

ENTRETIENS SUR L'ANTIQUITÉ CLASSIQUE

TOME LII

LA POÉSIE ÉPIQUE GRECQUE:
MÉTAMORPHOSES
D'UN GENRE LITTÉRAIRE

HUIT EXPOSÉS SUIVIS DE DISCUSSIONS
PAR

EGBERT J. BAKKER, GEORG DANEK,
CHRISTOS C. TSAGALIS, MARCO FANTUZZI,
ANTONIOS RENGAKOS, ALEXANDER SENS,
PIERRE CHUVIN, MASSIMO FUSILLO

Entretiens préparés et présidés par Franco Montanari et Antonios Rengakos

FONDATION HARDT
POUR L'ÉTUDE DE L'ANTIQUITÉ CLASSIQUE
VANDŒUVRES – GENÈVE

Les premiers «Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique» ont eu lieu en 1952, du 8 au 13 septembre. Dans l'avant-propos du volume où ils sont consignés, le Baron Kurd von Hardt en donne la définition. La voici: «Chaque année, au siège de la Fondation à Vandœuvres, auront lieu des 'Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique', au cours desquels des spécialistes, représentant plusieurs pays, feront des exposés sur un domaine choisi et, au cours des discussions, procèderont à d'enrichissants échanges de vue.»

Conçue et mise au point par des savants tous aujourd'hui décédés – parmi eux Ludwig Curtius, Bruno Snell, Kurt von Fritz, Albin Lesky, Theodor Klauser, Olof Gigon –, l'institution s'est révélée viable. Cinquante-deux fois, des savants de divers pays se sont réunis en été à Vandœuvres; les «Entretiens» ont été régulièrement publiés.

P 23197/52 + Annexe



1901492600

FONDATION HARDT
POUR L'ÉTUDE DE L'ANTIQUITÉ CLASSIQUE

ENTRETIENS
TOME LII

**LA POÉSIE ÉPIQUE GRECQUE:
MÉTAMORPHOSES
D'UN GENRE LITTÉRAIRE**

Annee à P 23197/52

Erratum

Le titre de la contribution de Massimo Fusillo (pp. 271-307,
ainsi que la table des matières p. VIII) doit être lu sous la
forme suivante:

METAMORFOSI ROMANZESCHE DELL'EPICA

ENTRETIENS SUR L'ANTIQUITÉ CLASSIQUE

TOME LII

LA POÉSIE ÉPIQUE GRECQUE: MÉTAMORPHOSES D'UN GENRE LITTÉRAIRE

HUIT EXPOSÉS SUIVIS DE DISCUSSIONS

PAR

EGBERT J. BAKKER, GEORG DANEK,
CHRISTOS C. TSAGALIS, MARCO FANTUZZI,
ANTONIOS RENGAKOS, ALEXANDER SENS,
PIERRE CHUVIN, MASSIMO FUSILLO

Entretiens préparés et présidés par Franco Montanari et Antonios Rengakos

VANDOEUVRES – GENÈVE

22-26 AOÛT 2005

Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique
édité par la Fondation pour l'Antiquité Classique et la Fondation
Françoise & André Gide
à Vandoeuvres (Genève) du 22 au 26 août 2005
dirigé par Franco Montanari et Antonios Rengakos
et préparé par les deux derniers avec l'aide de Georges
Danek, Christos Tsagalis, Marco Fantuzzi, Massimo Fusillo, Egbert J.
Bakker, Georg Danek, Pierre Chувин et Alexander Sens.

ENTRETIENS SUR L'ANTHROPOLOGIE CLASSIQUE

LA LOGIQUE HÉGÉLOGUE GRECQUE
MÉTAMORPHOSES
D'UN GENRE LITTÉRAIRE

HUIT ÉTUDES SUR LES DISCUSSIONS

PAR

CHRISTIAN BERNARD, CHRISTOPHE DAMEZ,
ANTHONY LEAGUE, MAGGIE MINTON,
ELIEZER CHUAN, MASSIMO LURITO

ISSN 0071-0822
ISBN 2-600-00752-0

TOUS DROITS RÉSERVÉS
© 2006 by Fondation Hardt, Genève

380/16 07/05

Schweizerische Nationalbibliothek NB
Bibliothèque nationale suisse BN
Biblioteca nazionale svizzera BN
Biblioteca naziunala svizra BN

PRÉFACE

Les 52^{èmes} Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique et la Fondation Hardt à Vandœuvres n'ont pas en commun que le lieu de la rencontre: l'idée de 'métamorphose' les lie tout autant. Resurgie fortifiée de quelques années difficiles, la Fondation accueillait les participants venus pour la rencontre annuelle dans une Chandoleine rénovée, cadre propice à de fructueux échanges scientifiques. Pierre Ducrey, mon successeur à la présidence de la Fondation, a contribué de manière décisive aux travaux de rénovation et de réorganisation: il n'est pas seulement un spécialiste engagé des sciences de l'Antiquité, mais ses activités de longue date au sein du monde académique et dans l'administration de fondations lui ont apporté l'expérience pratique et les relations dont la Fondation Hardt a besoin. Qu'il soit remercié de sa disponibilité.

Ma gratitude va aussi aux collaborateurs de la Fondation: sans leur appui et leur fidélité à l'institution, la 'métamorphose' n'eût pas été possible. L'heureux déroulement des Entretiens 2005 doit beaucoup à l'enthousiasme de Monica Brunner, secrétaire scientifique, qui a préparé la réunion en collaboration avec les organisateurs et suivi les étapes de la publication. Dans l'édition du présent volume, Bernard Grange se signale, comme chaque année, par sa compétence scientifique et son acribie; si les relations avec les auteurs et le personnel de l'imprimerie sont exemptes de toute friction, sa patience est parfois mise à l'épreuve par des problèmes techniques consécutifs à l'emploi de diverses polices de caractères. Pour la première fois, les textes grecs du présent volume ont été saisis sur la police Ifao Grec. Nous remercions Davide Muratore, de l'Università degli Studi di Genova, Dipartimento di Archeologia e Filologia Classica, qui a bien voulu se charger du travail de conversion.

Les Entretiens 2005 de la Fondation Hardt et leur publication ont été financés par l'Université de Genève. Nous lui exprimons notre très vive reconnaissance.

Je souhaite à ce volume un accueil favorable et à la Fondation Hardt un avenir prospère ad multos annos.

*Margarethe Billerbeck,
Présidente de la Fondation Hardt 2003-2005*

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Introduzione par Franco MONTANARI	IX
I. EGBERT J. BAKKER	
<i>Homeric Epic between Feasting and Fasting</i>	1
Discussion	31
II. GEORG DANEK	
<i>Die Gleichnisse der Ilias und der Dichter Homer</i>	41
Discussion	72
III. CHRISTOS C. TSAGALIS	
<i>Poet and Audience: From Homer to Hesiod</i>	79
Discussion	131
IV. MARCO FANTUZZI	
<i>The Myths of Dolon and Rhesus from Homer to the 'Homeric/Cyclic' Tragedy Rhesus</i>	135
Discussion	177
V. ANTONIOS RENGAKOS	
<i>Homer and the Historians: The Influence of Epic Narrative Technique on Herodotus and Thucydides</i>	183
Discussion	210

VI.	ALEXANDER SENS	
	"Τίπτε γένος τούμὸν ζητεῖς;" :	
	<i>The Batrachomyomachia,</i>	
	<i>Hellenistic Epic Parody, and Early Epic</i>	215
	Discussion	245
VII.	PIERRE CHUVIN	
	<i>Nonnos de Panopolis</i>	
	<i>et la "déconstruction" de l'épopée</i>	249
	Discussion	269
VIII.	MASSIMO FUSILLO	
	<i>Metamorfosi romanesche</i>	
	<i>dell'epica</i>	271
	Discussion	304
	Schlussbetrachtungen par Antonios RENGAKOS	309
	INDICES	313

INTRODUZIONE

Ringrazio tutti i colleghi per avere accettato l'invito a partecipare a questi *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique* della Fondation Hardt, che sono i LII della serie: grazie di essere venuti da diversi paesi per dare vita a questo incontro sul tema della poesia epica greca e della sua evoluzione come genere dall'età arcaica fino all'età tardoantica.

È ben noto che la Fondation Hardt vive in un contesto e un ambiente assolutamente internazionali. Tutta la sua storia lo dimostra fin dalle origini: la lista degli ospiti e le testimonianze autografe lasciate nel libro d'oro, le persone che hanno fatto parte degli Organi di gestione, soprattutto la serie degli Entretiens, i cui risultati scientifici sono conservati nei volumi apparsi con una regolarità assolutamente notevole e rara e consegnati agli scaffali delle biblioteche del mondo intero. Anche il presente attesta inequivocabilmente il carattere internazionale di questa istituzione e della sua vocazione culturale.

Ambiente internazionale vuol dire anche, ovviamente, pluralità di lingue: per parte mia, sono molto contento che, malgrado la consueta prevalenza dell'inglese, anche altre lingue siano rappresentate nelle esposizioni di questi giorni e lo siano nel volume stampato. Poiché ci troviamo in un territorio francofono, ho deciso che questo era un buon motivo per fare in francese la mia introduzione ai lavori: una buona scusa per me, dato che nella comunicazione orale pratico meglio il francese. Ma nello scritto ho preferito tornare alla mia lingua madre, riconosciuta lingua scientifica nel campo degli studi classici e figlia diretta del latino che per lunghi secoli fu la lingua di comunicazione europea.

Questi Entretiens sono un'occasione un po' particolare nella storia della Fondation Hardt e devo sottolineare che mi sento particolarmente felice e onorato perché diverse circostanze for-

tuite mi abbiano portato a essere qui proprio ad aprire gli Entretiens 2005, che vedono questa antica e prestigiosa istituzione rilanciata nella sua vita e nella sua funzione culturale.

I primi Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique si tennero nel 1952 (8-13 settembre) sul tema *La notion du divin depuis Homère jusqu'à Platon* e il volume vide la luce nel 1954.¹ Seguirono nel 1953 i secondi Entretiens su *L'influence grecque sur la poésie latine de Catulle à Ovide*, pubblicati nel 1956. Dopo quelli del 1960 (*Hésiode et son influence*) e del 1961 (*Grecs et Barbares*), entrambi pubblicati nel 1962, a partire dai IX Entretiens del 1962, il cui volume uscì nel 1963, la serie ha avuto fino ad oggi una impressionante regolarità, per cui ogni anno ha visto un'edizione dell'ormai celebre seminario della Fondation Hardt e la pubblicazione del relativo volume è seguita nell'arco dell'anno successivo. Il volume degli Entretiens L 2003 (*Sénèque le tragique*) ha visto la luce nel 2004; quello degli Entretiens LI 2004 (*L'apologétique chrétienne gréco-latine à l'époque prénicéenne*) è apparso nell'autunno 2005. Il volume dei nostri Entretiens 2005 è previsto regolarmente entro la fine del 2006.

Nella premessa al primo volume, il barone von Hardt scriveva: "Chaque année, au siège de la Fondation à Vandoeuvres, auront lieu des 'Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique', au cours desquels des spécialistes, représentant plusieurs pays, feront des exposés sur un domaine choisi et, au cours des discussions, procèderont à d'enrichissants échanges de vues". Intorno al fondatore, l'attività della Fondation fu concepita e messa a punto da personalità della storia degli studi come Ludwig Curtius, Kurt von Fritz, Olof Gigon, Theodor Klauser, Albin Lesky, Bruno Snell. Il barone von Hardt morì nel 1958, tre mesi dopo i VI Entretiens, tenutisi dal 4 al 9 agosto (*Euripide*, pubblicati nel 1960). Dopo un solo anno di interruzione, nel 1960 si riprese con la VII edizione (*Hésiode et son influence*; volume

¹ Con interventi di H.J. Rose, P. Chantraine, B. Snell, O. Gigon, H.D.F. Kitto, F. Chapouthier, W.J. Verdenius. Come altri della collezione, il vol. I era esaurito ed è stato ristampato per le Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura di Roma.

pubblicato nel 1962). E così, di anno in anno, siamo arrivati fino a oggi. Gli Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique costituiscono senza dubbio il risultato più duraturo e prestigioso dell'attività della Fondation: ripercorrendone la storia e la serie dei volumi, cosa che ora si può fare anche in rete sul sito web (www.fondationhardt.ch), si incontra una parte cospicua dei personaggi della storia della filologia classica dell'ultimo secolo.

Nell'ultimo decennio circa la Fondation Hardt si è trovata immersa in una crisi sempre più grave e pericolosa, di ordine economico-finanziario (rapporto fra i costi e le entrate, fatte di rendite patrimoniali e sussidi esterni) e strutturale (modalità di funzionamento interno), mentre restava fortunatamente intatta la serie degli Entretiens. Nell'autunno del 2003 il rischio di una chiusura fu quanto mai concreto: la crisi stava per diventare davvero mortale. Non è questo il momento né la sede opportuni per descrivere e ripercorrere il lavoro e il cammino che ha portato la Fondation Hardt a riaprire all'inizio di giugno dell'anno 2005, profondamente rinnovata in molti suoi aspetti e in grado di guardare al futuro con fiducia e speranza, come era ed è nei voti di tutti coloro che hanno a cuore gli studi classici.² Questi sono dunque i primi Entretiens che si tengono nella rinnovata Fondation Hardt e tutti speriamo che siano di augurio per una nuova e fortunata stagione di sviluppo e progresso della Fondation stessa e degli studi classici.

Il tema "La poésie épique grecque: métamorphoses d'un genre littéraire" è stato proposto alla Fondation Hardt qualche anno fa dal Prof. Antonios Rengakos, dell'Università di Thessaloniki. Secondo un'abitudine già consolidata, un membro del Comité Scientifique ha assunto il compito di affiancare l'organizzatore esterno e quindi gli Entretiens sono stati preparati insieme con il sottoscritto, che ha condiviso le scelte e la responsabilità scien-

² Cfr. F. MONTANARI, "La Fondation Hardt pour l'Étude de l'Antiquité Classique. Nuova vita e vitalità di una storica istituzione", in *Eikasmos* XVI (2005), 509-513.

tifica con il primo ideatore del progetto. Se dunque è un mio piacere dare il benvenuto ai partecipanti e introdurre i lavori, è ad Antonios Rengakos che sono affidate le conclusioni e il bilancio di queste giornate, pubblicati in fondo al volume. Il volume rispecchia questa struttura, così come riprende le discussioni seguite alle esposizioni: l'antica formula mostra tutta la sua vitalità e vale la pena mantenerla.

Gli argomenti delle relazioni sono vari e di grande interesse, suscitano riflessioni e problemi, gettano sguardi indagatori su temi di ricerca importanti e fecondi, che spaziano dall'epica greca arcaica a quella tardo antica e al romanzo. Gli argomenti delle relazioni mi suggeriscono alcune riflessioni, forse scontate e molto generiche, che però voglio esprimere *in limine*.

L'epica greca è un genere poetico che, da Omero a Nonno di Panopoli (accettati tutti gli aspetti convenzionali che questa espressione porta con sé), ha avuto una vita lunga e spericolata. Forse nessun altro genere della letteratura antica (e moderna) ha conosciuto tante intersezioni, commistioni, adattamenti e forse nessun altro ha mantenuto tanti elementi di riconoscibilità e di fedele conservazione per quanto riguarda sia le forme che i contenuti. Non è solo il versante delle forme dell'espressione in senso stretto, la lingua e il metro, a evolvere entro una descrivibile linea di cambiamento. L'analisi delle tecniche e delle strutture del racconto rivela rapporti di interscambio, parallelo e concorrenza con la poesia drammatica, ma anche con generi della prosa a prima vista lontani, quali la storiografia e il romanzo: un ventaglio di possibilità che gli autori esplorano e inventano, cercando la loro strada espressiva e una loro nuova sintesi. Sul piano dei contenuti, le storie degli dei e degli eroi, che costituiscono la grande "storia sacra" del mito greco, offrono un serbatoio inesauribile, dal quale trarre le storie e le loro varianti, sul quale operare incisioni profonde volte alle metamorfosi che interessano la poesia drammatica, la parodia, la decostruzione operata da Nonno con una vitalità incredibilmente nuova. La ricchezza del quadro è enorme e qui solo alcune parti trovano spazio: segmenti significativi del lungo e

multiforme percorso descritto dalla dialettica infinita tra tradizione e innovazione. E questo porta all'ultima riflessione che voglio proporre.

Quando gli studiosi riflettono sulla storia di un genere letterario, delle sue conservazioni e delle sue metamorfosi, mi sembra che si trovino sempre di fronte appunto alle problematiche poste dalla dialettica fra tradizione e cambiamento, fra conservazione e innovazione, fra gli aspetti consolidati da una consacrazione autorevole e la volontà di percorrere strade nuove, fra il piacere del riconoscimento del noto e il fascino dell'ignoto ancora da trovare, fra il riposo rassicurante sulle garanzie del conosciuto e del già apprezzato e lo sperimentare più o meno ardito nel pericolo del fallimento e della caduta ma nella possibilità della scoperta, dell'ampliamento degli orizzonti e delle possibilità, nella creazione di un nuovo che il successo farà a sua volta diventare parte dell'autorevole tradizione. Con la tradizione si può giocare in modo rispettoso e serio, porgendo un omaggio di considerazione e stima o addirittura di venerazione, oppure in modo scanzonato e irriverente, confrontandosi con umorismo e ironia e parodiando fino al riso beffardo. La si può intendere e usare come linguaggio e forma dell'espressione, un "aiuto al dire" cose simili o diverse, opposte o concordi; come portatrice di significati, alleata o avversaria, alternativa dialogante o polemica, *continuum* da cui ritagliare o spezzone da espandere, letto di Procuste, spada di Damocle, confortante rifugio e sicurezza, tesoro disponibile di preziose risorse, avventura inquietante e misteriosa. Non è questo uno dei principi cardine della vita umana, una delle linee-guida per interpretare la storia, una delle tensioni e delle corde che attraversano le sfere del pensiero e delle azioni degli uomini nel mondo? A ciascuno la sua sfera, naturalmente: a ciascuno l'ambito limitato e definito nel quale può dirsi ed essere serio e competente. Il nostro compito in questi giorni è studiare la poesia epica greca nei suoi sviluppi ed evoluzioni come genere letterario. Ma non è vietato lasciare che il pensiero corra ad orizzonti più larghi.

I
EGBERT J. BAKKER

HOMERIC EPIC BETWEEN FEASTING AND FASTING

Homer provides *la leçon par l'exemple*. The posthumous fame that epic poetry confers on heroic achievement is inseparable from the fame of the poetry's own achievement as the foundational texts of the Western literary tradition, a fame that is renewed across generation after generation of new readers, from antiquity to the present day. In such a conception, Homer easily becomes a prototypical, ideal, manifestation of epic as a transcendental genre, a foundational norm to which other instantiations of the genre aspire or conform to a greater or lesser degree. The difference between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is seen in this perspective as a matter of the poet's personal progress (or aging), with the *Odyssey* invariably representing a later, more developed world view — or as simply two different instantiations of the genre of epic, one epic being taken as 'heroic' and the other as 'romantic', or some such characterization.

Such an epic conception of the epic genre may be in line with Homer's own future orientation and with the self-evident central place the Homeric poems have always occupied in the Greek educational curriculum and in the Western canon, but it leaves important aspects of the poetry unexplored. Epic is not only as the beginning of literature a diachronic cultural phenomenon; it is also, synchronically, a cross-cultural phenomenon, the domain of anthropologists and ethnographers rather

than humanists and literary critics.¹ Students of epic in the comparative dimension repeatedly stress epic's multifarious nature.² No single epic can be found that represents all the genre's core features and functions. Especially when the dimension of performance is added, Homer loses much of its uniqueness and canonical primacy, but many opportunities are created to elucidate the poetry from viewpoints that are unknown to the classical paradigm.

The argument that follows will start with one such a viewpoint, the relation between speech and narrative. What is for the grammarian a distinction between speech and *quoted* speech (*oratio recta*, whose source is not the speaker of the moment but another speaker at another time) and for the narratologist a distinction between narrator and character (with characteristic differences in knowledge and "focalization" between the two³) may acquire a new significance when the dimension of performance is introduced. Already Plato's terminology, involving the action nouns μίμησις and διήγησις,⁴ suggests performance by bringing theatrical phenomena such as playing (characters') *roles* to the fore. The cross-cultural perspective adds to this observation that those roles may be traditional as genres of speech that can have an existence independent of the epic tradition. Epic can appropriate those minor genres,⁵ so becoming a matrix genre, a stage on which alternative speech genres are performed: boasts, insults, promises, supplications, laments, commemorations, and narratives.

¹ See A. FORD, "Epic as Genre", in *A New Companion to Homer*, ed. by I. MORRIS and B. POWELL (Leiden 1997), 396, and B. GRAZIOSI, "The Definition of Epic", Paper presented at a conference *Homerizontes*, Center for Hellenic Studies, June 2005.

² E.g., J.M. FOLEY, "Epic as Genre", in *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. by R. FOWLER (Cambridge 2004), 171-187.

³ E.g., I.J.F. DE JONG, *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam 1987), 149-194.

⁴ *Rep.* 3, 393 c 5-9.

⁵ E.g., J.M. FOLEY, *art.cit.* (n.2), 172 ("omnibus genre").

Homeric epic calls such subordinate genres ἔπος, as opposed to ἀοιδή, the term used for epic, the matrix genre. In later times, however, and outside epic, ἔπος comes to designate epic itself, perhaps first in Pindar and frequently in Herodotus.⁶ It is not entirely clear how this sense for ἔπος developed, but it is striking that epic as a whole comes to be typified by the generic term for the variety of speech acts that are performed by the epic characters.⁷ The semantic development of ἔπος is a reflex of the nature of the relation between the matrix genre and the embedded genres: neither is likely to remain unaffected in a process that can be seen as a *dialogue* over time, a reciprocal shaping. Homer goes perhaps farther than some other attested epic traditions: it imposes its own metrical conditions on the speech genres it appropriates and in turn borrows their poetics.⁸

⁶ *Nem.* 2, 2 φαπτῶν ἐπέων ... ὀοιδοί. See also the usage in Herodotus, e.g., 2, 116, 3; 4, 29. On ἔπος, see also H. KOLLER, "Epos", in *Glotta* 50 (1972), 16-24.

⁷ The other major term for "spoken utterance" in Homer, μῦθος, had of course a semantic development that prevented it being used to refer to "epic" as such. For the use of μῦθος and ἔπος in Homer, see R.P. MARTIN, *The Language of Heroes. Speech and Performance in the Iliad* (Ithaca and London 1989), 1-42. MARTIN redefines (p.12) μῦθος in Homer as "a speech-act indicating authority, performed at length, usually in public, with a focus on full attention to every detail", whereas ἔπος is glossed as "an utterance, ideally short, accompanying a physical act, and focusing on message, as perceived by the addressee, rather than on performance as enacted by the speaker". We may add that a μῦθος in Homer typically does not expect a reply, which sets it up as anti-dialogic counterpart of λόγος in the later distinction.

⁸ This idea of a dialogue between genres is indebted to the work of M. BAKHTIN, e.g., *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. by C. EMERSON and M. HOLQUIST (Austin 1981), 3-4; *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays*, ed. by C. EMERSON and M. HOLQUIST (Austin 1986), 60-102. Ironically, Bakhtin sees in epic a fundamentally un-dialogic genre, seeing dialogue at work mostly in the novel and in its "precursors" (such as the Socratic dialogue). Another difference between Bakhtin's work and the argument presented here is that I envisage dialogism in an epic tradition as essentially diachronic, not synchronic. As for the interaction between the discourse of the Homeric narrator and that of the characters, in *Pointing at the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics* (Washington-Cambridge 2005), 99-102, 107, 170 I argue that the strategies for "vividness" that are available to the Homeric narrator may involve the use of deictic markers used in the speech of characters in its dynamic and interactive settings.

Nor does this dialogue stop with ‘minor’ genres; the Homeric poems *themselves*, I will argue, are engaged in a dialogue with each other. Rather than being finished manifestations of a transcendental epic genre, the two epics shape each other as they feed into and digest each other. And the idea of feeding and digesting is appropriate for my purposes, because, as I will argue, much of the multiple dialogue between ἔπος and ἀοιδή as well as between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is concerned with food.

The Iliad: Heroic Speech, Heroic Feasts

It seems promising, then, to start looking for ‘epic’ in what is for epic ἔπος. What do Homeric characters do with words that might typify the matrix speech act that holds them? After all, the epic hero is expected to leave his words to posterity no less than his deeds, as old Phoenix reminds Achilles (<μύθων τε ὁρητῆρ' ἔμμεναι πρηκτῆρά τε ἔργων, *Il.* 9, 443). Can we differentiate the two epics on the basis of what their heroes say? Let us start with some well-known observations on the ‘heroic code’ in the *Iliad* as it is presented by the heroes themselves.

In the *Iliad* heroes attest in their ἔπη to the interconnection of past, present, and future in what we may call a commemorative society. Hector, when he faces death at the hands of Achilles, is acutely aware of the obligation to die gloriously after performing a “big deed”, so that there is something for “men in the future to learn about”:

μὴ μὰν ἀσπουδί γε καὶ ἀκλειῶς ἀπολοίμην
ἀλλὰ μέγα δέξας τι καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι
(*Il.* 22, 304-305)

Let me not perish without some great effort or *kleos*;
No, <I'll die> after doing some great deed, for men that will be to learn about.

He who lives in a commemorative society, a society that is open to the past, will always be open to the future, confident that his own achievements will be remembered and commemorated in

turn: ἔπος anticipates future ἀσιδή. What Hector anticipates is to be part of the ongoing κλέα ἀνδρῶν, the kind of singing that Achilles does at *Il.* 9, 189 (ἀειδε δ' ἄρα κλέα ἀνδρῶν) or the kind of *exemplum* that Phoenix presents at *Il.* 9, 524-605. A hero's very identity is bound up with the κλέα ἀνδρῶν, as grammatically expressed in the patronymic epithets. A good example is the speech of Glaukos, whose self-presentation to Diomedes crucially involves the κλέα ἀνδρῶν of his ancestors:

Ίππόλοχος δέ μ' ἔτικτε, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ φημι γενέσθαι·
πέμπε δέ μ' ἐς Τροίην, καὶ μοι μάλα πόλλα' ἐπέτελλεν,
αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπεροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων,
μηδὲ γένος πατέρων αἰσχυνέμεν, οἴ μέγ' ἀριστοι
ἐν τ' Ἐφύρῃ ἐγένοντο καὶ ἐν Λυκίῃ εὐρείῃ.
ταύτης τοι γενεῆς τε καὶ αἴματος εὔχομαι εἶναι.
(*Il.* 6, 206-211)

Hippolokhos fathered me and I claim to be born from him.
He sent me to Troy, and enjoined me in many ways
always to excel and to be more prominent than others,
nor to put the race of my fathers to shame, who were greatly the best
in Ephyre as well as in broad Lycia.
Of that lineage and from that blood I claim to have sprung.

Noblesse oblige is what counts in the transfer of κλέος across the generations.

Noblesse oblige is also what counts between the hero and his entourage. Between the remembered past and the anticipated future, when the present will be remembered, there is also the present itself and the compensation it might give for running the risk of death, just as κλέος is compensation for death itself. In the middle of the poem (12, 310-328) the same Glaukos is famously exhorted to battle by his lord Sarpedon with a brief reflection on their life back in Lycia:⁹ they enjoy the best places at the feast, the best meats, and godlike honor. But they are expected to fight among Lycia's foremost fighters to earn *kleos*.

⁹ On this passage, see P. PUCCI, *The Song of the Sirens: Essays on Homer* (Lanham and New York 1998), 49-68; see also J. GRIFFIN. *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford 1980), 14.

This obligation, Sarpedon goes on, is intimately bound up with the human condition: if they were impervious to old age and death, there would be no reason to join battle and fight. Indeed, we may add, the constant proximity of death (*νῦν δ' ἔμπης γὰρ κῆρες ἐφεστᾶσιν θανάτοιο | μωρίαι*, 12, 326-327) is what makes Sarpedon's fighting present meaningful, and gives it a future.

The central importance of food in Sarpedon's speech is prepared in the lion simile that immediately precedes:

βῆ δ' ἵμεν ως τε λέων ὀρεσίτροφος, ὃς τ' ἐπιδευής
 δηρὸν ἔη κρεῶν, κέλεται δέ ἐ θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ
 μήλων πειρήσοντα καὶ ἐς πυκινὸν δόμον ἐλθεῖν·
 εἴ περ γάρ χ' εὔρησι παρ' αὐτῷ φι βώτορας ἄνδρας
 σὺν κυσὶ καὶ δούρεσσι φυλάσσοντας περὶ μῆλα,
 οὕτα τ' ἀπειρητος μέμονε σταθμοῖ δίεσθαι,
 ἀλλ' ὅ γ' ἄρ' ἡ ἥρπαξε μετάλμενος, ἡὲ καὶ αὐτὸς
ἔβλητ' ἐν πρώτοισι θοῆς ἀπὸ χειρὸς ἀκοντι·
 ως ὁταντὸν Σαρπηδόνα θυμὸς ἀνῆκε
τεῖχος ἐπατέξαι διά τε ῥήξασθαι ἐπάλξεις.
αὐτίκα δὲ Γλαῦκον προσέφη, παῖδ' Ἰππολόχοιο.
 (Il. 12, 299-309)

The close link between Sarpedon and the lion is expressed by *αὐτίκα* in 309.¹⁰ The kingly animal's heroic craving for meat is the urge of its *θυμός* (*κέλεται δέ ἐ θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ*, 300); it makes the lion risk his life at the hands of the shepherds who guard their flock: the javelin from a swift hand might kill it "among the foremost fighters" (*ἐν πρώτοισι*, 306). A human hero dying in this way would certainly be assured undying *κλέος*, and we may accordingly explore the links between *κλέος* and food.

The symbolic value of food and its connections with *τιμὴ* and *κλέος* is a recurrent theme in the *Iliad* and its warrior society. Two memorable scenes involve no one other than Odysseus, whose relation to food is richly complex and informs important aspects of Homeric poetics, as we will see. In the first scene (4, 343-348), Agamemnon rebukes Odysseus for standing first in line when it comes to the *δαίς*, the heroic banquet, while lag-

¹⁰ See PUCCI, *op. cit.* (n.9), 51.

ging behind when the actual fighting starts.¹¹ The δαίς is one of the prime occasions in heroic life, second only to the distribution of booty, in which τιμή, honor, recognized value, is enacted in the proportional share that one receives. The dispensation of meat reflects and underscores relative differences in τιμή in the community.¹² The scene helps create a less than heroic persona for Odysseus, which, as I shall argue later, is put to good use by the *Odyssey* as it realizes its hero's νόστος.

The second scene, from Book 19 of the *Iliad*, opposes two radical departures from the heroic feast and its symbolic value. Achilles' murderous rage makes him stop wanting to eat altogether: his is a lust for blood rather than a craving for meat; Odysseus, in response, stresses the advantages of food over fasting, but he is not so much interested in heroic feasting, which satisfies most of all the θυμός, as in the biological necessity of feeding. Odysseus argues that no heroic achievement can be achieved until the γαστήρ is given its due share.¹³ As we will see, this stance of Odysseus will prove central to the *Odyssey*'s strategies in realizing its hero's return.

The Odyssey: Poetry and Food

Turning now to the *Odyssey*, we notice, and not for the first time, that the perspective on κλέος here is quite different from that of the *Iliad*. We usually attribute this, not unreasonably, to the *Odyssey* being a post-war epic, for whose characters the

¹¹ Similarly, Agamemnon exhorts the Achaeans by reminding them of the boast made over "many meats" (*κρέα πολλὰ*, *Il.* 8, 231) that now turn out to be empty. See also *Il.* 8, 161-166 (Hector to Diomedes).

¹² On the δαίς, see S. SAÏD, "Les crimes des prétendants, la maison d'Ulysse et les festins de l'*Odyssee*", in *Études de littérature ancienne*, ed. by S. SAÏD, F. DESBORDES, J. BOUFFARTIGUE, and A. MOREAU (Paris 1979), 9-49, arguing (pp.19-21) that the δαίς not only is parallel to other systems of distribution (such as booty), but also "proportionate" and allowing for parts of honor.

¹³ *Il.* 19, 154-237. On this scene, see the fundamental discussion of P. PUCCI, *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad* (Ithaca and London 1987), 165-172.

heroic exploits of the Trojan War are already the past, a matter of κλέα ἀνδρῶν. This creates ample opportunities, used to the full by the *Odyssey* and widely noted by modern scholars, for self-reflexive poetics and epic's exploration of its own transmission and reception, indeed its very truth. Yet at the same time these modern features are matched by features that seem far less advanced than the *Iliad*'s heroic warfare: tales about encounters with witches, ogres, and monsters that are commonly categorized under labels such as 'folktale', 'Märchen', etc. Can these conflicting features be reconciled? How do they relate to the *Iliad*? Is it even safe to say that the two Homeric epics belong to one and the same genre?

The *Odyssey*'s temporal orientation is strikingly different from that of the *Iliad*; Odyssean characters occupy a position that is a blend of the perspective of the Iliadic heroes themselves and the "late-born men" (*όψιγονοι, ἐσσόμενοι*) that Hector thinks will be the audience of his exploits in the future. This is nowhere clearer than in the case of Odysseus himself. Iliadic heroes such as Hector and even Achilles himself have an identity that consists in the encounter of past and future temporalities; both draw, as enacted through their patronymics, on the past κλέος of their line and both have to locate their own κλέος in the future. Odysseus, on the other hand, is the self-made man, the hero who cannot fall back to the same degree on his lineage;¹⁴ in fact, when he does, the results are disastrous. The κλέα ἀνδρῶν do not seem to work for Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, an epic that tends to emphasize the non-Iliadic qualities of the world in which Odysseus is forced to travel (though not without re-integrating its hero at the end, as we will see). The hero's achieved κλέος allows him to speak about it in the present tense (*καί μεν κλέος οὐρανὸν ἴκει, Od. 9, 20*) where Iliadic heroes have to use the future.¹⁵ But this κλέος has two sides; it may already have

¹⁴ S. BENARDETE, *Achilles and Hector: The Homeric Hero*, ed. by R. BURGER (South Bend, Indiana 2005), 30-31.

¹⁵ See Ch. SEGAL, *Singers, Heroes, and Gods in the Odyssey* (Ithaca and London 1994), 86-87; BAKKER, *op.cit.* (n.8), 111. Note that when κλέος is presented

been attained during the hero's life, but it cannot but signify his death to those who are left behind on Ithaka. In Penelope's γύοι for her vanished husband, the latter's *κλέος* comes to symbolize, in a striking reversal of Iliadic temporality, his absence in the present rather than his presence in the future:¹⁶ this heroic, epic fame is not compensation for death; it is, for Penelope, a painful symbol for death itself.

The *κλέος* that the *Odyssey* confers is of course, in another reversal of Iliadic orientations, the accomplishment of *νόστος*. Whereas from the point of view of the *Iliad*'s heroics, *νόστος* is poetic death, the elimination of any possibility of *κλέος* and of that poem's *telos*, the *Odyssey* places the achievement of *κλέος*, and so the poem's *telos*, squarely in the completion of the hero's *νόστος*. The hero's return is the necessary condition for his fame in the future, since no one but Odysseus himself can tell the tale and save his adventures for posterity. In fact, the telling of the story is tantamount to the achievement of *κλέος* and the hero cannot accomplish his *νόστος* but by becoming a singer. This is what Alkinoos, king of the Phaeacians acknowledges when Odysseus is in the process of uttering epic's longest and in more than one way most fantastic *ἔπος*:

σοὶ δ' ἔπι μὲν μορφῇ ἐπέων, ἔνι δὲ φρένες ἐσθλαί,
μῦθον δ' ὡς ὅτ' ἀοιδὸς ἐπισταμένως κατέλεξας
(*Od.* 11, 367-368)

Upon you is comeliness of words, and in you is a noble mind.
The μῦθος, as if you are an ἀοιδὸς, you have told with great skill.

Odysseus' *ἔπος* like no other speech in Homer blurs the distinction between speech and song, between hero and poet, and so turns *ἔπος* (or *μῦθος*) into *ἀοιδή*.

Odysseus' narrative *tour de force* is well prepared and well integrated in the chain of events. In terms of subject matter, in

as extending into the future, the achievement worthy of commemoration has always already been realized. In fact, the realization may be the poem itself, as in the case of Penelope at *Od.* 24, 196 τῷ οἱ *κλέος* οὕποτ' δλεῖται.

¹⁶ τοῦ *κλέος* εὑρὺ καθ' Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἀργὸς, *Od.* 1, 344; 4, 726.

requesting Demodokos to sing of the Wooden Horse and the fall of Troy, Odysseus creates a basis from which he can start his own story by relay with a seamless chronological fit. But integration applies also to the context in which the story is told, which takes us back to the theme of food. Both Demodokos and Odysseus perform in the context of the Phaeacian *δαις*, which just as the feasts of the *Iliad* is what the banquet should be: a proportionate division of meat and honor. But the *Odyssey* adds a crucial element, because here poetry and poets are included in the distribution. First, poetry is, as Alkinoos puts it, “wedded to the banquet”:

ἢδη μὲν δαιτός κεκορήμεθα θυμὸν ἔτσης
φόρμιγγός θ', ἢ δαιτί συνήρορός ἐστι θαλείη
(*Od.* 8, 98-99)

We have now satisfied the desire of our θυμός for the well-balanced banquet, and for the lyre, which is wedded to the rich banquet.

The bond between poetry and food is prominent and clear throughout the poem.¹⁷ What is new at the Phaeacians’ banquet is that Odysseus, the hero-turned-into-poet, turns the poet Demodokos into a hero, allowing him to partake of the heroic and timocratic distribution of meat by offering him a choice piece:

“κῆρυξ, τῇ δή, τοῦτο πόρε κρέας, ὅφρα φάγησι,
Δημοδόκω, καὶ μιν προσπτύξομαι, ἀχνύμενός περ.
πᾶσι γάρ ἀνθρώποισι ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἀοιδοῖ
τιμῆς ἔμμοροι εἰσὶ καὶ αἰδοῦς, οὕνεκ' ἄρα σφεας
οἴμας Μοῦσ' ἐδίδαξε, φίλησε δὲ φῦλον ἀοιδῶν.”
ὅς ἄρ' ἔφη, κῆρυξ δὲ φέρων ἐν χερσὶν ἔθηκεν
ἥρω Δημοδόκω· δ' ἐδέξατο, χαῖρε δὲ θυμῷ.
(*Od.* 8, 477-483)

“Herald, there! Give him this piece of meat, so that he eats, to Demodokos, and I will salute him, grieved though I am. For among all humans who dwell on earth the singers are entitled to honor and respect, since them

¹⁷ E.g., *Od.* 8, 539; 9, 5-11; 13, 24-28; 17, 258-263; 17, 605-606; 21, 430.

the Muse has taught the paths of song, and she loves the race of singers". Thus he spole and the herald took it and put it in his hands, to Demodokos the Hero; and he, he received it and rejoiced in his spirit.

The ἀοιδός, endowed with τιμή, whose songs carry κλέος themselves (*Od.* 8, 74), becomes a hero when his status is confirmed in the δαις and he receives his proportionate share of meat.

The interdependence of poet and hero through meat at the δαις has a number of important consequences for the poetics of the *Odyssey*. First, what counts in the *Iliad* as compensation for heroic action or as its symbolic equivalent becomes in the *Odyssey* the thing itself: singing the song is tantamount to accomplishing the deed, with the difference between μῆθοι/ἔπεα and ἔργα — in the *Iliad* two separate departments of heroic achievement — disappearing. This is nowhere clearer than in the climactic ending of the hero's νόστος, the δαις of death of the Suitors in Odysseus' μέγαρον, when the poet's lyre turns into a deadly weapon:

ώς ὅτ’ ἀνὴρ φόρμιγγος ἐπιστάμενος καὶ ἀοιδῆς
ρήγιδίως ἐτάνυσσε νέω περὶ κόλλοπι χορδὴν,
ἄψας ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐϋστρεφὲς ἔντερον οἵσις,
ώς ἄρ’ ἀτέρ σπουδῆς τάνυσσεν μέγα τόξον Ὁδυσσεύς.
δεξιτερῇ δ’ ἄρα χειρὶ λαβὼν πειρήσατο νευρῆς.
ἡ δ’ ὑπὸ καλὸν ἀεισε, χελιδόνι εἰκέλη αὐδὴν.
(*Od.* 21, 406-411)

Just as when a man who is expert in the lyre and in song
easily fastens a string on the new peg,
fastening on either side the well-twisted sheep gut:
so then, without effort, did Odysseus string the great bow
and taking it with his right hand he tested the string,
and it sung a beautiful tune, similar to the song of the swallow.

The lethal force of poetry, here mediated through the voice of the primary narrator and the simile, becomes explicit in the grim humor of the hero-poet's ἔπος a little later:

νῦν δ’ ὥρη καὶ δόρπον Ἀχαιοῖσιν τετυκέσθαι
ἐν φάει, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα καὶ ἄλλως ἐψιάσθαι
μολπῇ καὶ φόρμιγγι· τὰ γάρ τ’ ἀναθήματα δαιτός.
(*Odyssey* 21, 428-430)

Now it's the moment to prepare the Achaeans a meal
in the light; and thereafter to amuse ourselves in other ways,
with song and the lyre; for those are the delights of the banquet.

In addition to preparing the interdependence of poet and hero, word and deed, the proportionately balanced meal in Alkinoos' μέγαρον and its harmonious wedding to ἀοιδή/έπος also acts as counterpoint to the feasts of the Suitors, where the δαις is corrupted, to the point at which the very term becomes inappropriate, since no distribution takes place, no proportional division, no exchange or compensation, and no sacrifice.¹⁸ The meats at this non-δαις become "blood-defiled"¹⁹ in what is perhaps the most extreme characterization of the Suitors' continuous and excessive feasting. The Suitors' meat consumption, as I think the poem makes clear, is in itself a transgression, a violation.

The *Odyssey*, when one looks at it in this way, suddenly becomes full of ravenously hungry bellies and meals that go terribly wrong. The feast is not only the setting for stories, song, music, and τιμή, but can also provide a setting for strife among the table guests, as in Demodokos' first song that tells of the νεῖκος of Achilles and Odysseus which occurred θεῶν ἐν δαιτὶ θαλείῃ (8, 76). Meals in the *Odyssey* are often in and of themselves problematic, inappropriate, dangerous, even deadly. Odysseus' companions are surprised by the returning Kikones while eating an undue and inappropriate meal;²⁰ Agamemnon was murdered while dining, butchered like the beef on which he was feasting,²¹ his companions slaughtered "like white-tusked boars" for the feast of a wealthy man;²² their corpses were strewn all around the tables laden with food and the floor of the dining hall was seething all over with their blood.²³ These

¹⁸ On the Suitors' crimes and transgressions, see SAID, *art.cit.* (n.12), 23-32.

¹⁹ αἰμοφόρυχτα, *Od.* 20, 348.

²⁰ *Od.* 9, 45-51.

²¹ *Od.* 4, 534-535; 11, 411-412.

²² *Od.* 11, 412-415.

²³ *Od.* 11, 419-420. Note that the phrase δάπεδον δ' ἄπαν αἴματι θῦε (420) is

images vividly anticipate the carnage that will take place at Ithaka when Odysseus will reverse the roles of hunter and hunted, butcher and butchered. Agamemnon's νόστος was wrecked in food.

An even more striking link with the Suitors' feasting and demise is created by Odysseus' companions eating the Cattle of the Sun, the only adventure from the travels beyond that is singled out for prominent inclusion in the poem's proem. Even though they are numbered and immortal (12, 129-131), the oxen of Helios are not for the Companions food in the sense of distribution of honor, as in the δαΐς, but mere biological sustenance; they satisfy less the cravings of the θυμός than those of the γαστήρ.²⁴ And yet, indispensable as they are, they are untouchable. Helios took away the day of their νόστος for their meat consumption that is characterized as ἀτασθαλία (1, 7), just as are the depredations of the Suitors (22, 416). Both the Companions and the Suitors ate beyond what was their share and met with self-inflicted doom. In the *Odyssey*, νόστος can only be achieved through abstinence and fasting.

We see, then, that in the world depicted in the *Odyssey*, food and the meal are all but the self-evident system of distribution that in the *Iliad* sustains the heroic code. Is the *Odyssey* merely reacting to the *Iliad* by problematizing its conception of the social importance of feasting, just as it reverses the war poem's vision on νόστος and κλέος? Or has the stance on food of the νόστος poem a different motivation? In order to arrive at an answer, let us look more closely at the poem's ἔπεια, in particular the νόστος-turned-into-speech, which is the hero's report on his voyage. Not counting Odysseus' Cretan tales, the *Odyssey* offers us two such tales: Odysseus' own report in Books 9-12, the *Apologue*, and Menelaos' report in Book 4 (351-586).

picked up in another description of a νόστος ending in a bloodbath (22, 309, cf. 24, 185), stressing the structural similarity between the two scenes. See also n. 70 below.

²⁴ *Od.* 12, 332 ἔτειρε δὲ γαστέρα λιμός. Cf. *Od.* 4, 369 in an entirely comparable νόστος-story.

The Shaman's Tale

The *Apologue* has been variously interpreted. The narratologist sees in it an instance of a typically Homeric narrative strategy, the telling by a character of events that took place before the poem's constructed plot.²⁵ But Odysseus' story is surely very different from, say, Nestor's story of his youthful exploits or Phoenix's Meleager story. Those are *exempla* addressed to Achilles, and part of the κλέα ἀνδρῶν, tested and confirmed in accepted tradition of which the community's elders are the repository;²⁶ the narrator is certainly not its exclusive source. Odysseus' and Menelaos' stories, on the other hand, are personal reports about adventures in a world beyond the reach of the audience, unconfirmed and unverifiable, meant to explain the narrator's being here — stories about hardships endured precisely in order to "come home". Others take the personal, the unconfirmed and unverifiable, as a typically Odyssean study in narrative authority, an exploration of the uncertain borderline area between truth and falsehood in a self-reflexive poetics.²⁷

Such self-reflexive explorations do indeed take place, but that does not mean that Odysseus' first-person narrative is not in itself a traditional thing to do with words. Returning to the suggestion made in the beginning about the dialogue between ἔπος and ἀοιδή, I propose that Odysseus' tale may be a traditional type of ἔπος that the Homeric tradition has appropriated and used for its own epic purposes. I am reaching back here to an older suggestion by K. Meuli, who observed that Odysseus' story, the first-person report on a *Jenseitsreise*, is typologically the *shaman's tale* of his journey in the world beyond,²⁸ a jour-

²⁵ See I.J.F. DE JONG, *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey* (Cambridge 2001), 221.

²⁶ See the way in which Phoenix introduces his tale at *Il.* 9, 524-527 (ἐπείθομεθα κλέα ἀνδρῶν ... μέμνημαι τόδε ἔργον ἐγώ πάλαι, οὐ τι νέον γε).

²⁷ E.g., S. GOLDHILL, *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature* (Cambridge 1991), 54-56.

²⁸ K. MEULI, "Scythica", in *Hermes* 70 (1935), 168 = *Gesammelte Schriften II* (Basel/Stuttgart 1975), 869-870. Also A. THORNTON, *People and Themes in*

ney that involves encounters with monsters, demons, masters of animals, not to mention suffering, ingenuity, heavenly consorts, and fasting. It is not completed until it is turned into utterance, the obligatory tale that signifies the shaman's return to humanity and so seals his '*nostos*'.²⁹

Shamanism is a phenomenon of confusing and disconcerting diversity; its many aspects include among others (though not necessarily simultaneously in any one given culture) healing, magic, divination, and securing success in the hunt. The common denominator of these various functions can best be summed up as mediation with the supernatural, the world beyond, to which the shaman — his spirit leaving the body — must travel in order to carry out some mission: conduct a soul to the world beyond, bring one back (as an act of healing), or find out the supernatural cause of a famine or disaster for the community and remedy it.³⁰ Prerequisite for his legitimacy in this function is in many cases his union with a supernatural consort,³¹ such as the daughter of the spirit-giver of game, an alliance that makes hunting partake of the system of exchange around which marriage revolves.

Shamanism has been described for many cultures the world over, but its core area is generally located in Siberia and Central Asia. Most discussions of shamanism in the Greek world assume a northerly (Thracian or Pontic) connection.³² For the *Odyssey*

Homer's Odyssey (Dunedin 1970), 16-37; A.T. HATTO, *Shamanism and Epic Poetry in Northern Asia* (London 1970, School of Oriental and African Studies), 2. W. BURKERT, *Creation of the Sacred: Tracks of Biology in Early Religions* (Cambridge, MA and London 1996), 68.

²⁹ R. HAMAYON, *La chasse à l'âme. Esquisse d'une théorie du chamanisme sibérien* (Paris 1990), 527.

³⁰ M. ÉLIADE, *Le chamanisme et les techniques archaïques de l'extase* (Paris 1951), 21-22; HATTO, *op.cit.* (n.28), 1-3. The notion of ecstatic shamanism is sometimes criticized as too narrow in that spirits from the world beyond may also come to the shaman and possess him, e.g., Å. HULTKRANTZ, "Introductory Remarks on the Study of Shamanism", in *Shaman* 1 (1993), 3-14.

³¹ ÉLIADE, *op.cit.* (n.30), 79-80; HAMAYON, *op.cit.* (n.29), 425-539.

³² E. ROHDE, *Psyche. Seelenkult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen* (Leipzig 1897), 151; K. MEULI, *art.cit.* (n.28); E.R. DODDS, *The Greeks and the Irrational*

in particular it is of interest that Pontic geography has recently been reasserted as a plausible area for Odysseus' voyage on the basis of the poem's drawing on an earlier *Argonautica*.³³

Shamanism has been frequently cited as an important source of epic, with sometimes a separate, shamanistic type of epic being singled out³⁴ or parallelisms being noted between the shaman and the hero.³⁵ To apply this to the *Odyssey* might seem plausible, since so many features of the *Apologue* do indeed have a shamanistic appearance: the hero's mysterious sleeping;³⁶ his union with Circe the daughter of the Sun, master of animals; his journey to the Underworld; his union with Calypso, who resides at the navel of the sea, and daughter of Atlas who holds the pillars that separate heaven from earth;³⁷ the hero's alliance with Athena, presented as a goddess who is prone to take on birds' shapes;³⁸ his closeness in role and function to Apollo, archer god with boreal connections;³⁹ and last but not least for

(Berkely and Los Angeles 1951), 135-142. A.N. ATHANASSAKIS, "Shamanism and Amber in Greece: The Northern Connection", in *Shamanhood, Symbolism, and Epic*, ed. by J. PENTIKÄINEN (Budapest 2001) stresses the possibly Nordic connections of Menelaos' adventure with Proteus (*Od.* 4, 351-572).

³³ M.L. WEST, "Odyssey and Argonautica", in *CQ* 55 (2005), 39-64.

³⁴ MEULI, *art.cit.* (n.28), 164 ff.; HATTO, *op.cit.* (n.28); C.M. BOWRA, *Heroic Poetry* (New York²1972), 29-30, 70-78; D.A. MILLER, *The Epic Hero* (Baltimore and London 2000), 32-33.

³⁵ MILLER, *op.cit.* (n. 34), 298-304.

³⁶ *Od.* 12, 338; 13, 79-80.

³⁷ *Od.* 1, 50; 53-54. Calypso seems in this respect a multiform of her father insofar as "navel" can be seen as a multiform of the "Pillar of the World", see E.J. BAKKER, "The Greek Gilgamesh, or the Immortality of Return", in *EPANOΣ. Proceedings of the 9th International Symposium on the Odyssey* (Ithaki 2001), 346. On the World Pillar, see ÉLIADE, *op.cit.* (n. 30), 214-215, Å. HULTZKRANZ, "A New Look at the World Pillar in Arctic and Sub-Arctic Religions", in *Shamanism and Northern Ecology*, ed. by J. PENTIKÄINEN (Berlin and New York 1996), 31-49.

³⁸ On the relation between shamans and birds, see HAMAYON, *op.cit.* (n. 29), 493-494, 552. Note that Circe may have avian (falconese) features downplayed by our text, cf. M.L. WEST, *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford 1997), 408. On birds in general in the *Odyssey*, see P. FRIEDRICH, "An Avian and Aphrodisian Reading of Homer's *Odyssey*", in *American Anthropologist* 99 (1997), 306-320.

³⁹ E.g., MEULI, *art.cit.* (n.28), 160-163 = 861-864; DODDS, *op.cit.* (n.32), 141; THORNTON, *op.cit.* (n.28), 24-25.

our discussion of the importance of food, feasting, and fasting in Homer, there is the importance of the hunt and the hero's purveyance of meat for his companions, most notably on "Goat Island" off the coast of the land of the Cyclopes and on Circe's island, where he kills a giant stag; finally, outside the confines of the *Apologue*, the remarkable expression ἦν ... ψυχήν from the poem's Proem springs to mind with its unique agentive conception of "one's soul".⁴⁰

Still, such shamanistic leanings of the Odysseus' tale are hard to test without some evidence of how the shaman's *tale*, shamanism as *discursive practice*, relates to epic. Returning to Meuli's first-person narrative as criterion, can we assume that Odysseus' tale is a shaman's story that has been incorporated wholesale into our Homeric *Odyssey* and put in Odysseus' mouth? Has the shaman's *ἐπος*, a speech genre whose performance, as travelers and missionaries attest, can be spectacular,⁴¹ been imported into the matrix genre of epic? Such an import is unlikely, if only because the performing 'shaman' in question is a character with an independently confirmed status as a Trojan War hero. And abrupt, overnight borrowing is unlikely to happen in evolving oral traditions; much more likely is the co-existence over time of two genres, the bard's tale and the shaman's tale, as the 'dialogue' of genres that I mentioned in the beginning. What we need, then, is comparative evidence of the shaman's tale and the bard's epic as co-existing discursive practices.

A suggestive case of such co-existence can be found in the Buryat cultures of Southern Central Siberia, around Lake Baikal, as interpreted by the French anthropologist Roberte Hamayon, in particular the Ekhirit-Bugalat west of the Lake. The Buryat have an epic tradition whose ritual performance is strictly confined to the season when the constellation of the Pleiades rises at sunset, that is, from October to May, the winter and hunt-

⁴⁰ On this expression in the proem, though not in connection with 'shamanism', see PUCCI, *op.cit.* (n.9), 14-16.

⁴¹ R. HUTTON, *Shamans: Siberian Spirituality and the Western Imagination* (London and New York 2001), 85-87.

ing season.⁴² Buryat epic suggestively has as function to prepare, and propitiate, the hunt. As such it achieves in the physical world what the shaman's journey accomplishes in the supernatural world of the spirits. Hero and shaman are linked in the hunt. The parallelism between them is further expressed in the metaphorical link between the hero's Quest for marriage and the shaman's marriage with the daughter of the spirit of the wood, giver of game.⁴³ The former, the epic marriage, is an image of the condition to be fulfilled for the shaman to acquire his power, whereas the latter, the shamanic marriage, is in its turn the necessary condition for the spirit of the wood to give some of his game, reindeer, to the hunter as prey. Marriage and the hunt, therefore, are thematically connected in this tradition.

At the level of enunciation, the similarities between the shaman and the bard are equally clear, in that to perform epic is called to 'shamanize' it, whereas, conversely, the shaman's tale borrows from epic its rhythms, melodies, and patterns of versification.⁴⁴ In this evolving 'dialogue' between the two parallel and complementary discursive practices, and with the hunt diminishing in importance, epic wins out over the shamanic speech genre, so that the hero takes over some of the shaman's features.⁴⁵ The result is an epic in which song-action comes to be linked with shamanic practice.

Quest and Marriage

No direct contact between the Greek world and any ancestor of Buryat epic and shamanic practice can of course be estab-

⁴² HAMAYON, *op.cit.* (n.29), 167-168, 180. Without pressing the coincidence, we may note that the evening rising of the Pleiades is the time of Odysseus' departure from Calypso (*Od.* 5, 272, Πληγάδας ἐσορῶντι καὶ ὁψὲ δύοντα Βοῶτην); see N. AUSTIN, *Archery at the Dark of the Moon: Poetic Problems in Homer's Odyssey* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1975), 240-243.

⁴³ HAMAYON, *op.cit.* (n.29), 276-277.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 169-170.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 590-591; R. HAMAYON, "The Dynamics of the Epic Genre in Buryat culture. A Grave for Shamanism, a Ground for Messianism", in *Epic Adventures: Heroic Narrative in the Oral Performance Traditions of Four Continents*, ed. by J. JANSEN and H. MAIER (Münster and Hamburg 2003), 3-65.

lished.⁴⁶ But the interdependence between shaman and bard is suggestive, and we may wonder, speculating about the prehistory of the *Odyssey*, whether Odysseus' poem is not an example of such a 'shamanized' epic. What is of most interest here are not so much the shamanistic elements in the *Apologue* in themselves as the way in which Odysseus' first-person narrative and the matrix story feed into each other. Odysseus' supernatural consorts Circe and Calypso, the former providing paradisiacal feasting on "unlimited meats" and the latter nothing less than immortality, are turned from the successful completion of the shaman's mission into obstacles to the hero's quest. The tale of supernatural consorts is integrated within and subject to the tale of marriage to the mortal consort; but conversely Penelope takes on important features of Odysseus' divine sexual partners.⁴⁷ It is only through the dialogue of her tale with the *Apologue* that she becomes a Mistress of Animals whose wooing brings death to her unfortunate suitors. In that dialogue the Suitors come to occupy the slot reserved for Odysseus' companions in the *Apologue*. Both eat meat that is not only forbidden but also numbered, counted: the Cattle of Helios number three-hundred-fifty and the boars in Eumaios' enclosure, the Suitors' favorite food, three-hundred-sixty.⁴⁸

Such similarities inevitably put Odysseus himself in the role of the various Masters of Animals he encountered earlier. There are (subdued) solar features in the hero's remark that the Suit-

⁴⁶ But note that the one-eyed Arimaspoi and the "gold guarding griffons" of the poem of Aristeas of Proconnesus — another first-person narrative whose status (shaman's tale, epic quest, or geographic exploration?) is disputed — have been equated with the Altai and the Mongols. Cf. HDT. 4, 13; 25-27; J.D.P. BOLTON, *Aristeas of Proconnesos* (Oxford 1962), 78-80; H. FRÄNKEL, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (München 1962), 277-279.

⁴⁷ See M.N. NAGLER, "Dread Goddess Revisited", in *Reading the Odyssey*, ed. by S.L. SCHEIN (Princeton 1996), 141-161. In particular we may note the paradigmatic link between the living trunk on which Odysseus' bed has been built and the *axis mundi* (n. 37).

⁴⁸ Od. 12, 129-130; 14, 20. Note also that in answer to the paradisiacal $\kappa\varphi\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$ $\ddot{\alpha}\sigma\pi\tau\alpha$ which Odysseus and the Companions enjoy in the world beyond (9, 162, 557; 10, 184, 468; 12, 30) we have Eumaios' remark (14, 96) that Odysseus' estate used to be $\ddot{\alpha}\sigma\pi\tau\alpha\varsigma$ before the Suitors' depredations started.

ors' 'meal' is to take place ἐν φάει,⁴⁹ and in the simile depicting the Suitors' corpses as big fish lying in the sand, killed by Shining Helios.⁵⁰ Perhaps the most striking reversal is Odysseus in the role of the Cyclops as returning master of the house, since in the *Apologue* he was in the position of the Suitors, in entering a house uninvited and helping himself to the food supplies. Odysseus' μέγαρον, hermetically closed, comes to resemble the Cave of the Cyclops, but since the one who guards the threshold (22, 2) has more μῆτις than those trapped within and more than him who guarded the cave's exit, no one will come out alive. There is a complementary reversal, aligning not Odysseus but the Suitors with Polyphemos, which is underlined by the following repetition:

τὸ δὲ νήπιος οὐκ ἐνόησεν *Od.* 9, 442
 τὸ δὲ νήπιοι οὐκ ἐνόησαν *Od.* 22, 32

The former captor and those presently captured, Cyclops and Suitors, are similar in suffering from a fundamental lack of understanding of the situation. They stand both in contrast, respectively with the present captor and those formerly captured.

Epic in Dialogue

But there are other significant repetitions in the *Mnēstērophonia*. The significance of Odysseus' *nostos* is not exhausted with the interplay of the shamanic quest and the marriage-return story: a further dialogue is underway. The *Odyssey* tradition as a whole, I argue, interacts with the heroic tradition of the Trojan War and in particular its most memorable episode, the Wrath of Achilles as treated in the *Iliad* tradition. This new dialogue involves the two epics not as poems, fixed and finished, but as evolving speech genres in their own right. Such a dia-

⁴⁹ *Od.* 21, 429. See also 18, 343-344 with N. AUSTIN, *op.cit.* (n.42), 282-283 n.16.

⁵⁰ *Od.* 22, 384-389.

logue seems to me more fruitful as paradigm for 'transhomeric' research than to assume, either that the *Odyssey* contains elements of *mythical* epic that as such predate the largely *historical* epic frame of the *Iliad*,⁵¹ or is a 'later' composition that shows a 'post-epic' awareness.

In the new dialogue Odysseus' shamanic quest is incorporated not so much into the marriage tale of *nostos* proper as into the heroic tale of the Trojan War and its main epic tradition the *Iliad*. This means that Odysseus not only departs from and returns to his physical home at Ithaka; he also disappears from the heroic world of the *κλέα ἀνδρῶν*, the world of the Trojan War and the *Iliad*, in order to re-appear and be reintegrated at the end. The hero's wanderings in the world beyond are not only supernatural but also self-reflexive (or metapoetic), since the world in which he is forced to travel is defined with respect to epic through a denial or reversal of typically heroic values and functions, *kleos* in particular. The Wanderings, at this level, are a de-heroization followed by a re-heroization in which Odysseus comes to play yet another role, that of Achilles. The process, as we shall see, is charted not only through a number of salient verbal repetitions, but also through the aforementioned themes of feasting, feeding, and fasting.

The poem starts with presenting Odysseus' greatest claim to fame as no more than a starting point: the Sack of Troy only leads to wandering (*Od.* 1, 2). The hero's first adventure after leaving Troy, the sack of the Kikonian city of Ismaros and the ensuing battle, is mundane heroic routine, hardly worthy of *kleos*, and apparently meant merely to deepen the contrast with the episodes that are to follow.⁵² After Odysseus' ships get caught in a supernatural storm, *λαιλαπτι θεσπεσίη* (*Od.* 9, 68),

⁵¹ For "historical" vs. "mythical" epic, see P. ZUMTHOR, *Introduction à la poésie orale* (Paris 1983), 110-111, for whom "mythical" comes to supplant BOWRA's (n.34) notion of "chamanistic epic".

⁵² Note that the episode's most important event, Odysseus sparing the life of Maron the priest of Apollo, is not told until the wine Odysseus received in return becomes relevant for the story (*Od.* 9, 196-211).

no epic prerequisite or practice will further the hero's interests, and it soon transpires that those interests at this point are not 'epic' at all in any traditional sense. This is the moment when the aforementioned reversal of Iliadic values begins to take place: *nostos* turns from being an antitheroic suggestion into epic's primary goal, and *kleos* turns from poetic immortality into a liability.

Proportionate heroic δαιτές are attempted before and after the Cyclops episode; the first time there is feasting on the "unlimited meats" of the wild goats, the second time on the sheep stolen from the Cyclops' cave.⁵³ On both occasions Odysseus gets a share that the *Iliad*'s Sarpedon would have envied, but the heroic portion does not get Odysseus very far and merely anticipates the scenes in which the crew is feasting and the hero fasting.

The Cyclops story, in many ways an important learning experience for Odysseus, shows that in this new world epic forms of exchange and etiquette are at best useless, and potentially much worse. The Cyclops simply ignores Odysseus' Iliadic self-introduction as "troops of Agamemnon whose κλέος under the sky is now greatest"⁵⁴ and when Odysseus finally reveals himself as "Odysseus the Sacker of Cities, son of Laertes and having his home in Ithaka",⁵⁵ unleashing the Cyclops' prayer which will be specified by Teiresias' prediction, the results are disastrous for Odysseus' epic νόστος, but highly beneficial for the *story* of his νόστος as the object of a prolonged Quest.⁵⁶ The *Iliad*'s failure is the *Odyssey*'s success.

The hero's remoteness with respect to the reference-point of heroic epic is strikingly expressed by song of the Sirens.⁵⁷ The deadly singers take on the identity of the Iliadic Muses, in claim-

⁵³ *Od.* 9, 158-165, 548-557.

⁵⁴ *Od.* 9, 263-265.

⁵⁵ *Od.* 9, 504-505.

⁵⁶ See E.J. BAKKER, "Polyphemos", in *Colby Classical Quarterly* 37 (2002), 135-150.

⁵⁷ PUCCI, *op.cit.* (n.9), 1-9.

ing, using the language of the Muses,⁵⁸ to have omniscient knowledge of the world's richest source of κλέος, the battlefield of the Trojan War, and they address Odysseus in language that evokes the hero's Iliadic identity, most notably his intellectual superiority over Achilles.⁵⁹ However, as Pucci, Segal, and others have observed, to listen to the song of these anti-Muses means the very undoing of epos' victory over death in the form of κλέος.⁶⁰ Incorporation in the κλέα ἀνδρῶν as transmitted by heroic poetry, specifically the *Iliad*, is not within reach or even in the interest of someone who has drifted away so far from epic's deictic center. In order to enjoy the benefits of heroism in a traditional epic way, Odysseus has to have had a chance to *tell* his story. But this will not happen until he has survived the time on the island of Calypso, the immortal goddess whose very name signifies death in Iliadic parlance.⁶¹

But once Odysseus has set foot on Scheria, the island of the Phaeacians and the place where he starts securing his νόστος by telling it, signs of an epic identity being regained begin to accumulate. A process of return has started, a return not only to Ithaka and the hero's οἶκος, but also a 'transgeneric' return back to epic, Odysseus' heroic home. The hero appears before Nausicaa as a needy lion driven by the urge of his belly (κέλεται δέ ἐ γαστήρ, *Od.* 6, 133) in a simile that evokes and contrasts with the heroic and valiant lion that Sarpedon is compared to, the lion that is driven by the θυμός (κέλεται δέ ἐ θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ, *Il.* 12, 300).⁶² The contrast sets up an 'unheroic' identity for Odysseus that is distinctly Iliadic as part of the meta-epic process of homecoming that the *Odyssey* achieves. The process really gets

⁵⁸ *Od.* 12, 189, 191 ίδμεν ... πάνθ' ὅσ' ἐνὶ Τροίη εύρετι; *Il.* 2, 485 πάρεστέ τε ἵστε τε πάντα.

⁵⁹ *Od.* 12, 188 πλείονα εἰδώς; *Il.* 19, 219 πλείονα οἶδα. See PUCCI, *op.cit.* (n.9), 3; on the Achilles-Odysseus scene in *Iliad* 19, see below.

⁶⁰ SEGAL, *op.cit.* (n. 15), 102-103.

⁶¹ Black night envelops the Iliadic hero at the time of his death (τὸν δὲ σκότος ὅσσε κάλυψε, *Il.* 4, 503, etc.).

⁶² PUCCI, *op.cit.* (n. 13), 158-159.

underway when Odysseus, the fasting hero, starts talking about his γαστήρ and its needs, and so becomes not so much a feasting hero. This happens first at the court of Alkinoos:

ἀλλ' ἐμὲ μὲν δορπῆσαι ἔάσατε κηδόμενόν περ·
οὐ γάρ τι στυγερῇ ἐπὶ γαστέρι κύντερον ἄλλο
ἔπλετο, ή τ' ἐκέλευσεν ἦ οὐ μνήσασθαι ἀνάγκη
καὶ μάλα τειρόμενον καὶ ἐνī φρεσὶ πένθος ἔχοντα,
ώς καὶ ἐγὼ πένθος μὲν ἔχω φρεσίν, ή δὲ μαλ' αἰεὶ¹
ἐσθέμεναι κέλεται καὶ πινέμεν, ἐκ δέ με πάντων
ληθάνει ὅσσ' ἔπαθον, καὶ ἐνιπλήσθηναι ἀνώγει. (*Od.* 7, 215-221)

But now let me have my meal, afflicted though I am;
there is nothing more shameless than the γαστήρ,
which by force urges us to remember it,
no matter how many troubles he has, how much pain is in his heart.
Just so I too have pain in my heart, but she, the γαστήρ, always
Urges me on to eat and drink and forget my troubles, and demands to be
filled.

This remarkable passage has been much criticized for its less than heroic indulging in the belly. But its central feature is *memory* and its notional opposite forgetting. The γαστήρ, I suggest, signifies Odysseus' previous self as hero of the *Iliad*. We may even wonder whether there is not a more specific self-reflexive element here: remember *oneself* as part of regaining an identity that was lost.⁶³ After all, the affinity between Odysseus and the γαστήρ is so strong, and growing, that he finally actually turns into one, in a remarkable simile in which he is compared to a γαστήρ, a "paunch filled with fat and blood" that is writhing as it is cooked on the grill (*Od.* 20, 25-28).⁶⁴

Odysseus utters a second *ἔπος* focusing on his γαστήρ after he has set foot on Ithaka:

⁶³ On memory (*μνήσασθαι*) in epic as an actual realization in the present of the thing remembered, see E.J. BAKKER, "Remembering the God's Arrival", in *Arethusa* 35 (2002), 67-73.

⁶⁴ Further γαστήρ-related details include the Iris-episode (*Od.* 18, 53-54 ἀλλὰ με γαστήρ / δτρύνει κακοεργός, see again PUCCI, *op.cit.* [n. 13], 161-164), which will earn the beggar a "paunch...full of blood and fat" (γαστέρα...έμπλειν κνίσης τε καὶ αἴματος, *Od.* 18, 118-119, cf. 20, 25-28).

γαστέρα δ' οὐ πως ἔστιν ἀποκρύψαι μεμαυῖαν,
οὐλομένην, ἡ πολλὰ κάκ' ἀνθρώποισι δίδωσι
(*Od.* 17, 286-287)

As for the γαστήρ, there is no way to hide it when it is excited, accursed thing, which gives humans so many woes.

These words not only evoke the Proem of the *Iliad* (μῆνιν . . . οὐλομένην, ἡ), substituting Achilles' μῆνις for Odysseus' γαστήρ; they also revive the Iliadic scene in which these two clash as mutually exclusive concepts: fasting versus feeding. When Achilles returns to the fighting, his μῆνις turning from wrath into unrelenting lust for revenge, Odysseus urges him to take food beforehand, opposing to Achilles' denial of the heroic code and disdain for the needs of the body a practically-minded emphasis on the belly which is similar in wording to Odysseus' words on Ithaka:⁶⁵

γαστέρι δ' οὐ πως ἔστι νέκυν πενθῆσαι Ἀχαιούς
(*Il.* 19, 225)

With <denying> the belly, there is no way for the Achaeans to mourn a corpse.

In emphasizing the belly and its needs, Odysseus not only evokes the epic world from which he departed and to which he is now returning; he also evokes his own role in it.⁶⁶

But when the climax to the νόστος has arrived, a remarkable further development takes place. The hero's reaching the epi-

⁶⁵ On this whole scene with extensive discussion of the issues involved in Odysseus' and the *Odyssey's* preoccupation with the γαστήρ, as opposed to Achilles and the *Iliad*, see PUCCI, *op.cit.* (n. 13), 157-187. See also J. SVENBRO, *La parole et le marbre. Aux origines de la poétique grecque* (Lund 1976), 50-59; O. LEVANIOUK, "Aithôn, Aithon, and Odysseus", in *HSCPh* 100 (2000), 25-51 points out semantic links with the γαστήρ theme and Odysseus' pseudonym Aithon (*Od.* 19, 183). On the belly as a source of poetic inspiration, see J. KATZ and K. VOLK, "Mere Bellies? A New Look at *Theogony* 26-8", in *JHS* 120 (2000), 122-129.

⁶⁶ On Odysseus in the *Iliad*, see J.S. CLAY, "A Ram among the Sheep. Some Notes on Odysseus in the *Iliad*", in *Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*, ed. by J.N. KAZAZIS and A. RENGAKOS (Stuttgart 1999), 364-365; C.O. PACHE, "War Games. Odysseus at Troy", in *HSCPh* 100 (2000), 15-23.

center of the domestic world he is about to reconquer, his marriage and his control over his estate and its resources, is matched by a final move in his metapoetic return to the epic center from which he has departed: he begins to take on features of Achilles, that epic's central hero.

It starts again with *ἔπος*. When Odysseus has won the bow contest, killed Antinoos with his first arrow, and revealed himself as Odysseus, Eurymachos tries to make a deal: he pledges that everything that has been eaten in Odysseus' μέγαρον will be repaid, each Suitor bringing in a restitution worth twenty oxen, and on top of that bronze and gold. Here is the *ἔπος* that Odysseus makes in answer:⁶⁷

Εὐρύμαχ', οὐδ' εἴ μοι πατρώϊα πάντ' ἀποδοῖτε,
ὅσσα τε νῦν ὑμίν' ἔστι καὶ εἰ ποθεν ἄλλ' ἐπιθεῖτε,
οὐδέ κεν ὡς ἔτι χεῖρας ἐμάς λήξαιμι φόνοιο
πρὶν πᾶσαν μνηστῆρας ὑπερβασίην ἀποτίσαι.
(*Od.* 22, 61-64)

Eurymakhos, not if you suitors gave me all your ancestral wealth in return, all that is now yours and even if you somehow added more wealth to it, not even so would I stop my hands from the slaughter, not until the suitors have paid for all their transgression.

The response is distinctly Achillean in its uncompromising refusal even to make a settlement that would have yielded him great profit. Indeed it performs Achilles' own words — ironically addressed to no one other than Odysseus himself — in his response to the highly lucrative terms on which Agamemnon offers to settle their dispute:

οὐδ' εἴ μοι δεκάκις τε καὶ είκοσάκις τόσα δοίη
ὅσσα τέ οἱ νῦν ἔστι, καὶ εἰ ποθεν ἄλλα γένοιτο
(*Il.* 9, 379-380)

⁶⁷ See S. SCHEIN, "Homeric Textuality: Two Examples", in *Euphrosyne: Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*, ed. by J.N. KAZAZIS and A. RENGAKOS (Stuttgart 1999), 352-354. Schein points out that this response is uncharacteristic of Odysseus as a subject continuously in search of κέρδεα.

Not if he gave me tenfold, twentifold as much,
all that is now his, and even if more wealth would somehow come to him.

The γαστήρ and its needy, gain-seeking impulses gives way to the implacable, destructive forces of heroic wrath. Odysseus has returned in more than one sense, and he is more at home in the heroic world than before his departure from it.

The change is apparent in the bloody events that follow. The μνηστηροφονία starts as a hunt, Odysseus killing his victims one by one, as befits an epic in which the hero's quest for marriage, the shaman's return, and the hunt are linked with strong thematic ties, not to mention the complementarity of the lyre and the bow and the unity of word and deed, song and action. The shooting at a distance also befits the father of 'far-fighter' Telemachos,⁶⁸ who performs his νόστος on the day sacred to Apollo the Far-Shooter whose role he adopts.⁶⁹ But the hunter will inevitably run out of arrows and his human game will be armed with the weapons Melanthios supplies them with: the far-fight will turn into a combat at close quarters, the clash of the πρόμαχοι, and the language of Iliadic battle narrative will take over. The context will be created for Odysseus to become Achilles in a network of textual relations that seals the hero's return, physically and metaphysically, poetically and metapoetically.

The basis is Achilles wreaking havoc in the river Xanthos, at the height of his murderous rage:

τύπτε δ' ἐπιστροφάδην τῶν δε στόνος ὅρνυτ' ἀεικῆς
ἄσοι θεινομένων, ἐρυθαίνετο δ' αἴματι ὕδωρ
(*Il.* 21, 20-21)

He struck them left and right; and their groan rose, terrible
as they were smitten with the sword, and the water turned red with their
blood.

⁶⁸ Cf. Odysseus' self-presentation at *Il.* 4, 354 with the ironical play on Τηλέμαχος and πρόμαχος. See PUCCI, *op.cit.* (n. 9), 54-55.

⁶⁹ For the Holiday, see *Od.* 20, 155-156, 276-279; 21, 258-259.

These lines are taken up by the *Odyssey* in a way that at the same time evokes the νόστος of Agamemnon:⁷⁰

τύπτον ἐπιστροφάδην· τῶν δὲ στόνος ὅρνυτ' ἀεικής
κράτων τυπτομένων, δάπεδον δ' ἄπαν αἴματι θῦε
(*Od.* 22, 308-309)

The lines also provide a shared context for a memorable entreaty made to the rampaging hero,⁷¹ in which the metrical and prosodic equivalence of Achilles' and Odysseus' names (an important grammatical tool in the epic dialogue under study here) is exploited to the full:

γουνοῦμαι σ', Ὁδυσσεῦ, σὺ δέ μ' αἰδεο καὶ μ' ἐλέησον (*Od.* 22, 312)
γουνοῦμαι σ', Ἀχιλεῦ, σὺ δέ μ' αἰδεο καὶ μ' ἐλέησον (*Il.* 21,74)

I supplicate you, Odysseus/Achilles, and you show decency and have pity on me.

Achilles' suppliant is Lycaon, son of Priam; Odysseus' is Leodes. Both men are unarmed and both are killed in a similar way. Odysseus includes just as Achilles the harmless and the innocent in his murderous revenge.

The final step in the νόστος-turned-heroization is reached when Odysseus turns for the last time into a lion:

εὗρεν ἔπειτ' Ὁδυσῆα μετὰ κταμένοισι νέκυσσιν,
αἴματι καὶ λύθρῳ πεπαλαγμένον ὡς τε λέοντα,
ὅς ῥά τε βεβρωκὼς βοὸς ἔρχεται ἀγραύλοιο.
πᾶν δ' ἄρα οἱ στῆθός τε παρήγα τ' ἀμφοτέρωθεν
αἴματόεντα πέλει, δεινὸς δ' εἰς ὅπα ἰδέσθαι·
ὡς Ὁδυσσεὺς πεπάλακτο πόδας καὶ χεῖρας ὑπερθεν
(*Od.* 22, 401-406)

Thereupon she found Odysseus among the dead corpses, spattered and defiled with blood and gore, as a lion who has feasted on a bull from the field and walks away from the slaughter.
All his breast and his cheeks on either side

⁷⁰ *Od.* 22, 308-309; see note 23 above. Cf. *Od.* 24, 184-185.

⁷¹ PUCCI, *op.cit.* (n. 13), 134-138.

are covered with blood; he is fearsome to look in the face:
Thus Odysseus was spattered and defiled, his legs and his arms above.

This lion is neither needy nor hungry. He returns from a killing spree, without his life being at stake and lust for blood has eclipsed all his need for food. Odysseus not only matches Achilles in his final revenge; he surpasses him in having Apollo on his side rather than as divine antagonist who will eventually be his doom. The poem is getting ready for the final σύγκρισις between the two heroes and their poems as mediated through Agamemnon's ghost.⁷²

But the dialogue is not completed without the *Iliad*, in its turn, listening to the *Odyssey*; just as the dialogue between ἔπος and ἀοιδή, shamanic quest and tale of marriage and return, the two epics shape each other. The Achilles poem may be a model for the song of Odysseus' *nostos*, but it allows itself to be shaped in return. The Odysseus who opposes Achilles with the advice to eat before the fighting is no less an import from the *Odyssey* tradition than it is a reference for it.⁷³ And just as Odysseus takes on Achillean features at the end of the poem, the Iliadic Achilles takes on Odyssean features at the end of *his* poem. His νῦν δὲ μνησώμεθα χάρμης from the exchange with Odysseus (*Il.* 19, 148, an epic phrase echoed by Eurymachos at *Od.* 22, 73) turns into a νῦν δὲ μνησώμεθα δόρπου (*Il.* 24, 601) when he exhorts Priam to eat and puts an end to his own fasting.

The numerous Odyssean allusions to the *Iliad*, then, are not so much a matter of parody or intertextuality as an integral part of the poetics of the *Odyssey*. The hero's journey, modeled, as I argued, on the shaman-hero's adventure that blends supernatural travel with marriage and the hunt, combines two epic genres into one epic model of great complexity. The hero's νόστος involves a departure from, and a return into, his home, which is not only his home on Ithaka, but also the *Iliad*. Epic has sus-

⁷² *Od.* 24, 36, 192.

⁷³ Note that the *Iliad* also presents Odysseus with his fundamental Odyssean epithet πολύτλας (8, 97, etc.)

pended its normal workings by allowing its hero to travel beyond the reach of *kleos* and heroic song; it does so, as I argued, by importing a shaman-oriented travel report that interacts vigorously with the matrix story. At both levels, fasting is required in a departure from normal heroic practice. At the epic-shamanic level, the hero has to forsake food in order to secure his return to the physical world of mortals; at the heroic level, he has to overcome the limitations of γαστήρ in order to compete with the *Iliad's* fasting, bloodthirsty protagonist.

The evolution of these two diverging and converging traditions has taken place in a continuous dialogue between epic and ἔπος as well as between Achilles' epic and Odysseus'. The orchestration of these multiple dialogues and the various levels of mutual shaping that they entail is in the hands of Homer, the Joiner, who fused ἔπος with epic, poet with hero, κλέος with food, and Odysseus with Achilles — an altogether heroic act whose *kleos* in the future constitutes the Western epic tradition.

DISCUSSION

P. Chuvin: This lecture about “the symbolic value of food and its connections with τιμή and κλέος” was delightful indeed. I should like to comment on two points. My first remark bears on the simile between the bow and the lyre, the second on the use of so-called shamanistic concepts.

1) The simile between the bow and the lyre at the “δαΐς of death” of the Suitors. It seems to me not that “the poet’s lyre is turned into a deadly weapon” but rather, conversely, that, as Odysseus the expert archer is compared to an expert singer, a deadly weapon (the bow) is compared to the singing lyre, then the song of the lyre to the song of the swallow. Thus the human song and music are taking on another significance. Here we might ask ourselves what a swallow means for a Greek. It foretells, on the one hand, the return of spring; on the other hand, the swallow is a bird without a tongue (in fact, it has a very short, triangular-shaped tongue), which does not sing but screams (this being explained by the gruesome tale of Procne and Philomèle). So don’t you think that the sound of the bow, as well as the song of the poet, is at the same time quite merry and telling of death? That will be made quite explicit at 21, 411, as you said rightly.

2) The shamanistic features of Odysseus’ return. Is the shamanistic reference necessary? It would remind you of the fine article by Charles Segal (one of his best, in my opinion), “The Phaeacians and the Symbolism of Odysseus’ Return”, where Segal gives a coherent overview of Odysseus’ return without calling for such far references. What might be the shamanistic references of Odysseus’ travels? Proper to the shaman is the *Himmelsfahrt* (to go there and back) from which he brings some practical information. Generally, the shaman travels at goose-

back. But Odysseus' trip is, at most, a *Jenseitsfahrt*; never does he climb to the sky. Even in his travels to the land of the Dead he does not really enter their realm, but stays at the extreme limit, on the edge of the sacrificial trench. If we were to look for external patterns for this travel, we should better turn to Mesopotamian epics. As for other typically shamanistic features, I think we are looking for them in vain (e.g., horse sacrifice, non-blood spilling killing of game or of a respected enemy, preservation and careful burying of the skeleton). Or by 'shamanistic', should we understand merely 'hunting culture'?

3) Two marginal observations: there are seals in the Mediterranean, and stags, even huge ones, in Mediterranean forests.

E.J. Bakker: Thank you for the observation about the bow and its singing. It adds to the significance of the simile. As for shamanism, I agree with you that for a literary interpretation of Odysseus' νόστος the parallels I've adduced are not in themselves necessary and may even seem farfetched. But my purpose was not only to interpret, but also to reflect on Homer as freed from the generic label 'epic' that we apply looking back to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* from the future. Such reflection may involve the 'prehistory' of the Homeric tradition, and in connection with that the introduction of concepts, such as shamanism, of which the singers themselves were probably not aware. As to shamanism itself as an ethnographic reality, I've said that the phenomenon is extremely fluid and diverse and certainly also prone to turn into whatever the researcher wants it to be. The features you mention cannot, I think, be generalized as criterial features of 'shamanism', to the effect that when we don't find them in a given epic the case for shamanism is thereby lost. I think shamanism as discursive act, as tale, speech act, or performance, is more important than any ethnographic reality we might want to bring to bear on the interpretation of the *Odyssey*. I talked about the specific culture described by Roberte Hamayon because it offers a combination of features (solo-performance, epic tale, marriage, hunting) that I think are relevant

for the *Odyssey*; it represents the only case that I know in which the often used notion of "shamanistic epic" or "the origin of epic in shamanism" is grounded in real, observable, discursive action: shamans' tales and bards' epic performances.

M. Fusillo: I'd have a question about the relationship between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. You seem to refuse the current interpretation in terms of parody, intertextuality, or post-epic awareness (so to say, the postmodern interpretation). On the other hand, you are not inclined to accept a mythological and folkloric reading of the second Homeric poem, although your shamanistic interpretation of the *Odyssey* could sometimes give the opposite impression. Could you say some more about your very stimulating concept of a dialogue?

E.J. Bakker: I do not at all want to exclude parody and intertextuality from the poetics of the *Odyssey* altogether. The kind of 'dialogue' I talk about depends on intertextuality in the sense of one discourse showing awareness of another. The idea on the interrelationship of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* that I proposed is based on the observation that the links between Odysseus and Achilles seem to cluster towards the end of the poem; the passages that seem to be amenable to intertextuality are therefore not randomly distributed over the poem and this suggested to me that that might also color/specify the parody and intertextuality involved. I do not intend to resist mythological or folkloric readings either. What I tried to do is provide a plausible scenario for the way in which an epic of a different type from the 'heroic' *Iliad* can have evolved out of two or more earlier discourse types. 'Dialogue' seems an appropriate metaphor for such an evolution, especially when there are no written texts and a solidifying textual tradition: not only the genres of discourse but also discourses themselves (when they are meant to be repeated and re-performed) are fluid and so susceptible to be changed in the conversation with their 'dialogue partner'.

A. Rengakos: Wann hat sich die 'Kreuzung' der beiden epischen Gattungen (historisch gesprochen) ereignet? War es der Verfasser unserer *Odyssee*, der zum ersten Mal diese Kreuzung vornahm? Wie verhält sich diese Theorie zur motivgeschichtlichen Forschung (Neoanalyse)?

E.J. Bakker: In this paper I am interested in phenomena that are to be distinguished from the kind of borrowing of motifs of a given epic by the poet of another epic, the phenomenon that the Neoanalyst is interested in. As far as the origin of the type of epic represented by the *Odyssey* is concerned, my argument pertains, as I said, to the 'prehistory' of the Greek epic tradition. Below the 'surface' of our poems we can make progress only through more or less speculative comparisons. When one goes back to a time before one can speak of a 'Homeric tradition' or even of 'precursors' of our extant *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, it is unlikely that such concepts of 'work' or 'poet' are meaningful or useful. So my argument is not 'neo-analytic' in the sense of a poet borrowing material from other poems dealing with the same saga. The argument is a bit similar to what I once proposed for the relation between Homer and *Gilgamesh*: not so much a deliberate borrowing from the final product of one tradition by a specific poet who is responsible for the finally recorded version of his own tradition, but a maybe centuries long process of co-existence, whereby two traditions, let's say an Odysseus tradition and a Gilgamesh tradition, talk to each other and shape each other. The case for 'shamanism' in connection with the Homeric *Odyssey* has not often been made, presumably because the main proponents of the idea of shamanism reaching the Greek world from the North (such as Meuli or Dodds) seem to assume that that happened too late (6th cent. BC) to affect Homer. I'm less concerned with such precise historical chronology and would allow, even at that relatively late moment, for enough 'fluidity' in the Homeric tradition to absorb new influences. The concern of food and meat eating is certainly not something exotic, remote in space and time. Let's not forget that we have

in Empedokles' poem a 'late' and powerful statement on soul-travel, reincarnation, and the problems involved in eating meat.

G. Danek: Die *Apologoi* des Odysseus unterscheiden sich, narratologisch gesehen, von der Erzählung des Menelaos in *Od.* 4: Menelaos erzählt seine Erlebnisse bis zu dem Punkt seiner Ankunft zu Hause; sein Bericht betrifft daher seinen *vóστος*. Odysseus hingegen hat den Teil seiner Abenteuer vom Schiffbruch bis zur Ankunft in Scheria schon in Buch 7 erzählt. Seine *Apologoi* in 9-12 enthalten also *nicht* seinen *vóστος*, sondern umfassen eine abgeschlossene Periode der Vergangenheit, genau so wie sonst im mythologischen Exemplum. So wie in den mythologischen Exempla greift Odysseus hier auch auf Stoffe zurück, die traditionell sein *κλέος* bilden und dem externen (nicht dem internen!) Publikum gut bekannt sind. Ich glaube daher, dass es nicht ganz richtig ist, wenn man sagt, dass Odysseus sein *κλέος* durch seine eigene Erzählung von seinem *vóστος* produziert.

E.J. Bakker: I think that over and above the function of "performing one's *vóστος*" that I mentioned, both Menelaos' and Odysseus' narrative serves a specific communicative purpose in its narrative context. Menelaos' telling about his own *vóστος* takes place strictly speaking not for its own sake but in service of providing information to Telemachus about Odysseus' *vóστος*; and Odysseus tells about his adventures as an extension of his self-presentation and self-identification to the Phaeacians. Of course the subject matter of the *Apologoi* is for the *Odyssey's* external audience (that is internal to the *Odyssey tradition*) a source of *kleos*, but I would resist equating Odysseus' story without further ado with such narratives as Nestor's report on his youthful exploits (not to speak of Phoenix's Meleager story, which of course is not even a first-person story). At the level of the *Odyssey's* plot, Odysseus' story is not yet traditional, and Odysseus himself is its only source, but I agree that the difference between individual/unconfirmed and traditional/confirmed

is gradual. In any case it seems to me that the narratological characterization in terms of 'flashback or analepsis' is insufficient in both cases.

Chr. Tsagalis: Is there a possibility that the *Odyssey* (even through false etymologizing) aims at suggesting a link between ἀτασθαλίαι (*Od.* 1.7; 22.416) and eating beyond one's share in the θαλή? The word ἀτασθαλίαι is also used at *Il.* 22.104 (νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ ὥλεσα λαὸν ἀτασθαλίησιν ἐμῆσιν) by Hector, in his long internal monologue, his address to his own θυμός. Hector refers to his "wrongdoings", to his excessive and arrogant attack against the Achaean camp. Excessiveness is, once more, the common denominator, but with no reference to food. Hector's ἀτασθαλίαι led to the death of numerous Trojan soldiers and—by extension—to the dire necessity of a final confrontation between Hector and Achilles, i.e., to Hector's own death. In the *Odyssey*, on the other hand, the ἀτασθαλίαι refer to the comrades and the Suitors, not to Odysseus. The *Odyssey* directs the ἀτασθαλίαι from the main hero to the comrades and the Suitors; for those who accept all the basic tenets of oral theory, this Iliadic-Odyssean interplay may also be working the other way. The *Iliad* is employing a 'marked' term (ἀτασθαλίαι) with an Odyssean coloring to draw the line between itself and a rival epic tradition. In this way, the *Iliad* highlights martial arrogance, whereas the *Odyssey* underscores the negative consequences of excessive food. But this antithesis can be pursued even further. While in the *Iliad* the penalty is self-referentially directed to the doer (Hector himself), in the *Odyssey* it refers to the comrades and the Suitors, not to Odysseus. In fact, the *Odyssey* capitalizes on erasing most notions of responsibility on the part of Odysseus.

E. Bakker: The etymology is most intriguing and continuing along the same lines, one could also think of ἄτη! I like the idea of Hector's ἀτασθαλίη being parallel to that of the Suitors, the more since Hector's monologue and subsequent death occurs,

just as the Suitors' demise, at the end of the epic. Still, there is an important difference, which has to do with the common characterization of the *Iliad*, as opposed to the *Odyssey*, as a tragic poem. No one in the *Odyssey*, neither the companions nor the Suitors, comes to recognize, verbally, their ἀτασθαλίη as does Hector in *Iliad* 22. It may be that the common use of ἀτασθαλίη is meant to highlight this difference; it may also be that the difference is there regardless of the common feature. As regards the responsibility of Odysseus, it can be, and has been, said that Odysseus learns his lesson as the story progresses, whereas the Companions don't. The Cyclops adventure is of course the most obvious example of Odysseus' mistakes and it is precisely in connection with this adventure that Odysseus is accused by Eurylochos on Circe's island, of ἀτασθαλίη (*Od.* 10.437, τούτου γὰρ καὶ κεῖνοι ἀτασθαλίησιν ὅλοντο).

