

**The Geography of the *Iliad* in Ancient Scholarship**

**by**

**Cassandra J. Borges**

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
(Classical Studies)  
in The University of Michigan  
2011**

**Doctoral Committee:  
Professor Richard Janko, Chair  
Professor Ruth S. Scodel  
Associate Professor Francesca Schironi  
Assistant Professor Ian S. Moyer**

## Acknowledgements

This dissertation is fundamentally about how nothing scholarly happens in a vacuum. There is nothing like the process of writing a dissertation to bring this truth home. I could not have sustained this project without the help and encouragement of an assortment of people, both within and without the academy.

Thanks go first to my committee, who collectively taught me a lot about working within a scholarly tradition. My advisor, Richard Janko, brought an incredible breadth and depth of learning and a rigorous eye for detail to the project; without his initial shrewd guess that what this particular budding Homerist needed was scholia, it never would have happened. It has been a privilege to work with him. Ruth Scodel has provided a number of astute and perceptive comments on the *Iliad*, and her propensity to get inside the psychology of everyone from Antenor to Zenodotus was tremendously bracing; she has helped to sharpen and focus my thought. Francesca Schironi, a late (and lucky, from my perspective!) addition to the project, was a superb and enthusiastic resource for how to deal with Homeric scholarship. Finally, Ian Moyer has bravely dealt with an unfamiliar mass of material, and I appreciate his enthusiasm for the idea of doing cultural history through the scholia. I owe them all a great deal.

Others in the Department of Classical Studies at Michigan and elsewhere have assisted me in small-group discussions of segments of this project: among these are Benjamin Acosta-Hughes, Ruth Caston, Benjamin Fortson, Jim Porter, Jay Reed, Mira Seo, Mike Sampson, and Arthur Verhoogt. In addition, Michelle Biggs (administrator

*extraordinaire*) has been invaluable on multiple occasions. The support of the Classical Studies department with a D'Ooge fellowship in 2007, for preliminary exams that led to this dissertation, and with two summers of funding for finishing it, is heartily appreciated. Thanks go likewise to the Rackham Graduate School for supporting me on a Rackham Merit Fellowship during my time at Michigan, and for the grants that enabled me to visit Homeric sites in Greece and Turkey in the summer of 2009 for research: the Hammel Research Fellowship and the Brooks Wheeler Memorial Grant, which enabled me to read the *teichoskopia* on the walls of Troy.

I am fortunate beyond words to have colleagues and officemates that I count as friends, who provide support, feedback, and snacks on a regular basis. Thanks to Karen Acton, Evelyn Adkins, Kate Allen, Bram ten Berge, Clara Bosak-Schroeder, Joe Groves, Dina Guth, Beth Platte, Rebecca Sears, Julia Shapiro, and Shonda Tohm—*non sine* Richard Persky, whose levels of exposure to secondhand scholia have surely reached dangerous levels, and whose consummate skill in recognizing when I need to talk about Strabo and when I need to be distracted from Strabo has enriched the last few years tremendously. Without his support—and that of my family, whose boundless faith in my ability to make this happen had to be justified—I would still be looking for Troy in all the wrong places.

## Table of Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>Chapter I. Introduction</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>Chapter II. Finding Troy</b> .....	<b>17</b>
1. The Greeks in Ilion: history and archaeology .....	19
2. Trojan War Tourism at Ilion.....	32
3. Ilion's Total Destruction .....	43
4. Case Study I: The Knees of Athena.....	46
5. Case Study: Hot and Cold Springs.....	52
6. Case Study III: True Names .....	62
7. Conclusion: The Inevitability of Destruction.....	74
<b>Chapter III. Finding the Trojans</b> .....	<b>81</b>
1. The Carian barbarophōnoi .....	91
2. The Phrygian capitalists .....	104
3. The Dardanian watchdogs .....	113
4. The allies who weren't there .....	128
<b>Chapter IV. Finding Hellas</b> .....	<b>137</b>
1. Salamis and the biographies: Homer's knowledge .....	144
2. Boeotia and Thessaly: the first and the last.....	159
3. Sparta and the problems with authority.....	172
4. Conclusion.....	191
<b>Chapter V. Conclusion</b> .....	<b>194</b>
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	<b>199</b>

## **Abstract**

### **The Geography of the *Iliad* in Ancient Scholarship**

**by**

**Cassandra J. Borges**

**Chair: Richard Janko**

Ancient Greek scholarship on Homer's *Iliad* is known largely through scholia: marginalia in medieval manuscripts condensed from classical, Hellenistic, and Roman-period. Among the interpretive issues the scholia cover is geography, particularly where the places described in Homer correspond imperfectly, if at all, to places in the known world. These discrepancies are problematic in antiquity for both geographers and literary critics because Homer's authority, even on matters outside the realm of poetry, is seldom challenged. This dissertation examines the elaborate strategies used in ancient scholarship to defend the poet's authority, concluding that the construction of place in Homer is, for ancient writers, an integral part of his reliability.

I first focus on the poem's most crucial location, the city of Troy itself—the nature and location of which has been debated by moderns and ancients alike. The latter ultimately uphold Homer's description of the city by emphasizing its absolute

destruction: Troy's canonical doom ensures that it never, in any historical period, has to be exactly as the poet described it.

Chapter 3 moves from the geographical center of the poem, Troy itself, outward through the Trojan-allied territories of Asia Minor. I argue that the ancient sources, starting with the notoriously sparse Trojan Catalogue, read these allies as occupying a conceptual, rather than a physical, space along the periphery. Their uneasy relationship to the Trojan ruling elite, as well as their marked barbarianness—a trait ancient Greek readers are eager to maximize—lends them a dysfunctionality that assists the scholia in their reading of Homer as a constant philhellene, even in a poem about Greek dysfunction.

Chapter 4 treats the Catalogue of Ships, which describes an exhaustively detailed list of places outside the actual scope of the *Iliad*—since they are all in the homeland the Greeks left behind them—and yet crucial for its construction of place. The scholia's admiration of the Catalogue extends to the poet who created it, whose ability to describe Greek places, even though ancient biographies place him outside the Greek mainland, becomes normative for later discussions of these territories. They therefore reinforce Homer's authority.

## Chapter I. Introduction

The scholia to Homer's *Iliad* are full of observations that seem banal on first glance, but turn out to have quite a lot going on. Consider, for example, the very first entry in the commentary:

ζητοῦσι, διὰ τί ἀπὸ τῆς μῆνιδος ἤρξατο, οὕτω δυσφήμου ὀνόματος... (Σ AT *ad Il.* 1.1a)

They ask why he began with “wrath”—such an ill-omened noun.

Word choice is a problem that takes a leisurely paragraph to resolve, yet the question with which this particular body of commentary on Homer's epic opens raises a whole set of further questions. For instance, the way the entry is phrased by no means makes it clear just who is doing the asking, and for a thing to become a ζήτημα Ὀμηρικόν, a Homeric Question, someone must needs be asking it. We therefore get from this sentence a taste of the way sources may or may not be cited in the scholia, revealing a tantalizing glimpse into debates where we are (mostly) barred from entry. The question gets at the heart of interpretation in trying to explain why Homer does what Homer does. In other words, the scholars who wonder about the *Iliad*'s inauspicious beginning would presumably have picked some other word to start with. They would, in so doing, have missed a chance to do something ultimately quite desirable, as the scholion concludes. Homer had two reasons for beginning with μῆνις: to make the audience more receptive to the greatness of the poetry (ἵνα προσεκτικωτέρους τοὺς ἀκροατὰς ποιήσῃ) and to make

the praises of the Greeks more plausible (ἵνα τὰ ἐγκώμια τῶν Ἑλλήνων πιθανότερα ποιήσῃ). This latter interpretation places the scholiasts on the other side of a gulf from modern commentators. How is focusing on μῆνις supposed to contribute to the praise of the Greeks, who are nearly destroyed over the course of the poem by the accursed (Homer's word) wrath of Achilles? How pro-Greek can the author of this poem be, and how can the first line be interpreted as programmatic in that sense? The answer that the scholion provides is deceptively simple: by acknowledging Greek dysfunction, Homer makes their victory all the more impressive—and realistic. Thus the poet who emerges from the commentary is easily characterized from the outset. Homer is psychologically savvy: he will deploy negative qualities judiciously in order to build an ultimately positive image. Homer is biased: he has a particular version of the Trojan War to champion and will argue for it with all the rhetorical tools he possesses. Homer is concerned with realism: despite his biases, he is not interested in paragons or best-case scenarios. And Homer is knowledgeable: the decisions that he makes must be the right ones, or else he would not have made them.

The assumption that Homer is generally right underlies most of the ancient scholarship on the poems—and anything that falls outside this category is easily recognized as polemic, parody, or both. The tradition of doubting Homer's account goes back all the way to Stesichorus, whose palinode rescuing Helen from disgrace (and himself from blindness) has a telling opening salvo:

οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος,  
οὐδ' ἔβας ἐν νηυσὶν εὐσσέλμοις  
οὐδ' ἴκεο πέργαμα Τροίας (fr. 15 *PMG*).

It isn't true, that story.  
You didn't embark in the well-benched ships

and you didn't reach the citadel of Troy.

It is the story that is explicitly attacked as untrue, and a first or second century CE commentary preserved on papyrus (P. Oxy. 2506) offers an interpretation for whose story is in question: [μέμ]φεται τὸν Ὅμηρο[ν] (he blames Homer). Alternatively, there is the *Trojan Oration* of Dio Chrysostom, a rhetorical showpiece designed to defend the supposedly indefensible proposition that the Trojan War was entirely invented and that the destruction of the city never actually took place.<sup>1</sup> Lucian constantly tilts at Homeric windmills in his quest to mock whatever seems implausible and is nevertheless widely respected.<sup>2</sup> Apart from these, the commonplace observation that ancient readers assumed that there was truth value in the Homeric poems generally holds, but what has been less well examined is how scholars made this assumption work. It may not be revolutionary to assert that Homer knows what he is doing, but it is a premise that requires sustenance. This dissertation will analyze the ways in which ancient scholars worked to affirm Homer's authority, and why they felt they needed to do so in the first place.

Ancient scholarship on Homer is primarily found in the several bodies of scholia—marginalia found in medieval manuscripts of the *Iliad* (and the *Odyssey*, but to a lesser extent), condensed from earlier material. How early it is varies. The bT scholia contain some of the latest material, especially from the Roman period, though some is Hellenistic in its origin; its commentary is derived in large part from the work of the scholar Didymus Bibliolathas, whose *floruit* under Augustus was a productive period in Greek scholarship.<sup>3</sup> These scholia are commonly referred to as “exegetical.”<sup>4</sup> Regardless,

---

<sup>1</sup> This text will be examined in more depth in Chapter 1, section 7 below.

<sup>2</sup> On these latter two, see Kim 2010.

<sup>3</sup> So called because he wrote so many books that he could not remember what was in them (Athenaeus 4.17.3).

they contain a higher proportion of literary-critical material, as opposed to glosses or textual issues—than the other bodies of scholia, and are therefore valuable for revealing what ancient scholars wanted to get out of Homer.<sup>5</sup> The A scholia—so named because they are found in the 10<sup>th</sup>-century Venetus A manuscript of the poem—contain material that is very definitely Hellenistic, much of which is concerned with establishing the text of the poem.<sup>6</sup> The postscripts to the end of each book make this focus abundantly clear:

Παράκειται τὰ Ἀριστονίκου σημεῖα, καὶ τὰ Διδύμου Περὶ τῆς Ἀρισταρχείου διορθώσεως, τινὰ δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῆς Ἰλιακῆς προσωδίας καὶ Νικάνορος Περὶ στιγμῆς (Σ A *ad Il.* 1.postscript).

Included are selections from Aristonicus's *Critical Signs* [sc. of Aristarchus], Didymus's *On the Aristarchean Edition*, [Herodian's] *Prosody of the Iliad*, and Nicanor's *On Punctuation*.

These four works all date from the late Hellenistic to early Roman periods. Aristonicus and Didymus tend to report on the readings of the early- to mid-second century CE grammarian Aristarchus of Samothrace, the fifth librarian at Alexandria and certainly the most influential editor of Homer in antiquity.<sup>7</sup> Herodian and Nicanor are more narrowly focused. Based on these postscripts, modern scholars have posited an evolutionary step between the four individual works and their appearance in the Venetus A: the so-called *Viermännerkommentar* (VMK), “four-man commentary,” abridged versions of these four texts that were condensed into a self-standing commentary that would cover all the

---

<sup>4</sup> Erbse 1969: xii.

<sup>5</sup> Richardson (1980) is by now the classic, and his argument that the literary criticism in the scholia derives mainly from Aristotelian principles is a very sound one.

<sup>6</sup> Digital images of the Venetus A are available online at <http://chs75.chs.harvard.edu/manuscripts/>; as the name “Homer Multitext Library” suggests, the site’s makers are interested primarily in advancing the ultimately problematic idea of the *Iliad* as a multitext, existing in multiple formats until a relatively late period. The images themselves are a precious resource for scholars of the *Iliad* and of ancient scholarship on it: the proportion of marginalia to text is hard to grasp from Erbse’s edition alone.

<sup>7</sup> His techniques and focus also owe a great deal to Aristotle, as Schironi (2009) demonstrates. Pfeiffer (1968: 231) read Aristarchus’s take on Homer as fundamentally non-theoretical, a view which Schenkeveld ably refuted (1970: 162).

important textual issues a reader of the *Iliad* would need: critical apparatus, accentuation, and punctuation. There is also some attention to explication of the text and literary criticism generally. The critical signs of Aristarchus that are crucial to the works of Didymus and Aristonicus are used to indicate a variety of issues, from transposed lines, to his predecessors' readings that Aristarchus considered erroneous, to σχήματα πάμπολλα καὶ ζητήματα: “numerous other figures and questions.”<sup>8</sup> Both the A and the bT scholia are collected in Hartmut Erbse's monumental edition of the *scholia vetera*.<sup>9</sup>

There is one other group of Homeric scholia that will be dealt with in this discussion: the D scholia, misleadingly named after Didymus, who has already been mentioned here.<sup>10</sup> The D scholia contain some of the earliest material in any of the scholiastic traditions, in the form of glosses; these are datable as early as the fourth century BCE, since very similar Homeric glosses are quoted in Aristophanes' comedy

*The Banqueters*:

A. πρὸς ταύτας δ' αὖ λέξον Ὀμήρου γλώττας· τί καλοῦσι κόρυμβα;  
 [...] τί καλοῦσ' ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα;  
 B. ὁ μὲν οὖν σός, ἐμὸς δ' οὗτος ἀδελφὸς φρασάτω, τί καλοῦσιν ἰδυίους;  
 [...] τί ποτ' ἐστὶν ὀπύειν; (fr. 233 K-A)<sup>11</sup>

-Next, define some Homeric words. What does “κόρυμβα” mean?  
 What does “ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα” mean?  
 -How about if your son and my brother explains this: what does “ἰδυίους” mean?  
 What does “ὀπύειν” mean?

<sup>8</sup> From the prolegomena to the D scholia in one manuscript; see Erbse (1969: lix).

<sup>9</sup> A fourth group, the Geneva scholia, is found in a different set of manuscripts but generally duplicate entries found in either the A or the D scholia, aside from an extensive section in *Iliad* 21, where they provide material not found elsewhere; they will nevertheless be very little dealt with in this discussion, due to the portions of the poem that will be focused on. Nicole (1891) is still, improbably, the standard edition.

<sup>10</sup> Erbse (1969: I.xi) is eloquently dismissive: “alterum...*Scholia Didymi* (D) vocatur (quamquam haec ab illo grammatico neque collecta neque conscripta sunt).”

<sup>11</sup> See Dyck (1987:119).

These glosses, flung from a father to a wayward son out of frustration at his unstudious ways, indicate the obscurity of Homeric vocabulary in and after the classical period, and commentaries at the more elementary levels were dominated by glosses on the stranger words. This is not the only element of the D scholia, however; there is extensive mythographic material, attributed to an author called the Mythographus Homericus, that provides background for the poem.<sup>12</sup> There is a small amount of literary criticism and almost no emphasis on textual issues. The standard edition of the D scholia was for many years the 1517 *editio princeps* of Lascaris; various partial editions were collated afterwards, but a full modern edition of the D scholia was not forthcoming until 2000, when Helmut van Thiel made his edition available on the Internet.<sup>13</sup> Nicola Conrad has since added her excellent edition of the D scholia to the *Odyssey* in the same place.

Because modern scholarship on the Homeric scholia has focused so strongly on the textual criticism of the *Iliad*, the A scholia, with their heavily philological focus and their unparalleled access to Alexandrian work, were for many years privileged above the bT and especially the D scholia. Erbse's edition of the scholia includes only the "scholia grammatica vel maiora," and he explicitly omits anything from the Venetus A that overlaps with D material. The landscape is rapidly changing, however, due to a resurgence of interest in ancient scholarship generally. The idea of looking for ancient literary criticism in the scholia is not a new one; Nicholas Richardson's previously cited 1980 article on Aristotelian criticism in the exegetical scholia is one example, and Kenneth Snipes followed it up with a survey specifically of the *Iliad*'s similes in the scholia in 1988. More recently, René Nünlist has taken a narratological approach to the

---

<sup>12</sup> van der Valk 1963: I.303. Montanari 1995 argues that the MH, which also survives in various papyrus fragments, is derived from 1<sup>st</sup>-century academic commentary.

<sup>13</sup> Currently downloadable at <http://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/1810/> in PDF format.

scholia, arguing that they demonstrate an awareness of techniques such as focalization that were previously considered discoveries of modern scholarship.<sup>14</sup> He has proceeded to extend this kind of analysis to scholia generally, which—one hopes—will bring even greater visibility to this body of work.<sup>15</sup> Also contributing to increased visibility of the scholia generally, and the exegetical scholia particularly, is Eleanor Dickey’s recent introductory text *Ancient Greek Scholarship*, which provides an entry point into these difficult and often forbidding bodies of commentary to classicists who wish to make use of them. She has only a short section on Homer, in keeping with the general focus of the work, but one that is useful as an introduction to the material, and (one hopes) a great inducement for non-specialists to take a closer look at the Homeric scholia and ancient scholarship generally.<sup>16</sup>

This discussion treats the scholia *maiora* and *minora*, which means that the material under examination spans well over a millennium. Some might argue that this is an excessively diachronic approach, and it is certainly one that comes with some risks. It is difficult, for this reason, to make any sweeping claims about what ancient Homeric scholarship in general said. What I am instead seeking to do is to tease out some of the trends that can be noticed and commented upon—not only from the scholia, but also from other ancient texts that are engaging with the major players in Homeric scholarship from

---

<sup>14</sup> Nünlist 2003: 62-63 connects the modern concept of “focalization” with the ancient concept of λύσις ἐκ τοῦ προσώπου (character-based solution), as for example when Aristarchus notes at *Il* 17.558a that the seeming contradiction that arises from calling Menelaus “soft,” where elsewhere he is “dear to Ares,” can be resolved by taking into account that the insult is coming from an enemy and is meant to be slander; thus the insult is focalized through a hostile character (in this case, Apollo masquerading as the Trojan Phaenops) rather than through the consistent, reasoned narrative voice of Homer himself.

<sup>15</sup> This is his explicit hope as well: Nünlist 2009a: 82. His recent book (2009b) provides an excellently readable introduction to the peculiarities of the scholia, with their condensed format and their elliptical entries. Its focus is not explicitly Homeric, but readers of Homer will gain a great deal from his discussion of the critical vocabulary of ancient scholarship.

<sup>16</sup> Dickey 2006.

the classical period forward. For this reason, I am focusing on one particular issue that crops up repeatedly in the Homeric scholia: geography. By looking at the various places that are under discussion in the scholia, I also make it possible to compare other, datable, texts: Strabo, the *periploi*, the historians. This approach fleshes out the sparse, chronologically diffuse body of scholia and simultaneously puts it in the perspective of other scholarly writing, particularly from the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, which thus become the focus of this dissertation. Approaching the scholia from a geographical perspective, therefore, gives a more complete picture of some of the aims and approaches of ancient Greek scholarship; Strabo and the exegetical scholia, for instance, have a great deal of dialogue in common, and the geographer, who comes from a known time and place and has a name, helps to anchor the anonymous, timeless entries from the scholia.

The other, and more important, reason that I have focused this dissertation on issues of geography is that the construction of places in Homer turns out to be an important problem in ancient scholarship, with ramifications for the poet's educational value and truthfulness generally. Strabo, in his programmatic opening to book 1 of his *Geography*, argues simultaneously for the philosophical value of geography and the geographical value of poetry:

τῆς τοῦ φιλοσόφου πραγματείας εἶναι νομίζομεν, εἴπερ ἄλλην τινά, καὶ τὴν γεωγραφικὴν, ἣν νῦν προηγήμεθα ἐπισκοπεῖν. ὅτι δ' οὐ φαύλως νομίζομεν ἐκ πολλῶν δῆλον: οἳ τε γὰρ πρῶτοι θαρρήσαντες αὐτῆς ἄψασθαι τοιοῦτοί τινες ὑπῆρξαν, Ὅμηρος τε καὶ Ἀναξίμανδρος ὁ Μιλήσιος καὶ Ἑκαταῖος, ὁ πολίτης αὐτοῦ, καθὼς καὶ Ἐρατοσθένης φησί: καὶ Δημόκριτος δὲ καὶ Εὐδοξὸς καὶ Δικαίαρχος καὶ Ἐφορος καὶ ἄλλοι πλείους (Strabo, *Geography* 1.1).

I consider that, if any other branch of learning is a matter for the philosopher, then so is geography, which is what I have now proposed to discuss. That I have not considered this incorrectly is evident from many proofs. Those who first undertook to discuss geography were themselves

men of this sort, such as Homer, Anaximander of Miletus, and his fellow Milesian Hecataeus, just as Eratosthenes says, Democritus, Eudoxus, Dicaearchus, Ephorus, and several more.

Strabo's examples of great geographers of the past, derived from Eratosthenes of Cyrene, do not include anyone normally classified as a geographer. The early natural scientists and historians are there in force. Heading the list, however, is Homer himself, who will be the focus of Strabo's subsequent opening gambit, which surveys the places mentioned in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in an effort to prove the breadth and value of Homer's geographical information—comparing, for example, the poet's descriptions of the fortunate inhabitants of the West with the Iberians, lucky possessors of important natural resources, with the goal in mind of proving Homer had access to reliable information about these people, which he then transmuted into his poetry. For the geographer, the poet is normative and authoritative.

While there has been a fair amount of work done on the places in the *Odyssey*, the *Iliad* seems, at first glance, to be much less complicated.<sup>17</sup> The places in it are anchored in an Asia Minor that bears close and constant resemblance to known territory; Mount Ida's identification is never a problem as, for example, the island of Polyphemus is. The situation is not always this simple, however. The *Iliad* has proven surprisingly intractable to map since the first Greek colonists arrived at the site they would call Ilion at the dawn of the first millennium BCE. In a Greek cultural context, where the historicity of the Trojan War is generally taken as a given (as, for example, even the notoriously hard-

---

<sup>17</sup> On ancient approaches to locating the places in *Odyssey*, see Romm (1992: 183ff), Buonajuto 1996, Clay 2007. There is a robust modern tradition of looking for Ithaca in particular: see Bittlestone 2005 and Goekoop 2010. This location, more than any other, has caught the attention of non-specialists; Goekoop's family has been financing research into the site of Ithaca since Dörpfeld's excavations in 1900. His premise that "what Homer says about geography and landscape has remained relatively unexplored" (2010: 16) is rather startlingly erroneous.

nosed Thucydides does), being able to stop at a site and observe the path Hector and Achilles took in running around the city, the beach where the Achaeans drew up their ships, the river that gods called Xanthus and mortals Scamander, involves something halfway between a tourist expedition and a pilgrimage. Both are devalued if the place visited is not actually the one Homer described. Yet to say that Homer described it involves making a number of assumptions that are worth teasing apart: who Homer is, how he knew what he is supposed to have known, what it even means to say, “This was Troy.” In this manner, issues of place cut to the very heart of the Homeric Question, as both moderns and ancients have seen it. The paths modern research has taken to answer the question are simply much different from those that antiquity favored.

This dissertation, therefore, examines the strategies used in ancient scholarship to answer the question of how Homer knew what Homer knew. The assumption that Homer can and should be authoritative on geographical questions is common to both the scholia and the geographers, and I argue that only by reading the two bodies of scholarship in tandem can we arrive at what geography actually had to do with fictionality in ancient readings of the *Iliad*. The multiple voices of ancient scholarship are offering, in the end, a feedback loop in which their sometimes quite subtle and arresting analyses are offering a justification for the thing that they most want to see: a Troy comparable to the one Homer describes, an Asia inhabited by its allies, and a Greece that reflects the Catalogue of Ships.

Chapter 2 begins with the city of Troy itself—the center of the *Iliad* and its defining location. Its physicality has haunted the poem’s readers and listeners from the very outset, and as a result its material culture and remains have been a hotbed of

scholarly discussion both in antiquity and in the modern era. Since its early excavations under Frank Calvert and Heinrich Schliemann—the latter, especially, concerned with finding an explicitly Homeric city—the site has presented a tangle of challenges to modern archaeologists, who are still in the present day embroiled in a debate over whether the site identified as Troy was a large and prosperous city or a hilltop outpost. The situation was no different in antiquity, when the excavation of the city was almost entirely a conceptual one. Though Ilion existed as a Greek city since the earliest days of Greek colonization in Asia Minor, it did so largely thanks to its presence in the legendary past that made it a desirable and symbolic site: thus our earliest literary references (e.g. Alcaeus) to the Troad make explicit reference to the Trojan War and in so doing establish that what the Greeks at this site are really fighting over, in addition to the harbors and fertile plains of Asia's west coast, is the epic resonances that attach to this particular city. All of this history serves as background to the heated discussions of Troy's legitimacy that surface in the Hellenistic and Roman periods in Greek scholarship. I argue that some seemingly trivial issues are used in the Homeric scholia to explore the difficult issue of Homer's fictionality. This subject was already being explored in Greek historiography (consider Hecataeus of Miletus's judgment that the stories of the Greeks were many and foolish, or Herodotus's deduction that Homer knew the story of Helen in Egypt but suppressed it as insufficiently epic), but in later scholarship geography is used as a sustained and fertile entry point into the discussion. When discrepancies arise between the Troy that Homer describes and the Ilion that anybody can go see—indeed, it features nonchalantly in the *periploi*—this is a source of real anxiety for those who, like Strabo, argue that Homer's educational value lies in his fundamental accuracy on matters such as

these. This same anxiety is reflected in the scholia, where small points of difference between the heroic age and the present day are cause for scholarly contortions. Thus, for instance, it becomes a lively question whether the cult statue of Athena was depicted as seated or standing; what the gates of Troy were named and how many there are supposed to have been; and similar questions that appear trivial at most to modern readers, but are entry points into deep-seated questions about the reliability of Homer's physical descriptions, as encapsulated in this one city that is of paramount importance. Ultimately, the way most of these discrepancies are resolved in the scholia is to underline the fragility of Troy. Its repeated annihilation—mirrored in the numerous destruction levels that archaeologists have now identified at the site—serves to explain why it can never be precisely the city that Homer describes. In the end, the phenomenon that the archaeologist Frank Kolb describes as “Iliad Syndrome”—the desire by modern writers to see a grand and imposing city, worthy of this epic—turns out to be a very ancient one indeed.<sup>18</sup>

Chapter 3 moves outwards from the city of Troy itself to the territories occupied by the Trojan allies. The treatment of said allies in ancient scholarship reveals the ways in which geography overlaps with the discipline now called ethnography, although neither the word nor the distinction was much in use in antiquity. Thus the Trojan Catalogue, focusing as it does on the places from which Troy's allies come, also offers plenty of opportunities for anthropological surveys of their customs and their sometimes uneasy relationship with the city that holds their allegiance. It is a sparse catalogue, relatively under-studied in modern scholarship, though we can surmise that this was not the case in

---

<sup>18</sup> *Iliad syndrome*: see Kolb 2004: 577. He is engaged in a polemic regarding the nature of Bronze Age Troy with Manfred Korfmann, now deceased, and his successors at the site: see Chapter 2, section 1 for more details on this *querelle*.

antiquity, given the presence of a papyrus commentary on this section of the poem (P.Oxy. 1086) and the fragments we have surviving from Demetrius of Scepsis' second-century monograph *Περὶ τοῦ Τρωικοῦ Διακόσμου* (*On the Trojan Catalogue*). Thus despite its relative brevity when compared to the Catalogue of Ships, the Trojan Catalogue is nonetheless a vein of information about ancient ethnography and its relationship to topography—specifically the ways in which Troy's periphery relates to its center. Following the example set out in the previous chapter, I use several case studies to explore the catalogue: first, the Carians, who are anomalous within the Trojan side in that they are specifically identified as “barbarian-voiced” (βαρβαροφώνων, *Iliad* 2.867). This reminder that the Trojans are a polyglot society squares uneasily with ancient historical accounts of the Carians' Greek origins and prior colonization of Asia Minor; this uneasiness is the source of textual debates about this entry in the catalogue—demonstrating the ancient commentators' overwhelming desire to make sure Homer got the details right. The second case study concerns the Phrygians, who are simultaneously connected with the Trojan royal family by the strongest kinship and marriage bonds (as the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite reinforces, by making the goddess masquerade as a noble Phrygian bride for Anchises) and at odds with them through their economic supremacy; Hector represents them as systematically buying out the Trojans and accepting their bribes to keep the war going. The final study deals with the Dardanians, who are geographically impossible to pin down—Dardania being a hypothetical first city of the Trojan royal family, founded by Dardanus on his advent in Asia Minor, but defunct for generations at the time of Priam's reign. Rather than hailing from the eponymous city, then, the Dardanians are interpreted as occupying a particular political, rather than

geographic, space: led by Aeneas and the sons of Antenor, the reluctant warriors fated to survive not only the poem but also the Trojan War itself, and therefore more than a little suspect in a poem where Troy's doom is pervasive. These three contingents receive more attention in the scholia than the others, and I argue that this is because they present a picture of the Trojan side that the ancient commentators want to see: once one is outside the walls of Troy, the uneasiness of the alliances that hold the Trojan side together are clearly visible, and thus the supposed pro-Greek bias of the poet is upheld, since in this reading he portrays the Trojans as fractured and ineffective, unable to bridge the gaps between one people and another.

Chapter 4 examines the Catalogue of Ships, which dominates Book 2 of the *Iliad* and introduces a variety of Greek places, which would otherwise remain entirely in the background, to the geographical discussion. Despite these places' relative lack of importance in the poem itself, the Catalogue of Ships is valuable to Greek antiquarians for its information on what the political landscape of the heroic period looked like; this antiquarian research can then be mirrored back onto the present, effectively making Homer's map of the Greek world normative for later periods. I begin with a close reading of the longest and most detailed ancient biography of Homer, a second-century CE text purporting to be the work of Herodotus; crucially, this text plots the poet's research career around the Greek world (though stopping just short of the mainland) as a sophisticated way of constructing a Homer whose knowledge could be viewed as normative. I then move to a series of examples from the scholia of how this knowledgeable Homer is constructed. For instance, the Catalogue's explicit placement of Telamonian Ajax and his men next to the Athenian contingent (*Iliad* 2.557-558) was

copiously cited in antiquity as a reason for maintaining the strong ties between Salamis and Athens—or marked as spurious because it was supposed to have been a Solonian insertion for political effect: a neat summary of the ways in which Homer’s geography could be used and abused in antiquity. The placement of contingents generally can be a powerful tool; thus we see a great deal of discussion in the scholia regarding Boeotia’s massive, sprawling entry at the head of the Catalogue of Ships, a placement at odds with the region’s dwindling population and consequence throughout the historical period; yet its quintessential Greekness and its centrality are able to make up for this lack of consequence, even as the various splintered Thessalian regions that come at the end of the Catalogue are viewed as marginally Greek by post-Homeric authors, and therefore worthy of their place. Finally, the case of Sparta recasts the issue of Homer’s authority entirely by attempting to define what precisely Spartan territory is, and particularly whether or not it includes Messenia. For Hellenistic authors, it is natural enough that Sparta should have controlled the region in the past, and therefore the expansion of this past back into the heroic period—before the absorption of Messenia by the Lacedaemonians actually took place—is natural enough. The second problem with authority comes from the scholiastic attitude toward Menelaus, whose grip on this territory is ultimately as tenuous as his grip on Helen, through whom he has (in some accounts) acquired it. Thus Sparta is a case study for classical and Hellenistic misinterpretations of Greek antiquity—misinterpretations all the more telling since they proceed from a conviction that Homer knew what he was talking about.

I make extensive use of case studies in this dissertation; the reasons are twofold. First, and foremost, there is simply too much material to claim anything like an extensive

survey of the material in question. Erbse's edition of the scholia vetera to the *Iliad*—excluding the D and the Geneva scholia—runs to seven volumes; Strabo's *Geography* is massive even in its incompleteness; there is simply an embarrassment of riches for anyone attempting to make sense of this material. The ancient scholarship on the Catalogue of Ships, especially, could (and should) be a book by itself. I have thus been forced to select very carefully what to focus on and what to pass over, and the result of this ruthless culling is, if incomplete, at least a starting point for what can be done with this material. The second reason is that this project is, as much as anything else, a cultural history of ancient Homeric scholarship—almost an anthropology—and in this discipline, case studies are usual and frequent. By making use of these examples, I hope to provide patterns for how the scholia can be read fruitfully, in the light of other ancient Greek scholarship and geographical writing, without getting swept away by a tsunami of critical signs. In this way, the scholia can reassert their place in the history of reading the Homeric text, as more than mere curiosities or sources to mine for Alexandrian textual criticism.

I offer, finally, a brief word of explanation about the treatment of Greek proper names in this dissertation. I have chosen to use the Latinate forms throughout, despite my own inclinations as a Hellenist, but this seemed to be the only way of achieving some form of logical consistency without referring to Thoukudides and Aias. In the end, is this project not about situating ourselves at one end of a long and complicated tradition?

## Chapter II. Finding Troy

Finding Troy has long been complicated. The Achaeans, who should have known better, are said to have missed it the first time around, arriving in Mysia only to find that Menelaus's princess was in another castle.<sup>19</sup> At the other end of the timeline, the identification of the Homeric city with the site at Hisarlık excavated most notoriously by Heinrich Schliemann beginning in 1871 still provides fodder for scholarly debate. It is clear that there are many levels of habitation on the site, from the fourth millennium BCE through the Byzantine period. Of these, the Late Bronze Age city (levels VI and VIIa, Anatolian fortresses consistent with contemporary developments in the region) is now considered the likeliest suspect for Homer's Troy, as the relative chronology works well enough and it is a large and heavily fortified city destroyed by violence.<sup>20</sup>

The archaeological work at the site continues to be both lively and productive; the excavations were begun anew in 1988 under the auspices of the universities of Tübingen and Cincinnati. The late director Manfred Korfmann's work, in particular, has challenged long-held assumptions about the size and importance of Bronze Age Troia, as the archaeological site is generally known; the lower city is, according to Korfmann's estimations—not universally accepted—considerably larger in terms of both area and potential population than previous excavators, e.g. Schliemann and Blegen, had

---

<sup>19</sup> For this story see e.g. Apollodorus, *Library* 11.17.

<sup>20</sup> Regarding the chronology, Eratosthenes' date for the sack of Troy (1184 BCE) is well in line with the dates for this level of the city. Korfmann (1998), Latacz (2001: 25), and Rose (1998: 405-406) are good starting points.

thought.<sup>21</sup> They had both, of course, focused on the upper city, surrounded as it was by walls that still impress the modern visitor with their size and solidity. Of course this was the Troy visitors wanted: the idea of an extensive and bustling lower city *outside* the mammoth walls and the “Scaean” gates is decidedly unromantic. Yet, if we accept Korfmann’s reconstructions, this lower city was there; and if we look at the evidence from Hittite sources about the city of Wilusa, whose cultural importance resonates across Anatolia, something too large to fit on the mound of Hisarlık appears to be indicated.<sup>22</sup>

Nevertheless, it is not the Homeric stage of the city, or its reality as a Bronze Age Anatolian fortress, that will be the focus of this discussion. The relative merits of Hittite and Luwian, the records of Alaksandu of Wilusa and the recent developments in the Bronze Age archaeology of the Troad—these all have practically nothing to do with later Greeks’ perception of the city of Troy and the history of its habitation. Homer’s Trojans are only vaguely foreign, for starters.<sup>23</sup> Moreover, the Ilians of the historical period are Greek, but in a complicated way that allows them to reach back to both sides in their attempts to claim their links to the legendary past. Even as Homeric scholarship

---

<sup>21</sup> Against Korfmann’s reconstruction, see e.g. Kolb 2004 and Kolb/Hertel 2003; in defense of Korfmann’s version of Troy, see Easton *et al.* 2002 and Jablonka/Rose 2004. Even after the death of Manfred Korfmann, the argument is ongoing. It is difficult for a non-archaeologist to take a useful stand on the debate. The site as it appears to visitors (I visited in July 2009) is largely a product of Korfmann’s school—a filtered view, therefore, as valuable as it is. Kolb has, moreover, identified a strain of thought in Trojan archaeology since the beginning, which he calls “*Iliassyndrome*,” or *Iliad Syndrome*. He defines the syndrome thus: “The entire history of investigations have been so polarized by the fascination exerted by Homer’s Troy that data provided by more recent excavations at other sites and the factual data offered by the Troy excavation itself have not been sufficiently taken into account” (2004: 577). He has recently published a new book categorizing Troy as a “crime scene,” used by archaeologists since Schliemann to further their own ends (2010); it remains to be seen how influential this extravagantly polemical book, aimed at a popular audience as Latacz 2004 was, will be.

With these caveats in mind, I acknowledge that Korfmann’s excavations—continued since his death by Professor Ernst Pernicka of the University of Tübingen—are meticulous and immensely valuable, and he creates a convincing picture of Troy as a city of some importance, even as I share Kolb’s reservations about just how important it actually was, *versus* how important lovers of the *Iliad* have wanted it to be.

<sup>22</sup> Latacz (2004) provides not only a survey of the evidence, but an impassioned defense of the Hittite city of Wilusa’s identification with the city of (W)ilios—the earliest Greek form of Ilion’s name.

<sup>23</sup> See the introduction to Chapter 3.

highlighted the differences between “then” and “now,” the Ilians made extravagant claims for the continuity of the tradition that linked them to the Homeric poems. These claims were then the subject of spirited debate by the Alexandrians and their successors, who juggled the unequivocal statements within the Homeric poems about the destruction of the city, the locals’ claims that the tradition of habitation on the site had been unbroken and that certain important artifacts from the Trojan War were available to see. This chapter will explore the semi-reality of Troy itself: as a city that had a powerful hold on the imagination of Greeks in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, a place where the definition of fiction became particularly slippery. Everyone knew what had happened at Ilium, and everyone with the means and inclination could visit it; yet traces remain in the scholarly and literary records that indicate visitors to the site experienced some anxiety over whether they were really visiting Homer’s Troy or not.

## **1. The Greeks in Ilium: history and archaeology**

The grand complicating factor in the re-settlement of Troy is the presence of Greeks on the site as far back as the beginning of the seventh century.<sup>24</sup> While literary evidence for what went on at the site of Troy is slim before the Hellenistic period, Carl Blegen’s excavations in the 1930s found large amounts of clearly Hellenic pottery, particularly in the areas identified as sacred precincts; much of this is East Greek pottery, either locally made or imported, and dating from the seventh and sixth centuries.<sup>25</sup> Little

---

<sup>24</sup> The dating is Dörpfeld’s (1902: 201ff), and subsequent scholars have largely agreed. Hertel (2003: 186-189) dates the resettlement considerably earlier, to before 900 BCE, which would perhaps make it one of the earlier Greek settlements in Asia Minor.

<sup>25</sup> Blegen 1958: 254.

else is known about the city at this period. Blegen noted that, aside from the “gray ware” that formed the largest percentage of the pottery fragments found at the site—and that was presumably a native development, since it was “obviously akin” to pottery found in the earlier, pre-Greek settlements—the material remains found at the site had “the closest affinities...with contemporary East Greek and Aeolic settlements along the Anatolian coast.”<sup>26</sup> He therefore identified the Greek inhabitants of the site as Aeolian on these grounds.

That is what the archaeological record can tell us, and it is not insignificant: we know that Greeks were living at the site of Troy from at least the seventh century, if not earlier, and their imported Greek wares mingled with the productions of the earlier inhabitants. Nothing in the historical record exists to tell us more about the reasons the site was chosen, and whether the Greeks who lived there were consciously co-opting a place made famous in legend—though in what form they would have known the legend is difficult to tell—or whether they were simply identifying and claiming a defensible location with a good harbor and economic potential. That the consciousness of the Trojan War did play a role in early Greek colonization, at least in retrospect, seems to be the point of a Herodotean anecdote over the city of Achilleum, named for the famous tomb it purported to contain, in the Troad. This tomb has since been identified by modern archaeologists as Besik-Sivritepe on the coast of the Dardanelles.<sup>27</sup> When both the Mytileneans and the Athenians at Sigeum claimed the city toward the end of the seventh century, the latter felt it necessary to point out that Aeolians had no monopoly on Trojan territory, since the Trojan War had been a pan-Hellenic enterprise. The argument

---

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.* 248.

<sup>27</sup> See Rose 2008.

was apparently convincing enough in context, as Periander’s arbitration ultimately favored the Athenians, who were thus able to consolidate their hold on Sigeum. Valuable contemporary testimony for this struggle comes from Alcaeus, who notoriously abandoned his shield in battle against the Athenians; he appears briefly in Herodotus’ narrative, and two (garbled) lines of his are preserved by Strabo (13.1.38):

Ἄλκαος σάος †ἄροι ἐνθάδ’ οὐκυτὸν ἀληκτορίν†  
ἐς Γλαυκώπιον ἴρον ὀνεκρέμασαν Ἄττικοι  
(401 B Voigt = 428 Lobel-Page).

Alcaeus, safe, † has not brought back his arms; †  
the Athenians hung them up in the temple of the bright-eyed goddess.

Alcaeus’ version of the story adds another nicely Homeric touch: in calling the temple where the victorious Athenians hung his shield Γλαυκώπιον, he recalls the formula γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη that pervades both epics. It is hard to see this resonance as a coincidence or an accident, and the archaic lyricists frequently reveal their awareness of (and self-definition against) the epic tradition, no matter which form this tradition took.<sup>28</sup> Whether or not the way Alcaeus knew Homer is similar to the way we know Homer—and I suspect that he did—he undoubtedly knew the stories that were involved, and his vocabulary reflects some interaction with the fledgling *Iliad*.<sup>29</sup> This knowledge is reflected in his topical, political poems, such as this one, that expressly link heroic themes with present-day political struggles. If we accept this level of epic influence on the poetry of the late seventh century, it is easy to see why Mytilene and Athens fought

---

<sup>28</sup> MacLachlan (1997: 150-151) discusses Alcaeus’ use of epic, and specifically Trojan, themes in the context of his personal and political poetry.

<sup>29</sup> It is not my intention to engage with the issue of when, exactly, the Homeric poems were put in written form. Overall, I prefer West’s model of one poet, steeped in the oral tradition, forming this poem which was then written down in the Asia Minor of the mid-seventh century (indeed, he makes a compelling case that it was a product of the Troad, given the number of epics we know that are named after their creator’s place of origin) and spread in both oral form, in episodes, and in written form, as the result of an entire poetic school (2001: 4-7).

over Sigeum and Achilleum: not only are they valuable sites for colonization, but they are also outstanding examples of the Greeks' heroic past. It is entirely plausible that the Aeolians' reasons for reclaiming Ilion were similar to their reasons for claiming Achilleum; moreover, the Athenians' claim in Herodotus that the Aeolians have no better share of the Ἰλιάδος χώρας than any other group of Greeks suggests that the Aeolians were especially persistent in colonizing the Troad—and that is in fact what we find in the material record at Ilion as well as in Strabo (13.1.38), who identifies the Lesbians' claim on Sigeum as typical of their activities in the entire region:

Τοῦτο δὲ κατέσχον μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι Φρύωνα τὸν ὀλυμπιονίκην πέμψαντες, Λεσβίων ἐπιδικαζομένων σχεδὸν τι τῆς συμπάσης Τρωάδος· ὧν δὴ καὶ κτίσματά εἰσιν αἱ πλεῖσται τῶν κατοικιῶν, αἱ μὲν συμμένουσαι καὶ νῦν, αἱ δ' ἠφανισμένα.

The Athenians held onto this place [Sigeum], sending in Phrynon the Olympic victor, but the Lesbians were laying claim to almost all of the Troad. Most of its colonies are, in fact, their foundations; some of these remain, and some have now disappeared.

The note of disappearance, sounded here, will return again in Strabo's analysis of the Troad's history; the conflicting claims and counter-claims to the territory highlight the ephemeral nature of city foundations in general. Some remain and some vanish; yet here, where the violent destruction of one city, so crucial to Greek thought, took place, there is more than a simple meditation on the vagaries of fortune to be found.

The continued afterlife of the Trojan War plays a significant part in other colonial foundations well into the classical period, both inside and outside the Troad. It is common enough for cities to create foundation myths for themselves based on the *nostoi* of assorted heroes after the war, and not all of these myths make much of whether their legendary founders were Greek or Trojan. We may consider the Mytilenaeon colony of

Arisbe, a Trojan ally in the Homeric catalogue. Its own story, bearing similarities to stories from several other cities, including Scepsis, in the region, is that it was jointly founded by Hector's son Scamandrius and Aeneas' son Ascanius, yet it was clearly another Aeolic Greek settlement along the lines of Ilion; its Greekness nevertheless allows it to claim Trojan antecedents, in an attempt to link itself to the Homeric site.<sup>30</sup>

An important source is Stephanus of Byzantium, who cites an impressive array of ancient authors in his attempt to trace this city's foundation (*Ethnika* 119):

Ἀρίσβη, πόλις τῆς Τρωάδος, Μυτιληναίων ἄποικος, ἧς οἰκισταὶ Σκαμάνδριος καὶ Ἀσκάνιος υἱὸς Αἰνείου. κεῖται μεταξὺ Περκώτης καὶ Ἀβύδου. Κεφάλων δέ φησιν ὅτι Δάρδανος ἀπὸ Σαμοθράκης ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν Τρωάδα τὴν Τεύκρου τοῦ Κρητὸς θυγατέρα γαμεῖ Ἀρίσβην. Ἑλλάνικος δὲ Βάτειαν αὐτὴν φησιν. ἔστιν ἑτέρα ἐν Λέσβῳ ἀπὸ Ἀρίσβης τῆς Μάκαρος θυγατρὸς. Ἐφορος δὲ Μέροπος αὐτὴν γενεαλογεῖ καὶ πρώτην Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ Πριάμου γαμηθῆναι. Ἡρόδοτος δὲ καὶ ἰάζων Ἀρίσβαν καλεῖ ἐν πρώτῃ.

Arisbe: a city of the Troad, a Mytilenaeon colony, whose founders were Scamandrius and Ascanius, the son of Aeneas. It is located between Percote and Abydus. Cephalon (*FrGH* 45 F 4) says that Dardanus, coming from Samothrace to the Troad, married the daughter of Teucer of Crete, Arisbe. Hellanicus (*FrGH* 4 F 24b) calls her Bateia. There is another city by this name in Lesbos, named after Arisbe the daughter of Macar. Ephorus (*FrGH* 70 F 164) traces her descent from Merops and says she was first married to Alexander, son of Priam. Even though Herodotus uses the Ionic dialect, he calls it Arisba in book 1 [A 426].<sup>31</sup>

Gaede detects the influence of Demetrius of Scepsis on this bit of local lore.<sup>32</sup> Despite the confusion over which Arisbe is even under discussion, and which mythical woman—Cretan, Lesbian, or Trojan—the name refers to, the implication is clear: the most important aspect of the city's ethnic identity is its self-identification as a foundation by

---

<sup>30</sup> Strabo 13.1.52.

<sup>31</sup> The numeration is that of Billerbeck's recent edition (2011), which will be used in preference to Meineke's edition whenever possible--as of this writing, Billerbeck has only completed her excellent text and translation through the letter I.

<sup>32</sup> He includes it in his 1880 edition of the grammarian's *On the Trojan Catalogue* as fragment 20; we will deal more with this important figure in the history of Trojan scholarship later in this chapter.

the sons of the two most prominent Trojan heroes—one of whom, from a purely mythical perspective, should not have lived long enough to found anything.

Scamandrius/Astyanax, as the single doomed son of Hector, has no easy place in the narratives that the Aeolic colonies in the Troad developed in an attempt to bridge their Greek origins and their new Trojan affinities; Ascanius is easier to explain, if we discount the tradition that would ultimately drown this one out and that placed his ultimate home in the West, following his father Aeneas.

Indeed, Aeneas himself presents a puzzle for anyone trying to work out the politics of heroic myth in the Troad; he has affinities with both Trojans and Greeks long before the Romans' use of his legend comes to overshadow all others. Two prophecies, one from the *Iliad* itself and another from the somewhat later Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite, are the beginning of the problem:

νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνεΐαο βίῃ Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει  
καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται (*Iliad* 20.306-307).

And now indeed mighty Aeneas will rule over the Trojans,  
and his children's children, whichever are born in the future.

σοὶ δ' ἔσται φίλος υἱὸς ὃς ἐν Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει  
καὶ παῖδες παῖδεσσι διαμπερὲς ἐκγεγάονται (*H. Aph.* 196-197).

You will have a dear son who will rule over the Trojans,  
and children will continue to be born to his children.

The first, of course, comes from Poseidon and the second from Aphrodite. The repetitions are significant, as are the discrepancies: Both gods promise the child born to Anchises and Aphrodite future rule over Trojans (with Poseidon using the periphrastic formula Αἰνεΐαο βίῃ). The difference is that Aphrodite only promises that the line of Anchises will continue through this son of theirs, and Poseidon explicitly grants these

offspring of Aeneas, the continuation of Anchises' line, rule over future generations of Trojans. This rule becomes even more sweeping in an alternate reading, πάντεσσιν ἀνάξει at *Il.* 20.306 instead of Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει, as Aristonicus reports:

σημειοῦνταιί τινες πρὸς τὴν ἱστορίαν, καὶ ἐπεὶ μεταγράφουσί τινες “Αἰνεῖω γενεῇ πάντεσσιν ἀνάξει,” ὡς προθεσπίζοντος τοῦ ποιητοῦ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἀρχὴν (Σ Α *ad Il.* 20.306).

Some people put a sign here in reference to the story, and then some change the reading of the line to “the line of Aeneas will rule over all people,” as if the poet were prophesying the rule of the Romans.

Though the word τινες is not straightforward, the *modus operandi* of Aristonicus is to report on the comments of Aristarchus; we may therefore be confident that we are seeing a reading that was known to Aristarchus. He may have contented himself with putting a *sēmeion*, probably a *diplē*, by the line in his usual fashion to indicate that there was an issue present in the line that needed attention. The second τινες likely refers to the post-Aristarchan authors whose revision of the line takes into account the changes the Romans had wrought in the reception of the Aeneas legend.

At any rate, this rather sweeping promise to Aeneas drew some criticism in antiquity, as we are told in a scholion to Euripides' *Trojan Women* 47:

εἴ σε μὴ διώλεσεν Παλλὰς Διὸς παῖς, ἦσθ' ἂν ἐν βάθοις ἔτι: σεσημείωται ὡς μηκέτι αὐτῆς οἰκουμένης: ὑπόπτεικε γὰρ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐκ τούτου τὸ “νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνεῖαιος βίη Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει.”

“If Pallas, daughter of Zeus, had not destroyed you, you would still be standing firm”: this line has been marked, on the grounds that [the city] was never inhabited again. For Aristophanes suspected, on the basis of this line, the line “now indeed mighty Aeneas will rule over the Trojans.”

The claim that the city of Troy was never again inhabited will be examined later; our concern here is with the future of Aeneas. Aristophanes of Byzantium's claim that this

verse from Euripides invalidates the prophecy from the *Iliad* seems absurd at first glance; why should we look for continuity between the two Poseidons? Yet that is not what he is doing; his basis for questioning the lines from the *Iliad* is that the Troy they represent is inconsistent with the reality, in which there is nothing for Aeneas and his shadowy progeny to rule in the first place. Later authors—Aristonicus as well as Strabo, who in 13.1.53 cites 20.307 as Αἰνεΐαιο γένος πάντεσσιν ἀνάξει among them—explicitly take these two lines as a prediction of Roman rule, which by the time of Aristonicus and Strabo had returned to Ilion; this, of course, was not an option open to Euripides, Aristophanes of Byzantium, or indeed Aristarchus, for whom Troy was a more-or-less unimpressive Greek village.

