Early Greek Indexicality
Markers of Allusion in Archaic Greek Poetry

Thomas James Nelson
Trinity College
University of Cambridge
September 2018

This dissertation is submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Abstract

Early Greek Indexicality: Markers of Allusion in Archaic Greek Poetry

Thomas J. Nelson | Trinity College | PhD | September 2018

This thesis is concerned with early Greek literary history and the nature of archaic Greek allusion. It examines how our earliest Greek poets self-consciously marked and signalled their interactions with other texts and traditions, often in a deeply antagonistic fashion.

In recent years, scholars have explored how Roman poets signposted references to their predecessors through a range of relational metaphors, representing their allusions as acts of recollection, echo and theft. Yet although these readings have proved a popular and rewarding interpretative approach, such allusive phenomena are often assumed to be the preserve of the scholarly, literate and bookish climates of the Hellenistic and Roman worlds.

In this study, by contrast, I highlight how these very same devices can already be detected in Archaic Greek Poetry, from Homer to Pindar, challenging any simple dichotomy between the orality of Archaic Greece and the literacy of Hellenistic Rome. After an introduction in which I lay out the objectives of my study and address the methodological difficulties of discussing allusion and intertextuality in early Greek poetry, the majority of the thesis is divided into three main sections, each of which addresses a different ‘index’ (marker/pointer) of allusion in archaic Greek epic and lyric. The first addresses what Latinists call the ‘Alexandrian footnote’: vague references to hearsay and anonymous tradition which frequently conceal specific nods to precise literary predecessors. The second focuses on poetic memory, exploring how characters’ reminiscences of events from their fictional pasts coincide with recollections of earlier literary texts and traditions. The final chapter turns to time and temporality, to explore how Greek poets both evoke and pointedly replay episodes of the literary past or future beyond their immediate narrative. Together, these three case studies demonstrate that the indexing and signposting of allusions was nothing new by the time of the Hellenistic age. What are sometimes considered distinctively learned flourishes of self-consciousness were in fact, I contend, an integral part of the literary tradition from the very start, a key feature of the grammar of allusion with which ancient audiences were already intuitively familiar.
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PART I.

INTRODUCTION
I.1 Indexicality and Allusion

I.1.1 Allusion: Greece versus Rome

Two decades ago, the late Don Fowler set out his vision of the ‘principal tasks’ that lay ahead ‘for future intertextual criticism’. In particular, he pinpointed the need to expand our understanding of early Greek allusion and ‘to apply to Greek texts, especially of the archaic and classical periods, the intensely ideological readings of genre and intertextuality that have proved so successful in Latin studies.’¹ In the past twenty years, scholars have responded to this clarion call with much gusto and have drawn on the interpretative strategies of later periods to highlight the rich intertextual potential of early Greek poetry.² Few indeed would now contend (if any ever did) that allusive sophistication is ‘the private preserve of Alexandrian and Augustan poets and their exegetes’.³

Yet there remains an underlying fissure in scholarship on early Greek allusion, which revolves around one central question: how similar were the allusive practices of archaic Greece and Augustan Rome? Already in 1997, Fowler remarked that ‘there is no reason why anyone should not use the full tools of detailed intertextual analysis on early Greek texts’ – a sentiment he shares with other scholars who foreground the continuities of literary history.⁴ But set against such optimism are voices of caution, those who warn that the oral environment of early


² E.g. Torrance (2013); Currie (2016); Rawles (2018); Spelman (2018a).


Greek poetry precludes the same interpretative strategies available to readers of Latin literature. Robert Fowler’s assessment of archaic lyric is typical: ‘there are no Virgils here’. 5

This debate is a complex one and largely stems from scholars’ differing theoretical preconceptions. But it is further hindered by scholars’ tendency to examine archaic Greek poetry in a compartmentalised fashion: most studies of early Greek allusion focus on a single author, or – at best – a single genre, which limits our ability to chart diachronic developments or investigate similarities and differences in depth. Moreover, the insistent emphasis on the ‘if’ of early Greek allusion overrides an exploration of the ‘why’. Scholars’ fixation on proving or denying a case of allusion often usurps consideration of an allusion’s interpretative significance, short-circuiting an exploration of the manner in which individual texts construct and contest their inherited tradition. When it comes to understanding the scope, quality and significance of early Greek allusion, there is still much work to be done.

In this study, I will re-examine the nature of archaic Greek allusion by embarking on a track that is both broader and narrower than the usual path. On the one hand, I will explore the development of allusive practices in archaic Greece from our earliest Greek epic poetry to late archaic lyric – offering a broader perspective on archaic allusivity. But to do so, I will focus on one very particular feature of this allusive system: the marking and signposting of allusion, a phenomenon which I call ‘indexicality’ (see below). Such signalling is often considered the most learned and bookish device in a Roman poet’s allusive arsenal. But in this study, I intend to demonstrate that this phenomenon was already deeply embedded in the earliest extant Greek poetry – a conclusion that strengthens the case for deep continuities between the allusive practices of Greece and Rome.

In the remainder of this chapter, I shall survey the recent developments and limitations of scholarship on allusive marking, before turning in the next to outline my methodological approach to early Greek allusion.

I.1.2 Indexicality: Marking Allusion

Literary scholars have long attempted to catalogue and categorize the means by which authors may mark—and readers recognize—allusions. In the words of Jeffrey Wills, we are all deeply immersed and trained in a ‘grammar of allusion’, by which we read and interpret allusive references. For ancient Greek and Roman poetry, we can pick out four overarching strands of this ‘grammar’: (i) verbal allusion, the repetition of specific words or phrases, especially if they are distinctive or unusual, e.g. dialectally charged or rarely used (like Homeric *hapax legomena*); (ii) aural allusion, the repetition of specific sonic, rhythmic or metrical patterns; (iii) structural allusion, the use of a similar word order or similar placement of a word or phrase within a line or whole poem; and (iv) thematic allusion, the exploitation of similar themes, contexts or content. Most cases of ancient allusion derive their power from some combination of these four categories, although such a simple, formal list will undoubtedly prove unsatisfactory in some cases, given the varied and nuanced application of allusion.

In addition to these broad overarching categories, however, scholars in the past few decades have begun to dwell increasingly on a range of more self-reflexive techniques by which ancient and modern poets have signposted their allusive engagements. In the field of English literature, John Hollander has examined echo as a ‘mode of allusion’ in Milton and Romantic poetry, David Quint has explored rivers’ sources as a topos of literary debt, and Christopher Ricks has probed the range of motifs by which English poets self-consciously figured themselves as heirs to tradition, exploiting tropes of paternity, inheritance and succession. Inspired by such studies, classical scholars have noted a similarly sophisticated array of allusive markers in Latin literature.

By far the most commonly attested is the so-called ‘Alexandrian footnote’, a device which assimilates literary allusion to the transmission of talk and hearsay: general appeals to

---

tradition (such as *fama est*, *ferunt* or *audi vi*) often signal an allusion to specific literary predecessors, despite their apparent vagueness and generality. A famous example of this device is the opening of Catullus’ *epyllion*, Carmen 64, where the *dicuntur* (‘they are said’) in the second line flags the poem’s polemical interaction with numerous other treatments of the Argonautic voyage. A simpler example, however, is that of *fertur* in Virgil’s description of the two gates of horn and ivory in *Aeneid* 6, which points back to Penelope’s famous description of these very same gates in the *Odyssey* (*Aen*.6.893-96 ~ *Od*.19.562-67). In addition to the verbal and thematic echoes of the Odyssean passage, Virgil’s vague appeal to tradition invites his audience to ask where these details have been ‘reported’ before, an extra spur to recall the legitimising authority of Homer.

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

---

10 The phrase ‘Alexandrian footnote’ is usually attributed to Ross (1975) 68, although he only uses it in passing when describing the ‘neoteric’ nature of Prop.1.20.17’s *namque ferunt olim* (with a cross reference to Norden (1957) 123-24). The phrase was later brought to prominence and invested with its current intertextual associations by Hinds (1987) 58 with n.22, (1998) 1-3.
the Pindaric scholia.\textsuperscript{12} In this case, Virgil’s *fama est* gestures not only to a single literary source, but rather to a plurality of competing traditions, within which Virgil signals his own solution: ‘he simultaneously refers to this *zetema*, and tells us who was right’.\textsuperscript{13} 

In other cases, meanwhile, hearsay is invoked at points of apparent innovation, where inherited tradition is creatively reworked or completely rewritten. When Virgil claims in the *Georgics* that Aristaeus’ bees were lost through sickness and hunger (*amissis, ut fama, apibus morboque fameque, G.4.318*), he seems to be lending the authority of tradition to what is in all likelihood his own invention, further reinforced by the aural jingle of *fama* and *fame*.\textsuperscript{14} In the *Aeneid*, meanwhile, Sinon prefaces an untraditional account of Palamedes’ genealogy and pacifism with an emphatic assertion of the hero’s famous reputation (*Aen.2.81-83*):

\begin{verbatim}
fando aliquod si forte tuas pervenit ad auris Belidae nomen Palamedis et incluta fama gloria …
\end{verbatim}

This insistence on Palamedes’ fame lends a legitimising veneer to Sinon’s (and Virgil’s) untraditional account, but it also invites an audience to challenge the claims that follow, to hone in on their innovations and to dwell on their significance.\textsuperscript{15} Such ‘faux footnotes’ as these are ‘a kind of poetic smoke and mirrors’,\textsuperscript{16} a means for a poet to mark his own creative ability and his own unique place in tradition. Indeed, by presenting such innovations as ‘traditional’, the poet implies that his own work is co-extensive with the literary tradition: any word he utters is immediately incorporated into the larger web of authoritative *fama*.

The Alexandrian ‘footnote’, then, is not simply a shortcut to mark literary debts and sources. It is also a polemical signpost of contested tradition, and an authorising signal of

\textsuperscript{12} Cf. Σ Ol.4.11c; Hunter – Lämmle (forthcoming). It is unsurprising that Virgil’s *Fama* prefers the tradition about her own brother (cf. *Enceladoque sororem, Aen.4.179*: Clément-Tarantino (2006a) 585).


\textsuperscript{14} Thomas (1988) II.203; Horsfall (2016) 130.


\textsuperscript{16} Townshend (2015) 94.
literary innovation. At its heart, it is a tool of literary self-representation, a means for a poet to position himself against what his predecessors have said and what his audiences have heard – a valuable feature of any Roman poet’s intertextual repertoire.

Besides the ‘Alexandrian footnote’, Latin scholars have also identified a host of other tropes which figure, model and mark allusive interactions. Foremost amongst these are embedded references to memory, repetition and echo. Ovid’s Mars, for example, reminds Jupiter in the Metamorphoses of a prophecy he had previously made in Ennius’ Annals (tu mihi concilio quondam præsente deorum | (nam memoro memori que animo pia verba notavi), Met.14.812-13). The war god’s emphatic juxtaposition of memoro memori and his overt appeal to the past in quondam help signal the following verbatim quotation of Jupiter’s former words: the god explicitly recalls the earlier Ennian poem (unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli, Met.14.814 = Ann.54). Similar, if a little more implicit, is Ovid’s description of Narcissus’ death in the Metamorphoses: Echo’s repetition of the egotist’s words there (dictoque vale ‘vale’ inquit et Echo, Met.3.499-501) self-consciously highlights Ovid’s own ‘echoing’ of Virgil’s ‘fading doubled vale’ in the Eclogues (Ecl.3.78-79: ‘...vale, vale’ inquit, ‘lolla’). The most famous example of this phenomenon in modern scholarship, however, is the speech of Ariadne in the Fasti (Fast.3.471-76):

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

---


As scholars have long noted, Ariadne’s words assert a strong sense of literary déjà vu. Abandoned by the god Bacchus, she recalls the similar mistreatment she has received from Theseus in earlier poetry, not only in Ovid’s previous treatments of the myth (Her.10, A.A.1.525-64, Met.8.169-82), but also in the ecphrastic account of Catullus’ Carmen 64 (Catull.64.52-266).\(^{19}\) The accumulation of temporal markers (*en iterum, en iterum, nunc quoque*) and the language of repetition and similarity (*similes, eadem, relata...est*) cue us to see this scene as a self-conscious repeat, alongside the pointed *memini* that precedes her self-quotation: she actually ‘remembers’ her earlier literary appearance(s).\(^{20}\) Amassed together, these motifs of memory, iteration and similarity proclaim Ovid’s allusive debts. Like the Alexandrian footnote, they are a crucial tool of literary self-representation.

We could spend much time surveying further examples of such self-consciously figured allusions in Roman poetry – indeed, a comprehensive catalogue of the phenomenon, though a Herculean enterprise, would be an extremely useful resource. For now, however, it suffices to note that a range of other self-reflexive tropes have been read in a similar manner in Roman literature.\(^{21}\) Besides report, echo and memory, scholars have explored the allusive potential of other metaphors, including footsteps, grafting, prophecy, recognition, succession and theft.\(^{22}\) Any trope, in short, which suggests a relation of dependence or the voice of authority can easily be co-opted as a metaphor of allusive relationships. And even a mere temporal adverb can evoke diachronic literary relationships, as when Ovid’s Achaemenides is

---

19 Note *periure et perfide Theseu* (Fast.3.473) – *perfide...perfide...Theseu* (Catull.64.132-3), *periiuria* (Catull.64.135); *nunc quoque nulla viro...femina credit* (Fast.3.475) – *nunc iam nulla viro...femina credat* (Catull.64.143).


‘no longer’ roughly clad, as he had been in Virgil’s *Aeneid* (*iam non*, *Met*.14.165 ~ *Aen*.3.590-94),\(^{23}\) or when Statius’ Achelous ‘*still*’ shows the traces of his Ovidian past (*adhuc*, *Theb*.4.106-9 ~ *Met*.9.96-97).\(^{24}\) Taken together, these phenomena form a nexus of inter-related tropes for figuring and marking allusion. In general terms, they fit into a broader category of metaliterary ‘marking’, standing alongside signals of generic affiliation, etymological play and acrostics.\(^{25}\) But in their range, variety and adaptability, they stand apart. They may not be as explicit as a modern philologist’s footnotes, but as Jeffrey Wills notes, they ‘function much as quotation-marks do in modern scripts, alerting the reader that some reference is being made, the specific source of which must be deduced in other words.’\(^{26}\) They offer a useful supplement to the ‘grammar’ of ancient allusion, and it is thus no wonder that they have been taken up with such scholarly vigour in recent decades.

However, modern scholarship’s engagement with this phenomenon of allusive marking is not without its problems. First among these is the indiscriminate and uncritical labelling of examples. Ever since Stephen Hinds opened his seminal *Allusion and Intertext* with these devices, the ‘Alexandrian footnote’ and other allusive markers have become a familiar concept in classical scholarship. They now proliferate in discussions of not just Latin, but also later Greek authors.\(^{27}\) Yet like a commentary’s ‘cf.’, the identification of footnotes and markers can all too often mark the end of the interpretative process, rather than its beginning. These terms have become a convenient shorthand, avoiding the need for closer engagement with the


details of a specific allusion. What was once an exciting and liberating insight into the self-consciousness and reflexivity of Latin poets now seems a banal cliché.

The uncritical acceptance of these allusive markers is even visible in the very sobriquet which the ‘Alexandrian footnote’ has received. Given the apparent intellectual demands triggered by such tags, one can understand why Stephen Hinds adopted David Ross’ ‘Alexandrian footnote’ to describe the phenomenon. As he argues, the footnoting which we find in Catullus and elsewhere figuratively portrays the poet ‘as a kind of scholar, and portrays his allusion as a kind of learned citation,’ ‘encod[ing] a statement of alignment with the academic-poet traditions of Callimachus and the Alexandrian library.’ In this, he resembles the views of earlier and later scholars: Kirk argues that φασίν in the Michigan Alcidamas papyrus ‘smacks of post-Alexandrian scholarship’; Hollis regards fama est as ‘an indication that we are in the world of learned poetry’; Morrison explores how ‘they say’ statements in Hellenistic poetry form part of the creation of a scholarly and learned narratorial persona; and Nethercut treats Lucretius’ use of the device as evidence of his neo-Callimacheanism. Norden, moreover, distinguishes between earlier Greek and later Hellenistic/Latin appeals to tradition, arguing that only the latter suggest a reliance on a source, whereas the former are simply earnest assertions of the truth of tradition. And Conte, last of all, has seen in Ovid’s allusive signposting the ‘capacity of Alexandrianism to mirror its art in itself and to revel in its skill’, a means for the poet to highlight ‘the artifice and the fictional devices underlying his own poetic world.’ Allusive ‘footnoting’, it would seem, is regarded as something distinctively Hellenistic, learned and self-conscious.

Indeed, such a view can be traced back at least as far as the Homeric scholia. When Achilles’ horse Xanthus claims that he and Balius ‘could run swift as the West wind’s blast, which they say (φάσ’) is the fleetest of all winds’ (Il. 19.415-16), the scholiast complains that it

---

is ‘not believable that a horse would say φασίν as if he were a πολυίστωρ man’ and had ‘acquired it from ἱστορία’ (Σ II.19.416-17). The underlying assumption is that this footnoting tag only befits an erudite scholar, such as Callimachus himself, who is elsewhere described with the very same adjective in a life of Aratus (Καλλίμαχου πολυίστωρος ἀνδρός καὶ ἀξιοπίστου, test.79 Pf.). Such scholarly baggage is also apparent in another scholiastic note, when the Homeric narrator claims that the eagle, ‘they say’ (φασίν), ‘has the keenest sight of all winged things under heaven’ (Σ II.17.674-75):

ἀξιοπίστως τὸ φασί προσέθηκεν ὡς πρὸ τοῦ ἐπιβαλέσθαι τῇ ποιήσει ἐξητακὼς ἅπαντα. bT φησὶ δὲ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ὡς ἵστησι τοὺς νεοσσοὺς πρὸς ἥλιον ἀναγκάζειν βλέπειν· καὶ ὁ μὲν δυνηθεὶς ὁρᾶν τοῦ ἀετοῦ υἱός ἐστιν, ὁ δὲ μὴ ἐκβέβληται καὶ γέγονεν ἁλιαίετος. AbT

It is to give a guarantee that he has added the ‘they say’, like someone who has verified everything in a very precise manner before introducing it in his poetry. bT Aristotle also says that the eagle places its children facing the sun and makes them look at it. The child which can sustain its view is raised, while that which cannot is removed and becomes a ‘Haliaete’. AbT

Here, too, the scholiast associates the use of φασί with erudite, scholarly activity, in this case the careful and precise checking of one’s facts and references (the other quality of the Aratean Vita’s Callimachus: ἀξιοπίστως, cf. ἀξιοπίστου, test.79 Pf.). Yet it is the following citation which is especially illuminating: the scholiast refers to a passage from Aristotle’s History of Animals to corroborate Homer’s statement on the eagle’s sharp-sightedness (Hist.an.9.34.620a1). Clément-Tarantino has read this under-appreciated passage as the scholiast’s appropriation of Homer’s generalised φασί ‘pour le transformer en «référence» à une observation précise d’Aristote’.

However, in doing so, she seems to suggest that the scholiast would have interpreted Homer as himself having intended this Aristotelian link. Yet any ancient scholar would surely have been aware of the chronological impossibilities of such a view and we know of other cases where scholiasts provide cross-references to later parallels.
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of a specific detail, rather than earlier sources.\footnote{Harder (2013) 104.} Rather than showing that the Alexandrians regarded Homer as a scholiast \textit{avant la lettre}, it is better to see this scholiastic comment as a reflection of Alexandrian reading practices: when coming across a \textit{φασί} in a text, the scholiast’s first inclination was to ask ‘who says?’ and find an appropriate source for the fact under discussion – not necessarily Homer’s original ‘source’, but another piece of external evidence to confirm that this is indeed what ‘people say’. The evidence of the Homeric scholia, therefore, suggests that, already in antiquity, \textit{φασί} was considered an emblem of erudite scholarship and a spur for readers to go source-hunting.\footnote{Scholia to other authors respond similarly: e.g. \textita{Σ Pind.Ol.2.51d} (quoting \textit{Od.5.333-35}, §II.3.1: 92), \textita{Σ Pind.Pyth.6.22} (quoting Hes.fr.283, §II.3.1: 97-99).} The concept of the ‘Alexandrian footnote’ has a considerable pedigree.

However, this lingering perception of the ‘Alexandrinianness’ of such footnoting relies on the assumption of a dichotomy between the literary cultures of archaic and classical Greece and those of the Hellenistic world and Rome. Yet as we saw above, this is an area of considerable contestation, and any literary history (of continuity or change) should be argued for, not assumed. In the case of allusive markers, there is little evidence or argument to restrict the phenomenon \textit{a priori} to Alexandria and Rome. To support the Hellenistic connection, Hinds notes how an ‘Alexandrian footnote’ mimics ‘very precisely...the citation style of a learned Latin commentary.’ But the example he cites (Servius on \textit{Aen.1.242}) differs significantly from the ‘Alexandrian footnote’: Servius explicitly names his source (Livy), whereas poetic footnotes do not.\footnote{Serv. \textit{ad Aen.1.242}: \textit{hi enim duo Troiam prodidisse dicuntur secundum Livium}.} Despite highlighting the presence of an allusion, they do not point to the specific source – they leave the audience to fill in the gaps themselves.

Other Latinists, meanwhile, cite individual lines of Callimachus to prove the ‘Alexandrian’ nature of Roman footnoting, including the famous \textit{μῦθος δ’ οὐκ ἐμός, ἀλλ’ ἑτέρων} (\textit{hAth}.5.56) or the fragmentary \textit{ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν ἀείδω} (fr.612 Pf.) and \textit{τῶς ο γέγειος...}
ἔχει λόγος (fr.510 Pf.). When they are taken out of context, however, it is uncertain whether these lines can be said to function in the same allusive manner as Hinds’ ‘footnotes’. And nor is it clear why scholars should not cite earlier comparanda. After all, the famous remark from Callimachus’ fifth Hymn is closely modelled on a line from Euripides’ Melanippe the Wise (οὐκ ἐμὸς ὁ μῦθος, ἀλλ’ ἐμῆς μητρὸς πάρα, fr.484), and we can already find similar sentiments elsewhere in fifth-century Greece, such as Pindar’s φαντὶ δ’ ἀνθρώπων παλαιὰ ῥήσιες (Ol.7.54-5) or Euripides’ παρὰ σοφῶν ἔκλυον λόγους (Hypsipyle, fr.752g.18). There seems little substantial justification or argument, therefore, for considering these allusive markers to be distinctively scholarly, post-classical or (just) self-consciously fictionalising.

Yet this is precisely how the phenomenon is constantly presented. Numerous scholars frame the device in terms that stress its apparent artificiality and self-consciousness: Conte’s ‘reflective allusion’, Hinds’ ‘reflexive annotation’, Barchiesi’s self-reflexive ‘tropes of intertextuality’ and Tsagalis’ ‘meta-traditionality.’ Others, meanwhile, use the term ‘Alexandrian footnote’ as a catch-all title for every case of intertextual signalling, even beyond plain appeals to tradition, making the whole process an archetype of learned and scholarly behaviour. And Wright has coined ‘metamythology’ as an umbrella term to define ‘a type of discourse which arises when mythical characters are made to talk about themselves and their own myths, or where myths are otherwise presented, in a deliberately self-conscious manner’,
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I.1.2 Indexicality: Marking Allusion

a phenomenon which he considers specifically intellectual and destabilising, emphasising ‘the fictionality of myth’.\(^\text{40}\)

In the face of such terminology, bound up with hazardous preconceptions and assumptions, I have deemed it necessary to depart from the language of my predecessors in this study and instead talk of allusive ‘indexicality’.\(^\text{41}\) Amid the mass of pre-existing terminology, this is not a gratuitous neologism, but rather a means for us to focus on the essence of this phenomenon: its signalling and signposting role. Rather than just seeing such marking as the self-aware technique of a terribly clever and bookish poet, this term instead focuses on the ‘pointing’ function of allusive markers: ‘What’s the point?’, we are invited to ask, and ‘what are we being pointed to?’ Of course, indexicality itself is not a new term: it is commonly used in linguistics and the philosophy of language to refer to the manner in which linguistic and nonlinguistic signs point to aspects of context.\(^\text{42}\) But here I am looking further back to the original associations of the Latin *index* (‘pointer, indicator’), which derives, like the verb *dico* (‘I say’), from the proto-Indo European root *deik*- (‘show’).\(^\text{43}\) I am also indebted to the American philosopher Charles Peirce’s trichotomy of signs, in which the ‘index’ is a sensory feature that denotes and draws attention to another object: smoke, for example, can signal the presence of fire, just as an allusive marker signals the presence of allusion.\(^\text{44}\) But there is also

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

\(^{41}\) The best pre-existing neutral term I have found is Will’s ‘external markers’ of allusion ((1996) 30-31), but describing these markers as ‘external’ may make them sound too detached and risks undermining how integral they are to the process of poetic interpretation. My preferred terminology is already gaining some currency: Spelman (2018b) §III (‘Indices of Intertextuality’).

\(^{42}\) Hughes – Tracy (2015). Admittedly, this is a mal-formation from the Latin: ‘indicality’ would be more accurate, but given the pre-existing currency of ‘indexicality’, I retain it here. For similar talk of allusive indexing in ancient literature in the context of catalogues: Skempsis (2016) 224, (2017).


\(^{44}\) On Peirce’s ‘index’: Atkin (2005); cf. Gell (1998)’s adoption of the term (esp. 13-14). Strictly speaking, it might be better to regard allusive markers in Peirce’s division as ‘symbols’, given their lack of a specific factual or physical
one further association of ‘index’ which makes it particularly fruitful for this study. In modern English, an ‘index’ most often refers to the catalogue at the back of a book which lists specific words or phrases alongside the page numbers where they can be located. Such literary roadmaps are an apt analogy for allusive marking; an allusive ‘index’ similarly points to a specific element of a larger mythical and literary whole, moving from a single passage back to the larger pathways of myth. In what follows, I shall thus be employing the language of indexicality: an ‘index’ (pl. ‘indexes’, adj. ‘indexical’) is a word that signposts allusion.

### I.1.3 The Path Ahead

In current scholarship, the ‘Alexandrian footnote’ and other indexes of allusion are thus frequently considered the preserve of Alexandrian and Roman poetic culture, one of the key attributes that distinguish archaic Greece from later centuries. In this study, however, I contend that such an assumption is seriously flawed, and that a close inspection of many early Greek examples reveals a similar use of these devices. From Homer onwards, indexes were employed to signpost allusion and to position a poet against their larger tradition. From the very start of the (visible) Greek tradition, indexicality was a well-established phenomenon.

Thankfully, this argument is supported by recent scholarship on early Greek poetry, which has already begun to take significant steps in this direction. A growing interest in metapoetry has led many to read archaic epic and lyric in pointedly self-conscious terms. And in particular, a number of scholars have already suggested specific moments in these texts that can be read as knowing indexes of allusion. A selective review of examples may help set
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connection with the objects to which they refer; the denotation is rather based on interpretation, habit and convention. But the signalling focus of Peirce’s ‘index’ is still a useful analogy for the present study.

the scene: stories are explicitly acknowledged as familiar to an audience, as when Circe advises Odysseus in the Odyssey to avoid the path of the ‘Argo known to all’ (Ἀργῶ πᾶσι μέλους, Od.12.70), pointedly highlighting Homer’s debts to, and divergences from, the Argonautic saga, or when Odysseus similarly designates Oedipus’ woes and crimes as ‘known to men’ (ἀνάπυστα...ἀνθρώποισιν, Od.11.274). The transfer of specific individuals’ property appears to signal cases of intertextual role-playing: ‘in borrowing Aphrodite’s girdle’ to seduce Zeus in Iliad 14, Hera ‘metapoetically dons Aphrodite’s mantle’, replaying the love goddess’ seduction of Paris and Anchises (II.14.188-223), while Patroclus adopts both Achilles’ armour and persona in the Iliad (II.16.130-44), just as the hero’s son Neoptolemus symbolically succeeds his father by taking his armour in the Little Iliad. Epic characters’ tears have also been read as presaging future woes which only an audience could know from the larger literary tradition, while catalogues too appear to have been loaded sites for incorporating and contesting other traditions. Even the whole divine framework of Greek literature seems to involve a significant indexical element: what is ‘fated’ is often shorthand for what is (or is at least claimed to be) traditional; counterfactuals explore narrative alternatives that go against tradition; major gods act as figures for the poet; and heroes are often saved because they are ‘destined’ to play a role in future episodes of the tradition.

46 The Odyssey and Argonautic traditions: Strabo 1.2.38; Meuli (1921); Danek (1998) 252-57; West (2005b); Alden (2017) 36-37n.93. On this index: Currie (2016) 143.


51 Currie (2016) 105-46.


In addition, other specific indexes have been identified in these early texts, including cases of echo and family relations. For the former, we could cite the *Homeric Hymn to Pan*, which pointedly ‘echoes’ a famous nightingale simile from the *Odyssey* (Hh.19.16-18 ~ Od.19.518-21); the ‘echoing cicada’ of the Hesiodic *Aspis*, which recalls its earlier appearance in Hesiod’s *Works and Days* (Scut.393 ~ Op.582); and the presence of ‘Echo’ in Aristophanes’ *Thesmophoriazusae*, which self-consciously tropes the dramatist’s extensive rewriting of Euripides’ *Andromeda* (Thesm.10569-97). As for family relations, we may note the intertextual relationship between specific *Homeric Hymns* (the sibling rivalry of Hermes and Apollo in *HhHerm*; the father-son relation of Pan and Hermes in *Hh.19*); Aristophanes’ figuring of Philocles’ *Pandionis* tetralogy as a derivative ‘descendant’ of Sophocles’ *Tereus* (Ar.Av.281-83); and Theognis’ substitution of the Hesiodic Αἰδώς with her daughter Σωφροσύνη, marking his own debts to his Hesiodic ‘parent text’ (Thgn.1135-50 ~ Op.200). In Attic tragedy more generally, Isabelle Torrance has also argued for a wide range of ‘metapoetically loaded terms’ which are ‘used as triggers for audience recognition of novelties or continuations in relation to earlier sources’: δεύτερος, δισσός, καινός, and μῦθος.

These recent approaches give an idea of how fruitful a fuller exploration of allusive marking in early Greek poetry may prove to be. Yet despite these first steps, no previous scholar has offered a comprehensive study of allusive marking in any period, let alone early Greek poetry. Individual examples are normally adduced in support of a specific argument for a specific allusion, which leaves the larger picture remarkably hazy. As far as I am aware, the scholar who has come closest to offering a fuller catalogue is Bruno Currie, who concludes his
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discussion of ‘pregnant tears’ with a list of some allusive markers in Homer and Attic tragedy, many of which I will discuss at greater length in this study. However, in simply providing a select catalogue of potential examples, without detailed examination, and with no mention of Pindar or other lyricists, these few pages do little more than cover some of the groundwork for this present work. In analysing these and further examples in detail, I intend to provide a more holistic and analytical study of these allusive markers, exploring their purpose and function, as well as their development across time.

In this study, I have chosen to focus on the development of three specific indexes of allusion in archaic epic and lyric poetry (including iambus, elegy and melos), from Homer to Pindar. The three I have selected represent the indexes most commonly identified in literature of later times: [1] appeals to tradition and report (the ‘Alexandrian footnote’ proper); [2] the allusive force of characters’, narrators’ and audiences’ memories (and knowledge); and [3] the manipulation of temporality to evoke both former and future literary events. All three, I contend, were deeply embedded in our earliest archaic Greek poetry, and in each chapter I shall explore their comparable and complementary usage. Due to limitations of space, I cannot cover every example, but the impression I have gained is that a very high percentage of examples of the language of hearsay, memory and time are indexical – a far higher percentage than one might initially suspect. Rather than offer a dry catalogue, I shall focus on a selection that illuminate the range of ways in which each index was used in archaic epic and lyric. We shall see that all three of these indexes were an integral part of the literary tradition from the very start, a conclusion which compels us to radically reconfigure modern narratives of ancient literary history and our perception of archaic Greek poetics.
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61 Currie (2016) 26-27, 139-44. Spelman (2018a) now offers a few hints for Pindar and lyric (General Index, s.v. ‘dicitur motif’, ‘metatraditionality’).

62 I use ‘lyric’ throughout in its broad sense: Campbell (1982) xiv-xxix; Budelmann (2009) 2-7. I recognise the anachronism of this usage and that it risks blurring the significant differences between these different genres, but it remains a convenient catch-all category, especially to oppose this material to ‘epic’.
Before we turn to each index in turn, however, I must first outline my methodological approach to allusion in archaic Greek poetry as a framework for this study. This is a controversial topic, and one that raises some different (and difficult) questions to those which face scholars of Hellenistic and Roman texts. It is thus worth spending some time addressing the issues involved.
I.2 Frameworks for Intertextuality in Early Greek Poetry

The earliest extant Greek texts were not composed in a vacuum. Already in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, we find a keen awareness of numerous mythological traditions that lie beyond the scope of their immediate narratives. The exploits of other heroes, the wider Trojan war tradition and the events of other mythical sagas repeatedly punctuate both Homeric poems, as the narrator and his characters recall past and future events, often very obliquely. Lyric poets, too, frequently mention and narrate a whole host of myths, many of which – we know – had already been treated by their peers and epic forebears. As far back as our evidence lets us see, Greek poets were deeply immersed in a larger tradition of poetry and myth.

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

These are complex questions, with no easy answers. Yet how we address them is of crucial importance for any study of early Greek intertextuality, especially when dealing with
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the earliest and most controversial case of all: Homeric epic. The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are products of a long-established oral tradition, comparable to those found in many other parts of the world, but we encounter them today in a fixed, written form. How we reconcile these two facts is a constant scholarly dilemma. To make matters worse, we do not even know when or how these texts became fixed in a form similar to that in which we read them today: were they dictated by an oral bard, gradually crystallised through centuries of (re-)performance, or carefully crafted by an oral poet who was able to take full advantage of the nascent technology of writing? Despite these uncertainties, two major approaches have emerged in modern scholarship that offer alternative frameworks for understanding Homer’s engagement with the wider poetic tradition: ‘traditional referentiality’ and ‘neoanalysis’. Since I will exploit elements of both in this study, it is worth touching on each before I go on to outline my own approach to early Greek allusion.

The first, ‘traditional referentiality’, foregrounds the oral background of the Homeric poems and the larger ‘resonance’ embedded in their structural elements. Scholars who favour
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this approach interpret individual formulae, type scenes and story patterns against all their other appearances in the tradition, unearthing a further connotative or immanent meaning which would have been familiar to attuned ancient audiences. In every instance, this immanent meaning raises expectations in an audience that can be fulfilled or thwarted, and departures from the norm are poetically meaningful: when Aeneas lifts a stone to throw at Achilles in *Iliad* 20.285-86, for example, he performs an act that usually leads to a decisive victory. For a brief and transitory moment, Homer raises the possibility that the Trojan might defeat the Greek hero.⁶⁷ Even a single word can bear such an associative resonance: μῆνις, the opening word of the *Iliad*, is traditionally restricted to gods in early Greek epic, except for four Iliadic occasions on which it refers to Achilles. For an audience familiar with this traditional usage, the poem’s very first word marks the hero’s superhuman status and special connection with the divine.⁶⁸ On a larger scale, too, words and motifs can be packed with a specifically generic resonance, evoking the traditional trappings of one particular genre (such as choral lyric, epigram, hymn, iambus, lament), which can then be manipulated and redeployed in other contexts.⁶⁹ By focusing on the rich pool of tradition, this ‘algorithm of *pars pro toto*’ thus downplays the possibility of specific referentiality in early Greek poetry, instead favouring typological ‘recurrence’ over pointed ‘repetition’.⁷⁰ In its most extreme form, it can even deny the possibility of direct and specific allusion outright, although this – as we shall see – is a step too far.⁷¹ Nevertheless, traditional referentiality is an extremely useful framework, which rescues the formula from accusations of dry banality and highlights the rich associative depths of the epic language.
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⁷¹ E.g. Nagy (1979) 42: ‘when we are dealing with the traditional poetry of the Homeric (and Hesiodic) compositions, it is not justifiable to claim that a passage in any text can refer to another passage in another text.’
The second dominant approach of contemporary Homeric criticism, ‘neoanalysis’, foregrounds the textuality of the Homeric poems and postulates other fixed ‘texts’ as specific sources for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Scholars of this approach reconstruct these lost texts on the basis of internal evidence within each poem, as well as later external sources, such as the Homeric scholia, prose mythographers and surviving information about the Epic Cycle. In the past, these putative ‘texts’ were considered to be written works, but more recent neoanalysts have revised this view to embrace the idea of the poet interacting with ‘fixed’ oral texts. A common argumentative strategy is that of ‘motif transference’: neoanalysts identify a motif known from later sources whose employment appears better suited and contextualised than its application in Homer, concluding that the Homeric instance is secondary, while the other account is primary and reflects a pre-Homeric source. For example, when Thetis laments over Achilles after Patroclus’ death in *Iliad* 18 (*Il*.18.1-147), many scholars discern a proleptic foreshadowing of Achilles’ own death, an episode familiar to us from the Cyclic *Aethiopis* (*Aeth*.arg.4a) and other later sources (*Od*.24.47-64; *Pind*.Isth.8.57-8; *Quint*.Smyrn.3.525-787), but which they suppose was already established in pre-Homeric poetry; Homer’s evocation of this scene reinforces the impression of Achilles’ impending demise. Through such arguments as these, neoanalysts enrich our appreciation of Homeric poetry and the creative and allusive uses that Homer made of his poetic tradition.

These two approaches are often opposed by scholars, but they are far from incompatible in practice: typical motifs and transferred motifs are not mutually exclusive. Scholars of both camps readily acknowledge this compatibility, even if they largely refrain from treating the other approach as invalid. Useful surveys: Clark (1986); Willcock (1997); Davies (2016) 3-24; Gainsford (2016) 104-9.


from pursuing it themselves.\textsuperscript{77} In many ways, the theoretical debates that arise between these two ‘schools’ are akin to those found in later Latin literature, as to whether one should prioritise allusion to specific texts or evocation of generic topoi.\textsuperscript{78} And as in Roman poetry, so too here, we can gain a fuller picture of Homer’s ‘allusive art’ by focusing on his evocation of both the typological and the specific. In this study, I thus strive to follow a middle path between these two approaches, taking account of archaic poetry’s oral, typological background as well as its potential for more specific, pointed reference. In this, I am indebted above all to Jonathan Burgess’ framework of ‘oral, intertextual neoanalysis’, a sophisticated remodelling of neoanalysis within an oralist frame.\textsuperscript{79} When dealing with the lost pre-Homeric poetic context, Burgess detects allusion not to specific pre-Homeric poems, but rather to pre-existing mythological traditions, the core elements of a story that would be familiar from every telling.\textsuperscript{80} This is a small, but significant difference. Not only does it avoid the implausibility of reconstructing specific fluid-yet-fixed oral poems,\textsuperscript{81} but it also fits with the Homeric poems’ own presentation of the fluidity of epic song as a series of interconnected paths (οἶμαι), from


\textsuperscript{80} See already Willcock (1983) 485n.8 (‘mythological material’). Comparable are discussions of ‘song traditions’ rather than specific ‘poems’: Nagy (1990a) 79; Tsagalis (2008) 67-68.

\textsuperscript{81} Currie’s example of this phenomenon is unconvincing: he cites the first 9 lines of the fourth and eighteenth Homeric Hymns (both to Hermes) as independent instantiations of the very same poem (Currie (2006) 2, (2016) 14). But it is not really fair to describe them as such, given the huge disparity in their lengths (580 and 12 lines respectively), and the complete lack of a narrative in the shorter poem. Nor do we have any reason to suppose that the verbal similarity is the result of oral recomposition, rather than later written excerption (cf. West (2003a) 4-5, 18). Even more implausible is the idea of poets recycling ‘stable’ and static poems that have been memorised word-for-word (e.g. Montanari (2012) 6), an approach which is difficult to reconcile with comparative evidence of other oral traditions, where even ‘memorised’ or ‘reperformed’ songs are not repeated verbatim (Finnegan (1977) 76-77); cf. Martin (2013).
which one can start at any point (ἁμόθεν, Od.1.10). The internal songs of the Odyssey, after all, are defined not as discrete poems but rather in terms of their mythological content: the return of the Achaeans (Ἀχαιῶν νόστον, Od.1.326), the quarrel of Odysseus and Achilles (νεϊκὸς Ὀδυσσῆος καὶ Πηλείδεω Αχιλήος, Od.8.75), the construction of the wooden horse (ἵππου κόσμον... δουρατέου, Od.8.492-93). Given that we lack any access to the host of earlier pre-Homeric stories, it is methodologically far more responsible to follow Burgess in talking of Homer’s engagement with such mythological traditions, rather than putative, isolated and specific poems. I shall outline and exemplify this approach below (§I.2.1), before addressing the further issues of our limited evidence (§I.2.2) and the transition from such ‘mythological’ to full ‘textual’ intertextuality (§II.2.3).

I.2.1 Mythological Intertextuality

Crucial to Burgess’ case for an ‘oral, intertextual neoanalysis’ is the recognition that there are limits to the formulaic nature of early Greek poetry. As he remarks, ‘typology does not overwhelm the distinctiveness of individual characters and their stories;’ otherwise, ‘a myth-teller would be free to gather together a new collocation of motifs every time the story is told. Achilles could wear a lion skin and brandish a club, Odysseus could command the Argo, and Agamemnon could put out his eyes after marrying his mother.’ Such a humorous counterfactual highlights the limits of typology, limits which were already recognised in

83 Even hardcore Neoanalysts occasionally slip into this mode of discourse: Currie (2012) 574-75n.163 claims that a ‘Prometheus narrative [not ‘poem’!] of some textual fixity seems to lie behind Hes. Th. and WD.’ His earlier claim that ‘it does not matter that there is no single definitive narration within the Dumuzi-Inana corpus’ (2012) 559n.90) might also make us question the need to reconstruct individual Greek epics.
84 Burgess (2006) 155-58 (quotation p.156); cf. Scodei (2002) 24: ‘The most famous events associated with a hero...create a core heroic personality’, which ‘bards could reduplicate...in different situations.’
antiquity: Aristotle remarks in the Poetics that one cannot break up ‘transmitted stories’ (παρειλημμένους μύθους), such as Clytemnestra’s death at Orestes’ hands or Eriphyle’s at Alcmaeon’s (Aristot. Poet. 14.1453b.22-6). Individual myths and stories clearly contained their own steady core of specific elements which did not depend on any particular instantiation. It is to specific motifs of this ‘stable skeleton of narrative’, Burgess contends, that other songs and performances could allude, even within the traditional and typological context of early Greek epic. For archaic epic, some of these mythological traditions would have doubtless been epic in form; indeed, as Tsagalis notes, the shared performance context ‘would have channelled mythical allusion towards other epic songs performed under similar conditions’. Yet they would have also embraced other media, including non-epic storytelling, other kinds of poetry and artistic representations. The plausibility of this model is reinforced by comparative oral traditions in which we can identify similar allusions to other stories.

Of course, mythological traditions themselves were never static and unchanging, and some have questioned whether any definitive and stable version of past myths ever existed. If multiple conflicting versions were in circulation, even within the very same poem, and if poets were free to add innovative elements to mythical paradeigmata to fit their immediate contexts, how can we determine to which version of a myth poets might be alluding in any given case, or even which of many potential versions their original audiences might have been familiar with or considered ‘canonical’? This is a pressing concern, and one which is too often glossed over by neoanalysts. Yet one must equally be wary of exaggerating the significance of

85 Lord (1960) 99.
86 Tsagalis (2011) 232 (original emphasis).
89 E.g. Andersen (1990), who contends that ‘even basic mythological facts are represented differently by different characters according to context’ in the Iliad (p.40) and argues from this that ‘there never was a “standard” version that the poet could rely on and the audience keep in mind. Inside as well as outside of the Iliad, “facts” seem to have been rather fluctuating’ (p.41). Cf. Andersen (1998). For such fluidity in vase depictions: Lowenstam (1992) 189-91.
such discrepancies in the archaic mythological record. Where differences occur, they tend to be minor and superficial for the overall narrative trajectory and it is often only the instigator of an action which changes, not the action itself: Thetis is still given to Peleus, whether by the gods (Il.18.84-85), Zeus (Il.18.432) or Hera (Il.24.60); Coroebus, a suitor of Cassandra, is still killed, whether by Neoptolemus (in the ‘majority version’, ὁ πλείων λόγος) or Diomedes (according to the poet ‘Lescheos’, Λέσχεως: Paus.10.27.1 = Il.Parv.fr.24); Polyxena still dies, whether through wounds inflicted by Odysseus and Diomedes in the sack of Troy (Cypria fr.34 PEG) or as a sacrifice on Achilles’ tomb (Il.Pers.arg.4c); and Astyanax is still thrown from the city walls, whether by Neoptolemus (Il.Parv.fr.29) or Odysseus (Il.Pers.arg.4a).\footnote{On the myth and its reception: Kern (1918); Phillippo (2007). Some later accounts have Scamandrius (= Astyanax?) survive and found a new Troy or other settlements, sometimes alongside Aeneas’ son Ascanius, but this version may simply reflect later epichoric foundation narratives (Andersen (1998) 139n.6; Erskine (2001) 102), or echo an earlier tradition in which Hector had two separate sons, Astyanax (who was killed) and Scamandrius (who survived): Smith (1981) 53-58; cf. Anaxikrates FGrH 307 F1. In that case, \textit{Il.} 6.402-3 would acknowledge and smooth over Homer’s assimilation of the pair.} In all four of these cases (Thetis’ marriage, and the deaths of Coroebus, Polyxena and Astyanax), we have a fixed, unalterable event of the Trojan war narrative, even if its precise details varied. As Burgess has remarked, ‘[w]hile it would be mistaken to insist that the details of any one manifestation of a myth were always present in every telling of that myth, it is also clear that Greek myth was remarkably stable in the presentation of the sequences of major actions that constituted any given story.’\footnote{Burgess (2009) 5; cf. Ford (1992) 40.} The same view was also apparently dominant in antiquity. When Sophocles has Agamemnon die in the bath (El.445) rather than at the table as in Homer (Od.4.535), the scholia dismiss the inconsistency (Σ S. El.446):

 hendekai γὰρ τὰ ὅλα συμφωνεῖν τῷ πράγματι· τὰ γὰρ κατὰ μέρος εξουσιάν ἔχει ἐκαστὸς ὡς βούλεται πραγματεύσασθαι, εἰ μὴ τὸ πᾶν βλάπτῃ τῆς υποθέσεως.

For it is enough if the general lines of the stories agree. As for the details, each <poet> has the licence to treat them as he likes, provided he does not do damage to the story at large. (tr. Nünlist (2009) 179)
Whether Agamemnon was killed in the bath or at a feast, it ultimately does not matter: he died either way, and that is the fixed element of the myth.\textsuperscript{93} It is thus possible, with appropriate care and caution, to reconstruct the core details of a mythological narrative, what Kullmann would call a Faktenkanon or Burgess a fabula, a constellation of fixed narrative events with which the Homeric and other later poems could allusively engage.\textsuperscript{94}

Given the typological oral environment of early Greek epic, we should largely expect allusions to such fabulae to be based around repeated key themes and motifs, rather than extensive verbal repetition. The foremost example of such motif-based allusion is the Iliad’s evocation of the ‘death of Achilles’ fabula, which lies at the heart of the second half of the poem and has been extensively studied by numerous scholars: the allusion is not based primarily on verbal correspondence, but rather on large-scale motif transference, as a whole series of episodes from the fabula of Achilles’ death are redeployed in another context.\textsuperscript{95} On a larger scale, moreover, the whole myth of the Trojan war appears to be constructed around an extensive chain of such interlocking fabulae: the sack of Andromache’s Thebe foreshadows and parallels that of Troy; the Trojan horse eerily mirrors the ships with which Paris first sailed to Sparta, cut from the same Idaean wood (cf. Tryph.59-61); and most elaborately, Neoptolemus’ career closely follows that of his father Achilles: the hero pointedly receives his father’s arms from Achilles as a sign of succession (Il.Parv.arg.3a), spear and all, unlike Patroclus’ flawed attempt at Achilles-imitation (Il.Parv.fr.5; II.16.140-4); his first victim, Eurypylus (Od.11.519-20, 93)

\textsuperscript{93} On questions of poetic licence: Nünlist (2009) 174-84. For an alternative view: Σ Ol.4.31b; Σ Isth.1.15b; Eratosthenes (fr.I.A.19). But as Nünlist remarks (p.180), Strabo’s polemic against Eratosthenes (1.2.3) is ‘more representative of the ancient outlook.’


\textsuperscript{95} Burgess (2009) 72-97.
Il. Parv. arg. 3c-d), parallels both Achilles’ first, Telephus (Eurypylus’ father) and last, Memnon (cf. Od. 11.522); and his savage refusal of Astynous’ supplication (Il. Parv. fr. 21) mirrors Achilles’ treatment of Lycaon (Il. 21.34-135). All these parallels, however, only serve to underlie the ultimate difference in the two heroes’ treatment of Priam, Achilles’ sympathy in Iliad 24 serving as a foil for Neoptolemus’ unquenchable bloodthirst (Il. Pers. arg. 2c; Il. Parv. fr. 25).  

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


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

These verses, comprised of a likely iambic trimeter and two dactylic hexameters, set up a humorous and pointed opposition between archaic epic and the world of the symposium.

---


98 I follow most commentators in regarding the first line as an iambic trimeter (with εἰμι, it would be a choriamb and two iambic metra) (e.g. Watkins (1976) 33-37; West (1982) 40n.27; Pavese (1996) 9-10) rather than plain prose (contrast Hansen (1976) 35-40; Powell (1991) 165n.116).

The humble clay *kotyle* that bears the inscription is contrasted with the epic Nestor’s large and elaborately-wrought drinking vessel familiar to us from the *Iliad* (II.11.632-37). Many scholars have suspected a precise allusion to this Iliadic scene in the inscription, taking it as evidence that our version of the *Iliad* was already well-known in the Greek world of Euboea and its colonies in the late eighth century.\(^{100}\) Given our lack of further evidence for eighth century literary culture, such a direct literary relationship cannot be ruled out, but it should be stressed that the cup’s allusion is not based on any verbal correspondences with our Iliadic passage, and its diction departs significantly from Homeric usage.\(^{101}\) In reality, the parallel depends only on similarities of theme and topic: the knowledge required for the allusion to work is simply that Nestor possessed a large and ornate cup, awareness of which could derive from many other sources besides our *Iliad*.\(^{102}\)

Indeed, scholars have not refrained from proposing other potential epic ‘sources’ for the cup’s allusion: Stephanie West suggests epic poetry on the exploits of Nestor’s youth,\(^{103}\) while Danek proposes the scene from the *Cypria* in which Nestor hosted Menelaus (*Cypr.*arg.4b) and apparently encouraged him to drink wine to scatter his ‘cares’ (*Cypr.*fr.18).\(^{104}\) It would be misleading, however, to pinpoint any of these as the specific ‘source’ of the cup’s allusion, given that Nestor appears to have been associated with lavish hospitality, plentiful drinking and a large, ornate cup in many texts and traditions. Drinking vessels, like many other material objects, were highly prized in the world of Greek epic as a source of prestige and authority,\(^{105}\) and elaborate descriptions of them were a traditional feature of not just Greek,


\(^{103}\) West (1994) 14.


but also Near Eastern poetic traditions. Yet Nestor’s association with drinking-ware transcends such typological norms. In addition to the *Iliad* and *Cypria*, we could cite *Odyssey* 3, where Pylos is first presented as a place of feasting and merriment (*Od*.3.5-9, 32-66). Nestor’s son Peisistratus there presents Telemachus and Athena-Mentor with a beautiful golden cup for prayer (*χρυσείῳ δέπαϊ, Od*.3.41; *χρύσειον ἄλεισον, 3.50, 53; *καλὸν δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον, 3.63), a cup which Bing has suggested could be the very same as in the *Iliad*, given that the goblet there is said to have been brought from home (*ὅ οἰκοθεν ἦγ᾽ ὁ γεραιός, Il*.11.632). Athenaeus’ later mention of a ‘cup of Nestor’ dedicated to Artemis in Capua, not far from Ischia, might also suggest a local tradition surrounding the heroic Nestor’s cup which could have already been circulating in the region in archaic times. Nestor was thus closely associated with a large, ornate cup throughout early Greek epic, symbolising his panache for hospitality and storytelling. Rather than detecting a precise engagement with the *Iliad* or any other specific text in the Pithecusan inscription, it is better to see an allusion to an established feature of the *fabula* of the hero’s life. The inscription evokes not just the Nestor of the *Iliad*, but rather the Nestor of tradition at large, known for his many instances of hospitality and feasting. In so doing, it situates its humbler self within the literary tradition, setting its brief epigrammatic form against the grandeur of the epic tradition. This allusion can thus be taken as an archetype of what we might usually expect in archaic Greek epic itself: an engagement with the themes, motifs and narrative events of other mythological traditions (*fabulae*), rather than precise verbal echoes of another specific poem.

---

108 Athen.11.466e, 489b-c; Faraone (1996) 106-7; Lamboley (2001) 34-36.
Nevertheless, although the majority of archaic ‘mythological’ allusions would function in this manner, an oral poetic environment does not entirely preclude the possibility of verbal allusion and ‘quotation’, even when we are talking of mythological traditions, not fixed poems. As Burgess has again demonstrated, certain phraseology could become associated with specific *fabulae*, narrative contexts or characters and then allusively redeployed in other settings. As Homeric examples, he offers the phrase μέγας μεγαλωστί, which appears to be connected with the *fabula* of Achilles’ death (Od.24.40, Il.18.26), and the language associated with Astyanax’s fate which is pointedly and proleptically evoked in the *Iliad* (Il.Parv.fr.29.3-5; II.6.467-70, 24.735). As a further example, we could cite the Iliadic description of the hundred-hander Briareus as ‘greater in strength than his father’ (ὁ γὰρ αὖτε βίῃ οὗ πατρὸς ἀμείνων, Il.1.404), a phrase which seems to allude to the *fabula* of Achilles’ birth and the prophesied supremacy of Thetis’ offspring. These are not cases of one text quoting another, but rather instances in which the use of certain phrases and language may evoke specific episodes and characters from the fixed *fabulae* of the mythological tradition. Although the usual neoanalytical challenges of issues of priority and direction of influence apply in these cases (see below), Burgess’ arguments offer an attractive framework for exposing the allusive potential of some early epic repetitions. Most repetitions in epic poetry are, of course, likely to be typological in character, so most of these cases of pointed repetition will involve rarely attested phrases which have come to be associated with specific and identifiable contexts or individuals.


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

114 Especially problematic is the fact that the phrase μέγας μεγαλωστί also occurs in the *Iliad* of the horseman Cebriones (Il.16.776), which might suggest that it is merely context-specific (describing a fallen warrior), rather than character-specific (evocative of Achilles’ death). Burgess (2012) 172-76 offers sensible discussion.

115 Cf. Bakker (2013) 157-69 on his ‘scale of interformularity’: ‘the more specific a formula and/or the more restricted its distribution, the greater the possible awareness of its recurrence and of its potential for signalling meaningful
Early Greek poetry, therefore, should be regarded as able to engage allusively with specific mythological traditions on the levels of both motif and phraseology. In a fluid oral poetic environment, where specific episodes would have been repeatedly re-performed, such engagements were likely multidirectional, as various traditions and story patterns came to influence one another, but we are no longer in a position to discern such intricacies. Currie has objected that this model restricts us to ‘an impersonal and anonymous model of allusion’, in which we cannot conceive of ‘individually authored compositions’ setting themselves apart from others. But this is far from the case: many of the interpretations that follow will show just how sophisticated and agonistic the Homeric poems were in setting themselves apart from the whole tradition. Even if they are not always alluding to a specific poem, this does not deny their own poetic integrity. Nor is this approach designed in principle to rule out the possibility of direct interaction between texts at an early date (see further below). Rather, it prevents us from thinking anachronistically of a mass of neat, self-contained, easily distinguishable epics interacting with each other as the norm in the archaic period. Instead, when dealing with the lost poetic traditions of early Greek poetry, the framework of mythological intertextuality best accounts for the fluid and flexible nature of oral traditions. It is the default paradigm that I will follow in this study.

repetition’. Of course, any rare phrase could simply be an under-attested formula, so caution is still necessary in this venture.


119 Cf. Louden (2018)’s criticism of Currie: ‘For his arguments to work, we have to assume no other epics existed, save those we have.’
Some scholars, however, might object to the term that I have used for this phenomenon. ‘Mythological intertextuality’ may sound a little misleading or even paradoxical, especially since we are not talking here about interaction with specific ‘texts’. Nevertheless, I believe there are good reasons for retaining this familiar noun. For a start, this usage is closer to Kristeva’s original conception of ‘intertextuality’, in which any cultural product, and not just a literary work, could be considered a ‘text’. But more importantly, this familiar nomenclature is extremely useful, since it highlights the considerable similarity between this kind of fabula-based allusion and the text-based allusion with which Classicists are more familiar: both involve a reference to another external source (in contrast to intratextuality: allusion within the bounds of a specific poem). By employing the term here, we thus acknowledge this essential continuity: in both ‘mythological’ and ‘textual’ intertextuality, the underlying allusive process is the same, even if the target of the allusion is different in each case.

I.2.2 Reconstructing Lost Traditions

Despite its methodological advantages, however, this framework of mythological intertextuality still has to deal with one crucial obstacle that faces any neoanalytical undertaking: namely, our limited access to the rich range of traditions and poems that once populated archaic Greece. Given how little we now have, either in full or in fragments, our gaze is extremely blinkered. In the case of the Iliad and Odyssey, our earliest extant Greek texts, this limitation is particularly pressing: how can we talk of allusion in these poems if we have no clear window onto what came before them?