M. Fantuzzi: Classical parodic poetry in hexameters has adopted food and the sympotic behaviour of parasites as its main topic. Archaic and classical elegy (which for the ancients was just another form of *ἔπος*) have sometimes theorized about what lawful and correct behaviour in the symposium consists of (Euenus), and Solon or Theognis often use the imagery connected to the symposium or the etiquette of apportionment of food (*δαἰς έἰση*, for instance, as a metaphor of the well governed city). It is usually maintained that the parodic obsession with food depends on the trend of parodic poetry to reverse the sublimity of the Homeric heroes and ideals and opt for humble subjects though using the same meter and the same diction, and that the obsession of elegy with sympotic imagery and rules depends on the fact that the symposium is the usual place of performance of elegiac poetry. But in light of the 'dialogue' which, as appears from your talk, Odysseus entertains with Achilles' heroic-sublime ideology of the negation of the biological need for food, would it be possible to believe that in different ways both elegiac and parodic poetry were 'furthering'/developing a couple of combined topics—food and the

etiquette of apportionment and consumption of food—which they already found in the Homeric, ‘post-Iliadic’ ideology of Odysseus?

E.J. Bakker: I think you address a very important topic. I find it entirely conceivable that the ancient tradition of basing parody of Homer and epic on food would go back to something already present in epic. We can think of the interest in food in itself in the *Odyssey* that I have discussed as a basis for this; we can also think of a tradition of parody already in pre-Hellenistic or even archaic times existing side by side with the ‘high’ version of epic. In this connection we can think of the buffoon side (or version) of heroes such as Heracles or Odysseus, precisely the ‘shamanic’ kind of hero that does not fight other heroes but monsters and retrieves animals from caves etc.

A. Sens: It seems to me that there are several important considerations for thinking about the prominence of culinary themes in parody. First, the popularity of gastronomic (mis)-behavior as a topic of epic parody must be connected to the popularity of the theme in Middle Comedy. But, insofar as we can tell, it’s clear that Matro, at least, was attracted to certain passages of Homer, and the fact that he draws very heavily on the Polyphemos episode of *Od.* 9 must reflect the thematic suitability of the episode to his own poem. In this sense, it does seem that Matro was picking up a basic theme—the question of proper dining—that he found in Homer.

I think it would be interesting to follow up on the question of the role of fasting in the *Iliad* as well as the *Odyssey*. After all, as much as Odysseus’ abstinence from food, both in his *Apology* and in the Ithakan narrative, is essential to his νόστος and so his κλέος, so too is Achilles’ abstinence from food an important aspect of his withdrawal in the *Iliad*. Do you see this as part of a larger ‘epic’ narrative substructure, withdrawal and return of the hero?

E.J. Bakker: The notion of 'withdrawal and return' is of course an important pattern that is common to both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Again there is a common feature that at the same reveals important contrasts that may or may not be meant to be in themselves a contrast with the common feature. Achilles' abstinence from food is different from Odysseus' in that it is not a necessary condition for his 'return'; it rather typifies the state *from which* he has to return. Achilles' notional *vόστος* is confirmed by his renewed acceptance of food. We could say therefore that there is a reversal in the causality (fasting in order to return in the case of Odysseus vs. fasting as a notional 'departure' in the case of Achilles). But in any case fasting is an important feature of both heroes' 'withdrawal'.

GEORG DANEK

DIE GLEICHNISSE DER ILIAS UND DER DICHTER HOMER

I

Der Titel dieses Beitrags berührt zwei Themenbereiche, die in den letzten Jahren nur selten miteinander verknüpft wurden: auf der einen Seite die Frage nach der Funktionsweise des epischen Gleichnisses, auf der anderen Seite die Frage nach der individuellen 'Leistung' des Dichters Homer. Damit ist ein Teilaspekt der alten 'Homerischen Frage' erfasst, die sich bekanntlich spätestens seit den Forschungen von Milman Parry zu einer Frage nach dem Spannungsfeld zwischen Traditionalität und Originalität des Sänger-Dichters Homer gewandelt hat. In den Forschungen zum homerischen Gleichnis hat diese Fragestellung hingegen bis zuletzt nur wenig Bedeutung gewonnen. In diesem Beitrag soll nun gezeigt werden, dass die Gleichnisse der *Ilias* — und auch der *Odyssee* — uns viel über die Dichter-Persönlichkeit Homers verraten. Die zugrunde gelegte Frage wird dabei lauten, ob und wie ein *oral poet* vor dem Bezugsfeld seiner eigenen Tradition eben diese Tradition transzendentieren kann.

Wie es um die Forschungssituation zu den homerischen Gleichnissen bestellt ist, mag einleitend mit einem Seitenblick auf Sappho beleuchtet werden, nämlich auf das *carmen* 58 (Voigt), das erst unlängst durch den neuen Kölner Papyrus als poetische Einheit greifbar geworden ist.¹

¹ Erstpublikation des Kölner Papyrus: GRONEWALD/DANIEL 2004. Ich beziehe

Sappho spricht die jungen Mädchen ihres Kreises an, die sich der Dichtung und Musik widmen, und klagt, dass sie selbst alt geworden sei und nicht mehr so wie früher tanzen könne. Sie fügt sich aber in ihr Schicksal mit der Gnome, dass der Mensch nicht "alterslos werden könne" (v. 8), und erläutert diese Gnome mit dem mythologischen Exemplum von Tithonos: Auch dieser war jung und schön, und er wurde deshalb von der Göttin Eos entrückt und zu ihrem Gatten gemacht. Doch auch ihn ergriff das Alter, während er eine unsterbliche Göttin zur Frau hatte.

Was haben wir hier vor uns? Auf den ersten Blick verwendet Sappho den Mythos für ein simples *exemplum a maiore*: Tithonos musste alt werden, obwohl er mit einer Göttin verheiratet war (oder: obwohl er von exzptioneller Schönheit war); also kann Sappho als gewöhnliche Sterbliche dem Prozess des Alterns erst recht nicht entkommen. Doch blickt man genauer hin, so lässt sich der Mythos von Tithonos nicht eins zu eins auf die Situation des 'Lyrischen Ich' bei Sappho übertragen, da die Figur der Sappho sowohl zu Tithonos wie auch zu der von Eros bezwungenen Eos Parallelen aufweist. In den Vergleich müssen zudem die eingangs apostrophierten Mädchen mit einbezogen werden. Somit ergibt sich eine doppelte Personenkonstellation, wobei die Relation zwischen Sappho und ihren Mädchen einerseits der Relation zwischen Eos und Tithonos, andererseits jener zwischen Tithonos und Eos entspricht. Wenn wir uns weiters vergegenwärtigen, dass Sappho bei ihrem Publikum den Mythos von Tithonos in seiner Gesamtheit als bekannt voraussetzt, so werden wir darauf verwiesen, dass Eos ihren Geliebten ja unsterblich gemacht hat.² Denken wir das Analogie-Schema konsequent weiter, so gelangen wir zu einer (metaphorischen) Unsterblichkeit Sapphos, d.h. ihrer Dichtkunst. In der späteren

mich auf die Textgestaltung mit Ergänzungen und ersten wichtigen Hinweisen zur Interpretation bei WEST 2005.

² Der *locus classicus* ist der Homerische *Aphroditehymnus* (218-238); auch die Erwähnungen des Tithonos an der Seite seiner göttlichen Gattin in *Ilias* (11, 1) und *Odyssee* (5, 1) setzen wohl seine Unsterblichkeit voraus.

Antike hat man Sapphos Gedichte als ihre unsterblichen Töchter bezeichnet und Sappho selbst als die zehnte Muse.³ Sichtlich war diese Vergöttlichung von Sapphos Dichtkunst schon in ihrem eigenen Werk angelegt.

Ich breche meine Überlegungen an diesem Punkt ab. Zweifellos wird die Sappho-Forschung schnell weitere Facetten zu diesem 'neuen' Gedicht entdecken.⁴ Mein erster tastender Versuch fügt sich jedenfalls in die Tendenzen der aktuellen Sappho-Forschung: Man sucht nach Komplexität und Polyvalenz; man geht davon aus, dass Sappho und ihr Publikum die zugrunde gelegte mythologische und poetische Tradition kannten und ausloteten; man respektiert, dass Sappho in selbst-referenzieller Weise permanent auf die poetische Tradition, ihr eigenes Werk und ihre Stellung als Dichterin verweist. Und um zu unserem Thema zurück zu kehren: Wenn Sappho mythologische Vergleiche verwendet, so gehen die Interpreten davon aus, dass diese selbstverständlich komplex und vielschichtig sind.⁵

Schwenken wir von Sappho zu Homer, so stellen wir mit Verwunderung fest, dass es zu den mythologischen Exempla im Epos keine neuere repräsentative Monographie gibt.⁶ Noch mehr verwundert es, dass die mythologischen Exempla so gut wie nie zu den epischen Gleichnissen in Beziehung gesetzt werden, obwohl sie dieselbe rhetorische Funktion erfüllen: In beiden Fällen wird die aktuelle Handlung mit einem außerhalb dieser Handlung liegenden Bereich verglichen und dadurch besser beleuchtet. Der rhetorische Unterschied besteht vor allem in der narrativen Einbettung: Der mythologische Vergleich gehört fast ausschließlich in die Figurenrede, das Gleichnis vorherrschend in den Erzählertext.

³ *Anthol. Pal.* 9, 506 ('Platon'); *Anthol. Pal.* 7, 407 (Dioskorides); zum Motiv vgl. WILLIAMSON 1995.

⁴ Erste Hinweise jetzt bei HARDIE 2005, 27-29.

⁵ Vgl. zuletzt PFEIFFER 2000, zum mythologischen Vergleich in fr. 16 V.

⁶ Zuletzt ALDEN 2000 (mit Bibliographie), mit einer weiter gefassten und zugleich weniger präzisen Zielsetzung. Vgl. vor allem auch LANG 1983 und EDMUNDS 1997.

Die Diskussion zu den homerischen Gleichnissen kreist seit der Antike vor allem um die Frage nach dem *tertium comparationis*.⁷ Zwei Parteien stehen einander gegenüber. Die einen vertreten den strengen Standpunkt des Vergleichspunkts, d.h. dass Gleichnis und epische Handlung sich nur in einem einzigen Begriff berührten, während der narrative Rest des Gleichnisses nur ποιητικὸς κόσμος sei.⁸ Die andere Partei möchte die Analogie zwischen dem gesamten Gleichnis und der Handlung möglichst weit fassen; dieser Standpunkt ist seit dem epochalen Werk von Hermann Fränkel aus dem Jahr 1921 gut etabliert. Schon Fränkel hat die wichtige Bedeutung der Gleichnistypik hervorgehoben, womit ein zentraler Aspekt der *oral poetry*-Forschung vorweggenommen war. Dieser Aspekt ist von Tilman Krischer noch besser beleuchtet worden, der die Gleichnis-Typen im Rahmen des Aristie-Schemas untersucht hat.⁹ Die für die *oral theory* zentrale Fragestellung, inwiefern Homer sein poetisches Instrumentarium aus der Tradition übernommen oder originell gebildet hat, wurde hingegen für die Gleichnisse zumeist nur *en passant* gestreift.¹⁰

Nun ist aber genau diese Frage nach Traditionalität bzw. Originalität für das Verständnis des Gleichnisses entscheidend. Die

⁷ Die jüngeren Monographien zum homerischen Gleichnis gehen semiotischen Fragestellungen nach (NIMIS 1987) oder beschränken sich auf einzelne Motivstränge (LONSDALE 1990); bei FRIEDRICH (1995) wird auf die neuere Forschung kaum eingegangen. Auch NANNINI (2003) weicht der Frage nach dem Zusammenhang zwischen Gleichnis und Handlung weitgehend aus. Zusammenfassende Darstellungen bei EDWARDS 1991, 24–41; PATZER 1996, 118–130 und 139–142; BUXTON 2004.

⁸ Zuletzt ERBSE 2000. Das Gleichnis wird oft überhaupt vernachlässigt. So findet sich im *New Companion* von MORRIS/POWELL (1997) kein relevanter Eintrag im Index. Symptomatisch für das damit oft verbundene Unverständnis des Gleichnisses SEECK 2004, 32: "Fremd sind uns auch die — besonders in der Ilias — häufigen Vergleiche oder Gleichnisse, weil es sie in unseren Romanen fast gar nicht mehr gibt. Ein zusätzliches Problem liegt darin, daß sie oft wie kleine selbständige Bilder über den Kontext, in dem sie stehen, hinausgehen, also mehr enthalten als das direkt Vergleichbare."

⁹ FRÄNKEL 1921; KRISCHER 1971. Vgl. auch SCOTT 1974; MOULTON 1977.

¹⁰ Vergleichbare Kritik bei MARTIN 1997, 142f. Wenig ergiebig SCOTT 1974; fruchtbare Weiterführung über FRÄNKEL hinaus zum Typus des Löwengleichnisses bei LONSDALE 1990 und SCHANDL 2002.

homerischen Gleichnisse bilden eine Analogie zu der Haupthandlung. Die Hörer bzw. Leser müssen diese Analogie erkennen und zu diesem Zweck Assoziationen einbringen, um möglichst viele Aspekte des Gleichnisses zu möglichst vielen Aspekten der Handlung in Beziehung setzen zu können. Aus welchen Quellen beziehen nun die Hörer diese Assoziationen? Aus dem Kontext der jeweiligen Stelle, d.h. aus eigener Anschauung, verbunden mit intratextuellen Bezügen? Oder aus ihrer Kenntnis der poetischen Tradition, der *oral tradition* im üblichen Sinn? Zweifellos lieferte für die traditionellen Hörer/Leser vor allem die Gleichnistypik das notwendige Assoziationsmuster, um den Hintergrund des typischen Kontexts eines bestimmten Gleichnisses erkennen und im individuellen Fall mit assoziieren zu können. Ich gehe daher davon aus, dass nicht erst Homer das epische Gleichnis aus kurzen Vergleichs-Formen entwickelt hat, sondern dass dieser Pool von Grundmustern schon in der vorhomerischen mündlichen Tradition ausgebildet war, dass es also schon vor Homer mehr oder weniger breit ausgeführte Gleichnisse mit einer entwickelten Typologie gab.¹¹ Hier stellt sich allerdings die Frage, ob wir einen Punkt bestimmen können, an dem der Dichter der *Ilias* (und/oder der *Odyssee*) über die traditionelle Typologie hinaus greift und Assoziationsmuster verwendet, die nicht mehr allein aus der traditionellen Typik gespeist werden.

Im Folgenden will ich anhand von drei Fallbeispielen beleuchten, wie in Gleichnissen Bedeutung entsteht: Woher kommen die Assoziationen, die die Hörer/Leser einbringen müssen, um das gesamte Gleichnis, nicht nur die mechanische Koppelung ("wie — so"), in eine Analogie-Beziehung zu der verglichenen Handlungssituation setzen zu können? Wir wer-

¹¹ Die gegensätzlichen Positionen werden in der Gleichnis-Forschung kaum diskutiert: Forscher wie SCOTT (1974), MOULTON (1977) und LONSDALE (1990) gehen als selbstverständlich davon aus, dass die homerischen Gleichnisse komplett aus der *oral tradition* übernommen seien; ERBSE (2000, 270f.) sieht in ihnen hingegen nach wie vor die originellste Erfindung Homers und traut der 'Tradition' nur Kurzvergleiche zu.

den dabei mit einer Vielschichtigkeit des homerischen Gleichnisses konfrontiert werden, die nicht immer entsprechend gewürdigt wird.

II

Zu Beginn von *Ilias* 14 nimmt Nestor, der seit dem Ende von Buch 11 in seinem Zelt den verwundeten Machaon pflegt, erstmals den Schlachtlärm wahr, der bereits seit dem Fall der Mauer (Ende Buch 12) innerhalb des Schiffslagers tobt, und tritt aus dem Zelt (*Il.* 14, 13-26):

στῇ δ' ἐκτὸς κλισίης, τάχα δ' εἰσιδεν ἔργον ἀεικές,
τοὺς μὲν ὀρινομένους, τοὺς δὲ κλονέοντας ὅπισθεν,
Τρῶας ὑπερθύμους· ἐρέριππο δὲ τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν.
15
ώς δ' ὅτε πορφύρῃ πέλαχος μέγα κύματι κωφῷ
ὅσσοβμενον λιγέων ἀνέμων λαιψηρὰ κέλευθα
αὔτως, οὐδὲ ἄρα τε προκυλίνδεται οὐδὲ ἔτερωσε,
πρίν τινα κεκριμένον καταβήμεναι ἐκ Διὸς οὐρον,
ώς δὲ γέρων ὕδρων δαιζόμενος κατὰ θυμὸν
διχθάδι', ἢ μεθ' ὅμιλον οἴοι Δαναῶν ταχυπώλων,
20
ἢ μετ' Ατρείδην Αγαμέμνονος ποιμένα λαῶν.
ώδε δέ οἱ φρονέοντι δοάσσατο κέρδιον εἶναι,
βῆναι ἐπ' Ατρείδην. οἱ δὲ ἀλλήλους ἐνάριζον
μαρνάμενοι λάκε δέ σφι περὶ χροῦ χαλκὸς ἀτειρής
25
νυσσομένων ξίφεσίν τε καὶ ἔγχεσιν ἀμφιγύοισιν.

Und er trat aus der Hütte und erblickte sogleich die missliche Lage, die einen in Aufruhr, die anderen von hinten nachdrängend, die hochgemutten Troer; und eingerissen war der Achaier Mauer. 15
Und wie wenn die große Meeresfläche brodelt in stummer Welle, da sie vorausblickt auf der jähnen Winde plötzliche Pfade, nur so, und sich da weder vorwärts wälzt noch rückwärts, bevor nicht ein definierter Windstoß von Zeus herabfährt:
So erwog der Greis, zerrissen in seiner Absicht, 20
zweifach, ob er zum Haufen gehen solle der flinkfohligen Achaier, oder zum Atriden Agamemnon, dem Hirten der Männer.
Und so entschied es sich ihm beim Bedenken effizienter zu sein, zum Atriden zu gehen; und jene zerfleischten einander, da sie kämpften, und ihnen barst am Leib das unnachgiebige Erz, 25
da sie zustießen mit den Schwertern und doppeltgekrümmten Lanzten.

Was wird hier womit verglichen? Sämtliche Interpreten orientieren sich an der formalen syntaktischen Verknüpfung ὡς (16) — ὡς (20) und folgern daraus, dass sich das unentschieden wogende Meer, das einen entscheidenden Windstoß "voraussehe", ausschließlich auf den mental-psychischen Zustand Nestors beziehe, der wie das Meer auf einen entscheidenden inneren Anstoß warte.¹² Ich habe in einem früheren Artikel zu zeigen versucht, dass diese Auffassung zu kurz greift, weil damit die zugrunde liegende Gleichnis-Typik nicht berücksichtigt wird:¹³ Wellen und Wind im Gleichnis stehen regelmäßig in Analogie zu der Heeresmasse, die von ihren Anführern voran getrieben wird und auf die Feinde trifft.¹⁴ Homer hat diesen Grundtypus wohl aus der Tradition übernommen, und sein Publikum konnte ihn von daher kennen. Da unser Gleichnis unmittelbar an eine Beschreibung der Kampfsituation (v. 14f.) anschließt, muss es somit beim Hörer die Assoziation eines unentschiedenen Wogens auf dem Schlachtfeld auslösen.

Wir sind aber nicht darauf angewiesen, uns ausschließlich auf eine nicht näher definierte 'Tradition' zu berufen. Exakt derselbe Grundtypus ist nur rund 50 Verse vor unserer Stelle, am Ende des 13. Buches, eingesetzt. Dort treibt Hektor die Troer an, und diese werden mit Wellen verglichen, die vom Wind in Bewegung gesetzt werden (*Il.* 13, 795-802):

οἱ δὲ ἵσαν ἀργαλέων ἀνέμων ἀτάλαντοι ἀέλλη, ἃς ἡ θύεσθαι πατρὸς Διὸς εἴσι πέδονδε, θεοπεσίων δὲ ὄμαδῶν ἀλλι μίσγεται, ἐν δέ τε πολλὰ κύματα παφλάζοντα πολυφλοίσθιο θαλάσσης κυρτὰ φαληρίωντα, πρὸ μὲν τὸν ἄλλον, αὐτὰρ ἐπ’ ἄλλον ὡς Τρῷες πρὸ μὲν ἄλλοι ἀρηρότες, αὐτὰρ ἐπ’ ἄλλοι, χαλκῷ μαρμαίροντες ἥμ’ ἡγεμόνεσσιν ἔποντο. "Εκτωρ δὲ ἡγεῖτο βροτολοιγῷ ίσος Ἀρη ...	795 800
--	------------

Und jene gingen, dem Orkan der raffenden Winde gleichend,
der ja unter dem Donnern des Vaters Zeus in die Ebene kommt

¹² Vgl. FRÄNKEL 1921, 9f.; JANKO 1992, *ad* 14, 16-19; PATZER 1996, 127-129.

¹³ DANEK 1999, 82-86.

¹⁴ FRÄNKEL 1921, 16-19; SCOTT 1974, 62-66.

und mit gewaltigem Tumult sich ins Meer vermengt, und dort sind viele
aufbrodelnde Wellen des vielwogenden Meeres,
gewölbt sich aufbuckelnd, voran die einen, doch darauf die andren:
So die Troer, voran die einen dicht gefügt, doch darauf die andren, 800
sind sie, von Erz funkeln, zugleich den Anführern gefolgt.
Und Hektor führte sie an, dem mannverderbenden Ares gleichend.

Das Gleichnis in Buch 14 folgt knapp auf jenes in Buch 13;¹⁵ in 13 ist der Gleichnistypus sichtlich in seiner traditionellen Grundform (Wind weht Wellen gegen Schiff/Felsen/Strand = Anführer treibt Truppen gegen Feind/Hindernis) an den Kontext adaptiert. Das Gleichnis in 14 ruft also den unmittelbar zuvor evozierten Grundtypus in Erinnerung und wird daher zunächst selbst als Spielart dieses Grundtypus wahrgenommen: Das Meer brodelt in Erwartung, ohne erkennbare Ausrichtung, da kein Wind geht. Die Zuhörer müssen dieses Bild während des linearen Textvortrages zunächst als Widerspiegelung der Patt-Situation auf dem Schlachtfeld interpretieren, wo auf beiden Seiten keine entscheidende Initiative eines Anführers erfolgt; es ist exakt dieser Zustand, mit dem der Erzähler die Schlachtbeschreibung am Ende von Buch 13 abgebrochen hat. Die Übertragung des Gleichnisbildes auf den psychisch-mentalnen Zustand des Nestor kann der Zuhörer somit erst im Nachhinein vollziehen, wenn dieser Bezug im Text mit ὥς (v. 20) ausdrücklich hergestellt wird.

Das Gleichnis eröffnet somit zwei unterschiedliche Assoziationsfelder: eines nach vorne, hin zur Beschreibung des Schlachtfeldes, und eines nach hinten, zur Überlegungs-Entscheidungs-Szene des Nestor. Im oben genannten Aufsatz habe ich zu zeigen versucht, dass Homer mit dieser Überblend-Technik die unterschiedlichen Erzählperspektiven — die des primären Erzählers und die des Nestor als sekundären Fokalisors — synchronisiert. Homer erzielt diesen Effekt einer Synchronisation der ‘objektiven’ und der ‘subjektiven’ Handlungs-

¹⁵ Vgl. MOULTON 1977, 23f. (“... a contrasting, balanced effect”); JANKO 1992, ad 16-19: “This image is paired with 13.795-9 (where see n.), as if the squall there causes the ominous swell here, as indeed in the narrative it does.”

ebene, indem er einen Gleichnistypus, der traditionell der ‘objektiven’ Erzählebene angehört, als Überraschungseffekt auf die ‘subjektive’ Erzählebene überträgt und verlagert: Nestor nimmt die Patt-Situation auf dem Schlachtfeld wahr wie eine unentschieden wogende Meeresfläche; diese Wahrnehmung überträgt sich im Verlauf des Gleichnisses unausgesprochen auf seinen eigenen inneren Zustand.

III

Zu Beginn von *Ilias* 3, unmittelbar nach der Beendigung von Schiffs- und Troer-Katalog, setzen sich zunächst die Troer in Bewegung. Ihr Lärm wird veranschaulicht im berühmten Gleichnis von den laut schnatternden (und offen aggressiven) Kranichen.¹⁶ Nach diesem Gleichnis erfolgt keine Rückblende auf die Troer, sondern der Erzähler schwenkt zur Gegenseite, zu den Achaiern, die schweigend vorrücken. Es folgt ohne erkennbaren syntaktischen Anschluss ein zweites Gleichnis (*Il.* 3, 1-14):

Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κόσμηθεν ἄμ’ ἡγεμόνεσσιν ἔκαστοι,
 Τρῶες μὲν κλαγγῆ τ’ ἐνοπῇ τ’ ἵσαν δρυιθες ὁῖς,
 ἥμτε περ κλαγγὴ γεράνων πέλει οὐρανόθι πρό,
 αἱ τ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν χειμῶνα φύγον καὶ ἀθέσφατον ὅμβρον,
 κλαγγῆ ταὶ γε πέτονται ἐπ’ Ὄκεανοῦ ῥοάων
 ἀνδράσι Πυγμαίοισι φόνον καὶ κῆρα φέρουσαι·
 ἡέριαι δ’ ἄρα ταὶ γε κακὴν ἔριδα προφέρονται.
 οἱ δ’ ἄρ’ ἵσαν σιγῇ μένεα πνείοντες Ἀχαιοί,
 ἐν θυμῷ μεμαῶτες ἀλεξέμεν ἀλλήλοισιν,
 εὗτ’ ὅρεος κορυφῆσι Νότος κατέχευεν ὀμίχλην
 ποιμέσιν οὐ τι φίλην, κλέπτη δέ τε νυκτὸς ἀμείνω,
 τόσσον τίς τ’ ἐπιλεύσσει ὅσον τ’ ἐπὶ λᾶσαν ἴησιν·
 ὡς ἄρα τῶν ὑπὸ ποσσὶ κονίσαλος ὥρνυτ’ ἀελλῆς
 ἐρχομένων· μάλα δ’ ὥκα διέπρησσον πεδίοιο.

Aber als sie geordnet waren, mit den Anführern, alle einzelnen, sind die Troer mit Geschrei und Getöse gegangen, wie die Vögel:

¹⁶ Zum Kraniche-Pygmaen-Gleichnis vgl. MUELLNER 1990, der jedoch nicht auf das unmittelbar folgende Nebel-Gleichnis eingeht.

So wie das Geschrei der Kraniche aufkommt, bis unter den Himmel,
 die, wenn sie also dem Winter entfliehen und dem maßlosen Regen,
 mit Geschrei dann fliegen, zu des Okeanós Strömen,
 um den Pugmaien-Männern Mord und Todeslos zu bringen,
 und des Morgens also lassen sie da den bösen Zwist hervortreten.—
 Doch jene also gingen in Stille, die Energie atmenden Achaier,
 wie sie im Mut begierig waren, einander beizustehen:
 So wie den Gipfeln des Berges der Südwind den Nebel übergießt,
 für die Hirten gar nicht lieb, für den Dieb aber besser als die Nacht —
 so weit blickt einer voran, wie weit er den Stein voranwirft —,
 so also ist unter deren Füßen der Staub dicht aufgestiegen,
 wie sie gingen, und sehr schnell haben sie die Ebene durchmessen.

Was wird mit diesem zweiten Gleichnis verglichen? Auch hier sind sich die meisten Interpreten einig: Die syntaktische Kopplung εὗτε (10) — ὁς (13) lege das Gleichnis ausschließlich auf die nachfolgende Aussage des Erzählers fest, und der Nebel auf dem Berg bilde eine exakte Parallel zu dem Staub der marschierenden Truppen. Die Aussage unmittelbar vor dem Gleichnis, dass die Achaier im Gegensatz zu den Troern schweigend marschieren, wird als für das Gleichnis irrelevant erachtet. Etliche Editoren schneiden den Zusammenhang völlig ab, indem sie mit εὕτ' (v. 10) einen neuen Absatz beginnen und das Gleichnis (und den staub-erzeugenden Vormarsch) somit auf beide Heere beziehen.¹⁷

Im Gegensatz dazu plädiere ich dafür, das Gleichnis auf die Achaier zu beziehen und die unmittelbar vor dem Gleichnis erfasste Handlungssituation mit einzubeziehen: Da im vorangehenden Gleichnis das Lärmen der Troer illustriert wird, stellt sich für die Rezipienten die Erwartung ein, dass auch das Schweigen der Achaier im folgenden Gleichnis beleuchtet wird. Dichter Nebel kann zweifellos die Assoziation einer lastenden Stille auslösen;¹⁸ der Dieb im Gleichnis ist für den Hirten und

¹⁷ So LEAF und VAN THIEL in ihren Editionen. Vgl. FRÄNKEL 1921, 23; ausdrücklich argumentiert bei HEUBECK 1950, 21f.; BERGOLD 1977, 8f. und 21f.

¹⁸ Physikalisch nachweisbar ist der Effekt der Dämpfung des Schalls durch erhöhten Wassergehalt der Luft. Psychologische Studien zeigen auch, dass die Einschränkung des Sehvermögens eine Reduktion der akustischen Wahrnehmung nach sich zieht.

seine Herde deshalb bedrohlich, weil die Geräuschlosigkeit des Diebes mit der verminderten Sicht des Hirten gekoppelt ist. Es ist somit wohl das schweigende Vorrücken der Achaier, die durch die Staubwolke für die Feinde sowohl unsichtbar als auch unhörbar werden, das bei den Troern eine analoge bedrohliche Empfindung auslöst, wie sie die Angst eines Hirten vor einem Dieb beschreibt.

Dass das Gleichnis sich nicht auf beide Heere, sondern nur auf die Achaier bezieht, erkennt man auch hier leichter, wenn man wenige Verse zurückblickt: Nach dem Abschluss des Schiffskatalogs (und somit von unserer Situation nur durch den Troer-Katalog getrennt) setzen sich die Achaier in Bewegung, und ihr Vormarsch wird erstmals durch ein Gleichnis illustriert (*Il. 2, 780-785*):

Οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἵσαν ὡς εἴ τε πυρὶ χθῶν πᾶσα νέμοιτο· γαῖα δ' ὑπεστενάχιζε Διὸν ὡς τερπικεραύνῳ χωμένῳ, ὅτε τ' ἀμφὶ Τυφωέϊ γαιῶν ἴμασση εἰν Ἀρίμοις, θῇ φασὶ Τυφωέος ἔμμεναι εὐνάς· ὡς ἄρα τῶν ὑπὸ ποστὶ μέγα στεναχίζετο γαιὰ ἐρχομένων· μάλα δ' ὥκα διέπρησσον πεδίοιο.	780
	785

Doch jene also gingen, als würde vom Feuer der ganze Boden verzehrt; 780 und die Erde ächzte darunter, wie unter dem blitzfreudigen Zeus, der grollt, wenn er rings um den Typhoeus die Erde geißelt, in Árimoi, wo sie sagen, es sei das Lager des Typhoeus.
 So also hat unter deren Füßen die Erde laut geächzt,
 wie sie gingen; und sehr schnell haben sie die Ebene durchmessen. 785

Die Rahmung der beiden Gleichnisse erfolgt durch identische Formulierungen (2, 780a = 3, 8; 2, 784a = 3, 13a; 2, 785 = 3, 14).¹⁹ Die Wiederholung bewirkt eine Verklammerung: Der Erzähler hat die Beschreibung des Vorrückens der Achaier durch

¹⁹ Die Wendungen wirken zwar formelhaft, sind es aber nur zu einem geringen Teil: Die Auflösung eines Gleichnisses mit ὡς ἄρα τῶν (oder einem anderen Casus) findet sich noch sieben Mal in der *Ilia*; μάλα δ' ὥκα an derselben Versstelle steht noch weitere fünf Mal in der *Ilia*; nur noch in *Il. 23, 364* steht οἱ δ' ὥκα διέπρησσον πεδίοιο. Die Wiederholung der komplexeren Formulierungen ist also auf die kurze Distanz für die Zuhörer deutlich als solche wahrnehmbar.

einen Blickwechsel auf die troische Seite und den anschließenden Troer-Katalog unterbrochen,²⁰ im Hintergrund aber während dieser Digression den Vorwärtmarsch der Achaier kontinuierlich weiter laufen lassen. Auch hier dient das Gleichnis also der Synchronisation zweier Handlungsstränge. Der Gegensatz zwischen schweigenden Achaiern und lärmenden Troern wird wieder aufgenommen am Ende von Buch 4, nach dem Abschluss aller weiteren Digressionen, die den Beginn des Massenkampfes hinauszögern. Auch hier findet sich je ein Gleichnis für die Achaien und für die Troer (*Il.* 4, 422-438):²¹

Ως δ' ὅτ' ἐν αἰγαλῷ πολυυηχέῃ κῦμα θαλάσσης
ὅρνυτ' ἐπασσύτερον Ζεφύρου ὑπὸ κινήσαντος. —
πόντω μέν τε πρῶτα κορύσσεται, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
χέρσω φόργηνύμενον μεγάλα βρέμει, ἀμφὶ δέ τ' ἄκρας 425
κυρτὸν ἐδὸν κορυφοῦται, ἀποπτύει δ' ἀλὸς ἀχνην. —
ώς τότ' ἐπασσύτεραι Δαναῶν κίνυντο φάλαγγες
νωλεμέως πόλεμόνδες· κέλευε δὲ οἴσιν ἔκαστος
ἡγεμόνων· οἱ δ' ἄλλοι ἀκὴν ἵσαν, οὐδέ κε φαίης
τόσσον λαὸν ἔπεσθαι ἔχοντ' ἐν στήθεσιν αὐδήν, 430
σιγῇ δειδιότες σημάντορας· ἀμφὶ δὲ πᾶσιν
τεύχεα ποικίλ' ἔλαφυπε, τὰ είμενοι ἐστιχόωντο.
Τρῶες δ', ως τ' ὅιες πολυπάρυνος ἀνδρὸς ἐν αὐλῇ
μυρίαι ἐστήκασιν ἀμελγόμεναι γάλα λευκὸν
ἀζηχές μεμακυῖαι ἀκούσουσαι ὅπα ἀρνῶν, 435
ώς Τρώων ἀλαλητὸς ἀνὰ στρατὸν εύρὺν δρώρει.
οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἦν δύος θρόνος οὐδὲ ία γῆρυς,
ἀλλὰ γλῶσσα μέμικτο, πολύκλητοι δ' ἕσαν ἄνδρες.

Und wie wenn an der vielschallenden Küste des Meeres Welle
sich dicht auf dicht erhebt unter dem Zephyros, der sie bewegt hat —

²⁰ Vgl. HEUBECK 1950, 20-23. Der Vormarsch der Achaien, der nach dem Schiffskatalog mit dem Gleichnis 2, 780-785 erfasst wird, hat schon innerhalb der langen Gleichniskette vor dem Schiffskatalog eingesetzt; die Entsprechung ist auch hier durch Wiederholungsstrukturen markiert, cf. 2, 465f. ... ἐς πεδίον προχέοντο Σκαμάνδριον· αὐτὰρ ὑπὸ χθῶν / σμερδαλέον κονάβιζε ποδῶν αὐτῶν τε καὶ λίππων. Die Vorwärts-Bewegung wird aber zunächst (2, 467 ἔσταν) für den Orderungsprozess durch die Kontingent-Führer unterbrochen, der zum Schiffskatalog führt.

²¹ Im ersten Gleichnis (422-428) wird durch die re-etymologisierten Metaphern *κορύσσεται* und *κορυφοῦται* der Blickwechsel vom Einzelkämpfer Diomedes zum Gesamtheer der Griechen vollzogen, vgl. MARTIN 1997, 154-156.

am Meer behelmt sie sich zuerst, jedoch danach dann
 bricht sie sich am Land und brüllt laut auf, und rund um die Klippen 425
 behauptet sie sich gekrümmt und spuckt des Meeres Schaum aus —,
 so haben sich da dicht auf dicht bewegt der Danaer Reihen,
 unaufhörlich zum Krieg hin, und es befahl den Seinen ein Jeder
 der Führer; und die anderen gingen still, und nicht hättest du gemeint,
 es folge so viel Kriegsvolk, das in der Brust eine Stimme habe, 430
 schweigend, in Furcht vor den Kommandanten; und rings um sie alle
 glänzten die funkeln den Waffen, die sie anhattan und marschierten.
 Und die Troer, so wie die Schafe im Hof des vielbegüterten Mannes
 zu Tausenden da stehen und die weiße Milch gemolken werden
 und unentwegt blöken, da sie die Stimme der Lämmer hören, 435
 so war der Troer Kriegsruf über das weite Heer hin erhoben.
 Denn nicht war aller Sprache gleich noch die Lautung dieselbe,
 sondern vermischt war die Zunge, und vielberufen die Männer.

In Verbindung mit anderen Wiederholungsfiguren gliedern in diesem Abschnitt vom Aufmarsch der Griechen bis zum Ausbruch des Massenkampfes die thematisch zusammengehörigen Gleichnisse die Erzählung, verweisen aufeinander und bilden die Signale der Koppelungen, an denen die Handlung nach Einschüben des Erzählers oder nach retardierenden Aktionen wieder zu ihrem roten Faden zurück findet.²²

Wir können uns jetzt der Frage zuwenden, ob die im Gleichnis verwendete Motivik auf traditionelle Bildtypik zurückgreift. Das Bild ‘Wolke’ ist in der *Ilias* mehrfach im Gleichnis verwendet, um das Motiv ‘Heeresmasse’ zu illustrieren, basierend auf einer traditionellen Metapher ‘Wolke = Heer’.²³ Fränkel hat gezeigt, dass das wichtigste Assoziationsmuster in diesem Bild-Typus darin besteht, dass die Wolke sich einem Objekt nähert und dieses verschlingt, so dass ihr Herannahen als bedrohlich empfunden wird.²⁴ Der Bildtypus ‘Wolke’ versinnbildlicht somit

²² Damit geht Homers Technik deutlich über das hinaus, was MARTIN (1997) als die Rhythmisierungs-Funktion der Gleichnisse beschreibt.

²³ Vgl. *Il.* 16, 66: Τρώων νέφος; 4, 274 – 23, 133: νέφος ... πεζῶν; 17, 243: πολέμοιο νέφος.

²⁴ FRÄNEL 1921, 21–25, mit einem historischen ‘Stammbaum’ des Bild-Typus. Vgl. auch MOULTON 1977, 33–38, zu einer Gleichnis-Sequenz mit dem Wolken-Motiv.

die Situation eines heranziehenden Heeres, das den Bereich des Gegners zu überfluten droht.

Geht man von diesem Grundmuster aus, so ist die lineare Zuordnung der Bildmotive in unserem Fall zunächst sehr präzise: Das Heer der Achaier rückt vor; der Vergleich mit der Nebel-Wolke erfasst seine bedrohliche Wirkung auf das Gegenüber. Doch ist der Vormarsch des achaiischen Heeres bereits zuvor näher charakterisiert und in einen Gegensatz zu dem Vormarsch der Troer gestellt worden. Das Gleichnis auf der achaiischen Seite erregt also die Erwartung, exakt diesen Aspekt, nämlich das Schweigen beim Vormarsch, näher zu beleuchten. Die poetische Herausforderung besteht somit darin, den Bildtypus 'Heer = (bedrohliche) Wolke' so zu adaptieren, dass damit der Aspekt 'Schweigen / Stille' in dem Aspekt 'Bedrohlichkeit der Wolke' identifiziert wird. Wir benötigen eine 'schweigende Wolke', und es ist das, was das Gleichnis leisten will.

Das Gleichnis tut das auf indirekte Weise, so dass das 'Schweigen' in der Wolke nur implizit präsent wird, d.h. das 'Schweigen der Wolke' muss aus der persönlichen Erfahrung des Hörers / Lesers ergänzt werden: Dieser spezielle Nebel ist bedrohlich, weil er den Aspekt der verminderten Sicht mit dem der Geräuschlosigkeit (veranschaulicht im heimlichen Dieb) kombiniert. Das vorwärts marschierende Heer ist bedrohlich sowohl durch seine von der Tradition vorgegebene optische Ähnlichkeit mit einer alles verschlingenden Wolke als auch durch sein Schweigen, das im Gleichnis als integraler Bestandteil der 'typischen' Wolke etabliert wird.

IV

Unser drittes Gleichnis entstammt der *Odyssee*, wird aber durch den Blick auf mehrere *Ilias*-Gleichnisse erhellt werden. Durch die lange Erzählung seiner Irrfahrten hat Odysseus den versprochenen Termin der Abreise mit dem Schiff am Abend versäumt und muss einen ganzen weiteren Tag bei den Phai-

ken verbringen. Dieser Tag wird vom Erzähler nur kumulativ erfasst: Alkinoos bringt ein Opfer dar, alle Phaiaken speisen, Demodokos singt, ohne dass wir diesmal vom Inhalt seines Liedes erfahren, und nur Odysseus ist nicht erfreut. Er wartet auf den Sonnenuntergang, der den Zeitpunkt seines endgültigen Aufbruchs nach Hause markiert, und dieses Warten wird mit einem Gleichnis illustriert (*Od.* 13, 28-36):

αὐτὰρ Ὄδυσσεὺς
πολλὰ πρὸς ἡέλιον κεφαλὴν τρέπε παμφανόωντα,
δῦναι ἐπειγόμενος: δὴ γὰρ μενέαινε νέεσθαι. 30
ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀνὴρ δόρπου λιλαίεται, ὃ τε πανῆμαρ
νειὸν ἀν' ἔλκητον βόε οἴνοπε πηκτὸν ἀροτρον·
ἀσπασίως δ' ἄρα τῷ κατέδυ φάος ἡελίοιο
δόρπον ἐποίχεσθαι, βλάβεται δέ τε γούνατ' ἴόντι.
ὣς Ὄδυσσης ἀσπαστὸν ἔδυ φάος ἡελίοιο. 35
αἰψα δὲ Φαιήκεσσι φιληρέτμοισι μετήνδα ...

aber Odysseus

wandte häufig zur voll glänzenden Sonne den Kopf hin,
da er begehrte, dass sie untergehe; denn er wollte ja heimkehren. 30
Und wie wenn ein Mann das Abendmahl ersehnt, dem ganztäig
übers Brachfeld zwei weinfarbene Ochsen den Komposit-Pflug ziehen,
und willkommen ist ihm da das Licht der Sonne untergegangen,
zum Abendmahl zu gehen, und ihm knicken beim Gehen die Knie ein:
So willkommen ging für Odysseus das Licht der Sonne unter, 35
und sogleich sprach er unter den Ruder-liebenden Phaiaken:

Dieses Gleichnis wurde unterschiedlich erklärt. Nach Fränkel illustriert der Bauer, der den ganzen Tag gepflügt hat und den Sonnenuntergang begrüßt, nicht nur das einen Tag lange Warten des Odysseus auf seine Abreise, sondern verweist zugleich auf die um zehn Jahre verzögerte Heimkehr.²⁵ Demgegenüber hat Mattes darauf beharrt, dass das Gleichnis nur die Befind-

²⁵ FRÄNEL 1921, 46: "Als die Last eines langen schweren Arbeitstages, der nun, wie dieser letzte Tag sehnsgütigen Wartens, zu Ende geht, so erscheinen jetzt die zwanzigjährigen Mühen und Leiden des Helden. So vermag das Gl. einen weitreichenden Zusammenhang in ein treffendes Bild zusammenzudrängen, und die Bedeutsamkeit des Augenblicks, die entscheidende Schicksalswendung, knapp und doch höchst eindrucksvoll zu schildern."

lichkeit des Odysseus an dem letzten ereignislosen Tag bei den Phaiaken erfasse.²⁶ Doch die Details des Gleichenisses lassen sich nicht punktuell auf die Handlungssituation übertragen ($\pi\alpha\nu\eta\mu\alpha\rho = 3.$ Tag bei den Phaiaken). Das zeigt sich an dem pointierten Kontrast zwischen Gleichenisis- und Handlungssituation: Im Zentrum des Gleichenisses steht die Sehnsucht des Pflügers nach dem Abendmahl (31 δόρποιο — 34 δόρπον). Odysseus hingegen hat den ganzen Tag mit den Phaiaken gefeiert und gegessen und sehnt somit den Abend geradezu als Ende des Essens herbei. Der konkrete, physische Hunger des Pflügers im Gleichenis versinnbildlicht also einen ‘metaphorischen Hunger’ des Odysseus. So unterscheidet auch de Jong zwischen primärer und sekundärer Funktion des Gleichenisses.²⁷

Doch was hat das Bild des Pflügens mit der Situation des Odysseus zu tun? Können wir noch mehr Elemente innerhalb des Gleichenisses für die Handlungssituation funktionalisieren? Auch hier müssen wir einen Blick zu einem ähnlichen Vergleich in der Handlung der *Odyssee* machen, auch hier nur ungefähr 50 Verse zurück, und auch hier überschreiten wir eine Buchgrenze, wie schon in den ersten beiden Beispielen.²⁸ Die beiden Gleichenisse sind hier zusätzlich durch einen Wechsel in der Erzählebene voneinander getrennt.²⁹ Am Ende des 12. Gesangs

²⁶ MATTES 1958, 17-55.

²⁷ DE JONG 2001, 315 (*ad Od.* 13, 31-35): “The primary function of the simile is ‘advertised’: both farmer and Odysseus feel joy (...) at seeing the sun go down (...). The exhaustion of the farmer may, by way of secondary function, suggest Odysseus’ weariness, both physical and mental, after ten years of wanderings (cf. 90-1).”

²⁸ Alle drei von mir besprochenen Beispiele haben gemein, dass zwei aufeinander bezogene Gleichenisse durch eine Buchgrenze getrennt sind — und offenbar aus diesem Grund von den modernen Interpreten nur selten zusammen betrachtet wurden.

²⁹ Die Motiv-Doppelung über die Grenze der Erzählebene hinweg (Apolo-goi/primärer Erzähler) ist gerahmt von einer analogen Doppelung bei einem anderen Motiv: Zorn und Rache des Helios an den Gefährten (12) / Zorn und Rache des Poseidon an den heimkehrenden Phaiaken (13), jeweils sanktioniert in einem Dialog mit Zeus. Mit diesem Signal wird der Abschluss der Apologoi (traditionelle Irrfahrten; Odysseus als rückblickender interner Erzähler) in Parallele gesetzt

erzählt Odysseus als Abschluss seiner Apologoi, wie er, auf dem Kiel seines Schiff-Wracks schwimmend, in die Charybdis abgetrieben wurde und sich vor dem Meeresstrudel rettete, indem er sich wie eine Fledermaus³⁰ an den überhängenden Feigenbaum klammerte (*Od.* 12, 437-444):

τοῦτο μὲν ταῦτα πεπάντη
ιστὸν καὶ τρόπιν αὗτις· ἐελδομένω δέ μοι ἦλθον,
ὅψ· ἥμος δ' ἐπὶ δόρπον ἀνήρ ἀγορῆθεν ἀνέστη
κρίνων νείκεα πολλὰ δικαζουμένων αἰζηῶν, 440
τῆμος δὴ τά γε δοῦρα Χαρύβδιος ἐξεφαάνθη.
ἥκα δ' ἐγώ καθύπερθε πόδας καὶ χεῖρε φέρεσθαι,
μέσσω δ' ἐνδούπησα παρέξ περιμήκεα δοῦρα,
ἐζόμενος δ' ἐπὶ τοῖσι διήρεσα χερσὶν ἐμῆσιν.

Und unentwegt hing ich da, bis [Charybdis] wiederum ausspeie
den Mastbaum und den Kiel; und sie kamen mir ersehnt
spät; und dann, wann ein Mann zum Abendmahl vom Platz aufsteht,
da er viele Konflikte entscheidet der prozessierenden Männer, 440
dann also tauchten die Bretter wieder auf aus der Charybdis,
und ich ließ von oben herab die Beine und Arme fallen,
und plumpste mitten hinein neben den sehr langen Brettern,
und setzte mich auf diese und ruderte durch mit meinen Armen.

Odysseus wartet darauf, dass die Charybdis wieder sein improvisiertes Floß ausspucke. Das geschieht erst spät (ὅψ, 439), und zwar zu dem Zeitpunkt am Tag, wann ein Mann auf der *Agorá* seine Tätigkeit als Richter beendet und nach Hause zum Abendmahl geht. Formal gesehen haben wir es hier also nicht mit einem Gleichnis zu tun, sondern mit einer Zeitangabe, die durch den Vergleich von zwei Situationen definiert wird.

Zur Deutung dieser Zeitangabe hat Stanford darauf hingewiesen, dass Odysseus in seinem 'normalen' Leben als βασιλεύς eben diese richterliche Tätigkeit ausüben würde; de Jong schlägt

und gewissermaßen wiederholt und ersetzt durch den Abschluss der Heimkehr des Odysseus (Phaiakis als individuelle Gestaltung unserer *Odyssee*; primärer Erzähler).

³⁰ Signalisiert der Vergleich mit der Fledermaus bereits, dass Odysseus den ganzen Tag bis zum Abend hängend überbrücken muss? Oder erinnert der 'Totenvogel' bzw. 'Unterweltsvogel' auch daran, dass Odysseus sich am Rande des Todes befindet?

vor, dass Odysseus sich die Zeit des Wartens mit der Erinnerung an seine eigene Vergangenheit (und erhoffte Zukunft) überbrücke.³¹ Die durch den Vergleich ausgelöste Assoziation verweist dann auf einen Aspekt des Lebens des Odysseus, der außerhalb der aktuellen Handlungssituation liegt. Diese Assoziation ist im Text selbst durch nichts angelegt; sie erinnert aber an das Schema des *reverse simile*,³² das in der *Odyssee* als fester Typus ausgebildet ist und dessen markanteste Vertreter an Knotenpunkten der Handlung stehen: Odysseus freut sich, als er im Meer schwimmend das Land der Phaiaken erblickt, so wie sich Kinder freuen, wenn ihr Vater nach langer Krankheit wieder gesund wird; Eumaios begrüßt Telemachos, so wie ein Vater seinen Sohn begrüßt, der nach zehn Jahren wieder heimgekehrt ist; Penelope freut sich über die Heimkehr des Odysseus, so wie sich Männer freuen, die nach einem Schiffbruch wieder das Land erreichen.

In all diesen Fällen zitiert die Handlung des Gleichnisses eine Konstellation, die typisch für die Handlung der *Odyssee* ist, aber auf eine andere Person zutrifft. Diese Technik ist charakteristisch für die Selbst-Referenzialität der *Odyssee*, und sie greift wohl sicher nicht auf eine traditionelle Gleichnis-Typik zurück. Ich vermute deshalb, dass wir in unserer Zeitangabe in *Od.* 12 eine ähnliche Assoziation entwickeln sollen: Odysseus wartet, am Baum hängend, auf das Nachlassen der Charybdis, wie ein Richter auf das Ende seines Arbeitstages wartet — und das heißt, dass seine Situation innerhalb der Irrfahrten mit einer für ihn typischen Tätigkeit auf Ithaka verglichen wird.³³ Der Querbezug zwischen den Erzählebenen übernimmt in der *Odyssee* dieselbe Funktion, die in der *Ilias* über die Assoziationen aufgrund der traditionellen Gleichnistypik hergestellt wird.

³¹ STANFORD 1964, *ad loc.*; DE JONG 2001, *ad loc.*

³² FOLEY 1978, mit Verweis auf weitere Literatur.

³³ Die Motivik mag als Parallele gesehen werden: Der Richter schlichtet den ganzen Tag lang *νείκεα*; Odysseus hängt am Baum und muss tatenlos warten, bis die *νείκεα* unter seinen Füßen von selbst zu einem Ende kommen.

Doch das greift hier schon voraus. Die Präzisierung einer Zeitangabe durch einen Vergleich mit der Alltagswelt beruht sehr wohl auf einem (traditionellen) Typus, der in der *Ilias* fassbar ist; zunächst in einem Beispiel, das sowohl formal wie auch thematisch ähnlich ist (*Il.* 11, 84-90):

ὅφρα μὲν ἡώς ἦν καὶ ἀέξετο ἵερὸν ἥμαρ,
τόφρα μάλ' ἀμφιτέρων βέλε' ἥππετο, πίπτε δὲ λαός· 85
ἡμος δὲ δρυτόμος περ ἀνὴρ ὥπλισσατο δεῖπνον
οὔρεος ἐν βήσησιν, ἐπεὶ τ' ἐκορέσσατο χεῖρας
τάμνων δένδρεα μακρά, ἀδος τέ μιν ἔκετο θυμόν,
σίτου τε γλυκεροῦ περὶ φρένας ἴμερος αἴρει,
τῆμος σφῆ̄ ἀρετῆ̄ Δαναοὶ ὥξαντο φάλαγγας ... 90

Solange es Dämmerung war und der heilige Tag zunahm,
so lange trafen reichlich Beider Geschoße und fiel das Kriegsvolk. 85
Doch dann, wann ein Holzfäller-Mann die Jause anrichtet
in des Berges Schluchten, nachdem er die Hände gesättigt hat,
da er hohe Bäume schneidet, und Völle hat sein Herz erreicht,
und nach der süßen Speise umfasst das Verlangen seine Sinne:
Dann durchbrachen die Danaer mit ihrer Tatkraft die Reihen. 90

Hier liegt so wie in den beiden Beispielen der *Odyssee* die Anschauung zugrunde, dass der Tagesablauf des Menschen durch die Mahlzeiten gegliedert sei.³⁴ Noch kürzer ist das im folgenden Beispiel ausgeführt, das thematisch an das Pflügergleichnis der *Odyssee* erinnert (*Il.* 16, 777-780):

ὅφρα μὲν ἡέλιος μέσον οὐρανὸν ἀμφιβεβήκει,
τόφρα μάλ' ἀμφιτέρων βέλε' ἥππετο, πίπτε δὲ λαός·
ἡμος δ' ἡέλιος μετενίσετο βουλυτόνδε,
καὶ τότε δή β' ὑπὲρ αἴσαν Ἀχαιοὶ φέρτεροι ἥσαν. 780

Solange die Sonne um die Himmelsmitte herum schritt,
so lange trafen reichlich Beider Geschoße und fiel das Kriegsvolk.
Doch dann, als die Sonne sich zum Ochsen-Abspannen herab senkte,
da also waren dann über die Bestimmung hinaus die Achaier stärker. 780

³⁴ Wie in *Od.* 13, 28ff. ist das Ende der Arbeit und die Mahlzeit mit dem Motiv der Erschöpfung gekoppelt. Selbst die Pointe, dass Odysseus im Gegensatz zum hungrigen Pflüger das Ende der Tag-langen Mahlzeit ersehnt, scheint im *Ilias*-Gleichnis vorgeprägt, wenn der Holzfäller seine Hände am Holzfällen „gesättigt“ hat.

Damit greifen wir den zugrunde liegenden Gedanken: Sonnenuntergang = Ende des Arbeitstages (= Abendessen). Schon im ersten angeführten Beispiel aus der *Ilias* ist dieser einfache Grundtypus aber in der Form eines Vergleichs stärker elaboriert. Was gewinnen wir damit für das Pflügergleichnis in *Odyssee* 13? Der Dichter hat die Aussage der Zeitangabe endgültig in die formale Kategorie eines Gleichnisses überführt. Dabei übernimmt er auch Details aus einem anderen Bildbereich, wie wir an einer weiteren Stelle der *Ilias* sehen können (*Il.* 13, 701-708):

Αἴας δ' οὐκέτι πάμπαν, 'Οιλῆος ταχὺς υἱός,
ἴστατ' ἀπ' Αἴαντος Τελαμωνίου, οὐδ' ἡβαιόν,
ἀλλ' ὃς τ' ἐν νειῶ βόε οἴνοπε πηκτὸν ἄροτρον
ἴσον θυμὸν ἔχοντες τιταίνετον· ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρα σφιν
πρυμνοῖσιν κεράεσσι πολὺς ἀνακηκλεὶς ἴδρως·
τὰ μέν τε ζυγὸν οἰον ἐῦξον ἀμφὶς ἔέργει
ἴεμένω κατὰ δλκα· τέμει δέ τε τέλσον ἀρούρης·
ῶς τὰ παρβεβαῶτε μάλ' ἔστασαν ἀλλήλουιν.

705

Und Aias hat sich gar nicht mehr, der schnelle Sohn des Oileus, von Aias getrennt, dem Telamonier, auch nicht ein bisschen, sondern wie am Brachfeld zwei weinfarbene Ochsen den Komposit-Pflug dahin zerrn mit dem gleichen Willen, und rings um die beiden quillt an den Wurzeln der Hörner reichlich der Schweiß hervor — 705 und es trennt sie nur das gutgeglättete Joch von einander, da sie die Furche entlang streben, und es erreicht des Ackers Wende — So waren die beiden zusammen getreten und standen nah beieinander.

Die Übereinstimmungen in der Formulierung sind auffällig (*Il.* 13, 703b = *Od.* 13, 32), ohne dass analytische Schlussfolgerungen zielführend wären.³⁵ Doch zeigt der Vergleich die unterschiedliche Stoßrichtung der beiden Gleichnisse. In der *Ilias* sind es die zwei Ochsen, deren vereinte Kraftanstrengung zum Vergleich mit den Helden in der Handlung herausfordert. In

³⁵ Vgl. auch *Il.* 10, 353, ἐλκέμεναι νειοῦ βαθεῖης πηκτὸν ἄροτρον, mit dem Kommentar von HAINSWORTH 1993: "The language of this quasi-simile and those at 13.703-7 and *Od.* 13.31-4 (...) is clearly related, though without any necessity that this is true of the passages themselves."

der *Odyssee* ist es der Pflüger, der sich anstrengt und mit Odysseus verglichen wird. Für den Pflüger besteht die Anstrengung aber nicht nur im physischen Kraftaufwand, sondern vor allem in Geduld und Ausdauer bis hin zur Erschöpfung, jener Tugend des Odysseus, die in unserer *Odyssee* in den Vordergrund gerückt sind.

Der Unterschied zwischen den Gleichnissen der *Ilias* und denen der *Odyssee* liegt aber auch auf einer anderen Ebene. Die Gleichnisse der *Ilias* zielen zumeist auf einen Kontrast zwischen der heroischen Sphäre der kämpfenden Helden, die jenseits der Alltagserfahrung in einer mythischen Vergangenheit angesiedelt ist, und der zeitlosen Alltags-Realität einer zivilen Gegenwart ab (der Mensch in Einklang bzw. Auseinandersetzung mit der Natur). Dasselbe Vergleichsschema, eingesetzt in der *Odyssee*, zielt hingegen nicht auf einen Kontrast der Lebenssphären ab: Während ein Achilleus der *Ilias* nie ein δρυτόμος oder ein Pflüger sein könnte, war Odysseus vor seiner Ausfahrt nach Troia sehr wohl ein βασιλεύς, der auf Ithaka die Funktion des Richters ausübte. Sein Fehlen wirkt sich, wie die Volksversammlung in *Od.* 2 zeigt, darin aus, dass es auf Ithaka keine Instanz gibt, die Konflikte schlichten oder entscheiden kann. Der Richter in *Od.* 12 gehört somit zu der sozialen Schicht der Helden nach dem Krieg und verweist damit auf eine Handlungsebene der *Odyssee* selbst.

Für den pflügenden Bauer in *Od.* 13 findet sich auf der Handlungsebene der *Odyssee* nun zwar kein direkter Anknüpfungspunkt.³⁶ Jedoch verweist der Vergleichspunkt ἀσπασίως (33) / ἀσπαστόν (35) auf das Motiv der glückten Heimkehr und/oder Errettung aus höchster Gefahr³⁷ und damit auf die

³⁶ Die Tätigkeit des Pflügens ist in der *Odyssee* noch einmal erwähnt, 18, 371-375, wo Odysseus den Freier Eurymachos zu einem Pflüger-Wettkampf herausfordert. Er mutet damit als Bettler dem Adeligen pointiert eine un-aristokratische Betätigung zu, vgl. EDWARDS 1993, 70-74.

³⁷ Von den 18 übrigen Belegen für ἀσπάσιος / ἀσπαστός in der *Odyssee* stehen 14 im Kontext der Errettung aus höchster Gefahr und /oder der glückten

zentrale Thematik der *Odyssee*. Dieses Stichwort findet sich auch in zwei der oben erwähnten *reverse similes*.³⁸ Die Verwendung in *Od.* 13 signalisiert somit den Hörern/Lesern, dass es sich auch in diesem Fall um ein 'reverse simile' handelt und dass das Motiv des Pflügens ebenfalls auf die Handlungsebene der *Odyssee* verweist.

Was hat also Odysseus mit einem Pflüger gemein? Eine erste Vermutung könnte in die Mythologie ausgreifen, da der pflügende Odysseus ein Motiv aus der Vorgeschichte des Trojanschen Krieges darstellt: Um sich der Teilnahme am Krieg zu entziehen, stellt sich Odysseus wahnsinnig, pflügt mit Ochs und Esel und streut Salz in die Furchen, wird aber von Palamedes enttarnt.³⁹ Dieser Assoziation folgend ließe sich leicht eine 'geistreiche' Interpretation entwerfen.⁴⁰ Doch stünde damit dieses Gleichnis in einem Gegensatz zu allen anderen *reverse similes*, da es auf eine Episode des Odysseus-Mythos verweisen würde, die in der *Odyssee* selbst sonst konsequent verschwiegen wird.⁴¹

Ich ziehe es daher vor, das konkrete Pflügen der Gleichnis-handlung als den Verweis auf ein metaphorisches Pflügen der Odysseehandlung aufzufassen. So hat auch das zentrale Thema in unserem Gleichnis, das δόρπον, im Rahmen der Odysseehandlung eine metaphorische Qualität: In 20, 392 und 21, 428 ist das Abendessen (δόρπον), das Odysseus den Freiern noch am helllichten Tag (ἐν φάει, 21, 429) serviert, deren 'letzte Mahlzeit', d.h. ihre Ermordung. Für welchen realen Tätigkeitsbereich der *Odyssee* steht dann die Metapher 'Pflügen'?

Heimkehr. Der Begriff erhält damit den Charakter eines Leitmotivs, mit der endgültigen Einlösung in *Od.* 23, 296, ἀσπάσιοι λέκτροι παλαιοῦ θεσμὸν ἔκοντο.

³⁸ *Od.* 5, 394-398 (dreimal) und 23, 238f. (zweimal).

³⁹ Belegt im Kyprien-Referat des Proklos (§22 bei KULLMANN 1960, 52-57): καὶ μάνεσθαι προσποιησάμενον Ὁδυσσέα ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ θέλειν συστρατεύεσθαι ἐφώρασαν, Παλαμήδους ὑποθεμένου τὸν υἱὸν Τηλέμαχον ἐπὶ κόλασιν ἔξαρπάσαντες.

⁴⁰ Das Pflügen stehe demnach für Odysseus am Anfang und am Ende seiner Reise; diesmal bringe Odysseus sein 'Pflügen' geduldig bis zum Ziel ...

⁴¹ In *Od.* 24, 102-119 wird der Kontext dieser Episode evoziert, sie selbst bleibt aber ausgeblendet, vgl. DANEK 1998, 476-478.

Mein Anknüpfungspunkt ist die Fügung βόε οἴνοπε. Das Epitheton οἴνοψ erscheint bei Homer sonst nur noch in der Formel οἴνοπα πόντον / οἴνοπι πόντω (5x *Ilias*, 13x *Odyssee*). Und erinnert das beharrliche Pflügen des Ackers nicht an das Durchpflügen des Meeres, das Odysseus die letzten zehn Jahre erleben musste und dessen Ende jetzt unmittelbar bevorsteht? Die Assoziation lässt sich aus Homer selbst nicht belegen,⁴² auch wenn die parallelen Aspekte der beiden Bereiche jeweils für sich erwähnt werden.⁴³ Doch wir können belegen, dass Apollonios Rhodios sich mit den beiden Pflüger-Gleichnissen und dem Potenzial ihrer Bildsprache intensiv auseinandergesetzt hat (Apoll. Rhod. 3, 409-412):

δοιώ μοι πεδίον τὸ Ἀρήιον ἀμφινέμουνται
ταύρῳ χαλκόποδε, στόματι φλόγα φυσιόωντε·
τοὺς ἐλάω ζεύξας στυφελὴν κατὰ νεὶὸν Ἀρηὸς
τετράγυνον, τὴν αἰψί ταμῶν ἐπὶ τέλσον ἀρότρῳ ...

410

Zwei sind es, die mir auf der Ares-Ebene weiden,
zwei erzhufige Stiere, die Feuer mit dem Maul aushauchen,
die ich anspanne und über das grause Brachfeld des Ares treibe,
das vier Morgen große, das ich schnell bis zur Wende mit dem Pflug durch-
schneide ...

410

Apollonios spielt hier mit dem Wortlaut des *Ilias*-Gleichnisses und kommentiert dabei wahrscheinlich die aktuelle philologische Debatte zu Homer: τέμει in *Il.* 13, 707 wird paraphrasiert mit ταμῶν in 412,⁴⁴ womit wir eine typische Instanz eines nicht hinreichend dokumentierten ‘Rengakos-Wortes’ haben.⁴⁵

⁴² Die Metapher erscheint erstmals bei AESCHYL. *Suppl.* 1007, πόντος ... ἡρόθη δορὶ.

⁴³ Das Schiff durchschneidet die Wellen (ἐταμνεῖν, *Od.* 13, 88) bzw. das Meer (τέμνειν, *Od.* 3, 175); der Acker wird hinter dem Pflug schwarz (*Il.* 18, 548) wie das Meer von den Rudern weiß wird (*Od.* 12, 172); die Seefahrt führt zur Erschöpfung (*Od.* 12, 78f., und öfter); nach der Beendigung einer Seefahrt denkt man zuerst an das Essen (*Od.* 10, 56f.; 12, 282f., etc.).

⁴⁴ Vgl. JANKO ad 13, 703-707. τέμει gehört zu ἔτετμον; gut bezeugt ist jedoch die unmetrische varia lectio τέμει. Die Notiz in *Schol.* A, καὶ ὅτι τέμει ἀντὶ τοῦ τέμνει, spiegelt vielleicht eine antike Debatte zur Bedeutung von τέμει wider.

⁴⁵ Zur Problematik der ‘Homerenischen Wörter’ bei APOLL.RHOD. vgl. RENAKOS 1994: Apollonios zitiert nicht nur die Homer-Wörter und ihre Belegstellen

Die beiden Pflüger-Bilder der *Ilias* und *Odyssee* werden aufgegriffen, um die rudernden Argonauten zu versinnbildlichen, die mit dem Schiff das Meer durchfurchen wie pflügende Ochsen den Acker (Apoll. Rhod. 2, 662-670):

δύως ὅτ' ἐπ' ἥματι νύκτα
νήνεμον ἀκαμάτησιν ἐπερρώντ' ἐλάτησιν.
οἵοι δὲ πλαδόωσαν ἐπισχίζοντες ἄρουραν
ἐργατίναι μογέουσι βόες, πέρι δ' ἀσπετος ίδρως
εἴβεται ἐκ λαγόνων τε καὶ αὐχένος, ὅμματα δέ σφιν
λοξὰ παραστρωφῶνται ὑπὸ ζυγοῦ, αὐτὰρ ἀυτῷ
αὐαλένη στομάτων ὄμοτον βρέμει· οἱ δ' ἐνὶ γαίῃ
χηλᾶς σκηρίπτοντε πανημέριοι πονέονται.
τοῖς ἕκεινοι ήρωες ὑπὲξ ἀλὸς εἶλκον ἐρετμά.

665
670

und auf den Tag folgend die Nacht,
die windlose, tummelten sie sich an den unermüdlichen Rudern.
Und so wie sich beim Durchspalten des feuchtschölligen Ackers
die Arbeits-Ochsen mühen, und unermesslicher Schweiß ringsum
quillt aus den Flanken und dem Nacken, und ihre Augen
rollen quer hervor unter dem Joch; jedoch das Schnauben
dröhnt unaufhörlich trocken aus den Mäulern; und in die Erde
stemmen sie die Hufe und plagen sich den ganzen Tag lang.
Diesen gleich zogen die Helden die Ruder aus dem Meer heraus.

665
670

Das Bild der schwitzenden Ochsen evoziert das Gleichnis der *Ilias*; das Stichwort *πανημέριοι* knüpft jedoch an das zentrale Motiv *πανῆμαρ* des *Odyssee*-Gleichnisses an (31), und das ungewöhnliche Bild der Helden, die die Ruder aus dem Meer “herausziehen” (670 *εἶλκον*), zitiert die *Odyssee*-Ochsen, die den Pflug “ziehen” (32 *ἔλκητον*). Suggeriert Apollonios damit eine Meta-Interpretation des *Odyssee*-Gleichnisses, wonach die vom Bauern gelenkten pflügenden Ochsen an die von Odysseus geleiteten Gefährten erinnern, die das Meer ‘pflügen’? Und dürfen wir diese Assoziation des Apollonios übernehmen und uns mit dem Gleichnis des endlos pflügenden Bauern an die endlosen Seefahrten des Odysseus erinnert fühlen?

len, sondern auch die jeweils damit verbundene aktuelle philologische Debatte. Diese ist oft in den Scholien kenntlich, lässt sich aber oft auch nur durch Indizien erschließen.

V

In allen drei besprochenen Beispielen schert Homer aus der engen Typik der traditionellen Gleichnis-Typologie aus, verankert aber durch ein vorgelagertes weiteres Gleichnis das Assoziationsmuster in eben jener Typik, aus der er dann ausschert. Damit markiert er die Überschreitung im je individuellen Fall:

- In *Il.* 14 wird das Gleichnis-Motiv ‘Wind–Wellen’, das traditionell im Kontext ‘Schlachtgetümmel’ verankert ist, auf den psychischen Bereich verlagert bzw. ausgeweitet.
- In *Il.* 3 passt das Grund-Motiv ‘Wolke’ zum allgemeinen Kontext des marschierenden Heeres, wird aber durch Zusatz-Angaben zu einer ‘schalllosen Wolke’, die das bedrohlich schweigende Heer spiegelt, umstilisiert.
- In *Od.* 13 wird der Grundtypus ‘Zeitangabe via Vergleich’ von dem *Odyssee*-spezifischen Schema *reverse simile* überlagert. Das Gleichnis erhält dadurch eine Zusatzkonnotation für den pfügenden Bauern, die über den Odysseus des unmittelbaren Kontextes auf den Odysseus der gesamten *Odyssee*-Handlung hinausweist.

Homer — der Dichter der *Ilias* und der Dichter der *Odyssee* — setzt die Tradition der Gleichnis-Typologie bei seinem Publikum als bekannt voraus, geht aber über sie hinaus, setzt sein eigenes Werk an die Stelle der Tradition und erschafft sich seine eigene ‘Tradition’. Ist er damit noch ein Dichter innerhalb der Tradition oder nicht?

Zuletzt hat der bosnische Gelehrte Zlatan Čolaković die Frage gestellt, inwiefern Homer mit Milman Parrys berühmtem bosnischen Sänger Avdo Mededović verglichen werden könne, und hat die provokante Antwort formuliert, dass weder Homer noch Mededović traditionelle Sänger gewesen seien:⁴⁶ Der breite Strom der traditionellen Sänger entspreche demnach dem Typus eines Rhapsoden, dessen Intention darin bestehe, die Lieder der Tradition mehr oder weniger präzise wiederzugeben; hingegen

⁴⁶ ČOLAKOVIĆ 2004. Vgl. auch die Kritik an der Parry-Lord-These bei ČOLAKOVIĆ / ROJC-ČOLAKOVIĆ 2004, mit der Besprechung in DANEK 2005.

erlaubten sich sowohl Međedović wie auch Homer künstlerische Freiheiten und Abweichungen von der Tradition, die sogar von ihrer eigenen Kollegenschaft missbilligt würden.

Referenzialität besteht, von der Seite des Sängers einer mündlichen epischen Tradition gesehen, in der impliziten oder expliziten Bezugnahme auf das Corpus traditioneller Erzählungen, das ihm selbst zugänglich ist und somit sein eigenes Repertoire bildet. Unter diesem Gesichtspunkt kann *traditional referentiality*⁴⁷ als ein Netz von Querbezügen auf das (potenziell) eigene Werk betrachtet werden. Für das Publikum sind diese Querbeziehungen umso eher nachvollziehbar, je homogener eine lokale Teil-Tradition ist, aber auch je vertrauter es mit dem Werk des Autors/Sängers ist. Die Gleichnisttechnik Homers zeugt von höchster Entwicklungsstufe des poetischen Kosmos des Sängers Homer: Er spinnt sein Netz aus Bezügen quer durch seine Kreation, die ihm über die Jahrzehnte hinweg so sehr vertraut geworden ist, dass sie für ihn den Status der ‘Tradition’ gewonnen hat. Er spielt auf sein eigenes Werk mittels Querbezügen in derselben Weise an wie auf alle von Alters her vorgegebenen Bestandteile des traditionellen Mythos. Dies hat sich besonders deutlich bei der Kategorie der *reverse similes* in der *Odyssee* gezeigt. Homer erzeugt dadurch eine Polyvalenz und Komplexität, die nur bei einem Publikum seine volle Wirkung entfalten kann, das mit seinem Schaffen bestens vertraut ist.

VI

Und noch ein letzter Schwenk zurück zur *Ilias*. In 3, 151f. werden die troischen Greise, die beim Eintreffen Helenas auf dem Turm der Stadtmauer sitzen, mit Zikaden verglichen. Die Analogie ist nicht auf einen einzigen Punkt beschränkt: Die Zikaden sitzen auf dem Baum, sie zirpen unentwegt mit “lilienhafter Stimme”, wie die Alten den ganzen Tag mit dünner

⁴⁷ Zu diesem Konzept vgl. FOLEY 1991 sowie DANEK 2002.

Stimme reden, und sie evozieren Blutleerheit und Kälte wie die alten Männer (Scholien). Die wichtigsten dieser Greise sind unmittelbar zuvor namentlich aufgezählt worden. Drei von ihnen sind Brüder des Priamos, wie wir an einer anderen Stelle der *Ilias* erfahren.⁴⁸ Ein weiterer Bruder, der an jener Stelle auch aufgezählt wird,⁴⁹ fehlt hier: Tithonos, der im Alter schrumpfte wie eine Zikade oder sogar — nach späteren Quellen — in eine Zikade verwandelt wurde. Stellt sich uns diese Assoziation erst jetzt ein, weil wir über die Bedeutung des Tithonos-Exemplums bei Sappho nachgedacht haben? Die Assoziation findet sich in keinem der gängigen *Ilias*-Kommentare, wo der Vergleich üblicherweise auf den akustischen Bereich (Zirpen der Zikaden — Schwätzchen der Greise) eingeschränkt wird. Fränel zieht den Mythos des Tithonos zwar zur Beleuchtung des Vergleichs heran, kommt aber zu dem umgekehrten Schluss: "Wieder erscheint der Vergleich als sagenbildend."⁵⁰ Anders sehen das hingegen die Scholien (AB zu II. 3, 151):

Τιθωνοῦ τοῦ Λαοδάμαντος, Πριάμου δὲ ἀδελφοῦ, ἡράσθη ἡ Ἡμέρα,
ἐξ οὕπερ ἐποίησεν νιὸν Μέμνονα. μακρῷ δὲ βίῳ δαπανηθέντος ἐκεί-
νου μετέβαλεν αὐτὸν εἰς τέττιγα ἡ θεός. διὸ δὴ αὐτοῦ τοὺς συγγενεῖς
δημογέροντας τέττιξιν εἰκάζει ὁ ποιητής. ἴστορεῖ Ἐλλάνικος.

In den Tithonos, Sohn des Laodamas, Bruder des Priamos, verliebte sich Hemera, mit dem sie den Sohn Memnon zeugte. Als er aber ein langes Leben verbracht hatte, verwandelte ihn die Göttin in eine Zikade. Deshalb also vergleicht der Dichter seine Verwandten, die 'Tattergreise', mit Zikaden. Die Geschichte steht bei Hellanikos.

Die Dinge liegen nun zweifellos nicht so einfach, wie der Scholiast vermutet.⁵¹ Doch neige auch ich zur Ansicht, dass beim

⁴⁸ Il. 20, 238 = 3, 147, Λάμπον τε Κλυτίον θ' Ἰκετάονά τ', ὅζον Ἀρηος.

⁴⁹ Il. 20, 237, Λαομέδων δὲ ὅρα Τιθωνὸν τέκετο Πρίαμόν τε.

⁵⁰ FRÄNEL 1921, 83.

⁵¹ Die Mythos-Variante, dass Tithonos in eine Zikade verwandelt worden sei, bildet den Ausgangspunkt für die Weiterdichtung in Platons *Phaidros* (Zikaden als Musen-Vögel) und deren Fortwirkung im Hellenismus (vgl. CRANE 1986). Bei Homer schlafst Tithonos an der Seite seiner göttlichen Gattin, steht also noch in seiner Jugendblüte, obwohl seine Brüder bereits Greise sind. Heißt das, dass die Tradition ihn sich ursprünglich als unsterblich *und* alterslos vorstellte?

Vergleich zwischen den Greisen und den Zikaden bereits eine traditionelle Verbindung Tithonos — Zikade vorausgesetzt ist. Wesentlich erscheint mir vor allem, dass der Scholiast davon ausgeht, dass Homer in seinen mythologischen Vergleichen auf ein traditionelles Wissen seines Publikums rekuriert und dieses kreativ weiter führt. Dieser Ansatz ist auch für die epischen Gleichnisse fruchtbar.

LITERATUR

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ALDEN 2000 | M. ALDEN, <i>Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the Iliad</i> (Oxford 2000). |
| BERGOLD 1977 | W. BERGOLD, <i>Der Zweikampf des Paris und Mene-laos</i> (Bonn 1977). |
| BUXTON 2004 | R. BUXTON, "Similes and Other Likenesses", in <i>The Cambridge Companion to Homer</i> , ed. by R. FOWLER (Cambridge 2004), 139-155. |
| ČOLAKOVIĆ
2004 | Z. ČOLAKOVIĆ, "Homer: Cor Huso ili Avdo, rapsod ili aed?", in <i>Almanah</i> 27/28 (2004), 47-66. |
| ČOLAKOVIĆ /
ROJC-ČOLAKOVIĆ
2004 | Z. ČOLAKOVIĆ / M. ROJC-ČOLAKOVIĆ, <i>Mrtva glava jezik progovara</i> (Podgorica 2004). |
| CRANE 1986 | G. CRANE, "Tithonus and the Prologue to Callimachus' Aitia", in <i>ZPE</i> 66 (1986), 269-278. |
| DANEK 1998 | G. DANEK, <i>Epos und Zitat. Studien zu den Quellen der Odyssee</i> (Wien 1998). |
| DANEK 1999 | G. DANEK, "Synchronisation von Handlungssträngen in Ilias 14, 1-40", in <i>Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of D.N. Maronitis</i> , ed. by J.N. KAZAZIS and A. RENGAKOS (Stuttgart 1999), 76-88. |
| DANEK 2002 | G. DANEK, "Traditional Referentiality and Homeric Intertextuality", in <i>Omero tremila anni dopo. Atti del Congresso di Genova 6-8 luglio 2000</i> , a cura di F. MONTANARI (Roma 2002), 3-19. |

- DANEK 2005 G. DANEK, Rezension von ČOLAKOVIĆ / ROJC-ČOLAKOVIĆ 2004, in *WS* 118 (2005), 278-282.
- EDMUND 1997 L. EDMUND, "Myth in Homer", in MORRIS / POWELL (1997), 415-441.
- EDWARDS 1993 A.T. EDWARDS, "Homer's Ethical Geography. Country and City in the *Odyssey*", in *TAPhA* 123 (1993), 27-78.
- EDWARDS 1991 M.W. EDWARDS, *The Iliad. A Commentary. Vol. V: Books 17–20* (Cambridge 1991).
- ERBSE 2000 H. ERBSE, "Beobachtungen über die Gleichnisse der Ilias Homers", in *Hermes* 128 (2000), 257-274.
- FOLEY 1978 H.P. FOLEY, "'Reverse Similes' and Sex Roles in the *Odyssey*", in *Aretbusa* 11 (1978), 7-26.
- FOLEY 1991 J.M. FOLEY, *Immanent Art. From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic* (Bloomington & Indianapolis 1991).
- FRÄNKEL 1921 H. FRÄNKEL, *Die homerischen Gleichnisse* (Göttingen 1921).
- FRIEDRICH 1996 W.-H. FRIEDRICH, *Vom Wohlstand der Gleichnisse* (Stuttgart 1996).
- GRONEWALD / DANIEL 2004 M. GRONEWALD / R.W. DANIEL, "Ein neuer Sappho-Papyrus", in *ZPE* 147 (2004), 1-8.
- HAINSWORTH 1993 B. HAINSWORTH, *The Iliad. A Commentary. Vol. III: Books 9–12* (Cambridge 1993).
- HARDIE 2005 A. HARDIE, "Sappho, the Muses, and Life After Death", in *ZPE* 154 (2005), 13-32.
- HEUBECK 1950 A. HEUBECK, "Studien zur Struktur der Ilias (Retardation — Motivübertragung)", in *Gymnasium Fridericianum. Festschrift zur Feier des 200-jährigen Bestehens des Hum. Gymnasiums Erlangen 1745–1945* (Erlangen 1950), 17-36.
- JANKO 1992 R. JANKO, *The Iliad. A Commentary. Vol. IV: Books 13–16* (Cambridge 1992).
- DE JONG 2001 I. DE JONG, *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey* (Cambridge 2001).

- KRISCHER 1971 T. KRISCHER, *Formale Konventionen der homerischen Epopie* (München 1971).
- KULLMANN 1960 W. KULLMANN, *Die Quellen der Ilias (Troischer Sagenkreis)* (Wiesbaden 1960).
- LANG 1983 M.L. LANG, "Reverberation and Mythology in the *Iliad*", in *Approaches to Homer*, ed. by C.A. RUBINO / C.W. SHELTERDINE (Austin, Texas 1983), 140-164.
- LONSDALE 1990 S.H. LONSDALE, *Creatures of Speech. Lions, Herding, and Hunting Similes in the Iliad* (Stuttgart 1990).
- LORD 1960 A.B. LORD, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, MA 1960).
- MARTIN 1997 R.P. MARTIN, "Similes and Performance", in *Written Voices, Spoken Signs. Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text*, ed. by E. BAKKER, A. KAHANE (Cambridge, MA & London 1997), 138-166.
- MATTES 1958 W. MATTES, *Odysseus bei den Phäaken. Kritisches zur Homeranalyse* (Würzburg 1958).
- MORRIS / POWELL 1997 I. MORRIS / B. POWELL (edd.), *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden 1997).
- MOULTON 1977 C. MOULTON, *Similes in the Homeric Poems* (Göttingen 1977).
- MUELLNER 1990 L. MUELLNER, "The Simile of the Cranes and Pygmies. A Study of Homeric Metaphor", in *HSPh* 93 (1990), 59-101.
- NANNINI 2003 S. NANNINI, *Analogia e polarità in similitudine. Paragoni iliadici e odissiaci a confronto* (Amsterdam 2003).
- NIMIS 1987 S.A. NIMIS, *Narrative Semiotics in the Epic Tradition. The Simile* (Bloomington & Indianapolis 1987).
- PATZER 1996 H. PATZER, *Die Formgesetze des homerischen Epos* (Stuttgart 1996).

- PFEIJFFER 2000 I.L. PFEIJFFER, "Shifting Helen. An Interpretation of Sappho, Fragment 16 (Voigt)", in *CQ* 50 (2000), 1–6.
- RENGAKOS 1994 A. RENGAKOS, *Apollonios Rhodios und die antike Homererklärung* (München 1994).
- SCHANDL 2002 G. SCHANDL, *Der Held als Löwe. Hektor in den Gleichnissen der Ilias* (ungedruckte Diplomarbeit, Wien 2002).
- SCOTT 1974 W.C. SCOTT, *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile* (Leiden 1974).
- SEECK 2004 G.A. SEECK, *Homer. Eine Einführung* (Stuttgart 2004).
- STANFORD 1964/65 W.B. STANFORD (Ed.), *The Odyssey of Homer*, 2nd ed. (London & New York 1964/65).
- WEST 2005 M.L. WEST, "The New Sappho", in *ZPE* 151 (2005), 1–9.
- WILLIAMSON 1995 M. WILLIAMSON, *Sappho's Immortal Daughters* (Cambridge, MA 1995).

DISCUSSION

A. Sens : I think it might be worth emphasizing the way the examples you have given consist of closely connected similes in which the first provides a kind of intratextual template for understanding the second — without the first the reader/listener would have much more trouble correctly understanding the second. Do you think that the proximity of the two members of the pair makes a difference for thinking about the poet's composition and technique? It seems to me that, at any rate, the experience of reader/listener would be different were the 'traditional' and 'innovative' versions of a simile-type disjoined from one another by a greater distance.

G. Danek : Ja, ich glaube, das ist ein wichtiger Unterschied: In dem einen Fall ist es der Gegensatz zwischen einem mehr oder weniger typischen Erzählmuster und einer individuellen Variante, die vor dem Hintergrund des allgemeinen Schemas gelesen werden will; im anderen Fall, wie in den von mir untersuchten Beispielen, weist uns der Dichter mit dem Mittel eines 'anticipatory doublet' exakt darauf hin, welche Aspekte der 2. Instanz, des folgenden Gleichnisses, als innovativ zu betrachten sind.

E.J. Bakker : Thank you for a very illuminating presentation. I found the insistence on "Querverbindungen" between similes very illuminating. My question concerns the perspective in which you place these observations when you make a distinction between a δαψωδός who is 'traditional' and an ἀοιδός, such as 'Homer', who is transcendental, capable of the things you describe as 'non-traditional'. This is of course not the way in which the distinction is usually made. I wonder whether what

you discuss as “transcendental quality” cannot be treated as ‘interpretation’, ‘Überarbeitung’ *within* an ongoing tradition. That would mean of course that the work, or works (the entire Homeric corpus) becomes a tradition, and the interpreting δοιδός would be responsible for the high-quality, non-traditional features that you observe.

G. Danek : Vielleicht sollten wir besser die plakativen Termini δοιδός und δραψωδός vermeiden, die Čolaković in provokativer Absicht aufgegriffen und umgedeutet hat. Ich glaube, es gibt in jeder mündlichen Tradition einen fliessenden Übergang zwischen traditionellen, wenig kreativen, repetitiven Sängern auf der einen Seite, und kreativen Sängern auf der anderen Seite, die innerhalb der Tradition verbleiben und trotzdem innovativ und individuell sind (und damit dazu beitragen, die Tradition als Ganzes weiter zu entwickeln). Der Begriff der ‘transcendental quality’ eines Sängers kann immer nur als eine relative Bestimmung im Vergleich zu seinen zeitgenössischen Kollegen und Konkurrenten verwendet werden. Međedović ist innovativ: Das kann man dort feststellen, wo Parry zwei Versionen eines Liedes aufgenommen hat und Međedović in der späteren Version Korrekturen und Verbesserungen an der Handlungsstruktur vornimmt.

Chr. Tsagalis : One rather minor point concerning your concluding remark about *Il.* 3.151 f. The word γήραξ in *Il.* 3.150 may be also ‘playing’ with the meaning of γῆρας ‘dry skin’ which the cicada (as well as other animals) used to cast away together with old age (Arist. *HA* 5,17, 549 b 26; 8,17, 600 b 20 ff.; Thphr. Fr. 177).

G. Danek : Diese Annahme stützt meine Vermutung einer Anspielung auf den Tithonos-Mythos sehr gut!

M. Fusillo : Ich hätte eine Frage über Apollonios von Rhodos. Die Apollonios-Forschung hat immer betont, dass die

Gleichnisse in den *Argonautica* im Gegensatz zu Homer eine engere Beziehung mit dem erzählerischen Zusammenhang haben. Von diesem Vortrag bekommt man ein ganz anderes, sehr nuanciertes Bild der homerischen Gleichnisse. Kann man aus dieser Perspektive behaupten, dass Apollonios nicht Homer verbessern, sondern nur seine Technik entwickeln und explizit machen will?

G. Danek : Ja, man hat oft geglaubt, dass Apollonios davon ausging, dass die Gleichnisse bei Homer nur in einem Vergleichspunkt mit der Handlung verbunden sind, und dass er Homer in dieser Beziehung kritisieren und korrigieren wollte. Dieser Standpunkt wurde zweifellos in der alexandrinischen Homerforschung vertreten (Aristarch); ich neige aber auch zur Ansicht, dass Apollonios seinen Dichter-Kollegen Homer besser verstanden hat und die Tendenzen, die er schon bei Homer erkannte, weiter entwickeln wollte.

M. Fantuzzi : The example of Apoll.Rhod. 3.409 ff. seems to me something more than a mere reuse of the simile in Homer, *Il.* 13.701 ff., and maybe ought to deserve a specific, separate analysis.

This passage is in my opinion an anticipation of the crucial features of Jason's *aristeia* which is described later in the third book, and of the poetics of Apollonius' description. Indeed this *aristeia* is the most 'miraculous' and extraordinary event narrated in the *Argonautica*, and certainly the most unprecedented in Homeric terms (Jason's antagonists are not other heroes, but monstrous bulls and "men born from the earth", generated by the dragon's teeth which Jason himself has 'sowed', and his weapons too are put to novel uses: the helmet serves first of all as a bowl for the dragon's teeth, and then as a drinking vessel, and in the clash with the "men born from the earth" it is never even mentioned; Jason's spear is used as a goad for the bulls). Therefore I think that also Apoll.Rhod. 3.409 ff. should be interpreted in the light of the large number of similes in this sec-

tion of the poem, which are often clearly indebted to the Homeric model, and are mainly intended to create a strong impression of the 'already-heard', by exploiting the similarity between the often rustic character of the martial similes in Homer and the quasi-rustic elements that characterise Jason's deeds. In both cases, Homeric allusions become in Apollonius a guide to our understanding of the far-from-Homeric feat which Jason performs. Jason's extraordinary exploits, whose substance would fit neither into Homeric narrative patterns nor the Homeric lexicon, thus become a sort of 'familiar' events, based on a repertory of, mostly agricultural, images drawn from the similes with which Homer had amplified his battle-narratives (I will take the liberty of referring to M. Fantuzzi & R. Hunter, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* [Cambridge 2004], chapter 6.4).

The case of Apoll.Rhod. 3.409 ff. / Homer, *Il.* 13, 701 ff. is in my opinion proleptical and especially emblematic of such a narrative integration of the rustic similes of Homer, as it is not even a simile any longer, but turns out to be the most complete integration of the ex-simile ex-Homeric image — the oxen are not a secondary comparatum, as in Homer, but the real, primary protagonists of Apollonius' narration.

A. Rengakos : Was bedeutet die Technik der Querbezüge zwischen den Gleichnissen, die im Grunde dieselbe Technik wie die "Fernbeziehungen" (Schadewaldt, Reichel) auf der Handlungsebene ist, für das Problem Mündlichkeit / Schriftlichkeit?

G. Danek : Ich sehe in dieser Technik der Grob- und Feinstrukturierung der Erzählung ein deutliches Indiz für den hohen Grad an Entwicklung, Präzisierung und Fixierung des Textes der *Ilias* durch den Sänger-Dichter Homer. Dieser Prozess findet jedoch nach meiner Überzeugung im Kopf des Sängers statt, durch Jahrzehntelanges Konstruieren, Reflektieren, Memorieren und Performieren der Textgestalt. Die schriftliche Fixierung hat vor allem dazu geführt, dass diese perfekte Endversion letztlich aber doch in einer Momentaufnahme konser-

viert wurde (für den Dichter selbst, vor allem aber für seine Nachfolger).

E.J. Bakker : I wonder whether besides the two levels you distinguish ("Gleichnistypus" and "Querbeziehung") it would be useful to distinguish a third type or level: similes that do not only 'talk' to other similes, but that tell something important about the themes of the work/tradition as a whole. And would that type, if you accept its validity, not be more common in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*?

G. Danek : Es ist schwierig, eine solche Meta-Kategorie exakt zu bestimmen. Das von mir zuletzt behandelte Gleichnis-Paar der *Odyssee* kommentiert nach meiner Interpretation jedenfalls auch die Erzählstruktur der *Odyssee*: Das Gleichnis von *Od.* 12, unmittelbar vor dem Ende der *Apologoi*, verweist thematisch auf die Welt des Odysseus ausserhalb der Irrfahrten, in der zivilen Welt; das Gleichnis von *Od.* 13, unmittelbar nach dem Ende der *Apologoi*, führt thematisch zurück in den Bereich der Irrfahrten. Die strukturelle Mitte der *Odyssee* wird damit deutlich markiert.

P. Chuvin : Vous avez dit "erlaubten sich sowohl Medđedović wie auch Homer Abweichungen von der Tradition". Ne pensez-vous pas qu'Homère est en un sens moins 'déviant' de la tradition qu'extérieur à celle-ci? Il raconte seulement quelques jours d'une très longue guerre et, dans ceux-ci, deux événements qui ne sont pas décisifs, la mort de Patrocle et celle d'Hector, deux héros qui ont peu de légende en dehors de l'*Iliade*, par contraste avec d'autres. Comme Kullmann l'a montré dans *Die Quellen der Ilias*, Homère a emprunté des schémas précis à la tradition et les a réutilisés dans son poème, plus qu'il n'a modifié celle-ci. On pourrait dire, de même, pour les aventures d'Ulysse telles qu'elles sont racontées dans les *apologoi*, qu'elles sont extérieures aux autres *nostoi*: jamais Ulysse ne croise un autre des chefs de la Guerre de Troie. Tout ceci (par

exemple, l'élaboration du duel entre Ajax et Hector) ne suppose-t-il pas une composition écrite et non pas reposant seulement sur la mémoire?