That Aphrodite’s prediction is slightly less sweeping than Poseidon’s was observed already by Arie Hoekstra in 1969; his study treats the later prophecy as a clear adaptation of the former in response to contemporary pressures. If, he argues, Aphrodite in her hymn promises Anchises only genetic continuity, rather than the unending rule Poseidon mentions, there must be individuals in the region claiming descent from Aeneas: individuals who had perhaps “been reduced to the status of mere honorary (presumably religious) functionaries.”<sup>33</sup> Strabo places this development in Scepsis specifically, rather than Troy; he informs us that the descendants of Scamandrius and Ascanius ruled Scepsis πολὺν χρόνον until the government shifted to an oligarchy; further, when the Milesians arrived, they developed a democracy in which the heirs of the former sovereigns nevertheless enjoyed special privileges (13.1.52).

---

<sup>33</sup> 1969: 40. He further notes that their claims to Aenean descent “may have been as unfounded as those of the Julii.” Nevertheless, as long as those claims were taken seriously at the time they were made, the question of their foundation in reality is irrelevant.

Thus the bold promise in the *Iliad* prophecy, at which Aristophanes had good reason to look askance, is moved away from Troy itself and downsized slightly to something more in keeping with the realities, yet still capable of pleasing someone whose self-definition involved claiming descent from Aeneas. The tradition involving the Aeneadae in the Troad that has developed in the scholarship since is difficult to parse; the evidence for their existence is indirect at best.<sup>34</sup> Ancient references to Aeneadae as key players in the politics of the Troad are not to be found even in Strabo, who firmly believed, and in opposition to Hellanicus, that Aeneas stayed in Troy to rule over Trojans rather than migrating west.<sup>35</sup> Indeed, such references are hard to come by anywhere: when Cassius Dio, for instance, refers to the Aeneadae, he means the Romans.<sup>36</sup> It is thus difficult to figure out what exactly is going on in Arisbe or Scepsis when their inhabitants claim to be descended from Aeneas and from Hector; they are certainly referring to the Homeric (and hymnic) prophecies.<sup>37</sup> Greek though they were, in part at least—and they needed to assume a similar level of Greekness, centered around the common bonds of heroic myth, in those who received and accepted their claim—it went relatively unchallenged in antiquity, and it is clearly part of the same trend as the Ilians’ own claims to uninterrupted habitation on the site of the Homeric city.

---

<sup>34</sup> Smith (1981:17) ultimately traces the scholarly lineage of the Aeneadae back to Wilamowitz, who in *Die Ilias und Homer* (1916:83) posited in no uncertain terms a “halbhellenisiertes Herrscherhaus,” located perhaps in Scepsis, whose patronage produced the Aeneas legend in its various forms.

<sup>35</sup> ἐμφαίνει [sc. Homer] γὰρ μεμενηκότα τὸν Αἰνεΐαν ἐν τῇ Τροίᾳ καὶ διαδεδεγμένον τὴν ἀρχὴν (13.1.52).

<sup>36</sup> ἐντεῦθεν καὶ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις τοῦ σφετέρου γένους ἀρχηγέτης νενόμισται καὶ Αἰνεΐαδαὶ καλεῖσθαι αὐχοῦσι (in Zonaras 7.1).

<sup>37</sup> For a recent and balanced view, see Faulkner (2007: 18); he argues that the case against the Aeneadae has been exaggerated in the interest of advancing ahistorical interpretations of the poem, but allows that their existence is not as certain as has sometimes been claimed.

More striking is the conscious appropriation of a hero for a colony's mascot in the historical period.<sup>38</sup> Yet Polyaeus (6.53) reports on a culture-bending *aition* for the Athenian settlement of Amphipolis on the River Strymon in Thrace, prompted by the following delivery from the Delphic oracle, in 437 BCE:

τίπτε νέως κτίσσαι πολύπουν μενεαίνετε χῶρον,  
κοῦροι Ἀθηναίων; χαλεπὸν δὲ θεῶν ἄτερ ὑμῖν.  
οὐ γὰρ θέσφατόν ἐστι, πρὶν ἂν κομίσητ' ἀπὸ Τροίης  
Ῥήσου ἀνευρόντες καλάμην πατρίῃ δέ τ' ἀρούρη  
κρύψητ' εὐαγέως· τότε δ' ἂν τότε κῦδος ἄροισθε.

Why do you now desire to colonize a well-trodden place,  
youth of the Athenians? It will be hard for you without the gods.  
It is not so decreed for you until you find and bring back  
from Troy the stubble of Rhesus and, in his native soil,  
bury him reverently; only then can you receive glory.

The general Hagnon then follows the oracle in scrupulous detail, even to the point of performing a *dolos* (building walls by night in apparent defiance of a treaty with the local Thracians) worthy of Diomedes and Odysseus—a revealing Homeric, or quasi-Homeric, link in itself. In reaching for Rhesus, who plays a central role in a version of the Trojan story whose claim to be part of the Homeric poems was not universally recognized in antiquity, the *oikist* of Amphipolis highlights the difficulties of determining what is and is not a literary reference at any given period. The T scholia claim that the incorporation of the Doloneia into the *Iliad* is a peculiarly Athenian innovation: φασὶ τὴν ῥαψωδίαν ὑφ' Ὀμήρου ἰδίᾳ τετάχθαι καὶ μὴ εἶναι μέρος τῆς Ἰλιάδος, ὑπὸ δὲ Πεισιστράτου τετάχθαι εἰς

---

<sup>38</sup> Aeneas is perhaps the most successful (in mythical terms) of legendary line-founders after the Trojan War, but other heroes participated as well: Antenor as founder of Padua (Strabo 5.1.4, Livy 1.1; his *Nachleben* will be further discussed in the next chapter) or of Cyrene (Pindar, *Pythian* V.82-88); Nestor as founder of Metapontion in south Italy (Strabo 6.1.15); and Odysseus as father of Latinus (Hesiod, *Theogony* 1011-1016), for instance.

τὴν ποίησιν.<sup>39</sup> Whether the anecdote Polyaeus reports is an oblique testament to the book's acceptability as part of the *Iliad* at the period in question, or whether the Rhesus story was known well enough from other sources to be a viable reference to heroic legend, the Athenians are using the figure of Rhesus to stake their claim on the territory; for this strategy to work, Rhesus and his role in the Trojan War has to be well known. It is curious that the Athenians are using a Trojan ally rather than a Greek in their effort to colonize Amphipolis.<sup>40</sup> Apparently, by this point, the mere fact that the community possesses an important hero cult from the Trojan War overrides the affiliation the hero originally had.<sup>41</sup> The Athenians at Amphipolis lose nothing of their Greek identity by taking over Rhesus; if anything, they are recreating the Doloneia in their audacious nighttime trickery at the site of Rhesus' tomb. This later story therefore provides a counterpoint to the history of colonization at Ilion: the expansion-minded Greeks, both of Athens and of Lesbos, use the pan-Hellenic story of the Trojan War to bolster their claims on Trojan territory. In effect, they are fighting the war all over again, only this time the rifts among the Greeks come to overshadow any conflicts with outsiders, and the effects are permanent.

Even heroines are fair game for this sort of analysis, as a relatively recent archaeological find from the Troad, now housed at the Archaeological Museum of Çanakkale, demonstrates. The so-called Polyxena sarcophagus, excavated in 1994 from

---

<sup>39</sup> Σ T *ad Il.* 10.1. Hainsworth (1993: 150-151) discusses perceptively the narrative difficulties involved in inserting an episode of this length into the *Iliad*; the difficulty of propagating the version is an entirely different matter.

<sup>40</sup> McCauley (1998:232) links the story to an "explosion of interest in heroes and their cults during the fifth century throughout the Greek speaking world." She further emphasizes the importance of the local connection: bringing the Thracians' Trojan War hero home gave the Athenians a foothold in the area.

<sup>41</sup> It is worth noting that, according to the scholia to Lycophron 417, Neoptolemus had buried Phoenix only a few miles downstream at Eion; nevertheless, the oracle makes it explicit that the Athenians need to settle at this site and no other, and invoke this hero and no other, despite the availability of Greek hero-cult nearby.

the site of Gümüşçay a few dozen kilometers to the northeast of Troy, near the modern town of Biga, illustrates beautifully the complicated identity politics at work in the Troad of the late archaic period. It has been dated to the end of the sixth century, largely on artistic grounds.<sup>42</sup> This dating places the sarcophagus within a complex cultural network, where Greek artists living in a highly Persianized milieu produced a style with affinities to both Lycian and Greek art. The Greek affinities are readily apparent in the sarcophagus's iconography: on one side, three muscular young men (beardless, with fillets in their hair) hold an unresisting young woman horizontally as a fourth man holds her by the hair with one hand and plunges a dagger into her throat with the other. Behind this man is a dome-shaped structure with a knob at the top and—significantly—a tripod. The man holding the woman's feet looks backwards toward a series of women tearing their hair in lamentation. The second long side depicts a funeral procession; the short sides show a veiled, mourning older woman and a scene of feasting featuring more women. It is the first long side that has given the sarcophagus its name: we may compare it with a slightly later black-figure Attic vase (London 1887.7-27.2) in which three similar men—now clad in hoplite armor—hold a similarly unresisting woman for their comrade to strike. The difference in the vase, as opposed to the sarcophagus, is that all the characters are labelled in the Attic script: the woman is clearly Polyxena, the sacrificer Neoptolemus. This is the iconography of human sacrifice *par excellence*; this piece's identification as the "Polyxena sarcophagus" is borne out all the more by its stylistic affinities to other artistic versions of the myth.

What, then, does it mean to find this sarcophagus in Asia Minor at this period?

The artist's treatment of Polyxena is, overwhelmingly, sensitive and sympathetic; the

---

<sup>42</sup> Sevinç 1996: 262.

brutality of her sacrificers is underscored by the hand gripping her hair and forcing her throat back into position for the fatal blow.<sup>43</sup> The mourning women are easy to interpret as Trojan women, whose lamentations, beginning in the *Iliad*, continued to typify the city's response to its disaster in Greek sources, both literary and artistic.<sup>44</sup> It is impossible to tell what kind of burial took place in this sarcophagus; it had been robbed before the excavators at Gümüşçay were able to locate it, and the skeleton was in disarray.<sup>45</sup> We have therefore nothing in the way of grave goods or remains to give further context to what must have been a rich and elaborate burial; yet the choice to depict this sacrifice on the sarcophagus is noteworthy even in the absence of such potentially useful evidence. What we have here is a reference to an important, extra-Homeric (there is no reference to Polyxena in either poem) myth in the Trojan cycle, a myth that locates itself geographically at the tomb of Achilles and temporally on the brink of the city's destruction. We are told by Proclus (*Chrest.* 275) that the sacrifice of Polyxena ended the *Iliou Persis*; this sarcophagus could therefore be contemporary with, or slightly later than, the earliest literary representations of the myth. Meanwhile, a scholion on Eur. *Hec.* 41 asserts that in the *Cypria*, Polyxena was killed by Diomedes and Odysseus (this detail is also present in Ibycus fr. 36) during the city's sack; Neoptolemus, in an unusual burst of piety, buried her. The story is, therefore, part of the Epic Cycle. As an example of Greek brutality against the Trojans, there could hardly be anything more striking. We have no evidence for hero-cult directed toward Polyxena at

---

<sup>43</sup> The Attic vase approaches this detail rather differently; Polyxena faces downward and her blood gushes to the ground like that of a slaughtered animal.

<sup>44</sup> *Iliad* 24.725ff most notably; for artistic representations of Trojan women, see Hedreen (2001).

<sup>45</sup> Sevinç (1996: 252). She further notes that the area surrounding the tumulus in which the sarcophagus was found was called Kizöldün ('dead girl') locally, but that another—undisturbed—sarcophagus in the same mound contained the skeleton of a young girl; this is undoubtedly the 'dead girl,' not Polyxena, as delightful as such a folk memory would be.

any period—indeed, her story is most often interpreted as a wildly exaggerated version of hero-cult for Achilles, who in this story bypasses the usual libations for heroes and moves straight to royal virgins—but the presence of this artifact indicates that the legends of the Trojan war are already in circulation at this time, in the very region where they had taken place, and that they were cherished as part of the area’s cultural heritage.

## 2. Trojan War Tourism at Ilion

We return now to Ilion itself, as gawkers, sightseers, students, and patriots have been doing for millennia. We can attempt to tell, based on the material record at the city, where its Greek settlers came from and when; this is important information indeed and our knowledge of the site would be sadly lacking without it. The first glimpses of the city in the literary record are nevertheless fascinating in their potential for overt Homeric references. Herodotus depicts Xerxes making a stop at Troy on his way to Greece:

ἐπὶ τοῦτον δὴ τὸν ποταμὸν ὡς ἀπίκετο Ξέρξης, ἐς τὸ Πριάμου Πέργαμον ἀνέβη, ἕμερον ἔχων θεήσασθαι. Θεησάμενος δὲ καὶ πυθόμενος ἐκείνων ἕκαστα, τῇ Ἀθηναίῃ τῇ Ἰλιάδι ἔθυσσε βοῦς χιλίας· χοὰς δὲ οἱ μάγοι τοῖσι ἥρωσι ἐχέαντο. Ταῦτα δὲ ποιησαμένοισι νυκτὸς φόβος ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον ἐνέπεσε (7.43).

Xerxes then arrived at this river [sc. the Scamander] and went up to the Pergamon of Priam, since he had a longing to see it. Once he had seen it and learned about everything that had happened there, he sacrificed a thousand cattle to Athena Ilias and his *magoi* poured libations to the heroes. When they had done this, fear fell by night upon the camp.

Whether this actually happened, or whether it is Greek embroidery, is irrelevant; Briant places it in the context of Xerxes’ other interactions with Greek deities: interactions which lend a certain validity to the story.<sup>46</sup> Nonetheless, the importance of this anecdote

---

<sup>46</sup> 1996: 565.

is that Herodotus' Greek audience could picture the Great King of Persia indulging in some tourism—with a strategic stop to venerate local gods and heroes—on his way to conquer the world.<sup>47</sup> This account of Xerxes' trip to Ilion is uncharacteristically sparse for Herodotus, but still allows us to glean a few details about how the city was viewed from outside at this period when inside views are overwhelmingly non-literary. The archaeological record, as Boulter argues, presents us with an Ilion suffering from “comparative stagnation” after its “moderately active existence” in the first two centuries of the Greek colony there, and yet there is enough at the site to interest foreign visitors.<sup>48</sup> The city appears to have been called Ilion; the name Troy appears only four times in Herodotus, each with reference to the heroic period rather than the present.<sup>49</sup> In the Ilion that Xerxes visits, there is already a tourist industry, complete with guides who can tell Xerxes everything he wants to know about the city—though he has to have heard something previously, or one wonders why he wanted to see Priam's citadel in the first place.<sup>50</sup> It is commonly assumed that Athena is the chief deity of Ilion at this period, the *poliouchos* comparable to the goddess whom Helenus urges the Trojans to placate at *Iliad* 6.92. This assumption is borne out in the remains of the city from the Hellenistic period, and it is not unreasonable to assume that Athena's position as city-goddess of Troy began

---

<sup>47</sup> Griffin (2006: 47) highlights the extent to which Herodotean Persians participate in the “game” of allusion to Greek legend: not only does Xerxes visit Troy here, but elsewhere he points out Pelops' Phrygian origins as justification for making war on the Greeks (7.8.3) and claimed kinship with the Argives on the grounds of the Persians' descent from Perseus (7.150). In the latter case, as in the assertion that the Medes are named for Medea (7.62.1), there is more than mere wordplay at issue. These are arguments carefully crafted to appeal to Greeks, whether they are genuine examples of Persian propaganda or (more likely) a reflection of the Hellenocentric worldview that Herodotus shares with his audience.

<sup>48</sup> Boulter 1976: 407.

<sup>49</sup> *Histories* 4.191, 5.13, 7.91, and 7.171. Interestingly, all of these passages deal with colonial movement and migration; for Herodotus, the epic Troy is a source for various peoples as far away as Thrace and Libya. Given Herodotus's general method, we can imagine that this is the story the half-shaved, red-painted Libyans or the inhabitants of the Strymon—whose Trojan connections we have already seen—told him; a stake in the heroic past is a valuable commodity all over the Mediterranean.

<sup>50</sup> The way Herodotus words Xerxes's educational activity in Troy is vague: *πυθόμενος ἐκεῖνων ἕκαστα*. I follow How and Wells (1912) *ad loc.* for the interpretation.

far earlier—though we risk falling into the trap of believing what the locals want us to believe, as will become apparent later in this chapter.

In addition to worshipping Athena, the Persians in Herodotus' narrative honor an unspecific array of heroes.<sup>51</sup> It is difficult to determine who these actually were, since none is named at any point in the anecdote (his reference to the Pergamon of Priam is the only mention of a specific figure from the Trojan cycle); our testimonia for other heroes honored at Troy are all much later. Both Achaeans and Trojans are represented, though the epigraphic record privileges the Trojan side: Aeneas is worshipped as a god in one Hellenistic statue base (πάτριον θε[ὸν], *I.Ilion* 143). We have seen that the archaic and classical evidence for veneration of Aeneas in the Troad, including the legend of the Aeneadae, is spotty; if it previously existed, the Roman occupation of Ilion could only have increased its distinction. Later inscriptions honor Priam and Hector; a dedication to the latter refers self-consciously to the Homeric tradition and invokes τέχνα to honor the hero's deeds.<sup>52</sup> On the literary side, Philostratus' *Heroicus* mentions a statue of Hector that appears as a ἡμίθεος and wreaks vengeance on the unwary Assyrian who misidentifies it as a representation of Achilles (19.3-6)—the worst possible mistake, from the semi-divine Hector's perspective.

Yet only paragraphs before, Philostratus has identified a deep-seated local superstition that prevents shepherds from taking their flocks anywhere near the grave of Ajax, for fear that they will become diseased (18.3). A statue base, which nobody from Schliemann onward has managed to date, is evidently dedicated to an unnamed Greek hero:

---

<sup>51</sup> Briant (1996: 565) thinks that "il s'agit évidemment ici des héros 'asiatiques,' à savoir Priam et ses compagnons," but the text offers no direct evidence either way.

<sup>52</sup> Priam: *I.Ilion* 141; Hector: *I. Ilion* 142.

Γαῖ πατρίηι γάθοντα | κατέσχε με Ἴλιος αἴ|α  
ἀλκὰν Ἑλλαδικὰ[v] | κευθομένα λαγός|σιν (I. Ilion 145).<sup>53</sup>

Ilian land holds me, rejoicing in my native land,  
hiding Greek might in her flanks.

Frisch identifies the hero tentatively as Telamonian Ajax, based on the resonances between ἀλκὰν Ἑλλαδικὰ[v] and the Homeric epithet πύργος Ἀχαιῶν, but allows that there are other possibilities.<sup>54</sup> Strabo had already noted down the Ilians' offerings to Achilles, Patroclus, Ajax, and Antilochus (13.1.42), so it is reasonable to assume that these cults extended back into the Hellenistic period, and perhaps even before.

Erskine reads this variety of cult activity at Ilion, extending more or less impartially to both sides, as proof of the Ilians' ambiguous position as Greeks once more having captured Troy: "Instead of seeing themselves as Greeks who had supplanted the Trojans, the Ilians felt it added to their own glory to place themselves in a direct line from the Trojans."<sup>55</sup> Yet his analysis fails to explain sufficiently the sheer strangeness of a Greek colony, under the influence of a Greek legend, apparently deciding to self-identify as the heirs of their former enemies. Yet, to a large extent, that is what they appear to have done. They take their Trojanness to extremes, according to Strabo: they claim that they have collected the sacrifice of the Locrian maidens, demanded as expiation for the crimes of Ajax, since shortly after the city was captured (13.1.40). It is hard to accept that the Greek colonists of the archaic period should have been demanding Locrian captives, and this looks like a piece of blatant self-editing on the part of the Ilians.<sup>56</sup> The

---

<sup>53</sup> Several of the readings are uncertain; see Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca* 1081. I follow here both the text and the interpretation of Frisch.

<sup>54</sup> 1975: 238. The four heroes mentioned by Strabo (13.1.42) are the likeliest; Frisch vigorously rejects Kubitschek's suggestion that the epitaph refers to the lesser Ajax.

<sup>55</sup> 2001: 105.

<sup>56</sup> Strabo rejects their story on entirely different grounds, as we shall see later.

juxtaposition of Athena Ilias—a notoriously pro-Greek goddess in the Homeric record—with the Trojan Priam highlights the difficulty of Ilian identity politics even at this early period; in its continual attempt to associate itself with its heroic past, the city claims a dual nature by necessity.

In any case, it is clear enough that the Troy that Xerxes visits is defined entirely by the Trojan war, as seen through the lens of heroic legend, if not specifically the Homeric epics. More explicitly Homeric is the setting for Alexander’s visit a century and a half later—here, in an instance of undoubtedly conscious symmetry, on his way from Europe to invade Persia.<sup>57</sup> We have several accounts for this visit; we shall start with Plutarch:

Τοιαύτη μὲν <οὖν> ὄρμῃ καὶ παρασκευῇ διανοίας τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον διεπέρασεν. ἀναβὰς δ’ εἰς Ἴλιον, ἔθυσσε τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ καὶ τοῖς ἥρωσιν ἔσπεισε. τὴν δ’ Ἀχιλλέως στήλην ἀλειψάμενος λίπα, καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἐταίρων συναναδραμῶν γυμνὸς ὥσπερ ἔθος ἐστίν, ἐστεφάνωσε, μακαρίσας αὐτὸν ὅτι καὶ ζῶν φίλου πιστοῦ καὶ τελευτήσας μεγάλου κήρυκος ἔτυχεν. ἐν δὲ τῷ περιιέναι καὶ θεᾶσθαι τὰ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν ἐρομένου τινὸς αὐτόν, εἰ βούλεται τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου λύραν ἰδεῖν, ἐλάχιστα φροντίζειν ἐκείνης ἔφη, τὴν δ’ Ἀχιλλέως ζητεῖν, ἧ τὰ κλέα καὶ τὰς πράξεις ὕμνει τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκεῖνος (*Life of Alexander* 15.7-9)

With this sort of drive and mental preparation he crossed the Hellespont. Going up to Ilion, he sacrificed to Athena and poured libations to the heroes. He also anointed the tombstone of Achilles with oil and ran up over it naked with his companions, as the custom goes; he then garlanded it and called him blessed, since he happened upon a faithful friend while he lived and a great herald when he died. As he was going around and looking at everything in the city, someone asked him if he wanted to see the lyre of Alexander. He said that he cared hardly at all for that one, but that he was looking for the lyre of Achilles, with which he used to sing of the fame and deeds of good men.

---

<sup>57</sup> Erskine (2001: 105) has already raised the point that Alexander “was visiting a place where a guided tour of Trojan Ilion was possible,” but does not develop it much further than that. His Alexander is essentially a bridge between Greek conquerors and Roman conquerors, and Homer is not a key player in his analysis.

In Plutarch's text, Alexander is taking sides much more explicitly than Xerxes, as becomes evident when one of those anonymous, well-meaning local guides offers to show him a Trojan relic; he effectively disavows his Trojan namesake in order to align himself more fully with his Greek hero. Like Xerxes, Alexander honors Athena and the heroes, but the prominence of Achilles is notable and significant. This is explicitly a Homeric Achilles, as the reference to Patroclus indicates. The action of the *Iliad* has become crucial to the definition of the entire war, and Patroclus is almost as important to Achilles' postmortem fame as Homer, the μέγας κήρυξ to whom Alexander refers. The custom of holding nude races on the tomb of Achilles is otherwise unknown, but it re-enacts on a small scale the funeral games that define book 23 of the *Iliad*, and which include a foot-race—though the concept of using a hero's tomb as the definition of the race course recalls the chariot race instead, perhaps consciously. Alexander is going Achilles one better: instead of having his competitors loop around what might or might not be τεο σῆμα βροτοῖο πάλαι κατατεθνηῶτος (the tomb of some man who died long ago: Ψ 331), they are circling around the known and venerated tomb of a very specific hero, Achilles himself. This race becomes, in Plutarch's narrative, the centerpiece of Alexander's pro-Greek claims at Ilion. His hero-worship is explicitly Homeric in its focus, and it aligns Alexander with everything that is best about the best of the Achaeans.

This is Plutarch's version, and it is typically Plutarchan: the style is rambling, paratactic, almost superficial. The locals' ready willingness to produce the lyre of Paris falls almost too conveniently in place for Alexander to demonstrate his affinities with the hero over the antihero. This episode is, for Plutarch, an opportunity to show off his

subject's behavior over all, and historical details take second place to this focus. In contrast, Arrian's Alexander takes a slightly more ambiguous stance:

ἀνελθόντα δὲ ἐς Ἴλιον τῇ τε Ἀθηνᾷ θῦσαι τῇ Ἰλιάδι, καὶ τὴν πανοπλίαν τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀναθεῖναι ἐς τὸν νεών, καὶ καθελεῖν ἀντὶ ταύτης τῶν ἱερῶν τινα ὄπλων ἔτι ἐκ τοῦ Τρωικοῦ ἔργου σωζόμενα. καὶ ταῦτα λέγουσιν ὅτι οἱ ὑπασπιστὰι ἔφερον πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἐς τὰς μάχας. θῦσαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ Πριάμου ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ἑρκείου λόγος κατέχει, μῆνιν Πριάμου παραιτούμενον τῷ Νεοπτολέμου γένει, ὃ δὴ ἐς αὐτὸν καθῆκεν. (Arrian, *Anabasis* 1.11.7-8).

Going up to Ilium, he sacrificed to Athena Ilias and placed all of his own gear in the temple; instead of this he took from the temple some of the arms that had been preserved from the Trojan war. And they say that the hypaspists bore them in front of him into battle. The story also goes that he sacrificed to Priam on the altar of Zeus Herkeios, begging Priam to cease from his anger (*mēnis*) against the race of Neoptolemus, which descended even to him.

For Arrian, whose focus is primarily military history, this is a digression indeed—but one for which he has prepared his audience by putting into the mouth of a soothsayer the judgment that the poets were going to have a lot to do with this man and this expedition.<sup>58</sup> This prophecy looks forward; this Alexander, on embarking upon his military campaign into Asia, takes some time to look back. Alexander's Ilian tourism in this text involves a sophisticated change of armor, an acquisition of a mascot, and a complicated web of associations that links Priam to Achilles and Achilles to the present. Alexander's own claim to Greekness through the line of Neoptolemus is unequivocal.<sup>59</sup> Yet the prayer that he makes to Priam is an apology for the inhumanity of the Greeks, as exemplified by the son over whom the dead Achilles rejoiced, and whom Alexander claims as his ancestor.

---

<sup>58</sup> Ἀρίστανδρος δέ, ἀνὴρ Τελμησεύς, μάντις, θαρρεῖν ἐκέλευσεν Ἀλέξανδρον· δηλοῦσθαι γὰρ, ὅτι ποιηταῖς ἐπὶν τε καὶ μελῶν καὶ ὅσοι ἀμφὶ ᾠδὴν ἔχουσι πολὺς πόνος ἔσται ποιεῖν τε καὶ ἄδειν Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργα (*Anabasis* 1.11.2: "Aristander of Telmessus, a prophet, told Alexander to have courage, for [the omens] made it clear that there was going to be a great deal of work for the epic and lyric poets, and those who dealt with odes, in singing Alexander and Alexander's deeds.")

<sup>59</sup> Arrian, *loc. cit.* and Plutarch, *Alexander* 2.1: Olympias claimed descent from Neoptolemus through Molossus, his son with Andromache.

The implicit reflection is that violence in the East is simultaneously Alexander's heritage and his shame. Moreover, the word that Arrian chooses to attribute to Priam, μῆνιν, is the first word of the *Iliad*, and hence notoriously associated with Achilles himself. It is a curious word to select for Priam's long-term, entirely justifiable anger toward the descendants of the Greek army at Troy, and it unites Priam and Achilles emotionally in a way that had not perhaps happened since their meeting in *Iliad* 24. That Alexander makes this connection under the auspices of Zeus Herkeios—Zeus in his most protective, fatherly aspect, the ancestral god as city god—is significant, and entirely separate from the sacrifices to Athena Ilias that both Alexander and Xerxes make elsewhere. Priam is assimilated to the tutelary father god, in front of whose altar he was slain in the *Iliou Persis*, rather than the tutelary warrior god whom his city tried in vain to placate.<sup>60</sup> It is Alexander himself who is assimilated to Athena through the armor swap that he initiates at her temple, and the legendary armor shown off as a relic of the Trojan War becomes a symbol of the military glory that he has received from her and from her involvement in the Τρωικὸν ἔργον.

Of course, less exalted visitors made it to Ilion as well; Xerxes and Alexander are the most prominent and best documented Homeric tourists, but they are certainly not the only ones. The briefest of mentions in the *Periplus* of pseudo-Scylax anchors the Troad firmly in the worlds of both literature and history:

Ἐντεῦθεν δὲ Τρωὰς ἄρχεται, καὶ πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες εἰσὶν ἐν αὐτῇ αἶδε·  
 Δάρδανος, Ῥοῖτειον, Ἴλιον (ἀπέχει δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάττης στάδια κε') καὶ ἐν  
 αὐτῇ ποταμὸς Σκάμανδρος. Καὶ νῆσος κατὰ ταῦτα κεῖται Τένεδος καὶ  
 λιμὴν, ὅθεν Κλεόστρατος ὁ ἀστρολόγος ἐστὶ. Καὶ ἐν τῇ ἠπείρῳ Σίγη καὶ  
 Ἀχιλλεῖον καὶ Κρατῆρες Ἀχαιῶν, Κολωναί, Λάρισσα, Ἀμαξιτὸς καὶ ἱερὸν  
 Ἀπόλλωνος, ἵνα Χρύσης ἱερᾶτο (95).

<sup>60</sup> From the argument to the epic preserved in Procl. Chrest. 239 (Bernabé 88): καὶ Νεοπτόλεμος μὲν ἀποκτείνει Πρίαμον ἐπὶ τὸν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ἐρκείου βωμὸν καταφυγόντα.

From here the Troad begins, and these are the Greek cities in the region: Dardanus, Rhoiteion, Ilion (which is 25 stades away from the sea) and in it the River Scamander. An island lies near these places: Tenedos and its harbor; Cleostratus the astronomer comes from here. On the mainland there is Sige and Achilleum and the Mixing-Bowls of the Achaeans, Coloniae, Larissa, Hamaxitus, and the temple of Apollo, where Chryses was priest.

This text is difficult to place. The title clearly refers to the late sixth-century Persian explorer Scylax of Caryanda, mentioned by Herodotus (4.44); the text itself dates to at least the mid-fourth century BCE, given the reference, in section 67 of the *Periplus*, to the Athenian politician Callistratus as founder of the city of Daton/Crenides in Thrace, later Philippi; since this occurred in the late 360s, the text in its latest form cannot have existed before then, and it cannot have been written much after then either, to judge from certain crucial omissions.<sup>61</sup> Strabo appears to have used and respected pseudo-Scylax as a source.<sup>62</sup> At any rate, the *Periplus* provides a breezy, simplified version of the places to which it refers, focusing on the πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες. Occasionally he will mention important individuals, usually heroes rather than historical figures. He refers to one of each in connection with the Troad: the astronomer Cleostratus of Tenedos and the priest Chryses, both mentioned in the same breath and with little distinction in tone, though Cleostratus belongs to the historical period and to the Greek colonies in the Troad, while Chryses is a figure of legend (and aligned with Homer's Trojans, to boot, in that he,

---

<sup>61</sup> Fabre (1965) offers the most precision in dating the text: he narrows it down to the four years between 361 and 357, citing the former as the date for the foundation of Daton. The latter is as late as he is willing to go, largely on the grounds that in his discussion of Lucania, Scylax does not mention the Bruttii, who, according to Diodorus Siculus XVI.15, formed their republic and assigned themselves the name in 356 (1965: 359).

<sup>62</sup> He calls Scylax a παλαιὸς συγγραφεύς (14.2.20), implicitly placing him in the tradition of Thucydides, and cites him twice elsewhere as an authority (12.4.8 and 13.1.4).

through his daughter, was a victim of Achaean violence).<sup>63</sup> The Greek cities mentioned in pseudo-Scylax’s catalogue are noteworthy as well. Dardanus is a mythologically loaded name.<sup>64</sup> Ilion itself is identified in conjunction with its significant river and its relation to the sea. Sige and Achilleum introduce the second list, and we have seen them previously as disputed territory with enormous significance for the Greeks in Asia Minor.<sup>65</sup> The city where Chryses’ temple is located is left unnamed; presumably any reader could have filled in the name Chryse. The distinction between legend and reality thus becomes increasingly tenuous in this passage. This popularizing, ambiguous stance finds its match in the *Περὶ ἀπίστων* of Palaephatus, a collection of rationalized myths that includes a discussion of the Trojan horse—presumably one of the least unbelievable parts of the Trojan cycle, inasmuch as it relies on human dishonesty rather than divine machinery.<sup>66</sup> Nevertheless, the story demands explanation, for Palaephatus and his audience at least:

Φασὶν ὡς Ἀχαιοὶ οἱ ἐν ξυλίνῳ κοίλῳ ἵππῳ ἀριστεῖς κατέβαλον τὴν Ἴλιον. ἔστι δὲ μυθώδης ἄγαν ὁ λόγος. ἡ δὲ ἀλήθεια αὕτη. ἵππον κατεσκεύασαν ξύλινον πρὸς μέτρον τῶν πυλῶν, ὅπως μὴ ἐλκόμενος εἰσέλθῃ, ἀλλ’ ὑπερέχη τῷ μεγέθει. οἱ δὲ λοχαγοὶ ἐκάθηντο ἐν κοίλῳ χωρίῳ παρὰ τὴν πόλιν, ὃς Ἀργείων λόχος ἐκαλεῖτο μέχρι τοῦ νῦν (*De incredibilibus* 16).

They say that the top Achaeans took Troy down in a hollow wooden horse, but this story is too fanciful. This is the truth: they set up a wooden horse made with the measurements of the gate in mind, so that it was too

<sup>63</sup> Müller, in his edition, places Cleostratus in the late sixth century, “inter Olymp. 58 et Eudoxi aetatem” (1882:69). Unlike Callistratus, therefore—the only other non-mythological individual mentioned in the *Periplus*—he is not helpful for fixing the date of the text’s composition.

<sup>64</sup> See Chapter 3, section 3.

<sup>65</sup> Sige is probably to be identified with Sigeum, as Müller (*ibid.* 69), claims, if Gronovius is correct in his emendation to Σίγη καὶ Ἀχιλλεῖον from the manuscript’s Τοίχη καὶ Ἀγιαλεῖον. The first part is rather strained: going from ΤΟΙΧΗ to CΙΓΗ requires a little more ingenuity than going from ΑΓΙΑΛΕΙΟΝ to ΑΧΙΑΛΕΙΟΝ.

<sup>66</sup> Complicating the question of Palaephatus and his audience, of course, is the existence of up to four authors by the same name, according to the *Suda*. Trachsel (2007: 164) takes this Palaephatus as the historian of Abydus, the supposed *paidika* of Aristotle and writer of both *Περὶ ἀπίστων* and *Τρωϊκά*.

large and could not be dragged in. The leaders then waited in a hollow near the city, which is called “the Achaeans’ Trap” until the present day.<sup>67</sup>

For Trachsel, this is another bit of Ilian tourism at work here: she argues that the story demonstrates that Palaephatus has seen the place and heard an explanation from the locals that is compatible with the unusual place-name he mentions.<sup>68</sup> Perhaps—but in contrast to what we have seen so far, this is a version of the fall of Troy that is incompatible with the story of the horse, and thus explicitly incompatible with part of the Homeric narrative. Why should the Ilians be promoting it, and the place called the Achaeans’ Trap along with it? Palaephatus, if he is the protégé of Aristotle, would have been roughly contemporary with Alexander, and therefore a generation or so after pseudo-Scylax; the concept of a non-Homeric Ilion is almost anathema by this point. In essence, the landscape—so important to Trachsel’s analysis—is taking the place of the narrative that makes it worth visiting in the first place. Perhaps the Achaeans’ Trap (a less opaque name than the Achaeans’ Mixing-Bowl, at least) is the vestige of a competing rationalistic explanation, but the contemporary Ilians have no reason to rationalize what is fantastic or mythical in Homer’s poems, since that is the very quality that attracted Xerxes and Alexander, and (further back) that partially motivated the Greeks’ colonization of the area in the first place. In the end, the inconcinnity is merely part of a larger problem: How can we say this city was the same city sacked by the Achaeans in the heroic cycle when discrepancies are clearly visible between the past and the present?

---

<sup>67</sup> Palaephatus goes on to explain that the size of the horse meant that the Trojans had to knock down a portion of the wall in order to get it into the city, and the Greeks took advantage of this hole—hardly more plausible than the standard version of the story with the Greeks inside the horse; certainly it requires the Trojans to be at least as dim-witted.

<sup>68</sup> “L’extrait laisse croire que Palaïphatos a vu l’endroit et que les indigènes lui ont expliqué la version de la prise de Troie compatible avec le nom de l’endroit”: *ibid.* 170.

### 3. Ilion's Total Destruction

Given the wealth of references to the historical Ilion in the literary record, as well as the robust tradition of Greek habitation on the site as revealed by the archaeological record, it is all the more astonishing that a significant number of sources in antiquity asserted that the city had been entirely destroyed by the Greeks at the end of the Trojan War, and that since then it had existed in various states of abandonment and decay. The fourth-century orator Lycurgus is our first culprit here:

τὴν Τροίαν τίς οὐκ ἀκήκοεν, ὅτι μεγίστη γεγενημένη τῶν τότε πόλεων καὶ πάσης ἐπάρξασα τῆς Ἀσίας, ὡς ἄπαξ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων κατεσκάφη, τὸν αἰῶνα ἀοίκητός ἐστι; (*Oratio in Leocratem* 62.3)

Who has not heard of Troy and how it became the greatest of the cities at that time and ruled over all of Asia, and then was obliterated all at once by the Greeks and is eternally uninhabited?

The last part of Lycurgus' great rhetorical question appears patently false; if his audience could not physically travel to Ilion to see that the city did, in fact, continue to exist, at least the story of Xerxes' visit and sacrifice would have had some circulation thanks to Herodotus. It would have been assumed that there was something there—perhaps still mainly ruins with opportunistic squatters on them, but a place nonetheless, with some rudimentary infrastructure that allowed visitors to experience the site. On the face of it, it seems logical to assert, as Mahaffy did in his perceptive study of Hellenistic Ilion, that Lycurgus “*confused utter with permanent destruction.*”<sup>69</sup> This he did under the influence of a literary and dramatic tradition that emphasized the complete and lasting effects of the city's sack by the Achaeans—a tradition so overwhelming that it could override even the

---

<sup>69</sup> 1882: 77 (emphasis original). Alain Ballabriga echoes him over a century later: “Lycurgue...ne s’embarrasse guère d’exactitude historique” (1997: 31).

physical presence of a long-standing settlement on the site. We have already seen something of the Troy Euripides presents in the *Trojan Women*: Poseidon's opening speech makes it clear that there is nothing left. Mahaffy's reasoning is vivid and persuasive, but his interest in the political motivations behind this emphasis on Ilian destruction keeps him from pushing the point as far as he could have. Whereas for Xerxes and Alexander, the Troy of the epics was vividly present in the Ilium they visited, for Lycurgus, it was vanished and unobtainable. He marks, for us, the beginning of a phase that dominates ancient scholarship on the region in the Hellenistic and Roman periods: the *aphanismos* phase, in which the destruction of Troy is taken as a given and the city's contemporary existence fades to nothing next to the monumentality of Homer's vanished city.

We must turn now from Lycurgus to a local expert who, through Strabo, defines *aphanismos* for us. Demetrius of Scepsis is a shadowy figure; Strabo mentions him (13.1.45) as a contemporary of Aristarchus and Crates, which dates his *floruit* to the first half of the second century BCE. His *tour de force* was a treatise, in thirty books, on the bare sixty-one lines of the Trojan catalogue. It is a loss to philologists that the entire Τρωϊκὸς διάκοσμος does not survive, but a few dozen fragments remain, mostly in Strabo (who used him extensively as a source for his discussion of the Troad in Book 13) and Athenaeus. Very little attention has been paid to Demetrius in the modern period, though Alexandra Trachsel's treatment of the author in her recent work on the Troad--and her forthcoming edition of his fragments--may signal a shift in Demetrius' fortunes. Nevertheless, the standard edition of his fragments is Richard Gaede's 1880 doctoral dissertation, he rates a scant paragraph in the latest edition of the *Oxford Classical*

*Dictionary*, and the most sustained treatment of the author and his goals is an 1882 article by J.P. Mahaffy. The latter focuses on the political motivations for Demetrius' disparaging treatment of the modern foundation of Ilion in the *Diakosmos*: as a native of the competing city of Scepsis, he had a natural reason to cut Ilion down to size whenever possible.<sup>70</sup> His local bias is convincing enough: when he reports that, in his boyhood, the city of Ilion was singularly unimpressive and not even the roofs were tiled, we can detect the veiled contempt for what must have seemed like ridiculous posturing on the Ilians' part.<sup>71</sup> It thus appears to be Demetrius who sets in motion the idea that modern Ilion is not the same as ancient Troy, an idea that Strabo picks up and propagates, since it resonates so thoroughly with the way he thinks about the Homeric poems as true historical texts. It is difficult to say whether Strabo started with the geographical discrepancies between the Homeric Troy and the current Ilion or with the political mindset, taking the criticisms of Demetrius as a jumping-off point, that prompted him to look for alternative sources for Roman greatness than the backwater that Ilion appears to have been at the time. (Surely it is difficult otherwise to justify this sort of attack on Troy in the Augustan period; in this light, Strabo's political motivations seem somewhat more nuanced than, for instance, Virgil's.) Whatever reasons he has, he stands firm on this point: the city we have now is not the same as the Homeric city, which was completely destroyed at the time of the Achaean sack; the modern Ilion is therefore a fraud. The proofs for this stance will ultimately make it clear why he defended it with such vehemence: for Strabo and those like him who want Homer to have some truth value,

---

<sup>70</sup> 1882: 70.

<sup>71</sup> φησι γοῦν Δημήτριος ὁ Σκήσιος μειράκιον <ῶν> ἐπιδημήσας εἰς τὴν πόλιν κατ' ἐκείνους τοὺς καιροὺς, οὕτως ὀλιγορημένην ἰδεῖν τὴν κατοικίαν ὥστε μηδὲ κεραμωτὰς ἔχειν τὰς στέγας (fr. 21 Gaede; from Strabo 13.1.27).

Troy is at the center of a series of discussions about Homer and fiction that we must situate within the techniques and assumptions of ancient literary criticism as a whole.

For Homer to be accurate, Troy must be lost.

#### 4. Case Study I: The Knees of Athena

The first concrete evidence for Troy's disappearance Strabo (13.1.41) finds in Homer himself, despite the Ilians' insistence that certain traditions—particularly the sacrifice of the Locrian maidens to Athena as expiation for the lesser Ajax's rape of Cassandra—had been carried out continuously for a very long time. Strabo disagrees:

Οὕτω μὲν δὴ λέγουσιν οἱ Ἰλιεῖς, Ὅμηρος δὲ ῥητῶς τὸν ἀφανισμόν τῆς πόλεως εἴρηκεν “ἔσσειται ἡμαρ ὅταν ποτ’ ὀλώλη Ἴλιος ἱρή.” “ἢ γὰρ καὶ Πριάμοιο πόλιν διεπέρσαμεν αἰπήν.” “πέρθετο δὲ Πριάμοιο πόλις δεκάτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ.” καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα δὲ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τίθενται τεκμήρια, οἷον ὅτι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τὸ ξόανον νῦν μὲν ἐστηκὸς ὄραται, Ὅμηρος δὲ καθήμενον ἐμφαίνει· πέπλον γὰρ κελεύει “θεῖναι Ἀθηναίης ἐπὶ γούνασιν,” ὥς καὶ “μὴ ποτε γούνασιν οἷσιν ἐφέζεσθαι φίλον υἷόν.”

This is what the people of Ilion say, but Homer has explicitly referred to the disappearance of the city: “There will be a day when holy Ilios is destroyed” (*Iliad* 4.164) and “for indeed we destroyed the lofty city of Priam,” (*Odyssey* 3.130, 11.533, 13.316) and “the city of Priam was sacked in the tenth year” (*Iliad* 12.15). These sorts of proofs for the same circumstance are produced: for instance, the statue of Athena is now seen to be standing, but Homer portrays it as seated: he orders that a robe be placed “on the knees of Athena” (*Iliad* 6.92). Compare “that never should a dear son sit on his knees” (*Iliad* 9.455).

The first set of proofs—citations from both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*—is straightforward enough, and no reader of either epic can ignore the inevitability of destruction that the poems present: both Troy's destruction and that of individual heroes on both sides.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> The second reference has three close analogues in the *Odyssey* (3.130, 11.533, and 13.316) but differs slightly from all of them. Either Strabo has a different text or (more likely) he is quoting imperfectly from memory.

The second, however, manages to be simultaneously trivial and deeply revealing in a way completely characteristic of ancient scholarship. We begin with the apparently straightforward command from Helenus: *θεῖναι Ἀθηναίης ἐπὶ γούνασιν ἠὔκόμοιο* (to place [the robe] on the knees of lovely-haired Athena). We end with the current representation of the city's patron goddess. It follows, therefore, that the temple of Athena must contain a different statue (*ξόανον*) from the one that Helenus and Hecuba tried to placate; for the robe to be placed on her knees, she must out of necessity be seated, unlike the current statue; for the cult statue of Athena to be replaced, the old one must have been destroyed; for the old temple to have been destroyed, the city must have been destroyed.<sup>73</sup> Strabo is evasive about whose proof, exactly, this line of reasoning is: Gaede traces it to Demetrius (going so far as to put his name down in angle brackets, as if the subject of the verb *τίθενται* were not a vague, unspecified plural entity, but in fact a singular person).<sup>74</sup> Yet Strabo is generally not hesitant to tell us where he is relying on Demetrius, whom he respects as an *ἀνὴρ ἐντόπιος*.<sup>75</sup> The vagueness of his reference becomes even more apparent when he contrasts this interpretation of the passage with its competitor, in the passage immediately following the one quoted above:

βέλτιον γὰρ οὕτως ἢ ὡς τινὲς δέχονται ἀντὶ τοῦ “παρὰ τοῖς γόνασι θεῖναι” παρατιθέντες τὸ “ἢ δ’ ἦσται ἐπ’ ἐσχάρῃ ἐν πυρὸς ἀύγῃ” ἀντὶ τοῦ “παρ’ ἐσχάρῃ.” τίς γὰρ ἂν νοηθεῖη πέπλου ἀνάθεσις παρὰ τοῖς γόνασι; καὶ οἱ τὴν προσωδίαν δὲ διαστρέφοντες, “γουνάσιν” ὡς θυιάσιν, ὀποτέρως ἂν δέξωνται, ἀπεραντολογοῦσιν, εἶθ’ \*\*\*ἰκετεύοντες †τε φρένας†. πολλὰ δὲ

---

<sup>73</sup> Leaf finds this discussion “more interesting from what it omits than from what it contains” (1923: 195). The omission he focuses on, however, is Strabo’s failure to discuss the theft of the Palladium from Troy in the Epic Cycle; this story would provide an organic, completely mythological reason for the cult statue of Athena in “modern” Ilium to be a different object from the ancient one.

<sup>74</sup> The passage quoted above, as well as the next one, form part of Gaede’s fr. 28.

<sup>75</sup> Strabo 13.1.45: *δεῖν προσέχειν ὡς ἀνδρὶ ἐμπείρῳ καὶ ἐντοπίῳ*.

τῶν ἀρχαίων τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ξοάνων καθήμενα δείκνυται, καθάπερ ἐν Φωκαίᾳ Μασσαλία Ῥώμῃ Χίῳ ἄλλαις πλείοσιν.<sup>76</sup>

For it is better to explain it this way than as some do: instead of [reading the line as] “to put it by her knees,” they compare the line “she sat at [*epi*] the hearth in the light of the fire” (*Odyssey* 6.52) instead of “by [*par*] the hearth.” Now who would think that the robe would be placed “by” her knees? Those who change the accent so it reads *gounásin*, on the analogy of *thuiásin*, get into pointless discussions whichever way they interpret it... Many of the ancient cult statues of Athena are shown seated, such as in Phocaea, Massilia, Rome, Chios, and a number of other cities (13.1.41).

The passage is corrupt, lacunose, and highly compressed; the suppliants can be pieced out of it with some difficulty, but the reference to their minds is completely unintelligible.

Nevertheless, Strabo presents us with two other groups of scholars who have tried to make sense of Helenus’ order: those who argue that the women of Troy placed the robe beside Athena’s knees (surely as difficult as putting it on her knees, if the statue is in fact standing), and those who emend the text to place the robe on the suppliants themselves (*gounásin* instead of *gónasi*, forming a word γούνας on the analogy of θουιάς, “maenad”).

Gaede identified the first group as Aristarchus and his circle based on a corresponding A scholion:

ἡ διπλῆ, ὅτι ἀντι τῆς παρά, ἴν’ ἢ παρὰ γούνασιν· ὀρθὰ γὰρ τὰ Παλλάδια κατεσκευάσται. καὶ ἔστιν ὅμοιον τῷ “ἡ μὲν ἐπ’ ἐσχάρη” (ζ 52) ἀντι τοῦ παρ’ ἐσχάρη· ἡ γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπάνω σχέσιν σημαίνει.

The dipole is there because [Homer uses *epi*] instead of *para*, so the line means the same thing as *para gounasin*; for the Palladia are depicted as standing. It is similar to “she sat at the hearth” instead of “by the hearth”; *epi* means the same thing as above.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>76</sup> The text cited is that of Radt (2004). There are some serious textual problems here that are not easily to be resolved. Meineke (1877) read εἶθ’ ἱκετ<εἰας ἐρμην>έυοντες <εἶ>τε φρένας, which still does not make much sense; Heyne suggested τεφρείας or τέφρας (in the ashes) for τε φρένας.

<sup>77</sup> The word ὅτι clearly demonstrates that the scholion is derived from the work of Aristarchus, via Aristonicus, *Peri semeiōn*; the similar B scholion is derived, as its form indicates, from Porphyry’s *Zetemata*; see MacPhail 2007: 214. Porphyry, in turn, may well be drawing on Aristarchus for his analysis.

Preposition versus preposition: it seems like the driest, least productive sort of philology imaginable, and yet behind it the debates reported by Aristonicus and telescoped into the margins of the Venetus A have immense significance for the concept of Homer as fiction. The “modern” inhabitants of Ilion, as Strabo reports, would like a high degree of continuity between the Homeric city and their own, for obvious reasons. Yet they too have to deal with the passages both in the *Iliad* and in the *Odyssey* that treat the Homeric city as a soon-to-vanish, or already vanished, place. The scholars—including Aristarchus—who interpreted ἐπί with the dative as equivalent to παρά with the dative can marshal Homeric support for their judgment: this is the word used in the *Odyssey* to describe Queen Arete sitting next to the hearth (ἐπ’ ἐσχάρῃ, 6.52). Strabo thinks that this is a poor editorial decision, since nobody would ever place the robe next to the statue. Neither he nor the scholion supplies Aristarchus’ reason for interpreting it in this way; it is up to us to read between the lines. The use of prepositions, of course, had altered tremendously since the period when the Homeric text was composed. Although this line of reasoning is admittedly speculative, I think we must allow for some significance in the equivalency that is established in the scholion, rather than merely chalking it up to the gulf between the Hellenistic *koine* and the epic language. Equating ἐπί and παρά offers the possibility of downplaying the significance of the statue’s position; if Helenus is ordering the Trojan women to place the robe next to Athena, it does not matter whether she is sitting or standing. No judgment is therefore made about the provenance of the modern ξόανον at Ilion, and the possibility that it is the same one that is mentioned in *Iliad* 6 is entirely open. The objection raised in the A scholion—ὀρθὰ γὰρ τὰ Παλλάδια κατεσκεύασται—may have come from Zenodotus or some other opponent of Aristarchus

who suspected the lines on the grounds that Homer is inaccurately representing a Palladium as seated; Aristarchus therefore rebuts their claim with an alternative interpretation for the preposition that gets around the problem neatly.

