© Copyright 2017

Eunice Seungyeon Kim

The Fugitive: Murder and Exile in the Age of Heroes

Eunice Seungyeon Kim

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

2017

Reading Committee:

Olga Levaniouk, Chair

Alexander Hollmann

Deborah Kamen

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Classics

University of Washington

Abstract

The Fugitive: Murder and Exile in the Age of Heroes

Eunice Seungyeon Kim

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:
Professor Olga Levaniouk
Classics

This dissertation examines fugitive murderers and the conceptual functions they fulfill in Homeric poetry. The story pattern of the fugitive murderer is a background against which the Homeric poems consistently portray Achilles' and Odysseus' characters, and offers a new framework for understanding the *Iliad*'s and *Odyssey*'s poetics and politics. Through close readings of the epics and by employing ideas drawn from anthropological, legal, and political theory, I show how Homeric fugitive murderers refract concerns about the relationship between violence and displacement (on poetic, ritual, moral, and legal levels) that affect our current understanding of the *Iliad*'s and *Odyssey*'s drama. Fugitive murderers regularly cluster around Achilles and Odysseus in a way that focalizes their respective character arcs, framing their roles as akin to that of a fugitive murderer. In both cases, the heroes undergo a conceptual

transformation from a fugitive murderer into a more productive type of figure: a host in the case of Achilles and a founder in the case of Odysseus. In facilitating these transformations, fugitive murderers also negotiate a compromise between different mythological traditions that closely associate Achilles and Odysseus with the fugitive-murderer type. Thus by revealing a complex view of homicidal violence both as a threat to community and as a force of conciliatory exchange, this study not only contributes to current scholarship on Homeric poetry and early Greek myth, but also intersects with recent critical interest concerning the place of violence in theories of political order and global displacement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Chapter 1. Fugitive Murderers: A Story Pattern 9

1.1 Language of Homeric Manslaughter 11

1.1.1 *ἄνδρα κατακτάς* 13

1.1.2 *φῶτα κατακτείνας* 17

1.1.3 Other Participial Formulas 19

1.1.4 Subordinate Clauses 20

1.1.5 The Function of the Man-Slaying Formula 23

1.2 The Narrative Pattern of Murder and Exile 26

1.2.1 Murder 26

1.2.2 Flight 30

1.2.3 Relocation 40

Chapter 2. Variations on the Fugitive Murderer: Tlepolemus and Phoenix 54

2.1 Tlepolemus 55

2.1.1 Murder and Intergenerational Strife 58

2.1.2 Exile and Colonization 64

2.1.3 The Fugitive-Murderer Pattern within the Catalogue of Ships 70

2.2 Phoenix 74

2.2.1 Attempted Homicide: An Option in Performance 78

2.2.2 Seeing Red: The Killer in Phoenix' Name 87

Chapter 3. Achilles: From Murderous Insurgent to Honored Host 96

3.1 The Quarrel: Competing Visions of Violence and Dissent 99

3.2 The Embassy: Competing Visions of Compensation 108

3.3 Priam's Ransom: The Murderer Transformed 117

Chapter 4. Odysseus: From Fugitive Murderer to Murderous Founder 123

4.1 The Death of Antinous: Reversal of the Murder-and-Flight Pattern 128

4.2 *Mnesterophonia* Reinterpreted: Colonization and the Transformation of Violence 137

4.3 A Divine Resolution: The Apolline Subtext of the *Mnesterophonia* 148

4.4 Fugitive Murderers as Figures of Reconciliation: The *Odyssey* and Post-*Odyssey* Tales 165

Conclusion 173

Bibliography 174

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Much like the fugitives who are the subject of my study, I am fortunate to have been able to join many different communities (albeit without committing any violence on my part) and to acquire a wide circle of teachers, colleagues, friends, and family. I am grateful for the wisdom, support, and encouragement that I have received from all quarters.

The first debt of gratitude goes to my adviser, Olga Levaniouk, for her unfailing guidance and enthusiasm for my project. Her teaching, criticism, and stimulating comments have prompted me to take my research in new exciting directions I had not expected to go; some directions I still have yet to pursue, but soon will. My dissertation has also benefitted immensely from the generous contributions of my scrupulous readers, Alexander Hollmann and Deborah Kamen. Both, together with Olga, have been important guides to me throughout my time at the University of Washington (UW). I should add that every member of the UW Classics Department has shown support for me in some way or other, and so I would also like to thank the entire faculty. This is a debt I can only try to repay and pay forward over the years to come.

Collegiality at the faculty level is matched at the graduate level. I cannot imagine a warmer or more encouraging group of colleagues to have spent my time with than the graduate students in the UW Classics Department. Among my fellow students, I am especially grateful to Matthew Gorey, Joshua Hartman, Luke Parker, and Adriana Vazquez for their willingness to read or discuss parts of my work. Both their companionship and witty repartee were welcome sources of inspiration. I give, as one example of our productivity, Matthew's epigraph to my dissertation, half of which, I am happy to say, is no longer true:

vita excedam atque hunc nemo leget (ei mihi!) librum.
doctus scribere sed doctor ero frustra.

Outside of the UW Classics department, my project found its first group of listeners in the wonderfully dynamic 2013-2014 cohort of fellows of the Joff Hanauer Endowed Fellowship for Excellence in Western Civilization. I thank René Boullet, Verena Kick, Jesse Meredith, Yasaman Naraghi, and Professor John Toews for their early support and feedback for my project. Portions of the dissertation have since been delivered as oral presentations at the annual meeting of the Society for Classical Studies, Gonzaga University, the University of Richmond, and the University of Notre Dame; I would like to thank those audiences for their many thoughtful comments.

I am additionally indebted to the generous support of the Jim Greenfield Dissertation Fellowship, which I received from the UW Classics Department in Spring Quarter of 2016, as well as the support of the Alvord Fellowship in the Humanities and the Graduate School Presidential Dissertation Fellowship, which I received from the University of Washington for the 2016-2017 academic year. These last two fellowships were instrumental to the timely completion of my dissertation.