G. Danek: Nein, ich glaube nicht, dass Homer ausserhalb seiner Tradition steht, sondern dass er seine Tradition aussergewöhnlich selbstständig verwendet, um sein eigenes poetisches Ziel zu erreichen. Die Methode, anhand einer kleinen, für sich wenig bedeutsamen Episode den Kosmos eines gesamten traditionellen Mythos-Bereichs paradigmatisch darzustellen und damit diese Tradition zu repräsentieren oder gar zu ersetzen — diese Methode kann ich zumindest im Ansatz auch bei Međedović erkennen. Und wie Čolaković zeigt, wurde Međedović deshalb von seinen Kollegen als 'Lügner' bezeichnet.

III
CHRISTOS C. TSAGALIS

POET AND AUDIENCE:
FROM HOMER TO HESIOD

The influence Homeric epic has exercised on its Hesiodic counterpart has been at the focus of scholarly research for a number of years. The majority of Hellenists have zoomed their scientific lens on the treatment of myth,¹ the language, style and motifs employed in Homer and Hesiod. This contribution to the ongoing dialogue concerning the relationship of the two oldest Greek epic traditions aims otherwise. I will set out to explore the way the Homeric and Hesiodic epic traditions deal with matters of poetics, such as poet and audience. By studying how these two traditions deal with themselves, namely what they consider themselves to be, we may be able to arrive at a reappraisal of their relationship. Rigid genre classification tends to screen out the evolutionary process of dealing with generic conventions,² which may be altered by the poet or the tradition³ (for those who side with hard-core oralists) in order to create a special effect on the audience. To this end, I will try to show that by studying the representations of poet and audience in the Hes-

¹ For a recent reappraisal of 'Hesiodic' mythology with special emphasis on the *WD*, see W. BLÜMER, *Interpretation archaischer Dichtung. Die mythologischen Partien der Erga Hesiodeis I-II* (Münster 2001).

² On the 'genre' of didactic poetry and Hesiod as its initiator, see F. MONTANARI, *Introduzione a Omero, con un'appendice su Esiodo* (Firenze 1990), 135-137.

³ For a detailed presentation of questions dealing with the Hesiodic tradition from the point of view of oral theory, see R. LAMBERTON, *Hesiod* (New Haven and London 1988), 1-37.

iodic tradition and by comparing them to its Homeric predecessor, one is able to re-determine their relation and arrive at a better understanding of generic limits, especially if genre-cohesion does not exclude shifts from a traditional model but must be rather seen as a more fluid framework.

1. *The Poet*

I will, therefore, first study the representation of the poet in the Homeric and Hesiodic epic traditions by focusing my interest on the following three aspects: (a) the proems, (b) what the science of narratology calls “commentary”, i.e. “speech acts that go beyond narrating, describing, or identifying”⁴ and which strongly suggest the implied author’s own persona”,⁵ and (c) common metaphors used for the poet and his craft.

1.1 *The Proems: Beginning a song, introducing a song-tradition*

The presence of the Muses in the proem of the *Theogony* is of crucial importance for understanding the aims of Hesiodic poetry. Addressing the Muse is, needless to say, a typologically established song-beginning pattern, bearing the trademark of the two Homeric epics.⁶ A closer look, though, shows that the

⁴ See S. CHATMAN, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structures in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, NY 1978), 228.

⁵ K. STODDARD, *The Narrative Voice in the Theogony of Hesiod* (Leiden-Boston 2004), 162.

⁶ For the proem of the *Iliad*, see J. GRIFFIN, *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford 1980), 118 ff.; G.S. KIRK, *The Iliad. A Commentary* (Cambridge 1985), 51-53; J. LATAZ, *Homer. Der erste Dichter des Abendlands* (München-Zürich 3¹⁹⁹⁷ [1985]), 98-104; Homers Ilias. *Gesamtkommentar I.1.2* (München-Leipzig 2000), 11-23. For the proem of the *Odyssey*, see: S.E. BASSETT, “The Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*”, in *AJPh* 44 (1923), 339-348; A. VAN GRONINGEN, “The Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*”, in *Meded. Koninkl. Ned. Akad. van Wetensch. Afd. Letterkunde N.R. 9.8* (1946), 279-294; K. RÜTER, *Odysseeinterpretationen. Untersuchungen zum ersten Buch und zur Phaiakis* (Göttingen 1969), 28-52; Δ.Ν. ΜΑΡΩΝΙΤΗΣ, ‘Αναζήτηση και νόστος τοῦ Ὀδυσσέα. Ἡ διαλεκτικὴ τῆς Ὀδύσσειας’ (Αθήνα 6¹⁹⁷¹), 73-91; J.S. CLAY, “The Beginning of the *Odyssey*”, in *AJPh* 97 (1976), 313-326; A. LENZ, *Das Proem des frühen griechischen Epos. Ein Beitrag zum*

invocation of the Muses in the proems of the two major Hesiodic epics is much more systematically and thoroughly pursued. Whereas the Iliadic and Odyssean proems restrict themselves to one (*Il.* 1.1: θεά) and two (*Od.* 1.1: Μοῦσα, 1.10: θεά) references to the Muse respectively, the proems of the *Theogony* and of the *WD* develop these invocations, the former into a divine epiphany, the latter into a systematic hymnic invocation.

In the *Theogony* proem (1-115), the Muses who inhabit mount Helicon are presented as dancing around a spring and the altar of Zeus (3-4). Their carefully described localization is at odds with their vague invocation in the Iliadic and Odyssean proems. The plural ἀρχώμεθ' (*Th.* 1: Μουσάων Ἐλικωνιάδων ἀρχώμεθ' ἀείδειν), which is opposed to the present ἀρχομαι employed in the proem of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*⁷ (as well as in the proem of 7 of the shorter Homeric Hymns),⁸ should not be regarded as grammatical trivia. In *Iliad* 2.485-486: ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἔστε, πάρεστέ τε, ἵστε τε πάντα, | ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν, οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν, and in *Odyssey* 1.10: τῶν ἀμόθεν γε, θεά, θύγατερ Διός, εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν, where poet and

poetischen Selbstverständnis (Bonn 1980), 49-64; J.S. CLAY, *The Wrath of Athena. Gods and Men in the Odyssey* (Princeton 1983), 9-53; G.E. DIMOCK, *The Unity of the Odyssey* (Princeton 1989), 5-12; A. FORD, *Homer. The Poetry of the Past* (Ithaca-London 1992), 18-31; V. PEDRICK, "The Muse Corrects: The Opening of the *Odyssey*", in *YCS* 29 (1992), 39-62; T.R. WALSH, "Odyssey 1.6-9: a Little more than Kine", in *Mnemosyne* 48 (1995), 392-403; P. PUCCI, *The Song of the Sirens. Essays on Homer* (Lanham-Boulder-New York-Oxford 1998), 11-29; I.J.F. DE JONG, *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey* (Cambridge 2001), 5-8; C.C. TSAGALIS, "Detextualizing Homer: Intonation Units, Background Knowledge, and the Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*", in *EEAth* 36 (2004-2005), 281-291.

⁷ *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 2.1: Δήμητρ' ἡύκομον σεμνὴν θεὸν ἄρχοι' δείδειν.

⁸ *Homeric Hymn to Athena*, 11.1: Παλλάδ' Ἀθηναίην ἐρυσίπτοιν ἄρχοι' ἀείδειν — *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 13.1: Δήμητρ' ἡύκομον σεμνὴν θεὸν ἄρχοι' ἀείδειν — *Homeric Hymn to Asclepius*, 16.1: Ἰητῆρα νόσων Ἀσκληπιὸν ἄρχοι' ἀείδειν — *Homeric Hymn to Poseidon*, 22.1: Αὔρι Ποσειδάωνα, μέγαν θεόν, ἄρχοι' ἀείδειν — *Homeric Hymn to the Muses and Apollo*, 25.1: Μουσάων ἄρχωμαι Ἀπόλλωνός τε Διός τε — *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*, 26.1: Κισσοκόμηην Διόνυσον ἐρίβρομον ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν — *Homeric Hymn to Athena*, 28.1: Παλλάδ' Ἀθηναίην, κυδρὴν θεόν, ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν.

audience seem to converge at the end of the proem, the poetic voice employs the plural 'we' in contrast to the plural 'you'. In the aforementioned examples from the Homeric epics the plural highlights the antithesis between human inability and divine omniscience in respect of poetics. Conversely, in Hesiod the plural ἀρχώμεθ'(α) aims at enlarging the proem's scope by including both poet and Muses, who initially shared a tutor-student relation. Hesiodic song will be verbalized by a common voice, the voice of the inspired poet who, having received the gift of song from the Muses, is able to sing *with* them and *through* them. Thus, the plural ἀρχώμεθ'(α), prepares the ground for a meticulous description of the process of poet-Muse convergence through the presentation of their meeting in mount Helicon and the ensuing *Dichterweihe*. Under this light, the plural ἀρχώμεθ'(α) acquires a secondary, figurative meaning, which becomes all the more important within the framework of a poem like the *Theogony* that is especially concerned with the first beginnings of the world. In this way, the Hesiodic tradition emphatically deviates from its Homeric counterpart, not only in respect of the poet-Muse relation but also in determining the song's starting point. By making within the framework of song the beginning of the *Theogony* coincide with the beginnings of the world this epic describes, the Hesiodic tradition makes a profound statement that distinguishes it from its Homeric rival, since neither the *Iliad* nor the *Odyssey* take up the story *ab ovo*.

The choice of Helicon for the shepherd's initiation into poetry is indicative of the poetic targeting of the theogonic proem. The non-Olympian localization of the Muses aims at highlighting their distinction from the well-known Olympian Muses of Homeric song. The epithet Ὀλυμπιάδες will be later on employed in the *Theogony* (25, 52) but only in retrospect, within the analeptic reference to the shepherd's poetic initiation. The first verse of the *Theogony* is verbalized by the united voice of poet and Muses, who acquired their new identity and are called Heliconian, just as the unknown shepherd has become

Hesiod, 'the one who utters or emits song'.⁹ Under this light, Helicon is not a simple geographical location but a term of Hesiodic poetic topography, the birthplace of the Hesiodic tradition, which needs its own Muses for its own special kind of epic song.

The ensuing activity of the Muses is divided into two songs, one pre- (2-21) and the other post-initiatory (36-52). This distinction is narratively underscored by the timelessness of the first song and the temporal aspect of the second.¹⁰ Whereas the first song is void of temporal references, the second one is replete with temporal markers placed at marked positions within the hexameter line (45: ἐξ ἀρχῆς ..., 46: οἱ τ' ἐκ τῶν ἐγένοντο ..., 47: δεύτερον αὗτε ..., 48: [ἀρχόμεναι θ' ... λήγουσαι τ' ...], 50: αὗτις). The narrative fissure between the two songs is further effectuated by the cryptic formula about "the oak and the rock". The question-shaped form of this stereotypical expression paves the way for the temporalization of the second song, which is made possible only *after* and *because* of the divine epiphany of the Muses and the *Dichterweihe*. The words of the Muses are presented as secondary focalization embedded in direct speech. This choice increases their special weight as it makes possible the presentation of the poetic initiation not only from the primary narrator's point of view in indirect discourse (30-34) but also from that of the Muses in direct speech (26-28). In a nutshell, on the one hand the theogonic proem deliberately encapsulates the derogatory comments of the Muses against the shepherds, whereas it downplays on the other their positive advice concerning the poetic inspiration of the initiated shepherd. The relevant passage reads as follows (*Th.* 24-29):

τόνδε δέ με πρώτιστα θεαὶ πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπον,
Μοῦσαι Ὄλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοι·
“ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ’ ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶνον,
ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν δμοῖα,

⁹ See G. NAGY, *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Ithaca and London 1990), 47. On insightful criticism of the use and abuse of the Hesiodic landscape as 'historical' reality by the so-called 'biographists', see LAMBERTON 1988, 27-37.

¹⁰ See STODDARD 2004, 131-133.

ἴδμεν δ' εὗτ' ἐθέλωμεν ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι.”
Ἄς ἔφασαν κοῦραι μεγάλου Διὸς ἀρτιέπειαι.

The repetitive (25 & 29) reference to the divine identity of the Muses and the underscoring of their origin from Zeus, emphatically placed in the speech introduction and closure, frame their speech and acquire their full semantical potential only when compared with the three-colon address to the shepherds (*ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ’ ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον*). The plural used to designate both the Muses, who are considered to be a unified, single group of divinities, and the shepherds, the derogatory tone of the Muses’ speech that levels all differences between humans and the animals they look after by attributing to them characteristics of these animals (26: *γαστέρες οἶον*), and last but not least the antithesis between the *ἔτυμα* (27) and the *ἀληθέα* (28), clearly show that the Hesiodic tradition aims at making the distinction between gods and men the main motif of the *Dichterweihe*. This last observation is crucial for the poetics of the *Theogony* as illustrated in the programmatic proem of this epic. The terms *ἔτυμα* and *ἀληθέα* designate human and divine truth respectively, i.e. they refer to two different forms of truth, human truth (*ἔτυμα*), which depends on limited knowledge of physical reality, and divine truth (*ἀληθέα*), which is completely independent from any physical constraints.¹¹ The aforementioned distinction is very different from that between truth and lies in the *Odyssey*, since it introduces into the language of the *Theogony* a sort of relativism, since human truth (*ἔτυμα*) is presented as something unstable, changing and, therefore, as a form of falsehood.

¹¹ The term *ἔτυμα* is related to the verb ‘to be’ and, therefore, indicates ‘real’ things, i.e. things perceived as real by humans, whereas *ἀληθέα* designate things, which are deprived of the element of oblivion (*λήθη*) and stretch beyond human knowledge. The Muses are capable not only of saying many lies which are similar to human truth (*ἔτυμα*) but also of uttering, in the form of authority-conferring religious language (*γηρύσασθαι*), eternal truth transcending human knowledge, a form of truth immune to deception. For *ἔτυμα* and *ἀληθέα*, see L.H. PRATT, *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar. Falsehood and Deception in Archaic Greek Poetics* (Ann Arbor 1993), 95-113.

This distinction is reinforced by the use of different verbal forms in respect to ἔτυμα and ἀληθέα. The verb λέγειν, which is used with ἔτυμα, simply refers to the utterance of speech, not to its evaluation, as is the case with the infinitive γηρύσασθαι that belongs to religious language, which is, by definition, authoritative. In this post-Promethean world, divine speech is often an unsolvable riddle, a semantical conundrum whose content humans will always struggle to decypher. Thus, verse 27 (ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν δμοῖα) despite its dictional similarities with *Od.* 19.203 (ἴσκε ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοισιν δμοῖα), where the external narrator reminds his audience that Odysseus is capable of employing false or fictional stories (his famous *Trugrede*) to achieve his goal, follows a different orbit from its Homeric counterpart. Keeping its distance from the absolute distinction between truth and falsehood the *Odyssey* is so fond of, the speech of the Muses indicates that the language of the *Theogony* will indeed be a jigsaw puzzle deliberately hard to solve.¹²

It is within this interpretive framework that we must place the aorist tenses devoted to the *Dichterweihe*, which are attested in verses 22-33. The Hesiodic tradition amply uses the aorist, a pseudo-past tense, in order to point to the performance *per se* of the *Theogony*. Drawing on the powerful insights of Bakker,¹³ who

¹² See PRATT 1993, 110-111, who rightly observes that the slippery and evasive language of the Muses is a riddle the initiated poet needs to solve. The language of the Hesiodic Muses reflects the dual nature of poetic speech, whose enchantment is based on the blurring of truth and fiction. See P. PUCCI, *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry* (Baltimore and London 1977), 8-16. On the meaning of ἔτυμος, see T. KRISCHER, "ΕΤΥΜΟΣ und ΑΛΗΘΗΣ", in *Philologus* 109 (1965), 161-173; H. HOMMEL, "Wahrheit und Gerechtigkeit. Zur Geschichte und Deutung eines Begriffspaares", in *Antike und Abendland* 15 (1969), 159-186; J.S. CLAY, *Hesiod's Cosmos* (Cambridge 2003), 60-61, 78.

¹³ See E.J. BAKKER, "Storytelling in the Future: Truth, Time and Tense in Homeric Epic", in *Written Voices, Spoken Signs. Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text*, ed. by E.J. BAKKER & A. KAHANE (Cambridge, Mass.-London 1997), 11-36; "Pointing to the Past: Verbal Augment and Temporal Deixis in Homer", in *Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*, ed. by J.N. KAZAZIS and A. RENGAKOS (Stuttgart 1999), 50-65; "Similes, Aug-

has shown that the augment was not a temporal marker but a deictic prefix designating the act described by the verb in respect of place, I would like to argue that these aorists are a sophisticated mechanism of creating vividness (*ἐνάργεια*), the very means epic poetry amply uses to present past events, as if they are actually happening in front of the audience's eyes, at the moment the bard is singing his song. The alternation between unaugmented and augmented past tenses in Homeric poetry is reflected in their distribution in speeches and main narrative. If we extend these observations to Hesiodic poetry and in particular to the proem of the *Theogony*, we can plausibly argue that the aorists of the *Dichterweihe* do not simply underline the Muses' subjugation to human temporality, but function as a means of asserting that the *Theogony* is the par excellence reenactment of this divine epiphany. Under this light, the very utterance of this particular theogonic song acquires an almost ritual-cultic status: the Hesiodic *Theogony* reenacts through its very performance the divine epiphany of the Muses, which is conjured up from poetic memory and is 'reiterated' in place and time, during the *hic et nunc* of the performance, in front of a real audience.

The poetic effect of this process is noteworthy. Handling time becomes the poetic metalanguage of the *Theogony* in order to 'translate' divine timelessness or extra-timeness into a linear sequence of genealogies that is about to begin. The transformation of divine a-temporality into human time, which progresses in a vertical manner, is facilitated by the use of catalogues organized according to the model of genealogies, with which the audience would be familiar enough.

The proem of the *WD* is much shorter than that of the *Theogony* but its poetological interest is undeniable. Its principle features can be summarized in the following list: two addressees (the Muses, 1-2 and Zeus, 9-10), emphatic reitera-

ment, and the Language of Immediacy", in *Speaking Volumes. Orality and Literacy in the Ancient Greek and Roman World*, ed. by J. WATSON (Leiden 2001), 1-23. See also STODDARD 2004, 135-136.

tion of Zeus' ease to offer justice and punishment, and a remarkably clear declaration of the poetic 'I' as well as of the internal addressee of the epic.

Μοῦσαι Πιερίηθεν, ἀοιδῆσι κλείουσαι,
δεῦτε, Δι' ἐννέπετε σφέτερον πατέρ' ὑμνείουσαι,
ὅν τε διὰ βροτοὶ ἄνδρες ὁμῶς ἄφατοι τε φατοὶ τε
ρήτοι τ' ἄρρητοι τε Διὸς μεγάλοιο ἔκητι.
ἵέα μὲν γάρ βριάει, ἕέα δὲ βριάοντα χαλέπτει,
ἵεια δ' ἀρίζηλον μινύθει καὶ ἄδηλον ἀέξει,
ἵεια δέ τ' ίθύνει σκολιὸν καὶ ἀγήνορα κάρφει
Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης ὃς ὑπέρτατα δώματα ναίει.
κλῦθι ἴδων ἀιών τε, δίκη δ' ίθυνε θέμιστας
τύνη· ἔγώ δέ κε Πέρση ἐτήτυμα μυθησαίμην.

These features show that the role of the narrator will be very different from that of the *Theogony*. The speaking voice in the *WD* is an internal narrator, one who will participate in the epic's plot and will relate 'in his own name' events directly linked to him. I will return to this characteristic of the *WD*, which permeates the entire poem and finds numerous manifestations in the 'I-you' interaction, in the apostrophes to the narratee, in the second person verbal forms and in the stark imperatives employed throughout this epic. The proem of the *WD*, despite its limited length, is programmatic in respect to the role both of the speaking 'I' and of his internal audience in the poem. Diverging not only from the *Theogony*, where the speaking voice disappears after the lengthy proem but also from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, where the 'I' of the narrator is almost covert as it is just mentioned by the datives of the personal pronoun, the proem of the *WD* inaugurates a poem characterized by the bold step towards the creation of an internal narrator.

1.2 'Commentary'

By 'commentary', I designate "speech acts that go beyond narrating, describing, or identifying"¹⁴ and "strongly suggest the

¹⁴ CHATMAN 1978, 228.

implied author's own persona".¹⁵ These speech acts take the form of direct comments offered by the narrator, who is constantly commenting on his own narrative.¹⁶ Stoddard has recently argued that the narrator of the *Theogony* employs 'commentary' both on the level of the 'story' and on the level of the 'discourse'¹⁷ in order to allude to his own persona.¹⁸ When commenting on the 'story', the narrator pauses only to offer his own view about his text, by engaging himself in explaining, judging, or interpreting his own words. When commenting on the 'discourse', the narrator freely indulges in making "explicit reference to his activity as narrator".¹⁹ Let us first deal with 'commentary' concerning the *story*.

One form of 'commentary', happily coined 'explanatory',²⁰ is used in order to supply the audience with information that the narrator has acquired through his divine inspiration by the Muses. Such are the cases of name-etymologizing, which is based on knowledge that the poet could otherwise not have possibly possessed. The audience would, at all probability, comprehend that this etymologizing obsession is a hint offered by the narrator, as textual representative of the poet, showing that he has been divinely inspired, that he is no longer the ignorant shepherd in Helicon but the omniscient mouthpiece of the Muses. At the same time, etymologies of proper names help the narrator disclose the poetic persona hidding behind him. Etymologizing²¹ *per se* confirms a process of name-memorization, posi-

¹⁵ STODDARD 2004, 162.

¹⁶ See R. NÜNLIST, "Hesiod", in *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, ed. by I.J.F. DE JONG, R. NÜNLIST & A. BOWIE, Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative I (Leiden-Boston 2004), 25-34 [29].

¹⁷ S. RICHARDSON, *The Homeric Narrator* (Nashville, Tenn. 1990), 140.

¹⁸ STODDARD 2004, 162.

¹⁹ STODDARD 2004, 163.

²⁰ RICHARDSON 1990, 141-143.

²¹ On etymologizing in Hesiod, see K.VON FRITZ, "Das Hesiodische in den Werken Hesiods", in *Hésiode et son influence*, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 7 (Vandoeuvres-Genève 1962), 53-58. The impressive density of etymologies attested in Hesiod cannot, in my opinion, be explained either through his desire to disclose some hidden reality concerning the nature of the

tively evaluating catalogs and lists. In oral composition in front of a real-time audience, names do not simply function as in a written text. By recalling creatures of the past or summoning creatures of a non-human time and place in present time and place, the narrator makes them tangible realities at the very moment of the performance of his song. Under this scope, etymologizing reinforces their existence in the present of the performance. The singer shows to his audience that 'his' theogonic version of the creation of the divine world is the most authoritative, since it does not simply refer to some gods or semi-divine creatures but revives through language integral parts of their existence or shape. When the audience hears that the Cyclopes had acquired their name because of a huge, round eye in their forehead (*Th.* 144–145: Κύκλωπες δ' ὄνομ' ἡσαν ἐπώνυμον, οὕνεκ' ἄρα σφεων / κυκλοτερής ὀφθαλμὸς ἔεις ἐνέκειτο μετώπῳ), we can plausibly argue that the singer is showing to his listeners not only his ability to refer to the Cyclopes, but also that he is aware of the unbreakable link between language and meaning, since the name Cyclops is a dictional icon of an anatomic characteristic of the Cyclopes, their round eye. Needless to say, the mental image of a huge giant with a round eye in the forehead would easily come to the audience's mind, who would appreciate the singer's ability to make them visualize the content of his narrative.

Another form of 'commentary' is the so-called 'judgement' or 'critical commentary'.²² In this case, the narrator is not addressing directly his audience but employs evaluative language expressing his view or opinion about a character of the 'story'. These narrative tactics are common in the Homeric epics, taking the form of epithets modifying a character of the plot. In the *Odyssey* proem, the evaluative term *nepioi* (1.8: νήπιοι) may

gods or by his interest in newly invented deities. Etymologizing has to be examined within a performance-based framework, i.e. as an authority-conferring process for the singer.

²² RICHARDSON 1990, 158; STODDARD 2004, 167.

be considered an early case of 'critical commentary', which functions like a narrative hybrid, as it is later on constantly employed throughout the entire epic. In Hesiodic epic, the function of critical comments of this sort is twofold: first, it is a gesture on the part of the narrator towards his audience, as he allows himself to intrude in the 'story' and influence their judgement, and secondly, it is a sophisticated authority-conferring means to Hesiodic song. By fostering a technique of 'critical commentary' established by Homeric epic, Hesiodic tradition exploits at full length the status of its famous predecessor and makes its own identity recognizable through the usurpation of status-conferring narrative tactics. The 'neutral' name-listing and catalogue-offering is interrupted by the intrusion of a personal voice, as in the following example from the *Theogony* (950-955):

"Ηβην δ' Ἀλκμήνης καλλισφύρου ἄλκιμος νίός,
ἰς Ἡρακλῆος, τελέσας στονόεντας ἀέθλους,
παιδία Διὸς μεγάλοιο καὶ Ἡρῆς χρυσοπεδίλου,
αἰδοίην θέτ' ἄκοιτιν ἐν Οὐλύμπῳ νιφέντι·
ὅλβιος, δις μέγα ἔργον ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνύσσας
νάει ἀπήμαντος καὶ ἀγήραος ἥματα πάντα.

The mythological item "Hbη in the divine catalogue of the *Theogony* is organized, as other mythological items of the same or equivalent content, on the basis of the marriage of this 'lemmatized' goddess with Heracles, son of Zeus and Alcmene. The narrator exploits the occasion offered by such a famous hero as Heracles, a symbol of the world of humans in the *Theogony*, whose special role in the poem the audience is well aware of due to the narrative digressions concerning the descendants of Keto and the excursus on Prometheus. By embedding a personal comment in the item "Hbη, which stands outside the limits of the plot, the Hesiodic tradition lets its audience infer that 'this tradition' has absolute control of the mythical variants it avails itself of, that what seems a *prima facie* mythological companion in verse bears the lasting imprint of a carefully planned and scrupulously executed personal selection. By using the epithet ὅλβιος, the Hesiodic song 'looks in perspective at' the

mythological material it lemmatises, it actually views it backwards, from the future, which, needless to say, is possible only for the external narrator, the textual representative of the poet. Should we examine the 'lemmata' or items devoted to divinities in this part of the *Theogony*, we will notice that only in this 'lemma' the focus, as it can be inferred from the deification process, is not on a female figure, but on a male character. The special emphasis laid on Heracles (further underscored not only by the critical comment ὅλβιος but also by the relative expansion ὃς μέγα ἔργον ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνύσσας) triggers a personal comment made by the narrator. This highlighting of Heracles and his privileging by the narrator must be connected with the special weight Heracles has as a mediator between the world of the humans and the world of the immortals, a topic belonging to the thematic kernel of the *Theogony*. By interrupting the monotonous sequence of lemmatised figures with the insertion of a critical comment, the Hesiodic song leaves its trademark on its proposed theogonic version. Placed at the end of the epic, the Heracles comment allows the Hesiodic tradition to make its presence strongly felt.

Another form of commentary may be called 'interpretive'.²³ It consists of remarks the narrator makes, aiming at convincing his audience to adopt his hermeneutical stance. According to Stoddard,²⁴ the passage devoted to the myth of Typhoeus, followed by a description of the disastrous consequences the winds have for mortal men, is a kind of 'interpretive' commentary, since the narrator attempts to attribute meaning to the present state of things by using mythical material pertaining to an immortal-mortal conflict. In *Theogony* 869-880, the narrator embarks on a description of divine activity and continues by an exposition of its results for both the divine and human worlds. In this way, he assumes the role of a mediator between the divine and human spheres, bringing his audience closer to a

²³ RICHARDSON 1990, 148; STODDARD 2004, 170-176.

²⁴ STODDARD 2004, 171-172.

world that only ‘he’ of all people is able to know, due to the mediation of the Muses. What the Muses have offered to him, he is now offering to his audience.

Narratorial comments on the ‘discourse’ are also attested in the Hesiodic poems. In his list of direct comments offered by the narrator, Nünlist²⁵ mentions statements of ‘eternal truths’, such as maxims and aetiological explanations. Comments of this kind are regularly found in the Homeric epics, but the extent of narratorial interruption is much greater in Hesiod, as can be observed in the following passage (*Th.* 556-557):

ἐκ τοῦ δ' ἀθανάτοισιν ἐπὶ χθονὶ φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων
καίουσ' δοτέα λευκὰ θυηέντων ἐπὶ βωμῶν.

The narrator’s insistence on the continuity of cult practice down to his own and the audience’s time bridges the gap between the remote past of the narrative and the ‘present’ of the performance. By doing so, the Hesiodic narrator not only intrudes in the discourse, but also indirectly asserts his own undisputed command over the entire performance. He implies to his audience that it is his own *Theogony* that explains a reality surrounding them and, therefore, its supremacy is confirmed by this same reality the audience are aware of. In other words, the narrator figuratively ‘allows’ the audience to check the accuracy of his song by connecting it with what is familiar to them.

Like his Homeric counterpart, the Hesiodic narrator marks the end of a narrative section by offering a short summary.²⁶ *Theogony* 362-363 is a typical example:

αὗται ἔρ' Ὡκεανοῦ καὶ Τηθύος ἐξεγένοντο
πρεσβύταται κοῦραι· πολλαῖ γε μέν εἰσι καὶ ἄλλαι.

If we paraphrase the content of these two verses, then the purpose of the summary becomes obvious: ‘These were the oldest daughters born to Oceanos and Tethys; there are, of course,

²⁵ NÜNLIST 2004, 29; STODDARD 2004, 54-55.

²⁶ See also *Th.* 263-264, 362-363, 448-449, 613.

many others'. By marking the end of a section with such a 'selection'- based statement, the narrator indicates to his audience that it is his own decision to include in his list only a limited number of Oceanids. His version is selective, bearing the seal of the tradition he belongs to. Summarizing comments of this kind are also known from Homer. At the end of the Catalogue of Ships, by far the longest catalogue in Homeric epic, the narrator marks its closure with the following verse (*Il.* 2.760): οὐτοι ἄρ' ἡγεμόνες Δακαῶν καὶ κοίρανοι ἥσαν. The same is the case with statements indicating that the narrator has offered only a selection from a much longer list. At the end of the Catalogue of Nereids in *Il.* 18.49, the audience is informed by the narrator that 'there also were other Nereids at the bottom of the sea', but the narrator refrains from mentioning nominativi: ἀλλαί θ' αἱ κατὰ βένθος ἄλδος Νηρηγῆδες ἥσαν.²⁷

One last category of 'commentary' on the level of 'discourse' occurs when the narrator makes direct references to the very act of poetic composition and performance of his song. A *locus communis* is *Th.* 369-370:

τῶν δύνομ' ἀργαλέον πάντων βροτὸν ἄνδρα ἐνισπεῖν,
οἱ δὲ ἔκαστοι ἵσασιν, δσοι περιναιετάουσι.

In these two verses, the narrator makes his presence strongly felt. His inability to recall all the names of the rivers constitutes a typologically established technique of epic poetry, whose Homeric echoes are easily discernible (*Il.* 2.489-490: οὐδ' εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ' εἰεν, / φωνὴ δ' ἀρρητος, χάλκεον δέ μοι ἤτορ ἐνείη). This narrative technique does not only aim at an implicit recognition of the importance of the Muses' gift but also at evaluating the act of narrative itself.²⁸

²⁷ I have deliberately excluded from my study introductory statements because they are all attested in the *WD*, where there is an internal narrator, 'Hesiod', who according to my non-autobiographical reading of the Hesiodic poems is distinct from the poet or the tradition he represents.

²⁸ NÜNLIST 2004, 29.

The above examination of several categories of ‘commentary’ both on the level of the ‘story’ and on the level of ‘discourse’ shows that the Hesiodic narrator, with greater intensity and, sometimes, different focus, avails himself of narrative techniques Homeric epic occasionally employs. These techniques are perhaps more crucial to the *Theogony* than to the Homeric poems. This is due to the fact that the *Theogony* is practically deprived of an internal audience in the form of narratee or narratees. One needs only to bring in mind the multiple internal audiences the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* dispose of to comprehend the difference. Lack of narratees necessarily robs the *Theogony* of alternate means through which the Homeric narrator makes his presence felt: presentation through negation (*Th.* 488, 529, 687) is less frequent than in Homer, an ‘if-not situation’ occurs only once (*Th.* 836-838), temporal anachronies are basically excluded because of the strictly genealogical and chronological blueprint the *Theogony* follows.²⁹ Despite all these narrative deficiencies, the Hesiodic tradition has taken great pains to build upon a solid genealogical scaffolding an epic composition of considerable merit.

1.3 Common metaphors for poet and poetry: the poet as farmer and seafarer³⁰

One of the most noteworthy forms of metaphor in epic poetry is the one concerned with the presentation of the poet as a skilled artisan. Scholars, like Schmitt³¹ and Campanile have convincingly shown that this attitude towards poetry reflects, in fact, an old indoeuropean tradition. The poet is a τέκτων ἐπῶν and his activity is equal to that of a professional.

²⁹ See NÜLIST 2004, 28.

³⁰ See X.K. ΤΣΑΓΓΑΛΗΣ, “Ποίηση και ποιητική στο γειτόδειο corpus”, in *Μονοάντι Αρχώμενα: ο Ήσιόδος και η αρχαϊκή επική ποίηση*, ed. by N.Π. ΜΠΕΖΑΝΤΑΚΟΣ & X.K. ΤΣΑΓΓΑΛΗΣ (Αθήνα 2006), 139-255.

³¹ R. SCHMITT, *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden 1967), 295-306; E. CAMPANILE, *Ricerche di cultura poetica indoeuropea* (Pisa 1977), 35-54.

Hesiodic poetry, especially in the *WD*, consistently shows a certain poetological concern, mainly through metaphors concerning two of its core sections, the 'Agriculture' and the 'Nau-tilia'. The 'Agriculture' section (383-617) contains such an extensive network of similarities between the lives of farmer and poet, that certain scholars have suggested a figurative reading of this entire part of the *WD*.³² By presenting the specialized knowledge the farmer possesses as analogous to that of the poet and by connecting the skills of both these craftsmen to Zeus, the guiding principle permeating the entire poem, the Hesiodic tradition is able to introduce itself in stark manner, assimilating the poet to a craftsman whose work is familiar to the audience.

The 'labor and beggary' sub-section (383-404) begins by determining the right season for undertaking farming activities, such as ploughing and harvesting. The initial phrase Πληγάδων Ἀτλαγενέων ἐπιτελλομενάων / ἀρχεσθ' ἀμήτου, ἀρότοιο δὲ δυσο-μενάων (383-384) contains the verb ἀρχομαι and therefore recalls its programmatic use at the proem of the *Theogony* and the proems of the *Homeric Hymns*.³³ The poetological function of ἀρχομαι is guaranteed by its traditional referentiality, its metonymic use in epic poetry. Thus, the 'Agriculture' section begins in the same way as Hesiodic poetry, an observation that plausibly points to the 'farmer-poet' scenario. Moreover, the disappearance of the Pleiads in the sky for a period of fourty days and nights must be interpreted by the means of the Hesiodic poetic metalanguage, as indicating a negative condition the farmer has to endure until he is allowed to begin cultivating the land and living a prosperous life. The appearance of the Pleiads in the sky (*WD* 387: φαίνονται) is expressed in terms analogous

³² New studies have deepened our knowledge of the importance of the 'Agriculture' section for Hesiodic poetry. See D.W. TANDY & W.C. NEALE, *Hesiod's Works and Days. A Translation and Commentary for the Social Sciences* (Berkeley 1996); S. NELSON, *God and the Land. The Metaphysics of Farming in Hesiod and Vergil*, with a translation of Hesiod's *Works and Days* by D. GRENE (New York–Oxford 1998).

³³ See section 1.1.

to the appearance of the Muses in mount Helicon at the moment of Hesiod's *Dichterweihe*. The farmer is advised to plough the land after the rise of the Pleiads in the sky, just as the poet Hesiod begins his song only after the divine epiphany of the Muses in Helicon.

The analogy between farming and poetry is also implied by the expressions οὗτός τοι πεδίων πέλεται νόμος (388) and ἀχρεῖος δ' ἔσται ἐπέων νομός (403).³⁴ Of these two verses the former determines how agriculture is practiced, whereas the latter refers to Perses' 'meadow of words', which will be completely useless when he (Perses) asks for his neighbours' assistance. In other words, Hesiodic tradition sets land cultivation (denoted by the former expression) on the antipods of beggary (delin- eated by the latter). At the same time the semantical and aural interplay, within this limited space of a few verses, between νόμος and νομός 'legitimizes' the metaphorical interpretation of the aforementioned passage. The language of Perses, his ἔπεια, being that of beggary will be rejected both by his brother Hesiod (396-397: ... ἐγώ δέ τοι οὐκ ἐπιδώσω / οὐδ' ἐπιμετρήσω ...) ³⁵ and by his neighbours. Being ἀχρεῖος, the 'meadow of words' Perses is using will not yield any products, whereas the undertaking of agricultural work at the right season (394: ὥρι ἀέξηται), which the internal narrator's voice suggests, will eventually lead to a decent life. Extending this figurative antithesis

³⁴ See *Hesiod. Works and Days*, ed. with Prolegomena and Commentary by M.L. WEST (Oxford 1978), 259, who offers the following parallel passages: *Il.* 20.248-249: στρεπτὴ δὲ γλῶσσ' ἔστι βροτῶν, πολέες δ' ἔνι μῦθοι / παντοῖοι, ἐπέων δὲ πολὺς νομὸς ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα, *Hom. Hymn to Apollo* 3.20-21: πάντη γάρ τοι, Φοῖβε, νομὸς βεβλήσται ὡδῆς, / ἡμὲν ἀν' ἄπειρον πορτιτρόφον ἡδὸνὰ νήσους, *PIND. Nem.* 3.82: χραγέται δὲ κολοιοὶ ταπεινὰ νέμονται, *AESCHYL. Ag.* 685: γλῶσσαν ἐν τύχᾳ νέμων. Agriculture is used as a metaphor for poetry not only in Greek but also in Vedic tradition. See R. NÜNLIST, *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Stuttgart-Leipzig 1998), 135, who refers to ploughing, sowing (*Rigveda* 10.101.3-4) and pasturing (*Rigveda* 1.114.9) as metaphors for the language of poetry.

³⁵ See *WD* 648: δεῖξω δή τοι μέτρα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης & *WD* 694: μέτρα φυλάσσεσθαι.

further, one may plausibly argue that the πεδίων νόμος in the 'Agriculture' section is a trace of the poetological dialect of the *WD* in epic and didactic guise. By inventing a language which befits work instead of beggary, the Hesiodic tradition shows that it is only this poetical dialect that is able to create an analogy between farmer and poet, and is, therefore, entitled to expect, farmer-like, a rich harvest from its own metaphorical meadow of song.³⁶

Another aspect of the analogy between farming and poetry is the meticulous description of making a ploughshare. The insistence of the Hesiodic text on the importance for the farmer of selecting the right material in given quantities is so typical, that it has been interpreted as a 'working' analogy for the process of selecting the right dictional material (words, expressions etc.) by the poet.³⁷

³⁶ Apart from the 'meadow of words', archaic epic employs two other 'agricultural' metaphors for poetic speech, that of καρπός (a) and that of ploughing, sowing or pasturing (b). See NÜNLIST 1998, 135-141 and 214, who offers the following examples: (a) PIND. *Ol.* 7.7-8: καὶ ἐγώ νέκταρ χυτόν, Μοισῆν δόσιν, ἀεθλοφόροις / ἀνδράσιν πέμπων, γλυκὺν καρπὸν φρενός, PIND. *Isthm.* 8.46-46a: ἐπέων δὲ καρπός / οὐ κατέφθινε; (b) PRATINAS, *PMG* 710: οὐ γὰν αὐλακισμέναν / ἄρδην, ἀλλ' ἀσκαφὸν ματεύων, PRATINAS, *PMG* 712a: μήτε σύντονον δίωκε / μήτε τὸν ἀνειμέναν [[Ιαστὶ]] / μοῦσαν, ἀλλὰ τὸν μέσαν / νεῶν ἄρουραν αἰόλυζε τῷ μέλει, *Mel. Adesp.* 923.4: ἀλλοτρίοις δ' οὐ μίγνυται μοῦσαν ἄρούρας, *Mel. Adesp.* 947a (= Simonides?): ἀ Μοῦσα γάρ οὐκ ἀπόρως γενεῖ τὸ παρὸν μόνον ἀλλ' ἐπέρχεται πάντα θεριζόμενα, PIND. *Ol.* 9.25-26: εἰ σύν τινι μοιριδιώπι παλάμα / ἔξαρτετον Χαρίτων νέμομαι κᾶπον, PIND. *Ol.* 11.8-9: τὰ μὲν ἀμετέρα / γλῶσσα ποιμαίνειν ἔθελει, PIND. *Pyth.* 6.1-3: Ἀκούσατ· η γὰρ ἔλικώπιδος Ἀφροδίτας / ἄρουραν ἡ Χαρίτων / ἀναπολίζομεν ..., PIND. *Nem.* 1.13: σπεῖρέ νυν ὀγλαΐαν - τινὰ νάσω ..., PIND. *Nem.* 6.31-33: Βασσάδαισιν ἢ τ' οὐ σπανίζει, παλαίφατος γενεά, / ίδια ναυ- στολέοντες ἐπι-κώμια, Πιερίδων ἀρόταις / δινατοί παρέχειν πολὺν ὕμνον ἀγερώχων ἐργμάτων, PIND. *Nem.* 7.104-105: ταύτα δὲ τρίς τετράκι τ' ἀμποτεῖν / ἀπορίᾳ τελέθει, τέκνοι-σιν ἀτε μαψυλάκας "Διός Κόρινθος", PIND. *Nem.* 8.37-39:... χρυσὸν εὔχον-ται, πεδίον δ' ἔτεροι / ἀπέραντον, ἐγώ δ' ἀστοῖς ἀδών καὶ χθονὶ γυῖα καλύψαι, / αἰνέων αἰνητά, μομφάν δ' ἐπιστείρων ἀλιτροῖς, PIND. *Nem.* 10.25-26: ἐκράτησε δὲ καὶ ποθ' "Ελλα-να στρατὸν Πυθῶνι, τύχῃ τε μολών / καὶ τὸν Ισθμοῖ καὶ Νεμέα στέφανον, Μοί-σαισι τ' ἔδω·" ἀρόσαι.

³⁷ See M.S. MARSILIO, *Farming and Poetry in Hesiod's Works and Days* (London-New York 2000), 15-21.

WD 422-436:

τῆμος ἄρ' ὑλοτομεῖν μεμνημένος, ὥριον ἔργον.
 ὅλμον μὲν τριπόδην τάμνειν, ὕπερον δὲ τρίπηχυ,
 ἀξονα δ' ἐπταπόδην· μάλα γάρ νύ τοι ἄρμενον οὔτω·
 εἰ δέ κεν ὀκταπόδην, ἀπὸ καὶ σφῦράν κε τάμοιο.
 τρισπίθαμον δ' ἄψιν τάμνειν δεκαδώρῳ ἀμάζη·
 πόλλ' ἐπικαμπύλα κᾶλα· φέρειν δὲ γύην ὅτ' ἂν εὕρης
 εἰς οἴκον, κατ' ὄρος διζήμενος ἢ κατ' ἄρουραν,
 πρίνινον· δις γάρ βουσὶν ὀχυρώτατός ἐστιν,
 εὗτ' ἂν Ἀθηναῖς δμωδὸς ἐν ἐλύματι πήξας
 γόμφοισιν πελάσας προσαρήρεται ἴστοβοῆι.
 δοιὰ δὲ θέσθαι ἄροτρα πονησάμενος κατὰ οἴκον,
 αὐτόγυνον καὶ πηκτόν, ἐπεὶ πολὺ λώιον οὔτω·
 εἰς χ' ἔτερον ἀξαις, ἔτερόν κ' ἐπὶ βουσὶ βάλοιο.
 δάφνης ἢ πτελέης ἀκιώτατοι ἴστοβοῆες,
 δρυδὲς <δ> ἔλυμα, πρίνου δὲ γύης ...

The most impressive feature of the above passage is neither knowledge nor accuracy of information but rather the emphasis on the importance of selecting and measuring the proper wood. Marsilio³⁸ has convincingly argued that the poet chooses for himself those mythical versions he is going to employ in his song. Like the farmer who selects the appropriate material in order to make a ploughshare, the singer, having at his disposal a wealth of mythical variants whose authority is undisputed, must select the material that is appropriate to his own song in order to meet the needs of his audience.

The study of Hesiodic language³⁹ has shown that the most ‘innovative’ or ‘neoteristic’ part in the entire Hesiodic corpus are verses 401-600 of the *WD*, which represent a significant part of the ‘Agriculture’ section. In particular, verses 421-430 offer impressive examples of the way Hesiodic poetry reshapes traditional material also attested in Homeric poetry. The words ὅλμον (423), ἐπταπόδην (424), γόμφοισιν (431) are also attested in

³⁸ MARSILIO 2000, 18-19.

³⁹ G.P. EDWARDS, *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context* (Oxford 1971), 30-39; see also MARSILIO 2000, 19.

Homer, where they occupy exactly the same part of the verse.⁴⁰ Edwards has shown that this is the case not only with identical but also with similar words or expressions attested in Homer and Hesiod. A good example is that of the forms ὑλοτόμοι (*Il.* 23.123) and ὑλοτόμους (*Il.* 23.114), which correspond to 'Hesiodic' ὑλοτομεῖν (*WD* 422) and are placed between positions 3-5 in the dactylic hexameter, i.e. they occupy the entire second foot down to the penthemimeral caesura. According to Edwards, Homeric and Hesiodic language place the same or similar dictional forms, more or less, in the same verse-position. These observations are very crucial for the following reason. Despite the fact that the 'Agriculture' section contains subject matter that is not appropriate to the Homeric epics due to thematical restrictions, it nevertheless draws, whenever possible, dictional material attested in Homer and uses it in more or less the same metrical manner. Sometimes, it makes bold new steps deviating from its Homeric counterpart. Verse 427 offers a remarkable example of such differentiation. Γύην and δτ' ἀν are placed in such a way that they ignore Hermann's bridge by creating a trochaic caesura in the fourth foot of the hexameter line. By placing the word γύην in this particular slot, the Hesiodic tradition highlights its use for the narrative to follow. In fact, γύης will become an important thematic element in the ensuing verses.⁴¹

Furthermore, the 'Agriculture' section displays a special interest in creating an analogy between the literal storing of the harvest by the farmer and the metaphorical 'storing' of Hesiod's advice in Perses' mind. This analogy is exemplified by the use of the following terms:

(a) the verb φράζεσθαι is employed both for the advice given to Perses (404: φράζεσθαι χρειῶν τε λύσιν λιμοῦ τ' ἀλεωρήν) and

⁴⁰ *Il.* 11.147: ὄλμον δ' ὅς ἔσσευε κυλίνδεσθαι δι' ὅμηνος; *Il.* 15.729: θρῆνυν ἔφ' ἐπταπόδην, λίπε δ' ἵκρια νηὸς ἔτσης; *Od.* 5.248: γόμφοισν δ' ἄρα τὴν γε καὶ ἀρμονίησιν ἄρασσεν. See MARSILIO 2000, 19, 74, ft. 90.

⁴¹ See EDWARDS 1971, 35; B. PEABODY, *The Winged Word* (Albany, NY 1975), 183; WEST 1978, 266.

for the advice offered to the farmer (448: φράζεσθαι δ' εὗτ' ἀν γεράνου φωνὴν ἐπακούσεις);

(b) the apostrophe νήπιε/μέγα νήπιε is employed both for Perses (286: σοὶ δ' ἐγὼ ἐσθλὰ νοέων ἔρέω, μέγα νήπιε Πέρση, 396-397:... ἐγὼ δέ τοι οὐκ ἐπιδώσω / οὐδὲ ἐπιμετρήσω· ἔργαζεο, νήπιε Πέρση, 633: ὡς περ ἐμός τε πατήρ καὶ σὸς μέγα νήπιε Πέρση) and for the farmer (456: νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὸ οἴδ': ...);⁴²

(c) the verb τίθεμαι is employed not only in respect to Perses (27: ὁ Πέρση, σὺ δὲ ταῦτα τεῷ ἐνικάτθεο θυμῷ) but also in reference to storing at home what is needed for building a carriage (456-457: νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὸ οἴδ': ἐκατὸν δέ τε δούρατ' ἀμάξης. / τῶν πρόσθεν μελέτην ἔχέμεν οἰκήια θέσθαι);

(d) the underscoring of the importance of reciprocity in farming activities (349-350: εῦ μὲν μετρεῖσθαι παρὰ γείτονος, εῦ δ' ἀποδοῦναι, / αὐτῷ τῷ μέτρῳ, καὶ λώιον, αἱ κε δύνηαι) as well as in recognizing Hesiod's debt to the Muses (656-659: ἀθλ' ἔθεσαν παῖδες μεγαλήτορος· ἔνθα μέ φημι / ὑμνων νικήσαντα φέρειν τρίποδ' ὡτώεντα. / τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ Μούσης 'Ελικωνιάδεσσ' ἀνέθηκα, / ἔνθα με τὸ πρῶτον λιγυρῆς ἐπέβησαν ἀουδῆς).

The metaphorical overtones of the 'Agriculture' section can be also seen through the highlighting of Zeus. He is responsible for raining (415-416, 488), it is he to whom the farmer must address his prayers (465), he will offer abundance of goods (474) but also hardships to mortal men (483), such as the winter season (565). Zeus is then presented in the 'Agriculture' section as both the cause of both benefaction and hardships for mankind. Given that this ability of the supreme deity has been programmatically underscored in the proem, where one encounters similar vocabulary concerning the activity of Zeus, who is able to increase and let grow the good man and destroy the arrogant one, we are entitled to believe that the *WD* use Zeus as a link

⁴² On the address νήπιος, νήπιε, μέγα νήπιε in Hesiodic poetry, see J.S. CLAY, "The Education of Perses: From 'Mega Nepios' to 'Dion Genos' and Back", in *Mega Nepios: il destinatario nell'epos didascalico*, ed. by A. SCHIESARO, Ph. MITTIS, J.S. CLAY, in *MD* 31 (Pisa 1993), 23-33.

between the poetological connotations of the proem and the 'Agriculture' section. In fact, as Marsilio⁴³ has rightly observed, the verbs μινύθω, ἀέξω (*WD* 6) and κάρφω (*WD* 7) belong to farming vocabulary and are found in the 'Agriculture' section, in verses 409, 394, and 575 respectively. Under this light, one can see that agricultural vocabulary has been deliberately employed in the proem, where the Hesiodic tradition presents itself before it leaves the floor to Hesiod, the internal narrator of the *WD*. In other words, the farming metaphor of the proem is rounded off by its literal use in the 'Agriculture' section,⁴⁴ making Zeus the link between the narrative agenda presented in the proem and its practical manifestation in the farming section.

Finally, another aspect of the poetological connotations of the 'Agriculture' is the cicada imagery (582-584), which employs poetical vocabulary to suggest a two-edged analogy, the positive side of which refers to the Hesiodic poet, the negative side to Perses. The relevant verses run as follows:

ἡμος δὲ σκόλυμάς τ' ἀνθεῖ καὶ ἡχέτα τέττιξ
δενδρέω ἐφεζόμενος λιγυρήν καταχεύετ' ἀοιδήν
πυκνὸν ὑπὸ πτερύγων θέρεος καματώδεος ὥρη

Both intratextual associations such as (1: ἀοιδῆσι κλείουσαι — 583: ἀοιδήν, 583: λιγυρήν καταχεύετ' ἀοιδήν — 659: ἔνθά με τὸ πρῶτον λιγυρῆς ἐπέβησαν ἀοιδῆς, 583: δενδρέω ἐφεζόμενος — 593: ἐν σκιῇ ἐζόμενον) and intertextual analogies such as (582: ἡχέτα τέττιξ — Archilochus 223 W: τέττιγος ἐδράξω πτεροῦ, Callimachus, fr. 1.29-30 Pfeiffer: τῷ πιθόμη]ν· ἐνὶ τοῖς γὰρ ἀειδομεν οἱ λιγὺν ἥχον / τέττιγος, θ]όρυβον δ' οὐκ ἐφίλησαν ὄνων) clearly show the metaphorical connection between poet and cicada.⁴⁵ Petropoulos has even suggested that this analogy may

⁴³ MARSILIO 2000, 25-27.

⁴⁴ MARSILIO 2000, 26. It is noteworthy that Perses is apostrophized as δῖον γένος (299), in contrast to the internal narrator and the farmer who are closer to Zeus as they obey his orders. See MARSILIO 2000, 76-77, ft. 111.

⁴⁵ See G. NAGY, *The Best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek*

be alluding through the notorious laziness and lack of prudence of the cicada to a negative comment concerning Perses.⁴⁶

The cicada passage leads to further considerations concerning the poetics of the 'Agriculture' section. Ornithological ($\gammaέρανος$, $\kappaόκκωξ$) or insecticidal ($\tauέττιξ$) imagery is used as an indication of seasonal change: the crane (448-452) is associated with winter, the cuckoo (486-490) with spring, and the cicada (582-596) with summer time. In addition to the mechanisms used to link these three examples of ornithological or entomological imagery found in the 'Agriculture' section, the activity of these three birds 'replays' on the level of poetics what happens in respect of farming as seasons change. Beginning with the winter and the crane, moving on to the cuckoo and the spring, the internal narrator is clearly heading towards the summer and the cicada being the only bird its activity he is willing to assimilate to that of the singer. The selection of the summer is not a random choice. It functions as a proleptic advance mention of the analogy that will be suggested in the ensuing 'Nautilia' section between the literal sea journey and the metaphorical sailing at the sea of poetry, activities which must take place at summer time. If we press the point a bit more, following the steps of Rosen, who drew an analogy between bad weather-good weather on the one hand and poetical immaturity and maturity on the other in the 'Nautilia' section, we can then interpret Hesiodic preference for summer time not in terms of working advice but of poetic metaphor.

All the above observations show that the *WD* exploit a thick web of associations between farming and poetry, which the Homeric poems are unaware of. Before drawing any more thorough conclusions, we need to turn our attention to the 'Nautilia' section.

Poetry (Baltimore-London 1979), 302 ft. 11; R. ROSEN, "Poetry and Sailing in Hesiod's *Works and Days*", in *Classical Antiquity* 9 (1990), 99-113 [107-109]; MARSILIO 2000, 77, ft. 113.

⁴⁶ See J.C.B. PETROPOULOS, *Heat and Lust. Hesiod's Midsummer Festival Scene Revisited* (Lanham 1994), 77, ft. 29.

The 'Nautilia' (618-694) contains in its larger part advice concerning the time and means that Perses, Hesiod's alleged brother, should use in order to gain profit from seafaring. However, the 'Nautilia' has gained its own poetic profit because of a famous self-referential statement of poetics made by 'Hesiod' himself, a statement directly linked to his receiving a poetic award, which virtually amounts to a remarkable acknowledgement of his poetic skills. In particular, 'Hesiod' explicitly refers to a song-contest he participated and won in Chalkis, in the funeral games of Amphidamas. He amply states that this was the only time he traveled by sea and that after winning this contest by singing a hymn (657: ὅμηρος νικήσαντα), he dedicated his prize, a tripod, to the Heliconian Muses. The brief reference to his short journey over a limited stretch of water from Aulis to Chalkis becomes the stepping stone to a daring poetological leap: the bay of Aulis is explicitly connected to the sailing out of the Achaean army for Troy and implicitly to those epic poems dealing with the Trojan War.

This poetological reading of the aforementioned section was first proposed by Nagy⁴⁷ but it was systematically pursued by Rosen,⁴⁸ who convincingly showed that the 'Nautilia' functions as a "pictorial triptych", where the first and the third part refer literally to commercial activity at sea, whereas the second part, the centrally located *sphragis*, explains through an effective poetic metaphor the other two parts.

⁴⁷ G. NAGY, "Hesiod", in *Ancient Writers. Greece and Rome*, ed. by T.J. LUCE (New York 1982), I 43-73 [66]. R. HAMILTON, *The Architecture of Hesiodic Poetry* (Baltimore-London 1989), 69 argues that the reference to the Trojan expedition in the 'Nautilia' section must be linked to the passage dealing with the heroes in the Myth of Races. I do not agree with W. NICOLAI, *Hesiods Erga. Beobachtungen zum Aufbau* (Heidelberg 1964), 126-127, who has argued that verses 631-662 form a coherent unit, since the very text of Hesiod employs specific and clear-cut ways in order to separate the first part of the 'Nautilia' (618-645) from the second, i.e. the self-referential *sphragis*, and from the third (663-694). See HAMILTON 1989, 68. WEST's view (1978, 55) that the *sphragis* has been composed as an alternative proem to the 'Nautilia' seems far-fetched, but is useful in the sense that it, too, underscores the programmatic style of verses 646-662.

⁴⁸ ROSEN 1990, 99-113.

Rosen⁴⁹ plausibly argued that expressions like ναυτιλίης δυσπεμφέλου ἵμερος αἵρεϊ (618), νηὸς πτερὰ ποντοπόροιο (628), μέτρα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης (648) - μέτρα φυλάσσεσθαι (694), ἔργων μεμνημένος εἶναι / ὀραίων πάντων (641-642), οὕτε τι ναυτιλίης σεσοφισμένος οὔτε τι νηῶν (649), τόσσον τοι νηῶν γε πεπείρημαι πολυγόρμφων (660), λιγυρὴν καταχεύετ' ἀοιδήν (583) - λιγυρῆς ἐπέβησαν ἀοιδῆς (659), the interrelation between

⁴⁹ WD 624-628: νῆα δ' ἐπ' ἡπείρου ἐρύσαι πυκάσαι τε λίθοισιν / πάντοθεν, ὅφ' ἵσχωσ' ἀνέμων μένος ὑγρὸν ἀέντων, / χείμαρον ἔξερύσας, ἵνα μὴ πύθῃ Δίδος ὄμβρος. / ὅπλα δ' ἐπάρμενα πάντα τεῷ ἐγκάτθεο οἰκῳ, / εὐκόσμως στολίσας νηὸς πτερῷ ποντοπόροιο. For the figurative wings of poetry, see ROSEN (1990, 109), who brings attention to verse 237-254 from the *Corpus Theognideum*: σοὶ μὲν ἐγὼ πτέρῳ ἔδωκα, σὺν οἷς ἐπ' ἀπειρονὰ πόντον / πωτῆσῃ καὶ γῆν πᾶσαν ἀειδόμενος / ῥιζῖδις· θοίνης δὲ καὶ εἰλαπίνησι παρέσσηι / ἐν πάσαις, πολλῶν κείμενος ἐν στόμασιν, / καὶ σὲ σὺν αὐλίσκοισι λιγυφθύργοις νέοι ἄνδρες / εὐκόσμως ἐρατοι καλά τε καὶ λιγέα / ἀιστονται. καὶ διὸν δινοφρῆς ὑπὸ καύθεις γαίης / βῆμις πολικωκύτους εἰς Ἀτταὶ δόμους, / οὐδέποτι οὐδὲ θανάτους ἀπολεῖς καλέος, ἀλλὰ μελήσεις / ἀφιτον ἀνθρώποις αἰὲν ἔχων δόνομα / Κύρνε, καθ' Ἑλλάδα γῆν στρωφώμενος ἦδ' ἀνὰ νήσους / ἴχθυσεντα περῶν πόντον ἐπ' ἀτρύγετον, / οὐχ ἵππαν νάτοισιν ἐφήμενος, ἀλλά σε πέμψει / ἀγλαὰ Μουσάων δῶρα ἰστεφάνων / πᾶσι δ' ὅσοισι μέμηλε καὶ ἐσσομένοισιν ἀοιδῇ / ἐσσηὶ ὄμδες, ὅφ' ἂν γῆ τε καὶ ἡέλιος· / αὐτὰρ ἐγῶν δλίγης παρὰ σεῦ οὐ τυγχάνω αἰδοῦς, / ἀλλ' ὁσπερ μικρὸν παῖδα λόγιος μ' ἀπατᾷς. For the same metaphor, see also NÜNLIST 1998, 277-283, whence the followings examples: ANACREON, PMG 376: ἀρθεὶς δῆντ' ἀπὸ Λευκάδος / πέτρης ἐς πολιὸν κῦμα κολυμβῶ μεθύων ἔρωτι, ANACREON, PMG 378: ἀναπτέτομαι δῆ πρὸς "Ολυμπὸν πτερύγεσσοι κούφηις / διὰ τὸν "Ἐρωτ". οὐ γάρ ἐμοὶ <-> θέλει συνηθᾶν, TELESTES, PMG 805b: ἀλλὰ μάταν ἀχρέοτος ἀδει ματαιολόγων / φάμα προσέπταθ' Ἐλλάδα μουσοπόλων/ σοφᾶς ἐπίφθονον βροτοῖς τέχνας δηνειδος, mel. adesp., PMG 954b: μέλεα μελιπτέρωτα Μουσῶν, PIND. Ol. 9.11-12: πτερόεντα δ' ἵει γλυκύν / Πυθωνάδ' διστόν· οὗτοι χαμαιπετέων λόγων ἐφάψει, PIND. Pyth. 5.114-115: ἐν τε Μοίσαισι ποτανὸς ἀπὸ ματρὸς φίλας, / πέφανται θ' ἀρματηλάτας σοφός, PIND. Pyth. 8.32-34:... τὸ δ' ἐν ποσὶ μοι τράχον / ἵτω τεὸν χρέος, ὡς παῖ, νεωτατὸν καλῶν, / ἐμῷ ποτανὸν ἀμφὶ μαχανῷ, PIND. Nem. 6.48-49: πέταται δ' ἐπὶ τε χθόνα καὶ διὰ θαλάσσας τηλόθεν / δύνυμ' αὐτῶν, PIND. Nem. 7.20-23:... ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον ἔλπομαι / λόγον Ὁδυσσέος ἡ πάθαν - διὰ τὸν ἀδυεπῆ γενέσθ' Ὄμηρον / ἐπεὶ φεύδεσι οἱ ποτανῷ <τε> μαχανῷ / σεμνὸν ἔπεστί τι, PIND. Isthm. 1.64-66- εἴη νιν εὐφώνων πτερύγεσσιν ἀερθέντ' ἀγλαῖς / Πιερίδων, ἔτι καὶ Πυθῶν / Ολυμπιάδων τ' ἔξαιρέτοις / Αλφεοῦ ἔρνεσι φράξαι χεῖρα, PIND. Isthm. 5.63: καὶ πτερόεντα νέον σύμπεμψον ὕμνον, PIND. fr. 227:... νέων δὲ μέριμναι σὺν πόνοις εἰλισσόμεναι / δόξαν εὐρίσκοντι· λάμπει δὲ χρόνῳ / ἔργα μετ' αἰθέρ' <ἀερ>θέντα, BACCH. fr. 20B. 3-5:... δρμαίνω τι πέμπ[ειν] / χρύσεον Μουσῶν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ πτερόν / καὶ συμποσ[ια]σιν ὥγαλμ' [ἐν] εἰκάδεσ[σιν], PRATINAS, PMG 708.3-5:... ἐμὲ δεῖ κελαδεῖν, ἐμὲ δεῖ παταγεῖν / ἀν' ὅρεα σύμενον μετὰ Ναιάδων / οἴτα τε κύκνον ἥγοντα ποικιλόπτερον μέλος.

literal poverty and poetic destitution (*WD* 20-26) and the metaphor of the ship and wings (624-629) amply show that the entire 'Nautilia' section should be interpreted as a bold manifestation of Hesiodic poetics.

2. Audience

2.1 Creating an internal audience (*Phaeacians-Perses*)

The *Odyssey* and the *WD* insist on poetological signs, as one can infer from the special concern they show in respect of creating a chief internal narrator and a main internal addressee. Homeric epic is characterized by the presence of an omniscient external narrator who controls the action and decides about the rhythm and deployment of the plot. Various characters function as secondary narrators-focalizers (to employ the apt narratological term of de Jong), who have their own internal audiences. But the *Odyssey* despite this rather strict narratological framework, makes a daring step of unprecedented size and weight by creating a chief internal narrator, the poem's principal hero, Odysseus, who relates to an internal audience, the Phaeacians, his own version of his wanderings, from his departure from Troy to his arrival at the island of Calypso. This is effectuated through the so-called 'Apologoi', his extensive embedded narrative in Books 9-12. *Mutatis mutandis*, the *WD* show a similar concern with poetics which, with the exception of the proem, is absent from the *Theogony*. Moreover, the *WD* exploit Odyssean concerns about poetics, especially in the *sphragis* (646-662), the most heavy loaded with poetological overtones passage of the entire epic.

In the light of the multiple poetical strands of this section, let us now turn to the *sphragis* (646-662) and compare it with a dictinally relevant passage from the *Odyssey* (8.159-164). The *sphragis* constitutes an 'autobiographical' section within a poem, voiced in a distinct narrative tone, signaling through self-referential statements the author's (if we are dealing with a histori-

cal author) or the tradition's personal trademark. Given the strictly determined narrative agenda of the *sphragis*, it is worth considering the diction of this personally charged sub-section, the more so since it shares certain features with the way the *Odyssey* depicts Alcinous' sponsoring of the games in Scheria, which included athletic and musical contests.⁵⁰

WD 646-662 (sphragis):

εῦτ' ἀν ἐπ' ἐμπορίην τρέψας ἀεσίφρονα θυμόν
 βούλησαι χρέα τε προφυγεῖν καὶ λιμὸν ἀτερπέα,
 δεῖξω δὴ τοι μέτρα πολυφλοίσθοιο θαλάσσης,
 οὕτε τι ναυτιλίης σεσοφισμένος οὔτε τι νηῶν·
 οὐ γάρ πώ ποτε νηὶ γ' ἐπέπλων εὐρέα πόντον,
 εἰ μὴ ἐς Εὔβοιαν ἔξι Αὐλίδος, ἢ ποτ' Ἀχαιοί
 μείναντες χειμῶνα πολὺν σὺν λαὸν ἄγειραν
 'Ελλάδος ἔξι Ιερῆς Τροίην ἐς καλλιγύναιακα.
 ἔνθα δ' ἐγών ἐπ' ἀεθλα δαΐφρονος Ἄμφιδάμαντος
 Χαλκίδα τ' εἰς ἐπέρησα· τὰ δὲ προπεφραδμένα πολλά
 ἄθλ' ἔθεσαν παῖδες μεγαλήτορος· ἔνθά μέ φημι
 ὅμνων νικήσαντα φέρειν τρίποδ' ὡτώεντα.
 τὸν μὲν ἐγώ Μούσης 'Ελικωνιάδεσσ' ἀνέθηκα,
 ἔνθά με τὸ πρῶτον λιγυρῆς ἐπέβησαν ἀοιδῆς.
 τόσσον τοι νηῶν γε πεπείρημαι πολυγόμφων·
 ἀλλὰ καὶ ὃς ἐρέω Ζηνὸς νόνον αἰγάλοχοι·
 Μοῦσαι γάρ μ' ἐδίδαξαν ἀθέσφατον ὅμνον ἀείδειν.

Odyssey 8.159-164:

“οὐ γάρ σ' οὐδέ, ξεῖνε, δαήμουνι φωτὶ ἐτσκω
 ἄθλων, οἴλα τε πολλὰ μετ' ἀνθρώποισι πέλονται,
 ἀλλὰ τῷ δέ θ' ἄμα νηῇ πολυκληῆδι θαμιζῶν,
 ἀρχὸς ναυτάων οἴ τε πρηκτῆρες ἔασι,
 φόρτου τε μνήμων καὶ ἐπίσκοπος ἥσιν ὁδαίων
 κερδέων θ' ἀρπαλέων· οὐδὲ ἄθλητῆρι ἔοικας.”

In the *Odyssey* (8.159-164), the ἄθλα/ἄεθλα refer to athletic contests, while Odysseus is compared to a man of the sea who cares about his cargo and aims at acquiring profit greedily. In

⁵⁰ See R. SCODEL, *Listening to Homer. Tradition, Narrative, and Audience* (Ann Arbor 2002), 178.

like manner, Perses must turn his mind to seafaring (*WD* 642-643) taking care of his cargo. In contrast to this initial analogy, Perses' cargo soon becomes figurative, as it designates Hesiodic poetry and, likewise, the ἀθλα/ἀεθλα do not indicate martial or athletic events but poetical *contests* (654-655: ἐνθα δ' ἐγῶν ἐπ' ἀεθλα δαΐφρονος Ἀμφιδάμαντος / Χαλκίδα τ' εὗς ἐπέρησα) and *prizes* (655-656: τὰ δὲ προπεφραδμένα πολλά / ἀθλ' ἔθεσαν παιᾶντος μεγαλήτορος). Unlike the *Odyssey*, the *WD* present a framework of contest and rivalry which is colored neither by the aristocratic ideal of reciprocity nor the beguiling greed of deceit, but rather by the *σοφία* and knowledge of commercial antagonism, which necessitates the opening up of Hesiodic song to a larger audience, no more in miserable Ascra, but in Chalkis, the metaphorical gateway to poetical recognition and fame. The poetical contest in which Hesiod excels and the prize of his victorious performance presuppose the ruseful mind of the travelling merchant, who knows the *metra of the turbulent sea*, i.e. the rules of poetry, and is able to escape poetical isolation. In this way, Hesiodic poetry introduces for the first time in ancient Greek literature a new, complex but fascinating definition of a poetry-prize. Exploiting at length the figurative aspect of κέρδος, Hesiodic song redefines poetic κλέος, evaluating it not through Homeric standards but by means of a metaphor taken from the world of economic and commercial activity.

The Odyssean presentation of sea-trade and the general tenor of the Hesiodic 'Nautilia' set the tone for elaborating the aforementioned comparison even further. The *Odyssey* capitalizes on the emphatically stressed polarity between two versions of sea-trade activity, narratively epitomized in two distinct seafaring communities, the Phaeacians and the Phoenicians. Dougherty has carefully presented the two communities, which share certain common features, such as possession of wealth, excellence in weaving, and, most importantly, ships and sailing.⁵¹ At the

⁵¹ C. DOUGHERTY, *The Raft of Odysseus. The Ethnographic Imagination of Homer's Odyssey* (Oxford 2001), 102-121 and, in particular, 112.

same time, the two peoples are strongly differentiated in respect to the manner they perform trade. In fact, the *Odyssey* depicts Phaeacians and Phoenicians as belonging to opposite ends of the spectrum: the former do not engage in profit-bringing activities, despite their excellence in seafaring, whereas the latter are famous traders, merchants, and overseas sailors. Phaeacian proficiency in ships is reflected in their very names, which are derived from the world of the sea, whereas Phoenician talent is deflected in their manipulative greed for profit at all expense. Conducting an almost altruistic gift exchange, the Phaeacians inhabit an ideal world of unceasing agricultural productivity, while the Phoenicians seem to have turned themselves to seafaring activities because of the pressure of dire necessity. Dougherty has convincingly shown that the *Odyssey* "attempts to carve out a position for the Greeks somewhere between the idealized model of gift exchange represented by the Phaeacians and the negative image of trade as a kind of piracy projected by the Phoenicians".⁵² Setting the Hesiodic picture of seafaring activity next to this Odyssean tableau, one can see that the *WD* negotiate for the same middle ground between the two extremes. This time however, the middle ground is defined in terms of a personalized conflict between two brothers, Hesiod and Perses. Whereas the *Odyssey* fuses Phaeacian and Phoenician elements in the amalgamated personality of the epic's principal hero, Odysseus, the *WD* consciously indulge in highlighting a dynamic tension between productive labor and carefully planned seafaring activity on the one hand, and idleness and risky, profit-yielding sailing undertakings on the other. What is more, the *WD* exploit this motif even further, as they use it as a pretext for poetical considerations lying at the heart of the poem's reconceptualization of a rival Odyssean tradition.

This line of interpretation is decisively reinforced by the reference to Hesiod's victory in verses 656-659. In an athletic contest, the victor used to dedicate the laurel-crown of his athletic

⁵² DOUGHERTY 2001, 112.

triumph to his own city, as a sign of recognition of the city's participation in his victory but also as a kind of protection, an almost magical *aegis* fending off any sort of danger. In Hesiodic poetry, the dedication of the tripod the poet won at the funeral games of Amphidamas in Chalkis to the Heliconian Muses is also a symbolic acknowledgment of his debt to them, who first taught him the art of song. Kurke⁵³ has plausibly argued that the epinician poetry of Pindar and Bacchylides has reappropriated and adjusted Homeric *κλέος* to the political framework of *κῦδος* by substituting the Homeric king with the city, which does not only receive but also shares the victor's fame.⁵⁴ Under this light, the use of athletic terminology (*ἀθλα/άεθλα, νικήσαντα*), the dedication of the victor's prize, the tripod, to the Heliconian Muses, and last but not least, the framework of commodity trade by sea, which the 'Nautilia' successfully advertizes, are harmoniously orchestrated in order to promote *a symbolic economy of Hesiodic κλέος*.

Seafaring trade, profit-gaining commercial antagonism, cargo-carrying ships, choosing a season suitable for sailing enterprises, all these issues allude to poetical value.⁵⁵ Hesiodic poetry in its

⁵³ L. KURKE, "The Economy of *Kudos*", in *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece. Cult, Performance, Politics*, ed. by C. DOUGHERTY & L. KURKE (Cambridge 1993), 131-163 [137-138].

⁵⁴ See PIND. *Ol.* 5.1-8: Υψηλῶν ἀρετῶν καὶ στεφάνων ἄωτον γλυκύν / τῶν Οὐλυμπίᾳ, Ὄκεανοῦ θύγατερ, καρδίᾳ γελανεῖ / ἀκαμαντόποδός τ' ἀπήνας δέκευ Ψαύμιός τε δῶρα· / ὃς τὰν σὰν πόλιν αὔξων, Καμάρινα, λαιστρόφον, / βιωμοὺς ἔξ διδύμους ἐγέραρεν ἑορταῖς θεῶν μεγίσταις / ὑπὸ βουθυσίαις ἀεθλῶν τε πεμπαμέροις ἀμίλλαις, / ἵπποις ἡμιόνοις τε μοναμπυκίᾳ τε. τὸν δὲ κῦδος ἀβρόν / νικάσας ἀνέθηκε, καὶ δὴ πατέρ' Ἀ-κρων' ἐνάρυξε καὶ τὸν νέοικον ἔδραν.

⁵⁵ A.T. EDWARDS, *Hesiod's Ascra* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 2004), 44-62 offers a detailed economic analysis of Hesiod's presentation of trade and *κέρδος*. He maintains (61) that "Hesiod expresses an ambivalent attitude towards trade". The author is certainly right when he argues that "[t]he possibility of *kerdos* is offset by the risks presented by sea-voyaging to life and goods" (61). According to my argument, this analysis should be placed within the context of poetical references 'Hesiod' makes in the 'Nautilia'. The "continuity between trading and farming and the subordination of both to the self-sufficiency of the *oikos*", as EDWARDS 2004, 61 has argued, does not only refer to the interrelation between trading and farming for the community of Ascra, but it also connotes the continuity of Hesiodic song.

struggle to utter its own, distinct and identifiable voice, to sing its own song, constructs a metapoetic language aiming at being both traditional and innovative. In this respect, the metaphor of the right season for sailing is useful and instructive. Hesiod argues that one should not start his poetic career on the figurative wings of epic poetry, but should wait for the ὥραῖος πλόος, the period of fruitful inspiration, after having mastered the technique of sailing. Under this scope, singing the *Theogony*, which at all probability lies under the general term ὕμνος (657) Hesiod employed to refer to his song in Chalkis, is a much more prudent choice than the risky business of singing a long and demanding epic poem, in the manner of the Homeric epics. Appropriating imagery stemming from the world of economic activity may seem strange, to say the least, but in fact its function has to be conceived in relation to the position Hesiodic poetry ambitiously claims for itself.

The ἄθλα/ἄεθλα stand both for the song contest and for the victor's poetic prize, and in that way, the funeral games in honor of Amphidamas in Chalkis constitute an excellent opportunity for Hesiod to make his song known to a larger audience. Clay⁵⁶ has rightly emphasized the fact that the autobiographical references to 'Hesiod' throughout the *WD* have a metaphorical, rather than a literal meaning. Even the mentioning of Cyme as the birthplace of Hesiod's father may be concealing an allusion to the common origin of Homer (according to the Herodotean life of Homer)⁵⁷ and Hesiod, as well as to their ensuing poetic differentiation. Extending Clay's argument further, one may argue that the negative portrait of Ascra as a miserable dwelling place throughout the entire year must not be interpreted in terms of geographical and historical accuracy but as a poetic metaphor. By mapping out the perils of poetic isolation, Hesiodic poetry attempts to trace its opening towards a larger audi-

⁵⁶ CLAY 2003, 181.

⁵⁷ Cf. 1-3. See also *Homeric Hymns*, *Homeric Apocrypha*, *Lives of Homer*, ed. and transl. by M.L. WEST (Cambridge, Mass.–London 2003), 371, ft. 21.

ence. It is not inferior to Homeric poetry, only to its widespread fame. Ascra and Chalkis, poetic isolation and advertisement respectively, constitute the two poles of Hesiodic poetic topography. The journey from Ascra to Chalkis is therefore a metaphorical *iter* to poetic fame, a transition from the local, epichoric community of Ascra to a pan-Hellenic⁵⁸ audience in Chalkis. Hesiodic song is equally well equipped with its famous Homeric rival, as it also knows of well-bolted ships (660: τόσσον τοι νηῶν γε πεπείρημαι πολυγόμφων) and the measures of the loud-roaring sea (648: δεῖξω δὴ τοι μέτρα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης), and is able to sail successfully to the sea of archaic Greek epic.

In respect to Perses as internal addressee of the *WD*, the following observations should be made. Obbink has argued that "in the archaic and early classical period such extreme *sphragidization*, which we may define as the embedded assertion of the identity of the poet with his narrative persona, betrays anxieties over the ownership of poetry and its status as property. The introduction of addressee(s) is one way in which the relationship between the poet and his audience may be articulated or negotiated, in such a way that the poet nominally retains control over the poem as created artifact, but initiates its transfer to a general audience through the mediation of an elite, exclusive addressee". The 'obsession' of the *WD* with a dispute between Hesiod and Perses over property issues should be seen in a double perspective: the tradition our poem belongs to aims both at consolidating its status and identity and also at addressing a larger audience. The property quarrel should be

⁵⁸ The pan-Hellenic scope of the *WD* can be seen in the themes this epic develops. One, often neglected theme, is its very subject matter and, in particular, the emphasis laid on the *oikos* as the only remaining community, now that polis and periphery are not operating by the old set of rules. This 'social' aspect of the poem is applicable to all peripheral communities experiencing tensions with the polis-center and so its applicability dovetails well with the pan-Hellenic aim of Hesiodic song. See D.W. TANDY, *Warriors into Traders. The Power of the Market in Early Greece* (Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1997), 214–215.

interpreted in similar manner to Hesiod and Perses, who are fictive characters of the plot, mere masks under which the Hesiodic tradition of didactic poetry, usurping the epic and lyric constraints of its age, carefully discloses its face, its addressees, and its aims. The property dispute between the two brothers is not textually asserted autobiographical trivia, at least not more than Hesiod himself and Perses. By “inventing” the property dispute with its *special* addressee, Perses, the Hesiodic tradition of didactic epic mirrors on the level of the plot a typical poetic strategy. The fraternal relation between Hesiod and Perses is, in fact, an effective way to represent the audience on the level of the plot. By creating a fictive addressee, Perses,⁵⁹ to whom a fictive poet, Hesiod, addresses his advisory song, the tradition of didactic poetry, which we may call Hesiodic, is able to make its message successful and much more effective.

Greek and Roman poetry make ample use of fictive addressees, somehow related to the speaking ‘I’, such as Cyrnos in the *Corpus Theognideum*, Pausanias in Empedocles, Theodoros in Dionysius Chalkous, Moschos in Archestratus of Gela, Memmius in Lucretius’ *De Rerum Natura*. In contrast to Eastern traditions, where the addressee is often the son of the man who advises, the aforementioned examples indicate that an addressee ‘socially equivalent’ to the master or wise advisor is of prime importance for the effectiveness of the poem’s *didache*. In fact, Hesiod’s superficially distinct personae as mouthpiece of the Muses in the *Theogony* and as counselor in the *WD* are interrelated through the appropriation of a seemingly autobiographical detail, namely his status as a *metanastes*. Martin⁶⁰ has rightly

⁵⁹ See scholia vetera [PERTUSI], Prolegomena, B 9-16: Μετὰ τὴν ἡρωϊκὴν γενεαλογίαν καὶ τὸν καταλόγους ἐπεζήτησε καινουργῆσαι πάλιν ἐτέραν ὑπόθεσιν· καὶ δὴ καταχρησθέντων τῶν εἰς πολέμους καὶ μάχας, καὶ τῆς γεωργίας διδασκαλίαν εἰσφέρει καὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὴν κρᾶσιν, πρόσωπον ἀναπλάσας καὶ παραλαβόν <τὸ> τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Πέρσου, εἴτε κατ’ ἀλήθειαν, εἴτε κατὰ τὸ εὐπρόσωπον καὶ ἀρμάζον τῇ ὑποθέσει, ὡς ἀν μὴ δυσπρόσωπον εἴη καὶ ἵνα δόξῃ ἐξ ἔριδος τῆς κατὰ τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἐληλυθέναι.

⁶⁰ R.P. MARTIN, “Hesiod’s Metanastic Poetics”, in *Ramus* 21 (1992), 11-33.

argued that certain features of the *WD*, such as (a) autobiographical information concerning Hesiod, his brother, and their father, (b) certain aeolisms popping up in 'Hesiodic' dialect, (c) incorporation of verse-long maxims in the text, and finally (d) preference for rare dictional coins instead of more common ones ($\grave{\alpha}$ νόστεος, φερέοικος), must be reevaluated in relation to the audience this song is addressed to. By presenting himself as the son of an immigrant from Asia Minor, Hesiod assumes the persona of a foreigner, a *metanastes*, aiming at making his advice more persuasive to his audience. The authority of didactic epic is considerably strengthened, as Hesiod presents himself speaking as some 'other', who, by extension, holds a superior position to those he is advising. A good analogy is that of Phoenix in the *Iliad*, who arrives at Phthia as a *metanastes*, only to become at a later stage the educator of Achilles. Concocting specific 'plot-conditions' for transmitting a didactic message constitutes an indispensable and well established method used by a poetic tradition, in order to create the necessary framework for expressing its *didache*. Under this scope, Perses as Hesiod's brother is a much more effective choice than the invention of, say, a hypothetical son. Perses has the advantage of belonging to the same generation with Hesiod and so his brother's $\sigma\omega\phi\imath\alpha$ need not be presented as belonging to an older and more experienced person. This strategy would have been completely incompatible with the position of *metanastes* Hesiod desires to assume. Hesiodic poetry boldly replaces the typical didactic pair of master-student, father-son, old-young, for it aims at emitting its message from the position of a *metanastes*, an outsider, a wandering bard, not from the point of view of a wise old man. By fostering the $\sigma\omega\phi\imath\alpha$ of a *metanastes*, Hesiodic poetry is able to put its lasting mark on its didactic song and claim future success by addressing different and varied audiences. To accomplish this goal, it needs a song wider in scope, a pan-Hellenic didactic epic, whose *didache* will not be limited in miserable Ascra but will address, traveling as a *metanastes*, an itinerant bard, the whole of Hellas.

2.2 *The pan-Hellenic scope of Hesiodic poetry*

The pan-Hellenic perspective of Hesiodic poetry can be best exemplified in the way this epic deals with mythical variants. I have selected the so-called 'Hymn to Hecate', a passage which has attracted time and again scholarly interest. Hellenists have focused their attention on the following topics: (a) the size of the 'hymn', (b) its insertion in the midst of genealogical catalogues, and (c) its peculiar encomiastic tone for a 'second-category' deity, such as Hecate. I begin by offering a brief presentation of the various theories proposed:

(1) The analytical theory: its supporters have argued that the 'Hymn to Hecate' is an interpolation, a later addition to the main body of an *Ur-Theogonie* (like the *Ur-Ilias*), which would bear the undisputed trademark of one and single poet, the historically determined Boeotian poet Hesiod. The arguments of the analysts are of two kinds: dictional eccentricities or deviations from Hesiodic diction or Hesiodic semantics showing that the hymn may have been added later to the main body of the *Theogony* either by propounders of orphism⁶¹ or by someone who was familiar with such a tradition from the area of Eastern Asia Minor (this is the place Hesiod's father came from).⁶² Sellschopp⁶³ has argued that the word *τιμή* is twice attested in the 'Hymn to Hecate' with a meaning that deviates from regular practice. In verses 414 (*ἥ δὲ καὶ ἀστερόεντος ἀπ'* οὐρανοῦ ἔμορε *τιμῆς*) and 418 (... *πολλή τέ οἱ ἔσπετο τιμῆ*), the word *τιμή* does not designate Hecate's position in divine hierarchy but the special place she occupied for mortal men. Most of this argumentation has been successfully dealt with already in the 19th century,⁶⁴ and West in his commentated

⁶¹ A. FICK, *Hesiods Gedichte* (Göttingen 1887), 17.

⁶² U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* I (Berlin 1931), 169 ff.

⁶³ I. SELLSCHOPP, *Stilistische Untersuchungen zu Hesiod* (Hamburg 1934), 52, ft. 83.

⁶⁴ See *Hesiod. Theogony*, edited with Prolegomena and Commentary by M.L. WEST (Oxford 1966), 278.

edition of the *Theogony*⁶⁵ removes once and for all the suspicions raised by Kirk⁶⁶ concerning the authenticity of this passage. In this case, a general observation concerning the use of stylistic criteria for deciding about the genuiness of a given passage in Hesiodic poetry might be expressed in the following way: determining Hesiodic style is extremely hard and the limits of 'normality' or 'regularity' in respect to vocabulary, syntax, and semantics are a slippery concept. Moreover, if any deviation from regular use is considered the privileged ground of an imitator or some sort of Hesiodic *Bearbeiter*, then it is clear that we are following the wrong path. The chimaeric search for dictional uniformity may end up in an obsessive linguistic determinism, which is at odds with the very nature of oral poetry such as Hesiodic song.

(2) The 'biographical' theory: according to the scholars who have fostered this interpretation, the 'Hymn to Hecate' reflects, through the emphasis it places on certain elements pertaining to the actual cult of this goddess, Hesiod's personal connection with her. Aly has argued that the hymn shows that Hecate belonged to an unofficial private cult.⁶⁷ Along these lines, Pfister⁶⁸ has even maintained that the Hesiodic *Theogony* devotes considerable space to a lesser deity belonging to the lower classes because, contrary to the Homeric epics, it does not address aristocratic circles but the lower peasantry. The social dimension of Hesiodic poetry has been interpreted by the biographers as indicating the social reality a historical Hesiod belonged to. The biographers do not simply believe in a historical poet, creator of the *Theogony* and the *WD*, but they also take for granted the convergence of physical and poetical

⁶⁵ WEST 1966, 276-280.

⁶⁶ G.S. KIRK, "The Structure and Aim of the *Theogony*", in *Hésiode et son influence*, Entretiens Hardt 7 (Vandoeuvres-Genève 1962), 63-107 [80].

⁶⁷ W. ALY, "Hesiodos von Askra und der Verfasser der *Theogenie*", in *Hesiod*, ed. by E. HEITSCH, Wege der Forschung 44 (Darmstadt 1966), 65, ft. 23.

⁶⁸ F. PFISTER, "Die Hekate-Episode in Hesiods *Theogenie*", in *Philologus* 84 (1928), 1-15 [8].

reality. What the school of Neoanalysis has successfully done in the case of Homeric poetry by drawing the line between physical and poetical reality, the supporters of the 'biographical' theory in Hesiodic poetry have failed even to comprehend. And what is even worse, this *a priori* belief has led them to argue that Hesiodic poetry is the degraded counterpart of Homeric epic, the poetry of the poor and the socially weak. West has claimed that the use of the same name, Perses, both for Hesiod's brother and for Hecate's father is not a coincidence but must be interpreted in biographical terms, since it shows the special importance the goddess Hecate had for Hesiod's family.⁶⁹ Despite the fact that this view does not end up in the textual dissecting of the analysts, it virtually endorses their pattern of reasoning, i.e. that the 'Hymn to Hecate' bears a close relation to the personal life of Hesiod. Mazon has, more or less on the same tone, maintained that the *Theogony* has been composed for some festival in honor of Hecate, who must have been worshipped in Ascra as a local variant of the πότνια θηρῶν.⁷⁰ The same view has been also adopted by Van Groningen, who has thus attempted to cater for the privileged place Hecate occupies within the *Theogony*.⁷¹ Inextricably linked to Hesiod, his personality, his family, his place of origin or, last, the cultic practice of his region, the 'Hymn to Hecate' became for the supporters of the 'biographical' theory the *lydian stone* for a historically-based interpretation of Hesiodic poetry, an interpretation which is nothing more than a predicted reshuffling of the cards of historical determinism.

(3) The 'religious' theory: the definite advantage of this theory is the use of interpretive criteria which are not historically

⁶⁹ WEST 1966, 276-280.

⁷⁰ *Hésiode. Théogonie, les Travaux et les Jours, le Bouclier*. Texte établi et traduit par P. MAZON (Paris 1928), 5.

⁷¹ B.A.VAN GRONINGEN, *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque* (Amsterdam 1958), 269-270.

determined. Judet de la Combe⁷² and Wismann⁷³ think that Hecate is representing chthonic powers, whose ultimate origin is Gaia. Therefore, Hecate is a relic from the older generation of the Titans, but nevertheless is part of the world of Zeus, whose kingdom the *Theogony* celebrates. Boedeker⁷⁴ underlines the tri-functionalism of Hecate (authority, power, productivity) that virtually reflects the three basic functions of the proto-indoeuropean religious world and the proto-indoeuropean heroic pantheon. According to Boedeker,⁷⁵ Hecate is the transformation of an older indoeuropean divinity, the female equivalent of Zeus, who is, of course, the par excellence representative of tri-functionalism.

(4) The 'gender-oriented' theory: Zeitlin⁷⁶ has argued that the principal feature of the 'Hymn to Hecate' is its opposition to the myth of Pandora, which will soon follow as the *Theogony* goes on. The 'Hymn to Hecate' must be seen as the positive side within a series of negative female creatures of the *Theogony*, Pandora being the most negative example. From a purely structural point of view, this theory is corroborated by the fact the Hecate and Pandora frame the passage devoted to the birth of Zeus, the key figure in the entire epic.

(5) The 'textual' theory: the main supporter of this theory is Clay⁷⁷ who has laid emphasis on the 'wilfullness' of Hecate, her

⁷² P. JUDET DE LA COMBE, "La dernière ruse: Pandore dans la *Théogonie*", in *Les métiers du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, ed. by F. BLAISE, P. JUDET DE LA COMBE, Ph. ROUSSEAU (Villeneuve d' Ascq 1996), 263-299.

⁷³ H. WISMANN, "Propositions pour une lecture d' Hésiode", in *Les métiers du mythe. Lectures d'Hésiode*, ed. by F. BLAISE, P. JUDET DE LA COMBE, Ph. ROUSSEAU (Villeneuve d' Ascq 1996), 15-24 [21].

⁷⁴ D. BOEDEKER, "Hecate: A Transfunctional Goddess in the *Theogony*?", in *TAPhA* 113 (1983), 79-93 [85].

⁷⁵ BOEDEKER 1983, 92.

⁷⁶ F. ZEITLIN, "Signifying Difference: The Case of Hesiod's Pandora", in *Playing the Other. Gender and Society in Classical Greek Society* (Chicago 1996), 53-86.

⁷⁷ J.S. CLAY, "The Hecate of the *Theogony*", in *GRBS* 25 (1984), 27-38 [34-37].

mediating ability between mortals and immortals, so that the former may receive from the latter what they ask during the ritual sacrifice. Clay's analysis is heavily text-based but at the same time she makes good use of certain aspects of the 'religious' theory of Judet de la Combe and Wismann, who also see Hecate as a bridge between the human and divine worlds. In fact, this function of Hecate must be textually linked to the episodes of Prometheus and Pandora that follow. Rudhardt's analysis is also textually oriented despite the fact that it is heavily depended on the religious aspect of Hecate.⁷⁸ According to this view, Hecate owes her privileged treatment in the *Theogony* to her ability to benefit and harm at the same time.