This explanation cannot have pleased everybody. A D scholion on the same line therefore takes it one step farther:

ἐπὶ γούνασιν: ἀντὶ τοῦ παρὰ τοῖς γόνασιν, παρὰ τοὺς πόδας. ὀρθὸν γὰρ ἔστηκε τὸ Παλλάδιον (Σ D *ad Iliad* 6.92).

On her knees: instead of by her knees, by her feet. For the Palladium stood upright.

This line of reasoning mirrors Aristarchus' argument that ἐπὶ means παρὰ, but offers another simplifying explanation, in essence a gloss: the Trojan women are simply supposed to lay the robe next to Athena's feet. Glosses frequently tend to be the earliest levels of ancient criticism represented in the D scholia, stretching back into the classical period.<sup>78</sup> The insertion nevertheless does not appear in Z, the earliest manuscript of the D scholia, but only in later manuscripts; it is therefore difficult to determine its antiquity or provenance.<sup>79</sup> It is an interesting gloss nonetheless: the equivalence does not assume that γούνασιν actually means feet, but replaces one anatomical reference with another that is less critically volatile.

Both of these explanations from the scholia involve playing with the meaning of the preposition. The second group in Strabo's analysis offers instead an explanation for the word *gounasin*: they resort to creating the feminine noun γουνάς ("suppliant") on the analogy of θυιάς ("maenad"), with the result that the robe is to be draped over the Trojan women (ἐπὶ γουνάσιν, rather than ἐπὶ γούνασιν) as they offer it to the goddess. Leaf

---

<sup>78</sup> See van Thiel 2000: 5-7.

<sup>79</sup> van Thiel 2000: 260.

blames “some Ilian wiseacre” for the invention of a feminine noun, meaning “suppliant,” that removes the question of the statue’s position entirely.<sup>80</sup> While his image of the clever village schoolmaster playing with accents initially appears fanciful, it is nevertheless clear that this explanation needs to come from a local source for the polemic to make any sense—and it is also clear that these sources universally accept the identification of this cult statue of Athena with the Palladium. As a result, it becomes clear why Demetrius—if we accept, following Gaede, that he is the source Strabo refers to in his judgment that the Homeric statue of Athena was seated—disagrees with their line of reasoning. What seems originally to have been an issue of local politics, of Scepsis and Ilium jockeying for position in the Hellenistic political landscape of Asia Minor, had considerably larger implications for the world of Homeric scholarship. If modern Ilium (with its statue of Athena standing in what appears to have been the accepted pattern for a Palladium) is supposed to have been Homeric Troy, it was necessary to deal with the problem set up by this line of Homer. Strabo rejected the identification of the two statues entirely. Aristarchus, if he is actually involved in this debate rather than simply solving a minor vocabulary problem, offers a reinterpretation of the preposition with the result that the reader, if he or she so desires, can step around the problem completely. The D scholia both mirror Aristarchus and offer a banal, inoffensive gloss to substitute for his reading. These approaches all underline the profound unease ancient scholarship had regarding the physical reality of Homer’s Troy: the very fact that so many explanations exist for this problem is an indication of how important the issues behind Athena’s knees actually are.

---

<sup>80</sup> 1923: 195.

## 5. Case Study: Hot and Cold Springs

We see a similar unease in the scholarship on another striking feature of the Homeric city, and one that stands out more clearly to us as fictional, even if it did not to ancient commentators: the two springs at the source of the Scamander.

κρουνώ δ' ἴκανον καλλιρρόω· ἔνθα δὲ πηγαι  
δοιαὶ ἀναΐσσουσι Σκαμάνδρου δινήεντος.  
ἦ μὲν γάρ θ' ὕδατι λιαρῷ ῥέει, ἀμφὶ δὲ καπνὸς  
γίγνεται ἐξ αὐτῆς ὡς εἰ πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο·  
ἦ δ' ἑτέρη θέρεϊ προρέει ἐϊκυῖα χαλάζη,  
ἦ χιόνι ψυχρῇ ἢ ἐξ ὕδατος κρυστάλλω.  
ἔνθα δ' ἐπ' αὐτάων πλυνοὶ εὐρέες ἐγγὺς ἔασι  
καλοὶ λαΐνιοι, ὅθι εἵματα σιγαλόεντα  
πλύνεσκον Τρώων ἄλοχοι καλάϊ τε θύγατρει  
τὸ πρὶν ἐπ' εἰρήνης πρὶν ἔλθεῖν υἴας Ἀχαιῶν.

They came to a pair of beautifully flowing streams, where  
two springs of the whirling Scamander leap forth.  
One flows with warm water, and all around steam  
comes out of it as if out of a burning fire;  
the other one flows on in summer like hail,  
or cold snow or ice formed out of water.  
There at those springs are many broad troughs nearby,  
lovely stone ones, where they used to wash  
shining garments—the lovely wives and daughters of the Trojans,  
before, in peacetime, before the Achaeans' sons came (*Iliad* 22.147-156).

It is a superbly constructed vignette, describing an idyllic environment perfectly adapted for human needs: a trope that appears time and again in Homer, where the beauty of the natural world functions primarily as a mirror for humans' activities and desires.<sup>81</sup> It is placed to evoke maximum pathos: we move from the wonders of the place to the plaintive imperfect πλύνεσκον and the anaphora of πρὶν, both of which remind us that this all happened a long time ago; we are actually taking a brief pause from watching

---

<sup>81</sup> The most striking example of this tendency is the extended discussion at *Odyssey* 9.116-141 of the island near the Cyclopes that is inhabited only by goats: its abundant charms are famously put in the context of human colonization, for which it would be particularly apt.

Achilles chase Hector around the walls of the city, and the peacetime vision of the Trojan women washing their shining linen is irretrievably lost.

The actual Trojans' water-collection systems have been illuminated by the productive excavations of the mid-1990s: a cave uncovered in the northwestern quadrant of the site at Hisarlık, on the edge of the lower city's walls, contains a still-functional spring—though it does not run warm and cold—and basins excavated further down the cut must have been important for supplying the city with water.<sup>82</sup> That there were springs at this site was already known to Schliemann, who cited our passage in connection with them: with his customary enthusiasm for all things Homeric, he clearly believed that he had located the place mentioned in *Iliad* 22.<sup>83</sup> While there is undoubtedly an element of realism in this elaborate description of the Trojans' washing-basins outside the city, we must note that it is *outside* the city in this passage. Korfmann points out that Schliemann would not have known about the existence of the lower city or its walls—nor would the inhabitants of Troy in the archaic period have lived there, but only on the hill. Therefore, in his view, the passage cited could fit the local geography at the time the Homeric poems were composed, thus appealing to the *Iliad*'s original audience, but not actually during the Bronze Age, when we are to imagine the events of the poem taking place.<sup>84</sup> That attempts were made to identify these springs, or any springs identifiable as sources of the Scamander, in later periods is evident from a T scholion on X 147:

κρουνώ: κρουνοὶ καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρέων μετὰ ψόφου καὶ κρούσεως  
νάοντες· “κρουνοῶν ἐκ μεγάλων” (*Iliad* 4.454). αἱ δὲ ἀληθινὰὶ πηγαὶ  
Σκαμάνδρου κατὰ ἀνατολὰς τῆς Ἰδης πρὸ τριακοσίων σταδίων τῆς Ἰλίου  
εἰσὶν· ἴσως δὲ ὑπόγεως ῥέων ἐξ Ἰδης ὧδε ὀρᾶται.

---

<sup>82</sup> Korfmann 1998: 60. These recently discovered caves are now shown to tourists, with a trilingual sign depicting a smiling bat. There is only one body of water; it is cool, if not cold.

<sup>83</sup> For Schliemann's springs, see (1881: 697-699) and (1884: 70-73).

<sup>84</sup> *ibid.* 59-60.

Two springs: sources, and also those streams that flow down from the mountains with noise and splashing: “from the great springs.” The real streams of the Scamander are on the east side of Ida, under three hundred stadia from Troy; perhaps this one, flowing underground from Ida, becomes visible here.<sup>85</sup>

The phrase ἀληθινὰ πηγαὶ is striking: it indicates a belief that the streams in the *Iliad* were not, in fact, real, and that they could not possibly correspond to the real sources of the Scamander. In the context of the scholion, it is clear that the “real” springs are supposed to be viewed in contrast to those in our passage; the question is whether the source of this scholion considers the springs in the *Iliad* passage to be an invention out of whole cloth or simply a different set of springs (on the east side of Ida) from the ones that are commonly seen. The latter is more likely, as the scholiast takes pains to point out an important parallel between the real springs and the dual springs in the passage: they both flow from Ida. The springs in the passage, however, are imagined not as the actual springs on the mountain that served as the Scamander’s sources—clearly these could have been nowhere near the city—but as a second set of springs, surfacing from underground and bubbling up near the city for the Trojans’ convenience.

---

<sup>85</sup> There is a similar entry in the b scholia:

κρουνοὶ καλοῦνται καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρέων μετὰ ψόφου καὶ κρούσεως νάοντες χεῖμαρροι. νῦν δὲ αἱ τῶν πηγῶν ἀπόρροιαι· ὁ γὰρ Σκάμανδρος κατὰ ἀνατολὰς τῆς Ἰδης ῥεῖ, πρὸ †τριῶν† τῆς Ἰλίου σταδίων. **b**(BCE<sup>3</sup>E<sup>4</sup>) ὑπόγειος δὲ γινόμενος ἐν Ἰλίῳ δύο ἀναδίδωσι πηγὰς, ἀφ’ ὧν οἱ κρουνοί. **b**(BE<sup>3</sup>E<sup>4</sup>).

The storm-swollen streams that flow down from the mountains with noise and splashing are also called springs. Now they are the streams from the sources; for the Scamander flows from the east side of Ida, under †three† stadia from Ilion. Beginning underground, it produces two sources in Ilion, from which the springs come.

Despite the textual issues that reduce the distance, absurdly, from three hundred to three stadia, the information is substantially the same and in places the wording is actually clearer; the word νῦν here highlights the distinction between Homeric topography and what is currently available for observers. The etymology given here connects the splashing sound that the streams make with the word κρουνοί.

As we look through the scholia further, in an attempt to tease out the argument swirling around these sets of springs in antiquity, we find that, once again, a preposition is at the center of the discussion, according to a T scholion:

ἄλλως· καὶ πῶς ἐν τῇ M (sc. 19—21) ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδης φησὶν ἔχειν αὐτὸν τὰς πηγὰς; ῥητέον οὖν ὅτι νῦν φησι τὰς πηγὰς ταύτας ἀναβλύζειν ἀπὸ τοῦ Σκαμάνδρου, ἵνα λείπη ἢ ἀπό, ‘ἀπὸ Σκαμάνδρου’ (cf. X 148). οἱ δὲ τοπικώτερον ἱστοροῦντες δύο λιβάδας εἶναι ἐτέρας τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδης πηγῶν, ἃς εἰς τὸν Σκάμανδρον ἐμβάλλειν. μεταξὺ δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ τείχους τρέχει ὁ Ἔκτωρ ἴσως, †ἀναστηριζόμενος† ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους ὑπὸ Ἀχιλλέως (Σ T ad 22.147b1).

Differently: and how in book 12 does he say that [the Scamander’s] streams come from Ida? We must therefore say that he asserts here that these streams shoot forth from the Scamander, and thus the word *apo* is left off: “*from* the Scamander.” Others, speaking more geographically, tell us that the two springs are different from the streams that come from Ida, which it shoots out into the Scamander. Hector runs between them and the wall perhaps, while he is being kept away from the wall by Achilles.

The argument is, unsurprisingly, compressed and evasive. As it stands, we can see a variety of sources for it: the first part of the entry (from καὶ πῶς through ἀπὸ Σκαμάνδρου) may have passed through Porphyry, as the *zētēma*-style wording suggests, probably in the form of an epitome.<sup>86</sup> The origins of the second part are unclear, and it is uncertain who οἱ δὲ are, the ones with the more geographical mindset. Meanwhile, a parallel A scholion proves that the discussion of *apo* is derived from Aristarchus, as reported by Aristonicus.<sup>87</sup> For him, the problem is the syntax of lines 147-48: ἐνθα δὲ πηγαὶ/δοιαὶ ἀναΐσσουσι Σκαμάνδρου δινῆεντος. The genitive is what makes it sound as though these are the sources of the Scamander—which, as discussed above, is both un-Homeric and geographically impossible; the actual sources of the river must be on Mount

<sup>86</sup> John MacPhail, personal communication (2008).

<sup>87</sup> ὅτι λείπει πρόθεσις ἢ ἔκ ἢ ἀπό· ἐκ Σκαμάνδρου γὰρ ἢ ἀπὸ Σκαμάνδρου.

Ida.<sup>88</sup> The mountain's epithet *πολυτίδακα* feeds this idea, and later authors take it for granted that the sources are here; as for example Macrobius, who argues that the Gargara Virgil mentions in book 1 of the *Georgics* as a paradigm of lush fertility is a town located below the summit of Ida, also called Gargara.<sup>89</sup> By the time Macrobius gets there, enough effort has been expended to establish the mountain as a well-watered source of richness that any question of there being other sources for the Scamander is anathema. The solution to the problem is simple enough, unlike the contortions that Aristarchus performed on *epi* in the discussion of Athena's statue earlier; here we need only assume that the preposition, either *ek* or *apo*, has been left out, and thus these are not the sources of the river; they are merely offshoots of the river that come to the surface here.

The location of these springs is therefore dealt with in ancient scholarship in two primary ways: by putting their streams underground, so as not to conflict with the waterways visible in the historical period, and inserting a directional preposition to remove the necessity of seeing them as the sources of the Scamander in the first place. Yet there is still another problem to deal with: the double warm and cold spring, surely a fantastic geographical elaboration in any case, and not observable in any historical era. The most ingenious solution to this particular problem in antiquity was proposed by one of Demetrius's sources, an otherwise obscure author called Democles.<sup>90</sup> Strabo, once again, is the source:

---

<sup>88</sup> M 19 clearly situates the sources of the river on the mountain: ἀπ' Ἰδαίων ὀρέων ἄλαδε προρέουσιν. A Porphyrian question on this line attacks the same question raised in the passage we have been examining and concludes that the omission of ἐξ is the solution to the problem, as we find in the scholion here.

<sup>89</sup> *Saturnalia* 5.20.10: *Et omnem quidam illam Mysiam opimis segetibus habitam satis constat, scilicet ob humorem soli.*

<sup>90</sup> Müller (*FrHG* 21.1) identifies this Democles with the Democles of Pygela or Phygela south of Ephesus, mentioned in Dionysius of Halicarnassus *On Thucydides* 5 in a list of ἀρχαῖοι συγγραφεῖς who wrote πρὸ τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ πολέμου. He also suggests that this may be the same writer whom Athenaeus (IV.76.11) calls Democleides, who apparently reported on a local Phoenician name for Adonis. This all is

πολλῶν δὲ συναγωγὰς ποιησαμένων τοιαύτας (scil. de terrae mutationibus) ἀρκέσει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Σκηψίου Δημητρίου συνηγμένα οικείως παρατεθέντα. μνησθεῖς γὰρ τῶν ἐπῶν τούτων “κρουνῶ δ’ ἴκανον καλιρρόω· ἔνθα τε πηγαῖ/δοιαὶ ἀναΐσσουσι Σκαμάνδρου δινήεντος./ ἢ μὲν γάρ θ’ ὕδατι λιαρῶ... ἢ δ’ ἑτέρη θέρει προρέει εἰκυῖα χαλάζει” (22.147ff). οὐκ ἔῃ θαυμάζειν, εἰ νῦν ἢ μὲν τοῦ ψυχροῦ ὕδατος μένει πηγή, ἢ δὲ τοῦ θερμοῦ οὐχ ὄραται. δεῖν γὰρ φησιν αἰτιᾶσθαι τὴν ἔκλειψιν τοῦ θερμοῦ ὕδατος. μιμνήσκειται δὲ πρὸς ταῦτα τῶν ὑπὸ Δημοκλέους λεγομένων σεισμούς τινας μεγάλους τοὺς μὲν πάλαι περὶ Λυδῖαν γενομένους καὶ Ἰωνίαν μέχρι τῆς Τρωάδος ἱστοροῦντος, ὑφ’ ὧν καὶ κῶμαι κατεπόθησαν καὶ Σίπυλος κατεστράφη κατὰ τὴν Ταντάλου βασιλείαν καὶ ἐξ ἐλῶν λίμναι ἐγένοντο, τὴν δὲ Τροίαν ἐπέκλυσε κῦμα.

Even though many people have made such collections (i.e. on changes in the landscape), the examples collected by Demetrius of Scepsis will be sufficient, since they are appropriately cited. For he refers to these lines: “They came to a pair of beautifully flowing streams, where two springs of the whirling Scamander leap forth. One flows with warm water...the other one flows on in summer like hail.” He does not permit us to wonder that the spring of cold water remains now and the spring of hot water is not to be seen, for he says we must blame the failure of the hot water. In regard to this subject, he recalls the words of Democles, who described certain large earthquakes that occurred long ago around Lydia and Ionia as far as the Troad, and because of which villages were swallowed up and Mount Sipylus was shattered, during the reign of Tantalus, and lakes formed from swamps, and a wave washed over Troy.<sup>91</sup>

This passage raises several questions immediately. We do not have enough of Demetrius’s work on the Trojan catalogue to determine where a set-piece catalogue of cataclysms would fit in, but presumably it must have come from there; we have no reference to any other work of his that could be the source. This earthquake that is said to have occurred due to the reign of Tantalus—complete with a tsunami that devastated the entire coastal region—is otherwise unattested; furthermore, if it is supposed to have

---

insufficient evidence to label Democles, as the old *Pauly* does, “ein bekannter Lokalantiquar des 5. oder 4. Jahrhunderts.” This Democles/Democleides is not in Jacoby’s *Fragments of the Greek Historians*, suggesting that he found the identification insufficient. The source Demetrius mentions does not by any means have to be a historian or a “local antiquarian”; he may be the Democles who is already known as an Attic orator, a contemporary of Lycurgus (ps.-Plutarch, *Moralia* 842, from the “Lives of the Ten Orators”)—compare Lycurgus’s assertions about the destruction of Troy quoted above.

<sup>91</sup> Demetrius fr. 48 Gaede = Strabo 1.3.17.

occurred during the reign of the legendary Tantalus, as it indeed must have, it could hardly have affected the geography of the Troad after the Trojan War. We must not assume that Democles is blaming this particular earthquake for the demise of the hot spring in *Iliad* 22; instead, he is merely pointing out a parallel that proves similar events occurred in the region, and something like this could very well have happened between Hector's sprint past the springs and any historical observer's visit to the same site. It still requires a leap of faith on the part of the reader to make this the cause of the springs' non-correspondence to current realities. Demetrius asks us—with Strabo's complete approval—to accept that some cataclysmic natural event, otherwise unrecorded and unprovable, took place some time between the late Bronze Age and the Hellenistic period and changed the face of the Troad significantly. While it would be unsurprising to find seismic and volcanic activity on this scale in the Aegean, it is surprising that no trace of it should be found in the historical record outside Demetrius. It may be a geographer's *aition*, a sensationalized disaster account that draws on preserved cultural memories of events such as the Thera eruption.

In contrast to this elaborate piece of geological speculation, the bT scholia, not uncharacteristically, focus on the emotional impact of the entire passage on the poem's audience: αὐτὸς δὲ ψυχαγωγεῖ τὸν ἀκροατὴν (he himself enchants the listener). The crucial word in this scholion is ψυχαγωγεῖ, and its interpretation is difficult; yet it is key to our understanding what the exegetes think Homer is actually doing here: the idea that the poet can be deliberately creating a scene that unites dramatic tension and emotional manipulation will have serious consequences for discussing the fictional element in the *Iliad*, as we shall see later. Invoking the concept of *psychagōgia* as a literary-critical

term almost inevitably leads back to Plato’s definition, not unsympathetic, of rhetoric: τέχνη ψυχαγωγία τις διὰ λόγων, “a kind of art that leads souls by means of words” (*Phaedrus* 261a). As the term is used in the scholia, it refers to a variety of emotional effects that Homer is trying—successfully in general—to impose upon his audience, generally with the purpose of entertainment in mind.<sup>92</sup> There is ethnographic curiosity at *Iliad* 3.6, in reference to the Pygmies (ἀνδράσι Πυγμαίοισι):

καὶ τῷ ξένῳ τῆς ἱστορίας ψυχαγωγεῖ καὶ τὸν θροῦν αὐξεῖ. (Σ AbT *ad Il.* 3.6)

And with the foreignness of the story he entertains and makes the noise louder.

Here the power of *psychagōgia* extends as far as the physical senses, which are manipulated along with the listener’s taste for the exotic. Phoenix is therefore represented as making an attempt at a different sort of *psychagōgia* in the *Litai* episode, according to a bT scholion:

μυθολόγοι οἱ γέροντες καὶ παραδείγμασι παραμυθούμενοι. ἄλλως τε ψυχαγωγεῖ τὴν ὀργὴν ὁ μῦθος (Σ bT *ad Il.* 9.447).

Old men are storytellers and they exhort with examples. Alternatively, a story beguiles anger.

Here, the *psychagōgia* in question is clearly an attempt at persuasion or emotional manipulation by means of a story rather than an attempt at mere entertainment: Phoenix is about to tell Achilles what appears to be a completely irrelevant story about how he fled to Peleus after seducing his father’s concubine. The scholion, however, points out in a sparse but sophisticated piece of analysis that the purpose of the story is twofold.

---

<sup>92</sup> Nünlist (2009: 144) highlights the “broad applicability” of the term at the same time as its relative rarity, arguing that *psychagōgia* is less a literary effect than an element of the poem’s style. I argue, in turn, that a phrase with such profound psychological resonances deserves a more sustained and detailed treatment, and that when the scholia use this term, they are in fact talking about an effect produced directly on the audience. Meijering, meanwhile, focuses on the ways in which *psychagōgia* functioned in antiquity as a means of differentiating poetry from genres such as history (1986: 10-11).

Phoenix is providing himself as a rather pointed example (*paradeigma*) of youthful strength turned fruitless as a result of bad decision-making. What is more important, though, he is attempting to distract Achilles from the ὀργή (surely a less threatening word than μῆνις!) that drives the plot of the *Iliad*. This second part of the argument is *psychagōgia* in its potentially negative sense: rather than amusing Achilles as Homer amuses us, Phoenix is attempting to use μῦθοι as a way of almost reprogramming the hero. That he fails spectacularly—as the rest of book 9 details—is a testimony to the fact that Phoenix is simply not as good at this sort of thing as Homer.

Homer is, indeed, very good. A bT scholion to *Iliad* 2.323 points out what it considers a particularly clever example of *psychagōgia*. For context, Odysseus is reminding the assembled Achaeans of an omen they all witnessed at the beginning of the war—an omen so unusually clear that the prophet Calchas himself asked them why they kept silent instead of interpreting it for themselves. The scholiasts are particularly interested in why Odysseus repeats the seer’s entire speech word for word ten years later:

ἐπιτιμᾷ ὡς οὐ δεομένοις μαντείας. καλῶς δὲ οὐ περιέτεμε τὸν λόγον, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τοῦ μάντεως κέχρηται ῥήμασιν, ὅπως ψυχαγωγοῖντο δοκοῦντες αὐτοῦ ἀκούειν (Σ bT *ad Il.* 2.323).

He [either Odysseus or Calchas] rebukes them as people who do not need prophetic skill. He did well not to cut the speech short, but rather he uses the words of the prophet, so that they may be entertained/manipulated, thinking that they are listening to [Calchas] himself.

Calchas, Homer, and Odysseus all know when to keep silent and when to speak; unlike Phoenix, they are masters of μῦθοι. Odysseus, and by extension the poet who gives him all his words, delivers the speech almost the way an actor would, in order to give the Achaeans the impression that they are once more hearing Calchas deliver these lines. Their reaction is a frenzy of shouting and praise for Odysseus’ words (2.335) This is

another case of *psychagōgia* at its most ambivalent: Odysseus, as usual, is creating something that is both manipulative and diverting. Yet the tone of the scholion is entirely approving; poet and character alike, in this interpretation, know that their job is to create a particular emotional affect in their audience. The picture of *psychagōgia* that emerges from the bT scholia is of something that is an integral part of poetry's purpose (not that *didaskalia* is excluded), and something that Homer, the primal *exemplum* for all later Greek poetry, has mastered completely.

We therefore return to the image of the Trojans' washing-place, which the scholion calls an example of Homeric *psychagōgia*. It is clear now that this is a term of approval. Like the story Phoenix tells Achilles, the lavish description of the natural stone troughs and the geologically improbable hot and cold springs seems irrelevant and unnecessary to the story at hand. That is precisely why it works, in the scholiasts' view. Unusually enough, it is immaterial for them whether the stone troughs referred to in this passage exist or not; the important thing is the way their description functions in context. It has been inserted into the passage as a way both of manipulating the audience's emotions and entertaining them generally, and an integral part of the *Iliad's* entertainment value is its emotional impact. The bT scholia have a blind spot for Homer's supposed philhellenism,<sup>93</sup> but individual instances of pathos directed toward the Trojans, whose lives have been irreversibly turned upside-down by the long siege of their city, slip by nonetheless, and do not fail to touch the audience—whether scholarly or casual, ancient or modern.

---

<sup>93</sup> This sentiment is most notoriously clear in a bT scholion at 10.14-16: ἀεὶ γὰρ φιλέλλην ὁ ποιητής.

## 6. Case Study III: True Names

We have just been dealing with a relatively sophisticated set of literary-critical efforts (sophisticated from the viewpoint of modern scholarly techniques, at least) on the part of the ancient commentators. More immediately foreign to our conception of scholarship and its goals is their obsession with etymologies and names, some of which we have already seen: in the discussion of Arisbe, for instance, which is parsed at great length for etymological significance.<sup>94</sup> This sort of discussion—obviously crucial to Stephanus of Byzantium’s work, as seen above—pervades the scholia as well. It is clear that at all levels of Homeric scholarship, the names of places are used as a key to both their origins and their significance, and nowhere is this more evident than in the discussion of those places that have more than one name. Discussions on dual naming in Homer have ultimately proven, as G.S. Kirk notes, fruitless.<sup>95</sup> There is no way to systematize their occurrence; most of the dual names in the *Iliad* itself are applied to Trojans or Trojan places, but whether they represent an effort to deal with discrepancies in the tradition or simply an attempt to render the Greeks’ enemies more exotic is unclear. To that end, it must be noted that some of these names are obviously non-Greek: an extra-Iliadic case is that of Priam. His original name, Podarces, is the Greek member of the doublet, while the name by which he is better known—ancient and modern attempts to derive it from πρίω aside—is in all likelihood Luwian.<sup>96</sup> In any case, onomastic

---

<sup>94</sup> See Chapter 1, section 1, above.

<sup>95</sup> 1985: 94. He further notes that the instances where this trope occurs in the *Odyssey* give only the divine name; the *Iliad* differs in that it spells out the human name for us as well.

<sup>96</sup> See Starke 1997. On the name Podarces, see ps.-Apollodorus, *Library* 2.136.9; Lucian, *Podagra* 252; and the Geneva scholia on *Iliad* 1.19.

doublets provide the ancient commentators with an irresistible *zētēma* to untangle, and in doing so they inevitably reveal some of their biases and assumptions.

At one such doubly-named place the Trojans are marshalled for their catalogue at the end of Book 2:

ἔστι δέ τις προπάροιθε πόλιος αἰπεῖα κολώνη  
ἐν πεδίῳ ἀπάνευθε περιδρομος ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα,  
τὴν ἦτοι ἄνδρες Βατίειαν κικλήσκουσιν,  
ἀθάνατοι δέ τε σῆμα πολυσκάρθμοιο Μυρίνης.

There is a certain steep hill before the city,  
far off in the plain with a clear space to run all around,  
which, to be sure, men call Batieia,  
but the immortals call the tomb of springing Myrine (2.811-814).

The place in itself is expansive, easily accessible from the city, and equipped with high ground for surveying the surroundings completely: an ideal place for gathering the Trojan army together. None of this is significant to the scholiasts, who are entirely occupied with ferreting out the origins of both these names and the reason Homer is able to include both.

Stephanus of Byzantium offers an entry point into the discussion:

Βατίεια, τόπος τῆς Τροίας ὑψηλός. κέκληται ἀπὸ Βατείας τινός, ὡς Ἑλλάνικος ἐν πρώτῃ Τρωικῶν, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ πάτου τῶν ἵππων ἢ γοῦν τῆς τροφῆς, τροπῆ τοῦ π εἰς β, ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν βάτων. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Βατιεύς καὶ Βατιειάτης (B 55).<sup>97</sup>

Batieia: a high place in the Troad. It is named after a certain Bateia, as Hellanicus (*FrGH* 4 F 24a) says in the first book of the *Troica*. Or [it is named] for the gait of horses or from horse feed (*patos*), with the π changed into a β, or for brambles (*batos*). The ethnic designation is Batieus and Bateiates.

---

<sup>97</sup> Billerbeck 2011: 331 offers the most convincing reconstruction of the thought processes behind this compressed and elliptical entry: *patos* can mean either the horses' step or their diet (she compares a scholion on Aristophanes, *Wealth* 118c, where *πάτος* is glossed as τροφή).

We have already seen that Hellanicus of Lesbos is an important source for us on many aspects of the Troad (recall the story of Sigeum as representative of Lesbos' interest in the region). We are not told here precisely what he had to say about the mysterious Bateia, the hill's purported namesake; Stephanus appears to be more interested in the alternative explanations.<sup>98</sup> We have an extremely similar extract from the *Etymologicum Magnum*, appearing ultimately to derive from Herodian, which contains additional information: the derivation from *patos* (either gait or horse feed) comes from one Epaphroditus, undoubtedly the Neronian-era grammarian from Chaeronea who worked on both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.<sup>99</sup> In addition to his *hypomnemata* on both Homeric epics, as well as the pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield of Hercules* and Callimachus' *Aitia*, Epaphroditus is known to have compiled a collection of comic glosses (Λέξεις); his interest in Homeric etymologies is therefore in line with his general research interests.<sup>100</sup> The alternate etymologies for the toponym are unremarkable enough: the one involving brambles adds a nice touch of local color that has the ring of authenticity about it. The Bateia mentioned is slightly more fanciful: the mythical wife of Dardanus is nevertheless a plausible enough candidate for an eponym.<sup>101</sup> Neither entry mentions Myrine and the gods' name for the place specifically, although the reference to the horses has parallels in other sources that speak of the Amazon—who may, as such, be expected to have some connection to horses.

---

<sup>98</sup> This is the same Bateia that he has identified with Arisbe; see chapter 2, section 1 above.

<sup>99</sup> Fr. 23 Braswell/Billerbeck = fr. 3.1.277 of Herodian (in Lentz's edition) = *Etymologicum Magnum* β 75. Our primary source for the life of Epaphroditus is the *Souda* (α 1895 = Testimonium 2 in Braswell and Billerbeck's new 2007 edition of his fragments).

<sup>100</sup> Braswell and Billerbeck 2007:28.

<sup>101</sup> Her story is developed further in e.g. Arrian: she was the daughter of Teucer, and her sons with Dardanus, who also married her sister Neso (whether simultaneously or subsequently we are not told), were Erichthonius and Ilus (fr. 95 Jacoby).

Strabo, in fact, highlights the Amazon stereotype in his explanation of the place's name.

πόλεις τε παλαιαὶ ὁμολογοῦνται ἐπώνυμοι αὐτῶν· ἐν δὲ τῷ Ἰλιακῷ πεδίῳ κολώνη τις ἔστιν “ἦν ἦτοι ἄνδρες Βατίειαν κικλήσκουσιν,/ ἀθάνατοι δὲ τε σῆμα πολυσκάρθμοιο Μυρίνης,” ἦν ἱστοροῦσι μίαν εἶναι τῶν Ἀμαζόνων ἐκ τοῦ ἐπιθέτου τεκμαιρόμενοι· εὐσκάρθμους γὰρ ἵππους λέγεσθαι διὰ τὸ τάχος· κάκείνην οὖν “πολύσκαρθμον” διὰ τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς ἠνιοχείας τάχος· καὶ ἡ Μύρινα οὖν ἐπώνυμος ταύτης λέγεται (12.8.6).

It is agreed that ancient cities are named after them [i.e. the Amazons]. In the plain of Ilion there is a certain hill “which indeed men call Batieia, but immortals call the tomb of much-springing Myrine,” who, they say, was one of the Amazons, judging from her epithet, for horses are called “well-springing” on account of their speed. So they call her “much-springing” on account of her speed in chariot-driving, and so Myrina is said to be the hill's namesake.

It is curious that Strabo should use this place-name as an example of cities—*poleis*—named after the Amazons; though he himself makes it immediately clear that Batieia is a hill, not itself a *polis*, a D scholion on 2.811 shows that there was at least some confusion on this score in antiquity.<sup>102</sup> As we have seen previously, Stephanus gives not one, but two ethnic names for this location, which suggests that people considered themselves to be from Batieia in the historical period; it is nevertheless difficult to imagine a village, much less a *polis*, springing up so close to Ilion itself, and we must allow for the possibility that Stephanus was simply inventing the ethnics out of whole cloth. In any case, the undeniable gap between the Homeric evidence and the later perception remains.<sup>103</sup> Strabo gives no further examples of Amazonian toponyms and evinces no interest in the name Batieia; his focus is all on the other namesake of the place, its true namesake.

<sup>102</sup> Βατίεια: πόλις Τρωική ἀπὸ τῶν περὶ αὐτὴν βάτων. The derivation from brambles is reminiscent of Eraphroditus, but it is difficult to determine which way the influence goes.

<sup>103</sup> As previously discussed, we have seen other burial mounds displayed and recognized in the historical period: that of Achilles most notably, but also Telamonian Ajax and Protesilaos.

The real crux of the problem, for ancient interpreters, is the tension between how mortals and gods define the place. The easy assumption is that the gods are correct and humans have incomplete knowledge, and that is precisely the assumption that the exegetical scholia make:

τὴν μὲν δημωδεστέραν ἀνθρώποις, τὴν δὲ ἀληθῆ θεοῖς προσάπτει. ἢ ὡς μουσοτραφῆς οἶδε τὴν τῶν θεῶν διάλεκτον. Βατίεια δὲ παρὰ τὸ βαίνεσθαι ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις (Σ b *ad* 2.813-14).

He assigns the more common name to people and the true name to the gods. Or, since he was educated by the Muses, he knows the language of the gods. [The name] Baticia comes from marching (βαίνεσθαι) in battles.

The implicit judgment here in the word δημωδεστέραν is that some sort of correction is desired as a counterbalance to the errors that slip into common currency. Homer, of course, is excluded from these errors: in his capacity as divinely taught poet, he can logically be expected to know the language of the gods, and therefore to give the true name for this Trojan landmark. The adjective *mousotraphēs* is noteworthy in that it almost always refers to Homer, and never to another poet.<sup>104</sup> Eustathius uses it six times to refer either to Homer or to one of the poets in the Homeric epics; hardly a significant distinction, given the eternal temptation to take Homer's Muse-trained creations as reflections of himself. It occurs only in one other instance in the scholia, and again, a dual name is at stake, that of Briareus/Aegaeus at *Iliad* 1.403:

ὡς μουσοτραφῆς καὶ τὰς παρὰ θεοῖς ἐπίσταται λέξεις, ἢ τὰ τελειότερα θεοῖς ἀνατίθησιν (Σb(BCE<sup>4</sup>)T *ad* 1.403).

Since he was educated by the Muse, he also understands the gods' language. Alternatively, he ascribes to the gods those things that are more perfect.

---

<sup>104</sup> *Sermones* 5.70 is the only instance where the epithet is not directly applied to Homer; Eustathius is there speaking on general terms about poets rather than specifically referencing Homer, or anyone else.

This Homer is bilingual as a result of his upbringing, and the result is that he has access to information that mere mortals generally do not. Again the contrast is between the incomplete and the flawless, the mortal misreading and the divine emendation.

This preoccupation with true and false names inevitably recalls Plato's *Cratylus*. The *Batieia* issue is, in fact, referenced in this dialogue, along with another list of Homeric doublets that Socrates marshalls in his attempt to tease out the inherent truth—or not—of names in general. His list includes the mortal and divine words for a certain bird (*χαλκίς/κύμινδις*), and the double names of the river Xanthos/Scamander and the child Scamandrius/Astyanax (*Cratylus* 392a-b). This last receives the lion's share of the attention, since only here, where both names come from mortals and are easily parsed, can we determine some kind of criterion for assigning the two: again, the issues are authority and superior knowledge.<sup>105</sup> The Socratic assertion, unsurprisingly accepted by his interlocutors, is that the Trojan men are undoubtedly better sources (being *φρονιμωτέρους*, 392b) for the child's true name than the Trojan women (who are *ἀφρονεστέρας*). Likewise, in the passage we have been examining, the gods are more reliable sources than mortals. That the dialogue ends up calling into question just this sort of reasoning, as originally espoused by Cratylus—that names are an inherent reflection of the qualities of things, and that they must therefore be devised by qualified specialists—is ultimately not the point that makes it into the Homeric commentary. Rather, the discrepancy between our knowledge and the gods' defines the terms of the discussion. The etymologies given for the name *Batieia*, whether they involve brambles (*βάτοι*) or horses' steps (*πάτοι*), do reflect some portion of the place's nature: the local

---

<sup>105</sup> The etymologies for the two names are merely icing on the cake, extra proof that one name is more sensible and appropriate than the other.

plant life in the first case, the handiness of *sēmata* as turning-points for horse races in the second. All the emphasis on where the horses turn around does, in fact, suggest that this is what Hellanicus, and Herodian and Stephanus who quote him, have in mind: we may compare the race in the funeral games for Patroclus in *Iliad* 23. There, Antilochus is advised to make a sharp turn around the σῆμα of some long-dead, nameless man.<sup>106</sup> Here, we have the tomb of a woman keen on racing, a woman given a name by the grace of the Muses who communicate with the poet; around this tomb, then, horses continue to turn.

The mythical Bateia, ancestress of the Trojans, is another option for the name's derivation, but left relatively shadowy. The preference given to the divine name, taken from the Amazon Myrine, in the scholia is a reflection of the ancient commentators' adulation for the poet, who has a special link to the gods in his capacity as student of the Muses and mediator between them and the audience. This leaves them in the uncomfortable position of having to construct a story for Myrine based only on the indications given in Homer: thus her epithet leads to her identification, rather than the other way around. The Muses, and their mouthpiece, have given us only hints of what the vanished past contains. We may compare the way the aforementioned Xanthos/Scamander doublet is treated in the scholia: one name is mortal (Scamander) and the other divine (Xanthos), and again an aesthetic comparison is drawn between the two. Any way you look at it, the Scamander loses:

τῶν διωνύμων τὸ μὲν προγενέστερον ὄνομα εἰς θεοῦς ἀναφέρει ὁ ποιητής,  
τὸ δὲ μεταγενέστερον εἰς ἀνθρώπους (Σ D *ad Il.* 20.74).

---

<sup>106</sup> Cf. *Iliad* 23.331.

Of things with two names, the poet attributes the older name to the gods and the later one to mortals.<sup>107</sup>

The mortal name is a more recent development than the divine, a particularly striking assertion when Xanthos is obviously the Greek member of the couplet, and Scamander is not; we would expect a Greek to look at it the other way around, and ascribe the non-Greek name to the gods. The name Xanthos is explained further in the T scholia by its ability to render yellow whatever is washed in it—including Aphrodite, who turns out not to be a natural blonde.<sup>108</sup> Otherwise, the duality of the name is of little interest to any of the commentators; certainly not as much as the comparatively minor Batiēia, which has the capacity to spark a discussion about the gap between divine and mortal knowledge. The river's two names are merely a curiosity in their view.

Thus, given the whims of scholarship, and the uncertainty of what in the original text will prompt a slew of commentary on any given point, it may be useful to contrast an onomastic doublet that is entirely a creation of the scholia. Homer is remarkably non-specific in discussing the famed gates of Troy: the Scaean gates are referred to twelve times and the Dardanian gates three; gates are mentioned with no name at all eleven

---

<sup>107</sup> The T scholia judge this doublet in much the same way that they judge the Batiēia/Tomb of Myrine doublet:

παρὰ Μουσῶν τοῦτο οἶδεν. τινὲς δὲ τὰ εὐφραδέστερά φασιν αὐτὸν περιτιθέναι <τοῖς θεοῖς> (Σ T *ad Il.* 20.74).

He has this knowledge from the Muses. Some say he ascribes the more elegant things to the gods.

The vocabulary of aesthetic comparison—more elegant, less common—is the most striking feature of these analyses of the divine names.

<sup>108</sup> Ξάνθος δὲ καλεῖται, ἐπεὶ τὰ σώματα τῶν λουομένων ἢ τοὺς καρποὺς ξανθίζει. οἱ δὲ, ὅτι πρὸ τῆς κρίσεως Ἀφροδίτη λουσαμένη αὐτοῦ ξανθὴ γέγονεν (It is called the Xanthus, since it makes yellow the bodies of those who wash in it—or fruits. Some say that before the judgment [of Paris], Aphrodite washed in it and became blonde; Σ T *ad Il.* 20.73). Szemerényi (1987: 343ff) argues convincingly that Xanthus is a Hellenization of the river's local name, Seha, by way of the form \*S(e)hant-; the exchange of the consonants is amply motivated by the process of folk etymology.

times.<sup>109</sup> For all that, we have no way of telling whether the same gates are under discussion each time, or whether the city has multiple sets. (If Thebes rates seven gates, after all, how can Troy, with its celebrated walls, be far behind?) *Iliad* 2.809 = 8.58 (παῖσαι δ' ὀίγνυντο πύλαι) suggests that Troy had many gates; otherwise it would hardly be worth pointing out that they were all open. Yet there, as in the other instances where motion through the gate is made explicit at all, the gates appear to be in roughly the same place, letting out onto the plain where the fighting takes place and where the Trojans marshal the troops for their catalogue. Of course, movement goes in the opposite direction as well: at 21.531, Priam commands the gatekeepers to hold the doors open so the battered Trojans can escape from the plain to the safety of the city. A particular oak tree serves as a landmark on the plain in front of the Scaean gates at 6.237 and 9.354; in both cases, it demarcates the end of the Trojan safe zone.<sup>110</sup> Important deaths take place in front of the gates: at 22.35, Hector waits in front of the Scaean gates for Achilles to fight their fatal battle; at 22.194, he hopes that the Trojan archers will cover him in front of the Dardanian gates; at 22.360, he predicts the death of Achilles before the Scaean

---

<sup>109</sup> Scaean Gates: *Iliad* 3.145, 3.149, 3.263, 6.237, 6.307, 6.392-93, 9.354, 11.170, 16.712, 22.6, 22.35, 22.360. Dardanian Gates: 5.789, 22.194, 22.413. All other references to Troy's gates: 2.809, 4.34, 8.58, 17.405, 18.275, 21.531, 21.537, 22.99, 22.137, 22.507, 24.446.

<sup>110</sup> Compare 5.789, where Diomedes says that the Trojans never fought in front of the Dardanian gates while Achilles was involved; they instead stayed within the walls. Their current daring in venturing outside the city is, therefore, a recent development. On the oak tree as an extramural landmark, a T scholion complicates matters for us further:

δύο εἰσὶ φηγοί· ὅφ' ἦ μὲν ἱερὸν Διός (cf. H 60), ὅφ' ἦ δὲ Ἴλου τάφος (cf. Λ 166-7); Σ T *ad Il.* 5.789.

There are two oak trees: under one is the shrine of Zeus, under the other the tomb of Ilos. We need not assume, however, that there are two distinct gates simply because there are two trees. The tree mentioned at 7.60 is a convenient spot for Apollo and Athena to watch the battle, without reference to any gate at all as a landmark. The other tree mentioned at 11.170, in the vicinity of the tomb of Ilos mentioned at 166-7, is quite clearly near the Scaean gates. An oak tree near the south gate of Troy VI is still shown to visitors at the site; it features a convenient placard with citations from the *Iliad* regarding this tree translated into German. Perhaps nothing else at the site is as evocative of the long history of reconstructing Homer's Troy. It is a fine old tree, but not the palaeobotanical marvel that *the* tree would be at this point.

gates at the hands of Paris and Apollo. All this is to say that in the *Iliad*, the number of Trojan gates or their names are considerably less important than their twofold function: connecting city to battlefield and serving as a locus for important events.

This is where the scholia come in. Not content with this degree of ambiguity and imprecision in the Homeric text, they identify the Scaean gates with the Dardanian without bothering to give the reason why. Certainly there is no evidence in the text either for or against this identification, and nothing in the city of Ilion itself that would make it necessary. The Greek habit of referring to any gate in the plural evidently caused some confusion in antiquity, since Aristarchus had to issue a correction:

Σκαιάς τε πύλας: ὅτι πληθυντικῶς εἶπε τὴν πύλην μίαν οὖσαν. Σκαιαὶ δὲ καὶ Δαρδάνια αἱ αὐταί. ἡ δὲ δρυὶς πρὸ τῆς Ἰλίου ἦν (Σ A *ad Il.* 9.354).

Scaean gates: because he referred to the gate, which is single, in the plural. The Scaean and Dardanian gates are the same. The oak tree [mentioned as being on the site] was outside of Ilion.<sup>111</sup>

The intervention of Aristarchus is motivated not by a textual problem, but a semantic one. Reading between the lines, we can tell that someone argued that the Scaean and Dardanian gates were different and separate, and that is why Homer used the plural πύλαι. Aristarchus quite sensibly rejects this notion, on the grounds that Homer is perfectly capable of referring to a single gate in the plural—a usage that is normal in Greek at all periods. Other Aristarchean scholia reinforce his insistence that the gate is singular, even if the word is plural:

πᾶσαι δ' ὠϊγνυντο πύλαι: ὅτι ἔμφασιν ἔχει πολλῶν πυλῶν, μία δὲ ἐστὶ, καὶ ἔστι τὸ πᾶσαι ἀντὶ τοῦ ὅλαι (Σ A *ad Il.* 2.809 [Aristonicus]).

---

<sup>111</sup> This last sentence is rather confusing—it perhaps has to do with the problem of the number of trees, and by referring to *the* oak tree, it makes the assertion that there is only one worth bothering about.

All the gates were open: because he gives the impression that there are many gates, but there is one, and “all” is used instead of “entirely.”

The same editorial judgment appears almost *verbatim* at Σ A *ad Il.* 8.58a, where it is also Aristarchean. Where Homer refers to “all the gates” being open, therefore, Aristarchus argues that this is a reference to the one gate, for which the plural usage is standard, being open all the way.<sup>112</sup>

A clearer discussion of this doublet is found in a D scholion to *Iliad* 3.145, in which the non-combatant Trojans gather at the Scaean gates (here so named) for the *teichoskopia*:

Σκαιαὶ πύλαι: αἱ τῆς Ἰλίου. αὗται δὲ καὶ Δαρδάνειαι προσαγορεύονται, δι’ ὧν ἐξήεσαν εἰς τὸ πεδίον οἱ Τρῶες. Σκαιαὶ δὲ εἴρηγται, ἤτοι ἀπὸ Σκαιοῦ τοῦ κατασκευάσαντος, ἢ ὅτι ἐν τοῖς σκαιοῖς καὶ ἀριστεροῖς μέρεσι τῆς πόλεως κεῖνται. οἱ δὲ φασιν, ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ σκαιοῦ βουλευσασθαι τοὺς Τρῶας. τὸν γὰρ δούρειον ἵππον κατ’ αὐτὰς ἐδέξαντο τὰς πύλας (Σ D *ad Il.* 3.145).

Scaean gates: the gates of Ilion. The same gates are also called Dardanian, through which the Trojans went out into the plain. They were called Scaean either from Scaeus who built them or because they were located in the unlucky and sinister parts of the city. Others say that [they are called Scaean] because the Trojans made an unlucky decision, for they brought in the wooden horse through these gates.

The name “Dardanian” is easy enough to explain; if we can have a prominent local hill named after one of the wives of Dardanus, naming a major landmark in the city after the man himself is entirely appropriate.<sup>113</sup> It is the name “Scaean” that should give us pause.

The obvious meaning—that the gate is on the west side of the city, since the *mantis* facing north would have it on his left side—is completely ignored. Instead, the tradition

---

<sup>112</sup> Schironi (2004: 142), however, thinks this is ultimately a strange position for Aristarchus to take, given the size of the city, and compares a dissenting opinion from Σ T *ad Iliad* 22.194, which asserts that the Dardanian gates are on the east side of the city and the Scaean gates on the left.

<sup>113</sup> See also Chapter 2, section 3, on the Dardanian contingent or faction within Troy.

focuses on the figurative meaning of the adjective *skaios*, with a heavy dash of retrospect. The later tradition concerning the destruction of Troy is so overwhelming as to have influenced the name of these gates while the city was still standing. The Trojans notoriously resisted all prophetic efforts to reveal their city's oncoming doom: do we, or the ancient commentators, really expect them to have named their gates Sinister in a prescient nod to that doom? The οἱ δὲ referred to here are so vague as to be useless for pinning down the ultimate source of this notion. The alternative explanation advanced in the scholion, that the gates were so named because they were located in the seamy part of town, is hardly more credible and looks like a stopgap attempt to make up for the complete implausibility of the other explanation. We thus see the same etymological urge that characterized the discussion of the name Batieia reappearing here. One of these names, Scaean, requires some explanation, and etymologies are accordingly produced; this same name is easily treated as a piece of authorial foreshadowing and reflection, almost instead of something the Trojans actually called their gates.<sup>114</sup> Given the cruelty of Troy's destruction, this name turns out to have been the *Cratylus*-style true name all along: it reflects the place's real nature in a way that the bland moniker Dardanian ultimately fails to do. Calling the gates Unfortunate may make little logical sense during the period in which the *Iliad* is taking place, but there was a strain in ancient scholarship that recognized that the poem is haunted by the fates even of those, such as Achilles and the city of Ilion, whose destruction comes after the burial of horse-taming Hector.

---

<sup>114</sup> It is worth noting as well that only once does a voice other than the narrator's refer to the Scaean gates: at *Iliad* 6.307 where the Trojan women beg Athena to strike Diomedes down Σκαιοῶν προπάροιθε πυλάων and protect the women and children of the city. That Athena promptly denies this request (311) only highlights the gates' association with misfortune for the Trojans.

## 7. Conclusion: The Inevitability of Destruction

We are thus brought back to *aphanismos*, or disappearance, the term Lycurgus and Strabo both used to describe what happened to Troy between its destruction at the hands of the Achaeans and their own periods. This disappearance is the lens through which a number of disparate, and occasionally quite unexpected, citations from the *Iliad* are viewed by the ancient commentators. Elements as disparate as the previously mentioned springs and the bizarre, briefly flourishing Achaean wall can therefore be marshalled as proof that whatever is created in Homer is subject to destruction at any time--and at the back of all these destructions is the one that does not actually take place during the *Iliad*, that of Troy itself.<sup>115</sup>

Assuming that the city was entirely destroyed, that it vanished from the earth as Lycurgus asserts in the face of all the contemporary evidence, gives ancient commentators who are uncomfortable with the concept of Homer wantonly creating subjects for his poetry a framework within which to discuss comfortably the shape of Athena's cult statue and the competing names of the landmarks in and around Troy. Interpreting the scholia in this way allows us, in turn, to pin down more precisely the context of Demetrius and Strabo's assertions that modern Ilion and ancient Troy are not the same place. We need, therefore, to place this discussion within the greater trends of ancient Homeric scholarship. It is evident from what we have that some sort of controversy was occurring in Hellenistic scholarship and extending into its Roman-era successors regarding the accuracy of Homer's *plasmata*. At one extreme we have

---

<sup>115</sup> On the Achaean wall, see Porter 2011. His assertion that "fictionality was not openly allowed in the ancient critical traditions, and therefore the pleasures it afforded had to be stolen, displaced, and disputed as well" (33) is, perhaps an overstatement, but it establishes the terms of all these discussions about fictionality and destruction in the *Iliad*.

perhaps Strabo, who wanted to preserve poetry’s educational usefulness by arguing for some sort of truth, whether literal or allegorical, in its contents—albeit with a thin overlay of fanciful elaboration to make it more palatable:

ἄτε δὴ πρὸς τὸ παιδευτικὸν εἶδος τοὺς μύθους ἀναφέρων ὁ ποιητῆς ἐφρόντισε πολὺ μέρος τάληθοῦς, ἐν δ’ ἐτίθει καὶ ψεῦδος, τὸ μὲν ἀποδεχόμενος, τῷ δὲ δημαγωγῶν καὶ στρατηγῶν τὰ πλήθη. “ὡς δ’ ὅτε τις χρυσὸν περιχεύεται ἀργύρῳ ἀνήρ,” οὕτως ἐκεῖνος ταῖς ἀληθέσι περιπετείαις προσεπετίθει μῦθον, ἡδύνων καὶ κοσμῶν τὴν φράσιν, πρὸς δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ τέλος τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ καὶ τοῦ τὰ ὄντα λέγοντος βλέπων.

