

Durham E-Theses

Heroism and Narrative in Herodotus' Histories: The Democratisation of Homeric Heroism

QUILL, AARON

How to cite:

QUILL, AARON (2025) *Heroism and Narrative in Herodotus' Histories: The Democratisation of Homeric Heroism*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/16070/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Heroism and Narrative in Herodotus'
Histories: The Democratisation of
Homeric Heroism

Aaron Quill

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy

Department of Classics and Ancient History

Durham University

2024

Abstract

This thesis examines Herodotus' implementation of Homer's vocabulary of heroism. It argues that Herodotus' use of this terminology differs in many significant ways from Homeric epic. While adopting some Homeric uses, Herodotus implements the terms in innovative ways. Herodotus broadens their sociological applications and sometimes uses Homer's language of heroism to highlight characters' unheroic nature.

This thesis examines selected terms as applied to Achilles and Odysseus in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Each term is analysed in its Homeric context before evaluating Herodotus' use of the same term. This thesis is divided into three chapters to reflect the constituent parts of Homeric heroism: fame, military prowess, and cunning intelligence. Chapter 1 examines Herodotus' application of selected Homeric terms to denote fame and public image: κῶδος, γέρας, κλέος and τιμή. It demonstrates that Herodotus applies each term to a greater range of characters than Homer. Chapter 2 looks at how Herodotus uses Homer's terminology to describe acts of fighting: ἀλκή, κράτος and βίη. This chapter demonstrates that Herodotus applies Homer's terminology denoting fighting to a wider range of characters than Homer and also uses the terms to highlight characters' unheroic natures. The final chapter explores how Herodotus utilises two Homeric terms for cunning intelligence: δόλος and subsequently, in conclusion, a brief examination of μῆτις. The sociological implications of δόλος are surprising, while μῆτις is nearly absent from the *Histories*.

It is a well-trodden path of Herodotean scholarship to cite Herodotus' ancient reputation as the 'Prose Homer of History' (*The Pride of Halicarnassus*, SEG 48.1130, 1.43) or that he was 'Most Homeric' ([Long.] *Subl.* 13.3). By comparing Herodotus' use of Homer's vocabulary of heroism to the practice within Homeric epic itself, we are in a better position to evaluate the validity of such assertions for Herodotus' construction of the heroic.

Acknowledgements

My thanks and gratitude go above all to my supervisor, Professor Edith Hall, for her guidance, enthusiasm for the topic and ability to help me realise the potential of fledgling arguments. I know I made the right choice in supervisor. I would like to thank Dr George Gazis for stepping in at short notice to provide supervision when Edith was unable.

I have been lucky with my teachers throughout my studies. My lecturers at Swansea University – Maria Oikonomou, Fritz-Gregor Herrman, Mark Humphries, Maria Pretzler, Ian Repath, and my friend and seminar leader Pamela Dennis. This is to name only those who taught me throughout my Bachelor's and Master's degrees; from them I learnt a great many things, but most importantly the sheer joy that studying Classics can bring. A special note of gratitude should be made to my comprehensive secondary school, St Columba's Catholic Boys School, where I was ever encouraged to pursue learning in all its forms.

Working alongside completing a PhD has come with its own challenges. I wish to extend my gratitude to Department of Classics and Ancient History at Durham University for allowing me to complete this thesis as a distance student, as well as the library staff for being accommodating in sending me (many) books as postal loans. I should like to express my thanks to my colleagues at the Bank of England, and formerly Next Crayford, for providing me with the necessary flexibility, especially in the days leading up to this thesis' submission.

Special thanks must go to my family and friends. My Mum, Dad and brother Jordan provided me with the essential love and unwavering support to see this thesis through to completion. My friends Chloe, Ella, Elliott, Emma, Hari, Hirushi, James, Keertana, Ramone, Rebekah, Rose, Tanya, and Thomas have all been there throughout this thesis and who have all provided gentle words of encouragement along the way.

I dedicate this thesis to all of these people, and more, whose examples have and continue to inspire me.

Statement of Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the author's prior written consent and the information derived from it should be duly acknowledged.

Note on Translations and Texts

The Greek text of Herodotus is Wilson (2015a) and (2015b) in two volumes. The Greek text of Homer's *Iliad* is Monro and Allen (1920a) and (1920b) in two volumes. The Greek text of Homer's *Odyssey* is Allen (1917) and (1919) in two volumes. Unless otherwise specified, the Greek text for all other authors is taken from the most recent Loeb Classical Library edition. All translations from Greek and modern foreign languages are my own, unless otherwise stated. Abbreviations for authors and texts follow those of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th edition.

Contents

Abstract	2
Acknowledgements	3
Statement of Copyright	4
Note on Translations and Texts	4
Introduction	7
i. Herodotus' Prologue, Heroism and Homer	7
ii. Problems of Definition	11
iii. Heroism Studies	15
iv. Academic Revision of the Heroic	18
v. Methodology	20
vi. Literature Review	29
vii. Overview of Chapters	39
Chapter 1 - Fame Words:	
1.1. Introduction - Homeric and Herodotean Fame Words	42
1.2. Κῦδος	
1.2.1. Homeric κῦδος	46
1.2.2. Herodotean κῦδος	54
1.2.3. Conclusion	63
1.3. Γέρας	
1.3.1. Homeric γέρας	65
1.3.2. Herodotean γέρας	74
1.3.3. Conclusion	88
1.4. Κλέος	
1.4.1. Homeric κλέος	89
1.4.2. Herodotean κλέος	102
1.4.3. Herodotean κλειτός and κλεινός	112
1.4.4. Conclusion	114
1.5. Τιμή	
1.5.1. Definitions of Homeric τιμή	115
1.5.2. Homeric and Herodotean τιμάω and τίω	116
1.5.3. Homeric τιμή	118
1.5.4. Herodotean τιμή	132

1.5.5. Conclusion	146
1.6. Chapter Conclusions – Fame Words	147
Chapter 2 – Fighting Words:	
2.1. Introduction - Homeric and Herodotean Fighting Words	151
2.2. Ἀλκή	
2.2.1. Homeric ἄλκιμος	154
2.2.2. Homeric ἀλκή	155
2.2.3. Herodotean ἀλκή	172
2.2.4. Herodotean ἄλκιμος	183
2.2.5. Conclusion	186
2.3. Κράτος	
2.3.1. Homeric and Herodotean κρατερός and κρατέω	188
2.3.2. Homeric κράτος	193
2.3.3. Herodotean κράτος	206
2.3.4. Conclusion	217
2.4. Βίη	
2.4.1. Homeric βίη	219
2.4.2. Herodotean βίη	238
2.4.3. Conclusion	246
2.5. Chapter Conclusions – Fighting Words	247
Chapter 3 – Cunning Intelligence:	
3.1. Introduction - Homeric and Herodotean Trickery	251
3.2. Δόλος	
3.2.1. Homeric δόλος	254
3.2.2. Herodotean δόλος	266
3.2.3. Conclusion	283
3.3. Coda: Μῆτις	
3.3.1. Homeric μῆτις	285
3.3.2. Herodotean μῆτις	295
3.3.3. Conclusion	299
3.4. Chapter Conclusions – Cunning Intelligence	300
Conclusions	306
Bibliography	312

INTRODUCTION

Heroes function through fabulous deeds at the extreme end of pro-social activity. It is not only the way in which they take action but also the result that wins them admiration. This has not gone unnoticed by scholars across a range of disciplines discussing the topic. Heroism has recently been described as representing ‘the pinnacle of human behaviour’.¹ Certainly, the ways in which a hero’s adventures and exploits are often narrated easily lend them to climactic language and narrative patterns which help them to be received as figures who attain this ‘pinnacle’. Hughes-Hallett, introducing biographies of selected male heroes, describes heroes as ‘dynamic seductive people [...] exceptionally, perhaps even supernaturally, gifted so as to be capable of something momentous’.² Hughes-Hallett’s assessment foregrounds the astonishing aspect assigned to heroes. The achievement of something ‘momentous’ is crucial to the hero’s appeal. Heroes exceed the mundane and thus, in both the literal and figurative senses of the word, are awesome.

i. Herodotus’ Prologue, Heroism and Homer

Language similar to modern discussions of heroism is found at the beginning of Herodotus’ *Histories*. Herodotus promises to tell the ‘great and wonderful deeds’ (ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά, 1.1.0) of humans as part of his project to detail the cause and course of the Persian Wars.³ From his opening sentence, Herodotus’ conception of his task aligns with how heroes and heroic actions are discussed in modern considerations of heroism. The prominence

¹ Allison *et al.* (2017) 1.

² Hughes-Hallett (2004) 1.

³ All references are to Herodotus’ *Histories* unless otherwise stated. I refer to Herodotus’ first sentence as the ‘Prologue’ and 1.1-5 as the ‘Proem’. On Herodotus’ Proem, inclusive of the Prologue, see in particular: Chiasson (2012a). Rood (2010). Wecowski (2004). Krischer (1965) and Bakker (2002) 6-7 see the Prologue as based on Homeric ‘syntactical articulation’; this phrase is used at Bakker (2002) 6.

Herodotus lends to recording ‘great’ (μεγάλα) deeds finds its parallel in the emphasis those discussing heroism place on the extraordinary nature of heroes’ deeds. Similarly, Herodotus’ designation of deeds being ‘wonderful’ (θωμαστά) reflects the impact made by heroic actions – ‘human beings can arouse wonder for their heroism’.⁴ Modern readers might therefore expect something heroic as they begin reading the *Histories*.⁵

Herodotus continues in his Prologue to use language similar to that found in contemporaneous discussions of heroism. He says that his intention in recording his *Histories* is so that those great and wonderful deeds ‘not become without fame’ (μήτε [...] ἀκλεᾶ γένηται, 1.1.0).⁶ The use of the adjective ‘without fame’ (ἀκλεής), with its constituent part being from the same etymological root as the epic word ‘fame’ (κλέος), appears to denote a further heroic tone. ‘Fame’ (κλέος) is the very reason Achilles gives for fighting at Troy (*Il.* 9.410-6, with κλέος at *Il.* 9.413 and 415). Thus, from both a modern and ancient perspective, at the inception of Herodotus’ work it aligns with a heroic idiom.

In combination, the Homeric poems form the largest and most celebrated catalogue of heroic deeds prior to Herodotus’ own time of composition.⁷ Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were

⁴ Priestley (2014) 55. Marincola (2007a) 67: ‘epic’s capacity to imagine worlds not known to everyday experience ensured that wonder, as Herodotus had first intended when he chose ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά as his subject, remained a motivating force behind the historian’s and his audience’s curiosity’.

⁵ I refer to the external narratee of the *Histories* as a ‘reader’ for convenience; although it is likely that Herodotus gave readings of selected passages to an audience, on this see Matijašić (2019), who, in arguing for a textual emendation of Athenaeus to include the performance of Herodotus’ *Histories*, gives an excellent account of the ancient evidence for oral performances of Herodotus’ work. Grethlein (2023) 18. Nicolai (2007). Bakker (2006) 95. Slings (2002). Murray (1987/2001a). Murray (2001b). Thomas (2000) 249-69. Romm (1998) 128. For the *Histories* as being designed to be read see Moles (2002) 34. Rösler (2002). Moles (1999). Flory (1980).

⁶ ‘[...]’ denotes where I have removed a portion of the Greek text to include only that which is relevant.

⁷ Among the vast scholarship on Homeric heroism, I have found the following most helpful: Barker and Christensen (2020). Kundmueller (2019). Kohen (2014). Langerwerf and Ryan (2010), in particular 6-11. Benardete (2005). Clarke (2004) offers an excellent starting point along with Nagy (2005). Buchan (2004). Miller (2000) makes some observations throughout. Finkelberg (1995). Schein (1984). Nagy (2013) and (1979) though largely through the lens of hero-cults. Whitman (1958), though published over sixty years ago, still remains relevant; in particular 154-220.

widely heard and read at Herodotus' time and 'a Greek was likely to have learned great stretches of the two poems by heart'.⁸ 'Fame', as denoted by κλέος, is a prominent epic term; and so, 'in claiming to preserve the *kleos* of remarkable deeds Herodotus audaciously appropriates for his ambitious prose work what had long been recognised as an essential function of poetic song'.⁹ Herodotus' debt to (Homeric) epic is a well-reiterated subject within Herodotean scholarship.¹⁰ Two pieces of ancient evidence support this view. Pseudo-Longinus says that 'Herodotus was most Homeric' (Ἡρόδοτος Ὀμηρικώτατος, [Longinus], *Subl.* 13.3); there is a (relatively) recently discovered Halicarnassian inscription which names Herodotus 'The prose Homer in history' (τὸν πεζὸν ἐν ἱστορίαισιν Ὀμηρον).¹¹ Both Pseudo-Longinus and the inscription constitute common parlance in the scholarship which looks at the influence of Homeric epic on the Herodotean *Histories*.¹² The antiquity of such claims and the fact that they have literally been set in stone go a long way to explaining why this approach to Herodotus has been so favourable. This thesis argues, however, that Herodotus does not use the epic vocabulary of heroism in the same way despite Herodotus' Homeric accolade.

⁸ Finley (1956) 21. Homer as common cultural currency at Herodotus' time see Hall (2025) 74: 'Homeric poetry has profoundly informed subsequent literature and society in many and diverse ways, from providing exemplars of human heroism, love, death, and conflict as well as representations of speech and action, to creating expectations of tone, image, grandeur, scale, and magniloquence'. Hunter (2004) 246. Horsley (2000). Morgan (1998). 'Homer' refers to the poet of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. References to Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are denoted by *Il.* and *Od.* respectively.

⁹ Chiasson (2012a) 118.

¹⁰ On the relationship between Herodotus and Homer see Matijašić (2022). Pelling (2022). Haywood (2022). Harrison (2022). Fragoulaki (2022). Barker (2022). Donelli (2022). Tribulato (2022). Tuplin (2022). Currie (2021). Sheehan (2018) 33-4. Marincola (2018). Foster (2012). Rutherford (2012). Chiasson (2012b). See Vandiver (2012), esp. 144: Herodotus uses 'concepts familiar from epic, oral tradition and the rich background of traditional tales [...] to endow particularly important scenes or characters with an aura that would recall the tone, assumptions, and authority of epic'. de Bakker (2012). Baragwanath (2008) 35-54. Marincola (2007). Pelling (2006a). Griffiths (2006) 135-43. Marincola (2006). Hunter (2004) 241. Boedeker (2002). Romm (1998) 12-31. Hartog (1996). Lateiner (1989) 99-100. Fornara (1983) in particular, 62-3 and 76-7. Strasburger (1972). Haywood (2013) 78 n.15 collects further earlier bibliography.

¹¹ Isager (1998) contains this inscription, entitling it *The Pride of Halicarnassus*, *SEG* 48.1130, 1.43.

¹² Quoted by, *inter alia*, Haywood (2022) 59. Barker (2022) 174. Marincola (2018) 3. Priestley (2014) 187-90. Kazanskaya (2013) 161. Haywood (2013) 78. Chiasson (2012a) 114. Baragwanath (2008) 35. Marincola (2006) 13. Griffiths (2006) 135. Tritle (2006) 209-10. Hornblower (2006) 306. Boedeker (2002) 97. Boedeker (2001a) 29-30.

It is not the contention of this thesis that there are no moments of Homeric intertextuality or allusion in the *Histories*. This would be incorrect, since ‘the presence of epic or epic-looking elements in Herodotus is an undeniable fact’.¹³ Instead, this thesis argues that Herodotus often does not draw upon the epic vocabulary of heroism to construct an epic aura for his heroes.

Differences from epic vocabulary can be seen even from Herodotus’ opening sentence. The *Histories* begin ‘Herodotus of Halicarnassus here displays his inquiries’ (Ἡροδότου Ἁλικαρνησέως ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις ἥδε, 1.1.0). By ‘starting with his own name, the historian (unlike the epic poet) claims final responsibility and authority for his work’.¹⁴ Herodotus describes his work as an ‘inquiry’ (ἱστορίη), from which we get the modern word ‘history’, and ‘so far as our evidence [...] allows us to judge, Herodotus was the first writer to apply the powerful new concept of ‘inquiry’ to the study of the human past’.¹⁵ Rosalind Thomas has demonstrated that Herodotus’ opening sentence aligns itself with Ionian natural philosophy, through the use of ἱστορίη,¹⁶ and the language of oratorical persuasion with ἀπόδεξις,¹⁷ and, with the latter term, ‘Herodotus is the first attested author to use the word, and the fact that it occurs so prominently in his very first sentence implies deliberate emphasis’.¹⁸ The ‘great and wonderful deeds’ Herodotus announces he will present are those ‘from humans’ (ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, 1.1.0). Analogously, Homer begins the *Odyssey* with the accusative form for the subject of his work ‘man’ (ἄνδρα, *Od.* 1.1),¹⁹ and, at the beginning of the *Iliad*, Achilles’ wrath is said to send to Hades many souls of **heroes** (ἡρώων, *Il.* 1.3-4). In epic, ‘deeds are done by *andres*,

¹³ Tribulato (2022) 255. Haywood (2022) 81: ‘The placement of Homeric allusions is rarely, if ever, incidental’.

¹⁴ Dewald and Munson (2022) 179.

¹⁵ Fowler (2006) 32.

¹⁶ Thomas (2000) 135-67.

¹⁷ Thomas (2000) 249-69.

¹⁸ Thomas (2000) 261.

¹⁹ It should be noted that Odysseus ‘saw cities of many **humans** (ἀνθρώπων) and learnt their mind’ (*Od.* 1.3), but this term describes other inhabitants in the Homeric world and not Odysseus.

words are spoken by *anthrôpoi*; and if human beings do anything, it is only the tillage of the fields'.²⁰ Even the crucial use of ἀκλεής can be considered to be a variation on epic phraseology.²¹ Herodotus creates a double negative construction, 'not become **without** fame' (μήτε [...] ἀκλεᾶ γένηται, 1.1.0), rather than simply stating that he wishes to bestow 'glory' (κλέος). Further, ἀκλεής is a rare form in (Homeric) epic and is thus not a major term in the construction of the heroic.²² At the outset, Herodotus is not using 'epic' language. Herodotus makes it clear that his work is not a reshaping of Homeric-style 'glorious deeds of men' (κλέα ἀνδρῶν, *Il.* 9.189), but that he is writing an entirely separate and distinct form of heroic narrative.²³

ii. Problems of Definition

Heroism is a slippery term to quantify and define. Korte and Wendt, introducing an edited volume on *Heroism as a Global Phenomenon in Contemporary Culture*, note the transcultural and transnational nature of the concept:

[T]he heroic is part of major cultural fantasies, like the superheroes that crowd our cinematic universe, and it is manifest in reports of real deeds—by soldiers, firefighters, and policemen, by those who fight against oppression, and by 'normal' people in everyday life.²⁴

²⁰ Benardete (2005) 13. Referencing: *Il.* 16.392, 17.549-50, 19.131.

²¹ Tuplin (2022) 297: 'If *aklea* and the 'what was the cause/the cause was' structure do evoke Homer, the effect is nonetheless to mark distance and claim distinctive status for Herodotus as author'.

²² ἀκλεής: *Od.* 4.728; *Il.* 7.100 and 12.318; the related ἀκλεῶς appears only in the *Odyssey*, twice at 1.241 and 14.371; the other related term, ἄκλειστος, appears in neither Homeric epic. See further Romm (1998) 19-20, who discusses the appearance of ἀκλεής in Sarpedon's discussion of Homeric heroism (*Il.* 12.310-29, with ἀκλεής at 12.318). on Sarpedon's speech see p.13 and pp.116-7.

²³ Cf. Sheehan (2018) 62. Pelling (2007) 150. Bakker (2002) 26-8. Donelli (2022) 228 sees the Proem (1.5.3-4) as drawing upon 'implicit Homeric echoes'.

²⁴ Korte and Wendt (2019) 3.

Korte and Wendt highlight just how disparate heroism can be; a variety of agents can undertake action which can be described as ‘heroic’. In the introduction to their edited volume on *Heroism and Global Politics*, Kitchen and Mathers warn that

heroism is a concept that is widely used but rarely defined in popular media. Instinctively we feel that no formal definition is needed; we all know a hero when we see one.²⁵

Whether in academic publications, everyday conversations or other discussions of heroism pinning down precisely what is meant by the terms ‘hero’, ‘heroism’ and ‘heroic’ provides one challenge for approaching the topic. Heroism is polymorphous. Singh and Tholia summarise the issue for defining heroism in modern society succinctly:

[N]ow there is more fluidity and flexibility to this concept. In this age of social media where everyone demands for his/her/their ‘kind’ of hero, this faceless crowd can raise someone as their hero, and anyone can be a hero if they want.²⁶

From a Herodotean perspective, one definition of ‘hero’ is easier to discern. The Greek word ‘hero’ (ἥρως), from which we get the modern English term ‘hero’,²⁷ has a specific meaning of a (deceased)²⁸ individual to whom religious honours were paid.²⁹ While this is

²⁵ Kitchen and Mathers (2019a) 2.

²⁶ Singh and Tholia (2022) 2.

²⁷ The *Oxford English Dictionary* shows that the earliest English attestation of ‘hero’ is in a 1522 translation of the *Aeneid*: OED *hero*, n. 1. ‘a1522 G. Douglas tr. Virgil *Aeneid* (1959) IX.200: ‘And na less murnyng hard thai in that sted For Rhamnetes, fund hedless, pail and ded, Togiddir with samony capitany, And gret **herys** [1553 heros].’ My emphasis. This is valuable evidence for showing that due to translations of ancient epic that the word ‘hero’ enters the English language.

²⁸ Currie (2004) 158-200 discusses the idea of those who were to become ἥρωες receiving favourable treatment while they still lived and, in exceptional circumstances, becoming living ἥρωες (p.180-200).

²⁹ See above all Currie (2004), who gives both an excellent terminological and cultural analysis of the phenomenon. See further Jones (2010). Nagy (2013).

important for the term's etymology, the religious dimension of hero cult would stray too far from my lexical focal point. Nonetheless, Homer and Herodotus use the term in differing ways. Herodotus uses ἥρωες exclusively for the heroes of hero cults,³⁰ whereas 'the Homeric use of ἥρωες [...] has no religious implications'.³¹

Scholars have attempted to define the term 'hero' specifically within the framework of Homeric epic. It has been suggested, for example that 'the major epic characters are heroes [...] and] almost any warrior in the *Iliad* can be designated *hērōs*',³² but this is unsatisfactory. The *locus classicus* for the study of Homeric heroism is found in *Iliad* 12.310-28 (see discussion on pp.116-7). Here Sarpedon turns to his comrade Glaucôn and, in the words of one scholar, provides the 'clearest statement in the *Iliad* of the imperatives that govern the heroic life and their justification'.³³ However, 'Sarpedon is not introduced as a 'hero' (ἥρωες) in *Iliad* 12 nor is Glaucôn (in fact, neither Sarpedon nor Glaucôn is ever explicitly called a hero in the *Iliad*), nor indeed does Sarpedon mention any 'heroes' (ἥρωες) in his speech'.³⁴ Thus the term ἥρωες is not particularly instructive for a definition of the term 'hero'. More informative is instead the perspective that, more generally, '*hērōs* is felt to mark a particular genre, the *heroic* poems of Homer',³⁵ where 'Homer's *hērōes* describe a group of men fighting at Troy *en masse*'.³⁶ To talk of heroes in the context of ancient epic is thus to talk of the figures fighting at Troy.³⁷ For

³⁰ 1.167.4, 1.168, 2.44.5, 2.45.3, 2.50.3, 2.143.4, 4.145.3, 5.66.2, 5.114.2, 6.69.3, 7.43.2, 7.117.2, 8.39, 8.109.3, 8.143.2, 9.25.3. N.B. 4.145.3 refers to the heroes of the *Argo*. 5.66.2 refers to the heroes of Homer. For the heroes of hero cult in Herodotus see Dewald (2012) 77. Gray (2012). Munson (2012). Jones (2010) 23. Serghidou (2007) 286. Boedeker (2003) 20. Gray (2002) 313. Hartog (1988) 158.

³¹ Currie (2004) 60. See also Coldstream (1976).

³² Martin (2011) 25. Compare: Jones (2010) 12.

³³ Hainsworth (1993) 352. See also Clarke (2004) 77-8. Finkelberg (1995) 1. Schein (1984) 70-1. Redfield (1975) 99.

³⁴ Haubold (2000) 4.

³⁵ Barker (2024) 2.

³⁶ Barker (2024) 3, Barker continues p.3 to suggest that this 'correlates the players of the Homeric poems to the generation of *hēmītheoi* whom Hesiod describes', citing Clarke (2004) 78-80.

³⁷ I should stress that this thesis is not an examination of mythical heroes (e.g. Theseus, Jason, Perseus), except where specific pieces of the epic vocabulary of heroism is used in relation to them

the purposes of this thesis, I shall therefore be adopting the definition of ‘hero’ as a figure who fought at Troy (see further for the particular heroes of focus: pp.22-3).

This brings me to the second problematic definition: Homeric epic. In particular,

what do we mean by Homer? Just the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*? [...] There is also the question of genre: how far is any thought ‘how Homeric!’ and how far ‘how epic!’? If ‘how epic!’, does that just mean ‘how grand!’, or is it something sharper and more specific? Is it ‘ah, Homer!’? Or ‘ah, the Trojan War!’?³⁸

Homer’s ‘authority led to the ascription of many poems of the epic cycle to him’.³⁹ This included the *Cypria* and the *Epigoni*. However, Herodotus is ‘sceptical about the authorship of the *Epigoni* (4.32), [and he] rejects outright the attribution of the *Cypria* to Homer’,⁴⁰ and Herodotus even cites a *Cypria* passage (2.117) ‘that proves the author is not Homer’.⁴¹ It should be stressed, as Pelling notes, that ‘the case about *Cypria* needed to be made, and not all of his readers will have agreed’.⁴² Thus Herodotus has his own views as to what constitutes ‘Homeric epic’, which does not necessarily tally with that of his contemporaries. It is therefore unhelpful to think in terms of ‘Homeric epic’ when looking at Herodotus’ adaption of epic vocabulary. Instead, I shall be examining the use of selected terminology within the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* to provide the raw data for thinking about the vocabulary differences between epic more generally and Herodotus’ new genre of *historiē* (see further: pp.26-7). Further, it has been noted that the *Histories* are ‘a prose narrative that equalled the scope and grandeur of a Homeric

(e.g. Heracles on pp.173-5). On mythical heroes in the *Histories* see de Bakker (2012). de Jong (2012). Munson (2012a). Vandiver (1991).

³⁸ Pelling (2022) 41.

³⁹ Matijašić (2022) 7.

⁴⁰ Barker (2022) 178.

⁴¹ Tuplin (2022) 293.

⁴² Pelling (2022) 41.

poem and indeed nearly doubled the *Iliad* in sheer length'.⁴³ Thus, to ensure that there is a fair comparison, I shall be using both Homeric poems so that the original data source is of roughly equal length.

iii. Heroism Studies

The study of heroism now constitutes an entire field of scholarship called 'Heroism Studies'. Scholars of Heroism Studies fall into one of two camps when defining the term: the objective and the subjective. The objective approach helps not only to identify examples of heroism but also to distinguish them from other related social phenomena such as altruism.⁴⁴ This method, stresses core characteristics in defining the terms heroism, hero, and heroic. Allison *et al.* outline these attributes as follows:

First, heroism involves taking one or more actions that are deemed to be morally good, or that are directed toward serving a noble principle or the greater good. Second, these good actions must be exceptional, not minor or ordinary. Third, heroism involves making a significant sacrifice. Fourth, heroism involves taking a great risk.⁴⁵

This definition is certainly attractive and can be used to encompass a wide range of endeavours and activities in its definition of heroic. However, the open-ended nature of this definition is also part of its problem as it means that it can be applied to even disparate manifestations of heroism.

⁴³ Romm (1988) 13, see also p.xv: 'above all, [Herodotus] made it long – longer, almost certainly, than anything else yet written in the world, and more than double the length of the longest Greek text that went before it'.

⁴⁴ Franco *et al.* (2011).

⁴⁵ Allison *et al.* (2017) 5. Scholars adopting the objective approach include Kohen (2014). Kohen (2013). Franco *et al.* (2011). Campbell (1949). Carlyle (1841).

The subjective approach is reactive to the objective method.⁴⁶ Advocates of the subjective approach stress the inadequacy of rigid definitions on account of the ‘vast subjective interpretation’ to which such definitions are prone, asking questions such as these: ‘if heroism is good, who defines what is good? And how much good is a heroic amount?’⁴⁷ While such questions may seem facetious, they do expose the inadequacies of attempting to apply a strict definition of heroism in the light of moral and cultural relativism. Rather than fruitlessly debate the exact components that make up heroism, subjective approach analysts tend to focus on the reception of those deemed heroic by their audiences and how the wider public define heroism. Dittmer, attempting to come to a concrete definition of the nationalist superhero, suggests this:

Rather than obsess about who is a superhero and who is not, I see it perhaps more useful to consider genres as continually in interaction with one other, each a hybrid form, continually in process, with influences from a wide array of antecedents.⁴⁸

Franco *et al.* suggest that heroism is a social construct and is largely based on what a particular society requires, making it a ‘historically, culturally and situationally determined’ concept.⁴⁹ This explains how heroes of the same time period can mean different things to different people.⁵⁰ Franco *et al.* help to clarify that this stance largely explains why ‘heroes of one era may prove to be villains in another time [...] and] the very same act accorded hero status in one

⁴⁶ Scholars of the subjective approach include authors in Singh *et al.* (eds.) (2022). Authors in Korte *et al.* (eds.) (2019). Authors in Kitchen and Mathers (eds.) (2019). Allison and Goethals (2011).

⁴⁷ Allison *et al.* (2017) 6.

⁴⁸ Dittmer (2013) 7.

⁴⁹ Franco *et al.* (2011) 99. Similar arguments for heroism as a social construct: Jones *et al.* (2014) 789. Jones (2007) 439. Braudy (1986) 588. Carlyle (1841) 1 is also suggestive of this approach when he writes, ‘Universal History, the history of what man has accomplished in this world, is at bottom the History of the Great Men who have worked here’.

⁵⁰ Goodrum (2019) 29.

group [...] is absolutely abhorrent to many others.⁵¹ By examining heroic figures for what they represent to each culture, the subjective approach seeks to expose the intimacy between heroes and the society which creates and venerates them.⁵² Thus, in the concluding section of their largely subjective and relativist study, Allison and Goethals posit that ‘heroism exists in the eyes of the beholders.’⁵³

Neither approach is without its flaws. The objective approach, which attempts a concrete definition, is open to the charge of being reductionist and lends itself to essentialist rather than nuanced perspectives. Meanwhile, the subjective approach has been criticised for its failure to produce a clear definition, that is to say it is *too* subjective. Kohen’s *reductio ad absurdum* argument demonstrates this:

If someone claims that Stalin is a hero or a cactus is a hero and a researcher says, ‘well, heroism is in the eye of the beholder,’ then the researcher’s implicit argument is that absolutely anyone or anything is a hero because there’s no way to judge one person’s claim from another person’s without taking sides, being partial.⁵⁴

While Kohen’s argument is drawn from an extreme perspective, he encapsulates the flaws of the subjective approach. However, I would argue that one of the advantages of the subjective approach is to demonstrate just how elastic heroism can be.

There has been growing interest in the idea of ‘everyday heroes/heroism’.⁵⁵ Kohen has suggested that, ‘the heroic often raises the status of an otherwise average citizen to that of a

⁵¹ Franco *et al.* (2011) 99. See also Mak (2019) 191: ‘Different times call for different types of heroes, and a hero from a specific era can be another’s villain’.

⁵² Marshall (1997).

⁵³ Allison and Goethals (2011) 196.

⁵⁴ Kohen (2013).

⁵⁵ Zankar (2022). Butter (2019) 126. Hochbruck (2019), esp. 146. Partridge (2019). Mather and Kitchen (2019b) 220: ‘heroes act as a bridge between ideals and everyday life’.

celebrity’.⁵⁶ In Homeric epic, however, while any character fighting at Troy can be called a ‘hero’,⁵⁷ the main focus is on the action of the aristocratic and ruling elite. This is particularly the case in the *Iliad*. Herodotus’ *Histories*, meanwhile, provides pivotal narrative roles to a much more expansive sociology. One strand of this thesis will therefore be to examine the spread of the epic vocabulary of heroism throughout the sociological layers present in the narrative worlds. This will allow us to see whether the vocabulary is inflected based on characters’ social positions within the respective texts. Further it will enable us also to judge whether the application of the epic vocabulary of heroism applies to a fixed sociology in Homeric epic, or whether Homer at times grants this vocabulary to the lower class of his narrative world. Just as an average citizen can become a celebrity through the achievement of something ‘heroic’, this also ‘uncomfortably reminds us that there exists a fine line between heroism and villainy’.⁵⁸

iv. Academic Revision of The Heroic

The study of exemplary figures, whether of individuals or collectives, has undergone a re-evaluation in recent years which is in distinct contrast to how figures were instrumentalised to enforce exclusionary ideologies and nationalistic agendas. The use, and abuse in many cases, of heroes serves to demonstrate the dark side of the subjective approach towards heroism, particularly the changing relationship audiences have with heroes.⁵⁹ Figures once hailed as

See also Scott (1985).

⁵⁶ Kohen (2014) 1. As celebrities can be viewed as heroes, it is useful to quote Marshall (1997) 241: ‘the public personality or celebrity is the site of intense work on the meaning of both individuality and collective identity in contemporary culture. It is the capacity of these public figures to embody the collective in the individual, which identifies their cultural signs as powerful’.

⁵⁷ This is what I give as my definition of ‘hero’ above.

⁵⁸ Allison *et al.* (2017) 6.

⁵⁹ Hall (2025) 19-42 for audiences’ changing reception of the *Iliad*.

heroes can be reviewed later with suspicion as to the ideologies that they either deliberately or unwittingly espoused.

The academic revision of heroes is drawn from across multimedia. For example, Goodrum has shown that the protagonist Biggles, of the once popular children's literature series, serves British colonialist and imperialist agendas.⁶⁰ Similarly, the expansive worlds of comic books have been shown to harbour racist views and prejudices for both villains and heroes.⁶¹

A similar trend is found in receptions of the classical. The Hollywood epic historical action movie *300* recounts the Battle of Thermopylae (first detailed in the *Histories*).⁶² However, this post-9/11 film continued the trend of portraying 'Arab' people through racist orientalist stereotypes.⁶³ The wider misuse, to put it at its mildest, of the ancient past rears its head in 20th-century far-right political movements.⁶⁴ Krebs has shown how the Germans' ancient past played a key role in nationalistic agendas, culminating in the Third Reich's conceptualisation of the 'ideal' Aryan German.⁶⁵ Roche, exploring German classical education methods, notes the emphasis placed on the teaching of selected passages which espouse the

⁶⁰ Goodrum (2019).

⁶¹ On the problematic nature of superhero narratives see Falkenhayner and Hardt (2019). Dittmer (2013). Hack (2009). McWilliams (2009). Sutliff (2009). Cf. Korte and Wendt (2019) 1-2. Arnaudo (2010). On the appropriateness of comparing Classics to comics see Phillips (2024). Marshall and Kovacs (2016). Marshall and Kovacs (2011).

⁶² Hall (2025) 28-9 notes that the: 'influence is distorted by the intermediary of the comic-strip illustrated novella version'.

⁶³ For this trend before the release of *300* see Shaheen (2001). Ahmed (1992). Compare this with the comments from a 19th-century introduction to the *Histories*, Swayne (1870) 5: 'the two great victories which followed within a year – Plataea and Mycale, gained on the same day – indicated for ever the superiority of Europeans over Asiatics'. For further references and bibliography on the use of Herodotus in 19th-century debates on racial superiority see Harrison and Skinner (2020) 9. For Herodotus in the 19th century more generally see Rood (2020). Hall (2020). Skinner (2020). Vasunia (2020).

⁶⁴ Roche (2017a).

⁶⁵ Krebs (2011).

Nazi regime's agenda.⁶⁶ Similarly, Marcello notes that Mussolini's *decennale* was carefully curated to imitate Augustus' *decennali*.⁶⁷ Thus both dictators employed the leading and exemplary figures, some would say heroes, of the classical past to aggrandise their political hegemony.

Thus, as even a brief survey shows, there is no doubt that heroic figures and Classics have been consciously manipulated and abused to further disgusting fascist regimes. However, as Krebs ends his exploration in his sensationally titled *A Most Dangerous Book: Tacitus' Germania From The Roman Empire to The Third Reich*, no book is inherently evil. Neither, too, is an entire discipline. As Krebs concludes: 'In the end the Roman historian Tacitus did not write a most dangerous book; his readers made it so'.⁶⁸

v. Methodology

And so, not only have heroic figures been abused, but also the field of Classics as a discipline. This makes the study of heroism in the field of Classics doubly contested territory. However, in line with recent developments in the study of the heroic,

the revelation of a hero's feet of clay should not be the end of the process of enquiry, but the beginning. Why and in what ways were flaws obscured in the constructions of heroic reputation?⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Roche (2017b). Such as Julius Weisweiler's school textbook seemingly drawing comparisons between the Führer and the great classical statesmen of old. Roche (2017b) 246. Weisweiler (1942) 101 and 113. See further Winkler (2016).

⁶⁷ Marcello (2017) 393.

⁶⁸ Krebs (2011) 250.

⁶⁹ Jones (2007) 442.

This is precisely the approach of this project. It does not seek to aggrandise individuals from the *Histories*—indeed, quite the opposite. It will show that often Herodotus’ depiction of heroes differs from Homeric epic and that Herodotus himself does not blindly aggrandise individuals.

The research framework is a narratological and sociolinguistic application of the subjective approach to Heroism Studies which implements traditional referentiality. Narratology assists in unpicking how heroic narratives are told and presented within both Homeric epic and the *Histories*. Through registering any actorial focalisation, this study demonstrates how narration influences the reader’s reception of heroes and heroic narratives and the application of epic vocabulary.⁷⁰ Since this study examines the vocabulary for presenting (historical) individuals, it is also sociolinguistic. It examines selected terms as applied to Achilles and Odysseus, the central protagonists of their respective Homeric epics, and assesses Herodotus’ use of these same terms in the *Histories*. Each chapter begins with an examination of a Homeric term in its Homeric context. This is followed by comparison to the use of the term in an epic context. It adopts the linguistic approach to subjective heroism found in Allison and Goethals (2011).

Through a sociological experiment, Allison and Goethals compiled what they coined the ‘Great Eight’. They asked their participants to name the personality traits which they deemed heroic, and the following adjectival attributes found common consensus: smart, strong, selfless, caring, charismatic, resilient, reliable, and inspiring.⁷¹ Regrettably, it is not possible to question Homeric heroes directly and ask them to name qualities which they see as advantageous. However, there are two scenes where a number of characteristics are applied to

⁷⁰ Above all see de Jong (2014) 167-9 and Baragwanath (2008). On the appropriateness of a narratological approach to the *Histories* see further Allan (2018). van Wees (2018). Tsakmakis (2018). de Bakker (2018). de Jong (2018). Marincola (2018). Sheehan (2018) 33-40. de Jong (2012). de Bakker (2012). Thomas (2012). Chiasson (2012b). Pelling (2006b). Larson (2006). Hazewindus (2004). Brock (2003). de Jong (2002a). Dewald (2002). Gray (2002). de Jong (1999). Dillery (1996). Marincola (1987). Dewald (1987). Lang (1984).

⁷¹ Allison and Goethals (2011) 61-2.

the two central Homeric heroes Achilles and Odysseus. The first is the embassy scene of *Iliad* 9 (189-655), which is ‘widely regarded in contemporary Homeric scholarship as the interpretive key to the poem, the linchpin to its plot and tragic vision’.⁷² Here the envoys apply vocabulary to Achilles as they describe his character as the martial hero *par excellence*.⁷³ The emissaries also use language denoting fame and positive public image to tempt Achilles with the benefits of returning to battle. The second scene is when Athene drops her disguise as she talks to Odysseus in *Odyssey* 13 (291-310). There she praises Odysseus’ ability with trickery,⁷⁴ and compares him to herself; in so doing, she applies to Odysseus a number of terms to denote cunning intelligence. The terms selected for this study which appear in these two scenes are: ‘glory’ (κῦδος), ‘prize’ (γέρας), ‘fame’ (κλέος), ‘honour’ (τιμή), ‘valour’ (ἀλκή), ‘power’ (κράτος), ‘might’ (βίη), ‘trickery’ (δόλος), and ‘cunning intelligence’ (μῆτις).

There are several reasons for focussing on Achilles and Odysseus. As Benardete says, ‘Achilles is a hero in a world of heroes; he is of the same cast as they, though we might call him the first impression which has caught each point more finely than later copies’.⁷⁵ The other Achaeans all recognise Achilles’ pre-eminence and thus he stands at the pinnacle of their

⁷² Wilson (1999) 132, with further bibliography.

⁷³ On Achilles as the paradigmatic war hero see Kundmueller (2019) 51-7. Kohen (2014) 9-36. Nagy (2005). Benardete (2005). Lateiner (2004). Hughes-Hallett (2004) 1-40. Buchan (2004) 101-10. Miller (2000) 355-8. Schein (1984) 90-1. Nagy (1979). Whitman (1958) 180-220.

⁷⁴ On Odysseus as the wily, crafty hero see most recently Turner (2024), who shows how the figure of Odysseus was treated in Attic tragedy. Kohen (2014) 42. McConnell (2010), though from a reception perspective looking at the Odyssean figure in Ralph Ellison’s *Invisible Man*, has much to say about Odysseus’ own characterisation as a wily hero. See also Hughes-Hallett (2004) 541-65; Buchan (2004), in particular 150-1 and 154-5 for the *Cyclopeia*; Silk (2004); de Jong (2001) has much scattered discussion; Miller (2000) 280-1; Finkelberg (1995); Pucci (1987); Friedrich (1987); Newton (1987). Fletcher (2008) also has a lot to say on trickery more generally. See further Coillie (2000), esp. 133-6.

⁷⁵ Benardete (2005) 3. Mackie (2008) 2: ‘Achilles seems to dominate the heroic world of his generation in an entirely different way from Heracles in the previous era’.

definition of their heroic values.⁷⁶ Analogously, ‘Odysseus is the great trickster’,⁷⁷ and this is likewise recognised by characters within the Homeric world.⁷⁸ Both figures fought at Troy and thus align with the definition of ‘hero’ as discussed earlier (pp.12-4). Further, these two heroes embody differing, often opposing,⁷⁹ forms of heroism. By looking at the terms which characters apply to Achilles and Odysseus, we can see the values that the other members of Homeric society invest in them as central figures in the definition of these types of heroism and way of life.

There are some notable omissions from the above catalogue of collected terms. There are other terms, both within the selected scenes and elsewhere in Homeric epic, that Homer uses to denote heroism. For example, the term ‘good’ (ἀγαθός) will not constitute part of this thesis as the term is too broad in meaning for my current purposes. The term has nonetheless been shown to refer primarily to the nobility in Homer;⁸⁰ whereas ‘Herodotus uses ἀγαθός and its superlative ἄριστος widely to indicate anything that is ‘good’, from ‘valiant’ in battle to the purely material ‘goods’ from which one may draw advantage’.⁸¹ Analogously, I shall not be examining the crucial term ‘spirit’ (θυμός) as Homer uses the term 758 times across both

⁷⁶ See ‘of men Telamonian Ajax was by far the best, while Achilles raged’ (*Il.* 2.768-9). See also the phrase ‘best of the Achaeans’ (ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν) as applied to Achilles. On this phenomenon see Nagy (1979) 26-58. Nagy (1979) is built upon by Edwards (1984), who looks at other examples where (p.61) ‘the epithet *aristos* appears independent of any limiting genitive, as well as other usages which parallel ‘best of the Achaeans’, such as ‘best of the Phocaeans’ or ‘best of the Aetolians’.

⁷⁷ Silk (2004) 38.

⁷⁸ Odysseus makes this claim himself (*Od.* 9.19-20). See also *Od.* 3.120-2, 13.292-3. *Il.* 3.200-2, 4.339 (Agamemnon), 11.430 (Socus).

⁷⁹ Nagy (1979) 25. Nagy suggests this is seen in two episodes within Homeric epic. The first is in Demodocus’ first song (p.45), which has Odysseus and Achilles quarrelling to Agamemnon’s delight (*Od.* 7.75-82). The second resolves the problem of the awkward dual forms (p.49-56) when Achilles addresses the three envoys (Odysseus, Phoenix, and Ajax) in *Iliad* 9 (*Il.* 9.196-8). Nagy posits that the duals in *Iliad* 9 refer to Phoenix and Ajax, meaning that Achilles excludes Odysseus from his welcome, making Odysseus’ Iliadic narrative role incidental. This heroic opposition has found general scholarly consensus since the publication of Nagy’s volume, and constitutes an accepted literary motif. See *inter alia*: Kohen (2014) 37. Langerwerf and Ryan (2010) 7. Buchan (2004) 92-3. Hughes-Hallett (2004) 560.

⁸⁰ On ἀγαθός in Homer as denoting nobility see Finkelberg (1998) 20. Long (1970) 121-39.

⁸¹ de Bakker (2015) 59.

epics.⁸² This is a dataset far larger than I can explore fully in the word count of this thesis. One of the terms Athene uses to describe Odysseus' cunning intelligence 'deceit' (ἀπάτη) actually has a more general negative tone to it in Homeric epic and so shall not form part of this discussion (on Homeric ἀπάτη, see further pp.267-9).

Further, I have also not included any Homeric epithets in this discussion. Homer uses a range of epithets to denote Odysseus' intellectual epithets – 'of many counsels' (πολύμητις), 'ingenious' (πολύφρων), 'of many devices' (πολυμήχανος), 'full of various wiles' (ποικιλομήτης) and 'of many turns' (πολύτροπος).⁸³ However, epithets are a feature of oral poetry and Herodotus does not use epithets.⁸⁴ An in-depth discussion of Homeric epithets would therefore add little weight to this comparative study as there would be no Herodotean examples against which to judge the Homeric application.

Other terms are omitted as there is a clear differentiation of use between the two authors. One important Homeric term is the ideal of 'excellence' (ἀρετή). In Homeric epic, ἀρετή is a term 'used to identify the hero and to summarize the deeds and skills by which he attained heroic status',⁸⁵ and almost exclusively refers to individual excellence.⁸⁶ Of the 24 times the term occurs in Herodotean prose, 18 refer to a plurality,⁸⁷ and when the term does apply to an

⁸² Griffin (1995) 26 sees θυμός as an important Homeric heroic term.

⁸³ Williams (2018) 1 n.1 on the significance of epithets in the construction of Odysseus' heroism. See further: Clay (1983) 26-31.

⁸⁴ Herodotus gets very close to using πολύτροπος, but instead uses a form of πολυτροπία, which is unattested in Homeric epic, in the story of the Egyptian thief 2.121ε.3.

⁸⁵ Helleman (1995) 230.

⁸⁶ Homeric ἀρετή of individuals: *Od.* 2.206, 4.629, 4.725, 4.815, 8.237, 8.239, 12.211, 14.212, 14.402, 17.322, 18.133, 18.205, 18.251, 19.124, 21.187, 22.244, 24.193, 24.197, 24.515. *Il.* 8.535, 11.763, 13.237, 13.275, 13.277, 14.118, 15.642, 20.242, 20.411, 22.268, 23.571 and 23.578. Only five Homeric uses of ἀρετή are for pluralities: Two refer to the Phaeacian people as a whole *Od.* 8.244 and 13.45. At *Il.* 9.498 Phoenix, drawing a comparison between Achilles and the gods, applies ἀρετή to the characters of the gods in general. At *Il.* 11.90 the term is applied to the Danaans as a whole. At *Il.* 23.276 and 23.374 the term is applied to collectives of horses.

⁸⁷ On the 'pluralisation' of epic terms in Herodotus *Histories* see further the discussion of Pelling (2006a) on pp.32-3.

individual it is focalised through another character's perspective.⁸⁸ Similarly, 'Athene characterizes [sic.] her resemblance to Odysseus in terms drawn from *kerdos* and *dolos*',⁸⁹ with the first term that Athene attributes to Odysseus being the adjective *κερδαλέος* (*Od.* 13.291). This word is used widely throughout both epics.⁹⁰ Herodotus only uses *κερδαλέος* twice,⁹¹ and only to mean 'gain' in the sense of favourable circumstances rather than denoting any mental activity which enabled circumstances to be positive for the character; both uses of *κερδαλέος* are also tinged with actorial focalisation as they occur in character speech.⁹²

There are further terms which Homer uses but which are entirely (or largely) absent from the *Histories*. Some Homeric terms Herodotus does not use at all, such as *μηδός*,⁹³ a term for crafty intelligence, and *εὐχος*, a term which can denote a hero's boasting over a defeated opponent.⁹⁴ Other crucial terms are marginalised in the Herodotean text. Herodotus uses *μένος* only twice (and in an oracular quotation, which is not directly narrator text) whereas Homer uses *μένος* 179 times over both epics. Analogously, another term found frequently in Homeric battle scenes is *σθένος*, which Homer uses 42 times over both epics. Herodotus likewise only

⁸⁸ Herodotean ἀρετή of a plurality: 1.134.2, 1.176.1, 3.120.2, 5.49.3, 7.5.3, 7.102.1, 7.225.1, 8.1.1, 8.26.3, 9.21.2, 9.28.3, 9.40, 9.70.2 and 9.71.1. Herodotean ἀρετή of individuals: 1.52 the oracle of Amphiaraus focalised through Croesus, 3.88.3 Darius' horse focalised through Darius, 7.154.2 Gelon is promoted to be Hippocrates' general, 7.181.2 Pytheas focalised through the Persians, 7.237.2 the hypothetical virtuous man posed by Xerxes, 8.92.1 Pytheas for the second time and again focalised through the Persians' perspective.

⁸⁹ Barnouw (2004) 53.

⁹⁰ *Od.* 2.74, 2.320, 5.474, 6.145, 6.148, 8.548, 9.228, 10.153, 11.358, 13.291, 14.355, 15.204, 15.451, 18.93, 18.166, 19.283, 20.304, 20.316, 20.331, 20.381, 22.338 and 24.239, *Il.* 3.41, 5.201, 6.153, 6.410, 7.28, 7.352, 10.44, 13.458, 14.23, 15.197, 15.226, 16.652, 17.417, 19.63, 22.103 and 22.108.

⁹¹ 6.86γ.2 and 9.7α.2.

⁹² This is also Herodotus' only use of the cognate noun κέρδος: 2.121δ.2, 3.71.4, 3.72.4, 6.13.2, 6.100.2, 7.108.2, 7.50.2, 7.51.3, 7.235.2 and 9.38.1.

⁹³ *Od.* 2.38, 6.12, 6.129, 11.202, 11.445, 13.89, 18.67, 18.87, 19.353, 20.46, 22.476. *Il.* 2.340, 3.202, 3.208, 3.212, 7.278, 15.467, 16.120, 17.325, 18.363, 24.88, 24.282, 24.674.

⁹⁴ *Od.* 9.317, 21.338 and 22.7. *Il.* 2.15, 5.285, 5.654, 7.81, 7.154, 7.203, 11.288, 11.290, 11.445, 12.328, 13.327, 15.462, 16.625, 16.725, 21.297, 21.473 and 22.130. Herodotus does use the verb form εὐχομαι, but this only appears to mean pray rather than boast 1.27.4 where the term occurs twice, 1.31.4, 2.65.4, 2.181.4, 3.76.1, 4.76.3, 7.54.2 where the term occurs twice, 7.178.1, 7.192.2, 8.64.2 where the term occurs twice. On the complex semantics of εὐχος /εὐχομαι see Adkins (1969). See also Gazis (2018) 34 n.24. Nagy (1979) 45. Muellner (1976).

uses σθένης twice, both in Cambyses' character speech, 3.65.6 (see further pp.271-2). The absence, or near absence, of these terms from Herodotean discourse must make us question whether his heroes can be categorised as 'Homeric' or even 'epic' if the same vocabulary choices are not applied to Herodotus' characters.

There is, rightfully, criticism that 'searching for Homer can induce tunnel-vision. Other intertextual targets *were* available'.⁹⁵ There can be no doubt that Herodotus knew the Homeric epics intimately,⁹⁶ but, in the words of Christopher Pelling:

It is easier to make, and indeed to accept, those grand generalizations than to be sure that 'Homer' is what comes to Herodotus' listeners' minds every time he occurs to us, or indeed that 'Homer' would have meant to Herodotus what he means to us.⁹⁷

This is undeniably true. The idea of wearing Homeric 'goggles' implies the idea of a self-fulfilling prophecy: in looking for Homer, we see Homer, therefore Homer is present.

Instead, it is more helpful to take the Homeric poems as providing evidence for the use of vocabulary in epic more generally. In tracing the terminology applied to heroic figures in and across the Homeric poems, this thesis adopts the framework of traditional referentiality.

⁹⁵ Tuplin (2022) 304, Tuplin's italics. Not in the least Greek tragedy; on Herodotus' relationship with Attic tragedy see Sheehan (2018) 38: 'the theatrical aspect that Herodotus brings to his text has dual influences and Attic drama is likely to have been as much, if not more, of an inspiration as Homer'. Baragwanath and de Bakker (2012) 52-3. Vandiver (2012) esp. 155-66. Baragwanath (2012). Rutherford (2007). Dewald and Kitzinger (2006). Griffin (2006). Chiasson (2003). Said (2002). Pelling (1997). Laurot (1995). Chiasson (1982). Hartog (1980) 336 'The tragic schemas thus serve as a model of intelligibility for despotic power [...] But the *Histories* are neither a tragedy nor a combination of tragedies'. Lesky (1977). Rieks (1975). Meunier (1968). Thomas (2000) shows how Herodotus orientates his work in the Ionian natural philosophy.

⁹⁶ Currie (2021) gives an excellent analysis of Herodotus' criticism of Homer.

⁹⁷ Pelling (2006a) 77. I share Barker's admission on this matter, Barker (2022) 175 n.59: 'I am sure that I have also too readily conflated the two in the past'. Matijašić (2022) 25: 'not everything we find in both Homer and Herodotus must be connected: several alleged epic references and echoes in the historian's narrative could belong to everyday speech or relate to other works of poetry'.

Foley defines traditional referentiality as the process where repeated words, phrases, and entire scenes in early Greek hexameter poetry:

are not simply compositionally useful, nor are they doomed to a “limited” area of designation; rather they command fields of reference much larger than the single line, passage, or even text in which they occur.⁹⁸

Thus, an analysis of the vocabulary in the Homeric poems can ‘help us retrieve its (customary or normative) semantic charge’;⁹⁹ that is to say its ‘epic usage’. This provides us with a backdrop against which to compare Herodotus’ use of those selected terms and whether Herodotus’ deployment can be considered ‘epic’.

Single word studies have been rightly criticised. O’Sullivan correctly warns that dedicating entire works to the study of single Greek terms can lead to ‘a tendency to over-emphasise the significance of the term in question to the exclusion of other relevant considerations’.¹⁰⁰ This thesis does not constitute, however, the examination of any one term. I am looking at Homer’s overall usage of selected terms as a reference point against which to judge Herodotus’ use of the same terms, to see whether Herodotus’ use of the term can be considered ‘Homeric’.

One question remains: why a comparative study? Why not, for example, look at Herodotean heroes in isolation without a comparison to previous literature? Leo Braudy’s still seminal study details the history of fame and explains why there is a need to look at existing precedents for the construction of the heroic. Braudy begins with the figure of Alexander the

⁹⁸ Foley (1991) 7.

⁹⁹ Barker (2022) 167.

¹⁰⁰ O’Sullivan (2001) <https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2001/2001.02.02/> [accessed 26/06/2024]. See also Ormand (2005).

Great, who, ‘for the worldwide scale of his grappling with the problem of fame and his constant awareness of the relation between accomplishment and publicity, Alexander deserves to be called the first famous person’.¹⁰¹ Braudy argues that Alexander consciously imitated the literary figures of Homer’s epics to ‘justify the men of the present as heroic inheritors of Homeric grandeur’.¹⁰² Thus, Braudy argues, Alexander drew on epic inspiration both to legitimise and aggrandise his campaign. Braudy perhaps places too much faith in the historicity of the sources which romanticise Alexander’s career, but his approach remains instructive.¹⁰³ It demonstrates how ancient historical texts will incorporate poetic material into their schemata to aggrandise their own narratives. Braudy then demonstrates how Alexander’s reputation led to a subsequent emulation in the Roman period; ‘once a vocabulary is created, once a group of gestures is made, they can be reproduced and refined by others’.¹⁰⁴ Braudy’s underlying theory is that the methods for attaining fame in antiquity are based upon the successful imitation of pre-existing precedents.

This is something already seen within Homeric epic. Nestor frequently refers the much greater warriors who walked the earth when he was younger, and he tries to instruct his no-so-heroic present-day comrades (heroic enough to Homer’s audience and to us) in the fundamentals of battle tactics.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰¹ Braudy (1986) 32.

¹⁰² Braudy (1986) 34.

¹⁰³ Braudy (1986) 34-51. On Alexander the Great’s alleged Homeric obsession see Murphy (2019). Zeitlin (2012) 30: ‘Whether Alexander himself believed the self-image he so carefully fashioned or merely exploited the potential of a resurrected heroic model in real life to gain his political ends is finally less significant than his originality in drawing inspiration from the Homeric past to create a new vision of the world, with himself as the embodiment of its ideals and the new champion of the Greeks’. Scheer (2007) 218. Carney (2000) 274-77. Stewart (1993) 80 n. 35 collects the following ancient evidence: Arr. *Anab.* 7. 14. 4; cf. Dio Chrys. 2. 14. 32, etc. Lysimachos: Plut. *Alex.* 5.

¹⁰⁴ Braudy (1986) 55.

¹⁰⁵ Braudy (2003) 6.

Achilles himself draws inspiration from Heracles who ‘is the only mortal to whom Achilles compares himself and to whom Achilles is compared by others’.¹⁰⁶ Further, scholars have argued that the ‘New Simonides’ fragments feature the general Pausanias, a prominent figure in the *Histories*, alongside Achilles the Trojan War hero.¹⁰⁷ This demonstrates that contemporary authors were comparing leading heroes from the Persian Wars to the central heroes of Homeric epic. More generally the Trojan War was utilised in classical Greece as an analogy for the Persian Wars.¹⁰⁸ It would therefore make sense for Herodotus to draw upon the same vocabulary as his literary predecessors in his depiction of heroes. This thesis argues that Herodotus does not use the epic vocabulary of heroism in the same way as Homer.

vi. Literature Review

Existing scholarship on Herodotean heroism is lacking and the topic has not been examined in depth for over 30 years. The most recent study is Nagy’s tome, *The Ancient Greek Hero in 24 Hours* (2013), although it centres around the practice of hero cult rather than the characterisation of exceptional individuals. While Nagy includes a specific section on heroes in prose media, he dedicates only 81 pages to prosaic heroes as a whole and his treatment of Herodotus is sparse.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁶ Schein (1984) 134. E.g. *Il.* 18.117-21. See also Barker and Christensen (2014).

¹⁰⁷ Shaw (2001) 178-181 argues for a connection between the two figures, especially 181: ‘if Agesilaos, eighty years later, could consciously imitate Agamemnon, why should not Pausanias have done the same with Achilles, or Simonides have done it for him?’. Parsons (1992) 32. Boedeker (2001) 158 argues that ‘Achilles serves here as paradigm for the collective Greeks at Plataea’ rather than referring specifically to Pausanias as the leading figure. Aloni (2001) 98: Achilles ‘is the model for all those who are mourned and praised – those whose death made victory over the Persians possible’. Pavese (1995) 20-24 and Burzacchini (1995) 24-5 argue, unconvincingly, that Achilles represents Leonidas, but given the elegy’s focus on Plataea, where Pausanias features, I find this view untenable. See also Schachter (1998) 29-30. Lloyd-Jones (1994).

¹⁰⁸ Trojan War – Persian Wars analogy *inter alia*: Pelling (2022) 47 ‘this is the new Trojan War, and will live in memory just as Homer’s war did’. Haywood (2022) 82. Bridges, Hall, and Rhodes (2007) 8. Priestley (2014) 191. Baragwanath and de Bakker (2012) 46. Said (2012) 97. Cf. Tupin (2022) 347.

¹⁰⁹ Nagy (2013) 301-82; 301-11, 345-8, 377-81 are more specifically on Herodotus.

Elizabeth Vandiver's *Heroes in Herodotus: The Interaction of Myth and History* (1991), by its title, might suggest that it will examine heroism in the *Histories*. This is not, however, the purpose of Vandiver's work; Vandiver's focus is instead to 'examine the interaction of myth and history in Herodotus' *Histories* through an analysis of his treatment of mythological heroes'.¹¹⁰ Vandiver makes convincing arguments about the use of heroes not as narrative figures, but as part of a Herodotean methodology for communicating fixed temporal references points in the past. Viviers' review of Vandiver's monograph is perhaps overly critical: 'this book will be of little interest to those who try to discover the nature and meaning of the hero in ancient Greece'.¹¹¹ Vivier does not make it clear whether he means 'hero' in the sense of hero cult or in the sense of narrative characterisation. While Vandiver does not thoroughly examine hero cult,¹¹² she does explore how references to mythical heroes add to Xerxes' characterisation.¹¹³ This is, however, not used as a tool to build a heroic persona for Xerxes, but instead serves as a tool to heighten Xerxes' hubristic characterisation.

Flory's ten-page article, 'Arion's Leap: Brave Gestures in Herodotus' (1978), is the main examination of heroic narratives in the *Histories*. Flory identifies a common narrative pattern in selected accounts of bravery and demonstrates that they form a Herodotean motif. Flory focusses his attention on Arion's narrative (1.23-4), and compares his other narratives with Arion's to demonstrate a common narrative pattern; methodologically this is sound and it is well-argued. Flory, however, wrongly suggests that Herodotus' main type of heroism is that of the 'suffering hero' and misleadingly emphasises 'a quiet sort of heroism composed of acceptance and persistence rather than agonistic combat'.¹¹⁴ This is surprising given that one

¹¹⁰ Vandiver (1991) 1.

¹¹¹ Viviers (1995) 286 ('cet ouvrage n'intéressera que fort peu ceux qui tentent de percer la nature et la signification du héros en Grèce antique').

¹¹² Vandiver (1991) 210-3.

¹¹³ Vandiver (1991) 311-57.

¹¹⁴ Flory (1978) 418.

example Flory draws upon is the Battle of Thermopylae; Flory focusses solely on battle preliminaries, as opposed to the battle itself, meaning that, with respect to the battle's prelude, Flory's argument stands. However, the subsequent Thermopylae narrative undermines Flory's argument – the fallen of Thermopylae, far from placidly accepting their fate, make one last final show of strength (7.223-4) before being overwhelmed.

One strength of Flory's article is the inclusion of a heroine in his catalogue of brave gestures: Pharandates' unnamed concubine who supplicates Pausanias after the Battle of Plataea (on this scene see further pp.110-1 and p.242).¹¹⁵ However, this is far from the most obvious example of a Herodotean heroine; to be sure, there are other, more prominent, Herodotean heroines Flory could have drawn upon. To name but one, the Carian admiral Artemisia,¹¹⁶ for example, leads her forces in person (8.87), and outside of battle speaks her controversial opinion freely to Mardonius (8.68); this is subsequently relayed to Xerxes himself to be well-received (8.69). One of the article's merits lies in not separating off Pharandates' concubine due to her gender. This allows for holistic inferences to be drawn from Flory's selected brave gestures, rather than isolating Phrandates' concubine for individual examination solely by virtue of being a woman. On the other hand, this significantly limits the scope of Flory's exploration. Flory gives no consideration to how the concubine's gender impacts her presentation. My study attempts to reconcile the strengths of both approaches. It examines the uses of Homer's vocabulary of heroism in the *Histories* holistically, but highlights areas where Herodotus applies terms to female figures to see if their gender has any bearing on our reception of that figure and the use of the Homeric term.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ Flory (1978) 416.

¹¹⁶ On Artemisia see in particular: Munson (1988).

¹¹⁷ On women in the *Histories* see Soares (2014). de Jong (2012). Vandiver (2012) 143-55. Welser (2009). Baragwanath (2008) 153. Larson (2006). Dewald and Kitzinger (2006). Hazewindus (2004). Blok (2002). Georgiou (2002). Gray (1995). Lateiner (1989) 135-40. Gould (1989) 130-1. Munson (1988). Flory (1987) 35-46. Dewald (1981). Dewald (1980).

Two other main weaknesses of Flory's article present themselves. The first is the article's brevity at only ten pages long. It is therefore understandable that Flory does little more than identify the common narrative pattern. The second is that Flory overlooks any external evidence for his examination of brave gestures in the *Histories*. Whilst this is not Flory's aim, his stated purpose being 'Brave Gestures in *Herodotus*' (my emphasis), a comparison with external material would enhance the study of Herodotean heroism. It would ground the Father of History's presentation of heroism within his wider literary context.

While the volume of literature on Herodotean heroism is lacking, the scholarship on Herodotus' engagement with Homer has grown almost exponentially in recent years. The tradition of comparing Herodotus with Homer, it has been noted, started in antiquity (p.9). In modern scholarship, Strasburger's 1972 44-page pamphlet *Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung* contains the first sustained discussion of epic elements in the ancient historians.¹¹⁸ Strasburger notes numerous similarities between Homer and Herodotus for narrative style including: an insistence on veracity, detailing of historical causation for events, 'how the *Iliad* poet strips old stories of their original fairytale elements',¹¹⁹ and the honing in on the actions of famous men. Due to the sheer amount of scholarship on Herodotus' engagement and interplay with Homeric tropes, language, and narrative pattern, I limit myself to discussion of only those publications on the topic which have significantly informed my thinking. By doing so, I hope to highlight simultaneously the need for this current project.

The foundational study is Pelling's 2006 pithily entitled chapter 'Homer and Herodotus'.¹²⁰ Pelling highlights a number of parallels between Homeric epic and the Herodotean *Histories* at both the level of lexical similarity along with narrative patterns and

¹¹⁸ Strasburger (1972).

¹¹⁹ Strasburger (1972) 32 ('wie der Iliasdichter alte Erzählungen ihrer ursprünglich märchenhaften Elemente entkleidet').

¹²⁰ Pelling (2006a), which collects earlier bibliography on the topic.

tropes. Two of Pelling’s arguments are particularly relevant for this thesis. The first relates to the idea of ‘collectivisation’. This is the process whereby Homeric terms have been pluralised in the *Histories*. The κλέος at Thermopylae ‘is no longer a matter just of individual glory, but to be part of a group’.¹²¹ Analogously the appearance of μῆνις in the *Histories* is no longer an individual possession, instead ‘now it is the collective [Spartans] who feel the wrath’ for Aristodemus’ absence from battle.¹²² The application of epic vocabulary to collectives, where previously the terms were (at least predominantly) applied to individuals, is one way in which terminology can be pluralised. The other is to widen the sociology to whom the terms are applied. This is to say, in (Homeric) epic the main focus of the action is the ruling elite. As I will show, there are occasions when Herodotus applies these terms to figures not in the aristocracy.

The second of Pelling’s arguments is instructive for this thesis. Pelling notes that characters in the Herodotean narrative world seem aware of epic tropes and themes. Pelling sees this when commenting on the Spartans preparations at Thermopylae: ‘it is indeed natural to use such language of ‘role’ and ‘plot’, for Leonidas and the Spartans are almost writing their own script, carefully ensuring that everything looks right’.¹²³ Individuals within the narrative world might well view themselves as undertaking epic-style actions, but, as I will show, Herodotus’ appraisal can often be less grandiose.

Histos recently published a supplementary volume on this topic.¹²⁴ In this thorough, scholarly collected edition the authors examine Homeric elements in Herodotus’ *Histories*. Although all contributors provide excellent discussions for their chosen take on the topic, I limit myself to the most relevant to this project.

¹²¹ Pelling (2006a) 95. This use of κλέος is discussed further on pp.104-6.

¹²² Pelling (2006a) 96.

¹²³ Pelling (2006a) 94.

¹²⁴ *Histos* (2022) Suppl. 14.

In this volume, Pelling provides another important paper. Pelling's article is formatted by asking probing questions on the methodological basis for this point of scholarly inquiry. As such, I give an extended discussion of this chapter in order to answer and justify this project's approach. I summarise selected questions which Pelling raises which are relevant to this project before I give my own answers and suggest how this thesis addresses these concerns.

Questions two and five raise the question of genre. In question two, Pelling asks whether when we talk of 'Homer' are we talking about just the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* or wider epic poetry. As discussed above (pp.14-5) I will be taking 'Homer' and 'Homeric epic' to mean the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* for the purposes of this thesis. More broadly, question five suggests that different readers see different intertextualities; more specifically 'some might not think of particular literary treatments but of the myths themselves. The author cannot control which of those, if any, it will be'.¹²⁵ By using the process of traditional referentiality (discussed: pp.26-7), this thesis will trace the meaning and semantic range of epic terminology across the Homeric poems. This will yield data for thinking about whether Herodotus' use of the terminology can be considered 'epic' as represented by the terms' use in Homeric epic.¹²⁶

Questions seven and eight are more narratological in scope. Question seven asks 'what value is added?'.¹²⁷ Pelling suggests that intertextuality provides a way in which readers can make sense of the material with which they are being presented. Pelling draws a legal comparison whereby 'juries are more likely to believe a narrative if it maps on to a pattern that they find familiar from their reading or listening or viewing'.¹²⁸ However this also poses issues for the construction of the *Histories* as a work of unaffected, accurate historiography. As I

¹²⁵ Pelling (2022) 44.

¹²⁶ Compare the comments on Pelling (2022) 54-5.

¹²⁷ Pelling (2022) 47.

¹²⁸ Pelling (2022) 47.

show, Herodotus' deployment of the (Homeric) epic terminology of heroism often shows an awareness of this historical-fictional issue.

Finally, question eight asks 'how does character-text intertextuality interact with the narrative voice?',¹²⁹ that is to say how does it work when characters within the narrative text apply epic/Homeric vocabulary to narrative events. This then becomes a matter of Homeric intertextuality but at one level of remove. Herodotus may present the characters thinking in and attributing Homeric/epic vocabulary, but he, as a narrator external to the narrative events, might not be so kind in categorisation. As we will see, Pelling's comment that 'character-text 'elevations' have a habit of falling flat,'¹³⁰ is a recurring motif. I also show that there are confusions between characters based on the Homeric and Herodotean uses of terms. Nonetheless by focussing on the narratological layers, including any actorial focalisation, this thesis will show that Herodotus' characters can oftentimes be grandiose in the application of Homeric/epic terms, but Herodotus is rarely so himself.

Barker's contribution to the volume provides some answers to Pelling's above questions and adopts the methodology of this thesis. Looking specifically at 'the conjunction λ(ε)ιποψυχέω [which] has a counterpart in the Homeric collocation of λείπω with ψυχή',¹³¹ Barker employs traditional referentiality (discussed: pp.26-7) to suggest an aggregate use for the Homeric collocation against which to compare Herodotus' use of λ(ε)ιποψυχέω at 7.229.1. It becomes not a simple matter of direct imitation or opposition between the two authors, but rather a reaction to the wider generic use of the term as exemplified in Homeric epic. Barker's argumentation is compelling and he also raises relevant points regarding of the differing forms of heroism in the two genres. This thesis applies Barker's methodology to the epic language of

¹²⁹ Pelling (2022) 48.

¹³⁰ Pelling (2022) 49.

¹³¹ Barker (2022) 168.

heroism. It uses the analysis of the terms in the Homeric poems to get a sense of their ‘epic’ usage against which to compare Herodotus’ application.

Fragoulaki’s article aligns closely with my approach. Fragoulaki reads significance into the absence of gory descriptions of battle and death on the battle field. Fragoulaki looks at the specific Greek term for ‘blood’ (αἷμα) and finds that:

This linguistic element is widely used in descriptions of death in Homer (and is an element present in the harsh realities of war in all periods), but is totally absent from Herodotus’ battle descriptions, although it appears (rarely) in non-battle contexts.¹³²

I argue for something similar in Herodotus’ approach to the epic vocabulary of heroism. I show that Herodotus minimises (or omits, see discussion: p.25-6) the epic language of heroism from the discourse of the *Histories*. The sheer disparity of in frequency between the two authors is noted in the introduction to the discussion of each term in the *Histories*.

Strikingly, although they provide important works on the topic, neither Boedeker nor Marincola contribute to this collected edition. In their earlier publications, both take a similar stance to Fragoulaki by noting points of difference rather than highlighting similarities. Marincola shows that Herodotus, like Homer, also uses a set narrative pattern for recounting battle narratives,¹³³ but ‘the actual descriptions of the fighting tend to be amongst the thinnest parts of his history; this already suggests a certain distancing from Homer’.¹³⁴ After detailing Herodotus’ battle narrative pattern, Marincola highlights some further differences between the two authors: the narrator’s uncertainty,¹³⁵ Herodotus’ gods functioning behind the scenes

¹³² Fragoulaki (2022) 111.

¹³³ Cf. Tritle (2006).

¹³⁴ Marincola (2018) 5.

¹³⁵ Marincola (2018) 17-8.

compared to their active battlefield role in Homeric epic,¹³⁶ while noting that Herodotus cannot use Homer as model for a naval battle which is ‘wholly alien to the spirit and *Realien* of the Homeric world’.¹³⁷

Boedeker takes a similar stance and focusses on authorial differences. Boedeker argues that descriptions of warriors’ deaths in the *Iliad* ‘provide moments of pathos, which display the simultaneous vitality and fragility of the human condition’, while in the *Histories* they ‘are treated as ‘pedestrian’ events, worthy of mention but not elaboration. What counts, most often, is why they were risked, and what they achieved, especially in political terms’.¹³⁸ Boedeker’s last point is undoubtedly true. Often deaths in the *Histories* serve a narrative purpose, that is to say, something is achieved or results from the death. In Homeric epic deaths occur frequently and often with little consequence.¹³⁹ Thus, as Marincola ends his chapter, ‘Herodotus may indeed have been ‘most like Homer’, but he was above all most like himself’.¹⁴⁰

One area where Herodotus is truly idiosyncratic, and a more nascent area of Herodotean scholarship, is Herodotus’ use and sense of humour. Humour is something which is seen throughout Herodotus’ text but begins in the Proem. Scholars have observed the humorous nature of the ‘tongue-in-cheek woman-snatching’¹⁴¹ narrative which ‘contains elements of slapstick’¹⁴² to open the *Histories* and Herodotus’ deadpan delivery of these stories.¹⁴³ The

¹³⁶ Marincola (2018) 18.

¹³⁷ Marincola (2018) 18.

¹³⁸ Boedeker (2003) 36.

¹³⁹ Though Homeric deaths are certainly not always without consequence, e.g. Patroclus’ death spurring Achilles to action.

¹⁴⁰ Marincola (2018) 20. Both Boedeker and Marincola have authored chapters which also serve as good, general introductory pieces for the topic: Marincola (2006). Boedeker (2002). See also Marincola (2007a) which provides a ‘meta’ approach to the topic; Marincola argues that the character of Odysseus, as a figure who travels and reports a coherent narrative of those travels, aligns with the figure of Herodotus. However, as Marincola correctly suggests, this similarity actually works against Herodotus as he tries to convince his audience of his own account’s veracity.

¹⁴¹ Mash (2017) 68.

¹⁴² Dewald (2006) 146.

¹⁴³ Dewald and Munson (2022) 182: ‘If H.’s’ Persian sources here are obliquely mocking the Greek tendency to regard heroic legends as embellished history, they are also using them to construct an

presence of humour so early on in the narrative of the *Histories* presents it as almost a programmatic concern and alerts the reader that not everything in the content of the *Histories* is to be taken entirely seriously – perhaps neither too are Herodotus’ heroes? Dewald notes that Herodotus’ use of humour may be ‘an aspect of Herodotus’ own quirky psychology’,¹⁴⁴ but her chapter demonstrates how Herodotean humour often has an underlying, if not always serious, point.

The more serious point often has an ethnocentric or ethnographic undertone.¹⁴⁵ Both classical and anthropological studies can illuminate this type of humour. Mash, for instance, explores the embassy scene of 3.17-25 and compares it to Aristophanic comedy. He argues that Herodotus uses this scene ‘to indulge in ethnocentric humour by manipulating stereotypes of the Persians and Ethiopians’,¹⁴⁶ building on the work of his doctoral thesis.¹⁴⁷ More broadly anthropologists have discussed how ethnic humour is used as an expression of racial/cultural superiority. Apte’s *Humor and Laughter: An Anthropological Approach* provides excellent groundwork and makes many observations which can usefully be applied to the text of Herodotus. Most telling are Apte’s following observations:

elaborate pro-Persian apologia’. Flory (1987) 25: ‘Herodotus here parodies not just myth but rationalism itself’. Compare: Ar. *Ach.* 523-9.

¹⁴⁴ Dewald (2006) 148.

¹⁴⁵ Herodotus says in his Prologue that he will present ‘the things brought about by Greeks and **Barbarians** (βαρβάροισι)’ (1.1.0). This statement is broad and ‘barbarian’ (βάρβαρος), as Hall (1989) 9-11 notes, encompasses not only the Persians as the main enemy, but also other non-Greek races in the Herodotean world. On representations of other cultures in the *Histories* see *inter alia* the collected essays in Figueira and Soares (2020). Thomas (2006). Thomas (2000). Sourvinou-Inwood (2003). Thomas (1997). Pelling (1997a) and (1997b). Gray (1995). Cartledge (1993). Hall (1989). Hartog (1988). See also Plutarch’s complaints *De Herodoti Malignitate* 857A ‘Herodotus is a barbarian lover’ with Pelling (2007).

¹⁴⁶ Mash (2017) 78.

¹⁴⁷ Mash (2010).

Ethnic humor [sic.] mocks, caricatures, and generally makes fun of a specific group or its members by the virtue of their ethnic identity; or it portrays the superiority of one ethnic group over others. In addition, its thematic development must be based on factors that are the consequences of ethnicity, such as ethnocentrism, prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination.¹⁴⁸

The use of humour in scenes depicting non-Greek characters can thus be seen as an exploration of Greek cultural superiority. This is an important concept to bear in mind as we read such passages.

Humour is used in many more ways than the purely ethnological. Some of the major battle scenes in the *Histories* have their humorous elements as well as Herodotus' presentation of many leading characters both male and female. This thesis will therefore endeavour to contribute to this area of modern scholarship. It shows how Herodotus often creates a humorous tone with the epic language of heroism and with a number of his narratives within the *Histories* more broadly.

vii. Overview of Chapters

This thesis is split into three chapters. Each handles a different aspect of Homeric heroism: fame and status, militaristic prowess, and cunning intelligence. Every chapter draws upon a specific set of vocabulary related to the respective parts of Homeric heroism it explores. I follow the same methodology in each chapter. Each term is analysed in isolation, though any points of similarity or incongruity to other terms is noted. I examine each piece of vocabulary in its Homeric context, before comparing the Homeric use with Herodotus'. This allows for an

¹⁴⁸ Apte (1985) 139-40.

informed and significant conclusion to be drawn as to whether Herodotus' use of individual terms is 'Homeric'.

Chapter 1 analyses 'fame words' and explores the idea of fame and status. It looks at the terms by which these concepts are denoted in Homeric epic. The vocabulary explored in this section is 'glory' (κῦδος), 'prize' (γέρας), 'fame' (κλέος), and 'honour' (τιμή). I begin with terms denoting the concepts of fame and status as Achilles and Odysseus share a concern for their public image. The reception of heroes by their contemporaneous public is also the foundation of Heroism Studies and thus warrants special attention. This section investigates the greatest number of terms to reflect the importance of the concepts to both heroes and to the field of Heroism Studies. It illustrates that Herodotus applies the terms in innovative ways to a greater pool of characters than the terms are attributed in Homeric epic.

Chapter 2 examines 'fighting words' and surveys the Homeric lexical choices used to denote fighting. The terms studied in this section are 'spirit of defence' (ἀλκή), 'power' (κράτος), and 'might' (βίη). Both Achilles and Odysseus, and nearly every character mentioned in the *Iliad*, fight. I deviate slightly from the sociological perspective of other chapters to examine ἀλκή from a behavioural angle. This is because the behaviour exhibited by characters who adopt ἀλκή in the *Histories* is different from the actions of Homeric actors who utilise ἀλκή. Given the prominence of fighting in the Homeric world, I examine three 'fighting words'.

Chapter 3 examines the marginal type of heroism: cunning intelligence. To correspond with the lower frequency of trickster heroes in Homeric epic, this section only examines 'trickery' (δόλος) in full, before ending on a short chapter, a 'coda', looking briefly at 'cunning intelligence' (μῆτις). The Homeric and Herodotean analysis of μῆτις is shorter than the considerations of other terms as Herodotus only uses the term once. Nonetheless, where and

how Herodotus does use the term is of critical importance. It is argued that this use is, in many ways, emblematic of Herodotus' approach to the Homeric vocabulary of heroism.

CHAPTER 1: FAME WORDS

1.1 Introduction - Homeric and Herodotean Fame Words

This section examines how Herodotus uses Homer's vocabulary of fame and status. Both Achilles and Odysseus share a desire for personal recognition. Achilles makes a conscious choice for a short life and to be compensated for it with glory (*Il.* 9.410-6). Similarly, 'unable to resist claiming credit for outwitting Polyphemos, Odysseus calls out his own name to taunt the Cyclops, as he and his men sail away' (*Od.* 9.502-5).¹⁴⁹ While embodying radically different types of heroism, Achilles and Odysseus share a desire for fame; 'the poems that celebrate fame and honor [sic.] are handbooks of heroism for the future'.¹⁵⁰

There are different layers to the fame and status to Homeric heroes. Narratology provides a helpful toolkit with which to unpick the different layers of heroic narratives.¹⁵¹ There is the status in the eyes of other internal narrative characters as inhabitants of the same Homeric world. Then, there is the fame of the hero within the narrative world after they have died which they hope future generations will hear about – creating a pseudo-immortality.¹⁵² The status in the eyes of others while living is more immediate than the faux-immortality as it relates to the

¹⁴⁹ Slatkin (2005) 322. de Jong (2001) 242: 'Odysseus views his blinding of the Cyclops in terms of the heroic code: he longs for revenge and glory (317 ≈ *Il.* 7.81b, 154b; and 16.725b); cf. 106–566n. We are prepared for his imprudent – but eminently heroic – behaviour in 474–505'.

¹⁵⁰ Braudy (1986) 39.

¹⁵¹ On the narratological presentation of Homeric narrative see above all: de Jong (1987) for the *Iliad*. de Jong (2001) for the *Odyssey*. See also Currie (2019). Bonifazi (2018). Kelly (2018), with 372-3 where Kelly catalogues instances of 'retellings' in the *Iliad* (i.e., where characters become internal narrators). Currie (2016). Hunter (2014). Bakker (2013), esp. 13-35. Aceti (2008). Leuzzi (2008). Pagani (2008). Morrison (2007) 36-102. de Jong (2002b). Rengakos (2002). Doherty (1991).

¹⁵² E.g., Helen at *Il.* 6.357-8 and Hector at *Il.* 22.83-6 and 22.304-5. Cf. Athene's words to Telemachus: 'surely, then, the gods have not given you a nameless lineage **for time to come** (ὀπίσσω) since Penelope gave birth to you' (*Od.* 1.222-3).

prestige enjoyed by the heroes while they live. Both these perspectives are internal to the Homeric world.¹⁵³

There are also the external narrative levels to consider. First, there is the renown of the hero from the perspective of Homer, as the narrator, where Homer is external to the events he is narrating, but internal in the form of a construct within the text. This is paired with the internal anonymous narratee to whom Homer narrates. There is then the further external narrative layer of the ‘real world’: that is, Homer, as the historical composer of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and his relationship with the ‘real-world’ audience of historical individuals, across millennia, who receive the texts, whether orally or in a written format. Whether the Homeric narrative characters themselves refer to real-world historical individuals or not is irrelevant for my current purposes.¹⁵⁴ Herodotus’ engagement with the Homeric model, and language, of fame is the important factor. It is with a sensitivity to these narratological concerns that I shall proceed with the following examination of the terminology employed by Homer to denote the status and admiration of his heroes.

Public recognition is of fundamental importance to Homeric heroes.¹⁵⁵ Buchan finds a hero-audience based relationship as he deciphers the limits of heroism.¹⁵⁶ Discussing Achilles’ hypothetical apocalyptic situation, where only he and Patroclus survive the Trojan War (*Il.* 16.97-100), Buchan finds his titular limit of heroism: ‘Achilles thus articulates a perverted best-case scenario; as a warrior, he dreams of maximizing the glory from others’ deaths [...], yet he

¹⁵³ Walden (2021) 15: ‘heroic identity is itself a textually-constituted phenomenon in the Homeric poems’.

¹⁵⁴ On the historicity of Homeric epic see Kelly (2006). Osborne (2004). Goddard (2001). Bennet (1997). Morris (1997). Sherratt (1990). Finley (1956) 22-50.

¹⁵⁵ On Homeric heroes’ pursuit of glory and the importance placed on public recognition see Kohen (2014), in particular 9-36 on Achilles. de Jong (2006) discusses the Homeric narrator’s own glory. Edwards (2005) 310. Buchan (2004) 6 and 25. Clarke (2004). Scodel (2004). van Wees (1996) 1: ‘An egotistical pursuit of personal glory is generally regarded as characteristic of so-called primitive warriors’. Goldhill (1991) 70. Braudy (1986) 31. Griffin (1980) 93. Nagy (1979). Redfield (1975) 32.

¹⁵⁶ Buchan (2004) 107-32.

retains a minimal audience [sc. Patroclus] to whom the tale can be recounted'.¹⁵⁷ Achilles imagines a *reductio ad absurdum* of the heroic lifestyle, but, even in this extreme abstract scenario, the audience dimension remains. Analogously, Achilles' motivation for leaving the battlefield in the manner he does 'is not selfishness, much less materialism, but the little that remains to him planted in this barren, now blasted landscape: his status and honour'.¹⁵⁸ Clarke argues that Homeric hero's drive towards heroism is because of 'a need for social validation: status, respect, honour in the eyes of other men'.¹⁵⁹ Homeric heroes feel a need to be admired.

The audience-based relationship that the Homeric hero has with his own self-worth finds a negative consequence in Achilles and Agamemnon's quarrel in *Iliad* 1. In the lead-up to the argument, Homer has been careful to stress the presence of the amassed Achaean crowd for the chief Achaeans' discussion and thus, as the quarrel arises, Agamemnon's insult to Achilles.¹⁶⁰ For an image-conscious Homeric hero, the presence of a large crowd to view his utter humiliation, rather than his glorious exploits in battle, exacerbates Achilles' dishonour. The argument escalates and Achilles contemplates withdrawing from the crowd witnessing his mortification and sail home since, as he says, 'I have no ambition to remain here thus dishonoured' (*Il.* 1.170-1). An audience can just as well possess a negative consequence for a Homeric hero as a positive one.

The current section examines selected Homeric words relating to fame. As the desire for fame is shared by both Achilles and Odysseus, this chapter will examine the terms that show both Homeric heroes valuing glory and good public image. The selected terms are 'glory'

¹⁵⁷ Buchan (2004) 107.

¹⁵⁸ Lateiner (2004) 25.

¹⁵⁹ Clarke (2004) 77.

¹⁶⁰ Hom *Il.* 1.54: 'on the tenth day Achilles called the masses **to the assembly point** (ἀγορήνδ᾽)'. *Il.* 1.57: 'when they were **assembled** (ἤγερθεν) and **met together** (ὁμηγερέες)'. *Il.* 1.73: 'he [sc. Calchas] **addressed the assembly** (ἀγορήσατο) and spoke among them'. *Il.* 1.109 'and now **you address in assembly** (ἀγορεύεις) the Danaans uttering prophecies'. Barker (2009) 151: 'the assembly as the place for debate had been set up as a response to a crisis in the Achaean camp precipitated by the autocratic behaviour of the king'.

(κῦδος), ‘gift of honour’ (γέρας), ‘fame’ (κλέος), and ‘honour’ (τιμή). Each word is found in the embassy to Achilles in *Iliad* 9 and refers to favourable public opinion and status. Were Herodotus to be engaging in an exercise of extended Homeric emulation we would expect to see Herodotus use the Homeric language to denote glory and positive public image enjoyed by leading figures in the *Histories*.¹⁶¹ The current section will show that Herodotus does not do this. It will instead demonstrate that the Herodotus is doing something more radical with the Homeric vocabulary of fame.

¹⁶¹ Tuplin (2022) 315-9 discusses the idea of Homeric fame in the *Histories*.

1.2.1 Homeric κῦδος

As Odysseus concludes his speech to Achilles during the embassy of *Iliad* 9, he speaks of the ‘glory’ (κῦδος) Achilles could win if he returned to battle (*Il.* 9.303).¹⁶² Thus κῦδος is presented as something desirable.¹⁶³ Homer employs κῦδος 77 times across both epics.¹⁶⁴ There is a higher concentration of κῦδος in the *Iliad* (69 occurrences) compared to the *Odyssey* (8). Quantitatively, this suggests that the attaining of ‘glory’ (κῦδος) might be something gained through martial exploits; this is something we shall see. κῦδος is a good starting point for a comparison between Homer and Herodotus as κῦδος is decidedly Homeric; no other subsequent author uses κῦδος as frequently as Homer. Other authors, with works in Herodotus’ milieu, either entirely omit κῦδος from their texts or make minimal use of the term. When κῦδος does appear in texts available at the time Herodotus was composing, it nearly always has a connection with the divine.¹⁶⁵ The connection with the divine is also found in Homer and constitutes the main argument of this section: Homeric κῦδος is intimately connected to the gods.

¹⁶² On Homeric κῦδος see above all Jaillard (2007) for a comprehensive discussion. See also Race (2014). Pucci (2010). Nagy (1979) 63-4, 76-7, 334-6. Benveniste (1969b) 57-68 remains the starting point.

¹⁶³ This use is found at *Il.* 10.307 in the (spurious) *Doloneia*, where Hector says κῦδος will be won by the person who undertakes the night raid.

¹⁶⁴ *Od.* 3.57, 3.79, 3.202, 4.275, 12.184, 15.78, 15.320, 22.253. *Il.* 1.279, 1.405, 3.373, 4.95, 4.145, 4.415, 5.33, 5.225, 5.260, 5.906, 7.205, 8.51, 8.141, 8.176, 8.216, 8.237, 9.303, 9.673, 10.87, 10.307, 10.544, 10.555, 11.79, 11.81, 11.300, 11.511, 12.174, 12.255, 12.407, 12.437, 13.303, 13.676, 14.42, 14.358, 14.365, 15.327, 15.491, 15.595, 15.596, 15.602, 15.644, 16.84, 16.88, 16.241, 16.730, 17.251, 17.287, 17.321, 17.419, 17.453, 17.566, 18.165, 18.294, 18.456, 19.204, 19.414, 20.502, 21.543, 21.570, 21.596, 22.18, 22.57, 22.207, 22.217, 22.393, 22.435, 23.400, 23.406, 24.110.

¹⁶⁵ Hes. *Theog.* 433 and 438. Hes. [Sc.] 339. Hes. *Frag.* 75 l.19. Aesch. *Pers.* 455. Aesch. *Sept.* 317. Bacchylides *Epinicia*, 1.160, 6.3, 10.17. Ar. *Eq.* 200. The text of Bacchylides *Frag.* 65a l.2. is too fragmentary (even κῦδος appears at κ]ῦδος) to judge whether there is a definite connection to the gods, but given the reference in l.1 to ἀθάνατον it seems likely there was a divine connection to κῦδος. Exceptional to this general pattern are Hes. *Op.* Line 313. See also Xen. *Mem.* 2.6.11 line 4, though this last is a quotation of a Homeric formula *Od.* 12.184 and Xenophon was writing after Herodotus’ work was completed.

The divine quality of κῦδος is shown when gods give κῦδος to humans.¹⁶⁶ This can take a number of forms. It can be found in simple requests by humans for κῦδος from a deity. Achilles, for example, appeals to ‘wide-ruling Zeus send **glory** (κῦδος) to follow this man’ (*Il.* 16.241) as Patroclus goes into battle. Similarly, Athene, disguised as Mentor, prays for Poseidon ‘to send **glory** (κῦδος) to Nestor, first and foremost, and to his sons’ (*Od.* 3.57). In both examples, we see that the human agent recognises the gods’ ability to grant κῦδος. This recognition by human agents is repeated in numerous character statements on the gods’ ability to give out κῦδος.¹⁶⁷

The gods’ ability to grant κῦδος is best demonstrated through Zeus and Hector. Zeus is the god who most frequently gives κῦδος,¹⁶⁸ and within Book 12, as Hector is propelling the Achaeans ever closer to the ships, Zeus is said to award κῦδος to Hector three times. After Asius’ anguished cry to Zeus, Homer reflects that Asius did not change Zeus’ mind, ‘for it was to Hector that the spirit of him [sc. Zeus] **wanted to give glory**’ (ἐβούλετο κῦδος ὀρέξαι, *Il.* 12.174). The middle verb ‘wanted’ (ἐβούλετο) indicates that κῦδος has not actually been given, but it is what Zeus intends to do. This statement, with its proleptic force, not only raises the reader’s expectations for the forthcoming narrative, but, for our current purposes, it tunes the

¹⁶⁶ *Od.* 3.57, 4.275, 15.320. *Il.* 1.279, 5.33, 5.225, 5.260, 7.205, 8.141, 8.176, 8.216, 11.79, 11.300, 12.174, 12.255, 12.437, 15.327, 15.596, 15.602, 16.88, 16.241, 16.730, 17.251, 17.453, 17.566, 18.294, 19.204, 19.414, 21.570, 23.400, 23.406. See also *Il.* 24.110, where Zeus is giving the opportunity for κῦδος if Achilles relinquishes Hector’s corpse, on this specific use of κῦδος see Race (2014) who argues that this use of κῦδος refers primarily to Achilles giving up Hector’s corpse and treating Priam with compassion and only secondarily to Priam’s ransom.

¹⁶⁷ *Od.* 15.320 and 22.253. *Il.* 1.279, 5.225, 5.260, 7.205, 11.79, 16.88, 17.251. Gods also comment on the gods’ ability to give κῦδος: *Il.* 5.33 Athene comments on Zeus’ ability to award κῦδος; *Il.* 14.358 Sleep runs to Poseidon instructing him to give κῦδος to the Achaeans while Zeus sleeps.

¹⁶⁸ Zeus awarding κῦδος to Hector: see *Il.* 8.216, 11.300, 12.174, 12.255, 12.437, 15.596. Apollo also gives κῦδος to Hector at *Il.* 15.327 and 16.730. See also Xanthus, Achilles’ immortal horse, saying at *Il.* 19.414 that Apollo gave Hector κῦδος. For Homeric characters recognising Zeus giving Hector κῦδος see *Il.* 8.141 with the lightning strike which prompts Nestor to say to Diomedes that Zeus gives Hector κῦδος; 8.176—Hector himself saying that Zeus gives κῦδος to him; 17.566—Menelaus says to the disguised Athene that he would stay and fight if Athene would give him strength but Zeus gives Hector κῦδος; 18.294—Hector disagrees with Polydamas’ advice to retreat as he says that Zeus is giving him κῦδος; 19.204—Achilles claims that Hector killed Patroclus while Zeus was giving him κῦδος.

reader's attention to Hector and his actions for the mechanics of how κῦδος is gained. Polydamas expresses his doubts to Hector as to whether they should advance (*Il.* 12.210-29) and Hector rebukes him (*Il.* 12.230-50), before Zeus sends the portent of the 'gust of wind' (*Il.* 12.253) and '**granted glory** (κῦδος ὄπαζε) to the Trojans and Hector' (*Il.* 12.255). Hector's assault then gains momentum as he and the Trojans start tearing off parts of the wall, but 'even then the Danaans gave no ground' (*Il.* 12.261). The last time Zeus is said to grant Hector κῦδος comes as he is the first Trojan fighter to push through the Achaean defences. The battle line held steady '**until when** (πρίν γ' ὅτε) Zeus **gave** (δῶκε) the greater **glory** (κῦδος) to Hector' (*Il.* 12.437). Hector throws a massive boulder, crushing the gate which held back the Trojans (*Il.* 12.445-71). The double deployment of temporal adverbs 'until' (πρίν) and 'when' (ὅτε) demonstrates a causative relationship between Zeus awarding the third portion of κῦδος and Hector's ability to make significant progress down the battlefield.

Benveniste posits a sensational summary of κῦδος in Homeric epic, whereby 'it designates an irresistible magical power, the prerogative of the gods who occasionally grant it to the hero of their choice and thus ensure his triumph'.¹⁶⁹ While I cannot see that κῦδος represents a 'magical' power,¹⁷⁰ Benveniste's synopsis captures two important elements of κῦδος. The first is that the gods are able to give it to their champions. In the above examples where Zeus gives κῦδος to Hector, and indeed in every example of a god giving κῦδος, there is a verb solidly meaning 'give' (ὀρέξαι, ὄπαζε and δῶκε) to illustrate that κῦδος has positively been assigned to the hero. Benveniste's second point, that κῦδος is a marker of success, is also seen in the above examples. Each time Zeus gives κῦδος to Hector in *Iliad* 12 Hector enjoys a

¹⁶⁹ Benveniste (1969b) 57 ('il désigne un pouvoir magique irrésistible, apanage des dieux qui le concèdent occasionnellement au héros de leur choix et assurent ainsi son triomphe').

¹⁷⁰ Jaillard (2007) 95 shares my reservations: '*Kudos* is not a magic power' ('Le *kydos* n'est pas un pouvoir 'magique'). Similarly, Pucci (2010) 201 cites and agrees with Jaillard's objections. See also the etymology as given in Chantraine, s.v. κῦδος.

moment of success. This culminates in the final bestowal of κῦδος (*Il.* 12.437) and the destruction of the Achaean wall (*Il.* 12.445-71). Thus, not only do characters believe in the gods' ability to give out κῦδος, but Homeric gods are actually presented as granting κῦδος within the Homeric narrative world.

The gods can also act as removers of κῦδος.¹⁷¹ Aphrodite breaks the strap of Paris' helmet, and Menelaus would have 'won boundless **glory** (κῦδος), **had not** (εἰ μὴ) Aphrodite daughter of Zeus keenly noticed' (*Il.* 3.373-4). Menelaus was on the right path for achieving κῦδος, yet the emphatic delayed protasis in the conditional structure names Aphrodite as the figure who robs Menelaus of κῦδος. The reader is therefore in no doubt as to the reason Menelaus failed to attain κῦδος: it was Aphrodite a divinity who hindered him.

The one instance where it is a mortal who appears to remove κῦδος from another mortal highlights the divine connection to κῦδος all the more. In *Iliad* 18, we are told that Hector would have dragged Patroclus' body away and 'won boundless glory (κῦδος)' (*Il.* 18.165), if Iris had not relayed Hera's request for Achilles to arm for battle (*Il.* 18.166-80). Achilles explains that he lacks arms, but his subsequent battle cry scares the Trojans so that the Achaeans can snatch away Patroclus' body (*Il.* 18.202-38). Achilles, however, is here functioning as a divine instrument. Not only does he act in response to Iris' repetition of Hera's message, but Athene also places the aegis around his shoulder and causes a gleaming flame to flare up (*Il.* 18.203-6) and calls aloud herself (*Il.* 18.217-8). Thus, while it is Achilles (a demi-god but a non-immortal nonetheless) who takes away Hector's opportunity for κῦδος, he does

¹⁷¹ Divinities taking a hero's κῦδος: *Il.* 15.595 (Homer says that Zeus took κῦδος from the Argives); *Il.* 8.237 (Agamemnon asks Zeus if before he has taken other kings' κῦδος). See also *Il.* 15.491 where Hector, seeing Teucer put aside his bow, says it is easy to see to whom Zeus gives and takes away κῦδος. Apollo: *Il.* 21.596 (Homer says Apollo snatches Agenor away so Achilles does not get the κῦδος of defeating Agenor); *Il.* 22.18 (Achilles says that by leading him away from the city gates, Apollo has robbed him of κῦδος); *Il.* 17.321 (the Argives would have won κῦδος has not Apollo roused Aeneas).

so acting as a divine instrument while the goddess Athene herself shouts. Thus, it remains a divine presence (Hera and Athene) which deprives Hector of achieving κῦδος.