(6) The poetological theory: the principal supporters of this theory are Griffith and Nagy. Griffith has convincingly argued that Hecate stands for the transition from an older state of the world to the new one, which the Hesiodic *Theogony* strongly promotes. Hecate's role should be seen, according to Griffith, as poetical, not as biographical reflection of a historical poet in the text. According to Nagy, Hecate is a 'synthetic' deity with a pan-Hellenic scope. Her presence in the Hesiodic *Theogony*, which Nagy believes was performed in a pan-Hellenic festival, is consonant with the deliberate effort on the part of the Hesiodic tradition to reach out to a wider audience interested in a song of pan-Hellenic range. The same view is accepted by Stoddard,⁷⁹ who oscillates between the poetological and the textual theory. This balance between these two aforementioned theories is probably the most crucial contribution to decyphering the function of this riddling hymn.

My own contribution to this ongoing dialogue concerning the 'Hymn to Hecate' attempts to put into good use most of the aforementioned analyses with the exception of the 'analytical' and 'biographical' theories. I would like to make it clear that the

⁷⁸ J. RUDHARDT, "À propos de l'Hécate hésiodique", in *MH* 50 (1993), 204-213 [211-213].

⁷⁹ STODDARD 2004, 7-11.

poetological aspect of the 'Hymn to Hecate' is, in fact, consonant both with the 'textual' theory, which explains the placement of the hymn, and with the 'gender-oriented' and 'religious' theories, which underscore the hymn's relation to Zeus. On the other hand, none of these theories is able to explain the size or the structure of the 'Hymn to Hecate'. Given the pan-Hellenic scope of the *Theogony*, we should 'read' the hymn as an effort made by the tradition this epic represents to become 'recognizable' as a tradition trying to reach a pan-Hellenic audience. The hymn is, in my view, an early form of *sphragidization*, which I define as an internal indication that this specific *Theogony*, is the Hesiodic *Theogony*, the most authoritative version among other rival theogonies. This argument is based on the following: (a) The so-called 'rhetorical' features of the 'Hymn to Hecate' (noticed by Friedländer⁸⁰ and Solmsen⁸¹) may be seen as an effort (also observable at the proem of the *WD*) to make this passage 'Hesiodic', as a trademark of its authenticity and personal character; (b) by inserting a hymn of such length within the rather monotonous genealogical lists, the *Theogony* shows considerable maturity in dealing with traditional material, which it is able to appropriate to its own purpose; (c) the use of the name Perses both for Hesiod's brother and for Hecate's father shows that if Hesiod and Perses represent the chief internal narrator and internal addressee respectively, then the 'Hymn to Hecate' may well stand for another poetological strategy of the Hesiodic tradition to create for its audience recognizable links between its subject matter and its own performance conditions. In other words, it would have been a very effective policy of poetic promotion to address the advice contained in the poem to a fictive addressee, Perses, whom the song itself would 'introduce' to its audience by a name that the father of a pan-Hellenic deity, Hecate, also bears. To ensure that the connection between the two is made, the Hes-

⁸⁰ P. FRIEDLÄNDER, "Das proen.ium der *Theogonie*", in *Hermes* 49 (1914), 1-16 (= *Hesiod*, ed. by E. HEITSCH, WdF 44 [Darmstadt 1966], 277-294).

⁸¹ F. SOLMSEN, *Hesiod and Aeschylus* (Ithaca, NY 1949), 51f., ft. 169.

iodic tradition would have taken great pains to offer this information to its audience, by inserting it in the 'Hymn to Hecate'; (d) the reference to ἀεθλα (Th. 435-438: ἐσθλὴ δ' αὖθ' ὁπότ' ἄνδρες ἀεθλεύωσ' ἐν ἀγῶνι, / ἐνθα θεὰ καὶ τοῖς παραγίνεται ἥδ' ὀνίνησι, / νικήσας δὲ βίη καὶ κάρτει, καλὸν ἀεθλον / ῥεῖα φέρει χαίρων τε, τοκεῦσι δὲ κῦδος ὁπάζει) indicates the existence of an agonistic context, pointing to that of the 'Nautilia', where Hesiod refers to his victory in the poetic contest in Chalkis. The analogy is remarkable: as the Muses through their divine epiphany inspired Hesiod and made possible, in the long run, his distinguished performance in the funeral games for Amphidamas, so Hecate stands by those who participate in contests and helps them win; (e) the use of diction which is employed in poetologically colored passages: δυσπέμφελος (Th. 440) — (WD 618), ῥεῖα (Th. 419, 438, 443), ῥηιδίως (Th. 442) — ῥέα / ῥεῖα (WD 5, 6), ἀτρυγέτοι θαλάσσης (Th. 413) — πολυφλοίσθοι θαλάσσης (WD 648). Needless to say, I am not arguing for any poetological connotations inherent in the aforementioned diction. I am simply highlighting the fact that passages of poetological coloring display, on a secondary level, equivalent dictional features, triggered by the analogous function of these passages; (f) the honor (*τιμὴ*) Zeus has bestowed to Hecate may be seen as an internally expressed encomium to that poetic tradition which treated this divinity in such a privileged manner. A great theogonic poem needs great deities, identifiable by all audiences, standing beyond the borders occupied by local gods and goddesses. The 'Hymn to Hecate' may be seen as the trademark of Hesiodic poetic credo, which desires to surpass the limits of Boeotia and become the par excellence theogonic song of the Greek world.

2.3 *Epic rivalry*

One of the basic tenets of oral poetics is that poetic traditions tend to shape themselves through a dynamic process, namely through their acquisition of a recognizable identity that would differentiate them from other traditions belonging to the same

genre. Stability is thus acquired through a process of 'marking' certain features, passages, characters with a personal poetic stamp that would at once make them identifiable as belonging to this and no other poetic tradition. This dynamic, 'synthetic' process leading to an obsession with surpassing rival epic traditions extends to other song-traditions (external) but also involves epics belonging to the same tradition (internal). I will first deal with external epic rivalry, i.e. with cases where the Hesiodic tradition 'confronts' its Homeric counterpart.

2.3.1 *External epic rivalry*

The 'Nautilia' section has been recognized as the *locus classicus* for this sort of epic rivalry. The Hesiodic tradition employs the well-known reference to the sailing of the Greek fleet from Aulis to Troy as the 'HomERICALLY colored', mythical catch-episode, and turns it into a background reference to an epic tradition from which it deviates. What is of particular interest and has not been, to my knowledge, carefully studied, is 'how' this reference is treated by the Hesiodic tradition. This would, of course, lead to another, equally important question: does Hesiodic tradition treat references to rival traditions in the same way Homeric tradition deals with references to other, say Cyclic, traditions? An interesting case-study is that of the second 'Nekyia' in *Odyssey* 24 and especially the speech of Agamemnon to Amphimedon in verses 192-202:

“ὅλβιε Λαέρταο πάι, πολυμήχαν· Ὄδυσσεῦ,
 ἦ ἄρα σὺν μεγάλῃ ἀρετῇ ἐκτήσω ἄκοιτιν·
 ὡς ἀγαθαὶ φρένες ἡσαν ἀμύμονι Πηγελοπείη,
 κούρῃ Ἰκαρίου· ὃς εῦ μέμνητ· Ὄδυσσῆος,
 ἀνδρός κουριδίου. τῷοι κλέος οὐ ποτ’ ὀλεῖται
 ἢς ἀρετῆς, τεύξουσι δ’ ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἀοιδήν
 ἀθάνατοι χαρίεσσαν ἐχέφρονι Πηγελοπείη,
 οὐχ ὡς Τυνδαρέου κούρη κακὰ μήσατο ἔργα,
 κουριδίου κτείνασσα πόσιν, στυγερὴ δέ τ’ ἀοιδή
 ἔσσετ’ ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπους, χαλεπήν δέ τε φῆμιν ὀπάσσει
 θηλυτέρησι γυναιξί, καὶ ἡ κ’ εὐεργῆς ἔησιν.”

As I have extensively argued elsewhere⁸² this “highly sophisticated passage (24. 192-202) has a special importance for the poetics of the *Odyssey*, since it deals with κλέος which ‘entails not only a relationship between heroes, but one between poems as well’”.⁸³ In this passage, it becomes clear that “Penelope is not simply the model of the loyal wife, the good queen who waits for Odysseus to come home; she is the vehicle that redefines κλέος in such a way that it becomes a condition for the creation of the poem’s own subject-matter. As a result, in this highly sophisticated passage Penelope emerges in a metapoetic cloth becoming the emblem of the poetics of the Odyssean κλέος”.⁸⁴ This example shows that the *Odyssey* inscribes the contrast between Penelope and Clytaemestra and, in consequence, between Odysseus and Agamemnon within a framework of epic rivalry, of contrasting its song with other epic songs, in this case with the *Nostoi*. The supremacy of the *Odyssey* is thus established through a process not of ‘condemning’ other rival traditions to silence but by hinting, *en passant*, to them, only to certify its own poetic supremacy.

Revisiting the Hesiodic epic of the *WD*, one can detect a truly remarkable analogy between the Hesiodic expression κέρδος ἀρητῶν and its Homeric equivalent κλέος ἀρέσθαι,⁸⁵ as well as its formulaic allomorphs εὔχος/κῦδος ἀρέσθαι.⁸⁶ In the ‘Nautilia’

⁸² C.C. TSAGALIS, “*Odyssey* 24, 191-202: A Reconsideration”, in *WS* 116 (2003), 43-56 [54].

⁸³ A.T. EDWARDS, *Achilles in the Odyssey. Ideologies of Heroism in the Homeric Epic* (Meisenheim am Glan 1985), 90.

⁸⁴ TSAGALIS 2003, 53-54.

⁸⁵ See C.C. TSAGALIS, “The Metaphor of Sailing and the *Athlon* of Song: Reconsidering the ‘Nautilia’ in Hesiod’s *Works and Days*”, in *Αθλα και Έπαθλα στα Ομηρικά Έπη, Πρακτικά του 10^{ου} Διεθνούς Ομηρικού Συνεδρίου* (Ιθάκη, 16-18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2004), forthcoming.

⁸⁶ Κλέος, εὔχος, κῦδος ἀρέσθαι / Il. 7.203: δός νίκην Αἴαντι καὶ ἀγλαὸν εὔχος ἀρέσθαι / Il. 12.407: χάζετ’, ἐπεὶ οἱ θυμὸς ἔέλπετο κῦδος ἀρέσθαι / Il. 16.88: δώῃ κῦδος ἀρέσθαι ἐρίγδουπος πόσις “Ηρῆς / Il. 17.16: τώ με ἕα κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἐνὶ Τρώεσσιν ἀρέσθαι / Il. 17.287: ἀστυ πότι σφέτερον ἐρύειν καὶ κῦδος ἀρέσθαι / Il. 17.419: ἀστυ πότι σφέτερον ἐρύσαι καὶ κῦδος ἀρέσθαι / Il. 20.502:... δὲ ἵετο κῦδος ἀρέσθαι / Il. 21.297:... δίδουμεν δέ τοι εὔχος ἀρέσθαι / Il. 21.543:.... μενέαντε δὲ

section, the expression *κέρδος ἄρηαι* (WD 632) is directly linked to the metaphorical use of cargo (WD 631-632: *καὶ τότε νῆσθαι ἀλαδὸν ἐλκέμεν, ἐν δέ τε φόρτον / ἄρμενον ἐντύνασθαι, ἵνα οἴκαδε κέρδος ἄρηαι*), which has been regarded as a disguised formula pointing to poetics.⁸⁷ Once we have established a figurative use of cargo, then it is much easier to understand that the ‘cargo-dependent’ formula *κέρδος ἄρηαι* alludes to poetical profit. According to the findings of historical linguistics, the connection between *κέρδος* and a poet’s profession was initially self-evident. The pathbreaking studies of Watkins⁸⁸ and Campanile⁸⁹ in Celtic and Welsh traditions have amply shown that *cerdd*, the equivalent of Greek *κέρδος*, was the standard form expressing not only the idea of ‘job’, ‘profession’, but, specifically, ‘a poet’s profession’, ‘poetry’, and ‘music’. “It is obvious”, as Campanile rightly argues,⁹⁰ that “initially poetry was conceived under the light of a professional activity, as profit bringing labor”.

In fact, the dictional convergence between Hesiodic *κέρδος ἄρηαι* and Homeric *κλέος ἀρέσθαι* may be interpreted as a *read-*

κῦδος ἀρέσθαι / Il. 21.596:... οὐδὲ τοτὲ ἔασεν Ἀπόλλων κῦδος ἀρέσθαι / Od. 22.253: δῶρη Ὁδυσσῆα βλῆσθαι καὶ κῦδος ἀρέσθαι. Theog. 628: σὺν κείνοις νίκην τε καὶ ἀγλαὸν εὗχος ἀρέσθαι / Sc. 107: σὰς ἐς χεῖρας ἀγουσιν, ἵνα κλέος ἀσθλὸν ἄρηαι / fr. 75.19 Merkelbach-West (*Catalogue of Women sive Ehoiai*): νικήσῃ καὶ οἱ δώρη Ζεὺς] κῦδος ἀρέσθαι.

⁸⁷ See B. GENTILI, *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece. From Homer to the Fifth Century* (Baltimore–London 1988 [transl. by A.Th. COLE]), 64, who, setting performance poetry in its social context, rightly remarks: “What is involved is a different perspective on reality, and a new measure of man, more suited to the changed political conditions of Greek society and to the continuing development of the new exchange economy that had replaced the landed wealth (*ploūtos*) of the past with a new wealth derived from colonial expansion and business (*kérdos*). In many cases the prerogatives to be claimed on the basis of inherited, inalienable power, capacity, and wealth were diminished or profoundly altered. The new plutocratic *agathoi*, unlike the aristocratic *agathoi* of an earlier age, could only boast the unstable wealth acquired through the toils and risks of trade”.

⁸⁸ C. WATKINS, *How to Kill a Dragon. Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (Oxford 1995), 76.

⁸⁹ CAMPANILE 1977 (note 31 above), 37.

⁹⁰ CAMPANILE 1977, 37.

ing-guide for Hesiodic poetics. In this way, a clear authorial voice begins to be heard, aiming at promoting a new form of poetical profit: not Homeric κλέος, κῦδος, εὐχος ἀρέσθαι any more, but an equally inspired Hesiodic κλέος.

The Hesiodic tradition employs in the ‘Nautilia’ section the same rival tactics as its Homeric counterpart. It does not ‘condemn’ the Homeric tradition to silence but uses it as the necessary background against which it will ‘issue’ its poetical *manifesto*. The fact that both traditions, Homeric and Hesiodic, deal in the same way with matters of external epic rivalry is very important. By using either an episode (the sailing from Aulis) or a character of the plot (Penelope and Clytaemestra) as a means to allude to an epic tradition, the Homeric and Hesiodic songs offer an internal testimony about the way we should treat them. This sort of allusion shows that an ancient audience would identify the sailing to Aulis with the tradition of the Trojan War, while the reference to Clytaemestra would point to the direction of the *Nostoi*. This common way of creating intertextual allusion is a sophisticated means of epic indexing and may well be regarded as a trademark of the genre of Archaic Greek song.

2.3.2 Internal epic rivalry

The *Theogony* and the *WD* show traces of a deliberate tradition-internal rivalry, as it is also the case with the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Pucci has shown that the *Odyssey* employs in the song of the Sirens Iliadic diction and formulas in order to make the Sirens’ call to Odysseus not only literal but also figurative.⁹¹ By refusing to set foot on their island and by rejecting the content of their song, Odysseus rejects the Iliadic tradition and decides to stay on his Odyssean ship and remain the hero of the *Odyssey*.

⁹¹ P. PUCCI, *The Song of the Sirens. Essays on Homer* (Lanham–Boulder–New York–Oxford 1998), 1–9 (= “The Song of the Sirens”, in *Arethusa* 12 [1979], 121–132).

Likewise, Segal has convincingly argued that in the Cyclops' episode in *Od.* 9, Odysseus alters Iliadic formulas designating *κλέος* in order to define, his own, new, Odyssean *κλέος*.⁹² Odysseus and, through him, the Odyssean tradition even comments on Iliadic *κλέος*, by implying that it is problematic in the world of the *Odyssey*, since by acting as an Iliadic warrior and killing the Cyclops, Odysseus will find himself trapped in the giant's cave, as nobody is able to remove the huge rock from the cave's entrance. By reshaping the *κλέος*-formulas, Odysseus denotes a different kind of *κλέος*, not one depending on martial power as propagated by the *Iliad*, but one of wit, *δόλος*, and, most of all, of cunning intelligence (*μῆτις*) the *Odyssey* has profusely bestowed its principal hero with.

Hesiodic tradition displays the same kind of internal rivalry between the *Theogony* and the *WD*. The Prometheus and Pandora digressions are good examples concerning the way the *WD* considerably deviate from the treatment of the same myths by the *Theogony*.

In the *Theogony*, the Prometheus myth is extensively narrated and is followed by a rather brief reference to Pandora. In the *WD*, it is limited in size but still anticipates the Pandora digression. In the *Theogony*, the Prometheus myth interrupts the sequence of the genealogically organized catalogues letting the audience infer that it is the Hesiodic tradition which is in control of the mythical apparatus it refers to, that what seems a *prima facie* lemmatized mythological companion bears its own lasting imprint. The Prometheus myth functions like an *aition* in the *Theogony*, in order to create a link between the divine and human worlds: offering sacrifices to the gods, stealing the fire, Pandora the first woman, all these features show that this epic aims not at mythologizing history but at historicizing myth.

In the *WD*, scholars have argued that the Pandora myth has been embedded in the plot as an *aition* for the *pithos*, which is

⁹² C. SEGAL, "Kleos and Its Ironies in the *Odyssey*", in *L'Antiquité Classique* 52 (1983), 22-47.

absent from the *Theogony* but is of crucial importance for the *WD*, as it is inextricably linked to *Elpis* remaining at the bottom of the jar.⁹³ My own approach aims at highlighting the connection between the Prometheus and Pandora digressions in the *WD*, which is fundamental to the theme of internal epic rivalry.

Despite the fact that the myth of Prometheus anticipates that of Pandora in the *WD*, as in the *Theogony*, the son of Iapetos plays an indirect role in the Pandora myth, since his advice to Epimetheus not to accept any gift from Zeus is not followed. *Mutatis mutandis*, Prometheus acts very differently in the Zeus and Pandora episodes: in the former he deceives, in the latter he is, even indirectly, deceived. The emphasis lies in both cases on the motif of deception, which is of fundamental importance for the *WD*, since it underscores the strife between Hesiod and his brother Perses from the beginning of the poem. Under this light, one can see that the digressive function of the Prometheus-Pandora myths in the *WD* systematically promotes speech as the means through which deception is effectuated: Zeus offers Pandora the gift of human voice (61), Peitho participates in Pandora's preparation (73-74), Hermes 'translates' Zeus' advice to give Pandora κύνεόν τε νόον καὶ ἐπίκλοπον ἥθος (67) into ψεύδεά θ' αἰμαλίους τε λόγους καὶ ἐπίκλοπον ἥθος (78). This insistence on the importance of speech as a means of deceit is not only an effort to connect the main theme of the epic with the Prometheus-Pandora digressions, but also a poetological gesture on the part of Hesiodic song, an implied self-referential statement concerning the very subject-matter of the epic. This observation is reinforced by the fact that Zeus' advice is expressed in indirect discourse, against the traditional epic practice of giving orders or advice in direct speech.⁹⁴ This narrative trick is in stark contrast to the Prometheus episode, which is

⁹³ I. MUSÄUS, *Der Pandoramythos bei Hesiod und seine Rezeption bis Erasmus von Rotterdam* (Göttingen 2004), 51. For the Pandora myth as a whole, see MUSÄUS 2004, 13-66.

⁹⁴ PUCCI 1977, 87-88.

expressed in the form of a symmetrically balanced dialogue between Zeus and Prometheus. The antithetical juxtaposition of the two myths in terms of syntactical techniques points both to the devaluation of Zeus' role in the Pandora myth and to a significant promotion of Pandora. The use of indirect discourse decreases the authority of Zeus, distributing his orders to various gods who interpret them at will. But if Pandora is the mythical paragon of deceit through speech, then this may well be a self-referential statement concerning the *WD* at large, the more so since this epic is programmatically and systematically concerned with speech, it is after all a didactic epic. What is the value of Hesiod's advice to Perses in a poem, where mortals hear that speech can both persuade and deceive, argue and seduce? These highly sophisticated digressions delineate the framework within which the self-conscious didactic tradition of Hesiodic song places itself. By making such a daring statement of poetics, the *WD* allude to the *Theogony*, where the same myths were employed as a trademark of supremacy against other rival theogonic traditions.⁹⁵ Internal epic rivalry acquires here an extremely revealing aspect, since the poem of the *WD* uses material familiar to the *Theogony* not to propagate its supremacy, as is the case with the *Odyssey* vs. *Iliad* rivalry, but to disclose a self-conscious, almost ironical glance at its own subject-matter, the true mark of all great poetry.

Concluding remarks

Hesiodic poetry has often been regarded as 'secondary-level' poetry, whose belonging to the same genre with its Homeric

⁹⁵ See G.W. MOST, "Hesiod and the Textualization of Personal Temporality", in *La componente autobiografica nella poesia greca e latina fra realtà e artificio letterario*, ed. by G. ARRIGHETTI & F. MONTANARI (Pisa 1993), 73-92. MOST (91) argues that "Hesiodic autobiography not only represents the self textually: it constructs the self intertextually". He thus interprets autobiographical elements in the two major Hesiodic poems as a revision and correction on the part of the *WD* of material treated in the *Theogony*.

counterpart must be based purely on employing the same meter, the dactylic hexameter. Oral Poetics have opened the door to a new world, that of oral or oral-based cultures and have subsequently paved the way for understanding and appreciating a new form of Poetics, long needed, in order to disclose the fascinating world of Archaic Greek Epic. Under this scope, Hesiodic poetry is representing a tradition of epic song, which has been crystallized in the course of the Archaic Period in a corpus of given texts, which we call Hesiodic. The profound analysis of Homeric epic under the light of Oral Poetics allows for an extended comparison between the two traditions, Homeric and Hesiodic, in matters of poetics. As far as the figure of the poet is concerned, Hesiodic song shows a deeper interest in presenting the process of acquiring authority to sing. The detailed description of the *Dichterweihe* in the *Theogony* is unprecedented and bears fruitful narrative results. The obsession with the 'first beginnings' of things is reflected in the narrative trick of making the beginning of the world and the beginning of song converge. By adopting the focus of a mortal man who is narratively 'glancing at' the world of the immortals, the Hesiodic tradition diverges from its Homeric rival, declaring that linearity and genealogical taxonomy will become its principal guiding strategies. The proem of the *WD* diverges not only from the *Theogony*, where the speaking voice disappears after the lengthy proem but also from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, where the 'I' of the narrator is almost covert as it is only mentioned by the datives of the personal pronoun. The proem of the *WD* inaugurates a poem stamped by the bold step towards the creation of an internal narrator, a preoccupation the *Odyssey* has masterly directed towards transforming its main hero, Odysseus, into an authoritative internal narrator of only part of the plot, the famous 'Apologoi'. In respect to what we have called 'commentary', the Hesiodic narrator employs with greater intensity and, sometimes, different focus narrative techniques Homeric epic is aware of. These techniques are perhaps more crucial to the *Theogony* than to the Homeric poems. This is due to the fact

that the *Theogony* is practically deprived of a narratee or narratrees, an internal audience. One needs only to bring in mind the multiple internal audiences the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* dispose of to comprehend the difference. Lack of narratees necessarily robs the *Theogony* of alternate means through which the Homeric narrator makes his presence felt: presentation through negation (*Th.* 488, 529, 687) is less frequent than Homer, an 'if-not situation' occurs only once (*Th.* 836-838), temporal anachronies are basically excluded because of the strictly genealogical and chronological blueprint the *Theogony* follows. Despite all these narrative deficiencies, the Hesiodic tradition has taken great pains to build upon a solid genealogical scaffolding an epic composition of considerable merit. Hesiodic song uses a thick web of associations between farming and poetry the Homeric poems are unaware of. This is not the case with metaphors concerning the analogy between sailor and poet, which both the *Odyssey* and the 'Nautilia' section in the *WD* exploit at great length.

In respect to the audience, both the *Odyssey* and the *WD* show consistent interest in creating internal audiences, the Phaeacians and Perses respectively. This is not the case with the *Iliad* and the *Theogony*. Like the Homeric poems, Hesiodic tradition aims at a pan-Hellenic audience. The 'Hymn to Hecate' may be seen as the trademark of Hesiodic poetic *credo*, which desires to surpass the limits of Boeotia and become the par excellence theogonic song of the Greek world. Hesiodic and Homeric poetry show the same preoccupation either externally with other rival epic traditions or internally between the poems belonging to a given tradition. Through my analysis I have made two new suggestions: (a) that the *WD* show significant similarities with the *Odyssey* in respect to several issues: an internal narrator, an internal audience, common metaphors for the sailor-poet, the postponing of the internal narrator's coming into the plot (Hesiod begins to offer his advice to Perses, only after the mythological part, just as the *Odyssey* 'allows' Odysseus to narrate his tales to the Phaeacian audience only in Book 9); (b) in many respects the *WD* are to the *Theogony* what the *Odyssey* is

to the *Iliad*. In both cases the later epic, even if this is a belief of historical positivism refuted by oral poetics, seems to rival the older one in a way that makes one think about the coincidence of this analogy, which may be explained as the by-product of genre-internal transformation, from martial (*Iliad*, *Theogony*) to non-martial epic (*Odyssey*, *Works and Days*).

DISCUSSION

E.J. Bakker : You argue that the *WD* in its poetological stance adopts a strategy different from the Homeric poems, in equaling poetry with the ruseful mind of the traveling merchant. But isn't that rather Odyssean? I'm thinking of Odysseus' second speech on his *gaster* in which he states that the *gaster*, called οὐλομένη just as Achilles' μῆνις, is what drives people to piracy and risky commercial adventures.

Chr. Tsagalis : Building on the foundations of Dougherty's work on the Greeks standing somewhere between the Phaeacians' idyllic world and the Phoenicians' greed for profit, I argued that the *WD* try to carve out an analogous place for the poem's διδαχή, i.e., between productive labor and carefully planned seafaring activity on the one hand, and idleness and risky, profit-yielding sailing undertakings on the other. I agree with Edwards who expresses the view that Hesiod has an ambivalent attitude towards trade.

M. Fusillo : I would have a question regarding the category of commentary on the 'story'. Your use of this narratological concept is absolutely correct, and the results are certainly stimulating. But I think that it would be maybe better to distinguish between various degrees of this notion. The examples of Greek archaic epic seem in fact still embryonic: a kind of micro-level of commentary, especially if we compare them with the praxis of Hellenistic poetry. Apollonius, for example, clearly comments his own narration, expressing his personal vision of the events (e.g. on the death of Apsyrtus or on the magical elimination of Talos), and fully exploiting what Genette calls the "ideological" (or "interpretative") function of the narrator.

Moreover, I do not see a clear connection between the "greater intensity" and "different focus", employed by the Hesiodic narrator in comparison to Homeric narrative techniques, and the lack of a internal audience in the *Theogony*. Could you please explain a little bit more this point?

E.J. Bakker : In the case of this etymologizing 'comment', there may also be a polemic involved, an explanation of a 'difficult' word integrated *within* the poetic text. Modern linguists at least do not take Hesiod's Κύκλ-ωψ (wheel-eye) for granted, thinking instead of an ancient and original κυ-κλωψ. Would Hesiod's comment reflect this semantic issue?

Chr. Tsagalis : You are very right to draw my attention on the various degrees of commentary 'in the story'. We should see this narratorial intervention working vertically, not only horizontally. Of course, when the comparison is made in reference to Hellenistic epic, all this seems embryonic.

In respect to your question concerning the connection between "greater intensity" and "different focus" or rather "greater focus" because of the lack of an internal narrator in the *Theogony*, I was simply wondering what means the narrator of the *Theogony* would employ to make his presence felt, now that he cannot address an internal audience.

A. Sens : Can I ask you to expand a bit on your observation that the *WD*, like the *Od.*, is concerned with "poetological signs" inasmuch as it creates an internal audience. It seems to me that the presence of an internal narrator is not ipso facto necessarily a mark of poetic self-reflexivity. When Odysseus delivers a mini-epic narrative in Books 9-12, I can see that that might call attention to the performance of epic as a genre. But can the same thing be said about the very fact that Hesiod addresses himself to Perses?

A propos of ἔτυμα v. ἀληθής it strikes me that the real opposition is between the infinitives, that is between those who speak

ordinary things ($\lambda\acute{e}γειν$) and privileged poets like Hesiod who will be able to deliver a marked type of poetry ($\gamma\eta\rho\acute{u}\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$).

Also, a point of clarification. Can I ask about whether it is really possible to speak about 'timelessness' in reference to the gods of the epic world? After all, the poetry we have places them exclusively in a markedly temporal framework.

G. Danek : Ich glaube nicht, dass für die Aussage der Musen in *Th.* 27f. der Gegensatz zwischen $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\mu\mu\circ s$ und $\grave{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\acute{h}\circ s$ entscheidend ist, sondern der zwischen $\psi\acute{e}\nu\delta\acute{h}\circ s$ und $\grave{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\acute{h}\circ s$. Wenn wir die Wortbildung von $\grave{\alpha}\cdot\lambda\eta\theta\acute{h}\circ s$ als "nicht-verbergend" verstehen, so lautet die Aussage der Musen: "Wir können viele Dinge sagen, die betrügerisch sind ($\psi\acute{e}\nu\delta\acute{e}\alpha$) und den realen Dingen ähnlich sind; wir können aber auch, wenn wir wollen, Dinge verkünden, die nicht-verbergend ($\grave{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\acute{e}\alpha$) sind".

E.J. Bakker: $\Lambda\acute{e}γειν$ in the first colon deserves more attention than it has received so far. The term does not, I think, designate a 'generic' sense of speaking; it is in fact highly marked in epic diction, and is not one of the usual verbs for speaking. It denotes speaking as "merely speaking", "just words", without substance, which in fact makes the deceptive nature of even $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\mu\mu\circ\iota\sigma\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}$ $\grave{\delta}\mu\acute{o}\iota\alpha$ more remarkable.

Chr. Tsagalis : The *Odyssey* is the only archaic epic where an internal narrator is privileged in such a way. The fact that Odysseus tells his Phaeacian audience (Books 9–12) all his adventures from Troy to the island of Calypso and — moreover — the fact that he is also the central hero of the poem, the principal plot agent is, in my view, a profound poetic statement. By endowing its hero with exceptional poetic abilities, the *Odyssey* or the tradition it represents, displays its special concern about these issues. The *Works and Days*, in opposition to the *Theogony*, have a main internal addressee, Perses: My analogy has to be seen in the light of the antithesis these 'later' epics show in respect to their 'earlier' predecessors, the *Iliad* and the *Theogony*.

respectively. The *Odyssey* is clearly more interested in poetological issues (there are two bards, Demodocus in Scheria and Phemius in Ithaca) than the *Iliad*. Mutatis mutandis the analogy is valid for the *Works and Days* in respect to the *Theogony*, where there is not an internal narratee.

In respect to the ἔτυμα/ἀληθέα antithesis that was also supported by Bakker's comments but refuted by Danek's argumentation, I would like to say that (1) the words are not synonymous, (2) that the fact that they are placed in two continuous verses may be indicative of the poem's will to draw a semantical line between them, (3) that they are accompanied by λέγειν and γηρύσασθαι, different (in fact very different) 'speaking' verbs. Bakker is very right to underscore the fact that λέγειν is a highly marked verb in epic diction, it means 'just uttering words' (note the adjective πολλά in πολλὰ λέγειν), whereas γηρύσασθαι is imbued with authoritative force as it is employed in religious language.

Finally, in respect to the question of 'timelessness'. Translating divine into human time is one of the aims of the *Theogony*. The genealogical organization of the past is the standard way to 'historicize' myth.

E.J. Bakker : You observe that the *Theogony* is more concerned than the Homeric poems with 'starting point' (ἀρχώμεθ'). I don't deny of course that the *Theogony* with its interest in 'birth' and 'origins' is different from Homer, but a factor seems to me also that the beginnings of the *Theogony* and of the *Iliad* are typologically different: the one is a hymn, to the Muses, and should as such be compared to the *Homeric Hymns* (that are concerned with 'starting from the God', just as the *Theogony*) and that served as 'proems' to an epic performance.

Chr. Tsagalis : I fully agree with your point. Further study on the *Theogony's* relation to the *Homeric Hymns* would be very interesting. Let me just remark that the *Theogony* is a collective presentation of the divine word, which has embedded and reshaped a great amount of hymnic material (Hecate, Zeus etc.).

IV

MARCO FANTUZZI

THE MYTHS OF DOLON AND RHESUS
FROM HOMER TO THE 'HOMERIC/CYCLIC'
TRAGEDY *RHESUS*

The idea that the *Rhesus* is "nothing else than an *Iliadis* carmen diductum in actus", as the tragedy was authoritatively described one century ago,¹ would no longer find many supporters among modern scholars. Indeed, even in merely quantitative terms, only one-fourth of the play (1-263) can be considered a sort of dramatization of the Doloneia of *Iliad* 10, while the rest of the play's events either have no precedent in Homer, or are presented in a way essentially different from *Iliad* 10 — in particular, the author might very well have followed the premises and the source of information that in *Iliad* 10 lead Odysseus and Diomedes to the killing of Rhesus in Homer, but he did not, as we shall see. Furthermore, the dynamics of the relation of this tragedy to the Homeric texts and to the tragic conventions in terms of literary genre are by far more complex than they might initially seem.

We will see how the intention of the *Rhesus* to be a 'continuation' of *Iliad* 10 resembles the Cyclic and Aeschylean experiences in adopting a post-Homeric approach to events connected to the Trojan War. We will also see how, in spite of the conditioning of the epic model, the Doloneia of the *Rhesus* attempts to be a properly tragic piece. We will finally see how the non-

¹ CHRIST 1889, 203.

Homeric part of the *Rhesus*, which was conceived *ad hoc* for the theatrical performance and originally intended to be a piece of tragedy, displays a kind of radical epicization of the usual tragic conventions.

The motif of the arrival and death of the fabulously rich and powerful allies of the Trojans had already been featured, though marginally, in the *Iliad*, but most probably had played an important narrative role only in the epic Cycle, especially in the post-Iliadic *Aethiopis*. The *Aethiopis* was entirely devoted to the arrival on the battlefield of Penthesileia with her Amazons and the Aethiopian prince Memnon. In this poem, at least, it is easy enough to guess that the intervention of the Trojans' allies provided substantial narrative prolongation of the action by temporarily misleading the audience about the outcome of the war, which at that point had already been more or less decided in favour of the Greeks, through a series of renewed battles boosting false expectations about Troy's survival.² Penthesileia and Memnon were also certainly given consistent attention by the author of the *Aethiopis*. Both heroes enjoyed an *aristeia* before dying (Procl. *Chrest.* 5 and 12-13, PEG I pp.67-8), and both of their deaths led to a substantial reaction: Achilles killed Therites when the latter accused him of having fallen in love with the Amazon,³ and Eos, the mother of Memnon, prayed to Zeus and won immortality for her son (Procl. *Chrest.* 6-8 and 14-15, PEG I pp.68-9). Furthermore, in at least the case of Memnon, the death of this Trojan ally was in all probability treated as parallel to the death of Hector if, as seems most likely, the result of the duel between Achilles and Memnon was decided by Zeus (assisted by Hermes) in a scene of *psychostasia* comparable to that in which Zeus had decided about the duel of Achilles and Hector in *Il.* 22.209-213.⁴ Last but not least, Eos' mourning

² Cf. WEST 2003, 9.

³ This Cyclic episode became in the 4th cent. the subject of Chaeremon's *Achilleus Thersitoctonus* (*TrGF* 71 F *1b).

⁴ That there was a *psychostasia* in the *Aethiopis* is evidenced by a few pre-Aeschylean vase-representations of the weighing of Achilles' and Memnon's souls:

for Memnon and her intervention with Zeus prove a telling anticipation of Thetis' mourning for Achilles and her escorting of him to his life of relative immortality on the island of Leuke, given that Achilles' death at the hands of Paris and the intervention of Thetis were apparently described immediately following Eos' prayer to Zeus, at the end of the same *Aethiopis* (Procl. *Chrest.* 14-16 and 19-23, PEG I pp.68-9).⁵ This parallelism, which equates the behaviour of two divine mothers from the two opposing factions, means that it is plausible that Eos' reaction to the death of her son was related with some degree of empathy, and that the *Iliad's* usual Greek perspective on the events would have been suspended in order to portray her grief from the point of view of the "losers": the Trojans and above all their allies.

In the *Iliad*, where scenes of mourning and lament speeches for dead Greek warriors and the Trojan Hector are all but infrequent,⁶ the two most significant deaths of Trojan allies, Rhesus and Sarpedon, not only carry lesser narrative weight, but also do not lead to any kind of substantial mourning. The description of Sarpedon's death, in the 16th book, includes some hints of its pathetic reactions, and has other clear points of contact with

cf. LIMC VI 1 pp.451-3 (A. KOSSATZ-DEISSMANN). The parallelism between Memnon, "hero of the East" and Achilles "hero of the West" — both are sons of a divine mother, both get a shield manufactured by Hephaestus — had also been well highlighted by REINHARDT 1960, 15. In *Il.* 18.95-96 Thetis anticipates that the fatal destiny of her son Achilles "is ready soon after Hector" (*αὐτίκα γάρ τοι ἔπειτα μεθ' Ἐκτόρα πότμος ἐτοῖμος*), though in the narrative of the actual *Iliad* Achilles does not die at all soon after Hector, and WEST 2003, 7-8 plausibly reproposes with new arguments that these lines "must reflect an earlier conception of the narrative plan... in which Achilles after killing Hector did just what Patroclus does after killing Sarpedon: forgot the advice he had been given and went on pursuing the enemy to the gates of Troy".

⁵ See especially the nearness of Memnon's death to that of Achilles' in Proclus' *Chrest.* 14-16: "... Achilles kills Memnon. And Eos confers immortality upon him after prevailing on Zeus. Achilles puts the Trojans to flight and chases them into the city, but is killed by Paris and Apollo". On the parallelism between Thetis and Eos see lastly SLATKIN 1986, 1-9, who also addresses the iconography of this parallelism, most probably modelled on the *Aethiopis*.

⁶ A specific discussion in TSAGALIS 2004; for a list, cf. p.28.

the pathos of Memnon's story.⁷ However these responses hardly provoke a significant description of pathos, as they concern Sarpedon's father Zeus, whose sorrowful tears of blood (*Il.* 16.459-461) are quite peculiar and distant from the more pathetic level of human grief.⁸ As for the human focalizers, the importance of Sarpedon for the destiny of the war and the mourning of the Trojans is presented only in *Il.* 16.548-551 through a brief and detached comment: "the Trojans were taken head to heel with a sorrow untakeable, not to be endured, since he was their city's stay (*σφίσιν ἔρμα πόληος ἔσκε*), always, though he was a foreigner, and many people came with him, but he was the best of them all in battle always".

Zeus' original intention had simply been to rescue Sarpedon from Patroclus' hands (16.436-438), but he later follows Hera's advice as she dissuades him from abusing his powers and transgressing the general principle of the Iliadic world and narrative: nothing is allowed to happen contrary to or beyond fate.⁹ She allows Zeus only to rescue Sarpedon's body and carry it back to Lycia (16.453-457 ~ 671-675):

αὐτάρε ἐπήν δὴ τόν γε λίπην ψυχή τε καὶ αἰών,
πέμπειν μιν Θάνατόν τε φέρειν καὶ νήδυμον Ὑπνον
εἰς ὃ κε δὴ Λυκίης εὐρείης δῆμον ἵκωνται,
ἔνθα ἐ ταρχύσουσι καστγνητοί τε ἔται τε
τύμβωι τε στήληι τε· τὸ γάρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων.

⁷ It is a commonplace of especially Neo-analysis that the Iliadic narration of the death of Sarpedon derived from and was modelled on the death of Memnon narrated in the *Aethiopis* — bibliography in CLARK-COULSON 1978, 65-66. JANKO 1994, 373 suggests: "I conclude that Homer or a predecessor made Sarpedon die at Troy because that was where a great Asiatic warrior had to die, just as the *Nibelungenlied* falsely synchronizes Attila and Theoderic...; but, needing to return his body to Lycia as local cult required, the poet adapted the tale of Memnon's death". For a criticism of this perspective see DIHLE 1970, 19-20, NAGY 1990, 130-131.

⁸ On the similar behaviour of Zeus vis-à-vis Athena concerning the death of Hector, and on the inevitable detachment with which gods watch human events, with the result that only human focalizers provide full expression of the pathos, cf. BREMER 1987, 42-43.

⁹ Cf. JANKO 1994, 375: "if Zeus saves Sarpedon, the story fails, for then Thetis could save Akhilleus, as Hera hints; but if Zeus does nothing, he looks implausibly feeble; so he must yield to a higher power".

Indeed Zeus' concern and the intervention of his helpers Hypnos and Thanatos do not clearly inform us that Zeus provides Sarpedon with any kind of compensatory immortality, such as that which, in contrast, Eos (via Zeus) and Thetis manage to gain for Memnon or Achilles in the *Aethiopis*; Sarpedon is only granted funerary honours in his homeland. This was certainly a form of distinction, as all other Homeric warriors who fell at Troy were buried in the Troad, with Sarpedon alone receiving burial in his own land, but there is no explicit statement in the *Iliad* of Sarpedon's immortality as a hero¹⁰ — though there may have probably been an implicit hint. The verb $\tau\alpha\rhoχύειν$ is usually translated as “to give someone burial”, both here and in the only other Homeric passage in which it occurs (*Il.* 7.85-86). Nonetheless, as Sarpedon elsewhere expressly mentions the ‘divine’/heroic honours already granted him in his lifetime (*Il.* 12.310-21), it is quite plausible that, as far as Sarpedon is concerned, the verb $\tau\alpha\rhoχύειν$ still involved the meaning ‘to heroicize’/‘to treat as a god’ (a sense inferable from one of its possible etymologies¹¹), and so hinted at a tomb cult of Sarpedon that included his ‘immortalization’ as a hero. What is clear, in any case, is that this implicit reference would have had to be recognized through the lens of the Homeric restraint on the miraculous, as if the idea of cultic immortalization of a hero could not easily coexist with the otherwise consistent Homeric idea that immortality is the fruit of the *kleos* granted by epic song or the usual Homeric silence concerning cult-worship of heroes.¹²

¹⁰ On the recurrence of the theme of immortality (especially cultic immortality) in the more “accommodating world” of the Cyclic poems (and of the *Odyssey*), and the *Iliad*'s greater restraint on it, cf. GRIFFIN 1977, 42-43, with the qualifications by EDWARDS 1985, 215-218; see also SOURVINOU-INWOOD 1995, chap.2 and BURGESS 2001, 168-169.

¹¹ For the etymology of $\tau\alpha\rhoχύειν$, already accepted by P. CHANTRAIN, *DELG* (but rejected by JANKO 1994, 377), and the consequent interpretation of the Homeric passage, cf. NAGY 1990, chap.5.

¹² As CURRIE 2005, 51 nicely puts it, “it might be argued that two traditional epic features lie behind the story of Sarpedon in *Iliad* 16: first, a hero cult of Sarpedon, known to be practised in Lycia; second, a traditional epic narrative which told of the immortalization of Memnon. Homer seems to have retained the

As for Rhesus, in *Iliad* 10 his role is almost entirely limited to his being the owner of the horses going to be acquired by Odysseus and Diomedes (cf. 434-441, 474-501). In only the briefest way does Homer narrate how Rhesus' cousin, Hippocoon, mourns for him at 10.518-522¹³ — and not without first recognizing the absence of the horses, and the slaughter of Rhesus and the other Thracians only later! As for the Trojans, they appear simply to be indignant over the extent of the devastation provoked by the two Greek spies/commandos, with no thought at all for the importance that the loss of Rhesus might have for the outcome of the war (cf. 523-525).

The death of some of the great allies of the Trojans is on the contrary a motif that also enjoys some *Nachleben* in tragedy, after the Cycle. In the *Poetics* (23.1459 b 6) Aristotle suggests *Eurypylos* as one of the “more than eight” tragedies that can be developed from the *Parva Ilias* (Eurypylos the son of Telephus, king of Mysia, after performing great deeds at Troy, was killed by Neoptolemus, while his father Telephus had been wounded by Neoptolemus’ father Achilles), and a tragedy with this title was composed by Sophocles (*TrGF* 206-222b). The *Cypria* had narrated the death of the Thracian Cycnus, the son of Poseidon, who was killed by Achilles soon after the first Greek casualty, Protesilaus, had been killed by Hector, and Sophocles’ *Poimenes* (*TrGF* 497-521) — if it really was a tragedy, and not a satyr drama, as has been recently proposed¹⁴ — featured Cycnus as protagonist (frs. 499 and 501), no less than Protesilaos, and included the description of a marching army (Cycnus’

shape of this tradition, but changed its contents in negating the cult or immortalization of Sarpedon”.

¹³ Cf. HAINSWORTH 1993, 206; BARRETT 2002, 171-172.

¹⁴ ROSEN 2003. I do not know whether the evidence for comic language and tone provided by Rosen is enough to believe his interpretation of the genre. But certainly this Sophoclean ‘tragedy’ — as well the *Rh.* (cf. PIPPIN BURNETT 1985) — included elements of excessive boast, which might seem comic (fr. 501), and furthermore included terms which might belong to comedy.

army arriving at Troy? or the Greek army after landing?¹⁵⁾ presented in narrative form by a shepherd (*TrGF* 502):

έωθινδς γάρ, πρίν τιν' αὐλιτῶν ὁρᾶν,
θαλλὸν χιμαίραις προσφέρων νεοσπάδα
εἶδον στρατὸν στείχοντα παρ' ἀλίαν ἄκραν.

This passage may be at least vaguely echoed by the announcement of Rhesus' arrival by the shepherd-messenger in the *Rhesus* (276-277 and 290-291):¹⁶

ἀνὴρ γάρ ἀλκῆς μυρίας στρατηλατῶν
στείχει φίλος σοι σύμμαχός τε τῇδε γῆι
...
πολλῆι γάρ ἡχῇ Θρήκιος ῥέων στρατός
ἔστειχε, κτλ.

There may have also been some description of a frightening and powerful army of Trojan allies (Cycnus and/or Memnon?) in Aeschylus, according to a passage in the parody of Aristophanes, *Ranae*, where Euripides proudly states (962-963):

οὐδ' ἔξεπληγτον αὐτούς
Κύκνους ποιῶν καὶ Μέμνονας κωδωνοφαλαροπώλους.¹⁷

At any rate Aeschylus certainly wrote two tragedies whose protagonist was Memnon, *Memnon* and *Psychostasia*, which most likely belonged to a single trilogy — if these are not alternative titles of the same tragedy.¹⁸ We also know that there circulated under his name the title *Cares or Europa* (*TrGF* 99-101), whose subject was the burial of Sarpedon in Lycia and his mourning

¹⁵⁾ The former hypothesis is favoured by WILAMOWITZ (*loc.cit.* n.10); the latter by the editors A.C. PEARSON and H. LLOYD-JONES.

¹⁶⁾ As was supposed by WILAMOWITZ 1877, 13. The doubts raised by RITCHIE 1964, 81 can hardly be shared.

¹⁷⁾ For a full analysis of Aristophanes' passage, and of the motif in Aeschylus and Sophocles as underlying the shepherd's description of Rhesus' army at 301-308 of our tragedy see PATTONI 2001 and, independently, MICHELAKIS 2002, 170 and n.62.

¹⁸⁾ Bibliography in *TrGF* III p.376. On *Psychostasia* see below pp. 169-170.

by Europa.¹⁹ Recently doubts about the paternity of this tragedy have been raised,²⁰ but from my perspective it makes no difference whether it was written by Aeschylus or by Aeschylus' son Euphorion. It also makes no difference whether the *Cares* or *Europa* was combined in a trilogy with the other title(s) *Memnon* and *Psychostasia* (or *Memnon/Psychostasia*), or not.²¹ In all events these Iliadic/'Trojan' tragedies would have fully balanced Aeschylus' Iliadic/'Greek' trilogy including *Myrmidones* (which staged the last phase of Achilles' *menis*, and Patroclus' death) and *Phryges* (about Priam's visit to Achilles to ransom Hector's body) + *Nereides* (the second play, if it staged the delivery of Achilles' new armour by Hephaestus, and the death of Hector, as is usually believed; the third play, if its theme was Achilles' death and Thetis' mourning²²). The two series of tragedies thus appear to have accomplished the task of presenting the grief of the Trojan war not only from the Greek point of view, which Homer's *Iliad* had preferred, but from that of the Trojans as well. Indeed, if *Nereides* was concerned with the mourning of Achilles, then the possible *Cares-Memnon-Psychostasia* trilogy

¹⁹ As was already suggested in the 19th cent. by Hartung and Blass (*contra Bergk*): see *TrGF* III p.217. See also METTE 1963, 110; KEEN 2005, 68.

²⁰ By WEST 2000, 347-350.

²¹ The idea of a trilogy *Cares-Memnon-Psychostasia* has been maintained by METTE 1963, 108-112; KOSSATZ-DEISSMANN 1978, 73-4; WEST 2000, 347; *contra* GANTZ 1978/9, 303 n.82; SOMMERSTEIN 1996, 56-57. It is true, as Gantz maintains, that the arrangement *Cares-Memnon-Psychostasia* would be "more thematic than narrative in its connection", but this thematic link is especially strong: as SOMMERSTEIN 1996, 43 correctly observes, "in *The Weighing of Souls* Eos would be shown doing for Memnon what Apollo, Death and Sleep are described in the *Iliad* (16.666-683) as doing for another leading ally of the Trojans, Sarpedon". Furthermore the coupling of Memnon and Sarpedon as objects of the gods' grief in Aristophanes, *Nubes* 622 may provide evidence that the Athenians had fairly recently had cause to think of these two heroes and to link them together (anon. referee quoted by WEST 2000, 347 n.51, and KEEN 2005, 66).

²² As suggested by WEST 2000, 341-343. It will hardly be by chance that both *Myrmidones* and *Nereides* were two of the few tragedies beginning with an anapestic parodos (the other were Aeschylus' *Persians*, *Supplices*, and most probably *Prometheus Lyomenos* [*TrGF* 190-192], furthermore Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis*, whose initial anapestic dialogue has been however often doubted).

might be seen as an even more "complementary construct" to the Iliadic/'Greek' trilogy, "covering roughly the same time-span but from the barbarian side".²³ This attention of Aeschylus to the *pathē* of the barbarian losers has already been correctly compared to the perspective of Atossa and the Persian chorus in the *Persians*.²⁴ After all the case of Memnon and Eos suggests, as we have seen, that the "enemy's mourning", precisely in connection with the deaths of the great Trojan allies, had probably been already a major theme of the epic Cycle.

There is quite a telling difference, however, between *Memnon* and/or *Psychostasia* on one side, and *Cares or Europa* on the other. In the former case Aeschylus had been developing a subject and a point of view already found in his epic model, the *Aethiopis*. As for Sarpedon, on the other hand, the *Cares* had 'continued' a myth of which Homer's *Iliad* had only narrated the beginning, namely the death of Sarpedon and the conveyance of his corpse to Lycia by Hypnos and Thanatos. We do not know how much of the story of *Iliad* 16 was retold in the *Cares or Europa* (e.g. in the form of a report by some witness or messenger, as in the *Persians*, since the scene is in Caria²⁵), but *TrGF* **99 — a long fragment of 23 lines from a *PDidot*, most probably from the initial part of the tragedy, in which Europa thinks back over her relation with Zeus and mournfully presents her fears about Sarpedon's life — leads us to infer with some confidence that at least this beginning chronologically overlapped with the Homeric events: it is quite reasonable that in order to highlight the usual tragic lack of knowledge of reality this monologue will have been pronounced by an Europa still unaware of what was happening to Sarpedon on the battlefield, or just after this fatal event had taken place, with the effect of anticipating/duplicating the pathos of the actual event

²³ See, most recently, WEST 2000, 350.

²⁴ See, e.g., KOSSATZ-DEISSMANN 1978, 65-66.

²⁵ Caria, and not Lycia as in Homer, or Caria=Lycia (cf. STRAB. 14.3.3 p.665). The mention of Mylasa, the capital of Caria, in *TrGF* 101 makes the first hypothesis more probable: cf. WEST 2000, 348 n.54.

of Sarpedon's death, in a similar way to the dream of the charioteer in *Rh.* 780-788 (see below). The most pathetic arrival of Sarpedon's body to Lycia, carried by Hypnos and Thanatos (the last Iliadic image concerning Sarpedon: 16.682-683), probably formed part of the scenic action (of course by means of the *mechane*), as it is plausible to suppose in the light of three extant vases datable from about 430 to 380 BC, which have probably been influenced by the text of the *Cares*, and focus on the carrying of the body by Hypnos and Thanatos.²⁶ The *Cares* would then have moved on to focus on the more typically tragic tale of the pathetic reaction of Sarpedon's mother to the news of her son's death. In the *Rhesus* as well, the Doloneia of the first two hundred lines deals primarily with the story of *Il.* 10, but the tragedy also goes into much more detail concerning the death of Rhesus,²⁷ through the report of the driver (756-803), where the device of the dream duplicates the description of a scene of terror and death; it also adds the 'new' mourning of his corpse by the Muse and the prophecy about his future survival as a hero in Thrace (962-973).²⁸ Some sort of parallelism is thus evident in the genesis of the *Cares or Europa* and the *Rhesus*: both tragedies consist in the continuation of an Iliadic episode whose tragic aftermath of pathetic maternal grief had not been exploited by Homer, via the Cyclic deployments of this motif. Incidentally, if the *Cares or Europa* also celebrated Sarpedon's death as an *aition* of the heroic cult that existed around the

²⁶ Cf. most recently ROBERTSON 1988, 113-114 and KEEN 2005, 68-69. That this scene was featured in the *Cares* was already proposed by H. WEIR SMYTH back in 1926.

²⁷ About *Il.* 10, see above, p. 140.

²⁸ THUM 2005 has managed to show that the author of the *Rh.* has lost many an opportunity to develop pathetic possibilities of his plot, and reasonably criticized Xanthakis-Karamanos' emphasis on the pathetic features which would make the *Rh.* and Astydamas' *Hector* closely comparable as 4th cent. pieces. But to prove that some chances of pathetic exploits were disregarded does not mean that the *Rh.* did not exploit other ones — and as a fact Thum appears to underestimate such episodes of the *Rh.* as the report by the charioteer or the Muse's mourning, which unquestionably are pathetic 'additions' to Homer.

tomb of Sarpedon,²⁹ the analogy should be even stronger, since the Muse of the *Rhesus* (962-973) anticipates Rhesus' heroic immortality — this latter hypothesis, however, although plausible, can be nothing more than just that, owing to the absence of support from the fragments.

The *Rhesus* may also challenge an older, Cyclic model for the pathetic treatment of Rhesus' death and the Muse's reactions, namely the *Aethiopis*. As we have already seen, it is possible to infer from the *immediate* narrative contiguity of the deaths of Memnon and Achilles that in this Cyclic poem the parallelism between Eos' and Thetis' reactions to the loss of their sons was emphasized. It is also sure that in the *Aethiopis* the Muses were recorded to be present in the mourning over Achilles' corpse, together with Thetis (Procl. *Chrest.* 20, PEG p.69):

καὶ Θέτις ἀφικομένη σὺν Μούσαις καὶ ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς θρηνεῖ τὸν παῖδα.

The participation of the Muses in Achilles' funerals had been also briefly reported in *Od.* 24.58-62:

ἀμφὶ δέ σ' ἔστησαν κοῦραι ἀλίοι γέροντος
οἴκτρ' ὀλοφυρόμεναι, περὶ δ' ἄμβροτα εἵματα ἔσσαν.
Μοῦσαι δ' ἐννέα πᾶσαι ἀμειβόμεναι ὅπῃ καλῇ
θρήνεον· ἔνθα κεν οὖ τιν' ἀδάκρυτον γ' ἐνόησας
Ἄργειων· τοῖον γάρ οὐπώροε Μοῦσα λίγεια.

Though the slay of Rhesus is all but close in time to Achilles' death (differently from the deaths of Memnon and Achilles in the *Aethiopis*), a new parallelism between Rhesus' and Achilles' deaths is established by the Muse of the *Rhesus*, who also prophesies her and her sisters' participation in Achilles' funerals (974-979):

ῥᾶιον δὲ πένθος τῆς θαλασσίας θεοῦ
οἶσω· θανεῖν γάρ καὶ τὸν ἐκ κείνης χρεών.

²⁹ Cf., e.g., OGIS 552; APP. BCIV. 4.10.78-79; PHILOSTR. *Her.* 14; *Schol. ad Hom. Il.* 16.673; KOSSATTZ-DEISSMANN 1978, 63-65 and 74.

Θρήνοις δ' ἀδελφαὶ πρῶτα μὲν σ' ὑμνήσομεν,
 ἔπειτ' Ἀχιλλέα Θέτιδος ἐν πένθει ποτέ.
 οὐ δύστεται νῦν Παλλάς, η̄ σ' ἀπέκτανεν·
 τοῖον φαρέτρα Λοξίου σώιζει βέλος.

I suggest that by means of these words this final prophecy of the *Rhesus* emphatically reproposes the same kind of parallelisms in maternal-divine grief that was narrated in the *Aethiopis*. As is well known, all of the extant tragedies of Euripides, with the exceptions of *Alcestis*, *Trojan Women*, and possibly *Phoenician Women*,³⁰ conclude with a prophecy.³¹ Usually delivered by a speaker with privileged knowledge of events outside the play, such as a god (in most cases a *deus ex machina*), this sort of prophetic ending “helps to create or reinforce a distinction between the end of the dramatic performance and the continuity of events portrayed”.³² Our case is rather special. The prophecy in the *Rhesus* not only predicts future events (the night of Rhesus’ death chronologically precedes Achilles’ death) but also recounts the pre-existing text of the *Aethiopis* that had narrated at least one of these events (the participation of the Muses in the mourning for Achilles), and had pointed to another parallel grief of divine mothers for mortal children (Eos and Thetis for Memnon and Achilles). Therefore the words of the *Rhesus*’ Muse constitute a gesture that at the same time recalls the most probable role of the *Aethiopis* as model for the divine mourning in the last part of the tragedy, and enhances the net of parallel mournings described by this very model, extending the continuity not of the events, as usually in the final tragic prophecies, but of the griefs: the future parallel funerals and the mourning

³⁰ *Phoenician Women* is of course an exception only for the critics who remove the entire *exodos* or those who delete 1703-1707, but is not anomalous for those who retain these lines along with some other portions of the *exodos*. For a most persuasive defence of the authenticity of 1703-1707, see MASTRONARDE 1994, 626.

³¹ The *Rhesus* may well not be by Euripides (so I believe), though in its mannerism it imitates Euripides from several perspectives.

³² Cf. DUNN 1996, 66-67.

of the Muses narrated in the *Aethiopis* come to have a longer past after the *Rhesus*.

The Muse's prophecy may also otherwise 'compete' with the model of the *Aethiopis*. Indeed it reshapes in a slightly different way the function of the Muse within the future events which were already narrated by *Aethiopis*.³³ I will not insist on the challenging comparison with Thetis' mourning which the Muse may be drawing at *Rh.* 974-975, if we accept Musgrave's and Valckenaer's $\phi\alpha\imath\omega\nu$ instead of $\beta\alpha\imath\omega\nu$ (as I think we should). Apart from this textually uncertain case of explicit challenge, the Muse expresses an implicit challenging stance towards Athena: not only my son will die, but also Thetis' son in spite of Athena's protection. We cannot rule out that in the Cyclic poem as well the Muse may have already evoked her grief for her own child, before mourning for Achilles, though I am much more prepared to believe that this was an innovation of the *Rhesus* — no hint of this sense of revenge and challenge can either be detected in *Od.* 24.57-62 or plausibly supposed in the *Aethiopis'* extended narrative, as it is too strongly connected with the proximity of the death of Rhesus, and the consequently resentful atmosphere of the speech by the *Rhesus'* Muse, to exist separately from them.³⁴ Furthermore even the Muse's reference forward to Apollo as the slayer of Achilles in *Rh.* 978-979 quoted above might be understood as an explicitly threatening and vengeful reconception of the role of Apollo in *Iliad* 10, which is oriented in the same direction as the implicit taunt against Pallas con-

³³ "If the text is asked to provide an analogy for its intertextual origins, one could say that the *past* is the most natural site for any form of intertextual recall... But what happens when the older tradition enters a new text as a view of the *future*? The idea that the characters can have a future that has already been written down is much less natural, and calls for constant negotiation between author and reader. A certain alignment is now broken" (BARCHIESI 1993, 333-334 = 2001, 105).

³⁴ VATER 1837, p.CXLVII (*Vind.* v.viii) suggested to understand the Muse's mention of the death of Achilles by supposing that the next tragedy of the trilogy featuring the *Rhesus* would have dealt with the death of Achilles: a too simplistic explanation, which relies on the unknown.

cerning Achilles' funeral. In *Il.* 10.511 Athena had warned Odysseus and Diomedes to return immediately to the ships, in order to avoid that some other god might stir up the Trojans ($\mu\eta\pi\tau\iota\varsigma\;\kappa\alpha\iota\;\Tau\tilde{\omega}\alpha\varsigma\;\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma\;\theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma\;\ddot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\varsigma$), and four lines after Apollo was actually stirring up awareness of the death of Rhesus among the Trojans, and woke up Hippocoön (10.515-522). Instead of a thoroughly epic action with simultaneous or adjoining divine interventions, in the *Rh.* Apollo's hostility to Athena is postponed to the future and gains from this a great aggressive power, acquiring the role of a real tit-for-tat revenge by the Muse on Athena for the death of Rhesus.

* * *

My second point has to do with how the Doloneia of the *Rhesus*, in spite of its obvious Homeric precedent, is made to conform to the generic features of tragedy. This section will be far more a brief summary of a few examples than an exposition, since I have recently already addressed this subject.³⁵ The author of the *Rhesus* appears, in his treatment of the Doloneia, to be concerned mainly with 'staging' the anxiety (especially the fear of being tricked by enemies) along with the lack of real knowledge and self-deception that misleads all of the characters; he makes this section of the piece a real 'tragedy of errors'. This is evident not only from the play's emphasis on the idea of *phobos* (Hector's personal *phobos* concerning the general *phobos* of the soldiers, i.e. the military panic), and the reciprocal accusations of a failure to acknowledge reality exchanged between the chorus and Hector and between Hector and Aeneas, but also from the fact that the Trojans' satisfaction with Aeneas' plan of sending a spy rather than mobilizing the army is indicative of general self-deception. The Trojans' decision to send a spy-mission will of course turn out to be the cause of their utter ruin: had the Trojan camp not been asleep, Odysseus and Diomedes

³⁵ FANTUZZI 2006.

would never have killed Rhesus. In addition, the author of the *Rhesus* misdirects the spectators by means of allusions that ascribe to the Trojans behaviour and actions that had belonged to the Greeks in *Il.* 10, or in other cases by attributing to Trojans speeches that had, in the *Iliad*, actually been delivered by different Trojan characters.

A few examples of this intertextual misdirection will suffice.³⁶ The Doloneia of the *Iliad* begins with a series of awakenings in the Greek camp: Agamemnon goes to wake Nestor for advice; the two decide to hold an assembly and so Nestor goes to wake Odysseus and Diomedes. The *Rhesus* begins with an analogous action: the sentinels go to wake Hector. The re-use of the motif would in this case establish an ideal continuity between the *Rhesus* and the *Iliad*, and would do so without disorienting the spectator but on the contrary by directing him to the model and thus the guideline to be followed for understanding the tragedy. But the *Rhesus* does not limit itself to adopting the motif, and stages it in such a way as to disorient, rather than orient, the audience. At 7-8 the guards entreat Hector to wake up with the words:

ὅρθου κεφαλὴν πῆχυν ἐρείσας,
λῦσον βλεφάρων γοργωπὸν ἔδραν, κτλ.

As a marginal note in cod. Vatic.gr. 909 has already pointed out, having just awoken, the Hector of the *Rhesus* performs exactly the same gesture with which Nestor awoke when Agamemnon had roused him from sleep in *Il.* 10.72-81. At 80 the Iliadic Nestor wakes up:

ὅρθωθεις δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' ἀγκῶνος, κεφαλὴν ἐπαείρας.

Again, in the *strophe* of the first choral song of the *Rhesus*, the watchmen press for general mobilization of the army and think of the various requirements necessary for making this happen. After having solicited Hector to alert his division and the allies, the chorus reminds him that it will be necessary to rouse the

³⁶ For a fuller analysis see FANTUZZI 2006.

most distinguished leaders, of whom they name two (*Rh.* 28-29):

τίς εῖσ' ἐπὶ Πανθοῖδαν
ἢ τὸν Εὐρώπας, Λυκίων ἀγὸν ἀνδρῶν;

In both cases, the two illustrious Trojan leaders are not cited by name; the first is referred to rather by his patronymic and the second by his matronymic (in the first case they are speaking of Euphorbus or Polydamas, in the second of Sarpedon). It is difficult to attribute this formality of designation to chance, given that, in *Iliad* 10, Agamemnon had asked Menelaus to wake all of the warriors he came across as he went through camp, taking care to be especially polite by addressing them with their patronymics (10.67-70):

φθέγγειο δ' ἦι κεν ἔηισθα καὶ ἐγρήγορθαι ἄνωχθι
πατρόθεν ἐκ γενεῆς ὄνομάζων ἀνδρα ἔκαστον
πάντας κυδαίνων· μηδὲ μεγαλίζεο θυμῶι,
ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοί περ πονεώμεθα, κτλ.

In the *Iliad* Agamemnon's suggestion that Menelaus use the patronymic was appropriately motivated by the need to show the greatest respect possible (69) in a dramatic situation in which everyone, the highest leaders included, had to present himself as a participant in responding to a common cause for concern (70).³⁷ In the *Rhesus*, apart from the generic deference the watchmen show towards the leaders (a deference that accounts for the use of the patronymic, but not for the unnecessary absence of the name), there is no motivation for this other than intertextuality (as Agamemnon had instructed Menelaus, so Homer has instructed the author of the *Rhesus*): the chorus of Trojan watchmen truly seem to put into practice, as regards

³⁷ Cf. RABEL 1991, 286: "Book 10 dramatizes the multiplicity of needs engendered in the Achaean army as a result of Achilles' rejection of the embassy. The effect of this setback is revealed most critically as a heightened need of co-operative endeavor on the part of the Achaean army, as if in compensation for the tension and disruption caused by the secession of its greatest hero".

the Trojan leaders, the admonition in *Iliad* 10 that Agamemnon directs at Menelaus!

And even when it was a Trojan who had uttered phrases in the *Iliad* that a Trojan character of the *Rhesus* will happen to repeat, in the tragedy the identity of the speaker will change. After the dialogue with the chorus in which Hector, after some difficulty, accepts the proposal for an immediate attack, he must have a confrontation with Aeneas who, more effectively than the chorus, advises against the night attack and proposes instead a spy-mission. Aeneas begins by telling Hector that he is not skilled enough when it comes to deliberation, but on the other hand excuses him, citing the *topos* that not everyone can do everything (105-108):

εἰθ' ἥσθ' ἀνὴρ εὑρισκούλος ὡς δρᾶσαι χερί.
ἀλλ' οὐ γάρ αὐτὸς πάντ' ἐπίστασθαι βροτῶν
πέφυκεν· ἄλλωι δ' ἄλλο πρόσκειται γέρας,
σὲ μὲν μάχεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ βουλεύειν καλῶς.

Precisely this same assessment of Hector had been made by Polydamas in *Iliad* 13 (726-734), according to the same rhetorical strategy that seeks to justify Hector's lack of deliberation by the fact that he instead excels in warfare. There too the argument had been made in preface to a discourse that would eventually conclude with precise strategic counsel, in that case during a very difficult moment for the Trojans, the battle at the ships that Polydamas himself had advised them to suspend in *Il.* 12.216-229, following the omen of the eagle and the serpent. Cf. *Il.* 13.726-731:

"Εκτορ, ἀμήχανός ἐσαι παραρρητοῖσι πιθέσθαι.
οὔνεκά τοι περὶ δῶκε θεὸς πολεμήια ἔργα
τούνεκα καὶ βουλῆι ἐθέλεις περιίδμεναι ἄλλων·
ἀλλ' οὐ πως ἄμα πάντα δυνήσεαι αὐτὸς ἐλέσθαι.
ἄλλωι μὲν γάρ ἔδωκε θεὸς πολεμήια ἔργα,
ἄλλωι δ' ὀρχηστύν, ἐτέρωι κίθαριν καὶ ἀοιδήν, κτλ.

The audience was thus, from the first moment of the tragedy, subject to a series of minor pitfalls concerning the identifica-

tion of the place and characters of the tragic action. This misleading intertextuality could also have most effectively compelled a prompt understanding of the changed perspective on events: it is no longer Homer's mostly Hellenocentric perspective on the events, but a purely Trojan point of view, in accordance with the Cyclic focusing on the false hopes of the losers regarding the seemingly powerful and victorious Trojan allies, which we have considered in the previous section. But this was also a way for the author to cause the audience to experience some minor form of that lack of understanding of reality that the protagonists of the tragedy would have been enacting on the stage. Tragic stories are usually tales of grave mistakes in the acknowledgement of reality, in the two different forms of plots of intrigue and of plots of *hamartia*, the active or reflexive deception that the protagonists purposely or inadvertently practise on others, or suffer in the form of self-delusion. Both the *Rhesus'* staging of the anxiety about the enemies' *doloi* and of the generalized misunderstanding of reality, and the formal, minimalistic *dolos* of the misleading intertextuality make clear to the audience just how far the Doloneia of the *Rhesus* is from being a mere dramatization of the Doloneia of *Iliad* 10. It also underscores just how cleverly the author selected the only section of the *Iliad* concerned with the *doloi* of an ambush and a treacherous raid as an homage to the poetics of tragedy, a genre that privileged actions involving *doloi* and atmospheres of misunderstanding or lack of knowledge of reality, and how expertly he succeeded at making the deceitful intertextual identification of his own characters and places a cooperative enhancement to these atmospheres.

* * *

I will now address the way in which the *Rhesus* would have also reminded the audience of the epic origins of its myth in the parts, following the Doloneia, that had no precise Homeric model and thus were most likely conceived of by the tragic

author as original elements for the tragedy.³⁸ This second part of the tragedy is from several points of view presented as a new beginning of the action.

As soon as Dolon leaves the Trojan camp, the glory of his mission is celebrated with bitter tragic irony in a short choral song. At its end (*Rh.* 263) the Doloneia proper is concluded, since the author does not deal with the encounter of Diomedes/Odysseus and Dolon, which had been described in detail by *Iliad* 10 (338-468), and only later hints very briefly at it (573, 575) and just indirectly at Dolon's death (*Rh.* 591-593, 863-866), possibly because Rhesus' death will now become the real focus of the second half of the tragedy. At this point a long section begins in which Rhesus' arrival at the scene of the war, and thus his participation in the action of the tragedy, is introduced. But this very introduction unexpectedly problematizes and delays Rhesus' participation for almost three hundred lines: the second and third *epeisodia* see the right of Rhesus to concrete participation in the war, and thus in the tragedy, first hotly opposed and later at least challenged by Hector. In his dialogue with the messenger-shepherd (264-341), Hector initially seems to refuse Rhesus, whom he considers too much of a late-comer, interested only in sharing in the profits of the war. After the pressure exerted by the messenger and the chorus, Hector is temporarily inclined to accept Rhesus but only as a guest, not as an ally (336-337). And finally, in his subsequent dialogue with Rhesus, which will result in Hector permitting Rhesus to camp near the Trojans, Hector again accuses the Thracian king of ingratitude (406-412) and of lazy self-indulgence (418-419).

Iliad 10 does not at all problematize Rhesus' participation in the action of the war. The Thracians are listed among the Tro-

³⁸ The idea that the tragedy relied on a Cyclic model, besides if not more than on *Iliad* 10, was suggested by FENIK 1964, and has had some scholarly favour, but it is completely hypothetical: cf. DIHLE 1970, 34-41; FANTUZZI 2005.

jan allies in the catalogue (*Illiad* 2.844-845), but Rhesus is not mentioned as their leader; they are also referred in books 4 and 5, though nowhere later before *Illiad* 10, and Rhesus never; therefore when Dolon first mentions Rhesus in *Illiad* 10 he might be imagined as either having been camped alongside the Trojans very recently, or as having just arrived. A different tale appears in Pindar, Fr. 262 Maehler (*ap. Schol. ad Hom. Iliad.* 10.435), where Rhesus clearly fought for one day, and showed what a danger he could be for the Greek enemy (μίαν ἡμέραν πολεμήσας πρὸς Ἑλληνας μέγιστα αὐτοῖς ἐνεδείξατο κακά). The author of the *Rh.* is however very clear about stressing that the Thracian king had just arrived in Troy the night he was slain, and thus appears to follow at least in part a third version of the myth, attested by *Schol. D ad Hom. Iliad.* 10.435:

Ἐνιοι δὲ λέγουσιν νυκτὸς παραγεγονέναι τὸν Ρῆσον εἰς τὴν Τροίαν, καὶ πρὶν γεύσασθαι αὐτὸν τοῦ ὄδατος τῆς χῶρας φονευθῆναι. χρηστὸς γὰρ ἐδέδοτο αὐτῷ, φασιν, δότι εἰ αὐτός τε γεύσηται τοῦ ὄδατος καὶ οἱ ἵπποι αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σκαμάνδρου πίωσι καὶ τῆς αὐτόθι νομῆς, ἀκαταμάχητος ἔσται εἰς τὸ παντελές.³⁹

In our tragedy Rhesus is thus neither the ephemeral character who is irrelevant in the *Iliad*, nor the Pindaric hero who thanks to his single day of action “could have dressed his fate in a full and classic solemnity”, but Athena’s words of alarmed praise of Rhesus at 598-605 do provide him with a sort of virtual epic greatness⁴⁰ — though it is a greatness which is never

³⁹ “In part”, because there is no hint at all in the tragedy at the oracle-promised invulnerability of Rhesus, though it may be dissimulated in Rhesus’ boast at 447-450 (ἐμοὶ δὲ φῶς ἐν ἡλίῳ καταρκέσει / πέρσαντι πύργους ναυστάθμοις ἐπεσπεσεῖν / κτεῖναι τ’ Ἀχαιούς· θατέραι δ’ ἀπ’ Ἰλίου / πρὸς οἰκον εἴμι, συντεμῶν τοὺς σοὺς πόνους) and in Athena’s alarmed prediction at 600-604 (εἰ διοίσει νύκτα τὴνδ’ ἐς αὔριον, / οὔτ’ ἂν σφ’ Ἀχιλλεὺς οὔτ’ ἀν Αἴαντος δόρυ / μη πάντα πέρσα ναύσταθμ’ Ἀργείων σχέθοι, / τείχη κατασκάψαντα καὶ πυλῶν ἔσω / λόγχηι πλατεῖαν ἐσδρομὴν ποιούμενον).

⁴⁰ The quotation is from PIPPIN BURNETT 1985, 32. I do not agree, however, with her stress in this page on the idea that the *Rh.* has univocally and purposefully opted for the Iliadic, un-heroic version about the destiny of the hero. Her position is more nuanced at 182 n.60, 184 n.74 (see below).

shown in action, as it belongs to the superior omniscience of the goddess to know it, and also to annihilate.⁴¹ In conclusion, the leader of the Trojans, Hector, appears not at all to trust the importance of Rhesus' contribution to the war and the two Greeks who are about to kill him, Odysseus and Diomedes, do not even know of his existence until a short time before Athena leads them against him. The only character who knows the crucial relevance of Rhesus, and unveils it, thus promoting the action which will focus on his elimination, is Athena herself.

As soon as Hector officially assents to Rhesus' participation in the war (and so in the tragic action), the sentinels of the chorus begin a new song (527-564), in which they express their anxiety about the lateness of Dolon's return (556-562), thus reminding the audience that by that time Dolon should be already dead. The stage is eventually set for the action to begin. But, again, the start is extremely slow. At the very beginning of the tragedy the sentinels of the chorus — whose behaviour and movements (they had abandoned their guard posts 17-18) drive Hector to suppose that they are affected by φόβος (37, 52, 80⁴²) — emphatically assert their identity as members of a specific watch (5-6). Their progression towards both the bivouac of Hector and Hector himself had already been described: after the opening self-apostrophe of the chorus (1), which apparently takes place far away from the bivouac, the sentinels encounter Hector's squires, address them, introduce themselves as one of the watch of the fourth part of the night, and thus also define

⁴¹ As PIPPIN BURNETT 1985, 184 aptly states, "the dramatist has selected his motifs so as to leave the fate of Rhesus as open as possible, while he yet reminds his audience of the alternative possibilities offered by the lyric and the epic traditions. The flexibility of Rhesus' fate is emphasized by another detail as well, when Athena tells Odysseus and Diomedes that they may not kill Hector or Paris, because their deaths are fixed... When she goes on to tell them that they should kill Rhesus, the natural conclusion is that his death is not so precisely fixed, and we therefore feel that we are watching divinity as it constructs 'what is' by conflating divine will with 'what had to be'".

⁴² Cf. FANTUZZI 2006.

the time of the night.⁴³ Only from l. 7 do they begin to apostrophize the sleeping Hector. See 1-7:

Βῆθι πρὸς εὐνάς τὰς Ἐκτορέους·
τίς ὑπασπιστῶν ἀγρυπνος βασιλέως
ἢ τευχοφόρων;
δέξαιτο νέων κληδόνα μύθων,
οἱ τετράμοιρον νυκτὸς φυλακὴν
πάσης στρατιᾶς προκάθηνται.
ὅρθου κεφαλὴν, κτλ.

Right in the physical middle of the tragedy, the chorus identifies the nature of its watch in connection with the time of the night, with a chronological specification which is even more clearly reminiscent of *Il.* 10.252-253 than *Rh.* 5, and attempts to wake the other sentinels who ought to be on guard duty (528-533):

τίνος ἀ φυλακά; τίς ἀμείβει τὰν ἐμάν; πρῶτα
δύεται σημεῖα καὶ ἔπτάποροι
Πλειάδες αἰθέριαι·
μέσα δ' αἰετὸς οὐρανοῦ ποτᾶται.
ἔγρεσθε· τί μέλλετε; κοιτᾶν
ἔξιτε πρὸς φυλακάν.

A few lines later, another series of details is provided to the audience that would also give them the impression of a new beginning. Odysseus and Diomedes, who had just appeared on stage at 565, move towards Hector's bivouac — once again it is Hector's bivouac, just as it had been at the beginning,⁴⁴ and once

⁴³ In a way which may be reminiscent of the chronological specification of the third part of the night in *Il.* 10.252-253: in particular τετράμοιρος νυκτὸς φυλακὴ in *Rh.* 5 may be an attempt to concentrate in a single phrase Odysseus' words in *Il.* 10.252-253, just before the arming scene with which the expedition by Odysseus and Diomedes starts: (ἀστρα δὲ δὴ προθέβηκε,) παροίχωκεν δὲ πλέων νύξ / τῶν δύο μοιρῶν, τριτάτη δὲ τι μοῖρα λέλειπται.

⁴⁴ The space in front of Hector's bivouac permanently is in the *Rh.* the place of the scenic action (or rather the place of the reports about the action, as almost nothing happens within it): cf. STROHM 1959, 266 and PÖHLMANN 1989, 105-106). But it is at the beginning and at this point in the middle of the tragedy that the author concentrates on its description.

again they are affected by φόβος (569).⁴⁵ The two Greeks first acknowledge the absence of Hector's soldiers (575), then see that Hector is not there either — once again, this slow approach recalls the sentinels' coming progressively closer to Hector's tent at the beginning of the tragedy (574-581):

'Οδ. εύνάς ἐρήμους τάσδε πολεμίων ὄρῶ.
 Δι. καὶ μὴν Δόλων γε τάσδ' ἔφραζεν Ἐκτορος
 κοίτας, ἐφ' ὅπερ ἔγχος εἰλκυσται τόδε.
 'Οδ. τί δῆτ' ἀν εἴη; μῶν λόχος βέβηκέ ποι;
 Δι. ἵσως ἐφ' ἡμῖν μηχανὴν στήσων τινά.
 'Οδ. θρασὺς γάρ τοι Ἐκτωρ νῦν, ἐπεὶ χρατεῖ, θρασὺς.
 Δι. τί δῆτ', 'Οδυσσεῦ, δρῶμεν; οὐ γάρ ηὔρομεν
 τὸν ἄνδρα ἐν εὐναῖς, ἐλπίδων δ' ἡμάρτομεν.'

The parallelism between the presentation of the sentinels at the beginning and now of Odysseus and Diomedes approaching toward Hector's tent could not stress in a better way, at the level of what we might call 'verbal scenography', the transition from the first to the second section of the play, namely the 'new beginning'. But for the tragedy to begin, the sentinel of the chorus had to find Hector in his tent, whereas Odysseus and Diomedes do not; hence the second part of the tragedy is unable to start in the way the two Greeks have planned (with the task of killing Hector), but appears to have reached an impasse, as Diomedes' last words to Odysseus in the dialogue quoted above make especially clear.

Indeed Odysseus and Diomedes seem completely unaware of the new task of killing Rhesus and capturing Rhesus' horses, the mission they will shortly complete, thanks to Athena's intervention and advice. This task is so far from their minds that they think nothing of the "iron clash made by halters striking the rail of the chariot" — a noise which is described at length

⁴⁵ Cf. PIPPIN BURNETT 1985, 37: "the killers of the Doloneia were matter-of-fact and effective, the sort that makes use of darkness as an advantage (*Il.* 10.251), but these two are baffled by the night, obstructed by error, and soon acquainted with failure and panic".

here in the *Rh.*, possibly with no aim other than to emphasize that the still unidentified “horses” (567, 569) that were its source were tethered to the chariot but not yoked, as was normal for night-time, and therefore could be captured more quickly and easily. It is clear that these easily available horses which Odysseus and Diomedes do not, for the moment, care about are designed to anticipate the horses of Rhesus’ chariot, which will later become the aim of the two Greeks’ action:⁴⁶ but at the beginning (namely before Athena’s epiphany) Odysseus and Diomedes are so exclusively concerned with the danger represented by the enemies and with the need to get back to their camp in one piece that for them the noise from the halters and the chariot-rail falls into the category of *κενὸς ψόφος*, “senseless noise” (565). Furthermore, just before Athena’s intervention, they appear to be completely in the dark about what they should do: they had intended to kill Hector, but did not find him in his bivouac, to which they had been directed by Dolon (575-579). Diomedes would have liked to try some other exploit, and to attack Aeneas or Paris (585-586), but Odysseus, who was content with having killed Dolon and wants to get back to the ships safely, finally persuades his companion to agree to his more prudent plan (591-594). From the human perspective of the two protagonists, the mission (and the second part of the tragedy) would not seem to be starting again, but to have already concluded, by this point.

The same impression of impasse would also be strengthened among the audience up until the very beginning of Athena’s epiphany, thanks to the audience’s Homeric memories. Athena

⁴⁶ Rhesus’ chariot will be introduced by Athena as being ἐγγύς “near” (613) the spot where the two Greeks are now speaking, and indeed the Thracian camp, “separate from where the rest are stationed” (613-614), is near Hector’s tent, which Odysseus and Diomedes have just left (cf. BATTEZZATO 2000, 368); furthermore the δεσμά of the horses are said to be tied to the chariot precisely in the way the horses of Rhesus will be later said to be “tethered to the chariot” at 616-617. Finally, the uncommon adjective πωλικός, used of these δεσμά at 567, will become the epithet for referring to Rhesus’ horses in the rest of the tragedy (see 621, 784, 797).

also appears in *Iliad* 10 with advice for the two Greek spies, at a moment of the action when, after Diomedes has killed Rhesus and Odysseus has conquered his horses, Diomedes is pondering whether they should stay and kill some other enemies — more or less the same vehement proposals as in *Rh.* 585-590. See *Il.* 10.503-506:

αὐτάρ δὲ μερμήριζε μένων ὃ τι κύντατον ἔρδοι,
ἢ ὃ γε δίφρον ἐλών, ὅθι ποικίλα τεύχε' ἔκειτο,
ὕμοιού ἔξερύοι ἢ ἐκφέροι νύφοσ' ἀείρας,
ἢ ἔτι τῶν πλεόνων Θρηικῶν ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἔλοιτο.

But in *Il.* 10, quite differently from what is going to happen in the *Rhesus*, Athena appears on Diomedes' side and tells him to promptly return to the Greek camp (10.508-510):

ἐγγύθεν ἴσταμένη προσέφη Διομήδεα δῖον·
νόστου δὴ μνῆσαι μεγαθύμου Τυδέος νιέ
νῆας ἐπὶ γλαφυράς, κτλ.

This intertextual precedent stresses in the most effective and surprising way how in the *Rh.* it is only Athena's intervention that restarts the action that will lead to the killing of Rhesus. While Odysseus is persuading Diomedes that they should retreat, her appearance is so immediate that she seems to have been eavesdropping on the two Greeks: she apostrophizes them with a phrase, 595-598: "Where are you going, departing from the Trojan ranks, heartsick that the god did not permit you to kill Hector or Paris?", which clearly presupposes Odysseus' insistence on the necessity of a prompt retreat, as well as the previous conversations of the two Greek spies about attacking Aeneas or Paris, or not (585-586).

As she radically changes the course of the action, Athena plays a role formally comparable to the divinity who quite often appears, mainly *ex machina*, at the end and sometimes at the beginning of tragedies; her intervention here also especially resembles, and as we will see is possibly modelled on, the hostile tone and intentions against Ajax that Athena (once again) had adopted in her epiphany to Odysseus (once again) at the

beginning of Sophocles' *Ajax* — though the latter epiphany was, because of its initial position, quite more in tune with the conventions of tragedy. Indeed, it is quite exceptional that a divinity appears on stage not at the beginning or the end, but in the middle of a tragedy (for Iris and Lyssa in Euripides' *Heracles*, see below). Furthermore, divine influence on human action quite often takes place in tragedy, and a play like Euripides' *Hippolytus* features a kind of 'coexisting' influences of two divine powers, by virtue of the sense of presence of the two presiding/conflicting deities, Aphrodite and Artemis. But the coexistence of two divine epiphanies in the *Rh.* is totally unparalleled for what we know or can reconstruct of Greek tragedy, as Athena's intervention in the middle of the tragedy coexists with the epiphany of the Muse at the end — though this final appearance of the Muse is itself much more predictable, according to the practice of the Euripidean endings.⁴⁷

In *Iliad* 10 Athena had let her assistance be made known to Odysseus at the beginning of the mission through the omen of the heron at 274-295, and as we have seen at the end she had advised the pair to retreat back to the Greek camp after the killing of Dolon. The *Rhesus*, by contrast, may have relied more openly on the Pindaric version of the myth, according to which κατὰ δὲ πρόνοιαν "Ἡρας καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς ἀναστάντες οἱ περὶ Διομήδεα ἀναιροῦσιν αὐτόν (scil. Rhesus; *Schol. bT ad Hom. Il.* 10.435 – Fr. 262 Maehler, already quoted above). It is Athena who informs Odysseus and Diomedes about the necessity of killing Rhesus (*Rh.* 595-607; in *Iliad* 10 Dolon had informed them about Rhesus' great horses); she also prevents Diomedes from killing Paris, who had been entering the scene during their dialogue (*Rh.* 627-635); finally she disguises herself as Aphrodite, in order to entertain Paris, and to prevent him from raising the alarm among the Trojans (637-674). In the tragedy, consequently, 1) Rhesus dies because of Athena's instruction, and not, as in Homer, because of the information provided by

⁴⁷ Cf. above p.146.

Dolon (in the *Rhesus*, before being killed, Dolon had on the contrary given directions to reach Hector's quarters, besides providing the password to enter the Trojan camp); 2) because of her order Paris also does not die, and 3) Odysseus and Diomedes are not discovered.⁴⁸ Her intervention in the tragic action could therefore not be more decisive. Even more importantly in terms of poetics, Athena actually appears in some way on the stage. How, exactly, she appears — whether she was at stage level, or was visible only to the audience, possibly on high in the *theologeion*, or was an offstage disembodied voice⁴⁹ — has long been a matter of scholarly dispute, in this case as well as in the case of the Athena's epiphany at the beginning of Sophocles' *Ajax* (see below, pp.165-6). At any rate this voice is in dialogue with Odysseus and later with Paris, and therefore the goddess is unquestionably integrated into the action of the stage.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ As STROHM 1959, 261 effectively synthesised, "Im Drama sind Freund und Feind nichts als Marionetten Athenes". The different importance of Athena's role in the action has been used to maintain that the author of the *Rhesus* relied primarily on a pre-Iliadic text of a Cyclic character that would also have underlain the Pindaric narration: cf. FENIK 1964, 23-25. I find this argument weak, and believe that the Pindaric precedent may have been more than enough for the *Rhesus'* greater emphasis on the goddess; this emphasis, as I will try to show, may also have been a poetologically relevant initiative by the author of the *Rhesus*, intended to challenge through an over-epicization of the role of Athena both the Iliadic model and the tragic form he was dealing with.

⁴⁹ As maintained, most recently, by TAPLIN 1977, 366 n.1 and BURLANDO 1997, 81-82. The opposite position was maintained by HEATH 1987, 166, according to whom Athena "should be at ground level, since this would facilitate her rather complex interaction with the human characters and express more clearly in terms of theatrical space the controlling presence which enables her to direct the sequence of human movements". But see the agnosticism on Athena's visibility at stage level by MASTRONARDE 1990, 274-275, which I share. MINGARELLI 1995, 128 interestingly suggests that epic, where the convention that gods in their epiphanies could be visible only to some characters and not be seen by others (e.g. *Il.* 1.198), or invisible and understandable only through the voice (e.g. *Il.* 2.182), had made "il ricordo dell'invisibilità e del riconoscimento attraverso la voce... caratteri imprescindibili della dea che li mantiene anche nelle sue apparizioni sulla scena teatrale... quindi, quando Odisseo (nell'*Aiace* e nel *Reso*) e Diomede (nel *Reso*) si trovano davanti alla dea nella rappresentazione scenica, il pubblico non aveva nessuna difficoltà a immaginarla invisibile, sebbene fosse in scena con gli attori".

⁵⁰ Therefore the role of Athena had necessarily to be played by a fourth actor, as has been observed by BATTEZZATO 2000, 371.

This kind of divine appearances and influence in the course of the human action was not at all common in Greek tragedy. A passage from Aristotle's *Poetics* (15.1454 a 37-b 7) explicitly criticizes the use of divine appearances as a device to rescue a plot which had reached an impasse:

clearly the denouements of plots should issue from the plot as such, and not from the *μηχανή*, as in the *Medea* and the scene of departure in the *Iliad*. The *μηχανή* should be employed for events outside the drama — preceding events beyond human knowledge, or subsequent events; for we ascribe to the gods the capacity to see all things. There should be nothing irrational in the events; if there is, it should lie outside the play, etc.⁵¹

Aristotle's main emphasis is on drama in this section of the *Poetics*, but the term *μηχανή* appears to be employed here not only apropos of the use of the crane for the dramatic *skene*, but of all divine interventions, including those for which the concrete *μηχανή* was not used, such as Athena's appearance and dispensation of advice to Odysseus in *Il.* 2.166-181 (the advice because of which Odysseus persuades the other Greeks not to reembark and go home).⁵² According to Aristotle's idea of the perfect plot, divine appearances are something like a technical convenience for supplying more-than-human information at the beginning or at the end — in any case, at the margins — of the action. Aristotle elaborated this principle from a historical fact: it is true that the extant plays of the Tragedians present gods announcing the future *at the beginning or end* of the action, rather than intervening in the sequence of events, whereas epic poetry had always presented the intervention of the gods *at any point* of the heroes' actions. As we have seen,⁵³ the 'second' part of the *Rh.* is introduced as a new beginning, and, as Athena's intervention takes place within this new beginning of the 'second' part of the tragedy, it may thus have

⁵¹ Translation by S. HALLIWELL, with modifications.

⁵² See LUCAS 1968, 163-164.

⁵³ Pp.153-157.

been less disruptive of the usual poetics of the tragic action. It hardly finds, however, precise parallels in what survives of Greek tragedy.