Thanks also to the coffee communities of Cafe Solstice (Cristian Bambilla, Ben Brunn, Riqui Castellanoz, Beau Castillo, and Katrina Freitag), which raised me throughout my graduate career, and Cafe Zoka Tangletown (John Roberts, Morgan Johnson, Allen Trainer, Graham Baker, Elan Green, Tess Lively-O'Neill, and Leah Royal), which housed me for the duration of my dissertation-writing process.

Finally, this dissertation could not have been completed without the love and understanding of my family. My deepest thanks go to Kyung-Suk Kim, Saeja Oh Kim, Irene Kim, and Clare Kim for their unwavering support, and to Travis Webb for his encouragement, thoughtfulness, and willingness to stay up and work alongside me.

DEDICATION

To my parents Kyung-Suk Kim and Saeja Oh Kim

INTRODUCTION

In many traditions handed down from antiquity, heroes guilty of homicide go into exile, but contrary to most modern sensibilities, they also successfully reenter society. In Roman myth, for example, King Evander founds the Italian city Pallantium after he kills his father in Arcadia (Serv. ad *Aen.* 8.51). According to Irish tradition, another parricide from Greece named Partholon eventually settles in Ireland and introduces agriculture there (*Lebor Gabála Érenn*, section 4). The biblical figure Cain is the most famous example of the type. Although condemned to a life of exile for the murder of his brother Abel, Cain ultimately builds the city of Enoch and establishes the Cainite civilization (*Genesis* 4: 14-17). Clearly, then, the fugitive murderer who is reintegrated into society is a prevalent folktale motif found almost universally.[1] This is, in all likelihood, because he encapsulates such fundamental human experiences familiar to all cultures across the world. But the fugitive murderer occupies a uniquely important position in ancient Greece, where examples of his figure are markedly abundant. He is featured as a defining element of many Greek etiologies, city foundations, and mythic cycles of the Heroic Age, particularly those captured in Homeric poetry.[2] It is within this body of literature that the present study seeks to investigate the conceptual importance of the fugitive murderer.

I have limited the scope of my study to the Homeric poems because they offer some of the earliest, most elaborate, and conveniently concentrated iterations of fugitive murderers in Greek myth. Seven examples of the figure appear in the *Iliad* (Tlepolemus, Phoenix, Medon, Lycophron, Epeigeus, Patroclus, and a killer in a simile), while another four appear in the *Odyssey* (Odysseus in the guise of Cretan fugitive, an anonymous Aetolian, Theoclymenus, and a

[1] Thompson 1960: Q 431.1, 431.9, R331.

[2] No complete list of Greek fugitive murderers exists, but Parker 1983: 375-92 and Nünlist 2009 have compiled a considerable number of examples.

killer in a generalization made by Odysseus).[3] In every case, the hero kills a kinsman or fellow compatriot, flees his native home, and then successfully relocates elsewhere either by reintegrating into another community or by founding a new one of his own. This pattern of experiences that all of the Homeric fugitive murderers undergo reveals an intriguingly complex view of homicide. Such violence, on the one hand, poses a significant threat to the community and is accordingly treated as a heinous crime. But, on the other hand, the same act of violence serves as the impetus for conciliatory exchange and even foundation. Thus the murderer, though a violent figure whose defining activity generally elicits visceral reactions of revulsion, is also a formative influence with a considerable number of redeeming and positive qualities.

The broad range of experiences and values that the Homeric fugitive murderer embodies is, I believe, what makes him such a compelling figure – a sentiment clearly shared by many others, as we can see from the number of remarks that have already been made about different facets of the subject. Many of the existing discussions are merely descriptive and interested in establishing a typology.[4] A few notable studies, however, have attempted to account for the significance of the figure from a variety of disciplinary focuses, particularly Greek law, religion, and myth. Michael Gagarin, for instance, has examined fugitive murderers with an eye to the historical development of Athenian homicide law, and deduced that they reflect a common legal procedure in response to homicide.[5] Jakob Seibert and Joseph Roisman have similarly treated the

---

[3] There are also a few more Homeric heroes who are traditionally considered fugitive murderers but not explicitly depicted as such in the poems. These include Peleus, Tydeus, Bellerophon, Orestes, and Oedipus, but the epics sometimes seem to implicitly acknowledge their murderous backgrounds. I believe this to be the case of Peleus in particular, as my discussion in Chapter 3 will demonstrate. See Nünlist 2009: 632 for potential explanations for the lack of elaboration on their statuses as fugitive murderers.

[4] Homeric fugitive murderers are cursorily summarized and discussed by Merz 1953: 11-20; Strasburger 1954: 29-31; Fenik 1968: 206-07; Apthorp 1980: 91-99; Sale 1994: 50; Stoevesandt 2004, esp. 134-36; Bowie 2007.

[5] Gagarin 1981. Bonner and Smith 1930 have similarly approached fugitive murderers from a legal and historical perspective. Gagarin attributes the legal practice to the late Bronze and Archaic age. While I agree that fugitive murderers must reflect historical experiences, I do not believe that they can be correlated so easily to a specific historical period. This issue broaches a popular debate about using Homeric poetry as historical documents. Moses

Homeric cases as historical evidence, but pointedly draw attention to the social aspects of the experiences of exile.[6] According to all of these views, Homeric fugitive murderers are mirrors of a frequently encountered historical and social reality in archaic Greece, which probably contributed to their prevalence in Greek myth.

Alternatively, coming from the perspective of Greek religion, Robert Parker has emphasized the flight of the murderer as a remedy to the pollution incurred from shedding blood.[7] His observations are particularly useful in that they demonstrate how exiled killers embody many conceptual categories through which other significant issues can be explored. René Nünlist has also, to some extent, considered the fugitives in this manner. Observing subtle alterations to and innovations in their depiction after Homer, he accordingly tracks significant developments in the attitudes of later authors towards the fugitives.[8] These approaches demonstrate the value of fugitive murderers as useful barometers for change and cultural meaning.