---


121 This problem is equally alive for any attempt to situate Homeric poetry against its larger tradition: e.g. in the case of traditional referentiality, the ‘totality of tradition’ may often only amount to extant Homeric examples, which makes it difficult to determine whether the associations scholars construct are truly pan-traditional, or merely intratextual, an idiosyncratic system of a specific text: Kelly (2007a) 9-10; Cook (2009) 15.
To escape this poverty of evidence, some scholars have recently looked beyond the Greek canon to Near Eastern narratives as a possible ‘source’ of interaction. Numerous parallels of technique, motif and theme have long suggested some kind of connection between Greek and Near Eastern texts, but it remains hotly debated how best to frame the relationship. A growing recent trend, however, is to see Homer and Hesiod ‘directly’ and ‘intentionally’ alluding to the likes of *Gilgameš* and the *Enuma Eliš*. This is an exciting possibility, but there is need (at the very least) for caution. Johannes Haubold has noted that Greek epic (unlike fable) does not advertise itself as engaging with Near Eastern traditions – indeed, the Homeric conception of the world mentions no human society east of Cilicia and the Phoenicians – while historical Greeks, even if they were aware of such traditions, were apparently not concerned with spotting references to them. Nor, we might add, were they even interested in mentioning them: Γιλγαμος appears only once in extant Greek literature, and only then nearly a millennium after Homer at the turn of the second/third centuries CE, in a context divorced from his Mesopotamian epic adventures. Despite the broad cultural

---

122 Fundamental are Burkert (1992); West (1997). Recent key contributions include López-Ruiz (2010), (2014); Louden (2011); Bachvarova (2016); Kelly – Metcalf (forthcoming). One should acknowledge that the ‘Near East’ is but a convenient (and conventional) label for what is in fact a wide range of different cultures, languages and traditions: Rollinger (2015) 9-10.


125 Haubold (2013) 20-33. Currie (2016) 200n.283 dismisses the silence of ancient reception as the result of the Homeric scholia’s ‘Greek chauvinism’ and argues instead (pp.200-208) that the *Iliad* shows some interest in the Near Eastern provenance of myths and names, its ‘non-assimilation of origins’ acting as a ‘signal’ of the poet’s debt (203). This, however, is difficult to square with Currie’s alleged major cases of allusion (Achilles ~ Gilgamesh, Aphrodite ~ Ishtar), which lack such ‘non-assimilation’, and instead seem to involve a ‘neutralising’ and ‘assimilative’ ‘refiguration’; precisely where we would want a ‘signal’ to these Near Eastern traditions, we do not find one.

126 Ael.NA.12.21. Henkelman (2006) 816-49 adduces this passage as evidence for long-lasting oral traditions on *Gilgamesh*. But he acknowledges the lack of fit with the Mesopotamian epic, and pursues connections with Sargon and Etana instead. Tigay (1982) argues that ‘assumption of ultimate dependence on a Mesopotamian original does not seem compelling’ (p.253) and sees the ‘confusion’ with the story of Sargon as ‘symptomatic of
influence of the Near East on archaic Greece, it is very difficult not to take the general silence of Greek audiences and writers as a sign of disinterest in (or ignorance of) these foreign myths. Moreover, many of the underlying Greek-oriental literary parallels are often not ‘sufficiently compelling’ (Currie’s own criterion: (2016) 174) or close enough to necessitate or even encourage a direct or allusive connection. Although it is ultimately a subjective matter, alternative explanations for similarity often seem more plausible, usually involving closer and more meaningful parallels within a Greek context. The converted would of course respond that allusion always works through creative adaptation and reworking, so we should not expect precise similarity. But differences can eventually become so overwhelming that it simply becomes misleading to continue postulating direct allusion.

More fundamentally, however, this allusive model struggles to give a convincing account for such direct transmission and reception of the Near Eastern poems across time and space. Undoubtedly, ‘historical connections and cultural influence are abundantly attested between archaic Greece and the ancient Near East’, but this alone does not help overcome the vast temporal gap between our earliest Greek texts (eighth-seventh centuries BCE) and many of their Near Eastern counterparts (originally composed in the third-second millennia BCE). Scholars have thus resorted to positing centuries of unattested Near Eastern oral traditions that were detached from, but treated the same myths as, the highly scribal, coded and literary context of our cuneiform texts. Even if such traditions survived for so long, however, it is not easy to imagine how they would have become known to Greek poets, let

---

alone their audiences. Scholars have hypothesised the schooling of Greek poets in the East, the arrival of bilingual bards to Greece, and even Greek translations of Near Eastern poetry, all of which are certainly not impossible. But given the complete silence of our sources, any of these ‘solutions’ requires a rather large leap of faith – one which I am not currently prepared to take. I thus side with those who view parallels with Near Eastern texts as the result of long-term interaction and evolution, extremely valuable for tracing the distant prehistory of Greek poetic motifs – and for identifying the distinctive and unique ‘narrative choices’ made by the Greek tradition – but less so for those interested in intertextuality as a phenomenon of performance and reception.

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

The first is the post-Homeric date of our evidence: there is every possibility that these texts are simply reacting to and shaping their narratives against the Homeric poems themselves. Later poems may allusively rework a Homeric motif or simply add meat to the narrative bones of a passing reference in Homer – in which case, they cannot reliably provide

---

131 Currie (2016) 218-20 with further bibliography. What would a Greek ‘translation’ look like? West (2014a) 31-32 imagines a bilingual poet introducing ‘a whole series of Gilgâmesh motifs into an epic on a Greek mythological theme’, such as Heracles’ labours (cf. West (2018)), but it would be a stretch to call this a ‘translation’.
us with secure, unmediated access to the coveted pre-Homeric tradition. This is especially true of the Epic Cycle, our evidence for which is late and limited, based on scattered fragments and the summaries of Proclus from the second or fifth centuries CE. It is striking how much early Homeric neoanalysis failed to tackle this problem, and simply assumed as ‘fact’ that the poems of the Epic Cycle reflect pre-Homeric tradition. Recent attempts to treat evidence of any date as an authentic ‘multiform’ are equally problematic, however, since they collapse chronology and impugn later storyteller’s potential for invention. In reality, the later our sources date in time, the greater our problems become: attempts to reconstruct the traces of a pre-Odyssean Argonautic tradition from Apollonius’ Argonautica are extremely problematic given how heavily steeped that epic is in the reception and study of both Homeric poems, while the content and attributions of prose mythographers cannot always be taken at face value. Similar difficulties arise, moreover, when the Iliad and Odyssey are mined for evidence of earlier traditions with which they might interact, where there is a latent danger of circularity. The chronological limitations of our evidence are thus a major obstacle, and one which must be taken seriously.

---


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


141 This is particularly clear in attempts to reconstruct ‘alternative’ pre-Homeric versions of Odysseus’ return (§IV.2.2: 199n.34). Goldhill (2007) criticises the ‘grotesque circularity’ of such arguments. Similarly circular is Kopff (1983)’s attempt to reconstruct from the Iliad an Aethiopis that he then holds to be the source for our Iliad.
The other major chink in the neoanalysts’ armour is the subjectivity of their arguments for the priority of one version of a myth over another. This usually depends on assessment of their relative ‘suitability’, a criterion that can be traced back as far as the work of Zenodotus. Not only must the parallel motifs they trace prove to be more than just typological, but their arguments for fittingness frequently lack any objective, clearly-defined criteria. In particular, are we justified in assuming that a motif’s original use will be more suitable and better-fitting than later adaptations, or could a later poet not adapt and improve the application of a pre-existing motif in a new context? Arguments for a motif originally ‘belonging’ to one specific myth or story must thus be treated with considerable circumspection.

Neither of these issues is insurmountable, however, and with due caution, they can both be overcome. In the case of using post-Homeric evidence, we should be wary of unduly exaggerating the primacy of Homer, at least at an early date. Among many scholars, Burgess has noted that early Greek artists reflected non-Homeric cyclic themes ‘much earlier and much more often than they reflected Homeric themes,’ suggesting that it was not until the late sixth century that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* came to dominate the tradition. In that case, ‘post-Homeric evidence for the pre-Homeric tradition is not necessarily contaminated by Homeric influence, at least not at an early date.’ Of course, early epic chronology is a disputed field of research, but this observation at least offers the opportunity for us to see in other sources evidence of traditions that may well have developed before the overbearing shadow of the Homeric poems rose to pre-eminence. More generally, given the limited possibilities for the diffusion of epics at an early date, both through performance and literary circulation, Burgess has also noted that ‘relatively late poems are not necessarily influenced by relatively early poems’ and that chronologically ““late” poems may well represent mythological traditions that precede “early”

---

142 Cf. Sittl (1882) 1-2. Zenodotus identified the less suitable instances of repeated lines or phrases to excise them as derivative interpolations.


Given this situation, it would be overly reductive and dogmatic to preclude the possibility that some post-Homeric evidence might reflect pre-Homeric traditions.

In that case, neoanalytical arguments of priority remain our best tool for identifying such potential pre-Homeric traditions. A degree of subjectivity is impossible to escape (as indeed it is in any allusive interpretation of poetry), but there are some cases in which it would be difficult to deny the transfer of motifs from one character or situation to another. This is especially the case when a motif is particularly rare, or when we encounter a uniquely shared combination of motifs which we can plausibly argue is more appropriate in one context than another. A commonly cited intratextual example within the *Iliad* is the relationship of Diomedes and Achilles. The pair share numerous similarities, from their Hephaestan armour (*Iliad* 8.195 ~ 18.369-19.13) and the supernatural fire that surrounds their heads (*Iliad* 5.4-8 ~ 18.205-14, 225-7) to their theomachic pretensions (*Iliad* 5.330-54, 841-59 ~ 21.212-82) and patronage by Athena, a favour shared by nobody else in the poem (*Iliad* 5.121-23, 290, 793-859 ~ 20.448-49, 22.214-95). As scholars acknowledge, all these traits ‘fit’ Achilles better, relating to the poem’s central protagonist at the climax of the narrative. Diomedes is thus an ‘anticipatory doublet’, or *altera persona*, of Achilles, displaying elements that primarily ‘belong’ to the Phthian hero. In a case such as this, then, arguments for priority are extremely plausible and enrich our interpretation of the poem. Diomedes exhibits these traits first, but they prove more at home when later repeated of Achilles. In the same way, instances of a motif that appear to us first in Homer may rework other pre-existing traditions or *fabulae*, even if they are only attested for us at a later date.

---


Of course, each individual case of such motif transference will have to be assessed on its own merits and treated with extreme care. In some cases, priority might not always be discernible and we may sometimes suppose that different examples of a motif developed simultaneously through mutual interaction. But in at least some instances, this approach will help us exploit later evidence as a guide for potential earlier literary traditions with which Homer and later poets could interact. After all, as Jim Marks has observed, ‘even if the non-canonical evidence...is “post-Homeric,” it still offers our best approximation of the kinds of stories that would have been known to poets [...] and to their audiences.’\textsuperscript{149} Certainty is impossible, but it would be overly defeatist and far less interesting to ignore categorically the hints and clues we have from later sources.

I.2.3 From Myth to Text

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

Again, there are no simple answers to this question. But when we turn to Greek lyric poetry of the seventh to fifth centuries BCE, we find an increasingly clear sense of authorship, literary history and engagement with specific texts and authors.\textsuperscript{150} This is manifested above all in poets’ direct naming of themselves and their predecessors. Numerous testimonia attest to a growing phenomenon of citing other poets by name. Already in the mid-seventh century, Archilochus (fr.303) and Callinus (fr.6) are said to have ascribed the \textit{Margites} and \textit{Thebais} respectively to Homer, while we are told that Alcman in the late seventh century made explicit

\textsuperscript{149} Marks (2003) 223.

mention of the poet Polymnestus of Colophon (fr.145). Similarly in the sixth century, a poem of Sappho was apparently composed in response to Alcaeus (fr.137), while Stesichorus is said to have blamed Hesiod and Homer (fr.90), attested that Xanthus predated him (fr.281) and ascribed the *Shield of Heracles* to Hesiod (fr.168). At the dawn of the fifth century, too, Bacchylides apparently called Homer a native of Ios (fr.48), Epicharmus named Aristoxenus of Selinus as the first to introduce a certain type of iambus (fr.77 K–A), and Pratinas reputedly made direct mention of a number of his musical predecessors: Olympus, Thaletas and Xenodamus (713 PMG). Olympus apparently featured again in Pindar (fr.157), who is also said to have mentioned Sacadas of Argos (fr.269), called Homer a Chian and Smyrnaean (fr.264) and ascribed the *Cypria* to him (fr.265). Alongside literary critics’ and philosophers’ engagement with Homer from the late sixth century onwards (Theagenes of Rhegium, Xenophanes, Heraclitus), this evidence suggests an increasingly strong awareness of distinct and recognisable poetic predecessors.\(^{151}\)

However, scholars frequently denigrate the value of these preceding examples, since they are all based on indirect testimonia and may only reflect the inferences and biographical fantasies of later readers.\(^{152}\) Chamaeleon’s claim that Stesichorus ‘blamed’ both Homer and Hesiod, for example, could have simply been extrapolated from the poet’s general criticism of the epic tradition and its myths (e.g. fr.91a.1), rather than being based on any direct naming of either poet in Stesichorus’ poetry.\(^{153}\) In some cases, too, potential textual corruption complicates our assessment of the evidence.\(^{154}\) Yet despite these problems, it would be excessively sceptical to dismiss every single one of these testimonia: not only are some

---


\(^{154}\) E.g. ‘Archilochus’ in Archil.fr.303 may be an error for Cratinus’ *Archilochoi* or for ‘Aristophanes’, who quotes a phrase from the *Margites* as ‘Homeriç’ (Μουσάων θεράπων, *Av*.909-10, *Marg*.fr.1 GEF); Davison (1955) 134-36. Or it may only reflect the fact that the same proverbial line featured in both the *Margites* and Archilochus (fr.291): West (1999) 371. Similarly, the Callinus passage depends on emendation of Paus.9.5.5: Ἐνιαίος for Ἐνιαίος; Καλλίνος/Καλλίνῳ for Καλαίνος/Καλαίνῳ: Davison (1955) 136-37.
independently confirmed by other evidence, but the general picture they paint is reinforced by numerous examples from our extant lyric texts and fragments in which poets did directly name their forebears.

Alcman may again offer an early example from the seventh century: his description of apparent poetic novelties ([σαυ]μαστὰ δ᾿ ἀνθ[ρώποιο](... γαρύματα μαλακά ... νεόχυ ρἀ διαρέχονται τε[ρή]) Alcm.4 fr.1.4-6) has plausibly been interpreted as a reference to poetic predecessors, potentially including Terpander (τερπανδρικόν 4 fr.1.6) and Polymnestus (cf. Alcm.fr.145). Yet it is in the sixth and fifth centuries that extant examples proliferate: Alcaeus explicitly attributes the maxim that ‘property makes the man’ to Aristodemus, one of the seven sages (Ἀριστόδαμον, fr.360) and may even address Sappho directly (ιόπλοκ’ ἀγνα μελλιχόμειδε Σάπφοι, fr.384). Hipponax directly names Bias of Priene, another of the seven sages (Βίαντος τοῦ Πριηνέως, fr.123). Solon explicitly quotes and criticises a verse of Mimnermus, whom he identifies directly by his patronymic (Λιγιαστάδη, fr.20). Bacchylides quotes a saying of Hesiod (Βοιωτὸς ἀνὴρ …Ἡσίοδος, Bacchyl.5.191-4). Corinna explicitly finds fault with Myrtis for competing with Pindar (Μουρτίδ᾿ ...Πινδάροι, fr.664a).

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

156 Lobel (1957) 23; Davies (1986b); Spelman (2018a) 153 with n.62. Terpander is also cited by Pindar (fr.125), Timotheus (791.225 PMG).

157 Yatromanolakis (2007) 169-71. ιόπλοκ’ envoques a common Sapphic compound: δολόπλοκος (fr.1), μυθόπλοκος (fr.188); Robbins (1995) 231. Sappho’s name is elsewhere spelled Ψάπφοι in Lesbian (= Sapphic) poetry, which prompted Voigt to follow Maas in printing a different word division (μελλιχόμειδες ἄπφοι, ‘sweet-smiling darling’, cf. ἀπφῦς, Theoc.Id.15.13-15). Even with this reading, however, there would be a clear aural allusion to Sappho’s name, as Yatromanolakis (2007) 171 notes. West (1966) 87-88n.3 speculates that Alcaeus may have also named Hesiod in a lost fragment (accounting for the spelling Αἰσίοδος in Etymologica).

158 Αἰγιαστάδη is Bergk’s emendation, but given the quotation and context, a reference to Mimnermus is beyond doubt: West (1974) 182.

159 Cf. Clayman (1993), although I prefer a pre-Hellenistic dating of the poetess: Silanion’s statue of the poetess provides a terminus ante quem of the late fourth century (Stewart (1998) 278-81; cf. Collins (2006) 19-20). This
Simonides quotes Pittacus’ saying that it is difficult to be good (fr.542), critiques Cleobulus’ epigram on Midas’ tomb (fr.581), acknowledges Homer and Stesichorus as sources for his account of Meleager (fr.564), and even attributes to the ‘man from Chios’ a hexameter line from the famous leaves simile of Iliad 6.146-49 (fr.eleg.19.1-2, cf. ἀνδρὸς, 11.15-18; Ὅμηρος, 20.14). Yet it is Pindar who refers to the greatest range of predecessors, including Archilochus (Ol.9.1-2, Pyth.2.54-56), Homer (e.g. Pyth.4.277, Nem.7.21, Isth.4.41, Pae.7b.11), Hesiod (Isth.6.66-68), Polymnestus of Colophon (fr.188), Terpander (fr.125), and perhaps also Alcman, Arion (Ol.13.18), and Xenocritus of Locri (Πολυμνέας τής, fr.140b). In some cases, these Pindaric references can even be traced to specific lines of other extant poems (e.g. Isth.6.66-68 ~ Op.412; Pyth.4.277-78 ~ Il.15.207; Nem.7.21 ~ Od.1.4). And to all these examples we could also add instances of poets’ self-naming (e.g. Αλκμάνικος, Alcm.fr.17, 39; Ψάπφως, Sapph.fr.1.20, 65.6, 94.5, 133.2), and especially Theognis’ assertion of his personal ownership of his collection of verses in his seal poem (Θεογνίδος ἐστιν ἔπη | τοῦ Μεγαρέως, Thgn.22-23). Alongside the increasing evidence for the use of writing and literacy throughout the

---

161 Cf. the ethnic Αἰολεύς (Pind.fr.191), which has been interpreted as another reference to Terpander: Nagy (1990b) 93n.57; Prauscello (2012) 75-76.
162 Αλκμάνικος, P.Oxy.2389 fr.9, col.i.9-10 (= Alcm.TA1a = fr.13a), plausibly ascribed to Pindar: Spelman (2018a) 258-60.
164 Even quotations of mythological personages may point to specific texts, e.g. Adrastus (Ol.6.12-17): Pindar’s ἀμφότερον μάντιν τ’ἀγαθὸν καὶ δουρὶ μάρνασθαι (Ol.6.17) can easily be converted to a full hexameter with a simple change of the verb (μάχεσθαι), suggesting that Pindar was adapting the content of an epic Thebaid, as the scholiast in fact claims on the authority of Asclepiades of Myrlea: West (2011b) 53 with n.7.
sixth and fifth centuries, all this evidence suggests that we are very much justified in seeing increasingly greater intertextual engagement with specific texts in this poetry.

In practice, however, any discussion of allusion in Greek lyric still faces many of the same issues that we have already encountered above: not least, whether to prioritise engagement with the limited range of texts we have access to, and how we should negotiate the boundaries of the typological and the specific. When Archilochus describes his seduction of Neoboule in the first Cologne epode (fr.196a), for example, should we conceive of this as a pointed rewriting of Hera’s seduction of Zeus in *Iliad* 14, or a broader engagement with the epic type-scene of seduction? Similarly, does Mimnermus fr.2 allude to the leaves simile of *Il.6.146-49* or to a traditional analogy that is found frequently elsewhere, both in Homer and later texts? So too with the Lesbian poets: does Sappho fr.44 evoke a patchwork of Iliadic passages, or a wider range of Trojan traditions, including not just Hector and Andromache’s wedding, but also that of Paris and Helen? And does Alcaeus fr.347 closely rework Hesiod’s description of summer in the *Works and Days* (Op.582-96), or draw independently on a traditional body of seasonal song, attested elsewhere by a parallel description at [Hes.]Scut.393-97? In all these and other cases, we should be wary of unduly privileging the

---


167 Cf. too intratextuality within individual poets’ oeuvres, especially centred around sequences and cycles of songs, e.g. Archilochus on Lycambes, Alcaeus on his exile, Sappho on her family: Budelmann – Phillips (2018) 18-19.

168 Some are generally sceptical of the extent of allusion in early Greek lyric: Fowler (1987) 3-52; Kelly (forthcoming). In any case, traditional referentiality can still be fruitfully applied to Greek lyric: e.g. Barker – Christensen (2006).


few texts that we still possess over the broader tradition, but this should not stop us from arguing for direct allusion when the context and content of the passages justify it. In the case of Alcaeus’ summer scene, for example, the parallels between the Alcaean and Hesiodic passages are so numerous and precise that a merely indirect connection seems improbable. On closer examination, the arguments for a traditional motif are also not particularly compelling: the Aspis parallel passage is more likely another ‘echo’ of the Works and Days (even self-consciously marked as such through the recurrence of the ‘echoing’ cicada: ἠχέτα τέττιξ, Scut.393), a means to increase its own ‘Hesiodic’ texture, rather than an independent manifestation of a recurring motif. In this case, therefore, it is plausible to read Alcaeus’ fragment as a pointed appropriation of Hesiod’s paraenetic posturing, marking his generic difference to and distance from Hesiod’s far longer didactic epic.

In recent years, however, several scholars have attempted to downdate the origins of extensive textual intertextuality to the time of Stesichorus in the sixth century, a poet whom they perceive as marking a particularly significant watershed in the development of poetic allusion. It is true that Stesichorus does offer us several plausible cases of precise engagement with Homeric epic, often with apparently rarer moments of Homeric narrative: the comparison of Geryon’s drooping head to a poppy echoes the Iliad’s similarly poignant description of Gorgythion’s head (Geryoneis fr.19.44-47 ~ Il.8.306-8); Geryon’s mother baring her breast recalls Hecuba’s same action before Hector (Geryoneis fr.17 ~ Il.22.83); and Telemachus’ departure from Sparta replays events from the Odyssey (Nostoi fr.170.1-11 ~ Od.15.1-184). Such precise engagement can also be traced in Stesichorus’ successors, not only in the three famous epinician poets (Simonides, Bacchylides and Pindar), but also Ibycus, whose Polycrates Ode

---


plausibly makes sophisticated use of the Iliadic Catalogue of Ships and Hesiod’s Works and Days.\textsuperscript{176}

However, to posit Stesichorus as a dramatic point of change overplays the novelty of such precise references and underplays the significance of earlier Stesichorean predecessors, such as Alcaeus. We have already noted his precise verbal engagement with Hesiod, but we could also cite his fr.44, which appears to evoke the key theme of the Iliad: in its fragmentary state, we see a son call to his Naiad mother who then supplicates Zeus on the subject of her son’s wrath (μὰνιν, fr.44.8 – μῆνιν, Il.1.1); it is difficult to deny a reference to our Iliad or at least an Iliadic tradition here.\textsuperscript{177} Moreover, scholars’ sceptical arguments about earlier texts can also be turned against their own Stesichorean examples: in the case of Geryoneis fr.19, for example, Kelly himself notes that flower similes are common in early Greek epic, while the image of each poppy simile is considerably different: in Stesichorus, the flower sheds its leaves; while in Homer, it is weighed down by the weight of fruit and rain.\textsuperscript{178} In addition to this, we could add that arrows likely played a larger role in other epic material, especially in traditions featuring Philoctetes and Heracles, so the shared instrument of death need not be particularly distinctive or marked. And Kelly’s argument that the Iliadic model is a rare and obscure episode, in comparison to earlier lyricists’ engagement with more mainstream, marquee-episodes, is undermined by its simile form – it is a far more vivid and memorable moment than Kelly supposes. All this is not enough, I believe, to dismiss this Stesichorean allusion, but it goes some way to highlighting the subjectivity inherent in any argument for or against allusion in early Greek poetry. For any particular example, the case can be made both ways.

It is not possible, therefore, to pinpoint a specific watershed moment at which we can start talking of precise intertextual engagements rather than allusion to more general mythological traditions. Indeed, returning to the world of archaic epic, it is even possible that we should not entirely rule out the possibility of direct textual intertextuality even in our

\textsuperscript{176} Barron (1969); Steiner (2005); Stamatopoulou (2016) 49-51.


earliest extant texts. Scholars have long noted the elaborate intratextual connections within individual epic poems, especially in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*’s large-scale repetitions of speeches and similes, even over vast distances (*Il.15.263-68 = 6.506-11; Od.17.124-46 ~ 4.333-50, 4.556-60; Od.23.157-61 = 6.230-34*).\(^{179}\) It is difficult to deny Currie’s conclusion that ‘each poet knows his own poem as a fixed text, and recalls part of it by quoting specific lines.’\(^{180}\) And if such fixity and ‘sense of text’ is possible within an individual work, it is difficult to resist extending it to a poet’s engagement with other poems.\(^{181}\) This alone does not permit us to reconstruct a host of lost ‘fixed’ archaic epics, for the reasons we have discussed above. But when exploring the relationships of our extant texts, it would be overly restrictive to deny the possibility of direct contact at some points. And this, indeed, is what a number of scholars have found. The Hesiodic corpus, for example, is marked by a number of close connections, especially between the *Theogony* and *Works and Days*, whose relationship borders on ‘deliberate cross-referencing’.\(^{182}\) not only do both poems feature Hesiod’s pseudo-biographical relationship to the Muses from Mount Helicon (*Theog.22-35, Op.658-59*) and both treat the myths of Prometheus and Pandora in a complementary diptych with numerous verbal parallels (e.g. *Op.48 ~ Theog.546, 565; Op.70-72 ~ Theog.571-73*),\(^{183}\) but the beginning of the *Works and Days* also appears to self-consciously ‘correct’ the *Theogony*’s claim that there was only one Strife (*Op.11-26 ~ Theog.225-26*).\(^{184}\) Similar intertextual links have also been identified in the wider canon of archaic Greek epic, both between the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* and Homer, and

---

\(^{179}\) See e.g. Lohmann (1970); Bannert (1988); Di Benedetto (1994) 177-238; Reichel (1994); Bakker (2017).

\(^{180}\) Currie (2016) 17.

\(^{181}\) Homer’s ‘sense of text’: Dowden (1996).


between the *Homeric Hymns* and a number of other early Greek hexameter poems.\(^{185}\) Admittedly, in some cases, these connections may still be better explained as instances of mythological intertextuality or traditional referentiality.\(^{186}\) Yet these examples – especially Hesiod’s intertextual diptych – are extremely suggestive for an early sense of (relatively) fixed textuality in the poetic world of archaic Greece.

The most controversial case, however, remains the relationship of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. There are many parallel passages between the two epics,\(^ {187}\) and a number of scholars have made plausible cases for seeing allusive connections between their structure, language and motifs.\(^ {188}\) In particular, it has often been argued that the fraught relationship of Achilles and Odysseus in both poems self-consciously reflects the competition between their respective epics, as each hero is defined against the other: the figure of βίη against that of μῆτις – certainly an attractive hypothesis.\(^ {189}\) It is understandable that some might shrink from arguing for direct allusion between these poems, given the apparently oral setting of archaic epic. And there is, after all, no smoking gun. Yet by reading the pair in dialogue, I believe that already here we can gain a richer reading and an attractive narrative of literary *aemulatio*.

To contemplate such a relationship, however, we must tackle the remarkable fact that neither poem directly mentions any event from the other, a phenomenon customarily known

---


\(^{186}\) E.g. Aphrodite’s bathing at Paphos (*HhAphr.*58-63) – perhaps directly lifted from *Od*.8.362-66 (e.g. Baumbach (2012) 137-38), but more likely an independent manifestation of an ‘allurement scene’ (Forsyth (1979)), or an evocation of the *fabula* of (or hymnic poetry on) Aphrodite’s seduction of Anchises and her pseudo-seduction of Paris (Currie (2016) 147-60).

\(^{187}\) Gemoll (1883); Usener (1990); West (2014a) 70-77.


\(^{189}\) Thalmann (1984) 182; Edwards (1985a); Wilson (2005); Currie (2016) 46 with n.46; Grethlein (2017).
Only the mixing of Achilles’ and Patroclus’ bones may offer an exception to this phenomenon (requested by Patroclus’ shade at I.23.82-92, and recalled by Agamemnon’s at Od.24.73-84), but even this is an event that strictly lies outside the main narrative of both poems. Page once concluded from this absence that the Iliad and Odyssey developed in complete isolation from each other, but given the length and similar subject matter of both, it is difficult not to interpret the complete avoidance of each other’s narrative content as deliberate. After all, the monumental scale of both poems sets them apart from other early Greek epics we know of, while the pair also display an unusually high degree of complementarity. While we can trace numerous contradictions and differences of detail between the Cyclic epics and Homer, the contents of the Iliad and Odyssey are strikingly consistent and compatible. Indeed, Foley and Arft have argued that ‘overlap and even contradiction’ are ‘natural and expectable’ in a multiform, pre-textual tradition. The absence of both in this case is extremely telling. Moreover, when taken as a pair, the Iliad and Odyssey appear to offer an extremely convenient survey of the whole Trojan war: in its main narrative

---

190 Monro (1901) 325.

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

192 Page (1955b).


194 Cycle and Homer: Both the Cypria (Cypr.arg.12c) and Iliad (Il.2.816-77) contain catalogues of Trojan allies; they disagree on where Chryseis was captured (Lyrnessus: Il.2.688-93, 19.59-60, 295-96; Pedasus: Cypr.fr.23) and on the duration of Paris’ voyage from Sparta to Troy (Il.6.289-92, Cypr.fr.14; cf. Hdt.2.116-7). Cf. inconsistencies and overlaps in the Cyclic poems: Ajax’s suicide features in both the Little Iliad (Il.Parv.arg.1b) and Aethiopis (Aeth.fr.6); Astyanax is killed by Odysseus in the Sack of Ilium (Il.Pers.arg.4a), but by Neoptolemus in the Little Iliad (Il.Parv.fr.29).

and cross-references, the *Iliad* treats the first sack of Troy to the death of Achilles, while the *Odyssey* picks up from that point until the end of Odysseus’ story. This complementarity was already recognised in antiquity: Homer in the *Odyssey* was said to have filled out what was left out of the *Iliad* (τὰ λελειμμένα). But given how seamlessly and coherently the two epics cover the whole Trojan war narrative, this unity certainly seems intentional and premeditated.

Of course, those who remain sceptical could still argue that the *Odyssey* is merely familiar with many episodes of the *fabula* of Achilles and the Trojan war, and the *Iliad* similarly with the *fabula* of Odysseus’ returns, but – in my view – the extent of the connections encourages something greater in this case – that the poet of the *Odyssey* could have been familiar with the *Iliad* as a distinctive text, or at least with the distinctive contours of an Iliadic tradition. Such fixity would not necessarily depend on writing, but it would equally not preclude it: the excavation of the cup of Acesander at Methone has recently provided further evidence that poetry was recorded in writing by the mid-eighth century BCE. We should not, however, take this relationship as the norm for early Greek allusion: indeed, our foregoing discussion has highlighted the limitations of that approach. But rather, these strong links between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* show that both mythological and textual intertextuality could co-exist at an early date – much as specific and generic allusion could co-exist in later Latin poetry.

In my discussion of Greek epic and lyric that follows, therefore, I will be exploring cases of both mythological and textual intertextuality. My instinct is to assume engagement with mythical *fabulae*, rather than texts, especially when dealing with the lost traditions underpinning both Homeric poems, unless a particularly strong case can be made for direct textual interaction. But as we proceed to Greek lyric, potential cases of direct allusion will become more numerous. The indexing of such allusions (to *fabulae* and/or texts) will be the

---


197 Edwards (1985a) 8-9 considers such a stance ‘the most skeptical view’.

198 Janko (2015) 23-27, comparing the Dipylon oenochoe, Nestor’s Cup and a cup with three hexameters from Eretria. He concludes that ‘by this time, alphabetic writing could be used to record poetry on more serious occasions and at far greater length’.
main focus of this study, but I will also stay attuned throughout to the traditional referentiality of individual words and phrases. In this way, we will best be able to appreciate the rich texture of archaic Greek allusion.

* * *

With this framework and these considerations in mind, then, it is time to turn from theory to practice. In each of the sections that follow, we shall explore the various ways in which archaic Greek poets indexed their allusions to both traditions and texts. Throughout, I shall follow the practice of many modern scholars in supposing an ideally competent audience, whose previous exposure to tradition has equipped them with the prior knowledge necessary to appreciate poets’ allusive interactions.¹⁹⁹ Of course, ancient audiences – like those today – would have varied widely in capabilities and interests, but this should not limit us to pursuing the lowest common denominator of interpretation. And nor does an oral context of performance preclude the reception and appreciation of such allusions: modern music, theatre and film offer many examples of clearly detectable allusions mid-performance.²⁰⁰

As a final caveat, I shall also be imputing a significant degree of self-reflexivity into these archaic texts, going beyond a naturalistic reading of scenes to detect an additional layer of self-conscioussness. In particular, I shall often read the poet’s external motivation into the words of his characters, an approach that blurs the narratological distinction between primary (extradiegetic) and secondary (intradiegetic) narrators.²⁰¹ Some might challenge such a reading and object that a character’s words are ‘just’ directed to their internal audience, and that it is unwarranted to jump from an internal character’s speech to what the poet implicitly ‘says’ to his external audience. Yet this relies on a false dichotomy between ‘naturalistic’ and ‘self-


²⁰⁰ E.g. the Musical *Wicked*, a self-conscious ‘prequel’ to the *Wizard of Oz*, where we find numerous, often extremely subtle, foreshadowings of ‘later’ events within the play’s fictional world.

conscious' interpretations of poetry, a distinction that is often mapped onto that of ‘archaic’ and ‘modern’ literature. On closer inspection, however, ancient Greek texts, from Homer onwards, are manifestly self-conscious: scholars have long admired the embedded songs of the *Odyssey*, the meditation on artistic creation in the Homeric shield ecphrasis, and the self-reflexive figuring of the Homeric poet in his characters, including Odysseus, Calchas and Nestor. In the case of embedded speeches, too, there is no reason to deny such self-conscious interpretations. Characters’ words are, after all, still the product of – and shaped by – their narrator, and so they can always be interpreted on multiple levels: both internally (as an address within the story world of a poem) and externally (as an address to audiences beyond it). Such a suggestion is not, I should add, a radical departure from interpretative norms. Phoenix’s Meleager exemplum in *Iliad* 9 has long been interpreted in such a manner: internally, as a speech that aims to exhort Achilles back to the battlefield, and externally, as an authorial nod to Achilles’ impending demise at the hands of Apollo. In this study, I intend to extend this approach further, exploring how characters’ (and narrators’) words reach beyond their immediate context. By doing so, we will be able to gain a richer appreciation of archaic Greek poetics.

---


PART II.

THE PRE-ALEXANDRIAN FOOTNOTE
II.1 Introduction

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

In the chapters that follow, I argue that this same indexical potential is already manifest in archaic Greek poetry’s engagement with hearsay and its transmission. From Homer onwards, archaic poets evoke, confront and revise what others have previously ‘said’.
II.2 Epic Fama

In the world of archaic epic, fame and renown played a prominent role. Both Homeric poems convey a strong impression of tales and traditions circulating between individuals and communities. This is especially visible in the *Odyssey*, where we witness the stories of the Achaeans’ returns recounted by Phemius, Nestor and others, as well as Telemachus’ active quest to seek news (*ἀκουήν*, *Od.14.179*) of his father’s fortunes. Yet even in the *Iliad*, stories of the past circulate continuously: characters repeatedly appeal to a range of past tales as paradigms for their own circumstances, including the former deeds of Bellerophon, Meleager and Niobe. Nor is this concern with the telling of tales limited to a retrospective concern with the past; it also looks to the present and future. In both epics, Homer’s characters are intimately concerned to preserve their own κλέος, a word which is often translated as ‘fame’, ‘renown’ or ‘reputation’, but which etymologically means ‘that which is heard’ (cf. κλύω). Heroes may win κλέος on the battlefield (*Il.5.3, 18.121*), in athletic contests (*Od.8.147-48*) or even for fine words in council (*Od.16.241-42*). And throughout Homeric society, there is a recurring concern with how future generations will hear of and judge their actions (note especially the repeated verse-end ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι, ‘for future generations to hear’).\(^1\) Even objects can enjoy a κλέος of their own, often through elaborate stories attached to them, such as Agamemnon’s sceptre (*Il.1.234-39*) or Meriones’ boar-tusk helmet (*Il.10.261-70*).\(^2\) In the words of one critic, the Homeric universe is bound together by ‘an elaborate network of gossip, rumor, and reputation.’\(^3\) It is κλέος which drives heroic activity. And it is κλέος which eventually becomes memorialised in song.\(^4\)

---

Throughout both Homeric poems and archaic Greek epic more generally, characters often appeal to these circulating traditions in vague and generalised terms through verbs of hearing and speaking, especially the third person plural φασί. In current scholarship, such gestures are often interpreted as a component of a larger epic contrast between reliable first-hand experience and the indirect transmission of hearsay. Since these appeals to tradition are primarily found in the mouths of mortal characters, who often acknowledge their lack of direct autopsy, they are thought to reflect the limitations and fallibility of human knowledge, a foil to the omniscient and divinely-authorised perspective of the epic narrator. In the invocation of the Muses in Iliad 2, the poet famously remarks that ‘you are goddesses and are present and know all things, whereas we hear only a rumour and know nothing’ (ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε πάρεστε τε ἴστε τε πάντα, ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδὲ τι ἱδμεν, Il.2.485-86). As Andrew Ford has argued from this and other such passages, the ‘fiction’ of the Muses conceals the reality of bardic education and transmission, freeing Homer – unlike his characters – from needing to rely on ‘mere’ κλέος. By presenting matters in this way, Homer is said to establish his own poetry’s κλέος as superior to other socially-embedded, self-interested forms of oral report.

There is certainly an element of truth to this opposition, but it is overly reductive to restrict every instance of φασί to such rhetorical posturing. After all, the same idiom also appears in the mouths of epic narrators (Il.2.783, 17.674; Od.6.42; Theog.306; Op.803-4), alongside a number of other remarks which acknowledge the limitations of their knowledge.

5 φασί(ν) appears in the Iliad (21x), Odyssey (21x), Theogony (1x), Works and Days (1x), Homeric Hymns (3x), and at least one epic fragment. de Jong (2004) 237-38 offers a useful list of the Homeric examples, grouped into four main categories that reflect her narratological priorities.


8 Ford (1992) 61-63, 90-130


10 A fact ignored by Mackie (2003) 69, who claims that ‘the Homeric poet himself, never does, and never would, legitimate his own narrative in this way’ [sc. by grounding ‘the validity of his tale in its traditional character’].
A straight dichotomy between mortal ignorance and poetic omniscience simply cannot hold. Nor does inspiration from the Muses deny poets’ independence: it is clear from the Odyssey that this is conceived as a familiar instance of ‘double determination,’ involving both divine and human agency. Phemius famously declares that he is both self-taught and the recipient of divine aid (αὐτοδίδακτος δ᾽ εἰμί, θεὸς δέ μοι ἐν φρεσίν ὁίμας | παντοίας ἐνέφυσεν, Od.22.347-48), while Alcinous’ description of Demodocus makes it clear that his poetry is both god-given and the product of his own θυμός (τῷ γὰρ ὁθεὸς πέρι δῶκεν ἀοιδὴν | τέρπειν, ὅππῃ θυμὸς ἐποτρύνησιν ἀείδειν, Od.8.44-45). The poet’s divinely-inspired status, therefore, is not opposed to but rather complements his own poetic craftsmanship on the mortal plane. However hard Homer tries to conceal his fallibilities behind the smokescreen of the Muses, he ultimately cannot avoid embracing and engaging with other traditions and ‘what men say’.

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

We shall focus first on the Iliad and Odyssey, exploring the two main ways in which indexical hearsay functions in Homeric epic: first, as an acknowledgment of the poet’s encyclopaedic mastery of tradition (§II.2.1); and second, as an agonistic gesture to suppressed

---

11 Cf. de Jong (2004) 47-49. The Homeric passages (ll.12.175-78, 17.260-61) have been suspected by ancient and modern scholars. But it is a *petitio principii* to claim that Homer does not indulge in any self-reference, and then remove all lines which do not fit this view. Both passages can be amply defended: the scholia identify Ὀμηρική ἐνάργεια in ll.12.175-78; Edwards (1991) 88 notes poetic expansion in ll.17.260-61.

narrative alternatives (§II.2.2). We shall begin by examining how these indexes function in character speech, before turning to their comparable use in the narrator’s own voice (§II.2.3). To conclude, we shall broaden our perspective by comparing this Homeric pattern to the use of this device in the wider corpus of early Greek epic (§II.2.4).

II.2.1 The Authority of Tradition

When Homer’s characters appeal to hearsay, they often point to details of the mythical tradition that are established and familiar. Even if – within the internal story world – their gesture may reflect their limited first-hand knowledge, it can also be read as the poet’s invocation of the authority of epic tradition, marking his own encyclopaedic mastery of it.

In *Odyssey* 4, for example, Peisistratus reminisces about his dead brother Antilochus, whom ‘men say was above all others preeminent in speed of foot and as a warrior’ (περὶ δ᾿ ἄλλων φασὶ γενέσθαι ἄντιλοχον, πέρι μὲν θείειν ταχύν ἢδὲ μαχητήν, *Od*.4.201-2). Within the internal story world, this remark reflects Peisistratus’ lack of direct acquaintance with his brother’s exploits, given that he was not himself present at Troy to see them (οὐ γὰρ ἠντήσ’ οὐδὲ ἴδον, *Od*.4.200-1), but it also evokes the Trojan war traditions through which Antilochus’ fame has reached him and with which Homer’s audience would have been familiar. The Pylian youth played a significant part in the war as a close friend of Achilles, especially after Hector’s killing of Patroclus. In particular, his death at the hands of the Ethiopian Memnon was a prominent feature of the larger tradition, a key episode in the later Cyclic *Aethiopis* (*Aeth*.arg.2c) and one which the Homeric narrator has just recalled with the loaded language of memory (μνήσατο, ἐπιμνησθεῖς, *Od*.4.187-89, §III.2.1: 134-35). Peisistratus’ appeal to hearsay acknowledges the central role that his brother played in the mythical tradition.

The emphasis on Antilochus’ speed, however, points not so much to the hero’s duel with Memnon as to his more general reputation as a runner in the wider tradition. In the *Iliad’s*
footrace, he is introduced as the fastest of all the Achaean youths (ὅ γὰρ αὐτὲ νέους ποσὶ πάντας ἐνίκα, II.23.756), while Menelaus earlier claims that he is unmatched in his youth, speed and valour, paralleling Peisistratus’ description of his brother’s key traits (οὐ τις σεῖο νεώτερος ἄλλος Αχαιῶν, ὃντ’ ἄλκιμος ὡς σὺ μάχεσθαι, II.15.569-70). Elsewhere in the Iliad, moreover, Antilochus is called a ‘swift warrior’ (θοός...πολεμιστής, II.15.585), a phrase used only once elsewhere in Homer of Aeneas, another hero renowned for his speed,13 while his agility is repeatedly stressed in his key contribution to the Iliadic narrative: his delivery of the news of Patroclus’ death to Achilles (θᾶσσον ἱόντα, II.17.654; βῆ δὲ θέειν, II.17.698; πόδες φέρον, II.17.700; πόδας ταχύς, II.18.2). Although we do not have other evidence for his depiction elsewhere in archaic Greek epic, such a character trait was presumably an established feature of Antilochus in the Trojan war myth, not just limited to the Iliad. After all, earlier in the Odyssey, Nestor has already described his son in precisely the same terms as Peisistratus does here, suggesting that the attributes are formulaic and traditional (Ἀντίλοχος, πέρι μὲν θείειν ταχὺς ἠδὲ μαχητής, Od.3.112~Od.4.202). It is, moreover, especially appropriate for Antilochus to share a major attribute of his companion, ‘swift-footed’ Achilles (e.g. Ἀχιλῆα πόδας ταχύν, II.13.348).14 Peisistratus’ appeal to hearsay in Odyssey 4, therefore, looks beyond the immediate narrative to point to Antilochus’ pre-eminence as a runner in the wider Trojan tradition. By indexing another element of the epic cycle, Homer signals not just his allusion to other features of the Trojan war narrative, but also his mastery over the mass of mythical material at his disposal.

This incorporative aesthetic is a recurring feature of indexical hearsay. On many occasions, Homer similarly indexes other details of tradition, acknowledging the broader context in which his own poetry is situated. In the Iliad, Aeneas emphasises his familiarity with his own and Achilles’ ancestry as what they both ‘know’ from ‘hearing the ancient legends told by (or ‘about’) mortal men’ (ἴδμεν...πρόκλυτ ἀκούοντες ἔπεα θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων, II.20.203-4), a comment which – as Edwards notes – can easily be taken as a reference ‘to epic


poetry celebrating the exploits of the two heroes.’ Indeed, such a reference is reinforced by the use of the noun ἔπεα: not just ‘words’ in general, but also ‘poetic’ or even ‘epic utterances’. Alongside the mention of ἄνθρωποι (‘men’), commonly singled out as the audience of epic poetry elsewhere, Aeneas’ emphasis on the fame and antiquity of these ἔπεα highlights the epic traditionality of his and Achilles’ lineage.

In the Odyssey, meanwhile, the protagonist’s resourcefulness and cunning is similarly acknowledged as an established feature of tradition: Telemachus claims that ‘they say’ (φάσ’) his father is pre-eminent in wiles (μῆτιν, Od.23.124-26), while when Odysseus reveals his identity in Phaeacia, he similarly asserts that he is an object of concern to all men’ for his tricks (δόλοι) and that his fame reaches the heavens,’ employing language that mirrors Circe’s later allusive nod to Argonautic myth (ὅς πᾶσι δόλοισιν | ἄνθρωποι μέλω, καὶ μεν κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει, Od.9.19-20; cf. Ἀργὼ πᾶσι μέλουσα, Od.12.70). These comments point to the well-established tradition of Odysseus as the arch-deviser of the Trojan war myth, a reputation reflected in his formulaic epithet πολύμητς (‘of many wiles’), and more than deserved by his role in such episodes as the ambushes of Dolon, Rhesus and Helenus, as well as his various spying missions in Troy and the mobilisation of the Wooden Horse (Il.10.338-579; Il.Parv.arg.2a, 4b-d; Od.8.500-20). These indexes highlight the traditionality of Odysseus’ cunning, while also perhaps acknowledging the Odyssey’s own role in cementing it.

---

16 Thus Nagy (1979) 271, Chap.15§7. On this meaning of ἔπος, cf. §IV.3.1: 211n.70 Cf. Martin (1989) 16 who highlights the close association of ἔπος with the audition and transmission of words.
17 §II.2: 67-68.
18 For this Argonautic allusion: §I.1.3: 17. For μέλω of literary concern, cf. Thgn.245-7 (μελήσεις | ...ἀνθρώποιοι' ... | Κόρνε); Thgn.1058 (μέλους | ἀμφιτεροκτίσσαι). The noun ἄνθρωποι also points to poetic audiences: §II.2.2: 67-68; cf. ἔπ’ ἄνθρωποι, Od.23.125.
19 Cf. e.g. the verbal play with Οὔτις / μή τις (‘nobody’) and μῆτις (‘cunning’) in Odysseus’ encounter with Polyphemus, esp. Od.9.414.
In both Homeric poems, therefore, indexical appeals to hearsay invoke the authority of tradition, highlighting the poet’s control and mastery of the larger mythical canon. On occasion, such self-aware citation of tradition may even extend to direct textual allusion. Our most plausible case comes from the *Odyssey*, when Telemachus reports to Mentor-Athena that Nestor has been king for three generations of men (*Od*.3.243-46):

\[\text{νῦν δ᾽ ἐθέλω ἔπος ἄλλο μεταλλῆσαι καὶ ἐρέσθαι Νέστορ′, ἔπει περὶ οἶδε δίκας ἠδὲ φρόνιν ἄλλων-}
\[\text{τρις γὰρ δὴ μὲν φασίν ἀνάξασθαι γένε’ ἀνδρών-}
\[\text{ὡς τέ μοι ἀθάνατος ἰνδάλλεται εἰσοράασθαι.}

On an internal level, this reference to Nestor’s age emphasises his wisdom and authority. He is a reliable source of information for Telemachus to consult. Such fabled seniority is the very kind of thing that Telemachus would have doubtless heard stories about as he was growing up on Ithaca, so *φασίν* makes natural sense within the story world. Yet as scholars have long recognised, this description of the Pylian king also closely resembles his opening description in the *Iliad* (*II*.1.250-52):

\[\text{τῷ δ᾽ ἤδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων}
\[\text{ἔφθιαθ᾽, οἵ οἱ πρόσθεν ἅμα τράφεν ἠδ᾽ ἐγένοντο}
\[\text{ἐν Πύλῳ ἡγαθέῃ, μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἀνάσσεν.}

This similar treatment of Nestor’s triple rule was noted by ancient and Byzantine scholars: the Odyssean scholia remark that Telemachus’ sentiment ‘has been composed from the phrase in the *Iliad*’, while Eustathius comments that ‘the poet succinctly paraphrases what was said about Nestor at more length in the *Iliad*.’

---


II.2 Epic Fama

scholars have long been vexed by a slight discrepancy between them: on a literal reading, Nestor appears to have only ruled for one generation in the Iliad, but three in the Odyssey.22 However, Grethlein has recently highlighted the essential consistency between both passages: in each case, Nestor is pictured as having ruled over his own generation, as well as those of his children and grandchildren. The resulting timeframe skews both epics’ implicit chronology (seemingly interposing another generation between Nestor and his sons), but in both passages this can be accounted for as an exaggeration to reinforce Nestor’s authority.23 Given this similar hyperbole and the shared emphasis on Nestor’s age, experience and wisdom, it would be tempting to see the Odyssey here alluding directly to the Iliad. Telemachus would then be justifying his exaggerated claim through appeal to the precedent of the Iliad, signposted through the seemingly general φασίν. After all, the Iliadic passage derives from Nestor’s very first appearance in that poem, part of a memorable description of the Pylian king’s mellifluous speech which aligns him with other representatives of song, including the Muses, epic bards and the Sirens (II.1.248-49).24 It is – to use a phrase familiar from later periods – a ‘purple patch’ that could easily stick in an audience’s mind (cf. Hor.Ars P.14-19). By evoking it here, Homer and Telemachus would draw on literary precedent to authorise their exaggerated claim about Nestor’s age, gesturing to the fuller prior account of the Iliad: a truly ‘brief paraphrase’, as Eustathius claimed.25

Such a direct connection is certainly possible, and one that I would not want to rule out. It is likely, however, that such a characterisation of Nestor’s seniority and triple-rule would not have been restricted to these two places in the archaic epic tradition.26 We have

22 Σ Od.3.245a; Leaf (1886–88) I.16; Kirk (1985) 79.
23 Grethlein (2006b). Contrast West (2014a)71 (‘an egregiously unsuccessful attempt to reproduce the sense of A 250-2’).
25 ἔπος ἄλλο μεταλάληθαι (Od.3.243) could even pre-empt this allusion: literally ‘ask about another matter’, but also ‘search after another epic’ (i.e. the Iliad).
already explored his well-established place in the mythical canon (in relation to the Nestor’s Cup inscription, §I.2.1: 30-32) and we shall later turn to his central role as a repository of tales and stories, a status for which his age and experience are crucial (§IV.2.1: 196-98). On this occasion, it is thus more plausible to see Telemachus evoking a more general motif of Nestor’s seniority, a motif that ran throughout the Greek epic tradition, rather than a specific nod to its Iliadic manifestation. Whichever way one prefers to read the reference, however, we should acknowledge that φασίν again marks Homer’s allusion to the legitimising authority of tradition. Like the previous indexes we have examined above, the device situates Homer’s poetry within a larger map of myth, highlighting the poet’s encyclopaedic mastery of his mythical repertoire.

II.2.2 Contesting Tradition

In other Homeric cases, characters’ appeals to hearsay bear a far more agonistic edge, not just acknowledging the wider tradition, but directing an audience to specific elements of it that Homer has pointedly suppressed or diverged from.

In the Iliad, such combative positioning is especially centred around the figure of Achilles. When Eurypylus claims that ‘they say’ (φασίν) Patroclus learnt his knowledge of healing herbs from Achilles, who in turn learnt it from Cheiron (Il.11.830-32), the poet nods to the tradition of Achilles’ tuition by Cheiron, a fantastical version of the hero’s upbringing which Homer tends to downplay elsewhere. More polemical, however, is Agenor’s assertion of Achilles’ mortality, that ‘people say he is mortal’ (II.21.568-70):

καὶ γάρ θην τούτω τρωτός χρώς ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ, ἐν δὲ ἴα ψυχή, θνητὸν δέ ἐ φασ᾽ ἄνθρωποι ἐμμενεῖ· αὐτάρ οἱ Κρονίδης Ζεὺς κύδος ὀπάζει.

Unlike all the other examples we have discussed so far, this φασὶ is unusual since it does not lack a nominative agent, prompting de Jong to group it under her category (A) of φασὶ-utterances, those ‘with definite subject’. Yet ἄνθρωποι (‘mankind’) hardly provides much more precise specification than the usual anonymous use of φασὶ; it is an ill fit when grouped alongside other specified subjects such as the Trojans (Il.9.234), Ajax’s comrades (Il.17.637), the suitors (Od.2.238), the Phaeacians (Od.7.322) or Odysseus’ father and son (Od.11.176). The apparently superfluous ἄνθρωποι thus lays unusual stress on the phrase. On the one hand, this may play on the subject of the talk: ‘mortals’ claim that Achilles is ‘mortal’. But it is also significant that the noun ἄνθρωποι indicates the audience or propagators of poetry elsewhere in early Greek epic: Helen and Paris will be the subject of song for men of future generations (ἄνθρωποι...ἄοιδιμοι ἐσσομένοις, Il.6.358); Odysseus claims that he is the subject of song among men because of his trickery (πᾶσι δόλοισιν ἄνθρωποι μέλω, Od.9.19-20); and Agamemnon’s shade claims that Clytemnestra will be a hateful song among men (στυγερὴ δέ τ’ ἀοιδὴ ἐσσετ’ ἐπ’ ἄνθρωποις, Od.24.200-1). It is thus tempting to treat this φασὶ as an invitation for Homer’s audience to consider other poetic traditions surrounding Achilles and questions of his (im)mortality: ‘men say’ that Achilles is mortal, but are they right? As with Achilles’ tuition from Cheiron, φασὶ here appears to allusively acknowledge but simultaneously reject an alternative tradition in which Achilles was more than mortal.

29 Cf. Nagy (1979) 37, §13a.4 on epic’s conventional link between ἐπ’ ἄνθρωποις and κλέος. Admittedly, ἄνθρωπος is a common noun in Homer, but it usually occurs in an explicit contrast between mortals and gods, a contrast which is lacking in all these metapoetic cases. Cf. Il.20.204 (ἔπεα θνητῶν ἄνθρωπως; §II.2.1: 63-64); Od.11.274 (ἀνάπυστα...ἄνθρωποις; Barker – Christensen (2008) 24: §I.1.3: 17); Od.24.197-98 (ἐπιχθονίοις). Later lyric examples include Thgn.245-46 (μελήσεις ἀφθιτον ἄνθρωποις: §II.3.1: 92); Pind. Pyth.3.112 (ἄνθρωποι φάτις: §II.3.1: 92), Dith.1.fr.70a.15 (Λέγοντι...φάετοι: §II.3.1: 92-93n.91); Ibyc.fr.303 (φάε...φάετοι: §II.3.3: 107-9).
30 Note too the hesitation implied by θην (equivalent to the particle δή: Denniston (1954) 288), conveying a sceptical or ironical tone: Denniston (1954) 229-36, esp. 234: it ‘often denotes that words are not to be taken at their face value...δή often gives the effect of inverted commas.’
Of course, direct evidence for the tradition of Achilles’ immortality is attested only far later. The first extant instances of Thetis’ attempts to immortalise Achilles occur in the Hellenistic period, with passing references in Dosiadas’ Altar (σποδεύνας ἰνις Ἐμπούσας, AP 15.26.3) and Lycophron’s Alexandra (178-79, with Tzetz. ad Alex.178). Apollonius of Rhodes offers a fuller account in his Argonautica (4.869-79), but this seems to draw heavily on Demeter’s similar treatment of Damophon in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, which complicates any attempt to trace the myth’s earlier history. Moreover, the Styx-dipping tradition, the most famous aspect of the myth in modern popular-culture, appears first in literature only in Statius (Ach.1.133-34, 268-70, 480-81), and even later in art. It is thus possible that traditions of Achilles’ immortality are a post-Homeric invention. Indeed, some scholars suspect a Hellenistic origin for the myth.

Despite our late and limited evidence, however, it is likely that earlier traditions did exist surrounding Thetis’ concern over Achilles’ mortality and the hero's subsequent invulnerability. The obliqueness and brevity of Statius’ triple allusion to the Styx story suggest that the poet was drawing on an already familiar tradition, which he even indexed through temporal adverbs (saepe, iterum, Ach.1.133-34). This alone would not rule out a Hellenistic origin for the myth, but there are strong grounds for tracing it back earlier. Invulnerability was a common attribute of other heroes in archaic myth, and we can find a number of hints that it was also applied to Achilles at an early date: Thetis’ attempts to immortalise her children by Peleus were already recounted in the Hesiodic Aegimius (Hes.fr.300), and we know that Achilles already enjoyed quasi-immortality in the Aethiopis with his afterlife on the White Isle (Aeth.arg.4b). The Iliad itself also conceals a veiled allusion...
to Achilles’ heel and the hero’s associated invulnerability in its treatment of Diomedes’ foot-wound from Paris (II.11.369-83), part of Diomedes’ larger adoption of Achillean traits in the first half of the poem (§I.2.2: 41). Various hints in archaic poetry thus suggest that the myth was of considerable antiquity. Such a conclusion can be bolstered further, however, by a neoanalytical case of priority. A number of scholars have argued that the Apollonian ‘immortalisation by fire’ is more appropriate to Achilles than Damophon, and thus cannot be wholly derived from the Homeric Hymn. The logic of the myth appears to be that fire burns off the infant’s mortal half, leaving only his immortal nature, and as Burgess notes, it is Achilles, not Damophon, who ‘is semidivine, and so could logically become immortalised if his mortality were burned away.’