The epiphany of Iris and Lyssa in Euripides' *Heracles* (815-873), who are most probably deposited by the crane on the roof of the palace,⁵⁴ has rightly been invoked as a point of comparison,⁵⁵ since it is the single sure parallel in tragedy for a divine intervention that truly drives forward the action of the plot from a point somewhere in the middle.⁵⁶ However neither of these goddesses actually converses with the human characters onstage in *Heracles* (they only speak to the chorus), and consequently the protagonist (Heracles) neither knows nor accepts that his actions are directed by gods — whereas this direct conditioning is, in the *Rh.*, what appears to stand in contrast to the extremely consistent ideology and praxis of tragedy. We also know that in Aeschylus' *Xantriai* and *Semele or Hydrophoroi*, respectively, Lyssa and Hera appeared to the chorus (once again, probably only to them), and Hera was disguised as a prophetess;⁵⁷ but hardly anything more can be said of these lost pieces.⁵⁸

Differently from Euripides' *Heracles*, in the *Rhesus* Athena does engage in a dialogue with the protagonists, far more in accordance with epic than with tragic practice, as Odysseus and Diomedes are willing to embark on a course of action advised or rather imposed by her. Furthermore, by appearing to Paris as Aphrodite, Athena also assumes one of those protective disguises which are quite rarely adopted by tragic gods, but had been often featured by the gods in Homer — for instance when Hermes takes the form of a young nobleman so that he may assist

⁵⁴ Cf. MASTRONARDE 1990, 269.

⁵⁵ Cf. RITCHIE 1964, 120-122.

⁵⁶ "The entry of Dionysus at Ba. 604 (after his cries off stage during the earthquake scene) has the atmosphere of a divine epiphany, but he is a character in the play and is on the same level as Pentheus at 645 ($\pi\tauονώπιος$)": Euripides. *Heracles*. With Introd. and Comm. by G.W. BOND (Oxford 1981), 279.

⁵⁷ Cf. LLOYD-JONES 1957, 566-571; TAPLIN 1977, 427-428.

⁵⁸ In general on divine epiphanies in tragedy, cf. SOURVINOU-INWOOD 2003, 459-511.

Priam's passage through the Greek camp to Achilles' tent: *Il.* 24.339-348.

Athena's epic behaviour in this scene is not only explicitly reminded in Odysseus' first words to the goddess (*Rh.* 608-610):

δέσποιν' Ἀθάνα, φθέγματος γὰρ ἡσθόμην
τοῦ σου συνήθη γῆραν· ἐν πόνοισι γὰρ
παροῦσ' ἀμύνεις τοῖς ἔμοις ἀεί ποτε

by its clear textual connection with the analogous though not strictly epiphanic passage of *Il.* 10.278-279, where at the beginning of the spy mission a heron sent by Athena is heard in the night, and Odysseus prays to her as the one ἡ τέ μοι αἰεὶ / ἐν πάντεσσι πόνοισι παρίστασαι, but also probably highlighted by an emphatic intertextual marker, *συνήθη*, through which Athena's epiphany in the *Rh.* is connected to the long story of Athena's epiphanies to Odysseus and, in all probability, specifically to the similar apostrophe by Odysseus to Athena at the beginning of another epic/Cyclic tragedy, Sophocles' *Ajax*.⁵⁹ At the moment in the Iliadic story when the night of the stories of Dolon and Rhesus takes place, the Odysseus of the *Iliad* appears to have been visited by an epiphany of Athena only once, in 2.167-182 (precisely in the passage, quoted above, which Aristotle singled out to exemplify divine interventions in mid-course and not at the margins of the plot). Therefore *συνήθη* of *Rh.* 609 can hardly be understood just in connection with the past of Odysseus up to that moment of the Trojan war, but will refer to the whole story of Odysseus as a mythical character,⁶⁰ and

⁵⁹ Some of the formal connections between the epiphanies of Athena in the *Ajax* and in the *Rh.* had been emphasized by NOCK 1930. The practice of stressing the epic derivation of the scene through precise reminiscences of the Homeric epic would be in tune with Sophocles' presentation of a similar epiphany of Athena at the end of the *Philoctetes*, as analyzed by PUCCI 1994, 23-38.

⁶⁰ Only in the *Odyssey*, 13.300-301 and 20.47-48, can she practically and deservedly claim to have granted Odysseus assistance ἐν πάντεσσι πόνοις. "Athena's reputation for μῆτις developed *pari passu* with her favouritism for Odysseus. Both are embryonic in the *Iliad*. Odysseus is visited and aided by Athena, but not as frequently as other heroes. He is not yet marked out as a unique favourite... In

also possibly point to the literary dimension of other narratives concerning him, as it may recall the lexicon of memory which Greek and Latin poets often used to indicate the learnedness intended by their borrowings from previous authors.⁶¹ These words uttered by the tragic Odysseus thus establish a direct connection between his present experience and the previous ones of his literary past, namely the many epiphanies that the goddess made to him and more broadly the many occasions on which the goddess had offered him her help in the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, Sophocles' *Ajax*, etc. In the light of one verbal and one thematic point of contact (Athena's voice being called φθέγμα, and Odysseus' statement about his acknowledging the goddess' voice), I am attracted by the idea that these first words by Odysseus to an Athena who is going to shortly fool Paris (*Rh.* 637-674) echo and challenge the way another tragic Odysseus, namely the Odysseus of Sophocles' *Ajax*, had evoked his epic acquaintance with Athena in his first words (14-17) at the beginning of a tragedy which stages the fooling of a hero by the goddess:⁶²

ἄφθεγμ' Ἀθάνας, φιλτάτης ἐμοὶ θεῶν,
ώς εὐμαθές σου, καὶ ἀποπτος ἡις, δύμως
φώνημ' ἀκούω καὶ ξυναρπάζω φρενί,
χαλκοστόμου κώδωνος ώς τυρσηνικῆς.

Given the references to the goddess being ἀποπτος ("invisible", "out of sight", or "seen afar off"), at least for Odysseus,⁶³ though visible to the audience⁶⁴ — possibly on the high⁶⁵ —

the *Doloneia* we see Athena's patronage of cunning, and her connection with Odysseus, both somewhat further emphasized": POPE 1960, 123-124.

⁶¹ HINDS 1998, 3-4.

⁶² The connection between the deceit of Paris and the deceit of Ajax has been already drawn: cf., e.g., STROHM 1959, 261.

⁶³ Cf. BUXTON 1980, 22, nn.1-2; CALDER III 1965, 115; PUCCI 1994, 19. TAPLIN 1977, 116 untypically maintains that the goddess is visible (ll. 14-17 "say that Odysseus knows Athena so well that he can recognize her by her voice alone even when she is not visible — unlike the present occasion").

⁶⁴ Cf. GARVIE 1998, 124.

⁶⁵ As suggested by CALDER III 1965, 115-116; MASTRONARDE 1990, 278.

and above all to Odysseus' being promptly able (*εὐμαθές*) to infer the presence of the goddess based on the sound of her voice, the Odysseus of Sophocles' *Ajax* appears to be especially reminiscent of the two Iliadic passages *Il.* 2.182 = 10.512 ὡς φάθ', δὲ ξυνέγκε θεᾶς ὅπα φωνησάσης, in which the goddess' intervention had been acknowledged by Odysseus based only on her voice.⁶⁶ One of these two cases had occurred at *Il.* 2.182, which (as we have seen) was also the only epiphany of Athena that Odysseus had experienced in the *Iliad* before the night of *Il.* 10. The second belongs to *Iliad* 10 and concerns, as we have also seen (above, p.159), the last advice that the goddess gives to the couple of Greek spies Odysseus and Diomedes, when she recommends Diomedes to stop looking for new deeds of bravery against the Trojans, and to go back to the Greek camp. Since the Cyclic Odysseus of the *Ajax*, at the end of the war for Troy, might be thought of as relying on a long agenda of multifarious epiphanies and instances of aid given by Athena, in the text of Sophocles we can hardly presuppose an intertextual semantic motivation for the fact that Odysseus recalls the voice-epiphany of Athena of these two Homeric intertexts. But a clear and specific motivation would of course underlie an allusion to both these passages in the *Rhesus*, as the first one is the only epiphany of Athena to the Iliadic Odysseus before the night of *Iliad* 10, and the second is precisely the epiphany of Athena, in the night of *Iliad* 10, which 'corresponds' to her intervention in the *Rhesus*. Therefore I suggest that the words of the Odysseus of the *Rhesus* might include a "window reference",⁶⁷

⁶⁶ There are other epiphanies of just the divine voice in the *Iliad* (often in the *Iliad* and usually in the *Odyssey* gods do appear to human in full bodies, though almost always in disguise: cf. KULLMANN 1956, 105; CLAY 1974 and 1983, 160-169). However in two of the other Iliadic epiphanies of the voice the acknowledgement of the voice by the humans is not stressed (11.195-209, 15.236-261); different is the case of Apollo appearing to Hector in *Il.* 20.380 (... ταρβήσας, δέ τ' ἀκούσε θεοῦ ὅπα φωνήσαντος), where the second hemistich of *Il.* 2.182 = 10.512 is re-used.

⁶⁷ The window reference "consists of the very close adaptation of a model, noticeably interrupted in order to allow reference back to the source of that model:

behind the *Ajax*, to these two most relevant Iliadic appearances of Athena.

Furthermore, when Paris appears on stage, Diomedes promptly expresses his wish to kill him (*Rh.* 633), but Athena stops him with the motivation (634-637):

οὐκ ἀν δύνατο τοῦ πεπρωμένου πλέον·
τοῦτον δὲ πρὸς σῆς χειρὸς οὐ θέμις θανεῖν.
ἀλλ' ὅπερ ἡκεις μορσίμους φέρων σφαγάς
τάχυν·

These words may easily have recalled the statement on the unchangeability of the *πεπρωμένον* formulated in Hera's speech to Zeus about the destiny of Sarpedon in *Il.* 16.441-443, and repeated by Athena to Zeus about the fate of Hector in *Il.* 22.179-181:

ἄνδρα θνητὸν ἔόντα πάλαι πεπρωμένον αἰσχη
ἀψ ἐθέλεις θανάτῳ δυσηγένος ἔξαναλῦσαι;

I do not mean that the *Rhesus* includes here a specific allusion to the two Iliadic passages — the single linguistic trait *d'union πεπρωμένον* would be too weak (though this rare word only occurs in Homer in these two passages with the developed sense of *αἰσχη*⁶⁸) and above all the idea of the unchangeable fate is too much of a *topos*. I think rather that Athena's words about not attacking Paris but going to kill Rhesus for fate's sake may have evoked the role as assertors/'guardians' of the destiny which Hera and Athena had in these two passages of the *Iliad*. If I am correct, this reminiscence may also have involved some emphasis on the greater articulation the narrative function of Athena has within this tragedy than in *Iliad* 22 or than Hera's role in *Iliad* 16. Indeed Athena does not appeal here to the *πεπρωμένον* just to restrain the acting characters and remind them that events should take their destined course — this is her role in the

the intermediate model thus serves as a sort of window onto the ultimate source, whose version is otherwise not visible": THOMAS 1986, 188 = 1999, 130.

⁶⁸ Cf. JANKO 1992, 249.

case of Paris, who must not be killed. She also manages to ‘help’ fate along and nudge other events toward their destined course. In the case of the *Rhesus*, she is still the only one who knows that the *σφαγαῖ* of Rhesus are *μόρσιμοι* “destined”, or rather makes them *μόρσιμοι* with her intervention (see above, p.167): as we have seen, the two future killers still do not know at all, before she speaks, that they “had come to accomplish the destined slaughter” of the Thracian king, and at least the oracle recorded by a version of Rhesus’ myth did include the opposite possibility of an ‘open’ fate for Rhesus, becoming eternally invincible/invulnerable (*ἀκαταμάχητος* … *εἰς τὸ παντελές*). In conclusion, the destiny of Rhesus, which Athena claims to forward, mainly is a ‘textual’ fate — the fate which is especially decided for a literary character belonging to the prototypical and most authoritative text of Homer — rather than the really lopsided destinies some other characters had within less ‘open’ myths. Were it not for Athena, were it not for the *Iliad*, in our tragedy as well as in myth the scene was set for Rhesus to possibly survive that first night and acquire his invulnerability, though of course in that case the *Iliad* would have had to be ‘rewritten’ — a daunting prospect, which the author of the *Rhesus* did not choose to face. Once again, here as well as in *Iliad* 2, to which we have shown that our passage is most probably looking back, Athena is the ‘guardian of the plot’, as she prevents the textual events from taking a different course than the single one they necessarily have to take in order for the plot to be forwarded, and the tragedy not to stop or to continue in contrast with the hardly changeable model of Homer.

Athena’s appearance is thus at the same time an innovative divergence from the Homeric model of *Iliad* 10 (since in Homer’s Doloneia Athena does not have this extremely important role), and an epic feature which is strongly in tune with Athena’s role, more broadly, in the *Iliad*, but is anomalous to the praxis of tragic tales.⁶⁹ “Very rare”, but possibly not unique.

⁶⁹ In a poet of the middle comedy, Amphis, Zeus appeared disguised as

A passage by Plutarch, *How to study poetry* 2, 16 F-17 A, which illustrates how poets fabricate or inherit false πλάσματα to be imparted to the readers, quotes four lines from Homer, *Il.* 22.210-213 (the scene where Zeus puts the lives of Achilles and Hector on his scales), and adds that "Aeschylus has fitted a whole tragedy to this story, giving it the title *Psychostasia*, and has placed besides the scales of Zeus on one side Thetis and on the other Dawn, entreating on behalf of their sons who are fighting". From this testimony, and other passages that agree in ascribing the *psychostasia* to Aeschylus' tragedy, it has usually been inferred that Zeus, appearing on the *theologeion*, would have intervened in the fight between Eos and Thetis, and initiated, as a *dramatis persona*, the ensuing action that consists in the final duel between Achilles and Memnon. It has been argued that Plutarch was wrong (and that the other testimonies are misinformed or misleading), or that he reflected a post-Aeschylean imitation of Aeschylus, which means that Zeus would not have appeared on stage in Aeschylus' tragedy (indeed Zeus hardly ever took part in a tragedy as a character elsewhere): the *psychostasia* would thus have been just reported within the tragedy in a narrative form.⁷⁰ At all events, unless Plutarch (and the other sources) were completely mistaken,⁷¹ we would have had already in Aeschylus another Trojan play where another case of 'epicization' of a tragedy took place via a strong personal intervention of a god in the action, which would fully parallel the

Artemis (*PCG* II p.234, Fr. 46) in his attempt at seducing Callisto, the fellow nymph of Artemis (cf. HENRICH 1987, 262); the same scene may have already taken place in the earlier *Callisto* by the comic poet Alcaeus (*PCG* II pp.8-9, Fr. 17-18), if this comedy dealt with the nymph, and not with a famous prostitute with the same name. In Euripides' satirical drama *Cyclops* 581ff., the drunk Polyphemus takes the Satyrs to be Charites and Silenus to be Ganymedes, but this is in no way a concrete disguise by Silenus, *pace* PIPPIN BURNETT 1985, 40. The anomaly of Athena's intervention has been recently stressed by ZANETTO 1998, 152.

⁷⁰ Both ideas are by TAPLIN 1977, 431-433. Cf. already BETHE 1896, 153.

⁷¹ For a sound criticism of this perspective, cf. SOURVINOU-INWOOD 2003, 463-464.

epiphany of Athena in the *Rhesus* — though it is plausible that in Aeschylus the *psychostasia*, even should it not have been presented in a narrative form, did not take place in the middle of the action, as in the *Rhesus*, but, more expectably, in the prologue.⁷² Therefore the abrupt interruption and reopening of the scenic action in the *Rhesus* was probably even more striking and unusual than it was in Aeschylus, but we might perhaps speak of a broader trend toward allowing the interventionist Homeric gods to have an especially relevant role in the tragic re-workings of episodes from the Trojan war.

The balance between epic and tragic forms or contents of the *Rhesus* is a matter of fact which needed to be highlighted. We might perhaps venture to speak of a poetic of the 'Homeric/Cyclic tragedy', which purposefully narrated the Trojan myths by means of a combination of epic and tragic conventions, and extended, beyond the text of our tragedy, to include at least the *Cares* and the *Psychostasia* of Aeschylus as well. If we knew, for instance, something more about the *Hector* of Astydamas, which had a special fortune,⁷³ or the "Ἐκτόρος λύτρα of Dionysius, or the *Achilles* by Astydamas, Carcinus, Cleophon, Evaretus, we would be able to ascertain if this poetic extended into the 4th century, to which in several scholars' opinions the *Rhesus* should be dated.

My paper, however, mainly intended to be a specific attempt at defining the literary strategies of the *Rhesus*, which is the only surviving testimony of this poetic, and at pointing to its possible parallels, independently on the date it was composed — whether it was a juvenile work by Euripides immediately reflect-

⁷² WILAMOWITZ 1914, 58-59; NESTLE 1930, 36; METTE 1963, 112; WEST 2000, 345.

⁷³ If *TrGFI* 60 F**1h and i, from a *PHibeh* and a *PAmherst* of the 2nd cent. BC, really belong to Astydamas' tragedy, it would prove that this text was still read more two centuries after it was staged: cf. SNELL 1971, 140-141. A set of terracotta masks from Lipari (about 350 BC), representing Priam, Hecuba, Hector, Paris, Deiphobus and a nurse, may be related to this play: cf. XANTHAKIS-KARAMANOS 1980, 169 n.7.

ing the Iliadic tragedies by Aeschylus, or it was a 4th century piece which archaeologically presupposed them and/or shared the Iliadic experiences of the contemporary tragedians.⁷⁴

WORKS QUOTED

- BARCHIESI 1993 A. BARCHIESI, "Future Reflexive: Two Modes of Allusion and the Ovid's *Heroides*", in *HSCP*h 95 (1993), 333-365, now in ID., *Speaking Volumes. Narrative and intertext in Ovid and other Latin poets* (London), 105-127.
- BARRETT 2002 J. BARRETT, *Staged Narrative. Poetics and the Messenger in Greek Tragedy* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London).
- BATTEZZATO 2000 L. BATTEZZATO, "The Thracian Camp and the Fourth Actor at *Rhesus* 565-691", in *CQ* 50 (2000), 367-373.
- BETHE 1896 E. BETHE, *Prolegomina zur Geschichte des Theaters im Alterthum* (Leipzig).
- BREMER 1987 J.M. BREMER, "The So-Called 'Götterapparat' in *Iliad* XX-XXII", in *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*, ed. by J.M. BREMER, I.J.F. DE JONG and J. KALFF (Amsterdam), 31-46.
- BURGESS 2001 J.S. BURGESS, *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* (Baltimore and London).
- BURLANDO 1997 A. BURLANDO, *Reso: i problemi, la scena* (Genova).
- BUXTON 1980 R.G.A. BUXTON, "Blindness and Limits: Sophokles and the Logic of Myth", in *JHS* 100 (1980), 22-37.
- CALDER III 1965 W.M. CALDER III, "The Entrance of Athena in *Ajax*", in *CPh* 60 (1965), 114-116.

⁷⁴ This paper profited from the advice of James Diggle, Donald J. Mastronarde, and Michael Silk, whom I warmly thank.

- CHRIST 1889 W. CHRIST, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur bis auf die Zeit Justinians* (Nördlingen).
- CLARK and COULSON 1978 M.E. CLARK and W.D.E. COULSON, "Memnon and Sarpedon", in *MH* 35 (1978), 65-73.
- CLAY 1974 J.S. CLAY, "Demas and Aude: The Nature of Divine Transformation in Homer", in *Hermes* 102 (1974), 129-136.
- CLAY 1983 J.S. CLAY, *The Wrath of Athena. Gods and Men in the Odyssey* (Princeton).
- CURRIE 2005 B. CURRIE, *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford).
- DIHLE 1970 A. DIHLE, *Homer-Probleme* (Opladen).
- DUNN 1996 F.M. DUNN, *Tragedy's End. Closure and Innovation in Euripidean Drama* (New York and Oxford).
- EDWARDS 1985 A.T. EDWARDS, "Achilles in the Underworld: *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and *Aethiopis*", in *GRBS* 26 (1985), 215-227.
- FANTUZZI 2005 M. FANTUZZI, "L'Omero del *Reso*, secondo i suoi scoliasti", in *La cultura ellenistica: il libro, l'opera letteraria, l'esegesi antica*, a cura di R. PRETAGOSTINI e E. DETTORI (Roma 2005), 415-424.
- FANTUZZI 2006 M. FANTUZZI, "La Dolonia del *Reso* come luogo dell'errore e dell'incertezza", in *I luoghi e la poesia nella Grecia antica*, a cura di M. VETTA e C. CATEGNACCI (Alessandria), 241-263.
- FENIK 1964 B. FENIK, *Iliad X and the Rhesus. The Myth*, Coll. Latomus Vol. 73 (Bruxelles).
- GANTZ 1978/9 T. GANTZ, "The Aischylean Tetralogy. Prolegomena", in *The Classical Journal* 74 (1978/1979), 289-304.
- GARVIE 1998 *Sophocles. Ajax*. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary by A.F. GARVIE (Warminster).
- GRIFFIN 1977 J. GRIFFIN, "The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer", in *JHS* 97 (1977), 39-53.

- HAINSWORTH 1993 B. HAINSWORTH, *The Iliad. A Commentary*. Volume III: Books 9-12 (Cambridge).
- HEATH 1987 M. HEATH, *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy* (London).
- HENRICHS 1987 A. HENRICHS, "Three Approaches to Greek Mythography", in *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, ed. by J. BREMMER (London), 242-277.
- HINDS 1998 S. HINDS, *Allusion and Intertext. Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge).
- JANKO 1994 R. JANKO, *The Iliad. A Commentary*. Vol. IV: Books 13-16 (Cambridge).
- KEEN 2005 A. KEEN, "Lycians in the *Cares* of Aeschylus", in *Lost Dramas of Classical Athens: Greek Tragic Fragments*, ed. by F. McHARDY, J. ROBSON, and D. HARVEY (Exeter), 63-82.
- KOSSATZ-DEISSMANN 1978 A. KOSSATZ-DEISSMANN, *Dramen des Aischylos auf westgriechischen Vasen* (Mainz).
- KULLMANN 1956 W. KULLMANN, *Das Wirken der Götter in der Ilias* (Berlin).
- LLOYD-JONES 1957 H. LLOYD-JONES, *Appendix & Addendum*, Aeschylus, Vol. II (repr. 1957 of the 1926 ed.) (London and Cambridge, MA), 523-603.
- LUCAS 1968 Aristotle. *Poetics*. Introduction, Commentary and Appendixes by D.W. LUCAS (Oxford).
- MASTRONARDE 1990 D.J. MASTRONARDE, "Actors on High: The Skene Roof, the Crane, and the Gods in Attic Drama", in *Classical Antiquity* 9 (1990), 247-294.
- MASTRONARDE 1994 Euripides. *Phoenissae*, ed. with Introduction and Commentary by D.J. MASTRONARDE (Cambridge).
- METTE 1963 H.J. METTE, *Der verlorene Aischylos* (Berlin).
- MICHELAKIS 2002 P. MICHELAKIS, *Achilles in Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge).

- MINGARELLI
1995 S. MINGARELLI, "Il personaggio invisibile: le epifanie degli dei nel teatro del quinto secolo", in *Invigilata lucernis* 17(1995), 121-129.
- NAGY 1990 G. NAGY, *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Ithaca, NY and London).
- NESTLE 1930 W. NESTLE, *Die Struktur des Eingangs in der attischen Tragödie* (Stuttgart).
- NOCK 1930 A.D. NOCK, "The *Rhesus*", in *CR* 44 (1930), 173-174.
- PATTONI 2001 M.P. PATTONI, "La fastosa entrata del guerriero come modulo teatrale eschileo: il caso di Cicno, Memnone e Reso", in *Studium atque urbanitas: Miscellanea in onore di S. Daris* (= *Papyrologica Lupiensia* 9) (Galatina), 311-331.
- PIPPIN BURNETT
1985 A. PIPPIN BURNETT, "Rhesus: Are Smiles Allowed?", in *Directions in Euripidean Criticism. A Collection of Essays*, ed. by P. BURIAN (Durham NC), 13-51 & 177-188.
- PÖHLMANN
1989 E. PÖHLMANN, "Scene di ricerca e di inseguimento nel teatro attico del quinto e quarto secolo", in *Scena e spettacolo nell'antichità. Atti del convegno internazionale di studio, Trento, 28-30 marzo 1988*, a cura di L. DE FINIS (Firenze), 89-109.
- POPE 1960 M.W.M. POPE, "Athena's Development in Homeric Epic", in *AJPh* 81(1960), 113-135.
- PUCCI 1994 P. PUCCI, "Gods' Intervention and Epiphany in Sophocles", in *AJPh* 115 (1994), 15-46.
- RABEL 1991 R. RABEL, "The Theme of Need in *Iliad* 9-11", in *Phoenix* 45 (1991), 283-295.
- REINHARDT
1960 K. REINHARDT, *Tradition und Geist. Gesammelte Essays zur Dichtung* (Göttingen).
- RITCHIE 1964 W. RITCHIE, *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides* (Cambridge).

- ROBERTSON
1988 M. ROBERTSON, "Sarpedon Brought Home", in *Studies in Honour of T.B.L. Webster*, ed. by J.H. BETTS, J.T. HOOKER, and J.R. GREEN (Bristol), II 109-120.
- ROSEN 2003 R.M. ROSEN, "Revisiting Sophocles' *Poimenes*: Tragedy or Satyr Play?", in *Shards from Kolonos: Studies in Sophoclean Fragments*, ed. by A.H. SOMMERSTEIN (Bari), 373-386.
- SCHMID 1934 W. SCHMID, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, I 2: *Die griechische Literatur in der Zeit der attischen Hegemonie vor dem Eingreifen der Sophistik* (München).
- SLATKIN 1986 L.M. SLATKIN, "The Wrath of Thetis", in *TAPhA* 116 (1986), 1-24.
- SNELL 1971 B. SNELL, *Szenen aus griechischen Dramen* (Berlin).
- SOMMERSTEIN
1996 A.H. SOMMERSTEIN, *Aeschylean Tragedy* (Bari).
- SOURVINOU-
INWOOD 1995 C. SOURVINOU-INWOOD, *'Reading' Greek Death to the End of the Classical Period* (Oxford).
- SOURVINOU-
INWOOD 2003 C. SOURVINOU-INWOOD, *Tragedy and Athenian Religion* (Lanham).
- STROHM 1959 H. STROHM, "Beobachtungen zum Rhesus", in *Hermes* 87(1959), 257-274.
- TAPLIN 1977 O. TAPLIN, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus. The Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford).
- THOMAS 1986 R.F. THOMAS, "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference" (*HSCP*h 90 [1986], 171-198), now in ID., *Reading Virgil and His Texts* (Ann Arbor), 114-141.
- THUM 2005 T. THUM, "Der *Rhesos* und die Tragödie des 4. Jahrhunderts", in *Philologus* 149 (2005), 209-232.
- TSAGALIS 2004 Chr.C. TSAGALIS, *Epic Grief: Personal Laments on Homer's Iliad* (Berlin-New York).

- VATER 1837 *Euripidis Rhesus cum scholiis antiquis*, recensuit et annotavit Fr. VATERUS (Berlin).
- WEST 2000 M.L. WEST, "Iliad and Aethiopis on the Stage: Aeschylus and Son", in *CQ* 50 (2000), 338-352.
- WEST 2003 M.L. WEST, "Iliad and Aethiopis", in *CQ* 53 (2003), 1-14.
- WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF 1877 U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *De Rhesi scholiis disputatiuncula*, Index scholarum in Univ. Gryphiswaldensi ..., now in ID., *Kleine Schriften* I (Berlin 1935), 1-16.
- WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF 1914 U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Aischylos. Interpretationen* (Berlin).
- XANTHAKIS-KARAMANOS 1980 G. XANTHAKIS-KARAMANOS, *Studies in Fourth-Century Tragedy* (Athens).
- ZANETTO 1998 *Euripide. Ciclope-Reso*, a cura di G. ZANETTO (Milano).

DISCUSSION

A. Rengakos : The model for the parallelism between Rhesus' and Achilles' deaths in *Rh.* 974-979 is, apart from the *Aethiopis*, the *Iliad* itself with Thetis' lament in Book 18 about the mourning Achilles. This 'anticipated' lament foreshadows her lament for his death which will occur later — after the end of the *Iliad*.

M. Fantuzzi : I fully agree that Thetis' participation in the funeral of Patroclus, and her contemporary pain for the future death of her son in *Il.* 18, is of course a kind of anticipation, within a funeral, of a future mourning, which may have re-used the description of Achilles' funeral in the *Aethiopis* (in neo-analytical terms) and provided a model for our passage. Indeed I believe that for the author of the *Rh.* and his audience presupposing the Iliadic mourning of Thetis may have been a "window reference" (see above n.57) to the *Aethiopis*, and also vice versa. But of course the Muse(s) mourning for Achilles in the *Aethiopis* is an uniquely close parallel for the *Rh.*, as in the former poem, as well as in our tragedy, they are presented as sharing the grief for a Greek, after mourning the death of the Trojan ally Rhesus.

G. Danek : Ich glaube, wenn Dolon in *Il.* 10 über Rhesos spricht, bildet das eine deutliche Anspielung auf die in den Scholien referierte Version, dass Rhesos in der Nacht in Troja ankommt und aufgrund des Orakels noch in derselben Nacht getötet werden muss: Dolon bezeichnet die Thraker in *Il.* 10, 434 als *νεήλυδες* *έσχατοι ἀλλων* und erklärt damit, warum sie abseits lagern.

M. Fantuzzi : I agree with you that the text of the *Iliad* presupposed that Rhesus' Thracians have only arrived very recently

to Troy, namely just before the night or in the night when Rhesus is killed. After all, there is no hint in the *Iliad* at any participation of Rhesus in the war, the day before the night in which he is slain by Odysseus and Diomedes.

Therefore it is probable, or at least possible that Homer knew of the oracle-version concerning Rhesus' invulnerability and unavoidable triumph (had he lived enough to let his horses drink Scamander's water, etc.). What I maintain simply is that the author of the *Rh.* very clearly *stresses* that the Thracian king had just arrived in Troy the night he was slain — the whole *rhe-sis* by the shepherd is dedicated to the description of the arrival of Rhesus' army (*Rh.* 264-316) and Hector's doubts about his participation in the war, and the settlement (or not) of his quarters take more than one hundred lines (388-527). The author of the *Rh.* thus more clearly implies the oracle-version (though even he only implies, and does not explicitate it); the author of *Il.* 10 does not even clearly imply it.

G. Danek: Wenn Odysseus in seiner ersten Rede zu Athene sagt, sie stehe ihm immer bei, haben wir eine klare strukturelle Parallel zu der Stelle in der *Dolonie*, wo Odysseus in seinem Gebet zu Athena nach der Erscheinung des ἐρωδιός sagt: ή τε μοι αἰεὶ / ἐν πάντεσσι πόνοισι παρίστασαι (*Il.* 10, 278f.). Beide Stellen bilden die Mitte der Handlung von *Dolonie* / *Rhesus* und markieren den Übergang von der ersten zur zweiten Hälfte der Handlung. Vielleicht wird damit auch (sowohl in der *Dolonie* wie im *Rhesus*) die entscheidende Rolle zitiert, die Athene in der Orakel-Version des Mythos haben musste, wo sie die Griechen über die Gefahr des neu angekommenen Rhesos informieren musste.

M. Fantuzzi: I take your interesting point on *Il.* 10.278-279 as a possible model for *Rh.* 609b-610. I had not emphasised the Iliadic passage, because this very quasi-intervention of Athena in the Iliadic Doloneia takes place via the heron, and thus is an only indirect manifestation of the divine presence. I would be

inclined to think that *Rh.* 608-609a (the epiphany of the voice, which is the focus of my analysis) had its main model in Sophocles, *Ajax* 14-17, whereas *Il.* 10.278-279 provided the model for the 'proleptical' readiness of Athena to help Odysseus, which is expressed in *Rh.* 609b-610.

Chr. Tsagalis: The 'replacement' or 'substitution' of the Iliadic Polydamas by Aeneas may be connected to the fact that the poet of the *Rhesus* desired to have a 'first-rank' hero as Hector's opponent. Moreover, he was not bound by the *Iliad*'s tendency to downplay Aeneas' importance, as a second Hector.

P. Chuvin: Je suis tout à fait d'accord avec Christos Tsagalis pour penser que si Enée reçoit le rôle d'opposant au projet d'Hector, c'est parce que dans l'*Iliade* il représente précisément la figure de l'opposant. J'ajouterai aussi que Polydamas est une figure beaucoup moins connue du public qu'Enée. Or, à l'évidence, l'auteur du *Rhesus* a voulu mettre en scène des figures illustres, héros ou dieux. Il me semble que ces deux considérations suffisent à expliquer la substitution de personnages.

M. Fantuzzi: I fully agree with you, Christos. Why the poet of the *Rhesus* decides to eliminate the character of Polydamas, diffracting his character between Aeneas and the professional soothsayers, is an authorial choice for which one could conjecture various motivations.

In my 2006 paper I have suggested that the author of the *Rhesus* tests here a future development of the Trojan leadership, or compares the Iliadic and the post-Iliadic leaders of the Trojans, and thus presents his Aeneas playing a sort of dress-rehearsal of the role as a leader he will often play in post-Iliadic poems of the epic Cycle.

This problem of why he chooses Aeneas, however, is not the problem that interests me now. The problem on which I focused is why he replaces the character AB with the character CD, but

on the other hand the Iliadic material of the 'advice of AB' is so attentively and recognizably redistributed between Aeneas and the soothsayers, that the audience of the tragedy might seem to 'remember' Polydamas behind Aeneas's words and the soothsayers' action (had Aeneas been a protagonist of importance in the *Rhesus*, one could more easily imagine that it was only out of mechanical reuse that the tragic poet had attributed to this important character the words of an Iliadic one, Polydamas, but as a fact, after dissuading Hector from the night attack, Aeneas does not reappear any longer in the whole tragedy!).

Indeed the replacement of a character within a well known story 'canonized' by the authority of Homer is not a banal initiative at all: the ancient literary culture was for the most part one of retelling mythology rather than creating fiction, and this was especially true of the literary genre of ancient drama, itself only born after the long elaboration of mythology by epic, both Homeric and cyclic, and lyric poetry. This initiative either was intended to, or had the result to heighten the disorientation of the readers who remembered that Hector's adviser *par excellence* in the *Iliad* was Polydamas and not Aeneas, and/but found out that Aeneas, not Polydamas, in conversation with Hector, sustained the arguments affirmed by the Iliadic Polydamas.

M. Fusillo: I completely agree with your interpretation in terms of interaction between tragic and epic elements, and with the identification of tragic with the δόλος-theme. I only find a little bit awkward to put on the same level the thematic, tragic δόλος, and "the formal minimalistic *dolos* of the misleading intertextuality".

M. Fantuzzi : For sure I do not put on the same level the authorial adoption of *dolos*-themes, and the misleading allusion.

In my 2004 paper (publ. 2006), to which I have also referred in the text, I have sought to show how the clearly recognizable details of character, behaviour and place from *Iliad* 10 and the

preceding and the successive books about the battle at the wall protecting the Greek ships are displayed, though 'renamed', by the author of the *Rhesus*. Some events or narrative details (the fires, e.g., or the definition of the reward for the spy mission), or narrative functions of these elements (e.g. the fires cause alarm in both cases in the opposite camp, and in both cases the definition of the award highlights the characterization of the future Trojan spy), or many pieces of behaviour of the characters are the same, though the camp where their actions are fulfilled changes. The connotations remain the same, but the identity is altered. The ancient spectator of these first two hundred or so lines of the *Rhesus* would have, as is obvious, recognized (thanks to the names of the characters) that the scene was set in the Trojan camp. But, so I believe, just as much a spectator with Homer present in his mind was led more than once by his Homeric memories to have, at least for a moment, the impression that the scene was instead in the Greek camp, or that Aeneas was not Aeneas but rather Polydamas, or had to wonder why Hector was behaving with Dolon in the same way as Agamemnon with his promises to Achilles.

It is the norm of intertextual practice that situations, actions, words and places characterizing Person X in the model can very well, in a new work that tells a completely different story, be attributed through allusion to a different Person Y without the new work's audience feeling misled. The public itself, guided by the author of the alluding work, acknowledges the combination of the character of the new work and a character from a preceding story or work, and is content to recognize the analogy, even if (or really because) the character of the new, allusive work and the character of the model-work being alluded to have two different identities. The allusive strategy of the *Rhesus* is however much more demanding and disorienting for the audience, because for the Trojans it stages pieces of behaviour and settings of places that are clearly reminiscent of behaviours and places already present for the Greeks *in exactly the same story* within the Iliadic model, thereby collapsing the difference between the

Greek characters and setting of the *Iliad*, and the Trojan ones of the *Rh.* The audience is naturally imbued with the expectation that these analogous 'containers' hold the same identities. When instead such identities prove to be different — and at the beginning of the *Rh.* this is often the case — a sort of marginal disorientation may have descended upon the audience.

Within the most common practice of allusion in Greek and Latin poetry the presence of the preceding text that is evoked for allusion very often reveals, or rather displays, its non-pertinent relationship to the new discourse in which the allusive text is stretched and/or finalized. But the author of the *Rh.* consistently makes a completely distinctive use of such 'impropriety', at least in the opening of the play which should serve to inform of its 'setting'. I dare suggesting that we might call this use 'deceptive', and that it is in tune with the selection of a series of events from the *Iliad* in which the actualization of *dolos* predominates.

ANTONIOS RENGAKOS

HOMER AND THE HISTORIANS:
THE INFLUENCE OF EPIC NARRATIVE TECHNIQUE
ON HERODOTUS AND THUCYDIDES

Epic poetry is one of the main models for Greek historiography. Early forms of various historical concepts seem already to exist in archaic epic poetry — commonly cited examples being the “Greek national consciousness” and the “clash of East and West” — as do attempts to structure time and space in the narration (genealogy, geography, ethnography). Questions of causality, method, and truth appear also to be dealt with for the first time in the epic; and the prominence of military history, which became canonical from Thucydides onwards, has been correctly traced back to the choice of *klea andrôn* as the subject-matter of the epic. Last but not least, Greek historiography owes to epic a great number of striking literary-formal tools — one need only mention catalogues and *ecphrasis*-type descriptions.¹

¹ A pioneering work is F. CREUZER, *Die historische Kunst der Griechen in ihrer Entstehung und Fortbildung* (Leipzig-Darmstadt 1845). Cf. also Ed. SCHWARTZ, “Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichte bei den Hellenen” (1928), in *Gesammelte Schriften I* (Berlin 1938), 67-87; W. SCHADEWALDT, “Die Anfänge der Geschichtsschreibung bei den Griechen” (1934), in *Hellas und Hesperien* (Zürich-Stuttgart 1960), 395ff., esp. 399ff.; ID., *Tübinger Vorlesungen. Die Anfänge der Geschichtsschreibung bei den Griechen* (Frankfurt 1982), 81ff.; W. SCHMID-O. STÄHLIN, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur I 2* (München 1934), 643ff.; O. REGENBOGEN, “Herodot und sein Werk” (1930), in *Herodot. Eine Auswahl aus der neueren Forschung*, ed. by W. MARG (Darmstadt 1965), 57-108, esp. 76ff.; H. STRASBURGER, *Die Wesensbestimmung der Geschichte durch die antike Geschichtsschreibung* (Wiesbaden 1966), 17, 24ff.; ID., *Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung* (Heidelberg 1972).

But all these similarities in ideas, methods, language, style, themes or motifs are of secondary importance, for what actually had a far deeper influence on Herodotus, to turn to the father of historiography first, was epic narrative technique.² There was only one model Herodotus could look to for the composition and structure of the purely narrative parts of his historical work, and this was the Homeric epic, a continuous narrative of comparable extent. Herodotus' predecessors, the so-called *logographoi*, in particular Hecataeus of Miletus, the most important of them, lacked the capacity to see the object of narration as something coherent, to visualize events in causal terms, and make associations between actions involving different agents and taking place in different locations. While Herodotus was not the first practitioner of the art of narration, he was certainly the first to structure the events he narrated in terms of larger groupings and to map the ramifications of these events across several generations.³ His predecessors should actually be seen as the heirs to the non-narrative tradition of didactic epic, which goes back to Hesiod and whose primary aim was the transmission of information. Herodotus' imitation of Homer was not lost on Thucydides, who largely followed him in this respect — as for that matter did all subsequent ancient historians.

The clearest indication of the legacy of the epic in historiography is the use of the third narrative mode, which combines the two other modes, to wit simple narration (*diegesis*) and *mimesis* or dramatic reproduction of speeches, a combination which Plato viewed as a fundamental component of Homeric poetry (*Republic* 3, 392 c-394 b). Another borrowing from epic is the

² L. HUBER, "Herodots Homerverständnis", in *Synusia. Festgabe für Wolfgang Schadewaldt*, ed. by H. FLASHAR-K. GAISER (Pfullingen 1965), 29-52; H. ERBSE, *Studien zum Verständnis Herodots* (Berlin 1992), and I. DE JONG, "Aspects narratologiques des *Histoires d'Hérodote*", in *Lalies. Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature* 19 (1999), 217-275; C.W. FORNARA, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1983), 31; O. LENDLE, *Einführung in die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* (Darmstadt 1992), 62.

³ C. MEIER, *Die Entstehung des Politischen bei den Griechen* (Frankfurt 1980), 327.

description of characters' mental processes, in other words the narration of their thoughts, feelings, experiences, motives and intentions, or "internal focalisation" in the terminology of Genette.⁴ These two characteristics of ancient historiography, the mixed narrative mode and the reporting of mental processes, have long been identified as part of the legacy of epic in the genre. However, the influence of Homer goes far deeper, above all in terms of the temporal aspect of the narration, upon which I shall be focusing in the next section. The issue of the temporal structuring of the narration needs to be investigated in the context of a more general inquiry into Homer's — and Herodotus' and Thucydides' — narrative strategies, i.e. the methods by which poets and historians sought to awaken the interest of their audience and to steer it in specific directions.

I

Narration by definition is based on a temporal sequence of events, and thus the representation of time is a constitutive aspect of narrative texts. The basic form of every narrative is an "...and then...", yet in the earliest two, monumental narrative texts of Western literature, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, which do not begin *ab ovo* but *in medias res*, the monotonous sequence of events is torn apart, interrupted, altered or even completely annulled in various ways. Upon closer inspection, the seemingly very linear plot of the *Iliad* reveals a complex and masterful manipulation of time in narrative. I shall mention just one example, the so-called "reverberation or *doppelte Zeitlichkeit*" in the first eight books of the epic, that is, the way in which the past nine years of the war are mirrored in the first few of the 51

⁴ H. MONTGOMERY, *Gedanke und Tat. Zur Erzählungstechnik bei Herodot, Thukydides, Xenophon und Arrian* (Lund 1965); C. SCHNEIDER, *Information und Absicht bei Thukydides. Untersuchung zur Motivation des Handelns* (Göttingen 1974).

days of the tenth year that the dramatic time of the epic actually covers.⁵ The achievement of the poet of the *Odyssey* is equally impressive: the gradual convergence of the two strands of the story, the adventures of Odysseus and the Telemachy, is effected with astonishing dexterity and the background material is artfully distributed throughout various parts of the first half of the epic. The most remarkable examples are the great flashback of the so-called *Apologoi*, Odysseus' long narration at the court of Alcinous, and the complex embedding of various temporal levels in the digressions.

If one examines it carefully, Herodotus' treatment of time in the *Histories* turns out to be equally complex, despite the apparently chronographical arrangement of the material. Roland Barthes, one of the founders of modern narrative theory, has fittingly described it as "histoire en zigzags ou en dents de scie".⁶ The parallel between the first historical work of Western literature and the *Odyssey* with its intricate structure has been drawn many times and is particularly appropriate. Their basic structural pattern is strikingly similar: in both cases, two strands of the story which are initially presented separately converge in the last third of the work: in the *Odyssey*, the so-called Telemachy and the adventures of Odysseus finally converge in book 15, and in a similar way the primary and secondary strands of Herodotus' *Histories* — the history of Persia and the history of Greece, the latter initially presented as a series of excursions — only mesh in book 6. Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War* also exhibits a complex temporal structure, though to a lesser extent

⁵ W. KULLMANN, *Die Quellen der Ilias* (Wiesbaden 1960), 367; J. LATAZ, *Homer. Der erste Dichter des Abendlands* (Düsseldorf 2003), 161ff. A. RENGAKOS, "Die Argonautika und das 'kyklische Gedicht'. Bemerkungen zur Erzähltechnik des griechischen Epos", in *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung*, ed. by A. BIERL, A. SCHMITT, A. WILLI (Leipzig 2004), 277ff.

⁶ R. BARTHES, "Le discours de l'histoire" (1967), in *Le bruissement de la langue. Essais critiques IV* (Paris 1984), 166; cf. also Ch.-O. CARBONELL, "L'espace et le temps dans l'œuvre d'Hérodote", in *Storia della storiografia* 7 (1985), 138-149; P. PAYEN, "Comment résister à la conquête? Temps, espace et récit chez Hérodote", in *REG* 108 (1995), 308-338.

and only in the first book; the remainder of the work has aptly been likened to the more linear *Iliad*.⁷

Can more specific aspects of the temporal structure of both epics be found in the work of Herodotus or Thucydides? Before addressing this question, a few observations on the overall temporal structure of the two historical works are in order. The primary borrowing from the Homeric epics in the case of both historians is the following intricate and intriguing technique: by employing foreshadowing and harking back at judiciously chosen points in the narrative, they manage to expand the temporal scope of their work considerably. The *Iliad* represents the entire Trojan War and the *Odyssey*, the *nostoi* of the Achaean leaders, including that of Odysseus, beginning with the departure of the expedition for Troy. Likewise the scope of Herodotus' narrative is not limited to the narrowly-defined subject-matter of his work, the war between the Greeks and Persians, but encompasses both the recent and more distant past of all the major nations of the then known world.⁸ Either explicitly or in subtle, indirect ways, Herodotus regularly alludes to events beyond the temporal limits of his work, namely the final shifting of the theatre of operations to Asia Minor in the winter of 479/478 BC. In a very similar fashion, the *Iliad* contains constant foreshadowings of the death of Achilles and the fall of Troy, both of which came after the death of Hector. In the final three books of his work, Herodotus uses the Persian conquests as a discreet foil for the imperialism of the Athenians in the fifty years leading up to the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war.⁹

⁷ S. HORNBLOWER, "Narratology and Narrative Techniques in Thucydides", in *Greek Historiography*, ed. by S. H. (Oxford 1994), 131-166, esp. 140; M. STERNBERG, "Telling in Time (I): Chronology and Narrative Theory", in *Poetics Today* 11 (1990), 922ff.

⁸ I. DE JONG, "The Anachronical Structure of Herodotus' *Histories*", in *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics*, ed. by S.J. HARRISON (Oxford 2001), 93-116, esp. 96f.

⁹ J. MOLES, "Herodotus warns the Athenians", in *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 9 (1996), 259-284 and most recently ID., "Herodotus and Athens", in *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* ed. by E. BAKKER-I. DE JONG-H. VAN WEEES (Leiden-Boston-Köln 2002), 33-52.

Thucydides for his part begins his work with a brief overview of early Greek history and then goes on to describe the events which directly preceded the outbreak of the war, in the so-called Archaeology. Later, though, in the *Pentecontaetia* excursus of the first book, he links his work to that of Herodotus by means of an extended flashback covering fifty years.

II

The similarity between epic and historiography is even more striking when it comes to the narration of simultaneous events.¹⁰ This is a major problem for any narrative, but Homer came up with a superb solution in the so-called 'desultory method', which works as follows: he describes action A until it becomes stable, then puts it aside and starts to describe action B. When the latter in its turn becomes stable, he returns to A, and so on and so forth. As is well-known, synchronicity permeates the macrostructure of the Homeric epic, especially the *Odyssey*. The two strands of the epic, the Telemachy and Odysseus' adventures, are repeatedly suspended and become interlocked many times over.¹¹ The interlocking primarily serves to generate meaning, as it were: Homer wants to stress the simultaneity of the two strands of the story, that is to say he strives to show that both strands are leading simultaneously to the same goal, the reunion of father and son. The two characters gradually approach each other, their actions becoming increasingly interwoven. These processes are also highlighted by the gradually-decreasing size of the passages that narrate the two strands of the story.

¹⁰ A. RENGAKOS, "Zeit und Gleichzeitigkeit in den homerischen Epen", in *Antike und Abendland* 41 (1995), 1-33, with bibliography; ID., "Zur Zeitstruktur der Odyssee", in *WS* 111 (1998), 45-66.

¹¹ Cf. E. SIEGMANN, *Homer. Vorlesungen über die Odyssee* (Würzburg 1987), 135ff. Cf. also I. DE JONG, "Developments in Narrative Technique in the *Odyssey*", in *Epea pteroenta. Beiträge zur Homerforschung. Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann*, ed. by M. REICHEL-A. RENGAKOS (Stuttgart 2002), 77-91.

Even a cursory examination of the three last books of the *Histories* shows that Herodotus is also a master of the art of narrating simultaneous events, and that he has been schooled in this by his epic predecessor. The task Herodotus set himself was to give a vivid description of the approach of the Persian army and the simultaneous response of the Greeks to this, and he too uses the 'desultory method' to achieve his goal, switching the focus of his narration between the two adversaries. In 7.1-137 we follow the advance of Xerxes' forces until they reach Therme in Macedonia. Chapters 138-178 tell us about the preparations the Greeks were making in the meantime. Successive sections describe the battles at Thermopylae (chs. 179-239) and Artemision (8.1-25). Like Homer in the *Odyssey*, Herodotus gradually decreases the size of the passages that narrate each strand of the story in order to illustrate how the two sides come nearer and nearer to each other until they meet in the decisive sea-battle at Salamis: after 8.23, the next 16 chapters are devoted to the Persian side, and the following 10 to the Greek. Another 5 chapters for each side, and then another 2, bring us to the account of the sea-battle in ch. 73. The frequent switching from the Persian to the Greek side and vice versa serves to stress the close interdependence of the actions of the two sides. Two sequences of events that have been running in parallel up to this point now gradually converge, the Greek victory finally bringing them together.

But it was Thucydides who elevated the method just discussed to the status of a governing principle in his historical work.¹² Both ancient critics and modern scholars have repeatedly taken the historian to task for obscuring the sequence of

¹² Cf. A.W. GOMME, *The Greek Attitude to Poetry and History*, Sather Classical Lectures 26 (Berkeley-Los Angeles 1954), 127ff.; J. DE ROMILLY, *Histoire et raison chez Thucydide* (Paris 1956), 56ff.; E. DELEBECQUE, *Thucydide et Alcibiade* (Aix-en-Provence 1965); C. DEWALD, *Taxis. The Organization of Thucydides' History, Books II-VIII* (Berkeley 1975); W.R. CONNOR, *Thucydides* (Princeton 1984), 219ff.; H. ERBSE, *Thukydides-Interpretationen* (Berlin-New York 1989), 42ff.; T. ROOD, *Thucydides. Narrative and Explanation* (Oxford 1998), 120ff.

events through excessive, annalistic segmentation into summers and winters, and even within the framework of these relatively short periods of time, Thucydides very often interrupts the narration in order to provide information about events that were taking place somewhere else in the meantime. The third book, which has been often criticized in this respect, is a fine example of this practice. The account of the Mytilenean revolt of 427 in the first 26 chapters of this book is interrupted no less than four times so that Thucydides can report events that were taking place in other theatres of operations in Western Greece, Attica and Boeotia. The same method is employed even in the brief account of the *Pentecontaetia* excursus of the first book. The expedition of the Athenians to Egypt (from 460 BC), which takes up chapters 104-110, is narrated in parallel with the Aegina war (460-56) and the battles at Oenoe (460), Tanagra and Oinophyta (457). It is obvious that this choice cannot only be meant to provide a more precise chronological framework, as has often been argued; rather, the consciously-employed technique is intended to impress upon the reader the explosive energy of the Athenians during the *Pentecontaetia* and the Peloponnesian War. To give some other notable examples: in the second part of book 4 the focus alternates between Brasidas' expedition against the Athenian allies in Northern Greece and the unsuccessful operations of the Athenians in Boeotia. Similarly, the end of book 6 and the beginning of 7 are devoted to an account of the precarious position in which Syracuse found itself as a result of the Athenian siege and to the journey and arrival of the Spartan Gylippus who rushed to the city's aid. Again, the historian's use of the 'desultory method' is particularly effective at generating meaning. In the case of book 4, Thucydides emphasizes the thoughtlessness of the Athenians: had they reacted in time, they could have stopped Brasidas' advance with a fraction of the forces engaged in Boeotia. In the case of book 6, he underscores Syracuse's last-minute, narrow escape in a highly dramatic fashion.

III

The technique by which Homer and the ancient historians awakened and sustained the interest of their audience best illustrates the close relationship between epic and historical narrative; we may safely label it "epic suspense".¹³ Contrary to what was commonly accepted until a few years ago, the epic poet constantly endeavours to generate and sustain suspense, especially anticipatory suspense as to how the action will unfold, known as "*Spannung auf das Wie*". By contrast, suspense as to how the narrative will end, or "*Spannung auf das Was*", commonly used in the modern novel, is foreign to the epic since the conclusion of the story is fixed in the tradition. The same applies *mutatis mutandis* in the case of historical works because they too deal with events whose sequence and outcome are known in advance. In the two Homeric epics suspense is achieved by four means: a) retardation in its three forms, i.e. interruption of the plot, deceleration of its pace and temporary reversal of its direction, b) step-by-step clarification of the course of action, c) 'dramatic irony', which stems from the contrast between the knowing audience and the ignorant characters in the epic (or the contrast between knowing and ignorant characters), and d) intentional misleading ('misdirection') of the audience by the poet.¹⁴

Retardation is used mainly in the *Iliad* while misleading of the audience is common to both epics. 'Misdirection' is brought about by means of major discrepancies between predictions about important events and what actually occurs. In the *Iliad*, for example, this method is used to generate suspense about the

¹³ A. RENGAKOS, "Spannungsstrategien in den homerischen Epen", in *Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and Its Legacy in Honor of D.N. Maronitis*, ed. by J.N. KAZAZIS-A. RENGAKOS (Stuttgart 1999), 308-338; also still important is G.E. DUCKWORTH, *Foresighting and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Vergil* (Princeton 1933).

¹⁴ J.V. MORRISON, *Homeric Misdirection. False Predictions in the Iliad* (Ann Arbor 1992).

scale of the victory, guaranteed by Zeus' promise to Thetis, which the Trojans will achieve before Achilles sends Patroclus to battle in his place. In the *Odyssey* it is primarily Athena, the protector of both Telemachus and Odysseus himself, who functions as the poet's agent. The goddess' announcements and admonitions to both heroes, which also outline to the audience the subsequent development of the plot, are in most cases misleading.

I shall now focus exclusively on how Herodotus generates epic suspense in his work, examining in more detail the techniques of retardation, dramatic irony and misdirection of the audience which the historian uses in the so-called Xerxes *logos*, i.e. books 7-9.

Retardation¹⁵ in all three of its varieties (interruption, deceleration and temporary reversal of the direction of the narrative) is particularly in evidence in this part of the work.

i) Especially effective is the strikingly slow pace of the narrative in the first of the three Xerxes books, the account of the Persian army's long march from Asia Minor to the borders of Thessaly. Every place, river or mountain crossed by Xerxes' army is listed with meticulous care, multifarious notes are inserted and, in short but elaborate scenes, detailed descriptions and catalogues follow one after another: the historian uses every means at his disposal to suggest the image of a huge, unstoppable wave surging in from the East.¹⁶ In this long and relatively uneventful stretch of the narrative (from 7.1 to ch.138, 65 pages of text in the *OCT* edition), not a word is said about the reaction of the Greeks, who are thus cast in the role of silent and powerless spectators.

ii) In the introductory part of book 7, retardation is achieved not only via the slow pace of the narrative but also by means of

¹⁵ For a definition of "retardation" see M. REICHEL, "Retardationstechniken in der *Ilias*", in *Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen*, ed. by W. KULLMANN-M. REICHEL (Tübingen 1990), 127.

¹⁶ Cf. M. POHLENZ, *Herodot. Der erste Geschichtsschreiber des Abendlandes* (Leipzig 1937), 129; also A. BAUER, *Die Entstehung des herodotischen Geschichtswerkes* (Wien 1878), 162.

various scenes, catalogues and similar digressions which interrupt the plot. The most important of these 'stationary points' in the Herodotean narrative is the first detailed scene of the Xerxes *logos*, right at the start of book 7, the session of the royal council in which the Great King himself announces his decision to wage war upon the Greeks in a lengthy speech (7.8 a-d 2). Mardonius then delivers an inflammatory speech against the Greeks (ch. 9), after which Artabanus speaks against the war (ch.10). This is followed by Xerxes' outraged retort (ch.11) and the famous account of the triple dream (chs. 12-19) which finally convinces the now wavering Xerxes, as well as the sceptical Artabanus, of the necessity of war.

Two further extensive non-narrative digressions occur immediately after the departure of the Persian army: they form the so-called second *prooimion* (20.2-21) where, in a manner that was to become canonical in ancient historiography, Herodotus emphasizes the magnitude and scope of Xerxes' enterprise, chiefly by comparing it with earlier expeditions. In addition, the historian is particularly interested in certain technical aspects of the Persian preparations for the expedition, namely the construction of the Athos canal, the Strymon bridge and store-houses, which he describes in detail (22-25). The passage of the Persian army from Asia to Europe (ch. 54-55) gives occasion for a new 'stationary point' in the narrative, the historian emphasizing it with the extensive conversations which Xerxes has with Artabanus (ch. 46-52) and Demaratus (ch. 101-104) as well as with the lengthy cataloguing of the Persian army (59.2-99, on the occasion of the inspection of troops at Doriskus). Thus the advance of the immense Persian force pauses at the gates of Europe for more than 24 pages of text.

iii) The third variety of retardation, temporary reversal of the direction of the narrative, is employed twice at the beginning of book 7, albeit in a relatively short stretch of the narrative. Immediately after Xerxes becomes king, we learn that he initially had no intention of attacking Greece (7.5.1). Only after the first speech of Mardonius, the pressure applied by the exiled Alevads

and Peisistratids and the falsification of the oracles of Musaeus by Onomacritus does the Great King eventually change his mind (7.5.2-6). The royal council mentioned above also provides occasion for a surprising reversal of the direction of the narrative: following the decision to go to war, Xerxes decides before going to sleep not to attack Greece after all (7.12.1); but an apparition which comes to him in a dream then attempts to persuade him not to abort the expedition (12.2). The next morning the king announces his decision not to go to war (13), but the apparition revisits him in a second dream and threatens him with the loss of his power (14). A third dream, in which Artabanus is visited by the apparition, finally leads to the decision to attack Greece (15-18). Clearly the main purpose of the dreamed apparitions is to show that the destiny of a man who commits *hybris* cannot be escaped. Nevertheless, the dramatic effect produced by the portrayal of the Great King struggling against the war is extremely powerful.

IV

Retardation is not the only means by which Herodotus builds up suspense in his Xerxes *logos*; the interest of the audience is also intensified by misdirection, a concept whose deployment in a historical work might at first sight seem inappropriate. By 'misdirection' I mean all those narrative techniques which result in the audience wondering 'how?' with increasing urgency. In the course of his account of Xerxes' expedition Herodotus systematically brings to the fore a host of elements which at first seem to hint at a Persian victory — the opposite of what eventually happens, in other words. By doing this, however, Herodotus constantly confronts his audience with the question of how the Greek victory could have happened under the circumstances he recounts.

To achieve his goal, Herodotus starts by describing the Persian preparations for war in exhaustive detail. When illustrating

the might of the Persians the historian does not merely report the numerical superiority of the invading force but instead subtly heightens his audience's suspense about the five decisive battles of the war by providing all sorts of information at carefully selected points in book 7. For example, he compares the invasion of Greece with famous expeditions of the past, describes the engineering works ordered by the Persian high command, lists the numerous contingents of the army with their multifarious geographical origins and special weaponry and discusses complex logistical problems.

Right at the beginning of the Xerxes *logos* we are told of Dareius' impressive preparations for the campaign against the Greeks (7.1.2): "he lost no time in sending messengers around to the towns and cities with instructions to raise an army; every community was required to provide considerably more men than they had before, as well as ships, horses, supplies, and transport vessels. Asia was in turmoil for 3 years as a result of these demands...". The preparations of his successor Xerxes are described in much greater detail (19.2-25): the prelude is the abovementioned second *prooimion* (20.2-21), which compares Xerxes' expedition with famous campaigns of the past (Dareius' attack on the Scythians, the Scythian invasion of Asia Minor, the expedition of the Achaeans against Troy etc.) and ends with the historian's tempestuous rhetorical questions: "After all, was there any Asian people he did not lead against Greece? And was there any source of water, apart from huge rivers, they did not drink dry?" In what follows we learn all kinds of technical details about the Athos canal, the preparations for the construction of bridges and store-houses (22-25) and are then given a very detailed description of the construction of the Hellespont bridge (34-37.1); after this we read a short note about the royal escort (ch. 41) and an Iliadic catalogue of the Persian army and fleet giving the ethnic origin of the people in each contingent, the name of their leader and information about their weapons (59.2-99). At a later stage we learn of the tremendous burden imposed upon the European cities which hosted the Persian

army (118-120) and of the immense stretch of coast-line occupied by the Persian camp at Therma (127.1) and, just before the first battles at Artemision and Thermopylae, the mightiness of the still-intact Persian army (184-187), with an estimated total of 5.283.220 men, is detailed.

The powerful threat posed by Xerxes' army is further confirmed by Herodotus' accounts of the first Persian successes and of the various manifestations of Persian self-confidence, which also serve to mislead the audience, increasing suspense by making them wonder whether a Greek victory is possible despite the superiority of the barbarians. For instance, the historian often stresses the fact that Xerxes "conscripted everyone ... into his army" (7.108.1): in ch. 110 he mentions all Thracians except the Satrians, in 115.2 the nations inhabiting Pangaion. The Persian feeling of superiority is apparent from Xerxes' excursion into the Tempe valley (7.128-30), which gives the impression that he is just taking a walk through Greece, and from the freeing of the Greek spies which is mentioned soon afterwards (7.146-47). Note too the horse races that the king organizes between his own and the Thessalian cavalry, the best in Greece (7.196; the result: "the Greek horses were easily beaten"), or the measures taken by the Persians in the sea-battle of Artemision to prevent the Greeks from fleeing immediately (8.6.2: "However, they decided that this was not the time to make a frontal assault, in case the Greeks turned and fled at the sight of them coming, and night came down while they were trying to escape. If that happened, the Greeks would presumably get away, but as far as the Persians were concerned no one, not even a fire-bearer, should escape alive."). The Persians' confidence that they will soon be victorious is not only shared by their Greek subjects, the Ionians; even the historian himself views it as fully justified (8.10.1-2): "When Xerxes' troops and their commanders saw the small number of Greek ships bearing down on them, they were certain that the Greeks must have gone mad. They too put to sea, expecting an easy victory — *not an unreasonable hope, since they could see that their ships far outnumbered*

the Greeks' and were more manoeuvrable too. And so they confidently set about encircling the Greek fleet. However, some of the Ionians in the Persian fleet, who were pro-Greek and had joined the expedition against their will, were very concerned at the sight of the Greeks being surrounded. They were sure that, given the apparent weakness of the Greek forces, none of them would return home".

In book 7 the motif of the "dried-up river" occurs frequently, suggesting that the huge Persian force descended on Greece like some natural disaster. I have already mentioned the rhetorical question in the so-called second prooemium ("was there any source of water, apart from huge rivers, they did not drink dry?"), and this anticipates the dried-up river motif which makes its first appearance at 7.43.1: "When the army reached the Scamander, which was the first river they had come across since leaving Sardis and setting out on their journey that failed to provide enough water for the men and animals and that they drank dry", etc. Reports of this type, that this or that river failed, appear time and time again in what follows and are often phrased in a very similar way: the Black River (58.3) and a lake in the region of the Thasians in Thrace (109.2), the river Echedorus in Therma (127.2), the river Onochonus in Thessaly, and the river Epidanus in Achaea (196.2), which all but dried up. Herodotus also brings the dried-up driver motif into his calculation of the size of the Persian army (187.1): "In short, it does not surprise me in the slightest that the waters of some rivers should have failed; what I find far more astonishing is the logistics of feeding all those tens of thousands of people."

What is said about the reaction of the Greeks to the Persian attack also contributes significantly to the build-up of suspense via the technique of 'misdirection'. Especially noteworthy is the Greeks' defence plan (chapters 138ff.), which Herodotus describes after the first part of book 7, which deals exclusively with the Persian advance. In a council of war at the Isthmus the Greeks, who have resolved to fight against the barbarians, make three decisions (145.1ff.): first, "to lay aside all mutual antago-

nism and end any wars that were currently being fought among themselves"; second, "to send spies to Asia to keep an eye on Persian affairs" and, third, to dispatch embassies to Argos, Sicily, Corcyra and Crete in order to forge an alliance against the Persians. While Herodotus allots just one sentence to informing us that the first part of this defence plan, the putting aside of all internal feuds, was successfully implemented (146.1), we are given a lot more detail about the failure of the other two parts.

The Greek intelligence mission to Asia (146-147) turns into a farce and ultimately serves to re-emphasize Xerxes' superiority and confidence in his own victory. The Greeks who have been sent to spy on the Great King's army in Sardis are captured and sentenced to death, but when Xerxes learns of this, he sets them free and allows them to continue their reconnaissance before returning to Greece, reckoning that Greek intelligence about the Persian preparations will play to his advantage, i.e. that if the Greeks are convinced of the Persians' superiority, they will not resist. The anecdote about Xerxes seeing Greek merchant ships bound for Aegina and the Peloponnese crossing the Hellespont (147.2) also suggests his certainty about victory: he lets the ships pass, reasoning that, with the crushing of the Greek resistance imminent, it is the Persian army that will soon be profiting from their cargo.

The attempts of the Greek allies to secure the assistance of other Greek forces failed miserably. As Herodotus explains in 148-171, none of those asked by the allies for help was willing to stand up for the freedom of Greece. In Argos, the first state the allies turned to, the embassy immediately met with a rebuff (148-152), and Herodotus counts Argos among those who adopted a position of neutrality — and, as he puts it, "if I may speak bluntly here, remaining neutral was the same as collaborating with the Persians" (8.73.3). Herodotus goes into even greater detail about how Gelon came to power and the fruitless negotiations which the Greek embassy to Sicily had with the tyrant, who, as the historian has already remarked at 7.145.2, had "enormous resources, far greater than those available to any-

one else in Greece" (cf. 156.3). The length of the section on Gelon undoubtedly emphasizes the fact that the Greeks bitterly regretted his unwillingness to help, for he had the ability (158.4) to raise 20.000 hoplites, 2.000 horse, 6.000 lightly armed soldiers and a fleet of 200 ships (more than half of the Greek fleet at Salamis!); the modest Greek army which subsequently advanced to Thessaly (approximately 10.000 hoplites; 173.2) pales in comparison with such forces. Corcyra and Crete, the other two Greek powers whose help the allies attempted to secure, also declined the invitation to join the Greek camp.

In the last three books of the *Histories*, the Greeks' fear of the advancing Persians is mentioned in many passages and is another striking way by which Herodotus brings about misdirection with regard to the reactions of the Greeks. Recurrent and conspicuous (it appears in a total of 16 passages), the fear motif clearly indicates that the narrator intends to mislead the audience: since the motif occurs before major Greek victories, the audience probably perceives these victories as totally unexpected.

Some of the 16 passages in question are part of the section on the Greek reaction to the Persian invasion which I referred to above. The tone is set by Herodotus' conclusion in 7.138.2 that "other Greeks had not given these tokens of submission and so were terrified, first because there were not enough ships in Greece to confront the Persian advance, and second because most of them did not want to take an active part in the war, and were therefore eagerly collaborating with the Persians". The Greek ambassadors to Gelon also justify their fear that Greece will fall to the Persians with the same arguments (157.2) and the tyrant himself thinks that the Greeks may not be able to withstand the onslaught of the barbarians (163.1), an opinion also shared by the Corcyreans (168.2: "they did not anticipate a Greek victory but expected that the Persians would easily win and would gain control over the whole of Greece"). So it is not surprising that the Greek force which advanced to Thessaly to confront the Persians retreated as soon as the envoys of Alexan-

der, the king of Macedonia, advised them “to pack up and leave the pass without waiting to be trampled underfoot by the advancing army”. As Herodotus himself remarks, “the deciding factor was fear, induced by the fact that they had found out that there was another route into Thessaly from inland Macedonia” (173.3-4). Finally, the Delphians consulted the god “because they were frightened about their own future and that of Greece as a whole” (178.1). In the short section dealing with the preparation of the Greeks (chapters 132ff.), the fear motif appears no less than seven times, as it were setting the tone for the beginning of hostilities in chs. 179ff.

Fear and an almost instinctive tendency to flee are the dominant characteristics of the Greeks in every major battle. The Greek fleet, which is stationed near Artemision, retreats to the south towards Chalcis immediately after the first skirmish, in which the Persians destroy three Greek ships (183.1: “The news made the Greeks afraid and they changed their anchorage from Artemision to Chalcis.”). As Xerxes draws near the narrow path at Thermopylae, the fearful Greeks prepare to flee (207; here, as at 178.2 and 183.1, Herodotus uses the strong verb *katarrhōdeô* [cf. *arrhōdiê* in 173.4]). After the battle of Thermopylae the Greek navy, which has regrouped near Artemision, prepares to flee once again (8.4.1: “when the Greeks stationed at Artemision saw how many ships were moored at Aphetae and saw Persian troops spread out everywhere, they were terrified [another use of *katarrhōdēsantes!*], because this was not the condition they had expected the Persians to be in, after the storm”). The fleet is only persuaded to stay at Artemision when Themistocles bribes both Eurybiades and Adeimantos on behalf of the Euboeans, although one would certainly have expected it to flee, as the Persians evidently do (6.2): “the Persians decided that this was not the time to make a frontal assault, in case the Greeks turned and fled at the sight of them coming, and night came down while they were trying to escape. If that happened, the Greeks would presumably get away, but as far as the Persians were concerned no one, not even a fire-bearer, should escape

alive". Immediately after the sea-battle at Artemision the historian observes stereotypically in 8.18 that the Greeks "had been badly mauled (especially the Athenians, half of whose ships were damaged) and decided to retreat down into Greece". This manoeuvre of the Greek navy is again characterized as "fleeing" soon afterwards in 23.1: "a man from Histiae sailed over to the Persians and told them that the Greeks had escaped from Artemision".

The fear motif is also prominent in the account of the sea-battle at Salamis, in which the Greeks scored their most decisive victory. Five times the Greeks are about to flee, above all after the devastation of Attica (8.56.1): "When news of the events on the Athenian Acropolis reached the Greeks on Salamis, they were so panic-stricken that some of the commanders did not even wait for a final decision on the proposal about what action to take, but rushed for their ships and began to hoist their sails with the intention of beating a hasty retreat". Their fear lasts until the eve of the sea-battle. While the Persian fleet is *en route* to Salamis and readying itself to engage the enemy on the following day, "the Greeks were seized by terror. The Peloponnesians were particularly afraid, because there they were on Salamis, about to fight for Athenian territory, and if they lost the battle they would be trapped and blockaded on an island, leaving their own territory undefended" (70.2). The same motif appears in 74.1: "so the Greeks at the Isthmus undertook the task of building a defensive wall, because the race they were running was an all-or-nothing-affair, and because they did not expect great things from the fleet. Although their colleagues on Salamis heard what they were doing, it did not alleviate their fear (which was for the Peloponnese rather than for themselves)". Soon these fears bring out the typical Greek tendency to flee (75.1-2): Themistocles dispatches Sikinnos to the Great King and informs him that "the Greeks are in a state of panic and are planning to retreat". There are two versions of the beginning of the battle of Salamis, an Athenian account and an alternative which Herodotus reproduces without revealing its ori-

gin. According to the Athenian account, the battle began as the Greek fleet attempted to flee but its flight was interrupted by a chance event, while the alternative account has it that a miraculous apparition of a woman harshly reprimanded the Greeks with the taunt “fools, when are you going to stop retreating?” (84.2).

After Artemision, Thermopylae and Salamis, Plataea is the fourth battle before which the Greeks experience fear of their adversaries. After the Macedonian king Alexander has revealed Mardonius’ plan to attack the next morning to the Greeks, “Pausanias became afraid of the Persians” (9.46.1). He proceeds to shift the positions of the Greek forces so that the Athenians will face the Persians, but the stratagem is foiled by the corresponding repositioning of Mardonius’ forces and thus the adversaries end up resuming their original positions. Mardonius then taunts the Spartans: “you’ve already pulled back and left your post” (48.2); later he tells the Thessalian leaders accompanying him that “the Lacedaemonians never flee from battle, you told me. Their military prowess is unsurpassed... You’ve already seen them swapping their positions around, and now, as we can all see, they have used the cover of darkness last night to run away” (58.2). The fear induced in the Lacedaemonians by the Persian cavalry is also mentioned in 56.2.

V

The third technique which Herodotus uses to increase suspense is ‘dramatic irony’, employed frequently in the last three books. As suggested above, ‘dramatic irony’ ensues from the discrepancy between the knowledge of the audience and the ignorance of the main characters in the Xerxes *logos*. This ignorance primarily manifests itself in book 7, through a multitude of cross-references (*Fernbeziehungen*) to events described subsequently. These references take the form of predictions which are put into the mouths of Persians for the most part and bring to

the fore the false expectations of the attackers. Another series of predictions is included in the speeches of characters who function as typical Herodotean warning figures — whose warnings always go unheeded, as is stereotypically the case with such figures. The first warning of this kind is given in the royal council at the beginning of book 7. The almost prophetic speech of Artabanus, which, as we shall see, accurately predicts future events in many respects, provides a remarkable foil to the blindness of Mardonius and Xerxes. The latter's programmatic speech in 7.8 is characterized by reckless arrogance throughout: he aspires to world domination (8.1ff.: "We will make Persian territory end only at the sky, the domain of Zeus, so that the sun will not shine on any land beyond our borders. With your help I will sweep through the whole of Europe and make all lands into a single land"; the essence of this statement is repeated in 50.4 and 54.2) and believes that he is the agent of divine will (8.1: "It is the god who steers us in this direction, and so we prosper as we follow his guidance time and again"). What he actually names as the cause of his decision, revenge on the Athenians, ironically reveals the limit of his enterprise (8.2: "I will not rest until I have captured Athens and put it to the torch. The Athenians were the original aggressors against me and my father").

Likewise, Mardonius' incendiary speech against the Greeks (7.9), which falsely predicts the outcome of the war, contains an assertion which will repeatedly turn out to be completely off the mark: he threatens that, should the Greeks wish to fight the Persians, they will learn that "when it comes to military matters there is no one in the world to match us". Three subsequent passages, one apiece in the accounts of the battles at Thermopylae, Salamis and Plataea, hark back to this assertion and reveal the emptiness of Mardonius' boasting. After the first failed Persian attacks against the Greeks we hear in 7.210.2 that "they made it plain to everyone, however, and above all to the king himself, that although he had plenty of troops, he did not have many men" and in 211.3 "the Lacedaemonians made it quite clear

that they were the experts, and that they were fighting against amateurs". At 8.68 Artemisia advises the Great King not to engage the Greeks in the narrows of Salamis "because at sea your men will be as far inferior to the Greeks as women are to men". Xerxes is soon forced to reach the same conclusion (8.88.3): "My men have turned into women and my women into men!". Finally, in the account of the climax of the battle of Plataea, Herodotus makes the following remark (9.92.3): "In courage and strength the Persians and the Greeks were evenly matched, but the Persians wore no armour; besides, they did not have the skill and expertise of their opponents." Needless to say, both Thermopylae and Plataea correspond exactly to the advice that Mardonius offers to the "thoughtless" Greeks in his speech (7.9.2): instead of fighting on level ground where even the victors suffer heavy losses, "they should find a battleground where it is particularly hard for either side to defeat the other and fight it out there". Similarly, his view of the rivalries among the Greeks (9.2) will prove to be mistaken. As we have already seen, the putting aside of internal hostilities was the only Greek defense measure to bear fruit (7.146.1).

I have called Artabanus' warning (7.10) a prophetic speech because it accurately predicts subsequent events in many respects. The same may be said of his second conversation with Xerxes at Abydus and of the conversation of Demaratus with the Great King at Doriscus, which also predicts important subsequent events. Artabanus' prophetic speech resembles Zeus' famous prophecies in the *Iliad* and predicts developments that will take place throughout the Xerxes *logos*. In particular Artabanus not only anticipates the Persian defeat by land and sea (7.10.1f.) and the death of Mardonius on Greek soil (3), but also outlines the dangers that will later beset the Persian army in reality. In ch. 10 he points out that "even a massive army may be destroyed by a small force if it attracts the god's resentment and he sends panic or thunder, until they are shamefully destroyed". Some of Artabanus' predictions come true when the Persians are advancing into the region of Troy (7.42.2): "while

they were spending a night at the foot of Ida they encountered their first thunderstorm, with high winds, and quite a large number of them were killed". Then the following night "fear spread throughout the army" (43.2). Later, panic will also destroy the Persian contingent that advances to Delphi (8.38).

Artabanus moreover recalls Dareius' expedition against the Scythians and hints that after a victory at sea "the Greeks might sail to the Hellespont and dismantle the bridge". This is a constant threat to Xerxes' expedition. The king becomes anxious about the Hellespont bridge immediately after the disaster at Salamis (8.97), directly puts together a plan for flight and commands his fleet to sail as soon as possible from Phaleron to the Hellespont (8.107.1) in order "to guard the pontoon bridge". Themistocles' suggestion that the Greek fleet should pursue the Persians and sail to the Hellespont to dismantle the bridges (108.2) is rejected by Eurybiades. And so Artabanus' fear that the fate of the entire army would depend on a single man (7.10.2) materializes, exactly as happened in Dareius' expedition against the Scythians. Then it was Histiaeus, the tyrant of Miletus, who averted the dismantling of the bridges over the Thracian Bosphorus and thus saved the fleeing Persian army. A final verbatim reference to Artabanus' words to Mardonius ("what kind of men you are trying to persuade the king to attack") is made in the cry of Tritantaechmes, the son of Artabanus, after the battle of Thermopylae (8.26.3): "Well, Mardonius, what sort of men are these you have brought us to fight?"

Artabanus' later predictions in his conversation with Xerxes at Abydus also turn out to be fairly accurate. At 7.49.2 he expresses concern that "in actual fact, if you were to assemble further troops, the two factors I have in mind would become even more of a problem. The two factors are the land and the sea. As for the sea, there's no harbour anywhere, as far as I can tell, with the capacity to shelter this fleet of yours in the event of a storm and so keep your ships safe....The chances of starvation are increased the more land you gain and the more time you spend getting it". And the Persians are indeed faced with

both the lack of safe harbors and an inadequate food supply. At 7.188.1ff. Herodotus reports the loss of 400 Persian ships at Cape Sepias due to a storm, and more specifically because only a few ships could be beached on the narrow shore while the others had to be anchored at sea and were thus wrecked by the storm. Hunger, the second danger mentioned by Artabanus, afflicts the Persian army not when it is advancing but when it is retreating (8.115).

At Doriscus Demaratus takes on the role of warning figure and he too makes predictions which are borne out by subsequent events. At 7.102.2f. he foresees that the Spartans will resist under any circumstances: "as for the size of their army, there's no point in your asking how, in terms of numbers, they can do this. If there are in fact only a thousand men to march out against you (though it may be fewer or it may be more), then a thousand men will fight you". This obviously anticipates the number of Greeks who will make the last stand at Thermopylae (300 Spartans and 700 Thespians, 7.222).

After the aforementioned apparitions in dreams and the final decision of Xerxes and Artabanus to attack Greece, Herodotus puts a multitude of false predictions into the mouths of various Persians. Artabanus himself adopts Xerxes' view that Persian victory is favoured by the god (7.8.1) and formulates it thus (7.18.3): "but since your impetuousness is god-given, and since the destruction overtaking the Greeks is apparently heaven-sent, it is my turn to back down and change my mind". At the beginning of book 7, a series of mistaken interpretations of various signs underscores the Persians' blindness: at 7.19 the Magi interpret one of the Great King's dreams as a prediction that he will achieve world domination; at 7.37.2f. an eclipse of the sun is similarly interpreted by the Magi, who "said that the god was foretelling the abandonment by the Greeks of their towns and cities, because in their view the sun prophetically symbolized the Greeks, and the moon themselves". After the crossing of the Hellespont Herodotus reports two more omens but also points out explicitly that Xerxes failed to grasp that in truth they fore-

told his defeat (7.57.1f.). The Persians' increasing confidence that they will be victorious also serves to generate tragic irony. Before the crossing of the Hellespont Xerxes reiterates his plans for world domination to Artabanus (7.50.3): "by the time we get back home we will have conquered the whole of Europe." Immediately after inspecting the army he tells Demaratus that "it seems to me that all the Greeks, and even the combined forces of the entire western world, would be incapable of withstanding my advance, unless they formed a unified front" (7.101.2).

VI

The above-discussed techniques for structuring time and generating suspense are not the only narrative tools which Herodotus borrowed from the epic. Equally important are the techniques of foreshadowing and harking back, the so-called *Fernbeziehungen* (cross-references),¹⁷ which are crucial in providing an overview of larger sections of the narrative and in linking smaller sections to one another. A complex network of associations permeates the work and serves to connect even distant sections with one other; it is the presence of these associations which reveals the unity of Herodotus' work, because the relevance of many of the sections is often not immediately apparent; they 'refer' to, or can be understood only in relation to, another part of work. Let us look at two particular categories of indirect *Fernbeziehungen* borrowed from the epic, 'piecemeal complementation'¹⁸ and the use of the 'anticipatory doublet'.¹⁹

Both in the epic and in Herodotus' *Histories*, information about sequences of events which do not belong to the main plot

¹⁷ M. REICHEL, *Fernbeziehungen in der Ilias* (Tübingen 1994).

¹⁸ "Stückweise Ergänzung" in the terminology of W. SCHADEWALDT (*Iliasstudien* [Darmstadt 1966], 85 n. 2).

¹⁹ B. FENIK, *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad* (Wiesbaden 1968), 213f.

is often given in a number of different parts which are fairly far from, and complementary to, one another. In the *Odyssey* this is well exemplified by the narratives of Nestor and Menelaus about the return of the Achaeans, since they complement one another but also by the *Apologoi*. From the *Histories* one can mention, e.g., the digressions on the history of Athens or Sparta in books 1, 5 and 6, i.e. before the main narration of the Persian wars. In the work of both Homer and Herodotus, these disparate parts are meant to be viewed in a larger context: the later parts refer the audience back to the previous, interrupted narrative.

As for the 'anticipatory doublet', one of its main features is the preparatory character with which the first passage in which the motif appears is almost always invested: in other words, a short form of a type-scene (or of some other structural pattern) precedes a fuller version, as if to familiarize the audience with the concept before its most significant occurrence. For example, Achilles grants old Priam's request to bury his son (the episode is presented in detail in book 24) as he had earlier permitted the burial of Andromache's father Eetion (Andromache briefly mentions this at *Il.* 6.416-20). In much the same way, chains of motifs are also generated through the repetition and simultaneous intensification of a motif: these exemplify the epic technique of "*gestaffelte Vorbereitung*", "step-by-step preparation", first identified by Schadewaldt; the best-known example is the encounters of Ajax and Hector.

In the *Histories*, the large-scale use of the 'anticipatory doublet' is apparent in the high number of common motifs in the accounts of Dareius' Scythian expedition and Xerxes' Greek expedition.²⁰ Most of these motifs appear briefly in book 4 and then much more expansively in books 7-9. The entire Scythian *logos* thus functions largely as an anticipation of the Persian attack against Greece. In fact, Dareius' Scythian expedition is

²⁰ A. RENGAKOS, "Epic Narrative Technique in Herodotus' *Histories*", in *Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca* 4 (2001), 256ff.

modelled on Xerxes' Greek expedition, i.e. most of the motifs in book 4 should be viewed in the light of books 7-9. The Scythian *logos* is unique in Herodotus' work on account of its many intra-textual associations with the last third of the *Histories*, and for this reason has aptly been characterized as "the main link that safeguards the unity of the work".²¹

To sum up: some of the most important weapons in Herodotus' narrative arsenal are taken from the epic. The historian faced a complex task: he had to construct a plot in order to narrate, in a comprehensible, plausible and vivid manner, chains of events which spanned vast stretches of time and space. To meet this challenge he made a decision which was to have far-reaching consequences: to write history substituting a poetic format for the chronicles and catalogues of his predecessors, whose sole aim had been to transmit information. The fact that Herodotus was imitated by generations of historians, beginning with Thucydides and continuing down to our own times, is no small tribute to the "father of historiography" and his genius.

²¹ H. IMMERWAHR, *Form and Thought in Herodotus* (Atlanta, Georgia 1986), 106.

DISCUSSION

E.J. Bakker : I would like to talk about Herodotus' manipulation of time in light of Chapter 9 of the *Poetics* of Aristotle, where of course the distinction between *historia* and *poiesis* is made. Your discussion of Books 7-9 of the *Histories* with their 'desultory' technique of jumping back and forth between two action strings (the Persian preparations and march to Greece, and the reaction from the Greek side) that will in the end converge into one really suggests some kind of Aristotelian *sustasis tōn pragmatōn* — much more in fact than *the whole* of the work with the excursions ton the Greeks in Book 1 and so on. I was wondering whether this difference in perceived unity of two (or more) separate action strings is related to the markers in the text for 'meanwhile'. For example, Herodotus uses *en de toutōi tōi chronōi* much more often than does Thucydides, who seems to be much more 'Homeric' in this regard. On the assumption that *en toutōi tōi chronōi* signals a simultaneity between *causally unrelated* events I can understand that as a consequence of Thucydides seeing everything that happens in 'his *polemos*' as always already related, causally. So I wonder whether there is a difference in this regard between Herodotus' Books 7-9 and the earlier books.

A. Rengakos : It is doubtless true that the *sustasis* in Books 7 to 9 is much more intense than in the previous books. But the 'Greek' line is present in the first books not only through the excursions on Athens/Sparta in Books 1, 5, and 6, but also in other ways: beginning from 1.5, where Herodotus announces that he will start with Croesus, who was the first to attack the Greeks, the motif of Ionian revolts and subjugation by the Persians is a well known unifying device of the

Histories. The 'Greek' story-line is also present through the aborted mission of Dareius' doctor, Demodorus, and through the whole Scythian logos which anticipates the final Persian expedition.

I am not sure that 'markers' of simultaneity like *en toutōi tōi chronōi* combine two causally unrelated events. I am thinking in particular of the second half of Book 5 where Herodotus links with this phrase the operations of different Persian armies against the revolted Ionian cities of Asia minor. These episodes are clearly causally related events.

A. Sens : I would like to ask about Herodotean and Homeric 'dramatic irony' and in particular about the character and extent of narrative 'commentary' on the ignorance of individual speakers or actors. Am I wrong to think that, despite the fact that Herodotus' narrative ego is much more prominent — in the sense that he regularly comments on his own methods and so on — the Homeric narrator more often comments omnisciently on the foolishness of an utterance or action? I'm thinking, of course, of passages like the narrator's observations about the true cause of the absence of Helen's brothers from the battlefield in *Il.* 3 or comments of the '*nēpios ...*' type. In Herodotus, the foolishness of speaker seems to emerge from the outcome of events without specific commentary from the narrator, and this makes me wonder of the role of tragedy as an alternative model for this sort of irony.

A. Rengakos : I agree with you that Herodotus very rarely comments directly on the action or the sayings of a person. In that respect he is much more close to Thucydides (whose judgements of persons are limited to Pericles, Brasidas, and Alcibiades) and to Homer. Although, it is true that tragedy has had an important influence on Herodotus (cf. the 'mini-tragedies' of Gyges or Atys in Book 1), I think that the way he uses 'dramatic irony' throughout Books 7 to 9 is very Homeric and especially Odyssean.

Chr. Tsagalis : Apart from the narrative techniques the Herodotean narrator shares with his Homeric predecessor, one could point to the 'low-key' end of both the Homeric epics and Herodotus. The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* reach their climax in Book 22 (with Hector's death and the *mnēstērophonia* respectively), just as Herodotus closes the *Histories* with the 'low-key' end of Xerxes returning to Asia and the story of Amestris, Masistes' wife.

Other techniques one might look at are comments concerning the way 'dramatic irony' is expressed. In Homer, it is the external narrator who does that. Andromache is waiting for Hector to return from the battlefield in vain, and it is the external narrator who tell us that Hector had died and that she was ignorant of that development. In Herodotus, as in Greek tragedy, there is a tendency to generalize, the difference being that — due to genre-restrictions — in Herodotus this is done by the external narrator (*phthoneron gar to theion*) whereas in tragedy it is done by the characters themselves.

G. Danek : Chariton unterbricht seine Erzählung der Kallirhoe-Linie in 3, 2, 17 mit der Bemerkung: "Ich will zuerst berichten, was während derselben Zeit in Syrakus geschehen war". Er greift damit ausdrücklich in der Zeit zurück und erzählt, was auf einem 'verdeckten Handlungsstrang' geschehen ist. Dasselbe macht Heliodor, wenn er in 5, 4ff. die Erlebnisse von Charikleia und Theagenes seit der Trennung von Knemon (2, 13) als auktorialer Erzähler 'nachträgt'. Die Roman-Autoren verwenden damit sichtlich eine Erzähltechnik, die für das historiographische Genos zu ihrer Zeit voll etabliert und akzeptiert ist, die aber bei Homer streng vermieden ist: Zielinskis 'Gesetz' verbietet den Nachtrag von 'verdeckter Handlung' durch den primären, aber auch durch einen sekundären Erzähler (Achilleus Tatios wird den zweiten Typus ausgiebig zur Erzeugung von Spannung einsetzen). Gibt es bei Herodot eine Stelle, wo der Erzähler in ähnlicher Weise in der Zeit zurückgreift und einen 'verdeckten Handlungsstrang' nachträgt? Ich kann mich an

keine Instanz erinnern, und ich glaube, dass Herodot in dieser Beziehung, der Präsentation der unterschiedlichen Handlungsstrände in ihrem zeitlichen Verhältnis, sich ganz eng an die künstliche Stilisierung des Zeitablaufs bei Homer anlehnt.

A. Rengakos : Ich glaube, Sie haben Recht: es gibt bei Herodot keine Erzählung eines 'verdeckten Handlungsstranges'. Er greift in der Zeit zurück, aber das betrifft Fälle, wo er die Zeitebene seiner Geschichte verlassen hat (z.B. 7.137.3). In diesem Fall verweist er ausdrücklich darauf hin, dass er "zu seinem vorherigen Logos zurückkehrt".

M. Fusillo : I would have just a general, methodological question. How do you see the relationship between your epic interpretation of Greek historiography and the debate of literary theory on the rhetoric and narrative nature of historiography? (I am referring obviously to Hayden White's very controversial book *Metahistory*.)

Secondly, a small remark: I would say that even in the modern tradition the *Spannung auf das Wie* plays a prominent role, especially if we think of the master of suspense, Alfred Hitchcock, who strongly preferred and theorised the Homeric type of suspense.

A. Rengakos : I believe that Herodotean and Thucydidean historiography is, despite the protests of Momigliano against H. White, 'emplotted' and that on a whole it fully supports the *Metahistory*'s central thesis of the historical work being mainly a literary artefact.

Chr. Tsagalis : What about advance mentions in the sense of 'orange-light' passages, like 'passing a river' or the '*dis hepta*' formula? This of course brings in mind the Homeric technique of anticipation but I am rather talking about elements recognizable by the audience (features colored by their traditional referentiality, their metonymical force).

E.J. Bakker : I'm not sure Herodotus and Thucydides took Homer as an example in the matter of internal, psychological motivation, at least not as regards narrative strategy and linguistic articulation. Herodotus and Thucydides have an elaborate syntax of indirect speech which is not found in Homer and which must be an innovation in narrative and in grammar. Homer does have psychological deliberation, of course, in the addresses of heroes of their *thumos*, but that is a different strategy, direct speech. I think the difference between Homer and the historians, in particular Thucydides, is in the end determined by the possibilities and constraints of speech and writing: it is difficult if not impossible to perform someone's inner feelings, emotions etc.

A. Rengakos : 'Internal focalisation' is certainly much more developed in Thucydides than in Herodotus or Homer. But even in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* cases of 'participial motivation' as those studied by Mabel Lang in Thucydides are very often.

P. Chuvin : La présence de catalogues chez Hérodote, que vous soulignez à juste titre, ne montre-t-elle pas que l'influence hésiodique est présente aussi chez le "père de l'historiographie"?

A. Rengakos : C'est sans doute une influence hésiodique, mais plus généralement épique, puisque les catalogues sont aussi un élément des poèmes homériques.