Lastly, by far the most popular understanding of the fugitive murderer is as a "Lokomotionssaga," a kind of myth invented to explain the movement of heroes from one setting to another.[9] Such movement accounts for how a hero can be mythologically active in two

---

Finley (1965) famously treated the epics as evidence for an actual Homeric society, while Snodgrass (1974) subsequently countered this view by noting the composite character of the society depicted in the poems. The positions of both have each found their fair share of supporters who have since expanded the issue considerably. For a useful summary of concerns, arguments, and positions on the problem of historicizing Homeric poetry, see Elmer 2013: 8-13.

[6] Seibert 1979; Roisman 1981: 8-49; Roisman 1982.

[7] Parker 1983. I will revisit the issue of pollution in Chapter 1.

[8] Nünlist 2009.

[9] The phrase was coined by Lesky 1966: 32, although Allen 1921: 102-03 was the first to observe the fugitive murderer in this way. Their opinions are restated by Apthorp 1980: 96; Janko 1992 ad *Il.* 13.694-97; Westbrook 1992: 70; Seaford 1994: 27-28; Wilson 1996 ad *Il.* 15.458-61, 16.470-76; Nünlist 2009: 634; Alden 2012: 122. Brügger 2017 ad *Il.* 24.480-84 also views it as justification for mythical-political facts or social connections. Not coincidentally, practically every Homeric fugitive murderer has been accused at one time or another of being an invention of Homer, including Medon (Janko 1992 ad *Il.* 13.694-97), Patroclus (Beye 1964: 372n41; Seaford 1994: 154-57), Phoenix (see discussion in Chapter 2), and Theoclymenus (see discussion in Chapter 4), to name a few.

disparate geographical regions. The exile of the murderer is then operative and productive on two levels: On one level, it allows for Homeric heroes to build new relationships elsewhere; on another level, it allows for the bridging of different, sometimes conflicting, versions of a myth. Seen in this way, fugitive murderers are essentially red flags for fissures in a tradition.

Though all of these studies touch upon interesting and important features of the fugitive murderer, contributing significantly to our understanding of him, they notably neglect to address the narrative power he exerts in the Homeric poems of which he is a part. In this respect, three studies are exceptional. Two brief articles by Robin Schlunk and Bruce Heiden examine the poetic significance of the fugitive murderer, although they restrict discussion of him solely to the *Iliad* and, what is more, concentrate primarily on the simile of the fugitive homicide in Book 24.[10] Timothy Perry conducts a more comprehensive study of exile in both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. But he, too, limits his analysis to the immediate narrative contexts in which each example appears.[11] The story pattern of the fugitive murderer, however, is a background against which the Homeric poems consistently portray Achilles and Odysseus. This suggests to me that the pattern has considerably more influence on the developing action of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* than has previously been acknowledged within Homeric studies.

There are thus three shortcomings, as I see it, to the previous approaches taken to Homeric fugitive murderers. First, they all tend to underestimate or altogether disregard the role that fugitives play in shaping the narratives of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The ideas and experiences that these figures exemplify can be observed beyond their immediate narrative contexts; they in fact regularly intertwine with the very experiences of violence and displacement that Achilles and Odysseus undergo in the epics. Moreover, as devices regularly used to mediate alternative

---

[10] Schlunk 1976 and Heiden 1998.

[11] Perry 2010.

and local versions of a myth, fugitive murderers offer a useful means to tap into other mythological and poetic traditions that may influence Homeric poetry.

Neglect in these areas is a natural consequence of the second shortcoming that I have observed, namely that discussions of the fugitive murderer are too insular and do not account for how the different dimensions of the figure relate to one another. Mythological representations can be tied to legal and social considerations; likewise ritual concerns have substantial bearing on the poetic. All of these categories are relevant factors in the depiction of the fugitive murderer and should be considered together synchronously.

Finally, among the host of topics and issues that have already been examined, one glaring omission remains: No discussion takes into consideration the socio-political undercurrents of the fugitive murderer. There is even, at times, a concerted effort to deny the relevance of politics to the situation of the Homeric fugitives.[12] Yet their exclusion from and inclusion in a community are both clearly linked to the norms, values, and organizational makeup of communities, making their situation an inherently political issue. This oversight, in turn, makes any discussion of Homeric fugitive murderers and their significance naturally incomplete, since the Homeric poems themselves are exceptionally political.[13]

This dissertation brings together all of the above considerations to interrogate the various conceptual functions that fugitive murderers fulfill in Homeric poetry. I specifically examine the socio-political problems and mythological complexities that they encompass in relation to the central thematic conflicts that drive the plots of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. I argue that the Homeric fugitive murderers serve as meaningful conceptual models for Achilles and Odysseus, helping to guide interpretive responses to the various challenges the heroes face in their respective epics. At

---

[12] E.g. Roisman 1981: 8: "[…] the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* do not furnish examples of persons who left their country for political reasons."

[13] On the political themes and program of Homeric epic, see Ulf 1990; Flaig 1994; Elmer 2013.

the same time, I suggest that the fugitives also operate as poetically reflexive mediums through which the epics can directly address other mythological traditions closely associating Achilles and Odysseus with the fugitive-murderer type. Fugitive murderers are, in short, an invaluable point of access to the poetics and politics of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey.*

Since the issues raised by my argument pertain to a diverse set of disciplinary interests, I accordingly draw upon many different currents of research, particularly anthropological, legal, and political theory. My methods, however, remain primarily philological and involve close attention to diction, patterns and themes, etymology, and context-sensitive readings. I also show sensitivity to formulaic language, mythic variation, and the performative nature of Homeric poetry, since a founding premise of my study is that the Homeric poems are products of a highly traditional yet fluid song culture.[14] Mindfulness of this performative context helps to underline the multifaceted and transformative capacities of fugitive murderers that lend themselves so well to being illuminating lenses with which to view Achilles' and Odysseus' stories.

My examination will proceed in two stages. The first stage, which consists of two chapters, provides a thick description – to borrow Clifford Geertz's method[15] – of Homeric fugitive murderers. Chapter 1 surveys all cases of murder and exile in the epics and produces a comprehensive overview of the general pattern associated with them. I first offer definitions of the fugitive murderer and a lexical analysis of their narratives, showing how the various Homeric formulas for manslaughter evoke significant semantic complexes. I then lay out the issues and interpretive problems that underpin each action the fugitives take, all the while incorporating legal, ritual, political, and mythological considerations into my discussion. In Chapter 2, I expand upon many of the observations that I put forward in the first chapter by considering, on

[14] My understanding of the poems is particularly indebted to the works of Milman Parry (1971) and Albert Lord (1960). See additional discussion in Chapter 2.

