the phrase suggests that we could even treat it as a direct quotation of the earlier scene, or at least a quotation from a specific and recognisable *fabula* of Diomedes' theomachic *hybris*. After all, the frequency with which later writers refer to the '*Aristeia* of Diomedes' as an independent and recognisable part of the epic suggests that it would have been a self-standing and familiar episode of tradition.[55] But in any case, there is a particular irony in Ares' reminiscence here, which unwittingly foreshadows the outcome of this present clash: as before, Ares will be defeated by Athena's intervention (21.403–14).[56]

This intratextual example, in which we can actively point to the incident recalled, lends strength to other cases noted above where we no longer have an early epic treatment of the episode in question. Events both beyond and within the poem are 'recalled' in the same manner, suggesting the continuum of larger mythological traditions. Specifically 'Iliadic' events are treated no differently than those belonging to other parts of the Trojan war tradition. All episodes are conceived as different paths, οἶμαι, within the broader network of song.[57]

Remember, Remember . . .

This conclusion can be strengthened by numerous other intratextual back references which are similarly flagged through the language of memory and knowledge, tying the threads of the narrative together. In the *Iliad*, Diomedes' charioteer Sthenelus does not forget the instructions he had received from Diomedes a short while earlier to steal Aeneas' horses (**οὐδ'** υἱὸς Καπανῆος **ἐλήθετο** συνθεσιάων, *Il.* 5.319 ~ *Il.* 5.259–73), while in the *Odyssey*, Odysseus *does* forget Circe's advice that Scylla cannot

[54] See too Richardson (1993) 10 for further thematic parallels between these episodes.

[55] E.g. ἐν Διομήδεος ἀριστείῃ, Hdt. 2.116.3 (~ *Il.* 6.289–92); ἐν τῇ τοῦ Διομήδους ἀριστείᾳ, Σ A *Il.* 8.385–7a1 *Ariston.* (~ *Il.* 5.734–6); κἀν τῇ Διομήδους ἀριστείᾳ, Σ T *Il.* 11.90–8 *ex.* (~ *Il.* 5.159–64); Διομήδους ἀριστεία, Eust. 511.8 ad *Il.* 5 = II 1.2 van der Valk.

[56] Cf. Purves (2019) 60 on *Iliad* 5 as a 'trial run' for Ares' defeat in Book 21.

[57] For οἶμαι as 'paths of song': Thornton (1984) 148–9; Ford (1992) 41–3.

be fought or defended against and vainly arms against her (**λανθανόμην**, *Od.* 12.226–7 ~ *Od.* 12.119–20). In *Iliad* 9, meanwhile, Diomedes remarks that 'the young and old of the Argives **know** all this', that he was earlier rebuked by Agamemnon (ταῦτα δὲ πάντα | **ἴσασ'** Ἀργείων ἠμὲν νέοι ἠδὲ γέροντες, *Il.* 9.35–6), a back reference to 'Agamemnon's ill-judged censure' of Tydeus' son in *Iliad* 4 (*Il.* 4.370–400).[58] Diomedes marks this intratextual knowledge as familiar to the whole community through the totalising polar expression 'young and old' (ἠμὲν νέοι ἠδὲ γέροντες).[59] It is knowledge shared by everyone, not only Diomedes' internal audience, but also Homer's external one. Such intratextual links connect small chains of narrative together, inviting audiences to recall recent episodes in the plot and more clearly follow their development.[60]

At times, this intratextual function of memory even appears to draw self-conscious attention to the structuring of the narrative itself. At the start of *Odyssey* 5, for example, Athena '**remembers**' the many woes of Odysseus (**μνησαμένη**, *Od.* 5.6) and bemoans how 'nobody **remembers**' him any longer (οὔ τις **μέμνηται**, *Od.* 5.11–12), repeating the earlier words of Mentor at *Od.* 2.233–4. Such a repeated emphasis on the failure to remember Odysseus in the poem's opening books may self-reflexively draw attention to the narrative delay of the 'Telemachy' which dominates *Odyssey* 1–4, with its unexpected focus on Ithaca and Telemachus, rather than Odysseus.[61] After these opening four books, it is indeed as if the poet and audience have themselves 'forgotten' the poem's alleged protagonist.[62]

---

[58] Hainsworth (1993) 64; cf. Griffin (1995) 78–9.   [59] Cf. Griffin (1995) 79.

[60] Also **οὐ λήθετ'**, *Il.* 1.495 ~ *Il.* 1.393–412; **μνήσομαι**, *Il.* 9.647 ~ *Il.* 1.53–430; **μνησαμένοισ'**, *Od.* 10.199 ~ *Od.* 9.105–542, 10.81–132; **μνησάμενοι**, *Od.* 12.309 ~ *Od.* 12.245–59. Cf. Gaetano (2016) on Herodotus' use of 'memory' to guide his audience through the structure of his narrative.

[61] Cf. Richardson (2006) 341; Σ DE *Od.* 1.284d *ex.*: τῆς Ὀδυσσείας οὐκ ἐχούσης ἐξ αὐτῆς ποικιλίαν ἱκανήν, τὸν Τηλέμαχον ἐξελθεῖν εἰς Σπάρτην καὶ Πύλον ποιεῖ, ὅπως ἂν τῶν Ἰλιακῶν ἐν παρεκβάσεσι πολλὰ λεχθείη διά τε τοῦ Νέστορος καὶ τοῦ Μενελάου, 'Since the *Odyssey* does not have sufficient variety in itself, the poet makes Telemachus go to Sparta and Pylos so that much Iliadic material may be mentioned in passing through Nestor and Menelaus'; cf. Proclus' similar description of Nestor's 'digressions' in the *Cypria* (ἐν παρεκβάσει, arg. 4b *GEF*).

[62] For a similar 'narrative wink' acknowledging a character's absence, cf. Kozak (2017) 47 on *Il.* 5.472–6.

194

More significantly, however, this indexical function of memory also conveys the sense that events within each Homeric poem are already becoming traditional, joined to the larger map of myth. Just as we saw the language of hearsay attached to the events of the Trojan war (§II.2.3), so too is the language of recollection. In *Iliad* 1, Achilles begins his summary of events to his mother by remarking, '**You know**. Why should I tell the tale to **you who know** all the details?' (**οἶσθα**. τίη τοι ταῦτα **ἰδυίῃ** πάντ' ἀγορεύω; *Il*. 1.365) – a question that not only marks Thetis' privileged divine knowledge, but also self-consciously acknowledges the audience's familiarity with his coming words; they have already heard the story that he is about to repeat (*Il*. 1.6–349).[63] At points, characters even consider the future recall of their contemporary events, looking ahead to the reception of Homeric song. When Agamemnon tells Achilles that 'long will the Achaeans, I think, **remember** the strife between me and you' (Ἀχαιοὺς | δηρὸν ἐμῆς καὶ σῆς ἔριδος **μνήσεσθαι** ὀΐω, *Il*. 19.63–4), he lays implicit claim to the preservation of the *Iliad* itself, with its opening topic of the quarrel between the two warriors (ἐρίσαντε, *Il*. 1.6; ἔριδι, 1.8).[64] Similarly, Hector claims that there should be a '**memory**' of consuming fire around the Greeks' ships (**μνημοσύνη**, *Il*. 8.181), implicitly pointing to the immortalising power of Homer's own words to preserve and commemorate this significant turning point in the narrative.[65] In the *Odyssey*, meanwhile, Odysseus suspects that 'these dangers, too, I think, we shall someday **remember**' (**μνήσεσθαι**, *Od*. 12.212) – a claim that hints at the future poetic fame of his *Apologoi*, just as the Phaeacians' repeated requests for Odysseus to '**remember**' them point to their future preservation in song (Alcinous: **μεμνημένος**, *Od*. 8.244; Arete: **μεμνημένος**, *Od*. 8.431; Nausicaa: **μνήσῃ**, *Od*. 8.462). In sum, poetic memory is not only about nodding to other traditions and poems which the poet subsumes within his work, but also a means for Homer to mark out

---

[63] Cf. de Jong (1985) 11, comparing Odysseus' words at *Od*. 12.450–1: τί τοι τάδε μυθολογεύω; | **ἤδη** γάρ τοι **χθιζὸς** ἐμυθεόμην, 'why should I tell you this tale? I **already** told it to you **yesterday**' (~ *Od*. 7.241–97: Heubeck (1989) 143).

[64] Cf. Moran (1975) 209.

[65] Cf. Nagy (1979) 17 §3 n. 2, who notes that this memorialisation is effectively achieved when the narrator later invokes the Muses to tell how fire first came upon the Greeks' ships (*Il*. 16.112–13).

his own place in this tradition – to ensure that future generations too will remember the events that he narrates, just as he and his characters remember other episodes of the mythical past.

III.2.3 Selective Recall

In many of the cases that we have explored above (§III.2.1–2), indexical memory gestures to a wider canon of myth, incorporating broader traditions and details that reflect on the present poem. These signposts often introduce allusions that seem less agonistic than many of the instances of indexical hearsay that we have explored before. But indexical memory is not entirely free from combative posturing. We have already noted the competitive aspect in characters' challenges to their addressees' memories, revealing an anxiety surrounding the fallibility of individuals' powers of recall. But beyond this, there are also cases of indexical recall which introduce a selective and partial reshaping of tradition. We have already noted Athena's omission of Hera's enmity, but here we shall explore two more complicated cases, one from the *Odyssey* and one from the *Iliad*. Appeals to memory authorise departure from tradition, while also inviting audience members to supply what is left untold from their own knowledge.

Recruiting Odysseus

The first passage comes from *Odyssey* 24, when Agamemnon's shade addresses the newly deceased Amphimedon's ghost. After recognising the suitor and inquiring how he died, Agamemnon appeals to their former *xenia* and asks whether he remembers the time when the Atreidae came to Ithaca to recruit Odysseus for the expedition against Troy, employing the same introductory phrase that we have seen repeatedly before (*Od.* 24.115–19):

> **ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ ὅτε** κεῖσε κατήλυθον ὑμέτερον δῶ,
> ὀτρυνέων Ὀδυσῆα σὺν ἀντιθέῳ Μενελάῳ
> Ἴλιον εἰς ἅμ' ἕπεσθαι ἐϋσσέλμων ἐπὶ νηῶν;
> μηνὶ δ' ἐν οὔλῳ πάντα περήσαμεν εὐρέα πόντον,
> σπουδῇ παρπεπιθόντες Ὀδυσσῆα πτολίπορθον.

> **Don't you remember when** I came there to your house with godlike Menelaus to urge Odysseus to accompany us to Ilium in his well-benched ships? It took us

196

a whole month to complete our journey over the wide sea, since it was only with great difficulty that we won over Odysseus the sacker of cities.

Agamemnon's question evokes the traditions surrounding the mustering of Greek troops for the Trojan expedition, an episode which Amphimedon does indeed remember (**μέμνημαι** τάδε πάντα, *Od.* 24.122).[66] Like Achilles' raids in the Troad, these events were also treated in the *Cypria* (*Cypr.* arg. 5 *GEF*) and alluded to in the *Iliad*, where Achilles' recruitment by Nestor and Odysseus is twice mentioned (*Il.* 9.252–9, 11.765–90). Agamemnon's question here, however, emphasises the specific difficulties involved in recruiting Odysseus, who seems to have shown some reluctance: the whole expedition to win him over took a whole month (μηνὶ δ' ἐν οὔλῳ, 24.118); Odysseus was only persuaded with difficulty (σπουδῇ, 24.119) and deceit (παρπεπιθόντες, 24.119);[67] and the Atreidae had to stay at Amphimedon's house, rather than at Odysseus' own, suggesting some friction in their relationship (24.115).[68] This emphasis on Odysseus' reluctance seems to hint at a specific tradition of his unwillingness to join the Trojan expedition, an episode also familiar to us from the *Cypria*.[69] In that poem, according to Proclus' summary, Odysseus refused to join the mission and even feigned madness to avoid it, only to be tricked by Palamedes into revealing his sanity when the life of his son Telemachus was threatened (*Cypr.* arg. 5b *GEF*). The reason for his reluctance was apparently a prophecy by the seer Halitherses, indicating that Odysseus would not return from Troy until the twentieth year (cf. *Od.* 2.170–6).[70]

---

[66] Moran (1975) 206–7 notes that this expression also initiates Amphimedon's distorted account of the suitors' death (*Od.* 24.123–90), indexically marking his skewed 'recollection' of the *Odyssey*.

[67] See LSJ s.v. παραπείθω, 'freq. with notion of deceit or guile'. Both other Odyssean uses of the verb (*Od.* 14.290, 22.213) bear this negative association: Danek (1998) 477.

[68] Cf. Sammons (2017) 88. Contrast the cooperation and elaborate hospitality that Nestor and Odysseus encounter in Peleus' house (*Il.* 11.765–90). The epithet πτολίπορθον (119) acknowledges the ultimate success of the embassy, nodding to Odysseus' key role in the eventual sack of Troy (cf. Haft (1990) for the significant resonance of this epithet in the *Iliad*).

[69] Cf. Stanford (1963) 83; Moran (1975) 206–7; Danek (1998) 476–8; Tsagalis (2012b) 328–30; Currie (2015) 288, (2016) 141.

[70] On the myth: Jouan (1966) 339–63; Gantz (1993) 580; Griffith (2013). From later accounts, we hear that Odysseus attempted to avoid the war by donning the headgear

197

The figure of Palamedes is, of course, notably absent from the *Odyssey*, which could suggest that this tale is simply a post-Homeric invention, and perhaps even an embellished extrapolation from this very passage.[71] However, aspects of Palamedes' character suggest a figure of considerable antiquity,[72] and one can easily understand why Homer would have muted his presence in the poem: as another figure of cunning and guile who had outwitted even Odysseus, he would be a rival claimant to the title of πολύμητις ἀνήρ. In addition, any mention of Odysseus' vengeful and deceitful murder of Palamedes (*Cypr.* arg. 12b, fr. 27 *GEF*) would considerably impair our estimation of the poem's protagonist. Palamedes' absence is thus, in all likelihood, a pointed case of Homeric exclusion.[73] Agamemnon's memory of the incident, like Homer's, is selective.

Regardless of Palamedes' involvement, however, the traditionality of Odysseus' feigned madness is reinforced by the fact that it reflects a facet of Odysseus' character that is already well established in Homer: his devotion to his family.[74] On several occasions in the *Iliad*, Odysseus describes himself as the 'father of Telemachus' (Τηλεμάχοιο πατήρ, *Il.* 2.260; Τηλεμάχοιο φίλον πατέρα, 4.354), uniquely defining himself in terms of his son, rather than the usual heroic practice of one's father.[75] This same concern with family is at the heart of the recruitment episode, in which Odysseus not only tries to stay at home but also abandons

---

of a sick man, yoking two incompatible animals to his plough (an ox and a horse/ass) and sowing his fields with salt. Palamedes unmasked the trick either by placing Telemachus before the plough (Hyg. *Fab.* 95; Serv. *ad Aen.* 2.81; Σ Lycoph. *Alex.* 815a, Tzetz. *ad Alex.* 384–6, 815) or by threatening the infant with a sword (Apollod. *Epit.* 3.7; Lucian, *De domo* 30), as Telephus did Orestes (Eur. *Telephus* test. vb *TrGF*; Ar. *Thesm.* 689–764).

[71] Cf. Strabo 8.6.2; Stanford (1963) 82–4. Clua (1985) 74–5 n. 14 catalogues various views on this Homeric silence.

[72] Cf. Phillips (1957); Kakridis (1995). Gerhard (1867) v 30–1 sees evidence of pre-Homeric tradition in an Etruscan mirror that depicts Ajax, Menelaus, Palamedes and Diomedes (in preparation for the recruitment of Odysseus?); cf. Christopoulos (2014) 155 n. 3 (correcting the table reference to CCCLXXXII,2).

[73] Thus Philostr. *Her.* 24.2, 43.15; *V.A.* 4.16.6; Kullmann (1960) 165–6; Szarmach (1974); Danek (1998) 139, 237; Schlange-Schöningen (2006).

[74] Cf. Borthwick (1985) 9–11.

[75] A scholiast apparently took at least one of these phrases as a self-conscious prefiguring of the *Odyssey* (προοικονομεῖ δὲ τὰ περὶ τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν, Σ Τ *Il.* 2.260a *ex.*; cf. Lentini (2006) 19–92), but given the more general and traditional association of Odysseus and Telemachus (as visible in the recruitment episode), a direct foreshadowing of the *Odyssey* is by no means certain.

198

his ruse to save his son. Both these Iliadic scenes, moreover, can be seen to evoke the context of Odysseus' maddened ploughing: in Book 2, Odysseus goes on to claim that any man becomes impatient who is parted from his wife even for a single month (ἕνα μῆνα, *Il.* 2.292–3), a sentiment which parallels his initial reluctance to go to the war, especially if 'one month' was the traditional duration of his delay (μηνὶ ... οὔλῳ, *Od.* 24.118). In Book 4, meanwhile, he has just been rebuked by Agamemnon for not entering the battle more quickly (*Il.* 4.336–48), just as he shirked from battle on Ithaca. As Scodel remarks, by mentioning his son in this context, the poet again 'links Telemachus with a question of whether Odysseus is eager to fight'.[76] Although, as ever, certainty is impossible given our limited evidence, it is likely that the tradition of Odysseus' reluctance and Palamedes' resolution of the impasse pre-dated the *Odyssey*. After all, we know from the Hesiodic *Catalogue* that Odysseus was not bound to participate in the Trojan war by the oath of Tyndareus, unlike Helen's former suitors (Hes. fr. 198.2–8, 204.78–84); he thus had more reason to avoid participation than most.

By alluding to the episode through the language of memory, therefore, Agamemnon once more indexes the recollection of another episode from the larger Trojan war tradition. In this case, however, we may also have a case of partial *mis*remembering, and not just because of Palamedes' omission. As we have seen above (§III.2), the Homeric epics tread a fine line between the opposite poles of memory and oblivion, and any act of memory is always liable to be partial, gradually eroded by the passage of time. In the case of this episode, it is worth noting that, outside the Odyssean Underworld (here and *Od.* 11.447–8), Agamemnon is not known to have featured in other early versions of the embassy to Odysseus. According to Proclus (*Cypr.* arg. 4–5 *GEF*), the embassy in the *Cypria* comprised Menelaus, Nestor and Palamedes,[77] while in Apollodorus' *Epitome*, Agamemnon is said to have sent a herald to each king, avoiding the dirty work of negotiation himself (*Epit.* 3.6). Judging by other Iliadic scenes,

---

[76] Scodel (2002) 15–16, noting the aptness of Telemachus' name here: 'fighting at a distance'.
[77] Cf. Heubeck (1992) 372–3; West (2013) 102, (2014a) 299 n. 244.

such delegation was his usual modus operandi: he sent the heralds Talthybius and Eurybates to take Briseis from Achilles (*Il.* 1.318–48), dispatched Phoenix, Ajax and Odysseus to speak on his behalf in the embassy to Achilles (*Il.* 9) and delegated the initial pre-war recruitment of Achilles to Nestor and Odysseus (*Il.* 9.252–9, 11.765–90).[78] Later in Apollodorus' *Epitome*, meanwhile, it is Menelaus, Odysseus and Talthybius who go to Cyprus to recruit Cinyras, the local king who offers a gift of breastplates to the pointedly 'absent' Agamemnon (Ἀγαμέμνονι . . . οὐ παρόντι, *Epit.* 3.9; for this gift, cf. *Il.* 11.20–8: §IV.2.1). In the case of Odysseus' recruitment too, it is thus likely that Agamemnon did not traditionally play a direct role.[79] Agamemnon's 'recollection' here appears to rewrite tradition, effacing any memory of Palamedes and substituting Agamemnon in his place.[80]

For an audience versed in tradition, Agamemnon's indexical appeal to memory would encourage recollection of this suppressed detail. Just as Agenor's indexical **φασί** effaces the tradition of Achilles' immortality in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 21.569: §II.2.4), so too does Agamemnon's reminiscence conceal Palamedes' role in a cloud of forgetfulness, subtly acknowledging the *Odyssey*'s partisan presentation of events. The appeal to memory invites audiences to recall this omitted detail and acknowledge Homer's more positive

---

[78] In the *Cypria*, Odysseus, Phoenix and Nestor recruited Achilles (*Cypr.* fr. 19 *GEF*). Agamemnon's art of delegation is not restricted to diplomacy: Achilles complains that he similarly does nothing in battle but retains the lion's share of booty (*Il.* 1.158–68, 9.328–33). On Agamemnon's characterisation: Taplin (1990); Porter (2019).

[79] Our only other evidence for Agamemnon's involvement comes in several late sources which were presumably influenced by the *Odyssey*: Hyg. *Fab.* 95; Quint. Smyrn. 5.191–4 (the indexical use of memory reinforces the likely connection with Homer's own 'recollection': ἠὲ τόδ' ἐξελάθου, ὅτ', 5.191. For such a chain of indexical memory, cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 9.52 (***memini***) ~ Callim. *Epigr.* 2.2 Pf. = *AP* 7.80.2 (**ἐμνήσθην**) ~ Heraclitus 1.8 *HE* = *AP* 7.465.8 (**μναμόσυνον**)). Contrast Palamedes' involvement elsewhere: Accius, *Ajax* 109–14 (= Cic. *Off.* 3. 98); Ov. *Met.* 13.34–42; Lucian, *De domo* 30; Philostr. *Her.* 33.4; Σ Soph. *Phil.* 1025; Serv. *ad Aen.* 2.81; Σ Stat. *Achil.* 1.93–4; *Myth. Vat.* 1.35, 2.228; Tzetz. *ad* Lycoph. *Alex.* 384–6, 815. Compare the competing traditions as to whether Agamemnon took Briseis in person or through heralds, evidenced in both the *Iliad* and vase painting: Lowenstam (1997) 39–44; Dué (2002) 28–30.

[80] Cf. Heubeck (1992) 372, who also suspects that the guest-friendship between Agamemnon and Amphimedon's father, Melaneus, is a Homeric invention; cf. Jones (1992) 78–9. This example of selective memory would support Gazis' case for a distinctive 'Poetics of Hades' (2018), in which the Underworld fosters alternative and partisan accounts of the epic past – though, as we have seen, such reframing of tradition is not unique to the Underworld.

presentation of Odysseus as the sole πολύμητις ἀνήρ. Memory, just like hearsay, not only marks allusive references but also signposts particularly contentious points of tradition, inviting audiences to recall other competing versions.

The Greeks at Aulis

A similarly selective treatment of the mythical past is visible in the *Iliad*. As the Greek army start disbanding in response to Agamemnon's 'testing' speech in *Iliad* 2, Odysseus rallies them by recalling an event from before the start of the war (*Il.* 2.299–304):

> τλῆτε, φίλοι, καὶ μείνατ' ἐπὶ χρόνον, ὄφρα δαῶμεν
> ἢ ἐτεὸν Κάλχας μαντεύεται, ἦε καὶ οὐκί.
> **εὖ** γὰρ δὴ **τόδε ἴδμεν** ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἐστὲ δὲ πάντες
> **μάρτυροι**, οὓς μὴ κῆρες ἔβαν θανάτοιο φέρουσαι·
> **χθιζά τε καὶ πρωΐζ', ὅτ'** ἐς Αὐλίδα νῆες Ἀχαιῶν
> ἠγερέθοντο κακὰ Πριάμῳ καὶ Τρωσὶ φέρουσαι·

> Endure, my friends, and wait a little longer, until we can learn whether Calchas' prophecy is true or not. **We know this well** in our minds – you were all **witnesses** to it, those whom the fates of death have not since carried off. **It seems just like yesterday or the day before when** the ships of the Achaeans were gathering at Aulis, bringing trouble for Priam and the Trojans.

He goes on to recall an omen that they witnessed while sacrificing to the gods at Aulis: a terrible blood-red-backed snake appeared near the altar and devoured eight sparrow chicks alongside their mother, before disappearing or being turned to stone (*Il.* 2.305–20).[81] Calchas immediately interpreted this omen to mean that the Greeks would sack Troy in the tenth year of the war, a prophecy that Odysseus recalls now to stop the Achaeans disbanding the war effort on the cusp of victory (*Il.* 2.321–32). This event appears to have been a well-established feature of the pre-war tradition.[82] Like many of the episodes we have discussed above (§III.2.1/3), it was

---

[81] On the authenticity of 2.319 and the disputed reading of 2.318 (ἀρίζηλον, 'conspicuous' or ἀΐζηλον, 'invisible'): Kirk (1985) 149–50; West (2011a) 108; Hunter (2018) 143–4.

[82] Kullmann (1960) 263; West (2011a) 32–3. Verzina (2014) n. 47 further argues that the eight-year time frame may be 'a residual feature of an ancient motif'. Later accounts closely follow that of Homer and the *Cypria*: Cic. *Div.* 2.30.63–5; Ov. *Met.* 12.11–23; Apollod. *Epit.* 3.15. Ovid's *vetus* . . . *ara* (*Met.* 12.12) indexically acknowledges the antiquity of Homer's version (cf. Musgrove (1997) 276–8).

treated in the *Cypria* (*Cypr.* arg. 6 *GEF*). And already in *Iliad* 1, the importance and traditionality of Calchas' pre-war prophecies have been suggested by his introduction as the man who guided the Greek ships to Troy with his art of prophecy (*Il.* 1.71–2) and by Agamemnon's scathing criticism of his ever-unfavourable prophecies (*Il.* 1.106–8).[83] By introducing his account of Aulis as something which he and his audience have witnessed (μάρτυροι, 2.302) and know (ἴδμεν, 2.301), Odysseus reinforces the sense that this is indeed a familiar and traditional episode,[84] an impression strengthened by a string of further indexical markers: the temporal phrase χθιζά τε καὶ πρωΐζ' ὅτε (2.303) marks the event as fresh in the Greeks' memories ('it seems just like yesterday or the day before'),[85] while Calchas goes on to predict that the fame of this omen will never die (κλέος οὔ ποτ' ὀλεῖται, *Il.* 2.325), a phrase which not only self-referentially marks the *Iliad*'s role in preserving that κλέος,[86] but also the fame and reputation that the tale has already acquired in tradition. Indeed, by recalling events in Aulis, the poet paves the way for the subsequent Catalogue of Ships (*Il.* 2.494–779), a passage which evokes the initial mustering of the Greek contingent at Aulis.[87]

There is one detail, however, that complicates the simplicity of Odysseus' appeal to knowledge. According to Proclus' summary of the *Cypria*, this snake and sparrow portent took place many years before the Greeks even arrived at Troy, during the army's first gathering at Aulis. Rather than immediately reaching Troy after this mustering, they mistakenly landed in Mysia, attacked Telephus and his men and returned home after being scattered by a storm (*Cypr.* arg. 7 *GEF*).[88] Proclus does not specify the time frame of this first abortive 'Teuthranian' expedition, but according to Apollodorus, it added an extra ten years to the whole expedition: the Greeks set out to Mysia in the second year after Helen's rape and only gathered again in Aulis eight years later, where they were helped by Telephus' local knowledge to reach

---

[83] For the possible allusion to Iphigenia's sacrifice at Aulis, see §IV.2.2; Nelson (2022).
[84] Cf. Currie (2016) 142; Hunter (2018) 140. For μάρτυροι, cf. Callim. fr. 612 Pf. (ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν ἀείδω); Catull. 64.357 (*testis* erit . . . *unda Scamandri* ~ *Il.* 21.1–382).
[85] Kirk (1985) 148.   [86] Taplin (1992) 88; cf. Nagy (2003) 25–7, (2009) 74–105.
[87] West (2011a) 32–3, 111–13. Significantly, Aulis is one of the very first places named in the catalogue (*Il.* 2.496).
[88] For this expedition as a doublet of the Trojan War: Currie (2015) 290.

Troy (Apollod. *Epit*. 3.18–20). Scholars have long debated whether these events are presupposed by the *Iliad*.[89] Their details seem to have been well established at an early date: Telephus is mentioned in passing as the father of Eurypylus in the *Odyssey* (*Od*. 11.519–20), his birth and flight from the Greeks are narrated in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* (Hes. fr. 165) and his encounter with Achilles appears to have been treated in the *Little Iliad* (*Il. Parv.* fr. 4 *GEF*). In recent years, moreover, Archilochus' Telephus elegy (fr. 17a Swift) has added further evidence that the myth was a familiar part of the epic tradition by at least the seventh century.[90] Yet the *Iliad* is conspicuously silent on this episode: it makes no direct mention of Telephus, and it is Calchas – not Telephus – who is said to have guided the ships to Troy through his own art of divination (*Il*. 1.71–2).[91] In the *Odyssey*, moreover, these extra ten years are incompatible with the poem's internal time frame, in which Odysseus returns to Ithaca after twenty years, ten spent wandering and ten at Troy. Even so, however, there is one detail in the *Iliad* that seems to presuppose the Teuthranian expedition: Helen's complaint that she has now been in Troy for twenty years (ἐεικοστὸν ἔτος, *Il*. 24.765–6), a total that is difficult to explain without presupposing the additional ten-year delay in Mysia (λέγεται τὸν πόλεμον εἰκοσαετῆ γενέσθαι, *Epit*. 3.18).[92] It is only a small hint, but it is enough to suggest that the audience of the *Iliad* could have been aware of the Teuthranian campaign.[93]

---

[89] *Iliad* presupposing: Kullmann (1960) 189–203, (2012) 15–20; Currie (2015) 289. Contrast: Σ A *Il*. 1.59c *Ariston.*, Σ T *Il*. 1.59d *ex.*; Page (1961) 207–8; Hölscher (1966) 120–1.

[90] Cf. Kullmann (2012) 16.

[91] νήεσσ' ἡγήσατ' Ἀχαιῶν Ἴλιον εἴσω, *Il*. 1.71 (of Calchas). Contrast: ὡς ἡγεμόνα γενησόμενον τοῦ ἐπ' Ἴλιον πλοῦ, *Cypr.* arg. 7d *GEF* (of Telephus). However, these versions are not mutually exclusive: in Apollodorus' *Epitome*, Telephus shows the course to steer, and Calchas confirms the accuracy of his information through his art of divination (*Epit*. 3.20).

[92] Thus Kullmann (1960) 192–3; cf. Σ T *Il*. 9.668b *ex.*; contrast: Σ T *Il*. 19.326a1 *ex.* I find Kullmann's argument more plausible than those who take 'twenty' simply as 'an intensification of ten' or 'equivalent to any large number' (Macleod (1982) 154; Richardson (1993) 358), as taking account of the time it took to muster the troops in the first place (Macleod (1982) 154), or as a polemical usurpation of a distinctively Odyssean time frame (*Od*. 19.222–3, 24.321–3; Tsagalis (2008) 135–49; cf. Reinhardt (1961) 485–90; Hooker (1986)).

[93] Kullmann (1960) 195–6 further suggests that the combination of πάλιν and ἄψ in *Il*. 1.59–60 (reading πάλιν πλαγχθέντας instead of παλιμπλαγχθέντας) might presuppose

203

In that case, we should ask how this larger tradition affects our interpretation of Odysseus' recall of Calchas' prophecy in *Iliad* 2. With the knowledge of hindsight, it seems that Calchas' calculation only determined how long the Greeks would spend in Troy once they had actually arrived there, but this was not the only possible way of interpreting his words. Like many ancient oracles and prophecies, Calchas' speech is polysemous. The crucial word is the adverb αὖθι (ὡς ἡμεῖς τοσσαῦτ' ἔτεα πτολεμίξομεν αὖθι, *Il.* 2.328). Taken with its locative meaning ('there'), it indicates that the Greeks will fight for ten years in Troy, and so it is fully compatible with the Teuthranian expedition before that time. However, if we foreground its temporal meaning ('forthwith/ immediately'), the prophecy tells that the Greeks will fight for ten years from the moment of the portent, a time frame that leaves no space for the Teuthranian campaign. Within the immediate context of *Iliad* 2, however, evoking a prophecy that preceded a failed and lengthy expedition is not especially auspicious. Indeed, as Hunter has remarked, if 'the audience of the *Iliad* were aware that this portent was elsewhere connected with an abortive first Trojan expedition, then this can only have increased a sense that Odysseus was manipulating "the facts" for rhetorical effect'.[94] Odysseus' evocation of knowledge, like Agamemnon's of memory, is pliable and selective. He avoids explicit mention of the many years of hardship endured even before they reached Troy, but in evoking the communal knowledge of his Greek audience, he invites Homer's external audience to recall this other episode, with all its additional baggage.

III.2.4 *Proleptic Knowledge*

Internal characters' repeated references to memory, knowledge and forgetting thus had a strong indexical potential in both Homeric poems, triggering an audience's recall of other episodes from the larger tradition, even those that had been suppressed or pointedly reshaped. Before turning to the phenomenon in the

a former return, that from Mysia: this is attractive, although not the most natural interpretation of the Greek.

[94] Hunter (2018) 140 n. 10.

204

wider epic tradition, however, it is worth dwelling on a distinctive aspect of indexical knowledge: the tendency for Homer's characters to exhibit knowledge which transcends the expected limits of their immediate circumstances, displaying an uncanny familiarity with events of the mythical future.

A simple example of this phenomenon occurs in *Iliad* 10. After Diomedes has chosen Odysseus to accompany him on his night mission, the Ithacan hero insists that Diomedes should not say too much about him, since 'you are saying these words among Argives **who know**' (**εἰδόσι** γάρ τοι ταῦτα μετ' Ἀργείοις ἀγορεύεις, *Il.* 10.250). As Maureen Alden has noted, 'What Odysseus thinks the Argives know on this occasion is that joint action by himself and Diomede[s] is a common theme in the tradition, and that he also has a number of solo night missions to his credit.'[95] Indeed, shortly before this, Diomedes has asked how he could possibly '**forget**' Odysseus as his ideal partner (πῶς ἄν … **λαθοίμην**, *Il.* 10.243), making the very same point. What Alden does not acknowledge, however, is the fact that most of these collaborations and nocturnal missions are events that take place after the action of the *Iliad*. Their joint theft of the Palladium (*Il. Parv.* arg. 4e *GEF*) and wounding of Polyxena (*Cypr.* fr. 34 *PEG*),[96] as well as Odysseus' capture of Helenus (*Il. Parv.* arg. 2a *GEF*) and disguised expedition in Troy (*Il. Parv.* arg. 4b–d *GEF*; *Od.* 4.240–58) all take place after the death and burial of Hector; only their joint slaying of Palamedes occurs earlier than the events of the *Iliad* (Paus. 10.31.2 = *Cypr.* fr. 27 *GEF*).[97] Odysseus thus presents the Greeks as having an anachronistic knowledge of his expertise and companionship with Diomedes

---

[95] Alden (2017) 10 with n. 38; cf. Kullmann (1960) 86; Fenik (1964) 12–13; Nagy (1979) 34–5.

[96] West does not print this fragment in his edition because he follows older scholars in arguing that this episode (ascribed to τὰ κυπριακά) derives not from the epic *Cypria*, but from another source (a prose treatment of Cyprus?): West (2013) 55 n. 1, cf. Welcker (1865–82) II 164; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1884) 181 n. 27; Bethe (1966) 69 n. 5. But such variation in the poem's title is common, and I follow those who attach this fragment to the *Cypria*: Bernabé (1987–2007) I 62, cf. I 38; Burgess (2001a) 242 n. 19, 252 n. 116.

[97] The pair are connected at several points earlier in the *Iliad* (e.g. *Il.* 5.519, 8.92–6), although their fullest collaboration again follows the *Doloneia*: *Il.* 11.310–400. Both are also associated with the return of Philoctetes from Lemnos (*Il. Parv.* arg. 2b *GEF*; Apollod. *Epit.* 5.8; Fenik (1964) 13 n. 2). For the later reception of this partnership, cf. Ov. *Met.* 13.98–102, 239–42, 350–3.

from previous tellings of the myth. Their knowledge becomes aligned with that of Homer's audience.

Such proleptic knowledge is a recurring element of both Homeric poems. In the Odyssean *Nekyia*, the newly deceased Elpenor already '**knows**' (**οἶδα**) what lies in store for Odysseus after his Underworld trip – that he will make a return visit to Circe on Aeaea before continuing his homeward voyage (*Od.* 11.69–70). Such knowledge is strictly anachronistic – and the first that Homer's audience has heard of this plot detail.[98] As with the Iliadic Argives' larger knowledge of Odysseus and Diomedes' teamwork, so too here, Elpenor's knowledge derives from the larger tradition, or at least from an atemporal familiarity with the whole of the poem that is still in progress. In the *Iliad*, meanwhile, both Hector and Agamemnon claim with unerring accuracy that they know full well that Troy will fall, an event that lies not only in their future, but even beyond the scope of their current poem (*Il.* 4.163–5 = 6.447–9):

> **εὖ** γὰρ **ἐγὼ τόδε οἶδα** κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν·
> ἔσσεται ἦμαρ **ὅτ᾽** ἄν ποτ᾽ ὀλώλῃ Ἴλιος ἱρὴ
> καὶ Πρίαμος καὶ λαὸς ἐϋμμελίω Πριάμοιο.

> **I know this well** in my mind and heart: the day will come **when** sacred Ilios will be destroyed, along with Priam and the people of Priam of the good ash spear.

These repeated verses provide a complementary and contrasting insight into what Troy's fate means to both the Greeks and the Trojans, Agamemnon's assertive declaration serving as a foil for Hector's later pathetic acknowledgement.[99] But the knowledge they express here again transcends their usual mortal limits. Agamemnon could be referring back to the Aulis prophecy which Odysseus recalled several books earlier, but Hector, as far as we are aware, has not been privy to any such divine message. Moreover, it is striking that after these verses both speakers utter alternative visions of the future which contradict this confessed 'knowledge': Agamemnon goes on to fear that Menelaus will die and the expedition be abandoned in ignominy (*Il.* 4.169–82), while

---

[98] Heubeck (1989) 81.
[99] Kirk (1990) 220; Di Benedetto (1994) 184–7; Stoevesandt (2016) 160–1. On the *Iliad*'s allusions to Troy's fall more generally: Kullmann (1960) 343–9; Haft (1990) 39–40.

206

Hector changes his tune to pray that his son Astyanax may rule mightily over Troy and be deemed superior to his father, a source of continuing joy for his mother – an image incompatible with his previous vision of Troy's ruin (*Il.* 6.476–81).[100] Their prophetic knowledge almost seems to be a quotation of the mythical tradition, of which they themselves in character remain uncertain.[101]

Even more striking than this prophecy of Troy's general doom, however, is Hector's dying prediction of Achilles' future death (*Il.* 22.356–60):

> ἦ **σ' εὖ γιγνώσκων** προτιόσσομαι, οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔμελλον
> πείσειν· ἦ γὰρ σοί γε σιδήρεος ἐν φρεσὶ θυμός.
> φράζεο νῦν, μή τοί τι θεῶν μήνιμα γένωμαι
> **ἤματι τῷ ὅτε** κέν σε Πάρις καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων
> ἐσθλὸν ἐόντ' ὀλέσωσιν ἐνὶ Σκαιῇσι πύλῃσιν.

> Yes, I see what will be – **I know you well**; I wasn't going to persuade you, since your heart is truly like iron in your breast. But take care now, in case I become a cause of divine wrath against you **on the day when** Paris and Phoebus Apollo destroy you at the Scaean gates, despite your bravery.

Hector shows an intimate awareness of the details of Achilles' death, the clearest in the whole poem. Throughout the *Iliad*, we have received increasingly precise premonitions of Achilles' fate, especially from his own horse Xanthus (*Il.* 19.416–17), and Achilles himself has admitted that he '**knows full well**' that he will die thanks to the insight of his divine mother Thetis (**εὖ** νυ τὸ **οἶδα** καὶ αὐτὸς ὅ μοι μόρος ἐνθάδ' ὀλέσθαι, *Il.* 19.421).[102] But Hector's remarks here transcend such a general awareness to specify the precise details of Achilles' fate: he will die at the hands of Paris and Apollo at the Scaean gates. Scholars often note that the dying were thought capable of supernaturally prophetic speech in antiquity, the same kind of precognition also displayed by Patroclus when he predicts Hector's impending

---

[100] Such vacillation of moods is 'characteristic of Homeric psychology': Griffin (1980) 72; Stoevesandt (2016) 64. And especially of Hector: Kullmann (2001) 397–9.

[101] Cf. too *Il.* 7.401: Diomedes claims that it is '**known**' (γνωτόν) that Troy is destined to fall.

[102] The recurring emphasis on fate further reinforces the traditionality of this coming death: it is demanded by tradition (**μόρσιμον**, 19.417; **μόρος**, 19.421; **μοῖρα**, 21.110).

demise at Achilles' hand (*Il.* 16.852–4).[103] But as Currie has argued, it is striking that Hector here – despite his misreading of the future at other times in the poem – matches the record of traditional mythology precisely.[104] In both the *Aethiopis* and later artistic depictions, it is both Paris and Apollo who are responsible for the hero's death (*Aeth.* arg. 3a *GEF*), while the Scaean gates are mentioned in the context of Peleus, Thetis and Achilles in a highly fragmentary papyrus ascribed to the Hesiodic *Catalogue* (Σκαιῆσι πύλῃσι, Hes. fr. 212b.5).[105] Crucially, Hector prefaces this prediction by emphasising his own knowledge (**γιγνώσκων**), marking his privileged understanding of Achilles' whole *fabula*. His knowledge transcends what a character should logically know within the plot.

Besides evoking episodes of the mythical past, therefore, characters' declarations of knowledge can also have a proleptic edge, looking forward to future events that reach beyond the strict confines of narrative logic. Such indexing of tradition is even more self-conscious than retrospective nods elsewhere, since it involves characters' familiarity with events of which they should strictly have no awareness. Of course, in a world that believes in prophecy, these moments could perhaps be taken as naturalistic descriptions of plausible human behaviour within the story world. But there are a number of factors that differentiate these episodes from the usual mantic mode elsewhere in Homer. First, they are not spoken by seers or prophets: except for those at death's door, these words are spoken by ordinary mortals from whom we would not expect such spontaneous, intuitive divination.[106] Second, their

---

[103] Σ AT *Il.* 16.854a *ex.* (citing Pl. *Ap.* 39c); Duckworth (1933) 19; Janko (1992) 420; de Jong (2012) 149. Perhaps we should add Elpenor's exceptional foreknowledge to this category (*Od.* 11.69–70).

[104] Currie (2016) 144, citing Andersen (1990) 27 (Hector is 'prone to be mistaken about the state of things') and further noting the breach of 'Jörgensen's law', the convention that Homer's mortal characters cannot usually name the specific deity who intervenes in human affairs: Jörgensen (1904); cf. Duckworth (1933) 32.

[105] For the myth of Achilles' death and its sources, cf. Burgess (2009) 38–9, although he does not mention the Hesiodic fragment. Later mentions of the Scaean gates: Apollod. *Epit.* 5.3; Quint. Smyrn. 3.82.

[106] On the role of the seer in antiquity, see Flower (2008); cf. Beck (2019). Finkelberg (2011b) 694 argues that 'divine messages may be received by non-professionals', but of her two examples, one is spoken by a god in disguise (*Od.* 1.200–2: Mentes/Athena) and the other is an interpretation of a bird omen and not just a 'spontaneous utterance'

predictions are direct, unmediated by a dream or the interpretation of omens.[107] And third, their prolepses are both specific and precise, lacking the normal ambiguity of literary prophecies.[108] Even in antiquity, their proleptic knowledge of future events would have been arresting and unusual. Through his characters' words, the prophet-like poet looks ahead to future mythical events.[109] Characters' knowledge can look both forwards and backwards to incorporate the whole story of the Trojan war.

III.2.5 *Mapping Epic Memory*

As the foregoing examples have demonstrated, poetic memory was already a well-established feature of Homeric poetry. Characters' recollections and knowledge of other episodes in their fictional world repeatedly map onto the recall of both earlier and later episodes from the epic tradition. Of course, not every mention of 'memory' will necessarily have such indexical potential. When characters 'recall' general nouns, such as 'battle', 'valour' and 'food', we would be hard pressed to interpret these indexically.[110] But in every instance where Homeric characters recall events (of the past or future), often alongside a temporal ὅτε (or ὡς/ὅσα), they appear to index a familiar episode from the larger cycle of epic myth.

So far, we have focused almost entirely on the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as rich sources for such cases of indexical memory. When we turn to the broader corpus of early Greek epic, by contrast, it is striking how few parallels we can find. In Hesiod's *Works and Days*, we

---

(*Od*. 15.172–3: Menelaus). Both speakers, moreover, explicitly acknowledge their divine inspiration, unlike any of our examples above.

[107] Contrast the dreams of Agamemnon (*Il*. 2.5–83), Penelope (*Od*. 4.795–841, 19.535–53) and Nausicaa (*Od*. 6.13–40), and the various bird omens in Homeric epic (e.g. *Il*. 13.821–3; *Od*. 15.160–5, 15.525–8); cf. Collins (2002); Lateiner (2011).

[108] Cryptic prophecies and enigmatic oracles: Struck (2004) 170–80; Klooster (2022) 39–41. Of course, such ambiguity may be more of a literary device than a reflection of historical reality: Naerebout and Beerden (2013).

[109] Prophet-like poet: cf. Klooster (2022) 35 on *Il*. 1.69–70 (Calchas) and Hes. *Theog*. 31–2 (Hesiod).

[110] E.g. χάρμης, *Il*. 4.222; θούριδος ἀλκῆς, *Il*. 6.112, *Od*. 4.527; δόρπου, *Il*. 24.601; φυλακῆς, *Il*. 7.371; νόστου, *Il*. 10.509; κοίτου, *Od*. 16.481. Though these could perhaps be interpreted as marking the resumption of traditional aspects of heroic life: fighting, feasting and sleeping are what these heroes are 'supposed' to be doing.

209

only encounter repeated exhortations to Perses to 'remember' the instructions he has received (μεμνημένος, *Op.* 298, 422, 616, 623, 641, 711, 728; cf. *HhAphr.* 283: Aphrodite to Anchises), while in the *Theogony*, characters only remember a handful of events from within the narrative: the Cyclopes recall Zeus's favour (**ἀπεμνήσαντο**, *Theog.* 503); Zeus recollects Prometheus' deception (**μεμνημένος**, *Theog.* 562); and the Hundred-Handers remember their friendship with Zeus (**μνησάμενοι**, *Theog.* 651). The best non-Homeric example occurs at the start of the seventh *Homeric Hymn* (to Dionysus), which does not launch into its narrative with the usual hymnic relative clause, but rather with an act of memory (*Hh.* 7.1–4):

> ἀμφὶ Διώνυσον Σεμέλης ἐρικυδέος υἱόν
> **μνήσομαι, ὡς** ἐφάνη παρὰ θῖν᾽ ἁλὸς ἀτρυγέτοιο
> ἀκτῇ ἐπὶ προβλῆτι, νεηνίῃ ἀνδρὶ ἐοικώς
> πρωθήβῃ·

> **I shall recall how** Dionysus, the son of glorious Semele, appeared on a protruding headland by the shore of the barren sea, looking like a young man in the prime of youth.

As we have already observed, the *Homeric Hymns* frequently foreground their narrator's engagement with memory, especially at their opening and close (§III.2), and scholars frequently suggest that this specific *Hymn*'s phrasing is a simple variant for the imperatival ἔννεπε/ἔσπετε found in other hymnic introductions.[111] But it is noteworthy that this foregrounding of memory precipitates an immediate dive into the *Hymn*'s narrative: such framing suggests that the subsequent story of Dionysus' capture and revenge was a familiar story. After all, the delocalised and distilled nature of the hymn's narrative certainly seems to presuppose a fuller pre-existing tradition of Dionysian epiphany and retribution.[112]

---

[111] Cf. *Hh.* 19.1, 33.1; Allen et al. (1936) 380; Jaillard (2011) 140 n. 19. For a full list of hymnic introductory phrases: Pavese (1991) 160–2.

[112] Jaillard (2011) 144; Jáuregui (2013) 242. The next extant appearances of the myth of Dionysus and the sailors are in Pindar (fr. 236: Lightfoot (2019); cf. Philodemus, *De pietate*, *P. Herc.* 1088 fr. 6: Obbink (1995) 203–4) and Euripides (*Cycl.* 11–12), although the details of the story may already be presupposed by Exekias' black-figure Munich kylix, *c.* 530 BCE; cf. Mackay (2010) 235. For fuller accounts: Ov. *Met.* 3.582–691; Nonn. *Dion.* 45.105–68. On the myth: Crusius (1889); James (1975); Herter (1980).

210

Of course, the precise nuance of μνήσομαι here could be debated: the verb hovers ambiguously between the poles of 'making mention of' something (i.e. introducing it into – and inscribing it within – collective memory) and actively 'recalling' it (i.e. drawing it from pre-existing memories). In this case, however, the latter interpretation is encouraged by a close Iliadic parallel which combines the same verb (μνήσομαι) and same conjunction (ὥς) in a context which clearly refers to the recollection of prior information (*Il.* 9.646–8):[113]

> ἀλλά μοι οἰδάνεται κραδίη χόλῳ, ὁππότε κείνων
> **μνήσομαι, ὥς** μ' ἀσύφηλον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔρεξεν
> Ἀτρεΐδης, ὡς εἴ τιν' ἀτίμητον μετανάστην.

> But my heart swells with anger whenever **I remember** this, **how** the son of Atreus insulted me among the Argives, as if I were some worthless migrant.

In his final dismissive response to the embassy, Achilles cites Agamemnon's original misstep as the cause of his continuing rage. His recollection intratextually looks back to the first book of the poem. It is thus plausible that the hymnic poet's own recollection, phrased in similar language, looks out intertextually to prior Dionysiac traditions in a similar fashion, presenting the ensuing account as established and authoritative.

Even if we count this example, however, our extant remains of early Greek epic offer slim pickings when it comes to indexical memory beyond the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. As far as our evidence goes, it seems to be an almost exclusively Homeric phenomenon, far more so than in the case of indexical hearsay. This is a significant finding, and one that could lend support to those scholars who picture Homeric epic as uniquely 'meta-Cyclic' or 'meta-epic', positioning itself against larger traditions in an extremely self-conscious manner.[114] However, it is likely that this apparent Homeric monopoly on indexical memory is largely a result of the narrative form of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, rather than any unique self-reflexivity. This allusive mode relies above all on the presence of character speech in extended mythical narratives,

---

[113] Cf. Moran (1975) 198–9. Of course, in the *Iliad* the verb is an aorist subjunctive, in the *Hymn* a future indicative.

[114] Finkelberg (1998) 154–5, (2011a), (2015). Cf. Burgess (2006) 149.

precisely what we find repeatedly in Homer, but rarely in the rest of extant archaic Greek epic. If other early Greek epics survived in their entirety, our picture would likely be very different. It is well known that Proclus' summaries of the Epic Cycle downplay the significance of character speech, making it very difficult to see what role it played there.[115] Rather than claiming 'poetic memory' as something originally or distinctively 'Homeric', then, it is better to see it as particularly tied to Homer's blend of the mimetic and diegetic modes.

Before concluding, however, we should address two potential objections to many of these cases of indexical memory in Homer and archaic epic. The first is the potentially formulaic nature of the language in which they are expressed. Many of the above examples have been introduced by a single recurring phrase, ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ/οἶσθ' ὅτε (*Il.* 15.18, 20.188, 21.396; *Od.* 16.424, 24.115), while the close structural parallels between *Od.* 1.29–31 and *Od.* 4.187–9 might similarly suggest formulaic scaffolding.[116] If so, the allusive readings above may put too much weight on what were simply traditional modes for introducing narratives and character speech. However, I do not think this is the case. For a start, we should not overplay the formulaic nature of all these examples: with *Od.* 1.29–31 and *Od.* 4.187–9, for example, we must stress that these are the only two places in Homer which combine the verbal forms μνήσατο and ἐπιμνησθείς; a fact which should make us hesitate before classing them as formulaic.[117] But in any case, this 'formulaic' objection relies on an outdated view of Homeric formulae as empty place-fillers, convenient building blocks devoid of meaning. Recent scholarship, by contrast, has highlighted the connotative meaning embedded in recurring formulae based on their repeated appearances (cf. §1.2). In this case, we could plausibly argue that the traditional resonance of ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ ὅτε lies precisely in its evocation of other stories and

---

[115] Sammons (2017) 230–1.

[116] Cf. Edwards (1991) 312: 'ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ is formular'; Kelly (2007a) 312–13.

[117] Rarity of repetition is often treated as a key indicator of a word or phrase's allusive potential: Bakker (2013) 157–69. Oralists have typically taken three instances as 'the minimum criterion of typicality': Kelly (2007a) 10. In the rest of archaic Greek epic, ἐπιμνησθείς occurs nowhere else, and μνήσατο only once (*HhDem.* 283).

characters: traditionally, this phrase functions as a longhand 'cf.'. In short, the formulaic quality of this language bolsters, rather than inhibits, its indexical value.

The second possible objection to this analysis is the fact that most of these Homeric instances of indexical memory are extremely naturalistic. Characters within this fictional world remember events or people from their own past, which is a completely natural human process. In comparison to the Ovidian Ariadne's overtly metaleptic memories, these Homeric examples are generally less marked, less in-your-face.[118] Given this greater subtlety, it might seem an overinterpretation to read these Homeric memories indexically. However, once again, I would challenge this reasoning. First, the instances of proleptic knowledge above (§III.2.4) involve the citation of mythical traditions which do extend beyond the natural limits of a character's available knowledge, not all of which can simply be explained away by ancient views on the supernatural insight of the dying. Moreover, it is striking that in every instance where characters recollect other events, these events belong either to earlier moments of the same text or to other traditional moments of the epic tradition. It would be overly sceptical to dismiss this mapping as a complete coincidence and deny its allusive significance.

Indeed, rather than seeing this difference between Homer and Ovid as a reason to dismiss our Homeric interpretations, it would be better to see it as an indicator of this index's diachronic development. While indexical memory functions smoothly and seamlessly in Homer, it gradually becomes more overt and artificial over time. The embeddedness of the Homeric process certainly fits with an overarching incorporative aesthetic: the Homeric text subsumes all past traditions within itself, a practice which again fits with Scodel's concept of Homer's 'rhetoric of traditionality' (cf. §II.2.3).[119] By casting the literary and mythical past as 'memories' of his characters, the poet maintains the pretence that everything is familiar and traditional – even, as we have seen, when those memories prove pointedly selective.

---

[118] See Nauta (2013) 223–30 for the Ovidian Ariadne's 'recollection' as a case of metalepsis (i.e. the breaking down of narrative boundaries).

[119] Scodel (2002) esp. 65–89.

213

III.3 Lyric Recall

Archaic lyric poets were no less concerned with memory and the immortalising aspects of poetry than their epic counterparts. They too fostered a close relationship with the Muses: they boast of being the Muses' attendants, messengers, interpreters, helpers and even sons,[120] and they often talk of their poetry or their poetic ability as a 'gift of the Muses'.[121] Like epic poets, they invoke the Muses as a source of inspiration, to grace them with their presence, to begin a new song, to give lovely charm to their poetry and – in epic style – to sing on a certain subject or answer a specific question.[122] But it is, above all, because of the Muses' ability to know everything (ἴσθ' … πάντα, Pind. *Pae*. 6.54–5) and to bestow metaphorical immortality in song that they are frequently summoned, thanks to their close association with memory.[123] More generally, lyric poets are also deeply invested in preserving the memory of whatever they narrate, including places (*Ol*. 6.92, *Pyth*. 9.88), gods (*Nem*. 7.80), *laudandi* (*Nem*. 7.14–16; *Isth*. 8.62) and themselves (Thgn. 100 = 1164d). Just like epic poets, they are embedded in an elaborate system of literary commemoration and preservation.[124]

The anxiety of forgetfulness also underlies much lyric poetry, where song again proves the antidote to eternal oblivion.[125] In Pindar's epinicia, oblivion is aligned with silence, darkness and

---

[120] Attendant: Sapph. fr. 150; Thgn. 769; Bacchyl. 5.192–3. Messenger: Thgn. 769; Pind. *Ol*. 6.90–1. Interpreter: Pind. *Pae*. 6.6; Bacchyl. 9.3; cf. Pind. fr. 150. Helper: Pind. *Ol*. 13.96–7. Son: Pind. *Nem*. 3.1.

[121] Archil. fr. 1.2; Sapph. fr. 32; Solon fr. 13.51; Thgn. 250; Bacchyl. 5.4; Pind. *Ol*. 7.7.

[122] Presence: Sapph. frr. 127–8; Stesichorus fr. 90.8–9. Beginning: Alcm. frr. 14a, 27. Charm: Alcm. fr. 27.2–3; Pind. fr. 75.2; cf. Hes. *Theog*. 104 (in this respect, they are closely associated with the Graces, who also grant poetic charm: *Theog*. 64–5; Sapph. fr. 103.5, fr. 128; Pind. *Pyth*. 9.1–4, *Nem*. 9.53–5). Subject: Simon. fr. *eleg*. 11.20–8; Hipponax fr. 128; cf. *Il*. 1.1, *Od*. 1.1. Question: Bacchyl. 15.47; Pind. *Pyth*. 4.70–2; cf. *Il*. 1.8.

[123] Cf. Sapph. fr. 55; Bacchyl. 3.90–8, 9.81–7; Pind. *Ol*. 10.91–6, *Nem*. 6.28–34; *Nem*. 7.11–16, *Isthm*. 8.56a–62; Arist. *Hymn to Virtue*, 842.17–19 *PMG*. On occasion, lyric poets play on the Muses' etymological association with memory: Μουσῶν μνησόμεθ', Thgn. 1056; Μοῖσα μεμνᾶσθαι φιλεῖ, *Nem*. 1.12; μνα<μο>νόοι, Pind. fr. 341. Generally, cf. Maslov (2016).

[124] Cf. Spelman (2018a) esp. 63–78. Memory was also an important concept at the symposium: Rösler (1990). For similar concerns in Attic tragedy: Wright (2010) 169–71.

[125] Segal (1986) 70–3; Montiglio (2000) 82–115.

obscurity as a foil to the commemorative 'light' of song. In *Nemean* 7, the poet acknowledges that 'great feats of strength live in deep darkness if they lack hymns' (ταὶ μεγάλαι γὰρ ἀλκαί | σκότον πολὺν ὕμνων ἔχοντι δεόμεναι, *Nem.* 7.12–13), and they are only preserved 'if, by the grace of shining-crowned Mnemosyne, recompense for labours is found in the famous songs of poetry' (εἰ Μναμοσύνας ἔκατι λιπαράμπυκος | εὕρηται ἄποινα μόχθων κλυταῖς ἐπέων ἀοιδαῖς, *Nem.* 7.15–16). It is the shining light of poetic Memory that ensures one's legacy in the face of gloomy forgetfulness.[126] Similarly, Sappho remarks that an unknown addressee will lack any remembrance (μναμοσύνα, fr. 55.1) after dying and will wander 'unseen' (ἀφανής, fr. 55.3) in the house of Hades because she has 'no share in the roses of Pieria', the birthplace of the Muses (οὐ γὰρ πεδέχῃς βρόδων | τὼν ἐκ Πιερίας, fr. 55.2–3); by apparently failing to mention the addressee's name, Sappho ensures her Muse-less and forgotten fate.[127] By contrast, the poet is confident that she and another addressee will still be remembered in the future (μνάσασθαί τινα φα‹ῖ›μ' ἔτι κἄτερον ἀμμέων, fr. 147) and that she will not be forgotten even after death (οὐδ' ἀποθανούσης ἔσται λήθη, Aristid. *Or.* 28.51 = fr. 193).[128] Lyric poets were concerned to preserve both their subject matter and their own name from the threat of eternal oblivion.

Despite this prominent concern with memory, however, extant lyric poetry offers few direct parallels for the kinds of indexical memory that we have identified in Homer. As in the larger corpus of archaic Greek epic, there are very few cases in which characters' reminiscences overlap with the audience's recall of the

---

[126] Carey (1981) 139–41; Most (1985) 142–3; Loscalzo (2000) 121–7. Cf. *Isth.* 7.17–19 with Agócs (2009). Athletic victories can also put an end to the oblivion of a household (ἔπαυσε λάθαν, *Nem.* 6.20–1), another parallel between song and deed: Segal (1986) 72.

[127] Those who quote the passage only identify the addressee as an 'uneducated' (ἀπαίδευτον, Stob. 3.4.12), 'wealthy' (πλουσίαν, Plut. *Coniug. Praec.* 145f–146a) or 'uncultured and ignorant' woman (τινα τῶν ἀμούσων καὶ ἀμαθῶν γυναικῶν, Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 646e–f). The absence of her name 'suggests that Sappho omitted it' (Hardie (2005) 18). The anonymity is reinforced by etymological play between ἀφανής and Ἀΐδα (cf. *Il.* 5.844–5; Soph. *Aj.* 606–8; Pl. *Cra.* 403a5–8, *Grg.* 493b4–5, *Phd.* 80d6–7).

[128] On Sappho's poetic immortality: Hardie (2005); Lardinois (2008); Spelman (2018a) 155–61.

literary and mythical past. Some of the examples that follow will thus be more speculative and open to debate than those we have encountered before. But given the well-established presence of indexical memory in Homeric epic, it is worth considering the various ways in which the device may also function in our lyric corpus – an exploration which opens up a number of interesting possibilities. In particular, the different narratological frame of lyric seems to invite other kinds of indexical memory to operate. The stronger presence of the first-person narratorial voice means that the narrator's own memories, rather than those of internal characters, can serve as an allusive trigger. In addition, lyric poets' more explicit acknowledgement of their audiences means that they could also appeal directly to their auditors' knowledge of the literary past – a stark contrast to the indirectness of Homer.

In the following sections, we will consider these various aspects of indexical memory in lyric, beginning with our limited evidence for the overlap of characters' and audiences' memories (§III.3.1). We will then consider the recollections of lyric narrators, which can both blur with events of the mythical past (§III.3.2) and evoke episodes of a contemporary poetic present (§III.3.3). And we will close by exploring lyric poets' explicit evocation of their audiences' memories and knowledge (§III.3.4).

III.3.1 *Mythical Recall*

When we turn to extant lyric poetry's treatment of myth, we find nothing precisely comparable to the Homeric cases of indexical recollection that we have explored above. There is no clear case of a character recalling an event from the mythical or poetic past. But there are a few glimpses of possible examples in several fragments and testimonia, which are worth exploring for what they tell us about lyric's engagement with indexical memory.

At times, the lyric narrator notes that characters did or did not remember an aspect of the mythical past, a comment that invites an audience to recall their own knowledge of the myth in question. In *Isthmian* 8, for example, Pindar claims that the gods '**remembered**' the pre-eminence of the Aeacids (ἐμέμναντ᾽) at the time when (ὅτ᾽) Zeus and Poseidon quarrelled over marrying Thetis

216

(*Isth.* 8.24–31). This opening emphasis on memory not only acknowledges the traditional excellence of the Aeacid line (including Achilles, Ajax and Peleus),[129] but also serves as a springboard into the narrator's own recollection of the marriage of Thetis and Peleus. The combination of a verb of memory with the temporal conjunction ὅτε is almost a Pindaric rebranding of the common epic formula ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ ὅτε; the phrase has been redistributed but retains its allusive function.

Scholars have long debated whether Pindar is here following a familiar tradition or innovating, especially on the points of Zeus and Poseidon's quarrel over Thetis and Themis' subsequent prophecy revealing the danger of Thetis' offspring for its father.[130] If these were Pindaric inventions, the poet's appeal to divine 'memory' may partly authorise this departure (especially when compounded by the concluding **φαντί**, *Pyth.* 8.46a). There is some evidence, however, that these elements are not complete fabrications. As Anne Pippin Burnett notes, Themis' role might already be suggested by an early sixth-century dinos of Sophilos (*LIMC* s.v. 'Peleus' 211), on which Themis follows immediately after Cheiron in the wedding procession.[131] Regardless of the degree of Pindaric innovation, however, it is significant that this myth is introduced as an act of character memory, precipitating the audience's own similar recall of the mythic past.[132]

In other lyric instances, a character reports their own memories or challenges that of another. An extremely scrappy fragment of Stesichorus' *Geryoneis* offers a particularly tantalising case (fr. 18):

[129] Cf. *Isth.* 8.40, where their piety is indexically marked (**φάτις**).
[130] Inventions: Σ *Isth.* 8.57b, Σ *Isth.* 8.67; Köhnken (1975) 34 n. 19; Hubbard (1987a) 5–16; Rutherford (2015) 456; Spelman (2018c) 194 n. 85. Tradition: Solmsen (1949) 128 n. 19; Stoneman (1981) 58–62.
[131] Burnett (2005) 115 n. 28. She further notes that some sort of mediator is 'implicit in the abandoned rivalry of Zeus and Poseidon, as seen at *N.*5.37'. In the versions of the *Cypria* (fr. 2) and Hesiodic *Catalogue* (fr. 210), Thetis honours Hera by refusing Zeus, who then gives her to Peleus, so there is no need for Themis' intervention.
[132] Cf. Sapph. fr. 16.10–11, where the Helen who fails to remember her family when she goes to Troy (κωὐδ[ὲ] . . . ἐμνάσθη) is a tangential 'recollection' of the epic heroine, who was all too mindful of what she had abandoned (*Il.* 3.139–40, 173–5; *Od.* 4.261–4): Rissman (1983) 41; Rosenmeyer (1997) 143–4; Segal (1998a) 66–7. Helen's forgetfulness may model the narrator's own skewed memory of the epic tradition.

— ⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑ μ]ιμνε παραὶ Δία
    παμ[βασιλῆα ⏑ —.
⏑ ⏑ — γλαυκ]ῶπις Ἀθάνα
⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑ —]ς ποτὶ ὃν κρατερό-
    φρονα πάτρω' ἱ]πποκέλευθον·
"⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑ —]ς **μεμναμένος** α[
    ⏑ ⏑ — —]
⏑⏑ — ⏑⏑ Γαρυ]όναν θ[αν]άτου

. . . remained beside Zeus, king of all; . . . grey-eyed Athena . . . to her strong-minded, horse-driving uncle: ' . . . **remembering** . . . Geryon . . . (from/of) death . . .

From what survives, we seem to have the start of an exchange between Athena and her uncle Poseidon – two gods who were no strangers to indexical memory in the *Iliad* (§III.2.1). Athena begins her speech by appealing to Poseidon's memory (**μεμναμένος**). The surrounding context is frustratingly lacunose, but the most plausible supplements offer an intriguing situation (fr. 18.6–9, suppl. Page and Barrett):[133]

ἄγ' ὑποσχέσιο]ς **μεμναμένος** ἅ[ν-
    περ ὑπέστας]
μὴ βούλεο Γαρυ]όναν θ[αν]άτου
    [ῥῦσθαι στυγεροῦ].

Come now, **remember** the promise that you made, and don't desire to rescue Geryon from hateful death.

These supplements offer a plausible reconstruction, with good epic and lyric parallels,[134] and they also fit the larger context well: it is natural that Poseidon would be inclined to save his grandson Geryon, just as he saves his sons the Moliones from Nestor in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 11.750–2).[135] Moreover, Poseidon and Athena are traditional rivals, not only in their competition for Athens, but also in their opposing treatments of Odysseus in the *Odyssey*; this is the latest in a series of ongoing confrontations. In

---

[133] Curtis (2011) 133–4 offers alternative (though unconvincing) supplements: see the critiques of Finglass (2012) 356; Coward (2013) 164.

[134] Cf. *Il.* 2.286 and *Od.* 10.483 (ὑπόσχεσιν ἥν περ ὑπέσταν/ὑπέστης), Alc. fr. 34.7–8 (θα[ν]άτω ῥύεσθε | ζακρυόεντος); Davies and Finglass (2014) 282.

[135] Cf. other gods' concern for their descendants: Ares and his son Ascalaphus (*Il.* 15.110–42); Zeus and Sarpedon (*Il.* 12.402–3, 16.431–8).

218

any case, if this reconstruction is along the right lines, Athena here invites Poseidon to recall a promise that he had once made not to interfere in Geryon's death, a promise that may well have featured earlier in the narrative.[136] Athena's appeal to Poseidon's memory would then be akin to the intratextual recall of the Iliadic theomachy, where Ares challenges Athena's own memory of Diomedes' *aristeia* (*Il.* 21.394–9: §III.2.2). This, of course, can remain no more than a tentative possibility, not only because of our dependence on supplements, but also because there is no guarantee that this 'promise' would have appeared earlier in the poem. In comparable cases from epic and drama, such 'reminiscences' sometimes invoke a promise or oath that has not in fact been mentioned previously.[137] The 'memory' here would then establish a fact as newly traditional, inscribing it into tradition, rather than looking back to anything pre-existing. On current evidence, we cannot determine the truth, but this example at least shows the potential for indexed memories in narrative lyric.

The other most tantalising example of mythical recall in lyric also concerns the Heracles tradition: Archilochus' treatment of Deianeira's rape by Nessus and the centaur's subsequent death at Heracles' hands. For this poem, we have no direct text at all, only a number of indirect references (frr. 286–9). Among these is the critique of Dio Chrysostom, who claims that some objected to the manner in which Archilochus portrayed the episode (Archil. fr. 286 = Dio Chrys. 60.1):

ἔχεις μοι λῦσαι ταύτην τὴν ἀπορίαν, πότερον δικαίως ἐγκαλοῦσιν οἱ μὲν τῷ Ἀρχιλόχῳ, οἱ δὲ τῷ Σοφοκλεῖ, περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸν Νέσσον καὶ τὴν Δηιάνειραν, ἢ οὔ; φασὶ γὰρ οἱ μὲν τὸν Ἀρχίλοχον ληρεῖν ποιοῦντα τὴν Δηιάνειραν ἐν τῷ βιάζεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Κενταύρου πρὸς τὸν Ἡρακλέα ῥαψῳδοῦσαν, **ἀναμιμνήσκουσαν** τῆς τοῦ Ἀχελῴου μνηστείας καὶ τῶν τότε γενομένων, ὥστε πολλὴν σχολὴν εἶναι τῷ Νέσσῳ ὅτι ἐβούλετο πρᾶξαι· οἱ δὲ τὸν Σοφοκλέα πρὸ τοῦ καιροῦ πεποιηκέναι τὴν τοξείαν, διαβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἔτι τὸν ποταμόν.

Can you solve this crux for me, whether or not some are right to criticise Archilochus, and others Sophocles, for their treatment of Nessus and

---

[136] Cf. Barrett (2007a) 17; Lazzeri (2008) 188; Rozokoki (2009) 3; Davies and Finglass (2014) 282.

[137] E.g. *Od.* 10.483–6 (Heubeck (1989) 68); Soph. *Trach.* 1222–4 (**μεμνημένος**, though perhaps a partial reference to *Trach.* 1181–90; N.B. μηδ' ἀπιστήσεις ἐμοί, 1183 ~ μηδ' ἀπιστήσῃς πατρί, 1224); Ar. *Ran.* 1469–70 (**μεμνημένος**: Dover (1993) 378, comparing Soph. *Phil.* 941); cf. Sommerstein and Torrance (2014) 86–111.

Deianeira? Some say that Archilochus is talking nonsense when he makes Deianeira sing a long speech to Heracles while she is being assaulted by the centaur, **reminding him** of the wooing of Achelous and the events that happened then – with the result that Nessus had plenty of time to do what he wanted. Others say that Sophocles introduced the shooting of the arrow before the right moment, when they were still crossing the river.

Dio's anonymous critics considered the length of Deianeira's appeal to Heracles inappropriate in context, giving her assailant all too much time to have his wicked way with her.[138] To prompt such critical censure, Deianeira's speech must have been an account of some length. The participle ῥαψῳδοῦσαν certainly suggests as much, figuring Deianeira as an epic rhapsode, stringing out an extensive recitation.[139]

Most significant for us here, however, is the content of her speech. According to Dio, she '**reminded**' Heracles of her earlier wooing by Achelous and the events that took place at that time (**ἀναμιμνήσκουσαν**), recalling a previous occasion on which Heracles had faced another bestial foe to secure Deianeira's hand in marriage.[140] We know little more about the speech than what Dio gives us, but a Homeric scholion provides the further detail that Archilochus depicted Achelous in a taurine form (Archil. fr. 287). In that case, we might suspect that Deianeira's report included a key detail known from many later accounts, a detail which is first explicitly attested in Pindar: that Heracles tore off one of Achelous' horns in the skirmish.[141]

We do not have any original verses from this poem, and we do not even have direct evidence of its genre or metre. But Ewen Bowie has plausibly argued that Archilochus' poem was

---

[138] Cf. Diod. Sic. 4.36.4, where Heracles' arrow strikes Nessus while he is mid-intercourse.

[139] Cf. Swift (2019) 413: 'ῥαψῳδοῦσαν and ἀναμιμνήσκουσαν imply a reasonable amount of narrative'. Originally, ῥαψῳδία appears to have been used for any spoken or recitative metre, but over time it 'became more and more associated with epic and with Homer': Ford (1988) 306.

[140] On the myth and the river: Isler (1970) 123–91; Brewster (1997) 9–14. The river is mentioned elsewhere in early Greek poetry; *Il.* 21.194; Hes. *Theog.* 340, fr. 10a.35; Pind. *Pae.* 21.9, fr. 70.1. Its earliest appearances in iconography date to the seventh and sixth centuries BCE: Ostrowski (1991) 16–17.

[141] Pind. fr. 249a; Ov. *Am.* 3.6.35–6, *Her.* 9.139–40, 16.267–8, *Met.* 8.882–4, 9.85–8, 9.97; Hyg. *Fab.* 31.7; Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.7.5; Philostr. min. *Imag.* 4.3; Nonn. *Dion.* 17.238–9. Rationalised by Diod. Sic. 4.35.3–4; Strabo 10.2.19. Sophocles may allude to this detail in his account's emphasis on Achelous' horns (*Trach.* 507–8, 519–22).

a narrative elegy,[142] and it is tempting to suppose that Dio's summary reflects, at least in part, the basic language and structure of Archilochus' original. In that case, given Dio's emphasis on Deianeira's 'reminding' of Heracles, the captured maiden could have explicitly prompted Heracles to recall the former occasion of the conflict with Achelous, perhaps even introducing it with the formula ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ ὅτε, a phrase that we have seen repeatedly in Homer. The Achelous episode would have provided a natural model for Heracles' current situation, marking Nessus as a doublet of the river, another rival for Deianeira's affections.[143] In addition, it would presage his coming defeat: like Achelous, Nessus is no match for Heracles. Just as the Iliadic Achilles recalled his former encounter with Aeneas, so too here would Deianeira recall a former tussle for her love as a paradigm for the present.

Admittedly, this is a speculative case, dependent on the language of Dio's summary, but it is the closest we come to the Homeric usage of this device in lyric. It may be significant, then, that this potential instance occurs in a strongly epicising context. As Bowie notes, 'On the scant evidence we have, this is a poem in which elegy handled material usually treated in hexameter epic, and did so in the same way as hexameter epic.'[144] Indexical memory within character speech may have thus carried a distinctively epic resonance, a resonance which would have been all the stronger if Stesichorus' *Geryoneis* did indeed contain a comparable example. Scholars have long remarked on the epicising nature of Stesichorean lyric, and an epicising narrative is

---

[142] Bowie (2001) 51–2, noting that ps.-Longinus pairs Archilochus and Eratosthenes as elegiac poets (*Subl.* 33.5), and that Archilochus' uncontrolled, abundant flood of verses there (Ἀρχιλόχου πολλὰ καὶ ἀνοικονόμητα παρασύροντος) matches Deianeira's uncontrolled outburst here. He further notes that an embedded exemplum is unlikely, since other Archilochean exempla seem to be animal fables (frr. 172–81, 184–7, 192; though now see the Telephus elegy, fr. 17a), and that the unsuitable length of Deianeira's speech suggests a self-standing narrative.

[143] In later art and literature, these two river-based incidents were presented as doublets: e.g. Ov. *Her.* 9.138–42, *Met.* 9.96–102. The throne of Apollo at Amyclae featured both episodes (Paus. 3.18.12, 16), and Sophocles' *Trachiniae* narrated both in quick succession (*Trach.* 507–30, 555–81).

[144] Bowie (2010b) 150; cf. Biggs (2019) on the epic resonance of river battles. Notopoulos (1966) even used this poem as evidence for his argument that Archilochus composed hexameters, but note the scepticism of Aloni (1984); Bowie (1986) 34.

221

more likely to exhibit extended character speech, the prime host for indexical recall.[145] Indeed, if we had a complete text of other Stesichorean poems, such as the *Oresteia*, *Nostoi* or *Games for Pelias*, we might well expect to find further cases.

There are thus only very limited hints of indexed character memories in lyric, whether in the voice of the narrator or characters. As with the larger corpus of archaic Greek epic, the major reason for this must be our general dearth of extended mythical narrative in lyric – a dearth which results in part from the fragmentary state of our evidence, forcing us to rely on scrappy fragments and second-hand testimonia.[146] But it also reflects a larger compositional strategy of the genre: Greek lyric poets frequently introduce myths in passing and in summary form, as paradigms for their present. In so doing, they rarely give direct voice to the characters of the mythical past – and even when they do, rarely at any length.[147] With this dominant approach to myth, it is unsurprising to find fewer cases of indexical memory in extant lyric. After all, every possible case we have explored concerns a fuller mythical narrative, each of which has a distinctively epic hue. We have already noted the epicising nature of Stesichorus' lyric and of Archilochus' Heracles narrative, while Pindar's account of the gods and Thetis concerns the origins of the whole Trojan war, a key epic theme. Indexical memory may thus have had not only a close association with narrative, but also more specifically with epic traditions.

---

[145] Epicising Stesichorus: Antip. Sid. or Thess. *AP* 7.75; Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.62 (*epici carminis onera lyra sustinentem*); ps.-Long. *Subl.* 13.3 (Ὁμηρικώτατος); Haslam (1978); Maingon (1980); Russo (1999); Hutchinson (2001) 117–19; West (2015a). Character speech: Barrett (2007a) 4; Carey (2015) 59–61.

[146] Besides Stesichorus fr. 18 and Archil fr. 286 above, cf. too Alcman's extremely fragmentary fr. 7, which involves some kind of memory connected to the Dioscuri (ἐμνάσαντ᾿, 7.13; cf. [ἐμ]νήσθη[σαν], 7.16), apparently in relation to their cult at Therapne alongside Menelaus and Helen (cf. Σ Eur. *Tro.* 210). It is uncertain who is doing the recalling and what is being recalled. For the Dioscuri in Alcman, cf. too fr. 21.

[147] It is notable that Pindar and Bacchylides are the only archaic lyric poets to feature in de Jong et al. (2004), a study of narrators, narratees and narratives in ancient Greek literature. On lyric narrative, cf. Caliva (2019); Fearn (2019); Purves (2021) 176–81.

222

III.*3.2* *Personal and Mythical Memory*

Besides these cases of internal characters' memories within poems, we can also identify instances where a lyric narrator foregrounds their own memory at a moment of allusion to mythical precedents and prototypes. Here too, the myths recalled have a distinctively epic tinge. In *Nemean* 9, Pindar uses an act of recall (**μνασθείς**, v. 10) as a springboard into his account of Adrastus, Amphiaraus and the expedition against Thebes, evoking Theban myth (*Nem.* 9.10–27). In another unplaced fragment, he bids Apollo '**remember**' that Heracles set up an altar to him and Zeus on Paros (**μνάσθηθ᾽ ὅτι**, fr. 140a.62–8), recalling the hero's sojourn on the island during his quest for Hippolyte's belt before his initial expedition to Troy, a tale that likely dates at least to the time of Archilochus.[148] In a poem of the *Theognidea*, meanwhile, the speaker's personal memory precipitates a summary account of archetypally epic adventures (Thgn. 1123–8):

> μή με κακῶν **μίμνησκε·** πέπονθά τοι οἷά τ᾽ Ὀδυσσεύς,
>   ὅς τ᾽ Ἀΐδεω μέγα δῶμ᾽ ἤλυθεν ἐξαναδύς.
> ὃς δὴ καὶ μνηστῆρας ἀνείλετο νηλέι θυμῷ
>   Πηνελόπης εὔφρων κουριδίης ἀλόχου,
> ἥ μιν δήθ᾽ ὑπέμεινε φίλῳ παρὰ παιδὶ μένουσα,
>   ὄφρα τε γῆς ἐπέβη †δειμαλέους γε μυχούς†

> Don't **remind** me of my misfortunes: I have suffered the kinds of things that Odysseus did, he who returned after coming up from the mighty house of Hades. With a pitiless spirit, he gladly slaughtered the suitors of Penelope, his wedded wife, who waited for him for a long time, staying by the side of her dear son, until he set foot on his land . . .[149]

The speaker's wish not to be 'reminded' of his ills segues into the recall of a mythical figure who has endured such suffering: the epic Odysseus, an archetypal endurer (πέπονθα, 1123 ~ πάθεν, *Od.* 1.4).