VI

ALEXANDER SENS

“ΤΙΠΤΕ ΓΕΝΟΣ ΤΟΥΜΟΝ ΖΗΤΕΙΣ,”:
 THE *Batrachomymachia*,
 HELLENISTIC EPIC PARODY, AND EARLY EPIC

Introduction

When Hellenistic poets like Theocritus or Callimachus adapted the diction and meter of Homeric poetry to goatherds, shepherds, and other humble figures, they expanded the range of approaches to ‘serious’ epic (Arist. *Po.* 4, 1448 b 34), which traditionally had as its focus the deeds of gods and heroes.¹ Indeed, the (often subtle and witty) reapplication of epic material to more ordinary figures from ‘everyday life’ — a shift whose tonal effect is notoriously hard to pin down — must be counted one of the hallmarks of learned Hellenistic verse. During the same period, however, other hexametric poets continued the long tradition, going back at least to Hipponax fr. 128 West² and the pseudo-Homeric *Margites* (for which, cf. Archil. fr. 303; Cratinus, fr. 368), of adapting Homeric language to humble themes for more straightforward comical effect (Arist. *Po.* 4, 1448 b 38–1449 a 2).³ These manifestly ‘parodic’ poems have

¹ Cf. M. FANTUZZI–R. HUNTER, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge 2004), 138–141.

² On this fragment, see now C.A. FARONE, “Hipponax Fragment 128W: Epic Parody or Expulsive Incantation?”, in *Class. Ant.* 23 (2004), 209–245, arguing that it is a curse for expelling an enemy rather than parody such as later composed by Euboeus and others.

³ For Hegemon of Thasos, see S.D. OLSON–A. SENS (Eds.), *Metra of Pitane*

often been dismissed by scholars as subliterary, and the precise ways in which they engage with the archaic epic tradition at the verbal level have consequently received relatively limited attention.

In a recent study of the gastronomic parodies of the early Hellenistic poet Matro, Douglas Olson and I have argued that that poet's use of archaic epic not infrequently involves a more sophisticated familiarity with and approach to his models than has usually been allowed. In more than a few passages of his *Attic Dinner Party* (fr. 1 Olson-Sens = SH 534), for instance, Matro reworks disparate but thematically related models in ways that seem to imply that he expected at least some members of his audience to recognize specific antecedents and derive amusement from the way in which he redeploys them.⁴ In the present paper, I would like to focus on what is probably the most famous work of ancient Greek epic parody, the *Batrachomyomachia*, a poem attributed in antiquity to Homer or to a certain Pigres but almost certainly the product of the Hellenistic period.⁵ That poem, which seems to show evidence of familiar-

and the Tradition of Epic Parody in the Fourth Century BCE. Text, Translation, and Commentary (Atlanta [Oxford] 1999), 7–9. For the Δειλιάς of Nicochares mentioned by ARIST. *Po.* 2, 1448 a 13, see FANTUZZI–HUNTER (*op.cit.* above n.1), 138–139.

⁴ OLSON-SENS 21, expanding on a view of Matro advanced by E. DEGANI, "Problems in Greek Gastronomic Poetry. On Matro's *Attikon Deipnon*", in *Food in Antiquity*, ed. by J. WILKINS–D. HARVEY–M. DOBSON (Exeter 1995), 413–428. B.I. PEITZER, *De parodica Graecorum poesi et de Hipponactis, Hegemonis, Matronis parodiarum fragmentis* (Monasterii 1855) and H.G. PAESSENS, *De Matronis parodiarum reliquiis* (Monasterii 1856) also saw Matro as a clever and learned writer on other grounds.

⁵ The poem, first mentioned MART. 14.183 and STAT. *Silv.* 1 *praef.*, has been variously dated to the 5th (most recently L.J. BLIQUEZ, "Frogs and Mice and Athens", in *TAPhA* 107 [1977], 11–25) or even 6th centuries (e.g. A. LESKY, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* [Bern and München 1971], 111 n.3), but the linguistic evidence assembled by J. WACKERNAGEL, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* (Göttingen 1916), 188–199 strongly suggests that the poem was the product of the (late) Hellenistic period, and as do the points of contact between the poem and passages of Callimachus and Moschus (cf. below, n.6). For discussion with bibliography, cf. M.L. WEST, "Near Eastern Material in Hellenistic and Roman Literature", in *HSCP* 73 (1969), 123 n.35; H. WÖLKE, *Untersuchungen*

ity with refined Hellenistic poetry like Callimachus' *Aetia* and Moschus' *Europa*,⁶ continues to be denigrated as having little literary merit,⁷ and despite several important studies by Wölke, Glei, and Fusillo, among others, over the course of the past few decades, critics have focused relatively limited attention on the precise mechanics of the poet's engagement with his epic models beyond the simple accumulation of parallels, which commentators tend simply to list without more detailed discussion.⁸ In at least some passages, however, a closer examination reveals that the poem's engagement with the traditions on which it draws is more subtle and sophisticated than has often been assumed. This does not mean, of course, that the poet consistently alludes to the tradition in the same learned way that, for example, Callimachus does. At a basic level, it seems obvious that the poet's goals were different from those of learned Alexandrians; the work, for instance, clearly lacks much of the metrical refinement one finds in Callimachus and his contemporaries. In some sense, therefore, the poem, like Matro's *Attic Dinner Party*, may thus serve as a test case for evaluating the extent to which some of the practices one usually associates with main-

zur Batrachomyomachie (Meisenheim am Glan 1978), 46–70; R. GLEI (Ed.), *Die Batrachomyomachie. Synoptische Edition und Kommentar* (Frankfurt am Main 1984), 34–36; M. FUSILLO (Ed.), [Omero.] *La Battaglia delle rane e dei topi. Batrachomyomachia* (Milano 1988), 39–43.

⁶ That vv. 78–81 referred to Moschus' poem was posited already by Leopardi. For discussion of this possible link, as well as of the supposed connection between vv. 3, 12, 116–118, 180 and various passages of Callimachus' *Aetia*, cf. WÖLKE 58–61, 114–119; GLEI 22.

⁷ E.g. K. DOWDEN, review of WÖLKE (*op.cit.*), in *CR n.s.* 30 (1980), 136: "one may perhaps wonder whether a poem of such irredeemable mediocrity is worth 164 pages of further elucidation, especially as Wölke is apparently under no illusions about its lack of literary merit"; A. CAMERON, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton 1995), 276 describes the author as a poetaster.

⁸ The foundational collection of the poem's epic models is that of A. LUDWICH (Ed.), *Die Homerische Batrachomyomachia des Karers Pigres nebst Scholien und Paraphrase* (Leipzig 1896); cf. A. CAMEROTTO, "Analisi formulare della *Batrachomyomachia*", in *Lexis* 9–10 (1992), 1–54. B. VINE, "BATR. 240: Toward the Stylistic Analysis of the *Batrachomyomachia*", in *Mnemosyne* 39 (1986), 383–385 is a useful exception to the tendency of scholars simply to accumulate parallels without discussing the ways in which they combined.

stream Hellenistic poetry in fact form part of a broader set of approaches that go beyond the narrow boundaries of the literary elite.⁹ How far one should be willing to push in allowing for refinement and sophistication in the poet's use of his models remains a thorny question. At the very least, however, in a number of passages the *Batrachomyomachia* becomes considerably richer and more interesting if readers apply some of the same strategies that now are taken for granted in reading learned Alexandrian poetry.

*Epic Parody and Generic Self-Consciousness:
The Batrachomyomachia and the Parodic Traditions of the
Hellenistic Period*

The loss of all but a few examples of Hellenistic parody makes it impossible to know the full range of its themes, but, so long as one is careful to avoid drawing generic lines too sharply and to allow for some overlap, the extant texts of likely Hellenistic date may be said to fall broadly into three main categories. The first of these is what might for want of a better name be termed the 'battle narrative', in which the grand language of Homer and Hesiod was used to recount fights between absurdly unHomeric human combatants, like the lowly bathmen of Euboeus' *Battle of the Bathmen*, or between animals, as in the *Batrachomyomachia*, in an apparently Hellenistic narrative recounting a war between mice and weasels,¹⁰ and perhaps in such undateable, lost poems as the *Arachnomachia* and *Psaromachia* that were said to have been composed as $\pi\alpha\iota\gamma\nu\alpha$ by Homer (*Suda* o 251; [Hdt.] *Vit.Hom.* p. 207 Allen).¹¹ A second

⁹ For the question of the extent to which Alexandrian 'values' were diffused in non-elite poetry, cf. M. FANTUZZI-A. SENS, "The hexameter of inscribed Hellenistic epigram", forthcoming in *Beyond the Canon*, ed. by M.A. HARDER et AL. (Leuven).

¹⁰ H.S. SCHIBLI, "Fragments of a Weasel and Mouse War", in *ZPE* 53 (1983), 1–25 = *SSH* 1190.

¹¹ The status of the *Geranomachia* that is mentioned along with them is especially problematic. Cf. WEST 124–125; WÖLKE 99–100; SCHIBLI 7–12.

type of parody used Homeric diction for 'philosophical' ends, playfully following the footsteps of earlier philosophers who used the dactylic hexameter as the medium for expressing their own serious ideas. Timo Phliasius, for instance, manipulates the language of Homeric epic to mock other philosophers in the two books of his *Silloi*, while Crates of Thebes plays with early hexametric and elegiac poetry (*inter alia*) to poke fun at his rivals and to express his own Cynic ideas. The best attested parodic theme, however, is gastronomic. In addition to the late Classical Sicilian poet Archeistratus' mock didactic *Hedypatheia*, in which the narrator presents himself as an expert on obtaining and preparing a variety of foodstuffs, we know of a series of narrative poems describing elaborate dinner parties. The best preserved of these is the *Attic Dinner Party* of Matro of Pitane (fr. 1 Olson-Sens = SH 534), a poem that opens with the narrator's request, closely modeled on the first line of the *Odyssey*, for the Muse's assistance in singing of δεῖπνα ... πολυτρόφα καὶ μάλα πολλά, though in fact the subject of the surviving verses is a single elaborate and contentious affair hosted in Athens by a prominent citizen, Xenocles, and attended by the narrator, by the Athenian politician Stratocles, and by the infamous parasite Chaerephon, all of whom squabble for the choicest morsels of food. Indeed, the exiguous fragments of other poems suggest that luxurious dinners and the voracious appetite of their attendees were common parodic themes, much as they are in the surviving fragments of Middle Comedy.¹² According to the epitome of Athenaeus (1.5a–b), the parodist Hegemon of Thasos, work-

¹² The interconnection between comedy and parody is well illustrated by the fact that a fragment of Plato Comicus' *Phaon* contains an extended passage of dactylic hexameter (fr. 189.9–22) in which Homeric language is distorted and applied to culinary topics; cf. S.D. OLSON and A. SENS (Eds.), *Archeistratos of Gela. Greek Culture and Cuisine in the Fourth Century BCE*. Text, Translation, and Commentary (Oxford 2000), xl–xliii. Hermippus fr. 63, an extended mock epic account of the places whence various goods (including but not restricted to foodstuffs) are imported, parodies the Catalogue of Ships (cf. R. KASSEL–C. AUSTIN *ad loc.*) and makes use of language drawn from throughout the Homeric poems.

ing at the end of the 5th century, composed a poem entitled *Deipnon*, of which nothing survives but which was presumably similar in content to the works of Matro. The only surviving fragments of an obscure and undated figure called Hipparchus treat gastronomic themes (*SH* 496–497), and two anonymous fragments of epic parody show an explicit interest in food (*adesp.parod.* frr. 4–5 Olson-Sens [= fr.incert. ii–iii Brandt]), while another (*adesp.parod.* fr. 3 Olson-Sens = fr.incert. i Brandt), modeled on Nestor's after-dinner advice to the Greek chieftains at *Il.* 7.324, mentions a κόλαξ, “parasite” (for the terminology, cf., e.g., Alexis fr. 262).

It is impossible to believe that Hellenistic epic parody did not treat other themes as well — an epigram of Alexander Aetolus praises the pre-Hellenistic parodist Boeotus of Syracuse for using the splendor of Homeric language to talk about thieves and shoemakers, among others, though it provides no sense of the precise contexts in which he did so.¹³ Several passages of extant parody nonetheless seem to reflect a playfully self-conscious awareness of the boundaries between different ‘types’ of epic parody, and in particular to treat gastronomic parody in particular as an established form that could itself serve as a ‘foil’ for other sorts of parodic projects. A good example is provided by the longest surviving hexametric fragment of the Cynic parodist Crates of Thebes (*SH* 351), in which the poet describes an imaginary ideal city in which simple foods abound and from which parasites, gluttons, and civil strife are absent:¹⁴

¹³ ALEX.AET. fr. 5.5–8 Magnelli: ἔγραψε δ' ὡνήρ // εῦ παρ' Όμηρειν ἀγλατῆν ἐπέων // πισσύγγους ἢ φῶρας ἀναιδέας ἢ τινα χλούνην // φλύοντ' ἀνθηρῇ σὺν κακοδαιμονίῃ. The “hero” of the pseudo-Homeric *Margites*, a work attested already in the mid-fifth century (Cratinus fr. 368), was an extraordinarily bumbling fool; cf. OLSON-SENS, p.6. For a synoptic discussion of extant parody, cf. especially E. DEGANI (Ed.), *Poesia parodica greca* (Bologna ²1983).

¹⁴ For discussion of this and other fragments of Crates, see M. NOUSSIA, “παρῳδία e filosofia in Cratete Tebano”, in *La cultura ellenistica: il libro, l'opera letteraria, l'esegesi antica*, a cura di R. PRETAGOSTINI e E. DETTORI (Roma 2004), 127–135; EAD., “La Nekyia di Platone e di Cratete Tebano”, in *I luoghi e la poesia nella Grecia antica*, a cura di M. VETTA e C. CATENACCI (Alessandria 2005);

Πήρη τις πόλις ἔστι μέσω ἐνὶ οἰνοπι τύφω
καλὴ καὶ πίειρα, περίρρυπος, οὐδὲν ἔχουσα,
εἰς ἦν οὔτε τις εἰσπλεῖ ἀνὴρ μωρὸς παράσιτος,
οὔτε λίχνος πόρνης ἐπαγαλόμενος πυγῆσιν·
ἀλλὰ θύμον καὶ σκόρδα φέρει καὶ σῦκα καὶ ἄρτους.
ἔξ ὡν οὐ πολεμοῦσι πρὸς ἀλλήλους περὶ τούτων,
οὐχ ὅπλα κέντηνται περὶ κέρματος, οὐ περὶ δόξης.

The opening verses of this passage closely parody the first lines of Odysseus' description of his fictive homeland Crete at *Odyssey* 19.172–177:

Κρήτη τις γαῖ^α ἔστι μέσω ἐνὶ οἰνοπι πόντῳ,
καλὴ καὶ πίειρα, περίρρυποι· ἐν δ' ἄνθρωποι
πολλοὶ ἀπειρέσιοι, καὶ ἐννήκοντα πόλης·
ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα μεμιγμένη· ἐν μὲν Ἀχαιοῖ,
ἐν δ' Ἐτεόκρητες μεγαλήτορες, ἐν δὲ Κύδωνες
Δωριέες τε τριχάκες δῖοι τε Πελασγοί·

In the first two verses, Crates' approach to his Homeric model resembles that used by epic parodists like Matro, who regularly borrows a hemistich or entire verse from an epic model, changing only a word or short phrase for humorous effect;¹⁵ in many cases, the new material phonetically resembles what it replaces, as happens here in the case of Κρήτη and Πήρη. Beyond that change, Crates alters γαῖ(α) to πόλις; πόντῳ to τύφῳ; περίρρυποι to περίρρυπος; and ἐν δ' ἄνθρωποι to οὐδὲν ἔχουσα, thereby replacing a phrase that signified the bountiful presence of men on Crete with one asserting the lack of everything on Pere. In the subsequent verses, however, the poet's parodic technique changes noticeably. In vv. 3–7, he departs from the language of his model and instead varies it thematically: whereas in Odysseus' description the salient characteristic of Crete is the

EAD., "Fragments of Cynic Tragedy", forthcoming in *Beyond the Canon*, ed. by M.A. HARDER et AL. (Leuven).

¹⁵ For Matro's approach to Homeric material, see below, pp.227–8. We have less surviving material from other late Classical or early Hellenistic parodists like Euboeus and Boeotus, but the exiguous fragments, taken in conjunction with the testimony of Alexander Aetolus, suggests that they had a similar approach.

presence of boundless numbers of men of diverse origins and cultures, in Crates' *Pere* is defined by the absence of people of a certain sort; and whereas Odysseus calls attention to the ethnic diversity of the island's residents, Crates emphasizes the civic and social unity of his imaginary city.

As Maria Noussia has argued, these final verses allude to and engage with Socrates' description of the first and most natural city at Plato, *Resp.* 2.369 b–372 d, so that the epic parody of the first two verses serves as a foil for the poet's engagement with a very different sort of model in the balance of the fragment.¹⁶ For my part, I would like to suggest that, in structuring the fragment as he has, Crates also situates his poem in a larger parodic tradition whose themes and interests he acknowledges but rejects. As we have noted, one of the predominant themes of gastronomic parody, at least to judge from Matro's *Attic Dinner Party*, was the gluttonous and wanton behavior of dinner guests. Seen against this backdrop, the third and fourth verses of Crates' *SH 351* are striking. Although *LSJ* assign λίχνος the unique meaning "lewd" in this passage, the word's basic sense is "gluttonous" (cf. *Batrach.* 10 λίχνον ... γένειον), and there is no reason to think that it means anything else here. Gluttony and sexual appetites are treated as a unit, and the basic point of the lines is that parasites and gluttons do not come to Pere in search of lavish banquets, with all that they have to offer gastronomically and sexually, because there are none to be found on the island, which offers only simple, Cynic fare. Crates' engagement with literary models is thus complex: whereas the first lines of *SH 351* clearly have the passage from the *Odyssey* as their direct linguistic model, the subsequent verses take on special point if one allows that the poet knew and was responding to a tradition of epic parody in which elaborate dinners and the wanton behavior of guests were prominent themes.¹⁷ Read

¹⁶ NOUSSIA, "παρῳδία"; EAD., "Fragments".

¹⁷ For the sexual behavior of dinner guests, cf. MATRO fr. 1.121–122 πόρναι δ' εἰσῆγθον, κοῦραι δύο θαματοποιοί, // ἀς Στρατοκλῆς ἤλαυνε ποδώκεας ὅρνιθας ὡς.

this way, Crates' poem does not merely parody Homer, but also tacitly assumes and calls attention to the existence of parodic poetry as a literary form that has its own set of generic expectations or codes. Having drawn heavily on a single Homeric passage in the first two lines, the poet, by suggesting that the Utopia he describes has no elaborate parties to entice parasites and gluttons,¹⁸ unexpectedly moves in a different direction and implicitly distances his work from another sort of epic parody in which Homeric models are used to describe the outrageous behavior of just such people. Thus the fragment is in a sense programmatic: the opening verses mark it as a parody of Homer, but what follows marks its divergence from what, the fragment implies, was a canonical parodic mode.¹⁹

In this sense, then, Crates' parody has as its 'target' not only the Homeric poems *per se*, but also other works that parody them. Such self-consciousness about the poem's place in a tradition of epic parody may find a parallel in the philosophical parodies of Timo Phliiasius, the first book of whose *Silloi* opens with a parody of the invocation to the Muses that introduces the Catalogue of Ships (*SH* 775 ~ *Il.* 2.484; cf. the opening of Hermippus fr. 63). The use of the opening of a famous 'purple' passage of Homer is thematically appropriate to the catalogue of philosophers that follows, but it also serves as a generic marker, as an indicator that the poem will engage with Homeric models throughout, in much the same way that Matro adapts the opening of the *Odyssey* in the first verse of his *Attic Dinner-Party*. Little else that can be assigned to the first book of the *Sil-*

¹⁸ With the claim that Pere offers only simple produce, one might contrast the list of importable goods at Hermippus fr. 63.

¹⁹ The way in which *SH* 351 situates itself not only against Homeric epic but also the tradition of epic parody suggests that it represents the first lines of a poem, much as the parody of the opening of Solon fr. 13 W marks the beginning of an individual poem by Crates (*SH* 359). If so, the narrator's claim that the residents of Pere do not take up arms against one another over either material possessions or reputations may reverse the larger themes of the Homeric poems, and in particular the *Iliad*, which takes the origin of the strife between Achilles and Agamemnon as its narrative starting point.

loi survives, but Athenaeus 15.698 a (*SH* 776 = fr. 2 Di Marco) reports that at some point, the poet mentioned the parodist Euboeus of Paros by name, and although the precise nature of this reference and its position in the first book are now unfortunately lost, Marco Fantuzzi has offered the attractive suggestion that Timo mentioned Euboeus' parodies in order to locate his own engagement with epic in an ongoing parodic tradition,²⁰ presumably both to call attention to his stylistic debt to Euboeus and to make clear the ways in which, at least at the level of content, his own poetry differed from that of his parodic predecessor.²¹

These examples shed light on an extended passage of the *Batrachomyomachia* in which the mouse Psicharpax responds to the inquiry by the frog king Physignathus about his lineage. In a speech reminiscent of Glaucus' response to Diomedes in *Iliad* 6 (see below, pp.235-6), Psicharpax wonders why Physignathus wants to learn his race, then begrudgingly names his father and his mother, who raised him on "figs and dates and all sorts of foods" (σύκοις καὶ καρύοις καὶ ἐδέσμασι παντοδαποῖσιν). He concludes by rejecting the overture of friendship on the ground that frogs and mice, inasmuch as they live in different places, eat different foods (33-55):²²

σοὶ μὲν γάρ βίος ἔστιν ἐν ὄντασιν· αὐτὰρ ἔμοιγε
ὅσσα παρ' ἀνθρώποις τρώγειν ἔθιος· οὐδέ με λήθει
ἄρτος τρισκοπάνιστος ἀπ' εὐκύκλου κανέοι,
οὐδὲ πλακοῦς τανύπεπλος ἔχων πολὺ σησαμότυρον,
οὐ τόμος ἐκ πτέρνης, οὐχ ἡπτατα λευκοχίτωνα,

35

²⁰ FANTUZZI-HUNTER (*op.cit.* above n.1) 7.

²¹ Cf. M. DI MARCO (Ed.), *Timone di Flunte. Silli*. Introduzione, edizione critica, traduzione e commento (Roma 1989), 43: "Proprio la menzione di Eubeo ... ma in modo ancor più diretto l'insieme di frammenti dei Silli ... ci mostrano tuttavia che la funzione che Timone assegna alla parodia non è più soltanto quella di un *divertissement* fine a se stesso; all'opposto, la parodia si fa strumento di una satira pungente e corrosiva, si pone al servizio di una *iambikè idea* in cui torna come a rivivere lo spirito dei giambografi arcaici e dei comici dell'ἀρχαῖα".

²² Vv. 42-52 are almost certainly an interpolation; cf. LUDWICH 335-336; GLEI 129-130.

οὐ τυρὸς νεόπηχτος ἀπὸ γλυκεροῦ γάλακτος,
οὐ χρηστὸν μελίτωμα, τὸ καὶ μάκαρες ποθέουσιν,
οὐδὲ ὅσα πρὸς θοίνας μερόπων τεύχουσι μάγειροι,
κοσμοῦντες χύτρας ἀρτύμασι παντοδαποῖσιν. 40
οὐ τρώγω δαφάνους, οὐ κράμβας, οὐ κολοκύντας,
οὐ σεύτλοις χλωροῖς ἐπιβόσκομαι, οὐδὲ σελίνοις:
ταῦτα γάρ οὐδέτερ' ἔστιν ἐδέσματα τῶν κατὰ λίμνην.

Whereas frogs eat only raw, aquatic greenery (or so Psicharpax wrongly claims), the diet of mice consists of the “cooked” — of foods transformed by the art of the *μάγειρος* — including breads, cakes, cheese, and the other variegated creations.²³ Such elaborate food-lists are common in Middle Comedy, and the exuberance of Psicharpax’ interest in cuisine seems intended by him to illustrate the cultural sophistication of his race, but also, for the reader, affiliates the mouse and his kind with the sorts of gourmands whose behavior seems to have been a frequent source of humor on the comic stage, while the allegedly vegetarian diet of frogs finds an analogue in comic descriptions of an impoverished, rustic lifestyle (e.g. Poliochus fr. 2; Antiphanes fr. 225; Alexis fr. 167). The most obvious parallels for the contrast drawn by Psicharpax, however, are to be found in epic parody on gastronomic themes.²⁴ At Archestatus fr. 60.13–16 Olson-Sens, for example, the narrator denigrates legumes and fruits as a marker of ‘beggary,’ but goes on to recommend the Athenian flatcake, much as Psicharpax contrasts *πλακοῦντες* and other confections to the vegetarian fare eaten by frogs:

τὰ δὲ ἄλλα γ' ἔκεινα τραγήματα πάντα πέφυκε
πτωχείης παράδειγμα κακῆς, ἐφθοί τ' ἐρέβινθοι
καὶ κύαμοι καὶ μῆλα καὶ ἴσχάδες. ἄλλὰ πλακοῦντα,
αἰνῶ Ἀθήνησιν γεγενημένον.

²³ Cf. WOLKE 226–233.

²⁴ The parodic background is noted briefly by GLEI 21 and by FUSILLO 95, who primarily emphasizes the influence of comedy on the passage (“L’insistenza sulla sfera alimentare si richiama senz’ altro alla commedia (oltre alla poesia gastronomica pseudoepica)”).

So, too, the narrator of Matro fr. 1.111–18 Olson-Sens reports that he avoided the fruit offered as *tragemata*, but could not resist the flatcake:

δεύτεραι αὗτε τράπεζαι ἐφωπλίζοντο γέμουσαι·
ἐν δ' αὐταῖςιν ἐπῆν ἄπιοι καὶ πίονα μῆλα,
ὅιοιαί τε σταφυλαί τε, θεοῦ Βρομίοι τιθῆναι
< >

πρόσφατος, ἦν θ' ἀμάμαξυν ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσι.
τῶν δ' ἐγώ οὐδενὸς ἥσθιον ἀπλῶς, μεστὸς δ' ἀνεκείμην.
ώς δε ἵδον ξανθὸν γλυκερὸν μέγαν ἔγκυκλον, ἄνδρες,
Δήμητρος παῖδ' ὅπτὸν ἐπεισελθόντα πλακοῦντα,
πῶς ἀν ἔπειτα πλακοῦντος ἐγώ θείου ἀπεγοίμην;

The mouse is thus depicted as the sort of opsophagetic character who — again to judge from the fragments of Matro and others — was a stock figure in Hellenistic epic parody, and Psicharpax' gastronomic logorrhea is thus ironic: though his account of the culinary sophistication of mice is, like the boasts of Iliadic generals, designed to show his own superiority, the association it creates between him and the buffoonish gourmands of the parodic tradition reveal him to be laughable. At the same time, Psicharpax' speech forms part of a self-referential game, since in both style and content his account of the foods he eats may be read as a sort of *gastronomic* set piece that has been incorporated into a larger *battle narrative*. In this sense, the passage acknowledges the range of parodic themes available to the poet — it is at least noteworthy in this regard that the speech is framed as a list of items that “do not escape the notice” of Psicharpax (34 οὐδέ με λήθει) — and thus, like Crates’ claim that gluttons and profligates do not visit Pere, calls attention to the poem’s position in a broader generic context. On such a reading, the author of the poem, like Crates, not only expands the range of his ‘target’ texts beyond ‘serious’ Homeric and post-Homeric hexameter models,²⁵ thereby treating gastronomic par-

²⁵ For the importance of "animal fable" as a source for the poem, cf. WÖLKE 91–98.

ody as a coherent type with its own set of conventions,²⁶ but also implicitly invites readers to consider the relationship of the *Batrachomyomachia* to the tradition of epic parody as a whole.

The 'epic technique' of the Batrachomyomachia

In the most basic sense, all epic parody depends on the disjunction between its form and its content — on, in other words, the application of epic meter and diction to fundamentally unepic characters,²⁷ be they humble bath men, thieves, shoemakers, or animals. The precise dynamics of the parodists' engagement with the actual text of Homer and Hesiod, however, is highly variable — sometimes, as we saw in the case of Crates, even within a single poem. The *Attic Dinner Party* of Matro may serve as a useful example of some of the possible approaches to epic models.²⁸ At one extreme in that poem are lines that combine short snatches of Homeric language (often used in the same metrical positions in which it appears in early epic) with other material, but that do not seem based on any particular epic models. More than half of the verses, however, draw on specific Homeric antecedents, and these cases fall into two categories. The first and most common of these are verses based on an entire Homeric line in which one or two new elements, often phonetically close to those they replace, have been introduced for humorous effect, as in the first verse of the poem, which evokes *Od.* 1.1, with the substitution of δεῖπνα for ἀνδρα, πολυτρόφα for πολύτροπον and καὶ for ὅς; five of the next six verses employ a similar technique.²⁹ On occasion, the poet adapts a single Homeric passage of more than a single line. The

²⁶ The application of 'high-style' epithets to everyday foods, as especially in vv. 36–37, is a common technique of gastronomic parody.

²⁷ Cf. ALEX.AET. fr. 5.5–8 Magnelli (above, n.13).

²⁸ For full discussion, cf. OLSON-SENS (*op.cit.* above n.3) 20–24; F. CONDELLO, "Note al *Convivium Atticum* di Matrone (fr. 1 O-S = SH 534)", in *Eikasmos* 13 (2003), 133–150, esp. 133–136.

²⁹ Cf. OLSON-SENS 35.

poet's other major technique is to combine two Homeric half-lines — that is, the parts of the line leading up to and immediately following the 3rd-foot caesura — occasionally in unadapted form, but far more often slightly altered by the substitution of a single new element; indeed, one of the striking features of Matro's verse is that he almost never uses a Homeric line verbatim or combines two intact Homeric hemistichs.

At the same time, Matro's alterations of his Homeric and Hesiodic models almost always have some recognizable motivation in humor or grammar, and it is extremely rare for the poet to engage in what one might think of as 'variation for variation's sake' — that is, to introduce verbal changes to a model when they are not needed for the sake of a joke or to ensure grammatical or logical continuity. An isolated exception to this tendency is fr. 1.104 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δόρποιο μελίφρονος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο, a line which seems to overlay the phrase δόρποιο μελίφρονος (used in the same sedes at *h.Dem.* 2.129) on the common Homeric line αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδήτυος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο. The change has no obvious comic purpose, and although it serves to take account of the fact that the sympotic part of the evening has yet to occur, Matro could, had he wished, simply have taken over verbatim the Homeric line οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν σίτοιο μελίφρονος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο (*Od.* 24.489).

In the *Batrachomyomachia*, one finds a very different sort of interaction with epic models. Study of the poet's engagement with the literary past is unfortunately complicated by the sorry condition in which the text has been preserved for us, and the fact that it is riddled with several obviously interpolated passages naturally allows doubts to arise about any particular verse, especially in cases where it is not universally transmitted by all branches of the tradition. So far as one can tell, however, the poet only on rare occasions uses a Homeric line in unaltered form,³⁰ with the effect of producing an amusing contrast

³⁰ 152 = *Od.* 23.130; 269 = *Il.* 8.132; 272 = *Il.* 13.99, etc. Verse 205, pre-

between the grandeur of the original context and the miniature scale of his own narrative. In the more numerous instances where a Homeric hemistich is redeployed in its original form, the other half of the line usually contains material that has been stitched together from more than a single source; only infrequently does the poet combine two half lines taken without some change from archaic epic and joined at the medial caesura (e.g. 231).³¹ The fundamental difference between the compositional technique of the *Batrachomyomachia* and that of Matro's parodies, however, lies in the fact that it is very rare for the humor of a given verse to depend on the introduction of a single incongruous word or two into a Homeric line or into a pair of epic hemistichs conjoined at the caesura. By far the largest number of lines draw on shorter snatches of epic language derived from multiple sources, including Hesiod as well as Homer, and in large part the poet seems interested in capturing an epic flavor without simply taking over long Homeric phrases unchanged.

Indeed, a fundamental aspect of the epic technique of the *Batrachomyomachia* is the author's apparent interest in varying his Homeric models, even when doing so has no particular humorous point. This is not to say that the poet does not often draw on Homeric formulae unchanged — far from it. But in a number of passages, the poet seems concerned to create the appearance of Homeric "formularity"³² while simultaneously

served in one branch of the manuscript tradition, consists of the commonplace Homeric line δούπησεν δὲ πεσών, ὀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ (e.g. *Il.* 4.504), which seems to have been introduced into the tradition as a variation of 204. SCHIBLI (*art.cit.* above, n.10) 4 notes that unlike the fragmentary *Battle of Mice and Weasels*, the *Batrachomyomachia* never draws on whole lines taken over intact from Homer for its speech introductions, but only uses Homeric half-line formulae.

³¹ In several cases, however, the alteration involved is minimal, and is designed only to ensure continuity of syntax or regularity of meter (e.g. 242, where κνήμην δεξιερήν of *Il.* 4.519 has been converted to the nominative).

³² CAMEROTTO (*art.cit.* above, n.8), who emphasizes the extent to which the poet reuses and alters his own language in different passages in order to create the appearance of formulaic variation; G.S. KIRK, *Homer and the Oral Tradition* (Cam-

engaging in the sort of analogical variation of his models that is typically associated with more ‘refined’ Hellenistic poetry.³³ An instructive example is to be found in v. 204 κὰδ δ' ἔπεσεν πρηνής, ἀπαλάς δ' ἐκόνισεν ἐθείρας. κὰδ δ' ἔπεσεν occurs commonly in verse-initial position in Homer, often followed by ἐν κονίησι (cf. ἐκόνισεν) but never in conjunction with πρηνής. That adjective is commonly conjoined with the aorist of καταπίπτω in other metrical position (cf. *Od.* 5.374 //αύτὸς δὲ πρηνής ἀλὶ κάππεσε; cf. *Il.* 16.310–311 δὲ πρηνής ἐπὶ γαῖῃ // κάππεσ'; 16.413–414 δὲ ἄρα πρηνής ἐπὶ γαῖῃ // κάππεσεν), but is used in a metrically and semantically equivalent context in the expression ἥριπε δὲ πρηνής (*Il.* 5.58; *Od.* 22.296), a phrase that, had he wished, the author of the poem could simply have taken over whole cloth.³⁴ The departure from the Homeric model has no humorous point, and seems to have been introduced to avoid taking over the Homeric phrase unaltered³⁵ — and perhaps to show the poet’s cleverness in grafting one epic expression onto another. The phrase στιβαρὸν δόρυ at *Batrach.* 207 involves a similar variation. Both words in this expression appear in metrical *sedes* in which they also appear, separately, in early epic, and the expression as a whole seems intended to have a ‘traditional’ flavor, but the juncture itself is unHomeric:³⁶ when the adjective στιβαρός is used of spears in Homer, the weapon in question is called ἔγχος. Indeed, the poet had at his disposal the metrically equivalent formula δολιχὸν δόρυ (*Il.* 13.162; 15.474; 17.607; *Od.* 19.448), a phrase that, had the poet used it, would have been no less comically incongruous with the tiny size of the actual weapon than is the expression

bridge 1976), 188–190 = “Formular Language and Oral Quality”, in *YCS* 20 (1966), 161–163.

³³ For discussion of these techniques, cf. M. FANTUZZI, *Ricerche su Apollonio Rodio* (Roma 1988), 7–46.

³⁴ Cf. *Batrach.* 214, a verse absent from one branch of the mss. tradition.

³⁵ By contrast, the use of ἐθείρας rather than χαίτας, as in *Il.* 21.407 ἐκόνισε δὲ χαίτας// is metrically convenient.

³⁶ For the phrase, cf. *Anacreon tea* 28.9 West στιβαρὸν δόρυ κραδαίνων; QUINT.SMYRN. 1.236 δόρυ στιβαρὸν; OPP. *Hal.* 5.389.

employed by the poet.³⁷ In such cases, it is hard to see any specific motivation for the change in humor, meter,³⁸ or syntax, and the simplest conclusion is that the poet is interested, at least to a certain extent, in avoiding verbatim repetition of Homeric material.³⁹

One device commonly used by the author of the *Batrachomyomachia* when he does borrow directly from early epic is to link several short Homeric phrases via one or more common elements. Brent Vine has pointed out, for instance, that *Batrach.* 240 κείμενον ἐν δαπέδῳ λίθον ὅβριμον, ἄχθος ἀρούρης combines, in an “overlapping” fashion, the phrase λίθον ὅβριμον, found uniquely in Homer at *Od.* 9.305 (in the same verse position), with the expression ὅβριμον ἄχθος, a unique Homeric collocation at *Od.* 9.233 (at verse end) and the clausula ἄχθος ἀρούρης (*Il.* 18.104; *Od.* 20.379).⁴⁰ A similar technique may be seen in *Batrach.* 16 δῶρα δέ τοι δώσω ξεινήια πολλὰ καὶ ἐσθλά. Here, the first hemistich is adapted from *Il.* 22.341 δῶρα τά τοι δῶσουσι πατήρ καὶ πότνια μῆτηρ. The second half of the verse, on the other hand, combines, via the common element πολλά, the phrase ξεινήια πολλά, used by Homer at *Od.* 4.33 in the same metrical position, with the clausula πολλὰ καὶ ἐσθλά. A simple listing of these parallels is potentially misleading, since it might

³⁷ WÖLKE 157.

³⁸ A substantial number of passages involve changes to Homeric models that also happen to be metrically convenient for their context. Thus, for example, at v.106 ὑπτιος ἔξηπλωτο is a metrically convenient variation of the Homeric ὑπτιος ἔξετανύσθη, though of course the Homeric phrase could have been employed in the same metrical position had the poet chosen a word beginning in vowel as the next word.

³⁹ The fragmentary account of a war between weasels and mice takes over a line from the Catalogue of Ships all but unchanged (v.7 - *Il.* 2.700) and in two places (vv.13, 58) uses verbatim whole Homeric speech-introductory lines (a practice in which it differs from the *Batrachomyomachia*) but for the most part draws on and combines shorter epic phrases; cf. SCHIBLI 4-5.

⁴⁰ VINE (*art.cit.* above, n.8), who points out that at *Il.* 7.264 and 21.403, λίθον appears in the same metrical sedes and is followed in the next verse by κείμενον ἐν δαπέδῳ, the hemistich with which *Batrach.* 240 opens. Thus the verse may be understood as an example of compression of Homeric material, a phenomenon we will consider in more detail in a moment.

well leave the impression that the verse consists of an arbitrary jumble of Homeric phraselets, but in fact πολλὰ καὶ ἐσθλά in Homer regularly appears (4 out of 7 occurrences) as part of the hemistich κειμήλια πολλὰ καὶ ἐσθλά — that is, preceded by a word similar in phonetic shape to ξεινήια (*Il.* 9.330; 24.381; *Od.* 15.159; 19.272) — in contexts involving the giving of presents. Here, in other words, the lynchpin that connects the two phrases is not merely πολλά, but also the phonetic resemblance between κειμήλια in one model and ξεινήια in the other. Finally, we might note a closely related but slightly different technique at the end of v. 156 ὅς τις σχεδὸν ἀντίος ἔλθη, where the poet combines each of the two unique Homeric expressions that begin with ὅς τις and end with a 3rd-person form of the aorist ἔλθ- in the same verse positions — the first *Il.* 5.301 = 17.8 ὅς τις τοῦ γ' ἀντίος ἔλθοι and the second *Il.* 20.363 ὅς τις σχεδὸν ἔγχεος ἔλθη — in such a way that he substitutes the word found in one passage for the form found in the metrically identical position of the other.

In a number of instances, the poet's manipulation of Homeric material is more complex. An interesting case in point is *Batrach.* 228–229 ἔγκέφαλος δὲ // ἐκ ρινῶν ἔσταξε, παλάσσετο δ' αἴματι γαῖα, a passage that notionally resembles *Od.* 9.290, where the brains of Odysseus' men are said to flow to the ground and moisten the earth (ἐκ δ' ἔγκέφαλος χαμάδις ρέε, δεῦε δὲ γαῖαν). At a verbal level, the second half of v. 229 combines the phrase παλάσσετο δ' αἴματι θώρηξ (*Il.* 5.100) with the clausula αἴματι γαῖα (*Il.* 4.451; 8.65 ρέε δ' αἴματι γαῖα/; 10.484 ἐρυθαίνετο δ' αἴματι γαῖα). What makes this phraseology particularly interesting, however, is that in Homer the phrase ἔγκέφαλος δέ occurs in verse-final position, as in *Batrach.* 228, only in the recurring phrase ἔγκέφαλος δὲ // ἔνδον ἄπας πεπάλακτο (*Il.* 11.97–98 = 12.185–186 = 20.399–400). In that phrase, which seems to have been a source of some discussion among Alexandrian scholars,⁴¹ πεπάλακτο seems to mean that the brain

⁴¹ According to *Schol.* A ad HOM. *Il.* 11.97, Apollonius (presumably Apollonius of Rhodes) read ἔγκέφαλονδε in that line and athetized the next.

was splattered within the helmet, though the verb was said by *Schol. AbT ad Il.* 11.98 to mean “was moistened”, i.e. by the blood flowing into the wound. The composer of the *Batrachomymachia* has taken over the clausula ἐγκέφαλος δέ // but slightly altered the point — here the damaged brain flows from the dead fighter’s nose — while retaining the idea of splattering, which he displaces to the ensuing clause. That the poet here is deliberately engaging with his Homeric models in a sophisticated rather than haphazard way is made more likely by the poet’s apparent reversal — in both word order and sense — of *Il.* 19.39 στάξε κατὰ ρινῶν, ἵνα οἱ χρώς ἔμπεδος εἴη, where the point is that Thetis dripped nectar and ambrosia down over the nostrils of the dead Patroclus.

A similarly complex engagement with epic models, including not only Homer but also Hesiod, may be seen in *Batrach.* 207–208 τὸν δὲ πεσόντα // εὗλε μέλας θάνατος, ψυχὴ δ’ ἐκ σώματος ἔπτη. The phrase τὸν δὲ πεσόντα occurs in Homer at *Il.* 4.463, where it is also the object of a verb meaning to “take”, but where it appears at the opening rather than the conclusion of the verse. Although commentators regularly cite parallels from the Homeric epics, in fact the opening of *Batrach.* 208 compresses and adapts *Works and Days* 154–155 θάνατος δὲ καὶ ἐκπάγλους περ ἔόντας // εὗλε μέλας, λαμπρὸν δ’ ἔλιπον φρός ήλείοι, where θάνατος occurs in the same verse position and is similarly modified by μέλας but where the adjective and noun are separated from one another over two lines.⁴² The second hemistich, on the other hand, formally resembles expressions describing the soul’s departure from the body, like ψυχὴ δ’ Ἀϊδόσδε κατῆλθεν (*Od.* 10.560), in which ψυχὴ δὲ also immediately follows the masculine caesura.⁴³ Its content, however, seems to rework the Homeric verse ψυχὴ δ’ ἐκ ρεθέων πταμένη

⁴² There is a useful discussion of this passage in WÖLKE 157–158, who does not mention the Hesiodic model.

⁴³ Cf. in different sedes, *Il.* 23.100; 11.65; and in the same sedes but a slightly different context, *Il.* 11.538.

Ἄιδόσδε βεβήκει (*Il.* 16.856; 22.362), with the unHomeric phrase ἐκ σώματος serving as a virtual gloss on the Homeric phrase ἐκ ρέθεων, an expression sufficiently striking as to warrant explanation by ancient critics (cf. *Schol.* bT *ad Il.* 16.856 ὅτι πνεῦμα ποιὸν ἡ ψυχὴ κατὰ παντὸς οἰκοῦν τοῦ σώματος; *Hsch.* p 186 ρέθη· μέλη τοῦ σώματος. σῶμα).

Full appreciation of such passages thus requires that a reader recognize, at least in a general way, the Homeric expressions with which the poet works, though it does not seem to depend on the identification of the precise context from which they derive. As in Matro's poetry, however, the humor of the *Batrachomomyomachia* sometimes depends on the recognition of the specific context from which the epic models are drawn. At *Batrach.* 248–249, for instance, a wounded fighter, apparently Physignathus himself,⁴⁴ withdraws from battle and leaps into a ditch to avoid death: *σκάζων* ἐκ πολέμου ἀνεχάζετο, *τείρετο* δ' αἰνῶς: // *ἥλατο* δ' ἐξ τάφρους, ὅππως φύγῃ αἰπὺν ὅλεθρον. In this case, almost the entire couplet is constituted from Homeric words and phrases reused, with little variation, in their original epic *sedes*. Thus the hemistich *σκάζων* ἐκ πολέμου derives verbatim from *Il.* 11.811, of the wounded Eurypylus; *ἀνεχάζετο* appears in its most common Homeric verse position (*Il.* 5.600; 11.461; 16.710; 17.108); and the final half of v.249 reworks the second hemistich of *Il.* 14.507 ὅπῃ φύγοι αἰπὺν ὅλεθρον. As commentators have noted, moreover, the clausula of v.248 has been taken over directly from *Il.* 5.352, where Aphrodite withdraws from battle after having been wounded (and chided) by Diomedes: *ώς* ἔφαθ', ἦ δ' ἀλύουσ' ἀπεβήσετο, *τείρετο* δ' αἰνῶς. At a basic level, the use of the phrase in a parallel context — in each, a wounded “warrior” withdraws from battle — suggests that readers are meant to recognize and appreciate the source: the full

⁴⁴ Verses 247–254 seem to have been transmitted in confused order (cf. WÖLKE 220–221), and it seems reasonable to transpose vv.248–249 into the place occupied in the paradosis by the interpolated v.251, so that the sequence of the lines is 250, 248–249, 252 (cf. GLEI 194; FUSILLO 127).

humor of the phrase as it is reused in the *Batrachomyomachia* depends on the implicit contrast between the goddess Aphrodite (herself a bathetic, semi-comic figure in the Homeric context) and the wounded frog. So, too, at vv.10–11, where Psicharpax sticks his face in the marsh to drink (*πλησίον ἐν λίμνῃ λίχνον προσέθηκε γένειον, // ὅδατι τερπόμενος μελιηδέι*), some of the humor of the claim that the mouse was “delighting in the honey-sweet water” surely depends on our recognition of the Homeric model, *Od.* 11.582–584 Τάνταλον ἐσεῖδον … // ἔσταότ’ ἐν λίμνῃ· ἢ δὲ προσέπλαζε γενείω· // στεῦτο δὲ διψάων, πιέειν δ’ οὐκ εἶχεν ἐλέσθαι, where Tantalus, though standing up to his chin in water, is unable to take any satisfaction from it or, for that matter, to enjoy the bountiful feast that surrounds him (*Od.* 11.588–592);⁴⁵ put differently, the verbal similarity between *Batrach.* 10 and *Od.* 11.583 sets up the sharp contrast between the two ensuing lines.

These are a relatively straightforward cases; a more complex example may be found at *Batrach.* 25–26, where Psicharpax responds to Physignathus’ inquiries about his background:

τίπτε γένος τούμὸν ζητεῖς; δῆλον δὲ ἐν ἄπασιν
ἀνθρώποις τε θεοῖς τε καὶ οὐρανίοις πετεγνοῖς.

Commentators have noted that the passage thematically resembles *Il.* 6.145–151,⁴⁶ where Glaucus, in response to Diomedes’ inquiry about his lineage, wonders why he asks, compares the races of men to falling leaves, and asserts that his race is widely known before recounting his background:

Τυδεῖδη μεγάθυμε, τίη γενεὴν ἐρεείνεις;
οἵη περ φύλλων γενεὴ, τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν.
φύλλα τὰ μέν τ’ ἀνεμος χαμάδις χέει, ἄλλα δέ θ’ ὥλη
τηλεθόωσα φύει, ἔαρος δ’ ἐπιγίνεται ὥρη·
ώς ἀνδρῶν γενεὴ ἢ μὲν φύει ἢ δ’ ἀπολήγει.

⁴⁵ The contrast lends special point to the epithet *λίχνον*: Psicharpax drinks glutonously; Tantalus not at all. For the text, cf. LUDWICH 324–325; WÖLKE 26 with n.56.

⁴⁶ GLEI 124; FUSILLÓ 92–93;

εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις καὶ ταῦτα δαήμεναι ὅφρ' ἐն εἰδῆς
ἥμετέρην γενεὴν, πολλοὶ δέ μιν ἄνδρες ἵσασιν·

The connection between the meeting of Psicharpax and Physignathus and that of Diomedes and Glaucus is subsequently underscored by the reuse of *Il.* 6.150 in the Frog's response in v.62 (where *ταῦτα* refers to Physignathus' claims about the amphibious life he leads rather than to his lineage), but in vv.25–26 the borrowing is once again thematic rather than verbal, for the poet compresses Glaucus' speech while avoiding any direct repetition of its language.⁴⁷ Thus the question *τίπτε γένος τούμὸν ζητεῖς*; recalls Glaucus' *τίη γενεὴν ἔρεείνεις;*, but with every individual element varied: *τίη* becomes *τίπτε*, *γένος* is used instead of *γενεὴ*, and the unHomeric verb *ζητέω* takes the place of Homeric *ἔρεείνω*. So too, the Homeric warrior's claim that "many men know it" (*Il.* 6.151 *πολλοὶ δέ μιν ἄνδρες ἵσασιν*) finds a thematic but not a verbal parallel in Physignathus' assertion that his race is clear to all men, gods, and birds.

Verse 26 is missing from one branch of the tradition, and some scholars have questioned its authenticity. Against Wachsmuth's objection that the line amounts to inelegant and incongruous bragging,⁴⁸ it is sufficient to notice that such boasting plays on the characteristic behavior of Homeric heroes.⁴⁹ But, as Massimo Fusillo has noted, Psicharpax's enumeration of those to whom his kind is famous also plays to comic effect on the traditional tripartite division of the universe: in speaking only of the realms of earth (men) and sky (gods and birds), the mouse omits the aquatic world to which the frog belongs and thus justifies his interlocutor's ignorance of his background.⁵⁰ Onto the traditional pair "men and gods", Psicharpax grafts a

⁴⁷ WÖLKE 111–113 emphasizes the differences in the context and content of the two passages to argue against drawing a connection between them.

⁴⁸ C. WACHSMUTH, "Zu Batrachomyomachie", in *RhM* 20 (1865), 185; cf. LUDWICH 330.

⁴⁹ GLEI 125.

⁵⁰ FUSILLO 92–93. For triadic elements in the poem, see A. ESTEBAN, "Ratones, ranas y dioses: el esquema ternario de la *Batracomioquia*", in *CFC(G)* 1 (1991), 57–71.

third element, with the effect that birds are made the climactic and thus the most important item in the series, especially since they are given a conventional (though unHomeric) epithet of gods (e.g. *h.Cer.* 2.55; Aeschylus, *Ag.* 90). Some have seen in this sequence a possible reference to the primordial place of birds in the cosmogony given in the parabasis of Aristophanes' *Birds* (685ff.), but the emphasis that Psicharpax places on birds has a more obvious humorous point that is based as much in basic natural history as it is in literature: many birds eat mice, so that when the Mouse King asserts that his line is “clear” ($\delta\eta\lambda\omegaν$) to all of them, he is boasting about a fact that should be a source of special concern to him.

The joke is underscored in interesting ways by the verse's engagement with ancient epic. The phrase οὐρανίοις πετεήνοις varies the Homeric ὑπουρανίοις πετεήνοις, an expression that occurs in a single passage of early epic. At *Il.* 17.673–678, Menelaos, peering around the battlefield, is compared to an eagle that uses its extraordinary eyesight to locate, attack and kill a rabbit hiding in a bush:

ώς ἄρα φωνήσας ἀπέβη ξανθὸς Μενέλαος,
πάντοσε παπταίνων ὡς τ' αἰετός, ὃν ἡδὲ τέ φασιν
δξύτατον δέρκεσθαι υπουρανίων πετεηνῶν,
ὅν τε καὶ νψόθ' ἔόντα πόδας ταχὺς οὐκ ἔλαθε πτώξ
θάμνῳ ὑπ' ἀμφικόμῳ κατακείμενος, ἀλλά τ' ἐπ' αὐτῷ
ἔσσυτο, καὶ τέ μιν ὥκα λαβὼν ἔξειλετο θυμόν.

Read against this background, *Batrach.* 26 emerges as anything but an awkward and inept expansion of Glaucus' claim that many men know his race (*Il.* 6.151). Even without knowledge of the Homeric background, one may find humorous irony in Psicharpax's claim: for the race of mice, to be conspicuous among birds is by no means a good thing. But the language of the passage also evokes a specific Homeric passage that emphasizes a bird's ability to see a small, well-hidden creature even from a great distance.⁵¹ Thus, the adaptation of *Il.* 17.675 may

⁵¹ *Schol.* bT *ad HOM. Il.* 17.676–7 point out that the rabbit's position beneath a bush increases the difficulty of seeing it from afar.

be understood as an allusion in the richest sense: readers are invited to recognize the context in which the model occurs, and to allow that context to inform their reading. For those who are able to recognize it, the model not only underscores the point of the reference to birds, but also suggests the irony of Psicharpax' boast by emphasizing the grave danger inherent in being 'conspicuous'.

Something similar may be said about another model for the verse. Critics have noted that at a structural level v.26 seems modeled on Hes. *Op.* 277. That verse forms part a passage in which the narrator uses the behavior of animals as a foil for talking about human justice (*Op.* 274–278):

ὦ Πέρση, σὺ δὲ ταῦτα μετὰ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῆσιν,
καὶ νῦ Δίκης ἐπάκουε, βίης δὲ ἐπιλήθεο πάμπαν.
τόνδε γάρ ἀνθρώποισι νόμον διέταξε Κρονίων,
ἰχθύσι μὲν καὶ θηρσὶ καὶ οἰωνοῖς πετεγνοῖς
ἔσθειν ἀλλήλους, ἐπεὶ οὐ δίκη ἔστι μετ' αὐτοῖς.

Although the issue treated in this passage is cannibalism rather than (as in *Il.* 17.675) the consumption of one species by another, the focus on the eating habits of animals may help to underscore the witty point of *Batrach.* 26. In any case, the second hemistich of *Batrach.* 26 combines two distinct models, both of which contain a reference to birds eating other creatures: onto the second half of Hes. *Op.* 277 (*καὶ οἰωνοῖς πετεγνοῖς*), the poet overlays a reworking of *Il.* 17.675 by substituting the adjective *οὐρανίοις*, adapted from the Homeric *ὑπουρανίων*, for *οἰωνοῖς*. As such, the verse may be understood as an example of a phenomenon that occurs regularly in Matro, who often combines allusions to multiple, contextually related passages, as for example when he combines a reworking of the description of Ajax withdrawing under pressure with a passage from the Catalogue of Ships in which the same hero is mentioned.⁵²

Such passages ought to encourage us to be careful about dismissing the literary merit of the poet's engagement with epic

⁵² OLSON-SENS (*op.cit.* above, n.3), 21–2.

models, as if he drew at random on Homeric phraseology with no consideration of its original context. Indeed, in some cases, the poet's approach to his epic material resembles techniques used by Hellenistic poets whose sophistication can no longer be called into question. An interesting example is *Batrach.* 64, where Physignathus urges his newfound companion to mount his back "in order that rejoicing you might reach my home" (ὅππως γηθόσυνος τὸν ἐμὸν δόμον εἰσαφίκηαι). As in the case of numerous other passages of the poem, modern commentaries on v.64 list a series of epic models without providing any clear sense of how they might be related to one another or to the larger context. Ludwich *ad loc.* cites *Od.* 5.269 γηθόσυνος δ' οὔρφ πέτασ' ίστια δῖος Ὁδυσσεύς, *Il.* 20.336 μὴ καὶ ὑπὲρ μοῖραν δόμον Ἀιδος εἰσαφίκηαι, and [Hes.] *Sc.* 45 ἀσπασίως τε φίλως τε ἐδόμον εἰσαφίκανεν. His list is taken over by Glei (p.136), who adds Mosch. *Eur.* 117 and observes that the reminiscence of the Iliadic passage (with its reference to Hades) is "fast makaber" given ensuing events.

Closer inspection, however, suggests that the verse's engagement with epic models might be considerably more nuanced and sophisticated than scholars have allowed. First, it is important to note that γηθόσυνος is not restricted to *Od.* 5.239, but occurs in a number of other passages of early epic as well (e.g. *Il.* 4.272, 326, 7.122, 18.557; *Od.* 11.540; *h.Ahpr.* 217).⁵³ In the majority of its epic occurrences, the adjective either occurs at the head of the verse or falls immediately after the bucolic diaeresis. Its metrical position in *Batrach.* 64, however, has only a single epic parallel, *Il.* 13.82, a verse not mentioned by any of the commentators. Ludwich's (and later Glei's) privileging of *Od.* 5.239 over *Il.* 13.82 and the other epic passages in which the word occurs thus seems to depend on his recognition of a contextual parallelism: in both the *Batrachomyomachia* and the *Odyssey* the adjective is used of someone embarking on a sea

⁵³ The treatment of epic models by CAMEROTTO (*art.cit.* above, n.8) is also selective.

voyage “home” (though in the former case the home in question will be that of Psicharpax’ would-be host rather than, as in the case of Odysseus, his own).

Even if one does not draw this association, Physignathus’ expectation that his interlocutor will reach his home “rejoicing” turns out to be deeply misguided, since the trip he invites him to take ends in his death. The irony is increased, however, if one recognizes a specific thematic reminiscence of the *Odyssey*, where the hero’s joyous departure from Calypso’s island soon gives way to shipwreck: read against that passage, attentive readers understand what Physignathus does not, namely that, like Odysseus’ raft for the epic hero, the frog will prove a less than secure mode of transportation for Psicharpax. On this reading, the single word $\gamma\eta\theta\sigma\nu\omega\varsigma$ sets up a larger parallelism between Psicharpax’ ill-fated voyage and Odysseus’ departure from Calypso’s island, and prepares for a further point of contact between the two episodes, for as commentators have noticed, the description of the death of Psicharpax, weighed down by his fur despite all his struggles (91f.), resembles, at a thematic level (though once again not in its specific phraseology), the near-drowning of Odysseus (*Od.* 5.319ff.), weighed down by his wet clothes.

There is, however, more to be said about the engagement with epic models in this passage. The final phrase δόμον εἰσαφίκηαι occurs at Hes. fr. 283 (εῦ νῦν μοι τάδ' ἔκαστα μετὰ φρεσὶ πευκαλίμησι // φράζεσθαι πρῶτον μέν, δτ' ἀν δόμον εἰσαφίκηαι, // ἔρδειν ιερὰ καλὰ θεοῖς αἰειγενέτηισιν), but at a phonetic and grammatical level the end of the line more closely resembles a passage of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 195.45 = Sc. 45) ἀσπασίως τε φίλως τε ἐδόμον εἰσαφίκανεν (cf. τὸν ἐμόν δόμον εἰσαφίκηαι), describing Amphitryo’s arrival home. This passage is routinely cited without further discussion by commentators, but so far I can determine, it has not been explicitly observed that the points of contact with it are not restricted to the second hemistich, since $\gamma\eta\theta\sigma\nu\omega\varsigma$ in the first half of *Batrach.* 64 is close in sense to ἀσπασίως τε φίλως τε in the Hesiodic

passage. If one found the verse in a poem by Callimachus — to pick only the most obvious poet — one would have no trouble assuming that he had taken over and slightly adapted — by converting the verb from third to second person and the pronoun from third to first person — the second hemistich of the Hesiodic verse, while ‘glossing’ the first hemistich, and in particular $\alpha\sigma\pi\alpha\sigma\iota\omega\varsigma$, with a different, semantically identical word, which he places in the *sedes* in which it occurs least often in early epic. In short, we would likely assume, because such a specific connection *could* reasonably be drawn, that it *should* be drawn, and the slight circularity involved would be justified by the regularity with which similar arguments could be made about other passages of the poet’s work. In the case of the *Batrachomyomachia*, we are likely to be far more restrained in our assumptions; perhaps we need not be.

In this light, as a final case of the complexity of the poet’s engagement with his models, let us return to look more closely at the opening scene of the narrative, in which the frog Physignathus espies and addresses Psicharpax, who has come to the edge of the marsh for a drink following his escape from a weasel: $\tauὸν \deltaὲ κατεῖδε // λιμνόχαρις πολύφημος$, $\varepsilonπος \delta' ἐφθέγξατο τοῖον$ (11–12). Since the frog does not give his name until v.17, the reader who reaches v.12 initially cannot know whether $\piολύφημος$ is to be understood as an adjective or a proper noun.⁵⁴ That the adjective plays on the name of the Cyclops of Homer’s *Odyssey* has been recognized at least since the 16th century, when Leonhartius Lycius observed that “*πολυφήμου epitheto admirabili ioco usus est propter ambiguam significationem, et proprium hoc nomen tributum immani illi et hominum devoratori Cyclopi.*” As Glei has observed, moreover, the epithet (which occurs in the same *sedes* as a proper name at *Od.* 1.70), is thematically appropriate, since like the Cyclops Physignathus goes on to ask his

⁵⁴ One branch of the tradition (*l*) transmits $\piολύφωνος$, apparently originating as a gloss. Cf. LUDWICH 326; GLEI 118–119. Λιμνόχαρις and Πολύφωνος are transmitted as proper names in v.212.

interlocutor who he is and what he wants, and since the treatment the guests are afforded in each case turns out to be highly problematic (though the Frog is at least interested in guest-friendship and gift exchange). The point can be turned in a different direction: the sly equation of Physignathus with Polyphemus creates expectations that are fulfilled in humorous ways in the ensuing narrative, in the sense that like Polyphemus, Physignathus is a disastrously bad host.

As critics have recognized, the opening verse of the frog's speech reworks Polyphemus' first words to Odysseus at *Od.* 9.252. Physignathus' opening query in v.13, ξείνε, τίς εῖ; converts to the singular the plurals of Polyphemus' first words δέξεῖνοι, τίνες ἔστε;. The frog's second question πόθεν ἥλθες ἐς ἥδηνα;, on the other hand, involves a more complex engagement with its Homeric model (πόθεν πλεῖθ' ὑγρὰ κέλευθα;). Polyphemus' question naturally assumes that Odysseus and his men are sea voyagers who have reached his land by ship, and at first glance, Physignathus' question seems to be roughly equivalent, since asking "whence have you reached the shore" would be a perfectly acceptable way to inquire whence someone has sailed. In the *Batrachomyomachia*, however, the relative positions of the frog and mouse reverse those of Odysseus and Polyphemus: whereas in the *Odyssey* Polyphemus dwells on land, and his visitors arrive by sea, here Psicharpax has reached the shore by land, and his would-be host addresses him from the water. Although it is possible to understand this reversal as deriving solely from engagement with the Homeric model, the language of the passage and in particular its description of Physignathus as a λιμνόχαρις πολύφημος takes on special point if it is read against the representation of the Cyclops in post-Homeric poetry.

An important source of humor in the famous and influential treatment of Polyphemus' love for the sea-nymph Galatea in Theocritus 11 is that the Cyclops has no gills (54–55) and cannot even swim (60–61), so that he must be reduced to pleading his erotic case from the shore. Precisely how the matter was handled in Philoxenus' famous but now poorly preserved

dithyramb is not wholly clear,⁵⁵ but the divide between the terrestrial Polyphemus and the aquatic object of his desire was a recurring theme not only in Hellenistic poetry, which regularly emphasizes the Cyclops' position on the shore — consistently described as an ἥών (Theoc. 11.14; Bion fr. 16 Reed; [Bion] 2.1–3; [Mosch.] 3.58–63; cf. *Batrach.* 13) — or shows him looking wistfully towards the sea from land (Hermesianax fr. 1, p.96 Powell δερκόμενος πρὸς κῦμα, μόνη δέ οἱ ἐφλέγετο γλῆν), but also in Roman wall painting (O. Touchefeu-Meynier, *LIMC* VIII 1 (1997), 1018, with nos. 55–60; Philostratus, *Im.* 2.18). The question of whether Polyphemus could actually swim, indeed, seems to have been treated as a point of poetic ‘controversy’ by Posidippus, who in an epigram that clearly alludes to Theocritus’ treatment of the Cyclops represents him as diving frequently with Galatea (19.7–8 Austin–Bastianini),⁵⁶ and a painting from the “House of Livia” on the Palatine (*LIMC* VIII 1, no.54) shows Polyphemus standing in water up to his chest and gazing at Galatea as she rides a sea-horse.⁵⁷ Seen against this background, the description of Physignathus as a λιμνόχαρις πολύφημος in v.12 may perhaps be read as a literary joke that depends on the well established (though not surprisingly variable) tradition that distinguished sharply between the terrestrial

⁵⁵ A letter of Synesius (*Epist.* 121) reports that Odysseus promised to use his magic powers to help Polyphemus win Galatea’s love, if only the Cyclops would release him from his cave. That this passage might derive from Polyxenus was first suggested by T. BERGK (Ed.), *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* (Leipzig ²1853, ³1867, ⁴1882) and is now generally accepted; cf. J.H. HORDERN, “The Cyclops of Philoxenus”, in *CQ N.S.* 49 (1999), 445–455, esp. 450–451; E. LIVREA, “Un epigramma di Posidippo e il *Cyclops* di Filossoeno di Citera”, in *ZPE* 146 (2004), 41–46.

⁵⁶ Cf. R. HUNTER, “Notes on the *Lithika* of Posidippus”, in *Labored in Papyrus Leaves*, ed. by B. ACOSTA-HUGHES–E. KOSMETATOU–M. BAUMBACH (Cambridge, MA and London 2004), 103–104; V. RAIMONDI, “Αἰπολικὸς δύσερως in Posidippo 19 A.–B.: un richiamo al Ciclope innamorato infelice di Theocr. *Idd.* 6 e 11”, in *Posidippo e gli altri*, a cura di M. DI MARCO–B.M. PALUMBO–E. LELLI (Pisa–Roma 2005), 133–146, esp. 145–146. LIVREA (*art.cit.* above, n.55) plausibly argues for the dependence of Posidippus’ treatment on Philoxenus’ dithyramb.

⁵⁷ Cf. G. BASTIANINI–C. GALLAZZI–C. AUSTIN (Eds.), *Posidippo di Pella. Epigrammi*, Papiri dell’Università degli Studi di Milano, 8 (Milano 2001), 131.

Polyphemus and the aquatic Galatea: the frog is πολύφημος (a word that readers may initially take as a proper name) but also takes pleasure in the water.⁵⁸ In this sense, the poem's use of the Homeric episode may be mediated by the post-Homeric development of the Cyclops story. On this reading, which is supported by the poet's apparent familiarity with other Hellenistic poetry, the post-Homeric treatment of Polyphemus as a land-locked lover lends special resonance to the evocation of the (Homeric) Cyclops episode as a model for the encounter between Physignathus and Psicharpax. Like Theocritus 11 and its successors, the scene in the *Batrachomyomachia* depends on the unbridgeable gap between those who are able to swim and those who cannot, but here it is the neo-Cyclops Physignathus who can survive, and thrive, in the water.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ One might suspect that the πολύφημος of the poem's title refers to the "swell" or "surge" of water in which Physignathus swims, but the word πολύφημος is also used in Homeric contexts to denote a "marshy" or "swampy" place, and the πολύφημος of the poem's title is probably best understood as referring to the poet's desire to evoke the image of a "marshy" or "swampy" place, where Physignathus can survive and thrive. This reading is supported by the poet's choice of the word λιμνόχαρις, which is preserved by some manuscripts and by Methodius, and presupposed by the *scholia ad loc.*, to mean "delight in the marsh" (λιμνοχαρίς), rather than "decoration of the marsh" (*vel sim.* λιμνοχαρία). Cf. WÖLKE 258–259.

⁵⁹ I am grateful to Marco Fantuzzi, Charles McNelis, Rebecca Miller, and S. Douglas Olson for their reactions to earlier drafts of this paper.

DISCUSSION

Chr. Tsagalis: What about the way the *Batrachomyomachia* treats names? In the case of Φυσίγναθος, apart from the anatomical background of the name, it seems that there is some sort of playful allusion to the man-eating Cyclops of the *Odyssey*. On the other hand — given a late dating of the *Batrachomyomachia* — do you think that Ψιχάρπαξ may be a variant of Ψυχάρπαξ pointing to the mouse's death in the *Batrachomyomachia*? This might be reinforced by your observation that — unlike Odyssean Odysseus — Psicharpax will have an ill-fated voyage that will lead to his death. In this light, one is tempted to ask the question whether name-parody in this work is based both on the Homeric pre-life of the main characters and/or their 'present' life in the *Batrachomyomachia*.

A. Sens: Yes, the poet's manipulation and play with names is an interesting mark of his sophistication, as of course it is for Homer as well. As for the specific instance you mention, it is certainly possible that a Greek reader might have heard a pun on Ψυχάρπαξ / Ψιχάρπαξ though I wonder whether the doomed mouse can really be thought of a "Soul-snatcher". In any case, one would have to admit that the pun would be a faint one, given that there do not seem to be clear textual pointers to it.

G. Danek: In *Batrach.* 156, ὅς τις σχεδὸν ἀντίος ἔλθη, kombiniert der Dichter zwei unterschiedliche homerische Modelle, weil keines von den beiden allein für seinen eigenen Zweck brauchbar ist. Mein Eindruck ist, dass diese Methode die sprachliche Grundlage für dieses Gedicht bildet: die einfache Übernahme von homerischen Formeln/Formulierungen, mit Adap-

tationen an den neuen Kontext. Damit müsste aber noch nicht notwendig eine parodistische Absicht verbunden sein, genauso wie in den späten Homer-Zentonen der Gebrauch der homerischen Sprache nicht parodistisch ist.

A. Sens: While I agree that neither of the poet's models for v.156 would have fit the context exactly, that fact alone did not require him to manipulate and combine these two particular passages — the very two places in which ὅς τις ... ἔλθ- occurs. In this particular case, I think that the practices of a poet like Apollonius of Rhodes might be a better point of comparison than those of later writers of Homeric *centos*. But it is certainly true that it is sometimes hard to gauge the precise difference in tone between a poem like the *Batrachomyomachia* and 'serious' Hellenistic poems in which Homeric language is reapplied to unHomeric subject matter.

E.J. Bakker: Your reading of the *Batrachomyomachia* opens up interesting perspectives on Homeric diction as a “χόσμος ἐπέων”, a language in its own right in which you could express yourself in a time well beyond the life of the oral tradition as envisaged by Parry and Lord. Even for us modern scholars and our students it makes somehow more sense to 'compose' Homeric hexameters than, say, Sophoclean trimeters. In this regard I was wondering about your remarks on the text's transmission, its interpolations, etc.: couldn't our received text represent some kind of learned/playful tradition of parodic epic discourse? Some of the 'interpolations' (e.g. line 26) in any case certainly improve on the text's quality and humoristic value.

A. Sens: I absolutely agree that the place of epic in Greek culture — and in Greek education — must have contributed to making it an almost irresistible target of parody, and that many readers of the *Batrachomyomachia* may well have been tempted to try their own hand at improving the text. I also suspect that the very irreverence of parody was part of the appeal to inter-

polators (I think, for example, of forgeries of Petronius' *Satyri-con*). It is also certainly true that, given the state of the text, we can never be absolutely sure that a given line was present in the original version. Still, I think that the parodic approach I have described is sufficiently well distributed throughout the poem that, with due caution, one can talk about the poem as a whole as the work of *an* author.

M. Fusillo: Although the *Batrachomyomachia* is certainly a text particularly apt to be interpolated for the reasons E. Bakker clearly described, I think that this paper brilliantly showed an authorial strategy in the pseudo-Homeric poem, especially regarding the recreation of a Homeric 'flavour' and the intentional evoking of narrative contexts.

M. Fantuzzi: About the mouse's disparagement of the vegetarian diet of frogs, which you connect to Archestratus's statement that "legumes and fruits are a marker of beggary", I wonder whether we may see in this passage another example of the relationship between Crates and gastronomic parody. Indeed, we also find in Crates *SH* 359 the precise opposition — though of course from a completely different perspective — between the δαπάναι τρυφεραί (11) and the narrator's appeal to the Muses and Hermes for χόρτος δουλοσύνης (4). This stance clearly has a Hipponactean matrix (cf. fr. 36.6 Degani), as is also proved by the Hipponactean invocation to Hermes (on which cf. M. Noussia, in the proceedings of the conference: *La cultura letteraria ellenistica: persistenza, innovazione, trasmissione*, Roma, 19-21 Sept. 2005), but certainly was an especially widespread Cynic theme. Should we think that the Cynic 'beggar's' diet, or Crates' text advertising it, may have especially attracted the attention of both Archestratus and the author of the *Batrach.*, or the other way round? We would thus have a further element in the net of interlacing connections between parodic poetry and Crates, which you have perfectly highlighted at the beginning of your paper.

A. Sens: Thank you for reminding me of this passage of Crates, which fits my argument nicely. Given the rise in interest in food in general from at least the beginning of the 4th century, I think it is perhaps more likely that Crates is reacting to the sort of elaborate and expensive dining recommended by poets like Archeistratus and described by Matro and others than that those poets (and the author of the *Batrach.*) were thinking specifically of the Cynic position. Indeed, Archeistratus, in particular, seems in other passages of his poem to be criticizing those who have the money to spend on food (and the desire to spend it) but not the proper culinary knowledge to do it well.

A. Rengakos: Are there any allusions in the *Batrachomyomachia* to questions of Homeric *Textkritik* and interpretation comparable to those found in the major Hellenistic poets (e.g. Callimachus or Apollonius of Rhodes)?

A. Sens: I have not found any examples thus far, but a fuller investigation might prove interesting.

P. Chuvin: Une remarque très accessoire à ce brillant et solide exposé. Au début du poème, le rat Psicharpax rencontre la grenouille Physignathus et se vante de son origine (d'après *Il.* 5, Diomède et Glaucos). Il lui dit: "Ma famille est célèbre chez tous les hommes, chez les dieux et chez les oiseaux dans le ciel". Vous avez bien remarqué que les oiseaux 'connaissent' les rats des champs ou musaraignes, qu'ils attrapent et mangent. Mais les oiseaux représentent pour les grenouilles un danger non moindre que pour les rats, et illustré dans la littérature (la fable). Y a-t-il une explication?

A. Sens: You are absolutely correct, of course, and that fact from natural history may well increase the humor. In the end, though, it seems to me that what matters most here is the speaker Psicharpax' own failure to recognize the dangerous implications of his own boast.

VII

PIERRE CHUVIN

NONNOS DE PANOPOLIS
ET LA "DÉCONSTRUCTION" DE L'ÉPOPÉE

Il peut paraître paradoxal de parler, selon un terme à la mode, de "déconstruction de l'épopée" à propos des *Dionysiaques*, alors que tout l'effort de la critique, aujourd'hui, vise à montrer que l'œuvre a fait l'objet d'une construction soignée de la part de son auteur. Même si cette construction semble parfois ne pas obéir aux critères d'enchaînement narratif et de vraisemblance psychologique, elle existe et nous ne manquons pas de concepts éprouvés pour la décrire. Trois au moins sont spécialement importants: (1) l'usage, traditionnel dans la poésie grecque, de la composition annulaire, la circularité des thèmes; (2) l'esthétique nonnienne de la variété, des tons ou des thèmes, la fameuse *ποικιλία* annoncée au début du poème (1, 15); (3) l'imitation, reprise ou variation sur les thèmes des devanciers, Nonnos se voulant "émule des Anciens et des Modernes"¹ (*νέοισι καὶ ἀρχεγόνοισιν ἐριζων*, 25, 27), en particulier d'Homère, "mon modèle", dit-il (25, 8). Encore faut-il appliquer ces concepts à bon escient, de manière suffisamment précise.

Pourquoi donc parler de "déconstruction"? C'est qu'un doute persiste sur le sérieux des intentions de l'auteur. Celui-ci, visiblement, prend à l'occasion des distances avec son sujet. L'ironie, parfois même, si notre sensibilité moderne ne nous égare

¹ Sauf indication contraire, les traductions de Nonnos sont celles des différents auteurs de l'édition de la CUF.

pas, la bouffonnerie ou la dérision trouvent leur place dans les *Dionysiaques*. Il y a globalement une discordance entre la solennité, voire l'emphase de la perspective ouverte par les premiers chants — situer dans l'histoire universelle la venue de Dionysos parmi les hommes — et le résultat final — l'avènement annoncé d'un troisième Dionysos, Iacchos, certes ‘mystique’, mais dont l'auteur ne nous laisse pas entrevoir ce qu'il va bien pouvoir apporter aux hommes, alors que c'était fort clair pour son prédecesseur, le deuxième Dionysos, Bacchos, le donateur de la vigne et du vin, symboles de la “joie de vivre”. Au genre humain “privé de joie”, ἄμυορον εὐφροσύνης, de 7, 10, fait écho la mention de l’εὐφροσύνη βιότοι, 42, 26, procurée par Bacchos. Mais l'apothéose de ce deuxième Dionysos représente une récompense individuelle et non pas un bénéfice collectif: elle n'apporte rien de plus à l'humanité.

Ainsi, l'histoire universelle dans les *Dionysiaques* se clôt en fait aux chants 41-43, qui définissent la nature et posent les limites du rayonnement dionysiaque, avec la consultation des tables d'Harmonie et la rivalité entre Dionysos et Poseidon pour le patronage de Beyrouth (et de la Justice). Le chant ultime du poème, 48, apporte ‘seulement’ une conclusion d'ordre mythographique — l'apothéose de Dionysos Bacchos. La perspective la plus importante que dessinent les *Dionysiaques* est d'ordre politique — l'établissement, à jamais, du pouvoir romain — et non pas eschatologique. De la double mission universelle que Zeus fixe à Dionysos en 13, 6-7, “enseigner à tous les peuples ses rites avec leurs danses nocturnes et le fruit vineux de la vendange”, seule la seconde est développée. Les *orgia* de Dionysos font figure de simples réjouissances; rien ne permet de leur attribuer une valeur salvatrice et le dieu n'est à aucun moment présenté en vainqueur de la mort. Les affirmations sur le sort d'Ampélos tué par un taureau, en 12, 142-145 (“Il vit, Dionysos, ton jeune ami... Ampélos n'est pas mort à jamais, bien qu'il ait connu la mort”), même si elles ont (et avaient sans doute déjà à l'époque de Nonnos) des résonances chrétiennes, ne sortent pas du cadre mythologique des métamorphoses.

Dans ces conditions, les huit chants 41-48 risquent de paraître quelque peu superflus. Déjà au milieu du chant 40, c'est-à-dire après sa victoire sur les Indiens, Dionysos a rempli les conditions qui lui étaient posées pour accéder à l'Olympe et la rencontre avec Héraclès à la Tunique d'Étoiles (deuxième partie du chant 40) contient tous les éléments d'une apothéose, plus solennelle et plus détaillée que celle, rapide, qui clôte le chant 48 et l'ensemble du poème. Dès lors, pourquoi faut-il que Dionysos continue son circuit terrestre? Certes, cela permet à l'auteur d'intégrer à son poème, dans la série extensible des combats et exploits divers du futur dieu, différentes légendes qui n'avaient rien à voir avec la guerre des Indes. Et l'affrontement avec Penthée, pour ne prendre que cet exemple, était attendu depuis le chant 5 qui l'annonçait.² Mais Nonnos n'a pas cherché à être exhaustif. Un épisode important des traditions argiennes relatives à Dionysos, le plongeon à Lerne, est totalement passé sous silence, bien qu'il eût servi d'*aition* à des cultes à mystères restés vivants jusqu'au IV^e siècle ap. J.-C. et fournit un bon exemple de ces *orgia* nocturnes que Dionysos est censé propager.³ Il représentait Dionysos en vainqueur de la mort, allant arracher à l'Hadès sa mère Sémélé. Nonnos omet cette légende bien rattachée à son thème principal alors qu'il lui arrive d'en introduire dans son poème qui semblent être de pures digressions, comme le récit du triste sort de Phaéthon (38, 90-434), sur lequel nous reviendrons.

N'y aurait-il pas, dans cette fin des *Dionysiaques*, une sorte d'émettement, ce qui n'empêcherait du reste nullement certains morceaux d'être parmi les plus réussis? C'est toute la question de la cohérence du poème qui est posée. Pour répondre, nous partirons d'une donnée qui a frappé tous les lecteurs des *Dionysiaques*. Leurs quarante-huit chants se subdivisent en deux

² Les chants 3-5 et 44-46, que l'on peut qualifier de "thébains", occupent une place symétrique par rapport au début et à la fin du poème. Voir ci-après, p.258-259, sur ces arrangements.

³ Je me permets de renvoyer à ma *Chronique des derniers païens* (Paris 1990), 218-220.

groupes de vingt-quatre, et le premier de ceux-ci à son tour se divise en deux de douze, dont le premier se subdivise à nouveau en deux groupes de six. Mais le jeu s'arrête là. Correspond-il vraiment à un principe d'organisation? Pourquoi ce schéma paraît-il n'être qu'ébauché? Est-il remplacé, et comment? C'est ce que nous examinerons, brièvement pour le récit de la guerre des Indes, plus longuement pour la toute dernière partie de l'œuvre, avant de nous interroger sur le statut du héros dans le poème.

Une régularité tôt brisée

Si l'auteur ne se soucie pas de faire un récit complet, celui-ci n'en est pas moins structuré — mais selon des logiques successives et différentes. En effet, Nonnos semble d'abord adopter une ordonnance en groupes de chants, régulière, non seulement arithmétique mais thématique. Les quarante-huit chants du poème sont autant que l'*Iliade* et l'*Odyssée* réunies. Cela ne veut pas dire qu'on y trouve une *Iliade* et une *Odyssée*, même si un (deux, en fait) récits de voyage (mais, pour ce qui est du voyage proprement dit, très abrégés) y encadrent, non pas une *Iliade*, mais un récit de guerre qui juxtapose certaines scènes et certaines situations de l'*Iliade*. Les emprunts à l'*Odyssée* sont beaucoup plus rares et de bien moindre ampleur, et le Polyphème nonnien vient de la poésie bucolique plutôt que d'Homère.

Du reste, l'*Iliade* n'est pas le seul modèle de Nonnos pour les épisodes guerriers de son épopée. Il a recours à d'autres imitations et aussi, ce qui est plus original, à des souvenirs historiques, proclamés quand il s'agit des guerres médiques (Marathon aux chants 27, 299-300 et 28, 126-157, Salamine, ainsi que Xerxès faisant fouetter l'Hellespont, pour la bataille navale du chant 39), bien reconnaissables pour ce qui est de la lutte autour du lac de Nicée (chants 14-15, d'après la victoire décisive de Septime Sévère sur Pescennius Niger en 193 av. J.-C.) ou du franchissement de l'Hydaspe (chants 22-24, inspiré par le passage du même fleuve par Alexandre, avec l'utilisation en

parallèle du combat homérique entre Achille et le Scamandre en 22, 379-383⁴).

Le poème dans son ensemble se divise nettement en deux parties. L'auteur n'en garde pas moins toute sa liberté dans le traitement, homérique ou non, de ces parties. Le début du chant 25 (donc, arithmétiquement, de la deuxième moitié) est marqué très clairement par un second prologue, qui fait référence à Pindare (20-21) aussi bien qu'à Homère. Si l'on observe les divisions de la première moitié, dans les chants 1-24, à la fin du chant 6, puis du chant 12 et du chant 18, on note aussitôt deux articulations nettes: entre 6 (le premier Dionysos, Zagreus, et son échec) et 7 (promesse d'un réconfort pour les hommes), puis entre 12 (apparition de la vigne) et 13 (début de la campagne contre les Indiens: mobilisation); il sera plus difficile d'en trouver une entre 18 (bon accueil chez Staphylos) et 19 (après une tournée de conversions, retour chez Staphylos, mort subitement, et jeux funèbres). Ici la gradation s'efface devant un simple contraste esthétique. Les chants 6 et 12 sont marqués par des consultations oraculaires. Une troisième aura lieu au chant 41, en étroit rapport thématique, on le verra, avec les deux précédentes, mais à l'évidence sans aucun rapport avec elles pour ce qui est de l'articulation en groupes de chants.

Dans la seconde partie de l'œuvre, cette répartition par groupes de six n'est donc plus du tout respectée. On cherchera en vain, à la fin de 30, 36, 42, la possibilité d'une coupure, la marque d'une étape. Pas tout à fait en vain, peut-être: le groupe de 31 à 36 est consacré à deux épisodes à signification théolo-

⁴ N. HOPKINSON et F. VIAN, *Les Dionysiaques*, VIII (Paris 1994), dans la Notice du chant 23, pp.124-128, me paraissent minimiser l'influence des historiens d'Alexandre sur Nonnos. L'idée même d'une bataille pour le franchissement de l'Hydaspe et non de l'Indus ne peut venir que de l'expédition d'Alexandre. Cf. *Mythologie et géographie dionysiaques. Recherches sur l'œuvre de Nonnos de Panopoli* (Clermont-Ferrand 1991), 288, s'appuyant sur l'article de F. BORNMANN, "Sulla spedizione di Dioniso in India nel poema di Nonno", in *SIFC* N.S. 47 (1975), 52-67. La différence essentielle vient de ce que la bataille contre Poros s'achève par la soumission de Poros et la réconciliation des adversaires, ce qui était exclu ici.

gique'. Une *Dios apatè* (chants 31-35) de plus ample portée que celle de l'*Iliade*, qui lui a évidemment servi de modèle, introduit le thème de la folie de Dionysos (chant 32) et, au dénouement, oblige pour la première fois Héra à renoncer à sa haine pour Dionysos et, en lui donnant le sein, à lui faire accomplir un pas de plus vers la divinisation (chant 35). Une théomachie, au chant 36, est elle aussi profondément homérisante mais comporte une interprétation allégorique, bien mise en évidence par F. Vian.⁵ Elle assure "la sauvegarde de l'ordre cosmique". On peut remarquer que le chant 37 décrit des jeux funèbres, comme le faisait 19, marquant respectivement une coupure avec 36 et 18; même si cette répartition régulière est voulue, au chant 37 aussi elle ne peut avoir de signification qu'esthétique. Les visions grandioses de ces chants ne les isolent pas dans cette deuxième partie du poème. Le chant 30, la "Morrhéide", prépare le "roman" de Morrheus et Chalcomédé aux chants 33-35. Il y a donc bien un groupe 31-36, mais pas de groupe 25-30. Pas davantage de groupe 37-42. Le chant 42, en effet, est la pièce centrale de l'épisode de Dionysos à Beyrouth (41-43). Il n'occupe à aucun degré une position-limite ou charnière.

Nonnos semble ainsi s'engager sur des voies qu'il ne suit pas jusqu'au bout. Appliquant les mêmes procédés pour l'ensemble du poème et pour ses épisodes isolés, il lui arrive souvent de paraître nous proposer un "plan limpide ... aussitôt abandonné"⁶. Il ne va pas pour autant tout à fait à l'aventure. Une lecture attentive révèle à travers l'œuvre des progressions qui ne peuvent guère être gratuites: ainsi dans la manière de combattre de Dionysos.⁷

Les grands tournants dans la carrière de Dionysos ne sont pas forcément signalés par des fins de chant. L'exemple le plus frap-

⁵ F. VIAN, "La théomachie de Nonnos et ses antécédents", in *REG* 101 (1988), 275-292 [423-438].

⁶ F. VIAN, *art.cit.*, 276.

⁷ F. VIAN, "Dionysus in the Indian War", in *Studies in the Dionysiaca of Nonnos*, ed. by N. HOPKINSON (Cambridge 1994), 96 [511-512].

pant est fourni par la victoire définitive sur les Indiens qui intervient dans le chant 40, mais n'en occupe que la première partie. Le chant se trouve ainsi brisé en deux morceaux sensiblement égaux, mais de contenu très différent, victoire militaire d'un côté et visite pacifique de Dionysos à l'Héraclès tyrien de l'autre. Certes cette visite, première forme d'apothéose, pourrait apparaître comme la récompense directe de la victoire remportée au début du chant, récompense promise solennellement par Zeus au tout début de la campagne indienne, à la charnière des chants 12-13. Cette possibilité n'est pas exploitée par l'auteur, qui n'a pas choisi de souligner par une rupture formelle le changement de décor, pourtant total. C'est d'autant plus remarquable qu'il emploie, lorsqu'il passe de la guerre des Indes à la visite de Tyr (début de la seconde partie du chant), au vers 298 du chant 40, une formule de début ou de fin de chant tout à fait analogue à celles qu'il utilise en 40, 580 (fin du chant) ou, par exemple, au début du chant 44 ou en 48, 1-3. De telles 'irrégularités' ne peuvent qu'être voulues. Elles relèvent de la volonté de *poikilia* du poète. La coupure entre la deuxième partie du chant 40 (Tyr) et le chant 41 (Beyrouth) n'était pas évidente compte tenu de la proximité à tous égards des deux villes. Elle est maintenue par un procédé curieux et révélateur: un bref rappel du site de Tyr au début du chant 41 (15 sq.) sert non à prolonger son éloge mais à dénigrer son site par comparaison avec celui de Beyrouth. Il contribue ainsi à mettre en valeur le contenu de 41, cette vision cosmique qui va de l'origine du monde à l'avènement de Rome, alors que les légendes tyriennes de 40 restaient étroitement centrées sur la cité et son territoire.

Critères de cohésion interne de la guerre des Indes

Même si Nonnos semble le plus souvent désinvolte avec les scènes militaires, la guerre des Indes proprement dite n'est pas le foisonnement de *membra disjecta* qu'y voyaient Paul Collart et Rudolf Keydell. Une construction par correspondances ou effets de contraste avec d'autres parties de l'œuvre n'a pas encore

livré tous ses secrets. Ainsi, on pourrait comparer la participation des troupes marines au combat contre les Indiens, au côté de Dionysos (chant 39), et leur lutte contre les troupes dionysiaques, au côté cette fois de Poseidon (chant 43).

C'est en le replaçant dans ce système de renvois qu'on pourra proposer une explication au récit de la légende de Phaéthon, qui paraît de prime abord totalement gratuit, 'accroché' à l'explication d'un prodige (une éclipse). Or ce récit est fait par Hermès à Dionysos en tête-à-tête, ce qui lui donne une certaine solennité:

"Alors, comme Dionysos, l'ami des rochers, se trouve seul, du haut du ciel vient, en messager de Zeus, son frère Hermès qui lui dit ces paroles rassurantes pour sa victoire".⁸

Les perturbations induites par l'inexpérience de l'adolescent Phaéthon (chant 38) rappellent les bouleversements cosmiques provoqués par Typhée (chants 1-2): tout se passe comme si le malheur de Phaéthon était une reprise du drame des deux premiers chants, distanciée par un récit dans le récit, par le recul du temps, et atténuée par la faiblesse du héros-victime. Et ce rappel est placé avant la victoire définitive de Dionysos (chant 40), mais après que l'issue conciliatrice de la bataille entre les dieux du chant 36 a assuré définitivement la sauvegarde de l'ordre cosmique.⁹ Ce qui peut expliquer le caractère burlesque de la Gigantomachie de Dionysos au début du chant 48. Le vrai danger est passé. Phaéthon fait penser aussi au νήπιος Zagreus du chant 6, l'enfant victime de son immaturité; le rapprochement est fait par Nonnos lui-même (38, 209-210) et dès lors nous pouvons aussi comparer à des passages similaires du chant 6 l'évocation de la sphère céleste (38, 222 sqq., cf. la sphère armillaire du ch. 6, v. 64-88), le thème de l'éclipse et celui du déluge purificateur (38, 416, cf. 6, fin).

⁸ Chant 38, 75-77, trad. B. SIMON (Paris 1999), modifiée pour le vers 77.

⁹ F. VIAN, *loc.cit.* ci-dessus. Sur Hermès introduceur et protecteur de Cadmos et de Dionysos, voir M.-C. FAYANT, "Hermès dans les *Dionysiaques* de Nonnos de Panopolis", in *REG* 111 (1998), 145-159.

Il y aurait bien d'autres moyens encore de lier cette 'Indiade' au reste de l'œuvre: par exemple, aligner les défaites de Dionysos, contre Lycurgue (chants 20-21), contre Dériade lors de la seconde et de la troisième journée de bataille (chants 30-36), contre Poseidon (chant 43) et enfin contre Persée (chant 48). F. Vian a souligné de manière probante les parallèles entre la Lycurgie (chants 20-21) et la Folie de Dionysos aux chants 30-36, d'autant plus importants que Nonnos déplace la folie du dieu dans la biographie de celui-ci, l'enlevant aux Enfances où l'autorité d'Homère la plaçait pour en faire une péripétie de la guerre des Indes, introduisant une étape importante de sa divinisation.

Cohérence narrative: la structure des chants 41-48

Comme le remarquent chacun de son côté F. Vian et M.-C. Fayant, les chants 41-48 sont ordonnés selon une symétrie assez curieuse, mais certainement pas fortuite: deux groupes de trois chants, 41-43 et 44-46, sont consacrés chacun à un seul épisode (lutte pour Beyrouth / lutte pour Thèbes), tandis que les deux chants suivants renferment chacun trois épisodes: pour 47, le don de la vigne à Icarios, en Attique; le mariage avec Ariadne, à Naxos; la lutte contre Persée, à Argos; et pour 48, le combat contre les Géants, en Chalcidique; l'étreinte avec Palléné, également en Chalcidique; le viol d'Aura, dans la région de Cyzique. Ces épisodes ne manquent pas non plus de cohérence géographique: le chant 47 se déroule au cœur de la Grèce classique; 48, dans des régions proches de la 'Nouvelle Rome', du côté de l'Europe ou de l'Asie.