[15] Geertz 1973. Geertz developed and borrowed the phrase from the philosopher Gilbert Ryle.

an individual basis, the homicide narratives of Tlepolemus and Phoenix. Their cases offer us the most elaborate examples of the fugitive-murderer pattern, and yet present significant variations on it. These variations revealingly expose a two-fold conception of the fugitive murderer as both a politically dangerous figure (an insurgent) and a constructive facilitator of social change and socioeconomic empowerment (a colonial founder).

Using the conclusions I reach in these first two chapters, I turn more broadly to assessing the epic narratives of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* through the prism of the fugitive-murderer story pattern. This second stage of my examination also consists of two chapters, wherein I demonstrate that the fugitives are structurally and thematically linked with the heroes of each epic. In Chapter 3, I discuss how habitual association with and comparison to the Iliadic fugitives casts Achilles as a fugitive-murderer type within the Achaean army. This correlation occurs from the very outset of his quarrel with Agamemnon. Tracing out from there how the fugitive-murderer pattern maps on to the rest of Achilles' narrative of withdrawal and return, I show that the rehabilitation of Achilles' position is conceptually facilitated through his transformation into a host to fugitive murderers by the end of the epic. Chapter 4 discusses the problem of the *Odyssey*'s end, particularly the slaughter of the suitors, which initiates a series of events that correspond strikingly to the pattern of murder and flight. Contrary to the typical murderer, who breaks ties with his home community and flees to a new one, Odysseus starts out as an outcast and ultimately becomes a killer who gets to be reintegrated into his original home. His violent return is made possible through a pointed contrast with the other Odyssean fugitives and through a conceptual assimilation of his actions to those of a colonial founder. This resolution in turn responds directly to alternative versions of Odysseus' story, wherein he does go into exile for the slaughter of the suitors, ultimately appropriating these competing traditions within its own

narrative.

Thus a comprehensive understanding of the fugitive murderer will bring out previously unobserved nuances within the poems, and also help to recover alternative poetic traditions with which the epics interact. The cluster of issues that I have set out to examine, then, opens up a new area to look for poetic and mythical material, and conveys a new way to evaluate the drama of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Bearing these aims and outcomes in mind, I now turn to the specific cases of fugitive murderers in Homeric poetry.

Chapter 1. FUGITIVE MURDERERS: A STORY PATTERN

Despite the clear prominence of fugitive murderers in Homeric poetry, with seven examples in the *Iliad*[1] and another four in the *Odyssey*,[2] there is considerable uncertainty about the type of compositional pattern they represent. The divergent ways in which scholars have referred to them easily reflects this uncertainty. In addition to being identified as a "familiar scene,"[3] the plot of the fugitive murderer has been labeled as a literary "topos,"[4] "motif,"[5] "theme,"[6] and even "story pattern."[7] These terms, however, generally refer to quite different morphological units of narrative in Homeric criticism.[8]

Irene de Jong's own set of definitions, which I privilege here purely for the sake of example, makes the following distinctions: a motif is "a minimal recurrent narrative unit (e.g.,

---

[1] Tlepolemus (*Il.* 2.661-70); Phoenix (*Il.* 9.458-61); Medon (*Il.* 13.694-97=15.333-36); Lycophron (*Il.* 15.430-32); Epeigeus (*Il.* 16.571-76); Patroclus (*Il.* 23.83-90); killer in a simile (*Il.* 24.480-83).

[2] Cretan-disguised Odysseus (*Od.* 13.256-86); anonymous Aetolian (*Od.* 14.378-81); Theoclymenus (*Od.* 15.223-25, 272-78); killer in a generalization (*Od.* 23.118-22).

[3] Leaf 1900-02 ad *Il*. 24.480. Other similar designations include "a more usual situation" (Macleod 1982 ad *Il.* 24.480-4) and a "common situation" (Wilson 1996 ad *Il.* 24.480-2). All of these descriptions, however, are too vague in that they do not clarify whether the situation is common to Greek literature or to actual contemporary experience, or even to both.

[4] Janko 1994 ad *Il.* 13.694-7; Wilson 2002: 8; Westbrook 2015: 212.

[5] Kirk 1985 ad *Il.* 2.661-6; Hoekstra 1989 ad *Od.* 15.272; Richardson 1993 ad *Il.* 23.85-90; Janko 1994 ad *Il.* 13.694-7; Reece 1994: 164n10; de Jong 2001 ad *Od.* 15.274; Brügger et al. 2003 ad *Il.* 2.653-70; Nünlist 2009; Alden 2012: 117; Bowie 2013 ad *Od.* 13.259; Brügger 2017 ad *Il.* 24.480-84.

[6] Beye 1964: 358; Schlunk 1976: 200; Apthorp 1980: 96; Willcock 1984 ad *Il.* 15.430-2; Hoekstra 1989 ad *Od.* 13.259; Richardson 1993 ad *Il*. 24.480-84; Wilson 1996: 239 ad *Il.* 9.458-61; Wilson 2002: 8; Bowie 2013 ad *Od*. 13.259. But Schlunk (1976: 200) also calls it "a recurrent motif in Greek mythology."

[7] Edwards 1992: 312; Higbie 1995: 170. In a similar vein, Bowie (2007: 27) refers to the fugitive murderer as the "story-type of exile brought about by *ἀνδροκτασίη*," while Dougherty (1993: 38) calls it the "narrative pattern of murderer-in-exile."