It is thus plausible that traditions about Thetis’ attempted immortalisation of her son existed already in the archaic period and that Homer’s original audiences may well have been aware of them. Homer’s general silence on this specific tradition would be in keeping with his suppression of immortality elsewhere in the Iliad, so as to emphasise the stark dichotomy between short-lived mortals and the immortal gods. Yet by having a character insist on the hero’s mortality with an indexical φασί, the poet acknowledges this alternative tradition, while pointedly highlighting his denial and divergence from it.

---

37 Cf. Heracles: Theoc.Id.24.82-83; Ov.Met.9.251-53, 262-70. For fire’s deifying power: Edsman (1949).
39 Some suspect that the story could have featured in the Cypria: Severyns (1928) 258; Mackie (1998) 331n.9. It may be a step too far to argue that Agenor even echoes language traditionally attached to this fabula: τρωτὸς χρῶς ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ (II.21.568) closely parallels and inverts Ach.1.481 (pulchros ferro praestruxerit artus), but it cannot be proved that Statius’ phrasing derives from earlier tradition, rather than this very Homeric passage.
41 Later poets reassert the immortality tradition: see Heslin (2016) on Ovid’s polemical ‘correction’ of Homer.
II.2.2  Contesting Tradition

The same agonistic strategy is also in play when Homer situates his own poetry against other traditions of poetry and myth beyond those of the Trojan war. A prime example is the relationship of the *Odyssey* to female catalogue poetry. Scholars have long suggested that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* presuppose earlier traditions of female catalogue poetry familiar to us from the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*: Finkelberg has argued that Ajax’s appearance in the list of Helen’s suitors (Hes.fr.204.44-51) lies behind his entry in the Homeric Catalogue of Ships (II.2.557-58), while Rutherford has highlighted various correspondences between the *Catalogue of Women* and other poems in the early epic tradition, especially the catalogue of heroines in the Odyssean *Nekyia* (Od.11.225-329). However, the *Odyssey*’s engagement with catalogue poetry is first signalled far earlier in the poem, during the Ithacan assembly of book two. Antinous, in his frustration at Penelope’s devious tricks for delaying the suitors’ advances, claims that she is unrivalled, even among women of a former age (Od.2.115-22):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{εἰ δ᾽ ἔτ᾽ ἀνιήσει γε πολὺν χρόνον νίὰς Ἀχαιῶν, } \\
\text{τὰ φρονέουσ’ ἀνὰ θυμόν, ὡς ἀχίλλης } \\
\text{ἐργά τ᾽ ἐπίστασθαι περικαλλέα καὶ φρένας ἐσθλὰς } \\
\text{κέρδεά θ᾽, οἰς ὅ πὼ τιν’ ἄκούσαν οὐδὲ παλαιῶν, } \\
\text{τάων αἳ πάρος ἦσαν ἐνόησε.}
\end{align*}
\]

Antinous here compares Penelope with three women of the distant past: Tyro, Alcmene and Mycene, all of whom occupy prominent positions in Greek myth as the ancestors of many of its most famous heroes. In mothering Aeson, Pheres, Amythaon, Pelias and Neleus (Od.11.254-59), Tyro in particular counts numerous heroes from the Trojan, Theban and Argonautic sagas in her lineage, including Melampus, Jason, Admetus, Adrastus and Nestor; Alcmene was the mother of Heracles, whose numerous affairs ensured a plentiful progeny; and Mycene, the

---

eponymous heroine of Mycenae, was a significant ancestor in the Argive family tree as the mother of Argus, guardian of Io. By claiming Penelope’s superiority to such eminent figures of the mythological and literary past, Antinous inadvertently highlights her obvious appeal to the suitors: on this logic, whoever succeeds in wooing her will enjoy an illustrious and unsurpassed progeny. As Danek notes, however, the comparison also exposes the suitors’ own *hybris*: all three of these mythical women had divine lovers, so if Penelope is superior to them, she is completely out of the suitors’ league.⁴⁴

Besides this unintentional and ironic reflection on the suitors’ situation, however, Antinous’ direct contrast between Penelope and these other mythical women also activates a more allusive contrast between the *Odyssey* and female genealogical poetry. All three of Antinous’ *comparanda* also feature prominently in Hesiodic Catalogue poetry: Tyro appears first in the Odyssean *Nekyia* and conspicuously in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* (*Od*.11.235-59; *Hes.frr*.30-32), while we find Alcmene in both lists (*Od*.11.266-68; *Hes.fr*.193.19-20, fr.195.8-63 = *Scut*.1-56), and in the *Great Ehoiai* (*Hes.fr*.248), where Mycene is also said to have featured (*Hes.fr*.246).⁴⁵ Given the close combination of these women here, Antinous’ words thus point towards pre-existing female catalogue traditions, just like Odysseus’ in the *Nekyia*. The likelihood of a reference to such traditions is further reinforced by the very nature of these lines: by listing the women in a miniature catalogue, Antinous repeats the compositional technique of *Ehoiai* poetry itself, while the word with which he introduces them, the relative pronoun οἷα (*Od*.2.118), acts as a generic signpost, echoing the common introductory formula of such poetry (ἤ οἴη).⁴⁶ Antinous’ comparison thus imitates the key features of Hesiodic catalogue poetry at the very same time as he evokes some of its principal protagonists.⁴⁷

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

---

⁴⁷ Compare also οὐ πῶ τιν’ (*Od*.2.118) ~ οὐ πῶ τις (*Hes.fr*.195.17, see below), a parallel which further highlights the degree to which Alcinous appropriates the rhetoric of female catalogue poetry.
(παλαιῶν, πάρος). The names of these women have reached him through transmitted tales, while their very age marks the venerability of these traditions and heightens the contrast with the present. Stephanie West remarks that ‘the antiquarian note’ of these lines ‘is slightly strange’, yet viewed as indexes of allusion, their function is clear: once more, appeal to hearsay signposts allusive interactions. After all, as Sammons notes, the suitors are themselves ‘aficionados of epic poetry.’ As regular audience members of Phemius’ songs (Od.1.325-27), it is no surprise if they derive their knowledge from older song traditions.

Given this evocation of Hesiodic Catalogue poetry, Antinous’ comparison thus does much more than simply highlight Penelope’s desirability (and objectionable craftiness). It also sets her Odyssean self against other poetic traditions. In asserting her superior handiwork, knowledge and cunning (attributes which make her a prime match for Odysseus), Antinous agonistically indicates the superiority of the tale in which she features: nobody before has been quite like her; and just as Penelope surpasses these women of the past, so too does the Odyssey trump the Hesiodic tradition of female catalogues. Antinous’ ensuing claim seals this agonistic one-upmanship: Penelope is winning great κλέος for herself (μέγα μὲν κλέος ἀυτῇ | ποιεῖτ’, Od.2.125-26). As she surpasses the likes of Tyro and Alcmene, she too joins the ranks of those who are the subject of song in their own right.

The polemic of this comparison, however, is heightened when we consider how these Hesiodic women were themselves presented as unrivalled paragons of womanhood. The Hesiodic Catalogue explicitly sets out to list those women who were ‘the best at that time [and

---

48 West (1988) 139 on Od.2.120.
49 In this regard, one might wonder whether the frequent use of φασί in discussions of ancestry in early Greek epic could point to larger traditions about heroic genealogies, as exemplified by the Catalogue: e.g. II.5.635, 6.100, 20.105, 20.206, 21.159; Od.1.220, 4.387, 18.128.
50 Sammons (2010) 61n.8.
52 Compare Agamemon on Penelope’s enduring κλέος and future song: Od.24.196-98.
most beautiful on the earth)’ (αἱ τότ’ ἄρισται ἔσαν [καὶ κάλλισται κατὰ γαῖαν], Hes.fr.1.3), and both Tyro and Alcmene are further celebrated as flawless models of femininity in their own entries in the Catalogue: Tyro surpasses all female women in beauty (εἶδος [πασάων προφύσεσκε γυναι]κῶν θηλυτεράων, Hes.fr.30.33-34), while Alcmene receives a particularly lavish encomium (Hes.fr.195.11-17 = Scut.4-10):

ἠ ῥα γυναικῶν φύλον ἐκαίνυτο θηλυτεράων
eidei te megethi te· νόνν γε μὲν οϟ tis ērĩζε
táwv ἀς θνηται θνητοῖς τέκον εὐνηθεῖσαι.
tíς καὶ ἀπὸ κρήθην βλεφάρων τ’ ἄπο κυανεάων
tioν ἀηθ’ οἰόν τε πολυχρύσου Αφροδίτης.
η δὲ καὶ ἡς κατὰ θυμὸν ἑὸν τίεσκεν ἀκοίτην,
ὡς οὗ πώ τις ἐτίσε γυναικῶν θηλυτεράων

In part, these verses draw on traditional elements of epic encomium: εἶδος and μέγεθος are frequently combined in the praise, criticism or description of an individual’s physique, alongside other nouns such as δέμας and φυή. The image of wafting beauty, meanwhile, is paralleled elsewhere in the Catalogue (fr.43a.73) and the Homeric Hymn to Demeter (HhDem.276). Yet the larger focus here on Alcmene’s νόος and marital fidelity are uncommon in such descriptions: φρένες are sometimes picked out for praise, yet the only other mention of νόος in such contexts is Odysseus’ negative dismissal of Euryalus’ ‘stunted mind’ during the Phaeacian games of Odyssey 8, in comparison to his outstanding looks (εἶδος μὲν ἀριστερές...νόον δ’ ἀποφλοίος, Od.8.176-77). The Hesiodic poet’s emphasis on this attribute here, then, in notably combative terms (οὧ τις ἐτίσε, Hes.fr.195.12), highlights Alcmene’s exceptionality. So too does the ‘honour’ which she pays to her husband, an expression which

53 Merkelbach’s proposed supplements here and in fr.30.34 reinforce my argument. But even if we leave the lacunae unsupplemented, these verses still display an emphasis on pre-eminence (ἄρισται, fr.1.3) and physical appearance (εἶδος, fr.30.33).
54 Il.2.58; Od.5.217, 6.152, 14.177, 24.253, 24.374; HhDem.275; HhAphr.85. Cf. Il.23.66, where tradition is adapted to describe Patroclus’ ghost (μέγεθος, ὄμματα, φωνή).
55 Il.1.115; Od.4.264, 11.337, 14.178, 17.454, 18.249.
finds no direct parallel in the early Greek tradition, although there is perhaps an underlying touch of irony given her coming ‘affair’ with Zeus during Amphitryon’s absence. In any case, if these two traits (her intelligence and fidelity) were particularly associated with Alcmene in early genealogical traditions, as the uniqueness of these lines may suggest, Antinous’ use of her in the *Odyssey* as a foil to Penelope has even more point. Not only does Penelope surpass the best women of the past, but she eclipses even her closest rival in wit and marital loyalty. She too displays an unparalleled facility with κέρδεα (2.118), an attribute that is ‘arguably a defining theme of the *Odyssey* itself.’

This emphasis on Penelope’s incomparability recurs several times later in the *Odyssey* with a similarly agonistic point. When speaking to the disguised Odysseus on his return to Ithaca, Penelope wishes to be judged preeminent among other women for her wit and prudent counsel (δαήσεαι εἶ τι γυναικῶν ἂν ἀλλὰς περίειμι νόον καὶ ἐπίφρονα μῆτιν, *Od*.19.325-26). But it is especially Telemachus’ compliments before the bow contest in *Odyssey* 21 which resonate with Antinous’ earlier words (*Od*.21.106-9):

```
ἀλλ’ ἄγετε, μνηστῆρες, ἐπεὶ τόδε φαίνετ’ ἄεθλον,
οἷη νῦν οὐκ ἔστι γυνὴ κατ’ Ἀχαιΐδα γαῖαν,
οὔτε Πύλου ἱερῆς οὔτ’ Ἄργεος οὔτ’ Μυκήνης,
[οὔτ’ αὐτῆς Ἰθάκης οὔτ’ ἥπειροι μελαίνης.]
```

Like Antinous’ former praise, these verses evoke key features of Hesiodic *Catalogue* poetry: the οἷη (*Od*.21.107) nods to the formula of catalogue poetry, like οἷα in book 2, while the very context of these lines – the wooing of a woman and the idea of a woman as a prize (ἀεθλον) –

---

56 The only close parallel is the honour Alcinous shows to his wife Arete in Phaeacia (*Od*.7.66-70), although here the genders are reversed.

57 Hes.fr.195.34-63 = *Scut*.27-56; cf. Diod.Sic.4.9, Apollod.*Bibl*.2.4.8. The mention of her dark eyebrows may also suggest an erotic context: compare Ibycus’ description of Eros (κυανέοισιν...βλεφάροις, fr.287.1-2).

58 Sammons (2010) 60-61, citing Katz’s observation ((1991) 4) that the attributes in *Od*.2.117 are formulaic (cf. the Phaecian women, *Od*.7.111), whereas the enjambled κέρδεα are a unique addition.

resonates with many of the common themes of the catalogic genre. Here too, Penelope is thus set against the traditions of the Catalogue and comes out on top. Yet these lines also have a closer connection with Antinous’ earlier words. The initial trio of cities which Telemachus lists are all intimately linked with Antinous’ own exempla: Tyro’s descendants ruled Pylos (Neleus/Nestor); Alcmene was herself from Argos, while her son Heracles was frequently imagined as the ruler of the locality; and the city of Mycenae drew its very name from the maiden Mycene. Telemachus’ words thus not only evoke traditions of female catalogue poetry, but also recall the implicitly agonistic intertextuality of the earlier episode. After all, he ends by claiming that the suitors themselves ‘know’ of Penelope’s incomparability (καὶ δ’ αὐτοὶ τόδε γ’ ἱστε, Od.21.110), a remark that almost acknowledges their familiarity with Antinous’ earlier words. The initially signposted contrast with another literary tradition and its paradigmatic representatives thus continues to resonate through the whole poem.

Indexical appeals to hearsay in Homer, therefore, not only flag and signpost allusion, but also mark a deeply agonistic engagement with other traditions. As in later Latin poetry, the device is used to mark out a larger map of poetic territories within and against which a poet defines himself. The device exhibits not only an encyclopaedic but also an agonistic drive. In the following section, we shall see how this same combination of nuances co-exist in the poet’s own voice.

II.2.3 The Poet’s Voice

Cf. Skempis – Ziogas (2009) 234n.59, whose examples include Atalanta (Hes.frr.72-76), Mestra (fr.43a.21) and Helen (fr.196-204).

This reading may lend additional support to West’s deletion of Od.21.109, which introduces Ithaca and the mainland, places which are unnecessary for the catalogic allusion. The line is absent in many manuscripts and could have been adapted from Od.14.97-98.
The first instance of φασί in the Iliad, and one of the few in the narrator’s voice, well emblematises both these aspects of indexical hearsay. It occurs at the end of the Catalogue of Ships in Iliad 2, within a pair of climactic similes that connect the events unfolding on earth with the supernatural strife of Zeus and Typhoeus (II.2.780-85):

οἳ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἴσαν ὡς εἴ τε πυρὶ χθὼν πᾶσα νέμοιτο·
γαῖα δ᾽ ὑπεστενάχιζε Διꜷ ὃς τερπικεραύνῳ
χωμένῳ ὅτε τ᾽ ἀμφὶ Τυφωέϊ γαῖαν ἱμάσσῃ
εἰν Ἀρίμοις, ὅτι φασὶ
Τυφωέος ἔμμεναι εὐνάς.
ὡς ἄρα τῶν ὑπὸ ποσσὶ μέγα στεναχίζετο γαῖα
ἐρχομένων κτλ.

Scholars have long admired the artistry of these lines, which close the Greek catalogue with an elaborate ring-composition, echoing the series of similes with which it opened: the scorched land of verse 780 generalises and extends the devastation of the forest fire at II.2.455-58, while the earth groaning beneath the Greeks’ feet recalls the earlier emphasis on the din of their steps (αὐτὰρ ὑπὸ χθὼν ἁμερδαλέον κονάβιζε ποδῶν αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἵππων, II.2.465-66). Yet these lines themselves also offer a miniature ring-composition of their own: the chiastic arrangement of γαῖα δ᾽ ὑπεστάνιζε … στεναχίζετο γαῖα is framed in turn by two verbs describing the Greeks’ advance (ἴσαν, ἐρχομένων). Less attention has been paid, however, to the unobtrusive φασι clause in verse 783, an aside which attributes part of the Typhoeus tale to the anonymous talk of men.

Eustathius, building on a remark of the Homeric scholia (Σ II.2.783a), interpreted this appeal to hearsay as a distancing device (Eust. II.347.8f. = I.544.6-7 VdV):

tὸ δὲ φασιν ἐπεὶ κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς ὁ ποιητής, ἵνα μὴ προσκρούοιμεν ὡς Ὠμηρικῷ ὄντι διὰ τὸ μυθώδες.

The poet said ‘they say’ in respect to the ancients, so that we do not disapprove of the passage in seeing it as a strictly Homeric tale, on account of its fabulous character.

---

The Byzantine scholar constructs Homer in his own rationalistic image, distancing himself from an implausible, legendary myth. But as he further notes, φασί here acknowledges Homer’s debt to his ‘ancestors’ (παλαιοί). Like his hearsay-invoking characters, the narrator here gestures to pre-existing tradition. We should go further, however, and ask who the anonymous ‘they’ are who claim that Typhoeus’ bed is among the Arimoi.

For scholars who regard Homer as engaging allusively with Near Eastern ‘sources’, one possible answer might be that φασί points to the poetic traditions of the Near East. Typhon appears to have a Semitic pedigree (compare the Canaanite-Phoenician name ṣāpōn) and Homer’s placement of him here among the Arimoi (= Aramaeans?) has been thought to be a self-conscious acknowledgement of the myth’s eastern origins. However, as I argued in the introduction (§I.2.2: 36-38), we should be cautious of this approach which assumes an active and interpretable engagement with Near Eastern myth. Here in particular, the Aramean location appears to be a traditional feature engrained in the Greek tradition (cf. Hes. Theog. 304; Pind. fr. 93), and it is far more easily explained as the passive trace of a more distant literary genealogy, rather than a self-conscious cue to an earlier oriental tradition. It is unlikely that φασί would direct any audience member to Near Eastern myth, a ‘source’ which would also add little to our immediate appreciation of this simile.

Instead, a likelier answer to the significance of Homer’s φασί lies in the Iliadic passage’s similarity to Hesiod’s description of Typhoeus’ defeat in the Theogony (Theog. 843-47, 857-59):

ἐπεστονάχιζε δὲ γαῖα.
καῦμα δ᾿ ὑπ᾿ ἀμφοτέρων κάτεχεν ἱοειδέα πόντον
βροντῆς τε στεροπῆς τε πυρὸς τ᾿ ἀπὸ τοῖο πελώρου
πυρητήριων ἀνέμων τε κεραυνοῦ τε φλεγέθοντος:
ἐξε ἐδ χθὼν πάσα καὶ οὐρανὸς ἢδε θάλασσα:
... αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ μιν δάμασεν πληγήσαν ἴμάσας,
ήμπτε γνωθείς, στενάχιζε δὲ γαῖα πελώρη

63 Cf. Σ Od.6.42b, where Homer is similarly thought to ‘indicate the tradition transmitted from his ancestors’ (διὰ δὲ τοῦ φασί τὴν ἐκ προγόνων παράδοσιν ἐμφαίνει).
There are a number of significant parallels between these two passages. In both accounts, Zeus lashes the ground (ἱμάσσῃ, II.2.782) or his foe (ἱμάσσας Theog.857), and the earth groans under the weight of these blows (γαῖα δ᾽ υπεστενάχιζε, II.2.781, στεναχίζετο γαῖα, II.2.784) or the warring participants themselves (Τυφοεῦς: στεναχίζε δὲ γαῖα, Theog.858, Zeus: ἐπεστονάχιζε δὲ γαῖα, Theog.843). In the wider context of both passages, emphasis is laid on Zeus’ thunder as the weapon which vanquishes Typhoeus (Διὶ ὣς τερπικεραύνῳ, II.2.781 ~ κεραυνωθέντος, Theog.859), and fire is a central element: the Iliadic fire simile which immediately precedes the description of Typhoeus (II.2.780) matches the Theogony’s similar emphasis on the fiery destruction of the physical environment during Zeus’ clash with the monster (Theog.844-7, esp. τυρός, 845, χθὼν πᾶσα, 847 ~ πυρὶ χθὼν πᾶσα νέμοιτο, II.2.780). Within a handful of Iliadic lines, there are thus numerous verbal connections with Hesiod’s account of Typhoeus’ defeat, connections which again reinforce the closural ring-composition of this simile: already before the Catalogue, the earth had thundered terribly beneath the Achaeans’ feet (σμερδαλέον κονάβιζε, Il.2.466), just as it did in Hesiod’s Typhonomachy (σμερδαλέον κονάβησε, Theog.840).

The relationship between Homer and Hesiod is, of course, a matter of much debate. Scholars ancient and modern have long debated the question of priority. Most today would take Homer to be prior, but a number of eminent scholars have argued for the opposite conclusion: that Hesiod precedes Homer. If we accept this conclusion for the moment and consider a direct textual relation between the two possible, then we could see here a direct Iliadic allusion to Hesiod’s Theogony, signposted through a footnoting φασί. Indeed, the Iliad’s Typhoeus simile appears to offer a compact and miniature postscript to a major episode of Hesiod’s poem, highlighting how the defeated Typhoeus continues to be punished in terms precisely comparable to his initial defeat (note the subjunctive ἱμάσσῃ, indicating a recurring

---


action). As in the *Odyssey*'s possible reference to the Iliadic Nestor, Eustathius’ phrase παραφράζων συντόμως captures the essence of this allusive strategy – Homer appears to invoke and epitomise a central episode of another poem.

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

> ή δ’ ἔρωτ’ εἰν Ἀρίμοισιν ὑπὸ χθόνα λυγρὴ Ἀχίδα, ἀθάνατος νῦμφη καὶ ἀγήραος ἕματα πάντα. τῇ δὲ Τυφάονα φασί μιγήμεναι ἐν φιλότητι δεινὸν θ’ υβριστὴν τ’ ἄνομόν θ’ ἑλικώπιδι κούρῃ ἡ δ’ ὑποκυσαμένη τέκετο κρατεόρφονα τέκνα.

Just as Homer places Typhoeus’ bed ‘among the Arimoi’ (εἰν Ἀρίμοις, Il.2.783), Hesiod claims that Typhoeus slept with Echidna εἰν Ἀρίμοισιν. Here too, it would be attractive to see Homer allusively reshaping the Hesiodic narrative: as the ancient scholia note, Homer’s εὐνάς is a euphemism: this was not his ‘bed’, but his ‘tomb’ (εὑρήμως δὲ τὸν τάφον εὐνάς ἐκάλεσεν, Σ.2.783a). Yet Homer’s choice of language pointedly recalls the Hesiodic context in which Typhoeus did indeed sleep among the Arimoi: his final resting place matches his domestic place of rest in life. In doing this, however, Homer significantly departs from the Hesiodic conclusion, in which Typhoeus was dispatched to Tartarus (Theog.868). Homer’s φασί, then, may not only signpost his allusive engagement, but also acknowledge competing versions of the myth. If so, this first Homeric instance of φασί would be very similar to the *dicuntur* that introduces Catullus’ polemic sifting of Argonautic myth in *Carmen* 64.

What is particularly striking, however, is how Hesiod’s own mention of Typhoeus’ mingling with Echidna among the Arimoi is also indexed with a φασί – the sole use of the device in his whole poem (Theog.306). Given this shared use of the index in a similar context, we might even wonder whether it could hint at a reciprocal relationship between these two passages: if both poems were developing at a similar time, we might see a self-reflexive cycle of cross-referencing, in which each author knowingly nodded to the ‘talk’ of their poetic peer.
This, however, is a bit of a stretch, and as in the case of Nestor’s age, so too here, it may again be more realistic to see both poets evoking a more general Typhoean and theogonic tradition, rather than a specific text. This is not only because of the uncertainties over the relative dates of our *Iliad* and *Theogony*, but also because Homer’s account appears to reflect core features of the mythological tradition (or *fabula*) of Zeus’ fight with Typhoeus that transcend Hesiod’s specific telling: lashing, thunder, fire and the groaning earth. These elements are familiar to modern readers from Hesiod’s poem, but they evidently pre-dated it. Watkins has argued that the lashing/binding motif is a very old element of the tradition, originally deriving from earlier Hittite versions of the tale, and it certainly seems that the lashing motif was an integral part of the early Greek tradition too: in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, Typhoeus’ mother Hera similarly whips the earth before giving birth to the monster (ἵμασε χθόνα, *HhAp*.340). The key moments of Typhoeus’ life (his birth and defeat) are both marked by the same violent act. In this regard, it does not matter if any of these motifs are common or ‘typical’ in epic individually. The ‘groaning earth’, for example, recurs elsewhere (*Il*.2.95, 10.484; *Hes.Theog*.159, 843, *Scut*.344), although never with precisely the same phrasing as here. But it is rather the combination of these motifs together in the same context which is distinctively and recognisably theogonic.

In both *Iliad* 2 and the *Theogony*, therefore, φασί signposts engagement with traditional theogonic narratives. In both cases, the index nods to the authority of tradition, marking each poet’s encyclopaedic control of their poetic heritage. But in the case of *Iliad* 2, we can also detect a further agonistic edge, as Homer establishes his own narrative as both a peer and rival of theogonic myth. Through his simile, the pending conflict between the Greeks and Trojans becomes a replay of the cosmic struggle between Zeus and Typhoeus, between the defender of civilisation and the threat of chaos. Homer signals his appropriation of theogonic myth, as he encapsulates it and subsumes it within a handful of verses. The mortal conflict of Greece and Troy is established as a fair match for the divine and primeval discord of the theogony. As

---


68 Though see Lovell (2011) 56-62 on the instability of this parallel – the Greek army can be aligned with both Zeus and Typhoeus.
with Antinous’ allusion to female catalogue poetry, moreover, it is telling that this indexed allusion introduces a parallel which continues to underlie much of the whole poem: Titanomachic imagery recurs at various key points of the narrative. Just like his characters, therefore, the Homeric narrator invokes hearsay to signpost his command of tradition.

II.2.4 The Epic Archive

As we have seen, Homeric appeals to hearsay in both the characters’ and narrator’s voice thus highlight the poet’s mastery of his mythical repertoire, within which he selects and builds his own narrative, following some paths of song while pointedly suppressing others. These indexes tend to have an encyclopaedic or agonistic function: gesturing to the authoritative mass of tradition, or polemically challenging one aspect of it. Yet in both cases, Homer positions his own poem against the larger store of traditional tales from which he draws his material, gesturing to an archive of epic song.

Turning now to the broader epic tradition, we can see that both these aspects of indexical hearsay (the encyclopaedic and the agonistic) were in play. As an example of the former, we could cite a papyrus fragment (from Hesiod or the epic Minyas), which draws on the authority of tradition with a character’s indexing φασί (P.Ibscher col.i; Minyas fr.7.12-22 GEF = fr.*6 EGEF = Hes.fr.280.12-22). After encountering Meleager in the Underworld, Theseus justifies his and Pirithous’ katabasis by arguing that Pirithous is merely following the example of the gods in desiring to marry a relative: ‘they say (φασί) that they [the gods] woo their sisters and make love without the knowledge of their dear parents’ (ἐκείνους φασὶ κασιγνήτας με γ[... ]εις | [μνησ]τεύειν, γαμέειν δὲ φίλων ἀπαντευθε τοκήων , vv.15-16).

On one level, this index points to the traditional incest of the Olympian pantheon, an established feature of myth. But the phrase φίλων ἀπαντευθε τοκήων may also invite us to

---


recall the most famous divine union of all, that of Zeus and Hera. In the Iliadic *Dios Apate*, Zeus is famously struck by a passion equal to that when he and his sister first furtively slept together ‘without their parents’ knowledge’ (φιλοὺς λήθοντε τοκῆας, *Il*.14.296), a phrase that closely parallels the sense and structure of the papyrus in the very same metrical *sedes*. Some caution is required, given the fragmentary nature of the papyrus, and the frequency with which ‘parents’ (τοκῆες) are ‘dear’ (φίλοι) throughout early Greek poetry. But if Pirithous were indeed modelling his behaviour on that of Zeus (either as a reference to the *Iliad*, or the *fabula* of the divine marriage), it would reinforce the brazenness (and ultimate futility) of his already hybristic mission: Meleager is right to shudder at what he hears (Οἰνείδης δὲ κατέστυγε μύθον ἀκού̄σ̄ᾱ̄ς, v.24).

A stronger case for a direct textual echo can be made for the sole instance of *φασί* in the *Works and Days*, a case that may parallel Telemachus’ potentially textual evocation of the Iliadic Nestor in the *Odyssey*. In the closing catalogue of ‘Days’, Hesiod claims that ‘on the fifth day, they say the Erinyes attended the birth of Oath, whom Eris bore as a plague to perjurers’ (ἐν πέμπτῃ γάρ φασιν Ἐρινύας ἀμφιπολεύειν | Ὅρκον γεινόμενον, τὸν Ἐρις τέκε πῆμ’ ἐπιόρκοις, *Op*.803-4). We do not find the precise detail of the Erinyes attending Oath’s birth elsewhere, but this index attests to the traditional association that personified Oath (*Op*.219) and the Erinyes (*Il*.19.259-60, cf. 3.278-79) had with the punishment of perjurers, while also providing an aetiological explanation for the dangers that the fifth day of each month presented to those who were foresworn. Most significantly, however, the detail of Oath’s birth looks back to its similar description in the *Theogony*, where the catalogue of Eris’ fourteen offspring reaches a climactic conclusion with Oath (*Theog*.231-32):

---

71 E.g. *Il*.4.477; Hes.*Theog*.469; Sapph.fr.16.10; Thgn.1.263; Aesch.*Eum*.271. The common formula strengthens the supplement τοκήων, which is also plausible given the apparently formulaic nature of the clausula ἀπάνεθε τοκήων (*Il*.24.211; *Od*.9.36).


73 Thus West (1978) 360.
Besides the general thematic link, the *Works and Days* echoes this passage verbally, ἐπιόρκιος and πῆμ’ picking up on the *Theogony*’s πημαίνει and ἐπίορκον – a rare verbal combination which only appears once elsewhere in extant Greek literature: of the river Styx in the *Theogony*, the divine equivalent of Oath, who causes ‘great woe’ to any divinity who proves foresworn (μέγα πῆμα θεοῖσι. | ὃς κεν τὴν ἐπίορκον ἀπολλείψας ἐπομόσση | ἀθανάτων κτλ., *Theog.*792-94). Given the numerous close connections between the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* (§I.2.3:49), it is very possible that here too we should see a specific cross-reference to Hesiod’s earlier poem, drawing on its established authority. Of course, the *Theogony* did not specify the date of Oath’s birth or the presence of the Erinyes, but its precedent nevertheless buttresses the addition of these new details. In gesturing to hearsay, Hesiod expands and develops a pre-existing strand of tradition.

A more agonistic case, meanwhile, is offered by the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, in which the eponymous god attributes Apollo’s art of prophecy to tradition (*HhHerm.4.471-72*):74

σὲ δὲ φασὶ δαήμεναι ἐκ Διὸς ὀμφῆς
μαντείας, Ἑκάεργε, Διὸς πάρα θέσφατα πάντα·

*They say* that you know the art of prophecy (that derives) from the utterance of Zeus, Far-Shooter, the complete revelation of Zeus’ will.

Besides the irony that the newborn Hermes is already somehow immersed in the currents of hearsay, this phrase is a clear reference to the traditional association of Apollo with prophecy, an association already attested in the *Iliad* by his patronage of the prophet Calchas (*Il.1.72*). Beyond this general association, however, it is notable that Hermes’ words here are repeated by Apollo later in the same poem (ὅσα φημὶ δαήμεναι ἐκ Διὸς ὀμφῆς. | μαντείην δὲ κτλ.’, *HhHerm.532-33*). The verbal repetition may suggest an independent formulaic phrase to which Hermes’ earlier φασὶ could allude, but the repetition may also add a touch of humorous irony:

---

Hermes has prophetically pre-empted Apollo’s own claim to prophecy. It is as if he has proleptically heard and quoted Apollo’s sentiments, beating him at his own game of prophetic prediction. This agonistic one-upmanship would fit into the Hymn’s larger intertextual engagement with the Homeric Hymn to Apollo, a ‘sibling’ hymn with which it has been seen to compete agonistically elsewhere. In the Apolline poem, Apollo’s oracular ability also played a central role: indeed, the god’s opening words prophetically predicted his future occupation (χρήσω τ’ ἀνθρώποις Διὸς νημερτέα βουλήν, HhAp.132), a phrase that matches the sense, if not the vocabulary, of Hermes’ sentiment. Hermes’ appeal to hearsay in his own Hymn could thus point not only to Apollo’s established role as an oracular deity, but also his particular establishment as such in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo. By co-opting the prophetic voice himself, Hermes positions his own poem against that of a rival, just as Antinous’ words in Odyssey set Homer’s poem against female catalogue poetry.

To close this chapter, however, let us turn to an example which appears to be doing something a little different to what we have seen so far: not simply invoking or contesting the authority of tradition, but openly reworking it. In the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite, the disguised goddess of love fabricates a patently false genealogy during her seduction of Anchises, which she legitimises through appeal to hearsay (HhAphr.111-12):

Ὀτρεὺς δ᾿ ἐστὶ πατὴρ ὄνομάκλυτος, εἰ ποι ἄκούεις, ὃς πάσης Φρυγίης εὐτειχῆτοι ἀνάσσει.

Aphrodite conceals her fabrications with the veneer of hearsay, appropriating the authority of tradition. Indeed, her language is very similar to that of Sinon in Aeneid 2, in a comparable context of disguised invention (εἰ ποι ἄκούεις ~ si forte tuas pervenit ad auris, Aen.2.81; ὄνομάκλυτος ~ incluta fama gloria, Aen.2.82-83: §1.1.2: 7). In context, this is a patent lie. Aphrodite is not the son of a mortal, but of Zeus, king of the gods, as the narrator has just reminded us (Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη, HhAphr.107). But her fictitious cover-story is not an outright invention. It rather builds on and adapts tradition. We know barely anything else
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about Otreus, the man whom she co-opted as her father, but he is mentioned once elsewhere in archaic Greek literature, as one of two Phrygian rulers whom Priam assisted during an Amazon invasion (Il.3.186). In later sources, he was considered Priam’s maternal grandfather (Apollod. Bibli. 3.12.3) or Dymas’ son, and so Hecuba’s brother (Σ Il.3.189). He may thus belong to lost traditions of Trojan and Phrygian conflicts against the Amazons, perhaps part of the larger background of Penthesilea’s involvement in the later stages of the Trojan war. But this alone hardly warrants his description as ὀνομάκλυτος.

As Olson has suggested, however, these references to hearsay may also index a more specific allusivity in Aphrodite’s surrounding language, marking engagement with the Iliad. As he argues, Otreus’ sole mention in the Iliad is during the teichoscopia, to which the hymnist’s unique εὐτειχήτοιο (‘well-walled’) could nod. Similarly, the adjective used to describe Otreus in the Hymn (ὀνομάκλυτος) is a Homeric hapax legomenon that appears in Iliad 22, when Priam appeals to Hector, again from the vantage point of the Trojan walls (Il.22.51). As Olson concludes, ‘Aphrodite’s lying tale – which leads directly to the birth of Aeneas, who escaped the destruction of Troy – thus engages pointedly with the story of the ruin of Priam and his branch of the royal family’. Through a strong emphasis on hearsay, her audience are invited both to see through her fiction and to ask where they have heard these words before.

This is an attractive reading, but the intricate verbal precision may go a little too far. After all, although the adjective ὀνομάκλυτος is strictly a Homeric hapax legomenon, it does occur again in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes (HhHerm.59), and – in divided form as a noun and adjective – twice in the Odyssey (ὁνόμα κλυτόν, Od.9.364, 19.183). A precise link to the Iliadic line thus seems implausible, especially given the absence of any real thematic connection. As for εὐτείχητος, the adjective may be unique here, but the comparable εὐτείχεος occurs seven times in the Iliad, which suggests that describing something as ‘well-walled’ may carry a generic force, undermining a precise link with the Iliadic teichoscopia. Even so, however, the traditional resonance of the epithet may still lend a note of foreboding to Aphrodite’s words:

---

76 Olson (2012) 196-97.
77 Olson (2012) 196.
78 Cf. τοῦ ὀνομακλήδην (Od.4.278); later lyric appearances: Pind. Pae.6.fr.52f.123; Semon.fr.7.87; Ibyc.fr.306.1.
every Homeric instance of εὐτείχεος appears in the context of city-sacking, six times of Troy (II.1.129, 2.113, 2.288, 5.716, 8.241, 9.20) and once of Briseis’ hometown (II.16.57). When used of Phrygia in the Hymn, the epithet may thus look ahead to the future defeat of the Trojans and Phrygians in the coming war, even if not to the specific fate of Priam.

Once again, a character’s emphasis on hearsay invites an audience to situate her words against the larger epic tradition. But in this case, the index plays a further role: marking and authorising the poet’s openly creative reworking of tradition. In this regard, the hymnic poet appears to pre-empt an aspect of indexical hearsay which is more familiar in later literature: ‘faux footnoting’. In the next chapter, we shall see how this aspect of the index is further developed in lyric poetry, especially Pindaric epinician.

Throughout early Greek epic, therefore, hearsay was already a well-established motif for the transmission and interaction of songs and stories. Characters’ and narrators’ appeals to what ‘people say’ and what their audiences have heard frequently signalled references to other traditions or even – on occasion – specific texts. These indexes variously flag a poet’s encyclopaedic control of his material, an agonistic urge to compete and suppress alternative accounts, or even – on at least one occasion – the creative reworking of tradition. The various functions of the ‘Alexandrian footnote’ which we traced in the introduction are thus already deeply engrained in the allusive system of our earliest Greek poetry. From the very start, Greek poets could self-consciously index other traditions to carve out their space in the broader tradition. The ‘Alexandrian footnote’ could just as well be renamed the ‘epic’, ‘Homeric’, or ‘poetic’ footnote. It is not at all intrinsically tied to the scholarly interests and pedantic learning of the Alexandrian library.

Cf. too Thgn.1210 (εὐτείχεα of Thebes, another city known for being sacked); Eur. Andr.1009 (εὐτείχες of Troy).
As we turn now to lyricists’ use of indexical hearsay, we shall see that this allusive device remained an integral feature of early Greek intertextual practice throughout the archaic age.
II.3 Lyric Fama

Just like their epic forebears, lyric poets display a strong interest in the circulation of news and stories. In the present, they are concerned with the preservation and memorialisation of their own subject matter, setting it on a par with the poetry of the past. Epinician poets, in particular, repeatedly stress the importance of the report of victory and the enduring fame it will provide for their laudandi, as well as their family and homelands. But they are far from alone in doing so: Theognis similarly claims that Cynus’ fame will never die (Thgn.245-46), Sappho is concerned with the immortalising power of poetry (fr.55, fr.193), and Ibycus even promises Polycrates κλέος ἄφθιτον, that prized goal of epic heroes (S151.47, cf. II.9.413). Lyricists are deeply committed to the propagation of renown.

In addition, however, lyricists are equally concerned with stories and myths of the past, which they commonly cite as exempla. Here too, these myths are regularly marked by the language of hearsay and rumour: φασί, λόγος, and similar forms occur frequently across the extant canon of early Greek lyric poetry, used occasionally in gnomic contexts but largely to introduce specific mythological tales. As in epic, these appeals to tradition can be interpreted as having a strong indexical force, flagging engagement with and departure from the literary tradition. In contrast to epic, however, we can often make a stronger case for the indexing of precise sources, rather than the indexing of traditions in general.

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

80 Gnomae: φαντί, Pyth.4.287; φαντί, Pyth.7.19; λέγεται, Nem.6.56; ἦστι δὲ τις λόγος ἀνθρώπων, Nem.9.6.
II.3.1 Traditions and Texts

Like their epic peers, archaic lyricists frequently invoke hearsay when mentioning and narrating myths, imbuing their accounts with the authority of tradition. Due to our limited extant evidence and the fragmentary state of many of these poems, it is often difficult to situate cases of indexical hearsay within the larger traditions surrounding a given myth. But even from what we have, we can identify numerous plausible cases from at least the sixth century onwards.⁸¹ We shall here explore the phenomenon in general, before turning to further nuances of its use in the following sections.

Sappho and Alcaeus present a number of early examples of indexical hearsay. In a small fragment of Sappho, for example, we find an indexed allusion to a tradition about Helen’s birth (fr.166):

\[ \phiαισι δή ποτα Λήδαν ύακίνθινον 
... οιον ευθην πεπυκάδμενον \]

The wider context of this fragment is lost, but what we have corresponds to the version of the myth in which Helen was not the daughter of Zeus (or Tyndareus) and Leda, but rather the product of a liaison between Zeus and Nemesis – born from an egg that Leda received from a wandering shepherd (Apollod. Bibl. 3.10.7) or Hermes (Hyg. Astr. 2.8).⁸² The story was a popular

---

⁸¹ Archilochus’ Telephus elegy may offer an earlier example, but only if we accept Bowie’s proposed reconstruction of the fragment: ἡ[[κω’ ὑτε[ε]δα[μθ]’ ἀ[νδρ]/ἀ[φ]υγείν (fr.17a.4: Bowie (2010b) 151 with 163n.22, (2016) 19-20 with n.12), indexing engagement with the myth of the ‘Teuthranian Expedition’, an episode familiar to us from the Cypria and elsewhere (Cypr.arg.7; §III.2.3: 150-153). However, few scholars accept Bowie’s interpretation of the elegy as a self-standing narrative, since the fragment gives signs of being a paradigmatic exemplum that does not extend far beyond the surviving portion of text (Swift (forthcoming) ad fr.17a; cf. Lulli (2011) 100-4). A more dynamic first person verb is thus more likely, e.g. [εἵμεθ’ ἄ[η√]α φυγείν (West (2006) 12-13).

⁸² In Etruscan iconography, Hermes or one of the Dioscuri deliver the egg: Carpino (1996).
subject of fifth century vase painting and also featured in Cratinus’ *Nemesis*, but the tale was already well-established significantly before the fifth century: elements of the myth suggest a primal and even pre-Homeric pedigree, and it certainly featured already in the cyclic *Cypria* (*Cypr.frr.10-11*). Sappho’s awareness of Cyclic epic is well-established from other fragments, including fr.17 on the Atreidai at Lesbos (~ *Od*.3.168-75, *Nostoi* arg.1; Burris et al. (2014)), fr.58 on Tithonus (§II.3.3: 109-115), fr.16 on the adultery of Helen (§III.3.2: 170n.132), and fr.44 on the marriage of Hector and Andromache (§II.3.3: 106-7). In such a climate of cyclic awareness, Sappho’s φαῖσι thus signposts her introduction of a familiar epic episode, perhaps even nodding to a specific Cyclic source.

A comparable engagement with epic myth can also be found in Alcaeus, who similarly appeals to hearsay when discussing Priam’s grief and the destruction of Troy ‘because of Helen’, (ὡς λόγος, fr.42.1), evoking a larger epic discourse surrounding her responsibility for the war. Such a direct case of indexicality suggests we should expect something similar in two far more fragmentary Alcaean appeals to hearsay: the third poem in the first book of the poet’s Alexandrian edition began by invoking tradition to authorise the Nymphs’ creation from Zeus (Νύμφαις ταῖς Δίος ἐξ αἰγιόχω φαῖσι τετυχμέναι, fr.343=S264.21-22 SLG). The poet nods to the familiar origins of the divine spirits, but we cannot now determine the larger context. Even more obscure is another fragment which only preserves the poet’s appeal to

---

84 Kerényi (1939). If the myth predates the *Iliad*, there may be some irony in the Trojan elders’ claim on the walls of Troy that there need be ‘no nemesis’ for the Greeks and Trojans to be fighting over Helen (οὐ νέμεσις, *Il*.3.156).
85 West (2013) 63-65 dates the *Cypria* to the sixth century, but acknowledges the likely existence of ‘a connected narrative – an epic, we should imagine – that covered more or less as much of the story as the *Cypria* did’ by at least ‘the last quarter of the seventh century’ on the basis of a bronze tripod leg from Olympia preserving a series of episodes from the *Cypria* (cf. id. 42).
tradition, without any further context (ὡς λόγος ἐκ πατέρων ὄρωρε, Alc.fr.339). Even so, these examples suggest that Alcaeus – like Sappho – invoked hearsay at various points to authorise his myths and situate them against a larger tradition.

It is in the fifth century, however, that the device is particularly prominent – a fact that may suggest a gradual increase in its usage over time or simply reflect the better preservation of complete poems from this era. Pindar, in particular, is a fruitful source of the device; he is the most intense and frequent footnoter of tradition. In Isthmian 8, Zeus’ assent to the marriage of Peleus and Thetis is signposted with φαντί (Isth.8.46a); the poet signals his engagement with the larger tradition of the pair’s wedding and the threatening power of Thetis’ offspring (§III.3.2: 169-70). In Pythian 3, Nestor and Sarpedon are singled out as ‘the talk of men’ (ἀνθρώπων φάτις, Pyth.3.112), known to later generations from ‘such echoing verses as wise craftsmen constructed’ (Pyth.3.113-14); we are invited to recall the pair’s prominent role in early Greek epic, perhaps especially in the Iliad. And in Olympian 2, the poet similarly indexes Ino’s immortal life among the Nereids (λέγοντι, Ol.2.28-30), an account which might look to the Odyssey’s specific description of her immortalisation and new life in the sea (Od.5.333-35: cf. Σ Ol.2.51d); but given her mentions elsewhere in archaic literature, we might suspect a more general nod to her mythical fabula. Alongside his frequent indexing of non-Trojan myth, it

88 For similar frustrations surrounding limited context, cf. Xenophanes fr.7, which indexes an otherwise unknown fable: the poet moves on to ‘another account’ (ἄλλον ἐπειμι λόγον) and reports a story about Pythagoras (fr.7a): ‘they say’ (φασίν) that a passerby ‘once’ (ποτέ) took pity on a maltreated puppy, recognising the soul of a dear friend just from its voice. The satirical allusion to Pythagorean metempsychosis is obvious, but it is unclear whether this is an isolated invention of Xenophanes or part of a wider tradition of Pythagorean parody. Spelman (2018a) 106-9. Though see §I.2.1: 30-32 for the wider traditionality of Nestor. On the significance of the allusion: Sider (1991); A.M. Miller (1994).


90 E.g. Deucalion and Pyrrha (λέγοντι μαν, Ol.9.49: perhaps a reference to the Hesiodic Catalogue, Hes.frr.2-7, fr.234: D’Alessio (2005b) 220-28; Pavlou (2008) 555); Ixion’s punishment (φαντί, Pyth.2.21); the deaths of Otus and Ephialtes (φαντί, Pyth.4.88); the Danaids (ἄκουσεν, ποτ’ Pyth.9.112); Zeus’ rape of Danae (φαμέν, Pyth.12.17); Zeus’ fathering of Aeacus and Heracles (λέγοντι, Nem.7.84); Aeacus (κλεινος Αἰακοῦ
is thus clear that Pindar frequently marked his mythical allusions through the language of hearsay, authorising his account with the backing of tradition.92

Yet such appeals to hearsay are not restricted to the epinician genre in the fifth century. A similar indexical appeal to epic traditions is also visible in a pair of Attic skolia preserved by Athenaeus (15.695c = 898-899 PMG):

\[\text{παί Τελαμώνος, Αἰαν ἀιχμητά, λέγουσι σε}
\text{ὲς Τροίαυν ἄριστων ἐλθεῖν Δαναῶν μετ' Ἀχιλλέα}
\]

\[\text{τὸν Τελαμώνα πρῶτον, Αἰαντα δὲ δεύτερον}
\text{ἐς Τροίαν λέγουσιν ἐλθεῖν Δαναῶν καὶ Ἀχιλλέα.}
\]

The first focuses on the credentials of the Greek hero Ajax, gesturing to a well-established tradition of the hero as the second-best of the Achaeans. The sentiment recurs repeatedly in Homer and a variety of later authors, suggesting that it was a fixed part of Ajax’s fabula.93 Indeed, it is a crucial element of the hero’s mythical biography, since it explains the great shame and anger he feels after he fails to beat Odysseus in the contest for Achilles’ arms. The arms were a ‘victory prize for the best’ (τῷ ἀρίστῳ νικητήριον, Apollod. Epit. 5.6). Based on the form of tradition, Ajax should have been their rightful heir. Aided by the indexical λέγουσι, these verses thus evoke an established element at the heart of Ajax’s mythical fabula.

---

92 Cf. Bacchylides: on Euenus’ harsh treatment of his daughter Marpessa and his defeat by Idas (λέγουσι, fr.20a.14): cf. ll.9.555-64; Simon.fr.563; the chest of Kypselos (Paus.5.18.2); Bacchyl.20 (esp. χρυσάσπιδος υἱὸ[ν Ἀρεός], 20.11 - [Ἀρεός χρυσόλοφον παῖ[δα], fr.20a.13-14). Also on Heracles’ katabasis in pursuit of Cerberus (πλοτ’, λέγουσιν, Bacchyl.5.56-57): cf. ll.8.367-69; Od.11.623-26; Hes. Theog.310-12. Burnett (1985) 198n.7 notes other possible links with the Minyad, Stesichorus’ Cerberus (frr.165a-b) and Cercops of Miletus’ Aegimius (Robertson (1980).

93 ll.2.768-70; ll.17.279-80 = Od.11.550-1; Od.11.469-70 = Od.24.17-18; Alc.fr.387; Pind.Nem.7.27-30; Soph.Aj.1340-41. Cf. Ibyc.S151.32-34. At Troy, Achilles and Ajax were stationed at opposite ends of the Greek camp (ll.11.7-9), ‘the best fighters securing the army’s flank’ (Heath – Okell (2007) 365). The pair are also frequently associated in art: Brommer (1973) 334-39, 373-77; Brunori (2011).
The second skolion, however, builds on and caps the first by imitating its allusive strategy while simultaneously shifting its point of comparison from heroic excellence to temporal priority. Ajax is now a peer of Achilles, but still in second place to his father, since Telamon beat him to Troy by a whole generation. The skolion thus picks up on and reworks the earlier poem’s patronymic (παῖ Τελαμίωνος), as well as its concern with Ajax’s status. Indeed, the hero is explicitly marked as δεύτερος here (in comparison to the first poem’s ἄριστος), an adjective which may itself reflect this skolion’s secondary and epigonal status in relation to its predecessor.\footnote{For this epigonal resonance of δεύτερος, cf. Torrance (2013) 194-97.} Crucially, however, this poem clinches its argument through another appeal to hearsay, marking its allusion to another well-established element of Trojan myth: the tradition of Heracles’ earlier expedition against Troy, in which Telamon played a key role.\footnote{Heracles’ expedition: II.5.638-42 (NB φασί, ποτέ); Hes.fr.43a.87-88, fr.165.10-14; Gantz (1996) 442-44. Telamon’s involvement: Peisander fr.10 GEF; Pind.Nem.3.36-37, Nem.4.25, Isth.5.36-37, Isth.6.27-30; Soph.Aj.434-36; Eur.Tr.799-819.} Like its predecessor, this skolion thus alludes to an established feature of the Trojan war fabula and legitimises its claim with an indexing λέγουσιν. As a pair, they both invoke familiar features of tradition to justify their competing perspectives on Ajax. As generically ‘low’ sympotic song, they invoke the lustre of epic to authorise their own status as literature.

Besides nodding to the authority of tradition at large, however, the first skolion may also look back to a specific, famous instantiation of the Ajax-as-second-best motif. In Odyssey 11, when Odysseus encounters his adversary’s shade, he not only recalls the arms contest (Od.11.544-49) and twice expresses the second-best motif (Od.11.469-70, 550-51), but also addresses the hero as παῖ Τελαμίωνος (Od.11.553), the same apostrophe that we find in the skolion. Indeed, this is a notably rare collocation that appears elsewhere only in Sophocles’ Ajax (Aj.183) and an anonymous epigram in the Palatine Anthology (AP 9.116.3), both in the context of the arms contest and its aftermath.\footnote{In Sophocles’ drama, the phrase appears in the context of Ajax’s frenzied revenge attempt on the Greek chieftains (with a potential echo of the skolion itself: G.S. Jones (2010)). In the epigram, Achilles’ shield summons Ajax as its ‘worthy bearer’ (ἀξίων ἀσπιδιώτην).} Given the unique combination of the motif with this
rare vocative address, the skolion may thus look back to Odysseus’ account of the Underworld encounter, an episode in which Ajax’s status played an important role. Behind the vague λέγουσι, we may see a specific reference to Homer and Odysseus as the key authorities for this claim. Even in this case, however, we should be wary of overplaying the evidence, especially given the frequency with which Ajax is defined by his patronymic elsewhere in early Greek poetry (Τελαμωνιάδης, e.g. II.9.623, Od.11.543, Pind.Nem.4.47; νιός Τελαμώνος, II.13.177, 17.284, 17.293, Pind.Nem.8.23). The collocation παῖ Τελαμώνος is ultimately not as distinctive as it first seems. Alongside the numerous other evocations of the second-best motif, and further echoes of epic phraseology in the skolion itself, it is thus more plausible to see here an evocation of a more general motif of the epic tradition, rather than one specific instantiation.

The skolion poet musters the support of tradition to prove his point, invoking a familiar and well-established feature of Ajax’s mythical fabula.

So far, we have seen that lyric poets frequently indexed their mythical references by appealing to hearsay, signposting and authorising their engagement with other traditions (or perhaps even precise texts: the Cypria, Iliad, Odyssey). In two other cases, however, we can be very confident that an index points to a specific text even despite the appeal to anonymous hearsay. The most obvious of the two is a fragment of Simonides in which the mountain of Arete is introduced as a pre-existing tale (fr.579):98

ἐστὶ τις λόγος
τὰν Ἀρετὰν ναείν δυσαμβάτοις ἐπὶ πέτραις,
τὸν δὲ μὲν θεαντ χώρον ἀγνὸν ἀμφέπεινν
οὐδὲ πάντων βλεφάροις θνάτων
ἐσοπτος, ὦ μὴ δακέθυμος ἱδρὼς
ἐνδοθεν μόλη,
ἐκ τε ἐς ἀκρον ἀνδρείας.

97 Ajax is classed as an αἰχμητής in his Iliadic duel with Hector: ἄμφω δ’ αἰχμητά, II.7.281 (~αἰχμητά, 898.1 PMG).

98 On the fragment’s possible context (an encomiastic poem?): Rawles (2018) 64-68.
As scholars have often remarked, these lines are a clear adaptation of a passage from Hesiod’s *Works and Days* on the diverging paths of ἀρετή and κακότης (Op.286-92):

σοι δ’ ἐγὼ ἐσθλὰ νοέων ἐρέω, μέγα νήπιε Πέρση.
τὴν μὲν τοι Κακότητα καὶ ἰλαδὸν ἐστὶν ἐλέσθαι
ἡμίδιως· λείη μὲν ὁδός, μάλα δ’ ἐγγύθι ναίει
τῆς δ’ Ἀρετῆς ἱδρῶτα θεοὶ προπάροιθεν ἐθήκαν
ἀθάνατοι μακρὸς δὲ καὶ ὀρθὸς ὀίμος ἐς αὐτήν
καὶ τρηχὺς τὸ πρῶτον· ἐπὴν δ’ εἰς ἄκρον ἰκηται,
ἡμίδιῃ δήπετα πέλει, χαλεπῇ περ ἐοῦσα.

Simonides’ evocation of this passage is secured by a number of verbal and thematic parallels: in Simonides’ fragment, Arete dwells (ναίειν, fr.579.2 ~ ναίει, Op.288 of Κακότης) among rocks which are ‘difficult to ascend’ (δυσαμβάτοις’, fr.579.2), just as the Hesiodic path to arete is ‘long, steep and rough’ (μακρὸς δὲ καὶ ὀρθὸς ... | καὶ τρηχὺς, Op.290-91), while both passages also focus on reaching the pinnacle (εἰς ἄκρον ἰκηται, Op.291 ~ ἰκητ’ ἐς ἄκρον 579.7), an endeavour which requires much sweat (ἵδρȳτα, Op.289 ~ ἱδρώς, 597.5). Although Simonides attributes this image to mere λογος, there is thus a clear connection to the *Works and Days* passage, a connection which is further reinforced by the very personification of Arete: as Hunter notes, personification is a typically Hesiodic trope, through which Simonides here ‘leaves little doubt stylistically as to which poet he is following.’

99 Behind its vague anonymity, the opening phrase ἐστι τις λόγος thus points not only to a familiar commonplace, but also to a specific literary predecessor.

100 Of course, this is not to say that the index here introduces a verbatim quotation of Hesiod’s λόγος in the *Works and Days*. Scholars have long noted Simonides’ selective treatment of the Hesiodic passage. For a start, the lyricist has elided all mention of Hesiod’s κακότης and the smooth journey to it (Op.287-88, 292), instead focusing solely on ἀρετή. But even

---

here he transforms its significance: in Hesiod, ἀρετή stands largely for agricultural success and material prosperity – once it is achieved, one’s path becomes easy. In Simonides, by contrast, ἀρετή has a more moral aspect, restricted exclusively to those who exhibit manly virtue (ἀνδρεία). Moreover, the struggle and sweat to achieve it has now become internalised and figurative (ἔνδοθεν), in comparison to the primarily physical labour envisioned by Hesiod, and there is now a perpetual difficulty and ongoing hardship even just to maintain virtue, unlike in Hesiod, where the path becomes easy as soon as ἀρετή has been achieved. As Babut remarks, Simonides has ‘profoundly modified the structure and significance’ of Hesiod’s parable, rebranding it into a moral object lesson.103 Simonides’ opening appeal to hearsay, therefore, not only points to a precise literary predecessor, but also appropriates Hesiod’s authority to legitimise his own new moral outlook. Simonides presents a pointedly appropriative intertextuality, signposted through the indexical introduction: ἐστί τις λόγος.