While it is only immortals who can give or take κῦδος, mortals still attempt to acquire κῦδος on their own through martial achievements.¹⁷² When Achilles is on his rampage in *Iliad* 20, Homer stresses κῦδος as a motivating factor while the hero conquers foe after foe: ‘and the son of Peleus **hastened** (ἔτετο) to win **glory** (κῦδος), his invincible hands splattered with gore’ (*Il.* 20.502-3). Here the imperfect tense ‘hastened’ ἔτετο has an iterative effect to illustrate Achilles’ determination and unrelenting pursuit of κῦδος. Homer structures the sentence so that κῦδος appears as Achilles’ motivating factor as he ploughs down scores of Trojans. Analogously, when Sthenelus defends Diomedes from Agamemnon’s rebuke that he is an unworthy son to Tydeus, Diomedes replies to Sthenelus that he does not begrudge Agamemnon’s encouragement to do battle as ‘**glory** (κῦδος) **will follow** (ἔψεται) this man [sc. Agamemnon] if the Achaeans slay the Trojans and take **holy** (ἱρήν) Ilios’ (*Il.* 4.415-6). Here Diomedes uses the future tense to indicate that κῦδος will result after the sack of Troy and thus will be a marker of their success. Further, the chosen epithet of ‘holy’ (ἱερός) to describe Troy hints that, even when an immortal is not explicitly mentioned, there is an underlying association of κῦδος with the divine. In both cases, whether it concerns individual foes or the conquering of a city, κῦδος is said to be the driving force behind an agent’s martial actions.

κῦδος even appears in the martial mini-narrative of *Odyssey* 22. Agelaus encourages the other suitors, ‘but, come, you six first hurl your spears, **if** (αἶ κέ) **Zeus grants** (Ζεὺς δώῃ) that Odysseus is struck and **glory** (κῦδος) shall be won’ (*Od.* 22.252-3). The conditional particles αἶ κέ in conjunction with the subjunctive δώῃ expresses Agelaus’ wish for how he

¹⁷² *Od.* 22.253. *Il.* 4.95, 4.145, 4.415, 12.407, 13.676, 14.365, 15.644, 16.84, 17.287, 17.419, 18.456, 20.502, 21.543, 22.207, 22.217, 22.393. See also *Il.* 22.57 where Priam tells Hector to come inside the wall so as not to give Achilles κῦδος, marking the conquering of a foe in battle as one way in which to attain κῦδος.

would like circumstances to play out. While this is not concrete evidence of the giving of κῦδος, since it appears in a hypothetical statement concerning a desire for future events, there is still an explicit divine connection with Zeus. Thus, even when mortals seek κῦδος militaristically, we see remnants of the god-given nature of κῦδος.

Where mortals strive for κῦδος in battle, it is the goal and not actually achieved. κῦδος is in the future for Agamemnon, according to Diomedes, but he has not yet achieved it (*Il.* 4.415-6). Achilles certainly undertakes some impressive feats, but Homer's use of the verb ἵημι, particularly as an iterative imperfect, similarly suggests it has not been achieved (*Il.* 20.502-3). Agelaus uses a conditional grammatical construction to highlight the uncertainty of attaining κῦδος, while also emphasising reliance on Zeus to grant it (*Od.* 22.252-3). This is a common feature of all uses of κῦδος where it is attached to a human achievement without divine assistance: it is the goal to attain κῦδος, but it is questionable whether it is reached.

I say 'questionable' as there are two instances where κῦδος is associated with a human's completed action, but where it would be difficult to assign κῦδος concretely. In *Iliad* 4 Athene encourages Pandarus to shoot Menelaus 'you should venture to send forth a swift arrow at Menelaus, a favour to all the Trojans and **you might win glory** (κῦδος ἄποιο)' (*Il.* 4.94-5). Again, there is a hypothetical mood used to indicate uncertainty on the result. Pandarus is actually successful, but κῦδος is not the result. Agamemnon says to Talthibius, who repeats the same formula to Machaon, that someone has shot Menelaus and 'to him [sc. the shooter] **fame** (κλέος)' (*Il.* 4.197=4.207). I shall return to Homer's use of κλέος later, but for our current purposes the use of κλέος and not κῦδος here is key; κλέος has been achieved and not κῦδος.

The other example where κῦδος is said to be have been achieved through a completed action is when Achilles kills Hector. The term is used three times in this scene: Achilles first makes a sign to his comrades not to throw spear so they do not take his κῦδος (*Il.* 22.205-7); secondly, by Athene who says great κῦδος will be won for the Achaeans if Achilles kills Hector

(*Il.* 22.216-8); and finally, after Achilles kills Hector, Achilles says ‘we have won great **glory** (κῦδος)’ (*Il.* 22.393). This implies that κῦδος has definitely been achieved without any divine intervention, but this statement is in Achilles’ direct speech and so is focalised through Achilles’ character. *Achilles* believes κῦδος has been won, but, naturally, Achilles would want to think he has achieved κῦδος. Although Athene, a goddess, says that he will achieve κῦδος from his action (*Il.* 22.217), without a firm ascription of κῦδος by the Homeric narrator, we cannot know for certain that κῦδος results for Achilles.

The unattainability of κῦδος by purely human means also explains why there are so many hypothetical statements outlining the characters’ pursuit of it.¹⁷³ The use of κῦδος in relation to Ajax embodies this meaning well: ‘yet he did not give ground completely, for the spirit in him **hoped** (ἐέλπετο) to win **glory** (κῦδος)’ (*Il.* 12.406-7). The verb ἔλπομαι expresses the hero’s wish, Ajax ‘hopes’ to win κῦδος. Ajax’s hope is akin to the above examples where I showed that κῦδος is chased but not attained. Aspirational verbs, such as Ajax’s ‘hope’ (ἔλπομαι), contrast to the more definite verbs used in the example of Zeus bestowing κῦδος on Hector ‘give’ (ὀρέξαι, ὅπαζε and δῶκε). And so, while mortals can pursue κῦδος and ‘hope’ to achieve it on their own, κῦδος will remain hypothetical until a god grants it.

κῦδος also appears in Homeric formulae. Formulaic phrases are a distinctive feature of epic verse,¹⁷⁴ and not a (common) feature in Herodotean prose,¹⁷⁵ so I shall mention these uses

¹⁷³ At *Il.* 12.407 Ajax does not retreat from Sarpedon as he still hopes to win κῦδος; at *Il.* 13.676 the Achaeans would have won κῦδος, but Hector breaks the Achaean’s ranks; at *Il.* 14.365 Poseidon rouses the troops by asking if they will let Hector win great κῦδος; at *Il.* 17.287 Ajax defends Patroclus’ body while the Trojans attempt to claim Patroclus’ body and get κῦδος; at *Il.* 17.419 an anonymous Achaean says it would be better for the ground to open than the Trojans achieve their purpose and steal Patroclus’ body and win κῦδος. Compare these uses with *Il.* 22.207, where Achilles stops his comrades throwing spears as this could potentially remove his κῦδος if he kills Hector. Aeschylus, the only extant Attic tragedian to use κῦδος, applies the term exclusively to positive martial achievement: Aesch. *Pers.* 455 and *Sept.* 317.

¹⁷⁴ Clark (2004).

¹⁷⁵ Cf. Zelnick-Abramovitz (2022). See (pp.267-9) on the formulaic phrase ‘without trickery or deceit’ (ἄνευ τε δόλου καὶ ἀπάτης) within the *Histories*.

briefly. The first of these formulaic phrases is as an honorific employed by speakers as they address Nestor and Odysseus as ‘great **glory** of the Achaeans’ (μέγα κῦδος Ἀχαιῶν).¹⁷⁶ In this capacity, ‘the one whose word has the most weight in the council can be said to have the greatest *kudos*’.¹⁷⁷

The other Homeric formula featuring κῦδος is the description of Zeus ‘sat exulting in his glory (κύδει)’.¹⁷⁸ As the god who most frequently grants κῦδος, a formulaic phrase denoting Zeus’ possession of this quality is not entirely unexpected; formulaic phrases in Homeric epic often highlight qualities particularly associated with given characters.¹⁷⁹ There is one exception where it is Briareus who sits in κῦδος: ‘for he is greater in force than his father; he sat **next to Zeus** (παρὰ Κρονίωνι) exulting **in glory**’ (κύδει, *Il.* 1.404-5). Briareus is placed ‘next to Zeus’ (παρὰ Κρονίωνι) but it is Briareus himself, both literally and grammatically, who is exulting in κῦδος. It has been suggested that that ‘the *kudos* in which Briareus rejoices might just as well be that of Zeus, as the power in which both are associated at this critical moment [...] the *kudos* will remain with Zeus and Briareus can participate in it, rejoice and shine in it’,¹⁸⁰ but Zeus does not have a monopoly on κῦδος. Homer, in narrator-text, describes other gods giving

¹⁷⁶ Nestor: *Od.* 3.79, 3.202, 12.184 and *Il.* 10.544, 11.511 and 14.42. Odysseus: *Il.* 9.673, 10.87, 10.555

¹⁷⁷ Jaillard (2007) 97 (‘celui dont la parole a le plus de poids au conseil peut être dit avoir le plus grand *kudos*’). Cf. Hecabe applying κῦδος as an honorific to the dead Hector, saying the Trojans ‘received you as a god for you were a great **glory** (κῦδος) to them while you lived’ (*Il.* 22.434-6).

¹⁷⁸ *Il.* 5.906, 8.51, 11.81.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Barker and Christensen (2020) 34, with 32-43 on the formula ‘swift-footed Achilles’ (πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς, e.g. *Il.* 1.58, 1.489 etc.).

¹⁸⁰ Jaillard (2007) 93 (‘Le *kudos* dans lequel se réjouit Briarée peut aussi bien être celui de Zeus, que la puissance dans laquelle tous deux se trouvent associés à ce moment critique [...] Le *kudos* restera à Zeus et Briarée peut en participer, se réjouir et rayonner en lui’).

κῦδος to heroes,¹⁸¹ so there is no reason to exclude Briareus, another immortal being, from the ability to give κῦδος.¹⁸²

Overall, Homeric κῦδος has been shown to have an overwhelming association with the divine. The higher concentration in the *Iliad* does indeed show an underlying connection between military endeavours and κῦδος. Heroes can hope to attain κῦδος, and take steps towards achieving it, but they will never achieve it by their own agency. For a hero to possess κῦδος it must be given by a divinity and, equally, while the gods can grant κῦδος, they can just as easily take it away.¹⁸³

1.2.2 Herodotean κῦδος

Herodotus uses κῦδος differently from Homer. The first point of difference is the sheer disparity in frequency: Herodotus uses κῦδος only three times in comparison with Homer's 77.¹⁸⁴ This is particularly curious as Herodotus' self-stated project, similar to that of the Homeric bard, is the bestowing of glory and remembrance on heroic feats. It is therefore conspicuous that κῦδος does not feature, and often, as a part of Herodotus' word palette. It might be that Herodotus holds this word back, applying it only to the most exceptional circumstances, to infuse those selected passage with Homeric undertones and thus a sense of grandeur. This, however, is not the case. Where Herodotus does use the term, there is a marked difference in tone to its Homeric deployment.

¹⁸¹ E.g. Apollo: *Il.* 15.327, 16.730 and 19.414; Ares and Phobos: *Il.* 13.303. Although, in character speech, see further: *Il.* 14.358 Sleep running to Poseidon instructing him to give κῦδος to the Achaeans while Zeus sleeps, but Homer, in narrator-text, never describes Poseidon giving κῦδος explicitly.

¹⁸² Jaillard (2007) 93 continues in this vein saying that κῦδος is 'An anonymous force, capable of passing and circulating, kudos is not the property of any one god'. ('Force anonyme, susceptible de passer et de circuler, le kudos n'est la propriété d'aucun dieu').

¹⁸³ There is one outstanding example of κῦδος not yet discussed (*Od.* 15.78). I shall return to this use when discussing an example of γέρας in the *Odyssey* (pp.71-2) as both instances represent a shift in tone from the Iliadic world.

¹⁸⁴ 4.88.2, 6.77.2, 7.8a.2.

Herodotus first uses κῦδος in the inscription accompanying Mandrocles' painting. Herodotus quotes Mandrocles' epigraph, located in the temple of Hera, in its entirety:

Having bridged by boat, the fishy Bosphorus (Βόσπορον ἰχθυόεντα γεφυρώσας ἀνέθηκε),
Mandrocles dedicates this memorial to Hera,
He took for himself a **crown** (στέφανον), and for Samos **glory** (Σαμίοισι δὲ κῦδος),
For bringing to completion the mind of King Darius (4.88.2).

The first thing to note is that Herodotus makes a generic shift from prose to verse text as he quotes the dedication verbatim. The Herodotean Mandrocles claims that κῦδος has been positively realised, but without a reference to a divinity giving κῦδος.¹⁸⁵ It should be noted that, while a rare term in literary texts, κῦδος also appears in inscribed texts. In this setting, κῦδος appears 123 times, in both Attica (29 occurrences) and Asia Minor (49 occurrences).¹⁸⁶ In particular, κῦδος appears in a fifth-century inscription for the battle of Tanagra in 457 BCE,¹⁸⁷ roughly concurrent with Herodotus' time of composition. Herodotus' use of κῦδος within the context of an inscription therefore follows the contemporaneous usage. Crucially, however, Herodotus attributes the text to the narrative character Mandrocles within the world. Narratologically, this means there is a level of authorial distancing from the attribution of κῦδος: Herodotus does not attribute κῦδος in his own narratorial persona Mandrocles'

¹⁸⁵ Compare this with Achilles at *Il.* 22.393.

¹⁸⁶ The full breakdown of κῦδος in (extant) inscriptions by location is as follows (found using the PHI Epigraphy Project database): 29 times in Attica (*IG* I-III); 6 times in Peloponnesus (*IG* IV-[VI]); 5 times in Central Greece (*IG* VII-IX); 5 times in Northern Greece (*IG* X); 6 times in Thrace and the Lower Danube (*IG* X); 1 time in North Shore of the Black Sea; 16 times in Aegean Islands, incl. Crete (*IG* XI-[XIII]); 49 times in Asia Minor; 2 times in Greater Syria and the East; 1 time in Egypt, Nubia and Cyrenaica; and 3 times in Sicily, Italy, and the West (*IG* XIV).

¹⁸⁷ Proietti (2013) 26 n.19 provides this dating for *IG* I³ 1181. Arrington (2010) suggests possible purposes for this inscription: p.66 n.91 suggests it 'may belong to a public monument to the cavalry from this engagement', while p.61 n.57 and p.71 n.120 suggest that it might have formed the basis for a casualty list, though these are not necessarily mutually exclusive outcomes, both parts of this hypothesis are speculation.

achievement. It is only Mandrocles' perception that κῦδος has been achieved, but Herodotus may not see κῦδος as resulting from this event.

It has been suggested that 'Mandrocles represents himself, implausibly, as if on a par with an Olympic victor'.¹⁸⁸ This is because of Mandrocles' reference to winning a 'crown' (στέφανος) – the honorary wreath awarded to athletic champions. The reference to κῦδος for Samos implies a further parallel, but with Homeric heroes. However, there are key differences from Homeric κῦδος. The first is sociological; Mandrocles is an 'architect' (ἀρχιτέκτονα, 4.88.1) not a warrior. The only method by which Homeric characters sought to achieve κῦδος was through shows of militaristic prowess (e.g. *Il.* 4.415-6, 17.287 and 20.502-3).¹⁸⁹ In each case, however, the Homeric hero pursuing κῦδος was unable to attain it unless he had divine assistance. This highlights the second point of difference from Homeric epic: the nature of the undertaking which is said to lead to κῦδος. Mandrocles begins his inscription: 'having bridged the fishy Bosphorus' (Βόσπορον ἰχθυόεντα γεφυρώσας, 4.88.2). Mandrocles' pride is palpable. Rather than beginning with his own name (as Herodotus does) or the goddess Hera to whom he is making the dedication, Mandrocles begins with the reason for the offering: his architectural accomplishment. This has led to a variety of scholarly responses.

Rivers, however, hold a particular importance in the *Histories*. Elsewhere Herodotus uses moments where non-Greek rulers cross rivers to create an ominous tone as they set out on an expedition.¹⁹⁰ A number of scholars have commented on the crossing of rivers as a narrative tool to cast Eastern rulers as hubristic through the breaking of significant boundaries.¹⁹¹ Not

¹⁸⁸ Cartledge (2013) 671 n.77.

¹⁸⁹ Odysseus suggests to Eumaeus that Hermes gives κῦδος for all men's work (*Od.* 15.319-20), but this is in character speech and still relies on Hermes giving the κῦδος.

¹⁹⁰ 1.75.2, 1.208, and famously Xerxes at the Hellespont at 7.55.

¹⁹¹ On crossing rivers as symbolic of breaking boundaries see Haywood (2021) 238. Baragwanath (2008) 261-2. Thomas (2000) 99-100. Lateiner (1989) 127-44, esp. 127-35. Boedeker (1988) 43. See also Aesch. *PV* 717-8 Prometheus warns Io 'you will come to the river **Hubristes** (Ὑβριστήν) which does not lie, do not cross it'.

only does Mandrocles' epigram form 'a very satisfactory conclusion of the fateful step which took the Persians beyond the limits ordained for them',¹⁹² but, narratologically, 'the epigram temporarily slows down the narrative, and encourages the reader to reflect on the significant moment when Darius precipitated an intercontinental conflict'.¹⁹³

Another view has been posited by scholars. It has also been suggested that 'interfering with nature to exert control is not, per se, an impious affront to the gods for Herodotus and nothing sacrilegious is suggested when Darius crosses the Bosphorus (4.87–8)',¹⁹⁴ or that in Herodotus' presentation of Mandrocles, 'there is no suggestion that this was anything other than an appropriate memorial of a great accomplishment'.¹⁹⁵ This scene therefore treads intermediary ground: while representing a breaking of natural boundaries, Herodotus is nonetheless unable to 'suppress his admiration for the *sophiē* that made possible such monumental changes to the earth'.¹⁹⁶ Herodotus presents Mandrocles' achievement and κῦδος as of questionable positivity.

The passage's ambiguity in tone is compounded in the last two lines of the inscription. It is with the first of Darius' gifts of gratitude (ἀπαρχή, 4.88.1) that Mandrocles has the painting (and inscription) commissioned. This painting 'he set up in the Heraion' (4.88.1). Mandrocles 'doubtless [...] wished to publicise his achievement before his fellow citizens, but the piety of the gesture is also noteworthy: at the moment of his greatest glory, the reverent Mandrocles subordinates himself to the gods, thereby avoiding the taint of *hybris*'.¹⁹⁷ The inscription itself draws on this reverence as Mandrocles says he 'dedicates this memorial to Hera' (4.88.2). The

¹⁹² West (1985) 282.

¹⁹³ Haywood (2021) 238.

¹⁹⁴ Sheehan (2018) 204.

¹⁹⁵ Scullion (2006) 193.

¹⁹⁶ Romm (2006) 190.

¹⁹⁷ Romm (1998) 83-4.

hubristic quality of an act otherwise categorised as hubristic in the *Histories* is nullified through his piety.

Mandrocles subordinates himself not only to the god but to Darius, by not acquiring the ‘crown’ (στέφανος) or ‘glory’ (κῦδος) of his own volition. The inscription’s concluding verse says that he acted ‘to bring to completion the mind of Darius’ (4.88.2). Thus ‘the clever Greek wisdom of the engineer Mandrocles becomes something to exploit for Persian aggressive purposes’.¹⁹⁸ In Homeric epic κῦδος signified a moment of success,¹⁹⁹ but the overall tone of Mandrocles’ inscription is not so jubilant. Herodotus allows Mandrocles’ inscription a full quotation, even affording him the prominent Homeric term κῦδος, but it is to enact the will of the Persian king. The real-life dedication might have stood as a proud declaration of Mandrocles’ achievement but, in Herodotus’ *Histories*, ‘it is now a melancholic image of the Persian onslaught, eliciting a much more sober response in its Herodotean context’.²⁰⁰

The second Herodotean occurrence of κῦδος comes as part of the oracle prior to the Battle of Sepeia. Here, Herodotus also breaks from his prosaic style to give an exact oracular quotation. Again, we should be careful of seeing κῦδος present in the narrative as this is not text in Herodotus’ narratorial voice. Nonetheless, the Argives fear trickery from the Spartans because of the following oracle:

But when the female agent overcomes (νικήσασα) the male,
she drives him out (ἐξελάσῃ) and wins **glory** (κῦδος) in Argos (ἐν Ἀργείοισιν),
many Argive women will have cheeks scored in grief.
So, some human yet to come shall say,
‘Terrible three-coiled serpent overpowered and killed by the spear’ (6.77.2).

¹⁹⁸ Pelling (2011) 5.

¹⁹⁹ See above all the use with Hector discussed above (pp.47-9).

²⁰⁰ Haywood (2021) 238.

The presentation of the oracle is focalised through the perspective of the Argives who believe the oracle refers to the upcoming Battle of Sepeia (6.77.2). Herodotus offers no objection to this interpretation and it is in this light, I would argue, that the reader should interpret the narrative and oracle. κῦδος features in the oracle as the result of action in Argos by a female agent overcoming a male. However, ‘the oracle is notoriously polysemic’,²⁰¹ and it is unclear to whom the female agent refers and thus who achieves κῦδος. Hornblower and Pelling make a number of sensible suggestions, seeing the female agent referring to either Argos or Sparta, but do not reach a definitive conclusion.²⁰² I would argue, however, that by looking at the following narrative it is possible to see who acquires κῦδος.

The oracle says that κῦδος is achieved at Sepeia by the female agent. There is one crucial piece of textual evidence which I would argue means that we should assign this role to Cleomenes and the Spartans. Once Cleomenes discovers the Argives’ charade of copying the Spartan herald, he attacks and the Spartans ‘slew many of them, yet more by far [...] **fled** (καταφυγόντας) [...]’ (6.78.2). The oracle says that ‘the female agent **shall overcome** (νικήσασα) the male and **drive them out** (ἐξέλαση)’ (6.77.2). Not only are Cleomenes and the Spartans victorious and overcome the Argives by slaying many of them (πολλοὺς μὲν ἐφόνευσαν αὐτῶν, 6.78.2), but they also succeed in causing the Argives to flee (καταφυγόντας), which aligns with the oracle’s prediction that the female agent shall ‘drive them out’ (ἐξέλαση). We can therefore retrospectively assign the female agent from the oracle’s prediction to Cleomenes and the Spartans.

²⁰¹ Barker (2006) 27.

²⁰² Hornblower and Pelling (2017) 193-5, after giving various interpretations, concede to the oracle’s ambiguity (p.195) ‘still, this passage remains puzzling, and the answer may not yet have been found’.

This allows us to plug the Spartans into the oracle as the female agent to understand the oracle's prediction of κῦδος. As we move to the second line of the oracle, there is no new grammatical subject introduced meaning that the figure who represents the female agents, suggested above to be the Spartans and Cleomenes, are the one(s) to achieve κῦδος. How Cleomenes and the Spartans achieve κῦδος is significantly different.

The 'battle scene' between the Argives and Spartans features an extended period of implicit narrated time where both sides are fooling around in drawing up battle formations. The Argives copy the Spartans' herald so that '**whenever** (ὅκως) the Spartans' herald **ordered** (προσημαίνου) the Spartans, the Argives did the same thing' (6.77.3).²⁰³ The use of the temporal adverb 'whenever' (ὅκως) alongside the optative mood for 'ordered' (προσημαίνου) creates an iterative effect and implies a repeated sequence where the Argives mimic the Spartans' actions. I would argue that this is humorous. The Argives' recurrent copying of the Spartans' actions creates an image of the two side of the battle scrambling to undertake one action and then, at a word from the Spartan herald, scrambling just as fast to change activity or position to obey a new instruction.

The Argives stall for time and their martial dilly-dallying is a far cry from the action of Homeric heroes as they strive for κῦδος. In Homeric epic, when a hero pursued κῦδος he was presented as taking decisive action (e.g., Hector (*Il.* 12.437-71.), Achilles (*Il.* 20.502-21.34)).²⁰⁴ This is not the case here in the *Histories*. There is no drive to start the battle quickly. In particular, the Spartans are the greatest victim of this humorous scene. While the Spartans enjoy a reputation as formidable fighters in the *Histories*,²⁰⁵ 'Spartan slowness and hesitancy were

²⁰³ Griffiths (1989) 57 compares this scene with Babrius 33, where the farmer notices the birds flying off at the mention of a 'sling' and so instructs the young boy to shout 'bread' instead and then use his sling.

²⁰⁴ This is also seen in tragedy: Aesch. *Pers.* 454-64).

²⁰⁵ Croesus pairs Sparta with Athens as the 'most powerful in Hellas' 1.56.1. See also 6.108.2-3 and 9.48.1-4.

stereotypes in Thucydides’,²⁰⁶ and we may see a humorous hint of this here. Whether it is the Argives’ fault for hindering the battle is a moot point as the Spartans could have initiated battle sooner. The effect of this scene is twofold: it reduces the reader’s impression of the Argives’ martial capabilities and it reduces the Spartans’ κῦδος. The Argives, quaking in their boots, do not make for a glorious foe for the Spartans to vanquish; they are instead painted as timid. The Spartans’ victory is paler and the resultant κῦδος greatly diminished.

Alternatively, Cleomenes and the Spartans’ κῦδος results from the actions after this battle. Cleomenes entraps and burns the Argives in a grove (6.80), Cleomenes then asks one of the Argives who had come out of the grove to which god the grove belongs, and they reply ‘Argos’ (Ἄργου, 6.80). This could be the ‘**in Argos**’ (ἐν Ἀργείοισιν), to which the oracle refers in 6.77.2. However, this would also create a questionable type of κῦδος. Cleomenes’ action inside the grove is entirely sacrilegious as he burns alive defenceless Argives who took sanctuary inside the holy grove. Hornblower and Pelling note that as Cleomenes asks to which god the grove belongs, Herodotus presents Cleomenes as knowing that the grove is at least sacred.²⁰⁷ The Herodotean Cleomenes harbours no hesitation in pursuing irreverent action.²⁰⁸ How ever we interpret Cleomenes’ κῦδος, whether it is won through the feeble battle scene or by the burning of the victims in the divine grove, it results from actions which are at best unimpressive or at worst sacrilegious.

²⁰⁶ Turner (2024) 77, noting that ‘the Spartans missed the battle of Marathon because they could not leave Sparta during the Carneia (6.106 and 6.120). The Carneia also prevented the Spartans from sending their whole army to Thermopylae (7.206)’. Debnar (2020) quotes Thuc. 1.70.2-4 (the Corinthians speech) and 8.96.5 (Thucydides’ own narratorial persona) as evidence of Spartan slowness in Thucydides. See also Jaffe (2017) 64. Roisman (1987) 385. Wassermann (1964) 290.

²⁰⁷ Hornblower and Pelling (2017) 197 suggest that Cleomenes’ phrasing of the question shows that he knows the grove is sacred.

²⁰⁸ Before Cleomenes arrived at Sepeia he received an oracle, relayed in indirect discourse, ‘for when Cleomenes was seeking divination in Delphi, it was prophesised that he would take Argos (Ἄργος αἰρήσεν, 6.76.1)’. Cleomenes recognises his error outside of the grove: ‘I guess this is the fulfilment of my oracle (6.80)’.

The final occurrence of Herodotean κῦδος is in Xerxes' war council. This final example is not given as part of a verse quotation, but it remains outside Herodotus' narratorial voice. Xerxes addresses the Persian council, 'now, I find, on consideration, that both **glory** (κῦδος) shall become ours and we shall gain land' (7.8α.2). Here Xerxes is using κῦδος in a Homeric manner. κῦδος is presented as a potential motivating factor to spur the Persian war council to action. This is analogous to how Odysseus used κῦδος (*Il.* 9.303) in an attempt to encourage Achilles to return to battle. Xerxes, like Odysseus, is unsuccessful in using κῦδος to persuade his audience. Mardonius makes a fawning speech (7.9), but 'the other Persians remained **silent** (σιωπόντων)' (7.10.1). By their very silence, the Persians express their apathy to a campaign against Greece: κῦδος fails as a trigger to action. While the Persians' indifference to κῦδος aligns with Achilles' own indifference in *Iliad* 9, the Achillean rejection of κῦδος is exceptional and we later see him actively pursuing κῦδος (*Il.* 20.502-3). Further, only Mardonius is moved by Xerxes' appeal, but Mardonius does not say he seeks κῦδος: κῦδος is of no interest to any Persian. A lack of drive towards κῦδος creates a distinctly 'un-Homeric' portrait of the Persians.

Moreover, Xerxes changes his mind, not once but twice, and so even he is not lured to action by κῦδος. Xerxes is visited by two dreams which 'are clearly intended to deceive',²⁰⁹ resulting in him confirming to the Persian council that they will be attacking Greece. For our current purposes, the council scene's 'real importance lies not in the discussion of the

²⁰⁹ Harrison (2002) 559. Influenced by the counsel of Artabanus, who urges caution (7.10α.1-θ.3), Xerxes decides after the council scene not to attack Hellas (7.12.1). Xerxes is visited by a dream which tells him 'to do as you planned during the day' (7.12.2), but Xerxes ignores this dream and tells the Persians that they will not be invading Greece (7.13.2-3). Xerxes then has another dream (7.14), where he is told to pursue war or 'thus you shall swiftly be brought low again' (7.14), a dream which is confirmed to be true by Artabanus (7.15-8), leading Xerxes to tell the Persians they shall indeed be waging war on Greece. On Xerxes' dreams see Flaucher (2021). Sheehan (2018) 200-1. Scullion (2006) 197. Flower (2006) 278: 'what was subconsciously weighing upon Xerxes' mind: if he backed down, he might lose the support of the Persian nobility'. Boedeker (2002) 103. Evans (1961).

advisability of the Greek campaign, but in the description of Xerxes' motives'.²¹⁰ Xerxes' spur to action is not the pursuit of heroic κῦδος, nor an attempt to prove himself in battle, but instead fear of the dream which visited him (and Artabanus).

1.2.3 Conclusion

While κῦδος does appear in the *Histories*, Herodotus' use of the term κῦδος is markedly different from that of Homer. Not only does Herodotus use κῦδος merely three times, but it is uncertain whether κῦδος is ever manifest in the *Histories*. Herodotus never applies the term himself; every time κῦδος appears in the *Histories* it is in text outside Herodotus' narratorial persona, whereas Homer, as narrator, frequently assigned κῦδος. Thus, in the *Histories* it is only within characters' perceptions that κῦδος occurs – even if one of the 'characters' who cites it is an oracle.

Using κῦδος three times has been found not to represent a move for selective glorious, Homeric characterisation. Quite the opposite. The first example did not result from any warrior's magnificent feat in battle, but to Mandrocles the architectural accomplishment in bridging the Bosphorus. Whichever of the narrative events lead to Cleomenes' κῦδος, Herodotus does not present him in a glorious light. Either Cleomenes overcame a weak fighting force, after a scene which perpetuated the Spartan stereotype for slowness, or Cleomenes received a perverted κῦδος for burning victims alive in a holy grove. The final occurrence of κῦδος in the *Histories* was as an unsuccessful persuasive tool. Xerxes' appeal to the Persians that they might win κῦδος in attacking Greece fell on an unresponsive audience; Xerxes himself changed his mind on whether to pursue the campaign, before only proceeding under compulsion from his

²¹⁰ Immerwahr (1966) 128. Cf. Grethlein (2009) for a metahistorical approach to the *Histories*, which includes some discussion of this scene, on how Xerxes uses the past as presented in the *Histories* to his own purposes.

dream. As a result, both the debating Persians and Xerxes himself are presented as un-Homeric figures. The Herodotean application of κῦδος thus differs greatly from the Homeric original use.

1.3.1 Homeric γέρας

In the embassy scene of *Iliad* 9 Achilles stresses the ‘heroic prize’ (γέρας) and its retraction as the motivating factors behind his withdrawal (*Il.* 9.334-6).²¹¹ Thus, by presenting it as the driving force behind his exit from battle, he highlights the fundamental importance of the term to himself as a Homeric hero. Homer uses γέρας 42 times.²¹² The two meanings for γέρας which enjoy the greatest range of Homeric attestations are where γέρας is used as a status symbol and/or a heroic prize. This chapter argues that γέρας is a linguistic instrument for demonstrating the social status of individuals within communities, a marker of (often elite) privilege.

The most relevant use of γέρας for this study is when it designates a reward for heroic action.²¹³ This aspect of γέρας is essentially transactional. Odysseus tells Achilles in the Underworld of Neoptolemus’ achievements at Troy: ‘but **when** (ὅτε) we sacked utterly the lofty city of Priam, having his share of the noble **prize** (γέρας) he went to his ship’ (*Od.* 11.533-4). The temporal conjunction ὅτε (‘when’) indicates the casual relationship between the heroic achievement (the sacking of the city) and the attainment of γέρας (Neoptolemus’ reward). This relationship can be expressed in the negative. Achilles taunts Aeneas on the battlefield boasting ‘but **if** (εἰ κεν) **you** **slay** (ἐξεναρίξῃς) me, **not** (οὐ) **on account of this** (τοῦνεκά) will Priam put the **reward** (γέρας) into your hands’ (*Il.* 20.181-2). The hypothetical construction, ‘if’ (εἰ κεν), with the aorist subjunctive, ‘you slay’ (ἐξεναρίξῃς), is then negated by the negative ‘not’ (οὐ), which creates a counterfactual statement. The counterfactual construction demonstrates the

²¹¹ On Homeric γέρας see Christensen (2020) 211. Catanzaro (2005). Zanker (1994) 11. Schein (1984) 71. van Wees (1992) 299-310. Nagy (1979) 132-3.

²¹² *Od.* 4.66, 4.197, 7.10, 7.150, 11.175, 11.184, 11.534, 15.522, 20.297, 24.190, 24.296. *Il.* 1.118, 1.120, 1.123, 1.133, 1.135, 1.138, 1.161, 1.163, 1.167, 1.185, 1.276, 1.356, 1.507, 2.237, 2.240, 4.49, 4.323, 9.111, 9.334, 9.344, 9.367, 9.422, 16.54, 16.56, 16.457, 16.675, 18.444, 19.89, 20.182, 23.9, 24.70.

²¹³ For γέρας as a heroic prize see *Od.* 11.534. *Il.* 1.118, 1.120, 1.123, 1.133, 1.135, 1.138, 1.161, 1.163, 1.167, 1.185, 1.276, 1.356, 1.507, 2.240, 9.111, 9.334, 9.344, 9.367, 16.54, 16.56, 18.444, 19.89, 20.182.

normal practice: through achieving a great deed, such as overcoming the ferocious Achilles, ‘on account of this’ (τοῦνεκά) Aeneas would receive a ‘reward’ (γέρας). There is an element of exchange; for undertaking a heroic action, the hero receives γέρας.

Homeric heroes view γέρας as a distinct category of recognition. This is demonstrated by Odysseus’ appeal for Achilles to accept ‘gifts’ (δῶρα) from Agamemnon (*Il.* 9.261, 9.263 and 9.301). Achilles furiously rejects this alternative: ‘hateful to me are his **gifts**’ (ἐχθρὰ δέ μοι τοῦ **δῶρα**, *Il.* 9.378), rendering δῶρα as an inadequate substitute for the plural γέρα. As Achilles refuses Agamemnon’s recompense, he draws a sharp distinction between the differing types of material compensation. By rejecting δῶρα in favour of γέρα, Achilles not only highlights the worth of the γέρα for Homeric heroes but also demonstrates that it stands in a separate category to δῶρα and something not easily replaced.

Through its use of γέρας the quarrel of *Iliad* 1 highlights the connection between heroism and social status. Achilles says that Agamemnon should wait until the sack of Troy to be compensated for the loss of Chryses (*Il.* 1.122-9). Agamemnon declares that he wants immediate compensation and, ‘if [the Achaeans] do not give it, I will come myself and take yours, or Ajax’s, or Odysseus’ **prize** (γέρας)’ (*Il.* 1.137-9). Agamemnon makes no idle choices in targeting Achilles, Ajax, and Odysseus. All three are members of the ruling elite who ‘through their personal qualities stand out from the crowd’.²¹⁴ Achilles is recognised as the best fighter on the Achaean side (e.g., *Il.* 1.244), Ajax is said to be the best fighter while Achilles sulks (*Il.* 2.768-9), and Odysseus has prowess in stratagems (*Il.* 3.200-2). Agamemnon’s own primacy is due to his inherited status as king, βασιλεύς, and with it the sceptre from Zeus (*Il.* 2.100-8), rather than any exceptional personal qualities. It has been astutely argued that γέρας functions in a symbolic way in *Iliad* 1 so that Homer ‘seems almost to want to present γέρας

²¹⁴ Catanzaro (2005) 386 (‘per loro qualità personali si distinguono dalla massa’).

as an essential requirement of power'.²¹⁵ I agree, and by taking away the γέρας of another hero, Agamemnon would be removing 'the tangible token of the hero's superior reputation'.²¹⁶

Agamemnon aims to demonstrate the magnitude of his social superiority. This attempt backfires tremendously. Achilles does not take Agamemnon's threat to remove his γέρας lightly. Close to physically assaulting Agamemnon, and only stopped by Athene (*Il.* 1.194-222), Achilles delivers one last tirade against Agamemnon, concluding:

'[...] You will tear the heart within you

in anger that you did not honour the **best of the Achaeans** (ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν).'

So spoke Peleus' son, and **he dashed the sceptre to the ground** (σκῆπτρον βάλε γαίῃ)

(*Il.* 1.243-5).

Scholars have noted that Agamemnon's sceptre symbolises his power.²¹⁷ I would argue that by throwing the sceptre to the floor Achilles illustrates his rage at Agamemnon pulling rank on him. Even though Achilles is the 'best of the Achaeans' (ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν *Il.* 1.244) because of his superior fighting abilities, 'the heroic superiority of Achilles is canceled [sic.] by the social superiority of Agamemnon'.²¹⁸

Thersites questions this discrepancy between earned status, exemplified by Achilles, and inherited status, represented by Agamemnon.²¹⁹ Thersites deploys γέρας twice as he denounces Agamemnon:

²¹⁵ Catanzaro (2005) 386 ('pare quasi voler presentare il γέρας come un requisito essenziale del potere').

²¹⁶ Friedrich (1987) 126.

²¹⁷ Stein (2016) 451-3. Yamagata (1997) 10. Griffin (2004) 165 posits another interpretation: 'the sceptre which is the symbol of civilised discourse', which also appears to be at play here.

²¹⁸ Nagy (2013) 32.

²¹⁹ van Wees (1992) 83: 'It would seem that the poet has tailored his image of the heroic world to fit the ideology that hereditary power and honour should be justified by merit'.

‘[...] Let us leave this man,
 here, in Troy to digest his **honours** (γέρα), so that he might see
 Whether we are in some way an aid to him, or not:
 Achilles, who is **by far a better** (μέγ’ ἀμείνονα) man, he now
 dishonours: he has taken Achilles’ **prize** (γέρας) keeping it for himself’ (*Il.* 2.236-40).

Thersites’ first use of γέρας is pejorative. Whether this use indicates elevated status or heroic prize, Thersites’ point remains: Agamemnon’s γέρας will afford him nothing without other people. This throws into high relief the power dynamic between the Homeric ruler and their subjects. The ruler, Agamemnon, is reliant on his people to achieve his aims where, without common support, his status, and his γέρας, means nothing.

The second use of γέρας develops this argument. Thersites says that Achilles is a man ‘by far better’ (μέγ’ ἀμείνονα) than Agamemnon. Agamemnon, however, is a king and Achilles prince of a nation much smaller than Agamemnon’s.²²⁰ Thersites’ implication is that Achilles is ‘by far a better’ man than Agamemnon because of the former’s abilities. Thersites’ radical denunciation of the aristocracy is quickly quelled by Odysseus (*Il.* 2.244-69), who ‘uses Agamemnon’s sceptre as a representative credential to impose [...] order on the troops, using it [...] in a more practical way as a blunt instrument’.²²¹ Homer is careful to present Thersites as an unsympathetic character being ‘the **ugliest** (αἰσχιστος) man who came to Ilium’ (*Il.* 2.216).²²² Nonetheless Thersites usefully highlights the duality of Homeric γέρας.

²²⁰ *Il.* 2.576-8 describes Agamemnon bringing the largest number of ships to Troy.

²²¹ Melena (1972) 326 (‘utiliza el cetro de Agamenón como credencial de representación para imponer [...] el orden a la tropa, utilizándolo a [...] de un modo más práctico como instrumento contundente’).

²²² Barker (2009) 56: ‘the narrator’s entry into the debate in his introduction of Thersites *shapes* our response to him’. On Homeric physiognomy: Christensen (2021) 372. Marr (2005) 4. Kouklanakis (1999) 38-9. Cf. Seibel (1995) 388 n.16: ‘Is Thersites a ‘fallen’ aristocrat who no longer even deserves to have his lineage mentioned, but instead heaps all accusations of abomination on him?’ (‘Ist Thersites ein ‘gefallener’ Aristokrat, der es nicht einmal mehr verdient, daß man seine Abstammung erwähnt, sondern ihn stattdessen mit allen Vorwürfen der Abscheulichkeit überhäuft?’). Marks (2005) argues for a similar view.

In the *Odyssey* γέρας predominately indicates members of the aristocracy.²²³ Odysseus enters Alcinous' palace and 'sees the leaders (ἡγήτορας) and rulers (μέδοντας) of the Phaeacians' (*Od.* 7.136). Odysseus then supplicates Arete for transportation home and he includes in his appeal that the Phaeacian noblemen 'each hand down the **wealth** (κτῆματ) in their halls and their **prerogative** (γέρας) both, which the **common people** (δῆμος) gave' (*Od.* 7.149-50). The leading Phaeacians are demarcated through their 'wealth' (κτῆμα) and the 'prerogative' (γέρας). It might be argued that, as Odysseus has just arrived on the island, he has no way of knowing the social customs of the Phaeacian people. While this is certainly true, this scene nevertheless demonstrates that Odysseus, a participant in the wider Homeric society, identifies the possession of γέρας with the social elite. The mention of the 'common people' (δῆμος) as the ones upon whom the noblemen depend for their γέρας mirrors Thersites' point above.

γέρας as a status symbol is also seen when Homer describes how Nausicaa came by her maidservant Eurymedousa. The Phaeacians, returning from Apeire, decided 'Eurymedousa (Εὐρυμέδουσα) [...] they chose her **as a privilege** (γέρας) for Alcinous, **since** (οὐνεκα) he was lord of all Phaeacia' (*Od.* 7.8 and 7.10-11 respectively). The conjunction 'since' (οὐνεκα) creates a causal link between Alcinous' aristocratic position and the receipt of Eurymedousa. Homer does not specify why the journey to Apeire was undertaken or how the Phaeacians came by Eurymedousa, only that they decided she would be an appropriate γέρας for Alcinous. It is not necessarily the case that here γέρας has a militaristic connotation.²²⁴ Though Homeric γέρας can refer to humans as captives taken in war, like Briseis (*Il.* 1.184-5), there is no indication of

²²³ For γέρας referring specifically to social position see *Od.* 4.66, 7.10, 7.150, 11.175, 11.184, 15.522. *Il.* 9.422.

²²⁴ Ahl and Roisman (1996) 56: 'the language is military'.

Phaeacian warfare.²²⁵ Instead, in line with how Odysseus applies γέρας to the Phaeacian noblemen (*Od.* 7.149-50), we should see the use of γέρας as commensurate with Alcinous' status. In particular, Eurymedousa's name is made up of the adjective 'wide' (εὐρύς) and the verb 'rule' (μέδω). The conferring of a person whose name literally means 'Wide-ruling' I suggest is intended to refer to Alcinous' position as the king of Phaeacia and thus makes an appropriate 'gift of honour' (γέρας) for him.²²⁶

Outside Phaeacia, γέρας is most typically used as a marker of Odysseus' social rank. When Odysseus sees his mother in the Underworld, after inquiring how she met her end, and asking after his father and son, Odysseus asks, 'is my **prerogative** (γέρας) still with them, or is it already with some other man?' (*Od.* 11.175-6). Odysseus demonstrates an almost immediate concern for his γέρας, inquiring into this aspect of his home life *before* asking after Penelope's faithfulness (*Od.* 11.177-9). Anticleia soon relieves Odysseus' anxieties, in Homeric *hysteron proteron* fashion,²²⁷ saying 'your fine **prerogative** (γέρας) no one yet has, but Telemachus holds the lands' (*Od.* 11.184-5). Anticleia's confirmation that Odysseus *still* possesses γέρας operates on two narratological levels. For Odysseus as a character internal in his autobiographical tale, it demonstrates his concern to return home to as a nobleman. As a now external narrator on Phaeacia, Odysseus' anxiety may be to stress to the Phaeacians that he is a man of significant social status.²²⁸ On both narrative levels, γέρας is presented as the thing which indicates Odysseus' status as ruler of Ithaca. This use of γέρας is later echoed by Telemachus. Telemachus instructs Theoclymenus to seek hospitality in Eurymachus' house

²²⁵ The Phaeacians are proud of being a 'soft' nation; 'for we are not flawless boxers or wrestlers, but we run swiftly by foot and are the best on ship, and always dear to us is feasting and the lyre and the dance and changes of clothes and warm baths and the bed' (*Od.* 8.246-9).

²²⁶ Louden (1995) on word play with Homeric names.

²²⁷ On Homeric so-called *hysteron proteron* see Minchin (2007) 102-16. Minchin (2001). Russo (1994). Willcock (1975). Bassett (1920).

²²⁸ Arft (2022) 229: 'From the moment Odysseus began to interact with the Phaeacians, his status was in question [...]'.

‘for he is the best man by far and the most minded / to marry my mother and have the **prerogative** (γέρας) of Odysseus’ (*Od.* 15.521-2). And so, whether on the isolated island of Phaeacia or in Ithaca, γέρας functions to distinguish a society’s ruler from the masses.

Menelaus uses γέρας more broadly. He does not allow Telemachus or Peisistratus to speak before welcoming them and drawing attention to their superior looks, ‘for the line of your ancestors is not lost on you but you are of the race of men who are sceptre-bearing kings, cherished by Zeus, since **no common man** (οὐ κε κακοὶ) could have begot you’ (*Od.* 4.62-4).²²⁹ Menelaus straight away recognises the pedigree of the two princes and demarcates them from common people, where the Greek word ‘bad’ (κακός) denotes a member of lower social status.²³⁰ Menelaus then ‘took in hand the fatty, boiled flesh of an ox, and gave it to them, the **portions of honour** (γέρρα) which had been put before himself’ (*Od.* 4.65-6). This also takes place before either Telemachus or Peisistratus utter a word to identify themselves. Menelaus instinctively knows that they are members of the aristocracy and acts accordingly. It is Homer who ascribes the term γέρας, but it is focalised through Menelaus’ perspective. Here γέρας refers only to a portion of meat, nothing overly prestigious or heroic.²³¹

I would argue that this can be understood in terms of Telemachus’ growth into manhood in a post-heroic world.²³² The pre-existing methods for gaining heroic values, and thus for becoming a man in a heroic world,²³³ have ceased with the end of the Trojan War. This use of

²²⁹ Zenodotus, Aristophanes and Aristarchus all bracket these lines, yet the following use of γέρας suggests to me that we should retain them.

²³⁰ Cf. Finkelberg (1998) 19.

²³¹ Christensen (2020) 211 also notes the semantic shift of γέρας in the *Odyssey* compared to the *Iliad*.

²³² *Odyssey* as a post-heroic society: see Turner (2024) 228. Pelling (2022) 48: ‘The world of the *Iliad* has changed; perhaps it had already changed a little by the time of the *Odyssey*, as Penelope and Arete and even Nausicaa are not bad at taking the initiative themselves’. Barker and Christensen (2020) 232. Gazis (2018) 80. Brelinski (2015) 2. Purves (2010) 341. Mackie (2008) 39. Benardete (2005) 16. Moignard (1998) 213. Brooks (1977) 455 suggests that Circe reproves Odysseus’ impulse to fight Scylla is because ‘The war is over; new and, to use a modern term, post-heroic responses [...] are required for the world of the *nostoi*’. On the *Odyssey* representing a post-heroic world see pp.167-72.

²³³ On Telemachus’ growth to manhood see Patzer (1991) 31-2, and 35. Clarke (1963), esp. 141: ‘the *Telemacheia* is not simply a schooling or an education; it is not something taught but something

γέρας can be taken to represent the societal shift from the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*. While it only refers to a piece of meat, the term retains its broader sense to illustrate social esteem: it is through the presentation of pieces of meat as a γέρας that Menelaus shows his awareness of Telemachus' and Peisistratus' social standing. Menelaus makes an analogous use of κῦδος. He says that Telemachus, by dining before he travels, will receive 'glory (κῦδος) and splendour and refreshment' (*Od.* 15.78). We see further echoes of this as Orestes gains the prized concept of κλέος (discussed in the next chapter) for avenging his father's murder by Aegisthus (*Od.* 1.298 and 3.204). The *Odyssey* shows characters redefining their life outside combat. Moreover, each of these innovative uses of heroic terminology occurs in character speech. Both uses for Telemachus occur in Menelaus' speech, the use of κλέος at *Od.* 1.298 is in Athene's character speech and at *Od.* 3.204 this is in Telemachus' character speech. I would argue further that this represents characters within the Odyssean world recognising this cultural shift. Homer's characters understand the change in society and apply terms denoting traditional concepts in innovative ways as the post-war youth seek to attain the same honours as their fathers.

The above examination allows us to understand better the one exceptional instance of γέρας that does not fall into the above schema. Ctesippus attacks Odysseus: 'but, come, I too shall give him a **guest gift** (ξείνιον), so that he can give a **gift of honour** (γέρας) to the bath pourer or another of the household slaves' (*Od.* 20.296-8). Here, the use of 'guest gift' (ξείνιος) and 'privilege' (γέρας) are clearly ironic and pejorative. Ctesippus does not intend the ox's hoof, which he then throws at Odysseus, to mark a genuine tie of hospitality. Ctesippus' suggestion that Odysseus subsequently use the hoof as a γέρας is also ironic: it would be neither a heroic prize or mark high status for the bath pourer or household slave. Instead, the hoof

imparted; it is an experience, one young man's initiation into a world he has inherited and whose values he will soon have to defend by force'. See also Martin (1993) 240.

Ctesippus launches at Odysseus functions inversely as a marker of the low status of Odysseus (and the bath pourer and household slave). Ctesippus' uses γέρας, with ξένιος, as a loaded term to humiliate the pauper Odysseus: he is neither hero nor nobleman. Further, the item in question is an ox's hoof which is no choice cut of meat like when Menelaus presents Telemachus and Peisistratus with the fatty chine (*Od.* 4.65-7), but instead a gristle cast off from the main animal carcass. Here, the typical meaning of γέρας acts to throw Ctesippus' contempt for Odysseus, as a lowly beggar, and, indeed, Ctesippus' own arrogance into high relief.

There are three further uses of γέρας in Homeric epic which are less well-attested. These uses are where γέρας is used for the honours due to the dead,²³⁴ to the gods,²³⁵ and to elders.²³⁶ I shall not linger on these uses for two main reasons. They appear as part of metrically formulaic phrases and, as Herodotus writes in prose without metre and the generic convention of repeated formulaic phrases, these would be of little benefit for comparing the two authors. Further, this is a comparative study and Herodotus does not use γέρας for any of these reasons. This in and of itself is significant as it points to another point of difference between the two authors.

The above discussion of Homeric γέρας has shown that it has a number of facets. It can operate as referring to the honours due to the dead, gods, or elders, but these are outweighed by the two main uses as heroic prizes, where the greatest concentration is found in the *Iliad*, and as a marker for elevated social status, most commonly in the *Odyssey*. These two semantic strands can become interlinked, such as when Achilles' social status is called into question by Agamemnon's confiscation of his heroic prize, Briseis—something which Thersites disputes.

²³⁴ *Od.* 24.190 and 24.296. *Il.* 16.457, 16.675, 23.9. *Od.* 4.197 is exceptional for not having the same formulation, 'for this is the **privilege** of the dead' (γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων).

²³⁵ *Il.* 4.49 and 24.70: both uses in characters speech by Zeus to Hera, where he says, 'for that is the **privilege** we gods have received' (τὸ γὰρ λάχομεν γέρας ἡμεῖς).

²³⁶ *Il.* 4.323 and 9.422: 'for this is the **privilege** of the elders' (τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ γερόντων). Harakopos (2019) 9 suggests that Nestor 'embodies the etymological and semasiological connection between γῆρας (old age) and γέρας (honour)' (my emphasis). Nestor as an 'embodiment' of old age is also in line with the wider findings of Heroism Studies as a discipline, as outlined in my Introduction: Nestor as a hero embodies a representation of old age.

The difference in how the term is used in each epic might relate to the slightly later date ascribed to the composition of the *Odyssey*, and represent wider societal changes from a warrior class system to a more defined ‘domestic’ social hierarchy.²³⁷

1.3.2 Herodotean γέρας

Herodotus uses γέρας a total of 17 times,²³⁸ less than half the Homeric 42. This disparity in frequency would not be so striking if Herodotus’ project were markedly different from Homer’s. However, Herodotus regularly narrates the actions of the aristocracy and so γέρας could easily formed part of his vocabulary – especially if he wanted to flatter these figures by imbuing them with a Homeric aura. The Herodotean use overlaps with Homeric precedent in several ways. Herodotus does use the term for those in elevated social positions and in the sense of ‘heroic prizes’, but often the context of the passages presents the term in a different way to that found in Homeric epic.

One Herodotean use of γέρας akin to that found in Homeric epic is its use to designate the ruling elite.²³⁹ Herodotus uses γέρας twice when detailing Spartans’ customs to denote the Spartan king’s prerogatives in war (6.56) and in peace (6.57.5). Demaratus, as a narrative character, confirms that the Spartans designate the honours afforded to their kings as a γέρας when he discusses the loss of his ‘prerogatives’ (γέρεά) with Xerxes: ‘you know yourself very well, that they took away my honour and **privileges** (γέρεα)’ (7.104.2).

Herodotus uses γέρας for a similar purpose in a Persian context. Demaratus suggests to Xerxes that he cites the Spartan cultural practices where the first born while the father is king, and not the overall eldest heir, inherits the throne, meaning that Xerxes, and not Artobazanes,

²³⁷ Hall (2025) 32: ‘There were already suggestions in antiquity that the *Odyssey* was the product of Homer’s weakened genius in old age, and was somehow more “effeminate” than the *Iliad*’.

²³⁸ 1.114.2, 2.168.1, 3.85.1, 3.142.4, 4.143.1, 4.162.2, 4.165.1, 6.56, 6.57.5, 7.3.3, 7.29.2, 7.104.2, 7.134.1, 7.154.1, 8.125.1, 9.26.5, 9.27.5.

²³⁹ 4.162.2, 4.165.1, 6.56, 6.57.5, 7.3.3, 7.104.2.

should inherit the throne (7.3). Demaratus says ‘therefore, it is neither reasonable nor just that any other have **the right to rule** (τὸ γέρας) before yourself’ (7.3.3). Demaratus is putting Greek cultural practices into terms to which Xerxes can relate. As a private speech between two characters, in a distant land, sometime removed from the time of Herodotus’ composition, we can reasonably assume that these are not the precise words used by Demaratus, if this conversation even ever took place. These words are therefore Herodotus’ invention. The ascription of γέρας to the Persian cultural practice can thus also be said to operate at the level of author and (original) reader, with Herodotus applying words familiar to his Greek audience to a faraway nation as a way of explaining their culture.²⁴⁰

Analogously, γέρας is used in relation to the social elite in Cyrene. Arcesilaus, unhappy with Demonax’s decision to devolve power onto the Cyrenean people, ‘demanded back **honours** (γέρεα) of his forefathers’ (4.162.2). Arcesilaus, though expelled from Cyrene for making such a demand, frames γέρας as the phenomenon which, if he possessed it, would mark him as the ruler of Cyrene. As a colony, Cyrene is neither entirely Greek nor entirely the land of foreigners: it has an in-between cultural status.²⁴¹ Cyrene’s colonisation is described before Arcesilaus is introduced to the narrative (4.150-8) as though to prompt awareness of Cyrene’s former Greekness as we read of his expulsion. Herodotus uses γέρας indiscriminately for the social elite of a variety of nationalities.

The second use of γέρας in a Cyrenean context is surprising. After Arcesilaus gets revenge, he goes to live in Barce; at this time Pheretime, his mother, ‘had her son’s **privilege** (γέρεα) in Cyrene and **administered to business** (τάλλα νεμομένη) and **sat in council** (ἐν βουλῇ παρίζουσα)’ (4.165.1). Pheretime, a woman, is presented as a character with γέρας. This

²⁴⁰ For Herodotus using cultural concepts familiar to Greeks to explain foreign practice see Brandwood (2020). Agnolon (2020). Hartog (1988).

²⁴¹ On Cyrene as a Greek colony see Baragwanath (2020) 155. Chiasson (2012a) 116. Hornblower (2002b) 57-8. Osborne (2000) 3-4. Reynolds (1998) 204-5. Osborne (1996) 8.

marks a major point of difference from Homeric epic where only men have γέρας. A Homeric woman may be referred to as a γέρας, such as Briseis (*Il.* 1.184-5) or Eurymedousa (*Od.* 7.8-11), but a Homeric female character is never said to possess it – even leading societal figures such as Arete and Penelope.

Pheretime does not merely possess γέρας as a figure-head, but functions as the ruler. Herodotus presents her ‘administering to business’ (τᾶλλα νεμομένη, 4.165.1) and ‘sitting in council’ (ἐν βουλῇ παρίζουσα, 4.165.1). While Herodotus does not detail exactly what Pheretime does while sitting in council (is she outspoken, or does she purely sit in attendance?) or to what affairs precisely she attends (her own household, or the wider ruling of Cyrene?), I would argue that we are supposed to see Pheretime as an outspoken, ruler of Cyrene – especially given her later bloody revenge (4.202.1).²⁴²

The use of γέρας to define the social elite leads to one of Herodotus’ more amusing tales. Following Polycrates’ death, Maendrius makes a proclamation. He says that he holds the ‘sceptre’ (σκῆπτρον, 3.142.3) of Polycrates and ‘it is in my power to rule over you’ (3.142.3). Readers might be reminded of the Homeric Agamemnon’s sceptre (*Il.* 2.100-8) which acted as a symbol of his kingship and right to rule. Maendrius continues to say he is renouncing his right to rule and giving the Samians ‘equality of political rights’ (ἰσονομία, 3.142.3, see further pp.212-3). In return, Maendrius says, ‘I claim as much as this as **honours** (γέρεα) for myself’ (3.142.4), specifying six talents from Polycrates’ store and the priesthood of Zeus for himself and his descendants (3.142.4). After giving up power, the very thing denoted by γέρας in the *Histories* and Homeric epic, Maendrius employs γέρας to refer to the special privileges he wants to keep for himself.

²⁴² Pelling (2022) 48 also highlights Pheretime’s active role in contrast to the Iliadic Briseis who ‘wait[s] around for nineteen Books before she becomes a personality’.

This speech is met with a curt reply by Telesarchus. Telesarchus, whom Herodotus afterwards describes as ‘reputable’ (δόκιμος, 3.143.1),²⁴³ notably a term unattested in Homeric epic (p.138 and 239), denounces Maendrius in an almost Thersitean manner: ‘but **you are not worthy** (οὐδ’ ἄξιος) to rule over us, **low-born** (γεγονώς τε κακῶς) and despicable’ (3.142.5). Telesarchus says that Maendrius is ‘not worthy’ (οὐδ’ ἄξιος, 3.142.5) to rule and then draws attention to Maendrius’ ‘low birth’, with κακός as the designation for this.

Telesarchus, however, appears to have missed Maendrius’ point. Maendrius is not claiming to be the ruler; in fact, quite the opposite. We can understand Telesarchus’ misunderstanding based on Maendrius’ own use of the term γέρας. Maendrius says he is giving up power, but then confusingly uses the term γέρας more broadly to denote those privileges he will retain. Telesarchus appears to be latching onto Maendrius’ use of γέρας and interprets it in line with its (Homeric) use as a marker of the ruling social elite rather than the more general application Maendrius makes of the term.

²⁴³ Other major and influential individuals, from both a narrative and cultural perspective, are called δόκιμος: Lycurgus 1.65.2; Deioces 1.96.2; Cyrus punishes the son of Artembares, a δόκιμος man, during his play 1.114.3; Harpagus says either he or another reputable Mede will lead the army against Cyrus’ revolt at 1.124.3; Lacrines 1.152.3; Aristodocus 1.158.2; Apries sends Patarbemis a δόκιμος man to summon Amasis back at 2.162.3; Amasis farts and the remaining people turn to Amasis’ side seeing how he treats δόκιμοι people at 2.162.6; Critobolus 2.181.2; Prexaspes 3.75.3; Oroetes kills two anonymous δόκιμος Persians at 3.126.2; Darius sends 15 anonymous δόκιμοι Persians with Democedes at 3.135.1; Herodotus speculates that Democedes wants to marry Milo of Croton’s daughter as Darius knows Milo is δόκιμος at 3.137.5; Telesarchus (as above) 3.143.1; Zopyrus 3.155.1 and 3.157.1; Polymnestrus (father of Cyrenean Battus) 4.155.1; Demonax the Mantinean peacemaker on Cyrenean (4.161.2); Megabazus sends the 7 most δόκιμοι Persians after himself to Macedonia at 5.17.1; the banished Alcmaeonidae (5.62.3); the Lacedaemonians send Anchimolus, a δόκιμος man, to free Athens at 4.63.2; Isagoras 5.66.1; Melanthius, who goes with the Athenian ships (5.97.3); Onesilus’ squire 5.111.1; Pythagoras 5.126.1; Theasides 6.85.2; Nicodromus 6.88; two δόκιμοι Eritreans (Euphorbus and Philagrus) betray the city at 6.101.2; Alcmaeonidae 6.124.1; after sending Artabanus away with his royal symbols Xerxes speaks to the most δόκιμοι Persians at 7.53.1; Artaches, the overseer of the canal digs 7.117.1; Antipatrus, chosen by Thasians, expends 400 talents of silver entertaining Xerxes at 7.118; Timon 7.141.1; Democritus 8.46.3; Harmocydes 9.17.2; Artabazus 9.41.1; the caretakers of the sun god’s sacred cattle 9.93.1. δόκιμος is also used of five rivers (Peneus, Apidanus, Onochonus, Enipeus, and the Pamisus) collectively called δόκιμος 7.129.2; and notable cities in the Peloponnese 8.73.2. In one manuscript, Darius calls together the most δόκιμοι Persians to kill Oroetes at 3.127.2, although Wilson (2015) reads λόγιμος instead.

Herodotus, unlike Homer, uses γέρας more generally to denote societal roles that do not necessarily fall to the aristocracy. Herodotus uses this term to refer to the duty of the Spartan Talthybiadae who ‘are given the **responsibility** (γέρας) of all the heralds from Sparta’ (7.134.1). The Talthybiadae possess γέρας just like the ruling Spartan kings (6.56 and 6.57.5). Analogously, when Herodotus describes the roles which the infant Cyrus assigns to his playmates after he has been chosen as their king, ‘some were spear-bearers, one of them (I suppose) to be eye of the king, and to one he gave the **responsibility** (γέρας) of carrying his messages’ (1.114.2). While this second example is drawn from the young Cyrus’ playground, it is curious that Herodotus uses the term to denote the responsibilities of a messenger, like the Talthybiadae, but not as a lexical instrument for designating Cyrus their recreational ruler. This would not be so striking if the term were not to appear in this scene at all, but, since it does, it is peculiar that Herodotus does not use it for Cyrus.

The term also refers to priesthoods, like that of Maendrius. In an Egyptian context, Herodotus says that ‘privileges’ (γέρεα, 2.168.1) are given to the warrior class and the priests alone. The only religious use of γέρας in Homeric epic was formulaic, to describe sacrifices given to the gods (p.73). In the *Histories*, Herodotus appears to have humanised γέρας so that it refers to mortals. Here it is implemented as a way to mark the priests as distinctive human figures, thus almost inverting the Homeric religious use by distinguishing humans rather than the gods. It is notable that Herodotus does not use γέρας to denote the Egyptian king’s social status, as he does with Spartan and Persian royalty. Herodotus appears to have widened the use of the term to incorporate a range of figures from differing societal strata and with differing community functions and not just the social elite.

The most relevant use of γέρας for this study is its use to denote heroic prizes. It is contestable whether Herodotus uses γέρας in this way. The remaining examples of γέρας in the *Histories* are where γέρας is given to a character as a result of an action where something has

been achieved which can broadly be called heroic. In each case Herodotus stresses different aspects of the narrative to undermine a Homeric tone.

The first Herodotean use of γέρας refers to the kingdom Darius will win if his horse is victorious. Darius says to his groom, Oebares, ‘now, if you have the **cunning** (σοφίην), **contrive** (μηχανῶ) a way that **we shall have** (ἡμεῖς σχῶμεν) this **prize** (γέρας) and no other’ (3.85.1). Darius uses the grammatically superfluous collective pronoun ‘we’ (ἡμεῖς) alongside the inflected verb form ‘we shall have’ (σχῶμεν). The repetition of collective forms not only detracts from Darius’ victory, but also highlights the genuine agent: the humble groom Oebares. Oebares’ role is emphasised again as he is named in the inscription Darius has set up after he claims the throne (3.88). It is unlikely that such an inscription was indeed commissioned (why would the new-found king of Persia wish to undermine his achievement by sharing it with his groomsmen?), but from a textual perspective this has a massive impact on how the reader receives Darius as a character. In Homeric epic the lower-classes were certainly involved in the achievement of heroic deeds (e.g., *Od.* 9.263-6), but they are never recognised in such a prominent manner and certainly not as named individuals. Another aspect of the pleonastic collective pronouns is to highlight that Darius splits the possession of γέρας between himself and Oebares. In Homeric epic γέρας was an individual possession, not shared between characters.

Darius’ means of achieving γέρας is also different from Homeric epic. Darius commands Oebares to ‘contrive’ (μηχανάομαι, 3.85.1) a plan and to use ‘intelligence’ (σοφίη, 3.85.1) to win the kingdom. This is not Homer’s language for denoting cunning intelligence. Further, the use of σοφίη constitutes a new way of denoting intellectual heroism without Homeric precedent (pp.239-40). Only once in Homeric epic is γέρας, as a heroic prize, associated with craftiness. Odysseus tells Achilles how Neoptolemus was a member in the Trojan Horse and how Neoptolemus ‘went on ship with his fair share of noble the **prize**’ (γέρας,

Od. 11.534). The Trojan horse in and of itself, however, does not result in Neoptolemus' γέρας, but is coupled with the sacking of Troy (i.e. military action). For Darius it is the use of intelligence itself which wins γέρας *without fighting*. Darius deceptively has the mare, which excites his stallion to neigh first, brought to the place where he and the other contenders for the throne are to hold their competition. The competition is designed to afford each of the would-be kings an equal opportunity for the throne, but Darius' machinations undermine such equitability.

By outsourcing his plan to the groom, Darius demonstrates he lacks the imagination to devise a plan. Notably, in the previous political discussion (3.80-3), Darius argued strongly for imposing a monarchy as 'nothing appears better than the rule of the **one best man**' (ἀνδρὸς [...] ἐνὸς τοῦ ἀρίστου, 3.82.2). In this respect Darius falls short of being the 'best' (ἄριστος), as he requires the help of his social inferior. This passage also poignantly highlights the failings of monarchical government after a passage where it was judged to be the best. By being made king, Darius becomes an embodiment of the Persian way of life. Thus, Darius' character should align with Persian culture, but this is not the case. Darius gives a famous defence of needful lying (3.72.4), which stands in stark contrast to the Persian practice that 'they regard lying as most shameful' (1.138.1).²⁴⁴ Darius has achieved the peak position of Persianate culture, but he did so by engaging in behaviour which that very same culture holds as 'most shameful'.

The next Herodotean example of γέρας refers to the verbal (not material) honours paid to Megabazus. Herodotus says that 'to this man Darius once gave this **honour** (γέρας)' (4.143.1). When Darius is about to eat a pomegranate, he is asked what he would have, if he could have anything to match the number of pomegranate seeds. He replies, 'Megabazus, I would have as many men numbering this as him rather than the subjugation of Hellas'

²⁴⁴ Immerwahr (1966) 170. See also Dorati (1998) 203. On Persian hypocrisy for the cultural custom against lying see (pp.269 and 308).

(4.143.2). It is significant that Herodotus, as the narrator, labels this compliment a γέρας so it possesses no actorial focalisation. This makes its use particularly informative for understanding Herodotus' use of the term.

The use of γέρας, a prominent Homeric term, might suggest we are to view Megabazus as a Homeric hero and see his actions as commensurate with Homeric achievements. A quick summary of Megabazus' accomplishments, however, demonstrates that this far from the case. There is no denying that Megabazus achieves some impressive feats. He subdues the cities on the Hellespont (4.144.3), conquers the Perinthians (5.1.1), and marches through Thrace (5.2). However, each of these exploits is narrated in only one sentence, which makes them appear inconsequential. Achilles also summarily describes the subduing of cities (*Il.* 9.328-9), but Achilles is later afforded the opportunity to demonstrate his battle prowess. Megabazus' other two deeds, to which Herodotus awards far more extensive narrative time, do not paint him in a gloriously Homeric light. Megabazus plays only a supervisory role when transporting the Paeonians, who surrender without a fight (5.14-5), and in his unsuccessful delegation to Macedonia, he is clueless to the slaughter of prominent Persians (5.17-22). Herodotus stresses those unimpressive feats and glances over those which would create a more favourable impression of Megabazus. This manipulates the reader's reception of Megabazus and we question whether he is worthy of γέρας in a Homeric sense. It may be due to this that Megabazus' γέρας is verbal. Herodotus does not detail any physical manifestation of this compliment. A Homeric hero would find such a 'prize' laughable and the lack of concrete instantiation insulting.²⁴⁵

There is one occasion where Herodotus potentially uses γέρας as a heroic prize for a ruler. Pythius, having counted his treasury, says '**I give as a gift** (δωρέομαι) to you these things'

²⁴⁵ Achilles cites 'gratitude' (χάρης) as lacking from Agamemnon's treatment of him at *Il.* 9.315-7.

(7.28.3). Pythius apparently does not hesitate to impoverish himself to aid Xerxes' war effort, but Pythius' 'politeness may be a canny plan to forestall confiscation. If so, the plan works'.²⁴⁶ Xerxes is delighted and replies, 'In return for this (ἀντὶ αὐτῶν), I give to you **gifts of honour** (γέρεα) such as these' (7.29.2). Xerxes then offers to supplement Pythius' already extensive wealth to provide him with the seven thousand staters required to reach the next whole integer of four million staters. The second γέρας is to become a 'guest-friend' (ξένος) with Xerxes himself (7.29.2). Hospitality (ξενία) is another major Homeric theme and so Herodotus guides the reader to see this narrative as evoking Homeric tropes; this influences our reading of γέρας.²⁴⁷

Herodotus does not make Pythius' social status clear. Lewis argues that Pythius is a nobleman descended from Croesus,²⁴⁸ but there is no evidence in the *Histories* to support this theory.²⁴⁹ In any case, Xerxes makes it clear that he is not offering γέρας to Pythius based on his lineage. Xerxes says that it is 'in return for' (ἀντὶ) his intended donation. Further, Xerxes appears to have an awareness of the hierarchical relationship between γέρας and δῶρον found in Homeric epic (p.66). Pythius offers his wealth using the verb δωρέομαι which is cognate with δῶρον. Xerxes counters this offer with one which he designates a γέρας, making it appear of higher value. What Xerxes offers, however, is of a much lower monetary value and so it is as though Xerxes does not fully understand the superior position of γέρας compared with δῶρον. It might be that we are to understand Xerxes' offer of being a ξένος as trumping the

²⁴⁶ Flory (1987) 60. On Pythius see further Thomas (2012), especially 235-44. Lewis (1998). Flory (1987) 59-61.

²⁴⁷ While a thorough examination of the relationship between Herodotean and Homeric ξενία is beyond the scope of this thesis, Vandiver (2012) argues that Herodotus foregrounds *xenia* to add significance to the *logoi* of Croesus' acceptance of Adrastus as a *xenos* (1.35-45) and Proteus' rebuke of Paris for wronging Menelaus (2.114-117).

²⁴⁸ Lewis (1998).

²⁴⁹ Vandiver (2012) 241 shares my concern for a lack of Herodotean evidence.

inequivalence of monetary value by increased symbolic value, but this is shown to be of little consequence.

After an eclipse spooks Pythius, he asks Xerxes to leave behind his eldest son, ‘being encouraged by the **gifts** (δωρήμασι)’ (7.38.1). Earlier the term γέρας was focalised through Xerxes’ perspective to denote the same gifts in which Pythius now finds optimism. Now the γέρεα appear in Herodotus’ narrator text and are downgraded to a term cognate to δῶρον: δώρημα. This implies that Xerxes’ honours to Pythius are to be accredited with less value than Pythius might believe them to have been given. This plays out in the following narrative. When Pythius asks to leave his son behind ‘Xerxes was incredibly angry’ (7.39.1), and then had Pythius’ eldest ‘cut down the middle’ (7.39.3) and half of the corpse placed on either side of the road for the army to walk between. Whether this demonstrates remnants of a Hittite purification ceremony is of little consequence: ‘no extent of accurate reporting would make it anything other than an act of barbaric cruelty for the Greeks’.²⁵⁰ Moreover, Xerxes’ γέρας to Pythius was to become his ‘guest-friend’ (ξένος, 7.29.2; compare p.110) and ξενία as ‘the core of civilised life’,²⁵¹ is meant to ensure protection for guest and host.²⁵² Xerxes thus destroys the ξενία relationship between himself and Pythius.

Taken at face value, Xerxes implies that he understands γέρας and becoming someone’s ξένος. This would paint Xerxes as a Homeric hero. However, Xerxes’ use of neither γέρας nor ξένος can be said to correspond with the expected (Homeric) behaviour denoted by these terms. Whether taken as ignorance for the practices of ξενία or a wilful contempt of the concept, Xerxes fails in the Homeric ritual of guest-friendship. Analogously, he does not understand the

²⁵⁰ Thomas (2012) 242, with further bibliography on the Hittite connection.

²⁵¹ Slatkins (2005) 319.

²⁵² The protection afforded by ξενία is in fact divine, overseen by Zeus. On ξενία see Senn (2000) 427. Beidelman (1989) 232. Redfield (1975) 195-8. Levy (1963). Podlecki (1961). Donlan (1982) 427: ‘The obvious purpose of the ‘contract’ is mutual aid between inter-tribal *oikoi*’.

increased value which should be afforded to γέρας as opposed to δῶρον. Herodotus therefore presents Xerxes as quite the opposite of a Homeric hero. Whether this is intended to depict humorously Xerxes as an inadequate foe for the Greek army, or simply highlight his barbarism, Herodotus shows Xerxes falling short of Homeric heroes' standards.

Telines returning the exiles to Gela also results in γέρας. Herodotus describes how Telines said he would return them if he and his descendants possessed the priesthood of Demeter and Persephone (7.153.3);²⁵³ Telines returns the exiles 'not with a force of men, but the holy instruments of the goddess' (7.153.3). Herodotus then presents a questionable portrait of Telines. Herodotus feigns surprise: 'it is a wonder to me' (7.153.4) that 'Telines accomplished such a deed as this' (7.153.4). This might be because Herodotus doubts the validity of Telines' success on his own, and this is certainly how I remember first reading this narrative. Thus, the unbelievability of Telines' actions reflects favourably on Telines' disposition: he has done something awesome. Herodotus continues what seems a heroic presentation of Telines: 'this sort of deed is not customarily achieved by all men, but by men of **good spirit** (ψυχῆς [...] ἀγαθῆς) and **manly strength** (ρώμης ἀνδρηίης)' (7.153.4). Herodotus highlights favourable qualities for Telines: 'good spirit' (ψυχῆς [...] ἀγαθῆς) and 'manly strength' (ρώμης ἀνδρηίης) and contrasts Telines with the majority of men.

The tone, however, changes with indirect discourse. Herodotus resumes, 'but he is said, by those living in Sicily, to be naturally **the opposite** (τὰ ὑπεναντία), to be an **effeminate** (θηλυδρίας) and **soft** (μαλακώτερος) man' (7.153.4). There is an unexpected inversion of characterisation. This is driven home by the attribution of the traits which Telines does have ('effeminacy' (θηλυδρίας, 7.153.4) and 'softness' (μαλακός, 7.153.4)) in contrast to those Herodotus originally ascribed. Such a surprising overturn in actorial description can be seen as

²⁵³ For Demeter as an important factor in Greek identity see Rodrigues (2020).

humorous in ‘the witty, delicate humour of the author’s delivery’.²⁵⁴ Herodotus suddenly subverts the reader’s expectations and to humorous effect. Thus, the reader is left laughing at Telines, and all the more by having first been manipulated into thinking of Telines as a masculine figure.

This problematises Telines’ γέρας. While still smirking at this humorous portrayal of Telines, Herodotus says, ‘this man procured this **right** (γέρας)’ (7.154.1). The use of the term γέρας to denote Telines’ desired priesthood is akin to the wider Herodotean use of γέρας in a religious setting—namely of the Egyptians (2.168.1) and Maendrius (3.142.4), but still falls short of the valuable objects which were denoted by γέρας in Homeric epic. Perhaps this might be Herodotus making a statement on how heroes can take a number of forms, even unsuspecting characters such as Telines? Or is Herodotus bringing low Gelon, Telines’ descendant, who out of refusal to be led by either the Athenians or Spartans denied help to the allied Greeks in their hour of need against the Persian army (7.157-162)? I personally find the latter explanation more plausible – but both readings are possible.

Themistocles is another character said to be in receipt of γέρας. The jealous Timodemus belittles Themistocles’ treatment at the hands of the Spartans, saying, ‘he had the **honours** (γέρεα) from the Lacedaemonians **on account of Athens** (διὰ τὰς Ἀθήνας), not due to himself’ (8.125.1). Timodemus, whose name appropriately means ‘honour of the common people’, makes the claim that it is only because of his status as an Athenian that Themistocles was so received by the Lacedaemonian. Timodemus represents a Thersitean character who challenges an individual with power and vocalises the thoughts of the common people. Timodemus’ claim can be said to represent an attempt to democratise Themistocles’ individually received γέρας by assigning it to the wider city of Athens. One can imagine Themistocles might disagree with

²⁵⁴ Griffiths (1995) 42.

such a sentiment as it would undermine his own achievement. This however is not the case. Themistocles amusingly replies, ‘this is true: if I were from **Belbina** (Βελβινίτης) I would not be honoured thus by the Spartans, nor **you** (σὺ), sir, even though you are an **Athenian**’ (Ἀθηναῖος, 8.125.2). Themistocles agrees with Timodemus (‘this is true’), and wittily shoots down Timodemus’ attack. Themistocles further retorts that he would not be honoured if he were from the proverbially insignificant Belbina (Βελβινίτης), and in effect asks Timodemus what his excuse is for lacking γέρας, since he is from the prominent city-state of Athens.²⁵⁵ Themistocles is endorsing Timodemus’ view that γέρας is less an individual acquisition and more closely associated with one’s city-state. Timodemus’ words mark another break from the Homeric tradition where γέρας, whether denoting social status or heroic prize, was an individual possession rather than communal.

The last two examples of Herodotean γέρας appears as part of the preliminaries to the Battle of Plataea. Both the Athenians and the Tegeans use γέρας to refer to the privilege of holding the right wing. The Tegeans cite their ancestor’s decisive defeat of Hyllus: ‘from this deed we have obtained from the Peloponnesians of that time this [sc. Occupation of the second wing] and other great **privileges** (γέρεα)’ (9.26.5). The Tegeans present their argument to hold the wing as being one of their historic due ‘privileges’ (γέρεα) from the Peloponnesians.

The Athenians question the relevance of the Tegeans’ claims. The Athenians cite a catalogue of Athens’ mythical achievements to justify their claim to the flank: sheltering the Heraclidae, fighting at Thebes against the Cadmeans to retrieve the dead and bury them at Eleusis, defeating the Amazonians and ‘in the toil at Troy, we were left lagging behind by no one’ (9.27.4). The Athenians call and raise the Tegeans’ claims and include their more recent

²⁵⁵ See Blösel (2001) for Themistocles as a depiction of fifth-century Athens.

accomplishment and it is here that they use the term γέρας: ‘but we are worthy due to our feat at Marathon to have the **privilege** (γέρας)’ (9.27.5).²⁵⁶

As part of their rebuttal the Athenians make one fascinating claim. They argue that their feats at Marathon should be accounted as more considerable than any mythical achievements,

‘for those that were **brave** (χρηστός) **before** (τότε) might **now** (νῦν) be **cowardly** (φλαῦρος), and those who were **before** (τότε) **cowardly** (φλαῦρος) might **now** (νῦν) be better. Enough of the deeds **long ago** (παλαιῶν)’ (9.27.4-5).

The Athenians posit a contrast between how those who were before ‘brave’ (χρηστός, 9.27.4) might now be ‘cowardly’ (φλαῦρος, 9.27.4) – neither term having Homeric precedent. The Athenians’ implicit criticism of the Tegeans is that they, the Tegeans, in adducing historical rather than recent achievements, might have become ‘cowardly’ (φλαῦρος) since they do not give any recent evidence. Further, the Athenians argue for the increased relevance of more recent actions; they have heard enough of the deeds ‘**long ago**’ (παλαιῶν, 9.27.5). The Athenians make their meaning quite plain. They ‘consider these arguments perfunctory. In the conclusion to their speech, after pointing to the recent victory at Marathon, they explicitly diminish the argumentative value of the deep past in a typically Herodotean manner’.²⁵⁷

Since Herodotus’ *Histories* were and are used as a record of historical deeds, I would argue that Herodotus is here making a subtle challenge to his poetic predecessors.²⁵⁸ The Athenians dismiss the value of Homeric epic as an instrument in debate or as worthy of

²⁵⁶ Haywood (2022) 82: ‘The Herodotean narrator is more typically cautious than his protagonists in straightforwardly juxtaposing heroic events against more recent ones’.

²⁵⁷ Saïd (2012) 95. On the mythico-political dimension of this debate see Baragwanath and de Bakker (2012) 39. de Bakker (2012) 110 n.13. Bowie (2012) 282-4. See also Tuplin (2022) 340: ‘Once Salamis (as well as Marathon) has happened, Homer was unnecessary’.

²⁵⁸ Though it should be noted, with Grethlein (2012) 14, that: ‘In antiquity [...] the Trojan War and the return of Odysseus were considered historical events’.

consideration. What the Athenians say *is* relevant is the Battle of Marathon, a battle which Herodotus narrates. Herodotus therefore draws an implicit comparison between his own work and that of Homer, a comparison in which Herodotus, naturally, presents his own work's content as coming out on top. This can be seen as playing into Herodotus' wider strategy for bolstering his reputation as a historical chronicler by creating a contrast between the content of his own work and that of his literary antecedent.

1.3.3 Conclusion

Herodotus' use of γέρας differs in a number of significant ways to Homer. Herodotus uses γέρας less than half the number of times of Homer, but this is not the only difference between the two authors' use of the term. The most prominent use of Homeric γέρας was as a status symbol. This was shown to be the possession which marked members of the ruling elite, a use which Herodotus was shown to have adopted. The major distinction between Homeric and Herodotean γέρας in this sense was Herodotus' use of the word to embody the right to rule which a woman could possess, with its use by Pheretime. It was also demonstrated that Herodotus applies the term in a much wider sociological fashion than it is used in Homeric epic. Herodotus also deploys the term to refer to the responsibilities of messengers and the designation of those who hold priesthoods. He seems also to have inherited the other primary use of Homeric γέρας, its use to denote heroic prize, but the context and content of the narratives where the term is used in this way differ from the Homeric original. Thus, the Herodotean use of γέρας, though possessing a number of shared facets with the Homeric meaning, differs greatly from the Homeric antecedent.

1.4.1 Homeric κλέος

The next word to be examined is ‘fame’ (κλέος).²⁵⁹ This is potentially the most highly-charged Homeric term for fame and glory, as Homer creates ‘a universe in which *kleos* (glory) is the highest value’.²⁶⁰ Achilles says he will get ‘undying fame’ (κλέος ἄφθιτον) as the reward for fighting at Troy and compensation for his short life (*Il.* 9.412-6); ‘Achilles chooses *kleos* over life itself, and he owes his heroic identity to this *kleos*’.²⁶¹ Homer uses κλέος 63 times over both epics.²⁶² This frequency is unsurprising. If Achilles, as a central example of the heroes’ self-conceptualisation, values the attaining of ‘fame’ (κλέος) more than a longer life then the regular occurrence of κλέος follows suit.

It should be noted that ‘*kleos* ‘glory’ and *kûdos* are not equivalent’.²⁶³ While the two terms can appear almost synonymous in English translation, the manner and context in which each term is implemented vary. The terms’ etymologies demonstrate this difference and inform the examination of κλέος. ‘Glory’ as denoted by κῦδος is a metaphysical quality used to indicate something which causes wonder and is bestowed by the gods on mortals.²⁶⁴ ‘Fame’ as designated by κλέος is linked with speech. ‘Fame’ (κλέος) is etymologically linked to the verbal forms κλύω = I hear and κλέω = I speak of / celebrate, and denotes that which is spoken about, which explains the wider linguistic connection between κλέος and the Sanskrit term for ‘word’.²⁶⁵ When a character has κλέος, the term’s etymology allows us to understand this in

²⁵⁹ On Homeric κλέος see Kohen (2014) 5-7. Nagy (2005) 88. Nelson (2005) 331. Buchan (2004) 6. Muellner (1996) 154-5. Zanker (1994) 11. Goldhill (1991) 70. Griffin (1980) 95. Nagy (1979). Currie (2004) 71-84, though focussing on Pindar, offers a lot to the discussion of Homeric κλέος.

²⁶⁰ Felson and Slatkin (2004) 92.

²⁶¹ Nagy (2005) 88. See also Nagy (2003) 39-48.

²⁶² *Od.* 1.95, 1.240, 1.283, 1.298, 1.344, 2.125, 2.217, 3.78, 3.83, 3.204, 3.380, 4.584, 4.726, 4.816, 5.311, 7.333, 8.73, 8.74, 8.147, 9.20, 9.264, 13.415, 13.422, 14.370, 16.241, 16.461, 18.126, 18.255, 19.108, 19.128, 19.333, 23.137, 24.33, 24.94, 24.196. *Il.* 2.325, 2.486, 4.197, 4.207, 5.3, 5.172, 5.273, 5.532, 6.446, 7.91, 7.451, 7.458, 8.192, 9.189, 9.413, 9.415, 9.524, 10.212, 11.21, 11.227, 13.364, 15.564, 17.16, 17.131, 17.143, 17.232, 18.121, 22.514.

²⁶³ Benveniste (1969b) 59 (‘*kleos* «gloire» et *kûdos* ne s’équivalent pas’). Redfield (1975) 33.

²⁶⁴ Chantraine s.v. κῦδος.

²⁶⁵ Chantraine s.v. κλέος.

terms of the character being spoken about and, in consequence, others hearing what is being said about them.

Bards, internal and external to the narrative, exemplify this etymology as they sing of κλέος not κῦδος.²⁶⁶ Both Achilles and Demodocus sing not the ‘renowned deeds of men’ (κῦδα ἀνδρῶν) but the ‘famous deeds of men’ (κλέα ἀνδρῶν).²⁶⁷ Homer uses the term κλέος to denote the subject of each bard’s songs; the verbal and aural nature of the songs typifies the term’s etymology by encompassing both of the related linguistic terms (κλύω = I hear and κλέω = I speak of / celebrate) and creates a connection between κλέος and the activities of the bard: the bard’s subject matter is denoted by κλέος.

Homer shares this definition for his own work.²⁶⁸ When he is gearing up to sing the Catalogue of Ships he makes a direct invocation to the Muses:

 speak to me now, Muses, who have your home on Olympia,
 for you are goddesses who are ever-present and know **all** (πάντα),
 but I hear only **fame** (κλέος) and **I know nothing** (οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν) (*Il.* 2.484-6).

Homer distinguishes between the Muses knowing ‘all’ (πᾶς) and his own knowledge which is designated κλέος. The direct address to the Muses breaks the narrative ‘fourth wall’ and draws attention to the text’s performative aspect. Homer is, in effect, stating that he typically performs that which is said about events, their κλέος, but now he is asking the Muses to furnish him with more exact knowledge. Minchin suggests that each epic’s opening invocation highlights the

²⁶⁶ de Jong (2006) describes the Homeric narrator’s own κλέος.

²⁶⁷ Achilles: *Il.* 9.189. Demodocus: *Od.* 8.73-4, ‘the Muse moved the minstrel to sing of **the glorious deeds of men** (κλέα ἀνδρῶν), from that lay **the glory** (κλέος) whereof had then reached broad heaven’. Cf. Phoenix, though not singing, ‘thus we have learnt about the **glorious deeds of heroic men** (κλέα ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων), when violent anger came on one of them’ (*Il.* 9.524-5). See also the prominent place afforded to bards within the text with Hornblower (1994a) 8.

²⁶⁸ Raafaub (2002) 180: ‘Homer sings to preserve the *kleos* of great heroes of the past’.

poem's 'divine source [a]s a guarantee of its authenticity and its quality'.²⁶⁹ While I largely agree, it is hard to reconcile this formulation with the repeated invocations to the Muses in the *Iliad*, as at *Iliad* 2.484-6. If Homer invokes the Muses to ascertain authentic and genuine factual information, are we to assume one invocation is insufficient to sustain the entire performance as the repeated Iliadic references seems to imply? If so, how does this principle operate in the *Odyssey*, where one opening invocation appears to be enough, and why does the *Iliad* require a full six?²⁷⁰ I would argue that the opening invocations are intended to set the scene of the original performance, 'the signal for the audience-to-be to stop talking',²⁷¹ and that the additional Iliadic addresses serve a specific narratological function.

Minchin argues that the Muses function as an addressee who has foreknowledge of the events, a 'knowing recipient'.²⁷² Minchin convincingly compares everyday conversation with the Muses' role in Homeric epic:

when a storyteller is aware of a 'knowing recipient' among his or her listeners, s/he displays uncertainty about events, even though s/he may be confident of the facts: s/he will hesitate, check details, and ask for confirmation. In Homer's telling of the *Iliad*-story we find behaviour of the same kind.²⁷³

Thus, the invocations function as a deference to the Muses' knowledge to reassure the reader of the veracity of the poet's account. At *Iliad* 2.484-6 and at 2.761 these invocations come as part of the Catalogue of Ships; at *Iliad* 11.218-20, the invocation is before Agamemnon's *aristeia* where he swiftly cuts down numerous Trojan foes; at *Iliad* 14.508-10, the invocation

²⁶⁹ Minchin (1995) 27.

²⁷⁰ *Od.* 1.1. *Il.* 1.1, 2.484, 2.761-2, 11.218-20, 14.508-10, 16.112-3.

²⁷¹ Minchin (1995) 27.

²⁷² Minchin (1995) 26-7.

²⁷³ Minchin (1995) 26.

is before Homer names the numerous Achaeans who despoil Trojan corpses. Each instance features a rapid turnaround of factual information and the reference to the Muses reassures the reader of its accuracy. At *Iliad* 16.112-3, the context of the invocation is slightly different. The need to assure the reader of the veracity of the account occurs not because of quick cataloguing, but from the chaotic narrative events. Homer presents the chaos of the fire spreading through the Achaean ships (*Il.* 16.114-23), and so by addressing the Muses, the poet claims divine authority for his account, thus lending it the appearance of truth.

At *Iliad* 2.484-6, Homer invokes the Muses to reassure the reader of the accuracy for the information he is about to relay. Homer categorises the knowledge he would have without the Muses as κλέος. By placing κλέος in apposition to the phrase ‘I know nothing’ (οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν), Homer stresses how little information he would possess if not for his divine inspiration. This makes the reader question how reliable a record denoted as κλέος can be. The etymology of κλέος helps us to understand better the type of knowledge to which Homer refers when he calls it κλέος. The connection of κλέος with verbs of saying and hearing implies that it is an oral and aural form of knowledge, the sorts of things which humans say about events (or indeed people), rather than what necessarily occurred. This is appropriate to the pre-literate world portrayed in the *Iliad*. Whether information reported as κλέος is true or not is immaterial: it is a type of truth as an accepted version of events which is repeated and recounted. This is why the term κλέος is sometimes translated as ‘rumour’.²⁷⁴ Here, Homer references the Muses to reassure the reader that, while he typically draws upon κλέος, he now has factual information from a god. It is hard to see this invocation as ‘a proud and boastful statement [...] boasting that his mind is directly connected’ to the all-knowing Muses.²⁷⁵ Instead, this invocation seems

²⁷⁴ E.g. Lattimore (1965); see *Od.* 1.282 (p.34), *Od.* 16.461 (p.252) and *Od.* 23.137 (p.338).

²⁷⁵ Nagy (2013) 44.

to me one of meekness; the bard is fully aware of his limited knowledge and names the Muses to bolster his reputation.

The lineation of the verses demonstrates this further. Homer says, ‘**you** know all / but **we** hear only fame’ (*Il.* 2.485-6). This proto-epistemological statement on the differing sources of information highlights further the disparity between the Muses’ knowledge and that denoted by κλέος,²⁷⁶ a ranking in which the Muses, as they are in the arrangement of these two verses, come out on top. Achilles and Demodocus can thus sing the ‘famous deeds of men’ (κλέα ἀνδρῶν) as they are human figures with access to κλέος, but Homer has access to the Muses who can grant greater knowledge.

‘Fame’ (κλέος) has a number of inter-related meanings besides denoting the songs of minstrels. The meaning most relevant for this study is ‘heroic glory’.²⁷⁷ By the phrase ‘heroic glory’ I mean more strictly the renown a character receives, or expects to receive, for their achievements. As Hector issues his challenge for single combat, he says that a monument will memorialise the foe he beats and ‘**my fame** (ἐμὸν κλέος) shall never die’ (*Il.* 7.91). Hector expresses a desire to be spoken about for slaying the Achaean champion. He makes this recognition transactional: Hector’s accomplishment, conquering his foe, will result in κλέος for himself. Key here is the emphasis on Hector’s individuality. The singular possessive pronoun ‘my’ (ἐμός) illustrates the individualistic nature of this glory – it is not something which is shared.

This individualistic aspect of κλέος is something more widely applicable. Odysseus attempts to impress Polyphemus by saying his crew were part of Agamemnon’s army: ‘we

²⁷⁶ Pratt (1993) 12: ‘the divine Muses dispense not beauty or poetic inspiration but a knowledge of people and events that would otherwise be inaccessible to a mere mortal’. See also Donelli (2022) 230: ‘the goddesses play [an ...] epistemological role in Homeric poetry’.

²⁷⁷ Where κλέος refers to heroic glory see *Od.* 1.240, 4.584, 5.311, 8.73, 8.74, 9.20, 9.264, 16.241, *Il.* 4.197, 4.207, 5.3, 7.91, 9.189, 9.413, 9.415, 9.524, 10.212, 17.16, 18.121. Cf. *Il.* 5.532 and 15.564, where characters are reminded that failure to undertake action will leave them without κλέος.

boast to be the **people of Agamemnon** (λαοὶ [...] Ἀγαμέμνονος), son of Atreus, **whose fame now is greatest** under the heavens' (τοῦ δὴ νῦν γε μέγιστον ὑπουράνιον κλέος ἐστί, *Od.* 9.263-4). Even while claiming to be a part of this company, λαός, the singular genitive pronoun τοῦ demonstrates that the resultant κλέος belongs to one person: Agamemnon. Though a multitude can contribute to, and are largely responsible for, Agamemnon's κλέος, it is his individual property.

In the Homeric world of heroic achievement and hyper-masculinity,²⁷⁸ there is still opportunity for one female agent to attain κλέος: Penelope.²⁷⁹ After Amphimedon outlines Penelope's loom trick, Agamemnon says 'on account of this **her glory** (οἱ κλέος) for **excellence** (ἀρετῆς) shall never die' (*Od.* 24.196-7). Penelope gains κλέος not through agonistic combat but through weaving Laertes' shroud to delay remarriage. Agamemnon uses the positive term 'excellence' (ἀρετή, see pp.24-5), to lavish praise on Penelope as he ascribes κλέος to her for her fidelity. Penelope is a Homeric anomaly as the only female character whose actions result in κλέος.

Does the attribution of κλέος to Penelope mean that we are to deem her as heroic on, and in, the same terms as other Homeric heroes? I think so. Penelope's domestic accomplishment – the stalwart defence of her household's integrity against the insatiable suitors – demonstrates the *Odyssey's* 'dialectical relation to the *Iliad* in terms of the sex-gender system'.²⁸⁰ The *Iliad's* focus on militaristic achievement enforces the male societal roles of warfare. The *Odyssey* reinforces the domiciliary function of its female actors, and Penelope chief among them. Each gender within the text has its own distinct role to play in Homeric

²⁷⁸ Graziosi and Haubold (2003). See also Bassi (2003) 33-7 for a similar linguistic approach to that of Graziosi and Haubold. Ransom (2011).

²⁷⁹ Redfield (1975) 33: '*kudos* belongs only to men, *kleos* also to women'. On the Homeric Penelope see Lesser (2019). Nickel (2010). Clayton (2004). Felson and Slatkin (2004) 103-13. Foley (1995). Zeitlin (1995). Felson (1994) Pomeroy (1994) 17-31. Katz (1991). Winkler (1990) 129-61. Murnaghan (1986). Marquardt (1985). Van Nortwick (1979).

²⁸⁰ Felson and Slatkins (2004) 112.

culture. Penelope's heroism 'sustains the *oikos* and protects the continuity of her husband's patriliney'.²⁸¹ Penelope's actions are entirely appropriate to her gender in the Homeric sex-gender structure:²⁸² 'where Odysseus is the *Odyssey*'s hero, his wife Penelope is its heroine'.²⁸³ The poet's use of κλέος in relation to Penelope suggests as much.

Not only is κλέος applied to Penelope, but she is also one of the characters to whom κλέος is most often applied across both epics. Homer uses the term in relation to Penelope five times,²⁸⁴ and this total is beaten only by Odysseus (eight times)²⁸⁵ and Hector (six times).²⁸⁶ Neither of these frequencies is entirely unexpected. Odysseus is the *Odyssey*'s central protagonist and characters often use κλέος to speak of his reputation in his absence (p.99 and p.257). Similarly, Hector is the Achaeans' main opponent. What is more astonishing is the number of characters who Penelope's tally beats: Telemachus (three times, *Od.* 1.95, 3.78, 13.422), Orestes (twice, *Od.* 1.298 and 3.204), Nestor (once, *Od.* 3.380), Agamemnon (twice, *Od.* 4.584 and 9.264), Alcinous (once, *Od.* 7.333), Amphinomus' father (once, *Od.* 18.126), Pandarus (three times, *Il.* 4.197, 4.207, 5.172²⁸⁷), Diomedes (once, *Il.* 5.3), Poseidon (once, *Il.* 7.458), and Meleager's heroic generation (once, *Il.* 9.524). Penelope's κλέος outnumbers key

²⁸¹ Felson and Slatkins (2004) 112.

²⁸² Finley (1956) 32-3: 'Penelope became a moral heroine for later generations, the embodiment of goodness and chastity, to be contrasted with the faithless, murdering Clytaemnestra, Agamemnon's wife; but 'hero' has no feminine gender in the age of heroes'.

²⁸³ Lesser (2019) 195.

²⁸⁴ *Od.* 2.125, 18.255, 19.108, 19.128, 24.196.

²⁸⁵ Where characters use κλέος to describe the reputation of Odysseus as obtained, see *Od.* 1.283, 1.344, 3.83, 4.726, 4.816, 9.20, 13.415, 16.241. Where the κλέος of Odysseus is described in hypothetical terms of what he could have achieved, e.g., at *Od.* 1.240 'then, **would** (κέν) all the Achaeans have made him a tomb, and he **would** (κε) have won great glory in days to come, and for his son', I quote lines 239-40 to provide the whole hypothetical statement. The two other hypothetical uses of κλέος for Odysseus are *Od.* 5.311 and 14.37.