[8] Many of these terms have been applied interchangeably by different scholars to the same kinds of generic narrative patterns that occur within the larger narrative of oral epic. Hence the "story pattern" of Albert Lord (1995: 11-12; 1960: 158-97) corresponds to "theme" as used by Wilson (2012: 14-15), while the "theme," defined as "a recurrent element of narration or description in traditional oral poetry" by Lord (1951: 73) and Foley (1990: 240-77) corresponds to the "type-scene" popularized by Arend (1933). Segal's "corpse/mutilation theme" (1971) is what Edwards (1992: 301) would call a "motif." For a full history of the terminology in Homeric scholarship and the preferred usage by specific scholars, see Edwards 1992: 285-98.

'watchdog' motif)"[9]; a theme is "a recurrent topic which is essential to the narrative as a whole (e.g., the theme of 'cunning versus force')"[10]; a story pattern is "a recurrent sequence of events or scenes, which is less formalized than a type-scene (e.g., the 'delayed recognition' story-pattern)."[11] These narrative divisions, while useful, are quite difficult to apply in practice. For in de Jong's terms, I could define the fugitive murderer as all three: a motif, theme, and story pattern. As a motif, the fugitive murderer is as a recurrent element in many different contexts. He appears as a minor feature of (auto)biographical exile narratives (Phoenix, Patroclus, Cretan-disguised Odysseus, the Aetolian, and Theoclymenus),[12] obituaries (Medon, Lycophron, and Epeigeus),[13] a Catalogue entry (Tlepolemus), and in points of comparison (killer in simile and killer in Odysseus' generalization). Appearing in these relatively few contexts in Homer, the fugitive murderer may easily be considered a "minimal recurrent narrative unit" that amounts to a motif, but as this dissertation argues, he also functions as an important and persistent topic with significant interpretive bearing on the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. In this sense, the fugitive murderer is "essential to the narrative," and thus constitutes a theme. At the same time this motif/theme contains distinct narrative elements of its own, each of which may then be considered a motif in itself: 1) murder; 2) flight; 3) relocation. Taken together, these elements form a story pattern that is easily traceable in the larger narratives of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey.* Finally, as a motival and thematized story pattern, the fugitive murderer unifies and highlights many other discrete, albeit related, central motifs/themes in the Homeric poems, such as anger, exile, and compensation,

[9] De Jong 2001: xv.

[10] De Jong 2001: xviii

[11] De Jong 2001: xviii. Cf. Lord 1960: 68-98. The type-scene, while it is similarly a kind of recurrent narrative with a distinct, identifiable structure, generally describes "recurrent actions of everyday life (e.g., the 'sacrifice' type-scene)" (de Jong 2001: xix).

[12] On Homeric exile narratives, see Perry 2010.

[13] Nünlist (2009: 630) believes the motif's usage in the obituary of a minor fighter "adds to the pathos of the scene and thus steers the emotions of the audience." On the composition of the forty-nine obituaries for slain heroes in the *Iliad*, see Griffin 1980: 138-41; Tsagalis 2004: 179-92; and Stoevesandt 2004: 145, with n463; Ready 2011: 228-38.

among others. Thus all of the narrative units defined earlier collapse together in the case of the fugitive murderer.

What can be stated with certainty is that the fugitive murderer both embodies and forms a recurrent structure of thinking about key thematic concerns in the Homeric epics. For practical purposes, then, I will generally refer to him as a story pattern, since this type of narrative is, in the words of Claude Lévi-Strauss, "good to think with," and, in my own words, a good way to think through the relation of the fugitive murderer to the Homeric poems of which he is a part.

This chapter provides a formal description of the fugitive murderer to prepare for an extended examination of the conceptual functions he fulfills in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. I begin with a lexical analysis of the killing act that initiates the story pattern, showing how the different Homeric formulas for manslaughter evoke semantic complexes with significant interpretive bearing on the rest of the story pattern. I then discuss the issues and interpretive problems underlying each element of the story pattern – murder, flight, and relocation. This discussion in turn highlights ideas embedded in the narrative about crime and punishment, as well as codes of honor that order social relationships in the Homeric poems.

1.1 Language of Homeric Manslaughter

Verbs of killing in Homer are varied and used predominantly of deaths on the battlefield, but the verbs used of manslaughter overlap considerably. A few of the Greek terms that regularly designate homicidal acts include *βάλε*, *ἕλε*, *ἐνήρατο, ἐξενάριξε, ἔπεφνε, ἔκτεινε*, and *κατέκτανε*.[14]

[14] See, for example, the condensed lists of slain men in *Il.* 5.37-84, 6.29-36, 15.328-42, 16.306-50, which are all passages displaying great variation in the verbs. The variety (*ποικιλία*) of killing verbs in the Homeric lexicon was observed as early as Eustathius (ad *Il.*15.328-42, 14.511-20). I have listed the verbs above as they appear in Homer to replicate the killing lists, but otherwise, I will generally refer to them by their infinitive forms.

In his analysis of these same verbs, Edzard Visser argued that the prosodic situation dictates the word choice: Fixed metrical determinants, such as the personal names of the killer and the killed, determine the verb itself and other variables within the same line.[15] Hence the different killing verbs available for Homeric composition are considered metrically distinct but essentially synonymous. Chiara Bozzone, however, has demonstrated a more productive way of looking at the variation in vocabulary by paying close attention to the information structure of the different killing formulas.[16] When subject to this kind of analytic focus, the verbs are noticeably associated with certain word orders and other discourse factors, so that the various killing words are *not* mere metrical variants of each other; rather, each term has a unique discourse function of its own.

Following Bozzone's observations on the distinctive discursive qualities of the different Homeric killing verbs, I would like to highlight one term in particular, *κατακτείνειν*. This term is used for nine of the eleven fugitive murderers in Homer,[17] and therefore appears to be the choice verb of criminal homicide that initiates the story pattern under consideration. The semantic nuances of *κατακτείνειν* have generally attracted little to no attention, perhaps since the verb's definition largely reproduces that of its base form *κτείνειν*, which is one of the most productive killing words in Homeric poetry.[18] In addition, Calvert Watkins identified the verb as the unmarked form of killing within the Greek lexicon, and its root *kten-, "to wound," as a 'rhyme-

[15] Visser 1988.

[16] Bozzone 2016: 18-19. The definitive study of how information is conveyed in discourse is Erteschik-Shir 2007.

