

GREEK TRAGEDY AND THE EPIC CYCLE:
NARRATIVE TRADITION, TEXTS, FRAGMENTS

By

Daniel Dooley

A dissertation submitted to Johns Hopkins University in conformity with the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Baltimore, Maryland

October 2017

© Daniel Dooley
All Rights Reserved

Abstract

This dissertation analyzes the pervasive influence of the Epic Cycle, a set of Greek poems that sought collectively to narrate all the major events of the Trojan War, upon Greek tragedy, primarily those tragedies that were produced in the fifth century B.C. This influence is most clearly discernible in the high proportion of tragedies by Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides that tell stories relating to the Trojan War and do so in ways that reveal the tragedians' engagement with non-Homeric epic. An introduction lays out the sources, argues that the earlier literary tradition in the form of specific texts played a major role in shaping the compositions of the tragedians, and distinguishes the nature of the relationship between tragedy and the Epic Cycle from the ways in which tragedy made use of the Homeric epics. There follow three chapters each dedicated to a different poem of the Trojan Cycle: the *Cypria*, which communicated to Euripides and others the cosmic origins of the war and offered the greatest variety of episodes; the *Little Iliad*, which highlighted Odysseus' career as a military strategist and found special favor with Sophocles; and the *Telegony*, which completed the Cycle by describing the peculiar circumstances of Odysseus' death, attributed to an even more bizarre cause in preserved verses by Aeschylus. These case studies are taken to be representative of Greek tragedy's reception of the Epic Cycle as a whole; while the other Trojan epics (the *Aethiopis*, *Iliupersis*, and *Nostoi*) are not treated comprehensively, they enter into the discussion at various points. Both the poems of the Epic Cycle and the majority of the tragedies that derived their stories from them survive only in meager fragments, and this study aims to improve how these small texts are read and how their lost contexts are reconstructed while also elucidating how the tragedians used and adapted the Cycle.

Preface

The present dissertation was born out of a 2010 seminar offered by Prof. Silvia Montiglio at Johns Hopkins University (JHU). The seminar centered on the figure of Odysseus in post-Homeric Greek literature, and I elected to write a paper on the hero's appearances in fragmentary Greek tragedy. I thus discovered the field-defining collection *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* and instantly was overawed by the richness and erudition of these volumes.¹ Having supposed at first (unjustly, as it turns out) that the fragments were suffering from relative scholarly neglect in recent years, I determined shortly thereafter to undertake a larger research project that depended on close examination of the tragic fragments. I considered attempting an edition of a particular fragmentary play² but decided instead to investigate the obvious (already to Aristotle) but not yet fully appreciated axis of influence connecting a vast number of mostly fragmentary tragedies to the earlier Epic (more specifically, Trojan) Cycle. It seemed appropriate then to attempt a sort of updating of Welcker's *Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus geordnet* (1839-41), but naturally, as I came to understand the complexities involved in dealing with these tiny texts, I had to whittle down the scope of the project and select just a few of the Cyclic poems to cover in depth. The result in essence is a sundry series of short commentaries tracing tragedy's appropriation and alteration of each heroic *ergon* and *parergon* narrated in those epic poems.

It has been my great fortune that Prof. Montiglio has served as my advisor throughout this endeavor; she has been ever helpful, insightful, encouraging, critical, and

¹ Hardly a unique or trivial experience among those who delve into any of the "impressively learned and sumptuously produced" collections of fragments published in classical studies, as Gibert 1998 notes.

² During my initial research on Odysseus in tragedy Müller 2000, a magisterial presentation of Euripides' *Philoctetes*, had been particularly inspirational.

patient. Likewise, I am delighted now to have Profs. David Rosenbloom and Matthew Roller as official readers after learning so much from them while a graduate student at JHU. The additional perspectives of Profs. Richard Jasnow and Joshua Smith are also greatly appreciated. Prof. Alan Shapiro has been kindly supportive of my efforts to incorporate evidence from Greek vase-painting, which I hope at least escape the charge of dilettantism.

I thank JHU librarian Donald Juedes for his assistance over the years and the staff of the New York Public Library who granted me the use of research rooms in the Stephen A. Schwarzman Building. I am grateful to Dr. Marco Fantuzzi for sharing an advance copy of the volume (now long since brought to light) Fantuzzi–Tsalalis 2015.

For many years my parents John (†)—*causa fuit pater his*—and Melanie, wife Alison, and siblings have lovingly nurtured this effort by offering abundant advice and encouragement for which I am extremely grateful.

In this work I do not strive for absolute orthographical consistency: although in the case of proper names it may appear that I stubbornly follow a Latinate system, aberrations like “Poseidon” (versus “Chiron”) and “skeptical” can be found throughout. I also beg the reader’s forgiveness for the presentation of titles of dramatic works; striving to name these works in the clearest format possible in every context has led me sometimes to shift between the original Greek title, a transliteration (or abbreviation thereof), and an English translation—all for the same play. In footnotes the conventional abbreviations of plays’ Latin titles are used. For Greek font I have utilized the GreekKeys software made available by the Society for Classical Studies.

Noveboraci scribebam pridie sollemnitatem omnium sanctorum anno MMXVII.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Preface.....	iii
Abbreviations.....	vii
1. Introduction: Tragedy Between Homer and the Epic Cycle.....	1
2. Tales from the <i>Cypria</i> : the Mythic Mother Lode.....	41
2.1. <i>Dios Boulē</i>	41
2.2. The Wedding of Peleus and Thetis.....	44
2.3. The Judgment of Paris.....	50
2.4. Paris' Departure for Greece and Seduction of Helen.....	62
2.5. The Death(s) of the Dioscuri.....	74
2.6. Menelaus Visits Agamemnon and Nestor.....	75
2.7. The Recruitment of Heroes.....	76
2.8. The Madness of Odysseus.....	93
2.9. The First Gathering at Aulis.....	101
2.10. Telephus.....	102
2.11. Achilles on Scyros.....	108
2.12. The Second Gathering at Aulis.....	114
2.13. Tenedos and Tennes.....	121
2.14. Philoctetes' Snakebite.....	122
2.15. Sophocles' Satyric <i>Fellow Banqueters</i>	123
2.16. Protesilaus and Cycnus.....	127
2.17. <i>Helenēs Apaitēsis</i>	138

2.18.	Achilles <i>Ptoliporthos</i>	143
2.19.	Achilles Beholds Helen.....	145
2.20.	The Slaying of Troilus	148
2.21.	The Murder of Palamedes.....	152
2.22.	Heroes at Play: Another Scene from the <i>Παλαμήδεια</i> ?.....	164
2.23.	Conclusions.....	167
3.	Odysseus' <i>aristeia</i> ? Big Moments in the <i>Little Iliad</i>	169
3.1.	The Awarding of the Arms of Achilles.....	171
3.2.	Ajax's Suicide and Its Aftermath.....	172
3.3.	Philoctetes	192
3.4.	The Last Recruits	210
3.5.	Odysseus in Troy	218
3.6.	The Palladium	230
3.7.	The Sack of Troy (Not the <i>Sack of Troy</i>).....	237
3.8.	Conclusions.....	245
4.	The Hero and the Heron: Telic Impulses in the <i>Telegony</i>	248
4.1.	After the Slaughter of the Suitors	250
4.2.	Odysseus' Other Bastard Son	254
4.3.	The Death of Odysseus	261
4.4.	Chiastic Couplings	284
4.5.	Conclusions.....	285
5.	General Conclusions	287
	Bibliography	300

Abbreviations³

A.	Aeschylus
adesp.	<i>adespoton/a</i> , designating a fragment or fragments lacking any attribution
Ar.	Aristophanes
arg.	argument in Proclus' <i>Chrestomathy</i> of whichever Cyclic poem is the focus of a given chapter (unless otherwise specified)
CPG	E. L. von Leutsch and F. W. Schneidewin, <i>Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum</i> , 2 vols. (Göttingen: 1839-1851).
E.	Euripides
<i>Epit.</i>	the <i>Epitome</i> of part of pseudo-Apollodorus' <i>Library</i>
F	fragment(s) in <i>TrGF</i> (otherwise "fr(r)." is used)
<i>FGrH</i>	F. Jacoby et al. (edd.), <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> (Leiden: 1993–).
<i>GG</i>	E. Schwyzer and A. Debrunner, <i>Griechische Grammatik: auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik</i> (Munich: 1934–71).
<i>GM</i>	M. L. West, <i>Greek Metre</i> (Oxford: 1982).
<i>GP</i> ²	J. D. Denniston, <i>The Greek Particles</i> , 2 nd ed., rev. by K. J. Dover (Oxford: 1954).
<i>IEG</i>	M. L. West, <i>Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati</i> (Oxford: 1972).
<i>incert. fab.</i>	<i>incertae fabulae</i> , designating a fragment or fragments of known author but unknown work
K.–A.	see <i>PCG</i>
Kannicht	see <i>TrGF</i>
<i>LfgrE</i>	B. Snell and H. J. Mette, <i>Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos</i> (Göttingen: 1955–).

³ Abbreviations not listed here either follow those in LSJ and *OLD* or are expansions thereof (e.g., "Phil." is used instead of "Ph." for "Philoctetes").

<i>LIMC</i>	J. Boardman et al. (eds.), <i>Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae</i> (Zürich: 1981–).
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , 9th ed., rev. H. Stuart-Jones et al. (Oxford: 1940).
M.–W.	F. Solmsen, R. Merkelbach, and M. L. West (edd.), <i>Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum, Fragmenta Selecta</i> (Oxford: 1970)
Nauck	A. Nauck, <i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , suppl. B. Snell (Hildesheim: 1964).
<i>OCD</i> ⁴	S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth, and E. Eidinow (eds.), <i>The Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> , 4 th ed. (Oxford: 2012).
<i>P.Oxy.</i>	B. P. Grenfell et al. (edd.), <i>The Oxyrhynchus Papyri</i> (London: 1898–). LXXX voll. to date.
Page	D. L. Page, <i>Lyrice Graeca Selecta</i> (Oxford: 1968).
<i>PCG</i>	R. Kassel and C. Austin (K.–A.), <i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> (Berlin–New York: 1983–).
<i>PMG</i>	D. L. Page, <i>Poetae Melici Graeci</i> (Oxford: 1962).
Radt	see <i>TrGF</i>
<i>RE</i>	G. Wissowa et al. (edd.), <i>Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> (Stuttgart: 1894–1980).
S.	Sophocles
<i>SFP</i>	<i>Selected Fragmentary Plays</i> , pub. as a series by Aris & Phillips (Oxford). E. vols. 1 (1995) and 2 (2004) ed. C. Collard, M. Cropp, and K. H. Lee; S. vols. 1 (2006) and 2 (2012) ed. A. H. Sommerstein, D. Fitzpatrick, and T. Talbot; cited as, e.g., “Cropp in <i>SFP</i> 2004: 38.”
Smyth	H. W. Smyth, <i>Greek Grammar</i> , rev. G. M. Messing (Cambridge, Mass.: 1956).
<i>SSR</i>	G. Giannantoni (ed.), <i>Socratis et Socraticorum Reliquiae</i> (Rome: 1990).
T	testimoni(um/a) about a tragedian in <i>TrGF</i> (otherwise “test.” is used)

- T.–W. A. D. Trendall and T. B. L. Webster, *Illustrations of Greek Drama* (London: 1971).
- TrGF* B. Snell, S. Radt, and R. Kannicht (eds.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen: 1972–2004). 5 vols., of which Snell and Kannicht edited i (minor tragedians) and ii (didascalia and adespota), Radt ed. iii (Aeschylus) and iv (Sophocles), and Kannicht ed. v (Euripides, in 2 parts).⁴
- West (W.) M. L. West, *The Epic Cycle* (Oxford: 2013).⁵
- Webster T. B. L. Webster, *Monuments Illustrating Tragedy and Satyr Play*, 2nd ed., BICS Suppl. 20 (London: 1967).
- Welcker F. G. Welcker, *Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus geordnet* (*RhM* Suppl. 2), 3 vols. (Bonn: 1839–41).

⁴ When not cited by fragment (F), these volumes are cited by volume and page number, such as “*TrGF* iv.181.” The minor tragedians are collected together in vol. i and are assigned authorial numbers, so that in a citation like “*TrGF* 20 F 29” the first number refers to a specific minor tragedian whose fragments are contained in vol. i.

⁵ The texts of the testt. and fr. are also found in West’s 2003 Loeb edition, which contains a concordance to earlier editions of the fragments, notably that by Bernabé. I give my own translations of these texts.

1. Introduction: Tragedy Between Homer and the Epic Cycle

Before the central defense speech of *Acharnians*, Dicaeopolis, the protagonist and Aristophanes' surrogate, in his search for a more pitiable persona and costume to don, finds the *enfant terrible* of tragic pathos and invention toiling away as a bibliomaniacal recluse. Cephisophon, the slave who answers the door, reports of his master (398-400):

ὁ νοῦς μὲν ἔξω συλλέγων ἐπύλλια
κούκ ἔνδον, αὐτὸς δ' ἔνδον ἀναβάδην ποιεῖ
τραγωδίαν.

His mind is out collecting versicles and not inside, but he himself is inside, composing a tragedy upstairs.⁶

Shortly thereafter the *ekkyklēma* is wheeled out to reveal Euripides at work. The tragedian is surely to be shown surrounded by book-rolls, the external sources of the *ἐπύλλια* he marshals together.⁷ Euripides' book collection was famous in Antiquity, even being mentioned alongside the libraries of the Pergamene kings.⁸ While it may be true that institutionalized book-collecting did not emerge in the Greek world until the third century B.C.,⁹ highly literate individuals who made it their business to trade in written texts could certainly have amassed personal collections of books, even before the well-

⁶ Unless ἀναβάδην means “with his feet up,” an alternative given by some of the scholia (cf. Ar. *Pl.* 1123). Note that this posture is more conducive to listening to a recitation (cf. κατακείσασθαι, Pl. *Phdr.* 230e) or to dictation than to the physical act of writing, which in antiquity was done on one's lap (Saenger 1997: 48 with n. 103).

⁷ Aristophanes reuses the verb συλλέγειν to describe Euripides' poetic process at *Ran.* 849, and at 1297 Aeschylus is in turn asked where he “picked up” some of his more unusual strains. The implication is that all poets borrowed freely from sources both noble (as Aeschylus defiantly claims his was) and ignoble.

⁸ E. T 49 = Athen. 1.3a; cf. Ar. *Ran.* 939-44 (= T 50a, 52a), where it is confirmed that Euripides “strained off” expressions from books with the help of his slave Cephisophon, and *ibid.* 1409 (= T 50b), where Aeschylus trivializes the heft of his rival's βιβλία.

⁹ Hendrickson 2014: 372.

attested “library” in Aristotle’s Lyceum.¹⁰ But which texts would have graced the cubbyholes of Euripides’ library? From where exactly did he derive his literary inspirations? Other than an anecdote according to which Euripides gave a work of Heraclitus to Socrates,¹¹ our biographical testimonia do not go into specifics about the writings he owned and perused. As a result, these questions must be addressed through *Quellenforschung*, as they have been for a long time.

One could dismiss the question of Euripides’ use of sources—or the reading practices of any tragedian, for that matter—on the grounds that a poet endeavors to create, not document. No doubt the selection of a poetic topic matters less than how the poet handles it. Moreover, the Aristophanic evidence cited above presents the tragedians as laboring over individual verses or songs, not being inspired or influenced at the level of the whole play. It follows *a fortiori*, however, that an imitator of details can also be an

¹⁰ See esp. Strabo 13.1.54; but Hendrickson 2014: 377 casts doubt even on the existence of this library. On the origins of a book trade in Greece around the middle of the fifth century B.C., see Reynolds–Wilson 1991: 2. There are signs that poets read each other well before this, such as the fact that Semonides and Alcaeus knew Hesiod’s *Works and Days* (West 1978: 61; Harris 1989: 49 undercuts the evidence by pointing to the “circuit for rhapsodes” that originally had nothing to do with written texts). The much debated Pisistratean recension of the Homeric poems would suggest that texts were circulating in Athens already during the Archaic period, and official *γραμματεῖς* had emerged there ca. 550 (Harris 1989: 50), while Athen. 1.3a reports that Pisistratus himself (not to mention Polycrates of Samos, and later Euripides) had a large personal library. Additional evidence for a book culture in Classical Athens comes from vase-painting: for book-rolls featured in fifth-century scenes of schoolrooms—including the famous example of Berlin 2285 = *ARV*² 431.48 (dated ca. 480 and including an open book-roll bearing an epic proem)—see Immerwahr 1964 (cf. Shapiro 1995: 218; and for a list including nine other RF scenes showing grammar schools, Harris 1989: 97). Attic tragedy explicitly acknowledges the art of writing with increasing frequency in the closing decades of the fifth century and beginning no later than the time of S. *Trach.* 157 (referring to a written will; the praise of writing at [A.] *PV* 460f. cannot securely be dated much earlier). Harris 1989: 95 n. 139 lists the ten references to writing-tablets in extant tragedy, and on p. 109 he discusses the alphabetic play in E. *Theseus*, which delighted its audience members—perhaps the semi-literate even more than the fully literate—enough to inspire two imitations (by Agathon and Theodectes). Writing even features in the plots of certain plays, such as E. *Palamedes* (discussed *infra*, §2.21) and *Hipp.* 856-81, 1311f.; it was perhaps inevitable that a medium of communication so familiar to the playwrights—if not also their audiences—should have crept into their mythological narratives. Toward the century’s end rapidly spreading literacy at Athens is suggested by Ar. *Ran.* 1112-4 (cf. 52-4 for the reading of tragedy in particular—though the genre chosen here is largely dictated by the identity of the reader, Dionysus). Harris 1989: 87, however, rightly notes the hyperbole in the passage; and whereas the dramatists themselves and their closest associates can be assumed to have been literate, there cannot have been any expectation that their literate references would be intelligible with entire audiences.

¹¹ T 46a-b = Diog. Laert. 9.11, Tatian. *Or. ad Graecos* 3.1, p. 3.11 Schwartz.

imitator of broad themes and of narrative elements, and careful analysis of the tragic corpus shows that the tragedians' basic choices about which stories to tell were neither haphazard nor unrelated to their ultimate goal of affecting the Athenian *dēmos* emotionally and intellectually while addressing the problems faced by the *polis*.¹² In fact, it is only by understanding the literary background to the oeuvres of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides that we can adequately appreciate their contributions to story-making (*mythopoeia*) and begin to assess why they made the innovations they did. What *Quellenforschung* aims to show is not simply that later texts are derivative (even ancient critics like Aristarchus were deceived on this point) but rather that the process of original composition necessarily begins with reading, listening, and overhearing. This is especially true for the genre of Greek tragedy, in which it was conventional to write about characters familiar from cult and myth, not to invent new characters.¹³ Finally, as a general principle it is worthwhile to trace the reception of Greek stories in tragedy (including in lost plays) because this genre came to be viewed as authoritative on mythological matters.¹⁴ Indeed, Athenian tragedy made it harder for the Cyclic poems to

¹² The goals of the genre are thus adumbrated in *OCD*⁴ s.v. “tragedy, Greek” (P. E. Easterling) §I.5; Heath 1987a; Gregory 1997; Mastronarde 2010. Aristotle famously defines tragedy as aiming at the generation of pity (*ἔλεος*) and fear (*φόβος*) and ultimately their evacuation or cleansing (*κάθαρσις*, *Poet.* 1449b27). But he also makes clear the crucial importance of the plot (*μῦθος*) in facilitating tragedy's fulfillment: the plot, itself defined as “the arrangement of deeds” (*τῶν πραγμάτων σύστασις*), is alternately called both the end (*τέλος*) and the beginning (*ἀρχή*) of tragedy (*ibid.* 1450a). Cf. the rather Aristotelian comic fragment of Timocles (fr. 6 Kock) explaining that the objective of tragedy is to please and educate spectators by allowing them to witness others more wretched than themselves. There is of course no shortage of wretched figures in the Epic Cycle, including the beggarly Telephus and the lame Philoctetes, both of whom Timocles mentions.

¹³ Cf. Hor. *A.P.* 119f. (*aut famam sequere aut sibi convenientia finge | scriptor*), and note that invention *ex nihilo* is precisely what Agathon did in his *Antheus*, according to Arist. *Poet.* 1451b; but the exception proves the rule.

¹⁴ Cf. Green 1996: 28, calling theater and its stories “the common reference point in...society,” at least for Tarentines. Besides their manifold influence on subsequent poets, the tragedians supplied endless fodder for mythographers, resulting in works such as the comparative study *Tragodumena* by Asclepiades of Tragilus (*FGrH* 12) and Dicaearchus' *Hypotheses* of the plays of Sophocles and Euripides, not to mention the *Library* of pseudo-Apollodorus (also generally regarded as a direct witness to the Epic Cycle: see *infra*) and pseudo-Hyginus' *Fabulae*. The canonization of the plays, which expanded their reach well beyond the

survive, supplanting them as a trove of mythological knowledge while eclipsing them in literary value.¹⁵

Scholars have by no means taken it for granted that the tragedians were highly discriminating when it came to their plots. Euripides in particular has been accused of a certain kind of “demythologization,” which suggests that for him the choice of which mythological material to dramatize was practically academic.¹⁶ It cannot be denied that Euripides displayed an academic tendency of a certain fashion: he scrutinized his myths as to their contemporary relevance and other external criteria rather than remaining preoccupied with the myths themselves. An ancient tale appealed not through its strangeness but on the contrary through its intelligibility. But a corollary of this tendency in Euripides’ method is that his selections and his pairings of story to theme (or lesson) should have mattered all the more to him as a poet, for as Aristotle says *μῦθος* is the *ἀρχή* of tragedy and determines the semantic limits of a given play.¹⁷ In other words, to the extent that a profane quality pervades Euripides’ plays, this only activates and underscores the vital contribution of their mythological content. While he may have sought to familiarize characters and situations that some of his contemporaries considered more hallowed and remote, each myth that he chose to treat was chosen not in order that its original status as a discrete and vital pattern might be effaced but because it was the

Attic milieu for which they were written by and large, was aided above all by Lycurgus, who not only commissioned honorific statues of the three great tragedians but also had official copies of their texts made (Plut. *Mor.* 841f)—though the expressed purpose of this was to safeguard against actors’ interpolations, not to establish the plays as definitive accounts of myths. See Kannicht 1997: 68 for the Hellenistic “Tales from Euripides,” a collection of prose summaries of the playwright’s works, which were regarded as authoritative; Wilamowitz 1875: 183f. had already ascertained the existence of these “Tales” before papyrology provided confirmation in the form of Euripidean hypotheses.

¹⁵ Cf. Heinze 1903: 3, on the story of the Fall of Troy: “Das alte Epos war von der Lyrik und vom Drama abgelöst worden.”

¹⁶ Heath 1987a: 50ff.

¹⁷ *Supra* n. 11.

perfect vehicle by which to explore whatever facet of the human experience he wished to explicate. His fixation on extracting practical meaning from mythological situations that could be distilled into pithy *γνῶμαι* drove him to study his myths still more zealously.¹⁸ Therefore, what has been described as demythologization, since that term imputes a process of leveling or banalization amongst the myths themselves that is not observable in Euripides' works, is understood better as exemplification. As poets, all three major tragedians surely understood that sublime art consisted in the selection (*λήψις* or *ἐκλογή*) and unification of those features that best characterize a given emotion or experience.¹⁹ In conformity with this attitude, choosing the right incidents to work up for a tetralogy had to be viewed as a task of paramount importance.

In Classical Athens, enduring popular interest in the vicissitudes of the Trojan War led to the creation of a vast number Trojan-themed tragedies.²⁰ Euripides, who unlike Aeschylus was hardly in the habit of composing trilogies on unitary themes, even wrote a "Trojan trilogy" in 415 B.C. that comprised the play *Alexander*, *Palamedes*, and *Trojan Women*.²¹ As the poems of Homer²² were relatively narrow in scope (though

¹⁸ On Euripides' fondness for *γνῶμαι* see Kannicht 1997: 68; Most 2003.

¹⁹ Paraphrasing Ps.-Longinus, *De Subl.* 10.3 (cf. the use of *λήψις* at 15.10).

²⁰ For the reception of Trojan myth in Classical Athens more generally, see Lange 2002; Pallantza 2005; Latacz 2008; Fantuzzi–Tsagalis 2015b.

²¹ Aelian, *VH* 2.8 records the year, and the metrical analysis of Cropp and Fick 1985: 72 on *Alexander* more or less corroborates the date and at the same time the unity of the trilogy. The standard study of the trilogy is Scodel 1980; briefer discussions in Jouan 1966: 114, 361f.; and Lee 1997: x-xiv, who in an addendum on p. 286 strongly defends the trilogy's thematic unity, which, while it may not be as obvious as the unity of, say Aeschylus' *Oresteia*, is nevertheless plain to see: the *Troades* depicts the divinely ordained punishment both of the Trojans for the crimes Paris and his community were poised to commit in the *Alexander* and of the Greeks for their wrongful killing of an ally in *Palamedes* as well as for their misconduct during the sack (recollected in the prologue of *Troades*); cf. Jouan 1966: 362. In this way the guilt of the Greeks feeds off that of the Trojans, resulting in the fateful shipwreck of the victorious fleet on its homeward voyage. Other unifying features include Cassandra's appearance as a speaking character in the first and third plays, Odysseus' in the second and third, and the internecine strife that leads Hecuba on one side to instruct Deiphobus to kill Paris and Odysseus on the other side to kill Palamedes.

²² For the sake of convenience I sometimes refer to Homer as the traditional author of both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, even though I think it is correct to distinguish between "the poet of the *Iliad*" and "the poet of the *Odyssey*" (cf. West 2011: 7f.).

filled with allusions to plenty of episodes outside his immediate concern), the texts of the Epic Cycle served prominently as a supplementary collection of source material for any tragedian who was fixated on Troy. The Cyclic poems did circulate in Classical Greece, although the extent and chronology of this are uncertain.²³ This study interrogates the evidence for the special affinity that tragic poets clearly harbored for the Trojan myths that framed Homer's masterpieces, and it argues that the Cyclic poems, despite the scantiness of their remains today, can be shown to have been consulted regularly by the ruminating tragedians. Of Euripides' 92 known plays,²⁴ 15 (16.3%) have arguments that certainly or probably derive from the Trojan Cycle; the figures for Aeschylus and Sophocles are respectively 14 out of 78 (17.9%)²⁵ and 41 out of 120 (34.1%).²⁶ Although prior to the advent of Athenian tragedy many of these stories had been treated not only in the poems of the Epic Cycle but also in lyric poetry, for example, the Epic Cycle was an obvious point of reference for those hoping to read up on Cyclic tales, and at any rate the intertextual possibilities—that is, the possible channels through which a later author could absorb mythological material related to the Trojan War—are far less nebulous than in the case of, say, Vergil's *Aeneid*.²⁷ Moreover, we can sometimes glean enough details

²³ West; Fantuzzi–Tsagalis 2015b.

²⁴ As counted in Welcker's introduction (cf. Nauck's index); see also T Id (Kannicht's summary of the evidence in *TrGF*, vol. 5, p. 80). The total play count is of course only an approximation of the playwright's true total output, but the percentage should be regarded as more or less representative since there is no reason to suppose a discrepancy in the rates of preservation of Trojan versus non-Trojan plays.

²⁵ The total number of plays is perhaps even more elusive in the case of Aeschylus than for the other two major tragedians; see Sommerstein 2012a: 10-13.

²⁶ Sommerstein 2015: 463. As for the Trojan-themed plays of the minor tragedians, statistical analysis is futile; all one can do is list their titles (*ibid.* 483-6). Note also that since those plays whose epic model was Homer are distinct from those based on the Epic Cycle, it is convenient simply to list the former, which are far fewer (*ibid.* 461f.; although Sommerstein neglects to mention here Euripides' *Cyclops* and the spurious *Rhesus*, he does allude (483 n. 75) to plays by minor tragedians called *Achilles* and *Odysseus*, which he assumes "to have been based on the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* respectively").

²⁷ Which, of course, has not prevented scholars from making suppositions. On Vergil's use of the Epic Cycle see the fine treatment by Gärtner 2015, but note that this poet's familiarity with the heroes of the Trojan Cycle may owe more to Greek tragedy, as revealed by *Aen.* 4.471, *scaenis agitatus Orestes*.

to link the contents of a Cyclic poem directly to a tragic treatment of a given topic, even excluding the possibility of another channel through which ideas might have been filtered. And although it may be exaggerating to say that we can glance over a tragedian's shoulder, as it were, to determine what he was reading as he wrote, at least in one instance it is possible to detect a spike of interest in the Cyclic poems that demonstrates a sustained trend in Euripides' poetry: in the years immediately following his Trojan trilogy of 415 B.C., he wrote his *Electra* (413), *Helen* (412), and *Iphigenia among the Taurians* (414 or 411), suggesting that he was especially fixated on Troy during this period.²⁸

Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker (1784-1868) was the first scholar to study in depth tragedy's gravitation toward Cyclic themes, which he had observed during his collection and analysis of the fragments of Greek tragedy. This was all part of his quest to enhance through fragmentary evidence our understanding of preserved texts and thus to push the field of Classics toward the *Totalitätsideal*.²⁹ In many respects, then, the present study seeks simply to update Welcker's voluminous *Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus* (1839-41). Such an effort appears justified both because there are more recently discovered fragments to consider—a task facilitated by the systematic integration of these fragments with the older material in the landmark *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, which supersedes Nauck—and because there is always room to address more closely the adaptive modes by which tragedians appropriated the myths

²⁸ Cf. Jouan 1966: 260 n. 1 for the dates.

²⁹ Welcker ##. On Welcker's visionary scholarship and the essential methodology that he established see Calder 1991a: 346f.; Radt 1986: *passim*.

received from the Epic Cycle.³⁰ In any case, study of the fragments is essential to the project, for the picture of how great an influence the Epic Cycle had on the tragedians becomes much clearer, both in each individual case and with a view to the statistical whole, when fragments are factored in.

To show that tragedy owed a great debt to the Epic Cycle was not Welcker's sole purpose in the work cited above. In one fell swoop he also attempted to reconstruct all of Greek tragedy's trilogies and tetralogies, even those not directly connected with the Epic Cycle, and to show that each group of plays was a coherent product. His groupings can thus be tendentious where no ancient testimony exists. But Welcker's studies also afford a preliminary understanding of what the tragedians hoped to achieve on each occasion by adapting material from the Epic Cycle. When Aeschylus said he was offering up "slices from Homer's ample feast" (Athen. 347 E), was he thinking of all the poems that could be termed "Homeric," that is, of the Cyclic epics as well as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*? Did he actually believe Homer wrote the Cyclic poems as well? We may surely answer the first question in the affirmative, even if we tend to doubt the latter possibility.³¹ Euripides was especially smitten with the stories of the *Cypria* (as Jouan amply demonstrates), while Aeschylus' tendencies vis-à-vis the Cycle have been analyzed extensively.³²

Aristotle explicitly states in his *Poetics* (1459b1) that the virtue of the *Cypria* and *Little Iliad*—if it can be called a virtue—is their narrative richness rather than the

³⁰ As West 45 n. 93 puts it, Welcker's "pioneering" catalogue of Cycle-derived tragedies (iii.1485-90) has ceased to be authoritative.

³¹ Cf. Pearson 1917: i.xxiii, who remarks that "[d]own to about 500 B.C." the poems of the Cycle were universally attributed to Homer. Welcker i.3 explains his choice to call the Cyclic poems "Homeric" by citing ancient usage and pointing out that even in Proclus' day some scholars ascribed them to Homer. If Aeschylus' pithy statement is genuine, his phrasing would have been dictated not only by a desire for terseness but by the lack of an alternative term for referring to the other Trojan epics (the phrase *κύκλος ἐπῶν* is not attested before Aristotle). See also Sommerstein 2015 and, for the question of which poems Pindar considered "Homeric," Rutherford 2015: 456f. (he offers further useful references in n. 38).

³² See Sommerstein 2012a, especially 241-53 (cf. the metaliterary evidence of *Frogs*).

skillfulness of their poetic execution. With more overt disdain Horace warns aspiring writers that dwelling “around the cycle” of events (*circa...orbem*) precludes making an original artistic contribution because the cycle is “cheap and wide open” (*vilem patulumque*).³³ Proclus, author of the *Chrestomathy*, offered a more objective account of the prevailing sentiment from the perspective of readers, as Photius reports (*Bibl.* 319a30):

λέγει δὲ ὡς τοῦ ἐπικοῦ κύκλου τὰ ποιήματα διασώζεται καὶ σπουδάζεται τοῖς πολλοῖς, οὐχ οὕτω διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν, ὡς διὰ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν ἐν αὐτῶν πραγμάτων.

And [Proclus] says that the poems of the Epic Cycle are preserved and studied by most [sc. of their readers] not so much because of their excellence as because of the sequential quality of the events in it.³⁴

These poems, then, were predominantly resources through which Greek audiences could digest with speed and ease the major events of their heroic past, allowing them to better appreciate the many allusions to these episodes in the superior works of great poets like Homer.³⁵ But more to the point, subsequent authors could exploit the Epic Cycle’s straightforward arrangement when, gripped by inspiration or longing for it, they needed to verify or supplement their own understanding of certain mythological details by

³³ *A.P.* 131f., where the adjective *patulus* carries a double application, referring to the cycle’s breadth of subject-matter (the image of embracing too much is enlivened by the term *hiatus* in 138) and to the fact that any poet can handle a superficial sketch thereof. The Cyclic poets thus violate Horace’s injunction in line 23: *denique sit quodvis, simplex dumtaxat et unum*. Cf. Callim. *Ep.* 28 and Pollianus’ elegiac censure (*Anth. Pal.* 11.130) of the Cyclic poets, whose favorite expression seems to him to be “*ἀντὶρ ἔπειτα*.”

³⁴ *Pace* Hartmann 1917: 8 n. 12, Photius is justified in writing *ἐν αὐτῶ* (rather than *ἐν αὐτοῖς*). Proclus’ judgment was that the Epic Cycle as a whole was valuable because it presented much mythological material in chronological order (whereas *ἐν αὐτοῖς* could imply that the individual poems possessed this quality separately). So the stories of the Epic Cycle were not only numerous (cf. *πολυμερῆς πράξις*, Arist. *loc. cit.*) but also in a sense conveniently catalogued, hence easy to reference. Cf. Fantuzzi 2015.

³⁵ Hartmann (*loc. cit.*) is probably mistaken to regard the phrase *τοῖς πολλοῖς* as a contemptuous reference to the rabble (Burgess 2001 joins in translating “most,” and at any rate it would be odd to find *hoi polloi* dignified with the verb *σπουδάζειν*), but he is right to infer from the passage that the poems of the Epic Cycle still circulated widely in Proclus’ day. For more on the “aesthetics of sequentiality” see Fantuzzi 2015. For Homer as the greatest of poets, see e.g. Pi. *I.* 4.37-9.

consulting another poetic authority. That is not to say that they always found in them answers to all their inquiries or that they always accepted those they found.

Plato called Homer the “first of the tragic poets,”³⁶ so the possibility of reworking Homeric stories into formalized tragedies must have been obvious to playwrights of the fifth century, even if Homer seemed to have forestalled their work.³⁷ At the same time, some scholars have overstated the degree to which tragedians felt apprehensive about treading on Homeric terrain.³⁸ Aeschylus wrote a whole trilogy—*Myrmidons*, *Nereids*, and *Phrygians* or *The Ransom of Hector*—directly concerned with Achilles’ exploits at Troy, his relationships with key Iliadic figures like Patroclus and Briseis, and the death of Hector.³⁹ Plays by Sophocles and Euripides depict younger versions of Achilles that roundly reject any notion that the *Iliad* held a monopoly on the exposition of this character.⁴⁰ In the fourth century Dionysius I of Syracuse wrote a *Ransom of Hector* that significantly altered the story from its configuration in *Iliad* Book 24.⁴¹ Lyric poets for their part show few qualms about openly challenging (e.g., in certain fragments of

³⁶ *Rep.* 605c-607a, discussed e.g. by Lefkowitz 2009: 528. Cf. *Theaet.* 152e; also Isoc. *Ad Nicolem* 48, where Homer’s grouping with tragedians is based on their shared ability to express human nature (*φύσις*) in poetry (on this passage see Fitzmyer 1945: 12f.). The view that Homer’s poetic sensibility was so close to that of a tragedian may help explain why, centuries after the flourishing of rhapsodic activity, Homeric scenes were acted out in theaters (Artem. *Onir.* 4.2.76-9 Pack; cf. Ach. Tat. 3.20.4). Cf. D. L. 4.20, recording the judgment of Polemon the Academic that Homer was an epic Sophocles (and Sophocles a tragic Homer). Pindar was another non-tragedian to earn the cognomen *τραγωδοποιός* (Hermog. *Id.* 1.6).

³⁷ Homer has already rendered the body of the *Iliad* *δραματικὸν...καὶ ἐναγώνιον* (Ps.-Longin. *loc. cit.*), an obvious deterrent to those whose aim was to elaborate.

³⁸ E.g., P. Easterling in *ead.*—Knox 1989: 342, which draws a contrast between the apparent reverence felt by fifth-century tragedians and the audacity of their fourth-century counterparts. But if, as is claimed there, Astydamas was reckless in treating of Hector’s encounter with Andromache à la *Il.* 6.392-496, then his folly should be construed simply as a failure to recognize that most of the individual episodes in Homer were not substantive enough to warrant or sustain a whole tragedy. Tragedians need not face repercussions simply for reproducing Homer. On the contrary, they may well have felt it easier to satisfy their audiences by plowing such familiar terrain, which, however, they would need to be wary of altering. Fantuzzi 2012: 18 writes of tragedy’s “metaliterary differentiation from epic” but misattributes the differences to tragedy’s desire to deflate the grandeur of Homer and espouse a more desperate worldview.

³⁹ As the satyr-play rounding out this composition Mette posited an *Alexander* on the basis of A. F 451 I; see Krumeich–Pechstein–Seidensticker 1999: 203f.

⁴⁰ For Sophocles’ *The Lovers of Achilles* and Euripides’ *Scyrians* see *infra* §§2.7 and 2.11.

⁴¹ Tzetz. *Chil.* 5.180. See Nauck 794.

Stesichorus) or recycling Homer, while Horace, at least, effectively condones the practice of adapting the *Iliad* to stage productions on the grounds that its contents were in the public domain (*A.P.* 128-31).⁴² And the canonization of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in Athens does mean that these were regarded as sacred and inviolable texts, with the result that it would be foolish and potentially blasphemous to offer an alternative version of these stories.⁴³ Yet this is precisely what many poets did, while both repetition and alteration of his stories could be expressions of deepest respect.⁴⁴ The malleability of Homeric epic is of course witnessed also at the level of diction, as when a tragedian gives a Homeric word a new meaning.⁴⁵

Nevertheless, a number of factors did contribute to the dearth of plays overlapping in their material with Homer. Besides individual playwrights' personal interests and the availability of many other legends, the most obvious determinant is the aforementioned narrowness of the *Iliad* in terms of the share of the Trojan War that it narrates.⁴⁶ In truth, the proportion of surviving and attested plays that derive their stories

⁴² This is not to deny that Homer was viewed as sacrosanct in some sense. Xenophanes, for one, earned the defamatory epithet *Ὀμηροπάτης* ("he who tramples on Homer") for aggressively disputing Homer's worldview (*D.L.* 9.18).

⁴³ In a social climate where Homer's poems were considered the repository of all learning (*Pl. Ion* 539d ff.), alternatives to Homer could have been seen as an invitation to despise knowledge itself.

⁴⁴ Enthusiasm for more direct imitation of Homer may have grown after the fifth century. Cultic reverence for Homer, most clearly embodied in his apotheosis on the famous Archelaos Relief (BM 1819.0812.1) of the late third century, regarded him as the source of all literature. When Comedy pays homage to the great poet, the connection may be seen as somewhat loose (if not consciously based on the attribution to Homer of the satirical *Margites*; cf. *Arist. Poet.* 13.92). By contrast, Tragedy's dependence on Homer extends in a very pronounced way to the stories that he transmitted, which tragedians among others continued to recycle even in the Hellenistic period (Kotlińska-Toma 2015). Perhaps a poet, having done just that and won a victory, commissioned the monument sculpted by Archelaos. Elderkin 1936: 498f. argues that the curtained colonnade before which Homer is crowned represents a *scaenae frons*. As a civic space dedicated to the performance of poetry, the theater could be viewed as the most vital manifestation of the bard's legacy.

⁴⁵ Consider e.g. the compound *ἀλφεισίβοιος*, which Homer uses of nubile girls who fetch oxen as their bride price (*Il.* 18.593, cf. *HH* 5.119) and Aeschylus later adapts to describe the Nile as "nourishing oxen" (*Supp.* 855; S. F 880 makes of the epithet a proper name).

⁴⁶ The poem is hardly uneventful, and in fact as Pseudo-Longinus says it has *τὴν πρόχρυσιν ὁμοίαν τῶν ἐπαλλήλων παθῶν* (*De Subl.* 9.13), but its focus on the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon and on the quarrel's immediate consequences severely limits its scope, and Homer even denies himself the

from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is roughly what one would expect given the relative paltriness of discrete events in those epics (especially the *Iliad*) as compared to the Cyclic epics.⁴⁷ Aristotle, like Plato, regards Homer as in effect the first author of tragedy,⁴⁸ but a corollary of this, as was obvious to the philosophers, was that the possible topics afforded by the *Odyssey* and especially the *Iliad* were easily exhausted, Homer having behaved like a tragedian by hewing a unitary tale out of the vast mountain of Greek mythology.⁴⁹ Despite their preeminence as works of poetry, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were but relatively small pieces of the mythological tradition. Thus the Iliadic Achilles hardly encapsulates the hero Achilles.⁵⁰ But while there was simply not enough “Homer” to supply *narrative* material for later poets, there was more than enough “Homer” to inspire later poets to tell

narration of Achilles’ death, so often foreshadowed as being imminent (West 2011: 396 *ad* 23.80-1; he argues *ibid.* 346 [*ad* 18.96] that the poet at some point decided to curtail his story, which originally had carried through with the promised death of Achilles after the slaying of Hector). Other authors, too, are traditionally thought to have deliberately avoided retelling Homer and to have attempted to “fill in the gaps” left by the Homeric poems. Such a presentist and Homerocentric bias, which preposterously views the mass of material not treated by Homer as “gaps,” underpins some studies of the Cyclic poems as well as Kennedy’s note *ad* Ov. *Met.* 12.72-188 that Ovid in the “Trojan” section of his *Metamorphoses* prefers to work “in the margins” of Homer, “avoiding direct confrontation” with the latter’s subject-matter. But again, the *Iliad* is narrow in narrative scope, addressing a single quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles and the latter’s killing of Hector. Meanwhile, the *Odyssey* describes the *nostos* of one (albeit very prominent) hero, who happens to relate in retrospective detail incidents that were in fact regularly taken up by dramatists, for example. Thus Homer himself can be said to have selected narrative material that was so sparing as to stake out a specialty within the Epic Cycle that could not be easily repeated or recycled (his selectivity also conforms to the demands of plot-structural unity, as prescribed by Aristotle, *Poetics* chh. 8, 17; however, ch. 18 suggests that the *Iliad* contains many potential dramas in its multiple plot-structures, and apparently some tried to write an “Iliupersis” as a single drama—or is Aristotle exaggerating to emphasize need for tight plots?).

⁴⁷ For the narrative scope of the *Iliad* and narratological issues pertaining to it generally see de Jong 2004; ead. 2001 for the *Odyssey*. See also Heath 1987a: 92ff. on the “mobility of focus” in Greek tragedy.

⁴⁸ Cf. Rinon 2008; cf. also the following comment by Eustathius: *ὁ δὲ ποιητῆς* [sc. Ὁμηρός] *εἰ καὶ δραματικῶς ἔγραψεν, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐδραματούρησε σκηνικῶς* (Eust. 6.8, quoted more fully in West 2011: 75 with n. 18).

⁴⁹ *Poet.* 1459a20ff. Sommerstein 2015: 389 observes that in fact several plays could be and were modeled on the *Iliad*, even more on the *Odyssey* (cf. Fantuzzi 2015: 344, who stresses Aristotle’s own assessment of the *Iliad*’s central topic as *πολύμυθος*, *Poet.* 1456a12-3); but the possibilities were nevertheless far more restricted than in the case of the Cyclic poems. Woodman and West, *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, may point to useful bibliography while giving overview of ancient authorial practices; see also Hinds 1998.

⁵⁰ Pindar’s regular view of Achilles is synoptic, extending to his exploits before and after the brief events of the *Iliad*; see Sommerstein in *SFP* 2012: 176.

other stories with Homer’s rhetorical skill, pathos, and the like.⁵¹ Or, to borrow critical terms from an influential scholar,⁵² Homer’s poems were more useful as “genre models” that showed later poets how to tap into the essence of epic (and indeed tragic) poetry, whereas the Cyclic poems were richer as “example models” furnishing a dense variety of specific scenes and stories.⁵³ Thus the ancient *Life* of Sophocles (§20)—which with only partial accuracy notes how that playwright, “modeling himself” (ἐκματτόμενος) on Homer, “copies the *Odyssey* in many of his plays” (τὴν Ὀδύσειαν δὲ ἐν πολλοῖς δράμασι ἀπογράφεται)⁵⁴ and “etymologizes” (παρετυμολογεῖ) names, “develops characters” (ἡθοποιεῖ), “embellishes” (ποικίλλει) his works, and “makes skillful use of concepts” (ἐπινοήμασι τεχνικῶς χρῆται), all in Homeric fashion—certainly errs when it makes the

⁵¹ Cf. Burgess 1996.

⁵² Barchiesi 2015. The distinction between the two forms of reception has been challenged (Hinds 1998: 41-43), but there is far less subjectivity surrounding instances in which the receiving text imports characters and episodes directly, as opposed to treating them implicitly as analogs to a different set of characters and episodes. Admittedly, Barchiesi’s terms are designed to elucidate intertextual analogizing, but they seem appropriate also to the present question of authors extracting arguments from earlier texts.

⁵³ By way of example, an ancient biographer of Homer demonstrates the tragedians’ usual relationship with the bard by quoting *Il.* 3.65 together with a couplet from a play by Sophocles (F 964) in order to show the latter’s debt to the former. The debt is obviously there, but it has nothing to do with the telling of a particular story; rather, a gnomic utterance that Homer’s Paris uses to deflect Hector’s criticism (οὐ τοι ἀπόβλητ’ ἐστὶ θεῶν ἐρικυδέα δῶρα) is rehashed by Sophocles as θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον τοῦτο· χρὴ δ’ ὄσ’ ἂν θεοὶ / διδώσι, φεύγειν μηδὲν, ὦ τέκνον, ποτέ (note that the vocative address in the second verse guarantees that the context of the utterance is no longer Paris speaking to his brother about the gifts he received from Aphrodite).

⁵⁴ There is major exaggeration in πόλλοις, as only three Sophoclean titles (*Nausicaa*, *Niptra*, and *Phaiakes*) support the claim. Davidson 1994, offering a thoughtful appraisal of this passage in the *Life* of Sophocles and his relationship with Homer more generally, focuses (pp. 376-78) on explaining the biographer’s singling out of the *Odyssey* as against the *Iliad*. Radt 1991 argued previously that the *Life* is here referring to Sophocles’ predilection (obvious to Eustathius as well) for Homeric modes of expression and the like, but Davidson dismantles this argument by pointing out (p. 376) that Sophocles’ stylistic affinities are not limited to the *Odyssey* but extend also to the *Iliad*, hence this sentence in the *Life* cannot be understood as referring to artistic features (though at 379 n. 5 Davidson allows that καὶ τὴν Ἰλιάδα may have fallen out of the text). However, Davidson’s argument that the reference is to Sophocles’ reconfiguration of *Odyssean* narrative patterns and motifs is also unconvincing, as it would probably require the author of the *Life* to have digested Davidson 1988 and *id.* 1995. Nor does anything substantiate Davidson’s alternative proposal that the *Life* means to say that Sophocles shares with the *Odyssey* an interest in τὸ ἠθικόν, whereas the *Iliad* deals with τὸ παθητικόν (Arist. *Poet.* 1459b is actually irrelevant to this passage). No, the ancient biographer of Sophocles is still thinking of μύθος (in their pure, integral state, i.e., without character substitutions or the transference of an established narrative framework to a new environment) when he asserts that Sophocles copied the *Odyssey*. (Radt in his edition of the text [*TrGF* iv.39f.] is right not to print a full stop between κατ’ ἴχνος τοῦ ποιητοῦ and καὶ τὴν Ὀδύσειαν.) Again, however, the assertion that the biographer is making is either ignorantly mistaken or willfully exaggerated.

broad claim that Sophocles also “takes his stories by following in the footsteps of the Poet” (τούς τε γὰρ μύθους φέρει κατ’ ἴχνος τοῦ ποιητοῦ).⁵⁵ Many Sophoclean *mythoi* are indeed Trojan-themed, but out of necessity relatively few are “Homeric.” In an apparent self-correction, the *Life* goes on to say that “Sophocles culls the brilliance from each [poetic predecessor and contemporary]” (ἀφ’ ἐκάστου τὸ λαμπρὸν ἀπανθίζει).⁵⁶ The critic Zoilus, meanwhile, correctly identified the Epic Cycle as a vital body of poetry on which “entire plays” (ὅλα δράματα) of Sophocles depended.⁵⁷ Sophocles stood out as “Homeric” not in his choice of plots but in his “characteristics and motifs of epic origin.”⁵⁸

The inverse of the Homeric epic that like a tragedy maintains its focus on a single plot (however complex) is the tragedy that foolishly takes on the style of historiographical narrative or of a Cyclic epic whose successive parts lack organic cohesion because they seek to cover a period of time rather than a single action. Such tragedies were produced alongside those with plots more restrictive in scope, and Aristotle censures them. Just as Homer is “divine” (θεσπέσιος) in Aristotle’s eyes because he composed by “taking one part” (ἐν μέρους ἀπολαβών) of the Trojan War, so are

⁵⁵ Or perhaps it regards Homer as author of many epics besides the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. This liberal definition is more obvious at an earlier date, specifically in the quip of Aeschylus discussed *supra*, p. ##.

⁵⁶ Sophocles’ nickname μέλιττα is invoked here (cf. sch. Ar. *Vesp.* 460). The point of this nickname is clear: bees, of course, do not spend all their time buzzing around a single source of nectar. Cf. Hor. *Carm.* 4.2.27-32 for another poet as bee.

⁵⁷ Davidson 1994: 375 also favors Zoilus’ comment, preserved in Athen. 7.277c. Zoilus was famously hostile toward Homer, earning the nickname Ὀμηρομάστιξ (Gal. 10.19). Did he find the Homeric poems to be lacking in variety and eventfulness, and is his promotion of the Epic Cycle tied to his disdain for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*?

⁵⁸ Tsagalis 2008: 115 (“χαρακτηριστικά και μοτίβα επικής”). There are really two issues: how broadly we define Homeric epic (i.e., whether at times it has been used to refer to the Trojan Cycle as a whole) and whether imitating Homer might be understood to include not merely recycling the stories he told but also approximating him in matters of style, characterization, etc.

“episodic” (ἐπεισοδιώδεις) tragic plots the worst of their kind.⁵⁹ Many modern scholars are no less bothered than the Stagirite by what they perceive as incoherent tragedies. For example, Euripides’ *Trojan Women*, which indeed treats a series of only loosely connected scenes from the aftermath of the sack of Troy, has often been held in contempt and even excluded from the tragic genre.⁶⁰ Its discursive composition could be explained as a contracted failure, that is, as a failure to be sufficiently selective and to adapt the already multitudinous contents of the Cyclic epic *Iliupersis* to the narrower confines of a tragedy. But a glance at Euripides’ corpus shows that he was very adept at effecting such a conversion (note e.g. the other two plays in his Trojan trilogy, *Alexander* and *Palamedes*, each of which centers on a single hero in a single situation). His repetition of the supposed artistic flaw in the bipartite *Hecuba* (where the second story, concerning Polydorus, could be largely invented by the playwright) may reveal something of his own opinion about the various myths contained in the *Iliupersis*: he may have felt that none of them was substantial enough to have a whole tragedy devoted to it.⁶¹ Yet Sophocles’ *Polyxena* and other plays prove that this opinion was hardly universal.⁶² At any rate, *Trojan Women* probably represents a deliberate attempt by Euripides to reproduce the great bulk of the *Iliupersis* in a single play.

⁵⁹ Arist. *Poet.* 1459a (epic) and 1451b (tragedy). The latter section declares that some tragedians compose such plays through incompetence, while others may do so to best the competition or to satisfy their actors (who apparently liked to play a variety of roles). For further discussion of Aristotle’s preference for unitary plots in both *epos* and tragedy see Fantuzzi 2015: 411-4.

⁶⁰ See the scholars cited in Lee 1997: xxxi n. 11.

⁶¹ On the “double plot” of *Hecuba* see Gregory 1999: xvi f. (for a survey of earlier criticism see Heath 1987b: 56-8). The play’s anomalous Thracian setting locates it outside the range of both the *Iliupersis* and the *Nostoi*.

⁶² Some scholars have thought that E. was influenced by S. *Polyxena* when he treated the sacrifice of that maiden in the first part of *Hec.*; see *TrGF* iv.404. Did Euripides wish to avoid writing a play that was coterminous with his rival’s? This may be the sort of thing that Arist. *Poet.* 1451b means when he speaks of rivalry as a factor that generates episodic plays.

The supposed trend of tragedians avoiding specifically Homeric myths is bucked at either end of the timeline of Classical Greek tragedy, however, when Aeschylus as well as several 4th-century tragedians deal directly with Achilles, the *Iliad*'s quintessential hero.⁶³ Just like Sophocles and Euripides, Aeschylus took Homer as a model in terms of language and usage and especially insofar as he set out to compose powerful scenes whose situations were analogous to Homeric scenes.⁶⁴ But he was also wont to imitate Homer more directly, as in two of his trilogies he reproduced some of the most famous episodes from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, respectively.⁶⁵ Two bits of ancient criticism about the venerable dramatist point to possible explanations for his willingness to do so.⁶⁶ First, Gorgias declares that the *Seven Against Thebes* is "brimming with Ares," and so one may consider the possibility that Aeschylus was more interested than other tragedians in epic combat, not only actual clashes in the heat of battle but debates between soldiers and, as is so prominently on display in *Seven against Thebes*, the arming of warriors.⁶⁷ Yet the evidence does not bear out this supposition in any marked way. For Aeschylus as for Pindar, Homer's account of Achilles may have been irresistible because of the immediacy of its martial spirit, but there were plenty of other epic battles that all tragedians could and did elect to write about. From the Trojan War alone, periods of extensive fighting shunned by Homer but commemorated by the Cyclic poets gave rise to

⁶³ Cf. Liapis 2012: xviii n. 7, xlvi.

⁶⁴ Some of the less obvious cases of this process of analogizing are explored by Kraias 2008. They include Hector's business in Troy in *Il. 6* as a model for Eteocles' interaction with the Chorus of Theban women in *A. Sept.* (pp. 41-58) and, less convincingly, the encounter between Odysseus and Nausicaa (*Od. 6*) as a model for that between Orestes and Electra in *A. Cho.* (pp. 59-74). Kraias also explores Aeschylus' appropriation of epic (not just Homeric) narrative forms and techniques, such as catalogues (pp. 108-19) and messenger scenes (120-38), and compares how Homer and Aeschylus crafted their concluding scenes (pp. 75-105). On Homer *ap.* Euripides see Lange 2002 and further *infra*.

⁶⁵ Tsagalis 2008: 114f. calculates that 42% of Aeschylus' Trojan-themed plays (10 of 24) were based on Homeric subjects, as against 17.5% of Euripides' plays and only 6.9% of Sophocles'.

⁶⁶ Cf. Russell 1995: 112f. on ancient attitudes toward literary imitation versus plagiarism (*κλοπή*).

⁶⁷ Moreover, prominent among the *Realien* of Aeschylus' life are the ancient testimonia about his epitaph, which proudly proclaimed his participation in Persian Wars.

tragedies such as Sophocles' *Shepherds*, which related the first day of fighting at Troy;⁶⁸ the *Eurypylus* of the same poet;⁶⁹ and Achaëus' *Philoctetes (in Troy)*, in which Agamemnon rallies the Achaeans to arms with the war-cry *ἐλελελεῦ!*⁷⁰ Consider *Frogs*—especially the parody of Homeric epic in the play (e.g., *ῥέπει*, 1393)—and the ways in which the tragedians are compared and contrasted with Homer in terms of style, language, etc.⁷¹

Another, less direct explanation for Aeschylus' encroaching on the *Iliad*'s home turf is furnished by an opinion attributed to his successor. Sophocles apparently admired his predecessor's effortless skill but stressed that it was after all effortless. This was captured in a legend relating how Aeschylus used to compose while drunk. Sophocles' wry revenge against Aeschylus' supreme talent was to say, "Aeschylus, even though you do what's needful, you surely do it unawares."⁷² The imputed failure to calculate and be deliberate was probably meant to explain the bits of unpolished language in Aeschylus' plays,⁷³ but it may also apply more broadly to the plays' easy, uninhibited relationship with the antecedent poems from which they drew their basic arguments. In other words,

⁶⁸ See *infra*, pp. ###, and note that Sophocles no less than Aeschylus had a distinguished military career, having been elected *stratēgos*.

⁶⁹ *Infra*, pp. ###, esp. ### on the preserved messenger speech whose large lacunae are not large enough to shroud the grim, indeed Iliadic tone adopted to relate the hero's death.

⁷⁰ *TrGF* i 20 F 37. According to the Suda's biography (= 20 T 1), the Eretrian tragedian Achaëus was only slightly younger than Sophocles and competed against him and Euripides some time during the 83rd Olympiad. For the story of Philoctetes in Troy, see *infra*, pp. ###.

⁷¹ See Lefkowitz 2012 for poets' biographies, but also testimonia in *TrGF* iii. Gorgias (fr. 24) called *Seven Against Thebes* "full of Ares" (*μεστὸν Ἄρεως*), although Plutarch (*Mor.* 715e) counters the sophist's judgment by saying that Dionysus is the god who most characterizes Aeschylus' poetry and who is most often represented in it. This view is corroborated by *Frogs* 1259 (Aeschylus called *τὸν Βακχεῖον ἄνακτα*, a phrase that must mean more than simply that he was the master poet of Bacchus' theater), by Athen. 10.428f (Aeschylus wrote *μεθύων*), and by Pausanias' vocational story (1.21.2) in which Dionysus appears to a young Aeschylus in a vineyard. Murray 1940: 145ff. explores the Dionysiac strain in Aeschylus' poetry. Of course, martial and Bacchic allegiances are not mutually exclusive.

⁷² ὦ Αἰσχύλε, εἰ καὶ τὰ δέοντα ποιεῖς, ἀλλ' οὖν οὐκ εἰδώς γε ποιεῖς, Athen. 10.428f [Kaibel paragraph 33.9] = A. F ###. In the larger passage Athenaeus is preoccupied with the impiety of introducing drunken characters into the (albeit Dionysian) theater.

⁷³ Cf. Quintilian's judgment that Aeschylus was *rudis in plerisque et incompositus* (*Inst. Orat.* 10.1.66 = A. T 145).

Aeschylus was deemed to lack the sort of self-conscious art that entails compunction about being unoriginal. This enabled him to feel that he had free rein, which he subconsciously exploited. His disposition, of course, had everything to do with the relative earliness of his career. When Aeschylus was writing, the rules of tragedy had not yet been fixed nor its limits demarcated or so clearly distinguished from other genres (i.e., lyric and epic). That does not mean that he felt compelled to follow in Homer's or anyone else's footsteps, only that he followed his own free-wheeling instincts, which evidently led him to embrace the opportunity of bringing the *Iliadic* Achilles onstage. His apparent temerity in doing so was born of innocence; it need not have been a confrontational challenge to the primacy of Homer. And it was surely the same intuitive approach to his art that drove Aeschylus to innovate in ways and degrees that ancient critics saw as exceptional.⁷⁴ Again, Aeschylus himself was quoted as saying that his plays were merely Homer's table scraps. Subsequent generations of poets felt gradually more burdened by the weight of earlier creations and by the urge to say something novel, a trend that culminated in an existential crisis during the Hellenistic period. And we should remember that the absence of attested plays in the corpora of Sophocles and Euripides that revolve around the events of the *Iliad* could simply be due to the fact that such a project did not particularly excite the genius of these playwrights; after all, lesser tragedians did take up the theme in the fourth century. For this they could be accused of a lack of imagination, but by that period a return to the classics could also be regarded ironically as counter-normative.

⁷⁴ Dion. Hal. *De Imitatione* II fr. 6.2.10 (= A. T 127) regards Aeschylus as more experimental in his introduction of *πρόσωπα* and novel *πράγματα*.

Additionally, Aeschylus may have been old enough to hear the Panathenaic rhapsodic recitations of Homer under the tyrant Hipparchus,⁷⁵ whereas Sophocles and especially Euripides probably did not have regular (that is to say, penteteric at a minimum) access to such performances; then again, Aristophanes and plenty of other figures from later in the Classical period are able to quote Homer.⁷⁶ It is probably true that Aeschylus relied more on oral recitations than reading, whereas Sophocles and especially Euripides were more literate, but Aeschylus still read.⁷⁷ Since the Cyclic poems were not definitely recited at Athens as far as we know, though rhapsodies separate from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* and of course lyric/dithyrambic performances abounded, it is likely that Aeschylus did obtain copies of and read at least some of these plays, e.g., some version of the *Aethiopsis*.⁷⁸

Aeschylus' *Phrygians* enacts a procedure that Achilles in the *Iliad* (22.351) only imagines in order to curse Hector: the weighing of Hector's corpse to determine the quantity of gold to be given as ransom.⁷⁹ This very literal interpretation, while in a sense calling Achilles' bluff and highlighting both his inconsistency and his mercenary side, also illustrates Aeschylus' deferential attitude toward Homer. On the other hand, the

⁷⁵ See West 2011: 74.

⁷⁶ Cf. Plat. *Ion*, esp. 530b, where the eponymous interlocutor is hoping to triumph at the Panathenaea. All the tragedians would have been able to attend iterations of these performances.

⁷⁷ Yet extreme caution must be exercised in guessing exactly what and how much he read. Welcker i.5f. rhetorically asks, "wer will bestimmen, wie wenig oder viele alte Lieder und Bruchstücke alter Poesieen [*sic*] durch die Hände des Aeschylus gegangen waren?" before pointing (i.6) to internal evidence from the corpus of Aeschylean drama to show that he revered the written word: F 331 reads, *ὡς λέγει γέρον γράμμα*. As Harris 1989: 49 states, throughout the Archaic period "[t]he experience of poetry continued to be aural for almost everyone"; yet there *were* a few exceptions—toward the end of that period "the written word... was in constant use by a small number of specialists" (*ibid.* 57)—and poets ought to have been foremost among them.

⁷⁸ On the historical development of the book trade in fifth-century Athens, besides the reference to Reynolds–Wilson *supra* 2 n. 8, see Johnson 2010; and again Hendrickson 2014. On the possibility that recitations from Cyclic epics were included in Panathenaic festival programs, see *infra*, ### n. #.

⁷⁹ Cf. Grossardt 2005: 228.

Chorus of Phrygians that accompanies Priam is a striking innovation in comparison with *Iliad* 24.⁸⁰

The poet of the *Iliad* had a penchant for embellishing his narrative with (sometimes anachronistic) narrations of and tangential allusions to episodes outside of his central theme, the wrath of Achilles.⁸¹ The poet of the *Odyssey* similarly relished giving his audience a taste of the backgrounds of various characters. Their shared tendency to be inclusive was fully exploited by the tragedians: the incidental stories that were interjected into the Homeric epics inspired playwrights to dig deeper. With his *Aeolus* Euripides furnishes a good example of the tragedians' general habit of excavating the faintest outcrops of Homer's mythological world.⁸² The lord of the winds is of course a prominent figure in *Odyssey* 10, but what captured Euripides' imagination was neither Aeolus' initial kindness toward Odysseus' cohort nor his subsequent renunciation of support for their successful *nostos*.⁸³ Rather, Homer's allusive reference to the intermarriage of Aeolus' sons and daughters appealed to Euripides' flair for both the *recherché* and the morally disturbing.⁸⁴ So he pursued the potential for problems by casting this epic motif into the real world of contemporary Athens. He elaborated one fictional love affair, that in which the young Macareus pursued and impregnated his sister

⁸⁰ Cf. Diphilus fr. 32.7f. K.–A., Phrynichus fr. 54 K.–A. LIMC s.v. *Achilleus* nos. 662, 664, and 667.

⁸¹ In English scholarship this Homeric technique is called “reverberation,” but it is an exaggeration to say that the *Iliad* thus “becomes a full-scale portrayal of the 10-year Trojan War” (*pace* Rengakos 2015: 155). He correctly lists examples of pre-Homerica recapitulated (with attendant displacement and deformation) in the *Iliad* but then curiously lists the death and funeral games of Patroclus as instances of Homer narrating post-Homerica. It goes without saying that while certain events in the *Aethiopsis* may be mirrored or intimated in the final third of the *Iliad*, they are hardly narrated.

⁸² This play along with the satyr-drama *Cyclops* and probably *Phoenix* are the only Euripidean works based on notices (or, in the case of the *Cyclops*, a whole episode) in Homer. Cf. Tsagalis 2008: 114.

⁸³ If Lycophron really did write two separate plays called *Aeolus* and *Aeolides* (*TrGF* i; cf. Mimidou 2013: 16), the former may well have hewn more closely to the actual events of *Odyssey* 10 (*viz.*, by treating the moral dilemma that Aeolus faced following Odysseus' second landing on his island).

⁸⁴ In certain respects Euripides anticipated the transformative impulses of Hellenistic literati; see Fowler 1989.

Canace.⁸⁵ After the birth of the child, Aeolus ordered its exposure and commanded Canace's suicide.⁸⁶ Mimidou's introduction addresses the originality of the story Euripides tells versus its possible antecedents. Aristophanes and Plato (q.v.) must be reacting especially to Euripides' version, which for Athenians of those times naturally overshadowed Homer's allusion to the incestuous family.

Do any fragments contain obvious epic borrowings, or do the fragments as a whole attest to a particular source of inspiration for Euripides' play?⁸⁷ Euripides sees in the story the essential paradigm of a contentious marriage beset by the contrasting forces of love and propriety.⁸⁸ One result is that he uses the conceit of an unusual marital

⁸⁵ Macareus is called *νεώτατος* in both the preserved hypothesis (P. Oxy. 2457 = test. ii K.) and Ps.-Plut. *Parall. Min.* 28 A p. 312 C (= test. iiii(2) K.), suggesting that *πρεσβύτατος* is a mistake in Stob. 4.20.72 (test. iiii(1) K.). Of these three synopses only Stobaeus, who along with Ps.-Plutarch follows Sostratus' *Tyrrenica* (*FGrHist* 23 F 3), names the sister, but in the missing end of line 7 of the Euripidean hypothesis (= line 24 of the papyrus) van Rossum finds room for *Κανάκης*.

⁸⁶ *Ov. Her.* 11 (= E. *Aeolus* test. vii b) is thought to follow Euripides' plot and is thus another useful witness to it.

⁸⁷ Fr. 2 Mimidou is a verse that should be assigned to Euripides but probably not to his *Aeolus*. Mimidou's text runs thus: *ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἔξω <σ> A[i]{λ}όλον {σ}σκηνωμάτων*. The lone source of the fragment, a rupestral inscription from Armenian Armavir, is not only difficult to read but obviously also corrupt at the precise point where Mette, whom Mimidou follows, conjectured Aeolus' name. I intend to show elsewhere that the text is an anthology of Euripidean verses (vv. 6-8 = E. *Hipp.* 616 + F 1034.3-4) that illustrate various poetic forms of repetition (anaphora, polyptoton, etc.; this does not require that the text was studied as such within the school, for it could have been selected arbitrarily as a practice text for engravers in training, as Bousquet suggested). Snell 1967: 327 saw that the verses formed an anthology, thinking them a collection of initial verses of longer passages to be memorized by students; but although there is sufficient evidence to attribute all of them to Euripides (not the least of which evidence is the fact that the word *σκήνωμα* is not used by other tragedians), *TrGF* counts it among the adespota fragments in vol. ii (F 279g, where the text of our verse (5) is given as: *ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἔξω α.λολους σκηνωμάτων*). Admittedly, Mette's conjecture has certain attractions: personal names are often the culprits behind textual corruptions, and Aeolus seems like a good candidate to be owner the *σκήνωματα* since Euripides uses the same noun to describe the abode of the cave-dweller Polyphemus (*Cyc.* 323f.; note, however, that while Verg. *Aen.* 52 describes Aeolus' palace as a cave, the reference to his *δῶμα* at *Od.* 10.10 is more ambiguous). Mimidou 2013: 40 amply shows that *σκήνωμα* can refer to various kinds of dwellings, not just tents in military camps. Yet reading Aeolus' name here leaves the verse lacking any example of repetition, which again seems to be the unifying principle of the anthology; and the numerous textual emendations required (inserting <σ> to prevent hiatus in the second metron, deleting the first λ while adding ι to produce the name, and claiming dittography of σ thereafter) do not bode well for Mette's ingenious suggestion. Hence this verse along with the others not already should be reassigned as *fr. incertarum fabularum* of Euripides.

⁸⁸ The play is dated before 423, the year of *Clouds*. Had there been a recent legal or social development to which Euripides wished to respond? Pericles' famous Citizenship Law of 451 B.C. (see Arist. *Pol.* 1278a) or something like it may have been on Euripides' mind as he composed the play, incest being as it were an extreme form of endogamy. See Mülke 1996 on Athenian laws governing marriage between siblings.

arrangement as an opportunity to rail against the worship of Plutus, even though Aeolus spurned outside marriages for his daughters such that his wealth remained intact,⁸⁹ while a more familiar problem in contemporary Athenian society was the pursuit of lucrative marriages by acquisitive citizens.⁹⁰ Euripides' critique here is in line with his tendency to discredit the traditional objective measures of personal merit such as good looks and an established, wealthy family, a tendency exemplified by Orestes' revelatory assessment of the poor farmer's virtue in *Electra*.⁹¹ Among his various alterations of the traditional myth, Euripides changes the names of Aeolus' children and wife.⁹² It is difficult to guess whether he improvised their names or followed a different account of the family from the one which the Homeric scholia follow. He may even have been able to read multiple versions of the story, picking and choosing his details from among the variants. Presumably the scholiasts derived their list of names from an authoritative source or at least a Hellenistic source purported to be authoritative.

Another aside in the *Odyssey* that is elaborated in tragedy is the marriage of Hermione and Neoptolemus (*Od.* 4.3-9). But a more essential detail from the epic, namely the reference to the royal bed of Ithaca by which Penelope tries Odysseus' trustworthiness for the last time, also served as a crucial element in a tragedy by an unknown author—assuming a modern conjecture is correct. The title by which Aristotle

⁸⁹ *Od.* 10.7-9 mentions in quick succession the incestuous arrangement and the family's wealth but does not connect the two ideas causally, whereas Euripides' play made the fate of Aeolus' κληῖρος an explicit concern, as the hypothesis and F 24a clearly show.

⁹⁰ The problem of wealth is the theme of *Aeolus* frs. 5-7 Mimidou (5 and 7 are quoted in Stobaeus' treatises on wealth). Note that contrary to Mimidou's rendering in fr. 5 it might be better to take οὐκ θαυμάζω as parenthetical, with θεόν as predicate accusative following εἰπῆς (unlike in fr. 7 there is no μοι to complete the idiom "don't speak to me about..."); alternatively, we could emend to θεός and keep the parenthesis: "Don't speak about wealth—I, a god(dess), don't care about it—which even..." At the very least, one should treat θεόν as predicative after θαυμάζω: "I don't celebrate as a god that which..."

⁹¹ See esp. lines 383-5; cf. Mimidou 2013: 61f. for many more passages illustrating Euripides' divergence from tradition in his attitude about the nature of nobility.

⁹² As we know from sch. *Od.* 10.6.

(*Poet.* 1455a14) refers to the play, *Odysseus the False Messenger*, uses an epithet (*ψευδάγγελος*) that is found once previously, at *Il.* 15.159. The epithet would seem to bear some relationship to similar names used in comedy, such as the metrically similar *ψευδαρτάβας* (*Ar. Ach.* 91, etc.), *ψευδαμάμαζυς* (*Vesp.* 326), or *ψευδαλαζών* (*Com. Adesp.* 294); yet it appears in a passage in which Aristotle's attention is fixed firmly on tragedy.

This play is particularly intriguing because its author apparently went out of his way to toy with the audience's familiarity with Homeric tradition in order to foster dramatic tension. In the course of classifying his five types of *ἀναγνώρισις*, Aristotle notes that there is a certain type that hinges on reasoning. He then writes:

ἔστιν δέ τις καὶ συνθετὴ [sc. ἀναγνώρισις] ἐκ παραλογισμοῦ τοῦ θεάτρου [θατέρου Hermann], οἷον ἐν τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ τῷ Ψευδαγγέλῳ· τὸ μὲν γὰρ τὸ τόξον ἐντείνειν <αὐτόν> [? Kassel], ἄλλον δὲ μηδένα, πεποιημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ καὶ ὑπόθεσις [sc. ἐστὶ], καὶ εἴ γε τὸ τόξον [λέκτρον Merkelbach] ἔφη γνῶσεσθαι ὃ οὐχ ἐωράκει· τὸ δὲ ὡς δι' ἐκείνου ἀναγνωριοῦντος διὰ τούτου ποιῆσαι παραλογισμός.⁹³

And there is a certain composite [form of recognition] [stemming] from the false reasoning of the audience, such as in the *Odysseus the False Messenger*; for it has been fashioned by the poet and is the *hypothesis* that <he himself> stretches the bow and no one else, even if he said that he would recognize the bow which he had not seen; but it is false reasoning that, when he is actually going to reveal himself through the former [means], he does it through the latter.

Merkelbach's conjecture of *λέκτρον* for the second occurrence of *τόξον* in the manuscripts improves the sense of the passage significantly and may well be right. The dramatic plot would thus incorporate two elements from the end of the *Odyssey* in a

⁹³ *Poet.* 1455a12-16.

novel way:⁹⁴ In this telling, when Penelope puts the “messenger” to a trial to validate her suspicion that he is Odysseus, he has not yet identified himself as such and indeed wants to conceal his true identity until he has conquered the suitors. So he lies, proclaiming that he will recognize their marriage bed if it is brought forth and presented to him (which is of course impossible, as the bed is immovable). This throws Penelope off the trail of discovery—indeed, she must now view him as an imposter—and makes for a greater climax when Odysseus does strain the bow.⁹⁵ An additional emendation that might clarify Aristotle’s meaning would be to change the infinitives *ἐντείνειν* and *ποιῆσαι* to future infinitives (*ἐντενεῖν* and *ποιήσειν*), so that the audience can be said to commit the *παραλογισμός* of expecting (along with Penelope) that Odysseus *will* reveal himself by recognizing his bed, which is impossible and ultimately thwarted by his surprise straining of the bow. In any case, the manner in which Odysseus apparently misled the audience⁹⁶ in *Odysseus Pseudangelos*—making a false claim about how he would reveal his identity to the other characters in the play—suggests that his ancient association with dishonesty could take on a playful dimension in drama.⁹⁷

Likewise, Sophocles’ *Thamyras* could have found its inspiration in a brief passage in Homer,⁹⁸ adding blindness to the ailments that the Muses inflicted on this Thracian singer for his *hybris*. If Sophocles was responsible for this innovation, it is worth noting

⁹⁴ In contrast, Aeschylus’ *Penelope*, to judge from F 187, reproduced the lie that Odysseus tells in *Od.* 19.165-307, namely that he has come as a beggar of Cretan origin. But it is not known whether this play also followed Homer in reuniting the spouses via either device (the bow or the bed).

⁹⁵ See Merkelbach 1969: 111-13.

⁹⁶ Even if Hermann’s conjecture *θατέρον* were to be accepted, the misleading of another character disrupts the audience’s ability to reason correctly from that perspective, as noted by Smith 1924: 165. Likewise, Smith’s assertion that *συνθετή* must be translated as “false” only means that Penelope or some other character should have made a definitive misidentification of the protagonist, and it does not require any alteration of the basic interpretation of this play.

⁹⁷ For much more on Odysseus’ deceitful nature and his multifaceted characterization in tragedy, see chapter 3.

⁹⁸ *Il.* 2.594-600. Naturally the Catalogue of Ships yields many biographical notices that lend themselves to poetic elaboration.

that the innovation was firmly rooted in the traditional association of blindness with those who enjoyed the Muses' inspiration.⁹⁹

Euripides' *Phoenix* may be yet another example of a tragedy that took its cue from one of Homer's many asides. Since in *Iliad* 9 Phoenix divulges much more of his personal background than we learn about the marriages of Aeolus' children in *Odyssey* 9, it is possible that Euripides was able to base his entire composition on the Homeric source text¹⁰⁰ and did not have to consult other sources or his own ingenuity to the same extent as in the case of his *Aeolus*. On the other hand, the rift between Phoenix and his father was also told. We should make a regular distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic stories that appear not only in the poems of Homer but also in the Cyclic poems as summarized by Proclus. Would a tragic playwright have been comfortable telling a story that he had only encountered as a tangent in a discursive speech of Nestor (e.g., in the *Cypria*) without reading a more focused account of the myth in question? Would a tragic poet even have considered the extrinsic or cursory telling of a tale in an epic poem (especially those outside the Homeric corpus) to be a potential source of inspiration worth seeking out and consulting? To take an extreme example, the brief mention of Antiope in *Od.* 11.260-65, can hardly have been the primary intertext for Euripides when he wrote his *Antiope*, as it only briefly identifies her as the mother of Amphion and Zethus, builders of the walls of Thebes, and makes no mention of the tragic plot wherein Antiope must flee from the hostile queen Dirce and participates in a fortuitous reunion with her once abandoned sons. Nor is the distinctive *ēthos* of either brother developed to

⁹⁹ Tyrrell 2012: 23.

¹⁰⁰ Which itself may have originally formed an *Einzelheid*. West 2011: 225 thinks rather that Homer cobbled together the advisor's backstory out of mythological commonplaces and passages like 11.786-9, where it is Patroclus who is presented as Achilles' mentor (Patroclus is certainly more integral to the *Iliad*'s narrative, but that does not necessarily mean his origin in the tradition antedates that of Phoenix).

any extent. (Do Σ *ad loc.* fill in the mythological background from other source? Was at least the exposure a motif going back to the Theban Cycle? How much of the plot did Euripides simply invent?)¹⁰¹ Compare the case of Protesilaus, who is mentioned in *Iliad* 2 but was actually alive and died during the main course of events in the *Cypria*. (However, it is not clear whether the story of his temporary reincarnation was told in this epic.) Cf. also Niobe, whose grievous fate Achilles narrates in *Iliad* 24, but only for the sake of elaborating a mythological *exemplum*.¹⁰² In general, it is only natural to assume that poets, if they relied on any antecedent works of literature, gravitated toward those which most overlapped with their own themes and which incorporated the target stories in an intrinsic way; of course, the exceptional renown of Homer may have distracted poets from this instinctive practice.

Although the *Doloneia* is firmly implanted in the transmitted text of the *Iliad*, it is now almost universally regarded as a rhapsody by a poet other than Homer¹⁰³ and thus presents a special case. But the ancient tragedians would doubtless have considered *Iliad* 10 to be an authentic creation of “Homer.”¹⁰⁴ Sch. T on *Il.* 10.0b Erbse suggests that

¹⁰¹ And as a matter of fact, even the sparse information that the epic passage may usefully have provided is ignored or contradicted by Euripides, who, rather than accepting her parentage as reported by Homer (*Ἀσωποῖο θυγάτρα*, 260), identified her father as Nycteus (assuming Hyg. *Fab.* 8 epitomizes Euripides’ play accurately in this regard). It should be noted that Antiope also featured in the *Cypria*, where she was said to be a daughter of Lycurgus. Thus Euripides also disregarded the account of this Cyclic poem, confirming the supposition that there was no reason for any poem about Troy to have served as an essential source on a remote or satellite figure like Antiope. A more likely source was the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, fr. 181-82, on which see Burkert 1983. Mythological interest in the particular domain of patronymics may be an outstanding feature of Euripides (on his penchant for studding his prologues with genealogical information, see Gregory 1999: 41 [n. on *Hel.* 3]). But the tendency to innovate is a different matter and one that is harder to trace. Of course, sometimes the identification of parents is figurative, as perhaps when Helen is called the daughter of Nemesis; but even such poetic touches could become codified in myth and religion.

¹⁰² On Aeschylus’ *Niobe* see esp. Seaford 2005; see also Kocziszky 2010.

¹⁰³ West 2011: 232-35, including n. on 9.705-9. Danek 1988: 233 allows Homeric authorship of Book 10 as a faint possibility, denying nonetheless that Homer could have composed it except as an intrusive afterthought to the rest of the poem.

¹⁰⁴ Danek 1988; West 2011.

Book 10, although written by Homer, was only inserted into the *Iliad* as part of the Peisistratean recension (a recension that according to West¹⁰⁵ never really occurred—he speaks instead of a “Panathenaic ordinance”). But if the story had been known and sung about previously, why was it overlooked by the Cyclic poems and not included in any of them, and why does it end up being situated during the midst of the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon? It is not as if Odysseus and Diomedes were only active when Achilles was idle, and the stories of Dolon and Rhesus could easily have been fitted into the *Cypria* or, more likely, the *Little Iliad*, in which similar nocturnal raids are performed. Either the *Little Iliad* was written after the Peisistratean recension of the *Iliad* and therefore excluded the *Doloneia* episode which otherwise would have fit well within it, allowing for the removal of the Trojan army from the plain back behind their walls (the *Cypria* can hardly have been written so late), or else the *Doloneia* was inserted into the *Iliad* earlier than the Peisistratean recension and thus from an earlier time prevented the Cyclic authors from treating the story. West argues¹⁰⁶ that the Rhesus story is an idiosyncratic creation of the poet of *Iliad* 10 that is inspired by the pairing of Odysseus and Diomedes in the theft of the Palladium as told in the *Little Iliad*,¹⁰⁷ the Palladium story being much more essential to the story of the Trojan War, as it contributes materially to the Achaeans’ ultimate goal. But this does not necessarily mean the *Little Iliad* had already been written. West’s view is more likely than that the original version of the *Doloneia* story involved a raid aimed against the walls of Troy, which was adapted

¹⁰⁵ West 2011: 233.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.* 234, citing Wilamowitz.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Hainsworth in West–Hainsworth–Hoekstra 1989: n. on *Il.* 10.243. Preller 1861: 406f. observes that the Trojan saga gave birth to the pairing, each hero originally occupying his own tradition. Odysseus is separately associated with Ajax on a number of occasions (West 2011: 86 on *Il.* 1.138, cf. p. 149 on *Il.* 4.494).

to fit within the context of the Trojan bivouacking near the Greek camp. West suggests¹⁰⁸ that *Iliad* 10 was composed ca. 600 B.C., largely based on the evidence of a Corinthian cup dated 20 years later that features Dolon¹⁰⁹ and several instances where West suspects the rhapsody influenced the poet of the *Odyssey*. In agreement with sch. T stands the *terminus ante quem* of the *Doloneia* (or rather its integration into the *Iliad*, which presupposes its existence), for given that *K* (i.e., Book 10) is accommodated by the Athenian division of the *Iliad* into 24 rhapsodies during the late sixth century,¹¹⁰ it must have been older than this division. Also, if this *Einzellied* was already attributed to Homer when the Cyclic poets were writing, even without being formally integrated into the *Iliad* it may have induced them to exclude the episode. One way or another, the *Rhesus* ended up as *Iliad* Book 10—a fixed part of the Homeric poem (West entertains the possibility that in contrast to the Athenian textual tradition there were manuscripts circulating in Ionia without the *Doloneia*, but he points out that no trace of such a copy has been found)—not in any of the Cyclic poems where it might have been more naturally situated.¹¹¹

But tragedians were no doubt also cognizant of the book's self-contained, autonomous nature, and this is the very consideration, along with the sympathy engendered by the seemingly short-lived *Rhesus*, that would have invited dramatic elaboration.¹¹² Although he fails to point out that the *Doloneia* is unabashedly pro-Greek in a way that the genuine *Iliad* is not, Fantuzzi aptly notes that the *Rhesus* is a great

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.* 234f.

¹⁰⁹ Friis Johansen 1967: 70-5.

¹¹⁰ As persuasively explained by West 2011: 74-6.

¹¹¹ Actually, the *Doloneia* was designed for the telescopic night narrated in the *Iliad*; i.e., there are enough references to what comes before in the *Iliad* embedded in the narrative of Book 10 that it seems this rhapsody was not based on a story set during another part of the war but was instead a completely original story (so the characters *Rhesus* and *Dolon* were perhaps invented expressly for this rhapsody).

¹¹² On the scholiastic comments on the relationship between the play and *Iliad* Book 10 see Merro 2008.

example of tragedy's favor for the Trojans as losers and victims deserving of sympathy.¹¹³

Against such a textual tradition the *Rhesus* was produced (Hipponax fr. 72 also treats the story, with line 7 stating: ἀνηναρίσθη Πῆσος Αἰνειῶν πάλμυς (the rarity of the final word caused textual corruption, which West addresses in the beginning to his handbook on textual criticism)). The tale was not necessarily ideally suited to the tragic stage. A certain rule obtains in the study of Greek tragedy according to which tragedians shied away from nocturnal myths since it was necessarily difficult during a daytime performance to simulate night from the sunlit *skēnē* of the Theater of Dionysus. Nevertheless, the author of the *Rhesus* managed it, as did other tragedians committed to staging the multiple nighttime raids undertaken by Odysseus in the *Little Iliad*.¹¹⁴ Perhaps the strategies they employed included continually hymning the Moon.¹¹⁵

Rhesus appears to be one play that eschewed examination of its epic predecessor. Liapis attempts to show its indebtedness to a Pindar fr., but it may be the analogous tragedy *Shepherds*, written by Sophocles, that had the greatest influence on this 4th-c. (as is now almost universally accepted) tragedy, as Wilamowitz argued (see work cited by Sommerstein). Indeed, among post-fifth-century tragedians (whose works are much more scantily preserved) it appears the tendency to read and use the poems of the Epic Cycle

¹¹³ Fantuzzi 2012: 18. A distinction must be drawn, however, between the point of view that a narrator adopts and his attitudes toward various characters: Homer's tendency to tell the story from the Achaeans' perspective does not make him callous with respect to Trojan suffering. Recall that Homer was regarded as a "tragic poet" in his own right.

¹¹⁴ *Infra*, chapter 3.

¹¹⁵ In a similar way, Vergil's *Aeneid* refers repeatedly to the Moon's glow during the Nisus and Euryalus episode. As shown by Schlunk 1974: 71-74, these references are intended to explain how Vergil's heroes were able to see sufficiently well at night while also defending "Homer" against the scholiasts who complained that the *Doloneia* was impractical due to lighting constraints.

waned. The utility of these poems as mythological sources had been overshadowed and displaced by the very works of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, and other tragedians.

Another case similar to the tragic treatment of *Iliad* 10 involves Aeschylus' *Psychagōgoi* ("Necromancers") and its rendition of the *Nekyia* (*Odyssey* 11): whatever doubts scholars may harbor about the authorship of this Homeric passage (and its recapitulation at *Od.* 23.241-88), Aeschylus surely believed he was adapting a scene that Homer had narrated. The title of *Psychagōgoi* sheds light on one difficulty in *Od.* 11, namely how it combines aspects of a *katabasis* with vivid images of a genuine *Nekyia*, that is, ghosts summoned up through a sacrificial pit.¹¹⁶ Whereas Homer's objective may be the thorough disorientation of his audience, Aeschylus (again to judge solely from the play's title) clearly envisions the episode as an instance of necromancy, so that Odysseus, even if he has had to reach the liminal river Ocean, is not required to descend into Hades itself.¹¹⁷ Of course, this is not to say that Aeschylus dismissed altogether Homer's intimations that a *katabasis* took place in some sense, nor would an ancient audience necessarily have been bothered by the apparent conflation of separate phenomena. What is clear is that Aeschylus recycled *Od.* 11, as did Polygnotus, another master narrator and Aeschylus' rough contemporary.¹¹⁸ Yet the most intriguing part of *Psychagōgoi* relates to

¹¹⁶ Cf. West 2014: 123, whose remarks on the curious hybrid of rituals form a part of his larger argument that the entire episode originally belonged to a different place and time (Thesprotia, just before the hero's return to Ithaca) before being shifted (for reasons unexplained) to its present state.

¹¹⁷ Besides *Psychagōgoi*, the ghost-raising scene in *Persae* (note esp. 687, *ψυχαγωγοὶ γόοι*) shows that Aeschylus was generally fascinated with the idea of summoning souls from the netherworld. For necromancy in tragedy cf. also E. *Alc.* 1128 and F 379a (from *Eurystheus*, with useful commentary in Krumeich–Pechstein–Seidensticker 1999: 426 n. 18); and more generally, Plu. 2.560f.

¹¹⁸ For a reconstruction of the painter's elaborate *Nekyia* in the Lesche of the Cnidians, see Stansbury-O'Donnell 1990. Paus. 10.28-31 detects in Polygnotus' work the influence of a number of literary sources, and in the same way Aeschylus' *Psychagōgoi* may have found inspiration in more than just Homer's version of the episode.

the story of Odysseus' death as described more fully in the *Telegony*, and so discussion of the fragments is reserved for Chapter 4.

In terms of narrative content the *Odyssey* is perhaps closer to the wide-ranging eventfulness of the Cyclic poems than to the almost singular focus of the *Iliad*, and one scholiast (sch. *Od.* 1.284d) explains the entirety of the Telemachy as a deliberate attempt by Homer to enhance the poem's *ποικιλία*.¹¹⁹ But its utility for tragic poets was largely restricted by the triumphant aspect of Odysseus' return (see E. Hall and Aristotle's *Poetics* again, which states that the focus around a single character also helpfully enhances the *Odyssey*'s sense of cohesion and unity). Tragedians did find ways to treat parts of this story, but often these clashed with the aims of the tragic genre, and thus satyr-play was a more convenient vehicle for them to use.¹²⁰

Aeschylus in fact wrote a tetralogy about Odysseus that probably comprised *Ostologoi* ("Bone-collectors"), *Penelope*, and *Psychagogoi*, with *Circe* serving as the coda.¹²¹ This group of works, a biographical cycle in its own right, is of course

¹¹⁹ Cf. Ps.-Longin. *De Subl.* 9.13: τῆς δὲ Ὀδυσσεΐας τὸ πλεόν διηγηματικόν. (This observation is especially valid for the *Apologoi* (Books 9-12), but it applies to the *Odyssey* generally in contrast to the *Iliad*.) The treatise goes on to attribute the strain of fantasy in the *Odyssey* to the advancing age of Homer. Again, fabulous elements also account for some of the principal episodes in the Cyclic poems (e.g., the magical healing property of Achilles' spear vis-à-vis the wounded Telephus), whereas in the *Iliad* the occasional flights of fancy are, when we discount divine intervention of all forms, relatively few (e.g., Achilles' talking horses at 19.404-18), and divine interventions can generally be rationalized at the audience's discretion (cf. the concept of "double determination," for an overview of which see H. Pelliccia's article in Finkelberg 2011: 218f.).

¹²⁰ As Sutton 1974 amply illustrates.

¹²¹ A. Wessels and R. Krumeich in id.-Pechstein-Seidensticker 1999: 157 with n. 1; the same authors (pp. 205-7) entertain the suggestion of Kudlien 1970: 303 that the *Ostologoi* was itself a satyr-play, but this can hardly be true: although the game *kottabos* is alluded to in F 179, the allusion is not necessarily humorous (just as the worldly objects thrown at the hero in the *Odyssey* are a source of entertainment for the hubristic suitors but no laughing matter for Odysseus himself); rather, it serves (1) to color Odysseus' grievances toward the suitors with epic detail; (2) to denigrate the suitors as smitten with drunken carousing beyond proper measure; and (3) perhaps to evoke for Aeschylus' aristocratic audience the familiar world of the symposium (cf. West 269 n. 36 on the updating of epic banqueting scenes in conformity with later dining practices). On the other hand, the real substance of the play, namely the desperate attempt of the suitors' brethren to secure for them proper funeral rites (a prominent theme in the works of Aeschylus' successor

comparable to Aeschylus' Achilles trilogy (or tetralogy; see above). The *Ostologoi* and *Penelope*, like the *Psychagōgoi*, are discussed in Chapter 4. As for the satyr-play, Aeschylus may have been interested not only in the outlandishness of the episode but also in its potential moral implications. A certain rationalizing exegesis made the story into an object lesson decrying indulgence in drinking,¹²² while the notion of a human soul entering a bestial body of course presents its own set of moral questions and has intrigued many thinkers both ancient and modern.¹²³ There are relevant vases to consider, including a red-figure pelike by the Ethiop Painter in Dresden.¹²⁴

Sophocles), is entirely sober and tragic. Cf. Grossardt 2003. For other theories about the contents and arrangement of Aeschylus' Odysseus tetralogy, see *TGF* iii, TRI B IV; Sommerstein 2012a: 249-52.

¹²² Athenaeus 1.10e, participating in a philosophical tradition that goes back at least as far as Socrates. According to Xen. *Mem.* 1.3.7, Odysseus was saved partly through Hermes' aid and partly through his own inborn *ἐγκράτεια*; cf. Montiglio 2011 on Odysseus as a model of virtue (and vice) in philosophical literature.

¹²³ Plutarch entertains the theory that dehumanization actually represents evolution insofar as human vices are shed: at *Mor.* 985d-992e Circe facilitates an interview between Odysseus and a certain Gryllus, who asserts that he is better off as a pig.

¹²⁴ Dr. 323; E. Hofstetter-Dolega in *CVA Deutschland* vol. 97 (2015), 42-4, pll. 29.7f. and 30. Besides Aeschylus' *Circe*, several pure comedies exploited the lighthearted dimension of the Aeaeon episode. Ar. *Pl.* 302ff. equates a certain notoriously bewitching prostitute with Circe. Bergk 1838: 404 n. theorized that a fragment from the *Circe* by the fourth-century comic playwright Anaxilas similarly used the Odysseus-Circe affair as a proxy for ridiculing one Cinesias and his weakness for a meretricious temptress (fr. 13 *PCG*; from the same play fr. 12 offers a slight expansion of *Od.* 10.433, while fr. 14 simply reports that Plato was mocked herein). Bergk's theory is plagued, however, by metrical as well as chronological difficulties (Cinesias was a fifth-century poet, whereas Anaxilas is dated to the fourth); and K.-A. accept Meineke's more plausible emendation to κνησιᾶν (a further alteration would yield even greater cohesion: δεινὸν μὲν γὰρ ἔχονθ' ὑὸς | ῥύγχος <σ>, ὃ φίλε, κνησιᾶν). But so enchanted by the sorceress was Anaxilas that in his *Calypso* he has Odysseus recall his harrowing experience upon arriving at Circe's abode (fr. 11, ῥύγχος φορῶν ἕειον ἡσθόμην τότε—apparently in this version Odysseus himself suffered the curse that in Homer afflicted only his men, or else the hero is recalling an interview with one of those victims [cf. the dialogue imagined by Plutarch and mentioned in the previous note]); and the hero's learned apprehension must then be appeased by Calypso, who reassures him of her innocence thus: προγεύσεται σοι πρῶτον ἢ γραῦς τοῦ ποτοῦ (fr. 10; this straightforward reconstruction (1) simplifies the interpretation of Bergk [loc. cit.], viz., that in this play Anaxilas again targeted Cinesias—K.-A. here merely record Meineke's doubt regarding the relevance of Cinesias—and (2) allows Odysseus to play the role of Odysseus just as Schmidt 1888: 398 and Moessner 1907: 13 wanted, although they argued that the fragment should be spoken by him in recollection of the advice he had received from Hermes before facing Circe—as though παραγεύσεται [sic] σοι... τοῦ ποτοῦ were equivalent to *Od.* 10.290, τεύξει τοι κκεῶ, as though it were unproblematic that Circe should be called an "old woman," and as though the middle voice of Anaxilas' verb should have no impact on meaning). Ehippus' *Circe* (fr. 11 *PCG*), as demonstrated by Schmidt 1888: 396, portrayed Odysseus as a παράσιτος at Circe's table. Deinolochos wrote a *Circe* as well (testt. *PCG*).

Another method of dealing with celebrated Homeric passages while avoiding the charge of redundancy was to alter the focalization of a particular episode (do cite de Jong here). For example, while Penelope is thoroughly developed as a subjective character in the *Odyssey*, there was evidently room for her further development on the Greek stage; in a similar vein, the comic playwright Anaxandrides wrote a play on the Trojan archer Pandarus, who plays a relatively brief yet essential role in *Iliad* 4.