On retrouvera le même genre de disposition, à plus petite échelle, au chant 40 dans la partie centrale de la litanie adressée par Dionysos à Héraclès Astrochitôn (391-406): Dionysos énumère, à la deuxième personne, cinq noms en deux vers, puis, à la troisième personne, consacre cinq vers pour un seul nom, le sixième; puis il reprend l'énumération: cinq noms en trois vers, à la deuxième personne, et à nouveau, à la troisième personne, cinq vers pour un seul nom, le douzième. Si l'on ajoute que le

chiffre douze convient particulièrement pour un dieu maître des heures et des mois, l'art de Nonnos apparaît extrêmement concerté en même temps qu'imprévisible.¹⁰

Comme on pouvait s'y attendre, on note des rappels thématiques entre les deux extrémités de l'œuvre aussi bien qu'à l'intérieur de ce final des chants 41-48.

Le plus évident est entre les deux groupes de trois chants qui, réunis, composent la 'Geste de Cadmos', 3-5 (fondation de Thèbes et malheur d'Autonoé à cause de son fils) et 44-46 (retour à Thèbes et malheur d'Agavé à cause de son fils); son unité thématique est soulignée dans les derniers vers du chant 46 (362-367). D'une part les chants 44-46 achèvent en effet le récit des "malheurs des filles de Cadmos", spécialement d'Autonoé et d'Agavé, mentionnées ensemble en 46, 362-363, avec une formule énigmatique où Dionysos les console en leur montrant "les oracles annonciateurs de l'espérance future".¹¹ Si l'on admet que le poète était chrétien, on peut voir là un écho de l'interprétation des oracles païens comme étant une forme imparfaite de la révélation chrétienne.¹² D'autre part ces chants se terminent avec l'accomplissement de la menace qui pèse sur Cadmos depuis le meurtre du dragon de Dirkè au chant 4, 417-420; c'est l'exil en Illyrie et la métamorphose de Cadmos et d'Harmonie en serpents de pierre.¹³ La 'Ringkomposition' se

¹⁰ B. SIMON dans son édition, tome XIV (Paris 1999), 148, ne semble pas s'être aperçue que "Soleil à Babylone" ne pouvait être qu'une épithète de Mithra, Babylone étant là pour Ctésiphon, capitale des Sassanides adorateurs de Mithra (dont le nom signifie 'Soleil'). Les trois identifications qui suivent cette litanie (407-409) sont sur un autre plan: elles reflètent des syncrétismes entre dieux tyriens, et non avec des dieux, en général solaires, de l'extérieur. Voir *Mythologie et géographie dionysiaques* (*op.cit.* n.4), 233-234.

¹¹ Cf. le thème pindarique des malheurs des quatre filles de Cadmos (et de Cadmos lui-même): PIND. *Ol.* 2, 22-30; *Pyth.* 3, 86-99. Autonoé et Agavé n'ont pas de compensation connue à leur malheur, à la différence de Sémélé et d'Inô.

¹² Voir G. AGOSTI, "La conversione della fonte Castalia", in *Des Géants à Dionysos. Mélanges de mythologie et de poésie grecques offerts à Francis Vian* (Alessandria 2003), 541-564.

¹³ Accomplissement en 46, 364-367; menace annoncée en 2, 669-679, expliquée en 4, 417-420 et 5, 121-125, rappelée enfin en 44, 113-118.

retrouve, dans un cercle plus restreint, à l'intérieur de la Penthéide des chants 44-46, puisqu'elle commence et s'achève en Illyrie¹⁴ (44, 1 + 107-118 et 46, 364-367). Le passage de Dionysos par l'Illyrie pour se rendre de l'Asie à Thèbes ne répond à aucune nécessité géographique, tout comme le rappel de la métamorphose future de Cadmos et d'Harmonie ne correspond à aucune nécessité narrative. L'un et l'autre ne semblent pas avoir d'autre motif que de permettre au poète de délimiter formellement un ensemble de trois chants.

Du coup, on peut se demander s'il n'y a pas certaines correspondances aussi entre les deux premiers chants, qui forment le 'prélude cosmique', et les deux derniers (47-48). Une au moins est claire: la lutte de Zeus contre Typhée aux chants 1-2 reçoit pour répondant la lutte de Dionysos contre les Géants (48, 1-89); le contraste entre les deux épisodes est frappant, tant pour l'ampleur que pour le ton. La participation de Cadmos à la lutte contre Typhée reste naturellement sans parallèle, puisque Dionysos emprunte des traits à la fois au grand dieu qui se bat et à son auxiliaire, dans un récit que l'auteur ne semble pas prendre très au sérieux, au contraire du ton adopté dans les chants 1-2.¹⁵ Nonnos s'écarte de la vulgate mythologique pour glorifier son héros, qui apparaît supérieur à Zeus même (89), avec une emphase qui confine au comique. Un autre parallèle avec la lutte contre Typhée, également au chant 48 dont il occupe la majeure partie (238-968), un peu plus subtil mais assuré, a été mis en évidence par F. Vian: c'est l'histoire d'Aura la Titanide, "figure monstrueuse: son comportement est conforme à son ascendance titanique et justifie les allusions faites à Typhée".¹⁶ Dans la vision simplifiée du monde qui est celle de Nonnos (et de son époque), le chant 47 dans son ensemble paraît être le chant des figures

¹⁴ F. TISSONI, *Nonno di Panopoli. I Canti di Penteo* (Dionisiache 44-46). *Commento* (Firenze 1998), 348.

¹⁵ Cf. les remarques *ad. loc.* de F. VIAN dans son édition, tome XVIII (Paris 2003), 7-9.

¹⁶ F. VIAN, "Théogamies et sotériologie dans les *Dionysiaques* de Nonnos", in *Journal des Savants* 1994, 209.

de qualité, des ‘bons’, qu’ils soient amis (Icarios et Érigone, Ariadne) ou adversaires (Persée) de Dionysos, 48 celui des ‘mauvais’, forcément adversaires du dieu (Géants, Palléné et son père qui forment un couple antithétique d’Icarios/Érigone, Aura). On retrouverait la même alternance, dans les deux groupes précédents, entre un ‘bon’ adversaire, Poseidon (chants 40-43), et un ‘mauvais’, Penthée (chants 44-46).

À l’intérieur du final, le parallèle entre deux combats de Dionysos, contre Poseidon et Persée, un frère et un fils de Zeus (41-43 et 47), n’est pas moins évident. D’autant plus que dans les deux cas, l’issue est en réalité une défaite de Dionysos, qui est présentée sous les dehors d’une réconciliation. Dionysos ne sera ni le patron de Beyrouth ni celui d’Argos. Il ne sera pas non plus celui de Tyr (Héraclès étant solidement installé à ce poste) ni bien sûr d’Athènes. Dionysos n’a pas vocation à devenir un dieu protecteur des cités, ni même à s’installer durablement quelque part, sinon dans l’Olympe.

Sérieux et parodie: l’ironie des Dionysiaques

On peut dès lors se demander quel genre de héros est Dionysos. Si l’on examine sans prévention les autres épisodes de la dernière partie du poème, on verra que l’action du futur dieu y est souvent présentée sous un jour plutôt négatif: à Thèbes il détruit ou ruine sa propre famille; à Athènes il apporte la mort à Icarios et à Érigoné; à Argos il déclenche une folie meurtrière; ses amours mêmes ne sont pas abouties: contrairement à une règle bien établie, qui veut que la couche d’un dieu soit toujours féconde, son union avec Palléné demeure stérile et ne sert qu’à la punition de son père; Ariadne lui donne il est vrai “de nombreux enfants” mais aucun ne joue un rôle ni même n’est nommé. Aura enfin tue l’un des jumeaux qu’elle a conçus du dieu, l’autre étant sauvé de justesse et confié à Nicaïa.

À nouveau se pose le problème du sérieux de Nonnos, devant cette multiplication finale de scènes d’horreur et d’anthropophagie, et devant les gesticulations d’Aura jetant l’un de ses

enfants en l'air, vers les "brisées" dont elle porte le nom (48, 892-895), avant de le dévorer (48, 917-924a). Nonnos n'a pas ou très peu besoin de la descendance de Dionysos: ses enfants restent anonymes (avec Ariadne), sont inexistants (avec Palléné) ou victime de sa mère (un des jumeaux d'Aura). La tradition lui suggérait de donner à Aura des jumeaux, en raison de la présence sur le territoire de Cyzique du mont Dindymon, leur naissance en ce lieu fournissant l'*aition* du nom de la montagne (48, 854-855). N'ayant ensuite de rôle que pour un garçon, Nonnos se débarrasse de l'autre.¹⁷ En revanche les deux seuls enfants qui soient nommément attribués à Dionysos, Télété, "Initiation", qu'il a avec Nicaia, et Iacchos avec Aura, sont en liaison étroite, élevés par la même nourrice, Nicaia, "régente de l'initiation bacchique" (48, 811), la fillette étant promise à "servir le fils et le père" (48, 886), tandis que Iacchos passe très vite dans les bras d'Athéna avant d'être confié à la population de l'Attique (48, 961b-968). Sa présence suscite des danses et des chants (967-968), sans aucune allusion précise à la diffusion d'un mysticisme dionysiaque. On semble être dans une atmosphère de pur divertissement.

Ces éléments, bouffons, humoristiques ou simplement plai-sants, dans l'épopée de Nonnos ne sont pas eux non plus sans antécédents homériques. Qu'il suffise de rappeler le petit Ajax s'étalant dans la bouse de vache, dans l'*Iliade*, ou l'adultère d'Aphrodite et d'Arès au chant VIII de l'*Odyssée*. Ce dernier poème surtout offrait des scènes tragi-comiques (le Cyclope dévorant ses victimes, Circé transformant les hommes d'Ulysse en cochons...). Elles n'ont fait chez Nonnos l'objet d'aucune imitation comparable à celle des grandes scènes de l'*Iliade* rappelées plus haut.

Les scènes guerrières sont le lieu de prédilection où Nonnos développe les côtés bouffons de son épopée;¹⁸ B. Gerlaud lui aussi signale cette parodie guerrière, avec une "alternance de

¹⁷ F. VIAN, Notice du chant 48, dans le tome XVIII, p.78.

¹⁸ Relevés par F. VIAN au chant 28, tome IX (Paris 1990), 159 et surtout 167.

l'érotique et du martial".¹⁹ Quant aux entreprises amoureuses du dieu, elles sont traitées sur des tons très variables selon le rang de la jeune fille courtisée et les espérances qu'entretient Dionysos. Les propos du faux jardinier à Béroé confinent à la grivoiserie rustique, la lutte avec Palléné offre l'occasion de saïssies lascives... ailleurs Dionysos est presque respectueux...

Nonnos est en effet capable, et ne s'en prive pas, de traiter le même sujet sur le ton de l'éloge puis du dénigrement (ou l'inverse): il en va ainsi, on l'a vu, avec la ville de Tyr; la nymphe Nicaia n'a pas le même caractère aux chants 14-16 (belle virago rebelle à l'amour) et au chant 48 (nourrice soumise du fils de son ancien amant); il trace des portraits d'Héraclès contrastés, ironisant sur les prétendus exploits du fils d'Alcmène au chant 25, affectant la vénération pour le dieu à la tunique d'étoiles du chant 40. Même la ville où il déclare travailler (1, 13-14), Alexandrie, n'est pas à l'abri de son impertinence: c'est la patrie des phoques puants de Protée (1, 37-38, réminiscence de l'*Odyssee*, 4, 406 et 441-442; avec reprise au chant 43, 76-77). Or Protée, maître de Pharos, est aussi un patron de la protéiforme esthétique nonnienne...

Cela ne veut pas dire que les *Dionysiaques* ne renferment pas des éléments de sérieux (nul ne pensera que les éloges de Rome relèvent de la dérision), mais ceux-ci se trouvent à un autre niveau. Après l'éloge de Byzance au chant 3, 365-371, associé à celui de Rome et de ses origines troyennes (195-199), ce sont les principales cités aux alentours de la capitale de l'Empire qui ont été évoquées: Nicomédie (au moyen du Geudis et du pays d'Alybè), Nicée avec son lac et le Sangarios, Cyzique avec le Dindymon et le Rhyndacos... On retrouve, encore qu'à un bien moindre degré, chez d'autres auteurs de l'Antiquité tardive la même association de tons narquois et solennel, de solennité et de désinvolture au moins affectée²⁰ (Paul le Silentiaire, Jean de Gaza...).

¹⁹ B. GERLAUD, tome XI (Paris 2005), 135.

²⁰ G. AGOSTI, "Late Antique Iambics and iambikè idéa", in *Iambic Ideas. Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*, ed. by A. CAVARZERE, A. ALONI and A. BARCHIESI (Lanham-Boulder-New York-London 2001), 217-254.

Ce ne sont pas les aventures amoureuses ou guerrières, à l'issue équivoque, des chants 41-48 que le lecteur attendait pour le retour des Indes, mais plutôt la procession triomphale si goûlée des arts figurés, qui paraissait mener tout droit à l'apothéose. Or elle est à peine évoquée. Tout se passe comme si Nonnos avait voulu éviter une célébration conventionnelle de son héros, tout en préservant l'unité thématique de son poème. Il soigne néanmoins le portrait qu'il trace de Dionysos, et dans une certaine mesure le prend malgré tout au sérieux.

Une apothéose calculée

J'en prendrai un exemple à travers la grande affaire de la carrière terrestre de Dionysos, le processus d'apothéose, fondamental pour la composition d'ensemble du poème. Cette apothéose est marquée par l'admission du nouveau dieu à la table de Zeus, où il boit le nectar en compagnie de ses frères, Apollon et Hermès (48, 974-978, derniers vers du poème). Fin abrupte, en cinq vers, ce qui, remarque F. Vian, n'est pas sans exemple dans l'épopée antique. Les *Argonautiques* aussi ont une fin rapide, et plus élusive que celle des *Dionysiaques*. Mais cette apothéose 'expédiée' avait été longuement préparée.

Dionysos avait bu du nectar, pour la première fois, après son combat contre Lycurgue, au chant 21: alors, bien que vainqueur grâce à Ambrosia et à ses alliés, il s'était réfugié dans la mer auprès de Thétis; il est servi par son frère Mélikertès, et serre dans ses bras son frère Palaimôn: il s'agit du même personnage, mais Nonnos laisse planer une équivoque.²¹ Le parallèle entre les deux scènes de même contenu, en 21 et en 48, est frappant; simplement, il s'agit, dans la première (qui est la plus développée) d'une apothéose sur le mode mineur: Dionysos est accueilli par 'deux' demi-frères, mais ce sont des divinités secondaires et non pas les grands Olympiens, tout au fond de la mer et non pas au firmament.

²¹ 21, 170-184. il en va de même au chant 43, où le même héros reparaît.

Une scène analogue, en position intermédiaire, permet d'autres repérages: au chant 40, Dionysos est accueilli par Héraclès à la tunique d'étoiles, à Tyr (411-421), dont la statue manifeste la présence divine en "lançant des éclairs" et en s'animant pour une *dexiosis*, geste d'accueil ancestral²² (413-415). Il goûte à nouveau le nectar (et l'ambroisie, mais Nonnos accorde visiblement plus d'importance au nectar, sans doute parce qu'il est liquide comme le vin). Là aussi, il est reçu à la table d'un dieu, mais sur terre. Les cadeaux échangés à la fin de la visite, après les entretiens, sont clairement symboliques: Dionysos est revêtu d'une "tunique étoilée", promesse d'ascension astrale, et Héraclès reçoit un cratère, rappel du bienfait qui vaut à Dionysos sa récompense (40, 576-578). Le choix des détails dans l'évocation du repas offert par Héraclès à son visiteur est hautement significatif:

"Et il [Héraclès] le [Dionysos] charme par un bon accueil à sa table amie; alors, le cœur réjoui devant un repas sans viande, Dionysos touche à l'ambroisie et au nectar; rien d'étonnant s'il boit le doux nectar après le lait immortel d'Héra".²³

Deux points méritent d'être relevés:

1) Il s'agit d'un repas sans viande (419), comme l'a bien vu D. Accorinti, d'un sacrifice non sanglant, qui évoque le repas sacrificiel chrétien, que perpétue aujourd'hui encore le rituel de la messe, catholique ou orthodoxe. Cette précision introduit un autre parallèle avec la scène chez Thétis, au chant 21, qui est en fait un volet d'une double apothéose, car elle est précédée, sur terre, par la divinisation de Lycurgue, mais, comme le suppose N. Hopkinson *ad loc.* (21, 161), Lycurgue fait figure de "faux dieu" et sa divinisation est une "contre-divinisation". Il reçoit

²² Comparer l'illumination des torches d'une statue d'Hécate à Pergame, en l'honneur de Julien, Eunape, *Vies des Sophistes*, 7, 2, p.475 Boissonnade. Et, beaucoup plus tôt, pour ne citer que cet exemple, la *dexiosis* des rois de Commagène avec Mithra, sur les reliefs d'Arsameia du Nymphaios.

²³ 40, 418-421, trad. B. SIMON modifiée.

des libations de sang. Or on connaît la répulsion manifestée dans l'Antiquité tardive, tant du côté des philosophes que bien sûr des chrétiens, pour le sacrifice sanglant. Celui-ci, dans les *Dionysiaques* comme dans la pratique, tant qu'il fut toléré, fait figure au mieux de reconstitution archaïsante: que l'on pense au sacrifice de la vache-guide par Cadmos au début du chant 4.²⁴ De même, les vaches noires consacrées à Poseidon en 43, 40-41 viennent de l'*Odyssée* et non d'une réalité plus récente.

2) D'autre part, en 40, 421, Nonnos rappelle que Dionysos a déjà goûté au lait d'Héra: autre rituel d'apothéose, cette fois-ci grâce à l'adoption par une déesse, symbolisée par cet allaitement. Cette double réception est déjà mentionnée au dernier vers (63) de la IVe *Bucolique* de Virgile: *nec deus hunc mensa, dea nec dignata cubili est*, le dieu ne l'a pas jugé digne de sa table, ni la déesse de son lit ... Chez Nonnos, il est question à plusieurs reprises du don de son lait par Héra. Comme pour la consommation du nectar, la scène principale est préparée par d'autres allaitements divins: par Rhéa (dès 1, 19-21, *al.*, jamais raconté mais objet d'allusions, ainsi en 35, 302 au moment de l'appel à Héra), par les nymphes du Lamos (9, 30-31), voire par Ino (9, 96-110). Elle intervient au chant 35, 278-335; mais Nonnos introduit dans le rituel un élément inédit: sur une prescription d'Hermès, l'allaitement lui-même (325-328) a été précédé par une onction de Dionysos sur tout le corps:

"[Hermès à Héra:] 'Faisant onction de ton lait sur le corps de Lyaios, enlève la souillure hideuse de la maladie qui égare son esprit'... Héra ne désobéit pas, mais, d'une goutte divine de son sein qui guérira les peines faisant onction sur le corps de Lyaios, elle chassa la souillure de la folie sauvage, venue de la divinité".²⁵

²⁴ F. VIAN, "Les cultes païens dans les *Dionysiaques* de Nonnos: étude de vocabulaire", in *REA* 90 (1988), 399-410.

²⁵ 35, 306-307, 319-321, cf. aussi 317-318 (non traduits ici). L'onction est ainsi mentionnée à trois reprises, dans des termes proches. Pour les parallèles chrétiens, on se reportera à l'excellent commentaire de G. AGOSTI au vers 306 (éd. de la BUR, tome 3, 2004), soulignant que le lait était utilisé dans le rituel baptismal chrétien.

On peut se demander s'il ne s'agirait pas, comme à propos du repas sacrificiel, d'éléments d'une culture commune à l'Antiquité tardive qui trouveraient des parallèles dans le monde païen (entrée dans une communauté par un rituel d'ondoiement, d'onction ou d'aspersion). Mais les références proprement chrétiennes nous paraissent évidentes, tant au niveau iconographique de l'allaitement qu'à celui, rituel, de l'onction qui évoque le baptême, effaçant le péché originel comme ici le lait efface la folie qui frappe Dionysos.

Parallèlement à cette progression, Dionysos révèle à plusieurs reprises son identité divine: à Béroé, en 42, 355-360a: "dépouillant son apparence mortelle, il change d'aspect et, tel un dieu, se présente à la jeune fille", puis à Ariadne en 47, 421-422, "près de la jeune fille, prenant son apparence divine, il resplendit".²⁶ Ses éiphanies guerrières, "transfigurations", à Dériade, aux pirates tyrrhéniens, à Persée, sont plus spectaculaires mais relèvent du même principe.²⁷

Les préludes cosmiques

L'apothéose de Dionysos d'une part, le mariage de Poseidon de l'autre, scellent définitivement une étape dans la marche de l'humanité. En effet, le don fait aux hommes, grâce à Béroé, de la justice, gage de la stabilité de l'État, a un parallèle évident, le don du vin, symbole de joie de vivre, grâce à Dionysos; l'un et l'autre sont mis en scène par le même procédé du "prélude cosmique" (chants 12 et 41) et constituent des "chapitres d'histoire universelle"²⁸ où l'on ne trouvera nul élément de dérision. Le don de la justice est préfiguré au chant 3 par l'arrivée des Saisons chez Électre pour la naissance de Dardanos, avec les

²⁶ Voir la Notice du chant 42, éd. de la CUF, tome XV, 71-72.

²⁷ F. VIAN, tome IX (Paris 1990), 216.

²⁸ C'est V. STEGEMANN, *Astrologie und Universalgeschichte. Studien und Interpretationen zu den Dionysiaka des Nonnos von Panopolis* (Leipzig-Berlin 1930), qui a le premier, non sans excès, mis l'accent sur cet aspect de l'œuvre. Pour les passages évoqués ici, voir F. VIAN, Notice du chant 12, tome V (Paris 1995), 60.

emblèmes impériaux, présage de la souveraineté des Romains, tout comme le don de la vigne est annoncé au début du chant 7 par les prières d'Aiôn. Les deux préludes du chant 12 et du chant 41 ont en commun un trait formel supplémentaire, celui de comporter deux versions, l'une 'ancienne' et l'autre 'récente'.²⁹

Enfin, la présentation successive, au chant 6, du globe céleste d'Astraios montrant l'ensemble du ciel et des constellations, puis, au chant 12, des tables rédigées par Phanès et répartissant l'histoire du monde selon le zodiaque, et enfin, au chant 41, des tables rédigées par Ophion et cette fois consacrées aux sept planètes, introduit une récurrence des mêmes thèmes ou de thèmes complémentaires, irrégulière certes mais parfaitement cohérente, à la fois sur le plan de la cosmographie (d'abord une sphère céleste, puis les douze signes du zodiaque, puis les sept planètes) et sur le plan de la révélation (le don du blé aux hommes, puis du vin, et enfin de la justice, le tout sous l'égide du pouvoir romain, annoncé aux chants 3 et 41). Cette belle ordonnance permet de distinguer ces trois préludes, avec leur assemblage complexe et raisonné de puissances primordiales, et deux interventions où, en sens contraire, ce sont les puissances du destin (ou plutôt du Temps personnifié) qui prennent l'initiative de la communication (les Saisons, Aiôn).

Pour conclure, Nonnos donne une épopee de la civilisation universelle, réunissant (sans doute) l'acceptation du monde contemporain tel qu'il est, christianisé, et la préservation de l'héritage du passé polythéiste. Si ses intentions n'apparaissent pas toujours clairement, s'il les révèle parfois au détour d'un vers ou d'une expression, ce n'est pas par volonté d'ésotérisme, mais par goût esthétique pour l'*arte allusiva*, pour mettre à l'épreuve la sagacité du lecteur et sa capacité à comparer les différents termes

²⁹ Les deux autres exemples de "juxtaposition érudite de versions différentes" relevés par F. VIAN dans sa Notice du chant 12, tome V, 75, sont moins proches que ces deux-là. Comparer aussi 12, 292 et 41, 155; autres juxtapositions à propos de l'éclipse de soleil (chant 38) et à propos des catastérismes (chant 47).

mis en balancement par la composition annulaire. Il y a bien, dans cette épopée peu soucieuse de réalisme malgré tous les éléments qu'elle emprunte au réel, "déconstruction" du héros épique — mais aussi exaltation optimiste d'une culture qui remonte à Homère et continue à s'épanouir à l'ombre de l'Empire fondé par Auguste, pour l'Éternité.

DISCUSSION

A. Sens : Even though the *Dionysiaca* cannot simply be divided into Iliadic and Odyssean halves, is it possible that its structure — with one half broken more regularly into units than the other — might have been influenced by the fact that, of the Homeric Corpus as a whole, one half — the *Odyssey* — might be understood to be more neatly into regular units than the other (the *Iliad*)?

P. Chuvin : It is quite possible that the *Odyssey*'s structure has influenced Nonnos. Though, from a narrative point of view, the *Odyssey* is much more refined than *Dionysiaca*. *Dionysiaca* put side by side heterogeneous pieces chosen for the sake of aesthetics or to create echoes through other parts of the poem (one of the best instances being Phaethon's tale, very different, I think, of whatever tale we might encounter in the *Odyssey*).

M. Fusillo : J'aurais deux questions. La première est plutôt générale. À propos de Protée, vous avez parlé d'une esthétique protéiforme. Est-ce qu'on peut parler aussi d'une esthétique dionysiaque? Y a-t-il une relation entre le choix de la matière narrative et la 'déconstruction' de l'épopée? Dionysos est notamment le dieu du chaos et de la métamorphose, le dieu qui 'déconstruit' toutes les oppositions binaires (masculin/féminin, humain/animal, etc.).

Deuxième question: Si j'ai bien compris, chez Nonnos il n'y a pas encore le parallélisme entre Dionysos et Christ, qui aura une chance extraordinaire dans la postérité, du *Christus patiens* jusqu'à Hölderlin et à Wole Soyinka.

P. Chuvin : 1) C'est Nonnos lui-même qui invoque Protée comme le maître de son esthétique. Mais il n'est que le porteur

des métamorphoses de Dionysos, et c'est bien une esthétique dionysiaque qui gouverne le poème.

2) Assez souvent, les *Dionysiaques* emploient des expressions à résonance chrétienne, à propos de Dionysos (βάκχος ἄναξ δάκρυσε, βροτῶν ἵνα δάκρυα λύσῃ) ou d'autres personnages, parfois avec une intonation qui peut sembler ironique (οὐκ ἔδοι, οὐ πυθόμην, ὅτι παρθένος υἱα λογεύει). Mais à aucun moment Dionysos ne vient apporter aux hommes le Salut éternel; il n'est que le dispensateur de la joie du vin. Il serait tout au plus (si l'on admet que Nonnos était chrétien) une préfiguration lointaine du Christ: ἔλπιδος ἐσσομένης πρωτάγγελα θέσφατα φαίνων (46, 363, vers surprenant).

G. Danek : Der Leser hat tatsächlich den Eindruck, dass Nonnos sein Epos plötzlich und unvermittelt abbricht, und Vian hat Recht, dass die *Argonautika* in dieser Beziehung ein Vorbild sein könnten. Doch Apollonios bricht seine Erzählung aus meta poetischen Gründen vor der Erreichung des Ziels der Reise ab und skizziert in den letzten Versen nur noch summarisch, was nach dem Ende seiner Erzählung geschehen wird. [Ähnlich ist es schon in der *Odyssee*: In den letzten drei Versen fasst der Erzähler zusammen, dass Athene nach dem Ende der Erzählung Frieden zwischen Odysseus und den Verwandten der Freier stiften wird.]

In den *Dionysiaka* hingegen wird das angekündigte Ziel der Handlung, die Apotheose des Dionysos, in den letzten fünf Versen, in extrem kurzer Form zusammengefasst.

P. Chuvin : Vous avez tout à fait raison. À la fin des *Argonautiques*, l'histoire de Jason et de ses compagnons est loin d'être achevée. A la fin des *Dionysiaka*, ni Dionysos ni l'humanité qu'il est venu aider n'ont plus rien à attendre ...

La brièveté de la mention finale de l'apothéose s'explique peut-être par le fait que celle-ci a été évoquée à de nombreuses reprises, annoncée par de multiples gestes.

MASSIMO FUSILLO

**METAMORPHOSI ROMANESCHE
DELL'EPICA**

Vorrei partire dalla fine. Cioè dall'ultimo e più complesso dei romanzi antichi, le *Etiopiche*, senz'altro il più vicino all'epica. Al centro del romanzo il sacerdote egizio Calasiris ci narra un sogno. Come il narratore primario, anche il narratore secondario delle *Etiopiche* è un maestro della focalizzazione interna:¹ ci riporta con rigorosa gradualità le percezioni di se stesso attore della storia (cioè della propria esperienza di sognatore), senza anticiparci nulla, senza sovrapporre la sua informazione a posteriori in quanto autore del racconto, e dunque senza rivelarci l'identità del vecchio che gli appare. Vi intesse però delle allusioni all'*Odissea* che il lettore colto può facilmente riconoscere. Il vecchio ha infatti membra rinsecchite, ma da sotto la tunica lascia intravedere il vigore di cosce ancora giovanili: proprio come Odisseo quando travestito da mendicante si sta per battere con Iro nel 18º libro (il termine ἐπιγούνιδα è lo stesso che viene usato in un discorso di anonimo al verso 74). Ma soprattutto ha uno sguardo ἀγχίουν δὲ ἄμα καὶ πολύτροπον: il primo termine ricorre in Omero nel discorso che Atena rivolge a Odisseo in un incontro particolarmente significativo, quello che si svolge non appena questi mette piede ad Itaca (*Od.* 13, 332); non c'è biso-

¹ J.J. WINKLER, "The Mendacity of Kalasiris and the Narrative Strategy of Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*", in *YClSt* 27 (1982), 93-158, parte 3, 137 sgg.: *What Kalasiris knew.*

gno di scomodare la “memoria incipitaria” per individuare nel secondo termine, πολύτροπον, un chiaro segnale intertestuale, che rimanda inequivocabilmente al protagonista del secondo poema omerico. La scrittura di Eliodoro procede sempre per indizi che vengono disseminati e poi svelati solo alla fine: l’identità del vecchio sarà infatti esplicitamente dichiarata al lettore solo al momento in cui, risvegliatosi, Calasiris dispone di far fare sacrifici a Odisseo. Leggiamo però il discorso dell’ombra che costituisce il nucleo centrale del sogno:

“Ω θαυμάσιε”, ἔφη, “σὺ δὲ μόνος ἐν οὐδενὸς λόγου μέρει τέθεισαι τὰ καθ’ ἡμᾶς, ἀλλὰ πάντων ὅσοι δὴ τὴν Κεφαλλήνων παρέπλευσαν οἰκόν τε τὸν ἡμέτερον ἐπισκηψαμένων καὶ δόξαν γνῶναι τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐν σπουδῇ θεμένων αὐτὸς οὔτως ὀλιγώρως ἔσχηκας ὡς μηδὲ τοῦτο δὴ τὸ κοινὸν προσειπεῖν, ἐκ γειτόνων καὶ ταῦτα οἰκοῦντα. Τοιγάρτοι τούτων ὑφίξεις οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν τὴν δίκην καὶ τῶν ὄμοιῶν ἔμοι παθῶν αἰσθήσῃ, θαλάττη τε ἀμά καὶ γῇ πολεμίοις ἐγτυγχάνων: τὴν κόρην δὲ ἦν ἄγεις παρὰ τῆς ἐμῆς γαμετῆς πρόσειπε, χαίρειν γάρ αὐτῇ φησι διότι πάντων ἐπίπροσθεν ἄγει τὴν σωφρωσύνην καὶ τέλος αὐτῇ δεξιὸν εὐαγγελίζεται”. (5, 22, 2-3).

L’eroe protagonista dell’*Odissea*, che nel poema omerico incontra una serie di premonizioni divine (sogni, oracoli, apparizioni), anticipa qui ai personaggi le dure peripezie che dovranno sostenere prima di arrivare all’esito felice, sottolineando esplicitamente il parallelismo (“proverai le mie stesse sofferenze”). È importante inoltre che il lieto fine sia preannunciato come una notizia da parte di Penelope per Cariclea: la moglie di Odisseo è infatti l’archetipo di quell’ideale di fedeltà coniugale che uniforma tutto il romanzo greco, e in particolare le *Etiopiche*, dove è declinato anche al maschile.

L’ira di Odisseo per i mancati sacrifici non viene più menzionata nel corso del romanzo, e non gioca quel ruolo incisivo che gioca invece nel *Satyricon* l’ira di Priapo, vera degradazione parodica dell’*Odissea*. Il sogno premonitore in cui l’eroe omerico profetizza le peripezie e il lieto fine ha soprattutto il valore di un omaggio intertestuale. Figura metaletteraria per eccellenza in cui si rispecchia, con effetto di *mise en abyme*, la figura dell’autore,

Calasiris sogna il personaggio archetipo su cui Eliodoro ha modellato sia lui stesso, sia la protagonista Cariclea, come vedremo fra poco.

Per comprendere bene il valore strutturale di questo rapporto fra le *Etiopiche* e l'*Odissea*, punto di arrivo di una lunga metamorfosi dell'epica nella nuova forma romanzesca, bisogna prima tentare di mettere meglio a fuoco queste due nozioni così spinose e delicate, e così interconnesse fra di loro, epica e romanzo; due nozioni su cui la teoria letteraria e l'estetica si sono ampiamente misurate soprattutto negli ultimi due secoli. Partiamo da una pagina famosa:

Ganz anders verhält es sich dagegen mit dem *Roman*, der modernen *bürgerlichen* Epopöe. Hier tritt einerseits der Reichtum und die Vielseitigkeit der Interessen, Zustände, Charaktere, Lebensverhältnisse, der breite Hintergrund einer totalen Welt sowie die epische Darstellung von Begebenheiten vollständig wieder ein. Was jedoch fehlt, ist der *ursprünglich* poetische Weltzustand, aus welchem das eigentliche Epos hervorgeht. Der Roman im modernen Sinne setzt eine bereits zur *Prosa* geordnete Wirklichkeit voraus, auf deren Boden er sodann in seinem Kreise — sowohl in Rücksicht auf die Lebendigkeit der Begebenisse als auch in betreff der Individuen und ihres Schicksals — der Poesie, soweit es bei dieser Voraussetzung möglich ist, ihr verlorenes Recht wieder erringt.²

Il complesso sistema delle singole arti, delineato nell'ultima parte dell'*Estetica* di Hegel, dedica all'epica una sezione lunghissima, che verso la fine comprende una breve pagina sul romanzo, da cui è tratto questo brano. È la famosa definizione di "moderna epopea borghese", che riprende temi comuni al pensiero estetico tedesco.³ Proprio in quanto forma non originaria e non poetica, il romanzo non poteva ottenere molto più spazio all'interno del-

² G.W.F. HEGEL, *Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik* III, Werke 15 (Frankfurt a.M. 1980), 392-393. Riprendo e rielaboro qui parti del mio lavoro "Fra epica e romanzo", in *Il romanzo*, II: *Le forme*, a cura di F. MORETTI (Torino 2002), 5-35.

³ Soprattutto F. VON BLANCKENBURG, *Versuch über den Roman* (1774), hrsg. von E. LÄMMERT (Stuttgart 1965); per la genealogia della teoria hegeliana cfr. H. HIEBEL, *Individualität und Totalität* (Bonn 1974).

l'ampia architettura hegeliana. La formula dell'epica borghese si è dimostrata però feconda e felice, dando vita a un vero e proprio mito critico (oggi certo da ripensare), che vede nell'epica la forma originaria per eccellenza, il genere che instaura la letteratura e che fonda l'identità nazionale, grazie a una poesia corale, impersonale, e soprattutto totalizzante; e vede invece nel romanzo la forma altrettanto per eccellenza secondaria, condannata alla frammentarietà e all'anelito verso una totalità perduta. Come è noto, questo mito critico è stato sviluppato soprattutto dal giovane Lukács nella *Teoria del romanzo*: un saggio che inizia con uno squarcio lirico in cui si condensa tutta la nostalgia romantica per la grecità come età felice, che non conosceva dissonanza fra io e mondo. Leggiamo dunque la sua definizione canonica del romanzo come forma dominata dalla *Sehnsucht* dell'epica:

Der Roman ist die Epopöe eines Zeitalters, für das die extensive Totalität des Lebens nicht mehr sinnfällig gegeben ist, für das die Lebensimmanenz des Sinnes zum Problem geworden ist, und das dennoch die Gesinnung zur Totalität hat.⁴

Anche se del tutto rovesciata di segno, ritroviamo la stessa tendenza a mitologizzare i due termini in un teorico speculare a Lukács: Michail Bachtin (è stato detto giustamente che su di loro si potrebbe scrivere una biografia parallela alla Plutarco).⁵ Per Bachtin l'epica è il polo negativo che implica monoliticità, monologicità, staticità, chiusura nel passato assoluto, cristallizzazione nel canone; mentre il romanzo è il polo positivo che implica plurivocità, dialogicità, dinamismo, e che diventa quasi metafora di uno spirito antigerarchico e antiautoritario, di una linea culturale carnevalesca e dionisiaca. Data la prospettiva metastoricista di Bachtin, si profila così una nuova genealogia del romanzo, che non è più, come in Hegel e in Lukács, una forma legata alla civiltà borghese (quindi a una classe sociale la

⁴ G. LUKÁCS, *Die Theorie des Romans. Ein geschichtsphilosophischer Versuch über die Formen der großen Epopä* (Berlin-Spandau 1963), 53.

⁵ V. STRADA, *Introduzione all'edizione italiana* di M. BACHTIN, *Tolstoj* (Bologna 1986), 21: "vite intellettuali divergenti".

cui ‘nascita’ ha avuto le datazioni più disparate, sconfinando spesso nella categoria transculturale: sappiamo bene quanto spesso anche l’ellenismo sia stato definito un’epoca ‘borghese’), e che accoglie invece svariate forme marginali e sotterranee della narrazione antica e medievale.⁶

Parlavo prima di mito critico non certo per negarne il valore euristico, ma perché la visione hegeliana e lukácsiana, poi rovesciata di segno da Bachtin, configura l’epica come una sorta di Eden perduto, caratterizzato da una comunione perfetta fra il poeta e il suo pubblico. Come succede spesso nel pensiero occidentale, ossessionato dal problema dell’origine, si tratta insomma di una sorta di unità primigenia, da cui scaturiscono forme secondarie, segnate dalla disgregazione e dal frammento, secondo una linea evolutiva inevitabilmente discendente. L’opposizione fra epica e romanzo ricalca dunque una serie di grandi binarismi su cui si è costruita l’identità occidentale, e che la cultura contemporanea sta rimettendo in discussione, binarismi in cui il primo termine ha sempre i caratteri dell’originarietà e quindi della superiorità: natura/cultura, pubblico/privato, collettivo/individuale, oralità/scrittura, tragedia/commedia, maschile/femminile. Se l’epica è infatti considerata un genere spontaneo e aurorale, incentrato su temi elevati e tipicamente maschili come la guerra e l’azione eroica, in cui si riconosce un intero popolo, il romanzo è considerato invece per definizione il genere di secondo grado, che nasce quando la scrittura è già ampiamente in uso, è legato all’insorgere di una nuova dimensione privata e sentimentale, ed è quindi orientato verso un pubblico prevalentemente femminile. Un orientamento che si fa risalire già al mondo antico, al punto che alcuni critici si sono spinti a ipotizzare per i romanzi greci autrici celate sotto pseudonimi maschili⁷ (non a caso già Samuel Butler aveva fatto la stessa ipotesi per l’*Odissea*...).⁸

⁶ Da vedere soprattutto M. BACHTIN, *Voprosy literaturi i estetiki* (Moscou 1975), trad. it. (Torino 1979), 445-482.

⁷ Cfr. T. HÄGG, *The Novel in Antiquity* (Oxford 1983), 95-96.

⁸ S. BUTLER, *The Authoress of the Odyssey*, Introduced by T. WHITMARSH (Bristol 2003).

Contrapporre epica e romanzo è in ogni caso un'operazione delicata. Si tratta di due modi di rappresentazione letteraria, a loro volta suddivisi in vari generi e sottogeneri, che appartengono però alla stessa grande tipologia espressiva, al regime narrativo, contrapposto, secondo una fortunatissima triade, al regime drammatico e a quello lirico. E all'interno di questo regime prevedono entrambi opere di grandi dimensioni e con ampio sistema di personaggi (la distinzione fra versi e prosa non è invece sempre valida). Se dunque sul piano astratto delle tecniche espressive non si possono distinguere nettamente (al punto che alcuni teorici soprattutto di ambito tedesco utilizzano il termine epica per inglobare entrambe le forme), si distinguono invece moltissimo sul piano dello statuto gerarchico: l'epica è il genere più codificato e canonico, il romanzo è invece il più fluido e aperto. Si tratta dunque di un'opposizione che va sempre storicizzata: bisogna chiedersi insomma cosa significava per un autore come Elio-doro scrivere un romanzo che si richiamasse all'epica.

Riflettiamo però ancora un po' in generale su un primo dato che salta subito agli occhi quando si passa alla dimensione diacronica: la nascita tardiva del romanzo e la morte precoce dell'epica. L'epica è il primo genere a sorgere, anzi quello che inaugura il sistema letterario, ma è anche quello di cui si lamenta ben presto il declino. Nella tradizione europea il *Paradise Lost* di Milton viene generalmente considerato l'ultimo vero poema epico, ma il processo di estinzione è comunque lungo e lento: il genere sopravvive soprattutto nella forma stravolta e parodica dell'eroicomico,⁹ salvo poi riapparire inaspettatamente (come è accaduto di recente per l'*Omeros* postcoloniale di Walcott, comunque molto lirico¹⁰). Le cose cambiano però se si segue la distinzione hegeliana fra epica originaria ed epica *künstlich gemachte* (variamente riformulata come epica letteraria, o revival sen-

⁹ Cfr. C. BERTONI, *Percorsi europei dell'eroicomico* (Pisa 1997).

¹⁰ Cfr. J. FARRELL, "Walcott's 'Omeros'. The Classical Epic in a Postmodern World", in *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World: The Poetics of Community*, ed. by M. BEISSINGER, J. TYLUS, S. WOFFORD (Berkeley 1999), 270-296.

timentale dell'epica).¹¹ Se dobbiamo escludere la seconda (a cui appartiene già Virgilio) dal vero spirito epico, perché prodotto inautentico, allora la morte dell'epica diviene realmente un fenomeno precocissimo: finiamo per definire epici solo i poemi di Omero, e alcune opere simili di altre culture, come l'epopea di Gilgamesh, o il *Rāmāyana* e il *Mahābhārata*.

La nascita tardiva del romanzo è invece un dato di fatto incontrovertibile, che ne ha causato anche lo statuto marginale e poco ufficiale, conservato per secoli. Molto più oscillante è però il momento effettivo di questa nascita, che tende a essere retrodatata sempre di più, soprattutto da quanto si è contestata la distinzione anglosassone fra *novel* e *romance*: un'operazione critica compiuta nel modo più drastico da Margaret Doody.¹² Pur contenendo tratti caratteristici del *romance*, il romanzo greco è più vicino al concetto di *novel*, se non altro per l'assenza di elementi fantastici e la presenza di una dimensione quotidiana. Il prototipo sarebbe allora la *Callirhoe* di Caritone, la cui datazione oscilla, come è noto, fra il I a.C. e il I d.C. Gli studiosi del romanzo greco hanno messo in rilievo molti tratti distintivi che la visione hegeliano-lukacsiana considerava tipici del romanzo moderno come forma borghese: la secolarizzazione, l'individualismo, l'isolamento dell'eroe, la dimensione privata e sentimentale, il sincretismo culturale.¹³ Sono elementi già in parte presenti nella commedia di Menandro, e ancor prima nelle ultime tragedie atipiche, esotiche ed avventurose, di Euripide, non a caso definite "romanzesche".¹⁴ La retrodatazione del romanzo

¹¹ G.W.F. HEGEL, *Vorlesungen...* (sopra, n.2), 348; sul revival "sentimentale" (termine di N. Frye) dell'epica letteraria cfr. J.B. HAINSWORTH, *The Idea of Epic* (Berkeley 1991), Ch. 1.

¹² M. DOODY, *The True Story of the Novel* (New Brunswick, NJ 1996): un libro che dà ampio spazio al romanzo antico e alla sua 'impurità' etnica e culturale, contrapponendosi alla celebre tesi di Ian Watt.

¹³ Cfr. soprattutto B. REARDON, *The Form of Greek Romance* (Princeton 1991), che però continua a preferire il termine *romance*, a differenza della maggior parte degli studiosi anglosassoni attuali.

¹⁴ Cfr. M. FUSILLO, "Was ist eine romanhaftre Tragödie? Überlegungen zu Euripides' Experimentalismus", in *Poetica* 24 (1992), 270-299.

non finisce comunque qui: molte delle peculiarità del secondo poema omerico, che derivano probabilmente dall'epoca diversa di composizione, sono state interpretate in chiave protoromanzesca. Leggiamo cosa scrive Gérard Genette in *Palimpsesti*, saggio summa su tutte le forme di letteratura di secondo grado:

Iliade/Odyssée: le plus fort argument en faveur de l'unité d'auteur est peut-être justement le fait que la seconde ne soit pas tout platement un démarquage de la première, mouvement naturel d'un épigone ou d'un concurrent, que l'auteur lui-même aura davantage la force et le goût d'éviter, plus tenté par une œuvre toute différente, et dont la relation à la précédente est ici assez oblique: dix ans après, comparse devenu héros, changement du thème d'action (de l'exploit à l'aventure) et de l'attitude narrative, soudain presque entièrement focalisée sur le seul héros — et secondairement, dans la *Télémachie*, sur son fils —, ce qui rompt totalement avec l'objectivité olympienne ("défilé extérieur", dit Hegel) du mode épique. Quasi changement de genre, donc, car Homère fait ici plus de la moitié du chemin qui sépare l'épopée du roman: passage du thème guerrier au thème de l'aventure individuelle, réduction du personnel multiple à un héros central, focalisation dominante du récit sur ce héros, et enfin inauguration, si contraire au régime narratif de l'*Iliade* (et, plus tard, de l'épopée médiévale), du début *in medias res* compensé, aux chants IX à XII, par un récit autodiégétique à la première personne.¹⁵

"Più della metà del cammino che separa l'epopea dal romanzo": con splendida spazzatura il narratologo può liquidare in pochi tratti la questione omerica, attribuendo a un unico autore il cambiamento. Genette non è certo il primo a sottolineare il carattere romanzesco dell'*Odissea*: lo faceva già, ad esempio, a inizi del Novecento il saggista Rudolf Borchardt. Nel suo *Die Odissee. Epos zwischen Märchen und Roman*, Uvo Hölscher sintetizza in termini più cauti la questione, attribuendo la peculiarità del secondo poema omerico a una maniera sentimentale e romanzesca di leggerlo, nata in età ellenistica:

¹⁵ G. GENETTE, *Palimpsestes. La littérature au second degré* (Paris 1982), 200.

Kein Zweifel, die Odyssee ließ sich auch lesen als Liebesroman. Kirke, Kalypso, Nausikaa — auf der anderen Seite die Freier um Penelope; das Thema der Treue über alle Bedrängnisse und Verzweiflungen hinweg, auf Odysseus' Seite die Beharrlichkeit des Dulders; am Ende die Wiedervereinigung der Liebenden in dem, was hellenistische Literarkritik das „Ziel der Odyssee“ nannte, das eheliche Lager: es ist sehr wahrscheinlich, daß im Hellenismus die Odyssee in diesem sentimental Sinne rezipiert wurde. Und es gibt Anzeichen dafür, daß sie gleichsam zur Romanlektüre gehörte [...].

Diese Annäherung der Odyssee, in der hellenistischen Rezeption, an den Roman hat ihren offensichtlichen Grund in der Grundstruktur des Epos, welche die Geschichte von den getrennten und wiedervereinigten Gatten ist. Wenn man den Blick nicht auf Einflüsse und Anleihen, sondern auf das Grundmuster richtet, wird man in der Odyssee das Vorbild der neuen Gattung nicht erkennen.¹⁶

L' *Odissea*, poema secondo e secondario per eccellenza (e quindi prototipo anche dell'intertextualità), che già l'Anonimo del *Sublime* riteneva un'opera della vecchiaia (9, 14) e un modello più adatto per la commedia, diventa quindi l'archetipo ideale del romanzo: a partire già dall'antichità con il *Satyricon* e con le *Etiopiche* fino a Joyce. Questo sia per gli aspetti tematici: il viaggio, l'avventura, l'esotismo, gli affetti privati, e in genere valori meno alti e indiscussi (l'astuzia, l'inganno, la finzione, per altro non del tutto estranei al primo poema omerico), che Adorno collegava chiaramente alla cultura borghese;¹⁷ sia per gli aspetti formali: una strutturazione narrativa incentrata sul singolo eroe, e più chiusa e compatta rispetto a quella dell'*Iliade*.

Quest'ultimo punto merita un po' più di attenzione. Nella *Teoria del romanzo* Lukács scrive che “in der Handlung der Ilias — ohne Anfang und ohne Abschluß — erblüht ein geschlossener Kosmos”;¹⁸ e riformula poi quest'osservazione in termini

¹⁶ U. HÖLSCHER, *Die Odyssee. Epos zwischen Märchen und Roman* (München 1988), 228-229.

¹⁷ M. HORKHEIMER, T.W. ADORNO, *Dialektik der Aufklärung. Philosophische Fragmente* (Frankfurt a.M. 1947), cap. 1.

¹⁸ G. LUKÁCS, *Die Theorie des Romans* (sopra, n.4), 51-52.

generali, definendo l'epica "eine homogen-organische Stetigkeit", e il romanzo invece "ein heterogen-kontingentes Diskretum".¹⁹ L'epica appare dunque come un flusso di eventi dotati di un'organicità intrinseca, da cui il poeta deve solo estrarre il suo segmento narrativo: l'inizio e la fine restano quindi arbitrarii e aperti. Il romanzo deve invece incanalare la propria materia disorganica e contingente attraverso un'architettura compositiva più rigorosa. Se ne dovrebbe dedurre a questo punto che l'opposizione fra epica e romanzo, già adombrata in quella fra *Iliade* e *Odissea*, si configuri sul piano della strutturazione narrativa come un'opposizione aperto/chiuso: e questo verrebbe confermato anche dai finali del romanzo greco, molto spettacolari e trionfali, tutti modellati sulla riunificazione della coppia dell'*Odissea*. In realtà anche questa polarità va storicizzata: le belle osservazioni di Lukács valgono infatti soprattutto per il periodo dell'Ottocento-Novecento, quando il romanzo è diventato un genere canonico, chiuso e ben strutturato (*pace* Bachtin), mentre i tentativi di trascendere le convenzioni del romanzo borghese e di recuperare una forma epica hanno al contrario un carattere aperto e polifonico: è il caso del grande capolavoro di Tolstoj, *Guerra e pace*, forse l'esempio più riuscito nella modernità del tentativo di recuperare l'epica antica e di far rivivere l'*Iliade*. Nei primi secoli della storia della narrativa il rapporto appare però del tutto inverso: soprattutto nelle polemiche cinquecentesche dei trattati di retorica e di poetica l'epica (in cui si faceva rientrare anche Eliodoro!) ha svolto la funzione di modello chiuso, organico e unitario nei confronti di un romanzo visto come regno della pluralità e della multiformità.²⁰

Torniamo al nostro itinerario semiparadossale sulla nascita del romanzo e sulla morte dell'epica. Al punto in cui siamo arrivati si ha dunque l'impressione che la forma epica allo stato puro sia rappresentata dalla sola *Iliade* (o da opere medievali più vicine

¹⁹ G. LUKÁCS, *Die Theorie des Romans* (sopra, n.4), 74.

²⁰ Cfr. P. PARKER, *Inescapable Romance. Studies in the Poetics of a Mode* (Princeton 1979); S. ZATTI, *Il modo epico* (Bari 2000), 101-105.

all'oralità come la *Chanson de Roland*), e infatti ci sono molti critici che lo hanno sostenuto. Alcune letture del primo poema omerico apparse negli ultimi decenni ne hanno dato però una visione sempre più sfaccettata, sottolineando la pluralità dei punti di vista, la polifonia espressiva, la visione antibellica ed antiautoritaria.²¹ Anche il suo protagonista, Achille (un protagonismo che rifugge proprio dall'assenza, come notava già Hölderlin), è ben lontano dall'incarnare uno spirito collettivo, ma vive la propria esperienza emotiva in contrasto con i codici del mondo circostante.²² A questo punto un neopragmatista concluderebbe che è la comunità interpretativa a creare il testo: siamo noi studiosi di un'epoca in cui il romanzo ha raggiunto, dopo millenni di marginalità, una posizione egemone a costruire una nuova *Iliade* romanzesca. Per quanto io ritenga il concetto di comunità interpretativa interessante e produttivo, proprio come antidoto agli eccessi del soggettivismo, sono però ancora convinto che "c'è un testo in questa classe".²³ L'interpretazione è infinita, in quanto ogni epoca e ogni cultura scopre nei testi nuove potenzialità, alimentando un dialogo inesauribile; ma non è illimitata, in quanto deve inevitabilmente partire dai molteplici percorsi del testo. Forse basta dire che, anche sotto la spinta del romanzo moderno, la critica contemporanea ha messo meglio a fuoco la complessità della poesia omerica, ridiscutendo idee che avevano dominato a lungo come oggettività, impersonalità e staticità. È una poesia che viene alla fine di complessi processi culturali: quindi ben lontana da ogni purezza primigenia, così come non è immune da contaminazioni con l'Oriente.²⁴ È stata l'osessione occidentale dell'originario a descrivere l'epica come un

²¹ Cfr. I. DE JONG, *Narrators and Focalizers. The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam 1987); R.J. RABEL, *Plot and Point of View in the 'Iliad'* (Ann Arbor 1997).

²² Cfr. G. PADUANO, *Le scelte di Achille*. Saggio introduttivo a Omero, *Iliade* (Torino 1997), IX-XLIX.

²³ Il riferimento è, ovviamente, a S. FISH, *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cambridge, Mass. 1980).

²⁴ Cfr. W. BURKERT, *Da Omero ai Magi. La tradizione orientale nella cultura greca* (Venezia 1999), cap. 1.

blocco monolitico e organico, inattinabile nella sua assolutezza: d'altronde enfatizzare la discontinuità, creando miti di passato assoluto, è uno dei modi con cui la modernità si autolegittima.²⁵ La stessa ossessione che ha spinto a stabilire un'equivalenza meccanica fra epica e oralità nelle culture 'primitive', equivalenza negata o almeno ridimensionata dalle ricerche antropologiche più recenti.²⁶

Se poi abbandoniamo la distinzione fra epica autentica ed epica letteraria, scorgiamo una progressiva 'contaminazione' romanzesca, che avviene sotto il segno di eros, un tema estraneo al rigido codice epico maschile.²⁷ Se infatti nell'universo guerresco dell'*Iliade* l'erotismo è implicito o collaterale, e nell'*Odissea* compare poi in forme significative ma circoscritte, diventa invece centrale nelle *Argonautiche* di Apollonio Rodio, quindi nell'età ellenistica che vede poco dopo la nascita del romanzo. Per la sua mistione tutta odissiaca di eros, viaggio e avventura, e per il suo antieroismo marcato, che arriva a tematizzare la perdita del codice epico, anche il poema apolloniano è stato considerato un prototipo del romanzo.²⁸

Cosa resta a questo punto dell'opposizione fra epica e romanzo? Molte delle osservazioni fatte finora potrebbero por-

²⁵ La citazione d'obbligo è H. BLUMENBERG, *Die Legitimität der Neuzeit* (Frankfurt a.M. 1966), 1.9.

²⁶ J. GOODY, "Dall'oralità alla scrittura. Riflessioni antropologiche sul narrare", in *La cultura del romanzo. Il romanzo I*, a cura di F. MORETTI (Torino 2001), 19-46.

²⁷ Cfr. B. PAVLOCK, *Eros, Imitation, and the Epic Tradition* (Ithaca and London 1990).

²⁸ E. ROHDE, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorfäuser* (Wiesbaden 1876), 21, 105; A. HEISERMAN, *The Novel before the Novel. Essays and Discussions about the Beginnings of Prose Fiction in the West* (Chicago 1977), 11-29; C.R. BEYE, *Epic and Romance in the Argonautica of Apollonius* (Carbondale and Edwardsville 1982), 71-74; la tesi dell'antieroismo di Giasone, recentemente molto ridiscussa, si deve G. LAWALL, "Apollonius' *Argonautica*. Jason as Anti-Hero", in *YClSt* 19 (1966), 119-169; contra R. HUNTER, "Short on Heroics. Jason in the *Argonautica*", in *CQ* 38 (1988), 436-453; S. GOLDHILL, *The Poet's Voice. Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature* (Cambridge 1991), 313-316; F. VIAN, "ΙΗΣΩΝ ΑΜΗΧΑΝΟΣ", in *Studi in onore di Anthos Ardzizzoni*, a cura di E. LIVREA e G. PRIVITERA (Roma 1978), 1023-1041.

tare a delle conclusioni scettiche; e c'è infatti chi ha sostenuto che si tratta di due nozioni che nella pratica critica finiscono per autodecostruirsi.²⁹ Non credo che si debba giungere a un risultato così negativo. *L'impasse* si può superare se si smette di considerare l'epica e il romanzo due entità fisse e immutabili, e li si tratta invece come due fasci di costanti transculturali che di epoca in epoca e di opera in opera possono essere più o meno attive, e possono anche trasformarsi del tutto. È evidente che in un genere fortemente codificato come l'epica è più facile individuare costanti (narrazione di imprese eroiche, mitiche o storiche, fondamentali per una comunità; linguaggio elevato e sublime; enciclopedismo), topoi e tecniche espressive (il catalogo, la similitudine, la discesa agli Inferi); mentre lo è molto meno per un genere per lungo tempo marginale e poco ufficiale come il romanzo, anche se non è certo impossibile (la dimensione privata e sentimentale; la forma aperta; l'identificazione patologica). Ma è anche chiaro che è soprattutto l'incrocio e l'interferenza fra questi due insiemi di costanti a individuare nel corso dei secoli l'universo della finzione narrativa.

Il rapporto fra epica e romanzo non va dunque pensato come contrapposizione netta fra originario e secondario, fra sublime e quotidiano, fra alto e basso, ma va ripensato come interferenza e ibridazione fra due generi narrativi distinti ma non totalmente separati. Se da un lato le varie metamorfosi dell'epica nei secoli si sono spesso configurate come una progressiva 'romanzizzazione', dall'altro il romanzo si è richiamato ai modelli epici per trascendere il proprio statuto marginale, e per rispondere ai vari attacchi subiti, riappropriandosi quindi del genere più canonico, con cui aveva in comune il regime narrativo e le dimensioni ampie. In un primo tempo solo per autoelevarsi o per tematizzare la propria diversità; e in un secondo tempo invece, quando il problema della marginalità era ampiamente superato, per espandersi e per raggiungere forme nuove sempre più totalizzanti.

²⁹ M.A. SHERMAN, "Problems of Bakhtin's Epic", in *Bakhtin and Medieval Voices*, ed. by T.J. FARRELL (Gainesville, FL 1996), 194.

Il romanzo antico ci offre due modelli opposti (e uno intermedio) di ibridazione con l'epica, entrambi destinati ad avere grande successo nella storia letteraria: la ripresa a fine di nobilitazione, che tende ad accettare la continuità fra i due generi, come fa appunto Eliodoro con il sogno di Calasiris; e il rovesciamento parodico, che tematizza invece la distanza dal sublime (fra di essi si interpone l'allusione ironica).

Il primo modello si presenta già nella fase iniziale di questo genere letterario: il romanzo di Caritone è infatti quello in cui si avverte di più il contrasto fra la dimensione quotidiana e 'borghese' del racconto, narrato in uno stile assai lineare, e il desiderio di nobilitare una forma letteraria ancora giovane. A questa seconda istanza si possono ascrivere le innumerevoli citazioni dirette, quasi esclusivamente tratte da Omero, e in particolare dall'*Iliade*. Come è noto, a causa delle nettissime differenze nella produzione e nella circolazione della cultura (assenza di riproduzione in serie del libro, e del concetto stesso di proprietà letteraria), nelle letterature antiche la citazione testuale — nozione più circoscritta rispetto alla citazione intesa da Kristeva in poi come sinonimo di intertestualità, così centrale in tutto il postmoderno³⁰ — è una prassi non molto diffusa, in genere sostituita dall'allusione e dalla parafrasi, o limitata a casi specifici, come la prosa filosofica, in cui si attiva un rapporto di 'metatestualità',³¹ di commento del testo secondo al testo primo (in uno dei pochi studi teorici sulla citazione, Antoine Compagnon giunge perciò alla conclusione paradossale che la citazione non esiste nell'antichità classica).³² Le cose cambiano un po' con l'ellenismo: ad esempio in uno dei generi che più hanno influen-

³⁰ Sulla base di questa nozione G. DANEK, *Epos und Zitat. Studien zu den Quellen der Odyssee* (Wien 1998), 15-23, può individuare nell'*Odissea* una serie di citazioni delle versioni alternative, relativizzando in tal modo la visione tradizionale dell'assolutezza epica.

³¹ Su questa forma di intertestualità cfr. G. GENETTE, *Palimpsestes* (sopra, n.15), 10.

³² A. COMPAGNON, *La seconde main, ou le travail de la citation* (Paris 1979), 95-97; la questione è posta comunque in termini problematici.

zato il romanzo, la commedia di Menandro, in cui la citazione testuale, corredata anche di indicazioni bibliografiche (come nella famosa scena dell'*Aspis*), produce un forte straniamento metaletterario, e rientra in una riflessione sui rapporti fra linguaggio tragico e linguaggio comico.³³ Nella prosa la questione è più complessa, in quanto valeva quel principio dell'omogeneità stilistica messo in luce dal classico studio di Norden:³⁴ l'inserzione di materiale allotrio, come il verso, era sentito come una trasgressione eccessiva, come una rottura dell'unità dell'opera. Non a caso i retori, come Demetrio (*Eloc.* 112-113, 150) o Ermogene (*Id.* 2,4), consigliavano un uso misurato dei poeti e delle citazioni, e lo circoscrivevano comunque solo al registro medio, allo stile elegante ($\gamma\lambda\alpha\varphi\omega\rho\varsigma$), in quanto destinato a produrre grazia espressiva, $\chi\alpha\varphi\iota\varsigma$; che è poi il registro in cui sceglie di muoversi Caritone.

Nelle *Avventure di Cherea e Calliroe* le frequenti citazioni omeriche, a cui la critica ha prestato attenzione relativamente di recente,³⁵ non scompaginano mai infatti la struttura del testo, come accade invece nelle consistenti oscillazioni del *prosimetrum* o nel *Satyricon*, e svolgono diverse funzioni: da quella puramente esornativa, in cui sintagmi omerici impreziosiscono situazioni connotate da un'emotività molto pronunciata (stupore, frenesia, turbamento amoroso, gelosia); a quella intertestuale, in cui si attiva quella tensione fra testo citante e testo citato di cui parla Compagnon,³⁶ e quindi un rapporto fra i due contesti narrativi, fino a giungere all'esplicito segnale metaletterario. Ovviamente,

³³ G. PADUANO, "Citazione ed esistenza (Menandro, 'Aspis' 407 sgg.)", in *RCCM* 20 (1978), 1055-65.

³⁴ Ed. NORDEN, *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance* (Leipzig und Berlin 1915), soprattutto 100-102.

³⁵ M. FUSILLO, "Il testo nel testo: la citazione nel romanzo greco", in *MD* 25 (1990), 27-48; G. MANUWALD, "Zitate als Mittel des Erzählens. Zur Darstellungstechnik Charitons in seinem Roman 'Kallirhoe'", in *WJA* 24 (2000), 97-122 (la quale insiste soprattutto sulla ripresa di elementi generalizzabili, sempre a fine di intrattenimento); P. ROBIANO, "La citation poétique dans le roman érotique grec", in *REA* 102 (2000), 509-529.

³⁶ A. COMPAGNON, *La seconde main...* (sopra, n.32), *passim*.

per capire la metamorfosi romanzesca dell'epica, sono queste due ultime funzioni quelle che ci interessano da vicino. È interessante notare innanzitutto come Caritone riprenda dall'*Iliade* — quindi da un poema in cui l'eros per statuto è destinato a rimanere ai margini — un paradigma amoroso che riguarda proprio il suo protagonista: la storia fra Achille e Patroclo, che, in quanto storia omoerotica, è relegata ancor più nel regime dell'implicito, secondo una norma epica che Caritone stesso rispetta al pari di Eliodoro, e a differenza degli altri romanzi.³⁷ Le citazioni tratte dall'episodio impegnato sulla morte di Patroclo e sulla reazione disperata e sublime di Achille costellano tutto il racconto della lunga separazione fra i due sposi, che costituisce il nucleo centrale e più consistente del romanzo, e che implica anche le morti apparenti di entrambi. All'inizio del plot, quando Cherea apprende la notizia del presunto adulterio di Calliroe, il narratore enfatizza la sua disperazione citando i tre versi con cui Omero descrive la reazione di Achille alla morte di Patroclo (*Il.* 18, 22-24, citati in 1,4,6). Quando a Mileto Calliroe, convinta che lo sposo è morto, è dilaniata dal conflitto interiore fra la fedeltà alla sua memoria e la convenienza di sposare Dionisio per dare alla luce il figlio che aspetta senza farlo cadere nello stato di schiavitù, l'apparizione in sogno del protagonista che scioglierà il dilemma è introdotta dalla citazione dei versi con cui Omero descrive l'apparizione in sogno dell'ombra di Patroclo ad Achille (*Il.* 23, 66-67 in 2,9,6). Infine, una volta terminato il gioco delle morti apparenti, quando i due sposi si ritrovano per il processo a Babilonia, lo stato emotivo di Cherea impossibilitato a parlare con la moglie è espresso tramite una ripresa abbreviata della prima citazione, quella che nel I libro contrappuntava il supposto adulterio (*Il.* 18, 23-24, citato in 5,2,4); dopo il recontro, quando Cherea scambia lo stupore afasico che colpisce Calliroe a causa della resurrezione dello sposo per segno di infe-

³⁷ B. EFFE, "Der griechische Liebesroman und die Homeroerotik. Ursprung und Entwicklung einer epischen Gattungskonvention", in *Philologus* 131 (1987), 95-108.

deltà, il suo ennesimo tentativo di suicidio³⁸ è introdotto da un'altra citazione dal discorso di Achille che giura memoria eterna al compagno amato prima di accingersi a straziare il corpo di Ettore (*Il.* 22, 389-390, citato in 5,10,9). Tre momenti chiave dunque della peripezia romanzesca, che si richiamano a tre momenti chiave dell'archetipo di Patroclo ed Achille.

Proprio per il suo carattere esplicito, la citazione spinge il lettore a fare un confronto fra il modello epico e il riuso romanzesco. Nel nostro caso si nota innanzitutto la studiata corrispondenza fra le situazioni narrative, che hanno sempre un nucleo comune: nel primo esempio la reazione a una notizia negativa riguardante l'essere amato; nel secondo, ancor più aderente, l'apparizione in sogno del partner; nel terzo la promessa di conservare la memoria affettiva oltre la morte. Salta subito agli occhi però lo scarto di registro, che scaturisce dall'opposizione autenticità/apparenza: nell'*Iliade* le citazioni riguardano sempre l'evento unico, tragico e ineluttabile per eccellenza, la morte; nel romanzo di Caritone nel primo caso si tratta di un adulterio fittizio, frutto di un inganno; nel secondo dell'apparizione dell'ombra di un uomo creduto morto, ma ancora vivo; e nel terzo di un suicidio che verrà subito dopo sventato, come sempre, dall'amico Policarmo; dunque eventi sentiti come tragici e ineluttabili dai personaggi, ma destinati a sciogliersi nell'immancabile lieto fine predisposto dall'autore.

Caritone trascrive la *gravitas* sublime di Omero nel registro medio di una commedia sentimentale; ed è un'operazione ambivalente: se da un lato l'epica si imborghesisce e si abbassa di tono, dall'altro il romanzo si eroicizza e si innalza, con piena corrispondenza biunivoca. L'eroicizzazione riguarda non a caso

³⁸ Questo topos molto presente in tutto il romanzo greco soprattutto della prima fase è stato assai valorizzato da S. MACALISTER, *Dreams and Suicides. The Greek Novel from Antiquity to the Byzantine Empire* (London and New York 1996), cap. 1, in quanto "gamble" con la morte, messa a rischio della vita affidandosi totalmente al caso, e quindi mezzo per acquisire identità da parte di personaggi tentati da un suicidio comunque egoistico e anomico, non altruistico come quello della Grecia classica (queste ultime categorie provengono da Durkheim).

la fase della separazione, in cui gli amanti credono morti o infedeli il loro partner: se è vero, come ho cercato di dimostrare in altra sede,³⁹ che la struttura tematica del romanzo greco, basata su di un parallelismo enfatizzato, concretizza nel testo il bisogno di simmetria tipico della logica inconscia, andando incontro alle attese di un pubblico in cerca di prodotti consolatori, allora la separazione è il trauma più dilacerante di questo universo tutto privato, proprio perché la coppia è descritta come un'unità inscindibile, sulle tracce del mito dell'androgino raccontato da Aristofane nel *Simposio*. Suggerendo come struttura soggiacente la morte di Patroclo e la reazione violenta e sublime di Achille, le citazioni omeriche aggiungono alle peripezie di Cherea e Calliroe separati dalla Tyche una connotazione eroica.

Lo scarto stilistico è meno dirompente per le citazioni omeriche che riguardano l'episodio della guerra, in quanto la somiglianza tematica fra i contesti è più marcata, anche se sussiste sempre una netta divaricazione.⁴⁰ Lo stesso vale per le citazioni con funzione metaletteraria: notevole soprattutto quella (doppia) inserita al momento spettacolare in cui Calliroe entra a Babilonia nell'aula del processo, fra l'attesa spasmodica del pubblico (*Il.* 3, 146, *Od.* 1, 366 e 18, 213, citati in 5,5,9). È l'unica citazione in cui il narratore si richiama esplicitamente a Omero, assimilandone la sua protagonista a due eroine antitetiche, Elena e Penelope; alla prima, in quanto la sua bellezza eccezionale e magnetica suscita una guerra fra due mariti e gli innamoramenti in serie di altri rivali prestigiosi; alla seconda, in quanto la sua figura incarna la fedeltà tenace e monomaniaca dell'eros contro le insidie del tempo e della sorte; sono in fondo le due componenti tematiche alla base di tutto il romanzo greco: Elena la polifonia, Penelope l'eros.⁴¹

³⁹ M. FUSILLO, *Il romanzo greco. Polifonia ed eros* (Venezia 1989), cap. 3.

⁴⁰ *Il.* 9, 48-49 in 7,3,5; 13, 131 e 16, 215 in 7,4,3; *Od.* 22, 308 (che ricalca comunque *Il.* 10, 483), in 7,4,6: nell'*Iliade* la guerra è il valore che unifica l'intero poema; nel romanzo è invece solo un episodio ritardante e nobilitante, del tutto subordinato all'intreccio privato.

⁴¹ Cfr. M. HIRSCHBERGER, "Epos und Tragödie in Charitons *Kallirhoe*. Ein

Forse non ha molto senso chiedersi quanto sia intenzionale l'abbassamento del modello omerico,⁴² e quanto sia invece frutto dei diversi generi e contesti, o ancora del nostro diverso gusto e della nostra maniera di leggere. Credo sia abbastanza chiara la scelta di Caritone di uno stile teso alla *χάρις* di cui parla Demetrio, e in cui le citazioni sono ammesse, purché ben integrate nel tessuto espressivo. E credo che si possa concordare con C.W. Müller, quando giunge alla conclusione che la frequenza delle citazioni omeriche svela il progetto di Caritone di essere una sorta di Omeride in prosa:⁴³ un continuatore dell'epica che utilizza anche altre tecniche parallele, come lo sfondo storico o l'*exemplum* mitico, per nobilitare un genere di intrattenimento non ufficiale e non codificato.

La stessa funzione nobilitante viene svolta in maniera assai diversa dalle *Etiopiche*. In un ambito come il romanzo greco, in cui i ritrovamenti papiracei hanno rivoluzionato le datazioni fin di cinque secoli, occorre sempre andare cauti, il che significherebbe in questo caso limitarsi a leggere le due diverse riprese dell'epica come frutto di diverse scelte stilistiche. Personalmente sono però convinto che nel romanzo greco siano ben distinguibili due fasi: una prima più popolare e di intrattenimento, di cui fanno parte Caritone e Senofonte Efesio; e una seconda più complessa e raffinata, legata alla Neosofistica, e di cui Eliodoro sembra il punto di arrivo.⁴⁴ Nonostante recenti tentativi di datarlo al II d.C.,⁴⁵ le due datazioni proposte (III o IV d.C.)

Beitrag zur Intertextualität des griechischen Romans”, in *WJA* 25 (2001), 167-169, che ricorda anche la “Klugheit” di Penelope, all'interno di un lavoro che dà spazio anche all'epica ellenistica.

⁴² È un problema che si pone G. MANUWALD, “Zitate...” (sopra, n.35).

⁴³ C.W. MÜLLER, “Chariton von Aphrodisias und die Theorie des Romans in der Antike”, in *A&A* 22 (1976), 115-136.

⁴⁴ È di diverso parere P. ROBIANO, “La citation...” (sopra, n.35), 528-29, secondo cui il romanzo è opera aperta, non destinata a lettori raffinati.

⁴⁵ G. RONNET, “Intérêt esthétique et religieux des “Éthiopiques” d'Héliodore”, in *Pallas* 42 (1995), 55-68, che lo pone all'età degli Antonini, facendone un contemporaneo di Apuleio e di Luciano, sulla base soprattutto dell'equiparazione fra Apollo e Helios.

sono ancora le uniche sostenibili (personalmente propendo oggi per la seconda ipotesi, ma è un problema spinoso).⁴⁶

Gran parte della complessità e del successo delle *Etiopiche* deriva dall'ibridazione con l'epica: come si è detto, esse riprendono infatti ed amplificano l'impianto narrativo e tematico dell'archetipo romanzesco per eccellenza, l'*Odissea*. Prima di Elio-doro tutti i romanzi greci presentavano una struttura lineare — dall'inizio alla fine dell'intreccio senza grandi deviazioni — che narrava però una storia rigorosamente circolare: l'innamoramento (o il matrimonio) della coppia protagonista nella loro comune città d'origine, la loro separazione con relativa serie di avventure parallele nello spazio e nel tempo, e la ricongiunzione finale nella città in cui era iniziata la storia. Nelle *Etiopiche* la situazione è totalmente rovesciata: la storia è lineare, perché narra il cammino progressivo da Delfi all'Etiopia con cui la protagonista Cariclea riconquista la sua patria perduta; mentre il racconto ha un andamento circolare, perché inizia *in medias res*, e quindi da uno dei tanti rapimenti topici della coppia protagonista, per poi recuperare l'antefatto tramite un lungo racconto nel racconto che termina giusto a metà romanzo. Entrambe queste innovazioni dipendono direttamente dall'*Odissea*: sia l'orientamento del viaggio verso la meta familiare, scandita da riconoscimenti spettacolari, sia la complessa strutturazione narrativa che sfrutta appieno l'arma antichissima della metadiegesi. Come succede spesso nei testi di secondo grado, il modello viene notevolmente amplificato: il finale non è solo un ritorno in patria, ma il recupero dell'identità e di uno spazio utopico; mentre l'inizio *in medias res* assume i caratteri di una suspense prolungata, e il racconto nel racconto è moltiplicato fino a giungere al quarto livello metadiegetico.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Si veda la sintesi efficace di J.R. MORGAN, "Heliodorus", in *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. by G. SCHMELING (Leiden-New York-Köln 1996), 417-421; per una difesa della datazione al III cfr. T. SZEPESSY, "Le siège de Nisibe et la chronologie d'Héliodore", in *AAntHung* 24 (1976), 247-276; per quella al IV P. CHUVIN, "La date des *Éthiopiques* d'Héliodore", in *Chronique des derniers païens* (Paris 1990), 321-325.

⁴⁷ Sul rapporto con l'*Odissea* cfr. C.W. KEYES, "The Structure of Heliodorus"

Questa amplificazione dell'epica è strettamente correlata a un'altra operazione con cui Eliodoro rinnova il romanzo: la riscrittura filosofica. Il mistero iniziale e la lunga progressione verso il finale sono parte di una visione neoplatonica che dà grande spazio alla decifrazione graduale dei segni del divino, del tutto parallela all'attività ermeneutica affidata al lettore.⁴⁸ Non è un caso quindi che il ruolo del narratore secondario, nell'*Odissea* affidato al protagonista, sia qui attribuito a un personaggio ricco di cultura neoplatonica e sincretistica come Calasiris, che utilizza termini tecnici della critica omerica,⁴⁹ e giunge anche a raccontare una vita di Omero (3, 14-15) in cui il poeta è figlio di Hermes e di una sacerdotessa egiziana, profeta costretto all'esilio dal padre putativo (quindi una sorta di suo alter ego). Ma la cosa più interessante, dal punto di vista del legame fra romanzo e pubblico femminile, è che alcuni tratti odissiaci siano attribuiti anche alla protagonista, Cariclea, primo esempio di eroina romanzesca ricca di iniziativa pragmatica.⁵⁰ Il protagonista maschile, Teagene, mostra invece una forte riluttanza all'uso della finzione, e ostenta un eroismo marziale, che si richiama al modello dell'*Iliade*. Fra i due elementi della coppia sembra quasi riflettersi alla lontana il contrasto fra i due protagonisti epici,

"Aethiopica", in *Studies in Philology* (Univ. of North Carolina) 9 (1922), 43-51, non sempre convincente; sulla linearità della struttura eliodorea cfr. T. SZEPESSY, "Die Aithiopika des Heliodoros und der griechische sophistische Liebesroman", in *AAntHung* 5 (1957), 241-259; sulla problematicità della categoria di inizio in *medias res* cfr. M. STERNBERG, *Expositional Modes & Temporal Ordering in Fiction* (Baltimore and London 1978), 38-45.

⁴⁸ Cfr. J.J. WINKLER, "The Mendacity of Kalasiris" (sopra, n.1), 93-158.

⁴⁹ Come ha dimostrato M. TELÒ, "Eliodoro e la critica omerica antica", in *SIFC* 17 (1999), 71-87; si veda in particolare l'osservazione di p.85: "trattava la sua opera come un nuovo poema omerico". Sull'intreccio fra filologia alessandrina e prassi creativa si veda A. RENGAKOS, "The Hellenistic Poets as Homeric Critics", in *Omero 3000 anni dopo*, a cura di F. MONTANARI (Roma 2002), 143-57.

⁵⁰ Cfr. B. EGGER, "Zu den Frauenrollen im griechischen Roman. Die Frau als Heldin und Leserin", in *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 1 (Groningen 1988), 33-66; la bibliografia sulla donna nel romanzo antico si è ovviamente decuplicata negli ultimi anni: si veda, ad esempio, R. JOHNE, "Women in the Ancient Novel", in *The Novel in the Ancient World* (sopra, n.46), 151-207.

Achille (da cui Teagene si vanta di discendere) e Odisseo, segnando però il chiaro trionfo del secondo, con il suo diverso orizzonte assiologico (un trionfo che perdurerà in tutta la tradizione moderna).⁵¹

Omero e Odisseo sono dunque paradigmi esistenziali prima ancora che modelli poetici per i due personaggi più importanti e innovativi: Cariclea, protagonista, e Calasiris, padre adottivo e protettore della coppia, regista dell'azione e narratore secondario, figura in cui l'autore evidentemente si rispecchia. Entrambi costretti all'esilio dalla patria (Cariclea per il sospetto di una nascita bastarda, come l'Omero eliodoreo), viaggiano insieme travestendosi da mendicanti, e usando l'arma del racconto menzognero, per giungere a Memfi alla fine del 6° libro (una sorta di finale primo) e vivere una serie di intesi riconoscimenti: in una scena ricca di richiami al teatro (in particolare alle *Fenicie*) Calasiris ritrova i suoi figli, sventando in tempo il fratricidio edipico e avviandosi a una morte serena che è un *unicum* nel romanzo greco; Cariclea ritrova invece Teagene in una scena che si richiama esplicitamente al riconoscimento fra Odisseo e Penelope (7, 7-8). Dopo il lungo episodio persiano, tornata in patria Cariclea sarà riconosciuta, nella lunga e solenne scena teatrale che chiude il romanzo, dai suoi genitori, così come l'eroe omerico viene riconosciuto alla fine dell'*Odissea* da suo padre Laerte: e in questa occasione sarà determinante il particolare della macchia fisica sul volto della fanciulla, riconosciuta dal sacerdote Sisimitre a cui era stata affidata infante, un elemento che richiama ovviamente la famosa scena della cicatrice. Il modello omerico viene dunque amplificato, complicato e moltiplicato ad incastro: il travagliato ritorno di Odisseo ad Itaca, che comporta finzioni, travestimenti ed architettati riconoscimenti, si sdoppia nelle sorti di Calasiris, che ha scelto volontà-

⁵¹ Cfr. l'ampio materiale di W.B. STANFORD, *The Ulisses Theme* (Oxford 1963); e, per un'impostazione più problematica, P. BOITANI, *L'ombra di Ulisse. Figure di un mito* (Bologna 1992). La fortuna moderna di Achille non ha dimensioni paragonabili.

riamente l'esilio e che ritrova la patria e i figli poco prima di morire, e di Cariclea, che non conosce la sua vera patria ma che da segni divini comprende di dover raggiungere una meta lontana: le due storie intrecciate hanno in comune la tormentata progressione verso uno spazio familiare, sentito nei termini di un'utopica felicità.

Il fatto che Eliodoro sottoponga il romanzo greco a una riscrittura epica e filosofica, supportando inoltre la sua operazione con una scrittura densa e preziosa, non deve far dimenticare che ci troviamo all'interno di un genere non codificato e marginale, che ambienta i suoi intrecci in una quotidianità 'borghese', per quanto teatralizzata. Accade dunque che uno dei topoi più caratterizzanti dell'epica, la discesa agli Inferi, vera e propria prova dell'eroe che si ritrova anche in varie riscritture epiche del romanzo moderno, venga qui trasformata in una scena magica, la resurrezione di un morto (6, 15), spiata non a caso dai due personaggi che riproducono il modello di Odisseo, Calasiris e Cariclea, e che ascoltano così la profezia del topico lieto fine. La stessa profezia che abbiamo trovato all'interno del sogno di Odisseo da cui siamo partiti, ugualmente rivolta a Calasiris e Cariclea: esempio lampante di introiezione del modello omerico. Per quanto Eliodoro si muova molto più in un registro elevato, non è dunque immune dalla secolarizzazione del mito e dalla borghesizzazione dell'epica: fenomeni che daranno vita ai due romanzi latini di Ditti Cretese e di Darete Frigio sulla guerra di Troia.

Per formalizzare la differenza fra le due diverse ibridazioni con l'epica di Caritone e di Eliodoro, che pure rientrano nello stesso modello-base della nobilitazione, possiamo richiamarci ai *Palimpsesti* di Genette, e alla differenza fra intertestualità e ipertestualità: la prima riguarda scambi localizzati fra i testi (allusioni citazioni plagi), la seconda invece comporta un rapporto massiccio e organico.⁵² Il rapporto fra le *Etiopiche* e l'*Odissea* coin-

⁵² G. GENETTE, *Palimpsestes* (sopra, n.15), 7-9.

volge infatti la macrostruttura dell'opera: è una trasposizione dell'intreccio odissiaco in un altro quadro spazio-temporale, come avverrà varie altre volte nella storia letteraria, fino al caso limite di Joyce, in cui sono soprattutto gli indici paratestuali del titolo e dei nomi a segnalare il parallelismo (qui invece, come si è visto, è lo stesso Odisseo a farlo). Se a livello pragmatico sono molte le modifiche (a partire dal cambiamento di sesso del protagonista), a livello semantico il modello omerico è modernizzato ma non stravolto: l'epos dell'avventuroso ritorno in patria e della riunificazione coniugale è stato, per questo romanziere del IV d.C., la struttura più adatta a formalizzare una storia d'amore edificante, ricca di ideologia neopitagorica e neoplatonica, e a elevare e riscrivere un genere popolare e di intrattenimento.

La ricchissima ricezione moderna delle *Etiopiche*, che ha avuto luogo quasi esclusivamente fra il Cinque e il Seicento, quindi in un periodo segnato da un intenso dibattito teorico su epica e romanzo, ci dà una conferma della loro rigorosa epicizzazione, e quindi anche di una certa fluidità dei confini fra i due generi. Eliodoro è letto come un prototipo di narrazione chiusa e compatta, fondamentalmente fedele al dettato aristotelico e quindi opposta all'infinita digressività romanzesca. Le *Etiopiche* sono imitate e discusse dalla figura chiave in Italia di questo grande dibattito allo stesso tempo narratologico e ideologico, Torquato Tasso.⁵³ Convinto che il romanzo fosse solo una variante anomala dell'epos, Tasso fu ossessionato per tutta la sua vita dall'idea di una forma epica unitaria e organica, che razionalizzasse le spinte centrifughe provenienti dal poema romanzesco di Ariosto, basato sull'erranza e sulla molteplicità (spinte che comunque rimangono nella *Gerusalemme* come tentazione continua).

⁵³ Cfr. W. STEPHENS, "Tasso's Heliodorus and the World of Romance", in *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, ed. by J. TATUM (Baltimore and London 1994), 67-87. È interessante notare che un'altra figura del barocco italiano, Giambattista Basile, versificò le intere *Etiopiche* facendone un poema epico dal titolo *Teagene*, un'operazione in cui è chiara tutta la tensione fra epica e romanzo: cfr. C. BERTONI e M. FUSILLO, "Heliodorus Parthenopaeus. The *Aithiopika* in Baroque Naples", in *Studies in Heliodorus*, ed. by R. HUNTER (Cambridge 1998), 157-181.

Più in generale, in tutta l'Europa espansionistica della Contro-riforma il genere epico assume una forte valenza politica, contrapponendosi nettamente all'alterità delle eresie e delle popolazioni da sottomettere. Ecco dunque che la polarità fra epica e romanzo sussume dentro di sé una serie di altre polarità, come quella fra unità e varietà, ordine e disordine, Occidente e Oriente, ragione e furore dei sensi, e ancora una volta mascolinità e femminilità.⁵⁴ Letta attraverso Aristotele e modellata su Virgilio molto più che su Omero, l'epica rappresenta un'istanza repressiva e centralistica, che mira a incanalare la pericolosa devianza romanzesca (tre secoli dopo, la situazione tenderà a rovesciarsi).

Anche all'interno della fluviale produzione di romanzi barocchi, le *Etiopiche* fungono da modello di regolarità classica. Nella sua *Philosophia Antigua Poética* (1596) il trattatista López Pinchano, che influenzerà anche Cervantes, considera *tout court* Eliodoro il terzo poeta epico antico dopo Omero e Virgilio. Uno dei primi teorici del romanzo, Pierre-Daniel Huet, sottolinea, nel *Trattato sull'origine dei romanzi* (1670), la coerenza compositiva eliodorea, come aveva fatto anche uno dei più importanti romanzieri barocchi, George Scudery, all'interno di un suo scritto teorico, la prefazione a *Ibrahim* (1641), romanzo della sorella Madeleine.⁵⁵ Rispetto al carattere magmatico della narrazione barocca, il romanzo eroico-galante, chiamato anche eliodoreo per il suo modellarsi sulle *Etiopiche*, si distingue per una architettura compositiva più salda: anche in questo caso epicità equivale a chiusura.

Caritone ed Eliodoro rientrano dunque pienamente in quella continuità e in quell'interferenza fra epica e romanzo da cui siamo partiti nell'introduzione teorica: le loro due opere si presentano come filiazioni dirette dei due poemetti di Omero. Il che

⁵⁴ Cfr. D. QUINT, *Epic and Empire. Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton* (Princeton 1993).

⁵⁵ Cfr. A.K. FORCIONE, *Cervantes, Aristotle, and the Persiles* (Princeton 1970), 55-87.

non implica nessuna conseguenza genetica: non vogliamo con questo postulare una nascita del romanzo dall'epica, in quanto è la questione stessa della genesi di un genere letterario a suonare oggi poco interessante e irrimediabilmente positivista (come si sa, quasi tutti i generi dell'antichità classica hanno influenzato il romanzo, e sono stati quindi proposti come progenitori di una nuova forma). La situazione cambia notevolmente quando passiamo agli altri romanzi greci interamente tradiiti: se da un lato Senofonte Efesio non mostra un rapporto consistente e significativo con i modelli dell'epica (il che potrebbe derivare dallo stato di epitome in cui ci sarebbe giunto il testo, o più probabilmente da una scelta espressiva in favore della pura narratività),⁵⁶ dall'altro Achille Tazio e Longo Sofista propongono un nuovo modello di ibridazione: l'allusione ironica. È interessante notare come questo tipo di ripresa, circoscritta e meno strutturale, coinvolga una delle norme più caratterizzanti del genere romanzesco: la fedeltà e la castità della coppia protagonista, abitualmente eroicizzata ed epicizzata (soprattutto da Senofonte Efesio e da Eliodoro), e invece ironicamente abbassata (ma mai stravolta) nel *Leucippe e Clitofonte* e nel *Dafni e Cloe*, gli unici due romanzi in cui viene raccontato un tradimento da parte di un protagonista (il secondo matrimonio di Calliroe, nel romanzo di Caritone, ha invece un carattere assai diverso: è un expediente per salvare il figlio di Cherea, autorizzato dall'apparizione del suo stesso marito in sogno). Non a caso entrambi i romanzieri appartengono a quella che ho chiamato fase seconda del romanzo greco; una fase in cui il genere era già ampiamente sviluppato, e diventava a sua volta oggetto di operazioni intertestuali complesse: il pastiche ironico di Achille Tazio, la contaminazione con la poesia bucolica di Longo Sofista, la reinterpretazione filosofica di Eliodoro.

⁵⁶ Sulla questione dell'epitome si veda la sintesi di B. KYTZLER, "Xenophon of Ephesus", in *The Novel in Ancient World* (sopra, n.46), 348-50; trovo ancora convincente la confutazione sistematica della teoria dell'epitome di T. HÄGG, "Die *Ephesiaka* des Xenophon Ephesios — Original oder Epitome?", in *Classica et Mediaevalia* 27 (1966), 118-161.

Il rapporto del *Leucippe e Clitofonte* con il genere letterario in cui si inscrive è del tutto ambivalente: ne trasforma ironicamente le convenzioni, senza però sovertirle e senza quindi comprometterne il funzionamento. Questo si nota fin dalla fase iniziale del plot, dall'innamoramento, che non è una folgorazione violenta e reciproca, come negli altri romanzi greci (lo è in effetti solo dal lato maschile, quindi dal lato del narratore autodiegetico, altra innovazione di carattere tecnico),⁵⁷ ma si esplica in un lungo corteggiamento che culmina in un appuntamento notturno nella camera da letto di Leucippe. Siamo dunque in un contesto pienamente comico: non a caso è la figura di un servo, dal nome parlante Satiro, che architetta tutto il piano, eliminando l'ostacolo principale, lo schiavo Conope (altro nome parlante), versando del sonnifero nel vino. Portato a termine il suo piano, Satiro dice al padrone: "Κεῖται σοι καθεύδων ὁ Κύκλωψ· σὺ δὲ ὅπως Ὁδυσσεὺς ἀγαθὸς γένη" (2, 23, 2-3).⁵⁸ L'allusione è troppo generica per poter essere letta come un richiamo diretto all'epica: non si può escludere un riferimento anche ad altre rivisitazioni dell'episodio del Ciclope, da Euripide a Teocrito; insomma, più che di allusione, parlerei di antonomasia. Se dovessimo comunque rintracciare un rapporto alla lontana con l'archetipo omerico, non potremmo non riconoscere anche un netto scarto ironico fra l'espeditivo forse più famoso dell'Odisseo omerico, il simbolo della vittoria della sua μῆτις contro la mostruosità informe, e le astute manovre a scopo erotico di un servo molto plautino. C'è infatti in nuce quella tecnica di allusione ironica che è usata con maggiore ricchezza e raffinatezza da Longo Sofista. Come sempre in Achille Tazio, l'irrisione delle convenzioni alla fine rientra: la castità della coppia protagonista verrà infatti salvaguardata da un sogno premonitore che sveglia la madre della ragazza, mentre durante le peripezie del

⁵⁷ Non è forse un caso che il narratore-personaggio sia tipico della tradizione romanzesca comico-realista: lo pseudo-Luciano, Petronio, Apuleio, *Le storie vere*.

⁵⁸ Va ricordato comunque che Κύκλωψ è congettura di Göttling, per il trādito Κύκνωψ.

romanzo i due protagonisti si convertiranno all'ideale dell'astinenza prematrimoniale.