[17] The other two fugitive murderers use a form of *κτείνειν* or *ἐξενάριζειν*.

[18] It occurs 156 times, and forms another compound verb of killing *ἀποκτείνειν*, which occurs 21 times. There are 62 instances of *κατακτείνειν* in Homer, plus 3 more with *κτείνειν* and the separable prefix *κατά*. The *κατά* preposition, although it often loses its local force, generally adds the idea of completion. So the compound form *κατακτείνειν*, which is a verb particular to poetry and rarely appears in prose (LSJ, s.v. *κατακτείνω*), perhaps denotes the sense, 'to succeed in killing,' as opposed to the uncompounded form *κτείνειν*, 'to kill.' Cf. Smyth 1648.

form' to the marked verbal root **g^{w}hen-*, "to smite, slay," whose Greek reflex is *πεφνέμεν*.[19] According to this hierarchy of vocabulary,[20] *κατακτείνειν* is an ordinary kind of killing, while *πεφνέμεν* is a more semantically charged kind that occurs on a cosmic level and relates specifically to the act of slaying a dragon.[21] But even as the less marked term, *κατακτείνειν* has a unique resonance and texture of its own.

In what follows, I will assemble and evaluate the murderous language of *κατακτείνειν* that surrounds the different Homeric fugitives, grouping them by formulaic and thematic similarities. We shall see that the force of *κατακτείνειν* generally narrates very specific circumstances of civil violence and subsequent migration, all of which are reflected by the formulaic style.

1.1.1 *ἄνδρα κατακτάς*

The primary verbal formula that expresses manslaughter for the Homeric fugitives is *ἄνδρα κατακτάς*, which occurs four times in total: twice in repetition during the obituary for the fallen warrior Medon in the *Iliad*, and twice during Theoclymenus' character description in the *Odyssey*. The latter figure's murder is recounted both by the external narrator and by the seer himself as part of his plea to Telemachus for help. The participial phrase always appears in emphatic line-final position:[22]

---

[19] The base form *κτείνειν* is classified as the unmarked form of killing at Watkins 1995: 365, 375-6, 379, 388, 396, 401, and its root **kten-* as a rhyme-form at Watkins 1995: 427n1. On the meaning of the PIE roots **kten-* and **g^{w}hen-*, see Beekes, s.v. *κτείνω* and Watkins 1995: 301 respectively.

[20] On the hierarchy of aesthetically marked versus unmarked forms within a given lexicon, see Watkins 1970; Toporov 1981; Watkins 1995: 38, 182.

[21] Watkins 1995: 301.

[22] The participle *κατακτάς* appears only twice more in the *Iliad*, again in line-final position: *καλά, τὰ Πατρόκλοιο βίην ἐνάριξα κατακτάς* (*Il.* 17.187 = 22.323, but with *ἐνάριξε*).

Murderer	Victim and verb of killing	Line number
Medon	[…] *αὐτὰρ ἔναιεν* *ἐν Φυλάκῃ, γαίης ἄπο πατρίδος,* ***ἄνδρα κατακτὰς*** *γνωτὸν μητρυιῆς Ἐριώπιδος, ἣν ἔχ’ Ὀϊλεύς·* […] but he dwelt in Phylace, far from his native land, because he killed a man, the kinsman of his stepmother Eriopis, whom Oileus kept.[23]	*Il.* 13.695-7 = 15.334-6
Theoclymenus	[…] *σχεδόθεν δέ οἱ ἤλυθεν ἀνὴρ* *τηλεδαπός, φεύγων ἐξ Ἄργεος* ***ἄνδρα κατακτάς,*** *μάντις·* […] and near him came a man from far off, fleeing from Argos because he, a seer, killed a man.	*Od.* 15.223-25
	οὕτω τοι καὶ ἐγὼν ἐκ πατρίδος, ***ἄνδρα κατακτὰς*** *ἔμφυλον·* Thus I too am away from my native land, because I killed a man, a kinsman.	*Od.* 15.272-73

Each instance of the formula here is meaningfully precise in its word order. The direct object *ἄνδρα,* representing the victim of the murder, immediately precedes the participle in the final two feet of the line. More significantly, a prepositional phrase expressing departure (*γαίης ἄπο πατρίδος*, *Il.* 13.696 = 15.335; *ἐξ Ἄργεος*, *Il.* 15.224; *ἐκ πατρίδος*, *Od.* 15.272) always introduces the formulaic expression of manslaughter. The marked juxtaposition of the two phrases draws a direct correlation between the murderer's separation from his homeland and his murderous crime.

On the other side of the formula, the abrupt enjambment of an adjective that further describes the slain victim (*γνωτόν*, *Il.* 13.697 = 15.336; *ἔμφυλον*, *Od.* 15.273)[24] characterizes the murders by Medon and Theoclymenus specifically as kin-killings. Both adjectives denote a close

---

[23] All translations, unless otherwise noted, are my own.

[24] The first description of Theoclymenus also nearly follows this presentation, only the subsequent enjambed adjective qualifies the murderer himself (*μάντις*, *Od.* 15.255).

familial relationship: the adjective *γνωτός* typically designates a blood-relative,[25] while *ἔμφυλος*, too, appears to refer to "one of [Theoclymenus'] own kin."[26] Both murders also, however, do not necessarily concern only the immediate lineal or consanguineal relationship between killer and victim; they additionally implicate the entire household and community-at-large (deme or tribe) in the violent conflict.

In the first case, the specific kinsman that Medon has slain is that of his stepmother Eriopis (*μητρυιῆς Ἐριώπιδος*, *Il.* 13.697 = 15.336). The hostile relations between a stepmother and her new family, particularly the stepson, are a frequent motif of Greek mythology and folktales in general.[27] Although the reason for hostilities between Medon and Eriopis' family are not specified here, they may very well result from either the stepmother's insidious plot to steal her stepson's inheritance or her adulterous sexual passion for him, which are the two primary reasons Patricia Watson has observed for the hatred that arises between stepmother and stepson.[28] But for Medon, the conflict between him and his stepmother appears to be transposed from the intra-familial, and enlarged in the form of an extra-familial feud with Eriopis' kinsman.