So in the end the “Homeric” strain in Athenian tragedy must be viewed as anomalous, and the plays just surveyed must be exceptions that prove the rule that, even if Homer was preferred for his superior *technē*, his masterful deployment of *mimēsis*, and his effectiveness as a storyteller, it was the Cyclic poets from whom the tragedians borrowed most of the *hyle* for their own compositions. Lange also argues persuasively that the *Odyssey* was largely responsible for Euripides’ keen interest in certain forms of *anagnōrisis* and the use of a *deus ex machina* as a literary device.

In the Cyclic poems there was of course much recycling of storytelling commonplaces, such as in the stream of Trojan allies who shimmered briefly on the battlefield before inevitably being extinguished: Cynus, Penthesileia, Memnon, Eurypylos.¹²⁵ Related to the proliferation of *typischen Szenen* within the Homeric poems, this phenomenon is merely the formulaic impulse of the oral epic tradition writ large. And it presented tragedians with a unique opportunity: faced with such repetition, it was up to them to discover what made each story interesting—or to manufacture interest by devising new details or an idiosyncratic way of telling the tale.

¹²⁵ Sommerstein in *SFP* 2012: 130 with nn. 70f. For the extent to which Rhesus conforms to this pattern, see Fenik 1964: 8-16 and Liapis 2012: xvii; for Sarpedon as well, Fantuzzi 2006: 136-40.

The arguments in the chapters that follow, which concern tragedy's reception of the Cyclic stories, naturally depend very much on the state of each given epic poem at the time of its reception. While I contend that the tragedians were avid readers of the Cyclic epics themselves,¹²⁶ their appropriation of stories from the Trojan saga of course had a number of other influences, including lyric poetry,¹²⁷ earlier dramas (of all three subgenres),¹²⁸ and older and contemporary works of visual art in various media.¹²⁹ In the discussions to follow it is more often the case that a work of art aids in the reconstruction of or is otherwise indebted to a work of literature than the other way around, but that is partly because the available evidence makes it easier to detect the influence of tragedy upon vase-painting and other minor arts than to detect the influence of major works of art (architectural sculptures, wall paintings, etc.) upon tragedy.¹³⁰ Finally, of course, there is

¹²⁶ Cf. Pearson 1917: xxiii: "To Sophocles the legends of Hellas were permanently embedded in its poetry; and the task of cataloguing his plays will only be adequately performed, in so far as we succeed in discovering their literary sources."

¹²⁷ R. P. Winnington-Ingram in Easterling–Knox 1989: 259 remarks, "One could say that the stories came to the tragedians rough-shaped for drama by epic and lyric poets."

¹²⁸ On Aeschylus as a prominent model and source for Euripides, see Aéliou 1983; Thalmann 1993.

¹²⁹ Comparison between the verbal and visual media of storytelling is of course ancient (e.g., *ὁ Σιμωνίδης τὴν μὲν ζωγραφίαν ποιήσιν σιωπῶσαν προσαγορεύει, τὴν δὲ ποιήσιν ζωγραφίαν λαλοῦσαν*, Plut. *De gloria Ath.* 3.346f.), and that they actually exchanged ideas and themes needs no defending. The modern practice of "monumental philology," or using archaeological evidence to understand literature, was especially cultivated by Otto Jahn (Calder 1991a: 347); important early studies include Luckenbach 1880 and Séchan 1926. Alongside tragedy, vase-painting serves as a parallel index of how fifth-century Athenians were receiving the stories of the Epic Cycle. For a good introduction to the reception of Trojan myths in Athenian red-figure, see Boardman 1976. For the question of literacy among Athenian vase-painters of the Archaic period, see Shapiro 1995. On the basis of certain sophisticated scenes into which the vase painters inserted themselves (e.g., Malibu 82.AE.53, a late-sixth-century RF psykter) as well as the substantial collection of competently executed (possibly even original, some?) metrical inscriptions reminiscent of sympotic skolia, Shapiro argues convincingly in favor of their literacy and participation (at least on a modest level) in the aristocratic life of Athens. He thus locates artisans alongside aristocrats at symposia, in the palaestra, and more broadly within the diffuse "song culture" of Archaic Athens (on which see Herington 1985). Note that the vase-painters' imitation of sympotic songs in this earlier period prefigures their postulated imitation of dramatic productions in the fifth century. If some members of this class of *banauoi* were avid consumers of elite drinking songs, then likewise they must have been keen spectators at the city's dramatic festivals. But of course this does not preclude that in the case of some dramatic scenes it was the buyer who unilaterally dictated the decoration while the artist merely executed his commission.

¹³⁰ An extraordinary example of the latter is the distorted ekphrasis on the temple of Apollo at Delphi in the parodos of E. *Ion* (184-236), on which see Stieber 2011: 284-302. The issue of the dramatists' hold on vase-painters is of course highly contentious. *Contra* Séchan 1926, Webster, T.-W., and other

the most elusive of all factors, namely the many oral exchanges that surely abounded but generally went unrecorded: rhapsodic performances in Athens, popular songs, learned or dialectic exchanges,¹³¹ and folk stories.

Lyric poetry was of course also an important filter through which tragedy received the myths first told in epic. To this end, some lyric poets were more useful than

interdisciplinary or “philodramatic” studies, Boardman 2001: 209-17 downplays the purported prevalence of drama-inspired scenes in vase-painting, except among fourth-century South Italian vases and especially Apulian volute craters (which shed more light on the tragic burlesques known as *φλύακες* than on classical tragedy). It is certainly true that external factors could sometimes inspire new creations in both tragedy and vase-painting, as Boardman argues (p. 211) in regard to the evolution of the Attic cult of Boreas after the Persian Wars. But whenever such an explanation cannot be posited (as often happens), interaction across different media must be considered as an alternative to mere coincidence. Moreover, one should not presume based on Boardman’s discussion that satyr-plays made a greater impact on artists than did tragedies, only that reflections of the former are better visually marked by the presence of satyr-players. Nor in principle would the psychological depth of tragedy have prohibited vase-painters from responding in their own way to what they witnessed on the stage—a process that may well have involved supplementing the cast of characters, eliding the stage along with its scenery and elements of the actors’ costumes (*pace* Boardman 2001: 216), and other distortions. Such distortions are nowhere more evident than on the so-called Exeter pelike (*ARV*² 1516.80) with its wildly synthetic (or doubly misrepresentative) depiction of the reunion of Electra and Orestes, which Coe 2013 deftly handles while demarcating appropriate methodologies for connecting vases with tragedies. Also exemplary in his approach is Taplin 2007, who stresses (pp. 26-8 and *passim*) the need to train our attention as much as possible on Attic tragedies not as textual artifacts but as performances—or, to be more precise as it relates to Taplin’s primary corpus of objects, as plays revived in fourth-century Apulia; this is despite the fact that only one or two of Taplin’s vases indisputably include the physical trappings of performance (e.g., a stage on a Sicilian calyx-crater by the Capodarso Painter, on which see *ibid.* 261f.). In general, it is appropriate to rely on the probability of reason and to say, for example, that the combination on one vase of two or more disparate scenes that were narrated together in exactly one antecedent poem entails that the artist borrowed from that poem. West 130 makes such an argument concerning certain Archaic BF amphorae juxtaposing Memnon and Penthesileia in imitation of the Cyclic *Aethiopsis*. Supposed reactions to epic poetry in art during the Archaic period—cited even as evidence for the dating of Homer—are no less controversial than the theory of tragedy in art. One might object that even a pair of scenes that a canonical text seems to have joined randomly or with striking originality could have been associated in undocumented ways independent of this text, or that at the very least word of mouth acted as a bridge between the epic and the work of art in question, thus destroying the idea of a direct link. It is therefore incumbent upon anyone who espouses the so-called philodramatist attitude to search for correspondence of minute details to corroborate all claims about influence.

¹³¹ Some of these diatribes thankfully were written down. One thinks especially of works such as Gorgias’ *Encomium of Helen* (perhaps to be ascribed instead to Anaximenes of Lampsacus, who otherwise wrote his own defense of her, as did Isocrates; see Jebb 1893: ii.98) as well as Antisthenes’ *Ajax* and *Odysseus* speeches and Gorgias’ and Alcidas’ *Palamedes* speeches (cf. also the Homeric material in dialogues such as *Hippias Minor*). It is unknown when the practice of composing such *ἐπιδείξεις* took hold in Athens, and even if the tragedians were familiar with this practice there is great doubt as to how much it materially impacted their reception of myths. Of course, *ῥηθοποιία* was a paramount concern for both dramatists and composers of (epideictic) oratory (for the latter, cf. D.H. *Lys.* 8), which might imply interaction between the two genres. But in those instances where we can detect similarities of thought or even language between a tragic text and an epideictic speech (e.g., the phrase *οὐχ ἐκῶν* used of Odysseus at the outset of the war at A. *Ag.* 841 and at Antisth. *Aj.* 9.3; observed by Kennedy 2011: 55), we must tend to view the former as original or assume both share a common source. On rhapsodic performances in Athens see Herington 1985.

others. One may compare the divergent models of Alcman, who used myths only selectively in his creation of poetry, and of Stesichorus, who dealt with myths exclusively.¹³² The second-century AD papyrus commentary 217 *PMGF* (= A. T 63 = *P.Oxy.* 2506 fr. 26 col. ii) asserts explicitly that Aeschylus and Euripides took cues from Stesichorus' poems.¹³³ Whereas lyric poets like Archilochus may still have been more attuned to oral trends,¹³⁴ one can argue that the idea of intertextuality, presupposing the act of reading texts, applies already to the tragedians.

Another concern is the extent to which Homer signals his familiarity with the versions of the stories that were later codified in the Cyclic poems (the central question of Neoanalysis, which also wonders about the relative chronology of all the Trojan epics), and the extent to which his intimations affect the approaches taken by tragic authors. For example, did Homer's exceptional renown mean that his oblique account of Agamemnon's *nostos* exerted greater influence on Aeschylus' *Oresteia* than did the direct account of the story in the *Nostoi*? Welcker argued that the author of the *Life* of Sophocles, for one, saw it that way; Radt followed Welcker.¹³⁵ But even if that is so, the author of the *Life* is manifestly wrong, for Sophocles as well as the other tragedians can be shown to have looked at the fuller treatments in non-Homeric sources of myths mentioned by Homer in passing. An example of a Trojan tragedy that could not have been built upon the meager notice Homer gives to the pertinent story is Sophocles' *Philoctetes*. Of this play's titular character Homer records only that he was left stranded

¹³² See e.g. Arrighetti 1994.

¹³³ Cf. Hutchinson 2001: 438 n. 18.

¹³⁴ The oralist approach of J. M. Foley, and specifically his concept of "resonant patterns," is applied sensitively to Archilochus by Barker–Christensen 2006.

¹³⁵ See the discussion of Davidson 1994.

by the Greek host on its way to Troy,¹³⁶ making no mention of his retrieval from Lemnos. The only lingering question is whether these “non-Homeric sources” were regularly the poems of the Epic Cycle.

The present study is arranged as a series of extended case studies. Because tragic poets were often responding to each other at the same time as they were responding to the Epic Cycle,¹³⁷ because each Cyclic epic comprised many episodes, some of which proved to be much more popular than others, and because various minor tragedians and even comic playwrights must enter into the discussion at various points, it has seemed best to make source text the overarching organizing principle, that is, to arrange the following discussions primarily by Cyclic poem rather than by tragic poet.¹³⁸ Thus each of the following three chapters attempts to elucidate the full history of tragedy's reception of one Cyclic epic in all of its constituent parts. I follow the Trojan Cycle's¹³⁹ inherent chronology, introducing each successive myth just as West does in his 2013 edition of and commentary upon the Epic Cycle (i.e., Proclus' *Chrestomathy*, with occasional supplements derived from Pseudo-Apollodorus). I then analyze how—and indeed whether—each tragic author treated the myth in question. While I draw upon the relevant surviving plays, given the nature of the evidence and of the project I devote significantly

¹³⁶ *Il.* 2.716-25, *Od.* 3.188-90, 6.219.

¹³⁷ Cf. the basic premise of Aélion 1983 that Euripides regularly imitated Aeschylus; also West 46. But it is argued *infra* (e.g., in regard to the notorious trio of *Philoctetes* plays, §3.3) that tragedians continued to engage with the Cycle even after one of their own (Aeschylus) had established a tragic model for a given episode.

¹³⁸ But the alternative arrangement, adopted for example by Tsagalis 2008 and at times exploited fruitfully by him, has its own advantages. Most significantly, it affords one the ability to visualize how much favor each of the three major tragedians showed to each Cyclic poem.

¹³⁹ Unless indicated otherwise, this study uses “Cyclic” and “Cycle” in strict reference to the canonical Trojan epics excluding the *Il.* and *Od.*; i.e., the Theban part of what is sometimes more broadly defined as the Epic Cycle is covered only by explicit references. Cf. n. 140 *infra*.

more space to discussing of tragic fragments.¹⁴⁰ Of course there are far too many relevant tragic fragments for one study to address them all; rather, I seek to treat in depth only those fragments that bear upon the question of how the narrative material of epic is converted to tragic form.

In order to narrow the focus of this study further, I have selected but three of the six epics that together with the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* constituted the canonical Trojan saga: the *Cypria* because it contained the greatest number of stories that could be and were appropriated by the tragedians; the *Little Iliad* because it ranks second according to the same criterion; and the *Telegony* on the grounds that its contents bear a uniquely abstruse relationship to the remnants of tragedy (it also marks the end of the Cycle as a whole).¹⁴¹ Entirely excluded from consideration are the four poems of the Epic Cycle that relate to Thebes. This large omission may appear to be arbitrary and to disregard the exceptional popularity of the myth of Oedipus, whose fate Sophocles even calls “thrice-told” (*τριπόλιστος*, *Ant.* 858). Yet it is justified by the fact that the ancient Greeks already considered the Trojan and Theban sub-cycles to be distinct,¹⁴² and my reasons for preferring to study the Trojan material are (1) that the triumvirate tragedians borrowed more often from the Trojan than from the Theban sub-cycle,¹⁴³ and (2) that the contents of the epics of the Trojan Cycle are attested externally by Proclus and probably pseudo-

¹⁴⁰ The theory and practice of using ancient literary fragments is itself an emergent subdiscipline: important methodological observations can be found in Sommerstein 2013 and throughout Most 1997 (cf. id. 1996).

¹⁴¹ I intend to pursue this project further by adding chapters on the missing links, namely the *Aethiopsis* (in the interpretation of which Neoanalysis has a special part to play), the *Iliupersis* (whose evocation of Trojan suffering paved the way for tragedies like *E. Hec.* and *Tro.*), and the *Nostoi* (a major part of which was dedicated to the homecoming of Agamemnon—but there was a long train of accounts thereof, each successively building upon its predecessors).

¹⁴² Sommerstein 2015; West. The term “sub-cycle” is used e.g. by Fantuzzi–Tsagalis 2015b: 15; West 2 speaks of the “Trojan sequence,” but he also uses “Epic Cycle” synonymously with “Trojan (sub)-cycle” (i.e., the “Epic Cycle” exclusive of the Theban sub-cycle), as I do throughout this study.

¹⁴³ Sommerstein 2015: 463, listing the Troy:Thebes ratios as 15:8 for Euripides, 14:8 for Aeschylus, and 41:6 for Sophocles (who accordingly, on a purely quantitative basis, was rather uninterested in Oedipus!).

Apollodorus,¹⁴⁴ whereas there is far less by which we can establish the contents of the Theban epics, some sense of which would be necessary before investigating how they were used as models.¹⁴⁵ For example, the plot of the Euripidean *Oedipus* is known to have differed drastically from that of Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*, but it is unclear to what extent the Cyclic epic *Oedipodea* accounted for the differences, indeed whether it influenced either or both of those dramas.¹⁴⁶ Aeschylus' *Oedipus* tetralogy of 468/7 B.C.

¹⁴⁴ For cautionary remarks regarding the utility of the latter's *Library*, see Davies 1989: 7. But often the Trojan section of this work, which survives in the form of an *Epitome*, serves as a useful tool for corroborating, supplementing, or otherwise controlling the evidence furnished by Proclus about the Cycle.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Rengakos 2015: 154.

¹⁴⁶ A well-known scholion *ad E. Ph.* 1760 relays much intriguing mythographic information from the writer Pisander (*FGrHist* 16 F 10), but this is generally discarded as evidence for Euripides' play (Collard 2005: 60 n. 22), and a definite connection with the epic poem is also wanting (Cingano 2015: 216). Nevertheless, it does seem that Euripides may have followed the Theban Cycle more faithfully than Sophocles did. For there is substantial agreement between the fragments of Euripides' play and the Pisander scholion, which may reflect the *Oedipodea* after all (*PEG* fr. 1 of that epic derives from an extended version of the same scholion in one MS (cod. Monac. 560) and describes Creon's son Haemon, whom Pisander's account mentions as a victim of the Sphinx). Pisander asserts that after murdering Laius Oedipus sent his chariot as a gift to Polybus, and the leading reconstruction of Euripides' play, set forth by Hose 1990 and approved by Collard 2005: 60f., treats the chariot as a crucial token by which Oedipus is convicted of the murder (but Oedipus' adoptive mother Periboea, a crucial witness and catalyst in the reconstruction of the drama, serves no such role in the scholion). Additionally, Pisander alleges that Laius' rape of Chrysippus incurred the wrath of Hera, and it is worth mentioning that E. also wrote a *Chrysippus* and that Laius' crime explains the grudge Apollo bore against him—a grudge announced in the first line of E. *Oed.* (F 539a). Sophocles by contrast tends to suppress Laius' guilt, allowing Apollo's persecution of the Labdacids to seem arbitrary (*S. Ant.* also presents a Haemon who is radically different from the Haemon of the *Oedipodea* in terms of his generation and fate; cf. Cingano 2015: 219). Elsewhere Euripides seems to follow the *Thebaid*, the epic sequel to *Oedipodea*: in E. *Ph.* Oedipus, far from having perished in exile as in *S. OC*, still lives in Thebes at the time of his sons' mutual slaughter, and in the *Thebaid* he survived at least long enough to curse his sons for vying to usurp *his* royal power (*PEG* fr. 2-3). On the other hand, E. *Ph.* also has Jocasta outlive her sons (very briefly), which clashes with the *Oedipodea* in two ways: in the epic poem she commits suicide as in *S. OT*, and Oedipus' four children are born from his second wife, Euryganeia (*PEG* fr. 2 = Paus. 9.5.10f.; cf. the Pisander scholion). And although E. *Ph.* has Oedipus growing old in Thebes, E. *Oedipus* seems to have ended with his voluntary exile, for in that play (dated ca. 415 B.C., hence later than *S. OT* but earlier than *OC*) Athens is addressed by apostrophe (F 554b; it is unlikely that Men. *Sam.* 324-6 has altered the name in the quotation), and Jocasta even pledges to join Oedipus in exile on the grounds that a wife should support her husband regardless of any deformity (F *545a). Pace Collard 2005: 61, Jocasta cannot know that Oedipus is her son when she makes this speech; Euripides was notorious for his shockingly libidinous women (e.g., the Phaedra of his *Hippolytus Veiled*), but it would be perverse and truly egregious for Jocasta to speak of her wifely duties to Oedipus while cognizant that she is his mother. In Euripides' play Oedipus does not blind himself but is blinded by Laius' servants after he has been found guilty of murder but before he has been identified as Laius' son (F 541). Jocasta's expression of fidelity to the exoculated Oedipus *qua* husband must also precede the latter's discovery. Euripides may nevertheless have kept Jocasta alive, thus furnishing a point of consistency with—or rather anticipating—his *Phoenissae* (dated a few years later). Jocasta also appears to rail against Creon for allowing his “envy” to destroy her and Oedipus (F 551 as interpreted by Collard 2005: 59);

(T 58a-b) contained a *Laius* and an *Oedipus* as well as his *Seven against Thebes*, and although this suggests the playwright's concerted engagement with the Theban Cycle as a whole, again solid evidence is lacking on both ends. There has also been a recent swell of scholarly interest in Thebes as a foil to Athens in tragedy,¹⁴⁷ but this has come about more in spite of than because of the amount of evidence that exists for the Theban Cycle itself (as distinct from the surviving plays *Seven Against Thebes*, *Antigone*, *Antigone*, etc.). Thus it is Trojan War mythology that unites all of the works discussed below. At the end of each chapter I attempt to synthesize findings and summarize trends—both general and specific—in the tragic output of Athens as it relates to each Cyclic poem.

To compare fragmentary Greek tragedy with the lost Epic Cycle is in many respects to explain *ignotum per ignotius*. However, the scholarly reconstruction of the general contents of the Cycle—based largely on Proclus' *Chrestomathy* but corroborated by other sources and by pure reason—is reliable. Thus this study is justified in seeking to detect the influence of the Cycle on tragedy as far as narrative content is concerned, even if the dearth of surviving verses lamentably curtails the possibility of more detailed source-criticism.

Creon's envy, which probably impelled him to conduct the investigation that ends with Oedipus' conviction and punishment, may indeed be a very old feature of the myth, although in S. *OT* 540ff. it seems more like a fiction born from Oedipus' desperate paranoia. Note finally that Euripides' play described Oedipus' defeat of the Sphinx in great detail (F 540, 540a, 540b) and may have drawn upon the *Oedipodea* to do so.

¹⁴⁷ Zeitlin 1990 deserves credit for establishing a working model (however overly schematic) for this dichotomy. More recently Berman 2015 has studied both Thebes' status in epic as a sort of proto-Troy (27-48) and the city's reinvention as an "anti-Athens" in drama (75-121). For a clear summary of the city's significance for tragedy (plus further bibliography) cf. D. Rosenbloom's article "Thebes" in Roisman 2013: 1390-2.

2. Tales from the *Cypria*: the Mythic Mother Lode

In the most likely scenario, the *Cypria* coalesced in the first half of the sixth century B.C. under the care of a final redactor, who collated and probably recomposed the preexisting epics about episodes imagined to have taken place from the origins of the Trojan War until its ninth year.¹⁴⁸ This poet, whether one of the Cypriots Stasinus or Hegesias or someone else, fashioned the whole work to be a grand introduction to the story of the *Iliad*. As discussed in the preceding chapter, Aristotle's characterization of this poem (and the *Little Iliad*) as *πολυμερῆ* (*Poet.* 1459a37) serves both as a (somewhat unfair) warning about the defective quality of the poem and as an indication of its narrative richness. Prominent among later authors who in their own creative capacity exploited this wealth of material were Sophocles and Euripides.¹⁴⁹

2.1. *Dios Boulē*

Zeὺς βουλευέται μετὰ τῆς Θέμιδος περὶ τοῦ Τρωϊκοῦ πολέμου.

Zeus takes counsel with Themis about the Trojan War. (Arg. 1a W.)

According to a surviving fragment of the *Cypria* that begins the poem's narrative, Zeus brought about the Trojan War as a way of alleviating Earth from her burden of sustaining the ponderous human race.¹⁵⁰ This godly initiative was not ideally suited to direct treatment in tragedy (the divine casts of *Prometheus Bound* and other plays

¹⁴⁸ West 63-65.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. *ibid.* 56 and Jouan 1966 (Euripides) and 1994 (Sophocles).

¹⁵⁰ Sch. (D) *Il.* 1.5 is the source of *Cyp.* fr. 1 W., which comprises seven hexameters and ends with, *Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή*. In view of the imperfect tense in the immediately preceding phrase *οἱ δ' ἐνὶ Τροίῃ | ἦρωες κτείνοντο*, Severyns 1928: 313 n. 3 is inclined to think that this summary of Zeus' plan to cull the human race should be placed later in the *Cypria*, viz., some time when the fighting at Troy is already under way. But this is known as *Cyp.* fr. 1 for good reason: *κτείνοντο* is proleptic (cf. West 68), just as the proem of the *Iliad*, from which the *Cypria* poet has borrowed *Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή*, describes the dire effects of Achilles' wrath before backtracking to describe its origins.

notwithstanding),¹⁵¹ but Euripides alludes to the cosmic impetus behind the war in several plays partaking in the Cycle.¹⁵² The verbal echoes are in fact so close as to guarantee that the playwright had the *Cypria* constantly before him—and, at that, probably the same version of the *Cypria* (of its proem at the very least) as the scholiast who recorded it.¹⁵³ The Euripidean passages consistently adhere to the straightforward account of the *Cypria*'s proem, in which Zeus resolves to thin out the human population by fanning (*ῥιπίσας*, line 5 of the fragment)¹⁵⁴ the flames of war and killing off the heroes. This is in contrast to the version related in the Homeric scholia, which admits of several elaborations and discrepancies. A papyrus giving a “hypothesis” to the *Iliad* coheres with the *Cypria* and Proclus' statement that Zeus consulted with Themis as to how to kill off a large number of men.¹⁵⁵ Euripides seems to ignore Themis' role, except that at *Or.* 1639 he names *θεοί* as opposed to naming Zeus alone. He tends to emphasize instead Helen's beauty as the means by which Zeus instigated the war.¹⁵⁶ In the *Helen* he demonstrates an Iliadic bias when he reinterprets the demonstration of Achilles' greatness as a secondary goal of Zeus' *original* plan (here the old epic formula is explicitly recalled

¹⁵¹ Cf. Sommerstein 2015: 463 on the human focus of tragedy.

¹⁵² *Hel.* 36-41, *Or.* 1639-42, *El.* 1282, and F 1082 (generally assumed to be from his *Alexandros*).

¹⁵³ Cf. Currie 2015: 295. Although “Euripides' verbatim allusions to [*Cyp.* fr. 1 W.]...are exceptional” (*ibid.* 281) as far as we can tell, the epic fragment itself, while not exactly exceptional, comprises seven of the scarcely 50-odd preserved verses of the *Cypria*, so that our ability to see its contents reflected in the Euripidean corpus is indeed a rare opportunity. The special attention given in ancient education to poetic proems (cf. *infra*, ### n. ##) should have applied doubly to the *Cypria* proem, which inaugurates not only that poem but the whole Cycle of Trojan epics. This also explains why Euripides returns to it frequently, but in the case of one so literate close engagement with the beginning of the poem tends to impute close engagement with the whole.

¹⁵⁴ The rarity of the “fanning” motif and the prominence of its usage here at the beginning of a major epic work raise the suspicion that *ῥιπίζει* in *Ar. Ran.* 360 is also inspired by this very passage.

¹⁵⁵ P. Oxy. 3829 ii 7, adding that Zeus was motivated by the *ἀσέβεια* of mortals (a merging with the Hesiodic myth of the Five Ages is plainly evident). The summary in the Homeric scholia combines the Earth's complaint with a redundant charge of human impiety, and even in the *Cypria* the fact that Themis (divine “Justice”) counsels Zeus implies that the war casualties deserved to die.

¹⁵⁶ *Ep.* 3.1 records the opinion of some that Zeus conceived the intercontinental war so that his daughter would be *ἔνδοξος*.

by the phrase τὰ...Διὸς βουλευόμενα, 36f.).¹⁵⁷ According to the Cycle that included the *Iliad*, Achilles was another tool by which to accomplish the goal of human destruction; Zeus concerned himself with the hero's aggrandizement only upon Agamemnon's affront and Thetis' intercession leading to a brokered deal.¹⁵⁸

The fuller version of the story as presented in the Homeric scholia, besides factoring in the Theban War as the first manifestation of Zeus' plan, substitutes Momus, the personification of reproach, for Themis in the role of Zeus' adviser. Momus convinces Zeus to forgo lightning bolts and cataclysms and instead to usher in a war by seeing to the births of Achilles and Helen.¹⁵⁹ Sophocles wrote a *Μῶμος Σατυρικός*,¹⁶⁰ which was argued by Pearson to pertain to this divine conspiracy.¹⁶¹ There is one apparent expression of sexual arousal that could relate to Zeus' seduction of Leda or to Helen's fatal attractiveness.¹⁶² If the plot was so constructed, then Sophocles either followed a source other than the *Cypria* or was himself responsible for introducing

¹⁵⁷ At S. *Phil.* 1415 Heracles says he has come τὰ Διός...φράσεων βουλευόμενα. He is especially entitled to represent Zeus both because (like Helen) he is Zeus-born (πατήρ at 1442 can be personal as well as generic) and because (unlike Helen) he is by now a god himself. Although Zeus' plans at the moment are concerned specifically with Philoctetes' journey to Troy with Heracles' bow, Sophocles probably wanted his Athenian audience to hear in these words a reference to the overarching Διὸς βουλή of the *Cypria*, which Philoctetes will help to fulfill. Tragedy also speaks of the βούλευμα of Zeus outside of a Trojan War context: [A.] *PV* 170. On the proliferation in tragedy of abstract nouns in -μα denoting "the result of action," see Long 1968: 18 (cf. Schein 2013: 125 (S. *Phil.* 35-7n.)); Διὸς βουλευόμενα may recall Zeus' active planning whereas Διὸς βουλή connotes his timeless purpose.

¹⁵⁸ The two plans are compatible, however, since Achilles' absence leads to more Achaean deaths.

¹⁵⁹ To extrapolate from the text, which actually refers to γνώμας δύο, τὴν Θέτιδος θνητογαμίαν καὶ θυγατρὸς καλῆς γένναν, ἐξ ᾧ ἀμφοτέρων πόλεμος Ἑλλησὶ τε καὶ βαρβάροις ἐγένετο. Themis must have given similar advice in the *Cypria*. In connection with Thetis' θνητογαμία there may have been talk of how her wedding would be an opportunity to sow discord.

¹⁶⁰ There is also a *Μῶμος* attributed to the tragedian Achaëus (*TrGF* 20 F 29), which Choeroboscus makes identical to Sophocles' play.

¹⁶¹ Pearson 1917: ii.77.

¹⁶² F 421, ἀναστῆναι, glossed by Hesych. s.v. as ἐπάρει τὸ αἰδοῖον (but also as στεινάζει, which could mean—if a correct reading, but Schmidt's στυσαι is a plausible emendation—that Sophocles used ἀναστῆναι [sc. τὰς ὀφρῶς] in the sense of "glower"). Lloyd-Jones 1996: 219 wonders whether *Momus* went beyond the planning and featured the actual seduction of Leda; presumably then the eponymous character, lest he lose his limelight, would have continued to berate Zeus while coaching him through the affair.

Momus in place of Themis, whence the account in the Homeric scholia.¹⁶³ But the evidence for the plot is so exiguous that we cannot even give preference to this Cyclic story over alternative stories involving Momus, who on other occasions denounced his fellow gods or their works and on one occasion specifically censured the Satyrs as unworthy followers of an unworthy god, Dionysus.¹⁶⁴ This story would afford the Satyrs of Sophocles' *Momus* a more integral role in the action;¹⁶⁵ otherwise they might simply have reflected the thematic lust that pervaded Zeus' plan.

2.2. The Wedding of Peleus and Thetis

παραγενομένη δὲ Ἔρις εὐωχομένων τῶν θεῶν ἐν τοῖς Πηλέως γάμοις νεῖκος περὶ κάλλους ἐνίστησιν Ἀθηνᾶ, Ἥρα καὶ Ἀφροδίτη· ...

Eris shows up while the gods are feasting at the wedding of Peleus and initiates among Athena, Hera, and Aphrodite a quarrel over beauty; ... (Arg. 1b W.)

¹⁶³ Would an ancient commentator have failed to appreciate that what a satyr-play said in jest was not meant to be taken as canonical? The very involvement of Momus bespeaks the possibility that the scholiast's source was a work from a less-than-solemn genre, and the scholiast may have been ignorant of another version of the story.

¹⁶⁴ Lucian, *Assembly of the Gods* 4, in which the debate concerns overcrowding not on earth but in heaven. Interestingly, F 424 (bearing the attribution Σοφοκλήος Νόμος but conjectured to come from his *Momus*) consists of the word ἄρπην, glossed as δρέπανον ("sickle"). If this is not part of a celebration of Dionysus' gift of viticulture, it may be an allusion to the ἄρπη used against Uranus, again to appease Gaia, at Hes. *Th.* 175ff. As an expression of the desire to inhibit procreation or contain a population, this would fit both the dilemma at the beginning of the Epic Cycle and Lucian's dilemma of too many gods. Another one-word fragment, ἀποσκόλοπτε (F 423, also attributed to *Momus* via a correction of the *paradosis*), probably refers to circumcision (Hesych. s.v.), not too distant from the idea of castration. Momus is featured yet again in Aesop. *Fab.* 102 (Hausrath), where his relentless criticism of Zeus, Prometheus, and Athena gets him thrown out of Olympus. For the variations on this story see Scheurer–Bielfeldt in Krumeich–Pechstein–Seidensticker 1999: 364 n. 8.

¹⁶⁵ Scheurer–Bielfeldt (*ibid.* 367) suggest that Lucian *loc. cit.* may have been inspired by a scene in Sophocles' play (but not that the actual conceit of the play (viz., divine xenophobia on crowded Olympus) is to be found in Lucian's dialogue, some of whose foreign deities were less familiar in Sophocles' day). There are a couple of very faint linguistic echoes between Momus' diatribe in Lucian and the fragments of Sophocles' play (σκιρτητικούς Luc. ≈ ἀνθρωσκε, S. F 422; φαλακροί [Σάτυροι] Luc. ≈ ἀλωπεκίαι in Hesych. s.v. ἀλώπηξ = S. F 998a, which Radt rightly sets apart from the more secure fragments of *Momus*). For another possible instance of Lucian drawing from Sophoclean satyr-drama, see *infra*, pp. ###.

In the *Cypria* Zeus did not shun Thetis after a prophecy that she would bear a son stronger than his father.¹⁶⁶ Rather, it was she who shunned him out of respect for Hera, and it was therefore in angry frustration, not fear, that Zeus married her off to a mortal man.¹⁶⁷ According to Ap. Rhod. 4.805-9 (and *Il.* 24.60f.), Hera ensured that Thetis at least wedded the choicest mortal at a ceremony attended by all the gods, but Apollod. 3.13.5, which is no less likely to reflect the narrative of the *Cypria*, indicates that Thetis remained reluctant, for Chiron had to advise Peleus how to grapple with the Nereid when she attempted to evade him through repeated metamorphosis (cf. Pi. *Nem.* 3.35f., 4.62-5, S. F 618).¹⁶⁸ This, taken together with the ascription of the *μεταμορφώσεις* to *οἱ νεώτεροι* in sch. (T) *Il.* 18.434a,¹⁶⁹ suggests that the story of Thetis' slippery resistance—in spite of Hera's efforts to appease her—goes back to the *Cypria*.¹⁷⁰ Proclus bypasses it because it would have been related only by way of a flashback at the outset of the wedding scene.

¹⁶⁶ West 69 says that Pi. *Isth.* 8.27ff. and other sources apparently imported this motif from the story of Metis in Hes. *Th.* 886-900.

¹⁶⁷ Philod. *De pietate* B 7241 Obbink = *Cyp.* fr. 2 W.; Ap. Rhod. 4.790-8.

¹⁶⁸ Chiron's role in this was probably invented as an afterthought on the model of Eidothea's aid in *Od.* 4.363ff. He would have been nominated to the role based on his wisdom, for which he was already famous (cf. the descriptor *μάντις ὁ φοιβάδα μοῦσαν εἰδώς*, E. *IA* 1064f.), and his association with Peleus in at least two other capacities (host of his wedding and tutor of his son).

¹⁶⁹ It is true that *οἱ νεώτεροι* can refer to any and all poets after Homer, but frequently it can be shown to refer specifically to the Cyclic poets (Severyns 1928: 66-8). As sch. (A) *ad loc.* reminds us, even the best mortal man was still mortal and would have mortal children, and this is what made Thetis reluctant to marry Peleus, even in the *Iliad*.

¹⁷⁰ Pace West 72 and despite his objection that the *Cypria* would then possess a redundancy, for it used the same motif in Zeus' pursuit of Nemesis (*Cyp.* fr. 10). The admission of repetitiveness (a recurring feature in the *Cypria*, which e.g. narrated two separate gatherings at Aulis) was probably overcome by the poet's keenness to demonstrate the truth of *Il.* 18.433f., *καὶ ἔτλην* (cf. *οὐκ ἔτλης*, Ap. Rhod. 4.794) *ἀνέρος εὐνήν | πολλὰ μάλ' οὐκ ἐθέλουσα*, where sch. (T) *Il.* 18.434a also comments, *ἐντεῦθεν οἱ νεώτεροι τὰς μεταμορφώσεις αὐτῆς φασιν*. The *Cypria* was already recycling a motif used of Menelaus and Proteus in *Od.* 4.454-61, so why not keep using it? Moreover, the wrestling match was a way for Peleus to prove that his worthiness matched Hera's commendation. Severyns 1928: 252f. and Jouan 1966: 72-4 argue, partly on the basis of the popularity of the scene already in sixth-century art, that the *Cypria* included Thetis' metamorphoses, whereas other scholars tend to doubt it.

Thetis' shape-shifting to elude Peleus had become a standard motif by the fifth century.¹⁷¹ Yet Euripides toys with the tradition in a passage of *Iphigenia in Aulis* in which Clytemnestra interrogates her husband about her promised son-in-law, Achilles. Asking just the right questions to provide an audience with a refresher on Achilles' origins, Clytemnestra insightfully wonders whether Peleus had to take Thetis *βίᾳ θεῶν* ("against divine will," 702), and Agamemnon prevaricates by replying, *Ζεὺς ἡγγύησε καὶ δίδωσ' ὁ κύριος* ("Zeus betrothed [her], and her overseer [sc. Nereus] consents," 703). Euripides is not contradicting tradition *per se*; rather, Agamemnon concentrates on the will of male divinities, not Thetis' own will, and thus purposely conceals the fact that Thetis was literally dragged into an unwanted marriage. His measured response is formulated to reassure Clytemnestra that he has Iphigenia's best interests at heart. He also draws a comparison between himself and Zeus as pledgers of daughters (in Zeus' case, someone else's daughter) and mentions Nereus, whose opinion about his daughter's marriage normally does not factor into the story, as a way of encouraging Clytemnestra to consent in the present circumstance (a special accommodation, for he, not she, is *κύριος* when it comes to Iphigenia, despite Clytemnestra's authoritative stance at 736). Agamemnon succeeds in portraying Achilles as a worthy husband by sidestepping his father's unworthiness as a husband—not to mention Zeus' ulterior motives for forcing the marriage—and in this way he forestalls Clytemnestra's misgivings.

Apollodorus' testimony also makes it likely that Chiron was featured prominently in the *Cypria*, both as co-matchmaker and as host of the wedding. The latter role is well

¹⁷¹ MMA 56.171.51, a RF stamnos attributed to the Altamura Painter and dated ca. 470 B.C., offers a good example of Peleus wrestling Thetis on its obverse and on its reverse shows two Nereids approaching their father, perhaps in order to make a complaint.

illustrated in Archaic art.¹⁷² Clytemnestra's reaction at E. *IA* 706 to learning that Pelion was chosen for this destination wedding suggests that this traditional detail was not without curiosity for a Classical audience. In the same play the Chorus reminds Thetis of a prophecy that Chiron once told about the valiant son she would bear (1062-75, though the retrospection gives way to a present vantage point at 1067). The fact that the prophecy is attributed to Chiron suggests the existence in the poetic tradition of some specific episode, possibly contained within the *Cypria*.¹⁷³ Presumably Chiron's prescient speech was delivered as a way either to encourage Peleus or to console Thetis in the lead-up to their wedding, or else it was a toast given on that occasion. In this last scenario, Chiron would not have been the only seer to bless the newlyweds. Aeschylus touches tangentially upon the wedding of Achilles' parents in his F 350 (quoted in Pl. *Rep.* 383b), in which Thetis in her bereavement bitterly recalls the songs sung by Apollo at the reception. We cannot tell whether any of the details in this fragment go all the way back to the *Cypria*—such as Apollo's deceptive assurance that Thetis' brood would be “free from sickness and long-lived” (both text and sense are dubious at the end of verse 2, but whatever Apollo said got Thetis' hopes up while concealing the dreadful truth; perhaps he meant that Achilles' life would live long in the memory of others).¹⁷⁴

¹⁷² West 71.

¹⁷³ Michelakis 2002: 122 discusses how this passage draws upon “the authority of the earlier literary tradition,” but he has in mind here the Iliadic tradition about Achilles rather than the potential literary precedents for Chiron's prediction. Michelakis is primarily concerned with how the “idealized” portrait of the warrior Achilles clashes with his helplessness in this play, although the hero's tendency to become alienated from the rest of the army is another essential aspect of his (Iliadic) character, while the fulfillment of his fate (not to mention the fate of the entire expedition) depends on his failure at Aulis.

¹⁷⁴ The performance by Apollo (and the Muses) at the wedding is also addressed at *Il.* 24.62f.; *Pi. Pyth.* 3.88-93, *Nem.* 5.22-5. When in *Pi. Isth.* 8 Themis first advises Zeus to marry Thetis off to Peleus, she says, *νιδὸν εἰσιδέτω* [*sc. Θέτις*] *θανόντ' ἐν πολέμῳ* (37), as if Achilles' glorious death will be a source of pride to his mother; apparently at the wedding it was feared that saying so much might backfire, provoking Thetis' maternal instinct to protect and thus keeping Achilles from fighting.

Sophocles' satyr-play *The Lovers of Achilles* dramatized the imbalanced and immediately strained marriage between Peleus and Thetis. F 150 from this play contains a list of Thetis' transformations while Peleus was pursuing her. F 151 (= sch. Ap. Rhod. 4.816) is a statement that in the play Thetis has left Peleus; clearly their divorce is described in retrospect (Σοφοκλῆς...φησι τὴν Θέτιν...καταλιπεῖν αὐτόν) and not presented as part of the onstage action. Peleus had scolded his wife for something, and if Sophocles specified his grievance, it was probably the fact that she was always testing the mortality of their children (they had several, apparently) through trials of fire and water.¹⁷⁵ This is the cause of their friction in [Hes.] fr. 300 M.-W. (*Aegimius*), which described how Thetis left Peleus for preventing her from testing Achilles in this way.¹⁷⁶ The separation makes sense in the world of Greek mythology, where liaisons between mortals and immortals were necessarily short-lived (cf. Aphrodite and Anchises). For Sophocles, the separation conveniently enabled him to avoid the difficult task of showing how a half-

¹⁷⁵ Severyns 1928: 258 n. 3 suggests that in Sophocles' play Peleus reviled Thetis for no other reason than that he caught her performing one of her shocking experiments, of which he saw only the danger, failing to see the point. Such a scene is described in Ap. Rhod. 4.869-79 and Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.13.6. In these accounts Thetis is trying not merely to determine whether her child is mortal but actually to render him immortal, and there are other unmistakable parallels to Demeter's attempt in *HH* 3 to do that to Demophoön, which provoked the horror of his uncomprehending mother.

¹⁷⁶ It is doubtful whether the *Cypria* addressed this or indeed any aspect of the couple's post-wedding relationship. Severyns 1928: 182 and 256-9 argues it did. He believes the *Cypria*, not *Aegimius*, was the target of the Aristarchean school's disapproving comments on the fiction of the divorce (the characteristically vague references are to *Νεώτεροι*); that one detail preserved in the scholia (that Thetis left when Achilles was 12 days old) can only have come from the *Cypria*; that Apollonius used the *Cypria* as his source for this story; and that Apollodorus, while primarily summarizing Apollonius' version, was also following the progression of the *Cypria* by moving from the wedding to the divorce (whereas West 104 insists that the next action after the wedding was the Judgment of Paris; in theory, Thetis' withdrawal could have been related later in the *Cypria* when the war party came to recruit Achilles or when she visited Achilles). Unfortunately, none of this is provable. The story about the divorce may be lurking in E. *IA* 708-10, where Clytemnestra asks whether Thetis or Peleus raised Achilles (this question may have bothered Euripides, too, especially if we allow intertextuality with *II*. 18.57, where Thetis explicitly says τὸν [*sc.* Achilles] μὲν ἐγὼ θρέψασα, cf. 436 and sch. (A) *ad* 438) and then deems Peleus very wise when she learns that he entrusted his son to Chiron. Agamemnon says that this arrangement was made simply ἵν' ἦθη μὴ μάθοι κακῶν βροτῶν, but Euripides may have known the myth related in *Aegimius* and felt that Agamemnon should also be aware that a custody battle over Achilles was the real reason he was placed in Chiron's foster care. In that case Agamemnon again deliberately suppresses an unsavory history of marital strife so that he can more easily persuade his wife to assent to the sham wedding of Achilles and Iphigenia.

divine couple could actually live together under the same roof.¹⁷⁷ The play also gives an erotically charged take on the rearing of the young Achilles, on which see below, §2.7.

West argues that the story of Eris' exclusion from the feast is a later development (seen e.g. in P. Oxy. 3829 ii 12), whereas in the *Cypria* Zeus, who *wants* strife to break out at the wedding, instructed her to come and stir up trouble.¹⁷⁸ It is also possible, given Zeus' omniscience, that he excluded her knowing all along that she would crash the party and cause the desired quarrel among the goddesses. This does seem convoluted in comparison to Zeus' direct order to Eris in *Il.* 11.3, but on the other hand P. Oxy. 3829 ii 12 paradoxically combines Zeus' plotting to destroy the heroic race with his exclusion of Eris. Here Zeus seems to work in tandem with Eris, taking the golden apple thrown by her and making it "a prize for the fairest" (in Hyg. *Fab.* 92 Eris herself shouts that the fairest should claim it); but since the apple is not inscribed "for the fairest" (as in Luc. *Dial. mar.* 7 and other sources, probably from conflation with Callimachus' story of Acontius and Cydippe) or earmarked in any other way, it may be that Eris, unaware of Zeus' grand plan, intended the bait to upset *all* the gods. Tragedy sheds no light on this issue, but the dynamics of the scene even in the *Cypria* need not have been totally logical. The apple device has been considered a later addition to the story (West); depictions of triumphant Aphrodite holding the apple include a bronze statuette of the 2nd century B.C.¹⁷⁹ But one must be cautious as apples in the hands of divinities could also signal simply cult offerings.

¹⁷⁷ Working in a non-mimetic albeit serious genre, Homer was free to suggest that Peleus and Thetis continued to cohabitate, as he does at *Il.* 18.89f. and 330-2 (cf. Aristonicus in the sch. *ad locc.*) and 16.574, among other places.

¹⁷⁸ West 74.

¹⁷⁹ Getty Villa 96.AB.149.

Another fragment of Sophocles (F 199) is attributed to an *Eris*, which Lloyd-Jones argues may be the same as his *Krisis* (Call. *H.* 5.18, part of S. F 361, does refer to ἔρις, but not Ἔρις).¹⁸⁰ But the wedding of Peleus and Thetis and the Judgment of Paris were two separate events and together would be too much for a single play.

The *Prometheus* trilogy of Pseudo-Aeschylus adapts from Pindar (*Isth.* 8) the idea that Themis forestalled Zeus' union with Thetis, making this the special knowledge with which Themis' son Prometheus can bribe Zeus.¹⁸¹

2.3. The Judgment of Paris

αἱ πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον ἐν Ἰδῆ κατὰ Διὸς προσταγὴν ὑφ' Ἑρμοῦ πρὸς τὴν κρίσιν ἄγονται. καὶ προκρίνει τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἐπαρθεὶς τοῖς Ἑλένης γάμοις Ἀλέξανδρος.

In accordance with Zeus' ordinance they [sc. the three goddesses] are led by Hermes to Alexander on Ida, to get the decision. And Alexander, roused by [the promise of] marriage to Helen, declares Aphrodite the winner. (Arg. 1b-c W.)

This famous and most fateful event is related in several Trojan-themed tragedies, but in terms of its proximity to the actual events of one of these dramas the Judgment of Paris is best represented by Euripides' *Alexander*, whose overall plot—the restoration of Paris to his princely birthright after he enters and wins a local athletic competition—may or may not actually have been in *Cypria*. Rich commentaries on this fragmentary play have been written by both Cropp and di Giuseppe. Euripides composed it as part of his 415 B.C. “Trojan trilogy,” which also included the *Palamedes* (to be discussed later in this chapter) and the *Trojan Women* (corresponding to the epic *Iliupersis*).¹⁸² Since he wrote all these plays around the same time, we may hypothesize that Euripides left traces of a coherent and idiosyncratic approach to adapting the Cyclic poems.

¹⁸⁰ Lloyd-Jones 1996: 76f.

¹⁸¹ West 70 n. 10. Cf. *TrGF*.

¹⁸² See Scodel 1980 for comprehensive analysis of the contours and aims of this trilogy.

The *Cypria* may have told in retrospect the earlier story of the exposure of an infant Paris as a way of explaining the long period during which he lived among shepherds on Mount Ida prior to his encounter there with the three goddesses. In this way it could have served as a source of narrative material for Euripides' *Alexandros*. Proclus does not mention any treatment of Paris' early life in the *Cypria*, but Apollodorus describes the story in the course of his detailed Trojan genealogy, which may have been informed by the Epic Cycle. He goes into detail (3.12.5) about Hecuba's dream and its interpretation but does not relate the story of Paris' restoration to his natural family, saying only that later "he discovered his parents."¹⁸³ West (on P.Oxy. 5094 fr. 1.4-9 = *Cyp.* fr. 29a W.) expresses doubts about the inclusion of Hecuba's dream in the *Cypria*.¹⁸⁴ Hecuba's dream vision of her son as a firebrand is recalled at any rate in *Troades* with the phrase *δαλοῦ πικρὸν μίμημ'* (922). This is one of the clearest points of contact demonstrating the connectedness of Euripides' Trojan trilogy.¹⁸⁵ It is impossible to tell whether the *Iliupersis* poet preceded him in explicitly recalling Hecuba's decades-old nightmare after the Fall of Troy. Later sources including Apollodorus also report that Paris enjoyed a wife named Oenone before venturing to take Helen and that at the end of his life he unsuccessfully sought her healing powers back on Ida.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸³ *τὸς γονέας ἀνεῦρε*. Other sources for Hecuba's dream and Paris' exposure: Pi. *Pae.* 8; sch. *Il.* 3.325; Tzetzes on *Lyc.* 86; Cic. *De Div.* 1.21.42; Hyg. *Fab.* 91. Whereas the diviner Aesacus advises the destruction of the infant Paris in *Apd.* and in Tzetzes' note on *Lyc.* 224, it is Cassandra who issues this warning at *E. And.* 293ff. She would then have to have been significantly older than her brother; has Euripides here conflated the initial shunning of Paris with Cassandra's foreboding prophecy upon his return as an adult?

¹⁸⁴ West 86, *contra* Jouan 1966: 135-7.

¹⁸⁵ Scodel 1980: 78; cf. Lee 1997: 286 (addenda to the discussion of the Trojan trilogy on pp. x-xiv). The reference at *Tro.* 90 to the cape of Caphareus has also been regarded as a nod to the story of Nauplius using false beacons to lead the Greek ships astray in retaliation for his son's murder (the disaster is overdetermined), which was been foretold in the second play of Euripides' trilogy, *Palamedes*; the same story features in *Hel.* 767ff., 1126ff. See Lee 1997: 78 (lines 89-91n.). See *infra*, ###.

¹⁸⁶ Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.12.6.

Part of Iphigenia’s commiseration with her mother in *Iphigenia at Aulis* (1284-90) makes it seem as though Priam exposed Paris against the will of Hecuba, which may or may not be compatible with the story of Hecuba’s prescient dream. Euripides’ primary intention here is clearly to highlight or forge a parallel between two acts of filicide (both of which, incidentally, were unsuccessful) from within the Trojan Cycle.¹⁸⁷ However, at the same time he makes Iphigenia, who demonstrates a remarkable knowledge of prior events at Troy, blame not her father but Paris. By stretching her lament far back along the chain of causality, she employs the same rhetorical technique that the Nurse uses at the beginning of *Medea*; or to take a closer parallel, at *Il.* 5.62-4 the ships that Phereclus built for Paris are called ἀρχεκάκους (“initiating sin”).¹⁸⁸

Aristarchus argued that in Homer Paris never lived in the country at all (and so μέσσαυλον at *Il.* 24.29 is inappropriate), for at *Il.* 3.54 Paris is practicing music, which is an urbane activity.¹⁸⁹ But Paris, who of course resides in Troy during the war (though music is hardly alien to rustic and pastoral milieux), could have lived on Ida earlier, at the time of the Judgment, and even Homer could have agreed with Cyclic tradition on this point. Nevertheless, for reasons other than Aristarchus’ special pleading *Il.* 24.29f. may in fact be interpolated.¹⁹⁰

The Judgment of Paris is also referred to in a fragment of Sophocles’ *Shepherds* (F 511):

†ἴδεν† δὴ ποτε μηλοτρόφῳ
<>

¹⁸⁷ The statement that Paris “was called Idaean in Phrygia” (*Ἰδαῖος Ἰ- | δαῖος ἐλέγετ’ ἐλέγετ’ ἐν Φρυγῶν πόλει*, 1289f.) is allusive and refers to the myth told in E. *Alexander*.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Mastronarde 2002: 161 (E. *Med.* 1-8n.).

¹⁸⁹ Severyns 1928: 263.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. West 2011: 412 (n. *ad loc.*).

ἤγαγε κλιτὸν τῆ Ἰδαίαν
<Ἑρμῆς> τριολύμπιον ἄρμα

The fragment makes sense as a part of the *parodos*,¹⁹¹ in which the Chorus wistfully recalls this fateful event (cf. again the beginning of *Medea* in which the Nurse laments a triggering event in the distant past) as the Trojans, evidently having been forewarned somehow, prepare for the landing of the Greek armada. Note that Wilamowitz's proposal of a lacuna after line 1 of this fragment seems to stem from the assumption that there are unconnected finite verbs in the first 2 lines, but the text is hardly secure, and hence neither is Wilamowitz's lacuna. Also note that it may be better to read ἐν κλ(ε)ιτύι τῆς Ἰδῆς in line 2 and to take the dative with *μηλοφόρω* in line 1. Pearson prefers to emend to τὴν Ἰδαίαν, probably because adjectival toponyms are used with *κλειτύς* at *S. Ant.* 1145 and *Tr.* 271, but Euripides could easily have used the same noun in a slightly differently phraseology. I should like the anapestic fragment, which could conceivably also come from an entrance song of Paris (assuming he is a character in the play), to run, "I once saw [Hermes] leading a chariot [ridden by] three Olympian [goddesses] on the sheep-rearing slope of Ida...." The phrase *τριολύμπιον ἄρμα* would scan in a hexameter, and *E. Andr.* 277 similarly describes the chariot in which Hermes drove the three goddesses to Paris as *τρίπωλον ἄρμα δαιμόνων* (which was also *καλλιζυγές* [278] for having one horse matched to each goddess).¹⁹² It would seem more likely for Sophocles' more strained expression (it is more natural for an adjective describing a chariot to refer to its team than

¹⁹¹ So Sommerstein (*SFP* 2012: 190), whose text is also followed here.

¹⁹² At *E. Tro.* 924 the goddesses themselves are a *τρισσὸν ζεῦγος*. Cf. *F* 357 (referring to the Graces) and *Ar.* fr. 576.

to its passengers) to have been modeled on Euripides' expression, but still one wonders whether *τριολύμπιον* ultimately came from the *Cypria*.¹⁹³

In the *Cypria* Cassandra prophesies at the time of the Paris' departure for Sparta (see next section); in Euripides' *Alexandros* she may have done so also immediately upon Paris' reintegration into Trojan society.¹⁹⁴ In fact, Lycophron frames his *Alexandra* as a forecast of the war that Cassandra delivers while she watches Paris embark. Besides agreeing with the *Cypria*, was this conceit of Lycophron also inspired by a Cassandra scene in Euripides' *Alexandros* or in another tragic predecessor?

Those steeped in philosophy and mythological allegories like the famed Choice of Heracles might be inclined to say that Paris made the disastrous mistake of choosing pleasure (Aphrodite) over virtue (Athena). According to Athenaeus, such an interpretation of the Judgment lay at the heart of Sophocles' *Κρίσις σατυρική* and in fact predated Prodicus' story about Heracles as related by Xenophon.¹⁹⁵ This reminds us that although satyr-drama regularly downplayed the tragic implications of events, it could still make serious points. Hence Sophocles' take on Paris' decision influenced later works ranging from Lucian's lighthearted *Judgment of the Goddesses* to Callimachus' *Hymn 5*, lines 15-32 of which make up S. F 361, along with Athenaeus' testimony.

According to this composite fragment, Aphrodite's strategy for winning the beauty contest included dousing herself in perfume and preening with a mirror in hand. With such a spectacle Sophocles surely meant to mock the vanity of certain people, but he was simply building on the tradition of the *Cypria*. In the epic version of this scene on

¹⁹³ It seems the "Hermes conducting three goddesses" typology was extended to other scenes, including the archaizing votive relief MMA 25.78.59, dated 320-300 B.C. and showing the god with three nymphs and Acheloös.

¹⁹⁴ West 85.

¹⁹⁵ *Mem.* 2.1.21 ff., referenced by Athen. 510c, who later (687c) describes Sophocles' play.

Ida, Aphrodite wore floral gowns fashioned by the Graces and Seasons and possessing their own fragrance.¹⁹⁶ She and her attendants also wore chaplets (again sweet-smelling),¹⁹⁷ and she a bejeweled necklace.¹⁹⁸ Callimachus focuses on the mirror that Aphrodite held as she incessantly rearranged her hair (*Hymn*. 5.22), and he evokes the Simois river (19f.) after using Athena's bath as his point of departure for this mythological digression, which suggests that he recalled the goddesses bathing in Sophocles' play. Indeed, Aphrodite's bedaubing with myrrh would naturally follow a bath, and Euripides has Helen refer very allusively to the *λουτρῶν καὶ κρηνῶν* visited by the goddesses before the fateful Judgment. These may all be echoes of a brief scene in the *Cypria* paralleling Aphrodite's bath on Cyprus at *HH* 5.61.

Only one line (F 360) of actual text from Sophocles' play is preserved:¹⁹⁹ *καὶ δὴ φάρει τῷδ' ὡς ἐμῷ καλύπτομαι*, "Look here, I am covering myself with this cloak as if it

¹⁹⁶ Athen. 682d-f = *Cyp.* fr. 5 W. The *Cypria* poet in turn was drawing on a typical epic theme, for which see West 75f. Instead of the Charites and Hōrai, did Sophocles have the Satyrs adorn Aphrodite?

¹⁹⁷ Athen. 682f = *Cyp.* fr. 6 W. Since crowns also signaled victory, it was presumptuous for Aphrodite to show up to a contest already wearing one. But maybe epinician customs were not fully developed at the time of the *Cypria*'s composition, and so only later authors like Sophocles had to concern themselves with this association.

¹⁹⁸ Naevius, *Cypria Ilias* fr. 1 Courtney = *Cyp.* fr. 7 W.; cf. the *ὄρμοι* of *HH* 5.88. Although Venus is not named in this passage, as West 75 says, the *Cypria* probably concentrated on the adornment of this goddess, perhaps almost exclusively.

¹⁹⁹ Based on the mention of perfume Radt (*TrGF* iv.325) suggests that to this play may belong F 785, *μόρφω λευγαλέω*, which is quoted in *Etym. Gen.* λ 72 Adler-Alpers. But as Reitzenstein 1891/2: 14 says, anyone can see that the reading *μόρφω λευγαλέω* in codex *A* of the *Etym. M.* (561, 27) is superior, although in principle it is a *lectio facilior*. The problem hinges on the fact that the lexicographer glosses *λευγαλέον* as *τὸ ὑγρόν*. Let us ask what was the meaning of the phrase that Sophocles wrote. "With wet unguent" is a bit redundant and imputes to him a serious misunderstanding of a fairly common epic word, and "with mournful unguent," although it would allow us to transfer the charge of ignorance to the lexicographer, is nonsensical. But "by a mournful doom" is exactly parallel to the key phrase in the lemma's second quotation, *νῦν δέ με λευγαλέω θανάτῳ* (*Il.* 21.281 = *Od.* 5.312). Reitzenstein, whose proposal of a lacuna between the two quotations seems unnecessary, easily persuaded Nauck 1892: xiv to adopt his text of the Sophoclean fragment. In fact, I cannot even believe that *τὸ ὑγρόν* was the gloss originally given and suspect that it was instead *λυγρόν* (indeed one may wonder at the apparent use of the article; as to the neuter ending of the headword, that may anticipate the impersonal nouns in the quoted passages). While it is true that *λευγαλέω θανάτῳ* in the Homeric verse is glossed *τῷ δι' ὕδατος* and that in both instances the death concerned is indeed a death by drowning, the confusion must have started when a scribe replaced *λυγρόν* with *τὸ ὑγρόν*, after which (1) *τῷ δι' ὕδατος* was added, (2) some codices changed *μόρφω* to *μόρῳ*, (3) the entry, in order that it might better conform to the regular usage of *λευγαλέος*, was extended with *σημαίνει δὲ*

were my own.” Given the *Cypria*’s emphasis on the fine raiment that Aphrodite donned for the contest, the garment referred to here is probably hers.²⁰⁰ Hence the one who speaks of putting on another’s *φᾶρος* must be someone else besides Aphrodite. Scheurer suggests that a Satyr, having pilfered the goddess’ mantle while she bathes, now tries it on.²⁰¹ However, *καλύπτομαι*, being more descriptive than *ἐνδύω* or *ἔννυμαι*, ought to point to some significant reason for the action taken. Veiling is of course associated with brides,²⁰² but the language of the Sophocles fragment is actually closest to Hes. *Op.* 198, where *Αἰδώς* and *Νέμεσις* flee the world of mortals after “concealing their pretty skin in white cloaks” (*λευκοῖσιν φάρεσσι καλυψαμένω χροά καλὸν*). Sophocles may have intended an allusion to this passage because it mentions Helen’s divine mother, Retribution (see below, pp. 62f.). But the real explanation for the verse must involve the other subject of the Hesiodic passage, namely Shame, which so often informs acts of cloaking.²⁰³ Paris should be ashamed to view a naked goddess, and he would be well advised to use that goddess’ discarded mantle to stop his eager eyes from gazing at what is (almost) always forbidden. In fact, shielding his eyes from such a sight can be thought

καὶ τὸ ὀλέθριον, and (4) in the text of the *Etym. M.*, τῷ δι’ ὕδατος is supplemented with ἡ χαλεπῶ, ἀδόξω, glosses found also in the scholia ad *Il.* 21.281 (note also that in *Etym. Gen.* χαλεπά is given as a gloss for *λυγρὰ*). Indeed the mistaken understanding of the adjective is very old, being refuted in sch. (AT) *loc. cit.* (*δίνυρον*) and affecting also the interpretation of Hes. *Op.* 525. Photius’ gloss *λευγαλέα· διάβροχος* is probably another reflex of the same original corruption.

²⁰⁰ Calypso puts on a *φᾶρος* at *Od.* 5.230, which shows that this term, often used of men’s clothing, can also denote a beautiful garment worn by a goddess.

²⁰¹ Scheurer in Krumeich–Pechstein–Seidensticker 1999: 361.

²⁰² Helen emerges *ἀργεννῆσι καλυψαμένη ὀθόνησιν* at *Il.* 3.141; at 14.184 Hera *κρηδέμνω δ’ ἐφύπερθε καλύψατο*.

²⁰³ E.g., *Od.* 8.84 (Odysseus hiding his tears); Ar. *Ran.* 911-3 (probably referring specifically to Achilles’ veiling himself in Aeschylus’ *Myrmidons*, though Sommerstein 2012a: 242 observes that “the same tableau of a seated, silent Achilles” could have recurred throughout the poet’s Iliadic trilogy); and S. F 291 (from *Inachus*), which gives us the tantalizing but poorly understood phrase *ἀναιδείας φάρος*. For averting one’s eyes due to *αἰδώς* and other alienating emotions, see Cairns 2001: 23ff. and id. 1993 *passim*.

of as a desperate act of self-preservation.²⁰⁴ To solidify our understanding of the fragment, we observe that in Attic Greek the combination *καὶ δὴ* is rarely connective but has a routine dialogic usage “[m]arking the provision or completion of something required by the circumstances.”²⁰⁵ So here another character has probably issued a warning to Paris, who announces that he is already taking preventive measures. He probably succeeded: whereas in Lucian’s dialogue the goddesses show off their naked bodies before Paris’ own eyes, Scheurer is right that nude goddesses cannot have been represented on the Athenian stage and that any disrobing would have been suggested from behind the *skēnē*.²⁰⁶

Athena, meanwhile, chose to exercise. This was a virtuous demonstration of her athleticism, but the goddess also may have sought thus to enhance the attractiveness of her body or to garner an excuse to anoint herself, albeit with plain olive oil (*μῶνον ἔλαιον*, Callim. *Hymn*. 5.29).²⁰⁷ She would have needed to strip at some point during these activities (at which point the actor must have retired behind the stage), and the prospect of seeing her nude body would have been just as enticing to Paris as a bathing

²⁰⁴ Cf. *HH* 5.83, where Aphrodite expects Anchises to react with terror upon seeing her true form, and 181-90 where, this having come to pass, Anchises buries his face in his bedcovers and begs not to be penalized with debilitation. In our fragment *φάρει* may carry its additional nuance of “pall” (as e.g. in *Od.* 2.97), with Paris fearing even fatal repercussions.

²⁰⁵ *GP*² 251. Sometimes the combination responds “to a definite command.” To draw connections Attic usually separates *καὶ* and *δὴ* or adds another *καί* (*ibid.* 253).

²⁰⁶ Too drastic is the statement of Wilamowitz 1924: ii.16 implying that nothing of the goddesses’ behavior during the Judgment was actually performed. This clashes with Athenaeus’ testimony, which combines *παράγει* with present participles modifying the goddesses. But given that some of their activities on Ida were indeed only narrated, Wilamowitz is also wrong to assume (p. 17) that Callimachus is responsible for the hyperbolic statement that Athena’s exercise consisted of running 120 *δίαυλοι*, for Sophocles could surely have included some such exaggeration in his satyr-play.

²⁰⁷ Athena was not totally unconcerned with physical beauty, even if in Sophocles and other authors she strove to attach a more abstract definition to *κάλλος*, the stated criterion of the present contest; at Callim. *Hymn*. 5.31f. a golden comb is ordered for her sleek hair. Note that one of the earliest artistic representations of the Judgment is on an ivory comb (*LIMC* s.v. Paridis Iudicium 22). Wilamowitz (1924: ii.17 n. 1) points out that E. *Hel.* 676 also mentions that all the goddesses bathed before the Judgment (perh. then a feature that goes back to the *Cypria*).

Aphrodite. Yet Athena failed to win the Trojan’s favor, and so it seems that later in the contest she bored him with talk of her embodied virtues and virginal status.²⁰⁸ Of course, the notoriously sybaritic Satyrs, who incidentally were right at home on Ida,²⁰⁹ would naturally encourage Paris to opt for Aphrodite. Sophocles may also have employed the *topos* of Eastern (i.e., Persian) luxury to explain Paris’ own inclination.

Scholars are divided as to whether Hera was included in the play. Athenaeus does not mention her, and Callimachus makes only the slightest remark, saying that like Athena she did not spend time staring at her own reflection before the Judgment (*Hymn*. 5.21). Outside of this episode there is at least one instance of a binary opposition between Aphrodite and Athena, namely in the *Iliad* when Achilles rejects Agamemnon’s offer (bribe, in fact) of his daughter’s hand even if she should possess Aphrodite’s beauty *and* Athena’s skills.²¹⁰ The three-actor rule, extended from Greek tragedy to satyr-play, has

²⁰⁸ In S. F 361 Athena is equated with *Φρόνησις*, *Νοῦς*, and *Ἀρετή*, and she probably attempted to entice Paris with those abstract concepts more than with the promise of success in war, as she did in the *Cypria* (assuming *Epit.* 3.2 is a witness to this) and later accounts such as Lucian’s dialogue. However, she could have done both, and Hyg. *Fab.* 92.3, which just might reflect Sophocles’ play, says Athena promised that if she won Paris “would be bravest among mortals and knowledgeable in every skill (*artificio*).” Sophocles’ portrait of Athena may betray a patriotic bias, but the identification Athena = Prudence was much older than this play and had even been detected in Homer (Kassel *ap.* Radt, *TrGF* iv.325). Athenian patriotism and the emphasis on wisdom as the greatest gift the goddess could offer are themes that show up together on an Attic BF neck-amphora attributed to the Group of Compiègne 988 and formerly of the Albert E. Gallatin coll., where Athena, holding an owl as well as a spear, has pride of place in a scene in which Hermes leads the goddesses to Paris.

²⁰⁹ Alternatively, they may have arrived there as slaves of Hermes. In drama the Satyrs sometimes served gods other than Dionysus; see e.g. Lloyd-Jones 1996: 141-3 on S. *Ichneutai*, in which the Satyrs seek emancipation on Cyllene.

²¹⁰ *Il.* 9.388. Stinton 1990: 23 does not make it quite clear enough when he cites this passage that although it has a definite eristic quality, it does not present passion and action, pleasure and virtue, or even beauty and skill as competing with each other; rather, it treats these as different areas in which goddesses can excel—or in which women can compete with goddesses. But Stinton is right to observe that Athena here is the master of *ἀρετή* “in a technical not moral sense” and that only later was the goddess “intellectualized” to the degree we witness in Sophocles. He also (*ibid.* n. 31) nicely defends Hera’s original inclusion in the story on the grounds that folktale’s fondness for the number three and its demand in this case for a triad of rivals acted like a Procrustean bed on the Olympian pantheon. If one were still bothered by Hera’s apparent lack of a clear contribution to the Judgment episode, one could also point to the need of Cyclic storytellers to show why she, like Athena, hated the Trojans. But such pleading is necessary only if the episode from its inception was intended to be more than a beauty contest, to be in some way symbolic. I doubt that it was. Now, the fact that Aphrodite and Athena represent standards of excellence in separate spheres—*κάλλος* and

also been cited in support of Hera’s exclusion, which would allow Paris to (cross-)examine the remaining two goddesses simultaneously.²¹¹ But Sophocles could have stayed closer to tradition and accommodated all three goddesses without violating dramatic convention simply by having them make separate entrances and having Paris interview them one at a time;²¹² their alternating absences could be excused with references to all their individual toilettes, etc. If Hera was involved, she would have “represented regal power” and offered it to Paris, who as a humble shepherd had no experience of it—and apparently no taste for it either.²¹³ A tripartite philosophical distinction between *ἀρετή*, *ἡδονή*, and *δύναμις* would have enriched Sophocles’ play and is inherent in later accounts such as Hyg. *Fab.* 92.3.

K. J. McKay sides with Jebb and Pearson in believing that Sophocles explicitly pointed out the allegorical associations of Aphrodite and Athena and that these are not merely inferred by Athenaeus. He argues on this basis that Callimachus via this intertext is showing Athena to be a multifaceted goddess.²¹⁴

West comments upon Paris’ fearful reaction to the (initial) appearance of the gods, his frequent representation with the lyre, and the fact that there is a canonical order

ἔργα, respectively—makes us accept that a contest in one of these criteria (*κάλλος*, say) was a foregone conclusion unless the definition of that criterion was defined so broadly as to dilute the advantage of its chief goddess. However, that hardly means that in its original form the story of the Judgment of Paris did involve such a broad and abstract approach to the notion of *κάλλος*. In fact, if Paris’ choice was created to be a choice among various ethical models, then the apple of discord should have been marked not “for the fairest” but “for the best.” Paris was therefore justified in declaring Aphrodite the victor given the specific terms of the contest, but later authors are also justified in censuring him for not taking a sufficiently broad view of *κάλλος*, especially once the bribes had been offered.

²¹¹ Scheurer in in Krumeich–Pechstein–Seidensticker 1999: 361. An advantage of all parties being present at once was that the playwright could then have the goddesses engage with each other, but Paris might also be used as a medium for their squabbling.

²¹² In a certain Corinthian folktale an arbitrator confronted with a case similar to Paris’ inspects each of three Nymphs on a separate day (Stinton 1990: 21 n. 23).

²¹³ Lloyd-Jones 1996: 195. In keeping with the *Alexandros* plays of Sophocles and Euripides, it is probable that in this play, too, Paris was still ignorant of his royal blood and thus more susceptible to bribery. Wilamowitz 1924: ii.17 n. 1 also insists on Hera’s inclusion in the *Krisis*.

²¹⁴ McKay 1962: 61.

in which the goddesses present themselves to Paris (Hera, Athena, Aphrodite; victor comes last), including in Crat. *Dionysalexandros* (fr. 140 K.-A.), which is altered in E. *Tro.* 925-31.²¹⁵ But West interprets too much from the almost certainly interpolated lines at *Il.* 24.29f., suggesting that they attest a version of the story in which Paris “explicitly disparaged” Hera and Athena.²¹⁶ That is surely what *veíkεσσe* should mean, but in the imagination of the interpolator the disparagement was probably just perceived by the two sore losers as implicit in Paris’ preferential praise of Aphrodite. To be sure, the inferior poet chose a not very apposite verb, presumably because he had in mind the noun *veĩkoc* in the sense “quarrel,” which applies only indirectly to the present situation.

Sophocles’ play reflects an enhanced appreciation for “the didactic, allegorical almost abstract nature of the choice between glory, power, and love.”²¹⁷ More particularly, descriptions of outward decoration in Classical Athenian texts are by and large far more ethically charged than those in epic poems like the *Cypria*, which do not bother with questions such as whether Aphrodite’s lavish dressing implies that she possessed less innate beauty. Indeed, the opposition of gymnastics and cosmetics was hardly trivial in Classical Athens, and Plato in his *Gorgias* (465b-c) forcefully expresses this antithesis as an analogy, ultimately, for the contrast between justice and rhetoric.²¹⁸

²¹⁵ West 78f.

²¹⁶ Wilamowitz proposed that the abuse may have occurred in the context of a theoxeny, where Paris did not realize that his visitors were goddesses; see the discussion of Stinton 1990: 19 n. 9, who even entertains the possibility that Paris “added insult to injury” after declaring Aphrodite victorious.

²¹⁷ Stinton 1990: 19. While he argues that “the didactic tone is proper to folktale,” which “is as old as saga,” it is possible that the *Cypria* poet did not make explicit the story’s moralizing pretensions: the goddesses could simply offer bribes germane to their respective characters, with Paris’ choice going unexamined. If, on the other hand, the poet did cast judgment on Paris, he may have adapted to this purpose an epic formulation such as *φρένας ἐξέλετο Ζεύς* (*Il.* 6.234, 19.137; Hes. *Sc.* 89; cf. *Il.* 17.470) or *τῶ δὲ φρένας ἄφρονι πείθεν* (*Il.* 4.104; cf. 16.842). In any case, later authors, notably Sophocles, seized the latent opportunity to elevate Paris’ choice to the level of Achilles’ choice between ignoble life and glorious death.

²¹⁸ Gymnastics, as the first of Plato’s two branches of noble bodily pursuits, in truth corresponds more directly to the political art of legislation, while it is medicine that nurtures the body as justice does the soul. Regardless, Paris is an incompetent judge because of his preference for things that flatter over real virtues,

Moreover, since according to this Socratic view rhetoric is so closely associated with pleasure (462c), we can be confident that Sophocles made Aphrodite put her mouth where her money was, so to speak. That is, her words would have matched her voluptuous promise to Paris, and her description of Helen's beauty (and her own) was no doubt a parasophistic *tour de force*.²¹⁹

In many versions of the Judgment in both art and literature, the goddesses arrive to find Paris amusing himself with his cithara.²²⁰ According to his ancient biography, Sophocles was himself an accomplished musician,²²¹ and he even played the musician Thamyras in his drama of that name, demonstrating such skill that he was honored with a portrait in the Stoa Poikile in which he held a lyre.²²² Might Sophocles have seized the opportunity again in his *Krisis* to show off his talent by taking on the role of Paris?

and Plato's hypothetical *εἰ... ἀντὸ τὸ σῶμα ἔκρινε* (465c-d) applies well to him. Stinton 1990: 23 n. 33 adduces Xen. *Oec.* 10.7ff.

²¹⁹ Parasophistic in that it ironically showed forth the deficiencies of that kind of speech—rhetoric—which is specious and devoid of real beauty (*πράγματός τινός ἐστι μόνιον οὐδενὸς τῶν καλῶν*, 463a, cf. 464d). On Plato's argument that pleasure in general is deceptive, see Moss 2006.

²²⁰ 2013: 78. The parallel with Achilles in *Il.* 9.186-91 (featuring an embassy of three allies instead of three rivals) is intriguing. A Neoanalyst might view this Homeric passage as derivative of the similar scene in a precursor to the *Cypria*, the Judgment being more essential to the Cycle as a whole than the supplication of Achilles. But it also could have been just a widely diffused type-scene element, and it occurs also in *Hymn. Aphr.* 80. Paris himself is portrayed as musically inclined already in the *Iliad* (3.54, cf. *ad loc.* West 2011: 129).

²²¹ See Power 2012 for details on his affinity for monodies, his relationship to the New Music, etc. On 289 he discusses S. F 906, whose salient phrase is *σοφιστήν ἐμόν*, used of a citharode. Power approves Welcker's assignment of this fragment to *Thamyras* and, building on a proposal of Wilson 2009: 78 that "my sophist" refers to Thamyras' father Philammon, Power argues that there may be an additional reference to Sophocles' own musical tutor, Lampros. I would dispute the reference to Philammon and consider Thamyras the addressee rather than the speaker of this fragment (cf. [E.] *Rh.* 924). But we are still free to imagine that Sophocles in playing Thamyras was also in some sense playing Lampros.

²²² Tyrrell 2012: 22f. The *Vita* says (§5) that Sophocles *ἐν μόνῳ τῷ Θαμύριδι ποτε ἐκιδάρισεν*, but beyond the minor problem of finding the title *Thamyris* attested instead of *Thamyras*, several scholars have suspected *μόνῳ* "only" (see *TrGF* iv.32 for the various suggestions, which include Welcker's attractive *ἐν μονοφῶδῳ*). *Vita* §4 says that Sophocles gave up acting *διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν μικροφονίαν*. I find the theory of Wilson 2009: 60f.—that this represents an apocryphal extrapolation from Sophocles' famed performance as Thamyras (punished in part by the loss of his musical tools)—more convincing than that of Power 2012: 287 n. 12, which suggests that Sophocles did in fact eventually yield to the trend of hiring professional singers.

2.4. Paris' Departure for Greece and Seduction of Helen

ἔπειτα δὲ Ἀφροδίτης ὑποθεμένης ναυπηγεῖται. καὶ Ἑλένος περὶ τῶν μελλόντων αὐτοῖς προθεσπίζει. καὶ ἡ Ἀφροδίτη Αἰνεΐαν συμπλεῖν αὐτῷ κελεύει. καὶ Κασσάνδρα περὶ τῶν μελλόντων προδηλοῖ.

Then [Paris] has ships built at Aphrodite's bidding. And Helenus prophesies to them [sc. the Trojans] about things to come, and Aphrodite orders Aeneas to sail with him [sc. Paris]. And Cassandra makes revelations about things to come (Arg. 1d W.)

The poet of the *Cypria* was not so inept as to begin *ab ovo* (an admonition issued later by Hor. *A. P.* 147), but he did at some point describe the supernatural birth of Helen, together with an account of her brothers' inception (Clem. *Protr.* 2.30.5 and Athen. 334b = *Cyp.* fr. 9-10 W.). Both Kullmann and West position this background material within the part of the *Cypria* when Paris under the guidance of Aphrodite travels to Sparta to claim his prize.²²³

Nemesis, who personifies retribution, was Helen's mother according to the *Cypria*. Euripides extends this allegorical genealogy when at *Tro.* 786f. he makes Alastor, an avenging deity, her parent along with several other unsavory figures that obviously plague Helen and all those who consort with her. The connection between Helen's genealogy and the Attic cult of Nemesis at Rhamnous was forged in Cratinus' *Nemesis* (*PCG* iv 179-85).²²⁴ This play, according to Plutarch, was a political lampooning of Pericles, whose affair with Aspasia was compared to that between Zeus and Nemesis. One interesting point to observe is that Hesiod conceived of Nemesis as beautiful yet destructive. This description naturally calls to mind another Hesiodic vixen, Pandora, not to mention the famous Sirens, but it also reinforces the claim that Nemesis

²²³ Kullmann 1992: 26; West 80.

²²⁴ West 81; Smith 2011: 41f.; for earlier views see Jouan 1966: 149 n. 2.

was the mother of Helen, who herself exhibited this pair of traits.²²⁵ Compare also *Anth. Pal.* 11.326 (Automedon), which features the question *κάλλους εἰσὶ τινες Νεμέσεις*;

Before arriving at Menelaus' house Paris stayed *chez* Dioscuri, as arg. 2a W.

informs us:

ἐπιβάς δὲ τῇ Λακεδαιμονίᾳ Ἀλέξανδρος ξενίζεται παρὰ τοῖς Τυνδαρίδαις, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐν τῇ Σπάρτῃ παρὰ Μενελάῳ.

And having landed in Lacedaemonia, Alexander is entertained by the sons of Tyndareus, and after this in Sparta by Menelaus.

West suggests that it was during Paris' initial stay with the Dioscuri in the *Cypria* that Helen's earlier abduction by Theseus was narrated (*Cyp.* fr. 12 = sch. (D) *Il.* 3.242).²²⁶ There were of course other sources from which the tragedians could draw for this story, which was peculiarly Athenian and yet may have been older even than the ultimately more famous story of Paris' abduction of Helen.²²⁷ Yet it seems that they preferred to avoid the story altogether, not so much because abducting Helen was seen as an evil deed but rather because the sequel to this affair involved an invasion of Attica by the Dioscuri, who had easy success due to Theseus' absence—he was away at the time aiding his friend Pirithous in the Underworld, and in addition to recovering Helen the Dioscuri took and enslaved Theseus' mother Aethra for good measure.²²⁸ In fact, in Seneca's *Phaedra* Theseus' sojourn to the Underworld is made to coincide with a much later time in the hero's life, thus rupturing the chronology of the story involving Helen and the Dioscuri; however, Euripides, who had a real incentive to pander to Athenian pride, offers a

²²⁵ Cf. Smith 2011: 45f., concerned especially with the imagery of Nemesis' cult statue base at Rhamnous.

²²⁶ West 86f.

²²⁷ Mills 1997: 7.

²²⁸ *Ibid.* 8.

different explanation for Theseus' absence (from Troezen) in his *Hippolytus*, and thus misses an opportunity to refute implicitly a notorious blight on Theseus' record.

On the recovery of Helen by her brothers see Hdt. 9.73. The Dioscuri are addressed as Lapersai in S. F 957, which has been attributed to *Helenēs Apaitēsis* (in which Menelaus, intent on sacking Troy, might have invoked his wife's immortal brothers in their capacity as city-sackers) but more often to *Lakainai*, a tragedy corresponding to the *Little Iliad* in which Helen or the Chorus of Laconian women could have chanted this prayer. An unassigned tragic fragment (adesp. F 270) applies to Paris the curious epithet *τραπεζίτης*, which must somehow refer to the hero as a guest at Menelaus' table.

Proclus continues, summarizing the *Cypria*'s account of the actual seduction in Menelaus' halls (arg. 2b-c W.):

καὶ Ἑλένη παρὰ τὴν εὐωχίαν δίδωσι δῶρα ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα Μενέλαος εἰς Κρήτην ἐκπλεῖ, κελεύσας τὴν Ἑλένην τοῖς ξένοις τὰ ἐπιτήδεια παρέχειν ἕως ἂν ἀπαλλαγῶσιν. ἐν τούτῳ δὲ Ἀφροδίτη συνάγει τὴν Ἑλένην τῷ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ. καὶ μετὰ τὴν μίξιν τὰ πλεῖστα κτήματα ἐνθέμενοι νυκτὸς ἀποπλέουσι.

And Alexander gives gifts to Helen at the feasting, and after this Menelaus sails to Crete, having bidden Helen to provide suitable things to the guests until he should return. And in the meantime Aphrodite brings Helen together with Alexander. And after their mingling they load up most of her belongings and sail away by night.

The ancient Hypothesis to Sophocles' *Ajax* begins by stating that that play "belongs to the business of Troy" (*τῆς Τρωϊκῆς ἐστὶ πραγματείας*) and goes on to compare four other such plays: the *Ἀντηνορίδαι*, the *Αἰχμαλωτίδες*, *Ἑλένης ἀρπαγή*, and *Μέμνων*. The first two are titles of plays by Sophocles (see below, p. 241 on the former). Although a play called *Memnon* written by him (as opposed to that by Aeschylus) is unattested elsewhere,

Sophocles certainly wrote a play called *Αἰθίοπες*, for which *Memnon* is probably just an alternate name. This makes it fairly certain that the author of the Hypothesis intended here to compile a partial list of Trojan dramas from the corpus of Sophocles alone.²²⁹ But the notice of a *Ἑλένης ἄρπαγή* by Sophocles is particularly difficult to account for, as it is attested only here. Nauck essentially argued that the author of the Hypothesis wrote *Ἑλένης ἄρπαγή* when he meant to write *Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις* (on *The Demanding Back of Helen* see below, §2.17) and that he was mistakenly recalling the title of a comedy by Menander's uncle Alexis (*PCG* ii.71f.). It is also conceivable that the Hypothesis writer or a later copyist carelessly substituted *ἄρπαγή* for *ἀπαίτησις* simply due to the greater familiarity of the phrase “the rape of Helen.” Far less plausible is the notion that anyone could have consciously deemed *The Rape of Helen* a fitting title for a play that was regularly called *The Demanding Back of Helen* and that described Menelaus' abortive embassy to Troy to retrieve his stolen wife.²³⁰ Hermann briefly entertains the possibility that Sophocles wrote a satyr-play called *Ἑλένης ἄρπαγή* but apparently prefers to regard the title as a phantom resulting from confusion either with *Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις* or with *Ἑλένης γάμος*.²³¹ As for the latter, it is again implausible that a play about Helen's wedding to Paris (see the end of this section) could stand to be called *The Rape of Helen* when these two events were quite distinct, one having taken place in Sparta and the other elsewhere.²³² If Sophocles did not write a *Ἑλένης ἄρπαγή*, conflation with Alexis' play of that name is the best way to explain the errant testimony of the *Ajax* Hypothesis; but

²²⁹ Jebb 1907: 3 and other scholars take it for granted that the plays named are Sophoclean (like the play to which the Hypothesis is devoted).

²³⁰ Even as a “loose mode of referring to *Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις*” (Pearson 1917: 123, cf. Hartung as cited in *TrGF* iv.181), the phrase *Ἑλένης ἄρπαγή* would be a definite misnomer.

²³¹ Hermann 1837: xv.

²³² This dual-title theory was held by Wüllner and Bothe (see again *TrGF* iv.181).

Nauck's explanation does not seal the matter. If Sophocles did write a *Ἑλένης ἀρπαγή*, the *Cypria* could have served as his chief inspiration, but there are other antecedent treatments of the myth to consider as well, most notable Alcaeus fr. 283 V.²³³

Many myth-based ancient comedies are known or thought to depend on antecedent tragedies of the same theme. Of course, Alexis' *Rape of Helen* hardly guarantees that Sophocles or another tragedian had already written a play on the famous topic (plenty of other literature, including Gorgias' *Encomium of Helen*, and artistic representations were in circulation and could have inspired Alexis). But the existence of the comedy does cause one to wonder, and in wondering to take the comment of the *Ajax Hypothesis* more seriously.²³⁴ On linguistic grounds Jebb suspected that the Hypothesis was written by two different authors. Whoever produced the first paragraph containing the four titles of Trojan plays struck Jebb as being "a well-informed Alexandrian scholar."²³⁵ So unless the title *Ἑλένης ἀρπαγή* is the result of later corruption to the original text of the Hypothesis, it comes down on fairly good authority, which we should not dismiss out of hand. In any case, if Sophocles genuinely did write a separate play bearing the title *Ἑλένης ἀρπαγή*, then, as Pearson declares, "I cannot believe that it dealt with any other matter than the seizure of Helen by Paris."²³⁶ Retracting an earlier theory that was indeed baseless, Welcker settled on the idea that the play was about Menelaus'

²³³ On which see Pallantza 2005: 34-43, arguing that the story embodied everything the poet despised.

²³⁴ Two of the seven words that comprise Alexis fr. 71 K.-A. may point to Sophoclean influence at the lexical level, which may in turn boost our confidence that he wrote a *Ἑλένης ἀρπαγή*. The verb *ἐντρέπομαι* ("hesitate (for), reverence"), which is otherwise lacking in comedy, occurs five times in Sophocles' extant plays but only once in Euripides and never in Aeschylus. The adjective *ἀκόλαστος* ("licentious") is more common in Aristophanes (four times, plus two uses of derivatives) and, among tragedians, Euripides (five times), but in its lone appearance in Sophocles' corpus, in the unplaced fragment *ἀκόλαστον σῶμα* (F 744), it has a particularly carnal significance—as it must in the comic fragment, too—that would nicely capture the lustful feelings between Helen and Paris (note that changing *σῶμα* to *ῶμα* as Shorey proposes (1918: 98) would not necessarily negate the patent eroticism of S. F 744).

²³⁵ Jebb 1907: 3.

²³⁶ Pearson 1917: 123, approved by Radt, *TrGF* iv.181.

reclaiming of Helen after he kills Deiphobus.²³⁷ This cannot be, and the word choice of *Iliup.* arg. 2d is telling: Menelaus does not “snatch” Helen but “leads her down to the ships” (ἐπὶ τὰς ναῶς κατάγει, cf. ἄγει in *Epit.* 5.22). Indeed, the only time Helen was snatched away illicitly (by persuasion or by force) was when Paris removed her from Sparta.²³⁸

It is ultimately rather surprising to find only one securely attested play about this momentous event. It may not be quite as surprising that this play was a comedy. First of all, no tasteful dramatist could affirm that Helen was taken by violence, for this would undermine the traditional complexity of her relationship with Paris and would permit only the staging of a scandalous spectacle. So Helen on some level had to be complicit in her removal to Troy—or to put it more forcefully, she was either willing or eager to go there with Paris. Some tension would arise from the presentation of Helen as ambivalent and of Paris as a perfidious guest. Certainly in retrospect Paris’ sin against Zeus ξένιος (“Lord of Hospitality”) is frequently cited as the bane of Troy.²³⁹ But although the union of Paris and Helen is a serious and far-reaching act, it takes place in a sort of vacuum. Both individuals are in a certain way deluded by Aphrodite, and unlike in the *Alexander* of Euripides where Cassandra foretold Troy’s demise, there is no one around in Sparta to deter Paris and prognosticate about the dire consequences that his actions will produce, while Helen’s retinue, ignorant (though perhaps suspecting) of the massive war that Menelaus will wage, can only cite the impending domestic breakdown to counteract

²³⁷ Welcker 158ff., after id. 1826: 294. Another opinion, belonging to Ahrens and Wagner and summarized by Pearson (*loc. cit.*), would inject tragic suspense by having the play cover the Trojan debate that attended Paris’ return from Sparta with Helen. The title *Ἑλένης ἀρπαγή* would work slightly better now as a way of denoting the topic of that debate, but Pearson rightly rejects the theory since Sophocles’ *Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις* makes such a play rather redundant.

²³⁸ Cf. the use of ἀρπάζω in *Il.* 3.444, and for the noun *A. Ag.* 534, *Th.* 351; *Hdt.* 2.118, 5.94 [pl. for sg.].

²³⁹ E.g., *A. Ag.* 362 (with language similar to *Od.* 9.271f.), 399-402; see further Jouan 1966: 185 n. 1.

Helen's adulterous feelings.²⁴⁰ Helen's adultery also sets a negative precedent for female depravity—a grave problem, to be sure—but at least on the face of things her sister's crime is much more dastardly. More *pathos* is to be found in the separation of mother and daughter, and Alexis surely faced a challenge in maintaining a comic tone in the face of the orphaning of a child. However, he need only have emphasized and exaggerated the blinding attraction between Paris and Helen and the mundane nature of the couple's passions: the adulterous affair violated man's law (not to mention the affront to Zeus Xenios), but it was not monstrous or unnatural in the way that Phaedra's desire for Hippolytus was (or consider Oedipus' mating with his mother, truly the stuff of tragedy); and Helen in her thirst for Trojan riches (cf. Hecuba's attack on her at *E. Tro.* 993-7) was not in fact as malicious as the greedy Eriphyle. It is reasonable, therefore, for Hermann to assume that if Sophocles' *Ἑλένης ἀρπαγή* ever existed it was a light-hearted satyr-play (after all, it is an erotic tale, and Satyrs all but personify lust).

Even if the potential for a connection to Sophocles is slight, consideration of Alexis' play is in order. The primary piece of evidence for it is fr. 71 K.-A., which is best taken as some Spartan's criticism of Helen's receptiveness to Paris' overtures:²⁴¹

*ἀκόλαστός ἐστι, τὴν δὲ πολὺν – ἦ –
οὐκ ἐντρέπεται*

²⁴⁰ Horace, in a lyric ode masquerading as martial *epos* (*Od.* 1.15), ingeniously has Nereus deliver the dire wake-up call to Paris as he escorts Helen across the sea. However, in a drama centered on the actual seduction of Helen (and in which there already appeared Aphrodite, staunchly on Paris' side), it is difficult to think of an appropriate divinity (Athena? Hera? Nemesis?) who could make a scolding epiphany such as Nereus'.

²⁴¹ The subject is less likely to be Paris because the person decrying the union must be a resident of Sparta (Helen's nurse, e.g.) who therefore had no basis for discussing the contempt that Paris is showing toward an elder relative. If the play were set back in Troy after the return of Paris with Helen, then these words could be imagined to be spoken by one of Antenor's faction in order to point out how Paris was selfishly casting his parents and the rest of the Trojans to ruin (cf. Hector's rebuke of his brother at *Il.* 3.39-51). A funny play could indeed be written about how Helen's beauty so overwhelmed the wits of the Trojans and induced them to grant that Paris keep her (cf. *Il.* 3.156), but this was not that play, to judge only from the title *Ἑλένης ἀρπαγή*.

“She is incorrigible, and she has no regard for her gray-haired...”²⁴²

Kock supplied the end of the first line with *μήτερα*, treating *πολιάν* as an adjective, but as far as her marriage to Menelaus was concerned Helen owed much more to Tyndareus than to Leda.²⁴³ Meineke’s *τοῦ πατρός* is thus preferable, even though the role of this abstract noun (“grayness of hair,” used notably at *Men. Mon.* 705) is in comedy generally fulfilled by the plural substantive *πολαιά* (sc. *τρίχες*). Besides this, there is fr. 70 K.-A., which alone is attributed simply to the *Helen* of Alexis. It probably comes from his *Robbery of Helen*, for it cautions against shallowness in love.

Alexis’ play may have begun just before Menelaus’ departure for Crete, a trip that *Epit.* 3.3 attributes to a family funeral that demanded his attendance,²⁴⁴ with the king giving his wife instructions relating to hospitality as in the *Cypria*. The potential for (humorous) dramatic irony is already evident from Proclus’ phrase *τὰ ἐπιτήδεια παρέχειν*. It is important to recognize that Menelaus, who watched as Paris showered Helen with gifts, bears some blame for his imperceptiveness. After much dithering and persuasion,

²⁴² Or we might take it as a question: “Is there no stopping her? Has she no regard for her aged...?” Meineke’s alternative proposal of making the verbs 2nd-person (*εἰ...ἐντρέπει*, yielding a single complete verse) would also invite an interrogative reading.

²⁴³ We should surely be considering only Helen’s mortal parents, however tempting it may be to search for allusions to (gray?) Nemesis the daughter of *Νύξ ἑρεβεννή* (*Hes. Th.* 214, 223) or to Zeus as a swan (but swans are proverbially white, as will be seen in the story of the hero Cynus, whereas *πολιός* describes other species of birds, like *κορῶναι* at *Ar. Av.* 967).

²⁴⁴ Adding that Menelaus left on the tenth day after Paris’ arrival. Uncle Catreus’ death, the occasion for the funeral, was either a coincidence or the work of Aphrodite. Note that the *Epit.* explicitly says Paris “persuades” (*πειθεῖ*) Helen, whereas Proclus says only that Aphrodite brings the couple together and makes it seem as though their lovemaking followed promptly. If Proclus’ *συνάγει* means that Aphrodite played the role of matchmaker as forcefully in the *Cypria* as she does in *Il.* 3.389ff., then Paris need not have used much persuasion.