A similarly specific index occurs in Pindar’s sixth Pythian, a poem which nominally celebrates a Pythian chariot victory by Xenocrates of Akragas, but which largely dwells on the filial piety of his son Thrasybulus. The youth, Pindar claims, upholds the precepts with which the centaur Cheiron once instructed the young Achilles (Pyth.6.19-27):

σὺ τοι σχεθών νιν ἐπὶ δεξιὰ χειρός, ὁρθὰν
ἀγείς ἐφημοσύναν,
tά ποτ’ ἐν οὐρανίῳ πάντων
μέγας ἐφημοσύναν,
τῷ Πηλείδῃ ἀκραίτῳ
ἡλικιώτητα λαμπράν
καὶ τελειομένοις
θεοῖς σεβόμεθα;
tούτας δὲ μὴ ποτὲ τιμᾶς
ἀμείρειν γονέων βίον πεπρωμένον.

These instructions, to revere both the gods and one’s parents, form a stock part of Greek moral didacticism. But the scholia note a possible source for this maxim, ‘the precepts of Cheiron’ (αἱ Χείρωνος Ὑποθῆκαι), a work attributed in antiquity to Hesiod (fr.283 = Σ Pyth.6.22):

τὰς δὲ Χείρωνος ὑποθήκας Ὑσιόδῳ ἀνατιθέασιν, ὃν ἤ ἄρχει:

ἐν γὰρ μοι τάδ᾽ ἔκαστα μετὰ φρειὸς πευκαλίμησιν
φράζεσθαι: πρῶτον μὲν, ὅταν [εἰς σὸν] δόμον εἰσαφίκηται,
ἔραυν ιερὰ καλὰ θεοῖς αἰειγενέτησιν.

Scholars have often taken this scholiastic note as evidence that the maxim in Pyth.6.23-27 derives directly from this Hesiodic poem, although the scholia do not quite say as much: all they claim is that Hesiod was attributed a poem on the same topic. Yet it is a plausible inference that Pindar had this specific poem in mind. Both Pindar and Bacchylides appear to have alluded to the work elsewhere, and the reverent and religious sensibility of the advice in Pythian 6 closely parallels the Hesiodic fragment’s injunction to sacrifice to the gods. Alongside Pindar’s description of the maxim as an ἐφημοσύναν, a term which Maslov suggests is ‘equivalent to the genre term hypothēke “piece of didactic wisdom”’, there are thus strong grounds for seeing φασί directing Pindar’s audience to a specific didactic predecessor. Given our near complete loss of the Χείρωνος Ὑποθῆκαι, we cannot determine how Pindar manipulated his model, beyond his exploitation of Cheiron as an authorising figure of


II.3.1 Traditions and Texts

paraenetic authority. But even from what remains, we can see that Pindar, like Simonides, indexed a precise citation through a vague appeal to hearsay.

In a host of lyric poems, therefore, indexical hearsay functioned as a way of marking allusion to other texts and traditions, appropriating their authority and signalling the poet’s command of his or her sources. The phenomenon is very similar to what we saw in epic, but here we are often on far stronger ground when arguing for the precise citation of earlier texts. As Scodel once claimed for Pindar, ‘What “they say” here may be what earlier canonical poetry said.’ But, as we have seen, this is not solely a Pindaric phenomenon. And if we had more texts surviving from antiquity, it is plausible that we could identify further precise references in many of the other cases we have explored. As things stand, however, we are simply no longer in a position to track their precise contours.

II.3.2 Suppression and Contestation

In other lyric cases, we find more agonistic and polemical invocations of alternative or additional details of myth, a phenomenon we have already seen in epic with Homer’s allusion to Achilles’ immortality. In lyric poetry, too, we find instances where poets employ the language of hearsay to highlight their suppression of further details of a myth or their engagement with a particularly contestable point of tradition.

In Theognis’ elegy on Atalanta, for example, the footnoting ἕσιν invites an audience to situate a specific telling of a myth within its wider mythological context (Thgn.2.1283-94):

\[ \omega \ παι, \ μη \ μ’ \ αδικει - \ ετι \ σοι \ καταθυμιος \ ειναι \ \\
\betaουλομαι - \ ευφροσυνη \ τουτο \ συνεες \ αγαθη. \ \\
ου γαρ τοι \ με \ δολω \ παρελευσαι \ ουδε \ απατησεις. \]

\[ 108 \text{ Cf. Pyth.9.29-65, Nem.3.53-8; Halliwell (2009).} \]

\[ 109 \text{ Scodel (2001) 124.} \]
In these verses, the spurned speaker uses the exemplum of Atalanta to show that his addressee cannot run from him forever: just as Atalanta fled from marriage (γάμον...φεύγειν, 1289-90; φεύγουσ’...γάμον, 1293), but eventually and unwillingly succumbed to its τέλος (1294), so too will the addressee, despite spurning love now (φεύγοντα, 1287), eventually feel the ‘wound’ of love (the speaker’s τέλος).

To the introductory phrase ὡς ποτέ φασιν is ‘a reference to poetic tradition’. But more than that, I contend, it also encourages an audience to look beyond the bare details of Theognis’ account to what the poet has left untold.

Ormand has noted that the opening verses of the poem, directed to the addressee, are larded with imagery relating to racing and competition: the boy will not pass the speaker by (παρελεύσεαι, 1285 – a verb commonly used in agonistic contexts), the boy has been victorious (νικήσας, 1286), and the speaker will ‘wound’ his fleeing beloved (1287, evoking a scene of hunting or battle). Given such preparatory clues, Theognis leads his audience to expect that

---

110 Some suspect the unity of this poem and see the remnants of a sloppy join in 1288’s ‘extraordinary tautology’ (West (1974) 166-67; Vetta (1980) 80-82), but Renehan (1983) 24-27 has convincingly refuted this view. In addition to his arguments in support of 1288, we could note the common apposition of παρθένος and κόρη in Greek poetry (Bacchyl.16.20-1; Eur.Tro.553-4, Hel.168; Ar.Thesm.1138-9; Autocrates fr.1.2 K–A; Antiphanes fr.122.9 K–A; Callim.fr.782 Pf. etc.), itself part of a widespread Greek tendency to juxtapose genus and species (e.g. βοῦς...ταῦρος, Il.2.480: Dodds (1960) 206; Renehan (1980) 348, (1985) 148). Those still unsatisfied may find inspiration for emendation in other full-verse descriptions of Atalanta: Callim.hArt.216; ps.-Aristot.Pepl.44.

111 Ziogas (2013) 178. Roman poets indexed the myth similarly: ferunt (Catull.2b.1); forsitan audieris (Ov.Met.10.560). For the indexical significance of ποτέ: §IV: passim.

112 Ormand (2013) 141-42.
the ensuing Atalanta exemplum will narrate the maiden’s footrace against her suitors, known from the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* and several other later sources. But this expectation is frustrated. Instead of the race, we are simply told that Atalanta retreated into the lonely mountains (1292).

This omission is particularly striking since in some versions of the tale (most probably including the *Catalogue*), Atalanta was said to have raced after her suitors fully armed, imitating a hunt, and killed them if she overtook them. Such a narrative of violence would more appropriately parallel the speaker’s desire to ‘wound’ his fleeing beloved here (σ’ἐγὼ τρώσω φεύγοντα με, 1287). Theognis’ avoidance of this version is thus particularly pointed, all the more so since his ensuing narrative shares a number of phrases with the *Catalogue*’s treatment of the episode, especially fr.73.4-5 and fr.76.6:

| πρὸς ἀνθρώπων ἀ[παναίνετο φῦλον ὁμι[εῖν ἀνδρῶν ἐλπομένη φεύγῃ[εῖν γάμον ἀλφηστᾶν|. |
| ἵετ’ ἀναινομένη δῶρα [χουσῆς Αφροδίτης]. |

Just as in Theognis, so too in the *Catalogue*, Atalanta flees from marriage and the gifts of Aphrodite (~Thgn.1289-90: ἀναινομένην γάμον ἀνδρῶν | φεύγειν; Thgn.1293-94 φεύγουσ’. ἰμερόεντα γάμον, χουσῆς Αφροδίτης | δῶρα). Admittedly, these parallels rely partly on reconstructions of the *Catalogue* that may be inspired by Theognis’ verses. But these

---

113 There is some confusion about the presence of two Atalantas in the mythological tradition: one Boeotian, the daughter of Schoineus and future wife of Hippomenes, involved in the footrace; the other Arcadian, the daughter of Iasius and future wife of Melanion, abandoned by her father and later a hunter: Gantz (1996) 335-39; Barringer (1996) 48-49; Fratantuono (2008) 346-52; Σ Eur. Phoen.150; Σ Theocr.3.40–42d. I follow Ormand (2013) 139 in seeing these doublets as deriving from an originally single mythical figure, sharing ‘the significant attributes of aversion to marriage and swiftness of foot’ and reflecting the same basic trope of a female paradoxically inhabiting a liminal, male, ephebic state (cf. Ormand (2014) 121-22; Detienne (1979) 30-32).


116 Cf. too fr.76.10 δῶρα θε[ὰς χουσῆς Αφροδίτης].
reconstructions are very plausible in their own right, and even without any supplementation the fragments still exhibit a clear emphasis on marriage and its refusal. Indeed, φεύγειν γάμον appears to have been a formula particularly associated with Atalanta’s fabula: besides its use in a general misogynistic gnome by Hesiod (Theog. 603), it appears nowhere else in extant archaic literature, while Aristophanes’ later use of the phrase for Atalanta’s lover Melanion offers a playfully comic distortion of the same myth, as he – rather than Atalanta – runs in flight (Lys. 781-96). In Theognis’ elegy, it is thus attractive to see the poet drawing on key vocabulary attached to the fabula of Atalanta’s race, or even the Catalogue’s specific instantiation of it, reapplying this traditional phrasing to a different context: the mountains rather than the racetrack. Theognis thus pointedly elided the expected tale of the footrace, while still evoking it through the opening language of violent competition, as well as several verbal echoes of its traditional fabula. The introductory ποτέ φάσιν, therefore, invites an audience to integrate this particular version of the tale within their wider knowledge of the myth, to appreciate the poet’s subtle appropriation and refashioning of a conflicted tradition. It is not simply an authorising mark of tradition, but also a cue for the poet’s audience to incorporate their broader knowledge of the myth and to consider the significance of what ‘others say’ about Atalanta, including – at least from our perspective – the poet of the Hesiodic Catalogue.

An even more knowing gesture to contestable tradition comes in Bacchylides’ fifth epinician, a poem whose embedded myth of Heracles’ katabatic encounter with Meleager is introduced – as we have already noted – with a footnoting λέγουσιν (Bacchyl. 5.57: §II.3.1:

117 ἀνδρῶν is highly likely in fr.73.5, since the adjective ἀλφηστής is always paired with ἀνήρ elsewhere in archaic epic (a combination also found in Attic tragedy: Aesch. Sept. 770, Soph. Phil. 708); the noun φῦλον is very frequently paired with a genitive plural noun, e.g. θεῶν, γυναικῶν and esp. ἀνθρώπων (e.g. Il. 14.361, Od. 15.409, HhDem. 352, Hes. Theog. 556, Op. 90); and ‘the gifts of (golden) Aphrodite’ are a common epicism (Il. 3.54, 3.64, HhDem. 102, Hes. Scut. 47, Hes. fr. 195.47).

II.3.2 Suppression and Contestation

93n.92). Over one hundred lines later, however, the narrative closes with an additional index, framing Bacchylides’ whole account in an allusive ring composition and placing additional weight on the poet’s final claim (Bacchyl.5.155-58):

φασίν ἄδεισιβόαν
Αμφιτρύωνος παιδα μοῦνον δὴ τότε
τέγξαι βλέφαρον, ταλαπενθέος
πότιμον οἰκτιρόντα φωτός·

Such an indexical frame may mark the general traditionality of this episode: after all, Heracles’ katabatic encounter with Meleager was also narrated by Pindar (*fr.249a, fr.dub.346(c)). But besides this, Bacchylides’ φασίν encourages an audience to recall other aspects of the myth besides those directly relayed here. In claiming that Heracles shed tears in his life ‘then and only then’ (μοῦνον δὴ τότε, 5.156), the poet appears to be protesting a little too much, and his indexical appeal to hearsay invites his audience to recall another later occasion on which Heracles was also said to cry: his death by the poisoned robe he had received from his wife Deianeira.119

In Sophocles’ later tragic account of that myth, the hero’s tears are a prominent motif: Heracles seeks pity for his pitiable self (οἰκτιρόν τέ με | πολλοίσιν οἰκτρόν, Trach.1070-71: contrast his pitying of Meleager in Bacchylides, οἰκτίροντα, Bacchyl.5.158) and claims that he has never cried before (καὶ τόδ᾿ οὐδ᾿ ἂν εἰς ποτὲ | τόνδ᾿ ἀνδρὰ φαίη πρόσθ᾿ ἰδεῖν δεδρακότα, | ἀλλ᾿ ἀστένακτος αἰὲν εἰχόμην κακοῖς, Trach.1072-74). Sophocles’ treatment post-dates Bacchylides’ Ode,120 so it cannot be a specific intertext for his epinician, but it is plausible that similar sentiments would have been expressed already in one of the many earlier treatments of the Heracles myth, especially given the hero’s broader tearless reputation in

119 On the myth: March (1987) 49-77; Gantz (1996) 431-34, 457-60. Deianeira was an established part of tradition from at least the seventh century (Archil.frr.286-88).

120 The dating of Trachiniae is uncertain, but it almost certainly post-dates Aeschylus’ Oresteia (458 BCE: Easterling (1982) 19-23). In any case, Sophocles’ first production was only in 468 BCE, considerably after the date of Bacchylides’ poem (476 BCE: Cairns (2010) 75-76).
antiquity. After all, in Bacchylides’ own dithyrambic treatment of the hero’s demise, Fate is said to ‘weave a shrewd, tear-filled plan’ for Deianeira, a phrase that suggestively alludes to the tears that result from her jealous attempts to regain Heracles’ love (ἀμαχὸς δαίμον | Δαιανείαια πολύδακρουν ύφα[νε] | μήτιν ἐπίφρον’, Bacchyl.16.23-25). And already in the Hesiodic Catalogue, the narrative of Heracles’ death (fr.25.20-25) closes with the hero going down to the ‘much-lamenting house of Hades’ (Αἰδ[α]ο πολύστονον ἱκε[το δῶμα, fr.25.25), a phrase which – if we accept Merkelbach’s plausible supplement – may not only evoke the generic doom and despair of the Underworld, but also the specific tears and lamentation of Heracles’ end, a contrast to his previously ἀστένακτος existence.

It is likely, therefore, that Heracles would have traditionally broken his tearless reputation only at the very end of his life, rather than in one chance encounter with a deceased hero in the middle of his labours. By importing the motif into Heracles’ katabasis (an adventure that itself imitates the end of life), Bacchylides is thus self-consciously innovating, introducing an ominous allusion to the hero’s future fate by means of ‘motif transference’. For a knowing audience, Bacchylides’ claim that this was the only occasion on which Heracles cried would be transparently untraditional and open to question. The claim is supposed to be challenged, and φασίν marks it as such: ‘who else has said this?’ we are invited to ask. The answer? ‘Nobody.’ Just as in Agenor’s Iliadic evocation of Achilles’ mortality, therefore, the indexical φασίν highlights a point of tradition at the point where it is most contestable.

An audience member who makes such a connection with Heracles’ future death, moreover, would find great irony in the fact that this underworld encounter with Meleager is

---

121 E.g. Soph. Trach. 1199-1201; Theoc. Id. 24.31.
122 Merkelbach’s supplement is extremely plausible: cf. Soph. OT. 29-30 for Hades’ association with lamentation. πολύστονος is not used of the ‘house of Hades’ elsewhere, but other attested adjectives do not fit the remaining space: εὐφυτυλές (Il. 23.74; Od. 11.571), μέλαν (Thgn. 1014), μέγα (Thgn. 1124).
also the very moment that precipitates Heracles’ future tears. It is in this meeting that the Theban hero first hears of his future wife Deianeira, Meleager’s sister (Δαϊάνειρα, 5.173). The closing reference to Deianeira as ‘still without experience of golden Cypris, that enchantress of men’ (νῆϊν ἔτι χρυσέας | Κύπριδος θελξιμβρότου, 5.174-75) is especially pointed, since Deianeira will kill Heracles precisely when she resorts to magic and θέλξις in an attempt to regain his love, the domain of Cyprian Aphrodite. Bacchylides’ φασίν is thus extremely loaded, inviting his audience to challenge his assertion and recall another occasion on which Heracles was traditionally thought to have cried. Indeed, Heracles’ Underworld tears proleptically foreshadow those which are still to come. Ultimately, Heracles’ fate is not very dissimilar from Meleager’s own and Heracles is not far from the truth when he suspects that he will be killed by Meleager’s murderer (Bacchyl.5.89-91). Their murderers are not the same, but still very similar: close female relatives, Deianeira and δαΐφρων Althaea (Bacchyl.5.137). Both heroes thus prove to be archetypal embodiments of the maxim which introduced Bacchylides’ extended narrative: ‘no man is fortunate in all things’ (οὐ | γὰ[ρ] τὶς ἐπιχθονίων | π[άν]τα γ’ εὐδαίμων ἔφυ, 5.53-55). Far from simply highlighting the traditionality of Bacchylides’ account, therefore, this concluding index encourages an audience to situate this specific version within their wider knowledge of the myth, emphasising the contestability of tradition and looking forward to Heracles’ traditional tears that are still to come.

As in Theognis, therefore, Bacchylides’ use of indexical hearsay has a pointedly agonistic edge. The index encourages an audience to set rival and competing alternatives against each other. Theognis relocates Atalanta’s asceticism from the racecourse to the

---


126 Burnett (1985) 146; Currie (2016) 129.

127 Acoustic echo between Deianeira’s name (man-destroyer) and the epithet of ‘Meleager’s murderous mother’: Lefkowitz (1969) 86; cf. δαΐφρων of Artemis (Bacchyl.5.122), another destructive female in the poem. The epithet may also evoke the firebrand of the Meleager myth: Cairns (2010) 89.
mountains, and Bacchylides invites his audience to challenge the assertion that Heracles cried only in his meeting with Meleager, rather than at the traditional moment of his death. As in epic, therefore, so too in lyric, indexical appeals to hearsay frequently emphasise the flexibility and fierce contestability of the mythical tradition.

II.3.3 The Poetics of Supplementation

These last examples, those of Theognis and Bacchylides, also exhibit an aspect of indexical hearsay that is considerably widespread in lyric – indexes which invite an audience to supplement the immediate narrative at hand with their larger knowledge of tradition. Just as Bacchylides invites audiences to recall Heracles’ future demise at the hands of Deianeira, so too do other lyricists frequently prompt an audience to supplement their sparse telling of a myth with further details. Such an invitation to ‘fill in the gaps’ was less common in epic. It presumably stems from lyric poetry’s briefer and more self-contained treatment of myth, with very few extensive narrations. Within lyricists’ selective treatments of a story, indexical appeals to hearsay evoke other untold details, complicating, ironising and enriching the present telling.

A familiar case of such signposted supplementation is Sappho fr.44, an epicising fragment on the wedding of Hector and Andromache. When the Trojan herald Idaeus predicts future κλέος ἀφθιτον (‘undying fame’) as a result of the marriage (fr.44.2-4), the audience are invited to supplement Sappho’s selective treatment of the myth with their wider knowledge of the couple’s famous but unhappy future: Hector’s death, Andromache’s enslavement, and their son’s brutal murder.\textsuperscript{128} Even at this joyous moment of marriage, Sappho’s invocation of

\textsuperscript{128} Similarly, Spelman (2017) 753. The phrase also acknowledges Sappho’s role in preserving this κλέος (Budelmann (2018) 141) and may look back to the Iliadic Hector’s hope for future κλέος (II.7.86-91: Xian (forthcoming)). Cf. ὑμνήμα τούτου in the final verse (fr.44.34), a self-reflexive nod to the songs produced about the couple. Other lyric instances of κλέος and its compounds similarly index tradition: Stesichorus’ Sack of Troy
κλέος invites her audience to incorporate their awareness of the *Iliad* or the larger Trojan war tradition, looking forward to the very end of the pair’s marriage, just as Homer, at Hector’s death, looks back to its very start (*Il.22.466-72*).129

A comparable and less well-known invitation to ‘fill in the gaps’ occurs in a short fragment of Ibycus, whose context is now lost (Ibyc.fr.303):

(κλέος, fr.100.14; [α]νθρώπους κλέος, fr.117.9; [Π]ολυμνης κλέεννόν, fr.117.6); Simon.fr.eleg.11.13-15 (άοιδημον, κλέος, cf. ἀγλαορήμειε, fr.eleg.10.5); Ibyc.S151 (see below).

129 Kakridis (1966); Rissman (1983) 119-41; Meyerhoff (1984) 118-39; Schrenk (1994); Pallantza (2005) 79-88. Even if one is wary of accepting specific allusions to the *Iliad* here (e.g. Kelly (2015a) 28-29), the traditional *fabula* of the couple’s impending fate will still hover in the background.

130 Cassandra: *Il.13.365-66, 24.699-706; Od.11.421-23; Cypr.arg.1d; Alc.fr.289; Bacchyl.23; Pind.Pyth.11.33, Pac.8a.fr.52i(A); LIMC s.v. ‘Aias II’.

Cassandra is here presented as a traditional figure of myth, within the grip of *fama* itself, as indeed she was: besides her appearances in epic, she featured in Alcaeus, Bacchylides, Pindar, as well as frequently in archaic art.130 In Ibycus’ Polycrates Ode, she appears again as the subject of song (τανυ[σφυ]υμ[ον | ὑμνης Κασσάνδραν, S151.11-12) in a poem that similarly emphasises the traditionality of the Trojan war myth, ‘the much-sung strife’ (δῆριν πολύυμνον, S151.6) around the ‘most renowned’ city of Troy (περικλεές, S151.2). The short Ibycan fragment in question here, however, lacks a clear context. Given its fragmentary state, we do not know what (if anything) came before or after it. Even so, the extant verses exhibit a strong epic flavour, akin to Sappho fr.44 with their epic-style compound adjectives and -οιο genitive ending. As in Sappho’s fragment, we might thus be encouraged to think of this φᾶμις as taking a specifically epic form.

But more than this, given the traditional resonance of the fragment’s epithets, the indexical φᾶμις may also point to a specific moment in Cassandra’s mythical biography. The adjective γλαυκώπις is a notably unusual choice for Cassandra: besides its appearance here, it...
is only ever used of Athena in archaic epic and lyric. Indeed, it is a stock epithet of the goddess, used over ninety times of her in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* alone.\(^{131}\) Given its traditional association, Ibycus’ innovative redeployment of the epithet for Cassandra suggests a close association between the goddess and the Trojan princess. As Wilkinson has suggested, the resulting link may parallel the beauty of both figures (for Cassandra’s beauty, see *Illi*.13.366), but it also evokes the story of Cassandra’s rape by Locrian Ajax, an episode in which Athena played a central role: not only did the rape take place in her temple at Troy, violating the goddess’ cult statue, but Athena was also the one to punish Ajax with death at sea and the rest of the Greeks with a stormy *nostos*.\(^{132}\) Through the unusual adjective, Ibycus thus gestures to this specific aspect of Cassandra’s mythical *fabula*, supported by the indexical force of *φᾶμις*.

The allusion is reinforced further, however, by the other adjective used to describe Cassandra in these verses, ἐρασιπλόκαμος (‘lovely-locked’). This is a very rare epithet, used elsewhere in extant Greek literature before late antiquity only twice of other mythical rape victims: of Tyro, who was raped by Poseidon (Τυροῦς ἐρασιπλοκάμου γενεά, *Pyth*.4.136; cf. 4.138 Παί Ποσειδᾶνος), and of the Muse Calliope, who bore Orpheus after being ravished by Oeagrus or Apollo (Μούσας ἐρασιπλοκάμου, *Bacchyl*.28.9-11).\(^{133}\) It thus appears to have been an epithet especially suited to victims of male sexual violence. Its use here would further encourage the recall of Cassandra as Ajax’s victim, just as γλαυκῶπις evokes Cassandra as a favourite of Athena.\(^{134}\) Given these hints, it would be unsurprising if these Ibycan verses were originally followed by a narrative account of the rape, similar to that we find in Alcaeus fr.298; the allusive hints in Ibycus’ language would then set the course for the ensuing narrative. But even if the original poem contained nothing more than a passing reference to Cassandra, its vocabulary, alongside the indexical *φᾶμις*, would still point to a specific moment in the

---

\(^{131}\) *Iliad* (36x), *Odyssey* (57x), *Homeric Hymns* (7x), Hesiod (12x); cf. Tyrt.fr.2.16; Stesich.fr.18.3; Peisander fr.7.1 GEF; Pind.Ol.7.51, *Nem*.7.96, 10.7, *Dith*.fr.70d.38.


\(^{133}\) Tyro: §II.2.2: 71 with n.43. Calliope: Prop.2.30b.35-36; Fedeli (2005) 865-66.

\(^{134}\) For the allusive potential of Ibycus’ epithets elsewhere: Barron (1969) 133-34; Steiner (2005).
heroine’s *fabula*. Ibycus’ allusive index thus invites an audience to look beyond (and through) his immediate words to harness the larger, unexpressed tradition that lies beyond them.

As a final example, we may turn to a particularly rich instance of such signposted supplementation: the recently reconstituted Sapphic poem on Tithonus and old age. In this poem, the poet’s persona laments her ageing physique before ending with a mythical exemplum that proves mortals’ inability to escape senile decrepitude (Sapph.fr.58.8-12):

\[\text{ἀγήραον ἄνθρωπον ἔοντ' οὐ δύνατον γένεσθαι.}\]
\[καὶ γάρ πίστα, Τίθωνον ἐφαντο βροδόπαχυν Αὔων ἔρῳ δεδάθεισαν βάμεν' εἰς ἔσχατα γὰς φέροισαν, ἐντα [κ]άλον καὶ νέον, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸν ὑμῶς ἐμαρψε χρόνω πόλον γῆρας, ἔχοντα̣ κα̣λ̣ο̣ν κα̣λ̣ο̣ν κα̣ νέον, ἀλλ’ αὖτον ὔμως ἔμαρψε χρόνῳ πόλο̣ν̣ γῆρας, ἔχον̣τ̣’ ἀθανάταν ἀκοιτῖν.}\]

Tithonus, the mortal husband of Dawn, is introduced to prove that even those intimately connected with the gods cannot escape old age: γῆρας still seized him, just as it did frail Laertes in the *Odyssey* (κατὰ γῆρας ἔμαρψεν, Od.24.390, cf. fr.58.11-12). At the outset, this tale is indexically marked as the subject of hearsay, a familiar part of tradition (ἐφαντο, fr.58.9). And indeed, Tithonus was a familiar mythical character from Homer onwards: in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, he is already the spouse of Dawn, lying in her bed as she rises to inaugurate the day (II.11.1-2, Od.5.1-2), while in Hesiod, he and Dawn are named as the parents of Memnon and Emathion (*Theog.*984-85). He may also, moreover, have made an appearance in the *Aethiopis* and its associated traditions, in which his son Memnon also receives immortality thanks to the intervention of Dawn (*Aeth.*arg.2e).\(^{136}\) However, it is only a little later that we first encounter clear evidence for the tradition of his flawed immortality, as evoked here by Sappho: he was granted exemption from death, but he could not stop the process of ageing and gradually withered away. In addition to Sappho fr.58, this tradition of Tithonus’ unavoidable

\(^{135}\) The text was first published by Gronewald – Daniel (2004a), (2004b) and has since received a flurry of scholarly attention. See esp. West (2005a); Budelmann (2018) 146-52. Here, I follow the text of Janko (2017), especially for v. 10 δεδάθεισαν (cf. Budelmann (2018) 151-52 on the textual crux).

ageing appears in the work of Sappho’s contemporary Mimnermus (fr.4: Janko (1990)), as well as more extensively in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, when the goddess introduces Tithonus’ plight as an exemplum for Anchises of the dangers of divine-mortal relations (*HhAphr*.218-38). Sappho’s ἔφαντο thus points to a well-established tradition of Tithonus as Dawn’s spouse and a figure of perpetual ageing. Indeed, it may even even point to our *Homeric Hymn* as a privileged intertext.

Besides invoking a specific tradition or text, however, Sappho’s ἔφαντο may also prompt her audience to recollect an aspect of the myth about which others have previously ‘talked’, but which she leaves unmentioned here: Tithonus’ subsequent transformation into a cicada. The Trojan prince wasted away to such an extent that he eventually became a tiny insect that feeds only on dew, left with nothing more than his own beautiful voice – an *aetion* to explain the fact that cicadas start chirping around dawn. The earliest explicit mention of this metamorphosis comes from Hellanicus of Lesbos in the fifth-century – notably, a compatriot of Sappho, perhaps suggesting a particularly Lesbian or Aeolic interest in this myth (*FGrHist* 4 F140 = fr.140 EGM). Yet earlier texts already hint at this tradition, especially the *Homeric Hymn*: as Kakridis has argued, the description of Tithonus’ ceaselessly flowing voice matches the constant chirping of the cicada (φωνὴ ῥεῖ ἄσπετος, *HhAphr*.237), and he is locked away in the θάλαμος like a cicada in a basket (*HhAphr*.236).

More significantly, Janko notes that the description of ‘shedding old age’ (ξύσαι τ’ ἄπο γῆρας, *HhAphr*.223) evokes the tradition of cicadas shedding their skin, playing on the polyvalent potential of γῆρας to mean...
both ‘old age’ and ‘exuvia’, while Rawles has suggested that the rare noun κίκυς (‘strength’, *HhAphr*.237) puns on the ‘kik’ sound of the insect (a sound also reflected in the insect’s Latin name, *cicada*, and in Greek vocabulary: Hsch. s.v. κίκους).\(^{143}\)

Despite no explicit mention, therefore, the hymnic poet leaves a number of traces that hint at the cicada metamorphosis, suggesting that this feature of the myth may have also been in the background of Sappho’s fragment.\(^{144}\) Indeed, the metamorphic myth could even be traced back to the *Iliad*, with its famous comparison of Trojan elders to cicadas (II.3.149-53): just like their relative Tithonus, these aged men are worn down by old age (γήραϊ), and though no longer fit for battle, they remain good speakers (ἀγορηταὶ ἐσθλοί).\(^{145}\) The simile encapsulates the core elements of Tithonus’ transformation: the physical decay of the body, but the enduring power of the voice. It is thus certainly possible that this metamorphosis already formed an established part of the literary tradition with which Sappho worked. And indeed, King has argued that another Sapphic fragment may even allude to the myth directly.\(^{146}\) We could thus interpret ἔφαντο here as another act of signposted supplementation, prompting an audience to consider the larger tradition of the story with which they were familiar. As Rawles notes, such a reference would certainly resonate against the poem’s larger concerns, adding a note of consolation to the dreary inevitability of old age. The insect’s enduring voice parallels the poetess’ immortal song: although Sappho’s body cannot conquer death, her poetry certainly can.\(^{147}\)

Sappho’s ἔφαντο, like her κλέος in fr.44, thus gestures to larger Trojan traditions: Tithonus’ marriage to the immortal Dawn, his own inescapable ageing and his eventual transformation into a cicada. In our discussion so far, however, we have avoided commenting on one feature of Sappho’s ‘footnote’ that has caused a great deal of scholarly consternation:


\(^{144}\) The overall muting of the metamorphosis fits Aphrodite’s rhetorical strategy in the *Hymn*: King (1986) 27-30.

\(^{145}\) Cf. Σ(D) II.3.151; Janko (2017) 286.


its unusual past tense. Instead of the usual φασί, we find the imperfect middle ἔφαντο, a form elsewhere found predominantly in epic.\textsuperscript{148} There have been many attempts to explain the apparent anomaly,\textsuperscript{149} but one particularly intriguing suggestion is that of Bettarini, who has argued that the verb’s tense establishes a contrast between two different versions of the Tithonus myth, one old and outdated, the other new and current.\textsuperscript{150} According to his argument, Sappho’s predecessors ‘used to say’ that Tithonus became immortal and ageless, remaining both young and beautiful (κ[ά̣λ̣ο̣ν και νέον), with no negative complications. Such a tradition, he argues, is reflected in Homer’s dawn periphrases (\textit{Il}.11.1-2, \textit{Od}.5.1-2), where Eos is pictured rising from the side of Tithonus, a detail that others too have taken to imply that – in Homer at least – ‘he was immortal and ageless like her’.\textsuperscript{151} In Sappho’s day, by contrast, following Bettarini’s argument, Tithonus is said to be immortal but still ageing: in this newer and still current version, even he could not escape the onset of γῆρας. For Bettarini, Sappho’s ἔφαντο thus points to a former tradition that is no longer active, contrasting it with the more recent and complicated instantiation of the myth with which she is concerned. If true, Sappho’s index here would not only point to other texts and traditions, but also exhibit an intense literary historical awareness, reflecting on the diachronic development of a specific myth.

Some support for this reading may be found in Pindar, who elsewhere similarly distinguishes different versions of a single myth. Brown compares Pindar’s first \textit{Olympian}, where the envious gossip of Pelops’ neighbour (also expressed with the imperfect: ἔννεπε, \textit{Ol}.1.47) is set against Pindar’s more ‘recent’ version of the myth (\textit{Ol}.1.35-52, §IV.3.2: 219-20).\textsuperscript{152} An even closer parallel, however, can be found in Pindar’s first \textit{Nemean}, where the poet claims

\begin{enumerate}
\item Edmunds (2006) 24 sees a contrast between what Sappho used to hear and think about old age, and what she understands now; Lardinois (2009) 47 sees a hint that the story dates back to a time before Sappho’s addresses were born.
\item Bettarini (2007) 1-5. Cf. Brown (2011) 22: ‘the imperfect seems to suggest something that is no longer true, although once asserted’, although he goes on to see this contrast in the mythical world of the story, rather than as a fact of literary history.
\item Brown (2011) 25.
\end{enumerate}
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that he is rousing up an ‘old tale’ (ἀρχαῖον ὀτρύνων λόγον, Nem.1.34). This appears to contrast his traditional account of Heracles’ infancy (possibly derived from Peisander’s epic Heraclea)\(^{153}\) with a more recent version, perhaps Pherecydes’ near-contemporary rationalisation of the myth (in which Amphitryon, not Hera, sent the snakes: frr.69a-b).\(^{154}\) If Pindar could draw such a distinction between different versions of the same myth, we may indeed wonder whether Sappho could do the same a century earlier.

However, I am sceptical whether ἔφαντο alone can mark the differentiation that Bettarini requires of it. Admittedly, his argument appears to be supported by the syntax of these verses: only the claim that Eos ‘went’ to the ends of the earth with Tithonus is strictly part of the indirect speech introduced by ἔφαντο, whereas the onset of old age is described by the poet herself with the indicative ἔμαρψε. The hearsay is thus strictly restricted to Tithonus’ alleged immortality. Moreover, the verb ἔφαντο often appears elsewhere in contexts ‘of false hopes or promises’ in epic,\(^{155}\) a traditional reference which would resonate effectively here: they said (or ‘thought’) that Tithonus was immortal, free from the usual handicaps of mortality, but this was ultimately not true. However, in spite of these supporting arguments, we should question Bettarini’s neat notion of a continuous development from one version of the Tithonus myth to another, an evolutionary model which fails to account for the potential of an ongoing interchange and dialogue between different versions in different contexts. We have, after all, already seen potential hints of Tithonus’ cicada transformation in the Iliad, while even the Homeric dawn periphrases do not explicitly contradict the version of Tithonus’ continuous ageing. Elsewhere in the Iliad, Tithonus is named as a son of Laomedon, a brother of Priam and

---

\(^{153}\) Peisander: Braswell (1992) 57.

\(^{154}\) For the different versions: Rosenmeyer (1969) 243; Braswell (1992) 54-55. Contrast Loscalzo (1988) 72. Cf. Eur.IA 78, where παλαιοῦς similarly appears to restate tradition against Thucydides’ recent rationalisation of the Tyndarid oath (Willink (1971) 347-48). Such polemic fits the authors’ chronology: Pherecydes’ Historiae has been dated between 508/7 and 476/5 BCE (Jacoby (1947) 33), although a date in the early 470s seems most plausible (Huxley (1973) 140-141). Nemean 1 is dated after the foundation of Aetna in 476/5 BCE; Braswell (1992) 25-27 suggests 469 BCE.

cousin of Anchises (II.20.237). Even if he had not achieved eternal youth, therefore, he would still have been within the usual life cycle of a human being during the events of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. There is, in short, no reason for seeing the Homeric formula as evidence for an earlier, more primitive version of the myth in which Tithonus enjoyed an unblemished immortality.

The anomaly of the past tense has also been considerably overplayed; it is not in fact without parallel. Besides the archaic and classical examples cited by other scholars, it is particularly worth comparing Aratus’ Hellenistic account of Orion’s rape of Artemis and the huntsman’s subsequent death from a scorpion sting (*Phaen.634-46*). Just as in Sappho, this tale is attributed to the talk of the poet’s predecessors with the imperfect ἐφαντο (προτέρων λόγος, οἱ μὲν ἐφαντο, *Phaen.637*), and it also transitions from an infinitive to a simple indicative during the course of its narration (ἐλκῆσαι, *Phaen.638*; ἡ δὲ...ἐπετείλατο, *Phaen.641*). Yet it ends with a present φασί in a kind of ring composition (*Phaen.645*), marking the complementarity of past and present speech. Both φασί and ἐφαντο can thus be used to gesture to other traditions, even within a single passage. Despite its attractions, therefore, we cannot maintain the distinction which Bettarini draws between the two versions of the Tithonus myth, or the significance he places on Sappho’s imperfect. Rather, I contend, ἐφαντο functions like any other index of hearsay, whether in the present or a past tense, alerting an audience member to other tellings of this myth and inviting them to supplement it with their wider knowledge. Indeed, if anything, the rare epic imperfect adds to the Homeric flavour of these lines, reinforcing the potential connection with the hexametric *Homeric Hymn*. As in Ibycus, Bacchylides, Theognis and others, Sappho’s appeal to hearsay indexes her engagement

---

156 Carrara (2011) 93 notes that in the *Hymn*, Aphrodite claims that Dawn stayed away from Tithonus’ bed as soon as his first grey hairs appeared (*H/Phr.228-30*), but this may be rhetorical exaggeration to suit her immediate argument.

157 E.g. Edmunds (2006) 24n.10: ἐπευθόμεθα (II.9.524); μόθον...δὸν ποτ’ ἠκουσ’...ἐτι παῖς ὦν (Ar.Lys.781-2). De Jong (2010) 159-60: Ελλήνων μὲν τινὲς...Ἐλεξαν (Hdt.2.20 – Thales of Miletus). Willigers (2017) 122: ἡς φάσαν (II.4.373). Cf. Westlake (1977) 349 on Thucydides: ‘there does not, however, seem to be much significance in his choice of tense, and it is seldom clear why he prefers the present to the past or vice versa’.
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with wider traditions and texts surrounding Tithonus, inviting her audience to supplement unmentioned details of the myth.

II.3.4 Lyric Innovation: Faux Footnoting?

So far, we have encountered numerous cases where lyricists’ appeals to hearsay footnote and signal interactions with other texts and traditions. But it is worth asking whether such indexical appeals to hearsay are always so ‘straight’, or whether they may sometimes conceal a degree of literary innovation. We have already seen Aphrodite bend the truth of tradition in her eponymous Homeric Hymn. And in lyric poetry, too, we can identify a number of similar cases where tradition is invoked precisely at points where it is creatively refashioned. Naturally, such an examination is severely hampered by our limited evidence for earlier traditions and literature, and it is often impossible to determine whether some specific element in a narrative is novel or traditional. Yet in spite of this degree of uncertainty, we can still explore at least a few possible cases of indexed innovation, especially in the work of Pindar.

On a number of occasions, Pindar pointedly alters the literary tradition to heighten the parallelism between a myth and his contemporary present, or to incorporate a primarily local myth into the traditional Panhellenic canon. In such cases, he often appeals to hearsay to embellish his account with the veneer of traditional authority. In Pythian 1, for example, the Theban poet introduces Philoctetes as a parallel for the Sicilian tyrant Hieron, recalling the Greek hero’s physical infirmity, rescue from Lemnos and key role in the sack of Troy (Pyth.1.50-55). The introductory φαντί (Pyth.1.52) marks the general traditionality of this myth, nodding to the hero’s gruesome snake wound and Helenus’ prophecy that Troy could not be taken without Philoctetes and Heracles’ bow, familiar from the Epic Cycle and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{158} But it

also authorises a patently untraditional element: in other versions of the myth, from the *Little Iliad* onwards, Philoctetes was cured of his wounds before he entered battle.\(^{159}\) In Pindar, by contrast, he continues to ‘walk with a weak body’ (ἀσθενεῖ...χρωτὶ βαίνων, *Pyth*.1.55), a detail that renders him a closer parallel for the poet’s sickly patron.\(^{160}\) Through the indexical ἐπαντι, Pindar thus invokes tradition to legitimise this revamped version of the myth.\(^{161}\)

However, Pindar does not only re-write tradition to enhance his victors’ glory. At other points, he adapts the mythical past to reflect the contemporary political realities of a victor’s hometown. In *Olympian 6*, for example, Evadna, the mother of Iamus and the Iamid line, is introduced not as the true biological daughter of Aeyptus, the king of Arcadia (as was traditional), but rather as his foster daughter. Instead, her true parents are said (λέγεται, *Ol*.6.29) to have been Poseidon and Pitana, the homonymous heroine of a Spartan city. As scholars have noted, this genealogy appears to reflect the contemporary politics of Pindar’s own day, in which the most famous Iamid prophet, Teisamenus of Elis, had been granted Spartan citizenship.\(^{162}\) By incorporating the Spartan Pitana into Iamus’ genealogy, Pindar integrates his contemporary reality into the mythical past. And by appealing to hearsay at this very moment, he legitimises this addition with a veneer of traditional authority. In the words of Pavlou, he ‘manages to present the recent insertion into the Iamid genealogy as already traditional and socially authoritative.’\(^{163}\)

\(^{159}\) Il.Parv.arg.2c; cf. Quint.Smyrn.9.459-79.


\(^{161}\) Cf. Spelman (2018b) §II. Cf. too Nem.9.39-40 where the indexed assertion that Hector fought by the Scamander (Λέγεται, κλέος) is not paralleled by extant literature, where Hector never strictly fights besides the river (von Leutsch (1859) 68 suggests a reference to Hector’s slaying of Protesilaus, but this is connected with the seashore, not the river: *Cypr*.arg.10a, fr.22). However, this detail enhances the parallel with Pindar’s laudandus Chromius, who is praised for fighting successfully by the Sicilian river Helorus (*Nem*.9.40-42): Braswell (1998) 121-23.

\(^{162}\) Hdt.9.33-35; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1886) 162-85; Huxley (1975) 28-30.

Finally, Pindar also appeals to the authority of hearsay when imbuing local, epichoric traditions with a Panhellenic pedigree, as in the mythical action of Rhodes in Olympian 7. The poet introduces the emergence of the island from the sea as the ‘ancient talk of men’ (Ol.7.54-57):

φαντὶ δ’ ἀνθρώπων παλαιά
ῥήσιες, οὕτω, ὅτε χθόνα δατέοντο Ζεύς τε καὶ ἀθάνατοι,
φανερὰν ἐν πελάγει Ῥόδον ἔμμεν ποντίῳ,
ἁλμυροῖς δ’ ἐν βένθεσιν νάσον κεκρύφθαι

The narrative continues with Helios, the Sun-God, failing to gain a share of land because of his absence during the lot-taking; but he sees Rhodes below the sea and requests it as his future domain when it rises (Ol.7.58-71). Here, once more, the language of hearsay and antiquity combine to index a mythical reference, alongside the specification of a community of ἄνθρωποι (cf. §II.2.2:67-68). However, as the Pindaric scholia note, this tradition of Rhodes’ submergence is not attested in literary sources before Pindar (Σ Ol.7.101). Rather, the scholia suggest that the poet is drawing on ancient local traditions, a plausible suggestion (Σ Ol.7.100a, 101). As Kowalzig has demonstrated, ‘the presence’ of Helios ‘and the importance of his legends on Rhodes at an early time...are undeniable’.164 It is worth noting, however, that the divine division of lots has a significant literary heritage of its own, going back at least to Poseidon’s account of the three-way division of the world in the Iliad (15.187-93). Kowalzig has highlighted Pindar’s numerous verbal connections with the Homeric passage,165 but also notes that the Pindaric scene exhibits a significant discrepancy with its epic forebear: in Homer, the earth remained common to all (γαῖα δ’ ἔτι ξυνὴ πάντων, II.15.193), while in Pindar it is precisely the earth that is divided up (ὅτε χθόνα δατέοντο, 55; χώρας ἀκλάρωτον, 59).166 Pindar thus appropriates and adapts the authority of the literary tradition to bolster local myth.

164 Kowalzig (2007) 243-44.

165 Kowalzig (2007) 243: ‘the division (δέδασται 189–δατέοντο 55) of earth is performed by mixing (παλλομένων 191–ἀμπαλον 61) and drawing lots (ἔλαχον/ἔλαχε/ἔλαχ’ 190/1/2–ἔνδειξεν λάχος 58).’

The introduction of the story with a gesture to ancient hearsay does not so much paper over Pindar’s own innovations as much as it endows a local and little-known story with the prestige of canonicity.

In lyric poetry, we thus do not find out-and-out mythological inventions disguised as traditional tales, but rather slight adaptations of pre-existing myths to reflect and enhance contemporary circumstances. In such cases, appeals to tradition bestow an element of canonicity on contemporary and epichoric traditions, inscribing them into the wider storehouse of communal song.\(^\text{167}\) This perfectly fits the more general practice of epinician, which often juxtaposes local figures and traditions with the major ‘panHellenic’ myths of the Greek world. But it is worth stressing that this is not solely a Pindaric or even epinician phenomenon. We can identify a comparable instance of authorised ‘innovation’ in another Attic skolion, on the immortality of the Athenian tyrant slayer Harmodius (894 PMG):

\[
\text{φίλταθ᾿ Ἁρμόδι', οὐ τί πω τέθνηκας,}
\]

\[
\text{νήσοις δ᾿ ἐν μακάρων σέ φασίν εἶναι,}
\]

\[
\text{ίνα περ ποδώκης Ἀχιλεὺς}
\]

\[
\text{Τυδείδην τέ ἡφασι τὸν ἐσθλὸν† Διομήδεα.}
\]

This text, as transmitted, contains two indexical appeals to tradition within the space of four lines. The second, if retained,\(^\text{168}\) is the more straightforward and evokes wider traditions surrounding Achilles’ and Diomedes’ immortalisation, here expressed through traditionally epic language.\(^\text{169}\) Achilles, in particular, was associated with a range of afterlife locations after his death: besides the Odyssean Underworld (Od.11.471-540), he was also situated on Leuke

---


\(^{168}\) The transmitted final verse is unmetrical, which has prompted a host of conjectures (Fabbro (1995) 32, 151-52), usually excising φασί, τὸν ἐσθλὸν, or Διομήδεα. I am inclined to follow Lowth’s popular conjecture and retain this φασί (Τυδείδην τέ φασιν Διομήδεα), but even if the verb is excised, this has no bearing on the first φασίν, which is the key to my argument here.

\(^{169}\) Cf. ποδώκης Ἀχιλεύς (Il.18.234); Τυδείδην Διομήδεα (Il.6.235, 10.150). If we retain φασί, we could also consider putting Achilles in the accusative, so that he is explicitly part of the indirect speech (ποδώκε’ Ἀχιλέα Ilgen; ποδώκη τ’ Ἀχιλέα Edmonds).
II.3.4 Lyric Innovation: Faux Footnoting?

(Aeth.arg.4b; Pind.Nem.4.49-50), the Elysian fields (Ibyc.fr.291; Simon.fr.558) and – as here – the isles of the Blessed (Pind.Ol.2.70-80; Plat.Symp.179e-180b). Diomedes, meanwhile, was immortalised by Athena, at least according to Pindar (Nem.10.7) and apparently also Ibycus (fr.294). The second φασί thus marks the traditionality of these heroes’ afterlives, while also perhaps nodding to the competing alternatives for Achilles’ final resting place.

The first φασίν, however, is more arresting, since it attributes the same immortal status to a historical individual, the Athenian tyrant slayer Harmodius. This youth famously lost his life alongside his adult lover Aristogeiton in their attempt to kill the Athenian tyrant Hippias and his brother Hipparchus in 514 BCE. In the grim light of history, their behaviour does not seem equal to that of Homer’s greatest heroes: it was an act of revenge, motivated by a personal slight, and only partially successful. The pair managed to kill Hipparchus but not Hippias, who responded to their plot with a harsher and more repressive rule. Despite these realities, however, Harmodius and Aristogeiton became lauded as ‘tyrant slayers’ in the popular imagination and were refashioned as the poster boys of Athenian democracy, celebrated with statues, song and hero cult.170 This skolion, alongside others on the same theme (893, 895-96 PMG), forms part of this larger ideological development of the Harmodius myth, setting the hero on a par with the greatest warriors from the Trojan war: after all, we have already seen in other skolia how the two heroes mentioned here, Diomedes and Achilles, were singled out as the greatest warriors who went to Troy (898-99 PMG, §II.3.1: 93-95). In this context, the poet’s initial φασίν is thus extremely loaded, drawing on the authority of tradition to authorise this local Athenian legend.

As in Pindar, this innovation is achieved through a creative reworking of tradition. Already in Hesiod’s Works and Days, the Isles of the Blessed were the home of the prosperous heroes (καὶ τοὶ μὲν ναίουσιν ... ἐν μακάρων νήσοισι ... ὀλβιοὶ ἡρωες, Hes.Op.170-72). But the skolion appropriates this long-standing epic tradition of heroic immortality for a specifically Athenian purpose, aligning a local hero with the panHellenic greats.171 In so doing,

it may also evoke Achilles as a prime model for Harmodius’ pederastic relationship with Aristogeiton. Elsewhere in Attic literature, Achilles and Patroclus are mentioned as ancient analogues for the tyrant-slayers (Aesch. Tim. 140, 142; Plat. Symp. 179e-180b, 182c), and in Plato’s Symposium Phaedrus claims that it is precisely Achilles’ love for his friend which guaranteed his immortalisation on the Isles of the Blessed (179e-180b). Achilles here is thus not only an exemplar of heroic immortality, but also of someone who has achieved it through pederastic devotion. As in Pindar, a local tradition is thus bolstered by the authority of the mythical past at the very same time that it is itself incorporated into the annals of song. The indexical ἐφασίν both authorises and cements the traditionality of the Harmodius myth.

Appeals to hearsay in lyric, therefore, not only signpost allusions to pre-existing traditions and texts, but also mark and authorise the creative reworking of tradition, building on the epic example we have already seen in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite. These are not so much cases of pure invention and fabrication, as occasions on which poets rework and revise traditional material. Our limited access to the whole range of lyric poetry inhibits a fuller perspective on such practice, but even from these glimpses, we see that lyric poets exploited the indexical potential of hearsay not only to mark and supplement their allusions to pre-existing texts and traditions, but also to authorise their innovative departures from the trodden path.

---


173 Cf. another skolion in which both tyrant slayers are promised ever-lasting κλέος in similarly epic language (αἰεὶ σφῶν κλέος ἵσσεται κατ’ αἶαν, 896.1 PMG).
II.4 Conclusions

In both archaic epic and lyric poetry, appeals to hearsay frequently evoke wider traditions and texts. In archaic epic, we have seen Homer and his fellow poets gesture to the traditional background of many myths, signalling the poet’s mastery and control of the many strands of song. Sometimes, these epicists gesture to the authority of tradition for specific details of their story (Peisistratus’ speed; Nestor’s age; the gods’ secret love-making), but at other points, they agonistically position their own stories against the tales told by others (the *Iliad* on Achilles’ upbringing and immortality) or against other whole traditions or texts (the *Odyssey* and female catalogue poetry; the *Iliad* and theogonic myth; the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* and the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*). Through these indexes of hearsay, epic poets constructed the contours of a nascent literary history, within and against which they positioned their own poems. We find here an underlying awareness of an epic archive, a storehouse of song.

Both these aspects of indexical hearsay (the encyclopaedic and agonistic) can also be traced directly into archaic lyric poetry. Here too, lyricists appealed to anonymous tradition as a source of authority, whether they were invoking a mythical *fabula* at large or a specific source text (Sappho on Leda’s egg; Attic *skolia* on Ajax; Simonides on Hesiod’s *Arete*; Pindar on Cheiron’s *Hypothekai*). And here too, they positioned their versions against competing narrative alternatives (Theognis on Atalanta; Bacchylides on Heracles’ tears; Pindar on Heracles’ infancy). But in lyric, we also find something new, a tendency to invoke tradition precisely at points of narrative ellipsis, an invitation for audiences to fill in the blanks of what a poet has left unsaid (Ibycus on Cassandra; Sappho on Andromache’s marriage and Tithonus). As we remarked above, such a process of signposted supplementation reflects a key aspect of lyric myth-making: a preference for brief exempla over extensive, continuous narrative. In addition to this phenomenon, however, lyric poetry also features more cases of indexed innovation, instances where tradition is creatively reworked, but legitimised through an appeal to hearsay (Pindar’s numerous connections of past and present; the Attic *skolion* on Harmodius) – an aspect that we already saw developing in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*.
Lyric poets thus built on and developed an allusive device already well-established in archaic epic.

Indeed, from the evidence we have, it is tempting to mark out a neat process of development for indexical hearsay through the ages from Homer to Pindar, centred on an increase in its usage to cite specific texts and to conceal literary innovations, culminating in the poetry of Pindar. The basic contours of such a development are clear, but we should be wary of treating it as too continuous a process. After all, we have already seen possible cases of direct textual citation in the Iliad (on Typhoeus), Odyssey (on Nestor) and Works and Days (on Oath’s birth), near the very start of the (visible) literary tradition. The prevalence of indexes in Pindar, moreover, may to some degree reflect the better survival of his poetry, rather than a substantial shift of gear or watershed moment. It is difficult to draw anything of statistical significance from the evidence we have.

If we had more space or time, we could also look beyond Pindar to explore how indexical hearsay continued to function in Attic drama and the prose writing of historians and philosophers in the fifth and fourth centuries, where a comparable allusivity is in play. Indeed, it is striking that even as literacy and writing began to play an increasingly important role in the preservation and commemoration of literature, this allusive trope maintained a fiction of pure orality: other texts continued to be ‘what people say’, rather than ‘what they write’. And even as poets began to name their contemporaries and predecessors directly, they still regularly employed the vague anonymity of hearsay to signpost their allusions.

Given the endurance and permanence of this phenomenon throughout early Greek literature, even into a time of writing and named authors, it is worth asking what motivated and maintained this allusive strategy. What advantages does it bring ancient poets and their audiences? One answer could be the influence of the epic tradition: appeals to tradition at large in early epic could have established a motif that later poets adopted into their own repertoire.


175 Cf. Schenkeveld (1992) on the prose uses of ἀκούω to mean ‘I read’.
Yet this alone does not seem a satisfactory solution – later poets were not restricted by the burden of their epic inheritance, and nor does this explain why epic poets themselves employed the device so readily. We might then focus on the anonymity of the device: on the one hand, it allowed poets to bolster their claims through the abstract authority of the poetic and mythical past, deriving legitimacy from a monolithic and uncontestable ‘tradition’. Yet on the other, it proved a way of subsuming rival poets into a vague and faceless mass of transmitted words, a means to avoid giving them any direct ‘air time’. Either way, however, it was also a means of fostering a special and direct connection with poetic audiences, flattering them as part of an in-crowd who were familiar with the traditions of myth, with all that people say and tell.

At the very start of the Greek literary record, therefore, indexical hearsay was a well-established and significant allusive tool. Well before the rise of Alexandria and Rome, it was deeply engrained in the archaic grammar of allusion. In the sections that follow, we shall reach similar conclusions about other allusive indexes – those of memory and time. As our evidence continues to accumulate, so too does our need to reconsider our traditional narratives of literary history.
PART III.

POETIC MEMORY
III.1 Introduction

In this section, our focus is the indexical potential of memory, occasions where the reminiscences of narrators or characters in the fictional world coincide with those of a poet’s audience. In later Hellenistic and Roman poetry, this frequently involves an alignment between characters’ autobiographical memories and the external audience’s knowledge of the literary tradition, as when Ovid’s Ariadne recalls her Catullan past (Fast.3.471-76) or Mars quotes his Ennian self (Met.14.812-15).\(^1\) But it can also extend beyond the purely autobiographical to embrace the recollection of more distant literary passages beyond an individual character’s fictional life: in Apollonius’ Argonautica, Medea’s recollection of the pleasures of life simultaneously recalls Asclepiades’ epigrammatic description of them (\(\mu νήσατο \mu εν τεοπτνιών \deltaο’ \ ε\’ι \zeta \zetaωιοι, Ap.Rhod.3.813 – \varepsilonν \zeta\zetaωιοι \tauα \τεοπτνια, AP 5.85.3 [HE 818]).\(^2\) Her memory does not index an earlier literary treatment of her own life, but rather an unrelated text on a similar theme.

To this indexical potential of memory, we can also add another sphere of personal cognition: knowledge. Just as characters recall events from the literary tradition, so too do they often ‘know’ or ‘recognise’ things that would strike an audience as familiar from the literary past. In Lucan’s De Bello Civili, a frenzied matron prophetically ‘recognises’ the disfigured trunk of Pompey at the very same time that an audience would recognise the echo of Priam’s own Pompey-like ‘nameless corpse’ from the Aeneid (agnosco, 1.685-86 ~ Aen.2.557-58).\(^3\) And in Ovid’s Metamorphoses, Ulysses’ complaint that Ajax does not ‘know’ the relief-work of Achilles’ shield (neque…novit, Met.13.291) immediately precedes his near quotation of the

---

Homeric shield ecphrasis – there is no doubt where Ulysses and Ovid ‘know’ these details from (Met.13.292-94 ~ Il.18.483-90).

In comparison to the indexical hearsay of the last section, these allusive gestures are dependent not on the external and circulating news of others, but rather on the first-hand, embedded experiences of literary characters. Yet they function in a very similar manner, prompting an audience to recall their own ‘memories’ of the literary tradition. In the chapters that follow, I shall explore how these allusive tropes are already manifest in our earliest Greek poetry.