For the case of Theoclymenus, the adjective *ἔμφυλος* can be defined in a way that broadens the affiliation between murderer and victim, and is alternatively translated more literally as "in the tribe" (*ἐν* + *φυλή/φῦλον*) for its sole Homeric attestation here.[29] Theoclymenus' victim, according to this interpretation, is merely a fellow tribesman. But the

---

[25] Defined as "kinsman, kinswoman" (LSJ, s.v. *γνωτός*, B). It is used as a kin term seven times in Homer, and only in the *Iliad*. Four of those instances interestingly occur in the context of blood vengeance (*Il.* 13.697 = 15.336, 14.485, 15.350, 17.35). Cf. Gates 1971: 26-27.

[26] As translated by Murray 1995: 97. Apthorp (1980: 96) and Perry (2010: 9) also identify the victim as a relative of the killer.

[27] The antagonistic quality of a stepmother is hinted at in *Il.* 5.389, and is practically proverbial in Hes. *Op.* 825: *ἄλλοτε μητρυιὴ πέλει ἡμέρη, ἄλλοτε μήτηρ*. On the stereotype of the evil stepmother in Greek and Roman antiquity, see Watson 1995. On the cruel stepmother as a folktale motif, see Thompson 1960: S31.

[28] Watson 1995: 21-2.

[29] Cf. LSJ, s.v *ἔμφυλος*; Autenrieth, s.v. *ἔμφυλος*; Roisman 1981: 12; Segal 1994: 175; Frame 2008: 490-91; Garland 2014: 133. Eustathius (ad *Od.* 15.273) also glosses the term as *φυλέτην, ὁμόφυλον.*

'kinsman' and 'tribesman' interpretations are not entirely incompatible, and I would argue that the use of the adjective *ἔμφυλος* for the slain man deliberately straddles this ambiguous divide between familial/private and tribal/communal. Outside of Homer, the term designates kinsmen in some cases,[30] and fellow community members in others.[31] The adjective *ἔμφυλος* must therefore have quite broad but inclusive social reference, signifying both a kindred and more general societal bond simultaneously, such that fellow citizens are to be understood as sharing a comparable kinship with each other. In addition, *ἔμφυλος* is a term that is inextricably tainted with the notion of bloodshed,[32] particularly *civil bloodshed*.[33] This association strongly intimates that intra-familial violence and intra-communal violence are interrelated forms of civil strife, and are equally a disfigurement of the body politic.[34] Both kinds of violence fracture the social body. Theoclymenus' crime of "emphuletic"[35] bloodshed likewise can be understood to expresses this all-inclusive civil strife.

As I have shown thus far, *ἄνδρα κατακτάς* is always framed by the murderer's separation from his homeland and by his kinship/emphuletic ties to his slain victim. But this kinship network is heavily implied to extend to the entire civic body. The meticulous structure of the man-slaying formula thus encodes the themes of exile and civil conflict, which are both themes that we will see dominating the content of the other Homeric formulas of manslaughter.

---

[30] E.g. Pi. *Pyth*. 2.32; Soph. *Ant*. 1264, *OT* 1406.

[31] E.g. Solon fr. 4 West, line 19 (quoted in Dem. 19.255); Alc. fr. 70 Voigt, line 11; Aesch. *Eum*. 863; Hdt. 8.3.1; Pl. *Leg*. 871a2, *Resp*. 565e.

[32] The adjective is almost always paired with words of violence, pollution, or dissention (e.g. *ἄγος*, *αἷμα*, *διχοστασία*, *μάχη*, *πόλεμος, στάσις*, *σφαγή*, *φόνος*). In addition to the citations listed in notes 30 and 31 above, see the list of occurrences compiled by Blickman 1986: 198n16-18 and Parker 1983: 126n85.

[33] On the special connection between the adjective *ἔμφυλος* and civil violence, see Blickman 1986: 197-99.

[34] This assimilation is consistent with the Greek notion of *miasma*, which arises from homicide (and other things) as a transmissible pollution that can threaten the entire polis, for which see Parker 1983: 104-43. I will return to this issue later in the chapter.

[35] Coined by Blickman 1986: 200.

1.1.2 *φῶτα κατακτείνας*

The next most frequently used formula for manslaughter also occurs in the form of a participial phrase, *φῶτα κατακτείνας*, which is not nearly as restricted in its metrical placement as *ἄνδρα κατακτάς*. The alternative formula appears in either the first or third foot of the line, and is notably used for the only two generalizations about exiled killers, namely the simile of the fugitive homicide in *Iliad* 24 and Odysseus' example of the same type in *Odyssey* 23:

Murderer	Victim and verb of killing	Line number
Killer in simile	*ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἄνδρ' ἄτη πυκινὴ λάβῃ, ὅς τ' ἐνὶ πάτρῃ* ***φῶτα κατακτείνας*** *ἄλλων ἐξίκετο δῆμον, ἀνδρὸς ἐς ἀφνειοῦ, θάμβος δ' ἔχει εἰσορόωντας, ὣς Ἀχιλεὺς θάμβησεν ἰδὼν Πρίαμον θεοειδέα.* And just as when close blindness seizes a man, who because he killed a man in his native land, comes to the deme of others, to the house of a rich man, and marvel holds those who look upon him, so Achilles marveled at the sight of god-like Priam.	*Il*. 24.480-84
Killer in Odysseus' generalization	*καὶ γάρ τίς θ' ἕνα* ***φῶτα κατακτείνας*** *ἐνὶ δήμῳ, ᾧ μὴ πολλοὶ ἔωσιν ἀοσσητῆρες ὀπίσσω, φεύγει πηούς τε προλιπὼν καὶ πατρίδα γαῖαν·* For in fact one, because he has killed one man in his deme, even if the man does not have many helpers in the future, flees, leaving both his kinsmen and native homeland.	*Od*. 23.118-20

The form of *κατακτείνας* here is not a markedly unique variant of *κατακτάς*, as both are aorist participles that derive from (*κατα*)*κτείνειν*, root **kten*-. The difference in their forms merely reflects the use of different aorist stems: the athematic aorist **ktn̥*- yields (*κατα*)*κτάς*,[36] while the sigmatic aorist, which goes back to the present stem **kten-je/o*-, yields (*κατα*)*κτείνας*.