Helen may then have been shown admitting Paris into her bedroom; the *Cypria* at least described their making love in Sparta.²⁴⁵

Any dramatic representation of the rape of Helen can be expected to have expanded the *dramatis personae* beyond her and Paris. (Helen's maidservants are the obvious choice to constitute a Chorus.)²⁴⁶ Aeneas may have aided and abetted the crime, or at least been present to witness it, as in the *Cypria*. If Menelaus does not appear briefly at the beginning of our imagined *Ἑλένης ἀρπαγή*, at least Hermione could be used as a silent character to showcase Helen's abandonment of her family. Most intriguing is the potential use of divine characters in such a play. It is hard to imagine leaving out Aphrodite; but did she appear only in the prologue to announce her designs (cf. *E. Hipp.*), or did she engage directly with Helen as she does in the *Iliad*? Some artistic representations also make Peithō, or Persuasion personified, complicit in the seduction. For example, a Roman marble relief kept in the Archaeological Museum of Naples shows Aphrodite persuading Helen to elope with Paris.²⁴⁷ Peithō's inclusion here could be purely allegorical, or the artist may imagine her being literally and corporeally present.²⁴⁸ In a particularly abstruse choral passage of *Agamemnon*, Aeschylus seems to suggest that *Πειθώ*, as the daughter of *Ἄτη* ("Ruin"), "forced" (*βιάται*) Paris to act "against his better judgment" by stealing Helen.²⁴⁹ But Helen's own self-deception under the spell of Peithō

²⁴⁵ Naevius, *Cypria Ilias* fr. 2 Courtney = *Cyp.* fr. 13 W., *penetrat penitus thalamoque potitur*, has been plausibly connected to Paris' surreptitious movement through Menelaus' halls.

²⁴⁶ Alexis used the term *Λάκαινα* in his comedy (fr. 72 K.-A.), but it is unclear whether he used it of Helen, her attendants, or both. On Sophocles' play called *Λάκαιναι*, which he derived from the *Little Iliad*, see *infra* pp. ###. Aethra, one of Helen's attendants, was of course not Laconian, but according to Athenian tradition she did wind up following Helen all the way to Troy, in ironic retribution for Theseus' earlier rape of Helen.

²⁴⁷ MMA 10.210.27 is a fragmentary copy of the same scene.

²⁴⁸ See LIMC s.v.

²⁴⁹ Denniston–Page 1957: 103, *ad A. Ag.* 385; cf. p. 104 *ad* 386ff.: "It is perfectly clear that Aeschylus takes the sin of Paris to be not a cause but an effect" of Trojan excess. So the playwright makes Paris the

cannot be far from Aeschylus' mind, just as for Pindar (*P.* 4.219) Medea becomes the victim of Peithō's violence when Aphrodite instructs Jason in the art of seduction. Consider in addition the name vase of the Heimarmene Painter, which features Helen surrounded by her mother Nemesis along with Peitho,²⁵⁰ Heimarmene, and two other goddesses perhaps representing Themis and Eukleia; on the reverse Himeros (not Aphrodite) incites Paris.²⁵¹ Personifications could grace the tragic stage in Athens, as exemplified by Kratos and Bia in [A.] *PV*, and we may wonder whether any of the conceptual goddesses who regularly accompany Helen in art also appeared in Sophocles' play. Note also that Nemesis and Zeus are paired at E. *Ph.* 182.

Herodotus (2.116.6-117 = *Cyp.* fr. 14 W.) states that in the *Cypria* Paris, after seducing Helen, made straight for home, reaching Troy on the third day after he fled Sparta. This leaves no time for a sojourn in Sidon and thus clashes with arg. 2d W.:

χειμῶνα δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐφίστησιν Ἥρα, καὶ προσενεχθεὶς Σιδῶνι ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος αἰρεῖ τὴν πόλιν.

Hera inflicts a storm upon them, and Alexander, putting in at Sidon, captures the city.

But *Il.* 6.291 also mentions Sidon, and the story of a phantom Helen in Egypt, exploited by Euripides and perhaps already fully fledged in Stesichorus' famous *Palinode*,²⁵²

victim of his own society as well as of the gods who visit fathers' crimes upon sons' heads (but interestingly Aphrodite is not singled out here for having supplied the opportunity to steal Helen). Note that *Atē* plans ahead (*προβούλον*, 386) but also keeps bearing down: a (*γάγγαμον ἄτης*) "net of ruin" has now been cast over Troy (361).

²⁵⁰ For the motif of Peitho as Aphrodite's accomplice, cf. an Apulian RF volute-krater in Dallas attributed to the Underworld Painter; the scene depicts the love of Selene and Endymion.

²⁵¹ This pointed amphoriskos dated to the 420s B.C. is discussed by Smith 2011: 44; cf. earlier Shapiro 1986: 12; Shapiro 2005: 51.

²⁵² But Dio Chr. *Or.* 11.41 represents Stesichorus' (no doubt original) version of the story as claiming *ὄτι τὸ παράπαν οὐδὲ πλεύσειεν ἢ Ἑλένη οὐδαμόσε*.

probably borrowed its location from the myth of her wandering with Paris.²⁵³ It would be strange, then, if the *Cypria* omitted an episode alluded to by Homer and known to other poets, only to be expanded to include it later, in time for the episode to be recorded in the Proclan summary. Yet most scholars have proposed some variation of this evolution.²⁵⁴ Has Herodotus made a mistake? Perhaps he has mixed up the protracted itinerary of Paris and Helen with the breezy return voyage of Aeneas. Or he may be consciously misrepresenting the Cyclic tradition (but a motive to do so is lacking, for confirmation is what he seeks, finding it in Homer). It is possible that the Attic tragedians were by contrast generally more faithful to epic's Paris-and-Helen-in-Egypt episode, although at least Euripides was also (in his *Helen*) willing to run with Stesichorus' innovative distinction between the "real" Helen who remained in Egypt and her Trojan *eidōlon*.²⁵⁵ The resolution of this corrective marvel belongs to the temporal framework of the *Nostoi*, another Cyclic poem that, like the *Cypria*, must have conditioned how the alternative Helen story was formulated and developed.²⁵⁶

²⁵³ Cf. Jouan 1966: 192. Egypt and Sidon are not the same place, but Hdt. *loc. cit.* stresses their proximity.

²⁵⁴ West 92 with n. 30.

²⁵⁵ E. *Hel.* 44-8 has Hermes, not Paris, bring (real) Helen to Egypt; in this radically altered context it would be otiose to insist that Paris still landed in Egypt on his way home (as the *Cypria* dictated, but now with a counterfeit Helen), and the brevity of Helen's account here (cf. Allan 2008: 153 *ad loc.*) avoids the trap of explaining any incidents from Paris' perspective, about which it is only right that she should be clueless. Note, however, that although Stesichorus' *Palinode* and E. *Hel.* pursue their own non-traditional myth, the impulse that motivates them to vindicate Helen's *timē* is found also in works that assume the canonical story—and not only in Classical works like Gorgias' *Encomium* but already in the *Iliad* when the heroine remonstrates and expresses remorse (e.g., 3.399, *δαιμονίη* [sc. *Αφροδίτη*], *τί με ταῦτα λιλαίειαι ἠπεροπέειν*; 24.764, [*Ἀλέξανδρος*] *ὄς μ' ἄγαγε Τροίηνδ' ὡς πρὶν ὄφελλον ὀλέσθαι*); cf. Allan 2008: 10 with n. 48. The Egyptian fantasy merely grants what Homer's Helen wishes for in her more sober moments: to repudiate her romance with Paris. It is also rhetorically appealing in that it enhances the apparent senselessness of the war; see Pallantza 2005: 309.

²⁵⁶ Even if we were to accept Herodotus' report that in the *Cypria* (i.e., the one he read) Paris sailed straight home with Helen, she still got to see Egypt later in the Cycle, while wandering with Menelaus. In fact, already in the *Odyssey* (4.228) Helen is said to have received her *φάρμακα* from the wife of the Egyptian Thon, implying the preexistence of the story according to which that king died trying to steal Helen from Menelaus during the latter's eastern detour (cf. sch. (Q.Vind.) *ad loc.*). In the course of relating the experiences of Menelaus' party in Egypt, the *Nostoi* probably elaborated on the Egyptian king's attempt to make Helen his own (cf. West 272); hence a model for the role of Theoclymenus and another way in which

Helen was married at least three times: to Menelaus, Paris, and Deiphobus (some later sources additionally made her Achilles' bride in the afterlife; on her early relationship with Theseus see above). Sophocles' *Ἑλένης γάμος* probably deals with her wedding to Paris, for this celebration, out of the several to which the play's title could refer, was the most fraught with drama and apprehension among its witnesses. The wedding of Helen and Menelaus, meanwhile, was suitable more for a discursive treatment of the heroine's life, and indeed it was featured in Stesichorus' *Helen* (fr. 84 and 88 Finglass).²⁵⁷ In the *Cypria* Paris and Helen, having already slept together, officially celebrate their wedding after arriving in Troy together:

καὶ ἀποπλεύσας εἰς Ἴλιον γάμους τῆς Ἑλένης ἐπετέλεσεν. (Arg. 2e W.)

And having sailed away to Ilium, he accomplished his wedding to Helen.

The union between Paris and Helen was not proper wedlock (hence the ironic usage of *γάμοι* at *E. Tr.* 932 and *Hel.* 190), but their wedding (to which Proclus' *γάμους* refers) would have followed the standard marital rites.

E. Hel. was grounded in tradition (similarly, by placing in Egypt the woman who spawned a magical *eidōlon*, Euripides was perhaps taking advantage of that land's reputed obsession with magic and was simultaneously engaging with epic tradition, merely relocating the Spartan couple's reunion from Troy to Egypt, where they spent time anyway according to the *Nostoi*). Allan 2008: 26 n. 128 prefers to regard the Homeric Proteus and Eidothea as the models for Theoclymenus and Theonoë, respectively, but his larger assessment of the *mythopoeia* underlying *E. Hel.* accords with mine: it "is indebted to even older (epic) models" apart from Stesichorus and Herodotus (p. 128, where a specific reference to the *Nostoi*, as on p. 21 in regard to Stesichorus' sources, could bolster Allan's argument). Comparing *E. Hel.* with the rationalistic account of Herodotus' Egyptian priests (2.112-20) yields a picture that is even murkier than the historian's relationship with the Epic Cycle and is best left out of the present discussion.

²⁵⁷ See Finglass 2015: 93-6.

2.5. The Death(s) of the Dioscuri

ἐν τούτῳ δὲ Κάστωρ μετὰ Πολυδεύκουσ τὰς Ἴδα καὶ Λυγκέωσ βοῶσ ὑφαιρούμενοι ἐφωράθησαν. καὶ Κάστωρ μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἴδα ἀναιρεῖται, Λυγκεὺς δὲ καὶ Ἴδασ ὑπὸ Πολυδεύκουσ. καὶ Ζεὺς αὐτοῖσ ἐτερήμενον²⁵⁸ νέμει τὴν ἀθανασίαν. (Arg. 3 W.)

At this time Castor along with Polydeuces were caught rustling the cattle of Idas and Lynceus. And Castor is killed by Idas, Lynceus and Idas by Polydeuces. And Zeus dispenses to them [sc. the Dioscuri] immortality on alternate days.

The quasi-deaths of Helen's brothers shortly after her departure from Sparta are alluded to in *Iliad* 3.236ff. during the *Teichoskopia*, and so they had to be narrated by the deferential poet of the *Cypria* (note also their mortal origins favored in *Od.* 12.298ff.). While the twins' special limbo status was proverbial and was freely bandied about without any sign of intertextual borrowing, the background to their passing from the mortal world required a more specific appreciation of myth. The story was of course preserved orally at their *hērōia* in Sparta and Athens and in artistic renderings, but literary works including *Pi. N.* 10.49ff. (cf. *P.* 11) and the *Cypria* surely helped inform subsequent writers about the details of the confrontation between the Dioscuri and Idas and Lynceus. After Pindar the cause of the conflict was changed to the contested pursuit of the Leucippides.

Tiberios discusses a red-figure pelike from Pydna²⁵⁹ depicting the fight between the Apharetides and the Tyndarides and proposes that Athenians during the Peloponnesian War may have wished to see the Dioscuri, heroes of Sparta first and

²⁵⁸ It is highly probable that Proclus read this word in the *Cypria*, for it appears elsewhere in epic (*Od.* 11.303) to describe the Dioscuri.

²⁵⁹ Dion inv. no. 2138, attributed to the Suessula Painter.

foremost, in a state of suffering.²⁶⁰ It is doubtful whether any such animosity colored contemporary tragedies featuring the Dioscuri.

As with all the fragmentary plays, there are lingering questions. Was Leda mentioned at all in the *Cypria*? Might the *Cypria* also have told of her suicide? This maternal figure is mentioned at E. *Hel.* 201f., cf. 387.²⁶¹

2.6. Menelaus Visits Agamemnon and Nestor

καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα Ἴρις ἀγγέλλει τῷ Μενελάῳ τὰ γεγονότα κατὰ τὸν οἶκον· ὁ δὲ παραγενόμενος περὶ τῆς ἐπ' Ἴλιον στρατείας βουλευέται μετὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ. καὶ πρὸς Νέστορα παραγίνεται Μενέλαος· Νέστωρ δὲ ἐν παρεκβάσει διηγεῖται αὐτῷ ὡς Ἐποπεὺς φθείρας τὴν Λυκούργου θυγατέρα ἐξεπορθήθη, καὶ τὰ περὶ Οἰδίπου, καὶ τὴν Ἡρακλέους μανίαν, καὶ τὰ περὶ Θησέα καὶ Ἀριάδην. (Arg. 4a-b W.)

And after this Iris reports to Menelaus what has happened in his household, and he comes and deliberates with his brother about the expedition against Troy. And Menelaus comes to Nestor, and Nestor in a digression narrates for him how Epepeus after he seduced the daughter of Lycurgus²⁶² was undone, and the things concerning Oedipus, and the madness of Heracles, and the things concerning Theseus and Ariadne.

Agamemnon reacts to Helen's flight as if his brother's loss was his own, and to underscore how an attack on one of the Atreidai was an attack on both, the Chorus of *Agamemnon* briefly portrays them as having lived together under the same roof even after they made their separate marriages (Paris came ἐς δόμον τὸν Ἀτρειδᾶν, 402).

Did the *Cypria* set the stage for Agamemnon's joyous reaction to Achilles' quarrel with Odysseus (*Od.* 8.75-82)—possibly the same occasion described in Sophocles' *Syndeipnoi*—by having Agamemnon consult the Delphic oracle here? This is

²⁶⁰ Tiberios 1990: 121; cf. pls. 28f.

²⁶¹ Comments on the latter passage in Diggle 1994: 176ff.

²⁶² Perhaps to be emended to Lycus: Jouan 1966: 375 n. 1.

a possibility proposed by West,²⁶³ and the story of the quarrel is elucidated below on *Syndeipnoi* (§15). If West's hypothesis is correct, and if the visit to Delphi featured in *Syndeipnoi*, Sophocles may have drawn from the *Cypria*, although the brief allusion in the *Odyssey* could have sufficed.

It is possible that the stories told by Nestor were specifically chosen to shed light on Menelaus' present circumstances, although Nestor as a literary figure had a well-established tendency to ramble.²⁶⁴ For example, Theseus was like Paris an abductor, although Ariadne had no Cretan husband to betray, only her father Minos.²⁶⁵ While tragic poets may have drawn from these extended narratives, it is very difficult to say anything edifying on the matter.²⁶⁶ However, the inclusion of the story of Theseus and Ariadne deserves special comment. As Mills has observed, "one may suspect that Menelaus would have been most effectively consoled by a story which had an unhappy ending for the abductor." Thus Nestor's version may have linked Theseus' abandonment of the Cretan princess with his father Aegeus' subsequent suicide, as in later sources.²⁶⁷ Again, it was natural for Athenian poets to avoid besmirching the reputation of their greatest hero-king, and so any negative portrayal of him in the *Cypria* was bound to be ignored. On the other hand, if Nestor somehow spoke of Theseus in more neutral terms, the mere fact that of his inclusion could have engendered Athenian pride.

2.7. The Recruitment of Heroes

ἔπειτα τοὺς ἡγεμόνας ἀθροίζουσιν ἐπελθόντες τὴν Ἑλλάδα. (Arg. 5a W.)

²⁶³ West 98. See more generally Jouan 1966: 373ff.

²⁶⁴ Not only in Homer: cf. his prolix Centauromachy narrative in *Ov. Met.* 12.189-576.

²⁶⁵ Cf. Jouan 1966: 374, 384-88.

²⁶⁶ Yet concerning the stories of Antiope and the madness of Heracles, Jouan 1966: 389 contends, "Il n'est pas douteux... qu'Euripide a connu les deux apologues des *Kypria*, mais pour atteindre à plus d'efficacité dramatique, il en a profondément modifié les données."

²⁶⁷ Mills 1997: 15.

Then traversing Greece they [sc. Menelaus, Nestor, et al.] gather the leaders.

Other than Odysseus (see the following section), the leaders who were visited go unspecified. Indeed, Proclus does not give us much here, but I strongly suspect that at the very least the *Cypria* elaborated the recruitment of Achilles. He deserved a formal introduction, and this was also an opportunity to reflect on his childhood, in particular his tutelage under Chiron (previously featured at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis) and/or Phoenix.²⁶⁸ *Epit.* 3.6 says that Menelaus sent heralds to do the recruiting, but the more important kings evidently received fuller delegations in which the Atreidai were personally involved. Odysseus' madness was probably the first major scene in the recruitment episode, followed by a prolonged stop at Phthia during which leaders including the recently conscripted Odysseus along with the Atreidai and Nestor convinced Peleus to release Achilles to their expedition (cf. Odysseus' participation at *Il.* 9.252-9, 11.765-91). The story that Achilles was retrieved from Scyros after Peleus' effort to conceal him there was a later invention,²⁶⁹ although the oracle that pinned Troy's capture to Achilles' involvement, an element associated with the Scyros story,²⁷⁰ may go back much further.

²⁶⁸ West 104. Far less convincingly, the section on Chiron in Severyns 1928: 259-61 implies (by its placement within the study) that the *Cypria* poet described the rearing of Achilles right after describing the divorce of Peleus and Thetis. Other scholars have argued for the *Cypria*'s inclusion of Achilles' education on the basis that Pindar's Third Nemean mingles this myth with the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. For references see Rutherford 2015: 459 n. 49 (cf. 450 with n. 4). Rutherford himself is generally (apart from *Nem.* 10) skeptical about Pindar's direct engagement with the Epic Cycle, and one is wise to take heed of his conclusion: "it is doubtful...that every detail of Pindaric myth can be traced to an earlier source, let alone to the Cycle" (*ibid.* 460). As the burden of proof for Pindaric intertextuality rests with the optimists, the standard of evidence for the tragedians' reception of the Cycle must also remain high.

²⁶⁹ Pace Severyns 1928: 285-91; see below, pp. ###.

²⁷⁰ In sch. *Il.* 19.326. Was this the same oracle that informed Agamemnon that Troy would fall shortly after a quarrel between the "best of the Achaeans"?

The *Cypria* did not directly narrate the betrothal and wedding of Helen to Menelaus,²⁷¹ but in describing the aftermath of her seduction it probably did tell, as the *Catalogue of Women* does, of certain oaths sworn by Helen's suitors at her mortal father's insistence.²⁷² Except for Achilles who was too young, all those who would become the chief Greek heroes of the Trojan War, each desiring Helen for himself, assented to Tyndareus' demand that they swear oaths to defend her husband, whomever her father should choose. The best evidence that the *Cypria* included this backstory is *Epit.* 3.6, where Menelaus is said to have invoked the oaths when assembling the forces to wage war. The epic poem dwelt at length upon at least one of Menelaus' recruitment visits, namely the one to Ithaca to rouse Odysseus, and this could easily have prompted the poet to reflect on the earlier pact; it could also have been broadcast in a more general way at the start of the recruitment campaign, hence agreeing with the generic statement in *Epit.* 3.6 that Menelaus sent the same reminder to *each* of the oath-bound kings.²⁷³ But it is hardly certain that the mythographer's narrative derives from the *Cypria*, even though the *incidental* recalling of the oaths in the midst of the recruitment of heroes is a feature more to be expected in the Cyclic poem than in any of the other early sources for the

²⁷¹ The wedding, like the betrothal discussed hereafter, may have been mentioned in passing by the outraged Menelaus. Partly on linguistic grounds Jouan 1966: 162 regards Stesichorus' *Helen* (*PMG* fr. 10-14) as the certain inspiration for Euripides' allusions to these nuptials at *Hel.* 637-41 (where Menelaus recalls receiving the blessing of Helen's *λεύκιπποι* brothers) and 722-5 (the same poem later inspired Theocritus' *Epithalamium of Helen*). One detail not to be attributed to Stesichorus, however, is Helen's reference to Achilles as one of her original suitors at *E. Hel.* 99, which could be simply a self-flattering and coquettish lie (thus rightly Jouan 1966: 161 *contra* Mayer 1883: 20).

²⁷² [*Hes.*] fr. 204.76-93 M-W. Additionally, sch. *Il.* 2.339 (where the *ῥρκια* mentioned by Nestor should not be equated with those demanded by Tyndareus) cites Stesichorus (*PMGF* 190) as telling the story. In analyzing this evidence, Severyns 1928: 275 sides with Robert 1920-6: 1066-9 and rejects that the *Cypria* would have contained the story of the oaths. Yet while he considers the oaths an invention of Stesichorus, he baselessly assumes that the poem did recount the (presumably contested) engagement of Helen at her father's court. The oath-taking, precisely because it explains why so many heroes were pressed into service, strikes me as the *raison d'être* for the story that all the finest Greek bachelors of the day sought her hand.

²⁷³ ὁ δὲ πέμπων κήρυκα πρὸς ἕκαστον τῶν βασιλέων τῶν ῥρκων ὑπεμύνησκειν ὧν ὄμοσαν.

tale.²⁷⁴ (The *Catalogue of Women* recounts the wooing of Helen for its own sake; it does then look ahead to the Trojan War, but not specifically to the function of the oaths in the assembly of the Greek expedition.)

In tragedy, the myth of the suitors' oaths likewise finds itself treated incidentally, at *E. IA* 57-65, 77-9 (where, just as in *Epit.* 3.6, Menelaus is said to have invoked the oaths when recruiting for war), 391f.; *S. Aj.* 1113, *F* 144, *Phil.* 72. Again, there is no way to show that the source for any of these passages was the *Cypria* as opposed to Stesichorus or another author. But in an altogether heterodox play, Euripides probably turns his back on all of his predecessors when he reinvents Achilles to be old enough to have been a suitor of Helen (*Hel.* 99). This romantic linking of the Trojan Cycle's two most glamorous figures in effect preempts the *Cypria*'s story of their face-to-face encounter at Troy, which of course could not have taken place if Helen never went there.²⁷⁵

Though of limited interest in tragedy, the fervor surrounding the betrothal of Helen was well suited to direct treatment in comedy. Alexis wrote a *Suitors of Helen*, and from this probably comes a fragment (fr. 241 K.-A.), actually attributed to Alexis' *Tyndareus*, in which someone complains about parasites or unexpected guests.²⁷⁶ If Schweighaeuser's suggestion is correct and the two titles belong to one play, the father of the bride would be complaining about how many high-class and thereby expensive

²⁷⁴ Bethe 1929: 233-5 argues for the story's presence in the *Cypria*, while West 101f. reserves judgment. Apollodorus had described the occasion of the oaths more fully earlier in his work (*Bibl.* 3.10.8f.), and it is interesting that there Odysseus is named first among the 28 suitors listed, as if in recognition of the fact that his participation in the Trojan War was to be particularly dependent upon the oath-swearing, or as if the vow haunted him in particular.

²⁷⁵ Fantuzzi 2012: 13 with n. 28. Their meeting at Troy is discussed *infra*, ###.

²⁷⁶ By contrast, Sophilus' *Tyndareus*, also called *Leda*, must relate not to the marriage of Helen but to the conception of Helen and her siblings.

suitors he has had to entertain.²⁷⁷ It would make sense that the pivotal character in *Ἑλένης μνηστῆρες* should be the flustered Tyndareus, who could thus become the titular character as well. By the same token, we might suppose (with Fabricius, *contra* Schweighaeuser) that Alexis fr. 70 K.-A., assigned to *Ἑλένη*, belongs to his *Ἑλένης ἀρπαγή* (not *μνηστῆρες*, which had less to do with the woman *per se*). On the other hand, there is a fragment, consisting of the word *εὐορκησία*, that is attributed to a *Helen* written by the comic poet Alexander (fr. 2 K.-A.) but that Kaibel assigned to Alexis.²⁷⁸ In a choice between Alexis' two plays with Helen's name in their titles, "faithfulness to one's oath" fits best in his *Suitors of Helen*, although the oaths sworn around Helen's marriage-bed continued to be relevant during and after her seizure by Paris. So the denuded title *Helen* could in theory be used of a play in which her direct participation in events was overshadowed by her father, who mediated as various heroes wrangled over her hand; but we must also contend with the possibility that the *Helen* of Alexis fr. 70 K.-A. represents yet a third play by him relating to the heroine.

²⁷⁷ Alexis places some stress on the arrival of guests on chariots, which meant that the host had to provide for the horses, too. Note that several brides in Greek mythology are wooed by chariot-driving heroes (notably Hippodamia and Alcestis), but in Classical Athens traveling by car, at least for ordinary purposes, was considered ostentation and *τροφή* ([Dem.] 42.24). Accordingly, despite the fact that Helen's suitors were coming from afar for an august occasion where the display of wealth was *de rigueur*, they are comically tainted by the image of the contemporary Cyrenaeans, who practiced rampant parasitism and always showed up with their horses. (Athenaeus [510A] makes it clear that *κάκεϊ* at the beginning of the *Tyndareus* fragment means "and in Cyrene," and just as Athenaeus' internal addressee Timocrates, having been bombarded with superabundant (examples of) dainty men, is compared to a beleaguered Cyrenaean host, so too Tyndareus may have been the subject of the same comparison in Alexis' play; the very words *ἄνθρωπος εἶναί μοι Κυρηναῖος δοκεῖς* may be a verse drawn from the same context as (the rest of) the fragment, and I would like to think that if another character (Odysseus?) did not say this to Tyndareus, then Tyndareus himself spoke the line, and Athenaeus has changed an original *δοκῶ* to *δοκεῖς* (van Herwerden suggested *δοκεῖ*). In Alexis fr. 73 K.-A., ascribed explicitly to his *Suitors (of Helen)*, there may be similar bashing of the young noblemen (it depends on how one assesses the testimony of Arsenius), and in the word *ρόαν* one detects an allusion to the marriage of Persephone (as if the suitors were no better than Hades). Further, fr. 75 K.-A. refers to the luxurious practice of taking hot baths.

²⁷⁸ Meineke preferred a third poet, Anaxandrides, who also wrote a *Helen*; on this comedy see *infra*, pp. ###.

To return to the *Cypria*, the posited episode describing the recruitment of Achilles would not have involved any suggestion that he was duty-bound to serve, for, as the *Catalogue of Women* points out (fr. 204.87-92 M–W), he was still residing with Chiron when Helen’s suitors swore to uphold her marriage to Menelaus. What would have distinguished the scene is a discussion among a large number of heroes about the value of fighting and the importance of Achilles’ participation in the impending war. And again, being Achilles’ first appearance in the Cycle, this episode should have contained some extended glimpse at the hero’s upbringing. Rather than looking ahead from the wedding of Peleus and Thetis to adumbrate the early life of Achilles and his tutelage under Chiron,²⁷⁹ the *Cypria* probably embedded this material here, in the course of narrating Achilles’ enrollment in the Trojan expedition.

A possible reconstruction of Sophocles’ satyr-play *The Lovers of Achilles* might explicate how Achilles’ education was integrated into the story of his recruitment. This is a play in which the Chorus of Satyrs are deprived of Achilles, their beloved, and consoled by Phoenix (F 153). The deprivation points to the moment when Achilles enlisted in the expedition against Troy. F 157a, consisting of the single word *ἐξανάξει*, may be spoken by one of the leaders who have come to fetch Achilles; it would then describe Agamemnon’s imminent leading of the army to Troy, which accords with the gloss it receives, *ἀνάξει πρὸς τὴν Ἰλιον*.²⁸⁰ The inevitable loss of one’s beloved is a theme

²⁷⁹ A prominent figure early in the poem, as stated above, and mentioned as tutor of Achilles at *Il.* 11.832. In keeping with the schematics of the Epic Cycle, the *Cypria* poet will have wanted to account for the *Iliad*’s mention of Chiron (cf. Severyns 1928: 259), who outside of that poem in fact overshadows Phoenix in his capacity as caretaker of Achilles (cf. West 2011: 225 on *Il.* 9.438-43; *The Lovers of Achilles* perhaps sought to reconcile an apparent discrepancy between that Homeric passage and the *Cypria* by presenting both Phoenix and Chiron and making them co-mentors of the young Achilles).

²⁸⁰ In the codex Zavordensis of Photius’ *Lexicon*, where the lemma must be corrected from *ἐξανάψει* and the title of the play is found only in the margin. The lexicon entry cites two parallel passages from Homer where the simpler verb *ἀνάγειν* is used, *Il.* 3.48 (Hector reminds Paris of the time he carried off Helen) and

conveyed also in F 149, perhaps spoken by Phoenix in a speech beginning with F 153 (or else by the wise Chiron). This well-studied fragment describes love as a disease (*νόσημα*, 1) that causes one to desire what one cannot keep, just as boys are disappointed when a handful of ice (or packed snow: *κρύσταλλον*, 4) that at first yielded pleasures (*ἡδονάς*, 5) finally melts.²⁸¹ The maturation of Achilles is for the Satyrs like the painful melting of ice, and—to paraphrase the final two verses—the same desire (*αὐτὸς ἕμερος*, 8) for Achilles causes them both to love him (if only they could keep him) and not to love him (because he is leaving them, or because he is becoming something else).

In a similar way, Achilles' departure for war (cf. evidence from vase-painting) could have been treated in the *Cypria* with a view to the sorrow it caused Peleus, Chiron, and others. Sophocles would have expanded the *Cypria*'s focus on the docile Centaur and his concern for Achilles to include the wilder Satyrs as Chiron's attendants or the lecherous observers of Achilles' education on Mount Pelion.²⁸² The attention Sophocles

13.627 (Menelaus reproaches the Trojans for taking his wife away); Snell thus thought *The Lovers of Achilles* referred to Paris' taking Helen to Troy, but the future tense of the verb would push back the dramatic timeframe, and then the report about the abduction of Helen to Troy would have to come in some sort of prophecy, which is not as effective as an exchange in which Achilles learns that the outrage has already been committed and he must help avenge it. For the same verb used of Agamemnon's leading the Greek fleet to Troy, see *Il.* 9.338 (LSJ s.v. *ἀνάγω* misprints *ἀείρας* for *ἀγείρας*). In our fragment *ἐξανάξει* could also be middle voice, addressed to Achilles as one about to set sail (cf. the use of *ἀνάξασθαι* in *Thuc.* 6.30).

²⁸¹ The text of verses 6f. of this fragment is far from secure, but the point is clear, especially given how Zenob. *Vulg.* 5.58 explains the derivative idiom *ὁ παῖς τὸν κρύσταλλον*. Radt (*TrGF* iv pp. 166f.) prints these lines as follows: *τέλος δ' ὁ θυμὸς οὔτε ὄπως ἀφῆ θέλει | οὔτ' ἐν χεροῖν τὸ κτῆμα σύμφορον μένειν*. But while Dobree's *θυμὸς* is attractive, codices have *χυμὸς*, and Meineke's *κρυμὸς* also suits the context of the passage, if not the phrasing of the verse. A further problem, as Radt points out, is the meaning of *θέλει*, tied as it is to a *ὄπως* + subjunctive construction. But if it is taken like *ἔχει* to denote ability, then the whole idea of the verse changes to this: even if one wanted to let the ice go, one has no way of doing so, once the ice has become water. (Note also that the very act of holding ice in warm hands accelerates its melting.)

²⁸² Fantuzzi 2012: 17 errs in calling Chiron a Satyr, but Satyrs and Centaurs are closely linked bestial species, and their imagined appearances converge in satyr-drama, in whose choral costumes equine features eventually displaced goatish ones, to judge from the evidence of the Pandora and Pronomos Vases. Like Satyrs, Centaurs are normally lascivious, and Hesychius records that *Κένταυρος* was a byword for a *παιδεραστής*. Chaeremon wrote a satyr-play called *Centaur* (almost certainly about Chiron; see *infra*), and even Chiron, who in Greek art is usually more anthropomorphic than other Centaurs, is depicted with the

pays to Achilles' spear (F 152) and other arms (F 156) could indicate that the play included the bestowal of Achilles' spear and first set of armor—a motif that Sophocles again might have borrowed from the *Cypria*.²⁸³ There were of course other Archaic sources bearing on the hero's formative years on which Sophocles could have based his satyr-play, but given the degree to which its fragments relate to other parts of the Cycle, especially to the relationship between Achilles' parents, the *Cypria* must be considered a probable source. Moreover, in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis*, whose dramatic date comes very shortly after the recruitment of Achilles, the young (*νεανίας*, 933) hero remains on the one hand preoccupied with his blissful school days and the teachings of Chiron and on the other hand wary of the leadership of the Atreidai, though eager to honor Ares (926-31). All this may add another witness to the proposed passage in the *Cypria*, in which Achilles' entry into the Achaean war alliance was presented as a sort of matriculation, and his military service as inextricable from his training on Pelion.

Even if the *Cypria* was not the primary source for Sophocles' satyr-play about Achilles' youth, the Cyclic spirit of presenting Homeric heroes at different stages in their lives extends to this drama. It is thus worthy of attention here. Fantuzzi credits the theory that Ov. *Trist.* 2.409-12 refers to Sophocles' *The Lovers of Achilles*,²⁸⁴ but even if it is

ears of a Satyr in the fresco from Herculaneum called *The Education of Achilles* and now in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Naples.

²⁸³ The spear must be the famous ash-spear given passed down to Achilles by Peleus, who had received it as a wedding present from Chiron (cf. *Il.* 16.143f., Apollod. 3.13.5). Athena and Hephaestus had helped manufacture it, *per sch.* [D] *Il.* 16.140 = *Cyp.* fr. 4 W.; perhaps Sophocles drew from this earlier passage of the *Cypria* in which this spear and its origins were described at length. *The Lovers of Achilles* F 156 must be referring to the armor that Peleus received from the gods (made “unbreakable by the craft of Hephaestus”), again at his wedding, and later gave to Achilles (cf. *Il.* 17.194-7, 18.82-5); it may be spoken at the moment the son receives his father's armor. Matheson 2009 shows how the bestowal of armor is a recurring element in generic and mythical scenes of departing warriors on Attic vases of the fifth century.

²⁸⁴ Fantuzzi 2012: 11f. The claim goes back to Burman's 1727 edition of Ovid and has been accepted by many. Welcker 1826: 168f. and Radt (*TrGF* iv 165) allow that Aeschylus' *Myrmidons* could instead be what Ovid had in mind, though Fantuzzi 2012: 12, following Ingleheart 2010: 324, doubts that Ovid would be returning to tragedy after shifting his discussion to satyr-play.

Sophocles “who made Achilles soft” (*mollem qui fecit Achillem*, 411), Ovid’s literary criticism is tendentious and by no mean straightforward. The Roman poet is complaining that he has been singled out for punishment when many others have indulged in erotic poetry, much of it dramatic, that is no less salacious than his. It is in Ovid’s interest to distort these other poems so as to magnify the degree to which they emasculate heroes and show them afflicted by (homo)sexual lust. But there is simply no evidence that *The Lovers of Achilles* treated its hero in this way, even if homosexual lust was the play’s primary theme, acted out by its Chorus of Satyrs. The quoting text that transmits F 153²⁸⁵ explicitly says that the Satyrs yield to womanly desire,²⁸⁶ whereas Achilles is only the passive *object* of this desire, i.e., the Satyrs’ *παιδικά*, and as such cannot be held out for censure or ridicule. On the contrary, by casting Achilles in the role of *erōmenos* Sophocles probably aimed to show that such a submissive status ill suited this most assertive hero. Again, F 152 from the play is all about Achilles’ famous double-pointed spear, which shows that his essential bellicosity is hardly suppressed,²⁸⁷ and F 156 strengthens this inference. Meanwhile, F 154 is probably an address by Achilles to the dog that grew up with him on Pelion (*τρέφος* [= *θρέμμα*], almost certainly the correct reading as against Eustathius’ *βρέφος*, highlights how Achilles’ rearing on Pelion was

²⁸⁵ In sch. *Ald. Ar. Vesp.* 1026 and several other places.

²⁸⁶ *ἐπιδόντων γάρ τι τῶν Σατύρων εἰς τὴν γυναικείαν ἐπιθυμίαν*. Pace Fantuzzi 2012: 16 n. 42, the Satyrs are not inclining toward “desire of women” but (regarding *γυναικείαν* as subjective) either toward “womanish [i.e., excessive, cf. *Ar. Th.* 151 for the misogynistic use of the adjective] desire” like Paris’ *μαχλοσύνη* in *Il.* 24.30 (though his lust is directed at a woman) or toward “the sort of desire that befits women,” i.e., desire for men.

²⁸⁷ Although the repetition of *δόρυ* twice (in two heteroclitic gen. sg. forms) within the space of three lines is not necessarily damning (pace Page on *PMG* fr. 1015), it may be that only the first line of this fragment should be attributed to the cited Sophocles drama. To suggest, however, that none of the quoted text is Sophoclean, as Dobree apparently did, blatantly ignores the text of the quoting author, sch. *BD Pi. Nem.* 6.85b, who after quoting from Aeschylus *Nereids* [A. F 152] writes, *καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ἀχιλλέως ἐρασταῖς*: ...

central to the play’s mythical backdrop), and the dog’s name, *Σύαργος*,²⁸⁸ confirms that Achilles’ training included the manly pursuit of hunting.²⁸⁹ There is also one fragment whose (albeit tenuously restored) language, far from eroticizing or altogether eliding the epic subject of war, cleaves to martial imagery in order to illuminate love: F 157, *ὀμμάτων ἄπο | λόγχας ἴησιν* (“he casts spears from his eyes”), which is quoted by Hesychius s.v. *ὀμμάτειος πόθος* (“eyeing desire”), may be speaking metaphorically of Achilles’ fierce, warrior-like demeanor which so enamored the Satyrs.²⁹⁰

Even though one is free to presume that this play was written after Euripides’ *Scyrians*, there is no good reason to think that it hinted at Achilles’ gender crisis on Scyros.²⁹¹ If anything, Euripides’ feminized Achilles on Scyros may have been motivated in part by Sophocles’ satyr-play, in which Achilles is an *erōmenos* in the eyes of the entire Chorus of Satyrs rather than being an *erastēs* with agency as he is in most of his epic romances. But even though *The Lovers of Achilles* put Achilles in a position sometimes occupied by unmanly men (the only potential evidence for which is the application of the term *παιδικά* to him), he was blissfully unaware of this and remained immune to effeminacy. Unless something outrageous lurks in the lost text of this play, he

²⁸⁸ Is the name of this hound, whom the juvenile but precocious Achilles leaves behind when he departs for the war, meant to recall Argos (*Od.* 17.292), who holds out long enough to see his master return to Ithaca? Literally it is a compound meaning “Boar-Hunter” (elsewhere it means “wild swine”), as Athen. 9.401c explains.

²⁸⁹ According to Xen. *Cyn.* 1.2, as many as 21 heroes learned to hunt from Chiron.

²⁹⁰ The *paradosis* is heavily restored. Nauck, building upon Casaubon, is responsible for the text presented above. Hsch. *o* 736 Latte actually runs as follows: *ὀμμάτειος πόθος*: *διὰ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ὄραν ἀλίσκεσθαι ἔρωτι· ἐκ τοῦ γὰρ ἔσορᾶν γίνεται ἀνθρώποις ἐρᾶν*’ (= a verse of Agathon [39 F 29] or Sthenelus [32 F 1]?). *καὶ ἐν Ἀχιλλέως ἐρασταῖς ὀμματωπάλογγα φησίν*. The martial sense of the fragment rests entirely on the assumption that *λόγχας* is to be read at the end of the jumble *ὀμματωπάλογγα*. Other editors have preferred to restore a form of *λαγχάνω* (poetic perfect: *λέλογχα*) or some derivative thereof, which nullifies this interpretation. (Along these lines one could further suggest something like *ὀμμάτων πάλω λέλογχα* “I have obtained by a lot consisting of eyes”; cf. Ellendt’s *ὀμματωπαλάχη*, a neologism which he renders as “an allotment obtained by the directing of one’s eyes.”) At any rate, the fragment may be purely about love and physical attraction (consistent with the Hesychian lemma in which the fragment is found), but Achilles would remain the object of that love.

²⁹¹ *Pace* Scheuer–Kansteiner in Krumeich–Pechstein–Seidensticker 1999: 234f. and Fantuzzi 2012: 16.

did not make the mistake that some *erōmenoi* made by luxuriating in the erotic attention he received or by prostituting himself as Alcibiades did with the chaste Satyr named Socrates.²⁹² The drama was not “disparaging” of Achilles,²⁹³ for the joke was surely on the ridiculous lover-Satyrs. In fact, Achilles’ attitude toward these lechers was probably similar to that of Heracles in Achaëus’ satyr-play *Linus*, named after the hero’s music teacher. In a fragment quoted in the *Deipnosophistae* in a discussion of *kottabos*, the *έρώμενος* Heracles seems to complain about all the attention he is getting:²⁹⁴

ρίπτοῦντες ἐκβάλλοντες ἀγνύντες, τί μ’ οὐ
λέγοντες· ὦ κάλλιστον Ἡρακλεί<διον>
λάταξ

Throwing, tossing, breaking, calling me every name under the sun [lit., “what not”]: “O prettiest <little> Herac-lees!”

Athenaeus explains that some were in the habit of throwing their wine drops at their beloveds while calling out their names. Perhaps it was all this fawning that drove Heracles to attack Linus in a fit of rage! Likewise Achilles had gone to Chiron to be educated, not flirted with.

²⁹² Pl. *Sym.* 216c. The Satyrs in Sophocles’ play obviously felt *erōs* for Achilles that went far beyond Platonic love, but perhaps Chiron appeared as a character who was an *erastēs* more akin to Socrates. The Socratic philosopher Antisthenes wrote a pair of dialogues making young Achilles the object of Heracles’ desire and juxtaposing him with the desirable Alcibiades (*SSR* v A 92, 199); these texts are briefly analyzed by Michelakis 2002: 177f. Separately, Michelakis seems to argue (p. 174) that the *mise en scène* of Sophocles’ play and specifically his arraying of the Satyrs appropriated the iconography of scenes of amorous gift-giving on vases. It is of course also possible that in constructing their scenes of lascivious gawkers both the play and this class of vases drew from a common source: real life.

²⁹³ Fantuzzi 2012: 17. He is right that Achilles would appear to have undergone a process of “familiarization” in his migration from epic to satyr-drama. But he confuses when he identifies disparagement both in Sophocles’ de-heroizing of epic Achilles and in Euripides’ presentation in *Hecuba* of a savage Achilles obsessed with his *γέρας*, an obsession totally in keeping with his Iliadic character. According to this view, shared to some extent by Michelakis 2002, tragedians reviled Achilles for being too submissive and also, paradoxically, for being too stubborn. Barring a conspiracy among them to sully Achilles’ reputation by any means necessary, it seems safer to conclude that the tragedians were simply interested in having Achilles’ character, defined ineluctably by the *Iliad*, tested in various non-Iliadic situations, but striving always to present him as *ὀμαλῶς ἀνόμαλον* (Arist. *Poet.* 1454a26-8).

²⁹⁴ Athen. 15.668a = *TrGF* 20 F 26. As Kassel observed, the diminutive *Κυκλώπιον* at E. *Cycl.* 266 supports the restoration of the suffix in line 2 of this fragment.

A hypothesis to Aeschylus' *Aetnaeans* relates that *The Lovers of Achilles* involved a shift in scene.²⁹⁵ Perhaps Achilles was summoned away from Pelion, and after bidding adieu to Chiron there he returned to his father's house, where he said his final farewells before setting out with the Achaean leaders.

Welcker thinks that the play dramatized Heracles' love for Achilles, a story that is almost certainly attested in [Erat.] *Cat.* 40,²⁹⁶ although that text only tells us that Heracles admired the beauty of a young boy in Chiron's dwelling, without naming the boy.²⁹⁷ Such a story, if it existed, might have been coined in Sophocles' satyr-play, and this novelty (intended to resolve the tension between the story of Heracles' accidental killing of Chiron and the fact that the younger heroes of the Trojan War had been educated by the Centaur?), along with the display of sharply contrasting forms of *erōs* (Heracles a virtuous *erastēs* like Socrates, the Satyrs wanton pederasts) would have been enough to sustain the audience's attention. How then would the scene(s) with Peleus and Phoenix fit in? The dramatic timeframe might theoretically cover not Achilles' departure for the Trojan War but his earlier departure from Phthia to the care of Chiron, after his mother had abandoned him. In that case, Achilles would be as young as possible—at the start of his boarding with Chiron and maybe too young even to remember—when the older hero Heracles meets him (convenient for myth-makers trying to reconcile their divergent ages with their separate connections to Chiron); and Thetis' departure (F 151) is a very recent sting for Peleus, who in F 150 is reacting to this but above all to being forced to release

²⁹⁵ *P. Oxy.* 2257, fr. 1.5ff. = F 451t (but see *TrGF* iii.127 for the relevant portion of the text).

²⁹⁶ Antisthenes cited as source; cf. n. 290 *supra*.

²⁹⁷ Welcker 1850: 8 n. 21. Fantuzzi 2012: 8 n. 11 suggests Heracles could have been admiring Asclepius, mentioned by Antisthenes *ap.* [Erat.] *loc. cit.*, and Welcker quotes Philostatus *Heroic.* 9 [= Eudokia p. 84?], which states that Heracles also made the acquaintance of Palamedes and Ajax when he stayed with Chiron, as he seems to have done frequently. But note well Ovid's account of a meeting between Heracles and a young Achilles (*Fast.* 5.379-414). The reported meeting of Heracles and Achilles—two great heroes—was surely born of the same impulse that produced the story of the latter's rendezvous with Helen at Troy.

his son to Chiron's charge; and ἐξανάξει (F 157a) could be referring to Chiron's leading of Achilles up to his haunt on Mount Pelion (the verb does not always refer to sea-fating; see E. *Heracl.* 218). But then the fragment spoken by Phoenix to the Satyrs would make little sense, even if we resort to translating ἀπόλεσας as "you corrupted" rather than "you lost." I believe this drama may well have featured Heracles as one of Achilles' lovers in Chiron's cave,²⁹⁸ but I maintain that the likeliest overall theme for it was Achilles' departure for the war, and that the *Cypria* provided a model for the reworking of this episode. Welcker also intimates that Sophocles' satyr-play *Heracles* may be the same as *The Lovers of Achilles*. This is *prima facie* unlikely given that Heracles must have been absent from the part of the play set in Phthia. Heracles' role in *The Lovers of Achilles* cannot have been so significant as to make *Heracles* a valid alternative title.

Does F 155 refer to Odysseus or another expeditionary ambassador who spoke winning words to Achilles or to Peleus to release his son? Presumably Achilles was a character in the play. Does he depart before the play's end, leaving his family and *erastai* to weep? The verse spoken by Phoenix to the Satyrs (F 153) would suggest Achilles' presence, since presumably they departed together, along with Patroclus (was he also featured in the play?). So Phoenix's utterance "you lost" must be quasi-proleptic.

Dio Chr. *Or.* 58 may preserve the memory of this play, as von Arnim argues.²⁹⁹ We may also consider whether Achilles' departure from home was presented as a sort of graduation to ephebic status and conflated with contemporary Attic rituals. Similarly, the time he spent on Scyros according to Euripides and later authors could have been seen as an attempt to shield Achilles from adulthood that nearly stymied his initiation. But his

²⁹⁸ For Heracles' dropping by a friend's home in tragedy, cf. E. *Alc.* It is also possible that Achilles' encounter with Heracles was contained in Sophocles' play in a flashback narrative.

²⁹⁹ Cf. T. Günther in Krumeich–Pechstein–Seidensticker 1999: 589f.

emergence from hiding on Scyros was also in itself very much like a rite of passage, especially insofar as it featured transvestism.³⁰⁰

According to my view that this play told of Achilles' departure for the war, F 150, which is probably spoken by Peleus since it is quoted just after another passage (F 618, from Sophocles' *Troilus*) where Peleus himself speaks of his marriage to Thetis, would come from a speech in which Peleus reacts to losing his son after struggling so hard to win over his mother and then losing her. On Thetis' decision to leave Peleus see on F 151, above p. 48. *The Lovers of Achilles* may have intended to draw an analogy between Achilles' evanescence and the way in which Thetis' kept slipping out of Peleus' grasp; in both cases the lovers have selected individuals who by nature belong out of their reach.³⁰¹

But what if Thetis were the speaker of F 150, as Steffen argued?³⁰² Compare *Il.* 18.52ff., where she begins a lament whose language the language of this fragment resembles. The second line of the fragment could end, e.g., *γεγώσ' ἐγώ*, with Thetis going on to discuss how despite her evasions she had to endure a mortal man's bed (cf. 18.433f.), then was unable to make her son immortal, and now had to send him off to war.³⁰³ Certainly according to Homer Thetis was present for Achilles' departure from home (*Il.* 16.222f., 18.58), but in order for that to be the case in Sophocles' play, we must imagine a reconciliation between Thetis and Peleus, for F 151 assures us that the play mentioned how Thetis had once left her husband. Perhaps Thetis protested against Peleus' allowing Achilles to join the army. Alternatively, we could detach the play from

³⁰⁰ Cf. Parker 2005: 209 with n. 77.

³⁰¹ Cf. Heslin 2005: 118-21, 261-7; Fantuzzi 2012: 17.

³⁰² Steffen 1975: 7-9

³⁰³ At *Il.* 18.434f. Thetis also complains that her husband is getting old. This complaint made toward the war's end would have had less relevance before the war had begun, though even back then it may have been on Thetis' mind, for she did not so much pity Peleus as she pitied herself for having a husband who would one day die.

the recruitment episode altogether and consider whether Thetis here laments only her unwanted marriage and now the slanderous abuse she has suffered from her mortal husband after being caught trying to immortalize her son. Then the scene could have shifted from Phthia to Pelion (as opposed to vice versa), and it could be Achilles' first arrival at Pelion that is described. Meanwhile, F 149 could be directed at Thetis, who is losing her dear son. But why then does Phoenix say *to the Satyrs* "you have lost your beloved" (F 153)? Ultimately it is much more straightforward to accept the view of Brunck, Radt,³⁰⁴ and other scholars and to assign F 150 to Peleus.

Anaxandrides' comedy *Achilles* may have treated the hero's education, as the use of the word *κακομαθής* ("bad at learning," fr. 8) implies. Better attested than this is a work by Chaeremon that may have been based on or similar in scope to Sophocles' *Lovers of Achilles*. The protagonist of Chaeremon's satyr-play *Centaur* was probably Chiron, and if so the drama was probably based on his amorous interaction with Achilles rather than his tragic end at the hands of Heracles, although by some accounts the latter event was precipitated by the former.³⁰⁵ Corresponding to the above argument for the martial tone of Sophocles' play is the imagery of Chaeremon F 10:

ἔνθ' αἱ μὲν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀπείρονα στρατόν
 ἀνθέων ἄλογγον ἐστράτευσαν, ἠδοναῖς
 θηρώμεν<αι ×>οντα λειμώνων τέκνα

There some of them warred after the endless, spearless³⁰⁶ army of flowers,
 hunting with delight the (bloom)ing [(θάλλ)οντα Cobet] children of the meadows.

³⁰⁴ *TrGF* iv.167.

³⁰⁵ For the genre and plot reconstruction, see T. Günther in Krumeich–Pechstein–Seidensticker 1999: 581, 585ff.

³⁰⁶ Recall the restored *λόγχας* in S. F 157.

In the *Iliad* there are many similes in which a soldier's death (tenor) is compared to an act of horticultural destruction (vehicle).³⁰⁷ Chaereon thus cleverly inverts a Homeric model, perhaps in order to assert that Achilles' presence could turn activity into an act of war.³⁰⁸ But the real question about this fragment concerns the identity of the female subjects (*αἱ μὲν... <αἱ>*). Are they women, girls, or Nymphs,³⁰⁹ and are they particular characters in the play or just a generic group? It would be more satisfying to find *οἱ μὲν* in the first verse, as this would allow us to consider whether it was the boys in Chiron's care who "hunted" for flowers (cf. the hunting dog of S. F 154). At any rate, F 11 from Chaereon's play (quoted by the same author, Athenaeus) *could* describe one of the wholesome chores performed by Chiron's pupils:

*στεφάνους ἐτοιμάζουσιν, οὐδ' εὐφημίας
κῆρυκας εὐχαῖς προὔβαλ' ἰοντο δαιμόνων*

[The children]³¹⁰ are preparing the crowns that they are wont to hold³¹¹ before themselves as heralds of religious silence for [their] entreaties of the gods.³¹²

Religious duties, hunting of various kinds, perhaps instruction in medicine and music:³¹³
we begin to get a sense of what Achilles' youth was like under the tutelage of Chiron.³¹⁴

³⁰⁷ E.g., the description of Euphorbus' death at 17.49-60. See Dué 2010: 101f.

³⁰⁸ At the same time the proposition that young Achilles and his cohort endured (or even relished) a laborious educational regime might serve as an inducement to contemporary Athenian boys to be obedient at home and in school. Similarly Michelakis 2002: 175-7 points out how Pindar's account of Achilles' rearing by Chiron (*Nem.* 3.43-64) advances the traditional assimilation of athletics to warfare and thus valorizes the former and more mundane experience. Sophocles, too, may have aimed to impart through his dramatization of the subject the simple lesson that diligent training early in one's life is productive of future greatness.

³⁰⁹ Günther *op. cit.* 584 n. 10.

³¹⁰ It is more likely that *οἱ παῖδες* in the introductory text of Athen. 15.676e are meant to be taken as the subjects, not the speakers of these verses.

³¹¹ Dropping a lambda from the verb fixes the meter while allowing a gnomic aorist to pick up the present-tense verb *ἐτοιμάζουσιν*.

³¹² The proclamation of religious silence is also the subject of S. F 893 (cf. E. *Hec.* 530, *IA* 1564, Ar. *Th.* 295); for heralding by means of crowns see also E. *Tr.* 223. For *εὐχαῖς... δαιμόνων* cf. Pl. *Phdr.* 244e, *θεῶν εὐχάς*.

Yet not all the details of Chaeremon’s vignette can be as old as the story itself, and some indeed reflect later attitudes. Another fragment, whose ascription names only the poet but whose form and content point to this play in particular,³¹⁵ reads thus (F 14b):

<i>Χρὴ τιμᾶν θ[]–...</i>	2
<i>Ἀρχὴ γὰρ θνητ[οῖς]</i>	
<i>Ἰμείρου πάση[ς]</i>	
<i>Ῥώμην τιμᾶμεν μ[]</i>	5
<i>Ἥθος ἔχειν ὄσιον ζῆ[]</i>	
<i>Μὴ πᾶν κέρδος ὄρα []</i>	
<i>[..]γ[.]·κιαν σαυτ[]</i>	
. . .	

Although the lacunae preclude a continuous translation, several themes especially familiar from the works of Classical Athens are recognizable here: for example, that purity of spirit ought to be honored alongside physical strength, and that *κέρδος* was a matter of scorn. Thus one can argue that Chaeremon exploited a traditional myth to strike a didactic tone,³¹⁶ but that marginalizes the consideration he had to give to his audience. By suggesting that the training given to epic heroes hardly differed from contemporary *paideia*, the dramatist encouraged eager Athenian youths to identify all the more closely with Achilles and philosophizing Athenian tutors with his master Chiron.

The foregoing extended investigation of two satyr-plays featuring Chiron and his entourage sprang from the argument that Achilles’ time with the wise Centaur was

³¹³ *Il.* 11.831f. casually refers to Achilles’ medical residency with Chiron; sch. *Il.* 22.391b reports that Chiron taught music to both Achilles (besides whom only “Paris sings in Homer”) and Orpheus, whereas sch. *Pi. Nem.* 3.75 insists on attributing to Homer the view that Achilles learned only medicine from Chiron.

³¹⁴ Cf. again *E. IA* 919-27 (in the hero’s own words).

³¹⁵ As Snell 1971: 167 argues, the fact that the fragment consists of hexameters coheres with ancient reports about the polymetric nature of *Kentauros*, and it contains just the sort of moral direction that would suit the voice of Chiron (cf. the Hesiodic work known as *Χίρωνος ὑποθήκαι*, on which see Friedländer 1913).

³¹⁶ The passage as a whole begs to be excerpted (the acrostic, which would hardly have been apparent during the performance of the play, ensuring that its author would not be forgotten), and indeed it is preserved in a Hellenistic anthology (*P.Hib.* II 224).

described in the *Cypria* around the time of Achilles' recruitment to war; it was further argued that Sophocles seized upon this passage as the framework for his *Lovers of Achilles*. Chaeremon's *Centaur* may likewise have combined the stories of Achilles' upbringing and his recruitment, but there is no solid evidence for this. The play's title would suggest that it was more narrowly focused on the world of Chiron, not on the Trojan War, and that it was set entirely on Pelion, without an accompanying scene in Phthia such as Sophocles' play had. On the other hand, the two quotations by Athenaeus might derive from an exchange in which Chiron or a servant informs a visitor (a herald of Menelaus?) that "the boys" are out of the cave or otherwise occupied at the moment. What else could propel a drama highlighting the relationship between Achilles and Chiron? What else besides what has been proposed for the *Cypria*, namely Achilles' coming of age in wartime?

2.8. The Madness of Odysseus

καὶ μαίνεσθαι προσποιησάμενον Ὀδυσσεῖα ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ θέλειν συστρατεύεσθαι ἐφώρασαν, Παλαμήδους ὑποθεμένου τὸν υἱὸν Τηλέμαχον ἐπὶ κόλασιν³¹⁷ ἐξαρπάσαντες. (Arg. 5b W.)

And by snatching up his son Telemachus for chastisement on Palamedes' suggestion, they [sc. Menelaus and probably Nestor and Agamemnon] detected Odysseus pretending to be insane because he did not wish to join the expedition.

This story, treated in Sophocles' *Odysseus Mainomenos* ("Odysseus Gone Mad"), initiates the fatal enmity between Palamedes and Odysseus. The later phase of the story,

³¹⁷ Welcker's *κόλουσιν* ("docking") does not appear in his work of 1839-41 (p. 100) but is an emendation that he devised later and translated as "Verstümmelung" ("mutilation") in Welcker 1882: 99. It is accepted by *TrGF* iv p. 378, but Proclus does not normally use such flowery language (this term is primarily horticultural). If Welcker is right, then, Proclus may have been influenced by the appearance of some form of *κολούειν* in the *Cypria*; but it is better to accept the text of the codices as sound and to allow some careless slippage in the clarity of Proclus' relation of events (i.e., the text implies that some sort of "punishment" or "correction" was aimed at Telemachus, whereas in fact he was being threatened or inflicted with injury only to elicit a particular reaction from his father).

comprising Odysseus' revenge and its aftermath, seems to have enjoyed wider appeal among the tragedians of the fifth century (see below).

As suggested above, the *Cypria* probably included, by way of providing background information to the recruitment scenes, the story of the oaths sworn by Helen's suitors. Although no such oaths are ever mentioned by Homer, they help explain how the Atreidai were able to rally such a large force, and they also make any failure to defend Menelaus' claim on Helen appear all the more disgraceful, as an act of perjury (e.g., Odysseus, having sworn to uphold the eventual marriage, would now be reneging on his sacred promise).³¹⁸ On the other hand, the first part of *Epit.* 3.7 simply refers to heroes being eager to join in a just cause.

According to E. *IA* 57, the idea for how to safeguard Helen's marriage simply came to Tyndareus. It is possible that in the *Cypria* and *Odysseus Mainomenos*, or perhaps only in the latter, Odysseus was portrayed as the architect of the oath, as the one who suggested the whole stratagem to Tyndareus. According to Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.10.9, Odysseus had forsaken his interest in Helen and instead set his sights on Penelope,³¹⁹ whom he apparently needed Tyndareus' help to secure (hence the favor regarding Helen). This factor in the story certainly enhances the irony of Odysseus' aporetic situation when the Atreidai come to draft him. And while Euripides does not cultivate a role for Odysseus in committing all the suitors, himself included, to the eventual Trojan War, he does use language suggestive of the insidious nature of the oath as it concerns these

³¹⁸ Gantz 1993: 565 suggests that Odysseus' pretended madness presupposes his being obligated to defend Menelaus' marriage. Otherwise, the subterfuge would be aimed purely at avoiding the charge of cowardice.

³¹⁹ Cf. already [Hes.] fr. 196.23-7 M-W, where Odysseus realizes that Menelaus is the shoo-in to win Helen. Note that Odysseus could not forsake his status as an erstwhile suitor of Helen: he still had to swear the oath that he devised.

heroes: when they swear, they are said to “curse” (*ἐπαράσασθαι*, *IA* 60).³²⁰ This curse targets on one level the man who would violate Menelaus’ right to Helen and on a deeper level the suitors themselves, who are damned should they refuse to contribute aid (*ξυναμυνεῖν*, 62) to Menelaus but also, in the event, doomed to endure many unanticipated hardships in order to make good on their vows.³²¹ Sophocles’ play, following the *Cypria*, explores the particular situation of Odysseus and his vain efforts to extricate himself from this quagmire.

But how can such a timorous Odysseus be the same hero who checked the Achaean mutiny at *Il.* 2.185-335? Why did the shameful prospect of surrendering Helen to the Trojans motivate him later (*ibid.* 176f.) whereas it had made no impression on him initially? If one wished to reconcile this passage with the reluctance that Odysseus displayed in the *Cypria*, one might say that his *mētis*, since it belonged to his very nature (cf. *ibid.* 169), had to be exercised at all times: thus his attempt to wriggle out of the war to help himself and his later determination to overcome the rest of the flagging army through the force of his words and intellect (and corporal punishment) would form two sides of the same coin. Alternatively, one might say that the hero’s sense of destiny inspired him, once resigned to his mission, to see it through to its end. In Hyginus’ version (to be examined presently), Odysseus receives an oracular response foretelling a 20-year absence from home full of hardships for himself and his followers. This mitigates substantially the apparent charge of cowardice (*δειλία*) that apologists like Aristarchus

³²⁰ Although LSJ s.v. translates this usage of the verb as “swear, vow” (cf. the similar use of the simple *ἄραομαι* with a future infinitive at *Il.* 23.144), I think it must convey some sense of imprecation, given the regular meaning of *ἄρα* in tragedy (LSJ s.v.).

³²¹ While oaths can be positive, having the power to stave off wickedness, it is worth recalling that in Hes. *Th.* 231f. *Ὀρκος* concludes the list of the children of Eris, and these also included *Πόνος*, *Μάχαι*, *ἄτη*, and—no help to Odysseus in his present dilemma—*Λήθη*.

and Eustathius so resented.³²² Moreover, it should not be forgotten that as soon as Odysseus had been enlisted, by all accounts he became for the Achaeans one of the most ardent prosecutors of the war (ardent even to a fault). At *Il.* 9.252-9 he speaks to Achilles as one who had visited Peleus' halls in the capacity of a recruiting officer, and this is confirmed by Nestor's words to Patroclus at 11.767ff.³²³ In another episode told slightly later in the *Cypria*, he aligns himself staunchly with Agamemnon, the prime mover of the expedition, against the petulant Achilles.³²⁴ But Odysseus' eager commitment to serve reaches its apex in the *Little Iliad*, and it is particularly difficult from that point on to fathom that the do-anything, go-anywhere Odysseus once feigned madness in a vain attempt to shirk his duty to uphold Helen's marriage at all costs. Nevertheless, Odysseus' initial draft-dodging cast an ignominious shadow over his later heroic exploits. It looms toward the end of the *Odyssey* (24.115-9), where Agamemnon recalls how he and his brother won Odysseus over "with effort" (*σπουδῆ*),³²⁵ and in tragedy at *A. Ag.* 841 and *S. Phil.* 1025.³²⁶

³²² See Severyns 1928: 145, 283f.

³²³ Alternatively, according to a Euripidean innovation, Odysseus et al. coaxed the young Achilles out of hiding on the island of Scyros. See *infra*, pp. ###. The whole conscription phase is beset by various ambiguities, with the Atreidai shifting in and out of focus as the managers of this monumental task. Curiously, Hera herself claims in the *Iliad* (4.26-8) to have worn herself out traveling far and wide to recruit Achaeans to join the cause of those wronged by Paris and the Trojans.

³²⁴ See §15 *infra* on this episode as told in Sophocles' *Syndeipnoi*. From the same playwright's *Αχαιῶν σύλλογος*, which is probably identical to *Syndeipnoi* (*TrGF* iv.163), comes a fragment (F 144) that may illustrate further how Odysseus suddenly dedicated himself to the war effort. If Welcker 111 is correct in his interpretation, here Odysseus instructs Agamemnon to call roll before the heroes are to discuss their plan of attack on the eve of their storming Troy's beaches: *σὺ δ' ἐν θρόνοισι γραμμάτων πτωχὰς ἔχων | νέμ' εἴ τις οὐ πάρεστιν ὃς ζηνώμοσεν*. If Sophocles produced this play after *Od. Mainomenos*, he may have expected his audience to identify a bit of ironic hypocrisy in Odysseus' casual reference to oaths (cf. Nestor at *Il.* 2.339). It is certainly stunning to find that Odysseus, soon after attempting to evade his duty, has sycophantically appointed himself Agamemnon's aide-de-camp.

³²⁵ The *Odyssey* reference stands out among passages that seem to show Homer's familiarity with the figure and exploits of Palamedes, even though there is no explicit mention of him here or anywhere (yet who but Palamedes could have outsmarted and coerced Odysseus?). Nevertheless, on the cumulative basis of these passages Sommerstein (*SFP* 2012: 112 n. 4, following Kullmann 1960) supposes that the Homeric epics deliberately suppressed the whole sordid cycle of myths revolving around Palamedes. But of course there

In this last instance Sophocles has Philoctetes berate Odysseus for not sailing with the expedition against Troy until he was “yoked” (*ζυγείς*) into doing so by the Atreidai (cf. *ζευχθείς* at *A. Ag.* 842). This reluctance contrasts both with Philoctetes’ own “willing” (*έκόντα*, 1027) participation and with the purported allegiance to the Atreidai that Odysseus now seemingly cowers behind in order to downplay his own responsibility vis-à-vis Philoctetes. The image of literal subjugation strongly suggests that Sophocles had in mind here, and also staged in his *Od. Mainomenos*, the particular motif whereby Odysseus acted out his madness by plowing his fields with two different beasts of burden yoked together as his team.³²⁷ This motif may in fact originate with Sophocles (especially

are many reasons for regarding *Od.* Book 24 as a later addition to the rest of the poem, so it remains quite unclear just how early the traditions about Palamedes were incorporated into the mainstream epic tradition.³²⁶ In the latter play Schein 2013: 132 (72-3n.) detects another allusion to the feigned madness episode where Odysseus points out that in contrast to him Neoptolemus has not sailed *έξ ανάγκης* (73), but this phrase could be merely tautologous with the preceding, *ένορκος ούδενί* (72), which alludes to the Oath of Tyndareus (cf. sch. *ad loc.*). It hardly behooves Odysseus to recall his own attempt to shirk his duty, especially in a play in which he ruthlessly enforces the duties of others. Since the point of his argument is that Neoptolemus as a newcomer (*οὔτε τοῦ πρώτου στόλου*, 73) lacks complicity in Philoctetes’ earlier maltreatment—a full account of which Odysseus self-servingly refrains from giving (cf. his cutting short the history lesson at v. 11 and his failure to explain after 46f. why he was most odious to Philoctetes)—and can therefore approach him safely and earn his trust (cf. *όμιλία...πιστή και βέβαιος*, 70f.), there is no logical need to recall the Oath either (except inasmuch as the unpledged Neoptolemus is freer to renounce his role in the war, as he will convince Philoctetes he has done; at 346f., however, Neoptolemus does relate the claim that it is *θέμις* that he should sack Troy, which the false merchant corroborates at 561ff. by alleging that the Achaeans are now pursuing Neoptolemus). But Odysseus (not to mention Sophocles) cannot resist doing so because the themes of duty and necessity weigh heavily on the dramatic situation (cf. *infra* ###). Additionally, he signals that he is after all fulfilling (however reluctantly) the requirements of his oath in order to forestall any claims that his dragooning of Philoctetes is hypocritical. Although it is possible that Sophocles wishes his audience to take *έξ ανάγκης* as an *inadvertent* allusion to Odysseus’ madness, it is more likely that he is allowing Odysseus to make a ploy for sympathy: in effect jockeying with the play’s miserable protagonist, he portrays himself as the Achaeans’ put-upon agent of necessity who derives no personal satisfaction from and indeed incurs resentment for what he does; he thus counters the prevailing image of himself as an opportunistic lackey. To recall the Oath alone better serves this gambit.

³²⁷ When *ζευγνύναι* is used metaphorically, it normally refers to wedlock (*S. Tr.* 536, *F* 583.11 [from *Tereus*], *E. Alc.* 996, etc.), but in poetry and especially tragedy it also appears in expressions of necessity (*Pi. Nem.* 7.6, *A. Ch.* 795, *E. Supp.* 220, and, in connection to oaths, *ibid.* 1229 and *Med.* 735; cf. *S. Aj.* 123, *ἄτη συγκατέζευκται κακῇ*). The full verse from *Philoctetes* is *καίτοι σὺ μὲν κλοπῇ τε κἀνάγκῃ ζυγείς*, which partakes of the rhetoric of obligation while coaxing double meaning out of *ζυγείς* (\approx *zeugma*: “having been mastered by [another’s] deception and in the yoke of compulsion”; for this meaning of *κλοπή* cf. *E. HF* 100). Notwithstanding the evidence that he is drawing on an established idiom, here Sophocles (rather than simply writing *ἀναγκασθείς*, as in the scholiast’s paraphrase *ad loc.*) selects an image that is particularly apposite given that Odysseus’ own attempt at deception had hinged on yoking a mismatched team, and the playwright was probably fully aware of this resonance. Philoctetes’ insult may also be

if this play was performed prior to the *Oresteia* in 458 B.C., which would have allowed Aeschylus to borrow the yoking motif at *Ag.* 842). In any case, it does not seem to have formed part of the *Cypria* episode: all we learn from *Epit.* 3.7 is that Palamedes drew his sword to threaten Telemachus, whom he had personally snatched from Penelope's bosom; and the fact that Proclus also speaks of the recruiters as "snatching up" (ἐξαρπάσαντες) the child increases the likelihood that *Epit.* 3.7 reflects the *Cypria*'s version of the story.³²⁸ By contrast, Hyginus (*Fab.* 95) may be a witness to the story as told by Sophocles. Here Odysseus, having received the odious oracle,³²⁹ stages a bizarre scene to substantiate his pretense of insanity: he dons a felt cap³³⁰ and drives his plow with the combination of an ox and a horse. Not to be outdone, Palamedes cleverly casts Telemachus (whom he need not have ripped away from his mother) in the path of Odysseus' plow and, thus preying upon Odysseus' paternal instincts, compels him to come clean.³³¹ Hyginus also paraphrases an appeal by Palamedes that references a cadre of pledges, surely in reference to the oaths taken around Helen's betrothal. He

informing us that (per Sophocles' interpretation of the story) Odysseus, having been forced to confess his sanity, still resisted and had to be reminded of the oath he had sworn.

³²⁸ So Severyns 1928: 284. On the other hand, Lucian (*De Domo* 30) describes a painting in which the act of plowing is combined with Palamedes' drawing of his sword against Telemachus. Euphranor depicted Odysseus' preposterous team yoked to a chariot (Pliny *NH* 35.129). Cf. the more famous baby-snatching episode in Euripides' *Telephus*, on which see *infra*, pp. ###. As it would have been maladroit for the *Cypria* to incorporate two baby-snatching stories without differentiating them, one must consider the possibility that the motif of Telemachus placed in the plow's path goes back to the epic. This possibility is noted e.g. by Schein 2013: 275 (*S. Phil.* 1025-8n.). But Sophocles' play remains the likelier source for Hyg. *Fab.* 95.

³²⁹ A recounting of this prophecy would make for a suitable dramatic prologue. Odysseus, however, need not have reported the prophecy himself; someone else might have cited it as the cause of his madness, which condition he could thus evince from his first appearance on stage. As expected, Odysseus cannot evade his fate, and by catching him out Palamedes serves as the divine oracle's human agent.

³³⁰ Apparently a commonplace in spurious displays of madness; cf. the *πλίδιον* that Solon supposedly sported when he staged such a spectacle (Plut. *Sol.* 8).

³³¹ Presumably this followed an initial round of interrogation through which Palamedes determined that Odysseus was faking his ailment. Sch. *S. Phil.* 1025 describes the trial as *ἐλεγχος*, which could entail cross-examination as well as other means of refutation. Odysseus responded in kind to Palamedes, putting his innocence to the test through complex *ἐλεγχος* that culminated in the discovery of physical evidence (cf. *Pi. fr.* 260 Snell-Maehler, quoted *infra* n. ##).

admonishes Odysseus, *inter coniuratos veni!* All this could very well indicate the general outlines of Sophocles' play. Odysseus' incongruous apparel, which may be only partially recorded by the mythographer, is indeed odd, and it is reminiscent of the beggar's clothes that Euripides was so fond of giving to his characters, especially Odysseus. However, one must be wary of jumping to the conclusion that *Od. Mainomenos* was a satyr-play or "fourth-place" play. After all, this grave episode instigated the enmity between Odysseus and Palamedes which led to the latter's tragic death.

Only one substantial fragment is preserved from this play (F 462):

πάντ' οἶσθα, πάντ' ἔλεξα τάντεταλμένα·
μῦθος γὰρ Ἀργολιστί συντέμνει βραχύς

You know all the commands—I spoke them all;
For a speech [delivered] in Argive fashion, though brief, cuts to the chase.

For an Athenian audience, the contemporary irony of *Ἀργολιστί* would be maximized if these lines were spoken by Menelaus, the king of Sparta.³³² We may prefer instead to assign them to Agamemnon, whose domain Argos was.³³³ At any rate, Agamemnon probably was a character in the play: in keeping with Hyginus 95, *Od.* 24.115-19, and the inclusion of both Atreidai in Sophocles' *Ajax*, for example, it is reasonable to assume that the two brothers were also included together as characters in *Od. Mainomenos*. Proclus' argument implies that in the *Cypria* Nestor, after being visited by Menelaus, went with him to rally the other leaders; and at this stage there is no mention of Agamemnon, who can be imagined to have engaged himself in other preparations for war while his brother

³³² The quotation comes from sch. (*BD*) Pi. *Isth.* 6.87a, which explains that Ionians are *μακρόλογοι* in contrast to both Laconians and Argives, who are *σύντομοι*. Menelaus' predilection for laconic speech is found already in Homer, *Il.* 3.214.

³³³ Welcker 101. A third, more remote possibility is that the lines belong to two separate speakers, with *γάρ* used by the latter (Odysseus?) to indicate justified assent (*GP*² 73).

pleaded his own case all over Greece. But Proclus may simply have omitted Agamemnon's name here since his role was at this stage ancillary to his brother's motives.³³⁴ On the other hand, it is unlikely that Sophocles would have kept or introduced Nestor, too, and thus crowded his play with a fourth character in the role of recruiter. Playwrights generally would have felt freer than the Cyclic poets to ignore Homeric passages such as those that make Nestor a participant in the action of recruitment.³³⁵ If the fragment about Argive speech does revolve around the figure of Agamemnon, it may play on Agamemnon's relative reticence in the *Iliad*.³³⁶

Welcker reasons from Accius' version of the *Hoplōn Crisis*, presumably represented in a fragment at Cic. *Off.* 3.26, that the story of Palamedes outsmarting Odysseus as the latter feigned insanity took for granted the story of the vow taken earlier by Odysseus and others to defend the sanctity of Helen's marriage. In fact, Hyginus' summary, as a witness to Sophocles' play, also points to this plot element with its use of *coniuratos*. Did this go all the way back to the *Cypria*?

The tragic tone of this play would have derived from the prophetic understanding of the anguish that Odysseus and the other Greeks would suffer during and after the Trojan War. Great dramatic tension is achievable at the moment Palamedes thrusts Telemachus before the plow's furrow, which was presumably staged rather than reported. Even knowing that Sophocles would not dare kill off Telemachus, spectators would have

³³⁴ Cf. Dio Chrys. 7.95 and E. *IA* 77-9. The actual visitations by Menelaus and his ever-increasing cohort may have followed an initial policy of mass delegations; at least this is the impression given by the mention of heralds at *Epit.* 3.6.

³³⁵ Incidentally, when Nestor was hosting Menelaus in the *Cypria*, one of the stories he told by way of the literary *παρέκβασις* was "the madness of Heracles" (arg. 4b) in the grip of which he murdered his children by Megara (cf. West 99). The same language used to describe this genuine fit of insanity would naturally lend itself to the subsequent description of Odysseus' pretended insanity, and similarly Sophocles' *Odysseus Mainomenos* must have overlapped not only thematically but also linguistically with E. *HF* and S. *Aj*. Cf. Harries 1891.

³³⁶ Cf. Kyriakou 2001: 254 n. 10.

felt the suspense of this moment if they were able to identify with the characters around Palamedes who, being less perspicacious than he, displayed their shock and horror at his cavalier endangerment of the child.

Levying the army that would sack Troy, then, was no small task. It need not have taken a decade as the Homeric scholia suggest in a moment of special pleading (sch. AbT II. 24.765), but by narrating the recruitment of Achilles and especially the contentious sequel on Ithaca, the *Cypria* could provide an adequate sense of the magnitude of the undertaking. Tragedy in turn recreated and sharpened these episodes against a backdrop of heightened urgency and tension and with an emphasis on the impending doom that the recruited heroes faced individually and collectively.³³⁷

2.9. The First Gathering at Aulis

καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα συνελθόντες εἰς Ἀυλίδα θύουσι. καὶ τὰ περὶ τὸν δράκοντα καὶ τοὺς στρουθοὺς γενόμενα δείκνυται, καὶ Κάλχας περὶ τῶν ἀποβησομένων προλέγει αὐτοῖς. (Arg. 6 W.)

And after that they gather in Aulis and perform sacrifices. And the events involving the serpent and the sparrows are revealed, and Calchas prophesies to them concerning the events to come.

The *Cypria* poet describes two separate gatherings of the Achaeans at Aulis, where they were twice poised to launch their attack on Troy, and distributes between them the events traditionally recited as having occurred there. The Teuthranian excursion that follows the first gathering leads to the need for the second, and the result is somewhat inelegant. But the inconcinnity was justified because it allowed the story of Telephus and his healing to

³³⁷ This reflects the standard process defining the tragic adaptation of epic themes, which Pallantza 2005: 308 describes thus: “Die tragischen Dichter integrieren die epischen Motive in ihre Werke und passen sie dabei an das von Oppositionen geprägte, spezifisch tragische System an, so daß dieselben Konfliktsituationen in noch deutlicher polarisierter Form—im Vergleich etwa zum homerischen Epos—auftreten und gerade als solche problematisiert werden.” The qualification “*noch* deutlicher polarisierter” is well taken, for it would be unfair to assert that the many conflicts of the Trojan War were not already clearly delineated in epic poetry.

be integrated into the main narrative of the Trojan War. Tragedians were able within the narrower scope of their plays to gloss over the Cycle's repetitiveness. At any rate, the *Cypria* sensibly assigns Calchas' augury to the first gathering, so that the war's ten-year clock begins to tick from this point.

Did the *second* gathering at Aulis also involve an omen in the *Cypria*? See A. *Ag.* 258ff., where the Chorus recalls the events at Aulis (two gatherings reduced (back?) to one) but describes an omen and prophetic interpretation by Calchas that are distinct from the matter of the serpent and the sparrows. Aeschylus describes an omen that foreshadowed not the duration of the war (note well that *στρουθῶν* in *Ag.* 145 is regarded as an interpolation by LSJ) but the sacrifice of Iphigenia. In addition, Aeschylus subtracts Agamemnon's moment of *hybris*, saying nothing of his boast to outstrip Artemis in war, so that he can better dramatize the conundrum in which the king is caught: in order to avenge another's crime (Paris' theft of Helen), he must himself commit a crime, for Artemis demands, now arbitrarily, the sacrifice of his daughter.

2.10. Telephus

*ἔπειτα ἀναχθέντες Τευθρανία προσίσχουσι, καὶ ταύτην ὡς Ἴλιον ἐπόρθουν.
Τήλεφος δὲ ἐκβοηθεῖ, Θέρσανδρόν τε τὸν Πολυνείκους κτείνει καὶ αὐτὸς
ὕπὸ Ἀχιλλέως τιτρώσκεται. ἀποπλέουσι δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῆς Μυσίας χειμῶν
ἐπιπίπτει καὶ διασκεδάσσονται.... ἔπειτα Τήλεφον κατὰ μαντείαν
παραγενόμενον εἰς Ἄργος ἰᾶται Ἀχιλλεὺς ὡς ἠγεμόνα γενησόμενον τοῦ ἐπ'
Ἴλιον πλοῦ. (Arg. 7a-b, d W.)*

Then after setting sail they reach Teuthrania, and this land they ravaged as if it was Ilium. And Telephus comes to the rescue, and he kills Thersander the son of Polyneices and is himself wounded by Achilles. And as they are sailing away from Mysia a storm befalls them and scatters them.... Then Achilles heals Telephus, who comes to Argos in accordance with an oracle, on the understanding that he will serve as guide for the voyage to Troy.

All three major tragedians treated the story of Telephus, the Greek-born son of Heracles who became ruler of Mysia. His involvement in the Trojan saga arises from the Achaean army's errant landing in his realm Teuthrania,³³⁸ which they mistake for Troy and begin to ravage, but more fundamentally Telephus is to play a crucial role by guiding the Greeks to their true destination.³³⁹ (In deference to *Iliad* 1.71f., however, the mythological tradition, perhaps going all the way back to the *Cypria*, somewhat awkwardly preserves a leading role for Calchas by having the seer formally put his faith in Telephus' directions, as *Epit.* 3.20 records.)

The story's initial conflict, in which Achilles wounds Telephus, serves largely as the background to the dramatic retellings (unless Sophocles' *Mysians* pertains to the invasion itself). The tragedians focus instead on Telephus' subsequent visit to Argos as he strives to be healed by the one who harmed him in accordance with the revelation of an oracle of Apollo. The best known of the relevant tragedies is unsurprisingly that by Euripides, which survives in a variety of fragments as well as in reminiscences of Aristophanes, especially in his *Acharnians*. An earlier version by Aeschylus, however, laid the dramatic groundwork for the central *ἰκεσία* scene, if one accepts the testimony of sch. *Ach.* 332 at face value:

ψίαθον ἀνθράκων προενήνοχεν, ὃν φασὶ παῖδα εἶναι τῶν Ἀχαρνέων πάνυ
 κωμικώτατα. τὰ δὲ μεγάλα πάθη ὑποπαίζει τῆς τραγωδίας, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ Τήλεφος κατὰ
 τὸν τραγωδοποιὸν Αἰσχύλον, ἵνα τύχη παρὰ τοῖς Ἑλλησι σωτηρίας, τὸν Ὀρέστην
 εἶχε συλλαβόν. παραπλήσιον δέ τι καὶ ἐν ταῖς Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις ἐποίησεν. ὁ γὰρ

³³⁸ This cannot have been an error in navigation (Palamedes' expertise would have precluded that, S. F 432.10f.); the Achaeans simply chose the wrong directional heading, thinking Troy was elsewhere than it was. Had Paris lied to his host Menelaus about the location of his homeland? Had Calchas somehow been deficient in his duties as seer?

³³⁹ West 2011: 43f. argues that the story originated outside of the Trojan War myth as part of a Achilles cycle developed in Lesbos. The Procrustean insertion of the Teuthranian expedition strikes West 106 as particularly "silly" in its narrative consequences (i.e., the entire conceit of two distinct Achaean sailings).

Εὐριπίδου κηδεστής Μνησίλοχος ἐπιβουλεύόμενος παρὰ τῶν γυναικῶν, ἀσκὸν ἀρπάσας παρὰ τινος γυναικὸς ὡς ἂν παιδίον ἀποκτεῖναι βούλεται.

He has brought forth a rush-mat of charcoals, which they say in an altogether very comic fashion is the child of the Acharnians. And he is playing on the great sufferings of tragedy, since Telephus too in the tragedian Aeschylus, in order that he may obtain salvation from among the Greeks, grabbing Orestes held him. And he did something approximate also in his *Thesmophoriazusae*. For Mnesilochus the father-in-law of Euripides being plotted against by the women, having seized a wine-skin from some woman means to kill it, as if it were a child.

Thus Telephus' seizure of Orestes as a means of coercing Agamemnon should go back to Aeschylus,³⁴⁰ and some have argued that this can be corroborated by the evidence of vase painting. In particular, among the several red-figure scenes depicting a suppliant Telephus, a single pelike falling early in the series shows the hero clutching Agamemnon's son in a moment of relative repose, as opposed to the rest of the scenes in which he wields his sword menacingly at Orestes as the surrounding figures react to the violence.³⁴¹ Some scholars believe that this scene reflects the staging of the episode by Aeschylus. In addition, it has commonly been supposed that it reflects a contemporary event in the history of Aeschylus' Athens, namely Themistocles' entreaty of the Molossian king Admetus as recounted by Thucydides (1.136).

It is, however, just possible that the vase painting, which is traditionally dated ca. 450 B.C., derives instead from Euripides' infamous staging of the story, which is known to have been produced in 438 B.C. Although no violence is immediately displayed on the "Aeschylean" pelike, there appears to be a definite *threat* of violence, for Telephus wears a baldric that the painter has drawn so deliberately as to betray and highlight for viewers the sword that must be hidden under the suppliant's rags. Another vase, dated before 470

³⁴⁰ That it was contained even in the *Cypria* (so Welcker 1824: 562; et al.) is unlikely.

³⁴¹ London E 382, as interpreted by Csapo 1990: 44ff., with whose arguments Preiser 2000: 51-9 agrees.

B.C. and signed by Hieron,³⁴² shows Telephus at an altar with no sign of Orestes. This has been taken to represent the version of the story current before Aeschylus (i.e., that of the *Cypria*), but it may well be a reaction to the first tragic instantiation. It is also conceivable that there were (in that play) two supplications by Telephus, one without Orestes and another, when the first failed, with the hostage. But what vase-painter would opt to show the less interesting earlier supplication if the same play or text contained the hostage scene? As for Themistocles, we should not make too much of the putative historical relevance of a putative play by Aeschylus. Even some ancient critics are staunchly skeptical that Greek tragedians were in the habit of embedding historical allusions in the mythological landscape of their plays, as if they were not content to leave it to Attic comedy to forge those connections.³⁴³ And the political and topical dimensions that appear prominent in Euripides may not be so pronounced in the works of Aeschylus, excluding the *Persians*. It is more likely, assuming there is any truth to the story about Themistocles, that it was he who got the idea to hold his host's son hostage from legends like the one concerning Telephus.

The *Epitome* (3.20) specifies the nature of the treatment administered by Achilles: Telephus “is treated, with Achilles shaving off the rust of the Pelian ash-spear”

³⁴² Boston MFA 98.931 = *ARV*² 817.

³⁴³ E.g., sch. Ar. *Eq.* 84b, referring to S. F 178: *τινὲς δὲ φασιν* [witness Sud. v 539] *ὅτι Σοφοκλῆς περὶ Θειμιστοκλέους τοῦτο φησι, ψεύδονται δέ· οὐ γὰρ ἔστι πιθανόν*. On the other hand, more and more scholarly attention has been given to the oblique representation of social and political life in Greek drama (including tragedy), a genre that “pretends to know only the traditional language and themes of its birth” (Dobrev 2001: 4). Although caution should be exercised in identifying contemporary allusions in tragic passages, occasionally the context points undeniably in that direction, such as when Sicily and Carthage are mentioned in a “dramatically inappropriate” way at E. *Tro.* 220-22 (produced just when Athens’ Sicilian Expedition was the talk of the town) or when Sparta comes in for unrestrained disparagement in *Supplices* and *Andromache* (Lee 1997: 102). But a tragedian’s demonstrating broad awareness of political issues is of course very different from making pointed references to contemporary personages.

(θεραπεύεται ἀποζύσαντος Ἀχιλλέως τῆς Πηλιάδος μελίας τὸν ἰόν).³⁴⁴ Often the *Epitome* runs close to the Epic Cycle, but since this account seems influenced by Euripides' play insofar as it asserts that Telephus came "dressed in rags" (τρύχεσιν ἠμφιεσμένος),³⁴⁵ it is probable that its description of the healing is similarly influenced.³⁴⁶ Preiser suspects that whereas the *Cypria* omitted any description of specialized medicine and simply reminded that Achilles had received medical training from Chiron, tragedy—probably Euripides—enlivened the story such that not only was the agent of the cure identical to the one who had inflicted the wound but even the weapon formerly used was now to be the healing tool.³⁴⁷ Odysseus was therefore needed to elucidate the exact meaning of Apollo's oracle (cf. Proclus' *κατὰ μαντείαν*), which according to the *Epitome* had promised Telephus "that he would obtain treatment at that time when the one having wounded becomes

³⁴⁴ Cf. Plin. *NH* 25.42.1 (note *gladio* used where we might have expected *pilo*), 34.152.1 and Preiser 2001: 281.

³⁴⁵ West 108; cf. Preiser 2001: 284, "Meines Erachtens steht Apollodor zwar im wesentlichen in der Tradition der *Kyprien*, ist aber in bestimmten Einzelheiten unzweifelhaft der euripideischen Mythopoiia verpflichtet." Euripidean influence on Hyginus is much more consistently detectable, and his synopsis of the Telephus myth (*Fab.* 101) follows this pattern. Hyginus also adds a second oracle, given to the Achaeans, stipulating that in order to sack Troy they needed to secure Telephus' aid (a reference to his eventual service in showing them the way there; this oracle, not the snatching of Orestes, may well have clinched success for Telephus). Meanwhile this mythographer's version of the oracle delivered to Telephus errs in giving too much away before Odysseus solves its meaning (*responsum est ei neminem mederi posse nisi eandem hastam qua vulneratus est*; but later: *tunc Ulixes ait, "Non te [sc., Achilles] dicit Apollo sed auctorem vulneris hastam nominat,"* as if *auctorem vulneris* had stood in place of *hastam* above).

³⁴⁶ The same summary (3.17) also says that Telephus "while being pursued, having gotten entangled in a vine-branch is wounded in his thigh by [Achilles'] spear" (διωκόμενος ἐμπλακεῖς εἰς ἀμπέλου κλήμα τὸν μηρὸν τιτρώσκειται δόρατι). Preiser 2001: 285 n. 30 reserves judgment as to whether this follows the battle narrative of the *Cypria* or is drawing from a passage of E. *Tel.* that recalled the earlier incident. Certainly any preexisting reference to Dionysus' plant would have been seized upon for the theater. If Euripides did include this detail in a retrospective passage, the description at Ar. *Ach.* 1178 of Lamachus' tripping and falling upon a vine-pole (χάραξ, but elevated to a δόρυ at 1193) could be a distorted parody thereof. But the Aristophanic element of the wine god's revenge cannot be traced backward to the story of Telephus, who despite the specific reference to a vine-branch in *Epit.* 3.17 is not said there to have outraged the wine god. This detail does emerge, however, in *P. Oxy.* II 214.1. Could the Aristophanic verse then be another allusion to Telephus in a play that has already parodied Euripides' tragic version of his story? Could Lamachus' lachrymose farewell at 1184f. perhaps come from Sophocles' rather mysterious *Mysians*?

³⁴⁷ Preiser 2001: 286. We can observe well here the pitfalls of working with fragments, as each scholar tends to assign a narrative innovation to whichever author serves the scholar's own argument. Thus Jouan 1966: 249 n. 2 gives credit to Euripides while one senses despite her cautious language that Aélion 1983: 40 n. 53 would prefer to award the credit to Aeschylus as Euripides' model.

healer” (τότε τεύξεσθαι θεραπείας ὅταν ὁ τρώσας ἰατρὸς γένηται). Jouan calls the spear-shavings motif “folklorique,”³⁴⁸ but it was also in touch with reality: metal—gold, at least—would have been known to Euripides’ Athenian audience as a purifying agent,³⁴⁹ even if rusty and metallic scourings were not yet a commonly prescribed form of treatment,³⁵⁰ so his account of Telephus’ healing—whether being his own reformulation or (less likely) a story borrowed from Aeschylus or from epic—hardly would have struck them as bizarre. That the scourings came from the Pelian ash-spear—the very implement that had caused the wound—only would have enhanced the verisimilitude for a public accustomed to the homoeopathic principle ὁ τρώσας ἰάσεται (“the one who has wounded will heal”).³⁵¹ Telephus’ healing was magic, but it was a familiar sort of magic.

The entire role of Telephus in the Trojan Cycle is predicated on a rather silly story in which the Achaeans, before ever reaching Troy, set sail and land in Teuthrania, mistaking the realm for their target. However, if the hero Achilles—as seems likely—was originally the subject of a separate body of traditional tales set in places south of Troy and including Teuthrania, then we can account for the absurdity of this earlier, abortive voyage across the Aegean. We may attribute the discordant effect on the narrative to the patchwork efforts of archaic poets working to integrate Achilles’ various exploits into the Trojan War saga. The *Iliad* manages to refer to many raids performed by Achilles (and to make the first nine years of the war seem at least somewhat eventful) without incurring any egregious implausibility. But it is silent on the Teuthrania episode, even though

³⁴⁸ Jouan 1966: 249 n. 2.

³⁴⁹ Parker 1983: 228.

³⁵⁰ Advanced by Pliny, as cited *supra* p. ## n. ##; cf. *NH* 34.100, 115, 152-3; also *Apd.* 1.9.12 for Melampus’ healing of Iphiclus by means of rust shaved off a sword. Despite Pliny’s insinuation of widespread use, however, the practice may have been most familiar to him from such stories, perhaps precisely from Euripides’ play; cf. Preiser 2001: 286.

³⁵¹ Note the bipolarity of a φάρμακον, and cf. Parker 1983: 233 on the “ambiguity of the sacred.” Some impure substances were thought to heal by absorbing pollution (*ibid.* 229).

Homer probably knew the story;³⁵² perhaps he regarded Teuthrania as too geographically remote to have been visited by Achilles during the actual siege of Troy. By contrast, the *Cypria*, given that it was an enterprise of comprehensive scope, had to accommodate Achilles' legendary wounding of Telephus, even at the expense of requiring the Achaean expedition to double back home afterwards (and to gather at Aulis not once but twice).³⁵³

2.11. Achilles on Scyros

Ἀχιλλεὺς δὲ Σκύρω προ<σ>σχῶν γαμεῖ τὴν Λυκομήδους θυγατέρα Δηϊδάμειαν.
(Arg. 7c W.)

And Achilles, putting in at Scyros, sleeps with³⁵⁴ Lycomedes' daughter Deidameia.

In the *Cypria* the present story interrupts the sequence of events involving Telephus, falling in between the Teuthranian expedition and the conference in Argos. But in fact Ancient sources offer essentially three different explanations for Achilles' visit to Scyros, where he slept with Deidameia, siring Neoptolemus: (1) he went with hostile purpose to subdue a resident population, which was subject to his father but had grown restive, and at the same time to levy auxiliary forces for the war;³⁵⁵ (2) a storm blew his ship to the

³⁵² It was told by Archilochus in the mid-seventh century (*POxy.* 4708).

³⁵³ Cf. West 2011: 43f.

³⁵⁴ For the use of *γαμεῖν* in extramarital contexts cf. *Od.* 1.36, *E. Tr.* 44. Cf. *infra* p. ## n. ##.