Before turning to archaic poetry, however, it is worth acknowledging that later Greek writers often employ the language of memory and knowledge when quoting other works, a practice which demonstrates their strong indexical potential, at least by the classical period. In a fragment of Philippides, a poet of New Comedy, a quotation of Euripides’ Steneboea is preceded by the instruction to ‘remember’ Euripides’ (Εὐριπιδοῦ μνήσθητι, fr.18 K–A), while in Aristophanes’ Frogs, Dionysus explicitly claims that he is ‘recollecting’ an iambic verse of Hipponax (ἰαμβὸν Ἰππώνακτος ἀνεμιμνησκόμην, Ran.661). In Plato’s Meno, Socrates similarly precedes his quotation of Theognis by asking his interlocutor whether he ‘knows’ what the poet says (οἶσθ’, Meno 95c-d). And the scholars of Athenaeus and the ancient scholia frequently introduce texts, cross-references and mythical figures with the language of memory. Most significant of all, however, is the famous fragment of Antiphanes’ Poiesis, which thematises the activation of memory and knowledge in a literary context: the speaker claims that the subject matter of tragedy is so ‘familiar’ to the audience (οἱ λόγοι ὑπὸ τῶν θεατῶν εἰσιν ἐγνωσισμένοι, fr.189.2-3), that a poet need only ‘remind’ them of it (ὡσθ’ ὑπομνῆσαι μόνον | δεῖ τὸν ποιητήν, fr.189.4-5), and that as soon as someone says ‘Oedipus’, ‘they know all the rest’ (τὰ δ’ ἀλλὰ πάντα ἰσασίν, fr.189.6). By the classical period, the

---

4 Cf. too Met.15.365 (cognita) ~ Georg.4.538-47 (Solodow (1988) 228); Met.9.508 (novi) ~ Od.10.7, Euripides Aeolus; also Fantuzzi (2004) 217-18 on novi/γιγνώσκω marking engagement with the bucolic Cyclops.

5 Dionysus’ memory may be humorously faulty: Σ Ran.661 ascribes the quoted verse to Ananius (fr.1 IEG), not Hipponax: Rotstein (2010) 201-4.

6 E.g. Σ Ar.Eq.762a(I) (μέμνηται); Σ Ap.Rhod.1.996-7 (μέμνηται); Athen.1.5b (μέμνηται), 7.309e (μνημεύεται).
discourse of recollection and knowledge was thus intimately integrated into the practice of literary citation and referencing. In the chapters that follow, I shall argue that we can trace this discourse even further back in time to the poetry of the archaic period.
III.2 Epic Recall

Memory is central to early Greek poetics, both as a prerequisite for its production and as a primary function of its performance.\(^7\) Oral poets’ very ability to recall, embellish and creatively retell their inherited tradition is heavily reliant on their own powers of memory,\(^8\) while a key goal of the epic genre itself is to preserve the memory of the heroic exploits of a bygone era, acting as a community’s storehouse for past deeds which articulate shared values and ethics.\(^9\) In a primarily oral society, where such a past could not easily be recorded, preserved and consulted through writing, epic song was a major vehicle for the transmission of a society’s (ever-changing) heritage, values and identity: a vehicle for the transmission and preservation of cultural memory.

The centrality of memory to early Greek epic is readily apparent from our extant texts, especially in the prominent position they attribute to the Muses as inspirers of epic song, the daughters of ‘Memory’ herself (Mnemosyne). In the famous invocation at the start of the Catalogue of Ships in \textit{Iliad} 2, the narrator admits that he could not name all those who came to Troy unless the Muses were to ‘recall’ them for him (\(\mu\nu\nu\sigma\alpha\iota\theta'\), \textit{Il}.2.492), while Hesiod’s \textit{Theogony} begins with a miniature Hymn to the Muses which includes a prominent description of their birth from Mnemosyne (\textit{Theog}.53-62), as well as an emphasis on their powers of knowledge (\(\iota\delta\mu\varepsilon\nu\ldots\iota\delta\mu\varepsilon\nu\), \textit{Theog}.27-28). Crucially, the Muses are a distinctive feature of Greek poetry, with no parallel in Near Eastern traditions, where literary creation and preservation were instead associated with writing.\(^{10}\) Their prominence in Homer onwards highlights the

---


\(^8\) Notopoulos (1938) 465-73; Calame (2011) 356.


core and unique role of memory in early Greek poetics. Indeed, it is such a central concept that ‘remembering’ in epic often stands as a synonym for ‘singing’.\footnote{11}

This emphasis on recollection is further reflected in epic’s concern to preserve κλέα ἀνδρῶν, as well as epic characters’ own interest in their future renown and immortality (§II.2: 59). Heroes aspire to be remembered for all posterity, especially by means of a prominent tomb,\footnote{12} or by the report of others (Od.8.241-45). And even poets themselves wish to be ‘remembered’, like the narrator in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo (μνήσασθ’, HhAp.3.167)

Set against this emphasis on memory, however, early Greek poetry also displays a reciprocal concern and almost perverse fascination with its opposite: forgetfulness. Material sites of memory repeatedly fail to preserve an individual’s kleos for very long in the Iliad and Odyssey,\footnote{13} and Homer’s heroes constantly fight against the overbearing threat of oblivion. In the Iliad, Achilles has a famous choice between an anonymous long life and the renown of a heroic, premature death, while in the Odyssey, Odysseus’ fame is reliant on his safe nostos, which is repeatedly threatened during his adventures. He is repeatedly ‘recalled’ by other characters, almost in an attempt to keep him and his story ‘alive’,\footnote{14} but numerous obstacles raise the threat of forgetfulness, including the Lotus-Eaters (Od.9.93-97), Circe (Od.10.234-36), and especially the Sirens, whose very ability to enchant passers-by mirrors the power of song (Od.12.39-46).\footnote{15} In the Greek world, moreover, Helen’s Egyptian drugs in Sparta threaten obscurity, bringing a ‘forgetfulness of every ill’ (κακῶν ἐπίληθον ἅπαντων, Od. 4.219-30),\footnote{16}

\footnote{11} Moran (1975); Richardson (1974) 325; Metcalf (2015) 142.
\footnote{12} Il.7.84-91; Od.1.239-41 = 14.369-71, 11.75-76, 24.32-34, 24.84.
\footnote{14} Penelope (μεμνημένη, Od.1.343; μέμνητ’, Od.24.195: Mueller (2007)); Telemachus (μνησθήναι, Od.4.118); Menelaus (μεμνημένος, Od.4.151); Phoetius (μνησαμένῳ, Od.20.205); Antinous (μνήμων, Od.21.95). Many characters are also encouraged by others to remember him, including Nestor (μνήσαι, Od.3.101), Zeus (μνήσαι, Od.4.765), and Athena-Mentor (μνήσαι, Od.22.208).
\footnote{15} Pucci (1979) 126-28.
while even the Muses are agents of oblivion as much as recall: in the *Theogony*, Mnemosyne is said to have given birth to them specifically as ‘forgetfulness of evils and relief from anxieties’ (λησμοσύνην τε κακῶν ἀμπαυμά τε μεμηράων, *Theog*.55), while a poet who sings ‘quickly forgets his sorrows and does not remember his anguish at all’ (αἶψ᾿ ὅ γε δυσφροσυνέων ἐπιλήθεται ουδὲ τι κηδέων | μέμνηται, *Theog*.102-3). This reflects a key ambivalence surrounding ancient perceptions of the power of song: it could commemorate and memorialise some deeds, but also omit others, consigning them to oblivion.

Memory and its opposite, therefore, were of central importance for early Greek poetry. Modern scholars, too, have been no less interested in exploring the power and significance of memory’s various facets in these poems, bolstered by the recent explosion of interest in memory studies in the humanities more generally. Especially productive has been the application of concepts from cognitive psychology to both Homeric epics, alongside the fruitful examination of the social and cultural features of remembrance. Yet more can still be said on the self-reflexive and indexical character of memory in early Greek epic. Already in these texts, as in later Graeco-Roman literature, memory and knowledge play an important indexical role, a means of both gesturing to and incorporating other traditions.

In the sections that follow, we shall again begin with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, exploring how the language of memory, forgetting and knowledge serves to signpost both inter- and intra-textual references within each poem (§III.2.1-2). After establishing the general contours of this pattern, we shall turn to cases in which characters’ reminiscences appear to involve tendentious and partial misrememberings of tradition (§III.2.3), as well as those in which characters exhibit an uncanny and proleptic knowledge of future events (§III.2.4). We shall close by exploring the evidence for indexical memory elsewhere in archaic Greek epic and then draw some more general conclusions (§III.2.5).

---

19 Martin (1989) 77-88; Grethlein (2008); Nikkanen (2012).
III.2.1 Intertextual Memories

In both Homeric poems, characters repeatedly recall events from their own past which were also familiar from the larger mythical tradition. Whenever a character remembers or reminds another of an earlier experience, the audience are similarly invited to recall their own knowledge of this episode. As we shall see, such indexical memory is generally less agonistic than the appeals to hearsay we encountered in the previous section, but it nevertheless serves an encyclopaedic and incorporative function: through characters’ reminiscences, the poet gestures to the broader web of tradition, within which he situates his own work.

On the human plane, such cases of indexical memory point to recent episodes of the Trojan war expedition. When Peisistratus reminisces about his brother Antilochus in *Odyssey* 4, his speech is indexed not only by an appeal to anonymous hearsay (φασί, *Od*. 4.201, §II.2.1: 62-63), but also by the narrator’s introductory emphasis on his act of memory (*Od*. 4.187-89):

μνήσατο γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀμύμονος Ἀντιλόχοιο,
τόν ὶ’ Ἠοὺς ἔκτεινε φαεινῆς ἀγλαὸς υἱός.
τοῦ ὅ γ’ ἐπιμνησθεὶς ἔπεα πτερόεντ’ ἀγόρευεν·

Peisistratus’ recollection of past events within the fictional world of the narrative precipitates and coincides with the audience’s own recall of a familiar episode from the Trojan war tradition: as we have noted before (§II.2.1: 62-63), Antilochus’ death was narrated in the *Aethiopis* of the Epic Cycle (*Aeth*. arg.2c). But the tradition evidently pre-dated it: Memnon’s periphrastic introduction here by the matronymic ‘son of Dawn’ (Ἠοὺς...ὑιός) suggests that he was a familiar figure of myth, while the traditionality of the whole *fabula* is also

---


presupposed by Iliadic allusions to it. Indeed, when Peisistratus goes on to note that Menelaus surely knew Antilochus (ἰδμεναὶ, Od.4.200), the overall message is reinforced: Antilochus was a familiar and memorable figure of myth.

More often in Homer, however, such instances of indexical memory occur in two-person dialogues in which one individual challenges the other’s memory of the past. When Achilles encounters Aeneas in Iliad 20, for example, he asks his adversary whether he remembers the previous time (ἡδη...καὶ ἄλλοτε) he was routed from the foothills of Mt. Ida (II.20.187-96):

�单 σὲ γε φημι καὶ ἄλλοτε δουρὶ φοβῆσαι. ἡ οὐ μέμνῃ ὅτε πέρ σε βοῶν ἀπο μοῦνον ἐόντα σεύα κατ’ Ἰδαῖον ὁρέων ταξέσσοι πόδεσσι καρπαλίμως; τότε δ’ οὐ τι μετατροπαλίζεο φεύγων. ἐνθὲν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησὸν ὑπέκφυγε· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν πέρασα μεθορμηθείς σὺν Αθήνῃ καὶ Διὶ πατρί, ληϊάδας δὲ γυναίκας ἀποκλεόν ήμαρ ἀποφανεῖται ἢγον· ἀτάρ σὲ Ζεὺς ἐρρύσατο καὶ θεοὶ ἄλλοι. ἀλλ’ οὐ νῦν ἐρύεσθαι ὡς ἐνὶ θυμῷ βάλλεαι.

Achilles invites Aeneas to recall their previous encounter as a parallel for the present, establishing expectations about the outcome of this latest meeting. Besides its paradigmatic force, however, Achilles’ recollection also invites Homer’s audience to recall their own memory of this episode from the larger epic tradition. According to Proclus’ summary, this encounter featured in the Cypria, alongside Achilles’ sacking of Lyrnessus, Pedasus and other surrounding settlements (Cypr.arg.11c-d). And here too, there are good grounds for supposing that this encounter, like much else in the Cypria, pre-existed the Iliad. Achilles’ raids

---


23 Cf. Moran (1975) 201-2; Currie (2016) 141.

appear early in art\textsuperscript{25} and were a crucial element in the larger \textit{fabula} of the Trojan war, as the occasion for Achilles’ acquisition of Briseis as his concubine. Within the \textit{Iliad}, too, they are a recurring point of reference: the narrator mentions how Achilles had previously captured two sons of Priam, Isus and Antiphus, while they were out herding their sheep (\textit{Il}.11.104-6, 111-12 – note \textit{ποτ’} and \textit{πάρος}). Within \textit{Iliad} 20 itself, moreover, Aeneas has already offered his own summary of the episode (\textit{Il}.20.89-96):

\begin{quote}
où \ μὲν γὰρ νῦν πρώτα ποδώκεος ἀντ᾽ Ἀχιλῆος στήσομαι, ἀλλʻ ἣδη με καὶ ἄλλοτε δουρὶ φόβησεν ἐξ Ἰὸς, ὅτε βουσίν ἐπήλυθεν ἡμετέρῃσιν, πέοσε δὲ Λυρνησσόν και Πήδασον· αὐτάρ ἐμε Ζεὺς εἰρύσαθ' ὡς μοι ἐπώρσε μένος λαψηρά τε γοῦνα. ἡ γ' ἐδάμην ὑπὸ χερσίν Ἀχιλῆος και Ἀθήνης, ἢ οἱ πρόσθεν ίοῦσα τίθει φάος ἤδε ἐκέλευεν ἐγχεῖ χαλκεῖῳ Λέλεγας καὶ Τρῶας ἐναίρειν.
\end{quote}

Despite Achilles’ polemical suggestion that Aeneas may have forgotten the event, the Trojan is all too mindful of it. Indeed, his account overlaps with that of Achilles in many details, even down to his speedy flight (λαψηρά τε γοῦνα, \textit{Il}.20.93 – \textit{ταχέεσσι πόδεσσι | καρπαλίμως, 20.189-90}), and it is similarly indexed in temporal terms (\textit{οὐ}…\textit{νῦν πρώτα}…, \textit{ἀλλʼ} ἣδη…\textit{καὶ ἄλλοτε}). Given the ‘ cursory manner’ of Aeneas’ account, Anderson has argued that ‘the Iliadic allusions derive from an earlier tradition which was ultimately codified in the \textit{Kypria},\textsuperscript{26} and although he takes this argument no further, additional support for his case can be found in the verbal echoes between Aeneas’ and Achilles’ narratives, which suggest a consistent and uniform \textit{fabula} underlying both passages. The Trojan prince is driven to Mt. Lynnessus (\textit{Λυρνησσόν, 20.92 ~ 191, same sedes}), which Achilles sacks (\textit{πέοσε, 20.92 ~ πέοσα, 20.192}), and he is saved only by Zeus (\textit{Ζεὺς | εἰρύσαθ', 20.92-3 ~ Ζεὺς ἐρρύσατο, 20.194}). Especially significant, however, is the repeated emphasis on Achilles’ routing of Aeneas with his spear (\textit{δουρὶ φόβησεν 20.90 ~ δουρὶ φοβῆσαι, 20.187, same sedes}). These are the only two

\footnotesize *
\end{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{25} A relief amphora from c.650 BCE appears to show Achilles raiding Aeneas’ cattle: Burgess (1996) 83n.29 = (2001a) 247n.70.

\textsuperscript{26} Anderson (1997) 63. Nagy (1979) 265-75 sees a confrontation between the \textit{Iliad} and an \textit{Aeneid} tradition.
appearances of this phrase in extant Greek literature before the Imperial period (Quint.Smyrn.8.150-51), a fact which suggests that the formula could have been specifically associated with the fabula of this episode. By redeploying the phrase twice here, Homer alludes to an established tradition surrounding the early years of the Trojan war and marks the parallel between the two heroes’ present (νῦν, 195) and previous (τότε, 190) encounters. Indeed, this current confrontation proves to be a close replay – or ‘doublet’ – of the earlier meeting. Although Achilles hopes that the gods will not save Aeneas this time (195-96), Poseidon ultimately intervenes to ensure that the Trojan hero escapes alive once more (Il.20.288-339, cf. 20.194).27

When Achilles asks Aeneas whether he can remember this event, therefore, Homer’s audience are invited to draw on their own knowledge of the larger Trojan war tradition. By having the heroes recall their earlier encounter, Homer effectively cites his model for the present scene: Aeneas and Achilles meet again, as they previously had on Mt. Ida. Through the language of memory, Homer gestures to his encyclopaedic control of the whole tradition, replaying an earlier episode with a self-conscious sense of déjà vu.

Such recall of past events can also be activated through the language of knowledge and forgetting. In the Odyssey, Penelope asks Antinous whether he is aware of the time when Odysseus saved his father Eupeithes, after he had joined Taphian pirates (ἠ οὐκ οἶσθ᾿ ὅτε, Od.16.424). Scholars suspect that this episode may have been invented for its immediate context,28 but even if that were true, it builds on the traditional associations of the Taphians as pirates and Odysseus’ allies, details with which not only Antinous but also Homer’s audience would have been familiar.29 In the Odyssean Underworld, Odysseus realises that Ajax has not forgotten the anger he felt because of his defeat in the contest for Achilles’ arms (οὐδὲ θανὼν λήσεσθαι ἐμοὶ χόλου εἵνεκα τευχέων | οὐλομένων, Od.11.554-55), an event that was a

---

27 This episode is also replayed at Il.5.311-17: Aeneas only escapes Diomedes after the intervention of his divine mother, Aphrodite. For Diomedes as an ‘altera persona’ of Achilles: §I.2.2: 41.


central part of his mythical fabula (§II.3.1:93), and again familiar to us from the Cyclic tradition (Aeth.arg.4d; Il.parv.fr.2, arg.1a). In the Iliad, meanwhile, both Achilles and Patroclus are criticised for forgetting the advice they received from their fathers before departing to Troy (σὺ δὲ λήθεαι, Il.9.259, 11.790), nodding to the traditions of pre-war recruitment as attested in the Cypria and elsewhere.30 Through the language of forgetting, memory and knowledge, therefore, the Homeric poet indexes a range of episodes from the wider Trojan war cycle, marking his control of his mythical repertoire.

It is especially on the divine plane, however, that we encounter such cases of indexical memory. Gods, too, can recall recent mythical events, as when Zeus opens the Odyssey by recalling the revenge of ‘far-famed’ Orestes (τηλεκλυτός), introducing an analogy that will underlie the whole poem (μνήσατο, ἐπιμνησθεῖς, Od.1.29-31).31 But more regularly, the gods look back to a more distant age, reflecting their more enduring powers of memory.32 A favourite subject of such divine recollection is the Greek hero Heracles, whose exploits are a recurring presence in Homer, Hesiod and archaic Greek poetry more generally.33 Indeed, the frequency and consistency of his appearances, alongside the developed formulaic system

---

30 For the Phthian embassy, cf. Il.7.127-28, 9.438-40. The specific details in these recollections of paternal advice are often considered the invention of the poet, specifically tailored to the speaker’s immediate context: Willcock (1977) 46-7; West (2011a) 33. Hunter (2018) 146 attractively remarks that the accusation of forgetfulness may index this invention: ‘you do not remember, because this never happened’.


32 Cf. II.2.811-14: they still recognise Myrine’s tomb, which humans merely believe to be a hill.

attached to his name, suggest a well-established tradition surrounding the hero, much of which likely went on to shape or influence the later Heracles epics that we know of. The gods’ frequent recollections of this former age set the current events at Troy in a broader mythological perspective.

In *Iliad* 8, Athena is frustrated by Zeus’ support of the Trojans and complains that he no longer remembers her previous support of his son Heracles (II.8.362-69):

{oùdē τι τῶν μέμνηται, ὁ οἱ μάλα πολλάκις νίόν
teiρόμενον σώσκον ὑπ᾽ Εὐρυςθήνας ἀέθλων.

ητοι ο μέν κλαίεσκε πρὸς οὐρανόν, αὐτάρ ἐμὲ Ζεὺς
τῷ ἐπαλεξήσουσαν ἄπτ᾽ οὐρανόθεν προϊάλλειν.

eι γάρ ἐγὼ τάδε ἣδε ἐνὶ φρεσί πευκαλίμησιν
εὗτε μιν εἰς Ἀειδαο πυλάρταο προούπεμιζεν
ἐξ Ἐρέβευς ἄξοντα κύνα στυγεροῦ Ἀειδαο,
οὐκ ἂν ἐπεξέφυγε Στυγὸς ὕδατος αἰπὰ ῥέεθρα.

Athena recalls how frequently she stood by Heracles’ side: the emphatic adverb μάλα πολλάκις and the pair of iterative verbs (σώσκον, 8.363; κλαίεσκε, 8.364) combine to render Zeus’ ingratitude all the more alarming. But the emphasis on frequency also highlights how traditional an element this is of Heracles’ *fabula*: Athena’s patronage of the hero and his labours are attested throughout archaic Greek epic, while the specific exploit she recalls here, the theft of the dog Cerberus from the Underworld, was also traditional at an early date (*Od*.11.623-26, *Hes. Theog*.310-12). When Athena recalls this episode, therefore, she refers to an episode that

34 Cf. Nilsson (1932) 199; Lang (1983) 149-50; Cairns (2001a) 36. Formulaic system: Burkert (1979) 177n.4. Some scholars reconstruct specific (oral or written) poems on Heracles as the source of these allusions (e.g. Mülder (1910) 117-41; Kullmann (1956b) 25-35; Sbardella (1994); West (2003b) 19-20, (2018)), but I shall stick here with traditions and *fabulae*.


not only Zeus should remember, but also Homer’s external audience, from frequent
(πολλάκις) tellings.

The same is true of other divine recollections of this earlier generation. In the Iliadic
theomachy, Poseidon complains that Apollo no longer remembers the woes that the pair
endured in their year-long service to Laomedon (οὐδὲ νῦ τῶν περ ἐμμέμνηαι, II.21.441-42),
referring to the story of Laomedon’s deceit, which precipitated Heracles’ campaign against
Troy.\footnote{Cf. II.5.638-51, 7.451-53, 20.145-48; Hellanicus fr.26 EGM; Moran (1975) 202-3; West (2011a) 32. As Currie (2016) 141n.188 notes, ‘the article, τὸ κῆτος (II.20.147), implies a familiar episode.’ On parallels between the first and

Earlier in the poem, meanwhile, Zeus accusses Hera of failing to remember when he
hung her up in the air by her feet and bound her wrists with an unbreakable gold band as
punishment for her treatment of Heracles (II.15.18-33). Hera’s enmity against the hero is a well-
established feature of his myth (II.19.95-133, Hes.\textit{Theog}.313-18, 327-32), but Zeus’ passing
reference to Heracles’ visit to Cos (Κόων δ’ εὖ ναιομένην, 15.28) evokes a whole further
episode of that hero’s adventures, in which he almost lost his life against the the Meropes, the
local inhabitants of the island.\footnote{Apollod.\textit{Bibl}.2.7.1; Plut.\textit{Mor}.304c-e; Janko (1992) 191-92; Yasumura (2011) 49-51. The myth is also presupposed

Hera’s hanging, meanwhile, fits into a larger tradition of the
succession myth and potential threats to Zeus’ rule, a major narrative thread that underlies the

In the first book of the poem, we have already heard of Hephaestus’ punishment for
attempting to help his mother in the past (ἤδη...ἄλλοτ’, II.1.590-94), as well as Achilles’
instruction to his mother Thetis to remind Zeus (μνήσασα, II.1.407) of the time when she freed
him from the bonds devised by the other Olympians, a story that he has ‘\textit{often heard}’ her tell
before (πολλάκι...\textit{άκουσα}, II.1.396).\footnote{Cf. Moran (1975) 205 with n.24; Slatkin (1991) 60-62, with n.6.} When Zeus frames his criticism of Hera with references
to memory (ἡ οὖ μέμνῃ, 15.18; τῶν σ’ αὔτες μνήσῳ, 15.31), Homer thus nods to tradition
once more: not only the fabula of Heracles, but also the wider myth of divine discord and past threats to Zeus’ dominion.

In all these cases, therefore, characters’ recollection of their past coincides with and precipitates the audience’s own recall of the same episodes from the larger mythical and literary tradition. Through such acts of recall, the poet maps out the larger contours of myth, against which he situates his own poem. Through such an encyclopaedic vista, he frequently gestures to earlier moments that act as models or doublets for the present myth, including Achilles and Aeneas’ previous encounter, Orestes’ revenge and Heracles’ sack of Troy. These recollections emphasise the inter-connected strands of myth.

III.2.2 Intratextual Memories

In all of these foregoing cases, we have been dealing with an inevitable degree of speculation, reliant on the usual Neoanalytical method of reconstructing potential pre-Homeric traditions from internal or post-Homeric evidence. Many of our examples seem very plausible, but given the state of our evidence, absolute certainty is impossible. Nevertheless, these cases of intertextual ‘poetic memory’ in Homer are supported by instances where memory and knowledge function similarly to index intratextual connections within each poem. Most striking of all is another divine recollection in the Iliadic theomachy. Ares asks Athena whether she remembers the time when she supported Diomedes as he fought against the war-god (II.21.394-99):

\[
\text{τίπτ᾽ αὐτ᾽ ὃ κυνάμυια θεοὺς ἕριδι ξυνελαύνεις θάρσος ἄτον ἔχουσα, μέγας δὲ σε θυμός ἀνήκεν; ή ὦ μέμνη ὅτε Τυδεΐδην Διομήδης ἀνῆκας οὖταμεναι, αὐτὴ δὲ πανόψιον ἐγχος ἐλούσα ἰθὺς ἐμεύ ὄσας, διὰ δὲ χρόα καλόν ἐδαιψάς; τὼ σ᾽ αὖ νῦν ὀϊω ἀποτισέμεν ὄσα ἐοργας.}
\]
With a formula which we have repeatedly encountered as an index of intertextual connections beyond both Homeric poems (Ἡ οὖ μεμνη ὅτε), Ares invites Athena (and the audience) to ‘recall’ an episode from earlier within the very same poem: Diomedes’ aristeia in Iliad 5. In that episode, Diomedes had been advised by Athena only to fight Aphrodite among the immortals (II.5.124-32), an injunction which he claimed he was still mindful of when later reproached by the same goddess (μέμνημαι, II.5.818). Despite his recollection of these instructions, however, both he and Athena soon disregarded them as Diomedes went on to attack Ares, the god of war himself, and wounded him with the help of Athena (II.5.855-59):

δεύτερος αὖθ᾽ ὡρμᾶτο βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης
ἐγχεῖ χαλκείῳ· ἐπέρεισε δὲ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη
νειάτον ἐς κενεῶν ὅθι ζωννύσκετο μίτῃ:
τῇ ὅ ἂ μιν οὕτα τυχὼν, διὰ δὲ χρόα καλὸν ἠδαψεν,
ἐκ δὲ δόρυ σπάσεν αὕτης.

In Iliad 21, Ares explicitly invites Athena to recall this episode. The recollection is reinforced verbally by the repetition of οὕτα (II.5.858) in οὔταμεναι (II.21.396) as well as the more pointed repetition of the whole phrase διὰ δὲ χρόα καλὸν ἠδαψεν/ἐδαψας (II.5.858 ~ II.21.398), an expression which is found nowhere else in extant Greek literature. The uniqueness of the phrase suggests that we could even treat it as a direct quotation of the earlier scene, or at least a quotation from a specific and recognisable fabula of Diomedes’ themachic hybris. After all, the frequency with which later writers refer to the ‘Aristeia of Diomedes’ as an independent and recognisable part of the epic suggests that it would have been a self-standing and familiar episode of tradition. This intratextual example, in which we can actively point to the incident recalled, lends strength to other cases noted above where we no longer have an early epic treatment of the episode in question. Events both beyond and within the poem are ‘recalled’ in the same manner, suggesting the continuum of larger mythological traditions. Specifically
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43 On further thematic parallels between these scenes: Richardson (1993) 10.
44 E.g. ἐν Διομήδεος ἀριστείῃ, Hdt.2.116 (~ II.6.289-92); ἐν τῇ τοῦ Διομήδους ἀριστείᾳ, Σ II.8.385-7α1 (~ II.5.734-36); κἄν τῇ Διομήδους ἀριστείᾳ, Σ II.11.90-8 (~ II.5.159-64); Διομήδους ἀριστεία, Eust.II.511.8 = II.1.2 VdV.
III.2.2 Intratextual Memories

‘Iliadic’ events are treated no differently than those belonging to other parts of the Trojan war tradition. All episodes are conceived as different paths, οἶμαι, within the larger network of song.\(^45\)

Indeed, this conclusion can be strengthened by numerous other back-references within individual poems, which are similarly flagged through the language of memory and knowledge, tying the threads of the narrative together. In the *Iliad*, Diomedes’ charioteer Sthenelus does not forget the instructions he had received from Diomedes a short while earlier to steal Aeneas’ horses (οὐδ’ ὦιός Καπανής ἔληθετο συνθεσιάων, *Il*.5.319 ~ *Il*.5.259-73), while in the *Odyssey*, Odysseus *does* forget Circe’s advice that Scylla cannot be fought or defended against and vainly arms against her (λανθανόμην, *Od*.12.226-27 ~ *Od*.12.119-20). In *Iliad* 9, meanwhile, Diomedes remarks that ‘the young and old of the Argives know all this’, that he was earlier rebuked by Agamemnon (ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἔσας’ Ἀργείων νέοι ἠδὲ γέροντες, *Il*.9.35-36), a back-reference to ‘Agamemnon’s ill-judged censure’ of Tydeus’ son in *Iliad* 4 (*Il*.4.368-400).\(^46\) Notably here, Diomedes marks this intratextual knowledge as familiar to the whole community through the totalising polar expression ‘young and old’.\(^47\) It is knowledge shared by everyone, not only Diomedes’ internal audience, but also Homer’s external one. Such intratextual links connect small chains of narrative together, inviting audiences to recall recent episodes in the plot and more clearly follow their development.\(^48\)

At times, this intratextual function of memory even appears to draw self-conscious attention to the structuring of the narrative itself. At the start of *Odyssey* 5, for example, Athena ‘remembers’ the many woes of Odysseus (μνησαμένη *Od*.5.6) and bemoans how nobody any longer remembers him (οὐ τις μέμνηται *Od*.5.11-12), repeating the words of Mentor at *Od*.2.233-34. Such a repeated emphasis on the failure to remember Odysseus in the poem’s
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opening books may self-consciously draw attention to the narrative delay of the ‘Telemachy’
that dominates Odyssey 1-4, with its unexpected focus on Ithaca and Telemachus, rather than
Odysseus. After these opening four books, it is indeed as if the poet and audience have
themselves ‘forgotten’ the poem’s alleged protagonist.

More significant, however, is the manner in which this indexical function of memory
conveys the sense that events within each Homeric poem are already becoming traditional,
joined to the larger map of tradition. In Iliad 1, for example, Achilles begins his summary of
events to his mother by remarking, ‘You know. Why should I tell the tale to you who know
all the details?’ (οἶσθα τί τοι ταύτα ἴδου Πάντ’ ἄγορεύω; Il.1.365) – a question that not
only marks Thetis’ privileged divine knowledge, but also self-consciously acknowledges the
audience’s familiarity with his coming words; they have already heard the story that he is
about to repeat (II.1.6-349). At points, characters even consider the future recall of their
contemporary events, looking ahead to the reception of Homeric song: when Agamemnon tells
Achilles that ‘long will the Achaeans, I think, remember the strife between me and you’
(Ἀχαιοὺς δηρὸν ἐμῆς καὶ σῆς ἔριδος μνήσεσθαι ὦ, Il.19.63-64), he lays implicit claim to
the preservation of the Iliad itself, with its opening topic of the quarrel between the two
warriors (ἐρίσαντε, Il.1.6). Similarly, Hector claims that the Greeks will ‘remember’ the
-consuming fires around their ships (μνημοσύνη, Il.8.181), implicitly pointing to the
immortalising power of Homer’s own narrative to preserve and commemorate this significant
turning point in the narrative. In the Odyssey, meanwhile, Odysseus suspects that ‘these
dangers, too, I think, we shall someday remember’ (μνήσεσθαι, Od.12.212) – a claim that

\[49\] Cf. Σ Od.1.284d: ‘Since the Odyssey does not have sufficient variety in itself, the poet makes Telemachus go to
Sparta and Pylos so that much Iliadic material may be mentioned in passing [ἐν παρεκβάσεσι].’

\[50\] For a similar ‘narrative wink’ of a character’s absence, cf. Kozak (2017) 47 on Il.5.472-76.

\[51\] Cf. de Jong (1985) 11, comparing Odysseus’ words at Od.12.450-54: τί τοι τάδε μυθολογεύω; ἣδη γὰρ
tο...ἐμυθεόμην (~ Od.7.241-97: Heubeck (1989) 143).

\[52\] Cf. Moran (1975) 209.

\[53\] Cf. Nagy (1979)17 §3n.2, who notes that this memorialisation is effectively achieved when the narrator later
invokes the Muses to tell how fire first came upon the Greeks’ ships (II.16.112-13).
could equally highlight the future poetic fame of his Apologoi, just as the Phaeacians’ repeated appeals that Odysseus ‘remember’ them might point to their preservation in song (Alcinous: μεμνημένος, Od.8.244; Arete: μεμνημένος, Od.8.431; Nausicaa: μνήσῃ, Od.8.462). Poetic memory, therefore, is not only about gesturing to other traditions and poems which the poet subsumes within his own work, but also a means for Homer to mark out his own place in this tradition – carving out his own space and claiming that future generations too will remember the events that he narrates, just as he and his characters remember other events of the mythical past.

III.2.3 Selective Recall

In many of the cases that we have explored above, indexical memory gestures to a wider canon of myth, incorporating broader traditions and details that reflect on the present poem. These signposts often introduce allusions that seem less agonistic than many of the instances of indexical hearsay that we have explored before. But indexical memory is not entirely free from agonistic posturing. We have already noted the competitive aspect in characters’ challenges to their addressee’s memories, revealing an anxiety in the fallibility of individuals’ powers of recall. But beyond this, we can highlight cases of indexical recall which introduce a selective and partial reshaping of tradition. We shall explore two such cases here, one from the Iliad and one from the Odyssey. Appeal to memory authorises departure from tradition, while also inviting audience members to supply what is left untold from their own knowledge.

The first passage comes from Odyssey 24, when Agamemnon’s shade addresses the newly deceased Amphimedon’s ghost. After recognising the suitor and inquiring how he died, Agamemnon appeals to their former xenia and asks whether he remembers the time when the Atreidae came to Ithaca to recruit Odysseus for the expedition against Troy, employing the same introductory phrase that we have seen repeatedly before (Od.24.115-19):

η οὖ μέμνη ὅτε κείσε κατήλυθον ύμέτερον δῶ,
Agamemnon’s question evokes the traditions surrounding the mustering of Greek troops for the Trojan expedition, an episode which Amphimedon does indeed remember (μέμνημαι τάδε πάντα, Od.24.122). Like Achilles’ ‘great foray’, these events were also treated in the Cypria (Cypr.arg.5) and alluded to in the Iliad, where Achilles’ recruitment by Nestor and Odysseus is twice mentioned (Il.9.252-59, 11.765-90). Agamemnon’s question here, however, emphasises the specific difficulties involved in recruiting Odysseus, who seems to have shown some reluctance: the whole expedition to win him over took a whole month (μηνὶ...οὔλῳ, 24.118), Odysseus was only persuaded with difficulty (σπουδῇ, 24.119) and deceit (παρπεπιθόντες, 24.119), while the Atreidae had to stay at Amphimedon’s house, rather than at Odysseus’ own, suggesting some friction in their relationship (24.115). As scholars have noted, this emphasis on Odysseus’ reluctance seems to hint at a specific tradition of Odysseus’ unwillingness to join the Trojan expedition, an episode also familiar to us from the Cypria. In that poem, according to Proclus’ summary, Odysseus refused to join the mission and even feigned madness to avoid it, only to be tricked by Palamedes into revealing his sanity when the life of his son Telemachus was threatened (Cypr.arg.5b). The reason for this reluctance was apparently a prophecy by the seer Halitherses, indicating that Odysseus would not return from Troy until the twentieth year (Od.2.170-76).
The figure of Palamedes is, of course, notably absent from the *Odyssey*, which could suggest that this tale is simply a post-Homeric invention, and perhaps even an embellished extrapolation from this very passage.\(^{59}\) However, aspects of Palamedes’ character suggest a figure of considerable antiquity,\(^{60}\) and one can easily understand why Homer would have muted his presence in the poem: as another figure of cunning and guile who had outwitted even Odysseus, he would be a rival claimant to the title of πολύμητις ἀνήρ. In addition, any mention of Odysseus’ vengeful and deceitful murder of Palamedes (*Cypr.* arg.12b, fr.27) would considerably impair our estimation of the poem’s protagonist. Palamedes’ absence is thus, in all likelihood, a pointed case of Homeric exclusion.\(^{61}\) Agamemnon’s memory of the incident, like Homer’s own, is pointedly selective.

Regardless of Palamedes’ involvement, however, the traditionality of Odysseus’ feigned madness is reinforced by the fact that it reflects a facet of Odysseus’ character that is already well-established in Homer: his devotion to his family.\(^{62}\) On several occasions in the *Iliad*, Odysseus describes himself as the ‘father of Telemachus’ (Τηλεμάχοιο πατήρ, II.2.260, Τηλεμάχοιο φίλον πατέρα, 4.354), uniquely defining himself in terms of his son, rather than the usual heroic practice of one’s father.\(^{63}\) This same concern with family is at the heart of the plough (an ox and a horse/ass) and sowing his fields with salt. Palamedes unmasked the trick either by placing Telemachus before the plough (Hyg. *Fab.* 95; Serv. *ad Aen.* 2.81; Σ Lycoh. *Alex.* 815a, Tzetz. *ad Alex.* 384-86, 818) or by threatening the infant with a sword (Apollod. *Epit.* 3.7; Lucian, *De Domof* 30), as Telephus did Orestes (Eur. *Test.* vb TrGF; Ar. *Them.* 695-764).
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59 Cf. Strabo 8.6.2; Stanford (1963) 82-84. Clua (1985) 74-75n.14 catalogues various views on this Homeric silence.


63 A scholiast apparently took at least one of these phrases as a self-conscious pre-figuring of the *Odyssey* (προοικονομεῖ δὲ τὰ περὶ τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν, Σ II.2.260a; cf. Lentini (2006) 19-92), but given the more general and traditional association of Odysseus and Telemachus (as visible in the recruitment episode), a direct foreshadowing of the *Odyssey* is by no means certain.
recruitment episode, in which Odysseus not only tries to stay at home, but also abandons his ruse to save his son. Both these Iliadic scenes, moreover, can be seen to evoke the context of Odysseus’ maddened ploughing: in Book 2, Odysseus goes on to claim that any man becomes impatient who is parted from his wife even for a single month (ἕνα μῆνα, Il.2.292-93), a sentiment which parallels his initial reluctance to go to the war, especially if ‘one month’ was the traditional duration of his delay (μηνὶ…οὔλῳ, Od.24.118). In Book 4, meanwhile, he has just been rebuked by Agamemnon for not entering the battle more quickly (Il.4.336-48), just as he shirked from battle on Ithaca. As Scodel remarks, by mentioning his son in this context, the poet again ‘links Telemachus with a question of whether Odysseus is eager to fight.’

Although, as ever, certainty is impossible given our limited evidence, it is likely that the tradition of Odysseus’ reluctance and Palamedes’ resolution of the impasse pre-dated the Odyssey. After all, we know from the Hesiodic Catalogue that Odysseus was not bound to participate in the Trojan war by the oath of Tyndareus, unlike Helen’s former suitors (Hes.fr.204.68-84); he thus had more reason to avoid participation than most.

By alluding to the episode through the language of memory, therefore, Agamemnon once more indexes the recollection of another episode from the larger Trojan war tradition. In this case, however, we may also have a case of partial misremembering, and not just because of Palamedes’ omission. As we have seen above, the Homeric epics tread a fine line between the opposite poles of memory and oblivion and any act of memory is always liable to be partial, gradually eroded by the passage of time. In the case of this episode, it is worth noting that, outside the Odyssean underworld (here and Od.11.447-48), Agamemnon is not known to have featured in other early versions of the embassy to Odysseus. According to Proclus (Cypr.arg.5b), the embassy in the Cypria comprised Menelaus, Nestor and Palamedes, while in Apollodorus’ Epitome, Agamemnon is said to have sent a herald to each king, avoiding the dirty work of negotiation himself (Epit.3.6). Judging by other Iliadic scenes, such delegation was his usual modus operandi: he sent the heralds Talthybius and Eurybates to take Briseis from
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64 Scodel (2002) 15-16, noting the aptness of Telemachus’ name here: ‘fighting at a distance’.

Achilles (II.1.318-48), dispatched Phoenix, Ajax and Odysseus to speak on his behalf in the embassy to Achilles (II.9), and delegated the initial pre-war recruitment of Achilles to Nestor and Odysseus (II.9.252-59, 11.765-90).\textsuperscript{66} Later in Apollodorus’ Epitome, meanwhile, it is Menelaus, Odysseus and Talthybius who go to Cyprus to recruit Cinyras, the local king who offers a gift of breastplates to the pointedly ‘absent’ Agamemnon (Ἀγαμέμνονι...οὐ παρόντι, Epit.3.9; cf. II.11.20-23 for this gift). In the case of Odysseus’ recruitment too, it is thus likely that Agamemnon did not traditionally play a direct role.\textsuperscript{67} Agamemnon’s ‘recollection’ here, therefore, appears to rewrite tradition, effacing any memory of Palamedes and substituting Agamemnon in his place.\textsuperscript{68}

For an audience versed in tradition, however, Agamemnon’s indexical appeal to memory would encourage recollection of this suppressed detail. Just as Agenor’s indexical φασί effaces the tradition of Achilles’ immortality in the Iliad (II.21.569, §II.2.2: 67-70), so too does Agamemnon’s reminiscence conceal Palamedes’ role in a cloud of forgetfulness, subtly acknowledging the Odyssey’s partisan presentation of events. The appeal to memory invites audiences to recall this omitted detail and acknowledge Homer’s more positive presentation of Odysseus. Memory, therefore, just like hearsay, not only marks allusive references, but also

\textsuperscript{66} In the Cypria, Odysseus, Phoenix and Nestor recruited Achilles (Cypr.fr.19). Agamemnon’s art of delegation is not restricted to diplomacy: Achilles complains that he similarly does nothing in battle but retains the lion’s share of booty (II.1.158-68, 9.328-33). On Agamemnon’s characterisation: Taplin (1990); Porter (2018).

\textsuperscript{67} Our only other evidence for Agamemnon’s involvement comes in several late sources which were presumably influenced by the Odyssey: Hyg.Fab.95; Quint.Smyrn.5.191-94 (the indexical use of memory reinforces the likely connection with Homer’s own ‘recollection’: ἐκ τῶν ἔξελαθον, ὅτ’, 5.191. For such a chain of indexical memory, cf. Virg.Ecl.9.52 (memini) – Callim.Epigr.2 (ἐμνήσθην) – Heraclitus 1.8 HE (μναμόσυνον). Contrast Palamedes in Accius, Ajax 109-14 (= Cic.Off.3.26.98); Ov.Met.13.34-42; Σ Soph.Phil.1025; Serv. ad Aen.2.81; Σ Stat.Achil.1.93-94; Tzet. ad Lycoph.Alex.384-86, 818; Lucian, De Domō 30; Philostr.Her.33.4; Myth.Vat.I.35; Myth.Vat.II.200. Compare the competing traditions as to whether Agamemnon took Briseis in person or through heralds, evidenced in both the Iliad and vase painting: Lowenstam (1997) 39-44; Dué (2002) 28-30.

\textsuperscript{68} Cf. Heubeck (1992) 372, who also suspects that the guest-friendship between Agamemnon and Amphimedon’s father, Melaneus, is a Homeric invention; cf. Jones (1992) 78-9. This example of selective memory would support Gazis’ case for a distinctive ‘Poetics of Hades’ (2018), in which the Underworld fosters alternative and partisan accounts of the epic past.
signposts particularly contentious points of tradition, inviting audiences to recall other, competing versions.

A similarly selective treatment of the mythical past is visible in the *Iliad*. As the Greek army start disbanding in response to Agamemnon’s ‘testing’ speech in *Iliad* 2, Odysseus rallies them by recalling an event from before the start of the war (*Il*.2.299-304):

τλῆτε, φίλοι, καὶ μείνατ’ ἐπὶ χρόνον, ὄφρα δαώμεν

ἡ ἐτεὸν Κάλχας μαντεύεται, ἥ και οὐκί.

ἐν γὰρ δὴ τοῦδε ἰδοὺν ἔνι φρεσίν, ἐστὲ δὲ πάντες

μάρτυροι, οὐς μὴ κῆρες ἔβαν θανάτοι φέρουσαν

χθιζά τε καὶ πρωίζ’, ὅτ’ ἐς Αὐλίδα νῆες Ἀχαιῶν

ἡγερέθοντο κακὰ Πριάμῳ καὶ Τρωσὶ φέρουσαν.

He goes on to recall an omen that they witnessed while sacrificing to the gods at Aulis: a terrible blood-red-backed snake appeared near the altar and devoured eight sparrow chicks alongside their mother, before disappearing or being turned to stone (*Il*.2.305-20).\(^{69}\) Calchas immediately interpreted this omen to mean that the Greeks would sack Troy in the tenth year of the war, a prophecy that Odysseus recalls now to stop the Achaeans disbanding the war effort on the cusp of victory (*Il*.2.321-32). As scholars have long recognised, this event appears to have been a well-established feature of the pre-war tradition.\(^{70}\) Like many of the episodes we have discussed above, it was treated in the *Cypria* (*Cypr.arg.6*). And already in *Iliad* 1, the importance and traditionality of Calchas’ pre-war prophecies have been suggested by his introduction as the man who guided the Greek ships to Troy with his art of prophecy (*Il*.1.71-72) and Agamemnon’s scathing criticism of his ever unfavourable prophecies (*Il*.1.106-8).\(^{71}\) By introducing his account of Aulis as something which he and his audience have witnessed
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\(^{71}\) For the possible allusion to Iphigenia’s sacrifice at Aulis: §IV.2.1: 195.
III.2.3 Selective Recall

(μάρτυροι) and know (ιδμεν), Odysseus reinforces the sense that this is indeed a familiar and traditional episode,²² an impression strengthened by a string of further indexical markers: the temporal phrase χθιζα τε και πρωιζ’ ὅτε (Il.2.303) marks the event as fresh in the Greeks’ memories (‘it seems just like yesterday’),²³ while Calchas goes on to predict that the fame of this omen will never die (κλέος οὔ ποτ’ ὀλεῖται, Il.2.325), a phrase that not only self-referentially marks the Iliad’s role in preserving that κλέος,²⁴ but also the fame and reputation that the tale has already acquired in tradition. Indeed, by recalling events on Aulis, the poet paves the way for the subsequent Catalogue of Ships (Il.2.494-779), a passage which evokes the initial mustering of the Greek contingent at Aulis.²⁵

There is one detail, however, that complicates the simplicity of Odysseus’ appeal to knowledge. According to Proclus’ summary of the Cypria, this snake and sparrow portent took place many years before the Greeks even reached Troy, during the army’s first gathering at Aulis. Rather than immediately reaching Troy after this mustering, they mistakenly landed in Mysia, attacked Telephus and his men, and returned home after being scattered by a storm (Cypr.arg.7).²⁶ Proclus does not specify the time frame of this first abortive ‘Teuthranian’ expedition, but according to Apollodorus, it added an extra ten years to the whole expedition: the Greeks set out to Mysia in the second year after Helen’s rape, and only gathered again in Aulis eight years later, where they were helped by Telephus’ local knowledge to reach Troy (Apollod.Epit.3.18-20). Scholars have long debated whether these events are presupposed by the Iliad.²⁷ Their details seem to have been well-established at an early date: Telephus is mentioned in passing as the father of Eurypylus in the Odyssey (Od.11.519-20), his birth and flight from the Greeks are narrated in the Hesiodic Catalogue (Hes.fr.165), and his encounter
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²⁵ West (2011a) 32-33, 111-13. Significantly, Aulis is one of the very first places named in the catalogue (Il.2.496).
²⁶ For this expedition as a doublet of the Trojan War: Currie (2015) 290.
with Achilles appears to have been treated in the *Little Iliad* (*Il.Parv.fr.4*). In recent years, moreover, Archilochus’ Telephus elegy (*fr.17a*) has added further evidence that the myth was a familiar part of the epic tradition by at least the seventh century. Yet the *Iliad* is conspicuously silent on this episode: it makes no direct mention of Telephus, and it is Calchas – not Telephus – who is said to have guided the ships to Troy through his own art of divination (*Il.1.71-72*). In the *Odyssey*, moreover, these extra ten years are incompatible with the poem’s internal time-frame, in which Odysseus returns to Ithaca after twenty years, ten spent wandering and ten at Troy. Even so, however, there is one detail in the *Iliad* that seems to presuppose the Teuthranian expedition: Helen’s complaint that she has now been in Troy for twenty years (ἐεικοστὸν ἔτος, *Il.24.765-66*), a total that is difficult to explain without presupposing the additional ten-year delay in Mysia (λέγεται τὸν πόλεμον εἰκοσαετῆ γενέσθαι, *Epit.3.18*). It is only a small hint, but it is enough to suggest that the audience of the *Iliad* could have been aware of the Teuthranian campaign.

In that case, we should ask how this larger tradition affects our interpretation of Odysseus’ recall of Calchas’ prophecy in *Iliad* 2. With the knowledge of hindsight, it seems that Calchas’ calculation only determined how long the Greeks would spend in Troy once they had actually arrived there, but this was not the only possible way of interpreting his words. Like
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79 νῆεσσ’ ἤγειστ’ Ἀχαιῶν Ἴλιον εἰσώ, *Il.1.71*. Contrast: ὡς ἤγειστον γενηρόμενον τῶν ἄπτεν Ἴλιον πλούτι, *Cypr.arg.7d*. However, these versions are not necessarily mutually exclusive: in Apollodorus’ *Epitome*, Telephus shows the course to steer, and Calchas confirms the accuracy of his information through his art of divination (*Epit.3.20*).


81 Kullmann (1960) 195-96 further suggests that the combination of πάλιν- and ἄψ in *Il.1.59-60* (reading πάλιν πλαγχθέντας instead of παλιμπλαγχθέντας) might presuppose a former return, that from Mysia: this is attractive, although not the most natural interpretation of the Greek.
many ancient oracles and prophecies, Calchas’ speech is misleading and ambiguous. The

crucial word is the adverb αὖθι (ὡς ἡμεῖς τοσσαῦτ᾽ ἔτεα πτολεμίξομεν αὖθι, Ι.Ι.2.328): taken

with its locative meaning (‘there’), it indicates that the Greeks will fight for ten years in Troy,

and so is fully compatible with the Teuthranian expedition before that time. However, if we

foreground its temporal meaning (‘forthwith/immediately’), the prophecy tells that the Greeks

will fight for ten years from the moment of the portent, a time-frame that leaves no space for

the Teuthranian campaign. Within the immediate context of Ιλιάδ 2, however, evoking a

prophecy that preceded a failed and lengthy expedition is not especially auspicious. Indeed,

as Hunter has remarked, if ‘the audience of the Ιλιάδ were aware that this portent was elsewhere

connected with an abortive first Trojan expedition, then this can only have increased a sense

that Odysseus was manipulating “the facts” for rhetorical effect.’\textsuperscript{82} Odysseus’ evocation of

knowledge, like Agamemnon’s of memory, is pliable and selective. He avoids explicit mention

of the many years of hardship endured even before they reached Troy, but in evoking the

communal knowledge of his Greek audience, he invites Homer’s external audience to recall

this other episode, with all its additional baggage.

III.2.4 Proleptic Knowledge

Mortal characters’ repeated references to memory, knowledge and forgetting thus had a strong

indexical potential in both Homeric poems, triggering an audience’s recall of other episodes

and moments of the larger tradition, even those that had been suppressed or pointedly

reshaped. Before turning to the phenomenon in the wider epic tradition, however, it is worth
dwelling on a distinctive aspect of indexical knowledge: the tendency for Homer’s characters
to exhibit knowledge which transcends the expected limits of their immediate circumstances,
displaying an uncanny familiarity with events of the mythical future.

\textsuperscript{82} Hunter (2018) 140n.10.
A simple example of this phenomenon occurs in *Iliad* 10. After Diomedes has chosen Odysseus to accompany him on his night mission, the Ithacan hero insists that Diomedes should not say too much about him, since ‘you are saying these words among Argives who know (εἰδόσι γὰρ τοι τὰῦτα μετ’ Ἀργείως ἀγορεύεις, *II*.10.250). As Alden has noted, ‘[w]hat Odysseus thinks the Argives know on this occasion is that joint action by himself and Diomedes[s] is a common theme in the tradition, and that he also has a number of solo night missions to his credit’.

Indeed, shortly before this, Diomedes has asked how he could possibly ‘forget’ Odysseus as his ideal partner (πῶς ἂν...λαθοίμην, *II*.10.243), making the very same point. What Alden does not acknowledge, however, is the fact that most of these collaborations and nocturnal missions are events that take place after the action of the *Iliad*. Their joint theft of the Palladium (*II.Parv.arg*.4e) and wounding of Polyxena (*Cyp.fr*.34 *PEG*), as well as Odysseus’ capture of Helenus (*II.Parv.arg*.2a) and disguised expedition in Troy (*II.Parv.arg*.4a-d, *Od*.4.240-58) all take place after the death and burial of Hector; only their joint slaying of Palamedes occurs earlier than the events of the *Iliad* (*Paus*.10.31.2, *Cyp.fr*.27). Odysseus thus presents the Greeks as having an anachronistic knowledge of his expertise and companionship with Diomedes from previous tellings of the myth. Their knowledge becomes aligned with that of Homer’s audience.

Such proleptic knowledge is a recurring element of both Homeric poems. In the Odyssean *Nekyia*, the newly deceased Elpenor already ‘knows’ (οἶδα) what lies in store for Odysseus after his Underworld trip – that he will make a return visit to Circe on Aea before continuing his homeward voyage (*Od*.11.69-70). Such knowledge is strictly anachronistic – and

84 West does not print this fragment in his edition because he follows older scholars in arguing that this episode (ascribed to τὰ κυπριακά) derives not from the epic *Cyпria*, but from another source (a prose treatment of Cyprus?): West (2013) 55n.1, cf. Welcker (1865–82) II.164; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1884) 181n.27; Bethe (1966) 69n.5. But such variation in the poem’s title is common, and I follow those who attach this fragment to the *Cyпria*: Bernabé (1987–2007) I.62, cf. I.38; Burgess (2001a) 242n.19, 252n.116.
85 The pair have already worked closely together earlier in the *Iliad*: e.g. *II*.5.519, 8.92-96. Both are also independently associated with the return of Philoctetes from Lemnos (*II.Parv.arg*.2b; *Apollod.Epit*.3.27; Fenik (1964) 13n.2).
the first that Homer’s audience has heard of this plot detail.\textsuperscript{86} As with the Iliadic Argives’ larger knowledge of Odysseus’ and Diomedes’ teamwork, so too here, Elpenor’s knowledge derives from the larger tradition, or at least from an atemporal familiarity with the whole of the poem that is still in progress. In the \textit{Iliad}, meanwhile, both Hector and Agamemnon, claim with unerring accuracy that they ‘\textbf{know full well}’ that Troy will fall, an event that lies not only in their future, but even beyond the scope of their current poem (\textit{Il}.4.163-65 = 6.447-49):

\begin{quote}
εὖ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄγω τὸδε οἶδα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν·
ἔσσεται ἡμαρ ὅτ’ ἀν ποτ’ ὀλὼλη Ἡλιος ἱρή
καὶ Πρίαμος καὶ λαὸς ἐνυμελίω Πρίαμοι.
\end{quote}

As scholars have noted, these repeated verses provide a complementary and contrasting insight into what Troy’s fate means to both the Greeks and the Trojans, Agamemnon’s assertive declaration serving as a foil for Hector’s later pathetic acknowledgement.\textsuperscript{87} But the knowledge they express here again transcends their usual mortal limits. Agamemnon could be referring back to the Aulis prophecy which Odysseus recalled several books earlier, but Hector, as far as we are aware, has not been privy to any such divine message. Moreover, it is striking that after these verses both speakers utter alternative visions of the future which contradict this confessed ‘knowledge’: Agamemnon goes on to fear that Menelaus will die and the expedition be abandoned in ignominy (\textit{Il}.4.169-82), while Hector changes tune to pray that his son Astyanax may rule mightily over Troy and be deemed superior to his father, a source of continuing joy for his mother – an image incompatible with his previous vision of Troy’s ruin (\textit{Il}.6.476-81).\textsuperscript{88} Their prophetic knowledge almost seems to be a quotation of the mythical tradition, of which they themselves in character remain uncertain.

\textsuperscript{86} Heubeck (1989) 81.