²⁸⁶ I exclude from this and the following totals those hypothetical statements towards attaining κλέος (*Od.* 1.240, 5.311, 14.370 and 24.33. *Il.* 5.273 and 17.17) as the κλέος has yet to be achieved. Odysseus' κλέος: *Od.* 1.283, 1.344, 3.83, 4.726, 4.816, 9.20, 13.415, 16.241. Hector's κλέος: *Il.* 6.446, 7.91, 17.131 (though as a physical manifestation (the armour) which is an atypical representation of κλέος), 17.143, 17.232 (though here Hector says this κλέος will be shared with Hector himself), 22.514 (again the burning of physical possessions functions as a demonstration of κλέος).

²⁸⁷ This use, however, entails Aeneas encouraging Pandarus asking where is his κλέος is and to attack whoever is harming the Trojans.

Homeric figures such as the Achaean leader Agamemnon, Meleager's generation (the heroic past), and the god Poseidon!²⁸⁸ Most striking of all has to be that Penelope's count outstrips that of Achilles (four times),²⁸⁹ whose '*kleos* is in fact the story which the *Iliad* recounts'.²⁹⁰ While frequency alone does not decipher the magnitude of Penelope's κλέος, it is instructive in quantitative terms. I would argue, therefore, that Homer intends us to view Penelope as heroic, just not exhibiting the same type of heroism as the male characters.²⁹¹

Homer's literary milieu illuminates the ascription of (positive) κλέος to Penelope. While this is a comparative study primarily focussed on Herodotus' use of Homer's vocabulary of heroism, Homer's contemporary poetic context demonstrates the standard against which he is working as he assigns κλέος to Penelope. The fragments of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* details numerous women who slept with gods and did not remain faithful to their husbands.²⁹² The opening five lines describe this well:

And now sing of the tribe of women, sweet-voiced
 Olympian Muses, [daughters of aegis-bearing Zeus,
 those who were then best [and most beautiful on the earth,
 and they **loosened their girdles** [and through golden Aphrodite

²⁸⁸ Poseidon is exceptional among the gods for having κλέος. Zeus reassures Poseidon that his κλέος (*Il.* 7.458) is greater than the κλέος Poseidon claims for the wall (*Il.* 7.451). Precisely how seriously we are to take this ascription of κλέος to Poseidon is uncertain. Considering Poseidon's vehemence at an inanimate object, as well as the source of Poseidon's strong sense that the wall he built while in service to Laomedon has been forgotten, a surely embarrassing period for the god, I would argue that we are not to take this ascription at face value.

²⁸⁹ *Od.* 24.94. *Il.* 9.413, 9.415, 18.121, although Achilles does not follow through with this claim to go into battle and win this κλέος.

²⁹⁰ Edwards (1985) 78.

²⁹¹ Schein (1995) 22-3: 'an oikos can generate the land of glory that in the *Iliad* and the Iliadic poetic tradition comes only from heroic warfare'. Schein, however, does not connect κλέος and Penelope's action.

²⁹² Asquith (2005) 273: 'The women selected in what we possess of the catalogue seem to be notorious, rather than being paradigms of *kleos*'. See also West (1985). Rutherford (2000) 81-93 esp. 91, where Rutherford suggests a potential connection to *Iliad* 14.313-28. (the catalogue of Zeus' lovers).

sleeping with gods...[

(Νῦν δὲ γυναικῶν [φῶλον αἰείσατε, ἡδυνέπειαι

Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδε[ς, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο,

αἱ τότε ἄρισται ἔσαν [καὶ κάλλισται κατὰ γαῖαν

μίτρας τ' ἀλλύσαντο διὰ χρυσέην τ' Ἀφροδίτην

μισγόμεναι θεο[ῖσιν]) (Hes. *Cat. Frag.* 1 1.1-5).

Even if we reject Merkelbach-West's textual emendations, as indicated by the square parentheses above, this text foregrounds the promiscuous nature of its female subjects in the double reference to actions of a sexual nature in 'they loosened their girdles' (μίτρας τ' ἀλλύσαντο, Hes. *Cat. Frag.* 1 1.4) and in 'they [sc. The women, (and women too as indicated by the feminine gender of the participle)] slept with the gods' (μισγόμεναι θεο[...], Hes. *Cat. Frag.* 1 1.5); the extant morpheme θεο[...] must surely denote gods given the later references in lines 17-8 and 20-22 to Poseidon, Ares, Hephaestus, Hermes and Heracles, and the overall subject of the poem. As salacious female figures feature prominently in a contemporary poem, a context is thus created in which the Homeric Penelope's κλέος, requires considerable qualification to remain positive.

We can see elements of this wider narrative of negative female κλέος in the *Odyssey*.²⁹³ The well-known catalogue of scandalous women in the *Odyssey*'s 'Nekyia' (*Od.* 11.225-329), including figures such as Alcmena, Leda, and Phaedra, creates κλέος for women who were famously unfaithful to their husbands by incorporating them in the catalogue of souls who greet Odysseus. Arete enjoys Odysseus' narrative (*Od.* 11.336-41) and this enjoyment may express recollections of the sorts of epic narratives sung in some traditional societies by women.²⁹⁴

²⁹³ Gazis (2015). Larson (2000). Rutherford (2000) 93-6. Steinrück (1994). Northrup (1980). Nagy (1979) 213-4.

²⁹⁴ Hall (2008) 115. With: Doherty (1991) 145-6.

Amid this literary context, Homer needs, and does, stress that Penelope's κλέος is favourable, especially considering the alternate *Odyssey* narrative where Penelope sleeps with all the suitors.²⁹⁵

Homer goes to lengths to stress that Penelope's κλέος is good. This highlights another aspect of κλέος: its use to denote character's reputations in the Homeric world.²⁹⁶ Helpful here is Redfield's formulation that κλέος 'is in the keeping of others; a man's *kleos* consists of what others say about him',²⁹⁷ which aligns with the term's etymology (pp.89-90). Each time κλέος refers to Penelope's actions it is in a positive capacity. Antinous first mentions Penelope's κλέος (*Od.* 2.125) when he describes her loom trick, the very act which maintained her fidelity to Odysseus. Penelope articulates the next occurrence: 'if that man [Odysseus] returned and looked after my affairs, **greater** (μειζόν) would be my **fame** (κλέος) and **fairer** (κάλλιον)' (*Od.* 18.254-5). Penelope uses positive comparative adjectives 'greater' (μειζόν) and 'fairer' (κάλλιον) to describe how her κλέος would increase, if/when Odysseus returns. This appears to be a stock answer which Penelope has prepared as Penelope replies to Odysseus' own claim that her κλέος reaches the heavens (*Od.* 19.108)²⁹⁸ with the same lines later on (*Od.* 19.127-8 = 18.254-5). This shows Penelope's awareness of the social role of κλέος in the construction

²⁹⁵ We find vestiges of this storyline in the *Odyssey* with her dream about the geese and the eagle *Od.* 19.535-53. Buchan (2004) 266 n.29 comments: 'Odysseus presses the connection between geese and suitors (in order to realize his own desire, their death), he is forced to drag along with him the affection of Penelope for them'. On this alternate version see Nelson (2021) 43. Slatkin (2005) 325. Fredricksmeyer (1997) 494-5. For a commentary on the dream see Rozokoki (2001). With: de Jong (2001) 480-1. See also Fredricksmeyer (1997) for the wider narrative of Penelope's promiscuity resulting in the god Pan: to this study p.494 I owe the following references: Hdt. 2.145, *FrGrHist* 76 F21, *FrGrHist* 1 F371, Pind. (Snell) Frag. 100. See also more widely Thuc. 2.45.2: 'Your great virtue is to show no more weakness than is inherent in your nature, and to cause least talk (κλέος) among males for either praise or blame.' Trans. Hammond (2009).

²⁹⁶ *Od.* 1.95, 1.344, 3.78, 3.83, 3.204, 4.726, 4.816, 7.333, 13.422, 14.370, 18.126, 18.255, 19.108, 19.128, 19.333, 24.33, 24.94, 24.196. *Il.* 5.172, 5.273, 6.446, 7.458, 17.143, 17.232. At *Il.* 22.514 Andromache burns Hector's possessions as a physical demonstration of Hector's κλέος and show his internal reputation.

²⁹⁷ Redfield (1975) 33.

²⁹⁸ Pucci (1987) 219 comments that 'The *Odyssey* – and its tradition – must be at the origin of that *kleos*, for in the *Iliad* Penelope has no *kleos* at all, since she is never mentioned'.

of societal character. The last attribution of κλέος to Penelope has already been mentioned (p.94), but it is important to note that Agamemnon qualifies κλέος with the attributive use of ‘excellence’ (ἀρετή) while contrasting Penelope’s devotion to the behaviour of Clytemnestra, whom Agamemnon does not even name (*Od.* 24.199-202). Homer, therefore,

does not tackle such problematic traditions [sc. Of female unfaithfulness] head-on but rather skirts round them by positioning Penelope against the infidelity and sexual transgressions of other mythical women.²⁹⁹

Here, this is made explicit with the periphrastic reference to Clytemnestra.

Jones employs Redfield’s formulation, and makes a convincing case for its use in relation to Telemachus, resolving the puzzling use of κλέος at *Odyssey* 1.95.³⁰⁰ Jones argues that the κλέος Athene says Telemachus will receive from his travels is a demonstration of his own identity as Odysseus’ son. Telemachus doubts whether Odysseus is his father (e.g., *Od.* 1.215-6), but by travelling to see Nestor, Helen, and Menelaus, who all comment on Telemachus’ likeness to his father (*Od.* 3.120-5, 4.141-6 and 4.148-50 respectively), Telemachus is reassured about his parenthood by listening to what others say about him.

Hector verbalises the constraints the potential to gain a negative κλέος places on an individual when replying to Andromache’s pleas to take command at a distance: ‘Woman, **I too have considered all this** (ἐμοὶ τάδε πάντα μέλει), but **I would feel shame** (αἰδέομαι) dreadfully before the **Trojan men and women** (Τρῶας καὶ Τρωάδας)’ (*Il.* 6.441-2). By drawing attention to the spectators of his status, the Trojan men and women (Τρῶας καὶ Τρωάδας), Hector’s statement highlights his concern for public opinion. Further, Hector says

²⁹⁹ Nelson (2021) 43.

³⁰⁰ Jones (1988). Cf. Patzer (1991) 18, who misses this nuance and is more dismissive of the sociological dimension of κλέος.

that if he were to dictate orders from afar, he would ‘feel shame’ (αἰδέομαι). Hector raises another important aspect of Homeric society: shame-culture.³⁰¹ Segal suggests,

in a shame-culture, like that of the society depicted in Homer, where esteem depends on how one is viewed and talked of by one’s peers, *kleos* is fundamental as a measure of one’s value to others and to oneself.³⁰²

It is in this context that Hector says he would ‘feel shame’ (αἰδέομαι) that the term κλέος appears. Hector says that he ‘trained himself to always be brave’ (*Il.* 6.446) so that he could ‘win **great fame** (μέγα κλέος) for my father and for **myself** (αὐτοῦ, *Il.* 6.446)’. The attributive adjective ‘great’ (μέγας), while functioning as a descriptor of the magnitude of his fame, can also operate to reflect Hector’s desire for good repute, since μέγας can also mean ‘great’ in a positive sense. Hector’s compulsion to win κλέος is not purely through an individual desire to attain martial excellence; shame also plays a part.³⁰³ It forms part of a wider dichotomy between the actions which Hector would like to undertake (safely commanding his forces from afar) and that which he must perform because of fears of how he would be perceived by his community. Κλέος, then, is not only entangled with questions of individual exceptionality, and heroism, but operates on a much wider cultural scale.

³⁰¹ On Homeric shame culture see Buchan (2004) 167: ‘Odysseus accuses the suitors of lacking *aidos* the sense of shame that structures a community (*Od.* 20.171). *Aidos* functions as the recognition of the impossibility of pure enjoyment, of having it all; one’s place in the social is determined by a sacrifice, and *aidos* – the ‘shame’ felt before others – reminds each social individual of the sacrifice that is constitutive of the social. It functions as an injunction of restraint’. Zanker (1994) 4 and 28, more generally 16-8, 25-7 and 37-9 for shame as a basis for cooperation. van Wees (1992) 67. Schein (1984) 177: ‘*Aidos* is both an individual and a social concept; it is an internal, emotional impulse toward correct behavior [sic.] in conformity with what is expected of one by others’. Segal (1983) 22. Redfield (1975). See also Cairns (1993) for *aidos* more generally.

³⁰² Segal (1983) 22.

³⁰³ Shame acting as a trigger to heroic action in Homeric epic: *Il.* 4.401-2, 6.441-5, 18.179-80, 22.104-7. See also *Il.* 4.242: Agamemnon also encourages the troops with a sense of shame (though here the verb σέβομαι is instead used).

This securing of a good opinion is crucial as Homeric characters know that they will die, and live in hope that their κλέος will outlive them.³⁰⁴ Agamemnon reassures Achilles, ‘thus not in dying did you lose your name, but **always** (αἰεὶ) you will have noble **fame** (κλέος) among all men, Achilles’ (*Od.* 24.93-4). The temporal adverb ‘always’ (αἰεὶ) has an iterative effect which implies that Achilles shall never be forgotten.³⁰⁵ The perpetuation of one’s κλέος consoles Homeric heroes, whose vision of the Underworld is decidedly ‘dark and murky’.³⁰⁶ There is a peculiar sense of audience satisfaction which arises from the character’s desire to be remembered operating at the level of narrative irony: Homeric heroes’ desire to be remembered ‘is fulfilled every time the poem is recited or read’.³⁰⁷

‘Fame’ (κλέος) also has two quotidian uses applied in Homeric discourse to create an elevated effect. The first is its use to mean ‘news’ in the sense of current affairs.³⁰⁸ Odysseus instructs the bard to commence playing, ‘lest the **news** (κλέος) of the killing of the suitors becomes wide-spread through the city’ (*Od.* 23.137-8). And so, to stop the κλέος which is oral/aural in nature from spreading, Odysseus blocks it out with something else audible.³⁰⁹ The second everyday use of κλέος is its application to non-human entities to increase their perceived value, though this seems to be an Iliadic quirk.³¹⁰ Whether κλέος is used to refer to ‘news’ or

³⁰⁴ On κλέος as remembrance after death see *Od.* 1.240, 4.584, 5.311, 14.370, 24.33, 24.94. At *Od.* 24.196 the κλέος of Penelope is implied to continue posthumously through the negation of the temporal particle ποτέ. *Il.* 7.91. At *Il.* 2.325, as at *Od.* 24.196, there is a negation of the temporal particle ποτέ which implies that the κλέος of the portent of the sparrows will be perpetuated.

³⁰⁵ Cf. Gazis (2018) 182: ‘And yet, in the *Odyssey* [sc. *Odyssey* 11], the hero [sc. Achilles] appears to renounce his choice of *kleos* in favour of a long and uneventful life’.

³⁰⁶ Gazis (2018) 14, though Gazis focusses on *Odyssey* 11.

³⁰⁷ Rutherford (1992) 17.

³⁰⁸ κλέος means ‘news’ at Hom *Od.* 1.283, 1.298, 2.217, 13.415, 16.461, 23.137. *Il.* 11.21, 11.227, 13.364.

³⁰⁹ Odysseus’ urgency is slightly unwarranted as the other use of κλέος to mean ‘news’ shows that κλέος does not travel quickly: Idomeneus kills Othryoneus ‘who had recently arrived following the news (κλέος) of war’ (*Il.* 13.364) - while the war is in its tenth year.

³¹⁰ κλέος is applied to non-human entities at *Il.* 2.325 (the portent of the sparrow and the serpent), 7.451 (the Achaean trench), 8.192 (Nestor’s shield), 17.131 (Achilles’ armour Patroclus was wearing), 22.514 (the clothes Andromache will burn to be a κλέος for the now dead Hector).

other non-human ‘things’, this is a much more mundane usage of the term than its other occurrences in Homeric epic.

Homeric κλέος, then, has an important role in the linguistic arsenal for depicting Homeric fame. Homeric κλέος is not only the realm of the bard, but is also the term used to denote bardic knowledge. The term has its more conventionally acknowledged meaning of ‘heroic glory’, in the sense of the result of achievement, but noticeably, as I have shown, this is the achievement of an individual. It was argued that, despite the egregiously masculine landscape of the Homeric poems, there is room for a woman to gain κλέος, namely Penelope. Further, it was argued that Penelope’s unwavering resolve to maintain her marriage was depicted as a heroic action and one appropriate to a Homeric woman. The wider role of κλέος as a constituent part in the wider Homeric culture has been noted, particularly in relation to Homeric shame-culture, but more broadly to denote an individual’s reputation with other Homeric characters.

1.4.2 Herodotean κλέος

Herodotus’ use of κλέος is slightly different from Homer’s. Herodotus only uses κλέος four times.³¹¹ As with κῦδος and γέρας, the term’s frequency is the first point of difference. This is, though, perhaps the most surprising absence from the Herodotean word palette, especially considering the prominent place given to the cognate ‘without glory’ (ἀκλεᾶ, 1.1.0) in the Prologue. Further, ‘*kleos* has been acknowledged as a major obvious hinge between the world of Homer and Herodotus’.³¹² And so, it is truly striking that Herodotus does not use κλέος more often. It might be that it forms part of Herodotus’ technique to hold κλέος in reserve for only those very special narrative occasions to stress their importance, but this is not the case.

³¹¹ 7.220.2, 7.220.4, 9.48.3 and 9.78.2.

³¹² Fragoulaki (2022) 145.

It is in no quotidian scenes which feature κλέος, but two of the major battles of the entire Persian War campaign: the Battles of Thermopylae and Plataea. Homer does not selectively deploy κλέος to maximise its impact, but rather uses the term liberally throughout both epics. Further, Tuplin notes that ‘only Spartans achieve *kleos* in Herodotus’,³¹³ and as the formidable martial heroes of the *Histories*, this application makes sense. Tuplin’s demarcation, however, can be narrowed even further: it is exclusively Spartan men who achieved κλέος. Already we can note another point of difference between Herodotus and Homer’s use of κλέος. Herodotus limits κλέος to men whereas Homer also had Penelope, a woman, attain favourable κλέος.

The Herodotean appearance of κλέος which excites the most scholarly attention is its occurrence in the Battle of Thermopylae. Κλέος occurs after the first bout of fighting, after Ephialtes has betrayed the back passage (7.213-9), when ‘**it is said** (λέγεται) Leonidas, himself **concerned** (κηδόμενος) for them, sent them [sc. his allies] away lest they died’ (7.220.1). It is worth stressing that this section is presented through indirect discourse. This chapter begins ‘it is said’ (λέγεται, 7.220.1), which ‘is a legitimate warning, easily passed over, that Herodotus does not vouch for what followed’.³¹⁴ Indirect discourse highlights that it is second-hand information, i.e. it is not Herodotus’ own narrative, and thus raises questions regarding the account’s veracity. This is especially significant as λέγεται does not feature in the Salamis and Plataea narratives after their introductory sections.³¹⁵ Lupi’s suggestion that ‘the ‘it is said’ (λέγεται) placed at the beginning of 7.220 serves to introduce the official Spartan explanation’ for why the allies left is tempting,³¹⁶ though there is no Herodotean textual evidence to support

³¹³ Tuplin (2022) 317.

³¹⁴ Lateiner (1989) 22. Waterfield (2009) 489. Shrimpton (1997) 112: ‘A reason for Herodotus’ assigning of material to a source was not always to verify the information; it could have been to distance himself from it’.

³¹⁵ Oliver (2017) 20.

³¹⁶ Lupi (2014) 355 (‘il «si dice» (λέγεται) posto all’inizio di 7. 220 serve ad introdurre la spiegazione ufficiale spartana’).

this theory. In any case, what is interesting is how this reported narrative presents Leonidas as an almost benevolent figure. He chooses to send away his fellow fighters out of ‘concern’ (κήδω, 7.220.1). This would create a favourable impression of the Spartan king if it were not for the preceding λέγεται distracting from its authenticity.

Herodotus then gives an alternative version of the allies’ dismissal. Herodotus prefaces this report with ‘this I myself think **most** (πλεῖστος) about this opinion which is **much better** (μᾶλλον)’ (7.220.2). It is difficult to capture both emphatic parts of speech ‘much better’ (μᾶλλον) and ‘most’ (πλεῖστος) in English translation, but combined they demonstrate that Herodotus endorses this amongst the alternative reasons. The other motive for sending away the allies but the Spartans remaining, Herodotus says, is that ‘to go away would not be seemly: but if he remained there, great **fame** (κλέος) **would be left behind** (ἐλείπετο), and the prosperity of Sparta not obliterated’ (7.220.2). At first sight this all seems very Homeric: there is an upcoming battle and there is the prospect of κλέος being won. However, it is uncertain to whom the κλέος will fall: ‘the Greeks, the Spartans, or Leonidas himself’.³¹⁷ While I agree that the third person verbal form ἐλείπετο can plausibly be translated as ‘a middle construction indicating Leonidas’ voice and agency — ‘he would leave behind great glory’’,³¹⁸ the textual ambiguity remains.

In Homeric epic, however, when κλέος is achieved, there is no doubt who attains it. The one exception occurs when Menelaus is shot following his duel with Paris. Agamemnon ascribes κλέος as he exclaims ‘**someone** (τις), skilled with the bow, has shot [Menelaus] some Trojan or Lycian, to them **fame** (κλέος) but despair to us’ (*Il.* 4.196-7.). The ‘someone’ (τις) who gets the κλέος is anonymous to Agamemnon. The reader, though, knows who receives the κλέος: Athene encouraged Pandarus to fire (*Il.* 4.93-103). For such a prized Homeric concept,

³¹⁷ Barker (2022) 193.

³¹⁸ Barker (2022) 193.

the imprecision of the middle-passive voice makes Herodotus' attribution of κλέος unclear in a situation where we might expect razor-sharp precision, especially considering that Herodotus scarcely deploys the term.

Herodotus then presents another motivating factor for Leonidas' actions at Thermopylae. Herodotus reports that there was an oracle which stated that 'either (ἢ) Lacedaemonia become ruined by the barbarian **or** (ἢ) the king would die' (7.220.3). Herodotus gives this oracle in both indirect discourse, as just quoted, followed by an exact quotation of the oracle (7.220.4). By recounting the oracle's content, twice and in quick succession, Herodotus both highlights its importance and orientates the reader's approach to the narrative with this oracle in mind. The meaning of this oracle has been fruitfully examined and to great effect.³¹⁹ I am less concerned here with any specific interpretation of the oracle itself, but instead with the way it shapes how we view Leonidas and his actions. The 'either...or' (ἢ...ἢ) construction, which is replicated in both direct and indirect quotations of the oracle, presents the events following the oracle as two mutually exclusive outcomes. 'Either' (ἢ) a Spartan king will die 'or' (ἢ) Sparta will fall to the barbarian. The oracle removes Leonidas' agency and thus presents Leonidas as effectively going through the motions to fulfil the oracle. Further, I would argue that the oracle here functions as one of what Baragwanath calls 'suggestions [...] of motives that set a rather ambivalent and downbeat tone'.³²⁰ Leonidas' decision to stay is framed not with a sense of heroic gumption, but instead a sense of resignation to undertake what is, in effect, a suicide mission.

³¹⁹ Lupi (2014) in particular sees this oracle as part of a wider narrative through the use of oracles which heroised Leonidas. Vannicelli (2012) 261-2. Bowie (2012) 274 n.18. Baragwanath (2012) 297. See especially Pelling (2006a) 93 n. 48: 'even the wording of the oracle at 220.4 has more in common with the *Iliad* sequence than its metre: cf. its last two lines with *Il.* 17.502-4'.

³²⁰ Baragwanath (2008) 68.

The second occurrence of κλέος features in relation to this oracle. Herodotus presents ‘Leonidas **pondering** (ἐπιλεγόμενον) these matters [i.e. the oracle], and wanting **fame** (κλέος) to be set down for the **Spartans alone** (μόνων Σπαρτιτῶν), he sent the allies away’ (7.220.4). Leonidas ‘ponders’ (ἐπιλέγω) the oracle and, to maximise the resultant κλέος for himself and the Spartans, sends the allies away. Leonidas’ response to the oracle can be considered very Homeric. Achilles, in his final showdown with Hector, gestures to stop another Achaean from taking away his glory (*Il.* 22.205-7).³²¹ Both instances feature characters dismissing others to attain greater repute for themselves. Pelling, in an important chapter on the relationship between Herodotus and Homer discussing this example of κλέος, suggests:³²²

Now the *kleos* to be ‘laid down’ is that ‘of the Spartans’: it is no longer a matter just of individual glory, but to be part of a group, one of Three Hundred Spartans [...] individual glory still matters—this is *kleos* ‘for him’ [Sc. Leonidas]—but it is more directly, or at least [...] more explicitly, intertwined with the fate of his community.³²³

I agree with Pelling that the individual ‘heroic’ κλέος has become diluted to become part of a collective effort, but as a result I do not think that we can simultaneously read individual glory for Leonidas.³²⁴ To me these options seem mutually exclusive. Barker examines the manuscript variant μόνον, in the accusative singular, as opposed to the plural μόνων, so that this alternate form would agree with the accusative singular ‘Leonidas’ (Λεωνίδην). This would yield individual, Homeric-style, κλέος for Leonidas, but ‘the repetition of μόνος [...] makes for uncomfortable reading’ and is ‘jarring’.³²⁵ Instead, I would argue that we are to see the κλέος

³²¹ Although the term is κῦδος rather than κλέος the result is the same.

³²² Pelling (2006a).

³²³ Pelling (2006a) 95.

³²⁴ Low (2011) 8 notes that: Leonidas’ ‘glory was isolated for particular praise by Simonides’.

³²⁵ Barker (2022) 194.

referring to the Spartans as a political identity – something key for the following example of Herodotean κλέος.

The next Herodotean use of κλέος features before the Battle of Plataea. The preceding narrative context influences how we read κλέος, so I shall outline it briefly. Pausanias suggests to the Athenians that they rearrange the battle lines so that the Athenians are opposing the Persians, rather than the Spartans, as the Athenians have experience of fighting the Persians from the Battle of Marathon (9.46.2-3). As the realignment of troops is underway, Mardonius ‘immediately essayed to make the change himself’ (9.47). Pausanias, however, perceiving the change to Persians’ arrangement, changes his position back to the original wing (9.47). In response, Mardonius once again moves to be opposite the Spartans thus both sides were now ‘in their earlier formation’ (9.48.1). Similar to the Battle of Sepeia (pp.58-61), the beginning of the fighting is chaotic. Where this battle differs, though, is in scale. This is one of the most, if not *the* most, central battles of the Persian Wars, not a fight between two individual *poleis*. Herodotus may be forgiven for creating a fumbling mess when it is two Greek city-states doing battle, but this farcical (humorous?) depiction of the allied Greek states’ main fighting force, namely the Spartans, completely undercuts the heroism of it all.

Mardonius capitalises on this with his message to the Spartans, pointedly using the term κλέος to do so. Mardonius says he feels misled:

these are not the actions of brave men; in fact, we have been greatly deceived in you. We expected, **based on your reputation** (κατὰ κλέος), for you to send a messenger to us challenging us **to fight against the Persians alone** (μόνοισι Πέρσησι μάχεσθαι, 9.48.3).

Mardonius expected to be challenged to a duel in Homeric style, perhaps like that of Paris (*Il.* 3.15-20) or Hector (*Il.* 7.67-91), where the Spartans would fight the Persians ‘alone’ (μόνος).

Mardonius expected this based on the Spartans' κλέος. In the etymological sense of the term, it seems that Leonidas' decision to remain at Thermopylae to leave behind κλέος worked. Mardonius has heard about the formidable fighting prowess of the Spartans and this, presumably, is due to the Spartans' actions at Thermopylae.³²⁶ I accede to Tuplin that 'it is Herodotus who makes [Mardonius] use the significant word *kleos* and I cannot see it mattered to the historian that we might imagine Mardonius actually used it'.³²⁷ While it does not make any real difference whether the *historical* Mardonius used the word κλέος, the effect of the *narrative character* Mardonius using the term is massive. Mardonius uses the same word, κλέος, to highlight the Spartan's apparent lack of heroism where at Thermopylae it reflected their heroism. Thus, Mardonius raises doubts about their reputation, since 'nothing could contrast more with Leonidas than the shambles of the Spartan troop-movements at Plataea, to and fro in front of the enemy's eyes'.³²⁸

Mardonius' use of κλέος also plays to Homeric tropes – just not the type of κλέος the Spartans perhaps would like. It was argued, (pp.92-3), that Homeric κλέος represents a lower quality of knowledge and that κλέος lays no claim to veracity: it is merely a replication of what others say about a particular person, event, or thing. Herodotus, through Mardonius, plays on this ambiguity. The Spartans' κλέος for being excellently brave warriors is just a replication of what people say – there might be no truth to the matter. To a large extent it does not matter whether Mardonius 'doubtless knew of Sparta's reputation',³²⁹ or whether he was 'unaware of Spartan heroism'³³⁰ at Thermopylae as the reader of the *Histories* is. Mardonius' taunt

³²⁶ Stadter (2006) 245 notes that the Spartans at Thermopylae resemble Herodotus' vision that, if the Athenians had gone over to the Persians, the Spartans 'being left alone, after performing great deeds, died nobly' (7.139.3).

³²⁷ Tuplin (2022) 302 n.41.

³²⁸ Pelling (2006a) 95.

³²⁹ Tuplin (2022) 302 n.41.

³³⁰ Flower and Marincola (2002) 194, for commentary on κατὰ κλέος (9.48.3) give only the translation 'in accordance with your reputation'.

encourages the reader to see the Spartans not as perfect Homeric heroes but instead as ‘reflect[ing] the fact that these events belong to contemporary history, not epic’.³³¹

Lampon applies the last Herodotean use of κλέος to Pausanias after the Battle of Plataea. Lampon addresses Pausanias:

‘O **son of Cleombrotus** (παῖ Κλεομβρότου), **you have excelled** (ὑπερφυές) in doing this deed of greatness and beauty [...] the **greatest** (μέγιστον) **famous act** (κλέος) of all the Greeks we know of has been set down’ (9.78.2).

This scene is very Homeric. The patronymic phrase ‘son of Cleombrotus’ (παῖ Κλεομβρότου) reminds the reader of the parallel patronymic designations of Homeric epic. The second singular ‘you have excelled’ (ὑπερφυές) also creates the impression that the κλέος mentioned belongs to Pausanias alone, rather than to a collective. Moreover, the superlative adjective ‘greatest’ (μέγιστος) attached to κλέος heightens the sense and scale of Pausanias’ κλέος. In many ways, Lampon’s words are a fitting conclusion to the final large-scale battle of the Persian Wars: a laudation to rival a Homeric hero.

Lampon’s next words, however, present another opportunity for a Homericism but Pausanias declines. Lampon says to Pausanias that ‘**you must do** (ποιήσον) the remainder’ (9.78.2); the ‘remainder’ is to behead Mardonius’ corpse in recompense for the mutilation of Leonidas (7.238.1).³³² Lampon’s imperative creates a tone of urgency as though this is something Pausanias can neither delay or ignore. Achilles acts precisely in this way: Achilles immediately mutilates the defeated Hector’s corpse (*Il.* 22.395-404). Were Pausanias to concede, it would develop his Homeric characterisation. Pausanias, however, declines. He

³³¹ Carey (2016) 83.

³³² Low (2011) 11: ‘We see an attempt to create an intrinsic link between the battles of Thermopylae and Plataea’.

seems almost outraged at the suggestion, ‘the very thing you suggest to do is **better suited to barbarians** (μᾶλλον βαρβάροις) **than to Greeks** (ἢ περ Ἑλλήσι, 9.79.1). Instead of more strongly associating himself with Homeric precedent, we see Pausanias instead ‘entirely reject the Iliadic model’.³³³ Additionally, as ‘Pausanias reject[s] advice to crucify [sic.] the Persian general (9.79), [he] does so in words that recall Odysseus’ rebuke of Eurycleia for exulting over the death of the suitors’³³⁴ (*Od.* 22.411-8). Pausanias ‘trumps Lampon’s Homeric [sic.] with something of his own’,³³⁵ and instrumentalises Homer to bolster his argument *against* Lampon’s suggestion. The behaviour Lampon describes was once Homeric, but it is now the action of a barbarian (βάρβαρος, 9.79.1) and ‘Pausanias will have none of it’.³³⁶

Herodotus also frames this scene with two others which actively characterise Pausanias in opposition to Homeric heroes. Before Lampon’s speech, Herodotus tells the reader how a *παλλακή* (9.76.1), a word Herodotus elsewhere uses to denote concubines or courtesans,³³⁷ crossed the battlefield to Pausanias and it is discovered that they are each other’s ‘guest-friend’ (ξεῖνος, 9.76.3, see further: p.83). There is in Homer a famous scene where Diomedes and Glaucus, prominent fighters on both sides, discover longstanding ties as one another’s ‘guest friends’ (ξεῖνος, *Il.* 6.512) which halts their duel. Herodotus plays out a similar scene, but substituting an exceptional fighter of the opposing side for a concubine.³³⁸ The bizarre spectacle this creates is rather amusing, but continues to paint Pausanias in a rather un-Homeric light: his longstanding guest is no prominent hero, but a courtesan.

³³³ Tuplin (2022) 361, see also 355.

³³⁴ Stambler (1982) 210. Pelling (2006a) 99 quotes Stambler and gives the Greeks she omits: ‘[...] the echo of Odysseus’ rebuke of Eurycleia at *Odyssey* 22.411–18, ‘it is impious [οὐχ ὀσίη, just as Pausanias pronounces himself content to ‘do and say holy things’, ὅσια, and Lampon’s proposal was ἀνοσιώτατον] to gloat over dead men... their outrages [ἄτασθαλίῃσιν] have brought them to a bad end’.

³³⁵ Pelling (2006a) 99.

³³⁶ Pelling (2006a) 99.

³³⁷ 1.84.3, 1.135, 1.173.5, 2.130.2, 3.1.2, 4.71.4, 5.18.2, 6.138.1, 7.83.2, 7.107.2, 7.187.1, 9.76.1, 9.81.1.

³³⁸ Flory (1978) discusses this scene as one of his ‘brave gestures’ but does not note the Homeric parallel.

The second scene follows Lampon's attribution of κλέος. Pausanias asks Mardonius' attendants to make a meal for him 'as they did for Mardonius' (9.82.1) and Pausanias asks the same from his Spartan aides but 'in Laconian fashion' (9.82.2).³³⁹ Pausanias laughs (γελάσαντα, 9.82.3) at the comparative richness of the Persian feast compared to his customary Spartan food. Sumptuous feasting is a defining feature of Homeric society and is 'not only an activity of Homeric heroes, but also one that helps demonstrate that they are indeed heroes'.³⁴⁰ Pausanias' habitual meal is massively different from meals of Homeric heroes. This at odds with an attempt to present Pausanias in a Homeric light, as the attainment and ascription of κλέος might otherwise suggest.³⁴¹

There is no narrative need for either the supplication of the concubine or the comparative feast scene. The narrative flow would continue seemingly unaltered if either or both of these chapters were removed. I would argue that the function of these scenes is akin to the refusal to maltreat Mardonius' corpse: it is designed to make us see Pausanias not as a Homeric hero but as a Herodotean hero.³⁴² By applying the term κλέος to Pausanias, Lampon attempts to cast Pausanias as a Homeric hero and seeks to flatter him into carrying out un-Greek actions. Herodotus, however, not only presents us with Pausanias rejecting this attempt to commit an atrocity, and with very Homeric language to eclipse that of Lampon, but also goes to lengths either side of this scene to characterise Pausanias as distinctly un-Homeric.

³³⁹ Shrimpton and Gillis (1997) note 'the story is both introduced and closed with a *legetai*, 'it is said'', making the authenticity of this narrative particularly suspect.

³⁴⁰ Sherratt (2004) 301. See also Bakker (2013).

³⁴¹ It would be natural to cast the Persians as the Homeric characters based on the culinary evidence. Barker (2022) 181: 'Herodotus' intertextual engagement with Homer is more complicated, and complicates any simple us-versus-them binary'. Pelling (2006b) 115-6 sees this episode as evidence for the 'two strands of 'softness' and toughness in the *Histories*. One is 'no wonder we won', no wonder the tough Greeks can overcome such Persian softness [...] the other is 'what is the point?', why bother to invade a country that is so poor'. Harrison (2002) 553 characterises this scene as 'demonstrat[ing] the absurdity of the Persian desire for Greece'. Cf. Pelling (1997b).

³⁴² Tuplin (2022) 362: 'No hero would have eaten like that or thought it consonant with his status, and once again it turns out that the Spartans of 479 are not really Homeric heroes'.

1.4.3 Herodotean κλειτός and κλεινός

There are, in Herodotus, two poetic adjective forms, κλειτός and κλεινός, which are etymologically linked to κλέος and have an important bearing on the current discussion. The first, κλειτός, is used twice as an attributive adjective as honorifics for Cypselus (5.92ε.2) and Megistias (7.228.3). Herodotus' attributive use of this adjective is similar to the Homeric use where it is likewise only used in attributive position.³⁴³ However, Homer only applies κλειτός to plural nouns,³⁴⁴ whereas in Herodotus it is applied solely to individuals. A minor point of difference; the use of κλεινός is more revealing.

As the above discussion of Herodotean κλέος demonstrates, Herodotus never applies κλέος to a woman. This marks a stark difference from the Homeric practice. The poetic term κλεινός, however, is used of a female character in the *Histories*. As a Herodotean *hapax legomenon* it is applied to the Rhodopis. After detailing Rhodopis' idiosyncratic dedication, Herodotus speaks more generally about the courtesans of Naucratis and Rhodopis:

the courtesans in Naucratis are, I suppose, accustomed to being sexually irresistible [...] for this woman [...] thus became **so** (δὴ) **famous** (κλεινὴ) that **all Greeks** (πάντες Ἕλληνες) **thoroughly knew** (ἐξέμαθον) the name of Rhodopis (2.135.5).

By mentioning Naucratan prostitutes' sexual allure, Herodotus leaves the reader in no doubt that Rhodopis' sexual prowess and attractiveness,³⁴⁵ not her dedication, won her fame in

³⁴³ *Od.* 6.54. *Il.* 1.447, 3.451, 4.102, 4.120, 4.379, 6.227, 7.450, 11.220, 12.6, 17.14, 17.212, 17.307, 18.229, 23.873.

³⁴⁴ *Od.* 6.54 sees the term applied to the multiple kings (βασιλῆας) at the banquet with Alcinous. *Il.* 3.451, 4.379, 6.227, 11.220, 17.14, 17.212 and 18.229 all refer to the collective plural forms of 'ally' (ἐπίκουρος). *Il.* 1.447, 4.102, 4.120, 7.450, 12.6, 23.873 all concern hecatombs where the term's etymology denotes the offering of *multiple* sacrifices, see LSJ s.v. A for this etymology. The only time κλειτός appears as a singular in Homer is at *Il.* 17.307, applied to the city of Panoepus, but this is to stress the exceptionality of Schedius among the many sent from Panoepus.

³⁴⁵ Nagy (2018) 111-2 constructs a profile of Rhodopis' physical appearance.

Greece. Herodotus highlights the extent of the fame Rhodopis receives for her sexual abilities with the emphatic particle δῆ and the verbal form ἐκμανθάνω with its prefix ἐκ- denoting the learning of something well and in-depth. It is possible to see an element of crude humour as Herodotus says that ‘all Greeks’ (πάντες Ἕλληνες, 2.135.5) knew of Rhodopis, as though she had met with all of Greece in a professional capacity.

Homer’s only female character to accrue κλέος was Penelope. Penelope, amid a wider tradition of women with freer sexual attitudes, received positive κλέος for her loyalty, both emotional and sexual, to Odysseus. Herodotus presents us with Rhodopis who attains an analogous type of fame: κλεινός etymologically related to κλέος. Rhodopis gains a reputation, in the etymological sense of κλέος, for *precisely* the opposite reason of chaste Penelope. To my reading of scholarship on Rhodopis, no scholar draws a parallel between Rhodopis and Penelope, perhaps because of their overwhelming dissimilarity.³⁴⁶ Tuplin perhaps comes closest commenting that Herodotus ‘playfully makes her (and Archidice for good measure) into quasi-epic heroines as his own version of an extravagant misrepresentation of the women’,³⁴⁷ though neither names Penelope nor highlights the use of κλεινός in relation to Rhodopis. Rhodopis would find a better home in the wider tradition of female κλέος, as represented by the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, with its detailing of female promiscuity. From the perspective of this examination of Herodotus’ use of Homeric κλέος, the use of the related term κλεινός for Rhodopis provides a stark contrast with the *only* Homeric female character to achieve κλέος, Penelope.

³⁴⁶ On the courtesan Rhodopis see Tuplin (2022) 316-7. Donelli (2021). Sheehan (2018) 107 mentions Rhodopis in passing, focussing less on Rhodopis’ abilities as a courtesan and her κλεινός to discuss Herodotus’ dismissal of Rhodopis’ ownership of the smallest of the three pyramids. Lloyd (2007) 337-9. Keesling (2006). Lidov (2002). Biffi (1997). Lloyd (1993) 84-7.

³⁴⁷ Tuplin (2022) 317.

1.4.4 Conclusion

Herodotus' engagement with Homeric κλέος presents a complicated picture. Herodotus provides only four references to κλέος and thus there is minimal data to examine from which to form judgements. At Thermopylae, where Herodotus is famously 'at his most Homeric',³⁴⁸ the first use Herodotus makes of κλέος leaves us in doubt as to who actually gets it. The second example of κλέος at Thermopylae resulted from not of individual action, as it is in Homer, but from the collective Spartan effort. Mardonius' use of κλέος as a sneer against Spartan battlefield tottering was shown to play upon the 'lower' accuracy resonance of κλέος in Homeric epic. While this use is Homeric enough, it is not the type of Homeric κλέος which reflects positively on the Spartans. Lampon attributes κλέος to Pausanias, but Pausanias refuses to mutilate Mardonius' corpse, as the Homeric Achilles does to Hector's body, and Herodotus framed this scene with micro-narratives demonstrating Pausanias' un-Homeric nature. None of the Herodotean examples of κλέος, however, occur in Herodotus' narratorial persona. They appear in either oracular quotations or within character speech. The adjectival forms κλειτός and κλεινός were also shown to differ from their Homeric use. The former, though, a marginal point, differed in its application to singular rather than plural nouns, like that which Pelling discovered in the inverse for κλέος proper;³⁴⁹ while the use of κλεινός for Rhodopis was found to reverse the sole Homeric use of κλέος for a woman to denote Penelope's extended show of devotion to Odysseus. Herodotus' use of κλέος, therefore, differs in some significant ways from Homer's.

³⁴⁸ Boedeker (2003) 36.

³⁴⁹ Pelling (2006a) 95.

1.5.1 Definitions of Homeric τιμή

The last word examined in this section is ‘honour’ (τιμή).³⁵⁰ Homer uses the term 38 times across both epics.³⁵¹ Just over two thirds of the appearances of τιμή occur in the *Iliad*, which gives us an initial quantitative understanding of the centrality of τιμή in that poem. Within the *Iliad* τιμή appears the most in *Iliad* 1, where Agamemnon dishonours Achilles, and the embassy in *Iliad* 9, where Agamemnon attempts to pacify Achilles – both scenes centring on the protagonist’s honour.

τιμή has a number of facets. Griffin suggests that Homeric τιμή is inseparable from outward displays of positive estimation and it is often materialised in honourable cuts of meat, gifts, or possessions.³⁵² While concrete representations of this good opinion are important to Homeric heroes this is related to its interpersonal use. Finkelberg suggests that, in English, τιμή is conventionally translated as ‘honour’, but ‘this is not to say that ‘honour’ and *timē* are strictly equivalent’,³⁵³ which, while true, makes coming up with a definitive translation difficult. Finkelberg’s study is largely concerned with the Homeric world as embodying competitive values,³⁵⁴ and suggests, ‘in the majority of contexts [...] the appropriate translation of the Greek *timē* would be ‘status’ and/or ‘prestige’ rather than unqualified ‘honour’’.³⁵⁵ This gives τιμή a sharper sociological nuance. Schein offers the temptingly terse ‘the basic meaning of *time*,

³⁵⁰ On Homeric τιμή see Finkelberg (1998). van Wees (1992) 61-165. Schein (1984) 53, 68, 71, 86 n.13. Nagy (1979) *passim*, but he discusses the meaning of the term at 118, in connection with hero cults and the use of the term in Herodotus. Long (1970). Benveniste (1969b) 49-55.

³⁵¹ *Od.* 1.117, 5.335, 8.480, 11.302, 11.304, 11.338, 11.495, 11.503, 14.70, 14.117, 22.57, 24.30. *Il.* 1.159, 1.278, 1.353, 1.510, 2.197, 3.286, 3.288, 3.459, 4.410, 5.552, 6.193, 9.319, 9.498, 9.514, 9.605, 9.608, 9.616, 15.189, 16.84, 17.92, 17.251, 20.181, 23.649, 24.57, 24.66.

³⁵² Griffin (1980) 14-5.

³⁵³ Finkelberg (1998) 16.

³⁵⁴ Finkelberg (1998). Finkelberg cites, on p.14, as the main proponent for the idea of a competitive Homeric society, Adkins (1960a) 30-85. Adkins’ study is succinctly summarised by Macintyre (1984) 133 ‘Adkins has usefully contrasted the co-operative and the competitive virtues. The competitive he sees as Homeric in their ancestry; the co-operative represent the social world of the Athenian democracy’.

³⁵⁵ Finkelberg (1998) 16.

‘honor,’ is ‘price’ or ‘value’ in a tangible sense’.³⁵⁶ Nagy focusses on another aspect of τιμή to look beyond the poems and stress the cultic usage. While there are hints of the cults of individual heroes within the epic,³⁵⁷ there is not an explicit occasion of τιμή in cult worship found in Homeric epics themselves, so this aspect is less relevant for the Homeric use of τιμή. Hans van Wees provides a yet further interpretation of τιμή.³⁵⁸ While he endorses the view that τιμή denotes elite status, he notes that it ‘is also the actions and words by which others acknowledge one’s status, the respect with which one is treated [...] it [also] corresponds to what we call *deference* [original emphasis]’.³⁵⁹ Thus, van Wees argues, deference is not only from subordinates to superordinates, but can encompass a range of sociological interactions.³⁶⁰ The keynote of each of these definitions of τιμή is that it remains, as I show in this chapter, the possession of the social elite, who can *choose* to award small manifestations of it at their discretion to their social underlings.

1.5.2 Homeric and Herodotean τιμάω and τίω

In a famous passage (see, p.13), Sarpedon turns to his comrade Glaucón and delivers an oration on their social position. Here we find the cognate verb of τιμή: τιμάω.

‘Glaucus, why is it that **we are honoured** (τετιμήμεσθα) greatly
with a seat and meat and filled wine cups
in Lycia. And everyone beholds us as god,
and we possess a great piece of land near Xanthus’ banks,
a fine orchard and wheat-bearing land?’ (*Il.* 12.310-14).

³⁵⁶ Schein (1984) 71.

³⁵⁷ Nagy (1979) 69-210.

³⁵⁸ van wees (1992) 69-71.

³⁵⁹ van Wees (1992) 69.

³⁶⁰ van Wees (1992) 70, drawing upon Goffman (1967) 59.

He continues to say that it is their duty as societal elite to stand in the front ranks of the fighting (*Il.* 12.315-28). Sarpedon uses the verb τιμάω to denote the esteem in which members of the social elite are held. This is the only Homeric use of the term. Whether the gods honour an aristocrat,³⁶¹ or the lower classes honour their rulers and social superiors,³⁶² a member of the social elite is the object of the honour given by the verb τιμάω. The exceptions to this rule actually underline this aspect of τιμάω further.³⁶³ Herodotus also uses τιμάω to describe characters internal to the narrative world holding in high esteem the social elite.³⁶⁴

However, Herodotus also uses τιμάω to encompass a range of positive opinions, rather than exclusively in relation to the social elite.³⁶⁵ Further, τιμάω is not Homer's preferred verb to express an individual being honoured; for this Homer uses τίω. This helps to explain the

³⁶¹ Where Homeric τιμάω denotes a god honouring a human: *Od.* 3.379. *Il.* 1.175, 1.454, 1.505, 1.559, 2.4, 8.372, 9.608, 11.46, 15.77, 15.612, 16.237, 16.460, 17.99 and 23.788.

³⁶² Where Homeric τιμάω denotes the lower classes honouring the Homeric elite and rulers: *Od.* 5.36, 7.69, 19.280 and 23.339. *Il.* 9.38, 9.155, 9.297, 12.310, 16.271, 22.235 and 23.649.

³⁶³ At *Od.* 14.203, not only is this during Odysseus' Cretan lie (making this use an invention by Odysseus as internal narrator), but the underlying use to a member of the aristocracy remains as Odysseus says Castor 'honoured me **like** (ἴσον) a lawful child'. At *Od.* 15.365, Eumaeus says that Anticleia brought up together Ctymene (Odysseus' sister) and Eumaeus though she honoured him less. Eumaeus was previously an aristocrat (*Od.* 15.412-4). At *Od.* 20.129, Telemachus asks Euryycleia if they have honoured their guest with food and a bed; this guest is the disguised Odysseus who is not actually a beggar; thus, τιμάω still refers to an aristocrat – just a disguised one.

³⁶⁴ Herodotus uses τιμάω in relation to the social elite: 1.208, 2.79.3, 3.15.2, 3.34.1, 3.160.2, 4.143.3, 5.20.4, 6.51, 6.52.5, 6.52.7 (where the term occurs twice), 8.69.1 and 9.25.1.

³⁶⁵ Herodotus uses τιμάω more broadly: 1.30.5 Tellus (where we do not know Tellus' social status); 1.31.4 Hera; 1.60.5 Peisistratus; 1.90.2 (implicitly) Apollo; 1.133.1 Persians honour birthdays; 1.134.2 (where the term occurs twice) referring to the inverse proportional honour the Persians hold surrounding people based on distance; analogously 1.134.3, each neighbour working outwards from the Persians rules the next neighbour out in the same inversely proportional relationship; 2.29.7 Zeus and Dionysus; 2.50.3 Poseidon; 2.75.4 (where the term occurs twice) the Egyptian Ibis bird; 2.179 the port at Naucratis; 3.14.9 Psammenitus' old dining companion; 3.55.2 (where the term occurs twice) the Samian people honoured by Archias; 3.154.1 (where the term occurs twice) the first use refers to Zopyrus knowing that among Persians doing good deeds is honoured and repaid and the second refers to Darius having the honour of taking Babylon; 5.5 the husband of Crestonean women's competitive shows of honour for their deceased husbands; 5.67.4 (where the term occurs twice) and at 5.67.5 the Sicyonians honoured Adrastus before Cleisthenes; 6.124.1 Alcmaeonidae; 7.107.1 Bages' children; 7.135.2 Xerxes said to honour good men; 7.213.3 Athenades; 7.238.2 Persians are said to honour valiant warriors; 8.105.2 Hermotimus; 8.124.2 (where the term occurs three times) and 8.125.2 refer to Themistocles; 9.71.4 Aristodemus is not honoured at Plataea due to his flight at Thermopylae; 9.79.2 Pausanias says Leonidas is honoured by innumerable souls. See especially 2.172.5, where Amasis turns a foot spa into a religious statue which the Egyptian people duly honour, and tells them likewise to honour him for having gone from a low status to being their king.

disparity in frequency of τιμάω occurring in Homeric epic and Herodotean prose. Herodotus uses τιμάω 51 times compared to Homer's 29 for τιμάω; but Homer uses τίω 57 times, which far exceeds Herodotus' singular use in a quotation of the Delphic oracle (5.92.β2). This absence of τίω shows another Herodotean difference from Homer's vocabulary of heroism.

In any case, the verbal form is of less import to this study of heroism than the noun. The primary reason is that treating someone with honour is different from them having honour themselves. In the first, treating someone with honour, the onus is on the honouring agent(s) and, in the latter, where an individual is said to possess honour, it is an individual's characteristic. For this study of heroic figures, it is of greater value therefore to study the noun rather than either verb.

1.5.3 Homeric τιμή

In many ways τιμή constitutes a fitting conclusion to this section on Homeric fame words as τιμή shares a number of the facets found in the other examined terms. It is something which can be given by the gods to mortals, like κῶδος, and also denotes public opinion like κλέος. This section argues that Homeric τιμή is a status symbol for the social elite. In this capacity it is analogous to Homeric γέρας, although τιμή is less concerned with physical manifestations of esteem and more primarily focussed on interpersonal interaction.

The gods have τιμή which marks them as superior beings.³⁶⁶ Phoenix makes the gods' possession of τιμή plain during the embassy scene in his appeal to Achilles: 'the gods themselves are pliant, even though they possess greater excellence, **honour** (τιμή), and might' (*Il.* 9.497-8). Τιμή is so very intimately connected with being a god that, on rare occasions, its bestowal denotes apotheosis. In the tempest of *Odyssey* 5, Homer introduces 'Ino, Leucothea,

³⁶⁶ Where τιμή denotes a characteristic of a divinity: *Od.* 5.335, 11.302 and 11.304. *Il.* 9.498, 9.514 and 15.189.

who **before** (πρὶν μὲν) used to be mortal (βροτός) of human speech, **but now** (νῦν δ') in the wide sea has a share of **honour** (ἔμμορε τιμῆς) from the gods' (*Od.* 5.333-5). Homer's introduction of Ino has an external completing analeptic force – it is a flashback to an event outside the *Odyssey*'s main narrative which increases our knowledge of Ino. The temporal adverbs contrast the Ino of 'before' (πρὶν), when she was a 'mortal' (βροτός), and her condition 'now' (νῦν), when she is a goddess. In the second part of the contrasting μὲν... δέ construction Homer comments that, now in her divine status, Ino has 'her share of honour' (ἔμμορε τιμῆς). Thus, in becoming a god Ino has received τιμή.

Ino's is not an isolated incident. Odysseus uses τιμή twice in quick succession when he describes the Dioscuri: 'under the earth they have **honour** (τιμὴν) from Zeus, they live on alternate days and on the other they are dead: they have been given their share of **honour** (τιμὴν) equal to the gods (ἴσα θεοῖσι)' (*Od.* 11.302-4). Castor and Polydeuces' τιμή which is 'equal to' (ἴσος) that of the other immortals explains how they become gods themselves. It is worth stressing that neither Ino nor the Dioscuri are major divinities. Homer only describes the apotheosis of these minor divinities; the other gods' status as gods are taken as read.

Odysseus' statement regarding the Dioscuri contains another important aspect of this apotheosis. Odysseus states that it was Zeus who made these mortals into gods: 'they have honour **from Zeus**' (τιμὴν **πρὸς Ζηνὸς** ἔχοντες, *Od.* 11.302). It might be that this is related to the phenomenon, to which we shall shortly return, of Zeus giving τιμή to mortals in the sense of favour or esteem. However, there are good reasons for positing a theological reading.

Hesiod gives us further evidence to substantiate this interpretation. In his *Theogony* Hesiod also uses τιμή to denote a quality of the divine,³⁶⁷ and more specifically for the differing

³⁶⁷ For τιμή as denoting a divine aspect see Hes. *Theog.* 74, 112, 203, 393, 396, 414, 418, 422, 426, 452, 885, 892 and 904, with the uses at 462, 491, 882 referring more strictly to the τιμή which the Titans had but which the gods took away.

spheres of control of individual deities,³⁶⁸ there Zeus is also said to dispense τιμή.³⁶⁹ After the cosmic battle between Titans and gods is completed, ‘they [sc. the other gods] encouraged, by Gaia’s cunning, far-seeing Olympian Zeus **to be king** (βασιλευμέν) **and lord over** (ἀνάσσειν) the immortals: and he divided the **honours** (τιμάς) among them’ (Hes. *Theog.* 883-5). Zeus is the only god who acts as a distributor of τιμή to other deities in the *Theogony*. Only the Hesiodic Hecate comes close to acting as a giver of τιμή, but Hesiod is careful to phrase it so that Hecate does not give explicitly hand out τιμή.³⁷⁰ Thus, in a Homeric setting, having Zeus as the one to award τιμή to Castor and Pollux is entirely appropriate given the Hesiodic parallel. We might even speculate that Ino’s ‘share of honour from the gods’ (θεῶν ἔξ ἔμμορε τιμῆς) might have originated from Zeus.

I would argue that Hesiod provides evidence for why Zeus is the only god who can distribute τιμή, which informs our understanding of the concept in Homer. After the Titanomachy, the gods install Zeus as their ruler: ‘they encouraged him to be king and lord over them’ (Hes. *Theog.* 883). Hesiod uses two verbs βασιλευμέν and ἀνάσσειν, of which the cognate nouns are ‘king’ (βασιλεύς) and ‘lord’ (ἄναξ) respectively, to denote that Zeus became the other gods’ ruler. The repetition of verbal forms which highlight Zeus’ supremacy among the other gods depicts him as occupying a higher social status than them. It is once Zeus has become the other gods’ superior that *then* he can distribute τιμή. This might explain why Zeus can only make promises of τιμή to the other gods before the battle (Hes. *Theog.* 393 and 396), rather than actually allocate τιμαί.

³⁶⁸ For τιμή as referring to the specific domain of power for individual gods see Hes. *Theog.* 112, 203, 452 and 904. This also appears to be the use Poseidon makes of τιμή at *Il.* 15.189, when he is detailing the domains of power for himself, Zeus, and Hades as the eldest brothers among the Olympians (*Il.* 15.189-93).

³⁶⁹ For the Hesiodic Zeus giving out τιμή see 74, 885, 904. The uses at 393 and 396 do not refer specifically to Zeus giving out τιμή, but Zeus instead implies that those who help him shall have τιμή.

³⁷⁰ Rather, it occurs in relation to her: ‘great **honour follows** (ἔσπετο τιμή) easily whose prayers the goddess receives favourably’ (Hes. *Theog.* 418-9). The verb ‘follow’ (ἔπομαι) implies that Hecate does not function as a bestower of τιμή.

Likewise, the Homeric Zeus is the only god to give τιμή. Zeus gives τιμή to humans who, as mortals, occupy a lower Homeric sociological status.³⁷¹ Achilles hints at this role when he complains to Thetis, ‘Mother, **since** (ἐπεὶ) you bore me **to be short-lived** (μινυνθάδιόν), high-thundering Olympian Zeus **ought** (ὀφείλλεν) to have put **status** (τιμὴν) into my hands’ (*Il.* 1.352-4). The conjunction ‘since’ (ἐπεὶ) along with the verb ‘ought’ (ὀφείλλω/ὀφείλω) creates a causal relationship between Achilles’ status as a ‘short-lived’ (μινυνθάδιος) being and the ‘status’ (τιμή) from Zeus he feels he deserves. Achilles later recognises that Zeus has given him τιμή. Phoenix says that if Achilles returns to battle ‘the Achaeans shall **honour** (τίσουσιν) you like a god’ (*Il.* 9.603) using the verb ‘I honour’ (τίω) which is etymologically linked to τιμή.³⁷² Achilles rejects this esteem, saying, ‘Phoenix, [...] I do not want this **honour** (τιμῆς), **I believe** (φρονέω) **I have been honoured** (τετιμῆσθαι) by the decree of **Zeus** (Διὸς)’ (*Il.* 9.607-8). The verb φρονέω, along with its use in character-speech, demonstrates that this is Achilles’ own perspective on how events have occurred. Achilles recognises the τιμή from Zeus and uses the verb τιμάω, a cognate of τιμή, to denote this. We see a similar hierarchical relationship between giver and receiver of τιμή: although Achilles is semi-divine and a member of the Homeric aristocracy, he is still inferior to the king of the gods.

The Homeric Zeus is so intimately concerned with giving τιμή that he quickly interjects when another god might grant τιμή. Hera angrily replies to Apollo’s appeal for sympathy towards to Hector’s corpse, ‘this might be as you say, lord of the silver bow, if **you give** (θήσετε) the same **status** (τιμὴν) to Achilles and Hector’ (*Il.* 24.54-5). The second person plural

³⁷¹ Where τιμή is given to mortals by Zeus: *Il.* 1.278, 1.353, 2.197, 9.608, 17.251. This list is in addition to those examples at *Od.* 5.335 and 11.302, discussed above, relating to Ino and the Dioscuri respectively. This is in contrast with the verb τιμάω where any god can honour a hero, but *not give* τιμή, as with Athene honouring Telemachus at *Od.* 3.379 and Athene and Hera thundering to do honour to Agamemnon at *Il.* 11.46.

³⁷² Chantraine s.v. τιμή ‘τιμή belongs to the same family as the verb τίω ‘to honour’ (τιμή appartient à la même famille que le verbe τίω « honorer »). Benveniste (1969b) 50 ‘*timē* (τιμή) is the abstract of the ancient verb *tíō* (τίω) ‘to honour’ (*timē* (τιμή) [...] est l’abstrait d’un verbe ancien *tíō* (τίω) « honorer »). For a thorough and more recent treatment see Weiss (2017).

‘you give’ (θήσετε) can be interpreted in one of two ways. This is either a collective plural, and refers the gods collectively awarding τιμή, or θήσετε is a poetic plural, referring specifically to Apollo, as Hera’s addressee, thus characterising Apollo as being able to bestow τιμή. In either case, it would not be Zeus giving τιμή. Zeus is swift to reassert his authority in this role, saying, ‘Hera, do not be wholly angry with the gods: for the **status** (τιμή) shall not be one [i.e., equal]’ (*Il.* 24.65-6). Zeus takes charge of the situation and hints that it shall be himself who gives τιμή. And so, when it appears (an)other god(s) may award τιμή, Zeus takes ownership of the dispensation of τιμή and reclaims it as his own prerogative.

Other than Achilles, one specific sociological grouping to receive τιμή from Zeus are kings.³⁷³ Odysseus draws on the Homeric characters’ collective understanding that regal τιμή comes from Zeus in Agamemnon’s shambolic test of the troops’ resolve in *Iliad* 2. Odysseus warns the troops, ‘Great is the spirit of a king, **nurtured by Zeus** (διοτρεφέων), whose **authority** (τιμή) is **from Zeus** (ἐκ Διός), and **Zeus** (Ζεύς), the counsellor, loves them’ (*Il.* 2.196-7). Odysseus cites Zeus three times in order to maximise the threat of Agamemnon’s authority. This authority, τιμή, emanates from Zeus the highest-ranking god. Here τιμή’s meaning is twofold: it both highlights Agamemnon’s status as king and denotes the position’s authority.

A king’s τιμή not only comes from Zeus, but also instantiates the king’s right to rule and authority.³⁷⁴ The first time Homer presents Telemachus, and indeed the situation on Ithaca, Telemachus is ‘fantasising in mind about his noble father, if he came, from somewhere, scattered the suitors, took his **house** (δῶματα), and **has the authority himself** (τιμήν δ’ αὐτὸς

³⁷³ τιμή is given to mortal kings from Zeus: *Il.* 1.278 and 2.197. The use at *Il.* 17.251 is a general address to other leading figures within the Achaean fighting force by Menelaus in his time of need over the body of Patroclus: ‘friends, leaders, rulers, who drink at common expense and each command your own people: whose **honour** (τιμή) and **glory** (κῆδος) attend on from Zeus’ (*Il.* 17.248-51).

³⁷⁴ τιμή denotes a king’s right to rule: *Od.* 1.117, 11.495, 11.503. *Il.* 1.278, 2.197, 6.193, 9.616, 17.251 (with the qualification given in the above footnote), 20.181.

ἔχοι) and was master of his **house**’ (δῶμασιν, *Od.* 1.115-7). As a scenario in Telemachus’ mind, it is tinged with focalisation from Telemachus’ perspective. Homer repeats reference to Odysseus’ household in the phrases ‘took his house’ (κατὰ δῶματα θείη) and ‘was master of his house’ (δῶμασιν οἷσιν ἀνάσσοι). The repetition of nouns denoting the household highlights its importance to Odysseus’ return to Ithacan power and has been read as symbolising Odysseus’ status as Ithacan king.³⁷⁵ This view has merit and explains the prominence lent to the house in Telemachus’ micro-narrative of Odysseus’ return. At the same time as envisioning Odysseus taking this symbol of authority, Telemachus imagines his father ‘has the **authority** himself’ (τιμὴν δ’ αὐτὸς ἔχοι). Thus, Telemachus sees twin aspects to Odysseus’ return to power the physical household and the retaking of τιμή.

In the Underworld, Achilles expresses anxiety concerning this aspect of τιμή. Achilles asks Odysseus,

‘Tell me about excellent Peleus, if you have learnt anything,
if he has **authority** (τιμὴν) among the Myrmidons,
or if he is **dishonoured** (ἀτιμάζουσιν) through Hellas and Phthia,
on account of his old age (κατὰ γῆρας) in hand and foot’ (*Od.* 11.494-7).

Achilles inquires whether Peleus still has τιμή to ask whether Peleus maintains his rule of Phthia. The alternative, as Achilles sees it, is to be ‘dishonoured’ (ἀτιμάζω). Etymologically, ἀτιμάζω is related to τιμή and has a privative alpha (ἀ-) prefix to show negation. While, semantically, this term can designate being ‘dishonoured’ as in disrespected or ill-treated, and

³⁷⁵ Christensen (2020) 224. Slatkin (2005) 316. Foley (1978) 11. Finley (1956) 53. Cf. Chaston (2002) 14, who emphasises Penelope’s position of power in maintaining Odysseus’ household and right to rule Ithaca.

this is certainly the main thrust of Achilles' meaning, ἀτιμάζω also has the more literal sense of being in a state 'without τιμή', in this instance 'without royal privileges'.

Achilles takes this view of Peleus seriously. Achilles continues,

'If I could go (εἰ [...] ἔλθοιμι) to my father's **house** (δῶ) for a short while:

I would make hateful (στύξαιμι) my might and invincible hands,

those who by force keep that man away from his **royal privilege** (ὑπὸ τιμῆς)' (*Od.* 11.501-3).

Achilles mentions τιμή in conjunction with the physical household, denoted by δῶ, which highlights again the importance of the physical household as a status symbol for kingship. The conditional conjunction 'if' (εἰ) expresses Achilles' wish for vengeance, while the optative mood for both 'I could go' (ἔλθοιμι) and 'I would make hateful' (στύξαιμι) adumbrates the hopelessness of Achilles' position: dead in the Underworld, Achilles cannot help Peleus. From Achilles' perspective, 'if a man is weak – because he is too old or too young, and has no one to support him – others are likely to attempt to deprive him of his position'.³⁷⁶ Achilles implies this is the case for Peleus and his τιμή.³⁷⁷ However, there is no Homeric evidence to suggest Peleus has lost his τιμή nor any extant tradition where Peleus loses his sovereignty;³⁷⁸ Achilles is voicing his filial anxiety.

Both these expressions of τιμή, as designating royal power, are focalised through characters' perspectives. We can therefore see τιμή as representing how Homeric characters understand royal power and τιμή operating. Were it one character who expressed τιμή as denoting the royal power then this might be taken as an individual character's quirk, but having

³⁷⁶ van Wees (1992) 102.

³⁷⁷ Odysseus can offer Achilles no reassurance either; 'regarding flawless Peleus, I have heard nothing' (*Od.* 11.505).

³⁷⁸ van Wees (1992) 101-2.

multiple characters use τιμή in this way allows us to confirm that Homeric figures conceptualise royalty as the possession of τιμή.

Τιμή can more broadly symbolise the esteem an aristocratic hero is held in by others.³⁷⁹ Nestor, due to old age, cannot partake in the funeral games of Patroclus and so Achilles presents him with a conciliatory urn (*Il.* 23.616-23). Nestor is delighted at the respect shown to his age and, after listing his youthful exploits (*Il.* 23.629-642), says,

‘**this** (τοῦτο) I willingly accept, and my heart rejoices,
as you always remember me with gentleness, and you **do not forget** (οὐδέ σε λήθω)
the esteem (τιμῆς) with which I should **be honoured** (τετιμῆσθαι) among the Achaeans’
(*Il.* 23.647-9).

The verb τιμάω is used in the Homeric sense, discussed above (pp.116-8), as Nestor is a member of the ruling elite. At first sight, this seems to invert the principle of social superiors giving τιμή to their social inferiors, as one member of the social elite is giving τιμή, through the verb τιμάω, to another of the same status. Nestor’s phrasing, though, is telling. Nestor is contented because he receives the urn which is designated by the singular demonstrative ‘this’ (τοῦτο).

The singular, rather than the plural, I would argue suggests Nestor is talking purely about the urn and that he is not receiving τιμή from Achilles. As noted (p.118), treating a character with τιμή is not the same as giving a character τιμή. When Nestor actually refers to his τιμή, he uses the verb for forgetting (λήθω) to state that his τιμή has not been forgotten. This demonstrates that he is not receiving τιμή, but that he has it and it is being remembered in

³⁷⁹ For τιμή as denoting the esteem of an individual in the eyes of others, see *Od.* 24.30. *Il.* 1.510, 4.410, 9.319, 9.605, 16.84. Cf. *Il.* 9.608 where Achilles says he gets τιμή from Zeus.

this social interaction. Thus, τιμή is what the aristocracy have. Τιμή is never given between social peers; instead, they engage with one another by remembering their own and another's τιμή.

That τιμή can mean 'esteem' allows us to understand why it can also mean 'compensation'. Adkins suggests that 'τιμή is thought of as something concrete, some commodity which may be transferred from one person to another'.³⁸⁰ By insulting an individual, the perpetrator can be thought of as taking away the other's τιμή. This aligns with the scholarly debate on how far to push the etymological family tree of τιμή. It is generally agreed that τιμή is connected with Homer's preferred older verb for 'honouring', τίω.³⁸¹ However, some etymologists posit a connection between 'I pay' (τίνω) and 'I honour' (τίω),³⁸² which would make a connection between 'I pay' (τίνω) and 'honour' (τιμή) at one remove. We see potential for this connection in Homeric epic. Agamemnon sets the terms for Menelaus and Paris' duel:

‘But if auburn-haired Menelaus should kill Alexander,
Then let the Trojans return Helen and all her treasure,
And **repay** (ἀποτινέμεν) to the Argives such **payback** (τιμὴν) as is proper,
Which shall remain in the minds of future men.
But if the Priam and the sons of Priam are not willing
to **pay** (τίνειν) **recompense** (τιμὴν) when Alexander falls,
then I shall fight on to exact compensation
and remain, until I reach an end of this war’ (*Il.* 3.284-91).

³⁸⁰ Adkins (1960b) 27.

³⁸¹ Chantraine *s.v.* τιμή. Benveniste (1969b) 50. Weiss (2017).

³⁸² Scholars who wish to push the etymological family tree further: Frisk *s.v.* τίω. Benveniste (1969b) 50.

Here it would be more natural to translate τιμή as ‘payback’, in the sense of requital, since the standard translation of ‘honour’ or ‘status’, or even van Wees’ ‘deference’, would be clunky and inappropriate. Despite the proximity and semantically similar meaning here, I am unconvinced, from a linguistic standpoint, of a connection between ‘I pay’ (τίνω) and ‘I honour’ (τίω) and, as a corollary, the link to ‘honour’ (τιμή). Chantraine perhaps puts it best, ‘if one insisted on accepting such a hypothesis, it would fall under glottogony and would thus lose all meaning’.³⁸³

Instead, Agamemnon’s use of τιμή to mean ‘payback’ is symptomatic of its primary role as a status symbol.³⁸⁴ Where τιμή is used to mean compensation, it typically refers to the ‘revenge’ (τιμή) sought by the Atreidai for Paris taking Helen from Menelaus.³⁸⁵ Menelaus laments over Patroclus’ body:

‘Ah, woe is me, if I leave behind the fine armour,
and Patroclus, who is lying there on account of my **honour** (τιμῆς),
lest **someone of the Danaans** (τίς [...] Δαναῶν) **sees** (ἴδεται) and finds fault with me’
(*Il.* 17.91-3).

Menelaus vocalises his uncertainty of whether to face Hector or retreat. It has been remarked that this scene constitutes one of the few true monologues in the epic,³⁸⁶ but ‘what is special is

³⁸³ Chaintraine *s.v.* τίνω and *s.v.* τίω. See also Weiss (2017) 875 n. 1: ‘Some have compared the root of τίνω ‘pay a price’, τίσις ‘retribution’ [...], but this is not necessary semantically and, as I will argue, formally excluded’.

³⁸⁴ Where τιμή means ‘payback’ for a negative action against a member of the social elite: *Od.* 14.70, 14.117, 22.57. *Il.* 1.159, 1.353, 3.286, 3.288, 3.459, 5.552, 17.92.

³⁸⁵ Where τιμή refers to the compensation pursued for Paris’ actions: *Od.* 14.70, 14.117. *Il.* 1.159, 3.286, 3.288, 3.459, 5.552, 17.92.

³⁸⁶ Aceti (2008) 103 n.227: ‘In the *Iliad* there are eleven monologues, four of which are called «deliberative», because they show a hero in the act of deciding between two different modes of behaviour: XI 404-410 (Odysseus), XVII 91-105 (Menelaus), XXI 553-570 (Agenore) and XXII 99-130 (Hector)’. (‘Nell’*Iliade* si incontrano undici monologhi, di cui quattro detti «deliberativi», perché mostrano un eroe nell’atto di decidere tra due diverse modalità di comportamento: XI 404-410

how it reveals the very process by which he takes his fateful decision’.³⁸⁷ Menelaus uses τιμή here with a dual function. It can mean ‘recompense’, since Patroclus came to Troy to avenge Menelaus’ treatment by Paris, but τιμή can also function to indicate Menelaus’ status more widely. Menelaus is anxious about how he will look if he retreats from Hector. The verb of seeing (εἶδον) and the mention of ‘someone of the Danaans’ (τίς [...] Δαναῶν) highlight that Menelaus reputation is, both literally and figuratively, in mind as he considers retreat.³⁸⁸

Agamemnon’s τιμή is also undermined by Paris’ actions. In his denunciation of Agamemnon in *Iliad* 1, Achilles says,

‘but for **you** (σοί), O great shamelessness, we followed, **to do you favour** (ᾠφρα σὺ χάρις),
to win **payback** (τιμὴν) for Menelaus and **you** (σοί), dog-face,
from the Trojans’ (*Il.* 1.158-60).³⁸⁹

By repeating forms of the second person singular pronoun ‘you’ (σύ), Achilles postulates that it was not just Menelaus’ τιμή which Paris called into question, but also Agamemnon’s.

Agamemnon’s τιμή is also presented in isolation from Menelaus’ as being challenged by Paris’ actions. Eumaeus assumes Agamemnon’s τιμή was the exclusive reason for the Trojan War: ‘for **on account of the honour of Agamemnon** (Ἀγαμέμνονος εἵνεκα τιμῆς) that man [sc. Odysseus] went to Ilios’ (*Od.* 14.70-1). This is perhaps surprising, considering that it was not Agamemnon’s wife, but Menelaus’, whom Paris took. Odysseus does not correct Eumaeus

(Odisseo), XVII 91-105 (Menelao), XXI 553-570 (Agenore) e XXII 99-130 (Ettore)’. For further bibliography on the Iliadic monologues see Aceti (2008) 103 n.227 and Garcia (2018) 315 n.1.

³⁸⁷ Stelow (2020) 93.

³⁸⁸ Stelow (2020) 94: ‘Menelaus betrays the same concern for others and for his reputation as elsewhere in the poem’. I also owe the following Homeric references to Stelow (2020) 94 n.347: *Il.* 3.99-100, 10.26-8, 23.607-8, cf. 5.552-3.

³⁸⁹ Beck (2005) 213: ‘[Achilles] very effectively neutralizes the normally positive associations of this word [sc. τιμή] by positioning it between two clearly and emphatically negative vocatives’.

but echoes Eumaeus' phrasing: 'you said that he [sc. Odysseus] died to win **recompense for Agamemnon** (Ἀγαμέμνονος εἵνεκα τιμῆς)' (*Od.* 14.117). Odysseus repeats Eumaeus' words that it was 'on account of Agamemnon's honour' (Ἀγαμέμνονος εἵνεκα τιμῆς) and likewise fails to mention Menelaus. Eumaeus may be forgiven for misidentifying the brother whose wife caused the Trojan War,³⁹⁰ but Odysseus actually fought at Troy. It is because of Agamemnon's familial ties to Menelaus that Agamemnon's τιμή can also be spoken of as being injured. By insulting one brother, Paris has dishonoured the Atreid family and, therefore, both brothers.³⁹¹

The other time τιμή means compensation it is spoken by Eurymachus as he pleads for his life. Eurymachus proposes this:

'but we shall go about the town,
and for all that has been eaten and drunk in your halls
each lead away **compensation** (τιμὴν) equal to twenty bulls' (*Od.* 22.55-7).

Eurymachus uses τιμή to denote the wealth and material compensation he proposes the suitors give to Odysseus to counteract the damage done to his estate. Eurymachus implies that 'insults or acts of injustice may be repaired by suitably generous gifts, and in such cases the adjustment of τιμή, if it is accepted, wipes out the reproach of the injured party'.³⁹² Odysseus is unmoved; 'Eurymachus, not if you brought me all of your father's estate, what you have now and will lay claim to in the future, not even then would I stay my hands from murder' (*Od.* 22.61-3).³⁹³ Notably, Odysseus does not use τιμή in his reply. This, I would argue, represents the wider

³⁹⁰ It might represent how the reliability of report regarding the Trojan War has diminished by the time it has reached Eumaeus' countryside setting.

³⁹¹ See also Aesch. *Ag.* 40-6 where Aeschylus fuses both sons of Atreus into one opposing force sent against Priam.

³⁹² Long (1970) 137.

³⁹³ Long (1970) 137 also notes Odysseus' refusal of Eurymachus' τιμή, but does not see it as more significant.

mechanics of how τιμή functions in Homeric epic: τιμή is for the Homeric social elite and it is not given by social inferiors to social superiors. Odysseus denies the very fact that Eurymachus can give him τιμή. Eurymachus' suggestion of giving τιμή might represent just how comfortable he has become on Ithaca in Odysseus' absence – Eurymachus believes that he (and the others suitors (?)), occupies the peak social position and thus can distribute τιμή. This might also explain the prominence placed on Odysseus' taking back τιμή in Telemachus' imaginative micro-narrative (*Od.* 1.115-7), as Eurymachus, and potentially other suitors, have become accustomed to being in the highest social position. Thus, Odysseus refuses to be placed in an inferior social position to Eurymachus.

Both exceptional uses of τιμή occur within Phaeacia. The first is where τιμή denotes a portion of meat sent to Demodocus. Odysseus, having enjoyed the first two songs of the bard, says, 'herald, give this meat to Demodocus, so he may eat, I shall greet him warmly, despite my grief: for among all men upon the earth bards have this share of **esteem** (τιμῆς) and reverence' (*Od.* 8.477-80). Analogous to Menelaus' presentation of choice meat to Telemachus and Peisistratus as a γέρας (*Od.* 4.65-6) to denote their status (pp.71-72), Odysseus gives Demodocus a portion of meat as a τιμή to denote the esteem in which he holds the bard. It is difficult not to see the self-serving nature of this passage, where the real-life historical bard is singing to a (most likely aristocracy-led), audience.³⁹⁴ The in-text character of Demodocus is receiving favourable treatment at the hands of his social superior Odysseus,³⁹⁵ just as Homer would have like to have been treated by his patrons. In any case, Odysseus, as social elite, presents Demodocus, his social inferior, with τιμή.

³⁹⁴ On the link between the blind Demodocus and Homer see Gazis (2018) 89. Nicolson (2014) 50: 'The name 'Homer' [...] may mean 'blind', at least in the dialect of Greek spoken on Lesbos'. Jensen (2005) 52. Dué (2005) 397. Graziosi (2002) 138-63 also summarises the previous scholarship.

³⁹⁵ This is precisely the treatment given as an example of downward deference by van Wees (1992) 70, with Goffman (1967) 59.

The other slightly exceptional instance of τιμή is where it refers to the ‘honour’ of being a guest’s host. Arete says to the gathered Phaeacians, ‘he is **my** guest-friend (ξεῖνος [...] ἐμός), but you **each share the privilege**’ (ἕκαστος δ’ ἔμμορε τιμῆς) (*Od.* 11.338), and suggests increasing their gifts to Odysseus. The people denoted by the determinant ‘each’ (ἕκαστος) can be assumed to be the same, or similar, to the ‘the leaders and rulers of the Phaeacians’ (*Od.* 7.136), whom Odysseus sees upon entering Alcinous’ palace—whether the same individuals or a different assortment of aristocracy is of little consequence; Arete refers to members of the aristocracy. Arete’s intervention in the *intermezzo* is not ‘belated and anticlimactic’,³⁹⁶ but rather Arete’s words are ‘one of the most densely encoded indicators of Arete’s social and poetic authority in the *Odyssey*’.³⁹⁷ This is Arete’s ‘first acknowledgment of the fact that it was herself and not Alcinous whom Odysseus approached in his suppliant’s posture ([*Od.*] 7.142-52)’,³⁹⁸ and she defines it as her own right with the singular possessive pronoun ‘my’ (ἐμός).

Arete follows the mechanics of τιμή seen elsewhere in Homeric epic. She claims Odysseus’ hospitality as her own right to bestow, but says the Phaeacian noblemen ‘share the privilege’ (ἔμμορε τιμῆς). Arete is thus ‘handing down’ τιμή, as social superordinate to subordinate, to the leading Phaeacians in a move which asserts her position as their social superior. This would have been a remarkable display of the Phaeacian queen’s pre-eminence and crucial evidence of female τιμή and autonomy in Homeric epic, were Echeneus not to interject. Echeneus agrees with Arete about giving Odysseus lavish gifts, ‘but this word and deed should follow from Alcinous’ (*Od.* 11.346). Alcinous, the king, has final say on the distribution of τιμή.

³⁹⁶ Fenik (1974) 106.

³⁹⁷ Arft (2022) 228.

³⁹⁸ Doherty (1991) 148.

Finkelberg suggests that ‘*timē*’ should be regarded not as a competitive [...] but rather as what can be called a ‘distributive’ value’,³⁹⁹ but this is only half of the picture. Homeric τιμή has a number of functions. It can mark a god being or becoming a god as was the case with Ino and the Dioscuri. Zeus was shown to be the only the only god who can give out τιμή – akin to his role in the Hesiodic *Theogony* – and this was demonstrated to result from his position as the ruler of the gods. Zeus thus gives τιμή to his subordinates. Zeus not only gives τιμή to the others gods, but also to humans. Most notably, it becomes an almost proverbial saying in Homeric epic that a king’s authority comes from Zeus, while τιμή can more generally be used to describe a king’s right to rule. τιμή also has a function between sociological equals. In this capacity Homeric heroes are careful not to give τιμή to one another, but rather treat each other as innately possessing τιμή and offer displays of that esteem without claiming to give τιμή to another hero. When an individual is insulted or attacked it removes their status, and therefore their τιμή, and so the hero must take it back – then τιμή is understood as recompense. Even where the term has more divergent meanings – such as referring to a cut of meat or the hosting of a guest – τιμή still operates with the same mechanics: it is the possession of the social elite and handed down, at their discretion, to their social inferiors.

1.5.4 Herodotean τιμή

Herodotus also uses τιμή, but in some remarkably different ways to Homer. Herodotus uses the term 27 times,⁴⁰⁰ again this is less than the frequency in Homeric epic. There is a greater prominence of τιμή in Herodotus’ first four contextualising and anthropological books (20 occurrences). Herodotus cites Homer (and Hesiod) in a context where he brings up τιμή:

³⁹⁹ Finkelberg (1998) 16.

⁴⁰⁰ 1.59.6, 1.91.1, 1.115.1, 1.118.2, 1.120.5, 1.134.2, 1.168, 2.46.3, 2.53.2, 2.62.2, 2.65.3, 2.83, 3.3.2, 3.34.1, 4.33.3, 4.35.1, 4.35.2, 4.145.4, 4.155.2, 4.162.1, 6.66.3, 7.8a.2, 7.36.1, 7.104.2, 7.119.2, 8.67.2, 9.28.3.

I believe Hesiod and Homer were around four generations prior to me and no more: these are the poets who gave the origins of the gods and names to the Greeks and divided up their **honours** (τιμᾶς) and skills and their appearances (2.53.2).⁴⁰¹

Herodotus connects Homer with τιμή. While Herodotus adopts one of the Homeric functions of τιμή (namely, its use to denote the honours of the gods), the Herodotean use often differs from the Homeric. This is not to say that Herodotus has radically reviewed the term's fundamental meaning; he has not. Instead, the types of characters and narrative contexts where τιμή is deployed, as well as the mechanics attached to τιμή, differ greatly from the Homeric contexts.

Herodotus uses τιμή in relation to the gods.⁴⁰² Astyages hides his anger when Harpagus reveals that Cyrus is still alive and says, 'send your own son to this newly arrived boy [sc. Cyrus], and come here to dine with me (for I intend to make a sacrifice for the saving of this child to the gods to whom this **honour is dedicated** (τιμή [...] πρόσκειται)' (1.118.2). The verb 'I dedicate' (πρόσκειμαι) used in conjunction with τιμή shows that the intended sacrifice is a τιμή for the gods. This inverts the Homeric mechanics of τιμή, where humans as social inferiors to the gods were on the receiving end of τιμή rather than, as we have it here, 'giving τιμή up' to the gods, their superiors.

The inversion for the procedure of giving τιμή, however, is the least of the concerns for this use. Harpagus goes away delighted at the positive turn of events, but later, 'Astyages, when

⁴⁰¹ On this passage see Donelli (2022) 223-4. Harrison (2022) 91-2, drawing upon Hes. *Theog.* 111-2, says that the 'obvious point of parallel with this passage [sc. Hdt. 2.53.2] would perhaps be Hesiod's *Theogony*, where the gods allocate themselves their *timai* rather than having them given to them'. As we have seen (p.120) this is not strictly true as Zeus allocates the *timai* at Hes. *Theog.* 883-5.

⁴⁰² 1.118.2, 1.168, 2.53.2, 2.62.2, 2.83, 4.33.3, 4.35.1, 4.35.2. See Sale (1961) for a discussion on the last 3 uses.

Harpagus' child arrived, **killed** (σφάζας) him, **cleaving apart** (διελών) the limbs, **roasted** (ῥπτησε) some of the flesh and **boiled** (ῥψησε) some other parts' (1.119.3). The use of four singular verbal forms (σφάζας, διελών, ῥπτησε and ῥψησε) in such close proximity creates the impression that Astyages undertook all of the preparation of Harpagus' son himself, seeking no help from servants. The level of detail Herodotus gives for the 'meat' preparation is reminiscent of the scenes of sacrifice and meat preparation in Homeric epic.⁴⁰³ Further, 'the standard method of cooking [...] is the barbecue, which real heroes are clearly expected to accomplish for themselves rather than leave to underlings'.⁴⁰⁴ On the one level then, Herodotus is presenting Astyages as a Homeric hero through his individual culinary capabilities. This is, of course, totally undercut by the meal he is preparing: Harpagus' son. By presenting the cooking of Harpagus' son in line with Homeric patterns of feasting and meal preparation, Herodotus highlights the sacrilegious nature of Astyages' actions. The combination of inverting the mechanics of giving τιμή to a god, along with the sacrilegious nature of this sacrifice, thus makes this use of τιμή differ starkly from the Homeric precedent.

Herodotus uses τιμή once for a hero cult.⁴⁰⁵ The refugees from Teos found the city of Abdera, although 'the [sc. city] had been founded by Timesius of Clazomenae but he had no good of it, but was driven out by Thracians; now Timesius now has **a cult as a hero** (τιμὰς [...]) ὡς ἥρωος ἔχει) by the Teians in Abdera' (1.168). Currie's seminal study on hero cults posits that 'by instituting a hero cult for a recently deceased person, a community may have had a means of rewarding a benefaction done by that person to itself'.⁴⁰⁶ The failed colony which Timesius set up in Abdera functions as a safe haven for the Teians fleeing Harpagus' attack. Thus, as a

⁴⁰³ *Od.* 3.5-9, 3.32-385, 3.435-64, 7.186-90, 12.359-65, 14.74-80 and 14.418-38. *Il.* 1.458-68, 2.421-31, 3.245-301, 7.313-22, 9.205-17 and 24.619-28. I exclude from this list of feasting scenes passing reference to the sacrifice of animals, in favour of those where the spitting and cooking of the flesh is detailed.

⁴⁰⁴ Sherratt (2004) 306.

⁴⁰⁵ See Vandiver (1991) 210-3 for hero cult in Herodotus.

⁴⁰⁶ Currie (2004) 4.

means of rewarding the (although unintentional) ‘benefaction’ of creating the Teians’ refuge, they institute a hero cult to Timesius.⁴⁰⁷ The Homeric practice of giving τιμή is once again inverted as the human Teian community present τιμή to the hero Timesius.

τιμή is also used in an Egyptian religious setting. Herodotus mentions the Feast of Lamps, ‘a sacred tale is told telling why this night is lit up and apportioned **honour** (τιμήν)’ (2.62.2). Herodotus does not tell us the source of the ‘honour’ (τιμή). While frustrating for a reader’s curiosity, this is Herodotus’ customary stance towards Egyptian religion. Herodotus begins the Egyptian *logos* with a methodological statement ruling out the discussion of religious matters unless absolutely necessary, and, three modern chapter divisions after the current use of τιμή at 2.62.2, Herodotus makes another such declaration.⁴⁰⁸ These statements superficially imply that religion is absent from the *Histories*. However, as here, ‘on closer examination Herodotus’ discretion can be seen to refer only to certain details of the myth and cult of Egypt’.⁴⁰⁹ Lloyd draws upon Egyptian sources to inform us that ‘the ἱπὸς λόγος [...] is a cosmology, the most detailed known, in which Neith [Egyptian Athena] functions as the Demiurge and which gives the background to the Feast of Neith’,⁴¹⁰ and so the tale is an aetiology. Herodotus uses τιμή to denote the religious offerings of the lamps dedicated to Neith-Athena, and so, once again, we see a reversal of the Homeric procedure of assigning τιμή.

⁴⁰⁷ Balkin (1987) 131: ‘The colonists of Teos, for example, who founded Abdera ca. 545 B.C., were well aware that the place had been previously settled by Timesias of Klazomenai (ca. 654 B.C.) and even accorded him heroic honours, probably as an oikist. This suggests that although the colony itself was definitely Teian, the oikist was not, in terms of the religious and symbolic roles he fulfilled’.

⁴⁰⁸ ‘Now, regarding such stories as I heard about the gods, I am not eager to recount, except only their names, I believe that all humans possess equal knowledge about them: I shall make mention of them, by **compulsion** (ἐξαναγκαζόμενος) as I tell my story’ (2.3.2). ‘But if I said why they are left alone as sacred, I should go down a narrative of divine matter, which I am very much averse to treating; I have spoken about these things lightly **by compulsion** (ἀναγκάϊη) where by compulsion I am forced to speak’ (2.65.2). On the compulsion (ἀνάγκη) of *logos* see Munson (2001) 46.

⁴⁰⁹ Harrison (2000) 12.

⁴¹⁰ Lloyd (1976) 282, see further 282-3. See also Smoláriková (2016).

Homeric kings get their authority from Zeus. Herodotus never vocalises this aspect of kingship, but does use τιμή to denote the role of king.⁴¹¹ Xerxes addresses the council chamber:

‘Since I took to the throne, **I keep thinking** (ἐφρόντιζον) of how I shall not fall short **in this role** (ἐν τιμῇ) **compared to those who came before me** (τῶν πρότερον γενομένων), nor acquire for the Persians a **lesser** (ἐλάσσω) power’ (7.8α.2).

The iterative imperfect ‘I keep thinking’ (ἐφρόντιζον) expresses Xerxes’ anxiety in his role (ἐν τιμῇ) as Persian king. The comparative genitive ‘those who came before’ (τῶν πρότερον γενομένων) shows to whom Xerxes is repeatedly comparing himself. Herodotus presents Xerxes as feeling the pressures of Persian imperial expansionism with the expression of fear of leaving the Persians with a ‘lesser’ (ἐλάσσω) power than before he inherited the throne. For Xerxes, the position of assuming τιμή and becoming the Persian monarch is an office filled with responsibility.

The Spartan king Demaratus uses τιμή as meaning ‘right to rule’, but expresses this idea in the negative. Demaratus says,

‘how much I love them at the moment you know perfectly well, since **they deposed me, robbed me of my ancestral rights** (τιμὴν τε καὶ γέρεα ἀπελόμενοι), and made me a stateless exile’ (7.104.2).⁴¹²

Waterfield renders the one Greek participle ἀπελόμενοι as the two English verbs ‘they deposed’ and ‘robbed’, since this participle has two direct objects; to have only one verb in English

⁴¹¹ Where Herodotus uses τιμή to denote the status of king: 1.91.1, 4.155.2, 4.162.1, 7.8α.2 and 7.104.2.

⁴¹² Translation Waterfield (1998) 440.

translation would make for clunky phrasing. However, as is often the case with translation, this loses an element of the original Greek. The single participle to denote the taking away of both τιμή and γέρας suggests that, at least from Demaratus' perspective, both were taken at the same time: in the single act of losing his kingship Demaratus lost both his τιμή and γέρας. In Homeric epic, we never saw a king lose his τιμή. There can be anxiety in Homeric epic about losing the kingship and τιμή, as expressed by Achilles (p.124), but this was never borne out in the Homeric texts.

Unlike Homer, Herodotus does not reserve τιμή exclusively for the role of monarchy, but uses it in reference to a wide range of societal roles.⁴¹³ After Peisistratus makes his first attempt at seizing tyranny in Athens, Herodotus says,

Peisistratus ruled (Πεισίστρατος ἥρχε) the Athenians; he **neither altered the offices** (οὔτε τιμὰς τὰς ἐούσας συνταράξας) nor changed the laws, but governed the city according to its existing practices fairly and well (1.59.6).

Peisistratus maintains the existing method of governing (ἐπὶ τε τοῖσι κατεστεῶσι ἔνεμε), but Herodotus says that he was the one 'ruling' (the verb is ἄρχω) in Athens. Despite Peisistratus' position as the tyrant, he is not presented as the one holding the τιμή. Here it is difficult to tell precisely what is denoted by τιμή (occupations within Athenian government or individual honours not to do with the running of state). The exact nature of what constitutes this use of τιμή is immaterial: Peisistratus does not have it and Peisistratus is the tyrant. This might be why this attempt at his tyranny does not succeed. Peisistratus leaves the Athenian τιμή as it was, but τιμή can legitimise a ruler.

⁴¹³ Where Herodotus uses τιμή to denote societal roles more broadly: 1.59.6, 2.46.3, 2.65.3, 3.34.1 and 6.66.3.

Herodotus uses the term much more broadly than in constitutional matters, designating a variety of roles as a τιμή: he explains the practice in Egypt where a cattle herder's 'son inherits from his father **the role**' (τὴν τιμήν, 2.65.3);⁴¹⁴ in a Persian setting τιμή is applied to the role of Cambyses' cupbearer 'the son of this man [sc. Prexaspes] was the cup-bearer to Cambyses, which is not a small **honour**' (τιμή, 3.34.1); and at Delphi, τιμή describes the role of the Pythia, as when Perialla is deposed following her false judgement that Demaratus was not the son of Ariston: 'Perialla the prophetess ceased from **her position**' (τῆς τιμῆς, 6.66.3). Each of these societal roles demonstrates a radical reapplication of the term compared with Homeric epic. The only societal role to be called a τιμή in Homeric epic was kingship, but Herodotus, as with his use of γέρας (p.78), widens the pool of social positions denoted by the term.

Herodotean τιμή can also mean esteem in the sense of respect between individuals.⁴¹⁵ Ahead of the Battle of Plataea, 'the Spartans chose the Tegeans to stand next to them **on account of their esteem and excellence** (τιμῆς εἵνεκα καὶ ἀρετῆς)' (9.28.3). Herodotus uses two very Homeric words: τιμή, with which we are currently concerned, and ἀρετή (see, pp.24-5), to describe the Spartans' respect for the Tegeans. This seems very Homeric and a positive characterisation of the Tegeans considering we are in the lead-up to the decisive battle of the Persian Wars.

In the previous chapter (9.27), however, the Athenians deliver a tirade denouncing the Tegeans and dissuading the army from giving the Tegeans the position at the battleline wing. In 9.27, the Athenians suggested that the acts of the Tegeans' ancestors do not prove any

⁴¹⁴ Herodotus also informs us that, of the herders, 'the goat-herders have the **greater honour** (τιμὰς μέζονας)' (2.46.3).

⁴¹⁵ Where τιμή refers to esteem: 1.120.5, 1.134.2, 3.3.2, 7.36.1, 7.119.2, 8.67.2, 9.28.3. The use at 1.115.1 blends the role of rank and esteem as Herodotus presents Astyages 'wanting to avenge Artembares' child **on account of his** [sc. Artembares'] **esteem/rank** (τιμῆς τῆς [...] εἵνεκα); either translation works of 'esteem' (Astyages' good opinion of Artembares) or 'rank' (at 1.114.3 Herodotus describes Artembares as 'notable' (δόκιμος), noticeably a word without Homeric precedent (p.77 and 239), implying he holds an office in the Median constitution).

capabilities of their current descendants (pp.87-88 for the use of γέρας). And so, the reader approaches the Spartans' selection of the Tegeans as battlefield neighbours with the loss of this debate in mind – including the scathing indictment that they are much lesser men than in previous generations (including the Homeric generation). This problematises the value of Homeric terms in Herodotus' account since the Spartans choose the Tegeans 'on account of' (εἵνεκα) these two Homeric terms.

This is difficult to reconcile. While Herodotus' Spartans view the Tegeans as possessing the Homeric qualities τιμή and ἀρετή, the Athenians suggest their modern-day capabilities pale in comparison to their Homeric predecessors and, notably, have just deprived them of the γέρας of the fighting wing (pp.87-8). Rather than see these as mutually irreconcilable standpoints, I would argue that this is representative of the subjectivity of heroism.⁴¹⁶ Just because the Athenians do not view the Tegeans as heroic (which in this case is the same thing as Homeric), does not mean that the Spartans cannot hold the Tegeans in Homeric 'esteem' (τιμή).

τιμή is also used to mean esteem in an Eastern setting. The Magi reassure Astyages that they are not part of a wider plot to depose him, 'but while you are king, being our fellow-citizen,⁴¹⁷ we have a share of the power and from you we have **great esteem** (τιμᾶς)' (1.120.5). After Cyrus takes power, Herodotus details the Persian customs, including their 'geographic scale' of τιμή: '**they hold in the greatest opinion** (τιμῶσι [...] ἄγχιστα) those who live closest to themselves, secondly those second closest: and **they assign esteem** (τιμῶσι) according to this rule: they regard least **in opinion** (ἐν τιμῇ) those who live furthest from themselves' (1.134.2). The reason Herodotus gives for the diminishing in esteem relative to distance is in the next clause: 'they believe themselves to be the very best of all humankind' (1.134.2). It is

⁴¹⁶ Franco *et al.* (2011) 99: 'the very same act accorded hero status in one group [...] is absolutely abhorrent to others'.

⁴¹⁷ By the noun 'fellow-citizen' (πολίτης) the Magi mean a fellow Median, and not one of the Persians who are subject to them.

a typically imperialist attitude to disregard cultures which are further afield in favour of one's own and those adjacent to one's own locality.

The gradation of τιμή based on location is replicated in the Persian council chambers. At Phalerum, 'when [Xerxes] arrived and sat on the throne, the tyrants and commanders of troops came from the ships at his summons, and they sat each **in rank** (τιμὴν) the king gave to them, first the king of Sidon, then the king of Tyre, and the others' (8.67.2). Here the noun τιμή refers not only to the esteem in which Xerxes holds the individual rulers and tyrants, but also to their location within the council chamber. Individuals sit further from the king based on Xerxes' perceived value of individuals and their cities. This use of τιμή can also have a material representation. Herodotus discusses cities' preparations for Xerxes' army. Herodotus describes one provision: 'they fed cattle, finding the finest **money could buy** (τιμῆς, 7.119.2)'. Here τιμή has a monetary meaning. The Greek cities hosting Xerxes and his army ensure that the stock of cattle they purpose is commensurate with their estimation of Xerxes' status.