³⁵⁵ The inhabitants were called Dolopes, and Phoenix is said to have led them into battle as slingers. Two tragic fragments are attributed to Sophocles' *Dolopes*, which Welcker 140ff. believed to be equivalent to his *Phoenix*. Cf. *Il.* 9.483f., where Phoenix recalls how Peleus granted to him rule over the Dolopes, and *Pi. fr.* 183, which records how Phoenix's led a contingent of these people to Troy—apparently after Achilles had suppressed their revolt. Note that any Attic play produced after 475 B.C. and mentioning a legendary conquest of the Dolopes would have stirred patriotic memories of Cimon's own victory over those ancient inhabitants (*Thuc.* 1.98). *Pace* Fantuzzi 2012: 24 with n. 10, the allusion in *Il.* 9.667f. to Achilles' seizure of Scyros should probably not be taken to mean that Achilles plundered the island in the course of his raids throughout the Troad, for the locations are geographically distant and the attack on the Dolopes was retributive while plunder *per se* (and perhaps a sort of initiation rite: *ibid.* n. 11) motivated the other raids, which in the *Cypria* at least were quite removed chronologically from the Scyrian episode. But Fantuzzi, to be clear, is imagining a different, altogether lost epic; and it is conceivable that the *Cypria* poet has divided up a block of previously continuous epic material concerning Achilles. Moreover, sch. *A Il.* 9.668

island while he was heading home from the abortive assault on Teuthrania; (3) Peleus secreted him there, where he dressed and lived as a daughter of King Lycomedes, in a vain attempt to avert and forestall the oracular omen that Achilles must die at Troy. Explanation (1) is implicit in the *Iliad* and fleshed out by its scholia, while (2) comes from the *Cypria*, not normally a work willing to part company with Homer's authority. Equally remarkably, take (3) on this Trojan myth (and the one that would really stick) seems to have been concocted rather late by Euripides in a thoroughly revisionist spirit (though the story is built upon traditional Cyclic motifs, e.g. the pairing of Odysseus and Diomedes in an important special mission). The playwright allowed himself to have a bit of experimental fun with this episode, which clearly was perceived as relatively malleable, so long as certain fundamental points, chief among them the fact of Neoptolemus' conception, remained undisturbed. As a departure from the Cycle, Euripides' *Scyrians* is almost as bold as the invention of a phantom Helen and the real Helen's relocation to Egypt. But Euripides did not invent that story, whereas there is no good evidence that the idea of Achilles' transvestitism antedated Euripides' play. West says flatly that the story "comes from Euripides' *Skyrioi*,"³⁵⁶ but this needs validating.

Achilles has already had a taste of battle by the time he arrives on Scyros in the *Cypria*, and there is little chance of his adopting the guise of a maiden after having embraced his warrior status. It is indeed difficult to imagine any action that might have taken place in the epic so as to inspire the bold conceit at the heart of Euripides' reconfiguration of the myth. Nevertheless, one can imagine. Homer represents Achilles as

explicitly reads Homer's words as transmitting that Achilles "also" (*καί*) sacked Scyros "with the other cities" (*μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων*); yet the same comment asserts that Scyros was both an island in the Cyclades (untrue) and a city in Phrygia, which once had been Cilicia.

³⁵⁶ West 104, *contra* Severyns 1928: 285-91. Cf. Fantuzzi 2012: 21ff.; Welcker 102-7, 476f.

intermittently scornful of warfare—that glorious but fatal arena—whether because of wrath (*Il.* 9.356-416, with his thoughts turning at 393-400 toward the prospect of a choice marriage back home in Phthia) or out of morose regret nursed from beyond the grave (*Od.* 11.489-91). Did the *Cypria* relate that during his time on Scyros the hero contemplated an early resignation after falling in love with the princess Deidameia?³⁵⁷ Perhaps ever-anxious Thetis took the opportunity to urge her son to pursue passion over glory. While Euripides may have detected in the Cyclic episode some hints of the hero's psychological wavering, it remains unlikely that the *Cypria*'s Achilles ever actually defected or went into hiding: with the expedition in disarray, Odysseus was not available in the narrative to coax him into submission once again, and Achilles was needed straightaway for the subsequent episodes in Greece.³⁵⁸ At any rate the precise idea of youthful cross-dressing must have suggested itself to the playwright from elsewhere. Although not strictly impossible, another theory, that in the *Cypria* this post-Teuthranian stopover was actually Achilles' second visit to the island, embroidered as an opportunity for him to meet his son or learn that he had impregnated Deidameia, is highly implausible given that neither Proclus' summary of the epic nor any other version of the myth asserts two separate trips.³⁵⁹ *Little Iliad* fr. 4 W.—assuming it is not actually from the *Cypria*

³⁵⁷ Proclus' *γαμεῖ* evokes profound love but should probably be regarded as euphemistic (cf. next note but one).

³⁵⁸ In particular, the duration of Achilles' dalliance on Scyros is in theory constrained by the need to have him return to Argos by the time the wounded Telephus arrives there; he also plays a vital albeit passive role in the succeeding activity at Aulis.

³⁵⁹ This is nonetheless how Burgess 2001: 21 tries to reconcile the sources, but as Fantuzzi 2012: 26 n. 16 points out, Proclus explicitly says Achilles makes love to (*γαμεῖ*, as the writer bashfully puts it) Deidameia after the storm that strikes the roaming Achaean fleet forces him to land on Scyros, whereas sch. D *Il.* 19.326 (surely to be dissociated from the *Cypria* and consistent with Euripides' reformulation) says quite naturally that Achilles had already seduced Deidameia before he was forced out of hiding by Odysseus. (All that really matters for the sake of argument is that in this version Achilles impregnated Deidameia before he reached the point in his life when the *Cypria* says he landed on Scyros, and that clearly the two accounts as transmitted are incompatible. In other words, Burgess contradicts Proclus' testimony by imposing on the Cyclic framework the Euripidean timeline for the conception of Neoptolemus. And the

and has been misattributed³⁶⁰—shows that at least two Cyclic poems told basically the same story (one as a background to the fetching of Neoptolemus late in the war), and both situate Achilles’ (single) sojourn on Scyros immediately after the Teuthranian affair.³⁶¹ Therefore, in sch. D *Il.* 19.326, which tells a story essentially identical to Euripides’ *Scyrians*, the concluding citation *ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ τοῖς κυκλικοῖς*—assuming it is not using the adjective *κυκλικοί* simply to mean “inferior” or “secondary” poets (in which case Euripides could be the real referent)³⁶²—cannot refer to the whole of the scholium’s preceding narrative (which looks more like a hypothesis to Euripides’ play) but only to the immediately preceding mention of his seduction of Deidameia and siring

theory cannot really be salvaged, for deferring to the stated chronology of the *Cypria*, whereby Neoptolemus is conceived after the Teuthranian expedition, would simply render pointless the notion that this constituted a return to Scyros—that Achilles had spent time there once before. It would look like the poet had missed the opportunity presented already by Achilles’ initial time on Scyros to account for Neoptolemus’ origins). Proclus is known to pass over in silence major episodes included in the Cycle, but even so his neglect of a cross-dressing Achilles would stand out as shocking. If in the *Cypria* there were two sojourns on Scyros and Proclus was only going to mention one of them, surely he would have mentioned this earlier one, to which so much action is attached, and not the latter, which is comparatively dull. More fundamentally, the *Cypria* poet would have found it awkward to combine the two stories. The post-recruitment, post-Teuthranian landing noted by Proclus always had the advantage of echoing Homer, thus fulfilling a Cyclic impulse, but this advantage would have been instantly undermined through the assertion of an earlier stay on the island, for the poet would then have needed to alter the “Homeric” tale so that a more mature Achilles was not presented as taking up arms against his former hosts. On the other hand, Euripides was free to imagine, if he so wished, that subsequent to the plot of his *Scyrians* a storm (cf. the *Cypria*) or some other force or happenstance brought Achilles back for a brief reunion with the Scyrians.

³⁶⁰ The cursory nature of the fragment (the first of two lines reads *Πηλείδην δ’ Ἀχιλλῆα φέρε Σκῦρόνδε θύελλα*) stands in the way of reassignment.

³⁶¹ An epic fragment (adespoton) that reads *ἔπλεον εἰς Σκῦρον Δολοπηίδα* is sometimes assigned to the *Cypria* (fr. 40 Bernabé = *inc. sed.* 17 W.) and thus taken as a reference to Achilles’ raiding of the island in that poem. However, *ἔπλεον* (spoken by Achilles if first-person singular, in the poet’s voice if third-person plural) suggests a purposeful or leisurely trip rather than being driven by or fleeing from a tempest; the context of the quotation (sch. T *Il.* 9.668) in fact clarifies that the fragment pertains to that version of the myth in which Achilles assaulted Scyros to punish the rebellious Dolopes (cf. Fantuzzi 2012: 24). And even if we accept that the fragment belongs to the Epic Cycle, it is so vague on its own that it could in theory apply rather to Odysseus and Phoenix (or other accomplices) as subjects and relate to their mission to fetch Neoptolemus from Scyros in the *Little Iliad* (it is quoted in sch. T *Il.* 9.668 within a discussion of Achilles’ attack, but this could merely be aimed at illustrating the application of the epithet “Dolopian” to the island). Also conceivable is that the fragment derives from a later epic following Euripides’ tale, in which case the subject could be a crew dispatched on Peleus’ orders to hide Achilles on Scyros; or it could refer to an altogether unrelated voyage thither.

³⁶² Fantuzzi 2012: 25f. While *οἱ νεώτεροι* in Aristarchean terminology often extends beyond the Cyclic poets to the tragedians (while *οἱ τραγικοί* are specifically cited just once, in sch. TV *Il.* 22.63), *οἱ κυκλικοί* is normally more restrictive.

of Pyrrhus/Neoptolemus, after which Achilles promptly went off to fight (the mention of Peleus' death in the same sentence presents another oddity).³⁶³

On Scyros Odysseus exposes Achilles' fraud just as Palamedes had done to him. Euripides may well have had Achilles or another character point this out with scorn for Odysseus' shiftiness. At the same time, the paradigm for *Scyrians* may be adapted from or informed by the plot of *Odysseus Mainomenos*. Even if their relative chronology is indeterminable, it must nevertheless be borne in mind that the basic story of the latter play with its reluctant hero motif was entirely traditional. Euripides could have drawn from this and endowed his *Scyrians* with the complementary addition of another motif, namely that of Achilles *μυνηθάδιος* ("short-lived," *Il.* 1.352), which of course precipitates efforts by his distressed mother to forestall his fate.³⁶⁴

Polygnotus painted Achilles dressed as girl.³⁶⁵ In addition, a volute crater in Boston probably shows the departure of Achilles from Scyros.³⁶⁶ The central warrior, beardless and sporting long, curly hair,³⁶⁷ takes up his armor (perhaps the armor of

³⁶³ For a similarly loose attribution, cf. sch. (D) *Il.* 16.140 = *Cyp.* fr. 4 W., where *ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ τῶν τὰ Κύπρια ποιήσαντι* at the end of the comment must apply only to the earlier description of the bestowal of the Pelian ash-spear at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis and not to the interjected and immediately preceding comment that both Peleus and Achilles used this spear to great advantage during battles.

³⁶⁴ Thetis' protective treatment of Achilles is seen not only in the *Iliad* (e.g. 18.96) but also in her unsuccessful effort to prevent him from killing Apollo's son Tennes (*Epit.* 3.26), her successful warning that he not be the first to disembark at Troy (*Epit.* 3.29), and her advice to Achilles about his duel with Memnon (*Aethiopsis* Arg. 2b W.). There is also, of course, the dip in the river Styx (cf. the story, related in sch. *Apoll.* *Rhod.* 4.816 = S. F 150, of her submerging her other children by Peleus to determine (*γνώναι*) whether they were mortal.

³⁶⁵ See Fantuzzi 2012: v, 28, 30 n. 29, 37f.

³⁶⁶ MFA 33.56 = *ARI*² 600.12. Simon 1963: 57-9 argues for the mythological setting of Scyros.

³⁶⁷ As Fantuzzi 2012: 59 points out, Achilles' sensational blond hair earned him the nickname *Pyrrha* ("Goldilocks") among the virgins, according to later sources including *Hyg. Fab.* 96.1 (cf. *Suet. Tib.* 70.3 on the possibility of other nicknames; also note that the adjective *πορρός* covers a color spectrum from red to yellow and is applicable to egg yolks (*Hp. Mul.* 2.171) and lions (*E. HF* 361)). This name "Pyrrha" can go back only as far as the inventor of the cross-dressing story—Euripides, we maintain—and was obviously based on the tradition that Neoptolemus also went by *Pyrrhus* (e.g., in *Archil.* fr. 304). Although later in origin, however, the innovative detail gives the impression that *Pyrrhus* was named after his father. In a certain sense, this may be correct. Whoever first dubbed Achilles "Pyrrha," whether Euripides or a later author, probably knew that in the *Cypria* (fr. 19 = *Paus.* 10.26.4) *Lycomedes* was said to have given

Peleus, which he could have placed on Scyros just in case, or perhaps taken from the weapons that Odysseus planted to lure Achilles out of his feminine disguise).³⁶⁸ A young woman, presumably Deidameia, bids him farewell with a touch of his chin, a supplicatory gesture that here may also hint at the lovers' tryst. One of the onlookers is an old man who is easily taken to be King Lycomedes.

Euripides was surely conscious of how his *Scyrians* could appear to present a distinctly non-*Iliadic* Achilles. The play takes Homer's hero out of his martial element and places him in the antithetical world of love and female pursuits. The ancient Aristarchean school of criticism for its part derided the "Neoteric" emasculation and de-heroization of the hero who in Homer had led an armed raid against Scyros.³⁶⁹ Sophocles' *Lovers of Achilles* (see above) bore a similarly cheeky relationship with the *Iliad*. If there was polemical intent in these dramatic undertakings, then this is in line with contemporary philosophical interest in asserting the fundamental morality of love and passion.³⁷⁰ There may be other motives behind these tragic portraits of Achilles, however. After all, Euripides and Sophocles did not necessarily intend for the settings of these plays to feel anti-Homeric or even exotic. They may have wished rather to exploit the superficial differences between Homer's work and their own in order to promote a re-examination of Achilles as he appears in the *Iliad*: even there the hero was not merely a warrior through and through, and the tragedians may well have felt that they were simply emphasizing those facets of his character that Homer had explored subtly but that the

Neoptolemus his original name of Pyrrhus. Evidently the Scyrians preferred blond(e)s, or else the king wanted to make it clear that fair-haired Achilles (*Il.* 23.141, e.g.) was the father of his grandson.

³⁶⁸ See Jouan 1966: 218ff. on the arms of Achilles.

³⁶⁹ sch. T *Il.* 9.668, cf. Severyns 1928: 144.

³⁷⁰ Cf. Fantuzzi 2012: 2 on the connection between Socrates as lover and an erotic reinterpretation of the *Iliad*.

majority tended to underappreciate. Ultimately, however, both of these plays reinforced the basic point that Achilles' warrior status could *not* be suppressed even in the face of strong erotic impulses. And apart from the theme of personal cowardice, both plays afforded opportunities to present the tragic yet beautiful spectacle of protective loved ones fruitlessly clinging to their departing hero before finally saying farewell (an experience all too familiar to the citizens of a *polis* beleaguered by war).³⁷¹ So the agreement between Homer and the tragic poets concerning the portrayal of Achilles and his world turns out to overshadow the differences even when we analyze the most “unhomerical” plays.

Sophocles' *Scyrians* was almost certainly about the fetching of Neoptolemus, not of Achilles, from the island (see ch. 3 below, p. 212).

2.12. The Second Gathering at Aulis

καὶ τὸ δεύτερον ἠθροισμένου τοῦ στόλου ἐν Αὐλίδι Ἀγαμέμνων ἐπὶ θήρας βαλὼν ἔλαφον ὑπερβάλλειν ἔφησε καὶ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν· μῆνισασα δὲ ἡ θεὸς ἐπέσχεν αὐτοῦς τοῦ πλοῦ χειμῶνας ἐπιπέμπουσα. Κάλχαντος δὲ εἰπόντος τὴν τῆς θεοῦ μῆνιν καὶ Ἰφιγένειαν κελεύσαντος θύειν τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι, ὡς ἐπὶ γάμον αὐτὴν Ἀχιλλεῖ μεταπεμψάμενοι θύειν ἐπιχειροῦσιν. Ἄρτεμις δὲ αὐτὴν ἐξαρπάσασα εἰς Ταύρους μετακομίζει καὶ ἀθάνατον ποιεῖ, ἔλαφον δὲ ἀντὶ τῆς κόρης παρίστησι τῷ βωμῷ.
(Arg. 8 W.)

And when the expedition had assembled for the second time at Aulis, Agamemnon, having hit a deer during a hunt, said that he excelled even Artemis; but the goddess, enraged, stayed them from their voyage by sending storms against them. And with Calchas reporting the wrath of the goddess and bidding them sacrifice Iphigenia to Artemis, they send for her on the pretext of giving her in marriage to Achilles and undertake to sacrifice her. But Artemis, snatching her away, delivers her to the Taurians and makes her immortal; and she places a deer upon the altar in place of the girl.

³⁷¹ Cf. Andromache's self-pitying plea to Hector at *Il.* 6.431 and in response his surrender to fate (487-9).

This is the first part of the Cycle for which we possess in its entirety a derivative tragedy. With respect to tracing the dramaturgical process by which Euripides adapted the myth of Iphigenia's sacrifice, it is difficult to go much beyond the analysis of Jouan, who regards this as the episode within the Epic Cycle that was most suitable for tragic treatment and most paradigmatic of the tension between private sentiment and civic duty.³⁷²

It is unsurprising, then, that Euripides was not the first tragedian to treat the myth. Aeschylus' own *Iphigenia* survives in only one fragment (F 94), but we can glean much from his *Agamemnon*, which concentrates on the long-delayed repercussions of the king's action in Aulis. Aeschylus also has his Chorus reflect at length on that old crime, and by altering the circumstances he enhances the horror and complicates the ethics of the event. For one thing, he suppresses Iphigenia's rescue, thus preserving the heavily tragic tone of the episode and Clytemnestra's sense of loss. But even more crucially, he elides the act of sacrilege that Agamemnon commits in the *Cypria*,³⁷³ placing him blameless at the mercy of Artemis, who shows him none. Nor does the playwright insist that Agamemnon is obligated to kill his own daughter in order to atone for an ancestral sin.³⁷⁴ The new

³⁷² Jouan 1966: 259. For the *Cypria* as the tragedians' early source for the myth, see Gantz 1993: 586f. and Currie 2015: 291. I doubt Currie's suggestion (*ibid.* 292) that the *Cypria*'s four daughters of Agamemnon could in the epic tradition predate even Homer, for the most plausible way to account for the synthetic genealogy is by referring to the well established desire of Cyclic poets to integrate Homer's poems as fully as possible into their broader mythological perspective. In naming the daughter of Agamemnon who was sacrificed at Aulis, the *Cypria* poet (or rather, his tradition) settled on Iphigenia, which had once been an alternative name for Iphianassa, one of the daughters named at *Il.* 9.145.

³⁷³ The absence in *Ag.* of a slain doe, which according to Hyg. *Fab.* 98 was also sacred to the goddess, suggests deliberate suppression, not ignorance, of this part of the tradition. In fact, Aeschylus seems to have retained the image of the marksman but transferred it from Agamemnon to his divine counterpart. *Epit.* 3.21 adds that Agamemnon had struck his victim *ἐν καιρίῳ*, while at *Ag.* 365 it is Zeus who in delivering the *coup de grâce* against Paris ensured that his shot did not fall *πρὸ καιροῦ κτλ.* Cf. the archer image at 628: *ἔκυρσας ὥστε τοξότης...σκοποῦ.*

³⁷⁴ Whether that be Atreus' force-feeding of Thyestes' children to their father or, as some argued according to *Epit.* 3.21, his failure to sacrifice to the goddess the golden lamb of Argos. This is what Furley 1986 (esp. pp. 112f.) argues on the basis of *Ag.* 154f., which he reinterprets as referring not to the vengeful wrath of Clytemnestra that lies in the future but on the vengeance that must be extracted for the past murder of Thyestes' sons. The importance of that old crime as the start of woes is confirmed by A. *Cho.* 1068f.

explanation of Artemis' wrath (*Ag.* 114ff.), far from holding Agamemnon accountable for his own predicament, rests on an arbitrary occurrence in nature—in fact one all but ordained by Zeus—and is totally unsatisfying.³⁷⁵ This must be exactly how Aeschylus wanted it to be, and what is morally unsatisfying becomes most compelling from a literary standpoint, for poetry is not in the business of providing tidy explanations for everything but serves especially to highlight how inscrutable human suffering can be.³⁷⁶ The *Cypria* offered a lesson in piety: never insult the supreme dignity of the gods. Aeschylus instead offers a lesson in futility: disaster can strike whether one displays *hybris* or not.

Furley calls the *Cypria*'s motivation for Iphigenia's sacrifice "petty enough"³⁷⁷ and goes on to argue how Aeschylus made it seem even more arbitrary—but in fact Lloyd-Jones (as cited by Furley) argues that other scholars have failed to appreciate that Artemis' anger has more to do with what the pregnant hare symbolizes—Troy, described as *δημιοπληθῆ* at *Ag.* 129—than with the hare's own suffering; and Agamemnon, while not in control of the hare's fate, was decidedly in control of Troy's fate and was therefore guilty in Artemis' eyes (but Furley in turn does not sufficiently appreciate that the war was also necessary and that the violence at Aulis is ultimately difficult to account for through pure logic, which may indeed be Aeschylus' essential point). Fraenkel objects to this reasoning on the grounds that it would show Artemis as perverting the legal principle *δράσαντι παθεῖν* into a *δράσοντι παθεῖν*, which, one may add, is proleptic but not preemptive, i.e., it does not actually deter the Trojans from the sack of Troy that so

³⁷⁵ Cf. Denniston–Page 1957: xxiii. My entire analysis of this play (especially its bearing on the Aulis myth) owes much to Page's introduction.

³⁷⁶ Furley 1986: 110, dismissing both Fraenkel 2.99 and Denniston–Page 1957: xxv, seems to miss this point.

³⁷⁷ Furley 1986: 109.

distresses Artemis (who could not overcome Zeus' will anyway), it only ensures that attackers will also suffer.³⁷⁸

But to return to the issue of pettiness, we ought to weigh Iphigenia's sacrifice not only against its immediate cause (Agamemnon's *hybris* or Artemis' spite) but also against the more fundamental motivation of waging war against Troy—a war mandated by Zeus (as Page argues) and on which the honor of all Hellas (not just Menelaus) was staked. In this wider perspective, the gravity of her sacrifice was matched by the gravity of the overall situation: this was a time of war, and wartime rules were in effect. Even if we remove Artemis' demand for a virgin sacrifice, Iphigenia's death might have been considered appropriate as a means of safeguarding such a righteous cause and such a massive expedition, and in another sense it might be seen as a necessary evil in that it helped to counterbalance all the evils that were to be inflicted on Troy, which after all Calchas identified with the pregnant hare. That Aeschylus and others challenge the propriety of virgin sacrifice shows at least that they acknowledged their more primitive ancestors' impulse toward this practice. Compare other mythical wars (e.g., that between Erechtheus and Eumolpus, cf. E. F 360)³⁷⁹ whose participants talked themselves into the belief that virgin blood was required to purchase communal safety.³⁸⁰ We should be wary of taking Proclus' summary as evidence that in the *Cypria* the sacrifice of Iphigenia was motivated *only* by Agamemnon's chance insult to Iphigenia. Among other considerations, there is the fact that at this moment Agamemnon consolidates his command of the

³⁷⁸ Fraenkel 1950: ii 97 n. 3.

³⁷⁹ Note that the blood of a royal princess in ancient thought seems to possess especial apotropaic power, so at Aulis the victim really has to be Agamemnon's daughter and no one else's, even before we consider the story of his impious boast. Cf. Jouan 1966: 288 n. 2.

³⁸⁰ For a comparative look at religiously motivated filicide that considers the case of Iphigenia, see Tucker 1999.

expedition, and his authority is an essential plot point that Cyclic poets did not merely take for granted on the basis of the *Iliad*. As awful as it is, Iphigenia's sacrifice is in its ancient Greek mythological context significantly more just and reasonable than, say, Polyxena's sacrifice after the conclusion of the war (her life is arrogated by the hero Achilles, not demanded by a god, a distinction that Euripides' vicious critique in *Hecuba* explores along with many other factors; cf. Sophocles' *Polyxena*).

Heath suspects the influence of fables (*αἴθροι*) on the animal imagery in the parodos of *Ag.* (and in *Cho.* 246f.),³⁸¹ but he argues that in these passages Agamemnon also innovatively recycles the portent of *Il.* 2.299-332 and of the *Cypria*. His reasoning is strong; however, it must be emphasized that not only are the particulars of the natural occurrence changed, but the entire omen is repurposed such that Calchas is led to prognosticate about the present situation at Aulis, not about the future at Troy. We must also consider whether the *Cypria* contained a second portent, i.e., included the Iliadic one in its account of the first gathering at Aulis and then described another at the second gathering that is the basis of the occurrence related in *Agamemnon*; look at text of Proclus: certainly there were other ways to have Calchas divine Artemis' wrath and its implications, but an omen would have been typical and appropriate. I agree with Heath that the fable genre acted as a filter through which (or another point of reference by which) Aeschylus adapted his primary epic source. Greeks of his day may have been programmed to understand all animal stories as somehow belonging to this genre. What remains most striking, as Page observes, is that the portent itself becomes the basis of Artemis' wrath, not its manifestation; Agamemnon commits no (prior) offense against the goddess. In this respect Aeschylus obviously does depart from the *Cypria*, which may

³⁸¹ Heath 1999, accepting an earlier argument by West 1979.

make it more likely that he invented the peculiar portent as well. Artemis' anger could have been divined by Calchas without the explicit mention of a portent in the *Cypria*, just as Apollo's anger over the insult to Chryses is interpreted in *Il.* 1. The portent in *Agamemnon* makes a moral point within the context of that play, but it does so in a manner that differs from the normal functioning of fables, which in general are straightforwardly didactic rather than illustrative of human subjectivity to the irrational spitefulness of the gods; in the present case Artemis takes out on Agamemnon and Iphigenia her anger over the loss of a pregnant hare, but the predatory eagles can also represent Artemis and perhaps Zeus. Note how in the Iliadic portent the birds are victims, whereas Agamemnon deals with birds of prey.

In a celebrated painting by Timanthes, Agamemnon was depicted with his head wrapped in his cloak as Iphigenia was being dragged away to be sacrificed.³⁸² The ancient criticism of this painting explained the artist's choice to conceal Agamemnon's head as an admission of the insufficiency of art to capture his extreme grief, which would have to excel the grief conveyed by the expressions of Odysseus, Menelaus, and Calchas in the scene. But the intent behind Agamemnon's concealment might rather have been different; perhaps he even hid his face to hide his *lack* of grief. In any case, the composition of the painting, perhaps executed in the early fourth century B.C., may have been influenced by one or more dramatic portrayals of the sacrifice.

A papyrus containing badly broken hexameter verses that almost certainly describe the sacrifice of Iphigenia has at one time been considered a fragment of the *Cypria*.³⁸³ In fact, distinct verbal parallels have been alleged between this reconstructed

³⁸² Plin. *N. H.* 35.73; cf. Cic. *Or.* 74. An apparent copy was discovered at Pompeii.

³⁸³ *P. Oxy.* XXX 2513, as interpreted by Janko 1982.

passage and Euripides' Iphigenia plays, which would bear out the thesis of the present study remarkably well. However, palaeographical and other considerations suggest that the papyrus text derives instead from the epic *Corinthiaca* by Eumelus,³⁸⁴ a regionally peculiar poem or cycle of poems unlikely to have been favored as a source-text by Attic tragedians.

The story's happy ending, whereby a deer replaces the would-be human victim,³⁸⁵ partakes of "the motif of the simulacrum or phantom (*εἶδωλον*) substituted for a real person at a critical time."³⁸⁶ The basic conception of Euripides' *Iphigenia among the Taurians* is probably rooted in the *Cypria*'s description of her deliverance to Tauris by a merciful Artemis.³⁸⁷ Yet whereas the Cycle quickly takes its leave of the girl by declaring her apotheosis, Euripides' play follows her, still a mortal, to Crimea and tells the story of her astonishing reunion years later with her brother Orestes. The *Nostoi*, the only poem of the Cycle that could conceivably have covered this reunion, apparently did not.³⁸⁸ There

³⁸⁴ Debiasi 2013. The papyrus looks to derive from the same manuscript as *P.Oxy.* LIII 3698, which Debiasi earlier assigned to the *Corinthiaca*. Eumelus apparently forged a connection between Corinth and Sparta (and hence the Trojan War) by asserting that Glaucus son of Sisyphus was Leda's true father. Cf. the introduction of Sisyphus into Odysseus' family (as his father) for the purpose of slandering the hero.

³⁸⁵ Not an entirely happy ending from at least one modern theorist's animal-rights perspective: see Dolgert 2012, whose anachronistic critique at least acknowledges that in ancient Greek society violent animal sacrifice was an essential mechanism in the forging and perpetuation of democratic consent.

³⁸⁶ West 1985: 134, arguing that the earliest genuine instances of the motif belong to the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (in its account of the sacrifice) and Stesichorus (in his *Palinode* on Helen). On the prevalence of "phantom doubles" in epic cf. Allan 2008: 20f.

³⁸⁷ In the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, besides being named differently ("Iphimede"), the rescued girl is simply deified, not transported to Tauris; and beyond those obstacles to supposing that the *Catalogue* was the inspiration behind *E. IT*, the verses in question (fr. 23a.21-6 M.-W.) are suspected (Debiasi 2013: 25 n. 26). It is possible that Stesichorus' *Oresteia* elaborated on the *Cypria*'s discussion of Iphigenia in Tauris and that Euripides in turn built on his lyric predecessor. Stes. fr. 181a F. testifies that Stesichorus' *Oresteia* mentioned Iphigenia in the context of her pretended wedding to Achilles; her later life may have been included as well. (On the pervasive influence of Stesichorus' *Oresteia* upon the tragedians, see Swift 2015: 127-32.) Note that the story of Iphigenia's *in extremis* rescue is scarcely compatible with Clytemnestra's justifying her murder of Agamemnon by reference to the sacrifice, as in tragedy (e.g., *A. Ag.* 1415-8), unless the queen failed to witness the rescue; better yet, it went entirely unnoticed by the host at Aulis. Cf. *E. IT* 564, where Orestes bases his belief that his sister is dead on unequivocal *λόγος*.

³⁸⁸ It did cover the *ὑπ' Ὀρέστου καὶ Πυλάδου τιμωρία*, as Proclus' summary of the poem states before immediately coming to its conclusion with *καὶ Μενελάου εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ἀνακομιδὴ* (*Nost.* arg. 5 W.).

is no evidence that Electra, let alone Iphigenia, appeared anywhere in it.³⁸⁹ In Euripides' *Orestes*, whose contents partially overlap with the *Nostoi*, Electra mentions Iphigenia in her prologue speech (23), but without giving any impression that she believes her sister survives, still less any indication of her possible whereabouts. Yet Electra also declines to go into her mother's professed reasons for murdering Agamemnon (26f.), thus sidestepping the issue of whether she should resent her father, as Clytemnestra claimed to, on account of Iphigenia.

2.13. Tenedos and Tennes

ἔπειτα καταπλέουσιν εἰς Τένεδον. (Arg. 9a W.)

Then they sail to Tenedos.

The only action that Proclus' summary records as occurring on Tenedos is merry feasting and, out of this, the maiming of Philoctetes (see next section). *Epit.* 3.26, however, reports that the Achaeans fought against the island's eponymous ruler Tennes, and so they probably did in the *Cypria*.³⁹⁰ Regarding *Epit.* 3.24-5, West argues that "the story of how Tennes came to the island after being falsely accused by his stepmother and cast out to sea by his father has no place in the epic; it may have originated in the *Tennes* ascribed to Euripides or Critias (*TrGF* ii 43 F 20)."³⁹¹ But although Achilles' killing of Tennes does not require an excursus on the victim's origins, providing such ancillary information would conveniently allow the poet to set the stage for Cyncus' imminent appearance and

³⁸⁹ Cf. West 286. After the celebratory feast following the retributive slaying of Aegisthus (*ibid.* 284, citing *Od.* 3.309), the poet may only have alluded briefly to Orestes' future (his need for purification?) before passing on to his uncle's return home.

³⁹⁰ Perhaps something has fallen out of Proclus' text, such as a sentence ending in *Τένην* that caused a *saut du même au même* when the scribe looked back at his exemplar after copying ... *Τένεδον*. The omission likewise puzzles Gantz 1993: 592 and West 111, who both suspect Tennes did feature in the *Cypria*.

³⁹¹ West 111.

death. For Cycnus' showdown with Achilles works well as a tale of revenge (see below), and Tennes might even have made Achilles aware of his invincible father. And the stepmother's role, so clearly parallel to Phaedra's indictment of Hippolytus, is hardly out of place in epic, where we find even stranger tales of families in crisis. For example, the personal narrative that Phoenix shares at *Il.* 9.447-77, which centers on his father's noxious concubine and accounts for Phoenix's flight from home, could have emboldened the poet of the *Cypria* to include the story of Tennes' eviction (whose true *aition* might lie instead in the colonization of Tenedos).

2.14. Philoctetes' Snakebite

καὶ ἐώχουμένων αὐτῶν Φιλοκτήτης ὑφ' ὕδρου πληγείς διὰ τὴν δυσοσμίαν ἐν Λήμνῳ κατελείφθη. (Arg. 9b W.)

And after Philoctetes is bitten by a snake while they are feasting, he is abandoned on Lemnos because of the foul odor [from the bite wound].

According to West, in the original story, reflected in *Il.* 8.228-34 as well as 2.721-5, the snake attack occurred on Lemnos, where the Achaeans' feasting had also taken place.³⁹²

Achilles sacked Tenedos (*Il.* 11.625), but this was an unrelated incident. The *Cypria* poet has changed the Achaeans' itinerary such that the snake appears when they are sacrificing to Apollo on Tenedos, which is followed by an *ad hoc* side trip to Lemnos to remove Philoctetes from the expedition (Proclus does not explicitly say that Philoctetes was bitten on Tenedos, but Lemnos is first mentioned late in the sentence, indicating that it was visited expressly for the purpose of abandoning Philoctetes; cf. *Epit.* 3.27, where the sacrifice—to Apollo, who at *Il.* 1.38 is connected with Tenedos—and the snake bite clearly precede Philoctetes' arrival on Lemnos and the emphasis on the gradual festering

³⁹² West 112f.

of his wound suggests that some time elapsed before the decision was made to dispose of Philoctetes). Thus the eventual abandonment of Philoctetes follows organically from the activity on Tenedos. But the *Cypria* makes sure (by employing Odysseus at the behest of Agamemnon) to transport Philoctetes to Lemnos (requiring backward travel away from Troy), where he was supposed to while away his misery according to tradition. And in accommodating tradition as represented in the *Iliad* the *Cypria* also dutifully sets up the action of Philoctetes' recovery, which gets told in the *Little Iliad*.

Sophocles enhances the desolation to which Philoctetes is subjected by making Lemnos an abandoned isle in defiance of both historical reality and the mythological tradition. In epic, for example, it is said that Patroclus sold the war-captive Lycaon into slavery on that island (*Cyp.* arg. 11f W.), which accordingly had to be populous, not to mention prosperous insofar as one of its inhabitants (Euneos) was able to pay a princely ransom.³⁹³ Within the context of Sophocles' treatment, it is easy to imagine Philoctetes viewing the choice of location as punitive or adding insult to injury, whereas Odysseus might have felt he was doing Philoctetes a favor by removing him from the company of all men, any of whom might soon see fit to rid themselves of the noisy pest. In Aeschylus' and Euripides' version of the story of Philoctetes' retrieval, the presence of local inhabitants is taken for granted or even integral to the plot.

2.15. Sophocles' Satyric *Fellow Banqueters*

καὶ Ἀχιλλεὺς ὕστερος κληθεὶς διαφέρεται πρὸς Ἀγαμέμνονα. (Arg. 9c W.)

And after Achilles receives a late invitation, he quarrels with Agamemnon.

³⁹³ Lycaon's full story is related in *Il.* 21.34-48, 23.746f., which the *Cypria* duly follows. See Schein 2013: 7f. for Lemnos in Greek myth.

So Achilles and Agamemnon had an enmity that preceded the crisis of *Iliad* 1. But Achilles also quarreled at this time with Odysseus, who perhaps intervened as a would-be peacemaker, and indeed this may have formed the central opposition in *Syndeipnoi*, Sophocles' satyr-play on the subject (whereas to Proclus the anticipation of the central Iliadic feud naturally stood out).³⁹⁴ *Od.* 8.75-82 mentions that Agamemnon had received an oracle at the war's outset promising that victory over Troy was destined to follow a quarrel between "the best of the Achaeans." According to Demodocus' song Agamemnon wrongly supposed that these were Achilles and Odysseus, not Achilles and himself. The oracle was really referring to the quarrel that breaks out in the *Iliad*.³⁹⁵ Perhaps Agamemnon's premature rejoicing featured in *Fellow Banqueters* as well.

Although Sophocles dramatized this episode as a satyr-play, failure to resolve the dispute would have had very serious implications. Achilles' initial exclusion from the feast of chiefs (whether deliberate or not) of course constituted a serious affront to his *τιμή*, for such feasts functioned to confirm participants as members of the elite social class within their community,³⁹⁶ and the youngster Achilles would have felt especially self-conscious and apprehensive among the older chieftains (he did not yet have even the confidence that would evolve nor the distinction that would accrue from his successful

³⁹⁴ We do have a fragment (F *566) in which Odysseus, "provoking" Achilles (*παροξύνων*, Plut. *De adul. et amico* 36, 74a), claims that he is afraid to face Troy and Hector; and another (F 567) in which someone (Weil proposed Achilles, but see *TrGF* iv.429) appears to repeat the accusation of S. *Aj.* 190 and *Phil.* 417 that Sisyphus was Odysseus' sire—which perhaps was becoming a stock element in invective speeches against meddling (cf. *ὄ πάντα πράσσω* in the fragment) Odysseus.

³⁹⁵ Cf. West 98.

³⁹⁶ Ford 2002: 27, building on Murray 1991 and other work by the latter scholar; cf. Mawhinney 2012: 80-8. The suggested dichotomy between the so-called "feast of merit" observed among Homer's warriors and the leisurely symposium, however, should perhaps not be maintained too strictly since, for as long as symposia preserved their aristocratic character, it is unlikely that individuals' anxiety about belonging ever really went away or was less acute in peacetime than in wartime. This point of continuity is stressed by van Wees 1995: 177-9, and it means that many members of Sophocles' Athenian audience could sympathize with Achilles' humiliation on a personal level.

raids around the Troad). Thus his severe reaction was perfectly natural, and the entire enterprise of the Trojan War could have been thwarted now before it really began.

The *Cypria* poet for his part evidently felt that the incident was grand and important enough to be included as official Cyclic material, although he may, like Homer, have felt it appropriate to elide those aspects of communal banqueting that were known or felt to be characteristic only of the symposium proper, a more recent development. Indeed, the exact nature of the banquet as described in the epic remains unclear. Given the *Cypria*'s later date, it is likely that the occasion reflected contemporary sympotic practice to a greater extent than any Homeric scene had. But even Homer himself was probably familiar with the institution of the symposium, or at least some of its features, for certain Homeric scenes can be and have been read as (emblematic of) symposia.³⁹⁷ This encourages us to consider it possible that Homer knew of the episode in question. It also means that poets after Homer could have borrowed from him in modest ways for their portrayals of the *δαίς* from which Achilles was excluded. Whatever touch of contemporary reality the *Cypria* poet infused into his portrayal, Sophocles can be presumed to have updated the episode still further for his play, although the glimpses of the festivities that we get from the surviving fragments—

³⁹⁷ Even many of those who recognize that sympotic images (e.g., reclining on couches) are largely absent from Homer, believing that this stems from an authorial choice to omit, have taken it for granted that Homer was familiar with sympotic practices; see Murray 1991: 95 and Ford 2002: 27f. n. 9. For perceived reflections of symposia in Homer see Colesanti 1999, who supports M. Vetta's argument, and Wecowski 2014; *contra* W. Arend, who would interpret such scenes as examples of the ritualistic *σπονδή* scene.

the presence of servants (F 562)³⁹⁸ and the performance of music as a diversion (F 568)³⁹⁹—accord equally with Homeric banquets and with Athenian symposia.

Sommerstein argues that in the play Thetis intervened to stay Agamemnon from violence,⁴⁰⁰ but despite Agamemnon's threats of violence against Achilles in the *Iliad* it seems more likely that it was again Achilles who had to be dissuaded from attacking his allies, just as Athena quells his wrath in *Iliad* 1. F 562 is itself a rather bland fragment, but we know from the quoting author⁴⁰¹ that it was spoken by Thetis to Achilles. Whether she left her marine abode to chide her son or (as in the *Iliad*) to back him up, this *dea ex machina* may well have been inspired by a divine visitation in the *Cypria*. The main target of Achilles' violent rage here was Odysseus, not Agamemnon,⁴⁰² an old twist that enabled the *Cypria* poet to avoid anticipating with too great similarity the great feud of the *Iliad* and made room for Agamemnon wrongly to take confidence in an oracle.

If *Σύνδειπνοι* is the genuine and original title of Sophocles' play (Cic. *Q.F.* 2.16.3),⁴⁰³ then it is possible that Euripides uses the term with an intertextual overtone at *Ion* 1172. Other interesting uses of the term (for its social connotations, e.g.) are Xen. *An.* 2.5.27 and Plut. 2.660b.

³⁹⁸ The author who quotes this fragment (Athen. 15.685f) refers to *παίδες*, but this comes outside of the fragment itself. Note that the heroes of the *Iliad* do much of their own meal preparation even when they have company, and the rest is generally performed by the women whom the Achaeans at this stage of the story had yet to capture.

³⁹⁹ The text of this four-line lyric passage is problematic at several points, but its message is clearly about the power of song to overcome oblivion and sustain brief mortal lives. See Ford 2002: 28ff. on music's place at Homeric banquets.

⁴⁰⁰ *SFP* 2006: 84-140.

⁴⁰¹ sch. AE Dion. Thr. 1, also found in an anonymous treatise on style (see *TrGF* iv.426).

⁴⁰² As the brief summary in Sommerstein 2012b: 202 makes clear.

⁴⁰³ The title *Ἀχαιῶν σύλλογος* is generally thought to be another name for the same play; see e.g. Sommerstein 2012b: 203 (and again id., *SFP* 2006: 84-140).

2.16. Protesilaus and Cynus

ἔπειτα ἀποβαίνοντας αὐτοὺς εἰς Ἴλιον εἶργουσιν οἱ Τρῶες, καὶ θνήσκει
Πρωτεσίλαος ὑφ' Ἑκτορος. ἔπειτα Ἀχιλλεὺς αὐτοὺς τρέπεται ἀνελῶν Κύκνον τὸν
Ποσειδῶνος, καὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς ἀναιροῦνται. (Arg. 10a-b W.)

Next as [the Achaeans] are disembarking at Ilium, the Trojans check them, and Protesilaus is killed by Hector. Then Achilles routs them, slaying Poseidon's son Cynus. And they collect their dead.

The first casualties of the Trojan War drew the interest of many poets including tragedians. Euripides wrote a *Protesilaus* relatively early play in his career,⁴⁰⁴ which suggests that already in the first half of his career—we may perhaps even say the first quarter, if Wilamowitz is right—he was basing some of his tragedies on Cyclic themes. Is this play in fact the first by Euripides to fall into the “Cyclic” category? It probably predates his *Telephus*,⁴⁰⁵ produced together with *Alcestis* in 438, and the *Philoctetes*, which is known to have been produced together with *Medea* in 431. Compare *Scyrians*, *Phoenix* (pre-426, given the reference at Ar. *Ach.* 421), and the demonstrably very late and “free” *Auge* (interestingly, it seems Euripides at the end of his life and career returned to the mother of one of his earlier heroes, Telephus). If Euripides did write *Protesilaus* before *Alcestis*, then that “fourth-place” play undermines in a generically distinct way an earlier demonstration of the concept that a permanent reunion with a deceased loved one is ultimately impossible. If the reverse is true and *Alcestis* came first, we may consider whether Euripides invented the story of Protesilaus' return in order to quell an uproar or to disabuse those who had credulously taken solace in the fantasy of *Alcestis*: a reunion with the dead can really be achieved only through the death of the

⁴⁰⁴ “Severe style” according to Cropp-Fick 1985: 90; cf. Wilamowitz 1935-72: V.i.524, cited there.

⁴⁰⁵ Cropp-Fick 1985: 91 accounts for the surprisingly high resolution-rate of this relatively early play by pointing to the concentration of the metrical phenomenon in the prologue fragment.

living partner, not through the reanimation of the deceased.⁴⁰⁶ In either case, the two stories are certainly linked by the theme of death's finality versus the efficacy of love, with *Protesilaus* privileging the former, *Alcestis* the latter. The motif of an *agalma* taking the place of a lost loved one is found both in *Alcestis* (348-54) and in the story of Laodamia and Protesilaus.

An important aspect of Protesilaus' death is that Achilles witnessed it. Grief over Protesilaus' death could have helped motivate Achilles to disembark even if his primary reason for doing so was that he wanted to fight all along, hesitating in obedience to his mother's warning not to be the first ashore.⁴⁰⁷ Achilles may also have been holding back initially because of his resentment toward Agamemnon; these motives are not mutually exclusive, and the last one may explain why in the *Cypria* (as against the *Iliad*) Protesilaus was able to fight for a while⁴⁰⁸ before his death enticed Achilles to battle. The poet may have presented the sequence as follows: "Protesilaus stepped off, first of the Achaeans, but still Achilles did not wish to fight, for he was wroth with Agamemnon.... But when Achilles saw Protesilaus lying dead, struck by grief he disembarked...." Such overdetermined behavior is hardly foreign to Greek epic.⁴⁰⁹

Pausanias (4.2.7 = *Cyp.* fr. 22 W.) says that the *Cypria* referred to Protesilaus' wife (mentioned anonymously at *Il.* 2.700) as Polydora, daughter of Oeneus' son Meleager. From this onomastic notice we can conjecture that the *Cypria* tangentially related Polydora's suicide,⁴¹⁰ if not also the couple's ephemeral reunion.⁴¹¹ It was then

⁴⁰⁶ Plut. *Mor.* 761 E-F has a hopeful, not to say credulous, attitude toward these myths and that of Orpheus.

⁴⁰⁷ *Pace* West 114.

⁴⁰⁸ *κτείννας οὐκ ὀλίγους*, *Epit.* 3.30.

⁴⁰⁹ On the possibility that the loss of Protesilaus affected Achilles as did the deaths of Patroclus and Antilochus, cf. Gruppe 1906: 671 n. 5, and cf. Paus. 10.30 on a relevant painting by Polygnotus.

⁴¹⁰ Severyns 1928: 302 and West 115. Some time must have passed before Protesilaus' wife learned of his death, but the *Cypria* poet probably described her reaction to this news proleptically, i.e., immediately after

Euripides' prerogative to focus on telling that story, which transpires in Phylake, far from Troy. Isn't the story of Protesilaus also featured as an *exemplum* in *Alcestis*? Certainly the

The comic playwright Anaxandrides wrote a *Protesilaus*, of which one long preserved extract (fr. 42 = Athen. IV, 131 A) details provisions for a wedding. The passage quickly devolves into a prolix list of dainties, perhaps in parody of epic or tragic descriptions of weddings. Kock theorized that the play as a whole parodied Euripides' *Protesilaus*, which accordingly may have included a wistful reflection on the wedding of Laodamia and Protesilaus. Did the play also take account of Protesilaus' hero cult, or more specifically of the story told at Hdt. 9.116, in which Xerxes' viceroy Artayctes despoiled the hero's tomb and precinct in Elaeus? The Athenians could boast that their successful siege of the Persian contingent at Sestus enabled the recovery of the votive treasures robbed from Protesilaus' sanctuary and the holy punishment of Artayctes. The restitution was accompanied by a "fishy" omen, also related by Hdt. 9.120, that ascribes Protesilaus' *post mortem* vitality not to his wife's devotion but to his status as a hero blessed by the gods. If Euripides was privy to all this, he hardly could have neglected it in his play.

Sophocles' *Shepherds* tells the story of the first day of fighting in the Trojan War,⁴¹² which saw (prob. also in the *Cypria*) the deaths of both Protesilaus and Cycnus. Hector is said to have slain Protesilaus in this play, whereas the killer is simply called

narrating his death or perhaps in the passage that Proclus records with the words *καὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς ἀναίρονται*. Homer himself may be alluding to the consequences of Protesilaus' death when he describes his wife as *ἀμφιδροφής* ("with both cheeks rent in grief") and his house as *ἡμιτελής* on the occasion of his departure.

⁴¹¹ Johnston 1999: 100 n. 41 rightly casts doubt on the possibility that Euripides found the story of Protesilaus' resurrection in the *Cypria*, but she also resists saying that he invented it.

⁴¹² See *SFP* 2012: 174-9.

Δάρδανος ἀνὴρ at *Il.* 2.701. Sommerstein is cautious,⁴¹³ but it seems quite likely that the Cynus whom Achilles kills at Troy simply did not have much of a background story at first, which allowed for later elaboration, including the incorporation of his children and the invention of their banishment to and deaths on Tenedos (after the ruinous actions of a decidedly Phaedraesque stepmother; this story also explains aetiologically the name and history of Tenedos). Cynus' journey to Troy could then, as Sommerstein suggests, be recast as a story of revenge (cf. Eurypylus, though in that case a son avenges his father, and Telephus was both wounded and healed by Achilles).⁴¹⁴ There is no need for this Cynus to have spent time in Tenedos, as Sommerstein imagines; he might have learned of his wife's deception at home in the Troad and soon thereafter, before a reconciliation could be effected, might have learned of his children's deaths abroad, setting up his last-ditch effort to redeem his family by killing Achilles. The tragic failure of this quest may be what Lycophron has in mind at *Alex.* 232f., but it is true that *ὄν πατρί* gives a different impression.

Is the scene described in *Cypr.* arg. lines 149-51 Severyns (reflected in the “*Epipōlēsis*” scene in *Iliad* 4) to be conceived of as taking place later than the first day of hostilities that Sophocles shows forth in *Shepherds*? Presumably the siege and Teikhoskopia both occur later (possibly after the demanding back of Helen).

F 509 (= alphabetical “O” in Sommerstein's edition in *SFP* 2012) probably derives from a passage in which Cynus, who may have foregone protective armor, takes to boasting. He no doubt revels in his impervious skin, calling his *χρῶς* (cf. *Il.* 4.510, of

⁴¹³ *Ibid.* 178f.

⁴¹⁴ On “revenge tragedy” as a subgenre see Foley 2014: 67ff. (regarding E. *Hec.*). Sommerstein 2012b: 203 interestingly distinguishes between those episodes in tragedy that dramatize revenge taken by outraged gods from those where insulted heroes are avenged, but he also points out that the same play can feature both, as does S. *Aj.*

which S. F 500 [G] is practically an inversion)⁴¹⁵ or *σάρξ* “[thicker] than the hides of a dog and a dark lowing cow” (alluding to the *κυνέη* and *βοέη*⁴¹⁶ of the Homeric panoply):

(παχίων) κυνὸς πελλῆς τε μωκάδος βοὸς
ρίνω̃ν

Compare the expression *ταλαύρινος χρώς* at *Anth. Pal.* 7.208, line 3,⁴¹⁷ and note that at *Il.* 4.447 *ρίνούς* stands for “ox-hide shields.” Note also that *πωλικῆς ρίνοῦ* occurs at [E.] *Rhes.* 784, and for several other reasons already Wilamowitz suspected that this later tragedy draws much from the *Shepherds*.⁴¹⁸ I offer (παχίων) only *exempli gratia*, and with the reservation that this comparative form occurs in less canonical sources than the alternative *πάσσων*. I accept M. Schmidt’s *μωκάδος*, just as Sommerstein gravitates toward it in his commentary. As for the transmitted †*ρήνέων*†, Meursius did well to suggest *ρίνόν* (which Sommerstein considered moving to the beginning of the line), but it is preferable to retain the ending, to which an inferior scribe may have introduced -ε- in an attempt to fix the meter. Similar comparative expressions are found in Homer and in tragedy. For *ρίνός* in reference to human skin, cf. *Od.* 22.277f. Perhaps Cycnus fought without armor and in this fragment responds to a Trojan inquiry about this, substituting

⁴¹⁵ The *Iliad* verse reads *οὐ σφι λίθος χρώς οὐδὲ σίδηρος*. Homer’s casual negation of this motif constitutes a “figure of speech” (West 2011: 149) that presupposes traditions about heroes like Cycnus for whom invulnerable skin was a reality. S. F 500, reading *οὐ χαλκός, οὐ σίδηρος ἄπιεται χροός* appears to combine the language of *Il.* 4.510 and 20.102 (*οὐδ’ εἰ παγχάλκεος εὔχεται εἶναι*—note how boasting forms part of the context) even as it replaces Homer’s negative constructions with what is effectively a positive assertion about a Cyclic hero’s invulnerability. But it is best to see Sophocles as operating within a web of linguistic and motival formulae that embraces both Homer and the Epic Cycle. Cf. also *E. Ba.* 757 (which scholars now transpose *post* 761; cf. Sommerstein in *SFP* 2012: 204).

⁴¹⁶ It would be tempting to find in F 499 (Sommerstein’s N) another (poetic) reference to Cycnus’ famously tough skin as shield-like, but besides the need to change *βοῖν* to *βοῖν* (i.e., *βοέην*), Sommerstein makes a strong case that the adjective *Κυκνῖτιν*, especially in the context in which it is quoted (Steph. Byz. *Ethn.* 392.6), would be more likely to mean “from Cycnus’ country” than “of Cycnus” (and *βοή* in the sense “reinforcement(s)” not only fits well into the story of this play but also occurs elsewhere in tragedy, whereas *βο(ι)έη* seemingly does not[?]).

⁴¹⁷ Referring to a horse’s hide; the quatrain is attributed to the third-century lyric poetess Anyte.

⁴¹⁸ Wilamowitz 1935-72: I.13; cf. Sommerstein in *SFP* 2012: 179 n. 19.

talk of his own body for talk of armor such as we find in A. F 58 (from *Memnon*, whose eponymous character had like Achilles received his arms from Hephaestus).

In F 507 (Sommerstein's J) someone speaks metaphorically of a fever:

*τριταῖος ὥστε πῦρ ἀφι[
κρυμὸν φέρων γναθοῖσιν ἐξ ἀμφομέρου*

[Having come?] on the third day like a fever
that brings chill to one's jaws after a a quotidian [fever].

The masculine *τριταῖος* must agree with the speaker, probably Cycnus, as subject (not with neuter *πῦρ* as Sommerstein's translation implies).⁴¹⁹ Sommerstein cogitantly interprets the fragment as "another of Cycnus' boasts" (cf. on next fragment).⁴²⁰ Coo recognizes the issue of grammatical agreement and offers a thorough discussion of the type of fever featured in the simile, but she opts for an erotic reading of the fragment that is ultimately unconvincing.⁴²¹ One may imagine that Cycnus has arrived in Troy on the third day after he was summoned or after an embassy was sent to him. For a different simile announcing the anticipated effect of a Trojan ally's arrival cf. A. F 57 (from *Memnon*).

F 501 (Sommerstein's H), spoken by Cycnus as Hesychius (ρ 537) relates, reads:

*καὶ μὴν ὑβρίζοντ' ἀντίκ' ἐκ βάθρων ἐλῶ,
ῥυτῆρι κρούειν γλουτὸν ὑπτίου ποδός*

And furthermore I will at once snatch [him], however much pride he exudes, from his footing, [resulting in his] striking his buttock with the strap of his upturned foot.

⁴¹⁹ S. F 502, from the same play, has another temporal adjective (*ἑωθινός*) agreeing with a first-person subject.

⁴²⁰ *SFP* 2012: 205.

⁴²¹ Coo 2012. I have, however, followed her reading *γναθοῖσιν* (instead of *γναθμ-*), defended by her on p. 93, n. 21.

Comparing Rhesus' arrogant speech at [E.] *Rh.* 467-517, Sommerstein remarks that "it would likewise be appropriate for Cycnus to look forward boastfully to inflicting crushing humiliation on the man destined to be *his* slayer."⁴²² It is also possible to translate *ὕβριζοντ'* as "because he commits outrageous violence," and the deed in question need not be the invasion of Troy in which Achilles participates, if perchance Sophocles chose to connect this play's plot with the earlier slaying of Tennes.

The result clause in the second verse (as printed above) would be unusual both because of the omission of the relative *ὅσπερ* and because in such a forceful positive assertion one would expect *ὅσπερ* followed by an indicative, not by an infinitive.⁴²³ In fact the codices read *κρούων*. Can we retain the transmitted form but regard it as factitive ("causing him to strike his...")? A gloss in Hesychius' entry includes *ποιήσω τύπτειν*.⁴²⁴ The alternative would be to interpret more straightforwardly, with Cycnus imagining himself literally kicking Achilles' butt in a rout. Can *ῥοπήρι* be taken with *ἐλῶ* (cf. D. H. 4.85), or might it refer to the strap of Achilles' sandal? It is hard to settle the text without knowing exactly what Cycnus envisions. Note that the phrase *ὑπτιος πούς* may be idiomatic for "the sole of the foot," just as *ὑπτία χεῖρ* means "the palm of the hand."⁴²⁵

The term *γλουτός* might seem to belong to vulgar diction, and Rosen accordingly regards this fragment as evidence that the *Shepherds* was a satyr-play. However,

⁴²² *SFP* 2012: 205. Sommerstein's commentary does not mention the verbal similarity between the first verse of this fragment and E. *El.* 608, *ἐκ βάρων ἀνηρῆσθαι*.

⁴²³ On these objections see Smyth §§2250a, 2258.

⁴²⁴ See Smyth §1711 on the "causative active" voice, an alternative to *ποιῶ* + inf. (§2142). But I have not been able to find a good parallel to support reading the present passage in this way.

⁴²⁵ Ar. Ec. 782, Plu. *Crass.* 18. Conversely, the phrase *ἄκρος πούς* can refer to the top surface of the foot or to the ankle, as Finglass 2009 demonstrates with particular reference to S. *Aj.* 238. *Pace* p. 226 of that article (and Hermann as cited there, n. 6), Ajax probably thought he was inflicting the smooth-talker Odysseus with elinguation, not Agamemnon *qua* arbiter, but that does not mean that Odysseus cannot also be identified in the second animal, whose punishment is described in lines 239-44, as Finglass argues (*ibid.* n. 5).

Sommerstein, distinguishing the anatomically correct *γλουτός* from the comically vulgar *πυγή* and citing the aesthetic judgment of Wilamowitz and others, convincingly refutes Rosen’s argument.⁴²⁶ It is true that striking the buttocks with one’s heel was practiced as a form of effusive dance or effeminate prance by worshippers of Dionysus, and on occasion Satyrs are seemingly depicted performing the move.⁴²⁷ But the taunt in this fragment, whatever audience reaction it may have temporarily generated,⁴²⁸ is deadly serious in its intent, just like E. F 384, e.g., or *Il.* 2.263, *αὐτὸν κλαίοντα ἀφήσω* (which Aristophanes, however, does frequently parody). It is deflated not by any latent comedic association but rather by the later *peripeteia* that sees Achilles, far from fleeing, brutally kill proud Cynus. Emasculating threats (*ἀπειλαί*) are of course abundant in the *Iliad*.⁴²⁹ Given the speaker’s reference to receiving a wound, it seems better to assign these words to Cynus rather than to Hector, as Sommerstein does. Perhaps another character has provoked his indignation by reporting that Achilles fancies himself the best of the Achaeans, or perhaps Achilles had made a direct threat against Cynus after slaughtering his son on Tenedos.

Mackie explains Aeneas’ scorn of “female *neikos*” as an attempt to vindicate Trojan reticence on the battlefield, yet she does not fully appreciate that such

⁴²⁶ *SFP* 2012: 186-8.

⁴²⁷ E.g., *BMA* 2014.44.

⁴²⁸ It may also have put some in mind of Achilles’ famous heel as the one vulnerable spot on his body.

⁴²⁹ See West 2011: 128f. on “the motif that the pre-eminent hero challenges all comers” (cf. *ibid.* 188). See Kyriakou 2001: 252 for further discussion of battlefield taunts in Homer, which are generally either scorned or undercut with irony—or cast in one’s teeth later, as at *Il.* 3.430f. (for more examples cf. *ad loc.* West 2011: 137)—whereas vaunting over a vanquished foe was normally condoned. In addition to being a taunt, delivered by apostrophe to an absent Achilles, Cynus’ damning words might also fall into the category of premature vaunts (*εὐχολαί*), such as Pandarus’ short speeches at *Il.* 5.102-5 and 284f.

dismissiveness is entirely at home in and compatible with a poem featuring so much male *neikos*.⁴³⁰

F 508 (Sommerstein's L) is more problematic from a textual standpoint: *λόγω γὰρ ἔλκος οὐδὲν †οἶδά που τυχόν†*. Sommerstein tentatively translates, "I am not aware that any wound <ever found a cure(?)> by mere words." Yet it is exceedingly rare for an inanimate subject to govern *τυγχάνειν* in its sense "happen upon, hit upon, meet with, find" (+ gen.).⁴³¹ So it seems better to emend to *ἔλκους... τυχόν*, hence "I am hardly aware of ever having gotten a wound by/from talk." For a parallel to the proposed phrase cf. A. *Ag.* 866 (*τραυμάτων...*); for the ironic *οὐδὲν οἶδα* + nominative participle cf. E. *Hec.* 394, a line embedded in stichomythia (as the present verse may have been). One wonders whether the transposition of *ἔλκος* and *οὐδὲν* in the MSS is due to efforts to satisfy the meter after *ἔλκους* had been corrupted to *ἔλκος* or is instead related to a desire to show *ἔλκους* is not partitive genitive with *οὐδὲν*—or was *τυχόν* first corrupted to *τυχόν* as may happen more readily at line-end, leading to the change of *ἔλκους* to *ἔλκος* so that the participle could agree with it? The major issue is that if my reading is correct and the line is another brag by the professedly invincible Cynus in the face of the threats emanating from Achilles (who may have been forewarned of Cynus' prowess by Tennes, whom he had recently killed), the scholiast who quotes the fragment *ad S. Aj.* 581 will have been mistaken to see a real parallel between the two verses (the premise

⁴³⁰ Mackie 1996: 80f. Her entire discussion at 55-83 is relevant to the present examination.

⁴³¹ See the passages cited in LSJ s.v. *τυγχάνω* B.II. Pace Schein 2013: 322f., at S. *Phil.* 1329 (where coincidentally the discussion centers on healing) the subject of *τυχεῖν* is the "you" implied in *ἴσθι*, and its object *παῦλαν* is anomalously put into the accusative so as to differentiate it from the (ablative) genitive that depends on it (*νόσου* in 1330; note that later in the same sentence (1333) *ἐντυχόν* also modifies "you"). An exception is Gorgias' abstract dictum *τὸ μὲν εἶναι ἀφανὲς μὴ τυχόν τοῦ δοκεῖν...* (B 26 D-K); at Pl. *Rep.* 491d the action of "finding" (*τυχόν*) is predicated of plants as well as animals. The form *τυχόν* appears frequently in impersonal accusative absolute constructions and as an adverb meaning "perhaps" (mostly in prose, but note E. F 953.9), but if anything these specialized uses add a reason for rejecting *τυχόν* in the present passage.

that actions speak louder than words, as it were, is implicit in our line—look no further than *λόγῳ*—but the urgent desire for a remedy need not be). But it is equally disturbing if he failed to quote the key word (*ἀκέσματος* or whatever) that demonstrated the parallel (of course, the final word of the citation could have fallen out in transmission). Moreover, whereas Ajax allows that *some* wounds are susceptible to incantations in order to emphasize the magnitude of his own wound, the speaker of our fragment (Hector, Sommerstein argues) would be making a categorical denial. And is it quite appropriate for Hector to refer to equate the invading army with a “wound”? (Must we imagine that the line’s surrounding context supplied the framework for a medical analogy as in the *Ajax* passage?) In my view the scholiast was reminded of another passage in which “wound” and “word” were collocated, and he did not bother to distinguish the divergent meanings of the two passages.

Since Cycnus’ skin was impenetrable (S. F 500), piercing weapons were useless against him. One obvious solution would be to damage the vital organs that lay beneath Cycnus’ skin. This is what Achilles is said to have done in *Epit.* 3.31, crushing Cycnus’ head with a hefty rock: *καὶ λίθον βαλὼν εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν Κύκνου κτείνει*. Some sources, however, specify that the blunt weapon Achilles used to cause the fatal injury was a millstone. Was Cycnus’ skin merely tough, or was it also resistant to force? To satisfy the notion that traditional blows, whether from sharp or from blunt weapons, could not hurt Cycnus but always glanced off his skin, the millstone must have been employed in some special way. Compounding our ignorance is the improbability of a millstone presenting itself amidst the Achaean beachhead before which Achilles engages Cycnus. Perhaps Achilles used an unworked rock from the plain of Troy as one uses a millstone, or

perhaps he unloaded a millstone that the Greeks had brought to prepare meals for themselves. Either way, he could have bruised and crushed Cycnus' head between the object he held in his hands and another rock or the hard ground. Did the pressing action cause decapitation? Note that Lycophron 233 says Cycnus was struck on his clavicle ("struck" implies a simple blow that happened to find the "key" or crucial [*kairion*] part of Cycnus' body, just as Achilles himself was notoriously vulnerable in exactly one spot, his heel; Hector hits Teucer's collar-bone in *Il.* 8.324-7).

An alternative application of the millstone may be posited by analogy with Mark 9:42, where Jesus in effect condemns those who interfere with his faithful to be drowned in the sea with a millstone hung around their necks.⁴³² Although this supposition finds no definite support in the surviving accounts of Cycnus' death, drowning is an obvious solution if one needs to do away with such a pesky foe, and after all the Hellespont was right there as Achilles' disposal. Indeed, the fr. assigned to a fisherman may actually describe the site of Cycnus' death and watery grave. Apparently other versions of the story played down or neglected the tradition according to which Cycnus could sustain any force of arms, with the result that his manner of death became much more mundane (one may say terrestrial) in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, for example. It must be wondered would account for the recurrence of the millstone motif in both the Greek myth of Cycnus and the Gospels. Note that the similarly invulnerable Caineus was dispatched by being bashed such that he sank, as it were, into the ground.

⁴³² Cf. Matt. 18:6, Luke 17:2; millstones occur in several different contexts in the Old Testament: Deut. 24:6; Judg. 9:53 (millstone dropped on Abimelech, crushing his skull; cf. 2Sam. 11:21); Job 41:24; Isa. 47:2; Jer. 25:10; cf. also Rev. 18:21, 22.

2.17. *Helenēs Apaitēsis*

καὶ διαπρεσβεύονται πρὸς τοὺς Τρῶας, τὴν Ἑλένην καὶ τὰ κτήματα ἀπαιτοῦντες· ὡς δὲ οὐχ ὑπήκουσαν ἐκεῖνοι, ἐνταῦθα δὴ τειχομαχοῦσιν (Arg. 10c W.)

And they send an embassy to the Trojans, demanding the return of Helen and her possessions;⁴³³ but when those people do not assent, thereupon they begin their siege.

The envoys dispatched were Odysseus and Menelaus, or at least included them.⁴³⁴ They are named in *Epit.* 3.28f., which goes on to describe in a bit more detail the embassy and its outcome:

συναθροισθείσης δὲ παρὰ τοῖς Τρωσὶν ἐκκλησίας οὐ μόνον τὴν Ἑλένην οὐκ ἀπεδίδουν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτους κτείνειν ἤθελον. τούτους μὲν οὖν ἔσωσεν Ἀντήνωρ, οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνας, ἀχθόμενοι....

After an assembly had been convened among the Trojans, they not only refused to give Helen back but were even ready to kill these men [sc. the envoys]. Antenor then saved them, but the Greeks, aggrieved....

A herald accompanies Odysseus and Menelaus on a bronze tripod leg that appears to depict this scene among others culled from the *Cypria*.⁴³⁵ The herald figure is named Talthybius on another vase representing the scene. The formal demand for the return of an abducted woman is a recurring motif in Greek mythology.⁴³⁶

Hermann argued that Sophocles' play *Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις* had to do either with the recovery of Helen upon the Sack of Troy or with a confrontation that Sophocles invented

⁴³³ The property ultimately belonged to Menelaus. Hence at Hdt. 2.118.3, τὰ χρήματα τὰ οἱ οἶχετο κλέψας Ἀλέξανδρος, the pronoun *οἱ* refers to him. Cf. *Il.* 13.626.

⁴³⁴ Hdt. 2.118.2 names only Menelaus, who was the mission's natural leader. Odysseus was surely chosen for his rhetorical ability, whose blizzard of words, following an initial show of being too angry or too dumb to speak, made quite an impression on Antenor (*Il.* 3.216-24). On this scene see Montiglio 2000: 74-6.

⁴³⁵ Olympia Mus. B 3600 = *LIMC* Achilleus 437, considered a probable reflex of the *Cypria* by West 42f., who stresses the significance of the lack of any close connection between the different scenes other than the fact that all were narrated in the same Cyclic poem.

⁴³⁶ Medea's father sends a herald to Greece to demand back his daughter at Hdt. 1.2.3.

between Menelaus and King Proteus.⁴³⁷ But the first suggestion is outlandish, the second, while compelling in some aspects, ultimately to be discarded. “The very title... proves that this play” dealt with the embassy at the outset of the war.⁴³⁸ The verb *ἀπαιτεῖν* is used in both poetry and prose⁴³⁹ to denote a formal pleading to reclaim lost property, which is not the sort of thing that could be done amidst the violence of the Sack, nor would the term apply very neatly to the recovery of Helen in Egypt, whether from the hands of Proteus or, as in Euripides’ *Helen*, his son.⁴⁴⁰ The use of the verb in the scholia relating to the embassy episode renders the noun *ἀπαίτησις* all the more applicable to it. It must also be observed that Sophocles cannot have preceded Euripides in composing a play based on the conceit that the true Helen languished in Egypt throughout the war, for Euripides’ *Helen* was a “new” one for Greek tragedy.⁴⁴¹ Nor is there a shred of evidence—beyond what Hermann makes of the fragments of *Helenēs Apaitēsis*—that Sophocles followed his younger rival in producing such a play.

The order of events varies among the sources. Proclus presents the *Cypria* as placing the embassy after the landing of the Achaean forces and the skirmish that

⁴³⁷ Hermann 1837: xv-xx.

⁴³⁸ Post 1922: 25.

⁴³⁹ Hdt. 1.2.3, again relating to the Colchians’ attempt to reclaim Medea, and 2.118.3, in reference to the present episode.

⁴⁴⁰ The verb happens to occur at *Hel.* 963 in an address to Proteus, but the addressee lies dead in his tomb, and it is the priestess Theonoë who controls the fate of Helen and Menelaus. Moreover, even if Sophocles had written a different, more straightforward version of this episode in which Menelaus spoke to a living but hostile Proteus and had to beseech him to deliver Helen, Proteus’ resistance would not accord with Euripides’ portrait of a noble king who was happy to do Zeus’ will and safeguard a foreign wife on behalf of her rightful husband. Finally, since Menelaus’ recovery of Helen in Egypt would have to be successful one way or another (as opposed to the unsuccessful embassy to Troy), it would have been inappropriate for ancient scholars to refer to a play about this Egyptian episode as “The Demanding Back of Helen.” The full or descriptive title for such a play would have been something like “The Restitution of Helen” (*Ἑλένης ἀπόδοσις vel sim.*) or “The Recovery of Helen” (*Ἑλένης κομιδή* [cf. Hdt. 9.73] *vel ἀνάληψις vel ἀνάκτησις vel sim.*), or even something more vague like “Helen in Egypt.”

⁴⁴¹ Sommerstein on *Thesmophoriazousai* 211, cited in Dobrov 2001: 204 n. 111.

attended this.⁴⁴² Herodotus gives a similar account,⁴⁴³ but unfortunately he does not corroborate Proclus' testimony of how things were arranged in the *Cypria*. For although in the immediately preceding chapters he has referred to this poem as well as to Homer, the historian claims to be basing his report of the embassy and Helen's captivity in Egypt not on any Greek epic but on the authority of some Egyptian priests, whose ancestors, they said, had spoken to Menelaus himself.

Apollodorus, on the other hand, whom it is frequently convenient to treat as a secondary witness to the Epic Cycle, says that the embassy was sent from Tenedos ahead of the army.⁴⁴⁴ The advantage of this embassy-first sequence, besides its logical coherence with principle that diplomacy is attempted *before* war is declared, is that it helps explain how the Trojans anticipated and impeded the main landing, as they do in *Shepherds*. One disadvantage of it is that it complicates the prophecy that the first Greek to set foot on Trojan soil would die; another is that one would prefer that Odysseus and Menelaus deliver their speeches with their army visible from the walls of Trojan, since this certainly enhances the sense of urgency (so Libanius *Decl.* 3 and 4). What was the order in Bacchylides and in Sophocles' play? Bethe, who calls the whole ending of Proclus' summary of the *Cypria* "ein wirres Durcheinander" ("a jumbled mess"), thinks the embassy cannot have followed a hostile engagement.⁴⁴⁵

What response did the Trojans give to the Greek claimants in the *Cypria* and in Sophocles' play? Surely they did not deny having Helen, as in Hdt. 2.118.3, since such an

⁴⁴² Frazer 1921: ii.197 (n. ad *Epit.* 3.29) misstates the testimony of Proclus on the sequence of the *Cypria*.

⁴⁴³ ἐκβάσαν δὲ ἐς γῆν καὶ ἰδρυθεῖσαν τὴν στρατιὴν πέμπειν ἐς τὸ Ἴλιον ἀγγέλους, Hdt. 2.118.2.

⁴⁴⁴ *Epit.* 3.28f. In Tzetzes, *Antehomerica* 154ff. the embassy is sent even before the departure of the army from Aulis! This clearly represents a later development in the myth, as does his inclusion of Acamas, Palamedes, and Diomedes (and no Odysseus) among the envoys.

⁴⁴⁵ Bethe 1929: 242.

excuse and disavowal do not cohere well with their defiant plotting to kill the ambassadors. They may have rebuffed Menelaus and Odysseus in language similar to Agamemnon's speech to Chryses at *Il.* 1.26-32. Although Chryses' mission is an attempt to ransom (*λυσόμενος*, *ibid.* 13) his daughter and thus differs somewhat from the demanding back of Helen, we do find the phrase *ἀπαίτησις Χρῆσηϊδος* used in a later synopsis.⁴⁴⁶ This serves as a clue to the manner in which ancient storytellers analogized different episodes of the Epic Cycle on a linguistic as well as narratological level, a process that could induce the borrowing of material from one episode for the elaboration of another.

Fragments attributed to play: in F 176 does Menelaus detect the Spartan dialect of an unseen Helen, or does she recognize the familiar accent of her husband? Welcker 119 prefers latter option. Engelmann agrees, allowing that in place of Helen one of her attendants hears Menelaus and relating a vase at the Vatican Museum appearing to show Helen eavesdropping on a conversation between Odysseus and Antenor (see Pearson 122). It is also possible that Antenor or another perceptive Trojan recognized Menelaus' Laconian accent, having heard Helen speak before. Either way, accept Hermann's correction *ἀυτός*.

F 177 may, as Bergk supposed, be parodied in Ar. fr. 451 K. Schmidt suggested that *ἐξελόντες* should be emended to *ἐξελαῶντες* (fut. of *ἐξελαύνω*); perhaps even *ἐξελοῦντες* (later fut. of *ἐξαιρέω*) might be considered. Erotian's quotation hinges on the word *θράσσει*, which he glosses as *ὄχλεῖ* for the quoted passage. As for line 2, it seems essential to proceed with Bergk's emendation of *μὲν ἔωλον* to *Μενέλεων* (accepted by Nauck; proper names were especially liable to textual corruption).

⁴⁴⁶ *Tabula of Zenodotus* (*IG* XIV.1290), line 5; see Petrain 2014: 218.

γυναῖκα δ' ἐξελόντες ἢ θράσσει με νῦν
τέως Μενέλεων γραβίοις ἐνημμένοις
<...νῦν δέ...?>

And having taken a woman who now vexes me
with Menelaus with lit wedding torches...
[but now Paris...?]

F 178 is assigned by the quoting text (sch. Ar. *Eq.* 84b) to Sophocles' *Helen*, but most scholars have agreed that, there being no other evidence for a Sophoclean play bearing that simple title, the lines should be assigned instead to *Helenēs Apaitēsis*.⁴⁴⁷ Grotius may be right, however, in assigning them to *Helenēs Gamos*; Trojan slander of Helen was probably not a central theme of a play in which both sides were competing to have her (unless she is reacting to the aspersions of the Antenoridai, a subset of Trojans who were eager to see her go), but it may well have been featured at the ill-omened wedding of Paris and Helen (was Helen even a character in *Helenēs Apaitēsis*?). Kannicht (comm. ad E. *Hel.* 262f.) sees a possible connection between F 178 and F 174, presently assigned to *Dolopes*. At F 178.2 Radt prints *μη' πὶ πλεῖον τῶνδ'*, but this represents only half of Wecklein's emendation *μη' πὶ πλεῖον χρόνον* and would seem to fall flat without the remainder. Can *τῶνδ(ε)* function as a genitive of source without a preposition ("from these men")?

F 180 indicates that the story of the seer Calchas' death was related somehow in this play. This makes it likely that Calchas was himself a character or that another Achaean quoted the prophecy that he had delivered in Aulis, stressing the point that Troy was doomed to fall; whereupon a Trojan character (Cassandra or Helenus?) attempted to

⁴⁴⁷ Hermann 1837: xv argues, in fact, that the scholiast's words *ἔστι γοῦν ἀπὸ Σοφοκλέους Ἑλένης* were meant to refer to the character who speaks the quotation.

discredit Calchas by foretelling that he would one day meet a superior seer and, crestfallen, would promptly die.⁴⁴⁸ Thus while retelling a myth contained in the *Cypria* Sophocles touches upon one contained in the *Nostoi*.⁴⁴⁹

2.18. Achilles *Ptoliporthos*

ἔπειτα τὴν χώραν ἐπέξελθόντες πορθοῦσι καὶ τὰς περιοίκους πόλεις... κάπειτα ἀπελαύνει τὰς Αἰνείου βοῶς, καὶ Λυρνησσὸν καὶ Πήδασον πορθεῖ καὶ συχνάς τῶν περιοικίδων πόλεων. (Arg. 11a, c-d W.)

Then marching out across the land they ravage the surrounding towns.... And then [Achilles] rustles the cattle of Aeneas. And he ravages Lyrnessus and Pedasus and many of the surrounding towns.

Perhaps not unexpectedly given their relatively marginal status, these exploits, which Homer twice recalls when Achilles and Aeneas meet in the *Iliad* (20.90-3, 187-94), are hardly reflected in surviving tragedy, counting even the fragments.⁴⁵⁰ Moreover, in comparison to Sophocles, Euripides pays little attention to all remaining episodes in the *Cypria*.⁴⁵¹ Nevertheless, it should not be forgotten that it was from either Lyrnessus (*Il.* 2.690, 19.60, 296) or Pedasus (*Cyp.* fr. 23 W.) that Achilles took Briseis after wreaking havoc on her people and noble family. Achilles' raids are also regularly cited and heavily leaned upon by scholars who confront the challenge of explaining how exactly the Trojan War advanced from its first year all the way to the end of its ninth and the start of the *Iliad*.⁴⁵²

⁴⁴⁸ Cf. Welcker 123; Pearson 1917: 122.

⁴⁴⁹ Alternative sources: Hes. fr. 188 and Pheryc. *FHG* 1.94.

⁴⁵⁰ Jouan 1966: 340 n. 2 suggests that E. *IA* 1067-70 alludes to Achilles' future ravaging of the Troad during the war's early stages, but it could also be that by using the phrase *Πριάμοιο κλεινὰν γαῖαν ἐκπυρώσων* the Chorus either predicts (wrongly) that Achilles will participate in the Sack of Troy or simply states his intention to do so. Cf. Pi. *Pae.* 6.89-91: *πρὸ πόνων | δέ κε μεγάλων Δαρδανίαν | ἔπραθεν, εἰ μὴ...*

⁴⁵¹ Jouan 1966: 339f.

⁴⁵² For the end of the ninth year as the point at which Homer picks up the story, see *Il.* 2.295. Eustathius explains why this was the "more economical" starting point (1.11.20ff. van der Valk): *οὐδὲ γὰρ εἶχεν ἄλλως ἀξιόλογον ὕλην γραφῆς, διότι τὰ μὲν προηγησάμενα ἐννέα ἔτη ἀνειμένως εἶχον τῆς μάχης, πολεμαρχοῦντος*

It is interesting that Proclus fails to name Hypoplakian Thebe, which was Andromache’s hometown (E. *Andr.* 1, *Θηβαία πόλις*) and which Homer mentions together with Lyrnessus as a prominent victim of Achilles’ destruction.⁴⁵³ Eustathius (*Il.* 119.4) attributes to the *Cypria* the story that Chryseis of Chryse was captured from Thebe after going there to aid in a sacrifice to Artemis (cf. sch. (bT) *Il.* 1.366c = *Cyp.* fr. 24 W.). Assuming Eustathius’ attribution is reliable, the *Cypria* did address Thebe’s fate, although it may also have engaged in some merging of locales as Aeschylus is said to have done in his *Phryges* (= *Ransom of Hector*).⁴⁵⁴ This might explain the apparent omission in Proclus’ summary, which however never sought to provide complete coverage anyway.

Just as the *Cypria* poet evidently took care to introduce Briseis and Chryseis at the appropriate times in anticipation of the events of *Iliad* Book 1, he may also have seized the opportunity to narrate (in real time, as it were) Achilles’ slaughter of Andromache’s father Eëtion and her seven brothers and the ransoming of her mother—all of which would corroborate the retrospective account Andromache herself gives at *Il.* 6.14-28—as

τοῦ ἀνδρειοτάτου Ἀχιλλέως καὶ τοὺς Τρῶας ὡς τὰ πολλὰ τῇ πόλει διὰ δέος ἐγκατακλείοντος. One can only imagine that in the *Cypria* it was boredom more than anything else that led Achilles to plunder the Troad.

⁴⁵³ See Willcock 1978: 190f. (*Il.* 1.184n.) and Currie 2015: 293f.

⁴⁵⁴ Sch. (*MNOGud.*) E. *Andr.* 1: ἐνιοὶ δὲ καὶ τὴν Χρῦσην καὶ τὴν Λυρνησσὸν ἐν τῷ τῆς Θήβης πεδίῳ τάσσουσιν, ὡς Αἰσχύλος Λυρνησσίδα προσαγορεύσας τὴν Ἀνδρομάχην ἐν τοῖς Φρυζίν, ἔνθα καὶ ζένως ἰστορεῖ Ἀνδραίμονος αὐτὴν λέγων· Ἀνδραίμονος γένεθλον <-> Λυρνησσίου, | ὄθεν περ Ἔκτωρ ἄλοχον ἤγαγεν φίλην’ (A. F 267). If both Andromache and Briseis came from Lyrnessus (here purportedly a part of the greater metropolitan area of Hypoplakian Thebe), an interesting link emerges between Achilles and Hector. Most scholars have taken γένεθλον to refer to Andromache, while Radt proposes (*TrGF* iii.368) that it may designate another “offspring” who was a compatriot of hers; but perhaps the term should be translated “race” (cf. A. *Supp.* 290), in which case it may even serve (instead of *Λυρνησσίου*) as the antecedent of ὄθεν. This interpretation shares with Radt’s the advantage of allowing Eëtion to remain Andromache’s father, as was canonical: Aeschylus might have viewed Andraemon as an older ancestor (the closest neighbor to bear that name was the Andraemon who founded Colophon according to Mimmermus *ap.* Strabo 14.1.3; another Andraemon was the father of Thoas, who commanded the Aetolians at Troy: *Il.* 2.638). Do the Euripidean scholia err in their exposition of A. F 267 or infer from it more than they should? Whether they do or not, it seems likely that Aeschylus followed these verses with a recollection of the ravaging of Lyrnessus (and other towns nearby), although that is not to say that he definitely consulted the *Cypria*.

well as to explain how Andromache escaped their doom (for now) because she had previously been married off to Hector.⁴⁵⁵ Their wedding is alluded to only briefly in the *Iliad* (22.468-72, cf. 6.398) but is described vividly by Sappho (fr. 44 V) and may well have been a traditional subject for lyric poets if not also for epic rhapsodists.⁴⁵⁶ After all, knowledge of the union's calamitous end makes any account of that joyous occasion instantly compelling.⁴⁵⁷ Thus the *Cypria* should be counted among the potential influences for vignettes about the famous wedding in tragedy, such as E. *Andr.* 2-5.⁴⁵⁸

2.19. Achilles Beholds Helen

καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα Ἀχιλλεὺς Ἑλένην ἐπιθυμεῖ θεάσασθαι, καὶ συνήγαγεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ Ἀφροδίτη καὶ Θέτις. εἶτα ἀπονοστεῖν ὠρμημένους τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς Ἀχιλλεὺς κατέχει. (Arg. 11b W.)

And after that Achilles desires to see Helen, and Aphrodite and Thetis bring [lit., “brought”] them together in the same place. Then Achilles checks the Achaeans when they start to make for home.

⁴⁵⁵ Cf. West 121. Although this is the most suitable place in the *Cypria* for a digression on their marriage, conceivably it could have been mentioned in any of the episodes set in Troy. These are few and far between, however, due to the poem's Hellenocentric quality, which is itself conditioned by the fact that the *antehomeric* mostly consist of preparations for war, and it is the Greeks who must mobilize and reach Troy. To wit, the other Trojan episodes in the *Cypria* that might have led to an aside on the wedding are: Paris' departure after the Judgment and his return home (*supra*, §2.4) and the first sortie undertaken by Hector (and Cycnus, *supra*, §2.16). (It is unlikely that the *Cypria* narrated the wedding *per se* because (1) the event is not causally linked to anything immediately preceding or following it, (2) it does not advance the onset of war, and (3) it is not mentioned as a distinct episode by Proclus or any other witness.)

⁴⁵⁶ Pallantza 2005: 80f., in discussing the debated authorship of the Sapphic poem, points to “der stark epische Charakter (bzw. die epische Atmosphäre) des Gedichtes,” to “die—für Sapphos Verhältnisse—außerordentliche Häufigkeit epischer Formen,” and most obviously to “das daktylische Versmaß.” While she prefers to attribute these features to Sappho's own genre-bending aspirations, it is also possible that they are due to the poetess' familiarity with earlier epic renditions of the same theme (cf. Kullmann 1960: 182ff. on the prospect of a version in the Cycle). Homer's generic description of γάμοι in the Shield of Achilles ephrasis (*Il.* 18.491-6) also supports this hypothesis, which does not contradict Pallantza's conclusion that “Sappho...[den] Stoff zu ihrem Zweck entwickelt” (84).

⁴⁵⁷ Yet Pallantza 2005: 81f. defends the *communis opinio* that Sappho fr. 44 V is an *epithalamium* on the grounds that it elides the unsavory future, tending in fact to elide the paradigmatic couple altogether while promoting the experience of the merrymakers, at once those of the myth and those of contemporary Lesbos.

⁴⁵⁸ Cf. E. *Tro.* 675f. (about the wedding night), 745-8. Cf. also A. F 276.2, quoted *supra*, n. 253; the fragment is cut off there, leaving us to wonder whether Aeschylus went into any of the traditional details about the wedding (e.g., what dowry the bride brought).

West regards this episode as the bellwether of a romantic strain in the *Cypria*.⁴⁵⁹ We can rule out that *Lakainai* was about this episode because that play is listed by Aristotle (*Poet.* 1459b6) as one of the plays deriving its material from the *Little Iliad*. West, rejecting the argument that the pair had sex,⁴⁶⁰ believes the rendezvous occurred in the Achaean camp; he compares Priam's divinely assisted secret infiltration of Achilles' hut in *Iliad* 24 and Aphrodite's concealment of Paris in *Il.* 3.380-2. Tzetzes on Lyc. 174 tells two stories in which Achilles, in addition to having sex with Helen in a dream, sees her on the walls of Troy. Unlike Fantuzzi, West does not hesitate to draw a causal connection between the two successive episodes connected by *εἶτα*:⁴⁶¹ Achilles' checking of the despondent Greeks is a demonstration of his newfound investment in and commitment to the war resulting from his laying eyes on Helen. Cf. Odysseus' checking of the restive Achaeans, a parallel passage in *Iliad* Book 2.⁴⁶²

There is no trace of this story in drama.⁴⁶³ This is unfortunate, for the story is also unparalleled in the rest of Greek literature, and therefore its recurrence in drama would be very strong evidence of the *Cypria*'s influence on playwrights. The impulse to bring Achilles and Helen together, however, is reflected in their marriage in the afterworld, attested in several sources, and even in the planned marriage of their children Neoptolemus and Hermione (*Od.* 4.6f.).⁴⁶⁴

⁴⁵⁹ West 61, cf. 118f.; Welcker i.159; Tsagalis 2004; Fantuzzi 2012: 13f.

⁴⁶⁰ Davies 1989: 48.

⁴⁶¹ In *Nostoi* arg. 3b W. Proclus uses *εἶτα* as an alternative to his usual *ἔπειτα* or *καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα* to introduce the next action without explicitly drawing a causal connection, but that alone does not preclude the *Cypria* from having drawn such a connection.

⁴⁶² And see Griffin 1977: 44.

⁴⁶³ Welcker 158ff. rescinded his earlier theory (1826: 294) that Sophocles' *Ἑλένης ἀρπαγή* told of Aphrodite's temporary removal of Helen from Troy to meet Achilles. On this barely attested play see *supra*, pp. 65-8.

⁴⁶⁴ Cf. West 286.

The *Cypria* poet no doubt based Achilles' restraining of the mutinous Achaeans on *Il.* 2.142-393, although Neoanalysts may wish to argue that the story in the *Cypria* predated the one in the *Iliad*. The differences between them lie first in the fact that at this early stage in the war one would expect morale to have been far higher among the Achaeans, who had met with initial success thanks to Achilles; it is unlikely that the *Cypria* repeated Homer's impetus for the mutiny, namely Agamemnon's dream-induced decision to test the army's commitment to the campaign. But this may only prove that many were expecting swift attainment of total victory, which the Trojans could easily avert simply by refusing to fight. Additionally, in the *Iliad* it is Odysseus who restores order, as Achilles has already withdrawn from the host (thus adding to their consternation). One might expect that, just as Odysseus uses a combination of corporal punishment and threatening words to chastise the troops, so too did Achilles in the *Cypria* employ both tactics, perhaps adding a contemptuous boast that in their absence he would sack Troy on his own and keep all the plunder for himself. Finally, we cannot say whether Thersites played the villain in the *Cypria* episode as he does in *Iliad* 2, but a confrontation between him and Achilles at this point would help to establish an enmity that recurs later in the Cycle. Indeed, Proclus reports that in the *Aethiopsis* Achilles murders Thersites after the scoundrel reviles him for having fallen in love with Penthesilea. Whereas the Achaeans unanimously jeer and laugh at Thersites when Odysseus manhandles him (*Il.* 2.270-77), killing him goes too far and leads to *stasis* rather than reconciliation. Fortunately, Achilles achieves *katharsis* through the beneficence of none other than Odysseus.⁴⁶⁵ On this episode Chaeremon wrote a play

⁴⁶⁵ *Aeth.* arg. 1d-e W.: καὶ Ἀχιλλεὺς Θερσίτην ἀναιρεῖ λοιδορηθεὶς πρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ὄνειδισθεὶς τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ Πενθεσιλείᾳ λεγόμενον ἔρωτα. καὶ ἐκ τούτου στάσις γίνεται τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς περὶ τοῦ Θερσίτου φόνου. μετὰ δὲ

called *Achilles Thersitoktonos*. As it is thought to have been a satyr-drama,⁴⁶⁶ one can assume that Chaerephon invited his audience to suspend their horror at the killing of allies and to consider Thersites to be as deserving of his death at Achilles' hands as he was of his beating at Odysseus'.

2.20. The Slaying of Troilus

καὶ Τρωΐλον φονεύει. Λυκάονά τε Πάτροκλος εἰς Λῆμνον ἀγαγὼν ἀπεμπολεῖ. (Arg. 11e-f W.)

And he murders Troilus. And Patroclus bringing Lycaon to Lemnos sells him off.

Before embarking on his quest to ransom Hector, Priam laments the loss of his best sons, among whom he names *Τρωΐλον ἰπποχάρμη*. This epithet and the scholium that connects it to Sophocles' *Troilus* have been misconstrued. To begin with, the epithet deserves its own lexical analysis. When the word recurs at *Od.* 11.259 it is glossed in the scholia as having two distinct possible meanings: *ἦτοι χαίροντα ἵπποις, ἢ ἐφ' ἵππων μαχόμενον*.⁴⁶⁷ The first element of the compound presents no problem.⁴⁶⁸ *Prima facie* the second element should derive from *χάρμη*, which bears a close semantic relationship to a verb (*χαίρω*), rather than from *χάρμη*, which is not (hence the scholiast's shift in the second alternative to a verb with a different root).⁴⁶⁹ The sense of the compound, then,

ταῦτα Ἀχιλλεὺς εἰς Λέσβον πλεῖ, καὶ θύσας Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ Ἀρτέμιδι καὶ Λητοῖ καθαίρεται τοῦ φόνου ὑπ' Ὀδυσσεύως.

⁴⁶⁶ Nauck 782f.

⁴⁶⁷ Hesychius s.v. attempts to justify the latter alternative by way of a (false) etymology: *ὁ ἐφ' ἵπποις χαίρων, ἢ μαχόμενος· χάρμη γὰρ ἢ μετὰ χαρᾶς μάχη*. Cf. sch. A^{el} Pi. O. 1.35 (the epithet used here is the slightly shorter *ἰπποχάρμης*, although the longer form appears throughout the scholia).

⁴⁶⁸ The substitution of *ἰππο-* for the root *ἵππο-* is “metrically conditioned” (Beekes 2010: 597, cf. 1606); very often the bare stem of a noun (without a case ending) serves as the first element in a compound (Debrunner 1917: 36f.).

⁴⁶⁹ In many compounds “[d]as Hinterglied regiert als Nomen agentis das Vorderglied” (Debrunner 1917: 48); but the relationship of the two elements need not be that of a direct object to a subject, and a dative, e.g., can be represented in the subordinate idea (*ibid.* 42). Beekes 2010: 1606 derives *χάρμη* from *χαίρω*, but the verb by itself cannot mean “delight in battle.”

matches ἵπποισιν καὶ ὄχεσφιν ἀγαλλόμενος (*Il.* 12.114) or post-Homeric φίλιππος and is not equivalent to ἵππεύς in the sense “chariot-fighter” (*Il.* 2.810). At the same time, it should be observed that in the Homeric compound μενεχάρμης “staunch in battle,” what allows the second element to bear the meaning of χάρμη is the fact that the first element fulfills the verbal role.⁴⁷⁰

Regarding *Il.* 24.257 we are told (sch. T) that on the basis of the epithet ἵπποχάρμης Sophocles portrayed Troilus as being ambushed “while training horses” (*ἵππους γυμνάζοντα*). In reality, even before Sophocles’ play the wider Cyclic tradition had long held that Troilus was occupied with horses at the time of Achilles’ assault; many black-figure vase paintings demonstrate this and at the same time concur that Troilus was young (only two “beardless” examples).⁴⁷¹ It is impossible therefore to determine exactly how Sophocles would have interpreted the epithet, yet the wording of the scholium is instructive about the characterization of Troilus, who neither in the *Iliad* nor in the remnants of Sophocles’ play is referred to unambiguously as a charioteer or indeed as having any real military experience. However, already in antiquity there was

⁴⁷⁰ Compounds such as ὀπλοχαρής and μουσοχαρής, derived from the second aorist stem of χαίρω, abound in late Greek (Beekes 2010: 1606), which may have impelled some Hellenistic scholars to dissociate ἵπποχάρμης from χαίρω, or at least from χάρμα in favor of χάρμη. One may wonder what prevented a formation like *ἵπποχαρής from being essayed earlier, but the same can be wondered about large classes of compounds including those in -ης derived from verbs in -εῖν, which “beginnen im Ionisch-Attischen kurz vor dem Übergang in die Koine und setzen sich in der letztern fort” (Debrunner 1917: 49; but note the apparent exception ποδάρκης [neuter sometimes oxytone according to Herodian, *De pros. cath.* p. 350 Lentz]). Conveniently for the poet, ἵπποχάρμης also differs metrically and semantically from e.g. ἵππόδαμος (used in the *Iliad* of Hector and the Trojans generally).