Now, in that Homer placed his stories in the context of education, he put a great value on the truth. He placed falsehood in them as well—accepting the former, but using the latter to please and guide the masses. “As when a man pours gold over silver [*Odyssey* 6.32 = 23.159],” he also added an element of legend to true occurrences, sweetening and adorning his wording, but looking toward the same goal as the historian and someone who speaks about what actually exists (1.2.9).

In this segment at least, Strabo hardly looks extreme. He acknowledges that elaborations in the poems do not necessarily need to be strictly factual in order to be valuable; they need only be the jam surrounding the educational pill. Nonetheless, he insists on the veracity of Homer’s stories in their general outlines, even with these elaborations designed to draw audiences, irresistibly, toward the truth contained in the poem. Compared to this, we may well see the other extreme in Eratosthenes, who pointed out that looking for the fabulous locations in the *Odyssey* makes about as much sense as looking for the cobbler who sewed Aeolus’s bag of winds.<sup>116</sup> We have this citation preserved third-hand: Strabo (1.2.15) reports that Polybius (34.2.11) did *not* approve of such remarks from Eratosthenes, and the context makes it evident that Strabo joins in his

---

<sup>116</sup> φησὶ τότε ἂν εὐρεῖν τινα ποῦ Ὀδυσσεὺς πεπλάνηται, ὅταν εὕρη τὸν σκυτέα τὸν συρράψαντα τὸν τῶν ἀνέμων ἄσκόν.

predecessor's disapproval.<sup>117</sup> We have to reconstruct a great deal, patiently, of what Eratosthenes said about the *Iliad*. Strabo, at least, uses his opinions on the *Odyssey* to draw some generalizations on the purpose of both geography and poetry: for Strabo, the aim of both is instruction about the shape of the world, literal and figurative.<sup>118</sup> This theory of his, in all likelihood, goes back to Crates of Mallus, a contemporary of Aristarchus and a philosopher-critic who favored allegorizing readings of Homer as a way of preserving his educational value.<sup>119</sup> Thus the dictum of Eratosthenes that a poet's goal is entertainment, not education (ποιητῆς πᾶς στόχαζεται ψυχαγωγίας, οὐ διδασκαλίας) is anathema to Strabo, who quotes it (1.1.10). He is too sophisticated a scholar to be moved merely by a horror of *psychagōgia*, with its tempting and ethically dubious allure. As Kim has recently observed, Strabo has been given short shrift in the discourse here: far from being the "Stoic convert" that previous scholarship has seen in him, or any other variety of pedantic moralizer, Strabo has real concerns over Homer's practical benefit if we divorce the poet's observations about the world from reality.<sup>120</sup> In this he is necessarily embroiling himself in a very old argument indeed: Can we really use poetry, even such spectacular poetry as Homer's, for education in practical affairs? For Strabo, the answer is yes, and the process is part of the *Iliad's* entertainment value. The Eratosthenes against whom he is arguing turns out to be asserting that poetry has no interest in anything but fiction, like a garrulous old woman who says whatever comes

---

<sup>117</sup> Eustathius (1.365.10) more charitably makes some allowances: παίζων πρὸς τε τὸν μῦθον καὶ τὸ ἀπίθανον τῆς Ὀδυσσέως πλάνης (he was joking about the story and the implausible element in Odysseus's wanderings). Certainly proposing a humorous absurdity, and waiting for the audience to recognize it and use that recognition to develop a more nuanced position on the matter in question, is a venerable educational technique.

<sup>118</sup> Biraschi (2005: 85) places this in the context of Greek *paideia* generally and argues that Strabo is reasserting Homer's cultural primacy for a Roman audience in a Hellenistic world--hence the real urgency of his position.

<sup>119</sup> Broggiato 2006: li-liv.

<sup>120</sup> 2007: 377. See also Kim (2010) for a further development of his position.

into her head (*Geography* 1.2.3). Strabo's defense of Homer's utility must therefore be read against this quixotic strain in Eratosthenes; perhaps the latter became so vehement, and so colorful, in his insistence on Homer's unconcern with accuracy because the prevailing weight not only of scholarly but also of popular opinion was so overwhelming. These are the terms of the debate, which he has inherited from Aristotle *via* the Alexandrians; by emphasizing enjoyment as the primary aim of poetry, he must out of necessity de-emphasize its focus on instruction—especially since geography itself suffers when Homer is used as an instructional text.<sup>121</sup> Kim's discussions, cited above, of these two authors' interplay has rehabilitated Strabo somewhat from the criticisms that Pfeiffer, for instance, has leveled at him, but he stops short of observing that Strabo and Eratosthenes both exaggerate to some degree—the latter to a greater extent, because he is taking a necessarily hyperbolic stance against the view that everything in Homer must be factual. What Eratosthenes creates is an artificial continuum, with him at one extreme and the hypothetical literalists at another. We must simply remember that it is, to a large extent, artificial.

The other authors who have participated in the debate on the fictionality of Homer's places demonstrate that this process had a long and vigorous life. Dio Chrysostom serves as a late and vexed representative; his eleventh *Oration*, ostensibly addressed to the people of Roman Ilium, makes an unprecedentedly brash argument.<sup>122</sup> The city was never captured in the first place, he asserts, on the grounds that the outlines and the details of the story, both within and without the *Iliad*, are patently ridiculous:

---

<sup>121</sup> See also Strabo's devastating description of Eratosthenes as a philosopher *manqué* at 1.2.2; his literary commentary is an entertaining, if ultimately forgettable, *parabasis* interrupting otherwise useful scholarship.

<sup>122</sup> The title given to the oration, ΥΠΕΡ ΤΟΥ ΙΛΙΟΝ ΜΗ ΑΛΩΝΑΙ, "On the Fact that Ilium Was Not Captured," sets the tone immediately—or reflects it, if it turns out to have been assigned by a later editor.

πῶς γὰρ ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ [οὕτῳ] πόλις ἀλοῦσα καὶ ἐρημωθεῖσα τοσαύτην ἐπίδοσιν ἔσχεν ὡς μεγίστην γενέσθαι τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν; πῶς δὲ ὁ μὲν Ἡρακλῆς σὺν ἕξ ναυσὶν εἶλεν ἐκ πολλοῦ ἀπόρθητον οὖσαν, οἱ δὲ Ἀχαιοὶ μετὰ νεῶν χιλίων καὶ διακοσίων ἐλθόντες οὐκ ἐδύναντο ἐλεῖν;

How, in [such] a short time, did a city that was taken and left deserted make such progress as to become the greatest of cities in Asia? How did Hercules take it with six ships when it had existed for a long time without ever being sacked, but the Achaeans, coming with twelve hundred ships, could not take it? (11.57.1)

It is difficult to know how seriously to take him. The oration is a sophistic showpiece, and as such it may very well be read as one specious rhetorical flourish after another: every effort to prove that the entire Trojan War unfolded very differently from Homer's version relies on arguments from *eikos* that—it must be admitted—make a disturbing amount of sense.<sup>123</sup> The fiction of the Egyptian priest who told him the entire story is a weird and delightful take on Herodotean inquiry with a dash of Stesichorus (who, Dio Chrysostom asserts, had the truth of the matter—and what better proof do we need than the cure for his blindness?) thrown in for good measure. It is clear that Dio Chrysostom is constructing, with evident relish, a set of fictions designed to call the nature of any of our knowledge into question; he is thus a true second-century sophist. What is particularly significant about this text is its insistence that Homer is playing upon the anxieties of the Greeks. He shows an awareness as keen as that of Plato for the manipulative possibilities of poetry, and instead of trying to rehabilitate it as positive and useful *psychagogia*, he dismisses it as so much quackery. Clearly this is the criticism of a

---

<sup>123</sup> Particularly interesting is his assertion (11.47) that steady commerce and communication already existed at the period of the Trojan War between Asia and Greece, an assertion that the Late Bronze Age evidence appears to bear out. Dio Chrysostom's version of the war's origins—from a story purportedly told to him by an Egyptian priest—features a Paris who wins over not Helen, but Tyndareus, with the boundless wealth and power of Asia and thus becomes a legitimate suitor to be preferred to any of the Greeks; this story, in the Herodotean vein, becomes both pragmatic and plausible.

different age, but it nonetheless reveals tensions that existed long before Dio Chrysostom wrote.

For Strabo, the disappearance of Troy, as encapsulated by the disappearance of landmarks ranging from Athena's old cult statue to the hot and cold springs outside the wall, is a way of explaining any such discrepancies that exist between the city described in the Homeric poems and the contemporary city of Ilion. This explanation works because it does not require us, at any point, to assume that Homer is mistaken or creating fictions. If Ilion fails to correspond, in size and greatness, to the city Priam ruled, Ilion is a fraud; again, recall Demetrius' remark about the city's untiled roofs.<sup>124</sup> Dio Chrysostom, on the other hand, emphasizes in the passage above Troy's subsequent return to opulence and fame after Hercules sacked the city, and furthermore tries to cast this return as an *adunaton*. The Troy the Achaeans supposedly sacked, in his reading, could never have been the great city that the Homeric tradition tries to make it, since Hercules would have left it shattered and a generation later it could hardly have bounced back. Thus the story is suspect from the beginning, and the modern city—in all its tourism-fueled posturing and purported shabbiness—is unexpectedly a very fitting heir to the Troy that must have existed if we accept the Herculean sack as mythologically valid. The speech becomes not so much a concerted attack on the heroic tradition as a virtuoso piece of shadowboxing against first one aspect of the city's history and then another; all aspects seem absurd, and by extension, so is the *Iliad* itself.

Ultimately, this is the process that characterizes all of Troy's post-Homeric history: the early Greeks squabbling over access to the site, the self-styled descendants of Trojans who dotted the Troad with Greek *poleis*, and the legions of scholars, named and

---

<sup>124</sup> fr. 21 Gaede.

unnamed, who among them managed to turn quite unremarkable and obscure lines of Homer into battlegrounds where the very notion of Homer's *Nachleben* was at stake. They have all selected the elements of the Trojan legends that they require to form their own concept of the site. The locals choose to emphasize Ilion's continuity in order to cement their place in the Troad and market it to Greeks elsewhere through the stories of Xerxes and Alexander, and the *periploi* such as that of pseudo-Scylax. In effect, they are constructing their own fictions about the place, and this very construction is a source of unease for scholars who place a high value on Homer's geographical and historical reliability. This reliability can best be preserved by viewing the entire *Iliad* through the lens of Troy's destruction and disappearance. Cataclysms can disrupt the hot springs and invaders can level temples; the physical remnants of the Homeric city are thus completely mutable and therefore irrelevant to contemporary reality. While the historical and archaeological evidence demonstrates that the site of Troy was by no means the wasteland that Lycurgus implied it was in his period, it still fails to measure up to its legendary past. The Homeric city thus becomes inaccessible through its remoteness and its sheer, overwhelming cultural importance; such a city could not exist anywhere but in the lines of the *Iliad*. Finding Troy is only complicated because it is, by definition, lost.

### Chapter III. Finding the Trojans

Troy's inevitable doom involves more than just a hero, as compelling as Hector is in the *Iliad*; more than just a family, as touching as the portraits of Andromache and Hecuba supplicating Athena in vain may seem; and more than just a city, as large and bustling as Manfred Korfmann's excavations would have it. The *Iliad* intentionally stretches its epic scope as far as it possibly can, involving the whole of Asia as well as the entire Greek world; or at least this is how its ancient Greek audience especially wanted to see it. Nowhere is this sense of vastness more evident than in the poem's catalogues, which pile noun upon noun, epithet upon epithet, clause upon clause, to create an overwhelming sensation—particularly for an audience in an oral culture, hearing the sonorous lists sequentially instead of going through and cross-referencing them. Nevertheless, the cross-referencing has been constant and vigorous since Homeric scholarship began. Cultural history and identity politics are staples of modern classical scholarship, but their antecedents go back through Alexandrian scholarship into the classical period, and the catalogues have proven particularly fertile ground for antiquarian researches since antiquity itself.

Modern scholarship has tended to give the Trojan catalogue short shrift, treating it as a sort of cheap knock-off of the Catalogue of Ships—or, more charitably, as a fascinating sidelight onto the details of oral-formulaic theory and the repetition of

traditional elements.<sup>125</sup> It is not nearly as long as the Catalogue of Ships, for one thing, and the individual entries are shorter and less informative. The longest entry in the Trojan Catalogue is devoted to the relatively insignificant Carians, who rate nine lines (*Il.* 2.867-875), most of which is devoted to their leader's shiny accoutrements rather than their own (relatively insignificant) contribution to the war. Five of the sixteen entries in the Trojan Catalogue are a bare two lines long. On the other hand, the two-line entry for Telamonian Ajax in the Catalogue of Ships (*Iliad* 2.557-558) is widely suspected, partly on the grounds of its unusual brevity; yet it would not be so unusual in the other catalogue.<sup>126</sup> Moreover, the beginning and the end of the Trojan Catalogue are not highly marked. The Catalogue of Ships begins with an extravagant invocation to the Muses, emphasizing the incomprehensible vastness of the army it is about to describe, and strictly limiting the portions of that army it plans to talk about (*Iliad* 2.484-493); it ends with a survey of the finest men and horses on the Greek side, a sort of critical overview of the resources it has just named (*Iliad* 2.761-773). The Trojan Catalogue begins, in parallel fashion, with a divine dream prompting the leader to marshal his troops (*Iliad* 2.786ff); there is no indication that anyone needs the Muse to name the polyglot allies who gather on the mound of Batiëia—a Trojan landmark discussed in the previous chapter. Rather, the poet launches right in, beginning with the central and most important contingent: that belonging to Hector, whose vision has started this whole exercise (*Iliad* 2.816-818). The catalogue ends with the entry on Glaucus and Sarpedon, leaders of the Lycians, who despite their eventual importance in the poem rate only a two-line entry (*Iliad* 2.876-

---

<sup>125</sup> See, for instance, Kirk 1985: 248-250. Latacz, in his new edition of the Ameis-Henze commentary on Book 2, considers the two catalogues "typologically comparable," despite the Trojan Catalogue's relative light weight, both in terms of the number of contingents it covers and in terms of the amount of biography each contingent's leader gets. Nonetheless, he argues, the elements are similar (2003:263).

<sup>126</sup> See Chapter 4, section 1 below for more on the problem of the Salaminian entry's authenticity.

877). Rather, this is where the end of the second book was placed. The poem actually makes a much more organic transition between the Trojan Catalogue and the Trojan perceptions of the war that dominate Book 3 than the creators of book divisions gave it credit for: the two armies are leaving the places where they have been marshalled, in ways significant for how they are to be subsequently compared to each other. The Trojans depart with a κλαγγή like a flock of birds—not just any flock of birds, but the cranes that fight the Pygmies, that exotic *tour de force* of the Greek orientalizing imagination (*Iliad* 3.3-7). The Achaeans, meanwhile, nurse their silent rage (σιγῆ μίνεα πνεύοντες, 3.9), every man for a moment an Achilles. The transition is used to bring both armies once again into focus, after the narrative intervention of Iris that took us from the Catalogue of Ships to the Trojan Catalogue. It is, nonetheless, a much less marked ending than the first catalogue received.

Rather than merely writing the Trojan Catalogue off as a pale replica of the Catalogue of Ships, ancient scholarship proposes to use it for a different and richer purpose: as a goldmine of useful information on Asia Minor in the heroic period. Thus we get the *Diakosmos* of Demetrius of Scepsis, for instance.<sup>127</sup> As previously mentioned, it purported to be an exhaustive treatise on the Trojan catalogue, but the surviving fragments suggest that it was more than that: the Trojan catalogue is used in Demetrius as a jumping-off point not only for analysis of the Homeric text, but also for extended discussions of the geography and history of western Asia Minor generally. The actual Trojan catalogue, and the groups it contains, are less well represented in the fragments we

---

<sup>127</sup> Currently, the standard (and only) edition of Demetrius is Gaede (1880)--a situation that is shortly to be remedied, with the forthcoming edition of Alexandra Trachsel, who also includes the most complete recent discussion of this little-known author in her 2008 monograph.

have than this sort of excursus; thus we largely have to turn to other sources to consider how the catalogue itself was read in ancient scholarship.

At this point we are moving away from geography in the modern sense, the catalogues of places and landmarks that are etymologically at the root of this study, and toward ethnography—a word not attested before Eustathius, who calls Stephanus of Byzantium an ἐθνόγραφος four times in his commentary on Homer.<sup>128</sup> The category, in fact, does not exist in antiquity as distinct from geography; the earliest *logographoi* pioneering prose descriptions of people and places do not distinguish people from places as objects of interest and study. The Homeric catalogues, of course, exist partly as a way of connecting peoples and the places they inhabit; aside from one notable exception, which will be dealt with later, in the Trojan catalogue, the whole array of Trojan allies is localized around Asia Minor with a specificity that rivals the larger and more detailed Greek catalogue. Despite their sometimes quite far-flung locations, all of these allies can be conceptualized as Trojan or not in antiquity as the reader wishes. A D scholion to *Iliad* 2.815 makes this conceptual fluidity explicit: Τρῶες; νῦν πάντες οἱ ἐν τῇ χώρῃ. If the Trojans are “now” to be considered all those who are in the region, then at other times the Τρῶες can be differently defined; they can be the inhabitants of the city, the contingent led by Hector, the contingent led by Pandarus, or some combination of the above.<sup>129</sup> Loosely, however, the Trojans are everyone who fights under the command of Hector against the Achaeans—except in those instances (mostly in the catalogues of

---

<sup>128</sup> Eustathius 1.449.10; 1.486.25; 1.580.10; and 3.313.6 (van der Valk).

<sup>129</sup> Hector’s contingent is referred to as Τρῶσι at 2.816. In the previous line, however, the Τρῶες are distinguished from the ἐπικούροι as they all assemble on the mound of Batieia. In his catalogue entry, Pandarus is named the leader of the wealthy Τρῶες who live in Zeleia along the river Aesepus—one way of distinguishing them from Hector’s Τρῶες (2.824-826). For further discussion of Pandarus’s Trojans, see section 4 below.

books 2 and 12) where a greater degree of precision is desired, or where Trojans proper need to be played off their allies, whose goals do not necessarily overlap with their own. This interplay of inclusion and exclusion, these Venn diagrams of who belongs where at what time, define the ancient commentators' approach to defining the peoples and places that appear in the Trojan catalogue. Attempts to narrow down the boundaries of Troy proper, as opposed to neighboring polities, are periodically made in antiquity; one such attempt comes from Demetrius of Scepsis, according to Strabo:

ὑπονοεῖ δ' ὁ Δημήτριος μέχρι δεῦρο διατείνειν τὴν περὶ τὸ Ἴλιον χώραν τὴν ὑπὸ τῷ Ἑκτορι, ἀνήκουσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ ναυστάθμου μέχρι Κεβρηνίας· τάφον τε γὰρ Ἀλεξάνδρου δείκνυσθαί φησιν αὐτόθι καὶ Οἰνώνης, ἣν ἱστοροῦσι γυναῖκα γεγονέναι τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου πρὶν Ἑλένην ἀρπάσαι (Demetrius fr. 22 Gaede = Strabo 13.1.33)

Demetrius suspects that the territory surrounding Troy and subject to Hector stretched inland from the naval base up to Cebrenia. He says that the tomb of Alexander and Oenone is pointed out there; the story goes that she was the wife of Alexander before he made off with Helen.

This is another spot on the Trojan War tourist itinerary, and the story of Alexander the Great turning up his nose at his namesake's lyre indicates that the first Alexander could be a draw for visitors as well as the more typically heroic of the heroes.<sup>130</sup> This passage offers a way of demarcating Trojan territory from allied territory; Demetrius has traced the extent of the land which Hector specifically ruled, as opposed to his neighbors or subject states. Strabo goes on to envision Cebrenia—with a defunct capital city, Cebrene—running parallel to Dardania, the status of which as distinct from Troy proper will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.<sup>131</sup> These are quasi-Trojan locations, distinct in various ways from the city itself but at the same time overlapping with it

---

<sup>130</sup> Plutarch: *Life of Alexander* 15.7-9. See also the discussion in the previous chapter.

<sup>131</sup> The names Cebrenia/Cebrene are perhaps constructed on the analogy of Messenia/Messene—itsself a problem in ancient Homeric scholarship; see Chapter 4, section 3.

uncomfortably; thus Strabo derives this name, Cebrenia, from the name of Priam's illegitimate son Cebriones.<sup>132</sup> This derivation is a problematic one for several reasons. It limits the scope of this region temporally to the generation around the Trojan War; Cebriones belongs to the same generation as Hector, and naming a territory after him is something that seems more plausible as a posthumous gesture (he is killed by Patroclus at 16.738) than as a useful toponym in the world that Homer describes. Demetrius's careful mapping of Cebrenia, therefore, is therefore not ultimately an attempt to explain how political divisions between Trojans proper and Trojans expanded worked in the *Iliad*. Rather, it superimposes a later geographical distinction onto the *Iliad* by invoking this minor character. Cebrenia, and by extension, any subdivision of Trojan territory, is defined utterly by what prior generations think of it, and these opinions may or may not be read back onto the *Iliad*, depending on whether the scholar involved wants to see unity or fragmentation among the Trojans.

This sense of simultaneous fragmentation and overlap is unique to the way the Trojans are treated in ancient scholarship. Nobody thinks of conflating the Ithacans and the Mycenaeans, for instance, even though the Ithacans are clearly fighting in support of the Mycenaean king's political and personal objectives; they are universally treated, by commentators both ancient and modern, as distinct entities. If Homer wants a catch-all term for the Greek side generally, "Achaeans" will have to do—yet Achaea is not contiguous with Agamemnon's territory.<sup>133</sup> Alternatively, they can be "Argives," and yet

---

<sup>132</sup> Κεβριόνην νόθον υἱὸν ἀγακλήος Πριάμοιο (*Iliad* 16.738).

<sup>133</sup> The land of Achaea is referred to several times in the *Iliad* (1.254, 3.75, 3.258, 7.124, and 11.770) as a locus of nostalgic desire, but is poorly defined. In the *Odyssey*, meanwhile, Telemachus says there is no woman like Penelope "in the land of Achaea—in holy Pylos, Argos, or Mycenae, [in Ithaca or on the mainland]" (*Od.* 21.107-109). He thus implies that all of these places are part of Achaea, thus making explicit something that was only implicit in the *Iliad*. The fact that line 109 is considered suspect reveals

Argos in the *Iliad* is ruled by Diomedes, who is just one of the many chieftains answering to Agamemnon. The situation of Troy is different in the *Iliad*, and the ancient commentators pick up on this difference in order to develop an entire framework for dealing with the Trojans as a people: they are simultaneously unified around the city of Troy, and discrete units with their own locations and agendas. The *Iliad* itself acknowledges both the concord and the discord between the allies and the Trojans, as for example in the case of Sarpedon after his death:

ὥς ἔφατο, Τρῶας δὲ κατὰ κρηῖθεν λάβε πένθος  
 ἄσχετον, οὐκ ἐπιεικτόν, ἐπεὶ σφισιν ἔρμα πόληος  
 ἔσκε καὶ ἀλλοδαπός περ ἑών: πολέες γὰρ ἄμ' αὐτῷ  
 λαοὶ ἔποντ', ἐν δ' αὐτὸς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι (*Il.* 16.548-51).

So [Glaucus] spoke, and grief overcame the Trojans,  
 unstoppable and unrelenting grief, for he had been the city's prop  
 even though he was a foreigner—for many fighters  
 had followed him, and he himself excelled at fighting.

Sarpedon, as co-leader of the Lycian contingent, has been mentioned earlier in this introduction as rating a mere two-line entry in the Trojan catalogue (*Iliad* 2.876-877). He is better appreciated here, at the center of Trojan power, even though he himself is clearly marked as other than Trojan. Indeed, an A scholion reads his death at the hands of Patroclus as unexpectedly significant for the entire city: τὸ σήκωμα τῆς νεῶς πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀνατρέπεσθαι ἐν τῷ ἴπεσεῖν† νῦν οὖν τούτου ἀποθανόντος ἀνετράπη ἢ Ἴλιος ([ἔρμα means] the ballast a ship that keeps it from being overturned if it falls; now, with his death, Ilios is overturned: Σ A ad 549a). This is the kind of encomium we expect of Hector, Troy's best and only defense; in death Sarpedon can be included in this category,

---

how dubious even calling Ithaca part of Achaea for purposes of celebrating Penelope's uniqueness—a political act of a sort in the context of the *Odyssey*—really is.

whereas in life he was a foreigner, ἀλλοδαπός, who by a special grace of the gods is carried to his faraway homeland to be buried.<sup>134</sup>

Thus the lack of cohesion mentioned earlier becomes central to the way the Trojan side is viewed in antiquity. Given that the entire narrative arc of the *Iliad* is focused on a specific and disastrous example of the Greeks' lack of cohesion, it is worth examining in further detail the way the Trojans are splintered in ancient readings of the poem: certain groups in particular become the focus of scholarly attention, and so they will be examined in depth here to get an idea of how "Trojan studies" work: that is, how the notions of foreignness within the Trojan side are constructed and deployed in order to illuminate the concept of foreignness as applied to the Trojan side generally by the Greeks, both within the *Iliad* and without.

If Troy itself is an elusive and nebulous place, its inhabitants and allies at least match. The cultural identity of the Trojans is an issue that the *Iliad* itself leaves ambiguous, and this chapter will survey the ways in which later scholarship found them difficult to pin down. They worship gods familiar to the Greeks, without the sort of self-conscious inclusiveness that characterizes foreign gods in, for instance, Herodotus: the Trojan Apollo and Athena *are* Apollo and Athena, not Trojan gods that are identified as equivalent to these Greek ones, as Ptah is Egyptian for Hephaestus. Language is an issue so minor as to be generally ignored—though a few notable exceptions will be explored in due course. Both sides positively bristle with heralds, but the issue of interpreting what one side says to the other is practically ignored. Family ties are equally problematic: as Aeneas points out to Achilles at *Iliad* 20.215ff, he and Hector are both descended from

---

<sup>134</sup> Sarpedon comes τηλόθεν ἐξ Λυκίης in the catalogue entry, *Il.* 2.877; Apollo is instructed to carry Sarpedon's body far away from the fighting at *Il.* 16.669.

Zeus through their ancestor Dardanus.<sup>135</sup> Aeneas avoids pointing out the obvious conclusion: that this lineage makes them cousin to the majority of the Greek heroes before Troy.<sup>136</sup> Religion, language, blood—what else is there to distinguish the two groups? Modern scholars have occasionally tried; most recently Hilary Mackie has made a large-scale argument for pervasive differences between Trojan speech and Greek in the *Iliad*.<sup>137</sup> Her claim that Homer consistently represents Trojan speech as passive-aggressive, riddled with tacit internal conflict, and disrespectful to authority, reveals potentially a great deal more about the history of the Trojans and their compatriots in Greek literature than about Homer’s depiction of the people of Ilion and their allies. If Homer is always philhellene (as ΣβΤ *ad Iliad* 10.14 claims: ἀεὶ γὰρ φιλέλλην ὁ ποιητής), it is because his ancient readers are too, almost inevitably. They are driven to stamp the foreign enemy of the text with the images of Easterners as they see them, for good or ill, but mostly for ill. The degree to which modern readers have found the Trojans in the *Iliad* sympathetic would have been anathema to their ancient counterparts.

However Homer appears to have intended audiences to view the Trojans and their allies in the *Iliad*, the focus of this discussion will be instead the ways in which later Greek scholarship interpreted the cultural and geographical milieu of the Trojan side. It has frequently been observed that the Trojans grow noticeably more “foreign” and particularly “barbarian” in Greek literary sources—particularly Attic tragedy—as a result

---

<sup>135</sup> Jonathan Hall, however, identifies descent specifically from Hellen as the factor Greeks point to in their lineage that distinguishes them from the foreigners to whom they may share mythical blood-ties (1997: 45). Descent from Zeus may not be anything terribly special in legendary contexts.

<sup>136</sup> Poseidon will shortly afterwards point out that Dardanus has an advantage over any of the Greek heroes: he was the son ὃν Κρονίδης περι πάντων φίλατο παιδῶν,/ οἱ ἔθεν ἐξεγένοντο γυναικῶν τε θνητάων (whom the son of Cronus loved best of all the children born of him and mortal women, 20.304-5)—but then Poseidon is notably pro-Trojan anyway, and this judgment may say more about his biases than Zeus’s.

<sup>137</sup> Mackie 1996.

of the Persian Wars.<sup>138</sup> This emphasis on the classical period provides the background for the developments of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, which have been, in comparison, under-studied. It is one thing for the Athenians to push their idea of the Trojan War as a Greek victory against the opulent barbarians of the East; it is another for those familiar characters, Zenodotus and Aristarchus, Demetrius of Scepsis and Strabo to be interrogating the Trojan catalogue in *Iliad 2* for a sort of cultural anthropology of Asia Minor in the heroic period. The results read like the problems Troy experienced on a grand scale. The Trojans' allies, like them, are hybrids in Homer; neither recognizably barbarian, for the most part, nor organized and led in precisely the same way as the Greeks. They provide a larger swath of terrain on which the dramas of cultural identity can be played out; in some cases their modern descendants were enemies of Greeks, which allows for a different set of attitudes on the part of Greek scholarship, and in some cases, they were as Hellenic as the colonists at Ilion. In either case, the Trojan catalogue inevitably raises questions, for its ancient audiences, of who the enemy really is. It holds the divisions among the Trojan side up to intense scrutiny, the end of which is to call seriously into question the cohesion of the Greeks' opponents and provide some explanation for Troy's doom: it partly lies in its allies' inability to forge a sense of unity, at least in the unabashedly pro-Greek reading that the scholia tend to offer. The geography of the Trojan allies thus turns out, in this set of sources, to be a conceptual one. The physical places that the inhabitants of the Trojan catalogue occupy are ultimately less important than the mindset they bring to the war, the uncomfortable relationships they sometimes display with the Trojan elite, and the opportunities they

---

<sup>138</sup> See E. Hall 1989.

offer readers to explore what “otherness” really means in the context of an *Iliad* where, at the outset, everyone looks more or less the same.

## 1. The Carian *barbarophōnoi*

We turn first to the Carians, whose section near the end of the Trojan catalogue introduces some of the issues at play here:

Νάστης αὖ Καρῶν ἠγήσατο βαρβαροφώνων,  
οἱ Μίλητον ἔχον Φθιρῶν τ' ὄρος ἀκριτόφυλλον  
Μαιάνδρου τε ροὰς Μυκάλης τ' αἰπεινὰ κάρηνα·  
τῶν μὲν ἄρ' Ἀμφίμαχος καὶ Νάστης ἠγησάσθην,  
Νάστης Ἀμφίμαχός τε Νομίονος ἀγλαὰ τέκνα,  
ὃς καὶ χρυσὸν ἔχων πόλεμον δ' ἱεν ἠύτε κούρη  
νήπιος, οὐδέ τί οἱ τό γ' ἐπήρκεσε λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον,  
ἀλλ' ἐδάμη ὑπὸ χερσὶ ποδώκεος Αἰακίδαο  
ἐν ποταμῷ, χρυσὸν δ' Ἀχιλεὺς ἐκόμισσε δαΐφρων (*Iliad* 2.867-875)

Nastes led the Carians, who speak strangely,  
who held Miletus and the leaf-tipped mountain of Phthires,  
the streams of Maeander and the high peaks of Mycale.  
Amphimachus and Nastes led them,  
Nastes and Amphimachus, the glorious children of Nomion.  
He even brought his gold and went to war like a girl—  
the fool! And that did not even prevent his bitter destruction,  
but he was conquered at the hands of the swift-footed descendant of  
Aeacus  
in the river, and fiery-minded Achilles took away his gold.

Nastes the Carian—or his brother, Amphimachus—makes a disproportionately flamboyant entry into the Trojan catalogue, draped in gold like a young bride and reeking of his future doom at the hands of a berserk Achilles.<sup>139</sup> Unlike many the Trojans with

---

<sup>139</sup> The identity of the hero here is at issue. Aristarchus (*A ad* 872) raised the question of whether the entire passage is supposed to refer to Nastes or whether the ὃς clause at 872 actually has as its antecedent the latter brother, Amphimachus. The latter would make sense grammatically, and Kirk (1985: 261) follows Aristarchus here in preferring Amphimachus to Nastes. This is a bit of a bait and switch, however, given the focus on Nastes in the earlier part of the passage, and Simonides (fr. 60 Page) in his lost Nastes poem assigns both the gold and the folly to him.

whom he has formed an alliance, Nastes is culturally exotic to the Greeks, at least in linguistic terms: his Carians are βαρβαρόφωνοι—whatever that means; the significance of the epithet will be discussed further. Both brothers’ names are nevertheless Greek. That of Amphimachus is straightforward enough, a standard martial-aristocratic type of compound; that of Nastes, is more difficult to parse. Hesychius (N 106) glosses the word as οἰκιστής and notes that it can also be a proper name—clearly thinking about this instance. With this meaning in mind, the name Nastes becomes a cruel irony: he will not have the chance to settle anywhere, thanks to Achilles. Strabo, meanwhile, in trying to dissect this entry’s significance for the linguistic map of Trojan territories, confusingly gives the name as Masthles (14.2.28). This may simply have been a corruption of Mesthles, who is named as co-leader of the Meiones in the previous entry (2.864), but other sources suggest that this is another *redende Name*, and a far more obvious one: derived from μάσσω and signalling his frivolous instability to the world.<sup>140</sup> The decision to go to war decked in gold—whether we are dealing with gold armor, as in the Glaucus and Diomedes episode at *Iliad* 6.119ff, or with some kind of jewelry, is unclear—is roundly condemned by the poet.<sup>141</sup> Nastes/Amphimachus is a νήπιος whose sense of priorities has nothing in common with that of the warriors who surround him and,

---

<sup>140</sup> See Herodian 548.26 and Phrynichus 89.2—the latter is explaining the word as a term of abuse in Aristophanes: ὁ μαλθακὸς καὶ μεμαλαγμένος τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ <μὴ> ἀνδρεῖος (a soft man, with a softened soul, and not brave). It is easy to see how Nastes would have been corrupted to Masthles, but less easy to see how it would have gone the other way; and since our manuscripts overwhelmingly report Nastes as his name anyway, there is little difficulty in determining which reading is correct. Nonetheless, it is significant that the Masthles variant should have spread in antiquity, partly thanks to Aristophanes’ use of the word at *Nub.* 449 and *Equit.* 269; an audience raised on Homer’s moral value would have appreciated the choice to name this character “Girly Man.” This also suggests that Strabo, and whoever circulated the Masthles variant before he got to it, thought that this brother, not Amphimachus, was the one who wore jewelry to war.

<sup>141</sup> Simonides (fr. 60 P) appears to believe it is armor. Kirk (*loc. cit.*) compares the silver and gold hair ornaments of Euphorbus, another spectacularly decked-out Trojan, at *Il.* 17.51.

ultimately, that of the warrior who will kill him in the battle at the river.<sup>142</sup> There are, granted, any number of νήπιοι in the Homeric epics, and they all display their own particular brand of foolishness, but Nastes/Amphimachus' identification as such in the catalogue puts him in a class by himself. The other Trojan allies need no such introduction.

This ally is so strongly marked as different, in fact, that a significant proportion of both ancient and modern scholarship on the Trojan catalogue has focused on why. The nagging problem is, simply, that the Carians were no more “barbarian” than anyone else in western Asia Minor from the archaic period onward, and significantly more Hellenized than most. Caria seems to have been a Cretan outpost; both literary and archaeological sources agree on this. The archaeological evidence for Carian/Greek connections is, in fact, plentiful. Hope Simpson and Lazenby assert that Miletus, the chief city in the Carians' domain, “was settled from Crete in the MM III-LM Ia period,” with subsequent Mycenaean influence.<sup>143</sup> Their conclusion—made in support of their general claim that the catalogues of *Iliad* 2 reflect a fundamentally Mycenaean archaeology of the Greek mainland and the Aegean—is refined and developed by subsequent developments in the archaeology of Caria. Mellink surveys the nature of Achaean settlement at Miletus in the MM III period, suggesting that the takeover may have been violent; regardless, the amount of Mycenaean and imitation Mycenaean pottery found at the site in the quarter

---

<sup>142</sup> Nonetheless he fails to appear onstage during the actual river battle in *Iliad* 21. A b scholion at line 872, typically, notices this: προανεφώνησεν, ἵνα μὴ ἔτι αὐτοῦ μνησθῆ ([Homer] foreshadowed this so that he would not have to repeat it again at that spot). Duckworth (1931: 325) notes this among other instances of Homeric foreshadowing where the event itself is left to occur outside the narrative scope of the epic; he further points out that the epithet νήπιος is itself an instance of Homeric foreshadowing in most of the places where it occurs, and the scholia recognize this device (*ibid.* 327). The signal difference between this and the case of Aeneas, who is similarly called νήπιος and warned of potential destruction at *Iliad* 20.296, is that the gods actually care about the latter; being a minor character in the Trojan catalogue is hazardous to one's health.

<sup>143</sup> 1970: 178; see also Niemeier 2001.

that would later host Athena's temple establishes the connection between the cultural centers of Mycenae and this outpost in Caria.<sup>144</sup> The late fourth-century bilingual proxeny inscription from Caunus, only recently deciphered and crucial in establishing what we know of the Carian language, suggests that the region's ties with the Greek world were both extensive and long-lasting.<sup>145</sup> They may date as far back as the late fourteenth century, when Hittite sources establish a link between the territory of Milawata/Millawanda, which has been identified with Miletus, and the civilization of Ahhiyawa, identified with Achaea and the Achaeans—Homer's Greeks.<sup>146</sup> All these pieces of evidence put Caria in the middle of a Late Bronze Age Aegean world in which cultural interactions between the Greek world and the cultures of Asia Minor are lively and productive.

In this light, we need to examine closely Strabo's origin story for the Carians:

Πολλῶν δὲ λόγων εἰρημένων περὶ Καρῶν ὁ μάλιστα ὁμολογούμενός ἐστιν οὗτος ὅτι οἱ Κᾶρες ὑπὸ Μίνω ἐτάττοντο, τότε Λέλεγες καλούμενοι, καὶ τὰς νήσους ᾤκουν· εἴτ' ἠπειρῶνται γερόμενοι πολλὴν τῆς παραλίας καὶ τῆς μεσογαίας κατέσχον τοὺς προκατέχοντας ἀφελόμενοι· καὶ οὗτοι δ' ἦσαν οἱ πλείους Λέλεγες καὶ Πελασγοί· πάλιν δὲ τούτους ἀφείλοντο μέρος οἱ Ἑλλήνες, Ἴωνές τε καὶ Δωριεῖς (*Geog.* 14.2.27).

Of the many stories told about the Carians, the one that receives the most agreement overall is this one: the Carians were subject to Minos and were then called Leleges; they lived in the islands. Then they moved to the mainland and took over much of the coastline and the inland region from the people who had previously lived there. Most of these were Leleges and Pelasgians. In their turn, the Greeks, Ionians and Dorians, took over part of their territory.

---

<sup>144</sup> Mellink 1983: 139: her brief survey of the evidence, in conjunction with Güterbock's in the same volume, establish the basis on which Miletus, the Mycenaean settlement, can be identified with Millawanda of the Hittite texts; the history of Greek/non-Greek cultural interactions therefore goes very deep in this part of the world.

<sup>145</sup> Adiego 2006: 3. His work on the Carian language has been fundamental both in expanding our knowledge of this language and in establishing decisively its Anatolian identity.

<sup>146</sup> Bryce 1998: 60-61.

The story that the Cretan Leleges—who may have been Pelasgians—were subject to Minos makes it unclear whether they are to be viewed as Cretans themselves like Minos or as some other group living elsewhere in the Aegean and politically subordinate to Knossos, like the mythical Athenians whom Theseus rescues. In any case, they are neatly distinguished from the later groups of Greeks who encroached on the territory that the Cretans had previously carved out for themselves. The levels of cultural and ethnic mixing that have had the chance to occur in this account are therefore what is notable about the coastline of Caria.

Similar—*mutatis mutandis*—is the Herodotean account of the Carians' ethnic origins:

Εἰσὶ δὲ τούτων Κᾶρες μὲν ἀπιγμένοι ἐς τὴν ἡπειρον ἐκ τῶν νήσων· τὸ γὰρ παλαιὸν ἐόντες Μίνω κατήκοοι καὶ καλεόμενοι Λέλεγες εἶχον τὰς νήσους, φόρον μὲν οὐδένα ὑποτελέοντες, ὅσον καὶ ἐγὼ δυνατός εἰμι <ἐπὶ> μακρότατον ἐξικέσθαι ἀκοῆ, οἱ δέ, ὅκως Μίνως δέοιτο, ἐπλήρουν οἱ τὰς νέας. Ἄτε δὲ Μίνω τε κατεστραμμένου γῆν πολλὴν καὶ εὐτυχέοντος τῷ πολέμῳ τὸ Καρικὸν ἦν ἔθνος λογιμώτατον τῶν ἐθνέων ἀπάντων κατὰ τοῦτον ἅμα τὸν χρόνον μακρῷ μάλιστα... Μετὰ δὲ τοὺς Κᾶρας χρόνῳ ὕστερον πολλῶ Δωριεὲς τε καὶ Ἴωνες ἐξανέστησαν ἐκ τῶν νήσων, καὶ οὕτως ἐς τὴν ἡπειρον ἀπίκοντο. Κατὰ μὲν δὴ Κᾶρας οὕτω Κρήτες λέγουσι γενέσθαι· οὐ μέντοι αὐτοὶ γε ὁμολογεύουσι τούτοις οἱ Κᾶρες, ἀλλὰ νομίζουσι αὐτοὶ ἐωυτοὺς εἶναι ἀτόχθονας ἡπειρώτας καὶ τῷ οὐνόματι τῷ αὐτῷ αἰεὶ διαχρεωμένους τῷ περ νῦν (*Histories* 1.171).

Of these [sc. the nations Harpagus attacked], the Carians arrived on the mainland from the islands. In antiquity they were subjects of Minos and called Leleges; they inhabited the islands, but paid no tribute, as far as I am able to determine from what I hear. Whenever Minos required it, they served as crews on his ships. Since, therefore, Minos generally took over a great deal of territory and was fortunate in war, the Carians were by far the most notorious of all the peoples at that time....Afterwards, at a much later period, the Dorians and Ionians drove the Carians out of the islands, and in this way they came to the mainland. That is what the Cretans say about the Carians; the Carians themselves do not agree with them, but consider themselves to be mainland natives who have always used the same name as they do now.

This account is, on the surface, extremely similar to Strabo's, but Herodotus plays with the detail and nuance in a way that is outside Strabo's scope. Here, too, the Leleges are a group of mysterious islanders, relocated to Caria, who are forced out of their new territory by the obviously Greek Dorians and Ionians. At least that is the Cretan tale; Herodotus declines to tell us whether he thinks it is plausible or so much Cretan balderdash. What the Carians in this version do with the story is more interesting: they deny it entirely, instead choosing to focus on their connection with the place where they are now. They reject the origin story that makes them displaced Cretans, forced to move from the islands to the mainland—a move with potentially disastrous consequences for their livelihood, if they are the mercenary sailors upon whom the Cretans depend. It is an understandable rejection: they have chosen to promote the more dignified story of their own autochthony and the unbroken continuity of their ethnonym. We have seen something like this before: the Greek colonists at Ilion tend to emphasize Trojan hero cults and the unbroken continuity of Trojan habitation at the site. Such a claim effectively complicates their actual Greekness without going so far as to claim full autochthony in the way the Carians in Herodotus are doing, yet the drive to identify with the place where they have settled, rather than the places from which they are said to have come originally, is similar in both groups. The Cretans' story about the Carians' origins, in Herodotus's account, makes their migration an effective exile: the result of pressure by waves of Dorian and Ionian invaders. (How this story accounts for the Ionians' presence in Asia Minor—evidently they kept going even after they had pushed the Leleges out of their native islands—is another question entirely.)

At all periods, the contrast between Carian Carians and Greek Carians is a problematic one. The “Hecatomnid” Hellenization of the region, particularly under Mausolus, is a source of lively historical debate: how Greek was his sphere of influence to begin with, and how did he balance local (Carianizing) demands with his Greek building programs?<sup>147</sup> The question has little to do with the Carian/Greek interactions of the late Bronze Age, which the *Iliad* appears to be reflecting in a glass, darkly; but it has a great deal to do with the ways in which later Greek sources deal with the Carians, since they inevitably take into account post-Homeric developments in the places they are describing. We need also to define *where*, precisely, we are in Caria in order to talk about its Hellenism or barbarianism; the inland areas were always less Greek than the coasts, which also contain the major cities such as Miletus and Halicarnassus that demonstrate heavy Greek cultural influence—as the archaeological record amply demonstrates—since well before we have any historical evidence at all.<sup>148</sup> From the temple of Athena at Miletus, for instance, we have evidence of extremely tight connections with Minoan Crete at the earliest building phase of the temple; it is generally agreed that rather than settlement by Cretans, other forms of cultural contact are indicated here.<sup>149</sup> When Carians appear in literary contexts, nonetheless they usually have some whiff of barbarianism clinging to them; we suspect, for instance, that Artemisia in Herodotus

---

<sup>147</sup> See Franco (1997) 148-149. The degree of Miletus’ Hellenic identity, and Caria’s Hellenization in general, is so great that Vanessa Gorman, for instance, can assert in her history of the city that early Miletus had no Carian population to speak of (2001: 41-3). This is a dangerous assumption to make; the Greek and Carian identities certainly existed alongside each other far later than the period in question.

<sup>148</sup> Herodotus’ interest in the region undoubtedly has something to do with his self-identification as a native of Halicarnassus; yet his world-view and cultural self-image are thoroughly Greek, and his approach to the Carians is not markedly different from his approach to e.g. the Scythians; they are foreign to him.

<sup>149</sup> Niemeier and Niemeier (1997: 192-193).

would never have gotten away with what she did if she had been an unambiguously Greek woman.<sup>150</sup>

Another Herodotean anecdote is revealing of this barbarianizing trend: at *Histories* 8.135, the Carian Mys (who appears to have a Greek name, and not an outlandish one at that; there are thirty-eight men named Mouse in the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* online database) is sent by Mardonius to test the oracles, as non-Greeks in Herodotus are so fond of doing.<sup>151</sup> At the Ptoeum oracle of Apollo, under Theban control, the locals who are present are astonished to hear βαρβάρου γλώσσης ἀντὶ Ἑλλάδος; Mys, however, snatches the Thebans' tablets eagerly in order to record the god's message, which is being delivered to him in Carian. Nowhere else on this prophetic tour is the language of any deity mentioned, but since the other places he visits are clearly Greek (the Theban oracle of Amphiaraus, a site in Phocis, the oracle of Trophonius) we can assume that the language there was Greek: unmarked for the original audience, and therefore not worth mentioning. The Carian message is the outlier. There is a lot that we are not told here—whether Carian was actually Mys's primary language (Herodotus says he is from “Europus,” wherever that is), whether he used translators at the other, less courteous, oracles—but here, at least, is a suggestion that the Carian language was, in the historical period, opaque to Greek audiences. This suggestion brings us, inevitably, back to Homer's βαρβαρόφωνοι.

---

<sup>150</sup> Though, as Munson points out, her ancestry is indisputably Greek (1988: 93). The Hecatomnid Carians provide an interesting glimpse into the continuation of both Greek/non-Greek ambiguity and unusual female power: see Carney (2005: 67) for a look at the possible naval prowess of Artemisia's namesake, at the period when Carian Hellenization was at its zenith.

<sup>151</sup> His name is likewise reminiscent of the city of Myus, in which the Ionian revolt notoriously broke out (Herodotus 5.35). This city would be abandoned and absorbed into the more significant Carian/Greek city of Miletus (Mackil 2004: 495).

Thucydides is one of the first to notice the problem with Homer's barbarians:  
there are none, properly speaking.

οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ βαρβάρους εἶρηκε διὰ τὸ μηδὲ Ἑλληνας πῶ, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ,  
ἀντίπαλον ἐς ἓν ὄνομα ἀποκεκρίσθαι (*Hist.* 1.3).

Clearly he did not refer to barbarians either, because, as it seems to me,  
the Greeks were not referred to at that point by one name in opposition [to  
non-Greeks].

Strabo (14.2.28) and the scholiasts take this as an error on Thucydides' part.<sup>152</sup>

Obviously Homer did refer to barbarians once, in the passage we are discussing; therefore  
Thucydides' sweeping claim is nullified. Or is it? It appears that, in his eagerness to  
vindicate Homer, Strabo has given short shrift to Thucydides. The earlier historian made  
a rather nuanced point: identity is, more often than not, a self-definition against  
something else (*ἀντίπαλον*). Homer's Greeks do not have the same interest as later  
Greeks in referring to themselves by a single ethnic term, though the catch-all terms  
*Danaoi*, *Achaioi*, and similar function in more or less the same way as the later term  
*Hellēnes* to which Strabo and Thucydides refer.<sup>153</sup> They are not drawing ethnic lines  
between themselves and the Trojans, with the barbarians on one side and the Greeks on  
the other. Thucydides is simply noting this difference between his contemporaries, who  
were keenly interested in the differences between themselves and the Easterners with  
whom they had a relationship that was, at best, complicated, and the Greeks in Homer

---

<sup>152</sup> See Σ A *ad Il.* 2.867: ὅτι Θουκυδίδης λέγει τὴν ὀνομασίαν τῶν βαρβάρων νεωτερικὴν εἶναι. ἐλέγχεται δὲ ἐντεῦθεν ([Aristarchus comments here] because Thucydides says the designation "barbarian" is later than Homer; he is refuted in this line). We can reconstruct the chain of events: Zenodotus, most likely, suspected *Il.* 2.867 on the basis of the word βαρβαροφῶνων, rendered suspect by Thucydides' judgment that Homer never refers to barbarians; given the frequency with which Zenodotus bases his editorial judgments on authors later than Homer, this is unsurprising. Aristarchus, in turn, would rather believe in the carelessness of Thucydides than the dubiousness of this line, and disagrees therefore with the judgment of Zenodotus.

<sup>153</sup> Kirk (1985: 150) notes particularly the metrical differences between Ἀχαιοί and Ἀργεῖοι; *ibid.* 58 emphasizes the mythical aspects of Δαναοί; these differences are, however, difficult to make much of in the context of individual passages.

who are clashing with enemies whose gods they worship and whose social rules they understand. The distinctions are therefore less important.

Technically, of course, Thucydides is right. Homer does not identify the Carians or anybody else as *barbaroi*; they are merely *barbarophōnoi*. The ways which this epithet—a *hapax legomenon* in Homer—is discussed in ancient scholarship reveals rather more about Greek assumptions than anything else.<sup>154</sup> *Barbarophōnoi* need not be speaking a different language at all, as it turns out:

ὅτι Κρητῶν ἄποικοι ὄντες ἠχρήστωσαν τὴν Ἑλληνίδα φωνήν. ἢ βαρβαροφωνεῖν ἐστὶ τὸ τοὺς ἐπιμιγνυμένους Ἑλλησι βαρβάρους ἐλληνίζειν μὲν διδάσκεσθαι, τῇ φωνῇ δὲ μὴ καθαρεύειν. ἢ ὅτι μεγαλόφωνοι ὑπῆρχον (Σ bT ad 2.867).

[The line is marked] because, although they were Cretan colonists, they corrupted the Greek language. Alternatively, “speaking like a barbarian” means that the barbarians who mixed in with the Greeks learned to speak Greek but did not use the language purely. Alternatively, it is because they had loud voices.<sup>155</sup>

The Carians’ origin story resurfaces once again as the reason for their barbarizing language—interestingly enough, not a separate language in itself, as modern scholarship has amply demonstrated from inscriptional evidence.<sup>156</sup> This language is, by either of the first two explanations, a mongrel thing. The Cretan colonists who, according to Strabo

---

<sup>154</sup> *Barbarophōnoi* may be a Homeric *hapax legomenon*, but it occurs, curiously enough, in the lexicon of Apollonius Sophista as a gloss on ἀκριτόμυθοι (“speaking confusedly”), which is used of Thersites at *Iliad* 2.246 and of dreams at *Odyssey* 19.560. Any speech so garbled as to be difficult to interpret—Penelope’s ambiguous dream falls into this category—runs the risk of sounding like barbarian speech.