---

[148] Cf. Rutherford (2001) 377–82; Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.5.9. Pre-Archilochean origin: Swift (2014b) 441. Heracles' settlement of the Parian sons of Minos on Thasos offers a mythical prototype for the Parian colonisation of Thasos by Archilochus and/or his father Telesicles (cf. Marcaccini (2001); Kivilo (2010) 92, 94, 98–9) and their conflicts with Thracian locals (fr. 5, fr. 93a; Tsantsanoglou (2008)).

[149] The final line is corrupt. The most attractive emendation is that of Wassenbergh: δαιδαλέου τε μυχοῦ ('and his skilfully decorated inner hall'), perhaps referring to Odysseus' crafted bridal chamber (*Od.* 23.184–201): cf. Condello (2006) esp. 66–8.

223

After launching into the exemplum with an act of recall, Theognis focuses on two major episodes of the hero's *fabula*: the descent to the Underworld and his slaughter of the suitors.[150] Such an Odyssean analogy fits into the larger narratorial posturing of the *Theognidea*,[151] or – if Bowie is right to ascribe the poem to Archilochus – the iambicist's similar Odyssean persona.[152] Most crucial for my current purpose, however, is how this mythical exemplum is once again introduced with the language of memory: the speaker's recall of his own ills prompts the recollection of an epic exemplar of such suffering. Personal memory transitions to mythical memory.

A similar blurring of personal and mythical recall occurs in Tyrtaeus' elegy on ἀρετή, in which the poet begins with a catalogue of mythological exempla introduced by another verb of memory (fr. 12.1–9):[153]

> οὔτ' ἂν **μνησαίμην** οὔτ' **ἐν λόγῳ** ἄνδρα τιθείην
> οὔτε ποδῶν ἀρετῆς οὔτε παλαιμοσύνης,
> οὐδ' εἰ Κυκλώπων μὲν ἔχοι μέγεθός τε βίην τε,
> νικῴη δὲ θέων Θρηΐκιον Βορέην,
> οὐδ' εἰ Τιθωνοῖο φυὴν χαριέστερος εἴη,
> πλουτοίη δὲ Μίδεω καὶ Κινύρεω μάλιον,
> οὐδ' εἰ Τανταλίδεω Πέλοπος βασιλεύτερος εἴη,
> γλῶσσαν δ' Ἀδρήστου μειλιχόγηρυν ἔχοι,
> οὐδ' εἰ πᾶσαν ἔχοι δόξαν πλὴν θούριδος ἀλκῆς·

> I would not **recall** a man nor include him **in my poetry**[154] for his prowess in running or wrestling, not even if he had the size and strength of the Cyclopes or could outrun Thracian Boreas, nor if he were more handsome than Tithonus in form or richer than Midas and Cinyras, nor if he were more royal than Pelops, son of Tantalus, or had Adrastus' smooth persuasive tongue, nor if he had a reputation for everything except for furious valour.

In this opening priamel, the poet exalts 'furious valour' (θοῦρις ἀλκή) as the pinnacle of excellence (ἀρετή), dismissing other candidates for the title (extraordinary strength, speed, beauty,

---

[150] For the difficulties of interpretation in v. 1124, see Condello (2006) esp. 50–4. I prefer to see a reference to the *Nekyia*, rather than to Odysseus' actual death.

[151] Nagy (1985) 74–6, noting the themes of νόος, poverty and versatility.

[152] Bowie (2008) 140–1. Odyssean Archilochus: Seidensticker (1978).

[153] Luginbill (2002) convincingly defends this poem's authenticity.

[154] For this rendering of ἐν λόγῳ ἄνδρα τιθείην and the associations of λόγος: Gerber (1970) 75; Schwinge (1997) 388; Année (2010); Allan (2019) 117.

224

wealth, royalty and eloquence), which are each represented by a famous mythical hero. Tyrtaeus insists that he would 'not **recall** nor include **in my poetry**' a man who even outstripped these mythical forebears, preferring instead the man who is good in battle, an opposition reinforced by verbal repetition (ἄνδρα, fr. 12.1 ∼ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ... ἐν πολέμῳ, fr. 12.10 = fr. 12.20, ἀνὴρ ... πολέμου, fr. 12.43–4). As H. James Shey has highlighted, however, these exempla are carefully selected to emphasise the dangers of the other traits: 'In every instance, the mythological characters of the priamel possess *aretaí* which cause harm to themselves or others, or which are unable to save them from harm, unhappiness, or bad reputation': Polyphemus' brawn was outwitted by Odysseus' brains, Tithonus' beauty eventually withered into an extreme old age and so on.[155] The larger tradition lying behind each name implicitly indicates why Tyrtaeus most highly values θοῦρις ἀλκή.

To build on Shey's point, we could note how the opening emphasis on memory and λόγος encourages an audience to recall these wider traditions and to fill in the rest of each story. As a common tactic of *praeteritio*, the speaker invites his audience to recall what he claims he will leave unspoken. Of course, if we wanted to, we could easily find a mythical candidate who equally exemplifies the dangers of θοῦρις ἀλκή: Telamonian Ajax exhibits this very trait in Homer (e.g. *Il.* 11.566), and as we have already seen, he too comes to an ignominious end (§ΙΙ.3.1). Tyrtaeus, however, avoids pointing us in that direction and rather encourages us to recall the *fabulae* surrounding the characters he does name. In this poem, memory has shifted from a character's embedded speech to the narrator's own voice. His power of memory controls which myths are recalled or not.

As Ernst-Richard Schwinge has emphasised, however, this priamel is not purely ethical, for it also has a larger poetic and generic significance. Tyrtaeus is not just dismissing specific myths associated with other potential ἀρεταί, but also a collection of

---

[155] Shey (1976) 7–13 (quotation p. 9).

myths with a distinctively epic timbre.[156] Most of the heroes he cites are familiar from the epic tradition; the values they represent are valorised in epic;[157] and the very language in which they are expressed also draws heavily on the epic tradition: verse-ends, in particular, exhibit a whole host of familiar epic idioms,[158] while the phrase Ἀδρήστου μειλιχόγηρυν (fr. 12.8) may also draw on an epic formula associated with lost Theban epic.[159] The poet's opening appeal to his own memory thus triggers the recall of a host of epic traditions as a foil for his elegiac poem, with its new attitude towards ἀρετή. In what follows, he articulates an alternative poetics distanced from epic. By beginning with his own act of memory (μνησαίμην), he even usurps the traditional role of the epic Muses (μνησαίαθ', *Il*. 2.492). The poet's memory evokes and appropriates the epic tradition – in many ways, a foreshadowing of the Roman *recusatio*.

Indexical memory in lyric, therefore, was not restricted to internal characters' recollections of their fictional autobiographies, but also extended to the memory of poetic narrators, especially in elegy. In both of the foregoing cases, however, it is worth emphasising again that the myths recalled have a distinctively epic resonance: Theognis' Odysseus and Tyrtaeus' catalogue of epic figures. Once more, indexical memory seems particularly associated with the epic past; it is as if lyric poets were specifically acknowledging the epic heritage of this indexical device.

III.3.3 Memories of the Moment

Another major distinction between lyric and epic poetry also helps to explain lyric poets' apparently limited use of indexical memory, namely their far greater concern for their immediate present. Lyric

---

[156] Schwinge (1997) esp. 390–1. On Tyrtaeus and epic generally: Romney (2011). Cf. Romney (2020) 78–9, who notes how Tyrtaeus' following reference to encouragement through ἔπεσιν (fr. 12.19) evokes specifically epic poetry; cf. §IV.3.1 n. 161.

[157] Cf. Tarkow (1983) 51, who highlights Tyrtaeus' 'implicit rejection of a characteristically Homeric manner of describing activities', e.g. βοὴν ἀγαθός (*Il*. 2.408); πὺξ ἀγαθός (*Il*. 3.237). Note the inversion of epic values in fr. 12.15 (ξυνὸν δ'ἐσθλόν ~ ξυνὸν δὲ κακόν, *Il*. 16.262: Fuqua (1981) 218 n. 11).

[158] v. 3 (μέγεθός τε βίην τε) = *Il*. 7.288; v. 4 (Θρηΐκιον Βορέην) ~ Hes. *Op*. 553 (Θρηικίου Βορέω); v. 7 (βασιλεύτερος εἴη) ~ *Il*. 9.160, 9.392, 10.239 (βασιλεύτερός ἐστιν/εἰμί).

[159] Campbell (1982a) 180, comparing μελίγηρυν Ἄδραστον (Pl. *Phdr*. 269a5) and suggesting the *Thebaid* as a possible common source.

226

poets frequently picture themselves and their audiences in their own contemporary world, focusing more on personalised reminiscences of specific occasions from the recent – not mythical – past. When discussing such contemporary affairs, the language of memory will inevitably have a different valence to that found in continuous mythical narratives.

The Lesbian poet Sappho, for example, shows an emphatic concern with the memories of (what she depicts as) her personal, lived experience.[160] In one fragment, the narrator addresses a departing woman and bids her '**remember** me, for **you know** how we looked after you' (**μέμναισ'**, **οἶσθα** γὰρ ὥς <σ>ε πεδήπομεν, fr. 94.8) and goes on to '**remind**' her (**ὄμναισαι**, fr. 94.10) of all that they experienced with a catalogue of past loves and festivities (fr. 94.10–29).[161] In another, a woman who has departed to Lydia '**remembers** gentle Atthis with longing' (ἀγάνας **ἐπι-|μνάσθεισ'** Ἄτθιδος ἰμέρῳ, fr. 96.15–16), while in the famous priamel on τὸ κάλλιστον, the speaker's description of Helen '**reminds**' her of another absent female friend, Anactoria (]με νῦν Ἀνακτορί[ας **ὀ]νέμναι-**|[σ' οὐ] παρεοίσας, fr. 16.15–16). These and other fragments evoke a network of fond female farewells, in which memory played a key role in preserving social bonds, apparently a far cry from the functioning of poetic memory in the heroic world of archaic epic.

The same social and contextual aspects of memory are also active in the work of many other lyric poets. In a 'ship-of-state' poem by Sappho's Lesbian contemporary Alcaeus, the poet encourages his addressees to '**remember**' some previous object or event (**μνάσθητε** τὼν **πάροιθε** μ[, fr. 6.11), recalling the turbulent and stasiotic life of his *hetaireia* on Lesbos.[162] Archilochus

---

[160] On the Sapphic theme of memory: Maehler (1963) 59–63; Burnett (1983) 277–313; Snyder (1997) 45–61; Jarratt (2002); Calame (2005), (2012); Rayor (2005); Lardinois (2008). Lardinois' theory that Sappho was concerned primarily with memory of her performances, rather than of her songs, is rightly criticised by Spelman (2018a) 158 n. 81.

[161] See McEvilley (1971); Burnett (1979); Howie (1979). Cf. too fr. 24a: Sappho refers to her addressee's memory of what she and they used to do in their youth (]εμνάσεσθ', 2); fr. 88: references to understanding (]συνίησθα καῦτα, 10) and forgetting ([λέ]λαθ', 11).

[162] For discomfort with the 'ship-of-state' tag: Uhlig (2018). Memory also features prominently in Alcaeus' more exiguous fragments, e.g. fr. 75.7 ([μέ]μναιμ'), fr. 169a.6 (μναμ[), fr. 206.4 (ἐπιμνα .[).

227

bids his friend Glaucus to '**remember**' the land of Thasos (γῆς **ἐπιμνήσαιο** τ[ῆσδε], fr. 96.3); Alcman hopes to preserve the '**memory** of those present' (ἔστι παρέντων **μνᾶστιν** † ἐπιθέσθαι †, fr. 118); and Pindar claims that Hieron will be '**reminded**' of the battles in which he previously stood steadfast (**ἀμνάσειεν**, *Pyth.* 1.47). Lyric poets' frequent focus on the present and recent past differs strikingly from epic poetry's immersion in the distant world of myth.

Even here, however, it is possible that these emphatic appeals to memory may have often served an indexical role, recalling recent poetry and songs on contemporary events. Sappho, in particular, is a likely candidate for such poetic self-reference. As we have already seen, she is insistent elsewhere that she and her group will be remembered in the future, unlike the anonymous addressee of fr. 55, a claim which asserts the commemorative power of her poetry (§III.3). And indeed, the women 'recalled' in frr. 16 and 96 do seem to have been regular fixtures in her larger poetic corpus. Atthis features repeatedly in other extant fragments (frr. 8, 49, 90(10^A).15, 130.3–4) and appears alongside Anactoria in later lists of Sappho's companions (*test.* 219, 253, 263 = Ov. *Her.* 15.17–19).[163] Whatever precise relationship Sappho had with these women, they were evidently a recurring feature of her poetry.[164] As Sappho recalls these absent friends and her former experiences with them, we may thus be invited to recall their presence in her other songs.

The language of these poems certainly encourages us to pursue such cross references. In fr. 94, for example, the events which Sappho recalls resonate richly against her wider extant corpus, with numerous echoes of language and theme (fr. 94.7–29):

---

[163] Cf. too fr. 90(10^B).2 (['Ἀτ]θι γλυ[κ-], suppl. Treu); S476.3 *SLG* ([ἀ]γέρωχος Ἀτ[θις], suppl. Page).

[164] Sappho is variously seen as a member of a *hetaireia* of women (cf. Parker (1993); Stehle (1997) 262–318; Caciagli (2011)), as a (cultic/choral/erotic) instructor of *parthenoi* (e.g. Merkelbach (1957); Calame (1977) 427–32 = (2001) 210–14; Rösler (1992); Lardinois (1994); Calame (1996); Ferrari (2010) 33–8) or (most implausibly) as part of a community of courtesans (Schlesier (2013); Loscalzo (2019); cf. Sen. *Ep.* 88.37).

228

Lyric Recall

χαίροισ᾽ ἔρχεο κἄμεθεν
μέμναισ᾽, οἶσθα γὰρ ὤς <σ>ε πεδήπομεν·

—

αἰ δὲ μή, ἀλλά σ᾽ ἔγω θέλω
ὄμναισαι [. . . (.)] . [. . (.)] . ϝαι   10
ὀσ[. . . . .] καὶ κάλ᾽ ἐπάσχομεν.

—

πό[λλοις γὰρ στεφάν]οις ἴων
καὶ βρ[όδων . . .]κίων τ᾽ ὔμοι
κα . . [. . . . . .] πὰρ ἔμοι περεθήκαο

καὶ πό⌊λλαις ὐπα⌋θύμιδας   15
πλέκ⌊ταις ἀμφ᾽ ἀ⌋πάλαι δέραι
ἀνθέων ἐ[. . . . . .] πεποημμέναις
<—>
καὶ π . . . . . [   ]. μύρωι
βρενθείωι . [   ]ρυ[. .]ν
ἐξαλ<ε>ίψαο κα[ὶ ⌊βασ⌋]ιληίωι   20
<—>
καὶ στρώμν[αν ἐ]πὶ μολθάκαν
ἀπάλαν παρ[   ]ογων
ἐξίης πόθο[ν   ] . νίδων,
<—>
κωὔτε τις[οὔ]τε τι
ἶρον οὐδ᾽ ὐ[   ]   25
ἔπλετ᾽ ὄππ[οθεν ἄμ]μες ἀπέσκομεν,
<—>
οὐκ ἄλσος . [   ] . ρος
           ]ψοφος
           ] . . . οιδιαι

Go, farewell, and **remember** me, for **you know** how we looked after you.[165] But if you don't, I want **to remind** you . . . and the good times we enjoyed. For you put on many wreaths of violets and roses and . . . together by my side; and . . . many plaited garlands made from flowers around your tender neck; and . . . with floral, regal perfume you anointed yourself . . . and on soft beds . . . tender . . . you satisfied your longing . . . There was no . . . nor shrine from which we were absent, no grove . . . sound . . .

The reminiscence moves in vivid snapshots, progressing at first through a scene of increasing intimacy (from head, to neck, to

---

[165] For the meaning of πεδήπομεν (Aeolic for μεθείπομεν): Page (1955a) 77.

229

body, to bed), before expanding back out to more communal spaces and activities.[166] At one level, this sequence of memories provides a 'naturalistic' recollection of a past experience, but for all these different details we can identify a range of parallel moments elsewhere in Sappho's poetry. Garlands are a recurring feature of many fragments, as are flowers – and especially roses.[167] Particularly suggestive are the connections with fr. 81, in which Sappho tells Dica to put lovely flowered garlands (στεφάνοις ... ἐράτοις, 81.4) around her locks with her 'tender' hands (ἀπάλαισι χέρσιν, 81.5), paralleling the 'tender' garlanded neck in fr. 94 ([ἀ]πάλαι δέραι, v. 16). More generally, the adjective ἀπαλός recurs often in Sappho's poetry, especially of her companions. Besides its appearances in fr. 94 (vv. 16, 22) and fr. 81, it describes Gyrinno (fr. 82a), a tender girl picking flowers (fr. 122), and a tender companion on whose bosom someone might sleep (fr. 126).[168] Indeed, if the πόθος which is satisfied in fr. 94.23 refers to a 'longing' for sleep, as some scholars have suggested,[169] fr. 126 would provide a particularly close parallel for Sappho's recollection here. But even if fr. 94 conceals a reference to erotic πόθος (as is more likely),[170] this too finds numerous parallels elsewhere in Sappho's corpus (frr. 22.11, 36, 48.2, 102.2). Finally, the transition to the shrine (ἶρον, v. 25) and grove (ἄλσος, v. 27) also maps onto other aspects of Sappho's poetry, especially fr. 2's ecphrasis of the 'holy temple' (ναῦον | ἄγνον, 2.1–2) and 'grove' (ἄλσος, 2.2).[171] The language and details of Sappho's reminiscences reverberate

---

[166] See Greene (1994) 45–50 for Sappho's 'intersubjectivity' and 'pattern of mutuality' in this poem.

[167] Garlands: frr. 81.4, 92.10, 98a.8. Flowers: frr. 2.10, 96.14, 98a.9, 105c.2, 122.1, 132.1. Roses: frr. 2.6–7, 55.2–3, 74a.4; cf. *AP* 4.1.6, where Meleager chooses the rose to symbolise her poetry. For Sappho and flowers more generally, see Waern (1972); McEvilley (1973) 265; Stigers (1977); Irwin (1984) 165.

[168] Cf. too fr. 96.13, where the adjective describes chervil.

[169] Cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1913) 50 ('das Bedürfnis (der Ruhe)'); Lardinois (1994) 71 n. 53, (2001) 86 n. 51, comparing *Il.* 13.636–8 (ὕπνου ... ἐξ ἔρον εἶναι). This is one of many suggestions which downplay the erotic aspect of these verses: see McEvilley (1971) 3 n. 2 and Burnett (1983) 298 n. 56.

[170] Cf. Thgn. 1063–4 (ξὺν ὁμήλικι πάννυχον εὕδειν, | ἱμερτῶν ἔργων ἐξ ἔρον ἱέμενον): Ferrari (2010) 141.

[171] Cf. too the altar of fr. 154 (βῶμον). For the presumably musical ψόφος of v. 28, cf. fr. 44.25.

230

repeatedly against her wider poetic corpus, evoking other past songs and performances.

Sappho's poetry in general is well known for its repetitive nature; throughout her corpus, she repeatedly returns to the same images, vocabulary and motifs.[172] One effect of such repetitions is the creation of a consistent speaking voice, conjuring a sense of 'Sappho' as a distinctive and recognisable personality.[173] But the degree of repetitions and mappings that we have traced in fr. 94 do more than simply establish such an authorial persona: they also seem to offer a summary and distillation of many of the key themes and motifs of her poetry. Of course, our perception could be skewed by the vagaries of transmission. This poem is itself rather fragmentary, and very little now remains from the nine books of Sappho's poetry that once comprised her Alexandrian edition.[174] But at least as far as we can judge from what survives of this poem and her other extant fragments, this recollection provides almost a 'table of contents' for many of Sappho's wider literary concerns. We should not suppose that this recollection looks back to another specific Sapphic poem which treated the same occasion(s); indeed, such stale repetition would be unparalleled within her larger corpus. Rather, these memories reflect a composite of experiences from other poems, evoking a familiar but disjointed Sapphic world.

Such a strategy of self-citation would fit within a wider phenomenon of Sappho's poetry which has attracted recent critical interest: her deployment of 'song cycles', sequences of inter-related but discontinuous poems on the same topic.[175] With the publication of Sappho's (unprovenanced) *Brothers Poem*, scholars have focused particularly on a family cycle centred on the actions of her brother Charaxus, where – as Anastasia-Erasmia Peponi states – individual Sapphic poems serve as 'snapshots' or

---

[172] Noted e.g. by McEvilley (1973) 260; Segal (1974) 153.

[173] Thus O'Connell (2021).

[174] Alexandrian edition: Suda σ 107; Tullius Laurea, *AP* 7.17; Liberman (2007) 42–4; Prauscello (2021) 224–7.

[175] On 'song cycles' in general, see Swift (forthcoming); cf. §II.3.1; §IV.3.1/2. For a similarly indexed self-citation through the language of memory and reminding, cf. Pl. *Symp.* 201a (§III.1).

'vignettes', 'distinct and self-standing facets of a narrative that was never explicitly organized as such'.[176] But we can equally identify traces of other cycles in Sappho's corpus, including one which appears to have charted various stages of her relationship with Atthis, from loving intimacy (fr. 96, cf. fr. 49a) to bitter separation (fr. 130.3–4).[177] Within such sequences of songs, Sappho's recollections and self-citations would gain added point, highlighting the larger connections between her poems. Indeed, positioning fr. 94 as a whole against her wider corpus adds even further to our interpretation of it. Sappho's female interlocutor stresses that she is now leaving 'against her will' (Ψάπφ', ἦ μάν σ' ἀέκοισ' ἀπυλιμπάνω, 94.5) – a claim which reverses Aphrodite's promise in fr. 1 that her similarly anonymous beloved would soon love her 'even against her will' (κωὐκ ἐθέλοισα, 1.24). This verbal parallel reinforces a key theme of fr. 1, the cyclicality of desire (cf. fr. 1.21–4): grudging union gives way to grudging departure. As a whole, therefore, fr. 94 invites us to trace links with Sappho's broader poetic corpus. The emphatically repeated appeal to memory (**μέμναισ'**, **οἶσθα**, v. 8; **ὄμναισαι**, v. 10) reinforces this invitation, spurring Sappho's audiences to recall her cycles of other related poems.

Such self-citation is also likely in Alcaeus' appeal to memory. His extant poems foreground their future reception less insistently than Sappho's,[178] but at various points he acknowledges their enduring appeal, as when he claims that the weapons which he has just described 'cannot be **forgotten**' (τῶν οὐκ ἔστι **λάθεσθ'**, fr. 140.14) – a remark that 'figures the poetic memorability of his own description'.[179] It is thus very possible that his recollection in fr. 6 similarly indexes his wider poetic corpus, although the precise reference in this case is obscured by the papyrus' fragmentary state, leaving the crucial object of memory concealed: **μνάσθητε**

---

[176] Peponi (2016) 234. Cf. Lardinois (2014) 192, 194, (2016) 171–3, (2021b) 171–3; O'Connell (2018); Swift (forthcoming); cf. §11.3.1. On the problematic provenance of the *Brothers Poem*: §11.3.1 n. 208.

[177] Cf. Rayor and Lardinois (2014) 137, comparing Catullus' poetic depictions of his shifting relationship with Lesbia. See too Tsantsanoglou (2020) for a possible Arignota cycle.

[178] Spelman (2018a) 155, 161–2.

[179] Fearn (2018) 104; cf. 105 n. 39, where he notes further cases where forgetfulness thematises literary permanence: Alc. fr. 70.9 (**λαθοίμεθ'**), fr. 73.8 (**λελάθων**). On memory and forgetfulness in Alcaeus more generally: Kantzios (2019).

232

τῶν **πάροιθε** μ[('**remember** the **previous** . . .', fr. 6.11). Yet even so, all plausible supplements carry a possible indexical force. Hunt's μ[υθῶν] ('previous words') would be particularly self-referential, gesturing to Alcaeus' previous poetic speech, while the alternative μ[όχθων] ('previous toils') would evoke the hardships which Alcaeus complains of and prays to escape elsewhere (cf. ⌊μό⌋χθων, fr. 129.11).[180] In any case, a connection with previous events – and their poetic articulation – is reinforced by the poet's opening remark that a wave comes upon the ship '**again**' in the manner of a '**previous** one' (⌊τόδ' **αὖ**⌋ **τε** κῦμα τὼ **π**⌊**ρ**⌋**οτέρ**⌊**ω** † νέμω † | στείχει⌋, fr. 6.1–2). The poet explicitly draws a connection with previous suffering at sea, perhaps evoking a larger cycle of ship-of-state songs, akin to Sappho's Charaxus or Atthis cycles. By explicitly recalling past events later in the fragment, Alcaeus invites his audience to look back to other poems of his corpus.

Similar arguments can be advanced for the other examples above. Hieron's martial achievements, for example, could have been celebrated elsewhere in song, especially given the frequency with which the tyrant appears to have patronised literary commemorations of his accomplishments. By 'reminding' Hieron of his past military success, Pindar could simultaneously recall earlier poetic celebrations of it (**ἀμνάσειεν**, *Pyth.* 1.47). As for Archilochus fr. 96, the addressee of Archilochus' injunction to remember – Glaucus – reappears elsewhere in his poetry much as Atthis does in Sappho's (frr. 15, 48.7, 105.1, 117, 131.1); the poet's invitation to recall Thasos may well look back to Glaucus' relationship with the island in other poems.[181] Of course, these final suggestions can be no more than tempting conjectures on current evidence, but from the work of Sappho and Alcaeus we can conclude that the indexical memory of archaic lyric was not restricted to the realm of myth. Poets' 'contemporary' memories looked not only to their immediate social contexts (real or imagined), but also to the wider construction and articulation of their worlds in song.

[180] Hunt (1922) 71. The noun μῦθος does not feature in Sappho and Alcaeus' extant work and otherwise first appears outside archaic epic and elegy in Pindar (*Ol.* 1.29, *Nem.* 7.23, 8.33), which makes it less likely here.

[181] Cf. Swift (2019) 284–5, noting that the historical Glaucus was buried on Thasos: *SEG* 14.565.

233

III.3.4 *Audience Knowledge*

As we have seen above (§III.3.1–3), lyric poets rarely invoke audience's memories of events. When they do, it is more often through the narrator's own recollection, rather than those of its internal characters. When we turn to cases of indexical knowledge, however, it appears that lyric's capacity for more direct engagement between narrator and audience revitalised this allusive mode. Lyric poets occasionally assert their own knowledge of the poetic past, as when Alcaeus claims that he '**knows for certain**' that one should not move gravel (**οἶδ' ἦ μάν**, fr. 344.1), advice that he may have drawn directly from a poem by his Lesbian contemporary Sappho (μὴ κίνη χέραδος, fr. 145 ~ χέραδος μὴ . . . | κίνεις, Alc. fr. 344.1–2).[182] More frequently, however, lyric poets appeal directly to their audience's knowledge of the literary and mythical past. In these cases, we can trace the significance of the allusions more clearly than with lyric poets' indexical memory. Poets appeal to their audience's familiarity with tradition, explicitly evoking what 'you all know'.

One such appeal to audience knowledge is Pindar's evocation of Ajax's suicide in *Isthmian* 4 (*Isth.* 4.35–6b):

<div align="center">ἴστε μάν</div>

Αἴαντος ἀλκὰν φοίνιον, τὰν ὀψίᾳ	35b
ἐν νυκτὶ ταμὼν περὶ ᾧ φασγάνῳ μομφὰν ἔχει	
παίδεσσιν Ἑλλάνων ὅσοι Τροίανδ' ἔβαν.	36b

Surely you know of Ajax's bloodied valour, which he cut through late in the night with his own sword, bringing reproach on all the sons of the Greeks who went to Troy.

Pindar directly invokes his audience's acquaintance with Ajax's ἀλκή, another element familiar from the epic tradition (cf. §III.3.2 above on Tyrtaeus' θοῦρις ἀλκή). Here, however, the poet does not just evoke Ajax's character in general, but rather a specific episode of his *fabula*: his ignominious suicide after losing to Odysseus in

---

[182] The expression may be proverbial, but for Alcaeus' direct reception of Sappho elsewhere, see §I.2.3 (Alc. fr. 384); Whitmarsh (2018) 146–8 (Alc. fr. 283 ~ Sapph. fr. 16); Rösler (2021). Alcaeus' use of the emphatic particle μάν reappears in Pindaric appeals to knowledge (see immediately below): cf. Hummel (1993) 404; Spelman (2018a) 52 n. 27.

234

the contest for Achilles' arms, familiar from cyclic epic and archaic art onwards.[183]

It is unclear, however, how stable the details of Ajax's death were in the early tradition. As Spelman has highlighted, at least in later tradition, the timing of his suicide differs from that in Pindar's account.[184] In Sophocles' *Ajax*, the eponymous hero kills himself during the daytime, a version of events that seems to be found in other later treatments of the myth.[185] It is thus possible that this appeal to the audience's knowledge may look to more precise precedent than the epic tradition in general, invoking a specific version in which Ajax killed himself at night. If so, the scholion to this passage names a plausible candidate: in discussing the polyvalence of the phrase ὀψίᾳ ἐν νυκτί ('late in the night', 35b–6), it notes that 'the details of the story also agree with those who take the expression as denoting the pre-dawn hours; for the author of the *Aethiopis* says that Ajax took his own life towards dawn' (τοῖς δὲ τὸν ὄρθρον ἀκούουσι καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς ἱστορίας συνᾴδει· ὁ γὰρ τὴν Αἰθιοπίδα γράφων περὶ τὸν ὄρθρον φησὶ τὸν Αἴαντα ἑαυτὸν ἀνελεῖν, Σ *Isth*. 4.58b = *Aeth*. fr. 6 *GEF*).[186] From this scholiastic citation, scholars have argued that Pindar is making a direct reference to the *Aethiopis*, marking it as familiar to his audience.[187]

However, significant caution is necessary here. First, we should note that Ajax's suicide also featured in the *Little Iliad* (*Il. Parv*. arg. 1b *GEF*). Proclus' summary of that epic does not specify its precise timing, but a nighttime setting is again most plausible: the suicide immediately followed Ajax's maddened attack on the Achaeans' livestock, an event that always takes place at night elsewhere.[188] In his recent case for a specifically Aethiopic reference in *Isthmian* 4, Spelman dismisses this possibility, considering

---

[183] Cycle: *Il. Parv*. arg. 1b; *Aeth*. fr. 6 *GEF*. Art: *LIMC* s.v. 'Aias I', nos. 103–41; Finglass (2011) 28–30; §II.3.1.

[184] Spelman (2018c) 187 n. 36.

[185] Ov. *Met*. 13.386–92: Ajax commits suicide immediately after losing his verbal duel with Odysseus; Quint. Smyrn. 5.352–486: Ajax's revenge attempt and suicide take place shortly after dawn (5.395–403).

[186] On ὄρθρος: Wallace (1989); Davies (2016) 83.

[187] Nisetich (1989) 11; Spelman (2018a) 52, (2018c) 185–8.

[188] Cf. Soph. *Aj*. 21 (νυκτὸς . . . τῆσδε); Quint. Smyrn. 5.395–403 (as dawn rises); Apollod. *Epit*. 5.6 (νύκτωρ). Notably, Apollodorus' *Epitome* shares other significant links with the *Little Iliad* (esp. Ajax's burial in a coffin: *Epit*. 5.7 ~ *Il. Parv*. fr. 3 *GEF*).

235

it 'significant' that the scholia only invoke the *Aethiopis* as Pindaric precedent, with no mention of the *Little Iliad*.[189] But such an argument from silence is of limited value, especially when discussing ancient habits of scholarly citation, which – just as today – were never exhaustive. Moreover, there are good grounds for supposing that Sophocles' daytime suicide was a specific innovation of the tragic stage, dependent on the restrictions of tragic staging and the common dramatic motif of a 'single day' of action.[190] I thus consider it likely that the traditional epic version of the myth included a nighttime hunt and nocturnal suicide, and that it was only the lasting influence of Sophocles' play that overrode this tradition. After all, even in the Sophoclean drama, Ajax's failed attempt to take revenge on the Greek commanders (which likely derives from the *Little Iliad*) took place during the night (νυκτὸς . . . τῆσδε, *Aj.* 21).[191] It is only the suicide that is delayed into the next day, to allow a protracted exploration of its consequences.[192] The *Aethiopis*' late-night suicide may well not be as distinctive as scholars assume.

On this occasion, therefore, I do not think our evidence is sufficient to argue for an intertextual link with a specific text. A precise epic may be intended, but on current evidence, it would be overly rash to argue for a direct link with the *Aethiopis* over the *Little Iliad*.[193] The most we can plausibly say is that

---

[189] Spelman (2018c) 187 n. 36.

[190] Cf. Finglass (2011) 39. Sophocles may have been pre-empted by Aeschylus' *Thracian Women* (frr. 83–5 *TrGF*; cf. fr. dub. 451q), but the suicide in that play was reported in a messenger speech (fr. 83), which would have offered more flexibility in timing. For the significance of 'today' in tragedy: West (1987) 184; Austin and Olson (2004) 76; cf. Soph. *Aj.* 131–2, 753, 756, 778.

[191] Finglass (2011) 38–9.

[192] If this were a Sophoclean invention, the opening of the play would be all the more pointed. Odysseus is hunting Ajax's tracks at dawn, the very time that Ajax traditionally killed himself. The audience might then wonder whether Odysseus will find Ajax on the point of suicide, or even already dead.

[193] It is true that the preceding verses (*Isth.* 4.34–5) may allude to Odysseus' defeat of Ajax in a contest of words for Achilles' armour, a version that would certainly disagree with the *Little Iliad*, in which the contest was decided by eavesdropping on the opinion of Trojan girls (*Il. Parv.* fr. 2 *GEF*). But all we know of the *Aethiopis* is that a dispute arose between Ajax and Odysseus (*Aeth.* arg. 4d *GEF*); we do not know how it was resolved. Davies (1989) 57–8, (2016) 79–81 suspects that the *Aethiopis* followed the version in which Trojan prisoners testified (cf. Σ HQV *Od.* 11.547). In any case, most scholars suppose that Pindar's version was his own or at least a later invention: Burnett (2005)

236

Pindar is evoking his audience's knowledge of the epic tradition, whether or not he has a specific text in mind. Yet in any case, the subsequent verses' celebration of Ajax's enduring fame through Homeric verse (*Isth.* 4.37–42) seems to attach these epic traditions to the Homeric canon.[194] By stressing Ajax's honour 'among **mankind**' (τετίμακεν δι' **ἀνθρώπων**, 37), Pindar emphasises the hero's reception among a range of poetic audiences.[195] The universalising and communal aspect of this noun looks back to Pindar's opening appeal to his audience's knowledge (**ἴστε**). Their familiarity with Ajax's fate proves the success of the epic tradition in preserving his name and reputation, a model for Pindar's own immortalisation of Melissus' achievements (43–5).[196]

Such an appeal to group knowledge may well build on Homeric poetry: there too, speakers frequently address the knowledge of the whole community (e.g. *Il.* 2.301, 9.35–36, 10.250, 20.203–4), a knowledge which – as we have seen – often extends to that of Homer's own audiences (§III.2). In Pindar's lyric, however, this appeal to his audience's collective knowledge has become more pointed: through the second-person plural verb, he addresses them directly.

Pindar's only other use of the expression **ἴστε μάν** occurs in the closely related *Isthmian* 3 and bears a similar indexical force (*Isth.* 3.13–16):

> ἀνδρῶν δ' ἀρετάν
> σύμφυτον οὐ κατελέγχει.
> **ἴστε μάν** Κλεωνύμου
> δόξαν **παλαιὰν** ἅρμασιν·

> He does not disgrace the innate excellence of his kinsmen. **Surely you know** of Cleonymus' **ancient** reputation for charioteering.

The relation between this poem and *Isthmian* 4 has been long debated. Uniquely in Pindar's corpus, these two poems address

---

173; Rutherford (2015) 454–5. The allusion to the contest of words, then, does not support a direct link with the *Aethiopis*.

[194] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1884) 352; Burkert (1987) 46; Spelman (2018c) 185–8. Contrast others who argue for a contrast between Ajax's ignominious end in the *Aethiopis* and his celebrated reputation in the *Iliad*: Nisetich (1989) 12; Willcock (1995) 79–80.

[195] For ἄνθρωποι as a poetic audience: §II.2.4 n. 127.

[196] Cf. McNeal (1978) 155; Spelman (2018a) 51–60.

237

the same victor in the same metre, which has prompted some scholars to join them.[197] However, most scholars now accept their independence on a variety of metrical and structural grounds: *Isthmian* 3 was composed for a chariot victory at Nemea, shortly after Melissus' earlier success in the Isthmian Games, celebrated in *Isthmian* 4.[198] When Pindar mentions 'twin prizes' in *Isth*. 3.9 (διδύμων ἀέθλων), he thus refers to the two 'crowns' that Melissus has won (cf. στεφάνους, 3.11), as well as the pair of poems which celebrate these achievements (cf. ὑμνῆσαι, 3.7; ἀγαναῖς χαρίτεσσιν, 3.8). In the verses quoted above, however, Pindar looks beyond these two victories to the larger reputation of Melissus' ancestors for chariot victories. This is again marked as something with which Pindar's audience should already be familiar (ἴστε μάν). And here too, it seems that they would have been: *Isthmian* 4 had already recalled the '**ancient fame**' of his clan, the Cleonymidae (**φάμαν παλαιάν**, *Isth*. 4.22), a fame which Pindar there specified as deriving from earlier chariot victories (*Isth*. 4.25–7):

ἅ τε κὰν γουνοῖς Ἀθανᾶν ἅρμα καρύξαισα νικᾶν
ἔν τ' Ἀδραστείοις ἀέθλοις Σικυῶνος ὤπασεν
τοιάδε τῶν τότ' ἐόντων φύλλ' ἀοιδᾶν.

That fame heralded their chariot's victory both on the hills of Athens and in Adrastus' games at Sicyon, and granted them leaves of song such as these from poets of that time.

It is likely that the 'leaves of song' (φύλλ' ἀοιδᾶν, *Isth*. 4.27) mentioned here are the source of the knowledge that Pindar invokes in *Isthmian* 3, especially given the verbal echoes between these passages (δόξαν παλαιὰν ἅρμασιν, *Isth*. 3.16 ~ φάμαν παλαιάν, *Isth*. 4.22, ἅρμα *Isth*. 4.25). Pindar expects his audience to be familiar with this family's reputation from its earlier poetic celebrations, whether composed by Pindar himself or another

---

[197] E.g. Boedeker (1895); Thummer (1968–69) II 55–7; Segal (1981) 69–70; cf. Cole (2003) (taking *Isth*. 3 as a modified opening for *Isth*. 4).

[198] E.g. Köhnken (1971) 87–94; Hamilton (1974) 111; Lidov (1974); Willcock (1995) 69–71; Barrett (2007b) 162–7; Ivanov (2010) 1–49. *Isthmian* 4 may have also celebrated a chariot victory: Privitera (1978–79).

238

epinician poet.[199] In *Isthmian* 3, the emphatic **ἴστε μάν** gestures indexically to this poetic precedent, reinforced by the adjective **παλαιάν**, which further emphasises the antiquity of this fame – it is an established feature of the epinician canon. By indexing this precedent through the plural **ἴστε**, Pindar again evokes his audience's communal, shared knowledge of past song. He sets his own poetry within a broader epinician tradition, just as he situates Melissus' victory within a larger framework of familial success.

This emphasis on an audience's collective knowledge of tradition is a recurring feature of Pindar's poetics. In fr. 188, the poet claims that '**you recognise** the **well-known** utterance of Polymnestus, the man from Colophon' (φθέγμα μὲν **πάγκοινον ἔγνωκας** Πολυμνάστου Κολοφωνίου ἀνδρός), referring to a poetic predecessor of the seventh century.[200] Unlike our previous examples, he employs a singular verb (**ἔγνωκας**, perhaps directed to a specific addressee), but the communality of this knowledge is still conveyed by the adjective **πάγκοινον**: the poet's song is 'common to all'. In *Pythian* 3, meanwhile, the poet recognises that both he and his audience '**know**' of Nestor and Sarpedon 'from resounding **verses**' (ἐξ **ἐπέων** κελαδεννῶν ... **γινώσκομεν**, *Pyth.* 3.112–14), explicitly acknowledging their shared epic heritage.[201] And in *Isthmian* 2, he claims that Thrasybulus' family is '**not unfamiliar**' with epinician poetry (**οὐκ ἀγνῶτες**, *Isth.* 2.30–2), a litotic expression which underscores how frequently the Emmenidae were recipients of poetic praise (cf. εὐδόξων ... ἀνδρῶν, *Isth.* 2.34).[202] Indeed, this claim concludes a list of Xenocrates' earlier victories which had begun with a similar reference to a '**not unknown**' Isthmian

---

[199] Such 'leaves of song' could have come from earlier in Pindar's own career, as Spelman (2018a) 32 assumes: his earliest dated poem is *Pyth.* 10 (498 BCE). But we could equally imagine the work of another poet, especially given the distancing τῶν τότ' ἐόντων ('from poets of that time', *Isth.* 4.27); cf. Farnell (1932) 348 ('an epinician poem'); Nisetich (1989) 76 n. 15 ('poetry'). For the allusive connection between *Isthmians* 3 and 4, cf. Currie (2021c) 343–4.

[200] On Polymnestus: Ar. *Eq.* 1287; [Plut.] *de mus.* 1132c, 1133a–b, 1134a–d, 1135c, 1141b; Almazova (2020).

[201] Cf. §II.3.1 on ἀνθρώπων φάτις (*Pyth.* 3.112). For Pindar's inclusive first-person verb here, cf. Neumann-Hartmann (2005) 154, comparing *Pyth.* 12.17–18, *Nem.* 7.86–9.

[202] Cf. Pindar's previous ode for Xenocrates (*Pythian* 6, cf. *Isth.* 2.18–19), Pindar's poems for Xenocrates' brother Theron (*Olympians* 2 and 3, cf. *Isth.* 2.23–9) and possibly a Simonidean ode for Xenocrates (fr. 513): Spelman (2018a) 226.

239

chariot victory (**οὐκ ἄγνωτ'** . . . Ἰσθμίαν ἵπποισι νίκαν, *Isth.* 2.12–13), a phrase which may again look to earlier literary celebrations of former achievements.[203] The emphatically repeated litotes reinforces the sense that Pindar's audience, too, should be familiar with these events from earlier song.

Such appeals to the audience's knowledge thus gestured to traditions of myth and poetry with which they would be familiar, against which the poet could situate his own work.[204] But as with indexical hearsay in lyric, this appeal to audience knowledge could also invite audiences to supplement a myth with their broader familiarity of tradition. In Bacchylides' ninth epinician, for example, a poem composed for the Phliasian athlete Automedes, the poet opens an allusive catalogue of Asopus' daughters by appealing to his audience's knowledge (Bacchyl. 9.47–56):

> στείχει δι' εὐρείας κελε[ύ]θου
> **μυρία** πάντα **φάτις**
> σᾶς γενεᾶς λιπαρο-
>   ζώνων θυγατρῶν, ἃς θε[ο]ί
> σὺν τύχαις ᾤκισσαν ἀρχα-
>   γοὺς ἀπορθήτων ἀγυιᾶν.
>
> **τίς γὰρ οὐκ οἶδεν** κυανοπλοκάμου
>   Θήβας ἐΰδμα[τον πόλι]ν,
> ἢ τὰν **μεγαλώνυ]μον** Αἴγιναν, μεγ[ίστ]ου
>   Ζην]ὸς [ἃ πλαθεῖσα λ]έχει τέκεν ἥρω

Countless reports travel along a broad path in every direction about your family, your bright-girdled daughters, whom gods settled with good fortunes as the founders of unsacked streets. **For who does not know** of the well-built city of dark-tressed Thebes, or of **great-named** Aegina, she who approached the bed of most mighty Zeus and bore the hero . . . ?

After commencing here with Thebes and Aegina, the subsequent fragmentary lines appear to mention Aegina's son Aeacus (father

---

[203] Cf. Spelman (2018a) 271 n. 45. Contrast Pavese (1966) 111, who takes the adjective proleptically, referring to the fame the present poem will bestow. But the list seems to refer to a string of Xenocrates' past victories which had likely already been celebrated elsewhere: see previous note.

[204] For an earlier possible case, see Tyrtaeus fr. 11.7–8, where the poet appeals to his audience's knowledge of the horrors of war (ἴστε, εὖ . . . ἐδάητ'), evoking not only their personal experiences of battle in seventh-century Sparta, but also epic and Homeric depictions of warfare: Nelson (2021d) 141–2.

240

of Peleus and Telamon) and continue with a list of other Asopids, before ending in a closural ring composition (9.64–5). The opening emphasis on the family's fame and renown (**μυρία . . . φάτις**, v. 48; [**μεγαλώνυ]μον**, v. 55) emphasises the traditionality of the catalogue that follows, a familiarity that is reinforced by Bacchylides' appeal to the audience's knowledge. The rhetorical question ('**For who does not know** . . . ?', v. 53) implies that everyone is expected to be familiar with this myth.[205] And indeed, the list of Asopus' daughters, all of whom had been wooed by gods and had become the eponyms of cities, appears to have been an established legend. A fragment of Corinna offers a similar list of nine Asopids, containing much overlap with Bacchylides (fr. 654 col. ii–iv).[206] And as Douglas Cairns has argued, both Corinna and Bacchylides seem to be following an earlier version of the myth, perhaps that by the Corinthian Eumelus or the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*.[207] We know, moreover, that an Asopid ancestry was an important feature of the Phliasians' local mythology and part of a larger debate as to whether the ancestor of these illustrious city-nymphs was the Asopus river in Boeotia or its namesake in Phliasian territory.[208] As part of their claim, the Phliasians dedicated both a statue group of Zeus and Aegina in Delphi (Paus. 10.13.6) and a group of Zeus, Asopus and five Asopids (including Thebes) at Olympia (Paus. 5.22.6). In asking who is not familiar with these famous cities and their Asopid ancestry, Bacchylides indexes his engagement with a familiar and politically charged local myth.

Besides evoking a well-known myth, this invitation for an audience to recall their knowledge of the Asopids also invites them to supplement the bare details that Bacchylides offers, especially in relation to the first name he mentions: Thebes. The city is described here as 'well-built' (ἐΰδμα[τον], 54) and introduced as an example of 'unsacked streets' (ἀπορθήτων

---

[205] Cf. Berman (2015) 56: 'The line . . . reveals a poet aware of his epic predecessors'.
[206] On Corinna's catalogue: Larson (2002).
[207] Cairns (2010) 262. Eumelus: Bowra (1938). On the Asopids in the *Catalogue*: West (1985) 100–3, 162–4; Cardin (2010). Nagy (2011) similarly suspects that the *Catalogue* influenced Pindar's Aeginetan odes.
[208] Larson (2001) 138–42, 303 n. 44; Fearn (2003) 358–62; Paus. 2.5.2 (Phliasians vs. Thebans). Σ D *Il.* 1.180 offers a compromise.

241

ἀγυιᾶν, 52). The earlier part of Bacchylides' poem had already recalled the failed expedition of the Seven against Thebes (9.10–20), an event which on the face of it reinforces this assessment: the city stood strong and repulsed its assailants.[209] But any mention of the expedition of the Seven cannot fail to evoke thoughts of its sequel, the successful sacking of the city by the Epigonoi (§IV.2.3). In appealing to his audience's knowledge of the myth, Bacchylides' silence on this point resonates all too loudly. 'Yes', we are invited to reply, 'we do know what happened to Thebes'. Scholars have seen a political purpose underlying this suppression of the Epigonoi myth, a way to downplay and negate Argive achievement while simultaneously 'super-imposing a skewed pro-Phliasian genealogy' onto Thebes.[210] But despite the explicit silence, the poet's appeal to his audience's knowledge gives space for the lingering shadow of tradition to rear its head, undermining any simple patriotism.

Indexical appeals to audience knowledge, just like indexical hearsay, therefore, can invite audiences to fill in the gaps of a story with their knowledge of tradition, complicating a simple treatment of myth by evoking elements that remain untold.

III.4 Conclusions

Memory and knowledge both functioned as significant indices of allusion in archaic Greek poetry. In many ways, this indexical device is a foil and complement to indexical hearsay. Whereas the latter evokes external traditions that are circulating on the airwaves of *fama*, ready to be picked up by observant listeners, indexical memory involves a more internal and personal act of preserving, retaining and transmitting knowledge. But as with hearsay, these metaphors of allusion are an apt model for the nature and process of poetic composition and performance.

In comparison to indexical hearsay, we have encountered more variation and divergence in the use of this indexical mode across time and genres. It is most prevalent in Homeric epic, where characters repeatedly urge their interlocutors to recall earlier

---

[209] The two passages are tied by a verbal echo: ἀγ[υιάς] (9.17) ~ ἀγυιᾶν (9.52): Fearn (2003) 360.
[210] Fearn (2003) 360–1 (quotation p. 361); cf. Cairns (2010) 261.

242

events of tradition, simultaneously inviting Homer's audiences to recall their own knowledge of episodes both within and beyond his poetry. Yet there are relatively few precise parallels for this in the rest of early Greek epic and archaic lyric. The extremely fragmentary state of much of our evidence must play some role in this absence, but it is striking that even in Pindar's completely extant epinicians and Hesiod's extant didactic works, poetic memory is not as productive. The principal reason for this seems to be the way in which these poems treat myth, and their relative dearth of character speech. Lyric poets in particular rarely tell a mythical narrative in its own right but rather introduce one as an exemplum or point of comparison for events of the real world. When we return to the mimetic world of tragedy, it is perhaps no surprise that cases of indexical memory appear to flourish once more in a mythical context.[211]

Despite its limited presence in lyric character speech, however, lyric poets adapted this indexical mode into various new forms, taking advantage of the greater prominence of the lyric narratorial voice. We have seen instances where the narrator's personal memories overlap and blur into recollections of myth and poetry, as well as cases where poets recall their own past poems, highlighting links across their cycles of song. In addition, lyric poets directly appeal to their audience's knowledge of the poetic tradition, a more overt and direct signposting of tradition.

This allusive index was thus already deeply engrained in Greek poetry from the very beginning. It was primarily used to gesture to and incorporate other mythical narratives, marking the poet's mastery of tradition. But we have also noted cases of misremembering, where a character's memory is pointedly selective, inviting audiences to fill in the gaps. In both cases, the device evokes wider traditions within which each poet situates himself and his work.

---

[211] Currie (2016) 139 cites several examples: Soph. *Aj.* 1273–87 (**μνημονεύεις**) ~ *Il.* 7, 13, 15; Eur. *Hec.* 239–50 (**οἶσθ' ... οἶδ' ... μεμνήμεθ'**) ~ *Od.* 4.240–58, *Il. Parv.* arg. 4b–d, frr. 8–9 *GEF*; *IA* 337–60 (**οἶσθ'**), concealing ad hoc invention? Cf. too e.g. Eur. *Tro.* 69–70 (**οἶσθ' ... οἶδ'**) ~ *Il. Pers.* arg. 3a *GEF*; Eur. *Hec.* 107–15 (**λέγεται ... οἶσθ'**) ~ *Hec.* 37–41, Soph. *Polyxena* (frr. 522–8 *TrGF*): cf. Nelson (2021d) 132–3.

CHAPTER IV

TIME FOR ALLUSION

IV.1 Introduction

In this chapter, we are concerned with the indexical potential of time, the way in which literary references to the past and future situate a poem within its larger tradition. Essentially, this index embraces a number of complementary and closely related concepts: first, broad chronological perspective – an awareness of earlier and later events which lie beyond the immediate narrative; second, marked iteration – a specific sense of literary déjà vu and cyclical repetition; and third, epigonal self-consciousness – an explicit concern with one's poetic predecessors. These instances of indexicality are more varied than those of hearsay and memory, but it is useful to treat them together because they all map the relationships of texts and traditions onto different temporal frameworks. All three, moreover, are frequently cited as indices of allusion in Hellenistic and Roman poetry. Here we shall see their considerable presence in archaic Greek poetics.

The first phenomenon – chronological perspective – involves poets self-consciously acknowledging the larger tradition beyond their immediate narrative. This is often achieved through the use of temporal adverbs and adjectives, especially those that look to the past, like **ποτέ** and *quondam*, or **παλαιός** and *antiquus*. Such 'explicit pointers of pastness' knowingly nod to the mythical and poetic past, signposting a reference to other stories and other texts which treat them.[1] But we also encounter cases which emphasise a

---

[1] Quotation: Lightfoot (2014) 171. E.g. Virg. *Aen*. 2.272 (*quondam*) ~ *Il*. 22.395–405 (Currie (2016) 139 n. 177); *Aen*. 12.347–9 (*antiqui*, *referens*, *quondam*) ~ *Il*. 10.314–27 (Tarrant (2012) 177); Lucilius 26–30 Marx (*olim*, *priore concilio*, *concilio antiquo*) ~ Ennius *Annals* Book 1 (Timpanaro (1994) 206–8); Mosch. *Ep. Bion*. 68–9 (**πρώαν**) ~ Bion *Epitaph. Adon*. 13–14; Arat. *Phaen*. 96–116 (**ἀρχαῖοι**, **πάρος**, **ποτ'**, **ἀρχαίων**, **παλαιῶν**) ~ Hes. *Theog*. 378–82, *Op*. 106–201 (Gee (2013) 24); cf. **φασίν**, *Phaen*. 98; **λόγος** . . . **ἄλλος**, *Phaen*. 100 (~ **ἕτερὸν** . . . **λόγον**, *Op*. 106).

244

greater deal of continuity or change with the past, as when Ovid's Achaemenides is '**no longer**' roughly clad, as he had been in Virgil's *Aeneid* (***iam non***, *Met.* 14.165 ~ *Aen.* 3.590–4; §1.1.2). In each case, the specific episode in question is situated within the larger span of literary history.

The second technique – marked iteration – involves poets self-reflexively replaying or foreshadowing another event from the poetic tradition in the present. We have already encountered the Ovidian Ariadne's repetition of her Catullan self (***iterum***, ***nunc quoque***: §1.1.2), but we could equally add Ovid's Cydippe in the *Heroides*, who finds herself '**now too**' reading the words written by Acontius (***nunc quoque***, *Her.* 21.110, cf. 20.216), just as Acontius finds himself writing '**again**' like his Callimachean incarnation (*en **iterum** scribo*, *Her.* 20.35 ~ *Aet.* frr. 67–75).[2] In Theocritus' first *Idyll*, meanwhile, Daphnis dismissively bids Aphrodite go to Diomedes '**again**', recalling her previous encounter with the hero in the *Iliad* (αὖτις, *Id.* 1.112 ~ *Il.* 5.330–430).[3] All these examples involve the self-conscious replay of an earlier episode from each character's fictional life, while also echoing an earlier literary treatment of that same episode.[4] But we can also identify cases of iteration where a character repeats the role of another, as in Statius' *Achilleid*, when Neptune is described as a '**second** Jupiter' (*secundi . . . Iovis*, *Achil.* 1.48–9), reflecting his replay of that god's opening role in the *Iliad*.[5]

---

[2] Barchiesi (2001) 120; cf. Hardie (1993) 17 on '*alius*, *alter*, *iterum*, *rursus*, etc.' Cf. similar uses of ***soleo*** ('I am accustomed': Cowan (2011) 363; Heyworth (2015) 391–2) and ***saepe*** ('often': Heyworth (2013)). Verbs can also index such iteration: e.g. *Aen.* 1.94: ***refert*** indexing Aeneas' repetition of Odysseus' words (*o terque quaterque beati . . .* ~ τρὶς μάκαρες Δαναοὶ καὶ τετράκις, *Od.* 5.306); cf. *si forte* ***refers***, *Am.* 2.8.17 ~ *Am.* 2.7.27–8. For *referre* of repetition, cf. *Aen.* 2.547–50, 5.563–5, 10.491–2.

[3] Currie (2016) 188. Cf. Asclepiades 15.4 *HE* = *AP* 12.46.4 (ὡς τὸ πάρος) ~ Anac. fr. 398; Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 3.117–24.

[4] Such allusions can even disrupt the strict chronology of the mythical world to reflect that of literary history. In Apollonius' *Argonautica*, Jason and Medea visit Circe and Alcinous 'before' Odysseus in their world but 'after' the *Odyssey* from the perspective of literary history: *Argon.* 4.667 (πάρος) ~ *Od.* 10.213, 235–6, 393–4; *Argon.* 4.1068 (ὡς τὸ πάροιθεν) ~ *Od.* 7.346–7 (Hunter (2015) 174–5, 228). Cf. 'future reflexive' allusions in Roman poetry: Barchiesi (1993).

[5] Hinds (1998) 96. Cf. Venus' indexed return to Horace (*rursus*, *Carm.* 4.1.2), which not only echoes earlier Horatian invocations of the goddess (1.19 and 1.30; esp. 4.1.5 = 1.19.1) but also replays and reworks Sappho fr. 1: Putnam (1986) 39–42; Nagy (1994) 417–21; Gramps (2021) 142–62.

245

The final category – epigonal self-consciousness – involves cases where characters and narrators explicitly appeal to their ancestors and predecessors, constructing an explicit map of literary history. In Theocritus' sixteenth *Idyll*, the poet establishes himself in a continuum with his encomiastic predecessors by recalling how former poets celebrated the battles of '**men of old**' to preserve their memory, setting himself on a par with the likes of Homer and Simonides of Ceos (φυλόπιδας **προτέρων** ὕμνησαν ἀοιδοί, *Id*. 16.50). Nor is his subject inferior to those of his predecessors: Hieron is an equal match to the 'heroes **of old**' (**προτέροις** ... ἡρώεσσι, *Id*. 16.80).[6] The prologue of Philip's *Garland*, meanwhile, establishes his collection of epigrams as a self-conscious sequel to that of Meleager. The poet begins by contrasting his addressee's '**knowledge**' of the '**fame of the ancients**' (**παλαιοτέρων εἰδὼς κλέος**, 1.5 *GP = AP* 4.2.5) with the brevity of the younger generation whose poems he has assembled (**γνῶθι καὶ ὁπλοτέρων** τὴν ὀλιγοστιχίην, 1.6 *GP = AP* 4.2.6), acknowledging the precedent and tradition within which he works.[7] In a similar fashion, the later epigrammatic anthologist Agathias introduces his collection by 'competing against **those born long ago**' (**παλαιγενέεσσιν** ἐρίζων, *AP* 4.3.113) and assembling examples of the 'wise imitation of **ancient** writing' (γράμματος **ἀρχαίοιο** σοφὸν μίμημα, *AP* 4.3.116). Through such explicit acknowledgement of their predecessors, poets constructed their own literary history.[8]

These temporal tropes have been well studied in Hellenistic, Roman and later texts, but they have rarely received any attention in earlier Greek poetry.[9] Yet there is considerable evidence that

---

[6] Cf. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 4.985, where the narrator self-consciously speaks '**a tale told by men of old**' (**προτέρων ἔπος**) about Cronus, looking back to Hes. *Theog.* 180–1, alongside other predecessors: Hunter (2008a) 118–19, (2015) 219.

[7] Cf. Goldhill (2020) 104–5. The opposition of ancient/recent is not straightforward, however: ὀλιγοστιχίην recalls a buzzword of Callimachus, one of the Meleagrian 'ancients' (~ [ὀλ]ιγόστιχος, *Aet.* fr. 1.9): Magnelli (2006) 394–6. Note Philip's further string of indices: knowledge (εἰδώς), fame (κλέος), recognition (γνῶθι), addition (καί).

[8] Cf. Williams (1983) and Hinds (1998) 52–144 on Roman poets' 'do-it-yourself' literary histories.

[9] The most notable exceptions relate to Attic drama: see McDermott (1987), (1991), (2000) and Torrance (2013) 194–7, 219–33, 292–4 on doubleness and novelty in Euripides (δεύτερος, δισσός, καινός); Wright (2012) 70–102 on novelty and anti-novelty

246

Greeks conceived of literature in temporal terms, at least by the classical period. Authors refer intratextually to 'earlier' and 'later' parts of their own works[10] and label pre-existing traditions as 'prior' and 'old'.[11] Here I shall argue that this temporal conception of poetic production extends all the way back to archaic poets' indexical practices. In the following sections, we shall see how all three of these temporal indices were already deeply embedded in archaic epic and lyric.

IV.2 Epic Temporalities

It has long been recognised that Homeric epic manipulates time in complex and sophisticated ways, allusively re-enacting events beyond the strict confines of its narrative.[12] Such replays of tradition 'out of sequence' are especially visible in the *Iliad*. The first half of the poem involves many elements which closely rerun the opening stages of the war: the catalogue of ships, the *Teichoscopia*, the duel of Paris and Menelaus, the encounter of Paris and Helen, the marshalling of troops and Pandarus' truce-breaking – these all re-perform acts that logically 'fit' the first, rather than tenth, year of the war.[13] In the second half of the poem, meanwhile, the poet allusively foreshadows what is to come: Patroclus' death presages Achilles' own,[14] Hector's death serves as a metonym for the fall of Troy[15] and the funeral games of Book 23 prefigure many later episodes of the tradition. Ajax and Odysseus' inconclusive wrestling match foreshadows the

---

in Aristophanes. Currie (2016) 142 notes some Homeric examples (cf. too his index, s.v. 'words of iteration').

[10] E.g. ὡς καὶ **πρῴην** εἴπομεν, Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 2.3.1104b18; ὡς μικρὸν **πρόσθεν** ἡμῖν λέλεκται, Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.12.5.

[11] E.g. **τὰ παλαιά**, Ar. *Eccl.* 580.

[12] Schein (1984) 19–28; Kullmann (2001) 388–9; Burgess (2006) 167–9; de Jong (2007); Nelson (2022) 55–6, on which this paragraph builds. This phenomenon was already recognised by Aristotle (*Poet.* 23.1459a35–7: Else (1957) 585–6) and Eustathius (Rengakos (2004) 292). On the *Iliad*'s temporal self-referentiality, cf. Christensen (2015b).

[13] Bowra (1930) 110–13; Reinhardt (1938); Whitman (1958) 265, 269–70; Edwards (1987) 188–97; Taplin (1992) 83–109; Hunter (2018) 71–5; Bowie (2019) 9–12; Nelson (2022). Cf. Finkelberg (2002) on *Iliad* 7 evoking Protesilaus and Cycnus (*Cypr.* arg. 10a–b *GEF*).

[14] E.g. Burgess (2009) 72–97; Horn (2021).

[15] E.g. Schein (1984) 24–5, 176; Papaioannou (2007) 210–12.

247

'Judgement of Arms' (*Il.* 23.708–39 ~ *Aeth.* arg. 4d, *Il. Parv.* arg. 1a *GEF*); Epeius' claim to be lacking in battle looks ahead to his use of brains, not brawn, in constructing the Trojan horse (23.670 ~ *Od.* 8.493, 11.523, *Il. Parv.* arg. 4a *GEF*); and Locrian Ajax's divinely induced slip in the footrace serves as a proleptic punishment for his future transgression against Athena by raping Cassandra (23.773–84 ~ *Il. Pers.* arg. 3a *GEF*).[16] Within its own narrow chronology, Homer's epic embodies the whole Trojan war *fabula*.

Within such a context of temporal manipulation, it is unsurprising to find that references to time frequently bear an indexical significance in Homeric epic, in the mouths of both the narrator and his characters. In the following sections, we shall explore the rich Homeric evidence for the first and second categories of temporal indices (chronological perspective, §IV.2.1, and marked iteration, §IV.2.2), with occasional cross references to examples elsewhere in the wider corpus of archaic Greek epic. In the final section (§IV.2.3), we shall consider whether archaic epic poets exhibit any kind of epigonal self-consciousness. No extant archaic epic makes direct mention of poetic πρότεροι ('predecessors'), but I shall argue that in both Homer and the Cycle, the voices and actions of internal characters implicitly reflect on their poet's epigonal relationships. By means of these three devices, archaic epics situate themselves within the larger temporal waves of myth and literary history, foreshadowing the allusive techniques of later periods.

IV.2.1 *Pointers to the Past*

In both Homeric epics, the narrator and his characters repeatedly evoke other moments of tradition through a temporal lens. We have already witnessed the Iliadic recollection of Aeneas' flight

---

[16] Whitman (1958) 263–4; Kullmann (1960) 333–5, 350, 356; Willcock (1973); Richardson (1993) 202–3; Rengakos (2007) 107–8. Forte (2017) 65–104 attractively argues that the finishing order of the foot and chariot races rank the time and distance of characters' *nostoi* in the Cyclic tradition. For further allusions to the Trojan horse at the end of the poem, cf. Franko (2005–6); Kawasaki (2019); Barker and Christensen (2020) 62.

248

before Achilles on Mount Ida, cued in part through temporal references (**ἤδη … καὶ ἄλλοτε**, *Il*. 20.90, *Il*. 20.187: §III.2.1), as well as Antinous' comparison of Penelope in the *Odyssey* to the Achaean women '**of old**' who lived '**long ago**' (**παλαιῶν … πάρος**, *Od*. 2.118–19: §II.2.4). Yet the examples can be multiplied many times over: temporally charged adverbs (**αἰεί, ἄλλοτε, αὖ, αὖτις, ἤδη, οὔποτε, πάλαι, πάλιν, πάρος, ποτέ, πρόσθεν**) and adjectives (**ἄλλος, ἀρχαῖος, παλαιός, πρότερος**) frequently mark references to other stories and traditions, both intra- and intertextually.[17] We shall begin here by focusing on retrospective glances to past events which situate the narrative within a broader chronological perspective.

Intratextual Pointers

On an intratextual level, these temporal indices mark the larger structuring and connections across a poem, in the same manner as characters' intratextual reminiscences – often in brief and passing mentions. Such cross references can be small-scale, as when Chryses prays to Apollo and recalls the god's previous fulfilment of his prayer earlier within the same book (**ποτ' … πάρος**, *Il*. 1.453 ~ *Il*. 1.35–52); the pair of temporal indices reinforces the sense of repetition, as the priest invokes the god in the very same terms (*Il*. 1.37–8 = 1.451–2). Similarly, Pandarus twice notes in Book 5 that he has already successfully shot Diomedes, but not killed him (**ἤδη**, *Il*. 5.188, 206), looking back to the wound he inflicted a short while earlier (*Il*. 5.95–100).[18] In the *Odyssey*, meanwhile, the tears which Odysseus sheds when reunited with his son are contrasted with his earlier behaviour, when he had '**previously** always restrained them' (**πάρος**, *Od*. 16.191), recalling an earlier episode within the same book: Telemachus' initial appearance at Eumaeus' hut, when Odysseus did indeed refrain from tears, and it was Eumaeus who played the paternal role, bursting into tears and embracing him as a father does an only son (*Od*. 16.16–21).[19]

---

[17] Generally, cf. Kullmann (1960) 386.
[18] At 5.190, Pandarus also paraphrases his earlier boasting (~ 5.101–5), while at 5.206–8 he further recalls his earlier wounding of Menelaus (~ 4.104–47).
[19] Currie (2016) 132; cf. Rutherford (1986) 157; de Jong (1994) 37.

249

Such temporal markers can also function on a far larger scale, tying together disparate parts of whole epics. Before he sends Patroclus out to battle, Achilles invokes Zeus as Chryses had Apollo, recalling the previous occasion when the god listened to his prayer (**ποτ'**, *Il.* 16.236). On this occasion, the hero makes a more distant cross reference to the first book of the poem, when Zeus accepted his wishes, as mediated by Thetis; hymnic *hypomnesis* coincides with intratextual recollection (*Il.* 1.393–412, 503–10). In the chariot race of *Iliad* 23, meanwhile, Diomedes lines up with the horses of Tros, which the narrator reminds us he had '**once**' taken from Aeneas (*Il.* 23.290–2):

> τῷ δ' ἐπὶ Τυδεΐδης ὦρτο κρατερὸς Διομήδης,
> ἵππους δὲ Τρῳοὺς ὕπαγε ζυγόν, οὕς **ποτ'** ἀπηύρα
> Αἰνείαν, ἀτὰρ αὐτὸν ὑπεξεσάωσεν Ἀπόλλων.

> Tydeus' son, strong Diomedes, rose after him and brought under his yoke the horses of Tros, which he had **once** taken from Aeneas – though Apollo had rescued Aeneas himself.

The adverb **ποτ'** signals a transparent cross reference to the events of *Iliad* 5, both the stealing of Aeneas' horses (*Il.* 5.318–27) and Apollo's eventual rescue of the Trojan hero (5.344–6, 445–8).[20] The reference here paves the way for Diomedes' impending victory in the chariot race, reminding an audience of these horses' supernatural ability (cf. *Il.* 5.265–72). It is worth noting, however, that this is not the first time that this incident has been recalled in the poem. Already in Book 8, Diomedes himself referred to it with the same temporal tag: [ἵπποι] οὕς **ποτ'** ἀπ' Αἰνείαν ἑλόμην, μήστωρε φόβοιο ('[the horses] which I **once** took from Aeneas, devisers of rout', 8.108). Both character and narrator refer to this episode as if it were a distant memory; as Scodel notes, **ποτ'** implies that it had taken place 'a long time before, instead of a few days'.[21] Rather than simply concluding with Scodel that 'Homeric narrative is not obsessed with precise chronology', however, we should note how this recent event

---

[20] Scodel (1999) 59; Currie (2016) 142.
[21] Scodel (1999) 59. Cf. Σ A *Il.* 108a *Ariston.*, Σ bT *Il.* 108b *ex.* The dual μήστωρε φόβοιο appears only at *Il.* 5.272 and 8.108, reinforcing the recollection. The epithet is only applied to major heroes elsewhere in the narrative (μήστωρα φόβοιο: Diomedes, 6.97 = 278; Hector, 12.39; Patroclus, 23.16); its use for these horses further elevates their status and aligns them with their new master, Diomedes.

250

is projected back into the authoritative past, as an established and independent reference point of tradition. In fact, these later mentions fulfil Diomedes' original prediction that 'if we could take these two horses, we would win noble **glory**' (εἰ τούτω κε λάβοιμεν, ἀροίμεθά κε **κλέος** ἐσθλόν, 5.273). The later temporally indexed recollections by the hero and narrator prove the establishment of this κλέος in real time.

Similar intratextual cross references are also marked temporally in the *Odyssey*. In the *Mnesterophonia*, the cowherd Philoetius kills the suitor Ctesippus and vaunts over his body (22.290–1):

> τοῦτό τοι ἀντὶ ποδὸς ξεινήϊον, ὅν **ποτ'** ἔδωκας
> ἀντιθέῳ Ὀδυσῆϊ δόμον κάτ' ἀλητεύοντι.

> This can be your guest-gift in return for the hoof which you **once** gave to godlike Odysseus when he roamed as a beggar throughout the house.

This boast looks back to Book 20, when Ctesippus hurled an ox-hoof at the disguised Odysseus (20.287–302), an explicit perversion of proper hospitality. Ctesippus ironically called the missile a 'guest-gift' (ξείνιον, 20.296), which Philoetius now reciprocates with his killing blow (cf. ξεινήϊον, 22.290).[22] The cowherd invokes this past act of violence to justify the present slaughter. Yet this back reference also resonates with the following simile which compares the suitors to maddened cattle (22.299–301), accentuating the reversal of their situation: not only is Ctesippus now the victim rather than perpetrator of violence, but he has also transitioned from feaster to the object of slaughter.[23] The temporal **ποτ'** indexes an earlier moment of the epic with broader thematic relevance for the immediate action.

Such temporally indexed cross references can also mark key structural moments of a poem. At the hinge of the *Odyssey*, the

---

[22] Ctesippus' perversion of hospitality: Saïd (1979) 31–2; Segal (1994) 160. Ctesippus' ox-hoof forms the climax of a triplet of increasingly ineffective missiles: cf. Antinous' chair (*Od.* 17.458–64) and Eurymachus' stool (*Od.* 18.387–98); see Fenik (1974) 180–7; Reece (1993) 176–8; Gottesman (2014) 49–54.

[23] Cf. 22.401–6 (Odysseus like a lion feasting on an ox); Nagler (1990) 340; Bakker (2013) 72–3; Loney (2019) 145–51.

251

narrator recalls the hero's former (**πρίν**) suffering (*Od.* 13.88–92):

ὣς ἡ ῥίμφα θέουσα θαλάσσης κύματ' ἔταμνεν,
ἄνδρα φέρουσα θεοῖσ' ἐναλίγκια μήδε' ἔχοντα,
ὃς **πρὶν** μὲν μάλα πολλὰ πάθ' ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν
ἀνδρῶν τε πτολέμους ἀλεγεινά τε κύματα πείρων·
δὴ **τότε** γ' ἀτρέμας εὗδε, **λελασμένος** ὅσσ' ἐπεπόνθει.

So the ship sped on swiftly and cut through the waves of the sea, carrying a man with a mind like the gods', he who had **previously** suffered many great griefs in his heart, traversing the wars of men and the grievous waves; but **now** he slept in peace, **forgetting** all that he had suffered.

This statement marks the transition from the first to second half of the *Odyssey*, as the poet leaves behind the hero's adventures and wandering, a transition here marked as an act of forgetting (**λελασμένος**, 92). The hero's 'previous' suffering at sea epitomises the action of the whole first half of the poem, but it looks particularly to the language of the Odyssean proem, of which verse 90 is a near-quotation (ἄνδρα . . . | ὃς **πρὶν** μὲν μάλα πολλὰ πάθ' ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν, | ἀνδρῶν τε πτολέμους ἀλεγεινά τε κύματα πείρων, 13.89–91 ~ ἄνδρα . . . ὃς μάλα πολλὰ | πλάγχθη, *Od.* 1.1–2; πολλὰ δ' ὅ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν, *Od.* 1.4).[24] Through these close verbal echoes and the indexical language of temporality and forgetting, the narrator recalls the very start of the poem in a closural ring composition, marking the return to Ithaca as a fresh start.

On both a macro- and micro-scale, therefore, these temporal indices signpost intratextual cross references across individual poems, situating the present events against the recent literary past. In comparison to the cases of hearsay and memory that we have explored before, these indices tend to signpost brief and passing references. At least in isolation, they do not tend to be a springboard into lengthy narrative or recollection.

Intertextual Pointers

Temporal markers also point to events beyond the scope of each poem, positioning the poet's work against the larger corpus of myth. Here too, such references are often very brief and invite the

---

[24] Hoekstra (1989)169; Bowie (2013) 111, cf. 2–6.

252

supplementation of further details from tradition, especially from earlier moments of the Trojan war *fabula*. When Odysseus compares Nausicaa to a palm tree that he '**once**' saw on Delos (**ποτέ**, *Od*. 6.162), the audience may be invited to recall the tradition of the hero's visit to the island in search of the nourishing daughters of Anius – an episode that featured in the *Cypria* (6.162–7; cf. Σ HP¹ *Od*. 6.164d *ex.*, *Cypr.* fr. 26 *GEF*).[25] In *Iliad* 11, meanwhile, we hear that Agamemnon wears a breastplate which Cinyras of Cyprus had '**once**' given him as a guest-gift (**ποτέ**, 11.20), a reference to pre-war recruitment traditions also familiar from the *Cypria*.[26] We know from later sources that Cinyras was reluctant to join the expedition – even sending a fleet of clay ships to avoid committing real resources to the cause – and this lavish gift may have similarly been designed as a bribe to avoid service.[27] If so, it is particularly significant that this episode is evoked at the beginning of Agamemnon's *aristeia*: however ornate the king's armour (11.24–8), it conceals a story of deception and draft-dodging which undermines his status and authority, perhaps hinting at the limited success and duration of his ensuing killing spree. The narrator's brief and temporally indexed reference invites recollection of further details which resonate poignantly in the present.

In a similar manner, Antenor introduces his recollection of the embassy of Odysseus and Menelaus in *Iliad* 3 with another temporal reference (*Il*. 3.205–8):

ἤδη γὰρ **καὶ** δεῦρό **ποτ**' ἤλυθε δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς
σεῦ ἕνεκ' ἀγγελίης σὺν ἀρηϊφίλῳ Μενελάῳ·
τοὺς δ' ἐγὼ ἐξείνισσα καὶ ἐν μεγάροισι φίλησα,
ἀμφοτέρων δὲ φυὴν ἐδάην καὶ μήδεα πυκνά.

Once before now too godlike Odysseus came here with Menelaus, dear to Ares, on an embassy concerning you. I hosted them and entertained them in my halls, and came to know the stature and shrewd schemes of them both.

---

[25] Tsagalis (2008) 44–62, noting potential rivalry with an alternative tradition in which Palamedes, not Odysseus, went to Delos (Σ Lycoph. *Alex.* 581a: cf. §III.2.3 for such rivalry). On the myth in the *Cypria*: Marin (2009); West (2013) 123–5.

[26] Cf. Wagner (1891) 181–3; Frazer (1921) II 179 n. 3; West (2003b) 72–3. Contrast West (2013) 103.

[27] Cf. Sammons (2017) 90. Clay ships: Σ T *Il*. 11.20b *ex.*; Apollod. *Epit.* 3.9. Cf. Echepolus of Sicyon's similar bribe of an exquisite horse (*Il*. 23.296–9). Alcidamas offers a slightly different version in which Cinyras bribed Palamedes (*Odysseus* 20–1).

This embassy is another episode familiar from the *Cypria* (arg. 10c *GEF*), but its antiquity is suggested by its apparent depiction on a bronze tripod leg at Olympia from the last quarter of the seventh century.[28] It is also mentioned again later in the *Iliad*, when Agamemnon kills two sons of a certain Antimachus, who is said to have been bribed by Paris into refusing the embassy and arguing for the death of the ambassadors (*Il*. 11.122–42: note **ποτ'**, 11.139).[29] In Apollodorus' later summary, it is specifically Antenor who saved Odysseus and Menelaus from such Trojan treachery (Apollod. *Epit*. 3.28–9), a detail that may well be implied by the Iliadic prominence of Antenor's personal hosting of the pair, expressed through the emphatic ἐγώ and first-person verbs in 3.207–8. The temporally marked introduction of Antenor's account invites Homer's audience to recall another episode of Trojan myth and supplement it with their wider knowledge of tradition: Antenor has every reason to remember the build and character of these two heroes.[30]

Such a strategy of supplementation also extends to mythical details beyond the Trojan war *fabula*. In the Iliadic Catalogue of Ships, we hear that Meges' father Phyleus 'had **once** moved away to Dulichium in anger at his father' (ὅς **ποτε** Δουλίχιόνδ' ἀπενάσσατο πατρὶ χολωθείς, *Il*. 2.629) – an oblique reference to part of the Heracles tradition. Phyleus' father was Augeas, whose stables Heracles was forced to clean. According to later tradition, Augeas defrauded Heracles of his promised reward, Phyleus was called on to arbitrate the quarrel and sided with Heracles, before leaving Elis for Dulichium in exile and/or anger.[31] Augeas' cheating of Heracles is first explicitly attested in Pindar (*Ol*. 10.26–30), but it likely already lies behind this passing reference: as we have seen before, the *Iliad* presupposes its audience's familiarity with a

---

[28] West (2013) 42.