⁴⁷¹ Scenes on vases depicting various stages of the encounter between Achilles and Troilus were quite popular in the Archaic period: see *LIMC* s.v. Achilleus, nos. 206-388; s.v. Troilus (17 more examples). The location of the encounter is variable (at a fountain-house or in the precinct of Apollo Thymbraios), but the presence of horses and the youthful (even pre-adolescent, à la Astyanax) appearance of the victim are almost universal, as is his lack of weapons. For some scholars (see *LIMC* viii.1.91 [Kossatz-Deissmann]) Priam’s naming of Ares as the murderer of his best sons including Troilus (*Il.* 24.260) suggests that Homer followed a version of the story in which Troilus challenged Achilles in battle and was killed therein. This is the version that much later Verg. *Aen.* 1.474-8 seems to follow, although it is just possible that Troilus was merely out training and dropped his weapons immediately for flight (note *amissis...armis*, 474); *congressus* in line 475 would then mean not “having joined battle with” but “having run into.” But Ares can logically be called the killer of all who died as a result of the Trojan War, whether in open combat or not.

evidently an ongoing debate over Troilus' age at the time of his death. The same scholium (T) states, *ὑπονοήσσειε δ' ἄν τις... τὸν Τρωΐλον οὐ παῖδα, διότι ἐν τοῖς ἀρίστοις καταλέγεται*. This is relatively measured commentary, but it is even uncertain whether Priam in his present state of distress would restrict the category of “best” to sons who had proved themselves on the battlefield, and indeed the rebuke of his surviving sons is stronger if they are held to be more worthless than one who never reached adulthood. By contrast, the Aristarchean scholion (A) is as usual polemical:

ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ εἰρησθαι ἵπποχάρμην τὸν Τρωΐλον οἱ νεώτεροι ἐφ' ἵππου διωκόμενον αὐτὸν ἐποίησαν. καὶ οἱ μὲν παῖδα αὐτὸν ὑποτίθενται, Ὅμηρος δὲ διὰ τοῦ ἐπιθέτου τέλειον ἄνδρα ἐμφαίνει· οὐ γὰρ ἄλλος ἵππόμαχος λέγεται.

Because⁴⁷² later poets, from the fact that Troilus was called *ἵπποχάρμης*, presented him being pursued while on a horse. And some suppose that he was a boy, but Homer through the epithet indicates that he was a mature man; for another [i.e., a younger man] is not [able to be] called “fighter on horseback.”

Thus at least two accusations are leveled against the *νεώτεροι*, who must include Sophocles: (1) they misconstrued the meaning of *ἵπποχάρμης*, and (2) as a result of that false reading they deceived themselves into thinking that Troilus was just a boy when Achilles killed him.⁴⁷³ There may also be a hint of disdain for the depiction of Troilus as fleeing Achilles on horseback: the scene that later poets imagined was derivative if not also inappropriate (far from affording a fine opportunity to relate that Achilles could outpace a horse). But for Aristarchus (or whichever ancient scholar is the source of this rant) to gloss *ἵπποχάρμης* as *ἵππόμαχος* simply begs the question at issue in accusation

⁴⁷² Aristonicus' reconstructed scholium on *ἵπποχάρμην* (*De signis Iliadis*, p. 345 Friedländer) prepends the phrase *ἢ διπλῆ*: “The *diple* [i.e., critical mark indicating ambiguity in the line's interpretation] because....”

⁴⁷³ Cf. Severyns 1928.

(1), which renders accusation (2) baseless as well.⁴⁷⁴ Pro-Homer fundamentalism often led to this kind of questionable argumentation among adherents of Aristarchus' school.

Nor is it just the evidence related to Troilus that favors translating *ἵππιохάρμης* as “rejoicing in horses.” Hesiod’s *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 7 M-W) uses the term to describe the hero Macedon immediately after describing Zeus as *τερπικέρανος* “delighting in thunder,” and there is a strong sense that each epithet denotes in parallel fashion a domain in which the respective individual exults. And although A. *Pers.* 29 uses *ἵππιохάρμης* in the vicinity of *ἵπποβάτης* “horseman” and *τοξοδάμας* “subduing with the bow,” it cannot be ruled out that the poet is using a word whose basic meaning is as broad as “rejoicing in horses” and supplying it with a more specific martial connotation entirely dependent on context. Such an interpretation at any rate is represented in the scholia.⁴⁷⁵

Much of the preceding serves to negate the argument that *ἵππιохάρμης* means “fighter on horseback.” There is also positive evidence that the epithet not only means “rejoicing in horses” but also is associated especially with youths, which is corroborated by the characterization of Troilus in Homer and in the Cyclic tradition. Hes. fr. 205 M-W describes Aegina’s son Aeacus as *ἵππιохάρμην* before continuing, *αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ’ ἦβης πολυηράτου ἴκετο μέτρον*.... This suggests that the hero, lacking human neighbors, found companionship in horses, and that this occurred while he was still young. So in Aeacus’ case and probably also in Troilus’, equine husbandry was a decidedly juvenile pursuit.

Since Troilus’ tender age remained canonical and a key aspect of his story (the lone

⁴⁷⁴ *ἵππόμαχος* occurs at *Il.* 10.431.

⁴⁷⁵ *ὁ τοῖς ἵπποις χαίρων* (cf. sch. *Pi. O.* 1.35, *τὸν τῆ ἵπτικῆ χαίροντα*, and in the same discussion the phrase *διὰ τὸ ἵπποτροφεῖν*); beside this straightforward gloss we find a contrary explanation: *ὁ διὰ τῶν ἵππων εἰς τὴν μάχην πορευόμενος*. But such a definition falls flat in the context of Homeric warfare, in which a chariot (*ἄρμα*) drawn by horses was the normal mode of transportation for heroes entering battle.

epithet used of him at Hor. *Od.* 2.9.15f. is *inpubis*), we may also assume—for every source that does not explicitly tell us otherwise—that his association with horses remained that of a boy, not that of a warrior.

2.21. The Murder of Palamedes

καὶ ἐκ τῶν λαφύρων Ἀχιλλεὺς μὲν Βρισηΐδα γέρας λαμβάνει, Χρυσηΐδα δὲ Ἀγαμέμνων. ἔπειτά ἐστι Παλαμήδους θάνατος. (Arg. 12a-b W.)

And from the spoils Achilles takes Briseis as his prize, Agamemnon Chryseis. Next comes the death of Palamedes.

Proclus does not indicate how Palamedes was killed in the *Cypria*. Based on the several reconstructed tragic treatments and subsequent mythological summaries (to be discussed below), one would expect that Odysseus, jealous of Palamedes, fabricated evidence in the form of gold or a forged note and orchestrated a trial by which he was wrongfully found guilty of treason and accordingly stoned to death. Thanks to Pausanias' autoptic testimony (10.31.2 = *Cyp.* fr. 27 W.), we know that things happened quite differently in the Cyclic poem:

Παλαμήδην δὲ ἀποπνιγῆναι προελθόντα ἐπὶ ἰχθύων θήραν, Διομήδην δὲ τὸν ἀποκτείναντα εἶναι καὶ Ὀδυσσεά, ἐπιλεξάμενος ἐν ἔπεσιν οἶδα τοῖς Κυπρίοις.

And I know, having read it in the *Cypria*, that Palamedes was drowned after going out to catch fish, and that Diomedes was the killer, and Odysseus.

In Homer fishing was a last resort for starving men, so the Achaean army was apparently under duress around this time.⁴⁷⁶ Palamedes had earlier helped manage the food shortage at Aulis, and according to sch. Lyc. *Alex.* 581 he later helped feed the army by enlisting

⁴⁷⁶ As Robert 1920-6: iii 1130 surmises. Cf. *Od.* 4.368f., 12.330-2.

the help of the magical Oinotropoi (see below).⁴⁷⁷ The fact that in the *Cypria* Palamedes was ambushed while fishing suggests that in the original configuration of the myth his murder occurred around the time of a food shortage, and in a passage of Servius generally taken to depend on Sophocles' *Palamedes* the theme of famine recurs as part of the background to Palamedes' murder. According to West, the poet of the *Cypria* inserted the famine story along with the assistance of the Oinotropoi as a way to fill up the uneventful first years of the Trojan War, and it was Odysseus and Menelaus who retrieved the nourishing daughters of Anius, as the scholia to *Od.* 6.164.⁴⁷⁸ Possibly this poet had it that Palamedes developed some improved technique or contraption⁴⁷⁹ for more efficient deep-sea fishing, and on the occasion of his demonstration of this Odysseus took his revenge. However, Pausanias clearly designates Diomedes as the lead assailant (*τὸν ἀποκτείναντα*), so in the *Cypria* Palamedes must have incurred the wrath of more than just Odysseus, unless the latter had deluded Diomedes into thinking that Palamedes was a traitor or in some other way deserving of death. The manner and motivation of Palamedes' death in the *Cypria* may thus have been more convoluted or involved than we can ascertain, but from a narrative standpoint such an eminent figure "[h]ad to be disposed of before the end of the poem as he had no existence in the *Iliad*."⁴⁸⁰ The tragedians were bound to alter the manner of Palamedes' murder since the *Cypria*'s fishing story simply was not "well suited for tragic presentation" (nor was the alternative given by Dictys 2.15).⁴⁸¹

⁴⁷⁷ Cf. Thucydides' "Archaeology" for ancient skepticism about the ability of the Greek troops at Troy to sustain themselves for so long.

⁴⁷⁸ West 124f. He also doubts that the Greeks made an initial call at Delos before arriving at Troy.

⁴⁷⁹ The word "net" appears in line 6 of Pi. fr. 260 Snell-Maehler, though not necessarily in this connection.

⁴⁸⁰ West 123.

⁴⁸¹ Sommerstein 2000: 123 n. 10.

By having Palamedes redress the food shortage not through fishing but through the procurement of grain following a failure by Odysseus to procure any, a later poet, perhaps one of the tragedians and most probably Sophocles, apparently altered the story so as to give Odysseus further cause for jealous hatred. Servius on Verg. *Aen.* 2.81 says that Odysseus for his part sought grain from Thrace, but it is not explicitly stated where Palamedes finally procured it. It could be that, as per the scholia to Lyc. *Alex.* 581, Palamedes helped win the aid of the daughters of Delian Anius, who could conjure wheat, wine, and oil at will. Separately, the scholia on *Od.* 6.164, citing Simonides (*PMG* 537), state that it was Menelaus, accompanied by Odysseus,⁴⁸² who undertook an embassy to Delos to fetch (such is the meaning that West assigns to the preposition *ἐπί*) these Oinotropoi, as they were also called. If that was the occasion when Odysseus tried and failed to obtain grain before Palamedes succeeded in the same place, then Servius' reference to Thrace rather than Delos is peculiar (moreover, beginning in Homer the Thracians were generally allies of the Trojans, so any Greek embassy that expected to receive a warm welcome there would have been misguided). Since the Greeks did encounter the Oinotropoi at some point in the *Cypria*, it is possible that the poet who wanted to give Odysseus added incentive to murder Palamedes did so by manipulating the timing and details of this episode. It is also possible that the *Cypria* already included the story of Palamedes' succeeding where Odysseus had failed (i.e., in procuring grain);

⁴⁸² The same pairing as in the *Helenēs Apaitēsis* episode. Even if Odysseus accompanied Menelaus on a special mission to Delos according to Simonides, it is unlikely that this is the episode to which Odysseus refers when addressing Nausicaa in the *Odyssey*. In describing a journey to Delos, he says, *ἦλθον γὰρ καὶ κείσε, πολλὸς δὲ μοι ἔσπετο λαός, / τὴν ὁδὸν ἣ δὴ μέλλεν ἐμοὶ κακὰ κήδε' ἔσεσθαι* (*Od.* 6.164f.). The party led by Menelaus and Odysseus on a quest for provisions would not have been large, and it seems more likely that, *contra* the ancient commentator, Odysseus is indeed describing *τὸν ἴδιον στόλον*, i.e., his homeward voyage from Troy, which indeed caused him much grief. Since Odysseus does not mention a stop at Delos in his later report to the Phaeacians, the poet of the *Odyssey* must not have thought much of the episode to which he alludes, or he may even be improvising here without any basis in tradition. (On the other hand, Vergil may have been taking a cue from tradition when he makes his hero travel to Delos in *Aeneid* 3.73ff.)

tragedy's main departure from the epic version would then be the omission of the fishing trip, apparently aimed at supplementing the grain already procured, which was replaced with an alternative, more cerebral account of the murder plot against Palamedes.

According to Scodel, who has had her followers, Aeschylus' *Palamedes* is essentially hypothesized in the scholia to Euripides' *Orestes* 432.⁴⁸³ Here it is actually a conspiracy among three Achaean kings, namely Agamemnon, Odysseus, and Diomedes, that ruins Palamedes.⁴⁸⁴ The inclusion of Diomedes in the murder plot would place Aeschylus closest to the Cyclic version of events,⁴⁸⁵ which conforms to our general conception that when tragedy took over a story from epic there followed a *gradual* departure from the original presentation of events owing to piecemeal changes over time. Aeschylus apparently omitted any mention of famine at Troy, an obvious move once he had decided to do away with the fishing trip and explain the murder of Palamedes via other means; the playwright was thus free to place the murder of Palamedes any time after his unintentionally mutinous *aristeia* at Aulis.⁴⁸⁶ (Sophocles, at least, being equally familiar with the Cyclic version of the story and desiring to give Odysseus added incentive, saw fit to restore the famine story, but without restoring the element of the fishing trip.) The interception of a Phrygian on his way to deliver gold to Sarpedon

⁴⁸³ Scodel 1980: 43-54; cf. Gantz 1993: 606. Sommerstein initially showed favor for Scodel's arguments (2000: 123 n. 10) but subsequently withdrew this support (*SFP* 2012: 118ff.).

⁴⁸⁴ The commentator uses the phrase "those around Agamemnon, Odysseus, and Diomedes," on which Sommerstein (*SFP* 2012: 118 n. 29) comments that "in later Greek this idiom need not include persons other than those actually named." Does this extend to instances where the phrase is used with just one name, e.g. sch. (bT) *Il.* 10.435 (see Liapis 2012: xix n. 9)?

⁴⁸⁵ Is it possible that we should restore Diomedes' name in line 10 of Pi. fr. 260 Snell-Machler (*διο[* is the reading of the papyrus)? Sommerstein argues by way of general inference (*SFP* 2012: 114) that the subject-matter of Pindar's poem, which apparently included Odysseus' denouncement of Palamedes (the first two lines read *τιν ἐλεγχο[| κρυφίον δὲ λό[γον]*), was derived from Aeschylus' play.

⁴⁸⁶ The many innovations of Palamedes at Aulis included measures for redressing a food shortage, which successfully brought parity to the distribution of rations but also drew the ire of the trio of kings mentioned in the source. Thus the causal connection between the abatement of famine and resentment among certain of Palamedes' peers is in fact present in multiple accounts.

(apparently a mercenary payment or bribe) is fortuitous, much like the capture of Helenus later in the war (the prophet was spared from execution by securing an oath from his captors, as opposed to this Phrygian page and Dolon, who were both executed immediately after the Greeks had exhausted their usefulness). It also calls attention to the question of the language barrier between the Greeks and Trojans. Homer of course allows the two sides to communicate, but the language of the letter would have to be one that the Phrygian captive was capable of writing and one that Palamedes could be assumed to read, and it gives one pause to consider whether that language was Greek or Trojan (Sommerstein says Greek for the version of the story summarized by Servius;⁴⁸⁷ that the letter is written “in Phrygian characters” in the version of sch. E. *Or.* 432 means Palamedes could read Phrygian, and so could independent members of the Greek army). It is of course ironic that Palamedes introduced “Phoenician letters” to the Greeks,⁴⁸⁸ who then contrived a plot to destroy him that was greatly dependent on a forged letter. Although the letter was not an original element of the story, the function given to it by the tragedians adheres to the suspicious attitude with which earlier authors purported to view such written communications. This is due to the fact that well into the Classical period a sinister air of secrecy surrounded letters, which were regarded as both “authoritative and deceptive” and generally employed as such rather than being applied to everyday occasions.⁴⁸⁹ Amidst this general suspicion the tragedians may have been inspired in

⁴⁸⁷ Sommerstein p. 117 n. 28.

⁴⁸⁸ A feat ascribed at A. *PV* 460f. and elsewhere to Prometheus, who in myth is a sort of soulmate to Palamedes.

⁴⁸⁹ Harris 1989: 88. From the historical record he cites (*ibid.* nn. 109-111) Hdt. 3.128, in which a satrap is destroyed by a letter forged in Darius’ name; id. 1.124f., in which Cyrus himself forges a letter; id. 8.120 as well as Thuc. 1.128, 129, and 137, all relating letters sent by Medizers to the Great King (Palamedes’ enemies alleged that he committed just such a crime); and the many grave letters recorded in Thuc. book 8. Antiphon offers a rhetorical argument (5.53-6) that messages are sent in (sealed) written form only to hide information from their messengers or when excessively long. In view of the mythical and historical stories

particular by *Il.* 6.168, in which Proetus compounds his wife's mendacity and betrays Bellerophon by means of *σήματα λυγρά* ("baneful symbols"; this is the sole reference to writing in Homer, and there is none in Hesiod). At any rate, the *Palamedes* plays do not chart any new terrain by having a letter serve as a vehicle of collusion and destruction. But it is on two different levels that they take advantage of the general presumption that letters were used for deceptive or otherwise nefarious aims: within the story the alleged conspiracy between Palamedes and the Trojans and the very existence of a physical letter, a natural medium for such treachery, corroborate each other to the hero's cost; meanwhile, the plays' audiences would have seen the successful fabrication of the letter as yet another reason to be wary of such objects—the stigma itself invited tampering, worthy of further stigma. Thus there was nothing good to gain in the exchange of letters: either a letter-writer was deemed someone who had something to hide and whose text should therefore be studied for incriminating evidence, or a letter was favorably received and acted upon despite being of spurious origins or making untrue claims (if not both). Exemplifying the latter occurrence, Euripides' *Hippolytus* hinges on a suicide note that did not merely bid its recipient farewell but bore a false and fatal accusation (856-81, 1311f.).

The Sophoclean version of the story, which scholars tend to agree is summarized in Servius' account, involved the remarkable spectacle of Odysseus duplicitously speaking in Palamedes' defense.⁴⁹⁰ This is one of the idiosyncratic points that could help

involving letters one need add only that they also served to authenticate messages. Early letters on lead like one from Berezan and dated ca. 500 are often responses to, as opposed to causes of, personal disasters (Harris: 1989: 56, cf. Thomas 2009: 25); cf. the *ἐπιστολαί* of the captive Iphigenia at *E. IT* 589.

⁴⁹⁰ Sommerstein's note on F 479 (*SFP* 2012: 119 n. 36) seems irrelevant, for even if *ὄδδε* were used in reference to the speaker, would not the verbs be 1st pers. sg.? In any case, the verses can be reliably assigned to Odysseus in the act of pretending to defend Palamedes, and this corroborates Scodel's view that Servius follows Sophocles' account (we must, however, carefully avoid circularity here). According to

us differentiate the plots of the three homonymous tragedies. The following table dissects the major discrepancies among the four surviving mythographic summaries of the story that, as Sommerstein and others agree, probably depend on the lost Greek plays.

Source	Form and contents of forged letter from Priam to Palamedes	Odysseus' strategy for planting the gold	Other distinguishing details
<i>Epit.</i> 3.7-8	Phrygian prisoner forced to write letter "about betrayal" (presumably in Phrygian script as in sch. E.)	"Odysseus...buried some gold in Palamedes' tent" (causative use of verb as in Servius?)	No mention of murder of Phrygian, though writing-tablet is dropped in the camp
Serv. ad <i>Aen.</i> 2.81	Odysseus forged letter (presumably in Greek script) "in which Priam thanked Palamedes for his treachery and mentioned that a secret payment of gold had been sent to him"	Odysseus "had himself hidden [the gold] during the night, by the agency of slaves [N.B. the plural] whom he had corrupted" ⁴⁹¹	Odysseus, in feigned support of Palamedes, invites judges to search his tent for gold; contest over grain included as background to plot
<i>Hyg. Fab.</i> 105	Odysseus wrote letter in which Priam promised "as much gold as Ulysses had buried in the tent, if [Palamedes] would betray Agamemnon's camp as he had agreed"	After army moves camp on pretense of his dream, Odysseus sneaks to original site of Palamedes' tent and buries gold	Phrygian captive is told to bring the message <i>to</i> Priam
sch. E. <i>Or.</i> 432	Phrygian captive forced to write letter "about betrayal in Phrygian characters"	A slave of Palamedes is bribed to put the gold <i>together with the letter</i> under her master's bed	Odysseus worked jointly with the equally jealous Agamemnon and Diomedes; they used gold taken from the Phrygian captive and destined for Sarpedon

Sommerstein elsewhere (2000: 123 n. 10), the amplification not only of Odysseus' guilt but also of his deviousness distinguished the *Palamedes* plays of Sophocles and Euripides from their Aeschylean model.

⁴⁹¹ This fleshed-out translation of the ablative absolute *corruptis servis* is borrowed from Sommerstein (*SFP* 2012: 117). It elegantly captures how the slaves' assistance must have extended to the act itself of burying the gold (the force of *ipse* in this clause is not to indicate that Odysseus personally hid the gold but to underscore that he was responsible for the appearance of gold exactly where he had implied none would).

The most striking departure in all the accounts is the ploy by Odysseus, reported only by Hyginus, to shift the entire camp for one night. Based on this, it seems clear that Hyginus was using a different play as his source than was used by any of the other three writers. The *Epitome* is cursory and vague enough that it could go either way, but in its simple formulation it tends to agree with the versions in which Odysseus is explicitly said to have relied on the services of Palamedes' slaves to gain indirect access to the (unmoved) tent of Palamedes. That Odysseus is said to have buried the gold "in Palamedes' tent," rather than "at the spot where Palamedes' tent had been," confirms this supposition about the basis of pseudo-Apollodorus' account. Conversely, Servius' account is detailed enough that it could hardly have omitted such a critical detail as the moving of the camp.

The forged letter as it was written in the version of Hyginus not only gains confirmation in the quantity of gold but also validates Odysseus' dream,⁴⁹² for it was probably reasoned after the discovery of the letter that Palamedes had arranged to surrender the Achaean camp to the Trojans on that very night when Odysseus compelled the camp to be moved. Robert and others have regarded the accounts of Servius and Hyginus as both dependent on Sophocles' play, but apart from the issue of the shifting camp, the precise text of the forged letter varies between the two versions. In Servius Priam writes in gratitude for intelligence already received, whereas in Hyginus the letter functions as a promissory note, with the gold confirming that the pact was carried out. It is possible, however, that Hyginus simply butchers the contents of the letter, or that both accounts refer to a situation in which Priam has given Palamedes an initial deposit and promises him an equal amount of gold if he should follow through on their arrangement.

⁴⁹² Several moments in the Epic Cycle could have suggested the use of a dream as a plot device; e.g., the dream Odysseus had wherein Athena advised him to build the Wooden Horse.

Palamedes was unable to convince Agamemnon that he was not colluding with the Trojans, and his death was a tragedy not only because of his innocence but also because his great services to the Greek army and to mankind were now curtailed. Some, especially Palamedes' own retainers and kinsmen, no doubt immediately regarded his conviction as flawed.⁴⁹³ The story bears some parallels to the *Hoplōn Crisis*, wherein Odysseus managed to overcome another rival by coercing Agamemnon's judgment.⁴⁹⁴

Practically all ancient authors who touched upon Palamedes made mention of his outstanding technical and cultural contributions, often listing them at length. Some of the surviving encomiastic fragments derive from plays about Nauplius and the aftermath of his son Palamedes' death and are discussed below in the *Nostoi* chapter. Take for example S. F 432:⁴⁹⁵

οὗτος δ' ἐφηῦρε τεῖχος Ἀργείων στρατῶ
...

And this man devised a wall for the army of the Argives....

The particular sentence of stoning may have resonated on some level with classical Athenian audiences.⁴⁹⁶ Did the Palamedes myth serve to challenge the prevailing attitude of optimism and idea of social progress in Classical Athens? Did the tragedians repeat it in order to show that whereas personal feuds and bloodlusts predominated in the heroic past, conflict was now, in their contemporary society, mediated through reliable judicial structures (cf. the appearance of this premise in the

⁴⁹³ See *infra*, pp. ##-##, on Sophocles' *Sinon*, which may have looked back on the murder of Palamedes. As Sommerstein points out in *SFP* 2012: 21, Agamemnon condemned Palamedes despite being his cousin.

⁴⁹⁴ See Schlange-Schöningh, 2006.

⁴⁹⁵ Sommerstein's J, *SFP* 2012: 152.

⁴⁹⁶ On stoning as punishment see Allen 2002, a trenchant study of Ancient Greek punitive measures in theory and practice.

Oresteia)? Or does it rather point out the persistent threat posed by a cunning man's unjust desire for vengeance, which could easily subordinate to its will even a carefully designed and faithfully administered criminal justice system? Given the increasing familiarization of the myth throughout the course of the dramatic treatments and their emphasis on the judicial process—whereas the tragic outcome remained the same always—the myths surely advanced some element of the cynicism inherent in the latter hypothesis. Indeed, the trial of Palamedes is perhaps the most sobering Greek myth to challenge the burgeoning notions of democratic enlightenment and perfected justice.⁴⁹⁷ For while Prometheus was punished despite what most would regard as severely extenuating circumstances, Palamedes was punished despite his sheer innocence.⁴⁹⁸ Occasional miscarriages of justice in Athenian courts of law and even the perception that the native system *could* be manipulated no doubt confirmed for many the view that primal rage could still carry the day. For the tragedians and their audiences, the real question surrounding Palamedes' wrongful execution concerned the extent to which the judge (Agamemnon) and jury (role-played by the proverbially ineffectual Chorus) were complicit in Odysseus' schemes—not that incompetence is any less to be feared in a murder trial than corruption. And the biggest concern of all was the extent to which forensic institutions could ever be remedied, through improved technology (but recall that

⁴⁹⁷ As argued by J. Billings in an as yet unpublished paper.

⁴⁹⁸ His case, moreover, would hardly have vindicated the democratic administration of justice that a generation later effectively rewarded the matricide Orestes with impunity. Note that the myth of Orestes, at least in its Aeschylean instantiation, is not entirely compatible with that of Palamedes, which anticipates certain aspects (e.g., the evidentiary standards) of the modern judicial system that the Athenians elsewhere traced to their own intervention after the murder of Clytemnestra. In his *Shield of Achilles* ecphrasis Homer presents a somewhat more primitive lawcourt scene, in which the people at large are excluded from the proceedings while elders compete to impress a presiding *ἵστωρ* with their counsels (*Il.* 18.501-8); it is in relation to this ancient kind of judicial trial that Athens assumed credit for improving justice, as conveyed in *A. Eum.*

the invention of writing had enabled Odysseus to frame Palamedes in the first place) or otherwise, so as to eliminate such abuses.

All this assumes, however, that the Trojan myth was meant to be interpreted first and foremost according to fifth-century standards. Within its original epic context, the victim's innocence is far from self-evident. The *Cypria* clearly pitted Palamedes and Odysseus against each other in a protracted contest of wits the prize of which was preeminent standing (*timē*) among the whole Greek army—these were serious stakes. If Palamedes did disparage Odysseus after surpassing him by procuring grain where the other had failed, then Odysseus' murder of his rival is substantially mitigated by the honor code of Homeric heroes. This was a world in which the hero brooked no insult and was *expected* to retaliate if he lost face within his community.⁴⁹⁹ Depending on the severity of the outrage, violence could be warranted, as in the cases of Odysseus' chastisement of Thersites in *Iliad* 2.211-77, Achilles' killing of the same man after a trivial jeer, and even Ajax's frenzy after being deprived of the Arms of Achilles.⁵⁰⁰ It is, of course, more complex than that: heroes were allowed to lash out when they were slighted by an inferior, and Odysseus would be hard pressed at this point in the campaign to convince anyone that he was the equal of Palamedes, let alone his superior. Still, Odysseus' assault on Palamedes hardly comes out of nowhere, and he might even justifiably blame Palamedes for the deaths of his comrades. In one fragment elucidating his grudge, Odysseus alleges that Palamedes "murdered" Telemachus, though of course this was never his intent nor was it possible so long as Palamedes was correct in identifying Odysseus as *compos mentis*. Hyginus seems to recognize that the murder of

⁴⁹⁹ See study on shame, cited by Gregory 1999.

⁵⁰⁰ Palamedes' attempt to usurp Odysseus' leading role among the Achaean ranks is parallel to the suitors' attempt to usurp Odysseus' status at home. Odysseus showed mercy to none of these offenders.

Palamedes represents something of a *quid pro quo*, for there is a clear verbal echo at the beginning and end of *Fab.* 105: *Ulixes quod Palamedis Nauplii dolo erat deceptus...*; *quo facto Palamedes dolo Ulixes deceptus....* (“Odysseus, because he had been caught out by the trick of Nauplius...”; “Palamedes, caught out in this way by Odysseus’ trick....”)

A more provocative but untestable attempt to justify Palamedes’ murder would be to argue that even if he was innocent, his execution, like Iphigenia’s sacrifice, fostered solidarity and order among the Greek army, a far-reaching benefit that trumped the evil of killing an individual, albeit a great one. But no ancient source actually entertains the notion that Palamedes was a necessary casualty whose life was taken in order to allay anxieties about the potential for treachery and to serve as a deterrent to future would-be traitors. On the contrary, Palamedes’ death was probably followed by a ban against the burial of his corpse (in Euripides’ version at least; certainly not in any version in which the hero drowned), such that the leaders of the community remained embroiled in a bitter dispute even after the execution. Agamemnon, the proclaimer of the ban, was perhaps joined by Palamedes’ foe Odysseus as he faced off against the victim’s brother Oeax, who may have won approval for the burial only with the backing of a god.⁵⁰¹ Although the feud was resolved so as to remain dormant for the duration of the war, it would resurface ten years later when Palamedes’ father Nauplius took extreme revenge.⁵⁰²

⁵⁰¹ Cf. Jouan 1966: 353f.; Welcker in his discussion (pp. 500-10) suggested Hermes interceded on Palamedes’ behalf in his capacity as patron of inventors. Both the *post mortem* continuation of animosity and the motif of a brother demanding that burial be allowed are elements paralleled in *S. Ajax*, on which see *infra*, ###.

⁵⁰² Coming to Troy, he did not succeed in gaining satisfaction. He returned to Greece and devised a plan (some say in collusion with Clytemnestra) to light false beacon-fires and lure the ships of *all* the returning heroes toward cape Caphareus such that they crashed. These are events belonging to the *Nostoi* and so not examined directly in this work, but Sophocles in addition to his *Palamedes* wrote a play called *Ναύπλιος καταπλέων* (“*sailing ashore*”) and another called *Ναύπλιος πυρκαεύς* (“*fire-kindler*”). Sommerstein treats all three plays together (they did not form a trilogy in any actual sense) in *SFP* 2012: 110-73.

Finally, the ethics of Palamedes' murder can also be analyzed through a modern philosophical lens. Nietzsche's dictum, stated in chapter nine of *The Birth of Tragedy*, that everything in Aeschylean tragedy is simultaneously just and unjust,⁵⁰³ means that the concept of an entirely innocent tragic hero (and concomitantly of a purely culpable antagonist) ought to be alien to Aeschylus' *Palamedes*, if not to all the tragedies concerning this hero's downfall. Rather, just like the figures of Prometheus and Oedipus as understood by Nietzsche, Palamedes in his consistent display of uncanny wisdom had in effect sinned against nature,⁵⁰⁴ and his punishment, necessitated at the cosmic, Dionysian level, also needed a worldly agent.⁵⁰⁵ Ultimately it is exacted through the profane *phthonos* of Odysseus and the concocted trial with its Apollonian dialectic and all-too-rational verdict. Odysseus himself, falling into the same category as these other heroes and demigods, would eventually run out of luck in the exercise of his prodigious intelligence.

2.22. Heroes at Play: Another Scene from the *Παλαμήδεια*?

Clearly a lost epic featuring Palamedes informed the making of the *Cypria*.⁵⁰⁶ This *Παλαμήδεια* would have included the hero's outfoxing of Odysseus on Ithaca and the murder just discussed. To judge from surviving artistic evidence, it also included a

⁵⁰³ Nietzsche 1974: 80. Goethe and many others have similarly defined ideal tragedy as the dramatization of insoluble conflicts; see e.g. Denniston–Page 1957: xx–xxi.

⁵⁰⁴ An excess of wisdom or judgment can be troublesome, even dangerous: E. *IA* 924.

⁵⁰⁵ Occasionally in antiquity Palamedes was considered to have been guilty of much more concrete crimes, as Jouan 1966: 358f. observes. Either he really had betrayed the Greeks to the enemy, or he had committed some other grievous offence such as undermining the army's morality with his inventions or declaring himself a pacifist (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.84, *quia bella vetabat*). Palamedes' guilt and Odysseus' spite are not mutually exclusive.

⁵⁰⁶ So Wilamowitz 1916: 328; *contra* Severyns 1928, who suspects (p. 285) that the *Cypria* invented the hero (but on p. 376 he refuses to state that the *Cypria* came before the *Nostoi*, which also treated of Palamedes' murder while narrating his father's revenge; the priority of the *Nostoi* would then only be possible if the Palamedes section were a later interpolation). For a summary of earlier scholarly views, see Jouan 1966: 358; he sides with Welcker's view that "*Palamedeia*" (attested but once) refers to the relevant section of the *Cypria* but believes (p. 356) that Nauplius and his sons go back to Cretan-Mycenaean myth.

popular story in which Palamedes' gift of games played a crucial role. A substantial group of vase paintings shows Ajax and Achilles eagerly competing at a board game. In fact, as some examples reveal, their competitiveness has reached a dangerous level, for they are so engrossed in their game that they neglect a present call to arms.⁵⁰⁷ The scene should therefore be the Greek camp at Troy, and the blare of the horn functioning as a military signal represents another, less obvious connection to Palamedes, for as seen above such signals were first implemented through his initiative.

This memorialized event may well have been picked up by the *Cypria*, although Proclus does not mention it anywhere in his *Eclogues*. It is preferable that Palamedes still be alive at the time it is narrated, which precludes its incorporation in an epic like the *Aethiopsis* that deals with events well after his death. Since it was back in Aulis that Palamedes had first introduced games to occupy the idle and hungry warriors,⁵⁰⁸ illustrations of Homeric heroes playing games could conceivably derive from that pre-Iliadic context, but the battlefield setting of our depictions negates this possibility.

Whether the artistic representations derive from the *Palamedeia* itself or from the synthetic *Cypria* which absorbed it, this scene, which is most famously exemplified by Exekias' masterful rendering,⁵⁰⁹ clearly has epic origins, as scholars have recognized for nearly a century.⁵¹⁰ Yet there continues to be vigorous debate about certain paradigmatic elements. Foremost among the points of contention is the appearance of Athena on some vases but not others. She must have acted in the epic story to end the leisure-induced daze

⁵⁰⁷ Another illustration of the hazards of dice is the murder of Amphidamas' son by Patroclus, who extenuates his crime by saying that at the time he was a young fool *ἀμφ' ἀστραγάλοισι χολωθείς*, *Il.* 23.88 (here Homer's chronology contradicts the story of Palamedes' invention of games). If Ajax's game against Achilles was cut short by a sudden battle, perhaps it was for his own good lest a defeat send his hotheaded opponent into a fury.

⁵⁰⁸ Sch. E. *Or.* 432.

⁵⁰⁹ On a BF amphora dated ca. 540: Vat. Mus. 344 = *ABV* 145, 13.

⁵¹⁰ Mommsen 1980: 140 cites F. Hauser at length.

of Ajax and Achilles, but then what accounts for the less complete examples (narratively speaking) from which she is absent?⁵¹¹

The tragic references to games among the inventions of Palamedes may embody allusions to this particular episode, but tragedians also referred to the episode overtly.⁵¹² It must have formed part of the subject matter of the drama to which Aristophanes refers at *Frogs* 1400, *βέβληκ' Ἀχιλλεὺς δύο κύβω καὶ τέτταρα*. We should perhaps also relate S. F 429, *κύβων βολαί*. Again, the *Cypria* may have been the source for these references to the Achaeans' ludic activities. Athenian artists apparently relished this story as a rare opportunity to depict the two great heroes Ajax and Achilles interacting (before the latter had become a corpse),⁵¹³ and it would be very surprising if a similar desire to present both of these grandsons of Aeacus⁵¹⁴ together did not affect the poets of tragedy.

⁵¹¹ See Boardman 1978; Woodford *JHS* 1982; Shapiro 1981.

⁵¹² See Nauck 1856: 187f.

⁵¹³ Mommsen 1980: 152, arguing against the view that the scene proliferated because gaming was a shockingly unheroic activity. She further wonders whether the depiction of Ajax on equal terms with Achilles (i.e., as his worthy competitor) was not only a compliment to Ajax but also a confirmation of the anti-Odysseus polemic that was brewing in fifth-century Athens. But in none of the literary or rhetorical expositions championing Ajax's claim in the *Hoplōn Crisis* are his games with Achilles cited. Nevertheless, it is worth considering why Odysseus never substituted for Ajax in the board game episode. One possible explanation is that Odysseus would naturally abstain from such games, not merely because his own mind was sufficiently capable of occupying his free time but more because he would not wish to be seen celebrating an achievement of Palamedes.

⁵¹⁴ The fact that Ajax and Achilles were related as Aiakidai and that this whole group was invoked to lend aid before the Battle of Salamis (Hdt. 8.64), taken together with the notion that Salaminian Ajax was increasingly honored in Archaic Athens (notably by Exekias) and exploited as a coopted symbol of Athenian hegemony over his island, conspire to allow a political reading of the board game scenes (Boardman 1978: 16, 24). But a much more obvious example of Athenian civic pride informing the prevalence of Ajax in vase-painting is the Codrus Painter's name vase (Bologna PU 273 = *ARV*² 1268,1; cf. Shapiro 1981: 174 with n. 6), where the eponymous hero appears alongside Menestheus, the captain of the (interpolated?) Athenian band at Troy (cf. *Il.* 2.557f. and 12.330-77). At any rate, Ajax's genealogical link to Aeacus, even if it somehow fed into the Athenian propaganda regarding Salamis, is definitely a post-Homeric fabrication. Achilles' relation to Aeacus and to Aeacus' mother Aegina is highlighted at E. *IA* 697-700.

2.23. Conclusions

Virtually every major episode in the reconstructed *Cypria* is repeated in tragedy. Possible exceptions to this are Paris' abduction of Helen and the *Cypria*'s story of the encounter between Achilles and Helen at Troy. Those stories dominated by divine characters make their way into smaller passages here and there, while from all the rest at least one entire play can trace its core content. Even some of the Cyclic poem's tangential material, including the tales about the Dioscuri if not also Nestor's extended digressions, show signs of having influenced tragedians. The fact that none of its stories goes unused tends to reinforce the supposition that the *Cypria* was in fact the source or one of the sources for these plays, albeit that most of the stories were independently famous in the Classical period and eventually enough tragedies were written to cover just about all of Greek mythology. At the risk of falling into circular reasoning, the tragedies may also help us in our reconstruction of the *Cypria*: that some of the plays appear to be heavily influenced by the *Cypria* in the ways they treat of myths tends to reinforce the supposition that Trojan-themed plays for which the corresponding parts of the *Cypria* are especially obscure can be regarded as witnesses to those lost epic passages (Sophocles' satyr-play *The Lovers of Achilles* might be an example of such a drama, although nothing is certain about its relation to the Trojan Cycle other than that it had to do with Achilles and some of his folk). As for plays that make major innovations or adaptations of Trojan lore, like Euripides' *Skyrioi*, there is generally still a nod to epic precursors, such as in the preservation of geographical setting. Aeschylus did not visit the stories of the *Cypria*

nearly as frequently (in absolute or relative terms) as did Sophocles and Euripides, who were both avid recyclers of the stories told there.⁵¹⁵

⁵¹⁵ Cf. Jouan 1966; Jouan 1994.

3. Odysseus' *aristeia*? Big Moments in the *Little Iliad*

The *Little Iliad* is chock full of episodes in which Odysseus demonstrates both bravery and cunning intelligence (*mētis*)⁵¹⁶ in the service of the Achaean war effort, the ultimate success of which, it cannot be denied, redounds largely, if not almost entirely, to his credit.⁵¹⁷ It has been argued that the *Iliad*, which unlike the *Odyssey* does not shower Odysseus with praise and credit for orchestrating the Sack of Troy, nevertheless intimates his exceptional role in this deed.⁵¹⁸ Having been deprived in the *Iliad* of a proper *aristeia* to match the likes of Achilles, Patroclus, Diomedes, Ajax, Agamemnon, and Menelaus—albeit Homer consistently marks Odysseus with distinction in the fields of speaking, counsel, scouting, and, yes, even combat—he becomes in many ways the central Greek hero, the *sine quo non*, in the succession of stories that eventually coalesced into the *Little Iliad*. Even so there is no obvious moment at which he spears and stabs his way to transcendent glory; instead, he forges a new sort of *aristeia* for himself by relying on his unique set of skills.⁵¹⁹ And whereas he uses these skills mostly to his own advantage in the *Odyssey*, where too the poet celebrates the hero's excellence,⁵²⁰ in the *Little Iliad* he puts them to use for the entire community of Achaean warriors. Moreover, while the *Odyssey* largely commemorates the hero in terms of his *πάθη* ("passive experience"), his

⁵¹⁶ The classic treatment of this ancient virtue is Detienne–Vernant 1991.

⁵¹⁷ Homer can be forgiven for his reductive use of the singular *ἔπερσε* in *Od.* 1.2. When Pindar wishes to honor Philoctetes (who stands for Hieron), he says that that hero "sacked" (*πέρσεν*, *Pyth.* 1.54) Troy; when the same poet turns his attention to Neoptolemus, it is *he* who did the sacking (*διέπερσεν*, *Pae.* 6.104). But both Philoctetes and Neoptolemus owe their involvement in the war to Odysseus, as discussed *infra*.

⁵¹⁸ Haft 1990.

⁵¹⁹ Stanford 1964 explores Odysseus' diverse qualities across a vast range of literary instantiations, his treatment of the subject superseding that of Schmidt 1885.

⁵²⁰ At *Od.* 8.78 Odysseus (not Ajax as elsewhere) is paired with Achilles in the use of the epithet *ἄριστοι Ἀχαιῶν*. For their supposed rivalry see on Sophocles' *Syndeipnoi* (above, §2.15); cf. Nagy 1999: ch. 3, §§21f.

role in the *Little Iliad* is all about *πράξις* (“active exertion”).⁵²¹ To cite one brief example of how this phase of the Trojan War marks Odysseus’ *floruit*, he can boast at the beginning of Sophocles’ *Ajax* (24) that he voluntarily yoked himself to the dangerous task of tracking the hero who is reported to have gone mad.⁵²² There was of course no better or more urgent time for Odysseus to prove his sense of duty and adroitness than in the immediate aftermath of his triumph in the contest for Achilles’ panoply.

Like all the Cyclic poems, the *Little Iliad* lies open to the accusation that it lacks unity.⁵²³ However, the more one comes to appreciate the ubiquity of Odysseus throughout its episodes, the more a sense of unity develops. The Judgment of Arms, moreover, turns out to be a natural point at which to recommence the narrative,⁵²⁴ for the one question that must be answered after the death of Achilles is which Achaean hero could be counted on not merely to fill the void on the battlefield but to bring about Troy’s destruction at long last. The solution to this dilemma and thus the star of the whole *Little Iliad* was Odysseus, “whose triumphs characterize and determine the poem’s focus on ambush and deception.”⁵²⁵ Picking up on this theme, the tragedians are happy to advertise Odysseus’ supreme status, even if in several plays they denigrate the very qualities that made him so indispensable.

⁵²¹ Pi. *Nem.* 7.20f. deploras Homer for exaggerating Odysseus’ suffering (whereas Ajax, Pindar continues, suffered all too unfairly); the emphasis on “suffering” (*πάθῶ*) suggests that Pindar’s invective is aimed at Homer the poet of the *Odyssey*, not, as some have thought, at “Homer” the poet of the *Aethiopis* or (more plausibly) the *Little Iliad* (Rutherford 2015: 457 rejects on different grounds the notion that Pindar here refers to the Cycle). Nonetheless, if Pindar hated Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, where the Judgment of Arms and Ajax’s suicide are mentioned only briefly, how he must have detested the *Little Iliad*’s Odysseus!

⁵²² For the language of yoking (here *ὑπεζύγην*) and how it is applied specifically to Odysseus, see Finglass 2011: 144 (n. *ad loc.*) and *supra*, p. 97 n. 327.

⁵²³ See again Arist. *Poet.* 1459a37.

⁵²⁴ Additionally, “quarrels are a standard epic introduction” (Kelly 2015: 322).

⁵²⁵ *Ibid.* 343, cf. esp. 324; West 170; Welcker 1882: 270 calls this Odysseus “die Seele des Kriegs” and “der Günstling der Dichtung.”

From our perspective the *Little Iliad* is also—again like all the Cyclic poems—something of a moving target. Several pieces of evidence including a papyrus similar to the summary of Proclus’ *Chrestomathy*⁵²⁶ have conspired to give the impression that in fact there may once have been *Iliades Parvae* (plural), which poems could have competed for the attention of Attic tragedians. But this only extends the central contention of the present study, namely that the tragedians actively engaged with a variety of epic texts in the course of composing their works. Nevertheless, in this chapter the title *Little Iliad* is used exclusively to designate the poem attributed by the Proclan summary to Lesches.⁵²⁷

3.1. The Awarding of the Arms of Achilles

ἡ τῶν ὀπλῶν κρίσις γίνεται καὶ Ὀδυσσεὺς κατὰ βούλησιν Ἀθηνᾶς λαμβάνει. (Arg. 1a W.)

The Judgment of Arms happens, and Odysseus wins by Athena’s will.

The *Aethiopsis* and *Little Iliad* overlapped significantly, each relating Ajax’s death and at least some of the events surrounding it.⁵²⁸ Proclus’ habit was to crop redundancies out of his summary, and so he is silent about this coda in the former poem. But more importantly, the *Little Iliad* account is likely to have been richer (and hence the model favored by later poets), for the climax of the *Aethiopsis* was the death of Achilles, and the destructive competition that followed might be seen simply as a ripple effect showing just how traumatic that loss had been.

⁵²⁶ PRylands 22; Kelly 2015: 328f. deems the existence of multiple poems covering the same epic material as the traditionally defined *Little Iliad* to be a moot hypothesis.

⁵²⁷ On the ascription to Lesches and rival claims, see West 35-7.

⁵²⁸ Finglass 2011: 27f.

According to a certain scholion,⁵²⁹ in the *Little Iliad* the winner of the Judgment was determined in the following manner, in accordance with Nestor's wishes: scouts were sent to eavesdrop on Trojan women prattling by the walls, and when one was heard denouncing Odysseus for letting Ajax haul Achilles' corpse from the plain, another, inspired by Athena, countered that Odysseus in fact endured the harder work (the following verses borrowed from the epic by Aristophanes):

καί κε γυνή φέροι ἄχθος, ἐπεὶ κεν ἀνὴρ ἀναθείη,
ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν μαχέσσαιτο· [...]

Even a woman could bear a load—provided a man should lay [it] upon [her shoulders]—but she could not do battle.

It is somewhat paradoxical that Odysseus wins the *Hoplōn Krisis* not only despite the greater dose of traditional valor in Ajax but also despite the fact that his greatest services to the Achaeans are, at the outset of the *Little Iliad*, still to come. As will be seen, these include the capture of Helenus and extraction of crucial information from him, the recruitment of Neoptolemus from Scyros, a daring rendezvous with Helen,⁵³⁰ the theft of the Palladium (with Diomedes, who in the *Little Iliad* also leads the mission to retrieve Philoctetes), and to a large extent the ruse of the Wooden Horse. Thus while the awarding of Achilles' arms is predicated on a relatively flimsy argument concerning the preservation of Achilles' corpse, Odysseus' subsequent vital achievements, which are of the sort that Ajax would not have undertaken even if he had survived, justify the decision and render it in some sense proleptic. Moreover, Ajax's martial prowess stands, even in the *Iliad*, as but one of several desirable virtues that a Homeric hero can possess. The

⁵²⁹ sch. Ar. *Eq.* 1056a = *Il. Parv.* fr. 2 W.

⁵³⁰ For the application of "daring" terminology to Odysseus' achievements cf. e.g. *Od.* 4.271, where ἔτλη describes his bravery in the Wooden Horse.

phrase “best of the Achaeans” is often qualified when applied to heroes who excelled in specific spheres, and beside other limiting terms like *ἐγγεσι* (“with weapons”) we routinely find *βουλή* (“in counsel”), showing that for Homer persuasive eloquence was indeed on par with fighting ability, so much so that Odysseus’ superiority in the former category could, depending on the outcomes it produced, trounce Ajax’s superiority in the latter. Then again, the poet of the *Little Iliad*, who elsewhere betrays greater interest in strategizing and clandestine activities than in straightforward combat, understands that if Odysseus is to win the arms of Achilles he must be commended as a *fighter*.

Of course, while the arms themselves embody martial spirit, the nature of the *Hoplōn Krisis*—a contest of words—would seem to grant Odysseus an automatic advantage, as he was equipped to undermine verbally all Ajax’s reminiscences of his physical deeds of merit, and so Ajax’s claim to victory was handicapped from the start. Yet this unfair advantage—the ability to manipulate people’s memories and views of events and circumstances—is precisely what makes Homer and others worship rhetorical excellence. In other words, it is not Odysseus’ fault that he is such a smooth talker, nor that he reaps so much success from this gift.⁵³¹ And the Achaeans who, voting not only with their eyes but with their ears as well (that is, in the light of what they were hearing and what they had seen), decided to award the Arms of Achilles to him, were keenly aware of the utility his peerless speaking ability provided to them. Yet in his rivalry with Ajax, if not in his earlier rivalry with Palamedes, Odysseus played more or less within the rules of the game; it cannot be said that he dissimulated or misled, only that he recalled the truth more effectively and persuasively than his rival, ultimately winning on the basis

⁵³¹ On Sophocles’ interest in depicting through Odysseus both the positive and the negative aspects of persuasion, see Worman 2012.

not only of the arguments he made but also of the impressive manner in which he made them.

Would Nestor really have advised risking the lives of Achaean warriors to get the opinion of the women in Troy about the respective merits of Ajax and Odysseus? And how could anyone expect the scouts would find women in the midst of such a conversation? The whole notion of eavesdropping on women's banter to settle the dispute over Achilles' arms is "an absurd idea" and shows that the original epic scene was already possessed of a comic dimension on which Aristophanes readily seized.⁵³² The folkloric tradition may be responsible for the tale. In any case, in defiance of the epic tradition tragedians opted for more sober argumentation carried out amongst the Achaean assembly and conducted especially between the antagonists themselves (the *Little Iliad* itself surely contained some of this as well). While it is tempting to deduce that the *Little Iliad* was sufficiently well known to the educated public that a significant number could be expected to recognize the source of Aristophanes' bookish quotation, it is more likely that the key verse in question (*καὶ γὰρ γυνή...*) circulated independently as a proverb deprived of its original context.⁵³³ Many in the Athenian audience were probably ignorant of what Nestor orchestrated in the *Little Iliad* (unless this episode unbeknownst to us was slipped into one of the tragedies—or a satyr-play—on the Judgment of Arms),

⁵³² Konstan 2015: 174. The exchange between the two Trojan women is also ironic since it is *Ἀθηνᾶς προνοία* that the latter woman denigrates women.

⁵³³ Pace West 46. Although the opening distich of the *Little Iliad* appears on two late fifth-century sherds from the northern Black Sea that may have been used as school texts (*ibid.*), this hardly proves that the average Athenian student's knowledge of the *Little Iliad* ever went beyond its incipit (cf. the quotation of just the first line of *Epigonoí* at Ar. *Pax* 1270). Welcker i.6 supposes that tragedy (not to mention vase-painting) not only draws from the poems of the Epic Cycle, "sondern auch vielfältig Bekanntschaft mit ihnen in Anspruch nimmt," but would the evidence really look any different if the goal were to divulge and inform rather than to remind the audience of things already known? See also Swift 2015: 125f. for the social dynamics of allusion and intertextuality in Greek drama (with special attention to how tragedy differs from comedy).

and of course Aristophanes could quote the original epic verses freely without appearing to challenge the prevailing tradition expressed in tragedy.

It is almost certain that Aeschylus composed his *Hoplōn Crisis* as the first leg of a trilogy covering Ajax's death and its aftermath.⁵³⁴ From the opening play we have a fragment (F 175) in which Ajax calls Odysseus the son of the proverbial fraudster Sisyphus (an insult that has been taken too literally by some scholars). It might have concluded with hints of Ajax's insanity—at least, that would be an emotionally affective ending—and it may have foreshadowed his suicide before the second play in the trilogy, called *The Thracian Women*, dramatized that central event (see below). Perhaps Sophocles felt that he could not improve upon Aeschylus' *Hoplōn Crisis* and deliberately avoided any overlap with this plot when he set out to compose his *Ajax*, taking the Judgment of the Arms as the background to the play.

Theodectas' *Ajax* (72 F 1) made Diomedes promote the titular hero's claim to the Arms of Achilles—this despite the tradition, going back in literature to *Iliad* 10, that paired Diomedes and Odysseus in combat (Diomedes expressly chose Odysseus as his companion in the *Doloneia*). It can be imagined how this would aggravate the relationship between Diomedes and Odysseus, and in fact tradition records that Odysseus attempted to murder his companion as they returned with the Palladium (see below).

3.2. Ajax's Suicide and Its Aftermath

Αἴας δ' ἐμμανῆς γενόμενος τήν τε λείαν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν λυμαίνεται καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἀναιρεῖ.
(Arg. 1b W.)

And Ajax, turning mad, both commits outrages upon the plunder [i.e., the flocks] of the Achaeans and kills himself.

⁵³⁴ Sommerstein 2012a: 34f.

How much happened in the *Little Iliad* surrounding the death of Ajax? What could any storyteller conceive to occupy the wake of this monumental event? These are important questions because in the opinion of many critics Sophocles, having selected a story apparently lacking in eventfulness, and seeking to avoid the monotonous repetition of threnodies (which is not to disparage a play like *Persians*), seems to be groping for filler “in his desire to prolong the drama.”⁵³⁵ Indeed, since antiquity many critics have felt dismay over the petty wrangling in the speeches that follow Ajax’s suicide at line 865. From the detractors’ perspective, if Sophocles overlooked some more significant, more wholesome action that either had been or could have been appended after the climax, his contempt for tradition doomed him or his imagination failed him, respectively; whereas, if he was untethered because no *post mortem* tradition existed previously *and* he was ill advised to invent one, his failure was twofold, consisting not only in his composition of uninspired and undignified drivel but also in his initial selection of a subject—Ajax’s suicide—that was inevitably too narrow in scope to warrant its own drama. Besides the obvious absurdity of the notion that Ajax’s suicide should remain off-limits for tragedians, the latter possibility is in fact negated by evidence showing that already in the *Little Iliad* Ajax’s death was followed by persisting resentment and a dispute (or at least a decree) affecting the treatment of his corpse. Sophocles was not grasping for new material but following tradition—and elevating it.

At any rate, many have complained that the *Ajax* exhibits a plot that is neither unitary nor in its latter stages worthy of tragedy at all. Such censure, however, has been addressed and effectively dismissed; one approach is to point out what the dissatisfied

⁵³⁵ ἐπεκτεῖναι τὸ δράμα θελήσας, a phrase used in sch. S. *Aj.* 1123, which specifically decries the σοφίσματα in the argument between Teucer and Menelaus.

have failed to grasp: that Sophocles deliberately juxtaposes a tone of grandeur and majestic horror before Ajax's death with one of frivolity after it in order to signify the decay of heroic society as a whole.⁵³⁶ One can also dispute the opinion that the frivolous claims of the antagonists late in the play ever actually diminish, let alone overwhelm, the seriousness of what is at stake in the debate. But at an even more basic narratological level, Ajax's suicide, by virtue of being a unilateral action carried out in seclusion, is by itself relatively short on thematic content. It is of course a story that deserves to be told, but if it is to be told in tragedy, it has to be imported intact along with its several associated characters and with the immediate sequel to the hero's death. Only with this baggage can it sustain the full scale of a dramatic work, and only by covering the reaction to it can a dramatic work adequately convey how humiliating Ajax's decline in status was for himself and his relatives and how devastating his death was for the entire community. Indeed, far from deserving blame for affixing a set of apparently substandard dialogues to the momentous loss of Ajax, Sophocles deserves credit for recognizing the essential unity of all these elements and discerning how his genre could appropriate the famous myth in the first place. Moreover, the rancor surrounding the fallen hero's right to burial honors, which tradition dictated and which adds so much to the drama, can only have been enhanced, refined, and dignified further by the master Sophocles (never mind if his treatment of it falls short of the standard he himself sets in *Antigone*, which hinges on the same agonistic motif). Aeschylus, who faced the same shortage of material as Sophocles, could have discovered another recourse to flesh out his version of the myth, or else he could have kept his play quite brief. On the other hand, the combination in a single

⁵³⁶ Finglass 2012; the specific approach cited is that of Knox 1961: 2. See also Finglass 2011: 51-7 on the question of the play's unity.

tragedy of the entire Judgment of Arms episode with the loser's astonishing suicide would have proved excessive, and both tragedians rightly rejected this possibility.

Epit. 5.6 predictably blames Ajax's madness on Athena. It also uses *βοσκήματα* instead of *λεία* (found in Proclus' summary and at *S. Aj.* 26 and 54) to refer to the Greek army's captured flocks,⁵³⁷ which Ajax did not merely assault but actually slaughtered "along with their shepherds" (*σὸν τοῖς νέμουσι*). Sophocles accepts the report about the shepherds (*Aj.* 27 and 232), apparently staying faithful to the Epic Cycle in this regard. But in neither case are these human victims anything more than an afterthought. Despite the fact that these men were evidently not members of the privileged group that the Achaeans constituted, the subordination of people to animals may seem preposterous. Yet the crucial issue is the impact of the slaughter on the character of Ajax, and for him "the killing of the animals is a greater mark of humiliation, and a more pathetic contrast with his intended victims."⁵³⁸ Sophocles rightly resists giving the herdsmen prominence.

In addition, a sentence from Zenob. vulg. 1.43 that West treats as a supplementary witness to Apollodorus runs as follows: *δύο δὲ μεγίστους κριοὺς κατασχὼν ὡς Ἀγαμέμνονα καὶ Μενέλαον δεσμεύσας ἐμάστιξε, καὶ κατεγέλα τούτων μαινόμενος* ("And after seizing the two biggest rams as if they were Agamemnon and Menelaus he bound and whipped them, and he scoffed at them in his madness").⁵³⁹ Assuming Zenobius did base this sentence on the full version of Apollodorus, and assuming (as we are wont to do) that Apollodorus in turn assembled his account of the Trojan War by drawing from

⁵³⁷ But the reference is still to sheep, not cattle (*pace* Frazer's translation and Finglass 2011: 38). Neither Greek term belongs to epic.

⁵³⁸ Finglass 2011: 145 (n. *ad* 25-7). He also points out how the removal of all potential witnesses is instrumental to Odysseus' bold reconnaissance mission in the play. One is free to imagine an alternative version in which the shepherds are killed but Odysseus does not undertake such a mission, but it should be kept in mind that the glorification of Odysseus is a constantly recurring theme in the *Little Iliad*.

⁵³⁹ West 177, citing Wagner 1891: 214 to authorize this editorial supplement.

the Cyclic poems, we can also regard Sophocles as following the Cyclic storyline very closely when it comes to the special cruelty Ajax is supposed to have inflicted upon two choice victims.⁵⁴⁰ First Athena in her general description of the carnage says that Ajax hallucinated at one point that he was killing “the double sons of Atreus” (*δισσοῦς Ἀτρείδας*, 57), which agrees perfectly with Zenobius except that there is not yet any indication that Ajax purposefully gave two of his animal victims this special designation. This detail emerges later, at 238-44, but now the explicit association with the Atridae goes missing, leaving room for alternative identifications.

There are other minute differences, of course, between this passage and the corresponding scene in Sophocles’ epic model (reconstructed on the testimony of later witnesses). For example, Sophocles’ Ajax applies the whip to only one of his two special victims. But arguably the most intriguing of the problems that we face when analyzing this play as an adaptation of its Cyclic model has to do with identity.⁵⁴¹ Ajax’s reserving special treatment for two rams that he imagines are specific enemies is a theme that originated in epic and is developed by Sophocles (*Aj.* 97-100, 237-44, and 302-4, 388-91, 837f.). In his note on verses 237-9 of the play Finglass understandably fixates on the notion of a related pair and advances the view that to Ajax these choice victims were the Atridae, but his secondary identification of the ram whose tongue is cut out (238f.) with Agamemnon as pronouncer of Ajax’s defeat is weak, for that organ cannot help but point

⁵⁴⁰ While the rams in Zenobius’ Cyclic account are “biggest,” Sophocles’ rams are distinguished as “white-footed” (*ἀγρίποδας*, 237, with the correct gloss given by sch. *ad loc.*). In the epic account (or better, accounts—for Ajax’s suicide is thought to have been described in both the *Aethiopsis* and the *Little Iliad*) either or both epithets could have been applied (*ἀγρίποδες* is found in Homer: *Il.* 24.211). The male sex of the creatures also contributes to their special status in Ajax’s eyes. Zenobius’ testimony further weakens the possibility—entertained but in no way promoted by Finglass 2011: 38—that in the *Little Iliad* Ajax never imagined he was killing Greeks, the slaughter being “an action undertaken at random by a frantic man.”

⁵⁴¹ West 177 advises that the Cyclic poem in question, reflected also in *Epit.* 5.6, is probably the *Aethiopsis* rather than the *Little Iliad*.

to Odysseus. It is almost as if Sophocles, in an effort to augment the sense of futility inherent in the scene and to reproduce Ajax's confusion, deliberately thwarts attempts by his audience (especially those proudly knowledgeable about this particular piece of tradition) to apply neat analogies to what transpires. Ajax himself was after all in no right frame of mind to be reliably consistent in his identifications.

In the same note Finglass marshals evidence to support the view that Ajax's slaughter of the flocks represents a perverted form of sacrifice. In particular the elinguation of the first ram makes this attractive,⁵⁴² but a sacrificial reading of the passage tends to undermine the more definite aspect of self-gratifying revenge, even if the two need not be mutually exclusive. The removal of that victim's entire head and the torture of the other victim make clear that Ajax's true motivation is a wicked desire to glut his rage. Thus the lopping off of extremities here is less reminiscent of sacrifice than of *μασχαλισμός* ("mutilation"), and although one explanation of the latter is that it aims at averting pollution or blood-guilt,⁵⁴³ at this time Ajax is hardly sane enough to observe such ritual protocol. Nor does he consecrate his victims to Athena (who declares, however, at 118 that the entire ordeal is a testament to the gods' power) or another divinity, whereas before his suicide he invokes various gods including Hermes (831f.) and the Erinyes (836-8, 843f.); indeed, this subsequent act of violence is more akin to a sacrifice,⁵⁴⁴ and Ajax himself is even compared to a bull/ox at 322 and 1253, albeit without an overtly sacrificial context in either case. Finally, even if the question is not

⁵⁴² See Finglass 2009: 224-8 for a thorough elucidation of *Aj.* 238, *γλῶσσαν ἀκραν*.

⁵⁴³ Cf. the sources that quote S. F 623, from his *Troilus: TrGF* iv.455. These late sources also link the practice specifically to ambush, and the present scenario proceeds from an ambush as no sacrifice ever does (*Epit.* 5.6 says Ajax *ἐπιβουλεύεται νύκτωρ τῷ στρατεύματι*, cf. *βούλευμ'* at *S. Aj.* 44, *βουλεύσας* at 1055).

⁵⁴⁴ Cf. the use of *σφαγεύς* at *Aj.* 815, where Ajax presents himself as "the object of sacrifice" (Finglass 2011: 380).

whether Ajax perceives a sacrificial quality in his slaughter of the flocks but whether Sophocles does, the language used casts a veil of doubt: only Tecmessa ever applies the verb *σφάζειν*, so regularly used of sacrificial killing, to Ajax's crime (235 and 299), and this may well reflect her inability to comprehend its significance, whereas the term *φόνος* ("murder") occurs thrice in the opening exchange between Athena and Odysseus and thrice thereafter.⁵⁴⁵ To the extent that Proclus and Apollodorus accurately capture the tenor of the *Little Iliad*, it is worth recalling that the arg. 1b W. uses *λυμαίνεσθαι* and noting that *Epit.* 5.6 has *φονεύειν*.

The manic laugh which is said at S. *Aj.* 303 to have punctuated the hero's frantic butchery is tied to a proverb that had much currency in antiquity: *Αϊάντειος γέλως*. Leutsch and Schneidewin⁵⁴⁶ took it for granted that the proverb originated with Sophocles' play, but the motif of Ajax's maniacal laughter may actually go back to the *Little Iliad*.⁵⁴⁷ Whether the proverb antedates Sophocles is difficult to tell, likewise whether he was the first to bring the arresting laugh to the stage.

The woman who comes to shroud Ajax's body on a cup by the Brygos Painter⁵⁴⁸ may be identified as Tecmessa (i.e., as Ajax's devoted female consort, who need not always have been named Tecmessa). The date of the vase⁵⁴⁹ almost certainly precedes the Aeschylean as well as the Sophoclean treatment of Ajax's death, increasing the likelihood that she was a character inherited from the *Little Iliad* or *Aethiopsis*. If she was

⁵⁴⁵ Finglass 2011: 155 (n. *ad* 55) himself remarks that "φόνος of killing animals has an unusually strong negative colouring." At 546 Ajax bluntly refers to his handiwork as *νεοσφαγή...φόνον*, but the prevailing force of the epithet comes from its first element. We also find the expressive *κατεναρίζειν* at 26.

⁵⁴⁶ *CPG* i.17, on the explanatory gloss of Zenob. vulg. 1.43, which itself clearly depends on S. *Aj.* 303; cf. ii.4 for the corresponding entry in Diogen. 1.41.

⁵⁴⁷ See West 177; Grossmann 1968: 71, 83; and Finglass 2011 on *Ajax* 303.

⁵⁴⁸ *LIMC* Aias (I) 140; see Finglass 2011: 30 on this vase.

⁵⁴⁹ Stated as ca. 490 B.C. in West 2011: 177; as 500-475 B.C. by Finglass 2011: 40, who also remarks that the same scene is probably depicted on a kylix of ca. 500-480 by Onesimus (cf. *ibid.* 30).

a figure of epic, she would have covered the corpse there too, for it is as improbable that the visual arts invented this moment later enacted by Sophocles (*Aj.* 915f.) as it is that they invented the woman herself. She is another instantiation of the mythical archetype represented by Briseis, who mourned the slain Achilles in the *Aethiopsis* and perhaps in Aeschylus' *Phrygian Women*.⁵⁵⁰ The covering of Ajax with a cloth is akin to the token burial of Polynices described at *S. Ant.* 245ff., and for those well versed in tradition it portends the coming dispute over the corpse.

Odysseus' reluctance to gloat over Ajax's corpse is reminiscent of his "lack of animosity and avoidance of elation" in his vaunt over Socus at *Il.* 11.450-5.⁵⁵¹ More generally, his "conciliatory attitude" throughout *S. Aj.* may be inspired by *Od.* 11.553-62.⁵⁵² This does not rule out the possibility (thoroughly lacking in evidence) that in the *Little Iliad* as well Odysseus pleaded with Agamenon on behalf of the dead man.

As for Aeschylus' own opinion regarding Odysseus and his role in Ajax' suicide, it is instructive to turn to a papyrus containing a fragmentary choral ode that has been assigned to the *Women of Salamis*. Here the Chorus may be comparing Ajax' lamentable

⁵⁵⁰ For the latter, cf. Sommerstein 2012a: 34. One thing Briseis and Tecmessa share is the distinction of being loved and honored by their men. Achilles even calls Briseis his "heart-pleasing bedmate" (*ἄλοχον θυμαρέα*, *Il.* 9.336, where *pace* LSJ s.v. *ἄλοχος* the translation "concubine" would diminish the intended effect, reinforced a bit later at vv. 340-3, of assimilating her to lawful wives; Achilles' complimentary language is partly due to genuine affection and partly tendentious, augmenting the injury inflicted by Agamemnon, who himself does something similar at *Il.* 1.113f.). As for Ajax's fondness for Tecmessa, Finglass 2011: 206f. avoids excessive romance by rendering *S. Aj.* 212 such that Tecmessa rather than Ajax is the subject of the verb *στέργω*. For the additional correspondence Tecmessa ≈ Andromache see Finglass 2011: 41.

⁵⁵¹ Kyriakou 2001: 254 n. 10. Cf. Plut. *Mor.* (*De cohib. ira*) 10, 458D and S. F 210 (from *Eurypylus*), where the usual pre-duel boasting is shunned. See also Headlam 1903: 288, which relates to S. F 210 (the part quoted by Plutarch) but also takes stock of Pindar's contrast between quiet Ajax and talkative Odysseus (*Pi. Nem.* 8.28).

⁵⁵² Finglass 2011: 41.

fate to the potentially similar situation of his brother Teucer, whose banishment by his father may have formed the play's *hypothesis*.⁵⁵³ The chorus sings:⁵⁵⁴

τὸν δὴ περιρρῶ[τ] .. [6
ὄλ[εσ]αγ ῥυσίπτολ[ιν	
π[οι]μανδρίδαι [
ῥρχαμ[οί].τ' ἐπίσκο[ποι	
τευχ[έ]ων [ἀ]πε[λ]πίσαντ[10
δίκα δ' Ὀδυσσῆϊ ζυνησαν [
ο]ὐκ ἴσο[ρ]ρ[όπ]ω φρενί·	
...	
ὥσπερ καὶ Τελαμῶ[ν	16
αὐ]τροκτόνος ὄλετο [

Him truly [of the] sea-girt [land?],
the savior of the cit[y], did
the s[he]pherds [of the people] destroy
and the chiefs in charge,
when he [d]es[p]aired of the armor.⁵⁵⁵
And they sided with⁵⁵⁶ Odysseus in (their) judgment
not with equanimity.

...
Just as also [the greater (?) son of] Telamon
perished as a suicide.

Although the chorus hardly praises Odysseus, it explicitly places blame on a broader group of the Greek chiefs—if *ποιμανδρίδαι* (line 8) does not refer to the leaders in general, it may even target Agamemnon and Menelaus specifically, thus pointing to a disgraceful depiction of the Atreidae à la Sophocles' *Ajax*—and to those who adjudicated the matter wrongly. In other words, Odysseus (at least in the part of the text that survives)

⁵⁵³ The current scholarly consensus is only that the fragment, because it narrates Ajax's suicide by way of comparison, cannot come from the play that related this episode as its primary subject. Thus whereas E. Lobel originally assigned the fragment to the *Hoplōn Crisis*, H. Lloyd-Jones suggested it came instead from *Philoctetes* (see Smyth–Lloyd-Jones 1957: 584; but this suggestion was doubted by Winnington-Ingram 1959: 241). The proposal that it belongs to *Salaminae* was made by H. J. Mette 1955: 399f. and is supported by Sommerstein 2008: 341.

⁵⁵⁴ F 451q (= *P. Oxy.* 2256 fr. 71), again following Sommerstein's Loeb ed. for both text and interpretation.

⁵⁵⁵ Alternatively, one could construe *τευχέων* with *ῥρχαμοι ἐπίσκοποι* ("the chiefs watching over the arms").

⁵⁵⁶ The form *ζυνησαν* probably belongs to *συνάδω* in the metaphorical sense of "to agree with," but it could also come from *σύνειμι* (< *εἶμι*), which can mean "to collude with."

is in no way criticized for simply vying for Achilles' armor, nor is he held directly accountable for his rival's death.⁵⁵⁷

Theodectes of Phaselis was a fourth-century rhetorician turned tragedian who was a student of Plato and Aristotle as well as of Isocrates, and given his background in rhetoric it is no surprise that he displayed an interest in the figure of Odysseus by writing both a *Philoctetes* and an *Ajax*.⁵⁵⁸ His *Ajax* in particular is known to have injected paradoxical reasoning into situations involving Odysseus. First, Aristotle records that at a certain point in the play the Doloneia episode is recalled and the suggestion is made that Diomedes selected Odysseus as his accomplice for this night expedition not to honor him as worthy but in order that he have an inferior follower.⁵⁵⁹ Thus Theodectes imagined the affair of the night raid to have been a source of long-standing animosity and resentment between Odysseus and Ajax. As regards the plot of Theodectes' *Ajax*, this testimony reveals that the scope of this play was quite different from that of Sophocles' *Ajax*, which

⁵⁵⁷ Moreover, even to the extent that Odysseus is besmirched here, the chorus cannot be assumed to be impartial or to reflect the views of Aeschylus himself. (There is no space here to address the contentious theory that the chorus was the mouthpiece of the poet. One may say that by all accounts Aeschylus would have admired the aristocratic idealism of Ajax—if *TrGF* adesp. F 110 belongs to his *Thracian Women*, it would support this view—but even Odysseus could have retained his honor in Aeschylus' plays about Ajax; after all, Dio 52.5 says that in his *Philoctetes* Aeschylus *καὶ τὸν Ὀδυσσεῖα εἰσήγε δριμύνην καὶ δόλιον, ὡς ἐν τοῖς τότε, πολὺ δὲ ἀπέχοντα τῆς νῦν κακοηθείας, ὥστε τῷ ὄντι ἀρχαῖον ἂν δόξαι.*) Therefore, the choral complaint from the papyrus must be viewed cautiously, just like the lines spoken by Ajax in Aeschylus' *The Judgment of Arms*. The same caution is also advised for *TrGF* adesp. 683, another fragmentary choral ode preserved on a papyrus (including musical notation), with lines 16-19 reading: *αὐτοφόνῳ χειρὶ καὶ φάσανον γ[| Τελαμωνιάδα, τὸ σόν, Αἴαν· ε[| δι' [Ὀ]δυσσεῖα τὸν ἀλιτρὸν οὔρη[| ἔλκεσιν ὁ ποθοῦμενος [.*

⁵⁵⁸ Athenaeus 4.134B associates the "skill" of Theodectes with a disgraceful *βάκηλος*.

⁵⁵⁹ *Rhet.* 2.23.20 (1399b28); cf. 3.15.10 (1416b12f.), where Aristotle says that one way (the slanderer's way) of explaining Diomedes' motives is that he chose the only accomplice who was too worthless (*φαῦλον*) to rival (*ἀνταγωνιστεῖν*) himself. Theodectes (or whoever of his characters makes this argument) contradicts certain aspects of the story as told in the *Iliad*. For example, at *Il.* 10.222f. Diomedes explains his desire for a companion thus: *ἀλλ' εἴ τις μοι ἀνήρ ἄμ' ἐποιτο καὶ ἄλλος, | μᾶλλον θαλπωρὴ καὶ θαρσαλέωτερον ἔσται.* One could imagine that Diomedes is being disingenuous, but why then request a companion in the first place? And even if he is looking simply to use the *νόσος* and *μητις* (226) of Odysseus without sharing an equal share of the glory, what he says in praise of him at lines 243-5 is corroborated by "Homer" himself, who states (line 232): *αἰεὶ γὰρ οἱ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμὸς ἐτόλμα.* Additionally, Agamemnon explicitly orders Diomedes to choose *τὸν ἄριστον* (236) without regard for such things as birth and rank. See Montiglio 2011: 62f. on Odysseus' "military worthlessness," which is corroborated by [Eur.] *Rhes.* 580-94.

does not mention Diomedes or the Doloneia and in fact does not feature any *agôn* that weighs the respective merits of Odysseus and Ajax. In fact, Theodectes' narrative structure is more reminiscent of Aeschylus' *Judgment Concerning the Arms* and of Antisthenes' pair of declamations, in which Ajax and Odysseus both stake their claims to deserving the fateful prize. So, for example, we can assume that either Ajax or one of his supporters (e.g., Teucer) made the argument about Diomedes, and it would have had the greatest impact in shaming Odysseus if uttered in his presence. Aristotle also says that Odysseus in this play addressed Ajax directly to explain why he was in fact *ἀνδρειότερος* than his adversary even though he seemed to his detractors to be inferior.⁵⁶⁰ This speech of Odysseus was certainly sophistic in some sense, but it may not have been sophistry for its own sake. Rather, it might very well reflect—just as Sophocles' *Ajax* does—a real, ongoing conflict between divergent definitions of terms like *ἀνδρεῖος* and *ἄριστος*.⁵⁶¹ It is impossible to know exactly what position Theodectes would have taken in this debate, but in contriving Odysseus' rhetorical exposition he at least had to be able to conceive of strong arguments (whether specious or sincere) to put into the character's mouth. Nevertheless, such arguments would certainly have underscored Odysseus' pride (not to say *hybris*) and thus subverted his *σωφροσύνη*. Similarly, Odysseus may have shown his argumentative side in Carcinus' *Ajax*, in which he said to the title character, *τὰ δίκαια χρῆ ποιεῖν* ("one must do what is right").⁵⁶² The actor playing Ajax apparently laughed

⁵⁶⁰ *ibid.* 2.23.24 (1400a27).

⁵⁶¹ See Lawall 1959 and especially Gasti 1992, who emphasizes Odysseus' association with the newer, collective ethic of hoplite warfare in contrast to the older culture of individual competition.

⁵⁶² Carcinus (70) F 1a = Zenob. Ath. 1.61 p. 355 Mill. This comes in a gloss of *Αἰάντειος γέλως* and shows that the maniacal laugh made famous in S. *Aj.* 303 was not the only dramatic interpretation given to the proverbial phrase (cf. Grossmann 1968: 65), or perhaps that a debate arose later as to which laugh assigned to the tragic hero ought to be regarded as the inspiration for the proverb. On sardonic laughter see Miralles 1987. Carcinus may have been consciously seeking to expand the range of laughter associated with the insane Ajax. Incidentally, the possibility that Carcinus F 8 belongs to his *Ajax* should also be considered.

ironically at this condescending bit of sophistry, and this laugh—not ἡδιστος but, we may say, πικρότατος—became famous in antiquity.

These plays depicting a more cynical and self-assured Odysseus are not, however, the final examples to be addressed. Yet another version of the story of Ajax's suicide, written by an unknown tragedian, has Teucer accuse Odysseus of murdering Ajax.⁵⁶³ Odysseus is now forced to defend himself against this obviously false charge and can thus garner some sympathy from the audience, especially if the audience was familiar with the version of events told in Sophocles' *Ajax*, in which Odysseus fights to secure for Ajax an honorable funeral. At the same time, it may also be telling of the depths to which Odysseus' reputation had sunk that he could plausibly be incriminated by such a harsh allegation. As a central part of the plot, it demanded far more consideration than did the offhand (yet provocative) remark about Sisyphus in Aeschylus' *Judgment Concerning the Arms*, which an audience member would have been free to disregard. Still, one is inclined to favor a sympathetic representation of Odysseus in the telling of Ajax's downfall, at least in comparison to how he appears in other episodes. In Sophocles, after all, Odysseus displays magnanimity by praising Ajax in an exchange with Athena (118ff.) even after hearing that Ajax wants to torture and kill him.⁵⁶⁴ Nor is this noble behavior nullified by the arrogance that Odysseus appeared to display previously in claiming the arms of Achilles, for all signs of this arrogance have now been obscured: just as in Athena's eyes,

⁵⁶³ *TrGF*, adesp. 438 b = Quintilian *Inst. Or.* 4.2.13: *...ut in tragoediis, cum Teucer Ulixem reum facit Aiakis occisi, dicens inventum eum in solitudine iuxta exanime corpus inimici cum gladio cruento, non id modo Ulixes respondet, non esse a se id facinus admissum, sed sibi nullas cum Aiace inimicitias fuisse, de laude inter ipsos certatum: deinde subiungit, quo modo in eam solitudinem venerit, iacentem exanimem sit conspicatus, gladium e vulnere extraxerit.*

⁵⁶⁴ At 110 Ajax says: *μάστιγι πρώτον νῶτα φοινιχθεῖς θάνη*. Apparently because of the infamy of Ajax's treatment of Odysseus, the suicidal hero was later identified as *μαστιγοφόρος* (*TrGF* iii.565), though it is impossible to deduce exactly what this epithet connoted or if it was simply another way of distinguishing him from Lesser Ajax.

at least, Odysseus is *δύστηνος* (109) and undeserving of what Ajax intends, Odysseus uses the same term, *δύστηνος* (122), to show compassion to his foe. This is in keeping with his respectful treatment of Ajax throughout this play (note, e.g., his recognition of Ajax' *ἀρετή* at 1357) and throughout the surviving sources on this episode.⁵⁶⁵

The aftermath of Ajax's death is not mentioned in Proclus' summary, but that the *Little Iliad* described the nature and circumstances of the hero's funeral is not a matter of supposition. Porphyry states that in that epic poem Ajax was denied the customary (within Homeric society) honor of cremation "because of the king's wrath" (*διὰ τὴν ὀργὴν τοῦ βασιλέως*).⁵⁶⁶ This is corroborated by *Epit.* 5.7, which refers to Agamemnon by name and adds that Ajax's tomb lay on the Rhoetean promontory and was thus a tangible cult for which the myth served as an *aition*.⁵⁶⁷ Since fireless burial as a mark of punitive degradation would have proved bewildering and possibly offensive to a community (such as Sophocles' Athens) where "[c]remation and inhumation were...practised concurrently..., with no apparent distinction in belief,"⁵⁶⁸ Sophocles transforms the

⁵⁶⁵ Odysseus also forestalls the charge of arrogance by dutifully giving the arms to Achilles' son Neoptolemus after retrieving him from Scyros (Neoptolemus then killed Eurypylos, presumably using the very spear that Achilles had used against Eurypylos' father Telephus). It would not be fair to complain that Odysseus only relaxes his *hybris* when it is convenient for him (i.e., that he can *afford* to be gracious toward Ajax once he has achieved his victory). In fact, Odysseus did not need to have an inflated self-worth to claim Achilles' arms; he only needed to be guided by the heroic code that valued the pursuit of excellence by excellent men, and his place among the "best of the Achaeans" was never in doubt. In addition, Odysseus' victory was sanctioned by the army's vote (Pindar, *Nem.* 8.27), though by some ancient accounts Athena interfered (*Little Iliad* fr. 2 West), while some scholars reject the significance of the people's opinion in any case; on the tension between democratic and heroic principles in Sophocles' *Ajax* see Rosenbloom 2001: 118.

⁵⁶⁶ *Paralip.* fr. 4 Schrader (*ap.* Eust. 285.34) = *Il. Parv.* fr. 3 W., where the term *σορός* must be translated as "coffin," not "cinerary urn" as is appropriate at *Il.* 23.91 (LSJ s.v.). Philostratus (*Heroicus* 12.3 §176) says that the debarring of Ajax's body from standard treatment was preceded by Calchas pronouncement that it was unholy for a suicide to be cremated, but this precept "is not a satisfactory explanation of the inhumation" (West 179) and in fact scarcely deserves a place in the Cyclic account, wherein Agamemnon's anger at being the target of Ajax's violence drives the action.

⁵⁶⁷ Cf. West 178.

⁵⁶⁸ *OCD*⁴ s.v. "death, attitudes to" (R. S. J. Garland). Through this alteration of heroic (i.e., epic) convention Sophocles happens to represent genuine Bronze Age burial customs more truly than Homer does.

penalty imposed on Ajax into a sweeping decree not to lay hands on the corpse (*Aj.* 1047f.).⁵⁶⁹ The plot is further simplified through the exclusive reference to burial as the desired action (577, 1141f.).⁵⁷⁰

The third leg of Aeschylus' Ajax trilogy was called *Salaminiae*. The title alone, advertising a chorus consisting of Salaminian women, is enough to prove that the play told of the brutally cold reception Ajax's brother Teucer received when he finally returned to the halls of their father Telamon.⁵⁷¹ Thus the progression from the first two plays of the trilogy to the last involved a geographical shift back across the Aegean as well as a temporal advancement of some weeks or months; but this poses no trouble, for such shifts are already familiar from the *Oresteia*,⁵⁷² and the continuity of Aeschylus' Ajax trilogy encourages our treatment of Teucer's *post bellum* career in this chapter on the *Little Iliad* even though strictly it belongs to the timeframe of the *Nostoi*. Indeed, a case has been made that the latter Cyclic poem contained the story of Teucer's exile.⁵⁷³ All the tragedians would then have been working from this traditional source.

Although he fought for Ajax's right to receive a proper burial (and Odysseus secured it), Teucer is ultimately banished by his father, probably on the grounds that he did not sufficiently support his brother throughout the crisis that led to his death; the

⁵⁶⁹ Cf. West 179 n. 14; here he adds his belief that Agamemnon's mistreatment of Ajax's corpse in the *Little Iliad* also gave rise to the plot of *S. Ant.*, which entails that Sophocles, evidently being drawn to this species of conflict, recognized that both Ajax and Polynices could be deemed enemies of the state.

⁵⁷⁰ Cf. Finglass 2011: 307 (on v. 577). The harsher punishment prescribed in Sophocles befits tragedy's aim of polarizing opponents, but fundamentally the *Ajax* and *Little Iliad* both explore the mistreatment of Ajax's corpse. Pace Finglass 2011: 41, the fact that Agamemnon successfully forbade cremation in the *Little Iliad* does not entail that the successful enforcement of the total ban on funeral rites ever seemed like a real possibility to anyone who had heard of Ajax's Rhoetean tomb, or indeed to anyone sufficiently pious to understand that some such rite was the hero's sole ticket to the halls of Hades; the suspense felt by Sophocles' audience depended rather on their willingness to forget what they already knew.

⁵⁷¹ Sommerstein 2012a: 35 is perhaps too cautious in positing that the play was not only called *Salaminiai* (as opposed to the attested variant *Salaminioi*) but also dealt with the event just described.

⁵⁷² Which of course opens with a Greek hero's *nostos*, whereas the Ajax trilogy closes with one.

⁵⁷³ Welcker i.191. For a discussion of the myth's reception in tragedy see Finglass 2011: 34-6.

failure to repatriate Ajax's remains may also have been an issue.⁵⁷⁴ Whatever glory Teucer earned through his participation in the successful sack of Troy failed to move Telamon, who in this episode exhibits the severity of his deceased son,⁵⁷⁵ apparently preferring that both sons had died together than that one should have disgracefully endured the army's disgracing of the other.⁵⁷⁶ Naturally Ajax's prayer that the Sun pause over Salamis and bring to Telamon news of his misfortune (S. *Aj.* 845-9) goes unfulfilled,⁵⁷⁷ and it is Teucer who must break the terrible news to his father. This will allow rash anger and the heat of passion to feed Telamon's decision to disown his surviving son, as Teucer virtually foreshadows at S. *Aj.* 1017f.⁵⁷⁸ Ajax's mother Eriboea, also called Periboea,⁵⁷⁹ probably appeared in the tragedies about Teucer's homecoming

⁵⁷⁴ sch. Pi. *Nem.* 4.76 states that Teucer was deemed by his father to be *αἴτιος... τοῦ φόνου τοῦ Αἴαντος*. Such an extreme allegation is supported by the fact that in myth exile was frequently a punishment dealt to homicides (cf. Finglass 2011: 427 [1019-20n.]). *Contra* Vell. Pat. 1.1.1, according to whom Telamon cast Teucer out "because of his dilatoriness [consisting] of the failure to avenge his brother's injury" (*ob segnitiam non vindicatae fratris iniuriae*). The Pindaric scholion's account implies a charge of negligence. Of this Teucer is implicitly acquitted at S. *Aj.* 562-4, where Ajax himself praises his brother as a steadfast *φύλαξ*. In fact, these verses suggest that had Teucer been present all along he would have perceived Ajax's distressed state of mind and stayed his hand from violence. Hence Teucer was removed the field of action not as a way of establishing his guilt but because it was necessary from the storyteller's perspective; to this end Sophocles posits a raiding expedition.

⁵⁷⁵ Cf. Teucer's description of his father as mirthless at S. *Aj.* 1010f. Finglass 2013: 426 comments *ad loc.* that "Telamon's self-description in S.'s *Teucer* is less austere," but the fragment cited (F 577, which has the vocative *ὦ τέκνον* and is better taken as being addressed directly to Teucer than as apostrophe of Ajax) refers to "empty joy" and is compatible with the portrait of a dour father, for whom *τέργις* could be defined as the absence of grief. Telamon's pessimism is best reflected in the fact that he does not rejoice that at least one son has returned home alive.

⁵⁷⁶ Thus Teucer at E. *Hel.* 104: [sc., *νοσῶ*] *ὀθοῦνεκ' αὐτῶ γ' οὐ ξυνώλομην ὀμοῦ*. Perhaps Telamon wished his son had attacked his son's killers (cf. again Vell. Pat. 1.1), even if it meant taking on the whole Achaean army.

⁵⁷⁷ The separate instruction that his son Eurysaces be delivered to his grandparents by Teucer (567-70) may not have been carried out either in the works that described Teucer's brief return to Salamis. Yet Teucer's taking care of the boy would reinforce his essential loyalty and lend a further pathetic touch to his alienation, and if Telamon could count on his grandson (though born to a barbarian woman just like Teucer) to be *γηροβοσκός*, that was all the more reason to dismiss his surviving son. Sophocles also wrote a *Eurysaces*, but just a single word of it survives (F 223).

⁵⁷⁸ *τοιαῦτ' ἀνήρ δύσοργος, ἐν γήρα βαρύς | ἐρεῖ, πρὸς οὐδὲν εἰς ἔριν θυμούμενος*. Pacuvius, whose *Teucer* could be based on A. *Salaminiae* or on S. *Teucer*, uses the performative phrase *naturam <ab>dico* to denote Telamon's formal disowning of Teucer (Pac. *Teuc.* 342-3 Ribbeck ≈ fr. 244 Schierl).

⁵⁷⁹ On her see Finglass 2011: 302f. (567-70n.). The earliest author to name her Eriboea is Pindar (*Isth.* 6.45), but she could have appeared (under that name or another) in the *Nostoi*.

and led a dirge for her son on behalf of the city, just as is predicted at S. *Aj.* 850f. She may also have played a very stepmotherly role by antagonizing Teucer and endorsing Telamon's impulse to banish him; the denigration of Teucer would no doubt have included references to his bastard status and Trojan blood (via his mother Hesione), thus validating the fears he so vividly expresses at S. *Aj.* 1012-6. These last three passages cited from the *Ajax*, a play that corresponds to the *Little Iliad* (not to mention the *Aethiopsis*), represent an admixture of material drawn ultimately from the *Nostoi*; that Sophocles traversed the Cycle so fluidly in his composition of the play may be a tribute to the influence of Aeschylus' Ajax trilogy, which had brought two discontinuous phases of myth together under one grouping.

The fragments of the plays dealing with Teucer's exile do not reveal how they ended.⁵⁸⁰ Sometimes when a character is forced into exile at the end of a tragedy his destination is anticipated, and sometimes not.⁵⁸¹ But the Salaminian diaspora, if this term is permissible, was particularly germane to public discourse in Athens, where an elite *genos* of priestly Salaminioi resided. Indeed, this connection also allowed Athens to insinuate itself more assiduously into the Trojan War; hence the whiff of propaganda in Sophocles' *Ajax* 859-63, where the moribund hero invests his legacy in three places, naming Athens in between Salamis and Troy.⁵⁸² Given this Athenian interest in all things

⁵⁸⁰ Furthermore, the apparent inclusion of Oileus (F 576) and Odysseus (F 579a) as characters in the play is also moot due to the uncertainty surrounding the attestations in question; cf. Finglass 2011: 34f. Any *Teucer* that featured Odysseus is more likely to have been set at Troy than on Salamis, for the latter is not one of the places that Odysseus reportedly visited during his decade of wandering; alternatively, the two heroes could have crossed paths in the years following Teucer's banishment, just as Odysseus and Neoptolemus encountered each other in Thrace according to the *Nostoi* (arg. 4b W.).

⁵⁸¹ Thus E. *Oedipus* apparently signaled that Athens lay open as a refuge, whereas S. *OT* omits this.

⁵⁸² Similarly, the Theseids Acamas and Demophon, the former of whom was like Ajax one of the ten tribal heroes of Attica, allowed Athens to claim a major stake in the sack of Troy (see *Il. Parv.* fr. 17 W., *Iliup.* arg. 4b W.), and the tragedians never passed up an opportunity to point out their participation in the sack. So at E. *Tro.* 31, where the division of Trojan booty is being discussed, we find *Ἀθηναίων τε Θησεΐδαι*

Salamian, it is unlikely that either Aeschylus or Sophocles concluded his play without adumbrating the new settlement to be founded by Teucer on Cyprus.⁵⁸³ In the case of Sophocles' *Teucer*, one possible interpretation of the storm described in F 578 is that it affected Teucer on his way to Cyprus.⁵⁸⁴ While Euripides did not devote an entire play to Teucer's expulsion from Salamis, he does use the hero as a foil toward the beginning of *Helen* (68-163), which is set at a point in time when Teucer is in limbo, still searching for Cyprus but evidently drawing closer to it.⁵⁸⁵ Apollo is said both here (147-50) and in Horace, *Carm.* 1.7.28f. to have advised Teucer what he should do (found a new Salamis) and—though this is not clearly stated in the latter text—whither he should go (but even in the *Helen* Teucer has not been given clear instructions for how to get to Cyprus, hence his quest to discover more information in Egypt).⁵⁸⁶ Apollo's intervention could have been passive, with Teucer having gone to consult his oracle at Delphi, but the dramatic works would have benefitted from the god's taking an active, for then a *deus ex machina*

πρόμοι. The scholiast *ad loc.* (= *Iliup.* fr. 6 W.) records the ancient view that their inclusion sought “to gratify pro-Athenian feeling” (Lee 1997: 70). Another seemingly gratuitous mention of them occurs at S. *Phil.* 562, although their involvement there in the putative mission to retrieve Neoptolemus for a second time could be due to factors beyond pandering patriotism, e.g. the relative shortage of famous heroes so late in the war and the playwright's desire to recall the story of Theseus' murder by Lycomedes (attested later at least, in Paus. 1.17.6), which makes the idea of a confrontation between their descendants intriguing (cf. Schein 2013: 214 (S. *Phil.* 561-2n.); there is no evidence of any animosity between them in the Epic Cycle).

⁵⁸³ Welcker i.191-7 argues that the migration to Cyprus was not merely predicted but actually realized in the play. This is unlikely given that it apparently took years for Teucer to reach his new home (cf. E. *Hel.* 112), and for so much time to elapse within the course of one play would violate tragic convention.

⁵⁸⁴ Cf. Finglass 2011: 34.

⁵⁸⁵ Teucer's successive stops in Egypt and Cyprus reverse a portion of Menelaus' route (*Od.* 4.83).

⁵⁸⁶ In Horace's ode Apollo is *certus* (28), but apparently he has not told Teucer where exactly to go (*quo nos cumque feret...fortuna*, 25). Even the meaning of the phrase *ambiguam...Salamina* (29) is somewhat ambiguous: is it equivalent to *alteram Salamina* (so L-S s.v. *ambiguus*, Quinn 1996: 137 *ad loc.*), or does it indicate that the location of this new Salamis is still unclear to the exiles (which brings out the antithesis with *certus* in the preceding line)? Perhaps the adjective is simultaneously attributive and predicative (after *futuram [esse]*: “that Salamis will be double”). The specific occasion described by Horace is set during a stop along the journey, when Teucer rallies his followers' spirits and exhorts them to drink. Was this invented by Horace (and modeled on thematically identical scenes like Verg. *Aen.* 1.198-207) to suit the argument of his ode, or was there an old *Einzelied* (a **Teucra*) that told of the hero's voyage to Cyprus in detail? And could some of this have informed the *Little Iliad* just as the putative *Palamedeia* infiltrated the *Cypria*? Horace's decidedly sanguine Teucer is quite different from the desperate hero of E. *Hel.*, but that does not rule out that both poets were working from the same tradition.

could provide a resolution at play's end.⁵⁸⁷ Apollo also may have instructed Teucer to construct a temple of Salaminian Zeus after reaching his new homeland.⁵⁸⁸ This historic sanctuary remained for a long time a source of great civic pride, as Tacitus records (*Ann.* 3.62.4) in a passage all about asylum.⁵⁸⁹ It is remarkable that Aphrodite, who lorded over Cyprus (especially Paphos),⁵⁹⁰ apparently has nothing to do with Teucer's salvation.

3.3. Philoctetes

μετὰ ταῦτα Ὀδυσσεὺς λοχῆσας Ἑλενον λαμβάνει, καὶ χρήσαντος περὶ τῆς ἀλώσεως τούτου Διομήδης ἐκ Λήμνου Φιλοκτήτην ἀνάγει. ἰαθεὶς δὲ οὗτος ὑπὸ Μαχάονος καὶ μονομαχῆσας Ἀλεξάνδρῳ κτείνει. καὶ τὸν νεκρὸν ὑπὸ Μενελάου κατακισθέντα ἀνελόμενοι θάπτουσιν οἱ Τρῶες. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Δηϊφοβὸς Ἑλένην γαμεῖ. (Arg. 2a-d W.)

After these things Odysseus seizes Helenus by ambushing him, and with this man proclaiming about the capture [viz., of Troy] Diomedes leads Philoctetes back from Lemnos. And this man having been healed by Machaon and having engaged in single combat with Alexander kills him. And after his corpse has been mutilated by Menelaus, the Trojans collect and bury it. And after this Deiphobus marries Helen.