<sup>155</sup> The *LSJ* offers the translation “corrupted” for ἠχρήστωσαν on the grounds of a passage in Eustathius that bears noteworthy similarities to two of the scholia under discussion in this section, and that makes it clear that a corrupt or faulty form of Greek is under discussion here, not a wholesale abandonment of the language: ἢ διότι, φασί, Κρητῶν ἄποικοι ὄντες ἠχρήστωσαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνήν ἢ ἐπειδὴ ἀγριόφωνοι ἦσαν καὶ ὅτι τὰ ἀρρενικὰ θηλυκῶς ἔλεγον καὶ ἀνάπαλιν (or, he says, because as colonists of the Cretans they corrupted the Greek language, since they were loud-voiced and they referred to masculine nouns in the feminine and *vice versa*, 1.579.23). In this passage, at least, it is clear that the relationship between their Cretan origins and their bad Greek is causal (διότι) and that the language they speak is a version of Greek that seems grotesque and debased to other Greek speakers.

<sup>156</sup> Carian’s affinities to Luwian and Lycian—in other words, its solid identification as an Anatolian language—are well summarized in Adiego (2007: 176).

and Herodotus, made their way to Caria and claimed it as their own managed to retain the Greek language in an imperfect form—either because they intermingled with the original inhabitants or because, as Cretans, their Greek was considered questionable by other Greeks to begin with. The Crete of the *Odyssey*, at least, is a polyglot society: ἄλλη δ’ ἄλλων γλῶσσα μεμιγμένη (*Od.* 19.175). We can form no really definite idea of where the notional ancestors of the Carians are supposed to have come from, short of Strabo’s diffident assertion that they could be Leleges (the difficulties of which identification have been previously discussed) or Pelasgians, which is a classification so vague as to be almost useless. The version of Greek these Cretans supposedly imported into Caria is, therefore, potentially riddled with foreign elements from the outset, that will only be amplified if they intermarry with the indigenous Carians rather than driving them out, as Strabo and Herodotus agree they did. The sense of the epithet is therefore diluted—these Carians may speak something as recognizably Greek as, for instance, Pseudartabas in the *Acharnians* manages to do in the end, but it is fundamentally Greek rather than Carian.<sup>157</sup> It simply happens to be very bad Greek. A D scholion parallels Eustathius’ later definition in giving a delightfully specific conception of what bad Carianizing Greek involves: ὅτι τὰ μὲν ἀρρενικὰ θηλυκῶς λέγουσιν, τὰ δὲ θηλυκὰ ἀρρενικῶς (“because masculine nouns are used in the feminine and feminine nouns in the masculine,” Σ D *ad* 2.867).<sup>158</sup>

---

<sup>157</sup> This episode illustrates, more than anything else, how Greeks apparently thought broken Greek, as spoken by a foreigner, ought to sound.

<sup>158</sup> This wholesale gender-swapping is rather appropriate coming from a contingent whose leader is dressed like a girl, and whose queen Artemisia continues the tradition of blurring the boundaries between men and women (cf. Xerxes’s famous line at Herodotus 8.88: οἱ μὲν ἄνδρες γεγόνασί μοι γυναῖκες, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες ἄνδρες).

The later sources, then, are dealing head-on with the epithet in a way that preserves some degree of Greekness among the inhabitants of Miletus and the surrounding area while still allowing for their supposedly bizarre grasp on the Greek language compared to the Achaean contingent, or even the rest of the Trojans. As previously mentioned, the issue of language only rarely arises in the *Iliad*: Glaucus and Diomedes need no interpreter to find out that they are hereditary *xenoi*—a Greek concept if ever there was one—and Hector has no difficulty understanding the taunts of Achilles as they circle the walls in their desperate final struggle. Only a handful of times in the poem does anyone acknowledge that other languages are spoken in Trojan or allied territories; one of these occurs at the beginning of the Trojan catalogue, when Iris-Polites is giving Priam instructions for mustering his troops:

πολλοὶ γὰρ κατὰ ἄστυ μέγα Πριάμου ἐπίκουροι,  
ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα πολυσπερέων ἀνθρώπων·  
τοῖσιν ἕκαστος ἀνήρ σημαίνεται οἷσί περ ἄρχει,  
τῶν δ' ἐξηγείσθω κοσμησάμενος πολιήτας (*Il.* 2.803-806).

There are many allies in the great city of Priam,  
and each speaks a different language of far-flung mortals.  
Let each man give the signal to the ones he commands,  
and let him marshall and lead out his own citizens.

The only scholiastic comments on this passage appear to be derived ultimately from Nicanor and reported in both the A and b scholia in very similar wording. His presence here is assumed since the major interpretive issue in this passage arises from its syntax. The scholia call this passage ἀσύνδετος: the grammarian is perturbed by the seeming lack of connection between lines 803-804 and lines 805-806. The conclusion that allows Nicanor to redeem Homer's intentions here is that the poet simply reverses the logical

order of the two statements and puts the *aition* first.<sup>159</sup> What he stops short of observing—and what is most relevant for this discussion—is that the realities of commanding an army as vast as the Trojans’ are frankly dealt with in this passage from the *Iliad*; each commander is presumed to be at least bilingual, speaking the language of the Trojans, whatever that is, as well as that of his own men. He is therefore tasked with giving meaningful orders (σημαινέτω) for his own contingent. The word used to describe the men who make up these contingents, πολήτας, is significant in itself. It assumes a number of *poleis* throughout Asia Minor, similar in organization and form either to Troy or to any city a Greek would know—perhaps even Miletus. The Trojans, in this passage from Homer, are already being interpreted in a way that is both Greek—a heterogenous collection of cities under the more or less rigid control of a king powerful enough to make them follow him—and non-Greek; Odysseus hardly has to translate Agamemnon’s orders for the Ithacan contingent.<sup>160</sup> The potential for disunity is enormous; the Trojan catalogue thwarts it neatly by lining up these disparate elements neatly, the Lycians and Phrygians and Carians in their inappropriate golden attire, in order to face off against the Greeks.

This sense of unity has entirely disappeared by the fourth book of the poem, in which the Trojan hubbub resembles nothing more than the helpless, cacophonous bleating of ewes spooked by the cries of their rams, and any communication that occurs is lost in the blur of their many languages: οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἦεν ὁμῶς θρόος οὐδ’ ἴα γῆρυς,/ ἀλλὰ γλῶσσα μέμικτο, πολύκλητοι δ’ ἔσαν ἄνδρες (4.437-438). In Mackie’s reading, the

---

<sup>159</sup> ἀσύνδετος γὰρ ὁ λόγος, τὴν αἰτίαν προλαβόντος τοῦ ποιητοῦ (Σ Α, b *ad* 2.805)

<sup>160</sup> Though he does act as a sort of interpreter in the *Peira* episode of book 2, elucidating Agamemnon’s counterintuitive suggestion by means of ἀγανοῖς ἐπέεσσιν (*Iliad* 2.189). The Achaeans’ communication problems are nowhere more in evidence than they are here, even if they do have the advantage of a common language that their enemies do not.

significance of the scene is the contrast it presents between Trojan hubbub and Greek silence (at 428-430), between chaos and discipline.<sup>161</sup> Yet more than that, it is a vivid picture of what Asia Minor must have sounded like to Greek ears at almost any period in their history together, from Troy in the Bronze Age to Miletus on the verge of the Ionian Revolt, and into the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Caria is, through the characterization of its contingent in the Trojan catalogue, at the center of the action: though it appears at first glance to be part of the polyglot crowd, the ancient sources, who know the area as partially Hellenized with extensive ties to Crete, end up reading them as failed Greeks, whose barbarous version of their own language is what makes them noteworthy among Homer's generally quite Hellenized Trojans. They are characterized in the Catalogue by their failures in communication: both in terms of their language and in terms of their *habitus*, which is summed up in their leader's inappropriate golden attire. More devastating than his inability to speak Greek properly is, in Homeric terms, his inability to use the language of war in presenting himself.

## 2. The Phrygian capitalists

The Carians are distinctly Other, even among the already-othered Trojans; this is not the case for every set of Trojan allies. The relationship between the Phrygians and the Trojans gets progressively more blurry over time. Even by the time of the tragedians, the Trojans may be called *Phryges* (and depicted artistically wearing the distinctive Phrygian cap); Virgil, for his part, uses *Phrygii* indiscriminately with a host of other terms (Teucrians, etc.) for his Trojans. That this development was perceived in antiquity to have started in tragedy is evident from observations in the *Iliad* scholia:

---

<sup>161</sup> Mackie 1996: 16. We may also compare the similar contrast at 3.3-9, discussed in Section 1 above.

ὅτι οἱ νεώτεροι τὴν Τροίαν καὶ τὴν Φρυγίαν τὴν αὐτὴν λέγουσιν, ὁ δὲ Ὅμηρος οὐχ οὕτως. Αἰσχύλος δὲ συνέχεεν (Σ Α *ad Il.* 2.862).

[The line is marked] because post-Homeric authors say Troy and Phrygia are the same, but Homer does not. Aeschylus confused them.

The observation—from Aristarchus, as the wording indicates—seems absurd on the face of it; nobody could argue that Troy and Phrygia are literally the same place; the overlap must be instead in the names that are assigned to the people. The Aeschylean play that is probably referred to here is the *Phryges*, known also under the title of *Hector's Ransom*; the Phrygians are Priam's bodyguard as he begs Achilles for Hector's body. It is simple enough in this play to see how the Phrygians and the Trojans can be conflated; Aeschylus sets the stage for later tragic developments here.<sup>162</sup>

Strabo tries at several points in his *Geography* to make sense of the overlap between these two peoples, asserting first that post-Homeric events set the confusion in motion.<sup>163</sup> This interpretation sounds the first note of a theme that will come out in the ancient scholarship on Homer's Phrygians: opportunism. They take advantage of the political vacuum in the Troad after the fall of the city to annex its still-desirable territories for themselves. Strabo here is unconcerned with an issue that dominated the Greeks' study of Phrygia in antiquity, the issue of their ultimate geographical origins. The Phrygians are Troy's close neighbors in this model, not another band of foreigners

---

<sup>162</sup> On these grounds Edith Hall (1988) takes issue with Wilamowitz's conjecture on Alcaeus 42.15 that would restore Φρύγες as a synonym for Trojans; she argues that Mytilenaeans of the sixth century knew enough about the Troad and environs not to mix the two groups up, and that the metonymy is unparalleled until later. Implicit in the scholion's assertion that Homer made a distinction that later authors do not is that Homer, like these Mytilenaeans some centuries later, also knew what he was talking about.

<sup>163</sup> Strabo 10.3.22: Φρυγίαν τὴν Τρωάδα καλοῦντες διὰ τὸ τοὺς Φρύγας ἐπικρατῆσαι πλησιοχώρους ὄντας τῆς Τροίας ἐκπεπορθημένης ([The sources] call the Troad Phrygia because the Phrygians, who lived in the vicinity, conquered the region once Troy had been sacked).

pouring out of Europe to plunder Asia's cities.<sup>164</sup> They manage to survive their ally's fall and regroup on Trojan ground in a way that the Greeks, historically, did themselves.

Whether Strabo is envisioning the Phrygians as squatters on the city's ruins or permanent inhabitants of the city is unclear; in any case, they are geographically almost on their own territory when they absorb the Trojans'.

This passage is more explicit about the Phrygians' origins and identity than Strabo's second claim, involving the previously-mentioned confusion between the two groups:

γέγονε δὲ ἡ ἀσάφεια οὐ διὰ τὰς μεταβολὰς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὰς τῶν συγγραφέων ἀνομολογίας περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ λεγόντων, τοὺς μὲν Τρῶας καλούντων Φρύγας καθάπερ οἱ τραγικοί, τοὺς δὲ Λυκίους Κᾶρας καὶ ἄλλους οὕτως. (*Geography* 12.8.7).

The lack of clarity has arisen not only through the changes but also through the disagreements of the historians, who do not say the same things concerning the same people—calling the Trojans Phrygians as the tragedians do, and the Lycians Carians, and others in the same way.

Strabo is being coy here about whom exactly he chooses to blame; the tragedians are widely accepted as the source for the confusion of the Trojans and Phrygians, as the scholion previously cited indicates, but the movements and migrations of peoples around Asia Minor have created more confusion than that one example alone.<sup>165</sup> The historians preceding Strabo have only added to this confusion by using the tragedians' inaccurate

---

<sup>164</sup> Drews (1993: 11-12) summarizes the arguments for and against the Phrygians' supposed European origins and ultimately finds both the story, and the scholarly consensus that readers in antiquity adopted it wholesale, unlikely. Strabo appears elsewhere to have accepted the Phrygians' European origin story, which is traceable both to Herodotus and to Xanthus of Lydia; this latter asserts that the Phrygians moved into Asia from Thrace after the Trojan War (Strabo 12.8.3 = Xanthus fr. 14 *FGH*), which neatly contradicts Strabo's picture of their movements in this passage. He was undoubtedly trying to make sense of varied traditions, and did not manage to harmonize them completely; in this passage he is following Homer, whose Phrygians certainly do seem to be Troy's next-door neighbors.

<sup>165</sup> It is unclear to whom Strabo is referring when he says that some sources have gotten the Lydians and the Carians mixed up.

diction. Thus the Phrygians' takeover of Trojan territory is not ultimately to blame for the conflation of these two peoples—at least not to the extent that later sources, with their onomastic errors, have become.

In Homer, we see the Phrygians as their own contingent, distinct from the Trojans and inhabitants of a far-flung region. Their entry in the Catalogue confirms this separate identity:

Φόρκυς αὖ Φρύγας ἦγε καὶ Ἀσκάνιος θεοειδής  
τῆλ' ἐξ Ἀσκανίης· μέμασαν δ' ὕσμῖνι μάχεσθαι (*Iliad* 2.858-859).

Phorcys led the Phrygians, along with godlike Ascanius,  
from far-off Ascania; they were eager to fight in the battle line.

The Phrygians are lumped in here with the Ascanians, who share their name with the Bithynian Lake Ascania (now called İznik, after the ancient settlement of Nicomedia).<sup>166</sup>

They and the Ascanians are a separate entity from the Trojans, on a par with the other members of the loose confederacy defending the city from the Greek besiegers.

Nevertheless the Phrygians have a peculiarly close relationship with the Trojans even in Homer; they appear to be geographically closer to them than the Carians and Lydians, despite the adverb τῆλε used to describe Ascania. They are, moreover, inextricably linked with the Trojan royal family:

Ἀσίῳ, ὃς μήτρῳς ἦν Ἔκτορος ἵπποδάμοιο  
αὐτοκασίγνητος Ἐκάβης, υἱὸς δὲ Δύμαντος,  
ὃς Φρυγίῃ ναίεσκε ῥοῆς ἔπι Σαγγαρίοιο (*Iliad* 16.717-719).

[Apollo appeared in the form of] Asios, who was the uncle of horse-taming Hector, the brother of Hecuba, and the son of Dymas, who lived in Phrygia by the streams of the Sangarios.

Hector is therefore the product of what must have undoubtedly been an important dynastic marriage between Priam of Troy and Hecuba of Phrygia. Her own parentage—

---

<sup>166</sup> See Kirk (1985): 260.

that favorite stumper of the emperor Tiberius—is disputed in antiquity; she is nevertheless generally held to be a Phrygian.<sup>167</sup> The suitability of a marriage between a Trojan and a Phrygian is again underlined in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, in which the goddess is almost over-anxious in reassuring Anchises that the identity she has constructed in order to seduce him is a viable one:

Ὀτρεὺς δ' ἐστὶ πατὴρ ὄνομα κλυτός, εἴ που ἀκούεις,  
 ὃς πάσης Φρυγίης εὐτειχίτοιο ἀνάσσει.  
 γλῶσσαν δ' ὑμετέρην καὶ ἡμετέρην σάφα οἶδα·  
 Τρωὰς γὰρ μεγάρῳ με τροφὸς τρέφεν...  
 οὐ σφιν ἀεικελίη νυὸς ἔσσομαι, ἀλλ' εἰκυῖα. (*h. Ven.* 111-114)

Otreus is the renowned name of my father—you might have heard of him—he rules over all of well-walled Phrygia. I know both your language and mine well; a Trojan nurse raised me at home... I will not be an unsuitable daughter-in-law for [your family], but an appropriate one.

Anchises finds this disguise so thoroughly convincing that he swears to marry the Phrygian princess who speaks his language and knows his family.<sup>168</sup> The poem's ultimate outcome is to turn the normal dynastic interplay between one people and another on its head: Anchises could have taken pride in a Phrygian wife who brought him the wealth she promised (139-140) and bore him impressive children (127), as well as reinforcing important economic and social ties with the Trojans' neighbors. Instead, he finds that he has made a match that can bring him no status in the end, since he is forbidden even from telling anyone the truth about the mother of his child (286-290). We

<sup>167</sup> Suetonius, *Tiberius* 70. Pherecydes (*FGH* 3.136b) makes Asios the son of the Homeric Dymas and the nymph Euthoe; the otherwise unknown Athenaion (*FGH* 546.2) makes him the son of Cisseus and Telecleia. A T scholion on *Iliad* 16.718 reports these two judgments and complicates the matter by (sensibly) pointing out that Asios and Hecuba may have different mothers; we remember that Hecuba herself bore only (!) nineteen of Priam's fifty sons (*Iliad* 24.495-497), and her natal family may have had a similar dynamic. The fact that this is a *zētēma*, or alternatively a dinner-party *bon mot*, indicates the enduring allure of using Homer as a source of brain-teasers in antiquity.

<sup>168</sup> Her father, Otreus, shares the name with a Phrygian whom Priam says he assisted against the Amazons at *Iliad* 3.186; Aphrodite (or rather, her creator) has done the research and come up with a name that brings in a sense of local color.

are left with the distinct impression that both Aphrodite and Anchises would have been more fortunate in the long run if she had been the daughter of Otreus the Phrygian instead of Zeus; but the episode does reinforce the ties of kinship between Phrygians and Trojans, even as it ultimately fails to deliver on them in this one particular instance.

When the Phrygians reappear in the *Iliad*, however, their relationship with their Trojan leaders is an almost antagonistic one. When Poulydamas makes the rather sensible suggestion that the way to defeat the Greeks is to retreat to the city and make a stand on their walls, Hector is superbly indignant:

ἦ οὐ πῶ κεκόρησθε ἐελμένοι ἔνδοθι πύργων;  
πρὶν μὲν γὰρ Πριάμοιο πόλιν μέρορες ἄνθρωποι  
πάντες μυθέσκοντο πολύχρυσον πολύχαλκον·  
νῦν δὲ δὴ ἐξαπόλωλε δόμων κειμήλια καλά,  
πολλὰ δὲ δὴ Φρυγίην καὶ Μηονίην ἐρατεινὴν  
κτήματα περνάμεν' ἵκει, ἐπεὶ μέγας ὠδύσατο Ζεὺς (*Iliad* 18.287-292).

Aren't you all sick yet of being caged behind walls? In the old days, all of humankind used to call Priam's city rich in gold and bronze. Now all of these fine treasures have disappeared from our houses, and we have gone and sold many things to Phrygia and lovely Maeonia, since great Zeus has become angry with us.

Heinrich Schliemann had evidently forgotten about this passage when he found "Priam's gold," or he would have been looking considerably farther east for it. Rarely do we get a glimpse into the economy of epic poetry; the Trojans' desperate measures, however, ring true. The war has forced them to sell the artifacts that they had previously treasured and that had formed the basis for their wealth and fame in the region. Hector mentions both gold and bronze; these we may imagine as the sort of cups and tripods and other χρήματα that make their way from hero to hero in Greek epic and can cement generations of *xenia* among them. The word κειμήλια used to describe these objects reinforces their nature, precious and irreplaceable. Adrestus offers Menelaus many κειμήλια of bronze, gold,

and iron from his father's house in exchange for his life at *Iliad* 6.47-48; Achilles complains bitterly at 9.330 that the *κειμήλια* he has plundered in battle have gone to enrich Agamemnon; Menelaus, in a less warlike setting at *Odyssey* 4.613ff, offers Telemachus *κειμήλια* as a guest-gift, including a priceless mixing-bowl made by Hephaestus and given to Menelaus by the king of Sidon. This last object is perhaps the *κειμήλιον* at its most precious; it is beautifully made, a thing aesthetically desirable in itself, and enriched by the associations it has been given. It is no longer a mere object of exchange, something that can be given away to sweeten a king or bargain for rescue.<sup>169</sup> It is an heirloom, as desirable as the Trojans' vanished treasures. In this passage, Hector's frustration at the way said treasures have drifted out of the gift-exchange economy and into a bewildering cash economy is palpable. Moreover, they move inexorably in one direction: out of Troy and toward the richer lands of Phrygia and Maeonia, less affected by the Greeks' long siege and therefore able to enjoy more disposable income. Hector has previously argued to the Trojans that he enjoys Zeus's favor; here he acknowledges the subtle and far-reaching effects of the god's anger.<sup>170</sup>

The exegetical scholia approve of the way in which Hector presents his judgment:

ὁ τοῦ Ἑκτορος λόγος μετὰ τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τὸ συμφέρον ἔχει, τουτέστι συμφέροντος μέρος ἐστὶ καὶ τὰ περὶ τῶν χρημάτων, ἅπερ πολυχρονίῳ πολέμῳ ἐξαναλωσθαι λέγει, ὅτι μείζων ἢ βλάβη πολιορκουμένων ἢ τῇ συμβολῇ κρίσιν διδόντων (ΣbT ad 18.290-292a).

The argument of Hector appeals both to aesthetics and to self-interest; that is, the portion relating to self-interest is the one that concerns their possessions, since he says they have been spent due to the protracted war,

<sup>169</sup> The futility of this bargain is then underscored by Nestor's exhortation to the Achaeans at 6. 67-71 not to waste time looking for spoils (*ἐνάρων*), but to kill as many Trojans as possible. The heroic economy, like any other, experiences fluctuations in the relative value of goods and lives.

<sup>170</sup> See *Iliad* 17.176-82, where Hector argues that the martial reputation of Ajax could be easily overturned by the will of Zeus and invites Glaucus to see it happen—a piece of bravado that Zeus himself recognizes for what it is: ἄ δειλ' οὐδέ τί τοι θάνατος καταθύμιός ἐστιν, / ὅς δὴ τοι σχεδὸν εἴσι (17.201-202).

because the damage is greater for those who are being besieged than for those who make their trial in battle.

The element of Hector's speech that is judged *kalos* is left hanging, or perhaps more accurately, taken for granted.<sup>171</sup> All the emphasis here is on τὸ συμφέρον, and the way in which it consists of the passivity of the Trojans, who are without resources; since they are being besieged, they have more to lose in συμβολή than the Greeks, who are here taking the initiative and acting. An exegetical scholion, in the meantime, seizes the opportunity to compare another instance where Hector's preoccupation with Trojan possessions is used to characterize him:

Φρυγῶν καὶ Μηόνων ἀγορὰς κομιζόντων τοῖς Τρωσὶ καὶ ἀντὶ τούτων ἀντιφορτιζομένων, τῶν πολεμίων ἀπαγόντων καὶ πωλούντων, ἢ αὐτῶν τῶν Τρώων, ἵνα χρήματα λαμβάνωσι πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον καὶ παρέχωσι τοῖς συμμάχοις, οἷον ὁ Ἔκτωρ ἔφη· “τὰ φρονέων δώροισι κατατρύχω <καὶ ἐδώδῃ /λαούς> (Σ Α ad 18.292b).

Since the Phrygians and Maeonians conducted commerce with the Trojans and imported and exported things in their place, when their enemies took things away and sold them, or the Trojans themselves [traded with them] so they could have money for the war and provide it to the allies, as Hector said: “With this in mind, I exhaust the people with gifts and food” (*Iliad* 17.225-226).

Here the Phrygians (and Maeonians) re-enter the scene, as the canny merchants who arrive in time to trade with the Trojans for the very funds they need in order to keep the allies' morale up. Hector is, in the passage from *Iliad* 17 the scholion quotes, haranguing the allies themselves in an attempt to remind them what they owe to the Trojans; he accuses them of leeching away his city's resources by the demands they make for gifts, supplies, and status. This Troy, rather than being the famously wealthy city that dominated Asia Minor, is being slowly hollowed out from the inside through the

---

<sup>171</sup> See also Lohmann (1970:119-120 and 201-2) on how Hector's speech parodies that of Poulydamas; this may be what the *kalos* element is, since the speech is so well constructed.

combined efforts of its enemies and its allies. The Trojan people (the λαοί of Hector's speech) are being slowly worn down through the enormous effort of feeding and paying the vast army that has been marshalled to defend the city for nine years. Neither the Phrygians nor the Maeonians are specifically mentioned in Hector's resentful speech to the allies, though Phorcys the Phrygian leader is in the audience, and so it is heavily implied that his contingent also is being kept on the Trojan side along with all the rest by these gifts; thus they have received twice over the wealth of Troy. It is hardly a flattering picture that Hector paints of his uncle's compatriots; their unabashed proto-capitalism is at odds with the heroic standards and the heroic economy that Hector is trying to invoke, and it is beginning to be a liability rather than an asset.

Trevor Bryce has seen this entire episode as an anachronistic look into the past of the Trojan War; the Phrygians' geopolitical importance was at its peak in the period when the Homeric poems were being formed, and assigning this wealthy and influential people the Trojans' gold, in this reading, seems the natural thing for the poet to do—particularly if Ilion itself is an unimpressive heap inhabited by a mix of squatters and Greek colonists.<sup>172</sup> If we had much at all in the way of Phrygian accounts of their own history, more could be made of this interpretation. We have no equivalent of the Greeks' stories about treasures from the Trojan War, such as the lyre of Paris in Plutarch's account of Alexander, hoarded to tempt Homerically minded travelers' interest.<sup>173</sup>

Euripides traces the Trojans' gold and the Phrygians' ultimately to the same destination:

πολὺς δὲ χρυσὸς Φρύγιά τε σκυλεύματα  
πρὸς ναῦς Ἀχαιῶν πέμπεται (*Troades* 18-19).

---

<sup>172</sup> Bryce 2006: 141; he suggests that the Phrygians themselves may have been propagating this story.

<sup>173</sup> See Plutarch: *Life of Alexander* 15.7-9, and also Chapter 2, section 2 here.

Much gold, and the spoils of Phrygia, are being sent to the Achaeans' ships.

This is the ultimate tragic conflation of Troy and Phrygia, two places whose overlapping fate has ultimately made them one and the same for classical audiences. Whatever circulates in Asia—coins or tripods, Trojan bribes or Phrygian purchases—inevitably ends up on the ships of the conquering Achaeans along with the Trojan women themselves. This is the ultimate tragic conflation of Phrygians and Trojans: whereas in Strabo, the Phrygians survive to annex Troy and its rich lands for their own after the Greeks retreat in conquering disarray, in Euripides, they ultimately end up suffering along with the Trojans at the hands of their Achaean conquerors. The Trojans' treasures are neither to be found in the city itself, despite Schliemann's romanticizing fantasies, nor in the hands of Phrygian collectors, but rather scattered around the Aegean, shipwrecked in disastrous *nostoi* or redistributed among Greek chieftains. They are no more capable than their owners—or their captors—of resisting the destruction the war has brought.

### **3. The Dardanian watchdogs**

We have thus seen two striking examples of the way Trojan disunity is perceived and amplified in post-Homeric traditions: first, in reference to the Carians' barbarian language and, indeed, the plurality of languages spoken among the Trojan allies to begin with; and second, in reference to the Phrygians' intervention into their leaders' and kinsmen's economy. Even in cases where members of the Trojan side are ethnically and linguistically homogeneous, however, the ancient commentators seem bent on ferreting out instances of their lack of cohesion. One such example is the Dardanian contingent, which attracts attention because of the way in which Homer has presented it in the first

place: the Dardanians are given no geographical indications whatever, which makes them difficult to distinguish from the Trojans. This is easy enough for modern readers to accept, but all of the major scholiastic traditions indicate that a set of *zētēmata* arose in order to explain why these two sets of Trojans—linked by close blood ties and given names that became virtually synonymous by the classical period—existed in Homer. An entire set of political developments that these readers found in the *Iliad* links up with this issue of identity: the Trojans and Dardanians can ultimately be distinguished only by their views on the war itself. Thus the notions of both geography and ethnography have been completely redefined in the discussion of this one catalogue entry; it is the mental, rather than the physical, space of the Dardanians that matters for ancient readers.

With this framework in mind, we can now turn to the Dardanian entry in the Trojan catalogue:

Δαρδανίων αὐτ' ἦρχεν ἐδὺς πάϊς Ἀγχίσιος,  
 Αἰνείας, τὸν ὑπ' Ἀγχίσι τέκε δῖ' Ἀφροδίτη,  
 Ἴδης ἐν κνημοῖσι θεὰ βροτῶι εὐνηθεῖσα·  
 οὐκ οἶος, ἅμα τῶι γε δύω Ἀντήνορος υἱε,  
 Ἀρχέλοχος τ' Ἀκάμας τε, μάχης εὖ εἰδότε πάσης. (2.819-823)

The noble son of Anchises led the Dardanians,  
 Aeneas, whom divine Aphrodite bore to Anchises,  
 a goddess lying with a mortal in the valleys of Ida.  
 He was not alone; at any rate the two sons of Antenor were with him,  
 Archelochus and Acamas, who knew all about battle.<sup>174</sup>

This entry is more about the leader than about the people he leads. Indeed, one begins to suspect that the real *raison d'être* for the Dardanian contingent's inclusion in the catalogue is to supply Aeneas—an important hero about whom the audience is expected to care—with some Trojan allies to lead, nominally, and so the Dardanians step in from

<sup>174</sup> The last two lines are repeated nearly verbatim in the small Trojan catalogue at *Il.* 12.99-100, where these two sons of Antenor are still assisting Aeneas.

nowhere to fill the gap. Most entries in the catalogues give some kind of geographic information on the peoples they treat; we can place the Carians and Lydians, or the Cretans and the Lacedaemonians, on a map, but the problem of mapping the Dardanians, geographically and ethnographically, is a thorny one.<sup>175</sup> There is one Homeric reference to a place called Dardania. Aeneas describes it in detailing his heroic genealogy for the benefit of Achilles, and he starts with the eponymous hero Dardanus, who came from Samothrace to the Troad and began the first wave of proto-Trojan habitation there:

κτίσσε δὲ Δαρδανίην, ἐπεὶ οὐ πῶ Ἴλιος ἱρή  
ἐν πεδίῳ πεπόλιστο πόλις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων,  
ἀλλ' ἔθ' ὑπωρείας ὄκειον πολυπίδακος Ἴδης.

He founded Dardania, since holy Iliion  
had not yet been established in the plain as a city of mortals;  
they still lived in the foothills of Ida, abounding in springs (*Iliad* 20.216-18).<sup>176</sup>

Dardanus is considered to have lived in the foothills of Ida—clearly visible from the modern site, and still riddled with streams—rather than on the plain, where the city later developed.

His descendants, however, appear to have moved downstream. Aeneas does not say when they did—and, in the normal way of heroic boasting, we can assume he would mention Dardania further if it were still a going concern—but the ancient commentators assumed, based on *Iliad* 20.221, that the next generation of Dardanians after Dardanus himself was moving towards the plain. Aeneas goes on to tell Achilles about the three

---

<sup>175</sup> Strabo is unclear on who they are; in his own period, there are Dardanians living in Illyria. They are not Trojan, however, and he has no interest in tracing their name or explaining the doublet (7.5.6). The Homeric Dardanians are a different people entirely who must be explained from within the text.

<sup>176</sup> A D scholion on this line misses the point that Dardania and Troy are two different places: Δαρδανία: πόλις Τροίας. Yet this is an important caveat for anyone untangling the relationship between these two places in antiquity: not all readers thought there was a difference in the first place, whether through creative geography or simply through careless reading.

thousand beautiful mares belonging to Dardanus's son Erichthonius, which he pastured ἔλος κάτω, down in the marshes. A series of scholiastic judgments, based ultimately on Aristotle's *Historia Animalium*, confirms that this lowland, riverside environment is what horses prefer.<sup>177</sup> While Ida and its foothills are riddled with streams, the term ἔλος (and θολερά, as in the Aristotle; cf. n. infra) imply flatter and more marsh-like floodplains than are likely to be found on higher ground; therefore Erichthonius and his horses are already moving closer to where the site of the city will be, although neither Aeneas nor any subsequent commentator on these lines implies that he was actually the one to found it.

Rather, the names of Erichthonius's son and grandson, Tros and Ilus, suggest that these were the generations of Dardanians conceptualized in antiquity as moving definitively onto the site where the city currently is and founding it: the city's two names are easily derived from the two of them.<sup>178</sup> Moving forward through the genealogy, we next find Laomedon, the son of Ilus and father of Priam, during whose reign, the Mythographus Homericus reports, the walls of Troy were built and sacked in quick succession: by this point, the city has reached the highest degree of monumentalization it will attain, a mere generation or so before it is sacked in the reign of Priam.<sup>179</sup> If anything, Aeneas's narrative underscores the fragility of all these places: Samothrace from which Dardanus flees, Dardania in the hills abandoned for fertile pastures below (the reference to the ever-increasing wealth of Erichthonius suggests this is the

---

<sup>177</sup> ἡδονται τοῖς ἔλεσι καὶ τοῖς θολεροῖς τῶν ὑδάτων αἱ ἵπποι, καὶ ἔστι φιλόλουτρον τὸ ζῶιον (mares like riverbanks and eddies of water; they are animals fond of baths) in T; a slightly abbreviated form is found in b. The wording is taken almost directly from *H. An.* 9.24.

<sup>178</sup> Kirk (1985: 253) makes the claim that Assaracus, the other son of Tros, "must have stayed on in Dardanie, probably a rural area or group of villages rather than a town." He does not make the grounds for this claim clear, but Assaracus was the grandfather of Anchises and it is not implausible that he should have stayed in the mountains while the other branch of the family moved to the plain. There is, however, no basis for this assumption in the Homeric text.

<sup>179</sup> See Σ D *ad* 20.145.

motivation for moving in the first place), and Troy itself doomed to fall. Hence, as a result of these quick waves of Dardanian/Trojan settlement in the Troad, comes the question of identity.

That it was considered a thorny question in antiquity as well is indicated by a fragment of an ancient commentary preserved in P. Oxy. 1086, dating to the first century BCE:

τὸ σημεῖον ὅτι .....] τοὺς Τρω[ῶ]ας διέστα<λ>κεν τ(ῶν) Δαρδάνων.  
(comm. pap. on 2.819)

The sign [is there because...] he disambiguates the Trojans from the Dardanians.

The phrase τὸ σημεῖον ὅτι, or simply ὅτι, is elsewhere attested in this text, so that Hunt's supplement here is logical. It is also the standard formula in the A scholia for indicating a place where an Aristarchean comment on a reading is being preserved. The scenario that emerges here is commonplace enough in ancient Homeric scholarship: Aristarchus is defending the Homeric distinction between these two groups against something. Perhaps an earlier commentator has cast doubt on these lines: after all, they are anomalous within the catalogue for the reasons already explained. The entry in the papyrus serves therefore to reinstate the Homeric text as received, with its clear distinction between Dardanians and Trojans—even if it does not appear to make sense on the face of it; after all, there is no indication why Homer should distinguish these two groups. There is no direct parallel for this section in the A scholia, but the papyrus is sufficient to indicate that there was already some anxiety in Hellenistic scholarship about the identity of the Dardanians.

This difficulty in distinguishing the two groups has persisted into modern scholarship. The *LSJ* cites Δαρδανίς as a synonym for Τρωιάς already in the *Iliad*, but a

closer look at the line it cites (καί τινα Τρωιάδων καὶ Δαρδανίδων βαθυκόλπων, *Il.* 18.122) suggests that this definition relies on an oversimplification: that this is a poetic reduplication and the Trojan women and the Dardanians with deeply-belted robes are one and the same. In reality, no such assumption needs to be made. There is no reason the line cannot refer to two groups of women among the Trojans and their allies, equally affected by Troy's disasters and equally ready to tear their cheeks in grief. The "Dardanian" gates of Troy, previously discussed, appear to be the main gates of the city in Homer, though that may simply be due to their opening out onto the plain, toward the Homeric Dardania.<sup>180</sup> The first actual instance of the epithet being used as a full synonym for Trojan occurs in Pindar (Δαρδανίδα κόραν Πριάμου Κασσάνδραν, *Pyth.* 11.19-20); none of Priam's children are Dardanian in Homer.

This is not to say that the Dardanians in Homer are not inextricably linked to the Trojans; in the catalogue entry, they appear to be a different branch of the Trojan royal family, led by Priam's cousins' sons just as the Trojans themselves are led by Priam's son. Their name, indeed, suggests nothing else; they have taken as their eponymous hero an ancestor a two generations farther back in the family tree than the Tros from whom the Trojans' name comes, but still from the same line. The kinship ties between them are reinforced through the generations. Anchises and Priam are second cousins.<sup>181</sup> Antenor's wife—though there is no indication that she is the mother of Archelochus and Acamas—is Theano, possibly Hecuba's sister if we follow the story that she was the

---

<sup>180</sup> See Chapter 2, section 6, on the Dardanian gates.

<sup>181</sup> As the family tree Aeneas gives at *Iliad* 20.213ff indicates: the two sons of Tros who lived among mortals long enough to reproduce, Ilus and Assaracus, each had a son: Ilus's son Laomedon fathered Priam, and Assaracus's son Capys fathered Anchises.

daughter of Cisseus the Phrygian.<sup>182</sup> Meanwhile, Antenor's brother or half-brother Alcahous—another son of Aesyetes, at any rate—is married to Aeneas's half-sister Hippodameia. This last relationship becomes particularly important at *Iliad* 13.430ff, when he is killed by Idomeneus and the Trojans rally behind Aeneas to protect the body of his brother-in-law, with whom he seems to have had a particularly close relationship:

ἀλλ' ἔπε', Ἀλκαθόωι ἐπαμύνομεν, ὅς σε πάρος γε  
γαμβρὸς ἐὼν ἔθρεψε δόμοις ἐνι τυτθὸν ἔόντα.

But come on, let's defend Alcahous, who at any rate in the old days was your brother-in-law and raised you in his house when you were little (*Il.* 13.465-66).

We get an unusual glimpse into the family life of Anchises in this passage; who his mortal wife was, and how many daughters they had, and whether this was all before or after the birth of Aeneas to Aphrodite is left in the dark. Nevertheless, we have a reference to at least one sister of his who was married to presumably a much older man, brother to the aged Antenor and a sort of father figure to the young Aeneas.<sup>183</sup> The Trojans and Dardanians are as adept as the historical Hittites at balancing the desire to keep to their own family group by fostering strong bonds, even marriages, between cousins, and the desire to expand their network of connections even further by marrying neighbors who bring both wealth and prestige; this is only one such connection of the first kind.<sup>184</sup> Furthermore, the connection solidifies the bonds between Aeneas and the Antenorids who are leading the Dardanian contingent along with him, a fact which deserves more attention—for it is significant in itself that these three men share a joint command.

---

<sup>182</sup> See Chapter 3, Section 2 above.

<sup>183</sup> Ages in epic are notoriously difficult to pin down.

<sup>184</sup> See Finkelberg (2002: 90ff) on the dynastic strategies at work here, which are common both to Hittite royal houses and to Greek mythological families.

It is hardly unusual, in the catalogue, to see a contingent led by more than one man. The Trojan side especially seems prone to share the command responsibility among multiple leaders, particularly if they are brothers. (We have seen Nastes and Amphimachus on the Carian side already.) Of the sixteen contingents in the Trojan catalogue, ten are led by pairs or triads of men; half of these pairs consists of two sons of the same father. In contrast, the twenty-nine contingents on the Greek side give multiple concurrent leaders only eight times—though the Boeotians help make up the difference by having no fewer than five named leaders.<sup>185</sup> There is little in the *Iliad* about how these command structures actually work in practice, a function of the poem's focus on the leaders' actions as opposed to those of the rank and file.<sup>186</sup> Such structures do, however, function in the catalogues as a way of defining the difference between the two sides: the collective Trojans versus the individual Achaeans. The bias on the Trojan side toward assigning multiple leaders to one contingent becomes an issue in the exegetical scholia, which see indications of political breakdown on the Trojan side in the way the Dardanian leadership is assigned. Aeneas, as the catalogue entry specifies, is the primary leader; yet two sons of Antenor, Archelochus and Acamas, are placed alongside him. These two men, it is further explained, have a particularly good knowledge of how battle works. The passage suggests that Archelochus and Acamas are assisting Aeneas to make up for his relative inexperience in war; he, as the son of Aphrodite, has the prestige, but they

---

<sup>185</sup> The larger scope and detail of the Catalogue of Ships necessarily means more explanation of the circumstances of each contingent's leadership. Thus I exclude the companies from Phylace and Methone from the dual-leadership column because we are explicitly told that Protesilaus from the former and Philoctetes from the latter have been replaced—whether this is by their co-leaders or by their seconds-in-command is unclear, but in any case both these groups have only one leader at the moment, however much they regret the loss of the one who, like Anactoria, is not here.

<sup>186</sup> See Van Wees (1986).

have the know-how, and so they are there to lend some military legitimacy to the leadership of the Dardanians that it would lack if Aeneas were left to his own devices.

There is something here to build court intrigue upon, and that is what the scholion has done. It has, unfortunately, given us just enough to tantalize:

ἴσως ὑποπτεύων Αἰνεΐαν <ὁ βασιλεὺς> τούτους αὐτῷ φύλακας ἔταξεν (Σ b ad 2.822).<sup>187</sup>

Perhaps it was out of suspicion of Aeneas that <the king> placed these men as guards over him.

There are two possible readings of this line: the less sinister is that these φύλακες are bodyguards for Aeneas—a task ultimately taken over in the *Iliad* by an entire coalition of gods who keep him alive to face his post-*Iliad* destiny despite his penchant for trouble. Or there is perhaps something more sinister going on, as the participle ὑποπτεύων suggests. This is a political word; Priam probably has more to suspect here than simply the competence of Aeneas. Indeed, he has many reasons to look askance: his cousin's goddess-born son is a potential threat to his rule and that of his sons. Furthermore, Aeneas has cause to resent Priam and the Priamids, as becomes clear in the section where his brother-in-law Alcahous, discussed above, is introduced. The hero has to be rallied to defend Alcahous's body since he is lurking at the back of the line in a state of positively Achillean sullenness:

... αἰεὶ γὰρ Πριάμοι ἐπεμήνιε δίοι,  
οὔνεκ' ἄρ' ἐσθλὸν ἔόντα μετ' ἀνδράσιν οὔ τι τίεσκεν (*Il.* 13.460-61).

For he was constantly wrathful towards glorious Priam,  
since, although he excelled among men, [Priam] didn't honor him at all.

---

<sup>187</sup> The supplement <ὁ βασιλεὺς> comes from Erbse's edition, via Eustathius; this textual issue will be explored in more detail below.

The verb is significant; we are invited to compare the μῆνις that drives the *Iliad* with this counterexample from the other side, where another man feels slighted and dishonored and is unwilling to fight.<sup>188</sup> A T scholion on this line presents both personal and political motivations for Aeneas' anger:

ἢ ὡς τῆς Ῥέας μνησιάσης Ἀλεξάνδρω. ἢ ὡς τιμωμένου ὑπὸ τῶν Τρώων· φησὶ γὰρ “Αἰνεΐας, ὃς Τρωσὶ θεὸς ὡς τίετο δῆμῳ” (Λ 58). οἱ δέ, ὅτι πολίτη τὴν ἀδελφὴν δέδωκεν Ἀλκάθῳ (cf. Ν 429)· καὶ γὰρ ἐγνωκῶς τὸν χρησμὸν (cf. Υ 307—8) οὐκ ἂν Αἰνεΐας ὑπερήσπισεν Ἔκτορος (cf. Υ 158—340), οὐ Κύπρις Ἀνδρομάχῃ παρέσχε τὴν ἄμπυκα (cf. Χ 470—2), οὐ τὸ σῶμα ἐφύλασσαν Ἔκτορος (cf. Ψ 185—7).

[Priam did not honor Aeneas] either because Rhea was enraged at Alexander, or because of the way Aeneas was honored among the Trojans, for Homer says, “Aeneas, who was honored among the Trojans as a god.” Some say it was because he gave his sister to a Trojan citizen, Alcahous. And in fact, if he had known about the prophecy, Aeneas would not have protected Hector, nor would Cypris have given Andromache the diadem, nor would he have guarded the body of Hector.

The reasons for Aeneas's anger at Priam and vice versa are difficult to untangle in this scholion, particularly with the confusing mention of Rhea. A very close parallel in Eustathius (942.15) makes it clear that Aphrodite, rather than her grandmother, is the goddess required here, and that she is not the one who is angry:

ἄλλοι δὲ μισεῖσθαι φασιν αὐτόν, ὡς τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἀφροδίτης ἐκμηνάσης τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον εἰς τὸν τῆς Ἑλένης ἔρωτα.

Others say Priam hated Aeneas on the grounds that his mother Aphrodite drove Alexander mad so that he loved Helen.<sup>189</sup>

Neither the Eustathius nor the scholion makes sense without the other, demonstrating that the tradition had become corrupt before it appears in either source. These sources, in

<sup>188</sup> An exegetical scholion deprives this verb of any force or meaning by glossing it as ἐμέμφοτο (bT *ad* 13.460). Janko (1985: 106) has noticed the parallel with Achilles but chalks it up to a common epic motif, that of the hero's withdrawal and return from battle, rather than a conscious echo.

<sup>189</sup> The word ἐκμηνάσης, “maddened,” recalls μνησιάσης in our scholion--certainly Aphrodite's push toward inexplicable behavior is more plausible here than Rhea's anger.

turn, represent two separate attempts at making it into something like sense, and both have failed. Yet the non-overlapping ways in which they have failed reveals what the original sense of the critical judgment must have been. Priam resents Aeneas because the hero's mother, Aphrodite, is to blame for the war's beginning in the first place, since she is the one who brought Paris and Helen together with disastrous results. Yet this is only one possible interpretation the T scholion gives. An array of further suggestions complicates the matter still more, particularly the second, which is unparalleled elsewhere. Somehow—and the syntax is still strained—either Priam or Aeneas is upset at Hippodameia's marriage to Alcahous, a "citizen." (Presumably this means a private citizen, rather than someone who moved in the first circles; yet, as Antenor's brother, Alcahous is as close to the Trojan elite as anyone can be.) The single political motivation that might plausibly be given for Aeneas's anger—at least as far as readers who know the Trojan cycle by heart are concerned—is removed here: the knowledge that he will be the one to survive the city's destruction and re-found the Trojan line elsewhere. The scholiast gives several arguments from *eikos* about how Aeneas could not have known this prophecy: both he and his mother would have acted very differently otherwise.<sup>190</sup> Presumably the reasoning, only sketchily fleshed out, is that an Aeneas who knew that Troy was doomed, and that he was not, would have even less of a personal stake in this war than he would have otherwise. This would be a psychologically brilliant motivation for his resentment toward the Trojan leadership, which had compelled him to get involved anyway and even nominally placed him at the

---

<sup>190</sup> The reasoning that Aphrodite would never have given Andromache a headdress to wear to her wedding is suspect. Homer's gods, while not omniscient in the strictest sense, have access to far more information than any of the mortals involved. If indeed Aphrodite had foreknowledge of the way the war would play out, this foreknowledge would not prevent her from giving a dramatically ironic gift to the doomed bride Andromache—a fine instance of the goddess's delight in manipulation.

head of an important contingent, but the scholion demonstrates its incompatibility with the attitude of the *Iliad*. The comparison between Aeneas and Achilles ends here: only one of them can see and choose his fate. Thus the scholiast points us to the first two reasons given for the strained relations between Aeneas and Priam: Aeneas's popularity with the Trojan rank and file and his mother's having caused the war in the first place. (Both, strangely, are given equal weight; surely the second is graver. This very culpability is perhaps what we are to imagine makes Aeneas's popularity rankle with Priam.)

We return therefore to the original scholion to the entry in the Trojan Catalogue, with its hint of suspicion between Aeneas and the Trojan command: ἴσως ὑποπτεύων Αἰνεΐαν <ὁ βασιλεὺς> τούτους αὐτῷ φύλακας ἔταξεν. (Σ b *ad* 2.822). It is revealing that Eustathius reads ὁ βασιλεὺς as the subject of the participle instead of a name.<sup>191</sup> Priam himself is not the emphasis here; it is simply his stylized official function that matters, his magisterial deputizing of two competent men to look after one whom he finds suspect. We have another classical and post-classical Greek perspective on the East offered here: the opulence of the Carians, the mercantile savvy of the Phrygians, and now the political scheming of the Dardanians. All the stereotypes are falling into place.

Alternatively, Hector appears to have the military command on the Trojan side, and he is as likely a candidate both for the assignment of Aeneas and for that of his guardians. The movement of the Trojan Catalogue is from center to periphery; we have the city itself, then the ethnic groups and contingents closest to it, and then the others, spiralling outwards until even the most distant Lycians and Carians are brought into the

---

<sup>191</sup> ἴσως γάρ, φασίν, ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑποπτεύων τὸν Αἰνεΐαν, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα δηλώσει πού ὁ ποιητής, φύλακας αὐτῷ συνέταξε (Eust. 1.552.23)

tidy lineup.<sup>192</sup> Aeneas is second only to Hector in the Catalogue; thus he is placed in enormously close geographical and social proximity to the “best of the Trojans.” It is easy enough to view Aeneas and his line as a threat to the Trojan succession at this point in the Trojan War saga, even if we have the benefit of hindsight and know that Hector and his son will perish at the hands of the Greeks, and Aeneas is left to carry on the Trojan line (almost) all by himself.

This particular bit of hindsight helps to explain the preoccupation with the Aeneadae examined in the previous chapter. If there is, in fact, a local family group in the Troad—at Scepis or elsewhere—claiming descent from Aeneas at any period in antiquity where the Homeric poems and their traditions were being formed, then the question of Aeneas’s threat to the usual pattern of Trojan succession is a very real one. The local traditions about the joint rule of Astyanax/Scamandrius and Ascanius at Scepis mean that this conflict potentially had a great deal of contemporary relevance to the purported descendants of Aeneas or Hector—or to the descendants of Antenor, whether in Libya or in Italy, for the traditions about Antenor’s post-war career are worth pursuing in themselves. It is significant for later readers of the poem that this branch of the Trojan royal lineage is the one involved with keeping Aeneas on the straight and narrow path.

The father of Archelochus and Acamas already appears in the *Iliad* as a proponent of peace with the Achaeans, even if it means returning Helen to Lacedaemon (*Iliad* 7.350-51)—effectively admitting to a Trojan mistake, even if he had no part in making it, and offering to rectify it even on terms that will be humiliating to his side. He is figured, in Danek’s terms, as someone who is parallel to Aeneas: they both bear no responsibility

---

<sup>192</sup> The contingents are clearly arranged with a sense of coherence and forethought, not haphazardly, whether as a mnemonic device or a hierarchy.

for the origins of the Trojan War, and they both will ultimately make it out alive to establish new cities for the Trojans in Italy.<sup>193</sup> In the aftermath of the Trojan War, the very fact of survival can be suspicious in itself. In the later traditions, the reasoning behind his survival (and sometimes that of Aeneas) is dramatically reinterpreted and he becomes culpable for the Trojans' destruction which he manages to flee; he is the man who opens the gates of Troy to the Achaeans and renders the city's fall even more overdetermined than it already was.<sup>194</sup> The tradition of Antenor's treachery was a lively one as far back as the late second century BCE, when the Roman historian L. Cornelius Sisenna, mostly lost to us, weighed in, according to Servius in his commentary on *Aeneid* 1.242:

sed hic non sine causa Antenoris posuit exemplum, cum multi evaserint Troianorum periculum...sed propter hoc, ne forte illud occurreret, iure hunc vexari tamquam proditorem patriae. elegit ergo similem personam; hi enim duo Troiam prodidisse dicuntur secundum Livium...et excusat Horatius dicens "ardentem sine fraude Troiam," hoc est, sine proditione. quae quidem excusatio non vacat; nemo enim excusat nisi rem plenam suspicionis. Sisenna tamen dicit solum Antenorem prodidisse. quem si velimus sequi, augemus exemplum; si regnat proditor, cur pius vagatur? ob hoc autem creditur Graecis Antenor patriam prodidisse.