[29] On Antenor and his family, see Espermann (1980); Danek (2005), (2006).

[30] Note too the repeated string of temporal markers throughout his account (ἀλλ' ὅτε δή, 3.209, 212, 216, 221). On Antenor, see Kullmann (1960) 275–6; Danek (2005) 19 n. 41, (2006) 8–9, 20; Currie (2016) 142. Antenor's involvement in this failed embassy foreshadows his unsuccessful attempts to facilitate a truce later in the poem (3.262, 312, 7.345–78): Roisman (2005a) 114.

[31] Cf. Gantz (1993) 392–3; Mitchell (2021) 89–90. See Callim. *Aet*. frr. 77c–d (= Σ D *Il*. 11.698, Σ D *Il*. 2.629); Diod. Sic. 4.33.4; Strabo 10.2.19; Apollod. *Bibl*. 2.5.5, 2.7.2–3; Paus. 5.1.10.

254

well-established Heracles tradition (§III.2.1), while Augeas' capacity for trickery is already attested elsewhere in the *Iliad* with his theft of Neleus' prize-winning horses (*Il.* 11.701–2). Moreover, the very positioning of this Dulichium contingent (2.625–30) immediately after that from Elis (2.615–24) hints at the larger context of Phyleus' migration, especially since the last named leader from Elis is another descendant of Augeas (Αὐγηϊάδαο, 2.624). Given that Phyleus himself seems to be a well-established figure, appearing in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* as the second husband of Leda's daughter Timandra (fr. 176.3–4),[32] there are thus strong grounds for seeing a passing Homeric reference here to a broader tradition. For audiences who recollect these further details, Phyleus' sympathetic treatment of Heracles would serve as a foil for the Trojans' perversion of hospitality, not only in Paris' theft of Helen, but also in Laomedon's former mistreatment of Heracles himself (*Il.* 5.649–51).

Besides marking brief and allusive references to other *fabulae* and traditions, these temporal references also tend to play an important inceptive role. In each of our opening examples, the temporal index appears at the start of the mythical reference, introducing Odysseus' Delian reminiscence (*Od.* 6.162–7), the narrator's account of Cinyras' gift (*Il.* 11.20–8) and Antenor's recollection of the embassy (*Il.* 3.205–24). The same is true of many other temporally indexed references, including Zeus's previous punishment of Hephaestus (ἤδη . . . καὶ ἄλλοτ᾽, *Il.* 1.590, introducing 590–4), Lycurgus' mistreatment of Dionysus and his nurses (ποτέ, *Il.* 6.132, introducing 130–40) and Hera's former deception of Zeus in her harrying of Heracles (ἤδη . . . καὶ ἄλλο . . . ἤματι τῷ ὅτε, *Il.* 14.249–50, introducing 249–61), accounts which all also appear to draw on pre-existing traditional tales.[33] In each of these cases, the temporal indices introduce the story that follows, not only signalling the allusive incorporation of other traditions, but also acting as a segue into this prior material.

---

[32] Cf. Gantz (1993) 321, presuming identity with the Iliadic figure; no other Phyleus is known in the mythical tradition. Cf. too *Il.* 15.529–34, where we hear of a breastplate which Phyleus once (ποτέ, 530) brought from Ephyre, after receiving it from his guest-friend Euphetes.

[33] Hephaestus: cf. *HhDion.*; West (2001b) 2–7; Rinon (2006a). Lycurgus: cf. Eumelus fr. 27 *GEF*; Stesichorus fr. 276; Aesch. *Lycurgeia* (Radt (1985) 234); Soph. *Ant.* 955–65; Σ T *Il.* 6.130 *ex.*; Privitera (1970) 53–74; Davies (2000) 19–23; Graziosi and Haubold (2010) 112–13. Hera and Heracles: cf. §III.2.1.

It is especially the Iliadic Nestor, however, who is most closely associated with the allusive potential of time and who most clearly combines the supplementary and inceptive functions of these temporal indices. As we have seen, he is introduced as an elder with much experience, who has already (ἤδη) witnessed the passing of two generations of mortals who had been born 'long ago' (πρόσθεν, *Il.* 1.247–52), a characterisation which is likely traditional given its apparent evocation in the *Odyssey* (§II.2.3). Moreover, his area of expertise is singled out in each epic as events of the past (πάλαι πολέμων ἐῢ εἰδώς, *Il.* 4.310; παλαιά τε πολλά τε εἰδώς, *Od.* 24.51), and he repeatedly invokes the conduct of '**predecessors**' (πρότεροι, *Il.* 4.308) as paradigms for the present. In both poems, he is also presented as an almost bardic figure: storytelling is his modus operandi.[34] As Bruce Louden notes, Nestor serves 'as a vector to pre-Homeric epic'.[35]

What has not previously been stressed, however, is the extent to which Nestor's numerous Iliadic stories are tinged with indexical temporal references. The aged hero repeatedly introduces his accounts with appeals to his former youth, a more intense and personalised form of temporal indexing. His recollections of his battle against Ereuthalion (*Il.* 4.318–21, *Il.* 7.132–57), his former conflicts with the Epeians (*Il.* 11.668–762) and his former athletic successes (*Il.* 23.627–45) are all framed by a longing for his bygone youth and a contrast of the past and present.[36] Each of these reminiscences has a paradigmatic function within its immediate narrative,[37] but they also evoke broader prior traditions attached to Nestor and Pylos. In the past, scholars have postulated pre-existing Pylian epics (or *fabulae*) behind Nestor's accounts, to which these

---

[34] Dickson (1995) esp. 47–100, Marks (2008) 112–31. Cf. the four stories he tells Menelaus in the *Cypria* (*Cypr.* arg. 4b *GEF*): West (2013) 98–101; Currie (2015) 288; Sammons (2017) 55–61.

[35] Louden (2018b) 152. Cf. Liñares (2003) esp. 65–68; Tsagalis (2012a) 219 n. 168: 'Nestor's narrative digressions evoke or reconstruct for all audiences, internal and external alike, a whole nexus of epic traditions rivaling Homeric epic, traditions which the *Iliad* has effectively erased.'

[36] Wish for youth: αἲ γάρ . . . ἡβῷμ᾽ ὡς ὅτ᾽, 7.132–3; εἴθ᾽ ὡς ἡβώοιμι, 7.157; πάρος . . . εἴθ᾽ ὡς ἡβώοιμι . . . ὡς ὁπότ᾽, 11.669–71; εἴθ᾽ ὡς ἡβώοιμι . . . ὡς ὁπότε, 23.629–30. Past/present contrast: εἰ τότε κοῦρος ἔα, νῦν αὖτέ με γῆρας ὀπάζει, 4.321; ὥς ποτ᾽ ἔον, 23.643; τότε δ᾽ αὖτε μετέπρεπον ἡρώεσσιν, 23.645; νῦν αὖτε νεώτεροι, 23.643.

[37] Pedrick (1983); Minchin (1991); Alden (2000) 74–111. For the structure of these tales, see Gaisser (1969) 7–13; Lohmann (1970) 70–5, 263–5.

256

indices would point – a plausible if unprovable hypothesis, and it is perhaps unwise to speculate further.[38] But in some cases, Nestor's temporal indices cue familiar mythical episodes for which we do have further evidence. For example, when Nestor refers to Heracles' destruction of Neleus' eleven other sons 'in **earlier** years' (τῶν **προτέρων** ἐτέων, *Il.* 11.691), we are invited to recall Heracles' theomachic battle at Pylos – a battle that is hinted at elsewhere in the *Iliad* and in other archaic poems, including the Hesiodic *Aspis*, which evokes the event through a similar temporal reference (ἤδη . . . **καὶ ἄλλοτε**, *Scut.* 359).[39] Through such temporal indices as these, Nestor positions the events of the *Iliad* against a wider diachronic nexus of epic traditions.

Most illuminating of all, however, is Nestor's very first speech in the *Iliad*, when he recalls his involvement in the duel of the Lapiths and Centaurs (1.259–68):

> ἀλλὰ πίθεσθ᾽· ἄμφω δὲ νεωτέρω ἐστὸν ἐμεῖο·
> **ἤδη** γάρ **ποτ᾽** ἐγὼ καὶ ἀρείοσιν ἠέ περ ὑμῖν
> ἀνδράσιν ὡμίλησα, καὶ οὔ ποτέ μ᾽ οἵ γ᾽ ἀθέριζον.
> οὐ γάρ πω τοίους ἴδον ἀνέρας οὐδὲ ἴδωμαι,
> οἷον Πειρίθοόν τε Δρύαντά τε, ποιμένα λαῶν,
> Καινέα τ᾽ Ἐξάδιόν τε καὶ ἀντίθεον Πολύφημον,
> Θησέα τ᾽ Αἰγεΐδην, ἐπιείκελον ἀθανάτοισι.
> κάρτιστοι δὴ κεῖνοι ἐπιχθονίων τράφεν ἀνδρῶν·
> κάρτιστοι μὲν ἔσαν καὶ καρτίστοις ἐμάχοντο,
> φηρσὶν ὀρεσκῴοισι, καὶ ἐκπάγλως ἀπόλεσσαν.

> But listen to me; you are both younger than I am. **Once before now** I kept company with men who were even greater than you, and they never disregarded me. I have never seen such men since, nor will I again: the likes of Peirithous and Dryas, shepherd of the people, and Caineus, and Exadius, and godlike Polyphemus, and Aegeus' son Theseus, peer of the immortals. They were the mightiest of all men reared on the earth; they were the mightiest, and they fought the mightiest foes, the mountain-dwelling Centaurs, and they violently destroyed them.

Nestor begins his recollection with some of the same temporal indices that we have seen above (ἤδη . . . **ποτ᾽**), before launching into a miniature catalogue of the Lapith warriors (1.263–5) who

---

[38] Bölte (1934); Cantieni (1942); Hampe (1950) 28–9 n. 79; cf. §1.2.1 on Nestor's cup.
[39] *Il.* 5.392–402; Hes. *Scut.* 359–67; Pind. *Ol.* 9.28–35. Cf. Russo (1965) 165.

cannot be rivalled by men of the present or future (1.262, cf. 271–2). These temporal pointers index a familiar and traditional story, the conflict that arose between the Lapiths and Centaurs, when the drunken Centaur Eurytion attempted to abduct and rape Peirithous' wife Hippodameia.[40] The tale appears in many archaic sources: it is referenced elsewhere in the *Iliad* (esp. 2.743–4: note **ἤματι τῷ ὅτε**), as well as in the *Odyssey*, where Antinous invokes the cautionary exemplum of Eurytion (*Od.* 21.295–304).[41] Beyond Homer, the battle is also described in the Hesiodic *Aspis* (*Scut.* 178–90), whose catalogue of warriors overlaps substantially with that in the *Iliad*, suggesting 'some common ancestry behind the two lists';[42] and it also appears in art from an early date, including on a bronze relief from Olympia (seventh century, featuring Caineus) and on the François Vase (early sixth century, featuring Theseus, Caineus and Dryas).[43] The story was evidently a well-established feature of the mythological tradition, to which Nestor here makes a brief summary reference.[44]

The ostensible purpose of Nestor's recollection is to establish his authority and status as an adviser: Agamemnon and Achilles should heed his advice as these superior heroes once did in the past (1.273–4).[45] Yet it also contains its own paradigmatic value. Not only does it offer an example of united heroic activity against a

---

[40] Nestor's presence in the battle has sometimes been considered an ad hoc invention (e.g. Reinhardt (1961) 78; Willcock (1964) 142–3), but it may result from an ancient 'confluence of Pylian and Thessalian epic tradition', reflected in the twin sibling relationship of Pylian Neleus and Pelias of Iolcus (West (2011a) 90; cf. M. L. West (1988) 160 with n. 68; Alden (2000) 75–6 n. 6).

[41] As Tsagalis (2012a) 212 notes, the diction in *Od.* 21.303–4 is reminiscent of an epic proem: ἐξ οὗ . . . νεῖκος . . . . πρώτῳ; cf. Ford (1992) 20 on such 'titling syntax'.

[42] Wachter (1991) 106, noting the similar positioning of several names; cf. Mason (2015) 266. Only Polyphemus is absent from the *Aspis* catalogue. However, Theseus' presence in the *Iliad* (1.265) may be a later Athenian interpolation, since the verse is missing from major manuscripts, is ignored by the scholia and reappears at *Scut.* 182: von der Mühll (1952) 24 n. 29; Kirk (1985) 80; West (2001a) 186, (2015b) 12.

[43] Cf. Minto (1955); Gantz (1993) 143–5; Chiarini (2012) 81–96. For the inscribed names on the François Vase, see Wachter (1991) 89, 104–7. Two names are now missing, of which one would have been Peirithous: Beazley (1986) 32; Wachter (1991) 104.

[44] Aelian's claim that a pre-Homeric poet, Melesander of Miletus, composed 'the battle of Lapiths and Centaurs' (Μελήσανδρος ὁ Μιλήσιος Λαπιθῶν καὶ Κενταύρων μάχην ἔγραψεν, *VH* 11.2) is undoubtedly fictional (Cameron (2004) 147–8) but nevertheless attests to an ancient appreciation that the Homeric poems presuppose this myth.

[45] Austin (1966) 301–2; Alden (2000) 76–80.

258

shared enemy, in contrast to the Achaeans' current infighting;[46] but for audiences familiar with the wider myth, it also provides a more pointed comment on Agamemnon's conduct. As Tsagalis has noted, the *Odyssey*'s account of the centaur Eurytion foregrounds his drunkenness (οἶνος, 21.295; οἴνῳ, 297; οἰνοβαρείων, 304) and folly (ἄασ', 296; ἄασεν, 297; ἀασθείς, 301; ἄτην, 302) – two characteristics which are equally applied to Agamemnon's behaviour in the quarrel (οἰνοβαρές, *Il.* 1.225; ἄτας, 9.115; ἀασάμην, 9.116, 119).[47] Tsagalis takes this point no further, but for an audience familiar with these aspects of the larger myth, Nestor's account would offer a veiled critique of Agamemnon's haughtiness: he behaves in Book 1 like a bestial Centaur, stealing away Briseis just as Eurytion once tried to carry off Hippodameia.[48] Such an implication would reinforce Nestor's overall assessment of the situation: he follows his account by explicitly telling Agamemnon not to take Briseis (1.275–6) and later recalls how Agamemnon's conduct did not follow his own thinking (9.108–9). Nestor's mythical reminiscence thus not only establishes the legitimacy of his advice but also implicitly criticises Agamemnon's actions. As elsewhere in archaic epic, this temporally indexed account invites an audience to supplement the telling with their broader knowledge of tradition, comparing Homer's characters to those of the Nestorian and mythical past.

Beyond Homer

Such temporal indices also extend beyond the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* to the wider corpus of archaic Greek epic. We have already noted a case in the *Aspis* (ἤδη . . . καὶ ἄλλοτε, *Scut.* 359: §IV.2.1 above), but we can add further examples from Hesiod and the *Homeric Hymns*. Like both Homeric epics, these poems frequently index passing references to myths with temporal adverbs. In the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, Apollo '**once**' killed Hyacinthus with a

---

[46] Segal (1971) 91–2.
[47] Tsagalis (2012a) 212. Agamemnon is particularly associated with plentiful wine: e.g. *Il.* 7.470–1, 9.71–2; *Od.* 3.139; cf. *AP* 15.9.4.
[48] Cf. Alden (2000) 80–2. There is also a further parallel with Paris' theft of Helen, the catalyst of the whole war. Contrast West (2011a) 90, who claims 'there is no analogy between the war of the Lapiths and Centaurs (260–73) and the present situation'.

259

discus (**ποτ'**, fr. 171.7), evoking the tale of the god's tragic killing of his beloved,[49] and Eëtion, also known as Iasion, '**once**' suffered for sleeping with Demeter (**ποτέ**, fr. 177.9).[50] In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, the myth of Typhon is introduced with a pair of **ποτέ** adverbs (*HhAp*. 305, 307), marking the traditionality of the myth,[51] while in the *Hymn to Aphrodite*, the goddess claims that the gods '**previously**' (**πρίν**) feared the 'whisperings and plots' with which she '**once**' (**ποτέ**) coupled all the immortals with mortal women (*HhAphr*. 249–50), evoking a key and recurring subject of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*. In the *Hymn to Hermes*, meanwhile, the newborn god sings of his parents' union as something of the past (**πάρος**, *HhHerm*. 58), an index which points not only to the traditional nature of the account, but also to the fact that the union has already been narrated in the poet's own voice at the start of the poem (*HhHerm*. 1–12); within the context of the hymn, this is indeed 'old news'.[52] As in Homer, both inter- and intratextual references are cued through a temporal frame.

In addition, these indices can also evoke other traditions in a more competitive mode. In Hesiod's *Works and Days*, for example, the poet makes a passing reference to the gathering of the Greeks at Aulis before the Trojan war, indexed with a temporal **ποτέ** (*Op*. 650–3):

> οὐ γάρ πώ ποτε νηὶ [γ'] ἐπέπλων εὐρέα πόντον,
> εἰ μὴ ἐς Εὔβοιαν ἐξ Αὐλίδος, ᾗ **ποτ'** Ἀχαιοὶ
> μείναντες χειμῶνα πολὺν σὺν λαὸν ἄγειραν
> Ἑλλάδος ἐξ ἱερῆς Τροίην ἐς καλλιγύναικα.

> For never yet have I sailed in a ship over the broad sea, except to Euboea from Aulis, where the Achaeans **once** waited for a great storm to pass and gathered a great army from holy Greece against Troy with its beautiful women.

This reference inaugurates an agonistic moment of Hesiodic self-fashioning, as the poet positions himself against martial epic. Hesiod evokes a core element of the Trojan war *fabula*, the

---

[49] Eur. *Hel*. 1471–5 (Allan (2008b) 323); Nic. *Ther*. 902–6; Apollod. *Bibl*. 1.3.3, 3.10.3; Hirschberger (2004) 343–4.

[50] *Od*. 5.125–8; Hes. *Theog*. 969–71; Apollod. *Bibl*. 3.12.1; Hirschberger (2004) 346.

[51] *Il*. 2.780–5; Hes. *Theog*. 820–80; §II.2.1.

[52] Cf. Vergados (2013) 271. Thanks to the proem, Hermes' lineage is indeed '**renowned**' (γενεὴν **ὀνομάκλυτον**, *HhHerm*. 59).

260

gathering at Aulis, as a foil for his own endeavours: his short, brief and immediately successful voyage contrasts with the long, arduous ἄεθλα of the Greeks (cf. ἄεθλα, *Op.* 654).[53] This competitive spirit is also visible on a verbal level. Scholars have previously noted the 'correction' of traditional epic language in verse 653: Troy is traditionally 'holy' and Greece known for its 'beautiful women', but Hesiod inverts these terms.[54] By stealing Helen, Troy hardly deserves to be called 'holy', but it is now very much a 'land of beautiful women'.[55]

I would add, however, that this agonism centres not only on Aulis, but also on the end point of Hesiod's journey, Euboea. This island also played an important role in the Trojan war tradition as a major point on the Greeks' return home from Troy. In the *Odyssey*, Nestor recalls how a large part of the army was encouraged by a god to 'cut through the middle of the sea to Euboea' (ἠνώγει πέλαγος μέσον εἰς Εὔβοιαν | τέμνειν, *Od.* 3.174–5) and promptly did so, arriving together at Geraestus before each group returned home (3.175–83). The island was conceptualised as a communal end point of the Greek expedition, marking the conclusion of a long and arduous campaign. But in addition, it was also associated with shipwrecks and failed homecomings: the island's Capherean rocks were the site of both Locrian Ajax's death (*Nostoi* arg. 3b *GEF*; Alc. fr. 298.6–7)[56] and of Nauplius' revenge on the Greek fleet for the murder of his son Palamedes.[57] Against this background, Hesiod's agonistic positioning gains further point. His journey not only starts where the Greek expedition began (Aulis), but also ends at the place where many of

---

[53] Steiner (2005) 350, (2007) 182–6; cf. Nagy (1982) 66; Rosen (1990b); Dougherty (2001) 21–5; Graziosi (2002) 169–71; Purves (2010) 78–9. μείναντες χειμῶνα (652) is paralleled by Proclus' summary of the *Cypria*: ἡ θεὸς . . . χειμῶνας ἐπιπέμπουσα (arg. 8 *GEF*); cf. Davies (2019) 144–5.

[54] Edwards (1971) 80–1. 'Beautiful-womaned' Greece (*Il.* 2.683, 9.447); Achaea (*Il.* 3.75, 258); Sparta (*Od.* 13.412, Hes. fr. 26.3). 'Holy' citadel of Troy (*Il.* 16.100, *Od.* 1.2), Ilion (*Il.* 4.46, 164, 416 etc.).

[55] Arrighetti (1998) 441; Graziosi (2002) 170; Debiasi (2008) 32–3; Scodel (2012) 502–3.

[56] Cf. *Aen.* 11.259–60. In the *Odyssey*, Ajax's death is situated at the 'Gyraean rocks' (*Od.* 4.499–511), which are most likely also located on Euboea: Bowra (1940); cf. Quint. Smyrn. 14.568–72. Contrast Sandbach (1942) (who prefers Tenos), criticised by Clay (1982).

[57] See Gantz (1993) 695–7. The story may have already featured in the *Nostoi*, where Nauplius was mentioned (fr. 11 *GEF*). For Homeric avoidance of the Palamedes myth, see §III.2.3.

261

the Greek forces returned or even failed to return (Euboea). Hesiod's journey evokes the whole Trojan war expedition in a miniaturised, sanitised and successful form: his straightforward trip of 'some 65 metres of water' serves as a stark foil to the years of suffering and loss that afflicted the Greek expedition.[58] He effortlessly succeeds where the Greek force had struggled. This competitive reframing of the Trojan war story is reinforced by the temporal adverb ποτέ, situating the events of the Trojan war as a past but familiar tradition against which Hesiod can position his own poetry. In this case, the temporal index marks a more competitive evocation of another mythic and poetic tradition.

As in Homer, therefore, temporal indices frequently signpost the evocation of another moment of myth against which the present poem is positioned. They frequently introduce brief and passing references, inviting audiences to supplement the telling with their wider knowledge of tradition. Crucially, however, as with poetic memory, events both within and beyond a single poem are evoked in a similar manner, suggesting that they are all conceived as a long continuum of myth.

IV.2.2 Poetic Déjà Vu

In addition to these signalled back references to earlier traditions and myths, archaic epic also exhibits cases of more pointed repetition and iteration – the second category of allusive temporality with which we began. These instances not only evoke an episode of the mythical past but depict the present as a replay of it, stressing even more clearly the continuity between past and present. As with broad chronological perspective, this is a phenomenon which works both intra- and intertextually.

Intratextual Repetitions

On an intratextual level, such repetitions again connect the narrative on both a large- and small-scale. We have already seen Ares rebuke Athena in the Iliadic theomachy for '**again**' driving the

---

[58] Quotation: West (1978a) 320. We might also detect an implicit contrast between Hesiod's pious and proper relationship with the Muses (cf. *Op*. 654–9) and the sacrilegious transgressions of Agamemnon (against Artemis at Aulis: Nelson (2022) 60–1) and Locrian Ajax (against Athena: Christensen (2019); §II.3.3).

262

gods to fight against each other, recalling her former support of Diomedes all the way back in Book 5 (**αὖτ'**, *Il.* 21.394: §III.2.2). In *Odyssey* 16, meanwhile, the same goddess makes Odysseus an old man '**again**' by striking him with her wand (*Od.* 16.456) – the indexical **πάλιν** directs us back to Homer's previous and more extended description of the same transformation at *Od.* 13.429–38. On other occasions, such repetitions occur within a short space of time in a single book.[59] When Aeneas and Pandarus face Diomedes in *Iliad* 5, for example, Pandarus claims that he will '**now again** test Diomedes with his spear' (**νῦν αὖτε** ἐγχείη πειρήσομαι, 5.279), a reference which looks back to Pandarus' previous attempt on the Greek hero with his bow (5.95–105).[60] His comment marks this scene as a doublet of that earlier encounter: in both cases, Pandarus' cast is followed by a near-identical boast that Diomedes 'won't last much longer' (βέβληαι . . . οὐδέ σ' ὀῒω | δηρὸν ἔτ' ἀνσχήσεσθαι, 284–5 ~ βέβληται . . . οὐδέ ἕ φημι | δήθ' ἀνσχήσεσθαι, 103–4).[61] But in this replay, Pandarus' shot proves less effective than it was before: whereas his arrow pierced Diomedes' breastplate and drew blood (98–100), his spear does not even puncture the breastplate (281–2), a sign of growing weakness which paves the way for his ensuing death (290–6).[62] Pandarus introduces his action as a self-conscious repeat, but the subtle differences between the two occasions reinforce his characterisation and foreshadow his fate.

In other cases, the adverbial use of **καί** ('**also**'/'**too**') signposts iterative action and speech.[63] In *Iliad* 3, Menelaus asks the assembled

---

[59] The shortest such repetition occurs in *Iliad* 1, when Thetis asks Zeus to support her son '**again a second time**' (δεύτερον αὖτις, *Il.* 1.513), marking the immediate repetition of her appeal after Zeus's initially silent response (503–10 ~ 514–16).

[60] An event which Pandarus has recently recalled to Aeneas (ἤδη, *Il.* 5.188, 206): §IV.2.1 above.

[61] Fenik (1968) 20–1 notes such 'premature boasting' as a typical battle element, but Pandarus' language is unique in these cases: ἀνσχήσεσθαι appears nowhere else in Greek poetry.

[62] Cf. the increasingly ineffective missiles which the suitors cast at Odysseus on Ithaca, building up to their slaughter: see §IV.2.1 n. 22 above.

[63] For the indexical potential of adverbial καί (cf. Latin *etiam*), see Currie (2016) 67 n. 170; Thomas (forthcoming). For later examples, cf. Soph. *Ant.* 944 (Antigone ~ Danae); Eur. *Phoen.* 854 (Erectheus ~ Menoeceus: Mastronarde (1994) 399); Hedylus 4.1 *HE* (**καί** τοῦτο: Sens (2015) 43 n. 8); Dioscorides 23.1–2 *HE* = *AP* 7.707.1–2 (where **καί**, alongside the language of otherness, **ἄλλος**, and kinship, **αὐθαίμων**, marks the epigram's close relationship with *AP* 7.37).

263

Greek and Trojan armies to 'listen **now** to me **too**' (κέκλυτε **νῦν καὶ** ἐμεῖο, 3.97), echoing Hector's own preceding address (κέκλυτέ μευ, 'listen to me', 3.86), while in the later battle by the ships, Deiphobus fails to hit Idomeneus with his spear '**then too**' (**καὶ τόθ'**, 13.518), repeating his earlier miss (13.404–10). On a larger scale, Odysseus asks Athena in the *Odyssey* why she did not tell Telemachus that he was still alive: 'was it perhaps so that he **too** might suffer woes wandering over the barren sea while others devour his property?' (ἦ ἵνα που **καὶ** κεῖνος ἀλώμενος ἄλγεα πάσχῃ | πόντον ἐπ' ἀτρύγετον, βίοτον δέ οἱ ἄλλοι ἔδουσι; *Od.* 13.418–19). His question signposts the larger doublet relation between Odysseus and Telemachus; the son's actions and wanderings at the start of the *Odyssey* are in many ways a mirror of Odysseus' own (cf. esp. ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα, 1.4; ἀλώμενον, ἄλγε' ἔχοντα, 5.336).[64] Here, **καί** does not index a momentary repetition, but rather a larger pattern that underpins the entire narrative.

On an even larger scale, whole series of repetitions are traced through a single poem. In the *Iliad*, both the narrator and characters stress Nestor's recurring role as a good counsellor. In Book 2, Agamemnon claims that Nestor has surpassed the other Greeks in speech '**once again**' with his advice to separate the Greeks by tribe, prompting the Catalogue of Ships (ἦ μὰν **αὖτ'** ἀγορῇ νικᾷς, γέρον, υἷας Ἀχαιῶν, 2.370). On one level, Agamemnon's remark contributes to Nestor's general characterisation as an 'ever sensible adviser', but it equally points back to the sole previous Iliadic occasion where Nestor has already offered advice: his attempt to break up the quarrel of Book 1 (1.247–84; §IV.2.1). Agamemnon effectively parrots Nestor's own self-presentation from that occasion: there too, Nestor claimed that his advice had proved best before among the previous generation of heroes (1.273–4). But Agamemnon no longer needs to look to such intertextual precedents; Nestor's conduct earlier within the poem justifies his claim.[65]

---

[64] For this doublet, see e.g. Rüter (1969) 238–40; Apthorp (1980) 12–22; Rutherford (1985) 138–9. Penelope already signals the parallel at *Od.* 4.724–8 (**πρὶν** μὲν πόσιν . . . **νῦν αὖ** παῖδ'): cf. Currie (2016) 128 with n. 132.

[65] Though Nestor's advice was not followed in Book 1, despite its sense: cf. Roisman (2005b) on the inconsistency between Nestor's reputation as an excellent counsellor and the frequently flawed or ineffective nature of his advice in practice.

264

On two later occasions in the *Iliad*, the narrator similarly introduces Nestor's speeches with reference to his former rhetorical success: Νέστωρ, οὗ **καὶ πρόσθεν** ἀρίστη φαίνετο βουλή ('Nestor, whose counsel seemed best **before as well**', *Il.* 7.325, 9.94). Just like Agamemnon, the narrator foregrounds the continuity of Nestor's conduct, though here before rather than after he has made his latest recommendations. As Nestor is about to propose the ceasefire in hostilities and the embassy to Achilles, we are reminded of his former words of advice and encouraged to see him playing the same role here. This introductory verse also appears once in the *Odyssey*, in the spectral Agamemnon's account of Achilles' funeral, where Nestor stopped the Greeks from fleeing at the approach of Thetis and her fellow Nereids (*Od.* 24.52). This further iteration of the verse may suggest that it is little more than a formulaic filler, marking Nestor's traditional role as a good adviser within the wider mythological tradition.[66] But its unique Odyssean instantiation could also be a more specific response to the chain of Iliadic references that we have been tracing, adding further point to the indexical **καὶ πρόσθεν**: not only 'before in tradition', but also 'before in the *Iliad*'. Whatever the precise reference, however, here too, this verse signposts Nestor's repeated conduct.

Intertextual Repetitions

Elsewhere in both Homeric poems, the poet indexes actions and behaviours that are repeated from the wider traditions of myth. Once more, adverbial **καί** is a recurring device to mark such doublets. In the *Odyssey*, it is especially used in connection with the Oresteia myth, as Telemachus is encouraged to follow the example of Orestes (**καὶ** σύ/κεῖνος, *Od.* 1.301, 3.197, 3.313) and Odysseus to avoid that of Agamemnon (**καὶ** σύ, 11.441).[67] In the

---

[66] Cf. too *Il.* 11.627: Nestor was awarded Hecamede after the sack of Tenedos because 'he constantly excelled everybody in counsel' (βουλῇ ἀριστεύεσκεν ἁπάντων); the iterative verb again stresses his pre-eminent counsel. On allusions to traditional features of Nestor elsewhere in Homer, cf. §I.2.1 (Nestor's cup), §II.2.3 (Nestor's legendary age), §IV.2.1 (Nestor's youthful exploits).

[67] *Odyssey* and Oresteia myth: §III.2.1 n. 38. Adverbial καί: see too *Il.* 18.120 (**καὶ** ἐγών: Achilles ~ Heracles), 21.106 (**καὶ** σύ: Lycaon ~ Achilles/Patroclus); *Od.* 11.618 (**καὶ** σύ: Odysseus ~ Heracles: §IV.2.3).

Iliad, meanwhile, Patroclus' shade highlights the parallel fate that he and Achilles share (*Il.* 23.78–81):

> ἀλλ' ἐμὲ μὲν κὴρ
> ἀμφέχανε στυγερή, ἥ περ λάχε γιγνόμενόν περ·
> **καὶ** δὲ σοὶ αὐτῷ **μοῖρα**, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ,
> τείχει ὕπο Τρώων εὐηφενέων ἀπολέσθαι.

> Hateful doom has gaped around me, the doom that must have been my lot since birth. But for you yourself **too**, godlike Achilles, it is **fated** to die beneath the wall of the wealthy Trojans.

Here, **καί** draws attention to the wider doublet relation between the two heroes: Patroclus' Iliadic death is a close foreshadowing of Achilles' in the wider Trojan war tradition, familiar to us from the *Aethiopis* and other later sources.[68] Particularly relevant for these verses is the parallel location of each hero's death. Patroclus predicts that Achilles will die beneath the walls of Troy (τείχει ὕπο Τρώων, 23.81),[69] the same place that Patroclus died earlier (τείχει ὕπο Τρώων, 17.404, 558) – a unique verbal repetition.[70] Patroclus' **καί** . . . **σοί** acknowledges the allusive doublet but flips it on its head: Achilles' death will here 'repeat' Patroclus', rather than vice versa.[71]

A similar sense of intertextual repetition is visible in the *Odyssey* when both Odysseus and Alcinous insist that the Phaeacians have '**previously**' escorted men across the sea, an insistence which seems to hint at earlier traditions of their seafaring prowess (ὡς **τὸ πάρος** περ, 8.31; cf. τὶς **ἄλλος**, 8.32; **καὶ ἄλλους**, 16.227–8).[72] As scholars have noted, the Phaeacians are unlikely to be a Homeric invention. The presence of alternative genealogies in Alcaeus (*test.* 441) and Acusilaus (fr. 4 *EGM*) 'make it *prima facie* unlikely that

---

[68] See e.g. Kullmann (1960) 321; Janko (1992) 408–10; Burgess (2001a) 74–5, (2009) 79–81.

[69] A consistent feature of the death of Achilles *fabula*: Burgess (2009) 38–9. Cf. *Il.* 21.277–8, 22.360; *Aeth.* arg. 3a *GEF*; Apollod. *Epit.* 5.3. Perhaps also Stesichorus fr. 119.3–7 (Ἀχιλλευ[. . . πόλιν . . . τείχεος).

[70] These are the only three instances of τείχει ὕπο Τρώων in this *sedes* in all extant Greek literature; the phrase reappears once elsewhere in a different *sedes* with different word order at 21.277, though still relating to Achilles' death (Τρώων ὕπο τείχεϊ).

[71] Cf. Burgess (2001a) 74, (2009) 79. Note too the framing of tradition as **μοῖρα** ('fate', *Il.* 23.80).

[72] Cf. Currie (2016) 142.

266

they too were only found in Homer in the Archaic period'.[73] More speculatively, it has also been suggested that the *Odyssey*'s mixed messages about the role of queen Arete may be indebted to other versions in which she played a more active role in hosting the hero (cf. *Od.* 6.303–15, 7.53–77).[74] In any case, Alcinous has already recalled a previous occasion when the Phaeacians transported Rhadamanthys to Euboea (*Od.* 7.321–4), a reference which 'must be to some story created at an earlier stage of the tradition'.[75] By repeatedly appealing to the Phaeacians' previous travels, the *Odyssey* establishes Odysseus' present voyage as a replay of their earlier, traditional escorting of men. Particularly intriguing in this regard is the claim that the Phaeacians who took Odysseus home sailed into Ithaca by the Cave of the Nymphs, a place which they '**knew previously**' (πρὶν εἰδότες, *Od.* 13.113). By foregrounding their familiarity with Ithaca, the poet hints again at their traditional role as ferrymen, but perhaps especially at earlier accounts of Odysseus' return.[76] The Phaeacians have been to Ithaca before, in earlier treatments of Odysseus' homecoming. Homer establishes a strong sense of déjà vu; it would indeed seem that the Phaeacians were '**famous for their ships**' from the larger tradition (ναυσίκλυτοι, *Od.* 13.166).

In other cases, intertextual iterations are marked through the adverbs αἰεί/αἰέν ('**always**') and πάρος ('**previously**'), foregrounding the continuity in a figure's actions or characterisation.[77] In both Homeric poems, characters repeatedly note Athena's support of Odysseus. When Odysseus encounters the goddess on Ithaca, he remarks that she was kindly to him '**in the past**' while he warred at Troy (πάρος, *Od.* 13.314), just as Locrian Ajax complains in the Patroclean funeral games that Athena has helped Odysseus, as she has done '**previously**' (τὸ πάρος, *Il.* 23.782–3). In the *Doloneia*,

---

[73] Kelly (forthcoming a); cf. Fowler (2000–13) II 555.

[74] Hainsworth (1988) 323–4. For discussions of the Phaeacians' origins and traditionality: Reinhardt (1948) 144–61; Germain (1954) 285–319; Heubeck (1974) 114; Cook (1992); Sergent (2002); West (2014a) 129–30.

[75] Garvie (1994) 232. Note φάσ', *Od.* 7.322; ὅτε, *Od.* 7.323. Cf. Danek (1998) 140–1; Currie (2016) 142. Contrast Hainsworth (1988) 339–40.

[76] For possible allusions to alternative versions of Odysseus' *nostos* elsewhere, cf. §II.2.3. Could Odysseus' promise to give gifts to the Naiad nymphs on Ithaca '**as before**' (ὡς τὸ πάρος περ, 13.358) similarly nod to previous tellings of his return?

[77] Cf. Marg (1938) 51–4 on the frequent use of αἰεί/πάρος in epic characterisation.

meanwhile, Odysseus prays to Athena (*Il.* 10.278–82), recalling how she is '**always**' by his side (**αἰεί**, 278) and asking her to show her love '**again**' (**αὖτε**, 280). Such statements evoke the close traditional association of hero and goddess, framing the present moment as the latest iteration of this recurring pattern.[78] On other occasions, such continuities may point back to more specific events of the mythical past, as we see with the fractious relationship between Zeus and Hera in *Iliad* 1. Zeus accuses Hera of '**always**' quarrelling with him and '**always**' suspecting (**αἰεί**, 1.520, 561), while Hera complains that Zeus '**always**' likes to plot apart from her and has '**never yet**' openly revealed his intentions (**αἰεί** ... **οὐδέ τί πω**, 1.541–3). On one level, these assertions characterise the pair's unhappy marriage as an ongoing divine *neikos* (cf. e.g. *Il.* 14.158), a foil and parallel for the opening mortal conflict between Agamemnon and Achilles.[79] But they also invite us to look back to previous moments of the pair's marital discord – especially concerning Heracles, an episode which is referenced repeatedly later in the *Iliad*.[80] Indeed, Hypnos makes this parallel explicit when he later claims that Hera is asking him to perform '**another**' impossible task '**now again**' (**νῦν αὖ** ... **ἄλλο**, *Il.* 14.262; cf. **ἤδη** ... **καὶ ἄλλο**, 249), framing Hera's current struggle against Zeus as a replay of her former efforts (cf. §III.2.1).

Similarly, in *Iliad* 1, Agamemnon upbraids Calchas for what he perceives as his consistently detrimental prophecies (*Il.* 1.106–8):

μάντι κακῶν, **οὐ πώ ποτέ** μοι τὸ κρήγυον εἶπας·
αἰεί τοι τὰ κάκ᾿ ἐστὶ φίλα φρεσὶ μαντεύεσθαι,
ἐσθλὸν δ᾿ **οὔτε τί πω** εἶπας ἔπος οὔτ᾿ ἐτέλεσσας.

Prophet of evil, **never yet** have you told me anything good. It is **always** dear to your heart to prophesy evil, and **never yet** have you said a good word or brought it to fulfilment.

Scholars have long suspected an allusion to the sacrifice of Iphigenia here, the previous occasion on which Calchas gave the

---

[78] Athena and Odysseus: e.g. in the *Iliad*: 2.166–82, 10.245, 11.437–8, 23.768–83. *Odyssey*: *passim*.

[79] Hera is attempting 'to live up to the role of consort in the Succession Myth': Kelly (2007a) 424; cf. O'Brien (1993) 94–111.

[80] Esp. *Il.* 14.249–62, 15.24–30; cf. Lang (1983); §III.2.1.

ruler some bad news.[81] Such a reference is reinforced by the generalised temporal frame (**οὐ πώ ποτε ... αἰεί ... οὔτε τί πω**), which underlines the continuity with the mythical past. Agamemnon goes on to emphasise the parallel with the present: Calchas is behaving in the same way '**now too**' (**καὶ νῦν**, 109). There is a strong sense of déjà vu as events at Aulis are replayed on the Trojan shore. Indeed, Agamemnon's fierce outburst seems to signpost a more extensive allusive engagement with the Iphigenia tradition, as the whole debate over Chryseis and her eventual return to her father replay the tale of Iphigenia's sacrifice.[82]

Finally, such repetitions do not just look back to earlier moments within a mythical *fabula*. They also look forward to future events within the story. When Zeus contemplates saving his son Sarpedon in *Iliad* 16, for example, Hera warns him of the precedent that he may set (16.445–7):

αἴ κε ζὼν πέμψῃς Σαρπηδόνα ὅνδε δόμονδε,
φράζεο μή **τις ἔπειτα** θεῶν ἐθέλῃσι **καὶ ἄλλος**
πέμπειν ὃν φίλον υἱὸν ἀπὸ κρατερῆς ὑσμίνης·

If you send Sarpedon home alive, beware that **in the future some other** of the gods **too** may want to send their own son from mighty battle.

As Currie has argued, these lines obliquely look ahead to later (**ἔπειτα**) episodes in the Trojan war *fabula* where other gods do indeed rescue their sons from the battlefield: Eos successfully appeals to Zeus to immortalise her son Memnon (*Aeth*. arg. 2e *GEF*), while Thetis snatches Achilles from his funeral pyre and conveys him to the White Isle (*Aeth*. arg. 4b).[83] Such a forward reference here is particularly significant given that Sarpedon appears to be an allusive doublet of Memnon, a foreign defender of Troy slain by Achilles' substitute, Patroclus.[84] In the context of

[81] Taplin (1992) 86; Dowden (1996) 53; Pulleyn (2000) 156–7; Kullmann (2001) 395–6; Nelson (2022) 74 n. 78.

[82] See Nelson (2022).

[83] Currie (2006) 35–6, (2016) 66–7; cf. Schoeck (1961) 25. Thetis may have also supplicated Zeus before rescuing Achilles' body: cf. *Ol*. 2.79–80, which may be indebted to the *Aethiopis* tradition: Kirkwood (1982) 75; Currie (2006) 32, (2016) 63–4. Contrast Willcock (1995) 160.

[84] Fenik (1964) 30–1; Clark and Coulson (1978); Janko (1992) 313; Currie (2006) 31–41, (2016) 63–9; Burgess (2009) 76–8. Contrast Dihle (1970) 17–20; Nagy (1983); Davies

269

Hera's speech, the parallel is not exact: Zeus considers sending his son home alive (ζών, 445) in contrast to Memnon's posthumous translation. But Sarpedon's actual fate later in the narrative proves a closer analogue to Memnon's: Apollo rescues his corpse, which Sleep and Death convey back to Lycia (16.676–83, cf. 453–7).[85] From this perspective, Hera's speculation that '**some other** of the gods **too**' may want to rescue their son '**in the future**' is particularly suggestive (**τις ἔπειτα** θεῶν . . . **καὶ ἄλλος**, 446); the traditional *fabula* is framed not as a fated certainty, but as a future possibility which Hera seeks to avert.[86] In comparison to the confident claims of future knowledge that we have encountered before (§III.2.4), tradition here is parsed as a hypothetical. Yet audiences know that Hera's fears will ultimately be fulfilled. In the end, even though Zeus does not save Sarpedon, later deities will indeed beg him to save their own sons. Here we are thus very close to the 'future reflexive' allusions of Hellenistic and Latin poets, where a character's comments or actions ironically foreshadow future events of a mythological story which are already known from older tellings.[87] From the perspective of tradition, Sarpedon replays Memnon's role, but within the context of the story, he prefigures it.[88]

In both Homeric poems, therefore, cases of both inter- and intratextual repetition are frequently indexed, drawing attention to various kinds of allusive reworkings. Once more, we find a notable consistency between internal and external references. Yet as with indexical memory, the phenomenon is largely limited to the Homeric poems.[89] It too largely seems to be the preserve of

---

(2016) 16–19. Later pairings of Memnon and Sarpedon suggest ancient recognition of this doublet: e.g. Ar. *Nub.* 622; Paus. 10.31.5: Spivey (2018) 167.

[85] Similarly, on the basis of artistic evidence, Memnon appears to have been rescued by Eos and carried away by Sleep and Death: compare and contrast Clark and Coulson (1978) 70–3; Burgess (2009) 35–8; Davies (2016) 36–42.

[86] Currie (2006) 35–36, (2016) 67, noting further inversions: Zeus is here the desperate parent, not the target of entreaty, and his son is ultimately not immortalised.

[87] Barchiesi (1993). For another Homeric example, cf. *Il.* 24.63: Hera calls Apollo 'companion of evil men, **always** faithless' (κακῶν ἔταρ', **αἰὲν** ἄπιστε), a criticism which may look ahead to his future killing of Achilles with his 'companion' Paris: Scodel (1977), though note the caution of Burgess (2004a).

[88] Just as the Iliadic Patroclus simultaneously repeats and foreshadows Achilles' fate: cf. *Il.* 23.78–81 above.

[89] For a rare Cyclic example, see §IV.2.3 below on **αὖτε** in the *Epigonoi*.

narrative poetry, less relevant for Hesiod and less visible in our paltry Cyclic fragments. To close this section, however, I wish to dwell on one particularly self-conscious case of intratextual iteration in the *Iliad*.

Self-Quotation: Hector as Before

The most striking instance of allusive iteration in Homeric epic extends beyond repeated action and characterisation to repeated language. Near the start of *Iliad* 12, the Trojans are afraid of Hector, who is said to 'fight like a whirlwind **as before**' (αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' **ὡς τὸ πρόσθεν** ἐμάρνατο ἶσος ἀέλλῃ, *Il.* 12.40). As the exegetical scholia note, this phrase looks back to the poet's similar description of Hector in the previous book (*Il.* 11.295–8):[90]

> Ἕκτωρ Πριαμίδης, βροτολοιγῷ ἶσος Ἄρηϊ.
> αὐτὸς δ' ἐν πρώτοισι μέγα φρονέων ἐβεβήκει,
> ἐν δ' ἔπεσ' ὑσμίνῃ ὑπεραέϊ <u>ἶσος ἀέλλῃ</u>,
> ἥ τε καθαλλομένη ἰοειδέα πόντον ὀρίνει.

> Priam's son Hector, the peer of Ares, bane of mortals. He himself strode out among the foremost with high thoughts in his mind and fell on the conflict <u>like a whirlwind</u> that blusters and stirs the violet-hued sea as it swoops down.

Notably, these are the only two instances of ἶσος ἀέλλῃ in all extent early Greek hexameter poetry, both occurring in the same *sedes*.[91] Of course, the phrase may be an under-attested formula. Elsewhere in Homer, ἶσος is paired with other nouns to produce comparable short similes (including θύελλα, 'hurricane', and λαῖλαψ, 'tempest'),[92] and the Trojans are once compared to 'a blast of dire winds' in similar language (ἀργαλέων ἀνέμων ἀτάλαντοι ἀέλλῃ, *Il.* 13.795). But even if the phrase is an under-represented formula (which is by no means certain), its unique repetition in close proximity is significant, marking the continuity in Hector's actions – not only is he still fighting the Achaeans as he

---

[90] Σ T *Il.* 12.40b *ex*.: **μέμνηται** τῶν ἐπῶν ἐκείνων "ἐν δ' ἔπεσ' ὑσμίνῃ, ὑπεραέϊ ἶσος ἀέλλῃ"; cf. Nelson (2020) 185 with n. 63.

[91] The phrase only reappears in imperial epic: Quint. Smyrn. 1.685; Nonn. *Dion*. 30.126; Orph. *Argon*. 840.

[92] E.g. ἶσος . . . δαίμονι (*Il.* 5.438, 5.459, etc.); Ἄρηϊ (*Il.* 11.295; *Od.* 8.115, etc.); λαίλαπι (*Il.* 11.747, 12.375, 20.51), φλογὶ . . . ἠὲ θυέλλῃ (*Il.* 13.39); ἔρνεϊ (*Il.* 18.56, 18.437; *Od.* 14.175).

was before, but he is doing so in precisely the same manner.[93] The abbreviated length of the *Iliad* 12 simile (a single half-verse) even seems to nod to this repetition: it presupposes the fuller, prior version from the previous book. Homer practically quotes himself, and by accompanying the verbal repetition with the indexical ὡς τὸ πρόσθεν, he acknowledges this iterative act.

On a larger structural scale, this repetition also marks the narrative's return to battle after several lengthy interludes: Patroclus' visit to the loquacious Nestor (11.596–848) and the narrator's proleptic digression on the Greek wall (12.1–35). In an elaborate ring composition, the narrator resumes the battle narrative where he left off. Strikingly, this ring composition also has a chiastic form. In Book 11, the whirlwind simile follows another which compares Hector to a huntsman facing a wild boar or lion (11.292–5: καπρίῳ ἠὲ λέοντι, 293); in Book 12, by contrast, it immediately precedes one which compares Hector to a wild boar or lion (12.41–50: κάπριος ἠὲ λέων, 42). Such wild beasts are common vehicles of Homeric similes, of which the boar and lion form a recurring pair,[94] but the language here is particularly close. In fact, these similes are the only two pairings of κάπριος and λέων throughout the whole poem.[95] This unique repetition, alongside the careful symmetry, invites us to make more of the connection: although Hector is still fighting like a whirlwind, he is now more like a beast than a hunter – a significant reversal. Moreover, this beast is notably killed by its own courage (ἀγηνορίη δέ μιν ἔκτα, 12.46), a detail which foreshadows Hector's future fate and echoes Andromache's earlier fear that his fury would kill him (φθίσει σε τὸ σὸν μένος, *Il.* 6.407).[96] Within the larger context of Book 12, this foreboding is particularly

---

[93] Cf. Kozak (2017) 107, noting the further Hector–storm simile at *Il.* 11.305–8. For such meaningful connections between the two occurrences of Homeric *dis legomena*, cf. Keil (1998) 91–174.

[94] Cf. *Il.* 5.782–3, 7.256–7, 8.338–42, 16.823–8. Other pairings outside similes: *Il.* 17.20–1; *Od.* 10.433, 11.611; Hes. *Scut.* 168–77; *HhHerm.* 569.

[95] κάπριος (in comparison to the more common κάπρος) only appears twice more elsewhere in archaic epic: *Il.* 11.414, 17.282.

[96] Cf. Hainsworth (1993) 322; Σ T *Il.* 12.46b1 *ex.*: καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἄλογον θράσος Ἕκτορος. A similar phrase is used of a lion to which Patroclus is compared at 16.753, also foreshadowing his death (ἑή τέ μιν ὤλεσεν ἀλκή) – one of the many points of connection between these two heroes' fates.

appropriate, as Hector is about to disregard Polydamas' advice, displaying an impetuousness that will eventually lead to his downfall (12.229–50).

This temporal index thus signposts a direct intratextual quotation within the *Iliad*, reinforcing the close connection between these two passages. In part, the indexed echo marks the resumption of the narrative proper, but it also has a larger resonance for the poem as a whole, enriching our appreciation of Hector's character and fate. Such carefully signposted iteration brings us very close to the literate poetics of a later age.

IV.2.3 *Epic Epigonality*

As we have seen above (§IV.2.1–2), the indexical potential of time extended throughout archaic Greek epic. It was largely employed to evoke other episodes in an encyclopaedic manner, gesturing to the larger map of tradition, but it could also play a more supplementary role (acknowledging other parts of Trojan myth mentioned in passing) or bear an agonistic edge (as with Hesiod and Aulis/Euboea). So far, we have noted plentiful examples of the first two categories of temporal indexicality, but no real example of the third, epigonal self-consciousness. In extant archaic epic, we find no direct invocations of poetic predecessors, a stark foil to later epic poets' direct naming of their forebears (Statius and the 'divine Aeneid', *divinam Aeneida*, *Theb.* 12.816–17; Nonnus and 'father Homer', πατρὸς Ὁμήρου, *Dion.* 25.265).[97] This absence largely reflects the predominantly anonymous persona of archaic epic (especially in Homer), as well as the prominence of the epic Muse: as we have noted before, the 'fiction' of the Muses conceals the reality of bardic education and transmission.[98] The poets' self-presentation did not permit a direct invocation of their πρότεροι.

Yet even so, there remains an underlying tension in the temporal framework of both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* which may enact the poet's relationship with his predecessors on a more implicit level. As we have seen, the Iliadic Nestor repeatedly contrasts the grandeur of the

---

[97] Cf. too Christodorus calling Homer 'my father' in his hexametric ecphrasis of the statues in Zeuxippus' gymnasium (πατὴρ ἐμός, *AP* 2.320).

[98] §II.2; Ford (1992) 61–3, 90–130.

273

past with the more mundane present (§IV.2.1). From his very first appearance in the poem, he unfavourably compares the men of the present with those of the past: mortals today are no match for the Lapiths and Centaurs of old (*Il.* 1.260–72, esp. 271–2), who were emphatically κάρτιστοι ('mightiest', 1.266, 267, 267) – superior even to Achilles, who is merely καρτερός ('mighty', 1.280, cf. 1.178).[99] Yet Nestor is far from alone in invoking such an intergenerational contrast.[100] Elsewhere in the *Iliad*, Diomedes is criticised by both Agamemnon and Athena for not living up to the standards of his father (4.370–400, 5.800–13; §II.2.2),[101] Tlepolemus asserts that his rival Sarpedon is far inferior to those warriors who were born to Zeus 'in **previous** generations of men' (ἐπὶ **προτέρων** ἀνθρώπων, 5.637; §II.2.4) and Antilochus complains of the honour which the gods offer '**older** men' (**παλαιοτέρους** ἀνθρώπους, 23.788), since he cannot compete with Odysseus, who is 'of an **earlier** generation and of **earlier** men' (**προτέρης** γενεῆς **προτέρων** τ' ἀνθρώπων, 23.790). Even Hector's prayer for Astyanax to be superior to his father proves tragically unfulfilled (*Il.* 6.476–81). In the *Odyssey*, meanwhile, Telemachus too faces an underlying pressure to live up to his father Odysseus (2.270–80, 3.122–5, 16.300), who in turn faces the precedent of even earlier generations. In Scheria, he claims that he would 'not attempt to rival men **of the past**', like Heracles or Eurytus of Oechalia (ἀνδράσι δὲ **προτέροισιν** ἐριζέμεν οὐκ ἐθελήσω, | οὔθ' Ἡρακλῆϊ οὔτ' Εὐρύτῳ Οἰχαλιῆϊ, *Od.* 8.223–4). Ultimately, as the disguised Athena tells Telemachus, 'few sons equal their father; most are inferior, and only a few are better' (παῦροι γάρ τοι παῖδες ὁμοῖοι πατρὶ πέλονται, | οἱ πλέονες κακίους, παῦροι δέ τε πατρὸς ἀρείους, *Od.* 2.276–7). Homer's heroes constantly live in the shadow of their predecessors.[102]

---

[99] Cf. too *Il.* 7.155: Nestor's former foe Ereuthalion is κάρτιστος, a foil to κρατερός Diomedes (7.163).

[100] For generational change and opposition in Homer generally, see Querbach (1976); Levine (2002–3) 147–50; Grethlein (2006a) 49–58; Mackie (2008). On Homeric father–son relationships: Wöhrle (1999).

[101] Andersen (1978) esp. 33–45; Alden (2000) 112–52; Pratt (2009); Barker and Christensen (2011); Davies (2014) 33–8; Sammons (2014). Cf. Stamatopoulou (2017) on the generational contrast between Diomedes' and Heracles' theomachies.

[102] Cf. too the Hesiodic 'Myth of Races', with its underlying narrative of intergenerational decline (*Op.* 109–201).

Given the degree of self-consciousness that we have encountered elsewhere in Homer, it would be attractive to interpret these epigonal moments as an implicit model for Homer's own relationship to his epic forebears and the pre-existing tradition.[103] After all, this nagging contrast between past and present explicitly extends to the narrator's own day when he acknowledges the greater strength of his heroes: not even two men of the present could match the strength of a Diomedes or a Hector in lifting rocks (*Il.* 5.302–4, 12.445–9, 20.285–7; cf. 12.381–3). It is not only Homer's characters that feel the burden of living up to the past, but also the contemporary world of the poet himself. Given this complementarity, we may be justified in seeing the heroes' anxious expressions of epigonality as an index of the poet's own tense relationship with tradition. Scodel has previously suggested such a metapoetic reading, arguing that the modesty of Homer's heroes reflects the poet's deference to tradition: 'as his characters stand in awe of the mighty men of the past . . . so the poet views other styles of epic with respect'.[104] It is certainly true that the Homeric poems present themselves as direct heirs to a deep tradition of great achievement. But I am less prepared to see this always as a simple expression of meek submission. Rather, I contend that these assertions of epigonality can also exhibit an eristic drive comparable to that we have encountered elsewhere: despite the overbearing burden of the past, neither Homer nor his characters are fully resigned to an inferior status.

Diomedes versus Tydeus: Troy versus Thebes

Such agonistic epigonality is clearest when a Homeric son explicitly matches or even surpasses his father, resisting the rhetoric of perpetual decline. As we have previously seen, both Agamemnon and Athena accuse Diomedes of failing to live up to his father's standards in the *Iliad* (4.370–400, 5.800–13), and Tydeus' shadow continues to linger over his son through the repeated use of his patronymic Τυδεΐδης (§II.2.2). However, such a narrative of filial inferiority is only one way of formulating the pair's relationship. Diomedes

---

[103] Cf. already Martin (1989) 229: 'What can be viewed as generational conflict within the story of the *Iliad* . . . is also a poetic contest as well'.

[104] Scodel (2004) 19.

275

himself, by contrast, sees far more continuity between himself and his father. During his *aristeia*, he asks Athena to assist him '**now in turn**' (*νῦν αὖτ'*) as she had '**once**' (*ποτέ*) supported Tydeus (5.116–17), and before the *Doloneia* he similarly bids her 'hear me **now too**' (κέκλυθι *νῦν καὶ* ἐμεῖο, 10.284) and 'follow me as **when** you followed my father' (σπεῖό μοι ὡς **ὅτε** πατρὶ ἅμ' ἕσπεο, 10.285). In his mind, there is a natural parallelism between the goddess' support of the different generations, reinforced by the balanced temporal adverbs and the chiastic symmetry of σπεῖό μοι . . . πατρὶ . . . ἕσπεο.[105] Before facing Pandarus and Aeneas, meanwhile, Diomedes boasts that it is 'not in my blood to fight skulking or to cower' (οὐ γάρ μοι γενναῖον ἀλυσκάζοντι μάχεσθαι | οὐδὲ καταπτώσσειν, 5.253–4), a claim which asserts his likeness to his father and implicitly counters Agamemnon's earlier criticism (τί πτώσσεις, 'why are you cowering?', 4.371).[106] From Diomedes' perspective, he equals the exploits of Tydeus. He stresses the continuity across generations, a stance which might also hint at Homer's parity with Theban tradition.

However, this intergenerational relationship could also be painted in a more competitive light. In immediate response to Agamemnon's criticism in Book 4, Diomedes' companion Sthenelus asserts his own and Diomedes' superiority to their fathers (*Il.* 4.403–10):

> τὸν δ' υἱὸς Καπανῆος ἀμείψατο κυδαλίμοιο·
> "Ἀτρεΐδη, μὴ ψεύδε' ἐπιστάμενος σάφα εἰπεῖν·
> ἡμεῖς τοι πατέρων μέγ' ἀμείνονες εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι·
> ἡμεῖς καὶ Θήβης ἕδος εἵλομεν ἑπταπύλοιο
> παυρότερον λαὸν ἀγαγόνθ' ὑπὸ τεῖχος ἄρειον,
> πειθόμενοι τεράεσσι θεῶν καὶ Ζηνὸς ἀρωγῇ·
> κεῖνοι δὲ σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο·
> τῶ μή μοι πατέρας ποθ' ὁμοίῃ ἔνθεο τιμῇ."

But the son of illustrious Capaneus answered: 'Son of Atreus, don't tell lies when you know the clear truth. We claim to be far better than our fathers: we

---

[105] Athena herself hints at this parallelism when repeating the same phrase to describe her support of each hero: τοίη οἱ ἐγὼν ἐπιτάρροθος ἦα (5.808, of Tydeus) ~ τοίη τοι ἐγὼν ἐπιτάρροθός εἰμι (5.828, of Diomedes).

[106] See *CGL*, LSJ and *LfgrE* s.v. for this meaning of the Homeric *hapax legomenon* γενναῖος ('true to one's birth', cf. Arist. *Hist. an.* 1.1.488b19). Diomedes also matches his father's solitary heroism: he rescues Nestor by himself (αὐτός περ ἐών, *Il.* 8.99), just as Tydeus challenged the Cadmeans solo (μοῦνος ἐών, 4.388; §II.2.2).

actually captured the seat of seven-gated Thebes, even though we brought a smaller force against a stronger wall, because we trusted in the portents of the gods and the help of Zeus. But they perished through their own recklessness. So do not ever set our fathers in equal honour with us.'

Contrary to Agamemnon's allegations, Sthenelus asserts that Diomedes outdoes his father, who is no paradigm worth emulating. Sthenelus and Diomedes succeeded where their parents had failed, sacking Thebes even when the odds were against them. They were the ones who successfully trusted the gods' portents (πειθόμενοι τεράεσσι θεῶν, 4.408), not Tydeus, as Agamemnon had claimed (θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήσας, 4.398). And they also profited from Zeus's help (Ζηνὸς ἀρωγῇ, 4.408), an extra detail which combatively caps Agamemnon's account: they even had the king of the gods on their side.[107] Tydeus, by contrast, perished alongside the rest of the Seven through their own folly (σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο, 4.409), an expression which recurs only once elsewhere in Greek poetry to describe the recklessness of Odysseus' companions in the *Odyssey* (*Od.* 1.7); like them, the Seven's intransigence and impiety caused their downfall.[108] Within an explicitly generational frame (ἡμεῖς . . . πατέρων, 4.405; μοι πατέρας, 4.410), Sthenelus' speech thus establishes a clear contrast between father and son in pointedly agonistic terms: the younger warrior, now at Troy, surpasses his father who fought at Thebes.[109]

For the *Iliad*'s relationship with Theban myth, this intergenerational opposition can be interpreted in at least two ways. The first is to see the presence of the Theban Epigonoi at Troy as an implicit threat to the Iliadic narrative, especially since Sthenelus' arguments for the superiority of the Epigonoi can be directed as much against Agamemnon and the *Iliad* as against the tradition of the Seven.[110]

---

[107] Barker and Christensen (2011) 26, (2020) 74. Diomedes' greater piety is also reflected in his avoidance of his father's barbaric consumption of Melanippus' brains (*Theb.* fr. 9 *GEF*): Scodel (2004) 18–19; cf. §II.2.2 n. 55.

[108] Cf. Barker and Christensen (2011) 25–6, (2020) 74; O'Maley (2014).

[109] Cf. too O'Maley (2018) 292–6: Diomedes equally surpasses his father as a speaker of words, a key heroic trait (cf. *Il.* 9.443). Diomedes' repeated squabbles with Nestor also reflect an agonistic desire to outdo the earlier generation (Querbach (1976) 61–3), especially given Nestor's role as an ersatz father for Diomedes (*Il.* 9.57–8; cf. 8.78– 112: Diomedes allusively role-plays 'Antilochus' by rescuing Nestor: Burgess (2009) 74; Cook (2009b) 151; Frame (2009) 195–7; Currie (2016) 247–53).

[110] Cf. Nagy (1979) 162–3 n. 3; Slatkin (2011a) 112; Tsagalis (2012a) 219–20.

The Epigonoi succeeded with a small force against a stronger defence (*Il.* 4.407), whereas Agamemnon has so far failed to sack Troy despite mustering an army which far outnumbers the Trojans (cf. *Il.* 2.119–30, 8.55–6, 13.737–9, 15.405–7); and the Epigonoi succeeded by heeding the gods' signs (*Il.* 4.408), a stark contrast to Agamemnon's arrogant disregard of the divine at the outset of the poem (e.g. 1.28). On this reading, the Trojan war (and Homer's account of it) risks being overshadowed by the former achievements of these Theban warriors.

However, this interpretation overplays the externality of this threat. As Laura Slatkin notes, Diomedes' following rebuke of Sthenelus (*Il.* 4.411–18) and his later words of support for the expedition (*Il.* 9.32–49) ultimately place him 'and his companion firmly within the Achaean cohort', seamlessly incorporating these former Theban warriors into Agamemnon's and Homer's Panhellenic project.[111] Indeed, Diomedes insists that he and Sthenelus have come to Troy 'with the aid of a god' (σὺν γὰρ θεῷ εἰλήλουθμεν, 9.49), just as they had come to Thebes with divine favour (πειθόμενοι τεράεσσι θεῶν, 4.408). Far from being a threat to the Achaean mission, they are an integral part of it: the most successful figures of the Theban tradition have been subsumed within Homer's Trojan narrative. From this perspective, their superiority to their fathers may stand as a symbol for Homer's own supremacy over this Theban tradition, despite his junior – even 'epigonal' – status.[112] Elton Barker and Joel Christensen have effectively demonstrated how this wider Iliadic scene sets Tydeus' solitary Achillean heroism against the larger Iliadic ethos of collaboration and collective achievement.[113] But we should add that it also implies a more direct disparity between the fortunes of the Seven and the Greeks at Troy: Zeus's signs of ill will when Tydeus visited Mycenae (παραίσια σήματα, *Il.* 4.381) directly contrast with the positive signals he offered at the start of the Trojan expedition (ἐναίσιμα σήματα, *Il.* 2.353).[114] If Pindar's

---

[111] Slatkin (2011a) 113.   [112] Cf. Cook (2009b) 157.

[113] Barker and Christensen (2011). On the centrality of the collective to the *Iliad*: Elmer (2013). Cf. too Diomedes' explicit preference for teamwork over isolation (*Il.* 10.222–6).

[114] Ebbott (2014) 334.

278

specification that Zeus failed to hurl propitious lightning for the Seven (οὐδὲ Κρονίων ἀστεροπὰν ἐλελίξαις, *Nem.* 9.19) draws on earlier Theban traditions, as Braswell has suggested,[115] the contrast would be even more direct: it was precisely Zeus's auspicious lightning that marked the departure of the Greeks to Troy (ἀστράπτων ἐπιδέξι᾽, *Il.* 2.353). Agamemnon's troops, like the Epigonoi, are set to succeed where the Seven failed.

Homer's evocation of Theban myth thus has a distinctively agonistic edge, defining the *Iliad* against the failed heroism of a rival tradition's older generation. Other archaic poets often presented Trojan and Theban war traditions on a par with each other;[116] yet Homer was clearly not content with such parity and instead implies his own poetic supremacy. He appropriates the successful Epigonoi for his present narrative and distances himself from the failings of the Seven, offering perhaps the earliest Greek instance of generational succession as an intertextual trope.[117] But what makes this poetic polemic so striking is how it reverses the common epic pattern of generational decline and the unreachability of the past. In contrast to Hesiod's 'Myth of Races' (*Op.* 109–201) and the repeated Homeric refrain of the greater strength of past heroes (*Il.* 5.302–4, 12.381–3, 12.445–9, 20.285–7), in this case the younger and newer generation proves superior: Diomedes surpasses Tydeus and Homer outshines Theban myth.

Odysseus' Katabatic Predecessors

A similarly agonistic stance is visible in Odysseus' relationship with the older heroes whom he encounters in the *Nekyia* of *Odyssey* 11. All the figures whom he meets in the Underworld

---

[115] Braswell (1998) 81–2, who suspects Pindar's debt to the *Thebaid* and compares the absence of thunder in Statius' scene of auspice-taking (*Theb.* 3.460–551). Pindar alludes to the *Thebaid* elsewhere: *Ol.* 6.17 (~ *Theb.* fr. 6 *GEF*, cf. §IV.3.1). For his use of Cyclic material more generally: Rutherford (2015); Currie (2016) 247–53; Spelman (2018c).

[116] Hes. *Op.* 161–5; Pind. *Pyth.* 3.86–103; *Anacreontea* fr. 26.1–2: Barker and Christensen (2011) 35–6.

[117] Cf. Chaudhuri (2014) 29–36; Barker and Christensen (2020) 47–89, esp. 88. For this trope in Roman poetry: Hardie (1993) 88–119. Another possible Homeric instance occurs at *Il.* 15.638–52, where the Greek warrior Periphetes proves far superior to his father Copreus, the former herald of Eurystheus. Could Homer be positioning his Trojan narrative as superior to the Heracles tradition?

can plausibly be read as representatives of different literary traditions, embracing female catalogues, Trojan myth, moral didacticism and other epic tales.[118] Crucially, however, Odysseus' encounter with these various mythical characters is retrospectively framed in temporal terms (11.628–30):

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν αὐτοῦ μένον ἔμπεδον, εἴ τις ἔτ᾽ ἔλθοι
ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων, οἳ δὴ **τὸ πρόσθεν** ὄλοντο.
καί νύ κ᾽ ἔτι **προτέρους** ἴδον ἀνέρας, οὓς ἔθελόν περ

But I stayed there where I was, in the hope that some other of the heroic men who perished **long ago** might still come. And now I would have seen yet more men **of former generations**, whom I longed to see.

The narrative closes with Odysseus hoping that he could have seen more 'men **of former generations**' (**προτέρους** . . . ἀνέρας, 630) who had died '**long ago**' (**τὸ πρόσθεν**, 629). The emphasis on these figures' anteriority stresses Odysseus' position as an epigone, interacting with a whole range of πρότεροι – a dynamic which equally applies to Homer's relationship with these other myths, a tapestry of prior tales against which he works.

It is particularly significant, then, that this gesture to predecessors is flanked by references to several heroes who provide a direct model for Odysseus' current katabatic activity. The final figure whom Odysseus has encountered in the Underworld is Heracles, who explicitly recounted his own former *katabasis* (11.617–26):

διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν᾽ Ὀδυσσεῦ,
ἆ δείλ᾽, ἦ τινὰ **καὶ** σὺ κακὸν μόρον ἡγηλάζεις,
ὅν περ ἐγὼν ὀχέεσκον ὑπ᾽ αὐγὰς ἠελίοιο.
Ζηνὸς μὲν πάϊς ἦα Κρονίονος, αὐτὰρ ὀϊζὺν
εἶχον ἀπειρεσίην· μάλα γὰρ πολὺ χείρονι φωτὶ
δεδμήμην, ὁ δέ μοι χαλεποὺς ἐπετέλλετ᾽ ἀέθλους.
καί **ποτέ** μ᾽ ἐνθάδ᾽ ἔπεμψε κύν᾽ ἄξοντ᾽· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ᾽ ἄλλον
φράζετο τοῦδέ γέ μοι κρατερώτερον εἶναι ἄεθλον.
τὸν μὲν ἐγὼν ἀνένεικα καὶ ἤγαγον ἐξ Ἀΐδαο·
Ἑρμείας δέ μ᾽ ἔπεμπεν ἰδὲ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη.

[118] Most (1992); Danek (1998) 230–1; cf. §11.2.4. See too Martin (2001) who sees in the Odyssean *Nekyia* a response to competitive pressure from a tradition of Orpheus' descent to Hades.

280

> Zeus-sprung son of Laertes, Odysseus of many stratagems, ah, poor man, do you **too** then drag out a wretched fate like that I endured beneath the rays of the sun? I was a child of Zeus, Cronus' son, but I had woe without limit. For I was made subject to a man much my inferior, who tasked me with arduous labours. **Once** he even sent me here to fetch the dog of Hades; for he thought that no other labour would be harder for me than this. But I took up the dog and brought it out of Hades. Hermes and grey-eyed Athena escorted me.

The hero recalls his quest in search of Cerberus, an episode whose traditionality is guaranteed by other mentions across archaic Greek epic (*Il.* 8.362–9, Hes. *Theog.* 310–12), indexed here through **ποτέ** (11.623).[119] Scholars have noted how the narrative at this moment implicitly signals Homer's debt to Heracles' earlier *katabasis* as a model for Odysseus' current adventure.[120] In particular, Heracles' **καὶ** σύ (11.618) indexes the parallel as a case of intertextual repetition: Odysseus '**too**', just like Heracles, is a man who faces difficult labours (ἀέθλους, *Od.* 11.622, ἄεθλον, 11.624; cf. *Od.* 1.18, 4.170, 4.241).[121]

What has not been stressed before, however, is the fact that this intertextual reading can equally be extended to the following heroes whom Odysseus wishes he could have also met. After expressing his desire to see more 'men **of former generations**' (**προτέρους** . . . ἀνέρας, 11.630), he immediately specifies two such individuals: Theseus and Peirithous (Θησέα Περίθοόν τε, 11.631). According to Plutarch, Hereas of Megara considered this verse a Peisistratid interpolation, designed 'to please the Athenians' through the prominent mention of the Attic hero Theseus (χαριζόμενον Ἀθηναίοις, Plut. *Vit. Thes.* 20.2).[122] But we should be wary of taking this claim at face value, not only because of Hereas' potential anti-Athenian bias given his Mergarian roots,

---

[119] Heracles' *fabula*: §III.2.1. The authenticity of Odysseus' encounter with Heracles has been challenged since antiquity (e.g. Petzl (1969) 28–43; Gee (2020) 15–38; Nesselrath (2020) 32–6), but for a convincing defence of these lines and their significance, see Hooker (1980); Karanika (2011).

[120] Crane (1988) 104–8; Heubeck (1989) 114; Tsagarakis (2000) 26–9; Currie (2006) 6, 22 n. 102, (2016) 47; S. R. West (2012) 129. On Heracles' *katabasis* tradition: Robertson (1980). For the *Nekyia* as a *katabasis*: Clark (1979) 74–8.

[121] Finkelberg (1995) 4–5; Danek (1998) 247–9. Indexical καί: §IV.2.2. For the *Odyssey*'s engagement with Heraclean myth generally: Clay (1997) 89–96; Crissy (1997); Danek (1998) 245–50; Thalmann (1998) 176–80; de Jong (2001) 507; Schein (2001), (2002); Karanika (2011); Andersen (2012); Alden (2017) 173–84.

[122] Cf. Heubeck (1989) 116; Frame (2009) 322–3.

but also because the verse appears consistently in the manuscript tradition and is commented upon by the scholia – unlike other such suspected Peisistratid interpolations.[123] Moreover, following on from the meeting with Heracles, the mention of this pair is in fact very well motivated: they too had a katabatic tradition attached to their name, involving Peirithous' attempt to steal Persephone and make her his own bride. The myth had an archaic pedigree: according to Pausanias, it featured in both the epic *Minyas* (10.28.2) and an apparently different work attributed to Hesiod (9.31.5), so it would have likely been familiar to at least some of Homer's audience.[124] Having just encountered one of his katabatic predecessors, Odysseus thus hopes to come across two more.[125] His hope ultimately proves unfulfilled, but it nevertheless continues to foreground the *Odyssey*'s relationship to earlier myth. Theseus and Peirithous join Heracles as Odysseus' katabatic πρότεροι, highlighting Homer's mythical models for this episode.

As with Diomedes' relationship to Tydeus, so too here there is a distinctly competitive edge to Odysseus' engagement with these mythical predecessors. Although Odysseus humbly claimed in Scheria that he would not rival men of the past like Heracles (*Od.* 8.223–4), his katabatic encounter with that very hero can be read in pointedly eristic terms.[126] Far from proving inferior to Heracles, Odysseus matches him in many respects: he too completes a *katabasis*, the most dangerous of Heracles' various ἄεθλοι (cf. 11.624), and performs 'wondrous deeds' which parallel the scenes depicted on Heracles' belt (θέσκελα ἔργα, *Od.* 11.374 = 11.610).[127]

---

[123] Potential bias: Herter (1939) 264; Davison (1955b) 15–18; Stanford (1959) 404. Manuscript support: Bolling (1925) 242–3; Herter (1939) 264.

[124] One of these poems is probably the source of the Ibscher papyrus fragment discussed above (Hes. fr. 280; §11.2.5). The myth is also closely connected to Heracles' *katabasis*: he rescued one or both heroes after they had become trapped: see n. 133 below. For other textual and iconographic sources, see Gantz (1993) 291–5; Bremmer (2015); Dova (2015).

[125] Cf. Walker (1995) 14–15; Dova (2012) 34.

[126] Cf. Alden (2017) 177–8: 'By making his character say that he would not want to contend with Heracles and Eurytus . . . the poet distracts attention from the fact that *he* is competing with the Heracles epics of previous generations, and his hero is in competition with Heracles'.

[127] Cf. Karanika (2011) 13–14. These are the sole appearances of this phrase in the whole *Odyssey*; it appears elsewhere in archaic epic at *Il.* 3.130; Hes. fr. 195.41 = *Scut.* 34, fr. 204.96.

282

Later in the poem, he is also described in a staunchly Heraclean mode by the dead suitor Amphimedon, who recalls Odysseus 'glancing about terribly' just like Heracles in the first *Nekyia* – a unique and meaningful Homeric repetition (δεινὸν παπταίνων, *Od.* 24.179 = 11.608).[128] By killing the suitors with the bow of Eurytus (another predecessor: *Od.* 8.224), Odysseus ultimately accomplishes a feat which sets him on a par with these heroes of an earlier generation.[129]

But as with Diomedes and Tydeus, Odysseus' relationship to Heracles can also be framed as one of superiority, not just parity. Whereas Heracles had relied on the divine help of Hermes and Athena in his *katabasis* (11.626), Odysseus stresses that he accomplished his mission independently, without a guide (*Od.* 10.501–5).[130] Moreover, within the Underworld itself, Heracles is pictured as always being on the verge of shooting his bow but never quite doing so (αἰεὶ βαλέοντι ἐοικώς, 11.608), a 'perpetual failure', which as Vayos Liapis notes, 'will be counterbalanced by Odysseus' successful killing of the suitors with his own bow' later in the poem.[131] In the present, Odysseus' archery is more potent than that of his predecessor. And in more general terms, Odysseus also proves morally superior by maintaining and restoring the proper norms of hospitality in his final deed, a contrast to Heracles, who violated *xenia* by killing Iphitus (21.27–9).[132] Odysseus emerges as the more civil, more independent and more successful hero.

The same competitive relationship also applies to Odysseus' relationship with Theseus and Peirithous. These heroes are only named in a passing reference, but well-versed audience members would have known that their attempts to steal Persephone were ultimately unsuccessful and in fact left the heroes trapped in the Underworld – at least for some time, if not for all eternity.[133]

---

[128] Karanika (2011) 11–12 (cf. πάπτηνεν δ' Ὀδυσεύς, *Od.* 22.381). On the verb's associations: Lonsdale (1989).

[129] Cf. Crissy (1997) 50.

[130] Alden (2017) 174; cf. *Il.* 8.366–9, where Athena stresses that Heracles would not have escaped from the Underworld without her help.

[131] Liapis (2006) 49.

[132] Clay (1997) 89–96; Schein (2001), (2002); Alden (2017) 176–84. Cf. Scodel (2004) 18–19 who stresses the greater respect and piety of Homer's heroes in comparison to their predecessors.

[133] In most traditions, Heracles eventually rescued Theseus alone (Eur. *HF* 619–21, 1221–2; Hor. *Carm.* 4.7.27–8; Diod. Sic. 4.63.4; Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.5.12, *Epit.* 1.24; Tzet. ad

283

In one variant of the tale, they became immobilised and fixed to the seat beneath them, as the rock grew into their flesh,[134] while in another, they were guarded or bound by snakes.[135] If these versions were known already in Homer's day, they would particularly resonate with the fear which forces Odysseus to retreat from the Underworld (11.633–5):

> ἐμὲ δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ᾗρει,
> μή μοι Γοργείην κεφαλὴν δεινοῖο πελώρου
> ἐξ Ἄϊδος πέμψειεν ἀγαυὴ Περσεφόνεια.