Even more striking than this prophecy of Troy’s general doom, however, is Hector’s dying prediction of Achilles’ future death (II.22.356-60):

\[
\text{ἦ σ᾿ εὖ γιγνώσκων προτιόσσομαι, οὐδ᾿ ἀό ἐμελλον}
\]
\[
\text{πείσειν: ή γάρ σοι γε σιδήρεος ἐν φρεσὶ θυμός.}
\]
\[
\text{φράζεο νῦν, μὴ τοί τι θεῶν μήνιμα γένωμαι}
\]
\[
\text{ήματι τῷ ὅτε κέν σε Πάρις καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων}
\]
\[
\text{ἐσθλὸν ἐόντ᾿ ὀλέσωσιν ἐνὶ Σκαιῆσι πύλησιν.”}
\]

Hector shows an intimate awareness of the details of Achilles’ death, the clearest in the whole poem. Throughout the Iliad, we have received increasingly precise premonitions of Achilles’ fate, especially from his own horse Xanthus (II.19.416-17), and Achilles himself has admitted that he ‘knows full well’ that he will die thanks to the insight of his divine mother Thetis (εὖ νυ τὸ οἶδα καὶ αὐτός ὁ μοί μόρος ἐνθάδ’, 19.421). But Hector’s remarks here transcend such a general awareness to specify the precise details of Achilles’ fate: he will die at the hands of Paris and Apollo at the Scaean gates. Scholars often note that the dying were thought capable of supernaturally prophetic speech in antiquity, the same kind of precognition also displayed by Patroclus when he predicts Hector’s impending demise at Achilles’ hand (II.16.852-54). But it is striking that Hector here, despite his misreading of the future at other times in the poem, matches the record of traditional mythology precisely. In both the Aethiopis and later artistic depictions, it is both Paris and Apollo who are responsible for the hero’s death (Aeth. arg.3a), while the Scaean gates are mentioned in the context of Peleus, Thetis and Achilles in a highly fragmentary papyrus ascribed to the Hesiodic Catalogue

---

89 The recurring emphasis on fate further reinforces the traditionality of this coming death: it is demanded by tradition (μόρσιμον, 19.417; μόρος, 19.421; μοῖρα, 21.110).
90 Σ II.16.854a (citing Plat. Ap.39c); Duckworth (1933) 19; Janko (1992) 420; de Jong (2012) 149. Perhaps we should add Elpenor’s exceptional foreknowledge to this category (Od.11.69-70).
91 Cf. Currie (2016) 144, citing Andersen (1990): Hector is ‘prone to be mistaken about things’.
92 Cf. Duckworth (1933) 32; Currie (2016) 144, further noting the breach of ‘Jörgensen’s law’, the convention that Homer’s mortal characters cannot usually name the specific deity who intervenes in human affairs: Jörgensen (1904).
(Hes.fr.212b.5). Crucially, Hector prefaces this prediction by emphasising his own knowledge (γιγνώσκων), marking his privileged understanding of Achilles’ whole fabula. His knowledge transcends what a character should logically know within the plot.

Besides evoking episodes of the mythical past like indexical memory, therefore, characters’ declarations of knowledge can also have a proleptic edge, nodding forward to future events that reach beyond the strict confines of narrative logic. Such indexing of tradition is even more self-conscious than retrospective nods elsewhere, since it involves characters’ familiarity with events of which they should strictly have no awareness. Characters’ knowledge, therefore, can look both forwards and backwards to incorporate the whole story of the Trojan war.

### III.2.5 Mapping Epic Memory

As the foregoing examples have demonstrated, poetic memory was already a well-established feature of Homeric poetry. Characters’ recollections and knowledge of other episodes in their own fictional world repeatedly map onto the recall of both earlier and later episodes from the epic tradition. Of course, not every mention of ‘memory’ will necessarily have such indexical potential. When characters ‘recall’ general nouns, such as ‘battle’, ‘valour’ and ‘food’, we would be hard pressed to interpret these indexically. But whenever characters recall events or episodes (of the past or future), often alongside a temporal ὅτε, they always appear to refer to a familiar feature of myth.

---


94 E.g. χάρμης, Il.4.222; θούριδος ἀλκῆς, Il.6.112/Od.4.527; νόστου, Il.24.601; νυκτὸς, Il.7.371 νόστου, Il.10.509; κοίτου, Od.16.481. Though even these could be interpreted as marking the resumption of traditional aspects of heroic life: fighting, feasting and sleeping are what these heroes are ‘supposed’ to be doing.
So far, however, we have avoided addressing a potential objection to many of these cases of indexical memory in Homer: the potentially formulaic nature of the language in which they are expressed. Many of the above examples have been introduced by a single recurring phrase, ἦν οὗ μέμνη/οἶσθ' ὅτε, while the close structural parallel between *Od*.1.29-31 and *Od*.4.187-89 might similarly suggest formulaic scaffolding. Even if such language is formulaic, however, this does not negate its indexical potential. Indeed, we could even argue that the traditional resonance of such phrasing lies precisely in its evocation of other stories and characters: traditionally, these phrases function as a longhand ‘cf.’ In the case of *Od*.1.29-31 and *Od*.4.187-89, too, we must stress that these are the only two places in Homer which combine the verbal forms μνήσατο and ἐπιμνησθείς, a fact which should make us hesitate before dismissing them as merely formulaic.\textsuperscript{95} Most crucially, however, it is striking that in every instance where characters recollect other events, Homer is pointing to other familiar elements of tradition – it would be overly cynical to dismiss this as a complete coincidence and deny it any allusive significance. As with Ovid’s Ariadne, all these cases of poetic memory forge a connection between the Homeric narrative and the larger epic tradition of which they form a part. Characters’ recollections of their historical past coincide with and trigger the audience’s recall of the very same events from the mythical tradition.

So far, we have focused almost entirely on the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as rich sources for such cases of poetic memory. When we turn to the broader corpus of early Greek epic, by contrast, it is striking how few parallels we can find. In Hesiod’s *Works and Days*, we only encounter repeated exhortations to Perses to ‘remember’ the instructions he has received (μεμνημένος, *Op*.298, 422, 616, 623, 641, 711, 728; cf. *HhAphr*.283: Aphrodite to Anchises), while in the *Theogony*, characters only remember a handful of events from within the narrative (the Cyclopes Zeus’ favour, ἀπεμνησάντο, *Theog*.503; Zeus Prometheus’ deception, μεμνημένος, *Theog*.504).

\textsuperscript{95} Rarity of repetition is often treated as a key indicator of a word or phrase’s allusive potential: Bakker (2013) 157-69. Oralists have typically taken three instances as ‘the minimum criterion of typicality’: Fenik (1968) 5; Kelly (2007a) 10. In the rest of archaic Greek epic, ἐπιμνησθεῖς occurs nowhere else, and μνήσατο only once elsewhere (*HhDem*.283).
The best non-Homeric example we can perhaps find is in the seventh Homeric Hymn (to Dionysus), which does not launch into its narrative with the usual hymnic relative clause, but rather with an act of recollection: Ἀμφὶ Διώνυσον… | μνήσομαι ὡς ἐφάνη (Hh.7.1-2). The poet begins by ‘remembering’ how Dionysus appeared by the shore in the guise of a young man. Scholars frequently note how this appears to be a simple variant for the imperatival ἐννεπε/ἔσπετε found in other hymnic introductions, but the foregrounding of memory is noteworthy and may suggest that the subsequent story of Dionysus’ capture and revenge was a pre-existing and familiar story. After all, as scholars have suggested, the delocalised and distilled nature of the hymn’s narrative seems to presuppose a fuller pre-existing tradition of Dionysian epiphany and retribution.

These various examples, however, are slim pickings, and indicate how indexical memory is an almost exclusively Homeric phenomenon in our extant remains of early Greek epic, far more so than in the case of indexical hearsay. This is a significant finding, and one that could lend support to those scholars who picture Homeric epic as ‘meta-Cyclic’ or ‘meta-epic’, uniquely positioning itself against larger traditions in an extremely self-conscious manner. However, it is likely that this apparent Homeric monopoly on indexical memory is largely a result of the narrative form of the \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Odyssey}, rather than any unique self-reflexivity. This allusive mode relies especially on the presence of character speech in extended mythical narratives, precisely what we find repeatedly in Homer, but very rarely in the rest of extant archaic Greek epic. If other early Greek epics survived in their entirety, our picture would likely be very different. It is well known that Proclus’ summaries of the Epic Cycle downplay


the significance of character speech, making it very difficult to see what role it played there.\footnote{Sammons (2017) 230-31.}

Rather than claiming ‘poetic memory’ as something originally or distinctively ‘Homeric’, then, it is better to see it as particularly tied to Homer’s blend of the mimetic and diegetic modes.

As we turn now to the limited use of the index in lyric poetry, we shall find further evidence to support this conclusion.
Archaic lyricists were no less concerned with memory and the immortalising aspect of poetry than their epic counterparts. They too fostered a close relationship with the Muses: they boast of being the Muses’ attendants, messengers, spokesmen, helpers and even sons, and they often talk of their poetry or their own poetic ability as a ‘gift of the Muses’. Like epic poets, too, they invoke the Muses as a source of inspiration, to grace them with their presence, to begin a new song, to give lovely charm to their poetry, and – in epic style – to sing on a certain subject or answer a specific question. But it is above all because of the Muses’ ability to know everything (ισθ’...πάντα, Pind.Pae.fr.52f.54-6) and to bestow metaphorical immortality in song that they are often summoned, thanks to their close association with memory. More generally, lyric poets are also deeply invested in preserving the memory of whatever they narrate, including places (Ol.6.92, Pyth.9.88), gods (Nem.7.80), laudandi (Isth.8.62, Nem.7.15; Simon.frr.eleg.24-25) and themselves (Thgn.100 = 1164d). Just like epic poets, they are embedded in an elaborate system of literary commemoration and preservation.


101 Archil.fr.1.2; Sapph.fr.32; Solon fr.13.51; Thgn.250; Bacchyl.5.4; Pind.Ol.7.7.

102 Sapph.frr.127-28; Stesichorus fr.90.8-9.

103 Alcm.frr.14a, 27.

104 Alcm.fr.27.2-3, Pind.fr.75.2; cf. Hes.Theog.104. In this respect, they are closely associated with the Χάριτες, who also grant poetic charm: Hes.Theog.64-65; Sapph.fr.103.5, fr.128; Pind.Pyth.9.1-4, Nem.9.53-5.

105 Subject: Simon.fr.eleg.11.20-28; Hipponax fr.128; cf. Hom.II.1.1, Od.1.1. Question: Bacchyl.15.47; Pind.Pyth.4.70-2; cf. II.1.8.

106 Sapph.fr.55; Bacchyl.3.90-98, 9.81-87; Pind.Ol.10.91-100, Pyth.1.93-100, Pyth.3.112-15, Nem.6.26-35; Nem.7.11-16, Isthm.7.16-26, Isthm.8.56a-63, fr.121; Arist., Hymn to Virtue, 842.17-19 PMG. On occasion, lyricists pointedly play on the Muses’ etymological association with memory: Μουσών μνησόμεθ’, Thgn.1056; μνακμενόνοι, Pind.fr.431, Μοῖα μεμνάσθαι φυλεί, Nem.1.11-12.

The anxiety of forgetfulness also underlies much lyric poetry, where song again proves the antidote to eternal oblivion. In Pindar’s epinicia, oblivion is aligned with silence, darkness and obscurity as a foil to the commemorative ‘light’ of song: in Nemean 7, the poet acknowledges that ‘great deeds of valour remain in deep darkness when they lack hymns’ (ταὶ μεγάλαι γὰρ ἀλκαὶ | σκότον πολὺν ὑμνῶν ἔχοντι δεόμεναι, Nem.7.12-13) and they are only preserved ‘if, by the grace of Mnemosyne with the shining crown, one finds a recompense for one’s labours in poetry’s famous songs’ (εἰ Μναμοσύνας ἔκατι λιπαράμπυκος | εὕρηται ἄποινα μόχθων κλυταῖς ἐπέων ἀοιδαῖς, Nem.7.15-16): it is the shining light of poetic Memory that ensures one’s legacy in the face of gloomy forgetfulness. Similarly, Sappho remarks that an unknown addressee will lack any remembrance (μναμοσύνα) after dying and will wander ‘unseen’ (ἀφανής) in the house of Hades because she has ‘no share in the roses of Pieria’, the birthplace of the Muses (οὐ γὰρ πεδέχῃς βρόδων | τῶν ἐκ Πιερίας, fr.55); by apparently failing to mention the addressee’s name, Sappho ensures her Muse-less and forgotten fate. By contrast, the poetess is confident that she and another addressee will be remembered ‘in the future’ (μνάσασθαί τινα φαίμι †καὶ ἕτερον†ἀμμέων, fr.147: καὶ ἄψερον Lobel, cf. fr.17.6 with Burris et al. (2014)) and that she will not be forgotten even after death (οὐδ’ ἀποθανούσης ἔσται λήθη, Ael.Aristid.Or.28.51 = fr.193). Lyricists were thus concerned to preserve both their subject matter and their own name from the threat of eternal oblivion.

In the following sections, we shall consider the limited evidence for indexical memory in lyric, beginning with lyricists’ recollections of their contemporary present (§III.3.1), before focusing on examples where mythical material is indexed through the language of

---

110 Those who quote the passage only identify the addressee as an ‘uneducated’ (ἀπαίδευτον, Stob.3.4.12), ‘wealthy’ (πλουσίαν, Plut.Conting.Prac.145f-146a) or ‘uncultured and ignorant’ woman (τινα τῶν ἀμούσων καὶ ἀμαθῶν, Plut.Quest.Conv.646e-f). The absence of her name ‘suggests that Sappho omitted it’ (Hardie (2005) 18). The anonymity is reinforced by etymological play between ἀφανής and Αἴδα (cf. Il.5.844-45; Soph.Aj.606-7; Pl.Cra.403a, Grg.493b, Phd.80d-81a).
111 On Sappho’s poetic immortality: Hardie (2005); Lardinois (2008); Spelman (2018a) 155-161.
recall (§IV.3.2). We shall close by exploring how lyricists transformed the functioning of indexical knowledge by directly appealing to their audiences’ familiarity with the literary past (§IV.3.3).

III.3.1 Meagre Memories

When we turn to extant lyric poetry, there is little direct parallel for the cases of indexical memory that we have identified in Homer – an absence that is all the more striking given lyric poetry’s considerable use of indexical hearsay. As in the larger corpus of archaic Greek epic beyond Homer, we can identify very few cases in which a character’s reminiscences overlap with the audience’s recall of the literary and mythical past. We shall consider the possible reasons for this in further detail below, but at the outset we can acknowledge that we are hindered by the fragmentary state of our evidence and the general dearth of extended character speech in extant archaic lyric.

Another major distinction between lyric and epic poetry, however, is the concern that lyricists display with their immediate present. Lyricists frequently picture themselves and their audiences in their own contemporary world and focus more on personalised reminiscences from the recent, rather than mythical, past. The Lesbian poetess Sappho, in particular, shows an emphatic concern with the memories of (what she depicts as) her personal, lived experience.112 In one fragment, the narrator addresses a departing woman and bids her ‘remember me for you know how we followed you’ (μέμναισ ὦ, οἶσθα γὰρ ὤς σε πεδήπομεν, fr.94.8) and goes on to ‘remind’ her of all that they experienced with a catalogue

---

112 On the Sapphic theme of memory: Maehler (1963) 59-63; Burnett (1983) 277-313; Raynor (2005); Lardinois (2008); Calame (2012). Lardinois’ theory that Sappho was concerned primarily with memory of her performances, rather than of her songs, is rightly criticised by Spelman (2018a) 158n.81.
of past loves and festivities (ὄμναισαι, fr.94.10-29). In another fragment, a woman who has departed to Lydia ‘remembers gentle Atthis with longing’ (ἀγάνας ἐπὶ ὠμάσθεισ’ Ἀτθίδος ἵμερῳ, fr.96.15-16), while in the famous priamél on τὸ κάλλιστον, the speaker’s description of Helen ‘reminds’ her of another absent female friend, Anactoria (μὲ νῦν Ἀνακτορί[ας ὄ]ν̣έ̣μναισ’ [οὐ] παρεοίσας, fr.16.15-16). These and other fragments evoke a network of fond female farewells, in which memory played a key role in preserving social bonds, apparently a far cry from the functioning of poetic memory in the heroic world of archaic epic.

The same social and contextual aspect of memory can also be found in the work of many other lyric poets. In a ‘ship-of-state’ poem by Sappho’s Lesbian contemporary Alcaeus, the poet encourages his addressees to ‘remember the previous (hardships?)’ that they had endured as inspiration to stand steadfast in the present (μνάσθε τῶν πάροιθε μι[όχθων, fr.6.11, suppl. Hunt), evoking the turbulent and stasiotic life of his hetaireia on Lesbos. Archilochus bids his friend Glaucus to ‘remember’ the land (ἐπιμνήσαιο, fr.96.3). Alcman hopes to preserve the ‘memory of those present’ (ἔστι παρέντων μνᾶστιν †ἐπιθέσθαι†, fr.118). And Pindar claims that Hieron will be ‘reminded’ of the battles in which he previously stood steadfast (ἀμνάσειεν, Pyth.1.47). Lyric poets’ frequent focus on the present and recent past thus differs strikingly from epicists’ immersion in the distant world of myth.

Even here, however, it is possible that these emphatic appeals to recall may have served an indexical role, recalling recent poetry and songs on recent events. Sappho, in particular, is a likely candidate for such poetic self-reference. As we have already seen, she is insistent elsewhere that she and her group will be remembered in the future, unlike the anonymous addressee of fr.55 (§III.3:162). Following Sappho’s own rhetoric of commemoration, we could say that the episodes and people recalled in her fragments are familiar precisely because of their mentions in her larger poetic corpus. Indeed, Atthis appears repeatedly elsewhere (frr.49,
90fr.10a.15, 131), as does Anactoria (frr.219, 253). As Sappho recalls these absent women and her former experiences with them, we are simultaneously invited to recall their presence in her other poems.

The same may also be true of Alcaeus. His extant poems foreground their future reception less insistently than Sappho’s, but at various points he acknowledges their enduring appeal, as when he claims that the weapons which he has just described ‘cannot be forgotten’ (τῶν οὐκ ἔστι λαθεσθ’, fr.140.15) – a remark that ‘figures the poetic memorability of his own description.’ The poet’s recall of previous hardships in fr.6, then, may similarly look back to other poems of the Alcaean corpus, perhaps evoking a larger cycle of ship-of-state songs. After all, the poet’s opening remark that a wave comes upon the ship ‘again’ in the manner of a ‘previous one’ certainly encourages recollection of the recent past (τόδ᾿ αὖτε κῦμα τῷ πνοτέρω ενέμω | στείχει, fr.6.1-2). Similar arguments could be advanced for the other examples above, including Pindar’s praise of Hieron’s martial achievements, which could have been celebrated elsewhere in song, and Archilochus’ appeal to Glaucus, a figure who reappears elsewhere in his poetry (frr.15, 105, 117, 131). Ultimately, such suggestions can be no more than tempting conjectures on current evidence, but it is worth acknowledging that indexical memory may not have been restricted to the realm of myth in lyric. It may have also been adapted to lyricists’ intense engagement with their contemporary present.

III.3.2 Mythical Recall

We are on slightly firmer ground, however, in the few identifiable lyric cases in which the mythical past itself appears to have been allusively recalled through the language of memory, in both the narrator’s and the character’s voice. As in epic, such reminiscences are a way of

---


117 Fearn (2018) 104, noting (p.105n.39) further cases where forgetfulness thematises literary permanence: Alc.fr.70.9, fr.73.8.
gesturing to other traditions or mythical episodes. Most lyric instances of this phenomenon appear to exhibit a markedly epic resonance, as if lyricists were specifically acknowledging the epic heritage of the indexical device. In this section, we shall first explore the meagre traces of the phenomenon in embedded character speech, before turning to lyric narrator’s own reminiscences of the epic past.

When we turn to extant lyric’s treatment of myth, we can find nothing precisely comparable to the Homeric cases of indexical recollection that we have explored above. There is no clear case of a character recalling an event from the mythical or poetic past. However, we might be able to detect potential traces of something similar in several fragments and testimonia. The participle μεμναμένος in an extremely scrappy fragment of Stesichorus’ Geryoneis may point to an intratextual recollection of a promise made by Poseidon earlier in the narrative, akin to the intratextual recall of the Iliadic theomachy (fr.18.6-8). But it is difficult to put too much weight on this: not only are the supplements surrounding the verb extremely uncertain, but in earlier and later literature, other similar ‘reminiscences’ often invoke a promise or oath that has not in fact been mentioned previously. Setting aside this example, then, our only other potential case of indexical recall in a mythical narrative is Archilochus’ treatment of Deianeira’s rape by Nessus and the centaur’s subsequent death at Heracles’ hands. For this poem, we have no direct text at all, but only a number of indirect references (frr.286-89). Among these is the critique of Dio Chrysostom, who claims that some objected to the manner in which Archilochus portrayed this episode (Archilochus fr.286 = Dio Chrys.60.1):

ἔχεις μοι λύσαι ταύτην τὴν ἀπορίαν, πότερον δικαίως ἐγκαλοῦσιν οἱ μὲν τῷ Ἀρχιλόχῳ, οἱ δὲ τῷ Σοφοκλεῖ, περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸν Νέσσον καὶ τῆς Δηιάνειρας, ἢ οὔ;
Dio’s anonymous critics considered the length of Deianeira’s appeal to Heracles inappropriate in context, giving her assailant all too much time to have his wicked way with her. To prompt such critical censure, Deianeira’s speech must have been an account of some length. The participle ῥαψῳδοῦσαν certainly suggests as much, figuring Deianeira as an epic rhapsode, stringing out an extensive recitation.

Most significant for us here, however, is the content of her speech: according to Dio, she ‘reminded’ Heracles of her earlier wooing by Achelous and the events that took place at that time (ἀναμιμνήσκουσαν), recalling a previous occasion on which Heracles had faced another bestial foe to secure Deianeira’s hand in marriage. We know little more about the speech than what Dio gives us, but a Homeric scholiast provides the further detail that Archilochus depicted Achelous in a taurine form, in comparison to the resiliently fluvial Scamander of Iliad 22 (Archil.fr.287). In that case, we might suspect that Deianeira’s report included a key detail known from many later accounts, a detail which is first explicitly attested in Pindar: that Heracles tore off one of Achelous’ horns in the skirmish.

---

121 Cf. Diod.Sic.4.36.3, where Heracles’ arrow strikes Nessus while he is mid-intercourse.

122 Cf. Swift (forthcoming) ad loc.: ‘ῥαψῳδοῦσαν and ἀναμιμνήσκουσαν imply a reasonable amount of narrative’. Originally, ῥαψῳδία appears to have been used for any spoken or recitative metre, but over time it ‘became more and more associated with epic and with Homer’: Ford (1988) 306.


124 Pind.fr.249a; Ov.Am.3.6.35-36, Met.8.882-84, 9.85-88, Her.9.139-40, 16.267-68; Nonn.Dion.17.238-39; Apollod.Bibl.2.7.5; Philostr. Imag.4.3; Hyg.Fab.31.7. Rationalised by Diod.Sic.4.35.3; Strabo 10.2.19. Sophocles may allude to this detail in his account’s emphasis on Achelous’ horns (Trach.507-8, 519, 520-22).
We do not have any original verses from this poem, and we do not even have direct
evidence of its genre or metre. But Bowie has plausibly argued that Archilochus’ poem was a
narrative elegy, and it is tempting to suppose that Dio’s summary reflects, at least in part,
the basic language and structure of Archilochus’ original. In that case, given Dio’s emphasis
on Deianeira ‘reminding’ Heracles, the captured maiden could have explicitly prompted
Heracles to recall the former occasion of the conflict with Achelous, perhaps even introducing
it with the formula ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ ὅτε, a phrase that we have seen repeatedly in Homer. The
Achelous episode would have provided a natural model for Heracles’ current situation,
marking Nessus as a doublet of the river, another rival for Deianeira’s affections. In addition,
it would presage his coming defeat: like Achelous, Nessus is no match for Heracles. Just as the
Iliadic Achilles recalled his former encounter with Aeneas, so too here would Deianeira recall
a former tussle for her love as a paradigm for the present.

Admittedly, this is a speculative case, dependent on the language of Dio’s summary,
but it is the closest we come to the Homeric usage of this device in lyric. It may thus be
significant that this potential instance occurs in a strongly epicising context. As Bowie notes,
‘[o]n the scant evidence we have, this is a poem in which elegy handled material usually
treated in hexameter epic, and did so in the same way as hexameter epic.’ Indexical memory
may have thus carried a distinctively epic resonance, a resonance which would have been all
the stronger if Stesichorus’ Geryoneis did indeed contain a comparable example. Scholars have

125 Bowie (2001) 51-52, noting that Longinus pairs Archilochus and Eratosthenes as elegiac poets (de subl.33.5), and
that Archilochus’ uncontrolled, abundant flood of verses there (Ἀρχιλόχου πολλὰ καὶ ἀνοικονόμητα
παρασύροντος) matches Deianeira’s uncontrolled outburst here. He further notes that an embedded exemplum
is unlikely, given that other Archilochean exempla seem to be animal fables (frr.172-181, 184-87, 192; though
now see the Telephus elegy, fr.17a: §II.3.1: 90n.81), while the unsuitable length of Deianeira’s speech suggests a
self-standing narrative.

126 In later art and literature, these two river-based incidents were presented as doublets: e.g. Ov.Her.9.138-42,
Met.9.96-102. The throne of Apollo at Amyclae featured both episodes (Paus.3.18.12, 16) and Sophocles’
Trachiniae narrated both in quick succession (Trach.507-30, 555-81).

127 Bowie (2010b) 150. Notopoulos (1966) even used this poem as evidence for his argument that Archilochus
composed hexameters, but note the scepticism of Aloni (1984); Bowie (1986) 34.
long remarked on the epicising nature of Stesichorean lyric, and an epicising narrative is more likely to exhibit extended character speech, the prime host for indexical recall. Indeed, if we had a complete text of other Stesichorean poems, such as the *Oresteia*, *Nostoi* or *Games for Pelias*, we may well expect to find further cases there.

As things stand, however, we have to turn to the narrator’s own voice to explore other potential cases of indexical memory. At times, the lyric narrator notes that characters did or did not remember an aspect of the mythical past, a comment that invites an audience to recall their own knowledge of the myth in question. In *Isthmian* 8, for example, Pindar claims that the gods ‘remembered’ the pre-eminence of the Aeacids (ἔμεμναντ’) at the time when (ὅτε) Zeus and Poseidon quarrelled over marrying Thetis (*Isth.8.24-31*). This opening emphasis on memory not only acknowledges the traditional excellence of the Aeacid line (including Achilles, Ajax and Peleus), but also serves as a springboard into the narrator’s own recollection of the marriage of Thetis and Peleus. The combination of a verb of memory with the temporal conjunction ὅτε is almost a Pindaric rebranding of the common epic formula ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ ὅτε; the phrase has been redistributed but retains its allusive function.

Scholars have long debated whether Pindar is here following a familiar tradition or innovating, especially on the points of Zeus and Poseidon’s quarrel for Thetis, as well as Themis’ subsequent intrusion and prophecy revealing the danger of Thetis’ offspring for its father. If these were Pindaric inventions, the poet’s appeal to divine ‘memory’ may partly authorise this departure (especially when compounded by the concluding φαντί, *Pyth.8.46a*). There is some evidence, however, that these elements are not complete fabrications: as Burnett notes, Themis’ role might already be suggested by an early sixth century dinos of Sophilos (*LIMC* s.v. ‘Peleus’ 211), on which Themis follows immediately after Cheiron in the wedding

---


129 Cf. *Isth.8.40*, where their piety is indexically marked (φάτις).

procession.\textsuperscript{131} Regardless of the degree of Pindaric innovation, however, it is significant that this myth is introduced as an act of character memory, precipitating the audience’s own similar recall of the mythic past.\textsuperscript{132}

Besides these cases of internal characters’ memories within poems, however, we can also identify instances where a lyric narrator foregrounds his or her own memory at a moment of allusion to mythical precedents and prototypes. Here too, the myths recalled have a distinctively epic tinge. In \textit{Nemean} 9, Pindar uses an act of recall as a springboard into his lengthy account of Adrastus, Amphiaraurus and the expedition against Thebes, evoking Theban myth (\textit{μνασθείς}, \textit{Nem}.9.10-27). In another unplaced fragment, he bids Apollo ‘\textit{remember}’ that Heracles set up an altar to him and Zeus on Paros (\textit{μνάσθηθ᾿ ὅτι}, fr.140a.62-69), recalling the hero’s sojourn on the island during his quest for Hippolyte’s belt before his initial expedition to Troy, a tale that likely dates at least to the time of Archilochus.\textsuperscript{133} In a poem of the \textit{Theognidea}, meanwhile, the speaker’s personal memory precipitates a summary account of archetypally epic adventures (Thgn.1123-28):

\begin{quote}
μή με κακῶν \textit{μμēνθєκє}: πέπονθὰ τοι οίδα τ´ Ὄδυσσεύς,
ὀς τ´ Αἴδεω μέγα δώμ´ ἠλυθεν ἔξαναδύς.
ὀς δή καὶ μνηστήρας ἀνείλετο νηλέι θυμῶ.
Πηνελόπης εὐφράων κουρώδης ἀλόχου,
ἤ μιν δήθ´ ὑπέμεινε φίλῳ παρὰ παιδὶ μένουσα,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{131} Burnett (2005) 115n.28. She further notes that some sort of mediator is ‘implicit in the abandoned rivalry of Zeus and Poseidon, as seen at \textit{N}.5.37’. In the versions of the \textit{Cypria} (fr.2) and Hesiodic \textit{Catalogue} (fr.210), Thetis honours Hera by refusing Zeus, who then gives her to Peleus, so there is no need for Themis’ intervention.

\textsuperscript{132} Cf. Sapph.fr.16.10-11, where the Helen who fails to remember her family when she goes to Troy (κωὐδ[ὲ]… \textit{ἐμνάσθη}) is a tangential ‘recollection’ of the epic heroine, who was all too mindful of what she had abandoned (\textit{Il}.3.139-40, 3.174-75): Rissman (1983) 41; Segal (1998a) 66-67. Helen’s forgetfulness may model the narrator’s own skewed memory of the epic tradition.

\textsuperscript{133} Cf. I.C. Rutherford (2001) 377-82; Apollod.\textit{Bibl}.2.5.9. Pre-Archilochean origin: Swift (2014b) 441. Heracles’ settlement of the Parian sons of Minos on Thasos offers a mythical prototype for the Parian colonisation of Thasos by Archilochus and/or his father Telesicles (cf. Marcaccini (2001); Kivilo (2010) 92, 94, 98-99) and their conflicts with Thracian locals (fr.5, fr.93a; Tsantsanoglou (2008)).
The speaker’s wish not to be ‘reminded’ of his ills segues into the recall of a mythical figure who has endured such suffering: the epic Odysseus, an archetypal endurer (πέπονθα ~ πάθεν, Od.1.1). After launching into the exemplum with an act of recall, Theognis focuses on two major episodes of the hero’s fabula: the descent to the Underworld and his slaughter of the suitors. Such an Odyssean analogy fits into the larger narratorial posturing of the Theognidea, or – if Bowie is right to ascribe the poem to Archilochus – the iambicist’s similar Odyssean persona. Most crucial for my current purpose, however, is how this mythical exemplum is once again introduced with the language of memory: the speaker’s recall of his own ills prompts the recollection of an epic exemplar of such suffering. Personal memory transitions to mythical memory.

A similar blurring of personal and mythical recall occurs in Tyrtaeus’ elegy on ἀρετῆ, in which the poet begins with a catalogue of mythological exempla introduced by another verb of memory (Tyrtaeus fr.12.1-9):

οὔτ’ ἂν μνησαίμην οὔτ’ ἐν λόγῳ ἄνδρα τιθείν
οὔτε ποδῶν ἀρετῆς οὔτε παλαιμοσύνης,
οὔδ’ ἐι Κυκλώπων μὲν ἔχοι μέγεθός τε βίην τε,
νικώι δὲ Θέων Θρηΐκιον Βορέην,
οὔδ’ ἐι Τιθωνοῖο φυήν χαριέστερος εἴη,
πλουτοῖο δὲ Μίδεω καὶ Κινύρεω μάλιον,
οὔδ’ ἐι Τανταλίδεω Πέλοπος βασιλεύτερος εἴη,
γλῶσσαν δ’ Αδρήτου μειλιχόγηρυν ἔχοι,
οὔδ’ ἐι πάσαν ἑχοί δόξαν πλῆν θούριδος ἀλκῆς.

In this opening priamel, the poet exalts θοῦρις ἀλκή as the pinnacle of ἀρετῆ, dismissing other candidates for the title (extraordinary strength, speed, beauty, wealth, royalty and eloquence), which are each represented by a famous mythical hero. Tyrtaeus insists that he would ‘not

---

134 Nagy (1985) 74-76, noting the themes of νόος, poverty and versatility.
136 Luginbill (2002) convincingly defends this poem’s authenticity.
recall nor tell in story a man who even outstripped these mythical forebears, preferring instead the man who is good in battle, an opposition reinforced by verbal repetition: ἀνήρ, fr.12.1 ~ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός...ἐν πολέμῳ, fr.12.10 = fr.12.20, ἀνὴρ...πολέμου, fr.12.43-44). As Shey has highlighted, however, these exempla are carefully selected to emphasise the dangers of these other traits: ‘In every instance, the mythological characters of the priamel possess aretaí which cause harm to themselves or others, or which are unable to save them from harm, unhappiness, or bad reputation’: Polyphemus’ s brawn was outwitted by Odysseus’ s brains, Tithonus’ beauty eventually withered into an extreme old age, and so on. The larger tradition lying behind each name implicitly indicates why Tyrtaeus most highly values θούρις ἀλκή.

To build on Shey’s point, we could note how the opening emphasis on memory and λόγος encourages an audience to recall these wider traditions and to fill in the rest of each story which implicitly proves Tyrtaeus’ point. As a common tactic of praeteritio, the speaker invites his audience to recall what he claims he will leave unspoken. Of course, if we wanted to, we could easily find a mythical candidate who equally exemplifies the dangers of θούρις ἀλκή: Telamontian Ajax exhibits this very trait in Homer (e.g. Il.11.566), but as we have already seen, he too comes to an ignominious end. Tyrtaeus, however, avoids pointing us in that direction, and rather encourages us to recall the fabulae surrounding the characters he does name. In this poem, memory has shifted from a character’s embedded speech to the narrator’s own voice. His power of memory controls which myths are recalled or not.

As Schwinge has emphasised, however, this priamel is not purely ethical, for it also has a larger poetic and generic significance. Tyrtaeus is not just dismissing specific myths associated with other potential ἀρεταί, but also a collection of myths with a distinctively epic timbre. Most of the heroes he cites are familiar from the epic tradition; the values they

137 For this rendering of ἐν λόγῳ ἄνδρα τιθείην and the associations of λόγος: Gerber (1970) 75; Schwinge (1997) 388; Année (2010).
138 Shey (1976) 7-13 (quotation p.9).
represent are valorised in epic; and the very language in which they are here expressed also draws heavily on the epic tradition: verse-ends, in particular, exhibit a whole host of familiar epic idioms, while the phrase Ἀδρήστου μειλιχόγηρυν (v.8) may also draw on an epic formula associated with lost Theban epic. The poet’s opening appeal to his own memory thus triggers the recall of a host of epic traditions as a foil for his own elegiac poem, with its new attitude towards ἀρετή. In what follows, he articulates an alternative poetics distanced from epic. By beginning with his own act of memory (μνησαίμην), he even usurps the traditional role of the epic Muses (μνησαίαθ’, Il.2.492). The poet’s memory thus evokes and appropriates the epic tradition – in many ways, a foreshadowing of the Roman recusatio.

Indexical memory in lyric, therefore, was not restricted to internal characters’ recollections of their own fictional autobiographies, but also extended to the memory of poetic narrators, especially in elegy. In both cases, however, it is worth emphasising again that the myths recalled have a distinctively epic resonance: Archilochus’ Heracles, Pindar’s Peleus, Theognis’ Odysseus and Tyrtaeus’ catalogue of epic figures. Indexical memory seems particularly associated with the epic past, implicitly acknowledging the precedent of Homer.

Nevertheless, we must admit that archaic lyric offers us relatively slim pickings, especially when we compare its examples to Homeric instances of indexical memory. As with the larger corpus of archaic Greek epic, I suspect the major reason for this is our general dearth of extended mythical narrative in lyric. Greek lyricists frequently introduce myths in passing and in summary form, as paradigms for their present. And in so doing, they rarely give direct voice to the characters of the mythical past. With this dominant approach to myth, it is unsurprising to find fewer cases of indexical memory in extant lyric.

140 Cf. Tarkow (1983) 51, who highlights Tyrtaeus’ ‘implicit rejection of a characteristically Homeric manner of describing activities’, e.g. βοὴν ἀγαθός (Il.2.408); πὐξ ἀγαθός (Il.2.237). Note the inversion of epic values in v.16 (ξυνὸν δ’ἐσθλὸν ~ Il.16.262, ξυνὸν δὲ κακόν: Fuqua (1981) 218n.11).
141 v.3 (μέγεθός τε βίην τε) = Il.7.288; v.4 (Θρηίκιον Βορέην) ~ Hes. Op.553 (Θρηκίου Βορέω); v.7 (βασιλεύτερος εἶη) ~ Il.9.160, 9.392, 10.239 (βασιλεύτερος εστιν/εἰμι).
142 Campbell (1982) 180, comparing μελίγηρυν Ἀδρήστον (Pl.Phaedr.269a) and suggesting the Thebais as a possible common source.
III.3.3 Audience Knowledge

As we have seen, lyricists rarely invoke audience’s memories of events. When they do, it is more often through the narrator’s own recollection, rather than those of its internal characters. When we turn to cases of indexical knowledge, however, it appears that lyric’s capacity for more direct engagement between narrator and audience revitalised this allusive mode. Lyricists occasionally assert their own knowledge of the poetic past, as when Alcaeus claims that he ‘knows for certain’ that one should not move gravel (οἶδ’ η μάν, fr.344.1), advice that he may have drawn directly from a poem by his Lesbian contemporary Sappho (μὴ κίνη χέραδος, fr.145 - χέραδος μή ... | κίνεις, Alc.fr.344.1-2). More frequently, however, lyricists appeal directly to their audience’s own knowledge of the literary and mythical past. In these cases, we can trace the significance of these allusions more clearly than with lyricists’ indexical memory. Poets appeal to their audience’s familiarity with tradition, explicitly evoking what ‘you all know’. In so doing, they again validate their own work and situate it within a larger tradition.

One such appeal to audience knowledge is Pindar’s evocation of Ajax’s suicide in Isthmian 4 (Isth.4.35a-36b):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἰστε μάν} \\
\text{Αἴαντος ἀλκὰν φοίνιον, τὰν ὀψία} & \quad (35b) \\
\text{ἐν νυκτὶ ταμόν περὶ ϕασγάνω μομφὰν ἔχει} \\
\text{παίδεσσιν Ἑλλάνων ὅσοι Τροίανδ’ ἔβαν.} & \quad (36b)
\end{align*}
\]

Pindar directly invokes his audience’s acquaintance with Ajax’s ἀλκή, another element familiar from the epic tradition (cf. above on Tyrtaeus’ θούρις ἀλκή). Here, however, the poet does not just evoke Ajax’s character in general, but rather a specific episode of his fabula: his

\footnote{The expression may be proverbial, but for Alcaeus’ direct reception of Sappho elsewhere, see §I.2.3: 44 (Alc.fr.384); Whitmarsh (2018) 146-48 (Sapph.fr.16 – Alc.fr.283). Alcaeus’ use of the emphatic particle μάν reappears in Pindaric appeals to knowledge (below): cf. Spelman (2018a) 52n.27.}
ignominious suicide after losing to Odysseus in the contest for Achilles’ arms, familiar from Cyclic epic and archaic art onwards.\textsuperscript{144}

It is unclear, however, how stable the details of Ajax’s death were in the early tradition. As Spelman has highlighted, at least in later tradition, the timing of his suicide differs from that in Pindar’s account.\textsuperscript{145} In Sophocles’ Ajax, the eponymous hero kills himself during the daytime, a version of events that seems to be found in other later treatments of the myth.\textsuperscript{146} It is possible, therefore, that this appeal to the audience’s knowledge looks to more precise precedent than the epic tradition in general: a specific version in which Ajax killed himself at night. In that case, the scholium to this passage would offer a plausible candidate: in discussing the polyvalence of the phrase ὀψίᾳ ἐν νυκτί (‘late in the night’, 35b-36), it notes that the details of the story agree with those who take the expression as denoting the morning; for the author of the Aethiopis says that Ajax killed himself towards dawn (τοῖς δὲ τὸν ὄρθρον ἀκούουσι καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς ἱστορίας συνάδει· ὁ γὰρ τὴν Αἰθιοπίδα γράφων περὶ τὸν ὄρθρον φησὶ τὸν Αἴαντα ἑαυτὸν ἀνελεῖν, Σ Isth.4.58b = Aeth.fr.6).\textsuperscript{147} From this scholiastic citation, scholars have argued that Pindar is making a direct reference to the Aethiopis, marking it as familiar to his audience.\textsuperscript{148}

However, significant caution is necessary here. First, we should note that Ajax’s suicide also featured in the Little Iliad (II.Parv.arg.1b). Proclus’ summary of the epic does not specify its precise timing, but a nighttime setting is again most plausible: the suicide immediately followed Ajax’s maddened attack on the Achaeans’ livestock, an event that always takes place at night elsewhere.\textsuperscript{149} In his recent case for a specifically Aethiopic reference in Isthmian 4,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{144} Cycle: II.Parv.arg.1b, Aeth.fr.6. Art: LIMC s.v. ‘Aias I’, nos.103-141; Finglass (2011) 28-30; §II.3.1: 93.
\item \textsuperscript{145} Spelman (2018b) §1n.36
\item \textsuperscript{146} Ov.Met.13.386-92: Ajax commits suicide immediately after losing his verbal duel with Odysseus; Quint.Smyrn.5.352-485: Ajax’s revenge attempt and suicide take place shortly after dawn (5.395-403).
\item \textsuperscript{147} On ὄρθρος: Wallace (1989); Davies (2016) 83.
\item \textsuperscript{148} Nisetich (1989) 11; Spelman (2018a) 52, (2018b) §1.
\item \textsuperscript{149} Cf. Soph.Aj.21 (νυκτὸς...τῆσδε); Quint.Smyrn.5.395-403 (as dawn rises); Apollod.Epit.5.6 (νύκτωρ). Notably, Apollodorus’ Epitome shares other significant links with the Little Iliad (esp. Ajax’s burial in a coffin: Epit.5.7 – II.Parv.fr.3).
\end{itemize}
Spelman dismisses this possibility, considering it ‘significant’ that the scholia only invoke the *Aethiopis* as Pindaric precedent, with no mention of the *Little Iliad*\(^{150}\). But such an argument from silence is dangerous, especially when discussing ancient habits of scholarly citation, which – just as today – were never exhaustive. Moreover, there are good grounds for supposing that Sophocles’ daytime suicide may have been a specific innovation of the tragic stage, dependent on the restrictions of tragic staging and the common dramatic motif of a ‘single day’ of action.\(^{151}\) It is thus plausible that the traditional epic version of the myth included a night-time hunt and nocturnal suicide, and that it was only the lasting influence of Sophocles’ play that overrode this tradition. After all, even in the Sophoclean drama, Ajax’s failed attempt to take revenge on the Greek commanders (which likely derives from the *Little Iliad*) took place during the night (νυκτὸς...τῆσδε, *Aj.* 21-22).\(^{152}\) It is only the suicide that is delayed into the next day, to allow a protracted exploration of its consequences.\(^{153}\) The *Aethiopis*’ late-night suicide may well not be as distinctive as scholars assume.

On this occasion, therefore, I do not think our evidence is sufficient to argue for a specific intertextual link. A precise epic may be intended, but on current evidence, it would be overly rash to argue for a direct link with the *Aethiopis* over the *Little Iliad*.\(^{154}\) The most we can

---

\(^{150}\) Spelman (2018b) §1n.36.

\(^{151}\) Cf. Finglass (2011) 39. Sophocles may have been pre-empted by Aeschylus’ *Thracian Women* (frr. 83-85; cf. fr.dub.451q), but the suicide in that play was reported in a messenger speech (fr.83), which would have offered more flexibility in timing. For the significance of ‘today’ in tragedy: West (1987) 184; Austin – Olson (2004) 76; cf. *Aj.* 131-32, 753, 756, 778.


\(^{153}\) If this were a Sophoclean invention, the opening of the play would be all the more pointed. Odysseus is hunting Ajax’s tracks at dawn, the very time that Ajax traditionally killed himself. The audience might then wonder whether Odysseus will find Ajax on the point of suicide, or even already dead.

\(^{154}\) It is true that the preceding verses (*Isth.* 4.34-35) may allude to Odysseus’ defeat of Ajax in a contest of words for Achilles’ armour, a version which would certainly disagree with the *Little Iliad*, in which the contest was decided by eavesdropping on the opinion of Trojan girls (*II.Parv.* fr.2). But all we know of the *Aethiopis* is that a στάσις arose between Achilles and Odysseus (*Aeth.* arg.4d); we do not know how it was resolved. Davies (1989) 57-58, (2016) 79-81 suspects that the *Aethiopis* followed the version in which Trojan prisoners testified (cf. Σ *Od.* 11.547). In any case, most scholars suspect that Pindar’s version was his own or at least a later invention: Burnett (2005)
plausibly say is that Pindar is evoking his audience’s knowledge of the epic tradition, whether or not he has a specific text in mind. In any case, the subsequent verses’ celebration of Ajax’s enduring fame through Homeric verse (Isth.4.37-42) may well attach these epic traditions to the Homeric canon.\textsuperscript{155} By stressing Ajax’s honour ‘among mankind’ (τετίμακεν δι’ ἀνθρώπων, 37), Pindar emphasises the hero’s reception among a range of poetic audiences.\textsuperscript{156} The universalising and communal aspect of this noun looks back to Pindar’s opening appeal to his audience’s knowledge (ἴστε), reinforced by the emphatic μάν.\textsuperscript{157}

Such appeal to group knowledge may well build on Homeric poetry: there too, speakers frequently addressed the knowledge of the whole community (e.g. II.2.301, 9.35-36, 10.250, 20.203), a knowledge which – as we have seen – often extends to that of Homer’s own audiences. In Pindar’s lyric, however, this appeal to his audience’s collective knowledge has become more pointed: through the second person plural verb, he addresses them directly.

Pindar’s only other use of the expression ίστε μάν occurs in the closely related Isthmian 3 and bears a similar indexical force. He claims that his audience ‘know the ancient fame of Cleonymus with chariots’ (Isth.3.13-16):


dόξαν παλαιὰν ἀρετὰν
σύμφυτον οὐ κατελέγχει.
ἴστε μάν Κλεωνύμου
δόξαν παλαιὰν ἀρετὰν.

The relation between this poem and Isthmian 4 has been long debated. Uniquely in Pindar’s corpus, these two poems address the same victor in the same metre, which has prompted some

\textsuperscript{173; Rutherford (2015) 454-55. The allusion to the contest of words, then, does not support a direct link with the Aethiopis.}


\textsuperscript{156} For ἀνθρώποι as a poetic audience: §II.2.2: 67-68.

\textsuperscript{157} On this particle: Hummel (1993) 404.
scholars to join them. However, most scholars now accept their independence on a variety of metrical and structural grounds: *Isthmian* 3 was composed for a chariot victory at Nemea, shortly after Melissus’ earlier success in the Isthmian Games, celebrated in *Isthmian* 4. When Pindar mentions ‘twin prizes’ in *Isthmian* 3.9 (καὶ διδύμων ἀέθλων), he thus refers to the two crowns that Melissus has won (στεφάνως, 3.11), as well as the pair of poems which celebrate these achievements (cf. ὑμνήσας, 3.7; ἀγαναίς χαρίτεσσιν, 3.8). In the verses quoted above, however, Pindar looks beyond these two victories to the larger reputation of Melissus’ ancestors for chariot victories. This is again marked as something with which Pindar’s audience should already be familiar (ἴστε μάν). And here too, it seems that they would have been: *Isthmian* 4 had already recalled the ‘ancient fame’ of his clan, the Cleonymidae (φάμαν παλαιάν, *Isthmian* 4.22), a fame which Pindar there specified as deriving from earlier chariot victories (*Isthmian* 4.25-27):

ά τε κάν γουνοῖς Ἀθανάν ἁρμα καρφύξασα νικάν
ἔν τ´ Ἀδραστείοις ἀέθλοις Σικυῶνος ὠπασέν
τοιάδε τῶν τότ´ ἐόντων φύλλ᾿ ἀοίδαν.

It is likely that the ‘leaves of song’ (φύλλ᾿ ἀοίδαν, *Isthmian* 4.27) mentioned here are the source of the knowledge that Pindar invokes in *Isthmian* 3, especially given the verbal echoes between these passages (δόξαν παλαιάν ἁρμασιν, *Isthmian* 3.16 ~ φάμαν παλαιάν, *Isthmian* 4.22, ἁρμα *Isthmian* 4.25). Pindar expects his audience to be familiar with this family’s reputation from its earlier poetic celebrations, whether composed by Pindar himself or another epinician poet. In *Isthmian* 3, the emphatic ἰστε μάν gestures indexically to this poetic precedent, reinforced by the adjective παλαιάν, which further emphasises the antiquity of this fame – it is an

---


160 Such ‘leaves of song’ could have come from earlier in Pindar’s own career, as Spelman (2018a) 32 assumes: his earliest dated poem is *Pyth*.10 (498 BCE). But we could equally imagine the work of another poet: Farnell (1932) 348 (‘an epinician poem’); Nisetich (1989) 76n.15 (‘poetry’).
established feature of the epinician canon. By indexing this precedent through the plural ἵστε, Pindar again evokes his audience’s communal, shared knowledge of tradition.

This emphasis on audience’s collective knowledge of tradition is a recurring feature of Pindar’s poetics. In fr.188, the poet claims that ‘you recognise the well-known song of Polymnestus, the man from Colophon’ (φθέγμα μὲν πάγκοινον ἔγνωκας Πολυμνάστου Κολοφωνίου ἀνδρός). Unlike our previous examples, he employs a singular verb (ἔγνωκας, perhaps directed to a specific addressee), but the communality of this knowledge is still conveyed by the adjective πάγκοινον: the poet’s song is ‘common to all’.

In Isthmian 2, meanwhile, Pindar claims that Thrasybulus’ family is ‘not unfamiliar’ with epinician poetry (οὐκ ἄγνωτες, Isth.2.30-32), a litotic expression which underscores how frequently the Emmenidae were recipients of poetic praise (cf. εὐδόξων...ἀνδρῶν, Isth.2.34). Indeed, this claim concludes a list of Xenocrates’ earlier victories which had begun with a similar reference to a ‘not unknown’ Isthmian chariot victory (οὐκ ἄγνωτ’, Isth.2.12-13), a phrase which may again look to earlier literary celebrations of former achievements. The emphatically repeated litotes reinforces the sense that Pindar’s audience, too, should be familiar with these events from earlier song.

Such appeal to audience’s collective knowledge of tradition is not restricted to Pindar, however. We can already find earlier precedent in one of Tyrtaeus’ elegiac exhortations to the Spartans. Tyrtaeus remarks that his audience, the ‘stock of unconquered Heracles’ (Ἡρακλῆος...ἀνικήτου γένος, fr.11.1), are familiar with the horrors of war (fr.11.7-8):
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161 In addition to the below, cf. γινώσκομεν, Pyth.3.114 on Nestor and Sarpedon: §II.3.1: 92, Spelman (2018a) 106-7.

162 On Polymnestus: Alcm.fr.114; Ar.Eq.1287; Plut.Mor.1132d, 1133a, 1134b-d, 1141b.

163 Cf. Pindar’s previous ode for Xenocrates (Pythian 6, cf. Isth.2.18-19), Pindar’s poems for Xenocrates’ brother Theron (Olympians 2 and 3, cf. Isth.2.23-29), and possibly a Simonidean ode for Xenocrates (513): Spelman (2018a) 226.

164 Cf. Spelman (2018a) 271n.45. Contrast Pavese (1966) 111, who takes the adjective proleptically, referring to the fame the present poem will bestow. But the list seems to refer to a string of Xenocrates’ past victories which had likely already been celebrated elsewhere: see n.163 above.
They ‘know how destructive the deeds of woeful Ares are’, and ‘have learned well the nature of grim war’. As with the personal memories of Sappho and Alcaeus, one could argue that such knowledge derives purely from private experience of battle in seventh century Sparta, in the midst of the second Messenian war. However, a close examination of the language of this couplet highlights that the knowledge which Tyrtaeus presupposes is simultaneously that of the literary tradition. War (πόλεμος) is indeed ἀργαλέος in both Homer and Hesiod (Il.14.187, Od.24.531; Hes.Op.229), while the epithet ἀΐδηλος is particularly associated with Ares and warfare in archaic epic, emphasising the god’s destructive capacity to render life ‘unseen’ (ἀΐδηλον Ἄρηα, Od.8.309; γένευ ὧδ’ ἀΐδηλος, II.5.897). The only pre-Tyrtaean instance of πολυδακρύος, meanwhile, is its sole appearance in the Iliad, where it again describes war (μάχης πολυδακρύου, II.17.192). It might be a step too far to see Tyrtaeus here alluding meaningfully and intentionally to a Homeric hapax legomenon in the manner of a Hellenistic poet, but even so, this precedent indicates that Tyrtaeus’ audience would have been familiar with the destructive aspect of war not only from life, but also from its literary manifestations. After all, even a local Spartan audience with little exposure to poetry beyond their hometown would still be familiar with the horrors of the literary battlefield, not only from Tyrtaeus’ own works, but also from Spartan epicists such as Cinaethon. As in Pindar’s appeals to audience’s knowledge, Tyrtaeus here evokes his audience’s familiarity with the wider literary tradition. Such appeals to audience knowledge thus gestured to traditions of myth and poetry with which they would be familiar, against which the poet could situate his own work. But as with indexical hearsay in lyric, this appeal to audience knowledge could also invite audiences to supplement a myth with their broader familiarity of tradition. In Bacchylides’ ninth
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165 Cf. II.5.757, where ἐργ’ ἀϊδηλα is a variant reading for Ares’ behaviour, in verse-final position as here: Christensen (2012).

166 On Cinaethon: Huxley (1969) 85-9; Tsagalis (2017) 175-96. His date is uncertain: Eusebius dates him to the mid-eighth century (Chron.Ol.4.2), but Huxley (1969) 87 suspects a post-Tyrtaean date around 625 BCE, or even as late as 550 BCE.
epinician, for example, a poem composed for the Phliasian athlete Automedes, the poet opens an allusive catalogue of Asopus’ daughters by appealing to his audience’s knowledge (Bacchyl.9.47-56):

στείχει δὴ εὐθείᾳς κελε[ύ]θου
μυρία πάνται φάτις
σᾶς γενεάς λιπαροζώνων
θηγατρὼν, ἃς ἠθε[ο]ί
σὺν τύχαις ἄκισσαιι ἀρχαγοὺς
ἀπορθήτων ἄγνιαν.
τίς γὰρ οὐκ οἶδεν
κυανοπλοκάμου
Θῆβας ἐΰδμα[τον πόλι]ν,
ἡ τὰν μεγαλώνυμον Αἴγιναν, μεγ[ίστ]ου
Ζηνός [ά] πλαθείσα λέξει τέκεν ἧμω

After commencing here with Thebes and Aegina, the subsequent fragmentary lines appear to mention Aegina’s son Aeacus (father of Peleus and Telamon) and continue with a list of other Asopids, before ending in a closural ring composition (9.64-65). The opening emphasis on the family’s fame and renown (esp. μυρία...φάτις) emphasises the traditionality of the catalogue that follows, a familiarity that is reinforced by Bacchylides’ appeal to the audience’s knowledge. The rhetorical question (’Who does not know…?’) implies that everyone is expected to be familiar with this myth. And indeed, the list of Asopus’ daughters, all of whom had been wooed by gods and became the eponyms of cities, appears to have been an established legend. A fragment of Corinna offers a similar list of nine Asopids, containing much overlap with Bacchylides (654 col.ii-iv PMG). And as Cairns has argued, both Corinna and Bacchylides seem to be following an earlier version of the myth, perhaps that by the Corinthian Eumelus or the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. We know, moreover, that an Asopid ancestry was an important feature of the Phliasians’ local mythology, and part of a larger
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debate as to whether the ancestor of these illustrious city-nymphs was the Asopus in Boeotia or its namesake in Phliasian territory. As part of their claim, the Phliasians dedicated both a statue group of Zeus and Aegina in Delphi (Paus. 10.13.6) and a group of Zeus, Asopus and five Asopids (including Thebes) at Olympia (Paus. 5.22.6). In asking who is not familiar with these famous cities and their Asopid ancestry, Bacchylides thus indexes his engagement with a familiar and politically charged local myth.

Besides evoking a well-known myth, this invitation for an audience to recall their knowledge of the Asopids also invites them to supplement the bare details that Bacchylides offers, especially in relation to the first one he names: Thebes. The city is described here as ‘well-built’ (ἐΰδμα[τον], 54) and introduced as an example of ‘unsacked streets’ (ἀπορθήτων ἀγυιᾶν, 52). The earlier part of Bacchylides’ poem had already recalled the failed expedition of the Seven against Thebes (9.10-20), an event which on the face of it reinforces this assessment: the city stood strong and repulsed its assailants. But any mention of the expedition of the Seven cannot fail to evoke thoughts of its sequel, the successful sacking of the city by the Epigonoi (§IV.2.3: 204-6). In appealing to his audience’s knowledge of the myth, Bacchylides’ silence on this point resonates all too loudly. ‘Yes’, we are invited to reply, ‘we do know what happened at Thebes’. Scholars have seen a political purpose underlying this suppression of the Epigonoi myth, a way to downplay and negate Argive achievement while simultaneously ‘super-imposing a skewed pro-Philiasian genealogy’ onto Thebes. But despite the explicit silence, the poet’s nod to his audience’s knowledge gives space for the lingering shadow of tradition to rear its head, undermining any simple patriotism.

Indexical appeals to audience knowledge, just like indexical hearsay, therefore, can invite audiences to fill in the gaps of a story with their knowledge of tradition, complicating a simple treatment of myth by evoking elements that remain untold.

III.4 Conclusions

In the foregoing discussion, we have seen that memory and knowledge both functioned as significant indexes of allusion in archaic Greek poetry. Their presence is most clear in Homeric epic, where characters repeatedly urge their interlocutors to recall earlier events of tradition, simultaneously inviting Homer’s audiences to recall their own knowledge of the mythical past. In many ways, this indexical device is a foil and complement to indexical hearsay: whereas the latter evokes external traditions that are circulating on the airwaves of *fama*, ready to be picked up by observant listeners, indexical memory and knowledge involve a more internal and personal act of preserving, retaining and transmitting knowledge. But as with hearsay, these metaphors of allusion are an apt model for the nature and process of poetic composition and performance.