But he [*sc.* Virgil] uses Antenor as an example for a reason (since many escaped the dangers of the Trojans)...but the reason was this: so that it would not by any chance occur to anyone that Aeneas is rightly accused of betraying his country. He selects, therefore, a similar character, for both of these men are said to have betrayed Troy according to Livy...and Horace excuses [them] saying, "Troy, burning without deception," which means "without betrayal." This is no idle excuse, since nobody excuses anything that isn't full of suspicion. Sisenna, however, says that only Antenor betrayed Troy. If we follow him, we make the comparison [*sc.* to Aeneas] even more pointed: if the betrayer becomes a king, why is the faithful man a wanderer? But for this reason Antenor is believed among the Greeks to have betrayed his country.

---

<sup>193</sup> Danek (2006): 6.

<sup>194</sup> See de Carlos (1994): 639.

Sisenna died in the Third Mithradatic War and is thus earlier than either Livy or Virgil, but the material with which he deals is relevant for both of them. Servius implies heavily that the debate at the time when Sisenna made his contribution was already not about whether Antenor betrayed Troy or not, but whether he had the help of Aeneas in so doing; his culpability is not questioned. The reason for this, in Servius' view, is simply that Antenor has a bad habit of trying to let Greeks go.<sup>195</sup> This is what makes the fact of his survival more suspicious than that of the other Trojans; when that suspicion spreads to Aeneas, it makes the Homeric association of the Antenorids with the leader of the Dardanians instantly more dubious—and, as Servius observes, things that require excuses are always suspicious.<sup>196</sup>

There is already a certain amount of suspicion in the interactions between Aeneas and Priam in the *Iliad*, yet the later tradition, full of treachery and backstabbing, that grew up around it makes sense in the context of the later history of Asia Minor and its interactions with the Greeks. The Dardanians are impossible, either geographically or ethnographically, to distinguish from the Trojans; we must instead distinguish them politically. The whiff of treason that clings to both Antenor and Aeneas, the leaders of the Dardanian faction, arises from their anti-war and pro-Greek tendencies—both unforgivable from the point of view of the Trojan establishment, and therefore good reason to treat this group of Trojans as something other than fully Trojan, despite their

---

<sup>195</sup> *quia...et auctor reddendae Helenae fuit et legatos ob hoc venientes suscepit hospitio, et Ulixem mendici habitu agnitum non prodidit* (Serv. in *Aen.* 1.242). The story of Odysseus infiltrating Troy as a beggar occurs at *Odyssey* 4.249-256, but there it is Helen alone (οἴη, 250) who recognizes him and sends him safely on his way. See also Ovid, *Met.* 13.200-201 for Ulysses' own version of his role as a legate: *accusoque Parin praedamque Helenamque reposco/ et moveo Priamum Priamoque Antenora iunctum* (I accuse Paris and ask for the return of Helen and his plunder, and I move Priam and Antenor, Priam's kinsman).

<sup>196</sup> Various sons of Antenor are said in our sources to have escaped Troy with him and joined in the founding of Padua, but not these two; Archelochus perishes gruesomely at the hands of Telamonian Ajax at *Il.* 14.464-468, and Acamas dies instantly of a wounded shoulder courtesy of Meriones at 16.342-344.

lineage. What makes the Dardanians so ripe for this kind of interpretation is precisely their inability to be distinguished from the Trojans in any other terms. Just as not all the descendants of Zeus are descendants of Hellen and therefore Greeks to a classical Greek audience, so not all descendants of Dardanus necessarily choose to call themselves Dardanians in the *Iliad*. Troy itself may be called Dardania and its landmarks equally so, but the two groups are separate enough in Homer that we can see them as remnants lingering in the historical consciousness—perhaps through autochthonous oral traditions that the Greeks encountered when they moved into Aeolis and Ionia—of a split in the Trojan royal house itself, in which genealogy is adapted to reflect politics. It is only later, in Pindar and tragedy, that the words Dardanian and Trojan are used interchangeably to refer to Priam and his offspring; in Homer, the Dardanians seem to be a separate family group within the city of Troy itself, occupying no particular lands of their own but coexisting more or less peacefully with the other branch of the family group. When, as in the case of Aeneas's resentment against Priam in *Iliad* 14, their coexistence tends toward the less peaceful, it only becomes clearer that the Dardanians are the Trojans' *doppelgängers* who ruin everything with their potential for ultimate disruption, their friendly overtures toward the Greeks, and their disturbing ability to survive.

#### **4. The allies who weren't there**

This discussion has focused so far on three distinct groups of Trojan allies mentioned in the catalogue, and the reason is simple: they receive quite a disproportionate amount of attention in ancient scholarship. The Carians provide an

opportunity to discuss language and colonization in Asia Minor; the Phrygians manage to take over Trojan identity (not to mention the Trojan economy) through a process of synecdoche that is already beginning in the classical period; and the Dardanians turn out to be doublets of the Trojan royal family in themselves. None of the other contingents in the Trojan catalogue have quite such interesting stories; the ones whose locations and identity are discussed fall easily into the pattern of one of the three most interesting contingents. Consider another group of Trojans, mentioned briefly in the introduction to this chapter:

Οἱ δὲ Ζέλειαν ἔναιον ὑπαὶ πόδα νεΐατον Ἴδης  
 ἀφνειοὶ πίνοντες ὕδωρ μέλαν Αἰσῆποιο  
 Τρῶες, τῶν αὐτ' ἦρχε Λυκάονος ἀγλαὸς υἱὸς  
 Πάνδαρος, ᾧ καὶ τόξον Ἀπόλλων αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν (*Iliad* 2.824-827)

And those who lived in Zeleia, under the farthest foot of Ida,  
 rich people drinking the dark water of the Aesepus,  
 Trojans: these were led by the glorious son of Lycaon,  
 Pandarus, to whom Apollo himself had given a bow.

The scholia seem mainly concerned with glossing τόξον as τοξεία (Apollo confers the gift of archery; he does not go around handing out armaments to random mortals) and explaining the strange form of ὑπαὶ. One b scholion, however, tackles the issue of what Τρῶες means in this passage:

Πάνδαρος οὗτος ὁ Λυκάονος ἠγεῖτο τῶν ἐκ Ζελείας, ὧν τὴν μὲν χώραν καλεῖ Λυκίαν, τοὺς δὲ οἰκήτορας Τρῶας.

This Pandarus son of Lycaon led the contingent from Zeleia, whose land he calls Lycia, but the inhabitants (or colonists) Trojans.

The scholion makes explicit something that was implicit in Homer: this is a group of Lycians, with some caveats: foremost, they are distinct from Sarpedon's Lycians,

mentioned at 2.876-77.<sup>197</sup> The commentator probably calls the land Lycia from the leader's patronymic, Lycaon; though when Pandarus exults over wounding Diomedes, he calls his homeland Lycia (*Iliad* 5.105).<sup>198</sup> This other Lycian contingent is called Trojan, though they clearly live elsewhere (and the geographical location is precisely marked, unlike that of the Dardanians), they are led by a grandson of Priam, and they inhabit a land that is not named for them. That they are called οικήτορας suggests that they may have colonized it: the word is used in this sense by both Thucydides (2.27 and 3.92) and Polybius (3.100.4). This would be a distinctively Greek way of interpreting a phase in Troy's development; looking to increase its wealth, it expands outward and occupies lands beyond its own city, creating sets of people with shifting and overlapping identities, at once Trojan and Lycian. This contingent looks more and more like the reflection of the Dardanians. They are called Trojans rather than having their own ethnonym, as the Dardanians do; and yet they have a distinct location—the sort of thing the Dardanians abandoned at the founding of Troy. Moreover, it is the ancestral home of Trojans generally. There is nothing like the kind of sustained discussion we see regarding the Dardanians, but only a chance mention lucky enough to have been preserved. The parallel nevertheless serves to reinforce the kind of category Aeneas's Dardanians and Pandarus's Lycians occupy: at the boundary between Trojan and non-Trojan, they invite ancient readers to consider what being Trojan actually means.

---

<sup>197</sup> Sarpedon's Lycians have a distinct geographical origin; they come from far off (τηλόθεν), unlike Pandarus's men from the nearby foothills of Ida.

<sup>198</sup> An A scholion to this line indicates that Aristarchus marked this line ὅτι τῆς Τρωικῆς Λυκίας, suggesting that the relationship between the two places was considered problematic by some readers. This interpretation—that Lycia is part of Trojan territory—allows Pandarus to claim either Lycian or Trojan identity at will.

Other minor Trojan contingents are used to consider the general theme of Easterners' relations with the Greeks. Thus the mention of Sestos and Abydos at *Iliad* 2.836 is an excuse for the D scholia to repeat the Herodotean story of Xerxes crossing the Hellespont on a bridge of boats, a vignette which has little immediate relevance to Asius son of Hyrtacus—painstakingly differentiated by Aristarchus from the Asius who is Hecuba's brother—but continues to reinforce ancient readers' cyclical view of history.<sup>199</sup> Asia invades Greece; Greece invades Asia; the same thing is repeated in later generations, with the names of the generals and the women being abducted changed—a motif familiar from the programmatic beginning of Herodotus's *Histories*.<sup>200</sup>

Another aspect of Greek-Asian interactions surfaces in the discussion of the Pelasgians from Larisa, who have a different set of issues to deal with when it comes to Greeks, as a b scholion on *Iliad* 2.841 suggests:

ταύτην οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν Αἰολίδων μεταναστάντες ἔκτισαν· διὸ Πελασγούς φησιν, ὡς ἄνωθεν Ἑλληνας ὄντας. καὶ μετὰ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν σῶσαι τὰ στοιχεῖα μόνους Ἑλλήνων φασιν.

This place [Larisa] was founded by Aeolid migrants. Therefore he calls them Pelasgians, since they are Greek by descent, and people say that after the Deluge, they alone among the Greeks preserved letters.

The Pelasgians, from Larisa, appear to be suffering from an identity crisis of their own; if they are being viewed as transplanted Greeks, then they have been co-opted into fighting against their own side. Geographically, the placement of this entry suggests that these

<sup>199</sup> On Hecuba's brother: Σ A ad *Iliad* 2.837-838: ὅτι ὁ Ἄσιος οὗτος ὁμώνυμός ἐστι τῷ Ἐκάβης ἀδελφῷ (cf. *Iliad* 16.717). ἐσημειοῦτο δὲ ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος τὰς ὁμωνυμίας πρὸς τὰ <περὶ> Πυλαιμένους. καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἐπανάληψιν, ὅτι πλεονάζει ἐν Ἰλιάδι: “[The line is marked] because this Asius has the same name as Hecuba's brother. Aristarchus also signalled the problem of two characters with the same name in reference to the lines about Pylaemenes. He also marked this line on account of the *epanalepsis*, because the poet repeats himself in the *Iliad*.” When two characters in the poem have the same name, the implication is, this is an issue deserving of critical attention; instead of considering it a textual problem, however, Aristarchus points out that this potential problem is not without parallel in the *Iliad*.

<sup>200</sup> In this context, the name Asius should be viewed as significant.

Pelasgians are located on the Hellespont, between the party from Sestos and Abydus, which precedes them, and the Thracian Hellespontine party, which follows; yet a D scholion on the same line glosses Larisa as a “city in Thessaly.” There are, of course, any number of Laris(s)as: Strabo mentions eleven of them.<sup>201</sup> The poet and the commentators both seem confused as to who these Pelasgians are and where they are supposed to live; I argue that this represents not a critical research failure, but a response to the confusion that arose from the number and variety of groups that the Greeks considered Pelasgian, and their possible status as Greek, pre-Greek, or anti-Greek peoples. Strabo (5.2.4) uses this passage as the basis for claiming that there was a group of Pelasgians from Lesbos, whose historic ties to Troy have already been noted. If these are the Homeric Pelasgians, what we have here is perhaps an issue of re-interpreting the distant past in light of the less distant past, and of reconciling local traditions—perhaps the inhabitants of the region in Strabo’s day claimed Aeolic descent, no unlikely situation in the light of Asia’s Greek colonization—with Homer’s intractable uncertainties.<sup>202</sup> Framing these Pelasgians as Greeks displaced by natural disaster but bearing fragments of their tradition with them to the Troad points up how hard it is not only to differentiate one batch of Trojans from another in antiquity, but also to differentiate them from the Greeks. This perhaps explains the scholiastic reticence on the topic; Strabo is ultimately reluctant to pin down this group of Trojan allies too carefully, despite the earlier suggestion that some Pelasgians are from Lesbos:

Πλείους δ’ εἰσὶ λόγοι περὶ τῶν Καυκῶνων· καὶ γὰρ Ἀρκαδικὸν ἔθνος  
 φασί, καθάπερ τὸ Πελασγικόν, καὶ πλανητικὸν ἄλλως, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνο.

---

<sup>201</sup> ΣD *ad Iliad* 9.440.

<sup>202</sup> Elsewhere (7.7.10) Strabo is similarly cagey about identifying who he thinks the ancient Pelasgians were, except that they were the oldest group of people to rule Hellas: οἱ δὲ Πελασγοὶ τῶν περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα δυναστευσάντων ἀρχαιότατοι λέγονται.

ἱστορεῖ γοῦν ὁ ποιητὴς καὶ τοῖς Τρωσὶν ἀφιγμένους συμμάχους, πόθεν δ' οὐ λέγει (8.3.17).

There are plenty of stories about the Caucones; some say they are an Arcadian people, like the Pelasgians, and given to wander anyway, like that people. For the poet says that they even ended up as allies of the Trojans, but he doesn't say where they came from.<sup>203</sup>

In the end, he is unwilling to identify the Homeric Pelasgians too fully with the ones from Lesbos and resorts to admitting it is impossible to know where this group of allies came from. We are thrown back into intractable uncertainties.

These are fleeting glances only at the groups of Trojan allies concerned; in most cases, we get a geographic gloss or so but no extended discussion of who these allies actually are. In fact, only three groups receive any extended scrutiny in the scholia at all, and they are the ones around which this discussion has centered: the Carians, Phrygians, and Dardanians. In the end, the modern conception of the Trojan catalogue—that it is a smaller, less interesting, less knowable version of the Greek catalogue—turns out to reflect the ancient conception. The volume of scholia on this section of Book 2 is markedly less than that on the Catalogue of Ships, though we are fortunate to have a papyrus fragment of a commentary on these lines (P. Oxy. 1086, cited in section 4 of this chapter on the Dardanian problem). The very existence of this fragment should clue us in that it is dangerous to speculate too far about the quantity of this or that: anything we have must be viewed in the light of a chance survival. Nonetheless, it is significant that there is a great deal more material on the Greek side than the Trojan. If Homer is always

---

<sup>203</sup> It is probable that Strabo is talking about the Pelasgians here as allies of the Trojans, rather than Caucones; the latter have no entry in the catalogue, though they are mentioned at the little “catalogue” of Trojan allies that Dolon gives Odysseus at *Iliad* 10.427ff. This catalogue has other inconsistencies with the Trojan catalogue; the Leleges are differentiated from the Carians, for instance, yet the section on the Carians above discusses how they are framed as successors of the Leleges in that region—meaning that either one group has superseded the other, or that they are one and the same.

philhellene, so are his commentators; they are less interested in the intricacies of the enemy side in this combat, except for the faithful Demetrius of Scepsis and his thirty books on the Trojan catalogue—much of which, in the fragments remaining to us, does not appear to have been directly about said catalogue anyway. If we can gauge scholarly interest across the centuries of ancient Homeric criticism from what remains to us, however, we can see interest in these disparate enemy groups picking up where there is a conflict with the larger Trojan side to be had. The Carians and their bizarre language—which, in some readings, proves to be a bastardized version of Greek rather than a different tongue entirely—provide an entry point into discussion of the ethnic groups jockeying for position in Asia Minor and the linguistic confusion that results. Other languages are briefly brought up in discussions of organizing the Trojan side as a whole, but the strange *hapax legomenon* “barbarian-voiced” creates an entirely new set of problems for those of Homer’s readers who want to believe he has no barbarians by that name; recasting the Carians as Cretans who have failed at preserving their Greek language intact sidesteps this confusion, even while they are allowed to take on stereotypically barbarian characteristics such as effeminacy and a love of finery. The Phrygians, meanwhile, are interested in gold for other reasons: despite their close dynastic ties with the Trojan royal family, they are undermining the city’s famed prosperity by buying off their treasured heirlooms so that the Trojans, exhausted by the long siege, can afford to conduct their war and keep their allies from revolting. Thus they reveal the cracks in Trojan unity even more deeply than the Carians do. Phrygia is wealthy and indisputably real, yet its people are gradually conflated in later readings of Homer until “Phrygian” is little but a synonym for “Trojan.” The dissonance that is

created when this interpretation is read back onto the speech of Hector where the economic tensions between the two groups are explored: ultimately it is the group of allies we can expect to be closest to the Trojans, both by birth and by the historical associations that render them synonymous, who destabilize them in the most subtle and lasting ways. The Dardanians' political tensions with the ruling house of Troy are more evident: they also share close kinship ties, yet the appointment of two other men to assist Aeneas in leading the Dardanians is recast as a maneuver on Priam's part to neutralize a faction that is possibly offensive to him, or simply a relative who is too popular to be trusted. Either way, Aeneas and his fellow Dardanians, most notably Antenor, become associated with Troy's betrayal in the end; the personal reasons that Aeneas has for resenting Priam in the *Iliad* thus become more and more political with each successive layer of re-reading.

The overlap between myth and politics, especially as regards the Trojan War, is nothing new; yet previous studies have focused on Greeks' own self-perceptions about this war. Irad Malkin has highlighted the importance of "shared foundational historical experience" in the formation of Hellenic identity, but the formation of Trojan identity must necessarily serve as a counterpoint to that of the Greeks.<sup>204</sup> The role that this war played for later Greeks in defining the differences between themselves and the "barbarians," as a more or less homogeneous but always hostile group, must not be underestimated. Yet the examples of Trojan subgroups scrutinized here shows that these barbarians never were a unified group in the Greek imagination. Hence the disproportionate interest among ancient scholars in the particular sets of Trojan allies where the cracks in their cohesion as a military and cultural force show most plainly.

---

<sup>204</sup> Malkin (2003): 66.

They elaborate more on the Homeric text—at least in what remains to us—in areas of special interest; thus the linguistic, economic, and ideological fissures among the Trojans come to the fore in discussions of their identity. The definition of one group's identity against another's is no new concept; as previously discussed, Thucydides recognized the inevitability of this process. Thus the poem's picture of the Greeks relies on the picture it paints of the Trojans; the eagerness with which ancient scholarship seized on the disunities of the Trojans provides a way of reading a poem about Greek dysfunctionality as, ultimately, philhellene.

## Chapter IV. Finding Hellas

Κι ο ποιητής αργοπορεί κοιτάζοντας τις πέτρες κι αναρωτιέται  
υπάρχουν άραγε  
And the poet lingers, looking at the stones, and asks himself  
do they really exist  
George Seferis, “The King of Asine”

We have moved gradually outward from Troy, where this examination of the geographies of the *Iliad* rightfully started—moving from the center, in the city on a rocky hill centered on its temple of Athena and ringed with walls, to the whole of Asia, where it drew its allies and its resources, and now to places that are only mentioned in passing in the *Iliad*, but which resonate in the consciousness of each character on both sides: the Greek world, which itself constructed the geographies under discussion. Greece and the islands are the homes of the heroes, appearing in the *Iliad* only as brief flashes of nostalgia or entries in the Catalogue of Ships; the following discussion will draw on both, but primarily the Catalogue of Ships, the most comprehensive and complete survey of what the Greek world of the *Iliad* looked like.

It is by now a truism that ancient readers found Homeric catalogues infinitely more compelling than modern readers, who are prone to regard them as an intrusion into

an otherwise exciting narrative.<sup>205</sup> And, for a truism, it is frequently accurate. Whether one explains the Catalogue of Ships—the most lengthy and glaring intrusion in the poem—as an ancient survival, a later interpolation, a crucial component of Homeric narrative, a dull digression that can easily be skimmed or skipped, or a flashback to the beginning of the war, it is quite evidently something other than the main narrative. It has generally been so treated in modern scholarship. Up until fairly recently, its primary interest for modern scholars lay in its ability to answer Homeric questions, if not the Homeric Question itself. Simply put, the Catalogue of Ships supplies a large and reasonably well-organized sample set for anyone looking to determine where, when, and how the *Iliad* was composed. Its linguistic and metrical features, and most of all, its array of personal and place names (which can be checked and re-checked against the historical and archaeological evidence), all lend themselves to being used more as evidence for some other point about the origins of the poem itself—even, in the heyday of Analysis, the Catalogue’s purported origins apart from the poem itself—than as a body of literary material in its own right, capable of aesthetic appreciation and analysis with a small *a*.

Consider a few examples of this trend in scholarship on the Catalogue. Hope Simpson and Lazenby are still widely cited as the major work in English, but their archaeology is relatively dated by this point and, more crucially, its focus is on proving their theory of the Catalogue’s Mycenaean origin; any evidence from ancient scholarship that tends against this conclusion is, therefore, thrown out wholesale.<sup>206</sup> A decade

---

<sup>205</sup> See, for instance Plato, *Hippias Major* (285c-d): the Spartans, according to Hippias, love listening to stories of heroic genealogies and foundations.

<sup>206</sup> Mabel Lang perceptively remarks on this tendency in a contemporary review: “When the authors say ‘assuming these identifications to be wrong, since they would make nonsense of the Catalogue’ (p. 142), they show how unconsciously they have assumed what has yet to be proved: that the ‘poetic’ sense of the Catalogue (in terms of its position and function in the tradition) is no guarantee of its historical or geographical sense but may be quite literally non-sense...” (1972: 602-603). In other words, their criterion

previously, Adalberto Giovannini had argued precisely the opposite: that the Catalogue makes no sense when compared to the map of Mycenaean Greece, and that it better reflects the seventh century and later. His argument relies heavily on ancient scholarship—or rather on the strange gaps and silences in ancient scholarship. When Strabo does not know how to locate a place (a situation that will become important later on in this chapter), that is a clue to the fundamental mutability of the landscape—a mutability not checked by the reintroduction of written record-keeping into the Greek world.<sup>207</sup>

The most recent large work on the catalogue is Edzard Visser's 1997 *Habilitationsschrift*, which is a monumental survey of all the major outstanding issues in scholarship on the Catalogue: its date, its method of composition, and its unity with the rest of the *Iliad*. Visser's conclusions are largely in the service of the alternative view of oral composition that he offers. Rather than calling the elements of the metrical lines *formulae* in the traditional Parryite sense, he prefers to identify three elements: metrical determinants (single words, usually the proper nouns), variables (usually verbs and conjunctions), and free elements (usually epithets).<sup>208</sup> Thus a line such as *Iliad* 2.646, οἱ Κνώσον τ' εἶχον Γόρτυνά τε τειχιόεσσαν (those who held Cnossus and walled Gortyn) falls into a type that has many parallels within the Catalogue, defined by the interplay between the two proper nouns, the verb, and the epithet that is applied to the second of the proper nouns.<sup>209</sup> Visser's argument is that his own theory is more flexible than the traditional formular systems and is therefore better equipped to handle anomalies such as

---

for geographical accuracy is the Catalogue itself, which does not take into account the many ways in which it is not, nor does it pretend to be, a treatise.

<sup>207</sup> Giovannini 1969: 14

<sup>208</sup> 1997.50.

<sup>209</sup> See *ibid.* 56 for a full list of the verses of this type in Visser's *schema*.

the Catalogue of Ships; this observation, in turn, is used in the service of demonstrating that the Catalogue can be original to the poem, because the earliest stages of the poetic tradition had both the tools and the geographical know-how to make it fit in.<sup>210</sup>

Fundamentally, what all three of these approaches share is an effort to localize a Homer somewhere in space and time, and to mine the Catalogue for historical details that would presumably prove the same. They effectively privilege Homer as a source of historical information—in a way that should be familiar to any reader of ancient scholarship. Yet the Catalogue of Ships has more to offer than merely confirmation of various theories on oral composition and poetics. In this chapter, I intend to go beyond the traditional approaches to the Catalogue of Ships. These approaches have tended to make it seem like something other than the main narrative, separate from the rest of the *Iliad* (even if not, as the analytical approach suggests, actually a different section uneasily grafted in). Rather, I propose reading the Catalogue through Homeric scholarship to discover the ways in which later audiences, both scholarly and non-scholarly, used it—in effect, to go beyond the truism that ancient audiences loved catalogue poetry and pinpoint more precisely the reasons that they did—particularly the major reason ancient scholarship gives for valuing the Catalogue of Ships highly, its real-world utility and concrete demonstration that Homer was a good source of information about the heroic world that they are trying to reconstruct.

This technique has been approached from the angle of catalogue poetry more generally in a recent book by Benjamin Sammons. His reading of this and the other Homeric catalogues is that, by amplifying pre-existing narrative structures, they are used

---

<sup>210</sup> His judgment—that Homer had “sehr konkrete Kenntnisse” of Greece in his own period, interpreted in the light of heroic myth—is a sound one, grounded in a minute and painstaking survey of the types of information included in the Catalogue (*ibid.*: 746).

not only “to explore some of the problems inherent to epic as a genre,” but also to construct the heroic world, foreign and lost to the past, for the original audience.<sup>211</sup> His goal, in fact, is to situate the *Iliad* within a larger poetic and narrative continuity, and his argument is that the catalogues’ brief step outside the narrative structure of the poem does just that by referring to events, places, and persons that could not fit inside the *Iliad*, vast as it is. The Catalogue of Ships fits into this schema beautifully. As a way of bringing the places of Greece into the *Iliad*, where otherwise they would not fit, they help to create a fuller world for the poem—and a more familiar one for many segments of the poem’s Greek audience, who would supply the ellipses in the poetic list with their own knowledge of the mainland and islands, and take pleasure in doing so.

The term “world-building,” a staple in fantasy and gaming circles, is not in much currency among classicists, probably because it tends to be used from the author’s perspective: the creator of a fantasy setting has to make the rules that his or her texts will subsequently follow. Yet the process is repeated again by everyone who encounters the setting and has to deduce its rules according to the information pieced out in the text. Thus casual readers and serious scholars of classical literature alike have to engage in this type of world-building. As classicists, we start from the idea that all the worlds we work with actually existed once, and that we are merely reconstructing them with the literary and archaeological remains that remain to us--deducing what they must have been like based on the evidence we have. But in reconstructing a lost heroic age, a great deal of ingenuity is required. What we are doing, and what ancient audiences were doing, in looking at the *Iliad* is not, in fact, so different from what readers of fantasy or historical novels have to do; the best authors show the audience bit by bit what they need to know

---

<sup>211</sup> Sammons 2010: 140.

about the world they are encountering, and the audience has to do the work of putting it together. The element of fantasy in both geography and history is at first glance antithetical to both disciplines; Mycenae, for instance, is somewhere, and actual things happened there that we can know about. Yet any attempt, by Homer or Strabo, to systematize this information inevitably brings with it some distortion, to the point where a modern geographer has traced the discipline's tendency to become "hyperreal and unreal even when it strives to be most prosaic, when it sticks to factual minutiae and is loaded with a surfeit of place-name and statistical information."<sup>212</sup>

It is perhaps most of all in this sense that Homer is, as Eratosthenes asserted, a geographer.<sup>213</sup> The Catalogue appears in this light like an attempt to dazzle with detail, with a surfeit of names and numbers to work its magic on the listener or reader. Any scholar, ancient or modern, trying to draw out historical and geographical information about the times and places presented in the Catalogue necessarily has to do a great deal of interpretation and selection. Not every detail is going to be notable or paradigmatic.

With our perspective on the late Bronze Age and forward, we can pinpoint to some degree (not entirely, which is why traditional scholarship on the Catalogue still flourishes) which aspects of the heroic culture Homer describes have a grounding in contemporary realities and which are extrapolation on the part of the poet or the poetic tradition. Later audiences, in any case, are well aware that they live in a different cultural setting than Homer's heroes; this is part of the reason why they enjoy Homer to begin with. The process of world-building involves establishing the general rules regarding how

---

<sup>212</sup> Tuan 1990: 141.

<sup>213</sup> οἱ τε γὰρ πρῶτοι θαρρήσαντες αὐτῆς ἄψασθαι τοιοῦτοί τινες ὑπῆρξαν, Ὅμηρός τε καὶ Ἀναξίμανδρος ὁ Μιλήσιος καὶ Ἑκαταῖος, ὁ πολίτης αὐτοῦ, καθὼς καὶ Ἐρατοσθένης φησί (those who first dared to grasp [the discipline of geography] were men such as Homer and Anaximander of Miletus and his compatriot Hecataeus, just as Eratosthenes says): Strabo 1.1.1.

characters interact with each other, creating a map of the world they inhabit, and generally reconstructing the milieu that the author created. It is a challenging process, because this world largely has to be elucidated through the information that the poem itself provides. When Porphyry neatly sums up the interpretive method of Aristarchus as “clarifying Homer through Homer” (Ὁμηρον ἐξ Ὁμήρου σαφηνίζειν), this process of using Homeric situations to interpret other Homeric situations is quite frequently what he is talking about.<sup>214</sup> The poems themselves define the relationship between the places they present. Messene is (they argue) its own entity in the Homeric poems, subject to Lacedaemon under Menelaus, but not yet the home of a helot population; Athens is a blip on the radar, notable only for its leader’s logistical skill; Miletus is Trojan-allied, not Greek—hence both ancient and modern attempts to determine when the Catalogue was composed, that it should offer such a view of the Greek world. In this chapter, I offer instead an alternative question: why these ancient attempts? What does the question of the Catalogue’s original context and purpose offer for the scholars of antiquity? The answer is to be found in what they tried to do with Homer: create a coherent, normative map of the Greek world as it appears in the *Iliad* and, to a lesser extent, the *Odyssey*, and reinterpret their own world by means of this map, placing Homer at the head of their research tradition.

The following discussion is, out of necessity, more heavily dependent on case studies than either of the previous chapters, and many entries in the Catalogue of Ships have had to go by the wayside. In this chapter I hope to offer an analysis of how the ancient critics used the places mentioned in the Catalogue to build a Homeric landscape--the sociology as well as the geography of the Greek world that the characters in the *Iliad*

---

<sup>214</sup> *HQ* I 56.3-6; see MacPhail 2010: 5.

have left behind. This does not purport to be an exhaustive treatment of the Catalogue of Ships--and indeed, it is my aim to show that not every treatment of this important part of the *Iliad* has to be exhaustive, but that targeted strikes can be an effective way of elucidating some of the strategies that ancient readers used for dealing with something so vast that it would take ten hearts to compose.

## 1. Salamis and the biographies: Homer's knowledge

A great deal of what we see happening in the scholia entries on the Catalogue of Ships is an attempt to define the ways in which the Homeric world from which each contingent comes is different from the geopolitical scene in the Greek world at any period in which students of Homer are working. Thus discussions of where place names originated, why a particular man is supposed to be the leader of a particular contingent, or how alliances have shifted between one period and another are issues of Homeric world-building that still have lively implications for later readers of the texts. Not only are they trying to recreate a vanished world, but, as it turns out, they are also trying to align their own world with it through antiquarian efforts.

The degree to which this attempt is made explicit surfaces particularly in one b scholion placed at the beginning of the Catalogue of Ships:

οὕτω δὲ ἡδὺς καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῆς ὁ Κατάλογος, ὥστε καὶ πόλεις ἀμφισβητοῦσαι τοῖς Ὀμήρου ἔπεσι χρῶνται. Καλυδῶνα μὲν Αἰτωλοῖς ἐχαρίσατο ἀμφισβητοῦσι πρὸς Αἰολέας, μνησθεὶς αὐτῆς ἐν Αἰτωλῶν καταλόγῳ (*Il.* 2.640). Ἄβυθνοὶ δὲ Σηστὸν παρὰ Ἀθηναίων ἐκομίσαντο διὰ τοῦτο τὸ ἔπος· “καὶ Σηστὸν καὶ Ἄβυδον ἔχον καὶ δῖαν Ἀρίσβην” (*Il.* 2.836). Μιλησίοις δὲ πρὸς Πριηνεῖς ὑπὲρ Μυκαλησ<σ>οῦ διαφερομένοις ἤρκεσε πρὸς νίκην τὰ ἔπη ταῦτα· “οἱ Μίλητον ἔχον Φθειρῶν τ’ ὄρος ἀκριτόφυλλον / Μαϊάνδρου τε ῥοὰς Μυκάλης τ’ αἰπεινὰ κάρηνα” (*Il.* 2.868-9). καὶ Σόλων τὴν Σαλαμίνα Ἀθηναίοις ἀπένειμε διὰ τὸ “Αἴας δ’ ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν δυοκαίδεκα νῆας” (*Il.* 2.557), προσθεὶς τὸ “στῆσε δ’ ἄγων

ἴν' Ἀθηναίων ἴσταντο φάλαγγες” (558) καίτοι Μεγαρέων ἀντεχομένων τῆς νήσου (Σb ad 2.494-877)

So pleasant and magnificent is the Catalogue that even cities use the words of Homer in their disputes. Calydon was granted to the Aetolians when they disputed with the Aeolians, in remembrance of its place in the Catalogue of the Aetolians. The people of Abydus took Sestus from the Athenians because of this verse: “And they had Sestus and Abydus and glorious Arisbe.” These words helped the Milesians against the Prienians when they disputed over Mykalessos: “they who held Miletos and the leaf-tipped mountain of Phtheira, the streams of the Meander and the tall heights of Mycale.” Solon also allotted Salamis to the Athenians because of the line, “Ajax led twelve ships from Salamis,” followed by the line, “and led them to stand where the ranks of the Athenians stood”—even though the Megarians made a rival claim to the island.

This is the exegetical scholia at their most expansive—and elusive. Its whirlwind tour of claims made about places in the Catalogue fueling border disputes between (mostly) Greek cities shows the variety of non-scholarly uses to which Homer could be put—which is particularly interesting since they are being drawn up like so many footsoldiers to prove an aesthetic point. How pleasant (ἡδύς) and awesome in its scope (μεγαλοπρεπής) is the Catalogue? The answer is that it continued to have geopolitical significance outside the heroic age and outside the Greek world. This is an aesthetic judgment transposed into a variety of different spheres, and a use of Homer that would have suited Ion the rhapsode.<sup>215</sup> And yet, despite the thickheadedness of that particular interlocutor, the notion that both aesthetic pleasure and suitable grandeur could be transposed into utility is very much within Plato’s scope, and it is an idea we have already seen informing Greek scholarship. The discussions of *psychagogia* in chapter 2 center around the relationship between emotional response and underlying motive—in

---

<sup>215</sup> ΣΩ: ἦ και στρατηγός, ὃ Ἴων, τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἄριστος εἶ; ΙΩΝ: εὖ ἴσθι, ὃ Σώκρατες· καὶ ταῦτά γε ἐκ τῶν Ὀμήρου μαθὼν (*Ion* 541b). Socrates: “So, Ion, you’re also the best general of the Greeks?” Ion: “You know it, Socrates! And I learned it all from Homer’s poems.”

other words, the way in which any source of pleasure or pain can be manipulated in order to have a certain effect. This scholion provides an unusually concrete set of examples.

The case of Sestus and Abydos is particularly interesting. These are two non-Greek cities, and they are not Greek in the catalogue; the entry referred to here is from the Trojan catalogue, and both cities, located on the Hellespont with convenient access to Troy, belong to Asius, the son of Hyrtacus (*Iliad* 2.835-39). What the Greeks think of their coexistence is therefore completely irrelevant for everyone inside the poem. So much for the heroic period; in the classical period, the question of their allegiances is a very lively one—not least because in this scholion, one group of Greeks is using Homer to wrest a city out of the Trojan catalogue away from another group of Greeks. The more one tries to pin this event to some kind of a historical context, the more elusive it becomes. Strabo is apparently of two minds about where these cities belong and when they were founded:

Ἄβυδος δὲ Μιλησίων ἐστὶ κτίσμα ἐπιτρέψαντος Γύγου τοῦ Λυδῶν βασιλέως: [...] Σηστός δὲ ἀρίστη τῶν ἐν Χερρονήσῳ πόλεων· διὰ δὲ τὴν γειτοσύνην ὑπὸ τῷ αὐτῷ ἡγεμόνι καὶ αὕτη ἐτέτακτο, οὕτω ταῖς ἡπεῖροις διοριζόντων τῶν τότε τὰς ἡγεμονίας. ἢ μὲν οὖν Ἄβυδος καὶ ἡ Σηστός διέχουσιν ἀλλήλων τριάκοντά που σταδίους ἐκ λιμένου εἰς λιμένα (*Geography* 13.1.22).

Abydos is a foundation of the Milesians, made by permission of Gyges, king of the Lydians....Sestus, meanwhile, is the best of the cities in the Chersonese. Because of their proximity, it was assigned to the same governor as Abydos, since governorships had not yet been divided up by continents. Abydos and Sestus are about thirty stadia distant from each other, harbor to harbor.

Strabo is analyzing a situation where politics and geography do not mesh comfortably; thus the two cities, three and a half miles apart, are either linked by proximity or divided by the Hellespont, according to the caprices of various periods' reckoning. Which periods

are involved, on the other hand, is a difficult question to untangle. His Abydos is simultaneously a Trojan ally and a Milesian foundation made under Gyges of Lydia, so his chronologies are overlapping and confused to begin with. In any case, the Romans dividing up their conquests—presumably after the Pergamene bequest of Attalus III in 133 BCE—could themselves have been very familiar with the Homeric tradition and based their divisions on it rather than on strict geographical boundaries, and if the governor Strabo refers to is a Roman, this is very likely to be the case. But it does not explain Sestus’ disentanglement from Athens, as in the scholion. Abydos itself revolted from the Athenian empire in 411 (Thucydides 8.61-2), but Sestus always seems to have been its less interesting appendage, and why it should have plausibly belonged to some city other than Abydos in the first place is a question the scholion never discusses<sup>216</sup>. What the scholion refers to is therefore difficult to recover; what is interesting is that the story is put forth here as a self-evident fact that can be used without qualms in demonstrating a larger point: the continuing relevance of the Homeric catalogues.

Other discussions of Homer-fueled disputes over territory are revealing in their own ways. The example of Ajax and his Salaminians is a notorious one, easy to read as an Athenian interpolation. Aristarchus appears to have marked as spurious 2.558, which puts the Salaminians next to the Athenians and which is omitted in certain manuscripts. Ajax’s catalogue entry—truncated and incomplete as it seems in the context of the wider whole—was yet used repeatedly by Solon to justify Athens’ claim on Salamis, we are

---

<sup>216</sup> Pseudo-Scylax 94 mentions both places, being careful to distinguish Sestus from its homonym (which would seem more necessary in the case of Abydos, given that there is a well-known one in Egypt), but gives no indication of their political affiliations.

told,(Plutarch, *Life of Solon* 10.1).<sup>217</sup> In other words, unlike the other examples the scholion sets forth, we have for the case of Salamis outside confirmation that Homer could be used as a weapon: or rather, that the notion of his poetry being so used was the sort of thing that could be put forth in the margins of the text without turning a hair.

Homer can, indeed, be a political weapon. Consider the story in Herodotus that the tyrant Cleisthenes of Sicyon suppressed the Homeric poems during a war with the Argives because Argos came in for too much praise in the epic tradition.<sup>218</sup> This is a strange incident and worth a closer look. Why does expelling the rhapsodes who sing Homer's songs become a propaganda technique? The story implies that the competitive performance of these songs in public contexts has an enormous potential to spread them widely, and that stopping these performances is, at the very least, a crucial blow to the information Cleisthenes does not want propagated at his expense. It is not my intention here to get embroiled in the vexed issues of the Homeric poems' composition and transmission in the archaic period. That is not the focus of this work, nor would it be a particularly constructive discussion in this context. It is interesting that Cleisthenes—and Herodotus, who reports this story for a classical audience that is perfectly capable of acquiring and reading copies of books—assumes first, that suppressing these set public performances means clamping down on the Homeric poems themselves; and second, that

---

<sup>217</sup> One detail in Plutarch's account—that the Athenians themselves tried to downplay this story—is generally downplayed itself by those who use this episode as evidence for a Pisistratean recension of the text and the interpolation of this line. Heiden (2008: 139) argues that, paradoxically, this is the entry that puts the most emphasis on the heroic qualities of the leader, as opposed to the multitude he brings with him, because Ajax occupies far more of his catalogue entry, proportionally, than any other hero.

<sup>218</sup> Κλεισθένης γὰρ Ἀργείοισι πολεμήσας τοῦτο μὲν ῥαψωδοῦς ἔπαυσε ἐν Σικυῶνι ἀγωνίζεσθαι τῶν Ὀμηρείων ἐπέων εἵνεκα, ὅτι Ἀργεῖοί τε καὶ Ἄργος τὰ πολλὰ πάντα ὑμνέεται (5.67). How and Wells (*loc. cit.*) think it is rather the *Thebaid* dubiously attributed in antiquity to Homer that is at issue here, since its *incipit* begins with the glories of Argos.

suppressing Homer is a useful weapon in the ruler's arsenal to begin with, because Homer already defines the way people think about things.<sup>219</sup>

The idea we see in, for example, Strabo, that the aesthetic value of Homer is constructed through real-world utility, takes an extremely concrete form here. If the texts of epic poems can be used as political weapons, it is because both their content and their cultural importance make them effective as a means of defining, or even recreating, the world around them. Cleisthenes the tyrant wants to delete Argos from the epic record and cannot do so without deleting the epic record itself; Abydos wants Sestus and Athens wants Salamis. Yet using Homer to support the claims that they make means assuming Homer knew how the map of the Greek world was supposed to look.

The same assumption is reflected in the ancient biographies of Homer. These fascinating texts are variously used in classical scholarship—to attempt to answer the questions of the epics' composition and transmission, mainly, by ferreting out what antiquity said about the origins of the Homeric poems. The biographies juggle the dates of the Trojan War as compared to the dates of the poems' composition, the complicated reports of the archaic kings who supposedly honored Homer for his compositions, and the Peisistratids' intervention in the text—thus they are an invaluable source for the archaic and classical traditions surrounding the origins of the Homeric poems. They are, indeed, constructed specifically to explain the poems' origins--and more crucially for present purposes, the origins of the Catalogue of Ships--by explaining that of the poet. Homer is famously hard to pin down, as Proclus indicates:

---

<sup>219</sup> West (1999: 377) cautions us against assuming Cleisthenes actually used this wording—a caution consistent with his argument that the name “Homer” for the composer/source of the epics could not yet be supposed current in Cleisthenes' time, and that indeed it was a back-formation from the tradition rather than the other way around; the second assertion is intriguingly plausible, while the first is more difficult to justify.

Ὅμηρος μὲν οὖν τίνων γονέων ἢ ποίας ἐγένετο πατρίδος, οὐ ράδιον ἀποφῆναι· οὔτε γὰρ αὐτός τι λελάληκεν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ οἱ περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰπόντες συμπεφωνήκασιν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ μηδὲν ῥητῶς ἐμφαίνειν περὶ τούτων τὴν ποίησιν αὐτοῦ μετὰ πολλῆς ἀδείας ἕκαστος οἷς ἠβούλετο ἐχαρίσατο. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οἱ μὲν Κολοφώνιον αὐτὸν ἀνηγόρευσαν, οἱ δὲ Χῖον, οἱ δὲ Σμυρναῖον, οἱ δὲ Ἴήτην, ἄλλοι δὲ Κυμαῖον· καὶ καθόλου πᾶσα πόλις ἀντιποιεῖται τάνδρος, ὅθεν εἰκότως ἂν κοσμοπολίτης λέγοιτο (*Chrestomathy* 1.2).

Concerning Homer—who his parents were or what kind of country he came from—it is not easy to say, for he has not said anything himself, nor do those who have talked about him agree on anything. Rather, because his poetry has not said anything clearly about these issues, all the sources have very freely made a present of it to anyone they want. It's on account of this that some have said he is from Colophon, others from Chios, others from Smyrna, others from Ios, others from Cyme. On the whole, every city lays claim to the man, with the result that he could reasonably be called a citizen of the world.

Proclus is making a virtue of necessity: the competing stories available about the origins of Homer simply serve to underline his status as *the* Panhellenic poet *par excellence*, and an important result of this Panhellenism is the capacity to gratify anybody in the Greek world by developing stories about the local origin of this cosmopolitan poet. Thus he underlines the explicitly political nature of trying to determine where in the Greek world the poet called home. Nobody makes Homer anything but Greek, however. He is never a citizen of the cosmos generally, but of the specifically Hellenic portions of it--and, in many of the biographies, his geographical and anthropological knowledge of the Greek world, as demonstrated in the Catalogue of Ships especially, is cited as one of the main reasons for his being a citizen of this specifically Greek world. This is where the biographies and the Catalogue intersect: in their insistence on Homer's authentic and reliable knowledge about the places he describes.

The geographical significance of the Homeric biographies is, generally, in their insistence on constructing as many events that occupy the physical spaces of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as possible. I have chosen as a case study—because of its completeness and detail—the pseudo-Herodotean Life of Homer. This biography is hedged with dubiety from its very outset. Ascribed in its opening line to the historian of Halicarnassus, it nevertheless is datable rather to the mid-first to mid-second century CE.<sup>220</sup> It is all the same exceedingly Herodotean in its style and technique—recalling Herodotus’s own curiosity about when Homer lived and, even more importantly, what Homer knew. Pseudo-Herodotus’s version of Homer has a surprising range of knowledge about the Greek world, gleaned from extensive travel; the poet is presented fundamentally as an echo of Herodotus himself, the original and archetypal traveling researcher. Thus the question of Homer’s origins becomes a question of where his research began. The multiple potential birthplaces of Homer are here reconciled neatly: Cyme and Smyrna make the strongest claims, and the Herodotean thing to do would clearly be to find out where both reports come from and ascertain where the element of fact enters into each. The text makes Homer’s mother a Cymaeian woman, Cretheis, who is sent by her guardians on a colonial expedition to Smyrna in order to hide her embarrassing out-of-wedlock pregnancy. Her son Melesigenes—a name that immediately links him to local geography in the person of the River Meles—is thus born in Smyrna. The significance of this as his birthplace is made clear shortly afterward, where Smyrna is figured as the best place to nurture his burgeoning literary talent:

---

<sup>220</sup> West (2003): 301. The *terminus ante quem* is provided by a reference c. 160 in Tatian, who asserts that Herodotus had done research into the dates and places of Homer’s life; while the *Histories* themselves go into Homer’s dates extensively (he puts Homer and Hesiod both at c. 400 years before his own period), they concern themselves not at all with what would later become a vexed question: the poet’s birthplace and sphere of activity.

ἦν δέ τις ἐν Σμύρνῃ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Φήμιος τοῦνομα, παῖδας  
γράμματα καὶ τὴν ἄλλην μουσικὴν διδάσκων πᾶσαν... ὁ παῖς δὲ ἦν τε  
φύσιν ἔχων ἀγαθὴν, ἐπιμελὴς τε καὶ παιδευσιος προσγενομένης αὐτίκα  
πολλὸν τῶν πάντων ὑπερεῖχε. χρόνου δὲ ἐπιγενομένου ἀνδρούμενος οὐδὲν  
τοῦ Φημίου ὑποδεέστερος ἦν ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ (4-5).

There was a certain man in Smyrna at this period named Phemius, who taught letters as well as all kinds of literary subjects to boys... The child [Melesigenes] was gifted, and with care and education he began right away to surpass everyone. As time went on and he became a man, he was in no way second to Phemius in learning.

It is worth noting that neither Cyme nor Smyrna is, properly speaking, a Homeric place: neither is mentioned in the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*. The foundation narrative of Smyrna here—for all it invokes Theseus—places it firmly in the heyday of Greek colonization in Asia Minor, not the legendary past. Yet Smyrna is transformed into a Homeric place by the presence of the singer Phemius, a literate, if anachronistically Ionian Enlightenment, version of the *Odyssey*'s bard. Thus the poet's own homeland is made parallel to Odysseus's homeland; Smyrna, as home of poetry, is collapsed into Ithaca through the figure of the poet who, in some sense, educated both young Melesigenes and young Telemachus. The first step on the poet's own odyssey from displaced bastard to epic poet is one of education in literary forms. It is an education that at the same time distances him from the non-literate poetic practices depicted in the *Odyssey*—Phemius teaches γράμματα, not oral composition-in-performance. It is, of course, an indication that second-century audiences could not conceive of orally composed epic, but more significantly, it is an indication that Homer's poetic formation carried with it some complexities. Far from simply transposing his teacher into the epic setting he portrays in the *Odyssey*, Melesigenes/Homer has to reconstruct the customs that will make Phemius the bard convincing in his historical context. In other words, research is required for the

biographer (in constructing a historical *milieu* that is alien to his own time, but in a convincing way) as well as for the poet himself.

The way in which the *Life* constructs research is fundamentally experiential. Once Melesigenes' literary formation is complete—and he has taken over for Phemius as the foremost teacher of the humanities in Smyrna—his next step is to close his school and go to sea. Again a transposed Homeric character is involved, for it is a sea captain named Mentès who persuades him that seeing the world while one is still young is worthwhile.<sup>221</sup> At Mentès' explicit suggestion, Melesigenes turns his stint as a sailor into a research trip in the Herodotean mode:

καὶ ὅπου ἐκάστοτε ἀφίκοιτο, πάντα τὰ ἐπιχωρία διεωρᾶτο, καὶ ἱστορέων ἐπυθάνετο· εἰκος δέ μιν ἦν καὶ μνημόσυνα πάντων γράφεσθαι (6).

And wherever he arrived each time, he scrutinized the local customs and learned about things by inquiry; it also seems likely that he made written notes about everything.

The author of the *Life* has imitated his author gloriously here. The significant participle ἱστορέων is a nod to the real Herodotus's characterization of his own work. Moreover, the insistence on research and inquiry into local customs wherever the hero goes is telling, and the detail that he probably wrote down notes is a typical Greek argument from *eikos*, but the second-century version of *eikos* in which Homer can be a fully literate scholar, with the note-taking habits of any contemporary scholar. He seeks out different versions of the events he records but gives preference to the one he considers most valid, e.g. in the case of alternatives to the accepted story of the Trojan War:

Ἑλένης μὲν ταύτην ἄπιξιν παρὰ Πρωτέα ἔλεγον οἱ ἱρέες γενέσθαι. Δοκέει δέ μοι καὶ Ὅμηρος τὸν λόγον τοῦτον πυθέσθαι· ἀλλ', οὐ γὰρ ὁμοίως ἐς τὴν ἐποποιίην εὐπρεπῆς ἦν τῷ ἐτέρῳ τῷ περ ἐχρήσατο, [ἐς δὲ] μετῆκε αὐτόν, δηλώσας ὡς καὶ τοῦτον ἐπίσταιτο τὸν λόγον (*Histories* 2.116).

---

<sup>221</sup> ἔπεισε τὸν Μελησιγένη... ὅτι τὸ χώρας καὶ πόλιας θεήσασθαι ἄξιον εἶη ἕως νέος ἐστί (6).

This was what the priests said about Helen's arrival at the court of Proteus. It seems to me that Homer also knew this story, but it was not as appropriate for epic poetry as the other one, the one he used, which is why he rejected it—but he made it clear that he knew this story also.

The story of Helen in Egypt provides a blueprint for how the Herodotean version of Homer works, which is subsequently imported into the *Life*. The poet's origin story therefore turns into a story of where his poetic methodology came from.

This methodology is further in evidence later in the *Life*, where Melesigenes (now Homer, after the Cymaeian word for his blindness—at least this is the interpretation this biography offers) finally decides to visit mainland Greece.<sup>222</sup> It is interesting in itself that it takes him so long to reach this decision. The movement of the *Life* is rather around Homeric places themselves, Asia Minor and the islands, than the places mentioned in the Catalogue of Ships. Nevertheless, it is the Catalogue that marks his subject matter's debut in mainland Greece. The ancient realization that the Athenian entry in the list looks uncomfortably like an interpolation finds itself expressed here: Homer realizes belatedly that his previous poetry (minor or spurious stuff, most of it) has praised Argos disproportionately and left Athens out (28). Another aspect of the poet's methodology in this account here emerges: a desire for completeness. It would be not only impolitic, but also inaccurate, to omit this important *polis* from his text.<sup>223</sup> Two entries are therefore

---

<sup>222</sup> This is presented in the *Life* as further evidence of his wanderlust, still his driving force despite the blindness that has by now overtaken him: συνεβούλευον οἱ ἐντυγχάνοντες αὐτῶι ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀπικέσθαι· ὃ δὲ προσεδέξατο τὸν λόγον, καὶ κάρτα ἐπέθυμει ἀποδημῆσαι (27).