> Pale fear seized hold of me, that queen Persephone might send against me out of Hades the head of the Gorgon, that terrible monster.

Odysseus is afraid that Persephone – the very goddess whom his predecessors had attempted to steal – will send a Gorgon against him, a monster famous for its petrifying gaze and serpentine associations.[136] In leaving the Underworld before seeing Theseus and Peirithous, he thus avoids following their fate: he is neither fixed perpetually in stone nor bound in place by serpents. In contrast to that pair, he has successfully navigated his *Nekyia*, retrieved the information required from Teiresias and safely returned to the 'real world'; he thus outdoes these mythical predecessors, steering clear of their former mistakes. Although the Iliadic Nestor had classed Theseus and Peirithous among the 'mightiest men' of previous generations with whom none of his present allies could compete (*Il.* 1.263–8), Odysseus' deeds in fact surpass theirs. In spite of his protestations of inferiority (*Od.* 8.223–4), Odysseus' actions prove superior to those of the

---

Ran. 142a; *Myth. Vat.* 1.48), or sometimes both heroes (Critias, *Peirithous*, frr. 1–14 *TrGF*: Alvoni (2006); Diod. Sic. 4.26.1; Hyg. *Fab.* 79.3), but some variants kept them both trapped forever (Diod. Sic. 4.63.4; Virg. *Aen.* 6.601, 617–18).

[134] προσφυῇ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ χρωτὸς ἀντὶ δεσμῶν σφισιν ἔφη τὴν πέτραν, Panyassis fr. 17 *GEF* = Paus. 10.29.9; προσφυέντες, Apollod. *Epit.* 1.24. This version is already found in art *c.* 600 BCE: Clark (1979) 125. Cf. *Myth. Vat.* 1.48: Heracles saves Theseus by brute force, leaving his posterior on the rock!

[135] δρακόντων ἐφρουρεῖτο χάσμασιν, Critias, *Peirithous*, Hyp. *TrGF*; σπείραις δρακόντων κατείχοντο, Apollod. *Epit.* 1.24.

[136] The Gorgon's petrifying glance is first securely attested in Pindar (λίθινον θάνατον, Pind. *Pyth.* 10.48), but her eyes and 'terrible gaze' already feature prominently in Homer (*Il.* 8.349, 11.36–7) and the Hesiodic *Aspis* (*Scut.* 236). Gorgons frequently wield two snakes in archaic literature (*Scut.* 233–4) and art (Chiarini (2012) 118–19). In later tradition, Heracles also faces a Gorgon in the Underworld (Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.5.12).

previous generation – a superiority which we can once more map onto Homer's own relationship to tradition.

In both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, therefore, Homeric heroes' fraught relations with their predecessors involve moments not only of meek inferiority, but also of intense competition. Given the larger intergenerational tensions of both poems, I have suggested that these may stand as an analogy for Homer's own relationship with tradition. The poet does not directly compare himself to his πρότεροι, but he does so implicitly through the anxieties voiced by his characters, and the various interactions which his heroes have with figures of the earlier generation. It is worth stressing that this intergenerational agonism is not limited to the masculine sphere either: we have previously seen the same phenomenon with the Odyssean Penelope who proves superior to the finest women of old (§II.2.4). As Homeric characters rival their πρότεροι, so too do the Homeric poems compete with other mythical traditions.

Cyclic Epigonality

An epigonal self-consciousness also pervades our wider corpus of archaic epic, especially the Epic Cycle. Many of the Cylic epics show a strong interest in intergenerational relationships and raise the question of whether a son can live up to the standards of their father. As in both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, this concern seems to map onto an individual poem's relationship with its wider tradition, or even specific poetic predecessors.

This phenomenon is most obvious in the Theban Cyclic tradition, given the underlying contrast between the efforts of the Seven and the Epigonoi. We have very few extant fragments of Theban epic, but the opening of the Cyclic *Epigonoi* clearly highlights its secondary status. The narrator invites the Muses to begin '**now, in turn**' on the '**younger men**' (*νῦν αὖθ' ὁπλοτέρων ἀνδρῶν ἀρχώμεθα, Μοῦσαι*, fr. 1 *GEF*). In a single line, temporal adverbs combine with the Nestorian language of youth to position the poem as a sequel to the *Thebaid*.[137] In particular, **αὖθ'** ('**in**

---

[137] Cf. Currie (2016) 26 n. 163; Barker and Christensen (2020) 53–4; and Cingano (2015) 254–5, who compares the use of *νῦν* to join the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* to the *Theogony*.

turn'/'**again**') marks this transition to a new but related composition, a process of both repetition and change.[138] We cannot know to what extent such epigonal posturing extended beyond this first line, but ancient readers appear to have been attuned to the sequence it implies: the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, which preserves this verse, claims that Homer 'first' recited the *Thebaid*, before 'then' moving on to the *Epigonoi* (πρῶτον μὲν τὴν Θηβαΐδα . . . εἶτα Ἐπιγόνους, *Cert.* 15). Whether or not both poems were composed by the same poet,[139] the generational succession embedded in Theban myth extends here – as in *Iliad* 4 – to the poet's relationship with his poetic heritage.

Such belatedness is also manifest more indirectly in the Trojan Cyclic tradition.[140] Sammons has recently demonstrated how the structure of several Cyclic epics pivots around a contrast between the younger and older generation. In both the *Little Iliad* and *Nostoi*, Achilles' son Neoptolemus appears to have gradually emerged from the shadow of a more senior hero, as the second half of an 'anticipatory doublet'.[141] From what we can discern from Proclus' summaries, at first he follows the example of the older, better-established hero, but he soon surpasses his model and 'takes over' the narrative himself. In the *Little Iliad*, he initially parallels Philoctetes: both are fetched from an island (Lemnos, arg. 2b / Scyros, arg. 3a), grow in strength in the Greek camp (Philoctetes is cured, arg. 2c / Neoptolemus receives his father's arms, arg. 3a) and defeat a major adversary (Paris, arg. 2c / Eurypylus, arg. 3d); but Neoptolemus then appears to have continued playing more of a major role in the narrative, featuring prominently in the sack of Troy and its aftermath (fr. 29 *GEF*). In the *Nostoi*, meanwhile, Neoptolemus' overland journey home (arg. 4) parallels that which Calchas had already attempted by land (arg. 2). Both journeys likely involved a divine warning (Calchas' through his prophetic ability: cf. Quint. Smyrn.

---

[138] For αὖτε as an allusive index, see too §IV.3.3 below; and cf. νῦν **αὖτε** marking the transition of Athena's support from Tydeus to Diomedes (5.116–17: §IV.2.3 above).

[139] In contrast to the *Thebaid*, the 'Homeric' authorship of the *Epigonoi* was often doubted in antiquity: see Cingano (2015) 244–6; Bassino (2019) 176–8.

[140] On father–son relations in Trojan myth: Anderson (1997) 27–48.

[141] Sammons (2019) 49–56, building on the foundational doublet study of Fenik (1974) 131–232. The following paragraphs rework and build on Sammons' arguments.

286

14.360–3; Neoptolemus' through Thetis: arg. 4a), and both featured the death and burial of a prominent elder (Calchas himself, arg. 2; Achilles' adviser Phoenix, arg. 4c).[142] As in the *Little Iliad*, however, Neoptolemus appears to outdo his elder's exploits: not only does he survive his journey, but he also receives a fuller narrative treatment, given his various encounters with Thetis (arg. 4a), Odysseus (arg. 4b) and Peleus (arg. 4c). As far as we can tell from Proclus' summaries, an intergenerational contrast underpinned the very structure of both works. By the end of each, Neoptolemus had surpassed the exploits of the older generation.

In both poems, this intergenerational dynamic is also reinforced by the overbearing shadow of Neoptolemus' father, Achilles. In the *Little Iliad*, Neoptolemus is visited by his father's ghost (arg. 3b); his first victim (Eurypylus, arg. 3c–d) parallels both Achilles' first (Telephus, Eurypylus' father) and last (Memnon, *Od.* 11.522); and his savage refusal of Astynous' supplication (*Il. Parv.* fr. 21 *GEF*) mirrors Achilles' treatment of Lycaon (*Il.* 21.34–135). His actions closely replay those of his father in the previous generation, a kind of role-playing which is symbolised by his acquisition of his father's armour (arg. 3a). Unlike Patroclus' flawed attempt at Achilles-imitation (*Il.* 16.140–4), he receives his father's full panoply, spear and all (fr. 5 *GEF*).[143] This intergenerational re-enactment is felt even more strongly, however, in another surviving fragment from the *Little Iliad* (fr. 29 *GEF*):

αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλῆος μεγαθύμου φαίδιμος υἱός
Ἑκτορέην ἄλοχον κάταγεν κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας,
παῖδα δ' ἑλὼν ἐκ κόλπου ἐϋπλοκάμοιο τιθήνης
ῥῖψε ποδὸς τεταγὼν ἀπὸ πύργου, τὸν δὲ πεσόντα
ἔλλαβε πορφύρεος θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταιή

But the glorious son of great-hearted Achilles led Hector's wife down to the hollow ships; he seized their child from the bosom of the fair-tressed nurse, grabbing him by the foot, and hurled him from the tower; when he fell, dark death and strong fate took him.

---

[142] Proclus' text claims that it was Teiresias who died at Colophon (Τειρεσίαν), but this is evidently an error for Calchas (cf. Apollod. *Epit.* 6.2: θάπτουσι Κάλχαντα); West (2013) 254–5.

[143] On these parallels, cf. Anderson (1997) 38–48.

287

In this passage, Neoptolemus mercilessly kills Hector's son Astyanax, replaying the conflict of Achilles and Hector in the next generation and with the same outcome: the death of the Trojan prince. This intergenerational repetition is reinforced by the poet's use of onomastic periphrases, introducing each character through their relation to these now-dead heroes: Neoptolemus is 'Achilles' son' (Ἀχιλλῆος . . . υἱός), Andromache 'Hector's wife' (Ἑκτορέην ἄλοχον) and Astyanax – by implication – Hector's 'child' (παῖδα).[144] Just like the insistent use of Diomedes' patronymic in the *Iliad*, this naming practice foregrounds the younger generation's epigonal status: Neoptolemus is constantly treading in his father's footsteps.

The same Achillean shadow also seems to hang over Neoptolemus' conduct in the *Nostoi*. Not only does Achilles' ghost appear to the Greeks before they depart (arg. 3a, cf. *Il. Parv.* arg. 3b *GEF*), but the whole narrative seems to emphasise Neoptolemus' relationship with Achilles through the prominent presence of Achilles' parents (Thetis and Peleus), as well as his surrogate father (Phoenix: cf. *Il.* 9.485–91). Indeed, Neoptolemus' whole *nostos* is framed by encounters with his paternal grandparents: he sets out with the help and advice of Thetis (arg. 4a *GEF*) and completes his journey by being recognised by Peleus (arg. 4c *GEF*).[145] Throughout his expedition, he is implicitly set in relation to his deceased father.

In both the *Little Iliad* and *Nostoi*, therefore, Neoptolemus emerges as an epigonal figure. In the structure of each poem, he imitates and outdoes both Philoctetes and Calchas, but he is also constantly juxtaposed to his father Achilles.[146] Our limited access to the texts of these epics prevents us from determining to what extent these relationships were further indexed in temporal terms as in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but we may well suspect that they were. In any case, as in both Homeric epics, this intergenerational positioning may also reflect each epic's own relationship to the wider literary tradition. Sammons has proposed something along

---

[144] Anderson (1997) 54; Kelly (2015b) 339; Sammons (2019) 52–3.
[145] Cf. Odysseus' final reunion with his father Laertes in Ithaca: *Od.* 24.216–382.
[146] This same epigonality is also manifest in Achilles' concern for news of his son in the Odyssean *Nekyia*: *Od.* 11.492–3, 506–40.

288

these lines, arguing that the *Little Iliad* and *Nostoi*, as post-Homeric compositions, 'are aware of themselves as "coming after" Homer's *Iliad*'; by dwelling on Neoptolemus, he suggests, they reject the notion of a cataclysmic end of the heroic age and assert that the epic tradition 'was not a closed corpus'.[147] Neoptolemus takes up Achilles' mantle just as these Cyclic epics succeed the *Iliad*, an assertion of literary expansion and continuity. However, here too, we should not elide the underlying sense of competition. We have already noted how Neoptolemus surpasses members of the older generation (Philoctetes and Calchas), but he also – at one key point – breaks free from his father's example. In contrast to Achilles' sympathetic treatment of Priam at the end of the *Iliad*, Neoptolemus ruthlessly slaughters the Trojan king during the sack of Troy, impiously dragging him from the altar of Zeus (*Il. Parv.* fr. 25 *GEF; Il. Pers.* arg. 2c).[148] All the other parallels that we have traced between father and son serve to underlie this crucial difference, one which paints Neoptolemus as more violent, bloodthirsty and sacrilegious than his predecessor.

In various Cyclic epics, therefore, just like the Homeric poems, intergenerational tensions may figure a poem's relationship with its literary predecessors. The above interpretations are just that – interpretations. They cannot be decisively proved, but given archaic epic's broader concern with intergenerational decline, these rare moments where a younger hero rivals or even outdoes his predecessors are striking, and it is attractive to read them as a comment on an individual poem's epigonal relationship to its tradition.

Notably, these examples of intergenerational competition go against the commonly celebrated 'co-operative' relationship of father and son in Homeric society.[149] Of course, such a dynamic

---

[147] Sammons (2019) 59. Contrast 'the quite ordinary Telemachus' of the *Odyssey*, who fails to live up to his father's trickster standards and marks 'the end of heroic tradition': Martin (1993) 240.

[148] Cf. Anderson (1990) 44–7.

[149] E.g. Redfield (1975) 110–13; Felson (1997) 67–91, (1999b), (2002) esp. 38–40; Mills (2000). See e.g. the supportive paternal advice of Hippolochus (*Il*. 6.207–9), Peleus (9.252–59, 438–43), Menoetius (11.764–89) and Nestor (23.304–50), or the harmonious and reciprocal dynamics of Odysseus' household.

can be overplayed: Greek epic offers several examples of strained filial relationships.[150] But what sets our examples apart from the co-operative pattern is the fact that in every main case the predecessors in question are already dead: Tydeus, Heracles, Theseus, Peirithous and Achilles.[151] This absence ensures a distance between epigone and πρότερος which allows for a more competitive relationship.[152] Yet it also ties into a broader association of literary and mythological history (the Underworld as the natural home for older heroes and older traditions), an association which is key to the metapoetic reading I have advanced above.

Finally, it is worth noting that not all our interpretations here have been as closely tied to specific indexical words as in our other discussions: Odysseus pictures Heracles, Theseus and Peirithous as **πρότεροι** who died in former times (**τὸ πρόσθεν**, *Od*. 11.629–30), and the *Epigonoi* begins '**now in turn**' (**νῦν αὖθ'**, fr. 1 *GEF*), but in the cases of the Iliadic Diomedes and the Cyclic Neoptolemus, we are dealing with a more thematic association. When it comes to the Cycle, this may reflect our very limited access to the original texts, but with the *Iliad*, we simply have a more implicit figuring of allusive relations. As we shall see later, however, such positioning against predecessors was to become an even more explicit and important part of later lyric poets' literary posturing (§iv.3.3).

Already in early Greek hexameter poetry, therefore, we find traces of all three categories of temporal indexicality with which we began. Time proved an active trope to figure a poet's relationship with other texts and traditions, with both an encyclopaedic and an agonistic edge. Temporal indices signpost passing references to other traditions, as well as more pointed replays of tradition, while epic heroes' epigonal relationships with their πρότεροι figure the tensions of the poet's relationship with his predecessors. Together, these various temporal indices map out the

---

[150] E.g. Laius–Oedipus (*Oedipodea*, *Od*. 11.271–80); Uranus–Cronus–Zeus (Hes. *Theog*.); Amyntor–Phoenix (*Il*. 9.444–91). Felson (2002) 41.

[151] Of Neoptolemus' Cyclic doublet models, Calchas too is dead (*Nostoi*), although Philoctetes remains alive (*Little Iliad*); but it is unclear the extent to which the poem presented Philoctetes as an explicit πρότερος.

[152] Cf. Pratt (2009) 149: it 'may simply be safer to invoke the Oedipal urge when the father is already dead'.

290

larger tradition against which epic poets situate their own epigonal work.

IV.**3 Lyric Temporalities**

The indexical potential of time is even more active in archaic Greek lyric, a corpus of poetry that is intimately concerned with occasion, performance and the interconnections of past and present.[153] Although lyric poetry focuses largely on contemporary events and situations, lyric poets often evoke moments of myth or history as parallels for the present. We saw above that cases of poetic memory were surprisingly rare in lyric poetry (§III.3), but time – by contrast – is a recurrent concern. As in epic, references to earlier events of the literary tradition are frequently framed in overtly temporal terms, marking lyric poets' epigonal relationship with their literary heritage (§IV.3.1). Yet even more explicitly, the frequently personal voices of lyric prompt a far greater awareness of the repetitive nature of poetic composition (§IV.3.2), as well as numerous direct references to earlier poetic predecessors (§IV.3.3).

IV.*3.1 Once upon a Time*

Let us start with lyric poets' more general appeals to poetic antiquity – occasions when they knowingly gesture to the literary past. As in Homer, earlier episodes from the mythological and literary tradition are often signposted as ancient and venerable traditions, framing the audience's and poet's relationships with them in temporal terms. Here too, these indices frequently sign-post brief allusive references.

Invoking the Past

Such temporal indices are visible from our earliest extant lyric poets onwards, where they seem to introduce relatively brief mythical allusions, as in Homer. Archilochus' Telephus elegy introduces the mythical exemplum of the Achaeans' retreat on Mysia with **καί ποτ[ε]** ('**once too**', fr. 17a.5), marking the familiarity of the myth,

---

[153] On temporality in lyric poetry, tied to issues of performance and occasion: Mackie (2003); D'Alessio (2004); Budelmann (2017).

as known from the *Cypria* and elsewhere (§II.3.1 n. 199). Similarly, Alcman introduces the myth of Odysseus and Circe with a Doric inflection of the same phrase, pointing to well-known Odyssean traditions (fr. 80): **καί ποκ'** Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος ὦατ' ἑταίρων | Κίρκα ἐπαλείψασα ('**And once** Circe, after anointing the ears of stout-hearted Odysseus' companions').[154] We have already seen Sappho introduce her mention of Leda's egg with a **ποτά** alongside **φαῖσι** (fr. 166: §II.3.1), while Alcaeus too uses the same adverb, apparently to introduce the story of Phalanthus, the Spartan founder of Tarentum (**ποτ'** ἔξεπε.[, fr. 7.7).[155]

A particularly loaded use of the temporal adverb occurs in the hymnic proem of the first book of the *Theognidea*. After two invocations of Apollo and one of Artemis, the poet calls on the Muses and Graces, recalling their former presence at the wedding of Cadmus and Harmonia (Thgn. 15–18):[156]

> Μοῦσαι καὶ Χάριτες, κοῦραι Διός, αἵ **ποτε** Κάδμου
>   ἐς γάμον ἐλθοῦσαι καλὸν ἀείσατ' **ἔπος**,
> "ὅττι καλόν φίλον ἐστί, τὸ δ' οὐ καλὸν οὐ φίλον ἐστί"·
>   τοῦτ' **ἔπος** ἀθανάτων ἦλθε διὰ στομάτων.

> Muses and Graces, daughters of Zeus, you who **once** came to Cadmus' wedding and sang a beautiful **utterance**: 'What is beautiful is dear, what is not beautiful is not dear.' This is the **utterance** that came through your immortal mouths.

This wedding was a well-established mythical episode, which the brevity of this Theognidean reference presupposes: the myth features already in Hesiod's *Theogony* (*Theog.* 937, 975) and Pindar's third *Pythian* ode, singing Muses and all (*Pyth.* 3.88–99, esp. 90

---

[154] Alcman may allude to an alternative version than that in our *Odyssey* or creatively combine elements from the tradition known to us, blurring Circe's advice to Odysseus (ἐπὶ δ'οὖατ' ἀλεῖψαι ἑταίρων, *Od.* 12.47) with her actual anointing of his companions to restore their human form (προσάλειφεν, *Od.* 10.392): cf. Davison (1955a) 139–40; Calame (1983) 496–8; Hinge (2006) 257; Kelly (2015a) 32–3.

[155] This poem is very fragmentary, but Phalanthus' name has been tentatively restored in verse 11 (Φάλ[ανθον]). The story of his shipwreck (Paus. 10.13.10) fits the fragment's inclusion of Crisa (Κιρσάηϲι, 9), fish (ἴχθυ[, 12) and ship-epithets (γλαφύρα[, 8; ὠκήαισι, 10): Page (1955a) 274 n. 3; Martin (1972) 76; Campbell (1982b) 243 n. 4.

[156] For these four prefatory invocations, scholars compare the four which precede a collection of Attic *skolia* preserved by Athenaeus 15.694c–5f (884–7 *PMG*). Despite the clearly composite nature of the *Theognidea*, I am prepared to read what we have as a unity with some design. For a summary of views on the corpus' origin: Gerber (1997) 117–20; Selle (2008) esp. 372–93; Gagné (2013) 249–51.

μελπομενᾶν ... Μοισᾶν).[157] Given its prominent proemial position, immediately before the poet's *sphragis*, the recollection here appears to have a particularly programmatic function: the Muses' and Graces' quoted verse exploits the polysemous range of καλός to praise not just moral goodness and nobility, a key concern of the *Theognidea*, but also aesthetic and poetic beauty.[158] What matters more specifically for us here, however, is the manner in which this famous mythical episode is signposted as a past event (**ποτέ**).[159] In part, this adverb contrasts the distant world of myth, when gods and mortals mingled and married (cf. Hes. fr. 1.6–7), with the Theognidean present of 'moral and social decline' (e.g. Thgn. 39–52, 183–92).[160] But it also indexes this marriage as a past and pre-existing tradition – and one, moreover, which is pointedly epic: the goddesses' *gnome* is explicitly called an **ἔπος** in the lines that precede and follow it (Thgn. 1.16, 18), perhaps prompting an audience to recall pre-existing hexameter traditions of the Theban marriage.[161]

The content of the quoted verse also reinforces this impression. Although the phrase was apparently proverbial by the fifth century,[162] it appears to have retained a specific association with Cadmus. In Euripides' *Phoenissae*, the chorus offer a variation of the phrase shortly before mentioning the same Theban marriage,[163] while the

---

[157] On the wedding: Gantz (1993) 471–2, adding Nonn. *Dion*. 5.88–189, the fullest extant treatment of the episode (with the Muses' song at 103).

[158] Levine (1985) 177 §3; Giannini (1993) 388. The goddesses' statement on τὸ καλόν is self-referentially described as καλόν: Kayachev (2016) 196. The 'harmonious' frame evokes Cadmus' wife Harmonia: Nagy (1979) 299 §12 n. 6, (1985) 28–9 §7.

[159] Cf. too Thgn. 1345–8, where **ποτέ** (1345) introduces the well-established paradigm of Zeus's abduction of Ganymedes; cf. e.g. *Il*. 5.265–7, 20.231–5; *HhAphr*. 200–17; Pind. *Ol*. 10.104–5 (N.B. **ποτέ**, 104).

[160] Spelman (2021) 134.

[161] Cf. Nagy (2010) 20, comparing Tyrtaeus fr. 4.2, where **ἔπεα** similarly flags citation of a hexameter oracle. On the meaning of ἔπος: Koller (1972), Nagy (1979) 272; Martin (2005) 13–14. The plural ἔπεα could also refer to elegy (ἔπεσιν, ἔπη, ἐπέων, Thgn. 20, 22, 755; κόσμον ἐπέων, Solon fr. 1.2), but the singular has a particular association with hexameter epic. On the *Theognidea*'s relationship with epic: Edmunds (1985). For ἔπος and ἔπεα as signposts of specifically hexameter tradition, cf. *Il*. 9.526 (§I n. 3), 20.204 (§II.2.3 n. 106); *Od*. 3.243 (§II.2.3 n. 103); Tyrtaeus fr. 12.19 (§III.3.2 n. 156). Pind. *Ol*. 6.16 (§IV.3.1 n. 172), *Nem*. 3.53 (§IV.3.3 n. 240).

[162] Plato cites it as such: ἀρχαίαν παροιμίαν (*Lysis* 216c6); cf. Ford (1985) 84 §4 n. 1; Colesanti (2011) 51.

[163] οὐ γὰρ ὃ μὴ καλὸν οὔποτ' ἔφυ καλόν (*Phoen*. 814); Ἁρμονίας δέ **ποτ'** εἰς ὑμεναίους | ἤλυθον οὐρανίδαι (*Phoen*. 822–3). Valckenaer's emendation (ἔφυ φίλον) reinforces the connection but is unnecessary.

293

sentiment reappears as a refrain in the third stasimon of the *Bacchae*, at the very moment when Pentheus, Cadmus' grandson, unwittingly heads to his death. With grim irony, the dynasty's origins are recalled at the demise of its last representative (ὅτι καλὸν φίλον **αἰεί**, *Bacch.* 881 = 901).[164] Given the phrase's recurring association with Cadmus' family, it is tempting to see Theognis self-consciously citing a famous verse associated with the marriage. Eric Dodds suspects Hesiod as the ultimate source,[165] but given our absence of further evidence, it makes more sense to speak of Theban epic tradition in general, a tradition which – as we have already seen – was a rich source of allusive material from Homer onwards (§II.2.2; IV.2.3). Once more, we thus have an allusive evocation of other traditions signalled in temporal terms, here with the additional prompt of a generic cue.

Such temporal indexing of other myths and traditions is especially prominent in the odes of Pindar.[166] In *Nemean* 3, the poet sets out to celebrate Aegina, the land 'where the Myrmidons **of old** dwelled' with their '**long-famed** assembly place' (Μυρμιδόνες ἵνα **πρότεροι** | ᾤκησαν, ὧν **παλαίφατον** ἀγοράν, *Nem.* 3.13–14). The double emphasis on antiquity reinforces a reference to the myth which originally situated Aeacus in Aegina, as the offspring of the nymph Aegina and Zeus, before he relocated to Thessalian Phthia.[167] In *Pythian* 6, meanwhile, Pindar introduces Antilochus' self-sacrifice to save his father Nestor as a model for Thrasybulus' similar behaviour in the present (*Pyth.* 6.28–45), recalling an episode already told in the *Aethiopis* (*Aeth.* arg. 2c *GEF*).[168] Here too, the myth is presented in a temporal frame: the opening **καὶ πρότερον** ('**in former times too**', *Pyth.* 6.28) firmly situates the episode in the past, as does the closural τὰ μὲν **παρίκει** ('these things **are past**', *Pyth.* 6.43). Together, these comments

---

[164] The addition of **αἰεί** may index this allusive continuity: cf. §IV.2.2 above.
[165] Dodds (1960) 187.   [166] Cf. Mackie (2003) 43.
[167] The double temporal reference may also index allusions to the *Iliad* (Xian (2018)) and to the tradition that the Myrmidons were transformed from ants (μύρμηκες: Hes. fr. 205; Carnes (1990)).
[168] Cf. §III.2.1; Welcker (1865–82) II 174; Burgess (2009) 31–4; West (2013) 145–6. Proclus' summary does not specify the manner of Antilochus' death (for which we have to turn to later sources: Philostr. *Her.* 26.18; Quint. Smyrn. 7.49–50, cf. 2.243–5), but the myth already seems to be allusively redeployed in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 8.78–112: cf. §IV.2.3 n. 109). The antiquity of the myth is further suggested by its presence on the East Frieze of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi: Shapiro (1988); Athanassaki (2012).

signal the literary antiquity of this episode, while also marking it off from Pindar's poetic present: like modern-day speech marks, they frame the mythical citation. This temporal distance is further reinforced by the final mention of the praise bestowed on Antilochus by 'the young men in the generation of those **long ago**' (τῶν **πάλαι** γενεᾷ | ὁπλοτέροισιν, *Pyth*. 6.40–1) – Antilochus' achievements belong to the distant past of literary myth. In this specific context, the emphasis on Antilochus' antiquity also forms an effective contrast with Thrasybulus, who attains the same standard most closely of men alive in Pindar's day (τῶν **νῦν**, *Pyth*. 6.44). The distance in time between the two youths aptly parallels the temporal sweep between Pindar and his literary predecessors.

In *Olympian* 6, a temporal index pinpoints an allusive reference which includes a direct verbal echo of a specific text. Pindar claims that his *laudandus* Hagesias is worthy of the 'praise' (αἶνος) which Adrastus '**once**' (**ποτ'**) proclaimed about Amphiaraus (*Ol*. 6.12–14). This claim introduces a miniature summary of an episode from Theban myth, peppered with further temporal conjunctions (ἐπεί, v. 14; ἔπειτα, v. 15): the story of Amphiaraus' disappearance beneath the earth and Adrastus' presence at the funeral of the Seven. The brief narrative closes with a direct quotation of Adrastus' αἶνος (*Ol*. 6.16–17):

> εἶπεν ἐν Θήβαισι τοιοῦτόν τι **ἔπος·** "ποθέω στρατιᾶς ὀφθαλμὸν ἐμᾶς ἀμφότερον μάντιν τ' ἀγαθὸν καὶ δουρὶ μάρνασθαι."

> [Talaus' son Adrastus] spoke an **utterance** such as this at Thebes: 'I miss the eye of my army, both a good seer and good at fighting with a spear.'

Within its immediate context, this myth has excellent exemplary value. The prophetic Amphiaraus is an ideal model for Pindar's *laudandus* Hagesias, a member of the prophetic Iamid line, and 'honey-sweet' Adrastus (Ἄδρηστον μελίγηρυν, *Theb*. fr. 4 *GEF*) offers an apt parallel for Pindar with his 'honey-voiced' Muses (μελίφθογγοι . . . Μοῖσαι, *Ol*. 6.21).[169] It is likely, however, that this whole mythical episode derives from the cyclic *Thebaid*. A certain Asclepiades claimed that at least part of these verses 'was taken'

---

[169] For further parallels between Amphiaraus and other Iamids, cf. Giannini (2014) 40–1.

295

from that poem,[170] and scholars have long recognised that verse 17 begins with a near-complete dactylic hexameter (restored by substituting μάχεσθαι for μάρνασθαι).[171] Pindar's τοιοῦτόν τι **ἔπος** could even signal the near-quotation: Adrastus spoke 'a hexameter (ἔπος) something like this'.[172] Beyond Adrastus' speech, the wider context of these lines also likely derives from the *Thebaid*: Amphiaraus' death at Thebes was a mainstay of the tradition, with his involvement already presupposed by the *Odyssey* (15.243–8, cf. 11.326–7),[173] while Adrastus' presence at the funeral of his fellow-fighters in the *Thebaid* is suggested by another surviving fragment in which he leaves Thebes 'wearing mournful clothes' (εἵματα λυγρὰ φέρων, fr. 11 *GEF*).[174] Pindar's opening **ποτ'** thus not only serves as an introduction and transition to the brief mythical narrative but also grounds it in a specifically literary past: that of the epic *Thebaid*. As in epic, these indexical 'pointers to the past' flag and introduce allusive engagement with other traditions.

Embedding the Cycle

Temporal indices were not limited to mythical and intertextual references in lyric poetry. They also punctuate individual poets' allusions to their wider cycles of songs. In Archilochus' Cologne Epode, the narrator refers to the 'charm' which Neoboule 'had **before**' (χάρις ἣ **πρὶν** ἐπῆν, fr. 196a.28), evoking an earlier time from the narrative of their relationship when he still found her

---

[170] Σ *Ol.* 6.26: ποθέω· ὁ Ἀσκληπιάδης φησὶ ταῦτα εἰληφέναι ἐκ τῆς κυκλικῆς Θηβαΐδος. The identity of this Asclepiades is debated (of Myrlea?/Tragilus?): Braswell (1998) 29 n. 5. For ταῦτα referring to the context of 6.12–17 as well as the text of (at least) v. 17, cf. Torres-Guerra (1995) 39 with n. 58; contrast Stoneman (1981) 51.

[171] Thus fr. 6 *GEF* (originally restored by von Leutsch (1830) 63); cf. Torres-Guerra (1995) 39–40; Hutchinson (2001) 381–2; West (2011b) 53; Adorjáni (2014) 23–4, 137. This reconstructed verse is of good epic pedigree (cf. *Il.* 3.179), is paralleled at Hes. fr. 25.37 and Soph. *OC* 1313–14, and is later echoed in an epitaph for Aeschines' uncle, the military seer Cleoboulus, for whom Amphiaraus would be a fitting mythical model (*CEG* 519.2 = *SEG* 16.193b.2, *c.* 370 BCE: Papadimitriou (1957) 160). For such Pindaric appropriation of a full hexameter, cf. *Pyth.* 1.16–17 ~ Hes. fr. dub. 388.

[172] For ἔπος signposting an epic reference or hexameter quotation, cf. §IV.3.1 n. 161 above. Cf. too *Isth.* 6.66–8, where Ἡσιόδου . . . ἔπος flags Pindar's paraphrase of *Op.* 412.

[173] On Amphiaraus' story, see Bener (1945); Braswell (1998) 27–41. For his fate (being swallowed alive in the earth), cf. *Nem.* 9.24–7, 10.8–9; Aesch. *Sept.* 587–9; Soph. *El.* 837–47 (N.B. **οἶδα**, 837); Eur. *Supp.* 925–7; Paus. 9.8.3; Bener (1945) 47–50.

[174] Welcker (1865–82) II 369; Hutchinson (2001) 383.

296

desirable (cf. fr. 118, where he longs 'to touch Neoboule with his hand', χειρὶ Νεοβούλης θιγεῖν).[175] In the Epode, by contrast, he considers her unattractive (vv. 24–34) and has moved his attention onto her sister (vv. 35–6). Archilochus' **πρίν** not only situates this moment within the larger cycle of the story but also looks back to past poems in which Neoboule's charm was praised and adored.

Similarly, Alcaeus refers to a number of past events which may reflect other songs. In fr. 129, he recalls how he and his companions '**once** swore' (**πο⌊τ'** ἀπώμ⌊νυ⌊μεν, v. 14) never to abandon their comrades, an oath which Pittacus has now broken (vv. 21–4). Dwelling on this moment is essential for his characterisation of Pittacus' treachery, but situating the event in the past (**ποτ'**) equally indexes other poems in which this same moment has already been treated.[176] Another fragmentary poem refers to past *hybris* (**ποτ'** ὔβριν, fr. 76.10) and recalls that 'we were **often** thrown down' (**πόλλακις** ἐ[σ]φαλη[με]ν, fr. 76.13), looking back to past sufferings and their poetic expression, while in another prayer or exhortation, Alcaeus bids someone 'come . . . if **ever at another time**', positioning the present poem against an ongoing and past relationship (ἄγι . . . | [αἴ **π]οτα κἄλλοτα**, fr. 208A.2–3). Such a backward glance is even more explicit in Pindar's *Olympian* 13, where the poet remarks that the past Olympic victories of Xenophon's family 'have, it seems, **already** been reported **before**' (τὰ δ' Ὀλυμπίᾳ αὐτῶν | ἔοικεν **ἤδη πάροιθε** λελέχθαι, *Ol.* 13.101–2) – a claim which looks back to Pindar's earlier mention of these successes within this same poem (30, 35–46), but presumably also to previous independent epinicia that celebrated them. The poet's following wish that he will sing of their future achievements (103) reinforces the sense of a continuing song cycle: he will always be on hand to record and celebrate every milestone in their continued prosperity, in an ongoing sequence of songs.[177]

---

[175] Cf. Swift (forthcoming), noting that the analogy of the fox and eagle fable (frr. 172–81) also implies desire: 'the eagle (like Lycambes) robs the fox of what it loves'. The wish in fr. 118 may be romantic or lewd: Swift (2019) 303.

[176] Cf. Budelmann (2018a) 98: 'Alcaeus probably spoke of Pittacus' oath in other poems too', citing fr. 306g and 'perhaps' frr. 67 and 167.

[177] Cf. Pind. fr. 122, a *skolion* written for the same Xenophon.

It is especially Sappho once more, however, who indexes her wider song cycle with temporal references. In one poem, the speaker claims that '**once long ago**, I loved you, Atthis' (ἠράμαν μὲν ἔγω σέθεν, Ἄτθι, **πάλαι ποτά**, fr. 49.1), a phrase which – like the reminiscences of Atthis in fr. 96 (cf. §III.3.3) – evokes a broader Atthis song cycle, which ended with Atthis flying off to another woman, Andromeda (fr. 130.3–4). In other poems, she foregrounds her past relationship with Aphrodite: in fr. 22, we hear that 'the Cyprus-born goddess herself **once** blamed me for praying' (καὶ γὰρ αὖτα δή **πο̣[τ’]** ἐμέμφ[ετ’ . . . | Κ]υπρογέν[ηα] | ὢς ἄραμα̣[ι], 22.15–17), while in the newly constituted *Kypris Poem*, she claims that the goddess was not '**previously**' hostile to her (μ’ οὐ **πρ̣ό̣τερ’** ἦσ[θ’ ἀπέχθης], fr. 26.7, suppl. Obbink (2020) 228–30). These comments seem to point to other occasions in Sappho's poetry where she speaks and collaborates with the goddess, such as fr. 1, a poem in which Aphrodite gently chides Sappho for her prayer (15–24) and is asked to be her ally (σύμμαχος, 28) (cf. §IV.3.2) . Elsewhere, she also refers to her brother Charaxus' activities in a similar way: in fr. 5, she hopes that her brother may atone for all his '**past**' wrongs (**[πρ]όσθ’** ἄμβροτε πάντα, 5.5) and refers to his '**previous**' suffering (**π̣[ά]ροιθ’** ἀχεύων, 5.11).[178] In all these cases, Sappho gestures to a broader ongoing history and series of events to which she constantly returns in her poems. Literary and biographical history blur into one.

Inventing the Past

There are also occasions where temporal references appear to conceal slight innovations in the mythical record, especially in the work of Pindar. We have previously noted the importation of the local into panhellenic myth, authorised by Pindar's appeal to the '**ancient talk** of men' in *Olympian* 7 (ἀνθρώπων **παλαιαί** | **ῥήσιες**, *Ol.* 7.54–5: §II.3.4), but we could also add the miniature narrative of Peleus' and Telamon's achievements in *Nemean* 3,

---

[178] Cf. O'Connell (2018) 252; Swift (forthcoming). Cf. too. fr. 15.11–12: Doricha apparently boasts of how Charaxus came a second time (**τὸ δεύ[τ]ε̣ρον**) for a longed-for desire, implying a far longer underlying history.

298

which is introduced with the description of Peleus taking delight in **παλαιαί** ἀρεταί, 'successes **of long ago**' (*Nem*. 3.32–9):

παλαιαῖσι δ' ἐν ἀρεταῖς
γέγαθε Πηλεὺς ἄναξ, ὑπέραλλον αἰχμὰν ταμών·
ὃς καὶ Ἰωλκὸν εἷλε μόνος ἄνευ στρατιᾶς,
καὶ ποντίαν Θέτιν κατέμαρψεν
ἐγκονητί. Λαομέδοντα δ' εὐρυσθενής
Τελαμὼν Ἰόλᾳ παραστάτας ἐὼν ἔπερσεν

καί **ποτε** χαλκότοξον Ἀμαζόνων μετ' ἀλκάν
ἕπετό οἱ, οὐδέ νίν ποτε φόβος ἀνδροδάμας ἔπαυσεν ἀκμὰν φρενῶν.

Lord Peleus rejoiced in his successes **of long ago**, when he had cut his unsurpassed spear – he who even captured Iolcus alone without an army, and pinned down the sea nymph Thetis after a great struggle. And Telamon, with his broad strength, stood alongside Iolaus and destroyed Laomedon, and **once** followed him in pursuit of the mighty bronze-bowed Amazons; and man-taming fear never checked the sharpness of his mind.

These verses summarise a number of major moments in each hero's life: Peleus' acquisition of his famous spear from Mount Pelion, his capture of the city of Iolcus and his marriage to Thetis, as well as Telamon's involvement in the first sack of Troy and his battle with the Amazons. These are all well-known features of each hero's mythological biography, here serving as appropriate models of success for Pindar's *laudandus* Aristocleidias.[179] In particular, Peleus' 'conquest' of Thetis is figured in distinctly athletic terms (κατέμαρψεν ἐγκονητί, vv. 35–6), presaging Aristocleidias' own pancratium success in the present.[180] But in the case of Peleus' other two successes, his acquisition of his spear and sack of Iolcus, Pindar's appeal to 'successes **of long ago**' appears to conceal pointed deviations from the mainstream tradition.[181] In the case of his spear, the hero is depicted as having

---

[179] For Peleus' sack of Iolcus: Hes. fr. 211, fr. 212b; Pind. *Nem*. 4.54–6. For his marriage to Thetis: *Nem*. 4.62–65, *Isth*. 8.26a–48. For Telamon's accompaniment of Heracles against Laomedon's Troy: §II.3.1 n. 238; and against the Amazons: fr. *adesp*. 9 *EGF* (= 1168 *SH*: Vecchiato (2016)) and various vases (von Bothmer (1957) 234: Index of Inscribed Names, s.v. 'Telamon'). Both these Telamonian exploits are occasionally associated with Peleus (Pind. *Isth*. 5.36–7, fr. 172; Eur. *Andr*. 797–801).

[180] Cf. Σ *Nem*. 3.61a: ἡ μεταφορὰ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀθλευόντων; Pfeijffer (1999) 207, 317–18. Thetis' resistance: *Il*. 18.434; *Cypr*. fr. 3 *GEF*.

[181] Cf. Pfeijffer (1999) 206–8.

299

cut it himself (ὑπέραλλον αἰχμὰν ταμών, v. 33), unlike earlier epic accounts in which the spear is a wedding gift from Cheiron (*Il.* 16.140–4 ≈ 19.387–91, *Cypr.* fr. 4 *GEF*), and even shaped by the divine hands of Athena and Hephaestus (*Cypr.* fr. 4 *GEF*); and in his sack of Iolcus, he is depicted as a lone fighter (μόνος ἄνευ στρατιᾶς, v. 34), unlike other versions in which he is helped by Jason and the Dioscuri.[182] As the scholia to the passage note, Pindar seems to be 'indulging Peleus for the sake of his Aeginetan victor', exaggerating his achievements for rhetorical effect (δόξει δὲ ὁ Πίνδαρος διὰ τὸν Αἰγινήτην χαρίζεσθαι τῷ Πηλεῖ, Σ *Nem.* 3.57). In fashioning his own supreme spear and in single-handedly sacking Iolcus, this Peleus is a pre-eminent paradigm of Aeginetan success. By introducing these adaptations as **παλαιαὶ** ἀρεταί, Pindar lends legitimacy to his innovative spin on tradition.

As in epic, therefore, temporal references in lyric poetry frequently signal interactions with other mythical stories and episodes. Temporally marked adjectives and adverbs highlight allusions both to earlier treatments of myths and to a poet's own earlier poetry. In this way, archaic lyric poets drew on the esteem of tradition to legitimise their poetic authority, while also occasionally concealing their innovative versions of myth in the garb of tradition. The literary past remained a fruitful resource to be both appropriated and reconfigured.

IV.3.2 *Iterative Poetics*

In addition to general references to the past, many lyric poets were also deeply fascinated by the idea of repetition and recurrence: they frequently presented their poems as self-conscious repetitions – not only of generic topoi, but also of other specific poems.

Déjà Vu: Lyric 'Again'

Few phenomena in Greek lyric are as familiar as the distinctive tag of **δηὖτε** and **αὖτε** ('**again**'), a device that is most often associated with love poetry.[183] Erotic poets constantly narrate episodes of

---

[182] Pherec. fr. 62 *EGM*; Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.13.7.
[183] Cf. Wells (1973); Carson (1986) 118–20; Mace (1993); Calame (1997); LeVen (2018) 225–32; Palmisciano (2018) 166–70.

300

love in a recurring iterative frame. First-person speakers present themselves as the repeated victims of passion with the particle-adverb **αὖτε** or more emphatic **δηὖτε**: Love warms Alcman's heart '**again**' (**δηὖτε**, fr. 59a.1); casts Ibycus '**again**' into the nets of Aphrodite (**αὖτε**, fr. 287.1); and '**again**' causes Sappho to tremble with desire (**δηὖτε**, fr. 130.1). Yet it is Anacreon who employs the motif most often: drunk with love, the poet dives '**again**' from the Leucadian cliff (**δηὖτ'**, fr. 376.1); seeks Pythomander's house '**again**' to escape Love (**δηὖτε**, fr. 400.1); is caught '**again**' in the paradoxical state of loving and not loving (**δηὖτε**, fr. 428.1); and is struck '**again**' both by Love's purple ball (**δηὖτε**, fr. 358.1) and by the smith-like god's axe (**δηὖτε**, fr. 413.1).

The frequency and consistency of this motif has led Sarah Mace to identify it as 'a distinct compositional form' in lyric poetry, combining the notion of 'again' with a first-person speaker and the god Eros: 'love . . . me . . . again'.[184] As she demonstrates, it is not a static motif but rather imbued with a variety of tones, from the pathetic to the humorous. Poets could also evoke it in non-first-person contexts: Anacreon describes the bald Alexis as wooing '**again**' (**δηὖτε**, fr. 394b), and Sappho asks Abanthis to sing of the maiden Gongyla, for whom desire flies around her '**again**' (here, 'love . . . me . . . again' becomes σε **δηὖτε** πόθος, fr. 22.11).[185] Individually, as Mace has highlighted, all these examples of erotic recurrence play a key role in the fashioning of each speaker's persona, presenting their personal experiences of love from a 'veteran's perspective'.[186] Yet given the repetition of the motif across a number of authors and contexts, this recurring topos can also be read on a generic level, marking – in Regina Höschele's words – 'the recurrence of love's overwhelming onset throughout the genre'.[187] In lyric poetry, love inflicts hurt again and again. By

---

[184] Mace (1993) esp. 337. Alcm. fr. 59a: Ἔρως με **δηὖτε**; Ibyc. fr. 287: Ἔρος **αὖτέ** με; Sappho fr. 130: Ἔρος **δηὖτέ** μ'; Anac. fr. 358: **δηὖτέ** με . . . Ἔρως; fr. 376: **δηὖτ'** . . . κολυμβῶ μεθύων ἔρωτι; fr. 400: **δηὖτε** . . . κατέδυν Ἔρωτα φεύγων; fr. 413: **δηὖτέ** μ' Ἔρως; fr. 428: ἐρέω τε **δηὖτε**. Cf. Ibyc. S257a fr. 32.2]ὖτ' Ἔρω[ς] (West (1984b) 32).

[185] The motif could even be evoked in other genres, e.g. πέπαλται **δαὖτέ** μοι φίλον κῆρ, Aesch. *Cho.* 410: Mace (1993) 353.

[186] Mace (1993) 338. Cf. Bernsdorff (2020) I 14 on the 'self-aware irony' that ensues.

[187] Höschele (2018) §6. Cf. Calame (2016) 302–3 on the 'reenactment' of erotic experience.

301

commencing with the tag αὖτε or δηὖτε, lyric poets self-consciously acknowledge this generic reality and situate their poems within the larger tradition of lyric love poetry.[188] From the perspective of re-performance, moreover, this topos of recurrence plays with the potential repeatability of each poem: every time a song is re-performed, Love's hurt is renewed.[189] With this recurring tag, lyric poets gesture to tradition as a whole, troping the very replication of this poetry as an act of iteration.

In treating this material, however, past scholars have focused primarily on the erotic sphere of lyric love poetry. This is understandable, since it is here that we have the greatest number of examples. But, on closer examination, we can see that this self-conscious iteration in fact spreads across many lyric subgenres.[190] Several cases also accumulate in a more general sympotic context: Anacreon asks for water and wine to be mixed in a ratio of 2:1 so that he may 'revel **again** without hybris' (δηὖτε, fr. 356a) and, in another fragment, bids his companions to abandon excessive Scythian drinking '**again**' (δηὖτε, fr. 356b); the same poet asks whether he will not be allowed '**again**' to go home now that he is drunk (δηὖτε, fr. 412) and may also claim that he is mad '**again**' from drink (ἐμάνην δηὖτε πιών, *P. Mich.* 3250c recto col. ii.1).[191] Already in the seventh century, meanwhile, Alcman bids a friend 'come **again** to the house of Cleësippus' (αὖτ', fr. 174). In each case, sympotic behaviour is presented as a recurrent event, yet each poet is also pointing to the traditionality of these elements in a sympotic context: moderate drinking and travelling to/from houses are staples of sympotic discourse.[192]

---

[188] LeVen (2018) 229–30 similarly frames δηὖτε as 'self-reflexive annotation'. The adverb frequently appears in the first line of a poem, reinforcing its resumptive force: Bernsdorff (2020) II 455.

[189] Cf. Xen. *Symp.* 9.4 where the symposiasts call for an 'encore' (αὖθις). On poetic re-performance: Morrison (2007b), (2011a); Hunter and Uhlig (2017). Budelmann (2018a) 194 further notes the possible connection 'with other pieces performed at the same *symposion* (an occasion for eroticised discourse)'.

[190] Mace (1993) acknowledges these other examples but relegates them to a footnote (350–1 n. 50) and an appendix (362–4). In addition to the below, cf. the extremely fragmentary and uncertain Alcm. fr. 69 († με δ' αὖτε † φαίδιμος Αἴας); Sapph. fr. 5.15 (αὖτ'), fr. 83.4 (δηὖτ'), fr. 99b.14 = Alc. fr. 303Ab.14 (δηὖτε); Alc. fr. 33c.1 (δαυτ.).

[191] For attribution to Anacreon: Bernsdorff (2014) 7–10, (2020) 842–3; cf. Borrelli et al. (2019) 48.

[192] Cf. Miller (2018) 140–1 on Anac. frr. 356a and 356b: the repeated δηὖτε 'implicates the tradition of re-enacting "Anacreon" in the actions of the individual speakers'; cf. Palmisciano (2019) 23.

302

So too in political and military contexts. Archilochus asks how (or where) the hapless army is assembled '**this time**' (**δηὖτ'**, fr. 88). Anacreon narrates how somebody '**again** plucks (i.e. mocks) the blue-shielded men of Ialysus' (**δηὖτ'**, fr. 349) and claims that he has '**again**' put his hand through a Carian-made shield-strap (**δηὖτε**, fr. 401).[193] And Alcaeus talks of a wave coming '**again**' (**αὖ⌊τε**), larger than the '**previous**' (**π⌊ρ⌋οτέρ⌊ω**), evoking and recalling his own tradition of nautical imagery for political disruption (fr. 6: §III.3.3). The world of lyric is repeatedly marked by an awareness of repetition and recurrence.

In other cases, poets even sum up the essence of their own lyric subgenres as acts of repetition. For iambus, Hipponax claims that he must '**once again**' take the otherwise unknown σκότος ('swindler'?) Metrotimus to court (Μητροτίμῳ **δηὖτέ** με χρὴ τῷ σκότῳ δικάζεσθαι, fr. 122), an admission that has been interpreted as an ironic reference to his arch-enemy Bupalus, elsewhere called a 'mother-fucker' (μητροκοίτης, fr. 12.2).[194] His statement thus hints at the frequency with which he clashes with Bupalus in his iambics.[195] Similarly, in Pindar's second *Olympian*, the poet pictures himself preparing his poetic quiver and asks 'at whom do we shoot, launching arrows of fame **this time** from a gentle heart?' (τίνα βάλλομεν | ἐκ μαλθακᾶς **αὖτε** φρενὸς εὐκλέας ὀϊστοὺς ἱέντες; *Ol.* 2.89–90).[196] Appropriately, he summarises the essence of his epinician activity with a common epinician metaphor.[197] In a hymnic context, meanwhile, Sappho bids the Muses 'come **again**', leaving a 'golden' location, perhaps the house of Zeus (δεῦρο **δηὖτε** Μοῖσαι χρύσιον λίποισαι, fr. 127), a request which highlights the frequency of Muse invocations not just in the

---

[193] Fr. 349 may refer to the invective of another poet: Giangrande (1971) 108. Cf. too Anac. fr. 371, where the poet appears to claim that '**this time** I am not steadfast nor easy-going with my fellow-citizens' (**δηὖτ'**), following Page in reading Schneidewin's οὐ δηῦτ'. But now see the arguments of Bernsdorff (2020) II 514–15 for preferring οὐδ' εὖτ'.

[194] Gerber (1999a) 455.

[195] Bupalus and Hipponax: Rosen (1988). Bupalus features in Hipponax frr. 1, 12.2, 15, 84.18, 95 (three times: vv. 3, 4, 15), 95a, 120 and possibly also frr. 77.4, 79.12.

[196] Cf. Willcock (1995) 164.

[197] Athletic metapoetics: Lefkowitz (1984); Nünlist (1998) 142–61. The bow is a common metaphor for Pindar's poetry: Simpson (1969) 449–73. Cf. Monbrun (2007) 31–81 on the frequent association of bow and lyre.

303

literary tradition, but also in her own poetry (cf. fr. 128: δεῦτέ νυν ἄβραι Χάριτες καλλίκομοί τε Μοῖσαι).[198] In all these cases, the poet marks out key features of their lyric subgenre, self-consciously highlighting its core and recurring attributes: abuse, praise and Muse-invocation. Far from simply serving as a tool of characterisation, as Mace argued, **αὖτε** and **δηὖτε** nod knowingly to the established norms and traditions of lyric poetry.

Intertextual Repetitions

Taken together, these various 'agains' highlight a distinctly generic self-consciousness, situating each poet's work within a pre-existing genre, defined by a series of repeating and recurring *topoi*. But it is worth asking whether we can see the establishment of any more precise intertextual connections here. It may be tempting to trace a neat literary history of gradual development from a primarily generic self-consciousness in archaic lyric to a more distinctively intertextual self-consciousness in later literature. But given the more specific intertextual connections we have already identified in epic and lyric more generally, it is worth pushing a little further. If epic poetry can employ self-conscious markers of inter- and intratextual iteration (§IV.2.2), why not lyric? The extremely fragmentary nature of most of our texts makes it difficult to identify any such cases, but we can find some hints of potentially 'iterative' relationships, especially within an individual poet's corpus. Here, we shall explore possible examples from Sappho, Bacchylides, Pindar and Stesichorus.

Our first case is Sappho fr. 1, the poet's prayer to Aphrodite, which has an incessant interest in repetition. The poem was most likely positioned at the start of the Alexandrian collection of Sappho's works, presumably in recognition of its programmatic qualities.[199] Scholars have long recognised its engagement with epic traditions,

---

[198] Cf. Terpander fr. 697 *PMG* (ἀμφί μοι **αὖτις** ἄναχθ' ἑκατηβόλον ἀειδέτω φρήν, 'let my heart sing **again** about the far-shooting lord [i.e. Apollo]'). This hymnic opening acknowledges Terpander's close association with Apollo at Delphi and in Sparta (cf. Quattrocelli (2007); Kivilo (2010) 135–66) and also 'dramatizes the serial reenactment of the persona of its legendary composer, Terpander of Lesbos, by the citharodes who assume the "I" of his *prooimion*': Power (2010) 195. On this fragment, see Gostoli (1990) 128–32; Beecroft (2008) 229–30; Metcalf (2014). Cf. too *Hh*. 31.1 (Ἥλιον ὑμνεῖν **αὖτε** . . . ἄρχεο Μοῦσα, 'begin **again**, Muse, to sing of Helios').

[199] Prodi (2017a) 572–82; Budelmann (2018a) 115–16; Prauscello (2021) 222–3; D'Alessio (2022) 177–84. Dale (2015) 23–4, 29–30 expresses caution, but his

304

but here my focus will be on its connections to Sappho's own oeuvre.[200] Sappho calls on Aphrodite to come and support her if the goddess has ever responded to her appeals on a previous occasion (**κἀτέρωτα**, fr. 1.5) and legitimises her request by recounting such an earlier time when the goddess did in fact visit (fr. 1.15–20):

> ἤ⌋ρε᾽ ὄττι **δ⌊ηῦτε** πέπονθα κὤττι
>   **δη⌋ῦτε** κ⌊άλημμι
> κ⌋ὤττι ⌊μοι μάλιστα θέλω γένεσθαι
> μ⌋αινόλᾳ ⌊θύμῳ· τίνα **δηῦτε** †πείθω
> .⌋. σάγην†⌊ ἐς σὰν φιλότατα; τίς σ᾽, ὦ
>   Ψά⌋πφ᾽, ⌊ἀδικήει;

> You asked what I had suffered **this time** and why I was calling **this time**, and what in my raving heart I most wanted to happen to me: 'Whom should I persuade **this time** . . . to bring to your love?'[201] Who wrongs you, O Sappho?'

As on that occasion, Sappho concludes by asking Aphrodite to 'come to me **now too**' to free her from distress (ἔλθε μοι **καὶ νῦν**, fr. 1.25). Such temporal framing is a typical part of cletic hymns, justifying present action through a past relationship (*da-quia-dedisti*).[202] And Sappho's incessant repetition of **δηῦτε** here contributes to the characterisation of her relationship with Aphrodite: even on this *previous* visit, the goddess was complaining about the frequency of her summons! When set against the literary background that we have traced above, however, this repetition also gains a further indexical resonance, situating her poem squarely within the genre of erotic love poetry.[203] Indeed, this iterative

---

alternative placement is unconvincing: the space is already filled by fr. 9: West (2014b) 2; Obbink (2016a) 24, (2016b) 40; D'Alessio (2019) 24–6. One wonders whether the poem may have already played an important proemial role for Sappho herself: cf. Clay (2011b) for the possibility that the ordering of Alexandrian editions may be indebted to pre-existing poetically designed structures (with a focus on Pind. *Ol.* 1–3).

[200] Iliadic allusions: Krischer (1968) 12–14; Di Benedetto (1973); Svenbro (1975); Rissman (1983) 1–29; Winkler (1990) 169–76; Blondell (2010) 373–7. Allusions to epic motifs and type scenes: Budelmann (2018a) 115; Kelly (2020) 271–7.

[201] Or, translating Lobel's emendation, 'Whom should I persuade **this time** to bring you back to her love?' ([ἄ]ψ σ᾽ ἄγην ἐς ϝὰν φιλότατα). For discussion and other interpretations, see Saake (1971) 54–9; Tzamali (1996) 72–8; Hutchinson (2001) 156–7; Burzacchini (2007) 83–9; Caciagli (2011) 77–88; Furley (2021).

[202] Pulleyn (1997) 16–38; cf. Burzacchini (2005) 13–18.

[203] Mace (1993) 360 has seen in the poem 'a witty and self-reflexive allusion to the independent motif of "Eros . . . me, again!"' Cf. Hutchinson (2001) 155; Budelmann (2018a) 119.

305

emphasis adds to the programmatic nature of the fragment, marking her poetry within a long-standing tradition of erotic discomfort.[204] Sappho's hymnic appeal offers a generic case of never-ending love writ large, highlighting the constant merry-go-round of lyric love.

Besides this generic self-consciousness, however, fr. 1 also seems to mark itself as an intertextual repetition of specifically Sapphic poetry. We have previously noted Sappho's tendency to reflect on connections between her broader 'song cycles' (§III.3.3; IV.3.1), and such a possibility is equally likely here. Indeed, Obbink has previously proposed such an interpretation, arguing on papyrological grounds that Sappho's appeal in fr. 1 may point back to an earlier poem. He notes evidence of a further text preceding fr. 1 on *P. Oxy.* 2288 and suggests that this could have been another Sapphic poem 'which Aphrodite alludes to and partly quotes' in fr. 1.[205] This is an alluring suggestion, but the papyrological arguments are not particularly compelling on their own: even if it came from the same papyrus, the preceding text in *P. Oxy.* 2288 could just as well be prefatory material or part of a later column in the papyrus (depending on which way it had been rolled).[206] Moreover, a recent study has convincingly demonstrated that this extra layer in fact derives from a completely separate papyrus that has been added to reinforce the Sappho roll.[207] And in any case, Obbink's concern with the fixed ordering of Sappho's Alexandrian collection is anachronistic when considering her poetry's original reception in the archaic period.[208] Yet even so, I would argue that Obbink's intuition was right, and that a stronger case can be made for seeing fr. 1 as a 'repeat' of other Sapphic poetry.

This case depends on the numerous thematic and verbal parallels between fr. 1 and other extant poems from Sappho's corpus. Aphrodite is a frequent feature of Sapphic song, mentioned or

[204] Cf. Prodi (2017a) 581.
[205] Obbink (2011) 33–8 (quotation p. 36). On this deeper layer, cf. Turner (1973) 25. Obbink further adduces evidence for variation in the ordering of Sappho's poems in antiquity: cf. Yatromanolakis (1999) 194–5.
[206] Cf. Furley (2021) 2 n. 10; D'Alessio (2022) 177–84.   [207] de Kreij et al. (2020).
[208] I am also unconvinced by Obbink's detailed reconstruction of the earlier poem, which presupposes too mechanical a process of 'copy and paste': Obbink (2011) 38.

306

referred to in over twenty-five fragments; and in many of these Sappho invokes or converses with the goddess in a similar manner and with similar language to fr. 1.[209] Fr. 60, for example, contains a similar mixture of calling, wishing, fighting and persuasion,[210] while fr. 86 is another prayer to the goddess which likely looks back to another past situation ([κλ]ῦθί μ' ἄρας αἴ **π[οτα κἀτέρωτα**], 'hear my prayer if **ever before**', fr. 86.5 ~ 1.5). Most emphatic, however, are the numerous parallels with Sappho's newly reconstituted *Kypris Poem* (fr. 26): as in fr. 1, Sappho directly addresses Aphrodite with a question and indefinite relative clause, complaining about the power and sufferings of love.[211] Audiences of fr. 1 who were already familiar with the *Kypris Poem* could easily suppose that such a song lies behind Aphrodite's repeated **δηῦτε**; we have indeed heard Sappho complaining to the goddess before.[212] Of course, this is not to argue that the *Kypris Poem* is the precise and only precedent lying behind fr. 1. We have already noted possible connections with other far more fragmentary Sapphic poems (frr. 60, 84), and we could doubtless identify even more if we had access to her now-lost corpus. Yet even from what we have, the scenario envisioned in fr. 1 seems to be a recurring Sapphic situation, and one which Aphrodite's repeated **δηῦτε** foregrounds.[213]

Moreover, fr. 1 is not the only Sapphic poem to index its iterative nature in this way. When desire '**again**' flies around in fr. 22 (**δηῦτε**, 22.11) and prompts Abanthis to be 'all aflutter' at the

---

209 Cf. Snyder (1997) 7–25; Schlesier (2016) 369–76; Swift (2021) 203–8. Invocation: frr. 2, 5.18, 15, 33, 86, 101. Dialogue: frr. 26, 35, 101, 134, 159 (possibly also frr. 60, 65, 133b).

210 θέλ', 60.2, θελήση[ς], 60.6 ~ θέλω, 1.17, ἐθέλοισα, 1.24; [τέ]λεσον, 60.3 ~ τέλεσσαι, 1.26, τέλεσον, 1.27; κάλημι, 60.4 ~ κάλημμι, 1.16; θῦμον, 60.5 ~ θῦμον, 1.4, θύμῳ, 1.18; ἔμοι μάχεσθα[ι], 60.7 ~ σύμμαχος ἔσσο, 1.28; πίθεισα[, 60.8 ~ πείθω, 1.18.

211 ἄσαιτο, 26.1 ~ ἄσαισι, 1.3; θέλοι μάλιστα, 26.3 ~ μάλιστα θέλω, 1.17; πάθαν, 26.3, πάθη[ν], 26.10 ~ πέπονθα, 1.15; φί[λ[ησι]/φί[λ[ησθα], 26.2 ~ φίλει, φιλήσει, 1.23; ἰμέρῳ λύσσαντι, 26.6 ~ μαινόλᾳ θύμῳ, 1.18 (cf. Obbink (2017) 130–1); perhaps also κάλ[εσσαι], 26.3 (suppl. Schlesier (2016) 389–90) ~ κάλημμι, 1.16; [κωὔ] θέλοι, 26.3 (suppl. Prodi in Obbink (2016a) 26) ~ κωὖκ ἐθέλοισα, 1.24. In addition, ὀνέερξαι/ὀνέερχ[θ]αι, 26.8 (see Burris (2017); Obbink (2020) 231) bears military overtones (Lardinois (2018b) 4), paralleling σύμμαχος, 1.28. Cf. Boehringer and Calame (2016) 357–60; Schlesier (2016) 391–5; O'Connell (2021) 174–5.

212 Cf. O'Connell (2021) 174–5.

213 As ever, such repetition also allows meaning to be drawn from pointed changes: see e.g. Schlesier (2016) 394–5 on the differing focalisations of fr. 1 and the *Kypris Poem*.

sight of Gongyla's dress (ἐπτόαισ' ἴδοισαν, 22.14), we may be invited to detect Abanthis' replay of the physiological response to love so memorably described in fr. 31 (ἐπτόαισεν, 31.6; ἴδω, 31.7). Even more strikingly, in the very first line of the *Kypris Poem*, Sappho similarly talks of '**often**' being overwhelmed by love (**θαμέως**, fr. 26.1) and later recalls beseeching Aphrodite '**many times**' (γονωμένaι [δὲ] | **πόλλα**, fr. 26.6–7) when the goddess was not '**previously**' hostile to her (οὐ **πρότερ'** ἦσ[θ' ἀπέχθης], fr. 26.7, suppl. Obbink (2020)).[214] Just like fr. 1, these remarks highlight the cyclical concerns of Sappho's poetry and could even look back to fr. 1 itself as a 'former' attempt to beseech the goddess (cf. λίσσομαί σε, 1.2). On a number of occasions, Sappho's poems thus index their repetitive nature, establishing a world of incessant and recurring ideas. Fr. 1 and the *Kypris Poem*, in particular, exhibit a number of close connections which allow each to be interpreted in the light of the other. Sappho's poetry is an echo chamber of interconnected and reverberating themes.

Such self-conscious repetitions are even more prevalent in epinician poetry, enabled by the cyclical nature of the Panhellenic athletic circuit: the same poets constantly competed to celebrate success at the same series of games, and this success was often achieved by the same recurring individuals and families. In such a context, epinician poets frequently mark their poems as self-conscious repeats, following in the tracks of previous ones. In Bacchylides' twelfth epinician, for example, the poet bids the Muse Clio steer his mind now 'if **ever** you did **before also**' (εἰ δή **ποτε καὶ πάρος**, Bacchyl. 12.4). As in Sappho fr. 1, this hymnic *clesis* extends beyond its religious function, inviting the Muse and audience to recall earlier poetry in which Clio had been invoked (e.g. Κλεοῖ, Bacchyl. 3.3, 468 BCE; Κλειώ, 13.9, Κλειώ, 13.228: 480s BCE).[215] In Bacchylides fr. 20c (470 BCE?), the poet similarly intends to send a song for Hieron 'if **ever before** I sang the praises of Pherenicus who won the victory with his swift feet both at Delphi and by the Alpheus' (εἰ **κ[αὶ | πρ]όσθεν** ὑμνήσας τὸν [ἐν Κίρρᾳ θ' ἑλόντα | πο]σσὶ λαιψ[η]ρο[ῖ]ς Φερ[ένικον ἐπ' Ἀλ-]|φ[ε]ῷ

---

[214] Cf. too **πόλλα** λίσσεσθαι (fr. 10.10); στεναχίσδω **θαμέως** (fr. 58c.7).
[215] Cf. Spelman (2018a) 226. Dating of Bacchyl. 3: Cairns (2010) 129–36.

308

τε ν[ί]καν, Bacchyl. fr. 20c.7–10). This retrospective glance may well look back to Bacchylides 5 (476 BCE), a poem that similarly celebrated the horse's double victory and unmatched speed (esp. Bacchyl. 5.37–41: Φερένικον | Ἀλφεὸν παρ' εὐρυδίναν | πῶλον ἀελλοδρόμαν | . . . νικάσαντα . . . | Πυθῶνί τ' ἐν ἀγαθέᾳ).[216] The opening of Bacchylides 4 (470 BCE), meanwhile, sets itself firmly against a tradition of earlier celebrations: the city of Syracuse is '**still**' loved by Apollo (**ἔτι**, 4.1); Hieron is 'hymned **for the third time**' at Delphi (**τρίτον** . . . ἀ[είδε]ται, 4.4–5); and the poet claims that 'the sweet-voiced cock of lyre-ruling Urania' has already 'cried out **once before**' ([**ποτέ**], 4.7–9, suppl. Maehler) – another possible back reference to Bacchylides 5.[217]

Pindar, too, makes such self-reflexive cross-references. He begins *Pythian* 6 by explicitly marking his act of repetition (*Pyth.* 6.1–4):

ἀκούσατ'· ἦ γὰρ ἑλικώπιδος Ἀφροδίτας
ἄρουραν ἢ Χαρίτων
ἀναπολίζομεν, ὀμφαλὸν ἐριβρόμου
χθονὸς ἐς νάϊον προσοιχόμενοι·

Listen! For indeed, we are **again** ploughing the field of rolling-eyed Aphrodite and the Graces, approaching the sacred navel of the loud-roaring earth.

The emphasis on iteration here looks back to the proem of *Paean* 6, the only other extant song in which Pindar associates Aphrodite and the Graces, and in which he similarly 'approaches' (προσοιχόμενοι, *Pyth.* 6.4 ~ ἦλθον, *Pae.* 6.9) 'the navel of the earth' (ὀμφαλὸν . . . χθονός, *Pyth.* 6.3–4 ~ χθονὸς ὀμφαλόν, *Pae.* 6.17).[218] The invocation of the goddesses invites an audience to recall Pindar's earlier poem, here marked not by a temporal adverb but the iterative prefix **ἀνα-**.[219] The opening injunction to 'listen'

---

[216] Cingano (1991); Maehler (2004) 251–2; Spelman (2018a) 227, further suggesting that ἐμοὶ **τότε** κοῦραι (fr. 20c.13) 'looks like a reference to past inspiration from the Muses'.

[217] Maehler (1982) II 71, (2004) 103; Morrison (2007b) 88; Spelman (2018a) 227. Contrast Catenacci and Di Marzio (2004) 74–6. Cf. Bacchyl. 6, which contrasts previous songs (ἄεισάν **ποτ'** Ὀλύμπια, 6.6) with the present (σὲ δὲ **νῦν**, 6.10).

[218] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1908) 345; Gentili (1988) 278 n. 60; Hubbard (1991) 38–9; Liberman (2004) 143 n. 219. Contrast Fennell (1893) 225, who suggests that Pindar 'had perhaps already composed an ode in honour of Xenokratês'.

[219] ἀναπολίζειν/ἀναπολεῖν means 'literally "to turn over the ground (i.e. plough) again", and figuratively "to go over (the same ground) again", "repeat"' (Schein (2013) 310 on *Phil.* 1238; cf. *Nem.* 7.104). Even if the verb 'simply reflects the ordinary practice of

309

(ἀκούσατ᾽) further alerts an audience to pay attention, to be ready to spot the reference.[220] Through this self-conscious iteration, Pindar adds authority to the poem that follows, presenting himself as an experienced singer, familiar with the terrain of the Muses.

At the start of *Isthmian* 6, meanwhile, Pindar explicitly marks his celebration of Phylacidas' boys' pancratium victory as a sequel to *Nemean* 5, his previous poem for Phylacidas' older brother Pytheas: he mixes a '**second** mixing bowl of the Muses' songs' (**δεύτερον** κρατῆρα Μοισαίων μελέων, 6.2) and '**now again**' celebrates a victory (**νῦν αὖτε**, 6.5), just as he had '**first**' at Nemea (ἐν Νεμέᾳ μὲν **πρῶτον**, 6.3).[221] In this case, the iteration is reinforced by a number of verbal echoes of *Nemean* 5's opening,[222] as well as the insistence that Phylacidas is the '**youngest**' of Lampon's sons (παίδων **ὁπλοτάτου**, 6.6), mirroring the chronological relationship between Pindar's epinicia: just as Phylacidas follows the precedent of his older brother, so too does *Isthmian* 6 follow on from Pindar's older poem.[223] This initial emphasis on repetition augments the praise of Phylacidas and his family, highlighting their ongoing athletic successes, as does the later mention of the family's other past victories, including those by the boys' uncle Euthymenes (6.56–64).[224] But there may also be more at stake in this opening: Pindar's insistence on the close connection between his two poems may be an attempt to efface the memory of Bacchylides, who had also celebrated Pytheas' original Nemean victory (Bacchyl. 13).[225] Pindar makes no explicit mention of his

---

ploughing, that is, going over a field several times' (Finley (1951) 61–2; cf. Farnell (1932) 184; Radt (1958) 91 n. 1), this still contains the inherent idea of repeated action (Gentili (1988) 278 n. 60).

[220] The imperative echoes the cry of a herald: cf. ἀκούετε λεῴ, Ar. *Ach.* 1000; Susarion fr. 1.1 K–A, etc. Thus Gildersleeve (1885) 316; Gentili et al. (1995) 541.

[221] Privitera (2009) 203; Spelman (2018a) 226–7.

[222] Λάμπωνος . . . γενεᾶς, 6.3 ~ Λάμπωνος υἱός, 5.4; στεφάνων, 6.4 ~ στέφανον, 5.5. On the intertextual connections between the epinicians for Lampon's family, see Morrison (2011a) 237–50.

[223] This mirroring extends to the embedded myths of each poem: *Nemean* 5 focuses on Peleus, and *Isthmian* 6 on his younger brother Telamon: Burnett (2005) 82; Morrison (2011a) 249.

[224] Esp. οἵαν μοῖραν | ὕμνων, 'what a share of poems!', 6.62; cf. *Nem.* 5.41–6, 50–4; *Isth.* 5.17–19. On these catalogues of past victories: Pfeijffer (1995) 319–22; Fenno (2005).

[225] See esp. 13.67–8, 190–1. Mann (2001) 192–3 suggests that these odes commemorated different victories, but see the caution of Cairns (2010) 129–31. On the relative and

310

rival's poem[226] and instead wishes for a 'third' libation at Olympia (τρίτον, *Isth*. 6.7–9): he wishes to achieve a monopoly over all celebrations of Lampon's family, past (Nemean), present (Isthmian) and future (Olympian). In self-consciously marking his poem as a sequel, Pindar establishes a continuous but claustrophobic literary history limited to his own songs.

Repeatedly in epinician poetry, therefore, poets acknowledge their previous work as a starting point for the present, not only emphasising the enduring success of their *laudandi*, but also asserting their own impressive credentials and growing canon of songs. As a final example of such literary repetition, however, let us turn to Stesichorus' *Palinode*, a notoriously controversial text whose precise nature and arrangement are uncertain. Based on conflicting ancient testimony, scholars disagree whether we should conceive of one or two *Palinodes* and whether one (or both) of these should be regarded as identical to the Stesichorean poem elsewhere called the *Helen*.[227] The issue is irresolvable on current evidence, and any proposed solution depends on how one weighs up a mass of inconsistent, unclear and unreliable sources.[228] For our purposes, however, we only need note that Stesichorus produced different poems (or portions of a single poem) that offered contradictory views on Helen. In the first (which I shall call the *Helen*), she was the archetypal adulterer of the epic tradition, one of Tyndareus' polygamous and unfaithful daughters (διγάμους τε καὶ τριγάμους ... | καὶ λιπεσάνορας, fr. 85.4–5); in the second (which I shall call the *Palinode*), she was recast as blameless, having neither set sail on Paris' ships nor arrived in Troy. It was in fact only a phantom (*eidolon*) of Helen that Paris took to Troy, while the heroine herself stayed behind with Proteus in Egypt (fr. 90.11–15). In a terse

---

absolute chronology of these poems: Maehler (1982) II 250–1; Pfeijffer (1995); Cairns (2007); Fearn (2007) 342–50.

[226] Though he may subtly incorporate it: his reference to Heracles' defeat of the Nemean lion epitomises part of Bacchylides' poem (*Isth*. 6.47–8 ~ 13.44–54; N.B. **ποτ**', 6.48), while his account of Ajax's origins expands a passing Bacchylidean detail (esp. παῖδα θρασὺν ἐξ Ἐριβοίας, 6.45 ~ Ἐριβοίας | παῖδ' ὑπέρθυμον, 13.102–3).

[227] For discussion: Bowra (1963); Sider (1989); Kelly (2007c); Bowie (2010c); Davies and Finglass (2014) 308–17.

[228] Wright (2005) 87–110 offers a particularly damning survey of our evidence. On the biographical focus of Chamaeleon, cited as a key source for the existence of two *Palinodes* (fr. 90.10–11): Schorn (2007).

311

fragment, the poet famously acknowledges his departure from tradition (fr. 91a):

οὐκ ἔστ᾽ ἔτυμος **λόγος** οὗτος,
οὐδ᾽ ἔβας ἐν νηυσὶν ἐϋσσέλμοις,
οὐδ᾽ ἵκεο Πέργαμα Τροίας·

This **story** is not true: you did not go on the well-benched ships, nor did you come to the citadel of Troy.

As it stands, this is a radical revision. Stesichorus not only recants his earlier account in the *Helen* but also rewrites the whole epic tradition – undermining one of its core moments, the very event that catalysed the entire Trojan war.[229] In language that pointedly appropriates epic phraseology (especially the common noun-epithet phrase νῆες ἐϋσσελμοι), Stesichorus sets himself against the likes of Homer and Hesiod, the major epic poets who preserved the traditional account.[230]

The recantation itself, whether it formed an independent poem or a new section of a larger work, apparently began with an invocation to a goddess (fr. 90.8–9):

δεῦρ᾽ **αὖτε** θεὰ φιλόμολπε

Come hither **again**, goddess, you who love song and dance.

The identity of this goddess is unclear from the fragment alone, but given the adjective φιλόμολπε, it is most likely a Muse, rather than Helen herself.[231] What immediately concerns us here, however, is the temporal specificity of the adverb **αὖτε**: like Sappho and the epinician poets, Stesichorus asks a goddess to visit him '**again**'. As with the Sapphic fragments (frr. 1, 127), this **αὖτε** could be little

---

[229] It is unclear whether Stesichorus invented the *eidolon* motif. According to a Byzantine paraphrase of Lycophron's *Alexandra*, he was pre-empted (and inspired?) by Hesiod (fr. dub. 358), but there are strong grounds for doubting this: Davies and Finglass (2014) 302–3.

[230] Cf. Beecroft (2006) 67: 'boarding a broad-benched ship metonymically means entering the epic tradition . . . Ultimately, the *logos* that is not *etumos* is the epic tradition itself.' On the poem's generic rivalry with epic: Beecroft (2010) 144–70, esp. 164–70.

[231] Bowra (1963) 246. Though if Helen were addressed (cf. the second-person address in fr. 91a), this would support the arguments of Carruesco (2017) that Helen adopts the role of the Muses in this poem and of Kelly (2007c) that the *Palinode* involved an epic-style epiphanic encounter with Helen.

312

more than a reciprocal prayer formula, recognising the generic frequency of such invocations, as Malcolm Davies and Patrick Finglass suggest. For them, the adverb 'acknowledges that the poet regularly invokes the Muse, and implies his hope that she will assist him now as before'.[232] However, given the more specific context of the *Palinode*, explicitly following and correcting the version of events in the *Helen*, there are strong grounds for seeing αὖτε here as a specific back reference to Stesichorus' 'traditional' presentation of his protagonist in the *Helen*.[233] In so doing, Stesichorus would be casting the *Palinode* as secondary and derivative, directly linking it to his previous treatment of the myth, just as Hesiod appears to correct his Theogonic description of Eris at the start of the *Works and Days* – and as the *Epigonoi* follows on from the *Thebaid*, again with an adverbial αὖτε.[234] In short, Stesichorus' αὖτε marks his return to and reversal of (πάλιν-) the same topic in another ode (-ᾠδή) – a pointedly intertextual case of allusive iteration.