There is one female character whose esteem is described as τιμή. Herodotus gives two reasons for the origin of Persian aggression against Egypt. The first reason is that Cambyses was promised Amasis' daughter, but Amasis sent the daughter of the former king Apries instead (3.1.3). This led 'Cambyses, son of Cyrus, into a great fit of rage' (3.1.5) and thus sparked the Persian attack on Egypt. This is the version attributed to the Persians (3.2.1).

There is another story for which Herodotus takes no responsibility: 'this story **is told** (λέγεται) also, to me it is not plausible' (3.3.1). With an outright denial of its truth, 'to me it is not plausible' (3.3.1) and the noncommittal λέγεται attributing the narrative to an anonymous narrator,⁴¹⁸ Herodotus primes our ears for a piece of palace gossip. When a Persian woman visits Cyrus' wives and praises Cassandane for her excellent children, Cassandane bitterly

⁴¹⁸ Compare λέγεται at Thermopylae (pp.103-4).

replies, ‘indeed, but though I am the mother of children such as these, Cyrus holds me **in dishonour** (ἐν ἀτιμίῃ), but places **in honour** (ἐν τιμῇ) his newly-acquired Egyptian woman’ (3.3.2). Cassandane draws a contrast between her ‘dishonour’ (ἀτιμία) and the ‘esteem’ (τιμή) in which Cyrus holds his new Egyptian woman: it is the reverse of what she would like. From an ancient Greek perspective, we can see some misogynistic humour. Cassandane is jealous of the attention Cyrus’ new Egyptian female companion (for Herodotus does not tell us whether she is a courtesan, another wife, or a prostitute) is receiving. This appears to be something of a typical male attitude towards female counterparts, where ancient Greek men believed that their wives sat around longing for their husbands.⁴¹⁹

Cambyes is more understanding to his mother’s distress. Cambyes, overhearing, says, ‘well then mother, when I become a man, I shall turn Egypt upside down’ (3.3.3). From his mother’s perspective, this is rather endearing. However, this narrative, unattributed to any definitive source, undercuts Cambyes’ masculinity and effectively depicts him as a ‘mummy’s boy’. It humorously presents Cambyes’ drive to war as fulfilling the enduring wish of a small boy, rather than a more glorious motivation such as Persian expansionism or indeed the conflict with Amasis over marriage to his daughter (3.1).

There are two more exceptional uses of τιμή. The first is in connection with the Minyae (4.145) and the second the bridging of the Hellespont (7.36). The use of τιμή with the Minyae requires some context and I shall examine this use first. The Minyae, expelled from Lemnos (4.145.2-3), ‘settled on Mount Taygetus and **kindled a fire** (πῦρ ἀνέκαιον)’ (4.145.2). The Spartans send a messenger whom the Minyae inform that they descend from the *Argo*’s crew (4.145.3). The Lacedaemonians resend a messenger ‘asking why they had come to this land

⁴¹⁹ Though potentially a little later than Herodotus’ time, since the play was first produced in 431BC, see also Jason’s reproach of Medea, Eur. *Med.* 1336-8: ‘But having been married to me and bearing children for me, you killed them on account of your sex life and the marriage-bed’.

and **kindled a fire**’ (πῦρ αἵθουεν, 4.145.4). The repeated references to kindling a fire mark it as significant. Balkin suggests that ‘there can be little doubt, therefore, that the kindling of fire in a new territory signified for Herodotus a new settlement’.⁴²⁰ However, Balkin’s certainty seems to me to be misplaced. Further, it contradicts Balkin’s wider argument that Greek colonisers took fire from the hearth of their mother-city when founding colonies to signal continuity with their mother-city.⁴²¹

Indeed, I am not convinced that the Minyae are founding a colony. Herodotus repeats the participle form ‘driven out’ (ἐξελασθέντες, 4.145.2) to describe the Minyae leaving Lemnos, and then when the Minyae reply to the Spartan messenger they use a semantically synonymous participle, ‘driven out’ (ἐκβληθέντες, 4.145.4). Both verbs imply not only haste but disorganisation of movement. The Minyae did not start their journey from the πρυτανεῖον (as at 1.146.2), nor is there any mention of the Minyae taking the sacred fire of their home. Thus, there is no evidence in Herodotus’ narrative to suggest that the Minyae are founding a formal colony. I would argue that the fire does not symbolise colonisation, but instead represents the Minyae making themselves at home. This is relevant for our reading of τιμή in the narrative.

The Minyae feel justified in settling near Taygetus. Herodotus reports their reply to the Lacedaemonian messenger:

driven out by the Pelasgians, they came **to the land of their fathers** (ἐς τοὺς πατέρας): for this was **most just** (δικαιότατον); but they asked (δέεσθαι) for a place to live (οικέειν) **at the same time as** (ἄμα) having **a shared portion of rights** (μοῖραν τε τιμέων μετέχοντες) and obtaining a portion of land (4.145.4).

⁴²⁰ Balkin (1987) 117.

⁴²¹ Balkin (1987) 114-34.

The Minyae say that they have returned to the land of their fathers (ἐς τοὺς πατέρας) as this was the correct place for them to resettle and entirely just (δικαιότατον). This creates a tone of certainty, but also of entitlement. Key here is Herodotus' word order as he details the Minyae's request to Lacedaemonians: the Minyae ask for a place 'to live' (οικέειν), and 'at the same time' (ἅμα) request 'a shared portion of rights' (μοῖράν τε τιμέων μετέχοντες) and 'obtaining a portion of land' (τῆς γῆς ἀπολαχόντες). Though the conjunction ἅμα suggests that the request for land and rights (τιμή) occurred at the same time, by placing the petition for τιμή first, Herodotus suggests this is the Minyae's priority.

The Minyae's use of τιμή signifies the right to rule and that this becomes problematic as the narrative progresses. The Spartans accept the Minyae and give them all that they asked for as the Dioscuri were heroes on the *Argo* (4.145.5) – crucially including τιμή. In Homeric epic, and indeed in Herodotean prose, τιμή denotes the king's status. However, Herodotus also widens the pool of social roles encompassed by τιμή (p.138). I would argue that this forms part of the very problem. The Lacedaemonians are happy to have given the Minyae τιμή because, in a Herodotean world, there are different types of τιμή which people can possess; it is not strictly royal. However, the Minyae talk in terms of the heroic past, mentioning the *Argo*, and so can be viewed as being stuck in the heroic world of the Argonauts. Part of this is the fixed understanding of that generation's view of what τιμή means. Herodotus continues that 'after not a long time went by, the Minyae quickly became over proud, and **demandd some of the kingship** (τῆς τε βασιληίης μεταίτεοντες) and did other impious things' (4.146.1). This stems from their being allocated a 'shared portion of rights' (μοῖράν τε τιμέων μετέχοντες, 4.145.4); that is to say a portion of τιμή. They have received a portion (μοῖράν, 4.145.4) of τιμή and think this entitles them to hold some of the kingship. The Minyae 'demandd a share of the kingship' (τῆς τε βασιληίης μεταίτεοντες) as this was the land of their forefathers, and so believe that the τιμή belongs to themselves by right of inheritance and not the Lacedaemonians.

The difference in understanding of how τιμή operates escalates. The Minyae's forefathers might have had the τιμή in a heroic generation, but Herodotus' world has moved on from mythical τιμή and the Spartans 'decided to kill them, and threw them all into prison' (4.146.2). Herodotus further undercuts the Minyae's pedigree and their τιμή by detailing their escape: 'all the women gave their clothes to the men and took those of the men, and the Minyae dressed themselves in women's clothing so that they could go outside as though women' (4.146.4, on this scene see further: pp.281-2). The Minyae thus misunderstand what τιμή means in a Herodotean context. This misunderstanding results in a clash of cultures from the heroic past and the Herodotean present.⁴²² The Minyae only escape death by cross-dressing and covert escape which (*pace* Achilles on Scyros) is a markedly unheroic turn of events.

The other exceptional use of τιμή is found at the scene of whipping the Hellespont – a scene 'attaining iconic status as a signature of human arrogance'.⁴²³ This scene is often compared by scholars to the bridging of other bodies of water by the previous Persian kings.⁴²⁴ After hearing that the bridge over the Hellespont is destroyed in a storm,

Xerxes [...] became angry and ordered the Hellespont to be subjected to three-hundred lashes with a whip and for a pair of fetters to be thrown into the ocean. **I even heard** (ἤδῃ δὲ ἤκουσα) that Xerxes sent branders to brand the Hellespont. He commanded them, while whipping the river to speak **barbarous** (βάρβαρά) and wicked words (7.35.1-2).

⁴²² On the clash between Herodotean present and heroic past see further the Maendrius episode pp.76-7 and 212-3. The Minyae episode pp.141-4. The wing debate at Tegea pp.86-8 and 138-9.

⁴²³ Sheehan (2018) 294. Other scholars who see Xerxes' actions at the Hellespont as arrogant include Thomas (2000) 99: 'a monumental act of arrogance'. Romm (1998) 84: 'Xerxes' behavior [sic.] at the Hellespont embodies the larger *hybris* of Persian imperialism'. Lateiner (1989) 130 sees this episode as 'the most full-articulated and best-known example of human transgression'. Maxwell-Stuart (1976) 361: '[Xerxes] sees everything as a slave – his army, foreign nations, even the Hellespont'.

⁴²⁴ Cyrus and the Araxes (1.205), Darius over the Bosphorus (4.88, see pp.56-8). Sheehan (2018) 204. Romm (2006) 188. Scullion (2006) 193. Flory (1987) 58. See also Pelling (2019) 117. Lateiner (1989) 130.

This is a scene of outrageous hubris. Aeschylus' *Persians*, decades earlier, reveals the extent to which Xerxes' behaviour was derided,⁴²⁵ and Herodotus' use of the adjective 'barbarous' (βάρβαρος) highlights just how 'un-Greek' this action is.⁴²⁶ I am not convinced that

our knowledge of ritual and religious behaviour of Persian kings is so limited that the assumption of Xerxes acting out his personal anger is hazardous, even if Herodotus clearly describes Xerxes acting in such terms.⁴²⁷

Herodotus' contemporary audience would not have been so forgiving as some modern scholars, but instead see the actions of an egregious megalomaniac. Herodotus even breaks the narrative fourth wall, 'I even heard' (ἤδη δὲ ἤκουσα), and draws attention to his own narratorial persona as though the shock of Xerxes' actions personally takes him aback.

Herodotus closes this spectacular scene of royal hubris with a statement containing τιμή: 'and so these things were done, to those it was assigned a **disgraceful honour** (αὕτη ἡ ἄχαρις τιμή)' (7.36.1). Here Herodotus not only subverts the typically positive semantics of τιμή, but perverts it too. Those who abuse the Hellespont are said to have been given τιμή by Xerxes. This intensifies the hubristic portrait of Xerxes. While we saw τιμή handed down from social superior to inferior, this τιμή is tainted by the reason for its conferment: the hideous maltreatment of the river.

⁴²⁵ Aesch. *Pers.* 744-50. Though, note, with Hall (1996) 160: '[Darius] sets Xerxes' actions in their theological context. This passage probably has nothing to do with the famous tradition in which Xerxes had the waters of the Hellespont flogged (Hdt. 7.35), a tradition which was either not yet current, or was unfamiliar to Aeschylus, or which he chose not to exploit'. The Aeschylean context remains important nonetheless for its hubristic characterisation of Xerxes.

⁴²⁶ On the semantics of βάρβαρος see Hall (1989) 5-6, 9-10 and 178-80.

⁴²⁷ Sacisi-Weerdenburg (2002) 585.

1.5.5 Conclusion

Herodotus thus uses τιμή in some radically different ways to Homer. Herodotus cites Homer as one of the poets (with Hesiod) to teach the Greeks the gods' τιμή. Herodotus uses τιμή to refer to honours given to the Persian and Egyptian gods, but never any of the Greek pantheon. Herodotus also uses τιμή for hero cult, while, in Homeric epic, the traces of hero worship do not include the term τιμή. In Herodotean religious settings, however, the Homeric mechanics of τιμή – where it is given from social superior to social inferior – are reversed. In the *Histories* humans give τιμή to the gods, rather than the other way around. Herodotus retains the use of τιμή to denote both Persian and Greek kingship, but shows that royal τιμή can be taken away—something which is never seen in the Homeric poems. Monarchy was the only Homeric societal role which was called a τιμή, but in Herodotus any number of professions – from to lowly Egyptian goat herder, to Delphic prophetess, to cupbearer – all are called a τιμή.

Herodotus also uses τιμή to mean respect or esteem – but the only application to Greek individuals, its use at Plataea, is problematic due to the Tegeans' hybrid status in terms of whether in fact they are Homeric and/or heroic. In a Persian setting τιμή as referring to 'esteem' was shown to be based on location rather character merit. The only decisive use of τιμή to mean unadulterated good esteem was the Magi's self-assigning of τιμή from Astyages (1.120.5). Herodotus, quite radically, has a female character possess τιμή, but rather than a sign of proto-feminism this was argued to undercut Cambyses' heroic potential. The Minyae narrative settling at Taygetus was shown to dramatize a contrast between the heroic past's understanding of τιμή and the Herodotean narrative world's understanding of τιμή, in which the Minyae quarrelled and were nearly executed for their misunderstanding. The use at the Hellespont was a total departure from the Homeric use of τιμή. There τιμή intensified the despotic portrait of Xerxes. While Herodotus has clearly adopted many of the Homeric uses for τιμή there are some radical innovations in the term's application.

1.6 Chapter Conclusions – Fame Words

This chapter has examined selected examples of the terminology of fame and status in epic and its use in the *Histories*. It has shown some (surprising) differences for κῦδος, γέρας, κλέος, and τιμή in Herodotean prose compared with the epic background as exemplified by the Homeric poems. There are themes which are not limited to the use of one term and emerge across the examination the above examination of epic fame vocabulary.

The first point to note is perhaps the most obvious. Herodotus uses each of the selected pieces of epic vocabulary less than it is found in the Homeric poems: κῦδος occurs 77 times in Homeric epic, but only 3 times in Herodotean prose; γέρας occurs 42 times in Homeric epic, but only 17 times in Herodotean prose; κλέος occurs 63 times in Homeric epic, but only 4 times in Herodotean prose; and τιμή occurs 38 times and 27 times in Herodotean prose. The dissimilarity in frequency for each fame term examined shows a hesitancy by Herodotus to deploy the epic vocabulary for fame.

One consistent change is the type of activity which results in the application of the epic fame word in the *Histories*. As might be expected for a martial epic, the *Iliad* predominantly features fighting as a source of glory. The *Odyssey*, while also showing glory resulting from fighting, provides other opportunities for glory – most notably the gendered use of κλέος for Penelope’s fidelity (p.94-99). In the *Histories* Herodotus applies the terms to a variety of roles and actions. Mandrocles the architect, not warrior, had κῦδος applied to him. Herodotus also described the roles of messengers and priests as γέρας (1.114.2 and 7.134.1, and 3.142.4, respectively); while a similar application of τιμή was found for the roles of cattle herder (2.65.3) and cup-bearer (3.34.1). This is not to say that glory does not result from fighting in the Herodotean world. We saw that the Spartans at Thermopylae achieved epic-style κλέος, particularly as they were said to have a reputation by Mardonius (9.48.3). Nonetheless,

Herodotus has broadened the variety of roles and activities to which the epic terms of fame and status are applied in the *Histories*. The dilution of the vocabulary's applicability contributes to the overall removal of the terms from the grandiose realms of epic.

Another point of difference is the use of the terms within or outside of narrator text. Two of these terms, κῦδος and κλέος, are only ever applied in text outside of the Herodotean narratorial persona. Herodotus assigns Mandrocles' κῦδος to a direct quotation of the inscription (4.88.2), the use at the Battle of Sepeia is likewise relegated to the quotation of an oracle (6.77.2), while Xerxes' hortative use in the war council of Book 7 is within his own character speech (7.8α.2). The same is true for the prized term κλέος. Both uses of κλέος at Thermopylae are outside of Herodotus' narratorial voice: 7.220.2 is preceded by the non-committal λέγεται and the use at 7.220.4 is focalised through Leonidas' perspective. The other two uses are found in character speech spoken by Mardonius (9.48.3) and Lampon (9.78.2). Thus, characters within Herodotus' narrative world are happy to think in terms achieving epic-style glory, but Herodotus himself holds this application at arm's length.

The difference is not only between Herodotus and his characters, but also between the characters of Herodotus' text. Maendrius and Telesarchus misunderstand each other for what γέρας means in a Herodotean context (pp.76-8). Analogously, the Minyae near Taygetus misconstrue what it means when the Lacedaemonians give them τιμή (pp.141-4). In the former, Telesarchus' reply sparks a moment of comedy. He in effect replies to Maendrius' claim to keep γέρας (the status symbol of the epic aristocracy) by saying "who are you?". In the latter, the Minyae talk in terms of the heroic past, mentioning the *Argo* (4.145.5), and seem entitled to τιμή. This escalates to bloodshed and imprisonment (pp.144, see also: pp.281-2). Characters' misunderstanding of terms' meaning in an epic context compared to Herodotus' *Histories* might be seen as amusing: some characters are stuck in the past. However, these scenes explicate the difference between the two narrative worlds.

Herodotus and Homer both innovate with the application of this terminology to women. We saw above just how hard Homer was stressing that Penelope's κλέος was a *good* κλέος. This was due to the concurrent idea of woman's infidelity resulting in a *negative* κλέος as typified by the fragments of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* and the vestiges found in the Odyssey's *Nekyia* (pp.96-8). However, the one time Herodotus describes a woman receiving the poetic term κλεινός, cognate with κλέος, it is the prostitute Rhodopis. This turns even the Homeric innovation on its head. Herodotus applies other fame terms, which are only awarded to men, to women as well. Herodotus, in his own narratorial persona, describes Pheretime holding the γέρας of Cyrene (4.165.1) and actively administering to the running of the city (pp.75-6). Another Herodotean female is afforded an epic fame term. Cassandane applies τιμή to Cyrus' newly-acquired Egyptian woman to describe her positive status in Cyrus' eyes (pp.140-1).

This last example, where Herodotus applies an epic fame term to a female character, also highlights the use of these terms in a humorous setting. Both Cassandane's reaction as a woman spurned and Cambyses' own response are humorous. It should be stressed that these are no everyday figures, but instead the wife of Cyrus the Great and Cambyses – the notorious mad king. Both Cassandane's and Cambyses' reactions result from a female character being invested with τιμή. A similar humorous application is found with γέρας in relation to Telines (pp.84-5). I suggested that Herodotus' sudden inversion of Telines' characterisation ultimately reflects on Telines' descendant: Gelon who denied the allied Greek forces aid in the wake of the Persian invasion (7.157-162). Humour is rarely without a point. Herodotus' humorous use of the epic vocabulary of fame might well reflect that he finds he laughable that there is someone fully Homeric in his Herodotean world. Drawing on the conclusion above, characters within Herodotus' narrative world may well see their actions or the actions of others as Homeric but Herodotus does not: and so, Herodotus laughs and encourages us to laugh as well.

There might well be very important historical figures who feature in Herodotus' text, but this does not preclude us from laughing at them.

As a work of *historiē*, which later comes to mean historiography, Herodotus is creating a new genre for recording events of the past. Epic provides one such model, but as a work of fiction an epic model provides limitations for espousing the veracity of an account – something Homer duly acknowledges (see use of κλέος pp.92-3). Each of the points raised in the conclusion to this chapter contribute to this claim to accuracy. The greatly reduced frequency of the term in the *Histories* demonstrates an almost conscious effort to avoid creating an epic aura. By widening the type of action celebrated with an epic fame term, Herodotus makes the everyday seem epic. By having characters, rather than himself as the narrator, apply the terms Herodotus often distances himself from the terms' application. Herodotus also presents characters within his text questioning or misunderstanding the term's meaning; this confusion often centres around whether a term holds its epic or Herodotean meaning. The very fact that this conflict arises demonstrates that it can hold a different meaning in the *Histories*. Analogous to the widening the type of actions awarded the fame word, the Herodotean use of epic fame vocabulary in relation to women further demonstrates its pluralisation: a greater sociology can now be in receipt of these once predominantly male values. Finally, the use of humour demonstrates Herodotus is not entirely serious with engaging with (Homeric) epic: by deploying the terms in amusing scenes or in a humorous manner Herodotus shows he is not to be thought of as seriously imitating Homer or epic more generally.

By writing in the new genre of *historiē* prose Herodotus is creating methods for guaranteeing its authenticity. By marginalising and adapting the epic vocabulary of fame, Herodotus provides one such method for strengthening the reputability and veracity of his account.

CHAPTER 2: FIGHTING WORDS

2.1 Introduction - Homeric and Herodotean Fighting Words

The previous chapter demonstrated the different use Herodotus made of Homer's vocabulary of heroism as it relates to fame and status. This section examines how that fame and status is achieved. As Schein says,

In the world of the poem, war is the medium of human existence and achievement; bravery and excellence in battle win honor [sic.] and glory and thus endow life with meaning. Heroes affirm their greatness by the brilliance and efficiency with which they kill. The flashing action of a warrior's triumph represents the fullest realization of human potential, despite the pain and loss for the victim, his family, and his community.⁴²⁸

Prowess in battle is the primary way in which a Homeric hero maintains his status and attains his glory.⁴²⁹ Indeed, this forms part of the social contract as vocalised by Sarpedon (p.13 and pp.116-7). He says to Glaucus that as they enjoy their respective seats of honour, meats, full cups of wine and a greater shares of Lycian lands, 'it is necessary for us two [sc. Sarpedon himself and Glaucus] to stand now **with the foremost Lycians** (Λυκίοισι μετὰ πρότοισιν)⁴³⁰ and meet with the raging battle' (Hom. *Il.* 12.315-6). Sarpedon demonstrates that the elevated status of a Homeric hero does not come obligation-free; 'the many social and economic

⁴²⁸ Schein (1984) 68.

⁴²⁹ Clarke (2004) 78.

⁴³⁰ For this use of *πρῶτος* to denote the Homeric *πρόμαχος* I accept Rey (2008) 60: 'Therefore, the use of the term '*prôtoi*' is largely a reflection of the uses [...] for the *prómachoi*'. ('Por tanto, el empleo del término '*prôtoi*' es en gran medida un reflejo de los usos [...] para los *prómachoi*').

advantages which he and Glaucus enjoy, must be earned by fighting in the front line together with other champions'.⁴³¹

It has been noted that 'both masculinity and heroism are ideas that share characteristics with each other'.⁴³² This is true in Homeric society. Homer presents fighting and warfare as exclusively masculine ventures.⁴³³ Braudy, examining masculinity through the ages, observes that 'throughout history, war has been one of the few social initiations that binds together this otherwise wide variety of masculine rites and traditions'.⁴³⁴ While it is true that 'the Homeric poems are interested in death far more than they are in fighting',⁴³⁵ fighting is the main cause of death in the Homeric poem. Fighting, and the death it causes, lead to acts of heroics so that 'heroism and death are tied together in a bond that is as certain as it is mysterious'.⁴³⁶ The *Iliad* 'showcases a zero-sum world of fighting, where the death of the opponent is exchanged for fame, through the traditional medium of song'.⁴³⁷ There is a directly proportional relationship between the status and the glory of a hero and the amount of death he causes; thus 'the greatest heroes are primarily men of war'.⁴³⁸

This section examines Herodotus' use of the Homeric terminology for fighting and strength. The vocabulary reviewed in this chapter are as follows: 'spirit of defence' (ἀλκή), 'power' (κράτος) and 'force' (βίη). Each term was applied to Achilles in the embassy scene of *Iliad* 9 and demonstrated a quality of his which the Achaeans were sorely lacking when he withdrew from battle. The examination of the first word ἀλκή differs from that of κράτος and

⁴³¹ Graziosi and Haubold (2003) 64.

⁴³² Partridge (2019) 69.

⁴³³ Graziosi and Haubold (2003) give an excellent account of Homeric masculinity and convincingly argue that (60) ἡνροπέη is a positive quality best understood as 'manliness', ἀγηνροπή denotes 'excessive manliness' in a pejorative sense'.

⁴³⁴ Braudy (2003) 21.

⁴³⁵ Griffin (1980) 94. McCoy (2013) 3-35 looks at the vulnerability of Homeric heroes. See further Renihan (1987) on the idea of 'heroic death'.

⁴³⁶ Clarke (2004) 75.

⁴³⁷ Buchan (2004) 107.

⁴³⁸ Bowra (1952) 97.

βίη by being a more behavioural study than sociological. This is because the resultant behaviour exhibited by a Herodotean character infused with ἀλκή is significantly different from that found in Homeric epic and warrants attention. The other terms, κράτος and βίη, are examined sociologically and illustrate how the terms add to the depiction of aristocratic figures.

As in the previous chapter, the narratological toolkit will help discern the layers of how the terminology is applied. This is to ask whether an application of a term focalised through a character's perspective influences the validity of the attribution of that term. It will show that, occasionally, characters misunderstand a corporeal experience and ascribe one term to the sensation when the Homeric narrator informs us that it is due to another quality.

2.2.1 Homeric ἄλκιμος

The first word examined in this chapter is ἄλκή. ‘Spirit of defence’ (ἄλκή) has a cognate adjective, ‘hardiness’ (ἄλκιμος), which I shall not be examining in detail. ‘Hardiness’ (ἄλκιμος) itself is used 48 times across both epics,⁴³⁹ with a greater Iliadic concentration. In the *Odyssey* ἄλκιμος is almost exclusively used to describe spears,⁴⁴⁰ or to describe a quality which youths lack.⁴⁴¹ The meaning shifts to a more martial connotation in *Odyssey* 22, where Odysseus battles the suitors, but both of these cases ἄλκιμος occurs in character speech and so is marked with actorial focalisation.⁴⁴²

In the *Iliad*, ἄλκιμος is most commonly deployed as an epithet for individual heroes.⁴⁴³ In his seminal study of Homeric epithets and formulae, Parry grouped ‘hardiness’ (designated by ἄλκιμος) in a table with other epithets which ‘refer to the character of the hero’ more generally as opposed to more specialised epithets reserved exclusively for individual heroes.⁴⁴⁴ Thus, ἄλκιμος would be useful for adducing a wider understanding of Homeric ἄλκή. However, this type of examination would have to reconcile the hermeneutic function of ἄλκιμος in each instance with its metrical use, that is whether it is employed purely for the metrical convenience of the Homeric bard in their performance or offers some insight into the use of ἄλκιμος in the Homeric conceptualisation of heroism. This would require a longer study than I can currently

⁴³⁹ *Od.* 1.99, 1.302, 3.200, 10.553, 15.551, 17.4, 20.127, 21.34, 22.25, 22.125, 22.138, 22.232. *Il.* 3.338, 5.529, 6.437, 6.522, 10.110, 10.135, 11.43, 11.483, 11.605, 11.814, 11.837, 12.1, 12.349, 12.362, 13.278, 14.12, 15.482, 15.570, 16.139, 16.209, 16.264, 16.278, 16.307, 16.626, 16.665, 16.689, 16.827, 17.111, 17.177, 17.429, 18.12, 18.455, 19.24, 20.169, 21.572, 21.586.

⁴⁴⁰ *Od.* 1.99, 15.551, 17.4, 20.127, 21.34, 22.25, 22.125. This use is also found, though more rarely, in the *Iliad*: *Il.* 3.338, 10.135, 11.43, 14.12, 15.570, 16.139.

⁴⁴¹ Of Telemachus at *Od.* 1.302 (said by Athene) and at *Od.* 3.200 by Nestor. The term is also used of Elpenor, the youngest of Odysseus’ crew, at *Od.* 10.553.

⁴⁴² Melanthius says that the passage is not capable of being taken as one man can defend it if he is ἄλκιμος (*Od.* 22.138). Athene rebukes Odysseus, asking why he now baulks at showing the suitors he is ἄλκιμος (*Od.* 22.232).

⁴⁴³ Diomedes at *Il.* 6.437. Meges at *Il.* 10.110. Ajax at *Il.* 12.349 and 12.362. Automedon at *Il.* 17.429. Patroclus, the character to whom the epithet is applied most frequently, at *Il.* 11.605, 11.814, 11.837, 12.1, 16.278, 16.307, 16.626, 16.665, 16.827, 18.12, 18.455, 19.24.

⁴⁴⁴ Parry (1971, [1928]) 88, with the table on 89-91, featuring ἄλκιμος on 89.

provide. Further, this thesis is primarily concerned with examining Herodotus' use of Homeric terms and Herodotus chose to write in prose rather than verse. Therefore, a detailed examination of the Homeric use of ἄλκιμος, and the prerequisite consideration of metrical analyses, would be only marginally relevant for this specific project. Instead, I shall focus on ἀλκή and supplement this examination with instances of ἄλκιμος where they help to elucidate further the qualities of ἀλκή.

2.2.2 Homeric ἀλκή

Homer uses ἀλκή 67 times over the two epics,⁴⁴⁵ with the majority of occurrences being in the *Iliad*. This suggests a connection between ἀλκή and battle-field heroism. This is precisely how the term appears in the embassy to Achilles of *Iliad* 9. At the end of *Iliad* 8, the Trojans are camped right outside the Achaean camp; in *Iliad* 9 Odysseus says to Achilles in the embassy, 'it is in doubt whether the well-benched ships shall be saved or destroyed, if you do not clothe yourself in **spirit of defence** (εἰ μὴ σύ γε δύσεαι **ἀλκήν**, *Il.* 9.230-1): Odysseus presents Achilles' ἀλκή as the deciding factor in the Achaeans' fate. A cursory glance at the term's use in the *Odyssey* highlights further this connection with battle. The book of the *Odyssey* with the highest concentration of the term is *Odyssey* 22, which contains the mini-battle narration of the suitors' slaughter. As the climactic scene where Odysseus slays the arrogant suitors in a scene of extended fighting, the prominent appearance of a battle term makes sense.

In this chapter, I argue that ἀλκή is intimately connected with the to-and-fro of battle. I posit that ἀλκή refers to the quality which enables a hero to make a stand against a foe as they

⁴⁴⁵ *Od.* 2.61, 4.527, 9.214, 9.514, 12.120, 17.315, 22.226, 22.237, 22.305, 23.128, 24.509. *Il.* 3.45, 4.234, 4.245, 4.253, 4.418, 5.532, 5.718, 6.265, 7.164, 8.140, 8.174, 8.262, 9.34, 9.39, 9.231, 9.706, 11.287, 11.313, 11.566, 11.710, 12.409, 13.48, 13.116, 13.197, 13.269, 13.330, 13.786, 13.836, 15.250, 15.322, 15.487, 15.490, 15.527, 15.564, 15.734, 16.157, 16.270, 16.357, 16.602, 16.753, 17.42, 17.81, 17.181, 17.185, 17.212, 17.281, 17.499, 18.154, 18.157, 19.36, 19.161, 20.256, 20.381, 21.528, 21.578, 22.282.

advance on them or otherwise allows a hero to advance towards the enemy. Where a hero fails to possess ἀλκή this results in the opposite action and the hero flees. Further, I demonstrate a distinction between how the two Homeric epics use the term. The *Iliad* uses the term freely of the heroes to signify the back-and-forth movements of the warriors' battlefield formations, whereas the *Odyssey* presents ἀλκή as a quality of a bygone era. There are glimmers of the ἀλκή of old in the *Odyssey*, that is, ἀλκή like that found in the *Iliad*, but this is rare and, as I will show, still tinged with the sense that the ἀλκή of the *Odyssey* is fundamentally different from that in the *Iliad*. Therefore, I shall begin with an examination of Iliadic ἀλκή, before turning to the ἀλκή of the *Odyssey*.

The term's etymology informs this chapter's argument. Chantraine connects ἀλκή with the verb ἀλέξω meaning 'I ward off/defend', so that ἀλκή as the abstract noun comes to mean 'force that allows one to defend oneself'.⁴⁴⁶ Once Hector lays hold of Protesilaus' ship, Ajax entreats those near him: 'O friends, Danaan heroes, attendants of Ares, be men my friends, **remember [the] furious spirit of defence** (μνήσασθε δὲ θούριδος ἀλκῆ)' (*Il.* 15.733-4). Ajax presents ἀλκή as the quality which will help them defend themselves against the advancing enemy.⁴⁴⁷ Ajax continues and says that their position is particularly perilous as they cannot retreat nor is there any additional help to be found (*Il.* 15.735-40). Their only option is to defend

⁴⁴⁶ Chantraine *s.v.* ἀλέξω ('force qui permet de se défendre').

⁴⁴⁷ Where ἀλκή is cited by characters to stop the enemy's progress: *Il.* 4.234, 4.245, 4.418, 11.313, 13.48, 13.116, 13.197, 16.602 and 17.181. ἀλκή can also be experienced by gods; Hera encourages Athene with ἀλκή to halt Ares' rampage (*Il.* 5.718). See also Nestor's characterisation of the Moliones who advance on Thryoessa, and so *should* be in possession of ἀλκή, but Nestor says 'in no way at all knew furious **spirit of defence** (ἀλκῆς)' (*Il.* 11.710). This exceptional instance might be a Nestorian strategy to diminish the threat the Moliones posed as he talks in self-praise about his youthful success. It should be noted that the Moliones subsequently *do* lack ἀλκή as they fail to put up sufficient resistance to Nestor. When Hector uses ἀλκή at *Il.* 17.185 to encourage the troops, either meaning (whether to advance or put up resistance to the enemy) would work – Hector's underlying point is not to lose ground without him. This double meaning is also shown at *Il.* 18.154, where Hector is said in ἀλκή to be like a flame, and 18.157, where the two Aiantes are said to be clothed in ἀλκή: the opposing sides switch between advancing and pushing back against the other side's advancement in the fight over Patroclus' body.

themselves; as they do so he instructs them to ‘remember [the] furious spirit of defence (ἀλκῆ)’. It should be noted that Ajax is not asking the troops to *use* ἀλκῆ, but rather remember it as they defend themselves. This is something more widely applicable to ἀλκή: it does not represent the physical act of fighting, but rather the internal gumption which leads to fighting.⁴⁴⁸

Homer also cites ἀλκή as assisting the resistance of an oncoming enemy.⁴⁴⁹ At the close of *Iliad* 13, Ajax and Hector taunt each other before ‘the Argives shouted from the other side, nor **did they forget spirit of defence** (οὐδὲ λάθοντο ἀλκῆς), but **awaited** (ἔμενον) the coming of the best of the Trojans’ (*Il.* 13.835-6). Crucially, as the enemy approaches, Homer attributes ἀλκή to the Argives *before* saying that they ‘awaited’ (ἔμενον) the oncoming troops. Homer, like Ajax, thus presents ἀλκή as the quality which will allow the troops to defend themselves. Once again ἀλκή does not represent any positive action, but instead indicates a state prior to action. This demonstrates that both characters internal to the Homeric narrative world and the external Homeric narrator envision ἀλκή as a characteristic which assists heroes as they confront the enemy.

Another component of ἀλκή is that it is often cited as helping warriors press forward and actively gain ground.⁴⁵⁰ Seeing Agamemnon’s injury, Hector encourages his troops:

⁴⁴⁸ Melena (1972) 355 finds a concurrent idea with μένος: ‘Μένος, then, designates the effect of the ingestion of force and not the force itself’ (‘μένος, pues, designa el efecto de la ingestión de la fuerza y no la fuerza misma’).

⁴⁴⁹ Where Homer cites ἀλκή as the reason individuals stop enemy progress: at *Il.* 4.253 ἀλκή is applied to Idomeneus resisting the Trojans. At *Il.* 13.836 the Argives are said not to forget their ἀλκή as they await the advancing of the best of the Trojans. At *Il.* 16.602 the Achaeans do not forget ἀλκή and maintain resistance against the Trojans. Agenor is compared to a leopard who ‘even pierced with spears does not put aside **spirit of defence** (ἀλκῆς), until it grapples [sc. with the attacking hunter] or is killed: so too glorious Antenor’s son, noble Agenor, **did not want to flee** (οὐκ ἔθελεν φεύγειν), before making a trial of Achilles’ (*Il.* 21.577-80). Not wanting to retreat in connection with ἀλκή shall be examined shortly.

⁴⁵⁰ At *Il.* 8.174, Hector encourages his troops with ἀλκή followed by the implied sequence of movement in the lines, ‘These [the Achaean walls shall not withstand our strength: but our horses **will easily jump over** (ῥέα [...] ὑπερθορόεονται) their dug trench’ (*Il.* 8.178-9). At *Il.* 12.409, Sarpedon encourages his troops to storm the wall asking why they have forgotten ἀλκή, followed by implied forward motion: ‘but **come on** (ἐφομαρτεῖτε), more men make less work’ (*Il.* 12.412). At *Il.* 15.487, there is implied movement as Hector encourages the troops to take thought of ἀλκή and fight among the ships. At *Il.*

‘Trojans, Lycians and Dardanians, fighters of close combat,
 friends, be men, **and remember [the] furious spirit of defence** (μνήσασθε δὲ θούριδος ἀλκῆς).
 Gone is the best man, and to me Zeus, son of Kronos, gives this great glory:
 but **drive** (ἐλαύνετε) your single-hoofed horses straight against
 the mighty Danaans, so that you may win the greater glory’ (*Il.* 11.286-90).

Hector instructs his troops to ‘remember furious ἀλκή’ (μνήσασθε δὲ θούριδος ἀλκῆς) followed by an instruction of action, namely the imperative of ‘drive’ (ἐλαύνω). This puts ἀλκή as the first step in a forward motion sequence. The character speech use of ἀλκή as part of a commander’s encouragement to their troops is not unique to Hector, but is used by leaders on both sides of the Achaean-Trojan conflict to spur their troops forward.

The consecutive relationship between taking thought of ἀλκή and forward action is perhaps more explicitly made when an individual who is said to have ἀλκή ceases forward movement. When Apollo asks Hector why he is apart from the battle, Hector replies ‘do you not already know that, while I was slaying his comrades at the sterns of the Achaean ships, Ajax, good at the war cry, threw a boulder at my chest, **and stopped my furious spirit of defence** (ἔπαυσε δὲ θούριδος ἀλκῆς)’ (*Il.* 15.248-50). By throwing the boulder at Hector, Ajax halts Hector’s advance on the ships. Hector explicitly connects the event which stops him moving forward, namely the boulder being thrown at him, with his ἀλκή ceasing (παύω).⁴⁵¹

16.270, as Patroclus and the Myrmidons enter the fray, Patroclus encourages them to take thought of ἀλκή. Thetis tells Achilles to put aside his anger against Agamemnon and ‘immediately arm yourself **to go into battle** (ἐς πόλεμον), and clothe yourself in **spirit of defence** (ἀλκήν)’ (*Il.* 19.36). See also Paris’ words implying movement to Hector: ‘**we will follow you** (ἐμμεμαῶτες ἅμ’ ἐνόμεθ’) eagerly, nor do I think we shall lack **spirit of defence** (ἀλκῆς) so long as there is strength enough’ (*Il.* 13.785-6).

⁴⁵¹ One might compare *Il.* 17.79-81, where Apollo says that Menelaus has stopped Euphorbus’ ἀλκή by killing him.

Thus, in the character's understanding of how ἀλκή functions in warfare, ἀλκή can be said to aid Homeric heroes with pushing forward.

The Homeric narrator external to the narrative also views ἀλκή as related to the idea of forward motion.⁴⁵² In the scuffle over Patroclus' body, the Achaeans fall back slightly before Ajax 'went straight' (ἴθυσεν) through the front-fighters like a wild boar in **spirit of defence** (ἀλκήν), who **easily** (ῥηϊδίως) scatters hounds and vigorous youths in the mountains, turning about on them in the glens' (*Il.* 17.281-3). The Homeric narrator deploys ἀλκή in combination with the dynamic verb 'I go straight' (ἰθύω) and the adverb 'easily' (ῥηϊδίως) to demonstrate how effortlessly Ajax's forward momentum cuts through the Trojan ranks. Here ἀλκή does not describe Ajax's action but rather an attendant quality as he pushes forward, with the forward motion being described with the separate verb 'I go straight' (ἰθύω). This is not unique to Ajax. Patroclus vaunts that Cebriones, because he falls from the chariot so well, would make an excellent diver, before Homer comments,

so speaking, he went on to the hero Cebriones
with the rush of a lion, who slaughters a stable,
having been struck on the breast, his own **spirit of defence** (ἀλκή) destroys him:
so too did **you Patroclus leap** (Πατρόκλεες ἄλσο) furiously on Cebriones (*Il.* 16.751-4).

Homer speaks in apostrophe to Patroclus, to whom he refers in the vocative case (Πατρόκλεες) and with the second singular verbal form 'you leap' (ἄλσο), and 'for a brief and transient

⁴⁵² Homer says that the Aiantes following Diomedes are 'clothed in furious **spirit of defence** (ἀλκήν)' (*Il.* 8.262). When Idomeneus returns to the battlefield, Homer describes how the Trojans 'saw him in **spirit of defence** (ἀλκήν) like a flame' (*Il.* 13.330). As the Myrmidons prepare to advance onto the battlefield, Homer comments that 'they are like flesh-eating wolves, who have unspeakable **spirit of defence** (ἀλκή) in mind' (*Il.* 16.156-7). As Hector puts on Achilles' armour preparing to go out to battle, he is filled with ἀλκή (*Il.* 17.212). At *Il.* 20.380-1, Achilles 'jumped in among the Trojans, clothed in **spirit of defence** (ἀλκήν)'.

moment, the usually strictly observed boundary between the world of narration and the story world is suspended and narrator and character are staged as sharing the same space'.⁴⁵³ Homer appears to be talking directly to Patroclus, thus placing this section of text, where ἀλκή is applied to the hero Patroclus, very much in the persona of the Homeric narrator. As Homer narrates the forward momentum of both Ajax and Patroclus, he links it with ἀλκή. Both Homeric characters within the narrative world and the Homeric narrator outside of the narrative world perceive ἀλκή as connected to onward motion.

Conversely, when a Homeric hero retreats, they are said to forget or no longer have their ἀλκή.⁴⁵⁴ When Achilles rampages in *Iliad* 21, we see the Trojans lose ἀλκή and turn tail; 'the Trojans, **fleeing** (πεφυζότες), were thrown into confusion by him, **no one had spirit of defence**' (οὐδέ τις ἀλκή γίγνεθ', *Il.* 21.527-9). The mere presence of Achilles on the battlefield is enough to make the Trojans 'flee' (φεύγω) and Homer directly connects this flight with the absence of ἀλκή.⁴⁵⁵ Similarly, in *Iliad* 15, while the Argives await the onrush of the Trojan forces, they stand firm until Apollo, holding the aegis, 'shook it, and himself shouted greatly, he unsettled'⁴⁵⁶ the spirit in their chest, and **they forgot furious spirit of defence** (λάθοντο δὲ θούριδος ἀλκῆς)' (*Il.* 15.320-2). The result of Apollo's intervention is not only that 'then man killed man, as the battleline was scattered' (*Il.* 15.328), but also that '**they fled in terror** (φέβοντο) this way and that, compelled **to go behind the wall** (δύοντο δὲ τεῖχος)' (*Il.* 15.345). Homer presents a scene of extended retreat. After Apollo makes the Achaeans forget ἀλκή,

⁴⁵³ Allan (2022) 80, with further bibliography on Homeric apostrophe.

⁴⁵⁴ Where individuals lose ἀλκή as they flee: *Il.* 11.566, 15.322, 16.357. See also *Il.* 13.269-71, where Meriones expresses this idea in the negative. See further Hector's taunt to Achilles, 'but you are a person glib of tongue speaking craftily, so that I was fearful of you and forget my **spirit of defence** (ἀλκῆς) and might' (*Il.* 22.281-2), where Hector implies that Achilles' speech was intended to make him lose his ἀλκή and flee. See further Collins (1998) 67. Benveniste (1969) 74. Trümper (1950) 220.

⁴⁵⁵ See also Aeneas saying to Achilles that 'you shall not turn me away with words, as I am eager with **spirit of defence** (ἀλκῆς), until we have fought with bronze' (*Il.* 20.256).

⁴⁵⁶ Θέλω is a difficult verb. The LSJ entry says it should be translated as 'enchant' or 'beguile', in a magical sense, perhaps related to the aegis' qualities, but this would be speculation. I have translated it as 'unsettled' to capture the tone of induced change more appropriate to the battlefield context.

Homer uses two verbs to describe their flight; the first, ‘I flee in terror’ (φέβομαι), is a general verb denoting flight to demonstrate their backwards motion and the second, ‘I go behind’ (δύω), to describe the direction in which the troops retreat.⁴⁵⁷ Similarly to how Trojan flight is connected with the loss of ἀλκή in the prior Achillean example, the loss of ἀλκή also operates with collectives as Apollo causes the Achaeans to retreat *en masse*.

I would argue it is no coincidence that Diomedes mentions ἀλκή when he criticises Agamemnon for suggesting that they retreat home (*Il.* 9.17-28). Diomedes replies to this suggestion, ‘you criticised **my spirit of defence first** (ἀλκὴν μὲν μοι πρῶτον) in front of the Danaans, saying that I was an unwarlike man **without spirit of defence** (ἀνάλκιδα)’ (*Il.* 9.34-5). The repetition of forms including ἀλκή, both ‘spirit of defence’ (ἀλκή) itself and the negative adjectival form ‘without spirit of defence’ (ἀνάλκις), underscores that Diomedes is very clearly talking about ἀλκή and this is appropriate enough. I have shown above that Homeric heroes associate a loss of ἀλκή with the idea of retreat. Diomedes highlights the injustice of the situation by in effect saying ‘you criticised my ἀλκή before, but what you are suggesting now is not behaviour embodying ἀλκή’. The temporal adverb ‘first’ (πρῶτον) not only creates a petulant tone but also reminds the reader of the previous occasion Diomedes is referring to in *Iliad* 4. It is curious, however, that during this prior time, when Agamemnon reprimands Diomedes (*Il.* 4.370-400), that Agamemnon does not mention ἀλκή, either as ἀλκή itself or through the negated form ἀνάλκις. In *Iliad* 4 Diomedes does not reply to Agamemnon and so, amusingly, ‘we get the impression that Diomedes [...] needs time to compose his reply to Agamemnon; for, when attacked in Book 4, he made no direct answer (4.411-18), but at the start of Book 9 he has a ready supply of words’.⁴⁵⁸ This demonstrates two points. Diomedes

⁴⁵⁷ See also Euphorbus’ reply to Menelaus: ‘but, no, this struggle shall not be untested, nor remain without battle, **whether for spirit of defence or fear** (ἤτ’ ἀλκῆς ἤτε φόβοιο)’ (*Il.* 17.41-2) and similarly placing ‘spirit of defence’ (ἀλκή) in opposition to ‘fear’ (φόβος).

⁴⁵⁸ Martin (1989) 24.

received Agamemnon's words in *Iliad* 4 as an attack on his ἀλκή, even though Agamemnon does not mention ἀλκή in his rebuke there. It also demonstrates that Diomedes understands his behaviour in *Iliad* 4, his lack of forward movement, demonstrated an absence of ἀλκή.

Diomedes takes his reply one step further. Diomedes says, 'to you the son of crooked-counselling Cronos gave a double entitlement (διάνδιχα): with the **sceptre** (σκήπτρῳ) he has given for you to be honoured by all, **but he did not give you spirit of defence** (ἀλκὴν δ' οὐ τοι δῶκεν), which is the greatest power' (*Il.* 9.37-9). Diomedes hints at a possible theological connection for ἀλκή, that 'the sceptre and the force ἀλκή are two halves of the same order of the same unit (διάνδιχα), a donation of Zeus to the sovereign',⁴⁵⁹ to which I shall return shortly (pp.165-7). But what I wish to highlight here is that Diomedes contrasts two of Agamemnon's traits: Agamemnon's status as king, denoted by mention of Agamemnon's 'sceptre' (σκήπτρον), and that, from Diomedes' perspective, Agamemnon lacks ἀλκή. At this point, Agamemnon can be said to lack ἀλκή for suggesting retreat, which I have shown indicates a lack of ἀλκή. Agamemnon may be king, but Diomedes argues that what he is suggesting demonstrates a lack of a vital heroic quality.

Homer also appears to play with the connection between retreat and loss of ἀλκή. Wishing to give success to Hector, 'father Zeus, throned on high, stirred Ajax to flight' (*Il.* 11.544). It therefore stands to reason that when Zeus causes Ajax to flee it is implicit that Ajax has lost his ἀλκή. Ajax does not flee outright, but instead undertakes a staggered retreat: 'Ajax **at another time** (ἄλλοτε μὲν) remembered [the] furious **spirit of defence** (ἀλκῆς) immediately turning about, and checked the battlelines of the horse-taming Trojans: **but sometimes he turned to flight** (ὅτε δὲ τρωπᾶσκετο φεύγειν)' (*Il.* 11.566-8). Ajax retreats but in a 'two-steps-backwards-one-step-forwards' manner, so that occasionally he is turning about and doing

⁴⁵⁹ Melena (1972) 356 ('el cetro y la fuerza ἀλκή son dos mitades del mismo orden de la misma unidad (διάνδιχα), donación de Zeus al soberano').

damage to the Trojans as they press what they believe to be an advantage. Homer draws a contrast between these two points in his retreat with the strong contrasting conjunctions μὲν...δὲ alongside the temporal adverbs ‘at another time’ (ἄλλοτε) and ‘sometimes’ (ὅτε). The iterative imperfect form ‘he turned’ (τρωπᾷσκετο), difficult to capture in translation, in conjunction with the contrasting construction and the temporal adverbs, highlights that Ajax is repeatedly switching between retreat and attack – and when Ajax makes a stand, he ‘remembered [the] furious spirit of defence’ (μνησάσκετο θούριδος ἀλκῆς).⁴⁶⁰ Once again, though, we see that the possession of ἀλκή does not signify the action of fighting itself, but is a precursor to the action of fighting.

As ἀλκή is the impetus to action it can lead to glory. In *Iliad* 5 Agamemnon shouts to his troops:

‘O friends, be men, **have a hardy heart** (ἄλκιμον ἦτορ ἔλεσθε),

have shame (αἰδεῖσθε) for one another in mighty battle:

when men have shame (αἰδομένων), the greater part of the force live than die:

and those who flee (φευγόντων) neither win **fame** (κλέος) nor have **spirit of defence** (ἀλκή)’

(*Il.* 5.529-32).⁴⁶¹

Agamemnon repeats cognate forms of ἀλκή, (ἀλκή and ἄλκιμος), and different inflected forms of αἰδέομαι. Cairns correctly notes, ‘in this passage the safety and the glory of the individual and the group are inextricably linked, and *aidōs* benefits on both levels’. While I agree with Cairns’ observations, I believe that repetition of cognate forms of ἀλκή alongside forms of

⁴⁶⁰ Compare this with the simile comparing Menelaus to a lion whose heart becomes less and less ἄλκιμος (*Il.* 17.111) as it is forced to retreat, the comparand for Menelaus’ retreats from Patroclus’ body.

⁴⁶¹ Agamemnon’s words are nearly identical to those of Ajax at *Il.* 15.561-4. This difference is noted by Collins (1998) 67-70, esp. 69. See also Cairns (1993) 68 n.78, who notes the repetition of exhortation.

αἰδέομαι suggests that both are important factors. I have argued above that ἀλκή assists warriors as they put up resistance to the advance of the enemy. Here the situation is so perilous there is a need for both spurs to resistance, both ἀλκή *and* αἰδώς: Ares has entered battle on the Trojan side (*Il.* 5.461), Sarpedon has roused Hector to join the fighting alongside himself (*Il.* 5.472-92) and Apollo has revived Aeneas (*Il.* 5.512-8). It is at this point, when the leading men of the Trojan fighting force assemble, and with a materially present god fighting on their side, that Agamemnon makes the above speech to encourage his own troops to resist the oncoming attackers. Agamemnon ‘doubles down’ on the qualities that make Homeric heroes stand their ground and resist the enemy. As Agamemnon says, the result is that ‘those who flee neither win **fame** (κλέος) nor have **spirit of defence** (ἀλκή)’ (*Il.* 5.532). Agamemnon counterfactually articulates the view that by not fleeing, and thus maintaining their ἀλκή, the men shall have ‘fame’ (κλέος).

Glory, as denoted by ‘fame’ (κλέος), is not the only recognition which Homeric heroes believe results from ἀλκή. Sarpedon, hard-pressed by Teucer and Ajax,

[...] did not entirely

give ground, since the spirit in him hoped to win **glory** (κῦδος),

he turned himself about and called to the godlike Lycians,

‘O Lycians, why do you slacken in this way your furious **spirit of defence** (ἀλκή)’

(*Il.* 12.406-9).

Sarpedon strives for κῦδος, a divine type of glory dispensed by Zeus (pp.47-9), and, to this end, Sarpedon encourages his troops to increase their measure of ἀλκή. This demonstrates that Sarpedon sees ἀλκή as the path towards κῦδος. Collins suggests something similar: ‘if one is

given *kudos* by Zeus, then one will also exhibit *alkē*,⁴⁶² but this is not strictly correct. For example, Nestor says to Diomedes,

‘Son of Tydeus, come, turn back in flight with the single-hoofed horses.

Do you not realise that **spirit of defence does not follow from Zeus** (ἐκ Διὸς οὐχ ἔπεται ἄλκη)?

For now, Zeus, son of Cronos, gives **glory** (κῦδος) **to another man** (τούτῳ)’ (*Il.* 8.139-41).

Nestor says that Zeus is awarding κῦδος ‘to another man’ (τούτῳ), namely Hector, as he presses towards them, but Nestor is quite clear on the absence of ἄλκη. Whether Nestor’s phrase ‘ἄλκη does not follow from Zeus’ (ἐκ Διὸς οὐχ ἔπεται ἄλκη) is a gnomic statement on the nature of ἄλκη is another question, to which we shall return below, but it is clear that while Hector is enjoying κῦδος he is not in possession of ἄλκη. Thus, it is more precise to say that ἄλκη can lead to κῦδος, as in Sarpedon’s example, but κῦδος does not lead to ἄλκη.

It is worth stressing that when ἄλκη is connected with a Homeric term denoting glory, it only ever occurs in character speech. Therefore, it is the characters who associate ἄλκη with glory, be it κλέος or κῦδος, a sentiment not necessarily shared by the Homeric narrator. From a narratological position this demonstrates how narrative characters perceive ἄλκη functioning in their world: ἄλκη can lead to glory of some kind. This is not to say that ἄλκη always leads to glory. Nearly all the instances where ἄλκη occurs in Homeric discourse are not associated with a Homeric ‘glory word’ to denote the achievement brought about by ἄλκη. Instead, ἄλκη is represented by the characters as one method of attaining glory.

Nestor’s words, that ‘ἄλκη does not follow from Zeus’ (ἐκ Διὸς οὐχ ἔπεται ἄλκη, *Il.* 8.140) raises another important question regarding Homeric ἄλκη; does Homeric ἄλκη originate from Zeus, or indeed any god? Nestor’s speech says that ἄλκη does not follow from

⁴⁶² Collins (1998) 51.

Zeus, but is this specific to that precise moment when Hector is advancing or does this play out more widely on the Homeric stage? Hector's remark that 'it is easy to see to which men Zeus gives **spirit of defence** (ἀλκή)' (*Il.* 15.490) seems to imply that ἀλκή comes from Zeus. However, Hector's words are in character speech, tinged with actorial focalisation,⁴⁶³ and Homer does not actually show Zeus bestowing ἀλκή as he does κῦδος.

The one other instance in the Homeric corpus where ἀλκή might be understood as coming from Zeus, or indeed any god, is in Automedon's prayer. As Aeneas and Hector advance towards him, Automedon 'prayed to father Zeus and **he was filled** (πλήτο) in his black heart with **spirit of defence** (ἀλκή) and strength' (*Il.* 17.498-9). This is text in Homer's narratorial persona and so does not possess any character focalisation. However, I am not entirely convinced that Zeus acts as a giver of ἀλκή here for two main reasons. The verbal form to describe the process in which Automedon gains ἀλκή is the passive form 'he was filled' (πλήτο), and so Zeus does not here actively give out ἀλκή; it comes about passively. Secondly, there is no confirmation that Zeus answers this prayer. Typically, when a Homeric mortal invokes a divinity there is confirmation whether their prayer has been answered or not.⁴⁶⁴ For Automedon's prayer to Zeus in *Iliad* 17, though, Homer is mute.⁴⁶⁵ I cannot therefore believe that ἀλκή comes from Zeus or indeed any god.

Rather, I would argue that ἀλκή is a characteristic which Homeric figures believe comes from the gods but which, in Homeric 'reality', external to individual subjectivities, does not.

⁴⁶³ Melena (1972) 356, on Diomedes' words at *Il.* 9.37-9, also seems to imply that ἀλκή is a divine quality: 'In this passage Diomedes marvels that the scepter has not transmitted divine ἀλκή to its possessor' ('En este pasaje Diomedes se maravilla de que el cetro no haya transmitido a su posesor la ἀλκή divina').

⁴⁶⁴ E.g., Apollo at *Il.* 1.43, Athene at *Il.* 6.311 (though this line was rejected by Aristarchus), Zeus at *Il.* 16.249-52, the river god hearing Odysseus at *Od.* 5.445-53, or Poseidon hearing Polyphemus at *Od.* 9.536. This last example is particularly interesting as it entails Odysseus ascribing the act of listening to Poseidon when he, as a terrestrial being, could have no way of knowing whether Poseidon, a divinity whose location at that time is unknown, heard Polyphemus or not.

⁴⁶⁵ Lateiner (1997) 252 lists Automedon's example within his category of 'unritualized [sic.] wishes directed to divinities'.

This reveals something interesting about the Homeric heroes' inner psychology. It is a well-known feature of Homeric epic that the gods play an important role in Homeric epic and often they 'interact with [heroes] directly or influence [their] circumstances from a distance'.⁴⁶⁶ When heroes enjoy a moment of success and advance, such as those instances discussed where ἀλκή features before successful forward action, it might be taken as a mark of divine favour. This was explicit in the Homeric examples of κῦδος in the first section of this thesis (pp.47-9). Similarly, when a hero finds that they possess enough courage to stand strong and meet their opponents, this too might be interpreted as a sign that the god stands with them. Homeric heroes can be forgiven for assuming that ἀλκή does come from the gods as the gods *do* bestow another type of courage on their favourite heroes, namely μένος,⁴⁶⁷ but it is not the case that 'Zeus [...] bestow[s] *alkē* on whomever he please[s] to sway the tide of battle'.⁴⁶⁸ Homer never explicitly presents Zeus, or any god, directly giving out ἀλκή to their favourites.

As noted, the *Odyssey* presents a post-heroic world (pp.71-2). Collins suggests that '*alkē* signifies for the *Odyssey* a militaristic way of life that has to be *transformed* [my emphasis] in order to become more appropriate to a domestic setting'.⁴⁶⁹ However, I will argue that there is not so much a 'transformation' of ἀλκή, but instead that Homer presents ἀλκή as a quality of a bygone era.⁴⁷⁰ This said, there are occasions where ἀλκή is used with a martial meaning in a more militaristic context, but this is limited to the 'battle in the hall' episode and the near-miss battle at the end of the *Odyssey*.⁴⁷¹ These instances themselves demonstrate a

⁴⁶⁶ Louden (2005) 90.

⁴⁶⁷ Apollo revives Aeneas and 'he put **courage** (μένος) into his [sc. Aeneas'] heart the shepherd of people' (*Il.* 5.513). After he encourages the Aiantes, Poseidon '**filled them with mighty courage**' (πλήσεν μένεος κρατεροῖο, *Il.* 13.60). N.B. the active form πλήσεν as opposed to the passive form πληῖτο given of the ἀλκή which fills Automedon after his prayer to Zeus at *Il.* 17.499.

⁴⁶⁸ Collins (1998) 3.

⁴⁶⁹ Collins (1998) 13.

⁴⁷⁰ This sentiment is also found in Collins (1998) 79.

⁴⁷¹ *Od.* 22.226, 22.237, 22.305, 24.509. N.B. *Od.* 23.128, where Telemachus says that they shall not lack ἀλκή as they resolve the issue of having killed the prominent Ithacan youths. This might represent

change in tone from Iliadic battle: in *Odyssey* 22, the suitors do not provide a great resistance to Odysseus' attack; in *Odyssey* 24, the battle does not even take place.

More specifically, the *Odyssey* has no encouragement based on ἀλκή like that in the *Iliad*. As Odysseus and Telemachus, along with others including Laertes and Dolius, arm to do battle with the suitors' relatives, Odysseus encourages his son to distinguish himself in battle 'so that there be no shame on **the line of your forefathers** (πατέρων γένος), who in the past surpassed all those on the earth in **spirit of defence** (ἀλκῇ) and manliness (ἡγορέη)' (*Od.* 24.508-9). Odysseus, while encouraging his son, draws attention to past generations of their family (πατέρων γένος), who possessed ἀλκή, along with ἡγορέη. Iliadic leaders often spur their troops to action with commands including ἀλκή (pp.156-7, 163 and 184), but Odysseus does not. Odysseus encourages his son to be like his forebearers, who were in possession of ἀλκή, but does not instruct Telemachus to have ἀλκή for himself.

Odysseus' own ἀλκή is presented with a dampened tone. Athene rebukes Odysseus during the battle in the hall that '**no longer** (οὐκέτι), Odysseus, is your courage and **spirit of defence** (ἀλκή) the sort it was **when** (ὅτ') for white-armed Helen, daughter of a noble father, you, **for nine years** (εἰνάετες), did battle with the Trojans **unceasingly without rest** (νωλεμέες αἰεῖ),' (*Od.* 22.226-8). Athene's reproach features no fewer than five references to temporality, 'no longer' (οὐκέτι), 'when' (ὅτε), 'nine years' (εἰναετής), 'unceasingly' (νωλεμέες) and 'without rest' (αἰεῖ), as though Athene is drawing a contrast between the Odysseus of 'then' at Troy and the Odysseus of 'now' in *Odyssey* 22. Thus, even in the *Odyssey*'s battlefield narrative, there is an underlying current of ἀλκή being associated more strongly with a previous time.⁴⁷²

Telemachus' belief that there shall be further fighting, which indeed there nearly is, but ἀλκή is mentioned only at the near-miss battle of *Odyssey* 24.

⁴⁷² There are two remaining examples of ἀλκή in the battle scene of *Odyssey* 22. The use at *Od.* 22.237 has a true Iliadic tone, since Athene does not give Odysseus an overwhelming victory to make a trial of

No where is the quality of ἀλκή presented as a characteristic of a bygone day better than through the depiction of Argus, Odysseus' faithful hound. Eumaeus informs Odysseus that 'if he [sc. Argus] were (εἰ τοιόσδ' εἴη) in both form of body (δέμας) and action (ἔργα) such as he was when Odysseus left him behind to go to Troy, at once you would be amazed seeing (θηήσαιο) the speed (ταχυτήτα) and **energy** (ἀλκήν)' (*Od.* 17.313-5). The Argus scene has inspired many symbolic readings.⁴⁷³ Beck, for example, convincingly argues for a connection between the depiction of an owner's hound (or hound-like pet) and the presentation of the dog's owner's dwelling, as Argus' bedraggled state represents the disarray of Odysseus' abode;⁴⁷⁴ while Steinbock sees the scene as a forerunner for Odysseus' later reunion with Laertes.⁴⁷⁵

I would like to suggest another layer of interpretation where Argus signifies the overall deterioration of ἀλκή in the *Odyssey*'s world. Eumaeus uses the protasis of the conditional clause 'if he were' (εἰ τοιόσδ' εἴη) to describe several factors of Argus' previous pedigree: his appearance (δέμας), what he was capable of (ἔργον), his speed (ταχυτής), and crucially for our current purposes, his 'spirit' (ἀλκή). Eumaeus says that Odysseus would be amazed, using the verb of beholding θεάομαι, which specifically denotes amazement at seeing,⁴⁷⁶ to have seen Argus' previous qualities. Eumaeus contrasts that with the current situation, 'but **now** (νῦν) he has an evil plight [...] the heedless women give him no care' (*Od.* 17.318-9). Eumaeus contrasts the condition of Argus before, when he was amazing and in possession of ἀλκή, and how Argus is 'now' (νῦν), being neglected by the serving women, the condition which Odysseus can see for himself is pitiful. By the deterioration, and indeed the death, of Argus, a previous

Odysseus and Telemachus' ἀλκή and σθένος. After Athene lifts the aegis and makes the suitors flee there is a simile in which Odysseus' group attacking the suitors is compared to vultures overpowering smaller birds that have no ἀλκή (*Od.* 22.305). While this is Iliadic in the sense of retreat representing a lacking of ἀλκή, it highlights the total absence of ἀλκή from the suitors' side of the battle since they were never ascribed this quality.

⁴⁷³ Beck (1991) 163 n.23 collects previous symbolic interpretations. See also Scodel (2005).

⁴⁷⁴ Beck (1991) 158-67, esp. 162.

⁴⁷⁵ Steinbock (2018) 22-7.

⁴⁷⁶ LSJ s.v. θεάομαι.

embodiment of ἀλκή, Homer truly marks the end of the heroic age and shows how ἀλκή is the property of a past time.

The other Odyssean uses of ἀλκή demonstrate that it is not a quality of the new age depicted in Homeric epic and I shall therefore only discuss them summarily. Aegisthus sets a guard to look out for Agamemnon ‘so that he does not slip by unnoticed, wary of his [sc. Agamemnon’s] furious **spirit of defence**’ (ἀλκῆς, *Od.* 4.527). Agamemnon returns home shortly after the conflict has concluded, and so is much more firmly a figure of the heroic age. It is therefore no surprise, when speaking of Agamemnon in that time period, or shortly after as we have it here, that ἀλκή is used in a genuine manner.

The next three examples occur in Odysseus’ own narration. Odysseus says that, upon arriving at the Cyclopes’ island, he packs wine for this reason:

‘[...] immediately my noble spirit knew that
we would meet with a man, **clothed in great spirit of defence** (μεγάλην ἐπιειμένον ἀλκὴν),
savage (ἄγριον), with no sense of justice or laws’ (*Od.* 9.213-5).

As a retrospective narrator, Odysseus is able to ascribe descriptors to the characters before they appear in the narrative and pre-emptively guide the narratees’ impression of the character. Here Odysseus ascribes both ‘spirit of defence’ (ἀλκή) and ‘savagery’ (ἄγριος) to the as yet unknown figure of Polyphemus. As the narrative progresses, we see Polyphemus act brutishly and eat some of Odysseus’ men raw (*Od.* 9.288-98 and 9.311-2). By assigning ‘spirit of defence’ (ἀλκή) and ‘savagery’ (ἄγριος) to the monstrous figure of Polyphemus, Odysseus presents these qualities as undesirable. Polyphemus says he is shocked that Odysseus is the one to blind him, ‘but I always expected a great and fine man to come here, clothed in great **spirit of defence** (ἀλκὴν),’ (*Od.* 9.513-4). Polyphemus’ statement, although made by Odysseus himself as

narrator to the Phaeacians, suggests that Odysseus does not have ἀλκή.⁴⁷⁷ This can be seen as further evidence for Odysseus' self-characterisation in light of what may further his cause of returning home. We saw this when he self-ascribes the status symbol γέρας (p.70). Odysseus increases his meekness and lessens any potential threat he could pose to the Phaeacians by saying that he does not have ἀλκή; both can be considered strategies to persuade the Phaeacians to help him. Polyphemus' statement that Odysseus does not have ἀλκή can also be seen as demonstrating the antithetical relationship between martial and intellectual heroism (p.23 n.79, inasmuch as, being a 'cunning intelligence' hero, Odysseus is not in possession of the same qualities as the militaristic heroes.

The last example of ἀλκή in Odysseus' narrative comes from Circe. Circe warns Odysseus not to attempt using ἀλκή when passing Charybdis for 'there is no **spirit of defence** (ἀλκή), to flee from her is the best course' (*Od.* 12.120). In Odysseus' narration of his adventures ἀλκή was not an effective solution to the problems which he encountered when attempting to get home.

It is little wonder that Telemachus laments at the assembly in the terms that he does:

‘[...] there is no man here,

the sort which Odysseus was, to ward off ruin from my house.

We do not **now** (νύ) have **the sort of men** (τοῖοι) to ward them off: **hereafter** (ἔπειτα)

we shall be in a sorry state and **ignorant of spirit of defence** (οὐ δεδαηκότες ἀλκήν)’

(*Od.* 2.58-61).

⁴⁷⁷ Odysseus does possess military capabilities, including in the skirmish with the Cicones immediately after leaving Troy, but this is summarily narrated by Odysseus (and Homer) (*Od.* 9.39-61). For Odysseus' individual fighting capabilities see p.252.

With the temporal conjunction ‘hereafter’ (ἔπειτα), Telemachus draws a strong contrast between the men of old, including his own father Odysseus, and the ‘sorts of men’ (τοῖοι) as there currently are ‘now’ (νύ) in Ithaca. Telemachus calls the situation on Ithaca a sorry state of affairs, λευγαλέος, and, crucially, says that it lacks anyone with ἀλκή. What Telemachus, in effect, is saying is that they need a Homeric hero, one with the gumption, the ἀλκή, to act, to put his house right, but this man is sorely missing.

Homeric ἀλκή is a tale of two epics. In the *Iliad*, ἀλκή is a force which assists warriors with the turbulent motions of the battlefield. ‘Spirit of defence’, ἀλκή, helps a hero respond to the oncoming threat of enemy soldiers and gain ground on the field. When a soldier retreats, this background motion is indicated through a loss of ἀλκή. Some Homeric characters see ἀλκή as a prerequisite for glory, but it was stressed that ἀλκή does not necessarily lead to glory. Crucially, it was shown that there is insufficient evidence that Homeric ἀλκή has a divine origin, despite the characters’ beliefs. The use of ἀλκή in the *Odyssey* contrasts greatly with that of the *Iliad* and represents one of the methods by which Homer depicts the world of the *Odyssey* as having moved on from the time period captured in the *Iliad*.

2.2.3 Herodotean ἀλκή

Herodotus also uses ἀλκή, but in a number of different ways to Homer. Herodotus implements ἀλκή only eight times.⁴⁷⁸ The first point of difference therefore is Herodotus’ limited frequency of using ἀλκή compared to Homer. Fighting occurs, and often, in the *Histories*. Were Herodotus to be emulating Homer, a regular occurrence of ἀλκή might be considered a natural choice. Further, none of Herodotus’ uses of ἀλκή come in character speech. While this may seem only

⁴⁷⁸ 2.45.1, 3.78.1, 3.110, 4.125.5, 4.132.1, 9.19.2, 9.70.4, 9.102.3.

a minor point, this represents a great difference from Homeric epic, where the vast majority of mentions of ἀλκή occur in character speech and often as exhortations to battle.⁴⁷⁹

It is curious, too, that the greater distribution of Herodotean ἀλκή is in the first four contextualising books, five of the eight instances, rather than in the books detailing more strictly the Greco-Persian conflict. Further, ἀλκή is conspicuously absent from book 7 and 8 (where the battles of Thermopylae, Artemisium and Salamis occur); the final three uses of ἀλκή appear in book 9, where the major battle of Plataea is recorded. This suggests that, as I argue, Herodotus is not concerned with using ἀλκή to create a Homeric tone in battle narratives, but instead uses the term more generally.

The first Herodotean appearance of ἀλκή is in the Egyptian *logos*. When Herodotus is detailing the Egyptians' observation of Heracles as a god (2.42-5), he says that 'the Greeks say many other inaccurate things; there is this one **silly myth** (εὐήθης [...] μῦθος) told about Heracles which they tell' (2.45.1). Herodotus distances himself from the narrative content by referring to it with the adjective 'silly' (εὐήθης) in conjunction with the noun 'myth' (μῦθος). This is only one of two occurrences μῦθος in the *Histories* and, in both cases, Herodotus uses the term 'to reject the historiographical value of a story'.⁴⁸⁰ Herodotus proceeds to tell us the narrative which he finds so foolish, 'when he [sc. Heracles] came to Egypt, the Egyptians crowned him and they led him in procession intending to sacrifice him to Zeus, until this time he kept his peace, but when they began the sacrificial ceremonies, **turning to force** (ἐς ἀλκὴν τραπόμενον) he slaughtered them all' (2.45.1). ἀλκή describes Heracles' change of mental state as he sees the Egyptians preparing to sacrifice him.

⁴⁷⁹ Of the total 67 mentions of ἀλκή in Homeric epic, 42 occur in character speech compared to 25 by the Homeric narrator. Cf. Marincola (2018) 18: 'There is also similarity in the exhortation to battle that we find in both Homer and Herodotus'.

⁴⁸⁰ Baragwanath and de Bakker (2012) 1; the other occurrence of μῦθος is at 2.23. This is also noted by Vandiver (1991) 215.

Here Herodotus uses ἀλκή for a figure from the mythical heroic age. This could have been an effective strategy for communicating the *spatium mythicum* from the *spatium historicum*,⁴⁸¹ that is to say, relegate ἀλκή purely to the past heroic age of myth analogously to Odyssean ἀλκή. However, Herodotus, in the following examples, uses ἀλκή for more contemporary historical individuals. While I agree that ‘the heroes provided a *terminus post quem* for the beginnings of human history’,⁴⁸² I believe that a subtler point can be adduced. After Herodotus details Heracles’ response to near-sacrifice, Herodotus takes a rationalising stance. First Herodotus says that this narrative demonstrates a general Grecian ignorance at Egyptian sacrificial practices as Egyptians only sacrifice ritually ‘clean’ (καθαρός) animals (2.45.2). So, Herodotus asks, how could the Egyptians countenance human sacrifice (2.45.2)?

Herodotus’ second objection is perhaps more illuminating for this discussion of ἀλκή. Herodotus expresses disbelief that ‘Heracles **still** (ἔτι) being one man and **still a human** (ἔτι ἄνθρωπον), as they say, **how is it natural** (κῶς φύσιν ἔχει) to kill a countless multitude?’ (2.45.3). The repetition of the temporal adverb ‘still’ (ἔτι) highlights that, in this narrative, Heracles is a human figure, while the expression ‘how is it natural’ (κῶς φύσιν ἔχει) demonstrates Herodotus’ utter incredulity at Heracles’ slaughter. Whether this refers to the ‘human’ Heracles of 2.44.5 or the pre-apotheosis Heracles is largely irrelevant: Herodotus is dubious that a ‘human’ (ἄνθρωπος), the subject of his work as announced in the Prologue (1.1.0),⁴⁸³ can bring about such a massacre. The story’s climax is told economically, within three Greek words ‘he slaughtered them all’ (πάντας σφέας καταφονεῦσαι, 2.45.1), Herodotus’ only descriptive detail is that Heracles ‘turned to force’ (ἐς ἀλκὴν τραπόμενον, 2.45.1).

⁴⁸¹ For this terminology see Sheehan (2018) 53 n.28. Baragwanath and de Bakker (2012) 1. Saïd (2007) 78-80 discusses the term. Boedeker (2002) 110. Cobet (2002) uses the terms throughout and otherwise provides an excellent account of temporal organisation in the *Histories*. Vandiver (1991). See also Finley (1975) 24-5.

⁴⁸² Vandiver (1991) 94.

⁴⁸³ See further, pp.7-11, esp. 10-11.

Homeric heroes use ἀλκή in hard-pressed situations to give them the necessary spirit to face their foes.

The verb associated with the Herodotean Heracles' ἀλκή is interesting. In Homeric epic, heroes are 'filled with ἀλκή' (e.g. *Il.* 17.212 and 17.499). Heracles, however, 'turned to' (τραπόμενον, 2.45.1) ἀλκή. The difference of verbal form suggests that there is a difference in how ἀλκή manifests itself. For Homeric heroes, it is an internal trait, while for Herodotean heroes the verb τραπόμενον suggests an external quality. Nonetheless, Herodotus doubts the validity of such a show of strength from a human figure endowed with ἀλκή even if that individual is Heracles.

Herodotus also uses ἀλκή to highlight the lack of heroism of whole nations and tribes. The Scythians lead the Persian force through numerous tribes and 'the Black-Cloaks, the Man-Eaters and the Neuroi, when the Persians came following the Scythians, **did not turn to spirit of defence** (οὔτε πρὸς ἀλκὴν ἐτράποντο), forget their threats, and fled, ever disordered, to the north into the desert' (4.125.5). In one fell swoop, Herodotus dismisses three Scythian *ethnē* in the armies' progress through the desert. These three tribes of Scythians are not new to the narrative, but are three of the five Scythian clans who refused to cooperate with the rest of Scythians (4.119.4). Often in Homer ἀλκή is represented as a co-operative value. Homeric leaders would often call upon their troops to take thought of ἀλκή when there was a need for decisive action. The absence of ἀλκή from the three tribes who denied help to the other Scythians highlights their lack of heroism.

Those Scythians who make a stand, though, also appear to lack ἀλκή. Darius interprets the Scythians' gifts of a bird, a mouse, a frog and five arrows (4.131) as them surrendering themselves to him. Herodotus gives Darius' logic: 'thus he reasoned, as the mouse lives in the ground eating the same fruits as men, the frogs in the water, the bird is much alike to a horse, and the arrows that **they gave over their fighting spirit** (τὴν ἐωυτῶν ἀλκὴν παραδιδούσι).'

(4.132.1). West suggests that ‘the objects conveyed his [sc. Idanthysus’, the Scythian king’s] meaning unimpeded by any language barrier’,⁴⁸⁴ but the Herodotean narrative, with Gobryas offering an alternative interpretation within the same Herodotean chapter (4.132.2-3), shows otherwise. Instead, I think it closer to the mark to say that ‘objects, like historical accounts, can mean different things to different people’.⁴⁸⁵ I would be dubious about suggesting that this was the historical Darius’ interpretation of the gift, if any such gifts were ever given, but it is the opinion Herodotus ascribes to him. Probably all, if not nearly all, character speech would be Herodotus’ own authorial invention; and so, it is Herodotus who makes Darius say that the Scythians give over their ἀλκή.

This implies that the Scythians had ἀλκή. However, we have just seen an extended scene of Scythian retreat (4.120-5); and so, we can firmly say that the Scythians are not in possession of Homeric ἀλκή since to retreat is to lose one’s ἀλκή. Yet, the Scythians are firmly in control during the retreat,⁴⁸⁶ and the Scythians play with the Persians in a number of ways. They always stayed one day’s march ahead (4.120.3 and 4.122.1), making them just out of reach of a battle. Darius sends a messenger to Idanthysus asking why they retreat, but Idanthysus sends a curt reply that the Scythians are not retreating but sticking to their peace time practice (4.127.1). Finally, the Scythians leave behind cattle to give the Persians hope (4.130). Darius ‘exhausts himself in this mockery of a hunt and emerges from it defeated, without ever even setting eyes upon his adversaries’.⁴⁸⁷ It is after this extended retreat that the puzzling gifts are sent and the Scythians allegedly hand over their ἀλκή. The only Homeric

⁴⁸⁴ West (2002) 455. West (1988) 207-11 gives an account of other cultures who present gifts of symbolic items to communicate a message, though for me such gift giving seems a hermeneutic trap of receiver’s confirmation bias – as is demonstrated in the Herodotean passage.

⁴⁸⁵ Lateiner (1989) 30 discussing the Scythian gifts of 4.131-2.

⁴⁸⁶ Compare the remarks of Hartog (1988) 41: ‘their [sc. the Scythians] function is that of bowmen and hunters. Now, what do the Scythians present Darius with in Scythia? A hunt, a strange hunt in which the roles of pursuer and pursued are switched, and in the last analysis the hunter becomes, in truth but without knowing it, the hunted’.

⁴⁸⁷ Hartog (1988) 61.

scene of retreat, which references ἀλκή, where the retreator is in some semblance of control, is the example discussed above of Ajax (pp.162-3). The tone of the two passages is markedly different. I have always read the extended narrative of Scythian retreat as a deeply comical, mock-heroic sketch by Herodotus. The Scythians are entirely unserious about their supposed engagement with the Persians; the Homeric Ajax is not playing, but retreating to save his very life.

The comedy of the Scythian scene comes to a head in the episode, which Herodotus is keen to highlight, occurs directly ‘after the gifts came to Darius’ (μετὰ τὰ δῶρα ἐλθόντα Δαρείῳ, 4.134.1). It is when the Scythians and the Persians prepare to do battle: ‘when the Scythians had arrayed themselves for battle, a hare ran into the middle of the two sides, and every Scythian seeing it chased the hare’ (4.134.1).⁴⁸⁸ It seems the Scythians could not care less about engaging the Persians in battle; ‘it is a comic moment but also one of poetic clarity; the indifference of the Scythians to Darius crystalizes [sic.] the nature of his difficulty – dealing with an enemy beyond his ken’.⁴⁸⁹ This scene prompts Darius to reevaluate the Scythian gifts. Darius now favours Gobyras’ prior opinion (4.132.3): the Scythians are saying that the Persians will not return home. No longer must Darius view the Scythians as having relinquished to him their ἀλκή; at this point in the narrative Darius, like the reader, may even wonder if the Scythians had ἀλκή.

At the more individualistic level, the magi are seemingly more successful in turning to ἀλκή in a moment of need. The seven conspirators close in and ‘when they [the magi] saw the eunuchs thrown into confusion and shouting aloud, they both run back as they learnt what was happening and **turned to force** (πρὸς ἀλκὴν ἐτράποντο),’ (3.78.1). One might expect to see an

⁴⁸⁸ Hartog (1988) 41: ‘the first appearance of the Scythians in the *Histories* is as masters of hunting’, citing 1.73.

⁴⁸⁹ Sheehan (2018) 145.

impressive battle scene. This expectation is both met and frustrated in equal measure; ‘one of them quickly took up a bow, and the other turned to a spear’ (3.78.2). The magus with the spear fares rather well and ‘he smote Aspathines **in the thigh** (ἐς τὸν μηρόν) and Intaphrenes **in the eye** (ἐς τὸν ὀφθαλμόν)’ (3.78.2). This magus makes Homeric-style wounds similar to the ‘over a hundred times, [where] the *Iliad* conjures up warriors who take shape as individuals only to disappear in a gripping description of how they suffered their death’.⁴⁹⁰ The nature of the wounds suggests we should view this scene in light of Homeric battle. Herodotus is quick to stress, though, that while ‘Intrapherenes was robbed of his eye by the wound, **however he did not die** (οὐ μέντοι ἀπέθανέ γε)’ (3.78.2). This magus may inflict wounds like a Homeric hero, but he falls short of killing like a Homeric hero.

The other magus fares much worse. Herodotus points out that ‘the one who picked up the bow, saw it was useless as the enemies were in **close proximity** (ἀγχοῦ) and **pressing hard** (προσκεμμένων),’ (3.78.2). The magus ‘in close proximity’ (ἀγχοῦ) to his enemies, and being ‘pressed hard’ (πρόσκεμμαι), made a poor choice of weapon for the fighting environment. The fighting space is small and a bow avails him nothing. Thus, Herodotus says that ‘when the bow became in no way useful to him, he went into the inner chamber to the men’s quarters’ (3.78.3). This magus flees and so we can say that he has lost his ἀλκή, at least in the Homeric sense. However, in the brief period of having ἀλκή, this magus achieves nothing. This magus’ failure is palpable by comparison with the other magus who turned to ἀλκή. Further, Herodotus devotes a greater amount of narrative time to the second magus’ floundering than the heroics of the first magus.

⁴⁹⁰ Boedeker (2003) 18, Boedeker opens her chapter with the example of Peneleos stabbing Ilioneus in the eye and killing him (*Il.* 14.489–502). Cf. Fragoulaki (2022) on the absence of gore in Herodotus’ descriptions of battle.

It need not even be a human who possesses Herodotean ἀλκή. Herodotus says that the Arabians dress themselves up in tough leather to reach where '[cassia] grows in a shallow river, in and around this same river live wild winged creatures, which closely resemble bats, which shriek terribly, and **make a strong show of force** (ἐς ἀλκὴν ἄλκιμα),' (3.110). Both Homeric epics present animals as having ἀλκή, but within similes and metaphorical language where ἀλκή forms the point of comparison to Homeric heroes.⁴⁹¹ No animal actually present in the Homeric world alongside the heroes has ἀλκή, though.⁴⁹² The only Homeric non-human and non-god individual to have ἀλκή is the Cyclops Polyphemus. Herodotus' bat-like creatures are no Cyclops. Polyphemus' possession of ἀλκή, it was suggested, formed part of Odysseus' strategy for communicating the Cyclops' savagery to the Phaeacians. While Herodotus clearly depicts the bats as presenting a threat to the Arabian people, it is hardly comparable to the threat posed by the monstrous Polyphemus. This can be seen as forming part of Herodotus' method for communicating the historicity of his historiographical narrative world. In Herodotus' world, where there are assuredly fantastic creatures,⁴⁹³ the Herodotean 'monster' with ἀλκή is merely a cassia-guarding bat.

The next two uses of ἀλκή appear in the battle of Plataea. As this is one of, if not the most, decisive battles of the Persian Wars, Herodotus may use ἀλκή to create a Homeric tone to immortalise Greek fighters with an Iliadic aura. However, Herodotus never uses ἀλκή for

⁴⁹¹ At *Od.* 22.305 Odysseus' men attack the suitors like vultures attacking smaller birds with no ἀλκή. At *Il.* 4.245 Agamemnon compares those dawdling to fawns without ἀλκή. At *Il.* 4.253 Idomeneus has ἀλκή like a wild boar. At *Il.* 16.157 the Myrmidons arm like wolves with unspeakable ἀλκή. At *Il.* 16.753 Patroclus is compared to a lion whose ἀλκή destroy itself. At *Il.* 17.281 Ajax runs through the Trojans like a wild boar in ἀλκή. At *Il.* 21.578 Agenor is compared to a leopard who will make a trial of ἀλκή against huntsman. There are similar uses of ἄλκιμος: At *Il.* 16.264 the Myrmidons go out to battle like wasps with ἄλκιμοι hearts. At *Il.* 17.111 Menelaus gradually gives ground like a lion whose ἄλκιμος heart is growing chill. At *Il.* 20.169 Achilles is compared to a lion whose ἄλκιμος heart moans within him. At *Il.* 21.572 Agenor is compared to an ἄλκιμος leopard.

⁴⁹² E.g. sacrificial cattle, horses, or the dogs and birds which feast upon the corpses of fallen heroes etc.

⁴⁹³ Fantastic creatures in Herodotus include, famously, the gold-digging ants (3.102-5); flying snakes (3.107); griffins (4.13 and 4.27); dog-headed men and huge snakes (4.191); werewolves or wizards (4.105). See further: Mayor and Heaney (1993). Mayor (1992). Wittkower (1942) 159-62.

any Greek either individually or collectively. At Plataea ἀλκή is used solely in relation to the Persians – who are the invading, *not* defending, force.

The first use in the Plataea sequence comes in Mardonius' test of the Phocians. Mardonius instructs the Phocian men-at-arms to draw up their battlelines, which they duly do, but Mardonius then sets the Persian cavalry on them, appearing to attack (9.17.2-3), only for the cavalry to turn away at the last second before engaging (9.18.1). Herodotus suggests two options as explanations. One is that the Persians were sent at the behest of the Thessalians to slay the Phocians, but the Persians turned tail for fear of casualties seeing the Phocians' resistance (9.18.2). The other option, as Herodotus presents it, is 'if [Mardonius] wanted to make a test of the Phocians' **spirit of defence** (ἀλκή) (9.18.2). This fits with the Homeric picture: 'ἀλκή, used here in the Homeric sense (related to ἀλέξω), refers to defence and (by extension) to the spirit with which one defends oneself'.⁴⁹⁴ The Phocians put up a resistance to the oncoming Persian cavalry force akin to the resistance Homeric heroes made to oncoming enemies. It also bodes well for Mardonius if he can test his troops and see a resolute display of ἀλκή:⁴⁹⁵ he has a fighting force like Homeric heroes.

In Homeric epic, however, you do not use ἀλκή against your allies. Nagler examines the dichotomy between 'strife' (ἔρις) and 'spirit of defence' (ἀλκή) and proposes that ἀλκή is an outgoing force against enemies, whereas '*eris* tak[es] place *within a community*'.⁴⁹⁶ In Herodotus' narrative we have Mardonius mobilising troops against his own forces, and so it is not a demonstration of Homeric ἀλκή but rather one of Homeric ἔρις since the attacker is attacking those on their own side. Further, as Herodotus introduces the test of the Phocians' ἀλκή he notes that all the Greeks encamped with Mardonius in Boeotia were set to join the

⁴⁹⁴ Flower and Marincola (2002) 136.

⁴⁹⁵ Compare Agamemnon's decision to test the Achaeans at *Il.* 2.72-5.

⁴⁹⁶ Nagler (1988) 83, original emphasis.

attack on Athens, but the Phocians alone joined Mardonius, ‘not willingly but under compulsion’ (οὐκ ἐκόντες ἀλλ’ ὑπ’ ἀναγκαίης, 9.17.1). The Phocians are presented as unwilling allies. Therefore, the use of ἀλκή can be seen as a legitimate response from the Phocian perspective to Mardonius’ attack: he is their enemy. The Phocians are not whole-hearted allies but occupy a position on their side through necessity. Indeed, ‘the orientation to community or communities is in fact what distinguishes the connotations among all the major words for conflict’.⁴⁹⁷ And so, ἀλκή helps to highlight the Phocians’ unwilling Medism.

The next use occurs when the Persians have scrambled away to their wooden walls in Theban territory. The Persians were getting the better of the Lacedaemonians, until the Athenians arrive and scale the walls, allowing the allied Greeks to enter, then, ‘when the walls fell the barbarians were no longer a body of men, **nor did any of them remember [the] spirit of defence** (οὐδέ τις αὐτῶν ἀλκῆς ἐμέμνητο), they were distraught, myriads of people seized with fear were walled into a small space’ (9.70.4). This would have been the perfect opportunity for the Persians to do what Herodotus says they do not and remember ἀλκή and, in Homeric fashion, make a show of resistance to the oncoming attack. The specific phrase of ‘remembering ἀλκή’ was one of the Homeric exhortations to battle and so this use of ἀλκή has a particularly strong Homeric resonance.⁴⁹⁸ The Persians, however, are far from Homeric; Herodotus stresses that ‘not one of them’ (οὐδέ τις αὐτῶν) adopts ἀλκή. Instead, the phrase, which is unquestionably Homeric, highlights the Persians’ status at this point in the war: they are no longer a threat to the Greeks, and certainly no Homeric-calibre enemy.⁴⁹⁹

⁴⁹⁷ Nagler (1988) 83.

⁴⁹⁸ Flower and Marincola (2002) 229-30 note this. Collins (1998) 102 n.32 perhaps oversells the case that ‘the language here [sc. Of Herodotus *Histories* 9.70.4] is Homeric and attests, I believe, to the continuing meaningfulness of the theme to Herodotus’ audiences in the 5th century B.C.E.’.

⁴⁹⁹ Compare this with Idomeneus’ use of the adjective ἄλκιμος as he replies to Meriones that the coward and hardy man make themselves known in an ambush (*Il.* 13.276-8).

The last use comes in the battle of Mycale. While the shield wall holds the Persians could maintain a defence, but, ‘as the wall was taken, **the barbarians did not still to turn to spirit of defence** (οὐτ’ ἔτι πρὸς ἀλκὴν ἐτράποντο οἱ βάρβαροι), and the others set out to flee, **except the Persians** (πλὴν Περσέων),’ (9.102.3). This scene also demonstrates the Homeric opposition between ἀλκή and flight, but furthers the characterisation of the Persians. The temporal adverb ‘still’ (ἔτι) implies that, before they forget it, the barbarians had ἀλκή. Throughout the *Histories*, Herodotus is not unduly critical of the Persians and ‘treats the ‘enemy’ with a certain amount of sympathy’.⁵⁰⁰ Here he excludes them, ‘except the Persians’ (πλὴν Περσέων), from his statement of those who retreat and so they stand ‘in contrast to their Asiatic allies, who are often faulted for cowardice and who either need the spur of the lash or flee in terror, the Persians at Marathon (6.113), Plataea (9.62–3) and Mycale (9.102) fight bravely and to the death’.⁵⁰¹ The Persians’ uniqueness at Mycale, as the sole contingent to remain, is certainly a favourable characterisation. Further, the Persians use ἀλκή in a Homeric manner; they are in a hard-pressed situation and defend against oncoming enemies. It could be that Herodotus wanted to extend the battle narrative just a little longer for the reader’s enjoyment, but I am convinced that the ‘defeat of them [sc. The Persians] means defeat of the entire force’.⁵⁰² A neat conclusion to the whole Persian War narrative; the Persians themselves singled out as the Greeks’ final foe.

From an ἀλκή perspective, Herodotus is ambiguous whether the Persians are still, literally, in possession of it as they continue their fight. Herodotus says that ‘**the barbarians** (οἱ βάρβαροι) did not continue to turn to [the] **spirit of defence**’ (ἀλκὴν, 9.102.3), before pointing out that the Persians alone remain behind to fight. Syntactically, the Persians can be

⁵⁰⁰ Flower and Marincola (2002) 15. Cf. Fornara (1983) 62.

⁵⁰¹ Flower (2006) 284-5.

⁵⁰² Flower and Marincola (2002) 282.

categorised under the plural form ‘the barbarians’ (οἱ βάρβαροι), and so they would not be in possession of ἀλκή since the barbarians ‘did not continue to turn to spirit of defence’ (οὐτ’ ἔτι πρὸς ἀλκὴν ἐτράποντο). Alternatively, ‘the barbarians’ (οἱ βάρβαροι) might not denote the Persians since Herodotus excluded them with the phrase ‘except the Persians’ (πλὴν Περσέων), meaning that the Persians could still be accounted as possessing ἀλκή. This I believe points to a master stroke of Herodotus’ literary style. It is ultimately for the individual reader to decide whether they wish to award the Persians the Homeric trait of ἀλκή or not.⁵⁰³ Herodotus’ original Greek audience may have hesitated to glorify their enemy, but Herodotus’ own impartial and unprejudiced historiographical style, if only subtly, will give credit where credit is due.

2.2.4 Herodotean ἄλκιμος

I end this section by briefly discussing the use of ἄλκιμος in the *Histories*. We saw above that in Homeric epic ἄλκιμος is used primarily in a general way to describe spears in the *Odyssey* and as a generic epithet in the *Iliad* (pp.154-5). In the *Histories*, the term has a more specialised use and is almost entirely used in a sincere manner to denote prowess in battle.⁵⁰⁴ There are two examples to which I wish to draw attention that problematise a wholesale categorisation in the *Histories*.

The first is the Massagetae. Herodotus says that ‘this tribe of people are said to be a **great** (μέγα) and **warlike** (ἄλκιμον) people’ (1.201). This is all well and good as Herodotus presents the enemy of Cyrus’ upcoming campaign and uses two positive adjectives ‘great’

⁵⁰³ This draws on the idea of reader response theory, for which see Iser (1974), Iser (1978) and Iser (1989), as applied to Herodotus in Baragwanath (2008).

⁵⁰⁴ 1.79.3 of the Lydians, of whom Herodotus says, ‘there was during that time no tribe of people in Asia braver or **hardier** (ἄλκιμώτερον)’; 1.103.1 of Cyaxares; 3.4.1 of Phanes; 5.49.3 sees the term used in a negative construction by Aristagoras of the Persians to encourage Cleomenes to war; 7.10β.1 of the Greeks by Artabanus based on the Battle of Marathon; 8.136.2 of the Athenians by Alexander (sent by Mardonius) when trying to get the Athenians to change sides. See also the batlike winged creatures of 3.110 which opt for ἀλκὴν ἄλκιμα to defend their cassia (above p.179); this is also a genuine use of the term.

(μέγας) and the adjective ‘warlike’ (ἄλκιμος) to show their threat to Cyrus. Herodotus then provides an ethnographic sketch of this tribe, first describing the territory held by the Massagetae (1.201-4) before pointing out that ‘a woman was queen of the Massagetae, following the death of her husband, her name was Tomyris’ (1.205.1). Tomyris, a woman, is the leader of a people described as ἄλκιμος. Never in Homeric epic is ἄλκιμος applied to an individual or a group overseen by a woman; nor is ἄλκιμος used to describe a woman anywhere in Homer. Likewise, ἀλκή is never used to describe any group where a woman is in charge and never of a mortal woman.⁵⁰⁵ The Homeric exhortation to remember ἀλκή emphatically shows the masculine nature of this trait: ‘Friends, be **men** (ἄνδρες), and remember furious **spirit of defence** (ἀλκῆς)’.⁵⁰⁶

The attribution of ἄλκιμος to her people need not mean that Tomyris is in possession of this trait herself. However, I would argue that this is how we are supposed to see her. Tomyris takes decisive action in sending a herald to Cyrus, who, at her bidding, offers Cyrus the choice of battle ground (1.206.1-3); later she threatens Cyrus after he kills her son by deceit (1.212.1-3); Herodotus says Tomyris ‘**collected** (συλλέξασα) together all **her** (ἐωυτῆς) forces and engaged him’ (1.214.1), before finally gloating over Cyrus’ corpse and enacting bloody revenge by forcing it into a wineskin filled with blood (1.214.4-5). The singular feminine participle ‘collected’ (συλλέξασα) and the feminine possessive pronoun ‘her’ (ἐωυτῆς) not only show Tomyris’ active narrative role, but also highlights her status as a singular female agent. While ἄλκιμος is not directly applied to Tomyris given her active status and leadership of an ἄλκιμος tribe it seems likely Herodotus is subtly attributing ἀλκή to her.

⁵⁰⁵ The application of ἀλκή to the masculine war goddess Athene in Hera’s command (*Il.* 5.718) is the only exception.

⁵⁰⁶ *Il.* 8.174, 11.287, 15.487, 15.734 and 16.270.

A female figure with ἀλκή is radical. As much as I would like to see Tomyris' characterisation as a show of Herodotean proto-feminism, this view is ultimately untenable. It is much more likely to play into contemporary misogyny. There seem to me two reasons for this. One is that Herodotus is continuing the trend, started in the *Odyssey*, showing ἀλκή having deteriorated since the *Iliad*'s time. The ascription of ἀλκή to a tribe led by a woman can be seen as continuing this trend, illustrating just how far-removed Herodotus' world is from Homer's. In one way this interpretation strengthens the credibility of Herodotus' narrative: a Homeric value is normalised to such an extent that now it can be applied to a woman, although Tomyris' ἀλκή is exceptional even in Herodotus.

The second reason is that the Massagetae demonstrate how the value of ἀλκή differs between Eastern barbarians and the Greeks. Excluding Heracles (though it was strictly Heracles in Egypt), ἀλκή is not attributed to any Greek individual or collective. The adjective ἄλκιμος, however, is applied to Athens and describes the Persians' esteem for Athens in military matters (7.10β.1 and 8.136.2). This is a positive use. However, when applied to Tomyris' Eastern army, ἄλκιμος suggests a lower grade of that virtue. A summary of the Eastern battles prior to Cyrus and Tomyris battle demonstrates this. The Lydians are first among the people of Asia for ἀλκή (1.79.3) but they are overcome by Cyrus' (humorous?) trick with the camels (1.80). Then, Cyrus' taskforce, who overcame the Eastern people with the greatest ἀλκή, is in turn worsted by the ἄλκιμος army led by a woman. By this logic, Tomyris is thus distinguished as the foremost fighter in the Asian region. But, as Tomyris is a woman, it would be all too easy for Herodotus' sexist contemporary audience to denigrate Eastern ἀλκή considering that Tomyris, a woman, comes out on top.

The other use of ἄλκιμος I wish to highlight shows Herodotus satirising ἀλκή. Herodotus tells how Sesostris set up different statues to commemorate his vanquished foes according to their level of resistance (2.102.4-5). Herodotus portrays this opposition in terms

of ἀλκή, which makes sense considering the etymology of the term (pp.156-7). Sesostris, ‘when he happened to meet with those who were **hardy** (ἀλκίμοισι) and strove hard for freedom’ (2.102.4), would then raise a pillar recording his triumph. Were the people cowardly, upon the pillar ‘he drew on it the private parts of a woman, wanting to make it clear that they were **without spirit of defence** (ἀνάλκιδες),’ (2.102.5). Aside from providing a humorous vignette of Sesostris’ campaign, Herodotus highlights the gendered nature of ἀλκή. Sesostris genders those ‘without ἀλκή’ (ἀνάλκιδες) as female by assigning them vaginas. Without wishing to be too low brow, I would argue further that we should perhaps read a gendered significance into the erecting of pillars to denote Sesostris’ vanquishing brave foes. This passage adds to our understanding of Tomyris. Tomyris’ ἀλκή is radical not only compared to Homeric epic, but also in comparison to Herodotean ἀλκή. Tomyris is thus truly exceptional.