We must acknowledge, however, the limits of this indexical mode in archaic Greek poetry. We have identified and discussed numerous cases in Homer, but relatively few in the rest of early Greek epic and archaic lyric. The extremely fragmentary state of much our evidence must play some role in this, but it is striking that even in Pindar’s completely extant epinicians and Hesiod’s extant didactic works, poetic memory is not as productive. As we have already noted, the principal reason for this seems to be the way in which these poems treat myth, and their relative dearth of character speech. Lyric poets in particular rarely tell a mythical narrative in its own right, but rather introduce one as an exemplum or point of comparison for events of the real world. When we return to the mimetic world of tragedy, it is perhaps no surprise that cases of indexical memory appear to flourish once more.\textsuperscript{174} Indexical knowledge, by contrast, is able to play a more active role in lyric poetry, especially when the poet directly addresses his audience, but even so, the phenomenon is less pervasive than in Homer.

\textsuperscript{174} Currie (2016) 139 cites a few examples (*Soph.*Aj.1273-87 ~ Il.7, 15, 18; *Eur.*Hec.239-248 ~ Od.4.244-58; IA.337-60 ~ *ad hoc* invention?). Cf. too e.g. *Eur.*Tro.69-70 ~ Il.Pers.arg.3a; *Eur.*Hec.107-115 ~ Hec.37-41, *Soph.*Polyxena (frr.522-28).
Nevertheless, the foregoing examples demonstrate the extent to which this allusive index was already deeply engrained in Greek poetry from the very beginning, especially in Homer. The device was primarily used to gesture to and incorporate other mythical narratives, marking the poet’s mastery of tradition. But we have also noted cases of misremembering, where a character’s memory is pointedly selective, inviting audiences to fill in the gaps. In both cases, the device evokes wider traditions, within which each poet situates himself and his own work.
PART IV.

TIME FOR ALLUSION
IV.1 Introduction

In this final section, we are concerned with the allusive potential of time: the way in which literary references to the past and future situate a poem within its larger tradition. Essentially, this index embraces a number of complementary and closely related concepts: first, broad chronological perspective – an awareness of earlier and later events which lie beyond the immediate narrative; second, marked iteration – a specific sense of literary déjà vu and cyclical repetition; and third, epigonal self-consciousness – an explicit concern with one’s poetic predecessors. All three are frequently cited as indexes of allusion in Hellenistic and Roman poetry, but here I shall highlight their considerable presence in archaic Greek poetics.

The first phenomenon (chronological perspective) involves poets self-consciously acknowledging the larger tradition beyond their immediate narrative. This is often achieved through the use of temporal adverbs and adjectives, especially those that look to the past, like ποτέ and quondam, or παλαιός and antiquus. Such ‘explicit pointers of pastness’ knowingly nod to the mythical and poetic past, signposting a reference to other stories and other texts which treat them. But we also encounter cases which emphasise a greater deal of continuity or change with the past, as when Ovid’s Achaemenides is ‘no longer’ roughly clad, as he had been in Virgil’s Aeneid (iam non, Met. 14.165 – Aen. 3.590-94). In each case, the specific episode in question is situated within the larger span of literary history.

The second technique (marked iteration) involves poets self-reflexively replaying or foreshadowing another event from the poetic tradition in the present. We have already encountered the Ovidian Ariadne’s repetition of her Catullan self (iterum, nunc quoque, §I.1.2: 8-9), but we could equally add Ovid’s Cydippe in the Heroïdes, who finds herself ‘now
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too’ reading the words written by Acontius (nunc quoque, Her.21.110, cf. 20.216), just as Acontius finds himself writing ‘again’ like his Callimachean incarnation (en iterum scribo, Her.20.35 – Aet.3.frr.67-75).³ In Theocritus’ first Idyll, meanwhile, Daphnis dismissively bids Aphrodite go to Diomedes ‘again’, recalling her previous support of the hero in the Iliad (nuntius, Id.1.112 – II.5.335-430).⁴ All these examples involve the self-conscious replay of an earlier episode from each character’s fictional life, while also echoing an earlier literary treatment of that same episode.⁵

The final category (epigonal self-consciousness) involves cases where characters and narrators explicitly appeal to their ancestors and predecessors, constructing an explicit map of literary history. In Theocritus’ sixteenth Idyll, the poet establishes himself in a continuum with his encomiastic predecessors by recalling how former poets celebrated the battles of ‘men of old’ to preserve their memory, setting himself on a par with the likes of Homer and Simonides of Ceos (φυλόπιδας ποιητέων ὕμνησαν ἄοιδοι, Id.16.50). Nor is his subject inferior to those of his predecessors: Hieron is an equal match to the ‘heroes of old’ (ποιητέων ὕμνησαν ἀοιδοί, Id.16.80). The prologue of Philip’s Garland, meanwhile, establishes his collection of epigrams as a self-conscious sequel to that of Meleager. The poet begins by contrasting his addressee’s ‘knowledge’ of the ‘fame of the ancients’ (παλαιοτέρων εἰδώς κλέος, AP 4.2.5) with the brevity of the younger generation whose poems he has assembled (γνῶθι καὶ ὅπλοτέρων τὴν ὀλιγοστιχὴν, AP 4.2.6), acknowledging the precedent and tradition within which he

---

³ Barchiesi (2001) 120.


⁵ Such allusions can even disrupt the strict chronology of the mythical world to reflect that of literary history. In Apollonius’ Argonautica, Jason and Medea visit Circe and Alcinous ‘before’ Odysseus in their world but ‘after’ the Odyssey from the perspective of literary history: Arg.4.667 (πάρος) ~ Od.10.213, 235-36, 393-94; Arg.4.1068 (ὡς το παροιθεν) ~ Od.7.346-7 (Hunter (2015) 174-75, 228). Cf. ‘future reflexive’ allusions in Roman poetry: Barchiesi (1993).
works. Through such explicit acknowledgement of predecessors, poets constructed their own literary history.

These temporal tropes have been well-studied in Hellenistic, Roman and later poetry, but they have rarely received any attention in archaic or classical Greek poetry. Yet there is considerable evidence that the Greeks conceived of literature in temporal terms, at least by the classical period: authors refer intratextually to ‘earlier’ and ‘later’ parts of their own works, and label pre-existing traditions as ‘prior’ and ‘old’. As in the previous sections, here too I argue that there are strong grounds for dating this temporal conception of poetic production back to the archaic age.
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6 The opposition of ancient/recent is not straightforward, however: ὀλιγοστιχίην recalls a buzzword of Callimachus, one of the Meleagrian ‘ancients’ (~ [ὀλ]ιγόστιχος, Aet.fr.1.9): Magnelli (2006) 394-96. Note Philip’s further string of indexes: knowledge (εἰδώς), fame (κλέος), recognition (γνῶθι), addition (καὶ).


9 E.g. ὡς καὶ πρῴην εἴπομεν, Arist.Eth.Nic.2.3.1104b18; ὡς μεκρόν πρόσθεν ἡμῖν λέλεκται, Apollod.Bibl.3.12.5.

10 E.g. τὰ παλαιά, Ar.Eccl.580.
IV.2 Epic Temporalities

It has long been recognised that Homeric epic manipulates time in complex and sophisticated ways, allusively re-enacting events beyond the strict confines of its narrative.\(^{11}\) Such replays of tradition ‘out of sequence’ are especially visible in the *Iliad*. The first half of the poem involves many elements which closely rerun the opening stages of the war: the catalogue of ships, the *teichoscopia*, the duel of Paris and Menelaus, the encounter of Paris and Helen, the marshalling of troops and Pandarus’ truce-breaking – these all re-perform acts that logically ‘fit’ the first, rather than tenth, year of the war.\(^{12}\) In the second half of the poem, meanwhile, the poet allusively foreshadows what is to come: Patroclus’ death prefigures Achilles’ own,\(^{13}\) while the hero’s funeral games reflect many later episodes of the tradition. Ajax and Odysseus’ inconclusive wrestling match foreshadows the ‘Judgement of Arms’ (*Il.*23.708-35 ~ *Aeth.*arg.4d, *Il.Parv.*arg.1a); Epeius’ physical frailty looks ahead to his use of brains, not brawn, in constructing the Trojan horse (*23.670 ~ Od.*8.493, 11.523, *Il.Parv.*arg.4a); and Locrian Ajax’s divinely induced slip in the footrace serves as a proleptic punishment for his future transgression against Athena by raping Cassandra (*23.774, 782 ~ Il.Pers.*arg.3a).\(^{14}\) Within its own narrow chronology, Homer’s epic embodies the whole Trojan war *fabula*.

Within such a context of temporal manipulation, it is unsurprising to find that references to time frequently bear an indexical significance in Homeric epic, in the mouths of
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\(^{13}\) E.g. Burgess (2009) 72-97.

both the narrator and his characters. In the following sections, we shall explore the rich Homeric evidence for the first two categories of temporal indexes (chronological perspective: §IV.2.1; and marked iteration: §IV.2.2), before exploring the phenomenon in the wider corpus of archaic Greek epic and asking whether Homeric epic exhibits any kind of epigonal self-consciousness (§IV.2.3). Homer makes no direct mention of his poetic πρότεροι, but I shall argue that he does so indirectly through the voices of his characters. By means of these devices, he situates his poem within the larger temporal waves of myth and literary history, foreshadowing the allusive techniques of later periods.

### IV.2.1 Pointers to the Past

In both Homeric epics, the narrator and his characters repeatedly evoke other moments of tradition through a temporal lens. We have already witnessed the Iliadic recollection of Aeneas’ flight before Achilles on Mt. Ida, cued in part through temporal references (Ἦδη...καὶ ἄλλοτε, Il.20.90, Il.20.187, §III.2.1: 135-37), as well as Antinous’ comparison of Penelope in the Odyssey to the Achaean women ‘of old’ who lived ‘long ago’ (παλαιῶν...πάρος, Od.2.118-9, §II.2.2: 71-76). Yet the examples can be multiplied many times over: temporally-charged adverbs (αἰεί, ἄλλοτε, ἄ, αὕτις, Ἦδη, οὔποτε, πάλαι, πάλιν, πάρος, ποτέ, πρόσθεν) and adjectives (ἄλλος, παλαιός, πρότερος) frequently mark references to other stories and traditions, both inter- and intra-textually.15

On an intratextual level, these temporal indexes mark the larger structuring and connections across a poem, in the same manner as characters’ intratextual reminiscences. Such cross-references can be small-scale, as when Chryses prays to Apollo and recalls the god’s previous fulfilment of his prayer earlier within the very same book (Ἦδη...ποτ’...πάρος, Il.1.453 ~ Il.1.35-52); the emphatic accumulation of temporal indexes reinforces the sense of

repetition, as the priest invokes the god in the very same terms (\textit{Il}.1.37-38=1.451-52). In the \textit{Odyssey}, meanwhile, the tears which Odysseus sheds when reunited with his son are contrasted with his earlier behaviour, when he had \textit{previously} always restrained them (\textit{πάρος}, \textit{Od}.16.191), recalling an earlier episode within the same book: Telemachus’ initial appearance at Eumaeus’ hut, when Odysseus did indeed refrain from tears, and it was Eumaeus who played the paternal role, bursting into tears and embracing him as a father does an only son (\textit{Od}.16.16-21).\footnote{Rutherford (1986) 157; de Jong (1994) 37; Currie (2016) 132.}

Such temporal markers can also function on a far larger scale, tying together disparate parts of whole epics: before he sends Patroclus out to battle, Achilles invokes Zeus as Chryses had Apollo, recalling the previous occasion when the god listened to his prayer (\textit{ποτ’}, \textit{Il}.16.236). On this occasion, the hero makes a more distant cross-reference to the first book of the poem, when Zeus accepted his wishes, as mediated by Thetis; hymnic \textit{hypomnesis} coincides with intratextual recollection (\textit{Il}.1.393-412, 503-510). In the chariot race of \textit{Iliad} 23, meanwhile, Diomedes lines up with the horses of Tros, which we are reminded he had earlier taken from Aeneas, although Apollo had saved the hero – a transparent cross-reference to the events of \textit{Iliad} 5 (\textit{ποτ’}, \textit{Il}.23.291-92 ~ \textit{Il}.5.318-27, 344-46).\footnote{Currie (2016) 142.} And at the hinge of the \textit{Odyssey}, the narrator remarks that the hero who had previously (\textit{πολιτ’} \textit{πρίν}) suffered at sea now sleeps in peace, forgetful of all that he had suffered (\textit{λελασμένος}, \textit{Od}.13.90-2). As scholars have long recognised, this statement marks the transition from the first to second half of the \textit{Odyssey}, as the poet leaves behind the hero’s adventures and wandering, a transition here marked as an act of forgetting. The hero’s ‘previous’ suffering at sea epitomises the action of the whole first half of the poem, but it looks particularly to the language of the Odyssean proem, of which verse 90 is a near-quotation (\textit{ἄνδρα} \ldots | \textit{ός πολιτ’} \textit{μέν μάλα πολλά πάθ’ ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν,} | \textit{ἄνδρων τε πτολέμους ἀλεγείνα τε κύματα πείρων,} \textit{Od}.13.89-91 ~ \textit{ἄνδρα}...\textit{ός μάλα πολλά} | \textit{πλάγχθη,} \textit{Od}.1.1-2; \textit{πολλά} \textit{δ’ ὑ’ ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν,} \textit{Od}.1.4).\footnote{Bowie (2013) 111, cf. 2-6.} Through these close verbal echoes and the indexical language of temporality and forgetting, the narrator recalls the
very start of the poem in a closural ring composition, marking the return to Ithaca as a fresh start. On a miniature scale, then, these temporal indexes signpost intratextual cross-references across individual poems, inviting audiences to situate the present events against the literary past.

In the same way, temporal markers also point to events beyond the scope of each poem, positioning the poet’s work against the larger corpus of myth. As with indexical memory, the cued references are often directed at other moments of the Trojan war fabula. In *Iliad* 3, for example, Antenor introduces his recollection of the embassy of Odysseus and Menelaus with a temporal reference (**ηδη...ποτ’,** *Il*.3.205-8):

> ἤδη γὰρ καὶ δεύρο ποτ’ ἦλυθε δίος Ὀδυσσεὺς σεν ἑνεκ’ ἀγγελίας σὺν ἀρηϊφίλῳ Μενελάῳ· τοὺς δ’ ἐγὼ ἐξείνισσα καὶ ἐν μεγάροισι φίλησα, ἀμφοτέρων δὲ φυὴν ἐδάην καὶ μήδεα πυκνά.

This embassy is another episode familiar from the *Cypria* (arg.10c), but its antiquity is suggested by its apparent depiction on a bronze tripod leg at Olympia from the last quarter of the seventh century,\(^\text{19}\) as well another mention later in the *Iliad*, when Agamemnon kills two sons of a certain Antimachus, who is said to have been bribed by Paris into refusing the embassy and arguing for the death of the ambassadors (*Il*.11.123-25, 138-41: **NB ποτ’,** 11.139). In Apollodorus’ later summary, it is Antenor who saved Odysseus and Menelaus from such Trojan treachery (*Apollod. Epit*.3.28), a detail which may well be implied by the Iliadic prominence of Antenor’s personal hosting of the pair, expressed through the emphatic ἐγὼ and first-person verbs in 3.207-8. The temporally marked introduction of Antenor’s account invites Homer’s audience to recall another episode of Trojan myth, and supplement it with their wider knowledge of tradition: Antenor has every reason to remember the build and character of these two heroes.\(^\text{20}\)
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\(^{19}\) West (2013) 42.

Indeed, the brevity of allusions introduced by temporal indexes frequently invite such supplementation of detail. When Odysseus compares Nausicaa to a palm tree that he ‘once’ saw on Delos (ποτέ, Od.6.160-67), the audience are invited to recall the tradition of the hero’s visit to the island in search of the nourishing daughters of Anius – another episode that featured in the Cypria (Σ Od.6.164d, Cypr.fr.26). In Iliad 1, meanwhile, Agamemnon memorably upbraids Calchas as a ‘prophet of evil’ who ‘has never yet given a favourable prophecy’ (II.1.106-8). Scholars have long suspected an allusion to the sacrifice of Iphigenia here, the previous occasion on which Calchas gave the ruler some bad news. Such a reference is reinforced by the generalised temporal frame (οὐ πώ ποτέ... αἰεί...οὔτε τί πω...), which emphasises the continuity with the mythical past. Besides such references to precise mythical episodes, however, temporal indexes can also gesture to more general elements of tradition: when Odysseus encounters Athena on Ithaca, the hero remarks that the goddess has been kindly to him ‘in the past’ while he warred at Troy (πάρος, Od.13.314), just as Locrian Ajax complains in the Patroclean funeral games that Athena has helped Odysseus, as she has done ‘previously’ (τὸ πάρος, II.23.782-83). Such statements evoke the traditional association of hero and goddess, familiar from many moments in the Iliad and elsewhere. Therefore, mark not only cross-references to earlier moments of an individual work, but also to the wider tradition of Trojan myth.

Yet it is not only events within the Trojan War cycle that are evoked through temporal references: other stories and traditions are also recalled in a similar manner. In the Odyssean Nekyia, Odysseus’ encounters with other heroes from other stories are explicitly marked as an engagement with the past. Odysseus’ narrative closes with his hope to see more ‘of the warrior heroes who died in the days of old’ (εἴ τις ἔλθοι | ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων, οἳ δὴ τὸ πρόσθεν οἴολοντο, Od.11.628-29) and ‘the men of an earlier time’ (προτέρους...ἀνέρας, Od.11.630).

---


These statements mark the literary antiquity of the figures he has encountered in the Underworld, who can plausibly be read as representatives of different literary traditions. The emphasis on their antiquity here marks Homer’s debt to these pre-existing fabulae. Yet it is also significant that the phrase πρότερος...ἀνέρας in 11.630 is followed in apposition with the name of two specific individuals, Theseus and Pirithous (Θησέα Περίθοόν τε, 11.631). Their presence here was already suspected in antiquity as a Peisistratid interpolation (Plut. Thes. 20), but from an allusive perspective, the pair are far from out of place. The last hero whom Odysseus actually encounters is Heracles, who recounts his former descent to the Underworld to fetch Cerberus (11.623-26, NB ποτέ, 11.623), a narrative which has often been viewed as an implicit signal of Homeric debt to this earlier katabasis as a ‘model’ for Odysseus’ current adventure. In particular, Heracles’ καὶ σύ (11.618) highlights the parallel: Odysseus too, just like Heracles, is a man who faces difficult labours (ἀέθλους, Od. 11.622, ἄεθλον, 11.624; cf. Od. 1.18, 3.197, 3.313 (καὶ σύ/κεῖνος: Telemachus ~ Orestes); Od. 13.418 (καὶ κεῖνος: Telemachus ~ Odysseus); Soph. Ant. 944 (ἐτήλα καὶ Δανάης...φῶς: Antigone ~ Danae); Dioscorides AP 7.707.1-2 (καὶ, alongside the language of otherness, ἄλλος, and kinship, αὐθαίμον, marks the epigram’s relationship with AP 7.37).

24 Most (1992); Danek (1998) 230-31; cf. §II.2.2: 71n.43.
long ago (πρόσθεν, Il.1.250-52), a characterisation which we have seen was likely traditional, given its apparent evocation in the Odyssey (§II.2.1: 65-67). Moreover, his area of expertise is singled out in each epic as events of the past (πάλαι πολέμων ἐδειδώς, Il.4.310; παλαιά τε πολλά τε εἰδώς, Od.24.51), and he is even presented as an almost bardic figure: story-telling is his modus operandi. When we turn to his numerous Iliadic stories, then, it is significant that they are all tinged with temporal references: the aged hero repeatedly appeals to his former youth and bygone times, highlighting a sense of belatedness and a contrast between the present and past. In Iliad 1, his account of his duel with the Centaurs alongside the great heroes of old (1.260-73) is introduced with the phrase ἐδει...ποτ’, alongside the qualification that he has never seen nor will ever see such warriors again (1.262) – indeed, no man of the present could even contend with them (1.269-70). His recollection of the time when (ὅτε) he defeated Ereuthalion (Il.4.318-21) is prefaced by a remark that men of former times (οἱ πρότεροι, 4.308) also sacked cities and walls with similar intent, and includes a contrast between his past youth and current old age (τότε κοῦρος ἔα, νῦν αὖτε με γήρας ὀπάζει, 4.321). The longer account of his duel with Ereuthalion (Il.7.132-56) is framed by wishes that he were still as young as that time (αἰ γάρ... ἡβωμί’ ὡς ὄτ’, 7.132-33; εἴθ’ ὡς ἡβώοιμι, 7.157), when he was the youngest of all participants (γενεῇ δὲ νεώτατος ἁπάντων, 7.153). And so too his account of former athletic successes, which is introduced with a similar wish for past youth (εἴθ’ ὡς ἡβώοιμι...ὡς ὀπότε, Il.23.629-30) and marked by a contrast between past and present (ὡς ποτ’ ἐν, 23.643; τότε δ’ αὖτε μετέπρεπον ἡρώεσσι, 23.645); athletic contests are now the preserve of younger men (νῦν αὖτε νεώτεροι, 23.643). Finally, his lengthy account of his former conflicts with the Epeians is similarly introduced with a wish for former youth (εἴθ’ ὡς ἡβώοιμι...ὡς ὀπότ’, Il.11.670-71), and includes Heracles’ destruction of Neleus’ eleven other sons ‘in earlier years’ (τῶν προτέρων ἐτέων, Il.11.691), cuing yet another episode of myth which appears to have been traditional: Heracles’ theomachic battle at Pylos is hinted at elsewhere in the Iliad and in other archaic poems, including the Hesiodic Aspis, which evokes

---

the event through a similar temporal reference (ἦδη...καὶ ἄλλοτε, Scut.359). Although these reminiscences each have a paradigmatic function within the immediate narrative, they all evoke other traditions attached to Nestor and Pylos. In the past, scholars have plausibly postulated elaborate Pylian epics as Homer’s sources, although we would do better to reframe them as traditions or fabulae. Nestor’s recurring temporal references thus frame his tales as prior traditions, against which Homer situates his own epic, comparing his own characters to the Nestorian and mythical past.

Temporal indexes, therefore, frequently signpost the evocation of another moment of myth, be it an intratextual reference to an earlier part of a single poem, or to the larger traditions against which Homer positions his own epics. Such indexes often convey a sense of continuity (Calchas still utters evil prophecies, Athena still supports Odysseus) or precedent (Odysseus follows in the tracks of Heracles, Theseus and Pirithous). Crucially, as with poetic memory, events both within and beyond a single poem are evoked in a similar manner, suggesting that they are all conceived as a long continuum of myth.

IV.2.2 Poetic Déjà Vu

In addition to these signalled back-references to earlier traditions and myths, both Homeric poems also exhibit cases of more pointed repetition and iteration – the second category of allusive temporality with which we began. These instances not only evoke an episode of the mythical past, but depict the present as a pointed replay of it, stressing even more clearly the continuity between past and present.

As with broad chronological perspective, this is a phenomenon which works both inter- and intra-textually. As an example of the former, we could cite the frequency with which the

28 Il.5.392-402; Scut.359-67; Pind.Ol.9.28-35.
30 Bölte (1934); Cantieni (1942); Hampe (1950) 28-29n.79; §1.2.1: 31.
*Odyssey* insists that the Phaeacians have ‘previously’ escorted men across the sea, an insistence which seems to hint at earlier traditions of their seafaring prowess (ὡς τὸ πάρος περ, 8.31; τίς ἄλλος, 8.32; καὶ ἄλλους, 16.227-78). As scholars have noted, the Phaeacians are unlikely to be a Homeric invention: the presence of alternative genealogies in Alcaeus (fr.441) and Acusilaus (fr.4 EGM) ‘make it *prima facie* unlikely that they too were only found in Homer in the Archaic period’, while the *Odyssey*’s mixed messages about the role of queen Arete may be indebted to other versions in which she played a more active role in hosting the hero (cf. Od.6.303-15, 7.53-77). Earlier in the poem, moreover, Alcinous has already recalled a previous occasion when the Phaeacians transported Rhadamanthys to Euboea (Od.7.321-24), a reference which ‘must be to some story created at an earlier stage of the tradition’. The *Odyssey* thus establishes Odysseus’ present voyage as a replay of the Phaeacians’ earlier, traditional escorting of men. Particularly intriguing in this regard, however, is the claim that the Phaeacians who took Odysseus home sailed into Ithaca by the Cave of the Nymphs, a place which they ‘knew previously’ (πρὶν εἰδότες, Od.13.113). By foregrounding their familiarity with Ithaca, the poet hints again at their traditional role as ferrymen, but perhaps especially at earlier accounts of Odysseus’ return. The Phaeacians have been to Ithaca before, in earlier treatments of Odysseus’ homecoming. Homer thus establishes a strong sense of déjà vu; it would indeed seem that the Phaeacians were ‘famous for their ships’ from the larger tradition (ναυσίκλυτοι, Od.13.166).

---


On an intratextual level, meanwhile, we can cite Ares’ rebuke of Athena in the Iliadic theomachy as an example of indexed iteration. We have already seen the god recall his former suffering at the hands of Diomedes (II.21.394-99, §III.2.2: 141-43), but we could also note the particle αὖτ’ which opens his complaint (II.21.394): Athena is ‘again’ driving the gods to fight against each other – a remark that even more self-consciously signals the replay of events from Iliad 5. In Odyssey 16, meanwhile, Athena makes Odysseus an old man ‘again’ by striking him with her wand (Od.16.456) – the indexical πάλιν directs us back to Homer’s previous and more extended description of the same transformation at Od.13.429-38. The temporal index marks the replay of a past action.

The most striking case of allusive iteration in Homeric epic, however, extends beyond repeated action to repeated language. Near the start of Iliad 12, the Trojans are afraid of Hector, who is said to ‘fight like a whirlwind as before’ (αὐτὰρ ὅ γ’ ώς τὸ πρόσθεν ἐμάρνατο ἰσος ἀέλλῃ, Il.12.40). As the Homeric scholia note, this phrase looks back to the poet’s similar description of Hector in the previous book (Il.11.294-98):35

Notably, these are the only two instances of ἰσος ἀέλλῃ in all extent early Greek hexameter poetry (both in the same sedes), a fact which suggests a strong connection between the two passages.36 Of course, the phrase may simply be an under-attested formula: elsewhere in Homer, ἰσος is paired with other nouns (including θῦελλα and λαίλαψ) to produce similar short similes, and the Trojans are once compared to ‘a blast of dire winds’ in comparable language (ἀργαλέων ἀνέμων ἀτάλαντοι ἀέλλῃ, Il.13.795-801).37 But even if the phrase is

35 Σ Il.12.40b: μέμνηται τῶν ἐπῶν ἐκείνων “ἐν δ’ ἐπεο’ ύσιμνη, ὑπεραεί ἰσος ἀέλλῃ”.
37 E.g. δαίμονι (Il.5.438, 5.459, etc.); Ἀρη (Il.11.295; Od.8.115, etc.); λαίλατι (Il.11.747, 12.375, 20.51), φλογὶ...ή ἲ θυέλλῃ (Il.13.39); ἐγνεῖ (Il.18.56, 18.437; Od.14.175).
IV.2.2 Poetic Déjà Vu

formulaic, its unique repetition within a short space of time here is significant, marking the continuity in Hector’s actions – not only is he still fighting the Achaeans as he was before, but he is doing so in precisely the same manner (cf. too the further storm simile at Il.11.305-8). The abbreviated length of the Iliad 12 simile (a single half-verse) may even hint at this repetition: it presupposes the fuller, prior version from the previous book. Homer thus practically quotes himself, and by accompanying the verbal repetition with the indexical ὡς τὸ πρόσθεν, he acknowledges this iterative act. On a larger scale, this repetition also marks the narrative’s return to action and battle after the lengthy interlude in Nestor’s tent in the later part of book 11. In an elaborate ring composition, the narrator picks up where he left off.38 Here, therefore, we have a temporal reference signposting an intratextual quotation within the Iliad, a phenomenon which closely resembles the literate poetics of a later age.

IV.2.3 Epic Epigonality

Already in Early Greek Epic, therefore, time was an important index of allusion: temporal references signalled interactions with other stories and episodes, as well as continuities with the larger tradition. However, as with the other indexes we have explored, this phenomenon is not restricted to the Iliad and Odyssey, but can be found throughout archaic Greek epic. We have already noted a case in the Aspis (ἡδη...καὶ ἄλλοτε, Scut.359, §IV.2.1: 197-98), and we can add further examples from Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns. These poems frequently index passing references to myths with temporal adverbs: in the Hesiodic Catalogue, Apollo ‘once’ killed Hyacinthus with a discus (ποτ’, fr.171.7), evoking the tale of the god’s tragic killing of his beloved,39 and Eetion, also known as Iasion, ‘once’ suffered for sleeping with Demeter (ποτέ, fr.177.9).40 In the Homeric Hymn to Apollo, the myth of Typhon is introduced with a pair

of ποτέ adverbs (HhAp.305, 307), marking the traditionality of the myth,\textsuperscript{41} while in the \textit{Hymn to Hermes}, the newborn god sings of his parents’ union as something of the past (πάρος, HhHerm.58), an index which points not only to the traditional nature of the account, but also to the fact that the union had been narrated in the poet’s own voice at the very start of the poem (HhHerm.1-12); within the context of the hymn, this is indeed ‘old news’.\textsuperscript{42} In Hesiod’s \textit{Works and Days}, meanwhile, the poet makes a passing reference to the gathering of the Greeks at Aulis before the Trojan war, indexed with a temporal ποτέ (Op.650-3):

\[\text{oὐ γάρ πώ ποτε νηὶ [γ'] ἐπέπλων εὐφέα πόντον,}\]
\[\text{εἰ μὴ ἐς Εὐβοιαν ἔξ Ἀὐλίδος, ἣ ποτ' Ἀχαιοὶ}\]
\[\text{μείναντες χειμώνα πολύν σὺν λαὸν ἄγειραν}\]
\[\text{Ἑλλάδος ἔξ ἱερῆς Τροίην ἐς καλλιγύναικα.}\]

As scholars have long noted, this reference inaugurates an agonistic moment of Hesiodic self-fashioning, as the poet positions himself against martial epic. Hesiod evokes a core element of the Trojan war \textit{fabula}, the gathering at Aulis, as a foil for his own endeavours: his short, brief and immediately successful voyage contrasts with the long, arduous ἄεθλα of the Greeks (cf. ἄεθλα, Op.654).\textsuperscript{43} In particular, scholars have noted the ‘correction’ of traditional epic language in verse 653: Troy is traditionally ‘holy’ and Greece ‘fair-womaned’, but Hesiod inverts these terms.\textsuperscript{44} By stealing Helen, Troy hardly deserves to be called ‘holy’, but it is now very much a ‘land of beautiful women’.\textsuperscript{45} Through the temporal adverb ποτέ, Hesiod thus evokes a past and familiar tradition against which he positions his own poetry. In this case, the temporal index marks a more competitive evocation of another myth and poetic tradition.

\textsuperscript{41} Il.2.780-85; Hes.\textit{Theog.}820-80; §II.2.3: 76-82.
\textsuperscript{42} Cf. Vergados (2013) 271.
The indexical potential of time, therefore, extended throughout archaic Greek epic. It was largely employed to evoke other episodes in an encyclopaedic manner, gesturing to the larger map of tradition, but it could also play a more supplementary role (nodding to other parts of Trojan myth mentioned in passing) or bear an agonistic edge (as with Hesiod and Aulis). So far, however, we have noted plentiful examples of the first two categories of temporal indexicality, but no real example of the third, epigonal self-consciousness. In extant archaic epic, we find no direct invocations of poetic predecessors, a stark foil to later epicists’ direct naming of their forebears (Statius and the ‘divine Aeneid’, divinam Aeneida, Theb.12.816-17; Nonnus and ‘father Homer’, πατρὸς Ὀμήρου, Dion.25.265). This absence may largely reflect the predominantly anonymous persona of archaic epicists (especially Homer), as well as the prominence of the epic Muse: as we have noted before, the ‘fiction’ of the Muses conceals the reality of bardic education and transmission.\(^46\) The poets’ self-presentation did not permit a direct invocation of their πρότεροι.

Yet even so, there remains an underlying tension in the temporal framework of both the Iliad and Odyssey which may enact the poet’s relationship with his predecessors on a more implicit level. As we have seen, the Iliadic Nestor repeatedly contrasts the grandeur of the past with the more mundane present, and he is far from alone in doing so.\(^47\) Tlepolemus claims that his rival Sarpedon is far inferior to those warriors who were sprung from Zeus ‘in the days of men of old’ (ἐπὶ προτέρων ἀνθρώπων, Il.5.637).\(^48\) Odysseus claims that he would not attempt to rival ‘men of the past’, like Heracles or Eurytus of Oechalia (ἀνδράσι...προτέροισιν, Od.8.223), the kind of men whom he encounters in the Underworld (προτέροις...ἀνέρας, Od.11.630). And Diomedes is criticised by Agamemnon for not living up to the standards of his father (II.4.365-400).\(^49\) Homer’s heroes constantly live in the shadow of their predecessors.

\(^{46}\) §II.2: 60; Ford (1992) 61-63, 90-130.

\(^{47}\) For generational change in Homer generally: Mackie (2008).

\(^{48}\) Kelly (2010).

Given the degree of self-consciousness that we have encountered elsewhere in Homer, it would be attractive to interpret these epigonal moments as a model for Homer’s own relationship to his epic forebears and the pre-existing tradition. After all, this nagging contrast between past and present explicitly extends to the narrator’s own day when he acknowledges the greater strength of his heroes: not even two men of the present could match the strength of a Diomedes or a Hector in lifting rocks (Il.5.302-4, 12.445-49, 20.285-87; cf. 12.381-83). It is not only Homer’s characters that feel the burden of living up to the past, but also the contemporary world of the poet himself. Given this complementarity, we may be justified to see the heroes’ anxious expressions of epigonality as indexing the poet’s own tense relationship with tradition. Scodel has recently suggested such a metapoetic reading, arguing that the modesty of Homer’s heroes reflects the poet’s own deference to tradition: ‘as his characters stand in awe of the mighty men of the past…so the poet views other styles of epic with respect’. It is certainly true that the Homeric poems present themselves as direct heirs to a deep tradition of great achievement. But I am less prepared to see this as a simple expression of meek submission. Rather, I contend that these assertions of epigonality exhibit an eristic drive comparable to that we have encountered elsewhere: despite the overbearing burden of the past, neither Homer nor his characters are fully resigned to an inferior status.

Such agonistic epigonality is clearest when a Homeric son explicitly surpasses his father, resisting the rhetoric of perpetual decline. As we have just noted, Agamemnon accuses Diomedes of failing to live up to his father’s standards in *Iliad* 4. His companion Sthenelus, however, revises this claim (*Iliad* 4.403-10):

\[
\text{τὸν δ᾽ υἱός Καπανήος ἀμείψατο κυδαλίμοιο·}
\text{Ατρείδη μὴ ψεüδε ἐπιστάμενος σάφα εἰπεῖν·}
\text{ἡμεῖς τοι πατέρων μέγ᾽ ἀμείνονε εὐχόμεθ᾽ εἶναι·}
\text{ἡμεῖς καὶ Θήβης ἕδομεν ἑπταπύλοι παυρότερον λαὸν ἀγαγόνθ᾽ ὑπὸ τεῖχος ἄρειον,}
\text{πειθόμενοι τεράεσσι θεῶν καὶ Ζηνὸς ἀρωγῇ·}
\text{κεῖνοι δὲ σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο·}
\text{τὼ μή μοι πατέρας ποθ᾽ ὁμοίῇ ἐνθέο τιμῆ.}
\]

Contrary to Agamemnon’s allegations, Sthenelus asserts that Diomedes is superior to his father, who is no paradigm worth emulating. Sthenelus and Diomedes succeeded where their parents had failed, sacking Thebes even when the odds were against them. They were the ones who successfully trusted the gods’ portents (πειθόμενοι τεφάεσσι θεῶν, 4.408), not Tydeus, as Agamemnon had claimed (θεῶν τεφάεσσι πιθήσας, 4.398). And they also profited from Zeus’ help (Ζηνὸς ἀρωγῇ, 4.408), an extra detail which combatively caps Agamemnon’s account: they even had the king of the gods on their side.\textsuperscript{51} Tydeus, by contrast, perished alongside the rest of the Seven through their own folly (σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσι ὄλοντο, 4.409), an expression which recurs only once elsewhere in Greek poetry to describe the recklessness of Odysseus’ companions in the \textit{Odyssey} (Od.1.7); like them, the Seven’s intransigence and impiety caused their own downfall.\textsuperscript{52} Within an explicitly generational frame (ἡμεῖς...πατέρων 4.405; μοι πατέρας, 4.410), Sthenelus’ speech thus establishes a clear contrast between father and son in pointedly agonistic terms: the younger warrior, now at Troy, surpasses his father who fought at Thebes.

For the \textit{Iliad}’s relationship with Theban myth, this intergenerational opposition can be interpreted in at least two ways. Slatkin has read the presence of the Theban Epigonoi in Troy as an implicit threat to the Iliadic narrative: given their former success with a small force against a stronger defence (\textit{Il}.4.407), these Theban warriors risk outdoing Agamemnon’s own warriors, who also outnumber the Trojan contingent (\textit{Il}.2.119-30, 13.737-39, 15.405-7).\textsuperscript{53} Yet as she herself admits, Diomedes’ rebuke of Sthenelus here and his later words of support for the expedition (\textit{Il}.9.32-49) place him ‘and his companion firmly within the Achaean cohort’, seamlessly incorporating these former Theban warriors into Agamemnon’s and Homer’s panHellenic project.\textsuperscript{54} Far from being a threat to the Achaean mission, they are an integral part of it.

\textsuperscript{52} Barker – Christensen (2011) 25-26; O’Maley (2014).
\textsuperscript{53} Slatkin (2011a) 112; cf. Nagy (1979) 162-63n.3.
\textsuperscript{54} Slatkin (2011a) 113.
In this regard, their superiority to their fathers can instead be interpreted as standing for Homer’s own supremacy over Theban tradition, despite his junior – even ‘epigonal’ – status. Barker and Christensen have effectively demonstrated how this whole Iliadic passage sets Tydeus’ solitary Achillean heroism against the larger Iliadic ethos of collaboration and collective achievement.\textsuperscript{55} Yet this passage also implies a more direct disparity between the fortunes of the Seven and the Greeks at Troy: Zeus’ signs of ill-will when Tydeus visited Mycenae (παραίσια σήματα, \textit{Il}.4.381) directly contrast with the positive signals he offered at the start of the Trojan expedition (ἐναίσιμα σήματα, \textit{Il}.2.353).\textsuperscript{56} If Pindar’s specification that Zeus failed to hurl propitious lightning for the Seven (οὐδὲ Κρονίων ἀστεροπὰν ἐλελίξαις, \textit{Nem}.9.19) draws on earlier Theban traditions, as Braswell has suggested,\textsuperscript{57} the contrast could be even more precise: it was precisely Zeus’ auspicious lightning that marked the departure of the Greeks to Troy (ἀστράπτων ἐπιδέξι’, \textit{Il}.2.353). Agamemnon’s troops, like the Epigonoi, are set to succeed where the Seven failed. Homer’s evocation of Theban myth thus has a distinctively agonistic edge, defining the \textit{Iliad} against the failed heroism of a rival tradition’s older generation. Other archaic poets often presented Trojan and Theban war traditions on a par with each other;\textsuperscript{58} yet Homer was clearly not content with such parity and instead implies his own poetic supremacy, offering perhaps the earliest Greek instance of generational succession as an intertextual trope.\textsuperscript{59} What makes this poetic polemic so striking, however, is how it reverses the usual epic pattern of generational decline and the unreachability of the past. In contrast to Hesiod’s ‘Myth of Races’ and the repeated Homeric refrain of the greater strength of past heroes (\textit{Il}.5.304, 12.383, 20.287), in this case the younger and newer generation proves superior: Diomedes surpasses Tydeus and Homer outshines Theban myth.


\textsuperscript{56} Ebbott (2014) 334.


The Homeric language of time, therefore, conveys a strong implicit sense of epigonality. The poet does not directly compare himself with his πρότεροι, but he does so implicitly through the anxieties voiced by his characters. A similarly agonistic stance can also be found in other cases where characters position themselves against former generations. In the *Odyssey*, although Odysseus claims that he would not compete with men of the past like Heracles (ἀνδράσι...προτέροισιν, *Od*.8.223), his katabatic encounter with that very hero can be read in pointedly eristic terms: the hero stresses that he went to Hades ‘under his own steam’ without a guide (*Od*.10.501-5), in comparison to Heracles, who relied on help from Hermes and Athena (11.626).\(^60\) Moreover, in killing the suitors with the bow of Eurytus (another predecessor: *Od*.8.224), he accomplishes ‘a feat suggesting a likeness between himself and these heroes after all’.*\(^61\) Indeed, Amphimedon’s ghost pictures Odysseus in a staunchly Heraclean mode as he commences the slaughter, glancing about terribly, just like Heracles in the Underworld – a unique and meaningful repetition (δεινὸν παπταίνων, *Od*.24.179 = 11.608).\(^62\) In spite of Odysseus’ protestations of inferiority, therefore, his actions in fact prove a match to those of the previous generation. In more general terms, too, the greater piety of the Homeric heroes can be read as a mark of their superiority over the brutality and theomachic pretensions of earlier generations.\(^63\) Homeric heroes’ tense relations with their predecessors, therefore, mark Homer’s own relationship with tradition.

And nor is this just a Homeric phenomenon: the opening of the Cyclic *Epigonoi* similarly highlights its epigonal status. The narrator invites the Muse to begin ‘now, in turn’ on the ‘younger men’ (νῦν αὖθ’ ὁπλοτέρων ἀνδρῶν ἀρχώμεθα, Μοῦσαι, fr.1). Here,

---


\(^61\) Crissy (1997) 50.


temporal adverbs combine with Nestorian language of youth to highlight the *Epigoni*’s self-conscious secondariness as a sequel to the *Thebaid*.64 As in *Iliad* 4, the generational succession embedded in Theban myth appears to have made it a ripe source for figuring the poet’s relationship with his traditional heritage. As we shall see in the next chapter, such positioning against predecessors was to become an even more important – and explicit – part of later lyric poets’ literary posturing.

Already in Early Greek Hexameter Poetry, therefore, we find traces of all three categories of temporal indexicality with which we began. Time proved an active trope to figure a poet’s relationship with other texts and traditions, with both an encyclopaedic and agonistic edge. Temporal indexes signpost passing references to other traditions, as well as more pointed replays of tradition, while epic heroes’ epigonal relationships with their πρότεροι figure the tensions of the poet’s own relationship with his predecessors. Together, these various temporal indexes map out the larger tradition against which epic poets situate their own, epigonal work.

---

IV.3 Lyric Temporalities

The indexical potential of time becomes even more potent in archaic Greek lyric, a corpus of poetry that is intimately concerned with occasion, performance and the interconnections of past and present. Although lyric focuses largely on contemporary events and situations, lyricists often evoke moments of myth or history as parallels for the present. We have seen that cases of poetic memory were surprisingly rare in lyric poetry, but time – by contrast – is a recurrent concern. As in epic, references to earlier events of the literary tradition are frequently framed in overtly temporal terms, marking lyricists’ epigonal relationship with their literary heritage (§IV.3.1). Yet even more explicitly, the frequently personal voices of lyric prompted numerous direct references to earlier poetic predecessors (§IV.3.2), alongside a far greater awareness of the repetitive nature of poetic composition (§IV.3.3).

IV.3.1 Once Upon a Time

Let us start with lyricists’ more general appeals to poetic antiquity – occasions on which they knowingly nod to the literary past. As in Homer, earlier episodes from the literary tradition are often signposted as ancient and venerable traditions, framing the audience’s and poet’s relationship with them in temporal terms. Archilochus’ Telephus elegy, for example, introduces the mythical exemplum of the Achaean’s retreat on Mysia with καὶ ποτὲ (fr.17a.4), marking the familiarity of the myth, as known from the Cypria and elsewhere (cf. §II.3.1: 90n.81), while Alcman introduces the myth of Odysseus and Circe with a Doric inflection of the same phrase, pointing to well-known Odyssean traditions (fr.80): καὶ ποκ’

---

65 On temporality in lyric poetry, tied to issues of performance and occasion: Mackie (2003); D’Alessio (2004); Budelmann (2017).
In a more personal, intratextual move, meanwhile, Sappho claims that ‘**once long ago**, I loved you, Atthis’ (ἠράμαν μὲν ἔγω σέθεν, Ἄτθι, πάλαι ποτά, fr.49.1), a phrase which – like the reminiscences of Atthis in fr.96 (cf.§III.3.1: 164-65) – may well evoke earlier poems about Sappho’s relationship with this girl, which ended with Atthis flying off to another woman, Andromeda (fr.131). A particularly loaded use of a temporal adverb, however, occurs in the hymnic proem of Theognis’ first book. After two invocations of Apollo and one of Artemis, the poet calls on the Muses and Graces, recalling their former presence at the wedding of Cadmus and Harmonia (Thgn.1.15-18):

Μοῦσαι καὶ Χάριτες, κούραι Διός, αἱ ποτε Κάδμου
ἐς γάμον ἐλθοῦσαι καλὸν ἀείσατ’ ἐπος,
“ὅτι καλόν, φίλον ἐστί· τὸ δ’ οὐ καλὸν οὐ φίλον ἐστί,”
τοῦτ’ ἐπος αθανάτων ἦλθε διὰ στομάτων.

This wedding was a well-established mythical episode: it features already in Hesiod’s *Theogony* (Theog.937, 975) and Pindar’s third *Pythian* ode, singing Muses and all (Pyth.3.88-99, esp. 90 μελπομενᾶν...Μοισᾶν). Given its prominent proemial position, immediately before the poet’s sphragis, the recollection here appears to have a particularly programmatic function: the Muses’ and Graces’ quoted verse exploits the polysemous range of καλός to praise not just moral goodness and nobility, a key concern of the *Theognidea*, but also aesthetic and poetic

---

66 Alcman may allude to an alternative version than that in our *Odyssey*, or creatively combine elements from the tradition known to us, blurring Circe’s advice to Odysseus (ἐπὶ δ’οὐατ’ ἀλείψαι ἑταίρων, Od.12.47) with her actual anointing of his companions to restore their human form (προσάλειφεν, Od.10.392): cf. Davison (1955) 139-40; Hinge (2006) 257; Kelly (2015a) 32-33.

67 For these four prefatory invocations, scholars compare the four which precede a collection of Attic *skolia* preserved by Athenaeus 15.694c-695f (884-87 PMG). Despite the clearly composite nature of the *Theognidea*, I am prepared to read what we have as a unity with some design. For a summary of views on the corpus’ origin: Gerber (1997) 117-20; Selle (2008) esp. 372-93; Gagné (2013) 249-51.

68 On the wedding: Gantz (1996) 471-72, adding Nonn.Dion. 5.88-189, the fullest extant treatment of the episode (with the Muses’ song at 103).
beauty. What matters more specifically for us here, however, is the manner in which this famous mythical episode is signposted as a past event (ποτέ). In addition to this temporal indexing, the Muses’ song is also flagged as pointedly epic: the goddesses’ gnome is explicitly called an ἔπος in the lines that precede and follow it (Thgn.1.16, 18), perhaps prompting an audience to recall pre-existing epic traditions of the Theban marriage.70 The content of the quoted verse also reinforces this impression. Although the phrase was apparently proverbial by the fifth century,71 it appears to have retained a specific association with Cadmus: in Euripides’ Phoenissae, the chorus offer a variation of the phrase shortly before mentioning the same Theban marriage,72 while the sentiment reappears as a refrain in the third stasimon of the Bacchae, at the very moment that Pentheus, Cadmus’ grandson, unwittingly heads to his death. With grim irony, the dynasty’s origins are recalled at the demise of its last representative (ὅτι καλὸν φίλον αἰεί, Bacch.881, 901). Given the phrase’s recurring association with Cadmus’ race, it is thus tempting to see Theognis self-consciously citing a famous verse associated with the marriage. Dodds suspects Hesiod as the ultimate source,73 but given our absence of further evidence, it makes more sense to speak of Theban epic tradition in general, a tradition which – as we have already seen – was a rich source of allusive material from Homer onwards (§IV.2.3:204-6). Once more, we thus have an allusive evocation of other traditions signalled in temporal terms, here with the additional prompt of a generic cue.


71 Plato cites it as such: ἀδιάκριτα παροιμία (Lys.216c).

72 οὐ γάρ ὁ μὴ καλὸν οὕτως ἐφη καλὸν (Phoen.814)... Ἀρμονίας δὲ ποτ’ εἰς ύμεναίους ἡλθείς οὐρανίδαι (Phoen.822-3). Valckenaer’s emendation (ἐφη φίλον) reinforces the connection but is unnecessary.

73 Dodds (1960) 187.
Such temporal indexing of other myths and traditions, however, is especially prominent in the odes of Pindar, from whom we only have space to cite several examples. In *Nemean 3*, the poet sets out to celebrate Aegina, the land ‘where the Myrmidons of old dwelled’ with their ‘long-famed assembly place’ (Μυρμιδόνες ἵνα πρότεροι ὄρισαν, ὧν παλαίφατον ἀγοράν κτλ., *Nem.3.13-14*). The double emphasis on antiquity reinforces a reference to the myth which originally situated Aeacus in Aegina, as the offspring of the nymph Aegina and Zeus, before he relocated to Thessalian Phthia.75 In *Pythian 6*, meanwhile, Pindar introduces Antilochus’ self-sacrifice to save his father Nestor as a model for Thrasybulus’ similar behaviour in the present (*Pyth.6.28-45*), recalling an episode already apparently told in the *Aethiopis* (*Aeth. arg.2c*). Here too, the myth is presented in a temporal frame: the opening καὶ πρότερον (*Pyth.6.28*) firmly situates the episode in the past, as does the closural τὰ μὲν παρίκει (*Pyth.6.43*). Together, these comments signal the literary antiquity of this episode, while also marking it off from Pindar’s poetic present: like modern-day speech marks, they frame the mythical citation. This temporal distance is further reinforced by the final mention of the praise bestowed on Antilochus by the young men in the generation of those ‘long ago’ (τῶν πάλαι γενεὰ | ὁπλοτέροισιν, *Pyth.6.40-41*) – Antilochus’ achievements belong to the distant past of literary myth. In this specific context, the emphasis on Antilochus’ antiquity also forms an effective contrast with Thrasybulus, who attains the same standard most closely of men alive in Pindar’s day (τῶν νῦν, *Pyth.6.44*). The distance in time between the two youths aptly parallels the temporal sweep between Pindar and his literary predecessors.


75 The double temporal reference may also index allusions to the *Iliad* (Xian (2018)) and to the tradition that the Myrmidons were transformed from ants (μύρμηκες; *Hes.fr.205*; Carnes (1990)).

As a final Pindaric example, however, we should cite a case in which temporal references appear to conceal slight innovations in the mythical record. We have previously noted the importation of the local into panhellenic myth, authorised by Pindar’s appeal to the ‘ancient talk of men’ in Olympian 7 (ἀνθρώπων παλαιαί ρήσιες, OI.7.54-5: §II.3.4: 117-18), but we could also add the miniature narrative of Peleus’ and Telamon’s achievements in Nemean 3, which is introduced with the description of Peleus taking delight in παλαιαί ἀρεταί, ‘achievements of long ago’ (Nem.3.32-39):

παλαιαίσι δ’ ἐν ἀρεταῖς
gέγαθε Πηλεὺς ἄναξ, ύπέραλλον αἰχμὰν ταμών·
διὰ καὶ Ιῳλκὸν εἶλε μόνος ἀνευ στρατιᾶς,
καὶ ποντίαν Θέτιν κατέμαρψεν ἐγκονητί.
sciously Λαομέδοντα δ’ εὐρυσθενής
Τελαμὼν Ἰόλαι παραστάτας ἔως ἐπερσεν·
καὶ ποτε χαλκότοξον Ἀμαζόνων μετ’ ἀλκὰν
ἐπετό οί· οὐδέ νίν ποτε φόβος ἀνδροδάμας ἔπαυσεν ἀκμὰν φρενῶν.

The verses summarise a number of major moments in each hero’s life: Peleus’ acquisition of his famous spear from Mt. Pelion, his capture of the city of Iolcus and his marriage to Thetis, alongside Telamon’s involvement in the first sack of Troy and his battle with the Amazons. These are all well known features of each hero’s mythological biography, here serving as appropriate models of success for Pindar’s laudandus Aristocleidias.77 In particular, Peleus’ conquest of Thetis is figured in distinctly athletic terms (κατέμαρψεν, ἐγκονητί), presaging Aristocleidias’ own pancratium success in the present.78 But in the case of Peleus’ other two

77 For Peleus’ sack of Iolcus: Hes.fr. 211, fr.212(b); Pind.Nem.4.54-65. For his marriage to Thetis: Nem.5.34-37, Isth.8.26-47. For Telamon’s accompaniment of Heracles against Laomedon’s Troy: §II.3.1: 94n.95; and against the Amazons: fr.adesp.9 EGF (= 1168 SH: Vecchiato (2016)), and various vases (von Bothmer (1957) 234: Index of Inscribed Names, s.v. ‘Telamon’). Both these Telamonian exploits are occasionally associated with Peleus (Pind.Isth.5.36-37, fr.172; Eur.Andr.796).

successes, his acquisition of his spear and sack of Iolcus, Pindar’s appeal to ‘ancient achievements’ appears to conceal pointed deviations from the mainstream tradition.\footnote{Cf. Pfeijffer (1999) 206-8.} In the case of his spear, the hero is depicted as having cut it himself (ὑπέραλλον αἰχμὰν ταμών, \textit{Nem}.3.33), unlike earlier epic accounts in which the spear is a wedding gift from Cheiron (\textit{Il}.16.140-44 ≈ 19.387-91, \textit{Cypr}.fr.4), and even shaped by the divine hands of Athena and Hephaestus (\textit{Cypr}.fr.4); while in his sack of Iolcus, he is depicted as a lone fighter (μόνος ἀνευ στρατιῶτας, \textit{Nem}.3.34), unlike other versions in which he is helped by Jason and the Dioscuri.\footnote{Pherec.fr.62; Apollod.\textit{Bibl}.3.13.7.} As the scholia to the passage note, Pindar seems to be ‘indulging Peleus for the sake of his Aeginetan victor’, exaggerating his achievements for rhetorical effect (δόξει δὲ ὁ Πίνδαρος διὰ τὸν Αἰγινήτην χαρίζεσθαι τῶι Πηλεῖ, Σ \textit{Nem}.3.57). In fashioning his own supreme spear and in single-handedly sacking Iolcus, this Peleus is a pre-eminent paradigm of Aeginetan success. By introducing these adaptations as παλαιαὶ ἀρεταί, Pindar thus lends legitimacy to his innovative spin on tradition.

As in epic, therefore, temporal references in lyric – and especially Pindaric poetry – frequently signal interactions with other mythical stories and episodes. Temporally marked adjectives and adverbs highlight allusions both to earlier treatments of myths and to a poet’s own earlier poetry. In this way, archaic lyricists drew on the esteem of tradition to legitimise their own poetic authority, while also occasionally concealing their innovative versions of myth in the garb of tradition. The literary past thus remained a fruitful resource to be both appropriated and reconfigured.

\subsection*{IV.3.2 Poetic Predecessors}

\footnote{Cf. Pfeijffer (1999) 206-8.}

\footnote{Pherec.fr.62; Apollod.\textit{Bibl}.3.13.7.}
Besides these allusive temporal markers, some lyricists also went further than their epic ancestors in directly acknowledging and citing their literary forebears. Thanks to the less detached voice of lyric, these poets could actively refer to their predecessors with an epigonal self-awareness, both naming them approvingly as a source of authority and citing them antagonistically as in need of correction. In the Introduction, we have already discussed lyricists’ direct naming of their forebears (§I.2.3:42-45). Here, however, I shall focus on vague appeals to anonymous predecessors, a loaded gesture of epigonality which often conceals citations of poetic traditions or even specific texts. Temporal relations in lyric poetry were not just elaborated in the world of myth itself, but also explicitly between these poets and earlier generations of bards.

In some cases, poetic πρότεροι are cited as a source of authority, whose example a poet readily follows. Again, this phenomenon is especially prevalent in Pindar. In Nemean 6, the Theban poet closes his description of Achilles’ victory over Memnon (Nem.6.49-53) with the claim that he follows the ‘highway of song’ that was found by ‘older poets’ (καὶ ταῦτα μὲν παλαιότεροι ὁδὸν ἀμαξιτὸν εὗρον· ἕπομαι δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔχων μελέταν, Nem.6.53-54). The poet marks his epigonal relationship to the epic tradition, especially that of the Aethiopis, with a firm sense of belatedness.81 Similarly in Nemean 3, the poet intersperses his account of Achilles’ life (Nem.3.43-63) with the claim that ‘The story I have to tell was told by my predecessors’ (λεγόμενον δὲ τοῦτο προτέρων ἔπος ἔχω, Nem.3.52-53). Here too, this gesture marks the traditionality of the whole account, both the preceding details of Achilles’ upbringing (Nem.3.43-52) and the following highlights of his military career, which – as in Nemean 6 – include his Aethiopic clash with Memnon (Nem.3.56-63).82 Pindar pictures his

---


82 Cf. Bury (1890) 55; West (2011b) 60; Agócs (2011) 207-8. Pfeijffer (1999) 350-51 suspects that the preceding account of Achilles’ miraculous youth is Pindaric invention, but see Rawles (2018) 38n.44 on the traces of such a tradition in iconography. Pfeijffer may be right, however, to see Achilles’ youth here foreshadowing Achilles’ future exploits as known in the Iliad (Pfeijffer (1999) 213), fitting the ode’s larger interest in the consistency of an individual’s virtue across a lifetime (Nem.3.70-75).
predecessors as a monolithic block, acknowledging the authoritative weight of the epic

As with indexical appeals to hearsay, however, generalised plurals can also conceal a

nod to specific literary predecessors. In Pythian 3, for example, Pindar cites his πρότεροι for a

statement which scholars both ancient and modern have read as a a reference to our Iliad

(Pyth.3.80-82):

εἰ δὲ λόγων συνέμεν κορυφάν, Τέρων, ὀρθὰν ἐπίστα, μανθάνων οἶσθα προτέροι
ἐν παρ’ ἑσλὸν πήματα σύνδυο δαιόνται βροτοὶ ἀθάνατοι.