However, it is unnecessary to choose between the generic and intertextual significance of αὖτε. Both are surely active at the same time in this poem. On the one hand, Stesichorus explicitly signposts his revision of his earlier *Helen*, but he also signals the traditionality of Muse invocations in general, reinforcing his appropriation of the epic tradition. Although Stesichorus may refer primarily to his own Muse invocations (e.g. fr. 277a), an awareness of the trope's traditionality cannot but evoke the epic genre, in which the Muses played a significant role. Stesichorus' iterative emphasis may thus also nod to epic tradition at large, setting himself against the habits of Homer and Hesiod.[235] Indeed, the papyrus commentary which preserves this verse claims that Stesichorus explicitly opposed himself to Homer in one *Palinode* and Hesiod in another ([μέμ]φεται τὸν Ὅμηρο[ν] . . . τὸν Ἡσίοδ[ον] μέμ[φετ]αι, fr. 90.1–6). This – of course – does not prove that these

---

[232] Davies and Finglass (2014) 331.   [233] Bowra (1963) 246; Feeney (1991) 15.
[234] Hes. *Op.* 11–26, *Theog.* 225–6: §1.2.3. *Epigonoi* fr. 1 *GEF*: §iv.2.3.
[235] Cf. Simon. fr. *eleg.* 11.23–4: the poet asks the Muses to 'prepare this honey-sweet ornament of our song **too**' ([ἔν]τυνο]ν **καὶ** τόνδ[ε μελ]ίφρονα κ[όσμον ἀο]ιδῆς | [ἡμετ]έρης . . .), a request which not only looks to the Muses' former support of his own poetry (Spelman (forthcoming)), but also to their former patronage of Homer (cf. fr. *eleg.* 11.15–18).

313

foremost representatives of the epic tradition were mentioned by name in the poem(s), given that an ancient commentator could have simply interpreted them as the implicit target of Stesichorus' critique.[236] But Plato's narrative of Stesichorus' blinding does at least suggest some direct competitiveness with Homer: whereas Stesichorus discovered the cause of his blindness by being μουσικός and resolved it by recanting his *Helen* (he was not ignorant: οὐκ ἠγνόησεν), Homer remained unaware (οὐκ ᾔσθετο) and blind (Pl. *Phaedr.* 243a). If this derives at all from Stesichorus' poem, as has been plausibly argued, we would thus have a clear case of Stesichorean poetic one-upmanship.[237] In asking the Muse to come 'again', the poet not only contrasts the *Palinode*'s account with that of his earlier *Helen*, but also with the epic tradition as a whole: the Muse comes again, as she repeatedly does, but now for a very different purpose.

In any case, however we decide to interpret this iterative marker, questions must remain over the sincerity of this opposition with epic. After all, Stesichorus' οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος (fr. 91a.1) is strikingly close to Penelope's words in the *Odyssey* when she (wrongly) refuses to accept the reality of Odysseus' return: ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅδε μῦθος ἐτήτυμος ('but this is no true story', *Od.* 23.62). As Jesús Carruesco has argued, this 'textual allusion to Penelope's manifestly false words in the *Odyssey* undermines the assertion "this is not a true story" and leaves open the possibility of viewing the *Palinode* as a *dissoi logoi* structure, where truth and untruth are not as clear-cut as we are being told'.[238] Like the Muses in Hesiod's *Theogony*, who can so readily mix truth and fiction (*Theog.* 27–8: §II.2.4), so too here the Muse whom Stesichorus invokes seems very capable of blurring the truth. In calling the same Muse to return and legitimise a radically different version of the Helen myth, Stesichorus problematises the tensions inherent in the Muses' authority – how can we trust them if they can tell such varied tales? Stesichorus challenges the distinction of truth and falsity. Poetry and tradition repeat themselves, and in so doing, the true story can easily get lost.

---

[236] Cf. §1.2.3. West (1985) 134; Carruesco (2017) 178 n. 3; Rawles (2018) 24. Though cf. Corinna fr. 664a (μέμφομη): §1.2.3 n. 197.
[237] Kelly (2007c).   [238] Carruesco (2017) 192.

Stesichorus' *Palinode* thus offers the most extreme case of a larger trend of repetition and recurrence in Greek lyric. Our extant fragments are dominated by an iterative poetics, in which the repetitive nature of poetic composition and key generic *topoi* are stressed. A wide range of lyric poets highlight both the repeatability of generic conventions and the potential reperformance of their own poems. But on occasion, they also foreground the repetition of specific themes, motifs and even specific poems, displaying a growing sense of a distinctive cycle or sequence of song.

IV.3.3 *Poetic Predecessors*

Besides these allusive temporal markers, some lyric poets also went further than their epic counterparts in directly acknowledging and citing their literary forebears. Thanks to the less detached voice of lyric, these poets could actively refer to their predecessors with an epigonal self-awareness, both naming them approvingly as a source of authority and citing them antagonistically as in need of correction. In Chapter I, we have already discussed lyric poets' direct naming of their forebears (§I.2.3). Here, I shall focus instead on vague appeals to anonymous predecessors, a loaded gesture of epigonality which at times even conceals the citation of specific texts. Temporal relations in lyric poetry were not just elaborated in the world of myth itself, but also explicitly between these poets and earlier generations of singers.

Following Predecessors

In some cases, poetic πρότεροι are cited as a source of authority, whose example a poet readily follows. This phenomenon is especially prevalent in Pindar. In *Nemean* 6, the Theban poet closes his description of Achilles' victory over Memnon (*Nem.* 6.49–53) with the claim that he follows the 'highway of song' that was found by '**older** poets' (καὶ ταῦτα μὲν **παλαιότεροι** | ὁδὸν ἀμαξιτὸν εὗρον· ἕπομαι δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔχων μελέταν, *Nem.* 6.53–4). The poet marks his epigonal relationship to the epic tradition, especially that of the *Aethiopis* (arg. 2d *GEF*), with a firm sense of belatedness.[239] Similarly in *Nemean* 3, the poet

---

[239] Nisetich (1989) 22; Gerber (1999b) 75; Rutherford (2015) 456; Spelman (2018a) 250–1, (2018c) 192–4. For the metapoetic resonance of following footsteps: Nelson (forthcoming a).

315

intersperses his account of Achilles' life (*Nem.* 3.43–63) with the claim that 'The **story** I have to tell was **told by my predecessors**' (**λεγόμενον** δὲ τοῦτο **προτέρων** | **ἔπος** ἔχω, *Nem.* 3.52–3). Here too, this gesture marks the traditionality of the whole account, both the preceding details of Achilles' upbringing (*Nem.* 3.43–52) and the following highlights of his military career, which – as in *Nemean* 6 – include his Aethiopic clash with Memnon (*Nem.* 3.56–63).[240] Pindar pictures his predecessors as a monolithic block, acknowledging the authoritative weight of the epic tradition.

As with indexical appeals to hearsay, however, generalised plurals can also conceal a reference to specific literary predecessors. In *Pythian* 3, for example, Pindar cites his **πρότεροι** for a statement which scholars both ancient and modern have read as a reference to our *Iliad* (*Pyth.* 3.80–2):

> εἰ δὲ **λόγων** συνέμεν κορυφάν, Ἱέρων, ὀρθὰν **ἐπίστᾳ, μανθάνων οἶσθα προτέρων**
> ἓν παρ' ἐσλὸν πήματα σύνδυο δαίονται βροτοῖς
> ἀθάνατοι.

> But if **you know** how to understand the true essence of **sayings**, Hieron, **you know by learning from predecessors** that the immortals apportion to mortals a pair of evils for every one good.

If Hieron can understand the true meaning of sayings, Pindar claims, he will know the lesson of their **πρότεροι**, that the immortals apportion to humans a pair of evils for every good. Since antiquity, this gnomic statement has plausibly been interpreted as a reference to Achilles' famous description of the jars of Zeus in *Iliad* 24: δοιοὶ γάρ τε πίθοι κατακείαται ἐν Διὸς οὔδει | δώρων οἷα δίδωσι κακῶν, ἕτερος δὲ ἑάων (*Il.* 24.527–8).[241] But while most other ancient

---

[240] Cf. Bury (1890) 55; Huxley (1975) 19; West (2011b) 60; Agócs (2011) 207–8; Rutherford (2015) 459 n. 49. ἔπος may once more signal specifically epic precedent: cf. §IV.3.1 n. 161. Pfeijffer (1999) 350–1 suspects that the preceding account of Achilles' miraculous youth is Pindaric invention, but see Rawles (2018) 38 n. 44 on the traces of such a tradition in iconography. Pfeijffer may be right, however, to see Achilles' youth here foreshadowing Achilles' future exploits as known in the *Iliad* (Pfeijffer (1999) 213), fitting the ode's larger interest in the consistency of an individual's virtue across a lifetime (*Nem.* 3.70–5).

[241] Macleod (1982) 133; Cannatà Fera (1986); Robbins (1990) 313–14; Mann (1994) 318–23; Fearn (2007) 73 n. 142; Morgan (2015) 287–8; Spelman (2018a) 92–3. Differently: Luppino (1959); Currie (2005) 390–2.

316

commentators interpreted the passage as referring to two jars, one of evil and one of good (e.g. Pl. *Resp.* 2.379d; Plut. *Quomodo adul.* 24a–b), Pindar appears to have creatively misread the text to make two parts of evil for every one part of good, a ratio which chimes with the ode's larger concern with the 'preponderance of pain'.[242] Of course, there are no precise verbal echoes between these specific lines, and Pindar does not even mention jars, which might lead us to suspect that he is simply referring to a more general *gnome*. Yet the ensuing paradigmatic presence of Peleus in both texts reinforces the connection: in each poem, the hero enjoys unsurpassed prosperity (ὄλβον ὑπέρτατον, *Pyth.* 3.89 ~ πάντας γὰρ ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ἐκέκαστο | ὄλβῳ τε πλούτῳ τε, *Il.* 24.535–6) and marries the divine Thetis (*Pyth.* 3.92–6 ~ *Il.* 24.537), but suffers because of the misfortune of his only child (μόνον, *Pyth.* 3.100–3 ~ ἕνα, *Il.* 24.540).[243] In both cases, moreover, the moral is the same: one must accept one's lot (*Pyth.* 3.103–4 ~ *Il.* 24.543–51). Given this series of parallels, it is thus tempting to see verses 81–2 as a pointed *variatio* (and misreading) of the Iliadic sentiment, suited to Pindar's larger consolatory goal, co-opting the authority of his Homeric predecessor. Moreover, besides the appeal to **πρότεροι**, this allusion is further triggered by a string of nearby indices, including Pindar's emphasis on words (**λόγοι**) and understanding (**ἐπίστα**, **οἶσθα**), alongside the footnoting **λέγονται** that introduces the account of Peleus (*Pyth.* 3.88). This accumulation of indexical markers encourages us to look to the specific Iliadic intertext underlying Pindar's rather vague gesture to his **πρότεροι**. Behind the generalised 'predecessors', we find a precise reference to the greatest of them all, Homer himself.

Such epigonal awareness is even clearer in the opening of *Isthmian* 2, as Pindar sketches out his own literary history by drawing a contrast between the behaviour of former poets ('men **of long ago**', οἱ μὲν **πάλαι** ... φῶτες) and modern-day hirelings obsessed with a profit. Whereas the former freely shot forth pederastic hymns at beautiful boys, the Muse of Pindar's day has now become a greedy labourer (*Isth.* 2.1–11):

---

[242] Misreading: Ford (1997) 97–8; cf. Σ *Pyth.* 3.141a. 'Preponderance of pain': Robbins (1990) 313–17.

[243] Robbins (1990) 313; Mann (1994) 319–20.

317

Οἱ μὲν **πάλαι**, ὦ Θρασύβουλε, φῶτες, οἳ χρυσαμπύκων
ἐς δίφρον Μοισᾶν ἔβαινον **κλυτᾷ** φόρμιγγι συναντόμενοι,
ῥίμφα παιδείους ἐτόξευον μελιγάρυας ὕμνους,
ὅστις ἐὼν καλὸς εἶχεν Ἀφροδίτας
εὐθρόνου μνάστειραν ἁδίσταν ὀπώραν.

ἁ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδής πω τότ᾿ ἦν οὐδ᾿ ἐργάτις·
οὐδ᾿ ἐπέρναντο γλυκεῖαι μελιφθόγγου ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας
ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλθακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί.
νῦν δ᾿ ἐφίητι <τὸ> τὠργείου φυλάξαι
ῥῆμ᾿ ἀλαθείας <‿ —> ἄγχιστα βαῖνον,

"χρήματα χρήματ᾿ ἀνήρ" ὃς φᾶ κτεάνων θ᾿ ἅμα λειφθεὶς καὶ φίλων.

Those men **of long ago**, O Thrasybulus, who used to mount the chariot of the golden-circleted Muses, encountering the **famous** lyre, readily shot their honey-sounding songs of love at any beautiful boy whose sweetest late-summer bloom could woo fair-throned Aphrodite. For in those days the Muse was not yet a lover of profit, nor a working girl; nor were sweet, soft-voiced songs sold off with silvered faces by honey-voiced Terpsichore. But now she instructs us to bear in mind the Argive's **saying** which comes . . . very close to the truth: 'Money, money makes the man', said he who lost both his possessions and friends.

Here too, a vague reference to earlier men (οἱ . . . **πάλαι** . . . φῶτες, v. 1) bears a specific poetic resonance, recalling earlier literary traditions, reinforced by the indexical reference to these poets' '**famous** lyre' (**κλυτᾷ** φόρμιγγι, v. 2). The scholia cite Alcaeus, Ibycus and Anacreon as the kinds of predecessors that Pindar must have in mind,[244] and Pindar's language supports this inference. Already in antiquity, scholars noted specific echoes of both Anacreon and Alcaeus: the former wistfully recalls a time when 'Persuasion did not shine all silver' (οὐδ᾿ ἀργυρῆ κω τότ᾿ ἔλαμπε Πειθώ, Anac. fr. 384), comparable to Pindar's nostalgic reminiscence of a time before the silver-faced songs of his own day (οὐδ᾿ . . . κω τότ᾿ ~ οὐ . . . πω τότ᾿, v. 6; ἀργυρῆ ~ ἀργυρωθεῖσαι, v. 8), while Alcaeus is also recorded as citing the proverb of Aristodemus in Sparta, presumably the same person as Pindar's 'Argive man' (fr. 360 ~ vv. 9–11).[245] But

---

[244] Σ *Isth*. 2.1b. This trio are commonly cited as erotic poets (e.g. Ar. *Thesm*. 161–2): Woodbury (1968) 532 n. 6.

[245] Σ *Isth*. 2.13; Σ *Isth*. 2.17. On the Alcaean link, cf. Santoni (1983) 97–104; Nafissi (1991) 345 n. 2; Spelman (2018a) 273 n. 51. Bergk's conjecture of τὠλκαίου for

318

there is more besides these long-acknowledged intertexts. One of the few earlier poetic appearances of the noun ὀπώρα is Alcaeus' τερένας ἄνθος ὀπώρας ('the flower of tender late-summer', fr. 397 ~ ὀπώραν, v. 5), a fragment whose floral imagery suggests a potentially pederastic context.[246] More generally, the erotic flavour of these verses is reinforced by the degrading prostitution of the Muse Terpischore: ἐργάτις (v. 6) here suggests 'courtesan' (cf. Archil. fr. 208), and ἐπέρναντο (v. 7) aurally evokes the role of the πόρνη,[247] while the description of silver-faced songs (v. 8) recalls the white-painted faces of Greek prostitutes in addition to the payment of silver coins.[248] Through his vague reference to 'men **of long ago**', Pindar conjures up a whole genre of pederastic poetry – and potentially even specific poets – as a foil for the epinician poetry of the modern day.[249] His reference to οἱ **πάλαι** φῶτες marks his allusive interaction.

Challenging Predecessors

In other cases, however, Pindar and his fellow lyric poets cite their predecessors in a more agonistic mode, polemically positioning themselves against what has come before. Commonly cited in this regard is Pindar's *Olympian* 1, in which the poet explicitly speaks out against his forebears by 'correcting' their version of Tantalus' banquet with the gods (υἱὲ Ταντάλου, σὲ δ' ἀντία **προτέρων** φθέγξομαι, 'son of Tantalus, I shall talk of you contrary to my

---

τὠργείου (*Isth.* 2.9: cf. Liberman (1999) 245) is unnecessary, since Pindar is more likely referring to the Argive Aristodemus (as Alcaeus does explicitly: Ἀριστόδαμον). Intriguingly, Alcaeus himself attributes this 'saying' to tradition (**φαῖσ'**, fr. 360.2, cf. **ποτ'**, fr. 360.1). Pindar is engaging in a pre-existing and ongoing tradition of citing and appropriating this adage.

[246] Other pre-Pindaric uses of the noun: *Il.* 22.27; *Od.* 11.192, 12.76, 14.384; Alcm. fr. 96. For Alcaeus' pederastic poetry: Barner (1967) 25–6; Buffière (1980) 246–9; Vetta (1982).

[247] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1922) 311 with n. 1; Thummer (1968–69) ii 40; Rawles (2018) 136 n.8.

[248] Bowra (1964) 355–6; Simpson (1969) 471 n. 65; Nicholson (2000) 241. Cf. Kurke (1999) 175–219 on the economic associations of the πόρνη. Σ *Isth.* 2.9a detects a Pindaric attack on Simonides in these lines; cf. Rawles (2018) 133–54.

[249] Cf. Maslov (2015) 259–66. There may thus be some point in the fact that Pindar composed a pederastic poem for Thrasybulus, the addressee of this epinician (fr. 124). There is much debate about the precise significance of this opening contrast: Woodbury (1968); Nisetich (1977); Cairns (2011); Kurke (2013) 208–22; Phillips (2017) 152–9; Stehle (2017); Spelman (2018a) 268–76.

319

predecessors', *Ol.* 1.36).[250] In the traditional version more familiar to us from later sources, Tantalus was invited to a banquet of the gods and served his own dismembered son to his hosts in a cauldron; the goddess Demeter (or in some versions Thetis) inadvertently consumed the boy's shoulder while distracted with grief for her daughter Persephone; and after the gods realised the trick, Hermes revived Pelops, who was given a new ivory shoulder crafted by Hephaestus to replace that which had been eaten.[251] Pindar's polemic clearly presupposes the pre-existence of this traditional version, as does the Pindaric scholia's attribution to his contemporary Bacchylides of a tale in which Rhea was responsible for restoring Pelops by lowering him into a cauldron (Bacchyl. fr. 42).[252] Rather than accept this account, however, Pindar proposes an alternative version, in which Poseidon fell in love with Pelops and took him away, just as Zeus later did Ganymedes;[253] Tantalus' punishment was for stealing ambrosia and nectar from the gods, not serving his own son to them (*Ol.* 1.54–66); and Pelops' ivory shoulder was simply a defect with which he was born (*Ol.* 1.26–7). Just as Stesichorus revised the fate of Helen (§ɪᴠ.3.2), so here Pindar rewrites that of Pelops.[254] The mainstream account, he asserts, is a malicious invention of envious neighbours which has managed to infiltrate the literary tradition.[255]

Far from cashing in on the prestige of his literary predecessors, therefore, Pindar here antagonistically opposes them (as he does the '**talk of mortals**' more generally: βροτῶν φάτις, 1.28–9). He asserts his own authority by highlighting the inadequacies of those

---

[250] Pini (1967) 359–67; Köhnken (1974), (1983); Howie (1983); Hubbard (1987b); Krummen (1990) 205–11 = (2014) 237–44; Vöhler (2005); Most (2012) 267–71.

[251] E.g. Eur. *IT* 386–8, *Hel.* 388–9; Lycoph. *Alex.* 152–5; Ov. *Met.* 6.403–11; Hyg. *Fab.* 83.

[252] Cf. Instone (1996) 102, who suggests the episode might have also featured in the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, which included Pelops and his descendants (Hes. frr. 191, 259); cf. Gerber (1982) 122; Howie (1983) 278–81.

[253] Pindar acknowledges his 'true' version as a doublet of the myth of Ganymedes (note the temporal index: δευτέρῳ χρόνῳ, *Ol.* 1.43): Kakridis (1930b).

[254] Cf. Σ *Ol.* 1.58d, which glosses the poem as a 'palinode' (παλινῳδίαν), like Stesichorus' poem.

[255] West (2011b) 67 compares Pindar to a textual critic, 'giving his story of how a postulated corruption came about'. Pelops' dismemberment 'limb by limb' (κατὰ μέλη, 1.49) also serves as an analogy for Pindar's deconstruction of the traditional myth: Hubbard (1987b) 14 with n. 60, noting the pun on μέλη ('limbs'/'songs').

320

who have come before him.[256] Naturally, there are clear advantages to his sanitised version of the myth. Not only is it in keeping with the positive sensibilities of epinician poetry, allowing him to speak well of the gods (cf. 1.35, 52–3), but it also enhances the paradigmatic value of the Tantalus myth for the present poem. In rewriting tradition, Pindar stresses the civilised decorum of Tantalus' feast: it is εὐνομώτατον ('most orderly', 1.37) and his homeland Sipylus is φίλαν ('friendly', 1.38). The result is a far more effective parallel for the poem's *laudandus*, Hieron, whose own table was earlier described with the same adjective (φίλαν, 1.16).[257] Yet for all this reframing, traces of the older myth still linger. Besides Pelops' ivory shoulder (1.27), his emergence from a cauldron (1.26) and the neighbours' malicious talk of cannibalism (1.47–51), we also hear that Tantalus could not 'digest' his good fortune (καταπέψαι, 1.55), a loaded alimentary metaphor.[258] Pindar acknowledges and alludes to the traditional version of the myth, while simultaneously deauthorising it. Pindar's appeal to his predecessors is not simply a legitimising act or allusive marker, but a means for the poet to situate himself and his version of a myth against what has come before.[259] In this case, the plural **πρότεροι** may well encompass prior tradition as a whole, but it could also perhaps conceal a specific reference to Bacchylides' own treatment of the myth (fr. 42) if that poem were produced earlier – a means for Pindar to dismiss his rival's version as passé.[260]

Such an agonistic mode is also visible in elegiac poetry. In Xenophanes' elegy on the well-ordered symposium, the poet

---

[256] Cf. Athanassaki (2004) 339–41: Pindar implicitly claims the Muses' favour as his exclusive prerogative; his πρότεροι only had access to *Charis*, 'Grace' (1.30).

[257] Cf. Gerber (1982) 75–6.

[258] Cf. too κόρῳ ('satiety'), 1.56; ἕψοι ('boil'), 1.83; Nagy (1986) 85–6; Griffith (1990) 200. For the ethical implications of this alimentary language, see Burgess (1993); Steiner (2002); cf. Morgan (2015) 237–9 for further tyrannical and Sicilian associations.

[259] We should be wary of accepting Pindar's posturing too innocently, however: the language used to describe his predecessors' deceitful embellishments parallels that used of his own poetry elsewhere: *Ol.* 1.29 (δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις) ~ *Ol.* 1.105 (δαιδαλωσέμεν), *Nem.* 8.15 (πεποικιλμέναν) and fr. 94b.32 (δαιδάλλοισ' ἔπεσιν): Feeney (1991) 18 with n. 49. Cf. Stesichorus' similar confusion of truth and falsity in his *Palinode*: §IV.3.2.

[260] For Pindar's polemical engagement with Bacchylides elsewhere, cf. §IV.3.2.

dismisses the battles of Titans, Giants and Centaurs as the 'fabri-
cations of **our predecessors**' (fr. 1.19–24 *IEG*):

> ἀνδρῶν δ' αἰνεῖν τοῦτον ὃς ἐσθλὰ πιὼν ἀναφαίνει,
>   ὡς ᾖ μνημοσύνη καὶ τόνος ἀμφ' ἀρετῆς,
> οὔ τι μάχας διέπειν Τιτήνων οὐδὲ Γιγάντων
>   οὐδὲ < > Κενταύρων, πλάσμα<τα> τῶν **προτέρων**,
> ἢ στάσιας σφεδανάς· τοῖς οὐδὲν χρηστὸν ἔνεστιν·
>   θεῶν <δὲ> προμηθείην αἰὲν ἔχειν ἀγαθήν.

> Praise that man who brings noble thoughts to light after drinking, so that there
> may be recollection of and striving after excellence. And do not treat[261] the
> battles of Titans or Giants or Centaurs, the fabrications of **our predecessors**,
> or violent factions: there is nothing of use in them. But always have good
> forethought about the gods.

Here too, Xenophanes' **πρότεροι** highlight poetic precedent:
Xenophanes' dismissal of the chaotic battles fought by Titans,
Giants and Centaurs evokes the warring world of epic, especially
those poems in which such primeval conflicts took centre stage:
Hesiod's *Theogony* (*Theog.* 617–720) and the Cyclic
Titanomachy. But other epics also invoked such subjects in pass-
ing: the Centauromachy features on Heracles' shield in the
Hesiodic *Aspis* (*Scut.* 178–90) and is also cited by Antinous in
the *Odyssey* (*Od.* 21.295–304: §IV.2.1) – appropriately enough for
the sympotic context of Xenophanes' fragment, a tale itself con-
cerned with the dangerous excesses of wine.[262] Xenophanes'
reference to the 'battles of Titans or Giants or Centaurs' thus
emblematises epic poetry as a whole, summing up the essence of
the genre and its tumultuous depiction of the divine. This generic
association is reinforced by the very language of these verses: the
rare adjective σφεδανός ('violent') has a distinctively epic ring,[263]
while πλάσμα<τα> τῶν **προτέρων** offers a playful variation on the
epic phrase κλεῖα προτέρων ἀνθρώπων (*Theog.* 100).[264] In add-
ition, the closing mention of 'forethought' (προμηθείην, 24) may

---

[261] διέπειν suggests both 'tell of' and 'emulate': Adkins (1985) 184.

[262] Cf. Thgn. 541–2 for the ὠμοφάγοι Centaurs as an exemplum of *hybris* in another
sympotic context.

[263] σφεδανός occurs previously only three times in Homer (*Il.* 11.165, 16.372, 21.542) and
again later in several hexameter poems (Euphorion fr. 11.10; Nic. *Ther.* 642; Dionysius
19 fr. 9 v. 15 *GDRK*).

[264] Ford (2002) 58. Cf. Lesher (1992) 50 n. 7.

322

allude to the hybristic Prometheus, another negative exemplum from the hexameter tradition (*Theog.* 507–616; *Op.* 47–105).[265] Just as Pindar's predecessors in *Isthmian* 2 were pederastic poets, so too Xenophanes' πρότεροι are epic singers.

Yet Xenophanes is particularly dismissive of his πρότεροι here, especially in his description of their πλάσματα, 'fabrications'. The precise nuance of the noun is not entirely clear in this context, given that this is by far its earliest attestation. In later literature, it became a technical term for 'fiction', the narration of unreal but plausible events, set in opposition to both 'myth' and 'history'.[266] We should be wary of importing too much anachronistic baggage here, but given that early instances of its cognate verb πλάσσω convey a sense of deception and trickery, an association with fictionality certainly seems likely.[267] Alongside the dismissive οὐδὲν χρηστόν in the following line, Xenophanes' sympotic strictures form part of his larger criticism of epic poetry and its main protagonists, Homer and Hesiod (cf. D8 L–M). In contrast to epic, ἀρετή and ἐσθλά have very little to do with strife and conflict in Xenophanes' world view.[268]

In these past two examples, Pindar's and Xenophanes' references to predecessors appear to act primarily on a generic level, evoking tradition as a whole, even if we have detected possible links with the likes of Bacchylides and Hesiod. Both poems, moreover, seem to derive from a Syracusan context, perhaps reflecting a broader intellectual culture of scepticism towards traditional myth at Hieron's court.[269] Yet as with *Pythian* 3's Iliadic citation, such polemical references to πρότεροι can also convey a more precise intertextual reference. In one of

---

[265] Collins (2004) 150; Mackenzie (2021) 60.

[266] See e.g. Sextus Empiricus, who contrasts πλάσμα with μῦθος, the narration of what is false and has never happened, and ἱστορία, the narration of what is true and has happened (*Adv. Math.* 1.263–5). Cf. Plutarch's criticism of Herodotean ψεύσματα καὶ πλάσματα ('lies and fictions', *De Her. mal.* 854f).

[267] E.g. Hes. *Op.* 70; Semon. fr. 7.21; Aesch. *PV* 1030; Soph. *Aj.* 148, *OT* 780; Eur. *Bacch.* 218. Cf. Timon of Phlius' sarcastic use of this word in his description of Xenophanes (ὅς, τὸν ἀπ᾽ ἀνθρώπων θεὸν ἐπλάσατ᾽ ἶσον ἅπαντη, 834.2 *SH*). On Timon's appropriation of Xenophanes' language more generally: Clayman (2009) 84. Note too the implicit parallel with false anthropomorphic images of gods: Ford (2002) 58.

[268] Cf. Mackenzie (2021) 27–46 on Xenophanes' broader relationship with hexameter poetry.

[269] Cf. Gostoli (1999).

323

Mimnermus' elegiac fragments, the poet attributes his knowledge of a brave, unknown Smyrnaean to his predecessors (fr. 14):[270]

οὐ μὲν δὴ κείνου γε μένος καὶ ἀγήνορα θυμὸν
    τοῖον ἐμέο **προτέρων πεύθομαι**, οἵ μιν ἴδον
Λυδῶν ἱππομάχων πυκινὰς κλονέοντα φάλαγγας
    Ἕρμιον ἂμ πεδίον, φῶτα φερεμμελίην·
τοῦ μὲν ἄρ' οὔ ποτε πάμπαν ἐμέμψατο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη
    δριμὺ μένος κραδίης, εὖθ' ὅ γ' ἀνὰ προμάχους
σεύαιθ' αἱματόεν<τος ἐν> ὑσμίνη πολέμοιο,
    πικρὰ βιαζόμενος δυσμενέων βέλεα·
οὐ γάρ τις κείνου δηίων ἔτ' ἀμεινότερος φὼς
    ἔσκεν ἐποίχεσθαι φυλόπιδος κρατερῆς
ἔργον, ὅτ' αὐγῇσιν φέρετ' ὠκέος ἠελίοιο

Not such were that man's might and heroic spirit, as **I learn from** my **predecessors**, who saw him routing the Lydian cavalry's packed ranks on the plain of Hermus, wielding his ash-spear. Pallas Athena never at all faulted his heart's fierce might, when he rushed among the front-fighters in the conflict of bloody war, defying the enemy's sharp missiles. For no man among his foes remained his better at going about the task of harsh war, when he sped <with his bronze armour shining like> the rays of the swift sun.[271]

On the face of it, this opening simply highlights the source of Mimnermus' eulogistic account, ascribing it to the authority of his elders. Yet it may also trigger recognition of an intertextual parallel that underlies the whole fragment. As Grethlein has highlighted, these verses engage extensively with the account of Diomedes' *aristeia* at Troy familiar to us from the *Iliad*.[272] Not only does the opening opposition of sight and hearing, alongside Mimnermus' appeal to ancestral knowledge (vv. 1–2), echo Agamemnon's similar words when chiding Diomedes (*Il.* 4.370–5),[273] but the following description of the warrior's successes also mirror those of the Iliadic Diomedes. In particular, verses 3–4 echo the Iliadic simile in which the torrent-like hero routs the Trojans (ἂμ πεδίον, *Il.* 5.87; πυκιναὶ κλονέοντο φάλαγγες |, *Il.* 5.93, ἂμ πεδίον ... κλονέοντα

---

[270] It is uncertain whether this fragment derives from the *Smyrneis* (Szádeczky-Kardoss (1968) 945; Steffen (1973) 64) or from a separate exhortatory elegy (Jacoby (1918) 293–6; Allen (1993) 9–10). See Vetta (1983a) xxiii; Allan (2019) 128.

[271] Translating West's supplement: <εἴκελα χαλκείοις τεύχεσι λαμπόμενος> (West (1989–92) ii 90, comparing *Il.* 22.134–5).

[272] Grethlein (2007) 105–8.

[273] Cf. Jacoby (1918) 288; Massa Positano (1946) 361–2.

324

φάλαγγας |, *Il.* 5.96 ~ πυκινὰς κλονέοντα φάλαγγας | Ἕρμιον ἂμ πεδίον, vv. 3–4). Alone, these verbal parallels may not be sufficient to suggest a connection with this specific mythical episode, especially given the formulaic nature of the language involved.[274] But Mimnermus' subsequent description of the warrior resonates more specifically against the fortunes of Diomedes: whereas the Iliadic hero was chided by Athena for avoiding battle (*Il.* 5.800–13), we are told that this Smyrnaean warrior never received such criticism from the same goddess (v. 5), while he is also said to defy his enemies' 'bitter missiles' (πικρὰ . . . βέλεα, v. 8), unlike the Iliadic Diomedes, who could not avoid being struck by the 'bitter arrow' of Pandarus (πικρὸς ὀϊστός, *Il.* 5.99; βέλος ὠκύ, 5.106). To these parallels noted by Grethlein, we could also add the fact that this Smyrnaean warrior was better than all his enemies (vv. 9–10), just as nobody could rival the Iliadic Diomedes (οὐδέ τίς οἱ δύναται μένος ἰσοφαρίζειν, *Il.* 6.101). Taken together, these echoes suggest that Mimnermus' poem engages directly with the *fabula* of Diomedes' *aristeia* at Troy, an episode which Mimnermus and his audience would have likely known, either via a version of the *Iliad* or some other epic treatment. After all, Mimnermus apparently treated Diomedes' unhappy *nostos* elsewhere (fr. 22), and in another fragment he makes a possible allusion to *Iliad* 6.146–9 (fr. 2), an episode in which Diomedes also plays a prominent role; the poet was evidently familiar with the hero and his story.[275] By stressing his reliance on the talk of his **πρότεροι** at the start of this fragment, Mimnermus invites his audience to recall what they too have heard from the epic past and to spot the underlying allusion.[276]

Crucially, however, this epic parallel involves a game of antagonistic one-upmanship: Mimnermus' unnamed Smyrnaean proves superior to the Iliadic Diomedes, since he emphatically receives no censure from Athena at any time (οὔ ποτε πάμπαν, v. 5) and averts multiple πικρὰ . . . βέλεα (v. 8), whereas Diomedes was struck by a single arrow. He surpasses his epic predecessor as much as he does his contemporary foes (vv. 9–10). We cannot be certain of the wider

---

[274] πυκινὰς κλονέοντα φάλαγγας: cf. *Il.* 4.281, 11.148, 15.448; Hes. *Theog.* 935. ἂμ πεδίον: cf. *Il.* 6.71, 23.464; *Od.* 5.329; *HhDem.* 17; *HhAp.* 228; Pind. fr. 172.4.
[275] Grethlein (2007) 106. On fr. 2's possible allusion: §1.2.3.
[276] Cf. Grethlein (2007) 108: 'the πρότεροι of v. 2 can be identified with the epic tradition'.

context of this fragment, but it most likely involves an unfavourable contrast between this stellar Smyrnaean and the present spirit of Mimnermus' contemporaries (οὐ . . . τοῖον, vv. 1–2).[277] In that case, the warrior fulfils a role parallel to the Iliadic Tydeus, a paradigm of past excellence for a lacklustre present. It is thus surely not a coincidence that Diomedes is the allusive model underlying this intergenerational *synkrisis*: as we have seen, he is a major paradigm of epigonal thinking in the *Iliad*, and Agamemnon's censure in *Iliad* 4 is a major moment when he is first set against his father (§II.2.2; IV.2.3). Mimnermus seems to pick up on these intergenerational tensions from the epic tradition and adapt them for his own context. But there remains an underlying competitive edge to this reworking. Mimnermus' new subject matter even surpasses Diomedes, an implicit assertion of his supremacy in the face of the epic tradition: the recent historical present outdoes the mythical past.[278] The appeal to πρότεροι in verse 2 thus introduces a competitive nod to epic predecessors, whose accounts of Diomedes fall short of Mimnermus' Smyrnaean hero.

Lyric poets, therefore, not only employed temporal adjectives and adverbs to mark their allusive engagement with earlier traditions but also cited their literary predecessors explicitly. Such epigonal references were often considerably antagonistic, as with the cases of Mimnermus, Xenophanes and Pindar's first *Olympian* Ode. But they were also a means to point to specific moments in earlier traditions, as in Mimnermus and *Pythian* 3. What had remained an implicit mode of figuring epigonality in archaic epic gradually transformed into a direct and active trope. With a keen awareness of their literary heritage, Greek lyric poets appealed to their predecessors as a source of authority and contention; and in so doing, they marked out their own distinctive place in the map of literary history.

---

[277] Thus Jacoby (1918) 287–9; Allan (2019) 129. For other possibilities, see Bowie (1986) 29; Grethlein (2007) 103–5; Swift (2015a) 101.

[278] Grethlein's acceptance of Meineke's conjecture ὥς for οἵ in verse 2 would reinforce such antagonism ('I have not heard of his strength and brave spirit, such as they were, from my elders, since I have seen him'). Mimnermus then emphasises his own direct witnessing of the warrior, in comparison to Agamemnon's reliance on hearsay or epic poets' dependence on the Muses (*Il.* 2.486): Grethlein (2007) 109.

326

IV.4 Conclusions

In archaic epic and lyric, temporality frequently serves as an index of allusion. We have seen how temporal adjectives and adverbs repeatedly signpost engagement with earlier mythological and poetic traditions, often inviting an audience to supplement bare references with their wider knowledge of tradition. Yet in addition, both corpora of poetry exhibit a strong interest in the iterative aspects of poetic composition: Homeric epic frequently marks cross references within individual poems as acts of repetition, while lyric poets flag their compositions as self-conscious replays of tradition or even specific prior poems.

Such temporal indices bear an implicit sense of epigonality, as epic and lyric poets situate their poetry against a wider, pre-existing tradition. But such an anxiety of influence particularly comes into play surrounding the discourse of πρότεροι. In epic, intergenerational tensions in the mythical world serve as a model for the poet's own relationship with his tradition, while in lyric, this concern becomes explicit, as poets repeatedly evoke their πρότεροι directly, at times even pointing to specific texts.

The various categories of temporal indices with which we began, therefore, can already be found throughout archaic Greek poetry, reinforcing the conclusions we have drawn from our explorations of indexical hearsay and memory. Archaic Greek poets already display a strong sense of literary history, situating their present against the poetic and mythological past and figuring this relationship through a range of temporal indices. Indexical temporality was deeply embedded in archaic Greek poetics from the very start.

Given the recurring prominence of indices in archaic Greek poetry, it is time to turn to some broader conclusions. These will be the concern of the Epilogue.

EPILOGUE

The marking of allusion was already deeply engrained in archaic Greek poetics. Phoenix's introduction of Meleager, with which we began, is but the tip of the iceberg. Epic and lyric poets employed indices of hearsay, memory and time to position themselves within and against their larger tradition, carving out their own distinctive space. What is perhaps most striking and surprising is the extent to which archaic poets employed these devices. The previous chapters have explored numerous cases of indexicality in action: poets gesturing to other traditions and texts, especially as they introduce their references; inviting their audiences to acknowledge competing alternatives or supplement unspoken details; and legitimising their departures from tradition with the veneer of traditional authority. From Homer onwards, archaic poets participated in a sophisticated and well-developed system of allusive indexing. Although they belong to the 'archaic' age, there is nothing 'primitive' about their poetic practice. This conclusion equally requires us to rethink our understanding of Hellenistic and Roman poets, whose 'footnoting' habits are not as novel, bookish or scholarly as we might think.

This book establishes the most forcible case to date for the prominence and prevalence of allusive marking in archaic Greek poetry. It is worth asking why these indices have not been identified or studied at such length before.[1] A key answer must be our limited and indirect access to many of the traditions behind these references (cf. §1.2.2), alongside underlying scholarly assumptions which have dissuaded us from looking for such indices or interpreting them in the same manner as we would when reading

---

[1] The most sustained prior treatment occurs in eight suggestive pages of Currie (2016) 26–7, 139–44: §1.1.4. His brief treatment anticipates some of the arguments that I have made in this book; the comprehensive analysis presented here brings out in full the richness and variety of these intertextual devices.

328

a Hellenistic or Roman poet (cf. §I.1.3). Yet in this study, I have highlighted that such interpretations are in fact possible, plausible and rewarding. Of course, this does not mean that the allusive systems of Greece and Rome were identical or that they remained unchanged for centuries. We have already tracked changes in the nature of intertextuality within the archaic period alone (§I.2). And we have also observed how archaic indices are sometimes less intrusive or metaleptic than their Roman successors (e.g. §III.2.5), another reason why they might have received less scholarly attention in the past.[2] But even so, what is striking is how, despite larger developments in allusive practice, indexicality remains a constant. Even as the target of allusion may shift from mythological traditions to specific texts, the very same allusive strategies are employed.

In any case, this argument for continuity should not be mistaken as a claim for uniformity in the use of indexicality throughout archaic poetry. We have focused on three of the most prominent indices of allusion in archaic Greek poetry which feature in both epic and lyric poetry. But we could have also explored others which are less ambidextrous: as we have already noted, the direct naming of other poets is primarily a lyric phenomenon which grows gradually stronger over time (§I.2.3), while the conceptualisation of tradition as fate seems far more dominant in epic narrative (§I.1.4). Even in the case studies that we have considered, we have noted considerable variation in the use of different indices. Hearsay and temporality are prominent throughout archaic epic and lyric, although the differing constructions of the narrator in each corpus result in different emphases, especially in their varyingly direct engagement with poetic πρότεροι. Poetic memory, by contrast, functions in different ways in each genre. In Homeric epic, it primarily features in embedded character speech, while in lyric, it centres around the narratorial voice and its direct address to audiences.

---

[2] We could compare the case of 'metatheatre' in Attic drama, which is explicit and overt in comedy, but more covert and far less metaleptic in tragedy: Taplin (1986a). The extent of tragic metatheatre has become increasingly apparent in recent years: e.g. R. B. Rutherford (2012) 357–64; Torrance (2013); Jendza (2020).

A further detail which we have not yet remarked upon is the variation in the use of the device between different lyric subgenres, especially the apparent scarcity of such indices in archaic iambus. The only examples from this corpus we have explored are the signposting of iambic fable (§II.3.1) and Archilochus' internal cross references in his Lycambid song cycle (§IV.3.1). Yet these instances only throw into greater relief the absence of indexicality in iambic allusions to mythical tales. Scholars have plausibly argued for various allusions to epic myth in iambus, especially to the Homeric Odysseus.[3] But as far as we can see, these were not indexically marked. The fragmentary state of our evidence may again be to blame.[4] But this balance may also reflect something of iambus' generic composition and self-perception. The genre appears to have only flagged its engagement with 'lower', more popular genres. This contrasts significantly with archaic elegy, which was more concerned with establishing a storehouse of wisdom, and melic lyric, with its focus on myths as exempla for the present. Iambus, by contrast, focused on *ainoi*, and it is these that the genre indexically marks. What poets indexed, as much as how they did so, is thus illuminating for our understanding of ancient genres and our appreciation of how ancient poets fashioned themselves within their tradition. Our map of archaic indexicality overlaps considerably with – but is not identical to – the overarching map of archaic intertextuality.

Despite these variations, indexicality was a remarkably consistent presence across many archaic texts. Indices of allusion proved a crucial tool for gesturing to the authority of an emerging canon, as poets variously appropriated, challenged and revised tradition. It would be illuminating to extend this study further and explore how such allusive marking continued into Attic drama and prose, corpora where scholars have identified

---

[3] Archilochus: Seidensticker (1978); Swift (2012), (2019) 21–24; Nelson (2021b). Hipponax: Degani (1984) 187–205; Miralles and Pòrtulas (1988) 77–83; Rosen (1990a); Carey (2008) 95–9; Steiner (2009), (2011); Cazzato (2015); Alexandrou (2016a); Hawkins (2016). Though note the caution of Prodi (2017b) and Kelly (forthcoming a).

[4] Cf. Alexandrou (2016b) 211.

330

a similar process of (often agonistic) intertextuality.[5] However, by focusing here on the most controversial period of allusion in the ancient Graeco-Roman world, we have been able to establish a stronger case for continuity. The deep presence of indices in archaic Greek poetry requires us to reconsider the capabilities of archaic poetics and to keep rethinking many established narratives of ancient literary history. From Homer onwards, archaic poets indexed a host of other texts and traditions. In this, as in so many other respects, they marked a path for later generations to follow.

---

[5] Tragedy: Garner (1990); Swift (2010); Torrance (2013). Comedy: Kugelmeier (1996); Montana (2009); Zogg (2014); Farmer (2017). Prose histories: Condilo (2017). Also relevant would be philosophers' (mis)quotations of poets: Labarbe (1949); Tarrant (1951); Benardete (1963); Lohse (1964), (1965), (1967); Halliwell (2000); Yamagata (2012).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Texts and Editions

Unless otherwise noted, I follow the text and enumeration of the following editions. For authors or texts not listed, I have used the editions available on *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/) and *PHI Latin Texts* (https://latin.packhum.org/).[1]

Archaic Epic: *Iliad*: Monro and Allen (1920). *Odyssey*: von der Mühll (1962). Homeric scholia: Erbse (1969–88) for the *Iliad*, with van Thiel (2014) for the Iliadic D scholia; Pontani (2007–) for *Od.* 1–10; Dindorf (1855) for the remainder of the *Odyssey.* Eustathius: van der Valk (1971–87) for the *Iliad*, Cullhed and Olson (2020–) for the *Odyssey.* Homeric Hymns, Apocrypha and *Vitae*: West (2003a). Epic fragments: West (2003b) [*GEF*]. Hesiod: Solmsen (1990). Hesiodic fragments: Merkelbach and West (1967), revised *apud* Solmsen (1990). Hesiodic scholia: Pertusi (1955) for the *Works and Days*, Di Gregorio (1975) for the *Theogony.*

Archaic Lyric: Iambic and elegiac poets: West (1989–92) [*IEG*], with Archilochus' Telephus elegy as fr. 17a (following Swift (2019)). Alcman and Ibycus: Davies (1988) [*PMGF*]. Stesichorus: Davies and Finglass (2014). Sappho: Neri (2021). Alcaeus: Voigt (1971). Anacreon: Page (1962) [*PMG*]. Simonides: Page (1962) for lyric [*PMG*], West (1989–92) for elegy [*IEG*], Poltera (2008) for *testimonia*. Pindar: Race (1997) for the epinicians, Snell and Maehler (1987–89) II for the fragments. Pindaric scholia: Drachmann (1997). Bacchylides: Maehler (2003).

Greek Drama: Aeschylus: Page (1972). Sophocles: Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1990). Sophoclean scholia: Xenis (2010a) for the *Electra*, Xenis (2010b) for the *Trachiniae*, Papageorgiou (1888) for the *Philoctetes*. Euripides: Diggle (1981–94). Euripidean scholia: Schwartz (1887–91). Tragic fragments: Snell et al. (1971–2004) [*TrGF*]. Aristophanes: Wilson (2007). Aristophanic scholia: Koster and Holwerda (1960–2007). Comic fragments: Kassel and Austin (1983–) [K–A].

Hellenistic Poetry: Aratus: Kidd (1997). Theocritus: Gow (1952). Theocritean scholia: Wendel (1914). Callimachus: Harder (2012) for the *Aetia*, Hollis (2009) for the *Hecale*, Pfeiffer (1949–53) for the remainder. Apollonius of Rhodes: Vian (1976–81). Apollonian scholia: Lachenaud (2010). Eratosthenes: Berger (1964) for geographical fragments. Euphorion: Lightfoot (2009). Lycophron: Hornblower (2015). Scholia on Lycophron: Leone (2002) for the

---

[1] All URLs in this Bibliography were last accessed in September 2022.

332

Bibliography

scholia vetera [Σ], Scheer (1958) for Tzetzes [Tzetz.]. Nicander: Gow and Scholfield (1953).

Other Greek Authors: Early Greek philosophers: Laks and Most (2016) [L–M]. Early Greek mythographers: Fowler (2000–13) [*EGM*]. Ion of Chios: Leurini (2000). Gorgias: Buchheim (1989). Alcidamas: Avezzù (1982). Aristotelian fragments: Rose (1886). Epicurus: Arrighetti (1973). Diodorus Siculus: Vogel and Fischer (1964–69). Strabo: Radt (2002–11). Apollodorus: Frazer (1921). Pausanias: Rocha-Pereira (1989–90). Philostratus: Fairbanks (1931) for both *Imagines*, Jones (2005) for the *Vita Apollonii*, Rusten and König (2014) for the *Heroicus*.

Latin Authors: Ennius' *Annals*: Skutsch (1985). Lucilius: Marx (1904–5). Catullus: Mynors (1958). Horace: Shackleton Bailey (1995). Propertius: Heyworth (2007). Virgil: Mynors (1969). Servius: Thilo and Hagen (1881–1902). Ovid: Ramírez de Verger (2003) for the *Amores* and *Ars Amatoria*, Alton et al. (2005) for the *Fasti*; Dörrie (1971) for the *Heroides*; Tarrant (2004) for the *Metamorphoses*. Lucan: Shackleton Bailey (1997). Statius: Dilke (1954) for the *Achilleid*, Hill (1996) for the *Thebaid*. Statian scholia: Sweeney (1997).

Works Cited

Abramowicz, S. (1937) *Études sur les hymnes homériques* (Rozprawy i materiały wydzialu i Towarzystwa przyjaciol Nauk w Wilnie 9.1) (Vilnius)

Aceti, C. (2008) 'Sarpedone fra mito e poesia', in L. Pagani (ed.), *Eroi nell'Iliade: Personaggi e strutture narrative* (Pleiadi 8) (Rome) 1–269

Adkin, N. (2011) 'Sinon on His "Pal" Palamedes (Virgil, *Aeneid* II 81–104)', *ACD* 47, 155–65

Adkins, A. W. H. (1985) *Poetic Craft in the Early Greek Elegists* (Chicago)

Adorjáni, Z. (2014) *Pindars sechste olympische Siegesode: Text, Einleitung und Kommentar* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 370) (Leiden)

Adrados, F. R. (1964) 'El tema del aguila, de la epica acadia a Esquilo', *Emerita* 32, 267–82

Agócs, P. A. (2009) 'Memory and Forgetting in Pindar's Seventh *Isthmian*', in L. Doležalová (ed.), *Strategies of Remembrance: From Pindar to Hölderlin* (Newcastle) 33–92

  (2011) 'Talking Song in Early Greek Poetry' (PhD Thesis, University College London)

Agócs, P. A., Carey, C. and Rawles, R. J. (eds.) (2012) *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge)

d'Agostino, B. and Ridgway, D. (eds.) (1994) Ἀποικία: *Scritti in onore di G. Buchner* (*AION (archeol.)* I) (Naples)

Alden, M. J. (2000) *Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the* Iliad (Oxford)
  (2017) *Para-Narratives in the* Odyssey: *Stories in the Frame* (Oxford)

333

Bibliography

Alexandrou, M. (2016a) 'Hipponax and the *Odyssey*: Subverting Text and Intertext', in A. Efstathiou and I. Karamanou (eds.), *Homeric Receptions across Generic and Cultural Contexts* (Berlin) 31–44

(2016b) 'Mythological Narratives in Hipponax', in Swift and Carey (2016) 210–28

Allan, W. (2006) 'Divine Justice and Cosmic Order in Early Greek Epic', *JHS* 126, 1–35

(2008a) 'Performing the Will of Zeus: The Διὸς βουλή and the Scope of Early Greek Epic', in Revermann and Wilson (2008) 204–16

(2008b) *Euripides:* Helen (Cambridge)

(2019) *Greek Elegy and Iambus: A Selection* (Cambridge)

Allan, W. and Cairns, D. L. (2011) 'Conflict and Community in the *Iliad*', in N. Fisher and H. van Wees (eds.), *Competition in the Ancient World* (Swansea) 113–46

Allan, W. and Swift, L. A. (eds.) (2018) *Moralizing Strategies in Early Greek Poetry*, Mouseion 15.1, 1–147

Allen, A. (1993) *The Fragments of Mimnermus: Text and Commentary* (Palingenesia 44) (Stuttgart)

Allen, G. (2011² [2000¹]) *Intertextuality* (Abingdon)

Allen, T. W. (1924) *Homer: The Origins and the Transmission* (Oxford)

Allen, T. W., Halliday, W. R. and Sikes, E. E. (1936² [1904¹]) *The Homeric Hymns* (Oxford)

Almazova, N. (2020) 'Artistic Heritage of Polymnestus of Colophon', *Mnemosyne* 74.3, 357–70

Aloni, A. (1984) 'Un Archiloco "epico" in Teocrito?', *Museum Philologicum Londiniense* 6, 1–5

Aloni, A. and Ornaghi, M. (eds.) (2011) *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali: nuovi contributi* (Orione 4) (Messina)

Alton, E. H., Wormell, D. E. W. and Courtney, E. (2005⁴ [1978¹]) *P. Ovidius Naso: Fastorum Libri Sex* (Berlin)

Aluja, R. (2018) 'Comentari referencial al cant XI de l'*Odissea*: Un estudi de l'estètica de la poesia oral a partir de la teoria de la referencialitat tradicional' (PhD Thesis, University of Barcelona)

Álvarez, M. A. S. (2016) 'Theseus' and Pirithous' Catabasis in P. Ibscher Col.1 (Hes. fr. 280 Merkelbach–West = *Minyas* fr. 7 Bernabé)', in T. Derda, A. Lajtar and J. Urbanik (eds.), *Proceedings of the 27th International Congress of Papyrology: Warsaw, 29 July–3 August 2013* (3 vols.) (Warsaw) I 37–51

Alvoni, G. (2006) 'Nur Theseus oder auch Peirithoos? Zur Hypothese des Pseudo-Euripideischen *Peirithoos*', *Hermes* 134.3, 290–300

Alwine, A. T. (2009) 'The Non-Homeric Cyclops in the Homeric *Odyssey*', *GRBS* 49.3, 323–33

Andersen, Ø. (1978) *Die Diomedesgestalt in der* Ilias (*SO* Suppl. 25) (Oslo)

(1987) 'Myth, Paradigm and "Spatial Form" in the *Iliad*', in J. M. Bremer, I. J. F. de Jong and J. Kalff (eds.), *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry. Recent Trends in Homeric Interpretation* (Amsterdam) 1–13

334

Bibliography

(1990) 'The Making of the Past in the *Iliad*', *HSCP* 93, 25–45

(1998) 'Allusion and the Audience of Homer', in M. Païsi-Apostolopoulou (ed.), *Homerica: Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on the Odyssey (1–5 September 1996)* (Ithaca) 137–49

(2012) 'Older Heroes and Earlier Poems: The Case of Heracles in the *Odyssey*', in Andersen and Haug (2012) 138–51

Andersen, Ø. and Haug, D. T. T. (eds.) (2012) *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Cambridge)

Anderson, M. J. (1997) *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art* (Oxford)

Année, M. (2010) 'Pouvoir du λόγος et λόγος d'un pouvoir chez Tyrtée', in E. Bona and M. Curnis (eds.), *Linguaggi del potere, poteri del linguaggio: Atti del Colloquio internazionale del P.A.R.S.A. (Torino, 6–8 Novembre 2008)* (Culture Antiche. Studi e Testi 23) (Alessandria) 79–85

Apthorp, M. J. (1980) 'The Obstacles to Telemachus' Return', *CQ* 30.1, 1–22

Arft, J. (2019) '*Agnoēsis* and the Death of Odysseus in the *Odyssey* and the *Telegony*', *YAGE* 3, 158–79

(2021) 'Repetition or Recurrence? A Traditional Use for ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει in Archaic Greek Poetry', in D. Beck (2021) 8–43

(2022) *The Queen and Her Question: Arete and the* Odyssey*'s Poetics of Interrogation* (Oxford)

Armstrong, R. (2006) *Cretan Women: Pasiphae, Ariadne, and Phaedra in Latin Poetry* (Oxford)

Arrighetti, G. (1973² [1960¹]) *Epicuro: Opere* (Biblioteca di cultura filosofica 41) (Turin)

(1996) 'Hésiode et les Muses: Le don de la vérité et la conquête de la parole', in F. Blaise, P. Judet de La Combe and P. Rousseau (eds.), *Le métier du mythe: lectures d'Hésiode* (Cahiers de philologie 16) (Villeneuve d'Ascq) 53–70

(1998) *Esiodo, Opere: testi introdotti, tradotti e commentati* (Biblioteca della Pléiade 27) (Turin)

Athanassaki, L. (2004) 'Deixis, Performance, and Poetics in Pindar's *First Olympian Ode*', in Felson (2004c) 317–41

(2012) 'Performance and Re-performance: The Siphnian Treasury Evoked (Pindar's *Pythian* 6, *Olympian* 2 and *Isthmian* 2)', in Agócs, Carey and Rawles (2012) 134–57

Athanassaki, L. and Bowie, E. L. (eds.) (2011) *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics and Dissemination* (*TC* Suppl. 10) (Berlin)

Atkin, A. (2005) 'Peirce on the Index and Indexical Reference', *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 41.1, 161–88

Aubriot, D. (2003) 'Autour de quelques fêtes épiques et lyriques: Homère et Pindare', in A. Motte and C.-M. Ternes (eds.), *Dieux, fêtes, sacré dans la Grèce et la Rome antiques: actes du colloque tenu à Luxembourg du 24 au 26 octobre 1999* (Homo Religiosus, Série 2.2) (Turnhout) 53–80

Austin, C. and Olson, S. D. (2004) *Aristophanes:* Thesmophoriazusae (Oxford)

Austin, N. (1966) 'The Function of Digressions in the *Iliad*', *GRBS* 7.4, 295–312

335

(1972) 'Name Magic in the *Odyssey*', *CSCA* 5, 1–19 [= Doherty (2009) 91–110]

Avezzù, G. (1982) *Alcidamante: Orazioni e frammenti* (Bollettino dell'Istituto di filologia greca Suppl. 6) (Rome)

Azoulay, V. (2014) *Les Tyrannicides d'Athènes: Vie et mort de deux statues* (Paris)

Babut, D. (1975) 'Simonide moraliste', *REG* 88, 20–62

Bachvarova, M. R. (2016) *From Hittite to Homer: The Anatolian Background of Ancient Greek Epic* (Cambridge)

(2018) 'Formed on the Festival Stage: Plot and Characterization in the *Iliad* as a Competitive Collaborative Process', in Ready and Tsagalis (2018) 151–77

Bader, F. (1968) 'Note sur les emplois homériques de μιμνήσκομαι', *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes* 42, 49–53

Bakker, E. J. (2002) 'Remembering the God's Arrival', in Higbie (2002b) 63–81

(2008) 'Epic Remembering', in Mackay (2008) 65–77

(2009) 'Homer, Odysseus, and the Narratology of Performance', in Grethlein and Rengakos (2009) 117–36

(2013) *The Meaning of Meat and the Structure of the* Odyssey (New York)

(2017a) 'Trust and Fame: The Seal of Theognis', in Bakker (2017c) 99–121

(2017b) 'Hector (and) the Race Horse: The Telescopic Vision of the *Iliad*', in Tsagalis and Markantonatos (2017) 57–74

Bakker, E. J. (ed.) (2017c) *Authorship and Greek Song: Authority, Authenticity, and Performance* (Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song 3) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 402) (Leiden)

Bakker, E. J. and Kahane, A. (eds.) (1997) *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text* (Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia 1) (Cambridge, MA)

Bakola, E. (2008) 'The Drunk, the Reformer and the Teacher: Agonistic Poetics and the Construction of Persona in the Comic Poets of the Fifth Century', *CCJ* 54, 1–29

(2010) *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy* (Oxford)

Bal, M. (2017[4] [1985[1]]) *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (Toronto)

Baldi, A. (1961) 'Tracce del Mito di Etana in Archiloco ed Esopo', *Aevum(ant)* 35, 381–4

Ballabriga, A. (1989) 'La prophétie de Tirésias', *Mètis* 4.2, 291–304

(1990) 'Le dernier adversaire de Zeus. Le mythe de Typhon dans l'épopée grecque archaïque', *RHR* 207.1, 3–30

Ballesteros, B. (2020) 'Poseidon and Zeus in *Iliad* 7 and *Odyssey* 13: On a Case of Homeric Imitation', *Hermes* 148.3, 259–77

(2021a) 'On *Gilgamesh* and Homer: Isthar, Aphrodite and the Meaning of a Parallel', *CQ* 71.1, 1–21

(2021b) 'Fashioning Pandora: Ancient Near Eastern Creation Scenes and Hesiod', in Kelly and Metcalf (2021) 262–75

Bibliography

Bannert, H. (1988) *Formen des Wiederholens bei Homer: Beispiele für eine Poetik des Epos* (*WS* Beiheft 13) (Vienna)

Bär, S. (2009) *Quintus Smyrnaeus* Posthomerica *1: Die Wiedergeburt des Epos aus dem Geiste der Amazonomachie: mit einem Kommentar zu den Versen 1–219* (Hypomnemata 183) (Göttingen)

    (2016) '"Ceci n'est pas un fragment": Identity, Intertextuality and Fictionality in Sappho's "Brothers Poem"', *SO* 90.1, 8–54

    (2018) *Herakles im griechischen Epos: Studien zur Narrativität und Poetizität eines Helden* (Stuttgart)

    (2019) 'Heracles in Homer and Apollonius: Narratological Character Analysis in a Diachronic Perspective', *SO* 93.1, 106–31

Baraz, Y. and van den Berg, C. S. (eds.) (2013) *Intertextuality and Its Discontents*, *AJP* 134.1, 1–148

Barchiesi, A. (1984) *La traccia del modello: Effetti omerici nella narrazione virgiliana* (Biblioteca di *MD* 1) (Pisa) [tr. as (2015)]

    (1986) 'Problemi d'interpretazione in Ovidio: Continuità delle storie, continuazione dei testi', *MD* 16, 77–107 [tr. as (2001) 9–28]

    (1993) 'Future Reflexive: Two Modes of Allusion and Ovid's *Heroides*', *HSCP* 95, 333–65 [= (2001) 105–27]

    (1995) 'Figure dell'intertestualità nell'epica romana', *Lexis* 13, 49–67 [tr. as (2001) 129–40]

    (2001) *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets* (London)

    (2015) *Homeric Effects in Vergil's Narrative* (Princeton) [tr. of (1984) by I. Marchesi and M. Fox]

Barker, E. T. E. (2008) 'Momos Advises Zeus: Changing Representations of *Cypria* Fragment 1', in E. Cingano and L. Milano (eds.), *Papers on Ancient Literatures: Greece, Rome and the Near East: Proceedings of the 'Advanced Seminar in the Humanities', Venice International University 2004–2005* (Padua) 33–73

    (2009) *Entering the Agōn: Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography and Tragedy* (Oxford)

    (2011) 'The *Iliad*'s Big Swoon: A Case of Innovation within the Epic Tradition?', *TC* 3.1, 1–17

    (2022) 'Die Another Day: Sarpedon, Aristodemos, and Homeric Intertextuality in Herodotus', in I. Matijašić (ed.), *Herodotus—The Most Homeric Historian?* (*Histos* Suppl. 14) (Oxford) 161–210

Barker, E. T. E. and Christensen, J. P. (2006) 'Flight Club: The New Archilochus Fragment and Its Resonance with Homeric Epic', *MD* 57, 9–41

    (2008) 'Oedipus of Many Pains: Strategies of Contest in the Homeric Poems', *Leeds International Classical Studies* 7.2, 1–30

    (2011) 'On Not Remembering Tydeus: Diomedes and the Contest for Thebes', *MD* 66, 9–43

Bibliography

(2014) 'Even Herakles Had to Die: Homeric "Heroism", Mortality and the Epic Tradition', in Tsagalis (2014c) 249–77

(2015) 'Odysseus's Nostos and the *Odyssey*'s Nostoi: Rivalry within the Epic Cycle', in Scafoglio (2015) 85–110

(2020) *Homer's Thebes: Epic Rivalries and the Appropriation of Mythical Pasts* (Hellenic Studies 84) (Washington, DC)

(2021) 'Epic', in Ogden (2021) 283–300

Barner, W. (1967) *Neuere Alkaios-Papyri aus Oxyrhynchos* (Spudasmata 14) (Hildesheim)

Barnes, T. G. (2011) 'Homeric ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην', *JHS* 131, 1–13

Barrett, W. S. (2007a) 'Stesichoros and the Story of Geryon', in Barrett (2007c) 1–24

(2007b) 'Two Studies in Pindaric Metre', in Barrett (2007c) 118–206

(2007c) *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, and Textual Criticism: Collected Papers* (ed. M. L. West) (Oxford)

Barringer, J. M. (1996) 'Atalanta as Model: The Hunter and the Hunted', *ClAnt* 15.1, 48–76

Barron, J. P. (1969) 'Ibycus: *To Polycrates*', *BICS* 16, 119–49

Barthes, R. (1990) *S/Z* (Malden, MA) [tr. by R. Miller]

Bassino, P. (2019) *The* Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi: *A Commentary* (Texte und Kommentare 59) (Berlin)

Bassino, P., Canevaro, L. G. and Graziosi, B. (eds.) (2017) *Conflict and Consensus in Early Hexameter Poetry* (Cambridge)

Bastianini, G. and Casanova, A. (eds.) (2007) *I papiri di Saffo e di Alceo. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Firenze, 8–9 giugno 2006* (Studi e Testi di Papirologia 9) (Florence)

Baumbach, M. (2012) 'Borderline Experience with Genre: The Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite* between Epic, Hymn and Epyllic Poetry', in Baumbach and Bär (2012) 135–48

Baumbach, M. and Bär, S. (eds.) (2012) *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Epyllion and Its Reception* (Leiden)

Baurain, C. (1992) 'Héraclès dans l'épopée homérique', in C. Bonnet and C. Jourdain-Annequin (eds.), *Héraclès: D'une rive à l'autre de la Méditerranée: bilan et perspectives* (Études de philologie, d'archéologie et d'histoire anciennes 28) (Brussels) 67–109

Beazley, J. D. (1947) 'The Rosi Krater', *JHS* 67, 1–9

(1986² [1951¹]) *The Development of Attic Black-Figure* (Sather Classical Lectures 24) (Berkeley)

Beck, B. (2020) 'Reassessing the Scholiastic Evidence for the Cretan *Odyssey* Theory', *TAPA* 150.2, 357–78

Beck, B., Kelly, A. and Phillips, T. (2021) 'Introduction', *BICS* 64, 1–5

Beck, D. (2005a) *Homeric Conversation* (Hellenic Studies 14) (Washington, DC)

(2005b) 'Odysseus: Narrator, Storyteller, Poet?', *CP* 100.3, 213–27

338

(2019) 'Prophecies in Greek Epic', in S. Finkmann and C. Reitz (eds.), *Structures of Epic Poetry.* Vol. II.2: *Configuration* (Berlin) 597–614

Beck, D. (ed.) (2021) *Repetition, Communication, and Meaning in the Ancient World* (Orality and Literacy in the Ancient World 13) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 442) (Leiden)

Beecroft, A. J. (2006) '"This Is Not a True Story": Stesichorus's *Palinode* and the Revenge of the Epichoric', *TAPA* 136.1, 47–69

(2008) 'Nine Fragments in Search of an Author: Poetic Lines Attributed to Terpander', *CJ* 103.3, 225–41

(2010) *Authorship and Cultural Identity in Early Greece and China: Patterns of Literary Circulation* (Cambridge)

Benardete, S. (1963) 'Some Misquotations of Homer in Plato', *Phronesis* 8.2, 173–8

Benelli, L. (2017) *Sapphostudien zu ausgewählten fragmenten* (2 vols.) (Paderborn)

Bener, F. (1945) *Die Amphiaraossage in der griechischen Dichtung* (Chur)

Berger, E. H. (1964) *Die geographischen Fragmente des Eratosthenes* (Amsterdam)

Bergren, A. L. T. (1981) 'Helen's "Good Drug"', in S. Kresic (ed.), *Contemporary Literary Hermeneutics and Interpretation of Classical Texts* (Ottawa) 200–14 [= (2008) 111–30; Doherty (2009) 314–35]

(2008) *Weaving Truth: Essays on Language and the Female in Greek Thought* (Hellenic Studies 19) (Washington, DC)

Berman, D. W. (2015) *Myth, Literature and the Creation of the Topography of Thebes* (Cambridge)

Bernabé, A. (1987–2007) *Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum. Testimonia et Fragmenta* (4 vols.) (Stuttgart, Munich and Berlin)

Bernsdorff, H. (2014) 'Notes on P. Mich. inv. 3498 + 3250b recto, 3250a and 3250c recto (List of Lyric and Tragic Incipits)', *APF* 60.1, 3–11

(2020) *Anacreon of Teos: Testimonia and Fragments* (2 vols.) (Oxford)

Bershadsky, N. (2011) 'A Picnic, a Tomb, and a Crow: Hesiod's Cult in the *Works and Days*', *HSCP* 106, 1–45

Bethe, E. (1966 [1929¹]) *Der troische Epenkreis* (Stuttgart)

Bettarini, L. (2007) 'Note esegetiche alla nuova Saffo: I versi di Titono (fr. 58, 19–22 V.)', *ZPE* 159, 1–10

Bettenworth, A. (2014) 'Sapphos Amme: Ein Beitrag zum neuen Sapphofragment (Brothers Poem)', *ZPE* 191, 15–19

Bierl, A. (2016) '"All You Need is Love": Some Thoughts on the Structure, Texture, and Meaning of the Brothers Song as well as on Its Relation to the Kypris Song (P. Sapph. Obbink)', in Bierl and Lardinois (2016) 302–36

Bierl, A. and Lardinois, A. P. M. H. (eds.) (2016) *The Newest Sappho: P. Sapph. Obbink and P.GC inv. 105, Frs. 1–4* (Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song 2) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 392) (Leiden)

Bibliography

Bierl, A., Schmitt, A. and Willi, A. (eds.) (2004) *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung: Festschrift für Joachim Latacz anlässlich seines 70. Geburtstages* (Munich)

Biggs, T. (2019) 'River Battles in Greek and Roman Epic', in S. Finkmann and C. Reitz (eds.), *Structures of Epic Poetry.* Vol. II.1: *Configuration* (Berlin) 355–90

Biles, Z. P. (2003) 'Perils of Song in Homer's *Odyssey*', *Phoenix* 57.3/4, 191–208
  (2011) *Aristophanes and the Poetics of Competition* (Cambridge)

Bing, P. (1990) 'A Pun on Aratus' Name in Verse 2 of the *Phainomena*?', *HSCP* 93, 281–5
  (2009) 'Allusion from the Broad, Well-Trodden Street: The *Odyssey* in Inscribed and Literary Epigram', in *The Scroll and the Marble: Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry* (Ann Arbor) 147–74
  (2012) 'A Proto-Epyllion? The Pseudo-Hesiodic Shield and the Poetics of Deferral', in Baumbach and Bär (2012) 177–97

Biondi, F. (2015) *Teagene di Reggio rapsodo e interprete di Omero* (Syncrisis 2) (Pisa)

Blaise, F. (1992) 'L'épisode de Typhée dans la *Théogonie* d'Hésiode (v. 820–885): la stabilisation du monde', *REG* 105, 349–70

Blondell, R. (2010) 'Refractions of Homer's Helen in Archaic Lyric', *AJP* 131.3, 349–91

Blößner, N. (2006) 'Relative Chronologie im frühgriechischen Epos: Eine empirische Methode und erste Ergebnisse', in A. Luther (ed.), *Geschichte und Fiktion in der homerischen* Odyssee (Zetemata 125) (Munich) 19–46

Blümer, W. (2001) *Interpretation archaischer Dichtung: Die mythologischen Partien der Erga Hesiods* (2 vols.) (Münster)

Bocksberger, S. M. (2021) *Telamonian Ajax: The Myth in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Oxford)

Boedeker, J. (1895) 'Pindari Carmen Isthmicum tertium num in duo carmina dividendum sit'(Thesis, Monasterii)

Boehringer, S. and Calame, C. (2016) 'Sappho and Kypris: "The Vertigo of Love" (P. Sapph. Obbink 21–29; P. Oxy. 1231, fr. 16)', in Bierl and Lardinois (2016) 353–67

Bolling, G. M. (1925) *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford)

Bölte, F. (1934) 'Ein pylisches Epos', *RhM* 83.4, 319–47

Bolton, J. D. P. (1962) *Aristeas of Proconnesus* (Oxford)

Borges, C. and Sampson, C. M. (eds.) (2012) *New Literary Papyri from the Michigan Collection: Mythographic Lyric and a Catalogue of Poetic First Lines* (Ann Arbor)

Borrelli, B., Colella, L. C., D'Angelo, M., Di Tuccio, A., Nicolardi, F. and Parisi, A. (2019) 'On the Michigan Ptolemaic Lyric Papyrus inv. 3498 + 3250b, 3250c, 3250a: New Readings and Remarks', *ZPE* 210, 21–53

340

Borthwick, E. K. (1985) *Odyssean Elements in the* Iliad (Inaugural lecture) (Edinburgh)

Bossi, F. (1973/74) 'Note al Nuovo Archiloco', *MCr* 8–9, 14–17

Bothmer, D. von (1957) *Amazons in Greek Art* (Oxford)

Bouvier, D. (1997) '"Mneme". Le peripezie della memoria greca', in S. Settis (ed.), *I Greci: storia, cultura, arte, società. 2: Una storia greca.* II*: Definizione* (Turin) 1131–46

(2002) *Le sceptre et la lyre. L'*Iliade *ou les héros de la mémoire* (Grenoble)

Bouxsein, H. (2020) 'That Would Have Been Better: Counterfactual Conditions in Homeric Character Speech', *Mnemosyne* 73.3, 353–76

Bowie, A. M. (2013) *Homer:* Odyssey *Books* XIII *and* XIV (Cambridge)

(2019) *Homer:* Iliad *Book* III (Cambridge)

Bowie, E. L. (1986) 'Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival', *JHS* 106, 13–35 [= (2021) 21–58; I. C. Rutherford (2019) 110–49]

(1993a) 'Greek Table-Talk before Plato', *Rhetorica* 11.4, 355–71 [= (2021) 119–34]

(1993b) 'Lies, Fiction and Slander in Early Greek Poetry', in C. Gill and T. P. Wiseman (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Exeter) 1–37 [= (2021) 85–118]

(2001) 'Ancestors of Historiography in Early Greek Elegy and Iambic Poetry?', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus* (Oxford) 45–66 [= (2021) 177–97]

(2008) 'Sex and Politics in Archilochos' Poetry', in Katsonopoulou, Petropoulos and Katsarou (2008) 133–43 [= (2021) 273–85]

(2010a) 'The Trojan War's Reception in Early Greek Lyric, Iambic and Elegiac Poetry', in L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke and N. Luraghi (eds.), *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece* (Stuttgart) 57–87 [= (2021) 466–97]

(2010b) 'Historical Narrative in Archaic and Early Classical Greek Elegy', in D. Konstan and K. A. Raaflaub (eds.), *Epic and History* (Oxford) 145–66 [= (2021) 391–415]

(2010c) 'Performing and Re-Performing Helen: Stesichorus' Palinode', in A. M. González de Tobia (ed.), *Mito y performance: De Grecia a la modernidad* (La Plata) 385–408 [= (2021) 498–516]

(2016a) 'Cultic Contexts for Elegiac Performance', in Swift and Carey (2016) 15–32 [= (2021) 683–99]

(2016b) 'How Did Sappho's Songs Get into the Male Sympotic Repertoire?', in Bierl and Lardinois (2016) 148–64 [= (2021) 717–32]

(2021) *Essays on Ancient Greek Literature and Culture*. Vol. I: *Greek Poetry before 400* BC (Cambridge)

Bowra, C. M. (1930) *Tradition and Design in the* Iliad (Oxford)

(1938) 'The Daughters of Asopus', *Hermes* 73.2, 213–21 [= (1953) 54–65]

(1940) 'Signs of Storm (Archilochus, fr. 56)', *CR* 54.3, 127–9

(1953) *Problems in Greek Poetry* (Oxford)

Bibliography

(1963) 'The Two Palinodes of Stesichorus', *CR* 13.3, 245–52

(1964) *Pindar* (Oxford)

Boyd, B. W. (2018) *Ovid's Homer: Authority, Repetition, Reception* (Oxford)

Braswell, B. K. (1971) 'Mythological Innovation in the *Iliad*', *CQ* 21.1, 16–26

(1977) 'Cassandra's Hair: A Linguistic Problem in Ibycus, *PMG* 303 (a)', *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 36, 9–17

(1988) *A Commentary on the* Fourth Pythian Ode *of Pindar* (Texte und Kommentare 14) (Berlin)

(1992) *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean One* (Fribourg)

(1998) *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine* (Texte und Kommentare 19) (Berlin)

Bremmer, J. N. (1988) 'La plasticité du mythe: Méléagre dans la poésie homérique', in C. Calame (ed.), *Métamorphoses du mythe en Grèce antique* (Religions en perspective 4) (Geneva) 37–56

(2015) 'Theseus' and Peirithoos' Descent into the Underworld', *LEC* 83, 35–49

Brenk, F. E. (1986) 'Dear Child: The Speech of Phoinix and the Tragedy of Achilleus in the Ninth Book of the *Iliad*', *Eranos* 84, 77–86

Brewster, H. (1997) *The River Gods of Greece: Myths and Mountain Waters in the Hellenic World* (London)

Brillante, C. (1992) 'Le Muse di Thamyris', *SCO* 41, 429–53

Brillet-Dubois, P. (2011) 'An Erotic *Aristeia*: The Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite* and Its Relation to the Iliadic Tradition', in Faulkner (2011) 105–32

Brockliss, W. (2017–18) 'Olympian Sound in the *Theogony* and the *Catalogue of Women*: Sweet Music and Disorderly Noise', *CJ* 113.2, 129–49

Broich, U. (1985) 'Formen der Markierung von Intertextualität', in U. Broich and M. Pfister (eds.), *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien* (Tübingen) 31–47

Brommer, F. (1973[3] [1956[1]]) *Vasenlisten zur griechischen Heldensage* (Marburg)

Brown, C. G. (2011) 'To the Ends of the Earth: Sappho on Tithonus', *ZPE* 178, 21–5

(2014) 'Vipers and Lost Youth: A Note on Old Age in Early Greek Epic', *CQ* 64.2, 825–8

(2018) 'Picturing a Truth: Beast Fable, Early Iambos, and Semonides on the Creation of Women', in Allan and Swift (2018) 29–47

Brügger, C., Stoevesandt, M. and Visser, E. (2010) *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar. Band II: Zweiter Gesang (B). Faszikel 2: Kommentar* (Berlin)

Brunori, S. (2011) 'Aiace, Achille e le armi tra epica arcaica e iconografia vascolare', in Aloni and Ornaghi (2011) 53–80

Buchheim, T. (1989) *Gorgias von Leontinoi: Reden, Fragmente und Testimonien* (Philosophische Bibliothek 404) (Hamburg)

Buchheit, V. (1963) *Vergil über die Sendung Roms: Untersuchungen zum Bellum Poenicum und zur Aeneis* (*Gymnasium* Beihefte 3) (Heidelberg)

Bibliography

Buchner, G. and Russo, C. F. (1955) 'La coppa di Nestore e un'iscrizione metrica da Pitecusa dell'VIII secolo av. Cr.', *RAL* 10, 215–34

Budelmann, F. (2009a) 'Introducing Greek Lyric', in Budelmann (2009b) 1–18

Budelmann, F. (ed.) (2009b) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge)

Budelmann, F. (2017) 'Performance, Reperformance, Preperformance: The Paradox of Repeating the Unique in Pindaric Epinician and Beyond', in Hunter and Uhlig (2017) 42–62