2.2.5 Conclusion

Herodotus’ envisioning of ἀλκή is thus very different from Homer’s. Herodotus is doubtful about the human Heracles’ show of strength when he draws upon ἀλκή precisely because he is a human, the subject of Herodotus’ work (1.1.0). Scythian ἀλκή underscored the a-heroism of the Scythians and played into the wider humorous depiction of the Scythian campaign more generally. Both the Magi turned to ἀλκή, but to disparate effect: one acts in a fairly Homeric manner, but falls short of complete heroic stature, while the other blunders. It was not the Cyclopean monster with ἀλκή but the Arabian bats which demonstrated Herodotus depicting a more realistic narrative world. Mardonius tested the Phocians’ ἀλκή which, it was argued drawing on Nagler (1988), perverted the Homeric principle of ἀλκή. The Persians’ inability to remember ἀλκή, notably an inversion of a typical Homeric exhortation, demonstrated how they were no longer an imposing threat to the allied Greek forces. The final use of ἀλκή at Mycale highlighted the sincere approach Herodotus has to heroism, by subtly crafting the narrative

both to allow and deny the Persians ἀλκή depending on individual reader's preexisting prejudices. It was also shown that Herodotus uses ἄλκιμος more sincerely than the uses in adduced in Homeric epic, although from a gender perspective the picture is not without ambiguity. It is therefore not strictly true to say that from Homer to 'in Pindar, in Herodotus, everywhere ἀλκή shows the same meaning'.⁵⁰⁷ Herodotus uses ἀλκή in a number of innovative ways and crucially, for this thesis, how Herodotus uses ἀλκή is not Homeric.

⁵⁰⁷ Benveniste (1969b) 74 ('chez Pindare, chez Hérodote, partout ἀλκή montre le même sens').

2.3.1. Homeric and Herodotean κρατερός and κρατέω

The next term to be examined is ‘power’ (κράτος/κάρτος).⁵⁰⁸ Homer deploys κράτος 42 times over the course of both epics;⁵⁰⁹ again, it most commonly occurs in the *Iliad*, reflecting the word’s martial preoccupations. This term is particularly interesting as ancient Greeks conceptualised ‘power’ (κράτος) as a god,⁵¹⁰ whom Hesiod gives as a constant attendant to Zeus along with ‘might’ (βίη).⁵¹¹ In the embassy scene, Odysseus reminds Achilles of his father Peleus’ words as he departed Phthia for the war: ‘my child, Athena and Hera will give you **power** (κάρτος), if they so wish’ (*Il.* 9.254). Odysseus therefore presents κράτος as one of Achilles’ qualities. Further, as Breuil has noted,

in the Classical era, κράτος is quite common among poets (Aeschylus: 26 occ., Sophocles: 24, Euripides: 23); among prose writers other than Herodotus, free employment is rare, and the word appears especially in the adverbialized [sic.] expressions ἀνά κράτος and κατά κράτος.⁵¹²

Herodotus’ deployment of κράτος, from a lexical rather than semantic point of view, is therefore contrary to the customary usage at the time and aligns more closely with poetic texts

⁵⁰⁸ I refer to both κράτος and κάρτος using the non-poetic form κράτος throughout, since this is the more common form, while retaining poetic forms in quotations.

⁵⁰⁹ *Od.* 1.70, 1.359, 3.370, 4.415, 5.4, 6.197, 9.393, 11.353, 13.143, 18.139, 21.280, 21.353. *Il.* 1.509, 2.118, 6.387, 7.142, 9.25, 9.39, 9.254, 11.9, 11.192, 11.207, 11.319, 11.753, 12.214, 13.484, 13.486, 13.743, 15.108, 15.216, 16.54, 16.524, 17.206, 17.322, 17.329, 17.562, 17.613, 17.623, 18.308, 20.121, 24.293, 24.311. Breuil (1989) 18 and 49 gives the total number of occurrences of κράτος as 43, by including the suspect use at *Il.* 8.226 without qualification. However, Murray’s translation (1928) 354 n.2 notes that ‘lines 224-226 are omitted in the best MSS.’ The same note appears in Wyatt’s revision of Murray’s translation, Wyatt (1999) 367 n.20. See also the apparatus criticus of Monro and Allen (1920).

⁵¹⁰ Aesch. *PV* 1-87 has ‘Power’ (Κράτος) on stage as a character goading Hephaestus to bind Prometheus to the rock. Aesch. *Cho.* 244-5 has Electra invoking ‘Power’ (Κράτος) along with ‘Justice’ (Δίκη) and Zeus. Hes. *Theog.* 385-8.

⁵¹¹ Hes. *Theog.* 385-8.

⁵¹² Breuil (1995) 73 (‘À l’époque classique, κράτος est assez fréquent chez les poètes (Eschyle : 26 occ., Sophocle : 24, Euripide : 23) ; chez les prosateurs autres qu’Hérodote, les emplois libres sont rares, et le mot apparaît surtout dans les locutions adverbialisées ἀνά κράτος et κατά κράτος’).

than with contemporaneous prose authors. Thus, *κράτος* is therefore felt to be archaic and poetic' in Herodotus' time.⁵¹³ This chapter will explore whether the semantic range of *κράτος* in the *Histories* aligns with the grammatical observations above in relation to *κράτος* in Homeric epic and in the Herodotean *Histories*.

While Homer uses both 'spirit of defence' (*ἀλκή*) and 'power' (*κράτος*) as fighting words, 'we would not be able to put an equality sign between the two terms'.⁵¹⁴ Homeric 'spirit of defence' (*ἀλκή*) refers more strictly to defensive manoeuvres, whereas, as this section will argue, Homeric 'power' (*κράτος*) is associated with the idea of overwhelming strength. Thus, it is entirely appropriate that the Hesiodic Zeus, as supreme ruler of the gods, is never without 'power' (*κράτος*). I suggest that we see an extension of this ideology in Homeric epic. I argue that *κράτος* functions as a symbol of Zeus' right to rule, as king of the gods, and propose that this aspect of Zeus' kingships finds a parallel in the human realm. I argue further that Homeric battlefield *κράτος* is the quality that allows an individual to overcome their opponent(s). Both lines of argument align with Chantraine's etymological interpretation of 'strength', in particular physical force which allows one to triumph, hence 'victory, power, sovereignty'.⁵¹⁵

It should be noted that Homer's preferred *κράτος*-term is not the noun 'power' (*κράτος*) itself but rather the adjective 'powerful' (*κρατερός*), which is used a total of 143 times. This is,

⁵¹³ Breuil (1995) 73 ('*κράτος* est donc senti comme archaïque et poétique *κράτος* est donc senti comme archaïque et poétique').

⁵¹⁴ Benveniste (1969b) 74-5 ('[...] nous ne saurions pour [...] mettre un signe d'égalité entre les deux termes').

⁵¹⁵ Chantraine s.v. *κράτος*: 'Meaning: the word, which comes from a root expressing the notion of 'hardness' (cf. *Od.* 9.393), means 'strength', in particular physical force which allows one to triumph, hence 'victory, power, sovereignty' ('Sens: le mot, qui relève d'une racine exprimant la notion de «dureté» (cf. *Od.* 9.393), signifie «force», notamment force physique qui permet de triompher, d'où «victoire, pouvoir, souveraineté»). Cf. Benveniste (1969b) 71-83 contests this etymology and suggests one based on two roots, similar in form: one root akin to 'hardiness' and the other related to the idea of 'prevalence'. While adding a layer of precision, this seems to me like hair-splitting argumentation: strength in physical ability can after all be a sign of one's physical ability to rule in the Homeric world (see, e.g. pp.222-3). I think above all of Achilles' concern for Peleus in the Underworld who, thinking of his father's weakness in old age, imagines Peleus losing the right to rule, *Il.* 11.494-503 – although, notably this is denoted by *τιμή* and not *κράτος* (see, p.123-5).

however, a comparative study and Herodotus uses κρατερός only twice.⁵¹⁶ Both the Herodotean occurrences are in direct quotations of verse oracles and therefore appear in text which is not directly that of Herodotus as author or narrator. This constitutes a major point of difference between the two authors which should be noted, and indeed emphasised: Herodotus is not drawing on the main Homeric κράτος-term in his construction of the historiographic narrative.

Relatedly, ‘power’ (κράτος) has a cognate verb κρατέω which can be translated as ‘I have power’ or ‘I overpower’ and which both Homer and Herodotus utilise. The verbal form κρατέω is used a paltry 13 times within the two epics,⁵¹⁷ compared to Herodotus’ 29 occurrences, which shows that κρατέω is not Homer’s primary tool for communicating ideas surrounding κράτος-type words. Moreover, as the cognate verb, κρατέω can be understood as a performance of κράτος. Thus, the verb is less useful for understanding what κράτος actually *is* as a concept rather than how it is enacted. In any case, some interesting differences can be noted in the two authors’ use of the term.

Homer employs κρατέω politically, more specifically, in the sense of the individual(s) invested with legislative power to rule over others.⁵¹⁸ For example, Homer refers to ‘heavenly Elis, where the Epeians **rule** (κρατεύουσιν)’ (*Od.* 13.275)⁵¹⁹ and Calchas sheepishly says, in the assembly, ‘I think I shall anger a man, who **rules** (κρατέει) greatly all the Argives and whom the Achaeans obey’ (*Il.* 1.78-9). This is the only use of κρατέω in the post-war *Odyssey* and aligns with the use of κράτος as a quality possessed by Zeus, the ruler of the gods.

⁵¹⁶ 1.67.4 and 8.77.1.

⁵¹⁷ *Od.* 11.485, 13.275, 15.274, 15.298, 16.265, 24.431. *Il.* 1.79, 1.288, 5.175, 16.172, 16.424, 21.214, 21.315.

⁵¹⁸ On this political/governmental use see *Od.* 11.485, 13.275, 15.274, 15.298, 16.265, 24.431. *Il.* 1.79, 1.288, 16.172.

⁵¹⁹ Breuil (1989) 26 notes that ‘the word must be quite old, since 5 of its 13 occurrences are formative in style: ν 275, ο 298, ω 431 (identical end of verse); Ε 175-176 = Π 424-425’. (‘Le mot doit être assez ancien, puisque 5 de ses 13 occurrences relèvent du style formulaire: ν 275, ο 298, ω 431 (fin de vers identique); Ε 175-176 = Π 424-425’).

The verb κρατέω is also used to describe the battle manoeuvre of an individual hero overcoming or overpowering their enemy.⁵²⁰ Aeneas encourages Pandarus, ‘but come, raising your hands to Zeus, let fly a missile at this man, **whoever he is this man is prevailing** (ὅς τις ὅδε κρατέει) and working many evil deeds’ (*Il.* 5.174-5). Aeneas uses the verb κρατέω in a more immediate sense to describe the actions of Diomedes as he presses the Trojans hard and overpowers them. Thus, we can say that the verb κρατέω denotes not only power over others, in the sense of political hegemony, but also the ability to overpower one’s enemies in the combative sense.

A man’s ability when enacting κρατέω, however, is not equal to that of a god. Achilles finds this out the hard way in *Iliad* 21 when in his bloodlust he kills scores of Trojans in the Scamander’s waters; Scamander, rightfully, becomes annoyed and begins his appeal to Achilles to stop, ‘O Achilles, **you are exceeding in power** (περὶ μὲν κρατέεις)’ (*Il.* 21.214). The adverbial use of the preposition ‘exceeding’ (περὶ) demonstrates that not only is Achilles performing the verb κρατέω, but that he is doing so to an extensive degree (see further p.229). Achilles, though a demigod with the divine Thetis as his mother, remains a mortal and it quickly becomes clear that ‘Achilles has finally met his match. He has reached the limits of his physical strength’.⁵²¹ Though Achilles is said to be ‘exceeding in power’ (περὶ κρατέω), the river overpowers him (*Il.* 21.233-83), interestingly with an action denoted neither by the verb κρατέω nor the noun κράτος – a human’s ‘overpowering strength’ can be matched, and indeed overpowered itself, by a simple action of a god.⁵²²

⁵²⁰ On the use of κρατέω for battle field manoeuvres see *Il.* 5.175, 16.424. Both the political and militaristic uses of κρατέω are noted by Breuil (1989) 26.

⁵²¹ Hall (2025) 190.

⁵²² This use of κρατέω is developed roughly 100 lines later when Scamander calls on Simois to help him overpower Achilles because he ‘is now **overpowering** (κρατέει), intending to be equal to the gods’ (*Il.* 21.315), on this scene further see (p.227-30).

Herodotus applies the verbal form κρατέω 29 times, a greater number of times than Homer. While Herodotus applies the verb to political rulers in the sense found in Homeric epic reserved for the aristocracy,⁵²³ he also uses the term to describe much humbler types of sovereignty, even stating that each man is ruler in his own fishing hut (!) (5.16.3). Herodotus therefore does not, like Homer, reserve κρατέω as a linguistic instrument to designate the aristocratic ruling class, but expands the meaning to incorporate even humble ‘rulers’. Analogously, Herodotus, akin to Homer, also uses κρατέω for the militaristic overpowering of an enemy. However, in Homeric epic, κρατέω is only ever used of overcoming an enemy by brawn rather than brains. In selected instances, Herodotus changes the nuance of the term to denote the overcoming of the enemy through cunning intelligence.⁵²⁴ Further, Herodotus also uses the term for collective battle action rather than individual one-to-one battles.⁵²⁵ This contributes to the overall democratisation of Homeric language prevalent throughout this discussion of Homeric vocabulary in the *Histories*.

Curiously, Herodotus also makes aesthetic use of the verb. By ‘aesthetic’ I mean using κρατέω in an elevated manner to achieve an aesthetic effect, such as when Spargapises, Tomyris’ son, ‘as soon as he was freed and **had power over his hands** (τῶν χειρῶν ἐκράτησε), he killed himself’ (1.213). Here, κρατέω is used hyperbolically to evoke the loosening of Spargapises’ bonds. Similarly, the guards of the Egyptian thief’s brother ‘**were overcome** (κρατηθέντας) with sleep’ (2.121δ.5) but this is just a flowery way of Herodotus saying that

⁵²³ For Herodotus using κρατέω for rulers of people see 1.92.4, 2.153, 3.65.5. At 8.136.3 Herodotus says Mardonius is motivated to befriend the Athenians ‘to master the sea’ (τῆς θαλάσσης κρατήσιν). Cf. also 2.144.2, where Herodotus says that always one of the Egyptian gods is always supreme and rules (denoted by the verb κρατέω), but that this is subject to change.

⁵²⁴ 1.212.1 (Cyrus’ trick with the feast), 3.159.1 (Zopyrus’ self-mutilation) and 8.27.4 (the Phocians overcoming the Thessalians by scaring them by covering themselves with gypsum).

⁵²⁵ 3.39.4, 5.1.3, 5.77.2, 7.53.2, 7.157.3, 7.182, 8.15.2, 8.60β, 8.130.3, 9.71.2. At 4.111.1 Herodotus says, ‘the Scythians **have mastery over** (ἐκράτησαν) the cadavers from the battle’, where I take Herodotus’ meaning to be that the Scythians have possession of the Amazonians’ bodies, which makes possible their identification as women. Pisistratus is exceptional; he is the only individual to have the verb κρατέω applied to him at 5.94.1.

the guards fell into a drunken stupor following excessive alcohol consumption (a close parallel is Aeschylus' *Eumenides* 148, 'overcome by sleep'). Homer, the true poet, does not make any 'poetic' uses of κρατέω, but curiously the Herodotus prosaic author does.⁵²⁶

The remaining Herodotean uses of κρατέω, though defying easier categorisation, are also un-Homeric.⁵²⁷ And so, even though Herodotus in fact uses κρατέω more frequently than Homer, Herodotus' use of κρατέω differs in significant ways from the precedent set in Homeric epic. I now show that Herodotus' use of the crucial noun 'power' (κράτος) also has several key differences from the Homeric model, if indeed we can say he is following Homer as a guide.

2.3.2 Homeric κράτος

In line with the opening reference to Hesiod (p.188), 'power' (κράτος) is presented in Homeric epic as something belonging to Zeus.⁵²⁸ At the beginning of *Odyssey* 5 the gods sit in assembly, and, 'among them, high-thundering Zeus, whose **power is the greatest** (κράτος ἐστὶ μέγιστον)' (*Od.* 5.3-4). At its most basic level this confirms the Hesiodic application of κράτος as a quality strongly associated with Zeus. Here, however, κράτος is not presented as an anthropomorphic deity, as in Hesiodic verse, but as an abstraction possessed by Zeus. Further, 'the superlative μέγιστον has a very clear oppositional value: the prevalence exercised by Zeus, or by his representative, over the gods and men, takes precedence over that exercised by any other

⁵²⁶ Other Herodotean poetic uses of κρατέω: the anonymous Persian concludes his speech to Thersander, 'it is the most hateful thing for a human to know many things and **no power** (μηδενὸς κρατέειν, 9.16.5)'. At 9.42.1 κρατέω describes Mardonius overpowering Artabazus' argument, an elevated vocabulary choice to increase the tension of the scene; this use is mentioned again at (pp.215-6).

⁵²⁷ The final Herodotean examples of κρατέω: at 2.136.2, in Egypt, a man lending money on the security of the borrower's father's corpse took possession of the entire vault—a legal empowerment rather than a political one. At 5.85.2 the Athenians fail to drag the statues stolen by the Aeginetans where the action of moving the statues is described with the verb κρατέω: 'they did not have the strength **to move** (κρατῆσαι) them in this way'. At 7.164.2 a participle of κρατέω describes Cadmus' empowered state with Gelon's wealth, 'for Gelon **had entrusted** him (κρατήσας) with great stores of money'.

⁵²⁸ For κράτος being associated with Zeus see *Od.* 5.4. *Il.* 2.118, 9.25, 15.108.

animate being’.⁵²⁹ It makes sense for Zeus, as the ruler of the gods, to have the greatest proportion of κράτος. He is the eternal cosmic overlord.

Hera demonstrates the importance of κράτος to Zeus’ character,⁵³⁰ as king of the gods, when she returns from seducing him. She addresses the assembled gods:

‘Fools, who in our foolishness rage against Zeus:

Even now we think to go near intending to stop him

With word or might: sitting apart he does not care for us

Nor pays us heed: for he says that among the immortal gods

He is **far** (διακριδὼν) the **best** (ἄριστος) in **power** (κάρτεϊ) and **strength** (σθένει)’

(*Il.* 15.104-8).

This is why Zeus can be so utterly unconcerned with the other gods. Hera suggests that ‘Zeus’s overall authority’⁵³¹ results from his possession of two Homeric fighting words—‘power’ (κράτος) and ‘strength’ (σθένος). The qualitative adverb and adjective ‘far’ (διακριδὼν) and ‘best’ (ἄριστος) demonstrate the scale of Zeus’ superiority and highlight these qualities as the reason Zeus rests easy in his authoritarian regime. By using κράτος and σθένος, both terms which also denote physical prowess, Hera also hints at another reason for Zeus’ supremacy: superior corporeal strength. The Homeric Zeus is not above using his physical pre-eminence to put other gods in their place;⁵³² and so, Hera’s use of two Homeric fighting words, including

⁵²⁹ Breuil (1989) 23 (‘le superlatif μέγιστον a une très nette valeur d’opposition: la prévalence exercée par Zeus, ou par son représentant, sur les dieux et les hommes, prime celle exercée par tout autre être animé’).

⁵³⁰ Zeus’ favourite bird is said to be greatest in κράτος too: *Il.* 24.293 and 24.311.

⁵³¹ Kearns (2004) 61.

⁵³² Zeus threatens to whip Hera for seducing him (*Il.* 15.16-7), and we get an external analepsis (a flashback to a time before the main narrative of the *Iliad*), where Zeus reminds Hera that he previously suspended her from the heavens with anvils on her feet (*Il.* 15.18-33), making the threat of whipping appear no idle threat. Zeus’ maltreatment of gods is not limited to Hera. In Agamemnon’s narrative of

κράτος, to denote Zeus' rule acts as a reminder of Zeus' deployment of physical force to enact his authority (see further p.221). Zeus possesses κράτος in line with the findings for the verb κρατέω; he both rules the other gods and is superior to them in strength; for the gods to believe they can act contrary to Zeus' wishes is, as Hera says, 'foolish' (ἄφρονέοντες). Hera's words therefore provide a fascinating glimpse into the workings of Olympian hierarchy: in the heavenly kingdom of Olympus might is right.

It appears Zeus can, in a similar manner to what we have seen with Homeric κῦδος (pp.47-9), dispense κράτος to mortals.⁵³³ It is in precisely these terms that Zeus sends Iris to tell Hector how Zeus will turn the tide of battle in Hector's favour. Zeus instructs Iris to relay this information:

‘but when, either wounded by a spear or shot with an arrow,
[Agamemnon] leaps on his chariot, **then I shall give power** (κράτος ἐγγυαλίξω) to [Hector],
to kill until he arrives at the well-benched ships,
and the sun goes down and holy night arrives’ (*Il.* 11.191-4).⁵³⁴

Zeus, both in his own voice and through Iris, does not name any other Homeric fighting word other than κράτος when dictating how he shall turn the sway of battle to Hector's advantage: κράτος is enough. The first person singular active verbal form ‘I will give’ (ἐγγυαλίξω)

Eurystheus' birth (*Il.* 19.90-144), Zeus grabs ‘Bewilderment’/ ‘Infatuation’ (Ἄτη) by the head and throws her from Olympus (*Il.* 19.126-31).

⁵³³ Where Zeus gives out κράτος to mortals: *Il.* 1.509, 9.39 (though in a negative construction – Diomedes says Agamemnon was *not* given κράτος by Zeus – and this κράτος is of a different type to the militaristic uses typical of κράτος given out by Zeus), 11.192, 11.207, 11.319, 11.753, 15.216, 17.206.

⁵³⁴ *Il.* 11.206-9, when Iris repeats Zeus' message to Hector, is a near-repetition of *Il.* 11.191-4, the only difference being the emphatic form τοι in line 11.207, rather than οἱ as in line 11.192, which highlights the role of Hector as the audience of Iris' words. On this use of τοι see LSJ s.v. τοι A.

demonstrates Zeus' agency in the bestowing of κράτος and the third person singular pronoun 'to him' (οἱ) illustrates that Zeus intends to give κράτος only to Hector.

Zeus' granting of κράτος is not restricted to individuals. Thetis' appeal to Zeus at the beginning of the *Iliad*, which in many ways sparks the Achaeans' struggle in the main narrative, is framed in terms of giving κράτος to a collective:

‘But you will do honour to him, Olympian Zeus the counsellor;

Give power to the Trojans (ἐπὶ Τρώεσσι τίθει κράτος), so that the Achaeans

Honour my son and increase his honour’ (*Il.* 1.508-10).

Thetis' wider request is for the Trojans to meet with success so that the Achaeans recognise the benefit Achilles brought and come to regret Achilles' maltreatment and honour him fully. Thetis asks for Zeus to give the Trojans κράτος and makes no mention of any other Homeric fighting word. This is not an isolated case, as Nestor says that Zeus assisted the men of Pylos by giving them κράτος to beat the Epeians (*Il.* 11.753) and Poseidon asks Iris to report to Zeus that he will be irreconcilable to Zeus if he does not let the Achaeans sack Troy or give the Achaeans κράτος (*Il.* 15.205-17, with κράτος at 15.216). And so, it is true that ‘Zeus can bestow *krátos* on one of the two contending armies; the beneficiary of this superiority is then a people, no longer an individual’.⁵³⁵

Zeus' intervention with κράτος is something recognised by Homeric characters. Diomedes, after Agamemnon is injured, suggests retreat, ‘since Zeus the cloud-gatherer wishes to give **power** (κράτος) to the Trojans rather than to us’ (*Il.* 11.318-20). Diomedes, a character

⁵³⁵ Benveniste (1969b) 76 (‘Zeus peut conférer le *krátos* à l’une des deux armées en lutte ; le bénéficiaire de cette supériorité est alors un peuple, non plus un individu’).

internal to the narrative world, not only sees the Trojan success as a result of attaining κράτος but also connects κράτος with Zeus.

It might be suggested that Zeus does not dispense κράτος. Each of the occurrences where Zeus bestows κράτος occurs in a character's speech, which more strictly represents the internal characters' perception of Zeus and which does not necessarily align with how the external Homeric narrator constructs the narrative world. Linguistically, Homer does not present a scene where Zeus literally gives κράτος to Hector, as we saw with κῦδος (pp.47-9) only that Zeus *intends* to give κράτος. I would argue, though, that there is sufficient evidence in Homeric epic to assign Zeus the role of κράτος-giver. It is not an isolated incident where a character says Zeus is capable of giving out κράτος. A number of characters do so (Nestor, Poseidon, Thetis, and Diomedes) and, it should be noted, this list includes two divinities; Thetis specifically goes to Zeus ask for him to give out κράτος. Further, Zeus himself says he is capable of giving out κράτος (*Il.* 11.191-4). And so, while Homer does not present us with a heavy-handed scene or phrase explicitly depicting Zeus dispensing κράτος, there is enough implicit evidence to suggest he is indeed capable of this act.

This, however, does not refute my claim that ἀλκή was not dispensed by Zeus or any other god (pp.165-7). Where ἀλκή was said to be god-given there followed a scene where another piece of Homeric vocabulary was dispensed by the god (p.167); alternatively, ἀλκή was said to come about with a middle/passive verb form (p.166), which contradicted the idea of Zeus or (an)other god(s) giving out ἀλκή. With the above argumentation for κράτος, there is no subsequent scene which directly contradicts the idea of Zeus giving κράτος as there was with ἀλκή.

Other gods, besides Zeus, are also thought to give out κράτος.⁵³⁶ In the *Iliad*, a character names the god(s) who gives out κράτος and, notably, it is only the primary gods of each side of the Achaeans-Trojan conflict who are thought to be in possession of this property. At *Iliad* 9.254-5 Odysseus reports Achilles and Peleus' conversation before the Trojan War when Peleus, as conveyed by Odysseus, speaks to a hypothetical future where Hera and Athene will give him κράτος if they are willing; at *Iliad* 16.524 Glaucus prays to Apollo to staunch his bleeding and to give him κράτος to fight over Sarpedon's body; at *Iliad* 17.562 Menelaus, speaking to Athene (disguised as Phoenix), prays to her for the κράτος to protect Patroclus' body; at *Iliad* 20.121 Hera sees Aeneas approaching Achilles and suggests that Athene, Poseidon, and herself give Achilles κράτος. The same idea surfaces in the *Odyssey* but with only one example and an anonymised god: Odysseus recommends that the suitors put down the bow and try again 'on the morrow and a god will give you **power** (κράτος) if he wants' (*Od.* 21.208). A variety of characters, therefore, across both epics claim in direct speech that gods, other than Zeus, are capable of providing κράτος to humans.

As with Zeus' ability to grant κράτος this is, from a narratological standpoint, suspect. Character speech is tinged with actorial focalisation, which makes it dubious whether κράτος is actually ever given out by a god or, as we saw with Homeric ἀλήθεια (pp.165-7), characters only believe it comes from the gods when in fact it does not. We saw above that Homer implicitly indicates that Zeus gives out κράτος, but that there are enough hints to suggest Zeus does in Homeric 'reality' act as a benefactor bestowing κράτος. It might therefore follow that other gods could provide κράτος to their favourites. However, if we look at the events after each character's statement where they suggest the gods give out κράτος, we see that κράτος is never actually dispensed: in the *Odyssey*, the suitors are slaughtered before they get the chance

⁵³⁶ Where gods other than Zeus are said to give out κράτος: *Od.* 21.280. *Il.* 9.254, 16.524, 17.562, 20.121.

to receive κράτος from the anonymous god; at *Iliad* 9.254, Peleus, through Odysseus, is speaking to a hypothetical future and κράτος is not actually given; at *Iliad* 16.524, Glaucus asks Apollo for κράτος but instead Apollo ‘put **courage** (μένος) into his heart’ (*Il.* 16.529, see also pp.166-7); at *Iliad* 17.562, Menelaus asks Athene for κράτος but she, akin to Apollo, ‘put **might** (βίην) into his shoulders and his knees,’ (*Il.* 17.569, see further: p.222); and at *Iliad* 20.121, when Hera suggests that they give κράτος to Achilles, Poseidon replies to Hera that they should leave Achilles and Aeneas to contend without divine interference, unless Apollo or Ares intervenes (*Il.* 20.133-43) and so neither κράτος nor any other Homeric fighting word occurs. It is therefore not strictly true to say that a hero is ‘granted krátos by the gods’, but more accurate to say ‘only Zeus can grant’ κράτος.⁵³⁷

On the divine plane, then, κράτος is firmly the domain of Zeus. It marks one quality of the king of the gods and acts as a reminder of Zeus’ greater physical strength. This finds a parallel in the Homeric human realm. ‘Power’ (κράτος) likewise refers to both kings’ and rulers’ power, in the sense of political control, but is also deployed to show the physical ability of warriors overcoming their enemies. I have already touched on the battlefield use of κράτος, when looking at Zeus’ ability to give out κράτος, so I shall briefly demonstrate the secular battlefield use, with no reference to Zeus, before showing how the term functions in reference to human rulers.

Power, as designated by κράτος, enables a hero to overpower his opponent.⁵³⁸ We have seen examples of this when looking at Zeus’ role as a giver of κράτος, where Zeus gave κράτος

⁵³⁷ Both quotations are from Nagy (1979) 90.

⁵³⁸ κράτος allows a hero to overcome their enemy: *Od.* 4.415. At *Il.* 6.384, Idomeneus fears Aeneas’ attack on account of Aeneas’ youth, which Idomeneus calls the greatest κράτος (*Il.* 13.484), and at *Il.* 13.486 Idomeneus says that were he and Aeneas of equal age either would have the κράτος (that is to say overpower the other); 13.743, 17.322 (though expressed as a counterfactual), 18.308. Compare *Il.* 7.142, in Nestor’s story, where Lycurgus killed Areithous of the iron mace by guile not strength, which plays on the literary *topos* where brute force is placed in opposition to cunning intelligence with the user of cunning intelligence coming out on top.

and it allowed the one given κράτος to overcome his enemy (pp.195-7). However, κράτος does not need to be said to have come from the gods to operate in this manner. For example, the housekeeper tells Hector that Andromache went to the walls, ‘because she heard the Trojans were **hard-pushed** (τείρεσθαι), and the **power** (κράτος) of the Achaean is great’ (*Il.* 6.386-7). The Achaeans having κράτος leads to the Trojans being overwhelmed, which is denoted by the passive form of ‘I oppress’ (τείρω). The housekeeper, though only occupying a domestic role, articulates the function of κράτος to overpower an enemy perfectly.

The engagement need not be strictly military. Eidothea instructs Menelaus:

‘When first you see he [sc. Proteus] has put himself to sleep,
Then take thought of **power** (κάρτος) and **might** (βίη) in yourselves,
And hold him there, as he yearns eagerly to escape’ (*Od.* 4.414-6).

Eidothea’s directions, while demonstrating the use of κράτος to overcome an opponent, present a different problem: human κράτος should not work on gods as they are too strong.⁵³⁹ We saw above Achilles arrogantly attempting to use κράτος,⁵⁴⁰ in the verbal form κρατέω, against Scamander (*Il.* 21.214), but Scamander quickly quelled Achilles’ efforts. Here, however, Homer, in a master stroke of linguistic precision, omits κράτος from the second part of Eidothea’s advice. Once Proteus has assumed the form in which they originally found him,

⁵³⁹ This also hints at the use of κράτος to mean more simply ‘physical strength’ more generally: *Od.* 3.370 of horses, 9.393 iron being tempered to get strength/hardiness. *Il.* 11.9 Ajax and Achilles flank the ships arranged on the bay, with the Achaeans trusting in their κράτος. It is difficult to tell what Zeus means about ‘godlike Polyphemus, whose **power** (κράτος) is the greatest of all Cyclopes’ (*Od.* 1.70-1), that is, whether this refers to his physical prowess or not. I am inclined to think it refers to his physical strength because (a) each male Cyclops had total jurisdiction over his own family and there were no laws or amalgamated state (9.112-15); (b) because of his feat with the enormous stone door which, after the first description, is moved with no lengthy description (*Od.* 9.240-3, 313-4, 340, 416), but which the reader only comes to see later in the narrative.

⁵⁴⁰ It is a fine line to using κράτος arrogantly, see *Od.* 13.143, 18.139. *Il.* 17.329.

Eidothea says, ‘then, check your **might** (βίης), and release the old man’ (*Od.* 4.422). And so Eidothea does not list κράτος in the final stages of overpowering Proteus.

It is interesting to note that a problem remains of a human using ‘might’ (βίη) to overpower a god. While a full examination of ‘might’ (βίη) will form the next section of this thesis, I note here that each use of these terms remains in Eidothea’s preliminary plan. In the course of the narrative, as narrated by Menelaus, none of these terms is deployed in the attack on Proteus. Homer (along with Menelaus) is conspicuously, and artfully, quiet, omitting any reference to characteristics or personal attributes as Menelaus and his team take on Proteus. While Eidothea lists attributes, including κράτος, which are not, in the end, used to overwhelm Proteus, Eidothea’s speech is useful for illustrating that she, as a Homeric character, understands κράτος as a way of overpowering an enemy even in a non-martial setting.

As Zeus, the king of the gods, has κράτος, so too do individual human kings.⁵⁴¹ When Arete suggests lavish gifts, Alcinous proudly proclaims, ‘this word shall be, if, **as I live, I am lord** (ἐγὼ γε ζωὸς [...] ἀνάσσω) over the oar-loving Phaeacians’ (*Od.* 11.348-9). Alcinous emphasises that because he, Alcinous, the one who is lord over (ἀνάσσω) all the Phaeacians has said so, Odysseus shall indeed receive his longed-for return. Alcinous draws attention to the length of his life (ζωὸς) as he makes this proclamation, which shows that he remains lord of the Phaeacians for the entirety of his life. Alcinous develops this self-characterisation saying ‘the send-off shall be the concern of all men, but especially mine: **for the power is mine** (τοῦ γὰρ κράτος) in this land’ (*Il.* 11.352-3). The inferential particle ‘for’ (γὰρ) demonstrates that, as King Alcinous sees it, he is the foremost Phaeacian because of his possession of ‘power’

⁵⁴¹ Κράτος and rulers: *Od.* 1.359, 6.197, 11.353, 21.353. *Il.* 12.214. Cf. *Il.* 9.37-9, where Diomedes says that Zeus gave Agamemnon the sceptre, but not ἀλκή which he classifies as the greatest κράτος. See also the use at *Il.* 16.54, where Achilles expresses disdain at a situation where one person takes another’s γέρας to prove their superiority in κράτος, clearly referring to Agamemnon’s taking of Briseis to show Agamemnon’s political superiority.

(κράτος). The combination of Alcinous' mention of his life span (ζωὸς) and the mention of κράτος as the characteristic to mark him as superior suggests that κράτος is a 'personal and permanent advantage'.⁵⁴²

Amusingly, Telemachus thinks that he has κράτος. He instructs his mother,

‘But go into the house and take thought of your own tasks,

The loom and the distaff, and bid your handmaidens,

To go to their own tasks: the bow **is the concern of all men** (ἄνδρεςσι μελήσει πᾶσι),

but especially me: **because I have the power** (τοῦ γὰρ κράτος) in the house’ (*Od.* 21.350-3).

Telemachus employs κράτος in the same formulaic way as Alcinous, using κράτος to make up the end of his metrical verse, but it is difficult to take Telemachus' claim to have κράτος seriously considering his maladroit attempt to rule as demonstrated through the abysmal state of affairs on Ithaca.⁵⁴³ Telemachus is using the correct word – he indeed should have the Ithacan power (κράτος) as Odysseus' heir – but his actions do not depict him as having power over the suitors. Rather it is more the case that the suitors, knowing they can abuse the laws of *xenia*, have power over him. Further, Telemachus says that the bow ‘is of concern to all the men’ (ἄνδρεςσι μελήσει / πᾶσι, *Od.* 21.352-3), but states that it is of particular interest to himself ‘because’ (γὰρ) of his possession of κράτος. The inferential particle γὰρ highlights the connection Telemachus sees between having κράτος and the right to attempt to string the bow.

The stringing of the bow has long been read as ‘emblematic of these characters’ heroic worth *vis-à-vis* that of Odysseus⁵⁴⁴ as well as Odysseus’ retaking of his place at the forefront

⁵⁴² Benveniste (1969b) 77 (‘avantage personnel et permanent’). Breuil (1989) 23 ‘κράτος marks a hierarchy [...] envisaged as lasting’ (‘κράτος marque une hiérarchie [...] envisagée comme durable’).

⁵⁴³ See also *Od.* 1.359 for Telemachus using κράτος in this way.

⁵⁴⁴ Russo (2004) 95. Zeitlin (1995) 118 views Odysseus’ bow as a link to the heroic network.

of the Ithacan political scene.⁵⁴⁵ None of the suitors comes close to matching Odysseus' ability to string the bow, and Telemachus, though close in ability, stops short at his father's prompting (*Od.* 21.118-29). By failing to string the bow, the suitors showcase their inability to take possession of Odysseus' κράτος; Odysseus' κράτος is safely his own and only his son comes close to taking it. This scene highlights the interconnectedness of κράτος and physical strength. Odysseus has the physical strength to string the bow, and therefore he has the physical strength to have the κράτος on Ithaca like Zeus on Olympus. And so, the corporeal strength which denoted Zeus' right to rule on Olympus finds a parallel on the mortal plane.

Indeed, κράτος so distinctively belongs to the ruling class that it is named as a phenomenon which the common people should seek to increase in their social superiors. Polydamas says to Hector:

‘Hector, you always reprove me **in the assembly** (ἀγορῇσιν)

Even though I speak well, since it would be absolutely unfitting

For **a common man** (δῆμον) **to speak in assembly** (ἀγορευέμεν) contrary to you, in council,

Or in war, but [a common man] should always increase your **power** (κράτος)’ (*Il.* 12.211-4).

Polydamas' speech is steeped in proto-democratic concepts. There is the double reference to the assembly, both as a physical place ('in the assembly' (ἀγορῇσιν)) and with the verb for speaking in the assembly (ἀγορεύω), as well as Polydamas' self-categorisation as a 'common man' (δῆμος). Schofield correctly suggests that Polydamas' words are sarcastic that he 'is as good as a commoner [sc. δῆμος] whose job, if he speaks at all, is to support Hector's cause

⁵⁴⁵ Ready (2010). Russo (2004) gives a good analysis of the scene. de Jong (2001) 508. Jamison (1999) 258–264. Thalmann (1998) 171-237 places the bow in the context of the Homeric society of competitive values. See also Hartog (1988) 43-4.

with appropriate deference'.⁵⁴⁶ Polydamas frames his speech by using terms which indicate the place of debate and the free exchange of advice, but to highlight the futility of such practice in a Trojan context.⁵⁴⁷ The Trojans are firmly not a functioning 'democracy' and Hector overrules Polydamas' suggestion of retreat (*Il.* 12.230-50), even though it is backed by divine omen (*Il.* 12.217-29).

Further, this is all muddled. The Achaeans are the ones who have come from mainland Greece, where democracies later came to flourish. Elton Barker has examined the idea of 'dissent' and debate in Greek literature, including Homeric epic, and finds that 'whereas the Achaean assembly is always a site of contention, the Trojan *agora* is frequently used by Hector for announcing his plan'.⁵⁴⁸ This points to Polydamas' argument: it is meaningless trying to debate with Hector since he can, and does in the above example, overrule other suggestions. This is explicated when it is noted that 'no one in a Trojan deliberating arena ever speaks after Hector has spoken'.⁵⁴⁹ While a formal democracy was not established until well into the post-Homeric world, this passage is interesting for demonstrating the alleged relationship between the aristocratic ruling elite and the common folk they ruled. All the more so as Homer uses the Trojans, not the Achaeans, to vocalise this tension.⁵⁵⁰ As Polydamas frames it, the 'power' (κράτος) lay with the upper social stratum. This aligns with the overall application of κράτος as seen through this chapter to mean overpowering/overwhelming power. Hector as the Trojan leader has power of his subjects. Nonetheless, Polydamas' words reflect a subtle awareness of the fragility of that power: it is augmented and dependent on the lower-class cooperating.

⁵⁴⁶ Schofield (1986) 19 n.30.

⁵⁴⁷ For Polydamas' narrative function as the 'wise adviser' see: Barker (2009) 72. Christensen (2007) 387-411. Redfield (1975) 143-52. Taplin (1992), 157-61. Schofield (1986) 18-22.

⁵⁴⁸ Barker (2009) 72, citing *Il.* 2.788 and 18.245-46.

⁵⁴⁹ Barker (2009) 73.

⁵⁵⁰ We will see other Eastern aristocrats exploring social structures, relating to the political use of κράτος, later in a Herodotean context (pp.213-4).

One key difference between the use of κράτος as denoting a leader's right to rule and battlefield supremacy is its (im)permanence. On the battlefield, κράτος is changeable, insofar as it can also be translated to mean 'victory': Meriones picks up the horses' reins and says to Idomeneus, 'you yourself realise that **victory** (κράτος) is **no longer** (οὐκέτι) with the Achaeans' (*Il.* 17.623). Here κράτος can be as easily translated as 'power' as 'victory' since the Trojans have κράτος with which they are overpowering the Achaeans (in the first sense) and have the strength to overwhelm the enemy leading to victory (in the second sense).⁵⁵¹ The temporal adverb 'no longer' (οὐκέτι) highlights that κράτος on the battlefield is impermanent: it alternates between the two sides of the conflict. When κράτος is used for a ruler, it has permanence. Alcinous drew attention to his lifespan when characterising himself as the Phaeacian king, to highlight to both Odysseus and the assembled Phaeacian nobility that he remains king and invested with κράτος his entire life. Telemachus suggests he has the κράτος on Ithaca, but Odysseus' return and subsequent stringing of the bow, even forestalling Telemachus, signals Odysseus' sole possession of the Ithacan κράτος – even after some 20 years of absence from Ithaca. The (im)permanence of differing classifications of κράτος will become an important factor when we come to consider Herodotean κράτος.

In Homeric epic, 'power', as denoted by κράτος, has both mortal and immortal connotations within and outside the battlefield. It belongs to Zeus, and only Zeus, and functions to show his sociological role among the gods as their king. So intimately is κράτος connected with Zeus that Homer characterises Zeus tacitly as a giver of κράτος. 'Power' κράτος was also shown to be a martial term which allows heroes to overcome their opponents and has a changeable timescale of possession. It was shown too that κράτος on the human plane, like Zeus' κράτος on Olympus, marks a king's right to rule and is a permanent, lifelong possession.

⁵⁵¹ This translation would also be appropriate, for example, at *Il.* 17.613.

Thus, the occurrence of κράτος in Homeric discourse can best be summarised: ‘everywhere *krátos* indicates the superiority of a man, whether he asserts his strength over those of his camp or over enemies’;⁵⁵² or, put more simply, it establishes ‘a relationship between a higher term and a lower term’.⁵⁵³

This holistic study of κράτος allows us to close this discussion of Homeric κράτος with some further observations concerning its sociological status. First, Homeric κράτος is exclusively male-orientated; no Homeric female operates with κράτος. Second, it is primarily a quality of the gods and the aristocracy— whether this is to denote a ruler or on action on the battlefield. Nowhere in Homeric epic do individual members of the lower-class act with κράτος; wholesale κράτος can be given or taken away from the Achaeans or the Trojans as collectives, but Homer does not invest individual members of the lower classes, who, it should be noted, make up the majority of the fighting force, with κράτος. Homeric κράτος is thus the property of a select group, namely ruling upper-class men; I turn now to Herodotus to see whether his approach to κράτος is as exclusive as that found in Homeric epic.

2.3.3 Herodotean κράτος

Herodotus only uses κράτος 15 times,⁵⁵⁴ which follows the regular pattern of Herodotus using Homeric terms much less frequently. The selective usage of κράτος could therefore create an archaising effect and represent a method by which Herodotus makes selected members of his cast of characters look like the heroes of old, in line with the findings of Breuil (quoted on p.188). Herodotus not only depicts a number of battles, but a number of fights in which

⁵⁵² Benveniste (1969b) 75 (‘partout *krátos* indique la supériorité d’un homme, qu’il affirme sa force sur ceux de son camp ou sur les ennemis’).

⁵⁵³ Breuil (1989) 46 (‘une relation entre un terme supérieur et un terme inférieur’), indeed Breuil refers to all κράτ- words.

⁵⁵⁴ 1.129.3, 3.69.2, 3.81.1, 3.81.3, 3.117.1, 3.142.1, 4.9.4, 6.35.1, 6.73.2, 7.3.2, 7.3.4, 7.96.2, 7.187.2, 8.2.2, 9.42.1.

Herodotus says one side annihilates the other;⁵⁵⁵ on these occasions, Herodotus could have easily deployed κράτος in the Homeric sense of overpowering the enemy, but does not. This is therefore a noticeable absence from the Herodotean word palette. The other main use of κράτος in Homeric epic was to denote the power of kings and leaders of people. This finds a more secure home in the *Histories*. However, as I will show, the conditions of being the leader or ruler, with its attendant κράτος, in Herodotean prose differ greatly from those found in Homeric epic. Herodotus also has a number of surprising uses for κράτος which present an altogether different picture than that found in Homeric epic.

Herodotus follows Homeric practice and uses κράτος to mark the ruler of a society. Most commonly this use refers to the Persian king. Astyages calls Harpagus the ‘most foolish and most unjust’ (σκαϊότατόν τε καὶ ἀδικώτατον, 1.129.3) man because he ‘gave to another **the power** (τὸ κράτος)’ (1.129.3), that is, he made Cyrus king rather than become king himself. Similarly, imposter Smerdis is said ‘to have the Persian **power** (κράτος)’ (3.69.2). In both examples κράτος is plainly used to denote the condition of having Persian royal power and being the Persian king. Even the Greek Demaratus, external to Persian society, uses κράτος to refer to the Persian rule when suggesting that ‘as he was born when Darius had the throne and the Persian **power** (κράτος)’ (7.3.2). The first two of these examples come in direct character speech and the second appears in indirect reported speech, the words which Demaratus says that Xerxes should use. This demonstrates that the characters within the narrative imagine Persian kingship in terms of having and possessing κράτος.

Herodotus, as narrator, shares this application of terminology for the Persian king. After giving the catalogue of Xerxes’ armament (7.184-6) Herodotus concludes this striking catalogue with the flat-toned, and distinctly unheroic, statement,

⁵⁵⁵ E.g. the Massagetan slaughter of the Persians at the end of Book 1 and the Persian massacre of the Spartans at Thermopylae at the end of Book 7.

no one can accurately say the number of cooking women, concubines, and eunuchs, nor the yoke animals and other beasts of burden and Indian dogs which followed (7.187.1).

Following the impressive list of nations and people who have joined Xerxes, Herodotus gives us the more everyday elements making up Xerxes' army.⁵⁵⁶ This contributes to the sense of scale of Xerxes' operation, but I think it incorrect to say Herodotus is 'sarcastic, appealing to our sense of the grotesque by means of hyperbole'.⁵⁵⁷ I would argue that this particular part of the army's catalogue acts to humanise the whole campaign by drawing attention to the army's human needs. To round off this catalogue Herodotus, in his own narratorial persona, says, 'of all those **countless** (μυριάδων) men, no one, for **handsomeness** (κάλλεός) or **stature** (μεγάθεος), was **more deserving** (ἀξιονικότερος) than Xerxes to have that **power** (κράτος)' (7.187.2). At first it appears Herodotus provides a favourable portrait of Xerxes; he uses positive adjectives, 'handsomeness' (κάλλεός) and 'stature' (μεγάθεος), to highlight Xerxes' exceptional status among the 'countless' (μυριάς) other men in his train. Herodotus says that he is 'deserving' (ἀξιόνικος) to have the 'power' (κράτος); thus κράτος, Herodotus suggests, is due to personal attributes.

How Herodotus structures the list of elements in Xerxes' host is crucial. It has been noted that 'the notion of display and the part it plays within the institution of Persian kingship'⁵⁵⁸ feature heavily in the *Histories*, as here. It begins with the warriors, then the logistical elements to the war force, followed by the characterisation of Xerxes as worthy of κράτος. Xerxes' character description is thus diminished, and to a large extent undercut, by its

⁵⁵⁶ For the catalogue of Xerxes' army as alluding to the Catalogue of Ships see Larson (2006) 228. Waters (1985) 61.

⁵⁵⁷ Maxwell-Stuart (1976) 359.

⁵⁵⁸ Baragwanath (2008) 265. Demont (2009) 201-3 on the notion of 'display' for Xerxes in the *Histories*.

placement after the mundane elements in Xerxes' army. Were the list to begin with the logistical elements, then the soldiers, and *then* Xerxes, then Xerxes would be flatteringly placed at the pinnacle of the attacking force, with the listing structure appearing to build towards Xerxes. Herodotus' chosen listing structure, while humanising Xerxes, but also lessens the impact of Xerxes' κράτος. Xerxes may be in charge and have κράτος, but the juxtaposition between the chattel items and Herodotus' statement that Xerxes deserves κράτος implies that Xerxes has a qualitatively low degree of κράτος.

Perhaps Herodotus' most innovative use of κράτος for rulers is its attribution to women, perhaps the most marked difference from Homeric epic. While 'the κράτος substantive appears as an archaic term' in the *Histories*,⁵⁵⁹ Herodotus' use of that archaic term is actually quite revolutionary and not archaic in tone. The first occurrence of female κράτος is in Scythia. Heracles falls asleep and loses his mares and, when searching, comes across a cave:

There in the cave he found a creature half in the form of a woman and half the form of a snake, being of the form of a woman **above her buttocks** (ἄνω ἀπὸ τῶν γλουτῶν), and below a snake, (4.9.1).

Herodotus emphasises the cut-off point of the form the snake-woman takes as being 'above her buttocks' (ἄνω ἀπὸ τῶν γλουτῶν). This imbues the encounter with a sexual tone by drawing attention to her posterior.

This sexualisation is thematic of the entire narrative. The snake-woman 'would not give them [sc. the mares] over until he slept with her' (4.9.2) and even 'delayed the handover of the horses, wanting the greatest amount of time together with Heracles' (4.9.3). So long does Heracles remain that the snake-woman has three children by him (4.9.3). The reader might be

⁵⁵⁹ Breuil (1995) 71 ('le substantif κράτος apparaît comme un terme archaïque').

surprised to find the snake-woman, whom Herodotus has sexualised, inform Heracles after they have spent an extended amount of implicit narrated time together that ‘I [sc. The snake-woman], myself, have the **power** (κράτος) in this land’ (4.9.4). Yet, far from demonstrating that she has power over the land to Heracles, in the Homeric sense, the Scythian snake-woman is overcome herself with infatuation for Heracles and, as Herodotus presents it, eagerly submits her body to him.

The reason for this might be a result of the individual to whom Herodotus attributes the narrative. After rounding off the Scythians’ own version of their origin, Herodotus introduces this narrative of Heracles and the snake-woman with the phrase, ‘this is a story of those Greeks who live by the Pontus’ (4.8.1), thus attributing this narrative to Greek interlocutors. It is easy to see why a Greek reporter would give this version of the Scythian origin story. The story’s ‘aim is to assimilate the origins of the barbarian people to Greek mythology’;⁵⁶⁰ it serves the wider Hellenocentric agenda of explaining the world in their own mythical terms.⁵⁶¹ The narrative reveals the Greeks’ perception of their cultural superiority. The snake-woman may have κράτος, and therefore have power over the Scythians, but this κράτος, like the Scythian *ethnos* as a whole, is forever tinged with the pedigree of a Hellenic hero with whom their earliest ancestor was all too keen to sleep.⁵⁶²

The other woman in possession of κράτος is Atossa. This use of κράτος comes in relation to another of the uses of κράτος in the *Histories*. As noted above (pp.207-9), while getting ready for war against the Egyptians, the quarrel arises about the successor for Darius’ kingship which, in indirect speech, Demaratus refers to as κράτος. Herodotus closes this

⁵⁶⁰ Corcella (2007) 578.

⁵⁶¹ See also Bickerman (1952) 73: ‘The unity of the Hellenic world was based on a common mythology’.

⁵⁶² It should be noted, with Gagné (2020) 238, that Herodotus caps this narrative with ‘a more plausible *logos* of successive invasions’ at 4.12, which Herodotus says is ‘told by Greeks and barbarians’ (4.12.3). See Gagné (2020) 245 n.6 for extensive bibliography on the Scythians’ successive invasions.

vignette in the Persian court, ‘it seems to me, that Xerxes would have become king without this suggestion: for Atossa had **all the power** (τὸ πᾶν κράτος)’ (7.3.4). This totally undercuts the alleged κράτος of either (or, indeed, both) Xerxes or Darius. Whether or not the historical Atossa had as much power as Herodotus suggests is of little consequence; Herodotus dismisses the Persian kings’ possession of κράτος and ‘the Great King’s agency is compromised’.⁵⁶³ However, it is also true, as Dominick has said, that ‘although she is able to influence the Persian state, and is [...] called “all-powerful” (7.3.4), Atossa is also open to the manipulation of her physician’, and ‘one must recall, however, that Atossa only persuaded Darius to invade Greece ‘having been instructed by Democedes’ (3.134.1)’.⁵⁶⁴ And so, with the character of Atossa, Herodotus exposes the darker side of an individual imbued with κράτος: if corrupted or manipulated, it can have catastrophic effects, effects like an international conflict.

Herodotean κράτος denotes not only sole political hegemony in the institution of monarchy, as it does in Homer, but other ruling political roles too. Peisistratus is said to have κράτος as a tyrant in Athens; the story of Miltiades is introduced, ‘in Athens **at this time** (τηνικαῦτα) Peisistratus had **all the power** (τὸ πᾶν κράτος)’ (6.35.1). In Homeric epic only kings had κράτος, but in the *Histories* Herodotus expands the categories of political power to which κράτος can refer to include the supremacy of a ruling tyrant. This use of κράτος, at 6.35.1, does not however appear as part of a narrative about Peisistratus and his rule in Athens; indeed, this is the only time κράτος is applied to Peisistratus. Instead, this use of κράτος marks a chronological and contextual reference point for when Miltiades left Athens. It does still, however, highlight a key facet to Herodotean κράτος. The temporal adverb ‘at this time’ (τηνικαῦτα) suggests that the possession of κράτος is a contingent quality and not something permanent. In Homeric epic, when an individual was in charge of a society, it was permanent

⁵⁶³ Tuplin (2022) 326 n.101.

⁵⁶⁴ Both quotes on Dominick (2007) 442.

and they held the κράτος until their death – indeed, Alcinous was almost too keen to stress this (pp.201-2).

In the Herodotean *Histories*, κράτος changes hands much more quickly. This is something characteristic of the κράτος afforded to all ruler/kings/leaders in the *Histories*. When the Aeginetans give earth and water to Darius (6.49.1), the Athenians straightaway go to Sparta to accuse the Aeginetans (6.49.2). Cleomenes, going to Aegina, is then refused custody by Crius, an influential Aeginetan, of those most guilty of causing Aegina to medize (6.50.1-3); Crius says that Cleomenes comes with no Spartan decree. Otherwise the other Spartan king, Demaratus, would have come too. Once Cleomenes has successfully deposed Demaratus, he brings with him to Aegina Leutychides, Demaratus' replacement, and 'they led off others, but also Crius son of Polycritus and **Casambus son of Aristocrates** (Κάσαυβον τὸν Ἀριστοκράτεος), who **had the greatest power** (εἶχον μέγιστον κράτος)' (6.73.2). The repetition of forms including κράτος, both κράτος itself and the patronymic 'son of Aristocrates' (Ἀριστοκράτεος) which means 'best - power' (Ἄριστο - κράτεος), stress the narrative role of κράτος. This episode features the tyrants of Aegina easily losing their κράτος, which is 'normally used of tyrants' to denote their political power.⁵⁶⁵ And so, Herodotus shows just how little κράτος can amount to in the Herodotean world by having those with the 'greatest' (μέγιστον) amounts of it removed from their city without an account of any resistance.⁵⁶⁶

In an episode already discussed (pp.76-7), we see Maendrius' power articulated in terms of κράτος. Herodotus says that 'Maendrius, son of Maendrius, had then the **power** (κράτος) of Samos' (3.142.1). This is a narrative in which Maendrius says he is going to relinquish political power to the people and install a regime of 'equality before the law' (ισονομία, 3.142.3).

⁵⁶⁵ Hornblower and Pelling (2017) 185.

⁵⁶⁶ Cf. Zeus' κράτος, also described as 'greatest' (μέγιστον, *Od.* 5.4), allowing him to do as he pleases, discussed on (pp.193-5).

Interestingly, in his character speech Maendrius does not say he has inherited Polycrates' κράτος, but instead his δύναμις (3.142.3), which in Homer refers to the physical bodily strength of an individual.⁵⁶⁷ The use of both of these Homeric fighting terms plays into the scene's wider transformation of Homeric vocabulary. Herodotus, the narrator, uses κράτος to refer to Maendrius' political power, but this is not how Maendrius as an internal character understands his authority.

This is interesting from a narratological perspective on how different narrative layers envision power on Samos. Herodotus frames it as Maendrius handing over κράτος to the multitude, but Maendrius sees this narrative as a handover of δύναμις. In Homeric epic, κράτος, as meaning an individual's right to rule, was not something which could be possessed by the multitude. We saw above with the example of Polydamas that the aristocracy took it as their right that their κράτος was to be augmented by the common people they ruled over (pp.204-5). Maendrius' handover of κράτος / δύναμις continues the trend we saw in this passage where Maendrius puts γέρας, another crucial piece of Homeric vocabulary, to a different use than found in Homeric epic. Herodotus presents a ruler's κράτος as something which can be owned by more than one person.

This is something more widely applicable for political κράτος in the *Histories*. In the no-doubt fictional constitutional debate of 3.80-3,⁵⁶⁸ Megabazus speaks against democracy: 'these things he says, **urging to give the power to the multitude** (ἐς τὸ πλῆθος ἄνωγε φέρειν τὸ κράτος), is an opinion which falls short of the best' (3.81.1); instead, he counsels, 'let us instil with the **power** (κράτος) a company of the best of men we choose' (3.81.3). Whether speaking to reject giving κράτος to the people as a whole or to suggest investing a selected

⁵⁶⁷ LSJ s.v. δύναμις.

⁵⁶⁸ On the so-called 'constitutional debate' see Linderborg (2019). Roy (2012). Pelling (2002). Forsdyke (2001) Lateiner (1984). Brannan (1963).

plurality with κράτος, Megabazus suggests that the κράτος of a ruler is something which can be shared between a number of people. In another example, Herodotus makes κράτος the possession of the Persians as a whole when describing how the plain, which used to belong to the Chorasmians, changed hands to the king when the Persians got the κράτος of the land (3.117.1).

Like Homer, Herodotus also uses κράτος in a martial setting. However, this is not in the Homeric sense found where κράτος, as a bodily force, is used to overpower an enemy in battle. Instead, Herodotus presents κράτος in more strictly sociological terms as relating to the position within the hierarchy of the fighting force. Herodotus says that each nation under Xerxes maintained its existing leader, but those leaders

followed not as commanders (στρατηγοὶ), but were slaves (δοῦλοι) like the rest of the army: since the commanders, who **had all the power** (τὸ πᾶν ἔχοντες κράτος) and led each of the tribes, those commanders were Persians, (7.96.2).

Here Herodotus uses κράτος to describe the state of being the leader. The national leaders come as ‘commanders’ (στρατηγοὶ) of their own forces, but in fact, Herodotus says, they are ‘slaves’ (δοῦλοι) and subordinates themselves when compared to the hierarchical position of the Persians. Herodotus’ method for demonstrating the Persian generals’ higher rung on the organisational ladder of the Persian multiethnic army is to use the term κράτος. This is Homeric in the sense of Homeric royal power, but, while this use of κράτος occurs in a militaristic scene, it does not follow the existing schema of Homeric battlefield κράτος as a bodily force which allows a hero to overcome an enemy.

Herodotus frames Eurybiades’ rank as admiral analogously. Eurybiades is elected admiral of the fleet at Artemisium: ‘the Spartans **gave** (παρείχοντο) Eurybiades, son of

Eurycleides, the position of admiral, the one with **the greatest power** (τὸ μέγιστον κράτος)’ (8.2.2). The Spartans are the subject of the verb ‘I give’ (παρέχω) and so they are the ones to invest Eurybiades with κράτος. This is fascinating, as we have seen examples in the *Histories* where κράτος is given to a multitude (such as Maendrius on Samos), but here it is the opposite: an individual is invested with κράτος by a multitude. Herodotus reports that ‘the **allies** (σύμμαχοι) said that if a Laconian were not the leader then they intended to disband the army than be led by the Athenians’ (8.2.2). Herodotus emphasises that it is not just the Lacedaemonians who choose Eurybiades as the leader, but that this reflects the general will of the collected allied forces (οἱ σύμμαχοι). Eurybiades is thus at two levels of preference: he is a Spartan (as specified by the allies) and then he has been chosen by the Spartans to have κράτος and, ‘though he is the leader, Eurybiades is not a member of either of the Spartan royal families’.⁵⁶⁹ This use of battlefield κράτος suggests a move away from the idea of a fixed aristocracy, in the sense of inflexible groups of nobility. This might represent a wider cultural shift towards a meritocracy – where the best individual for a particular task is chosen, rather than simply the individual born to the most powerful and influential family.

In both Herodotean battlefield examples, the description of the Persian forces and Eurybiades’ position as admiral, the uses of κράτος differ from the Homeric practice. These uses are less to do with individual battlefield manoeuvres and more reminiscent of the Homeric use of κράτος for rulers. And so, while Herodotus does use κράτος during militaristic scenes, Herodotean martial κράτος marks leadership rather than individual fighting abilities.

The last use of κράτος in the *Histories* concerns Xerxes. Artabazus suggests a tactical retreat to Thebes and a pay-off of selected influential Greeks to bring an end to the war (9.41.2), but Mardonius’ ‘more forceful’ (ισχυροτέρη, 9.41.4) and ‘more reckless’ (ἄγνομονεστέρα,

⁵⁶⁹ Bowie (2007) 91.

9.41.4) opinion is that they make war on the Greeks, trusting in the strength of their army. Herodotus says of Mardonius' opinion,

No one could rightly speak against, so that Mardonius **overpowered** (ἐκράτεε) the argument: for he had the **power** (κράτος) of the army **from the king** (ἐκ βασιλέος), but not Artabazus, (9.42.1).

Again, we see κράτος denoting the role of leader, but this statement also problematises the possession of κράτος. Herodotus shows that, as we saw with Zeus in Homeric epic (pp.193-5), κράτος allows an individual to act as they please, their opinion always prevailing. Herodotus uses the negative adjectives 'more forceful' (ισχυροτέρη, 9.41.4) and 'more reckless' (ἀγνωμονεστέρα, 9.41.4) to underscore the foolishness of Mardonius' proposal, and, though he may have κράτος, this does not furnish him with good sense. Further, as Herodotus presents it, the prepositional phrase 'from the king' (ἐκ βασιλέος) characterises Xerxes as a definite giver of κράτος. Only Zeus in Homeric epic dispenses out κράτος, and, even then, Homer only implies Zeus' ability to do so. It is one thing for Herodotus to present a plurality of people invest another or a group with κράτος, like the conspirators during the constitutional debate or Eurybiades being elected as admiral of the fleet, but quite another for one individual to give out κράτος. This adds to Herodotus' hubristic portrait of Xerxes, with Xerxes now, effectively, playing the role of the king of the gods giving κράτος to his mortal inferiors. Moreover, this also highlights Xerxes' own lack of judgement. Herodotus characterises Mardonius by such unintelligent negative adjectives as 'more forceful' (ισχυροτέρη, 9.41.4) and 'more reckless' (ἀγνωμονεστέρα, 9.41.4), but Xerxes chose to give κράτος to this man. And so, while Herodotus presents Xerxes as possessing the ability to distribute κράτος this does not necessarily reflect well on his character.

2.3.4 Conclusion

Herodotus, then, also uses κράτος in many of the same ways as Homer, but with some noticeable differences, omissions, and innovations. Herodotus uses κράτος just over a third of the number of times Homer does, which we have seen throughout this discussion is a characteristic disparity between Herodotus' use of the Homeric heroic vocabulary. Herodotus shares Homer's use of κράτος to denote royalty and applies it to the Persian king (both to denote the power of the king, as well as the status of being king). However, Herodotus was shown to be able to manipulate the narrative depiction of the king, and the crucial word κράτος, to diminish the reader's reception of Xerxes as a κράτος-holding individual. Herodotus also showed innovation with his use of κράτος by including royal and ruling women in the cast of characters imbued with ruling κράτος. However, this revolutionary use of κράτος remained subject to ancient misogynistic sensibilities, with the Scythian snake-woman being overtly sexualised by Herodotus and Atossa demonstrating the fatal consequences of an individual invested with κράτος being subject to manipulation.

Another Herodotean dissimilarity to Homeric epic is the wider sociological use Herodotus makes of the term. Herodotus refers to tyrants as possessing κράτος – but it is a κράτος which can change hands freely. A point of similarity for Herodotus' and Homer's use of κράτος is that both authors use κράτος in a martial setting. However, Herodotus' use did not reflect the Homeric sense—describing an individual or collective battlefield manoeuvre—but rather communicates the idea of being the commander. And so, crucially for our purposes of studying Herodotean heroism and its reflection and refraction of Homeric precedents, Herodotus' use of κράτος does not denote heroic battlefield action, but retains its sociological force even on the battlefield.

Finally, Herodotus depicts Xerxes as a giver of κράτος, akin to how Homer implicitly describes Zeus as a provider of κράτος, but it was suggested that Xerxes' ability to distribute

κράτος reflects poorly on his characterisation rather than elevating him to a superhuman level. This final use of κράτος within the *Histories* allows us to discern another point of difference between Herodotus and Homer: Herodotean κράτος is entirely secular in nature. Not once does Herodotus use κράτος in relation to Zeus or any god, either as a god's possession or with a character asking a god for κράτος. Therefore, Herodotus' use of κράτος is not entirely Homeric.

2.4.1 Homeric βίη⁵⁷⁰

The last Homeric fighting word I shall discuss is ‘force’ (βίη). Homer uses βίη 82 times,⁵⁷¹ making βίη the most frequent Homeric fighting word examined. As noted, (p.188), Hesiod presents βίη as a constant presence next to Zeus, while Κράτος and Βίη ‘uphold the cosmic regime of Zeus’.⁵⁷² It should therefore be unsurprising to see that the two terms hold semantically similar meanings. ‘Force’ (βίη) and ‘power’ (κράτος) share the underlying idea of an expression of superiority through greater political and/or physical power. However, κράτος was shown to be a demonstrable manifestation of this overwhelming power, whereas, as I will argue, βίη is a tacit expression of that superiority, an unactivated potentiality.

The frequency of βίη is almost equally split between the two epics. The *Iliad* has βίη 50 times and the *Odyssey* 32 times. This is striking, since I, at least, would have expected a much heavier concentration in the *Iliad*, reflecting this epic’s militaristic narrative. The near equal split of βίη between the two epics suggests that βίη is not wholly a martial term. As I hope the following discussion will justify, there is no one-size-fits-all translation for Homeric βίη. On the whole, I have opted for rendering βίη as ‘force’, since this seems to me to fit the majority of cases and communicates that the term implies a potential ability to exert force, a meaning for which this section will argue, rather than an instance where it is exerted.

⁵⁷⁰ I shall be using the Ionic form βίη rather than the Attic form βία in this discussion as both Homer’s and Herodotus’ texts are in the Ionic dialect.

⁵⁷¹ *Od.* 3.216, 4.415, 4.422, 4.646, 4.668, 6.197, 10.200, 11.118, 11.290, 11.296, 11.601, 13.143, 13.310, 14.468, 14.503, 15.231, 15.329, 16.189, 16.255, 17.540, 17.565, 18.4, 18.139, 18.234, 20.379, 21.126, 21.128, 21.134, 21.185, 21.253, 22.219, 23.31. *Il.* 1.404, 1.430, 2.658, 2.666, 3.45, 3.105, 3.431, 4.314, 4.386, 5.521, 5.638, 5.781, 6.478, 7.157, 7.197, 7.205, 7.288, 8.103, 9.498, 11.561, 11.670, 11.690, 11.787, 12.341, 13.572, 13.758, 13.770, 13.781, 15.106, 15.139, 15.165, 15.181, 15.186, 15.640, 16.213, 16.387, 17.24, 17.187, 17.569, 18.117, 19.98, 20.307, 21.177, 21.316, 22.323, 23.578, 23.629, 23.713, 23.859, 24.42.

⁵⁷² Nagy (1979) 187.

‘Force’ (βίη) is used in epithets.⁵⁷³ This use of βίη will not form part of this discussion. It would need to reconcile the interpretative function of βίη with its metrical use to demonstrate whether βίη as an epithet is used purely for the bard’s metrical convenience or whether it provides a genuine insight into the Homeric conceptualisation of βίη. For example, during Diomedes’ *aristeia*, Homer, in narrator-text, refers to the hero periphrastically as ‘the **force** of Diomedes’ (βίην Διομήδεος, *Il.* 5.781) when Hera encourages him and the troops around him. This occurrence of βίη appears just before Athene instructs Diomedes, recognisably as a goddess (*Il.* 5.815), to charge at Ares and strike him (*Il.* 5.829-34). Is the reader supposed to attach significance to the appearance of βίη with Diomedes just before he, a human, attacks a god?⁵⁷⁴ Or is it merely for metrical convenience that Homer refers to Diomedes with this periphrastic expression? To answer such questions, I would need to take each occurrence of βίη in its individual context. Further, this is a comparative study between Homer and Herodotus’ use of terminology, and Herodotus wrote in prose. Beyond the statement that Herodotus does not use βίη in verse text (that is, in neither his own verse constructions nor verse quotations), metrical considerations, while enlightening for the Homeric texts, would add nothing to our understanding of Herodotus’ use of βίη.

βίη is a quality possessed by the gods.⁵⁷⁵ Phoenix states this fact in (nearly) plain terms. Drawing a parallel between Achilles and the gods to describe Achilles’ own characteristics, Phoenix says, ‘the gods themselves are pliable, who have a greater possession of excellence, honour and **force** (βίη)’ (*Il.* 9.497-8). In quick succession, Phoenix names a number of the gods’ characteristics, including βίη. As this occurrence of βίη is in character speech, it represents the

⁵⁷³ Βίη used in formulas: *Od.* 10.200, 11.290, 11.296, 11.601, 15.231. *Il.* 2.658, 2.666, 3.105, 4.386, 5.521, 5.638, 5.781, 11.690, 13.758, 13.770, 13.781, 16.213, 17.187, 20.307, 22.323, 23.713, 23.859.

⁵⁷⁴ Cf. *Od.* 4.415 and 4.422, when Eidothea suggests Menelaus use βίη on Proteus, but when Menelaus actually grapples with Proteus the term is absent (see also above: pp.200-1).

⁵⁷⁵ Gods possessing βίη: *Il.* 9.498, 15.106, 15.165, 15.181 and 15.186. See also Briareus, ‘whose **force** (βίην) is greater than his father’s’ (*Il.* 1.404), according to Achilles’ retelling of Thetis’ narrative when she brought Briareus to assist in loosening Zeus’ bonds.

human Phoenix's understanding of the gods' attributes (including βίη) and so cannot be taken alone as reliable evidence of the gods' possession of βίη. Hera also ascribes βίη to the gods in a passage already examined (pp.194-5). When Hera returns from Zeus and communicates her disaffection with him to the other Olympians, she says, 'even now we think to go near **intending to stop** (μέμαμεν καταπαυσέμεν) him by word (ἔπει) or **by force** (βίη)' (*Il.* 15.105-6). Hera's use of a verb 'I intend' (μέμαα), which speaks to imagined action, and the future tense 'to stop' (καταπαυσέμεν), indicate a future or potential action, not one fully realised, where the gods act against Zeus either 'by word' (ἔπει) or 'by force' (βίη): it does not denote an actual or a fully realised use of βίη. Like Phoenix, Hera, a goddess herself, also attributes βίη to the gods and names it as something which they could utilise were they to undertake her proposed action. βίη is therefore the possession of the divine and this is recognised as such by the Homeric human characters.

Analogously with the greater stores of κράτος afforded to Zeus (pp.193-5), Zeus also has greater amounts of βίη. Zeus sends Iris to instruct Poseidon to withdraw from battle, 'since I say well, that I have **by far greater force** (βίη πολὺ φέρτερος), and I am the elder by birth' (*Il.* 15.165-6). The comparative form 'greater' (φέρτερος) coupled with the neuter adverbial 'by far' (πολὺ) combine to demonstrate not only the magnitude of Zeus' βίη but also the extent of its superiority relative to Poseidon's own βίη. As Zeus instructs Iris to say, Zeus cites his possession of a greater amount of βίη as the reason why Poseidon should desist from the fighting. It is important, however, that this is, and remains, a threat. Zeus never actually uses βίη on Poseidon, since Poseidon relents (*Il.* 15.205-19) before this threat can be carried out. This is similar to how βίη operates in the above examples: Phoenix only lists βίη as a possession of the gods, and so does not represent an actual display of their βίη, and Hera speaks hypothetically about using βίη. We never see a god use βίη.

Βίη can also be granted by the gods to their favourites.⁵⁷⁶ We saw this before with the example of Athene and Menelaus (p.199): Menelaus asked for κράτος (*Il.* 17.561-2), but received βίη (*Il.* 17.569); this explicitly shows a gods' ability to dispense βίη. However, in the subsequent narrative we do not see Menelaus actually using βίη. It might be that the reader is to assume that, having received βίη from Athene, Menelaus' current actions are implicitly connected to his previous receipt of βίη, but without a concrete instance of βίη in the narrative we cannot draw a definitive conclusion. Menelaus may well have been given βίη but that does not mean he uses it, especially considering that he initially asked for κράτος.

The gods' ability to grant βίη is something recognised by human characters in the Homeric world. After the heralds suggest an end to Ajax and Hector's duel, Hector says, 'Ajax, since **a god gave you stature and force** (δῶκε θεὸς μέγεθός τε βίην) and wisdom too, and with your spear you are foremost among the Achaeans, let us now stop this fight and battle for today' (*Il.* 7.288-91). Hector, a character internal to the narrative, recognises the gods' ability to bestow βίη. Although βίη is not bestowed in this scene, nor do we ever see a god give βίη to Ajax,⁵⁷⁷ Hector's words confirm that Homer's characters know that the gods can confer βίη.

βίη demonstrates superior social standing.⁵⁷⁸ This is how Zeus expresses his role as king of the gods (p.221). This principle operates on the human plane. The most illustrative example of this phenomenon is perhaps when Hector prays for Astyanax's future, 'Zeus and you other gods, grant that this, my child, as I am, be **pre-eminent** (ἄριπρεπέα) among the

⁵⁷⁶ Gods giving βίη: *Il.* 7.288 and 17.569. The heroes' prayer to the Zeus at *Il.* 7.202-5 includes asking for Ajax and Hector to be given βίη and κῦδος.

⁵⁷⁷ The use of βίη at *Il.* 7.205 during the prayer before Ajax and Hector's duel does not count as this is only a wish for βίη to be given to Ajax, and the wish does not see fulfilment.

⁵⁷⁸ Βίη as a sign of sociological superiority: *Od.* 6.197. *Il.* 3.45, 3.431, 6.478, 11.787, 15.139, 15.165, 15.181, 15.186. This might also be the idea behind Athene's rebuke of Ares, who says he is going to avenge his son, when she says that better ones in βίη have died and will die continue to die (*Il.* 15.139-40). See also Menelaus' expresses disdain at the hypothetical future slander against himself that Antilochus beat him by deceit and took away the mare as prize even though Antilochus' horses are of a lesser ability, but Menelaus himself is 'greater in excellence and force (βίη),' (*Il.* 23.578).

Trojans and likewise good in **force** (βίην), and **rule by strength over Ilium** (Ἰλίου ἱφι ἀνάσσειν, *Il.* 6.476-8)'. In this invocation Hector connects βίη with being 'pre-eminent' (ἀριπρεπής) and the sociological role of a ruler, by the phrase 'rule by force over Ilium' (Ἰλίου ἱφι ἀνάσσειν). The repetition of forms denoting violence, both βίη and the adverbial 'by strength' (ἱφι), demonstrates that in the Homeric world, parallel to the above findings with κράτος (pp.193-5 and 201-4), it is through the expression of physical superiority that the Homeric aristocracy demonstrate their superior social standing.

Further, Homeric βίη is emphatically not the possession of the lower-class. The first time Homer mentions Arneus, he says, 'he was known for his gluttonous stomach and constant eating and drinking, he had neither strength nor **force** (οὐδὲ βίην), and was very large in form' (*Od.* 18.2-4). Homer, in narrator-text with no character focalisation, introduces Arneus, a beggar, as a character without βίη.⁵⁷⁹ Analogously, one of the suitors says Telemachus is more 'ill-fated with guests' (κακοξεινώτερος, *Od.* 20.376) than anyone else, having brought into his house the beggar Odysseus who 'is practised in neither work nor **force** (οὐδὲ βίης), but is a burden upon the earth' (*Od.* 20.378-9). The anonymous suitor assumes that the disguised Odysseus does not have βίη – an assumption based on his appearance as a beggar. This would explain why Telemachus, knowing the beggar in truth to be Odysseus, explains Odysseus' victory over Irus to Penelope, saying, 'he was the greater in **force** (βίην)' (*Od.* 18.234) – Odysseus, in Homeric 'reality', is a noble man and so it would not be improper to ascribe βίη to him.⁵⁸⁰

⁵⁷⁹ I am quite convinced that, to use the words of de Jong (2001) 438, Odysseus' defeat of Arneus 'may be seen as a prefigurement of the Suitors' doom', given the similarity in excessive appetite afford to Arneus and his rude behaviour toward beggar Odysseus. See also Levine (1982).

⁵⁸⁰ This also raises the question of 'how much does Penelope know?' when faced with beggar Odysseus. Does Penelope suspect the beggar is her long-lost husband at this point or only later in *Odyssey* 23? Currie (2022) argues convincingly that Penelope recognises Odysseus at *Od.* 23.32-3, not the conventional 23.205-6. I would argue further that Telemachus' use of βίη at *Od.* 18.234 provides the first hint to Penelope to see beggar Odysseus as Odysseus proper, or at least as an aristocratic figure, rather than the pauper whom Odysseus' outward appearance suggests.

Paris embarrasses himself through showing a lack of βίη. Paris is a member of the Trojan ruling class and so it is expected that he has βίη.⁵⁸¹ When Menelaus strides out to answer Paris' challenge to single combat, Paris has the opportunity to demonstrate his βίη, but Paris shrinks back and Hector rebukes him:

‘I suppose the long-haired Achaeans will rejoice,
Saying that our **foremost man** (πρόμον) is our **champion** (ἀριστῆα) because of
Good looks, but has neither **force** (βίη) in him nor **valour** (ἀλκή)’ (*Il.* 3.43-5).

Hector repeats nouns, ‘foremost man’ (πρόμος) and ‘champion’ (ἀριστεύς), which highlight not only Paris' position at the top of the Trojan hierarchy, but also his current role in the duel as representative (hero?) of the Trojan people. In running away from Menelaus, Hector says that Paris falls short of two fundamental heroic attributes, that is, ‘force’ (βίη) and ‘spirit of defence’ (ἀλκή).⁵⁸² We have seen that ἀλκή represents the ability to stand and resist an enemy (p.157), which, in fleeing before Menelaus, Paris demonstrably lacks (pp.160-3), but Hector also frames his reproach in terms of Paris' lack of βίη.

When Hector prays for Astyanax's success as a ruler, he names βίη as fundamental to a ruler's ability to maintain rule through strength of arms; here βίη refers to Paris' physical ability to beat Menelaus in battle. Hector expresses a concern that ‘the long-haired Achaeans will rejoice’ (*Il.* 3.43) upon seeing the Trojan prince's lack of βίη. I would argue that Hector's harsh words also harbour an anxiety that the Trojan people see their rulers' physical shortcomings, by which, according to Hector (*Il.* 6.476-8), they maintain their position as aristocrats. Here,

⁵⁸¹ This aligns with heroism studies's theory of the heroic ‘exemplars’. See Allison and Goethals (2011) 53-80, esp. p.58 ‘our psychological development and our culture provide us with mental models or templates for heroes’; i.e. there are certain things we understand heroes *should* have.

⁵⁸² Helen pointedly uses βίη in her abuse of Paris: ‘before now you boasted to be better in your **force** (βίη) of hand and with your spear than Menelaus, dear to Ares’ (*Il.* 3.430-1).

although it is an expected quality, we see βίη not actually being used by a hero in Homeric discourse.

Thus far, the examples have highlighted that there is an undercurrent of meaning pertaining to βίη as a potential ‘force’ to overpower through physical strength. This is something more widely applicable to βίη. For example, when Ajax’s token signals that he will duel Hector, Ajax proudly states, ‘no one will drive me **by force** (βίη) to flee **willingly against my will** (ἐκὼν ἀέκοντα)’ (*Il.* 7.197).⁵⁸³ Ajax’s phrase ‘willingly against my will’ (ἐκὼν ἀέκοντα) is tautological, creating ‘a rhetorical flourish to strengthen βίη, for being driven back by force is obviously against one’s will’.⁵⁸⁴ Ajax’s words are a counterfactual construction. In effect Ajax is saying that, typically, βίη would enable his opponent to counter him with physical strength (βίη),⁵⁸⁵ but he boasts that this will not be the case now. I would agree that ‘the difference between the combat of Menelaus and Paris, that took place a few hours before,’ and the present duel of Ajax and Hector, ‘indicates the great change in the character of the war’.⁵⁸⁶ One way this ‘great change’ is indicated and subtly communicated is through the subsequent increase in the frequency of βίη in the *Iliad*. Before Ajax and Hector’s duel βίη occurs fourteen times; βίη is used three times during the duel,⁵⁸⁷ after the duel βίη appears 33 times before the end of the *Iliad*, most frequently in books 11 to 17 when the fighting gains pace. This indicates that as the intensity of battle increases so too does the level of βίη, while each side, through physical force, tries to push and overpower the other side in the to-and-fro of battle.

⁵⁸³ It should be noted that Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and Aristarchus all reject lines *Il.* 7.195-9.

⁵⁸⁴ Kirk (1990) 260.

⁵⁸⁵ The Trojans seek to overpower ‘by force’ (βίη, *Il.* 12.341) the gates of the Achaean wall.

⁵⁸⁶ Benardete (2005) 85-6.

⁵⁸⁷ Ajax’s use in the quotation above (*Il.* 7.197), the prayer including the plea that each champion gets equal βίη (*Il.* 7.205) and finally Hector’s closing statement that the gods gave βίη to Ajax (*Il.* 7.288).

The use of βίη to denote overpowering physical strength is also true off the battlefield.⁵⁸⁸ When Noemon, whose name denotes cleverness,⁵⁸⁹ ‘either very stupidly or very disloyally approaches the suitors demanding to know when Telemachos will be bringing his ship back’,⁵⁹⁰ Antinous replies, asking whether ‘it was **by force and unwillingly** (βίη ἄέκοντος) that he took from you your black ship, or did you give it **willingly** (ἐκών), because he spoke warmly to you with words?’ (*Od.* 4.646-7). Antinous, and Ajax above (p.225), contrast βίη with willing action so that βίη can be understood to mean overpowering another and forcing them to do your will. For Ajax this was his unwillingness to submit in battle and for Noemon it was submitting to the implied violence at Telemachus’ hands. However, both the unwilling action and βίη remain hypothetical. When Hector meets Ajax for the duel, Homer does not describe Hector using βίη against him. Likewise, Noemon replies to Antinous that he gave the boat willingly to Telemachus and replies ‘in reverse order, a common feature of Homeric conversation’,⁵⁹¹ so that his willingness appears at the beginning of his direct speech, immediately allaying any suspicion of βίη. In both examples, βίη is not actively used upon either character, but remains a threat.

As βίη shows sociological hierarchy, βίη also demonstrates Achilles’ heroic superiority. Nestor speaks to the distressed Patroclus, ‘you are the older, but he is the **greater by far in force**’ (βίη δ’ ὅ γε πολλὸν ἁμείνων, *Il.* 11.787).⁵⁹² The stating of βίη, unprompted by Patroclus, as relating to Achilles when comparing the two heroes, indicates that Nestor sees it is Achilles’ defining characteristic. Further, the combination of two quantitative adjectives, ‘greater’ (ἁμείνων) and ‘by far’ (πολλὸν), highlights that Achilles’ βίη is exceedingly large and

⁵⁸⁸ See the use of βίη at *Il.* 13.572 to denote in a metaphor the strength the herdsmen use to overpower the bull.

⁵⁸⁹ For the irony of Noemon’s name, see Higbie (1995) 12.

⁵⁹⁰ Haller (2014) 283.

⁵⁹¹ Heubeck, West and Hainsworth (1988) 233.

⁵⁹² At *Il.* 24.42, on the twelfth day after Hector has died, Apollo rebukes the other gods and says that Achilles is ruthless like a lion ‘in great force’ (μεγάλῃ τε βίῃ).

maximises his exceptionality. Nestor draws this comparison between the two heroes when the Achaeans are hard-pressed in the fighting. This highlights that Nestor would value Achilles' βίη and how, more widely, 'the Achaeans are doomed without [Achilles'] *biē*'.⁵⁹³ Further, Nestor's words demonstrate this:

the category of 'best of the Achaeans' transcends political sovereignty and pertains to traits that may or may not be a basis of political power, such as *mētis* 'creative cunning', *biē* 'destructive force', and their associated faculties, symbols, and consequences.⁵⁹⁴

Achilles is not the overall general of the Achaean force (a point emphatically brought out in *Iliad* 1), but holds a unique position due to his extraordinary abilities. Kirby infers that 'in a fundamental sense the whole poem is *about* the *peitho/bia* antithesis'.⁵⁹⁵ At the risk of oversimplifying the plot of the *Iliad*, this is broadly true: in *Iliad* 1 Achilles fails to persuade Agamemnon regarding the restitution of war booty and an instantiation of βίη is only just avoided; in *Iliad* 24, Priam successfully persuades Achilles to put aside his βίη.⁵⁹⁶ Achilles is exceptional for his βίη, but Nestor's statement remains a statement: it does not describe a situation in the past where Achilles' used βίη, but underlines Achilles' possession of βίη.

Nestor's attribution of βίη to Achilles also emphasises the magnitude of Achilles' βίη, which is illustrated in the plot of the *Iliad*. Achilles misfires with his spear against Asteropaeus and it gets trapped in the river bank (*Il.* 21.169-72). Both warriors are now without their spears, Achilles is quick to draw his sword, but Asteropaeus 'was unable to pull [Achilles' spear] out of the bank with his strong hand. Three times (τρίς μὲν) he made it quiver as he strove to pull

⁵⁹³ Nagy (1979) 317.

⁵⁹⁴ Muellner (1996) 121.

⁵⁹⁵ Kirby (1990) 216, the emphasis on 'about' is Kirby's own.

⁵⁹⁶ At the beginning of *Iliad* 24, Apollo says that Achilles has the βίη of a lion (*Il.* 24.42).

it, and three times he relaxed his **force**, (τρίς δὲ μεθῆκε βίης, *Il.* 21.175-7). Since Asteropaeus ‘relaxes his βίη’ (μεθῆκε βίης), it is implied that he was using βίη. This is one of the rare occasions where a hero implements βίη rather than βίη remaining a potential force.

Asteropaeus’ actions provide an example of the τρίς μὲν ... τρίς δέ motif which Beck neatly sums up:

a vigorous hero [who] gains the sympathy of the audience in the course of repeated attempts to surmount a powerful hostile force, as a result of which the audience feels greater pity and sorrow for his eventual failure.⁵⁹⁷

While Asteropaeus’ attempts are not against a ‘powerful hostile force’, I would agree that his failings provoke the audience to sympathy for him. I would argue further that this scene demonstrates the magnitude of Achilles’ βίη. Nestor describes Achilles’ βίη as being greater than that of Patroclus, but I would propose that this scene demonstrates that Achilles’ physical βίη is superior to any other hero’s. Asteropaeus’ use of βίη does not match the βίη Achilles used to embed the spear originally. At once the reader feels sympathy for Asteropaeus, but marvels at Achilles’ βίη.

Asteropaeus provides a particular challenge to Achilles’ heroic status. The encounter between the two heroes begins with Achilles asking who Asteropaeus is, to which Asteropaeus replies ‘my lineage is from Axius’ (*Il.* 21.157), an important river god. Achilles’ mother is the mid-ranking sea nymph Thetis and so, in terms of heroic family stock, Asteropaeus outranks Achilles. Further Asteropaeus is the sole hero to wound Achilles (*Il.* 21.161-8); this is not even

⁵⁹⁷ Beck (2018) 151. Strictly speaking, Asteropaeus tries a fourth time (*Il.* 21.177-9), which Homer suggests might have been more successful: ‘the fourth time, his spirit was keen to bend and break the ashen spear of Aeacus’ son’ (*Il.* 21.177-8). But Achilles reaches him too quickly for Asteropaeus to release the spear.

afforded to Hector, the best Trojan fighter, during the climatic duel of *Iliad* 22. Even with both these advantages, Asteropaeus still falls short of Achilles' status in terms of βίη. In the end, Achilles proves the victor, and provides his reason for victory: 'difficult it is to contend with the children of the mighty son of Cronos, **even one begotten by a river** (ποταμοῖό περ ἐκγεγαῶτι)' (*Il.* 21.184-5). Even though Asteropaeus outranks Achilles in terms of immediate lineage and draws blood from Achilles, this is insufficient to overpower a (very distant)⁵⁹⁸ descendant of Zeus.⁵⁹⁹

Homer makes it clear that, though Achilles' βίη exceeds that of other heroes, he is still weaker than a god. This is seen in Achilles' stand-off with Scamander, a scene which comes shortly after Asteropaeus fails to free Achilles' spear. After initially beating down Achilles (*Il.* 21.233-83, on Scamander's initial attack see p.191), Scamander does not abate but calls to Simois to 'raise a great wave' (ἴστη δὲ μέγα κύμα, *Il.* 21.313). It seems Scamander's aim is to annihilate Achilles, 'who is now **prevailing** (κρατέει),⁶⁰⁰ **and thinks to be equal to the gods** (μέμονεν δ' ὃ γε ἴσα θεοῖσι)' (*Il.* 21.315). Scamander then comments on Achilles' βίη: 'for I say that his **force** (βίην) shall not prevail him, nor his good looks, nor his fine armour' (*Il.* 21.316-7). Scamander combines the verb κρατέω (p.191) with βίη, which he assumes means that Achilles 'thinks [himself] to be equal to the gods' (μέμονεν δ' ὃ γε ἴσα θεοῖσι). During Scamander's first attack on Achilles, the emphasis is on Achilles' performance of the verb κρατέω (*Il.* 21.214, with p.191 and 200) and how his performance of κράτος pales before the strength of a (minor) god, even when there is no term to denote Scamander's strength. Here, after Achilles' super heroic βίη places him above the hero Asteropaeus, who has the superior (more immediately divine) lineage, Scamander says that he will make Achilles' exceptional βίη

⁵⁹⁸ Achilles gives the full lineage and develops his point on the superiority of Zeus to water gods in the lines subsequent to the above quotation (*Il.* 21.186-99). See Priestley (2014) 207-8.

⁵⁹⁹ Hall (2025) 197.

⁶⁰⁰ On Scamander's use of the verb κρατέω see p.191 and 200.

come to nought. Homer provides a limitation of Achilles' βίη: he may exceed other heroes in βίη, but this is still incomparable to the strength of a full-blown god.⁶⁰¹

Nestor's comparison between Patroclus and Achilles also highlights the relationship of βίη to age. Nestor contrasts Achilles' greater βίη with Patroclus' greater age; this is symptomatic of Homeric βίη more widely: βίη is believed to be lost in old age.⁶⁰² Diomedes addresses Nestor as Hector approaches: 'O **old man** (γέρον), the **young fighters** (νέοι [...]) μαχηταί are wearing you down, you have lost your **force** (βίη), and difficult **old age** (γῆρας) follows you,' (*Il.* 8.102-3). Diomedes opens his address 'old man' (γέρον), which is a word used throughout the passage both by the Homeric narrator (*Il.* 8.87, 8.90 and 8.100) and Diomedes (*Il.* 8.96 and 8.102) and 'seems to underscore Nestor's vulnerable position'.⁶⁰³ The structuring of Diomedes' speech implies a causal relationship between losing βίη and attaining old age; this is something which the juxtaposition between the 'young fighters' (νέοι μαχηταί) and the vocative 'old man' (γέρον) underscores. Odysseus introduces a fictitious story to Eumaeus making this connection explicit, 'if only I were as **young as before** and with **force**' (εἴθ' ὥς ἡβώοιμι βίη τέ μοι ἔμπεδος εἴη, *Od.* 14.468). The temporal adjective ἔμπεδος contrasts youth, denoted by the verb 'I am youthful' (ἡβάω), with the current state of having lost βίη. It is especially noteworthy that all of these examples of the loss of βίη in old age come in character speech and thus represent the characters' understanding of how this heroic attribute functions (and is lost) in their narrative world.

⁶⁰¹ See also Eidothea instructing Menelaus to use βίη (*Od.* 4.415 and 4.422) to hold Proteus down, but when Menelaus narrates the narrative, he omits any Homeric fighting word.

⁶⁰² βίη is said to be lost in old age: *Od.* 14.468 and 14.503. *Il.* 4.314, 7.157, 8.103, 11.670, 23.629. Cf. with Zeus at *Il.* 15.165 (repeated at 15.181 by Iris), where a god's increased age seemingly lends itself to greater stores of βίη. Βίη is explicitly connected with youth at *Od.* 4.668 and *Il.* 17.24; in both occurrences it is a sign of arrogance; on βίη as arrogance see the use with the suitors (pp.232-3). Βίη is also connected with youth in simile comparing the 'force' (βίη) of the children being overwhelmed by the ass to describe Ajax giving way to the Trojans (*Il.* 11.558-65).

⁶⁰³ de Jong (1987) 72. See also Cook (2009) 139.

Priam, however, is an old man and said to have βῆν. As Menelaus and Paris prepare for their duel, Menelaus suggests that they ‘lead here **mighty** (βῆν) Priam,’ (*Il.* 3.105) to officiate the sacrifice. This contradicts the wider pattern of βῆν lost in old age; Priam, as an elderly man, should not have βῆν.⁶⁰⁴ This use occurs in a formula, which I stated at the beginning of this section would not form part of my discussion. This particular use of βῆν, however, appears to contradict an otherwise clearly defined Homeric motif and so warrants individual discussion. Menelaus might mean Priam has βῆν because Priam is a remnant from the heroic age of old. Indeed, a number of figures from the previous heroic age have βῆν attributed to them within a phrasal epithet.⁶⁰⁵ Yet, Priam is afforded βῆν as he exerts it vicariously through Hector and the army. While Hector is the best Trojan fighter, Priam remains the Trojan king. We saw above that βῆν shows high social standing (p.222-5); while Priam may not have the physical strength of body which βῆν typically designates, βῆν here can be seen to indicate Priam’s status as the Trojan ruler. Menelaus mentions Priam’s βῆν at a crucial narrative juncture: there is a ceasefire as both sides come together to sacrifice. There needs to be absolute certainty that the Trojans will abide by the ceasefire; Priam’s social position provides this guarantee. Further, Priam’s βῆν fits with the wider pattern of Homeric βῆν. Priam has power, βῆν, over an enormous army which has the potential to see off any foes. At numerous points in the *Iliad*, Priam’s army overpowers the Achaeans and pushes them back, and there is always a fear of a premature

⁶⁰⁴ Menelaus continues this speech by saying that young men have unstable hearts but an old man will give balanced judgment before taking action (*Il.* 3.108-110), but these lines were rejected by Aristarchus.

⁶⁰⁵ Βῆν as an attribute of individuals in the previous heroic generation: Iphicles: *Od.* 11.290 and 11.296. Neleus: *Od.* 15.231. Priam: *Il.* 3.105. Eteocles: *Il.* 4.386. Heracles: *Od.* 11.601. *Il.* 2.658, 2.666, 5.638, 11.690, 15.640, 18.117, 19.98. D’Agostino (1981) 427 ‘it is the bié of the son of Zeus, who has it precisely because of his divine progeny’ (‘è la bié del figlio di Zeus, che ne dispone proprio perché è progenie divina’).

Achaean homecoming.⁶⁰⁶ And so, while Priam may not have bodily βίη, he certainly has politically instrumentalisable βίη.

Penelope's suitors are aristocrats, but their βίη is of a markedly different calibre to that of Homeric warriors.⁶⁰⁷ Teiresias tells Odysseus that he shall suffer on the route home, 'but coming home, you shall have recompense for the **outrages** (βίαις) of these men' (*Od.* 11.118). Homer appears to have repurposed the prized Iliadic term βίη in Teiresias' speech to refer not to an attribute of an agent but to the acts perpetrated by an agent – to the suitors' scandalous actions rather than their bodily strength or political sovereignty. Notably this use of βίη occurs in the plural (βίαις) rather than the singular (βίη): this represents a wider pattern across the Homeric poems. The singular forms of βίη refer to an attribute of an individual, but when βίη is deployed in the plural it refers to the results of actions of individuals. There are exceptions, but the exceptions are minimal compared to the number which align with the rule.⁶⁰⁸

This explains why, when Eumaeus talks of the suitors' personality, he uses the singular form. When speaking to the disguised Odysseus, Eumaeus says that the '**arrogance and outrage** (ὑβρις τε βίη) of these men reaches the iron heavens' (*Od.* 15.329). Eumaeus pairs the suitors' singular βίη with a term which more concretely refers to 'arrogance', ὑβρις, to highlight that their βίη is not a positive reflection on the suitors' character. When used in relation to the suitors' actions in Odysseus' household, the translation of βίη as 'arrogance' works in all

⁶⁰⁶ *Il.* 1.59-61, 2.149-56, 4.170-82, 6.526-9, 8.196-7, 8.510-11, 9.26-8, 9.417-20, 10.310-2 and 14.75-81.

⁶⁰⁷ The suitors' βίη: *Od.* 3.216, 11.118, 15.329, 17.540, 17.565 and 23.31. At *Od.* 16.189 and 16.255 it is implied that the βίη mentioned refers to the actions of the suitors. Similarly, at *Od.* 13.310, Athene instructs Odysseus to submit to the βίη of men, where βίη can be taken to refer to the actions of the suitors.

⁶⁰⁸ *Il.* 5.521 the plural form βίαις describes a plural of Trojans. βίη occurs in the plural in the metaphors at *Il.* 16.213 and 23.713, where the close joins of a house stop the 'forces of the winds' (βίαις ἀνέμων); there is a plural vehicle describing a singular tenor in the metaphor construction. Agelaus rebukes Mentor/Athene, telling her/him not to help Odysseus, or, 'we shall take away your **force** (βίαις) with bronze' (*Od.* 22.219). Here the plural of βίη describes the attribute of five fighters on Odysseus' side.

cases;⁶⁰⁹ indeed, the βίη of the suitors never refers to their prowess in battle or has any sociological meaning. βίη instead refers exclusively to the suitors' actions against Odysseus' house. The underlying potentiality of βίη is also present: if the suitors carry on eating and drinking in excess, then they threaten to overwhelm the house by completely depleting its resources, as Telemachus bemoans in the assembly (*Od.* 2.368-80).