<sup>223</sup> This is the case even if the importance of the city has to be imported from hindsight. This text puts Homer's *floruit* in the eleventh century BCE, at a time when the city had not yet made its influence axiomatic. Greek historiography tends to be slightly vague on what happened between the heroic period and the historical one, aside from genealogies that trace descent from various heroes. In this category we can place the charming story Hesychius cites, which makes Homer the son of Telemachus and Polycaste, the daughter of Nestor who gives him a bath in *Odyssey* 3. A salutary note of caution about the reliability of such genealogical claims can be found at Dickinson (1986:23). The Thucydidean reconstruction of post-Homeric society at 1.12 is more in line with what we can expect to see after the collapse of the

added to the Catalogue in the so-called Μεγάλη Ἰλιάς in order to rectify the situation. The Athenian entry in the Catalogue, with its praise of Menestheus and its origin story of Erechtheus, is easy enough to see serving the purpose Homer needs here.<sup>224</sup> It is the second interpolation, however, that provides in the end a direct point of contact between this biography and the scholion that started this discussion in the first place: the placement of Ajax and his Salaminians next to the Athenians in the catalogue. In his edition of the *Iliad*, West brackets this catalogue entry because it is so short and yet so marked by suspicion and potential inauthenticity; the *Life* makes it Homeric, but a Homeric afterthought: Αἴαντα δὲ τὸν Τελαμῶνος καὶ Σαλαμίνιους ἐν Νεῶν καταλόγῳ ἔταξε πρὸς Ἀθηναίους (28). The verb ἔταξε is significant. Menestheus may have been the best at marshalling (ἄριστος τάξαι, 28) infantrymen and charioteers, but Homer is the best at arranging the arrangers. He is not simply deploying Menestheus and the Athenian contingent in praise of Athens, but also the more significant hero Telamonian Ajax. The writer of the *Life* must be very well aware of the tradition that Solon, in turn, used this passage of Homer in support of Athens' control over Salamis.

Plutarch's account of the incident, nearly contemporary with the pseudo-Herodotean *Life*, is revealing in itself:

οἱ μὲν οὖν πολλοὶ τῷ Σόλωνι συναγωνίσασθαι λέγουσι τὴν Ὀμήρου δόξαν· ἐμβalόντα γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔπος εἰς νεῶν κατάλογον ἐπὶ τῆς δίκης ἀναγῶναι·

Αἴας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν δυοκαίδεκα νῆας,  
 στῆσε δ' ἄγων ἴν' Ἀθηναίων ἴσταντο φάλαγγες.  
 αὐτοὶ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι ταῦτα μὲν οἶονται φλυαρίαν εἶναι (*Solon* 10.2).

---

Mediterranean's Bronze Age cultures: cities and peoples in constant flux all over the mainland, with colonies eventually springing up on the fringes to let off some of the pressure.

<sup>224</sup> An exegetical scholion makes it explicit: ἐξάρει τὴν χώραν τῆι γενέσει, τῆι ἀνατροφῆι, τῆι τῆς βασιλείας μεγαλειότητι (he exalts the region by means of [Erichthonius's] birth, his education, and the greatness of the kingdom; Σb *ad* 2.547-9).

Now many say that Homer's reputation was a firm ally to Solon and that he inserted a line into the Catalogue of Ships when the matter was due to be judged: "Ajax led twelve ships out of Salamis, and placed them next to the Athenian phalanxes" (*Il.* 2.556-557). But the Athenians themselves think this story is ridiculous.

There is one important distinction: here Solon is the one inserting this line into the poem for the Athenians' benefit, and in the pseudo-Herodotean *Life*, it is Homer himself who does the job. Both accounts sense that there is something not quite original about Ajax's position next to the Athenians in the Catalogue of Ships and in the ranks of the Greek soldiers, but they disagree on when the addition was made. The *Life* makes it authentically Homeric, at least, even if it is a politically motivated afterthought; Plutarch makes it entirely Solon's strategy.

It is not my aim here to argue if, and when, the Salaminian entry was interpolated into the Catalogue, but rather to examine what ancient scholarship made of this anomalous entry, as perhaps the most controversial of the ancient border claims that were purportedly settled by reference to the text of Homer.<sup>225</sup> Just as Cleisthenes thought Argos was coming in for too much praise in the Herodotean account, so—as it turns out—did Homer in this biography. He countered with a praise-laden catalogue entry for Athens instead, to balance out the rivalry between Attica and the Peloponnese. It is significant that he places the Salaminian entry between Athens and Argos in the Catalogue; these are the two cities whose reputation is the most thoroughly at stake in both the Herodotean and the pseudo-Herodotean stories. The spiralling motion of the

---

<sup>225</sup> Finkelberg (1988: 39-40) has made, by comparison to Ajax's entry in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, the clearest case against the more or less traditional view that Ajax's entry in the Catalogue of Ships was a Pisistratean intervention; this may be as close to a definitive answer as we can get with the evidence currently at hand.

Catalogue allows for Salamis to be tucked in neatly next to Athens, its claimant, and from there to the Peloponnese is a short—entirely too short, at various periods—step.

Homer, in this biography, is therefore capable of controlling the political implications of his own work without turning a hair, or having to wait for a few generations of tyrants to do it for him. It is a superb conceit on the part of the author of this biography: turning a sharp eye on two different layers of antiquity. The text presents both Homer and its own author as researchers *par excellence*, who will stop at nothing in order to ferret out information. The author ends up reworking Herodotus—both in regards to the Sicyonian issue and at the very end, in regards to the date of Homer, which this *Life* puts at a bare two hundred fifty years after the Trojan War, itself dated unusually early. The *Life* assigns the dates both of the Trojan War and of Homer's career relative to the political foundation of Lesbos and the Aeolian colonial expeditions that subsequently developed from it; Homer is then back-dated from Xerxes' crossing of the Hellespont, another explicitly Herodotean device; Herodotus, on the other hand, dates Homer (and Hesiod) about four hundred years prior to his own time (2.53.2). His Homer, therefore, had his *floruit* during the ninth century, not the eleventh.

Graziosi, in her discussion of how Homer is dated in the *Lives*, focuses primarily on the question of Homer's antiquity relative to Hesiod, as a way of framing this debate within the various antique polemics about which poet should be considered earlier (and more authoritative): the poet of peace or the poet of war, in the *Certamen*'s terms.<sup>226</sup> Yet even without explicit reference to Hesiod, the question of Homer's authority as constructed through his life links up with issues of both time and place. Homer, as the

---

<sup>226</sup> 2002: 104. She argues that modern audiences too frequently come at the Contest with the assumption that Homer is grander and more authoritative than Hesiod, if not actually earlier—a preconception that is ultimately not useful in discovering what ancient audiences thought about the matter.

scholion to the Catalogue entry makes explicit, is authoritative regarding locations and their affinities. The problem is that, as the *Life* itself makes explicit, Homer is living at a period when Greece itself is conceptualized as being in flux. The poet is encouraged, after a life of traveling around Asia Minor and the islands, to go to “Ἑλλάς itself (28), which West translates as “mainland Greece.”<sup>227</sup> Wherever he has traveled so far has been on the fringes of Greekness, during a period when Greece itself was in a process of expansion. Smyrna is marginal; Chios is more promising; but the prospect of going to Athens is enough to get him to alter his poetry. The mainland is posited as somehow more important than Asia and the islands, which are as yet merely colonial enterprises—and which form the locations for both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. At the same time, the mainland is a place Homer never reaches in the pseudo-Herodotean *Life*. His repeated attempts to go to Athens are faintly comical by the end of the *Life*; he reaches first Samos where he is invited to celebrate the Apatouria—evidence they consider him one of their own as an Ionian (29)—then Ios, where he becomes ill and dies (34). Thus Homer has no definitive first-hand local knowledge of anywhere in or around the mainland, least of all Athens or Salamis.<sup>228</sup> The scholion with which we started emphasized the role of the Homeric poems in affirming a variety of territorial claims, only one of which actually took place on ground that is covered either in the Homeric poems or in this biography: the inhabitants of Abydos using Homer to purloin Sestus away from Athens during a dispute over control of the Hellespont. The scholion raises a question: if Homer is to be considered an authority on the places he is describing, in the catalogue and out of it, how

---

<sup>227</sup> 2003: 387.

<sup>228</sup> *Contra* Aristarchus, who suggested that Homer was an Athenian. (See the *Vita Scorialensis* [West 2003: 444] and ΣΑ *ad Iliad* 13.197, where Aristonicus says that he identifies Homer’s use of the dual Αἴαντε as an Attic idiom.)

did he acquire this authority? The biography offers an answer: he travelled and did research on the vast majority of the places mentioned in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and as for places such as mainland Greece that are only mentioned in passing—whether in the Catalogue’s meticulous list of the desirability of all the places its heroes came from, or in their own loving recollections of the places they left behind to fight this war—he tried to do the same. In any case, it is constructing a Homer who has the credentials that the point of view represented by the scholion, and typical of ancient scholarship, wants him to have: an intense and intimate geographical knowledge of the places he represents, bolstered by Herodotean *historia*. The case of Athens and Salamis provides the fullest and most complete case study for how this Homeric expertise is actually supposed to work out in practice in the context of the Catalogue of Ships.

## 2. Boeotia and Thessaly: the first and the last

After the invocation to the Muses, the Catalogue begins in earnest, and on a scale that lives up to said invocation. The first entry, for the Boeotians, is vast and sprawling, littered with purported heroes and places that tempt the reader, ancient or modern, to find them on a map:

Βοιωτῶν μὲν Πηνέλεως καὶ Λήϊτος ἦρχον  
 Ἀρκεσίλαός τε Προθοήνωρ τε Κλονίος τε,  
 οἳ θ’ Ὑρίην ἐνέμοντο καὶ Αὐλίδα πετρήεσαν  
 Σχοῖνόν τε Σκῶλόν τε πολύκνημόν τ’ Ἐτεωνόν,  
 Θέσπειαν Γραϊάν τε καὶ εὐρύχορον Μυκαλησσόν,  
 οἳ τ’ ἄμφ’ Ἄρμ’ ἐνέμοντο καὶ Εἰλέσιον καὶ Ἐρυθράς,  
 οἳ τ’ Ἐλεῶν’ εἶχον ἠδ’ Ὕλην καὶ Πετεῶνα,  
 Ὠκαλέην Μεδεῶνά τ’ ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον,  
 Κώπας Εὐτρησίν τε πολυτρήρωνά τε Θίσιβην,  
 οἳ τε Κορώνειαν καὶ ποιήενθ’ Ἀλιάρτον,  
 οἳ τε Πλάταιαν ἔχον ἠδ’ οἳ Γλισᾶντ’ ἐνέμοντο,  
 οἳ θ’ Ὑποθήβας εἶχον ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον,  
 Ὀγχηστόν θ’ ἱερὸν Ποσιδήϊον ἀγλαὸν ἄλσος,

οἳ τε πολυστάφυλον Ἄρνην ἔχον, οἳ τε Μίδειαν  
Νῆσαν τε ζαθέην Ἀνθηδόνα τ' ἐσχατόωσαν·  
τῶν μὲν πεντήκοντα νέες κίον, ἐν δὲ ἐκάστη  
κοῦροι Βοιωτῶν ἑκατὸν καὶ εἴκοσι βαῖνον. (*Iliad* 2.494-510)

The Boeotians were led by Peneleos and Leitus,  
Arcesilaus, Prothoenor, and Clonius:  
those who lived in Hyria and rocky Aulis,  
Schoenus, Scolus, and Eteonus, full of ravines,  
Thespeia, Graea, and Mycalessus of the wide dancing grounds;  
those who lived around Harma and Eilesion and Erythrae,  
who held Eleon and Hyle and Peteon,  
Ocalea and Medeon, that well-built city,  
Copae and Eutresis and Thisbe, full of doves;  
those who lived in Coroneia and grassy Haliartus,  
those who held Plataea and lived in Glisas,  
those who held Lower Thebes, that well-built city,  
holy Onchestus, Poseidon's shining grove,  
those who held Arne rich in grain and Mideia,  
sacred Nisa and Anthedon on the edges.  
Fifty ships of theirs went to Troy, and in each one  
went a hundred twenty young Boeotian men.

The entry is almost a miniature catalogue in itself. Although the places listed cannot all be identified and placed on a map as most of the entries in the actual Catalogue of Ships can, the impression the entry gives is very much that only our knowledge is at fault; otherwise we would well be able to plot the path the poet's song takes through the geographical space this contingent occupies. They have no fewer than five leaders—an oddity in the Greek listings, where single leaders are far more common than even pairs, in contrast to the Trojans' willingness to share command.<sup>229</sup> The city of Thebes, which we are surely primed to see as the most important city in the region given its well-documented Mycenaean presence, its importance in the Oedipus cycle of myths, and its primacy in the classical period, does not exist as such; instead we have *Hypothebai*,

---

<sup>229</sup> See Chapter 2, Section 3.

“Lower Thebes,” which could easily be taken as the same place.<sup>230</sup> Perhaps the name puts an emphasis on the lower city as opposed to the acropolis—not in the least usual. The entry sets out, furthermore, not only the number of ships in the Boeotians’ possession, which is standard for the Catalogue, but also the number of men that came in each one. The standard explanations for these anomalies are those offered most recently by Edzard Visser and Benjamin Sammons: that this wealth of detail is an effort on the poet’s part to engage in an unusually convincing feat of world-building.<sup>231</sup> Later audiences, as we have seen, are loath to discover fictions in the *Iliad*, but the discussions that are preserved about the strangeness of this catalogue entry and its discrepancies with observable fact in the region suggest that if this was indeed Homer’s intention—always a dangerous thing to argue—it was not a successful gambit: by baffling the audience, the catalogue entry only feeds their interest.

The scholiastic discussion regarding why Boeotia, of all places, was chosen to begin the Catalogue is at least as lengthy, proportionally, as its modern descendants. The centrality of the starting location and its leisurely spiral outwards have been well and repeatedly described, with special reference to its function as an aid to memory on the part of the poet—a crucial organizing feature for any catalogue on this scale, and one that trickled down into the smaller and less demanding Trojan catalogue, albeit in slightly altered form. Different, too, in the Trojan catalogue is the importance of the center and starting point. It is hard to argue with putting Troy front and center; that side of the

---

<sup>230</sup> Visser, indeed, considers the identification of Hypothebai as Thebes “kaum ernsthaft bestritten” (1997: 274).

<sup>231</sup> Visser (1997: 359) and Sammons (2010: 167). The latter very neatly argues that the entry “gives the listener an impression of historical objectivity and establishes the poet’s command of Greek geography, while at the same time preserving the catalogue and perhaps also the action of the *Iliad* from suspicions of fictionality.”

conflict has a direct geographical rallying point. Boeotia is more difficult to justify, since neither in Homer nor in the historical period does it enjoy the prominence of various other regions of Greece, and its chief πόλις, Thebes, enjoyed its mythological heyday a generation before the Trojan War. For all these reasons, the beginning of the Catalogue of Ships becomes a *zēiēma* of some importance in all branches of ancient Homeric scholarship—one which reveals some of said scholarship’s preoccupations with aesthetic value, historical validity, and continuity into the present day.

An exegetical scholion, rather unusually, gives us the Aristarchean view of the situation:

ἤρκεται δὲ ἀπὸ Βοιωτῶν κατὰ μὲν Ἀρίσταρχον οὐκ ἔκ τινος παρατηρήσεως, κατὰ δὲ ἐνίου, ἐπεὶ ἴμεσαιτάτωι τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἢ Βοιωτία... ἢ ὅτι μέγιστον εἶχε ναυτικὸν ὡς Φοινίκων ἄποικος. ἢ ὅτι ἐν Αὐλίδι συνήχθη τὸ ναυτικόν. ἢ ὅτι Ἑλλήν ὁ Δευκαλίωνος ἐν Βοιωτίαι ὤικησεν (Σb *ad* 2.494-877a).

He has begun with the Boeotians, according to Aristarchus, not out of some observation, but, as some say, because Boeotia is in the very middle of Greece... or because the Boeotians had the greatest fleet, being a Phoenician colony, or because the fleet assembled at Aulis, or because Hellen, the son of Deucalion, lived in Boeotia.

The scholion appears to be offering at least one view attributed to Aristarchus, and several others that appear to be alternatives to his suggestion. They certainly do not read like Aristarchus’ usual style: the genealogical and mythographic extrapolations that are going on are well outside of his bailiwick. They do, however, reflect some important preoccupations of Homer’s readers. The notion that the Boeotians come first because the Hellenes’ eponymous hero lived there is a sterling example of turning genealogy into geography. Hellen, after the flood that left his parents alone on the earth, is the ur-Greek;

the region in which he lived is therefore the pinnacle of Greekness, and the logical place to begin the Catalogue of Ships.

This is, in fact, the same sort of phenomenon that Jonathan Hall has observed in his successive attempts at defining the origins and spread of “Hellenicity”—originating in the territory of Hellas, southeast of Thessaly, home to Achilles’ Myrmidons. Rather than speaking of its origins, he argues, it is probably better to speak of its construction, partly through genealogy making use of figures such as Hellen.<sup>232</sup> The pull of the eponymous hero is a strong one; the development of a figure such as Hellen, and a geographical location bearing his name, invites users of his genealogy to devise some fairly farfetched claims such as the one under discussion here. The problem in this scholion is that Hellen is not said to live in Hellas proper, Hellas in the older sense; he lives in Boeotia.

The two territories are not without dynastic links; according to Thucydides, the Boeotians in his day were displaced Thessalians:

ἢ τε γὰρ ἀναχώρησις τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐξ Ἰλίου χρονία γενομένη πολλὰ ἐνεόχμωσε, καὶ στάσεις ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν ὡς ἐπὶ πόλῳ ἐγίγοντο, ἀφ’ ὧν ἐκπίπτοντες τὰς πόλεις ἔκτιζον. Βοιωτοὶ τε γὰρ οἱ νῦν ἐξηκοστῶ ἔτει μετὰ Ἰλίου ἄλωσιν ἐξ Ἄρνης ἀναστάντες ὑπὸ Θεσσαλῶν τὴν νῦν μὲν Βοιωτίαν, πρότερον δὲ Καδμηίδα γῆν καλουμένην ᾤκισαν. ἦν δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ ἀποδασμὸς πρότερον ἐν τῇ γῆ ταύτῃ, ἀφ’ ὧν καὶ ἐξ Ἰλίου ἐστράτευσαν (Thuc. 1.12.2-3).

For the Greeks’ delayed return from Ilion caused a great deal of political innovation, and there was quite a number of uprisings in the cities, from which those who were exiled founded cities. For instance, the Boeotians of the present day were forced out of Arne by the Thessalians, sixty years after the capture of Troy, and went to live in what is now called Boeotia but was previously called the land of Cadmus. All the same, there was a

---

<sup>232</sup> See, for instance, J. Hall 1997: 45-48 and id. 2002: 126-129. The shifting sets of eponymous heroes ascribed to Hellen’s gene pool, in this view, exemplifies a shifting set of valences for Greek identity—to the extent that there is such a thing before the war with Persia. Thus different genealogies represent different attempts to come up with a theory of where Greekness comes from. Finkelberg (2005: 33) makes the crucial point that “by no means all of the heroes of Greek legend are regarded as descendants of Hellen”—for instance, the entire family trees of Inachus.

sub-set of them that had been in that land previously, of whom some even fought at Troy.

Thucydides is trying to do a number of things here: reconcile the Boeotians of his period, with their origin story arising out of the political upheaval following the Trojan War, with the entry in the Catalogue that clearly specifies that the people living in Boeotia were called Boeotians; account for the multiple confused stories of polis foundations in the period between the collapse of the Bronze Age and the renaissance of Greek culture that brought us the Homeric epics in written form to begin with; and specify the differences between the mythical Boeotians (as the name *Cadmean land* indicates) and the modern ones, who are being re-conceptualized as not at all related to the Thebans of the myth cycles. He does leave room for the possibility that some of these non-Cadmean Boeotians lived in that territory prior to the Trojan War; indeed, they would have to have been there for the Catalogue entry to make any sense at all. His analysis deals with the fact that there are two large, unknowable, but crucially important periods in Greek history: the first in which all the initial foundation stories take place, which pave the way for the events in “mythological time,” and the second, which deals with the transition from mythological time to observed historical time. We have seen the Trojan War functioning as a boundary between the two periods already. Here, Thucydides is working with the similarities between the two. They share an overlapping eponym/toponym that is nevertheless used on two different peoples: the original Boeotians, whose descent is unknowable but who participated in the war against Troy, and the Thessalian immigrants who presumably have their own stories to which Thucydides is referring.

This is not precisely a conflation of Boeotia and Thessaly. It is a dynastic link that is too late for the pre-*Iliad* period that a discussion of Hellen necessarily requires, but it is relevant nonetheless. The same preoccupation with continuity as opposed to disruption in the post-Homeric traditions that we noted in regards to the city of Troy itself is taking shape here again. Like Troy, more than one Greek city is a doublet. There are the *poleis* founded in the mythological period, and there are the cities the political exiles founded in response to the *staseis* that gripped all of Greece after the war. The second group does not replace the first, as in the case of Troy; instead they coexist uneasily, leaving their traces into the historical period. The two periods of disruption overlap. Boeotia's previous identification as the land of Cadmus highlights another exile story, where the wanderer driven away from his own *polis* ends up creating another rather than trying to go back home again.

Jonathan Hall posits that this episode in Thucydides, along with the comparable myth of the Dorians' capture of the Peloponnese after the Trojan War, serves as the Greeks' excuse "from concerning themselves unduly with their premigratory existence outside the regions they were eventually to occupy."<sup>233</sup> That is, placing these migrations in the second unknowable period makes the lack of knowledge about the first, ultimately, more bearable. Hellen recedes into the background when the Hellenes experienced upheaval after the Trojan War. Though the scholion under discussion puts emphasis on this figure as a center point for Greek identity, and therefore the center point of the Catalogue, Thucydides demonstrates that there was a strain in Greek ethnographic thought that was uncomfortable with any analysis going that far back.

---

<sup>233</sup> 2006: 32.

Ultimately, the scholion gives no sources for its assertion that Hellen lived in Boeotia rather than Thessaly, because the fictive notion of Greek centrality located in this region is more important than anything else. The movement of the Catalogue begins, therefore, from this geographic and cultural center of Greek self-identity and ends on the fringes, both in the physical and the cultural sense, in what would become Thessaly.<sup>234</sup>

Μαγνήτων δ' ἦρχε Πρόθοος Τενθρηδόνοϋ υἱός,  
οἱ περὶ Πηνειὸν καὶ Πήλιον εἰνοσίφυλλον  
ναῖεσκον· τῶν μὲν Πρόθοοϋ θοὸϋ ἡγεμόνευε,  
τῷ δ' ἅμα τεσσαράκοντα μέλαινα νῆεϋ ἔποντο (*Il.* 2.756-59).

Prothous son of Tenthredon led the Magnesians,  
who lived around Peneion and Pelion of the quivering leaves;  
swift Prothous led them,  
and forty black ships followed him.

It is one of the sparer Catalogue entries, and there is no advance warning given that it is going to be the last. Prothous has an epithet that doubles his name—a mere jingle. The scholia, so keen on ferreting out why Boeotia was the first entry in the catalogue, has no interest in asking why this was the last; Homer's summation and rankings for the Greek heroes and their horses sparks more discussion, but the end of the catalogue as such goes largely unmarked in ancient scholarship, like the ending of the poem itself; both suffer from comparison to their lavish beginnings.<sup>235</sup>

Benjamin Sammons has recently framed this beginning and ending of the Catalogue of Ships as a dialogue between different strands of the poet's constructive

<sup>234</sup> The *Iliad* nowhere refers to the territory by this name. Two sons of Thessalos, grandsons of Heracles, lead a contingent from Nisyros and Cos in the Dodecanese at *Il.* 2.676-680; Kirk (1985: 228) refers to Cos's local tradition of having been founded from Thessaly, which would seem to be at odds with his own assertion that all the island entries in this batch have "a faintly Dorian colouring."

<sup>235</sup> Indeed, the ending of the *Iliad* was read as a sign of the "weakness" (ἀσθένεια) of the poet: his inspiration is supposed to have petered out in the end, and he reserved his last remaining resources for the *Odyssey* (ΣΤ *ad Iliad* 24.804a). The observation comes from one Menestheus, who is absent from Jacoby's *FHG*, but is listed in Müller's *FGH*, tentatively identified as a "grammarian from Miletus" (II.345). Erbse (*ad loc.*) identifies this Menecrates with a student of Aristarchus, from either Nysia or Carica, and referenced in Strabo 14.1.48.

force. In his reading, the Boeotians and Thessalians are linked, paradoxically, by a lack of the martial glory that is ostensibly at the heart of the *Iliad*. The Boeotians are a numerically impressive contingent, but none of them actually accomplishes anything in the poem.<sup>236</sup> The Thessalians are just as inglorious in their obscurity—their most interesting leaders, indeed, are the ones who are dead or absent. In short, though he does not make the juxtaposition explicit, he reads the Catalogue as beginning with a contingent that is “all *plethys* and no *kleos*” and ending with a contingent of men “who seem to stand on the edge of oblivion.”<sup>237</sup> Technically, in the latter case, he is referring to the second-to-last rather than the last group mentioned in the Catalogue, but several contingents, from Philoctetes’ on, command the fighters from what would eventually be engulfed in the territory of Thessaly. Such is the oblivion on the edge of which they teetered.

The way in which they are grouped is revealing in itself. The other Greeks cluster around *polis* centers for the most part: places such as Mycenae and Argos, whose mythic resonance is huge; the ones such as Pylos which are mere appendages to more powerful neighbors by the time the historical period comes around; and those, such as Ithaca, where an island appears to be one and the same as its homonymous *polis* and its territories. Certain groups, however, are denoted differently, particularly toward the end of the catalogue, and cities begin dropping out of the equation entirely. The last *polis* to be named as such is Oechalia at 2.730. Subsequent geographical references in the Thessalian portion of the catalogue are based rather in natural reference points rather than

---

<sup>236</sup> Peneus, one of the Boeotian leaders mentioned in the catalogue, acquires the opposite of *kleos* when he begins a rout during the battle over the body of Patroclus (17.597-600). Another, Arcesilaus, is killed by Hector at 15.330. This is a fairly pathetic showing.

<sup>237</sup> 2010: 168 and 194, respectively.

constructed ones.<sup>238</sup> Ethnonyms are also used to some degree; thus subsequently we have the Aenienes and Peraebi (2.749) and the Magnetes (2.756) rounding out the catalogue. This is a feature that the scholia would rather identify with the non-Greek peoples in the *other* catalogue:

δι' ἔθνῶν δέ, οὐ πόλεων ὀνομάζει τοὺς βαρβάρους (Σ b *ad* 2.816).

He identifies the barbarians by peoples, not by cities.

Finding this kind of quasi-tribal identification among the Greeks on the edges is significant. It marks the Thessalians out as somehow “other,” unlike the more politically organized Greeks at the center, and it defines the periphery in a non-geographical sense. Crete, for instance, is also easily “othered”—with its multiple languages (*Od.* 19.175) and its isolation from the mainland—but it is indisputably home to a number of *poleis* of great antiquity.

The fact that all of these Thessalian groups organized apolitically cluster around the end of the Catalogue of Ships requires, therefore, some discussion. Heiden reads the absence of Protesilaos and Philoctetes, and their troops’ dissatisfaction with the lesser men who have replaced them, as a Homeric focus on the mass of men as opposed to their leaders, as part of his overall thesis that the Catalogue of Ships has a much less aristocratic bent than is commonly assumed.<sup>239</sup> I argue that these contingents may more plausibly be read as suffering from a lack of organization that is no very flattering reflection on places without effective, strong, centralized leadership. Their lack of cities and their lack of viable heroes around whom to rally are two sides of the same problem

---

<sup>238</sup> With the possible exception of Dodona at 2.750-751: its inhabitants construct *oikia* and plant fields, sure signs of settled human habitation. It is never called a *polis*, however, and its religious significance as an oracular site overshadows other aspects of the city when it appears elsewhere in Homer.

<sup>239</sup> 2008: 142-143.

and a significant way in which they are portrayed differently from the other Greeks. Achilles, whose Myrmidons and Hellenes have “no thought” for battle because they lack a leader (2.686-687), fits in neatly alongside this group, but not quite in the way that Heiden argues. He sees the void in their leadership as something that could potentially be filled by anyone who could step in and activate their martial qualities—as, he notes, will happen eventually in the *Iliad*. But the results of this substitution, doomed as they are, do not reconcile comfortably with Heiden’s point. It is true that the Myrmidons need somebody, but indeed not just anybody. By associating them with these other groups, spatially linked on the map of Greece, who have no geographical center and no effective leader, the Catalogue associates Achilles with the fate of Protesilaus, destined to leave a tomb on Trojan ground, and Philoctetes, unappreciated by his own side with disastrous results. It therefore decenters these groups even further and emphasizes the fragility of their links to the rest of the Greeks.

Boeotia, on the other hand, is straightforwardly Greek, which is why its inclusion first on the list is, if anything, overdetermined. It represents simultaneously the beginning of the war by virtue of its promontory at Aulis; the home of the early Greeks, through its connection to Hellen; and the geographic heart of the Catalogue of Ships and by extension Greece itself. These variant explanations for its primacy in the catalogue represent a series of ancient historicizing impulses, born from a desire to read this segment of Homer as a key to mapping Greece in the heroic age. Less important for our purposes than the actual historicity—Mycenaean, archaic, or otherwise—of the catalogue is the effect it had on ancient readers of Homer. Boeotia thus became a *zētēma* in a way the other entries in the catalogue did not, largely because its primacy in the list did not

line up with its historical or narrative importance, outside the poem or inside it. Strabo outlines poignantly the gap between Thebes of the past and Thebes of the present:

ἐξ ἐκείνου δ' ἤδη πράττοντες ἐνδεέστερον αἰεὶ μέχρι εἰς ἡμᾶς οὐδὲ κόμης  
ἀξιολόγου τύπον σώζουσι· καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι δὲ πόλεις ἀνάλογον πλὴν  
Τανάγρας καὶ Θεσπιῶν· αὗται δ' ἱκανῶς συμμένουσι πρὸς ἐκείνας  
κρινόμεναι (9.2.5).

Ever since that time, Thebes has continually fared worse and worse up until our own time, and now it does not even preserve the appearance of a village worth caring about. The other cities in the region have fared similarly except for Tanagra and Thespieae. They have managed reasonably well, compared with Thebes.

The time to which Strabo refers is the re-foundation of Thebes after the Macedonians' crushing victory over the Greeks at Chaeronea in 338 BCE, an event which changed Boeotian history decisively. Earlier in the section, Strabo notes—with some wistfulness, perhaps—that the Thebans had briefly been the most powerful city in Greece.<sup>240</sup> Boeotia has, for Strabo, effectively become a parallel for Troy's *aphanismos*—only the damage has been done recently, in the historical period, where it can be documented and garnished with names and dates. In the space of a generation, the Boeotians went from dominance to defeat; by the time Strabo and his sources are writing, Thebes, like Troy, struggles to maintain the status of a mere κόμη. That beloved trope, the reversal of fortune, thus becomes a way of conceptualizing the vast changes that have occurred between the heroic age and the present.

Giovannini takes Boeotia as one example of drastic geopolitical change occurring between even the classical period and the Hellenistic period and utterly transforming the

---

<sup>240</sup> εἴτ' ἀνέλαβον σφᾶς πάλιν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ὥστε καὶ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀρχῆς ἀμφοισθητῆσαι Θηβαίους δυοὶ μάχαις κρατήσαντας Λακεδαιμονίους (9.2.5)  
Then they recovered themselves again so much that they acquired mastery over all the Greeks after defeating the Lacedaemonians in two battles [sc. Leuctra and Mantinea].

Greek landscape.<sup>241</sup> His assertion that Greece became “a desert” seems hyperbolic at the outset, but cities such as Thebes, which fail to hold on to their heroic past despite repeated attempts at re-foundation and comeback, are sobering proofs.<sup>242</sup> The many debates about the primacy of Boeotia in the Catalogue must be read against this backdrop of gradual, desperate decline, for this is why its position, front and center, rejoicing in five leaders where other contingents are left missing the ones they left behind, must be explained. It is no Troy, self-evidently an important place; despite the mythological primacy of the Theban cycle, which took place a generation before the Trojan War anyway, the city’s story of decline began much earlier and, for Strabo at least, was observably more complete. The story Thucydides relates about a mass migration from Thessaly into Boeotia is a symptom of such decline, and the ensuing ethnic overlap between the two places becomes, in some sense, a framing mechanism for the Catalogue of Ships itself. Beginning with Boeotia and ending with the various and inconsequential Thessalian groups serves as a means for ancient scholarship to discuss what the centers and margins of Greekness are across a range of periods, from the heroic period to the variety of present days that are represented. Homer’s own constructions of Greek geography in the Catalogue, as set out by the programmatic and epically scaled first entry, do not allow of easy access, particularly when the places under discussion are unrecognizable. Thus, from its outset, the reality of the Catalogue’s locations becomes a

---

<sup>241</sup> Already in the classical period we get hints that Boeotia is in economic trouble: Aristophanes’ wistful jokes about the embargoes keeping the eels of Lake Copais away from Athens (*Ach.* 880, 962; *Lys.* 36) are one comic example.

<sup>242</sup> “...entre l’*époque classique* et le II<sup>e</sup> s. la Grèce s’était peu à peu transformée en désert” (1969: 14). This assertion is in the service of his overarching claim that the Catalogue reflects the Mycenaean period less than the archaic period when the Homeric poems were being assembled; against earlier claims, such as Page’s (*History and the Homeric Iliad*), that an intervening “dark age” was necessary for the memories and locations of so many places to be lost, he marshalls examples such as Boeotia’s that demonstrate the readiness of loss to intrude even onto otherwise well-documented times and places.

debatable topic—a sign that Greece is no more immune than the Troad from the inevitability of destruction and loss.

### 3. Sparta and the problems with authority

Relatively soon in the Catalogue of Ships, following Mycenae and Argos in every way—including the prowess and repute of their rulers—Lacedaemon appears to remind the *Iliad*'s audience, even in this *tour de force* of a digression, what the poem is all about. The place is carefully constructed not only in relation to the surrounding *poleis*, but also and more crucially, in its spatial relationship to Helen:

Οἱ δ' εἶχον κοίλην Λακεδαίμονα κητώεσσαν,  
Φᾶρῖν τε Σπάρτην τε πολυτρήρωνά τε Μέσσην,  
Βρυσειάς τ' ἐνέμοντο καὶ Αὐγείας ἐρατεινάς,  
οἳ τ' ἄρ' Ἀμύκλας εἶχον Ἔλος τ' ἔφαλον πτολίεθρον,  
οἳ τε Λάαν εἶχον ἠδ' Οἴτυλον ἀμφενέμοντο,  
τῶν οἱ ἀδελφεὸς ἦρχε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος  
ἐξήκοντα νεῶν· ἀπάτερθε δὲ θωρήσσοντο·  
ἐν δ' αὐτὸς κίεν ἦσι προθυμίησι πεποιθῶς  
ὄτρύνων πόλεμον δέ· μάλιστα δὲ ἴετο θυμῷ  
τίσασθαι Ἑλένης ὀρμήματά τε στοναχάς τε (*Iliad* 2.581-590).

Those who held hollow Lacedaemon, full of ravines,  
Pharis and Sparta and Messe of the many doves,  
those who lived in Bryseae and lovely Augeae,  
those who held Amyclae and the seaside citadel of Elos,  
those who held Laas and lived in Oetylus—  
their leader was his brother, Menelaus, good at the war-cry,  
with sixty ships, and they were marshalled apart.  
Menelaus himself strode among them, confident in his valor  
and thirsty for war. His heart especially longed  
to avenge the troubles and groans over Helen.

This catalogue entry does not include mythological details about the places it mentions, as the subsequent Pylian entry does; it omits picturesque sidelights on the economics of war, as the entry on the landlocked Arcadians with their borrowed ships does; what it does do is focus directly on the emotional impact of this particular war, with the

multitude of groans over one woman. Line 590 is identical to 2.356, where Nestor, not the narrator, is speaking: he contends that raping Trojan wives will be the best way to *τίσασθαι Ἑλένης ὀρμήματά τε στοναχάς τε*. Aristarchus, in the service of unifying the poet of the *Iliad* with that of the *Odyssey*, notes that Helen is to be taken as an objective, not a subjective, genitive here—and presumably in the identical portion of the Catalogue entry as well.<sup>243</sup> By correcting this grammatical issue, he offers a suggestion for how we are to view the goal of the Trojan War in this poem: it is not being fought to acquire more wealth, territory, or prestige--the goals of most wars--but to create equal and opposite suffering for the Trojan side to repay the Achaeans’—and most of all Menelaus’s—suffering on account of one woman. This reading of the Lacedaemonian entry in the Catalogue, therefore, establishes the territory over which the war is being fought, and along the way, establishes a sort of personal geography that will dominate discussions of Menelaus and Helen in ancient scholarship.

Physical geography, of course, is given its fair share of attention. The places mentioned in this catalogue entry come with their own sets of problems—starting with the name of the city itself. First of all, the city and the region are variably difficult to distinguish in our sources. Sparta is always the city; Lacedaemon can refer either to the city or the region that it controls. The situation looks more clear cut in the Catalogue

---

<sup>243</sup> πρὸς τοὺς Χωρίζοντας· ἔφασαν (fr. 1 K.) γὰρ τὸν μὲν τῆς Ἰλιάδος ποιητὴν δυσανασχετοῦσαν συνιστάνειν καὶ στένουσαν διὰ τὸ βία ἀπῆχθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου, τὸν δὲ τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας ἔκοῦσαν, οὐ νοοῦντες ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς ὁ λόγος, ἀλλ’ ἔξωθεν πρόθεσιν τὴν περί δεῖ λαβεῖν, ἢ’ ἢ περί Ἑλένης· καὶ ἔστιν ὁ λόγος, τιμωρίαν λαβεῖν ἀνθ’ ὧν ἐστενάξαμεν καὶ ἐμεριμνήσαμεν περί Ἑλένης· παραλειπτικός γὰρ προθέσεών ἐστιν ὁ ποιητής (Σ A ad 2.356).

Against the Dividers: they said that the poet of the *Iliad* represented her as displeased and groaning because by force she had been carried off by Alexander, but the poet of the *Odyssey* said she went willingly. They did not know that the line is not applied to her, but the preposition *περί* has to be supplied, so that it means “on account of Helen.” And the speech means that they should take retaliation for the things they groaned and suffered on account of Helen—the poet is prone to omit prepositions.

entry itself, where Sparta is just another on the list of territories that Menelaus controls, along with Pharis, Messe, etc. This is not, therefore, a case analogous to that of the Xanthus/Scamander or the other instances of dual names noted in Chapter 1; rather, this is to be viewed as a later tradition trying to make sense of a distinction that Homer made differently than they did.<sup>244</sup> A D scholion puts the confusion in a succinct, if hardly less confusing, fashion:

Λακεδαίμονα δὲ τὴν χώραν λέγουσιν, τὴν δὲ πόλιν Σπάρτην. ἕτεροι δὲ καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς πόλεως τὸ μὲν τι Λακεδαίμονα, τὸ δὲ Σπάρτην καλοῦσιν (ΣΔ [ZQAR] *ad* 2.581).

They say the Lacedaemon is the region; the city, Sparta. Others also call part of the city itself Lacedaemon and another part Sparta.

By this account, there are two schools of thought as to how Lacedaemon and Sparta should be differentiated: one arguing that Lacedaemon is a region and Sparta is its chief city, the other—rather strangely—arguing that the city itself consists of two parts: Lacedaemon and Sparta. It sounds rather like Budapest: originally two distinct communities, now merged into one larger city that takes its name from either or both. The scholarly consensus is that the city of Sparta was, in fact, a conglomerate of several villages, called *obae*—originally the four communities of Pitana, Limnae, Mes(s)oa, and Cynosura; Amyclae was later added.<sup>245</sup> Later sources refer to these almost exclusively as population groups, rather than subdivisions of the city's territory; in this respect they function rather like Attic demes with perhaps less of a local force. It is therefore

---

<sup>244</sup> See Chapter 2, section 6.

<sup>245</sup> See Kennell (2010: 9). The *ὄβαι* are seldom discussed as such in classical sources, and when they are, it is usually as population groups, not geographical locations. *IG* V.1.26, a 2<sup>nd</sup>/1<sup>st</sup> century BCE inscription from Amyclae, is unusual in that it uses the term *ὄβαι* to refer to the place. The four “classic” *ὄβαι* are listed together only at Pausanias 3.16.9, in which he says the inhabitants of all four locales fought with each other—no picture of Spartan local harmony.

unsurprising that the scholion does not refer to these locales within Sparta’s city limits and instead substitutes two unimpeachably Homeric names as, effectively, parallel-universe *obae* mimicking the marriage of the mythological Lacedaemon and his wife Sparta.<sup>246</sup>

The scholion’s first explanation—that Lacedaemon is a regional term—corresponds more with other ancient conceptions of the city and its ambit; Strabo argues strenuously that Lacedaemon is a regional term, and incidentally gets us into another debate about Sparta’s sphere of influence:

“Ὅτι δὲ Λακεδαιμῶν ὁμωνύμως λέγεται καὶ ἡ χώρα καὶ ἡ πόλις, δηλοῖ καὶ Ὅμηρος· λέγω δὲ χώραν σὺν τῇ Μεσσηνίᾳ. περὶ μ[ὲν δὴ τῶν] τόξων ὅταν λέγῃ “καλά, τὰ οἱ ξεῖνος Λακεδαιμόνι δῶκε τυχήσας, Ἴφιτος Εὐρυτίδης,” εἶτ’ ἐπενέγκῃ “τὼ δ’ ἐν Μεσσηνίᾳ ξυμβλήτην ἀλλήλοιν οἴκῳ ἐν Ὀρτιλόχοιο,” τὴν χώραν λέγει, ἧς μέρος ἦν καὶ ἡ Μεσσηνία (8.5.8).

Homer makes it clear that the same name, Lacedaemon, is used for both the region and the city—but I mean a region that includes Messenia. Concerning the bow of Odysseus, when he says, “Beautiful things which a guest-friend, Iphitus the son of Eurytus, had given him when he met him in Lacedaemon,” then adds, “the two of them met each other in Messenia, in the home of Ortilochus,” [*Odyssey* 21.13, 15] he is talking about the region, of which Messenia is a part.

Leaving aside Messenia for a moment, the crucial piece of information here is that Strabo reads Homer’s Lacedaemon as a region that includes Messenia as well as a city. The latter is accomplished through an elaborate piece of reasoning, relying on a pair of exchanges in the *Odyssey*. When Penelope goes to retrieve her husband’s bow from the storeroom, the poet seizes the moment to discourse on where the bow came from—a story of *xenia* gone badly awry that, like every story in the *Odyssey*, is meant to reflect

---

<sup>246</sup> Apollodorus 3.116; Σ MTAB *ad Eur. Or.* 626.

some facet of Odysseus's own story.<sup>247</sup> The bow comes from Iphitus, who, like Odysseus, has come to Pherae in Messenian territory to search for livestock the Peloponnesians have stolen. This similarity in their circumstances instantly creates a bond between them, and they exchange guest-gifts. Yet it is the poet's insistence on the physical and geopolitical location of Pherae that creates the most vivid impression on the geographers, especially since Homer has made it clear before. Strabo goes on to cite a parallel journey from earlier in the *Odyssey* as further proof that Messene is in Lacedaemonian territory: that of Telemachus and Peisistratus as they go to visit Menelaus. At *Od.* 3.488, the two young men spend the night with Ortilochus's son Diocles at Pherae, which is said to be in Lacedaemon at *Od.* 21.15. Thus they are spending the night in Lacedaemon. At *Od.* 4.1-2 they leave this place to go to Menelaus's palace in Lacedaemon. The name must, Strabo concludes, refer to a region when Pherae is a subset of it, and a city when it is their destination from Pherae. It is as if they began, for instance, . Albany, New York, then drove to New York (City). Thus Strabo is able to make sense out of the catalogue entry, labeling the entire region Lacedaemon at *Il.* 2.581, encompassing the entire area Menelaus rules, and then proceeding to a list of individual cities within it.

We return therefore to Messenia. This region, and its chief city, Messene, is itself a sticking-point for ancient geographers, who would like to identify it with the Μέσση in the catalogue (*Il.* 2.582). That there was controversy regarding this identification is clear from an A scholion deriving from Aristarchus: ὅτι Μέσσην τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς Λακωνικῆς Μεσσήνην λέγει, συγκόψας τοῦνομα (*ΣΑ ad 582a*: "because 'Messe' means the Messene

---

<sup>247</sup> See Reese 1993: 191-192 for a discussion of the ways in which hospitality scenes in the *Odyssey* reflect, and refract, the main plot of the poem.

that is in Laconian territory, with syncopation of the name”).<sup>248</sup> Strabo follows this up by providing an exhaustive list of instances of syncopation in Homer and other poets (beginning with the most notorious instances in Homer, κῆ [for κῆῖθα] δῶ [for δῶμα], and μάψ [for μάψα], 8.5.3), in his further attempt to prove his reconstruction of Messe’s relation to Lacedaemon, and to disprove unnamed critics’ assertion that Messe in the Catalogue is to be identified with the Spartan *oba* of Mes(s)oa.<sup>249</sup> Indeed, all we have to support the identification of Messe with Messene is the strenuous arguments contained in Strabo and the Aristarchean scholion that it should be so, against opponents whose ideas have not survived. The very strenuousness of these arguments should give us pause: why should Strabo place such emphasis on Messenia’s subjection to Lacedaemon in the heroic period? The answer is most probably hinted at by Aristarchus in an instance where the A and b scholia converge with Strabo:

ὅτι γὰρ ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίους αὐτὴν οἶδεν, δῆλον ἐξ ὧν φησι “δῶρα τὰ οἱ  
 ξεῖνος Λακεδαίμονι δῶκε./ τὼ δ’ ἐν Μεσσήνῃ ξυμβλήτην ἀλλήλοισιν”  
 (ΣAb *ad* 2.582b).

[The line is marked] because Homer knew it was subject to the Lacedaemonians, which is clear when he says, “gifts which a guest-friend gave him in Lacedaemon...when they met each other in Messene” (*Od.* 21.13, 15).

The wording is Aristarchean; once again, this line has been criticized by other authors and he has redeemed it using the same passage from the *Odyssey* that Strabo would later push as far as it would go. Yet in clarifying Homer through Homer, he has made a claim for the poet’s information: saying ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίους αὐτὴν οἶδεν casts Messenia’s

<sup>248</sup> Σb *ad* 2.582b reiterates the same assertion.

<sup>249</sup> Τῶν δ’ ὑφ’ Ὀμήρου καταλεγόμενων τὴν μὲν Μέσσην οὐδαμοῦ δείκνυσθαι φησι· Μεσσοῖαν δ’ οὐ τῆς χώρας εἶναι μέρος, ἀλλὰ τῆς Σπάρτης, καθάπερ καὶ τὸ Λιμναῖον, κατὰ τὸν ... κα (8.5.3). The last phrase is corrupt in the manuscripts and has been variously reconstructed as καθὼς εἶρηκα (“just as I have said,”) or κατὰ τὸν Θράικα (“according to [Dionysius] Thrax”).

subjugation to Lacedaemon as something other than a historical, post-Homeric process. It is instead a fact, which Homer *knows*. As in the case of Salamis most famously, Homer's knowledge is authoritative. It is not, as in that case, being constructed as normative. By the period when Aristarchus is working, there is no reason to argue that Messene *should* be subject to Sparta. The refoundation of Messene by Epaminondas in 369 is much more a response to the changing political scenery of the Peloponnese and the ascendancy of Thebes over Sparta than a cause of it; by the period when Strabo was working, cultural tourism at Sparta rather emphasized the semi-imagined virtues of the period in which Messene would have been subject to Sparta than the earlier heroic period reflected in Homer where some degree of separation could be argued for.<sup>250</sup> In any case, Homer is not in this discussion being cited as an authority on how the Greek world ought currently to look; he is unsurprisingly being cited as an authority on how it should have looked in the heroic period. The chief problem with this strategy is that it would put the Spartan absorption of Messenia several hundred years earlier than it is generally held to have happened.<sup>251</sup> If, however, that historical projection is necessary to make the catalogue entry cohere, then that is what Strabo and Aristarchus both will be happy to do, and preserve Homer's authority over his text in preserving Lacedaemon's authority over Messenia. Reading Messe as Messenia, therefore, is more difficult and more desirable than any of the alternative identifications that our sources mention. Giving Menelaus kingship over a district within the city of Lacedaemon itself would be a pointless

---

<sup>250</sup> Cartledge (1979: 99) takes this line in the Catalogue as possible evidence that Sparta had a claim on Messe (and Oetylus) during the "Dark Age"--but is reluctant to assert that the Catalogue is a viable source for Mycenaean geography (*ibid.* 337).

<sup>251</sup> Tyrtaeus (fr. 5 West) puts the Spartan conquest of the Messenians about two generations before his own time; Luraghi (2002: 48-49) cautions all the same against assuming "Messenia" as an independent entity, with an identity distinct from Laconia and the neighboring areas, actually existed before the period of Spartan control of the region; at least the archaeological finds from the Geometric period are stylistically indistinct from those in Laconia.

exercise; giving him kingship over a region that Greeks of the classical period and after already assume has a long and difficult history with the Spartans is much more interesting and—if it can be justified geographically from the evidence available in the Homeric texts—more satisfying.

More so than its routine stop in the Catalogue of Ships, Lacedaemon's most memorable appearance in the *Iliad* occurs during the *teichoskopia*, where the pathos of incomplete knowledge may be fully explored, and where its most notorious inhabitant makes her stand. Helen underscores the distance between Troy and the Peloponnese in meditating on her two brothers, the Dioscuri, whom she is surprised not to see here (3.236-7). It is left to the narrator to inform us—but not her—that their geographical distance from Troy is, in fact, greater than Helen knows:

ὥς φάτο, τοὺς δ' ἤδη κάτεχεν φυσίζοος αἶα  
ἐν Λακεδαίμονι αὖθι, φίλῃ ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ (3.243-44).

So she spoke, but the life-giving earth already held them fast  
back in Lacedaimon, in [her/their] dear native land.

In this translation, I have intentionally avoided—against the inclinations of the English language—assigning a possessive article to said native land; the scholia indicate that the grammatical ambiguity was a source of distress. An A scholion on this line sets the tone for this discussion:

ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος γράφει “ἐῆ ἐν πατρίδι.” εἶτε δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν Διοσκούρων ἔσται τὸ “ἐῆ,” ἐνικὸν οὐχ ἀρμόσει, εἶτε ἐπὶ τῆς Ἑλένης, ἔκθεσμόν ἐστι τὸ οὕτω λέγειν· τοὺς δὲ ἤδη κάτεχεν φυσίζοος αἶα ἐν τῇ ἑαυτῆς πατρίδι (Σ A ad 3.244).

[The line is marked] because Zenodotus writes “in her native land.” Now if the word ἐῆ refers to the Dioscuri, the singular is not in agreement; if it refers to Helen, it is monstrous to refer to it in this manner: “the life-giving earth already held them fast in *her own* native land.”

Once again, this is Aristarchus criticizing a reading of Zenodotus, whose readings he frequently finds overly precious, implausible, un-Homeric; in this case, the reading has the potential to be worse. Ἐκθεσμον is a strong word: lawless, uncivilized, horrible.<sup>252</sup> Zenodotus has tried to make it clearer whose native land Lacedaemon is in this passage, but either it is grammatically improper (the singular pronoun ἐῖ being used where a dual or plural would be required) or it is revolting to the sensibilities, as the (slightly confusing) rephrase of the line in the scholion indicates. To refer to Sparta as Helen’s native land (ἐν τῇ ἑαυτῆς πατρίδι) is to draw excruciating emphasis to the reason the *Iliad* exists in the first place. Aristarchus would therefore rather read φίλη ἐν πατρίδι γαίη than the Zenodotean ἐῖ ἐν πατρίδι γαίη, leaving the question of who owns this native land ambiguous and unsettled.<sup>253</sup> The vehemence of his reaction is in sharp contrast to an exegetical scholion later in the poem, at 3.443, where Paris remembers when he brought Helen out of “lovely Lacedaemon” (Λακεδαίμονος ἕξ ἐρατεινῆς):

τοῖς ἐρῶσι καὶ αἱ πατρίδες τῶν ἐρωμένων δοκοῦσιν εἶναι καλαί (Σ bT *ad* 3.443).

To lovers, even the native lands of their beloveds seem beautiful.