  (2018a) *Greek Lyric: A Selection* (Cambridge)

  (2018b) 'Lyric Minds', in Budelmann and Phillips (2018b) 235–56

Budelmann, F. and Phillips, T. (2018a) 'Introduction', in Budelmann and Phillips (2018b) 1–27

Budelmann, F. and Phillips, T. (eds.) (2018b) *Textual Events: Performance and the Lyric in Early Greece* (Oxford)

Buffière, F. (1980) *Éros adolescent: La pédérastie dans la Grèce antique* (Paris)

Burgess, D. L. (1993) 'Food, Sex, Money and Poetry in *Olympian* 1', *Hermes* 121.1, 35–44

Burgess, J. S. (1995) 'Achilles' Heel: The Death of Achilles in Ancient Myth', *ClAnt* 14.2, 217–43

  (1996) 'The Non-Homeric *Cypria*', *TAPA* 126, 77–99

  (2001a) *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* (Baltimore)

  (2001b) 'Coronis Aflame: The Gender of Mortality', *CP* 96.3, 214–27

  (2004a) 'Untrustworthy Apollo and the Destiny of Achilles: *Iliad* 24.55–63', *HSCP* 102, 21–40

  (2004b) 'Performance and the Epic Cycle', *CJ* 100.1, 1–23

  (2005) 'The Death of Achilles by Rhapsodes', in Rabel (2005) 119–34

  (2006) 'Neoanalysis, Orality, and Intertextuality: An Examination of Homeric Motif Transference', *Oral Tradition* 21.1, 148–89

  (2009) *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles* (Baltimore)

  (2010) 'The Hypertext of Astyanax', in Tsagalis (2010) 211–24

  (2012a) 'Intertextuality without Text in Early Greek Epic', in Andersen and Haug (2012) 168–83

  (2012b) 'Belatedness in the Travels of Odysseus', in Montanari, Rengakos and Tsagalis (2012) 269–90

  (2015a) *Homer* (London)

  (2015b) 'The Death of Odysseus in the *Odyssey* and the *Telegony*', in Scafoglio (2015) 111–22

  (2016) 'Origins and Reception of the Trojan Cycle', in Gallo (2016) 13–30

  (2017a) 'The Tale of Meleager in the *Iliad*', *Oral Tradition* 31.1, 51–76

  (2017b) 'The Apologos of Odysseus: Tradition and Conspiracy Theories', in Tsagalis and Markantonatos (2017) 95–120

  (2019a) 'Introduction', *YAGE* 3, 1–47

  (2019b) 'The Corpse of Odysseus', *YAGE* 3, 136–57

343

Bibliography

Burkert, W. (1960) 'Das Lied von Ares und Aphrodite: zum Verhältnis von Odyssee und Ilias', *RhM* 103.2, 130–44 [= (2001) 105–16; tr. as (1997)]

(1972) 'Die Leistung eines Kreophylos: Kreophyleer, Homeriden und die archaische Heraklesepik', *MH* 29.2, 74–85 [= (2001) 138–49]

(1976) 'Das hunderttorige Theben und die Datierung der Ilias', *WS* 89, 5–21 [= (2001) 59–71]

(1979) *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Sather Classical Lectures 47) (Berkeley)

(1984) *Die orientalisierende Epoche in der griechischen Religion und Literatur* (Heidelberg) [tr. as (1992)]

(1987) 'The Making of Homer in the Sixth Century B.C.: Rhapsodes versus Stesichoros', in *Papers on the Amasis Painter and his World* (Malibu, CA) 43–62 [= (2001) 198–217; Cairns (2001) 92–116]

(1992) *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* (Revealing Antiquity 5) (Cambridge, MA) [tr. of (1984) by M. E. Pinder and W. Burkert]

(1997) 'The Song of Ares and Aphrodite: On the Relationship between the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*', in Wright and Jones (1997) 249–62 [= Doherty (2009) 29–43; tr. of (1960) by G. M. Wright and P. V. Jones]

(2001) *Kleine Schriften* I*: Homerica* (ed. C. Riedweg) (Göttingen)

Burnett, A. P. (1979) 'Desire and Memory (Sappho Frag. 94)', *CP* 74.1, 16–27

(1983) *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho* (London)

(1985) *The Art of Bacchylides* (Cambridge, MA)

(2005) *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina* (Oxford)

Burris, S. P. (2017) 'A New Join for Sappho's "Kypris Poem": P.GC. inv. 105 fr. 4 and P. Sapph. Obbink', *ZPE* 201, 12–14

Burris, S. P., Fish, J. and Obbink, D. (2014) 'New Fragments of Book 1 of Sappho', *ZPE* 189, 1–28

Burrow, C. (2019) *Imitating Authors: Plato to Futurity* (Oxford)

Burton, D. (2011) 'Response and Composition in Archaic Greek Poetry', *Antichthon* 45, 58–76

Bury, J. B. (1890) *Pindar: The Nemean Odes, edited with Introductions and Commentary* (London)

Burzacchini, G. (2005) 'Fenomenologia innodica nella poesia di Saffo', *Eikasmos* 16, 11–39

(2007) 'Saffo frr.1, 2, 58 V. tra documentazione papiracea e tradizione indiretta', in Bastianini and Casanova (2007) 83–114

Caciagli, S. (2011) *Poeti e società: comunicazione poetica e formazioni sociali nella Lesbo del VII/VI secolo a.C.* (*Lexis* Suppl. 64) (Amsterdam)

Cairns, D. L. (2001a) 'Introduction', in Cairns (2001b) 1–56

Cairns, D. L. (ed.) (2001b) *Oxford Readings in Homer's* Iliad (Oxford)

Cairns, D. L. (2007) 'Dating *Nemean* 5 and Bacchylides 13: Criteria and Conclusions', *Nikephoros* 20, 33–47

344

Bibliography

(2010) *Bacchylides: Five Epinician Odes (3, 5, 9, 11, 13): Text, Introductory Essays, and Interpretative Commentary* (Cambridge)

Cairns, F. (1997) 'Ancient "Etymology" and Tibullus: On the Classification of "Etymologies" and on "Etymological Markers"', *PCPS* 42, 24–59

(2011) 'Money and the Poet: The First Stasimon of Pindar *Isthmian* 2', *Mnemosyne* 64.1, 21–36

Calame, C. (1977) *Les choeurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque* (2 vols.) (Filologia e critica 20–1) (Rome) [tr. as (2001)]

(1983) *Alcman: Introduction, texte critique, témoignages, traduction et commentaire* (Lyricorum Graecorum quae exstant 6) (Rome)

(1996) 'Sappho's Group: An Initiation into Womanhood', in Greene (1996) 113–24

(1997) 'Diction formulaire et fonction pratique de la poésie mélique archaïque', in F. Létoublon (ed.), *Hommage à Milman Parry: Le style formulaire de l'épopée homérique et la théorie de l'oralité poétique* (Amsterdam) 215–22

(2001² [1997¹]) *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece: Their Morphology, Religious Role and Social Functions* (Lanham, MD) [tr. of (1977) by D. Collins and J. Orion]

(2005) 'Une poétique de la mémoire: Espace et temps chez Sappho', in A. Kolde, A. Lukinovich and A.-L. Rey (eds.), κορυφαίῳ ἀνδρί: *Mélanges offerts à André Hurst* (Recherches et rencontres 22) (Geneva) 53–67

(2011) 'The Homeric Hymns as Poetic Offerings. Musical and Ritual Relationships with the Gods', in Faulkner (2011) 334–57

(2012) 'La memoria poetica nei canti di Saffo: Performance musicale e creazione sociale', in X. Riu and J. Pòrtulas (eds.), *Approaches to Archaic Greek Poetry* (Orione 5) (Messina) 45–97

(2016) 'The Amorous Gaze: A Poetic and Pragmatic *Koinê* for Erotic *Melos*?', in V. Cazzato and A. P. M. H. Lardinois (eds.), *The Look of Lyric: Greek Song and the Visual* (Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song 1) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 391) (Leiden) 288–306

Caliva, K. (2019) 'The Past Made Present: Mythic References and Pragmatic Effects in Sappho', *AJP* 140.3, 415–38

Cameron, A. (1995) 'Ancient Anagrams', *AJP* 116.3, 477–84

(2004) *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (American Classical Studies 48) (New York)

Campbell, D. A. (1982a [1967¹]) *Greek Lyric Poetry. A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry* (Bristol)

(1982b) *Greek Lyric I: Sappho and Alcaeus* (Loeb Classical Library 142) (Cambridge, MA)

Campbell, M. (1981) *Echoes and Imitations of Early Epic in Apollonius Rhodius* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 72) (Leiden)

Bibliography

Canevaro, L. G. (2015) *Hesiod's* Works and Days*: How to Teach Self-Sufficiency* (Oxford)

  (2018) *Women of Substance in Homeric Epic: Objects, Gender, Agency* (Oxford)

Cannatà Fera, M. (1986) 'Pindaro interprete di Omero in *Pyth*. 3, 81–2', *GIF* 38, 85–9

Cantieni, R. (1942) 'Die Nestorerzählung im xi. Gesang der Ilias (V 670–762)' (PhD Thesis, Zurich)

Cardin, M. (2010) 'L'*ehoia* di Egina e le Asopidi nel *Catalogo delle donne esiodeo*', in E. Cingano (ed.), *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali: generi poetici e storiografia* (Hellenica 34) (Alessandria) 151–210

Carey, C. (1981) *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar: Pythian 2, Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8* (New York)

  (1984) 'Theognidea 1283–1294', *PP* 39, 362–6

  (2008) 'Hipponax Narrator', *Acta Ant. Hung.* 48, 89–102

  (2011) 'Alcman: From Laconia to Alexandria', in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011) 437–60

  (2015) 'Stesichorus and the Epic Cycle', in Finglass and Kelly (2015) 45–62

  (2018) 'Narrative, Authority, and Blame', in Allan and Swift (2018) 7–27

Carnes, J. S. (1990) 'The Aiginetan Genesis of the Myrmidons: A Note on *Nemean* 3.13–16', *CW* 84.1, 41–4

Carpenter, T. H. (2021) 'The Tyrannicides: A New Approach to Text and Image', *G&R* 68.2, 208–21

Carpino, A. A. (1996) 'The Delivery of Helen's Egg: An Examination of an Etruscan Relief Mirror', *EtrStud* 3, 33–44

Carrara, L. (2011) '"The very worst that could have been chosen": la funzione dell'exemplum di Titono nell'Inno omerico ad Afrodite', in Aloni and Ornaghi (2011) 81–115

Carruesco, J. (2017) 'The Invention of Stesichorus: Hesiod, Helen, and the Muse', in Bakker (2017c) 178–96

Carson, A. (1986) *Eros the Bittersweet: An Essay* (Princeton)

Carvalho, S. (2022) *Mythical Narratives in Stesichorus: Greek Heroes on the Move* (*TC* Suppl. 115) (Berlin)

Cassio, A. C. (1994) 'Κεῖνος, καλλιστέφανος, e la circolazione dell'epica in area euboica', in d'Agostino and Ridgway (1994) 55–67

  (2002) 'Early Editions of the Greek Epics and Homeric Textual Criticism in the Sixth and Fifth Centuries BC', in Montanari and Ascheri (2002) 105–36

Castagnoli, L. and Ceccarelli, P. (eds.) (2019) *Greek Memories: Theories and Practices* (Cambridge)

Castellaneta, S. (2013) *Il seno svelato ad misericordiam: esegesi e fortuna di un'immagine omerica* (Biblioteca della tradizione classica 9) (Bari)

Catenacci, C. and Di Marzio, M. (2004) 'Il gallo di Urania (Bacchilide, *Epinicio* 4)', *QUCC* 76.1, 71–89

Cazzato, V. (2015) 'Hipponax' Poetic Initiation and Herodas' "Dream"', *CCJ* 61, 1–14

346

Bibliography

Cazzato, V., Obbink, D. and Prodi, E. E. (eds.) (2016) *The Cup of Song: Studies on Poetry and the Symposion* (Oxford)

Cazzato, V. and Prodi, E. E. (2016) 'Introduction: Continuity in the Sympotic Tradition', in Cazzato, Obbink and Prodi (2016) 1–16

Cesca, O. (2022) *Ripetizione e riformulazione nell'Iliade. La tecnica discorsiva dell'ἄγγελος nella rappresentazione omerica della comunicazione verbale a distanza* (MythosEikonPoiesis 15) (Berlin)

Chapouthier, F. (1942) 'Léda devant l'oeuf de Némésis', *BCH* 66, 1–21

Chaudhuri, P. (2014) *The War with God: Theomachy in Roman Imperial Poetry* (New York)

Chiarini, S. (2012) *L'archeologia dello Scutum Herculis* (Rome)

Christensen, J. P. (2015a) 'Diomedes' Foot Wound and the Homeric Reception of Myth', in González (2015b) 17–42

    (2015b) 'Time and Self-Referentiality in the *Iliad* and Frank Herbert's *Dune*', in B. M. Rogers and B. E. Stevens (eds.), *Classical Traditions in Science Fiction* (Oxford) 161–75

    (2018) '*Eris* and *Epos*: Composition, Competition, and the Domestication of Strife', *YAGE* 2, 1–39

    (2019) 'Revising Athena's Rage: Cassandra and the Homeric Appropriation of *Nostos*', *YAGE* 3, 88–116

Christopoulos, M. (2014) 'Odysseus, Diomedes, Dolon and Palamedes: Crimes of Mystery and Imagination', in M. Christopoulos and M. Païsi-Apostolopoulou (eds.), *Crime and Punishment in Homeric and Archaic Epic: Proceedings of the 12th International Symposium on the Odyssey, Ithaca, September 3–7, 2013* (Ithaca) 153–66

Cingano, E. (1990) 'Lo strano ingresso di Aiace nel *Catalogo delle donne* esiodeo', in A. Schachter (ed.), *Essays in the Topography, History and Culture of Boiotia* (*Teiresias* Suppl. 3) (Montreal) 111–17

    (1991) 'La data e l'occasione dell'encomio bacchilideo per Ierone (Bacchyl. fr. 20 C Sn.–M.)', *QUCC* 38.2, 31–4

    (2002–3) 'Riflessi dell'epos tebano in Omero e in Esiodo', *Incontri triestini di filologia classica* 2, 55–76

    (2005) 'A Catalogue within a Catalogue: Helen's Suitors in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (frr. 196–204)', in Hunter (2005) 118–52

    (2009) 'The Hesiodic Corpus', in Montanari, Rengakos and Tsagalis (2009) 91–130

    (2015) '*Epigonoi*', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (2015) 244–60

Clark, M. E. (1986) 'Neoanalysis: A Bibliographical Review', *CW* 79.6, 379–94

Clark, M. E. and Coulson, W. D. E. (1978) 'Memnon and Sarpedon', *MH* 35.2, 65–73

Clark, R. J. (1979) *Catabasis: Vergil and the Wisdom-Tradition* (Amsterdam)

Clarke, M. J. (2019) *Achilles beside Gilgamesh: Mortality and Wisdom in Early Epic Poetry* (Cambridge)

Bibliography

Clarke, M. J., Currie, B. G. F. and Lyne, R. O. A. M. (eds.) (2006) *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils* (Oxford)

Clay, J. S. (1982) 'Ἄκρα Γυρέων: Geography, Allegory, and Allusion (Archilochus Fragment 105 West)', *AJP* 103.2, 201–4

   (1997² [1983¹]) *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the* Odyssey (Lanham, MD)

   (2003) *Hesiod's Cosmos* (Cambridge)

   (2011a) *Homer's Trojan Theater: Space, Vision, and Memory in the* Iliad (Cambridge)

   (2011b) '*Olympians* 1–3: A Song Cycle?', in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011) 337–46

   (2016) 'Homer's Epigraph: *Iliad* 7.87–91', *Philologus* 160.2, 185–96

Clay, J. S., Malkin, I. and Tzifopoulos, Y. Z. (eds.) (2017) *Panhellenes at Methone: Graphê in Late Geometric and Protoarchaic Methone, Macedonia (ca. 700 BCE)* (*TC* Suppl. 44) (Berlin)

Clayman, D. L. (1993) 'Corinna and Pindar', in R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell (eds.), *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald* (Ann Arbor) 633–42

   (2009) *Timon of Phlius: Pyrrhonism into Poetry* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 98) (Berlin)

Clayton, B. (2004) *A Penelopean Poetics: Reweaving the Feminine in Homer's* Odyssey (Lanham, MD)

Clayton, J. and Rothstein, E. (1991) 'Figures in the Corpus: Theories of Influence and Intertextuality', in J. Clayton and E. Rothstein (eds.), *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History* (Madison, WI) 3–36

Clément-Tarantino, S. (2006a) '*Fama* ou la renommée du genre. Recherches sur la représentation de la tradition dans l'*Énéide*' (PhD Thesis, Charles de Gaulle University – Lille III)

   (2006b) 'La poétique romaine comme hybridation féconde. Les leçons de la greffe (Virgile, *Géorgiques*, 2, 9–82)', *Interférences – Ars Scribendi* 4, 1–26

Clerc, A. (2007) '*Loca*: lieux d'intertextualité et de réflexivité dans les *Métamorphoses* d'Ovide. Étude d'un marqueur lexical de l'allusion' (Master's Thesis, Charles de Gaulle University – Lille III)

Clua, J. A. (1985) 'El mite de Palamedes a la Grècia antiga: Aspectes canviants d'un interrogant cultural i històric', *Faventia* 7, 69–93

Coffee, N. (2013) 'Intertextuality in Latin Poetry', in *Oxford Bibliographies* (Online: https://doi.org/10.1093/OBO/9780195389661-0113)

Cohen, B. (ed.) (1995) *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's* Odyssey (New York)

Cole, S. (2008) 'Annotated Innovation in Euripides' *Ion*', *CQ* 58.1, 313–15

Cole, T. (2003) 'Pindar's Two Odes for Melissos of Thebes', in F. Benedetti and S. Grandolini (eds.), *Studi di filologia e tradizione greca in memoria di Aristide Colonna* (2 vols.) (Naples) 1 241–52

348

Bibliography

Colesanti, G. (2011) *Questioni teognidee: La genesi simposiale di un* corpus *di elegie* (Pleiadi 12) (Rome)

Collins, D. (1999) 'Hesiod and the Divine Voice of the Muses', *Arethusa* 32.3, 241–62

(2001) 'Homer and Rhapsodic Competition in Performance', *Oral Tradition* 16.1, 129–67

(2002) 'Reading the Birds: *Oiônomanteia* in Early Epic', *ColbyQ* 38.1, 17–41

(2004) *Master of the Game: Competition and Performance in Greek Poetry* (Hellenic Studies 7) (Washington, DC)

(2006) 'Corinna and Mythological Innovation', *CQ* 56.1, 19–32

Collins, L. (1987) 'The Wrath of Paris: Ethical Vocabulary and Ethical Type in the *Iliad*', *AJP* 108.2, 220–32

Combellack, F. M. (1950) 'Contemporary Unitarians and Homeric Originality', *AJP* 71.4, 337–64

(1976) 'Homer the Innovator', *CP* 71.1, 44–55

Condello, F. (2006) 'Theogn. 1123–1128', *Eikasmos* 17, 49–68

Condilo, C. (2017) 'Agonistic Intertextuality: Herodotus' Engagement with Hecataeus on Genealogies', *Journal of Ancient History* 5.2, 228–79

Conte, G. B. (1981) 'A proposito dei modelli in letteratura', *MD* 6, 147–60

(1985) *Memoria dei poeti e sistema letterario: Catullo, Virgilio, Ovidio, Lucano* (Turin) [tr. as (1986)]

(1986) *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 44) (Ithaca, NY) [tr. of (1985) by C. Segal]

(2017) *Stealing the Club from Hercules: On Imitation in Latin Poetry* (Berlin)

Conte, G. B. and Barchiesi, A. (1989) 'Imitazione e arte allusiva: Modi e funzioni dell'intertestualità', in G. Cavallo, P. Fedeli and A. Giardina (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica* (5 vols.) (Rome) I 81–114

Cook, E. F. (1992) 'The Ferrymen of Elysium: Nostratic Eschatology and the Homeric Phaeacians', *JIES* 20.3/4, 239–67

(1995) *The* Odyssey *in Athens: Myths of Cultural Origins* (Ithaca, NY)

(2000) Review of Malkin (1998), *BMCR* 2000.03.22

(2009a) '"Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὁμήρου', Review of Kelly (2007), *CR* 59.1, 14–16

(2009b) 'On the "Importance" of *Iliad* Book 8', *CP* 104.2, 133–61

(2020) 'Mythic Background', in Pache (2020) 62–9

Coote, M. P. (1981) 'Lying in Passages', *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 15.1, 5–23

Corrêa, P. da C. (2007) 'A Human Fable and the Justice of Beasts in Archilochus', in Finglass, Collard and Richardson (2007) 101–17

Cowan, R. (2011) 'Sinon and the Case of the Hypermetric Oracle', *Phoenix* 65.3/4, 361–70

(2017) 'Ovid, Virgil and the Echoing Rocks of the Two Scyllas', *CCJ* 63, 11–28

(2019) 'Don't Panic at this Hispanic: Politics and Palindromes in *Georgics* 3', *Mnemosyne* 72.2, 340–7

349

Bibliography

Coward, T. R. P. (2013) Review of Curtis (2011), *JHS* 133, 163–5

Crane, G. (1987) 'The *Odyssey* and Conventions of the Heroic Quest', *ClAnt* 6.1, 11–37

  (1988) *Calypso: Backgrounds and Conventions of the* Odyssey (Frankfurt am Main)

Crissy, K. (1997) 'Herakles, Odysseus, and the Bow: *Odyssey* 21.11–41', *CJ* 93.1, 41–53

Cristóbal, A. J. S. (2009) 'The Meaning of βάκχος and βακχεύειν in Orphism', in G. Casadio and P. A. Johnston (eds.), *Mystic Cults in Magna Graecia* (Austin, TX) 46–60

Crusius, O. (1889) 'Der homerische Dionysoshymnus und die Legende von der Verwandlung der Tyrsener', *Philologus* 48.2, 193–228

Culler, J. D. (2001 [1981¹]) *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (London)

  (2002 [1975¹]) *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature* (London)

Cullhed, E. and Olson, S. D. (2020–) *Eustathius of Thessalonica, Commentary on the* Odyssey (Leiden) (Online: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2772-3216)

Curley, D. (2013) *Tragedy in Ovid: Theater, Metatheater, and the Transformation of a Genre* (Cambridge)

Currie, B. G. F. (2005) *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford)

  (2006) 'Homer and the Early Epic Tradition', in Clarke, Currie and Lyne (2006) 1–45

  (2012) 'The *Iliad*, *Gilgamesh*, and Neoanalysis', in Montanari, Rengakos and Tsagalis (2012) 543–80

  (2013) 'The Pindaric First Person in Flux', *ClAnt* 32.2, 243–82

  (2015) '*Cypria*', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (2015) 281–305

  (2016) *Homer's Allusive Art* (Oxford)

  (2019) 'The *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and Narratological Intertextuality', *SO* 93.1, 157–88

  (2020) 'The Birth of Literary Criticism (Herodotus 2.116–17) and the Roots of Homeric Neoanalysis', in Price and Zelnick-Abramovitz (2020) 147–70

  (2021a) 'Etana in Greece', in Kelly and Metcalf (2021) 126–44

  (2021b) *Herodotus as Homeric Critic* (*Histos* Suppl. 13) (Oxford)

  (2021c) 'Intertextuality in Early Greek Poetry: The Special Case of Epinician', *TC* 13.2, 289–362

  (2021d) 'Typhoeus and Etna in Hesiod, Pindar, and (Pseudo-)Aeschylus', in Prodi and Vecchiato (2021) 77–105

Curtis, P. (2011) *Stesichoros's* Geryoneis (Leiden)

Dale, A. (2015) 'The Green Papyrus of Sappho (*P.GC* inv. 105) and the Order of Poems in the Alexandrian Edition', *ZPE* 196, 17–30

D'Alessio, G. B. (2004) 'Past Future and Present Past: Temporal Deixis in Greek Archaic Lyric', in Felson (2004c) 267–94

350

Bibliography

(2005a) 'The *Megalai Ehoiai*: A Survey of the Fragments', in Hunter (2005) 176–216

(2005b) 'Ordered from the Catalogue: Pindar, Bacchylides, and Hesiodic Genealogical Poetry', in Hunter (2005) 217–38

(2019) 'Textual Notes on the "Newest" Sappho (on Sappho, Fragments 5, 9, 17 V., and the *Kypris Poem*)', *ZPE* 211, 18–31

(2022) 'Physical Lay-out, Material Damages and the Reconstruction of Fragmentary Texts: Two Case Studies from Lyric Poetry', in M. Alexandrou, C. Carey and G. B. D'Alessio (eds.), *Song Regained: Working with Greek Poetic Fragments* (Sozomena 20) (Berlin) 175–96

Dalley, S. and Reyes, A. T. (1998) 'Mesopotamian Contact and Influence in the Greek World: 1. To the Persian Conquest', in S. Dalley (ed.), *The Legacy of Mesopotamia* (Oxford) 85–106

Damon, C. and Pieper, C. (eds.) (2019) *Eris vs. Aemulatio: Valuing Competition in Classical Antiquity* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 423) (Leiden)

Danek, G. (1994/95) 'Der Nestorbecher von Ischia, epische Zitiertechnik und das Symposion', *WS* 107–8, 29–44

(1998) *Epos und Zitat: Studien zu den Quellen der Odyssee* (*WS* Beiheft 22) (Vienna)

(2002) 'Traditional Referentiality and Homeric Intertextuality', in Montanari and Ascheri (2002) 3–19

(2005) 'Antenor und die Bittgesandtschaft: Ilias, Bakchylides 15 und der Astarita-Krater', *WS* 118, 1–17

(2006) 'Antenor und seine Familie in der Ilias', *WS* 119, 5–22

(2010) 'Agamemnon's Ancestors and Ruža's Bridegroom: *Il.* 2.99–109 and a Bosnian Parallel', in Tsagalis (2010) 225–38

(2016) 'Modes of Intertextuality in Homer and Bosnian Epic', in Gallo (2016) 123–45

D'Arms, E. F. and Hulley, K. K. (1946) 'The Oresteia-Story in the *Odyssey*', *TAPA* 77, 207–13

Davies, M. (1986a) 'Prolegomena and Paralegomena to a New Edition (with Commentary) of the Fragments of Early Greek Epic', *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse* 2, 91–111

(1986b) 'The Motif of the πρῶτος εὑρετής in Alcman', *ZPE* 65, 25–7

(1986c) 'Alcaeus, Thetis and Helen', *Hermes* 114.3, 257–62

(1988) *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta.* Vol. 1: *Alcman, Stesichorus, Ibycus* (Oxford)

(1989) *The Epic Cycle* (Bristol)

(2000) 'Homer and Dionysus', *Eikasmos* 11, 15–27

(2014) *The Theban Epics* (Hellenic Studies 69) (Washington, DC)

(2016) *The Aethiopis: Neo-Neoanalysis Reanalyzed* (Hellenic Studies 71) (Washington, DC)

(2019) *The Cypria* (Hellenic Studies 83) (Washington, DC)

Bibliography

    (2020) *Lesser and Anonymous Fragments of Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary* (Oxford)

Davies, M. and Finglass, P. (2014) *Stesichorus: The Poems* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 54) (Cambridge)

Davison, J. A. (1938) 'Alcman's Partheneion', *Hermes* 73.4, 440–58 [= (1968) 146–72]

    (1955a) 'Quotations and Allusions in Early Greek Literature', *Eranos* 53, 125–40 [= (1968) 70–85]

    (1955b) 'Peisistratus and Homer', *TAPA* 86, 1–21

    (1968) *From Archilochus to Pindar: Papers on Greek Literature of the Archaic Period* (London)

Debiasi, A. (2008) *Esiodo e l'occidente* (Hesperìa 24) (Rome)

DeBrohun, J. B. (2007) 'Catullan Intertextuality: Apollonius and the Allusive Plot of Catullus 64', in M. B. Skinner (ed.), *A Companion to Catullus* (Malden, MA) 293–313

Degani, E. (1984) *Studi su Ipponatte* (Studi e commenti 2) (Bari)

Dell'Oro, F. (2013) 'Après l'inscription de la coupe de Nestor: disposition du texte et formes de transtextualité dans les épigrammes de l'époque archaïque en Grande Grèce et Sicile', *Gaia* 16, 307–32

Dell'Oro, F. and Lagacherie, O. (eds.) (2015) *Πολυφόρβῃ Γαίῃ: Mélanges de littérature et linguistique offerts à Françoise Létoublon* (*Gaia* 18) (Grenoble)

Denniston, J. D. (1954² [1934¹]) *The Greek Particles* (Oxford)

Deremetz, A. (2005) 'L'histoire du genre épique dans les catabases de Virgile, d'Ovide et de Silius Italicus', in J. P. Schwindt (ed.), *La représentation du temps dans la poésie augustéenne* (Heidelberg) 111–21

Detienne, M. (1967) *Les maîtres de vérité dans la Grèce archaïque* (Paris) [tr. as (1996)]

    (1977) *Dionysos mis à mort* (Paris) [tr. as (1979)]

    (1979) *Dionysos Slain* (Baltimore) [tr. of (1977) by M. Muellner and L. Muellner]

    (1996) *The Masters of Truth in Archaic Greece* (New York) [tr. of (1967) by J. Lloyd]

Di Benedetto, V. (1973) 'Il volo di Afrodite in Omero e in Saffo', *QUCC* 16, 121–3

    (1994¹ [1998²]) *Nel laboratorio di Omero* (Turin)

    (2001) 'Reuses of Iliadic Patterns in the *Odyssey*', *RCCM* 43.1, 7–14

Di Gregorio, L. (1975) *Scholia vetera in Hesiodi Theogoniam* (Scienze filologiche e letteratura 6) (Milan)

Dickey, E. (2007) *Ancient Greek Scholarship: A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period* (New York)

Dickson, K. M. (1992) 'Kalkhas and Nestor: Two Narrative Strategies in *Iliad* 1', *Arethusa* 25.3, 327–58

352

Bibliography

    (1995) *Nestor: Poetic Memory in Greek Epic* (Albert Bates Lord Studies in Oral Tradition 16) (New York)

Dietrich, B. C. (1965) *Death, Fate and the Gods: The Development of a Religious Idea in Greek Popular Belief and in Homer* (University of London Classical Studies 3) (London)

Diggle, J. (1981–94) *Euripidis Fabulae* (3 vols.) (Oxford)

    (1983) 'Corinna's Bed (*Amores* 2.11.7)', *PCPS* 29, 21–2

Dihle, A. (1968) *Der Kanon der zwei Tugenden* (Cologne)

    (1969) 'Die Inschrift vom Nestor-Becher aus Ischia', *Hermes* 97.3, 257–61

    (1970) *Homer-Probleme* (Opladen)

Dijk, G.-J. van (1997) Αἶνοι, Λόγοι, Μῦθοι: *Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature. With a Study of the Theory and Terminology of the Genre* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 166) (Leiden)

Dilke, O. A. W. (1954) *Statius: Achilleid. Edited with Introduction, Apparatus Criticus and Notes* (Cambridge)

Dindorf, W. (1855) *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam* (2 vols.) (Oxford)

Dodds, E. R. (1960) *Euripides:* Bacchae (Oxford)

Doherty, L. E. (ed.) (2009) *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Homer's* Odyssey (Oxford)

Dornseiff, F. (1938) 'Zum homerischen Hermeshymnos', *RhM* 87.1, 80–4

Dörrie, H. (1971) *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroidum* (Texte und Kommentare 6) (Berlin)

Dougherty, C. (2001) *The Raft of Odysseus: The Ethnographic Imagination of Homer's* Odyssey (New York)

Dougherty, C. and Kurke, L. (eds.) (1993) *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics* (Cambridge)

Dova, S. (2012) *Greek Heroes in and out of Hades* (Lanham, MD)

    (2015) 'Theseus, Peirithoos, and the Poetics of a Failed *Katábasis*', *LEC* 83, 51–68

Dover, K. J. (1993) *Aristophanes:* Frogs (Oxford)

Dowden, K. (1996) 'Homer's Sense of Text', *JHS* 116, 47–61

    (2004) 'The Epic Tradition in Greece', in Fowler (2004b) 188–205

Drachmann, A. B. (1997 [1903–27[1]]) *Scholia vetera in Pindari Carmina* (3 vols.) (Stuttgart)

Dräger, P. (2011) *Apollodor:* Bibliotheke*. Götter- und Heldensagen* (Berlin)

Drerup, E. (1913) *Das fünfte Buch der Ilias: Grundlagen einer homerischen Poetik* (Paderborn)

Duckworth, G. E. (1933) 'Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Vergil' (PhD Thesis, Princeton University)

Dué, C. (2002) *Homeric Variations on a Lament by Briseis* (Lanham, MD)

    (2012) 'Maneuvers in the Dark of Night: *Iliad* 10 in the Twenty-First Century', in Montanari, Rengakos and Tsagalis (2012) 175–83

Dué, C. and Ebbott, M. (2010) Iliad *10 and the Poetics of Ambush: A Multitext Edition with Essays and Commentary* (Hellenic Studies 39) (Washington, DC)

353

Bibliography

Dunbar, N. (1995) *Aristophanes:* Birds. *Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford)

Dunkle, R. (1997) 'Swift-Footed Achilles', *CW* 90.4, 227–34

Durante, M. (1971) *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica greca. Pt. 1. Continuità della tradizione poetica dall'età micenea ai primi documenti* (Incunabula Graeca 50, 64) (Rome)

Easterling, P. E. (1982) *Sophocles:* Trachiniae (Cambridge)

  (1993) 'Gods on Stage in Greek Tragedy', in J. Dalfen, G. Petersmann and F. F. Schwarz (eds.), *Religio Graeco-Romana: Festschrift für Walter Pötscher* (*GB* Suppl. 5) (Horn) 77–86

Ebbott, M. (2010) 'Error 404: Theban Epic Not Found', in Tsagalis (2010) 239–58

  (2014) 'Allies in Fame: Recruiting Warriors in the Theban and Trojan Epic Traditions', in Tsagalis (2014c) 319–35

Eberhard, P. E. (1923) *Das Schicksal als poetische Idee bei Homer* (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums 13.1) (Paderborn)

Eco, U. (1979) *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts* (Bloomington)

Edmunds, L. (1985) 'The Genre of Theognidean Poetry', in Figueira and Nagy (1985) 96–111

  (2001) *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry* (Baltimore)

  (2006) 'The New Sappho: ἔφαντο (9)', *ZPE* 156, 23–6

  (2016) 'Intertextuality without Texts in Archaic Greek Verse and the Plan of Zeus', *SyllClass* 27, 1–27

  (2019) *Toward the Characterization of Helen in Homer: Appellatives, Periphrastic Denominations, and Noun-Epithet Formulas* (*TC* Suppl. 87) (Berlin)

Edsman, C.-M. (1949) *Ignis divinus: Le feu comme moyen de rajeunissement et d'immortalité: contes, légendes, mythes et rites* (Lund)

Edwards, A. T. (1985a) *Achilles in the* Odyssey*: Ideologies of Heroism in the Homeric Epic* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 171) (Königstein/Ts.)

  (1985b) 'Achilles in the Underworld: Iliad, Odyssey, and *Aethiopis*', *GRBS* 26.3, 215–27

Edwards, G. P. (1971) *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context* (Publications of the Philological Society 22) (Oxford)

Edwards, M. W. (1987) *Homer: Poet of the* Iliad (Baltimore)

  (1991) *The* Iliad*: A Commentary.* Vol. v: *Books 17–20* (Cambridge)

Eisenfeld, H. (2015) 'Ishtar Rejected: Reading a Mesopotamian Goddess in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite', *ARG* 16.1, 133–62

  (2018) 'Geryon the Hero, Herakles the God', *JHS* 138, 80–99

Elmer, D. F. (2005) 'Helen *Epigrammatopoios*', *ClAnt* 24.1, 1–39

  (2013) *The Poetics of Consent: Collective Decision Making and the* Iliad (Baltimore)

Else, G. F. (1957) *Aristotle's Poetics: The Argument* (Cambridge, MA)

Emlyn-Jones, C. (1986) 'True and Lying Tales in the *Odyssey*', *G&R* 33.1, 1–10

354

Bibliography

Erbse, H. (1969–88) *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia vetera)* (7 vols.) (Berlin)

Erskine, A. (2001) *Troy Between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power* (Oxford)

Espermann, I. (1980) *Antenor, Theano, Antenoriden: ihre Person und Bedeutung in der Ilias* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 120) (Meisenheim am Glan)

Fabbro, H. (1995) *Carmina convivalia attica* (Lyricorum Graecorum quae exstant 11) (Rome)

Faber, R. A. (2017) 'The Hellenistic Origins of Memory as Trope for Literary Allusion in Latin Poetry', *Philologus* 161.1, 77–89

Fairbanks, A. (1931) *Elder Philostratus:* Imagines*; Younger Philostratus:* Imagines*; Callistratus:* Descriptions (Loeb Classical Library 256) (Cambridge, MA)

Falkner, T. M. (1989) 'Ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῷ: Homeric Heroism, Old Age and the End of the *Odyssey*', in Falkner and de Luce (1989) 21–67

Falkner T. M. and de Luce, J. (eds.) (1989) *Old Age in Greek and Latin Literature* (Albany, NY)

Fantuzzi, M. (2004) 'The Magic of (Some) Allusions: Philodemus *AP* 5.107 (*GPh* 3188ff.; 23 Sider)', *HSCP* 102, 213–36

(2012) *Achilles in Love: Intertextual Studies* (Oxford)

Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. L. (2004) *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge)

Fantuzzi, M. and Tsagalis, C. C. (eds.) (2015) *The Greek Epic Cycle and Its Ancient Reception: A Companion* (Cambridge)

Faraone, C. A. (1996) 'Taking the "Nestor's Cup Inscription" Seriously: Erotic Magic and Conditional Curses in the Earliest Inscribed Hexameters', *ClAnt* 15.1, 77–112

Farmer, M. C. (2017) *Tragedy on the Comic Stage* (New York)

Farnell, L. R. (1932) *The Works of Pindar. Translated with Literary and Critical Commentaries*. Vol. II: *Critical Commentary* (London)

Farrell, J. (1991) *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History* (New York)

(2005) 'Intention and Intertext', *Phoenix* 59.1/2, 98–111

Faulkner, A. (2008) *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: Introduction, Text, and Commentary* (Oxford)

Faulkner, A. (ed.) (2011) *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays* (Oxford)

Fearn, D. (2003) 'Mapping Phleious: Politics and Myth-Making in Bacchylides 9', *CQ* 53.2, 347–67

(2007) *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition* (Oxford)

Fearn, D. (ed.) (2011) *Aegina: Contexts for Choral Lyric Poetry. Myth, History, and Identity in the Fifth Century* BC (Oxford)

Fearn, D. (2018) 'Materialities of Political Commitment? Textual Events, Material Culture, and Metaliterarity in Alcaeus', in Budelmann and Phillips (2018b) 93–113

355

(2019) 'The Allure of Narrative in Greek Lyric Poetry', in J. Grethlein, L. Huitink and A. Tagliabue (eds.), *Experience, Narrative, and Criticism in Ancient Greece: Under the Spell of Stories* (Oxford) 36–58

Fedeli, P. (2005) *Properzio: Elegie libro* II. *Introduzione, testo e commento* (Cambridge)

Federico, E. (2015) *Ione di Chio: Testimonianze e frammenti (testo critico di Francesco Valerio)* (I frammenti degli storici greci 8) (Tivoli)

Feeney, D. C. (1991) *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition* (Oxford)

(2021) *Explorations in Latin Literature* (2 vols.) (Cambridge)

Feeney, D. C. and Nelis, D. (2005) 'Two Virgilian Acrostics: *Certissima Signa?*', *CQ* 55.2, 644–6

Fehling, D. (1971) *Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot: Studien zur Erzählkunst Herodots* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 9) (Berlin) [tr. as (1989)]

(1989) *Herodotus and His Sources: Citation, Invention and Narrative Art* (ARCA 21) (Leeds) [tr. of (1971) by J. G. Howie]

(1991) *Die ursprüngliche Geschichte vom Fall Trojas, oder, Interpretationen zur Troja-Geschichte* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft: Sonderheft 75) (Innsbruck)

Felson, N. (1997 [1994[1]]) *Regarding Penelope: From Character to Poetics* (Norman, OK)

(1999a) 'Vicarious Transport: Fictive Deixis in Pindar's *Pythian* Four', *HSCP* 99, 1–31

(1999b) 'Paradigms of Paternity: Fathers, Sons, and Athletic/Sexual Prowess in Homer's *Odyssey*', in Kazazis and Rengakos (1999) 89–98

(2002) '*Threptra* and Invincible Hands: The Father–Son Relationship in *Iliad* 24', in Higbie (2002b) 35–50

(2004a) 'Introduction', in Felson (2004c) 253–66

(2004b) 'The Poetic Effects of Deixis in Pindar's *Ninth Pythian Ode*', in Felson (2004c) 365–89

Felson, N. (ed.) (2004c) *The Poetics of Deixis in Alcman, Pindar, and Other Lyric, Arethusa* 37.3, 253–472

Felson, N. and Parmentier, R. J. (2015) 'The "Savvy Interpreter": Performance and Interpretation in Pindar's Victory Odes', *Signs and Society* 3, 261–305

Fenik, B. (1964) Iliad X *and the* Rhesus*: The Myth* (Brussels)

(1968) *Typical Battle Scenes in the* Iliad*: Studies in the Narrative Techniques of Homeric Battle Description* (*Hermes* Einzelschriften 21) (Wiesbaden)

(1974) *Studies in the* Odyssey (Wiesbaden)

Fennell, C. A. M. (1893[2] [1879[1]]) *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes, with Notes Explanatory and Critical, Introductions and Introductory Essays* (Cambridge)

Fenno, J. (2005) 'Setting Aright the House of Themistius in Pindar's *Nemean* 5 and *Isthmian* 6', *Hermes* 133.3, 294–311

356

(2008) 'The Wrath and Vengeance of Swift-Footed Aeneas in *Iliad* 13', *Phoenix* 62.1/2, 145–61

Fernandelli, M. (2012) *Catullo e la rinascita dell' epos: dal carme 64 all'* Eneide (Spudasmata 142) (Hildesheim)

Fernández-Galiano, M. (1992) 'Books XXI–XXII', in Russo, Fernández-Galiano and Heubeck (1992) 129–310

Ferrari, F. (1989) *Teognide: Elegie. Introduzione, traduzione e note* (Biblioteca universale Rizzoli L696) (Milan)

(2007) *Una mitra per Kleis: Saffo e il suo pubblico* (Biblioteca di *MD* 19) (Pisa) [tr. as (2010)]

(2010) *Sappho's Gift: The Poet and Her Community* (Ann Arbor) [tr. of (2007) by B. Acosta-Hughes and L. Prauscello]

(2014) 'Saffo e i suoi fratelli e altri brani del primo libro', *ZPE* 192, 1–19

Figueira, T. J. and Nagy, G. (eds.) (1985) *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis* (Baltimore)

Finglass, P. J. (2011) *Sophocles:* Ajax (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 48) (Cambridge)

(2012) 'The *Geryoneis*', Review of Curtis (2011), *CR* 62.2, 354–7

Finglass, P. J., Collard, C. and Richardson, N. J. (eds.) (2007) *Hesperos: Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry Presented to M. L. West on his Seventieth Birthday* (Oxford)

Finglass, P. J. and Kelly, A. (eds.) (2015) *Stesichorus in Context* (Cambridge)

(2021) *Cambridge Companion to Sappho* (Cambridge)

Finkelberg, M. (1988) 'Ajax's Entry in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*', *CQ* 38.1, 31–41 [= (2020) 291–304]

(1995) 'Odysseus and the Genus "Hero"', *G&R* 42.1, 1–14 [= (2020) 218–31]

(1998) *The Birth of Literary Fiction in Ancient Greece* (Oxford)

(2000) 'The *Cypria*, the *Iliad*, and the Problem of Multiformity in Oral and Written Tradition', *CP* 95.1, 1–11 [= (2020) 305–17]

(2002) 'The Sources of *Iliad* 7', *ColbyQ* 38.2, 151–61 [= (2020) 140–9]

(2003) 'Homer as a Foundation Text', in Finkelberg and Stroumsa (2003) 75–96 [= (2020) 318–30]

(2011a) 'Homer and His Peers: Neoanalysis, Oral Theory, and the Status of Homer', *TC* 3.2, 197–208 [= (2020) 158–68]

(2011b) 'Prophecy', in Finkelberg (2011c) II 694–5

Finkelberg, M. (ed.) (2011c) *The Homer Encyclopedia* (3 vols.) (Oxford)

Finkelberg, M. (2014) 'Boreas and Oreithyia: A Case-Study in Multichannel Transmission of Myth', in Scodel (2014) 87–100

(2015) 'Meta-Cyclic Epic and Homeric Poetry', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (2015) 126–38 [= (2020) 169–81]

(2016) 'Out of the Mainstream: Some Thoughts Concerning the Submersion Process of the Poems of the Trojan Cycle', in A. Ercolani and M. Giordano (eds.), *Submerged Literature in Ancient Greek Culture* 3*: The Comparative Perspective* (Berlin) 33–42

357

Bibliography

(2018) 'The Formation of the Homeric Epics', in F.-H. Mutschler (ed.), *Singing the World: The Homeric Epics and the Chinese* Book of Songs: *Foundational Texts Compared* (Newcastle Upon Tyne) 15–38 [= (2020) 182–96]

(2020) *Homer and Early Greek Epic: Collected Essays* (*TC* Suppl. 89) (Berlin)

Finkelberg, M. and Stroumsa, G. G. (eds.) (2003) *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World* (Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 2) (Leiden)

Finley, J. H., Jr. (1951) 'The Date of *Paean* 6 and *Nemean* 7', *HSCP* 60, 61–80

Finnegan, R. H. (1977) *Oral Poetry: Its Nature, Significance, and Social Context* (Cambridge)

Fish, S. E. (1970) 'Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics', *New Literary History* 2.1, 123–62 [= (1980) 21–67]

(1980) *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cambridge, MA)

Flores, J. (2015) 'Μοῖρα en Homero', *Nova Tellus* 33, 47–79

Flower, M. A. (2008) *The Seer in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley)

Foley, H. P. (1995) 'Penelope as Moral Agent', in Cohen (1995) 93–115

Foley, J. M. (1991) *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic* (Bloomington)

(1999) *Homer's Traditional Art* (University Park)

(2002) *How to Read an Oral Poem* (Urbana)

Foley, J. M. (ed.) (2005) *A Companion to Ancient Epic* (Malden, MA)

Foley, J. M. (2011) 'Oral Dictated Texts', in Finkelberg (2011c) ii 603–4

Foley, J. M. and Arft, J. (2015) 'The Epic Cycle and Oral Tradition', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (2015) 78–95

Fontaine, M. (2014) 'Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Comedy: Menander's *Kolax* in Three Roman Receptions (Naevius, Plautus and Terence's *Eunuchus*)', in S. D. Olson (ed.), *Ancient Comedy and Reception: Essays in Honor of Jeffrey Henderson* (Berlin) 180–202

Fontenrose, J. (1966) 'Typhon among the Arimoi', in L. Wallach (ed.), *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of H. Caplan* (Ithaca, NY) 64–82

Ford, A. L. (1985) 'The Seal of Theognis: The Politics of Authorship in Archaic Greece', in Figueira and Nagy (1985) 82–95

(1988) 'The Classical Definition of ῥαψῳδία', *CP* 83.4, 300–7

(1992) *Homer: The Poetry of the Past* (Ithaca, NY)

(1997) 'The Inland Ship: Problems in the Performance and Reception of Homeric Epic', in Bakker and Kahane (1997) 83–109

(1999) 'Odysseus after Dinner: *Od*. 9.2–11 and the Traditions of Sympotic Song', in Kazazis and Rengakos (1999) 109–23

(2002) *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece* (Princeton)

Fordyce, C. J. (1990) *Catullus: A Commentary* (Oxford)

358

Bibliography

Forsyth, N. (1979) 'The Allurement Scene: A Typical Pattern in Greek Oral Epic', *CSCA* 12, 107–20

Forte, A. S. W. (2017) 'Tracing Homeric Metaphor' (PhD Thesis, Harvard University)

  (2021) Review of Clarke (2019), *CP* 116.3, 456–62

Foster, M. (2019) 'Athens and Apolline Polyphony in Bacchylides' Ode 16', in M. Foster, L. Kurke and N. A. Weiss (eds.), *Genre in Archaic and Classical Greek Poetry: Theories and Models* (Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song 4) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 428) (Leiden) 191–228

Fowler, D. (1997) 'On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies', *MD* 39, 13–34 [= (2000) 115–37]

  (2000) *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin* (Oxford)

Fowler, R. L. (1987) *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies* (*Phoenix* Suppl. 21) (Toronto)

  (2004a) 'The Homeric Question', in Fowler (2004b) 220–32

Fowler, R. L. (ed.) (2004b) *The Cambridge Companion to Homer* (Cambridge)

Fowler, R. L. (2000–13) *Early Greek Mythography* (2 vols.) (Oxford)

Frame, D. (1978) *The Myth of Return in Early Greek Epic* (New Haven)

  (2009) *Hippota Nestor* (Hellenic Studies 37) (Washington, DC)

Franko, G. F. (2005–6) 'The Trojan Horse at the Close of the *Iliad*', *CJ* 101.2, 121–3

Fratantuono, L. (2008) '*Velocem potuit domuisse puellam*: Propertius, Catullus, and Atalanta's Race', *Latomus* 67.2, 342–52

Frazer, J. G. (1921) *Apollodorus: The Library* (2 vols.) (Loeb Classical Library 121–2) (Cambridge, MA)

Fredricksmeyer, H. C. (1997) 'Penelope *Polutropos*: The Crux at *Odyssey* 23.218–24', *AJP* 118.4, 487–97

Friedländer, P. (1914) 'Kritische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Heldensage', *RhM* 69, 299–341

Friedrich, R. (2019) *Postoral Homer: Orality and Literacy in the Homeric Epic* (*Hermes* Einzelschriften 112) (Stuttgart)

Fuqua, C. (1981) 'Tyrtaeus and the Cult of Heroes', *GRBS* 22.3, 215–26

Furley, W. D. (2021) '"Whom Should I Persuade . . . ?" Another Look at an Old Problem in Sappho fr. 1 (P. Oxy. XXI 2288)', *ZPE* 220, 1–6

Gaetano, F. (2016) 'Pratiche storiografiche di comunicazione: μνᾱσθαι e μνήμη fra Erodoto e il suo pubblico', *Lexis* 34, 105–15

Gagné, R. (2009) 'A Wolf at the Table: Sympotic Perjury in Archilochus', *TAPA* 139.2, 251–74

  (2013) *Ancestral Fault in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge)

Gainsford, P. (2016) *Early Greek Hexameter Poetry* (*G&R* New Surveys in the Classics 43) (Cambridge)

Gaisser, J. H. (1969) 'A Structural Analysis of the Digressions in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*', *HSCP* 73, 1–43

359

(1995) 'Threads in the Labyrinth: Competing Views and Voices in Catullus 64', *AJP* 116.4, 579–616 [= (2007) 217–58]

Gaisser, J. H. (ed.) (2007) *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Catullus* (Oxford)

Gale, M. R. (2012) 'Putting on the Yoke of Necessity: Myth, Intertextuality and Moral Agency in Catullus 68', in I. M. le M. Du Quesnay and A. J. Woodman (eds.), *Catullus: Poems, Books, Readers* (Cambridge) 184–211

Gallavotti, C. (1976) 'I due incunaboli di Atene e di Pitecusa ed altre epigrafi archaiche', *RAL* 31, 207–38

Gallo, F. (ed.) (2016) *Omero: Quaestiones Disputatae* (Ambrosiana Graecolatina 5) (Milan)

Gantz, T. (1993) *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore)

Garcia, L. F., Jr. (2013) *Homeric Durability: Telling Time in the* Iliad (Hellenic Studies 57) (Washington, DC)

Garner, R. S. (1990) *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry* (London)

Garvie, A. F. (1994) *Homer:* Odyssey. *Books* vi–viii (Cambridge)

Gazis, G. A. (2018) *Homer and the Poetics of Hades* (Oxford)

Gee, E. (2013) *Aratus and the Astronomical Tradition* (New York)

(2020) *Mapping the Afterlife: From Homer to Dante* (Oxford)

Gell, A. (1998) *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory* (Oxford)

Gély-Ghedira, V. (2000) *La nostalgie du moi: Echo dans la littérature européenne* (Paris)

Gemoll, A. (1883) 'Die Beziehungen zwischen Ilias und Odyssee', *Hermes* 18.1, 34–96

Gentili, B. (1984) *Poesia e pubblico nella Grecia antica: Da Omero al V secolo* (Rome) [tr. as (1988)]

(1988) *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the Fifth Century* (Baltimore) [tr. of (1984) by A. T. Cole]

Gentili, B., Bernardini, P., Cingano, E. and Giannini, P. (1995) *Pindaro: Le Pitiche* (Milan)

Gentili, B., Catenacci, C., Giannini, P. and Lomiento, L. (2013) *Pindaro: Le Olimpiche* (Milan)

George, A. R. (2003) *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic: Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts* (2 vols.) (Oxford)

Gerber, D. E. (1970) *Euterpe: An Anthology of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry* (Amsterdam)

(1982) *Pindar's Olympian One: A Commentary* (*Phoenix* Suppl. 15) (Toronto)

(1997) 'Elegy', in D. E. Gerber (ed.), *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* (Leiden) 89–132

(1999a) *Greek Iambic Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries* bc (Loeb Classical Library 259) (Cambridge, MA)

(1999b) 'Pindar, *Nemean* Six: A Commentary', *HSCP* 99, 33–91

Gerhard, E. (1867) *Etruskische Spiegel. Vierter Theil* (Berlin)

Gerhard, Y. (2011) 'La "coupe de Nestor": reconstitution du vers 1', *ZPE* 176, 7–9

Germain, G. (1954) *Genèse de l'Odyssée: le fantastique et le sacré* (Paris)

Germany, R. (2005) 'The Figure of Echo in the *Homeric Hymn to Pan*', *AJP* 126.2, 187–208

Giangrande, G. (1971) 'Interpretationen griechischer Meliker', *RhM* 114.2, 97–131

Giannini, P. (1993) 'Il proemio, il sigillo e il libro di Teognide: alcune osservazioni', in R. Pretagostini (ed.), *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica: Scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili* (3 vols.) (Rome) I 377–91

  (2014) *Homerica et Pindarica* (Filologia e critica 98) (Pisa)

Gildersleeve, B. L. (1885) *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes. With an Introductory Essay, Notes, and Indexes* (London)

Giusti, E. (2015) 'Caesar Criss-Crossing the Rubicon: A Palindromic Acrostic in Lucan (1.218–22)', *CQ* 65.2, 892–4

Goldhill, S. (1983) 'Narrative Structure in Bacchylides 5', *Eranos* 81, 65–81

  (1986) 'Framing and Polyphony: Readings in Hellenistic Poetry', *PCPS* 32, 25–52

  (1991) *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature* (Cambridge)

  (2007) Review of Clarke, Currie, and Lyne (2006), *BMCR* 2007.06.17

  (2020) *Preposterous Poetics: The Politics and Aesthetics of Form in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge)

González, J. M. (2013) *The Epic Rhapsode and His Craft: Homeric Performance in a Diachronic Perspective* (Hellenic Studies 47) (Washington, DC)

  (2015a) 'A Diachronic Metapoetics of Reception: Homeric *kleos* (κλέος) and Biblical *zera'* (זרע)', in González (2015b) 79–179

González, J. M. (ed.) (2015b) *Diachrony: Diachronic Studies of Ancient Greek Literature and Culture* (MythosEikonPoiesis 7) (Berlin)

Goode, C. F. (2012) 'Tydeus and the Cadmaeans', *Kyklos* 1 (Online: https://classics-at.chs.harvard.edu/tydeus-and-the-cadmaeans/)

Goold, G. P. (1958) 'A New Text of Catullus', *Phoenix* 12.3, 93–116

Gostoli, A. (1990) *Terpandro: Introduzione, testimonianze, testo critico, traduzione e commento* (Lyricorum Graecorum quae exstant 8) (Rome)

  (1999) 'La critica dei miti tradizionali alla corte di Ierone di Siracusa: Senofane e Pindaro', *QUCC* 62.2, 15–24

  (2007) *Margite: Omero. Introduzione, testimonianze, testo critico, traduzione e commento* (Testi e Commenti 21) (Pisa)

Gostoli, A., Fongoni, A. and Biondi, F. (eds.) (2017) *Poeti in Agone: Competizioni poetiche e musicali nella Grecia antica* (Giornale Italiano di Filologia – Bibliotheca 18) (Turnhout)

Gottesman, A. (2014) 'The Authority of Telemachus', *ClAnt* 33.1, 31–60

Gow, A. S. F. (1952^2 [1950^1]) *Theocritus* (2 vols.) (Cambridge)

Bibliography

Gow, A. S. F. and Scholfield, A. F. (1953) *Nicander: The Poems and Poetical Fragments. Edited with a Translation and Notes* (Cambridge)

Grafton, A. (1997) *The Footnote: A Curious History* (Cambridge, MA)

Graham, A. J. (1995) 'The *Odyssey*, History, and Women', in Cohen (1995) 3–16

Gramps, A. (2021) *The Fiction of Occasion in Hellenistic and Roman Poetry* (*TC* Suppl. 118) (Berlin)

Grand-Clément, A. (2009) 'Sophocle, le maître d'école et les langages de la couleur: À propos du fragment 6 de Ion de Chios', in M. Carastro (ed.), *L'Antiquité en couleurs: Catégories, pratiques, représentations* (Grenoble) 63–81

Gray, V. (2011) 'Thucydides' Source Citations: "It Is Said"', *CQ* 61.1, 75–90

Graziosi, B. (2001) 'Competition in Wisdom', in F. Budelmann and P. Michelakis (eds.), *Homer, Tragedy and Beyond: Essays in Honour of P. E. Easterling* (London) 57–74

(2002) *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic* (Cambridge)

(2010) 'Homer, from Reception to Composition', *Letras Clásicas* 14, 21–33

Graziosi, B. and Haubold, J. (2005) *Homer: The Resonance of Epic* (London)

(2010) *Homer:* Iliad *Book VI* (Cambridge)

Greene, E. (1994) 'Apostrophe and Women's Erotics in the Poetry of Sappho', *TAPA* 124, 41–56 [= (1996) 233–47]

Greene, E. (ed.) (1996) *Reading Sappho: Contemporary Approaches* (Classics and Contemporary Thought 2) (Berkeley)

Greene, E. and Skinner, M. B. (eds.) (2009) *The New Sappho on Old Age: Textual and Philosophical Issues* (Hellenic Studies 38) (Washington, DC)

Greensmith, E. (2020) *The Resurrection of Homer in Imperial Greek Epic: Quintus Smyrnaeus'* Posthomerica *and the Poetics of Impersonation* (Cambridge)

Gregory, J. (2018) *Cheiron's Way: Youthful Education in Homer and Tragedy* (Oxford)

Grethlein, J. (2006a) *Das Geschichtsbild der Ilias: eine Untersuchung aus phänomenologischer und narratologischer Perspektive* (Hypomnemata 163) (Göttingen)

(2006b) 'How Old Is Nestor?', *Eikasmos* 17, 11–16

(2007) '*Diomedes redivivus*: A New Reading of Mimnermus fr. 14 W²', *Mnemosyne* 60.1, 102–11

(2008) 'Memory and Material Objects in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*', *JHS* 128, 27–51

(2017) 'The Best of the Achaeans? Odysseus and Achilles in the *Odyssey*', in Tsagalis and Markantonatos (2017) 121–42

(2021) 'Author and Characters: Ancient, Narratological, and Cognitive Views on a Tricky Relationship', *CP* 116.2, 208–30

Grethlein, J. and Rengakos, A. (eds.) (2009) *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature* (*TC* Suppl. 4) (Berlin)

Gribble, D. (2016) 'Getting Ready to Pray: Sappho's New "Brothers" Song', *G&R* 63.1, 29–68

Bibliography

Griffin, J. (1977) 'The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer', *JHS* 97, 39–53

(1980) *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford)

(1995) *Homer:* Iliad *Book 9. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford)

Griffith, M. (1975) 'Man and the Leaves: A Study of Mimnermos fr. 2', *CSCA* 8, 73–88

(1990) 'Contest and Contradiction in Early Greek Poetry', in M. Griffith and D. J. Mastronarde (eds.), *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer* (Atlanta) 185–207

Griffith, R. D. (2013) 'Odysseus and the Salt-Ploughed Field (Serv. on Verg., *Aen*. 2.81)', *Latomus* 72.3, 805–6

Gronewald, M. and Daniel, R. W. (2004a) 'Ein neuer Sappho-Papyrus', *ZPE* 147, 1–8

(2004b) 'Nachtrag zum neuen Sappho-Papyrus', *ZPE* 149, 1–4

Grossardt, P. (2001) *Die Erzählung von Meleagros zur literarischen Entwicklung der kalydonischen Kultlegende* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 215) (Leiden)

(2002) 'The Place of Homer in the Epic Tradition. The Case of the Myth of the Calydonian Hunt', in Montanari and Ascheri (2002) 425–30

Guarducci, M. (1967) *Epigrafia greca*. Vol. I: *Caratteri e storia della disciplina. La scrittura greca dalle origini all'età imperiale* (Rome)

Guastella, G. (2017) *Word of Mouth:* Fama *and Its Personifications in Art and Literature from Ancient Rome to the Middle Ages* (Oxford)

Guez, J.-P., Klein, F., Peigney, J. and Prioux, É. (eds.) (forthcoming) *Dictionnaire des images du poétique dans l'antiquité* (Paris)

Gwara, S. (2007) 'Misprision in the Para-Narratives of *Iliad* 9', *Arethusa* 40.3, 303–36

Hadjimichael, T. A. (2019) *The Emergence of the Lyric Canon* (Oxford)

(2021) 'Bacchylides Playing Tragic', in Prodi and Vecchiato (2021) 215–33

Haft, A. J. (1984) 'Odysseus, Idomeneus and Meriones: The Cretan Lies of *Odyssey* 13–19', *CJ* 79.4, 289–306

(1990) '"The City-Sacker Odysseus" in *Iliad* 2 and 10', *TAPA* 120, 37–56

Hainsworth, J. B. (1988) 'Books V–VIII', in Heubeck, West and Hainsworth (1988) 247–385

(1993) *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*. Vol. III: *Books 9–12* (Cambridge)

Hall, A. E. W. (2011) '"And Cytherea Smiled": Sappho, Hellenistic Poetry, and Virgil's Allusive Mechanics', *AJP* 132.4, 615–31

Haller, B. S. (2013) 'Dolios in *Odyssey* 4 and 24: Penelope's Plotting and Alternative Narratives of Odysseus's νόστος', *TAPA* 143.2, 263–92

Halliwell, J. M. (2009) 'Epinician Precepts: A Study of Chiron and the Wise Adviser in Pindar' (PhD Thesis, University of Birmingham)

Halliwell, S. (2000) 'The Subjection of Muthos to Logos: Plato's Citations of the Poets', *CQ* 50.1, 94–112

Hamilton, R. (1974) *Epinikion: General Form in the Odes of Pindar* (De proprietatibus litterarum, Series Practica 91) (The Hague)

363

Bibliography

Hampe, R. (1950) 'Die homerische Welt im Lichte der neuen Ausgrabungen: Nestor', in R. Herbig (ed.), *Vermächtnis der antiken Kunst: Gastvorträge zur Jahrhundertfeier der Archäologischen Sammlungen der Universität Heidelberg* (Heidelberg) 11–70

Hansen, P. A. (1976) 'Pithecusan Humor: The Interpretation of "Nestor's Cup" Reconsidered', *Glotta* 54.1/2, 25–43

Hansen, W. F. (1977) 'Odysseus' Last Journey', *QUCC* 24, 27–48

Harder, M. A. (2012) *Callimachus,* Aetia*: Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary* (2 vols.) (Oxford)

(2013) 'From Text to Text: The Impact of the Alexandrian Library on the Work of Hellenistic Poets', in J. König, K. Oikonomopoulou and G. Woolf (eds.), *Ancient Libraries* (Cambridge) 96–108

Hardie, A. (2005) 'Sappho, the Muses, and Life after Death', *ZPE* 154, 13–32

Hardie, P. R. (1993) *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition* (Cambridge)

(2004) 'In the Steps of the Sibyl: Tradition and Desire in the Epic Underworld', *MD* 52, 143–56

(2012) *Rumour and Renown: Representations of* Fama *in Western Literature* (Cambridge)

Harris, W. V. (1989) *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, MA)

Harrison, S. J. (2007) *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace* (Oxford)

Harrison, S. J., Frangoulidis, S. and Papanghelis, T. D. (eds.) (2018) *Intratextuality and Latin Literature* (*TC* Suppl. 69) (Berlin)

Haslam, M. (1978) 'The Versification of the New Stesichorus (*P.Lille* 76abc)', *GRBS* 19.1, 29–57

Haubold, J. (2002) 'Greek Epic: A Near Eastern Genre?', *PCPS* 48, 1–19

(2005) 'Heracles in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*', in Hunter (2005) 85–98

(2011) 'Lykien (und Kilikien) in der Ilias', in R. Rollinger and C. Ulf (eds.), *Lag Troia in Kilikien? Der aktuelle Streit um Homers Ilias* (Darmstadt) 375–90

(2013) *Greece and Mesopotamia: Dialogues in Literature* (Cambridge)

(2017) 'Conflict, Consensus and Closure in Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Enūma eliš*', in Bassino, Canevaro and Graziosi (2017) 17–38

Havelock, E. A. (1963) *Preface to Plato* (Oxford)

(1982) *The Literate Revolution in Greece and Its Cultural Consequences* (Princeton)

Hawkins, T. (2001) 'Seducing a Misanthrope: Timon the Philogynist in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*', *GRBS* 42.2, 143–62

(2008) 'Out-Foxing the Wolf-Walker: Lycambes as Performative Rival to Archilochus', *ClAnt* 27.1, 93–114

(2016) 'Bupalus in Scheria: Hipponax's Odyssean Transcontextualizations', in Swift and Carey (2016) 229–52

Heath, M. (2002) *Interpreting Classical Texts* (London)

364

Bibliography

Heath, M. and Okell, E. (2007) 'Sophocles' *Ajax*: Expect the Unexpected', *CQ* 57.2, 363–80

Heerink, M. (2015) *Echoing Hylas: A Study in Hellenistic and Roman Metapoetics* (Madison, WI)

Heitsch, E. (1961–64) *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit* (2 vols.) (Göttingen)

  (2005) '*Ilias* und *Aithiopis*', *Gymnasium* 112, 431–41

  (2008) 'Neoanalytische Antikritik: Zum Verhältnis *Ilias – Aithiopis*', *RhM* 151.1, 1–12

Helbig, J. (1996) *Intertextualität und Markierung: Untersuchungen zur Systematik und Funktion der Signalisierung von Intertextualität* (Heidelberg)

Henderson, J. (1976) 'The Cologne Epode and the Conventions of Early Greek Erotic Poetry', *Arethusa* 9.2, 159–79

Henderson, W. J. (1989) 'Criteria in the Greek Lyric Contests', *Mnemosyne* 42.1/2, 24–40

Henkel, J. H. (2014a) 'Vergil Talks Technique: Metapoetic Arboriculture in *Georgics* 2', *Vergilius* 60, 33–66

  (2014b) 'Metrical Feet on the Road of Poetry: Foot Puns and Literary Polemic in Tibullus', *CW* 107.4, 451–75

Henkelman, W. F. M. (2006) 'The Birth of Gilgameš (Ael. *NA* XII.21). A Case-Study in Literary Receptivity', in R. Rollinger and B. Truschnegg (eds.), *Altertum und Mittelmeerraum: Die antike Welt diesseits und jenseits der Levante. Festschrift für Peter W. Haider zum 60. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart) 807–56

Henrichs, A. (1993) 'Identity and Crisis in Hellenistic Literature: Response', in A. W. Bulloch, E. S. Gruen, A. A. Long and A. F. Stewart (eds.), *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley) 171–95

Hermerén, G. (1992) 'Allusions and Intentions', in G. Iseminger (ed.), *Intention and Interpretation* (Philadelphia)

Herter, H. (1939) 'Theseus der Athener', *RhM* 88.3/4, 244–86, 289–326

  (1980) 'Die Delphine des Dionysos', *Archaiognosia* 1, 101–33

Heslin, P. J. (2005) *The Transvestite Achilles: Gender and Genre in Statius' Achilleid* (Cambridge)

  (2011) 'Achilles', Review of Burgess (2009), *CR* 61.2, 356–7

  (2016) 'Ovid's Cycnus and Homer's Achilles Heel', in L. Fulkerson and T. Stover (eds.), *Repeat Performances: Ovidian Repetition and the Metamorphoses* (Madison, WI) 69–99

  (2018) *Propertius, Greek Myth, and Virgil: Rivalry, Allegory, and Polemic* (Oxford)

Heubeck, A. (1954) *Der Odyssee-Dichter und die Ilias* (Erlangen)

  (1974) *Die homerische Frage: ein Bericht über die Forschung der letzten Jahrzehnte* (Erträge der Forschung 27) (Darmstadt)

  (1979) *Archaeologia Homerica Band* III*, Kapitel* X*: Schrift* (Göttingen)

  (1982) 'Zur neueren Homerforschung', *Gymnasium* 89, 385–447

  (1989) 'Books IX–XII', in Heubeck and Hoekstra (1989) 1–143

365

(1992) 'Books XXIII–XXIV', in Russo, Fernández-Galiano and Heubeck (1992) 311–418

Heubeck, A. and Hoekstra, A. (1989) *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey. Vol. II: *Books* IX–XVI (Oxford)

Heubeck, A., West, S. R. and Hainsworth, J. B. (1988) *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey. Vol. I: *Introduction and Books* I–VIII (Oxford)

Heyworth, S. J. (2007) *Sexti Properti Elegos* (Oxford)

(2013) 'Keeping On Keeping On: Repetition in the Propertian Narrative', *ORA* (Online: https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:0e07d210-8b2d-46f1-8b39-c19aae8b8b20)

(2015) 'Lutatius Catulus, Callimachus, and Plautus' *Bacchides*', *CQ* 65.1, 390–5

(2019) *Ovid:* Fasti *Book 3* (Cambridge)

Heyworth, S. J. and Morwood, J. (2017) *A Commentary on Vergil,* Aeneid *3* (Oxford)

Higbie, C. (1995) *Heroes' Names, Homeric Identities* (Albert Bates Lord Studies in Oral Tradition 10) (New York)

(2002a) 'Diomedes' Genealogy and Ancient Criticism', in Higbie (2002b) 173–88

Higbie, C. (ed.) (2002b) *Epos and Mythos: Language and Narrative in Homeric Epic*, *Arethusa* 35.1, 1–202

Hill, D. E. (1996² [1983¹]) *P. Papini Stati Thebaidos Libri* XII (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 79) (Leiden)

Hinds, S. (1987a) *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse* (Cambridge)

(1987b) 'Generalising About Ovid', *Ramus* 16.1/2, 4–31

(1995) 'Reflexive Annotation in Poetic Allusion', *Hermathena* 158, 41–51

(1998) *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge)

Hinge, G. (2006) *Die Sprache Alkmans: Textgeschichte und Sprachgeschichte* (Serta Graeca 24) (Wiesbaden)

Hirschberger, M. (2004) *Gynaikōn Katalogos und Megalai Ēhoiai: Ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten zweier hesiodeischer Epen* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 198) (Munich)

Hobden, F. (2013) *The Symposion in Ancient Greek Society and Thought* (Cambridge)

Hoekstra, A. (1989) 'Books XIII–XVI', in Heubeck and Hoekstra (1989) 145–287

Hoey, T. F. (1979) 'The Date of the *Trachiniae*', *Phoenix* 33.3, 210–32

Hollander, J. (1981) *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley)

Hollis, A. S. (1992) 'Hellenistic Colouring in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *HSCP* 94, 269–85

(2009² [1990¹]) *Callimachus:* Hecale. *Second Edition with Introduction, Text, Translation, and Enlarged Commentary* (Oxford)

Holoka, J. P. (1973) 'Homeric Originality: A Survey', *CW* 66.5, 257–93

Hölscher, U. (1966) Review of Kullmann (1960), *Gnomon* 38.2, 113–27

366

Bibliography

(1967) 'Die Atridensage in der *Odyssee*', in H. Singer and B. von Wiese (eds.), *Festschrift für Richard Alewyn* (Cologne) 1–16 [tr. as (1999)]

(1989² [1988¹]) *Die Odyssee: Epos zwischen Märchen und Roman* (Munich)

(1999) 'The Atreid Story in the *Odyssey*', in I. J. F. de Jong (ed.), *Homer Critical Assessments.* Vol. III: *Literary Interpretations* (London) 419–30 [tr. of (1967) by C. Krojzl and S. R. van der Mije]

Hooker, J. T. (1977) *The Language and Text of the Lesbian Poets* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 26) (Innsbruck)

(1980) 'The Apparition of Heracles in the *Odyssey*', *LCM* 5, 139–46

(1986) 'Helen and the Duration of the Trojan War', *PP* 41, 111–13

(1992) 'Some Uses of the Greek Imperfect', in B. Brogyanyi and R. Lipp (eds.), *Historical Philology: Greek, Latin, and Romance. Papers in Honor of Oswald Szemerényi II* (Amsterdam) 47–66

Hopkinson, N. (2000) *Ovid:* Metamorphoses *Book XIII* (Cambridge)

Horn, F. (2021) 'The Death of Achilles in the *Iliad*: Motif Transference and Poetic Technique', *Mnemosyne* 74.1, 1–28

Hornblower, S. (2015) *Lykophron: Alexandra. Greek Text, Translation, Commentary, and Introduction* (Oxford)

Horsfall, N. (1990) 'Virgil and the Illusory Footnote', in F. Cairns and M. Heath (eds.), *PLLS* 6*: Roman Poetry and Drama, Greek Epic, Comedy, Rhetoric* (ARCA 29) (Leeds) 49–63 [= (2020) 285–97]

(1991) *Virgilio: L'epopea in alambicco* (Forme materiali e ideologie del mondo antico 31) (Naples)

(2000) *Virgil,* Aeneid *7: A Commentary* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 198) (Leiden)

(2016) *The Epic Distilled: Studies in the Composition of the* Aeneid (Oxford)

(2020) *Fifty Years at the Sibyl's Heels: Selected Papers on Virgil and Rome* (Oxford)

Höschele, R. (2018) 'Κραδία γνωστὸς ἔνεστι τύπος (Meleager, *Anth. Pal.* 5.212.4): Self-Reflexive Engagement with Lyric Topoi in Erotic Epigram', *Hellenistica Posnaniensia: Faces of Hellenistic Lyric. Aitia* 8.1 (Online: https://doi.org/10.4000/aitia.1979)

Hosty, M. (2017) 'Schrödinger's Mouse: Liminality and the λίμνη in the *Batrachomyomachia*', *JHS* 137, 135–41

(2020) Batrachomyomachia *(Battle of the Frogs and Mice): Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford)

Howald, E. (1924) 'Meleager und Achill', *RhM* 73.4, 402–25

Howie, J. G. (1979) 'Sappho Fr. 94 (LP): Farewell, Consolation, and Help in a New Life', in F. Cairns (ed.), *PLLS* 2*: Vergil and Roman Elegy, Medieval Latin Poetry and Prose, Greek Lyric and Drama* (ARCA 3) (Liverpool) 299–342 [= (2012) 126–60]

(1983) 'The Revision of Myth in Pindar *Olympian* 1', in F. Cairns (ed.), *PLLS 4* (ARCA 11) (Liverpool) 277–313 [= (2012) 161–90]

(2012) *Exemplum and Myth, Criticism and Creation: Papers on Early Greek Literature* (Collected Classical Papers 3) (Prenton)

367

Bibliography

Hubbard, T. K. (1987a) 'Two Notes on the Myth of Aeacus in Pindar', *GRBS* 28.1, 5–22

(1987b) 'The "Cooking" of Pelops: Pindar and the Process of Mythological Revisionism', *Helios* 14.1, 3–21

(1991) *The Mask of Comedy: Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 49) (Ithaca, NY)

(2004) 'The Dissemination of Epinician Lyric: Pan-Hellenism, Reperformance, Written Texts', in Mackie (2004) 71–93

(2007) 'Theognis' *Sphrêgis*: Aristocratic Speech and the Paradoxes of Writing', in C. Cooper (ed.), *Politics of Orality* (Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece 6) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 280) (Leiden) 193–215

Hughes, J. M. F. and Tracy, K. (2015) 'Indexicality', in K. Tracy, C. Ilie and T. L. Sandel (eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction* (3 vols.) (Chichester) II 788–93

Hummel, P. (1993) *La syntaxe de Pindare* (Bibliothèque de l'information grammaticale 24) (Leuven)

Hunt, A. S. (1922) 'P. Oxy. 1789. Alcaeus', in B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XV* (London) 60–73

Hunter, R. L. (ed.) (2005) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge)

Hunter, R. L. (2008a) 'The Poetics of Narrative in the *Argonautica*', in T. D. Papanghelis and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Apollonius Rhodius. Second, Revised Edition* (Leiden) 115–46 [= (2008b) I 343–77]

(2008b) *On Coming After: Studies in Post-Classical Greek Literature and its Reception* (2 vols.) (*TC* Suppl. 3) (Berlin)

(2012) 'The Songs of Demodokos: Compression and Extension in Greek Narrative Poetry', in Baumbach and Bär (2012) 83–109

(2014) *Hesiodic Voices: Studies in the Ancient Reception of Hesiod's* Works and Days (Cambridge)

(2015) *Apollonius of Rhodes:* Argonautica *Book* IV (Cambridge)

(2018) *The Measure of Homer: The Ancient Reception of the* Iliad *and the* Odyssey (Cambridge)

Hunter, R. L. and Laemmle, R. (2019) 'Enkelados: Callimachus Fragment 1.36', *CP* 114.3, 493–8

Hunter, R. L. and Russell, D. A. (2011) *Plutarch: How to Study Poetry (De audiendis poetis)* (Cambridge)

Hunter, R. L. and Uhlig, A. S. (eds.) (2017) *Imagining Reperformance in Ancient Culture: Studies in the Traditions of Drama and Lyric* (Cambridge)

Hurst, A. (2020) 'Homère chez Pindare: Le "paradis" de la deuxième Olympique', in Rengakos, Finglass and Zimmermann (2020) 293–311

Hutcheson, L. G. (2018) 'Messengers and the Art of Reported Speech in the *Iliad*' (PhD Thesis, Boston University)

Bibliography

Hutchinson, G. O. (2001) *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Large Pieces: Alcman, Stesichorus, Sappho, Alcaeus, Ibycus, Anacreon, Simonides, Bacchylides, Pindar, Sophocles, Euripides* (Oxford)

(2013) *Greek to Latin: Frameworks and Contexts for Intertextuality* (Oxford)

Huxley, G. L. (1969) *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis* (London)

(1973) 'The Date of Pherekydes of Athens', *GRBS* 14.2, 137–43

(1975) *Pindar's Vision of the Past* (Belfast)

Hyland, B. D. (2021) 'A Note on the Provenance of the Sappho Fragments P.GC. inv. 105', *ZPE* 218, 1–16

Iff-Noël, F. (forthcoming) 'Mémoire / Memory', in Guez et al. (forthcoming)

Ingleheart, J. (2010) 'The Literary "Successor": Ovidian Metapoetry and Metaphor', *CQ* 60.1, 167–72