The strength used by the suitors and indeed Telemachus himself when pulling the bowstring is βίη. The stringing of the bow represents Odysseus reclaiming his political power (pp.202-3), but the manual process of stringing the bow is framed in terms of βίη. Three times Telemachus tries to string the bow and 'three times he relaxes his **force**' (τρίς δὲ μεθῆκε βίης, *Od.* 21.126), and then 'on the fourth attempt, he would have strung the bow **with force (βίη)**,' (*Od.* 21.128) had not Odysseus stopped him (*Od.* 21.129). Here we see another rare instance of βίη actually being implemented by a Homeric character, rather than remaining in the abstract. Telemachus' βίη is implicitly sufficient to string the bow, and thus claim the throne of Ithaca, but Odysseus crucially stops his final attempt. This matches onto the wider picture sketched above of Homeric βίη. Telemachus has the *potential* to overpower his father, but this is not fully realised in the narrative events.

Homer shows us that the suitors demonstrably do not have heroic, Iliadic, βίη. Telemachus calls to the suitors 'but come, **those who are better** than me in **force (βίη προφερέστεροί)**, try your hand at the bow and bring to an end this contest' (*Od.* 21.134-5). Telemachus flatters the suitors, saying that they have greater stores of βίη than himself, thus attributing βίη to the suitors. The suitors are part of the aristocratic ruling elite and *should* have

⁶⁰⁹ Βίη and arrogance: at *Od.* 4.667-8 Antinous demands that Zeus destroy Telemachus' βίη before Telemachus reaches manhood. At *Od.* 13.140-44 Zeus says Poseidon can smite a man who dishonours him and gives way to his κράτος and βίη. At *Od.* 18.138-50 Odysseus says to Amphimedon that he was once insolent and gave way to his βίη and Odysseus advises him to leave. At *Il.* 15.185-6 Poseidon says Zeus spoke 'arrogantly' (ὕπεροπλος, l.185) if Zeus intends by 'force' (βίη, l.186) to remove him from the battlefield. See also the metaphor of Zeus getting angry with a crooked judgement resulting from βίη in an assembly, at *Hom Il.* 16.387.

βίη like the rest of the Homeric aristocracy. The suitors, however, do not possess sufficient βίη, even when employing underhand tactics. Melanthius ‘brings in a great cake of fat and the young men warmed the bow and tried it, but they were not able to string it, for they were lacking by far **the force**’ (πολλὸν δὲ βίης ἐπιδευέες, *Od.* 21.183-5). This is Homeric narrator-text, with no actorial focalisation, and so represents Homer naming the reason for the suitors’ inability to string the bow. The suitors not only ‘lack’ (ἐπιδευής) βίη, but the adverbial neuter ‘by far’ (πολλὸν) underscores just how far short the suitors’ βίη falls of the required standard. Moreover, the leading suitor Eurymachus says that he does not so much grieve the loss of marriage to Penelope, which failing to string the bow signifies, ‘but we are so lacking in **force** (τοσσόνδε βίης ἐπιδευέες) compared to godlike Odysseus’ (*Od.* 21.253). Eurymachus vocalises that which the Homeric narrator has previously stated: the suitors lack βίη, especially when compared against Odysseus. The underlying logic of the suitors’ lack of βίη aligns with my suggested definition of βίη as a potential force for overpowering: the suitors lack the potential strength, βίη, to replace Odysseus.⁶¹⁰

One holistic quality of βίη becomes apparent: βίη is aggressively masculine. All of the characters who have or use, or hypothetically use, βίη are male.⁶¹¹ There is only one Homeric example of βίη being used in relation to a woman: its implementation by men to remove Briseis from Achilles. Thetis leaves Achilles in anger on the shore, ‘seething in spirit for the fair-girdled woman, who they took away **unwillingly by force** (βίη ἄεκοντος)’ (*Il.* 1.429-30). Homer, in his own narratorial person, places an emphasis on Briseis’ ‘unwillingness’ (ἄεκων) to go to Agamemnon which adds to Agamemnon’s tyrannical characterisation. Stoessl suggests

⁶¹⁰ It is amusing that, while both Telemachus and the suitors try to use βίη to string the bow, Odysseus, once he has strung the bow, says he did not linger in stringing the bow or miss the shot through the axe eyes, but ‘still my **strength** (μένος) is firm’ (*Od.* 21.426), citing his possession of μένος as the deciding factor in the stringing of the bow.

⁶¹¹ Hera says the gods have βίη at *Il.* 15.106 and Athene gives βίη to Menelaus at 17.569. They are female divinities, but the gods are exceptional in this sense.

that ‘only when βία is exercised on a resisting object does the word take on the meaning of being hostile, wicked, unjust’;⁶¹² I would suggest, however, that this is not strictly correct. We saw above with the examples of Ajax and Noemon that they were both unwilling objects of βίη; the same term for their unwillingness (ἄεκων) is applied in both instances. The tone of these passages, though, was far from ‘hostile’, ‘wicked’ or ‘unjust’, to borrow Stoessl’s categorisation, but instead matter-of-fact, simply stating that they were on the receiving end of βίη. I would argue that it is because βίη is such a masculine force that it should be considered brutish to use it on a woman.

This highlights an important use of βίη in Herodotus’ contemporary context: the use of βίη to denote rape and sexual violence. While this is primarily a comparative study between Homer and Herodotus, a brief examination of the term in Herodotus’ contemporary context allows us to see if he is aligning his use of βίη exclusively with Homeric epic (in the sense of ‘heroic force’) or whether there are glimmers of this contemporary usage. Rape in the ancient world is a topic fraught with scholarly difficulty, not in the least as there are numerous ‘problems of definition and interpretation’ for what actually constituted rape.⁶¹³ For example, Omitowoju has examined the concept of consent, crucial in modern definitions of the term rape, and found that ‘the issue of female consent is never prioritised as the central concern for the regulation of sexual behaviour, but rather that status acts as the most crucial factor’.⁶¹⁴ Ancient ideas of consent are hierarchical and status-dependent. Problems of definition are accentuated for this reason:

⁶¹² Stoessl (1960) 67 (‘Nur wo βία an einem widerstrebenden Objekt ausgeübt wird, erhält das Wort den Sinn eines Feindseligen, Widderrechtlichen, Ungerechten’). Stoessl (1960) 67 notes, too, ‘In the erotic sphere, however, the polarity of meaning that is clear for the basic word in Homer can also be determined for the derivations, something that was often overlooked’ (‘In der erotischen Sphäre aber läßt sich die für das Grundwort bei Homer deutliche Polarität der Bedeutung auch für die Ableitungen feststellen, was oft verkannt wurde’).

⁶¹³ Deacy and Pierce (2002) x.

⁶¹⁴ Omitowoju (1997) 3.

Ancient Greek has no explicit term for ‘rape’ in the sense of ‘sexual intercourse committed by force,’ but several expressions used in Greek to mean assault can, in certain circumstances, denote rape.⁶¹⁵

One of those expressions involves the use of βίη/βία to denote the force used on the unwilling participant.⁶¹⁶ Further, in Athens during the fifth century BCE, the legal terms for rape include the use of βίη (βίας δίκη in schol. Plato, *Rep.* 5.464e; ‘βία αἰσχύνεσθαι τινα’ at Lys. 1.32).⁶¹⁷ It would therefore be in line with the contemporaneous usage if Herodotus uses βίη for forced sexual intercourse. Herodotus has a choice. He can either use βίη exclusively to mean ‘force’ in the heroic sense or follow the wider concurrent societal trend to use βίη to describe rape. As we will see, he opts for the latter (pp.240-2 and 244-5).

There are glimmers of βίη to denote rape in Homeric epic. Agamemnon is keen to stress that he has not had sex with Briseis. When the embassy prepares to go to Achilles, Agamemnon says that he shall give Briseis back, and ‘I shall swear a great oath that I never went to bed with her nor slept with her’ (*Il.* 9.132-3). Had Agamemnon slept with Briseis he would have violated Achilles’ property beyond redemption; Agamemnon therefore needs to stress that he has not slept with Briseis. Later, when Agamemnon reconciles himself with Achilles, ‘this oath is demanded by Odysseus [*Il.*] 19.175, and publicly sworn by Agamemnon, [*Il.*] 19.257-65’.⁶¹⁸ Analogously, I suggest that we see a similar logic underlying Nausicaa’s words to the naked Odysseus. Nausicaa says, ‘I am the daughter of great-hearted Alcinous, who has power (κάπτος) and **force** (βίη) from the Phaeacian people’ (*Od.* 6.196-7). Nausicaa cites her father’s

⁶¹⁵ Cole (1984) 98, to whom I owe the list of terminology in the following footnote.

⁶¹⁶ E.g. βίασμός when describing ‘violence’ against a woman; βιάζω in the middle voice; βιάω in the middle voice; δαμάζω in the middle voice; ὑβρίζω; αἰσχύνω and ἀρπάζω.

⁶¹⁷ LSJ s.v. βία A. II. 3.

⁶¹⁸ Griffin (1995) 91.

possession of βίη when she is confronted with a naked stranger who might all too easily attack or mistreat her. This, I would suggest, is to act as a deterrent; in effect Nausicaa is saying, ‘you might be thinking of using βίη on me, but my father has political βίη which he will use on you if you do’. This functions to intimidate and prevent the stranger-Odysseus undertaking any malicious action against her.

In conclusion, Homeric βίη is similar to Homeric κράτος, but differs in remaining a hypothetical force rather than a manifested realisation of that force. Gods have βίη and humans recognise this, with Zeus having greater amounts of βίη, reflecting his status as king of the gods. The gods can also give βίη to mortals; humans recognise this divine capability, but only Homeric males can have βίη. In particular, mortal kings have βίη, while βίη is emphatically disconnected from the Homeric lower class. It was shown that βίη is placed in opposition to aging, so that a number of Homeric characters say that βίη is lost in old age.

It was also shown that βίη does not necessarily always reflect well on a Homeric hero. Homeric βίη has undertones of the resonances that the term comes to have in Herodotus’ contemporary society, denoting rape and forced sexual intercourse. Further, βίη was used to denote the suitors’ outrageous actions and, while they are members of the Homeric aristocracy, they did not possess βίη in the heroic sense. Homeric βίη is not always heroic. More generally, βίη appears in character speech but it is rarely an actioned capacity. It remains a hypothetical and unrealised power. Muellner suggests that, for Achilles, ‘it is actually the suppression of his exceptional *bīē* that characterises his *mēnis*’.⁶¹⁹ While βίη is the quality which marks the heroic superiority of Achilles to other heroes, as I have shown, the suppression of βίη is something found in relation to Homeric characters and heroes more generally.

⁶¹⁹ Muellner (1996) 123.

2.4.2 Herodotean βίη

Herodotus also uses βίη, but only ten times,⁶²⁰ compared with Homer's 82 occurrences. This infrequency is particularly striking when compared to the Homeric background where it was shown to characterise Achilles' exceptional heroism. Were Herodotus truly imbuing his heroic narratives with a Homeric tone, we might have expected a greater occurrence of βίη in the *Histories*, to create not just a Homeric but an Achillean tone for Herodotean heroes. A preliminary glance at the Herodotean use of βίη reveals that βίη is absent from the discourse of the key battles in the Greco-Persian conflict, namely from Thermopylae, Artemisium, Salamis and Mycale. As I will show, the use during the Battle of Plataea has nothing to do with the fighting. Further, I demonstrate that Herodotus' primary reason for using βίη in the *Histories* appears to be to highlight the absence of βίη from his narrative world. Where Herodotus uses βίη elsewhere, the term's tone differs greatly from that found for βίη in Homeric epic.

Herodotus is keen to emphasise that none of the Persian kings uses βίη. When Croesus suggests Cyrus stops the Persians removing war booty from Lydia on the pretext of making a tithe to Zeus, Croesus says, 'you will not be hated for taking away their booty **by force** (βίη, 1.89.3)' and so Cyrus would be seen to act 'justly' (δίκαιος, 1.89.3). Croesus emphasises the absence of βίη in the situation he proposes and says that to act without βίη would be to behave 'justly' (δίκαιος, 1.89.3), creating an opposition between using βίη and correct conduct. Herodotus then describes Cyrus' reaction, he '**rejoiced** (ὑπερήδeto), as he believed that he had spoken **well** (εὖ), and **praised** (αἰνέσας) him very much' (1.90.1). While this does not in itself demonstrate that Cyrus lacks βίη, the threefold repetition of forms indicative of Cyrus' positive response, 'rejoiced' (ὑπερήδeto), 'well' (εὖ), and 'praised' (αἰνέσας), to Croesus' recommendation, demonstrates that Cyrus believes acting without βίη is for the best.

⁶²⁰ 1.89.3, 3.19.3, 3.127.2, where the term occurs twice, 3.138.3, 6.5.2, 6.107.3, 9.76.2, 9.108.1, where the term occurs twice.

The next Persian king Cambyses also acts without βίη. When the Phoenicians say that they will not attack the Carchedonians as they are bound by a strict treaty, ‘Cambyses **did not think it just** (οὐκ ἔδικοῦ) to use **force** (βίην) on the Phoenicians’ (3.19.3), that is, to pursue an attack on Carchedon, since the Phoenicians surrendered to him without a fight. Herodotus, in his own narratorial persona, disapplies βίη to Cambyses, so that this next-generation Persian king also decides against employing βίη. Analogously to Croesus’ words above, we see an opposition between using βίη and acting justly, since Cambyses ‘did not think it just’ (οὐκ ἔδικοῦ) to use βίη on the Phoenicians. It is noteworthy that this occurrence of Cambyses lacking βίη occurs in Herodotus’ narratorial persona relatively soon into the narrative of Cambyses’ reign. It is as though Herodotus wishes to stress Cambyses’ hesitancy to deploy βίη at the outset of his reign and suggests Cambyses is not a βίη-wielding Homeric hero.

Darius, the next Persian king, also prefers another method to βίη. Darius opens his address to ‘the **most notable** (δοκιμωτάτους) Persians’ (3.127.2),⁶²¹ regarding Oroetes:

‘O Persians, who among you will promise to bring to completion this for me, **by intelligence** (σοφίῃ), and not **by force** (βίῃ) and numbers? Where there is need **for intelligence** (σοφίης), **force** (βίης) has no business’ (3.127.2).

Darius emphatically, and hypothetically, does not want to implement βίη against Oroetes. Darius’ words play into the literary *topos* which places the two types of heroism, body strength (conventionally attached to Achilles) and intellectual ability (conventionally attached to Odysseus), in binary opposition (p.23 n.79). Herodotus is innovative, however, in using σοφίη (Attic Greek: σοφία), to denote intellectualism rather than any of the terms which Athene applies to Odysseus in *Odyssey* 13. ‘Intelligence’ (σοφίῃ) is a term Herodotus uses elsewhere

⁶²¹ Δόκιμος is used as a Herodotean ‘fame word’ (see p.77 and 138).

to denote Odyssean-style cunning intelligence,⁶²² but σοφίη occurs only once in Homeric epic and then as the vehicle in a metaphor construction rather than the active descriptor for a Homeric character.⁶²³ Thus not only is Darius displaying an avoidance towards βίη, but Herodotus further distances Darius from Homeric emulation by using σοφίη, a non-Homeric word (pp.79-80), for his preferred action.

Xerxes also chooses not to use βίη, but in a wholly different capacity. Herodotus provides one final embarrassment for Xerxes: his ordeal with Masistes' wife. Herodotus begins the narrative stating that Xerxes is 'infatuated' (ἥρα, 9.108.1) with Masistes' wife. After sending ineffectual messages to her (9.108.1), Herodotus says that Xerxes 'did not want to use **force** (βίην) out of respect for his brother Masistes' (9.108.1). Given that this is a narrative about Xerxes' lust for Masistes' wife, it is clear that βίη refers to Xerxes sexually forcing himself on Masistes wife. Xerxes, like each of his Persian king forebears, actively chooses not to use βίη. It is worth remembering that 'the implication of the addition 'out of respect for his brother' is that his restraint is not motivated by respect/regard for the woman',⁶²⁴ but the choice against action involving βίη remains. This statement is focalised through the character of Xerxes and 'suggests that Xerxes as a king could have used violence',⁶²⁵ but he does not. This is something common to each of the Persians kings; they each actively choose not to use βίη. This is recognised by another internal character. Masistes' wife 'knew well that he would not use **force** (βίης, 9.108.1)'. This is a marked point of difference from Homeric epic. While

⁶²² Phanes escapes Amasis' eunuchs by getting them drunk and Herodotus comments, 'for Phanes cheated him [sc. a eunuch] by intelligence (σοφίη, 3.4.2)' – perhaps a play on Odysseus' intoxication of Polyphemus. Alexander 'by intelligence' (σοφίη, 5.21.2) covers up the Macedonians' slaughter of the leading Persians. Themistocles is given the 'olive crown for **intelligence** (σοφίης) and mental dexterity' (8.124.2). See also the tongue-in-cheek narrative of Amasis' repurposed footbath where Herodotus says, 'with intelligence (σοφίη), not with folly, Amasis won them over' (2.172.2).

⁶²³ The metaphor refers to a carpenter well-acquainted with the σοφίη of Athene making a timber straight (*Il.* 15.412), with the timber being the vehicle in the metaphorical construction and the metaphorical tenor the evenly pitched battle between the two sides.

⁶²⁴ Hazewindus (2004) 95-6.

⁶²⁵ Hazewindus (2004) 95.

characters in Homeric epic might threaten the use of βίη (I think above all of Zeus' words to Poseidon through Iris *Il.* 15.165-6), the party who would be on the receiving end the βίη does not know that βίη will not be used against them. This is precisely why it works as a threat. Masistes' wife is in the knowing position, aware that Xerxes will not use βίη, and thus Xerxes' βίη poses no threat.

Earlier in the *Histories*, significantly during the constitutional debate, Otanes speaks in favour of democracy and against sole rulers (3.80). Otanes lists the potential crimes of the monarch; 'significantly one of the three greatest crimes likely to be perpetrated by the tyrant is the violation of women, an outrage ranked with the change of ancestral laws and execution without trials'.⁶²⁶ Otanes says that an absolute ruler 'rapes women' (βιάται γυναῖκας, 3.80.5) and uses the verb βιάω (cognate to βίη), which Herodotus uses elsewhere in the middle voice to denote rape.⁶²⁷ Xerxes' hesitancy to rape reflects well on his character, as he does not engage in behaviour which his own culture views as tyrannical.

We saw that Homeric βίη was not always a positive characterisation for a Homeric figure, and there were glimmers of the use of Homeric βίη on a woman to suggest rape (p.236). Xerxes does not use βίη to rape Masistes' wife, which is a good thing – specifically placing him in opposition to the archetypal tyrant described by Otanes (3.80.5). However, it is the absence of βίη which carries the positive undertones. Indeed, each Persian king chooses not to act with βίη. This influences not only the audience's perception of the individual Persian kings, but also their understanding of the title of the Persian king. The Persian kings' hesitancy towards using βίη in a variety of settings on the one hand creates a not unfavourable portrait of

⁶²⁶ Walcot (1978) 142, discussing 3.80.5. This is also noted by Harrison (1997) 189.

⁶²⁷ βιάω in the middle voice is elsewhere used in the *Histories* to denote rape; Sataspes 'raped' (ἐβίησατο) the virgin daughter of Zopyrus son of Megabyzus' (4.43.2). The Pelasgians: 'whenever the Athenian women came [sc. To the Nine Wells] the Pelasgians **raped** (βιάσθαι) them through arrogance and contempt' (6.137.3); this is the reason Herodotus gives for the Pelasgians' expulsion.

Persian royalty: they do not hastily or unduly act with βίη. Alternatively, all of the Persian kings are presented as distinctly un-Homeric. This has an impact on how we read the narrative of the Persian wars more generally – it is no Homeric hero, and certainly no Achilles⁶²⁸ – who threatened the total destruction of Greece.

Xerxes' repudiation of rape is not the only time Herodotus uses βίη in the contemporary legal sense of rape. After the Battle of Plataea, Phrandates' concubine (παλλακή, 9.76.1) bedecks herself 'with many gold ornaments' (9.76.1) and 'in the finest clothes that she had' (9.76.1) to go and supplicate Pausanias so that 'in style, and her attention to style at such a crisis shows how calmly she faces the possibility of death'.⁶²⁹ After asking him to save her from slavery and thanking him for ridding the earth of the impious Persians (9.76.2), Phrandates' concubine says, 'the Persian had me, taking me **by force** (βίη) in Cos' (9.76.2). It might be that 'by force' (βίη) the concubine means that she was forcibly taken from her homeland against her will – like Briseis' removal from Achilles (*Il.* 1.429-30). However, I would argue that Phrandates' βίη denotes the concubine's rape. Herodotus' designation that she was a 'concubine' (παλλακή, 9.76.1), rather than a 'woman' (γυνή) or 'girl' (κόρη), uses a term with a sexual connotation suggests that βίη denotes the 'force of rape'. Further, when addressing Pausanias, the concubine highlights her Greekness, saying 'I am a Coan by birth' (9.76.2). This adds to her persuasive case and plays on Greek cultural prejudices since 'the maltreatment of a Greek would be seen as worse than that of a foreign woman'.⁶³⁰

The Persian kings are not the only Herodotean characters who abstain from βίη. The Cnidians obey Darius' request to send an escort to persuade the Tarentines to accept Gillus, but the 'Cnidians were **unable** (ἀδύνατοι) to persuade the Tarentines, and they were not able to use

⁶²⁸ As mentioned, Achilles' defining trait is βίη (see pp.226-230).

⁶²⁹ Flory (1978) 416.

⁶³⁰ Harrison (1997) 195.

force (βίην)’ (3.138.3). At the one level Herodotus is democratising the vocabulary of Homeric heroism by applying βίη to a plurality, something rarely seen in Homeric epic (pp.232-3). However, Herodotus is foregrounding the Cnidians’ inability (ἀδύνατος) to implement βίη, rather than actively apply the term to the Cnidian people. While characters in Homeric epic did not often explicitly use βίη, it was present as a quality which they *could* use if they chose. Thus, though their inability to use βίη, the Cnidians are characterised as a non-Homeric people.

The Cnidians are not the only Herodotean characters ineffectual with βίη. When the Milesians, ‘having had a taste of freedom’ (6.5.1), refuse to accept Histiaeus back into the city, ‘during the night, Histiaeus tried to go into Miletus **by force** (βίη), but he was wounded **in the thigh** (τὸν μηρὸν) by a Milesian’ (6.5.2). It might be the case that ‘Histiaios’ attempt to return ‘by force’ implies that he had a substantial following, although [Herodotus] has not said so explicitly’,⁶³¹ but more pertinent I believe is that Histiaeus tries to use βίη, as though he is a Homeric hero. This attempt, however, is ineffectual. Histiaeus, in trying to use βίη, is wounded and so he falls far short of Homeric heroism. Boedeker comments that Herodotus rarely gives ‘the specific circumstances of a death in battle, such as what kind of weapon was used or what part of the body it struck, unless these details are remarkable in some way’.⁶³² While Histiaeus does not die, Boedeker’s comments are instructive, and the same is more widely true of Herodotus’ battle descriptions (large or small): as one scholar puts it ‘Herodotus prefers to keep things clean’.⁶³³

Odysseus famously has a thigh wound from when he went hunting (*Od.* 19.388-475) and its scar functions as Odysseus’ concrete identifier (*Od.* 19.468-75). Herodotus might be

⁶³¹ Hornblower and Pelling (2017) 89.

⁶³² Boedeker (2003) 19.

⁶³³ Romm (1998) 193. See also Fragoulaki (2022) on the absence of blood from the *Histories*, and Tuplin (2022) 350-62 on Herodotean battle scenes differing from the Homeric precedent.

trying to present Histiaeus as ‘an Odysseus-like twister,’⁶³⁴ but Histiaeus is not the only Herodotean figure to receive a thigh wound.⁶³⁵ More convincing, in my view, is Felton’s analysis that Herodotean ‘thigh wounds mark the moments when these characters, who initially have high status, suffer reversals of fortune, falling from their former greatness because of the pursuit of their own self-interest’.⁶³⁶ This is true and reflects on Herodotus’ use of βίη. In Homeric epic, βίη showed the upper ruling class’s superior social standing (pp.222-5). Histiaeus’ lack of βίη not only drives home to the reader his loss of political power, but also characterises him as a failed Homeric hero.

Herodotus’ last attribution of βίη constitutes a concrete demonstration of it. Leading the Persians to Marathon, Herodotus narrates that Hippias dreamt ‘he slept with his own mother’ (6.107.1); Hippias interprets this dream to mean that he will return and regain his ‘power’ (ἀρχή, 6.107.2) as tyrant of Athens. This creates a bizarre tone in the prelude to the Athenians’ moment of shining valour. The peculiar tone is developed when Hippias arranges the troops, and ‘he came to sneezing and coughing greater than that to which he was accustomed’ (6.107.3). The result of this spluttering fit was that ‘one of his teeth was propelled out **by the force** (ὕπὸ βίης) of coughing’ (6.107.3). This scene is humorous as the expulsion of Hippias’ tooth comes as a total departure from the tone we might have expected in the run-up to the famous Battle of Marathon. This humour is augmented when we view the βίη which expels Hippias’ tooth through a Homeric lens. Hippias uses βίη both unintentionally and with

⁶³⁴ Scott (2005) 63.

⁶³⁵ Cambyses 3.63.3. At 6.75.3, Herodotus makes repeated references to Cleomenes’ thighs when he lacerates himself. During Miltiades’ 6.134.2 attack on Paros, after Miltiades’ success at Marathon, he jumps over a fence at the temple of Demeter and twists his thigh (though, as Herodotus says, ‘some others say he took a blow on his knee’, 6.134.2).

⁶³⁶ Felton (2014) 59. Felton (2014) 59 also suggests that ‘the evidence indicates that Herodotus intentionally emphasized thigh wounds even when other versions of these men’s injuries were available’.

undesirable consequences which creates a humorous and bizarre spectacle. This is in stark contrast to βίη in Homeric epic where, in any of its variety of uses, it is no laughing matter.

As is typically the case with Herodotean humour, there is a more serious undertone. Sneezing in Homer is already an omen (*Od.* 17.541-5), but ‘it is important not only that the tooth was ejected but also that it buried itself deep in the sand – penetration of the motherland as well as ejaculation’.⁶³⁷ The sexual symbolism of the narrative can be pushed one step further. The force with which the tooth is rammed out of his mouth and into the earth of his motherland is denoted by the term βίη. Given Herodotus’ use of βίη to mean ‘force to rape’ elsewhere in the *Histories* (pp.240-2), I would posit that the scene is symbolic of Hippias’ rape of his motherland, rather than just its ‘penetration’. Rape is the act of sexually forcing oneself on upon another without consent. Hippias is acting in an analogous manner. He is leading an invading contingent against his homeland and forcing himself back into his motherland.

There are two broader points on Herodotus’ use of βίη to highlight. Herodotus does not positively attribute βίη to the gods as we find in Homeric epic (see pp.220-2). This might be because, in Herodotus’ contemporary culture, βίη is known to be a divine attribute and so this would be understood by Herodotus’ audience. The second is that we do not see gods bestowing βίη on mortals, as with Athene to Menelaus (*Il.* 17.560-9). This would have provided a strong undercurrent of Homeric heroism, but Herodotus offers no such comparable scene. Pausanias, for example, looks to the Heraion during the Battle of Plataea – a perfect opportunity for a divine bestowal of βίη – but, though Pausanias prays to the goddess, there is not a granting of βίη as he goes into battle (9.61.3-9.62.1).

⁶³⁷ Hornblower and Pelling (2017) 237, Hornblower and Pelling (2017) 237 continue with further bibliography on whether the tooth represents a phallus or semen.

2.4.3 Conclusion

Homeric βίη is not entirely positive, but Herodotus' takes this a step further. Not only is βίη largely omitted from the discourse of the *Histories*, but it is also conspicuously absent from major Herodotean battle scenes. Herodotus' sole use of βίη during a battle scene, the use by Phrandates' concubine (9.76.2), has nothing to do with the cut and thrust of battle. Herodotean βίη has the same underlying meaning as Homeric βίη, a potential force to overpower, but Herodotus was primarily interested in showing his characters' lack of βίη. Every Persian king actively chooses not to utilise βίη. Other characters besides the Persian kings could not use βίη. The Cnicians as a nation were characterised through an inability to use βίη and Histaeus' βίη is ineffectual. While Homeric characters suppress their ability to use βίη, Homer still presents his cast as being able to use βίη if the need arises (or, though rarely, actually using it). The only Herodotean occurrence where βίη is utilised effectually is the βίη of Hippias' sneeze; a humorous scene with great symbolic significance. Herodotus aligns his use of βίη with the contemporary sense to denote rape, something hinted at but not concretely found in Homeric epic (pp.234-7). Homeric βίη may not be entirely positive, but in the *Histories* βίη is either absent or has no positive connotations.

2.5 Chapter Conclusions – Fighting Words

This chapter has examined fighting words in epic and compared its epic use against Herodotus' own in the *Histories*. As in Chapter 1, it has revealed some surprising differences in the use of ἀλκή, κράτος, and βίη in epic and Herodotean prose. While both Homer and Herodotus record fighting, Herodotus' description is markedly different to that of Homer. Marincola shows that Herodotus follows an idea of a set pattern for battle descriptions, akin to a regular pattern of narration found in Homer, but the constituent parts which make up the set pattern in each author differs (p.36). While 'the focus in the *Iliad* may be either on collective deaths reported in high-camera mode, or on individual deaths of named heroes in middle- or low-camera narrative mode',⁶³⁸ Herodotus maintains a distance from the fighting. Instead, it is consequences of the battle which Herodotus finds most crucial to report.⁶³⁹

Analogous to the findings in the conclusions to Chapter 1, the first difference between epic and Herodotus' use of the fighting terms is the reduced frequency of the terms in the *Histories*. Herodotus uses each epic fighting term less than it is found in the Homeric poems: ἀλκή occurs 67 times in Homeric epic, but only 8 times in Herodotean prose; κράτος occurs 42 times in Homeric epic, but only 15 times in Herodotean prose; and βίη occurs 82 times in Homeric epic, but only 10 times in Herodotean prose. The dissimilarity in frequency for each fighting term is great: each term is used much less than half of the Homeric count. This shows, again, a hesitancy by Herodotus to deploy epic vocabulary, but in this case for fighting.

As in epic, the terms do not solely denote strength of body. The terms also encompass superiority and power in the more general sense of political and sociological pre-eminence. It was shown above that the same epic fighting terms which denoted individual battle manoeuvres

⁶³⁸ Fragoulaki (2022) 116. Fragoulaki draws upon the use of cinematic language found in Lendon (2017a).

⁶³⁹ Boedeker (2003).

also substantiated how the aristocracy maintained their social positions. This was made explicit in the use of βίη as Hector addresses Astyanax (*Il.* 6.476-8, see pp.222-3), where Hector wishes for Astyanax to be strong in body to rule over Ilium. Moreover, we saw that βίη was thoroughly *not* the possession of the lower, working class. In a similar vein, Polydamas sees κράτος as the quality which the common people increase for Hector as their ruler (*Il.* 12.211-4, see pp.203-4). For the warrior class society which the (Homeric) epics describe the dual-use of fighting terms makes sense. It would have been precisely by strength of arms that the Bronze-Age aristocracy maintained their position.

In the *Histories*, by contrast, the terms rarely relate to shows of martial ability or strength on the battlefield. The only term to be utilised in this way is ἀλκή, but this is typically to highlight the (heroic) shortcomings of an individual or group, rather than imbue the character with an epic aura (pp.175-8). Instead, the terms in a Herodotean context more often refer to an individual's sociological and political power – even when used on the battle field.

As we saw with the deployment of fame terms in a Herodotean context, Herodotus also uses these terms in a gendered way. Both the Scythian ruling snake-woman and Atossa are attributed κράτος, with Atossa's κράτος even appearing in Herodotean narrator-text (pp.210-1). Tomyris is said to lead a 'warlike (ἄλκιμον) people' (1.201), and I argued that Tomyris herself should be ascribed ἀλκή (pp.183-5). Each radical attribution of an epic fighting term to a female character, however, is less a show of Herodotean proto-feminism than showing the consequences of strong female characters imbued with these characteristics. Tomyris caused the downfall of Cyrus the Great; the Scythian snake-woman readily sleeps with Heracles and establishes the Scythian line; and Atossa's manipulation by Democedes (3.134.1) is, as Herodotus depicts it, the spark which causes the Persian Wars. Each application of the term to a leading female character has major implication on the narrative world or the narrative itself.

It has been noted that ‘wars do not offer very promising material for humorists [sic.], and accordingly, Homer has never been considered a comic writer’.⁶⁴⁰ Herodotus, on the other hand, is quite happy to provide humour within his battle scenes. This extends to Herodotus’ use of Homeric fighting words. While ancient misogynistic sensibilities might have found the above uses of epic fighting terms in relation to women humorous,⁶⁴¹ we have seen other humorous applications of the terms by Herodotus. Sesostrius makes a gendered use of ἄλκιμος erecting pillars for vanquishing strong, manly opponents in his Egyptian campaign, and decorates those pillars erected for weak foes with vaginas (pp.185-6). Similarly, we saw humour in the singular effectual use of the βίη in the *Histories* when it expels Hippias’ tooth just before the crucial, and famous, Battle of Marathon (pp.244-5).

The description of the epic qualities denoted by the epic fighting terms not manifesting or being manifestly absent in the *Histories* contributes to the humour. The Scythians’ lack of ἀλκή as they run from Darius’ forces underscored their a-heroic character and played into the wider humour of the scene (pp.175-7). Herodotus is also keen to emphasise the lack of βίη. Nearly every Herodotean character does not use βίη, but most notably each Persian king chooses action which does not utilise βίη. One way to read this absence from characteristics in Herodotus’ world is as humorous. By pointing out the absence of these qualities in his characters Herodotus can be subtly suggesting that they are firmly *not* epic heroes.

Herodotus does not detail figures within the *Histories* fighting in the same way as epic heroes. Herodotus is more concerned with what happens after the battle than the battle itself, and treats battles scenes in an accordingly brief manner. The epic terms ἀλκή, κράτος, and βίη are used less frequently than they are found in the Homeric poems. And so, linguistically, this

⁶⁴⁰ Clarke (1969) 246.

⁶⁴¹ Laughable in and of itself that a female character could possess such qualities? A smug eye-roll moment that female investiture was bound to go wrong?

is one way in which the presentation of the fighting differs. Homer uses the terms to describe individual battle manoeuvres as well as political hegemony. For Herodotus the terms are nearly always solely political. Where the terms do refer to the cut and thrust of battle, namely with ἀλκή, it is to foreground marital shortcomings. A major difference between the epic and Herodotus' prosaic use of ἀλκή, κράτος, and βίη is to have important female characters be attributed the terms. Herodotus also uses the terms in a humorous way, something not seen with the Homeric application of the terms.⁶⁴² Thus, Herodotus' heroes' fighting is not described in an epic way.

⁶⁴² The Homeric 'playing' with how ἀλκή is used in the staggered retreat of Ajax (p.162-3) is not humorous.

CHAPTER 3: CUNNING INTELLIGENCE

3.1 Introduction - Homeric and Herodotean Trickery

Cunning intelligence is a tricky subject. Donald Lateiner summarises the position of cunning intelligence in the *Histories* and Greek culture more generally:

Herodotus prizes artful deception and quick-thinking acts that promote self-preservation. Particularly when the otherwise defenseless [sic.] individual outwits the powerful autocrat, or the group to be victimized outthinks the armed and threatening aggressor, Herodotus recounts in detail the survival of the (mentally) fittest. The phenomenon represents the Odyssean facet of Homeric Herodotus, indeed, but also such glorification of cleverness, moral and amoral, permeates not only Greek literature but Greek life, so far as we can reconstruct its reality as well as the response to literary representations.⁶⁴³

Greeks contemporary with Herodotus, and Herodotus himself according to Lateiner, allegedly loved trickery.⁶⁴⁴ The ascription of cunning intelligence terms might therefore reasonably be assumed to represent a positive characterisation by Herodotus. We will see that the picture is not this clear and that there was a much more ambivalent stance on trickery. One issue is that ‘deception [...] can [...] involve two different mentalities, as the distinction between acuity and lies is not always clear; especially when two opposing standards of judgment collide’.⁶⁴⁵ One side may view a trick as a brilliant ploy which gained them significant advantage. The

⁶⁴³ Lateiner (1990) 231.

⁶⁴⁴ See also Dorati (1998). Munson (1986) 100.

⁶⁴⁵ Belloni (2006) 289 (‘l’inganno [...] può [...] coinvolgere due diverse mentalità, non riuscendo sempre netta la distinzione fra ‘acutezza e la menzogna; soprattutto quando due opposti metri di giudizio si scontrano’).

individual(s) on other side of the trick, however, may feel cheated as the trick places them at a significant *disadvantage* about which they would be, to put it at its mildest, unamused.

We have seen above that martial prowess is placed in strong opposition to cunning intelligence (p.23 n.79). Odysseus is exceptional for his status as a trickster hero in Homeric epic. On the one level this makes sense. Homeric society is one where ‘might is right’. Those figures who are the strongest (militaristically and bodily) are those who rule.⁶⁴⁶ This is not to say that a trickster is necessarily weak of body; Odysseus ‘likes war as well as any man’,⁶⁴⁷ and does possess both martial abilities and extraordinary physical strength,⁶⁴⁸ but ‘*Metis*, *polymecheia*, *dolos*: by traditional standards these do not easily accord with the heroic ideal’.⁶⁴⁹ The reason for this is simple: ‘the *Iliad*’s heroes generally coped with hostility by hitting it’.⁶⁵⁰

Additionally, ‘The *Odyssey* and the figure of Odysseus had a great influence on the writing of history in antiquity’,⁶⁵¹ and none more so than Herodotus at the inception of historiographical prose.⁶⁵² Baragwanath notes that Herodotus often ‘exposes underlying and often disreputable motives’, in contrast to the glorifying approach of Homer and Simonides, ‘or, to put it differently, [there is] more of the Odysseus about him: of that subverter of the heroic code, who is concerned with *kleos*, though not in the same way as Homer’s other heroes are’.⁶⁵³ The Odyssean parallel makes sense: both Odysseus and Herodotus travel extensively

⁶⁴⁶ I think above all of Hector’s words to the baby Astyanax (*Il.* 6.476-8); on this scene see (pp.222-3).

⁶⁴⁷ Vermeule (1979) 83.

⁶⁴⁸ Odysseus fights well at *Il.* 11.310-488, in particular 419-55. Odysseus’ strength is elsewhere shown: at *Od.* 8.186-93 Odysseus’ superior physical strength is shown in sportsmanship, particularly impressive after treading water for two nights and two days (*Od.* 5.388-9); at *Od.* 9.382-94 Odysseus and his crew force the olive wood stake into Polyphemos’ eye (though this is narrated by Odysseus himself); at *Od.* 21.404-11 Odysseus is the only one strong enough to string his bow.

⁶⁴⁹ Friedrich (1987) 129.

⁶⁵⁰ Heatherington (1976) 231.

⁶⁵¹ Marincola (2007a) 66. Donelli (2022) 211. Tuplin (2022) 298.

⁶⁵² Barker (2009) 144 with further references and bibliography.

⁶⁵³ Baragwanath (2008) 58.

and report their findings in a coherent narrative format.⁶⁵⁴ However, this precedent would also work against Herodotus as he tries to convey the historicity of his account, since Odysseus is, notoriously, a liar.

To reflect the marginal status of the trickster hero in Homeric epic, this chapter is significantly shorter. This section will focus on Homer's and Herodotus' use of 'trickery' (δόλος, which can alternatively mean a single trick) and its plural, δόλοι, which always means acts entailing trickery rather than the abstract talent for trickery.⁶⁵⁵ Both authors use this term a number of times and in important contexts. There is a brief 'coda' looking at 'cunning intelligence' (μητις) since the term appears in the most famous of all Homeric tricks (Odysseus' ruse with Polyphemus) and once in a crucial Herodotean context.

⁶⁵⁴ On the relationship between Odysseus and Herodotus see most recently Tuplin (2022) 298 and 321, with further references and bibliography.

⁶⁵⁵ For this nominal flexibility and capacity to shift between abstract and concrete senses in a certain class of Greek nouns, see Smyth (1920) 270, par. 1000.3.

3.2.1 Homeric δόλος

Homer uses δόλος 43 times over the course of both epics.⁶⁵⁶ Three quarters of Homer's usages of δόλος occur in the *Odyssey*, where Odysseus is the protagonist and embodies this type of heroism. The greater concentration of δόλος in the *Odyssey* represents how 'there is no way in which Odysseus' behaviour throughout the *Odyssey* can be accounted for as heroic on [sic.] terms of the *Iliad*'.⁶⁵⁷ To examine this very different type of heroism it is necessary to look predominantly at the *Odyssey*. Homeric δόλος is polymorphous. The term encompasses 'many varieties of conceit envisioned and enacted'.⁶⁵⁸ To give an exhaustive catalogue of how the slippery term δόλος operates within the text(s) of each author is beyond this chapter's scope. Moreover, 'the etymology of δόλος remains doubtful',⁶⁵⁹ and so clues as to the term's meaning through linguistic genealogy are not an option. Instead, I will outline the Homeric sociology of δόλος to yield a character-focussed study. This will provide a better point of comparison for Herodotus' construction of heroic personae in opposition to the techniques of Homeric epic, since it will be centred on heroes' social standing rather than attempting a definition.

The first, and arguably most significant, use of δόλος in Homeric epic is that it is the defining trait of Odysseus.⁶⁶⁰ By way of introducing himself and the *Cyclopeia*, Odysseus

⁶⁵⁶ *Od.* 1.296, 2.93, 2.106, 2.368, 3.119, 3.122, 3.235, 4.92, 4.437, 4.453, 5.356, 8.276, 8.282, 8.317, 8.494, 9.19, 9.406, 9.408, 9.422, 10.232, 10.258, 10.380, 11.120, 11.439, 12.252, 13.292, 13.293, 19.137, 19.212, 23.321, 24.128, 24.141. *Il.* 3.202, 4.339, 6.187, 7.142, 11.430, 15.14, 18.526, 21.599, 21.604, 23.585, 23.725.

⁶⁵⁷ Finkelberg (1995) 2.

⁶⁵⁸ Williams (2018) 1 n.3.

⁶⁵⁹ Chantraine s.v. δόλος ('l'étymologie de δόλος reste douteuse'), tentatively suggesting, however, a connection with 'bait' (δέλεαρ), with which compare the use of δόλος at *Od.* 12.252, where Odysseus' men cry out at Scylla grabbing some of their fellow seamen and Odysseus (through Homer) compares this scene to a fisherman casting his 'bait' using δόλος.

⁶⁶⁰ δόλος (singular) to describe a singular trick carried out by Odysseus: *Od.* 11.120 is a hypothetical use in Tiresias' character speech to denote the slaughter of the suitors, 19.212 by δόλος Odysseus hides his tear from Penelope on one occasion. At *Il.* 23.725 the singular δόλος refers to Odysseus' talent for trickery as Homer says Odysseus does not forget his δόλος and buckles Ajax's knees during their wrestling bout. Although it is Epeius who manufactured the wooden horse at Troy 'godlike Odysseus led the **trick** (δόλον) to the upper city' (*Od.* 8.494); this is again a one-time trick denoted by the singular form. Characters only ever apply the plural δόλοι to Odysseus to denote his prowess in actions involving

stresses his skill at stratagems denoted by δόλοι: ‘I am Odysseus, son of Laertes, known to all men **for my tricks** (δόλοισιν), and my **fame** (κλέος) reaches the heavens’ (*Od.* 9.19-20). Odysseus self-characterises himself to the Phaeacians and his capacity for δόλοι is the only characteristic which Odysseus thinks to highlight. Odysseus also boasts to have far-reaching κλέος for δόλοι, a point which ‘is confirmed by the fact that it has even reached the isolated Phaeacians’.⁶⁶¹ We have seen that κλέος is the sought-after quality for Homeric heroes and represents the attribute of being spoken about by current (pp.89-90, 94-6 and 98-100) and future generations (p.101). But it is typically ‘bravery and excellence in battle [that] win honor [sic.] and glory’,⁶⁶² not cunning.

As his autobiographical narrative progresses, we see Odysseus’ exceptional cunning repeatedly manifested. Odysseus tells his Phaeacian audience that, after he and his crew had blinded Polyphemus, ‘I wove all **tricks** and **cunning intelligence**’ (πάντας δὲ δόλους καὶ μῆτιν ὕφαινον, *Od.* 9.422), to get the crew and himself out of the cave which was blocked by the enormous rock. The quantitative adjective ‘all’ (plural of πᾶς) as the object of the verb ‘I weave’ (ὑφαίνω) generates a ‘graphic metaphor from weaving’,⁶⁶³ creating the impression of Odysseus, like a weaver, pulling together numerous mental threads to formulate his final plan. Odysseus describes his plot with the two most prominent Homeric words for trickery, the plural of δόλος and μῆτις. The reader has high hopes for this plan. Odysseus’ strategy is to hang on the underside of Polyphemus’ cattle to escape undetected (*Od.* 9.424-66). However, this is hardly heroic; I would agree that,

trickery, *Od.* 3.122, 13.292, 13.293. *Il.* 3.202, 4.339, 11.430. Odysseus himself uses the plural δόλοι ‘tricks’ refers to his acts of trickery when planning escape from Polyphemus’ cave at *Od.* 9.422 and when he introduces himself to the Phaeacians at *Od.* 9.19.

⁶⁶¹ de Jong (2001) 228, citing Demodocus’ divine inspired song (*Od.* 8.499-520) as evidence of the Phaeacians knowing Odysseus.

⁶⁶² Schein (1984) 68.

⁶⁶³ Heubeck and Hoekstra (1989) 35.

a clash between Odysseus' qualities and the typical heroic temperament emerges. Ajax or Achilles would never have been willing to undergo some of Odysseus' experiences [...] including] his ignominious escape from the Cyclops' cave by hanging under a ram's belly.⁶⁶⁴

Odysseus, as the Homeric trickster *par excellence*, is much more flexible than either martial hero with what he is willing to endure in order to prevail or even merely to survive.⁶⁶⁵ This highlights just how disparate the two types of heroism (cunning intelligence and martial excellence) are from each other and thus the divergence between the heroes who embody them.

A number of characters attribute acts of δόλος to Odysseus.⁶⁶⁶ When Agamemnon rebukes Menestheus and Odysseus, Agamemnon addresses Odysseus periphrastically as 'you who surpass in **evil tricks** (κακοῖσι δόλοισι), you of the crafty mind (κερδαλέοφρον), why do you stand away cowering, waiting on others?' (*Il.* 4.339-40). The famous editor of the Homeric corpus Zenodotus suggested replacing 'of the crafty mind' (κερδαλέοφρον) with 'radiant Odysseus' (φαίδιμ' Ὀδυσσεῦ), thus naming Odysseus. However, I would suggest that this would lose something from the periphrastic phraseology. Homer has named Odysseus prior to Agamemnon's speech (*Il.* 4.329), and so the audience knows Agamemnon is speaking to Odysseus.⁶⁶⁷ To have Agamemnon refer to Odysseus periphrastically would demonstrate that Odysseus' reputation with trickery is such that he can be identified amid other Homeric heroes without the need to name him explicitly.

⁶⁶⁴ Stanford (1964) 74. See also Finkelberg (1995) 2. Griffin (1987) 93-8.

⁶⁶⁵ See also Kohen (2014) 37-56, who argues that Odysseus' primary heroic type is the suffering and enduring hero.

⁶⁶⁶ *Od.* 3.122 (Nestor), 13.292 (Athene), 13.293 (Athene). *Il.* 3.202 (Helen), 4.339 (Agamemnon), 11.430 (Socus).

⁶⁶⁷ I would argue further that there would be no need for Odysseus to be named at all. Odysseus' reputation with trickery and cunning would have been sufficient for Homer's audience to infer that Agamemnon is speaking to Odysseus. See also the opening lines of the *Odyssey*, 'Sing for/in me, Muse, of that **man of many ways**' (ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, *Od.* 1.1), where Odysseus is identified purely with the adjective 'of many ways' (πολύτροπος), denoting his versatility and resourcefulness if not explicitly his trickery.

Analogously, Telemachus goes to Nestor to gather the κλέος (*Od.* 3.83) of his father. When Nestor first mentions Odysseus it is to highlight Odysseus' supremacy in acts of δόλος:

‘For nine years we fabricated ruin for them, besetting them
With all kinds of **tricks** (δόλοισι); and scarcely did the son of Kronos bring it to an end.
Then no one ever wanted to be compared in cunning intelligence to him,
Since noble Odysseus **by far greatly excelled** (μάλα πολλὸν ἐνίκα)
in all **acts of trickery** (παντοίοισι δόλοισι)’ (*Od.* 3.118-22).

Nestor begins the conversation about Odysseus by comparing the Achaeans' attempts with trickery to those of Odysseus, who ‘by far greatly excelled’ (μάλα πολλὸν ἐνίκα, *Od.* 3.121). The two adverbial forms ‘by far’ (μάλα) and ‘greatly’ (πολλὸν) underscore not only Odysseus' possession of δόλος, but also his unique status in this regard. It is worth stressing that Telemachus has asked for his father's κλέος, and Nestor's first comment is to draw attention to Odysseus' prowess with δόλοι. When addressing the Phaeacians we can see why Odysseus ‘has every right to start with the proud claim that his δόλοι have made him world famous’;⁶⁶⁸ Nestor immediately casts praise on Odysseus' ploys with tricks when asked to give Odysseus' κλέος. Thus, to talk of δόλος is to talk of Odysseus.

Odysseus is not the only figure whose δόλος results in κλέος. Characters at several points describe Penelope's loom trick and ‘both the suitors and Penelope herself retrospectively identify the project as a ‘trick’ (δόλον, [*Od.*] 2.93 and [*Od.*] 24.128; δόλους, [*Od.*] 19.137)’.⁶⁶⁹

⁶⁶⁸ Heubeck and Hoekstra (1989) 13.

⁶⁶⁹ Lesser (2019) 197. Penelope's δόλος: *Od.* 2.93 (Antinous says Penelope has δόλος in her heart then details the loom trick), 2.106 (Antinous says for three years Penelope kept her δόλος a secret), 19.137 (Penelope herself says that, being pressured to marry, she weaves δόλος), 21.128 (Amphimedon says Penelope contrived a δόλος and describes the loom trick) 24.141 (Amphimedon says for three years she kept her trickery silent).

Antinous says that rather deny marriage Penelope ‘contrived in heart this **trick** (δόλον, *Od.* 2.93 ≈ *Od.* 24.128)’ and then provides further details of her ruse: ‘so **for three years** (τρίετες) she escaped notice **by trickery** (δόλῳ) and misled the Achaeans’ (*Od.* 2.106 = *Od.* 24.141). Penelope’s effectiveness with δόλος is shown by the extended amount of narrated time, ‘three years’ (τρίετες), it delays her remarriage. The lines quoted above are formulaic and they are repeated within the *Odyssey*; thus ‘Penelope’s weaving is [...] represented as a source of *kleos*’,⁶⁷⁰ with each reiteration of the loom trick compounding Penelope’s κλέος in the etymological sense of ‘being spoken about’ (pp.89-90). Further the term κλέος is actually stated by characters as resulting from Penelope’s δόλος with the loom (Antinous at *Od.* 2.125-6 and Agamemnon at 24.196-7). This demonstrates that characters internal to the narrative world see literal κλέος resulting from her loom trick.

It is no coincidence that both Odysseus and Penelope achieve κλέος through their use of δόλος. Odysseus flatters Nausicaa that she might find a husband with whom she can have ‘like-mindedness’ (ὁμοφροσύνη, *Od.* 6.180-2) and scholars have frequently commented upon Penelope and Odysseus’ own ὁμοφροσύνη.⁶⁷¹ One aspect of their ὁμοφροσύνη is that not only do they both implement δόλος and achieve κλέος for it, but they are themselves proud of the accomplishments with δόλος. Odysseus boasts to the Phaeacians of his skills at δόλος as he introduces himself; Penelope, when first speaking to the beggar-Odysseus, explains her situation ‘these men urge me to marriage; and I ply **tricks** (ἐγὼ δὲ δόλους τολυπεύω)’ (*Od.* 19.137). Penelope is apparently willing to talk to an apparent stranger about her δόλος. The couple are ‘alike in mind’ in the sense that both are keen to tell strangers about their prowess with δόλος. Penelope ‘proves that she is Odysseus’ worthy wife when she deceives the suitors

⁶⁷⁰ Lesser (2019) 197 n.24. Clark (2004) 134 notes that there is a formulaic repetition in each of these scenes.

⁶⁷¹ Lesser (2019) 195. Turkeltaub (2015) 280. Bolmarcich (2001). Helleman (1995). Stanford (1964) 57-8, without discussing the term.

by turning her actual weaving of Laertes's shroud into "a wile".⁶⁷² Thus, Odysseus and Penelope's mutual pride in δόλος signifies their compatibility as husband and wife and their 'homophrosyne is not just that of the faithful king and queen but also of the deceitful trickster and the resourceful, independent weaver'.⁶⁷³

Conversely, the suitors' incompetence in detecting or implementing δόλος highlights their unworthiness for Penelope. Eurycleia warns Telemachus 'as soon as (αὐτίκ') you are gone, they will conspire evil for you hereafter, so that by **trickery** (δόλῳ) you will be killed,' (*Od.* 2.367-8). Eurycleia says that the suitors will act as a collective in pursuing δόλος. Eurycleia uses δόλος to denote the underhand behaviour she envisions the suitors taking against Telemachus. Eurycleia perhaps credits the suitors with too much. The temporal adverb 'as soon as' (αὐτίκα) suggests that the suitors will all too quickly try to implement δόλος against Telemachus. In the event, the suitors do not act as Eurycleia describes.

After Antinous suggests that the suitors should ambush Telemachus at sea (*Od.* 4.669-72), and the other suitors approve (*Od.* 4.673), they do not immediately go to the harbour but back to Odysseus' house (*Od.* 4.674). In trying to enact δόλος we see that 'although the suitors are rivals for Penelope's favour, they behave more like a pack than like individuals hoping to distinguish themselves as worthy of her hand'.⁶⁷⁴ When the suitors attempt to see this δόλος through and kill the returning Telemachus (*Od.* 4.842-7), they are unsuccessful and Telemachus, aided by Athene (*Od.* 15.27-42), returns home unscathed. The suitors may share Odysseus' aristocratic status, but wily, trickster heroes they are not. Like the suitors' failure to

⁶⁷² Pantelia (1993) 496. See also Katz (1991) 25: 'It is this *dolos/mētis*, in particular, through which Penelope remains faithful to Odysseus while appearing to do otherwise, that makes up Penelope's *kleos*'.

⁶⁷³ Van Nortwick (2008) 114.

⁶⁷⁴ Slatkin (2005) 319.

string the bow (pp.202-3 and 232-4), their shortcomings in terms of δόλος highlight both their inability to match Odysseus' heroic worth and their aspiration to be Penelope's husband.⁶⁷⁵

Penelope is not the only female character who uses δόλος.⁶⁷⁶ Agamemnon laments his death and casts aspersions on Clytaemnestra's character (*Od.* 11.409-34). Odysseus replies,

‘alas, how most terribly wide-eyed Zeus
detests the line of Atreus through the plans of women
from the beginning; many died for Helen,
and Clytaemnestra made ready a **trick** (δόλον) for you while you were far off’ (*Od.* 11.436-9).

Odysseus not only assigns the entire stratagem to Clytaemnestra but he also uses δόλος pejoratively to describe her actions. Analogous to Eurycleia's ascription of δόλος to the suitors, δόλος can negatively characterise women. Odysseus is not alone in categorising Clytaemnestra's actions as a δόλος: Athene refers to (the unnamed) Clytaemnestra's actions as δόλος (*Od.* 3.235), as does Menelaus in referring to her (also unnamed) at *Od.* 4.92. Therefore, this is not merely one character's perception of Clytaemnestra's actions, but something shared by a number of Homeric figures. Just as each retelling of Penelope's δόλος represents a source of *positive* κλέος (pp.94-9), each retelling of Clytaemnestra's δόλος compounds her *negative*

⁶⁷⁵ The suitors' incapacity to use δόλος might explain why their downfall is prefigured by characters in terms of δόλος: Athene instructs Telemachus, after gathering word of Odysseus, 'then take thought in heart and mind in which manner you will kill the suitors in the great hall, whether by **trickery** (δόλῳ) or openly (ἄμφοδόν)' (*Od.* 1.294-6). Similarly, Tiresias, who by virtue of his status as a prophet with secure knowledge of the future, informs Odysseus that, when he has 'killed the suitors in the great hall **by trickery** (δόλῳ) or openly (ἄμφοδόν) with sharp bronze' (*Od.* 11.119-20), he must venture inland (*Od.* 11.121-34). This characterisation of the suitors' downfall makes sense: it would simultaneously instrumentalise Odysseus' defining character trait and play to the suitors' own weakness.

⁶⁷⁶ Δόλος and women: Clytaemnestra: *Od.* 3.235 (jointly with Aegisthus), 4.92 (jointly with Aegisthus), 11.439. Circe: *Od.* 10.232, 10.258, 10.380, 23.321. Scylla: *Od.* 12.252.

κλέος. The repeated use of δόλος in each instance provides another example of how Clytaemnestra's 'story is developed toward providing a foil for Penelope'.⁶⁷⁷

Clytaemnestra's use of δόλος however, instantiates a male anxiety about female δόλος. Odysseus narrates that Eurylochus does not go into Circe's hut, 'but remained behind, believing there to be **trickery**' (δόλον, *Od.* 10.232). Immediately, upon seeing Circe, Eurylochus suspects trickery from her; this suspicion is confirmed when Circe transforms the men into swine (*Od.* 10.237-43). Circe's δόλος, like Clytaemnestra's at *Od.* 11.439, occurs in Odysseus' character speech. Odysseus, as the character famous for δόλος, is in a good position to judge whether another's actions classify as entailing δόλος or not.⁶⁷⁸ Both Clytaemnestra and Circe's actions, therefore, can firmly be designated acts of δόλος.

Penelope's δόλος therefore operates within a wider stereotype of negative female δόλος. As Murnaghan notes,

the *Odyssey*'s unusually sympathetic portrait of the exemplary wife is placed in a wider context of suspicion towards women from which even she cannot altogether escape. Through the presentation of Penelope as an exception to the general rule, the poem self-consciously depicts the formation and authorization of a tradition of misogyny even as it places the counterexample at the center [sic.] of its story.⁶⁷⁹

In line with Penelope's κλέος running contrary to the wider literary tradition (pp.94-9), Homer needs to emphasise that Penelope's δόλος is a positive one. Each time that Penelope's δόλος is

⁶⁷⁷ Hölscher (1967) 6 (So läuft die Geschichte darauf hinaus, eine Folie abzugeben für Penelope). See also Zeitlin (1995) 139.

⁶⁷⁸ Circe's actions are confirmed to be a δόλος (*Od.* 23.321), when Odysseus tells his adventures to Penelope in indirect speech. As indirect speech it is the Homeric narrator's (and he is a figure outside the Homeric world) who classifies Circe's actions as δόλος, since we are not given a quotation of Odysseus' words, but rather the narrator's description of what Odysseus is saying.

⁶⁷⁹ Murnaghan (1986) 105.

mentioned there is a reference to Odysseus (*Od.* 2.96, 19.136 and 24.131), to remind the reader why she is undertaking δόλος. The downside of this expression of loyalty through δόλος is that it is therefore presented ‘as existing for the sake of Odysseus and as an adjunct to his heroic identity’,⁶⁸⁰ rather than an outright reflection on Penelope’s heroism in an individualised sense. Thus, Penelope’s δόλος runs contrary to the stereotype of negative female δόλος, but at the cost of a trickster hero status in her own right.

The gods also use trickery.⁶⁸¹ Homer narrates that Apollo whisks Agenor away from Achilles’ inbound trajectory and ‘**by trickery** (δόλω) he kept the son of Peleus away from the people’ (*Il.* 21.599); to do so Apollo adopts the form of Agenor and ‘running just a little ahead, **by trickery** (δόλω) Apollo misled him’ (*Il.* 21.604). Apollo’s trick takes two forms here: first the change of appearance, and secondly Apollo changing his pace to goad Achilles into maintaining the chase. Aside from illustrating a god utilising δόλος and ‘preview[ing] the running that is still to come involving Achilles and Hector’,⁶⁸² this scene is interesting as this the only time we see δόλος used for (or indeed by) a figure on the Trojan side of the conflict. Every other Iliadic occurrence of δόλος, (mortal or immortal; male or female) is by an Achaean or a god who has taken the Achaeans’ side.⁶⁸³ Apollo’s use of δόλος on the Trojan side is exceptional but foregrounds that no Trojan, and consequently only Achaean, mortals use δόλος.

Hephaestus is the god who arguably makes the most effective use of δόλος. In Demodocus’ second song, after Helios has informed Hephaestus of Aphrodite and Ares’ affair, Hephaestus sets to work and ‘he forged unbreakable chains which could not be loosened’ (*Od.*

⁶⁸⁰ Graham (1996) 21.

⁶⁸¹ Δόλος and the gods: Hephaestus at *Od.* 8.276, 8.282, 8.317. Apollo at *Il.* 21.599 and 21.604. This catalogue excludes goddesses, who are dealt with below.

⁶⁸² Purves (2011) 527. See also Fenik (1968) 214 on this scene as an anticipatory device.

⁶⁸³ A point made manifest with the Trojan horse (designated by the divine-inspired bard Demodocus a δόλος, *Od.* 8.494), led by Odysseus, the man of trickery himself.

8.274-5). Hephaestus then ‘prepared the **trick** (δόλον) seething at Ares’ (*Od.* 8.276) and ‘then spread the **whole trick** (πάντα δόλον) about the bed’ (*Od.* 8.282).

Demodocus applies δόλος as a substantive (the chains) rather than a mental or physical activity (as with, for example, Penelope’s actions at the loom). Hephaestus later, in direct speech, refers to the chains as a δόλος when he explains that ‘the **trick** (δόλος) and chains shall keep those two restrained’ (*Od.* 8.317) until he gets his gifts of wooing back from Aphrodite’s father. *Odyssey* 8 matches *Odyssey* 9 as the book division with the greatest frequency of δόλος. It has been argued that Hephaestus represents an analogue for Odysseus,⁶⁸⁴ with the Hephaestus-Ares-Aphrodite love triangle mirroring other love triangles on the mortal plane including that of Odysseus-suitors-Penelope.⁶⁸⁵ Although the Hephaestus-Ares-Aphrodite/Odysseus-suitors-Penelope love triangle is not a perfect parallel,⁶⁸⁶ it is instructive for seeing how Hephaestus shares the key trait δόλος with the Homeric hero. Both figures use δόλος in response to an unwanted suitor(s) and implement δόλος to outsmart that stronger the suitor(s) (numerically superior in the case of Odysseus and physical stronger in the case of Ares compared to the disabled Hephaestus).

Goddesses also use δόλος.⁶⁸⁷ After Eidothea retrieves the seal carcasses ‘**she imagined trickery** (δόλον δ’ ἐπεμήδετο) for her father’ (*Od.* 4.437) by laying the seal corpses on top of Menelaus and his men. As Menelaus is narrating, it is Menelaus, rather than the Homeric narrator external to the narrative events, who applies δόλος to Eidothea’s mental activity, denoted by the verb ‘I imagine’ (ἐπιμήδομαι). Menelaus also frames the following encounter with Proteus in terms of δόλος as he says that Proteus counted the seals, ‘nor in spirit did he

⁶⁸⁴ Newton (1987). See also Scally (1978).

⁶⁸⁵ Marg (1957) 14-5.

⁶⁸⁶ There are numerous differences between the two love triangles, for example, with Olson (1989) 141, ‘unlike the chaste Penelope, Aphrodite can be persuaded by gifts to betray her spouse ([*Od.*] 8.296; cf. [*Od.*] 18.275-303)’. Louden (2005) 97 sees Aphrodite as ‘an outrageous parody of Penelopean fidelity’. See further Rankine (2011) 44-5.

⁶⁸⁷ Goddesses and δόλος: Eidothea (*Od.* 4.437). Ino denies using δόλος (*Od.* 5.356), Hera (*Il.* 15.14).

suspect **trickery**’ (δόλον, *Od.* 4.452-3). It has been suggested that ‘Eidothea’s trick resembles Odysseus’ ruse for escape from the Cyclops’ cave’,⁶⁸⁸ since both tricks use animals to achieve their respective ends. However, a crucial difference between the two tricks is that in the *Cyclopeia* ‘neither divine protection nor divine enmity influence[s] the action’,⁶⁸⁹ whereas Menelaus’ deception of Proteus hinges on Eidothea’s help.

Eidothea’s readiness with δόλος may represent a stereotype: Homeric goddesses are credited with δόλος. Ino gives Odysseus a divine shawl to protect him in the storm, but Odysseus’ immediate reaction is, ‘O woe is me, let not one of the immortal gods be weaving **trickery** (δόλον) for me again’ (*Od.* 5.356-7). Odysseus does not trust that Ino means to assist him. It is only when Odysseus’ situation worsens, when Poseidon creates a colossal wave which destroys Odysseus’ raft (*Od.* 5.366-9), that Odysseus trusts Ino’s instructions (*Od.* 5.373-5). Odysseus’ first response to Ino’s words, in direct speech, is that Ino is misleading him and using δόλος. This may be symptomatic of a wider stereotype of goddesses’ use of δόλος in Homeric epic. Eidothea had no reason to plot δόλος, but is ready with advice and a plan to enact δόλος against her father. It is unsurprising that, in this context, Odysseus fears δόλος from Ino.

‘Trickery’ as denoted by δόλος is also found in the heroic generation before Homer’s heroes. When no Achaean volunteers to fight Hector in *Iliad* 7, Nestor recalls how Ereuthalion got his armour. It came from Areithous, ‘who men and fair-belted women called “mace-man”’ (*Il.* 7.138-9), because he fought with a mace and ‘shattered the ranks with his iron mace’ (*Il.* 7.141). Nestor presents Areithous as a formidable opponent. However, Nestor quickly continues, ‘Lycurgus killed him [sc. Areithous] by **trickery** (δόλῳ) and not at all **by power** (κράτει)’ (*Il.* 7.142). Lycurgus chose δόλος when attacking Areithous rather than κράτος.⁶⁹⁰

⁶⁸⁸ Heubeck, West and Hainsworth (1988) 221.

⁶⁸⁹ Clay (1983) 112.

⁶⁹⁰ This draws on the literary motif placing the two types of heroism (brains vs. brawn) in opposition p.23 n.79. Δόλος is also placed in opposition to βίη when the Cyclopes ask Polyphemus why he has

Lycurgus draws upon δόλος and is victorious.⁶⁹¹ This might suggest that Lycurgus views his own κράτος as insufficient compared to Areithous' strength. However, as this narrative illustrates, a hero can be an excellent and intimidating warrior, but still be undone by δόλος.⁶⁹²

'Trickery' (δόλος) features in another inset narrative from the heroic past. While Lycurgus uses δόλος to overcome a formidable opponent, Bellerophon is presented as overcoming δόλος. When detailing his pedigree, Glaucus informs Diomedes that after successfully completing the Lycian king's commands, the king 'wove another shrewd **trick** (δόλον)' (*Il.* 6.187), and set an ambush for Bellerophon. This places Bellerophon at a numerical disadvantage and shows δόλος being used as an underhand tactic by a collective against an individual, something for which Homer creates an ambivalent picture.⁶⁹³ This tactic is unsuccessful as Bellerophon vanquishes all his foes. Nonetheless δόλος still functions as a tool for heroic characterisation. Bellerophon's ability to overcome the ambush, referred to as a δόλος, speaks to his martial talents; δόλος controversially functions as a tool for characterisation: by overcoming the ambush/δόλος Bellerophon demonstrates his militaristic talents.

cried out and if someone 'is killing [him] **by trickery** or force' (κτείνει δόλῳ ἢ βίῃφιν, *Od.* 9.406); to this, Polyphemus replies that no one 'is killing [him] **by trickery** not force' (κτείνει δόλῳ οὐδὲ βίῃφιν, *Od.* 9.408).

⁶⁹¹ I would argue that this logic lies behind Menelaus' rebuke of Antilochus (see also p.222 n.578 for a discussion of the scene in terms of its use of βίῃ) that future generations will say Antilochus overcame him even though Menelaus 'is superior in excellence and force' (κρείσσων ἀρετῇ τε βίῃ τε, *Il.* 23.578) and asks Antilochus to swear that he 'did not willingly trample my [sc. Menelaus'] chariot **by trickery** (δόλῳ)' (*Il.* 23.585).

⁶⁹² This is also seen at *Il.* 23.725 in the wrestling match between Ajax and Odysseus, where Odysseus uses δόλος to outmanoeuvre the hero of brawn, Ajax.

⁶⁹³ We have seen Eurycleia's concern for Telemachus against the suitors' collective plan (*Od.* 2.367-8). Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra's attack on Agamemnon is called a δόλος (*Od.* 3.235 and 4.92). The reader, with no other information other than the numerical disadvantage, naturally feels sympathy for the defenceless and herdsmen unsuspecting of δόλος (*Il.* 18.526) on Achilles' shield. These examples illustrate a collective overpowering a smaller group (or individual) and the tone is negative. However, the δόλος of Eidothea (*Od.* 4.437 and 4.453), implemented by Menelaus acting as a collective with his men, has the more positive justification that it enables Menelaus' *nostos*. Further, the Achaeans are said to have used δόλος collectively by Nestor at *Od.* 3.119 and this collective use of δόλος is even celebrated in song at *Od.* 8.494, with Odysseus leading the horse for all of the Achaeans. There is no clear-cut picture on whether a group use of δόλος is a positive or negative use.

‘Trickery’ (δόλος) is used by a number of Homeric actors. It is Odysseus’ defining trait, something which is recognised by both Odysseus himself and other characters in the Homeric world of both epics. Like Odysseus, Penelope also uses δόλος and gains ‘fame’ (κλέος) for it – perhaps as a mark of the couple’s ‘like-mindedness’ (ὁμοφροσύνη) – but Penelope’s δόλος was shown to function only as a constituent of her fidelity to Odysseus, rather than independent, heroic, action. Meanwhile, the suitors’ incapability with δόλος underscores both their inability to match Odysseus’ heroic status and their unworthiness to marry Penelope. Other Homeric women, namely Clytaemnestra and Circe, use δόλος, but to a decidedly negative effect. ‘Trickery’ (δόλος) was also shown to be used by the gods, with Apollo instantiating the only Trojan use of δόλος: δόλος is fundamentally an Achaean trait. Goddesses also use δόλος. Eidothea is all too happy to connive δόλος against Proteus, so it is little wonder Odysseus fears δόλος from Ino when she was only trying to help him. Lycurgus’ δόλος and Bellerophon’s ability to overcome δόλος demonstrated that δόλος was seen by Homeric characters to have operated in the previous heroic generation. Thus ‘trickery’ (δόλος) is used by a wide array of agents: upper-class men and women as well as gods and goddesses. In terms of δόλος as a reflection on heroic status, the point of fundamental importance is that δόλος, though a problematic term, means the reader should be thinking in terms of Odysseus.

3.2.2 Herodotean δόλος

Herodotus also uses δόλος 17 times,⁶⁹⁴ and in the same broader sense to mean ‘trickery’. This is less than half the 43 times Homer uses the term. This is surprising given that ‘Herodotos’ *Histories* contain many tricksters who are able to think quickly, outwit others, and get what

⁶⁹⁴ 1.69.2, 1.91.1, 1.205.2, 1.214.5, 2.100.2, 3.65.6 (where δόλος occurs twice), 3.65.6, 3.158.1, 4.78.2, 4.146.3, 4.160.4, 4.201.1, 5.37.1, 6.77.1, 8.140α.4, 9.7α.1, 9.90.3.

they want using techniques that are not always honest'.⁶⁹⁵ Twelve of the uses of δόλος occur in the more ethnographic and contextualising first four books of the *Histories* rather than the later battle narrative. Δόλος is therefore noticeably absent from the main conflict of the Persian Wars.

The first use of δόλος occurs relatively early in the *Histories*. Croesus sends a message to the Lacedaemonians after the Delphic oracle instructed him to become allies with the leading Greek state (1.53.3), Croesus says he makes an offer of an alliance 'without **trickery** or **deceit**' (ἄνευ τε δόλου καὶ ἀπάτης, 1.69.2). Croesus also couples δόλος with another term Athene applies to Odysseus, namely 'deceit' (ἀπάτη, *Od.* 13.294). While a term applied to Odysseus, ἀπάτη is a fairly rare term in Homeric epic, which only uses it five times,⁶⁹⁶ and with only one Odyssean attribution (*Od.* 13.294). The tone of the ἀπάτη in Homeric epic is decidedly negative,⁶⁹⁷ and so, to make the offer of an alliance *without* ἀπάτη or δόλος is decidedly a good offer. But is the offer truly without trickery? Herodotus says that the Spartans accepted Croesus' offer 'as **he preferred** (προκρίνας) them over the rest of the Greeks' (1.70.1), so that it appears 'Sparta [...] accepted Croesus' invitation [...] in part because she was flattered by the offer'.⁶⁹⁸ It is of little consequence whether the historical Spartans accepted Croesus' offer because Croesus stroked their egos prior to making the offer: Herodotus' Spartans succumb to flattery. Flattery is a form of trickery as it manipulates, by speaking favourably to them, an individual or group to undertake a course of action which they might not otherwise have carried out. And

⁶⁹⁵ Hollmann (2005) 279.

⁶⁹⁶ *Od.* 13.294. *Il.* 2.114, 4.168, 9.21, 15.31.

⁶⁹⁷ *Il.* 2.114 (Agamemnon addressing the Argives that Zeus thought of a lie (ἀπάτη) when he said they would take Ilium), 4.168 (the deceit (ἀπάτη) of the Trojans attacking Menelaus when under truce), 9.21 (Agamemnon says Zeus has planned a lie (ἀπάτη) when he indicated Agamemnon would take Troy), 15.31 (Zeus reprimanding Hera for her deceit in seducing and lulling him to sleep). This makes the sole application of ἀπάτη to Odysseus (*Od.* 13.294) problematic for the construction of Odysseus as an exemplary figure if a term with a negative tone is applied to him. This does, however, create a more realistic portrait of Odysseus as a hero: a mixture of good and bad qualities.

⁶⁹⁸ Baragwanath (2008) 230.

so, while Croesus claims not to use δόλος, or indeed ἀπάτη, the Lydian king's offer still possesses an undercurrent of deception.

Further, as we saw with Herodotus' use of βίη (pp.238-44), Croesus is emphasising a lack of δόλος (and incidentally ἀπάτη). This is not the only time Herodotus stresses the lack of δόλος. Ahead of the decisive Battle of Plataea, Alexander of Macedon, because of 'his close relationship with the Persian aristocracy and his close relations with Athens',⁶⁹⁹ is selected by Xerxes to make an offer of alliance with the Athenians. This treaty is offered on, and in, the exact same terms as Croesus' offer, as one 'without **trickery** or deceit' (ἄνευ τε δόλου καὶ ἀπάτης, 8.140a.4). The Athenians subsequently relay Alexander's words to the Spartans verbatim, saying that the king's offer is 'without **trickery** or deceit' (ἄνευ τε δόλου καὶ ἀπάτης, 9.7a.1). In the event, we do not see if Xerxes' offer holds any cunning, as he suggests it will not, since the Athenians do not accept his offer.

Both Croesus and Xerxes use language reminiscent of the 'usual formula in Greek interstate treaties',⁷⁰⁰ which features a denunciation of deceit. Despite offering allyship, the proffering actor of the prospective alliance stresses that they will not engage in underhand tactics. Epigraphic evidence provides other phrases, often involving δόλος or a cognate,⁷⁰¹ 'explicitly aimed at binding the parties to respect *fair play*, prohibiting the use of intrigues and deceptions'.⁷⁰² Though potentially demonstrating Herodotus' awareness of the language of interstate treaties, this is less relevant for the Herodotean context. Both Herodotean examples are in direct character speech. Given the time difference between the events narrated and Herodotus' time of composition, Croesus' and Xerxes' words can safely be assigned to

⁶⁹⁹ Badian (1994) 121.

⁷⁰⁰ Asheri (2003) 358 ('formula usuale nei trattati interstatali greci').

⁷⁰¹ The standard treaty formula ἀδόλος καὶ ἀβλαβός

⁷⁰² Gazzano (2005) 13 ('dichiaratamente volte a vincolare le parti al rispetto del *fair play*, vietando il ricorso a intrighi e inganni'). Gazzano (2005) 13 collects other such phrases: πιστὸς καὶ ἄδολος, δικαίως καὶ ἀδόλως, ἀδόλως καὶ ἀβλαβέως, ἀπλῶς καὶ ἀδόλως, ἀδόλως καὶ ἀπροφασίστως.

Herodotus as the author. Further, as a phrase used in formal real-world epigraphic treaties, Herodotus' wording 'does not seem to have enjoyed much success at all. On the contrary, it is attested epigraphically in only two [sic.] inscriptions from the end of the 4th century'.⁷⁰³ Thus, as this evidence comes later than Herodotus' text, it is irrelevant for the current purposes of understanding Herodotus' use of vocabulary for constructing interstate treaties in his narrative world.

Nonetheless, I think it is worth stressing that there is no compulsion for Herodotus to repeat the same phrase each time. Repeated formulaic language is a key component of (Homeric) epic; the bard repeats certain phrases and epithets for metrical convenience and to aid remembrance. Herodotus has no metrical need to repeat the phraseology. The use of formulaic language to point out the absence of δόλος from the *Histories* drives home this very absence, by using language reminiscent of epic, where δόλος often features.

Xerxes' lack of δόλος removes the opportunity to characterise him as an Odyssean figure. This is not necessarily a bad reflection on Xerxes' character; it may actually be said to enhance it. When Herodotus gives the ethnography of the Persian people, he says that 'they believe it to be the most shameful thing to tell a lie' (1.138.1) and that Persian children are taught only three things, 'to ride, to shoot, and to tell the truth' (1.136.2).⁷⁰⁴ Given the Persians' cultural predisposition towards truthfulness and general contempt towards lying and liars Xerxes' lack of δόλος aligns him with his cultural values and thus makes him a hero in sense of embodying those characteristics which his culture values (pp.15-8).

⁷⁰³ Gazzano (2005) 25 ('l'espressione non sembra affatto aver goduto di grande fortuna. Al contrario, è attestata epigraficamente in due sole iscrizioni della fine del IV secolo'). Gazzano does not provide epigraphic references to the fourth-century inscriptions using this phraseology. However, there are three extant: *Iasos* 83 l.39, 47, 51; *Iasos* 95 l.17-8; and *Iasos* 96 l.28.

⁷⁰⁴ See further p.80.

Xerxes' stance towards δόλος is exceptional among the Persian kings. Every other Persian king utilises δόλος. After Cyrus' marriage proposal to Tomyris fails to secure him the land he desires (1.205.1), Herodotus comments that 'not progressing through **trickery** (δόλω)' (1.205.2), Cyrus proceeds militarily and arranges his army opposite the Massagetae army. Herodotus 'by calling Cyrus' wooing a trick [...] colours this act, so that he puts emphasis on Tomyris' understanding'.⁷⁰⁵ Not only does this highlight Tomyris' own shrewdness in that she detects Cyrus' ulterior motives, but it also characterises Cyrus himself as an inept Odyssean hero. Cyrus is not just any Persian king, but the founding father of the Persian monarchy, and so it might naturally be expected that he was the strongest adherent to Persian customs. This is true in Cyrus' youth. When Cyrus mistreats Artembares' son, he does not lie to escape punishment, but says, 'I did those things with justice' (1.115.2) and openly admits to maltreating Artembares' son. Herodotus depicts Cyrus 'as a culture hero who at this early stage of his life embodies a fundamental Persian ideal (at least as understood by Herodotus), even without the benefit of a Persian upbringing'.⁷⁰⁶ In maturity, Cyrus (it should be noted, unsuccessfully) uses δόλος and hides his true intentions from Tomyris.

Cyrus may be forgiven for using δόλος once, but his doomed marriage proposal is not the only trick up his sleeve. At Croesus' bidding (1.207.6-7), Cyrus sets a banquet for a small number of his troops and leaves food and wine to intoxicate and lull the victorious Massagetae to sleep before attacking them and taking Tomyris' son captive (1.211.2-3). Tomyris is furious and later, forcing Cyrus' head into a wineskin full of human blood, addresses the dismembered head with powerful words: 'you have destroyed me, though I live and have beaten you in battle, for you took my son **by trickery** (δόλω)' (1.214.5). Tomyris' application of δόλος is crucial as Cyrus' ruse with the wine is akin to Odysseus' *opus magnum* of trickery in getting Polyphemos

⁷⁰⁵ Hazewindus (2004) 154.

⁷⁰⁶ Chiasson (2012b) 227.

drunk so that he can be blinded.⁷⁰⁷ While there is an element of Homeric interplay, ‘Cyrus [...] fails to imitate Odysseus completely; he does not take his opportunity for retreat, and is killed’.⁷⁰⁸ I would argue further that another crucial difference between Cyrus’ and Odysseus’ δόλοι is that Cyrus’ trick does not advance his end goal. Odysseus’ δόλος is instrumental in evading Polyphemus’ attacks and leads to the crew’s subsequent undetected escape. Cyrus’ δόλος only sees him half way through his predicament. After his trick with Tomyris’ son’s forces, representing a fraction of Tomyris’ fighting force, Cyrus loses not only the battle but his own life. Cyrus’ δόλος, unlike Odysseus’, does not resolve his issue. Cyrus’ abortive attempts at δόλος may be symptomatic of the manner in which lying runs contrary to his own culture.

Cambyes, Cyrus’ son, also envisages the Persian use of δόλος. Realising his thigh wound is fatal, Cambyes charges the Persians not to let the Medes have sovereignty: ‘if **by trickery** (δόλω) they take it, then **by trickery** (δόλω) take it back, and if they achieve this **by strength** (σθένει) then recover it **by strength** (σθένει) and power (καρτερὸν)’ (3.65.6). Cambyes is another Persian king to suggest the Persians use δόλος.⁷⁰⁹ Cambyes implores the Persians in terms which feature the literary motif that places cunning intelligence (denoted here by δόλος) in opposition to strength (denoted here by σθένος (compare: pp.25-6) and καρτερός, the latter being Homer’s preferred term for expressing ideas surrounding κράτος (pp.189-90)). ‘Strength’ (σθένος) is also a term found frequently (42 times) in Homeric epic.⁷¹⁰ ‘Strength’ (σθένος) only occurs twice in the *Histories* in this one sentence. Cambyes entreats the Persians with Homeric vocabulary, as though avenging the Persian monarchy and ousting the imposter

⁷⁰⁷ Dewald and Munson (2022) 472-3.

⁷⁰⁸ Redfield (1985) 112.

⁷⁰⁹ Immerwahr (1966) 170: ‘usurpers use trickery to gain the throne’.

⁷¹⁰ *Od.* 8.136, 18.373, 21.282, 22.237. *Il.* 2.451, 5.139, 5.783, 7.257, 8.32, 8.337, 8.463, 9.237, 9.351, 11.11, 11.827, 12.42, 12.224, 13.193, 13.248, 13.678, 14.151, 15.108, 15.359, 16.542, 17.22, 17.135, 17.212, 17.322, 17.329, 17.499, 17.751, 18.274, 18.420, 18.486, 18.607, 20.36, 20.361, 21.195, 21.304, 21.308, 23.280, 23.827.

Smerdis would be a Homeric feat, but ‘those Persians present were full of disbelief that the Magi had the authority’ (3.66.3). The Persians’ disbelief demonstrates that such Homeric terms are insufficient motivation, perhaps because Cambyses’ instructions contravene the Persian prohibition of lying. While Herodotus has presented Cambyses disregarding other customs, most potently the Egyptians’ reverence of the Apis bull (3.27-9), the reader might have expected, or at least have hoped, that Cambyses, as the Persian king, would uphold his own cultural customs; this is not the case.

Darius also endorses deception and the use of δόλος. In the tale of Zopyrus storming Babylon, Zopyrus gives an extended example of deception against the Babylonians. When preparing for the ruse Herodotus describes in polysyndeton the act of Zopyrus ‘cutting away at his nose **and** (καὶ) ears **and** (καὶ) trimming his hair badly **and** (καὶ) whipping himself’ (3.154.2). The repetition of the conjunction ‘and’ (καὶ) not only shows Zopyrus’ act to be relentless, but also has a cumulative effect which ‘exhibits the extreme of loyalty as well as a most demanding false role’.⁷¹¹ There is a fairly natural comparison to be drawn with *Odyssey* 4.240-64, where Helen describes how Odysseus visited her in Troy after ‘marring himself with cruel blows, and throwing a hateful cloak around his shoulders, akin to a beggar’ (*Od.* 4.244-5). Both figures mutilate themselves to gain access to the enemy city. There is a noticeable difference in tone between Homer and Herodotus. Helen introduces the figure of Odysseus with the positive honorific ‘that mighty man’ (καρτερὸς ἀνὴρ, *Od.* 4.242), and Menelaus reflects positively on Odysseus’ character after Helen’s story (*Od.* 4.264-89). This is in contrast to Herodotus’ lexical choice in his narratorial person when detailing Zopyrus’ self-mutilation; he calls it an ‘outrage’ (λώβη, 3.154.2) and uses the cognate middle-voice verb, ‘I treat

⁷¹¹ Latiner (1990) 232 n.3. See also Asheri (2007b) 524. The emphasis, to be sure, is on doing this act of service *for* Darius: before Zopyrus mutilates himself he ‘goes to ask of Darius if he regarded it as very important to capture Babylon’ (3.154.1).

outrageously/mutilate' (λωβάομαι, 3.154.2), all within quick succession. By 'repeat[ing] a word which is central to that story or section',⁷¹² Herodotus leaves the reader with no illusions as to his view of the heinousness of Zopyrus' actions. Zopyrus adopts an Odyssean role but takes it to the extreme;⁷¹³ and, rather than this being something that Herodotus celebrates, he tinges it with a sense of the macabre.

After Darius expresses his shock at Zopyrus' condition, Zopyrus says, 'if I had told you what I was planning to do, you would have forbidden it' (3.155.4). While it is tempting to suggest that Zopyrus is implying that Darius would forbid the use of trickery as this would contradict Persian custom, it is more likely that Zopyrus is referring to his gruesome self-mutilation. Zopyrus then instructs Darius to launch small attacks for a number of days to convince the Babylonians that Zopyrus knows Darius' plans, before Zopyrus diverts the Babylonians away and lets the Persians into Babylon. When this final assault occurs, Herodotus comments, in his own narratorial voice, 'then Zopyrus revealed all **his trickery**' (τὸν δόλον, 3.158.1). It is Herodotus, and neither Zopyrus nor Darius, who is the one to refer to Zopyrus' actions as a δόλος. We can confidently categorise Zopyrus' actions retrospectively as a δόλος. While it is unclear whether Herodotus is referring specifically to Zopyrus' self-mutilation as a δόλος or to his whole undercover operation is immaterial for our purposes. It is more important that Zopyrus is not only a Persian, but the son of one of the seven conspirators who deposed the imposter Smerdis and restored the Persians to sovereignty (3.153.1). It is worthy stressing also that Herodotus concludes the narrative by saying that Darius lavished praise on Zopyrus for the service he did for him (3.160.1-2) – Darius rewards an extended display of deception.

⁷¹² de Jong (2002a) 259.

⁷¹³ Dorati (1998) 207: 'it will be necessary to have a real figure of deceiver, a new Odysseus, to be able to overcome the Babylonians' ('sarà [...] necessaria una vera figura di ingannatore, un novello Odisseo, per potere avere ragione dei Babilonesi').

Further, as Herodotus reports the story, Darius becomes a minor narrative figure. Herodotus does not present Darius and Zopyrus discussing the plan, only that Zopyrus ‘having given this charge, went to the gates’ (3.156.1). Darius is left to follow Zopyrus’ instructions. I think it likely that ‘Zopyrus, the Persian aristocrat who fled to Athens, may have supplied much of Herodotus’ Persian history (3.160.2),’⁷¹⁴ including this narrative as it features his grandfather and namesake. This provides a fascinating insight into the construction of familial tales of heroism, with family members perhaps exaggerating and expanding upon the stories so that ‘their ancestors played a more prominent or heroic role’.⁷¹⁵

Other leading Persians use trickery. Amasis, the general sent to assist Pheretima in the siege of Barca, wastes nine months besieging Barca, both by trying to tunnel under the walls and violent battles; he ‘learnt that Barca would not be taken by strength, but **by trickery** (δόλω) and he did thus’ (4.201.1). Amasis then dug a trench, put weak planks over it, followed by a sprinkling of dirt, and the Persians swore ‘a deceptive perversion of oath-taking’⁷¹⁶ for peace over the hollow ground: ‘if the earth holds the same, to maintain the oath’ (4.201.2) and thus through ‘the unexpected fulfilment of the wily conditional clause’,⁷¹⁷ the Persians can attack the Barcans without fear of divine retribution. It is not only the Persian kings who lie and cheat and go against their culture by using δόλος, but also their senior military leaders.⁷¹⁸

Persian δόλος is problematic for the construction of the Persian Wars as a new Trojan War or continuation of it. It has been observed that the Classical Greeks ‘compared it [sc. the Persian Wars] with the legendary Trojan War as a war between the Greeks of Europe and the barbarians of Asia’,⁷¹⁹ and, more specifically, ‘in the *Histories* it [sc. The Trojan War] serves

⁷¹⁴ Lateiner (1989) 101.

⁷¹⁵ Munson (2009) 465. Although Zopyrus may not actually have been responsible for capturing Babylon, see Gould (1989) 113.

⁷¹⁶ Baragwanath (2020) 173.

⁷¹⁷ Lateiner (2012) 163.

⁷¹⁸ See Hollmann (2011) 221 on Amasis’ manipulation of signs.

⁷¹⁹ Bridges, Hall, and Rhodes (2007) 8. Priestley (2014) 191.

repeatedly as an analogy for the Persian Wars'.⁷²⁰ In the Persian Wars-Trojan War analogy the Greeks function as the Achaeans and the Persians serve as the Trojans. However, we saw above that the mortal Trojans emphatically do not use δόλος (p.262) and only Apollo, amongst the gods on the Trojan side, used δόλος. Thus, the equation of the Persians with the Trojans does not align in terms of the Persians', and particularly the Persian kings', use of δόλος.

The other side of this parallel is that it was exclusively the Homeric Achaeans who used δόλος and so it should be the Greeks who use δόλος, but this is not overwhelmingly the case in the *Histories*. As the above discussion of Homeric δόλος showed, δόλος is distinctly Achaean. However, in comparison with Homeric epic, it is rare for δόλος to be used in relation to the Greeks (both Eastern and Western Greeks), and it is much more frequently associated with Eastern figures. Of the 17 occurrences of δόλος in the *Histories*, two are used in relation to Western Greeks (4.146.3 and 6.77.1), three in relation to Eastern Greeks (4.160.4, 5.37.1, and the use on Samos at 9.90.3). The remaining twelve examples of δόλος occur in a non-Greek setting. One appears in an Egyptian context (2.100.2), one in a Scythian context (4.78.2), two are in a Lydian context (1.69.2 and 1.91.1), while eight are used by or about Persians (1.205.2, 1.214.5, 3.65.6 (where the term occurs twice), 3.158.1, 4.201.1, 8.140α.4, 9.7α.1). Thus, we see almost a reversal of how we might have expected δόλος to be implemented in the discourse of the *Histories*. The Greeks, if they are meant to represent the δόλος using Achaeans of the Trojan War, hardly use δόλος; it is the Persians and other Eastern figures who have the lion's share of δόλος in the *Histories*.

When δόλος is used in relation to Greek individuals, it is only found in complicated circumstances. For example, Hegesistratus goes to Delos (with Lampon and Athenagoras) and

⁷²⁰ Baragwanath and de Bakker (2012) 46. Said (2012) 97: Herodotus 'employs the story, in a fashion typical of contemporary Greek art and literature, as a means of deepening his audience's understanding of the more contemporary events that are the subject of the *Histories*'.

says that the Persians at Mycale would be easy work for the Lacedaemonians, who should attack them, ‘and, if you suspect we are leading you on **by trickery** (δόλω) then we are ready to be led to your ships as **hostages** (ὄμηροι)’ (9.90.3). Hegesistratus is using δόλος only to point to its absence in their proposed action. While this may itself be a trick, i.e. to lure the Greeks to an easy defeat, the subsequent narrative shows the Greeks overcoming the Persians so that Hegesistratus’ indicated absence of δόλος from the Ionian Greeks is shown to be demonstrably true. Further, it is interesting to note that the term used for ‘hostages’ (ὄμηροι, 9.90.3) looks morphologically similar to the plural form of the proper noun ‘Homer’ (Ὀμηρος). Thus, as Herodotus points to the absence of a famous term in the Homeric vocabulary of heroism, he drives home this absence by using a term which morphologically resembles the bard’s name.

Perhaps one of the more bizarre instances of δόλος is its utilisation by the Spartans. In a narrative already discussed in relation to κῆδος (pp.58-61), the Argives arrive at Tiryns to do battle with the Spartans, ‘but there the Argives did not fear open battle, but being taken **by trickery** (δόλω)’ (6.77.1). I have argued elsewhere that this scene should be viewed as humorous on account of the Argives’ and Spartans’ wasting time and the Argives copying the Spartans’ herald’s commands (pp.60-1). This is how δόλος manifests itself in the scene. When Cleomenes realises that this is what the Argives are doing, he then gives a false signal to his troops to make breakfast, when in reality they should arm for battle, and in the subsequent battle a large number of Argives are killed (6.78.1-2); ‘here the trick consists precisely in manipulating the system of signs’.⁷²¹ The Argives are so preoccupied with being hoodwinked that they follow the Spartans’ commands to avoid being caught out, but in so doing they cast the net for their own snaring. This is unexpected. The Spartans are martial heroes and so it is

⁷²¹ Hollmann (2005) 280.

surprising for Herodotus to present the Argives fearing the use of δόλος by the major military group of the *Histories*.

I would have expected that of all the Greek city-states mentioned in the *Histories* it would be Athens that supplied an individual using δόλος. Herodotus expresses bafflement early in the *Histories* at the success of Peisistratus' plan to deceive the Athenians with Phye, as the Athenians 'are so much greater in **cleverness** (σοφίην) than the rest of Greece' (1.60.3).⁷²² The Athenians' mental talents are not afforded an opportunity to enact δόλος, but the Spartans are. This might be a subtle linguistic tactic for espousing Herodotus' Atheno-centric views in light of the emerging Peloponnesian War concurrent with Herodotus' time of composition: the Athenians do not engage in behaviour denoted by δόλος, but the Spartans do. This is something seen in Thucydides, in particular during Pericles' famous funerary oration, where 'Pericles is presented as constructing ideal oppositions between Spartan training and Athenian 'natural courage' and between Spartans deceit and Athenian openness'.⁷²³ While selected Herodotean Athenians do engage in tricks,⁷²⁴ this is not denoted by δόλος; and so, while we do have Greeks using δόλος, the Herodotean sociology of those Greeks is not as might have been expected.

The structuring of the narrative with the one use of δόλος in a Scythian setting, and the appearance of δόλος within this structure, drives home the lack of Greek δόλος. Anacharsis 'leaves the Scythian space altogether'⁷²⁵ and learns and adopts Greek customs, only to be slain upon his return during a ritual observance of the Cyzicenes' cult of the mother of all gods (4.76). Herodotus continues the theme of 'Greekness' by saying that a similar thing

⁷²² Lateiner (1990) 237 notes the irony: 'the Athenians were then supposed to be supreme in cleverness even among the Hellenes, but they were completely swindled by the tyrant and his impostor'.

⁷²³ Hesk (2000) 28, drawing upon Thuc. 2.39.1.

⁷²⁴ Peisistratus' first trick lacerating himself to win popular support (1.59); Peisistratus' trick with Phye (1.60); Themistocles' ability to profit from the Euboeans bribe (8.4-5); Themistocles' trickery with the written messages to the Ionians (8.22); Themistocles sending Sicinnus to Persians' admirals at Salamis (8.75-6). See further Juchneviciene (2016) on Themistocles' Odyssean traits.

⁷²⁵ Hartog (1988) 65.

(παραπλήσιος, 4.78.1) happened to Scyles, the son of Ariapeithes the king of Scythia, who was taught to speak and read Greek by his mother, who was from Istria (4.78.1). The reader is thus primed and thinking in terms of ‘Greekness’ when Herodotus interjects the story of Scyles to say, ‘Ariapeithes was later killed **by trickery** (δόλῳ) by Spargapeithos, king of the Agathyrsi’ (4.78.2) and Scyles ascends the throne. After this mention of δόλος, Herodotus continues to tell how Scyles ‘much preferred the Hellenic way of life’ (4.78.3) and this subsequently led to Scyles’ downfall (4.78-80). This exemplifies the closeness with which ‘the Scythians defend their customs’ (4.80.5). For our current purposes, the Scythian use of δόλος is sandwiched between the two expressions of Scythians being culturally influenced by Greek cultural practices. The story is couched in ‘Greekness’, but it is Spargapeithos, a Scythian who is not described as being influenced by Greek cultural practices, who uses δόλος. By having the use of δόλος appear in reference to by a character who has nothing to do the narrative of Greek cultural influence, it is as though Herodotus is emphasising that δόλος is not a Greek quality.

Herodotus, like Homer, also depicts women using δόλος.⁷²⁶ Two of the characters in the ‘vengeful queens’ motif use δόλος, which represents it as the weapon of a powerful woman. The first example of female δόλος appears near the beginning of the *Histories* in relation to the programmatic story of Candaules’ wife’s revenge.⁷²⁷ This application of δόλος is made retrospectively after Croesus’ downfall by the Delphic oracle, which says that Croesus suffers because his ancestor Gyges ‘being led **by the trickery** (δόλῳ) of a woman killed his master’

⁷²⁶ Actions by women which are explicitly labelled δόλος: Candaules’ wife at 1.91.1, Nitocris at 2.100.2, the wives of the Minyae at 4.146.3 and Eryxo at 4.160.4.

⁷²⁷ On the Gyges narrative as programmatic see Roberts (2011) 71. Baragwanath (2008) 73. Dewald (1981) 109 suggests, ‘The fact that the whole narrative of the *Histories* is sandwiched between the two accounts [sc. Of Amestris’ and Candaules’ wife’s revenge] gives them a programmatic weight’. Benardete (1969) 11-4 connects Herodotus own activity of looking and that of Gyges. Wolff (1964) looks at the programmatic placement of the ‘Harems-Liebesgeschichte’ at the beginning and end of the *Histories*. The Gyges narrative is the introduction to the Croesus *logos* that many scholars view as programmatic: Baragwanath (2020) 172. Sheehan (2018) 73. Forsdyke (2006) 239 n.31. Bakker (2006) 98. Pelling (2006b) 105. Moles (2002) 36. Raaflaub (2002) 168. Cobet (2002) 411. Blösel (2001) 180.

(1.91.1). These words are given as direct speech coming from the priestess at Delphi, which lends divine authority to the application of δόλος to Candaules' wife's actions. As direct speech from a character many years before the Persian Wars, and Herodotus' own time of composition, we might more accurately say that these words represent the application of δόλος to Candaules' wife's actions by Herodotus himself, rather than representing a faithful transmission of the exact words used by the Delphic priestess (if indeed this embassy and pronouncement from the priestess did ever actually occur). The tone of this use of δόλος is decidedly negative as the priestess, through Herodotus, is explaining the reason why Croesus is suffering at the hands of Cyrus – this aligns with how we saw negative exempla of female δόλος in Homer.

Another 'vengeful queen' uses δόλος. The economically narrated story of Nitocris is contained within only one chapter division; **'they say (ἔλεγον)** she avenged (**τιμωρέουσιν**) her brother, who the Egyptians killed while he was their king, and having killed him gave the kingdom to her, **avenging (τιμωρέουσιν)** this brother by killing many Egyptians **by trickery (δόλῳ)**' (2.100.2). Herodotus repeats the feminine participial form 'avenging' (τιμωρέουσιν, 2.100.2), which underscores Nitocris' gender and demonstrates that she has noble reasons for undertaking her δόλος: she is an avenger. Although Herodotus presents this story as hearsay through the use of the third-person imperfect plural verbal form 'they used to say' (ἔλεγον, 2.100.2), which raises questions of accuracy,⁷²⁸ this is immaterial for the construction of Nitocris' reputation for Odyssean heroism; I would argue that it matters more that there is this narrative attached to her name than whether this truly reflects any kernel of historical truth.