La ricca tessitura intertestuale del *Dafni e Cloe* è stata da lungo tempo ben indagata,⁵⁹ talvolta eccedendo nel cosiddetto 'conferrismo'. In particolare, per quanto riguarda i rapporti con l'epica, mi sembra interessante un'allusione su cui ha attirato l'attenzione Maria Pia Pattoni.⁶⁰ Si tratta dell'episodio chiave di Licenio, la donna raffinata proveniente dalla città che insegnava al giovane Dafni il sesso. Per liberarsi di Cloe e per appartarsì lontano con il protagonista, la donna inventa una storia a proposito delle proprie oche:

“σῶσόν με, εἶπε, Δάφνι, τὴν ἀθλίαν· ἐκ γάρ μοι τῶν χηνῶν τῶν εἴκοσιν ἔνα τὸν κάλλιστον ἀετὸς ἥρπασε, καὶ οὐα μέγα φορτίον ἀράμενος οὐκ ἡδυνήθη μετέωρος ἐπὶ τὴν συνήθη τὴν ὑψηλὴν κομίσαι ἐκείνην πέτραν, ἀλλ’ εἰς τὴν δύλην τὴν ταπεινὴν ἔχων κατέπεσε” (3, 16, 2).

È piuttosto immediato riconoscere in questo brano l'eco del famoso sogno di Penelope (*Od.* 19, 536-543), contaminato però con il presagio che appare a Telemaco in partenza da Sparta per Itaca (*Od.* 15, 160-178), esplicitamente interpretato da Elena come annuncio del ritorno e della vendetta di Odisseo: il primo passo è riecheggiato dal numero venti delle oche, il secondo invece dal particolare che l'aquila ne rapisce solo una. Longo trascrive il modello epico su un registro realistico, 'basso-mimético', che è già in parte il registro del secondo dei due brani omerici (in cui spicca la scenetta vivace dei contadini che inseguono l'aquila); da notare ad esempio l'insistenza con cui si pre-

⁵⁹ Fondamentale R.L. HUNTER, *A Study of Daphnis & Chloe* (Cambridge 1983).

⁶⁰ M.P. PATTONI, "I Pastoralia di Longo e la contaminazione dei generi. Alcune proposte interpretative", in *MD* 53 (2004), 83-123; poi ripreso in *I "Poimenika" di Longo e la contaminazione dei modelli*, Introduzione a Longo Sofista, *Dafni e Cloe* (Milano 2005), 7-117, in particolare 24-28; B. CZAPLA, "Literarische Lese-, Kunst- und Liebesmodelle. Eine intertextuelle Interpretation von Longos' Hirtenroman", in *A & A* 48 (2002), 36-37, sostiene invece un'interpretazione più allegorica: l'oca più bella sarebbe il marito di Licenio, l'aquila sarebbe Dafni.

cisa che l'aquila, a causa del forte carico,⁶¹ non è riuscita a volare in alto, ed è quindi scesa nel bosco: il particolare ha certo una funzione pragmatica, dato che è proprio nel bosco che Licenio vuole attirare Dafni; ma ha anche una funzione stilistica e inter-testuale: nonostante il loro carico, le due aquile dell'epica volano sempre molto in alto, mentre quella del romanzo si deve attenere alle leggi del verosimile; dagli spazi del sublime allo spazio del realismo, si potrebbe sintetizzare con una formula ad effetto. Ma lo scarto più significativo riguarda il personaggio intorno a cui ruota l'allusione: l'episodio di Licenio è infatti il momento in cui affiora in modo più lampante tutta la tensione di Longo fra l'idealizzazione bucolica e un latente voyeurismo urbano;⁶² ed è anche il luogo del testo in cui è messa in crisi l'idea di una naturalità del sesso, quasi suggerendo al contrario un suo carattere culturale (da qui partono infatti le letture in chiave gender di Winkler e di Zeitlin).⁶³ Proprio nel momento chiave in cui Longo incrina la convenzione romanzesca della coppia casta e fedele, anzi ne smonta gli stessi presupposti, l'allusione ci evoca la figura di Penelope, l'archetipo quindi della fedeltà coniugale a cui si ispira tutto il romanzo greco; la stessa figura che, come abbiamo visto, Caritone cita esplicitamente a proposito della sua eroina, e che Eliodoro fa intervenire nel sogno di Odisseo da cui siamo partiti. Se è vero che Licenio è un'anti-Penelope,

⁶¹ M.P. PATTONI, *I "Poimenika" di Longo...* (sopra, n.60), 21-22, nota come l'aggettivo μέγας sia trasferito dall'aquila al carico dell'oca nella trascrizione realistica di Longo, sulla falsariga del secondo passo omerico.

⁶² B. EFFE, "Longos. Zur Funktionsgeschichte der Bukolik in der römischen Kaiserzeit", in *Hermes* 110 (1982), 65-84; cfr. anche D.N. LEVIN, "The Pivotal Role of Lycaenion in Longus' Pastorals", in *RSC* 25 (1977), 5-17; secondo D. KONSTAN, *Sexual Symmetry. Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres* (Princeton 1994), 48, non sarebbe "sexual transgression" (come nemmeno il caso parallelo di Melite), perchè nel romanzo greco non c'è opposizione fra "love" e "lust", e ci sono scusanti singole.

⁶³ J.J. WINKLER, *The Constraints of Desire. The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece* (New York-London 1990), cap. 4; F.I. ZEITLIN, "The Poetics of Eros: Nature, Art, and Imitation in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*", in *Before Sexuality. The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, ed by D.M. HALPERIN, J.J. WINKLER, F.I. ZEITLIN (Princeton 1990), 417-464.

è anche vero d'altronde che, come in Achille Tazio, la trasgressione alla fine rientra: pur coperta da reticenza (come il bacio che Cloe riceve da Dorcone, altro rivale a cui sono destinate allusioni omeriche),⁶⁴ la lezione di Licenio è comunque funzionale al trionfo finale della coppia. L'allusione ironica, che Longo utilizza anche altre volte in relazione all'*Odissea* (ad esempio per l'innamoramento di Cloe che guarda Dafni farsi il bagno, in cui il richiamo è all'episodio di Nausicaa),⁶⁵ non stravolge infatti il modello e non compromette l'ideologia di fondo, ma resta sempre nei margini ampi ed ambigui dell'ambivalenza.

L'indagine sulla metamorfosi romanzesca dell'epica ci ha confermato innanzitutto che il romanzo greco non è un blocco monolitico e ripetitivo; ogni singolo romanziere possiede infatti le sue peculiari tecniche espressive: citazione testuale, antonomasia, allusione ironica, rifacimento ipertestuale. Ma soprattutto ci ha mostrato come queste tecniche siano sempre profondamente correlate con il piano tematico: il riuso dell'epica a fine di nobilitazione si trova infatti, pur con diverse configurazioni stilistiche, nei romanzieri che più esaltano ed eroicizzano la coppia e la sua fedeltà, Caritone ed Eliodoro; mentre l'allusione ironica ritorna nei romanzieri che incrinano la tenacia di un ideale in cui comunque rientrano, attraverso un avvicinamento all'universo quotidiano e basso-mimetico, che è poi l'universo del romanzo latino, con cui concludiamo.

Due secoli prima di Eliodoro la narrativa sentimentale greca era stata già oggetto di un'operazione intertestuale assai raffinata di segno del tutto opposto: un abbassamento parodico e non un'elevazione epica. Lo stato frammentario del *Satyricon* rende problematica la stessa definizione del genere letterario, anche se si è ormai imposta giustamente l'etichetta di romanzo, rispetto

⁶⁴ Tratte dalla *Dolonia*: cfr. M.P. PATTONI, *I "Poimenika" di Longo...* (sopra, n.60), 33-39.

⁶⁵ M.P. PATTONI, *I "Poimenika" di Longo ...* (sopra, n.60), 76-84; l'autrice discute nel resto del lavoro anche altre riprese omeriche, non tutte altrettanto significative, soprattutto riguardo la tecnica delle scene tipiche.

alla fortunata ma sfuggente categoria della satira menippea. Quel che possediamo è comunque sufficiente per riconoscervi il prototipo di un nuovo rapporto fra il romanzo e il grande codice epico, basato sulla nostalgia di un sublime perduto per sempre. Come è fin troppo noto, tutta la struttura narrativa del *Satyricon* sembra trascrivere in chiave grottesca l'archetipo dell'*Odissea*: la persecuzione di un dio, in questo caso il dio fallico Priapo, che costringe a un viaggio infinito. La ricchissima polifonia petroniana comporta comunque moltissimi altri echi e rifacimenti, comprese lunghe inserzioni in versi che sfruttano al massimo grado la scelta strategica di inserire un personaggio-poeta dal nome parlante come Eumolpo. L'inedita libertà strutturale creata dal *prosimetrum* permette anche una ampia varietà di registri stilistici, non sempre riconducibili alle tecniche dominanti della parodia e del grottesco: la problematica *Iliupersis*, ad esempio, è in fondo un saggio di poema epico.

Gian Biagio Conte⁶⁶ ha reinterpretato questo denso palinsesto secondo due nozioni base: il narratore mitomane e l'autore nascosto. Il primo è l'io narrante, Encolpio, uno *scholasticus* impregnato di cultura posticcia e di artificio retorico, che non riesce a distinguere la realtà dalla fantasia letteraria, e va sempre alla ricerca ossessiva di situazioni della letteratura sublime, e quindi soprattutto della tradizione epica. Il secondo elabora alle sue spalle una (subdola) strategia espressiva, intrappolandolo continuamente nelle sceneggiature triviali della narrativa di consumo del romanzo greco. A differenza degli scrittori satirici, Petronio non prende mai posizione, non impone la propria ideologia, quasi con una scelta di gusto *camp* ante litteram. Ma è proprio da questa divaricazione fra il sublime epico ormai improponibile, e il viaggio poliedrico nei linguaggi della quotidianità e della corporeità, che nasce una nuova forma di nar-

⁶⁶ G.B. CONTE, *L'autore nascosto. Un'interpretazione del 'Satyricon'* (Bologna 1997), apparso in contemporanea come *The Hidden Author* (Berkeley 1996). Da vedere anche il saggio classico di R. HEINZE, "Petron und der griechische Roman", in *Hermes* 34 (1899), 494-519.

tiva, per la quale vale ancora il termine ‘realismo’, nonostante la sua problematica genericità. L’idea di un personaggio che non distingue tra fantasia letteraria e realtà preannuncia infatti un grande mito della modernità — in cui si individua di solito la nascita del romanzo moderno: il *Don Chisciotte*; mentre la mistione di degradazione parodica e di riflessione metalinguistica anticipa il *Joseph Andrews* di Fielding e il metaromanzo di Sterne.

La degradazione parodica degli archetipi epici è evidente soprattutto nell’uso petroniano della tecnica intertestuale da cui siamo partiti a proposito di Caritone: la citazione. Dal punto di vista delle modalità espressive, la differenza fra le citazioni del romanzo erotico greco e quelle di Petronio richiama la differenza fra *κόλλησις* e *παρωδία* delineata da Ermogene in *Sui metodi dello stile forte* (*Meth.* 30): nella prima il verso si integra nella sua totalità nel nuovo contesto; nella seconda è invece modificato, amplificato e interpolato con parafrasi. Sul piano tematico si nota in Petronio una forte dissonanza fra i contesti: le sue citazioni richiamano da vicino l’uso trasgressivo e dinamico di un altro autore menippeo come Luciano,⁶⁷ o di altri romanzi perduti come quello di Iolao. Il caso limite è il passo in cui un centone di versi virgiliani, che riguardano soprattutto un momento sublime per eccellenza come il reincontro fra Enea e Didone, viene applicato al membro di Encolpio e ai suoi problemi di impotenza (*Aen.* 6, 469-470; *Ecl.* 5,16; *Aen.* 9, 436, in §132,11). Un uso molto simile si trova anche nell’episodio in cui più si percepiscono le tematiche bachtiniane, i vicinati paradossali fra sesso, morte e cibo, il rovesciamento del tragico in comico, e della morte in forza vitale: ovviamente la *Matrona di Efeso*.⁶⁸ Anche in questo caso i versi virgiliani dell’episodio di

⁶⁷ Cfr. M. FUSILLO, “La citazione menippea (sondaggi su Luciano)”, in *Come dice il poeta.... Percorsi di parole poetiche greche e latine* (Napoli 1992), 21-42; uso il termine menippeo nel senso della linea transculturale delineata da Bachtin, e legata al basso e al grottesco, e non nel senso ristretto di un genere letterario sfuggente come la satira menippea.

⁶⁸ Questa è l’interpretazione dominante (e secondo me anche abbastanza evidente): W. ARROWSMITH, “Luxury and Death in the *Satyricon*”, in *Arion* 5 (1966),

Didone (capolavoro di eros tragico) sono stravolti ed applicati a un rapido superamento della memoria di vedova, e a una eccezionale rivitalizzazione. Come sintetizza Daniel McGlathery, che ha letto in chiave bachtiniana tutto l'episodio: "The crossfertilization inherent in Petronius' comic parody of various genres thus results in a new, tospy-turvy literary portrayal of human life. The tomb of the epic becomes the womb of the novel".⁶⁹ La tomba dell'epica diventa il grembo del romanzo: frase molto efficace (anche se l'effetto si perde in traduzione) per sintetizzare solo uno dei tre rapporti fra epica e romanzo che l'antichità ci trasmette. La perdita dell'epica è infatti il presupposto per la narrativa comico-realistica e per tutto il romanzo moderno in senso bachtiniano; ma coesiste con l'omaggio nobilitante di Caritone e di Eliodoro e con la distanza ironica di Achille Tazio e Longo Sofista: a conferma che fra i due generi non ci sarà mai un confine netto.

304-331; E. SEGAL, "Laughter in the House", in *Horizon* 15 (1973), 90-93; M. BACHTIN, *Voprosy literatury...* (sopra, n.6), 3.8 (trad. it. 369-372); C.W. MÜLLER, "Die Witwe von Ephesus. Petrons Novelle und die "Milesiaka" des Aristeides", in *A & A* 26 (1980), 103-121; D.B. McGLATHERY, "Petronius' Tale of the Widow of Ephesus and Bakhtin's Material Bodily Lower Stratum", in *Aretusa* 31 (1998), 313-336; al contrario, R. HERZOG, "Fest, Terror und Tod in Petrons *Satyrica*", in *Das Fest, Poetik und Hermeneutik* 14 (München 1989), 133-136, ritiene che alla fine predomini la morte (giungendo all'idea del tutto infondata che i due non escano più dalla tomba per paura della punizione del soldato); infine, G. HUBER, *Das Motiv der "Witwe von Ephesus" in lateinischen Texten der Antike und des Mittelalters* (Tübingen 1990), 12-56, e M. PLAZA, *Laughter and Derision in Petronius' Satyrica. A Literary Study* (Stockholm 2000), 180-186, difendono un'interpretazione aperta, secondo cui Petronio lascerebbe al lettore la valutazione morale, limitandosi a relativizzare i valori suggeriti dal racconto.

⁶⁹ D.B. McGLATHERY, "Petronius' Tale of the Widow of Ephesus..." (sopra, n.68), 332.

DISCUSSION

G. Danek : Das finnische Kalevala steht in der Tradition der 'gelehrten' Kompilation von nationalen Volksliedern zu einem kohärenten Corpus, beginnend mit Ossian und dem Corpus der Serbischen Volksepik (Vuk Karadžić). 'Epos' wird zu dieser Zeit (Präromantik/Romantik) aufgefasst als eine Einheit, die nur potentiell, quasi als platonische Idee, im Volksgeist existiert und von einem Kompilator/Sammler/Dichter zusammengefügt werden muss, so wie man sich zu dieser Zeit die Geschichte der Homerischen Texte (Peisistratische Rezension) vorstellt. 'Epos' ist nach dieser Vorstellung eine Gattung, für die Fragmentation konstitutiv ist.

M. Fusillo : Mit Wolf hat man in Europa angefangen, die Epik als fragmentarische Gattung zu betrachten. Das hat auch die Beziehung zwischen Epos und Roman völlig geändert. Das Kalevala ist ein sehr interessantes Beispiel der Rückkehr des Epos in der Romantik.

E.J. Bakker : You have said many pertinent things on the way the novel as a genre situates itself *vis-à-vis* epic. But to what extent are the works we have typical of the genre? Wouldn't there be also a process whereby certain novels drive to oppose themselves and offer what was not according to the 'horizon of expectations' of the audience? Do we see differences between the degree to which our extant novels allow the 'hybridization' you talk about?

M. Fusillo : Your question involves one of the most delicate and thorny problems of method in analyzing literary genres. We are always tempted by seeing the matter in terms of norms and

transgressions, which is actually nowadays a too simplistic way, too much linked to the romantic idea of originality.

As you brilliantly write in your paper, it is a common mistake to impose a transcendental generic norm on the single texts. Regarding the Greek novel, I think that the so-called 'zero-degree' — to use an old-fashioned concept — can be represented by Xenophon of Ephesus. All the other novelists, especially in the second phase, seem to be extremely self-conscious about the conventions of their genre, and are able to play with the expectations of their public (for example Achilles Tatius regarding the convention of fidelity).

P. Chuvin : N'y a-t-il pas aussi une forme de dépendance de l'épopée par rapport au roman? Je pense à deux poèmes tardifs, en hexamètres, les *Dionysiaques* et *Héro et Léandre*. Dans les *Dionysiaques*, les conseils de séduction de Satyros chez Achille Tatios semblent bien trouver un écho au chant IV; les procédés de l'éloge de Tyr (énumération de voisinages paradoxaux, qui va en s'accélérant) sont identiques chez les deux auteurs. Ces liens pourraient-ils s'expliquer par une certaine ironie commune aux deux auteurs? Pour *Héro et Léandre*, leur histoire est l'inverse du schéma romanesque habituel: leur union physique intervient sans retard après leur rencontre; en revanche, la mort les sépare à la fin du poème (les contes syriaques qui reprennent la légende ont rétabli le *happy end*).

M. Fusillo : A mon avis, il est intéressant de noter qu'Achille Tatios pouvait être lu comme poète épique et comme auteur édifiant, surtout à l'époque byzantine, bien qu'il se montre plus libre sur le chapitre de la morale sexuelle. Naturellement, ce qui l'apparente à Nonnos, c'est l'ironie.

L'histoire de *Héro et Léandre*, comme à l'âge moderne celle de *Roméo et Juliette*, a beaucoup de points communs avec le schéma romanesque, si ce n'est sa fin tragique.

M. Fantuzzi : You have pointed to the *Argonautica* of Apollonius as an important moment in the history of the destabi-

lization of the epic code of narration, and indeed much recent work has been devoted to Apollonius' treatment of the hero in a way which is 'dialogical' with, if not polemical to the archaic epic ideal. On the contrary Theocritus hardly found any Bachtinian reader. But, would you not think that Theocritus' 'promotion to literature' of a new narrative world of 'humble' heroes and situations of the urban or rural environments is in a way another substantial 'pre-novel' alternative to the Homeric epic? — I mean is it not a coherent and dignified description of 'humble' life which most often activates a 'dialogue' with the sublimity of the epic codes, and is much closer than the *Argonautica* to the everyday register of the novel? Far from me any historical fondness for inquiring about the pre-historical origins of the novel. I am rather wondering: could Longus be aware of this very precedent, when he elaborated the poetics of his pastoral novel?

M. Fusillo : I completely agree with you. On one hand the concept of anti-heroism in the *Argonautica* is now very controversial, and surely the stylistic level of this poem is exclusively high and sublime; on the other hand Theocritus' more 'contaminated' language and his thematic preference for humble life seemed definitively pre-novelistic.

Chr. Tsagalis : Is it possible to argue that one of these novels played later on the role of a 'reference-text' as the most representative of this genre (in the manner of the Homeric epics)?

M. Fusillo : Surprisingly no ancient novel became canonical. Heliodorus could have been the reference text of a long lasting and flourishing genre, but on the contrary it has been only the fascinating, culminating point of a genre that lasted few centuries.

G. Danek : Die erhaltenen fünf griechischen Romane sind eine gezielte Auswahl aus byzantinischer Zeit nach ästhetischen

und moralischen Kriterien, bilden also nur einen schmalen Ausschnitt aus der tatsächlichen Produktion. Vor dem Hintergrund der Fragmente der nicht erhaltenen Romane ist die Ausnahmestellung Heliodors noch auffälliger.

M. Fusillo : Die byzantinische Wahl nach ästhetischen Kriterien hat wohl die fünf besten Romane getroffen, vor allem wenn man sie mit den Fragmenten aus dem sprachlichen Standpunkt vergleicht. Im Gegensatz dazu hat die Wahl nach moralischen Kriterien leider die komische, groteske, 'petronianische' Linie des griechischen Romans völlig ausgeschlossen.

Wir haben in den Zitaten nun wieder die Tradition, durch die Sonderheit des Wissenswerten, die spätere Fortbildung weitergehen. Das ist bestimmt nicht ohne einen Kontakt zwischen einem traditionellen Erzählerlicher Pfeilgong und einer Spur eines Mühelosigkeit zu erkennen wechselnden Themen der Nahrung ab ein lebendes Erzählen von konträren Themen miteinander.

Gerry Stark hat im Hinblick der zeitlichen Entwicklung der Rezeption zwischen Originalen und Textfragmenten der kriegerischen Thematik in konkreten Beziehungen und Abstand davor und von Einzelheit erfasst, dass diese Beziehungen, wenn man sie so sagen will, keinem Zweck dienen, also für keinerlei andere Zweck als Herabdrückung und Unterordnung für gewöhnlich fast die Referenzstellen sich nicht mehr in den Beziehungen auf das Konzept der Realität und soziale Aufgabe beziehen und dass es sich hierbei um Ersatzdramen handelt, in denen die gesamte Welt des Wissens der Tradition entsteht und wiederum eben nicht auf so manche Qualitätsschwäche zwischen beiden Geschichten von den Autoren herunter gesehen wird zu wissen.

Christina Liseppi hat uns die Unterschiede zwischen These und These, aber auch die methodologischen Differenzen zwischen Theorie und Praxis der Romanistik von Autoren erläutert und

SCHLUSSBETRACHTUNGEN

Wir sind am Ende unserer sehr ertragsreichen, glaube ich, *Entretiens* angelangt. Das Thema "Die archaische Epik: Metamorphosen einer literarischen Gattung" hat uns die Gelegenheit gegeben, der Präsenz des Epos in den bedeutendsten literarischen Gattungen der griechischen Literatur über eine Zeitspanne von fast einem Jahrtausend nachzugehen.

Mit Egbert Bakkers *Homeric Epic between Feasting and Fasting* haben wir uns den Anfängen der epischen Gattung genähert. Wir haben einen Zugang zum Wesen des Epischen durch die Semantik des Wortes *epos* in der epischen Dichtung selbst gefunden, die Selbstreflexivität der *Odyssee* als einen Dialog zwischen einem traditionellen Epos iliadischer Prägung und einer Shamenenerzählung zu erklären versucht und das Thema der Nahrung als ein beide Grossen typisierendes Thema näher betrachtet.

Georg Danek hat am Beispiel der epischen Gleichnisse die Spannung zwischen Originalität und Tradition in der homerischen Dichtung zu definieren versucht und einem alten und seit Fränkel vielbehandelten Thema überraschend neue Erkenntnisse abgewonnen. Er konnte zeigen, dass für Homer, der die höchste Entwicklungsstufe eines mündlichen Sängers erreicht hat, die Referenzialität sich nicht mehr in der Bezugnahme auf das Corpus der ihm und seinem Publikum bekannten traditionellen Erzählungen erschöpft, sondern dass sein eigenes Werk den Status der Tradition erreicht hat und dass er also in der Lage ist, multiple Querbeziehungen zwischen seinen Gleichnissen wie ein Netz über sein gesamtes Werk zu spinnen.

Christos Tsagalis hat uns die Unterschiede zwischen Hesiod und Homer, aber auch die intrahesiodischen Differenzen, zwischen *Theogonie* und *Erga kai Hemerai* vor Augen geführt, und

zwar durch eine Analyse der unterschiedlichen Erzählerfigur, der unterschiedlichen Konstituierung eines internen Publikums, der Metaphern für Dichter und Dichtung und der Inszenierung der Rivalität zwischen epischen Gedichten.

Marco Fantuzzi hat in *Rhesus* die posthomerische/zyklische Behandlungsweise des Trojageschehens und zugleich die kunstvolle intertextuelle Strategie gezeigt, die hauptsächlich der Dramatisierung der epischen Formen der zugrunde liegenden Texte der *Ilias* und des epischen Kyklos dient. Gleichzeitig hat Fantuzzi den Beweis erbracht, dass der nicht-epische, genuin tragische Teil des *Rhesus* umgekehrt einer radikalen Episierung unterzogen wurde.

In meinem Beitrag habe ich versucht, einige Erzähltechniken epischen Ursprungs in der griechischen Historiographie zu beschreiben, vor allem die verschiedenen Mittel der Zeitgestaltung und der Erzeugung und Aufrechterhaltung von Spannung, und somit eine Antwort auf die Frage zu liefern, wie Herodot und unmittelbar nach ihm Thukydides eine multisubjektive, sich auf einen langen Zeitraum erstreckende und eine grosse Zahl von handelnden Personen umfassende Erzählung zu strukturieren vermochten.

Alexander Sens hat uns zunächst mit der Tradition der epischen Parodie (Krates, Matro etc.) vertraut gemacht, und dann insbesondere das genuin hellenistische Streben der *Batrachomyomachia* nach *variatio* vor Augen geführt. Der Dichter der *Batrachomyomachia* erweist sich in seiner komplexen Strategie der Anspielungen auf kanonische epische Texte, in der Vermeidung der wörtlichen Wiederholung von homerischen Versen oder Halbversen und in der Kontamination mehrerer Modelle zur Erzeugung von Parodie ein den Hauptvertretern der hellenistischen Dichtung ebenbürtiger Literat.

Pierre Chувин hat uns die subtile, an Überraschungen reiche Aufbautechnik der *Dionysiaka* des Nonnos und seine Kunst der *variatio* gezeigt, aber auch die Art wie der spätantike Epiker durch das Mittel der Ironie seinen epischen Helden, Dionysos, systematisch dekonstruiert. Gleichzeitig bietet Nonnos am Aus-

klang der Antike das Panorama einer Welt, das ihre Anfänge in Homer hat.

Schliesslich ist Massimo Fusillo in einer glücklichen Ringkomposition auf die Definition der Epik, diesmal kontrapunktisch zum Roman, zurückgekehrt. Er hat die Filiation Epos — Roman umrissen und die Interferenz zwischen beiden Gattungen aufgezeigt. Durch den Begriff der Hybridisierung charakterisiert er drei verschiedene Metamorphosen der Gattung Epos in Richtung Roman, die Parodie, die ironische Anspielung und die Veredelung, exemplifiziert durch die Werke Heliodors, Achilles Tatius und Longus bzw. Charitons.

Es bleibt der Fondation Hardt und allen ihren Mitarbeitern, besonders Monica Brunner, für diese schönen Tage in Vandœuvres und für ihre Gastfreundschaft zu danken, auch Franco Montanari, der diese Entretiens mitorganisiert hat, und vor allem allen Teilnehmern, dafür, dass sie den Erfolg der *Entretiens* durch ihren Einsatz und das hohe Niveau aller Beiträge ermöglicht haben.

Antonios RENGAKOS

INDEX

A. INDEX LOCORUM

- A**chilles Tatius: 212, 296, 297, 300, 303, 305.
Leucippe et Clitophon : 296, 297, 306, 307, 2, 23, 2-3: 297.
Adespota parodica :
Fr. 3 Olson-Sens (= Fr.incert. I Brandt): 220.
Frr. 4-5 Olson-Sens (= Frr.incert. II-III Brandt): 220.
Aeschylus: 141, 143, 169-171.
Ag. 90: 237.
Ag. 685: 96.
Cares sive Europa, *TrGF* III F 99-101: 141-145, 170.
F **99: 143.
Memnon: 141-143.
Myrmidones: 142.
Nereides : 142.
Pers.: 142, 143.
Phryges: 142.
Prometheus Lyomenos, *TrGF* III F 190-192: 142.
Psychostasia: 141-143, 169, 170.
Semele sive Hydrophoroi: 163.
Suppl.: 142.
1007: 63.
Xantriai: 163.
Aethiopis: 136-139, 143, 145-147, 177.
Alcaeus, comicus, *Callisto*, *PCG* II pp.8-9, F 17-18: 169.
Alexander Aetolus, tragicus et lyricus: 220, 221.
Fr. 5, 5-8 Magnelli: 220, 227.
Alexis, comicus:
Fr. 167: 225.
Fr. 262: 220.
Amphis, comicus, *PCG* II p.234, F 46: 168, 169.
Anacreon Teius, lyricus:
PMG 376: 104.
PMG 378: 104.
Anacreonta, Fr. 28, 9 West: 230.
Anthologia Palatina :
7, 407 (Dioscorides): 43.
9, 506 ('Plato'): 43.
Antiphanes, comicus, Fr. 225: 225.
Apollonius Rhodius: 63, 64, 73-75, 131, 232, 246, 248, 263, 270, 306.
Argonautica: 74, 263, 270, 282, 305, 306.
2, 662-670: 64.
2, 670: 64.
3, 409-412: 63, 74, 75.
3, 412: 63.
Appianus, *BCiv.* 4, 10, 78-79: 145.
Apuleius Madaurensis, Lucius: 289, 297.
Arachnomachia (a Homero?): 218.
Archestratus Gelensis, parodius: 112, 247, 248.
Fr. 60, 13-16 Olson-Sens: 225.
Hedypatheia: 219.
Archilochus:
Fr. 223 West: 101.
Fr. 303 West: 215.

- Argonautica*: 16.
Aristarchus: 74.
Aristeas Proconnensis, epicus: 19.
Aristophanes: 288.
Av. 685 sqq.: 237.
Nub. 622: 142.
Ran. 962-963: 141.
Aristoteles: 162, 164, 295.
HA 5,17, 549 b 26: 73.
HA 8,17, 600 b 20 ff.: 73.
Po. : 162.
2, 1448 a 13: 216.
4, 1448 b 34: 215.
4, 1448 b 38-1449 a 2: 215.
9: 210.
15, 1454 a 37-b 7: 162.
23, 1459 b 6: 140.
Astydamas iunior, tragicus:
Achilleus: 170.
Hector: 144, 170.
TrGF I 60 F **1h & i: 170.
Athenaeus:
1, 5 a-b: 219.
15, 698 a: 224.
- B**acchylides: 109.
Fr. 208B 3-5: 104.
Batrachomyomachia: 216, 218, 224, 227-229, 231-235, 239, 241, 242, 244-248.
3: 217.
10: 222, 235.
10-11: 235.
11-12: 241, 242.
12: 217, 241-243.
13: 242, 243.
16: 231.
17: 241.
25-26: 235, 236.
26: 236-238, 246.
33-55: 224, 225.
34: 226.
36-37: 227.
- 42-52: 224.
62: 236.
64: 239, 240.
78-81: 217.
91-92: 240.
106: 231.
116-118: 217.
152: 228.
156: 232, 245, 246.
180: 217.
204: 229, 230.
205: 228, 229.
207: 230.
207-208: 233.
212: 241.
214: 230.
228: 232.
228-229: 232.
229: 232.
231: 229.
240: 231.
242: 229.
247-254: 234.
248-249: 234.
269: 228.
272: 228.
- Bion Smyrnaeus, bucolicus*, Fr. 16 Reed: 243.
[Bion] 2 (*Epithalamium Achillis et Deidameiae*), 1-3: 243.
Boeotus Syracusanus, parodius: 220, 221.
- C**allimachus: 215-217, 241, 248.
Aetia: 217.
Fr. 1, 29-30 Pfeiffer: 101.
Carcinus iunior, tragicus, Achilleus (*TrGF I* 70 F 1d): 170.
Centones Homeri: 246.
Centones Vergilii: 302.
Chaeremon, tragicus, Achilleus Therritoctonus, *TrGF I* 71 F *1b: 136.
Chanson de Roland : 281.

- Chariton, scriptor eroticus: 277, 284-287, 289, 293, 295, 296, 299, 300, 302, 303.
De Chaerea et Callirhoe: 277, 285, 287, 288, 296, 306, 307.
 1, 4, 6: 286.
 2, 9, 6: 286.
 3, 2, 17: 212.
 5, 2, 4: 286.
 5, 5, 9: 288.
 5, 10, 9: 287.
 7, 3, 5: 288.
 7, 4, 3: 288.
 7, 4, 6: 288.
- Cleophon Atheniensis, tragicus, *Achilleus* (*TrGF I* 77): 170.
- Crates Thébanus, poeta philosophus: 219-223, 226, 227, 247, 248.
Supplm. Hellen. 351: 220-223.
 351, 3-7: 221.
Supplm. Hellen. 359: 223, 248.
 359, 4: 247.
 359, 11: 247.
- Cratinus comicus, Fr. 368 Kassel-Austin: 215, 220.
- Cypria* : 140.
 §22 Kullmann (= ll.120-122 Severyns): 62.
- D**ares Phrygius: 293.
 Demetrius Phalereus: 289.
Eloc. 112-113: 285.
 150: 285.
 Dictys Cretensis: 293.
 Dionysius Chalcus, elegiacus: 112.
 Dionysius, Syracusanorum tyrannus, *Hectoris Loutra* : 170.
 Dioscorides Alexandrinus, epigrammaticus: cf. *Anthol. Palat.*
- E**mpedocles: 35, 112.
 Euaretus, tragicus, *Achilleus* (*TrGF I* 85): 170.
- Euboeus Parius, parodius: 218, 221, 224.
 Euenus Parius, elegiacus: 37.
 Eunapius Sardianus, *Vitae sophistarum* 7, 2, p.475 Boissonade: 264.
 Euphorion, Aeschyli filius: 142.
 Euripides: 146, 170, 277.
Alc. : 146.
Cycl. : 297.
 581 sqq.: 169.
HF: 160, 163.
 815-873: 163.
Hipp. : 160.
Iph.A.: 142.
Phoen. : 146, 292.
 1703-1707: 146.
Tro. : 146.
- [Euripides], *Rhesus*: 135, 136, 140, 144-152, 154, 158-164, 166-168, 170, 177, 179-182.
 1: 155.
 1-7: 156.
 1-263: 135, 144.
 5: 156.
 5-6: 155.
 7-8: 149.
 17-18: 155.
 28-29: 150.
 37: 155.
 52: 155.
 80: 155.
 105-108: 151.
 263: 153.
 264-316: 178.
 264-341: 153.
 276-277: 141.
 290-291: 141.
 301-308: 141.
 336-337: 153.
 388-527: 178.
 406-412: 153.
 418-419: 153.

447-450: 154.
 527-564: 155.
 528-533: 156.
 556-562: 155.
 565: 156, 158.
 567: 158.
 569: 157, 158.
 573: 153.
 574-581: 157.
 575: 153, 157.
 575-579: 158.
 585-586: 158, 159.
 585-590: 159.
 591-593: 153.
 591-594: 158.
 595-598: 159.
 595-607: 160.
 598-605: 154.
 600-604: 154.
 608-609a: 179.
 608-610: 164.
 609: 164.
 609b-610: 178, 179.
 613: 158.
 616-617: 158.
 621: 158.
 627-635: 160.
 633: 167.
 634-637: 167.
 637-674: 160, 165.
 756-803: 144.
 780-788: 144.
 784: 158.
 797: 158.
 863-866: 153.
 962-973: 144, 145.
 974-975: 147.
 974-979: 145, 146, 177.
 978-979: 147.
Cod. Vatic. Gr. 909: 149.

Geranomachia: 218.
Gilgamesh: 34, 277.

[Gregorius Nazianzenus,] *Christus patiens* : 269.

Hecataeus Milesius: 184.
 Hegemon Thasius, parodius: 215, 219.
Deipnon: 220.
 Heliodorus: 272, 276, 280, 284, 286, 289-296, 299, 300, 303, 306, 307.
Aethiopica : 271-273, 279, 289-295, 306, 307.
 2, 13: 212.
 3, 14-15: 291.
 5, 4 sqq.: 212.
 5, 22, 2-3: 272, 284.
 6, 15: 293.
 6, *ad finem* : 292.
 7, 7-8: 292.
 Hermesianax Colophonius, elegiacus, Fr. 1 p.96 Powell: 243.
 Hermippus Atheniensis, comicus, Fr. 63: 219, 223.
 Hermogenes Tarsensis:
Id. 2, 4: 285.
Meth. 30: 302.
 Herodotus: 3, 184-189, 192-214.
Historiae: 186, 199, 207-210, 212.
 1: 208, 210, 211.
 1, 5: 210.
 2, 116, 3: 3.
 4: 209.
 4, 13: 19.
 4, 25-27: 19.
 4, 29: 3.
 5: 208, 210, 211.
 6: 186, 208, 210.
 7: 192, 193, 195, 197, 202, 203, 206.
 7-9: 187, 189, 192, 194, 199, 202, 208-211.
 7, 1-137: 189.

- 7, 1-138: 192.
 7, 1,2: 195.
 7, 5,1: 193.
 7, 5,2-6: 194.
 7, 8: 203.
 7, 8,1: 203, 206.
 7, 8,1 sqq.: 203.
 7, 8 a-d 2: 193.
 7, 8,2: 203.
 7, 9: 193, 203.
 7, 9,2: 204.
 7, 10: 193, 204.
 7, 10,1 sqq.: 204.
 7, 10,2: 205.
 7, 10,3: 204.
 7, 11: 193.
 7, 12,1-2: 194.
 7, 12-19: 193.
 7, 13: 194.
 7, 14: 194.
 7, 15-18: 194.
 7, 18,3: 206.
 7, 19: 206.
 7, 19,2-25: 195.
 7, 20,2-21: 193, 195.
 7, 22-25: 193, 195.
 7, 34-37,1: 195.
 7, 37,2 sq.: 206.
 7, 41: 195.
 7, 42,2: 204, 205.
 7, 43,1: 197.
 7, 43,2: 205.
 7, 46-52: 193.
 7, 49,2: 205.
 7, 50,3: 207.
 7, 50,4: 203.
 7, 54-55: 193.
 7, 54,2: 203.
 7, 57,1 sq.: 206, 207.
 7, 58,3: 197.
 7, 59,2-99: 193, 195.
 7, 101-104: 193.
 7, 101,2: 206.
 7, 102,2 sq.: 206.
 7, 108,1: 196.
 7, 109,2: 197.
 7, 110: 196.
 7, 115,2: 196.
 7, 118-120: 196.
 7, 127,1: 196.
 7, 127,2: 197.
 7, 128-130: 196.
 7, 132 sqq.: 200.
 7, 137,3: 213.
 7, 138 sqq.: 197.
 7, 138-178: 189.
 7, 138,2: 199.
 7, 145,1 sqq.: 197, 198.
 7, 145,2: 198.
 7, 146,1: 198, 204.
 7, 146-147: 196, 198.
 7, 147,2: 198.
 7, 148-152: 198.
 7, 148-171: 198.
 7, 156,3: 199.
 7, 157,2: 199.
 7, 158,4: 199.
 7, 163,1: 199.
 7, 168,2: 199.
 7, 173,2: 199.
 7, 173,3-4: 200.
 7, 173,4: 200.
 7, 178,1: 200.
 7, 178,2: 200.
 7, 179 sqq.: 200.
 7, 179-239: 189.
 7, 183,1: 200.
 7, 184-187: 196.
 7, 187,1: 197.
 7, 188,1 sqq.: 206.
 7, 196: 196.
 7, 196,2: 197.
 7, 207: 200.
 7, 210,2: 203.
 7, 211,3: 203, 204.
 7, 222: 206.

- 8, 1-25: 189.
 8, 4,1: 200.
 8, 6,2: 196, 200.
 8, 10,1-2: 196, 197.
 8, 18: 201.
 8, 23: 189.
 8, 23,1: 201.
 8, 26,3: 205.
 8, 38: 205.
 8, 56,1: 201.
 8, 68: 204.
 8, 70,2: 201.
 8, 73: 189.
 8, 73,3: 198.
 8, 74,1: 201.
 8, 75,1-2: 201.
 8, 84,2: 202.
 8, 88,3: 204.
 8, 97: 205.
 8, 107,1: 205.
 8, 108,2: 205.
 8, 115: 206.
 9, 46,1: 202.
 9, 48,2: 202.
 9, 56,2: 202.
 9, 58,2: 202.
 9, 92,3: 204.
- [Herodotus.] *Vita Homeri* : 110.
 1-3: 110.
 24, p.207 Allen: 218.
- Hesiodus: 79, 82, 88, 93, 95, 96,
 99, 101, 103, 107, 110-116,
 119-121, 123, 124, 126-129,
 131-133, 184, 218, 227-229,
 233.
- Fragmenta:*
- Fr. 75,19 Merkelbach-West
 $(Ehoiai)$: 123.
 - Fr. 195, 45 M.-W. (*Ehoiai*) (=
 $Scut.$ 45): 240, 241.
 - Fr. 283 M.-W.: 240.
- Opera et dies*: 79, 81, 87, 93, 95,
 97, 100-102, 105, 107, 108,
- 110-113, 115, 119, 122, 124-
 134.
 1: 101.
 1-2: 86.
 1-10: 86, 87, 101.
 5: 120.
 6: 101, 120.
 7: 101.
 9-10: 86.
 20-26: 105.
 27: 100.
 61: 126.
 67: 126.
 73-74: 126.
 78: 126.
 154-155: 233.
 274-278: 238.
 277: 238.
 286: 100.
 299: 101.
 349-350: 100.
 383-384: 95.
 383-404: 95.
 383-617: 95.
 387: 95.
 388: 96.
 394: 96, 101.
 396-397: 96, 100.
 401-600: 98-102.
 403: 96.
 404: 99.
 409: 101.
 415-416: 100.
 421-430: 98.
 422: 99.
 422-436: 98.
 423: 98.
 424: 98.
 427: 99.
 431: 98.
 448: 100.
 448-452: 102.
 456: 100.

- 456-457: 100.
 465: 100.
 474: 100.
 483: 100.
 486-490: 102.
 488: 100.
 565: 100.
 575: 101.
 582: 101.
 582-584: 101, 102.
 582-596: 102.
 583: 101, 104.
 593: 101.
 618: 104, 120.
 618-645: 103.
 618-694: 103, 109, 120-124,
 129.
 624-628: 104.
 624-629: 105.
 628: 104.
 631-632: 123.
 631-662: 103.
 632: 123.
 633: 100.
 641-642: 104.
 642-643: 107.
 646-662: 103, 105, 106.
 648: 96, 104, 111, 120.
 649: 104.
 654-655: 107.
 655-656: 107.
 656-659: 100, 108, 109.
 657: 103, 110.
 659: 101, 104.
 660: 104, 111.
 663-694: 103.
 694: 96.
- Scutum:*
 45: 239, 240.
 107: 123.
- Theogonia:* 80-82, 84-88, 90-92,
 94, 95, 105, 110, 112, 114-
 119, 124-130, 132-134.
- 1: 81, 82.
 1-115: 81, 84, 86, 87.
 2-21: 83.
 3-4: 81.
 22-33: 85.
 24-29: 83, 84.
 25: 82, 84.
 26: 84.
 26-28: 83.
 27: 84, 85.
 27-28: 133.
 28: 84.
 29: 84.
 30-34: 83.
 36-52: 83.
 45: 83.
 46: 83.
 47: 83.
 48: 83.
 50: 83.
 52: 82.
 144-145: 89.
 263-264: 92.
 362-363: 92, 93.
 369-370: 93.
 413: 120.
 414: 114.
 418: 114.
 419: 120.
 435-438: 120.
 438: 120.
 440: 120.
 442: 120.
 443: 120.
 448-449: 92.
 488: 94, 129.
 529: 94, 129.
 556-557: 92.
 613: 92.
 628: 123.
 687: 94, 129.
 836-838: 94, 129.
 869-880: 91, 92.

- 950-955: 90, 91.
- Hesychius, lexicographus, ρ 186: 234.
- Hipparchus, epicus, *Supplm. Hellen.*
496-497: 220.
- Hipponax:
Fr. 36, 6 Degani (= 26 West):
247.
Fr. 128 West (= 126 Degani):
215.
- Homerus: 1-3, 9, 17, 32, 34, 38, 41,
43-45, 47, 48, 63, 65-68, 72, 74-
77, 79, 93, 99, 110, 121, 123,
124, 135, 139, 143, 144, 150,
152, 160, 163, 167, 168, 177,
180, 181, 184, 185, 188, 189,
191, 208, 210-214, 216, 218,
223, 226-233, 245, 252, 253,
257, 268, 271, 284, 287, 288,
292, 295.
Il. : 1, 4, 6-11, 13, 20-25, 29, 30,
32-34, 36-39, 41, 45, 51, 53,
54, 58-61, 63-67, 75, 76, 80,
82, 87, 94, 113, 124, 125,
127-130, 133-137, 139, 142,
143, 149, 151, 152, 164-168,
177-182, 185, 187, 191, 192,
212, 214, 223, 252, 254,
261, 269, 278-282, 284, 286-
288, 291.
1, 1: 81.
1, 1-2: 25.
1, 198: 161.
2: 168.
2, 166-181: 162.
2, 167-182: 164.
2, 182: 161, 166.
2, 465-466: 52.
2, 467: 52.
2, 484: 223.
2, 485: 23.
2, 485-486: 81, 82.
2, 489-490: 93.
2, 700: 231.
- 2, 760: 93.
2, 780-785: 51, 52.
2, 780: 51.
2, 784: 51.
2, 785: 51.
2, 844-845: 154.
3: 49, 211.
3, 1-14: 49, 50, 65.
3, 8: 51.
3, 10: 50.
3, 13: 50, 51.
3, 14: 51.
3, 146: 288.
3, 147: 67.
3, 150: 73.
3, 151-152: 66-68, 73.
4: 154.
4, 272: 239.
4, 274: 53.
4, 326: 239.
4, 343-348: 6.
4, 354: 27.
4, 422-428: 52.
4, 422-438: 52, 53.
4, 451: 232.
4, 463: 233.
4, 503: 23.
4, 504: 229.
4, 519: 229.
5: 154, 248.
5, 58: 230.
5, 100: 232.
5, 301: 232.
5, 352: 234.
5, 600: 234.
6, 145-151: 224, 235, 236.
6, 150: 236.
6, 151: 236, 237.
6, 206-211: 5.
6, 416-420: 208.
7, 85-86: 139.
7, 122: 239.
7, 203: 122.

- 7, 264: 231.
 7, 324: 220.
 8, 65: 232.
 8, 97: 29.
 8, 132: 228.
 8, 161-166: 7.
 8, 231: 7.
 9, 48-49: 288.
 9, 189: 5.
 9, 330: 232.
 9, 379-380: 26, 27.
 9, 443: 4.
 9, 524-527: 14.
 9, 524-605: 5.
 10 (*Doloneia*): 135, 140, 144,
 147, 149-154, 159, 160,
 166, 168, 177, 178, 180,
 300.
 10, 67-70: 150.
 10, 69: 150.
 10, 70: 150.
 10, 72-81: 149.
 10, 80: 149.
 10, 251: 157.
 10, 252-253: 156.
 10, 274-295: 160.
 10, 278-279: 164, 178, 179.
 10, 338-468: 153.
 10, 353: 60.
 10, 434: 177.
 10, 434-441: 140.
 10, 474-501: 140.
 10, 483: 288.
 10, 484: 232.
 10, 503-506: 159.
 10, 508-510: 159.
 10, 511: 148.
 10, 512: 166.
 10, 515-522: 148.
 10, 518-522: 140.
 10, 523-525: 140.
 11: 46.
 11, 1: 42.
- 11, 65: 233.
 11, 84-90: 59.
 11, 97-98: 232.
 11, 147: 99.
 11, 195-209: 166.
 11, 461: 234.
 11, 538: 233.
 11, 811: 234.
 12: 46.
 12, 185-186: 232.
 12, 216-229: 151.
 12, 299-309: 6.
 12, 300: 23.
 12, 306: 6.
 12, 309: 6.
 12, 310-321: 139.
 12, 310-328: 5.
 12, 326-327: 6.
 12, 407: 122.
 13, 82: 239.
 13, 99: 228.
 13, 131: 288.
 13, 162: 230.
 13, 701-708: 60, 63, 74, 75.
 13, 703: 60.
 13, 707: 63.
 13, 726-731: 151.
 13, 726-734: 151.
 13, 795-802: 47, 48.
 14, 13-26: 46, 48, 65.
 14, 14-15: 47.
 14, 16: 47.
 14, 20: 47, 48.
 14, 507: 234.
 15, 236-261: 166.
 15, 474: 230.
 15, 729: 99.
 16: 137, 139, 143, 167.
 16, 66: 53.
 16, 88: 122.
 16, 215: 288.
 16, 310-311: 230.
 16, 413-414: 230.

- 16, 436-438: 138.
 16, 441-443: 167.
 16, 453-457: 138.
 16, 459-461: 138.
 16, 548-551: 138.
 16, 666-683: 142.
 16, 671-675: 138.
 16, 682-683: 144.
 16, 710: 234.
 16, 777-780: 59.
 16, 856: 234.
 17, 8: 232.
 17, 16: 122.
 17, 108: 234.
 17, 243: 53.
 17, 287: 122.
 17, 419: 122.
 17, 607: 230.
 17, 673-678: 237.
 17, 675: 237, 238.
 18: 177.
 18, 22-24: 286.
 18, 49: 93.
 18, 95-96: 137.
 18, 104: 231.
 18, 548: 63.
 18, 557: 239.
 19: 7, 23.
 19, 39: 233.
 19, 148: 29.
 19, 154-237: 7.
 19, 183: 25.
 19, 219: 23.
 19, 225: 25.
 20, 237: 67.
 20, 238: 67.
 20, 248-249: 96.
 20, 336: 239.
 20, 363: 232.
 20, 380: 166.
 20, 399-400: 232.
 20, 502: 122.
 21, 20-21: 27.
 21, 74: 28.
 21, 297: 122.
 21, 403: 231.
 21, 407: 230.
 21, 543: 122, 123.
 21, 596: 123.
 22: 37, 167, 212.
 22, 104: 36.
 22, 179-181: 167.
 22, 209-213 (*Psychostasia*):
 136, 169.
 22, 304-305: 4.
 22, 341: 231.
 22, 362: 234.
 22, 389-390: 287.
 23, 66-67: 286.
 23, 100: 233.
 23, 114: 99.
 23, 123: 99.
 23, 133: 53.
 23, 364: 51.
 24: 208.
 24, 339-348: 164.
 24, 381: 232.
 24, 601: 29.
Od. : 1, 4, 7-13, 15-17, 19-23,
 25, 28, 29, 31-39, 41, 45, 54,
 56-66, 76, 80, 82, 84, 85, 87,
 94, 105-108, 122, 124, 125,
 127-134, 139, 165, 166, 185-
 189, 191, 192, 208, 212,
 214, 219, 222, 239-242, 245,
 252, 265, 269-273, 275, 278-
 280, 282, 290-293, 300, 301.
 1, 1: 81, 223, 227.
 1, 2: 21.
 1, 7: 13, 36.
 1, 8: 89, 90.
 1, 10: 81, 82.
 1, 50: 16.
 1, 53-54: 16.
 1, 70: 241.
 1, 344: 9.

- 1, 366: 288.
 2: 61.
 3, 175: 63.
 4: 35.
 4, 33: 231.
 4, 351-572: 16.
 4, 351-586: 13.
 4, 369: 13.
 4, 406: 262.
 4, 441-442: 262.
 4, 534-535: 12.
 4, 726: 9.
 5, 1: 42.
 5, 239: 239.
 5, 248: 99.
 5, 269: 239.
 5, 272: 18.
 5, 319 sqq.: 240.
 5, 374: 230.
 5, 394-398: 62.
 6, 133: 23.
 7: 35.
 7, 215-221: 24.
 8: 261.
 8, 74: 11.
 8, 76: 12.
 8, 98-99: 10.
 8, 159-164: 105, 106.
 8, 477-483: 10, 11.
 8, 539: 10.
 9: 38, 125, 129.
 9 – 12: 13, 35, 105, 132,
 133.
 9, 5-11: 10.
 9, 20: 8.
 9, 45-51: 12.
 9, 68: 21.
 9, 158-165: 22.
 9, 162: 19.
 9, 196-211: 21.
 9, 233: 231.
 9, 252: 242.
 9, 263-265: 22.
 9, 290: 232.
 9, 305: 231.
 9, 442: 20.
 9, 504-505: 22.
 9, 548-557: 22.
 9, 557: 19.
 10, 56-57: 63.
 10, 184: 19.
 10, 437: 37.
 10, 468: 19.
 10, 560: 233.
 11, 367-368: 9.
 11, 411-412: 12.
 11, 412-415: 12.
 11, 419-420: 12.
 11, 540: 239.
 11, 582-584: 235.
 11, 583: 235.
 11, 588-592: 235.
 12: 56, 58, 61.
 12, 30: 19.
 12, 78-79: 63.
 12, 129-130: 19.
 12, 129-131: 13.
 12, 172: 63.
 12, 188: 23.
 12, 189: 23.
 12, 191: 23.
 12, 282-283: 63.
 12, 332: 13.
 12, 338: 16.
 12, 437-444: 57, 58, 76.
 12, 439: 57.
 13: 56, 61, 62.
 13, 24-28: 10.
 13, 28-36: 55, 59, 60, 62, 64,
 65, 76.
 13, 31: 56.
 13, 31-34: 56, 60.
 13, 32: 60, 64.
 13, 33: 61.
 13, 35: 61.
 13, 79-80: 16.

- 13, 88: 63.
 13, 300-301: 164.
 13, 332: 271.
 14, 20: 19.
 14, 96: 19.
 15: 186.
 15, 159: 232.
 15, 160-178: 298.
 17, 258-263: 10.
 17, 286-287: 24, 25.
 17, 605-606: 10.
 18, 53-54: 24.
 18, 74: 271.
 18, 118-119: 24.
 18, 213: 288.
 18, 343-344: 20.
 18, 371-375: 61.
 19, 172-177: 221.
 19, 203: 85.
 19, 272: 232.
 19, 448: 230.
 19, 536-543: 298.
 20, 25-28: 24.
 20, 47-48: 164.
 20, 155-156: 27.
 20, 276-279: 27.
 20, 348: 12.
 20, 379: 231.
 20, 392: 62.
 21, 258-259: 27.
 21, 406-411: 11.
 21, 428: 62.
 21, 428-430: 11.
 21, 429: 20, 62.
 21, 430: 10.
 22: 212.
 22, 2: 20.
 22, 32: 20.
 22, 61-64: 26.
 22, 73: 29.
 22, 253: 123.
 22, 296: 230.
 22, 308: 288.
- 22, 308-309: 28.
 22, 309: 13.
 22, 312: 28.
 22, 384-389: 20.
 22, 401-406: 28, 29.
 22, 416: 13, 36.
 23, 130: 228.
 23, 238-239: 62.
 23, 296: 62.
 24, 36: 29.
 24, 57-62: 147.
 24, 58-62: 145.
 24, 102-119: 62.
 24, 184-185: 28.
 24, 185: 13.
 24, 192: 29.
 24, 192-202: 121, 122.
 24, 196: 9.
 24, 489: 228.
 24, 546-548: 270.
- Hymni Homerici* : 95, 134.
- 2, *Dem.* 1: 81.
 2, *Dem.* 55: 237.
 2, *Dem.* 129: 228.
 3, *Apoll.* 20-21: 96.
 5, *Aphr.* 217: 239.
 5, *Aphr.* 218-238: 42.
 11, *Ath.* 1: 81.
 13, *Dem.* 1: 81.
 16, *Ascl.* 1: 81.
 22, *Pos.* 1: 81.
 25, *Mus. et Apoll.* 1: 81.
 26, *Dion.* 1: 81.
 28, *Ath.* 1: 81.
- Ilias parva* : 140.
- Iliupersis*: 301.
- Ioannes Gazaeus: 262.
- Kalevala*: 304.
- [Longinus], *De sublimitate* : 279.
 9, 14: 279.

Longus, scriptor eroticus: 296-300, 303, 306.

Daphnis et Chloe : 296, 298, 300, 306, 307.
3, 16, 2: 298.

Lucianus: 289, 302.

Vera historia : 297.

[Lucianus]: 297.

Lucretius Carus, Titus, *De rerum natura* : 112.

Mahābārata : 277.

Margites: 215, 220.

Martialis, M. Valerius, 14, 183: 216.

Matro(n) Pitanaeus, parodius: 38, 216, 217, 219-222, 226-229, 234, 238, 248.

Fr. 1 Olson-Sens (*Convivium Atticum*) (= *Suppl. Hellenisticum* 534): 216, 217, 219, 227, 228.

Fr. 1, 1: 223.

Fr. 1, 3-7: 221.

Fr. 1, 104: 228.

Fr. 1, 111-118: 226.

Fr. 1, 121-122: 222.

Melica Adespota :

PMG 923, 4: 97.

PMG 947a (= Simonides?): 97.

PMG 954b: 104.

Memmius, Caius: 112.

Menander: 277, 285.

Aspis: 285.

Methodius, lexicographus: 244.

Moschus Syracusanus, bucolicus: 216.

Europa: 217.

117: 239.

[Moschus] 3 (*Epitaphius Bionis*), 58-63: 243.

Musaeus, epicus, *Hero et Leander* : 305.

Nicochares, comicus: 216.

Nonnus Panopolitanus: 249-265, 267, 269, 270, 305.

Dionysiaca: 249-251, 262, 263, 265, 269, 270, 305.

1 - 2: 256, 259.

1 - 24: 251-253.

1, 13-14: 262.

1, 15: 249.

1, 19-21: 265.

1, 37-38: 262.

2, 669-679: 258.

3: 266, 267.

3 - 5: 251, 258.

3, 195-199: 262.

3, 365-371: 262.

4: 305.

4 *initio*: 265.

4, 417-420: 258.

5: 251.

5, 121-125: 258.

6: 253, 256, 267.

6 *ad finem* : 253.

6, 64-88: 256.

7: 253.

7 *initio*: 267.

7, 10: 250.

9, 30-31: 265.

9, 96-110: 265.

12: 253, 255, 266, 267.

12, 142-145: 250.

12, 292: 267.

13: 253, 255.

13, 6-7: 250.

14 - 15: 252.

14 - 16: 262.

18: 253, 254.

19: 253, 254.

20 - 21: 257.

21: 263, 264.

21, 161: 264.

21, 170-184: 263.

- 22 – 24: 252, 253.
 22, 379-383: 253.
 23: 253.
 25: 262.
 25 – 30: 254.
 25, 8: 249.
 25, 20-21: 253.
 25, 27: 249.
 27, 299-300: 252.
 28: 261.
 28, 126-157: 252.
 30: 253, 254.
 30 – 36: 257.
 31 – 35: 254.
 31 – 36: 253, 254.
 32: 254.
 33 – 35: 254.
 35: 254.
 35, 278-335: 265.
 35, 302: 265.
 35, 306: 265.
 35, 306-307: 265.
 35, 317-318: 265.
 35, 319-321: 265.
 35, 325-328: 265.
 36: 253, 254, 256.
 37: 254.
 37 – 42: 254.
 38: 256, 267.
 38, 75-77: 256.
 38, 90-434: 251, 256.
 38, 209-210: 256.
 38, 222 sqq.: 256.
 38, 416: 256.
 39: 252, 256.
 40: 251, 255, 256, 262.
 40 – 43: 260.
 40, 298: 255.
 40, 391-406: 257.
 40, 407-409: 258.
 40, 411-421: 264.
 40, 413-415: 264.
 40, 418-421: 264.
 40, 419: 264.
 40, 421: 265.
 40, 576-578: 264.
 40, 580: 255.
 41: 253, 255, 266, 267.
 41 – 43: 250, 254, 257, 260.
 41 – 48: 251, 257, 258, 263.
 41, 15-16: 255.
 41, 155: 267.
 42: 253, 254, 266.
 42, 26: 250.
 42, 355-360a: 266.
 43: 256, 257.
 43, 40-41: 265.
 43, 76-77: 262.
 44: 255.
 44, 1: 259.
 44, 107-118: 259.
 44, 113-118: 258.
 44 – 46: 251, 257-260.
 46, 362-363: 258.
 46, 362-367: 258.
 46, 363: 270.
 46, 364-367: 258, 259.
 47: 257, 259, 260, 267.
 47, 421-422: 266.
 47 – 48: 259.
 48: 250, 251, 256, 257, 260,
 262, 263.
 48, 1-3: 255.
 48, 1-89: 259.
 48, 89: 259.
 48, 238-968: 259.
 48, 811: 261.
 48, 854-855: 261.
 48, 886: 261.
 48, 892-895: 261.
 48, 917-924a: 261.
 48, 961b-968: 261.
 48, 967-968: 261.
 48, 974-978: 263, 270.
Nostoi: 122, 124, 187.

O*GIS* 552: 145.

Oppianus Anazarbensis, epicus, *Hal.* 5, 389: 230.

P*Amb.* 2, 10 (= Astydamas iunior, tragicus, *TrGF* I 60 F **1 i): 170.

P*Didot* (Aeschyl. *Cares sive Europa*, *TrGF* III F **99): 143.

P*Hib.* 2, 174 (= Astydamas iunior, tragicus, *TrGF* I 60 F **1 h): 170.

P*Mich.* 6946 (*fragm. epicum*, ed. H.S. Schibli, in *ZPE* 53 [1983], 1-25): 218, 229.
7: 231.
13: 231.
58: 231.

Parodia: cf. *Adespota parodica*.

Paulus Silentarius, poeta Christianus: 262.

Petronius Arbitr, C. Titus: 297, 301-303.

Satyrica: 247, 272, 279, 285, 297, 300-302, 306, 307.
132, 11: 302.

Philostratus, Flavius, sophista, *Her.* 14: 145.

Philostratus Maior, sophista, *Im.* 2, 18: 243.

Philoxenus Cytherius, lyricus, *Dithyr.*: 243.

Pigres, elegiacus, cf. *Batrachomyomachia*: 216.

Pindarus: 109, 253.
Fr. 227: 104.

Fr. 262 Snell-Maehtler, *ap. Schol.* ad Hom. *Il.* 10, 435: 154, 160.

Isthm. :
1, 64-66: 104.
5, 63: 104.
8, 46-46a: 97.

Nem.:

1, 13: 97.

2, 2: 3.

3, 82: 96.

6, 31-33: 97.

6, 48-49: 104.

7, 20-23: 104.

7, 104-105: 97.

8, 37-39: 97.

10, 25-26: 97.

Ol. :

2, 22-30: 258.

5, 1-8: 109.

7, 7-8: 97.

9, 11-12: 104.

9, 25-26: 97.

11, 8-9: 97.

Pyth.:

3, 86-99: 258.

5, 114-115: 104.

6, 1-3: 97.

8, 32-34: 104.

Plato:

Phaedr. : 67.

Rep. 2, 369 b-372 d: 222.

Rep. 3, 392 c-394 b: 184.

Rep. 3, 393 c 5-9: 2.

Symp. 189 e: 288.

'Plato': cf. *Anthol. Palat.*

Plato Atheniensis, comicus, *Phaon*, Fr. 189, 9-22: 219.

Plutarchus: 169, 274.

*Quomodo adolescens poetas audire
debeat* 2, 16 F-17 A: 169.

Poliochus, comicus, Fr. 2: 225.

Posidippus Pellaeus, epigrammaticus: 243.

Epigr. 19, 7-8 Austin-Bastianini: 243.

Pratinas Phliasius, tragicus:

PMG 708, 3-5: 104.

PMG 710: 97.

- PMG* 712a: 97.
 Proclus: 62.
Chrestomathia:
 5, *PEG I* pp.67-68: 136.
 6-8, *PEG I* p. 68: 136.
 12-13, *PEG I* p.68: 136.
 14-16, *PEG I* pp.68-69: 136,
 137.
 19-23, *PEG I* p.69: 137.
 20, *PEG I* p.69: 145.
 cf. etiam *Cypria*.
Psaromachia (a Homero?): 218.
- Q**uintus Smyrnaeus, 1, 236: 230.
- R**āmāyana: 277.
Rigveda:
 1, 114, 9: 96.
 10, 101, 3-4: 96.
- S**appho: 42, 43, 67.
Carm. :
 16: 43.
 58: 41.
 58,8: 42.
- Scholia*:
 vetera ad Hes. Op., *Prolegomena* B 9-16: 112.
 ad Hom. Il. 3, 151 (*scholia AB*): 67.
 ad Hom. Il. 10, 435 (= Pind. Fr. 262 Snell-Maehler): 154, 160.
 ad Hom. Il. 11, 97 (*scholia A*): 232.
 ad Hom. Il. 11, 98 (*scholia AbT*): 233.
 ad Hom. Il. 13, 703-707 (*scholia A*): 63.
 ad Hom. Il. 16, 673: 145.
 ad Hom. Il. 16, 856 (*scholia bT*): 234.
 ad Hom. Il. 17, 676-677 (*scholia bT*): 237.
- Solon Atheniensis, nomographus: 37.
 Fr. 13 West: 223.
 Sophocles: 164.
 Aj.: 160, 161, 164-167.
 14-17: 165, 179.
Eurypylus: 140.
TrGF IV F 206-222b: 140.
- Philocetes* : 164.
Poimenes: 140.
TrGF IV F 497-521: 140.
TrGF IV F 499: 140.
TrGF IV F 501: 140.
TrGF IV F 502: 141.
- Statius, P. Papinius, *Silv. 1, praef.* : 216.
- Strabo, 14, 3, 3, p.665: 143.
Suda, o 251: 218.
- Synesius Cyrenensis, *Epist.* 121: 243.
- T**elestes Selinuntius, lyricus, *PMG* 805b: 104.
- Theocritus: 215, 297, 306.
 11: 242-244, 297.
 11, 14: 243.
 11, 54-55: 242.
 11, 60-61: 242.
- Theognis Megarensis, elegiacus: 37, 112.
 237-254: 104.
- Theophrastus, Fr. 177: 73.
- Thucydides: 183-188, 190, 209-211, 214.
 1: 187, 188, 190.
 1, 104-110: 190.
 3: 190.
 3, 1-26: 190.
 4: 190.
 6: 190.
 7: 190.
- Timo Phliasius, philosophus: 224.
- Silli*: 219, 223, 224.
 1, *SH* 775: 223, 224.

- 2, *SH* 776: 224.
- V**arro Reatinus, M. Terentius, *Men.*: 301, 302.
- Vergilius Maro, Publius: 277, 295, 303.
- Aen.* :
- 6, 469-470: 302.
- 9, 436: 302.
- Ed.* 4, 63: 265.
- 5, 16: 302.
- X**enophon Ephesius: 289, 296, 305.

B. INDEX NOMINUM

- A**ccorinti, D.: 264.
- Acosta-Hughes, B.: 243.
- Adorno, T.W.: 279.
- Agosti, G.: 258, 262, 265.
- Alden, M.: 43, 68.
- Aloni, A.: 262.
- Aly, W.: 115.
- Ariosto, Ludovico: 294.
- Arrighetti, G.: 127.
- Arrowsmith, W.: 302.
- Athanassakis, A.N.: 16.
- Austin, C.: 219, 243.
- Austin, N.: 18, 20.
- B**akhtin (Bachtin), M.: 3, 274, 275, 280, 302, 303, 306.
- Bakker, E.J.: 3, 8, 16, 22, 24, 70, 85, 187.
- Barchiesi, A.: 147, 171, 262.
- Barrett, J.: 140, 171.
- Barthes, R.: 186.
- Basile, Giambattista: 294.
- Bassett, S.E.: 80.
- Bastianini, G.: 243.
- Battezzato, L.: 158, 161, 171.
- Bauer, A.: 192.
- Baumbach, M.: 243.
- Beissinger, M.: 276.
- Benardete, S.: 8.
- Bergk, Th.: 142, 243.
- Bergold, W.: 50, 68.
- Bertoni, C.: 276, 294.
- Bethe, E.: 169, 171.
- Betts, J.H.: 175.
- Beye, C.R.: 282.
- Bierl, A.: 186.
- Blaise, F.: 117.
- Blanckenburg, F. von: 273.
- Blass, Fr.: 142.
- Bliquez, L.J.: 216.
- Blümer, W.: 79.
- Blumenberg, H.: 282.
- Boedeker, D.: 117.
- Boitani, P.: 292.
- Bolton, J.D.P.: 19.
- Bond, G.W.: 163.
- Borchardt, R.: 278.
- Bornmann, F.: 253.
- Bouffartigue, J.: 7.
- Bowie, A.: 88.
- Bowra, C.M.: 16, 21.
- Bremer, J.M.: 138, 171.
- Bremmer, J.: 173.
- Burger, R.: 8.
- Burgess, J.S.: 139, 171.
- Burian, P.: 174.
- Burkert, W.: 15, 281.
- Burlando, A.: 161, 171.
- Butler, S.: 275.
- Buxton, R.: 44, 68, 165, 171.
- C**alder III, W.M.: 165, 171.
- Cameron, A.: 217.
- Camerotto, A.: 217, 229, 239.

Campanile, E.: 94, 123.
 Carbonell, Ch.-O.: 186.
 Catenacci, C.: 172, 220.
 Cavarzere, A.: 262.
 Cervantes, Miguel de: 295, 302.
 Chantraine, P.: 139.
 Chatman, S.: 80, 87.
 Christ, W.: 135, 172.
 Chuvin, P.: 251, 253, 258, 290.
 Clark, M.E.: 138, 172.
 Clay, J.S.: 26, 80, 81, 85, 100, 110,
 117, 118, 166, 172.
 Čolaković, Z.: 65, 68, 69, 73, 77.
 Cole, A.Th.: 123.
 Collart, P.: 255.
 Compagnon, A.: 284, 285.
 Condello, F.: 227.
 Connor, W.R.: 189.
 Conte, G.B.: 301.
 Coulson, W.D.E.: 138, 172.
 Crane, G.: 67, 68.
 Creuzer, F.: 183.
 Currie, B.: 139, 172.
 Czapla, B.: 298.

Danek, G.: 47, 62, 65, 66, 68, 69,
 284.
 Daniel, R.W.: 41, 69.
 Degani, E.: 216, 220.
 Delebecque, E.: 189.
 Desbordes, F.: 7.
 Dettori, E.: 172, 220.
 Dewald, C.: 189.
 Dihle, A.: 138, 153, 172.
 Di Marco, M.: 224, 243.
 Dimock, G.E.: 81.
 Dobson, M.: 216.
 Dodds, E.R.: 15, 16, 34.
 Doody, M.: 277.
 Dougherty, C.: 107-109, 131.
 Dowden, K.: 217.
 Duckworth, G.E.: 191.
 Dunn, F.M.: 146, 172.
 Durkheim, E.: 287.

Edmunds, L.: 43, 69.
 Edwards, A.T.: 61, 69, 109, 122,
 131, 139, 172.
 Edwards, G.P.: 98, 99.
 Edwards, M.W.: 44, 69.
 Effe, B.: 286, 299.
 Egger, B.: 291.
 Eliade, M.: 15, 16.
 Emerson, C.: 3.
 Erbse, H.: 44, 45, 69, 184, 189.
 Esteban, A.: 236.

Fantuzzi, M.: 75, 148, 149, 153,
 155, 172, 215, 216, 218, 224,
 230.
 Faraone, C.A.: 215.
 Farrell, T.J.: 276, 283.
 Fayant, M.-C.: 256, 257.
 Fenik, B.: 153, 161, 172, 207.
 Fick, A.: 114.
 Fielding, Henry: 302.
 Finis, L. de: 174.
 Fish, S.: 281.
 Flashar, H.: 184.
 Foley, H.P.: 58, 69.
 Foley, J.M.: 2, 66, 69.
 Forcione, A.K.: 295.
 Ford, A.: 2, 81.
 Fornara, C.W.: 184.
 Fowler, R.: 2, 68.
 Fränkel, H.: 19, 44, 47, 50, 53, 55,
 67, 69.
 Friedländer, P.: 119.
 Friedrich, P.: 16.
 Friedrich, W.-H.: 44, 69.
 Fritz, K. von: 88.
 Frye, N.: 277.
 Fusillo, M.: 217, 225, 234-236, 277,
 285, 288, 294, 302.

Gaiser, K.: 184.
 Gallazzi, C.: 243.
 Gantz, T.: 142, 172.
 Garvie, A.F.: 165, 172.

- Genette, G.: 131, 185, 278, 284, 293.
 Gentili, B.: 123.
 Gerlaud, B.: 261, 262.
 Glei, R.: 217, 224, 225, 234-236, 239, 241.
 Göttling, K.W.: 297.
 Goldhill, S.: 14, 282.
 Gomme, A.W.: 189.
 Goody, J.: 282.
 Graziosi, B.: 2.
 Green, J.R.: 175.
 Grene, D.: 95.
 Griffin, J.: 5, 80, 139, 172.
 Griffith, M.: 118.
 Gronewald, M.: 41, 69.
 Groningen, B.A. van: 80, 116.
- H**ägg, T.: 275, 296.
 Hainsworth, J.B.: 60, 69, 140, 173, 277.
 Halliwell, S.: 162.
 Halperin, D.M.: 299.
 Hamayon, R.: 15-18, 32.
 Hamilton, R.: 103.
 Harder, M.A.: 218, 221.
 Hardie, A.: 43, 69.
 Harrison, S.J.: 187.
 Hartung, J.A.: 142.
 Harvey, D.: 173, 216.
 Hatto, A.T.: 15, 16.
 Heath, M.: 161, 173.
 Hegel, G.W.F.: 273-275, 277.
 Heinze, R.: 301.
 Heiserman, A.: 282.
 Heitsch, E.: 115, 119.
 Henrichs, A.: 169, 173.
 Hermann, G.: 99.
 Herzog, R.: 303.
 Heubeck, A.: 50, 52, 69.
 Hiebel, H.: 273.
 Hinds, S.: 165, 173.
 Hirschberger, M.: 288, 289.
 Hölderlin, Friedrich: 269, 281.
- Hölscher, U.: 278, 279.
 Holquist, M.: 3.
 Hommel, H.: 85.
 Hooker, J.T.: 175.
 Hopkinson, N.: 253, 254, 264.
 Hordern, J.H.: 243.
 Horkheimer, M.: 279.
 Hornblower, S.: 187.
 Huber, G.: 303.
 Huber, L.: 184.
 Huet, Pierre-Daniel: 295.
 Hulkranz, Å.: 15, 16.
 Hunter, R.: 75, 215, 216, 224, 243, 282, 294, 298.
 Hutton, R.: 17.
- I**mmerwahr, H.: 209.
- Janko, R.: 47, 48, 63, 69, 138, 139, 167, 173.
 Jansen, J.: 18.
 Johne, R.: 291.
 Jong, I. de: 2, 14, 56, 58, 69, 81, 88, 105, 171, 184, 187, 188, 281.
 Joyce, James: 279, 294.
 Judet de la Combe, P.: 117, 118.
- K**ahane, A.: 70, 85.
 Kalff, J.: 171.
 Karadžić, Vuk: 304.
 Kassel, R.: 219.
 Katz, J.: 25.
 Kazazis, J.N.: 26, 68, 85, 86, 191.
 Keen, A.: 142, 144, 173.
 Keydell, R.: 255.
 Keyes, C.W.: 290, 291.
 Kirk, G.S.: 80, 115, 229, 230.
 Koller, H.: 3.
 Konstan, D.: 299.
 Kosmetatou, E.: 243.
 Kossatz-Deissmann, A.: 137, 142, 143, 145, 173.
 Krischer, T.: 44, 70, 85.
 Kristeva, J.: 284.

- Kullmann, W.: 62, 70, 76, 166, 173,
186, 192.
 Kurke, L.: 109.
 Kytzler, B.: 296.
- L**ämmer, E.: 273.
 Lamberton, R.: 79, 83.
 Lang, M.L.: 43, 70, 214.
 Latacz, J.: 80, 186.
 Lawall, G.: 282.
 Leaf, W.: 50.
 Lelli, E.: 243.
 Lendle, O.: 184.
 Lenz, A.: 80.
 Leonhartius Lycius: 241.
 Lesky, A.: 216.
 Levaniovuk, O.: 25.
 Levin, D.N.: 299.
 Livrea, E.: 243, 246, 282.
 Lloyd-Jones, H.: 141, 163, 173.
 Lonsdale, S.H.: 44, 45, 70.
 Lopez Pinchano, Alonso: 295.
 Lord, A.B.: 65, 70, 246.
 Lucas, D.W.: 162, 173.
 Luce, T.J.: 103.
 Ludwich, A.: 217, 224, 235, 236,
239, 241, 244.
 Lukács, G.: 274, 275, 277, 279, 280.
- M**acAlister, S.: 287.
 McGlathery, D.B.: 303.
 McHardy, F.: 173.
 Magnelli, E.: 220, 227.
 Maier, H.: 18.
 Manuwald, G.: 285, 289.
 Marg, W.: 183.
 Maronitis, D.N.: 80.
 Marsilio, M.S.: 97-99, 101, 102.
 Martin, R.P.: 3, 44, 52, 53, 70, 112.
 Mastronarde, D.J.: 146, 161, 163,
165, 173.
 Mattes, W.: 55, 56, 70.
 Mazon, P.: 116.
- Međedović, A.: 65, 66, 73, 76, 77.
 Meier, Chr.: 184.
 Mette, H.J.: 142, 170, 173.
 Meuli, K.: 14-16, 34.
 Michelakis, P.: 141, 173.
 Miller, D.A.: 16.
 Milton, John: 276.
 Mingarelli, S.: 161, 174.
 Mitsis, Ph.: 100.
 Moles, J.: 187.
 Momigliano, A.: 213.
 Montanari, F.: 68, 79, 127, 291.
 Montgomery, H.: 185.
 Moreau, A.: 7.
 Moretti, F.: 273, 282.
 Morgan, J.R.: 290.
 Morris, I.: 2, 44, 69, 70.
 Morrison, J.V.: 191.
 Most, G.W.: 127.
 Moulton, C.: 44, 45, 48, 53, 70.
 Müller, C.W.: 289, 303.
 Muellner, L.: 49, 70.
 Musäus, I.: 126.
 Musgrave, S.: 147.
- N**agler, M.N.: 19.
 Nagy, G.: 83, 101-103, 118, 138,
139, 174.
 Nannini, S.: 44, 70.
 Neale, W.C.: 95.
 Nelson, S.: 95.
 Nestle, W.: 170, 174.
 Nicolai, W.: 103.
 Nimis, S.A.: 44, 70.
 Nock, A.D.: 164, 174.
 Norden, Ed.: 285.
 Noussia, M.: 220-222, 247.
 Nünlist, R.: 88, 92-94, 96, 97, 104.
- O**bbink, D.: 111.
 Olson, S.D.: 215, 216, 219, 220,
227, 238.
 Ossian: 304.

- P**ache, C.O.: 26.
 Paduano, G.: 281, 285.
 Paessens, H.G.: 216.
 Palumbo, B.M.: 243.
 Parker, P.: 280.
 Parry, M.: 41, 65, 73, 246.
 Pattoni, M.P.: 141, 174, 298-300.
 Patzer, H.: 44, 47, 70.
 Pavlock, B.: 282.
 Payen, P.: 186.
 Peabody, B.: 99.
 Pearson, A.C.: 141.
 Pedrick, V.: 81.
 Peltzer, B.I.: 216.
 Pentikäinen, J.: 16.
 Pertusi, A.: 112.
 Petropoulos, J.C.B.: 102.
 Pfeijffer, I.L.: 43, 71.
 Pippin Burnett, A.: 140, 154, 155,
 157, 169, 174.
 Plaza, M.: 303.
 Pöhlmann, E.: 156, 174.
 Pohlenz, M.: 192.
 Pope, M.W.M.: 165, 174.
 Powell, B.: 2, 44, 69, 70.
 Pratt, L.H.: 84, 85.
 Pretagostini, R.: 172, 220.
 Privitera, G.: 282.
 Pucci, P.: 5-7, 17, 22-25, 27, 28, 81,
 85, 124, 126, 164, 165, 174.
- Q**uint, D.: 295.
- R**abel, R.J.: 150, 174, 281.
 Raimondi, V.: 243.
 Reardon, B.: 277.
 Regenbogen, O.: 183.
 Reichel, M.: 75, 188, 192, 207.
 Reinhardt, K.: 137, 174.
 Rengakos, A.: 26, 63, 68, 71, 85, 86,
 186, 188, 191, 208, 291.
 Richardson, S.: 88, 89, 91.
- Ritchie, W.: 141, 163, 174.
 Robertson, M.: 144, 175.
 Robiano, P.: 285, 289.
 Robson, J.: 173.
 Rohde, E.: 15, 282.
 Rojc-Čolaković, M.: 65, 68, 69.
 Romilly, J. de: 189.
 Ronnet, G.: 289.
 Rood, T.: 189.
 Rosen, R.M.: 102-104, 140, 175.
 Rousseau, Ph.: 117.
 Rubino, C.A.: 70.
 Rudhardt, J.: 118.
 Rüter, K.: 80.
- S**aïd, S.: 7, 12.
 Schadewaldt, W.: 75, 183, 207.
 Schandl, G.: 44, 71.
 Schein, S.: 19, 26.
 Schibli, H.S.: 218, 229, 231.
 Schiesaro, A.: 100.
 Schmeling, G.: 290.
 Schmid, W.: 175, 183.
 Schmitt, A.: 186.
 Schmitt, R.: 94.
 Schneider, C.: 185.
 Schwartz, Ed.: 183.
 Scodel, R.: 106.
 Scott, W.C.: 44, 45, 47, 71.
 Scudéry, Georges de: 295.
 Scudéry, Madeleine de: 295.
 Seeck, G.A.: 44, 71.
 Segal, Ch.: 8, 23, 31, 125.
 Segal, E.: 303.
 Sellschopp, I.: 114.
 Sens, A.: 215, 216, 218-220, 227,
 238.
 Shelmerdine, C.W.: 70.
 Sherman, M.A.: 283.
 Siegmann, E.: 188.
 Simon, B.: 256, 258, 264.
 Slatkin, L.M.: 137, 175.

Snell, B.: 170, 175.
 Solmsen, Fr.: 119.
 Sommerstein, A.H.: 142, 175.
 Sourvinou-Inwood, C.: 139, 163,
 169, 175.
 Soyinka, Wole: 269.
 Stählin, O.: 183.
 Stanford, W.B.: 57, 58, 71, 292.
 Stegemann, V.: 266.
 Stephens, W.: 294.
 Sternberg, M.: 187, 291.
 Sterne, Laurence: 302.
 Stoddard, K.: 80, 83, 86, 88, 89, 91,
 92, 118.
 Strada, V.: 274.
 Strasburger, H.: 183.
 Strohm, H.: 156, 161, 165, 175.
 Svenbro, J.: 25.
 Szepessy, T.: 290, 291.

Tandy, D.W.: 95, 111.
 Taplin, O.: 161, 163, 165, 169, 175.
 Tasso, Torquato: 294.
 Tatum, J.: 294.
 Telò, M.: 291.
 Thiel, H. van: 50.
 Thomas, R.F.: 167, 175.
 Thornton, A.: 14, 16.
 Thum, T.: 144, 175.
 Tissoni, F.: 259.
 Tolstoi, L.: 280.
 Touchefeu-Meynier, O.: 243.
 Tsagalidis, C.C.: 81, 94, 122, 137,
 175.
 Tylus, J.: 276.

Valckenaer, L.C.: 147.
 Vater, F.: 147, 176.
 Vetta, M.: 172, 220.

Vian, F.: 253, 254, 256, 257, 259,
 261, 263, 265-267, 270, 282.

Vine, B.: 217, 231.
 Voigt, E.-M.: 41, 43.
 Volk, K.: 25.

Wachsmuth, C.: 236.

Wackernagel, J.: 216.

Walcott, D.: 276.

Walsh, T.R.: 81.

Watkins, C.: 123.

Watson, J.: 86.

Watt, I.: 277.

Wees, H. van: 187.

Weir Smyth, H.: 144.

West, M.L.: 16, 42, 71, 96, 99, 103,
 110, 114, 116, 136, 137, 142,
 143, 170, 176, 216, 218.

White, Hayden: 213.

Whitmarsh, T.: 275.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von:
 114, 141, 170, 176.

Wilkins, J.: 216.

Willi, A.: 186.

Williamson, M.: 43, 71.

Winkler, J.J.: 271, 291, 299.

Wismann, H.: 117, 118.

Wölke, H.: 216-218, 225, 226, 231,
 233-236, 244.

Wofford, S.: 276.

Xanthakis-Karamanos, G.: 144,
 170, 176.

Zanetto, G.: 169, 176.

Zatti, S.: 280.

Zeitlin, F.I.: 117, 299.

Zielinski, Th.: 212.

Zumthor, P.: 21.

De fin janvier à fin novembre, la Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique accueille pour des séjours d'étude de deux à quatre semaines comme hôtes des spécialistes des sciences de l'Antiquité. Pour une somme journalière modique, ils sont logés et nourris, et ont accès à une riche bibliothèque spécialisée. Les intéressés trouveront des informations et les conditions d'admission sur le site internet de la Fondation:

e-mail: hardt@bluewin.ch
www.fondationhardt.ch

ACHEVÉ D'IMPRIMER
SUR LES PRESSES
DE N.V. PEETERS S.A.
OCTOBRE 2006

DÉPOSITAIRES

LIBRAIRIE DROZ S.A.

11, *rue Massot,*
CH-1206 Genève
Tél.: (+41-22) 346 66 66
Fax: (+41-22) 347 23 91
E-mail: droz@droz.org
Web: www.droz.org

DR. RUDOLF HABELT GMBH,
Am Buchenhang 1, Postfach 150104,
D-53040 Bonn
Telefon: (+49-228) 923 83-0
Telefax: (+49-228) 923 83-6
E-mail: info@habelt.de
Internet: <http://www.habelt.de>
*pour l'Allemagne et les régions
de langue allemande*

ENTRETIENS SUR L'ANTIQUITÉ CLASSIQUE

Les volumes III, V, VIII, X, XI, XIX sont épuisés.

Volumes réimprimés en 1999:

- | | | |
|------|--------|--|
| II | (1956) | L'INFLUENCE GRECQUE SUR LA POÉSIE LATINE DE CATULLE À OVIDE. <i>Six exposés et discussions par J. Bayet, A. Rostagni, V. Pöschl, Fr. Klingner, P. Boyancé, L.P. Wilkinson.</i> |
| VI | (1960) | EURIPIDE. <i>Sept exposés et discussions par J.C. Kamerbeek, A. Rivier, H. Diller, A. Lesky, R.P. Winnington-Ingram, G. Zuntz, V. Martin.</i> |
| XIII | (1967) | LES ORIGINES DE LA RéPUBLIQUE ROMAINE. <i>Neuf exposés suivis de discussions par E. Gjerstad, F.E. Brown, P.J. Riis, J. Heurgon, E. Gabba, K. Hanell, A. Momigliano, A. Alföldi, F. Wieacker. Avec la participation de J.H. Waszink et D. van Berchem.</i> |

Volume réimprimé par les Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Roma.

- | | | |
|-------|-------------|--|
| I | (1954/2003) | LA NOTION DU DIVIN DEPUIS HOMÈRE JUSQU'À PLATON. <i>Sept exposés et discussions par H.J. Rose, P. Chantraine, B. Snell, O. Gigon, H.D.F. Kitto, F. Chapouthier, W.J. Verdenius.</i> |
| IV | (1958/2004) | HISTOIRE ET HISTORIENS DANS L'ANTIQUITÉ. <i>Sept exposés et discussions par K. Latte, J. de Romilly, K. von Fritz, K. Hanell, R. Syme, M. Durry, A. Momigliano.</i> |
| VII | (1962/2005) | HÉSIODE ET SON INFLUENCE. <i>Six exposés et discussions par K. von Fritz, G.S. Kirk, W.J. Verdenius, F. Solmsen, A. La Penna, P. Grimal.</i> |
| XXVII | (1981/2001) | LE SACRIFICE DANS L'ANTIQUITÉ. <i>Huit exposés suivis de discussions par J.-P. Vernant, G.S. Kirk, W. Burkert, H.S. Versnel, A. Henrichs, G. Piccaluga, U.W. Scholz, R. Turcan. Entretiens préparés et présidés par Jean Rudhardt et Olivier Reverdin.</i> |

Volumes disponibles:

- | | | |
|---------|--------|--|
| IX | (1963) | VARRON. |
| XII | (1966) | PORPHYRE. |
| XIV | (1969) | L'ÉPIGRAMME GRECQUE. |
| XV | (1970) | LUCAIN. |
| XVI | (1970) | MÉNANDRE. |
| XVII | (1972) | ENNUS. |
| XVIII | (1972) | PSEUDEPIGRAPHA I. |
| XX | (1974) | POLYBE. |
| XXI | (1975) | DE JAMBLINE À PROCLUS. |
| XXII | (1976) | ALEXANDRE LE GRAND, IMAGE ET RÉALITÉ. |
| XXIII | (1977) | CHRISTIANISME ET FORMES LITTÉRAIRES DE L'ANTIQUITÉ TARDIVE EN OCCIDENT. |
| XXIV | (1978) | LUCRÈCE. |
| XXV | (1979) | LE CLASSICISME À ROME AUX I ^{er} SIÈCLES AVANT ET APRÈS J.-C. |
| XXVI | (1980) | LES ÉTUDES CLASSIQUES AUX XIX ^e ET XX ^e SIÈCLES. |
| XXVII | (1982) | ÉLOQUENCE ET RHÉTORIQUE CHEZ CICÉRON. |
| XXIX | (1983) | SOPHOCLE. |
| XXX | (1984) | LA FABLE. |
| XXXI | (1985) | PINDARE. |
| XXXII | (1986) | ASPECTS DE LA PHILOSOPHIE HELLÉNISTIQUE. |
| XXXIII | (1987) | OPPOSITION ET RÉSISTANCES À L'EMPIRE D'AUGUSTE À TRAJAN. |
| XXXIV | (1989) | L'ÉGLISE ET L'EMPIRE AU IV ^e SIÈCLE. |
| XXXV | (1990) | HÉRODOTE ET LES PEUPLES NON GRECS. |
| XXXVI | (1991) | SÉNÉQUE ET LA PROSE LATINE. |
| XXXVII | (1992) | LE SANCTUAIRE GREC. |
| XXXVIII | (1993) | ARISTOPHANE. |
| XXXIX | (1993) | HORACE. |
| XL | (1994) | LA PHILOLOGIE GRECQUE À L'ÉPOQUE HELLÉNISTIQUE ET ROMAINE. |
| XLI | (1996) | PAUSANIAS HISTORIEN. |
| XLII | (1996) | LES LITTÉRATURES TECHNIQUES DANS L'ANTIQUITÉ ROMAINE. |
| XLIII | (1997) | MÉDECINE ET MORALE DANS L'ANTIQUITÉ. |
| XLIV | (1998) | LA BIOGRAPHIE ANTIQUE. |
| XLV | (1999) | HERMANN DIELS (1848-1922) ET LA SCIENCE DE L'ANTIQUITÉ. |
| XLVI | (2000) | LA RÉVOLUTION ROMAINE APRÈS RONALD SYME. BILANS ET PERSPECTIVES. |
| XLVII | (2001) | L'HISTOIRE LITTÉRAIRE IMMANENTE DANS LA POÉSIE LATINE. |
| XLVIII | (2002) | CALLIMAQUE. |
| XLIX | (2003) | GALIEN ET LA PHILOSOPHIE. |
| L | (2004) | SÉNÉQUE LE TRAGIQUE par W.-L. Liebermann, J. Dangel, M. Billerbeck, H.M. Hine, J. Luque Moreno, E. Malaspina, E.A. Schmidt, W. Schubert. <i>Entretiens préparés et présidés par Margarethe Billerbeck et Ernst A. Schmidt.</i> |
| LI | (2005) | L'APOLOGÉTIQUE CHRÉTIENNE GRÉCO-LATINE À L'ÉPOQUE PRÉNICÉNIENNE par A. Włosok, J.-C. Fredouille, A. van den Hoek, L. Perrone, Chr. Riedweg, E. Heck, A. Birley. <i>Entretiens préparés par Antonie Włosok et François Paschoud et présidés par Antonie Włosok.</i> |
| LII | (2006) | LA POÉSIE ÉPIQUE GRECQUE : MÉTAMORPHOSÉS D'UN GENRE LITTÉRAIRE par E.J. Bakker, G. Danek, C.C. Tsagalis, M. Fantuzzi, A. Rengakos, A. Sens, P. Chuvin, M. Fusillo. <i>Entretiens préparés et présidés par Franco Montanari et Antonios Rengakos.</i> |
| LIII | | (À paraître en 2007) RITES ET CROYANCES DANS LES RELIGIONS DU MONDE ROMAIN par C. Bonnet, J. Scheid, N. Belayche, J.M. Dillon, F. Marco Simon, Ph. Borgeaud, D. Stökl Ben Ezra, J. Kellens. <i>Entretiens préparés et présidés par John Scheid.</i> |

ISBN 2-600-00752-0



ISSN 0071-0822

ISBN 2-600-00752-0 .

9 782600 007528