Instone, S. (1996) *Pindar: Selected Odes. Edited with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Warminster)

Irwin, E. (1998) 'Biography, Fiction, and the Archilochean *ainos*', *JHS* 118, 177–83

(2005) *Solon and Early Greek Poetry: The Politics of Exhortation* (Cambridge)

Irwin, M. E. (1984) 'The Crocus and the Rose: A Study of the Interrelationship between the Natural and Divine World in Early Greek Poetry', in D. E. Gerber (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury* (Chico, CA) 147–68

Iser, W. (1974) *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (Baltimore)

Isler, H. P. (1970) *Acheloos: eine Monographie* (Schweizerische geisteswissenschaftliche Gesellschaft. Travaux 11) (Bern)

Ivanov, R. V. (2010) 'Pindar's *Isthmians* 3 and 4: Essays and Commentary' (PhD Thesis, Cornell University)

Jacoby, F. (1918) 'Studien zu den älteren griechischen Elegikern. II. Zu Mimnermos', *Hermes* 53.3, 262–307

(1947) 'The First Athenian Prose Writer', *Mnemosyne* 13.1, 13–64

Jaillard, D. (2011) 'The Seventh *Homeric Hymn* to Dionysus: An Epiphanic Sketch', in Faulkner (2011) 133–50

James, A. W. (1975) 'Dionysus and the Tyrrhenian Pirates', *Antichthon* 9, 17–34

Janko, R. (1982) *Homer, Hesiod, and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction* (Cambridge)

(1986) 'The *Shield of Heracles* and the Legend of Cycnus', *CQ* 36.1, 38–59

(1990) 'Mimnermus, Fragment 4 West: A Conjecture', *AJP* 111.2, 154–5

(1992) *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*. Vol. IV: *Books 13–16* (Cambridge)

(1998) 'The Homeric Poems as Oral Dictated Texts', *CQ* 48.1, 1–13

(2012) 'πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν ἀείδειν: Relative Chronology and the Literary History of the Early Greek Epos', in Andersen and Haug (2012) 20–43

(2015) 'From Gabii and Gordion to Eretria and Methone: The Rise of the Greek Alphabet', *BICS* 58, 1–32 [= Clay, Malkin and Tzifopoulos (2017) 135–64]

(2017) 'Tithonus, Eos and the Cicada in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* and Sappho fr. 58', in Tsagalis and Markantonatos (2017) 267–96

369

Bibliography

Jarratt, S. C. (2002) 'Sappho's Memory', *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 32.1, 11–43

Jáuregui, M. H. de (2013) 'Dionysos in the *Homeric Hymns*: The Olympian Portrait of the God', in A. Bernabé, M. H. de Jáuregui, A. I. J. S. Cristóbal and R. M. Hernández (eds.), *Redefining Dionysos* (MythosEikonPoiesis 5) (Berlin) 235–49

Jendza, C. (2020) *Paracomedy: Appropriations of Comedy in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford)

Jensen, M. S. (2011) *Writing Homer: A Study Based on Results from Modern Fieldwork* (Copenhagen)

Jocelyn, H. D. (1993) 'Hesiod, *Works and Days* 582–96 and Alcaeus, fr. 347 (Lobel-Page)', in H. D. Jocelyn and H. Hurt (eds.), *Tria Lustra: Essays and Notes Presented to John Pinsent* (Liverpool) 87–95

Johnston, S. I. (1992) 'Xanthus, Hera and the Erinyes (*Iliad* 19.400–418)', *TAPA* 122, 85–98

Jones, B. (2010) 'Relative Chronology Within (an) Oral Tradition', *CJ* 105.4, 289–318

Jones, C. P. (2005) *Philostratus: The Life of Apollonius of Tyana* (2 vols.) (Loeb Classical Library 16–17) (Cambridge, MA)

Jones, G. S. (2008) 'Singing the Skolion: A Study of Poetics and Politics in Ancient Greece' (PhD Thesis, Johns Hopkins University)

(2010) 'Echoes of the Attic Skolia in Sophokles' *Ajax*' (Online: http://dx .doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1607974)

Jones, P. V. (1992) 'The Past in Homer's *Odyssey*', *JHS* 112, 74–90

de Jong, I. J. F. (1985) '*Iliad* I. 366–392: A Mirror Story', *Arethusa* 18.1, 5–22

(1994) 'Between Word and Deed: Hidden Thoughts in the *Odyssey*', in I. J. F. de Jong and J. P. Sullivan (eds.), *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 130) (Leiden) 27–50 [= Doherty (2009) 62–90]

(2001) *A Narratological Commentary on the* Odyssey (Cambridge)

(2004² [1987¹]) *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the* Iliad (London)

(2006) 'The Homeric Narrator and His Own *Kleos*', *Mnemosyne* 59.2, 188–207

(2007) 'Homer', in I. J. F. de Jong and R. Nünlist (eds.), *Time in Ancient Greek Literature* (Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative 2) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 291) (Leiden) 17–37

(2010) 'Eos en Tithonus in de nieuwe Sappho (en bij andere dichters)', *Lampas* 43.2, 150–67

(2011) 'The Shield of Achilles: From Metalepsis to Mise en Abyme', *Ramus* 40.1, 1–14

(2012) *Homer:* Iliad Book XXII (Cambridge)

(2014) *Narratology and Classics: A Practical Guide* (Oxford)

de Jong, I. J. F., Nünlist, R. and Bowie, A. (eds.) (2004) *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature* (Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative 1) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 257) (Leiden)

370

Bibliography

Jörgensen, O. (1904) 'Das Auftreten der Goetter in den Buechern ι–μ der Odyssee', *Hermes* 39.3, 357–82

Jouan, F. (1966) *Euripide et les légendes des Chants cypriens: des origines de la guerre de Troie à l'*Iliade (Paris)

(1980) 'Le Cycle épique: état des questions', in *Association Guillaume Budé, Actes du Xe Congrès* (Paris) 83–104

Kahane, A. (1997) 'Hexameter Progression and the Homeric Hero's Solitary State', in Bakker and Kahane (1997) 110–37

(2016) 'Fan Fiction, Early Greece, and the Historicity of Canon', in I. Willis (ed.), *The Classical Canon and/as Transformative Work* (*Transformative Works and Cultures* 21) (Online: https://doi.org/10.3983/twc.2016.0681)

(2019) 'Formal Diction, Intertextuality, Narrative and the Complexity of Greek Epic Diction', *SO* 93.1, 234–66

Kakridis, J. T. (1930a) 'Τιθωνός', *WS* 48, 25–38

(1930b) 'Die Pelopssage bei Pindar', *Philologus* 85.4, 463–77

(1949) *Homeric Researches* (Lund) [tr. by A. Placotari]

(1966) 'Zu Sappho 44 LP', *WS* 79, 21–26

Kakridis, P. T. (1995) 'Odysseus und Palamedes', in Ø. Andersen and M. Dickie (eds.), *Homer's World: Fiction, Tradition, Reality* (Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 3) (Bergen) 91–100

Kambylis, A. (1965) *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik: Untersuchungen zu Hesiodos, Kallimachos, Properz und Ennius* (Heidelberg)

Kamptz, H. von (1982) *Homerische Personennamen: Sprachwissenschaftliche und historische Klassifikation* (Göttingen)

Kanavou, N. (2015) *The Names of Homeric Heroes: Problems and Interpretations* (Sozomena 15) (Berlin)

Kannicht, R. (2004) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta.* Vol. v: *Euripides* (2 parts) (Göttingen)

Kantzios, I. (2019) 'Memory and Forgetfulness in Alcaeus', *CP* 114.3, 322–43

Karanika, A. (2011) 'The End of the *Nekyia*: Odysseus, Heracles, and the Gorgon in the Underworld', *Arethusa* 44.1, 1–27

(2013) 'Wedding and Performance in Homer: A View in the "Teichoskopia"', *TC* 5.2, 208–33

Kassel, R. and Austin, C. (1983–) *Poetae Comici Graeci* (8 vols.) (Berlin)

Katsonopoulou, D., Petropoulos, I. and Katsarou, S. (eds.) (2008) *Archilochus and His Age: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades* (Athens)

Katz, M. A. (1991) *Penelope's Renown: Meaning and Indeterminacy in the Odyssey* (Princeton)

Kawasaki, Y. (2019) 'パトロクロスの葬礼競技と『アイティオピス』/ The Funeral Games of Patroklos and *Aethiopis*', *Media and Communication Studies* 72, 47–74 (Online: http://hdl.handle.net/2115/73284)

Kayachev, B. (2016) '*Catalepton* 9 and Hellenistic Poetry', *CQ* 66.1, 180–204

371

Bibliography

Kazazis, J. N. and Rengakos, A. (eds.) (1999) *Euphrosyne: Studies in Ancient Epic and Its Legacy in Honor of D. N. Maronitis* (Stuttgart)

Keil, D. (1998) *Lexikalische Raritäten im Homer: Ihre Bedeutung für den Prozeß der Literarisierung des griechischen Epos* (Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium 35) (Trier)

Keith, A. M. (1992) *The Play of Fictions: Studies in Ovid's* Metamorphoses *Book* 2 (Ann Arbor)

Kelly, A. (2006) 'Neoanalysis and the *Nestorbedrängnis*: A Test Case', *Hermes* 134.1, 1–25

(2007a) *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to* Iliad VIII (Oxford)

(2007b) 'How to End an Orally-Derived Epic Poem', *TAPA* 137.2, 371–402

(2007c) 'Stesikhoros and Helen', *MH* 64.1, 1–21

(2008a) 'The Babylonian Captivity of Homer: The Case of the Διὸς Ἀπάτη', *RhM* 151.3/4, 259–304

(2008b) 'Performance and Rivalry: Homer, Odysseus, and Hesiod', in Revermann and Wilson (2008) 177–203

(2010) 'Hypertexting with Homer: Tlepolemus and Sarpedon on Heracles (*Il.* 5.628–698)', in Tsagalis (2010) 259–76

(2012) 'The Mourning of Thetis: "Allusion" and the Future in the *Iliad*', in Montanari, Rengakos and Tsagalis (2012) 221–65

(2014) 'Homeric Battle Narrative and the Ancient Near East', in D. L. Cairns and R. S. Scodel (eds.), *Defining Greek Narrative* (Edinburgh Leventis Studies 7) (Edinburgh) 29–54

(2015a) 'Stesichorus' Homer', in Finglass and Kelly (2015) 21–44

(2015b) '*Ilias Parva*', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (2015) 318–43

(2015c) Review of Bakker (2013), *Mnemosyne* 68.4, 677–81

(2018) 'Homer's Rivals? Internal Narrators in the *Iliad*', in Ready and Tsagalis (2018) 351–77

(2020) 'With, or without, Homer: Hearing the Background in Sappho', in Rengakos, Finglass and Zimmermann (2020) 269–92

(2021a) 'Sexing and Gendering the Succession Myth in Hesiod and the Ancient Near East', in Kelly and Metcalf (2021) 276–91

(2021b) 'Sappho and Epic', in Finglass and Kelly (2021) 53–64

(forthcoming a) 'Homer and Hipponax', in V. Cazzato and E. E. Prodi (eds.), *The Limping Muse: Hipponax the Poet* (Cambridge)

(forthcoming b) 'From the *Odyssey* to the *Iliad*, and Round (and Round) Again', in Kelly and Spelman (forthcoming)

Kelly, A. and Metcalf, C. (eds.) (2021) *Gods and Mortals in Early Greek and Near Eastern Mythology* (Cambridge)

Kelly, A. and Spelman, H. L. (eds.) (forthcoming) *Texts and Intertexts in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Cambridge)

Kelly, G. (2008) *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian* (Cambridge)

Bibliography

Kenens, U. (2011) 'The Sources of Ps.-Apollodorus's *Library*: A Case-Study', *QUCC* 97.1, 129–46

Kerényi, K. (1939) 'Die Geburt der Helena', *Mnemosyne* 7, 161–79

Kern, H. (1918) 'Der antike Astyanax-Mythus und seine späteren Auswüchse', *Philologus* 75, 183–201

Kidd, D. (1997) *Aratus:* Phaenomena (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 34) (Cambridge)

King, B. (1999) 'The Rhetoric of the Victim: Odysseus in the Swineherd's Hut', *ClAnt* 18.1, 74–93

King, H. (1986) 'Tithonos and the Tettix', *Arethusa* 19.1, 15–35 [= Falkner and de Luce (1989) 68–89]

Kirk, G. S. (1950) 'The Michigan Alcidamas-Papyrus; Heraclitus Fr. 56D; The Riddle of the Lice', *CQ* 44.3/4, 149–67

   (1962) *The Songs of Homer* (Cambridge)

   (1985) *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*. Vol. I: *Books 1–4* (Cambridge)

   (1990) *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*. Vol. II: *Books 5–8* (Cambridge)

Kirkwood, G. (1982) *Selections from Pindar, Edited with an Introduction and Commentary* (Chico, CA)

Kivilo, M. (2010) *Early Greek Poets' Lives: The Shaping of the Tradition* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 322) (Leiden)

Klooster, J. J. H. (2022) 'The Parallels between Aetiology and Prophecy in Ancient Literature: Hindsight as Foresight Makes Sense', in A. Wessels and J. J. H. Klooster (eds.), *Inventing Origins? Aetiological Thinking in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Euhormos 2) (Leiden) 31–46

Knight, V. (1995) *The Renewal of Epic: Responses to Homer in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 152) (Leiden)

Knox, B. M. W. (1985) 'Books and Readers in the Greek World', in P. E. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Vol. I: *Greek Literature* (Cambridge) 1–41

Köhnken, A. (1971) *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar: Interpretationen zu sechs Pindar-gedichten* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 12) (Berlin)

   (1974) 'Pindar as Innovator: Poseidon Hippios and the Relevance of the Pelops Story in Olympian 1', *CQ* 24.2, 199–206

   (1975) 'Gods and Descendants of Aiakos in Pindar's Eighth Isthmian Ode', *BICS* 22, 25–36

   (1983) 'Time and Event in Pindar *O.* 1.25–53', *ClAnt* 2.1, 66–76

Koller, H. (1972) ''Έπος', *Glotta* 50.1/2, 16–24

Koniaris, G. L. (1984) Review of Vetta (1980), *AJP* 105.1, 102–7

Koning, H. H. (2010) *Hesiod: The Other Poet: Ancient Reception of a Cultural Icon* (Leiden)

Kopff, E. (1983) 'The Structure of the *Amazonia* (*Aethiopis*)', in R. Häag (ed.), *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century* BC*: Tradition and Innovation* (Stockholm) 57–62

Bibliography

Korenjak, M. (1998) 'Homerische Intertextualität ohne Formeln? Zwei phorminxspielende Helden in *Ilias* und *Odyssee*', *MD* 40, 133–43

Koster, W. J. W. and Holwerda, D. (1960–2007) *Scholia in Aristophanem* (4 parts) (Groningen)

Kowalzig, B. (2007) *Singing for the Gods: Performances of Myth and Ritual in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Oxford)

Kozák, D. (2012) 'λεγόμενον δὲ τοῦτο προτέρων ἔπος ἔχω· Literary Tradition in Pindar's *Nemean* 3 and Statius' *Achilleid*', in P. A. Agócs, C. Carey and R. J. Rawles (eds.), *Receiving the Komos: Ancient & Modern Receptions of the Victory Ode* (*BICS* Suppl. 112) 73–92

Kozak, L. (2017) *Experiencing Hektor: Character in the* Iliad (London)

Kozlowski, J. M. (2018) 'Gilgamesh's Quest for Immortality (*Gilg.* IX–XI) as a Narratological Pattern for Odysseus's *Nostos* (*Od.* V,1–XIII,187)', *Eirene* 54.1/2, 11–31

Kreij, M. de, Colomo, D. and Lui, A. (2020) 'Shoring Up Sappho: P. Oxy. 2288 and Ancient Reinforcements of Bookrolls', *Mnemosyne* 73.6, 915–48

Krischer, T. (1968) 'Sapphos Ode an Aphrodite (Typologische Bemerkungen)', *Hermes* 96.1, 1–14

Kristeva, J. (1980) *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (ed. L. S. Roudiez) (New York) [tr. by T. Gora, A. Jardine and L. S. Roudiez]

Krummen, E. (1990) *Pyrsos Hymnon: Festliche Gegenwart und mythisch-rituelle Tradition als Voraussetzung einer Pindarinterpretation (Isthmie 4, Pythie 5, Olympie 1 und 3)* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 35) (Berlin) [tr. as (2014)]

   (2014) *Cult, Myth, and Occasion in Pindar's Victory Odes: A Study of Isthmian 4, Pythian 5, Olympian 1, and Olympian 3* (ARCA 52) (Prenton) [tr. of (1990) by J. G. Howie]

Kugelmeier, C. (1996) *Reflexe früher und zeitgenössischer Lyrik in der alten attischen Komödie* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 80) (Berlin)

Kullmann, W. (1955) 'Ein vorhomerisches Motiv im Iliasproömium', *Philologus* 99, 167–92 [= (1992) 11–35]

   (1956a) 'Zur Διὸς βουλή des Iliasproömium', *Philologus* 100, 132–3 [= (1992) 36–7]

   (1956b) *Das Wirken der Götter in der Ilias: Untersuchungen zur Frage der Entstehung des Homerischen 'Götterapparats'* (Berlin)

   (1960) *Die Quellen der Ilias (Troischer Sagenkreis)* (*Hermes* Einzelschriften 14) (Wiesbaden)

   (1968) 'Vergangenheit und Zukunft in der Ilias', *Poetica* 2, 15–37 [= (1992) 219–42; tr. as (2001)]

   (1984) 'Oral Poetry Theory and Neoanalysis in Homeric Research', *GRBS* 25.4, 307–23 [= (1992) 140–55]

   (1991) 'Ergebnisse der motivgeschichtlichen Forschung zu Homer (Neoanalyse)', in J. Latacz (ed.), *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-*

374

Forschung: Rückblick und Ausblick (Colloquium Rauricum 2) (Stuttgart) 425–55 [= (1992) 100–34]

(1992) *Homerische Motive: Beiträge zur Entstehung, Eigenart und Wirkung von Ilias und Odyssee* (ed. R. J. Müller) (Stuttgart)

(2001) 'Past and Future in the *Iliad*', in Cairns (2001b) 385–408 [tr. of (1968) by L. Holford-Strevens]

(2005) '*Ilias* und *Aethiopis*', *Hermes* 133.1, 9–28

(2012) 'Neoanalysis between Orality and Literacy: Some Remarks Concerning the Development of Greek Myths including the Legend of the Capture of Troy', in Montanari, Rengakos and Tsagalis (2012) 13–25

(2015) 'Motif and Source Research: Neoanalysis, Homer, and Cyclic Epic' in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (2015) 108–25

Kurke, L. (1990) 'Pindar's Sixth *Pythian* and the Tradition of Advice Poetry', *TAPA* 120, 85–107

(1999) *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold: The Politics of Meaning in Archaic Greece* (Princeton)

(2013 [1991¹]) *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (California Classical Studies 1) (Berkeley)

(2016) 'Gendered Spheres and Mythic Models in Sappho's Brothers Poem', in Bierl and Lardinois (2016) 238–65

La Penna, A. (1964) 'Letteratura esopica e letteratura assiro-babilonese', *RFIC* 92, 24–39

Labarbe, J. (1949) *L'Homère de Platon* (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de philosophie et lettres de l'Université de Liège 117) (Liège)

Lachenaud, G. (2010) *Scholies à Apollonios de Rhodes traduites et commentées* (Fragments 9) (Paris)

Laird, A. (2020) 'Echoing Virgil and Narcissus: Structure and Interpretation of the *Culex*', in T. E. Franklinos and L. Fulkerson (eds.), *Constructing Authors and Readers in the* Appendices Vergiliana, Tibulliana*, and* Ouidiana (Oxford) 96–111

Laks, A. and Most, G. W. (2016) *Early Greek Philosophy* (9 vols.) (Loeb Classical Library 524–32) (Cambridge, MA)

Lamari, A. A. (2010) *Narrative, Intertext, and Space in Euripides'* Phoenissae (*TC* Suppl. 6) (Berlin)

Lamboley, J.-L. (2001) 'La coupe de Nestor: État de la question et essai de mise au point', *Gaia* 5, 29–39

Lambrou, I. L. (2015) 'Homer and the Epic Cycle: Dialogue and Challenge' (PhD Thesis, University College London)

(2020) 'Achilles and Helen and Homer's Telling Silence', *Mnemosyne* 73.5, 705–28

Lane Fox, R. (2008) *Travelling Heroes: Greeks and Their Myths in the Epic Age of Homer* (London)

Lang, M. (1983) 'Reverberation and Mythology in the *Iliad*', in Rubino and Shelmerdine (1983) 140–64

Langdon, M. K. (2015) 'Herders' Graffiti', in A. P. Matthaiou and N. Papazarkadas (eds.), *AΖΩΝ: Studies in Honor of Ronald S. Stroud* (Hellēnikē Epigraphikē Hetaireia 17) (Athens) 49–58

Lardinois, A. P. M. H. (1994) 'Subject and Circumstance in Sappho's Poetry', *TAPA* 124, 57–84

  (2001) 'Keening Sappho: Female Speech Genres in Sappho's Poetry', in A. P. M. H. Lardinois and L. McClure (eds.), *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society* (Princeton) 75–92 [= I. C. Rutherford (2019) 286–308]

  (2008) '"Someone I Say, Will Remember Us": Oral Memory in Sappho's Poetry', in Mackay (2008) 79–96

  (2009) 'The New Sappho Poem (*P. Köln* 21351 and 21376): Key to the Old Fragments', in Greene and Skinner (2009) 41–57

  (2014) 'Sappho en haar broers: een nieuw lied van Sappho', *Lampas* 47.3, 179–201

  (2016) 'Sappho's Brothers Song and the Fictionality of Early Greek Lyric Poetry', in Bierl and Lardinois (2016) 167–87

  (2018a) 'Eastern Myths for Western Lies: Allusions to Near Eastern Mythology in Homer's *Iliad*', *Mnemosyne* 71.6, 895–919

  (2018b) 'Sufferings Which Aphrodite Sustains: A New Reconstruction of the First Strophe of Sappho's Kypris Poem', *ZPE* 205, 1–5

  (2021a) 'Playing with Traditions: The Near Eastern Background to Hesiod's Story of the Five Human Races', in Kelly and Metcalf (2021) 109–25

  (2021b) 'Sappho's Personal Poetry', in Finglass and Kelly (2021) 163–74

Larson, J. (2001) *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore* (Oxford)

  (2002) 'Corinna and the Daughters of Asopus', *SyllClass* 13, 47–62

Laser, S. (1952) 'Zu einer Vorlage der Ἕκτορος ἀναίρεσις im *X* der Ilias', *Hermes* 80.3, 372–6

Latacz, J. (1990) 'Die Funktion des Symposions für die entstehende griechische Literatur', *ScriptOralia* 30, 227–64

  (1996) *Homer, His Art and His World* (Ann Arbor) [tr. by J. P. Holoka]

Lateiner, D. (2011) 'Omens', in Finkelberg (2011c) II 601–2

Laursen, S. (1997) 'The Later Parts of Epicurus, *On Nature*, 25th Book', *Cronache Ercolanesi* 27, 5–82

Lavelle, B. M. (1993) *The Sorrow and the Pity: A Prolegomenon to a History of Athens under the Peisistratids, c. 560–510 B.C.* (*Historia* Einzelschriften 80) (Stuttgart)

Lavigne, D. (2017) 'Ἵρος ἰαμβικός: Archilochean Iambos and the Homeric Poetics of Conflict', in Bassino, Canevaro and Graziosi (2017) 132–53

Lazzeri, M. (2008) *Studi sulla Gerioneide di Stesicoro* (Quaderni del Dipartimento di scienze dell'antichità, Università degli studi di Salerno 35) (Naples)

Leaf, W. (1886–88) *The* Iliad. *Edited with English Notes and Introduction* (2 vols.) (London)

  (1912) *Troy: A Study in Homeric Geography* (London)

376

Lefkowitz, M. R. (1969) 'Bacchylides' *Ode* 5: Imitation and Originality', *HSCP* 73, 45–96

(1984) 'The Poet as Athlete', *Journal of Sport History* 11.2, 18–24

Lentini, G. (2006) *Il 'padre di Telemaco': Odisseo tra* Iliade *e* Odissea (Biblioteca di *MD* 18) (Pisa)

Leone, P. L. (2002) *Scholia vetera et paraphrases in Lycophronis Alexandram* (Galatina)

Lesher, J. H. (1992) *Xenophanes of Colophon: Fragments. A Text and Translation with a Commentary* (*Phoenix* Suppl. 30; Presocratics Vol. 4) (Toronto)

Lesky, A. (1961) *Göttliche und menschliche Motivation im homerischen Epos* (Heidelberg) [abridged and tr. as (2001)]

(2001) 'Divine and Human Causation in Homeric Epic', in Cairns (2001) 170–202 [abridged tr. of (1961) by L. Holford-Strevens]

Lesser, R. H. (2017) 'The Pandareids and Pandora: Defining Penelope's Subjectivity in the *Odyssey*', *Helios* 44.2, 101–32

(2019) 'Female Ethics and Epic Rivalry: Helen in the *Iliad* and Penelope in the *Odyssey*', *AJP* 140.2, 189–226

Leurini, L. (1987) 'Pedanti a confronto: A proposito di Ione di Chio fr. 8 Bl.', *QUCC* 25.1, 131–9

(2000² [1992¹]) *Ionis Chii Testimonia et Fragmenta* (Classical and Byzantine Monographs 23) (Amsterdam)

Leutsch, E. L. von (1830) 'Thebaidis cyclicae reliquiae' (Thesis, Göttingen)

(1859) 'Pindarische studien', *Philologus* 14, 45–68

LeVen, P. A. (2018) 'Echo and the Invention of the Lyric Listener', in Budelmann and Phillips (2018b) 213–33

Levene, D. S. (2010) *Livy on the Hannibalic War* (Oxford)

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1955) 'The Structural Study of Myth', *The Journal of American Folklore* 68.270, 428–44

(1958) *Anthropologie structurale* (Paris)

Levine, D. B. (1985) 'Symposium and the Polis', in Figueira and Nagy (1985) 176–96

(2002–3) 'Poetic Justice: Homer's Death in the Ancient Biographical Tradition', *CJ* 98.2, 141–60

Li, Y. (2022) *Future Fame in the* Iliad*: Epic Time and Homeric Studies* (New York)

Liapis, V. (2006) 'Intertextuality as Irony: Heracles in Epic and in Sophocles', *G&R* 53.1, 48–59

Liberman, G. (1999) *Alcée: Texte établi, traduit et annoté* (Collection des universités de France 392) (2 vols.) (Paris)

(2004) *Pindare: Pythiques. Texte établi, traduit et annoté* (Paris)

(2007) 'L'édition alexandrine de Sappho', in Bastianini and Casanova (2007) 41–65

Lidov, J. B. (1974) 'The Poems and Performance of Isthmians 3 and 4', *CSCA* 7, 175–85

377

Lightfoot, J. (2019) 'Something To Do with Dionysus? Dolphins and Dithyramb in Pindar Fragment 236 SM', *CP* 114.3, 481–92

Lightfoot, J. L. (2009) *Hellenistic Collection: Philitas, Alexander of Aetolia, Hermesianax, Euphorion, Parthenius* (Loeb Classical Library 508) (Cambridge, MA)

(2014) *Dionysius Periegetes: Description of the Known World: With Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford)

Liñares, L. A. (2003) 'El discurso de los ancianos: Ilíada y paradigma' (PhD Thesis, University of Buenos Aires)

Littlewood, R. J. (2006) *A Commentary on Ovid's* Fasti*, Book 6* (Oxford)

(2011) *A Commentary on Silius Italicus'* Punica 7 (Oxford)

Liveley, G. (2008) 'Paraquel Lines: Time and Narrative in Ovid's *Heroides*', in G. Liveley and P. Salzman-Mitchell (eds.), *Latin Elegy and Narratology: Fragments of Story* (Columbus, OH) 86–102

Lloyd-Jones, H. (1981) 'Remarks on the Homeric Question', in H. Lloyd-Jones, V. Pearl and B. Worden (eds.), *History & Imagination: Essays in Honour of H. R. Trevor-Roper* (London) 15–29 [= (1990) 3–20]

(1984) 'The *Meropis* (*SH* 903 A)', in *Atti del XVII Congresso internazionale di papirologia* (3 vols.) (Naples) I 141–52 [= (1990) 21–9]

(1990) *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy: The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford)

Lloyd-Jones, H. and Wilson, N. G. (1990) *Sophoclis Fabulae* (Oxford)

Lobel, E. (1957a) 'P. Oxy. 2388. Alcman', in Lobel et al. (1957) 22–7

(1957b) 'P. Oxy. 2389. Commentary on Alcman', in Lobel et al. (1957) 28–48

Lobel, E., Roberts, C. H., Turner, E. G. and Barns, J. W. B. (eds.) (1957) *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part* XXIV (Graeco-Roman memoirs no. 35) (London)

Lockyer, C. W., Jr. (1971) 'The Fiction of Memory and the Use of Written Sources: Convention and Practice in Seneca the Elder and Other Authors' (PhD Thesis, Princeton University)

Lohmann, D. (1970) *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 6) (Berlin)

(1988) *Die Andromache-Szenen der Ilias: Ansätze und Methoden der Homer-Interpretation* (Spudasmata 42) (Hildesheim)

Lohse, G. (1964) 'Untersuchungen über Homerzitate bei Platon, Pt. 1', *Helikon* 4, 3–28

(1965) 'Untersuchungen über Homerzitate bei Platon, Pt. 2', *Helikon* 5, 248–95

(1967) 'Untersuchungen über Homerzitate bei Platon, Pt. 3', *Helikon* 7, 223–31

Loney, A. C. (2014) 'Hesiod's Incorporative Poetics in the *Theogony* and the Contradictions of Prometheus', *AJP* 135.4, 503–31

(2019) *The Ethics of Revenge and the Meanings of the* Odyssey (New York)

Long, A. A. and Sedley, D. N. (1987) *The Hellenistic Philosophers* (2 vols.) (Cambridge)

Lonsdale, S. H. (1989) 'If Looks Could Kill: παπταίνω and the Interpenetration of Imagery and Narrative in Homer', *CJ* 84.4, 325–33

Bibliography

López-Ruiz, C. (2010) *When the Gods Were Born: Greek Cosmogonies and the Near East* (Cambridge, MA)

(2014) 'Greek and Near Eastern Mythologies: A Story of Mediterranean Encounters', in L. Edmunds (ed.), *Approaches to Greek Myth. Second Edition* (Baltimore) 154–99

Lord, A. B. (1953) 'Homer's Originality: Oral Dictated Texts', *TAPA* 84, 124–34

(1960) *The Singer of Tales* (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature 24) (Cambridge, MA)

Lord, M. L. (1967) 'Withdrawal and Return: An Epic Story Pattern in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter and in the Homeric Poems', *CJ* 62.6, 241–8

Loscalzo, D. (1988) 'Il fr. 180 S.-M. di Pindaro', *QUCC* 29.2, 71–5

(2000) *La Nemea settima di Pindaro* (Daidalos 2) (Viterbo)

(2019) *Saffo, la hetaira* (Syncrisis 4) (Pisa)

Louden, B. (1993) 'Pivotal Contrafactuals in Homeric Epic', *ClAnt* 12.2, 181–98

(2006) *The* Iliad*: Structure, Myth, and Meaning* (Baltimore)

(2011) *Homer's* Odyssey *and the Near East* (Cambridge)

(2018a) 'The Homeric Epics and Other Texts', Review of Currie (2016), *CR* 68.1, 14–16

(2018b) '*Iliad* 11: Healing, Healers, Nestor, and Medea', *YAGE* 2, 151–64

Lovell, C. (2011) 'The Overburdened Earth: Landscape and Geography in Homeric Epic' (PhD Thesis, University of Texas at Austin)

Lowe, D. (2013) 'Women Scorned: A New Stichometric Allusion in the *Aeneid*', *CQ* 63.1, 442–5

(2014) 'A Stichometric Allusion to Catullus 64 in the *Culex*', *CQ* 64.2, 862–5

Lowenstam, S. (1992) 'The Uses of Vase-Depictions in Homeric Studies', *TAPA* 122, 165–98

(1993) 'The Arming of Achilleus on Early Greek Vases', *ClAnt* 12.2, 199–218

(1997) 'Talking Vases: The Relationship between the Homeric Poems and Archaic Representations of Epic Myth', *TAPA* 127, 21–76

(2008) *As Witnessed by Images: The Trojan War Tradition in Greek and Etruscan Art* (Baltimore)

Lowrie, M. (1992) 'A Sympotic Achilles, Horace *Epode* 13', *AJP* 113.3, 413–33

Luginbill, R. D. (2002) 'Tyrtaeus 12 West: Come Join the Spartan Army', *CQ* 52.2, 405–14

Lulli, L. (2011) *Narrare in distici: L'elegia greca arcaica e classica di argomento storico-mitico* (Quaderni dei *SemRom* 13) (Rome)

Luppino, A. (1959) 'Divagazioni e precisazioni sulla Pitica III di Pindaro', *RFIC* 37, 225–36

Luther, W. (1935) *'Wahrheit' und 'Lüge' im ältesten Griechentum* (Göttingen)

Lyne, R. (2016) *Memory and Intertextuality in Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge)

Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1994) 'Vergil's *Aeneid*: Subversion by Intertextuality: Catullus 66.39–40 and Other Examples', *G&R* 41.2, 187–204 [= (2007) 167–83]

(2007) *Collected Papers on Latin Poetry* (Oxford)

Lynn-George, M. (1988) *Epos: Word, Narrative and the* Iliad (Basingstoke)

379

Bibliography

Mace, S. T. (1993) 'Amour, Encore! The Development of δηὖτε in Archaic Lyric', *GRBS* 34.4, 335–64

Machacek, G. (2007) 'Allusion', *PMLA* 122.2, 522–36

Maciver, C. A. (2012) 'Representative Bees in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*', *CP* 107.1, 53–69

Mackay, E. A. (ed.) (2008) *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World* (Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece 7) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 298) (Leiden)

Mackay, E. A. (2010) *Tradition and Originality: A Study of Exekias* (BAR International Series 2092) (Oxford)

    (2019) 'The Force of Tradition in Early Greek Poetry and Painting', *Humanities Australia* 10, 40–53

Mackenzie, T. (2021) *Poetry and Poetics in the Presocratic Philosophers: Reading Xenophanes, Parmenides and Empedocles as Literature* (Cambridge)

Mackie, C. J. (1997) 'Achilles' Teachers: Chiron and Phoenix in the *Iliad*', *G&R* 44.1, 1–10

    (1998) 'Achilles in Fire', *CQ* 48.2, 329–38

Mackie, C. J. (ed.) (2004) *Oral Performance and its Context* (Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece 5) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 248) (Leiden)

Mackie, C. J. (2008) *Rivers of Fire: Mythic Themes in Homer's* Iliad (Washington, DC)

Mackie, H. S. (1997) 'Song and Storytelling: An Odyssean Perspective', *TAPA* 127, 77–95

    (2003) *Graceful Errors: Pindar and the Performance of Praise* (Ann Arbor)

Macleod, C. W. (1982) *Homer:* Iliad *Book* XXIV (Cambridge)

    (1983) 'Homer on Poetry and the Poetry of Homer', in *Collected Essays* (Oxford) 1–15

Maehler, H. (1963) *Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum bis zur Zeit Pindars* (Hypomnemata 3) (Göttingen)

    (1982) *Die Lieder des Bakchylides. Erster Teil: Die Siegeslieder* (2 vols.) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 62) (Leiden)

    (1997) *Die Lieder des Bakchylides: Zweiter Teil: Die Dithyramben und Fragmente. Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 167) (Leiden)

    (2003[11]) *Bacchylidis Carmina cum fragmentis* (Munich)

    (2004) *Bacchylides: A Selection* (Cambridge)

Magnelli, E. (2006) 'Il proemio della *Corona* di Filippo di Tessalonica e la sua funzione programmatica', in C. Cristante (ed.) *Atti del convegno internazionale: 'Phantasia. Il pensiero per immagini degli antichi e dei moderni', Trieste, 28–30 aprile 2005, Incontri triestini di filologia classica 4 (2004–5)* (Trieste) 393–404

Maingon, A. D. (1980) 'Epic Convention in Stesichorus' *Geryoneis*: *SLG* S15', *Phoenix* 34.2, 99–107

380

Bibliography

Malkin, I. (1998) *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity* (Berkeley)

Mann, C. (2001) *Athlet und Polis im archaischen und frühklassischen Griechenland* (Hypomnemata 138) (Göttingen)

Mann, R. (1994) 'Pindar's Homer and Pindar's Myths', *GRBS* 35.4, 313–37

Maravela, A. (2015) 'Demeter "Nods" to Aphrodite? Narrative Interactions between the "Homeric" *Hymn to Aphrodite* and the *Hymn to Demeter*', in Dell'Oro and Lagacherie (2015) 157–72

Marcaccini, C. (2001) *Costruire un'identità, scrivere la storia: Archiloco, Paro e la colonizzazione di Taso* (Studi e testi 20) (Florence)

March, J. R. (1987) *The Creative Poet: Studies on the Treatment of Myths in Greek Poetry* (*BICS* Suppl. 49) (London)

Marg, W. (1938) *Der Charakter in der Sprache der frühgriechischen Dichtung: Semonides, Homer, Pindar* (Kieler Arbeiten zur klassischen Philologie 1) (Würzburg)

Marin, T. (2009) 'Le Enotrope, Palamede e la sosta dei Greci a Delo nei *Cypria*', *Lexis* 27, 365–80

Marincola, J. (2005) 'Marcellus at Syracuse (Livy XXV, 24, 11–15): A Historian Reflects', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* XII (Brussels) 219–29

Marks, J. (2003) 'Alternative Odysseys: The Case of Thoas and Odysseus', *TAPA* 133.2, 209–26

(2005) 'The Ongoing *Neikos*: Thersites, Odysseus, and Achilleus', *AJP* 126.1, 1–31

(2008) *Zeus in the* Odyssey (Hellenic Studies 31) (Washington, DC)

(2010) 'Context as Hypertext: Divine Rescue Scenes in the *Iliad*', in Tsagalis (2010) 300–22

(2017) 'Conflict and Consensus in the Epic Cycle', in Bassino, Canevaro and Graziosi (2017) 154–69

(2020) 'Epic Traditions', in Pache (2020) 49–61

Maronitis, D. N. (1981) 'Die erste Trugrede des Odysseus in der *Odyssee*: Vorbild und Variationen', in G. Kurz, D. Müller and W. Nicolai (eds.), *Gnomosyne: Menschliches Denken und Handeln in der frühgriechischen Literatur. Festschrift für Walter Marg zum 70. Geburtstag* (Munich) 117–34

Marquardt, P. (1985) 'Penelope "πολύτροπος"', *AJP* 106.1, 32–48

Martin, H. M., Jr. (1972) *Alcaeus* (Twayne's World Authors Series 210) (New York)

Martin, R. P. (1989) *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the* Iliad (Ithaca, NY)

(1992) 'Hesiod's Metanastic Poetics', *Ramus* 21.1, 11–33 [= (2020) 259–84]

(1993) 'Telemachus and the Last Hero Song', *ColbyQ* 29.3, 222–40 [= (2020) 359–82]

(2001) 'Rhapsodizing Orpheus', *Kernos* 14, 23–33 [= (2020) 205–16]

(2005) 'Epic as Genre', in Foley (2005) 9–19 [= (2020) 31–46]

381

(2013) Review of Montanari, Rengakos and Tsagalis (2012), *BMCR* 2013.09.21

(2015) 'Festivals, Symposia, and the Performance of Greek Poetry', in P. Destrée and P. Murray (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Aesthetics* (Chichester) 17–30

(2017) 'Crooked Competition: The Performance and Poetics of *Skolia*', in Bakker (2017c) 61–79

(2020) *Mythologizing Performance* (Ithaca, NY)

(2021) 'Stesichorus and the Name Game', in M. Fantuzzi, H. Morales and T. Whitmarsh (eds.), *Reception in the Greco-Roman World: Literary Studies in Theory and Practice* (Cambridge) 48–71

Marx, F. (1904–5) *C. Lucilii Carminum reliquiae* (2 vols.) (Leipzig)

Maslov, B. (2015) *Pindar and the Emergence of Literature* (Cambridge)

(2016) 'The Children of Mnemosyne: A Contrastive Metapoetics of Pindar and Bacchylides', *Philologia Classica* 11.2, 223–43

Mason, H. C. (2015) 'The Hesiodic *Aspis*: Introduction and Commentary on vv. 139–237' (DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford)

Massa Positano, L. (1946) 'Nugae', *PP* 1, 359–72

Mastronarde, D. J. (1994) *Euripides:* Phoenissae (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 29) (Cambridge)

Matijević, K. (2018) 'Zur Beeinflussung der homerischen Epen durch das Gilgamesch-Epos. Mit einem Exkurs zu einer neuen Datierungsthese der Ilias', *Klio* 100.3, 599–625

Matthews, V. J. (1996) *Antimachus of Colophon: Text and Commentary* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 155) (Leiden)

Mazur, P. S. (2010) 'Formulaic and Thematic Allusions in *Iliad* 9 and *Odyssey* 14', *CW* 104.1, 3–15

Mazza, R. (2020). 'News on the Newest Sappho Fragments: Back to Christie's Salerooms', *Faces & Voices* (Blog, 13 January 2020) (Online: https://facesand voices.wordpress.com/2020/01/13/news-on-the-newest-sappho-fragments-back-to-christies-salerooms/)

(forthcoming) *The Secret Life of Manuscripts* (Stanford)

McConnell, T. (2019) 'Chronology, Dialect and Style: Studies in the Distribution of Linguistic Archaisms in Early Greek Hexameter Poetry' (DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford)

McDermott, E. A. (1987) '*Medea* Line 37: A Note', *AJP* 108.1, 158–61

(1991) 'Double Meaning and Mythic Novelty in Euripides' Plays', *TAPA* 121, 123–32

(2000) 'Euripides' Second Thoughts', *TAPA* 130, 239–59

McEvilley, T. (1971) 'Sappho, Fragment Ninety-Four', *Phoenix* 25.1, 1–11

(1973) 'Sapphic Imagery and Fragment 96', *Hermes* 101.3, 257–78

McNeal, R. A. (1978) 'Structure and Metaphor in Pindar's Fourth *Isthmian*', *QUCC* 28, 135–56

Bibliography

McNelis, C. and Sens, A. (2016) *The* Alexandra *of Lycophron: A Literary Study* (Oxford)

Merkelbach, R. (1957) 'Sappho und ihr Kreis', *Philologus* 101, 1–29

(1969) *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee* (Zetemata 2) (Munich)

Merkelbach, R. and West, M. L. (1967) *Fragmenta Hesiodea* (Oxford)

Metcalf, C. (2014) 'On the Dating of Terpander Fr. 2', *CQ* 64.1, 398–9

(2015) *The Gods Rich in Praise: Early Greek and Mesopotamian Religious Poetry* (Oxford)

(2017) 'The Homeric Epics and the Anatolian Context', Review of Bachvarova (2016), *CR* 67.1, 3–5

Meuli, K. (1921) *Odyssee und Argonautika* (Berlin) [= (1975) II 593–676]

(1975) *Gesammelte Schriften* (ed. T. Gelzer) (2 vols.) (Basel)

Meyerhoff, D. (1984) *Traditioneller Stoff und individuelle Gestaltung. Untersuchungen zu Alkaios und Sappho* (Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 3) (Hildesheim)

Michalopoulos, A. (2001) *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid's* Metamorphoses: *A Commented Lexicon* (ARCA 40) (Leeds)

(2006) *Ovid* Heroides *16 and 17: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (ARCA 47) (Cambridge)

Micozzi, L. (2015) 'Statius' Epic Poetry: A Challenge to the Literary Past', in W. J. Dominik, C. E. Newlands and K. Gervais (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Statius* (Leiden) 325–42

Miller, A. M. (1994) 'Nestor and Sarpedon in Pindar, *Pythian* 3 (Again)', *RhM* 137.3/4, 383–6

Miller, J. F. (1993) 'Ovidian Allusion and the Vocabulary of Memory', *MD* 30, 153–64

(1994) 'The Memories of Ovid's Pythagoras', *Mnemosyne* 47.4, 473–87

Miller, P. J. (2018) 'A Sympotic Self: Instruction through Inebriation in Anacreon', in Allan and Swift (2018) 131–47

Mills, S. (2000) 'Achilles, Patroclus and Parental Care in Some Homeric Similes', *G&R* 47.1, 3–18

Minchin, E. (1991) 'Speaker and Listener, Text and Context: Some Notes on the Encounter of Nestor and Patroklos in *Iliad* 11', *CW* 84.4, 273–85

(2001a) *Homer and the Resources of Memory: Some Applications of Cognitive Theory to the* Iliad *and the* Odyssey (Oxford)

(2001b) 'Similes in Homer: Image, Mind's Eye, and Memory', in Watson (2001) 25–52

(2005) 'Homer on Autobiographical Memory: The Case of Nestor', in Rabel (2005) 55–72

(2006) 'Can One Ever Forget? Homer on the Persistence of Painful Memories', *Scholia* 15.1, 2–16

(2007) *Homeric Voices: Discourse, Memory, Gender* (Oxford)

(2017) 'Voice and Voices: Homer and the Stewardship of Memory', in N. W. Slater (ed.), *Voice and Voices in Antiquity* (Orality and Literacy in the Ancient World 11) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 396) (Leiden) 11–30

(2018) 'The *Odyssey* after the *Iliad*: Ties That Bind', in R. Simms (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Prequels, Sequels, and Retellings of Classical Epic* (Leiden) 9–30

Minto, A. L. (1955) 'La centauromachia del vaso François', in *Anthemon: Scritti di archeologia e di antichità classiche in onore di Carlo Anti* (Florence) 21–40

Miralles, C. and Pòrtulas, J. (1988) *The Poetry of Hipponax* (Filologia e critica 55) (Rome)

Missiou, A. (2011) *Literacy and Democracy in Fifth-Century Athens* (Cambridge)

Mitchell, F. (2021) 'Labor V: The Augean Stables', in Ogden (2021) 80–94

Mitsis, P. (2010) 'Achilles *Polytropos* and Odysseus as Suitor: *Iliad* 9.307–429', in P. Mitsis and C. C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Allusion, Authority, and Truth: Critical Perspectives on Greek Poetic and Rhetorical Praxis* (*TC* Suppl. 7) (Berlin) 51–76

Möllendorff, P. von (2011) 'Es war einmal . . . ein Becher des Nestor. Probleme der Intertextualität und Intermedialität am Beispiel des Skyphos von Ischia', in U. Egelhaaf-Gaiser, D. Pausch and M. Rühl (eds.), *Kultur der Antike: transdisziplinäres Arbeiten in den Altertumswissenschaften* (Berlin) 413–33

Möller, M. (2014) 'Das Spiel mit der Zeit: Beobachtungen zur agonalen Struktur in den "Alters"-Elegien des Mimnermos und des Solon', *Philologus* 158.1, 26–52

Mommsen, H. (1988) 'Zur Deutung der Exekias-Amphora im Vatikan', in J. Christiansen and T. Melander (eds.), *Proceedings of the 3rd Symposium on Ancient Greek and Related Pottery, Copenhagen, August 31– September 4 1987* (Copenhagen) 445–54

Monbrun, P. (2007) *Les voix d'Apollon: L'arc, la lyre et les oracles* (Rennes)

Monoson, S. S. (2000) *Plato's Democratic Entanglements, Athenian Politics and the Practice of Philosophy* (Princeton)

Monro, D. B. (1901) *Homer's* Odyssey. *Books* XIII–XXIV (Oxford)

Monro, D. B. and Allen, T. W. (1920³) *Homeri Opera Tomi* I–II, *Iliadis Libros* I–XII *et* XIII–XXIV *Continentes, Editio Tertia* (Oxford)

Montana, F. (2009) 'Terpandrean Hypotexts in Aristophanes', *TC* 1.1, 36–54

Montanari, F. (2012) 'Introduction: The Homeric Question Today', in Montanari, Rengakos and Tsagalis (2012) 1–10

Montanari, F. and Ascheri, P. (eds.) (2002) *Omero tremila anni dopo* (Storia e Letteratura 210) (Rome)

Montanari, F., Rengakos, A. and Tsagalis, C. C. (eds.) (2009) *Brill's Companion to Hesiod* (Leiden)

(2012) *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry* (*TC* Suppl. 12) (Berlin)

Montiglio, S. (2000) *Silence in the Land of Logos* (Princeton)

Moran, W. S. (1975) 'Μιμνήσκομαι and "Remembering" Epic Stories in Homer and the Hymns', *QUCC* 20, 195–211

Morgan, K. A. (2015) *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century* B.C. (Oxford)

Morgan, L. (1999) *Patterns of Redemption in Virgil's* Georgics (Cambridge)

Morris, I. and Powell, B. B. (eds.) (1997) *A New Companion to Homer* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 163) (Leiden)

Morris, S. P. (1992) *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art* (Princeton)

Morrison, A. D. (2007a) *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge)

   (2007b) *Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes* (*BICS* Suppl. 95) (London)

   (2011a) 'Aeginetan Odes, Reperformance, and Pindaric Intertextuality', in Fearn (2011) 227–53

   (2011b) 'Pindar and the Aeginetan *patrai*: Pindar's Intersecting Audiences', in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011) 311–35

Morrison, J. V. (1992a) *Homeric Misdirection: False Predictions in the* Iliad (Ann Arbor)

   (1992b) 'Alternatives to the Epic Tradition: Homer's Challenges in the *Iliad*', *TAPA* 122, 61–71

   (1997) '*Kerostasia*, The Dictates of Fate, and the Will of Zeus in the *Iliad*', *Arethusa* 30.2, 273–96

Most, G. W. (1985) *The Measures of Praise: Structure and Function in Pindar's Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes* (Göttingen)

   (1992) 'Il poeta nell'Ade: catabasi epica e teoria dell'epos tra Omero e Virgilio', *SIFC* 10.1–2, 1014–26

   (1993) 'Hesiod and the Textualization of Personal Temporality', in G. Arrighetti and F. Montanari (eds.), *La componente autobiografica nella poesia greca e latina fra realtà e artificio letterario. Atti del convegno: Pisa, 16–17 maggio 1991* (Biblioteca di studi antichi 51) (Pisa) 73–92

   (1998) 'Hesiod's Myth of the Five (or Three or Four) Races', *PCPS* 43, 104–27

   (2003) 'Violets in Crucibles: Translating, Traducing, Transmuting', *TAPA* 133.2, 381–90

   (2012) 'Poet and Public: Communicative Strategies in Pindar and Bacchylides', in Agócs, Carey and Rawles (2012) 249–76

Moulton, C. (1977) *Similes in the Homeric Poems* (Hypomnemata 49) (Göttingen)

Mueller, Martin (2009² [1984¹]) *The* Iliad (London)

Mueller, Melissa (2007) 'Penelope and the Poetics of Remembering', *Arethusa* 40.3, 337–62

   (2016) 'Re-Centering Epic *Nostos*: Gender and Genre in Sappho's Brothers Poem', *Arethusa* 49.1, 25–46

Muellner, L. (1996) *The Anger of Achilles: Mēnis in Greek Epic* (Ithaca, NY)

Mülder, D. (1910) *Die Ilias und ihre Quellen* (Berlin)

Murko, M. (1929) *La poésie populaire épique en Yougoslavie au début du XX siècle* (Travaux publiés par l'Institut d'études slaves 10) (Paris)

Bibliography

Murnaghan, S. (1986) 'Penelope's *Agnoia*: Knowledge, Power, and Gender in the *Odyssey*', *Helios* 13.2, 103–15 [= Doherty (2009) 231–46]

(2018) 'Penelope as a Tragic Heroine: Choral Dynamics in Homeric Epic', *YAGE* 2, 165–89

Murray, O. (ed.) (1990) *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion* (Oxford)

Murray, O. (1994) 'Nestor's Cup and the Origins of the Greek Symposium', in d'Agostino and Ridgway (1994) 47–54 [= (2018) 63–75]

(2008) 'The *Odyssey* as Performance Poetry', in Revermann and Wilson (2008) 161–76 [= (2018) 89–104]

(2018) *The Symposion: Drinking Greek Style. Essays on Greek Pleasure 1983–2017* (ed. V. Cazzato) (Oxford)

Murray, P. (1981) 'Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece', *JHS* 101, 87–100

Musgrove, M. W. (1997) 'Change of Perspective in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 12.11–23', *AJP* 118.2, 267–83

(1998) 'Nestor's Centauromachy and the Deceptive Voice of Poetic Memory (Ovid *Met*. 12.182–535)', *CP* 93.3, 223–31

Mynors, R. A. B. (1958) *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina* (Oxford)

(1969) *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Oxford)

Naerebout, F. G. and Beerden, K. (2013) '"Gods Cannot Tell Lies": Riddling and Ancient Greek Divination', in J. Kwapisz, D. Petrain and M. Szymański (eds.), *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 305) (Berlin) 121–47

Nafissi, M. (1991) *La nascita del kosmos: Studi sulla storia e la società di Sparta* (Naples)

Nagler, M. N. (1974) *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer* (Berkeley)

(1990) 'Odysseus: The Proem and the Problem', *ClAnt* 9.2, 335–56

Nagy, G. (1974) *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter* (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature 33) (Cambridge, MA)

(1979) *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Baltimore)

(1982) 'Hesiod', in T. J. Luce (ed.), *Ancient Writers: Greece and Rome* (2 vols.) (New York) I 43–73

(1983) 'On the Death of Sarpedon', in Rubino and Shelmerdine (1983) 189–217

(1985) 'Theognis and Megara: A Poet's Vision of His City', in Figueira and Nagy (1985) 22–81

(1986) 'Pindar's *Olympian* 1 and the Aetiology of the Olympic Games', *TAPA* 116, 71–88

(1990a) *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Ithaca, NY)

(1990b) *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (The Mary Flexner Lectures 1982) (Baltimore)

(1994) 'Copies and Models in Horace *Odes* 4.1 and 4.2', *CW* 87.5, 415–26

(1996a) *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond* (Cambridge)

386

Bibliography

(1996b) *Homeric Questions* (Austin, TX)

(2002) *Plato's Rhapsody and Homer's Music: The Poetics of the Panathenaic Festival in Classical Athens* (Hellenic Studies 1) (Washington, DC)

(2003) *Homeric Responses* (Austin, TX)

(2009) *Homer the Classic* (Hellenic Studies 36) (Washington, DC)

(2010) 'Ancient Greek Elegy', in K. Weisman (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Elegy* (Oxford) 13–45

(2011) 'Asopos and his Multiple Daughters: Traces of Preclassical Epic in the Aeginetan Odes of Pindar', in Fearn (2011) 41–78

(2014) Review of Jensen (2011), *Gnomon* 86.2, 97–101

(2015) 'Homeric Cross-Referencing to a Cyclic Tradition of Performance', in Scafoglio (2015) 15–31

(2016) 'A Poetics of Sisterly Affect in the Brothers Song and in Other Songs of Sappho', in Bierl and Lardinois (2016) 449–92

(2020) 'From Song to Text', in Pache (2020) 80–95

Nash, T. [@theo_nash] (2020) 'In all the discussion and controversy surrounding the provenance of P. Sapph. Obbink, it strikes me that the Cologne Sappho—the Tithonus Poem—has rather dodged a bullet' (Twitter thread, 24 June 2020) (Online: https://twitter.com/theo_nash/status/1275725134909919234)

Nasta, M. (2006) 'La typologie des catalogues d'*Éhées*: Un réseau généalogique thématisé', *Kernos* 19, 59–78

Nauta, R. (2013) 'Metalepsis and Metapoetics in Latin Poetry', in U. E. Eisen and P. von Möllendorff (eds.), *Über die Grenze: Metalepse in Text- und Bildmedien des Altertums* (Narratologia 39) (Berlin) 223–56

Nelson, S. (2005) 'Hesiod', in Foley (2005) 330–43

Nelson, T. J. (2019a) '"Most Musicall, Most Melancholy": Avian Aesthetics of Lament in Greek and Roman Elegy', *Dictynna* 16 (Online: https://doi.org/10.4000/dictynna.1914)

(2019b) Review of Rawles (2018), *BMCR* 2019.02.46

(2020) 'Attalid Aesthetics: The Pergamene "Baroque" Reconsidered', *JHS* 140, 176–98

(2021a) 'Achilles' Heel: (Im)mortality in the *Iliad*', *Omnibus* 82, 7–9

(2021b) 'Archilochus' Cologne Epode and Homer's Quivering Spear (fr. 196a.52 *IEG*²)', *ZPE* 219, 4–7

(2021c) 'Intertextual *Agōnes* in Archaic Greek Epic: Penelope vs. the *Catalogue of Women*', *YAGE* 5, 25–57

(2021d) 'Repeating the Unrepeated: Allusions to Homeric *Hapax Legomena* in Archaic and Classical Greek Poetry', in D. Beck (2021) 119–57

(2022) 'Iphigenia in the *Iliad* and the Architecture of Homeric Allusion', *TAPA* 152.1, 55–101

(forthcoming a) 'Pas, traces de pas / Steps, footsteps', in Guez et al. (forthcoming)

(forthcoming b) 'Talk and Text: The Pre-Alexandrian Footnote from Homer to Theodectes', in Kelly and Spelman (forthcoming)

(forthcoming c) 'Vol, larcin / Stealing, theft', in Guez et al. (forthcoming)

Neri, C. (2015) 'Il *Brothers Poem* e l'edizione alessandrina (in margine a *P. Sapph. Obbink*)', *Eikasmos* 26, 53–76

(2021) *Saffo: Testimonianze e frammenti. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento* (Texte und Kommentare 68) (Berlin)

Nesselrath, H.-G. (2020) 'Heracles in Homer', in Rengakos, Finglass and Zimmermann (2020) 27–36

Nethercut, J. S. (2017) 'Empedocles' "Roots" in Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*', *AJP* 138.1, 85–105

(2018) 'The Alexandrian Footnote in Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*', *Mnemosyne* 71.1, 75–99

(2020) 'Lucretian Echoes: Sound as Metaphor for Literary Allusion in *De Rerum Natura* 4.549–594', in D. O'Rourke (ed.), *Approaches to Lucretius: Traditions and Innovations in Reading the* De Rerum Natura (Cambridge) 124–39

Neumann-Hartmann, A. (2005) 'Wenn Pindar "wir" sagt: Überlegungen zur 1. Person Plural bei Pindar', *Aevum(ant)* 5, 131–48

ní Mheallaigh, K. (2014) *Reading Fiction with Lucian: Fakes, Freaks and Hyperreality* (Cambridge)

Nicholson, N. (2000) 'Pederastic Poets and Adult Patrons in Late Archaic Lyric', *CW* 93.3, 235–59

(2013) 'Cultural Studies, Oral Tradition, and the Promise of Intertextuality', *AJP* 134.1, 9–21

(2016) *The Poetics of Victory in the Greek West: Epinician, Oral Tradition, and the Deinomenid Empire* (New York)

Nickel, R. (2003) 'The Wrath of Demeter: Story Pattern in the *Hymn to Demeter*', *QUCC* 73.1, 59–82

Niese, B. (1882) *Die Entwicklung der homerischen Poesie* (Berlin)

Nikkanen, A. (2012) 'A Note on Memory and Reciprocity in Homer's *Odyssey*', in V. Bers, D. F. Elmer, D. Frame and L. Muellner (eds.), *Donum Natalicium Digitaliter Confectum Gregorio Nagy Septuagenario a Discipulis Collegis Familiaribus Oblatum* (Washington, DC) (Online: https://chs.harvard.edu /anita-nikkanen-a-note-on-memory-and-reciprocity-in-homers-odyssey)

Nilsson, M. P. (1932) *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology* (Sather Classical Lectures 8) (Berkeley)

Nimis, S. A. (1987) *Narrative Semiotics in the Epic Tradition: The Simile* (Bloomington)

Nisetich, F. J. (1977) 'Convention and Occasion in *Isthmian* 2', *CSCA* 10, 133–56

(1989) *Pindar and Homer* (*AJP* Monographs in Classical Philology 4) (Baltimore)

Nøjgaard, M. (1964–67) *La fable antique* (2 vols.) (Copenhagen)

Norden, E. (1957⁴ [1903¹]) *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis Buch VI* (Stuttgart)

Notopoulos, J. A. (1938) 'Mnemosyne in Oral Literature', *TAPA* 69, 465–93

(1966) 'Archilochus, the Aoidos', *TAPA* 97, 311–15

Nünlist, R. (1998) *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 101) (Stuttgart)

Bibliography

(2009) *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia* (Cambridge)

(2014) 'Das Schiff soll unversehrt sein, nicht voll! Zu Sapphos neuem Lied über die Brüder', *ZPE* 191, 13–14

Obbink, D. (1995) *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace* (New York)

(2011) 'Vanishing Conjecture: Lost Books and their Recovery from Aristotle to Eco', in Obbink and Rutherford (2011) 20–49

(2014) 'Two New Poems by Sappho', *ZPE* 189, 32–49

(2015) 'Interim Notes on "Two New Poems of Sappho"', *ZPE* 194, 1–8

(2016a) 'The Newest Sappho: Text, Apparatus Criticus, and Translation', in Bierl and Lardinois (2016) 13–33

(2016b) 'Ten Poems of Sappho: Provenance, Authenticity, and Text of the New Sappho Papyri', in Bierl and Lardinois (2016) 34–54

(2016c) 'Goodbye Family Gloom! The Coming of Charaxos in the Brothers Song', in Bierl and Lardinois (2016) 208–24

(2017) 'A New Fragment of Sappho's "Kypris Poem"', in K. M. Coleman (ed.), *Albert's Anthology* (Loeb Classical Monographs 17) (Cambridge, MA) 129–33

(2020) '*Kypri Despoina*: Sappho's "Kypris Poem" Reconsidered', in P. Burian, J. S. Clay and G. Davis (eds.), *Euphrosyne: Studies in Ancient Philosophy, History, and Literature* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 370) (Berlin) 223–35

Obbink, D. and Rutherford, R. B. (eds.) (2011) *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons* (Oxford)

O'Brien, J. V. (1993) *The Transformation of Hera: A Study of Ritual, Hero, and the Goddess in the* Iliad (Lanham, MA)

O'Connell, P. A. (2018) '"Charaxus Arrived with a Full Ship!" The Poetics of Welcome in Sappho's Brothers Song and the Charaxus Song Cycle', *ClAnt* 37.2, 236–66

(2021) 'Repetition and the Creation of "Sappho"', in D. Beck (2021) 158–86

Ogden, D. (2013) *Drakōn: Dragon Myth and Serpent Cult in the Greek and Roman Worlds* (Oxford)

Ogden, D. (ed.) (2021) *The Oxford Handbook of Heracles* (New York)

O'Hara, J. J. (2017² [1996¹]) *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. New and expanded edition (Ann Arbor)

Olson, S. D. (1990) 'The Stories of Agamemnon in Homer's *Odyssey*', *TAPA* 120, 57–71

(1995) *Blood and Iron: Stories and Storytelling in Homer's* Odyssey (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 148) (Leiden)

(2012) *The* Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite *and Related Texts: Text, Translation and Commentary* (Texte und Kommentare 39) (Berlin)

O'Maley, J. (2011) 'Paradigm Introductions and Mytho-Historical Authority in the *Iliad*', in A. Mackay (ed.), *ASCS 32: Selected Proceedings* (Online: http://www.ascs.org.au/news/ascs32/O'Maley.pdf)

(2014) 'Controlling the Web: Hypertextuality, the *Iliad*, and the Crimes of Previous Generations', in R. S. Scodel (ed.), *Between Orality and Literacy: Communication and Adaptation in Antiquity* (Orality and Literacy in the Ancient World 10) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 367) (Leiden) 6–28

(2018) 'Diomedes as Audience and Speaker in the *Iliad*', in Ready and Tsagalis (2018) 278–98

O'Neill, K. (1999) 'Ovid and Propertius: Reflexive Annotation in *Amores* 1.8', *Mnemosyne* 52.3, 286–307

Ormand, K. (2013) 'Uncertain Geographies of Desire in the *Catalogue of Women*: Atalanta', in M. Skempis and I. Ziogas (eds.), *Geography, Topography, Landscape: Configurations of Space in Greek and Roman Epic* (Berlin) 137–60

(2014) *The Hesiodic* Catalogue of Women *and Archaic Greece* (New York)

(2017) 'Helen's Phantom in Fragments', in Tsagalis (2017b) 115–34

Orr, M. (2003) *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts* (Cambridge)

Osborne, R. (1996) *Greece in the Making, 1200–479 BC* (London)

Ostrowski, J. A. (1991) *Personifications of Rivers in Greek and Roman Art* (Studia z archeologii śródziemnomorskiej Zeszyt 12) (Kraków)

O'Sullivan, P. D. (2003) 'Victory Statue, Victory Song: Pindar's Agonistic Poetics and Its Legacy', in D. Pritchard and D. J. Phillips (eds.), *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World* (Swansea) 75–100

Pache, C. O. (2014) 'Theban Walls in Homeric Epic', in Tsagalis (2014c) 278–96

Pache, C. O. (ed.) (2020) *The Cambridge Guide to Homer* (Cambridge)

Page, D. L. (1955a) *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry* (Oxford)

(1955b) *The Homeric* Odyssey*: The Mary Flexner Lectures Delivered at Bryn Mawr College* (Oxford)

(1956) 'Greek Verses from the Eighth Century B.C.', *CR* 6.2, 95–7

(1961) 'The Sources of the *Iliad*', Review of Kullmann (1960), *CR* 11.3, 205–9

(1962) *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford)

(1963) 'Homer and the *Neoanalytiker*', Review of Schoeck (1961), *CR* 13.1, 21–4

(1972) *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoedias* (Oxford)

Pagliaro, A. (1951) 'La terminologia poetica di Omero e l'origine dell'epica', *Ricerche Linguistiche* 2, 1–46

Pallantza, E. (2005) *Der Troische Krieg in der nachhomerischen Literatur bis zum 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (*Hermes* Einzelschriften 94) (Stuttgart)

Palmisciano, R. (2018) 'Eros in azione: Considerazioni pragmatiche sulla poesia erotica simposiale', *QUCC* 120.3, 153–76

(2019) 'On Drinking Wine in Anacreon fr. 356 *PMG* (= 33 Gent.)', *AION (filol.)* 41, 17–30

Papadimitriou, I. (1957) 'Ἀττικά III: Ὁ θεῖος τοῦ Αἰσχίνου Κλεόβουλος ὁ Μάντις', *Platon* 9, 154–62

Papageorgiou, P. N. (1888) *Scholia in Sophoclis Tragoedias Vetera* (Leipzig)

390

Bibliography

Papaioannou, S. (2007) *Redesigning Achilles: 'Recycling' the Epic Cycle in the 'Little Iliad' (Ovid,* Metamorphoses *12.1–13.622)* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 89) (Berlin)

Paraskeviotis, G. C. (2016) 'The Echo in Vergilian Pastoral', *AC* 85, 45–64
   (2017) 'The Echo in Propertius 1.18', *AClass* 60, 145–61

Parker, H. N. (1993) 'Sappho Schoolmistress', *TAPA* 123, 309–51

Parkes, R. (2009) 'Who's the Father? Biological and Literary Inheritance in Statius' *Thebaid*', *Phoenix* 63.1/2, 24–37
   (2010) 'Dealing with Ghosts: Literary Assertion in Statius' *Thebaid*', *Ramus* 39.1, 14–23

Parks, W. (1990) *Verbal Dueling in Heroic Narrative: The Homeric and Old English Traditions* (Princeton)

Parmentier, R. J. (1994) *Signs in Society: Studies in Semiotic Anthropology* (Bloomington)
   (2016) *Signs and Society: Further Studies in Semiotic Anthropology* (Bloomington)

Parry, A. (1966) 'Have We Homer's *Iliad*?', in A. Parry and G. S. Kirk (eds.), *Homeric Studies*, *YClS* 20, 175–216 [= (1989) 104–40]
   (1989) *The Language of Achilles and Other Papers* (Oxford)

Pasquali, G. (1942) 'Arte allusiva', *L'italia che scrive* 25, 185–7 [= (1968) II 275–82]
   (1968) *Pagine stravaganti* (2 vols.) (Biblioteca Sansoniana critica 41–2) (Florence)

Passmore, O. (2018) 'Thaumastic Acoustics: Typhoeus and "Ty-phonics" in Pindar, *Pythian* 1.26 and Hesiod, *Theogony* 834', *Mnemosyne* 71.5, 733–49

Pataki, E. (2015) 'Variations sur l'immortalité. Tithon et la cigale chez Sappho (fragment 58) et dans la tradition homérique', in Dell'Oro and Lagacherie (2015) 535–47

Paton, W. R. (1912) 'The Armour of Achilles', *CR* 26.1, 1–4

Pavese, C. O. (1966) 'χρήματα χρήματ᾽ ἀνήρ ed il motivo della liberalità nella seconda Istmica di Pindaro', *QUCC* 2, 103–12
   (1991) 'L'inno rapsodico: analisi tematica degli inni omerici', in A. C. Cassio and G. Cerri (eds.), *L'inno tra rituale e letteratura nel mondo antico: Atti di un colloquio Napoli 21–24 ottobre 1991* (*AION (filol.)* 13) (Rome) 155–78
   (1996) 'La iscrizione sulla kotyle di Nestor da Pithekoussai', *ZPE* 114, 1–23

Pavlou, M. (2008) 'Metapoetics, Poetic Tradition, and Praise in Pindar *Olympian* 9', *Mnemosyne* 61.4, 533–67
   (2012) 'Pindar and the Reconstruction of the Past', in J. Marincola, L. Llewellyn-Jones and C. Maciver (eds.), *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras* (Edinburgh Leventis Studies 6) (Edinburgh) 95–112

Peabody, B. (1975) *The Winged Word: A Study in the Technique of Ancient Greek Oral Composition As Seen Principally Through Hesiod's* Works and Days (Albany)

Bibliography

Pearce, T. (2008) 'Homer, *Iliad* 24,614–17', *RhM* 151.1, 13–25

Pedrick, V. (1983) 'The Paradigmatic Nature of Nestor's Speech in *Iliad* 11', *TAPA* 113, 55–68

Peirce, C. S. (1998) *The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings*. Vol. II (1893–1913) (Bloomington)

Pelliccia, H. (1987) 'Pindarus Homericus: *Pythian* 3.1–80', *HSCP* 91, 39–63
  (2003) 'Two Points about Rhapsodes', in Finkelberg and Stroumsa (2003) 97–116
  (2011) 'Double Motivation', in Finkelberg (2011c) I 218–19

Penglase, C. (1994) *Greek Myths and Mesopotamia: Parallels and Influence in the Homeric Hymns and Hesiod* (London)

Peponi, A.-E. (2012) *Frontiers of Pleasure: Models of Aesthetic Response in Archaic and Classical Greek Thought* (Oxford)
  (2016) 'Sappho and the Mythopoetics of the Domestic', in Bierl and Lardinois (2016) 225–37

Peradotto, J. (1985) 'Prophecy Degree Zero: Tiresias and the End of the *Odyssey*', in B. Gentili and G. Paioni (eds.), *Oralità: cultura, letteratura, discorso. Atti del convegno internazionale (Urbino 21–25 Iuglio 1980)* (Rome) 429–59
  (1990) *Man in the Middle Voice: Name and Narration in the* Odyssey (Martin Classical Lectures n.s. 1) (Princeton)

Pertusi, A. (1955) *Scholia vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies* (Pubblicazioni della Università cattolica del Sacro Cuore n.s. 53) (Milan)

Pestalozzi, H. (1945) *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias* (Erlenbach)

Peters, M. (1998) 'Homerisches und Unhomerisches bei Homer und auf dem Nestorbecher', in J. H. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert and L. Olivier (eds.), *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of C. Watkins* (Innsbruck) 585–602

Petropoulos, J. C. B. (1994) *Heat and Lust: Hesiod's Midsummer Festival Scene Revisited* (Lanham, MD)
  (2011) *Kleos in a Minor Key: The Homeric Education of a Little Prince* (Hellenic Studies 45) (Washington, DC)

Petzl, G. (1969) *Antike Diskussionen über die beiden Nekyiai* (Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie 29) (Meisenheim am Glan)

Petzold, K.-E. (1976) 'Die Meleagros-Geschichte der Ilias: Zur Entstehung geschichtlichen Denkens', *Historia* 25.2, 146–69

Pfeiffer, R. (1949–53) *Callimachus* (2 vols.) (Oxford)
  (1968) *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford)

Pfeijffer, I. L. (1995) 'The Date of Pindar's Fifth *Nemean* and Bacchylides' Thirteenth Ode', *CQ* 45.2, 318–32
  (1999) *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar: A Commentary on Nemean* V, *Nemean* III & *Pythian* VIII (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 197) (Leiden)

Phillippo, S. (2007) '"A Future for Astyanax": Alternative and Imagined Futures for Hector's Son in Classical and European Drama', *IJCT* 14.3/4, 321–74

392

Bibliography

Phillips, E. D. (1957) 'A Suggestion about Palamedes', *AJP* 78.3, 267–78

Phillips, T. (2015) 'Echo in Euripides' *Andromeda*', *Greek and Roman Musical Studies* 3, 53–66

  (2016) *Pindar's Library: Performance Poetry and Material Texts* (Oxford)

  (2017) 'Pindar's Voices: Music, Ethics and Reperformance', *JHS* 137, 142–62

  (2018) 'Hesiod and Pindar', in A. C. Loney and S. E. Scully (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Hesiod* (Oxford) 261–77

  (2022) Review of Bernsdorff (2020), *BMCR* 2022.01.25

Pigman, G. W. (1979) 'The Metaphorics of *Imitatio* and *Aemulatio*', in *Humanities Working Paper, No. 18* (Pasadena, CA)

  (1980) 'Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance', *Renaissance Quarterly* 33.1, 1–32

Pini, G. (1967) 'Correzioni di miti in Pindaro', *Vichiana* 4, 339–82

Pironti, G. (2009) '"Ce muthos n'est pas de moi, je le tiens de ma mère." Cosmogonies grecques et savoir partagé', in J.-P. Aygon, C. Bonnet and C. Noacco (eds.), *La mythologie de l'Antiquité à la modernité: Appropriation–Adaptation–Détournement* (Rennes) 45–57

Pöhlmann, E. (1994) *Einführung in die Überlieferungsgeschichte und in die Textkritik der antiken Literatur. Band 1: Altertum* (Darmstadt)

Pollmann, K. (1993) 'Etymologie, Allegorese und Epische Struktur: Zu den Toren der Träume bei Homer und Vergil', *Philologus* 137.2, 232–51

Poltera, O. (1997) *Le langage de Simonide: étude sur la tradition poétique et son renouvellement* (Sapheneia 1) (Bern)

  (2008) *Simonides lyricus: Testimonia und Fragmente. Einleitung, kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 35) (Basel)

Pontani, F. (2007–) *Scholia Graeca in Odysseam* (5 vols. to date) (Pleiadi 6.1–5) (Rome)

Porter, A. E. (2014) 'Reconstructing Laomedon's Reign in Homer: *Olympiomachia*, Poseidon's Wall, and the Earlier Trojan War', *GRBS* 54.4, 507–26

  (2019) *Agamemnon, the Pathetic Despot: Reading Characterization in Homer* (Hellenic Studies 78) (Washington, DC)

  (2022) *Homer and the Epic Cycle: Recovering the Oral Traditional Relationship* (Leiden)

Porzig, W. (1930) 'Illujankas und Typhon', *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* 1, 379–86

Powell, B. B. (1991) *Homer and the Origin of the Greek Alphabet* (Cambridge)

  (1997) 'Homer and Writing', in Morris and Powell (1997) 3–32

Power, T. C. (2010) *The Culture of Kitharôidia* (Hellenic Studies 15) (Washington, DC)

Pratt, L. H. (1993) *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar: Falsehood and Deception in Archaic Greek Poetics* (Ann Arbor)

  (1995) 'The Seal of Theognis, Writing, and Oral Poetry', *AJP* 116.2, 171–84

393

(2009) 'Diomedes, the Fatherless Hero of the *Iliad*', in S. R. Hübner and D. M. Ratzan (eds.), *Growing Up Fatherless in Antiquity* (Cambridge) 141–61

Prauscello, L. (2012) 'Epinician Sounds: Pindar and Musical Innovation', in Agócs, Carey and Rawles (2012) 58–82

(2021) 'The Alexandrian Edition of Sappho', in Finglass and Kelly (2021) 219–31

Price, J. J. and Zelnick-Abramovitz, R. (eds.) (2020) *Text and Intertext in Greek Epic and Drama: Essays in Honor of Margalit Finkelberg* (Abingdon)

Primavesi, O. (2018) 'Phoinix über die Verblendung des Helden Auktoriale Erzählerperspektive und Figurenperspektive im Iota der Ilias', in S. Finkmann, A. Behrendt and A. Walter (eds.), *Antike Erzähl- und Deutungsmuster: Zwischen Exemplarität und Transformation* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 374) (Berlin) 7–35

Privitera, G. A. (1970) *Dioniso in Omero e nella poesia greca arcaica* (Filologia e critica 6) (Rome)

(1978–79) 'Le vittorie di Melisso nelle Istmiche III e IV', *Helikon* 18–19, 3–21

(2009⁵ [1982¹]) *Pindaro: Le* Istmiche (Milan)

Prodi, E. E. (2017a) 'Text as Paratext: Pindar, Sappho, and Alexandrian Editions', *GRBS* 57.3, 547–82

(2017b) '*P. Oxy.* 2174 fr. 5: an Odyssey for Hipponax?', *APF* 63.1, 1–10

Prodi, E. E. and Vecchiato, S. (eds.) (2021) *Φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ: Studi in onore di Willy Cingano per il suo 70° Compleanno* (Antichistica 31, Filologia e letteratura 4) (Venice)

Pucci, J. (1998) *The Full-Knowing Reader: Allusion and the Power of the Reader in the Western Literary Tradition* (New Haven)

Pucci, P. (1977) *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry* (Baltimore)

(1979) 'The Song of the Sirens', *Arethusa* 12.2, 121–32

(1987) *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the* Odyssey *and the* Iliad (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 46) (Ithaca, NY)

(2018) *The* Iliad*: The Poem of Zeus* (*TC* Suppl. 66) (Berlin)

Puelma, M. (1989) 'Der Dichter und die Wahrheit in der griechischen Poetik von Homer bis Aristoteles', *MH* 46.2, 65–100

Pulleyn, S. (1997) *Prayer in Greek Religion* (Oxford)

(2000) *Homer:* Iliad *Book* I. *Edited with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford)

(2019) *Homer:* Odyssey *Book* I. *Edited with an Introduction, Translation, Commentary, and Glossary* (Oxford)

Purves, A. C. (2010) *Space and Time in Ancient Greek Narrative* (Cambridge)

(2019) *Homer and the Poetics of Gesture* (New York)

(2021) 'Sappho's Lyric Sensibilities', in Finglass and Kelly (2021) 175–89

Putnam, M. C. J. (1986) *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes* (Ithaca, NY)

Bibliography

Quattrocelli, L. (2007) 'Les fragments de Terpandre et l'hymne dans la Sparte archaïque', in Y. Lehmann (ed.), *L'hymne antique et son public* (Recherches sur les rhétoriques religieuses 7) (Turnhout) 65–80

Querbach, C. A. (1976) 'Conflicts between Young and Old in Homer's *Iliad*', in S. Bertman (ed.), *The Conflict of Generations in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Amsterdam) 55–64

Quint, D. (1983) *Origin and Originality in Renaissance Literature: Versions of the Source* (New Haven)

Rabel, R. J. (ed.) (2005) *Approaches to Homer, Ancient & Modern* (Swansea)

Race, W. H. (1982) 'Aspects of Rhetoric and Form in Greek Hymns', *GRBS* 23.1, 5–14

(1997) *Pindar* (2 vols.) (Loeb Classical Library 56, 485) (Cambridge, MA)

Radermacher, L. (1931) *Der homerische Hermeshymnus* (Vienna)

Radif, L. (2002) *L'Iliade al quadrato: Retorica dell'allusività e miti concorrenti* (Alessandria)

Radt, S. L. (1958) *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian: Text, Scholien und Kommentar* (Amsterdam)

(1985) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Vol. III: *Aeschylus* (Göttingen)

(2002–11) *Strabons Geographika. Mit Übersetzung und Kommentar* (10 vols.) (Göttingen)

Ramírez de Verger, A. (2003) *P. Ovidius Naso. Carmina Amatoria: Amores, Medicamina faciei femineae, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris* (Munich)

Rangos, S. (2009) 'The Story of a Simile: Hidden Evidence for Dionysus in Homer and Beyond', in E. Karamalengou and E. Makrygianni (eds.), Ἀντιφίλησις: *Studies on Classical, Byzantine and Modern Greek Literature and Culture in Honour of John-Theophanes A. Papademetriou* (Stuttgart) 67–82

Rau, P. (1967) *Paratragodia: Untersuchung einer komischen Form des Aristophanes* (Zetemata 45) (Munich)

Rawles, R. J. (2006) 'Notes on the Interpretation of the "New Sappho"', *ZPE* 157, 1–7

(2018) *Simonides the Poet: Intertextuality and Reception* (Cambridge)

Rayor, D. J. (2005) 'The Power of Memory in Erinna and Sappho', in E. Greene (ed.), *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Norman, OK) 59–71

Rayor, D. J. and Lardinois, A. (2014) *Sappho: A New Translation of the Complete Works* (Cambridge)

Ready, J. L. (2012) 'Zeus, Ancient Near Eastern Notions of Divine Incomparability, and Similes in the Homeric Epics', *ClAnt* 31.1, 56–91

(2014) 'ATU 974 *The Homecoming Husband*, the Returns of Odysseus, and the End of *Odyssey* 21', *Arethusa* 47.3, 265–85

(2015) 'The Textualization of Homeric Epic by Means of Dictation', *TAPA* 145.1, 1–75

(2019) *Orality, Textuality, and the Homeric Epics: An Interdisciplinary Study of Oral Texts, Dictated Texts, and Wild Texts* (New York)

Bibliography

Ready, J. L. and Tsagalis, C. C. (eds.) (2018) *Homer in Performance: Rhapsodes, Narrators, and Characters* (Austin, TX)

Recchia, M. (2017) 'Pindaro e i poeti di Sparta arcaica: Un frammento pindarico in *POxy* 2389?', *QUCC* 115.1, 53–65

Redfield, J. M. (1975) *Nature and Culture in the* Iliad*: The Tragedy of Hector* (Chicago)

Reece, S. (1988) 'Homeric Influence in Stesichorus' *Nostoi*', *BASP* 25, 1–8

    (1993) *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene* (Ann Arbor)

    (1994) 'The Cretan Odyssey: A Lie Truer Than Truth', *AJP* 115.2, 157–73

    (2005) 'Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: From Oral Performance to Written Text', in M. C. Amodio (ed.), *New Directions in Oral Theory* (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 287) (Tempe, AZ) 43–89

    (2011) 'Penelope's "Early Recognition" of Odysseus from a Neoanalytic and Oral Perspective', in *Early Recognition in Homer's* Odyssey, *College Literature* 38.2, 101–17

Reeson, J. (2001) *Ovid* Heroides *11, 13 and 14: A Commentary* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 221) (Leiden)

Reichel, M. (1994) *Fernbeziehungen in der* Ilias (ScriptOralia 62) (Tübingen)

    (1998) 'How Oral Is Homer's Narrative?', in F. Cairns and M. Heath (eds.), *PLLS* 10: *Greek Poetry, Drama, Prose, Roman Poetry* (ARCA 38) (Leeds) 1–22

Reinhardt, K. (1938) *Das Parisurteil* (Wissenschaft und Gegenwart 11) (Frankfurt am Main) [= (1960) 16–36; tr. as Jones and Wright (1997) 170–91]

    (1948) 'Die Abenteuer der Odyssee', in *Von Werken und Formen: Vorträge und Aufsätze* (Godesberg) 52–162 [= (1960) 47–124, of which pp. 77–87 and 112–24 tr. as Jones and Wright (1997) 225–48]

    (1960) *Tradition und Geist: Gesammelte Essays zur Dichtung* (ed. C. Becker) (Göttingen)

    (1961) *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter* (ed. U. Hölscher) (Göttingen)

Reitzenstein, R. (1893) *Epigramm und Skolion: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der alexandrinischen Dichtung* (Giessen)

Renaud, J.-M. (2007) 'Les mythes chez Homère et chez Pindare: La famille vue sous des éclairages différents', in J. Boulogne (ed.), *Représentations mythologiques du sentiment familial: Autour de la haine et de l'amour* (Villeneuve d'Asq) 25–34

Renehan, R. (1971) 'The Michigan Alcidamas-Papyrus: A Problem in Methodology', *HSCP* 75, 85–105

    (1980) 'Review Article: Progress in Hesiod', *CP* 75.4, 339–58

    (1983) 'The Early Greek Poets: Some Interpretations', *HSCP* 87, 1–29

    (1985) 'Review Article: A New Commentary on Euripides', *CP* 80.2, 143–75

Rengakos, A. (2004) 'Die *Argonautika* und das "kyklische Gedicht": Bemerkungen zur Erzähltechnik des griechischen Epos', in Bierl, Schmitt and Willi (2004) 277–304

396

Bibliography

(2007) 'The Smile of Achilles, or the *Iliad* and its Mirror-Image', in M. Païsi-Apostolopoulou, A. Rengakos and C. C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Contests and Rewards in the Homeric Epics: Proceedings of the 10th International Symposium on the Odyssey (15–19 September 2004)* (Ithaca) 101–10

(2015) '*Aethiopis*', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (2015) 306–17

(2020) 'Neoanalysis and Oral Poetry: A Historic Compromise?', in Rengakos, Finglass and Zimmermann (2020) 37–49

(forthcoming) *Homeric Poetry and Neoanalysis* (Berlin)

Rengakos, A., Finglass, P. J. and Zimmermann, B. (eds.) (2020) *More than Homer Knew: Studies on Homer and His Ancient Commentators* (Berlin)

Revermann, M. (2006) 'The Competence of Theatre Audiences in Fifth- and Fourth-Century Athens', *JHS* 126, 99–124

Revermann, M. and Wilson, P. (eds.) (2008) *Performance, Iconography, Reception: Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin* (Oxford)

Richardson, N. J. (1974) *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford)

(1993) *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*. Vol. vi: *Books 21–24* (Cambridge)

(2007) '*The Homeric Hymn to Hermes*', in Finglass, Collard and Richardson (2007) 83–91

(2010) *Three Homeric Hymns: To Apollo, Hermes, and Aphrodite. Hymns 3, 4, and 5* (Cambridge)

(2011) 'Reflections of Choral Song in Early Hexameter Poetry', in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011) 15–31

Richardson, S. (1990) *The Homeric Narrator* (Nashville)

(2006) 'The Devious Narrator of the *Odyssey*', *CJ* 101.4, 337–59

Ricks, C. (1976) 'Allusion: The Poet As Heir', in R. F. Brissenden and J. C. Eade (eds.), *Studies in the Eighteenth Century* iii*: Papers Presented at the Third David Nichol Smith Memorial Seminar, Canberra 1973* (Canberra) 209–40

(2002) *Allusion to the Poets* (Oxford)

Ridgway, D. (1992) *The First Western Greeks* (Cambridge)

Riemer, P. (2000) 'Die "ewige Deianeira"', in A. Bagordo and B. Zimmermann (eds.), *Bakchylides. 100 Jahre nach seiner Wiederentdeckung* (Zetemata 106) (Munich) 169–82

Rinon, Y. (2006a) 'Tragic Hephaestus: The Humanized God in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*', *Phoenix* 60.1/2, 1–20

(2006b) '*Mise en abyme* and Tragic Signification in the *Odyssey*: The Three Songs of Demodocus', *Mnemosyne* 59.2, 208–25

Risch, E. (1987) 'Zum Nestorbecher aus Ischia', *ZPE* 70, 1–9

Rissman, L. (1983) *Love as War: Homeric Allusion in the Poetry of Sappho* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 157) (Königstein/Ts.)