Herodotus, however, undercuts the presentation of Nitocris as an ancient heroine with the narrative's concluding sentence. Nitocris traps those Egyptians 'most blameworthy' (μάλιστα μετὰίτιος, 2.100.3) in a cavern underground and drowns them (2.100.3), and then, the

⁷²⁸ Herodotus cites the names of the Egyptian monarchs coming 'from a book' (ἐκ βύβλου, 2.100.1 i.e. a scroll of papyrus), but the narrative itself is hearsay.

priests continued, saying (ἔλεγον, 2.100.4), ‘she threw herself into a pit of hot ashes, to be **without vengeance** (ὅκως ἀτιμώρητος γένηται)’ (2.100.4). This concluding statement makes the reader view Nitocris’ actions as negative. By saying that Nitocris’ escape from vengeance implies that what she did was wrong. Herodotus poignantly uses the term ‘without vengeance’ (ἀτιμώρητος, 2.100.4), cognate to the verb describing Nitocris’ action (τιμωρέω, 2.100.2), to describe the reason for Nitocris’ suicide. For our current purposes Herodotus’ application of the crucial term δόλος, followed by Nitocris’ suicide to escape vengeance for this δόλος, spins the narrative so that her δόλος is viewed in a negative light. Herodotus could have omitted the mention of Nitocris’ suicide to have the narrative read as a rightful avenging of her brother’s murder, but the inclusion of this last sentence makes the reader read it as though Nitocris *has* done something bad. This might imply a level of latent misogyny or fear of female empowerment on Herodotus’ part, especially as, in much later antiquity, Nitocris ‘appears as one of the old heroines of the country’.⁷²⁹ Thus we see Herodotus structuring the narrative so that a second ‘vengeful queen’ is portrayed negatively as a result of her δόλος.

‘Trickery’ (δόλος) appears in the addendum explaining how the Cyrenean sovereignty passed to the lame Battus. The Cyreneans suffer a defeat at the hands of the Libyans and ‘after this disaster Arcesilaus **being sickly and having drunk medicine** (κάμνοντά τε καὶ φάρμακον πεπωκότα) was strangled by his brother,⁷³⁰ Learchus, and Arcesilaus’ wife **by trickery** (δόλῳ) killed Learchus, and her name was Eryxo’ (4.160.4). The first of the two murders, Arcesilaus’ strangulation, is furnished with narrative details (Arcesilaus is sickly and had drunk medicine), which lend the narrative a sense of realism, but Eryxo’s murder of

⁷²⁹ Newberry (1943) 51, to whom I owe the following references: Dio Cass. 62.6.2. Julian. *Or.* 127B. However, Newberry’s reference from Julian is perhaps misleading, since Julian does not specify whether he is referring to the Egyptian or Babylonian Nitocris, whom Herodotus mentions at 1.185-7.

⁷³⁰ Corcella (2007) 689: ‘th[is] episode is told also by Nicolaus of Damascus, *FGrHist* 90 F 50, while according to Plutarch, *Mor.* 260d–261d, and Polyaeus VIII 41, Learchus (Laarchos) was a friend, not a brother, of Arcesilaus’.

Learchus is summarily treated with the verb ‘I kill’ (κτείνω) and the adverbial noun ‘by trickery’ (δόλῳ). While it is true that Eryxo ‘is given more direct agency in avenging her husband’s death by Herodotus (4.160) than Plutarch (*Mor.* 260E–261D) allows her’,⁷³¹ Herodotus does not provide a full portrait of her character, heroic or otherwise. Eryxo’s narrative demonstrates that ‘*Dolos* is entirely appropriate [...] to gain revenge’.⁷³² Aside from acting to avenge her husband and her use of δόλος, the reader is given no other information about Eryxo from which to draw a character portrait.

Further, Eryxo’s method of δόλος is not provided. Although the lack of specificity gives the reader the opportunity for personal creative imagination, perhaps filled with misogynistic sensibilities in the case of Herodotus’ original audience (and potentially some modern-day readers), Eryxo’s narrative can be quickly skipped over as we read. I would argue one reason for the summary treatment of Eryxo’s vengeance is because she functions as a precursor to another ‘vengeful queen’, Pheretime. Pheretime is a domineering figure in the *Histories* (see further pp.75-6) and to have another strong female character feature shortly before her appearance would lessen the impact of Pheretime’s striking character and revenge plot. Herodotus’ summary treatment of Eryxo’s δόλος, while adding to the impact of Pheretime’s appearance in the narrative, strips Eryxo’s character to the bare basics.

The δόλος of the wives of the Minyae provides an amusing example of Herodotean female δόλος. I have discussed this narrative for its problematic use of τιμή (representing a clash between Homeric and Herodotean narrative world values) and with reference to the male characters (pp.141-4). This narrative also gives prominence to a group of ingenious females. After their husbands ‘were arrogant’ (ἐξύβρισαν, 4.146.1), imprisoned and about to be executed, ‘the wives of the Minyae asked to go into the prison and for each to talk to her own

⁷³¹ Penrose (2016) 177.

⁷³² Lateiner (1990) 232.

husband. The Spartans allowed them, as they suspected there to be no **trickery** (οὐδένα δόλον) from them' (4.146.3). As the narrative unfolds, there *is* trickery. The Minyae escape the Spartans' prison in women's clothing. This is a humorous scene; not only are the Minyae ingloriously dressing up in women's clothing to escape from death at the hands of the Spartans, but the Spartans are implicitly characterised as dim-witted enough not to notice that the 'women' leaving the prison are men dressed as women (p.144). It is the Minyae's wives, however, who come up with the δόλος, not the husbands themselves. Thus, it is the women who are characterised as Odyssean. This is, however, not the keynote of the narrative; the story's focus is less on the reflection of the wives' Odyssean heroism and more on the Minyae's *unheroic* impersonation of women to escape their near-death. Moreover, Herodotus does not name the women. Larson convincingly argues that, for Candaules' wife and Masistes' wife, 'by omitting the names of respectable women [...], Herodotus [...] exculpates these women from direct blame',⁷³³ thus honouring the women by keeping them anonymous. A similar phenomenon may be at play here.⁷³⁴

The remaining example of δόλος in the *Histories* is mentioned summarily. Herodotus says that the Ionians resolved to revolt and capture the generals aboard the ships at Myus (5.36.4), then 'Iatragoras, for this purpose [sc. seizing of the generals] **by trickery** (δόλῳ) apprehended Oliatus of Mylasa son of Ibanollis, and Histiaeus of Termara son of Tymnes, and Coes son of Erxandrus – to whom Darius gave Mytilene – and Aristagoras of Cyme, son of Herclides, and many others' (5.37.1). Akin to Spargapeithos' use of δόλος to kill Ariapeithes, although Herodotus says that the arrest took place 'by trickery' (δόλῳ), 'Herodotus does not say what this 'ruse' consisted of',⁷³⁵ and I would agree that the brevity with which this episode

⁷³³ Larson (2006) 241-2.

⁷³⁴ Compare: Thuc. 2.45.2. Compare Flory (1978) 418, for Flory's 'quiet sort of heroism'.

⁷³⁵ Kienast (2002) 9 ('Worin diese "List" bestand, sagt Herodot nicht').

is narrated should be taken ‘as a sign that Iatragoras had done his job in an efficient manner and without any stir. He must have been an extremely cunning operator; the preservation of his name is scant credit for his merits.’⁷³⁶ Further, Herodotus introduces Iatragoras without patronymic or home city-state, and to say that ‘his Milesian identity surely follows from the preceding narrative’ is speculation.⁷³⁷ We are thus in no position to comment on Iatragoras’ sociological status. Was he an aristocrat? A pauper? Somewhere in between? We will probably never know. The best we can say from the Herodotean evidence is that there was a figure named Iatragoras who assisted in the Ionian revolt and that he was associated with the Odyssean type of heroism. A poor memorandum for such an instrumental figure.

3.2.3 Conclusion

Overall, Herodotean δόλος is different from Homeric δόλος. Some of Herodotus’ characters stress the absence of δόλος from their actions, while we saw both Odysseus and Penelope proudly boast of their actions with δόλος. For Xerxes this was a positive reflection on his character, aligning him more closely with the Persian cultural custom prohibiting lying. All other Persian kings either actively pursued δόλος or endorsed its use by others. Other leading Persians, the general Amasis and the nobleman Zopyrus, implement δόλος. Thus, the equation of Persians with the Trojans in the Trojan War-Persian Wars analogy does not align with the near absence of Trojan δόλος in Homeric epic. Further, a conspicuous near-absence of δόλος from the Greek side of the Persian Wars was noted, as instantiated with Hegesistratus proposing to be held hostage to prove a lack of δόλος. Greeks do use δόλος, but just not the Greeks the

⁷³⁶ Wallinga (1984) 430.

⁷³⁷ Hornblower (2013) 143; Hornblower continues that ‘the name, though exceptionally rare elsewhere [...] is in fact attested at 5th-cent. Miletos’, which still does not categorically make Iatragoras a Milesian.

reader might have naturally assumed used it: the Spartans, Herodotus' martial heroes. The Athenians, Herodotus' intellectual heroes, are never given this opportunity.

The one Scythian use of δόλος underscored the near total absence of Greek δόλος. The women Herodotus presents using δόλος were shown to align more closely with the negative exempla of Homeric women's δόλος. Even when women use δόλος for a more positive reason, like Nitocris and Eryxo, Herodotus shapes the narrative to put a negative spin on it.

The last example of δόλος in the *Histories* examined was shown to be the most ambiguous. Herodotus does not tell us what Iatragoras' δόλος is or anything else about him; we are left in the position, as readers, of guessing these aspects of his personality, something we never have to do for agents of δόλος in Homeric epic. One final point is that Herodotus never depicts either gods or goddesses using δόλος. While drawing on a similar sociology of status to Homer, Herodotus' use of δόλος differs from the use found in Homeric epic.

3.3.1 Coda: Homeric μῆτις

The final word examined in this thesis is ‘cunning intelligence’ (μῆτις). Homer uses μῆτις 37 times. μῆτις occurs more in the *Iliad* (with 22 occurrences) than the *Odyssey* (with 15 occurrences); this is perhaps surprising given the relatively minor Iliadic role of both Odysseus and cunning intelligence as a type of heroism. Homer uses other cognate terms to denote μῆτις: πολύμητις, μητιάω, μητίετα, μητιόεις and μητίομαι. Herodotus uses none of these terms,⁷³⁸ and so they shall not form part of this discussion. Indeed, Herodotus only uses μῆτις once. However, the one Herodotean occurrence of μῆτις is in a pivotal scene, and in a surprising manner, and thus warrants attention. As with δόλος, an attempt to define what constitutes μῆτις is beyond the scope of this chapter;

metis is a thought process which implies a complex but coherent body of mental attitudes, combining flair, wisdom, forethought, subtlety of mind, deception, resourcefulness, vigilance, and opportunism with various skills and experiences acquired over time. *Metis* principally emerges in shifting, disconcerting, and ambiguous situations, where precise calculation and rigorous logic either fail or lack time to operate.⁷³⁹

Instead, this chapter will categorise briefly the sociology of μῆτις. It has been noted that ‘*Mētis* is polymorphic and diverse; it can be applied in the many forms of knowledge which are the particular privilege of the various gods’.⁷⁴⁰ This brief discussion will show that the sociology of Homeric actors who use μῆτις is analogously polymorphic. It is not the purpose of this chapter to give an in-depth and comprehensive analysis of the sociology of μῆτις in

⁷³⁸ The one use of μητιόεις at 2.116.4 is a quotation of *Od.* 4.227-30, where Herodotus is discussing Helen in Egypt and not cunning intelligence.

⁷³⁹ Wheeler (1988) 25.

⁷⁴⁰ Detienne and Vernant (1991) 279.

Homeric epic; I merely wish to highlight the status of the Homeric characters who use *μητις* or have it attributed to them. The reason for the relative brevity is because this is a comparative study between Homeric epic and Herodotus' *Histories*, and, as mentioned, Herodotus only uses *μητις* once. Instead, this chapter will highlight how Homer presents *μητις* as an overtly Odyssean trait and note the wide variety of Homeric characters to whom *μητις* is attributed. The disparate statuses of Homeric characters who use *μητις* will then foreground why the near absence of *μητις* in the *Histories* is so profound.

‘Cunning intelligence’ (*μητις*) is strongly associated with Odysseus.⁷⁴¹ Odysseus tells Polyphemus proudly that he is of Agamemnon’s troop (*Od.* 9.259-66), but ‘when Odysseus [...] realizes that heroic exploits and values are meaningless to the *Kyklops*, he adopts an antithetical and paradoxical identity as *outis*, or “Mr. Nobody”’ (9.364-67).⁷⁴² Polyphemus asks Odysseus for his name, and he replies ‘**Nobody** (*Οὔτις*) is my name; they call me **Nobody**’ (*Οὔτιν*, *Od.* 9.366). Odysseus thus gives a pseudonym to Polyphemus which will prove to be the Cyclops’ downfall. I would agree that

Odysseus’ failure to supply an explanation for identifying himself as *Οὔτις* ‘nobody’, to Polyphemus (9.366–7) must make a first-time audience—and so certainly his internal audience of Phaeacians—wonder about his motivation in so doing, and suspect some significance in the act: for example, that he must be demonstrating foresight.⁷⁴³

⁷⁴¹ *μητις* and Odysseus: *Od.* 2.279, 3.120, 9.414, 9.422, 20.20, 23.125. Odysseus’ *μητις* is paired with that of Athene at *Od.* 13.303 and 13.386. Analogously, Odysseus’ *μητις* is said to be ‘equal to’ (*ἀτάλαντος*) Zeus’ *μητις* in the *Iliad*: see *Il.* 2.169, 2.407, 2.636, 10.137. Interestingly, Odysseus says he cannot think of any *μητις* at *Od.* 10.193.

⁷⁴² Cook (1999) 154.

⁷⁴³ Baragwanath (2008) 39. On Odysseus’ concealment of his identity see Rutherford (1986) 161: ‘he has lived so long with danger and the need for concealment that it has become almost second nature’. de Jong (1994) 37: ‘secrecy, dissimulation, and restraint are innate, not to say incorrigible, traits of Odysseus’ character’.

As the story progresses the reader, and the Phaeacians, see that it was indeed prescient for Odysseus to withhold his name.

The reason for forethought becomes clear after Odysseus attacks and blinds Polyphemus. Polyphemus groans to the Cyclopes who come to assist him, ‘O Friends, No-one (Οὐτίς) is killing me by trickery (δόλῳ) not by force’ (*Od.* 9.408). Odysseus’ earlier misidentification as ‘Nobody’ (Οὐτίς) helps to baffle the Cyclopes outside the cave. The other Cyclopes think that, since Polyphemus is saying that ‘Nobody’ (Οὐτίς) is attacking him, Polyphemus is not in danger and requires no help, when, in fact, Polyphemus appealing for help. Polyphemus, by using Odysseus’ provided name ‘Nobody’ (Οὐτίς), plays into the trick.⁷⁴⁴ The other Cyclopes conclude that Polyphemus is mentally unwell, as he would not otherwise make such a noise ‘if **nobody** (μή τίς) is doing violence to you’ (*Od.* 9.410). The negative morpheme Οὐ- changes to μή- in the conditional and creates a pun on ‘nobody’ (μή τίς) and ‘cunning intelligence’ (μῆτις).

Friedrich argues for a greater symbolic significance to this scene: ‘the *Cyclopeia* focusses on the triumph of Odysseus’ cunning intelligence (*metis*) over the Cyclops’ brute force (*bie*): the *aristeia*, as it were, of Odysseus’.⁷⁴⁵ However, I would argue that the significance of this word-play can be construed as resonating deeper than a mere surface-level pun or a topical symbolic interplay between brains and brawn. Odysseus rejoices at the deception’s success:⁷⁴⁶ ‘my dear heart laughed, as **my name** (ὄνομα [...]) ἐμὸν) and flawless cunning intelligence (μῆτις) deceived’ (*Od.* 9.413-4). Part of Odysseus’ plan involved adopting the new name of ‘nobody’ (μή τίς) or, with a different intonation, ‘cunning intelligence’ (μῆτις). Odysseus

⁷⁴⁴ It is notable that it is ‘by trickery’ (δόλῳ, *Od.* 9.408), which Polyphemus claims as his undoing, i.e. by the very characteristic in which Odysseus claims pre-eminence to his Phaeacian audience (*Od.* 9.19-20).

⁷⁴⁵ Friedrich (1987) 121.

⁷⁴⁶ On the success of Odysseus’ trick see de Jong (2001) 243-4. See also Peradotto (1990) 46-7. Schein (1970) 79-80. Podlecki (1961) 129-31.

becomes, even briefly, the very personification of cunning intelligence or μῆτις. This aligns with recent scholarly developments within Heroism Studies. I showed in the introduction that heroes are viewed as embodiments of characteristics which cultures and societies, or indeed individuals, like Odysseus, value (pp.15-6). Odysseus' pun, while aiding Odysseus in his moment of need within the narrative, also operates at another narrative level by demonstrating the intimate connection between Odysseus and μῆτις.

Aside from Odysseus, there is a staggeringly broad spectrum of Homeric characters who use μῆτις. Both Homeric men and women use μῆτις.⁷⁴⁷ Athene says that she and Telemachus shall find out what μῆτις Nestor has in his heart when they ask after Odysseus in Pylos (*Od.* 3.18). Here, however, the term does not mean 'cunning intelligence', nor is there any hint of deception; Athene stresses that 'he will not tell a lie (ψεῦδος δ' οὐκ ἐρέει)' (*Od.* 3.20). This demonstrates the semantic breadth encompassed by μῆτις: it can mean both deception *and* a true account, depending on the narrative context. Ajax is another male character who talks in terms of μῆτις. Ajax says that they require the best μῆτις to drag Patroclus' body away from the fighting (*Il.* 17.634).⁷⁴⁸ I do not think that Ajax is suggesting they attempt to deceive the Trojans, but instead formulate a plan, denoted by μῆτις, to rescue Patroclus' body. Thus, there is no real hint of trickery at play with this use of μῆτις. And so, while the term can be applied to heroic Odyssean wiliness, μῆτις also has an everyday function, meaning 'ability to strategise'.

⁷⁴⁷ Men using μῆτις (excluding those reference to Odysseus above): Nestor: *Od.* 3.18. *Il.* 7.324, 9.93, 10.19. Laertes: *Od.* 4.739. Suitors: *Od.* 4.678. Hector: *Il.* 7.47 and 11.200. The leading Achaeans: *Il.* 9.423. Ajax: *Il.* 17.634. Menelaus: *Il.* 17.712. Antilochus: *Il.* 23.313. Young men in general: *Il.* 23.590. See also *Il.* 10.226 when Diomedes wants a companion for the night raid as one man alone has less μῆτις. At *Il.* 15.509 Ajax says there is no better μῆτις than to fight the Trojans where they stand, demonstrating that he is at least thinking in terms of μῆτις. Only Penelope, as a Homeric woman, uses μῆτις: *Od.* 19.158 and 19.326.

⁷⁴⁸ A sentiment shared in the same words by Menelaus at *Il.* 17.712.

Ajax's use of *μητις* is interesting for another reason. Ajax is firmly a martial hero and the Achaean second only to Achilles for militaristic prowess.⁷⁴⁹ We have seen above that *μητις* is strongly associated with Odysseus, who is a trickster hero, and we have observed throughout this thesis that cunning intelligence is placed in binary opposition to martial heroism. Here, however, we see the breadth of *μητις* as the martial hero, Ajax, is advocating behaviour which is represented by *μητις*.

We saw that Homeric female *δόλος* is prefigured as negative (pp.96-9), but strikingly it is only Penelope who uses *μητις*. After detailing her loom trick, Penelope says there is greater pressure on her to marry, 'and now I am not able to escape the marriage, nor find **another** [stratagem entailing] **cunning intelligence** (τιν' ἄλλην *μητιν*)' (*Od.* 19.157-8). The adjectival determiner ἄλλος demonstrates that, if Penelope is talking about using *another* *μητις*, Penelope has already used *μητις* in the past. This may refer to her loom trick, which she has just narrated, but Penelope does not qualify this specific trick with this term. In any case, Penelope's use of *μητις* here clearly has deceptive undertones as Penelope is saying that she cannot think of another way to deceive the suitors out of marriage. The other time *μητις* is used in relation to Penelope is when she is talking to the beggar Odysseus. Penelope also asks, 'how shall you learn from me, stranger, if I excel other women with respect to my mind and thoughtful **counsel**?' (*μητιν*, *Od.* 19.325-6). In this second quote, there is no hint of deception, and so to translate *μητις* as 'cunning intelligence' would be clunky and miss the point of Penelope's words; this therefore represents another example of an 'everyday' usage of the term. Penelope, though, is exceptional among Homeric characters as a female figure who has *μητις* applied to her.

⁷⁴⁹ *Il.* 2.768-9 and 17.268-70.

It is worth highlighting that both of these uses of *μητις* occur in Penelope's own character speech and within 200 lines of each other. Both uses are focalised through Penelope's character and therefore represent Penelope's understanding of *μητις* rather than a concrete attribution of *μητις* to her by other characters or text articulated in the Homeric narrator's persona. Penelope is a character within the narrative world as created by the Homeric narrator, however, making Penelope's use of *μητις* originate from the Homeric narrator. I would argue that Penelope speaking in terms of *μητις* might illustrate her subconscious preoccupation with Odysseus. Both times when she uses *μητις* to describe her actions it is in the context of discussing Odysseus. At *Od.* 19.158 Penelope has just detailed her loom trick, which consolidated her marriage to Odysseus; at *Od.* 19.326, it is after the disguised Odysseus has just stated to Penelope that Odysseus will return (*Od.* 19.262-307). In both contexts Penelope is thinking about Odysseus and so her use of *μητις* might be a strategy by the Homeric narrator for showing that Penelope thinks in literally the same term(s) as Odysseus. For my current purposes, it is enough to note that *μητις* is used in relation to Penelope – a Homeric woman.

It was shown that Achaeans have exclusive rights to Iliadic *δόλος* (p.262), but *μητις* is applied to leading Achaean and Trojan figures.⁷⁵⁰ We noted above that Ajax thinks in terms of *μητις* to rescue Patroclus' body from the din of fighting (*Il.* 17.634), but the term is also applied to a leading Trojan. Hector is addressed in direct speech as 'Hector, son of Priam, equal to Zeus in **cunning intelligence**' (Ἑκτορ υἱὲ Πριάμοιο Διὶ **μητιν** ἀτάλαντε, *Il.* 7.47 = *Il.* 11.200). Though both references are in characters' direct addresses to Hector, one of those references (*Il.* 11.200) is by the goddess Iris, thus giving Hector's *μητις* divine warranty. The phrase 'equal

⁷⁵⁰ Hector is the sole Trojan with *μητις* applied to him: *Il.* 7.47 and 11.200. All other uses of *μητις* are applied to Achaeans, with the following exceptions: *Od.* 13.299, which refers to Athene alone (although a goddess on the Achaean side of the Trojan War conflict). *Il.* 7.447 refers to all humankind and so is not exclusively referring to the Achaeans. The uses at *Il.* 23.315, 23.316 and 23.318 referring to the woodsman, helmsman and charioteer respectively, are not clearly defined by ethnicity and speak to the general nature of *μητις* being employed by these professions.

to Zeus in cunning intelligence’ is the same formulaic phrase applied to Odysseus, but ‘for Hektor it is an ornamental compliment, and not especially appropriate in view of his portrayal with increasing emphasis in books 11—18 as overconfident’.⁷⁵¹ Nonetheless, it is notable that Hector is exceptional among the Trojans in terms of the attribution of μῆτις to him. While the Achaeans have the monopoly on Iliadic δόλος, the Achaean-Trojan boundary is blurred when it comes to the application of μῆτις. As the foremost Trojan, Hector’s μῆτις foregrounds that μῆτις is found on both sides of the Iliadic conflict.

Unlike what we saw with βίη (p.230, cf. 231-2), there is also no age restriction placed on μῆτις. The term is applied to the old man Nestor in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*,⁷⁵² but Nestor is not alone as an elderly man with μῆτις. Penelope suggests getting Dolius to find Laertes ‘so that he may weave some [piece of] **cunning intelligence** (μῆτιν)’ (*Od.* 4.739), and make a plea to the common people (*Od.* 4.740-1). While ‘Penelope’s hope may be unrealistic, [...] the idea of consulting Laertes seems sensible enough’,⁷⁵³ and Penelope’s choice to apply μῆτις to Laertes highlights that Nestor is not exceptional among the elderly in having μῆτις.

Antilochus, on the other hand, emphasises his youth in relation to his μῆτις. When Menelaus upbraids him and asks whether it was ‘by trickery’ (δόλω, *Il.* 23.585) that Antilochus hindered his chariot, Antilochus replies, claiming the folly of youth, ‘for I am **by far** (πολλὸν) **younger** (νεώτερός) than you, king Menelaus, and you are the elder and better man. You know the sort of transgressions brought to pass by **a young man** (νέου ἀνδρὸς): his mind is too rash and his **cunning intelligence** (μῆτις) shrewd’ (*Il.* 23.587-90). Antilochus refers to his youth with the comparative ‘younger’ (νεώτερός) and the intensifier ‘by far’ (πολλὸν), emphasising the degree of difference in the two heroes’ ages. The gnomic phrasing of the statement

⁷⁵¹ Hainsworth (1993) 247.

⁷⁵² *Od.* 3.18. *Il.* 7.324, 9.93 and 10.19.

⁷⁵³ West (1989) 117.

concerning the μῆτις of the ‘young man’ (νέου ἀνδρὸς) suggests that the connection between youth and overweening μῆτις is something generally recognised in the Homeric world. Thus, we see that μῆτις is the property of both young and old in Homeric epic.⁷⁵⁴

The plurality of characters who use μῆτις is encapsulated by the use of μῆτις by collectives. The grouping can be as small as a pairing like Athene and Odysseus.⁷⁵⁵ Or the group can be larger like Penelope’s suitors (*Od.* 4.678) or the Achaean leaders who Achilles says should plan a better μῆτις than trying to get him to return to fighting (*Il.* 9.421-6, with μῆτις at 9.423). Perhaps the most telling collective for demonstrating the breadth of agents for μῆτις is Poseidon’s words. Upon seeing the Achaeans building the wall, Poseidon asks, ‘Father Zeus, is there now any **of the mortals** (βροτῶν) on the boundless earth, that will any more declare to the immortals his mind and **plan**?’ (μῆτιν, *Il.* 7.746-7) – Poseidon makes the collective with μῆτις the *whole* of the ‘mortal’ (βροτός) race of men. Although the noun ‘mortal’ (βροτός) is grammatically masculine, the genitive plural ending -ῶν of βροτῶν, which Poseidon uses as he addresses Zeus, is the same in both the masculine, feminine and neuter grammatical cases. Morphologically the term looks to encompass all genders. Thus, μῆτις is not purely a component in the construction of individual personalities but it is also a term which can be applied to a group.

Gods also use μῆτις, though there is only one Homeric god and one Homeric goddess to whom the term is applied. Curiously, though the ancient Greeks conceptualised μῆτις as a goddess,⁷⁵⁶ Mētis as a goddess is neither mentioned nor appears in Homeric epic. The god who

⁷⁵⁴ See also Agamemnon’s words at *Il.* 14.107-8, ‘now I wish there was someone better to utter a **plan** (μῆτις) better than this, **whether a young man or old** (ἢ νέος ἢ παλαιός)’.

⁷⁵⁵ Athene says she came to Ithaca ‘in order that I might weave a **plan** (μῆτιν) with you’ (*Od.* 13.303). Odysseus replies that he nearly died like Agamemnon and instructs Athene to ‘weave a **plan** (μῆτιν ὕφηνον) by which I may pay them back; and stand by my side, and put in me dauntless courage, even as when we destroyed the bright crown of Troy’ (*Od.* 13.386-8), placing a strong emphasis on their joint action. Diomedes asks for a companion on the night raid, saying one man alone has less μῆτις (*Il.* 10.226).

⁷⁵⁶ Hes. *Theog.* 885-900.

is said to have μητις is Zeus. Zeus' μητις is never directly ascribed to him; it appears *en passant* with reference to either Odysseus' or Hector's μητις being 'equal to' (ἀτάλαντος) that of Zeus.⁷⁵⁷ We might find no specific attribution of μητις as Zeus is so intimately connected with μητις that it all but goes without saying that Zeus has μητις. The one goddess to have μητις is Athene.⁷⁵⁸ Given the absence of the Mētis herself from Homeric epic, the two divinities who have μητις make sense, particularly considering the mythological background of Athene's immaculate conception through Zeus' digestion of Mētis.⁷⁵⁹ Zeus and Athene's status as the sole gods who use μητις may be a remnant of this earlier mythological tradition. For our current purposes, Zeus and Athene's μητις demonstrates that it is not exclusively a human quality but also the possession of a god and a goddess.

Perhaps the most striking Homeric words spoken regarding μητις come from Nestor. Nestor instructs Antilochus ahead of the chariot race to use μητις to outperform superior horses as none is better than Antilochus for formulating μητις (*Il.* 23.311-4). Nestor continues with an excursus on the nature of μητις:

'By cunning intelligence (μήτι) a woodsman is better than by might:

By cunning intelligence (μήτι) does a helmsman run straight

A ship on the wine-dark sea that is blown by winds:

By cunning intelligence (μήτι) is charioteer better than charioteer' (*Il.* 23.315-8).

⁷⁵⁷ *Il.* 2.169, 2.407, 2.636, 7.47, 10.137 and 11.200.

⁷⁵⁸ *Od.* 13.299 and *Il.* 10.497, although Zenodotus, Aristophanes and Aristarchus as editors of the Homeric corpus all rejected the line *Il.* 10.497, where the second reference to Athene's μητις occurs, as an interpolation. Athene has μητις jointly with Odysseus at *Od.* 13.303 and 13.386.

⁷⁵⁹ Hes. *Theog.* 885-900. Chrysippus' fragment, which contains the lines 929e-929o, is of uncertain origin, although this passage was believed to have been by Hesiod but may have been inserted from another poem; see West (1966) 401-2.

Nestor shows that μῆτις operates at all levels of the Homeric societal class hierarchy. In Homeric society, it was only the aristocracy who could afford the resources necessary to maintain a chariot,⁷⁶⁰ whereas woodsmen and helmsmen occupy the social level of Homeric manual labourers. All of the other characters in the above discussion of μῆτις on the human plane in Homeric epic were member of the social elite, whereas Nestor demonstrates that, at least from his perspective, all walks of Homeric society have the potential to use μῆτις. Nestor thus presents a remarkably egalitarian approach to this piece of Homer’s heroic vocabulary.

I would argue that the flexible sociology of μῆτις is represented in Odysseus as the man of μῆτις. I showed above that Odysseus fleetingly becomes an embodiment of μῆτις (pp.286-8). This chapter has demonstrated that μῆτις is used by Homeric characters of a variety of sociological statuses. The multifaceted sociology of μῆτις is analogous to the many disguises which Odysseus adopts during the *Odyssey*: a father, a son, a husband, a beggar, an abducted slave, a victorious hero of the Trojan War, and even ‘No-one’. There are also those characters Odysseus creates for his Cretan lies (*Od.* 13.256-86, 14.192-359, 19.165-202), his invention to Antinous that he comes from Egypt (*Od.* 17.419-444), and his lie to Eumaeus that he is an excellent day-labourer (*Od.* 15.307-24). Odysseus, like μῆτις, can be found in a number of societal roles.⁷⁶¹ Further, we can see a parallel with how Homer begins the *Odyssey*, the story of Odysseus, with the invocation ‘Sing in me, muse, of the **man** (ἄνδρα) **of many ways** (πολύτροπον)’ (*Od.* 1.1). ‘Of many ways’ (πολύτροπος) provides translators a moment of interpretative translation and has been cast variously.⁷⁶² One way this ambiguous term can be

⁷⁶⁰ Raaflaub (2011) 21.

⁷⁶¹ Rankine (2011) demonstrates how close Odysseus comes, or claims to come, at several points to becoming a slave.

⁷⁶² Most recently, see Wilson (2018) 105: ‘a **complicated** man’. See further Verity (2016) 3: ‘man **of many turns**’. Lattimore (1965) 27: ‘of the man **of many ways**’. Rieu (1946) 3: ‘that **resourceful** man’. Shewring (1980) 1: ‘Goddess of song, teach me the story of a hero. This was the man of wide-ranging spirit [...]’ appears to split ἄνδρα [...] πολύτροπον between two sentences. Turner (2024) 7 suggests Wilson’s ‘complicated’ fits perfectly as Odysseus ‘is fundamentally a complicated character and as

interpreted is in light of the varying roles which Odysseus fulfils within the *Odyssey*. Odysseus ‘often seems willing to act in ways we might consider less than heroic in order to survive’,⁷⁶³ and part of that willingness is demonstrated through the frequency with which he adopts or claims to be other personae.

The demographic Homer presents as utilising *μητις* is therefore remarkably broad. Crucially, the attribution and demonstration of *μητις* represent a method to show the wiliness of Odysseus the protagonist of the *Odyssey* and the main proponent of the trickster hero in Homeric epic. Homer, however, uses *μητις* much more broadly to encompass a wide range of characters. Homer’s sociology of *μητις* includes mortal men, a mortal woman, Achaeans, the leading Trojan Hector, the elderly, the young, collectives (of varying size), the god Zeus, and the goddess Athene. The breadth of Homeric *μητις* was best illustrated by Nestor’s democratisation of *μητις* in his speech to Antilochus where we see both manual labourers and upper-class charioteers using the same approach to their tasks: *μητις*. Homeric *μητις* is thus a broad church.

3.3.2 Herodotean *μητις*

Herodotus, however, only uses *μητις* once (7.141.3). This, for me, was the most shocking absence from the Herodotean word palette of heroism. Homeric *μητις* was wide-ranging in cast of character and this sentiment could have easily found a home in the *Histories*. We have seen Herodotus apply Homer’s heroic terminology to a wider sociological spectrum than Homer in a variety of ways throughout this thesis. At 4.165.1 Herodotus applies *γέρας* to Pheretima, a woman, and elsewhere applies the term to societal responsibilities more generally (7.134.1 and

such can be reworked, reshaped, and reinterpreted time and again, while in some way still seeming true to form’.

⁷⁶³ Kohen (2014) 56.

1.114.2 for messengers; 3.142.4 for priests and 2.168.1 for Egyptian priests and warriors) rather than solely using γέρας to denote aristocratic or heroic male worth. At 7.220.4 we saw κλέος applied to a group of Spartiates rather than denoting individualistic fame. At 2.65.3 and 3.34.1 Herodotus applied τιμή to the much humbler occupations of cattle herders and cup-bearers respectively. We also saw Herodotus invest more than one woman with κράτος (4.9.4 and 7.3.4) and we saw glimmers that κράτος can be shared by a plurality rather than solitary individuals (3.81.1 and 3.117.1). Even with βίη, Achilles' defining character trait, Herodotus applies the term to the plurality of the Cnidians not being able to use βίη on the Tarentines at 3.138.3. Homer uses μῆτις in much the same way as Herodotus uses the other examples of Homer's heroic vocabulary examined in this thesis. In Homeric epic, μῆτις is already a term used by individuals and groups of varying societal status; μῆτις would therefore have been prime (epic) terminology for Herodotus to use to imbue characters with an epic tone. The near absence of μῆτις from the *Histories*, particularly with its broad epic sociology, is therefore contrary to what may have been expected considering how the term is used already in Homeric epic

It has been noted throughout this thesis that Herodotus uses nearly all of the epic terms examined much less frequently than the terms are found in Homeric epic. This is one way in which the Herodotean use of μῆτις is emblematic of the treatment of the epic vocabulary heroism: by its sheer absence μῆτις conforms to the regular pattern of epic terms appearing less frequently in the *Histories*.

Further, Herodotus' sole use of μῆτις provides other divergences from its use in epic. It occurs in the second oracle delivered to the Athenians in 7.141. After receiving the wholly unfavourable oracle of 7.140, instructing the Athenians to flee rather than to fight, the Athenians supplicate the oracle asking for a more favourable response. It is perhaps overstating the case to claim that these two oracles 'are in fact the most important documents of Greek

history surviving from such an early period',⁷⁶⁴ but they do provide a fascinating insight into the use of the epic term with which we are currently concerned. The oracle begins,

Not (οὐ) able is Pallas Athene to placate Olympian Zeus,
begging with many words and shrewd **cunning intelligence** (μήτιδι πυκνῇ) (7.141.3).

There are a number of aspects to this quotation which warrant attention. The first is that it is a direct oracular quotation. For my purposes it does not matter whether this is a faithful transmission of the oracle's exact words as delivered to the Athenians or not. Herodotus attributes these words to the Delphic oracle. Presenting the oracle as a direct quotation in hexameter verses places the occurrence of μήτις outside Herodotus' own prose text. This is particularly comparable to the phenomenon we saw with Mandrocles' κῦδος (p.55) due to the generic shift. We also saw that κλέος was never applied in the Herodotean narrator's voice (p.114). Thus, for being placed outside of narrator-text, how μήτις appears within the *Histories* (i.e. outside of narrator text) this is another reason that the Herodotean use of μήτις is emblematic for the argument of this thesis.

Due to the shift to verse text, we might therefore expect the use of μήτις in verse text to match onto epic usage. And in one sense we do see Homeric resonances. The oracle features Athene and Zeus—the only two gods to have μήτις directly applied to them in Homeric epic. Herodotus' oracle, however, frustrates this picture. Herodotus depicts Athene failing with μήτις, the very quality in which the Homeric Athene bragged to Odysseus she was pre-eminent among the gods (*Od.* 13.299). The first word of this oracle is the negative particle 'not' (οὐ), which immediately sets the tone for readers as they discover Athene's inability to exercise μήτις. This one Herodotean example of μήτις only highlights the absence of this quality from

⁷⁶⁴ Robertson (1987) 1.

the Herodotean world, or, at the very least, emphasises that *μητις* does not *work* in the *Histories*. The Homeric Athene may well have been pre-eminent among the gods for *μητις*, but the Herodotean Athene is not so adept. In whichever way we interpret the Herodotean Athene's attempt with *μητις*, as either absent or ineffectual, we see echoes of how other epic terms were exercised with incompetency in the *Histories* such as *βίη* (pp.242-4) or *ἀλκή* (pp.177-8).

Athene's failure with *μητις* has important narratological implications. Athene is unable to use *μητις* to provide help to the Athenians and so Herodotus presents them as being in a more vulnerable position than Homeric heroes, who frequently receive divine aid. While the lack of help from Athene does not preclude the opportunity for help from other deities, it does place the Athenians at the disadvantage of being without their patron goddess. This heightens the Athenians' perilous position as they are about to enter the crucial battles of the Persians Wars and the beginning of the full-scale military proceedings. For a second-time reader, and Herodotus' original audience, who knew the course of the war, this lack of divine support enhances the characterisation of the Greeks (particularly the Athenians) as they are presented as succeeding even without divine assistance.

Furthermore, this oracle provides the basis for possibly the most crucial use of intellect within the *Histories*. It is here that we find the famous reference to the 'wooden walls' (τεῖχος [...] ξύλινον, 7.141.3 l.6) which will provide aid to the Athenians during Xerxes' invasion. Famous too is the individual who provides the solution to this riddling oracle: Themistocles (7.143.1-3). Themistocles gives a linguistic analysis of the oracle (7.143.2) and convinces the Athenians of the importance of their navy. Themistocles has been described as 'the man of

mētis’,⁷⁶⁵ due to his ability to seize the opportune moment,⁷⁶⁶ but this is not strictly true.⁷⁶⁷ As shown above, there is only one example of μῆτις in the *Histories*, and rather than applying the one use of μῆτις to the vital solving of the ‘wooden wall’ riddle, Herodotus uses it to highlight its absence from the Herodotean narrative world. Thus, it is not strictly correct to talk of Themistocles as ‘the man of *mētis*’; neither he nor any other Herodotean trickster has the term applied to him or his actions.

3.3.3 Conclusion

Even with one of the most significant pieces of Homeric vocabulary for heroism, Herodotus does not follow Homer’s precedent. The term is all but absent from the discourse of the *Histories* and the one use of μῆτις highlights its ineffectual nature. In many ways the one use of μῆτις in the Herodotean narrative is emblematic for the arguments of this thesis. We have seen Herodotus attenuate the sociology of status for characters who possess or utilise Homeric heroic vocabulary and otherwise broaden how the individual terms are used. With μῆτις Homer provides fertile ground for Herodotus to use the term freely, and in the manner we have seen Herodotus use other examples of Homer’s vocabulary of heroism, but Herodotus does not. Homer’s vocabulary of heroism is often unHomeric in Herodotus’ hands.

⁷⁶⁵ Baragwanath (2008) 291 and 316-7.

⁷⁶⁶ Baragwanath (2008) 291 discusses the Herodotean ‘digression back to when another of Themistocles’ opinions ‘was the best at an important moment’ (ἐξ καιρὸν ἠρίστευσσε, 7.144.1)’. See also Detienne and Vernant (1991) 16, on the importance of καιρός for figures of μῆτις. Baragwanath (2008) 291 n.5 notes that this quality is highlighted in Thucydides’ obituary of Themistocles (1.138.3).

⁷⁶⁷ For Themistocles’ Odyssean traits see Pelling (2022) 51. Juchneviciene (2016). Blösel (2001) 185-6.

3.4 Chapter Conclusions – Cunning Intelligence

This chapter has examined two key pieces of vocabulary for cunning intelligence in Homeric poetry and compared its epic use with Herodotus' *Histories*. Trickery occurs in both epic and the *Histories*. Akin to the other epic terminology discussed, Herodotus' use of the epic terminology of trickery has been found to differ from its epic use.

Analogous to the findings in the conclusions to Chapter 1 and Chapter 2, the first difference between epic and Herodotus' use of the vocabulary of trickery is the greatly reduced frequency of the terms in the *Histories*. Herodotus uses each of the epic terms for trickery less than it is found in the Homeric poems: δόλος occurs 43 times in Homeric epic, but only 17 times in Herodotean prose; and μῆτις occurs 37 times in Homeric epic, but only one time in Herodotean prose. The disparity in frequency for each cunning intelligence term is significant: δόλος is used less than half of the Homeric count, while μῆτις makes only one token appearance. This plays into the wider hesitancy we have seen for the application of Homeric/epic vocabulary in the discourse of the *Histories*.

As a result, key examples of trickery in the *Histories* go without an attribution of the epic vocabulary of cunning intelligence. Crafty use of intellect is something seen right from the beginning of the *Histories*. Just after the narrative of Candaules' wife, which is afford an epic cunning intelligence term, Herodotus details Thrasybulus' deceptive feast in the impoverished city of Miletus (1.21-2), but an epic cunning intelligence term is absent. For me a personal favourite narrative of trickery in the *Histories* is the Egyptian thief (2.121). The Egyptian thief (2.121) is the son of the builder who designed the Egyptian king's treasury. This narrative therefore provides fertile ground for Herodotus to extend the sociology in receipt of epic vocabulary – something we have seen throughout this thesis. However, Herodotus does not apply the terms in this narrative. Further, and crucially, Herodotus records Themistocles'

deceptive carving into the rocks near the drinking water at Artemisium (8.22), either to induce the Ionians to change sides or raise Xerxes' suspicions and remove the Ionians from the battle. However, neither Themistocles nor the Egyptian thief nor Thrasybulus are granted 'epic status' by Herodotus through the application of an epic term for trickery.

However, as with the above examples, trickery *does* occur in the *Histories*. It also occurs in many pivotal scenes and with key characters (Themistocles being a case in point). However, Herodotus avoids the vocabulary used by (Homeric) epic for the description of such acts of trickery. To stick with only Themistocles for a moment, it could be that Herodotus does not attribute the epic vocabulary of trickery to Themistocles as it would undercut his presentation as a historical individual. However, this is hardly tenable. Herodotus' contemporary audience knew the name of Themistocles. Indeed, Themistocles, far from blurring into obscurity after the Persian Wars, became a famous defector to the Persians (Thuc. 1.135-8). It might be precisely due to Themistocles' later actions that Herodotus does not apply the terms to him – why, after all, heroicise someone who later becomes a turncoat?

The above is not satisfactory. Further, it does not satisfy the question of why the epic vocabulary of trickery is absent from other notable and, arguably, deserving of epic acclamation examples of trickery in the *Histories*. I began this chapter by noting that Odysseus and the *Odyssey* created issues for Herodotus as a narrator for convincing his audience of the *Histories*' accuracy. The absence of the epic vocabulary of cunning intelligence may contribute to Herodotus' methodology for creating a veracious tone. Not only does the near-absence of the terms minimise the linguistic cues to remind the audience of the famous liar Odysseus, but it also makes the examples of trickery in the *Histories* more believable. By not attributing the epic terms of cunning intelligence to his examples of trickery, Herodotus avoids epic

connotations. Thus, Herodotus' narratives of trickery are not laden with epic fictionality and thus appear to be more realistic.

Relatedly, Herodotus is keen to emphasise when epic trickery does not occur in his narrative. No where is this more patently demonstrated than in the singular use of *μητις* by the oracle at 7.141. Here the use only highlighted that *μητις* was not present, or at least did not work, in the Herodotean world. Similarly, other Herodotean characters were keen to emphasise that there was no *δόλος* in their actions. Both Croesus and Xerxes propose treaties without *δόλος* (pp.267-9). Hegesistratus takes this one step further, and, to instantiate the lack of *δόλος* in his words, offers himself as a hostage for subsequent punishment if his words are found to be deceitful (pp.275-6). Thus, not only are the epic terms for trickery absent from the discourse of the *Histories*, but characters within the narrative world are also found expressing a lack of (Homeric) style trickery in their actions.

Homer's sociology for the language of trickery was, in many ways, broad. A wide variety of societal figures were described as using, or were viewed by characters as having the potential to use, Homeric/epic *δόλος* and *μητις*. Homer presents both men and women using trickery. More crucially, Homer presents both men and women using acts of trickery *favourably*. The most famous example of favourable female trickery is Penelope's, but this was shown to make clear Penelope's (narrative) role is as a dutiful wife and partner of Odysseus rather than celebrate her craftiness. Moreover, Penelope's beneficial use of trickery runs contrary to the typically negative characterisation of female trickery in (Homeric) epic and so it is exceptional.

By contrast, Herodotus' exempla of female *δόλος* (since no Herodotean character uses *μητις*) were either prefigured as entirely negative or were obscured from the narrative limelight. The *δόλος* of Candaules' wife and the Egyptian Nitocris were both negatively portrayed by

Herodotus, even though the latter serves her brother as a male counterpart. In the narrative of the Minyae the role of the wives of the Minyae was minimised so that the narrative's take-home message was not their craftiness, but instead their husbands' cross-dressing. And so, while the *Histories*, like Homeric epic, has female characters using trickery, it is either in a negative capacity or in a narrative role which is afforded minimal narratorial attention.

The negative description of female trickery can also be seen to play into the 'realism' of Herodotus' narrative. It is on account of her craftiness with the loom that Penelope maintains her marriage to Odysseus and this is why her use of cunning intelligence is described positively. Homer romanticises Penelope and creates a sketch for the ideal of female fidelity. This is idealistic, not realistic. It is therefore entirely appropriate for a fictional epic. Other examples of female trickery in Homeric epic subscribe to a negative characterisation: female cunning intelligence is overwhelmingly a negative phenomenon. Herodotus' crafty female characters are characterised negatively or, where they are acting positively for their male counterparts, they occupy subsidiary narrative roles. By presenting female craftiness negatively, Herodotus not only plays into the male anxiety regarding female intelligence, but this portrait adheres to expected stereotypes. By conforming to a negative stereotype this enhances the narrative's believability. Negative female trickery therefore contributes to the overall credibility of Herodotus' narrative.

Homeric epic demonstrates just how intimately trickery is associated with the idea of being 'Achaean', and relatedly in a Herodotean context, 'Greekness'. There is no extended display of Trojan trickery in Homeric epic. Only Apollo, a god and not a mortal, on the Trojan side of the conflict utilises δόλος in the chase scene of *Iliad* 22 (p.262). Indeed, *Iliad* 10, the *Doloneia*, features the sole use of Trojan trickery (by a character called Dolon, no less) and it

is considered spurious.⁷⁶⁸ This demonstrates just how firmly trickery is to be considered an Achaean virtue in the Trojan War.

However, this was shown not to translate onto the Herodotean conflict. As discussed, (p.274-8), Homer's Achaeans would naturally be equated with the Greeks of the Greco-Persian/Achaean-Trojan paradigm. Herodotus' Persians, the 'new' Trojans in this equation, use δόλος. In particular, each Persian king aside from Xerxes was depicted as either actively encouraging the use of trickery or, as a minimum, not dissuading its use – even though lying goes against their cultural customs (1.136.2 and 1.138.1). Meanwhile the Greeks, the 'new' Achaeans, rarely have the epic vocabulary for trickery applied to them. When the terms are applied to Greeks, it was shown that this further complicates the picture of Greek political identity and the Greek city-states' expected type of heroism. The Spartans (more firmly martial heroes) were the ones to have δόλος applied to their actions, but Herodotus does not apply either of the epic terms for cunning intelligence to the Athenians (more strictly intellectual heroes).

Again, this complication adds to the realism of the *Histories*. The *Iliad* presents a clear-cut divide in the use of trickery, particularly with δόλος, between the Achaean and Trojan camps. However, real-life, that is to say the basis for historiographical narrative, is hardly ever so precise. Even the Persian kings' hypocrisy against lying and therefore trickery plays to the messiness of the narrative world and therefore contributes to its realism. The Persian kings are presented as *real* individuals, with their own flaws, and not perfect ideal specimens of their culture.

⁷⁶⁸ Fowler (2004) 221, citing the following two scholars as proponents for the *Doloneia* as an interpolation: Danek (1988). Hainsworth (1993) 151-5. Buchan (2004) 118-32 uses the *Doloneia* episode with no sensitivity to its potentially counterfeit authorship. My own view aligns with Hornblower (1994a) 9 that the *Doloneia* is 'a 'Homeric' book if not actually by Homer'.

Herodotean trickery is not, on the whole, given epic status by application of the epic terminology to denote trickery. This is not necessarily a bad thing for the construction of a realistic and credible narrative. Both δόλος and μῆτις are used significantly less in the discourse of the *Histories* than the terms are found in Homeric epic. Though trickery does occur within Herodotean prose, key examples of it are not afforded epic categorisation. Where the terms are found in the discourse of the *Histories* it was shown that often characters are keen to stress that they are not utilising these epic terms. More sociologically, both Homer and Herodotus depict women using trickery. However, Herodotus' female δόλος was either removed from the limelight or the narrative presented them in a negative manner – even when this trickery served male characters. This, though disappointing for a feminist stance, adheres to a concurrent stereotype and adds to the overall believability of the text. Finally, the unexpected use of δόλος with the Persians and the Spartan Greeks was shown to contribute to the messiness of the Herodotean world. Herodotus, unlike Homer, does not have clear-cut boundaries between how cunning intelligence terms are applied to either side of the conflict, and Herodotus even complicates heroic archetypes of martial and cunning intelligence heroism. And so, while trickery does occur within the *Histories*, Herodotean trickery is not epic.

CONCLUSIONS

This thesis has shown that Herodotus does not use the epic vocabulary of heroism in the same way as it is found in Homeric epic. Herodotus has a reputation for being Homeric, but this does not translate to the vocabulary choices for presenting heroic individuals. While often using the Homeric vocabulary of heroism with a similar underlying meaning as Homeric epic, Herodotus reveals some marked differences. Often when Herodotus attributes Homeric terminology to a prominent narrative character it does not aggrandise them, but highlights their shortcomings. Herodotus regularly shows that just because a character has a piece(s) of Homer's terminology of heroism applied to them, this does not necessarily make them Homeric, or even heroic. We also saw that Herodotus has broadened the sociology of status associated with the terms in Homeric epic to incorporate a larger range of societal figures and roles. Further, this study has shown there were moments when Herodotus attributed vocabulary unattested in Homeric poetry to characters to denote heroism, as though Herodotus were experimenting with a new, distinctly non-Homeric, vocabulary of heroism.

In the Introduction, I demonstrated some of the issues surrounding the topic of heroism. One of those issues was the reductive idealisation of heroic figures. Herodotus does not blindly place individuals onto gilded, marble (Homeric) pedestals. His portrait of heroism is more nuanced. It has been shown that Herodotus provides great subtlety in ascribing character motivations; often 'Herodotus' exposing of human motives [...] [has] the effect of rupturing the narrative's heroic tone'.⁷⁶⁹ The same is regularly true for his selective deployment of the epic vocabulary of heroism.

⁷⁶⁹ Baragwanath (2008) 14-5.

Most notably, the sheer deficiency of this terminology in the *Histories* suggests that Herodotus was not primarily concerned with casting Homeric/epic heroes. Quantitatively, almost all of the Homeric terms are used significantly less than half the times in the *Histories* than in Homeric epic. The crucial difference is that the most important terms for Homeric heroism find minimal usage: κλέος (Herodotus' 4 to Homer's 63), βίη (Herodotus' 10 to Homer's 82) and μητις (Herodotus' 1 to Homer's 37). Were Herodotus to be imitating Homer in the presentation of heroic individuals, I would have expected not only a far greater deployment of the terms denoting Homeric heroism, but particularly of those most significant terms. The difference is not just quantitative, but frequently qualitative.

Chapter 1 analysed the vocabulary of fame and status. The common theme across this chapter was that Herodotus applies the terms κῦδος, γέρας, κλέος and τιμή to characters of wider sociological status than was found in Homeric epic. Herodotus allowed κῦδος to result from Mandrocles the architect's accomplishment, rather than κῦδος being sought in battle or bestowed by a god. Herodotus also broadens the sociological implications of γέρας to encompass a range of societal roles outside of aristocratic ruling male elite to whom the term applies in Homeric epic. Herodotus uses the term of messengers (1.114.2 and 7.134.1), priests (3.142.4, and at 2.168.1 in conjunction with Egyptian warriors), and notably attributes γέρας to Pheretima, a woman (4.165.1). Analogously, we saw that κλέος (7.220.4), was applied to the collective Spartans present at Thermopylae rather than denoting individual fame as it does in Homeric epic. Homer uses τιμή to denote the quality of being a god or a king and it denoted the authority and esteem of a king. While it was shown that Herodotus has clearly adopted these uses, Herodotus also applies τιμή to the everyday roles of cattle herders (2.65.3) and cup-bearers (3.34.1).

Chapter 2 examined the terms denoting fighting. The keynote of this chapter was that the Homeric terms ἀλκή and βίη were often used to demonstrate characters' unheroic and un-

Homeric natures, while κράτος was applied to a broader sociology. Herodotean ἀλκή, while highlighting resilient Persian heroism at Mycale (9.102.3), underscored the Scythians' unheroic character as it was totally absent from the Scythians as they fled outright from the Persians (4.125.5) and did not adopt Homeric ἀλκή as a 'spirit of defence'. Homer describes κράτος as kings' exclusive and permanent prerogative, a sense which Herodotus inherits in the case of the Persian king (1.129.3, 3.69.2, 7.3.2 and 7.187.2). However, Herodotus also describes the contingent power of tyrants as κράτος (6.35.1, 6.73.2 and Maendrius inherits Polycrates' κράτος 3.142.1), the commanding position of a fighting force (7.96.2, 8.2.2 and 9.42.1), and even the power of two royal women (the Scythian snake-woman 4.9.4 and Atossa 7.3.4), although this last use probably contains undercurrents of misogyny. Homeric βίη was the defining heroic characteristic of Achilles, but Herodotus' typical move is to point out characters' lack of βίη (1.89.3, 3.19.3, 3.127.2, 3.138.3 and 9.108.1). Further, in Herodotus' contemporary culture βίη had undergone a semantic shift to include a legal term for sexual assault. Herodotus thus had a choice: either to use βίη exclusively for heroic force or to have βίη denote rape in line with contemporary usage. He chose the latter, unheroic, option (9.76.2 and 9.108.1, though this last denotes *not* raping).

Chapter 3 explored the language of trickery. It showed that Herodotus' sociology for δόλος was extensive, as in Homeric epic, but Herodotean δόλος reflected poorly on characters and the use of μῆτις contrasted with the Homeric precedent. Homeric δόλος was used by a broad demographic, including women, but crucially not the Trojans. In the *Histories*, selected characters emphasised that they were not using δόλος (1.69.2, 8.140α.4 and 9.7α.1) while all Persian kings, other than Xerxes, either actively pursued δόλος or endorsed its practice (Cyrus: 1.205.2 and 1.214.5; Cambyses: 3.65.6; and Darius: 3.158.1) along with other Persians (4.201.1), which hypocritically contravened their cultural custom prohibiting lies (1.138.1). The Persians are equated with the Trojans in the Persian Wars-Trojan Wars analogy, but no

mortal Trojan uses δόλος: Herodotus extends the use of δόλος to both sides of the conflict he narrates. Herodotus presents women using δόλος, but either characterises them negatively, even when δόλος is used for an arguably positive reason (2.100.2 and 4.160.4), or minimises the women's role in the narrative (4.146.3). With μῆτις, Herodotus had a heroic term which was used by the broadest possible array of characters in Homeric epic. However, the one occurrence of μῆτις in the *Histories* was to highlight the conspicuous absence of μῆτις from the Herodotean world. No trickster or any other Herodotean character uses μῆτις.

I showed, in the Introduction, that, in line with scholarship, heroic personae are typically constructed by adopting preexisting precedents. Homeric epic was the largest, and arguably most important source of inspiration available for Herodotus in the creation of the heroic. It should have therefore followed that Herodotus uses the Homeric vocabulary available to him to sculpt his own brand of heroism. This was seen not to be the case. Homer creates an exclusionary ideology of heroism. Homer's heroes are aristocratic men. It has been demonstrated throughout this thesis that Homer's vocabulary of heroism is applied strictly to this sociological group. Where the terms are applied to a female character, it is either for a negative purpose, or, as with Penelope's heroism, as an accessory to the heroic worth of a male, namely Odysseus in Penelope's case. This is not Herodotus' style. Herodotus makes the 'descent from the lofty realm of heroic myth to the more ordinary realities of mortal life';⁷⁷⁰ part of Herodotus' strategy in doing so involves using the Homeric vocabulary of heroism for a broader purpose, to a wider sociological range of statuses and for more everyday eventualities.

I also outlined in the Introduction the recent development of the academic discipline of Heroism Studies. In particular, the discipline has shown great interest in 'everyday heroics'. I

⁷⁷⁰ Romm (1998) 13.

conclude by suggesting that Herodotus' *Histories* show something similar. Herodotus ends his Proem:

I shall go forward with my account, going through in detail small and great cities of men. For many that were great long ago have become small: and those which are great in my time, were once small (1.5.3-4).

Herodotus' treatment of cities maps onto Herodotus' handling of human characters. Herodotus mentions the Great Persian king, prominent Greek political figures, and leading individuals from all of the various races within the world he describes. But Herodotus also gives important narrative roles to eunuchs, priestesses, and fishermen – groups afforded little attention in Homeric epic except when priestesses are high-class. Analogously, Herodotus has taken the Homeric vocabulary of heroism and applied it to more everyday, ordinary content. I would argue that in doing so Herodotus encourages us to see the heroic in everyday life—whether that is a soldier fighting bravery against overwhelming numbers (like Achilles); or the shrewd outsmarting of an aggressive foe (like Odysseus); or even the diligent performance of quotidian occupations necessary for society to function: be it messenger (1.114.2 and 7.134.1), priest (3.142.4), cattle herder (2.65.3) or even cup-bearer (3.34.1). This has implications for not just an ancient audience, but a modern one as well; and this, I would argue further, is part of the enduring charm of the *Histories*: they encourage the modern reader to see the heroic in the everyday, too.

To date, there has not been a full-scale examination of Herodotus' use of Homer's vocabulary of heroism. Given the recent emphasis on Herodotean intertextuality with Homeric epic and the intrinsic interest of studying heroic figures, this is surprising. I hope my study fills a small part of that gap in scholarship. The study of heroism should not spark a reaction where,

Suspensions may immediately be raised as to the essential mental maturity of someone who chooses so grand or grandiloquent a subject at any time, and *a fortiori* in our bland and gentle age of reputed equality, fraternity, and pacificocentrism [sic.].⁷⁷¹

To examine heroes is to put one's finger on the pulse of the society that brought them into being and raises profound sociological issues. While it is true that 'both heroes and the concept of heroism will be debated as long as ancient history and classical literature are studied',⁷⁷² this does not make the study of heroes and heroism a redundant task. Even this comparative study of the use of selected terms for heroism in two ancient authors has necessarily touched upon some broader questions of imperialism, class, and gender.

⁷⁷¹ Miller (2000) vii.

⁷⁷² Langerwerf and Ryan (2010) 24.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aceti, C. (2008) 'Sarpedone Fra Mito E Poesia', in: *Eroi Nell'Iliade: Personaggi e Strutture Narrative*, ed. Pagani, L. Rome, Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, 1-269.
- Adkins, A.W.H. (1960a) *Merit and Responsibility: A Study in Values*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Adkins, A.W.H. (1960b) 'Honour and Punishment in the Homeric Poems', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, No. 7, 23-32.
- Adkins, A.W.H. (1969) 'Εὔχομαι, Εὐχολή, and Εὐχος in Homer', *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 19, No. 1, 20-33.
- Agnolon, A. (2020, reprinted 2022) 'Cosmopolitanism and Contingency in Herodotus: Myth and Tragedy in the Book IV of the *Histories*', in: *Ethnicity and Identity in Herodotus*, eds. Figueira, T. & Soares, C. New York & London, Routledge, 159-77.
- Agri, D. (2010) 'Madness, *Pietas* and Suicide in Statius' *Thebaid* and Silius' *Punica*', in: *Zero to Hero, Hero to Zero: In Search of the Classical Hero*, eds. Langerwerf, L. & Ryan, C. Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Press, 141-60.
- Ahl, F. and Roisman, H.M. (1996) *The Odyssey Reformed*, Ithaca & London, Cornell University Press.
- Ahmed, L. (1992) *Women and Gender in Islam: Historical Roots of a Modern Debate*, New Haven & London, Yale University Press.
- Allan, R. (2018) 'Herodotus and Thucydides: Distance and Immersion', in: *Textual Strategies in Ancient War Narrative: Thermopylae, Cannae and Beyond*, eds. Van Gils, L., de Jong, I.J.F. & Kroon, C. Leiden, Boston, Brill, 131-54.
- Allan, R. (2022) 'Metaleptic Apostrophe in Homer: Emotion and Immersion', in: *Emotions and Narrative in Ancient Literature and Beyond: Studies in Honour of Irene de Jong*, eds. de Bakker, M.P., van den Berg, B. & Klooster, J., Leiden, Boston, Brill, 78-93.
- Allen, G. (2000) *Intertextuality*, London, Routledge.
- Allen, T.W. (ed.) (1917) *Homeri Opera: Vol. III² (Od. 1-12)*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Allen, T.W. (ed.) (1917) *Homeri Opera: Vol. IV² (Od. 13-24)*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Allison, S.T. & Goethals, G.R. (2011) *Heroes: What They Do & Why We Need Them*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

- Allison, S.T. & Goethals, G.R. (2017) 'The Hero's Transformation', in: *Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership*, eds. Allison, S.T., Goethals, G.R. & Kramer, R.M. New York & London, Routledge, 379-400.
- Allison, S.T., Goethals, G.R. & Kramer, R.M. (2017) 'Introduction: Setting the Scene: The Rise and Coalescence of Heroism Science', in: *Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership* eds. Allison, S.T., Goethals, G.R. & Kramer, R.M. New York & London, Routledge, 1-16.
- Allison, S.T., Goethals, G.R. & Kramer, R.M. (eds.) (2017) *Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership*, New York & London, Routledge.
- Almagor, E. (2016) 'Reinventing the Barbarian: Classical Ethnography Perceptions in *Asterix*', in: *Son of Classics and Comics*, eds. Kovacs, G. & Marshall, C.W. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 113-29.
- Aloni, A. (2001) 'The Proem of Simonides' Plataea Elegy and the Circumstances of its Performance', in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 86-105.
- Alonso-Nunez, J.M. (2003) 'Herodotus' Conception of Historical Space and the Beginning of Universal History', in: *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, eds. Derow, P. & Parker, R. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 145-52.
- Alston, R., Hall, E. & Proffitt, L. (eds.) (2011) *Reading Ancient Slavery*, New York, Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.
- Amantini, L.S. (ed.) (2005) *Dalle parole ai fatti: relazioni interstatali e comunicazione politica nel mondo antico*, Rome, L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- Apte, M.L. (1985) *Humor and Laughter: An Anthropological Approach*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Arft, J. (2022) *Arete and the Odyssey's Poetics of Imagination: The Queen and Her Question*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Arieti, J.A. (1995) *Discourses on the First Book of Herodotus*, London, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.
- Armayer, O.K. (1978) 'Herodotus' Catalogues of the Persian Empire in the Light of the Monuments and the Greek Literary Tradition', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 108, 1-9.
- Arnaudo, M. (2010) *The Myth of the Superhero*, Trans. J. Richards, Baltimore, the John Hopkins University Press.

- Arrington, N.A. (2010) 'Between Victory and Defeat: Framing the Fallen Warrior in Fifth-Century Athenian Art', PhD Thesis, University of California, Berkeley.
- Arthur, M.B. (1983) 'The Dream of a World without Women: Poetics and the Circles of Order in the "Theogony" Prooemium', *Arethusa*, Vol. 16, No. 1/2, 97-116.
- Ash, R., Mossman, J. & Titchener, F.B. (eds.) (2015) *Fame and Infamy: Essays for Christopher Pelling on Characterisation in Greek and Roman Biography and Historiography*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Asheri, D. (2003) *Erodoto Le Storie, Volume VIII, Libro VIII La Vittoria di Temistocle: a cura di David Asheri, Commento aggiornato da Pietro Vannicelli, Testo critico di Aldo Corcella, Traduzione di Augusto Fraschetti*, Milano, Fondazione Lorenzo Valla.
- Asheri, D. (2007a) 'Book I' in: *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*, eds. Murray, O. & Moreno, A. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 57-218.
- Asheri, D. (2007b) 'Book III' in: *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*, eds. Murray, O. & Moreno, A. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 379-527.
- Asquith, H. (2005) 'From Genealogy to Catalogue: The Hellenistic Adaptation of the Hesiodic Catalogue Form', in: *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, ed. Hunter R. L. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 266-86.
- Avery, H.C. (1979) 'A Poetic Word in Herodotus', *Hermes*, Vol. 107, 1-9.
- Badian, E. (1994) 'Herodotus on Alexander I of Macedon: A Study in Some Subtle Silences', in: *Greek Historiography*, ed. Hornblower, S. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 107-130.
- Badnall, T. (2010) 'Monty Python and the Lemnian Women: Argonautic Resonances in the Medieval and Modern Quest Tradition', in: *Zero to Hero, Hero to Zero: In Search of the Classical Hero*, eds. Langerwerf, L. & Ryan, C. Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Press, 183-205.
- Baker, C. (2019) 'Unsung Heroism? Show Business and Social Action in Britain's Military Wives Choir', in: *Heroism and Global Politics*, eds. Kitchen, V. & Mathers, J.G. New York & London, Routledge, 122-46.
- Bakker, E.J. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'The Making of History: Herodotus' *Histories Apodexis*', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 3-32.
- Bakker, E.J. (2006, reprinted 2013) 'The Syntax of *historie*: How Herodotus Writes' in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 92-102.

- Bakker, E.J. (2013) *The Meaning of Meat and The Structure of the Odyssey*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. (eds.) (2002, reprinted 2012) *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill.
- Bal, M. (1983) 'Sexuality, Semiosis and Binarism: A Narratological Comment on Bergren and Arthur', *Arethusa*, Vol. 16, No. 1/2, 117-35.
- Balcer, J.M. (1989) 'The Persian Wars against Greece: A Reassessment', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Vol. 38, 127-43.
- Baldick, C. (1996) *Criticism and Literary Theory 1890 to the Present*, London, Longman Group Limited.
- Balkin, I. (1987) *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, Leiden, New York, København, Köln, Brill.
- Baragwanath, E. & de Bakker, M. (2012) 'Introduction: Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus' *Histories*' in: *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, eds. Baragwanath, E. & de Bakker, M. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1-56.
- Baragwanath, E. & de Bakker, M. (eds.) (2012) *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Baragwanath, E. & Foster, E. (2017) 'Introduction: Clio and Thalia', *Histos*, Suppl. 6, 1-30.
- Baragwanath, E. (2008, reprinted 2012) *Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Baragwanath, E. (2012) 'Returning to Troy: Herodotus and the Mythic Discourse of his own Time' in: *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, eds. Baragwanath, E. & de Bakker, M. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 287-312.
- Baragwanath, E. (2015) 'Characterization in Herodotus', in: *Fame and Infamy: Essays for Christopher Pelling on Characterisation in Greek and Roman Biography and Historiography*, eds. Ash, R., Mossman, J. & Titchener, F.B. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 17-35.
- Baragwanath, E. (2020) 'History, Ethnography, and Aetiology in Herodotus' *Libyan Logos*', *Histos*, Suppl. 11, 155-88.
- Barchiesi, A. (2001) 'Simonides and Horace on the Death of Achilles', in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 255-60.

- Barker, E.T.E. & Christensen, J.P. (2011) 'On not remembering Tydeus: Diomedes and the contest for Thebes', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, Vol. 66, No. 1, 9-44.
- Barker, E.T.E. & Christensen, J.P. (2014) 'Even Herakles had to die: Homeric 'heroism', mortality and the epic tradition', *Trends in Classics*, Vol. 6, No. 2, 249-77.
- Barker, E.T.E. & Christensen, J.P. (2016) 'Odysseus's Nostos and the Odyssey's Nostoi: Rivalry within the Epic Cycle', *Philologia Antiqua*, Vol. 7, 85-110.
- Barker, E.T.E. & Christensen, J.P. (2020) *Homer's Thebes: Epic Rivalries and the Appropriation of Mythical Pasts*, Cambridge (Mass.) and London, Harvard University Press.
- Barker, E.T.E. (2004) 'Achilles' last stand: Institutionalising dissent in Homer's Iliad', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 92-120.
- Barker, E.T.E. (2006) 'Paging the Oracle: Interpretation, Identity and Performance in Herodotus' "History"', *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 53, No. 1, 1-28.
- Barker, E.T.E. (2009) *Entering the Agon: Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography and Tragedy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Barker, E.T.E. (2011) 'The Iliad's Big Swoon: A Case of Innovation within the Epic Tradition', *Trends in Classics*, Vol. 3 No. 1, 1-17.
- Barker, E.T.E. (2021) 'On Space, Place, and Form in Herodotus' Histories', *Histos*, Vol. 15, 88-130.
- Barker, E.T.E. (2022) 'Die Another Day: Sarpedon, Aristodemos, and Homeric Intertextuality in Herodotus', *Histos*, Suppl. 14, 161-210.
- Barker, E.T.E. (2024) 'The Hero in Homer', in: *Encyclopedia of Heroism Studies*, eds. Scott, A., Beggan, J. & Goethals, G. Cham, Springer, 1-7.
- Barnouw, J. (2004) *Odysseus, Hero of Practical Intelligence: Deliberations and Signs in Homer's Odyssey*, Lanham, University Press of America.
- Bassett, S.E. (1920) 'ὅσπερον πρότερον Ὀμηρικός (Cicero, Att. 1, 16, 1)', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 31, 39-62.
- Bassi, K. (2003) 'The Semantics of Manliness in Ancient Greece', in: *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, eds. Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 25-58.
- Beck (1991) 'Dogs, Dwellings, and Masters: Ensemble and Symbol in the Odyssey', *Hermes*, Vol. 119, 158-67.

- Beck, D. (2005) *Homeric Conversation*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- Beck, D. (2018) 'Emotional and Thematic Meanings in a Repeating Homeric Motif', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 138, 150-72.
- Beidelman, T.O. (1989) 'Agonistic Exchange: Homeric Reciprocity and the Heritage of Simmel and Mauss', *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 4, No. 3, 227-59.
- Belloni, L. (2006) 'Un Inganno Regale: (Erodoto, III 65, 6): « nomos » e « pathos » nella figura di Cambise', *La Parola del Passato*, Vol. 61, 279-93.
- Benardete, S. (1969, reprinted 2009) *Herodotean Inquiries*, Phoenix, St Augustine's Press.
- Benardete, S. (2005) *Achilles and Hektor: The Homeric Hero*, Indiana, St Augustine's Press.
- Bencsik, A. (1994) *Schelmentum und Macht: Studien zum Typus σοφός ἀνὴρ bei Herodot*, Bonn.
- Bennet, J. (1997) 'Homer and the Bronze Age', in: *A New Companion to Homer*, eds. Morris, I. & Powell, B. Leiden, Brill, 511-34.
- Benveniste, É. (1969a) *Le Vocabulaire des Institutions Indo-Européennes 1: Économie, Parenté, Société, Sommaires, Tableau et Index Établis Par Jean Lallot*, Paris, Les Editions de Minuit
- Benveniste, É. (1969b) *Le Vocabulaire des Institutions Indo-Européennes 2: Pouvoir, droit, religion, Sommaires, Tableau et Index Établis Par Jean Lallot*, Paris, Les Editions de Minuit.
- Bergren, A.L.T. (1983) 'Language and the Female in Early Greek Thought', *Arethusa*, Vol. 16, No. 1/2, 69-95.
- Bickerman, E.J. (1952) 'Origines Gentium', *Classical Philology*, Vol. 47, No. 2, 65-8.
- Bierl A., Schmitt, A. & Willi, A. (eds.) (2004) *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung*, Leipzig, B.G. Teubner.
- Biffi, N. (1997) 'Le storie diverse della cortigiana Rhodopis', *Giornale Italiano di Filologia*, Vol. 49, No. 1, 51-60.
- Blok, J. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'Women in Herodotus' *Histories*', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 225-42.
- Blösel, W. (2001) 'The Herodotean Picture of Themistocles: A Mirror of Fifth-century Athens' in: *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, ed. Luraghi, N. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 179-97.

- Blösel, W. (2012) 'Thucydides on Themistocles: A Herodotean Narrator?', in: *Thucydides and Herodotus*, eds. Foster, E. & Lateiner, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 215-40.
- Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. (2001) 'Introduction', in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 3-6.
- Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. (eds.) (2001) *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Boedeker, D. (1987a) 'Preface', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 5-8.
- Boedeker, D. (1987b) 'The Two Faces of Demaratus', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 185-201.
- Boedeker, D. (1988) 'Protesilaos and the End of Herodotus' "Histories"', *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 30-48.
- Boedeker, D. (1996) 'Heroic Historiography: Simonides and Herodotus on Plataea', *Arethusa*, Vol. 29, No. 2, 223-42.
- Boedeker, D. (2001a) 'Heroic Historiography: Simonides and Herodotus on Plataea', in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 120-34.
- Boedeker, D. (2001b) 'Paths to Heroization at Plataea', in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 148-63.
- Boedeker, D. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'Epic Heritage and Mythical Patterns in Herodotus', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 97-116.
- Boedeker, D. (2003) 'Pedestrian Fatalities: the Prosaics of Death in Herodotus', in: *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, eds. Derow, P. & Parker, R. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 17-36.
- Boedeker, D. (2007) 'The View from Eleusis: Demeter in the Persian Wars', in: *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars*, eds. Bridges, E., Hall, E. & Rhodes, P.J. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 65-82.
- Bolmarcich, S. (2001) 'ΟΜΟΦΡΟΣΥΝΗ in the Odyssey', *Classical Philology*, Vol. 96, No. 3, 205-13.
- Bonifazi, A. (2018) 'Embedded Focalization and Free Indirect Speech in Homer as Viewpoint Blending', in: *Homer in Performance: Rhapsodes, Narrators and*

- Characters*, eds. Ready, J.L. & Tsagalis, C. Austin, University of Texas Press, 230-54.
- Bosworth, A.B. & Baynham, E.J. (eds.) (2000) *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Bowie, A.M. (2007) *Herodotus: Histories Book VIII*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Bowie, A.M. (2012) 'Mythology and the Expedition of Xerxes' in: *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, eds. Baragwanath, E. & de Bakker, M. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 269-86.
- Bowie, E. (ed.) (2018) *Herodotus—Narrator, Scientist, Historian*, Berlin & Boston, De Gruyter.
- Bowra, C.M. (1930) *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Bowra, C.M. (1952, reprinted 1978) *Heroic Poetry*, London, The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Brandwood, S. (2020, reprinted 2022) 'Herodotus' Hermēneus and the Translation of Culture in the *Histories*', in: *Ethnicity and Identity in Herodotus*, eds. Figueira, T. & Soares, C. New York & London, Routledge, 15-42.
- Brannan, P.T. (1963) 'Herodotus and History: The Constitutional Debate Preceding Darius' Accession', *Traditio*, Vol. 19, 427-38.
- Branscome, D. (2013) *Textual Rivals: Self-presentation in Herodotus' Histories*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.
- Braudy, L. (1986, reprinted with a new afterword 1997) *The Frenzy of Renown: Fame & its History*, New York, Vintage Books.
- Braudy, L. (2003) *From Chivalry to Terrorism: War and the Changing Nature of Masculinity*, New York, Vintage Books.
- Brelinski, T. (2015) 'Medon Meets a Cyclops? "Odyssey" 22.310-80', *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 65, No. 1, 1-13.
- Breuil, J.L. (1989) 'ΚΡΑΤΟΣ et sa famille chez Homère: étude sémantique', in: *Études homériques : Séminaire de recherche sous la direction de Michel Casevitz*, Lyon, Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée Jean Pouilloux, 17-53.
- Breuil, J.L. (1995) 'De κράτος à δημοκρατία: Une famille de mots chez Hérodote', *Ktēma: Civilisations De l'Orient, De La Grèce Et De Rome Antiques*, No. 20, 71-84.

- Bridges, E., Hall, E. & Rhodes, P.J. (2007) 'Introduction', in: *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars*, eds. Bridges, E., Hall, E. & Rhodes, P.J. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 3-29.
- Bridges, E., Hall, E. & Rhodes, P.J. (eds.) (2007) *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Brock, R. (2003) 'Authorial Voice and Narrative Management in Herodotus', in: *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, eds. Derow, P. & Parker, R. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 3-16.
- Bronk, K.C. & Riches, B.R. (2017) 'The Intersection of Purpose and Heroism: A Study of Exemplars', in: *Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership*, eds. Allison, S.T., Goethals, G.R. & Kramer, R.M. New York & London, Routledge, 495-506.
- Brooks, C. (1977) 'The Heroic Impulse in the "Odyssey"', *The Classical World*, Vol. 70, No. 7, 455-6.
- Brown, C.W. (1966) 'Odysseus and Polyphemus: the Name and the Curse', *CompLit*, Vol. 18, 193-202.
- Buchan, M. (2004, reprinted 2007) *The Limits of Heroism: Homer and the Ethics of Reading*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.
- Burgess, J.S. (2017) 'The Apologos of Odysseus: Tradition and Conspiracy Theories', in: *The Winnowing Oar - New Perspectives in Homeric Studies*, eds. Tsagalis C. & Markantonatos, A. Berlin, New York, Walter de Gruyter, 95-120.
- Burian, P. (1997) 'Myth in *muthos*: The Shaping of Tragic Plot', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. Easterling, P.E. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 178-208.
- Burzacchini, G. (1995) 'Note al nuovo Simonide', *Eikasmos*, Vol. 6, 21-38.
- Butter, M. (2019) '"This Beast in the Shape of a Man": Right-Wing Populism, White Masculinity, and the Transnational Heroization of Donald Trump', in: *Heroism as a Global Phenomenon in Contemporary Culture*, eds. Korte, B., Wendt, S. & Falkenhayner, N. New York & London, Routledge, 114-31.
- Buxton, R. (2004, reprinted 2014) 'Similes and Other Likenesses', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Fowler, R. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 139-55.
- Cairns, D. & Scodel, R. (eds.) (2014) *Defining Greek Narrative*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

- Cairns, D. (1993) *Aidōs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Cairns, D. (2005) 'Values', in: *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. Gregory, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 305-20.
- Cairns, D. (2011) 'Ransom and Revenge in the *Iliad*', in: *Sociable Man: Essays on Ancient Greek Social Behaviour in Honour of Nick Fisher*, ed. Lambert, S.D. Swansea, Classical Press of Wales, 87-116.
- Callina, K.S., Lerner, R.M., Fremont, E., Burkhard, B., Stacey, D. & Su, S. (2017) 'Character Development and the Emergence of Heroic Leadership: Towards a Relational Developmental Systems-Based Model', in: *Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership*, eds. Allison, S.T., Goethals, G.R. & Kramer, R.M. New York & London, Routledge, 88-98.
- Camerer, L. (1965) *Praktische Klugheit bei Herodot: Untersuchungen zu den Begriffen μηχανή, τέχνη, σοφία*, Tübingen.
- Cameron, A. & Kuhrt, A. (eds.) (1983) *Images of Women in Antiquity*, London, Routledge.
- Campbell, J. (Originally printed 1949, reprinted with revisions 1968, revised edition printed 2008) *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, Novato, New World Library.
- Carey, C. (2016) 'Homer and Epic in Herodotus Book 7', in: *Homeric Receptions across Generic and Cultural Contexts*, eds. Efstathiou, A. & Karamanou, I. Berlin and Boston, De Gruyter, 71-89.
- Carlisle, M. & Arkadieva Levanidou, O. (eds.) (1999) *Nine essays on Homer*, Lanham, Rowman and Littlefield.
- Carlyle, T. (1841) 'On Heroes, Hero-Worship, & the Heroic in History. Six Lectures: Reported with Emendations and Additions By Thomas Carlyle', in: *The Norman and Charlotte Strouse Edition of the Writings of Thomas Carlyle: On Heroes, Hero-Worship, & the Heroic in History, Notes and Introduction by Michael K. Goldberg, Text Established by Michael K. Goldberg, Joel J. Brattin, and Mark Engel* (1993), Berkeley & Los Angeles & Oxford, University of California Press.
- Carney, E. (2000) 'Artifice and Alexander History', in: *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*, eds. Bosworth, A.B. & Baynham, E.J. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 263–85.
- Carroll, M. & Rempel, J. (eds.) (2011) *Living through the Dead: Burial and Commemoration in the Classical World*, Oxford, Oxbow Books.

- Cartledge, P. & Greenwood, E. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'Herodotus as a Critic: Truth, Fiction, Polarity', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 351-71.
- Cartledge, P. (1993, reprinted 2002) *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Cartledge, P. (2009) 'Taking Herodotus Personally', *The Classical World*, Vol. 102. No. 4, 371-82.
- Cartledge, P. (2013, reprinted 2014) 'Introduction & Notes' in: *Herodotus: The Histories*, Trans. T. Holland, London, Penguin Classics, XV-XXXII & 641-704.
- Catanzaro, A. (2005) 'Il γέρας e l'immagine dell'eroe: un aspetto del potere nel I canto dell'*Illiade*', *Il Pensiero Politico*, Vol. 38, No. 3, 373-90.
- Chantraine, P. (1968) *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque Histoire des Mots Tome I α-δ*, Paris, Klincksieck.
- Chantraine, P. (1970) *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque Histoire des Mots Tome II ε-κ*, Paris, Klincksieck.
- Chantraine, P. (1974) *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque Histoire des Mots Tome III λ-π*, Paris, Klincksieck.
- Chantraine, P. (1977) *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque Histoire des Mots Tome IV-I ρ-υ*, Paris, Klincksieck.
- Chantraine, P. (1980) *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque Histoire des Mots Tome IV-II φ-ω et Index*, Paris, Klincksieck.
- Chapman, G.A.H. (1972) 'Herodotus and Histiaeus' Role in the Ionian Revolt', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Vol. 21, 546-68.
- Charles, M.B. (2012) 'The Persian ΚΑΡΔΑΚΕΣ', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 132, 7-21.
- Chaston, C. (2002) 'Three Models of Authority in the "Odyssey"', *The Classical World*, Vol. 96, No. 1, 3-19.
- Chiasson, C.C. (1982) 'Tragic Diction in Herodotus: Some Possibilities', *Phoenix*, Vol. 36, 156-61.
- Chiasson, C.C. (2003) 'Herodotus' Use of Attic Tragedy in the Lydian Logos', *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 22, No. 1, 5-35.
- Chiasson, C.C. (2012a) 'Herodotus' Prologue and the Greek Poetic Tradition', *Histos*, Vol. 6, 114-43.

- Chiasson, C.C. (2012b) 'Myth and Truth in Herodotus' Cyrus' logos' in: *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, eds. Baragwanath, E. & de Bakker, M. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 213-32.
- Chitwood, K. (2019) 'Global Heroism as a Discursive Tradition: A Critical Response', in: *Heroism as a Global Phenomenon in Contemporary Culture*, eds. Korte, B., Wendt, S. & Falkenhayner, N. New York & London, Routledge, 227-41.
- Christensen, J.P. (2007) 'The Failure of Speech: Rhetoric and Politics in the *Iliad*', PhD Thesis, New York University, New York.
- Christensen, J. (2020) *The Many-Minded Man: The "Odyssey," Psychology, and the Therapy of Epic*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Christensen, J. (2021) 'Beautiful bodies, beautiful minds: some applications of disability studies to Homer', *Classical World*, Vol. 114 No. 4, 365-93.
- Clancy, L. (2015) Review of Marshall, P.D. (2014), *Celebrity Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 4, 615-8.
- Clark, M. (2004, reprinted 2014) 'Formulas, Metre and Type Scenes', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Fowler, R. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 117-38.
- Clarke, H.W. (1963) 'Telemachus and the *Telemacheia*', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 84, No. 2, 129-45.
- Clarke, H.W. (1969) 'The Humor of Homer', *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 64, No. 6, 246-52.
- Clarke, K. (2015) 'Putting up Pyramids, Characterizing Kings', in: *Fame and Infamy: Essays for Christopher Pelling on Characterization in Greek and Roman Biography and Historiography*, eds. Ash, R., Mossman, J. & Titchener, F.B. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 37-51.
- Clarke, M. (2004, reprinted 2014) 'Manhood and Heroism', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Fowler, R. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 74-90.
- Clarke, M.J., Currie, B.G.F. & Lyne, R.O.A.M. (eds.) (2006) *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil and the Epic Tradition presented to Jasper Griffin by former pupils*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Clay, J.S. (1983) *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Clay, J.S. (2001) 'The New Simonides and Homer's *Hemitheoi*', in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 182-4.
- Clayton, B. (2004) *A Penelopean Poetics*, Lanham, Md., Lexington Books.

- Cobet, J. (1994) Review of Vandiver, E. (1991), *Historische Zeitschrift*, Bd. 258, H. 3, 752-3.
- Cobet, J. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'The Organisation of Time in the *Histories*', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 387-412.
- Cohen, B. (ed.) (1995) *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, E.E. (2003) 'The High Cost of Andreia at Athens', in: *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, eds. Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 145-66.
- Coillie, G.V. (2000) 'Des ruses de l'intelligence à la prudence et au-delà: Homère, Sophocle, Aristote et Jean Chrysostome', *Les Études Classiques*, Vol. 68, 129-45.
- Coldstream, J.N. (1976) 'Hero-Cults in the Age of Homer', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 96, 8-17.
- Cole, S.G. (1984) 'Greek Sanctions against Sexual Assault', *Classical Philology*, Vol. 79, No. 2, 97-113.
- Collard, C. (2002, reprinted 2008) 'Introduction & Notes', in: *Aeschylus: Oresteia*, Trans. C. Collard, Oxford, Oxford University Press, XV-LXII & 114-228.
- Collins, D. (1998) *Immortal Armor: The Concept of Alkē in Archaic Greek Poetry*, Maryland, Rowman & Littlefield.
- Connolly, J. (2003) 'Like the Labors of Heracles: Andreia and Paideia in Greek Culture under Rome', in: *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, eds. Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 287-318.
- Connor, W.R. (1987) 'Commentary on the Conference', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 255-62.
- Cook E. (1999) '"Active" and "Passive" Heroics in the "Odyssey"', *The Classical World*, Vol. 93, No. 2, 149-67.
- Cook, E.F. (2009) 'On the "Importance" of Iliad Book 8', *Classical Philology*, Vol. 104, No. 2, 133-61.
- Cooper, A.F. (2019) 'Bringing Hyper-Empowered Individuals Back into Global Affairs: The Contested Terrain Between Celebrity, Hero, and Anti-Hero Status', in: *Heroism and Global Politics*, eds. Kitchen, V. & Mathers, J.G. New York & London, Routledge, 147-68.
- Corcella, A. (2007) 'Book IV' in: *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*, eds. Murray, O. & Moreno, A. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 543-721.

- Cullyer, H. (2003) 'Paradoxical Andreia: Socratic Echoes in Stoic 'Manly Courage'', in: *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, eds. Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 213-34.
- Currie, B. (2005, reprinted 2010) *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Currie, B. (2016) *Homer's Allusive Art*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Currie, B. (2019) 'The *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and Narratological Intertextuality', *Symbolae Osloenses*, Vol. 93, 157-88.
- Currie, B. (2021) 'Herodotus as Homeric Critic', *Histos*, Suppl. 13.
- Currie, B. (2022) 'Recognising Odysseus, reading Penelope: the *anagnorisis* in the 23rd book of the *Odyssey*', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 142, 1-29.
- D'Agostino, F. (1981) 'Bia. Appunti sul tema della violenza nel mondo greco classico', *Rivista Internazionale di Filosofia del Diritto*, Vol. 58, 409-42.
- Daigle, M. (2019) 'One of the Good Ones: Celebrity Heroism and Ending Sexual Violence in Armed Conflict', in: *Heroism and Global Politics*, eds. Kitchen, V. & Mathers, J.G. New York & London, Routledge, 195-212.
- Danek, G. (1988) *Studien zur Dolonie*, Vienna, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Darbo-Peschanski, C. (2007, reprinted 2011) 'The Origin of Greek Historiography', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 27-38.
- Davidson, J. (2000), 'Private Life', in: *Short Oxford History of Europe Classical Greece*, ed. Osborne, R. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 139-169.
- Davidson, J. (2005) 'Theatrical Production', in: *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. Gregory, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 194-211.
- Davies, M. (2007) 'The Hero and His Arms', *Greece & Rome*, Second Series, Vol. 54, No. 2, 145-55.
- de Bakker, M. (2012) 'Herodotus' Proteus: Myth, History, Enquiry, and Storytelling' in: *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, eds. Baragwanath, E. & de Bakker, M. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 107-26.
- de Bakker, M. (2015) 'Herodotus on Being 'Good': Characterisation and Explanation', in: *Fame and Infamy: Essays for Christopher Pelling on Characterization in Greek and Roman Biography and Historiography*, eds. Ash, R., Mossman, J. & Titchener, F.B. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 53-66.

- de Bakker, M. (2018) 'A Narratological Comparison of Herodotus and Diodorus on Thermopylae', in: *Textual Strategies in Ancient War Narrative: Thermopylae, Cannae and Beyond*, eds. Van Gils, L., de Jong, I.J.F. & Kroon, C. Leiden, Boston, Brill, 54-90.
- de Bakker, M.P., van den Berg, B. & Klooster, J. (eds.) (2022) *Emotions and Narrative in Ancient Literature and Beyond: Studies in Honour of Irene de Jong*, Leiden, Boston, Brill.
- de Bruyn, O. (2010) Review of eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. (2006), *L'Antiquité Classique*, T. 79, 381-3.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (1987) *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*, Amsterdam, Grüner.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (1994) 'Between Word and Deed: Hidden Thoughts in the Odyssey', in: *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature*, eds. de Jong, I.J.F. and Sullivan, J.P. Leiden, New York, Cologne, Brill, 27-50.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (1999) 'Aspects Narratologiques des Histoires d'Herodote', *Lalies*, Vol. 19, 217-75.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (2001, reprinted 2004) *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (2002a, reprinted 2012) 'Narrative Unity and Units', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 245-66.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (2002b) 'Developments in Narrative Technique in the Odyssey', in: *EPEA PTEROENTA: Beiträge zur Homerforschung: Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann zum 75 Geburtstag*, eds. Reichel, M. and Rengakos, A. Stuttgart, Franz Steiner, 77-91.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (2004) 'Herodotus', in: *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature Vol. 1*, eds. de Jong, I.J.F., Nünlist, R. & Bowie, A.M. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 101-14.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (2006) 'The Homeric Narrator and His Own kleos', *Mnemosyne*, Vol. 59, Fasc. 2, 188-207.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (2012) 'The Helen Logos and Herodotus' fingerprint' in: *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, eds. Baragwanath, E. & de Bakker, M. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 127-42.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (2014) *Narratology and Classics: A Practical Guide*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

- de Jong, I.J.F. (2018) 'Herodotus' Handling of (Narratological) Time in the Thermopylae Passage', in: *Textual Strategies in Ancient War Narrative: Thermopylae, Cannae and Beyond*, eds. Van Gils, L., de Jong, I.J.F. & Kroon, C. Leiden, Boston, Brill, 113-30.
- de Jong, I.J.F. and Sullivan, J.P. (eds.) (1994) *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature*, Leiden, New York, Cologne, Brill.
- de Jong, I.J.F., Nünlist, R. & Bowie, A.M. (eds.) (2004) *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature Vol. 1*, Leiden & Boston, Brill.
- De. Ste. Croix, G.E.M. (1977) 'Herodotus', *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 24, No. 2, 130-48.
- Deacy, S. & Pierce, K.F. (2002) 'Preface to the Paperback Edition, 2002', in: *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, eds. Deacy, S. & Pierce, K.F. London, Duckworth, vii-xiv.
- Deacy, S. & Pierce, K.F. (eds.) (1997, reprinted 2002) *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, London, Duckworth.
- Debnar, P. (2020) 'ΒΡΑΔΥΤΗΣ ΛΑΚΩΝΙΚΗ: Spartan Slowness in Thucydides' History', in: *Thucydides and Sparta*, eds. Powell, A. & Debnar, P. Swansea, Classical Press of Wales, 23-54.
- Decter-Frain, A., Vanstone, R. & Frimer, J.A. (2017) 'How and Why Groups Create Moral Heroes', in: *Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership*, eds. Allison, S.T., Goethals, G.R. & Kramer, R.M. New York & London, Routledge, 120-38.
- Delany, A.M. (2001) 'Women in the *Histories* of Herodotus', PhD Thesis, University of Natal, Durban.
- Demont, P. (2009) 'Figures of Inquiry in Herodotus's "Inquiries"', *Mnemosyne*, Vol. 62, Fasc. 2, 179-205.
- Denniston, J.D. (1943, Reprinted 1966) *The Greek Particles*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Denniston, J.D. (1952) *Greek Prose Style*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Derow, P. & Parker, R. (eds.) (2003) *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Deslauriers, M. (2003) 'Aristotle on Andreia, Divine and Sub-human Virtues', in: *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, eds. Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 187-212.
- Dethloff, C. (2011) 'Coming up to Code: Ancient Divinities Revisited', in: *Classics and Comics*, eds. Kovacs, G. & Marshall, C.W. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 103-14.

- Detienne, M. & Vernant, J.P. (1991) *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*, Trans. J. Lloyd, Chicago, London, University of Chicago Press.
- Dewald, C. & Kitzinger, R. (2006) 'Herodotus, Sophocles and the Woman Who Wanted Her Brother Saved', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 122-9.
- Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. (1987) 'A Selective Introduction to Herodotean Studies', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 9-40.
- Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. (eds.) (2006, reprinted 2013) *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Dewald, C. & Munson, R.V. (2022) *Herodotus Histories: Book I*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Dewald, C. (1980) 'Biology and Politics: Women in Herodotus' *Histories*', *Pacific Coast Philology*, Vol. 15, 11-18.
- Dewald, C. (1981) 'Women and Culture in Herodotus' *Histories*', in: *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*, ed. Foley, H. New York, London & Paris, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers Inc., 93-127.
- Dewald, C. (1987) 'Narrative Surface and Authorial Voice in Herodotus' *Histories*', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 147-70.
- Dewald, C. (1998, reprinted 2008) 'Introduction' in: *Herodotus the Histories*, Trans. Robin Waterfield, Oxford, Oxford World Classics, IX-XLI.
- Dewald, C. (2002, reprinted 2012) '“I didn't give my own genealogy”: Herodotus and the authorial persona', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 267-89.
- Dewald, C. (2006, reprinted 2013) 'Humour and danger in Herodotus' in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 145-64.
- Dewald, C. (2007, reprinted 2011) 'The Construction of Meaning in the First Three Historians', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 89-101.
- Dewald, C. (2012) 'Myth and Legend in Herodotus' First Book' in: *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, eds. Baragwanath, E. & de Bakker, M. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 59-85.
- Dewald, C. (2015) '“The Medium is Message”: Herodotus and his Logoi' in: *Fame and Infamy: Essays for Christopher Pelling on Characterization in Greek and Roman*

- Biography and Historiography*, eds. Ash, R., Mossman, J. & Titchener, F.B. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 67-81.
- Dillery, J. (1996) 'Reconfiguring the Past: Thyrea, Thermopylae and Narrative Patterns in Herodotus', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 117, No. 2, 217-254.
- Dittmer, J. (2013) *Captain America and the Nationalist Superhero: Metaphors, Narratives and Geopolitics*, Philadelphia, Temple University Press.
- Doherty, L.E. (1991) 'The Internal and Implied Audiences of "Odyssey" 11', *Arethusa*, Vol. 24, No. 2, 145-76.
- Dominick, Y.H. (2007) 'Acting Other: Atossa and Instability in Herodotus', *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 57, No. 2, 432-44.
- Donelli, G. (2021) 'Herodotus, the old Sappho and the newest Sappho', *Lexis*, Vol. 39, No. 1, 13-34.
- Donelli, G. (2022) 'Truth, Fiction, and Authority in Herodotus' Book 8', *Histos*, Suppl. 14, 211-40.
- Donlan, W. (1982) 'Reciprocities in Homer', *The Classical World*, Vol. 75, No. 3, 137-75.
- Dorati, M. (1998) 'Μῆτις e conquista del potere nelle « Storie » di Erodoto', *Acme*, Vol. 51, No. 3, 203-11.
- Dover, K.J. (1960) *Greek Word Order*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Dowden, K. (2004, reprinted 2014) 'The Epic Tradition in Greece', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Fowler, R. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 188-205.
- Drews, R. (1973) *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Dué, C. (2005, reprinted 2009) 'Homer's Post-classical Legacy', in: *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, ed. Foley, J.M. Oxford, Blackwell, 397-414.
- Duplouy, A. (2015) 'Genealogical and Dynastic Behaviour in Archaic and Classical Greece: Two Gentilician Strategies', in: *"Aristocracy" in Antiquity: Redefining Greek and Roman Elites*, eds. van Wees, H. & Fisher, N. Swansea, Classical Press of Wales, 59-84.
- Easterling, P.E. (ed.) (1997) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Easterling, P.E. (1997) 'Constructing the Heroic', in: *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*, ed. Pelling, C. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 20-37.