This entry, like many of the scholia’s generalizations about human behavior, seems somehow less than objective. Yet the observation is an interesting one, all the more since it indicates that Paris’s choice of adjective constituted a minor *zētēma*—in fact, a narratological problem, since this adjective seems incongruous coming from the voice within the poem that it does. Why should he, the Trojan who only came to Lacedaemon

<sup>252</sup> Ἐκθεσμος is first attested in Chrysippus, modifying ἀσέβεια (*Fragmenta Moralia* 209.6). Philo of Alexandria is particularly fond of the word, with 19 attestations, and Plutarch uses it once in the *Life of Caesar* to describe a dream Caesar has before crossing the Rubicon; in this dream he has sexual relations with his mother (32.9). It is a strong word and surprising here—unless Helen, or Zenodotus, has really crossed the line.

<sup>253</sup> Between this scholion and the A scholion previously referenced at 2.356, it seems increasingly clear that Aristarchus has very little use for Helen.

long enough to lure its queen away with him, call the place beautiful? It takes on that quality, the scholion answers, by its association with Helen. She is enough to make the land itself beautiful, in an interesting twist on Sappho 16.<sup>254</sup> Helen is, for Paris, not only the most beautiful thing on the dark earth; she makes the dark earth itself beautiful. The scholion equates the land with the beloved wholeheartedly. It is a striking contrast to the Aristarchean reading, which leaves Helen's connection with Sparta more tenuous by removing Zenodotus's possessive pronoun. Nevertheless, the equation of Helen with Sparta itself underpins the discussions of the place in the *Iliad*.

The actual possession of Sparta and its territories is less at issue in the *Iliad* scholia, yet there are genuine problems involving the possession of authority there—complicated by Helen's ever-shifting and unfathomable status, Menelaus's relative uselessness next to his imperious brother Agamemnon, and the imposition of much later historical patterns on the Homeric landscape of the Peloponnese. Sparta, of all the *poleis* involved in the Trojan War, has the most difficult time making the transition in the Greek imagination from that era to the historical era. There is ample evidence from the 7<sup>th</sup> century on—archaeological, epigraphic, and literary—for a cult of Menelaus and Helen at Therapnae in Laconia, just as there is for Agamemnon and Alexandra/Cassandra at Mycenae and Amyclae.<sup>255</sup> Differentiating archaeologically between ancestor cult and hero cult is crucial here: the former is likely to be anonymous and generic, while the latter relies on identifications.<sup>256</sup> The side effect is that to be a hero, nobody needs to be

---

<sup>254</sup> ἐπ[ί] γὰρ μέλαι[ν]αν / [ἔ]μμεναι κάλλιστον (16.2-3 Voigt)

<sup>255</sup> Salapata (1997: 246). She makes the case that molded reliefs of warriors with snakes, common to Corinth and Laconia both, represents Agamemnon in the latter territory—Menelaus does not even rate (250). The his-and-hers *heroon* is a common feature of both major Laconian sites associated with figures from the Trojan War.

<sup>256</sup> See Antonaccio (1994: 400-401).

an ancestor, a fact that will become crucial in constructing Menelaus and Helen's place in Spartan tradition and their genuine local significance. Their line does not need to continue for their particular powers to be venerated at the place where they are buried, according to Pausanias (3.19.9).<sup>257</sup> The most outstanding literary reference to Helen's local worship comes from Herodotus's origin story for the exiled Spartan king Demaratus at 6.62. His (unnamed) mother, Herodotus tangentially explained, was the most beautiful woman in Sparta, and had been the most unattractive child until her nurse took her daily to the shrine of Helen (ἐς τὸ τῆς Ἑλένης ἱρόν... ἐν τῇ Θεράπνῃ καλεομένη). When they saw a vision of a woman who touched the child's head and promised that she would become the most beautiful woman in Sparta, Herodotus does not need to spell out who this is: an epiphany has taken place, and Helen has bestowed her own uniquely destructive gift on this child. The site of Therapnae/Therapne lies directly across the river Eurotas from the city of Sparta itself, and is mentioned already in Alcman as the site of a "holy temple."<sup>258</sup> It is not itself Homeric, despite Toynbee's attempts to define it as the actual site of Homeric Lacedaemon.<sup>259</sup> It is, however, to be identified (on the basis of inscriptional evidence) with the later Menelaion, where Helen was venerated together

---

<sup>257</sup> He then gives an alternate story for the death and burial of Helen: after the death of Menelaus, his son Megapenthes drives her out of Sparta, so she goes to Rhodes where (as she thinks) she has a friend, Polyxo, the wife of Tlepolemus. He, however, had died at *Iliad* 5.657-59, and Polyxo avenges him here by sending her maids, dressed as Furies, to string Helen up on a tree—the *aition* for a Rhodian cult of Helen Dendritis (Pausanias 3.19.9-11). Why both cities ultimately want her cult, even though neither one wanted Helen herself in the Rhodian story, is a testament to the power of hero cult for even the most unsavory of characters. See also the Agamemnoneion at Mycenae.

<sup>258</sup> *ναὸς ἄγνός ἐν πύργῳ Σεράπνας* (fr. 14 Page).

<sup>259</sup> "The votaries of the Menelaion called the place Therapne; but when the city flourished, and Menelaos ruled there, its name was Lakedaimon" (1913: 246). He does not actually offer any argument for this identification, and later scholars (e.g. Hope Simpson/Lazenby 1970: 74) have, unsurprisingly, disagreed. Excavations under H. W. Catling revealed palace complexes at the Menelaion site, the first from the 15th c. BC (LH IIB), the later in the earlier 14th c. (LH IIIA1)—earlier than those at Mycenae, Tiryns, and Pylos. The antiquity of the site could well have lent luster to its heroic claims. See Catling 2009: 12-19.

with her Greek husband from the Geometric period on.<sup>260</sup> It is actually Polybius who describes the physical orientation of the city, the landscape, and the shrine most clearly. Sparta, he says, is in the shape of a circle (περιφεροῦς ὑπαρχούσης), mostly level but broken up by hills and valleys (5.22.1); the river flows to the east of it and borders the rugged and nearly inaccessible hills on which the Menelaion sits (συμβαίνει τοὺς βουνοὺς ἐφ’ ὧν τὸ Μενέλαιον ἐστὶ πέραν μὲν εἶναι τοῦ ποταμοῦ, κεῖσθαι δὲ τῆς πόλεως κατὰ χειμερινὰς ἀνατολάς, ὄντας τραχεῖς καὶ δυσβάτους καὶ διαφερόντως ὑψηλοῦς, 5.22.3). Thus the identification of the hilltop cult site at Therapnae, across the river from the city itself, with the hilltop Menelaion, also across the river from the city, is a secure one. Herodotus makes no mention of Menelaus in his story, and has no need to; Helen is the one who can be expected to concern herself with a young girl’s appearance. Nevertheless, they both seem to have received cult at this site. Pindar (*Nemean* 10.55-56) asserts that Therapnae is the particular bit of earth that hides the Dioscuri in turn during their mortal phases—perhaps in reference to the Homeric assertion that it was the land of Lacedaemon that turned out to hold them while their sister was away; in Pindar’s poem, it is their sister’s home that receives them at last.

Whereas Spartan cult has room for Menelaus and Helen, Spartan genealogies tend to sidestep anybody involved in the Trojan War in favor of a different, less embarrassing heroic ancestor: Hercules. Herodotus’ detailed genealogy of the Agiad line at 7.204 traces the descent of Leonidas back to the hero through his son Hyllus. Invoking Hyllus necessarily involves us in the return of the Heraclidae, for which Apollodorus is the

---

<sup>260</sup> Huxley 1976: 909.

major, if complicated, source.<sup>261</sup> Apollodorus (2.8.2) reports that Hyllus unsuccessfully attempted to retake the Peloponnese as his father had done before him; instead, it remained for his grandson to do so in the reign of Orestes' son by Hermione, Tisamenus. Thus the heroic genealogies of the Atreidae are replaced by those of the Heracleidae.<sup>262</sup> How the Atreidae obtained control of the Peloponnese in the first place, however, is another matter entirely. Strabo is ultimately vague about how they gained Argos and Mycenae (περιστάντων γὰρ εἰς τοὺς Ἀτρέως παῖδας ἀπάντων, 8.6.10), but is definite on how Spartan territory was added and divided up within their sphere of influence:

Ἀγαμέμνων ὢν πρεσβύτερος, παραλαβὼν τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ἅμα τύχη τε καὶ ἀρετῇ πρὸς τοῖς οὖσι πολλὴν προσεκλήσατο τῆς χώρας· καὶ δὴ καὶ τὴν Λακωνικὴν τῇ Μυκηναίᾳ προσέθηκε. Μενέλαος μὲν δὴ τὴν Λακωνικὴν ἔσχε (8.6.10).

Agamemnon, being the older of the two, seized power; due to his good luck and his excellence he added a great deal of territory to what he already had. What is more, he added Laconia to the territory of Mycenae. Menelaus got Laconia.

This account should be juxtaposed with the Hesiodic version of the story, in which Agamemnon still arranges for Menelaus to acquire Laconia, but by the peacetime expedient of marrying Helen.<sup>263</sup> In Strabo's version, instead, we see a typically Iliadic Agamemnon, using a combination of flair and luck to encroach on the territory surrounding what has already come to him, and generously giving his little brother the

<sup>261</sup> Fletcher (2008) has shown some of the flaws in the way Apollodorus is usually read, e.g. as a handbook of widely accepted, more or less canonical, Greek myth; nevertheless, his tendentious Apollodorus is still a valuable—perhaps even because he is biased—source for the kinds of stories that were available in the classical and post-classical consciousness.

<sup>262</sup> Modern scholarship has historicized this “return of the Heracleidae” by calling it the Dorian Invasion; the linguistic evidence on this front is interesting. Finkelberg (1994:29) posits that the variation represented in the array of Greek dialects can well be explained by “an early migration” which took speakers of Doric Greek in a different direction from speakers of e.g. Ionic or Arcado-Cyprian Greek: that is, south into the Peloponnese rather than east to the islands and Asia.

<sup>263</sup> Fr. 204 M-W: ἀλλ’ Ἀγαμέμνων γαμβρὸς ἐὼν ἐμνᾶτο κασιγνήτῳι Μενελάῳι (5[15]). Elsewhere in the surviving fragments we learn that Menelaus is the best of Achaeans in one respect: wealth (25).

lesser portion while reserving Mycenae, Achaea, Corinth, and Sicyon for himself.

Meanwhile, a b scholion has Hercules bestowing Lacedaemon on Tyndareus and his sons after Tyndareus is evicted by his brother Hippocoön:

ἐφ' οἷς Ἡρακλῆς ἅμα τῷ πατρὶ κατακτείνας αὐτοὺς τὴν ἀρχὴν Τυνδάρεωι δίδωσι καὶ τοῖς παισὶ, Κάστορι καὶ Πολυδεύκει. ὧν μὴ στρατευσάντων Μενέλαος ἄρχει (Σ b *ad* 2.581-6).

Hercules fought against them [*sc.* the Hippocontids] along with his father; he killed them and gave the kingship to Tyndareus and his sons, Castor and Polydeuces. Since they did not participate in the expedition, Menelaus was the leader.<sup>264</sup>

Tyndareus has a sense of legitimacy, since Hercules and his father are willing to intervene to assure his kingship in Sparta; yet this intervention puts responsibility for Spartan affairs ultimately in Hercules' hands, and Tyndareus receives the kingship as a favor from him. The implication from the scholion is that Tyndareus' sons would naturally receive it after him, but for their untimely death; only through this is Menelaus able to claim the kingship through his marriage to Tyndareus' daughter, the *epiklēros* of Lacedaemon. This is a pattern that Greek mythology repeats over and over: rule passing not from father to son, but from father-in-law to son-in-law; Finkelberg (1998) has provided the most explicit outline of how this process works.<sup>265</sup> Equally explicit is how poorly later authors understand this pattern of succession. As we shall see, they understand that it is absolutely crucial who Helen's husband is, but the reason is not fully

---

<sup>264</sup> Much of this scholion is repeated *verbatim* in the scholia to Euripides' *Orestes* (Σ MTAB *ad* Eur. *Or.* 457), with the added detail that Tyndareus married Leda and fathered their five children (Zeus is absent here, and there is an extra daughter, Timandra) while in exile, which is where Hercules met him and "handed him the rule of Sparta" (ἐγχειρεῖ αὐτῷ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Σπάρτης), then cemented the alliance by marrying Leda's younger sister Deianira.

<sup>265</sup> Yet, as she observes (1998: 305), many traditions, including the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 197-199 M-W), place the death of the Dioscuri after the marriage of Menelaus and Helen, and presumably the transmission of the kingship from Tyndareus to his carefully selected son-in-law.

explored. Yet there is something anomalous for them about the way Menelaus has come to rule the Spartans; it must be explained.

This is partly due to their eagerness to point out his deficiencies as a leader and a warrior. Consider the following vignette: Agamemnon, seeing Menelaus wounded by Pandarus in the disrupted single combat, imagines the Trojans, in a grotesque reversal of Trojan War tourism as the Greeks were to know it, pointing out the tomb where the army has left behind ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον (4.181). An exegetical scholion is quick to seize on this telling adjective:

ἀγαθὸν ἢ κατ' εἰρωνείαν, ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν Τρώων, ἢ ὡσεὶ πατέρα τις θάψας λέγοι “ἀγαθὸν πατέρα ἀπώλεσα”· οὐ τοσοῦτον γὰρ τὰ τοῦ γένους ὅσον τὰ τῶν τρόπων ἀγαπητά (Σ T ad 4.181).<sup>266</sup>

[He is called] “noble” either ironically, as it would be coming from the Trojans, or as if someone burying his father were saying, “I have lost a good father.” It is not the qualities of his descent as much as those of his habits that are loved.

The scholion first implies that only ironically could the epithet ἀγαθός be applied to this particular hero—at least, from the point of view of the Trojans whom Agamemnon is impersonating here. The second alternative is not much better, as heroic standards go: the scholion suggests that the epithet properly applies to someone dear to the speaker who is dead, someone characterized more as likable than as noble. Menelaus falls short in either interpretation. The scholion correctly puts the line in the perspective of Agamemnon’s attempts to encourage his brother to be more ἀγαθός rather than succumbing to his wound and embarrassing the entire Achaean host; nevertheless, it clearly casts Menelaus as a bumbling, second-rate version of his brother. Already at *Iliad* 1.7 a bT scholion has to clarify for us that the phrase ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν has to be inserted to clarify the patronymic

---

<sup>266</sup> A b scholion (BCE3E4) is similarly, though not identically worded, and must come from the same source.

Ἀτρείδης, because the patronymic could signify either Menelaus or Agamemnon, but Agamemnon is the only one entitled to be called “lord of men” (Σb[BE<sup>4</sup>]T). Similarly, the scholiastic analysis of the two heroes’ equipment in the Doloneia episode (Menelaus in a leopardskin, 10.29, and Agamemnon in a lionskin, 10.23), and the order in which Homer depicts the two of them awakening to sense danger, uses the episode to range the two brothers hierarchically:

κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν τῷ Ἀγαμέμνονι. ἀλλ’ ὁ ποιητὴς τῷ βασιλικωτέρῳ προσώπῳ ἀπένειμε τὴν προτέραν τάξιν τοῦ λόγου (Σ AbT *ad* 10.25).

[Menelaus was awake] at the same time as Agamemnon, but the poet assigned the first position in the episode to the more king-like character.<sup>267</sup>

Despite Agamemnon’s many faults as a βασιλεύς, he is still better at it than his brother, and thus he receives the priority whenever possible. I argue that the commentators are making a concerted effort to disambiguate the two brothers in terms of their *ethos*:

Agamemnon is more of a commander (the irony of this position, in the light of the *Iliad*’s complete breakdown of authority in the person of Achilles, is carefully left unexamined), but Menelaus is, quite simply, a nicer person to be around; even Homer thinks so.<sup>268</sup>

Another scholion, at 4.207 where a herald tells Machaon of Menelaus’s injury with the pithy formulation τῷ μὲν κλέος, ἄμμι δὲ πένθος, confirms this picture of his character:

<sup>267</sup> This entire episode is rich fodder for ancient psychologists: Agamemnon and Nestor have handed it to them in their bizarre exchange at 10.114-124, in which Nestor complains that Menelaus is lazy in remaining asleep while great deeds are afoot, and Agamemnon assures him that his brother is only diffident sometimes out of deference to Agamemnon’s judgment—but that this time, at least, he is ahead of the game. An A scholion at 10.123 neatly stands up for all three characters, particularly Agamemnon for his brotherly defense and Menelaus for his deference, οἷον εἶναι δεῖ νεώτερον ἀδελφὸν πρὸς πρεσβύτερον.

<sup>268</sup> This is an explanation given for one of the unusual features of the narrator’s diction, namely referring to Menelaus, among other characters, with the vocative: οὐδὲ σέθεν, Μενέλαε: ἀποστροφή ἀπὸ προσώπου εἰς πρόσωπον. προσπέπονθε δὲ Μενελάῳ ὁ ποιητὴς. διὸ συνεχέστερον αὐτῷ διαλέγεται, ὡς καὶ Πατρόκλω, Εὐμαίῳ, Μελανίπῳ (ΣbT *ad* 4.127). Presumably the poet only talks to characters with whom he can “sympathize” (προσπέπονθε).

οὐ διακόνου ὁ λόγος, φίλου δὲ καὶ συμπαθοῦς· τὴν ἀπὸ παντὸς γὰρ προσώπου εὖνοιαν εἰς Μενέλαον συνίστησιν ὁ ποιητής. τούναντίον δὲ ἐπὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ (ΣbT *ad* 4.207).

This is not the speech of a servant, but of a friend and sympathizer. Homer portrays the friendliness of each character towards Menelaus—and the opposite sentiment toward Alexander.

Helen’s two husbands are here neatly ranged on an axis from popular to unpopular.<sup>269</sup>

Menelaus is so universally beloved that even the heralds experience fellow-feeling with him at his injury. The scholion almost joins in with the general approval—not only of Menelaus, but of Homer, who was able to take the most minor incident and use it to demonstrate his excellent judgment of the characters he constructs.<sup>270</sup> Menelaus must be likable, and Paris unlikable, for the audience’s sympathies to be ranged on the correct side.

Yet the *Iliad* is a poem whose plot hinges on at least one person’s not liking Menelaus as well as Paris, and a linked pair of b and T scholia (not identical, but similar enough that they must derive from the same source) carefully observe that Homer never actually calls Menelaus Helen’s husband: διὸ Μενέλαον οὐδέποτε πόσιν αὐτῆς καλεῖ (Σb *ad* 13.766)/ εἶπεν (ΣT *ibid.*). This judgment—that Menelaus is, for the duration at least, not Helen’s husband, calls into question his kingly position in Sparta. However he acquired it, it is in jeopardy now: Agamemnon, who in both the Strabonian and the

---

<sup>269</sup> The same opposition is found in a scholion at 7.107, where Agamemnon is urging Menelaus not to fight Hector. διὰ τί τὸν μὲν Ἀλέξανδρον κελεύει μονομαχεῖν Ἑκτώρ, τὸν δὲ Μενέλαον κωλύει κινδυνεύειν Ἀγαμέμνων καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι τῶν Ἀχαιῶν βασιλεῖς; ὅτι τοῦ μὲν Ἀλεξάνδρου ἀδικοῦντος ἡδέως οἱ Τρῶες ἀπηλλάττοντο, τὸν δὲ ὡς ἀδικούμενον ἠλέουν (Σb[BCE<sup>3</sup>E<sup>4</sup>]T *ad* 7.107): “Why does Hector order Alexander to fight in single combat, but Agamemnon and the other kings of the Achaeans forbid Menelaus from running into danger? Because the Trojans would gladly be rid of Alexander, who is in the wrong, but everyone pitied Menelaus for being wronged.” The wording is that of a *zēthēma*; this entry is not, however, included among Porphyry’s fragments in MacPhail (2011).

<sup>270</sup> We may compare Σab *ad* 2.582b, cited above, in which Homer “knew” that Messenia was subject to Sparta. In both cases the poet is being praised not for his depiction, but for his keen perception.

Hesiodic accounts gave Menelaus his possessions (including Helen), has not been able to defend them. Indeed, he has been trying to defend Menelaus fairly consistently throughout the poem.<sup>271</sup> Menelaus, in turn, is represented as knowing when he is outclassed. Homer represents him as an effective speaker (3.212-215), so the question of why he does not intercede between Achilles and Agamemnon in the first book of the poem arises in the scholarship, specifically at Σb(BCE<sup>3</sup>E<sup>4</sup>)T *ad* 1.247-8: ἀλλ’ οὔτε Μενέλαος ἠδύνατο παραινεῖν· τῷ μὲν γὰρ ἀδελφῷ προστιθέμενος ἀπήχθετο Ἀχιλλεῖ (Menelaus could not advise him, for if he agreed with his brother, he would become Achilles’ enemy). Once again, a seemingly innocuous episode—Nestor’s intervention between the furious Achilles and Agamemnon—is cast as a challenge to Menelaus’s authority. Menelaus cannot afford to take sides between the fighting machine and the commander of the Achaeans—even if the latter is his brother and he has no personal quarrel with the former. Here is the diffidence that Nestor and Agamemnon discussed in the Doloneia, at least in the commentator’s estimation. What could be taken for pure sloth is instead a reasoned reluctance to get into a situation that can have no good outcome: this is the first picture of Menelaus’s strategy that we get in the *Iliad* scholia.

I argue that this is no accident, but that there is a sustained effort in the ancient scholarship to undermine the authority of this accidental king of Sparta—a warrior who can be compared to a lion fiercely attacking its chosen prey one moment (17.61-69), and a lion whose killing ardor is dampened by the approach of armed men and hunting dogs the next (17.109-113). The question of what Sparta controls, though lively enough in the

---

<sup>271</sup> See note 7; also Σ T *ad* 10.236, where Agamemnon is trying to get Diomedes to pick someone other than Menelaus to accompany him on his nighttime raid. The poet says explicitly at 240 that Agamemnon is afraid on his brother’s behalf, and the scholion at 236 notes drily: καλῶς παραιτεῖται Μενέλαον· οὐ γὰρ ἄριστος οὔτος (he is right to direct the request away from Menelaus, for he is not the best).

ancient scholarship on the territory's entry in the Catalogue of Ships, ultimately gives way to the question of who controls Sparta: Menelaus or Agamemnon, Hercules or Helen, or Paris: for if Menelaus has obtained Sparta by marrying Helen, and Homer is careful never to call Menelaus Helen's husband, then being Helen's husband is something disturbingly significant for the mechanics of the poem.<sup>272</sup>

The immense geographical and social distance between Lacedaemon and Troy is emphasized particularly in the *teichoskopia*, where Helen surveys the men fighting over her and wonders about the ones who are absent. This episode compresses the entire space of the Trojan War into one single combat—a barbarian custom, according to one scholion.<sup>273</sup> We are not allowed to forget about Lacedaemon, where the Dioscuri are dead and which she left behind with Paris; it, not Troy, is located at the center of this war. If Lacedaemon is a constant, Menelaus turns out to be the variable in the equation. His kingship is called into question, and his dynasty has no staying power. His place in Spartan history, therefore, and his niche in the Spartan landscape center around cult rather than genealogy. Thus we get another perspective on the issue of continuity between the heroic period and the present that troubles the scholiasts generally. The Catalogue of Ships raises the question of what can be considered Sparta, while the issue of who can be considered its leader crops up repeatedly elsewhere. The origins of Sparta's distinctiveness became a question dear to antiquarians very early on; looking for these origins in the period Homer represents turns out to be more complicated than it looks—and in any case, Menelaus's authority and his Spartan identity get called into question by necessity. We may finish by looking at a comment on the Achaean council at

---

<sup>272</sup> As Menelaus himself hints at *Il.* 3.100 when he characterizes the war as occurring εἴνεκ' ἐμῆς ἔριδος καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔνεκ' ἀρχῆς—though the question of what exactly Alexander stands to rule is left open.

<sup>273</sup> ΣβT *ad* 3.69: βαρβαρικὸν τὸ μονομαχεῖν ἔθος.

the beginning of *Iliad* 2 that sets the whole chain of events that culminates with the regrouping of the army and the Catalogue of Ships in motion. Homer says that Agamemnon, at the urging of his divinely sent dream, calls a βουλή μεγαθύμων γέροντων (2.53) next to Nestor's ship. A scholion comments on the political ramifications of this decision:

φθάνει δὲ τὴν Λακόνων πολιτείαν, βουλὴν γέροντων καὶ δύο βασιλεῖς λέγων (Σ A b (BCE<sup>3</sup>E<sup>4</sup>) T *ad* 2.53).

Homer anticipates the constitution of the Lacedaemonians by saying this is a council of elders and two kings.

The only two characters to speak in this political meeting are Agamemnon and the ship's owner, Nestor, Πυλογενέος βασιλῆος (2.54). Menelaus is silent. Whoever is anticipating the future of Sparta's dual kingship and Gerousia, he is not. The Catalogue of Ships may say that he rules hollow Lacedaemon, but in the end, the ancient commentators realize how tenuous his grip on it really is: as tenuous as his grip on Helen, who is able to make her homeland alluring by the power of her own allure.

#### **4. Conclusion**

The Catalogue of Ships brings us to a discussion of geography in the broadest possible sense: not simply juggling toponyms and mapping points, but the human geography of influence and authority. Authority, in fact, turns out to be the key word in all these case studies from the catalogue: whether it is the authority of the individual heroes enumerated alongside their followers and the regions they claim as their own, or the authority of the poet who is constructing these claims for his characters in the first place. The scholiastic description of the Catalogue of Ships as “sweet and magnificent” (ἡδὺς καὶ μεγαλοπρεπής, Σb *ad* 2.494-877) sets the tone for everything that is to follow.

This is an aesthetic judgment, but it forms the basis for a whole set of other judgments, with real-world applications and sometimes terribly prosaic consequences; whether assigning Salamis to Athens over competing claims from Megara, extrapolating Boeotia’s significance to the *Iliad* merely from its placement in the Catalogue of Ships, or lining up Messene neatly behind the figure of a king hardly able to control it. The poet claims in the proem to the catalogue that there is simply too much information. He is unable to process it, unable to give it the attention that it deserves, without the help of the Muses. Yet the ancient scholars and biographers were astute enough to know that a certain degree of research has to be involved, and there are no Muses for that. The way that the poem constructs the Muses as sources of information is, however, an experiential one—just like research:

ὕμεις γὰρ θεαί ἐστε πάρεστε τε ἴστε τε πάντα (*Il.* 2.485).

You are goddesses; you are everywhere and you know everything.

Aristarchus weighed in on this line’s textual problems, which elucidate how the Muses’ knowledge is supposed to have been attained:

πάρεστε: ὅτι τινὲς γράφουσι “παρήστε,” οἷον κατ’ ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον. βέλτιον δὲ καθολικῶς ἐπὶ πάντων (*Σ A ad 2.485*).

“You are present”: [The line is marked] because some sources write “you were present,” i.e. at that time. But it is better to apply it generally to everything.

In other words, these manuscripts read “you were present” because that gives the Muses direct access to the events the poem is describing—but since they are goddesses, they are always eyewitnesses to begin with, in a way that human researchers, including Homer, could only dream of. The pseudo-Herodotean *Life*, out of all the Homeric *Lives*, provides a Muse-free glimpse into what the background of a Homer who could have created this

catalogue looks like. He is, indeed, hampered by disadvantages: relying on reports, in the true Herodotean fashion, to fill in the gaps of his personal knowledge, and limited by where he is able to go. Thus the question of what Homer knows about any given subject at any given time is a crucial one. The poem answers in terms of the Muses; the scholars answer in terms of research. Homer is said to “understand” that Menelaus is a sympathetic character and to “know” that Messene is in his jurisdiction; the poet also chooses to include Athens and Salamis in the catalogue when it becomes clear that to do otherwise would be inaccurate and incomplete. He has his own reasons for putting Boeotia first, and they are all full of antiquarian interest. In other words, Homer is one of us. It is another truism that Homer is considered authoritative on a whole range of subjects in antiquity, but the ancient scholarly responses to the Catalogue of Ships allow us to delve into the mechanisms by which his authority is, ultimately, reinforced.

## Chapter V. Conclusion

The foregoing chapters have examined the mechanisms whereby ancient critics, geographers, tourists, and readers interpreted the physical space of Homer's poems. From the cult statue of Athena at the physical and spiritual center of the city of Troy, to the palace of Menelaus in Sparta where the war in some sense began, the poem covers a vast stretch of land and sea. It is this very vastness that makes the geography of the *Iliad* so irresistible for ancient scholarship. The *Iliad* is rich in places to be discussed, whether they are mentioned only once in the Catalogue of Ships ("and that uncertain," in the words of George Seferis) or repeatedly visited by the heroes of the poem as they play out their disputes on the terrain outside Troy.<sup>274</sup>

It is ultimately the fictionality of these places that turns out to be at issue in the scholarship. We have traced the ways in which the history of Troy itself has been shaped, over and over, by the desires of its visitors. Xerxes made his sacrifices to Athena Ilias at a place where there was something epic to be found, and realized when fear swept his camp in the night just how profoundly tremendous--in every sense of the word--this epic subject matter could be.<sup>275</sup> Herodotus, in reporting this story, had no doubt that something

---

<sup>274</sup> μόνο μια λέξη στην Ιλιάδα κι εκείνη αβέβαιη ("The King of Asine" 15).

<sup>275</sup> *Histories* 7.43; see also Chapter 2, Section 2.

monumental had happened on this site, even as he indicates elsewhere his doubts about the veracity of Homer's account as a whole.<sup>276</sup>

Such doubts pervade ancient readings of the *Iliad*, even as the majority of our authors try strenuously to resist them or explain them away entirely. The events that Homer describes make demands on the audience's imagination and its suspension of disbelief: the enumeration of the Greeks' forces only at the end of a ten-year war, the construction of elaborate defensive walls only to sink them into nothing.<sup>277</sup> These doubts are directly at odds with some of the most fundamental assumptions of ancient Homeric scholarship about its source material: that Homer was a real person who described real places; that the broad outlines of the Trojan War were as they were described in the *Iliad* and remembered in the *Odyssey*; that Homer was a reliable source who knew what he was talking about, because his poetic formation gave him the authority to narrate his stories; that this very reliability is what gives him his educational and cultural value. Hence we see genuine anxiety in our source material when the facts do not appear to add up, and strenuous efforts to construct a geography that can either match Homer's or explain the discrepancies.

The first main chapter, dealing with the city of Troy itself, traces the ancient manifestations of "Iliad Syndrome": the desire to see, on the coast of Asia Minor, the remains of a city such as the *Iliad* described.<sup>278</sup> Modern scholarship on Troy is painfully self-aware on this score, and its ancient predecessors were no less so. The history of Greek colonization and tourism at the site created a Troy that was at once the authentic

---

<sup>276</sup> See e.g. *Histories* 2.118.

<sup>277</sup> ὁ δὲ πλάσας ποιητῆς ἠφάνισεν (Aristotle fr. 162 Rose = Strabo 13.1.36); see Scodel 1982 and Porter 2011.

<sup>278</sup> Kolb 2004.

city of Homer and a haunting reminder of the city's destruction and unattainability. The city's major landmarks--the cult statue of Athena, the hot and cold springs past which Achilles and Hector run in their desperate life-and-death struggle, and the mounds of forgotten heroes all provide instances where there are gaps between Homer's knowledge and our own, gaps that can only be resolved by emphasizing the fundamental discontinuity between ancient and modern Troy.

The next chapter moves toward the human geographies of the Trojan Catalogue, often merely considered as an appendage to the Catalogue of Ships, but indicative in its own right of how Greek audiences differentiated one set of barbarians from another. The physical center of the Trojans' empire--the city itself--proves to be a very shaky center indeed from the political perspective. The half-Greek, half-barbarian Carians whose language is a stumbling block for everyone who tries to communicate with them, the Phrygians who are systematically buying out Troy and scattering its physical remnants across Asia, and the Dardanians who are inextricably linked to the Trojan royal house, yet at odds with its vision of Troy's future, all provide evidence of Trojan instability and inability to communicate across physical and cultural boundaries. At the same time, the scholarship underlines the degree to which Homer has purposefully left these boundaries blurry, so that it is impossible to tell where Troy ends and Dardania or Phrygia begins.

The final chapter moves farther outward to the Catalogue of Ships, a survey of the places that did not make it into the *Iliad* proper but are nevertheless at the back of characters' minds as well as readers'. I argue that the Catalogue is used in ancient scholarship to contribute to the richness of Homer's world-building and assert his poetic authority. By constructing this magisterial account of the places the Greek heroes left

behind them, the *Iliad* shaped many geopolitical arguments of antiquity and therefore the map of Greece itself. The notorious interpolation of the Salaminian entry into the Catalogue functions as a justification for the links between Salamis and Athens, and other boundary disputes are similarly mediated through the Homeric text; the strange primacy given to Boeotia in the Catalogue becomes a means of interrogating the Greeks' own stories about their origins; and the multiple breakdowns of authority that occur in Spartan territory and that Spartan outpost at Troy, Helen, ultimately serve to reinforce the authority of the poet to describe and create--in that order--the Greek places mentioned in the Catalogue.

The methods that ancient scholarship used in order to make these claims are worth untangling. The Homeric scholia cover both exegetical and textual issues--yet text and exegesis support each other, as in the case of the cult statue of Athena; juggling prepositions to make her either seated or standing can create different shades of meaning, and whether she is seated or standing turns out to have potentially enormous repercussions for the story of Troy's destruction. It is this juxtaposition of the large and the small scale that makes the cultural perspective of the scholia so fascinating, and so capable of being productively juxtaposed with Greek geography and historiography. The Homeric commentaries and Strabo turn out to have a great deal to say to each other--but so do the Homeric commentaries and Thucydides. We must therefore read these texts against each other in order to get the fullest picture of the strategies whereby ancient readers and students of Homer used the *Iliad*'s geography to reinforce the poet's authority over his material. They do so by patiently reconstructing not only the Homeric world, but the ways in which it had been damaged or destroyed between the time when

the Trojan War was supposed to have taken place and the poet's own time, and between the poet's time and their various times. Thus Strabo's assertion that Homer's poetry is meant to teach us something, and Porphyry's assertion that Aristarchus clarified Homer through Homer, are pithy summaries of the goals and aims of these major figures in ancient interpretation, but in reality a great deal of legwork is required to determine how these goals are actually achieved. This dissertation has offered some ways in which this work can be done--and there is still, even for an author with Homer's extensive history of analysis, plenty to be done.

## Bibliography

- Adiego, I. J. *The Carian Language*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . "Recent Developments in the Decipherment of Carian." In *Hellenistic Karia. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Hellenistic Karia*. Bordeaux, 2010:147-176.
- Allen, Susan Heuck. "'Finding the Walls of Troy': Frank Calvert, Excavator." *American Journal of Archaeology* 99.3 (1995): 379-407.
- Antonaccio, Carla M. "Contesting the Past: Hero Cult, Tomb Cult, and Epic in Early Greece." *American Journal of Archaeology* 98.3 (1994): 389-410.
- Ballabriga, Alain. "Survie et descendance d'Enée: le mythe grecque archaïque." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* N.S. 55 (1997): 23-39.
- Biraschi, Anna Maria. "Strabo and Homer." In *Strabo's Cultural Geography: The Making of a Kolossourgia*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 73-85.
- Bittlestone, Robert, James Diggle, and John Underhill. *Odysseus Unbound: the Search for Homer's Ithaca*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Boulter, Cedric. "Ilion." *Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*. Princeton: Princeton University Press (1976): 407.
- Briant, Pierre. *Histoire de l'empire perse: de Cyrus à Alexandre*. Paris: Fayard, 1996.
- Brown, Edwin L. "In Search of Anatolian Apollo." *Hesperia Supplements* 33 (2004) : 243-257.

- Bryce, Trevor. *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- . *The Trojans and Their Neighbours*. London; New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Buonajuto, Alessandra. "L'exokeanismos dei viaggi di Odisseo in Cratete e negli Alessandrini." *Atene e Roma* 41.1 (1996): 1-8.
- Cabella, Emanuela. "Varianti omeriche e citazione mnemoniche nei Saturnalia di Macrobio." *Athenaeum* 86.2 (1998): 505-517.
- de Carlos, Helena. "Los retornos de Enea y Antenor: fundamentos antiguos de un tema medieval." *Studi Medievali* 35.2 (1994): 629-642.
- Carney, E. D. "Women and *Dunasteia* in Caria." *American Journal of Philology* 126.1 (2005): 65-91.
- Cartledge, Paul. *Sparta and Lakonia: A Regional History, 1300-362 BC*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Catling, H. W. *Sparta: Menelaion I: The Bronze Age*. London: British School at Athens, 2009.
- Clarke, Katherine. *Between Geography and History: Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Clay, Diskin. "The Islands of the Odyssey." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 37.1 (2007): 141-162.
- Cook, J. M. "Greek Archaeology in Western Asia Minor." *Archaeological Reports* 6 (1959): 27-57.
- Crates. *I frammenti*. Ed. Maria Broggiato. La Spezia: Agorà, 2002.

- Cuillandre, Joseph. *La droite et la gauche dans les poèmes homériques en concordance avec la doctrine pythagoricienne et avec la tradition celtique*. Rennes: Imprimeries Réunies, 1943.
- Danek, Georg. "Antenor und seine Familie in der *Ilias*." *Wiener Studien* 119 (2006): 5-22.
- Dickey, Eleanor. *Ancient Greek Scholarship*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Dickinson, O. T. P. K. "Homer, the Poet of the Dark Age." *Greece & Rome* 33.1 (1986): 20-37.
- Diederich, Silke. "Geographisches in Scholien und Kommentaren." In *Geographie und verwandte Wissenschaften*. Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 2000. 209-226.
- Dörpfeld, Wilhelm et al. *Troja und Ilion. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen in den vorhistorischen und historischen Schichten von Ilion 1870-1894*. Athens: Beck & Barth, 1902.
- Drews, Robert. "Myths of Midas and the Phrygian Migration from Europe." *Klio* 75 (1993) : 9-26.
- Duckworth, George E. "Προαναφώνησις in the Scholia to Homer." *The American Journal of Philology* 52.4 (1931): 320-338.
- Dueck, Daniela, Hugh Lindsay, and Sarah Pothecary, eds. *Strabo's Cultural Geography: The Making of a Kolossourgia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Dyck, Andrew R. "The Glossographoi." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 91 (1987): 119-160.
- Easton, D. F. "Priam's Treasure." *Anatolian Studies* 34 (1984): 141-169.
- Easton, D. F. et al. "Troy in Recent Perspective." *Anatolian Studies* 52 (2002): 75-109.

- Edwards, Mark W. "The Structure of Homeric Catalogues." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 110 (1980): 81-105.
- . *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume 5: Books 17-20*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Epaphroditus. *Testimonia and fragments*. Ed. Bruce Karl Braswell & Margarethe Billerbeck. New York: Peter Lang, 2007.
- Erbse, Hartmut. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*. 7 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969.
- Erskine, Andrew. *Troy Between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Eustathius. *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes ad fidem codicis Laurentiani editi*. Ed. M. H. A. L. van der Valk. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Fabre, P. "La date de rédaction du périple de Scylax." *Les Études Classiques* XXXIII (1965): 353-366.
- Faulkner, Andrew. *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Finkelberg, Margalit. "Ajax's Entry in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*." *The Classical Quarterly* 38.1 (1988): 31-41.
- . "Royal Succession in Heroic Greece." *The Classical Quarterly* 41.2 (1991): 303-316.
- . "The Dialect Continuum of Ancient Greek." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 96 (1994): 1-36.
- . *Greeks and Pre-Greeks: Aegean Pre-History and Greek Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

- Fletcher, K. F. B. "Systematic Genealogies in Apollodorus' Bibliotheca and the Exclusion of Rome from Greek Myth." *Classical Antiquity* 27.1 (2008): 59-91.
- Franco, Carlo. "L'ellenizzazione della Caria: problemi di metodo." *Il dinamismo della colonizzazione greca*. Naples: Loffredo, 1997. 145-154.
- Frisch, Peter, ed. *Die Inschriften von Ilion*, Bonn: Habelt, 1975.
- Gabba, Emilio. "Sulla valorizzazione politica della leggenda delle origine troiane di Roma fra III e II secolo a.C." *I canali della propaganda nel mondo antico*. Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1976. 84-101.
- Giovannini, Adalberto. *Étude historique sur les origines du catalogue des vaisseaux*. Berne: Francke, 1969.
- Goekoop, Cees H. *Where on Earth Is Ithaca?: A Quest for the Homeland of Odysseus*. Delft: Eburon Uitgeverij B.V., 2010.
- Gorman, Vanessa. *Miletus: The Ornament of Ionia. A History of the City to 400 BCE*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001.
- Graziosi, Barbara. *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic*. Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Griffin, Jasper. "Herodotus and Tragedy." *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 46-59.
- Güterbock, Hans G. "The Hittites and the Aegean World: Part 1. The Ahhijawa Problem Reconsidered." *American Journal of Archaeology* 87.2 (1983): 133-138.
- Hainsworth, Bryan. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume 3: Books 9-12*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

- Hall, Edith. "When Did the Trojans Turn Into Phrygians? Alcaeus 42.15." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 73 (1988): 15-18.
- . *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition Through Tragedy*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Hall, Jonathan M. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- . *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Hedreen, Guy. *Capturing Troy: The Narrative Functions of Landscape in Archaic and Early Classical Greek Art*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001.
- Heiden, Bruce A. *Homer's Cosmic Fabrication: Choice and Design in the Iliad*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Hertel, Dieter. *Die Mauern von Troja: Mythos und Geschichte im antiken Ilion*. München: C.H. Beck, 2003.
- Hertel, Dieter, and Frank Kolb. "Troy in Clearer Perspective." *Anatolian Studies* 53 (2003): 71-88.
- Hoekstra, A. *The Sub-Epic Stage of the Formulaic Tradition. Studies in the Homeric Hymns to Apollo, to Aphrodite and to Demeter*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1969.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. "Some Problems in the Aeneas Legend." *The Classical Quarterly* 29.2 (1979): 372-390.
- How, W. W., and J. Wells. *A Commentary on Herodotus: With Introduction and Appendixes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

- Jablonka, Peter, and C. Brian Rose. "Forum Response: Late Bronze Age Troy: A Response to Frank Kolb." *American Journal of Archaeology* 108.4 (2004): 615-630.
- Janko, Richard. *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- . *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume 4: Books 13-16*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Jebb, R. C. "Homeric and Hellenic Ilium." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 2 (1881): 7-43.
- Kaibel, Georg. *Epigrammata græca ex lapidibus conlecta*. Berlin: Reimer, 1878.
- Kirk, G.S. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume 1: Books 1-4*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- . *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume 2: Books 5-8*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Kayan, Ilhan. "The Water Supply of Troia." *Studia Troica* 10 (2000): 135-183.
- Kennell, Nigel M. *Spartans: A New History*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Kim, Lawrence. "The Portrait of Homer in Strabo's Geography." *Classical Philology* 102.4 (2007): 363-388.
- . *Homer Between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Kolb, Frank. "Forum Article: Troy VI: A Trading Center and Commercial City?" *American Journal of Archaeology* 108.4 (2004) : 577-613.
- . *Tatort Troia. Geschichte, Mythen, Politik*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 2010.

- König, Jason. "Describing Greece. Landscape and Literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias/Researcher, Traveller, Narrator. Studies in Pausanias' Periegesis." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 127 (2007) : 169.
- Korfmann, Manfred. "Troia - Ausgrabungen 1997." *Studia Troica* 8 (1998): 1-70.
- . "Troia, an Ancient Anatolian Palatial and Trading Center: Archaeological Evidence for the Period of Troia VI/VII." *The Classical World* 91.5 (1998): 369-385.
- Kroll, John H. "The Ancient Image of Athena Polias." *Hesperia Supplements* 20 (1982) : 65-203.
- Lang, Mabel L. "Review: [*The Catalogue of the Ships in Homer's Iliad*]." *The American Journal of Philology* 93.4 (1972) : 602-605.
- Lasserre, François. *Etymologicum magnum genuinum. Symeonis etymologicum: una cum magna grammatica. Etymologicum magnum auctum*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1976.
- Latacz, Joachim, ed. *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar. Band II: Zweiter Gesang (B). Faszikel 2: Kommentar*. With Claude Brügger, Magdalene Stoevesandt, and Edzard Visser. Munich/Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 2003.
- . *Troy and Homer: Towards a Solution of an Old Mystery*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Levillain, Jean. *Étude sur la localisation d'Ilion d'après l'Iliade d'Homere, suivie du compte-rendu de deux excursions en Troade*. Istanbul: F. Siffrid, 1962.
- Lohmann, Dieter. *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1970.
- Luraghi, Nino. "Becoming Messenian." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 122 (2002): 45-69.

- Luyster, Robert. "Symbolic Elements in the Cult of Athena." *History of Religions* 5.1 (1965): 133-163.
- Lycophron. *Alessandra*. Ed. Massimo Fusillo, André Hurst, & Guido Paduano. Milan: Guerini e associati, 1991.
- Mackie, Hilary Susan. *Talking Trojan*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1996.
- Mackil, Emily. "Wandering Cities: Alternatives to Catastrophe in the Greek Polis." *American Journal of Archaeology* 108.4 (2004): 495-516.
- MacLachlan, Bonnie. "Personal Poetry: Alcaeus." *A companion to the Greek lyric poets*. New York: Brill, 1997.
- Mahaffy, J. P. "The Site and Antiquity of the Hellenic Ilion." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 3 (1882) : 69-80.
- Malkin, Irad. *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Washington, D.C.: Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Hellenic Studies, Trustees for Harvard University; Harvard University Press, 2001.
- McCauley, Barbara. "The Transfer of Hippodameia's Bones: A Historical Context." *The Classical Journal* 93.3 (1998) : 225-239.
- Meijering, Roos. *Literary and Rhetorical Theories in Greek Scholia*. Groningen: E. Forsten, 1987.
- Meineke, August, ed. *Strabonis Geographica*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1866.
- Mellink, Machteld. "The Hittites and the Aegean World." *American Journal of Archaeology* 87.2: 138-141.

- Minchin, Elizabeth. "Spatial Memory and the Composition of the Iliad." In *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World*. Ed. E. Anne Mackay. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Montanari, Franco. "Mythographus Homericus." In *Greek Literary Theory After Aristotle: A Collection of Papers in Honour of D. M. Schenkeveld*. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1995.
- Müller, Karl. *Geographi Graeci Minores*. Paris: Firmin-Didot et sociis, 1882.
- Munson, Rosaria. "Artemisia in Herodotus." *Classical Antiquity* VII (1988): 91-106.
- Nicole, Jules et al. *Scholia eis tēn Homērou Iliada. Les scolies genevoises de l'Iliade*. Geneva: H. Georg, 1891.
- Niemeier, Barbara, and Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier. "Milet 1994-1995: Projekt 'Minoisch-mykenisches bis protogeometrisches Milet': Zielsetzung und Grabungen auf dem Stadionhügel und am Athenatempel." *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (1997): 189-248.
- Niemeier, Wolf-Dietrich. "Archaic Greeks in the Orient: Textual and Archaeological Evidence." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 322 (2001): 11-32.
- Nünlist, René. "The Homeric Scholia on Focalization." *Mnemosyne* 56.1 (2003) : 61-71.
- . "Narratological Concepts in Greek Scholia." In *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*. Ed. Jonas Grethlein and Antonios Rengakos. New York: De Gruyter, 2009.
- . *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

- Pfeiffer, Rudolf. *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Porphyry. *Porphyry's Homeric Questions on the Iliad: Text, Translation, Commentary*. Ed. John MacPhail, Jr. New York: De Gruyter, 2010.
- Porter, James I. "Making and Unmaking: The Achaean Wall and the Limits of Fictionality in Homeric Criticism." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 141.1 (2011): 1-36.
- Radt, S. L., ed.. *Strabons Geographika*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002.
- Reese, Steve. *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993.
- Richardson, Nicholas. "Literary Criticism in the Exegetical Scholia to the Iliad: A Sketch." *The Classical Quarterly* 30.2 (1980): 265-287.
- . *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume 6: Books 21-24*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Romm, James S. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought: Geography, Exploration, and Fiction*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Rose, Charles Brian. "Troy and the Historical Imagination." *The Classical World* 91.5 (1998): 405-413.
- . "Separating Fact from Fiction in the Aiolian Migration." *Hesperia* 77 (2008): 399-430.
- Ruzicka, Stephen. *Politics of a Persian Dynasty: The Hecatomnids in the Fourth Century B.C.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992.

- Salapata, Gina. "Hero Warriors from Corinth and Lakonia." *Hesperia* 66.2 (1997): 245-260.
- Sammons, Benjamin. *The Art and Rhetoric of the Homeric Catalogue*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Schenkeveld, Dirk M. "Aristarchus and ΟΜΗΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΤΕΧΝΟΣ: Some Fundamental Ideas of Aristarchus on Homer as a Poet." *Mnemosyne* 23.2 (1970): 162-178.
- . "Strabo on Homer." *Mnemosyne* 29.1 (1976) : 52-64.
- Schironi, Francesca. *I frammenti di Aristarco di Samotracia negli etimologici bizantini: Etymologicum Genuinum, Magnum, Symeonis, Megalē Grammatikē, Zonarae Lexicon. Introduzione, edizione critica e commento*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.
- . "Theory into Practice: Aristotelian Principles in Aristarchean Philology." *Classical Philology* 104.3 (2009) : 279-316.
- Schliemann, Heinrich. *Troja; Results of the Latest Researches and Discoveries on the Site of Homer's Troy*, 1882. Bronx, N. Y.: B. Blom, 1967.
- Schliemann, Heinrich, Rudolf Virchow, and Paul Ascherson. *Ilios: Stadt und Land der Trojaner: Forschungen und Entdeckungen in der Troas und besonders auf der Baustelle von Troja*. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1881.
- Scholia Vetera Et Paraphrases in Lycophronis Alexandram*. Ed. Pietro Luigi Leone. Galatina: Congedo, 2002.
- Scodel, Ruth. "The Achaean Wall and the Myth of Destruction." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 86 (1982): 33-50.

- Sevinç, Nurten. "A New Sarcophagus of Polyxena from the Salvage Excavations at Gümüşçay." *Studia Troica* VI (1996): 251-264.
- Simpson, R. Hope., and J. F. Lazenby. *The Catalogue of the Ships in Homer's Iliad*. Oxford: Clarendon P., 1970.
- Smith, Peter M. "Aineiadaï as Patrons of Iliad XX and the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 85 (1981): 17-58.
- Snipes, Kenneth. "Literary Interpretation in the Homeric Scholia: The Similes of the Iliad." *The American Journal of Philology* 109.2 (1988): 196-222.
- Starke, Frank. "Troia im Kontext des historisch-politischen und sprachlichen Umfeldes Kleinasiens im 2. Jahrtausend." *Studia Troica* 7 (1997): 447-487.
- Stephanus et al. *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica*. Ed. Margarethe Billerbeck. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2006.
- Strabo on the Troad: Book XIII*. Ed. Walter Leaf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923.
- Szemerényi, Oswald. "Graeca Anatolica." In *Tractata Mycenaea: Proceedings of the VIIIth International Conference on Mycenaean Studies*. Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 1987.
- van Thiel, Helmut. "Die D-Scholien der Ilias in den Handschriften." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 132 (2000) : 1-62.
- . "Scholia D." 2000. <http://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/1810/> 27 July 2011.
- Toynbee, Arnold J. "The Growth of Sparta." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 33 (1913): 246-275.

- Trachsel, Alexandra. *La Troade: un paysage et son héritage littéraire: les commentaires antiques sur la Troade, leur genèse et leur influence*. Basel: Schwabe, 2007.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu. "Realism and Fantasy in Art, History, and Geography." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 80.3 (1990): 435-446.
- Blegen, Carl W. et al. *Troy: Excavations Conducted by the University of Cincinnati, 1932-1938*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.
- Vermeule, Cornelius C. "Neon Ilium and Ilium Novum: Kings, Soldiers, Citizens, and Tourists at Classical Troy." *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule*. Ed. Jane Carter & Sarah Morris. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995. 467-482.
- Visser, Edzard. *Homers Katalog der Schiffe*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997.
- van Wees, Hans. "Leaders of Men? Military Organisation in the Iliad." *The Classical Quarterly* 36.2 (1986): 285-303.
- West, M. L., ed. *Homeri Ilias*. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1998.
- , ed. *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- . *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*. München: Saur, 2001.
- . "The Invention of Homer." *The Classical Quarterly* 49.2 (1999) : 364-382.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich. *Die Ilias und Homer*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1920.