If Hieron can understand the true point of sayings, Pindar claims, he will know the lesson of

their πρότεροι, that the immortals apportion to humans a pair of evils for every good. Since

antiquity, this gnomic statement has plausibly been interpreted as a reference to Achilles’

famous description of the jars of Zeus in Iliad 24: δοιοὶ γάρ τε πίθοι κατακείαται ἐν Διὸς

οὔδε | δώρων οἷα δίδωσι κακῶν, ἕτερος δὲ ἑάων (II.24.527-28).83 But while most other ancient

commentators interpreted the passage as referring to two jars, one of evil and one of good

(e.g. Pl. Resp.379d; Plut. Mor.24a), Pindar appears to have creatively misread the text to make
two parts of evil for every one part of good, a ratio which chimes with the ode’s larger concern
with the ‘preponderance of pain’.84 Of course, there are no precise verbal echoes between these
specific lines and Pindar does not even mention urns, which might lead us to suspect that he
is simply referring to a more general gnome. Yet the ensuing paradigmatic presence of Peleus
in both texts reinforces the connection: in each poem, the hero enjoys unsurpassed prosperity
(ὀλβὸν ὑπέρτατον, Pyth.3.89 ~ πάντας γὰρ ἐτ’ ἀνθρώποις ἐκέκαστο | ὀλβῶ τε πλοῦτῳ τε, Il.24.535-36) and marries the divine Thetis (Pyth.3.92-96 ~ II.24.537), but suffers because of the
misfortune of his only (μόνον/ἑνα) child (Pyth.3.100-103 ~ II.24.540).85 In both cases, moreover,

83 Cannatà Fera (1986); Macleod (1982) 133; Robbins (1990) 313-14; Mann (1994) 318-23; Fearn (2007) 73n.142;

84 Robbins (1990) 313-17; cf. Σ Pyth.3.141a.

the moral is the same: one must accept one’s lot (Pyth.3.103-4 ~ Il.24.543-51). Given this series of parallels, it is thus tempting to see verses 81-82 as a pointed variatio (and misreading) of the Iliadic sentiment, suited to Pindar’s larger consolatory goal, co-opting the authority of his Homeric predecessor. Moreover, besides the appeal to πρότεροι, this allusion is further triggered by a string of nearby indexes, including Pindar’s emphasis on words (λόγοι) and understanding (ἐπίστα, οἶσθα), alongside the footnoting λέγονται that introduces the account of Peleus (Pyth.3.88). This accumulation of indexical markers encourages us to look to the specific Iliadic intertext underlying Pindar’s rather vague gesture to his πρότεροι. Behind the generalised ‘predecessors’, we find a precise reference to the greatest of them all, Homer himself.

Such epigonal awareness is even clearer in the opening of Isthmian 2, as Pindar sketches out his own literary history by drawing a contrast between the behaviour of former poets (‘men of long ago’, οἱ μὲν πάλαι ... φῶτες) and modern-day hirelings obsessed with a profit. Whereas the former freely shot forth pederastic hymns at beautiful boys, the Muse of Pindar’s day has now become a greedy labourer (Isth.2.1-11):

Οἱ μὲν πάλαι, ὦ Θρασύβουλε, φῶτες, οἱ χρυσαμπύκων
ὲς διφρόν Μοσάν ἐβαινὸν κλυτὰ φόρμιγγι συναντόμενοι,
όμιφα παίδειος ἐτύξεουν μελιγάρυας ύμνους,
δότες ἔων καλὸς εἶχεν Ἀφροδίτας
ἐυθρόνον μινάστει τάν ἀδίσταν ὀπώροις.

ἀ Μοίσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδής πω τότ’ ἦν οὐδ’ ἐργάτις:
οὐδ’ ἐπέρναν τῶν γιλικεία μελιφθόγγον ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας
ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωτα μαλθακόφωνοι αἰσθαί.

νῦν δ’ ἐφίητι <τὸ> τὸν τιφρείον φυλάεια
ψεῦδα ἀλαθείας < u -> ἀγχίστα βαῖνον,

“χρήματα χρήματ᾿ ἀνήρ” ὡς φά κτεάνων θ’ ἀμα λειψθεῖς καὶ φίλων.

Here too, a vague reference to earlier men (οἱ πάλαι φῶτες) bears a specific poetic resonance, recalling earlier literary traditions, reinforced by the indexical reference to these poets’ ‘famous lyre’ (κλυτὰ φόρμιγγι, Isth.2.7). The scholia cite Alcaeus, Ibycus and Anacreon as the kinds of
predecessors that Pindar must have in mind, and Pindar’s language supports this inference. Already in antiquity, scholars noted specific echoes of both Anacreon and Alcaeus: the former wistfully recalls a time when ‘Persuasion did not shine all silver’ (οὐδ’ ἀργυρη κω τότ’ ἐλαμπε Πειθώ, Anac.fr.384), comparable to Pindar’s nostalgic reminiscence of a time before the silver-faced songs of his own day (ἀργυρῆ ~ ἀργυρωθεῖσαι, Isth.2.8; οὐδ’ ...κω τότ’ ~ οὐ...πω τότ’, Isth.2.6), while Alcaeus is also recorded as citing the proverb of Aristodemus in Sparta, presumably the same person as Pindar’s ‘Argive man’ (fr.360 ~ Isth.2.9-11). But there is more besides these long-acknowledged intertexts: one of the few earlier poetic appearances of the noun ὀπώρα is Alcaeus’ τερένας ἄνθος ὀπώρας (‘the flower of soft autumn’, fr.397 ~ ὀπώραν, Isth.2.5), a fragment whose floral imagery suggests a potentially pederastic context. More generally, the erotic flavour of these verses is reinforced by the degrading prostitution of the Muse Terpischore: as previous scholars have recognised, ἐργάτις (2.6) here suggests ‘courtesan’ (cf. Archil.fr.208) and ἐπέρναντο (2.7) aurally evokes the role of the πόρνη, while the description of silver-faced songs (2.8) recalls the white-painted faces of Greek prostitutes in addition to the payment of silver coins. Through his vague reference to ‘men of long ago’, therefore, Pindar conjures up a whole genre of pederastic poetry – and potentially even specific

---

86 Σ Isth.2.1b. This trio are commonly cited as erotic poets (e.g. Ar.Thesm.161-62): Woodbury (1968) 532n.6.
89 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1922) 311 with n.1; Thummer (1968-69) II.40; Rawles (2018) 136n.8.
Poetic Predecessors

In other cases, however, Pindar and his fellow lyricists cite their predecessors in a more agonistic mode, polemically positioning themselves against what has come before. Commonly cited in this regard is Pindar’s *Olympian* 1, in which the poet explicitly speaks out against his forebears by ‘correcting’ their version of Tantalus’ banquet with the gods (νιὰς Ταντάλου, σὲ δ’ ἀντία προτέρων φθέγξομαι, *Ol*.1.36). In the traditional version more familiar to us from later sources, Tantalus was invited to a banquet of the gods and served his own dismembered son to his hosts in a cauldron; the goddess Demeter (or in some versions Thetis) inadvertently consumed the boy’s shoulder while distracted with grief for her daughter Persephone; and after the gods realised the trick, Hermes revived Pelops, who was given a new ivory shoulder crafted by Hephaestus to replace that which had been eaten. Pindar’s polemic clearly presupposes the pre-existence of this traditional version, as does the Pindaric scholia’s attribution to his contemporary Bacchylides of a tale in which Rhea was responsible for restoring Pelops by lowering him into a cauldron (Bacchyl.fr.42). Rather than accept this account, however, Pindar proposes an alternative version, in which Poseidon fell in love with Pelops and took him away, just as Zeus later did Ganymedes; Tantalus’ punishment was for stealing ambrosia and nectar from the gods, not serving his own son to them (*Ol*.1.54-66); and Pelops’ ivory shoulder was simply a defect with which he was born (*Ol*.1.26-27). The mainstream account, he asserts, is a malicious invention of envious neighbours which has managed to infiltrate the literary tradition.

---

91 There may thus be some point in the fact that Pindar composed a pederastic poem for Thrasybulus, the addressee of this epinician (fr.124). There is much debate about the precise significance of this opening contrast: Woodbury (1968); Nisetich (1977); Cairns (2011); Kurke (2013) 208-22; Spelman (2018a) 268-76.


95 West (2011b) 67 compares Pindar to a textual critic, ‘giving his story of how a postulated corruption came about’.
Far from cashing in on the prestige of his literary predecessors, therefore, Pindar here antagonistically opposes them. He asserts his own authority by highlighting the inadequacies of those who have come before him. Naturally, there are clear advantages to his sanitised version of the myth: not only is it in keeping with the positive sensibilities of epinician poetry, but it also enhances the paradigmatic value of the Tantalus myth for the present poem. In rewriting tradition, Pindar stresses the civilised decorum of Tantalus’ feast: it is εὐνομώτατον (‘most orderly’, 1.37) and his homeland Sipylus is φιλαν (‘friendly’, 1.38). The result is a far more effective parallel for the poem’s laudandus, Hieron, whose own table was earlier described with the same adjective (φιλαν, 1.16).\(^96\) In this case, therefore, Pindar’s appeal to his predecessors is not simply a legitimising act or allusive marker, but a means for the poet to situate himself and his version of a myth against the larger tradition.\(^97\)

Such an agonistic mode is also visible in elegiac poetry. In Xenophanes’s elegy on the well-ordered symposium, the poet dismisses the battles of Titans, Giants and Centaurs as the ‘fabrications of our predecessors’ (fr.1.19-24):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἀνδρῶν δ᾿ αἰνεῖν τοῦτον ὃς ἐσθλὰ πιὼν ἀναφαίνει,} \\
\text{ὡς ᾖ μνημοσύνη καὶ τόνος ἀμφ᾿ ἀρετῆς·} \\
\text{oὐ τι μάχας διέπειν Τιτήνων οὐδὲ Γιγάντων} \\
\text{oὐδὲ <τ> Κενταύρων, πλάσμα<τα> τῶν προτέρων,} \\
\text{ἡ στάσιας σφεδανὰς—τοῖς οὐδὲν χρηστὸν ἐνεστὶν—·} \\
\text{θεῶν <δ> προμηθείην αἰεν ἐχειν ἀγαθήν.}
\end{align*}
\]

Here too, Xenophanes’ πρότεροι highlight poetic precedent: Xenophanes’ dismissal of the chaotic battles fought by Titans, Giants and Centaurs evokes the warring world of epic, especially those poems in which such primeval conflicts took centre stage: Hesiod’s *Theogony* (*Theog*.617-720) and the Cyclic *Titanomachy*. But other epics also invoked such subjects in

---

\(^96\) For this ode’s interplay of moderation in speech and feasting: Steiner (2002).

\(^97\) We should be wary of accepting Pindar’s posturing too innocently, however: the language used to describe his predecessors’ deceitful embellishments parallels that used of his own poetry elsewhere: *Ol*.1.29 (δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις) ~ *Ol*.1.105 (δαιδαλωσέμεν), *Nem*.8.15 (πεποικιλμέναν) and fr.94b.32 (δαιδάλλοσ’ ἐπεσιν): Feeney (1991) 18 with n.49.
passing: the Centauromachy features on Heracles’ shield in the Hesiodic *Aspis* (*Scut.*178-90) and is also cited by Antinous in the *Odyssey* (*Od.*21.295-304) – appropriately enough for the sympotic context of Xenophanes’ fragment, a tale itself concerned with the dangerous excesses of wine. Xenophanes’ reference to the μάχας Τιτήνων, Γιγάντων and Κενταύρων thus emblematises epic poetry as a whole, summing up the essence of the genre and its tumultuous depiction of the divine. This generic association is reinforced by the very language of these verses: the rare adjective σφεδανός (‘violent’) has a distinctively epic ring, while πλάσματα τῶν προτέρων offers a playful variation on the epic phrase κλεῖα προτέρων ἀνθρώπων (*Theog.*100). Just as Pindar’s predecessors in *Isthmian* 2 were pederastic poets, so too Xenophanes’ πρότεροι are epic singers.

Yet Xenophanes is particularly dismissive of his πρότεροι here, especially in his description of their πλάσματα, ‘fabrications’. The precise nuance of the noun is not entirely clear in this context, given that this is by far its earliest attestation. In later literature, it became a technical term for ‘fiction’, the narration of unreal but plausible events, set in opposition to both ‘myth’ and ‘history’. We should be wary of importing too much anachronistic baggage here, but given that early instances of its cognate verb πλάσσω convey a sense of deception and trickery, an association with fictionality certainly seems likely. Alongside the dismissive οὐδὲν χρηστὸν in the following line, Xenophanes’ sympotic strictures thus form part of his larger criticism of epic poetry and its main protagonists, Homer and Hesiod (cf. 21 B 11 D–K). In contrast to epic, ἀρετή and ἐσθλά have very little to do with strife and conflict in Xenophanes’ world view.

---

98 σφεδανός occurs previously only three times in Homer (*Il.*11.165, 16.372, 21.542) and again later in several hexameter poems (**Euphorion fr.**11.10; **Nic.Ther.**642; **Dionysius 19.fr.9v.15 GDRK**).

99 See Sextus Empiricus, who contrasts πλάσμα with μῦθος, the narration of what is false and has never happened, and ἱστορία, the narration of what is true and has happened (**Against the Professors** 1.263-5).

100 E.g. **Hes.Op.**70; **Semon.fr.**7.21; **Aesch.PV.**1030; **Soph.Ajax** 148, **OT.**780; **Eur.Bacch.**218. Cf. Timon of Phlius’ sarcastic use of this word in his description of Xenophanes (δῶς, τὸν ἀνθρώπων θεὸν ἐπλάσατ’ ἰσον ἀπάντητον, 834.2 **SH**). On Timon’s appropriation of Xenophanes’ language more generally: Clayman (2009) 84.

In these examples, Pindar’s and Xenophanes’ references to predecessors act primarily on a generic level, evoking pederastic and epic poetry as a whole. Yet as with Pythian 3’s Iliadic citation, such polemical references to πρότεροι can also convey a more precise intertextual reference. In one of Mimnermus’ elegiac fragments, the poet attributes his knowledge of a brave, unknown Smyrnaean to his predecessors (fr.14):

οὐ μὲν δὴ κείνου γε μένος καὶ ἀγήνορα θυμόν
toῖν εἰόν ἑμέο προτέρων πευθομαί, οἵ μεν ίδον
Λυδῶν ἵππομάχων πυκινάς κλονέοντα φάλαγγας
᾿Ερμιον ἀμ πεδίον, φώτα φερεμμελήν
τού μὲν ἀρ’ οὐ ποτε πάμπαν ἐμέμψατο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη
δριμὺ μένος κραδίης, εὐθ’ ὅ γ’ ἀνὰ προμάχους
σεαυτ’ αἵματόν ε<τος ἐν> ύψιν πολέμιον,
πυκν’ βιαζόμενος δυσμενέων βέλεαν.
οὐ γάρ τις κείνου δηίων ἐτ’ ἀμεινότερος φώς
ἔσκεν ἐποίχεσθαι φυλόπιδος κρατερῆς
ἔργον, ὅτ’ αὐγήσιν φέρετ’ ὤκεος ἡμίλιον

On the face of it, this opening simply highlights the source of Mimnermus’ eulogistic account, ascribing it to his elders. Yet it may also trigger recognition of an intertextual parallel that underlies the whole fragment. As Grethlein has highlighted, these verses engage extensively with the account of Diomedes’ aristeia at Troy familiar to us from the Iliad. Not only does the opening opposition of sight and hearing, alongside Mimnermus’ appeal to ancestral knowledge (fr.14.1-2), echo Agamemnon’s similar words when chiding Diomedes (Il.4.399-400), but the following description of the warrior’s successes also mirror those of the Iliadic Diomedes. In particular, verses 3-4 echo the Iliadic simile in which the torrent-like hero routs the Trojans (ἀμ πεδίον, Il.5.87; πυκνάς κλονέοντα φάλαγγας I, Il.5.93, ἀμ πεδίον...κλονέοντα φάλαγγας I, Il.5.96 - πυκνάς κλονέοντα φάλαγγας | Ἂρμιον ἀμ πεδίον, fr.14.3-4). Alone, these verbal parallels may not be sufficient to suggest a connection with this specific mythical episode, given the formulaic nature of the language involved. But

Mimnermus’ subsequent description of the warrior resonates more specifically against the fortunes of Diomedes: whereas the Iliadic hero was chided by Athena for leaving battle (II.5.800-24), we are told that this Smyrnaean warrior never received such criticism from the same goddess (fr.14.5), while he is also said to defy his enemies’ ‘bitter missiles’ (πικρὰ...βέλεα, fr.14.8), unlike the Iliadic Diomedes, who could not avoid being struck by the ‘bitter arrow’ of Lycaon’s son (πικρὸς οἰστός, II.5.99). Taken together, these pointed echoes suggest that Mimnermus’ poem engages directly with the fabula of Diomedes’ aristeia at Troy, an episode which Mimnermus and his audience would have likely known, whether via a version of the Iliad or some other source, given the poet’s mention of Diomedes’ unhappy nostos (fr.22) and a possible allusion to Iliad 6.146-49 elsewhere (fr.2), an episode in which Diomedes also plays a prominent part.\footnote{Grethlein (2007) 106. On fr.2’s possible allusion: §I.2.3: 46 with n.170.} In combining these allusions together, Mimnermus enacts a game of antagonistic one-up-manship, hinting that this Smyrnaean warrior far surpasses Diomedes and that he does Homer. In introducing the mythical Greek hero as a foil for the successes of his unnamed warrior, he makes the present outdo the past, rewriting the usual epic convention of the past’s superiority.\footnote{Grethlein’s acceptance of Meineke’s conjecture ὥς for οἵ in verse 2 would reinforce such antagonism. Mimnermus would then emphasise his own direct witnessing of the warrior, distancing himself from reliance on his πρότεροι (i.e. epic singers).} Given this larger allusive framework, we can thus see in the πρότεροι of verse 2 a nod to poetic – and especially epic – predecessors, whose accounts of Diomedes colour the poem as much as their reminiscences of the Smyrnaean hero described.

Alongside employing temporal adjectives and adverbs to mark their allusive engagement with earlier traditions, therefore, lyricists explicitly cited their literary predecessors. Such epigonal references were often considerably antagonistic, as with the cases of Mimnermus, Xenophanes and Pindar’s first Olympian Ode. But they were also a means to point to specific moments in earlier traditions, as in Mimnermus and Pythian 3. Archaic lyricists...
thus developed what had remained an implicit mode of figuring epigonality in archaic epic, transforming it into a direct and active trope.

IV.3.3 Iterative Poetics

In addition to general references to the past, predecessors and priority, however, many lyricists were also deeply fascinated by the idea of repetition and recurrence. Erotic poets, in particular, constantly narrated episodes of love in a recurring iterative frame. First person speakers presented themselves as the repeated victims of passion with the particle-adverb αὖτε or more emphatic δηὖτε: Love warms Alcman’s heart ‘again’ (δηὖτε, fr.59a.1); casts Ibycus ‘again’ into the nets of Aphrodite (αὖτε, fr.287.1); and ‘again’ causes Sappho to tremble with desire (δηὖτε, fr.130.1). Yet it is Anacreon who employs the motif most often: drunk with love, the poet dives ‘again’ from the Leucadian cliff (δηὖτ’, fr.376.1); seeks Pythomander’s house ‘again’ to escape Love (δηὖτε, fr.400.1); is caught ‘again’ in the paradoxical state of loving and not loving (δηὖτε, fr.428.1); and is struck ‘again’ both by Love’s purple ball (δηὖτε, fr.358.1) and by the smith-like god’s hammer or axe (δηὖτε, fr.413.1).

The frequency and consistency of this motif has led Mace to identify it as ‘a distinct compositional form’ in lyric poetry, combining the notion of ‘again’ with a first-person speaker and the god ‘Eros’: ‘love...me...again’. As she demonstrates, it is not a static motif, but rather imbued with a variety of tones, from the pathetic to the humorous. Poets could also evoke it in other non-first-person contexts: Anacreon describes the bald Alexis as wooing ‘again’ (δηὖτε, fr.394b), and Sappho asks Abanthis to sing of the maiden Gongyla, for whom desire flies

---

around her ‘again’ (here, ‘Eros...me...again’ becomes σε δήντε πόθος, fr.22.11). Individually, as Mace has highlighted, all these examples of erotic recurrence play a key role in the fashioning of each speaker’s persona, presenting their personal experiences of love from a ‘veteran’s perspective.’ Yet given the repetition of the motif across a number of authors and contexts, this recurring topos can also be read on a generic level, marking – in Regina Höschele’s words – ‘the recurrence of love’s overwhelming onset throughout the genre.’ In lyric poetry, love inflicts hurt again and again. By commencing with the tag αὖτε or δήντε, lyric poets self-consciously acknowledge this generic reality and situate their own poems within the larger tradition of lyric love poetry. From the perspective of reperformance, moreover, this topos of recurrence plays with the potential repeatability of each poem: every time a song is re-performed, Love’s hurt is renewed. Lyric poets thus repeatedly gesture to the tradition as a whole, troping the very replication of this poetry as an act of iteration. We see here the dawn of a distinctively iterative poetics.

In treating this material, however, past scholars have focused primarily on the erotic sphere of lyric love poetry. This is understandable, since it is here that we have the greatest number of examples. But, on closer examination, we can see that this self-conscious iteration in fact spreads across many lyric subgenres. Several cases also accumulate in a more general sympotic context: Anacreon asks for water and wine to be mixed in a ratio of 2:1 so that he may ‘revel again without hybris’ (δήντε, fr.356a), and in another fragment, bids his companions to abandon excessive Scythian drinking ‘again’ (δήντε, fr.356b); the same poet asks whether he won’t be allowed ‘again’ to go home now that he is drunk (δηύτε, fr.412), and

---

107 The motif could even be evoked in other genres, e.g. πέπαλται δαὖτ' ἐμοί φίλον κέαρ, Choep 410: Mace (1993) 353.
112 Mace (1993) acknowledges these other examples but relegates them to a footnote (350-51n.50) and an appendix (362-64). Cf. too the extremely fragmentary Sapph.fr.83.4 (δηύτ'), Alc.fr.33c (δαὐτ').
may also claim that he is mad again from drink (ἐμά νην δηὔτε πιὼν, P.Mich.3250c r. col.ii.1). Already in the seventh century, meanwhile, Alcman bids a friend ‘come again to the house of Cleësippus’ (αὔτ’, fr.174). In each case, sympotic behaviour is presented as a recurrent event, yet each poet is also pointing to the traditionality of these elements in a sympotic context: moderate drinking and travelling to/from houses are staples of sympotic discourse.

So too in political contexts: Archilochus asks how (or where) the hapless army is assembled ‘this time’ (δηὔτ’, fr.88); Anacreon narrates how somebody ‘again plucks (= mocks?) the blue-shielded men of Ialysus’ (δηὔτ’, fr.349) and on another occasion claims that ‘this time I am not (obstinate?) nor easy-going with my fellow-citizens’ (δηὔτ’, fr.371); while elsewhere, he claims that ‘again’ he has put his hand through a Carian-made shield-strap (δηὔτε, fr.401), just as Alcaeus talks of a wave coming ‘again’ (αὔτε), larger than the ‘previous’ (προτέρ̣[ω], evoking and recalling his own tradition of nautical imagery for political disruption (fr.6a, §III.3.1: 164-65). The world of lyric is repeatedly marked by an awareness of repetition and recurrence.

In other cases, poets even sum up the essence of their own lyric subgenres as acts of repetition: for iambus, Hipponax claims that he must ‘once again’ take the otherwise unknown σκότος (‘swindler’?) Merotimus to court (Μητροτίμωι δηὔτε με χοῇ τῶι σκότωι δικάξεσθαι, fr.122), an admission that has been interpreted as an ironic reference to his arch enemy Bupalus, elsewhere called a ‘mother-fucker’ (μητροκοίτης, fr.12.2). His statement thus highlights the frequency with which he clashes with Bupalus in his iambics. Similarly, in Pindar’s second Olympian, the poet pictures himself preparing his poetic quiver and asks ‘at whom do we shoot, launching arrows of fame again from a kindly spirit’ (τίνα βάλλομεν | ἐκ μαλθακᾶς αὔτε φρενός εὐκλέας ὀἱ ἱέντες;, Ol.2.89-90). Appropriately, he summarises the essence of his epinician activity with a common athletic metaphor. In a hymnic context, meanwhile, Sappho bids the Muses ‘come again’, leaving a ‘golden’ location, perhaps the

113 For attribution to Anacreon: Bernsdorff (2014) 7-10.
114 Gerber (1999b) 455.
house of Zeus (δεύος δηύτε Μοῖσαι χρύσιον λίποσαι, fr.127), a request which highlights the frequency of Muse invocations not just in the literary tradition, but also in her own poetry (cf. fr.128: δεύτε νυν ἀβραι Χάριτες καλλίκομοι τε Μοῖσαι). In all these cases, the poet marks out key features of his or her lyric subgenre, self-consciously highlighting its core and recurring attributes: abuse, praise and Muse-invocation.

Taken together, these various ‘agains’ highlight a distinctly generic self-consciousness, situating each poet’s work within a pre-existing genre, defined by a series of repeating and recurring topos. But it is worth asking whether we can see the establishment of any more precise intertextual connections here. It is tempting to trace a neat literary history of gradual development from a primarily generic self-consciousness in archaic lyric to a more distinctively intertextual self-consciousness in later literature. But given the more specific intertextual connections we have already identified in epic and lyric more generally, it is worth pushing a little further. If epic poetry can employ self-conscious markers of inter- and intra-textual iteration (§IV.2.2: 198-201), why not later lyric? The extremely fragmentary nature of most of our texts makes it difficult to identify any such cases, but we can find some hints of potentially ‘iterative’ relationships, especially within an individual poet’s corpus: here, we shall explore possible examples from Sappho, Bacchylides, Pindar and Stesichorus.

Our first case is Sappho fr.1, the poet’s prayer to Aphrodite, a poem which has an incessant interest in repetition. It was most likely positioned in the opening position of the Alexandrian collection of Sappho’s works, presumably in recognition of its programmatic significance. Sappho calls on Aphrodite to come and support her, if the goddess has ever responded to her appeals on a previous occasion (κἀτέρωτα, fr.1.5), and legitimises her request by recounting such an earlier time when the goddess did in fact visit (fr.1.15-20):

η.getDeclared - It was most likely positioned in the opening position of the Alexandrian collection of Sappho’s works, presumably in recognition of its programmatic significance.

116 In the past, I suggested such a distinction: apud Höschele (2018) §31n.47.

Like on that occasion, Sappho concludes by asking Aphrodite to ‘come to me now too’ to free her from distress (ἐλθε μοι καὶ νῦν, fr.1.25). Such temporal framing is a typical part of cletic hymns, justifying present action through a past relationship (da-quia-dedisti). But when set against the literary background that we have already traced, Sappho’s incessant repetition of δηντε gains a further indexical resonance, situating her poem squarely within the genre of erotic love poetry. Indeed, if the prominent position of the poem within the Alexandrian edition of Sappho draws anything from Sappho herself, this iterative emphasis can be seen as particularly programmatic, marking her poetry within a long-standing tradition of erotic discomfort. Building on these textual hints, Dirk Obbink has even suggested that Sappho’s appeal in fr.1 may point back to an earlier poem – an alluring suggestion. At first sight, there is little going for it, especially given the poem’s apparent opening position at the start of the Alexandrian edition. However, Obbink supports his case by adducing evidence for variation in the ordering of Sappho’s poem in antiquity, alongside papyrological evidence of further text preceding fr.1 on an Oxyrhynchus papyrus. Other Sapphic poems, moreover, exhibit similar themes to those of fr.1, including fr.60, with the same mixture of calling, fighting and persuasion (κάλημι, 4; μάχεσθα[ι] 7; πίθεσα[ν] 8) and fr.86, another prayer to Aphrodite which may well recall an earlier occasion (αἴ ποτα κάτεροτα, fr.86.5). In that case, our fr.1 could exemplify an ‘intertextual self-referential allusion’ to another poem with similar


119 Mace (1993) 360 has seen in the poem ‘a witty and self-reflexive allusion to the independent motif of “Eros...me, again!”’ Cf. Hutchinson (2001) 155 on potential ‘metapoetic play’.

120 Cf. Prodi (2017) 581. For the possibility that the ordering of Alexandrian editions may be indebted to pre-existing poetically designed structures: Clay (2011b) on Pind.Ol.1-3; Kelly (2017) on Saph.fr.1.

121 Obbink (2011) 33-38.
themes. In many ways, this is an attractive hypothesis, but it cannot be anything more than speculation on current evidence. The papyrological evidence, in particular, is not watertight: the preceding text could simply be prefatory material, or a poem from later in the papyrus (depending on which way it had been rolled). We cannot rule out an intertextual resonance, therefore, but it may be safer to see in Sappho’s hymnic appeal a generic case of never-ending love writ large, highlighting the constant merry-go-round of love.

We are on firmer ground, however, in a number of cases where epinician poets appear to self-consciously mark their poems as repeats, following in the tracks of previous ones. In Bacchylides 12, the poet bids the Muse Clio steer his mind now ‘if ever you did before also’ (εἰ δὴ ποτὲ καὶ πάρος, Bacchyl.12.4). As in Sappho fr.1, this hymnic clesis extends beyond its religious function, inviting the Muse and audience to recall earlier poetry in which Clio had been invoked (e.g. Κλεοὶ, Bacchyl.3.3, 468 BCE; Κλειὼ, 13.9, Κλειὼ, 13.228: 480s BCE). In Bacchylides fr.20c (470 BCE?), the poet similarly intends to send a song for Hieron ‘if ever before I sang the praises of Pherenicus who won the victory with his swift feet (both at Delphi) and by the Alpheus’ (εἰ κ[α]ι π[ρόσσ]ηεν ύμνηςας τὸν [ἐν Δελφοῖς θ’ ἐλοντα] | πο[το]σί λαψήτης Φερέγκος έπτ’ ἀλφής, Bacchyl.fr.20c.7-10, suppl. Snell). This retrospective glance may well look back to Bacchylides 5 (476 BCE), a poem that similarly celebrated the horse’s double victory and unmatched speech (esp. Bacchyl.5.37-41 Φερένικον | Ἀλφεὸν παρ’ ἀλλοδόρωμαν... νικάσαντα...Πυθῶνι τ’ ἐν ἀγαθέαι). The opening of Bacchylides 4 (470 BCE), meanwhile, sets itself firmly against a tradition of earlier celebrations: the city of Syracuse is ‘still’ loved by Apollo (ἔτι, Bacchyl.4.1); Hieron is ‘hymned for the third time’ at Delphi (τρίτον...ἀ[είδε]ται, Bacchyl.4.4-5); and the poet claims that ‘the sweet-voiced cock of lyre-ruling Urania cried out once before’ (ποτέ, Bacchyl.4.7-9,

122 Obbink (2011) 33. I am unconvinced by Obbink’s reconstruction of the earlier poem, which presupposes too mechanical a process of ‘copy and paste’ (p.38).


suppl. Snell, Maas, Maehler) – another possible back-reference to Bacchylides 5. Pindar, too, makes such self-reflexive cross-references: in Isthmian 6, he explicitly marks his celebration of Phylacidas’ boys’ pancratium victory as a sequel to his previous poem for Phylacidas’ brother Pytheas, Nemean 5 (δεύτερον, 6.2; αὖτε, 6.5). And he begins Pythian 6 by explicitly marking his act of repetition: ‘we are again ploughing the field of rolling-eyed Aphrodite and the Graces, approaching the sacred navel of the thundering earth’ (ἀναπολίζομεν, Pyth.6.1-3). As scholars have noted, this emphasis on iteration looks back to the poet’s invocation of the same combination of goddesses in the proem of Paean 6, an earlier poem in which he similarly approached (προσοιχόμενοι, Pyth.6.3~ἥλθον Pae.6.9) the navel of the earth (ὁμφαλὸν...χθονός, Pyth.6.2-3 ~ χθονὸς ὀμφαλόν, Pae.6.17). The invocation of the gods simultaneously invites an audience to recall Pindar’s earlier poem, here marked not by a temporal adverb but the iterative prefix ἀνα-. Repeatedly in epinician poetry, therefore, poets acknowledge their previous work as a starting point for the present, not only displaying their own impressive credentials, but also emphasising the enduring success of their laudandi.

As a final example of such literary repetition, however, we should turn to Stesichorus’ Palinode, a notoriously controversial text whose precise nature and arrangement are uncertain. Based on conflicting ancient testimony, scholars disagree whether we should conceive of one or two Palinodes and whether one (or both) of these should be regarded as identical to the Stesichorean poem elsewhere called the Helen. The issue is irretractable on current evidence, and any proposed solution depends on how one weighs up a mass of inconsistent, unclear and unreliable sources. For our purposes, however, we only need note that Stesichorus produced different poems (or portions of a single poem) that offered contradictory views on Helen: in

---

126 Spelman (2018a) 226-27, further noting the emphasis on the ‘family’s cumulative epinician haul’ in Isth.6.62-64.
128 For discussion: Bowra (1963); Sider (1989); Kelly (2007b); Davies and Finglass (2014) 308-17.
the first (which I shall call the Helen), she was the archetypal adulterer of the epic tradition, one of Tyndareus’ polygamous and unfaithful daughters (διγάμους τε καὶ τριγάμους... καὶ λιπεσάνορας, fr. 85.4-5); in the second (which I shall call the Palinode), she was recast as blameless, having neither set sail in Paris’ ships nor arrived in Troy. It was in fact only a phantom (eidolon) of Helen that Paris took to Troy, while the heroine herself stayed behind with Proteus in Egypt (fr.90.11-15). In a terse fragment, the poet famously acknowledges his departure from tradition (fr.91a):

οὐκ ἐστ’ ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος,  
οὐδ’ ἔβας ἐν νηυσίν ἐὑσσέλμοις,  
οὐδ’ ἵκεο Πέργαμα Τροίας.

As it stands, this is a radical revision. Stesichorus not only recants his earlier account in the Helen, but also rewrites the whole epic tradition – undermining one of its core moments, the very event that catalysed the entire Trojan war.130 In language that pointedly appropriates epic phraseology (especially the common noun-epithet phrase νῆες ἐὑσσελμοί), Stesichorus sets himself against the likes of Homer and Hesiod, the major epicists who preserved the traditional account. In this poem, he is as antagonistic towards the world of epic as the sympotic Xenophanes.131  

The recantation itself, whether it formed an independent poem or a new section of a larger work, apparently began with an invocation to a goddess (fr.90.8-9):

δεῦρ' αὖτε θεὰ φιλόμολπε

---

130 It is unclear whether Stesichorus invented the eidolon motif. According to a Byzantine paraphrase of Lycophron’s Alexandra, he was pre-empted (and inspired?) by Hesiod (fr.dub.358), but there are strong grounds for doubting this: Davies – Finglass (2014) 302-3.

131 Cf. Beecroft (2006) 67: ‘boarding a broad-benched ship metonymically means entering the epic tradition... Ultimately, the logos that is not etymos is the epic tradition itself.’ On the poem’s generic rivalry with epic: Beecroft (2010) 144-70, esp. 164-70.
The identity of this goddess is unclear from the fragment alone, but given the adjective φιλόμολπε, it is most likely a Muse, rather than Helen herself. What immediately concerns us here, however, is the temporal specificity of the adverb αὖτε: like Sappho and the epinician poets, Stesichorus asks a goddess to visit him ‘again’. As with the Sapphic fragments (fr.1, fr.127), this αὖτε could be little more than a reciprocal prayer formula, recognising the generic frequency of such invocations, as Davies and Finglass suggest: for them, the adverb ‘acknowledges that the poet regularly invokes the Muse, and implies his hope that she will assist him now as before’. However, given the more specific context of the Palinode, explicitly following and correcting the version of events in the Helen, there are strong grounds for seeing αὖτε here as a specific back-reference to Stesichorus’ ‘traditional’ presentation of his protagonist in the Helen. In so doing, Stesichorus would be casting the Palinode as secondary and derivative, directly linking it to his previous treatment of the myth, just as Hesiod appears to correct his Theogonic description of Eris at the start of the Works and Days. In short, αὖτε marks Stesichorus’ return to and reversal of (πάλιν-) the same topic in another ode (-ᾠδή) – a pointedly intertextual case of allusive iteration.

However, it is unnecessary to choose between the generic or intertextual significance of αὖτε. Both are surely active at the very same time in this poem: on the one hand, Stesichorus explicitly signposts his revision of his earlier Helen, but he also signals the traditionality of Muse invocations in general, reinforcing his appropriation of the epic tradition. Although Stesichorus may refer primarily to his own Muse invocations (e.g. fr.277), an awareness of the trope’s traditionality cannot but evoke the epic genre, in which the Muses played a significant role. Stesichorus’ iterative emphasis may thus also nod to epic tradition at large, setting himself against the habits of Homer and Hesiod. Indeed, the papyrus commentary which preserves

132 Bowra (1963) 246. Though if Helen were addressed (cf. the second person address in fr.91a), this would support the arguments of Carruesco (2017) that Helen adopts the role of the Muses in this poem and of Kelly (2007b) that the Palinode involved an epic-style epiphanic encounter with Helen.

133 Davies – Finglass (2014) 331.


this verse claims that Stesichorus explicitly opposed himself to Homer in one Palinode and Hesiod in another ([μέμ]φεται τὸν Ὅμηρο[ν]...τὸν Ἡσιοδ[ον] μέμ[φετ]αι, fr.90). This – of course – does not prove that these foremost representatives of the epic tradition were mentioned by name in the poem(s), given that an ancient commentator could have simply interpreted them as the implicit target of Stesichorus’ critique.\textsuperscript{136} But Plato’s narrative of Stesichorus’ blinding does at least suggest some direct competitiveness with Homer: whereas Stesichorus discovered the cause of his blindness by being μουσικός and resolved it by recanting his Helen (he was not ignorant: οὐκ ἡγνώησεν), Homer remained unaware (οὐκ ἐξεθέτο) and blind (Pl.Phaedr.243a). If this derives at all from Stesichorus’ poem, as has been plausibly argued, we would thus have a clear case of Stesichorean poetic one-up-manship.\textsuperscript{137}

In asking the Muse to come ‘again’, the poet not only contrasts the Palinode’s account with that of his earlier Helen, but also with the epic tradition as a whole: the Muse comes again, as she repeatedly does, but now for a very different purpose.

In any case, however we decide to interpret this iterative marker, questions must remain over the simplicity or sincerity of this opposition with epic. As scholars have noted, Stesichorus’ οὐκ ἔστ’ ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος (fr.91a.1) is strikingly close to Penelope’s words in the Odyssey when she (wrongly) refuses to accept the reality of Odysseus’ return: ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἔσθ’ ὅδε μῦθος ἐτήτυμος (Od.23.62). As Carruesco has argued, this ‘textual allusion to Penelope’s manifestly false words in the Odyssey undermines the assertion “this is not a true story” and leaves open the possibility of viewing the Palinode as a dissoi logoi structure, where truth and untruth are not as clear-cut as we are being told.’\textsuperscript{138}

Like the Muses in Hesiod’s Theogony, who can so readily mix truth and fiction (Theog.27-28), so too here the Muse whom Stesichorus invokes seems very capable of blurring the truth. In calling the same Muse to return and legitimise a radically different version of the Helen myth, Stesichorus problematises the tensions inherent in the Muses’ authority – how can we trust them if they can tell such varied tales? Like Pindar in Olympian 1, who complicates his dismissal of his predecessors by


\textsuperscript{137} Kelly (2007).

\textsuperscript{138} Carruesco (2017) 192.
describing their lies as he does his own poetry (§IV.3.2: 220n.97), so too here, Stesichorus challenges the distinction of truth and falsity. Poetry and tradition repeat themselves, and in so doing, the true story can easily get lost.

Stesichorus’ Palinode thus offers the most extreme case of a larger trend of repetition and recurrence in Greek lyric. Our extant fragments are dominated by an iterative poetics, in which the repetitive nature of poetic composition and key generic topoi are stressed. A wide range of lyricists highlight both the repeatability of generic conventions and the potential re-performance of their own poems. Alongside appeals to former times and former poets, this recurring emphasis on repetition demonstrates that time was a key trope to articulate allusive relationships in lyric poetry. With a keen awareness of their literary heritage, Greek lyricists appealed to both generic conventions and their predecessors as a source of authority or contention, and in so doing, they marked out their own distinctive place in the map of literary history.
IV.4 Conclusions

In archaic epic and lyric, therefore, temporality frequently serves as an index of allusion. We have seen how temporal adjectives and adverbs repeatedly signpost engagement with earlier mythological and poetic traditions, often inviting an audience to supplement bare references with their wider knowledge of tradition. Yet in addition, both corpora of poetry exhibit a strong interest in the iterative aspects of poetic composition: Homeric epic frequently marks cross-references within individual poems as acts of repetition, while lyric poets flag their compositions as self-conscious replays of tradition, or even specific prior poems.

Such temporal indexes bear an implicit sense of epigonality, as epic and lyric poets situate their own poetry against a wider, pre-existing tradition. But such an anxiety of influence particularly comes into play surrounding the discourse of πρότεροι. In epic, inter-generational tensions in the mythical world serve as a model for the poet’s own relationship with his tradition, while in lyric, this concern becomes explicit, as poets repeatedly evoke their πρότεροι directly, often pointing to specific texts, and frequently in a deeply agonistic manner.

The various categories of temporal indexes with which we began, therefore, can already be found throughout archaic Greek poetry, reinforcing the conclusions we have drawn from our explorations of indexical hearsay and memory. Archaic Greek poets already display a strong sense of literary history, situating their present against the poetic and mythological past, and figuring this relationship through a range of temporal indexes: indexical temporality was deeply embedded in archaic Greek poetics from the very start.

Given the recurring prominence of indexes in archaic Greek poetry, it is time to turn to some broader conclusions. These will be the concern of the epilogue.
PART V.

EPILOGUE
οὕτω καὶ τῶν πρόσθεν ἐπευθόμεθα κλέα ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων, ὅτε κέν τιν’ ἐπιζάφελος χόλος ἰκου-δωρητῶν τε πελώντο παράφρητοι τ’ ἐπέεσσι. μέμνημαι τόδε ἔρημον ἐγώ πάλαι οὗ τι νέον γε ἀς ἤν· ἐν δ’ ὑμῖν ἐφέω πάντεσσι φίλοισι.

So Phoenix introduces his famous Meleager exemplum in the Iliad (Il.9.524-28), combining in a single passage all three indexes of allusion which we have explored in this study: he has ‘heard the glories’ of past men (ἐπευθόμεθα κλέα); he ‘remembers’ the deed (μέμνημαι); and the event is ‘of considerable antiquity’ (πάλαι οὗ τι νέον), the preserve of ‘heroes of a former age’ (πρόσθεν...ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων). Through this unparalleled accumulation of indexes, Phoenix (alongside Homer) marks the subsequent account as traditional and familiar, drawing on the mythological tradition, while also perhaps authorising his apparently novel treatment of the myth. Poet and speaker self-consciously tap into an encyclopaedic network of myths and traditions. If these five verses were to be found in a Latin poem, scholars would have long celebrated them as the epitome of self-conscious indexicality, a clearly signposted citation of tradition.

By now, we have established that the marking of allusion was already deeply engrained in archaic Greek poetics. Epic and lyric poets employed indexes of hearsay, memory and time to position themselves within and against their larger tradition, carving out their own distinctive space. What is most striking, however, is the extent to which archaic poets employed these devices. The previous sections have explored numerous cases of indexicality in action: of poets nodding to other traditions and texts; inviting their audiences to acknowledge competing alternatives or supplement unspoken details; and legitimising their departures from tradition with the veneer of traditional authority. From Homer onwards,

---

archaic poets were engaged in a sophisticated and well-developed allusive system. Although they are dated to the ‘archaic’ age, there is nothing ‘primitive’ about their poetic practice.

To close this study, I would like to take a step back and address two broader issues that arise from this project. First, I will return to the question with which we began and ask how this exploration of early Greek indexicality impacts our understanding of allusion in ancient Greece and Rome (§V.1). And second, I will situate the fruits of this research within a broader narrative of literary history, one which spans multiple cultures and media (§V.2).

V.1 Allusion: Greece and Rome

A key point that has emerged from this study is the similarity between allusive marking in archaic poetry and that of later literary cultures. To return to the question with which we opened, we must conclude that indexicality functions in a very similar manner in both archaic Greek and later Roman poetry. Of course, this does not mean that the allusive systems of Greece and Rome were identical or that they remained unchanged for centuries. We have already tracked changes in the nature of intertextuality within the archaic period alone (§I.2.3: 42-53). But what is striking is how, despite these developments in allusive practice, indexicality remains a constant. Even as the target of allusion may shift from mythological traditions to specific texts, the very same allusive strategies are employed.

Of course, this argument for continuity should not be mistaken as a claim for uniformity in the use of indexicality throughout archaic poetry. In the previous sections, we have noted considerable variation in the use of different indexes. Hearsay and temporality are prominent throughout archaic epic and lyric, although the differing constructions of the narrator in each corpus result in some differences, especially in their varyingly direct engagement with poetic πρότεροι. Poetic memory, by contrast, is largely the preserve of Homeric epic, a result – as we have seen – of its plentiful opportunities for embedded character speech.
A further detail which we have not yet remarked upon, however, is the apparent scarcity of such indexes in archaic iambus. In the foregoing sections, we have not cited a single iambic example. Archilochus’ name has been mentioned, but only in relation to his elegies on Telephus and Heracles. If we were to look for an iambic instance of indexicality, our best example would be Archilochus’ explicit citation of fables as αἶνοι. He self-consciously introduces his account of the fox and eagle as ‘a fable told among men’ (αἶνος τις ἀνθρώπων ὁδε, fr.174.1) and claims that he will tell his addressee Cerycides another ‘fable’, that of the fox and the monkey (ἐρέω τιν’ ὑμιν αἶνον, ὦ Κηρυκίδη, fr.185.1). Such explicit citations of αἶνοι appear to have been an established part of the handling of fable, but the former example is particularly interesting given its specification of an audience of ἄνθρωποι, a noun which we have elsewhere seen combined with other allusive indexes. In this case, too, Archilochus’ pretensions of following a well-known αἶνος are confirmed by the remaining words of the fragment, which closely paraphrase the beginning of Aesop’s version of the same fable (ὡς ἄρ’ ἀλώπηξ καίετὸς ξυνεωνίην | ἔμειξαν, fr.174.2-3 − ἀετὸς καὶ ἀλώπηξ φιλίαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ποιησάμενοι fab.1 Perry). More generally, the antiquity of the tale is supported by its well-known connections with Near Eastern myth, especially that of Etana: the fable has a long and established heritage. By explicitly introducing his fable as an αἶνος, Archilochus is doing something comparable to his peers in other genres, signposting his allusive adoption of another tradition.


5 Williams (1956); Trencsényi-Waldapfel (1959); Baldi (1961); Adrados (1964); La Penna (1964); Burkert (1992) 122-23; Corrêa (2007) 105-108; Currie (forthcoming).
Such signposting of iambic fable, however, only throws into greater relief the absence of indexicality in iambic allusions to mythical tales. Scholars have plausibly argued for various allusions to myth in iambus, especially to the Homeric Odysseus. But as far as we can see, these were not indexically marked. The fragmentary state of our evidence may again be to ‘blame’. But this balance may also reflect something of iambus’ generic composition and self-perception. The genre may have only flagged its engagement with ‘lower’, more popular genres. This would contrast significantly with archaic elegy, which was more concerned with establishing a storehouse of wisdom, and melic lyric, with its focus on myths as exempla for the present. Iambus, by contrast, appears to have focused on ainoi, and it is these that the genre indexically marks. What poets indexed, as much as how they did so, is thus illuminating for our understanding of ancient genres and our appreciation of how ancient poets fashioned themselves within their tradition.

Despite these variations, however, indexicality remains remarkably constant across the texts that we have studied in this project. Indexes of allusion proved a crucial tool for gesturing to the authority of an emerging canon, as poets variously appropriated, challenged and revised tradition. If space had permitted, it would have been illuminating to extend this study further and explore how such variation continued into Attic drama and prose, corpora where scholars have identified a similar process of (often agonistic) intertextuality. However, by focusing here on the most controversial period of allusion in the ancient Graeco-Roman world, we have been able to establish a more forcible case for continuity. The deep presence of indexes in archaic Greek poetry radically affects our appreciation of ancient literary history and the

---


7 Cf. Alexandrou (2016b) 211.

capabilities of archaic poetics. From Homer onwards, archaic poets self-consciously indexed a host of other texts and traditions.

V.2 A Broader Perspective

When situating early Greek indexicality within a wider context, however, we should not restrict our gaze to Rome. The evidence of other media and cultures also enhances our understanding of this phenomenon. The plausibility of such elaborate indexing in an oral poetic environment, for example, is reinforced by more modern oral traditions, where we can identify similar cases of allusive signposting. A Bosnian song by Mehmed Kolaković may serve as an example: in an extensive analepsis, the principal hero Stojan Janković recalls his own life story as a prelude to a new adventure (Janković Stojan i Hodžić Husein, HNP III.18.52-122). As Danek has recently emphasised, this recalled tale was ‘one of the most famous stories of the whole South-Slavic epic tradition, The Captivity of Stojan Janković, which “every singer can sing and every child can retell”.’

It would have been very familiar to Kolaković’s audiences. And indeed, as Danek has highlighted, the poet explicitly marks it as such: Janković begins his account by remarking that ‘You, too, know [it], you sirdars of Kotar’ (‘I vi znate, kotarski serdari’, HNP III.18.44). As in Greek epic and lyric, a character’s acknowledgement of his internal audience’s knowledge signposts the external audience’s own familiarity with the tale. In addition, we could note that the narrative proper begins with a temporal index, further marking the ensuing story as a familiar part of the poetic and historical past (‘Once upon a time I summoned an army,’ ‘Ja sam jednoca vojsku podignuo’, HNP III.18.61). Archaic Greek poetry’s indexing of pre-existing tradition is thus closely paralleled by the allusive techniques of more contemporary oral traditions. This lends support to the notion that indexicality is not intimately tied to literacy, but can function in more oral poetic environments.

---

9 Danek (2016) 133; and 138-42 for the larger significance of the allusion.
Rather than looking forward to more modern cultures, however, we can also look back to the distant past. Early Greek indexicality is also paralleled by the allusive practices of the ancient Near East, a fact that further cements the plausibility of the phenomenon in archaic Greece. Currie has recently highlighted one comparable example in the Babylonian epic *Gilgamesh*, in which the hero claims that he has come to the famous Ūta-napišti (SB X.249-50):

\[
\text{GIŠ-gim-maš ana šá-šu-ma izakkara(mu)\text{}}\text{a ana "UD-napi[št(zi)]\text{}}
\]
\[
[\text{ana\text{-}ku um-ma lul-lik-ma "UD-napišti ru-qa ša i-dab-bu-bu-uš lu-mur\text{}}]
\]

Gilgameš said to him, to Ūta-napišti:
I thought, ‘I will go and find Ūta-napišti the Far-Away, of whom people talk’.

As Currie remarks, this comment ‘may be taken as a (‘metapoetic’) signal to Utanapishtim/Atrahasis, familiar from earlier poetry…as the model for Gilgamesh’s quest for immortality’.\(^{11}\) But it also acknowledges the poet’s more general debt to the story of the flood from the Atra-ḫasīs epic. As George notes, Tablet XI offers ‘a straightforward and sometimes verbatim adaptation of part of that poem.’\(^{12}\) By highlighting the pre-existing fame of Ūta-napišti, the poet signposts his allusive debt. Indexical hearsay is not purely the preserve of the Graeco-Roman world.

However, Currie’s one example is not in fact an isolated incident in this poem: we can identify a number of other cases where the *Gilgamesh* poet highlights the traditionality of his tale. On the Yale Old Babylonian tablet, before setting out to fight the giant Huwawa in the cedar wood, Gilgamesh describes his opponent in very similar terms (OB III col.v.182-83):\(^{13}\)

\[
\text{ilam (dingir) [GIŠ] ša i-qá-ab-bu-ú lu-mu-ur}
\]
\[
ša šu-um-šu it-ta-nam-ba-la ma-ta-tum
\]

\(^{11}\) Currie (2012) 566n.122; cf. (2016) 143. Like Odysseus and Jason’s Argo (*Od*.12.70), Currie notes that Gilgamesh cannot follow fully in Utanapishtim’s footsteps, since he is unable to attain immortality.


\(^{13}\) Helle (forthcoming) n.34 notes this repetition as part of a larger parallelism and mirroring between the two halves of the poem (Huwawa – Ūta-napišti): we might compare the narrative doublets of Greek epic.
I will see the god of whom they speak,
whose name the lands do constantly repeat

And the elders of Uruk too claim they have ‘heard of him’ (OB III col.v.193-94):

\[
\text{ni-ši-em-me-ma dḫu-wa-wa ša-nu-ú bu-nu-šu}
\text{ma-an-nu-um š[a i-m] a-ḫa-ru ka-ak-ki-šu}
\]

We hear of Huwawa, (that) he is strange of visage:
Who is there who can withstand his weapons?

Within the story world, these assertions of Huwawa’s fame reflect the notoriety of the monster, but they also nod to the creature’s traditionality: Gilgamesh’s encounter with the ogre was the most popular of the separate older Sumerian tales of Gilgamesh that were later combined into the Old and Standard Babylonian versions.\(^{14}\) By emphasising Huwawa as an object of hearsay, the Gilgamesh poet acknowledges the familiar tradition upon which he builds. In addition, he also establishes a prototype for the fame that Gilgamesh wishes to achieve through his own deeds: just like an Iliadic hero, Gilgamesh is concerned with what men will say about him in the future (OB III col.iii.148-9) and longs to ‘establish a name that is eternal forever’ (šu-ma ša da-ru-ú a-na-ku lu-uš-ta-ak-na, OB III col.iii.160, cf.188). Already in Babylonian literature, we thus find significant precedent for Early Greek indexicality.

But what is the significance of these parallels? On the one hand, they may support the argument of those scholars who see a direct influence of the Babylonian Gilgamesh on Greek epic.\(^{15}\) After all, such a concern with tradition and fame appears to have been a distinctive feature of the Gilgamesh myth in the Near East, not readily shared by other literary texts. Perhaps the best parallel would be the wisdom composition Šimâ Milka, which is introduced as the advice of a certain Šūpē-amēli (‘most famous of men’). Cohen has recently suggested

---


that this name may allude to the famous Šuruppak, whose ‘Instructions’ were a thematically similar work. As the oldest known Mesopotamian wisdom composition, the ‘Instructions of Šuruppak’ would certainly be a natural (and ‘famous’) model for Šimâ Milka, indexed by the ‘speaking name’ Šūpê-amēli, but as Cohen himself recognises, the grounds are not particularly strong. In Near East literary culture, signposting allusive engagement with tradition thus seems to be a distinctive feature of the Gilgamesh epic.

However, it would be overly reductive to argue from this shared indexicality that the Babylonian Gilgamesh must be the source of Greek epic’s allusive practices. For a start, the Near Eastern text focuses only on fame and hearsay as indexes of allusion, with no comparable cases of indexical memory and temporality. This is perhaps unsurprising: we have noted the conspicuous absence of the Muses in Near Eastern literature, and the concomitant disinterest in bardic memory. The major indexes that we have detected in archaic Greek poetry, therefore, cannot simply have been imported from the Near East. Even more significantly, however, allusive indexes appear to exist in literature of various periods and cultures. We have already noted the Bosnian song of Mehmed Kolaković, but we can add numerous other examples, ranging from other oral traditions,17 medieval epics,18 Elizabethan theatre,19 and even ‘modern’ fiction across various media: novels, poetry, films, musicals and more.20 Such self-conscious


17 E.g. Manas by a Kara-Kirghiz bard, Sagymbai Orozbakov (1867-1930): ‘All happened very long ago… This is a tale of long past years’: Bowra (1952) 41.

18 The Old High German Hildesbrandlied begins Ik gihorta dat seggen (‘I’ve heard it said’); the Nordic Atlamál in Grønlenzko begins Frétt hefir ald (‘the world has heard’): Niles (1983) 51.


20 Novels: e.g. Henry Fielding, Joseph Andrews (1742) book IV, ch.4 (‘Madam, this is that charming Pamela, of whom I am convinced you have heard so much’) ~ Samuel Richardson, Pamela (1740): Currie (2016) 143-44. Poetry: Keats, Ode to Psyche 2 ... (‘sweet enforcement and remembrance dear’) ~ Milton, Lycidas 6 (‘Bitter constraint, and sad occasion dear’: Hartman (1983) 217; Hinds (1998) 1. Films: e.g. ‘easter-egging’ in the ‘Marvel Cinematic Universe’. Musicals: e.g. in Wicked, ‘Defying Gravity’ (Elphaba: ‘as someone told me lately, everyone deserves the chance to fly’) ~ Wicked, ‘A Sentimental Man’ (Wizard: ‘I think everyone deserves the chance to fly’).
signposting and figuring of literary relations appears to be part and parcel of how literature works.

In its extensive and embedded employment of indexicality, archaic Greek poetry thus belongs in a long continuum of literary expression that can be traced from (at least) ancient Babylon to the modern day. This is, of course, not to eclipse or flatten changes of focus and emphasis over time, but nor is it to argue for continuous and progressive development across the ages. Indeed, if anything, our classical examples of allusive marking (both Greek and Roman) stand out for their remarkable intensity and quantity. The literature of these cultures was deeply invested in situating itself within larger traditions of literary history and signposting its allusive manoeuvres. No less than their Roman successors, our earliest known Greek poets were capable of a complex and sophisticated range of allusive techniques, self-consciously appropriating their predecessors’ work to mark out their own space in the literary tradition. In so doing, archaic poets produced compositions that were not only elaborate and sophisticated in their own right, but also part of a larger poetic tradition – a tradition that bridges many cultures and millennia.
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