Ritoók, Zs. (1989) 'The Views of Early Greek Epic on Poetry and Art', *Mnemosyne* 42.3/4, 331–48

Robbins, E. I. (1990) 'The Gifts of the Gods: Pindar's Third *Pythian*', *CQ* 40.2, 307–18 [= (2013) 175–91]

397

Bibliography

(1993) 'The Education of Achilles', *QUCC* 45.3, 7–20 [= (2013) 58–71]

(1995) 'Sappho, Aphrodite, and the Muses', in *Mystery Cults in Late Antiquity*, *AncW* 26.2, 225–39 [= (2013) 121–44]

(2013) *Thalia Delighting in Song: Essays on Ancient Greek Poetry* (ed. B. MacLachlan) (*Phoenix* Suppl. 53) (Toronto)

Robert, C. (1915) *Oidipus: Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffs im griechischen Altertum* (Berlin)

(1920–26⁴) *Die griechische Heldensage* (Vol. II of L. Preller, *Griechische Mythologie*, rewritten by C. Robert) (Berlin)

Robertson, N. (1980) 'Heracles' "Catabasis"', *Hermes* 108.3, 274–300

Robinson, M. J. (2019) 'Arms and a Mouse: Approaching Acrostics in Ovid and Vergil', *MD* 82, 23–73

Rocha-Pereira, M. H. (1989–90² [1973–81¹]) *Pausaniae Graeciae Descriptio* (3 vols.) (Leipzig)

Rohdenberg, R. and Marks, J. (2012) 'Taphians and Thesprotians within and beyond the *Odyssey*', *Kyklos* 1 (Online: https://classics-at.chs.harvard.edu /taphians-and-thesprotians-within-and-beyond-the-odyssey/)

Roisman, H. M. (1994) 'Like Father Like Son: Telemachus' κέρδεα', *RhM* 137.1, 1–22

(2005a) 'Old Men and Chirping Cicadas in the *Teichoskopia*', in Rabel (2005) 105–18

(2005b) 'Nestor the Good Counsellor', *CQ* 55.1, 17–38

Rollinger, R. (2001) 'The Ancient Greeks and the Impact of the Ancient Near East: Textual Evidence and Historical Perspective', in R. M. Whiting (ed.), *Mythology and Mythologies: Methodological Approaches to Intercultural Influences. Proceedings of the Second Annual Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project held in Paris,* France*, October 4–7, 1999* (Melammu Symposia 2) (Helsinki) 233–64

(2015) 'Old Battles, New Horizons: The Ancient Near East and the Homeric Epics', in R. Rollinger and E. van Dongen (eds.), *Mesopotamia in the Ancient World: Impact, Continuities, Parallels* (Münster) 5–32

Römer, C. (2013) *Commentaria et lexica Graeca in papyris reperta* I.1.2.1: *Alcman* (Berlin)

Romero-González, D. (2021) 'Deianeira, Death, and Apotheosis', in Ogden (2021) 266–80

Romney, J. M. (2011) 'The Rhetoric of Cohesion: Allusions to Homeric Heroes in Tyrtaeus' Poetry' (MA Thesis, University of Victoria)

(2020) *Lyric Poetry and Social Identity in Archaic Greece* (Ann Arbor)

Rose, V. (1886) *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta* (Leipzig)

Rosen, R. M. (1988) 'Hipponax, Boupalos, and the Conventions of the *Psogos*', *TAPA* 118, 29–41 [= I. C. Rutherford (2019) 221–35]

(1990a) 'Hipponax and the Homeric Odysseus', *Eikasmos* 1, 11–25

(1990b) 'Poetry and Sailing in Hesiod's *Works and Days*', *ClAnt* 9.1, 99–113

398

Rosenmeyer, P. A. (1997) 'Her Master's Voice: Sappho's Dialogue with Homer', *MD* 39, 123–49

Rosenmeyer, T. G. (1969) 'The Rookie: A Reading of Pindar *Nemean* 1', *CSCA* 2, 233–46

Rösler, W. (1980) *Dichter und Gruppe: Eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historischen Funktion früher griechischer Lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios* (Munich)

(1990) 'Mnemosyne in the Symposion', in Murray (1990) 230–37

(1992) 'Homoerotik und Initiation: Über Sappho', in T. Stemmler (ed.), *Homoerotische Lyrik: Sechstes Kolloquium der Forschungsstelle für europäische Lyrik des Mittelalters* (Mannheim) 43–54

(2011) 'Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit', in A. Rengakos and B. Zimmermann (eds.), *Homer-Handbuch: Leben – Werk – Wirkung* (Stuttgart) 213–27

(2021) 'Sappho and Alcaeus', in Finglass and Kelly (2021) 65–76

Rosner, J. A. (1976) 'The Speech of Phoenix: *Iliad* 9.434–605', *Phoenix* 30.4, 314–27

Ross, D. O. (1975) *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy, and Rome* (Cambridge)

Rotstein, A. (2010) *The Idea of Iambos* (Oxford)

(2012) '*Mousikoi Agones* and the Conceptualization of Genre in Ancient Greece', *ClAnt* 31.1, 92–127

Rowe, C. J. (1978) *Essential Hesiod:* Theogony *1–232, 453–733;* Works and Days *1–307* (Bristol)

Rozokoki, A. (2009) 'Some New Thoughts on Stesichorus' *Geryoneis*', *ZPE* 168, 3–18

Rubin, D. C. (1995) *Memory in Oral Traditions: The Cognitive Psychology of Epic, Ballads, and Counting-Out Rhymes* (New York)

Rubino, C. A. and Shelmerdine, C. W. (eds.) (1983) *Approaches to Homer* (Austin, TX)

Rudolph, A. (2009) 'Die Transgression der Situation: Zur Text-Kontext-Relation als Konstituens der Literarizität sapphischer Lyrik', *Poetica* 41.3/4, 331–54

Russell, C. M. (2013) 'Homer's Roads Not Taken: Stories and Storytelling in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*' (PhD Thesis, UCLA)

Russo, C. F. (1965[2] [1950[1]]) *Hesiodi Scutum: Introduzione, testo critico e commento con traduzione e indici* (Florence)

Russo, J. A. (1999) 'Stesichorus, Homer, and the Forms of Early Greek Epic', in Kazazis and Rengakos (1999) 339–48

Russo, J. A., Fernández-Galiano, M. and Heubeck, A. (1992) *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey, Vol. III: *Books* XVII–XXIV (Oxford)

Rusten, J. and König, J. (2014) *Philostratus:* Heroicus, Gymnasticus, Discourses *1 and 2* (Loeb Classical Library 521) (Cambridge, MA)

Rüter, K. (1969) *Odysseeinterpretationen: Untersuchungen zum ersten Buch und zur Phaiakis* (Hypomnemata 19) (Göttingen)

Bibliography

Rüter, K. and Matthiessen, K. (1968) 'Zum Nestorbecher von Pithekussai', *ZPE* 2, 231–55

Rutherford, I. C. (2000) 'Formulas, Voice, and Death in *Ehoie*-Poetry, the Hesiodic *Gunaikon Katalogos*, and the Odysseian *Nekuia*', in M. Depew and D. Obbink (eds.), *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society* (Cambridge, MA) 81–96

(2001) *Pindar's* Paeans*: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford)

(2012) 'The *Catalogue of Women* within the Greek Epic Tradition: Allusion, Intertextuality and Traditional Referentiality', in Andersen and Haug (2012) 152–67

(2015) 'Pindar's Cycle', in Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (2015) 450–60

Rutherford, I. C. (ed.) (2019) *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Greek Lyric* (Oxford)

Rutherford, R. B. (1985) 'At Home and Abroad: Aspects of the Structure of the *Odyssey*', *PCPS* 31, 133–50

(1986) 'The Philosophy of the *Odyssey*', *JHS* 106, 145–62 [= Doherty (2009) 155–88]

(1991–93) 'From the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*', *BICS* 38, 37–54 [= Cairns (2001b) 117–46]

(1992) *Homer:* Odyssey XIX *and* XX (Cambridge)

(2012) *Greek Tragic Style: Form, Language, and Interpretation* (Cambridge)

(2013² [1996¹]) *Homer* (*G&R* New Surveys in the Classics 41) (Cambridge)

(2019) *Homer:* Iliad *Book* XVIII (Cambridge)

Saake, H. (1971) *Zur Kunst Sapphos: Motiv-analytische und kompositions-technische Interpretationen* (Munich)

Sachs, E. (1933) 'Die Meleagererzählung in der Ilias und das mythische Paradeigma', *Philologus* 88, 16–29

Sacks, R. (1987) *The Traditional Phrase in Homer: Two Studies in Form, Meaning, and Interpretation* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 14) (Leiden)

Saïd, S. (1977) 'Les combats de Zeus et le problème des interpolations dans la *Théogonie* d'Hésiode', *REG* 90, 183–210

(1979) 'Les crimes des prétendants, la maison d'Ulysse et les festins de l'*Odyssée*', in S. Saïd, F. Desbordes, J. Bouffartigue and A. Moreau (eds.), *Études de littérature ancienne: Homère, Horace, le mythe d'Œdipe, les 'Sentences de Sextus'* (Paris) 9–49

(1998) *Homère et l'*Odyssée (Paris) [tr. as (2011)]

(2011) *Homer and the* Odyssey (Oxford) [tr. of (1998) by R. Webb]

Sammons, B. (2010) *The Art and Rhetoric of the Homeric Catalogue* (New York)

(2013) 'Narrative Doublets in the Epic Cycle', *AJP* 134.4, 529–56

(2014) 'A Tale of Tydeus: Exemplarity and Structure in Two Homeric Insets', in Tsagalis (2014c) 297–318

(2017) *Device and Composition in the Greek Epic Cycle* (New York)

(2019) 'The Space of the Epigone in Early Greek Epic', *YAGE* 3, 48–66

400

Bibliography

Sampson, C. M. (2020) 'Deconstructing the Provenances of P. Sapph. Obbink', *BASP* 57, 143–69

Sandbach, F. H. (1942) '῎Ακρα Γυρέων Once More', *CR* 56.2, 63–5

Sano, Y. (1993) 'ニオベー・パラデイグマ(『イーリアス』第24巻602-620行)の一解釈：特に614-7行をめぐって / An Interpretation of the Niobe-Paradeigma (*Iliad* XXIV 602–620): Especially on Lines 614–7', *Journal of Classical Studies* 41,14–23 (https://doi.org/10.20578/jclst.41.0_14)

Santoni, A. (1983) 'Temi e motivi di interesse socio-economico nella leggenda dei "sette sapienti"', *ASNP* 13, 91–160

Sarischoulis, E. (2008) *Schicksal, Götter und Handlungsfreiheit in den Epen Homers* (Palingenesia 92) (Stuttgart)

Sbardella, L. (1994) 'Tracce di un epos di Eracle nei poemi omerici', *SMEA* 33, 145–62

  (1998) 'Il silenzio di Aiace: La revisione del mito della *hoplon krisis* nella *Nekyia* omerica', *SemRom* 1.1, 1–18

Scafoglio, G. (ed.) (2015) *Studies on the Greek Epic Cycle*. Vol. I (*Philologia Antiqua* 7, 2014) (Pisa)

Schadewaldt, W. (1965[4] [1944[1]]) *Von Homers Welt und Werk: Aufsätze und Auslegungen zur homerischen Frage* (Stuttgart)

Scheer, E. (1958[2] [1881–1908[1]]) *Lycophronis Alexandra* (2 vols.) (Berlin)

Schein, S. L. (1984) *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer's* Iliad (Berkeley)

  (1999) 'Homeric Intertextuality: Two Examples', in Kazazis and Rengakos (1999) 349–56 [= (2016) 81–91]

  (2001) 'Herakles and Odysseus' Bow: Mythological Allusion in the *Odyssey*', in M. Païsi-Apostolopoulou (ed.), *ERANOS: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium on the Odyssey, 2–7 September 2000* (Ithaca) 395–407

  (2002) 'Mythological Allusion in the *Odyssey*', in Montanari and Ascheri (2002) 85–101 [= (2016) 39–54]

  (2013) *Sophocles:* Philoctetes (Cambridge)

  (2016) *Homeric Epic and Its Reception* (New York)

Schenck zu Schweinsberg, J.-M. (2017) *Der pseudohomerische Hermes-Hymnus: Ein interpretierender Kommentar* (Heidelberg)

Schenkeveld, D. M. (1992) 'Prose Usages of Ἀκούειν "To Read"', *CQ* 42.1, 129–41

Schironi, F. (2018) *The Best of the Grammarians: Aristarchus of Samothrace on the* Iliad (Ann Arbor)

Schlange-Schöningen, H. (2006) 'ἐχθρὰ πάρφασις: Odysseus, Aias und Palamedes', in A. Luther (ed.), *Geschichte und Fiktion in der homerischen* Odyssee (Zetemata 125) (Munich) 93–105

Schlesier, R. (2013) 'Atthis, Gyrinno, and Other *Hetairai*: Female Personal Names in Sappho's Poetry', *Philologus* 157.2, 199–222

  (2016) 'Loving, but Not Loved: The New Kypris Song in the Context of Sappho's Poetry' in Bierl and Lardinois (2016) 368–95

Bibliography

Schmitz, C. (2001) '"Denn Auch Niobe … ": Die Bedeutung der Niobe-Erzählung in Achills Rede (Ω 599–620)', *Hermes* 129.2, 145–57

Schnapp-Gourbeillon, A. (1981) *Lions, héros, masques: Les représentations de l'animal chez Homère* (Paris)

Schoeck, G. (1961) *Ilias und Aithiopis: Kyklische Motive in homerischer Brechung* (Zürich)

Schorn, S. (2007) 'Chamaileon: Biographie und Schriften Περὶ τοῦ δεῖνα', *SCO* 53, 31–65

Schrenk, L. P. (1994) 'Sappho Frag. 44 and the *Iliad*', *Hermes* 122.2, 144–50

Schultz, A. L. (2021) 'Language and Agency in Sappho's Brothers Poem', *Helios* 48.2, 113–43

Schwartz, E. (1924) *Die Odyssee* (Munich)

(1887–91) *Scholia in Euripidem* (2 vols.) (Berlin)

Schwinge, E.-R. (1993) *Die Odyssee – nach den Odysseen: Betrachtungen zu ihrer individuellen Physiognomie* (Göttingen)

(1997) 'Tyrtaios über seine Dichtung (Fr. 9 G.-P. = 12 W)', *Hermes* 125.4, 387–95

Scodel, R. S. (1977) 'Apollo's Perfidy: *Iliad* Ω 59–63', *HSCP* 81, 55–7

(1996) 'Self-Correction, Spontaneity, and Orality', in Worthington (1996) 59–79

(1998) 'Bardic Performance and Oral Tradition in Homer', *AJP* 119.2, 171–94

(1999) *Credible Impossibilities: Conventions and Strategies of Verisimilitude in Homer and Greek Tragedy* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 122) (Stuttgart)

(2001) 'Poetic Authority and Oral Tradition in Hesiod and Pindar', in Watson (2001) 109–37

(2002) *Listening to Homer: Tradition, Narrative, and Audience* (Ann Arbor)

(2004) 'The Modesty of Homer', in Mackie (2004) 1–19

(2008) *Epic Facework: Self-Presentation and Social Interaction in Homer* (Swansea)

(2012) 'Hesiod and the Epic Cycle', in Montanari, Rengakos and Tsagalis (2012) 501–15

Scodel, R. S. (ed.) (2014) *Between Orality and Literacy: Communication and Adaptation in Antiquity* (Orality and Literacy in the Ancient World 10) (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 367) (Leiden)

Scodel, R. S. (2017) 'Homeric Fate, Homeric Poetics', in Tsagalis and Markantonatos (2017) 75–94

(2020) 'Homer's Innocent Aeneas and Traditions of the Troad', in Price and Zelnick-Abramovitz (2020) 9–20

(2021a) 'Reperformance, Writing, and the Boundaries of Literature', in D. Beck (2021) 236–60

(2021b) 'Myth in Sappho', in Finglass and Kelly (2021) 190–202

Scott, J. A. (1911) 'Repeated Verses in Homer', *AJP* 32.3, 313–21

Scully, S. (1990) *Homer and the Sacred City* (Ithaca, NY)

Segal, C. P. (1971) 'Nestor and the Honor of Achilles (*Iliad* 1.247–84)', *SMEA* 13, 90–105

402

Bibliography

(1974) 'Eros and Incantation: Sappho and Oral Poetry', *Arethusa* 7.2, 139–60 [= (1998b) 43–61; Greene (1996) 58–75]

(1981) 'Myth, Cult, and Memory in Pindar's Third and Fourth Isthmian Odes', *Ramus* 10.1, 69–86 [= (1998b) 229–49]

(1983) 'Sirius and the Pleiades in Alcman's Louvre Partheneion', *Mnemosyne* 36.3/4, 260–75 [= (1998b) 25–41]

(1986) 'Naming, Truth, and Creation in the Poetics of Pindar', *Diacritics* 16.2, 65–83 [= (1998b) 105–32]

(1994) *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the* Odyssey (Ithaca, NY)

(1998a) 'Beauty, Desire, and Absence: Helen in Sappho, Alcaeus, and Ibycus', in Segal (1988b) 63–83

(1998b) *Aglaia: The Poetry of Alcman, Sappho, Pindar, Bacchylides, and Corinna* (Lanham, MD)

Seidensticker, B. (1978) 'Archilochus and Odysseus', *GRBS* 19.1, 5–22 [= I. C. Rutherford (2019) 203–20]

Selle, H. (2008) *Theognis und die Theognidea* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 95) (Berlin)

Sens, A. (2003) 'Pleasures Recalled: A.R. 3.813–814, Asclepiades, and Homer', *HSCP* 101, 303–9

(2006) 'Epigram at the Margins of Pastoral', in M. Fantuzzi and T. D. Papanghelis (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral* (Leiden) 147–65

(2015) 'Hedylus (4 and 5 Gow–Page) and Callimachean Poetics', *Mnemosyne* 68.1, 40–52

Sergent, B. (2002) 'Les Phéaciens avant l'*Odyssée*', in A. Hurst and F. Létoublon (eds.), *La Mythologie et l'Odyssée: Hommage à Gabriel Germain: Actes du colloque international de Grenoble, 20–22 mai 1999* (Recherches et Rencontres 17) (Geneva) 199–222

Severyns, A. (1928) *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque* (Liège)

Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1995³ [1985¹]) *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* (Stuttgart)

(1997² [1988¹]) *De Bello Civili Libri* x (Stuttgart)

Shakeshaft, H. (2019) 'The Terminology for Beauty in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*', *CQ* 69.1, 1–22

Shapiro, K. D. (1988) '῞Υμνων θησαυρός: Pindar's Sixth Pythian Ode and the Treasury of the Siphnians at Delphi', *MH* 45.1, 1–5

Sharrock, A. and Morales, H. (eds.) (2000) *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations* (Oxford)

Shewan, A. (1913) 'Does the *Odyssey* Imitate the *Iliad*?', *CQ* 7.4, 234–42

Shey, H. J. (1976) 'Tyrtaeus and the Art of Propaganda', *Arethusa* 9.1, 5–28

Sider, D. (1989) 'The Blinding of Stesichorus', *Hermes* 117.4, 423–31

(1991) 'Sarpedon and Nestor in Pindar, *Pythian* 3', *RhM* 134.1, 110–11

(1996) 'As Is the Generation of Leaves in Homer, Simonides, Horace and Stobaios', *Arethusa* 29.2, 263–82

(2020) *Simonides: Epigrams and Elegies. Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford)

Bibliography

Simondon, M. (1982) *La mémoire et l'oubli dans la pensée grecque jusqu'à la fin du Ve siècle avant J.-C.: Psychologie archaïque, mythes et doctrines* (Paris)

Simpson, M. (1969) 'The Chariot and the Bow as Metaphors for Poetry in Pindar's Odes', *TAPA* 100, 437–73

Sinclair, T. A. (1932) *Hesiod:* Works and Days (London)

Sironi, F. (2015) 'La nutrice di Saffo in P. Oxy. 2289 e i paralleli omerici nel "Carme dei fratelli"', *Acme* 68.2, 111–18

(2018) 'La presenza del passato: Saffo e i personaggi dell'epos', *Lexis* 36, 60–77

Sittl, K. (1882) *Die Wiederholungen in der Odyssee: Ein Beitrag zur home-rischen Frage* (Munich)

Skempis, M. (2016) Review of Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (2015), *MH* 73.2, 223–4

(2017) 'The Riddle as Self-Indexing: Antiphanes, *Ganymedes* fr. 75 K–A', *MD* 78, 133–54

Skempis, M. and Ziogas, I. (2009) 'Arete's Words: Etymology, *Ehoie*-Poetry and Gendered Narrative in the *Odyssey*', in Grethlein and Rengakos (2009) 213–40

Skinner, M. B. (2003) *Catullus in Verona: A Reading of the Elegiac Libellus, Poems 65–116* (Columbus)

Skutsch, O. (1985) *The* Annals *of Q. Ennius* (Oxford)

Slater, N. W. (1996) 'Literacy and Old Comedy', in Worthington (1996) 99–112

Slatkin, L. M. (1991) *The Power of Thetis: Allusion and Interpretation in the* Iliad (Berkeley) [= (2011b) 19–95])

(2011a) 'Theban Traces at Troy', in Slatkin (2011b) 99–119

(2011b) *The Power of Thetis and Selected Essays* (Hellenic Studies 16) (Washington, DC)

Smith, P. M. (1981) 'Aineiadai as Patrons of *Iliad* XX and the Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite*', *HSCP* 85, 17–58

Smith, S. D. (2020) 'Gilgamos in Rome: Aelian *NA* 12.21', in A. König, R. Langlands and J. Uden (eds.), *Literature and Culture in the Roman Empire, 96–235: Cross-Cultural Interactions* (Cambridge) 328–43

Smyth, H. W. (1956) *Greek Grammar* (revised by G. M. Messing) (Cambridge, MA)

Snell, B., Kannicht, R. and Radt, S. L. (1971–2004) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (5 vols.) (Göttingen)

Snell, B. and Maehler, H. (1987–89) *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis* (2 vols.) (Leipzig)

Snodgrass, A. M. (1971) *The Dark Age of Greece: An Archaeological Survey of the Eleventh to the Eighth Centuries* BC (Edinburgh)

(1998) *Homer and the Artists: Text and Picture in Early Greek Art* (Cambridge)

Snyder, J. M. (1997) *Lesbian Desire in the Lyrics of Sappho* (New York)

Solez, K. (2019) 'Traveling with Helen: The Itineraries of Paris and Menelaus as Narrative Doublets', *YAGE* 3, 67–87

Solmsen, F. (1949) *Hesiod and Aeschylus* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 30) (Ithaca, NY)

Bibliography

(1990^3 [1970^1]) *Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum: Fragmenta selecta ediderunt R. Merkelbach et M. L. West* (Oxford)

Solodow, J. B. (1988) *The World of Ovid's* Metamorphoses (Chapel Hill)

Sommerstein, A. H. (1987) *Aristophanes:* Birds (Warminster)

Sommerstein, A. H. and Torrance, I. C. (2014) *Oaths and Swearing in Ancient Greece* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 307) (Berlin)

Sotiriou, M. (1998) *Pindarus Homericus: Homer-Rezeption in Pindars Epinikien* (Hypomnemata 119) (Göttingen)

Spelman, H. L. (2017) 'Sappho 44: Trojan Myth and Literary History', *Mnemosyne* 70.5, 740–57

(2018a) *Pindar and the Poetics of Permanence* (Oxford)

(2018b) 'Event and Artefact: The *Hymn to Apollo*, Archaic Lyric, and Early Greek Literary History', in Budelmann and Phillips (2018b) 151–71

(2018c) 'Pindar and the Epic Cycle', *JHS* 138, 182–201

(2019) 'Schools, Reading and Poetry in the Early Greek World', *CCJ* 65, 150–72

(2021) 'Theognis' Unoriginal Didactic Failure', in Prodi and Vecchiato (2021) 133–53

(forthcoming) 'Invoking Homer: The Catalogue of Ships and the Early Reception of the *Iliad*', in Kelly and Spelman (forthcoming)

Spieker, R. (1969) 'Die Beschreibung des Olympos (Hom. *Od.* ζ 41–47)', *Hermes* 97.2, 136–61

Spielberg, L. (2020) 'Ennius' *Annals* as Source and Model for Historical Speech', in C. Damon and J. Farrell (eds.), *Ennius' Annals: Poetry and History* (Cambridge) 147–66

Spivey, N. J. (2018) *The Sarpedon Krater: The Life and Afterlife of a Greek Vase* (London)

Stamatopoulou, Z. (2013) 'Reading the *Aspis* as a Hesiodic Poem', *CP* 108.4, 273–85

(2016) *Hesiod and Classical Greek Poetry: Reception and Transformation in the Fifth Century* BCE (Cambridge)

(2017) 'Wounding the Gods: The Mortal *Theomachos* in the *Iliad* and the Hesiodic *Aspis*', *Mnemosyne* 70.6, 920–38

Stanford, W. B. (1959^2 [1947^1]) *The* Odyssey *of Homer: Edited with General and Grammatical Introduction, Commentary and Indexes* (2 vols.) (London)

(1963) *The Ulysses Theme: A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero* (Oxford)

Steffen, V. (1955) 'De Mimnermi Smyrneide', in V. Steffen (ed.) *Quaestiones lyricae* I (Poznan) 5–21 [= (1973) I 60–75]

(1973) *Scripta minora selecta* (2 vols.) (Wrocław)

Stehle, E. (1997) *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece: Nondramatic Poetry in Its Setting* (Princeton)

(2016) 'Larichos in the Brothers Poem: Sappho Speaks Truth to the Wine-Pourer', in Bierl and Lardinois (2016) 266–92

(2017) 'The Construction of Authority in Pindar's *Isthmian* 2 in Performance', in Bakker (2017c) 8–33

Steiner, D. T. (2002) 'Indecorous Dining, Indecorous Speech: Pindar's First *Olympian* and the Poetics of Consumption', *Arethusa* 35.2, 297–314

(2005) 'Nautical Matters: Hesiod's *Nautilia* and Ibycus Fragment 282 *PMG*', *CP* 100.4, 347–55 [= I. C. Rutherford (2019) 368–79]

(2007) 'Feathers Flying: Avian Poetics in Hesiod, Pindar, and Callimachus', *AJP* 128.2, 177–208

(2009) 'Diverting Demons: Ritual, Poetic Mockery and the Odysseus–Iros Encounter', *ClAnt* 28.1, 71–100

(2010) *Homer:* Odyssey *Books* XVII–XVIII (Cambridge)

(2011) 'New Oil in Old Jars: Hipponax's *Lekythos*-Throw and Aristophanes' *Frogs* 1198–247', *Helios* 38.1, 1–25

(2017) 'Choruses and Catalogues: The Performative and Generic Context of the Asopids in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*', in Tsagalis (2017b) 47–82

Steinrück, M. (1999) 'Homer bei Sappho?', *Mnemosyne* 52.2, 139–49

(2008) *The Suitors in the* Odyssey*: The Clash between Homer and Archilochus* (Hermeneutic Commentaries 2) (New York)

Stelow, A. R. (2020) *Menelaus in the Archaic Period: Not Quite the Best of the Achaeans* (Oxford)

Stenger, J. (2004) *Poetische Argumentation: Die Funktion der Gnomik in den Epinikien des Bakchylides* (Berlin)

Stephens, S. A. (2015) *Callimachus:* The Hymns*. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (New York)

Stewart, A. F. (1998) 'Nuggets: Mining the Texts Again', *AJA* 102.2, 271–82

Steymans, H. U. (2010) 'Gilgameš im Westen', in H. U. Steymans (ed.) *Gilgamesch: Ikonographie eines Helden / Gilgamesh: Epic and Iconography* (Fribourg) 287–345

Stigers, E. S. (1977) 'Retreat from the Male: Catullus 62 and Sappho's Erotic Flowers', *Ramus* 6, 83–102

Stinton, T. C. W. (1976) '*Si Credere Dignum Est*: Some Expressions of Disbelief in Euripides and Others', *PCPS* 22, 60–89 [= (1990) 236–64]

(1990) *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Oxford)

Stocking, C. H. (2017) *The Politics of Sacrifice in Early Greek Myth and Poetry* (Cambridge)

Stoddard, K. (2004) *The Narrative Voice in the* Theogony *of Hesiod* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 255) (Leiden)

Stoevesandt, M. (2016) *Homer's* Iliad*: The Basel Commentary: Book* VI (Boston) [tr. by B. W. Millis, S. Strack and S. D. Olson]

Stoneman, R. (1981) 'Pindar and the Mythological Tradition', *Philologus* 125, 44–63

Stripeikis, C. A. (2018) 'Innovación y tradición en las mentiras cretenses de Odiseo (Cantos 13–19)', *Classica (Brasil)* 31, 25–42

406

Bibliography

Struck, P. T. (2004) *Birth of the Symbol: Ancient Readers at the Limits of Their Texts* (Princeton)

Suárez de la Torre, E. (2008) '"Ya vienen los novios": una lectura socioantropológica del fragmento 44 V. de Safo', *Faventia* 30, 143–60

Suter, A. (1993) 'Paris and Dionysos: *Iambos* in the *Iliad*', *Arethusa* 26.1, 1–18

(2009) 'Tragic Tears and Gender', in T. Fögen (ed.), *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World* (Berlin) 59–83

Svenbro, J. (1975) 'Sappho and Diomedes: Some Notes on Sappho 1 LP and the Epic', *Museum Philologicum Londiniense* 1, 37–49

Swain, S. C. R. (1988) 'A Note on *Iliad* 9.524–99: The Story of Meleager', *CQ* 38.2, 271–6

Sweeney, R. D. (1997) *Lactantii Placidi in Statii Thebaida commentum, Anonymi in Statii Achilleida commentum, Fulgentii ut fingitur Planciadis super Thebaiden commentariolum* (Stuttgart)

Swift, L. A. (2010) *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric* (Oxford)

(2012) 'Archilochus the "Anti-Hero"? Heroism, Flight and Values in Homer and the New Archilochus Fragment (P. Oxy LXIX 4708)', *JHS* 132, 139–55

(2014a) 'The Animal Fable and Greek Iambus: *Ainoi* and Half-*Ainoi* in Archilochus', in C. Werner, B. Sebastiani and A. Dourado-Lopes (eds.), *Gêneros poéticos na Grécia antiga: Confluências e fronteiras* (São Paulo) 49–77

(2014b) 'Telephus on Paros: Genealogy and Myth in the "New Archilochus" Poem (*P Oxy.* 4708)', *CQ* 64.2, 433–47

(2015a) 'Lyric Visions of Epic Combat: The Spectacle of War in Archaic Personal Song', in A. Bakogianni and V. Hope (eds.), *War as Spectacle: Ancient and Modern Perspectives on the Display of Armed Conflict* (London) 93–109

(2015b) 'Negotiating Seduction: Archilochus' Cologne Epode and the Transformation of Epic', *Philologus* 159.1, 2–28

(2018) 'Thinking with Brothers in Sappho and Beyond', in Allan and Swift (2018) 71–87

(2019) *Archilochus: The Poems. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford)

(2021) 'The Gods in Sappho', in Finglass and Kelly (2021) 203–16

(forthcoming) 'Song Cycles in Early Greek Poetry'

Swift, L. A. and Carey, C. (eds.) (2016) *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches* (Oxford)

Szádeczky-Kardoss, S. (1968) 'Mimnermos', in *RE Suppl.* XI, 935–51

Szarmach, M. (1974) 'Le mythe de Palamède avant la tragédie grecque', *Eos* 62, 35–47

Taplin, O. (1986a) 'Fifth-Century Tragedy and Comedy: A *Synkrisis*', *JHS* 106, 163–74

Bibliography

 (1986b) 'Homer's Use of Achilles' Earlier Campaigns in the *Iliad*', in J. Boardman and C. E. Vaphopoulou-Richardson (eds.), *Chios: A Conference at the Homereion in Chios 1984* (Oxford) 15–19

 (1990) 'Agamemnon's Role in the *Iliad*', in C. Pelling (ed.), *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature* (Oxford) 60–82

 (1992) *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of the* Iliad (Oxford)

Tarditi, G. (1968) 'Sull'origine e sul significato della parola rapsodo', *Maia* 20, 137–45

Tarkow, T. (1983) 'Tyrtaeus 9 D.: The Role of Poetry in the New Sparta', *AC* 52, 48–69

Tarrant, D. (1951) 'Plato's Use of Quotations and Other Illustrative Material', *CQ* 1.1/2, 59–67

Tarrant, R. J. (2004) *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses* (Oxford)

 (2012) *Virgil:* Aeneid *Book* XII (Cambridge)

Taylor, M. W. (1981) *The Tyrant Slayers: The Heroic Image in Fifth Century* B.C. *Athenian Art and Politics* (New York)

Teodorsson, S.-T. (2006) 'Eastern Literacy, Greek Alphabet, and Homer', *Mnemosyne* 59.2, 161–87

Thalmann, W. G. (1984) *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Baltimore)

 (1998) *The Swineherd and the Bow: Representations of Class in the* Odyssey (Ithaca, NY)

Thiel, H. van (1988) *Odysseen* (Basel)

 (2014) *Scholia D in Iliadem: Proecdosis Aucta et Correctior* (Elektronische Schriftenreihe der Universitäts- und Stadtbibliothek Köln 7) (Cologne)

Thilo, G. C. and Hagen, H. (1881–1902) *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii* (3 vols.) (Leipzig)

Thomas, O. (2011) 'The Homeric Hymn to Pan', in Faulkner (2011) 151–72

 (2014) 'Phemius Suite', *JHS* 134, 89–102

 (2017) 'Sparring Partners: Fraternal Relations in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*', in Bassino, Canevaro and Graziosi (2017) 62–83

 (2020) *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 62) (Cambridge)

 (forthcoming) 'Intertextual Effects in Early Epigram', in Kelly and Spelman (forthcoming)

Thomas, R. (1992) *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge)

 (2009) 'Writing, Reading, Public and Private "Literacies": Functional Literacy and Democratic Literacy in Greece', in W. A. Johnson and H. N. Parker (eds.), *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome* (Oxford) 13–45

Thomas, R. F. (1982) 'Catullus and the Polemics of Poetic Reference (Poem 64.1–18)', *AJP* 103.2, 144–64 [= (1999) 12–32]

 (1986) 'Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference', *HSCP* 90, 171–98 [= (1999) 114–41]

Bibliography

(1988) *Virgil:* Georgics (2 vols.) (Cambridge)

(1992) 'The Old Man Revisited: Memory, Reference and Genre in Virg., *Georg.* 4, 116–48', *MD* 29, 35–70 [= (1999) 173–205]

(1993) Review of Horsfall (1991), *Vergilius* 39, 76–80

(1998) 'Virgil's Pindar?', in P. Knox and C. Foss (eds.), *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen* (Stuttgart) 99–120 [= (1999) 267–87]

(1999) *Reading Virgil and His Texts: Studies in Intertextuality* (Ann Arbor)

Thornton, A. (1984) *Homer's* Iliad*: Its Composition and the Motif of Supplication* (Hypomnemata 81) (Göttingen)

Thummer, E. (1968–69) *Pindar: Die isthmischen Gedichte, textkritisch herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert, mit einer Analyse der pindarischen Epiniken* (2 vols.) (Heidelberg)

Tigay, J. H. (1982) *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Philadelphia)

Timpanaro, S. (1994) *Nuovi contributi di filologia e storia della lingua latina* (Testi e manuali per l'insegnamento universitario del latino 38) (Bologna)

Tor, S. (2017) *Mortal and Divine in Early Greek Epistemology: A Study of Hesiod, Xenophanes and Parmenides* (Cambridge)

Török, L. (2014) *Herodotus in Nubia* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 368) (Leiden)

Torrance, I. (2013) *Metapoetry in Euripides* (Oxford)

Torres-Guerra, J. B. (1995) *La* Tebaida *homérica como fuente de* Ilíada *y* Odisea (Madrid)

Townshend, J. R. (2015) 'Stop Me If You've Heard This One: Faux Alexandrian Footnotes in Vergil', *Vergilius* 61, 77–96

Trencsényi-Waldapfel, I. (1959) 'Eine Aesopische Fabel und ihre Orientalischen Parallelen', *Acta Ant. Hung.* 7, 317–27

Trimble, G. (forthcoming) *Catullus, Poem 64: Edited with an Introduction and Commentary* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries) (Cambridge)

Trinacty, C. V. (2014) *Senecan Tragedy and the Reception of Augustan Poetry* (Oxford)

Tsagalis, C. C. (2004) *Epic Grief: Personal Laments in Homer's* Iliad (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 70) (Berlin)

(2008) *The Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics* (Hellenic Studies 29) (Washington, DC)

(2009) 'Poetry and Poetics in the Hesiodic Corpus', in Montanari, Rengakos and Tsagalis (2009)131–77

Tsagalis, C. C. (ed.) (2010) *Homeric Hypertextuality*, *TC* 2.2, 209–359 (Berlin)

Tsagalis, C. C. (2011) 'Towards an Oral, Intertextual Neoanalysis', *TC* 3.2, 209–44

(2012a) *From Listeners to Viewers: Space in the* Iliad (Hellenic Studies 53) (Washington, DC)

(2012b) 'Deauthorizing the Epic Cycle: Odysseus' False Tale to Eumaeus (*Od.* 14.199–359)', in Montanari, Rengakos and Tsagalis (2012) 309–45

(2013) 'Typhon and Eumelus' *Titanomachy*', *TC* 5.1, 19–48

(2014a) 'Preface', in Tsagalis (2014c) 239–46

Bibliography

(2014b) 'γυναίων εἵνεκα δώρων: Interformularity and Intertraditionality in Theban and Homeric Epic', in Tsagalis (2014c) 357–98

Tsagalis, C. C. (ed.) (2014c) *Theban Resonances in Homeric Epic, TC* 6.2, 239–467 (Berlin)

Tsagalis, C. C. (2017a) *Early Greek Epic Fragments* I: *Antiquarian and Genealogical Epic* (*TC* Suppl. 47) (Berlin)

Tsagalis, C. C. (ed.) (2017b) *Poetry in Fragments: Studies on the Hesiodic Corpus and Its Afterlife* (*TC* Suppl. 50) (Berlin)

Tsagalis, C. C. (2018) 'Performance Contexts for Rhapsodic Recitals in the Archaic and Classical Periods', in Ready and Tsagalis (2018) 29–75

(2020) 'The Homeric Question: A Historical Sketch', *YAGE* 4, 122–62

(2022) *Early Greek Epic Fragments* II: *Epics on Herakles: Kreophylos and Peisandros* (*TC* Suppl. 129) (Berlin)

Tsagalis. C. C. and Markantonatos, A. (eds.) (2017) *The Winnowing Oar: New Perspectives in Homeric Studies* (Berlin)

Tsagarakis, O. (2000) *Studies in* Odyssey 11 (*Hermes* Einzelschriften 82) (Stuttgart)

Tsantsanoglou, K. (2008) 'Archilochus Fighting in Thasos: Frr. 93a and 94 from the Sosthenes Inscription', in Katsonopoulou, Petropoulos and Katsarou (2008) 163–80

(2020) 'The "Cycle" of Arignota: Sappho's frr. 95 and 96 V.', *TC* 12.2, 203–27

Tsirpanlis, E. C. (1966) 'Patronymics in Homer', *Platon* 18, 241–56

Tsitsibakou-Vasalos, E. (2009) 'Chance or Design? Language and Plot Management in the *Odyssey.* Klytaimnestra ἄλοχος μνηστὴ ἐμήσατο', in Grethlein and Rengakos (2009) 177–212

Tsomis, G. (2001) *Zusammenschau der frühgriechischen monodischen Melik: Alkaios, Sappho, Anakreon* (Palingenesia 70) (Stuttgart)

Turner, E. G. (1973) *The Papyrologist at Work* (J. H. Gray Lectures, *GRBS* Monographs 6) (Durham, NC)

Tzamali, E. (1996) *Syntax und Stil bei Sappho* (Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 16) (Dettelbach)

Uhlig, A. S. (2018) 'Sailing and Singing: Alcaeus at Sea', in Budelmann and Phillips (2018b) 63–91

Ungnad, A. and Gressmann, H. (1911) *Das Gilgamesch-epos, neu übersetzt von Arthur Ungnad und gemeinverständlich erklärt von Hugo Gressmann* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 14) (Göttingen)

Usener, K. (1990) *Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis der Odyssee zur Ilias* (ScriptOralia 21) (Tübingen)

Vaan, M. de (2008) *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and The Other Italic Languages* (Leiden)

van der Valk, M. H. A. L. H. (1958) 'On Apollodori *Bibliotheca*', *REG* 71, 100–68

(1971–87) *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem Pertinentes* (4 vols.) (Leiden)

Bibliography

Van Sickle, J. (1975) 'The New Erotic Fragment of Archilochus', *QUCC* 20, 123–56

Van Tress, H. (2004) *Poetic Memory: Allusion in the Poetry of Callimachus and the* Metamorphoses *of Ovid* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 258) (Leiden)

Vecchiato, S. (2016) 'Osservazioni critiche su un frammento epico adespoto (7 D. = *SH* 1168)', *Lexis* 34, 181–95

Verdenius, W. J. (1983) 'The Principles of Greek Literary Criticism', *Mnemosyne* 36.1/2, 14–59

Vergados, A. (2013) *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Texte und Kommentare 41) (Berlin)

(2014) 'Form and Function of Some Theban Resonances in Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*', in Tsagalis (2014c) 437–51

Vernant, J.-P. (1969² [1965¹]) *Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs: Études de psychologie historique* (Paris) [tr. as (1983)]

(1974) *Mythe et société en Grèce ancienne* (Paris) [tr. as (1980)]

(1980) *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece* (Brighton) [tr. of (1974) by J. Lloyd]

(1983) *Myth and Thought among the Greeks* (London) [tr. of (1969)]

Verzina, P. (2014) 'Achilles at Scyros and the *Cypria*: Tradition and Myth in the *Epic Cycle*', *Kyklos* 2 (Online: https://classics-at.chs.harvard.edu/achilles-at-scyros-and-the-cypria-tradition-and-myth-in-the-epic-cycle/)

Vetta, M. (1975) 'Forma e immagini del παιδικόν teognideo (Theogn. 1283–94)', *Prometheus* 1, 209–24

(1980) *Theognis: Elegiarum Liber Secundus* (Lyricorum Graecorum quae exstant 5) (Rome)

(1982) 'Il *P. Oxy.* 2506 fr. 77 e la poesia pederotica di Alceo', *QUCC* 10, 7–20

(1983a) 'Introduzione: Poesia simposiale nella Grecia arcaica e classica', in Vetta (1983c) xiii–lx

(1983b) 'Un capitolo di storia di poesia simposiale (Per l'esegesi di Aristofane, *Vespe* 1222–1248)', in Vetta (1983c) 119–55

Vetta, M. (ed.) (1983c) *Poesia e simposio nella Grecia antica: guida storica e critica* (Universale Laterza 621) (Rome)

Vian, F. (1960) 'Le mythe de Typhée et le problème de ses origines orientales', in O. Eissfeldt (ed.), *Éléments orientaux dans la religion grecque ancienne* (Paris) 17–37

(1976–81) *Apollonios de Rhodes: Argonautiques* (3 vols.) (Paris)

Vogel, F. and Fischer, K. T. (1964–69) *Diodori Bibliotheca historica* (6 vols.) (Stuttgart)

Vöhler, M. (2005) '"Ich aber". Mythenkorrekturen in Pindars 1. Olympie', in M. Vöhler and B. Seidensticker (eds.), *Mythenkorrekturen: Zu einer paradoxalen Form der Mythenrezeption* (Spectrum Literaturwissenschaft 3) (Berlin) 19–35

Voigt, E.-M. (1971) *Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta* (Amsterdam)

von der Mühll, P. (1952) *Kritisches Hypomnema zur Ilias* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 4) (Basel)

Bibliography

(1962³) *Homeri Odyssea* (Stuttgart)

Wachter, R. (1991) 'The Inscriptions on the François Vase', *MH* 48.2, 86–113

 (2006) 'Nestor Cup', in H. Cancik and H. Schneider (eds.), *Brill's New Pauly: Antiquity.* Vol. IX: *Mini-Obe* (Leiden) coll. 683–4

 (2010) 'The Origin of Epigrams on "Speaking Objects"', in M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic (eds.), *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram* (Cambridge) 250–60

Waern, I. (1972) 'Flora Sapphica', *Eranos* 70, 1–11

Wagner, R. A. (1891) *Epitoma Vaticana ex Apollodori Bibliotheca* (Leipzig)

Walcot, P. (1977) 'Odysseus and the Art of Lying', *AncSoc* 8, 1–19 [= Doherty (2009) 135–54]

Walker, H. J. (1995) 'The Early Development of the Theseus Myth', *RhM* 138.1, 1–33

Wallace, R. W. (1989) Ὄρθρος', *TAPA* 119, 201–7

Walsh, G. B. (1984) *The Varieties of Enchantment: Early Greek Views of the Nature and Function of Poetry* (Chapel Hill)

Ward, M. (2019) 'Glory and *Nostos:* The Ship-Epithet κοῖλος in the *Iliad*', *CQ* 69.1, 23–34

 (2021) 'γαμέσσεται/γε μάσσεται: Homer *Iliad* 9.394 and the Constitutive Role of Irregularity', *JHS* 141, 224–40

Watkins, C. (1976) 'Observations on the "Nestor's Cup" Inscription', *HSCP* 80, 25–40

 (1992) 'Le dragon hittite Illuyankas et le géant Typhôeus', *CRAI* 136, 319–30

 (1995) *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (New York)

Watson, J. (ed.) (2001) *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 218) (Leiden)

Węcowski, M. (2014) *The Rise of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet* (Oxford)

 (2017) 'Wine and the Early History of the Greek Alphabet: Early Greek Vase-Inscriptions and the *Symposion*', in Clay, Malkin and Tzifopoulos (2017) 309–28

Wees, H. van (1992) *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History* (Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology 9) (Amsterdam)

Weitzmann, K. (1959) *Ancient Book Illumination* (Martin Classical Lectures 16) (Cambridge, MA)

Welcker, F. G. (1865–82² [1835–49¹]) *Der epische Cyclus, oder die homerischen Dichter* (2 vols.) (Bonn)

Wells, C. M. (1973) 'The Greek Lyric Poets' "Again"', *EMC* 17, 1–11

Wendel, C. T. E. (1914) *Scholia in Theocritum vetera* (Leipzig)

West, M. L. (1966) *Hesiod:* Theogony (Oxford)

 (1970) 'Bemerkungen zu Versinschriften', *ZPE* 6, 171–4

 (1974) *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 14) (Berlin)

 (1978a) *Hesiod:* Works & Days (Oxford)

Bibliography

(1978b) 'Phocylides', *JHS* 98, 164–7 [= (2011–13) II 68–77]

(1982) *Greek Metre* (Oxford)

(1984a) 'The Ascription of Fables to Aesop in Archaic and Classical Greece', in F. R. Adrados and O. Reverdin (eds.), *La fable: huit exposés suivis de discussions* (Entretiens sur L'Antiquité Classique 30) (Geneva) 105–36 [= (2011–13) III 396–415]

(1984b) 'New Fragments of Ibycus' Love Songs', *ZPE* 57, 23–32

(1985) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure, and Origins* (Oxford)

(1987) *Euripides:* Orestes (Warminster)

(1988) 'The Rise of the Greek Epic', *JHS* 108, 151–72 [= (2011–13) I 35–73]

(1989–92² [1971–72¹]) *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati* (2 vols.) (Oxford)

(1992) *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford)

(1995) 'The Date of the *Iliad*', *MH* 52.4, 203–19 [= (2011–13) I 188–208]

(1997) *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford)

(1999) 'The Invention of Homer', *CQ* 49.2, 364–82 [= (2011–13) I 408–36]

(2001a) *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the* Iliad (Munich)

(2001b) 'The Fragmentary Homeric Hymn to Dionysus', *ZPE* 134, 1–11 [= (2011–13) I 313–28]

(2002) 'The View from Lesbos', in M. Reichel and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Epea pteroenta: Beiträge zur Homerforschung. Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann zum 75. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart) 207–19 [= (2011–13) I 392–407]

(2003a) *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer* (Loeb Classical Library 496) (Cambridge, MA)

(2003b) *Greek Epic Fragments: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries* BC (Loeb Classical Library 497) (Cambridge, MA)

(2003c) '*Iliad* and *Aethiopis*', *CQ* 53.1, 1–14 [= (2011–13) I 242–64]

(2004) 'An Indo-European Stylistic Feature in Homer', in Bierl, Schmitt and Willi (2004) 33–49

(2005a) 'The New Sappho', *ZPE* 151, 1–9 [= (2011–13) II 53–66]

(2005b) '*Odyssey* and *Argonautica*', *CQ* 55.1, 39–64 [= (2011–13) I 277–312]

(2006) 'Archilochus and Telephos', *ZPE* 156, 11–17 [= (2011–13) II 6–16]

(2007) *Indo-European Poetry and Myth* (Oxford)

(2010) 'The Calydonian Boar', in J. Dijkstra, J. Kroesen and Y. Kuiper (eds.), *Myths, Martyrs, and Modernity: Studies in the History of Religions in Honour of Jan N. Bremmer* (Numen 127) (Leiden) 1–11

(2011–13) *Hellenica: Selected Papers on Greek Literature and Thought* (3 vols.) (Oxford)

(2011a) *The Making of the* Iliad: *Disquisition and Analytical Commentary* (Oxford)

(2011b) 'Pindar as a Man of Letters', in Obbink and Rutherford (2011) 50–68 [= (2011–13) II 129–50]

413

(2011c) 'Echoes of Hesiod and Elegy in the *Iliad*', in West (2011–13) I 209–32

(2012) 'Towards a Chronology of Early Greek Epic', in Andersen and Haug (2012) 224–41

(2013) *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics* (Oxford)

(2014a) *The Making of the* Odyssey (Oxford)

(2014b) 'Nine Poems of Sappho', *ZPE* 191, 1–12

(2015a) 'Epic, Lyric, and Lyric Epic', in Finglass and Kelly (2015) 63–80

(2015b) 'Mythological and Political Interpolations in Homer', *Eikasmos* 26, 11–25

(2018) 'Gilgāmeš and Homer: The Missing Link?', in L. Audley-Miller and B. Dignas (eds.), *Wandering Myths: Transcultural Uses of Myth in the Ancient World* (Berlin) 265–80

West, S. R. (1981) 'An Alternative Nostos for Odysseus', *LCM* 6, 169–75

(1988) 'Books I–IV', in Heubeck, West and Hainsworth (1988) 49–245

(1994) 'Nestor's Bewitching Cup', *ZPE* 101, 9–15

(2012) 'Odyssean Stratigraphy', in Andersen and Haug (2012) 122–37

Westlake, H. D. (1977) 'Λέγεται in Thucydides', *Mnemosyne* 30.4, 345–62

Whitman, C. H. (1958) *Homer and the Heroic Tradition* (Cambridge, MA)

Whitmarsh, T. J. G. (2004) 'The Harvest of Wisdom: Landscape, Description, and Identity in the *Heroikos*', in J. K. B. Maclean and E. B. Aitken (eds.), *Philostratus's* Heroikos*: Religion and Cultural Identity in the Third Century* C.E. (Writings from the Greco-Roman World 6) (Leiden) 237–49

(2018) 'Sappho and Cyborg Helen', in Budelmann and Phillips (2018b) 135–49

Whitton, C. (2019) *The Arts of Imitation in Latin Prose: Pliny's* Epistles/*Quintilian in Brief* (Cambridge)

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1884) *Homerische Untersuchungen* (Philologische Untersuchungen 7) (Berlin)

(1886) *Isyllos von Epidauros* (Philologische Untersuchungen 9) (Berlin)

(1908) 'Pindars siebentes nemeisches Gedicht', *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 15, 328–52

(1913) *Sappho und Simonides: Untersuchungen über griechische Lyriker* (Berlin)

(1922) *Pindaros* (Berlin)

Wilkinson, C. L. (2013) *The Lyric of Ibycus: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Sozomena 13) (Berlin)

Willcock, M. M. (1964) 'Mythological Paradeigma in the *Iliad*', *CQ* 14.2, 141–54 [= Cairns (2001) 435–55]

(1973) 'The Funeral Games of Patroclus', *BICS* 20, 1–11

(1977) 'Ad Hoc Invention in the *Iliad*', *HSCP* 81, 41–53

(1983) 'Antilochus in the *Iliad*', in *Mélanges E. Delebecque* (Aix-en-Provence) 477–85

(1995) *Pindar: Victory Odes. Olympians 2, 7, and 11; Nemean 4; Isthmians 3, 4, and 7* (Cambridge)

414

Bibliography

(1997) 'Neoanalysis', in Morris and Powell (1997) 174–89

Williams, G. (1983) 'Roman Poets as Literary Historians: Some Aspects of *Imitatio*', *ICS* 8.2, 211–37

Williams, N. (2021) 'Deixis and Indexicals', in J. Stanlaw (ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Linguistic Anthropology* (Hoboken, NJ) (Online: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786093.iela0092)

Williams, R. J. (1956) 'The Literary History of a Mesopotamian Fable', *Phoenix* 10.2, 70–7

Willigers, S. (2017) 'Narrative Authority: From Epic to Drama' (PhD Thesis, University of Amsterdam)

Willink, C. W. (1971) 'The Prologue of *Iphigenia at Aulis*', *CQ* 21.2, 343–64

Wills, J. (1996) *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion* (Oxford)

(1998) 'Divided Allusion: Virgil and the *Coma Berenices*', *HSCP* 98, 277–305

Wilson, D. F. (2002) 'Lion Kings: Heroes in the Epic Mirror', *ColbyQ* 38.2, 231–54

(2005) 'Demodokos' *Iliad* and Homer's', in Rabel (2005) 1–20

Wilson, N. G. (2007) *Aristophanis Fabulae* (2 vols.) (Oxford)

Wilson, P. (2006) 'Thamyris of Thrace and the Muses of Messenia', *MedArch* 19/20, 207–12

Winkler, J. J. (1990) *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece* (London)

Wöhrle, G. (1999) *Telemachs Reise: Väter und Söhne in Ilias und Odyssee oder ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Männlichkeitsideologie in der homerischen Welt* (Hypomnemata 124) (Göttingen)

Wong, E. (2002) 'The Harmony of Fixed Fate and Free Will in the *Iliad*', *Antichthon* 36, 1–18

Woodbury, L. E. (1968) 'Pindar and the Mercenary Muse: *Isthm.* 2.1–13', *TAPA* 99, 527–42 [= (1991) 188–200]

(1991) *Collected Writings* (eds. C. G. Brown, R. L. Fowler, E. I. Robbins, and P. M. W. Matheson) (Atlanta)

Woodhouse, W. J. (1930) *The Composition of Homer's* Odyssey (Oxford)

Worthington, I. (ed.) (1996) *Voice into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 157) (Leiden)

Wright, G. M. and Jones, P. V. (1997) *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation* (Oxford)

Wright, M. E. (2005) *Euripides' Escape-Tragedies: A Study of* Helen, Andromeda, *and* Iphigenia among the Taurians (Oxford)

(2006a) '*Cyclops* and the Euripidean Tetralogy', *CCJ* 52, 23–48

(2006b) '*Orestes*, a Euripidean Sequel', *CQ* 56.1, 33–47

(2010) 'The Tragedian as Critic: Euripides and Early Greek Poetics', *JHS* 130, 165–84

(2012) *The Comedian as Critic: Greek Old Comedy and Poetics* (London)

(2016) *The Lost Plays of Greek Tragedy.* Volume 1: *Neglected Authors* (London)

415

Bibliography

(2022) 'Wisdom in Inverted Commas: Greek Comedy and the Quotable Maxim', *CCJ* 68, 244–67

Wyatt, W. F. (1989) 'The Intermezzo of *Odyssey* 11 and the Poets Homer and Odysseus', *SMEA* 27, 235–53

Xenis, G. A. (2010a) *Scholia vetera in Sophoclis 'Electram'* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 12) (Berlin)

(2010b) *Scholia vetera in Sophoclis 'Trachinias'* (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 13) (Berlin)

Xian, R. (2018) 'A Note on ἀγοράν in Pindar *N.* 3.14', *Mnemosyne* 71.1, 169–72

(2019) 'κλέος ἄφθιτον in Sappho fr. 44.4 V', *Hermes* 147.4, 392–405

Yamagata, N. (2012) 'Use of Homeric References in Plato and Xenophon', *CQ* 62.1, 130–44

Yasumura, N. (2011) *Challenges to the Power of Zeus in Early Greek Poetry* (London)

Yatromanolakis, D. (1999) 'Alexandrian Sappho Revisited', *HSCP* 99, 179–95

(2007) *Sappho in the Making: The Early Reception* (Hellenic Studies 28) (Washington, DC)

(2009) 'Ancient Greek Popular Song', in Budelmann (2009b) 263–76

Ypsilanti, M. (2009) 'οὐκ ἐμὸς ὁ μῦθος: Callimachus' Use of the Story of Melanippe in his *Bath of Pallas*', *QUCC* 92.2, 105–17

Yunis, H. (ed.) (2003) *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge)

Zabel, B. (2021) 'Archaic Greek Poetry and Hip-Hop: A Comparison', in P. Ferstl (ed.), *Dialogues Between Media* (The Many Languages of Comparative Literature 5) (Berlin) 539–50

Zarecki, J. P. (2007) 'Pandora and the Good Eris in Hesiod', *GRBS* 47.1, 5–29

Zarker, J. W. (1965) 'King Eëtion and Thebe as Symbols in the *Iliad*', *CJ* 61.3, 110–14

Zeitlin, F. I. (1995) 'Figuring Fidelity in Homer's *Odyssey*', in Cohen (1995) 117–52

Zetzel, J. E. G. (1996) 'Poetic Baldness and Its Cure', *MD* 36, 73–100

Ziemann, M. D. (2020) 'The Politics of Beginnings: Hesiod and the Assyrian Ideological Appropriation of *Enuma Eliš*', *ARG* 21–2.1, 343–68

Ziogas, I. (2013) *Ovid and Hesiod: The Metamorphosis of* The Catalogue of Women (Cambridge)

Zogg, F. (2014) *Lust am Lesen. Literarische Anspielungen im Frieden des Aristophanes* (Zetemata 147) (Munich)

Zutt, G. (1894) *Über den Katalog der Heroinen in der Nekyia* (Leipzig)

416

INDEX LOCORUM

417

Index Locorum

418

Index Locorum

419

Index Locorum

420

421

Index Locorum

422

Index Locorum

423

424

425

Index Locorum

Index Locorum

431

INDEX OF INDICES

The following is not intended as a comprehensive catalogue, but rather a list of the various lexemes for which I have proposed an indexical resonance in this monograph.

Talk

432

Index of Indices

433

Index of Indices

Miscellaneous

434

GENERAL INDEX

435

General Index

436

General Index

Currie, B. G. F., 25, 42, 45, 58, 208, 269
Cycle, Epic, 30, 47, 61, 117, 212, 285–90
cycles, of song, 55 n.205, 140, 231–3,
    296–8, 306–8, 330

Danek, G., 39, 119
Davies, M., 313
Deianeira, 155, 219–21
Demodocus, 64, 75, 106
Diomedes
    as allusive model, 323–6
    as doublet of Achilles, 49–50, 115,
        185 n.32
    as Odysseus' sidekick, 205–6
    captures horses of Aeneas, 250–1
    fights Pandarus, 249, 263
    immortality of, 170
    in Tydeus' shadow, 86–92, 274, 275–9
    recalls Agamemnon's slight, 194
    relationship with Nestor, 277 n.109
    wounds Ares, 192–3
Dionysus, 109–10, 177, 210–11, 255
Dioscuri, 115 n.139, 136 n.200, 222
    n.146, 300
Dodds, E. R., 294
doublet
    character, 50, 89, 101, 115, 160 n.282,
        185 n.32, 221, 264, 265–6, 269,
        286–7
    decreasing, 79 n.20
    narrative, 87–8, 185, 191, 202 n.88, 263,
        320 n.253

echo, as trope of allusion, 9, 12, 14, 24–5
Elpenor, 206, 208 n.103
Epeius, 248
Epic Cycle. *See* Cycle, Epic
etymology, 22, 74, 96 n.78
    folk-, 84 n.35
    markers of, 15
    play with, 11 n.31, 21 n.63, 123 n.167,
        179 n.14, 214 n.123, 215 n.127
Euboea, 38, 164 n.298, 260–2, 267
Eumaeus, 111, 249
Euripides, 20–1, 25, 71, 139–40, 155 n.269,
    177, 293–4
Eurypylus (son of Telephus), 203, 286–7
Eurytus of Oechalia, 274, 283

Eustathius, 77–8, 102, 247 n.12
Exekias, 143 n.235

fabula, as target of allusion, 35–42
Faktenkanon, 35
family relations, as trope of allusion, 25,
    273–9, 285–91
fate, 24, 154, 207 n.102, 266 n.71, 329
Finglass, P. J., 313
Finkelberg, M., 116
fixity
    of Homeric epic, 28, 62
    of myth, 34–6
    of texts, 30, 55 n.203, 58
Ford, A. L., 64, 75

genre, markers of, 15
gods
    as figures for the poet, 24
Gorgon, 141, 284
Grethlein, J., 71, 103, 324–5

Hades, 84, 154, 188, 200 n.80, 215, 223,
    281, 284
hapax legomenon, Homeric, 8, 90, 100,
    130, 276 n.106
Harmodius (and Aristogeiton), 169–72
Haubold, J., 44
Hector
    and family, 274, 287–8
    as symbol of Troy, 247
    characterisation of, 271–3
    fate of, 156–7
    on Troy, 93
    predicts Achilles' death, 207–8
    predicts fall of Troy, 206–7
Helen
    alternative stories about, 31 n.102, 311–14
    as cause of war, 137
    as subject of song, 69, 113
    birth of, 136–7
    drugs of, 180
    memory of, 217 n.132
Helenus, 105, 107, 167, 205
Hephaestus, 49, 190, 255, 300, 320
Hera
    and Zeus, 23–4, 126, 189–91, 255, 268
    borrows Aphrodite's girdle, 23–4

437

General Index

Hera (cont.)
    enemy of Heracles, 164, 189–90,
        255, 268
    mother of Typhoeus, 82
    opposes Sarpedon's rescue, 269–70
Heracles
    as allusive model, 279 n.117, 280–3
    at Cos, 190
    at Paros, 223
    cheated by Augeas, 254–5
    cheated by Laomedon, 189, 255
    death of, 153–6
    fights Achelous, 219–21
    (im)mortality of, 115 n.139, 155 n.270
    in Greek epic, 187–8
    infancy of, 164
    katabasis of, 140, 153–6, 188, 280–1
    labours of, 188–9, 311 n.226
    ruler of Argos, 124
    sacks Troy, 92 n.71, 94, 143, 189
    tears of, 153–6
    theomachy of, 257, 274 n.101
Hereas of Megara, 281
Hermes
    and Apollo, 25, 127–8
    and Leda's egg, 136
    and Pan, 25
    and Pandora, 111
    as singer, 260
    revives Pelops, 320
    supporter of Heracles, 283
Herodotus, 31 n.102, 194 n.60
Hesiod
    and the Muses, 59, 110–11, 179
    as target of allusion, 55–7, 145–52
    catalogue poetry, 116–24
    named by successors, 51, 53–4
    on poetic competition, 67
    relationship between *Op.* and *Theog.*,
        58–9, 126–7
    relationship to Homer, 76–85
    relationship to Trojan epic, 260–2
Hieron, 167, 228, 233, 246, 308–9, 316–17,
        321, 323
Hinds, S., 10, 14, 16–17, 19–20
Hipponax, 53–4, 177, 303
Hollander, J., 9
Hollis, A. S., 17
Homer

and Hesiod. *See* Hesiod, relationship to
    Homer
and pre-Homeric tradition, 48–9
as target of allusion, 9–10, 56–7, 142,
    144, 169, 177, 288–9, 312–14,
    316–17, 324–6
Homeric question(s), 28
named by successors, 51–4
relationship between *Il.* and *Od.*, 59–62,
    101–4, 265
Homeric Hymns, 25, 59, 67, 82–3, 109–10,
    114–15, 127–31, 161–2, 179,
    210–11, 260
Höschele, R., 301
Hunter, R. L., 148, 204
Huxley, G. L., 89
Hypnos, 190–1, 268

Iamus, 167–8
Ibycus, 57, 133, 157–9, 170, 301, 318
impersonation, poetic, 71–2
indexicality
    definition of, 21–3
    inceptive function of, 83–5, 91–2, 255
interpolation, in Homer, 48 n.178, 124
        n.171, 258 n.42, 281–2
intertextuality
    mythological, 33–43
    textual, 51–62
    use of term, 6–8, 42–3
intratextuality
    use of term, 8, 43
Iphigenia, 36, 268–9

Janko, R., 161

Kakridis, J. T., 161
katabasis, 125–6, 140, 153–6, 279–85. *See
        too Nekyia*
Kelly, A., 56–8, 189
King, H., 162
Kirk, G. S., 17, 91
Kolaković, Mehmed, 63 n.243
Kowalzig, B., 169
Kristeva, J., 43

Laertes, 101, 160, 288 n.145
Liapis, V., 283
lies, downgrading traditions as, 108–12

438

General Index

literacy. *See* writing
Louden, B., 256
lying tales, 111–12, 128–30

Mace, S. T., 301
Meleager, 1–4, 54, 114 n.133, 125–6, 153–6
Melesander of Miletus, 258 n.44
Memnon, 98–9, 160, 182, 269–70, 287, 315–16
Menelaus, 36, 39, 99, 106, 183, 199–200, 206, 247, 253–4, 263–4
Mimnermus, 53, 55, 161, 323–6
'Monro's Law', 60
Morrison, A. D., 17
motif transference, 30–1, 36, 49–51, 64–5, 152 n.262, 153–5
motival priority. *See* priority, motival
Muses, 67, 214, 226, 273, 310
    and Hesiod. *See* Hesiod, and the Muses
    and memory, 178–81
    Calliope, 159
    Clio, 308
    invocation of, 74–5, 97–8, 285, 292–3, 303–4, 308, 312–14
    relationship to poets, 74–6
    Terpsichore, 319
mythological intertextuality. *See* intertextuality, mythological

names of poets. *See* citation, of poets by name
narrators, 70–2, 74–6
Near Eastern poetry, 44–6, 78–9, 82
Nekyia, 116–17, 123, 196, 206, 224, 279–85
neoanalysis, 29–31, 47–51
Neoboule, 55, 296–7
Neoptolemus, 24, 34, 286–9
Nessus, 219–21
Nestor
    as figure for poet, 70
    as good counsellor, 264–5
    as storyteller, 95–7
    as subject of song, 142, 239
    cup of, 36–40
    old age of, 101–4
    reminiscences of, 256–9, 273–4
    rescued by Antilochus, 294–5
Nethercut, J. S., 17

Niobe, 131
Norden, E., 17

O'Connell, P., 139
Obbink, D., 139, 306
Odysseus
    alternative homecomings of, 97–8, 111–12
    and Achilles. *See* Achilles, and Odysseus
    and Diomedes, 205–6
    as allusive model, 223–4
    as figure for poet, 70
    cunning of, 106–7, 113, 120
    fame of, 69, 105–6, 113, 180
    father of Telemachus, 198–9
    forgets advice of Circe, 193–4
    in embassy to Troy, 253–4
    katabasis of, 279–85
    old age of, 100–1
    on Delos, 253
    recalls omen at Aulis, 201–4
    recruitment of, 196–201
    tears of, 249
    tells lying tales, 111
    transformed into old man, 263
    unknown fate of, 94–5
Oedipus, 23, 178, 290 n.150
old age, 100–4, 159–62
Olson, S. D., 130–1
Olympus (Mount), 84, 131
oral traditions, comparative, 32 n.108, 34, 63, 67 n.263, 111 n.124
orality, 27–30
Oresteia myth, 33, 35, 96, 111, 187 n.38, 265
Orestes, 33, 96 n.79, 187, 198 n.70, 265
Ormand, K., 150
Orpheus, 159, 280 n.118
Ovid, 12–15, 116 n.140, 176–7, 201 n.82, 213, 245

Pandarus, 247, 249, 263, 276, 325
Paris, 24, 36, 50, 55, 56, 115, 207–8, 247, 254, 311
Patroclus, 24, 31, 60, 112, 171–2, 186, 207–8, 247, 266, 269
Peirce, C. S., 21–2
Peirithous, 125–6, 258, 281–5

439

General Index

suppression of alternative traditions, 89 n.55, 112–16, 124 n.172, 149–56, 196–204, 241–2

Tantalus, 319–21
Taphians, 186
Telamon, 142–4, 298–300, 310 n.223
Telemachus
    as doublet of Odysseus, 264
    departs Sparta, 57
    in Odysseus' shadow, 274, 289 n.147
    on Nestor, 101–4
    praises mother, 123–4
    seeks news of father, 73, 94–5, 105–6
    threatened by Palamedes, 197
    κέρδεα of, 120
Telemachy, 194
Telephus, 136 n.199, 198 n.70, 202–3, 287, 291
Terpander, 53–4, 304 n.198
Teuthranian expedition, 136 n.199, 202–4
Theban myth, 86–92, 223, 226, 276–9, 285–6, 292–4, 295–6
Theognis
    alludes to Hesiod, 25
    on Atalanta, 149–52
    on immortalising poetry, 133
    on Odysseus, 223–4
    on Theban myth, 292–4
    sense of authorship, 54
    song contest in, 67
theogonic myth, 76–85
Theseus, 13–15, 125–6, 258 n.42, 281–5
Thetis
    attempts to immortalise children, 113–15
    converses with Achilles, 195
    forewarns Achilles, 207
    forewarns Neoptolemus, 287
    marriage with Peleus, 141–2, 216–17, 299, 317
    mother of Achilles, 105
    rescues Achilles, 269

rescues Zeus, 82, 190
Tithonus, 159–66, 225
Torrance, I., 25
traditional referentiality, 29–30, 130–1, 137 n.205, 158–9, 164–5, 212–13
traditionality, rhetoric of, 107, 213
Tsagalis, C. C., 20, 34, 259
Tydeus, 86–92, 274, 275–9, 326
type scenes, 29, 89
Typhoeus, 76–85, 260
Tyrannicides. *See* Harmodius (and Aristogeiton)
Tyro, 116–18, 121, 124, 159
Tyrtaeus, 161 n.283, 224–6, 240 n.204, 293 n.161

Virgil, 4, 9–12, 15, 245

West, M. L., 103
West, S. R., 39, 120
Wilkinson, C. L., 158
Wright, M. E., 20
writing, 62

Xanthus (horse), 17, 92 n.70, 207
Xenophanes, 52–3, 134 n.191, 321–3

Zeus
    and Ganymedes, 293 n.159, 320
    and Hera. *See* Hera, and Zeus
    and Sarpedon, 269–70
    as adulterer, 122, 141
    as father, 108–9, 136, 141, 294
    conquers Typhoeus, 76–80
    jars of, 316
    saves Aeneas, 185
    supplicated by Thetis, 57
    thunderbolt of, 92, 278–9
    unstable rule of, 84, 190