Odysseus' capture of Helenus was the first of several critical achievements accomplished by the Greek hero during nocturnal missions (if the night of *Iliad* 10 is discounted). That Helenus was captured at night is stated explicitly by *S. Phil.* 606 and that play's hypothesis, which adds that a prophecy by Calchas prompted the effort. The *Rhesus* also appears to describe this event (507-9), declaring Odysseus' penchant for ambushes and

⁵⁸⁷ Since *Salaminiae* was the conclusion of its trilogy there was no opportunity for Aeschylus to advertise a visit to Delphi and end the play while allowing the more permanent solution to linger in the distance, as he does in *Cho.*, continued by *Eum.*

⁵⁸⁸ Teucer and Ajax were great-grandsons of Zeus: Finglass 2011: 253 (*S. Aj.* 387n.).

⁵⁸⁹ I.e., asylum in the technical sense of "the territorial inviolability which was enjoyed especially by certain temples or shrines" whose surrounding communities strived "to demonstrate that their privilege had been properly granted or confirmed in the distant past" (Woodman 2004: 113 n. 128). This institution applies particularly strongly to the sanctuary founded by Teucer, who was himself a *profugus*, as Tacitus says.

⁵⁹⁰ The two other temples about which the Cyprians petitioned the emperor Tiberius according to Tacitus were hers; they outstripped Zeus' temple in age but evidently had less famous founders.

naming the altar of Thymbra as a favored location. This points to the capture of Helenus because Thymbra was the site of a shrine of Apollo that may well have had an oracular function. Note, however, that the allusion is left vague, which is for the best since it implies a major anachronism (namely, that Helenus was captured before the death of Hector, etc.). Fortunately for the Achaeans, Helenus was found conducting some religious business outside the walls of the city at a moment when their continuation of the war seemed hopeless.⁵⁹¹

Each of the three major tragedians produced a *Philoctetes*, Aeschylus perhaps between 470 and 459 B.C.,⁵⁹² then Euripides in 431, and finally Sophocles in 409.⁵⁹³ Fruitful comparison among the three texts goes back to Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 52, cf. 59), who boasts of having read all three and is keen to pinpoint the distinguishing features of each.⁵⁹⁴ The most crucial difference among the three tragedies in terms of plot construction—and what distinguishes them most obviously from the *Little Iliad*'s account—lies in the question of who among the Achaean heroes made the voyage to Lemnos.

Aeschylus' primacy in dramatizing the tale is confirmed when one uses this criterion to trace the history of the myth's reception in tragedy. Right away with his appropriation of the story an attitude of nonconformity to the epic tradition took hold,

⁵⁹¹ Cf. West 180. Thymbra is also the site of Achilles' ambush of Troilus (*supra*, §2.20); Odysseus is thus not alone in his fondness for this tactic. Apollodorus (*Epit.* 5.9), differing from the *Little Iliad* at this juncture (a rare instance of divergence), says that it was Calchas who proclaimed the need for Heracles' bow; only then did Helenus leave the city, upset and at odds with the Trojans because they had preferred to give the widowed Helen to Deiphobus.

⁵⁹² So Avezzù 1988: 102, but Müller 2000: 38f. and Gianvittorio 2015: 22 are more cautious. Calder 1991b: 359 points out our exceptional fortune in knowing for certain the order in which the three great tragedians wrote their *Philoctetes* plays (although Calder misstates the exact date of E. *Phil.* and gives a date range for A. *Phil.* that is too narrow).

⁵⁹³ Schein 2013: 5.

⁵⁹⁴ Epicharmus also wrote a comic *Philoktetes*. Cf. Schein 2013: 1ff. on the development of the myth.

which established a pattern that his successors would follow as well in their treatments of the same material. Rather than preserving Diomedes in his designated role, Aeschylus introduces Odysseus in his stead.⁵⁹⁵ This was no arbitrary choice, nor was it a matter of confusing the roles assigned by the *Little Iliad* to Diomedes, fetcher of Philoctetes, and to Odysseus, fetcher of Neoptolemus. On the contrary, Aeschylus was deliberately seeking to make his play more arresting and to endow the myth with a greater spirit of hostility by confronting Philoctetes with his worst enemy. Moreover, Aeschylus thus gave himself another opportunity to explore the habits and qualities of the wily schemer archetype as well as to inject strategy and intrigue into a story that in the Cycle might have amounted to a lot of repetitious pleading (by Diomedes). Odysseus can also be regarded as a natural choice to play the role of special agent inasmuch as the story was after all taken from the *Little Iliad*, wherein Odysseus was the constant star.

⁵⁹⁵ Not all scholars have accepted at face value Proclus' testimony that in the *Little Iliad* Diomedes alone went to fetch Philoctetes. Welcker 1882: 238 argued that Apollodorus provides the genuine reflection of the epic passage when he says both Odysseus and Diomedes went to Lemnos; at some point the phrase "with Odysseus" had dopped out of Proclus' commentary, Welcker thought. But that would still grant Diomedes the leading role in the *Little Iliad*, meaning that Aeschylus' presentation of Odysseus alone still marks a major departure from the epic model; and as West 182 n. 19 says, it is more likely that Apollodorus' account is based on Euripides' play (*TrGF* v.829 test. ivc.), where the combination of Odysseus and Diomedes, though it rings perfectly true since the two heroes are so frequently paired in epic (cf. *infra* ## n. ##), is in the case of this episode a novel touch and the result of the playwright's merging of two earlier versions, the Cyclic and the Aeschylean. Bethe 1966: 104 believes more or less the same as Welcker and links Aeschylus' decision to make Odysseus sole emissary with the two-actor limitation that governed Aeschylus' compositions (even though a two-actor limit is not the same as a two-character limit and indeed most of *S. Phil.* transpires with only two actos on stage). According to Bethe, Euripides, who enjoyed the luxury of having three actors at his disposal, simply followed what the Cycle said about who participated in the mission to Lemnos (so too would the message conveyed by the False Merchant at *S. Phil.* 592 be essentially traditional). It is true that *Pi. P.* 1.52 mentions heroes plural as going to retrieve Philoctetes, but that could mean Diomedes and some of his humble companions, or Pindar could be indulging in his own tailoring of the story handed down by the Cycle (which admittedly he does not go on to develop). And poets like Pindar and the tragedians, when they were telling or alluding to the story of the mission to Lemnos, could focus on that one mission, but a Cyclic poet had to be mindful of more. On this score it seems logical that the Achaeans, having decoded Helenus' prophecy (which we may presume provided several hints at once and was decoded all at once), would have dispatched two missions simultaneously (cf. West 182, citing Schneidewin 1849: 648). The separate missions to Lemnos and to Scyros required the (unusual) separation of Diomedes and Odysseus.

According to Hadjicosti, Aeschylus' substitution puts Philoctetes "in a complicated position; he hates Odysseus so much that he cannot accept the oracle and go happily to Troy where he will be cured."⁵⁹⁶ However, this slightly mischaracterizes the crisis in Aeschylus' play, which did not necessarily depend on Philoctetes' hearing a guarantee that he would be healed at Troy and believing it. First of all, Helenus' prophecy⁵⁹⁷ is never explicitly said to have included such a guarantee. Heracles' bow was demanded, or else the weapon's possessor, and even if the Achaeans decided to extrapolate from this that Philoctetes would be healed to his full fighting strength—or if they decided to lie to him to this effect—Philoctetes had little incentive to believe them (this applies all the more to Aeschylus' play, wherein the Achaean army's representative is the notoriously deceitful Odysseus). Sophocles complicates this further by withholding until Neoptolemus' final long speech at the end of the play a full account of what Helenus (apparently) said, including the stipulation that Philoctetes would indeed be cured after arriving "willingly" (*έκών*, 1332) in Troy and would win *kleos* by helping to sack Troy (1347). For the sake of nothing more than narratological convenience, it would seem, these details, amounting to a "fine additional gain" (*καλή... (έ)πίκτησις*, 1344) for Philoctetes, emerged neither during Neoptolemus' earlier interaction with Philoctetes nor in the false merchant's (apparently) curtailed report of Helenus' prophecy at lines 610-3.⁵⁹⁸ One result of this deferral of vital information is that we are not shown how Philoctetes would have reacted to the good news had it all been divulged before the encounter was tainted by lies and theft. Diomedes in the *Little Iliad* may have promised

⁵⁹⁶ Hadjicosti 2007: 221.

⁵⁹⁷ Not a typical "oracle," despite Proclus' *χρήσαντος*, because the prophet speaks under duress.

⁵⁹⁸ Cf. Schein 2013: 320 (1314-47n.), "there is no indication of how [Neoptolemus] knows these details of if they are accurate." Logically only Odysseus, whose relationship with Neoptolemus has now become strained, could have informed Neoptolemus about the prophecy.

Philoctetes a return to good fortunes in a more forthright manner, but again there is no evidence that the envoy in that poem was able in good faith to give such assurances. In fact, as long as we are not alerted otherwise we should assume that in the epic Helenus' prophecy offered only the bare minimum information (to wit, the bow's indispensability), as was customary in the proclamation of oracles and the like. In any event, in Sophocles' play it ultimately requires a *deus ex machina* to convince Philoctetes not only to go to Troy but also to trust in his own impending rehabilitation. This stark and innovative requirement unfortunately drives Hadjicosti to conceive the even more distorted image of an "epic story of abandonment with no hard feelings, no personal guilt."⁵⁹⁹ Her argument here is based largely on the semantics of Proclus' verb *ἀνάγει*, which she says indicates that no use of force was required to lure Philoctetes from Lemnos in the *Little Iliad*. But she does not address the alternative of a struggle requiring Diomedes to use rhetoric to entice a naturally resentful and reluctant Philoctetes. And at any rate the verb *ἀνάγω* is used at *Il.* 3.48 and 6.292 of Paris' abduction of Helen, which in Homer's mind probably required a great deal of effort and persuasion on Paris' part before Helen finally yielded to passion, she being no utterly submissive woman. West speculates that the poet of the *Little Iliad* dedicated "a good part of his Day 4" to an account of how Diomedes managed on behalf of the Achaeans to win back Philoctetes' trust or at least his cooperation.⁶⁰⁰ It certainly should have been a laborious feat, if only to make it worth the telling.

Sophocles and Euripides in their *Philoctetes* plays endorsed and repeated Aeschylus' involvement of Odysseus in the story, but, simultaneously emboldened by their predecessor's flexible approach to the traditional myth and specifically to who was

⁵⁹⁹ Hadjicosti 2007: 224.

⁶⁰⁰ West 185.

responsible for fetching the abandoned hero, they also made their own additions to the cast of characters. Thus the identities of the emissaries vary among all three tragedies, and yet there are signs that Sophocles and Euripides engaged with the original Cyclic version of the story even as they responded to Aeschylus' play.

In order to accomplish his novel insertion of the character Neoptolemus into the Lemnian episode of the *Little Iliad*,⁶⁰¹ Sophocles had to alter the internal chronology of that epic source. He was surely mindful when he shaped his plot that he was making this change, and the fact that Neoptolemus' retrieval immediately followed the visit to Lemnos in the *Little Iliad* must have informed Sophocles' strategy of including the young hero in his *Philoctetes*; that is, Sophocles saw an opportunity to enhance his drama by only subtly rearranging neighboring Cyclic episodes.⁶⁰² The change is easily executed without disrupting the flow of the story, or rather disconnected stories, of the *Little Iliad*. Evidently Sophocles figured Neoptolemus lent more interest to the story than Diomedes, and his immediate participation in a side mission after his own retrieval and killing of Eurypylos lends cohesion to the whole train of events, with the fetching of one distant hero becoming instrumental to the fetching of the other. Additionally, by enrolling Neoptolemus in the story Sophocles selects a hero whose inexperience heretofore makes him uncompromised in the eyes of Philoctetes and thus able to confront him without the need for any physical disguise, whether facilitated by Athena or not.⁶⁰³ Sophocles may

⁶⁰¹ On this innovation cf. Dio 52.15; Hadjicosti 2007: 220; Schein 2013: 23, noting in n. 70 that Telemachus was an obvious potential model for the young Neoptolemus whose character development Sophocles explores (thus another case in which Homeric and Cyclic influences could readily be amalgamated).

⁶⁰² On Sophocles' reordering of the fetching of Neoptolemus and Philoctetes, cf. West 166f. Unfortunately, the move cannot shed light on exactly how the Cyclic poet divided up his split narrative.

⁶⁰³ Odysseus himself points out almost as much at 70-3 (*σοὶ δ' ὁμίλια | πρὸς τόνδε πιστὴ καὶ βέβαιος κτλ.*). These verses may be consciously metaliterary and may imply criticism of certain aspects of the play's

have been keen to shed this element and to keep Odysseus offstage during the critical episode when the bow changed hands; nevertheless, the wily hero could and did remain in control.⁶⁰⁴ Because of Odysseus' brief possession of Achilles' arms, Neoptolemus also could tell a plausible lie in claiming to despise Odysseus, which was instrumental to the latter's plot-within-the-plot, namely his strategy of mastering Philoctetes through manufactured sympathy. Finally, it is curious and captivating to see the young hero acting nobly when he was notorious for impiety at the Sack of Troy, and there is an intentional ironic allusion at S. *Ph.* 1440-4 when Heracles counsels *εὐσέβεια*.⁶⁰⁵ West also suggests that the *Hoplōn Krisis* is chosen as the starting point of the *Little Iliad* in order "to establish a mood of despair among the Achaeans," with the two leading heroes of the *Iliad* now dead.⁶⁰⁶ In addition, this places a great burden on Odysseus, who must rise to the occasion and save the war.

The key concept interrogated in Sophocles' *Philoctetes* is that of necessity. Indeed it has been remarked that here "an entire play... find[s] its action reflected in the opposition of *χρή* and *δεῖ*."⁶⁰⁷ From Odysseus' perspective everything they are doing to capture Philoctetes is necessitated by the prophecy that only with his assistance will the Greeks take Troy. See *τοῦτο δεῖ σοφισθῆναι... ὅπως γενήσῃ* (77, cf. 54), *πρὸ τοῦ δέοντος*

forerunners, on the grounds that Philoctetes should have recognized Aeschylus' Odysseus, e.g. (cf. Dio *Or.* 52.5), or should not have been so easily won over by Euripides' Odysseus-in-disguise.

⁶⁰⁴ Cf. 971 *πρὸς κακῶν δ' ἀνδρῶν μαθῶν*, 1114 *τὸν τὰδε μῆσάμενον* (incidentally, the curse that Philoctetes here utters against Odysseus—that he should suffer *τὸν ἴσον χρόνον*—reveals that Sophocles wished to see a meaningful equivalence in the decade-long periods of alienation endured by Philoctetes in Cyclic and Odysseus in Homeric epic), 1247 *βουλαῖς ἐμαῖς*.

⁶⁰⁵ See Stinton 1990: 487f.

⁶⁰⁶ West 167.

⁶⁰⁷ Benardete 1965: 297, arguing that whereas Odysseus' allegiance is to *τὰ δέοντα* Neoptolemus and Philoctetes declare their autonomy by using *χρή* preferentially. Cf. Schein 1998 on the role of necessity.

(891), etc.⁶⁰⁸ But there are three issues here that Odysseus conveniently (or with devious guile) overlooks: First, they may in fact be able to capture Philoctetes by less disingenuous and more respectable tactics, as Neoptolemus wants (this is a hypothetical and so impossible to prove one way or the other, while the epiphany of Heracles at the play's end comes as a surprise such that no one could have counted on his intervention), but Odysseus (on purpose, no doubt) conflates the necessity of the end goal with the necessity of the stratagems he devises. Secondly, Odysseus never admits that by his very presence he is putting himself and Neoptolemus in more dire straits and greater necessity than is really required, for his perennial thirst for glory induced him to volunteer for the present mission despite knowing (at least this much he acknowledges) that he was the man most abhorred by Philoctetes, while others less odious could perhaps have tried other means in better faith. Why, unless he truly was essential to the mission as a result of his superior cunning—another moot hypothesis—would Odysseus deliberately put himself, not to mention the community, in circumstances that seemingly made success less attainable? Is it simply that he is *φιλότιμος*? Or is he a glutton for punishment or addicted to danger? (In Euripides' *Philoctetes* (F 789) Odysseus confesses that he undertakes difficult missions in order to obtain and keep *charis*.) Thirdly, the necessity of reenlisting Philoctetes presupposes as a condition the need to sack Troy, but the need to sack Troy, notwithstanding Zeus' plan, is itself not exactly a given as far as the whole host of Achaeans can reason. In fact, in Homer it is not even manifest to the best of the Achaeans, or so he claims (*τί δὲ δεῖ πολεμιζέμεναι... Ἀργείους; Il. 9.337*). Nevertheless, if Odysseus' *aristeia* is undermined by the observation that the Achaeans may not have

⁶⁰⁸ At 583 *δεῖ* is used of moral obligation, like *χρῆ*, rather than referring to actual necessity—cf. uses of *χρῆ* and *ἀνάγκη* in the play.

been fighting a just war, so too are the *aristeiai* of Achilles and his *Iliadic* substitutes (hence the tragic irony of Achilles' question, just cited), and so too is the determination of Neoptolemus to pursue the same ends by more idealistic means.

In Sophocles' *Philoctetes* deception, persuasion, and force (Heracles' words constrain, as does the disease itself, although it may be chance that determines the timing of Philoctetes' paroxysm at 732ff.) are all employed to bring about the stranded hero's acquiescence, and Sophocles consistently alludes to other potential scenarios in which these three basic tactics stand as alternatives that can also conspire in various ways.⁶⁰⁹

⁶⁰⁹ See especially lines 90f. (*πρὸς βίαν...καὶ μὴ δόλοισιν*) 102f. ([Ne.] *τί δ' ἐν δόλω δεῖ μᾶλλον ἢ πείσαντ' ἄγειν*; | [Od.] *οὐ μὴ πίθηται· πρὸς βίαν δ' οὐκ ἂν λάβοις*), 563 (*ἐκ βίας...ἢ λόγοις* regarding the invented pursuit of Neoptolemus), 593f. (*ἢ λόγῳ | πείσαντες ἄξειν ἢ πρὸς ἰσχύος κράτος*), 612 (*πείσαντες λόγῳ*), 617-9 (*ἐκούσιον λαβῶν κτλ.*), 629 (*λόγοις μαλθακοῖς*), 644 (*κλέψαι* [sc. *δόλω per* Schein 2013: 224 (643-4n.)] *τε χάρπάσαι βία*), 771 ([sc. *μήτ'*] *ἐκόντα μήτ' ἄκοντα μηδὲ τῷ τέχνῃ*); in this last citation (where most manuscripts read *μήτε τῷ* but a minority has the *lectio difficilior* *μηδὲ τῷ* (for *μήτε...μηδὲ* cf. Pl. *Prt.* 327d) indicating that beyond the voluntary/involuntary distinction concession is permissible "not even in any way") Philoctetes projects his own triple vulnerability onto Neoptolemus as he entrusts him with the bow (with *μηδὲ τῷ τέχνῃ* Philoctetes anticipates that the assailants may ask just to hold the bow temporarily, e.g.; Schein 2013: 241 (771n.) observes that *τέχνῃ* resonates with the idea of guile). Deception in a way straddles the alternatives of persuasion and force in that it seeks to win the target's consent while depriving him of real control: its success would mean he is both willing (in a counterfeit way) and yet (in truth) unwilling. From the play's outset Odysseus has decided to defraud rather than to persuade *bona fide*, reserving only violence as a potential backup plan (deemed hopeless at 103). Hence the most direct threats of violence come after the plan of deception has been tried in vain, namely at 983-5, where Odysseus declares that Philoctetes will be led "by force" (*βία*, 983) if he does not come along "willingly" (*ἐκόν*, 985), and finally at 1297f., where it is no longer Philoctetes but Neoptolemus who *may* relax his stubborn will (*εἰάν τ' Ἀχιλλέως παῖς εἴεν τε μὴ θέλῃ*, 1298) and avoid being overcome "by force" (*βία*, 1297). In neither instance can Odysseus harbor any real hope of success through persuasion, yet he was aware that a victory by such means was fated, as discussed in the next paragraph.

As Schein 2013: 269 (981-3n.) points out, for Odysseus to demand Philoctetes' person as well as his bow (*ἀλλὰ καὶ σὲ δεῖ | στείχειν ἄμ' αὐτοῖς*, 982f.) marks an as yet unexplained expansion (highlighted by *ἀλλὰ καὶ*) of the actual mission's stated objectives (whereas the false merchant consistently named Philoctetes as the target of the alleged mission). The apparently *ad hoc* addendum would have been easier for the original audience to accept right away if there was some tradition according to which Helenus' utterance prescribed the restitution of Philoctetes together with his bow. At any rate, Neoptolemus later elucidates the situation by relating that Helenus indeed made just such a proclamation (1326-47). It is thus revealed retroactively and piecemeal that while Odysseus kept insisting to Neoptolemus that the real prize was the bow (e.g., 78, 113-5), he was all along in pursuit of (a disabled) Philoctetes as ordained by the gods: his plan was first to steal the bow (by trickery), then to "persuade" Philoctetes to follow once he had been deprived of any real choice (*πειθανάγκη* arose later as a term for this). Schein 2013: 139 (103n.) highlights Odysseus' apparent contradiction of Helenus' prophecy as conveyed later by the false merchant (611-3) and then by Neoptolemus (Odysseus not only elides the need for Philoctetes but also absolutely rules out persuasion at 103). But this is of less consequence than the fact that he prevaricates at Neoptolemus' expense, twisting the terms of the prophecy in order to facilitate his own scheme and ensure

This is related to the recycling of the Euripidean mission to Lemnos undertaken by Odysseus and Diomedes, which Sophocles embeds as a lie told by the merchant (570ff.). The play thus digests all prior versions of the myth even as it asserts a novel account. By thematizing the controversial ethics of deception,⁶¹⁰ it also appears to engage in a consequentialist debate started by Aeschylus. Two Aeschylean fragments recorded together but without any ascription to a particular play have now been plausibly assigned to his *Philoctetes*: F 301, ἀπάτης δικαίας οὐκ ἀποστατεῖ θεός (“God does not recoil from deceit [when it is] just”); and F 302, ψευδῶν δὲ καιρὸν ἔσθ’ ὅπου τιμᾷ θεός (“But there are instances where God reveres the fitness of [*or* “opportunity for”] lies”).⁶¹¹ Having effectively refuted several earlier theories assigning the fragments to Aeschylus’ Danaids trilogy or his Prometheus trilogy, and having then identified Odysseus as the prime candidate for speaker of the verses and dismissed the other Aeschylean plays in which that hero appears, Gianvittorio proposes very reasonably that the fragments derive from a moment in the dramatist’s *Philoctetes* in which Odysseus seeks to justify his assumption of a false identity and his misrepresentation of the prevailing conditions back among the

that his protégé stick to the script, as it were (cf. 11-5, where Odysseus interrupts his own expository *rhēsis* and steers Neoptolemus toward his mission; on metatheatricality in the play see Schein 2013: 135 (83n.) and 211f. (542-627n.)). For if Helenus really did say that the Greeks would fetch Philoctetes *πείσαντες λόγῳ* (612), Odysseus would never deliberately bring about a situation in which every possibility for persuasion was squandered, although he may well have believed secretly that this condition imposed an intractable problem requiring a divine remedy (cf. Schein 2013: 221 (610-13n.)). Nevertheless, the unabridged account of Helenus’ prophecy was hardly needed to account for Odysseus’ supplementary demand, for one can easily imagine him reasoning that where vagueness remained it was better to be safe than sorry, or even more pragmatically he may have recognized that Philoctetes even in his current state would be an asset to the Achaean war effort.

⁶¹⁰ References to deception occur constantly, e.g. at lines 14 (*σόφισμα*: for the influence of sophistry on the play and on the tragic Odysseus see Schein 2013: 120 (13-14n.)), 55 (*λόγοισιν ἐκκλέψεις*, introducing the disagreement between the naïf Neoptolemus and the cynical Odysseus; cf. 968), 80, 133, 927-9, 949, 1111f., 1116f. (Chorus asserts that Philoctetes has been undone not by *δόλος* but by *πότμος...δαιμόνων*, which divine lot was manifest already in his very wound, has been proclaimed by Helenus, and is about to be both reinforced and ameliorated by Heracles), 1135f., 1288, etc.

⁶¹¹ Both fragments are quoted in *Dissoi logoi* 3, the former also by Eustathius 1.290.1 van der Valk (cf. 1.760.1-3 van der Valk, where Eustathius may betray his knowledge of the fragment’s original context when he names Odysseus as the quintessential example of one who lies out of necessity.)

Achaean host (in particular, Agamemnon is reported to have died and Odysseus himself to have been convicted of a grievous crime—charming news for their avowed enemy Philoctetes).⁶¹² Aeschylus thus anticipated to a large extent that part of Sophocles' play wherein Neoptolemus, after some stern coaching from Odysseus, lures Philoctetes with a falsified image of the Achaean army's current state that is bound to be much more attractive to the outcast than would be the truth. Gianvittorio's hypothesis also makes for a neat correspondence between the fragments and the testimony of Dio (*Or.* 52.9) regarding Odysseus' use of *ἀπάτη* and misleading *λόγοι* in Aeschylus' *Philoctetes*.

If the verses do belong to the *Philoctetes*, they are probably meant to represent Odysseus' sincere attitude (unlike in Sophocles' version, he has no apprehensive accomplice to persuade) and to embody a valid, not a patently absurd, worldview. This frankness is not so much because Aeschylus was obliged to commit himself to the *Little Iliad*'s laudatory portrait of Odysseus as due to (high) tragedy's preference for pointing out paradoxes as opposed to engaging in facile refutation of a particular argument. All this is to say that Aeschylus either approved of Odysseus' gnomic utterances or at least regarded them as undeniably defensible.

Sophocles' *Philoctetes* differs from this model only in what it emphasizes. Especially by arousing sympathy for the innocent Neoptolemus who appears to be corrupted under the influence of his director, it tends to sever the correspondence between Odysseus' actions on Lemnos and the overarching will of the gods that demands Troy's destruction, thus reinterpreting a salvific deed that should have counted toward

⁶¹² Gianvittorio 2015. Fully convincing is her argument on p. 21 that the fragments, both openly deferential to the gods, make the most sense if spoken by a mortal (as opposed to, say, Prometheus). But at the same time her praise of Odysseus as a purely noble trickster must be qualified, and *Palamedes* at least should not be included among the examples of Odysseus' observing moral boundaries as he works to deceive others.

Odysseus' *timē* as a shameless and duplicitous scheme that betrays his essentially villainous nature. The figure of Neoptolemus therefore serves yet another purpose, namely that of allowing Sophocles to challenge more effectively the message of Aeschylus' Odysseus. But the moral paradox persists. Neoptolemus himself recognizes the "great necessity" (*πολλή...ἀνάγκη*, 921f.), and it is driven home when Heracles comes to demand that Philoctetes go to Troy and enter into a close alliance with Neoptolemus (if not with Odysseus). If in the end the envoys' original purpose is vindicated, they cannot be utterly scorned. The unforeseeable nature of Heracles' arrival also leaves hanging the question of whether Odysseus was wrong to calculate that deceit offered the surest path to success. In fact, by then Philoctetes has already avowed that the bow could never have been snatched from him "except by guile" (*εἰ μὴ δόλω*, 948).

In his detestation of tricks and unwillingness to be an accomplice to deception, Neoptolemus clearly resembles his father (for Achilles' guilelessness, see *Il.* 9.312f.; *E. IA* 936-43, cf. *τρόπους ἀπλοῦς*, 933). The correspondence is of course built into these characters and was probably made overt already in the *Little Iliad*, just as the *Iliupersis* laid bare how Neoptolemus took after his father in being susceptible to violent outbursts of rage.

Proclus' language also does not explicitly state that Helenus' prophecy spoke of the tasks necessary for the sack of Troy, but this is obviously to be inferred. West posits the question, "[W]hy was the Trojan seer so cooperative with the enemies of his city?"⁶¹³ Probably the prophecy was not framed as advice that made any causal connections between events. Apparently in the *Little Iliad* it was not the case, as it is elsewhere, that a disillusioned Helenus was upset at having been denied the honor of marrying Helen in

⁶¹³ West 183.

Paris' wake; otherwise Odysseus would not have had to ambush the prophet as Proclus records, and more fundamentally the resentment and disaffection attributed as motives to Helenus in later versions of the story only make sense if Paris has already died and vacated Helen's marriage bed, whereas we are informed that in the *Little Iliad* the retrieval of Philoctetes, who kills Paris, was occasioned by Helenus' prophecy. So Helenus was not inclined to hasten Troy's doom. Nor would it be very satisfying if the vital but confidential information was simply tortured or bribed out of him, or if the prophet's knowledge of the future was so perfect that he was certain of Troy's destruction and therefore more willing to abet the inevitable. Instead, Helenus' speech to the Greeks was probably defiant, meant to taunt them with their own helplessness, and full of allusions not to the actionable objectives of seeking Philoctetes and Neoptolemus but instead more vaguely to what the two heroes possessed, the bow of Heracles and the blood of Aeacus, respectively.⁶¹⁴ It must have seemed to Helenus that these things were unobtainable, or at the very least that no one of the Greeks was shrewd enough to make the appropriate deductions. They could have asked him (since Calchas' providential powers were falling short) whether in fact they were destined to sack Troy, to which Helenus could have let slip inadvertently the secrets guarding Troy's welfare. It is intriguing that Sophocles at *Phil.* 606-9 follows the *Little Iliad's* account of how the Greeks were alerted to the need to fetch Philoctetes from Lemnos, for as many reasons as there are to revile Odysseus for his treatment of the abandoned hero, the righting of

⁶¹⁴ Cf. *ibid.*

wrongs done to Philoctetes in the past—not to mention the reviving of the entire Greek war effort—must be credited to the same wily Odysseus.⁶¹⁵

In Euripides' *Philoctetes* Odysseus is made to tell lies apparently modeled on the dissimulation of Sinon on the eve of the Sack. The recurrence of Palamedes as the maligned Greek may suggest that Odysseus, perhaps even feeling genuinely guilty about his rival's false conviction and murder, counseled Sinon about what to tell the Trojans (already in the *Little Iliad* and maybe the *Iliupersis* as well). Alternatively, Odysseus' self-criticism on Lemnos could be the older myth,⁶¹⁶ the motif then being adapted to the Sinon story later by e.g. Sophocles. But the more salient feature of the lie told about Palamedes and its greatest utility as a plot device lie in the fact that it provides a plausible motive for Sinon—as a self-professed sympathizer of Palamedes and hence adversary of Odysseus—to betray the Greeks, which in turn facilitates the Trojans' acceptance of the Wooden Horse.⁶¹⁷ Odysseus of course also instructs Neoptolemus to defame him in Sophocles' *Philoctetes* (65f.), but in this case a more direct route to defamation is furnished by the device of Achilles' arms, which thus become crucial in the lie Neoptolemus tells (343-90).

Besides the *Philoctetes* plays by each of the major tragedians, another was written by Theodectes, who flourished around the mid-fourth century. Aristotle (*EN* 7.8, 1150b12) recalls that in this play the hero unsuccessfully sought to endure his agony quietly, *κρύπτειν βουλόμενος τοὺς περὶ τὸν Νεοπτόλεμον* (“wishing to hide from those

⁶¹⁵ Cf. Gianvittorio 2015: 19 for a strong defense of Odysseus' conduct during the mission to Lemnos, at least as it unfolded in A. *Phil.*, on the grounds that it was deception in the service of a supremely just cause.

⁶¹⁶ As such it could go back only as far as Aeschylus, for he is widely viewed as responsible for the replacement of Diomedes with Odysseus in this episode. Another possibility, however, is that in the *Little Iliad* Diomedes beguiled Philoctetes with the lies about Odysseus' that later Euripides put into the wily hero's own mouth.

⁶¹⁷ See Heinze 1903: 8f. with nn.

about Neoptolemus”).⁶¹⁸ In imperial Greek the phrase *οἱ περὶ Νεοπτόλεμον* could be a periphrasis for “Neoptolemus,” but in Aristotle’s day it would normally designate Neoptolemus and his associates.⁶¹⁹ We can assume then that Theodectes followed Sophocles’ version of the story by having Philoctetes pursued by both Neoptolemus and Odysseus, but perhaps Neoptolemus now took the lead. In the sole surviving fragment (72 F 5b) Philoctetes begs for the amputation of his hand, where he was previously bitten.⁶²⁰ An injury in that part of the body could have impaired Philoctetes’ ability to shoot, rendering his treatment by Machaon all the more essential if he was to fulfill his destiny and defeat Paris in combat.⁶²¹

⁶¹⁸ For this use of *κρύπτω* cf. *HH* 1.7. More often an acc. rei accompanies the acc. pers., as in *S. Phil.* 915.

⁶¹⁹ LSJ s.v. *περὶ* C.I.2.

⁶²⁰ *κόψατε τὴν ἐμὴν χεῖρα* (is the plural imperative addressed to the Chorus, to two envoys, or to some other group?). One is free to imagine that the snake struck upwards as Philoctetes reached toward the sacrificial altar on Tenedos, but in an alternative account Servius (*ad Verg. Aen.* 3.402; cf. First Vat. Myth. 59, Second Vat. Myth. 165, Schein 2013: 3 n. 3) says that Philoctetes accidentally pricked himself with one of the poison-tipped arrows he had inherited from Heracles (who may have willed the accident, wroth that Philoctetes had revealed the location of his tomb). Although it is specified that Philoctetes dropped the weapon on his foot, in the original version of this alternative myth Philoctetes may have injured his hand, whether in the course of hunting, sporting, practicing (Servius says *cum exerceatur sagittis*), unpacking, etc. Note that at *S. Phil.* 777f. *μή σοι* [sc. Neoptolemus] *γενέσθαι πολύπον’ ἀντά* [sc. *τόξα*] *κτλ.* Philoctetes blames his weapons for his misfortune (equating his fate with Heracles’), but what he means is that possession of the bow provoked divine *φθόνος* resulting in the snakebite (cf. Schein 2013: 241 [776n.]). For accidental grazing by an arrow, cf. *Ov. Met.* 10.525f. (Venus the victim); id. *Fast.* 5.397f. (Chiron felled by another Heracleian arrow that falls on his foot; a similar story is told of Pholus in *Apd. Bibl.* 2.87 and *Diod. Sic.* 4.12.3, while *Theocr. Id.* 7.149f. describes an occasion when Pholus and Chiron jointly hosted Heracles). Heracles is of course also killed by the Hydra’s toxic blood, albeit in a more convoluted way. The Hydra, meanwhile, is after all another water-snake, which may furnish the logic behind the alternative account of Philoctetes’ injury (consider also the ambiguity of *ἰός*, which can mean both “poison” and “arrow”; cf. Schein 2013: 154f. (*S. Phil.* 166n.)).

⁶²¹ In Sophocles’ play too Philoctetes’ pain reaches such a peak that he would have the afflicted limb lopped off altogether (v. 748, cf. Finglass 2009: 223f.), but it is his foot that has been injured and he remains capable of hunting and thus providing for himself (vv. 165f., cf. 953-8). According to a hypothesis of *E. Phil.* (P.Oxy. 2455, line 253 = test. iiii, line 8) the hero survived rather on the pity of passersby, which would be all the more essential in a play (like Theodectes’?) in which the bowman was incapacitated as such (although his feet should have enabled him to forage for food). The questions of which body part was injured and whether Philoctetes retained his ability to use the bow intersect also with the question of whether the envoys’ original plan was to steal the bow without its owner, which in turn depends on what exactly Helenus’ prophecy entailed and raises the potential concern that Philoctetes was the only one capable of wielding the weapon (cf. *Il.* 16.140-4 on Achilles’ Pelian ash spear and *Od.* 19.585-7 and 21 *passim* on Odysseus’ bow). It is clear that these issues were handled differently by different authors, but many gaps in our evidence prevent a full analysis.

That the healing and the duel together constituted the plot of Sophocles' play *Philoctetes in Troy* is an easy inference to make.⁶²² The odds are that Sophocles wrote this work before writing *Philoctetes*, which he wrote toward the end of his life and career (in 409), much in the same way as he produced *Antigone* years before backtracking in the Theban Cycle to write *Oedipus the King* and *Oedipus at Colonus*. Sophocles' authorship of two plays about Philoctetes reflects his broad interest in physical suffering, disease, and medicine.⁶²³

Most if not all of the surviving fragments from *Philoctetes in Troy* (F 697-703) relate to the healing while looking back at Philoctetes' life as an invalid or reflecting on the art of medicine or the nature of disease. This may (but does not have to) indicate that the combat took up a relatively small part of the drama. The longest fragment (F 701) almost certainly refers to the rod of Asclepius:

καὶ ῥάβδος ὡς κήρυκος Ἑρμαία διπλοῦ
δράκοντος ἀμφίκρανος

And a staff like that of a herald which is associated with Hermes and surmounted on both sides by a double snake-head.⁶²⁴

⁶²² Cf. Pearson ii.307.

⁶²³ Cf. Biggs 1966, Worman 2000. Note e.g. S. F 589.4 (*μείζον...τῆς νόσου τὸ φάρμακον*, meaning "the cure is worse than the disease"). Perhaps correlated with this is an interest in magic (cf. F 536, with *κόρος* used to refer to some kind of voodoo doll).

⁶²⁴ Lloyd-Jones 1996: 335 translates, "And a staff of Hermes like that of a herald...", but that gives the false impression that *Ἑρμαία* modifies *ῥάβδος* apart from the simile *ὡς κήρυκος* when in fact we should observe in the complete verse a light sense-break after the third position and none after the hephthemimeral caesura (see West 1982: 84 for the distribution of sense-pauses in tragic trimeters). The serpentine imagery here associated with healing (cf. Cornutus 33) also harks back to the cause of Philoctetes' ailment and thus partakes of the same ambiguity as the term *φάρμακον*. Was Philoctetes in the *Little Iliad*, in Sophocles' play, or in any later source said to have been cured by ingesting snake venom (cf. Telephus' healing by the "hair of the dog," so to speak) or by his physician's sucking out the poison beneath the wound—a remedy that Machaon performs for Menelaus in *Il.* 4.218? Various other ancient authors describe ingested venom as harmless or even curative: Luc. *Bell. Civ.* 9.604-18, Pliny *NH* 29.4, Celsus 5.27.3B, Galen *Subfig. Emp.* 10 (treatment with venom ordered by Asclepius), Philostr. *Vit. Ap.* 3.44 (on Asclepiads' treatment of venomous snake bites "by the venomous creatures themselves," *τοῖς ἰοβόλοις αὐτοῖς*); on all these passages and more cf. Kelhoffer 2000: 438-40.

Although Heracles promises in Sophocles' *Philoctetes* (1437) that he will dispatch Asclepius to Troy to heal the crippled hero, the reference in F 701 to an attribute of the healer-god seems better suited to a description of someone absent and invisible. To enact the healing of a mortal by a god (involving direct physical contact) could have been inherently problematic, but conveniently it was the physician-hero Machaon who treated Philoctetes in the *Little Iliad* (arg. 2c W.).⁶²⁵ Perhaps then the Sophoclean fragment comes from a passage in which Machaon, prior to operating on Philoctetes, describes his medical training under his father Asclepius;⁶²⁶ or perhaps Asclepius visited his son in a dream to give instructions about the patient's stubborn ailment—which dream Machaon might recount. The latter possibility highlights the fact that Machaon's assumption of the role of healer is not altogether incompatible with Heracles' prediction at the end of Sophocles' other (extant) *Philoctetes*, where in any case the solemn attitude of the *deus ex machina* calls for the enlistment of a fellow god, no mere mortal.⁶²⁷ The lost text of the *Little Iliad* may itself have involved Asclepius remotely somehow in the healing of

⁶²⁵ *Epit.* 5.1 situates Machaon's death earlier in the war, making him one of Penthesilea's victims; later it is Podalirius who heals Philoctetes (*Epit.* 5.8). West 139, 160, and 185 n. 28 credibly supposes that this was told in the *Aethiopsis*, which did not have to account for the healing of Philoctetes. Conversely, Sophocles' *Philoctetes in Troy* was not obliged to count Machaon among the war's earlier casualties and so did not share Apollodorus' need for Podalirius as an *ad hoc* substitute; more fundamentally, the *Little Iliad*, not the *Aethiopsis*, was the Cyclic poem that Sophocles naturally would have consulted while he was composing both of his plays about *Philoctetes*.

⁶²⁶ For the father-son kinship see *Il.* 11.517f.; cf. 4.219 (*φάρμακα* passed from Chiron to Asclepius to his son Machaon), *S. Phil.* 1333 (*Ἀσκληπιῶδ' ὄν* must refer to both Machaon and Podalirius, cf. Schein 2013: 323 (1332-5n.)). In *Aeth.* fr. 5a W. Machaon and Podalirius are both described as recipients of medical knowledge from their father, and the corruption in v. 1 should probably be emended such that Asclepius remains their father as opposed to the "Earth-shaker" (i.e., Poseidon); cf. West 159 and note that if Penthesilea kills Machaon in the *Aethiopsis* it must be Podalirius who later in the poem diagnoses Ajax's madness (the attribution of the fragment to Arctinus' other poem, the *Iliupersis*, cannot stand).

⁶²⁷ Cf. Schein 2013: 339 (*S. Phil.* 1437-40n.), who notes the possibility that Asclepius "should be thought of as acting through his human sons" (or son).

Philoctetes. On the other hand, Sophocles famously “received” the god (i.e., promoted his cult) in Athens,⁶²⁸ and so it would not surprise if he also made room for him in his plays.

In a fragment of the minor tragedian Achaëus (*TrGF* (i) 20 F 37, attributed to *Philoctetes*), Agamemnon delivers a martial exhortation to the army, so this play must have covered the same action as Sophocles’ *Philoctetes in Troy*.⁶²⁹ One can imagine that Agamemnon’s harangue at *Il.* 8.228-44 inspired Achaëus on some level; shortly thereafter (281-91) he singles out for encouragement Teucer, an archer. But it is also possible that Achaëus followed such speeches in the *Little Iliad* (which in turn may have looked back at the Iliadic speeches). There is yet another fragment from an unknown play (adespoton F 654, *TrGF* ii.229) that Kannicht supposes was another *Philoctetes in Troy*.⁶³⁰

It is possible that the description of the archers’ duel between Paris and Philoctetes relegated to a single messenger speech toward the end of the play.⁶³¹ That speech may have included Menelaus’ maltreatment of Paris’ corpse.⁶³² For the motif of mutilation compare Achilles’ defilement of Hector’s corpse (*Il.* 22.395ff.) and the *μασχαλισμός* he undertook against Troilus (the first act due to a personal grudge, the second due to some other obscure reason). Later on the *Little Iliad* probably described Deiphobus’ murder during the Sack of Troy (carried out by Menelaus together with Odysseus according to *Od.* 8.517f.).⁶³³ Deiphobus was like Paris mutilated as the

⁶²⁸ See Parker 1996: 175, 179, 184f.

⁶²⁹ Thus while the embassy to Lemnos was presumably the first Philoctetes myth to come to mind for most Greeks (cf. West 185, discussing Aristotle’s inclusion of “*Philoctetes*” among the plays that could be based on the *Little Iliad*), there was no shortage of plays dealing with his later exploits at Troy.

⁶³⁰ See *TrGF* v(2).830.

⁶³¹ Cf. West 186f.

⁶³² Cf. the account of Q. S., but heed the warning of Lloyd-Jones 1996: 333.

⁶³³ Cf. West 219.

counterfeit husband of Helen and thus a most bitter enemy of Menelaus, at least according to Verg. *Aen.* 6.494-7 (cf. perhaps Alcaeus *SLG* 262.12).

There followed the funeral rites for Paris and the marriage of Helen and Deiphobus, which was surely preceded by an assembly in Troy that began as a hearing about whether to release Helen and devolved into a dispute over which Trojan prince deserved to marry her next. Bergk, probably wrongly, thought the play *Helenēs Gamos* might have related this late marriage.

3.4. The Last Recruits

καὶ Νεοπτόλεμον Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐκ Σκύρου ἀγαγὼν τὰ ὄπλα δίδωσι τὰ τοῦ πατρός. καὶ Ἀχιλλεὺς αὐτῷ φαντάζεται. Εὐρύπυλος δὲ ὁ Τηλέφου ἐπίκουρος τοῖς Τρωσὶ παραγίνεται. καὶ ἀριστεύοντα αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνει Νεοπτόλεμος. (Arg. 3a-d W.)

And Odysseus, leading Neoptolemus from Scyros, gives him his father's arms. And Achilles appears to him [as a ghost]. But Eurypylus comes to the Trojans as an ally. And as he is dominating [on the battlefield] Neoptolemus kills him.

Although Neoptolemus' recruitment may not have posed as great a challenge as that of the alienated Philoctetes, there was still substantial room in the *Little Iliad* for a colorful episode set on Scyros. Odysseus' journey there to fetch Neoptolemus recalls his fetching of Achilles from the same island, but in fact the latter myth had no place in the Epic Cycle; rather, Euripides invented it for his *Scyrians*, thus merging two Cyclic data, namely Achilles' sojourn on Scyros in the *Cypria* (arg. 7c W.) and the mission of Odysseus to retrieve his son in the *Little Iliad* (arg. 3a. W.).⁶³⁴ A fragment from the latter

⁶³⁴ If Proclus' summary is a reliable guide to the chronology of events in the *Little Iliad*, that epic poem followed in an uninterrupted train the series of events triggered by Philoctetes' retrieval (culminating in Paris' funeral and Helen's remarriage) before turning to Neoptolemus' induction into the war. But it is likely that both recruitments—as well as the need for the Palladium—were prompted by a single prophecy of Helenus earlier in the *Little Iliad*. Thus the fetching of Neoptolemus now represents the fulfillment of a requirement advertised earlier. It would have been understood that Diomedes and Odysseus embarked at the same time in different directions, but the poem in keeping with epic fashion would have used the phrase

epic (*Il. Parv.* fr. 5 W.) describing Achilles’ Pelian ash spear—part of his panoply, which Odysseus, having only recently come into possession of it, dutifully delivers to Neoptolemus—has its verb in the present tense (*ἀσπράπτει*, describing the spear’s golden gleam). This is consistent with epic dialogue and points to an ephrastic speech delivered by Odysseus, who may have needed to exert some pressure on Neoptolemus, especially after the latter had learning of his father’s death at Troy. The crafty hero would have found the armor (which conveniently he had left behind in Troy, no doubt on the pretext of safeguarding it) to be of use in baiting the young man.⁶³⁵ Sophocles’ *Philoctetes* represents Neoptolemus as rushing to Troy in order to see his father before burial (348-51) and demanding his weapons on his own accord (362); and when Odysseus coaches Neoptolemus earlier in the play he proposes saying that the Achaeans summoned the young hero “by means of prayers” (*ἐν λιταῖς*, 60), not by bribing him with the weapons. However, the fact that these details are embedded in a report fabricated to cozen Philoctetes makes it hazardous to apply them toward reconstructing the contents of the

“after this” rather than “meanwhile.” West 183 bases his schematic reconstruction of the poem in part on the fact that Scyros lay farther from Troy than did Lemnos (*ibid.* 182 with n. 21). Even if this did not inform the poet’s arrangement of events, it must at least be said that the desired chronology lines up nicely with geographical considerations.

⁶³⁵ West 188f., even as he notes that the scene plays out in exactly this way in Q. S. 7.194-204, doubts that Odysseus would have needed to lure Neoptolemus with the promise of his father’s weapons. But as we witness with Achilles, too, sometimes even a hero destined for martial greatness and eager for future battles still has to be coaxed out of juvenile obscurity and innocence (or out from under the aegis of overprotective parental figures). And an opportunity for Odysseus to exercise his persuasive skills would not have been wasted, least of all by the poet of the *Little Iliad*. An ephrasis of absent weapons would only enhance their majesty. As the poet had by then already indulged in an ephrasis during the earlier scene on Scyros, the actual handing over of Achilles’ weapons to Neoptolemus back at Troy was probably described very perfunctorily (unless Odysseus was represented as hesitating at the last moment to give up his extraordinary *γέρας*, delivering some less harsh version of his imagined sentiments at S. *Phil.* 372f., 379). Proclus’ summary subordinates the action on Scyros (*ἀγαγών*) and implies that the bestowal of Achilles’ arms was the event on which the poet expatiated, but it seems better to follow the evidence of the fragment and specifically its verb in the present tense (*pace* West 189, who suggests emending to *ἤσπραπτεν*).

Little Iliad; and the reference to *λιταί* at least reflects the fact that *some* kind of appeal had to be made.⁶³⁶

So the tragedians would have found in this part of the *Little Iliad* an incident not without developed drama; the devastating news of Achilles' death and its potential to thwart Odysseus' mission (and thus scuttle the whole Achaean war effort) were enough to sustain a tragedy. Sophocles' lost *Scyrians* is thought to have dramatized this very episode.⁶³⁷ From this play F 555 seems to be spoken by Lycomedes as a protective and apprehensive grandfather who must bid Neoptolemus farewell. This relationship could be modeled either on the same episode in the *Little Iliad* or on Euripides' account of Achilles' departure from Scyros. F 557, in which someone consoles an "old man" while pointing out the uselessness of tears, is more divisive in the scholarship: Robert thought of Neoptolemus addressing Phoenix, while Welcker and Bergk preferred to attribute the verses to Diomedes in dialogue with Lycomedes.⁶³⁸ There are too many apposite characters and potential sources of grief (not only Achilles' death in the war, mentioned within the fragment itself, but also Neoptolemus' present departure for the same war) for the matter to be resolved easily. Nevertheless, the fragments taken together support the designation of plot stated above. Aside from this play, however, tragedy as a whole gravitates not toward Neoptolemus' recruitment but toward his exploits after he reaches Troy. Yet on a minute level at least the cited epic fragment concerning Achilles' spear

⁶³⁶ There may also be an allusion to Phoenix's *λιταί* allegory at *Il.* 9.502ff., in his embassy speech to Achilles; at *S. Phil.* 344 Neoptolemus names Phoenix as Odysseus' co-delegate on Scyros.

⁶³⁷ Like most scholars Radt (*TrGF* iv.418) accepts this view (first proposed by Tyrwhitt) as opposed to Brunck's argument (followed by Welcker 102) that the play's plot matched that of E. *Scyrians*. The etymologizing of Neoptolemus' name in F 554 is inconclusive. If Radt et al. are correct, we have another instance of Sophocles adapting his favorite Cyclic poem, the *Little Iliad*.

⁶³⁸ It is easy to understand why a tragedy on this episode might focus on Lycomedes, who effectively loses a son-in-law and a grandson in a single day. But even if he is the addressee, could not Neoptolemus be the speaker? Note that Lycomedes, murderer of Theseus (cf. *supra* 191 n. 582), was no patriotic Athenian's favorite.

may have influenced tragedy: specifically, its bold metaphorical use of *ἀσπράπτω* (literally, “lighten” or “flash as lightning”) recurs in S. *OC* 1067 and E. *Ph.* 111.

Achilles’ appearance as a ghost is itself a sort of leitmotif in the Epic Cycle that may have carried its own conventions. Compare his apparition several days later when the victorious Greeks are about to embark for home. During this episode he demands to be honored, which results in the sacrifice of Polyxena at his tomb (as in Euripides’ *Hecuba*), and perhaps he also has some stern words for his son, mixed with encouragement. Concern for his son weighs heavily on the *ψυχή* of Achilles even at *Od.* 11.492f.

The bestowal of Achilles’ *ὄπλα* upon his son is relevant to his prompt clash with the worthy foe Eurypylus, whose father had both suffered and benefitted from the famous spear. Of less interest is the fact that Neoptolemus’ very ability to wield this hefty spear inevitably bothered Homeric scholars of a fundamentalist bent (see *Il. Parv.* fr. 5 W., from sch. (T) *Il.* 16.142).

The Mysian hero Eurypylus came to the war as a late ally of the Trojans. His allegiance was based on kindred blood, for his mother Astyoche was Priam’s sister. Under normal circumstances he would also have been motivated to join the fray by the memories of the Greeks pillaging his native land and inflicting a disastrous wound on his father Telephus. But as a condition of healing that wound, the Greeks (besides extorting their victim’s help in locating Troy) had barred Telephus and his descendants from taking up arms against them forever thereafter. So the young Eurypylus duly rebuffed Priam’s requests for help.⁶³⁹ His initial reluctance to fight also exemplifies the Greek proverb by

⁶³⁹ Cf. sch. Juv. 6.655: *ille (sc. Eurypylus) negavit monitus scilicet a patre suo*. Obedience to the earlier bargain may have been the sole reason for the admonishments of the now deceased Telephus, or he may

which easy prey was referred to as “Mysian plunder.”⁶⁴⁰ If the stereotype of the pusillanimous Mysian was as old as that of the mendacious Cretan, it is conceivable that it helped to suggest the whole conceit of the Achaean fleet landing in distant Mysia (even if it was at one time or another called Teuthrania) and raiding it without ever having to make amends. At the very least, the overall behavior of Mysians in the Trojan Cycle—apart from the personal heroics of Telephus (a Greek by birth) and Eurypylus (half-Greek)—must have served to perpetuate the stereotype used to denigrate their counterparts in the Classical period.

The basic story of Eurypylus son of Telephus is also related in *Od.* 11.519-22, where his excellence (including his extreme beauty) redounds to the glory of his killer and thus is supposed to cheer Achilles. Eurypylus’ people are here called Ceteians.

The papyrological remains of a *Eurypylus* plausibly credited to Sophocles serve as a useful warning that our ancient testimonia do not leave us fully apprised of the corpus of any of the tragedians. For nowhere is the play directly attributed to Sophocles; rather Aristotle (or an interpolator who augments the Stagirite’s text) informs us at *Poet.* 1459b6 that *Eurypylus* is one of the several tragedies that could be (and were) written from the material of the *Little Iliad*. This along with a connected passage in Plutarch⁶⁴¹ is the original basis of Tyrwhitt’s modern attribution (the other plays in Aristotle’s list are Sophoclean), which seems to have been confirmed by more recent papyrological discoveries. If *Eurypylus* was its own play, what was the plot of *Mysians*? If it was not

have calculated that it was simply impossible to exact revenge or to have any success against the indomitable Achilles. The death of the latter reduced the risks of fighting the Greeks, while the arrival of his son Neoptolemus revived the possibility of avenging the injury to Telephus in an intimate way. Did these considerations factor into Priam’s cajoling before the king resorted to bribery?

⁶⁴⁰ *Μυσῶν λεία* (Arist. *Rhet.* 1372b); cf. Stratt. 35 and Dem. 18.72 as well as A. *Pers.* 52.

⁶⁴¹ *καὶ τὸν Νεοπτόλεμον ὁ Σοφοκλῆς καὶ τὸν Εὐρύπυλον ὀπίσθας ἄκομπ’ ἀλοιδόρητα, φησὶν, ἔρρηξάτην ἐς κύκλα χαλκῶν ὄπλων,* *De cohib. ira* 10.458D. Cf. *TrGF* iv.200 on S. F **210.9, where the papyrus has been supplemented by Plutarch’s quotation.

part of a *Telepheia* (see *TrGF*), then Sophocles would have been able to recall an earlier work in his writing of a later play about a related character, adopting in the process a wide purview of the Epic Cycle.

Was Astyoche's role made up on model of Eriphyle in Theban Cycle? Was the bribery of Astyoche an invention of Sophocles? At any rate the golden *vine* may be an invention of the theater. Astyoche in Sophocles' play blames herself for Eurypylus' death (F 210), so she must have taken the bribe. But was she Eurypylus' mother or wife? The version of the story told by sch. Juv. 6.655 should probably be separated from Sophocles' play, but since it makes Eurypylus' wife the culprit and names her Eriphyle, there is still room in this version for a mother named Astyoche.

The golden vine is a rather lame motif, although it may feel somewhat appropriate to the Dionysian context of the Athenian theater. According to later authors, Dionysus impeded Telephus with a vine-shoot as he sought to defend his country against the attacking Greeks.⁶⁴² That both father and son should have stumbled on a vine, as it were, is the sort of parallelism characteristic of the more precious Alexandrian poetry but not of archaic epic or (probably) Sophoclean tragedy.⁶⁴³ Furthermore, the golden vine as a plot device is utterly derivative, as the bribery of Eriphyle in the Theban Cycle is attested earlier; sch. Juv. 6.655 even names Eurypylus' wife *Erypile* and says that she, not the hero's mother, accepted Priam's bribe.⁶⁴⁴

⁶⁴² Sources for this include *P.Oxy.* II 214.1; cf. *supra*, 106 n. 346, where a possible parallel is detected in Ar. *Ach.* 1178 (the general Lamachus, who has spurned the Bacchic lifestyle, trips on a vine-prop).

⁶⁴³ Cf. Strabo's dismissive comments (13.1.69) about those who claim to elucidate Homer's allusion to the fate of Eurypylus at *Od.* 11.519-21: οἱ γραμματικοὶ μὐθάρια παραβάλλοντες εὐρεσιλογοῦσι μᾶλλον ἢ λῴουσι τὰ ζητούμενα.

⁶⁴⁴ The variant blaming Eurypylus' wife is also recorded by Eust. 1.432.3f. Stallbaum (on *Od.* 11.521), although the woman remains anonymous.

Perhaps then the instrument of bribery was originally (and in Sophocles' play?) something else, such as the hand of one of Priam's daughters, who subsequently blames herself for the death of Eurypylus. Dictys (4.14) has Priam promise Eurypylus the right to marry Cassandra, whose name might fit in just before F 210.32. (Note that Astyoche could still have come to Troy with her son and could still be the woman who laments Eurypylus in the play, or both she and Cassandra could.) Compare the scholia and the commentary of Eustathius on *Od.* 11.521 (*γυναιῶν εἴνεκα δώρων*, which phrase, however, must mean "on account of gifts given to a woman" when it recurs at *Od.* 15.247 to describe the fate of Amphiaraus). We can also look at the passage in which Priam grieves for Eurypylus as if for his son: so far as the tattered papyrus permits us to see here, neither is the old man described as expressing remorse, nor indeed is there any intimation that the reporting messenger or any other character is cognizant of a devious scheme on the part of the king that has brought about their grave misfortune.

The traceable action of Sophocles' *Eurypylus* apparently was contained within Troy's walls, and this, barring a rare change of scene, entails that Eurypylus brought his mother with him to the war front. This is in line with the tradition that at the end of the war Astyoche was taken captive along with Aethilla and Medesicaste, also daughters of Laomedon. These were the women who set the Greek ships on fire in Italy, according to Tzetzes on *Lyc.* 921.⁶⁴⁵

It has been argued that *P.Oxy.* II 214 is based on Sophocles' *Eurypylus*,⁶⁴⁶ but maybe it has an epic model. The *Little Iliad* may have ceased circulating by the third

⁶⁴⁵ Cf. Strabo 6.1.12; Conon *Narr.* 13 changes the location to Thrace (Scione) and oddly names Protesilaus as the leader of the affected party. Cf. also the story of the Trojan women's torching their own ships in *Aen.* 5.604-771.

⁶⁴⁶ Rostagni 1912/3.

century A.D., when this text is dated, but perhaps another lost epic was used (cf. the later Trojan epics of Dares and Dictys). Grenfell and Hunt characterize the poem's style as Alexandrian (which militates against its being a fragment from the *Little Iliad*, e.g.). Robert (*apud ed. pr.*) believed that the Trojan female speaker of the speech represented on the *recto* of the papyrus was Astyoche but that the scene was Italy, where the daughters of Laomedon set their captors' ships aflame (whence the description on the *verso* of the perils of navigation).

One fragment has been taken as a verbal showdown before the duel, which could have some resonance with *Shepherds*. The duel was probably reported without being staged (again as in *Shepherds*),⁶⁴⁷ after Eurypylos had departed from the city and left his mother there. In F **206.19 it must not be Neoptolemus speaking in the first person but another character who refers in the third person to his arrival from Scyros.⁶⁴⁸ Sophocles may have sought to leave his audience with an appreciation for the unity of the Epic Cycle by presenting the duel between the newly arrived heroes as a sequel to the combat between their fathers.⁶⁴⁹

Might Eurypylos' departure be signaled in *P.Oxy.* 1175 fr. 91 (= S. F 221)? Significantly, the Chorus bids adieu to a "stranger" (ξένος, v. 13), so they cannot have been Mysians themselves; and in the case of a Chorus of Trojans, the title *Mysians* cannot have attached to this play (but this connection is itself not a certainty). This fragment, however, may not belong to *Eurypylos* at all. It prominently mentions Agamemnon (αγαξάνδρῶν Ἀτρείδης, v. 22), whose involvement Wilamowitz related to some earlier

⁶⁴⁷ I thus side with Hunt against Wilamowitz (1935-72: i.351).

⁶⁴⁸ Carden 1974 suggests a conversation between Priam and Eurypylos.

⁶⁴⁹ To this end, note that the fathers are named within two verses of each other in the messenger's speech comprising the beginning of F **210.

espionage but who is not elsewhere connected to the protagonist's death. The fragment may well come from a different play altogether.

3.5. Odysseus in Troy

Ὀδυσσεύς τε αἰκισάμενος ἑαυτὸν κατάσκοπος εἰς Ἴλιον παραγίνεται, καὶ ἀναγνωρισθεὶς ὑφ' Ἑλένης περὶ τῆς ἀλώσεως τῆς πόλεως συντίθεται, κτείνας τέτινας τῶν Τρώων ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς ἀφικνεῖται. (Arg. 4b-d W.)

Odysseus after having himself disfigured⁶⁵⁰ enters Ilium as a spy, and having been recognized by Helen makes a pact about the sack of the city, and having killed some of the Trojans arrives [back] at the ships.

The wording of Proclus' *Chrestomathy* indicates that this initial encounter with Helen represents a prelude to the theft of the Palladium and an entirely separate infiltration into Troy, but the events may not be totally unrelated. We are told that Odysseus struck a pact with Helen that would somehow help the Trojans sack Troy. West suggests this refers to Helen's agreement to send up a torch signal (which out to be a device that Odysseus passed on to Helen from its originator Palamedes, though this detail was probably ignored), as she does in *Aen.* 6.515-19, when the Wooden Horse had been permitted to infiltrate the city.⁶⁵¹ Rather than or in addition to this, in striking the pact with Helen Odysseus may have secured her assistance in furnishing the Palladium, as in *Epit.* 5.13 (*δι' ἐκείνης τὸ Παλλάδιον ἐκκλέψας*), though there the two covert missions of Proclus' account are combined into one. Lines 501-7 of the *Rhesus* corroborate this report of dual missions;⁶⁵² also in *Epit.* Odysseus has not yet conceived of the Horse stratagem, so he

⁶⁵⁰ Rather than imagining Odysseus engaged in self-flagellation, we should probably adopt a factitive translation of mid. *αἰκισάμενος*, for *Il. Parv.* fr. 8 W. (= sch. Lyc. 780) states that Odysseus marred his appearance with blows administered by his Aetolian comrade Thoas.

⁶⁵¹ West 198.

⁶⁵² The *Rhesus* moves the theft of the Palladium to a much earlier phase of the war, "solely, it seems, in order to motivate Rhesus' reaction on hearing the story" (*SFP* 2012: 205 n. 2). That reaction is one of

cannot ask Helen when he sees her to promise to give a signal once the Horse has entered Troy. For example, she might have announced some pretense requiring that the statue be removed from the watch of the priestesses entrusted with its care. (The statue was a portable companion to the statue of Athena supplicated at *Il.* 6.303-12; *Apd.* 3.12.3 describes the appearance of the Palladium, made by Athena in the image of her friend Pallas, daughter of Triton, and the story behind it.⁶⁵³) Compare Iphigenia’s invented obligation to purify by rinsing the human sacrificial victims together with the statue of Artemis (*E. IT* 1191-9).⁶⁵⁴ What was offered on Odysseus’ end of the bargain with Helen? Perhaps he simply told her that she would not incur any punishment from Menelaus upon their reunion and promised to make sure of that.⁶⁵⁵

The eponymous heroine of *Hecuba* expands the story in order to shame Odysseus (239-257):

<i>Εκ.</i>	<i>οἶσθ’ ἠνίκ’ ἦλθες Ἰλίου κατάσκοπος</i>	
	<i>δυσχλαινία τ’ ἄμορφος ὀμμάτων τ’ ἄπο</i>	240
	<i>φόνου σταλαγμοὶ σὴν κατέσταζον γένυν;</i>	
<i>Οδ.</i>	<i>οἶδ’· οὐ γὰρ ἄκρας καρδίας ἔψαυσέ μου.</i>	
<i>Εκ.</i>	<i>ἔγνω δέ σ’ Ἑλένη καὶ μόνη κατεῖπ’ ἐμοί;</i>	243
<i>Οδ.</i>	<i>μεμνήμεθ’ ἐς κίνδυνον ἐλθόντες μέγαν.</i>	

Hec. Do you recall when you came as a spy of Ilium, unkempt with shabby clothing, and drops of gore dripped down your cheek from your eyes?
Od. I recall; for it touched my heart not superficially.
Hec. And did Helen recognize you and betray you to me alone?
Od. We remember coming into great peril.

righteous indignation at Odysseus the “pirate and one who robs the temples of the gods” (*ληστήν...καὶ θεῶν ἀνάκτορα σπλῶντα, Rh.* 516f.).

⁶⁵³ Cf. *sch. Il.* 6.311; Paus. 1.28.9, 2.23.5; with Verg. *Aen.* 2.162ff. and other Roman sources the story changes such that the Greeks never steal the Palladion, which Aeneas rescues and carries away in his flight.

⁶⁵⁴ A not dissimilar ruse is Helen’s deception of Theoclymenus at *E. Hel.* 1237ff., wherein she pretends she needs to perform a ritual burial for Menelaus at sea, and Menelaus even extracts armor.

⁶⁵⁵ For other speculations see Chavannes 1891.

The two go on to recount how Odysseus supplicated Hecuba and won his own release, and Hecuba urges Odysseus to show gratitude by sparing Polyxena. He of course refuses. Whereas the tattered clothes and self-laceration are in keeping with tradition, the plot twist introduced at 243 is totally unprecedented. How and why Helen alerted Hecuba to the intruder is not explained, as Euripides makes the most of the luxury he enjoys of not having to explain such innovations. A scholiast (*ad* 241) rightly complains that Odysseus (however clever a speaker he may have been) should never have been able to persuade Hecuba to let him go. Moreover, how could Helen have been hostile enough toward Odysseus that she summoned Hecuba yet affable enough that she conspired with Odysseus about the impending Sack—an outcome that the playwright cannot contravene? In any case, Euripides boldly reworks tradition here, but this probably is not due to any reflexive desire on his part to debase Odysseus’ character. Rather, the addition is rhetorically motivated in that it “enables Hecuba to raise the issue of *χάρις*” and sets up another challenge for Odysseus, who again proceeds to evade the queen through verbal gymnastics, this time by “placing a narrow construction on his obligations” (he offers to protect Hecuba but not her daughter, so the ultimate effect of the exchange is undeniably his debasement).⁶⁵⁶

The versatile poet Ion wrote a tragedy called *Phrouroi* (“Watchmen”) about this rather arbitrary-sounding spy mission.⁶⁵⁷ Two excerpted lines have been recovered from a palimpsest text of the grammarian Herodian, one of them (Ion F 43b) being:

καὶ πᾶς παρήλθεν θάλαμον εὐναῖον ζένοσ [West; MS ζένον];

⁶⁵⁶ Gregory 1999: 74 (n. *ad* 239-50).

⁶⁵⁷ He also wrote a *Laertes*, which might conceivably have belonged to the same trilogy as *Phrouroi*, linked thematically through the figure of Odysseus.

And how did a stranger pass by the marriage-bedchamber?

This line, whose context is probably the conversation between Odysseus and Helen, could relate to a recounting by Helen of Paris' seduction of her back in Sparta.⁶⁵⁸ The other fragment cited by the grammarian (F 43c) is most likely from the same episode within the play and reads as follows:

τροπαῖον αὖ με παρεφόβησεν αὔρα [2 × ?]

Turning back [? (see below)] I was frightened mistakenly by a breeze.⁶⁵⁹

Snell concludes that Odysseus spoke this line, as if it described his own experience skulking about Troy. West, however, offers a more compelling alternative explanation that is corroborated by the previous fragment: “Helen may be the speaker; we know that she conversed with Odysseus in this play. The verse would suit an account of how she stole out of the palace [of Menelaus] with Paris and in her nervousness was alarmed by a

⁶⁵⁸ This is West's interpretation of the line (1968: 201), which is quite persuasive. The only remaining issue is the precise significance of *παρήλθεν*, which could mean that Paris (i) “passed by/eluded” the bedroom (a likely meaning, but why is the verb not plural if Paris and Helen were escaping together?), (ii) “disregarded” the bedroom (but then the context would be Paris' seduction of Helen more generally rather than a specific narration of their escape, and the emphasis on the *θάλαμος* as opposed to the *εὐνή* itself would be odd), (iii) “was superior to” the bedroom (but the same two problems as in (ii) would still apply, with only a shift in the focalization to Helen's point of view), or finally (iv) “entered [into]” the bedroom (for this meaning even without a preposition, cf. Euripides, *Medea* 1137, where Medea's “two-fold offspring” *παρήλθε νυμφικὸς δόμονος*—this could be the best alternative, and one could even retain the transmitted *ξένον* or emend to *ξένου* (*ξένος* can = *ξενόδοκος* “host” as well as mean “guest”) and translate, “And how did he (dare) enter a foreign/his host's marriage-bedchamber?”).

⁶⁵⁹ In reading *αὔρα* instead of *ἄβρα* (“favorite slave”), West (*loc. cit.*) is building on the observations of Hunger 1967: 8, 19. The above translation attempts through a transformation into the passive voice to connote a sense of relief, which the placement of the subject at the verse's end may signal. In addition, *παραφοβέω*, a *hapax* not in the main text of LSJ but included in the revised Supplement with the translation “drive aside in fright,” is taken instead to have the meaning “strike with misguided fear” (cf. *παράγω*, *παρακούω*, etc., and see LSJ *s.v.* *παρά fin.*). Even with the simplex verb *φοβέω*, the meaning “rout” is essential only in Homeric usage, though the idea that Helen was terrified enough to flee back to her room is not impossible and in fact would be reinforced by *αὖ*. West inserts <πάλιν> (often used with *αὖ*) at the end of the line, which would make a complete dialogue trimeter (though it requires scanning *με παρεφόβησεν* as six consecutive shorts).

noise which turned out to be nothing but a breeze.”⁶⁶⁰ If the fragment is read in this way, Helen is in the midst of answering Odysseus’ inquiry about her elopement with Paris. Conveniently, the grammarian did not have to direct his gaze far when recording the two verses.

Thus we can reconstruct a scene in which Odysseus and Helen meet and interrogate each other, and it so happens that our best evidence should relate to Odysseus’ interrogation of Helen, not vice versa. The significance of this conversation as it regards Odysseus’ character is ambiguous. On the one hand, there is a bit of evidence and a strong likelihood that he makes an effort to represent the indignation of all his comrades and especially of his friend Menelaus, who has a just claim in demanding the return of his erstwhile wife (in a similar way, Odysseus had visited Troy previously as Menelaus’ co-plaintiff, an episode that Antenor recalls during the *Teichoscopia* scene at *Iliad* 3.204-24). On the other hand, the end result of the story is the salvation of Odysseus from a position of vulnerability, and regardless of any advantage gained by Helen in striking a deal that promised her future protection, the means employed by the hero to secure his own safety were not entirely dignified, as other sources indicate. In particular, the eponymous heroine of Euripides’ *Hecuba* recalls having saved Odysseus, who became

⁶⁶⁰ West (*loc. cit.*). The real crux of this verse is the inflection and meaning of *τροπαῖον*. There is no room for it to be a substantive, as the object (*με*) and subject (*αὔρα*) are already evident and “trophy” even as an appositive does not fit the context. As an adjective, the word would not seem to be able to modify *με* if Helen is taken as the speaker. However, the very passage of Herodian (*De Prosodia Catholica* 1.369) that prompts this citation comprises a list of *τὰ μονογενῆ* (words that have a single inflection regardless of gender). In other words, although the adjective as normally inflected is *τροπαῖος*, -α, -ον, the entire reason for citing this verse is its striking use of *τροπαῖος* as a biterminal adjective (albeit Herodian’s overall aim has to do with accentuation—he is showing that the neuter substantive is *supposed* to be accented as a proparoxytone, while the predominant Attic form is in fact properispomenon). Cf. Smyth §289d, which notes that, especially in poetry, certain adjectives of three endings can use masculine endings for feminine agreement (one example given is *ἀναγκάιος*, which is formed very similarly to *τροπαῖος*). But even after all that, the semantics of *τροπαῖος* have yet to be considered. Surely the word should mean “causing rout” rather than “experiencing rout” or “turning (oneself)” (LSJ *s.v.*). It is therefore tempting to make it agree here with *αὔρα*, especially in light of the independent feminine substantive *τροπαία* “reverse wind.” Should one then emend the *paradosis* to *τροπαῖος* (nominative feminine)?

her *δοῦλος* (249) after Helen revealed to her the presence of a captured spy in Troy (243). Helen must have already secured via oath the promise from Odysseus that he would defend her at all costs in the future. She then apparently pursued a course of action midway between setting him free on the spot and turning him over to the Trojan warriors, who would not have been so merciful and easy to persuade as Hecuba. Once faced with the challenge of winning over the Trojan queen, Odysseus supplicated her (no doubt even more importunately than he supplicates Queen Arete in *Odyssey* Book 7) and spoke *πολλῶν λόγων εὐρήμαθ' ὥστε μὴ θανεῖν* (250). This line highlights Odysseus' desperation and, along with his confession about frantically clinging to the queen's robes (246), shows that he would have done (and would still do) anything to save his own life.⁶⁶¹ It should be kept in mind, however, that in Ion's play this cowardice may have been much less palpable than in Euripides', where Hecuba calls attention to the hypocrisy of Odysseus' present inclemency and the "might makes right" policy that he pursues vis-à-vis Polyxena (251-3).⁶⁶²

Since the remains and potential remains of Ion's *Phrouroi* are relatively rich, it is worth examining some fragments with a view toward reconstructing the plot more fully.

⁶⁶¹ Whereas the *πανουργία* that Odysseus displayed in disfiguring himself and entering Troy initially had the potential to benefit his community and also reveal his courage, he was now in a position where "doing anything" meant abasing himself and evincing his fear of death. Montiglio 2011: 42-44 shows how Plato's *Apology* implicitly condemns Odysseus for such behavior when Socrates refuses to make outlandish arguments to save himself as would a coward *πάν ποιῶν*.

⁶⁶² It is even doubtful whether Hecuba appeared at all as a character in the *Phrouroi*. There is no mention of her in the relevant passage of Proclus' *Chrestomathy* (228 Severyns), which implies that what saves Odysseus is the deal he strikes with Helen (who was apparently either predicting Troy's defeat or at least hedging her bets). Ion probably followed this more straightforward plot, just as Sophocles may have done in his *Lacaenae*, assuming that this tragedy (which derived its material from the *Little Iliad*, according to Aristotle, *Poet.* 23 [1459b7]) told the same story but featured a chorus of Helen's domestic servants from Sparta rather than Trojan sentinels. (Welcker, for one, posited this, but he apparently dismissed Proclus' testimony in favor of [Apoll.], *Epit.* 5.13, which treats the Palladium's capture as occurring on the same occasion as the encounter with Helen.) It has been suggested that the *Lacaenae* is identical with the *Ptocheia* ("Beggary") that is mentioned just before it in the Aristotle passage cited, but there is no reason for Aristotle to have glossed this one title among eight, so *TrGF* does well to record the latter as ades. 8k.

For example, F 46 consists merely of a two-word phrase, *νιφόεσσ' Ἑλένη* (“snow-white Helen”), but it is interesting because of its unusual imagery⁶⁶³ and because it may be possible to place it more or less precisely within the play, namely at the moment of Helen’s arrival on stage, which may be announced through these words by the chorus or another actor (note the anapestic meter, appropriate for the entrance of a new character). Further evidence for the actual dialogue between Helen and Odysseus is furnished in F 44:

σιγᾶ μὲν, ἐχθαίρει δέ, βούλεται γε μὴν

[It] is silent on the one hand, hates on the other, but yet prefers...

A scholion on *Frogs* 1425 records that Helen spoke this line to Odysseus and that Aristophanes parodied it in his scene, in which the characters Dionysus and Aeschylus have the following exchange:

(Δι.) *πρῶτον μὲν οὖν περὶ Ἀλκιβιάδου τίς ἔχετον
γνώμην ἐκάτερος; ἢ πόλις γὰρ δυστοκεῖ.*

Αι. *ἔχει δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ τίνα γνώμην;*

Δι. *τίνα;*

ποθεῖ μὲν, ἐχθαίρει δέ, βούλεται δ' ἔχειν. 1425
*ἀλλ' ὅ τι νοεῖτον εἶπατον τούτου πέρι.*⁶⁶⁴

(Dion.) First then, concerning Alcibades what opinion does each of you hold? For the city suffers in childbirth.

Aesch. And what opinion does it hold concerning him?

⁶⁶³ Indeed, Hesychius (v 601) was struck by the use of *νιφόεσσα* as a substitute for *λευκή*. In his commentary on the fragment, Snell notes that “snow-white” was an image less common among the Greeks than among the Romans, adding that for the Greeks *χιών* was generally considered to be horrible rather than something beautiful to behold. In the present context, the sudden appearance of a gleaming Helen might well have been a startling and worrisome sight to Odysseus as he moved surreptitiously through Troy (even if his intent from the outset was to accost her).

⁶⁶⁴ This is the text printed by Wilson 2007. For a defense of the attribution of the main part of line 1424, see Marr 1970. He also makes a strong case for reversing the attributions of the following *gnōmai* such that lines 1427-29 belong to Aeschylus and 1431f. to Euripides.

Dion. What [opinion]?! It longs for [him] on the one hand, hates [him] on the other, but it wants to have [him]. But both of you tell what you think about this man.

Since the subject of *Frogs* 1425 is ἡ πόλις (from 1423), it makes sense to assume ἡ πόλις (i.e., Troy) is also the subject of the parodied Ion verse. The most sensible choice for the implied object would then be με (i.e., Helen), whose love-hate relationship with the Trojans (and just about everyone else) was practically proverbial.⁶⁶⁵ Thus Helen explains to Odysseus that she has not been fully integrated into Trojan society, which Odysseus would have been keen to know (and keen to remind her about). Such a reconstruction of Ion F 44 would also enhance the humor of the *Frogs* passage, as an analogy between Alcibiades and Helen could comically play up the man's famous beauty as well as his strained relationship with Athens.

Following this bit of the dialogue between Odysseus and Helen, we have, finally, a fragment (45) that may come from a point late in the *Phrouroi* when impending dawn draws near, signaling the necessity of Odysseus' departure from Troy:

{π}ρόθει δέ τοι σῶριγζ Ἰδαῖος ἀλέκτωρ

But look you here, the Idaean rooster is clamoring [as] a shepherd's pipe.⁶⁶⁶

⁶⁶⁵ Wilamowitz 1935-72: iv.414 n. 1), in order to oppose a Byzantine scholion claiming Euripides was the inventor of Hecuba's involvement in the discovery of Odysseus, argues that Hecuba is the subject of Ion F 44. Apparently Wilamowitz imagines Helen here to be a *τριταγωνιστής* who comments on Hecuba's agonizing over the decision whether to release Odysseus; but the eminent scholar is relying too heavily upon the evidence of Euripides' *Hecuba* for the reconstruction of Ion's play. Blumenthal ad loc. (cf. Pohlenz 1954: ii.185f.) more aptly points to the implied subject being the πόλις (Troy), but he regards Paris as the implied object.

⁶⁶⁶ Athenaeus (4.185A) cites this fragment after recording that Ion referred to the αὐλός as a rooster (= Ion F 39) and then stating: ἐν δὲ Φρουροῖς τὸν ἀλεκτρούνα Ἰδαῖον εἶρηκε σύριγγα διὰ τούτων. Here Kaibel bracketed out τὸν before ἀλεκτρούνα and added τὴν before σύριγγα, indicating that he preferred to take σῶριγζ as the subject in F 45. His view is supported not only by the resulting parallelism with F 39 but also by the word order of F 45 and by the fact that the appositive in this sentence would be more forceful if it included the epithet Ἰδαῖος. Nauck agreed with Kaibel's interpretation, as did Wilamowitz, who compared *Il.* 10.13 (αὐλῶν συρίγγων τ' ἐνοπήν), thus reinforcing the notion that Troy was a pastoral society and advancing the possibility that the line in question refers to a vespertine rather than a matutinal event

By announcing the cockcrow, this line would seem to foster dramatic tension regarding Odysseus' chances for a safe escape from Troy. In effect, it marks a turning point⁶⁶⁷ and abruptly puts an end to Odysseus' nocturnal mission.⁶⁶⁸

Epicharmus wrote a comedy called *Odysseus Automolos* ("Odysseus the Deserter")⁶⁶⁹ dealing with the same episode as *Phrouroi* (not to mention the assumed plots of *Ptocheia* and Sophocles' *Lacaenae*). In it, Odysseus was vividly portrayed not merely as a beggar but as a swineherd (*συβώτης*) who had lost one of his herd. Having made it to Helen's abode on this pretext, Odysseus is received hospitably and even invited to enjoy a feast.⁶⁷⁰ Thus this particular tale borrowed from epic tends to celebrate

(Wilamowitz clearly thought it occurred toward the beginning of the play as evening fell and Odysseus set out on his mission, just as the music in *Il.* 10.13 may occur in the late evening, though two-thirds of the night are spent (10.253) before the *Doloneia* gets under way). However, an undesirable logical consequence of taking the line thus (i.e., with *σῦριγξ* as subject) is the implication that the Greeks were unfamiliar with pastoral life and the sound of panpipes at twilight and would therefore require a point of reference or comparison (namely, the crow of the cock, an animal that was in fact no more closely associated with the Greeks than with the oriental *barbaroi*—see, e.g., Callisen 1939: 160-178). Furthermore, if a pipe were actually played at this moment of the performance of *Phrouroi*, it would certainly be more artistic to refer to its noise as representing something other than what was literally heard. Thus there is no urgent need to suspect Athenaeus' own interpretation that *ἀλέκτωρ* is subject.

⁶⁶⁷ Though not a *περιπέτεια* in the strict Aristotelian sense of *Poet.* 1452a22. The major "reversal" of *Phrouroi* would have been Helen's *ἀναγνώρισις* of Odysseus.

⁶⁶⁸ The presence of *τοί* in F 45 suggests that it belongs to a dialogue passage, but the text must be strained to fit the schema of an iambic trimeter (this could be done, however, by replacing *ἀλέκτωρ* with the more colloquial *ἀλεκτρυόν* and by treating the initial iota of *Ἰδαῖος* as short *contra* LSJ s.v. *Ἰδη*). In any case, given the metaphorical content of the verse, it is reasonable to assign it to the *coryphaeus* if not to the chorus as a whole. It would then be possible to treat this line as introducing a choral stasimon to include Ion F 53. This lyric fragment (= *PMG* 746 Page) describes what could be the death-screch of a cock (or perhaps a different bird) that has been conquered by another: *οὐδ' ὄ γε σῶμα τυπείς διφνεῖς τε κόρας ἐπιλάθεται ἀλκᾶς, | ἀλλ' ὀλιγοδρανέων φθογγάζεται· | θάνατον δ' ὄ γε δουλοσύνας προβέβουλε.* (Obviously, the relevance of this depends on *ἀλέκτωρ* being the subject in F 45.) Philo attributes these lines to ὁ *τραγικὸς Ἴων* but does not assign them to a specific play, and the ascription proffered here is likely to be regarded as tendentious. The same goes for F 53b: *νῦν δ' ἐγγὺς ἠνίκ' οὐδέπω φάος | οὐδ' ἀμβλὺς ὄρθρος,* which again would fit with the announcement of the cockcrow.

⁶⁶⁹ The title seems ill suited to the story. Might *αὐτόμολος* be better translated as "going by himself" (i.e., "undertaking a risky mission on his own accord")? According to Montiglio 2011: 63 with n. 96 (citing Barigazzi 1955), Odysseus in this play "tried to make the Greeks believe that he had spied into Troy whereas he had not."

⁶⁷⁰ Garassino 1930: 243. The reconstruction of Epicharmus' plot raises further doubt as to whether Hecuba ever featured in this story before Euripides.

Odysseus as a master of disguise, whether it is represented in tragedy or indeed in comedy.⁶⁷¹

Odysseus' solo mission into Troy is also the likely setting of an anonymous tragedy from which a papyrus fragment has been preserved.⁶⁷² Here the hero appears to be speaking a pious address to Athena, which is in keeping with the positive treatment the hero received throughout the various episodes of the *Little Iliad*. Regardless of whether the Odysseus-as-rogue paradigm began definitively with the *Iliupersis* author, who thus sought to oppose the *Little Iliad* (not to mention the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*), or was a later development, with Pindar perhaps contributing most to the shaming of the hero, it seems that a sort of narrative inertia tends to preserve the hero's honor whenever later authors revisited stories first told in the *Little Iliad*. We do not in fact possess sufficient context for the fragment to be sure that Odysseus is not being more self-aggrandizing than sincerely pious. Yet if Odysseus conducted himself in a noble and dignified fashion in this play, Euripides' *Hecuba* is all the more striking for its revised take on the same episode (239-50), in which the queen of Troy is said to have apprehended the intruder (thanks to an apparently sympathetic Helen) only to release him after he had beguiled her (and humiliated himself: *ταπεινὸς ὄν*, 245).

The play represented by F 672a is of late date and carries the status of a revised autograph draft, thus shedding light incidentally on the practice of writing dramas. The "prologue" to the play consists of lines that Kannicht et al. tentatively attribute to Antenor. Note how Antenor's favored status before the Achaean conquerors features in the *Helenēs Apaitēsis* episode of the *Cypria* and in the Palladium episode of the *Little*

⁶⁷¹ The story lacks elements of tragic suffering (Proclus says Odysseus killed some Trojans on his way back to camp, but no *pathos* suggests itself), so it is especially ripe for comedy.

⁶⁷² adesp. F 672a (= P. Köln 245); cf. the addenda in *TrGF* vol. 5.2, pp. 1142-44.

Iliad. The reference here to Helen as a *μαινάς* (Kannicht goes with Parca's ed. pr.) recalls E. *Tr.* 173, where the mad woman is Cassandra. Perhaps the word carries tinges of other meanings: "the one who causes madness" (cf. Pi. *P.* 4.216) or even "harlot" (possibly only a later colloquialism, first seen in Poll. 7.203 cod. A).

According to Helen in *Od.* 4.245-8 Odysseus adopted two disguises the time he entered Troy and met Helen in secret. Verse 256 agrees with Proclus' statement that in the *Little Iliad* the hero struck a deal with Helen relating to the Achaeans' plans to sack Troy, while 257 describes his slaughter of many Trojans, again as does Proclus. This is all consistent with the set of formulae used to describe the several nocturnal raids undertaken by Odysseus, sometimes with other heroes and especially frequently with Diomedes. Such raids are perfectly Homeric as well as (arguably) perfectly heroic in terms of Homeric ethics.⁶⁷³ But certainly the tragedians may be said to have maintained and espoused different ethical standards.

Proclus uses *(κατ)αικίζειν* both of Menelaus' maltreatment of Paris' corpse and of Odysseus' self-abuse. But that probably reflects Proclus' own verbal tendencies and not the original language of the *Little Iliad*. Nevertheless, the language used to describe Odysseus' disfigurement of himself may have used formulae found in corpse-defiling passages. This language then may have influenced tragic descriptions in turn. Euripides in *Hecuba* gives only a brief description of this moment, with the salient detail being the tattered rag Odysseus donned (240f.). Nevertheless, many ancient poets seem to have been keenly interested in Odysseus' ever-changing physical appearance and his apparent obsession for beggar's clothes. Recall the moment related in *Od.* 22.487-491, when

⁶⁷³ See Dué–Ebbott 2010 on *Il.* 10.243 and in the same volume the entire central essay, "The Poetics of Ambush."

Odysseus is determined to continue wearing rags after Eurycleia has offered him clothes proper to his reclaimed status.⁶⁷⁴

Theodectas' *Helen* was set in Troy, for Aristotle quotes from it in the course of discussing a certain opposition drawn between Greeks and barbarians. In the surviving fragment she seeks to win sympathy by claiming that she is being treated as a slave. Since it is unlikely that she would have shown so much resentment and so little tact in an address to her Trojan captors, the play may have concerned Odysseus' secret visit to Troy, when Helen could identify with a fellow member of Greek royalty and openly gripe about the subservient status to which the Trojans had reduced her. Aristotle (*Pol.* 1255a) connects the chauvinism of contemporary Greek nobles to Helen's personal arrogance, rooted in her divine pedigree. Thus she asserts that she is entitled to freedom as a her birthright, which should persist irrespective of any external condition (*ἀπλῶς*, as Aristotle says), such as the fact that she is now living in a foreign land:

EAENH *θείων δ' ἀπ' ἀμφοῖν ἔκγονον ῥιζωμάτων
τίς ἂν προσειπεῖν ἀξιώσειεν λάτριν;*

Helen: But who would address as a slave the offspring of divine roots on both sides?

Helen could be aware in this instance that her true parents are Zeus and Nemesis, but she may just as well be thinking of more distant family connections to gods (e.g., Tyndareus was frequently said to belong to Perseus' line and hence to be a descendant of Zeus; Leda may have been a granddaughter of Ares). In any case, she is clearly complaining to someone (perhaps to a sympathetic, i.e., Greek figure like Odysseus) about the

⁶⁷⁴ On the status of beggars see Helmer 2015. On the semantics of *πτωχός* see Coin-Longeray 2014.

denigration of her social status at Troy when her divine origin means her right to freedom transcends national and all other boundaries.⁶⁷⁵

3.6. The Palladium

καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα σὺν Διομήδει τὸ Παλλάδιον ἐκκομίζει ἐκ τῆς Ἰλίου. (Arg. 4e W.)

And after these things with Diomedes he [sc., Odysseus] steals the Palladium from Troy.

Scholars unanimously accept that the plot of Sophocles' *Lacaenae* ("Laconian Women") concerned the theft of the Palladium by Odysseus and Diomedes.⁶⁷⁶ Some have surmised that it combined this with the episode that immediately preceded in the *Little Iliad* (namely Odysseus' sneaking into Troy in beggar's disguise) or with aspects thereof. This question depends largely on whether the title *Ptocheia*, attested only once—immediately before *Lacaenae* in Aristotle's list of *Little Iliad*-derived tragedies—is taken to refer to the same play. For several reasons—including the fact that the *Rhesus* (501-7) preserves a distinction between the two missions and that the theft of the Palladium, especially together with its aftermath (an altercation between Odysseus and Diomedes), already constitutes a great deal of action—it seems preferable to separate the two titles.⁶⁷⁷ But the

⁶⁷⁵ *TrGF* ii 231 on Theodectas (72) F 2 ought to pick up Aristotle's text one clause earlier (αὐτοὺς μὲν γὰρ οὐ μόνον παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐγενεῖς ἀλλὰ πανταχοῦ νομίζουσιν), for Helen's self-centered words express the Greeks' vain attitude about their own universal nobility, less so their deprecatory attitude toward Trojan nobility.

⁶⁷⁶ Welcker 146 argued logically and irrefutably that the play's Chorus consisted of Helen's maids and that the play's scene was therefore Helen's home in Troy. Aristotle (*Poet.* 1459b6) designates the play as predicated on the material of the *Little Iliad*, and Helen's only involvement in that epic was as Odysseus' co-conspirator before and during the theft of the Palladium. For the term *Λάκαινα* used in drama of Helen or her maidservants see E. *Hec.* 441, *Andr.* 486, Alexis, *Ἑλένης ἀρπαγή* fr. 72 K-A.

⁶⁷⁷ Cf. Welcker 951; *contra* Spengel, Gudeman, Schmid (see *TrGF* iv.328 for references). West 202 argues that the conflation of episodes in *Epit.* 5.13 (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 350f., Antisth. *Aj.* 6) derives from Sophocles' *Lacaenae* even as he asserts (in tacit agreement with Welcker) that the *Πτωχεία* was separate from *Λάκαιναι* (which "clearly stands for the Palladion episode") as a (potential) topic for a tragedy. The implication is that Sophocles' *Lacaenae* conflated the two episodes but that *Ptocheia* was the name of

lack of additional testimony for a (Sophoclean, if as is probable all the plays included in Aristotle's list were by Sophocles) *Ptocheia* is perplexing.

By most ancient accounts the two heroes infiltrated Troy via a sewer. *Lacaenae* shared this majority opinion, as F 367 shows (στενήν δ' ἔδυμεν ψαλίδα κοῦκ ἀβόρβορον, "And we entered [the city] by a drain narrow and not without muck").⁶⁷⁸ Although Servius records an alternative (but no less claustrophobic) account in which Odysseus and Diomedes gained access to Troy by digging their own underground tunnel(s),⁶⁷⁹ their emergence from a vaulted opening on the Tabula Capitolina suggests that the *Little Iliad* described the same route as the *Lacaenae*.⁶⁸⁰ Hence another instance of Sophocles' conservatism vis-à-vis the epic source.

According to Antisthenes (*Od.* 3) the Palladium was Greek property that Paris had plundered. Dionysius of Samos (*FGrHist* 15 F 3) asserts that it was made out of the bones of Pelops.⁶⁸¹ The *Little Iliad*, however, probably portrayed its acquisition by Odysseus as an act of larceny, although Proclus' ἐκκομίζει is neutral as to the matter of the object's rightful owner (*Epit.* 5.13 more tellingly has ἐκκλέψας...κομίζει). Nevertheless, the later accounts only serve to augment the glory of Odysseus' deed, which takes on an even greater aura of community service and like the repatriation of the

another play (whether by Sophocles or another tragedian—Welcker *loc. cit.* suggests that it could be identical with Ion's *Phrouroi*) that dealt solely with the earlier of the two episodes.

⁶⁷⁸ Taking ψαλίδα as an accusative of extent of space (Smyth §1581, cf. e.g. Xen. *Cyr.* 1.6.43, ἄγειν [sc. στρατιάν] στενάς ὁδούς) allows for a focus on the larger mission. This seems at least as likely as "we entered a drain" given that in tragedy a preposition usually accompanies δόω to mean "enter into" (LSJ s.v.). *Od.* 4.249 has κατέδυ Τρώων πόλιν. The verse probably comes from a prologue speech delivered by Odysseus or, more likely, by an indignant Diomedes who whines while Odysseus is off scouting nearby.

⁶⁷⁹ Servius (*ad Verg. Aen.* 2.166) uses the plural *cuniculis*, though perhaps only for parallelism with *cloacis* (that a network of sewer passages had to be navigated is more plausible); for the motif of burrowing cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 350, διορύττει.

⁶⁸⁰ West 200, *contra* Chavannes 1891: 50.

⁶⁸¹ Elsewhere (*Epit.* 5.10) these sacred tokens comprise a separate quest undertaken by the Greeks at Helenus' prompting. By equating Pelops' bones with the Palladium, Dionysius saves the Greeks a trip to Elis. Cf. West 201 n. 48.

Golden Fleece becomes symbolic of Panhellenic pride.⁶⁸² Similarly, a fragment from Sophocles' *Lacaenae* (F 368) insists on the original culpability of the Trojans:

θεοὶ γὰρ οὐποτ', εἴ τι χρῆ βροτὸν λέγειν,
ἄρξασι Φρυζὶ τὴν κατ' Ἀργείους ὕβριν
ζυvainέσσονται ταῦτα. μὴ μάχου βία

For the gods will never—if somehow a mortal must say so—concede these things to the Phrygians who took the initiative of outraging the Argives. Do not struggle against might.⁶⁸³

These lines call for the forfeit of the Palladium. The speaker may be Odysseus, the addressee Theano, wife of Antenor and likely custodian of the statue.⁶⁸⁴ Helen is less likely to be the addressee since her support for the Greek cause had already been enlisted during Odysseus' previous visitation (to accept the sequence of events in the *Little Iliad*), which as argued above was probably kept in the background of *Lacaenae* rather than being woven into its plot.⁶⁸⁵ It cannot be said whether Sophocles, like Antisthenes,

⁶⁸² For the Trojan War imagined as a contest between Panhellenism and barbarism, see Pallantza 2005: 308 and *passim*.