- Edwards, A.T. (1984) “‘Aristos Achaion’: Heroic Death and Dramatic Structure in the *Iliad*”, *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, Vol. 17, No. 2, 61-80.
- Edwards, M.W. (1987) *Homer: Poet of the Iliad*, Baltimore & London, Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Edwards, M.W. (2005, reprinted 2009) ‘Homer’s *Iliad*’, in: *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, ed. Foley, J.M. Oxford, Blackwell, 302-14.
- Efstathiou, A. & Karamanou, I. (eds.) (2016) *Homeric Receptions across Generic and Cultural Contexts*, Berlin and Boston, De Gruyter.
- Emlyn-Jones, C. (1986) ‘True and Lying Tales in the ‘Odyssey’’, *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 33, No. 1, 1-10.
- Erskine, A. (ed.) (2007) *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, Malden, Oxford & Carlton, Blackwell.
- Evans, J.A.S. (1961) ‘The dream of Xerxes and the νόμος of the Persians’, *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 57, No. 3, 109-11.
- Evans, J.A.S. (1968) ‘Father of History or Father of Lies; The Reputation of Herodotus’, *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 64, No. 1, 11-17.
- Evans, J.A.S. (1991) *Herodotus Explorer of the Past*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Evans, M. (2019) ‘Rousseau, the General Will, and Heroism in Drag: *Waltz with Bashir* as excessive Israeli Heroism’, in: *Heroism and Global Politics*, eds. Kitchen, V. & Mathers, J.G. New York & London, Routledge, 81-100.
- Fairey, E. (2011) ‘Persians in Frank Miller’s *300* and Greek Vase Painting’, in: *Classics and Comics*, eds. Kovacs, G. & Marshall, C.W. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 159-72.
- Falk, B.J. (2019) ‘Havel and Mandela: Leadership and Legitimacy at Home and Abroad’, in: *Heroism and Global Politics*, eds. Kitchen, V. & Mathers, J.G. New York & London, Routledge, 169-94.
- Falkenhayner, N. & Hardt, M.X. (2019) ‘One Hero Fits All? Cultural Translations in *Doctor Strange* (2016) as ‘Global Hero’ Movie’, in: *Heroism as a Global Phenomenon in Contemporary Culture*, eds. Korte, B., Wendt, S. & Falkenhayner, N. New York & London, Routledge, 81-98.
- Fantuzzi, M. (2001) ‘Heroes, Descendants of *Hemitheoi*: The Proemium of Theocritus 17 and Simonides 11 W²’, in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 232-41.
- Faraone, C.A. & McClure, L.K. (eds.) (2006) *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World*, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press.

- Farnell, L.R. (1921) *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality: The Gifford Lectures delivered in the University of St. Andrews in the year 1920*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Fehling, D. (1971) *Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot: Studien zue Erzählkunst Herodots*, Berlin & New York, Walter de Gruyter.
- Fehling, D. (1994) Review of Vandiver, E. (1991), *Gnomon*, 66. Bd., H. 4, 360-1.
- Felson, N. & Slatkin, L. (2004, reprinted 2014) 'Gender and Homeric Epic', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Fowler, R. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 91-114.
- Felson, N. (1994) *Regarding Penelope: From Character to Poetics*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Felton, D. (2014) 'The Motif of the "Mutilated Hero" in Herodotus', *Phoenix*, Vol. 68, No. 1/2, 47-61.
- Fenik, B. (1968) *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad: Studies in the Narrative Techniques of Homeric Battle Description*, Wiesbaden, Steiner.
- Fenik, B. (1974) *Studies in the Odyssey*, Wiesbaden, Steiner.
- Ferella, C. & Breytenbach, C. (eds.) (2018) *Paths of Knowledge: Interconnection(s) Between Knowledge and Journey in the Graeco-Roman World: Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 60*, Berlin, Ed. Topoi.
- Figueira, T. & Soares, C. (eds.) (2020, reprinted 2022) *Ethnicity and Identity in Herodotus*, New York & London, Routledge.
- Finkelberg, M. (1995) 'Odysseus and the Genus 'Hero'', *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 42, No. 1, 1-14.
- Finkelberg, M. (1998) 'Timē and Aretē in Homer', *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 48, No. 1, 14-28.
- Finkelberg, M. (ed.) (2012) *The Homer Encyclopedia*, Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Finley, M.I. (1956, Second Edition: 1977) *The World of Odysseus*, Edinburgh, Chatto and Windus Ltd.
- Finley, M.I. (1975) *The Use and Abuse of History*, New York and London, The Viking Press.
- Fisher, N. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'Popular Morality in Herodotus', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 199-224.

- Flaucher, S. (2021) 'Kriegsträume: Xerxes' Entschluss zum Feldzug gegen Griechenland: Traumgesichter in Herodot, Historien 7, 5-19', *Der Altsprachliche Unterricht: Latein, Griechisch*, Vol. 64 No. 3-4, 33-9.
- Fletcher, J. (2008) 'A Trickster's Oaths in the "Homeric Hymn to Hermes"', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 129, No. 1, 19-46.
- Flory, S. (1978) 'Arion's Leap: Brave Gestures in Herodotus', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 99, No. 4, 411-21.
- Flory, S. (1980) 'Who Read Herodotus' *Histories*', *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 101, 12-28.
- Flory, S. (1987) *The Archaic Smile of Herodotus*, Detroit, Wayne State University Press.
- Flower, M. (2006, reprinted 2013) 'Herodotus and Persia' in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 274-89.
- Flower, M.A. & Marincola, J. eds. (2002) *Herodotus Histories Book IX*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Foley, H. (1995) 'Penelope as Moral Agent', in: *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey*, ed. Cohen, B. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 93-115.
- Foley, H. (ed.) (1981) *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*, New York & London & Paris, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers Inc.
- Foley, H.P. (1978) '"Reverse Similes" and Sex Roles in the Odyssey', *Arethusa*, Vol. 11, No. 1/2, 7-26.
- Foley, J.M. (1991) *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic*, Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.
- Foley, J.M. (2004, reprinted 2014) 'Epic as Genre', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Fowler, R. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 171-87.
- Foley, J.M. (ed.) (2005, reprinted 2009) *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Fornara, C.W. (1971) *Herodotus: An Interpretative Essay*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Fornara, C.W. (1987) 'Commentary on Lateiner and Marincola', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 139-42.
- Forsdyke, S. (2001) 'Athenian Democratic Ideology and Herodotus' "Histories"', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 122, No. 3, 329-58.

- Forsdyke, S. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'Greek History, c.525-480 BC', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 521-49.
- Forsdyke, S. (2006, reprinted 2013) 'Political History and Political Thought', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 224-41.
- Foster, E. & Lateiner, D. (2012) 'Introduction', in: *Thucydides and Herodotus*, eds. Foster, E. & Lateiner, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1-9.
- Foster, E. & Lateiner, D. (eds.) (2012) *Thucydides and Herodotus*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Foster, E. (2012) 'Thermopylae and Pylos, with Reference to the Homeric Background', in: *Thucydides and Herodotus*, eds. Foster, E. & Lateiner, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 185-214.
- Fowler, D. (1997) 'On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies', *Materiali e discussion per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 39, 13-34.
- Fowler, R. (1996) 'Herodotos and His Contemporaries', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 116, 62-87.
- Fowler, R. (2003) 'Herodotus and Athens', in: *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, eds. Derow, P. & Parker, R. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 305-18.
- Fowler, R. (2004a, reprinted 2014) 'Introduction', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Fowler, R. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1-8.
- Fowler, R. (2004b, reprinted 2014) 'The Homeric Question', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Fowler, R. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 220-32.
- Fowler, R. (2006, reprinted 2013) 'Herodotus and his prose predecessors' in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 29-45.
- Fowler, R. (ed.) (2004, reprinted) *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Fowler, R.L. (2011) 'Mythos and Logos', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 131, 45-66.
- Fox, R.L. (2006) *The Classical World: An Epic History of Greece and Rome*, London, Penguin Books.

- Fragoulaki, M. (2022) 'Bloody Death in Greek Historiography and Homer: Discursive Presences and Meaningful Absences in Herodotus' Battle Narratives', *Histos*, Suppl. 14, 107-60.
- Franco, Z.E. (2017) 'Heroism in Times of Crisis: Understanding Leadership during Extreme Events', in: *Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership*, eds. Allison, S.T., Goethals, G.R. & Kramer, R.M. New York & London, Routledge, 185-202.
- Franco, Z.E., Blau, K. & Zimbardo, P.G. (2011) 'Heroism: A Conceptual Analysis and Differentiation Between Heroic Action and Altruism', *Review of General Psychology*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 99-113.
- Fredricksmeyer, H.C. (1997) 'Penelope "Polutropos:" The Crux at Odyssey 23.218-24', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 118, No. 4, 487-97.
- Friedman, R. (2006, reprinted 2013) 'Location and Dislocation', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 165-77.
- Friedrich, R. (1987) 'Heroic Man and *Polymetis*: Odysseus in the *Cyclopeia*', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 2, 121-33.
- Frischer, B. (1983) 'A Socio-Psychological and Semiotic Analysis of Epicurus' Portrait', *Arethusa*, Vol. 16, No. 1/2, 247-265.
- Frisk, H. (1960) *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch Von Hjalmar Frisk Band I: α-κο*, Heidelberg, C. Winter.
- Frisk, H. (1970) *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch Von Hjalmar Frisk Band II: κρ-Ω*, Heidelberg, C. Winter.
- Gagné, R. (2020, reprinted 2022) 'Mirages of Ethnicity and the Distant North in Book IV: Hyperboreans, Arimaspians, and Issedones', in: *Ethnicity and Identity in Herodotus*, eds. Figueira, T. & Soares, C. New York & London, Routledge, 237-57.
- Garcia, L.F. (2018) 'Hektor, the Marginal Hero: Performance Theory and the Homeric Monologue', in: *Homer in Performance: Rhapsodes, Narrators and Characters*, eds. Ready, J.L. & Tsagalis, C. Austin, University of Texas Press, 299-319.
- Gartziou-Tatti, A. (2013) 'Gods, Heroes, and the Battle of Marathon', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, No. 124, 91-110.
- Gazis, G.A. (2015) 'The *Nékyia*'s Catalogue of Heroines: Narrative Unbound', *Les Études Classiques*, Vol. 83, 69-99.
- Gazis, G.A. (2018) *Homer and the Poetics of Hades*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

- Gazzano, F. (2005) 'Senza frode e senza inganno: formule 'precauzionali' e rapporti interstatali nel mondo Greco', in: *Dalle parole ai fatti: relazioni interstatali e comunicazione politica nel mondo antico*, ed. Amantini, L.S. Rome, L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1-33.
- Genette, G. (1972) *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, Trans. J.E. Lewin (1980) Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Genette, G. (1983) *Narrative Discourse Revisited*, Trans. J.E. Lewin (1988) Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Georgiou, I.E. (2002) 'Women in Herodotus' *Histories*', PhD Thesis, Swansea University, Swansea.
- Gill, C. (1990) 'The Character-Personality Distinction', in: *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, ed. Pelling, C. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1-31.
- Glenginning, E. (2010) 'Heroic Female Death in Tacitus' *Annals* 14 and 15', in: *Zero to Hero, Hero to Zero: In Search of the Classical Hero*, eds. Langerwerf, L. & Ryan, C. Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Press, 96-119.
- Godart, L. (2001) 'Littérature mycénienne épopée homérique', *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 1561-79.
- Godley, A.D. (Tr.) (1920–5) *Herodotus: Persian Wars*, 4 volumes, Cambridge, Mass. and London, Harvard University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1967) *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour*, Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company.
- Goldhill, S. (1991) *The Poet's Voice: Essay on Poetics and Greek Literature*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Goldhill, S. (1997a) 'The Language of Tragedy: Rhetoric and Communication', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. Easterling, P.E. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 127-50.
- Goldhill, S. (1997b) 'Modern Critical Approaches to Greek Tragedy', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. Easterling, P.E. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 324-47.
- Gondek, R.M. & Sulosky Weaver, C.L. (eds.) (2019) *The Ancient Art of Transformation: Case Studies from Mediterranean Context*, Oxford and Philadelphia, Oxbow Books.
- Goodrum, M. (2019) 'Like a Cinema When the Last of the Audience Has Gone and Only the Staff Remain': Biggles and (Post-)Imperial Heroism', in: *Heroism as a Global*

- Phenomenon in Contemporary Culture*, eds. Korte, B., Wendt, S. & Falkenhayner, N. New York & London, Routledge, 19-37.
- Gould, J. (1989, reprinted 2000) *Herodotus*, London, Bristol Classical Press.
- Gould, J. (1998) 'Herodotus' in: *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilisation*, eds. Hornblower, S. & Spawforth, A. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 338-41.
- Graham, A.J. (1995) 'Introduction', in: *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey*, ed. Cohen, B. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 3-98.
- Gray, V. (1995) 'Herodotus and the Rhetoric of Otherness', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 116, No. 2, 185-211.
- Gray, V. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'Short Stories in Herodotus' *Histories*', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 291-317.
- Gray, V. (2012) 'Herodotus on Melampus' in: *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, eds. Baragwanath, E. & de Bakker, M. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 167-91.
- Graziosi, B. (2002) *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Gregory, J. (ed.) (2005) *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Grethlein, J. (2006) 'The Manifold Uses of the Epic Past: The Embassy Scene in Herodotus 7.153-63', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 127, No. 4, 485-509.
- Grethlein, J. (2009) 'How not to Do History: Xerxes in Herodotus' "Histories"', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 130, No. 2, 195-218.
- Grethlein, J. (2012) 'Homer and Heroic History', in: *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians*, eds. Marincola, J., Llewellyn-Jones, L. & Maciver, C. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 14-36.
- Grethlein, J. (2023) 'Establishing a New Genre: Thucydides and Non-historiographic Memory', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Thucydides*, ed. Low, P. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 17-30.
- Griffin, J. (1977) 'The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 97, 39-53.
- Griffin, J. (1980) *Homer on Life and Death*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Griffin, J. (1987) *Homer: the Odyssey*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Griffin, J. (1995) *Homer: Iliad Book Nine*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

- Griffin, J. (2004, reprinted 2014) 'The Speeches', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Fowler, R. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 156-67.
- Griffin, J. (2006, reprinted 2013) 'Herodotus and Tragedy', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 46-59.
- Griffith, M. (2005) 'Authority Figures', in: *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. Gregory, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 331-51.
- Griffiths, A. (1995) 'Latent and Blatant: Two Perspectives on Humour in Herodotus' in: *Laughter Down the Centuries: Volume 2*, eds. Jäkel, S and Timonen, A. Turku, Turun Yliopisto, 31-44.
- Griffiths, A. (2006, reprinted 2013) 'Stories and storytelling in the *Histories*' in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 130-44.
- Griffiths, A.H. (1989) 'Was Kleomenes mad?', in: *Classical Sparta (Routledge Revivals): Techniques Behind Her Success*, ed. Powell, A. London, Routledge, 51-78.
- Hack, B.E. (2009) 'Weakness is a Crime: Captain America and the Eugenic Ideal in Early Twentieth-Century America', in: *Captain America and the Struggle of the Superhero: Critical Essays*, ed. Weiner, R.G. Jefferson, North Carolina & London, McFarland & Company Inc., 79-89.
- Haft, A.J. (1990) "'The City-Sacker Odysseus" in Iliad 2 and 10', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 120, 37-56.
- Hainsworth, B. (1993) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. 3. Books 9-12*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Hajnal, I., Kölligan, D. & Zipser, K. (eds.) (2017) *Miscellanea Indogermanica: Festschrift für José Luis García Ramón zum 65 Geburtstag*, Innsbruck, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Hall, E. (1989, reprinted 2004) *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition Through Tragedy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Hall, E. (1996, reprinted 2007) *Aeschylus Persians: with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary by Edith Hall*, Oxford, Aris & Phillips.
- Hall, E. (1997) 'The Sociology of Athenian Tragedy', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. Easterling, P.E. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 93-126.

- Hall, E. (2007) 'Aeschylus' Persians via the Ottoman Empire to Saddam Hussein', in: *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars*, eds. Bridges, E., Hall, E. & Rhodes, P.J. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 167-99.
- Hall, E. (2008) *The Return of Ulysses: A Cultural History of Homer's Odyssey*, London & New York, I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.
- Hall, E. (2010) *Greek Tragedy: Suffering under the Sun*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Hall, E. (2020) '“Romantic Poet-Sage of History”: Herodotus and His Arion in the Long Nineteenth Century', in: *Herodotus in the Long Nineteenth Century*, eds. Harrison, T. & Skinner, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 46-70.
- Hall, E. (2025) *Epic of the Earth: Reading Homer's Iliad in the Fight for a Dying World*, New Haven & London, Yales University Press.
- Haller, B.S. (2014) 'Dolios in "Odyssey" 4 and 24: Penelope's Plotting and Alternative Narratives of Odysseus's νόστος', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 143, No. 2, 263-92.
- Halleran, M.R. (2005) 'Episodes', in: *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. Gregory, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 167-82.
- Halliwell, S. (1990) 'Traditional Conceptions of Character', in: *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, ed. Pelling, C. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 32-59.
- Hammond, M. (1987) 'Introduction' in: *Homer the Iliad*, Trans. M. Hammond, London, Penguin Classics, vii-1.
- Hammond, M. (2009) *Thucydides: The Peloponnesian War: A New Translation by Martin Hammond*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Hard, R. (2004) *The Routledge Handbook of Greek Mythology: Based on H.J. Rose's Handbook of Greek Mythology*, London & New York, Routledge.
- Harding, P. (2007, reprinted 2011) 'Local History and Atthidography', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 180-88.
- Harokopos N.A. (2019) 'On the threshold of old age: perceptions of the elderly in Athenian red-figure vase-painting', in: *The Ancient Art of Transformation: Case Studies from Mediterranean Contexts*, eds. Gondek, R.M. & Sulosky Weaver, C.L. Oxford & Philadelphia, Oxbow Books, 7-32.
- Harrell, S.E. (2003) 'Marvelous Andreia: Politics, Geography, and Ethnicity in Herodotus' Histories', in: *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, eds. Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 77-94.

- Harrison, S. (2001) 'Simonides and Horace', in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 261-71.
- Harrison, T. & Skinner, J. (2020) 'Introduction', in: *Herodotus in the Long Nineteenth Century*, eds. Harrison, T. & Skinner, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1-19.
- Harrison, T. & Skinner, J. (eds.) (2020) *Herodotus in the Long Nineteenth Century*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Harrison, T. (1997, reprinted 2002) 'Herodotus and the Greek Idea of Rape', in: *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, eds. Deacy, S. & Pierce, K.F. London, Duckworth, 185-208.
- Harrison, T. (1999) Review of Waterfield, R. (1998) [Translation of Herodotus], *The Classical Review*, New Series, Vol. 49, No. 1, 15-6.
- Harrison, T. (2000) *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Harrison, T. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'The Persian Invasions', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 551-78.
- Harrison, T. (2022) 'Herodotus, Homer, and the Character of the Gods' *Histos*, Suppl. 14, 91-106.
- Hart, D.K. & Smith, P.A. (1988) 'Fame, Fame-Worthiness, and the Public Service', *Administration and Society*, Vol. 20, No. 2, 131-51.
- Hartog, F. (1988) *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*, Trans. J. Lloyd, California, University of California Press Ltd.
- Haubold, J. (2000) *Homer's People: Epic Poetry and Social Formation*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Haubold, J. (2007) 'Xerxes' Homer', in: *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars*, eds. Bridges, E., Hall, E. & Rhodes, P.J. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 47-63.
- Havelock, E.A. (1982) *The Literate Revolution in Greece and its Cultural Consequences*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Haywood, J. (2013) 'Intertext and Allusion in Herodotus' *Histories*: Authority, Proof, Polemic', PhD Thesis, University of Liverpool, Liverpool.
- Haywood, J. (2021) 'The Use(s) of Inscriptions in Herodotus' Histories', *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 142, No. 2, 217-57.

- Haywood, J. (2022) 'Homeric Allusions in Herodotus' Histories', *Histos*, Suppl. 14, 59-90.
- Hazewindus, M. (2004) *When Women Interfere: Studies in the Role of Women in Herodotus' Histories*, Amsterdam, J.C. Gieben.
- Heatherington, M.E. (1976) 'Chaos, Order, and Cunning in the "Odyssey"', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 73, No. 3, 225-38.
- Helleman, W.E. (1995) 'Homer's Penelope: A Tale of Feminine Arete', *Echos du monde classique: Classical news and views*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 2, 227-50.
- Herington, J. (1991) 'The Poem of Herodotus', *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics*, Third Series, Vol. 1, No. 3, 5-16.
- Herman, D. (2009) *Basic Elements of Narrative*, Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Heryanto, A. (2019) 'Heroism and the Pleasure and Pain of Mistranslation: The Case of *The Act of Killing*', in: *Heroism as a Global Phenomenon in Contemporary Culture*, eds. Korte, B., Wendt, S. & Falkenhayner, N. New York & London, Routledge, 167-88.
- Herzfeld, M. (1983) 'The Excavation of Concepts: Commentary on Peradotto and Nagy', *Arethusa*, Vol. 16, No. 1/2, 57-68.
- Hesk, J. (2000) *Deception and Democracy in Classical Athens*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Heubeck, A. & Hoekstra, A. (1989, reprinted 1990) *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Volume II: Introduction and Books ix-xvi*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Heubeck, A., West, S. & Hainsworth, J.B. (1988, reprinted 1991) *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Volume I: Introduction and Books 1-8*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Higbie, C. (1995) *Heroes' Names, Homeric Identities*, New York, Garland.
- Hobbs, A. (2000, reprinted 2006) *Plato and the Hero: Courage, Manliness and the Impersonal Good*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Hochbruck, W. (2019) 'Axe and Helmet: The Widening Range of New York Fire-fighters as (Super-)Heroes', in: *Heroism as a Global Phenomenon in Contemporary Culture*, eds. Korte, B., Wendt, S. & Falkenhayner, N. New York & London, Routledge, 132-49.
- Holland, T. (Tr.) (2013, reprinted 2014) *Herodotus: The Histories*, London, Penguin Classics.
- Hollmann, A. (2005) 'The Manipulation of Signs in Herodotus' "Histories"', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 135, No. 2, 279-327.
- Hollmann, A. (2011) *The Master of Signs: Signs and the Interpretation of Signs in Herodotus' Histories*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

- Holloway, J. (1979) *Narrative Structure: Exploratory Essays*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Hölscher, U. (1967) 'Die Atridensage in der Odyssee' in: *Festschrift für Richard Alewyn*, eds. Singer H. & von Wiese, B., Cologne, Bohlau, 1-16.
- Hooker, J.T. (1989) 'Arion and the Dolphin', *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 36, No. 2, 141-146.
- Hornblower, S. & Pelling, C. eds. (2017) *Herodotus Histories Book VI*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Hornblower, S. & Spawforth, A. (eds.) (1998) *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilisation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Hornblower, S. & Spawforth, A. eds. (2012) *The Oxford Classical Dictionary: 4th Edition*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Hornblower, S. (1994a) 'Introduction', in: *Greek Historiography*, ed. Hornblower, S. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1-72.
- Hornblower, S. (1994b) 'Narratology and Thucydides', in: *Greek Historiography*, ed. Hornblower, S. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 131-66.
- Hornblower, S. (2001) 'Epic and Epiphanies: Herodotus and the "New Simonides"', in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 135-47.
- Hornblower, S. (2002a, reprinted 2012) 'Herodotus and his Sources of Information', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 373-86.
- Hornblower, S. (2002b) *The Greek World 479-323BC³*, London, Routledge.
- Hornblower, S. (2003) 'Panionius of Chios and Hermotimus of Pedasa (Hdt. 8.104-6)', in: *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, eds. Derow, P. & Parker, R. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 37-57.
- Hornblower, S. (2004, reprinted 2006) *Thucydides and Pindar: Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Hornblower, S. (2013) *Herodotus Histories Book V*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Hornblower, S. (ed.) (1994) *Greek Historiography*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Horsley, G. (2000) 'Homer in Pisidia: Aspects of the History of Greek Education in a Remote Roman Province', *Antichthon*, Vol. 34, 46-81.
- How, W.W. & Wells, J. (1912) *A Commentary on Herodotus*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

- Hubbard, T.K. (2001) “‘New Simonides’ or Old Semonides? Second Thoughts on POxy 3965 fr. 26’, in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 226-31.
- Hughes-Hallett, L. (2004, reprinted 2012) *Heroes: Saviours, Traitors and Supermen*, London, Fourth Estate.
- Humphreys, S. (1987) ‘Law, Custom and Culture in Herodotus’, *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 211-20.
- Hunter R.L. (ed.) (2005) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Hunter, R. (2001) ‘The Poet Unleaved: Simonides and Callimachus’, in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 242-54.
- Hunter, R. (2004, reprinted 2014) ‘Homer and Greek Literature’, in: *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Fowler, R. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 235-53.
- Hunter, R. (2014) “‘Where do I Begin?’ An Odyssean Narrative Strategy and its Afterlife’, in: *Defining Greek Narrative*, eds. Cairns, D. & Scodel, R. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 137-55.
- Immerwahr, H.R. (1966) *Form and Thought in Herodotus*, Cleveland, American Philological Association.
- Irwin, E. & Greenwood, E. (eds.) (2007) *Reading Herodotus: A Study of the Logoi in Book 5 of Herodotus’ Histories*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Irwin, E. (2009) ‘Herodotus and Samos: Personal or Political?’, *The Classical World*, Vol. 102, No. 4, 395-416.
- Irwin, E. (2010) Review of eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. (2006), *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 130, 202-4.
- Isager, S. (1998) ‘The Pride of Halikarnassos. Editio Princeps of an Inscription from Salmakis’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 123, 1-23.
- Iser, W. (1974, Reprinted 1990) *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*, Baltimore and London, The John Hopkins University Press.
- Iser, W. (1978) *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*, London and Henley, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- Iser, W. (1989, Reprinted 1993) *Prospecting: From Reader Response to Literary Anthropology*, Baltimore and London, The John Hopkins University Press.
- Jaffe, S.N. (2017) *Thucydides on the Outbreak of War: Character and Contest*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Jaillard, D. (2007) 'Kûdos arésthai (emporter le kûdos): Le kudos des rois, des guerriers et des athlètes au miroir des dieux', *Gaia : revue interdisciplinaire sur la Grèce Archaique*, Vol. 11, 85-99.
- Jäkel, S. and Timonen, A. (eds.) (1995) *Laughter Down the Centuries: Volume 2*, Turku, Turun Yliopisto.
- Jamison, S.W. (1999) 'Penelope and the Pigs: Indic Perspectives on the "Odyssey"', *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 18, No. 2, 227-72.
- Jensen, M.S. (2005, reprinted 2009) 'Performance', in: *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, ed. Foley, J.M. Oxford, Blackwell, 45-54.
- Johnson, K.P. (2011) 'Sequential Narrative in the Shield of Achilles', in: *Classics and Comics*, eds. Kovacs, G. & Marshall, C.W. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 43-58.
- Johnson, S.R. (2016) 'Xerxes, Lost City in the Desert: Classical Allusions in *Fullmetal Alchemist*', in: *Son of Classics, and Comics*, eds. Kovacs, G. & Marshall, C.W. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 95-110.
- Jones, C. (2010) *New Heroes in Antiquity: From Achilles to Antinoos*, London, Harvard University Press.
- Jones, M. (2007) 'What Should Historians Do with Heroes? Reflections on Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Britain', *History Compass*, Vol. 5, No. 2, 439-54.
- Jones, M., Sèbe, B., Strachan, J., Taithe, B. & Yeandle, P. (2014) 'Decolonising Imperial Heroes: Britain and France', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, Vol. 42, No. 5, 787-825.
- Jones, P.V. (2003) 'Introduction' in: *Homer the Iliad*, Trans. E.V. Rieu, London, Penguin Classics, ix-xlvi.
- Juchneviciene, N. (2016) 'Themistocles as a trickster in Herodotus', *Melita Classica*, Vol. 3, 45-61.
- Kafashan, S., Sparks, A., Rotella, A. & Barclay, P. (2017) 'Why Heroism Exists: Evolutionary Perspectives on Extreme Helping', in: *Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership*, eds. Allison, S.T., Goethals, G.R. & Kramer, R.M. New York & London, Routledge, 36-57.

- Karttunen, K. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'The Ethnography of the Fringes', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 457-74.
- Katz, M.A. (1991) *Penelope's Renown: Meaning and Indeterminacy in the Odyssey*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Kazanskaya, M. (2013) 'Les Expressions Homériques Dans Les Histoires d'Hérodote', *Lalies: Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature*, Vol. 34, 161-72.
- Kearns, E. (2004, reprinted 2014) 'The Gods in Homeric Epics', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Fowler, R. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 59-73.
- Keesling, C.M. (2006) 'Heavenly Bodies: Monuments to Prostitutes in Greek sanctuaries', in: *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World*, eds. Faraone, C.A. & McClure, L.K. Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 59-76.
- Kelly, A. (2006) 'Homer and History: "Iliad" 9.381-4' *Mnemosyne*, Vol. 59, Fasc. 3, 321-33.
- Kelly, A. (2018) 'Homer's Rivals? Internal Narrators in the *Iliad*', in: *Homer in Performance: Rhapsodes, Narrators and Characters*, eds. Ready, J.L. & Tsagalis, C. Austin, University of Texas Press, 351-77.
- Kienast, D. (2002) 'Bemerkungen zum Jonischen Aufstand und zur Rolle des Artaphernes', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Vol. 51, 1-31.
- Kiesling, E.C. (2003) 'The Oldest 'New' Military Historians: Herodotus, W.G. Forrest, and the Historiography of War', in: *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, eds. Derow, P. & Parker, R. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 88-100.
- Kinsella, E.L., Ritchie, T.D. & Igou, E.R. (2017) 'Attributes and Applications of Heroes: A Brief History of Lay and Academic Perspectives', in: *Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership*, eds. Allison, S.T., Goethals, G.R. & Kramer, R.M. New York & London, Routledge, 19-35.
- Kinzl, K.H. (ed.) (1977) *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory: Studies Presented to Fritz Schachermeyr on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*, Berlin, De Gruyter.
- Kirby, J.T. (1990) 'The "Great Triangle" in Early Greek Rhetoric and Poetics', *Rhetorica*, Vol. 8, 213-28.
- Kirk, G.S. (1971) 'Old age and maturity in ancient Greece', *Eranos Jahrbuch*, Vol. 40, 123-58.

- Kirk, G.S. (1985) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. 1. Books 1-4*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Kirk, G.S. (1990) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. 2. Books 5-8*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Kirkegaard, A.M.Ø. (2019) 'Excursions Into Marginality: Digitalised Memories of Militarised Masculinity in Rhodesian Understandings of Self', in: *Heroism and Global Politics*, eds. Kitchen, V. & Mathers, J.G. New York & London, Routledge, 101-21.
- Kitchen, V. & Mathers, J.G. (2019a) 'Introduction', in: *Heroism and Global Politics*, eds. Kitchen, V. & Mathers, J.G. New York & London, Routledge, 1-20.
- Kitchen, V. & Mathers, J.G. (eds.) (2019) *Heroism and Global Politics*, New York & London, Routledge.
- Kitchen, V. (2019) 'Heroism and the Construction of the Political Community', in: *Heroism and Global Politics*, eds. Kitchen, V. & Mathers, J.G. New York & London, Routledge, 21-35.
- Klisanin, D. (2017) 'Heroism in the Networked Society', in: *Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership*, eds. Allison, S.T., Goethals, G.R. & Kramer, R.M. New York & London, Routledge, 283-99.
- Knöbl, R. (2010) 'Death of a Hero? Euripides in Hellenistic Epigram', in: *Zero to Hero, Hero to Zero: In Search of the Classical Hero*, eds. Langerwerf, L. & Ryan, C. Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Press, 49-72.
- Kocher, U. (2022) 'The Hero – on Closer Inspection a Fool?', in: *The Hero and Hero-Making Across Genres*, eds. Singh, A., Tholia, S. & Patel, P.K. New York & London, Routledge, 37-48.
- Kohen, A. (2013) *Heroism and relativism*, retrieved from: <http://kohenari.net/post/53764408412/> [accessed 26/06/2024].
- Kohen, A. (2014) *Untangling Heroism: Classical Philosophy and the Concept of the Hero*, New York & London, Routledge.
- Kokkini, D. (2010) 'Admetos as Everyman in Euripides' *Alcestis*', in: *Zero to Hero, Hero to Zero: In Search of the Classical Hero*, eds. Langerwerf, L. & Ryan, C. Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Press, 28-48.
- Konijnendijk, R. (2016) 'Mardonius' Senseless Greeks', *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 66, No.1, 1–12.
- Konstan, D. (1987) 'Persians, Greeks and Empire', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 59-73.

- Korte, B. & Wendt, S. (2019) 'Introduction: Studying Heroism from a Global Perspective' in: *Heroism as a Global Phenomenon in Contemporary Culture*, eds. Korte, B., Wendt, S. & Falkenhayner, N. New York & London, Routledge, 1-18.
- Korte, B., Wendt, S. & Falkenhayner, N. (eds.) (2019) *Heroism as a Global Phenomenon in Contemporary Culture*, New York & London, Routledge.
- Kouklanakakis, A. (1999) 'Thersites, Odysseus, and the social order', in: *Nine essays on Homer*, eds. Carlisle, M. & Arkadieva Levanidou, O. Lanham, Rowman and Littlefield, 35-53.
- Kovacs, G. & Marshall, C.W. (eds.) (2011) *Classics and Comics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Kovacs, G. & Marshall, C.W. (eds.) (2016) *Son of Classics and Comics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Kovacs, G. (2011) 'Comics and Classics: Establishing a Critical Framework', in: *Classics and Comics*, eds. Kovacs, G. & Marshall, C.W. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 3-24.
- Kramer, R.M. (2017) 'To Become or not to Become? Existential Courage and the Quest for Identity', in: *Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership*, eds. Allison, S.T., Goethals, G.R. & Kramer, R.M. New York & London, Routledge, 262-82.
- Krebs, C.B. (2011) *A Most Dangerous Book: Tacitus' Germania from the Roman Empire to the Third Reich*, New York & London, W.W. Norton & Company.
- Krischer, T. (1965) 'Herodots Prooimion', *Hermes*, Vol. 93, 159-67.
- Kuhrt, A. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'Babylon', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 475-96.
- Kundmueller, M.M. (2019) *Homer's Hero: Human Excellence in the Iliad and Odyssey*, New York, State University of New York Press.
- Laing, G.J. (1921) Review of Norden, E. (1920), *Classical Philology*, Vol. 16, No. 1, 84-6.
- Lambert, S.D. (ed.) (2011) *Sociable Man: Essays on Ancient Greek Social Behaviour in Honour of Nick Fisher*, Swansea, Classical Press of Wales.
- Lang, M.L. (1984) *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse*, Cambridge and London, Harvard University Press.
- Lang, M.L. (1987) 'Commentary on Nagy and Boedeker', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 203-7.

- Langerwerf, L. & Ryan, C. (2010) 'Introduction', in: *Zero to Hero, Hero to Zero: In Search of the Classical Hero*, eds. Langerwerf, L. & Ryan, C. Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Press, 1-27.
- Langerwerf, L. & Ryan, C. (eds.) (2010) *Zero to Hero, Hero to Zero: In Search of the Classical Hero*, eds. Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Lankford, A. (2012) 'On Sacrificial Heroism', *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, Vol. 16, No. 5, 634-54.
- Larson, S. (2000) 'Boiotia, Athens, the Peisistratids, and the Odyssey's Catalogue of Heroines', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 3, 193-222.
- Larson, S. (2006) 'Kandaules' Wife, Masistes' Wife: Herodotus' Narrative Strategy in Suppressing Names of Women: (Hdt. 1.8.12 and 9.108-13)', *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 101, No. 3, 225-44.
- Lateiner, D. (1984) 'Herodotean Historiographical Patterning: The Constitutional Debate', *Quaderni di Storia*, Vol. 20, 257-84.
- Lateiner, D. (1987a) 'Nonverbal Communication in the *Histories* of Herodotus', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 83-119.
- Lateiner, D. (1987b) 'Response to C.W. Fornara's Commentary', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 143-5.
- Lateiner, D. (1989) *The Historical Method of Herodotus*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.
- Lateiner, D. (1990) 'Deceptions and Delusions in Herodotus', *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 9, No. 2, 230-246.
- Lateiner, D. (1997) 'Homeric Prayer', *Arethusa*, Vol. 30, No. 2, 241-72.
- Lateiner, D. (2002) 'The Style of Herodotus: A Case Study (7.229)', *The Classical World*, Vol. 95, No. 4, 363-71.
- Lateiner, D. (2004, reprinted 2014) 'The *Iliad*: An Unpredictable Classic', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Fowler, R. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 11-30.
- Lateiner, D. (2012) 'Oaths: Theory and Practice in the *Histories* of Herodotus and Thucydides', in: *Thucydides and Herodotus*, eds. Foster, E. & Lateiner, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 154-84.
- Lattimore, R. (1939) 'The Wise Advisor in Herodotus', *Classical Philology*, Vol. 34, No. 1, 24-35.

- Lattimore, R. (1958) 'The Composition of the History of Herodotus', *Classical Philology*, Vol. 53, No. 1, 9-21.
- Lattimore, R. (Tr.) (1951, reprinted 2011) *The Iliad of Homer*, London and Chicago, University of Chicago Press Ltd.
- Lattimore, R. (Tr.) (1965) *Homer: the Odyssey*, New York, Harper Perennial Classics.
- Laurot, B. (1995) 'Remarques sur la Tragédie de Crésus', *Ktema*, Vol. 20, 95-103.
- Lendon, J.E. (2017a) 'Battle Description in the Ancient Historians, Part I: Structure, Array, and Sea Battles', *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 64, No. 1, 39-64.
- Lendon, J.E. (2017b) 'Battle Description in the Ancient Historians, Part II: Speeches, Results, and Fighting', *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 64, No. 2, 145-67.
- Lenfant, D. (2007, reprinted 2011) 'Greek Historians of Persia', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 200-9.
- Lesky, A. (1977) 'Tragödien bei Herodot?' in: *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory: Studies Presented to Fritz Schachermeyr on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*, ed. Kinzl, K. H. Berlin, De Gruyter, 224-30.
- Lesser, R.H. (2019) 'Female Ethics and epic Rivalry: Helen in the *Iliad* and Penelope in the *Odyssey*', *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 140, No. 2, 189-220.
- Leuzzi, D. (2008) 'La Morte Dell'Eroe Nell'*Iliade*: Scene E Sequenze Narrative', in: *Eroi Nell'Iliade: Personaggi e Strutture Narrative*, ed. Pagani, L. Rome, Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, 271-325.
- Levine, D.B. (1982) 'Odyssey 18. Iros as a Paradigm for the Suitors', *Classical Journal*, Vol. 77, 200-4.
- Levy, H. (1963) 'The Odyssean Suitors and the Host-Guest Relationship', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 94, 145-53.
- Lewis, S. (1998) 'Who is Pythius the Lydian?', *Histos*, Vol. 2, 185-91.
- Liddell, H.G. and Scott, R. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, revised by H. S. Jones (1940), Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Lidov, J.B. (2002) 'Sappho, Herodotus, and the hetaira', *Classical Philology*, Vol. 97, No. 3, 203-37.
- Linderborg, O. (2019) 'The Place of Herodotus' Constitutional Debate in the History of Political Ideas and the Emergence of Classical Social Theory', *Akropolis*, Vol. 3, 5-28.

- Lindinger, S. (2022) 'The Other Side of Heroism: Construction and Deconstruction of the Heroic in German Literature on Greece's Struggle for Independence in Works by Wilhelm Müller, Friedrich Hölderlin, and E.T.A. Hoffmann', in: *The Hero and Hero-Making Across Genres*, eds. Singh, A., Tholia, S. & Patel, P.K. New York & London, Routledge, 69-80.
- Lloyd, A. (1976) *Herodotus Book II: Commentary 1-98*, Leiden, New York & Köln, Brill.
- Lloyd, A. (1993) *Herodotus Book II: Commentary 99-182*, Leiden, New York & Köln, Brill.
- Lloyd, A. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'Egypt', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 415-35.
- Lloyd, A. (2007) 'Book II' in: *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*, eds. Murray, O. & Moreno, A. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 219-378.
- Lloyd, A.B. (ed.) (1996) *Battle in Antiquity*, London and Swansea, Classical Press of Wales.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1971) *The Justice of Zeus*, Berkeley, Los Angeles & London, University of California Press.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1994) 'Notes on the New Simonides', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 101, 1-3.
- Long, A.A. (1970) 'Morals and Values in Homer', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 90, 121-139.
- Louden, B. (1995) 'Categories of Homeric Wordplay', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 125, 27-46.
- Louden, B. (2005, reprinted 2009) 'The Gods in Epic, or the Divine Economy', in: *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, ed. Foley, J.M. Oxford, Blackwell, 90-104.
- Low, P. (2005) 'Looking for the Language of Athenian Imperialism', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 125, 93-111.
- Low, P. (2011) 'The Power of the Dead in Classical Sparta: The Case of Thermopylae', in: *Living through the Dead: Burial and Commemoration in the Classical World*, eds. Carroll, M. & Rempel, J. Oxford, Oxbow Books, 1-20.
- Low, P. (2018) 'Panhellenism without Imperialism? Athens and the Greeks Before and After Chaeronea', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Vol. 67, 454-71.
- Low, P. (2020) 'Remembering, Forgetting, and Rewriting the Past: Athenian Inscriptions and Collective Memory', *Histos*, Suppl. 11, 235-68.
- Low, P. (2023) 'Thucydides on Empire and Imperialism', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Thucydides*, ed. Low, P. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 143-59.

- Low, P. (ed.) (2023) *The Cambridge Companion to Thucydides*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Lowenstam, S. (2000) 'The Shroud of Laertes and Penelope's Guile', *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 95, No. 4, 333-48.
- Luce, T.J. (ed.) (1982) *Ancient Writers: Greece and Rome: Volume 1 Homer to Caesar*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Luraghi, N. (2006, reprinted 2013) 'Meta-historie: Method and Genre in the *Histories*' in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 76-91.
- Luraghi, N. (2009) 'The Importance of being λόγιος', *The Classical World*, Vol. 102, No. 4, 439-56.
- Luraghi, N. (ed.) (2001) *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Mace, S. (2001) 'Utopian and Erotic Fusion in a New Elegy by Simonides', in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 185-207.
- Macintyre, A. (1984) *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, Notre Dame Indiana, Notre Dame University Press.
- Mackie, C.J. (2008) *Rivers of Fire: Mythic Themes in Homer's Iliad*, Washington DC, New Academia Publishing LLC.
- Mak, R.K.S. (2019) 'Shaolin Martial Arts Heroes in Industrial Hong Kong: Between Colonialism, Postcolonialism, and Globalism', in: *Heroism as a Global Phenomenon in Contemporary Culture*, eds. Korte, B., Wendt, S. & Falkenhayner, N. New York & London, Routledge, 189-208.
- Marcello, F. (2017) 'Building the Image of Power: Images of *Romanita* in the Civic Architecture of Fascist Italy', in: *Brill's Companion to the Classics, Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany*, eds. Roche, H. & Demetriou, K. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 325-69.
- Marg, W. (1957) *Homer über die Dichtung*, Münster, Aschendorff.
- Marincola, J. (1987) 'Herodotean Narrative and the Narrator's Presence', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, 121-37.
- Marincola, J. (2003) 'Introduction' in: *Herodotus The Histories*, Trans. Aubrey Selincourt, London, Penguin Classics, IX-XXXIII.

- Marincola, J. (2006, reprinted 2013) 'Herodotus and the Poetry of the Past' in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 13-28.
- Marincola, J. (2007a) 'Odysseus and the Historians', *Syllecta Classica*, Vol. 18, 1-79.
- Marincola, J. (2007b, reprinted 2011) 'Introduction', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 1-9.
- Marincola, J. (2007c, reprinted 2011) 'Speeches in Classical Historiography', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 118-32.
- Marincola, J. (2007d, reprinted 2011) 'Universal History from Ephorus to Diodorus', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 171-79.
- Marincola, J. (2007e) 'The Persian Wars in Fourth Century Oratory and Historiography', in: *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars*, eds. Bridges, E., Hall, E. & Rhodes, P.J. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 105-25.
- Marincola, J. (2015) 'Plutarch, Herodotus, and the Historian's Character', in: *Fame and Infamy: Essays for Christopher Pelling on Characterization in Greek and Roman Biography and Historiography*, eds. Ash, R., Mossman, J. & Titchener, F.B. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 83-95.
- Marincola, J. (2016) 'The Historian as Hero: Herodotus and the 300 at Thermopylae', *The American Philological Association*, Vol. 146, No. 2, 219-36.
- Marincola, J. (2018) "'Ὅμηρικώτατος'? Battle Narratives in Herodotus", in: *Herodotus—Narrator, Scientist, Historian*, ed. Bowie, E. Berlin & Boston, De Gruyter, 3-24.
- Marincola, J. (ed.) (2007, reprinted 2011) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Marincola, J., Llewellyn-Jones, L. & Maciver, C. (eds.) (2012) *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- Marks, J.R. (2005) 'The ongoing νεῖκος: Thersites, Odysseus, and Achilles', *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 126, No. 1, 1-31.
- Marquardt, P. (1985) 'Penelope "Polutropos"', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 106, No. 1, 32-48.
- Marr, J. (1995) 'Themistocles and the Supposed Second Message to Xerxes: The Anatomy of a Legend', *Acta Classica*, Vol. 38, 57-69.

- Marr, J. (2005) 'Class prejudice in the ancient Greek world: Thersites, Cleon, and other upstarts', *Pegasus*, Vol. 48, 2-9.
- Marshall, C.W. & Kovacs, G. (2011) 'Introduction', in: *Classics and Comics*, eds. Kovacs, G. & Marshall, C.W. Oxford, Oxford University Press, vii-xiii.
- Marshall, C.W. & Kovacs, G. (2016) 'Introduction', in: *Son of Classics and Comics*, eds. Kovacs, G. & Marshall, C.W. Oxford, Oxford University Press, xi-xxx.
- Marshall, C.W. (2011) 'The Furies, Wonder Woman, and Dream: Mythmaking in Dc Comics', in: *Classics and Comics*, eds. Kovacs, G. & Marshall, C.W. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 89-101.
- Marshall, P.D. (1997, reprinted 2014) *Celebrity and Power: Fame in Contemporary Culture*, Minneapolis & London, University of Minnesota Press.
- Martin, R.P. (1989) *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad*, Ithaca & London, Cornell University Press.
- Martin, R.P. (1993) 'Telemachus and the Last Hero Song', *Colby Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 3, 222-40.
- Martin, R.P. (2011) 'Introduction to Richmond Lattimore's *Iliad*' in: *The Iliad of Homer*, Trans. Richmond Lattimore, Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press Ltd, 1-65.
- Mash, M.C. (2010) 'Humor and Ethnography in Herodotus' *Histories*', PhD Thesis, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Mash, M.C. (2017) 'Humour, Ethnography, and Embassy: Herodotus, *Histories* 3.17-25 and Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 61-133', *Histos*, Suppl. 6, 67-97.
- Mathers, J.G. & Kitchen, V. (2019a) 'Introduction', in: *Heroism and Global Politics*, eds. Kitchen, V. & Mathers, J.G. New York & London, Routledge, 1-20.
- Mathers, J.G. & Kitchen, V. (2019b) 'Conclusions: Why Does Global Politics Need Heroes?', in: *Heroism and Global Politics*, eds. Kitchen, V. & Mathers, J.G. New York & London, Routledge, 213-26.
- Mathers, J.G. (2019) 'Medals and American Heroic Military Masculinity After 9/11', in: *Heroism and Global Politics*, eds. Kitchen, V. & Mathers, J.G. New York & London, Routledge, 36-59.
- Matijašić, I. (2019) 'Herodotus in the Theatre At Alexandria? On Athenaeus 14.620d', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 139 83-93
- Matijašić, I. (2022) 'Introduction: How Homeric Was Herodotus? Ancient and Modern Readers', *Histos*, Suppl. 14, 1-38.

- Maxwell-Stuart, P.G. (1976) 'Pain, Mutilation, and Death in Herodotus VII', *Parola del Passato*, Vol. 31, 356-62.
- Mayor, A. & Heaney, M. (1993) 'Griffins and Arimaspeans', *Folklore*, Vol. 104, No. ½, 40-66.
- Mayor, A. (1992) 'Guardians of the Gold', *Archaeology*, Vol. 47, No. 6, 52-9.
- McConnell, J. (2010) 'Invisible Odysseus: A Homeric Hero in Ralph Ellison's *Invisible Man*', in: *Zero to Hero, Hero to Zero: In Search of the Classical Hero*, eds. Langerwerf, L. & Ryan, C. Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Press, 161-82.
- McCoy, M.B. (2013) *Wounded Heroes: Vulnerability as A Virtue in Ancient Greek Literature and Philosophy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- McDonnell, M. (2003) 'Roman Men and Greek Virtue', in: *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, eds. Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 235-62.
- McInerney, J. (2003) 'Plutarch's Manly Women', in: *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, eds. Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 319-44.
- McWilliams, O.C. (2009) 'Not Just Another Racist Honkey: A History of Racial Representation in Captain America and Related Publications', in: *Captain America and the Struggle of the Superhero: Critical Essays*, ed. Weiner, R.G. Jefferson, North Carolina & London, McFarland & Company Inc., 66-78.
- Meier, C. (1987) 'Historical Answers to Historical Questions: The Origins of History in Ancient Greece', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 41-57.
- Melena, J.L. (1972) 'En torno al σκηπτρόν homérico', *Cuadernos de filología clásica*, Vol. 3, 321-56.
- Meunier, J. (1968) 'L'Épisode d'Adraste (Hérodote, I, 33-45).', *Didaskalikon*, Vol. 23, 1-12.
- Mikalson, J.D. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'Religion in Herodotus', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 187-98.
- Miller, D.A. (2000) *The Epic Hero*, Baltimore & London, The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Minchin, E. (1995) 'The Poet Appeals to His Muse: Homeric Invocations in the Context of Epic Performance', *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 91, No. 1, 25-33.
- Minchin, E. (2001) 'How Homeric Is "Hysteron Proteron?"', *Mnemosyne*, Vol. 54, Fasc. 6, 635-45.

- Minchin, E. (2007) *Homeric Voice: Discourse, Memory, Gender*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Moignard, E. (1998) 'How to Make a Monster', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies: Supplement*, No. 71, *Modus Operandi: Essays in Honour of Geoffrey Rickman*, 209-17.
- Moles, J. (1999) 'Anathema kai Ktema: The Inscriptional Inheritance of Ancient Historiography', *Histos*, Vol. 3, 27-69.
- Moles, J. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'Herodotus and Athens', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 33-52.
- Mondi, R. (1980) 'ΣΚΗΠΤΟΥΧΟΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΣ: An Argument for Divine Kingship in Early Greece', *Arethusa*, Vol. 13, No. 2, 203-216.
- Monro, D.B. and Allen, T.W. eds. (1920) *Homeri Opera: Vol. I³ (Il. 1-12)*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Monro, D.B. and Allen, T.W. eds. (1920) *Homeri Opera: Vol. II³ (Il. 13-24)*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Morgan, T. (1998) *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Morris, I. & Powell, B. (eds.) (1997) *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden, Brill.
- Morris, I. (1997) 'Homer and the Iron Age', in: *A New Companion to Homer*, eds. Morris, I. & Powell, B. Leiden, Brill, 535-59.
- Morrison, A.D. (2007) *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Mossman, J. (2005) 'Women's Voices', in: *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. Gregory, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 352-65.
- Most, G.W. (1983) 'Of Motifemes and Megatexts: Comment on Rubin/Sale and Segal', *Arethusa*, Vol. 16, No. 1/2, 199-218.
- Most, G.W. (1989) 'The Structure and Function of Odysseus' *Apologoi*', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* Vol. 119, 15-30.
- Mouzakis, S. (2019) 'Princess of a Different kingdom: Cultural Imperialism, Female Heroism, and the Global Performance of Walt Disney's *Mulan* and *Moana*', in: *Heroism as a Global Phenomenon in Contemporary Culture*, eds. Korte, B., Wendt, S. & Falkenhayner, N. New York & London, Routledge, 61-80.

- Muellner, L. (1976) *The Meaning of Homeric εὔχομαι Through its Formulas*, Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Muellner, L. (1996, reprinted 2005) *The Anger of Achilles: Menis in Greek Epic*, Ithaca & London, Cornell University Press.
- Munson, R.V. (1986) 'The Celebratory Purpose of Herodotus: The Story of Arion in *Histories* 1.23-24', *Ramus*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 93-104.
- Munson, R.V. (1988) 'Artemisia in Herodotus', *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 91-106.
- Munson, R.V. (1993) 'Herodotus' Use of Prospective Sentences and the Story of Rhampsinitus and the Thief in the *Histories*', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 114, No. 1, 27-44.
- Munson, R.V. (2001) 'Ananke in Herodotus', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 121, 30-50.
- Munson, R.V. (2006) 'An Alternate World: Herodotus and Italy', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 257-73.
- Munson, R.V. (2009) 'Who are Herodotus' Persians?', *The Classical World*, Vol.102, No. 4, 457-70.
- Munson, R.V. (2012a) 'Herodotus and the Heroic Age: The Case of Minos', in: *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, eds. Baragwanath, E. & de Bakker, M. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 195-212.
- Munson, R.V. (2012b) 'Persians in Thucydides', in: *Thucydides and Herodotus*, eds. Foster, E. & Lateiner, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 241-77.
- Murnaghan, S. (1986) 'Penelope's Agnoia: Knowledge, Power, and Gender in the *Odyssey*', *Helios*, Vol. 13, 103-15.
- Murphy, L. (2019) 'United in Grief: Achilles, Alexander and Hadrian' *New Classicists*, Issue 1, 59-67.
- Murray, A.T. (Tr.) (1928) *Homer the Iliad with an English Translation I*, London & New York, William Heinemann Ltd.
- Murray, O. & Moreno, A. (eds.) (2007) *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Murray, O. (1987/2001a) 'Herodotus and Oral History', in: *Achaemenid History, ii. The Greek Sources*, eds. Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H. & Kuhrt, A. Leiden, Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 93-115. Reprinted in: *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, ed. Luraghi, N. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 16-44.

- Murray, O. (2001b) 'Herodotus and Oral History Reconsidered', in: *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, ed. Luraghi, N. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 314-25.
- N'Guessan, K. & Späth, M. (2019) 'Y'a Bon? Popularizing the *Tirailleurs* as Heroes of (Anti-) Colonialism', in: *Heroism as a Global Phenomenon in Contemporary Culture*, eds. Korte, B., Wendt, S. & Falkenhayner, N. New York & London, Routledge, 38-60.
- Nagler, M.N. (1988) 'Toward a Semantics of Ancient Conflict: Eris in the "Iliad"', *The Classical World*, Vol. 82, No. 2, 81-90.
- Nagy, G. (1979, reprinted 1999) *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry Revised Edition*, Baltimore & London, The John Hopkins University Press.
- Nagy, G. (1983) 'Sēma and Nōēsis: Some Illustrations', *Arethusa*, Vol. 16, No. 1/2, 35-55.
- Nagy, G. (1987a) 'Herodotus the *Logios*', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 175-84.
- Nagy, G. (1987b) 'Response', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 209-10.
- Nagy, G. (2003) *Homeric Responses*, Austin, University of Texas Press.
- Nagy, G. (2005, reprinted 2009) 'The Epic Hero', in: *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, ed. Foley, J.M. Oxford, Blackwell, 71-89.
- Nagy, G. (2013, reprinted 2020) *The Ancient Greek Hero in 24 Hours*, Cambridge & London, Harvard University Press.
- Nagy, G. (2018) 'Herodotus on queens and courtesans of Egypt', in: *Herodotus—Narrator, Scientist, Historian*, ed. Bowie, E. Berlin & Boston, De Gruyter, 109-22.
- Naithani, S. (2022) 'Folktale's Hero in the Post-Truth World', in: *The Hero and Hero-Making Across Genres*, eds. Singh, A., Tholia, S. & Patel, P.K. New York & London, Routledge, 101-5.
- Nakamura, J. & Graham, L. (2017) 'The Impact of Heroism on Heroes and Observers: Stories of Elevation and Personal Change', in: *Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership*, eds. Allison, S.T., Goethals, G.R. & Kramer, R.M. New York & London, Routledge, 417-37.
- Nandi, S. (2019) 'Unlikely Tragic (Anti-)Heroes: Gangsters Translated into Hindi Films', in: *Heroism as a Global Phenomenon in Contemporary Culture*, eds. Korte, B., Wendt, S. & Falkenhayner, N. New York & London, Routledge, 150-66.
- Nelson, S. (2005, reprinted 2009) 'Hesiod', in: *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, ed. Foley, J.M. Oxford, Blackwell, 330-43.

- Nelson, T.J. (2021) 'Intertextual *Agōnes* in Archaic Greek Epic: Penelope vs. the *Catalogue of Women*', *Yearbook of Ancient Greek Epic Online*, Vol. 5, Iss. 1, 25-57.
- Neutatz, D. (2019) '*Zashchitniki (Guardians)*: A Failed Russian-Soviet Answer to Superman and Batman', in: *Heroism as a Global Phenomenon in Contemporary Culture*, eds. Korte, B., Wendt, S. & Falkenhayner, N. New York & London, Routledge, 99-113.
- Newberry, P.E. (1943) 'Queen Nitocris of the Sixth Dynasty', *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Vol. 29, 51-4.
- Newton, R.M. (1987) 'Odysseus and Hephaestus in the "Odyssey"', *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 83, No. 1, 12-20.
- Nickel, R. (2010) 'Athene, Penelope, and the Vengeance Plot Against the Suitors', *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, New Series, Vol. 96, No. 3, 29-54.
- Nicolai, R. (2007, reprinted 2011) 'The Place of History in the Ancient World', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 13-26.
- Nicolson, A. (2014, reprinted 2015) *The Mighty Heroic Dead Why Homer Matters*, London, William Collins Publishers.
- Nisbet, G. (2011) 'An Ancient Greek Graphic Novel: *P.Oxy. XXII 2331*', in: *Classics and Comics*, eds. Kovacs, G. & Marshall, C.W. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 27-41.
- Norden, E. (1920) *Die germanische Urgeschichte in Tacitus Germania*, Leipzig & Berlin, B. G. Teubner.
- Northrup, M.D. (1980) 'Homer's Catalogue of Women', *Ramus*, Vol. 9, 150-9.
- O'Sullivan, P. (2001) Review of: Collins, D. (1998), retrieved from: <https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2001/2001.02.02/> [accessed 26/06/2024].
- Obbink, D. (2001) 'The Genre of Plataea: Generic Unity in the New Simonides', in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 65-85.
- Oliver, I.C. (2017) 'The Audiences of Herodotus: The Influence of Performance on the *Histories*', PhD Thesis, University of Colorado, Boulder.
- Olson, D. (1989) 'Odyssey 8: Guile, Force and the Subversive Poetics of Desire', *Arethusa*, Vol. 22, No. 2, 135-45.
- Omitowoju, R. (1997, reprinted 2002) 'Regulating Rape: Soap Operas and Self-Interest in the Athenian Courts', in: *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, eds. Deacy, S. & Pierce, K.F. London, Duckworth, 1-24.

- Ormand, K. (2005) Review of Rosen R.M. and Sluiter, I. eds. (2003), *Phoenix*, Vol. 59, No. 3, 379-81.
- Osborne, R. (2000) 'The Creation of Classical Greece', in: *Short Oxford History of Europe: Classical Greece*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1-22.
- Osborne, R. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'Archaic Greek History', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 497-520.
- Osborne, R. (2004, reprinted 2014) 'Homer's Society', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Fowler, R. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 206-19.
- Osborne, R. (ed.) (2000) *Short Oxford History of Europe Classical Greece*, ed. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Osbourne, R. (1996, reprinted 2006) *Greece in the Making, 1200-479BC*, London, Routledge.
- Owen, E.T. (1989) *The Story of the Iliad*, Bristol, Bristol Classical Press.
- Packman, Z.M. (1991) 'The Incredible and the Incredulous: The Vocabulary of Disbelief in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon', *Hermes*, Vol. 119, 399-414.
- Pagani, L. (2008) 'Il Codice Eroico E Il Guerriero Di Fronte Alla Morte', in: *Eroi Nell'Iliade: Personaggi e Strutture Narrative* ed. Pagani, L. Rome, Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, 327-418.
- Pagani, L. (ed.) (2008) *Eroi Nell'Iliade: Personaggi e Strutture Narrative*, Rome, Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura.
- Pantelia, M.C. (1993) 'Spinning and Weaving: Ideas of Domestic Order in Homer', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 114, No. 4, 493-501.
- Papadodima, E. (2014) 'Sortition and Heroic Moral Values in Greek Tragedy. The Case of Sophocles' *Ajax* and Euripides' *Children of Heracles*', *Athenaeum*, Vol. 102, No. 2, 388-401.
- Parry, H. (1994) 'The *Apologos* of Odysseus: Lies, All Lies?' *Phoenix*, Vol. 48, No. 1, 1-20.
- Parry, M. [1928] *L'Épithète Traditionnelle dans Homère: Essai sur un problème de style Homérique*, Translated in: *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*, ed. Parry, A. (1971), Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1-190.
- Parsons, P. (1992) '3965: Simonides, Elegies' *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. 59, 4-50.
- Parsons, P. (2001) "'These Fragments We Have Shored Against Our Ruin'", in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 55-64.

- Partridge, K. (2019) 'Everyday Heroics: Motivating Masculine Protection in the Private Security Industry', in: *Heroism and Global Politics*, eds. Kitchen, V. & Mathers, J.G. New York & London, Routledge, 60-80.
- Patel P.K. (2022) 'The Hero and the Other: The Making and Unmaking of Heroes Across Cultures', in: *The Hero and Hero-Making Across Genres*, eds. Singh, A., Tholia, S. & Patel, P.K. New York & London, Routledge, 229-45.
- Patzer, H. (1991) 'Die Reise des Telemach', *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 16, 17-35.
- Pavese, C.O. (1995) 'Elegia di Simonide agli Spartiati per Platea', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 107, 1-26.
- Pelling, C. (1990) 'Preface', in: *Characterisation and Individuality in Greek Literature*, ed. Pelling, C. Oxford, Oxford University Press, v-vii.
- Pelling, C. (1997a) 'Aeschylus' *Persae* and History', in: *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*, ed. Pelling, C. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1-19.
- Pelling, C. (1997b) 'East is East and West is West – Or Are They? National Stereotypes in Herodotus', *Histos*, Suppl. 1, 51-66.
- Pelling, C. (2002) 'Speech and Action: Herodotus' Debate on the Constitutions', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, No. 48, 123-58.
- Pelling, C. (2006a) 'Homer and Herodotus', in: *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil and the Epic Tradition presented to Jasper Griffin by former pupils*, eds. Clarke, M.J., Currie, B.G.F. & Lyne, R.O.A.M. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 75-104.
- Pelling, C. (2006b, reprinted 2013) 'Speech and Narrative in the *Histories*' in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 103-21.
- Pelling, C. (2007) 'De Malignitate Plutarchi: Plutarch, Herodotus, and the Persian Wars', in: *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars*, eds. Bridges, E., Hall, E. & Rhodes, P.J. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 145-64.
- Pelling, C. (2011) 'Herodotus and Samos', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, Vol. 54, No. 1, 1-18.
- Pelling, C. (2019) *Herodotus and the Question Why*, Austin, Texas, University of Texas Press.
- Pelling, C. (2020) 'Homer and the Question Why', *Histos*, Suppl. 11, 1-35.
- Pelling, C. (2022) 'Homeric and Herodotean Intertextuality: What's the Point?', *Histos*, Suppl. 14, 39-58.

- Pelling, C. (ed.) (1990) *Characterisation and Individuality in Greek Literature*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Pelling, C. (ed.) (1997) *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Penrose, W.D. (2016) *Postcolonial Amazons: Female Masculinity and Courage in Ancient Greek and Sanskrit Literature*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Peradotto, J. (1983) 'Texts and Unrefracted Facts: Philology, Hermeneutics and Semiotics', *Arethusa*, Vol. 16, No. 1/2, 15-33.
- Peradotto, J. (1990) *Man in the Middle Voice, Name and Narration in the Odyssey*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Petridou, G. (2015) *Divine Epiphany in Greek Literature and Culture*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Phillips, R.L. (2024) 'Introducing Superhero Tales into the Classroom: Greek Myth and the Changing Nature of Story', *Classical Journal*, Vol. 119, No. 3, 347-74.
- Pitcher, L.V. (2007, reprinted 2011) 'Characterisation in Ancient Historiography', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 102-17.
- Podlecki, A.J. (1961) 'Guest-gifts and Nobodies in Odyssey 9', *Phoenix*, Vol. 15, 125-33.
- Pomeroy, S.B. (1994) *Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity*, London, Pimlico.
- Powell, A. & Debnar, P. (eds.) (2020) *Thucydides and Sparta*, Swansea, Classical Press of Wales.
- Powell, A. (ed.) (1989) *Classical Sparta (Routledge Revivals): Techniques Behind Her Success*, London, Routledge.
- Pownall, F. (2009) Review of eds. Dewald, C. and Marincola, J. (2006), *Phoenix*, Vol. 63, No. 1/2, 174-7.
- Pratt, L. & Sampson, C.M. (eds.) (2018) *Engaging Classical Texts in the Contemporary World: From Narratology to Reception*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.
- Pratt, L. (1993) *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar: Falsehood and Deception in Archaic Greek Poetics*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.
- Prentice, W.K. (1920) 'Thermopylae and Artemisium', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 51, 5-18.
- Priestley, J. (2014) *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture: Literary Studies in the Reception of the Histories*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

- Pritchett, W.K. (1958) 'New Light on Thermopylai', *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 62, No. 2, 203-13.
- Pritchett, W.K. (1993) *The Liar School of Herodotus*, Amsterdam, J.C. Gieben.
- Proietti, G. (2013) 'The Marathon Epitaph from Eua-Loukou: Some Notes about its Text and Historical Context', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Vol. 185, 24-30.
- Pucci, P. (1987, reprinted 1995) *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad*, Ithaca & London, Cornell University Press.
- Pucci, P. (2010) 'The Splendid figure of κῦδος', *LEXIS – Poetica, retorica e comunicazione nella tradizione classica*, Vol. 28, 201-25.
- Purves, A.C. (2010) 'Wind and Time in Homeric Epic', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 140, No. 2, 323-50.
- Purves, A.C. (2011) 'Homer and the Art of Overtaking', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 132, No. 4, 523-51.
- R.W.L. (1922) Review of Godley, A.D. (1921) [Translation of Herodotus], *The Classical Review*, Vol. 36, No. 5/6, 135.
- Raaflaub, K.A. (1987) 'Herodotus, Political Thought, and the Meaning of History', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 221-48.
- Raaflaub, K.A. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'Philosophy, Science, Politics: Herodotus and the Intellectual Trends of his Time', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 149-86.
- Raaflaub, K.A. (2011) 'Riding on Homer's Chariot: The Search for a Historical 'Epic Society'', *Antichthon*, Vol. 45, 1-34.
- Race, W.H. (2014) 'Achilles' κῦδος in *Iliad* 24', *Mnemosyne*, Vol. 67, 707-724.
- Rademaker, A. (2003) '"Most Citizens are Europrôktoi Now": (Un)manliness in Aristophanes', in: *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, eds. Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 115-26.
- Raeburn, D. & Thomas, O. eds. (2011) *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus: A Commentary for Students*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Rai, S. (2018) Review of Marshall, P.D. (2014), *International Journal of Communication*, Vol. 12, 2263-6.
- Rankine, P. (2011) 'Odysseus as Slave: The Ritual of Domination and Social Death in Homeric Society', in: *Reading Ancient Slavery*, eds. Alston, R., Hall, E. & Proffitt, L. New York, Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 34-50.

- Ransom, C. (2011) 'Aspects of Effeminacy and Masculinity in the Iliad', *Antichthon*, Vol. 45, 35–57.
- Ready, J.L. & Tsagalis, C. (eds.) (2018) *Homer in Performance: Rhapsodes, Narrators and Characters*, Austin, University of Texas Press.
- Ready, J.L. (2010) 'Why Odysseus Strings his Bow', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, Vol. 50, 133-57.
- Redfield, J. (1975, reprinted 1994) *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Redfield, J. (1985) 'Herodotus the Tourist', *Classical Philology*, Vol. 80, No. 2, 97-118.
- Redfield, J. (1987) 'Commentary on Humphreys and Raaflaub', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 249-53.
- Reichel, M. and Rengakos, A. (eds.) (2002) *EPEA PTEROENTA: Beiträge zur Homerforschung: Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann zum 75 Geburtstag*, Stuttgart, Franz Steiner.
- Renehan, R. (1987) 'The Heldenot in Homer: One Heroic Ideal', *Classical Philology*, Vol. 82, No. 2, 99-116.
- Rengakos, A. (2002) 'Narrativität, Intertextualität, Selbstreferentialität: Die neue Deutung der Odyssee', in: *EPEA PTEROENTA: Beiträge zur Homerforschung: Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann zum 75 Geburtstag*, eds. Reichel, M. and Rengakos, A. Stuttgart, Franz Steiner, 173-91.
- Rey, F.E. (2008) 'Los Prómachoi Homéricos Y La Formación Cerrada En La Épica Griega', *Herakleion*, Vol. 1, 41-67.
- Reynolds, J.M. (1998) 'Cyrene', in: *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilisation*, eds. Hornblower, S. & Spawforth, A. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 204-5.
- Rhodes, P.J. (2007) 'Impact of the Persian Wars on Classical Greece', in: *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars*, eds. Bridges, E., Hall, E. & Rhodes, P.J. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 31-45.
- Rhodes, P.J. (2007, reprinted 2011) 'Document and the Greek Historians', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 56-66.
- Richardson Jr, R.L. (1987) Review of Braudy, L. (1986), *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 74, No. 1 144-5.
- Richardson, N. (1993, Reprinted 1996) *The Iliad: A Commentary: Volume VI: Books 21-24*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

- Richardson, S. (1996) 'Truth in the Tales of the "Odyssey"' *Mnemosyne*, Vol. 49, Fasc. 4, 393-402.
- Ricoeur, P. (1983) *Time and Narrative Volume I*, Trans. K. McLaughlin and D. Pellauer, Chicago, London, The University of Chicago Press.
- Rieks, R. (1975) 'Eine Tragische Erzählung bei Herodot (*Hist.* 1.34-45)', *Poetica*, Vol. 7, 23-44.
- Rieu, E.V. (Tr.) (1946) *Homer: the Odyssey*, London, Penguin Classics.
- Rieu, E.V. (Tr.) (1950) *Homer: The Iliad*, London, Penguin Classics.
- Roberts, D.H. (2005) 'Beginnings and Endings', in: *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. Gregory, J. Chichester, John Wiley & Sons Inc., 136-48.
- Roberts, J.T. (2011) *Herodotus a Very Short Introduction*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Robertson, G.I.C. (2003) 'The Andreia of Xenocles: Kouros, Kallos and Kleos', in: *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, eds. Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 59-76.
- Robertson, N. (1987) 'The True Meaning of the "Wooden Wall"', *Classical Philology*, Vol. 82, No. 1, 1-20.
- Roche, H. & Demetriou, K. (eds.) (2017) *Brill's Companion to the Classics, Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany*, Leiden & Boston, Brill.
- Roche, H. (2017a) "'Distant Models'? Italian Fascism, National Socialism and the Lure of the Classics', in: *Brill's Companion to the Classics, Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany*, eds. Roche, H. & Demetriou, K. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 3-28.
- Roche, H. (2017b) 'Classics and Education in the Third Reich: *Die Alten Sprachen* and the Nazification of Latin-and-Greek-Teaching in Secondary Schools', in: *Brill's Companion to the Classics, Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany*, eds. Roche, H. & Demetriou, K. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 238-63.
- Rodrigues, N.S. (2020, reprinted 2022) 'A Goddess for the Greeks: Demeter as Identity Factor in Herodotus', in: *Ethnicity and Identity in Herodotus*, eds. Figueira, T. & Soares, C. New York & London, Routledge, 178-97.
- Rogers, B.M. (2011) 'Heroes Unlimited: The Theory of the Hero's Journey and the Limitation of the Superhero Myth', in: *Classics and Comics*, eds. Kovacs, G. & Marshall, C.W. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 73-86.
- Roisman, J. (1987) 'Alkidas in Thucydides', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Vol. 36, 385-421.

- Roisman, J. (2003) 'The Rhetoric of Courage in the Athenian Orators', in: *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, eds. Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 127-44.
- Romm, J. (1998) *Herodotus*, New Haven & London, Yale University Press.
- Romm, J. (2006, reprinted 2013) 'Herodotus and the Natural World', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 178-91.
- Rood, T. (2006, reprinted 2013) 'Herodotus and Foreign Lands' in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 290-305.
- Rood, T. (2007, reprinted 2011) 'The Development of the War Monograph', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 147-58.
- Rood, T. (2010) 'Herodotus' Proem: Space, Time, and the Origins of International Relations', *Ariadne*, Vol. 16, 43-74.
- Rood, T. (2020) 'From Ethnography to History: Herodotean and Thucydidean Traditions in the Development of Greek Historiography', in: *Herodotus in the Long Nineteenth Century*, eds. Harrison, T. & Skinner, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 20-45.
- Rosen, R.M. & Horstmannshoff, M. (2003) 'The Andreia of the Hippocratic Physician and the Problem of Incurables', in: *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, eds. Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 95-114.
- Rosenstock, B. (1983) 'Rereading the "Republic"', *Arethusa*, Vol. 16, No. 1/2, 219-246.
- Rösler, W. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'The *Histories* and Writing', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill 79-94.
- Roy, C.S. (2012) 'The Constitutional Debate: Herodotus' Exploration of Good Government' *Histos*, Vol. 6, 298-320.
- Rozokoki, A. (2001) 'Penelope's Dream in Book 19 of the "Odyssey"', *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 51, No. 1, 1-6.
- Rubin, N.F. & Sale, W.M. (1983) 'Meleager and Odysseus: A Structural and Cultural Study of the Greek Hunting-Maturation Myth', *Arethusa*, Vol. 16, No. 1/2, 137-171.
- Rubin, N.F. (1983) 'Introduction: Why Classics and Semiotics?', *Arethusa*, Vol. 16, No. 1/2, 5-14.

- Rubincam, C. (2012) 'The 'Rationality' of Herodotus and Thucydides as Evidenced by the Respective Use of Numbers', in: *Thucydides and Herodotus*, eds. Foster, E. & Lateiner, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 97-122.
- Russo, J. (1994) 'Homer's Style: Nonformulaic Features of an Oral Aesthetic', *Oral Tradition*, Vol. 9, No. 2, 371-89.
- Russo, J. (2004) 'Odysseus' Trial of the Bow as Symbolic Performance', in: *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung*, eds. Bierl A. et al., Leipzig, 95-101.
- Rusten, J.S. (2013) 'Ἀγλός Ἐκινήθη: An 'Imaginary Earthquake' on Delos in Herodotus and Thucydides', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 133, 135-45.
- Rutherford, I. (2001) 'The New Simonides: Towards a Commentary', in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 33-54.
- Rutherford, R.B. (1986) 'The Philosophy of the Odyssey', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 106, 145-62.
- Rutherford, R.B. (1992) 'What's New in Homeric Studies?', *JACT Review*, Vol. 11, 15-17.
- Rutherford, R.B. (2007, reprinted 2011) 'Tragedy and History', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 504-14.
- Rutherford, R.B. (2012) 'Structure and Meaning in Epic and Historiography', in: *Thucydides and Herodotus*, eds. Foster, E. & Lateiner, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 13-38.
- Saïd, S. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'Herodotus and Tragedy', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill 117-47.
- Saïd, S. (2005) 'Aeschylean Tragedy', in: *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. Gregory, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 215-32.
- Saïd, S. (2007, reprinted 2011) 'Myth and Historiography', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 76-88.
- Saïd, S. (2012) 'Herodotus and the 'Myth' of the Trojan War', in: *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, eds. Baragwanath, E. & de Bakker, M. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 87-105.
- Sale, W. (1961) 'The Hyperborean Maidens on Delos', *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 54, No. 2, 75-89.

- Sancisi-Weerdenburg, H. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'The Personality of Xerxes, King of Kings', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 579-90.
- Sancisi-Werdeenburg, H.W.A.M. (1983) 'Exit Atossa', in: *Images of Women in Antiquity*, eds. Cameron, A. & Kuhrt, A. London, Routledge, 20-34.
- Savan, D. (1983) 'Comment on Rosenstock and Frischer', *Arethusa*, Vol. 16, No. 1/2, 267-275.
- Scally, T. (1978) 'Odysseus as Audience', *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory*, Vol. 50, 55-9.
- Scardino, C. (2012) 'Indirect Discourse in Herodotus and Thucydides', in: *Thucydides and Herodotus*, eds. Foster, E. & Lateiner, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 39-96.
- Schachter, A. (1998) 'Simonides' Elegy on Plataia: The Occasion of its Performance', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 123, 25-30.
- Scheer, T.S. (2007) 'The Past in a Hellenistic Present: Myth and Local Tradition' in: *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, ed. Erskine, A. Malden, Oxford & Carlton, Blackwell, 216-31.
- Schein, S.L. (1970) 'Odysseus and Polyphemus in the Odyssey', *Greek, Roman & Byzantine Studies*, Vol. 11, 74-83.
- Schein, S.L. (1984) *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer's Iliad*, Berkley, Los Angeles, London, University of California Press.
- Schein, S.L. (1988) Review of Braudy, L. (1986), *Criticism*, Vol. 30, No. 2, 253-5.
- Schein, S.L. (1995) 'Female Representations and Interpreting the Odyssey', in: *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey*, ed. Cohen, B. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 17-27.
- Schepens, G. (2007, reprinted 2011) 'History and *Historia*: Inquiry in the Greek Historians', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 39-55.
- Schmiel, R. (1987) 'Achilles in Hades', *Classical Philology*, Vol. 82, No. 1, 35-37.
- Schofield, M.M. (1986) 'Euboulia in the Iliad', *Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 36, 6-31.
- Schröter, M. & Taylor, C. (2018) 'Introduction', in: *Exploring Silence and Absence in Discourse: Empirical Approaches*, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 1-21.
- Scodel, R. (2004, reprinted 2014) 'The Story-Teller and His Audience', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Fowler, R. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 45-55

- Scodel, R. (2005) 'Odysseus' Dog and the Productive Household', *Hermes*, Vol. 133, 401-8.
- Scott, A., Beggan, J. & Goethals, G. (eds.) (2024) *Encyclopedia of Heroism Studies*, Cham, Springer.
- Scott, J.C. (1985) *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*, New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Scott, L. (2005) *Historical Commentary on Herodotus Book 6*, Leiden, Brill.
- Scullion, S. (2006) 'Herodotus and Greek Religion', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 192-208.
- Segal, C. (1979) 'The Myth of Bacchylides 17: Heroic Quest and Heroic Identity', *Eranos*, Vol. 77, 23-37.
- Segal, C. (1983) 'Kleos and its Ironies in the Odyssey', *L'Antiquité Classique*, Vol. 52, 22-47.
- Segal, C. (1983a) 'Greek Myth as a Semiotic and Structural System and the Problem of Tragedy', *Arethusa*, Vol. 16, No. 1/2, 173-198.
- Seibel, A. (1995) 'Widerstreit und Ergänzung: Thersites und Odysseus als rivalisierende Demagogen in der Ilias (B 190-264)', *Hermes*, Vol. 123, 385-97.
- Seidensticker, B. (2005) 'Dithyramb, Comedy, and Satyr-Play', in: *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. Gregory, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 38-54.
- Selincourt, A.D. (1962, reprinted 2001) *The World of Herodotus*, London, Phoenix Press.
- Senn, F. (2000) 'Arguing about Law: Cyclopean Language', *James Joyce Quarterly*, Vol. 37, No. 3/4, 425-46.
- Serghidou, A. (2007) 'Cyprus and Onesilus: An Interlude of Freedom (5.104, 108-16)', in: *Reading Herodotus: A Study of the Logoi in Book 5 of Herodotus' Histories*, eds. Irwin, E. & Greenwood, E. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 269-88.
- Sergueenkova, V. (2016) 'Counting the Past in Herodotus' Histories', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 136, 121-31.
- Severyns, A. (1949) *Homère*, Bruxelles, Office de Publicité.
- Shaheen, J.G. (2001) *Reel Bad Arabs: How Hollywood Vilifies a People*, New York & New Hampton, Olive Branch Press.
- Shaw, P.J. (2001) 'Lord of Hellas, Old Men of the Sea: The Occasion of Simonides' Elegy on Plataea', in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 164-81.

- Sheehan, S. (2018) *A Guide to Reading Herodotus' Histories*, London, Bloomsbury.
- Sherratt, E. (1990) 'Reading the Texts: Archaeology and the Homeric Question', *Antiquity*, Vol. 64, 807-24.
- Sherratt, S. (2004) 'Feasting in Homeric Epic', *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, Vol. 73, No. 2, 301-37.
- Shewring, W. (Tr.) (1980) *Homer: the Odyssey*, Oxford, Oxford World Classics.
- Shrimpton, G.S. & Gillis, K.M. (1997) 'Appendix 1: Herodotus' Source Citations', in: *History and Memory in Ancient Greece with an Appendix on Herodotus' Source Citations by G.S. Shrimpton and K.M. Gillis*, Montreal & Kingston, London, Buffalo, McGill-Queen's University Press, 229-65.
- Shrimpton, G.S. (1997) *History and Memory in Ancient Greece with an Appendix on Herodotus' Source Citations by G.S. Shrimpton and K.M. Gillis*, Montreal & Kingston, London, Buffalo, McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Sider, D. (2001) "'As Is the Generation of Leaves" in Homer, Simonides, Horace, and Stobaeus', in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 272-88.
- Silk, M. (2004, reprinted 2014) 'The Odyssey and its Explorations', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Fowler, R. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 31-44.
- Simms, R.C. (2011) 'The Burden of War: from Homer to Oeming', in: *Classics and Comics*, eds. Kovacs, G. & Marshall, C.W. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 115-28.
- Simon, E. (1975) 'Kratos und Bia', *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol. 1, 177-86.
- Simpson, R.H. (1972) 'Leonidas' Decision', *Phoenix*, Vol. 26, No. 1, 1-11.
- Singer H. & von Wiese, B. (eds.) (1967) *Festschrift für Richard Alewyn*, Cologne, Bohlau.
- Singh, A. & Tholia, S. (2022) 'Introduction', in: *The Hero and Hero-Making Across Genres*, eds. Singh, A., Tholia, S. & Patel, P.K. New York & London, Routledge, 1-33.
- Singh, A., Tholia, S. & Patel, P.K. (eds.) (2022) *The Hero and Hero-Making Across Genres*, New York & London, Routledge.
- Skinner, J. (2020) 'Imagining Empire Through Herodotus', in: *Herodotus in the Long Nineteenth Century*, eds. Harrison, T. & Skinner, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 117-53.
- Slatkin, L.M. (2005, reprinted 2009) 'Homer's *Odyssey*', in: *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, ed. Foley, J.M. Oxford, Blackwell, 315-29.

- Slings, S.R. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'Oral Strategies in the Language of Herodotus' in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 53-77.
- Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. (2003) 'General Introduction', in: *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, eds. Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 1-24.
- Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. (eds.) (2003) *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden & Boston, Brill.
- Smith, G. (1921) Review of Godley, A.D. (1921) [Translation of Herodotus], *Classical Philology*, Vol. 16, No. 3, 303-4.
- Smoláriková, K. (2016) 'Egyptian Nocturnal Festival of Lamps in Honour of Athena-Neith', *Studia Hercynia*, Vol. 20, No. 1, 27-32.
- Smyth, H.W. (1920) *A Greek Grammar for Colleges*, New York, American Book Co.
- Snyder, J.M. (1981) 'The Web of Song: Weaving Imagery in Homer and the Lyric Poets', *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 76, No. 3, 193-6.
- Soares, C. (2014) 'Dress and Undress in Herodotus' *Histories*', *Phoenix*, Vol. 68, No. 3/4, 222-34.
- Solmsen, L. (1944) 'Speeches in Herodotus' Account of the Battle of Plataea', *Classical Philology*, Vol. 39, No. 4, 241-53.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (2003) 'Herodotos (and others) on Pelasgians: Some Perceptions of Ethnicity', in: *Herodotus and his World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, eds. Derow, P. & Parker, R. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 103-44.
- Stadter, P. (2006 reprinted 2013) 'Cities of Mainland Greece' in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 242-56.
- Stadter, P. (2012) 'Thucydides as 'Reader' of Herodotus', in: *Thucydides and Herodotus*, eds. Foster, E. & Lateiner, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 39-66.
- Stahl, H.P. (2012) 'Herodotus and Thucydides on Blind Decisions Preceding Military Action', in: *Thucydides and Herodotus*, eds. Foster, E. & Lateiner, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 125-53.
- Stambler, S. (1982) 'Herodotus', in: *Ancient Writers: Greece and Rome: Volume 1 Homer to Caesar*, ed. Luce, T.J. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 209-232.

- Stanford, W.B. (1964) *The Ulysses Theme: A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero*, Barnes and Noble Inc., New York.
- Stanley, K. (1993) *The Shield of Homer: Narrative Structure in the Iliad*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Stehle, E. (2001) 'A Bard of the Iron Age and His Auxiliary Muse', in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 106-19.
- Stein, C.D. (2016) 'The Life and Death of Agamemnon's Scepter: The Imagery of Achilles (Iliad 1.234-239)', *The Classical World*, Vol. 109, No. 4, 447-63.
- Steinbock, B. (2018) 'The narrative richness of the Argus scene (Od. 17.290-327)', in: *Engaging Classical Texts in The Contemporary World: From Narratology to Reception*, eds. Pratt, L. & Sampson, C.M. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 9-28.
- Steinrück, M. (1994) 'Die fremde Stimme: der Erzähler und das Schweigen der Frauen im 11 Buch der *Odysssee*', *Kleos*, Vol. 1, 83-128.
- Stelow, A.R. (2020) *Menelaus in the Archaic Period: Not Quite the Best of the Achaeans*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Stewart, A.F. (1993) *Faces of Power: Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Stockdale, E. (2018) 'With and without you: the νόστοι of Helen and Menelaos and the path to μήτις' in: *Paths of Knowledge: Interconnection(s) Between Knowledge and Journey in the Graeco-Roman World: Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 60*, eds. Ferella, C. & Breytenbach, C. Berlin, Ed. Topoi, 19-33.
- Stoessl, F. (1960) 'Zur Bedeutung von griech. Βία', *Die Sprache*, Vol. 6, 67-74.
- Strasburger, H. (1972) *Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung*, Heidelberg, Winter.
- Strid, O. (2006) 'Voiceless Victims and Memorable Deaths in Herodotus', *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 56, No. 2, 393-403.
- Struck, P.T. (2003) 'The Ordeal of the Divine Sign: Divination and Manliness in Archaic and Classical Greece', in: *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, eds. Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 167-86.
- Stuppy, A. & Mead, N.L. (2017) 'Heroic Leaders and Despotism Tyrants: How Power and Status Shape Leadership', in: *Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership*, eds. Allison, S.T., Goethals, G.R. & Kramer, R.M. New York & London, Routledge, 476-94.

- Sutliff, J. (2009) 'The Ultimate American?', in: *Captain America and the Struggle of the Superhero: Critical Essays*, ed. Weiner, R.G. Jefferson, North Carolina & London, McFarland & Company Inc., 121-124.
- Swayne, G.C. (1870) *Herodotus*, Edinburgh, William Blackwood & Sons.
- Szegedy-Maszak, A. (1987) 'Commentary on Carolyn Dewald', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 171-4.
- Taplin, O. (1990) 'Agamemnon's Role in the *Iliad*', in: *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, ed. Pelling, C. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 60-82.
- Taplin, O. (1992) *Homeric Soundings: the Shaping of the Iliad*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Thalmann, W.G. (1998) *The Swineherd and the Bow: Representations of Class in the Odyssey*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Theisen, N.A. (2011) 'Declassicizing the Classical in Japanese Comics: Osamu Tezuka's *Apollo's Song*', in: *Classics and Comics*, eds. Kovacs, G. & Marshall, C.W. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 59-71.
- Thomas, R. (1997) 'Ethnography, Proof, and Argument in Herodotus' *Histories*', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, Vol. 43, 128-48.
- Thomas, R. (2000) *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science, and the Art of Persuasion*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, R. (2006, reprinted 2013) 'The Intellectual Milieu of Herodotus', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 60-75.
- Thomas, R. (2012) 'Herodotus and Eastern Myths and Logoi: Deioces the Mede and Pythius the Lydian', in: *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, eds. Baragwanath, E. & de Bakker, M. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 233-253.
- Tomasso, V. (2011) 'Hard-Boiled Hot Gates: Making the Classical Past Other in Frank Miller's *Sin City*', in: *Classics and Comics*, eds. Kovacs, G. & Marshall, C.W. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 145-58.
- Tribulato, O. (2022) 'The Homericness of Herodotus' Language (with a Case-Study on -έειν Aorist Infinitives in the Histories)', *Histos*, Suppl. 14, 241-86.
- Trimble, G. (2010) 'Thesea Fide. Heroic Faith and Faithlessness in Ovid's Exile Poetry', in: *Zero to Hero, Hero to Zero: In Search of the Classical Hero*, eds. Langerwerf, L. & Ryan, C. Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Press, 73-95.
- Tritle, L. (2006, reprinted 2013) 'Warfare in Herodotus', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 209-23.

- Trümper, H. (1950) *Kriegerische Fachausdrücke im griechischen Epos: Untersuchungen zum Wortschatze Homers*, Basel, Helbing & Lichtenhahn.
- Tsagalis C. & Markantonatos, A. (eds.) (2017) *The Winnowing Oar - New Perspectives in Homeric Studies*, Berlin, New York, Walter de Gruyter.
- Tsakmakis, A. (2018) 'Narrative and Identity in Thermopylae (Herodotus 7.201-7.239)' in: *Textual Strategies in Ancient War Narrative: Thermopylae, Cannae and Beyond*, eds. Van Gils, L., de Jong, I.J.F. & Kroon, C. Leiden, Boston, Brill, 91-112.
- Tuplin, C. (2007, reprinted 2011) 'Continuous Histories (*Hellenica*)', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 159-70.
- Tuplin, C. (2022) 'Poet and Historian: The Impact of Homer in Herodotus' Histories', *Histos*, Suppl. 14, 287-374.
- Turkeltaub, D. (2015) 'Penelope's Lion, ΘΥΜΟΛΕΩΝ Husband, and ΘΥΜΟΣ-Destroying Pain', *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 110, No. 3, 279-302.
- Turner, D. (2024) '“Tell me about a complicated man”: Odysseus in Athens in the Fifth Century BC', PhD Thesis, University of Durham, Durham.
- Van Gils, L., de Jong, I.J.F. & Kroon, C. (eds.) (2018) *Textual Strategies in Ancient War Narrative: Thermopylae, Cannae and Beyond*, eds. Leiden, Boston, Brill.
- van Nijf, O. (2003) 'Athletics, Andreia and the Askêsis-Culture in the Roman East, in: *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, eds. Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 263-86.
- van Nortwick, T. (2008, reprinted 2011) *The Unknown Odysseus: Alternate Worlds in Homer's Odyssey*, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press.
- van Wees, H. & Fisher, N. (2015) 'Introduction: The Trouble with “Aristocracy”', in: *“Aristocracy” in Antiquity: Redefining Greek and Roman Elites*, eds. van Wees, H. & Fisher, N. Swansea, Classical Press of Wales, 1-57.
- van Wees, H. & Fisher, N. (eds.) (2015) *“Aristocracy” in Antiquity: Redefining Greek and Roman Elites*, Swansea, Classical Press of Wales.
- van Wees, H. (1992) *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History*, Amsterdam, J.C. Gieben.
- van Wees, H. (1996) 'Heroes, Knights and Nutters: Warrior Mentality in Homer', in: *Battle in Antiquity*, ed. Lloyd, A.B. London and Swansea, Classical Press of Wales, 1-86.
- van Wees, H. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'Herodotus and the Past', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 321-49.

- van Wees, H. (2018) 'Thermopylae: Herodotus versus the Legend', in: *Textual Strategies in Ancient War Narrative: Thermopylae, Cannae and Beyond*, eds. Van Gils, L., de Jong, I.J.F. & Kroon, C. Leiden, Boston, Brill, 19-53.
- Vandello, J.A., Goldschmied, N. & Michniewicz, K. (2017) 'Underdogs as Heroes', in: *Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership*, eds. Allison, S.T., Goethals, G.R. & Kramer, R.M. New York & London, Routledge, 339-55.
- Vandiver, E. (1991) *Heroes in Herodotus: The Interaction of Myth and History*, Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York, Paris, Peter Lang.
- Vandiver, E. (2012) "'Strangers are from Zeus': Homeric Xenia at the courts of Proteus and Croesus', in: *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, eds. Baragwanath, E. & de Bakker, M. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 143-66.
- Vannicelli, P. (2007, reprinted 2011) 'To Each His Own: Simonides and Herodotus on Thermopylae', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 315-21.
- Vannicelli, P. (2012) 'The Mythical Origins of the Medes and the Persians', in: *Myth, Truth, and Narrative in Herodotus*, eds. Baragwanath, E. & de Bakker, M. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 255-68.
- Vasunia, P. (2020) 'Of Europe', in: *Herodotus in the Long Nineteenth Century*, eds. Harrison, T. & Skinner, J. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 179-99.
- Vattuone, R. (2007, reprinted 2011) 'Western Greek Historiography', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 189-99.
- Verity, A. (2016) *Homer: The Odyssey*, Oxford, Oxford World Classics.
- Vernant, J.P. (1987) 'Commentary on Meier and Konstan', *Arethusa*, Vol. 20, No. 1 & 2, 75-82.
- Viviers, D. (1995) Review of Vandiver, E. (1991), *L'Antiquité Classique*, T. 64, 285-6.
- Walcot, P. (1978) 'Herodotus on Rape', *Arethusa*, Vol. 11, No. 1/2, 137-47.
- Walden, D.O. (2021) 'To Sing the Deeds of Men: Epithet and Identity in Homeric Epic', PhD Thesis, University of Michigan.
- Walker, L.J. (2017) 'The Moral Character of Heroes', in: *Handbook of Heroism and Heroic Leadership*, eds. Allison, S.T., Goethals, G.R. & Kramer, R.M. New York & London, Routledge, 99-119.
- Wallinga, H.T. (1984) 'The Ionian Revolt', *Mnemosyne*, Vol. 37, Fasc. 3/4, 401-37.

- Wassermann, F.M. (1964) 'The Voice of Sparta in Thucydides', *Classical Journal*, Vol. 59, No. 7, 289–97.
- Waterfield, R. (2009) 'On "Fussy Authorial Nudges" in Herodotus', *The Classical World*, Vol. 102, No. 4, 485-94.
- Waterfield, R. (Tr.) (1998) *Herodotus: The Histories*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Waters, K.H. (1985) *Herodotus The Historian: His Problems, Methods and Originality*, Norman, University of Oklahoma Press.
- Wecowski, M. (2004) 'The Hedgehog and the Fox: Form and Meaning in the Prologue of Herodotus', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 124, 143-64.
- Weiner, R.G. (ed.) (2009) *Captain America and the Struggle of the Superhero: Critical Essays*, Jefferson, North Carolina & London, McFarland & Company Inc.
- Weiss, M. (2017) 'Gk. τίω 'I honor' and τιμή 'honor'', in: *Miscellanea Indogermanica: Festschrift für José Luis García Ramón zum 65 Geburtstag*, eds. Hajnal, I., Kölligan, D. & Zipser, K. Innsbruck, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 875-86.
- Weisweiler, J. (1942) 'Griechische Lyrik im Dienste politischer Erziehung', *Die Alten Sprachen*, Vol. 7, 101-12.
- Welser, C. (2009) 'Two Didactic Strategies at the End of Herodotus' *Histories* (9.108-122)', *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 28, No. 2, 359-85.
- West, M.L. (1966) *Hesiod Theogony: Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary by M.L. West*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- West, M.L. (1985) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure, and Origins*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- West, S. (1985) 'Herodotus' Epigraphical Interests' *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 2, 278-305.
- West, S. (1988) 'The Scythian Ultimatum (Herodotus iv 131, 132)', *The Journal for Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 108, 207-11.
- West, S. (1989) 'Laertes Revisited', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, New Series, No. 35 (215), 113-43.
- West, S. (2002, reprinted 2012) 'Scythians', in: *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, eds. Bakker, E.J., de Jong, I.J.F. & van Wees, H. Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill, 437-56.
- West, S. (2007, reprinted 2011) 'Rhampsinitos and the Clever Thief (Herodotus 2.121)', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 322-7.

- West, S. (2008) Review of eds. Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. (2006), *The Classical Review*, New Series, Vol. 58, No. 1, 32-5.
- Wheeler, E.L. (1988, reprinted 2018) *Stratagem and the Vocabulary of Military Trickery*, Mnemosyne, Supplements, Vol. 108, Leiden, Boston, Brill.
- Whitman, C.H. (1958) *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*, New York, W.W. Norton & Company Inc.
- Willcock, M.M. (1970) *A Commentary on Homer's Iliad: Books I-VI*, London, Basingstoke, Macmillan and Co Ltd.
- Willcock, M.M. (1975) 'Hysteron Proteron in the Homeric Style', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 96, No. 2, 107-9.
- Williams, H. (2018) 'Polymetric Heroism in the Wanderings of Odysseus, *Odyssey* 9-12 (The Apologue)', *Akroterion*, Vol. 63, 1-20.
- Wilson D. (1999) 'Symbolic Violence in "Iliad" Book 9', *The Classical World*, Vol. 93, No. 2, 131-47.
- Wilson, D. (2002) *Ransom, Revenge, and Heroic Identity in the Iliad*, Cambridge & New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, E. (Tr.) (2018) *Homer: the Odyssey*, New York and London, W.W. Norton & Company.
- Wilson, N. (ed.) (2015a) *Herodoti: Historiae Libri I-IV*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, N. (ed.) (2015b) *Herodoti: Historiae Libri V-IX*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Winkler, J. (1990) *Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*, New York, Routledge.
- Winkler, M.M. (2016) 'Nazi Ideology and Tacitus's Dangerous Book: Eugen Fehrle's Editions of the 'Germania'', *New German Critique*, No. 127, 91-118.
- Wittkower, R. (1942) 'Marvels of the East: A Study in the History of Monsters', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 5, 159-97.
- Wolff, E. (1964) 'Das Weib des Masistes', *Hermes*, Vol. 92, 51-8.
- Wood, C. (2016) 'I Am Going to Say...': A Sign on the Road of Herodotus' Logos', *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 66, No. 1, 13-31.
- Woodman, A.J. (2007, reprinted 2011) 'Readers and Reception: A Text Case', in: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. Marincola, J. Oxford, Blackwell, 133-44.

- Wyatt, W.F. (Tr.) (1999, reprinted 2003) *Homer: Iliad: Books 1-12*, Cambridge Mass. & London, Harvard University Press.
- Yamagata, N. (1997) 'ἄναξ and βασιλεύς in Homer', *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 47, No. 1, 1-14.
- Yatromanolakis, D. (2001) 'To Sing or to Mourn? A Reappraisal of Simonides 22 W²', in: *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds. Boedeker, D. & Sider, D. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 208-25.
- Yue, K. (2010) 'Dying Like a Hero: Paulus and Varro at Cannae in Silius Italicus' *Punica*', in: *Zero to Hero, Hero to Zero: In Search of the Classical Hero*, eds. Langerwerf, L. & Ryan, C. Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Press, 120-40.
- Zankar, A. (2022) 'Meet the Real Protagonists of Everyday Life', in: *The Hero and Hero-Making Across Genres*, eds. Singh, A., Tholia, S. & Patel, P.K. New York & London, Routledge, 141-54.
- Zanker, G. (1994, reprinted 1997) *The Heart of Achilles: Characterisation and Personal Ethics in the Iliad*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.
- Zeitlin, F. (1995) 'Figuring Fidelity in Homer's Odyssey', in: *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey*, ed. Cohen, B. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 117-52.
- Zeitlin, F. (2009) *Under the Sign of the Shield: Semiotics and Aeschylus' Seven Against Thebes*², Lexington Books, Lanham, Plymouth.
- Zeitlin, F. (2012) 'Alexander the Great and Homer', in: *The Homer Encyclopedia*, ed. Finkelberg, M. Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell, 28-30.
- Zelmick-Abramovitz, R. (2022) 'An Epic Formula in Herodotus', *Scripta Classica Israelica*, Vol. 41, 5-29.
- Zimmermann, U. (2019) 'Interhuman. Interspecies. Global. Heroism in Wes Anderson's *Isle of Dogs* (2018)', in: *Heroism as a Global Phenomenon in Contemporary Culture*, eds. Korte, B., Wendt, S. & Falkenhayner, N. New York & London, Routledge, 209-26.
- Ziogas, I. (2014) 'Sparse Spartan verse: Filling gaps in the Thermopylae Epigram', *Ramus*, Vol. 43, No. 2, 115-33.