⁶⁸³ The punctuation of verse 3 by Pearson 1917: ii.36 is to be preferred, *ταῦτα* belonging more naturally with *ζυvainέσσονται* (as an internal accusative, cf. S. *O.C.* 1508) than with the subsequent clause (so Radt in *TrGF* iv.329). If *βία* was not followed in the next (missing) verse with a genitive referring back to the gods ("in spite of them"), its use here with *μάχομαι* is similar to Simon. 5.21 (*ἀνάγκη*); notice how through asyndeton the menacing speaker conflates his strength with the gods' will. Verse 2 of the fragment is difficult to translate, but the key point is that the Trojans without provocation committed *hybris* against the innocent Greeks; Pearson *op. cit.* 37 justly regards the accusative after *ἄρχω*, which is in fact what attracted the attention of the quoting author Priscian (*Inst.* 18.197), as internal.

⁶⁸⁴ So Pearson 1917: ii.35; Theano was Athena's priestess in Troy according already to *Il.* 6.300. That she surrendered the sacred image is asserted by sch. *B Il.* 6.311, where the *πρεσβεία* (cf. sch. *Lyc. Alex.* 658; *Dict. Cret.* 5.5.8, where Antenor joins in the betrayal).

⁶⁸⁵ Odysseus' initial reconnaissance mission into Troy (as a beggar) is difficult to motivate unless he already had designs on the Palladium (sch. *Od.* 4.246 says he went either to win Helen's assistance or to measure the city gates so that the dimensions of the Horse could be calibrated; neither explanation satisfies, cf. West 197). Therefore, he probably learned of the need to procure the statue earlier, from Helenus (cf. *Epit.* 5.10), rather than later, from Helen (Welcker i.146-8 entertains the latter possibility, as do Pearson 1917: ii.34 and West 201; some ancient sources have Antenor betray the information as well as the statue: see Pearson *loc. cit.*). So what exactly was Helen's role in all this? *Pace* West 198f. and 208, who imagines Helen as raising the torch signal at the sack of Troy, Proclus' phrase *περὶ τῆς ἀλώσεως τῆς πόλεως συντίθεται* (arg. 4c W.) may point instead (or additionally) to the more immediate future: Odysseus' goal from the outset, i.e. from before his first interview with Helen, may have been to extract from her a promise

counted the theft of the Palladium from Greece among the crimes perpetrated by the Trojans (here, *ταῦτα*).

The mission was a success, but no sooner was the Palladium securely in Greek hands than it incited a clash between the two heroes responsible. It was indeed over responsibility for the seizure of the Palladium (and the *kleos* that attended the feat) that Odysseus and Diomedes quarreled on their way back to the Greek camp. Some such incident must have been described in the *Little Iliad*, for an ancient Greek proverb consisting of the phrase *Διομήδειος ἀνάγκη* (“a Diomedean constraint”) is connected by Hesychius with the theft of the Palladium in that poem.⁶⁸⁶ Elsewhere (Paus. Att. δ 14, Serv. auct. *Aen.* 2.166) a more complete story is told: Odysseus, wishing to hog the glory, was on the verge of killing Diomedes when the latter descried the shadow of the drawn sword in the moonlight and, binding the would-be murderer, drove him all the way home by flogging.⁶⁸⁷ But given that the *Little Iliad* consistently celebrates Odysseus, it is

to help him obtain the Palladium (which would lead to the sack of Troy); it was indeed *δι' ἐκείνης* (sc. *Ἑλένης*) that Odysseus stole it according to *Epit.* 5.13 (which does merge the two infiltrations, however, and thus cannot be a perfect representation of the *Little Iliad*). One possibility is that he instructed her to summon Theano the next night and have her bring the Palladium to her own quarters, whither Odysseus would also return at that time. In this way narrative continuity is achieved between Odysseus' solo mission and his raid with Diomedes, allaying the puzzlement of e.g. West 200.

⁶⁸⁶ Hesych. δ 1881 = *Il. Parv.* fr. 11 W. Hesychius' *ὁ δὲ τὴν Μικρὰν Ἰλιάδα φησὶν ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ Παλαδίου κλοπῆς γενέσθαι* is clearly a brachylogy for, “But others say that [the proverb] comes from the story told in the *Little Iliad* about the theft of the Palladium.”

⁶⁸⁷ This story is not really worthy of a proverb, and *pace* Pearson 1917: ii.36 n. 1 there is nothing in it that would amount to Hobson's choice or anything other than plain old *ἀνάγκη* (Welcker's gloss is *πειθανάγκη*; while Paus. Att. δ 14 says that the phrase is used *ἐπὶ τῶν κατ' ἀνάγκην τι πραττόντων*, so general an idea cannot be the basis of a proverb). It is better therefore to credit Clearchus' alternative explanation of the proverb (fr. 68 Wehrli *ap.* Hesych. *loc. cit.*, cf. sch. *RA Ar. Eccl.* 1029), which is that the Thracian Diomedes used to force strangers to have sex with his prostitute daughters (\approx the infamous man-devouring mares of Diomedes) until the men were utterly spent. This is what Aristophanes (*loc. cit.*) and probably also Plato (*Rep.* 493d, where a hypothetical poet or politician is compelled to satisfy the corrupt taste of *hoi polloi*) have in mind when they refer to *Διομήδεια ἀνάγκη* (i.e., a being forced to do something that under ordinary circumstances is desirable but under present circumstances is fatal). The erroneous exegesis of the phrase is fortunate, however, since it preserves a bit of Cyclic myth that otherwise would have been lost. For further sources cf. *CPG* i.59f., ii.367f.

difficult to imagine his having taken such a wanton turn at this juncture.⁶⁸⁸ This is not to say that in the Cyclic poem the roles were simply reversed. Nor should we necessarily ascribe to it all the details of Conon's extravagant account (*FGrHist* 26 fr. 1.34), wherein Diomedes commits the first selfish act by leaving Odysseus behind after standing on his shoulders to scale the city wall and later tries to convince him that the Palladium he has obtained is not the one they needed, leading to a standoff followed by a flogging—this time administered by Odysseus against Diomedes. Instead, there may have been a simple verbal dispute arising from the ever-present competitive spirit and the two heroes' contrasting views on the best tactics and methods to practice in warfare.⁶⁸⁹

A Sophoclean fragment plausibly assigned by Welcker to the *Lacaenae* (F 799) may be evidence of such a dispute, by no means subdued but also far from life-threatening.⁶⁹⁰ In the six-line fragment, Odysseus upbraids Diomedes as the son of a reprobate who had inherited his father's bane of exile (from Aetolia).⁶⁹¹ The quoting author identifies the speaker and addressee and calls the passage an example of (a

⁶⁸⁸ Pace West 203.

⁶⁸⁹ Cf. Pearson 1917: ii.35. To trivialize the incident is in keeping both with the fact that elsewhere (e.g. in the *Doloneia*) Odysseus and Diomedes get along so well (cf. West 201) and with the *Little Iliad*'s light-hearted tone (recognized by Welcker 1882: 272-6; cf. Konstan 2015: 173f., who in his belief (p. 177) that Homer's grandeur was exceptional among epic poets would appear to disagree with the view of Cyclic decadence espoused by Severyns 1928: 333f. and West 170).

⁶⁹⁰ Welcker 150. Brunck's hypothesis that the fragment belongs to the *Syllogos Achaiōn* = *Syndeipnoi* is inferior, and as Pearson 1917: iii.38 acknowledges that the Palladium story is the only occasion we know of that ever spoke of a falling out between Odysseus and Diomedes. Pearson also notes (*op. cit.* ii.35) that the story described in the paroemiographic sources is inherently difficult to stage. In addition, any movement away from Helen's house would trigger the staging problem of what to do with the Chorus. For both these pragmatic reasons a verbal altercation chez Helen is a more likely scene for Sophocles' play, which could have transported the incident to the very moment the Greeks took hold of the Palladium or even before the start of the parley.

⁶⁹¹ Pearson 1917: iii.38 rightly spurns Jebb's conjecture that verse 2 (*φνγάς πατρώας ἐξελέγλασαι χθονός*) refers to Diomedes' flight from his faithless wife Aegiale after the Trojan War (on the myth see Mimmermus, *IEG* fr. 22, Lyc. 592-632).

particular kind of) *ἀστεῖσμός* (“wit”).⁶⁹² As we shall see in our study of other dramas, the harsh invective and loutish mockery should not necessarily be taken as evidence that the work was a satyr-play.

If we possessed only the literary evidence discussed above, we might conclude that the myth evolved in the following manner: the *Little Iliad* first represented Odysseus as having to ensure that Diomedes did not poach more than his share of credit for the poaching of the Palladium;⁶⁹³ Sophocles in his *Lacaenae* switched the roles of aggressor and victim while maintaining the myth’s relatively frivolous tone; some later unknown author, possibly to bolster his own ingenious explanation of the proverb *Διομήδειος ἀνάγκη*—and influenced by the degenerating image of an Odysseus who was now known less for daring heroic deeds than for shamelessly murdering both enemies (Astyanax) and allies (Palamedes)—became the first to assert that Odysseus had actually tried to stab his colleague in the back (paroemiographers propagated this account); and finally Conon revived Odysseus’ innocence (or diminished culpability) while adopting from the newer version the brandishing of swords. However, all this ignores the evidence of two vase-paintings dated ca. 480 B.C. in which Odysseus and Diomedes, *each* holding a Palladium, brandish swords against each other and must be restrained.⁶⁹⁴ The dueling

⁶⁹² [Herodian], *De fig.* (pp. 57f. Dindorf = *Rhet. Gr.* 8.601.10 Walz). The figure of speech illustrated is usually called *παράλειψις* (Latin *praeteritio* or *declinatio* or *occultatio*), but the fact that it is here called *ἀστεῖσμός* corroborates the idea that even as tempers flared there was no real threat of violence.

⁶⁹³ If Hesychius is indeed justified in linking the proverb with the *Little Iliad*, that poem’s version of the quarrel would still have to conclude with flogging or some other form of compulsion (but the adjective *Διομήδειος* could stand in a passive rather than active relationship to *ἀνάγκη*).

⁶⁹⁴ The RF vases are a cup by Macron in St. Petersburg (Herm. Mus. B 649 = *ARV*² 460, 13) and a belly amphora by the Tyszkiewicz Painter in Stockholm (Medelhavsmus 1963.1 = *ARV*² 1632, 33bis). On the former (for which see Sourvinou-Inwood 2011: 234) Agamemnon, Phoenix, Acamas, and Demophon all restrain the bickering heroes, which implies that the quarrel came to a head only after the two special agents had finished their journey back to camp; the presence of Theseus’ sons also suggests the influence of an Athenian version of the tale (this need not have been any play by Sophocles). On the latter vase Athena mediates between her two favorites (a narrative climax already supposed by Pearson 1917: ii.36, cf. iii.38f.).

Palladia are difficult to explain from a mythological perspective (from a historical perspective the duplication makes sense given that various places claimed to possess the “real” Palladium⁶⁹⁵). Nevertheless, the tradition was apparently quite old, though “later variously explained, and only explicitly linked with the quarrel between the heroes (perhaps about which [Palladium] was the real one) on these vases.”⁶⁹⁶ So after all it may well be that something close to what Conon describes was already related in the *Little Iliad*, with Odysseus plotting to attack Diomedes but not without provocation.⁶⁹⁷ At any rate the motif of the heroes’ threatening to kill each other clearly preceded Sophocles, who however did not have to incorporate any of this into his *Lacaenae* (or into whatever play it was where Odysseus defamed Diomedes).⁶⁹⁸

The teaming up of Odysseus and Diomedes for a nocturnal adventure is best understood as an epic motif that the *Doloneia* (*Iliad* 10) adapted from the Palladium myth,⁶⁹⁹ but the contentious aspect of the original story does not make its way very clearly into the newer composition, where the heroes enjoy a relatively unproblematic if amicably competitive relationship. Tragedians no doubt recognized the pattern of collaboration between the heroes, and for works like *Lacaenae* and [E.] *Rhesus* they may have opted to draw from the *Doloneia* and the *Little Iliad* simultaneously (not to mention

⁶⁹⁵ Dion. Halic. *Rom. Ant.* 1.68-9 says Aeneas brought the statue to Lavinium, while Ov. *Fast.* 6.419-60 “attempts to reconcile the legends by suggesting that the Greeks stole a copy rather than the genuine item” (Blakely 2011 *ad* Conon fr. 1.34; she also lists the other cities that claimed to have the Trojan Palladium).

⁶⁹⁶ J. Boardman and C. E. Vafopoulou-Richardson in *LIMC* 3.1 (s.v. “Diomedes I”), p. 408.

⁶⁹⁷ The idea of multiple Palladia (cf. the vases) or a dispute over the authenticity of the robbed statue (Conon) would seem to fit with the levity and whimsy of the poem.

⁶⁹⁸ For mutual betrayal as an element in the story of the Palladium, see Gantz 1993: 643f. and Dué–Ebbott 2010 on *Od.* 10.212-213. Sophocles easily could have simplified the quarrel or shifted its setting for his own dramatic purposes. Note also that he was not the only dramatist to treat the theft of the Palladium if Epicharmus fr. 84 *CGFP* is correctly interpreted as a parody of the adventure.

⁶⁹⁹ West 2011: 234.

the many other poems featuring Odysseus and Diomedes) in order to construct their own versions of this famous partnership.

Burkert likens the removal of the Palladium to the Athenian myth in which Athens was forsaken and then invaded by the Eleusinians, a myth ritually commemorated on the twelfth day of Attic Skirophorion.⁷⁰⁰ There is no explicit evidence that Attic tragedy ever made this connection, but the parallelism is noteworthy, and Athenians certainly did feel that any sack of a sacred city meant the protective deities had elected to depart (see F of E. *Erechtheus*).

3.7. The Sack of Troy (Not the *Sack of Troy*)

καὶ Ἐπειὸς κατ' Ἀθηνᾶς προαίρεσιν τὸν δούρειον ἵππον κατασκευάζει.... ἔπειτα εἰς τὸν δούρειον ἵππον τοὺς ἀρίστους ἐμβιβάσαντες τὰς τε σκηνὰς καταφλέξαντες οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἰς Τένεδον ἀνάγονται. (Arg. 4a, 5a-b W.)

And Epeius in accordance with Athena's plan constructs the Wooden Horse.... Then after loading the best men into the Wooden Horse and burning down the tents the rest of the Greeks set sail to Tenedos.

The construction and putting to use of the Wooden Horse, executed by Epeius and Odysseus respectively, was broken up in the *Little Iliad* by the two nocturnal raids undertaken by the latter (see above); but the two phases of the grand scheme form a single connected story. It is as much to Stesichorus (*PMGF* 200) as to the *Little Iliad* that Epeius owes his attainment of fame in the poetic tradition. The lyric poet begins his account of this myth with Athena's taking pity on and elevating Epeius, a man of high birth but humble rank whose obscurity up until the point of the Horse's construction apparently aroused curiosity in view of the paramount importance of that task.⁷⁰¹

Although there are several tragedies that either demonstrably or probably referred to him,

⁷⁰⁰ Burkert 1983: 158.

⁷⁰¹ Cf. Finglass 2013.

there is only the scantiest evidence that he was ever made a protagonist or even a *dramatis persona*. A relief sculpture depicting a seated Euripides flanked by an inscribed list of plays includes the title *ΕΠΕΟΣ* (for *ΕΠΗΟΣ*, i.e. *Ἐπειός?*), but there is no other record of the poet's having written such a play.⁷⁰²

Sophocles probably wrote a *Laocoön* and a *Sinon*, although a minority of scholars have believed that the attestation of the latter play is erroneous, *Sinon* having been merely a character in the *Laocoön*.⁷⁰³ Heyne suspected that *Sinon*'s speeches in Vergil's *Aeneid* (beginning at 2.69) was closely modeled on a Greek tragic source, but it is too hazardous to guess at a particular source.

Tragedians nearly faced an embarrassment of choice when it came to epic source material pertaining to the sack of Troy, which includes both the infiltration of the city by the chosen band inside the Wooden Horse and their emergence from it to unleash the final assault. The *Odyssey* describes the former event three times: (i) Demodocus' reported song at 8.499-520 is especially flattering to Odysseus, who in requesting the

⁷⁰² The so-called "Alban monument" (Louvre Ma 343) was found on the Esquiline hill in Rome but is said to be a 2nd-century A.D. copy of an original dating to the time of Lycurgus (ca. 325 B.C.). Its list (*IG XIV 1152* = E. T 6) is woefully incomplete and defective (36 titles, with *Antigone* listed twice, once in lieu of *Antiope*). If the play genuinely existed, it was probably satyric, for it is listed last of all *E-* plays in the Alban catalogue, which as Kannicht explains (*TrGF* v.57) is alphabetic but groups satyr-plays separately at the end of the section for each initial letter. The proverbial phrase *Ἐπειοῦ δειλότερος* (Zenob. vulg. 3.81, Cratin. test. 15 *PCG* iv.115 K-A), the hero's pitiful performance in the weight-throwing competition at *Il.* 23.838-40, and his characterization in Stesich. *PMG* 200 all show that he was a suitable figure for satyr-drama. To account for the glaring absence of any fragments, Kannicht (*op. cit.* 390) suggests that Euripides might have written an *Epeius satyricus* that was not among the 78 plays preserved at Alexandria but nevertheless crept into the Alban catalogue of those plays (via a separate list of Euripidean satyr-plays).

Welcker 523 assigns E. F 988 (*incert. fab.*) to *Epeius*. Indeed, the line *τέκτων γὰρ ὦν ἔπρασσεσ ὀ ξυλοργικά* could be an admonishment of Epeius for his having endeavored to excel outside of woodwork (e.g., in fighting). If spoken by Athena, the line would reflect the influence of earlier tradition on Euripides. The verse's alternative assignment to E. *Cretenses* by Wilamowitz 1935-72: i.192 is accepted by Collard (*SFP* 1995: 66f., 78) and preferred by Kannicht (*op. cit.* 975), but Daedalus' creation of a wooden cow, however inappropriate it may have been, cannot very reasonably be termed *ὀ ξυλοργικά*, and Welcker's theory accords much better with the context of the quoting author (Plut. *Praec. gerendae reip.* 15 [812e], *ὀ...πρὸς ὃ μὴ πέφυκε μὴδ' ἤσκηται προσάγων αὐτόν... οὐκ ἔχει παραίτησιν ἀμαρτάνων*). But if Euripides' *Epeius* had not survived even into the Alexandrian period, how could Plutarch have quoted from it? Was F 988 preserved independently in the paroemiographic tradition?

⁷⁰³ See Radt, *TrGF* iv.414.

song (still as an anonymous guest among the Phaeacians) gave credit to Epeius and Athena but stressed his own leadership (493f.),⁷⁰⁴ and yet it is focalized largely from the Trojans' perspective as it proceeds from the entrance of the Horse to the sack itself; (ii) Menelaus at 4.271-89 offers vivid details about Helen's failed attempt to inveigle the secreted Greeks into giving themselves away; (iii) at 11.523-34 Odysseus praises Neoptolemus to his deceased father by recalling the young man's intrepid and fervent demeanor while inside the Horse, and he assures the apprehensive Achilles that after the sack his son has obtained his due *γέρας* (534). These descriptions are all relatively brief, and there are some idiosyncrasies unlikely to have found favor;⁷⁰⁵ but because of the supreme status of Homer they were irrevocably fixed in the minds of later poets and audiences alike. Additionally, two Cyclic epics described the climactic sack and must have done so at greater length than Homer. These were the *Little Iliad* and *Iliupersis*. In keeping with his normal practice, Proclus trims the sack from the end of his summary of the *Little Iliad* so that he may begin his summary of the *Iliupersis* without excessive redundancy.⁷⁰⁶ Stesichorus also wrote a *Sack of Troy*, as referenced above.

This abundance makes it especially difficult to link sack-themed tragedies in whole or in part with one or another of the potential sources. For example, Poseidon's

⁷⁰⁴ Although his role is prominent in all three accounts, as Garvie 1994: 334 points out *ad loc.*, it is remarkable that here Odysseus eclipses Menelaus even in hunting down Deiphobus, the possessor of Helen (8.517f.). Garvie also notes *ibid.* that Demodocus' song corresponds to *Iliup.* arg. 1a W. in its indication of a threefold debate among the Trojans over what to do with the Horse (the only difference is that the suggestion in the *Iliupersis* of burning the artifice is replaced in *Od.* 8.507 with the alternative *διατυμῆσαι κοῖλον δόρυ νηλέϊ χαλχῶ*).

⁷⁰⁵ Chief among these is the fact that in Demodocus' account the Trojan debate is held with the Horse already having been admitted into the city. Noting that *Epit.* 5.16 bears the same illogicality, West 228 suggests that the *Iliupersis* may have originated this version so that it could begin with a tense debate rather than a potentially tedious description of the Horse's conveyance. In drama the *skēnē* would have represented the exterior face of the city walls, the Trojans thus deliberating on the plain.

⁷⁰⁶ The latter poem probably began with the Horse (either its construction or its discovery by the Trojans, cf. West 224), and Proclus does repeat himself to some extent (*Iliup.* arg. 1a W.). Cf. also *supra* on the double narration of Ajax's downfall at the end of the *Aethiopsis* and the beginning of the *Little Iliad*.

prologue in *Trojan Women* refers to Epeius and informs us that he was a Parnassian from Phocis (9f.).⁷⁰⁷ Euripides could have inferred this biographical information from *Il.*

23.665 where Epeius, appearing for the first time in the *Iliad* (to compete in the boxing match at the funeral games), is named as the son of Panopeus. It is more likely that the playwright had recently read one (or more) of the poems that dilated on Epeius and his building of the Horse; he then would have had a thorough portrait of the hero in mind.

But apart from being able to exclude the *Odyssey*, which never states Epeius' origins, we cannot specify Euripides' source(s) because the other details that he gives are common to all or most earlier accounts of the myth.⁷⁰⁸ In a notable and possibly conscious departure from epic, Euripides says that Epeius not only built the Horse but also “sent” it (*ἔπεμψεν*,

⁷⁰⁷ The scholia *ad loc.* add that his father was Panopeus and explain that “Parnassian” is used because the Delphians are being counted among the Phocians, as in Homer. Cf. *Hec.* 3 with n. *ad loc.* in Gregory 1999: 41 for Euripides' habit of advertising genealogies at the beginning of his plays. Some of his genealogies may indeed be of his own invention, but one can never rule out that a given genealogy was derived from an earlier source now lost or incompletely preserved. For example, the scholiast on E. *Tro.* 822 asserts that the playwright followed the poet of the *Little Iliad* (fr. 6 W.) in calling Ganymede the son of Laomedon.

⁷⁰⁸ E.g., that Athena furnished the means to build the Horse: *μηχαναῖσι Παλλάδος*, *Tro.* 10 (cf. *Od.* 8.493, *σὸν Ἀθήνη*, Stes. S89.6-8, *ἀνήρ [θ]εῶς ἰ[ό]τατι δαεῖς σεμν[ᾶς Ἀθάνας] μέτ[ρα] τε καὶ σοφίαν*, and *Il. Parv.* arg. 4a W., quoted above). Verses 13f. of *Tro.* are generally thought to be interpolated, and so Euripides would not be responsible for the appearance here of the moniker *δούρειος ἵππος* with its etymological wordplay (picking up *δόρυ* “spear” in verse 8) and its allusion to a bronze replica of the Horse on the Athenian Acropolis; cf. *ad loc.* Lee 1997: 68, who suggests interpolation by “a clever actor,” but Stieber 2011: 186 mounts a spirited defense of the authenticity of this “name-*αἴτιον*” (a term she borrows from Barrett) that Euripides applies to the Horse (possibly the same pun can be detected in the Horse's description with *δοριάλωτος* in 519, cf. *ἔνοπλον* in 520 with its hint of *ὄπλή* “hoof”). It is worth noting separately that the first diphthong of *δούρειος* (also at Pl. *Theaet.* 184d; Ar. *Av.* has *δούριος*) marks the adjective as Ionic, as if the Horse's official nickname was a loan from that dialect (the epic counterpart used at *Od.* 8.493 and 512 is *δουράτεος*). The use of the term *βρέτας* in v. 12 is also unusual, not morphologically but semantically: whereas it normally—and always elsewhere in Euripides—refers to a wooden image of a god (*ζόανον*, used of the Horse at *Tro.* 525, is less particular), its application here to the Wooden Horse is meant to convey its “extraordinary size and fateful nature” (Lee *loc. cit.*). For a more refined exegesis of Euripides' Horse descriptions see Stieber 2011: 185. The Horse was reportedly largest in the *Little Iliad*, so fancifully large in fact that (again reportedly) it was claimed to have held 3,000 troops (*Epit.* 5.14 = *Il. Parv.* fr. 12 W.); but Severyns 1928: 355f. argues (and persuades West 204) that the numeral *ιγ'* (= 13) was corrupted to *γ* (= 3,000), which corruption is more clearly visible in Tzetzes (in Lyc. 930), who uses the numerical notation, than in *Epitome's* *τρισχιλίους*. Whether or not the hyperbolic figure was a genuine feature of the *Little Iliad*, Euripides' Trojan Chorus in its despair appropriately avoids an exacting enumeration of the embedded enemy and calls them simply a *λόχος* (at once “band” and “ambuscade,” 534; an official *λόχος* comprised 24 men according to Xen. *Cyr.* 6.3.21, but not even the purported realist Euripides (Russell 1995: 132f.) would have sought to use the term so precisely) even as an impression is given of physical and consequential enormity (cf. the powerful metonymy in 560, *λόχου δ' ἐξέβαιν' Ἄρης*).

Tro. 12). Odysseus' management of the project, a significant aspect of the myth in both Homer and the *Little Iliad*,⁷⁰⁹ is passed over in silence. Thus the hero who is to be most reviled in the play is deprived at the outset even of any credit for the Greeks' great stroke of genius.

Investigating how drama drew on earlier poetry pertaining to the sack of Troy is indeed challenging, but it is not an altogether hopeless task. Gregory is able to tease out in remarkable and credible detail some probable sources of inspiration for many aspects of Euripides' *Hecuba*, even after confessing to a laissez-faire view of how "the matter of Troy" was recounted in Greek poetry and professing that "it is not possible to document the play's 'sources.'"⁷¹⁰ It is reasonable to suppose that the *Iliupersis* was the default source for those poets interested in adapting the story because it was the most expansive poem on the topic (it was effectively an *Einzellied*, unlike the *Little Iliad* with its sundry contents). Yet there are specific scenes that may have been drawn solely or especially from the *Little Iliad*. For example, West argues that the Antenorids were spared in the *Little Iliad*.⁷¹¹ This would constitute another correspondence with the *Cypria*, which had begun their story and explained the background to their privilege of immunity,⁷¹² and Sophocles wrote about this in his *Antenoridae*. Locrian Ajax's defilement of Athena's shrine and Cassandra: cf. Welcker's reconstruction of Aeschylus' trilogy about the Lesser

⁷⁰⁹ *Od.* 8.494f., 11.524; *Epit.* 5.14 also divides the labor, making Odysseus the mastermind and Epeius the ἀρχιτέκτων (Odysseus must also persuade his fellow ἄριστοι, who were evidently nervous about entering the belly of the beast). *Epic. adesp.* 11, quoted at the end of this chapter and possibly belonging to the *Little Iliad*, agrees with *Od.* 22.230 in attributing the capture of Troy to Odysseus' βουλή. Cf. West 194.

⁷¹⁰ Gregory 1999: xvii. Thalmann 1993 detects Aeschylean influence throughout the play.

⁷¹¹ West 222, cf. on *Il. parv.* fr. 22 W.

⁷¹² Cf. the *Little Iliad*'s resumption of the story of Philoctetes begun in the *Cypria*; also Neoptolemus' involvement in both epics and the arrival in the *Little Iliad* of Eurypylus, whose father Telephus had featured in the *Cypria*.

Ajax.⁷¹³ On the other hand, at *Poet.* 1459b6 Aristotle (or his interpolator) does not mention *Polyxena* as one of the many tragedies that can be fashioned from the *Little Iliad*.⁷¹⁴ This omission makes it probable that Sophocles in his *Polyxena* and Euripides in his *Hecuba* relied on the *Iliupersis* (arg. 4c W.) for the story of the maiden's sacrifice.

Because the *Little Iliad* could have ended at any point during the course of the Sack whereas the scope of the *Iliupersis* demanded a full account of it, it again might have been guessed that episodes belonging to the very end of the sack or its aftermath, such as the distribution of captive Trojan Women (*Iliup.* arg. 4a W.) as dramatized by Euripides in both *Hecuba* and *Trojan Women*, were drawn from the latter epic. Yet the division of booty, wherein the choicest γέρας was Andromache who went to Neoptolemus, was in fact featured in the *Little Iliad* (fr. 30 W.) as well as the *Iliupersis* (arg. 4a).⁷¹⁵ The fact that *Trojan Women* makes Odysseus the murderer of Astyanax, or at least the fierce advocate of his murder (721-5, though the Greeks bear collective guilt at 1122, just as at *Epit.* 5.23 the verb is plural: ἔρριψαν), shows that here at least Euripides

⁷¹³ The opening dialogue between Athena and Poseidon in E. *Tro.* at first suppresses the rape of Cassandra by Ajax, instead charging Agamemnon with impiety as he illegitimately “marries” (γαμεῖ, 44) her. But soon the more heinous and conspicuous crime is decried in a climax (69-72) that leads to the gods’ compact regarding the punishment of the Greeks. Poseidon takes umbrage on Athena’s behalf on the grounds that the violation of her altar demonstrates a lack of gratitude among the Greeks who relied on her support to secure victory (72), an interesting point that is less obvious than the desecration of her “temples” (ναοὺς, 69, cf. 96). Poseidon, an erstwhile ally of the Greeks, is experiencing his own feelings of indignation and, although anger against the Greeks and sympathy toward the Trojans are essentially two sides of the same coin, is probably motivated more by the former when he teams up with Athena. *Pace* Lee 1997: 67 (on line 7), evidence exists to show that the “pro-Trojan Poseidon,” who also appears at E. *IT* 1414f. and whose allegiance to the Greeks in the *Iliad* has been obliterated, is not a creation of Euripides but a fixture of tradition. The shipwreck suffered by the Greeks as they sail home was covered in the *Nostoi*. Although the corresponding part of Proclus’ summary (arg. 3b W.) lacks details, *Epit.* 6.5, shows that Athena had both Zeus and Poseidon as accomplices in this act of vengeance. Thus it is not so much the demands of the play as the demands of tradition that dictate Poseidon’s changed disposition.

⁷¹⁴ Cf. West 222.

⁷¹⁵ But the cursory nature of the *Little Iliad* fragment (preserved both by Tzetz. in Lyc. 1268, who also preserves five more verses from slightly earlier in the poem [= fr. 29 W.], and by sch. E. *Andr.* 14) shows that it was reliable only for the most basic information. The *Iliupersis* would have contained much more detail. Cf. West 220, who also points out that Aristotle counts *Troades* among the plays that derive their plots from the *Little Iliad*.

was following the tradition of the *Iliupersis* (arg. 4a W.) rather than that of the *Little Iliad*, which did tell of Astyanax's death but held Neoptolemus accountable.⁷¹⁶ If the supposition is correct that the *Iliupersis* viewed the Trojan losers with greater compassion than did the *Little Iliad*, this may be another reason that Euripides gravitated to the former. Accordingly, his gnomic remark that city-sackers are fools who pay for their destructiveness (95-7) could equally summarize his own attitude and that of the *Iliupersis*. Meanwhile, it is remarkable that in *Andromache* he opted not to blame Neoptolemus for the murder, where his vilification is especially in order. Instead, the titular heroine recalls her child's death in the passive voice (*παῖδα...ρίφθέντα πύργων Ἀστυάνακτ' ἀπ' ὀρθίων*, 9f.) without an expression of agency.⁷¹⁷ Sophocles' play

⁷¹⁶ *Il. Parv.* fr. 29 W., vv. 3-5. The killing of Astyanax and forced bedding of his mother are thus performed by the same hero. Conversely, Odysseus is an appropriate culprit insofar as he also takes the lead in the sacrifice of Polyxena, another royal Trojan youth (*E. Hec.* 130-43, 218ff.; cf. also his role in the sacrifice of Iphigenia)—except that Neoptolemus also had a sometimes prominent role in it (see sch. *Hec.* 41, with Gregory 1999: 109 [*Hec.* 523n.], but note that the *Κυπριακά* cited there probably designates a historical work).

⁷¹⁷ According to the scholia on *E. Andr.* 10, the critic Lysanias scolded Euripides for taking literally and making reality out of *Il.* 24.734f., in which a fearful Andromache only makes a random guess (so the argument goes) as to what may happen to Astyanax in the wake of Hector's death: *...ἢ τις Ἀχαιῶν | ῥίψει χειρὸς ἐλῶν ἀπὸ πύργου*. It is the critics represented in both passages, however, who were badly out of touch with epic tradition (in the case of Aristonicus' view as recorded in sch. *A Il.* 24.735a, the problem might not have been ignorance but a bias against *οἱ μεθ' Ὀμηρον ποιηταί*). In fact, Homer is probably alluding to an already existent tradition, as Willcock 1999: 321 says *ad loc.*; the motif appears in art as early as the seventh century B.C. (*LIMC* Equus Troianus 23, though the figures are not labeled). (If there was already in Homer's day a debate about whether Odysseus, Neoptolemus, or some other Achaean killed Astyanax, it is convenient that context allowed the poet to hedge his bets with *τις Ἀχαιῶν*.) Moreover, the Homeric scholia (bT *Il.* 24.735b) assume that if Andromache's fear was rooted in reality then the *ἔθος* accounting for it was that a conquered people's children were disposed of when they were too young to be of use as slaves; but the real motivation for killing Astyanax, which better characterizes Homeric society, is typologically different: the conqueror always feared future reprisals exacted by some surviving relative of his former enemy. This is conveyed by an epic verse that Clement attributes to Stasinus (*Cyp.* fr. 31 W.): *νήπιος, ὃς πατέρα κτείνας παῖδας καταλείπει* (*E. Tro.* 723 is virtually a gloss of this sentiment, or a blending of it with Andromache's own explanation of her fear at *Il.* 24.736-8: she thinks Astyanax's life is at risk because of the anger of the surviving Achaeans, so many of whose companions Hector killed). Jouan 1966: 372f. and West 240 ultimately reject Welcker's assignment of the fragment to a putative debate in the *Iliupersis* that leads to the resolution to kill the young boy (Welcker 1882: 187, 223), but wherever the verse stood, what it conveys must supply the main reason for Astyanax's murder.

Unfortunately, the second sentence in the Euripidean scholion is lacunose and possibly mutilated, but it is clearly a comment about the playwright's engagement with particular sources and also has broad implications for his *modus operandi* in dealing with Trojan mythology. Dindorf's text runs: *Ξάνθον δὲ τὸν τὰ Λυδιακὰ συγγράμαντά φασιν ὅτι Εὐριπίδῃ σύνθετος προσέχειν περὶ τοῖς Τρωϊκοῖς.....τοῖς δὲ*

Αίχμαλωτίδες (“Spear-captive Women,” cf. the use of the term at *E. Tro.* 28), which the hypothesis to *Ajax* assigns to “Trojan business” (*Τρωϊκή πραγματεία*), could have included the murder of Astyanax.⁷¹⁸ Much more could be said about the influence of the *Iliupersis* on tragedy in a separate chapter, but such has been omitted from the present study.

Heracles’ command at *S. Phil.* 1440-4 that Neoptolemus (and Philoctetes) observe *eusebeia* while sacking Troy “is a clear allusion to the story that [Neoptolemus] acted with conspicuous *impiety*” on that later occasion.⁷¹⁹ Sophocles thus instantly undermines the apparently blessed ending as far as Neoptolemus is concerned; that Neoptolemus should have received a specific warning from Heracles exacerbates his infamous crime (the desecration at Priam’s altar of Zeus Herkeios) in the eyes of all. Thus even as he fashions a unique solution (the *deus ex machina*) to the conflict between Philoctetes and

χρησιμωτέρους.....φοις. West’s much improved and slightly supplemented text (= *Iliup.* fr. 3 W.) makes it fairly certain that Lysanias was said to have regarded Xanthos’ account of Astyanax’s survival and migration (*FGrHist* 765 F 14, cf. what *οἱ νεώτεροι* said according to sch. *T Il.* 24.735b) as authoritative, hence the former’s pejorative view of *Andr.* 10; but others defended Euripides on the grounds that Xanthos was not the sort of authority the playwright was wont to follow anyway: <... *οἱ δέ*> *φασιν ὅτι <οὐκ ἔμελλεν> ὁ Εὐριπίδης Ξάνθῳ προσέχειν περὶ τῶν Τρωϊκῶν μύθων, τοῖς δὲ χρησιμωτέροις καὶ ἀξιοπιστοτέροις*. The scholion goes on to name two better sources for the story of Astyanax, Stesichorus (sc. *PMGF* 202) and “the Cyclic poet who arranged the *Sack*.” The scholiast thus admirably refutes Lysanias’ unfair complaint and correctly identifies precedents for what Euripides claims happened to the boy. In fact, whereas Stesichorus is said only to have asserted that Astyanax died, the *Iliupersis* is said to have reported *ὅτι καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους ῥίφθειη*. And it is the latter *ᾧ ἠκολουθηκέναι Εὐριπίδην*.

⁷¹⁸ But Pearson 1917: 25f. discredited Welcker 171-6, who on tenuous grounds had supposed that this was the central event of the play, in which case it probably would have included an elaboration of the debate among the Achaeans alluded to in *E. Tro.* 721-5. Notwithstanding this critique, it is not impossible that Accius’ *Astyanax* (Ribbeck 1875: 412ff.; a *Troades* is attested for the same author) was based on this or another Greek tragedy dealing with Astyanax, although Pearson rightly points out the futility of using the fragments of Accius to attempt a reconstruction of Sophocles’ play. Less likely is the conjecture of Schoell and Bergk that *S. Aichmalōtides* concerns the demanding back of Chryseis as told in *Iliad* 1, which would make it a rare example of a play written by a fifth-century tragedian other than Aeschylus that directly treats an Iliadic episode.

⁷¹⁹ Schein 2013: 340 (1440-4n.); cf. *E. Tro.* 16f.

the Achaean army,⁷²⁰ Sophocles also seizes on the opportunity to magnify Neoptolemus' culpability for his own fall from grace later in the Cycle.

In Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* Lampito recalls (155f.) how during the Sack a murderous Menelaus was disarmed by the beauty of Helen's bare breasts. A scholium *ad loc.* (= *Il. Parv.* fr. 28 W.) informs us that this short episode was related in the *Little Iliad*, another example of the poem's humorous strain.⁷²¹ Euripides took up the story as well in *Andr.* 627-31, but this is one of those instances where lyric (specifically, Ibycus *PMGF* 296) might have been the tragedian's immediate source; it also was a scene familiar in art going all the way back to a seventh-century relief pithos from Mykonos.⁷²²

3.8. Conclusions

Any positive evaluation of the exploits discussed above should be met with the response, *Sic notus Ulixes?* The incredulity voiced by Vergil's Laocoön (*Aen.* 2.44) panders to a much older bias. Indeed, Sophocles and Euripides were already tending toward the view that Odysseus was incapable of fair play. Yet the *Little Iliad* presented stories that framed Odysseus' *panourgia* in a more favorable light, and his sneaky behavior must be seen as justified to the extent that it was necessary for the fulfillment of the Achaean mission, provided the mission itself was founded on justice. Careful study of the fragments alongside the extant plays relating to Odysseus' career reveals that the attitude of the Greek tragedians toward this hero are much more ambivalent than has traditionally been appreciated. Ultimately, Odysseus' place in tragedy cannot be understood except as a

⁷²⁰ A change that "heightens the play's ethical complexity," Schein 2013: 5; Sophocles leaves his audience to wonder whether it was Odysseus or some other influence that led Neoptolemus, who in his interaction with Philoctetes ultimately shows himself to be noble and compassionate, down a path of depravity.

⁷²¹ The comical tone is probably original to the epic. But West 219 reminds us that Menelaus in all probability had just cut down Deiphobus (he may have done so in brutal fashion), so great poetic skill was needed to convey levity after such a transition.

⁷²² See *LIMC* s.v. Helene, no. 225.

studied response to both the triumphant portrait of the hero in epic, especially the *Little Iliad*, and Pindar's critical appraisal.⁷²³

Proclus' clipped summary of the *Little Iliad* makes it seem as though it ended on a major cliffhanger, with the Trojans feasting after having drawn the Wooden Horse within their walls (an ominous spectacle as the Chorus of *Hecuba* aptly depicts it). Various fragments assigned to the *Little Iliad* make it clear that this was not the case and that the poem continued on to describe the sack itself, however perfunctorily. Thus an author who wished to describe the ultimate demise of Troy might have consulted both the *Little Iliad* and the *Iliupersis*. At the same time it was advantageous to have read both because the *Iliupersis* provided a sort of antidote to the almost panegyric portrait of Odysseus in the *Little Iliad*, focusing instead on the plight of his victims—and increasingly the Trojans were presented as *his* victims, an evolution that owes much to tragedy. But this was not how Lesches (or whoever it was who wrote the *Little Iliad*) saw things; for him, with the walls of Troy breached and its population overwhelmed at long last, a great feat had been achieved that redounded to the glory of Odysseus and his patron Athena. An unplaced epic verse (Epic. adesp. 11), which Welcker proposed to derive from the *Little Iliad*,⁷²⁴ would perfectly encapsulate its overall theme. Odysseus is said to have taken Troy

βουλῆ καὶ μύθοισι καὶ ἡπεροπηῖδι τέχνη

by counsel and words and the craft of deception.

⁷²³ Cf. Kelly 2015: 320f., who cautions, however, that the figure of Odysseus was by the fifth century too widespread to allow for the detection of specific instances where the *Little Iliad* influenced the tragedians, e.g., in the matter of Odysseus' virtue.

⁷²⁴ Welcker 1882: 540; cf. West 194.

The verse is to be read with a triumphalist tone. Hence to the extent that tragedy disparages Odysseus for being deceitful, this was as much a repudiation of the entire worldview of the *Little Iliad* (and the *Odyssey*) as a shaming of the hero. And to some extent the worldview of the *Little Iliad*, such a vital source for tragedians (especially Sophocles), is itself dictated by ancient tradition: maybe it was better to fight one's battles honestly and openly than to do so stealthily and duplicitously; but the war was not won that way, and it was Odysseus who "through his guile achieved what Achilles through his valor had not been able."⁷²⁵ If later this was disappointing to some who had a low view of guile, at least there were cathartic dramas like Sophocles' *Philoctetes*.

⁷²⁵ Preller 1861: 409 ("durch sein List erreichte was Achill durch seine Tapferkeit nicht vermocht hatte").

4. The Hero and the Heron: Telic Impulses in the *Telegony*

The *Odyssey* gives modern readers the impression that the *nostos* of Odysseus was also his *telos*—that his triumphant return to Ithaca after the war should be the last major and purposeful event of his life, if not the last event of the Trojan saga. But two factors conspired to preclude such a neat and tidy ending: (1) the proliferation of stories about the folk hero Odysseus well before the *Odyssey*'s composition, and (2) the impulse of ancient Greek storytellers with “cyclic” designs to extend the saga at all costs.⁷²⁶

Eugammon of Cyrene, to whom the *Telegony* was and is consistently ascribed, was just such an author. The Thesprotian episode folded into the first of the *Telegony*'s two books must derive from a local tradition that predates by a long time the story of Odysseus' return from Troy to Ithaca, for if the hero's *telos* was to return home after the war and reclaim his native kingdom, as is supposed in the *Odyssey*, it makes little sense that he should then go on to found a new kingdom in a distant land, Thesprotia. Moreover, as West points out,⁷²⁷ it was a challenge for Eugammon to narrate this Thesprotian excursion and then make Odysseus return to Ithaca to be killed by Telegonus, for this story implies yet another conception of Odysseus' *telos*. The competing claims on Odysseus' later life, no doubt owing to the diverging interests of separate Greek communities, created complications similar to those that surrounded Heracles' death.

If the *Odyssey* presciently explores the Aristotelian concept of a *telos*, it concerns itself more with geographical ends. The *Telegony*, by contrast, is preoccupied with temporal finality. Odysseus' death marks the end of the Epic Cycle, one could even say of the Heroic Age. The anticlimactic nature of his death reinforces this sense of finality

⁷²⁶ Tsagalis 2015: 400 n. 111 recognizes this impulse as a key motivation for the *Telegony*'s action while noting that this is distinct from the poem's narrative function(s).

⁷²⁷ West 290.

and of a fading into the ordinary and familiar. Any remarkable deeds that were accomplished subsequently were the stuff of history, not of legend. Yet there are hints that the epic poet and his audience still yearned for further myths despite the general understanding that all great stories must come to an end (while endless continuation is not only ultimately impossible but also detrimental to the established material whose excellence risked dilution). The tragedians, mindful that their art would eventually exhaust the rich yet finite scope of mythic tradition suitable for dramatization, may have viewed the chronological end of the Cycle with a sense of relief, or it may have caused them to despair. Nonetheless, they explored only the most substantive episodes from the Cycle's relatively sparse and inconsequential finale.

Opinions about the traditional status of the *Telegony* and the degree of its indebtedness to Homer are somewhat more divergent than in the case of any of its fellow Cyclic epics. Thus while Burgess extends to this poem his general thesis about the Epic Cycle, namely that its stories were old and traditional and could have influenced the poet of the *Odyssey* himself,⁷²⁸ Bernabé maintains that the *Telegony* stands as an exception in that its stories were at once innovative and derivative with respect to Homer; that is, there was no robust and firmly established oral epic tradition behind the *Telegony*.⁷²⁹ But one must also think—again especially in the case of this poem—of another tradition apart from the oral epic, that of folklore. Thinking well beyond that, Tsagalis generously teases out four distinct sources behind Euegetas's work, not counting the *Odyssey*: “[w]estern

⁷²⁸ Burgess 2014, building on Burgess 2001.

⁷²⁹ Bernabé 2017: “es el poema más dependiente de Homero (al tiempo que contiene notables e incluso extravagantes innovaciones del poeta).”

epichoric traditions,” a lost epic *Thesprotis*,⁷³⁰ the story of Odysseus’ death at the hands of his bastard son Telegonus, and “Cyrenaean and Egyptian elements” that glorify the historical Battiad dynasty.⁷³¹ According to this view, it is largely through the recombination of existing motifs that Eugammon fashioned his poem.⁷³²

The lack of consensus as to the nature and status of the poem has something to do with the fact that the *Odyssey* refers to fewer of its stories than one might expect, but as will be seen the singular story of Odysseus’ death, which Homer refers to but only (for deliberate narrative reasons) in a most allusive way, also exercises an outsize influence on our judgment. By dealing with Odysseus’ death both from the temporal vantage point of the *Odyssey* and head-on like the *Telegony*, tragedy greatly enriches our evidence, albeit without providing an easy solution to the mystery surrounding the circumstances of Odysseus’ death as they were developed in the (folkloric and) poetic tradition.

4.1. After the Slaughter of the Suitors

οἱ μνήστορες ὑπὸ τῶν προσηκόντων θάπτονται. καὶ Ὀδυσσεὺς θύσας Νύμφαις εἰς Ἥλιν ἀποπλεῖ ἐπισκεψόμενος τὰ βουκόλια, καὶ ξενίζεται παρὰ Πολυξένῳ δῶρόν τε λαμβάνει κρατῆρα, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ τὰ περὶ Τροφώνιον καὶ Ἀγαμήδην καὶ Αὐγέα.

The suitors are buried by their relatives. And Odysseus, after he sacrifices to the Nymphs, sails away to Elis to inspect his cattle herds, and he is hosted at Polyxenus’ house and receives as a gift a crater, and on this [were depicted] the things concerning Trophonius and Agamedes and Augeas. (Arg. 1a-b W.)

The *Telegony* and Aeschylus’ *Ostologoi* (“Bone-collectors”)—the latter perhaps in imitation of the former—retain only one part of the end of the *Odyssey*, and this part is

⁷³⁰ Tsagalis assumes that this was known to Eugammon as an oral source and that he dramatically altered its narrative. Thus Clem. *Strom.* 6.25.1, asserting that Eugammon took the *Thesprotis* from Musaeus and made it book one of his *Telegony*, does not convince Tsagalis; but see also West 290f.

⁷³¹ Tsagalis 2015: 400.

⁷³² But on the very next page (401) Tsagalis confusingly reiterates his basic opinion that Eugammon “invented the myth of Telegonus,” which then should not be considered a source.

brief.⁷³³ At 24.415-17 (cf. 186-90) the suitors' families come to Odysseus' palace to retrieve their remains. Whereas in Homer the final reconciliation occurs only after a skirmish at Laertes' farm (battle being the default method of resolving conflicts in epic), Aeschylus attributes the same peace to the wily words of Odysseus. The king defends his actions before the distraught relatives, who must have come to him in a suppliant capacity. Just as in the *Odyssey* Athena finally intercedes to end the cycle of bloodshed on Ithaca, Aeschylus may have employed her as a *dea ex machina* in his play, supplementing the persuasiveness of Odysseus' own rhetoric.⁷³⁴

So Aeschylus' *Ostologoi* suppressed the knowledge of *Odyssey* 24 and told of the fetching and burial of the suitors' bodies, just as did the *Telegony*.⁷³⁵ This supposition has become the scholarly consensus.⁷³⁶ To judge from the two extant fragments, Odysseus was probably depicted in this play as full of cold-hearted yet hardly unjustified spite, which only extensive pleading and tearful groveling by the relatives of the deceased (and perhaps a divine epiphany by Athena) were able to conquer. Aeschylus' primary focus must have been the protracted dispute preceding the burial rather than the burial itself.

⁷³³ Let "the end" designate everything from line 23.297 on, which coda already Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus suspected of being non-Homeric. Note with West 292 that the discrepancy does not prove that the traditional end of the *Odyssey* was unknown to Eugeamon, let alone to Aeschylus: they may simply have opted to disregard elements that were not to their liking (and a slight overlap in material with Homer should not have bothered the Cyclic poet too much). The verbal clash between Odysseus and the suitors' relatives may be Aeschylus' own invention; West 294 speculates that in the *Telegony* Odysseus' visits to the cave of the Nymphs and father afield to Elis happened concurrently with the burial of the suitors' corpses, just as the *Odyssey* whisks the hero away to Laertes' farm to accommodate the burial (but in the *Telegony* there were no subsequent demands for satisfaction, etc.).

⁷³⁴ Cf. Sommerstein 2012a: 252. Cf. Athena's role in *A. Eum.*, where again she engineers the triumph of conciliatory speech over reactionary violence.

⁷³⁵ Kudlien 1970: 301; Grossardt 2003: 155 n. 2 and 156f. quickly demolishes the older theory proposed by Petit 1640: II.186 and followed by Welcker 1824: 454, namely that the "bone collectors" in question were beggars in search of meal scraps.

⁷³⁶ E.g., A. Wessels and R. Krumeich in Krumeich–Pechstein–Seidensticker 1999: 205; Grossardt 2003: 155 n. 3 credits Nitzsch 1852: 596–601 with first deducing that this was the plot of *Ostologoi*.

Pace Kudlien,⁷³⁷ the play's title need not dictate that the arrival of the suitors' kinsman followed the cremation of their bodies. It is true that *ὄστολογία* is used very literally at Diod. Sic. 4.38.5 and elsewhere, but "bones" could easily be used to refer to bodies. This amounts to either synecdoche or, given that the kinsmen no doubt intended to burn the bodies soon after retrieving them, prolepsis; a reference to "bones" instead of "bodies," by focusing on the part of the body that endures, might also impart a more epic and grandiose tone to the narrative.⁷³⁸ *Od.* 24.187 supports such an interpretation: *σώματ' ἀκηδέα κεῖται ἐνὶ μεγάροις Ὀδυσῆος* (cf. 417, *ἐκ δὲ νέκυς οἴκων φόρεον καὶ θάπτον ἕκαστοι*).⁷³⁹ Greater drama is achieved if the bodies have been in no way cared for, just as at *Od.* 22.448-51 they are simply piled up in the courtyard and left unburned (though in almost taunting fashion fire is used together with sulfur to fumigate the hall: 22.493f., 23.50f.).⁷⁴⁰ The *desis* of the play would derive from a clash between Odysseus' residual rage and the Chorus' duty to perform funeral rites for their deceased relatives. Such a conflict, reminiscent of the ransom of Hector and thus suggestive of a likeness between Odysseus and Achilles (normally opposed to each other), is bypassed in the *Odyssey*, in

⁷³⁷ *Loc. cit.*; Kudlien also erroneously regards the Chorus as consisting of satyrs (*ibid.* 303).

⁷³⁸ Cf. *Il.* 21.320f., where the river Scamander is determined to overwhelm Achilles, *οὐδέ οἱ ὅστε' ἐπιστήσονται Ἀχαιοὶ ἀλλέξαι*; at 23.252f., on the other hand, it is only after Patroclus' cremation that the Achaeans *ὄστεα...ἀλλεγον*, and similarly at Verg. *Aen.* 5.47, *reliquias divinique ossa parentis*, the bones of Anchises have been separated via cremation, as shown a few lines later [55], *cineres ipsius et ossa parentis*. Cf. also E. *Or.* 404, *φυλάσσαν ὀστέων* [*sc.*, of the cremated Clytemnestra] *ἀναίρεσιν*.

⁷³⁹ NB the verb here is *θάπτον*, and although this was eventually used of cremation (Plu. 2.286f has *πυρὶ θάπτειν*), Homer may have had in mind heroic burial even without incineration (cf. *Od.* 11.52, *οὐ γὰρ πω ἐτέθαπτο ὑπὸ χθονός*). But Aeschylus for his part was free to imagine a massive pyre being built to burn the corpses of the suitors, which would have been especially useful in the case of those whose remains had to be shipped abroad; Grossardt 2003: 156 n. 9 cites several passages that combine bone-collecting with repatriation (cf. the aetiological myth in which Heracles invented cremation, Andron fr. 10 Fowler).

⁷⁴⁰ The procession of the murdered and unburied suitors' souls into Hades at the start of *Od.* 24 only highlights the authorial confusion characterizing much of what follows *Od.* 23.296. In opposition to those scholars who have regarded this last portion of the epic as a later interpolation, West 2014 rightly argues that we can witness the original poet revising an older version of the story so as to reintroduce Laertes and tie up other loose ends: hence the festivities at the palace have been repurposed as a means of deluding the kinsmen of the slain suitors. But West does not adequately account for the inconcinnity surrounding the souls of the suitors. Did Aeschylus, sensing the anticlimactic quality of the end of the poem, seek with his *Ostologoi* to furnish a superior continuation?

which the hero is away visiting Laertes when the suitors' kinsmen retrieve their bodies from the king's palace. With Odysseus' release of his enemies' corpses initiating the dramatic *lysis*, the play could have covered the long anticipated cremation and then ended in a *kommos* scene led by one of the suppliant kinsmen (probably not Eupheithes, whose son Antinous had been the worst offender of Odysseus' majesty and who accordingly is the lone combatant killed in the *Odyssey's* final skirmish, at 24.523-5). In this way the Chorus members could at length execute the function—previously but an aspiration—implied in the label *όστολόγοι*.

Although the action in the *Ostologoi* did not involve exhumation, it is worth comparing the legendary recovery of the suitors' remains with a famous historical event involving the Athenian statesman Cimon. He won great renown by repatriating the bones of Theseus in or around 475 B.C.,⁷⁴¹ a time corresponding approximately to Aeschylus' floruit. Perhaps Aeschylus had seen the saintly relics of his *polis'* hero. The most natural response would have been to compose tragedies about Theseus (surely there's literature on this: see Mills), but in addition the recovery of bones may have fixed in his mind as a leitmotif.⁷⁴² The specificity of the title *Ostologoi* would be comprehensible as another reaction to contemporary history. Within the Epic Cycle, the bones of Ajax and Orestes also receive attention; for the afterlife of Orestes' bones, cf. Hdt. 1.67f. and Paus. 3.3.6 (historical feats such as these, even before they became part of traditional legend, appear indebted to the ancient story pattern whereby some precious object must be fetched from

⁷⁴¹ Plut. *Cim.* 8.6; cf. id. *Thes.* 36.1. The Athenian conquest of Scyros leading up to this glorious achievement is not securely dated, but according to Podlecki 1971 it should have occurred at some point in the latter 470s.

⁷⁴² The fluid relationship between myth and reality in Classical Greece need not be pressed here, nor should we guess too much at Aeschylus' particular train of thought; but let it suffice to point out that at most two degrees of separation stood between the historical retrieval of the bones of "Theseus" and the myths of the Trojan Cycle, for the same King Lycomedes who hosted the adolescent Achilles also according to tradition murdered Theseus on Scyros (see e.g. Plut. *Thes.* 35.3).

one's enemy before victory can be won—as witnessed especially in the *Little Iliad*). Note the alternation in Herodotus between *όστέα* (1.67.2 and, with *συλλέξας*, 68.6) and *νεκρός* (68.3); in this case decay had eaten the flesh rather than fire, but it is instructive to see that the Pythia's first oracular response to the Spartans had referred specifically to the hero's bones. Indeed, the very title of Aeschylus' play may reflect the influence of current events on the vocabulary used to describe a mythical episode.

4.2. Odysseus' Other Bastard Son

ἔπειτα εἰς Ἰθάκην καταπλεύσας τὰς ὑπὸ Τειρεσίου ῥηθείσας τελεῖ θυσίας. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰς Θεσπρωτοὺς ἀφικνεῖται. καὶ γαμεῖ Καλλιδικὴν βασιλίδα τῶν Θεσπρωτῶν. ἔπειτα πόλεμος συνίσταται τοῖς Θεσπρωτοῖς πρὸς Βρύγους, Ὀδυσσέως ἡγουμένου. ἐνταῦθα Ἄρης τοὺς περὶ τὸν Ὀδυσσεῖα τρέπεται, καὶ αὐτῷ εἰς μάχην Ἀθηνᾶ καθίσταται· τούτους μὲν Ἀπόλλων διαλύει· μετὰ δὲ τὴν Καλλιδικῆς τελευτὴν τὴν μὲν βασιλείαν διαδέχεται Πολυποίτης Ὀδυσσέως υἱός, αὐτὸς δὲ εἰς Ἰθάκην ἀφικνεῖται. (Arg. 1c, 2 W.)

Then sailing to Ithaca he fulfills the sacrifices dictated by Tiresias, and after this he arrives among the Thesprotians. And he marries Callidice, princess of the Thesprotians. Then a war is joined by the Thesprotians, with Odysseus commanding, against the Brygi. Herein Ares routs those around Odysseus, and Athena joins battle against him; Apollo breaks up these [gods], and after the end of Callidice Polypoetes, Odysseus' son, succeeds to the kingdom, and he himself returns to Ithaca.

With this account we must compare a certain mythological prose summary (*Erotica Pathemata* 3) by the late-Alexandrian poet Parthenius of Nicaea, which records how Odysseus fathered a son named Euryalus by Equippe, the princess of Dodona. When he reached maturity, this son embarked on a quest to meet his father but was tragically killed by him because of false charges leveled by Penelope; it seems probable that Penelope

also lied to Odysseus about the identity of his victim,⁷⁴³ and so the murder is partly attributable to a failure of recognition (a trope that will recur in short order before the conclusion of the Cycle). Parthenius prefaces his account with the superscription *ἱστορεῖ Σοφοκλῆς Εὐρύαλον*. Although it is unclear whether this refers to the whole of the story that follows or just some part of it, there is no reason to doubt the existence and relevance of the play. The nature of this *Euryalus* must have been at odds with most of the other dramas featuring Odysseus, for certainly Odysseus' *ἀμηχανία* in this later episode is uncharacteristic and leads to his own tragic suffering. It is up for speculation as to what *ὑβρις*, if any, Sophocles wanted his audience to be aware of as leading to the *ἄτη* that now seizes Odysseus, but certainly the tragedian would have concerned himself somehow with these themes. Perhaps the very act of fathering Euryalus was meant to be viewed as perilous if not illicit, as was the hero's previous seduction of Aeolus' daughter Polymele (Parthenius makes this quite clear in the foregoing section of *Erotica Pathemata*).

Odysseus' infidelity might have been regarded as especially blatant and blameworthy given Penelope's constant fidelity,⁷⁴⁴ and she takes revenge and outwits her husband (see below). In any case, Parthenius proceeds to say that soon after this occurrence Odysseus died "having been wounded by the prick of a sting ray" (*τρωθεὶς ἀκάνθη θαλασσίας τρυγόνος*). It appears that in saying this he is still drawing on tragedy rather than on the *Telegony*.⁷⁴⁵

⁷⁴³ Parthenius says, *τοῦ δὲ Ὀδυσσεὺς κατὰ τύχην τότε μὴ παρόντος Πηνελόπη καταμαθοῦσα ταῦτα καὶ ἄλλως δὲ προπεπισμένη τὸν τῆς Εὐίπης ἔρωτα πείθει τὸν Ὀδυσσεῖα παραγενόμενον, πρὶν ἢ γνῶναί τι τούτων ὡς ἔχει, κατακτείνει τὸν Εὐρύαλον ὡς ἐπιβουλεύοντα αὐτῷ.*

⁷⁴⁴ Parthenius himself extracts a simple moral about the lack of self-control, which vice he sees as a natural feature of Odysseus' character: *Ὀδυσσεὺς μὲν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐγκρατῆς φῆναι μηδὲ ἄλλως ἐπιεικῆς αὐτόχειρ τοῦ παιδὸς ἐγένετο.*

⁷⁴⁵ In these words Meineke, adducing a similar phrase recorded by Eustathius, purported to detect a Sophoclean verse. But Nauck questioned this, and he was followed by Spiro 1896: 731, who thought that this single verse, as it contains what would effectively be the whole argument of a play, should therefore be

According to Proclus' summary of the *Telegony* Odysseus fulfilled on Ithaca the sacrifices appointed by Tiresias and then went immediately (at least no other action is recorded by Proclus) to Thesprotia. What motivated this sojourn? The oracle at Dodona was situated in that region and was certainly worthy of consultation, but Odysseus was already aware of some business to which he needed to attend. Could it be that when he undertook this voyage Odysseus was still in the process of executing Tiresias' orders?

The prophet had said (*Od.* 11.121-34):

ἔρχεσθαι δὴ ἔπειτα, λαβὼν εὐῆρες ἔρετμόν,
 εἰς ὃ κε τοὺς ἀφίκηαι, οἳ οὐκ ἴσασι θάλασσαν
 ἀνέρες οὐδέ θ' ἄλεσσι μεμιγμένον εἶδαρ ἔδουσιν·
 οὐδ' ἄρα τοῖ ἴσασι νέας φοινικοπαρήγους
 οὐδ' εὐῆρε' ἔρετμά, τά τε περὰ νηυσὶ πέλονται. 125
 σῆμα δέ τοι ἐρέω μάλ' ἀριφραδές, οὐδέ σε λήσει·
 ὀππότε κεν δὴ τοι ζυμβλήμενος ἄλλος ὀδίτης
 φῆη ἀθηρηλοιγὸν ἔχειν ἀνὰ φαιδίμῳ ὤμῳ,
 καὶ τότε δὴ γαίῃ πῆξας εὐῆρες ἔρετμόν,
 ἔρξας ἱερὰ καλὰ Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι, 130
 ἀρνειὸν ταῦρόν τε συῶν τ' ἐπιβήτορα κάπρον,
 οἴκαδ' ἀποστείχειν ἔρδειν θ' ἱερὰς ἑκατόμβας
 ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι, τοῖ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσι,
 πᾶσι μάλ' ἐξείης.

Then at that time, taking a well-made oar, go
 until you arrive among those who do not know the sea
 nor are men who eat food mixed with salt:
 neither, I tell you, do they know red-cheeked ships
 nor well-made oars, which are ships' wings.
 And I shall tell you a very clear sign, nor will it deceive you:
 When truly another traveler meeting you
 says that you have a winnowing-fan above your shining shoulder,
 at that very moment fix your well-made oar in the earth,

attributed to a *grammaticus poeta*. It is indeed difficult to imagine Sophocles finding space in his treatment of Euryalus' death to cover Odysseus' death as well, unless perhaps the latter were foretold in a prophecy. On the other hand, Sophocles could have joined his *Euryalus* with a separate play (see *infra*) about the subsequent episode within a dramatic grouping that altogether served as Parthenius' source. The overarching theme would then have been comeuppance or *nemesis*, a concept that Parthenius all but reads into the legend by bridging the two episodes with *καὶ οὐ μετὰ πολὺν χρόνον ἢ τόδε ἀπειργάσθαι πρὸς τῆς αὐτοῦ αὐτοῦ γενεᾶς*.... In addition to Radt's discussion in *TrGF* iv.195, the fragment in question also stands as adesp. 323h in *TrGF* ii, where an alternative attribution to Agathon is recorded.

having offered beautiful sacrifices to Lord Poseidon,
a ram and a bull and a boar that mounts pigs,
leave for home and offer holy hecatombs
to the immortal gods who hold broad heaven,
to all in succession.

Thesprotia included some inland territory where it was conceivable one might discover an isolated community unfamiliar with the very notion of seafaring. It could be that Odysseus went there in the *Telegony* in an effort to discharge Tiresias' assignment, in which case the hero will have gleaned from elsewhere that Thesprotia was a clime agreeing with the prophet's description. Alternatively, he was headed to the oracle of Zeus at Dodona precisely to learn where he might encounter such a landlocked people.⁷⁴⁶ Parthenius says Odysseus went to Epirus "on account of some oracle" (*χρηστηρίων τινῶν ἔνεκα*), and that should refer to Tiresias' earlier prophecy in the Underworld—if not it refers to an oracle that lay in the future and that Odysseus was seeking in Dodona. In any case Odysseus in the *Telegony* should at least have sought to fulfill all the duties laid upon him by Tiresias; the Cycle thus would have been living up to its self-appointed project of contextualizing Homer.⁷⁴⁷ But he appears, crucially, to have gone about them in reverse order. That decision and his related fling with the Thesprotian princess turned out to be very costly for him.

⁷⁴⁶ Odysseus' report to Eumaeus of his visit to Dodona before returning (the first time) to Ithaca (*Od.* 14.327f.) could be based on a part of the epic tradition known to Homer according to which the hero did in fact travel to the oracle.

⁷⁴⁷ Accounting for everything in Homer probably mattered more to the Cyclic poets than following the larger tradition, but in this case Homer himself appears to have incorporated an older story. Tsagalis 2015: 389 says that in the *Telegony* "the older story of the 'Sailor and the Oar' was replaced by Odysseus' marriage with Callidice," but perhaps this "older story" was never actualized in any epic concerning Odysseus' later life (for its possible enactment in tragedy, however, see *infra* on S. F 453 and 454) and only existed as a goal pursued by Odysseus after an injunction once uttered by Tiresias, while in the event a very different sort of encounter—a love affair with a foreign princess—was always said to have interrupted, and Poseidon was therefore never appeased. Cf. *infra* on the distinction between the anticipated nature of Odysseus' death and his actual death. For Tsagalis' detailed arguments against the inclusion of the "Sailor and the Oar" motif in the *Telegony* see id. 2008a: 75-90.

In light of Parthenius' "oracle" (most likely a reference to Tiresias' prophecy), and since Epirus and Thesprotis could designate roughly the same region, a basic harmony exists between his story and what happened in the *Telegony*. We can therefore more or less confidently use our oblique witnesses to reconstruct the poetic history of this part of the saga: Eugeamon told of Odysseus' fertile affair⁷⁴⁸ with Callidice in Thesprotia and other exploits there, some of which the poet of the *Odyssey* already may have had in mind while composing Tiresias' prophecy; Sophocles then appropriated the story, apparently using the toponym Epirus (unless it is Parthenius in his summary who introduces this as a paraphrase of "Thesprotia") and substituting the names Euipe and Euryalus for Callidice and Polypoetes, respectively; he borrowed liberally from the Epic Cycle's account of this late affair that produced another bastard son for Odysseus, but he relegated what he borrowed to the background of his *Euryalus* (Kuiper supposes it was related in the play's prologue)⁷⁴⁹ and probably elided entirely Odysseus' long virtual regency in Thesprotia (which is not very compatible with the idea that father and son were unable later to recognize each other) while inventing a tragic sequel to the affair centering on the grown-up son. This last innovation actually had a precedent in the very same epic text Sophocles had been perusing, and in effect he has reduplicated the Telegonus episode—bastard son comes to Ithaca in search of his father—while engineering the opposite outcome (i.e., he makes Odysseus the survivor so as not to destroy the tradition about the hero's death). In some sense the *Telemachy* (*Od.* 2-4) follows a similar paradigm.

⁷⁴⁸ It is difficult to know whether Proclus' term *γαμει* is euphemistic for fornication here again (cf. *supra* 110 n. 357). On the one hand the gods should have vetoed Odysseus' bigamy, but the rest of Proclus' description—the fact that Odysseus stuck around and that Callidice retained her royal status after the child's birth—suggests a legitimate marriage.

⁷⁴⁹ Kuiper 1902: 145.

Penelope's jealousy is an interesting motif explored in Sophocles' play, perhaps in a way that was designed to correct the *Odyssey's* imbalance in fidelity and suspicion between Odysseus and his wife. For it is Penelope who after detecting the arrival of Eurypylus, , induces Odysseus to murder . Thus Odysseus suffers (for the first but not the last time) because of his philandering (Parthenius says *διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐγκρατῆς φῶναι*), and Penelope outwits him (in a similar but less elegant way—because there is no good explanation for the failure of his wits—Odysseus' fathering of Telegonus leads to his own death). Although Parthenius' account ends by connecting Odysseus' murder of Euryalus with his own murder by Telegonus (both events being punishments for his lust), Wilamowitz detaches the latter story from Sophocles' play.⁷⁵⁰ Odysseus did not divorce or cast out Penelope in the *Telegony*, for she is around after his death to marry his bastard son Telegonus. The story that Odysseus accused her of infidelity, causing her to wander to Mantinea and die, must be a later development.⁷⁵¹ Probably Odysseus' long stay and in Thesprotia despite having a wife back home in Ithaca was explained as necessitated by forces beyond the hero's control, just as his years with Calypso were spent against his will.

Maass and Hartmann argued that Parthenius' story is based on a play by an author later than Sophocles.⁷⁵² Compare Eust. *Od.* 1796, 50, citing Lysimachus (*FGrH* 382 F 15) for Odysseus' son by Euipe, though he is alternatively called Leontophron or Doryclus. Eustathius then refers to Sophocles' story (perhaps depending entirely on Parthenius' account of it) but says that Telemachus killed Euryalus. This is Eustathius' mistake according to Vürtheim, but Maass argues that Eustathius, having seen Sophocles'

⁷⁵⁰ Wilamowitz 1884: 190f.

⁷⁵¹ Paus. 8.12.6, *Epit.* 7.38; on the son P(t)oliporthes/os see *Epit.* 7.35, Paus. loc. cit., Dictys 6.6.

⁷⁵² Maass, *Ind. scholarum Greifswald* 1894: xi; Hartmann 1917: 182ff.

play independently, correctly describes its ending whereas the scholiast who writes *ἱστορεῖ Σοφοκλήης Εὐρύαλω* above meant only to indicate the similarity of Sophocles' play to Parthenius' version of the story. Kuiper for his part believes the phrase *ὄν ἀπέκτεινε Τηλέμαχος* belongs to Eustathius' summary of Lysimachus' story, with the reference to Sophocles being parenthetical. At least Eustathius' testimony increases our confidence that Sophocles did in fact write a poem about this son of Odysseus. Note that Calderini wanted to read *Εὐρυπόλω* for *Εὐμήλω* in the attributions of F 204, 205. Could *Εὐρύαλω* be another possibility?

For the trope of advancing to a land so distant its people are ignorant of some fundamental aspect of Greek civilization, cf. Duris 3. J.: “μέχρι τίνος φεύζη, Ἀρκαδίων;” καὶ ὅς, “ἔς τ' ἂν τοὺς ἀφίκωμαι οἱ οὐκ ἴσασι Φίλιππον.” Was Tiresias, even as he gave Odysseus instructions to honor Poseidon by bringing his worship (i.e., knowledge of the sea and seafaring, symbolized by an oar) to a desert climate, at the same time alluding to Odysseus' siring of Euryalus in Epirus? One could infer a phallic connotation in the prophecy about Odysseus' oar and thus see in it a latent allusion to Odysseus' sexual liaison with the Thesprotian princess and his fathering of a son by her (more on this below). Compare the wineskin prophecy delivered to Aegeus and predicting the conception of Theseus (another prophecy—like that of the black sails—that was misunderstood by the serially inept Aegeus).⁷⁵³ But it would be a violation of the benign disposition characteristic of prophets for Tiresias to go beyond predicting and actually to command Odysseus to perform an act that will end in calamity? Yet the order to implant his oar in the ground is safe so long as it is followed literally (conversely, Aegeus fails to

⁷⁵³ See Mastronarde 2002: 286 on E. *Med.* 679. For another sexually charged oracle delivered via an asexual metaphor, cf. Hdt. 5.92 (but there Melissa is speaking in code to Periander through his agents).

grasp a warning conveyed metaphorically)—and so long as Odysseus departs immediately. Is it possible that Odysseus went all the way to Thesprotia but upon his arrival there, perhaps getting caught off guard by some distraction such as a beautiful princess, forgot what his mission was? For the proverbial difficulty of comprehending (Pythian) oracles, cf. *A. Ag.* 1255.

4.3. The Death of Odysseus

κάν τούτω Τηλέγονος, ἐπὶ ζήτησιν τοῦ πατρὸς πλέων, ἀποβάς εἰς τὴν Ἰθάκην τέμνει τὴν νῆσον· ἐκβοηθήσας δὲ Ὀδυσσεὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ παιδὸς ἀναιρεῖται κατ' ἄγνοιαν.
(*Arg.* 3 W.)

And at this point Telegonus, after sailing in search of his father, disembarks at Ithaca and lays waste the island; and Odysseus, when he goes out to help, is killed by his son on account of [their mutual] ignorance.

Tiresias' prophecy to Odysseus from the Underworld (*Od.* 11.100-37) must have informed Eugammon's approach to writing about the rest of Odysseus' life after his return to Ithaca. At the very least, Eugammon had to contend with what was said there when constructing the *Telegony* from the several legends about Odysseus' later life. Tragic poets, in turn, could not have mined the *Telegony* for points of interest without remembering the famous Homeric *Nekyia*. It was Aeschylus who first elected to dramatize this episode (*Odyssey* Book 11) as one of the plays in his Odyssean trilogy.⁷⁵⁴ Whether he read the *Telegony* as well (as Sophocles did) before producing that

⁷⁵⁴ As mentioned *supra*, p. 30, Aeschylus evidently had more than a passing interest in necromancy, as the scene in *Persae* featuring Darius' ghost helps demonstrate (cf. Clytemnestra's ghost in *Eum.*). Just as in that scene a future disaster is foretold (the Persian defeat at Plataea, vv. 805-20), I shall argue that Odysseus' agonizing death is conveyed in Tiresias' prophecy to him in *Od.* 11, though in a much subtler way. Kraias 2008: 27-40, following Rose 1950: 270, compares Aeschylus' Darius with Homer's Tiresias. But the latter does more than serve as an archetype in the works of Aeschylus, whose *Psychagōgoi* replicates *per se* the prophet's consultation with Odysseus.

composition is a matter to be discussed presently (that he would have had access to it is assumed for the sake of argument).⁷⁵⁵

Does the fact that Sophocles in his *Odysseus Acanthoplēx* essentially quotes Tiresias' prophecy in *Od.* 11 imply that he did not consult the *Telegony* itself? What if Eugammon, the author of the *Telegony*, likewise used language similar to Homer? In the case of Aeschylus' *Psychagōgoi* it is clear that the vivid details preserved in F 275, if they are not all simply made up, derive from elsewhere than *Od.* 11:

ἔρωδιός γὰρ ὑψόθεν ποτώμενος
ὄνθῳ σε πλῆξει νηδύος χαλώμασιν·
ἐκ τοῦδ' ἄκανθα ποντίου βοσκήματος
σήψει παλαιὸν δέρμα καὶ τριχορρυές.

For a flying heron will strike you with dung from above by the loosening of its bowels; out of this this the barb of a creature reared in the sea will cause your aged and hairless skin to rot.

Aeschylus was obviously not content to rely on Tiresias' oblique foreshadowing of Odysseus' death, and accordingly it is very likely that both playwrights made use of the *Telegony*.

The appearance of πλῆξει in A. F 275.2 may be connected somehow to the second element of the compound ἀκανθοπλήξ used in Sophocles' title.⁷⁵⁶ Perhaps Sophocles borrowed the word from Aeschylus in order to recall and legitimate Tiresias' prophecy in *Psychagōgoi*, but it is more likely that "strike" was already a key word, heavily laden semantically, in the *Telegony*. It is therefore not Sophocles but rather Aeschylus, taking

⁷⁵⁵ Eusebius' *Chronicle* records Eugammon's *floruit* in the second year of the fifty-third Olympiad = 567/6 B.C., a date given much credence by West 39 and 289. There is no reason to suppose that the *Telegony* circulated in Athens even in the earliest phase of Aeschylus' career.

⁷⁵⁶ But the title may not go back to Sophocles himself. Sommerstein (*SFP* 2012) contends that Aeschylus, for example, is more likely to have concerned himself with naming whole trilogies, not individual plays.

his cue from epic, who plays with the term, pushing it beyond its default or more ordinary usage.

In the same way that *γλουτός* (anatomically correct and not vulgar, unlike *πυγή*, as Sommerstein notes) is used in *Shepherds* (S. F 501) without debasing the whole play to the tonal level of satyr-play or comedy, the myth in A. F 275 is scatological without being obscene. (In a similar way, *Ostologoi* contained a reference to Odysseus' being struck with a chamber-pot, which could have been funny had it not occurred in the midst of some deadly serious recriminations.) But the retention of tragic seriousness is best achieved when we regard the reference to heron excrement as a cipher for a very real and very tragic death. The prospective nature of Odysseus' exchange with Tiresias may well have been continued in an interview with Anticleia, if indeed Aeschylus followed Homer (*Od.* 11.152-224) in depicting such a scene. Odysseus' deceased mother was primarily equipped to inform him what he could expect upon returning to Ithaca, and given that the rest of the trilogy revolved around the hero's conflict with the suitors and their relatives, Aeschylus may have spent a great deal of time in *Psychagōgoi* vilifying them (through Tiresias) while praising Penelope's endurance (through Anticlea).⁷⁵⁷

It seems Heath deserves the credit for first seeing *ὄνθω σε πλήξει* in the manuscript reading *ὄν θ' ὡς ἐπλήξεν*, after Meursius worked out *νηδύος κοιλώμασιν* from *-ν, ἢ δ' υἱὸς χειλώμασιν*.⁷⁵⁸ Heath also changes *χειλώμασιν* to *γε λῶμασιν* (for *λῶμα* in the

⁷⁵⁷ Just as in *Od.* 11. Cf. Sommerstein 2012a: 250. By choosing the *Nekyia* as the first episode for his *Odyssey* trilogy, Aeschylus ensured that the whole composition could have the cohesiveness of his *Iliad* trilogy, which likewise centered on a single well-defined conflict.

⁷⁵⁸ Heath 1762: 162. Given that the fragment really *does* refer to a *υἱός* (Telegonus, namely), it is remarkable that the process of textual corruption unwittingly deciphered the riddling prophecy, bequeathing us a red herring (or heron, as it were).

sense of “dung” cf. Call. fr. 216), which can be taken in apposition to ὄνθω. Again, the diction is striking but not necessarily disqualifying from tragedy.

As Homer tells it, Tiresias’ prophecy to Odysseus in the Underworld concludes with some ostensibly good news about how the hero will meet his end:

θάνατος δέ τοι ἐξ ἀλός αὐτῷ
ἀβληχρὸς μάλα τοῖος ἐλεύσεται, ὅς κέ σε πέφνη
γῆρα ὑπο λιπαρῷ ἀρημένον· ἀμφὶ δὲ λαοὶ
ὄλβιοι ἔσσονται....

135

And death will come to you yourself from the sea, [a death] so very mild, which will slay you after you have been worn out by sleek old age; and the people around you will be prosperous....

West argues that the poet of the *Odyssey* included Tiresias’ prediction of Odysseus’ death “from the sea” without fully understanding that it alludes to a very old folktale about the hero’s death by heron excrement, which is the story Aeschylus tells.⁷⁵⁹ Aristarchus tendentiously glosses the key phrase ἐξ ἀλός as meaning “far away from the sea.”⁷⁶⁰ Rightly rejecting this, West also believes Eugammon is the one who bowdlerized the story, preserving the significant element of the fatal stingray barb but affixing it instead to a hostile spear so that Odysseus could die a nobler, if more tragic, death; this desired alteration could even have been the impetus for the invention of the character Telegonus (along with the influence of an archetypal Indo-European story in which a son mistakenly kills his father and perhaps some sense that the wily Odysseus could only be killed by one of his offspring). But it is also possible that the cleaner, more heroic version of Odysseus’ death was already established by the time the *Odyssey* poet recorded Tiresias’ prophecy, and “from the sea” could have alluded to a death in combat against

⁷⁵⁹ West 307ff.

⁷⁶⁰ sch. *Il.* 11.163a, *Od.* 11.134.

Telegonus when it appeared in the *Odyssey* poet's source.⁷⁶¹ It would have been rather easy for the poet of the *Odyssey* to ignore the existence of Telegonus in the mythological tradition, just as the poet of the *Iliad* deliberately left Memnon out of his story. The fact that the poet of the *Odyssey* does not explicitly mention Circe being impregnated by Odysseus does not mean that he had never heard of such an event.⁷⁶² On the contrary, he was perfectly capable of alluding to the existence of Telegonus in an oblique manner, and indeed Tiresias' prophecy becomes much more compelling if it can be read with dramatic irony as issuing Odysseus an all too subtle warning about the future approach of a seafaring stranger wielding an odd-looking weapon. In any case, Sophocles ignored Aeschylus' folksy story and recounted Odysseus' death in line with Eugammon's account.

The phrase ἐξ ἁλός possibly meaning something other than “from the sea,” consider not only “away from the sea” (to which cf. *Il.* 14.130, *Od.* 19.7, Hdt. 3.83, 5.24, S. *O.C.* 113—but it seems that in Homer ἀπό is used to mean “(far) away from” (e.g., *Il.* 19.329), whereas such a meaning for ἐκ is dubious) but also “after (the troubles) of the sea.” Compare *Il.* 5.865, 16.365 (with ἔρχεται); Pi. *Isth.* 7(6).38; Thuc. 1.120; and S. *Phil.* 271 (ἐκ...σάλου, which would almost justify advancing a novel etymology for the adjective ἔξαλος propounded by Herodian, if only Homer used σάλος or σαλεύω).

If ἐξ ἁλός does refer to the patricide Telegonus, West is right to point out that ἀβληχρός cannot mean “gentle,” as it usually does (*Il.* 5.337, e.g., used of Aphrodite's tender hand; but the prefixed form is admittedly a rare word). Robert and Dornseiff offer

⁷⁶¹ Pace Hartmann 1917: 91, whom West follows.

⁷⁶² West 308 with n. 30.

rather feeble explanations.⁷⁶³ Could *ἀβληχρός* mean “ungentle” (*alpha* privative instead of euphonic) or “easy” in respect to the action of death (cf. *ἀγανός* as applied to Apollo’s arrows), or could it carry both meanings so as to present Odysseus with an ominous ambivalence? It is a stretch, but maybe that is the point. Admonitions about the future are rarely straightforward. But then the unmistakably reassuring tone of the overall speech, or at least this passage, would be undermined. Still, the phrase *ἐξ ἀλόος* already by itself ought to be jarring and ominous for Odysseus, who has endured so much on the sea, and the poet may very well be trying to imbue the speech with dramatic irony and to have Odysseus for once fail to understand an encrypted message—just when it is his own life that is at stake. Alternatively, “from the sea” was borrowed from a context in which the ugly prophecy was stated more clearly, but the poet of the *Odyssey* out of confusion or forgetfulness added the incongruous *ἀβληχρός*. Maybe the story of Telegonus’ spear came first, and a scurrilous adaptation transferred the stingray barb from the spear to the excrement of a seabird. But why would Aeschylus choose the latter version? As West points out, F 275 from *Psychagōgoi* also places the story of Odysseus’ death in the prophetic mouth of Tiresias, i.e., during the *nekyomanteia* performed by the hero, so the two versions have more than the stingray barb in common. West also seems to err by privileging *ἀβληχρός* over *ἐξ ἀλόος* when he suggests that if the *Odyssey* were alluding to Telegonus’ spear it could have done so without suggesting that the spear tip was made from a stingray barb, since a normal spear “would still have come from the sea if Telegonus brought it” and a normal spear wound might be gentler than one inflicted with such a fearsome implement.⁷⁶⁴ But the *Odyssey* poet had no choice as to the nature of the

⁷⁶³ See West 308.

⁷⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

spear if he was simply reflecting a story previously formulated, which hinges on ἐξ ἁλός as a reference not only to the direction of Telegonus' approach (and when one lives on an island, it is difficult to receive visitors from anywhere *but* the sea) but also to the origin of his weapon. For the centrality of a weapon within a riddle, compare the story of Telephus' healing (above, §2.10); indeed both Achilles' spearhead and Telegonus' spearhead play very specialized and fabulous roles, but the one is salubrious and the other noxious, which suggests that they both descend from a single mythological paradigm that was very simplified in its typology. By contrast, there is no surviving precedent or comparandum within Greek myth for bird excrement concealing a deadly blade extracted from nature, and it is futile to argue that such a story belonged naturally to a lower stratum of storytelling (*sc.* folkloric rather than literary). Hence between the two stories involving a stingray barb, the heron shit story must be deemed more likely derivative.

But another possibility altogether is that the story of Telegonus' spear and the story of the heron excrement are not two distinct stories but one and the same. Aeschylus does not narrate the event in question, which indeed may never have been narrated as actually occurring.⁷⁶⁵ Rather, he makes Tiresias prophesy about Odysseus' impending doom, and as stated above Greek prophecies were usually delivered in riddling terms,⁷⁶⁶ and even a gifted seer like Tiresias did not have perfect vision but sometimes foretold events impressionistically. So a literal interpretation of the Aeschylean fragment is for the birds, as it were. We should rather consider how it might encode the story of Odysseus'

⁷⁶⁵ The literal occurrence of such a fanciful event would push *Psychagōgoi* into the realm of satyr-drama, but the fragments overall are not representative of that genre, whereas it is very likely that as a tragedy *Psychagōgoi* formed part of a tetralogy whose satyr play was *Circe* (cf. A. Wessels and R. Krumeich in *id.*–Pechstein–Seidensticker 1999: 208f. and Grossardt 2003: 156 n. 8). Welcker 1824: 460 (cf. Crusius 1882: 310) supposes that Aeschylus wrote his own *Odysseus Akanthoplēx* in which the prophecy is fulfilled literally, but this is without justification.

⁷⁶⁶ Moreover, a riddle (denoted by the verb *αἰνίσσασθαι* and its cognates) often predicts the downfall of the one who receives it: *Hdt.* 5.56.1, *S. OT* 439, etc.

death by Telegonus' barbed spear. What do we know of the heron? We know that by itself its appearance could be taken as a propitious omen, for thus Athena encourages Odysseus and Diomedes in the *Doloneia*.⁷⁶⁷ This makes the heron a fitting choice if the point of the prophecy is to lure Odysseus into a false sense of security, but it does not explain why the excrement of said bird insinuates itself. Was it associated with the island Aiaia (which would make it a geographically fitting substitute for Circe's son)? Was it thought to feast on rays (apparently some herons do like to eat crustaceans and can feed on large prey)? Do they kill their parents? Or was the heron viewed as appropriate to the allegory because it has a long, tapered, harpoon-like beak (maybe the spear that Telegonus wielded had a regular spear point at one end and the stingray barb at the other)? Empirical evidence is lacking for all of these hypotheses.

But there is this possibility: The danger posed by the defecating heron may be an analogy for the danger posed by a startled Telegonus. For the heron is notorious, at least in more modern times, for its behavior when startled: it defecates, whence its English byname "shitepoke";⁷⁶⁸ compare the image of the cuttlefish spraying ink, e.g., at Ar. *Ach.* 351. Such skittish behavior, certainly not confined to one species of bird or animal, may nevertheless have been observed as particularly characteristic of the heron (specifically, the common heron thought to be designated by the Greek *έρφιδίος*). Tiresias may thus be

⁷⁶⁷ *Il.* 10.274. West 2011: 234f. deems it more likely that the *Doloneia* influenced the *Odyssey* than vice versa. But given the allusiveness of Tiresias' prophecy, the heron's role in it must have been older than the *Odyssey* as well, so it is unlikely to represent an instance of direct borrowing from *Iliad* 10.

⁷⁶⁸ Ashcom 1953: 253: "SHITEPOTE, *n.* A variant of *shitepoke*, the heron known as a 'fly-up-the-creek' (*Butorides virescens*). *Shite* is a (now euphemistic) variant of the vulgar word for excrement, *poke* is a bag, and, as [Mathews 1951] says, the application of the composite to the heron derives 'from the bird's action when flushed.' In our form there is clearly an extension of euphemistic treatment to the element." On the green-backed heron (*Butorides striatus* but possibly conspecific with the *virescens* species) see Hancock-Kushlan 1984: 172-8; the bird is not found in Europe today, but of course other herons and bitterns are. Cf. entries in *OED* and Merriam-Webster. Consult with ornithologist about whether herons have been documented as eating stingrays and about their legendary defecation.

warning Odysseus that in a certain future encounter the stranger at whom he charges unexpectedly will react with fear but also mortal violence (the bit of dialogue that West imagines for Sophocles' play happens to emphasize Telegonus' sudden panic as essential to what transpires: "When you came rushing at me, I was forced to defend myself"). Involuntary defecation caused by alarm ("shitting bricks," in contemporary parlance) is normally a subject for comedy, but here the consequence is dire enough to warrant its appearance in a tragedy of august Aeschylus.⁷⁶⁹ Also consider the somewhat parallel animal analogies in Homer, such as when a trapped warrior is described as a lion surrounded by hunters. It is also interesting to note that stingrays (see on *Dasyatis pastinaca*) only use their stingers in self-defense, although it may have been difficult for ancient Greeks to know this. The question does remain why Tiresias did not simply make a stingray the featured animal of his allegory. Would this have been too obvious? Did Odysseus have Telegonus identify his unusual weapon before engaging him in combat? Note that the preserved lines in which someone (undoubtedly Odysseus) inquires about an object borne on another's shoulders is probably from a messenger's speech reporting the encounter and quoting the men involved (Odysseus himself would then stumble into the scene).

Aristotle (*HA* 609b21) delineates three types of heron (*έρωδιός*). He focuses on the pain experienced by the grey heron in mating and giving birth, and Pliny the Elder follows this account. There is no mention of involuntary defecation, nor does it appear that other ancient descriptions record the observation of such behavior. But herons are notoriously timorous, and it has been remarked that

⁷⁶⁹ The possibility that the play in question was a satyr-drama cannot be completely discounted, but on the issue of genre cf. *infra*.

[t]hey are sociable and peaceable yet ludicrously timid and when harassed by blackbirds and small hawks or even frightened by gun fire or earthquakes they freely utter loud, guttural squawks indicative of the highest expressions of cowardice and fear imaginable, laughable in the extreme.⁷⁷⁰

Certain species, particularly the Great Blue Heron and Great Egrets, have been observed methodically leaving the waters where they feed in order to defecate. This may be an evolutionary adaptation, for some amino acids in their feces contain an “alarm substance” that can scare off freshwater fish.⁷⁷¹ It may also have contributed historically to a proverbial association according to which they are thought to target human heads with their excrement—even if the perception that this is due to their own skittishness and linked to their being flushed is wrong—since they are so often observed approaching land to defecate.

Even if the Greeks were unfamiliar with the heron’s defecation habits, another more familiar aspect of its behavior could have inspired the image of the bird dropping a lethal instrument upon Odysseus’ head.⁷⁷² Certain species of seabirds can regularly be seen rushing at others so as to force them to drop the prey from their beaks,⁷⁷³ and Aristophanes in fact evokes such harassment by naming the heron together with a bird called *έλασᾶ* (*Av.* 886), which name in all likelihood designates the penchant of this

⁷⁷⁰ Cohen 1900: 11.

⁷⁷¹ Lawrence Slavitter *per litteras*; cf. Slavitter 1991.

⁷⁷² At *Ar. Av.* 1142 a messenger reports that *ερωδιοί* performed the service of carrying mud. Dunbar 1995: 600 suggests—how seriously is difficult to tell—that the following exchange may reveal contemporary familiarity with the heron extending at least to a basic knowledge of its anatomy. Cf. *ibid.* 2: “Aristophanes clearly had a wide knowledge of birds and relied on some knowledge in his audience. Part of this knowledge undoubtedly came from regularly *eating* wild birds; a very wide variety of species were *caught* and sold for food, as we see from e.g. *Ach.* 875-6, 1007, *Av.* 1079-82” (second emphasis mine).

⁷⁷³ On this and other forms of “kleptoparasitism” in roseate terms, see Shealer et al. 2005.

otherwise unattested species for driving at rivals along shore lines.⁷⁷⁴ From observation of such droppings the myth concerning Odysseus' death could have evolved. Onlookers from afar have historically misidentified the food disgorged by harried water birds as excrement, and such confusion actually gave rise to at least one striking misnomer: the skuas family of seabirds bears the scientific name *Stercorariidae*.⁷⁷⁵

This interpretation of the passage depends on our acceptance of the paradosis *έρωδιῶ*, *pace* Dunbar *ad Ar. Av.* 886,⁷⁷⁶ who all but ignores the possibility that a textual corruption in the scholiast produced the variant bird-name without affecting the text of the play itself. Although the scholia (*ad* 884) do contain a statement that *εἰδώλιος* has been used in place of *ἐδώλιος*, there is no good reason to suppose that the transmitted text of Aristophanes is in error rather in the scholium. Bentley supposed that the scholiast read *έρωδιῶ* in the text of Aristophanes but genuinely found *εἰδώλιος* in Callimachus and regarded it as an alternative form of *έρωδιός*, but it would not make sense to state that a more common variant is used “in place of” (*ἀντί*) a less common one. One should at any rate focus on the initial syllables of the two forms cited: this is sole place where the two transmitted forms disagree, and a scribe, lazily ignoring the original main text, may have made the same mistakes (change of *ρ* to *δ* and of *δ* to *λ*) in copying both variants of a word that was unfamiliar to him and written in a difficult hand. So we may emend the

⁷⁷⁴ *Pace* Dunbar 1995: 514 *ad Ar. Av.* 882-8, although it is clear that this list of “hero-birds” is determined largely by phonetic considerations (*πελεκᾶντι καὶ πελεκίνῳ* at 882f. providing the best jingle), there is also a clear preference for birds of aquatic habitats: the heron is listed amongst other water fowl (in the broadest sense) including not only the “pelicans” mentioned above but also the *πορφυρίων* (purple gallinule or “swamp hen,” cf. Dunbar 1995: 253 *ad Ar. Av.* 304, on the identical *πορφυρίς*), the *βασκάς* (a duck of some kind), and the *καταρράκτης* (probably a tern, cf. *ibid.* 516 *ad Ar. Av.* 887). Even though the *Stercorarius* species suggested by Rogers is too rare in Greece to be a candidate for the identity of the bird Aristophanes calls *έλασῶ* (*ibid.* 515 *ad Ar. Av.* 886), still it could easily refer to another seabird that gives chase to rival hunters; at any rate its etymological relationship to the verb *έλαύνειν* seems almost certain.

⁷⁷⁵ Jobling 2010: 365.

⁷⁷⁶ Dunbar 1995: 515f., with which Sommerstein agrees.

text in a balanced fashion as *καὶ ἀντὶ ἐρωδίου εἰρώδιος* (the accentuation remains a problem, but the lack of iota (subscript) is attested elsewhere⁷⁷⁷). All this is to say that the form *ἐδώλιος* never existed anywhere in any form (the glosses in Hesychius and Photius no doubt do nothing but reproduce this error in the scholia). Aristophanes describes a characteristic of the *ἐρωδιός*.

Let us return to Tiresias' prophecy liberated from the notion that it was intended to represent the future literally. The practice of couching a prophecy about one's death in vague or misleading terms finds parallels in many other stories, e.g., the unhelpful warning that Amphitryon gave his son (S. *Trach.* 1141-73). What is the point of such prevarication? Besides the fact that too much information would paradoxically equip an Odysseus or a Heracles with the ability to evade his fate and thus cancel out the mythological tradition, the recurrence of shady prophecies in Greek myth dramatizes the ineluctable fact of the human condition that while some events may be anticipated, absolute knowledge of the future is impossible, whether for the one whose fate is at stake or for the one who is giving this person counsel.

West is right to argue that the conceit of a stingray barb causing Odysseus' demise probably depends on the hero having widespread immunity to injury such that only the barb could do him in. This supposition, in turn, makes it more difficult to grant priority to the story of Telegonus' spear, for why would Circe specifically give her son the one thing that could harm his father? Or on the contrary did she, a witch possessed of many remedies and ingenious weapons, give Telegonus the stingray barb simply because she knew it could kill any adversary, yet never intending for it to be used against Odysseus? West apparently sees the Aeschylean fragment as the solution to a riddle, but

⁷⁷⁷ LSJ s.v.

it is better to regard it as the riddle itself in need of a solution. To put it in the terms literary criticism applies to metaphors, it is the subjective vehicle, not the objective tenor.

If I follow West's argument,⁷⁷⁸ he believes *ἀβληχρός* refers to the weakening of the barb through digestion in the heron's stomach. This seems as far-fetched as any proposal. Even if the barb was so weakened, the same can hardly be said of the death; such hypallage would be perverse. West's reading of *γήραι ὑπο λιπαρῶ ἀρημένον*, on the other hand, is instructive: just as Tiresias says, Odysseus' old age "will be a contributory factor" in his death. So again, a phrase that seems pleasant and welcome at first glance conceals a darker meaning.

West suspects that *λιπαρός* refers to a bald pate (rather redundant as a descriptor of old age). Perhaps Tiresias is misleading Odysseus into thinking his old age will be "fat, rich, prosperous" (just as most scholars translate the adjective here) when in fact it will be bleak; or else he is just consoling Odysseus, who at least will die having led a long life. Compare the phrase "ripe time of life" (*ώραίῳ...βίῳ*) at *S. Ph.* 968, where the context also has to do with being ready and due to die.

Why is Pacuvius' play⁷⁷⁹ called *Niptra* (a title also attested for Sophocles (F 421) and thought to be another name for his *Odysseus Akanthoplēx*) when it has to do with the mortal wounding of Odysseus by Telegonus? Let us give Cicero the benefit of the doubt and assume he has remembered all of his sources correctly. Perhaps the playwright fashioned a scene modeled on Eurycleia's recognition of her master, this time with Telegonus as the bather. The plot would go something like this: Telegonus arrives and is

⁷⁷⁸ West 310.

⁷⁷⁹ Caston 2015 carefully examines Cicero's preference (*Tusc. Disp.* 2.21.48f.) for Pacuvius' more sober and philosophical (read: Roman) depiction of tragic grief as opposed to Sophocles' emotive and effeminate heroes. Despite Cicero's patriotic moralizing agenda, his accounts of the plays in question should be regarded as essentially trustworthy.

misidentified as a brigand; Odysseus as King of Ithaca ventures forth to fight him and is wounded, but before any conclusion someone reveals that Telegonus has come on a peaceful mission, but Odysseus' identity is not yet revealed. Telegonus then says the king must be washed as his wound is infected with poison (note that the language of fr. 199.8-12 Schierl could indicate a present attempt by multiple individuals to wash Odysseus); Odysseus' demand to be stripped (cf. *nudate*) is important because it sets up the climactic revelation scene, as Telegonus, having been informed by Circe (who herself was thoroughly acquainted with Odysseus' body) about the appearance of his father, observes the same telltale scar that Eurycleia had. Tragic *anagnōrīsis* ensues as Odysseus cannot be saved and dies, but not before reciting the prophecy that he only now grasps. Finally, Athena intervenes and rearranges the surviving members of Odysseus' family. Perhaps Sophocles had already invented the basic outline of this plot (or even Eugammon before him?). In any case the recognition scene between Odysseus and his bastard son had to be effected *somehow* within the course of a play about their encounter.⁷⁸⁰ Their mutual bewilderment had to be dispelled. If Athena did appear at the end of Sophocles' drama, she may have explained not only Telegonus' filial relationship to Odysseus but also how his appearance fulfilled Tiresias' prediction ἐξ ἀλόζ.⁷⁸¹ To return to the matter of titles, Sophocles' "*Niptra*" must be equivalent to his *Odysseus Akanthoplēx* because the *Niptra* of Pacuvius was clearly based on a play of Sophocles (as Cicero's testimony shows) and it depicted a wounded (*saucius*) Odysseus on the edge of death.⁷⁸²

⁷⁸⁰ Contrast the rather bland reconstruction of West 304.

⁷⁸¹ So Ribbeck 1875: 278; *contra* Wilamowitz 1884: 195, who denies that Athena appeared at all.

⁷⁸² Cf. Pearson 1917: ii.105-10, but note that there are many dissenters, references to which are collected by Sommerstein 2015: 462 n. 6 (Lucas de Dios 1983: 229-31; Radt, *TrGF* iv.373; Schierl 2006: 392-4; Jouanna 2007: 650; add Séchan 1926 to this list).

Although the title *Niptra* by convention has always referred to *Odyssey* Book 6, the pampering that Odysseus received from Nausicaa's maidservants is by no means the only that he received. Indeed, bath-scenes are a type-scene in the *Odyssey*, and Odysseus stars in several such scenes. Besides the eventful bathing scene with Eurycleia, he also receives a bath from Circe's maids.⁷⁸³ It would therefore not be absurd for a poet to invent yet another bathing scene as the occasion for a recognition of (and by) Odysseus.

Some of the expressions of excruciating agony uttered by Odysseus in Sophocles' original could have had parallels in *Philoctetes*, whose titular character was likewise grieving over a (less fatal but equally painful) wound. This similarity entails a certain irony, of course, in that Odysseus had been quite unmoved by Philoctetes' cries and now found himself in the position of anguished victim. Sophocles' *Trachiniae* as well is notable for its jarring depiction of a man in staggering pain.⁷⁸⁴ An aggravated character wanting to strip off one's clothes to alleviate a paroxysm of (physical or mental) pain seems to be a recurring motif (with special relevance at *E. Med.* 1191ff.; cf. *id. Hipp.* 201f., where Phaedra's uncomfortable headdress becomes the outward manifestation of her emotional distress). In addition, one will recall that Plutarch praised Sophocles for portraying Eurypylos and Neoptolemus (or just Neoptolemus?) as heroes who knew to bite their tongues, although the loser groans much in the aftermath of their clash. Physical pain might be thought a better excuse for crying out than anger, but Cicero is even more fixated on the virtue of silence and is quick to chastise Sophocles' Odysseus for his

⁷⁸³ Another fateful bath not involving Odysseus is that which Clytemnestra gives to Agamemnon (*A. Ag.* 1107ff.), which does not produce an *anagnōrīsis* (except maybe in the sense that the bath is "revealing" of Clytemnestra's true feelings toward her husband) but rather a murder; Agamemnon's nakedness renders him vulnerable more than it reveals his identity.

⁷⁸⁴ Cf. Séchan 1926: 176. *Trachiniae* also involves a hero's son (Hyllus) marrying his stepmother, which resonates with the crisscrossing marriages following Odysseus' death.

voluble suffering. Was Cicero's literary appraisal influenced by the Stoic doctrines that had seeped into Rome? Philosophically, of course, Cicero was more a disciple of the Academics.

The evidence suggests that Odysseus remained on stage for a long time after receiving the fatal blow, although it is unclear whether, as in *Ajax*, the actual moment of death was shown or whether some of the screams were uttered from behind the *skēnē*. Despite Cicero's testimony, the conduct of Sophocles' Odysseus as he took his dying breaths cannot have been wholly undignified and irrational. That there was a formal *anagnōrīsis* arising from an exchange between father and son has already been discussed: Odysseus had this one last opportunity to exercise his *mētīs*, albeit retroactively. The scene would surely also have included, both in the *Telegony* and in *Od. Akanth.*, a speech in which the hero lamented the disgraceful manner of his death but submitted nevertheless to his fate.⁷⁸⁵ He could, for example, express a yearning to have met his end nobly in battle at Troy, as elsewhere both Achilles and Orestes do on Agamemnon's behalf.⁷⁸⁶ Then Telegonus had to mourn his father (*πολλὰ κατοδυράμενος, Epit. 7.37*),

⁷⁸⁵ This speech could have been addressed to Telegonus or another character, or it could have been delivered as a soliloquy along the lines of *Od.* 20.18-21 (*τέτλαθι δῆ, κραδίη κτλ.*), on which passage see Létoublon 2003; cf. the privacy of *S. Aj.* 815-65.

⁷⁸⁶ *Od.* 24.30-4, *A. Cho.* 345-54. See Kraias 2008: 73f. on this epic cliché. Odysseus himself already expresses this unfulfillable wish at *Od.* 5.306-12, when he believes he is about to die at sea. The famously "Homeric" Sophocles (cf. *supra* 13f.) would not have been so fiendish as to disregard such passages and to offer instead a humiliating portrait of an Odysseus made utterly deranged by physical pain and existential fear. On the contrary, Odysseus' cries of anguish, like those of Philoctetes, were meant to convince the audience that the pain he was experiencing was truly profound—which made it all the more impressive that he endured it long enough to speak his mind (*Arist. EN* 7.8, 1150b10 pardons those tragic heroes who try to resist extraordinary symptoms). For especially in drama physical pain is more difficult to convey adequately and naturally through mere description than is emotional trauma, while even descriptions of the latter draw on the language of vocalization (note e.g. *Od.* 20.13, *κραδίη δέ οἱ ἔνδον ὑλάκτει*, a striking example of "internal focalization" followed by a vivid analogy and then the soliloquy mentioned in the preceding note; a different metaphor is preferred by Liv. Andron. *ap. Serv. Verg. Aen.* 1.92, *Ulixi cor frixit prae pavore*). More than anything, *Od. Akanth.* was Odysseus' chance to prove once and for all that he was not *φιλόψυχος* (cf. *E. Hec.* 315); for him to do so was consistent with and worthy of the *πόλυτλας* hero of epic. Sophocles himself comments on the ethics of vocalizing pain at *Aj.* 317-22. Finglass 2011: 233 (*Aj.*

another scene that Sophocles probably adapted from his epic source. It was fitting at this point to bring Penelope (back) on stage to participate in the *kommos*, the penultimate scene before an epiphanic Athena instructed the survivors how finally to proceed.

Two fragments of *Odysseus Akanthoplēx* in particular should be mentioned. Modern scholars have almost unanimously considered Sophocles F 453 and 454 to belong together. In place of an exhaustive list of the many conjectures that have been offered to aid in deciphering the two verses in question, one of the more compelling interpretations should suffice to give an idea of the possibilities. The following version imagines an exchange between two speakers:⁷⁸⁷

A. ποδαπὸν τὸ δῶρον ἀμφὶ φαιδίμοις ἔχων
 ὄμοις; B. ἀθηρόβρωτον ὄργανον φέρω.⁷⁸⁸

A. Holding what sort of gift about your glistening
 shoulders? B. I am bearing a chaff-devouring instrument.

The sense of this is not exactly clear, but one can easily observe that Sophocles evokes Homer’s *Nέκνια* and specifically Tiresias’ prediction about the stranger who will see Odysseus carrying an oar ἀνὰ φαιδίμῳ ὄμῳ and mistake it for an ἀθηρηλοιογόν (“consumer of chaff,” i.e., “winnowing-fan,” *Od.* 11.128). Another configuration of the Sophoclean fragments promotes this bit of intertextuality by having a single speaker ask, “What sort of monstrous chaff-devouring instrument [i.e., winnowing fan] do you bear,

321-2n.) demonstrates that this discussion relates to the pitch, not the volume, of a man’s cries; cf. Schein 2013: 343 (*Phil.* 1455n.) on F 523.2-3 (*Polyxena*), ἄρσενας χοὰς | Ἀχέροντος ὄζυπλήγας ἠχούσας γόους.

⁷⁸⁷ Wagner’s proposal; see *TrGF* iv.375 for others.

⁷⁸⁸ The passage is cited in sch. *CAE* Dion. Thr. 12, which is concerned to explain the qualitative use of ποδαπός. Wagner substitutes φέρω for φέρον, and clearly there is a need for a finite verb when the “standard” text offers only two parallel participles (in fact, the matter is more complicated, as the codices actually contain ἔχων, which Bekker changed to ἔχων). The first line is vexing both because of the lack of an (expressed) finite verb and especially because of the seemingly unsound τὸ δῶρον, which has spawned many ingenious conjectures—with at least one more to come (see below).

holding [it] about your glistening shoulders?”⁷⁸⁹ This is misguided, however, since the meeting described by Tiresias is irrelevant to the story of Odysseus and Telegonus, and so Sophocles had no business including it in his *Odysseus Acanthoplēx*.⁷⁹⁰ On the other hand, what Tiresias predicts shortly thereafter concerning Odysseus’ death—that it will come ἐξ ἀλόος—most certainly does concern the subject of Sophocles’ *Odysseus Acanthoplēx*.⁷⁹¹ In all probability, this is what drew Sophocles to the speech of Tiresias’ ghost in the first place, and upon his perusal the playwright noticed a word that he wished to manipulate, though its original context was slightly at odds with his present composition. With his neologism ἀθηρόβρωτος, Sophocles simultaneously signals a

⁷⁸⁹ ποδαπὸν πέλωρον ἀμφὶ φαιδίμοις ἔχων | ὄμοις ἀθηρόβρωτον ὄργανον φέρεις; This is the reading of M. Schmidt, *ZfA* 14 (1856): 537; cf. again *TrGF* iv.375. Odysseus could be recounting a full version Tiresias’ prophecy to Penelope as he also does in *Od.* 23.267-84 (thus paving the way for his almost immediate from Ithaca according to the Cycle). The occasion for this recollection could in fact be Odysseus’ return to Ithaca from Epirus, or perhaps there was an arbitrary prologue like those characteristic of Euripides’ plays. Sophocles would then be including material not directly relevant to Odysseus’ fateful encounter with Telegonus so as to engage more extensively with epic tradition. Nevertheless, Schmidt’s emendation of the text is not the most compelling.

⁷⁹⁰ But a case could be made for relating this part of Tiresias’ prophecy to Odysseus’ other bastard son Euryalus (known as Polypoetes; their equivalency is argued for *supra*). When Tiresias utters the words “having planted [your] well-fitted oar in the earth” (γαίῃ πήξας ἐνῆρες ἐρετμόν, *Od.* 11.129), he may be playing on the meaning of “penis” that Hesychius (thinking of the Homeric passage? or of Old Comedy?) attests for ἐρετμόν. Thus he might be referring to Odysseus’ future trip to Thesprotia (≈ Epirus), during which he was to meet a princess (Eugammon’s Callidice, Sophocles’ Euipe) and sire a son who would eventually come looking for him (just as Telegonus does). At the same time, there could be an intimation that the oar would later feature as a σῆμα (cf. *Od.* 11.126) that conceals the truth of Odysseus’ relationship with this son. If the boy had (part of) the oar with him as a token when he landed on Ithaca, Odysseus (though not Penelope) obviously overlooked it. Sophocles could be alluding to Eugammon’s story or to his own *Euryalus* if that predated *Od. Ak.* Despite all of this, it must be emphasized that, just as Sophocles did not borrow from the Homeric passage concerning the ξυμβλήμενος ἄλλος ὀδίτης (*Od.* 11.127) on the grounds that it had anything to do with the subject of his play (Telegonus), the fact that the passage might allude to Euryalus, an individual in many ways parallel to Telegonus, was not necessarily on Sophocles’ mind *per se*. But it remains possible that Sophocles recombined several epic elements in an intricate way that cannot now be recovered.

⁷⁹¹ The meaning of ἐξ ἀλόος (*Od.* 11.134) is not, as Eustathius says, “far from the sea” but rather “from the sea.” The story of Telegonus’ murder of Odysseus conforms to this detail by focusing on the weapon used, which incorporates (or simply is) the barb of a stingray. See Merry–Riddell 1886 *ad loc.* Here the commentators suggest, based on what is known of the plot of the *Telegony*, that when Teiresias forecasts Odysseus’ visit to a people ignorant of the sea he is alluding to Odysseus’ liaison with Callidice, who bore him Polypoetes (this would obviously exclude Euipe’s child, Euryalus, from the discussion). It is pointed out, however, that the Thesprotians were not actually landlocked (by contrast, Dodona, the realm of Tyrimmas and his daughter Euipe, was famously remote). The commentary also takes the view that Teiresias’ prophecy is a post-Homeric interpolation into the *Odyssey*.

parallel with Homer's ἀθηρηλοιγός and produces a new compound with new meaning, one that makes sense in light of what we know happened in *Odysseus Acanthoplēx*.

This new word can only have referred to the weapon used by Telegonus. Fortunately we find that the term ἀθήρ, which in Homer's compound clearly meant "chaff, awn,"⁷⁹² was also used in the senses of "barb of a weapon"⁷⁹³ and even "spine or prickle of a fish."⁷⁹⁴ Hence ἀθηρόβρωτος must have a meaning along the lines of "devouring by means of a barb."

Now that the Sophoclean passage has been related to the argument of the play and specifically to a discussion of Telegonus' weapon, the next step is to make δῶρον agree with this. An easy solution recommends itself: alter δῶρον to δόρυ.⁷⁹⁵ So, revisiting the Sophoclean fragments as printed above, one can make the necessary changes and translate as follows:

[Odysseus?]: Having what sort of spear about your glistening shoulders?
[Telegonus]: [It is] an instrument [i.e., weapon] whose barb devours
[that] I bear.

Perhaps these two lines, then, form part of a conversation between Odysseus and Telegonus. This excerpted exchange would of course not have resulted in a recognition of their father-son relationship, even though, as seen already, it might have hinted indirectly at a prophecy that Odysseus had heard long before.

⁷⁹² See sch. *HV Od.* 11.128 for an extended discussion of the word.

⁷⁹³ *LSJ s.v.* cites the following as using the word with this meaning: Aristophanes frag. 154; Hippocrates, *Epidemics* 5.49; and Plutarch, *Cato the Younger* 70.

⁷⁹⁴ This meaning is "probable" in Athenaeus 7.303d (*LSJ s.v.*).

⁷⁹⁵ The resulting impairment of the meter could be reversed in a number of ways. For example, after δόρυ one could place the relative pronoun ὃν (deferring on the new problem of hiatus), and accordingly ἔχων could be changed to ἔχεις. Such "corrections," however, are left out here because the emphasis should be on best approximating Sophocles' original meaning. There is also the excuse of a poorly preserved piece of text, which indeed has prompted changes more extreme than what is proposed here.

As Montiglio points out,⁷⁹⁶ Odysseus in his final encounter at last resembles a tragic figure who can elicit sympathy. Her comparison of Odysseus with Oedipus is well supported by the summary of Proclus,⁷⁹⁷ who presents the story as a case of an inevitable death that occurs because Telegonus acts *κατ' ἄγνοιαν*. Aristotle specifically mentions Sophocles' *Odysseus Traumatias*, which may be just another way of referring to *Odysseus Acanthoplēx*, together with Sophocles' *Oedipus (Rex)* in the context of discussing tragic plots that hinge on *ἄγνοια*.⁷⁹⁸

Somehow or another, Telegonus after arriving on Ithaca was attacked out of ignorance. With the story of a native party fighting a landing party under false pretenses compare the story in the *Argonautica* where Jason's band battles their erstwhile hosts the Doliones, and for the father-son duel compare of course Oedipus' slaying of Laertes (but one should not think that because a similar story occurred within the (Theban) Cycle it must have inspired the alteration of the story of Odysseus' death from an original version involving a heron).⁷⁹⁹ There is another instance in which a son of Odysseus receives a hostile welcome in a foreign land: Telemachus is nearly rejected from Menelaus' palace by Eteoneus (*Od.* 4.29). Of course, it is not a *violent* welcome he receives, and the discourtesy is predicated not on any belligerence detected in Telemachus' appearance but rather on the present preoccupation of Menelaus with his children's weddings.

⁷⁹⁶ Montiglio 2011: 3. But cf. *ibid.* 158 n. 8, which states the real tragic protagonist of *Od. Acanthoplex* was probably Telegonus, who is the "Oedipus-figure." If blindness and blood-guilt are defining features for a tragic hero, then Odysseus at least got to play that role in S. *Euryalus*.

⁷⁹⁷ *Chrestomathy* 321 Severyns.

⁷⁹⁸ *Poet.* 1453b29ff. The connection between the two stories is all the more profound in that Teiresias is featured in both.

⁷⁹⁹ For the identification of Thebes as a prototypical Troy in Greek epic, see Berman 2015: 27-48, and for drama's reinvention of Thebes as the "anti-Athens" see *ibid.* 75-121. The spiritual kinship between Odysseus and Oedipus may be best illustrated by their common employment of Tiresias, although the Theban king's demise follows much more rapidly upon his interaction with the prophet.

A certain Chiusi skyphos, the name-vase of the Penelope Painter, has been thought to represent the prologue to Sophocles' *Niptra*.⁸⁰⁰ One of the two scenes depicted shows Penelope at her loom with Telemachus standing to one side; the other side has a bath scene, and here Odysseus does not seem to be in full beggar's disguise, while nurse who washes his feet is named by inscription as Antiphata rather than Eurykleia. Yet these discrepancies are insufficient grounds for linking the vase to *Odyseus Akanthoplēx*, even assuming that that play was equivalent to *Niptra* and contained a bathing scene. The skyphos also shows Penelope at her loom being visited by Telemachus, and despite scholarly efforts such a scene cannot be accommodated easily within a reasonable plot proposal for *Odyseus Akanthoplēx*.⁸⁰¹ The vase's scenes could simply be inspired by the *Odyssey*, with some confusion as to names and other details, as often happens.

Burkert, after noting an apocryphal version of the Trojan Horse myth in which Odysseus *πολιπόρθος* himself became a horse,⁸⁰² also points to a *fabula* in Serv. auct. *Aen.* 2.44 wherein Odysseus resumes his equine form just before his son stabs him with his spear, which Burkert describes as the sort of "extremely ancient" weapon that would have been used during the Upper Palaeolithic era. Both myths, therefore, would depend on a particular prehistoric ritual of horse sacrifice.⁸⁰³ However, neither in what we possess of the Epic Cycle nor in the tragic fragments concerning Odysseus' death is there any confirmation of Servius' account, which says that, as an alternative to his dying in old age (i.e., to Tiresias' prophecy in *Od.* 11), Odysseus *necatur...Telegoni filii manu*

⁸⁰⁰ *ARV*² 2.1300, on which See Ribbeck 1875: 270-9, esp. 273, and 681f.; Wilamowitz 1884: 194-8; Séchan 173ff.; Lowenstam 1992: 179; Roller–Roller 1994: 16.

⁸⁰¹ Pace Robert 1895: 78-81.

⁸⁰² Sextus *Math.* 1.264, 267; Ptolemaios Chennos, Phot. *Bib.* 150a16.

⁸⁰³ Burkert 1983: 159. In the case of the Trojan Horse, the priest Laocoön performs a sacrifice with his spear even as he rejects the supposed gift, and according to Timaios, *FGrHist* 566 F 36 = Polyb. 12.4b, the Romans reenacted this episode during their customary sacrifice of the Equus October.

aculeo marinae beluae extinctus. dicitur enim, cum continuo fugeret, a Minerva in equum mutatus. His flight, as we are informed earlier in Servius' commentary *ad loc.*, was the result of discovering in his halls the hideous child Pan, to whom Penelope had given birth (the father was either "all" the suitors collectively or Hermes); the panicked Odysseus then set out for new *errores*, apparently only to be mistaken by his son for a horse that needed to be slain. Again, despite much circumstantial detail, this exact story finds no support in any Greek sources, and it is a mystery where Servius picked it up.

Transformation into a horse would certainly help explain why Odysseus was not recognized by his son, but even if there is some connection between the hero's attested metamorphosis and the cult of Poseidon Hippios in Arcadia (Paus. 8.25.5),⁸⁰⁴ this sort of story would be out of place in tragedy (note that Hippolytus is killed when Poseidon sends a beast against his horse-drawn chariot, but Hippolytus never personally turns into a horse).

It is fitting that Odysseus' death should come ἐξ ἁλόος, for he had made the lord of the sea, Poseidon, his greatest enemy. But it is going too far to suggest (as Burkert seems to) that Odysseus fulfills the sacrifice he owes to Poseidon (cf. *Od.* 11.129-31) by himself becoming a sacrificial horse. In the ordinary version of the story as represented by the *Telegony*, Odysseus discharges his sacrificial duties and then proceeds to the next phase of his adventures (*Tel.* arg. 1c-2 W.). Some ancient authors apparently felt that it was insufficient to regard Odysseus' disastrous later life and tragic death as constituting a parable illustrating death's universal hold on mortals. Parthenius blames the hero's licentiousness: διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐγκρατῆς φῶναι μηδὲ ἄλλως ἐπιεικῆς... ("because of his being undisciplined and not otherwise well-behaved...").

⁸⁰⁴ As argued by Meyer 1895: 263.

Despite the vivid detail in A. F 275, the prophecy related there is no less riddling than that in *Od.* 11.134-6.⁸⁰⁵ If Tiresias' words are counted as a riddle rather than as a literal prediction, Aeschylus' story remains compatible with the *Telegony*. The phrase ἔξ ἁλόος in *Od.* 11.134-6 would relate to the Telegonus story in a much more oblique way than it would relate to the heron story, but that is precisely the point: the meaning of Tiresias' prophecy, as in the case of the wine-skin prophecy delivered to Aegeus (*inter alia*), is destined to remain opaque until it is too late for Odysseus.

West reasserts that the “droll” myth involving heron feces was not a mere prophetic riddle but a genuine version of Odysseus' death (in line with other trickster heroes who expire in unheroic fashion—though the supposed parallels that West cites do not line up very well with the case of Odysseus).⁸⁰⁶ He argues further that Odysseus' bizarre death by stingray poison is itself the solution to a riddle insofar as it circumvents some previously expressed “set of immunities,” perhaps by making it a deceased creature that kills Odysseus. All this may have been presented in a folktale, which naturally was never written down, involving Hermes or some wizardly figure from whom Odysseus extracted what he thought was perfect invulnerability. Far from being the original story of Odysseus' death which the *Telegony* elevated to a more austere and epic death, the heron-feces story was never meant to be taken literally, and based on our surviving evidence we must conclude that from the earliest time discernable all those who considered how Odysseus died espoused the story that he was killed by his bastard son Telegonus, who wielded a spear tipped by a poisonous stingray barb. We may assume that the Oedipal motif of son killing father was integral to the account of Odysseus' death from its very

⁸⁰⁵ Pace West 307.

⁸⁰⁶ West 2014: 14.

origin. That august Aeschylus took up the prophecy in detail in a tragedy (no evidence that *Psychagōgoi* may have been a satyr-play; cf. Introduction, where it is suggested that *Circe* was the satyr-play of this tetralogy) is the best confirmation that the heron-feces story was always intended to be taken metaphorically, never a sincere imagining of the hero's death told for a lark. Moreover, the folktale that West imagines would be seriously undermined in its impact if the true fate of Odysseus were presaged for him so far in advance, during his visit to the Underworld. Note that the motif of Od.'s invulnerability to any living creature and its circumvention through the deceased stingray's barb are as compatible with the story of his death at the hands of Telegonus as it is with the story of his death at the cloaca of the heron.

4.4. Chiastic Couplings

Τηλέγονος δὲ ἐπιγνοὺς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τό τε τοῦ πατρὸς σῶμα καὶ τὸν Τηλέμαχον καὶ τὴν Πηνελόπην πρὸς τὴν μητέρα μεθίστησιν. ἡ δὲ αὐτοὺς ἀθάνατους ποιεῖ, καὶ συνοικεῖ τῇ μὲν Πηνελόπῃ Τηλέγονος, Κίρκῃ δὲ Τηλέμαχος. (Arg. 4a-b W.)

And Telegonus, recognizing his error transports both the body of his father and Telemachus and Penelope to his mother, and she makes them immortal; and Telegonus lives in wedlock with Penelope, and Telemachus with Circe.

The end of the *Telegony* neatly ties up all loose ends in Odysseus' two families by having them intermarry. The novelty of this arrangement is reflected in Eustathius' neologism *ἀντιγῆμαι* ("marry in turn," Eust. *Od.* 1796.53), which he applies to the wedding of Telegonus and Penelope after recording that of Telemachus and Circe.

It may seem especially odd that Penelope marries Telegonus, but the oddity is circumvented through (1) Athena's authoritative intervention (an epic *dea ex machina*, as

it were⁸⁰⁷), (2) the fact that Penelope has little choice (in fact she stands to gain much by relocating to Circe's island and becoming her mother-in-law), and (3) the existence of epic precedents and parallels such as Andromache's union with Neoptolemus, an ever starker example of a female casualty of war having to yield to a victorious enemy.⁸⁰⁸

While Andromache does not marry her former husband's killer, instead becoming enslaved to that (now deceased) killer's son,⁸⁰⁹ her fate is almost singularly grievous and reflects her utter powerlessness. Meanwhile, Penelope's coupling with Odysseus' very murderer is mitigated by the fact that the killing proceeded from ignorance. And since she and Telegonus are not *ὄμαιμοι* ("consanguineous"), the fleeting shadow of incest is nothing like the truly incestuous marriage between Oedipus and Jocasta; their connection through Odysseus may even be seen to justify and facilitate their union. At any rate, there were no peculiarly Athenian scruples that might have posed an obstacle to Sophocles' reproducing the ending of the *Telegony* in his *Odysseus Akanthoplēx*.

4.5. Conclusions

Among the Athenians tragedians it was primarily Sophocles who dusted off the *Telegony* and worked it up, producing two plays: *Euryalus* and *Odysseus Akanthoplēx*. These projects may have resulted from Sophocles' broad interest in "broad-minded"

⁸⁰⁷ Hartmann 1917: 119f. Cf. Athena's mediation at the end of the *Odyssey* (24.472ff.), an obvious model which presented Eugammon with an easy exit strategy.

⁸⁰⁸ West 263 prefers to exclude Andromache altogether from the *Nostoi*, but the story of Neoptolemus' Molossian excursion did eventually expand to embrace her (*Epit.* 6.12f.).

⁸⁰⁹ Notice how the liberal use of *ἀθένητος* (normally "murderer") at *E. Andr.* 172 (cf. *Tro.* 660) paraphrases their true relationship, as Neoptolemus is homologized with his father. Even though this comes in a speech delivered by Andromache's antagonist Hermione, it bolsters the Trojan heroine's claim to being *δυστυχεστάτη γυνή* (v. 6). Hermione goes on to curse all barbarians as incestuous and lawless when it comes to marriage (vv. 173-6), but Andromache is hardly a willing bedmate of her master, and Hermione's Greek chauvinism is belied by stories like Penelope's marriage to Telegonus, the intermarriage among the Aeolidae, and indeed Hermione's own union with Orestes (they are doubly *ὄμαιμοι* and hence more like siblings than cousins).

Odysseus,⁸¹⁰ whose shrewdness ultimately could not save him. There was, however, an *Akanthoplēx* attributed to a later minor tragedian called Ps.-Apollodorus. More significantly, I contend that Aeschylus knew of and used the final Cyclic poem.⁸¹¹ His *Bone-collectors* drew as much from the beginning of the *Telegony* as from the end of the *Odyssey*, and his *Psychagōgoi* may demonstrate acquaintance with a postulated passage in the *Telegony* in which Tiresias' prophecy about Odysseus' death is either recalled or reinforced by a message obtained at Dodona. Alternatively, Aeschylus himself could have elaborated Tiresias' metaphorical prophecy after pondering the manner of Odysseus' death in the *Telegony*. At any rate, even the lone fragment surviving from the exchange between Odysseus and Tiresias in this play shows that Aeschylus' version of the prophecy was much more vivid than Homer's cryptic version.⁸¹²

⁸¹⁰ Worman 2012. For the enhanced tragic quality of Odysseus' later life as opposed to his earlier life, cf. again Montiglio 2011: 3.

⁸¹¹ Pace West 292, who is inclined to believe "that the *Telegony* did not become known at Athens before the second half of the fifth century"; however, his inference (based on a comparison with *Philoctetes*) that Sophocles' *Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλήξ* was composed late in that tragedian's career is attractive.

⁸¹² The "death by bird-dropping" motif proved to be memorable and was associated with Aeschylus regardless of whether he actually invented it. A legend developed concerning the poet's own death that clearly found its inspiration in his purple passage describing Odysseus': Plin. *NH* 10.7 (= T 97) says of the *morphnos*, a type of eagle, that *huius ingenium est et testudines raptas frangere e sublimi iaciendo, quae fors interemit poetam Aeschylum, praedictam fatis, ut ferunt, eius diei ruinam secura caeli fide caventem* (cf. Val. Max. 9.12 ext. 2 = T 96; Ael. *NA* 7.16 = T 98, adding that Aeschylus was writing at the time; [Sotad.] (fr. 15.12 Powell) *ap.* Stob. 4.34.8 = T 99; and—with a reference to *τοῦ φαλακροῦ τὸ κρᾶνίον* instead of Aeschylus' name—Democritus (68 A 68 D.-K.) *ap.* Simplic. *in* Arist. *Phys.* 2.4). Crusius 1882: 312 suggests that the parody may have its origins in Attic comedy, and some legend was bound to spring up given that Aeschylus died abroad (in Gela: *Anth. Gr. App.* vol. 3, *Epigrammata sepulcralia* 17; cf. *Anth. Gr.* 7.40 (Diodorus)). Note the elements that the parody preserves: in both cases a bird drops another creature—one not normally feared as being fatal to humans—on the head of an oblivious victim; the victim, even as he vainly seeks to avoid his fate, runs headlong into it; the quality of baldness is transferred from the aged Odysseus (cf. West 314 n. 39) to the aged Aeschylus, but in the latter instance it is endowed with a purpose insofar as it attracts the bird's lethal attention. Whoever started the rumor about Aeschylus' death surely did so in a lighthearted spirit and without making the mistake that some modern scholars are tempted to make, that of treating A. F 275 as a candid report of how Odysseus actually dies.

5. General Conclusions

μοῦσ' ἄρ' ἀοιδὸν ἀνήκεν ἀειδέμεναι κλέα ἀνδρῶν
οἴμης τῆς τότ' ἄρα κλέος οὐρανὸν εὐρὸν ἴκανε.... (Od. 8.73f.)

Then the Muse made the singer rise to sing the famous deeds of men
from a song whose fame at that very time was reaching broad heaven.

We cannot say much about the tragedians' personal relationships with their Muse, but we can say quite a lot about how they accessed the “famous deeds of men.” The Epic Cycle, in particular the Cycle of Troy, was the repository *par excellence* of a seemingly inexhaustible supply of stories suitable for dramatization. The tragedians were therefore not so different from Demodocus, Homer, and the other bards who were their poetic forebears. The tradition in which they composed was largely the same. When we combine the synoptic and largely statistical approach of certain scholars⁸¹³ with the Welckerian project of systematically investigating every Cyclic tragedy in turn,⁸¹⁴ a clear picture emerges of the broad and deep influence that the Epic Cycle had on Greek tragedy from its formative stages through the fifth century B.C. and beyond. The Epic Cycle is to be understood here not as an amorphous and evolving body of myths but as a connected series of concrete texts, specifically those summarized later by Proclus and sporadically cited by other students in antiquity. To make sense of this influence, we

⁸¹³ Sommerstein 2015; Tsagalis 2008 (Trojan Cycle only). Their figures (pp. 463 and 112f. respectively) are in approximate concordance, Tsagalis counting but stigmatizing those plays which are ascribed with less certainty and concluding that 28-37% of Sophocles' plays are Trojan-themed as against 22-29% for Aeschylus' and 19-22% for Euripides'. The figures given by Sommerstein 2012b: 195 for the ratios of Trojan plots to total outputs are somewhat higher all around and also augment Sophocles' lead (48%) over Aeschylus (29%) and Euripides (28%). One issue that can account for differences in such calculations is how broadly one defines that portion of heroic myth that was “Trojan” (Orestes, e.g., never went to Troy, but it is certainly reasonable to contend that was regarded as belonging to the Trojan Cycle).

⁸¹⁴ Thanks to a venerable undercurrent within classical scholarship that has been gathering momentum (we may dub this the “fragmentary turn”), Welcker's work has been richly superseded by even more penetrating studies, most crucially by the editions and discussions in *TrGF* but also by commentaries on individual fragmentary plays such as those in the *SFP* series.

must conclude that these texts counted as essential reading for most professional poets of the Archaic and Classical periods. Not least among those poets were Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, who by a certain paradox looked to these epic poems at every turn as both mythologically authoritative and endlessly malleable.⁸¹⁵ Similarly, the resulting works of drama generally appealed to their original audience's understanding of canonical Trojan myth but could also have appeared novel to many who were unacquainted with a given theme or version thereof. From a diachronic perspective, it can be said that as interest in recycling episodes described by Homer waned after Aeschylus, tragedians—Sophocles above all—came to view the Trojan Cycle as an important alternative source of inspiration.⁸¹⁶

It has been alleged that tragedy sharpened the *agōnes* (i.e., the conflicts, confrontations, and oppositions) that probably had already been clearly delineated in the Epic Cycle, if not quite to the degree of perfection witnessed in Achilles' feud with Agamemnon in the *Iliad*.⁸¹⁷ How exactly was this achieved? Perhaps the answer has to do with the fact that with a mimetic genre the audience can actually see different actors stubbornly inhabit the worldview of their respective characters.⁸¹⁸ Tragedians were also free to alter myths in order to generate greater conflict, as Aeschylus did in his *Philoctetes* by replacing the titular hero's antagonist, who should have been Diomedes

⁸¹⁵ They could even introduce stories altogether absent from the Cycle, the most notable example being Sophocles' *Antigone*; see Sommerstein 2015: 469-74.

⁸¹⁶ Cf. Tsagalis 2008: 114, where the preference of a tragedian for Cyclical versus Homeric epic is well treated as a secondary consideration after the distinction between Trojan and non-Trojan dramas.

⁸¹⁷ See Pallantza 2005 as cited *supra*, 101 n. 337; cf. Hadjicosti 2007: 2, who says, "Passion, pain and loss were magnified to serve the purposes of" Aeschylus; the same of course goes for the other tragedians.

⁸¹⁸ Cf. Hadjicosti 2007: 246, pertaining to the development of the myth of Palamedes' ruin and citing Polyaeus (proem. Book 1 *Strategemata*) on the special ability of drama as a genre to stage a formal *agōn*. But her claim that fifth-century Athens "had a special interest in legal procedures" should not be accepted without acknowledgment of the widespread interest in formal *νεῖκος* during the archaic period as reflected in epic (cf. e.g. *Il.* 18.497-508, Hes. *Op.* 28-30); it was more the specifically codified rhetorical strategies taught and practiced in fifth-century Athens that distinguished its trials both real and dramatized.

according to tradition, with the more odious Odysseus—a bold and brilliant coup. In addition, at a very basic level, tragedy generally dedicated more verses than epic to the exploration of the many psychological nuances that underlay conflicting perspectives—the exceptional *Iliad* being more like tragedy in its sustained attention to a single, albeit multifaceted conflict.⁸¹⁹ It cannot be proved that the lost poems of the Epic Cycle always failed to achieve the same degree of depth and *ἐνάργεια* (“vividness”). Yet basic quantitative analysis tends to corroborate Aristotle’s view of them as inferior in this respect. Proclus tells us how many books each of these epics spanned, and we can calculate based on those notices how many verses might have been devoted to a given episode in a given Cyclic poem, even just roughly by assuming that each distinct episode took up an equal proportion of the whole narrative.⁸²⁰

Or consider the following: The *Little Iliad* consisted of four books.⁸²¹ According to West’s (professedly tentative) hypothesis as to the distribution of episodes and days of action across these four, Book 3 covered at least three crucial episodes: the construction of the Wooden Horse (together with related preparations concluding with the army’s withdrawal to Tenedos), the nighttime parlay between Odysseus and Helen, and the theft of the Palladium. Let us assume that the typical length of a book of the *Little Iliad* was commensurate with the average length of a book of the *Iliad*; that figure is 654

⁸¹⁹ Arist. *Poet.* 1459b7 calls the plot of the *Iliad* *ἄπλοον*, which however does not mean it told a simple story: indeed, Aeschylus was able to distribute its action across a trilogy of plays. On Homer’s capacity to dramatize as well as to narrate see e.g. Arist. *Poet.* 1447a13ff., 1448b34ff.; Pl. *Rep.* 392d-394d. On his reputation as “first of the tragedians” (Pl. *Rep.* 606e-607a) see also Fitzmyer 1945: 9 and *passim*.

⁸²⁰ Whereas one of the *Tabulae Iliacae* (the *Tabula Borgiana* = IG xiv.1292 = SEG 35.1044 = *Tab. Il.* 10K Sadurska) states that the Cyclic epic *Oedipodea* comprised 6,600 verses and the *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* (*Thebaid* PEG T 4) states that the *Thebaid* and *Epigonoï* each had 7,000 verses (Cingano 2015: 214f.), there are no such figures for the poems of the Trojan Cycle.

⁸²¹ West observes that the poem’s material, comprising in his view “a concatenation of [six] potential *Einzellieder*” (164), “is very abundant for four books, and the narrative must have been rather concise” (168).

hexameters.⁸²² We may reasonably suppose that each of the three episodes just assigned to Book 3 of the *Little Iliad*—the second episode, say, describing Odysseus’ infiltration of Troy to meet with Helen—accounted for approximately a third of that book’s verses and thus was dealt with in not much more than 200 verses. Even accounting for the brevity of iambic trimeters and for the fashion of detaching choral odes from tragic plots, a play on the order of 1,500 verses—to wit, Ion’s *Phrouroi*—was able, indeed obliged, to lavish far more attention on the same episode, whether by means of elaboration, embellishment, or some combination of the two.⁸²³

If scholars debate so fervently things like characterization in preserved plays, it might seem impossible to draw any meaningful conclusions about such matters from the fragments of a lost play. At the same time, attempts to deduce patterns of reception across all Trojan-themed tragedies can appear misguided or arbitrary in the face of the great ideological variety that not even the fragmentary state of many texts can obscure.

Nevertheless, there is always some value in scholarly efforts to synthesize. Pallantza identifies three major intentions in the reception of the Trojan Cycle by the tragedians, or

⁸²² As calculated by Reichel 2011: 51. I have opted for the *Iliad*’s higher average rather than the *Odyssey*’s lower average (505 hexameters), for I would contend that the books of the *Little Iliad* were relatively long, perhaps even longer (but not vastly so) than those of the *Iliad*. This is not so much because they had to accommodate lots of material as because they were probably less subject to the constraints of oral performance, the *Little Iliad* being by design part of a textual literary project that aimed to consolidate a continuous narrative of the Trojan War (this goes for all the poems of the Epic Cycle except for the “pre-Cyclic” *Iliupersis*, cf. West 225; cf. *ibid.* 18 for restrictions on the notion that the Cycle was so designed). Of course, the “books” of the Epic Cycle may have been recited by rhapsodes, e.g., at the Panathenaea, as Fantuzzi–Tsagalis (2015b: 14-9) argue (the question of their performance is closely bound up with the question of what epic poetry counted as “Homeric” in what period and according to what source; see also Herington 1985 for the relevant source-texts). But this would have been in spite of their designated purpose: even if the poems of the Epic Cycle were not compiled as such (i.e., as a unified canon with the collective name “the Epic Cycle”) until the fourth century, perhaps under the influence of Aristotle’s school as it sought to draw up a formal reading list, they were composed and their texts fixed during the Archaic period with “the idea that the narration of a series of events was accomplished by a series of poems dealing with these events” (*ibid.* 29). Cf. the four bloated books of Apollonius’ *Argonautica*, which maxed out their scrolls at an average of 1,459 verses. Reichel *loc. cit.* discusses the theorized interaction between ancient book divisions and oral performance.

⁸²³ Cf. *SFP* 2012: 11, “dramatists...were forced to present at least one episode of a myth in greater detail than was necessary in any other genre.”

three ways in which tragedy represents the Trojan War: as a social phenomenon that had a huge impact on the kingdoms of Greece (the *Nostoi* in particular relates the fallout from all this turmoil); as an experiment in collaboration, which leads to conflicts such as that between Odysseus and Palamedes, that between Odysseus and Philoctetes, and that between Agamemnon and Achilles; and as the ultimate struggle between Panhellenic culture and barbarism (think of the plights of liminal figures such as Telephus and Teucer, whose Greek credentials are at times suspected).⁸²⁴

While these key concepts capture a great deal of what animates the tragedies discussed throughout this study, they risk oversimplifying the reception of earlier tradition by tragedians, neglecting the diversity on both ends. For example, to say only that Ajax's suicide resulted from internal strains that the Trojan War exerted on the Greek army ignores the extraordinary nature of the hero's character and the particular circumstances of his alienation. Again, it is ultimately impossible to generalize about the tragic treatment of Cyclic material or to identify any characteristic functions that the Cycle consistently served in the care of the tragedians. Indeed, the richness and diversity of the Epic Cycle itself as a body of loosely connected myths is what kept tragedians

⁸²⁴ Pallantza 2005: 308. There is no reason to think that these three motifs were products of the tragedians' own independent thinking about the Trojan War as a mythical construct to be considered apart from the poetic tradition. In fact, the myths were inseparable from the literary corpus that inscribed them, and the motifs enumerated by Pallantza in reference to tragedy are mostly inherent to the Trojan Cycle itself. The reading of Homer alone (so long as we accept as valid the many approaches of Homeric criticism) indicates that these motifs had already been formulated and articulated in a pronounced way in the earliest poetic tradition. Only the ethnographic dichotomy leaves much room for the tragedians to offer novel interpretations of the Trojan War, as historical developments including migration from Asia Minor and elsewhere, political conflicts including the Persian Wars, and other foreign encounters caused the concepts of Hellenic identity and barbarism to evolve in radically new directions. So Aeschylus' Memnon is said to hail from Persian (see Sommerstein 2008: 130f.). But even that dichotomy could have much deeper roots in the mythic tradition and could have informed the very creation of the myth of a Panhellenic expedition against an Eastern foe. To lean on historical context in assessing tragedy of course assumes that the tragedians, consciously or not, consistently allowed their own experiences to infuse their portrayals of traditional myths—an assumption that Pallantza 2005: 315 naturally makes when she states, "In diesen Tragödien gibt der Troische Krieg den Schauplatz ab, um aktuelle Probleme zu thematisieren."

revisiting it with new ideas and perspectives. While it may display tendencies that enhance its sense of thematic unity—for instance, many of its myths seem to explode the very notion of an ancestral world governed by heroic values—no special guiding principle or grand design characterizes tragedy’s adoption of all these stories; that is, nothing besides frequency distinguishes tragedy’s use of the Cycle from its use of other sources of primary material.⁸²⁵ To be sure, the many conflicts of the Trojan War all ultimately relate causally to the central conflict and often are exacerbated by the circumstances of war, but each has its own set of concerns and own source of intrigue quite distinct and detachable from the larger narrative. Although tragedians never deal with an episode in isolation but always situate it in its appropriate context, revealing where it connected with other episodes and with broader themes, they nevertheless treat each episode on its own terms and with special consideration for the particular dynamics operating among a relatively narrow cast of characters. The Trojan War *per se* is only indirectly responsible for Ajax’s suicide, which thus demands to be represented as an independent event contingent on a unique personality. While the Trojan battlefield was the arena in which Ajax displayed his virtues, the central themes of Sophocles’ *Ajax*—dishonor, madness, and strife—are examined away from combat, and this separation preserves their applicability to other social situations. Therefore, if Ajax’s death is a blight, it is a blight on the internal governance of the Achaean army, not on the external

⁸²⁵ Pace Pallantza 2005: 309, who after describing how the Greek heroes set out as avengers of Zeus Xenios but wound up committing sacrilege themselves during the sack of Troy—an irony that the tragedians fully exploit—then attempts to reduce the relationship between the Epic Cycle and tragedy to one or two essential functions: “Die Motive des epischen Kyklos werden...in einem polarisierten Komplex von Ursachen und Wirkungen auf menschlicher und göttlicher Ebene ausgeformt, um die idealisierende Schilderung des Troischen Krieges zu relativieren und ferner auf die Ausweglosigkeit der heroischen Welt hinzuweisen.” It is not clear where the idealized portrait of the Trojan War is supposed to have existed, whether in Homer or some other earlier poetry, in the words of certain characters, or in the minds of the tragedians or their audiences.

management of the war or on its ethical status. Thus it would be wrong to conclude that the *Ajax* is simply a commentary on the horrors of war; the typologies at play in it are much narrower in scope than such a reading allows. Furthermore, it cannot be said conclusively whether Ajax's fate signifies the failure of the entire heroic value system or the failure of one man to observe moderation and cope with defeat, and this ambiguity belies the notion that tragedians consistently engaged with the stories of the Cycle in order to proclaim a definite truth about the human condition.

A flexible understanding of Cyclic tragedy also leaves room for positive as well as negative appraisals of deeds performed in the midst of war. So in the *Philoctetes* plays the title hero is ultimately promised healing, redemption, and reintegration into the army, even while his earlier alienation and present exploitation and objectification are dramatized. To the extent that an individual story of the Cycle is extraneous to the waging of the war itself, any attention paid to the bigger picture risks distracting from the intrinsic moral significance of the single myth. But this very tension can also be a source of dramatic interest. Thus while the Achaean army's obligation to Philoctetes should by certain standards not have depended on his utility to the war effort, it is precisely the revelation that he will play an indispensable role in the sack of Troy that induces them to make amends. Nevertheless, such intricacies only prove that the tragedians' handling of a particular Cyclic episode depended on its specific contours, not on a fixed procedure of appropriation. The tragedians' recognition that the range of stories comprising the Epic Cycle made the Trojan War an exceptionally intricate mythical conflict did not translate into a monolithic approach to their dramatization. Once again, their approach to the Cycle

cannot be reduced to a single template, and no Cyclic tragedy should be regarded solely or even primarily as a commentary on the merits of the Trojan War.

In another sense the tragedians' flexible approach to storytelling was conditioned by the Cycle's absorption of so many traditional strands that were often difficult or impossible to harmonize. That same willful capriciousness served as an antidote to the stifling constraints that one tale could impose upon the contradictory elements of another. Observing that Euripides was willing to allow a particular theme to dictate the mythological framework upon which a given tragedy was erected, Jouan recalls the incompatibility of the *Helen* with those Euripidean plays in which the heroine's authentic presence at Troy is taken for granted; similarly the way in which the *Telephus* depends on one's belief in a certain expedition whose veracity elsewhere and especially in *Iphigenia at Aulis* is entirely suppressed; and the playwright's brief flight of fancy, again in his *Helen*, whereby Achilles is taken for one of her original suitors directly negates the presuppositions of *Scyrians*.⁸²⁶ Thus just as Greek tragedy based on the Trojan Cycle dealt in a variety of themes, in the matter of plot construction too tragedians granted themselves some leniency and demanded the same from their audiences.⁸²⁷ Each play sought to be internally consistent just as Aristotle would eventually prescribe, but the poets were shrewd enough not to pursue this virtue too far by seeking to manufacture total agreement across their entire literary output.⁸²⁸

⁸²⁶ Jouan 1966: 421f.

⁸²⁷ *SFP* 2012: 11 links this assumption of poetic license to the performative context of Greek tragedy, which above all was marked by competitiveness.

⁸²⁸ Whereas the Epic Cycle sought to frame Homer's poems within a narrative framework that was, to speak somewhat tautologically, encyclopedic (cf. the impulse behind "cycles" of heroic deeds in vase-painting, especially on kylikes), the tragedians collectively succeeded in importing virtually the whole of the Cycle into their art form but did so without any grand strategy in mind, each dramatic production being conceived of as a separate endeavor. It emerges from the discussion of Fantuzzi–Tsagalis 2015b: 5f. that the term *κύκλος* is more appropriate for the Trojan Cycle and the Theban Cycle separately than to the Epic

Likewise, it is very difficult to identify traits or themes that encapsulate the totality of any individual tragedian's use of the Epic Cycle.⁸²⁹ Euripides' fondness for bedraggled characters was satirized already by his contemporary Aristophanes, and the Epic Cycle furnished a few such individuals: Telephus and Odysseus both donned beggar's clothes, and the latter made sordid disguises his specialty. Another recurring theme in the Cycle is disease, often accompanied by the theme of healing, and this naturally appealed to the medical interests of Sophocles, who composed not one but two plays about Philoctetes' rehabilitation while also injecting his *Ajax* and other Cyclic plays with extensive disease imagery.⁸³⁰ But disease and healing are by no means features that distinguish the Trojan War from other bodies of myth, and so we must return to the larger point that the tragedians resist categorization as to their specific treatment of the Epic Cycle. According to Pallantza, Aeschylus, at least in the *Oresteia* trilogy, concentrates on the brutal aspects of Greek society before the emergence of the *polis* and its better institutions, resulting in a denial of the Heroic Age as such.⁸³¹ But the end of that trilogy signals a solution to the problem of revenge killing, not a solution to the problem of unjust violence overall, as Pallantza seems to suggest; nor does that incremental progress entail that for Aeschylus the Trojan War as a whole embodied a remote, less civilized epoch when every promise of greatness was dashed in hopelessness. Sophocles,

Cycle that embraced both along with a cosmogonic section (but that left out certain other pieces of Greek mythology). The term was also used to denote the completeness of mythographical works (in prose) like the *kyklos historikos* of Dionysius the *kyklographos* and the *Tragōidoumena* of Asclepiades of Tragilus. Fantuzzi and Tsagalis (*ibid.* 6) also note that unlike *κύκλος* English "cycle" does not seem strongly connected with the notion of completeness; perhaps we should rather complain that both terms are used illogically to refer to a series of events that has a discrete beginning and end and is thus not truly circular.

⁸²⁹ Sommerstein 2012b: 203 skillfully lists "common story elements" in the fragmentary plays of Sophocles, but the very length of the list and the fact that a given motif would seem to recur prominently in at most a half dozen of the Sophocles' works only reinforce the diversity of this corpus and of the tragedian's source material.

⁸³⁰ Cf. again Biggs 1966.

⁸³¹ Pallantza 2005: 316.

meanwhile, is said by Pallantza to have focused on those stories within the Epic Cycle that center on dissension and internal strife.⁸³² But it is Aeschylus and Euripides, not Sophocles, who treat the crisis at Aulis, while Aeschylus joined Sophocles in treating the downfall of Ajax, and all three tragedians dramatized the stories of Philoctetes and Palamedes. Pallantza deceives herself on this point by ignoring the evidence of fragmentary tragedy, and the Cycle offered plenty of examples of cooperation (albeit despite mutual suspicions and enmities) among the leaders of the Greek army, which emerges as another prominent theme in the plays of Sophocles, as Pallantza herself acknowledges. Finally, the image of the Trojan War in Euripides' works is exceedingly negative and full of irony according to Pallantza's assessment (which adheres to the *communis opinio*).⁸³³ But all that his plays critique, including the extreme violence and rampant egocentricity of those who participate in the war's events, is present already in the Epic Cycle itself and in works like Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* and Sophocles' *Polyxena*. And although it may be true that Euripides occasionally puts the language of virtue (e.g., the notion of Panhellenic pride, now reduced to an empty slogan) into the mouth of a base character in order to refute through irony the very belief in any idealized virtue, this practice is not always the driving force behind his storytelling and must be analyzed and appreciated on a case by case basis. The tragic poets remade the stories they inherited in a variety of ways and with a variety of goals, and the process of transformation or *mythopoeia* depended heavily on the particulars of a given story. This is no less true in the case of stories derived from the Epic Cycle, regardless of the Cycle's narrative continuity.

⁸³² *Ibid.*

⁸³³ *Ibid.*

Of course, not all intertextuality is bilateral, and epic was not the only genre with which tragic poets engaged, as I have endeavored to signal in the foregoing study by frequently citing Stesichorus, Pindar, and other lyric poets. One important direction for future research would be to focus on instances (e.g., the story of Orestes' matricide) where we know of epic, lyric, and tragic treatments of the same theme and to investigate whether the tragic member of the triad (assuming it came last chronologically) read "through" lyric to epic or otherwise assimilated both models to produce an original text.⁸³⁴

This sort of study begs indulgence inasmuch as no reconstruction of a fragmentary tragedy or of a lost epic can ever be approved or accepted with complete confidence. Its hypotheses can only be corroborated by appeals to a given author's or genre's established habits and conventions, to the text's reception (sometimes provable, sometimes only suspected) in later sources executed in various media, and to social developments that conditioned attitudes toward the mythical tradition. In a more radical fashion particular conjectures can be tried out before a living audience, as proponents of "experimentelle Philologie" advocate.⁸³⁵ Although limitations of time and resources will not permit every hypothesis to be acted out before a live audience, every textual critic who examines and tries to make sense of literary fragments should take a similarly practical approach to correcting and supplementing these texts, by running through each potential scene in his mind's eye and attempting to judge each performance by the standards of ancient audiences and by the habits of ancient playwrights. In this way more reliable conclusions can be reached at least within the narrower scope of individual

⁸³⁴ Cf. *supra*, pp. 34f.

⁸³⁵ Müller 1997: 309, ascribing the term to Schadewaldt, although of course the praxis of ancient tragedy as a form of a posteriori investigation has much broader currency.

fragments. Even if a completely accurate account of how the Epic Cycle influenced any given tragedy will remain elusive for as long as we lack the full texts, many plausible connections can be made, the cumulative force of which bears out the central hypothesis that the reception of the Cycle was a vital factor in the development of tragedy. And in the process there emerge fascinating insights into the attitudes of the tragedians, their predecessors, and their respective audiences. Thus it is hoped that this study has demonstrated the charms, if not also the merits, of a systematic comparison between all that remains of Greek tragedy and all that remains of the Epic Cycle.

Scholars who study fragments have on occasion self-deprecatingly dubbed their morbid fixation on dismembered texts an “addiction” or a “disease.”⁸³⁶ It cannot be denied that, while what the undertaking promises is by and large continual frustration,

the main motive for editing literary fragments is the hope of finding something new, something previously overlooked, something which, because of the discovery of collateral evidence, can only now be understood properly.⁸³⁷

Much of this applies more generally to the whole pursuit of textual criticism, but it is especially true of work done on fragments, in which work the degree of uncertainty is greater and therefore causes one to hope for proportionally greater rewards in the form of new findings and more impressive achievements in the form of ingenious explanations.

It is tempting to conclude by emulating Hollis’ tongue-in-cheek prayer that the complete text of Callimachus’ *Hecale*, whose fragments he edited, might remain hidden, at least for a while, before appearing and annihilating all the scholar’s reconstructive

⁸³⁶ Hollis 1997; anon. quoted *ibid.* 111.

⁸³⁷ *Ibid.* But the criticism that collecting and studying fragments is more antiquarian than humanistic must be acknowledged, too; on this see Kassel 1991.

work.⁸³⁸ The devotions of this breed of classicist are not such, however, nor the pains so great, that in truth any of us would fail to rejoice even at being utterly refuted by the sudden discovery of some (significant) scrap from, say, one of the Cyclic epics or an elusive Greek tragedy.

⁸³⁸ Hollis 1997: 111.

Bibliography

- Aélion, R. 1983. *Euripide héritier d'Eschyle*, ii vols.
- Allan, W. 2008. *Euripides: Helen*. Cambridge.
- Allen, D. S. 2002. *The World of Prometheus: The Politics of Punishing in Democratic Athens*. Princeton.
- Arrighetti, G. 1994. "Stesicoro e il suo pubblico," *MD* 32: 9-30.
- Ashcom, B. B. 1953. "Notes on the Language of the Bedford, Pennsylvania, Subarea," *American Speech* 28: 241-55.
- Avezzù, G. 1988. *Il Ferimento e il Rito: La Storia di Filottete sulla Scena Attica* (Studi e Commenti 7). Bari.
- Barchiesi, A. 2015. *Homeric Effects in Vergil's Narrative*, trans. I. Marchesi and M. Fox. Princeton [first publ. as *La traccia del modello: Effetti omerici nella narrazione virgiliana* (Giardini–Pisa: 1984)].
- Barigazzi, A. 1955. "Epicarmo e la Figura di Ulisse *ἩΣΥΧΟΣ*," *RhM* 98: 121-35.
- Barker, E. T. E. and J. P. Christensen. 2006. "Flight Club: The New Archilochus Fragment and its Resonance with Homeric Epic," *MD* 57: 9-41.
- Beekes, R., with L. van Beek. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden–Boston.
- Benardete, S. 1965. "*XPH* and *ΔΕΙ* in Plato and Others," *Glotta* 43: 285-98.
- Bergk, T. 1838. *Commentationum de reliquiis comoediae Atticae antiquae libri duo*. Leipzig.
- Berman, D. W. 2015. *Myth, Literature, and the Creation of the Topography of Thebes*. Cambridge.
- Bernabé, A. 2017. Review of Scafoglio 2014/2015. *BMCR* 2017.02.37.
- Bethe, E. 1929. *Homer: Dichtung und Sage*, vol. ii²: *Der Troische Epenkreis*. Leipzig–Berlin. [repr. 1966 with original pagination preserved]
- Biggs, P. 1966. "The Disease Theme in Sophocles' *Ajax*, *Philoctetes*, and *Trachiniae*," *CP* 61: 223-35
- Blakely, S. 2011. "Conon (26)," in I. Worthington (ed.), *Brill's New Jacoby*.

<<http://referenceworks.brillonline.com.proxy1.library.jhu.edu/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/conon-26-a26?s.num=0>>

- Boardman, J. 1976. "The Kleophrades Painter at Troy," *Antike Kunst* 19: 3-18.
- Boardman, J. 1978. "Exekias," *AJA* 82: 11-25.
- Boardman, J. 2001. *The History of Greek Vases: Potters, Painters and Pictures*. London.
- Burgess, J. S. 1996. "The Non-Homeric *Cypria*," *TAPA* 126: 77-99 [repr. in G. Nagy (ed.), *Greek Literature*, vol. ii: *Homer and Hesiod as Prototypes of Greek Literature* (New York: 2001), 113-135].
- Burgess, J. S. 2001. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Baltimore.
- Burgess, J. S. 2014. "The Death of Odysseus in the *Odyssey* and the *Telegony*," in Scafoglio 2014/2015 (vol. 7): 111-22.
- Burkert, W. 1983. *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, trans. P. Bing. Berkeley.
- Cairns, D. L. 1993. *Aidōs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford.
- Cairns, D. L. 2001. "Anger and the Veil in Ancient Greek Culture," *G&R* 48: 18-32.
- Calder III, W. M. 1991a. "How Did Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff Read a Text?" *CJ* 86: 344-52.
- Calder III, W. M. 1991b. Review of Avezzù 1988 and Schnebele 1988. *Gnomon* 63: 358-60.
- Callisen, S. A. 1939. "The Iconography of the Cock on the Column," *The Art Bulletin* 21: 160-178.
- Carden, R. 1974. *The Papyrus Fragments of Sophocles* [With a contribution on the *Niobe* fragments by W. S. Barrett]. Berlin.
- Caston, R. R. 2015. "*Pacuvius hoc melius quam Sophocles*: Cicero's use of drama in the treatment of the emotions," in D. L. Cairns and L. Fulkerson (edd.), *Emotions between Greece and Rome* (BICS Suppl. 125). London.
- Chavannes, F. 1891. *De Palladii raptu*. Diss. Berlin.
- Cingano, E. 2015. "*Epigonoï*," in Fantuzzi–Tsagalis 2015a: 244-60.

- Cohen, D. A. 1900. "Casual Observations on a Colony of Black-Crowned Night Herons," *The Condor* 2: 10-12.
- Coin-Longeray, S. 2014. *Poésie de la richesse et de la pauvreté: Étude du vocabulaire de la richesse et de la pauvreté dans la poésie grecque antique, d'Homère à Aristophane: ἄφενος, ὄλβος, πλοῦτος, πενία, πτωχός*. (Mémoires du Centre Jean Palerne 38). Saint-Etienne.
- Colesanti, G. 1999. "Il simposio in Omero," *MD* 43: 41-75.
- Collard, C. 2005. "Euripidean Fragmentary Plays: The Nature of Sources and their Effect on Reconstruction," in McHardy et al. 2005: 49-62.
- Coo, L. 2012. "Fire and Chill in Sophocles *Poimenes* fr. 507: Possible Contexts," *ZPE* 182: 89-94.
- Coo, L. 2013. "A Sophoclean Slip: Mistaken Identity and Tragic Allusion on the Exeter Pelike," *BICS* 56: 67-88.
- Cropp, M. and G. Fick. 1985. *Resolutions and Chronology in Euripides: The Fragmentary Tragedies* (BICS Suppl. vol. 43). London.
- Crusius, O. 1882. "Die Tradition vom Tod des Aischylos," *RhM* 37: 308-12.
- Csapo, E. G. 1990. "*Hikesia* in the *Telephus* of Aeschylus," *QUCC* 34: 41-52.
- Currie, B. 2015. "*Cypria*," in Fantuzzi–Tsagalis 2015a: 281-305.
- Danek, G. 1988. *Studien zur Dolonie*. Vienna.
- Davidson, J. F. 1988. "Homer and Sophocles' *Electra*," *BICS* 35: 45-72.
- Davidson, J. F. 1994. "Sophocles and the *Odyssey*," *Mnemosyne* 47: 375-79.
- Davidson, J. F. 1995. "Homer and Sophocles' *Philoctetes*," in A. Griffiths (ed.), *Stage Directions: Essays in Ancient Drama in Honour of E.W. Handley*. London: 25-35.
- Davies, M. 1989. *The Epic Cycle*. Bristol.
- Debrunner, A. 1917. *Griechische Wortbildungslehre*. Heidelberg.
- Denniston, J. D. and D. Page, edd. 1957. *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*. Oxford.
- Descœudres, J.-P., ed. 1990. *EYMOYΣΙΑ: Ceramic and Iconographic Studies in Honour of Alexander Cambitoglou*. Sydney.

- Detienne, M. and J.-P. Vernant. 1991. *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*, transl. J. Lloyd. Chicago.
- Diggle, J. 1994. *Euripidea*. Oxford.
- Dobrov, G. W. 2001. *Figures of Play: Greek Drama and Metafictional Poetics*. Oxford.
- Du , C. 2010. "Learning Lessons from the Trojan War: Briseis and the Theme of Force," in K. Myrsiades (ed.), *Approaches to Homer's Iliad and Odyssey*. New York: 93-126.
- Du , C. and M. Ebbott. 2010. *Iliad 10 and the Poetics of Ambush: A Multitext Edition with Essays and Commentary* (Hellenic Studies Series 39). Washington, DC.
- Dunbar, N. 1995. *Aristophanes: Birds*. Oxford.
- Easterling, P. E. and B. M. W. Knox, edd. 1989. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, vol. i: *Greek Literature*. Cambridge.
- Elderkin, G. W. 1936. "The Deification of Homer by Archelaos," *AJA* 40: 496-500.
- Fantuzzi, M. 2006. "The Myths of Dolon and Rhesus from Homer to the 'Homeric/Cyclic' Tragedy *Rhesus*," in F. Montanari and A. Rengakos (edd.), *Metamorphoses of Greek Epic*. Entretiens Hardt 52. Geneva: 135-76.
- Fantuzzi, M. 2012. *Achilles in Love: Intertextual Studies*. Oxford–New York.
- Fantuzzi, M. 2015. "The Aesthetics of Sequentiality and Its Discontents," in Fantuzzi–Tsagalis 2015a: 405-29.
- Fantuzzi, M. and C. Tsagalis, edd. 2015. *The Greek Epic Cycle and Its Ancient Reception: A Companion*. Cambridge. [cited as Fantuzzi–Tsagalis 2015a]
- Fantuzzi, M. and C. Tsagalis. 2015. "Introduction: *Kyklos*, the Epic Cycle and Cyclic Poetry," in Fantuzzi–Tsagalis 2015a: 1-40. [cited as Fantuzzi–Tsagalis 2015b]
- Fenik, B. 1964. *Iliad X and the Rhesus: The Myth* (Collection Latomus vol. 73). Brussels.
- Finglass, P. J. 2009. "Two Amputations in Sophocles," *MD* 62: 223-30.
- Finglass, P. J. 2011. *Sophocles: Ajax*. Cambridge–New York.
- Finglass, P. J. 2012. "*Ajax*," in Markantonatos 2012: 59-72.
- Finglass, P. J. 2013. "How Stesichorus Began His *Sack of Troy*," *ZPE* 185: 1-17.

- Finglass, P. J. 2015. "Stesichorus, Master of Narrative," in Finglass–Kelly 2015: 83-97.
- Finglass, P. J. and A. Kelly, edd. 2015. *Stesichorus in Context*. Cambridge.
- Finkelberg, M., ed. 2011. *The Homer Encyclopedia*. Chichester, West Sussex–Malden, MA.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. 1945. *The Aristotelian Elements of Tragedy as Found in Homer*, Chicago thesis (Loyola Univ.).
- Foley, H. P. 2015. *Euripides: Hecuba*. London–New York.
- Ford, A. 2002. *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton.
- Fowler, B. H. 1989. *The Hellenistic Aesthetic*. Madison.
- Frazer, J. G. 1921. *Apollodorus: The Library*, ii vols. London–New York.
- Friedländer, P. 1913. "Υποθήκαι," *Hermes* 48: 558-616.
- Friis Johansen, K. 1967. *The Iliad in Early Greek Art*. Copenhagen.
- Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore.
- Garassino, A. 1930. "Ulisse nel teatro Greco," *Atene e Roma* 11: 219-51.
- Garvie, A. F. 1994. *Homer: Odyssey Books VI–VIII*. Cambridge.
- Gasti, H. 1992. "Sophocles' *Ajax*: The Military *Hybris*," *QUCR* 40: 81-93.
- Gianvittorio, L. 2015. "One deception, many lies: Frr. 301/302 Radt and Aeschylus' Philoctetes," *WS* 128: 19-26.
- Green, J. R. 1996. "Messengers from the Tragic Stage: The A. D. Trendall Memorial Lecture," *BICS* 41: 17-30.
- Gregory, J. 1997. *Euripides and the Instruction of the Athenians*. Ann Arbor.
- Gregory, J. 1999. *Euripides: Hecuba*. *American Philological Association Textbook Series no. 14*. Atlanta.
- Griffin, J. 1977. "The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer," *JHS* 97: 39-53.
- Grossardt, P. 2003. "The Title of Aeschylus' *Ostologoi*," *HSCP* 101: 155-8.

- Grossardt, P. 2005. "Zum Inhalt der *HEKTOROS LYTRA* des Dionysios I (TGrF 1,76 F2A)," *RhM* 148: 225-41.
- Grossmann, G. 1968. "Das Lachen des Aias," *Mus. Helv.* 25: 65-85.
- Gruppe, O. 1906. *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*. Munich.
- Hadjicosti, I. 2007. *Aischylos and the Trojan Cycle: The Lost Tragedies*. Diss. London.
- Haft, A. 1990. "'The City-Sacker Odysseus' in *Iliad* 2 and 10," *TAPA* 120: 37-56.
- Hancock, J. and J. Kushlan. 1984. *The Herons Handbook*. New York.
- Harries, H. 1891. *Tragici Graeci qua arte usi sint in describenda insania*. Diss. Kiel.
- Harris, W. V. 1989. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge, Mass.–London.
- Hartmann, A. 1917. *Untersuchungen über die Sagen vom Tod des Odysseus*. Munich.
- Headlam, W. 1903. "Some Passages of Aeschylus and Others," *CR* 17: 286-95.
- Heath, B. 1762. *Notae sive lectiones ad tragicorum Graecorum veterum Aeschyli Sophoclis Euripidis quae supersunt dramata deperditorumque reliquias*. Oxford.
- Heath, M. 1987a. *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy*. Stanford.
- Heath, M. 1987b. "Iure principem locum tenet: Euripides' *Hecuba*," *BICS* 34: 40-68.
- Heinze, R. 1903. *Virgils Epische Technik*. Leipzig.
- Helmer, É. 2015. *Le dernier des hommes: figures du mendiant en Grèce ancienne. Les marches du temps*. Paris.
- Hendrickson, T. 2014. "The Invention of the Greek Library," *TAPA* 144.2: 371-413.
- Herington, J. 1985. *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition*. Berkeley–Los Angeles–London.
- Hermann, G. 1837. *Euripidis Tragoediae*, vol. ii.1: *Helena*. Leipzig.
- Heslin, P. J. 2005. *The Transvestite Achilles: Gender and Genre in Statius' Achilleid*. Cambridge.
- Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext*. Cambridge.

- Hollis, A. 1997. "A Fragmentary Addiction," in Most 1997: 111-23.
- Hose, M. 1990. "Überlegungen zum *Oedipus* des Euripides," *ZPE* 81: 9-15.
- Hunger, H. 1967. *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft* 16: 1-33.
- Hutchinson, G. O. 2001. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces (Alcman, Stesichorus, Sappho, Alcaeus, Ibycus, Anacreon, Simonides, Bacchylides, Pindar, Sophocles, Euripides)*. Oxford.
- Immerwahr, H. 1964. "Book Rolls on Attic Vases," in C. Henderson, Jr. (ed.), *Classical, Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies in Honor of Berthold Louis Ullman*. Rome: 17-48.
- Ingleheart, J. 2010. *A Commentary on Ovid, Tristia, Book 2*. Oxford.
- Jebb, R. C. 1893. *The Attic Orators*. London.
- Jebb, R. C. 1907. *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments, part 7: The Ajax*. Cambridge.
- Jobling, J. A. 2010. *The Helm Dictionary of Scientific Bird Names*. London.
- Johnson, W. A. 2010. *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities*. Oxford.
- Johnston, S. I. 1999. *Restless Dead: Encounters Between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley.
- de Jong, I. J. F. 2001. *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge.
- de Jong, I. J. F. 2004. *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*, 2nd ed. London.
- Jouan, F. 1966. *Euripide et les Légendes des Chants Cypriens: Des Origines de la Guerre de Troie à l'Iliade*. Paris.
- Jouan, F. 1994. "Sophocle et les *Chants cypriens*," in J. A. López Férez (ed.), *La épica griega y su influencia en la literatura española* (Madrid: 1994), 189-212.
- Jouanna, J. 2007. *Sophocle*. Paris.
- Kannicht, R. 1997. "TrGF v Euripides," in Most 1997: 67-77.
- Kassel, R. 1991. "Fragmente und ihre Sammler," in H. Hofmann and A. Harder (edd.), *Fragmenta Dramatica*. Göttingen: 243-53.

- Kelhoffer, J. A. 2000. *Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and Their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, ser. 2 vol. 112). Tübingen.
- Kelly, A. 2015. "Ilias Parva," in Fantuzzi–Tsagalis 2015a: 318-43.
- Kennedy, W. J. 2011. *Antisthenes' Ajax and Odysseus*. Sydney thesis.
- Knox, B. 1961. "The Ajax of Sophocles," *HSCP* 65: 1-37.
- Kocziszky, E. 2010. "Gewalt und Trauer. Niobe-Tragödien," in A. Bierl and W. Braungart (edd.), *Gewalt und Opfer: im Dialog mit Walter Burkert* (*MythosEikonPoiesis* vol. 2). Berlin–New York: 363-82.
- Konstan, D. 2015. "Wit and Irony in the Epic Cycle," in in Fantuzzi–Tsagalis 2015a: 164-77.
- Kotlińska-Toma, A. 2015. *Hellenistic Tragedy: Texts, Translations, and a Critical Survey*. London.
- Kraias, G. 2008. *Epische Szenen in tragischem Kontext: Untersuchung zu den Homer-Bezügen bei Aischylos*. Diss. Freiburg [republished 2011 as *PRISMATA* vol. 20].
- Krumeich, R., N. Pechstein, and B. Seidensticker, edd. 1999. *Das Griechische Satyrspiel*. Darmstadt.
- Kudlien, F. 1970. "Zu Arats Ὀστολογία und Aischylos' Ὀστολόγοι," *RhM* 113: 297-304.
- Kuiper, K. 1902. *Album gratulatorium in honorem H. v. Herwerden*. Utrecht.
- Kullmann, W. 1960. *Die Quellen der Ilias (troischer Epenkreis)* (*Hermes Einzelschriften* vol. 14).
- Kyriakou, P. 2001. "Warrior Vaunts in the Iliad," *RhM* 144: 250-77.
- Lange, K. 2002. *Euripides und Homer: Untersuchungen zur Homernachwirkung in Elektra, Iphigenie im Taurerland, Helena, Orestes, und Kylops* (*Hermes Einzelschriften* vol. 86). Stuttgart.
- Latacz, J. et al., edd. 2008. *Der Mythos von Troia in Dichtung und Kunst*. Munich.
- Lawall, S. N. 1959. "Sophocles' Ajax: Aristos...after Achilles," *CJ* 54: 290-4.
- Lee, K. H. 1997. *Euripides: Troades*, 2nd ed. London.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. 2009. "Biographical Mythology," in C. Walde and U. Dill (edd.),

- Antike Mythen: Medien, Transformationen und Konstruktionen* (Berlin–New York), 516-31.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. 2012. *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, 2nd ed. Baltimore.
- Liapis, V. 2012. *A Commentary on the Rhesus Attributed to Euripides*. Oxford–New York.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1996. *Sophocles: Fragments*. Cambridge, MA–London.
- Long, A. A. 1968. *Language and Thought in Sophocles: A Study of Abstract Nouns and Poetic Technique*. London.
- Lowenstam, S. 1992. “The Use of Vase-Depictions in Homeric Studies,” *TAPA* 122:165-198.
- Lucas de Dios, J. M. 1983. *Sófocles: Fragmentos*. Madrid.
- Luckenbach, H. 1880. *Das Verhältniss der griechischen Vasenbilder zu den Gedichten des epischen Kyklos. Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Suppl. 11: 491-638.
- Mackie, H. 1996. *Talking Trojan: Speech and Community in the Iliad*. Lanham, MD.
- Markantonatos, A., ed. 2012. *Brill’s Companion to Sophocles*. Leiden–Boston.
- Marr, J. L. 1970. “Who Said What About Alcibiades? *Frogs* 1422-34,” *CQ* 20: 53-55.
- Mastrorarde, D. J. 2002. *Euripides: Medea*. Cambridge.
- Mastrorarde, D. J. 2010. *The Art of Euripides: Dramatic Technique and Social Context*. Cambridge.
- Matheson, S. B. 2009. “Beardless, Armed, and Barefoot: Ephebes, Warriors, and Ritual on Athenian Vases,” in D. Yatromanolakis (ed.), *An Archaeology of Representations: Ancient Greek Vase-painting and Contemporary Methodologies*. Athens.
- Mathews, M. M. 1951. *A Dictionary of Americanisms on Historical Principles*. Chicago.
- Mawhinney, L. E. 2012. *Sympotic and Rhapsodic Discourse in the Homeric Epics*. Diss. Toronto.
- Mayer, M. 1883. *De Euripidis mythopoeia capita duo*. Berlin.
- McHardy, F., J. Robson, and D. Harvey, edd. 2005. *Lost Dramas of Classical Athens*. Exeter.

- McKay, K. J. 1962. *The Poet at Play: Kallimachos, The Bath of Pallas* (*Mnem. Suppl.* vol. 6). Leiden.
- Merkelbach, R. 1969. "Zwei Vermutungen zu Tragikerfragmenten," *RhM* 112: 109-13.
- Merro, G. 2008. *Gli scoli al Reso euripideo: Introduzione, testo critico e commento, Orione: Testi e studi di letteratura greca, 2*. Messina.
- Merry, W. W. and J. Riddell. 1886. *Homer's Odyssey: Books i-xii*. Oxford.
- Mette, H. J. 1955. "Literaturbericht über Aischylos für die Jahre 1950 bis 1954," *Gymnasium* 62: 393-407.
- Meyer, E. 1895. "Der Ursprung des Odysseusmythus: Mit Einem Anhang Ueber Todtendienst und Heroencult," *Hermes* 30: 241-88.
- Michelakis, P. 2002. *Achilles in Tragedy*. Cambridge.
- Mills, S. 1997. *Theseus, Tragedy and the Athenian Empire*. Oxford.
- Mimidou, E. N. 2013. *Ευριπίδη Αίολος: ερμηνευτικός σχολιασμός των αποσπασμάτων της τραγωδίας Αίολος του Ευριπίδη*. Athens.
- Miralles, C. 1987. "Le rire sardonique," *MHTIS* 2: 31-43.
- Moessner, O. 1907. *Die Mythologie in der dorischen und altattischen Komödie*. Diss. Erlangen.
- Mommsen, H. 1980. "Achill und Aias pflichtvergessen?" H. A. Cahn and E. Simon (edd.), *Tainia*, Festsch. Roland Hampe. Mainz am Rhein: 139-52.
- Montiglio, S. 2000. *Silence in the Land of Logos*. Princeton.
- Montiglio, S. 2011. *From Villain to Hero: Odysseus in Ancient Thought*. Ann Arbor.
- Moss, J. 2006. "Pleasure and Illusion in Plato," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 72: 503-35.
- Most, G. W. 1996. "Zur Theorie und Geschichte der Fragmentsammlungen," *Gnomon* 68: 574f.
- Most, G. W., ed. 1997. *Collecting Fragments/Fragmente sammeln. Aporemata 1*. Göttingen.
- Most, G. W. 2003. "Euripide *Ο ΓΝΩΜΟΛΟΓΙΚΩΤΑΤΟΣ*," in M. S. Funghi (ed.), *Aspetti Di letteratura gnomica nel mondo antico*, Florence: 141-66.

- Mülke, C. 1996. “Ποίων δὲ κακῶν οὐκ αἴτιος ἔστι: Euripides’ *Aiolos* und der Geschwisterinzeß im klassischen Athen,” *ZPE* 114: 37-55.
- Müller, C. W. 1997. *Philoktet: Beiträge zur Wiedergewinnung einer Tragödie des Euripides*. Stuttgart.
- Müller, C. W. 2000. *Euripides: Philoktet: Testimonien und Fragmente* (Texte und Kommentare 21). Berlin–New York.
- Murray, G. 1940. *Aeschylus: The Creator of Tragedy*. Oxford.
- Murray, O. 1991. “War and the Symposium,” in W. J. Slater (ed.), *Dining in a Classical Context*. Ann Arbor: 83-103.
- Nagy, G. 1999. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*, rev. ed. Baltimore.
- Nauck, A. 1856. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Leipzig. [largely superseded by later editions, the last of which is cited by author’s name alone (see p. viii *supra*)]
- Nauck, A. 1892. *Tragicae dictionis index, spectans ad Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. St. Petersburg–Leipzig.
- Nietzsche, F. 1974. *The Birth of Tragedy; or, Hellenism and Pessimism*, trans. W. A. Haussmann. New York.
- Nitzsch, G. W. 1852. *Die Sagenpoesie der Griechen*. Braunschweig.
- Pallantza, E. 2005. *Der Troische Krieg in der nachhomerischen Literatur bis zum 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr. (Hermes Einzelschriften vol. 94)*. Stuttgart.
- Parker, R. 1983. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Oxford.
- Parker, R. 1996. *Athenian Religion: A History*. Oxford–New York.
- Parker, R. 2005. *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford–New York.
- Pearson, A. C., ed. 1917. *The Fragments of Sophocles*. Cambridge. [“Edited with additional notes from the papers of Sir R. C. Jebb and Dr. W. G. Headlam”]
- Petrain, D. 2014. *Homer in Stone: The Tabulae Iliacae in their Roman Context*. Cambridge.
- Podlecki, A. J. 1971. “Cimon, Skyros and ‘Theseus’ Bones,”” *JHS* 91: 141-3.
- Pohlenz, M. 1954. *Die griechische Tragödie*, 2nd ed. Göttingen.

- Post, C. R. 1922. "The Dramatic Art of Sophocles as Revealed by the Fragments of the Lost Plays," *HSCP* 33: 1-63.
- Power, T. 2012. "Sophocles and Music," in Markantonatos 2012: 283-304.
- Preiser, C. 2000. *Euripides: Telephos: Einleitung, Text, Kommentar (Spudasmata vol. 78)*. Hildesheim–Zürich–New York.
- Preiser, C. 2001. "Achilleus' Heilmittel für Telephos in den *Kyprien*, in Euripides' *Telephos*, bei Plinius und bei Apollodor," *RhM* 144: 277-86.
- Preller, L. 1861. *Griechische Mythologie*, vol. ii: *Die Heroen*, 2nd ed. Berlin.
- Quinn, K. 1996. *Horace: The Odes*. London.
- Radt, S. L. 1986. "Welcker und die verlorene Tragödie," in W. M. Calder III et al. (edd.), *Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker: Werk und Wirkung. Hermes Suppl. vol. 49*. Stuttgart: 157-78.
- Radt, S. L. 1991. "Sophokles in seinen Fragmenten," in H. Hofmann and A. Harder (edd.), *Fragmenta Dramatica*. Göttingen: 79-110 [repr. from *Sophocle. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique* 29 (Vandœuvres–Geneva: 1982), 185-231].
- Reichel, M. 2011. "II. Epische Dichtung. 2. Homer," in B. Zimmermann (ed.) ["unter Mitarbeit von Anne Schlichtmann"], *Handbuch der griechischen Literatur der Antike*, vol. 1: *Die Literatur der archaischen und klassischen Zeit (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, part 7)*. Munich.
- Reitzenstein, R. 1891/2. *Index Lectionum*. Rostock.
- Rengakos, A. 2015. "*Aethiopsis*," in Fantuzzi–Tsagalis 2015a: 306-17.
- Reynolds, L. D. and N. G. Wilson. 1991. *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 3rd ed. Oxford.
- Ribbeck, O. 1875. *Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik*. Leipzig.
- Rinon, Y. 2008. "A Tragic Pattern in the *Iliad*," *HSCP* 104: 45-91.
- Robert, C. 1895. *Die Marathonschlacht in der Poikile*. Halle.
- Robert, C. 1920-6. *Griechische Mythologie*, vol. ii: *Die Heroen: Die griechische Heldensage*. Berlin. [revision of Preller 1861]
- Roisman, H. M., ed. 2013. *The Encyclopedia of Greek Tragedy*, iii vols. Chichester, West

Sussex–Malden, MA.

- Roller, D. W. and L. K. Roller. 1994. "Penelope's Thick Hand (*Odyssey* 21.6)," *CJ* 90: 9-19.
- Rose, H. J. 1950. "Ghost Ritual in Aeschylus," *HThR* 43: 257-80.
- Rosenbloom, D. 2001. "Ajax Is *megas*: Is That All We Can Say?" *Prudentia* 33: 109-29.
- Rostagni, A. 1912/3. "L'*Euripilo* di Sofocle ed un frammento epico adespoto," *Bollettino di Filologia Classica* 19: 156-8 = id., *Scritti minori* ii.1: *Hellenica–Hellenistica* (Torino: 1956), 56-8.
- Russell, D. A. 1995. *Criticism in Antiquity*, 2nd ed. London.
- Rutherford, I. 2015. "Pindar's Cycle," in Fantuzzi–Tsagalis 2015a: 450-60.
- Saenger, P. 1997. *Space Between Words: The Origins of Silent Reading*. Stanford.
- Scafoglio, G., ed. 2014/2015. *Studies on the Greek Epic Cycle*, ii vols. (*Philologia antiqua* 7 [2014] and 8 [2015]). Pisa–Rome.
- Schein, S. L. 1998. "Verbal Adjectives in Sophocles: Necessity and Morality," *CP* 93: 293-307.
- Schein, S. L. 2013. *Sophocles: Philoctetes*. Cambridge.
- Schierl, P. 2006. *Die Tragödien des Pacuvius: ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten mit Einleitung, Text, und Übersetzung*. Berlin–New York.
- Schlange-Schöningen, H. 2006. "Odysseus, Aias und Palamedes," in A. Luther (ed.), *Geschichte und Fiktion in der homerischen Odyssee*. Munich: 93-106.
- Schlunk, R. R. 1974. *The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid*. Ann Arbor.
- Schmidt, J. O. 1885. *Ulixes Posthomicus*. Diss. Berlin.
- Schmidt, J. O. 1888. "Ulixes Comicus," in *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Suppl. 16: 373-402.
- Schnebele, A. 1988. *Die epischen Quellen des Sophokleischen Philoktet*. Diss. Tübingen.
- Schneidewin, F. W. 1849. "Sophokleische Studien," *Philologus* 4: 645-72.
- Scodel, R. 1980. *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides (Hypomnemata 60)*. Göttingen.

- Seaford, R. 2005. "Death and Wedding in Aeschylus' *Niobe*," in McHardy et al. 2005: 113-27.
- Séchan, L. 1926. *Études sur la tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique*. Paris.
- Severyns, A. 1928. *Le Cycle Épique dans l'École d'Aristarque*. Liège–Paris.
- Shapiro, H. A. 1981. "Exekias, Ajax, and Salamis: A Further Note," *AJA* 85: 173-5.
- Shapiro, H. A. 1986. "The Origins of Allegory in Greek Art," *Boreas* 9: 4-23.
- Shapiro, H. A. 1995. "Literacy and Social Status of Archaic Attic Vase-Painters," *Revista do Museu de Arqueologia e Etnologia* 5: 211-22.
- Shapiro, H. A. 2005. "The Judgment of Helen in Athenian Art," in J. M. Barringer and J. M. Hurwit (edd.), *Periklean Athens and its Legacy*. Austin: 47-62.
- Shealer, D. A., J. A. Spendelov, J. S. Hatfield, and I. C. T. Nisbet. 2005. "The Adaptive Significance of Stealing in a Marine Bird and Its Relationship to Parental Quality," *Behavioral Ecology* 16: 371-76.
- Shorey, P. 1918. Review of Pearson 1917. *CP* 13: 94-99.
- Slavitter, L. M. 1991. *The Defecation Behavior of Great Blue Herons and Great Egrets in the South Carolina Piedmont, and Greenhead Shiner Responses to Great Blue Heron Feces*. Winthrop College thesis.
- Smith, J. A. 1924. "Aristotle, *Poetics*, c. XVI., § 10," *CQ* 18: 165-168.
- Smith, A. C. 2011. *Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art*. Leiden–Boston.
- Smyth, H. W. and H. Lloyd-Jones. 1957. *Aeschylus*, vol. ii: Agamemnon, Libation-Bearers, Eumenides, *Fragments, the Appendix*. London–Cambridge, MA.
- Snell, B. 1971. *Szenen aus griechischen Dramen*. Berlin.
- Sommerstein, A. H. 2000. "The Prologue of Aeschylus' *Palamedes*," *RhM* 143: 118-27.
- Sommerstein, A. H., ed. 2003. *Shards from Kolonos: Studies in Sophoclean Fragments*. Bari.
- Sommerstein, A. H. 2008. *Aeschylus: Fragments*. Cambridge, MA.
- Sommerstein, A. H. 2012a. *Aeschylean Tragedy*, 2nd ed. London.

- Sommerstein, A. H. 2012b. "Fragments and Lost Tragedies," in Markantonatos 2012: 191-209.
- Sommerstein, A. H. 2015. "Tragedy and the Epic Cycle," in Fantuzzi–Tsagalis 2015a: 461-86.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 2011. *Athenian Myths and Festivals: Aglauros, Erechtheus, Plynteria, Panathenaia, Dionysia*. Oxford.
- Spiro, F. 1896. Review of P. Sakolowski and E. Martini (edd.), *Mythographi Graeci* vol. ii, fasc. I (Leipzig: 1896). *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie* 13: 729-732.
- Stanford, W. B. 1964. *The Ulysses Theme: A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero*, 2nd ed. New York.
- Stansbury-O'Donnell, M. D. 1990. "Polygnotos's *Nekyia*: A Reconstruction and Analysis," *AJA* 94: 213-35.
- Steffen, V. 1975. "Quaestiunculæ Satyricæ," *Eos* 63: 5-13.
- Stieber, M. 2011. *Euripides and the Language of Craft*. Leiden–Boston.
- Stinton, T. C. W. 1990. *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy*. Oxford.
- Sutton, D. F. 1984. *The Lost Sophocles*. Lanham, NY–London.
- Swift, L. 2015. "Stesichorus on Stage," in Finglass–Kelly 2015: 125-44.
- Taplin, O. 2007. *Pots & Plays: Interactions Between Tragedy and Greek Vase-painting of the Fourth Century B.C.* Los Angeles.
- Thalmann, W. G. 1993. "Euripides and Aeschylus: The Case of the *Hekabe*," *CA* 12: 126-59.
- Thomas, R. "Writing, Reading, Public and Private 'Literacies': Functional Literacy and Democratic Literacy in Greece," in W. A. Johnson and H. N. Parker (edd.), *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*. Oxford: 13-45.
- Tiberios, M. 1990. "Apharetides—Tyndarides," in Descœudres 1990: 119-24.
- Tsagalis, C. 2004. "'Αχιλλεύς Ἐλένην ἐπιθυμῆ θεάσασθαι: ἀπό τα Κύπρια στην Ιλιάδα,'" *Ελληνικά* 55: 7-26.
- Tsagalis, C. 2008a. *The Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics*. Cambridge, MA.

- Tsagalis, C. 2008b. “Μεταμορφώσεις του μύθου. Ο Τρωικός Κύκλος στους τρεις μεγάλους τραγικούς,” in A. Markantonatos and C. Tsagalis (edd.), *Αρχαία Ελληνική τραγωδία. Θεωρία και πράξη*. Athens: 33-115.
- Tsagalis, C. 2015. “*Telegony*,” in Fantuzzi–Tsagalis 2015a: 380-402.
- Tyrrell, W. B. 2012. “Biography,” in Markantonatos 2012: 17-37.
- Wagner, R. 1891. *Epitoma Vaticana ex Apollodori Bibliotheca. Accedunt Curae Mythographae de Apollodori fontibus*. Leipzig.
- van Wees, H. 1995. “Princes at Dinner: Social Event and Social Structure in Homer,” in J. P. Crielaard (ed.), *Homeric Questions*. Amsterdam: 147-82.
- Wecowski, M. 2014. *The Rise of the Greek Aristocratic Banquet*. Oxford.
- Welcker, F. G. 1824. *Die Aeschyleische Trilogie Prometheus und die Kabirenweihe zu Lemnos nebst Winken über die Trilogie des Aeschylus überhaupt*. Darmstadt.
- Welcker, F. G. 1826. *Nachtrag zu der Schrift über die Aeschylische Trilogie, nebst einer Abhandlung über das Satyrspiel*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Welcker, F. G. 1850. *Kleine Schriften*, part 3. Bonn.
- Welcker, F. G. 1865-1882. *Der epische Cyclus, oder die homerischen Dichter*, ii vols. Bonn. [vol. i² published 1865; vol. ii² published 1882]
- West, M. L. 1968. “Notes on Newly-Discovered Fragments of Greek Authors,” *Maia* 20: 195-205.
- West, M. L. 1982. *Greek Metre*. Oxford.
- West, M. L. 2011. *The Making of the Iliad: Disquisition and Analytical Commentary*. Oxford.
- West, M. L. 2014. *The Making of the Odyssey*. Oxford.
- West, S., J. B. Hainsworth, and A. Hoekstra. 1989. *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey: Books IX-XVI*. Oxford.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1875. *Analecta Euripidea*. Berlin.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1884. *Homerische Untersuchungen*. Berlin.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1916. *Die Ilias und Homer*. Berlin.

- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1924. *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, ii vols. Berlin.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1935-72. *Kleine Schriften*. vi vols. Berlin.
- Willcock, M. M. 1978. *Homer: Iliad Books I-XII*. London.
- Willcock, M. M. 1999. *Homer: Iliad Books XIII-XXIV*. London.
- Wilson, N. G., ed. 2007. *Aristophanis Fabulae*, vol. ii. Oxford.
- Wilson, P. 2009. "Thamyris the Thracian: The Archetypal Wandering Poet?" in R. Hunter and I. Rutherford (edd.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality, and Pan-Hellenism*. Cambridge: 46-79.
- Winnington-Ingram, R. P. 1959. Review of Smyth-Lloyd-Jones 1957. *CR* N.S. 9: 239-41.
- Woodford, S. 1982. "Ajax and Achilles Playing a Game on an Olpe in Oxford," *JHS* 102: 173-85.
- Woodman, A. J. 2004. *Tacitus: the Annals*. Indianapolis-Cambridge.
- Worman, N. 2000. "Infection in the Sentence: the Discourse of Disease in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*," *Arethusa* 33: 1-36.
- Worman, N. 2012. "Oedipus, Odysseus, and the Failure of Rhetoric," in Markantonatos 2012: 325-48.
- Zeitlin, F. I. 1990. "Thebes: Theater of Self and Society in Athenian Drama," in J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin (edd.), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Greek Drama in Its Social Context*. Princeton: 130-67 [repr. from J. Peter Euben (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory* (Berkeley: 1986), 101-41].

Curriculum Vitae

I was born in Alexandria, VA on August 28, 1986. I first studied Latin and Greek at Gonzaga College High School in Washington, DC and in 2008 earned a BA in Classics (with Distinction) from the University of Virginia in Charlottesville, VA. Since completing my coursework for the Classics PhD program at Johns Hopkins University I have taught Classics courses at the University of Maryland–Baltimore County, Montclair State University, Brooklyn College, and the Latin/Greek Institute in New York City.