The lexical replacement of *φῶτα* for *ἄνδρα* in the specific context of these comparative generalizations is exceptional, and suggests that the former term, when paired with *κατακτείνας*,

[36] Cf. Watkins 1995: 427n1.

is the special designation for a man killed by a hypothetical, non-specified killer.[37] The use of *φώς* to refer to a generic man occurs at least four more times in Homer.[38] Outside of such generalizations, however, it appears to designate a "man of high rank,"[39] as when it is used in apposition to the highly esteemed heroes Machaon (*φῶτ' Ἀσκληπιοῦ υἱὸν ἀμύμονος ἰητῆρος*, *Il.* 4.194) and Agenor (*φῶτ' Ἀντήνορος υἱὸν ἀμύμονά τε κρατερόν τε*, *Il.* 21.546).[40] Its frequent occurrence in the formula *ἰσόθεος φώς*, "a god-like man," also "suggests the dignity of the word."[41] Thus the specific word choice of *φώς* as a generic victim of homicide perhaps helps to convey the enormity of the crime, which results in the loss of such an illustrious hero.[42]

In spite of the lexical renewal and participial variance, the overall word order of *φῶτα κατακτείνας*, the formula reserved for the indefinite *τις*-murderer, replicates that of *ἄνδρα κατακτάς*, the formula applied to a named murderer. Both place the victim directly before the participle. Moreover a prepositional phrase is similarly deployed in close proximity to the formula, occurring either immediately before, at the end of the previous line in the case of the *Iliad* simile (*ἐνὶ πάτρῃ*, *Il.* 24.480) or right after in the case of the *Odyssey* example (*ἐνὶ δήμῳ*, *Od.* 23.118). Though the arrangement of the prepositional phrase next to the formula does not match exactly, the collocation of the two syntagmas in performance is still noticeable and evocative. The close pairing encodes, once again, the theme of civil violence, as the prepositional

---

[37] The noun *φώς* is paired with a form of the verb *κατακτείνειν* only twice more in Homer of slain victims of Hector and Odysseus: *ἔνθ' Ἕκτωρ δύο φῶτε κατέκτανεν εἰδότε χάρμης* (*Il.* 5.608) and *καὶ γὰρ δὴ νῦν φῶτα κατέκτανες ὃς μέγ' ἄριστος/ κούρων εἰν Ἰθάκῃ·* (*Od.* 22.29-30).

[38] *ὡς ὅτε τις φώς* (*Il.* 16.406); *ἀλλότριος φώς* (*Il.* 5.214; *Od.* 16.101, 18.219).

[39] As defined by Boisacq (s.v. *φώς*). He further explains that it can refer to a human, man or female, or a mere mortal. Chantraine (s.v. *φώς*) lists similar definitions, adding "hero," which Beekes (s.v. *φώς*) lists as a definition used in tragedy.

[40] On both occasions, *φῶτ'* is in emphatic line-initial position.

[41] Torgerson 2006: 29. The formula always occurs in line-final position at *Il.* 2.565, 3.310, 4.212, 7.136, 9.211, 11.428, 11.472, 11.643, 15.559, 16.632, 23.569, 23.677; *Od.* 1.324, 20.124.

[42] The illustrious character of *φώς* may also be suggested by its connection to the root *$b^h eh_2$-, "shine," although the etymology is controversial. See Torgerson 2006: 28-29 and Beekes, s.v. *φώς* for further details.

phrases initiated by *ἐνί* recalls the emphuletic bloodshed seen previously in the case of Theoclymeus. The phrase *φῶτα ἐνὶ δήμῳ/πάτρῃ* is in fact a near-identical grammatical expression of *ἄνδρα ἔμφυλον*. Murder – this time of a fellow demesman or countryman – is a crime to be seen explicitly at the communal level.

1.1.3 Other Participial Formulas

Two more variations of the man-slaying formula occur in participial form within Epeigeus' obituary in the *Iliad* and Eumaeus' recounting of a visit from an unnamed Aetolian in the *Odyssey*. The word order of the formula in both instances follows the traditional pattern seen thus far, with an aorist participle of the "killing" verb placed immediately after its direct object, the slain victim:

Murderer	Victim and verb of killing	Line number
Epeigeus	*ὅς ῥ' ἐν Βουδείῳ εὖ ναιομένῳ ἤνασσε* *τὸ πρίν· ἀτὰρ τότε γ' ἐσθλὸν* ***ἀνεψιὸν ἐξεναρίξας*** *ἐς Πηλῆ' ἱκέτευσε καὶ ἐς Θέτιν ἀργυρόπεζαν·* He previously ruled in well-inhabited Boudeum, but then because he slew his good cousin, he came as a suppliant to Peleus and to silver-footed Thetis.	*Il*. 16.572-74
Aetolian	*ὅς ῥ'* ***ἄνδρα κτείνας****, πολλὴν ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἀληθείς,* *ἦλθεν ἐμὰ πρὸς δώματ'·* He, because he killed a man, wandered over much of the earth and came to my home.	*Od*. 14.380-81

The participial phrase used in the Aetolian's case nearly duplicates the primary man-slaying formula *ἄνδρα κατακτάς*, except that it uses the uncompounded form of *κατακτείνας*.

For Epeigeus, the formula undergoes complete lexical renewal, but such variations are a regular feature of the formulaic system, and do not disrupt the structural or semantic integrity of

ἄνδρα κατακτάς.[43] The substitution of *ἀνεψιόν* for *ἄνδρα* characterizes the murder as a kin-killing in a similar vein as Medon's and Theoclymenus' own murders, only the blood relationship between Epeigeus and his victim, a "same-generation first cousin,"[44] is even closer. The substitution of *ἐξεναρίξας* for the traditional *κατακτάς* or *κατακτείνας* similarly maintains the essential elements of the man-slaying formula. While the nuclear meaning of *ἐξεναρίζειν* appears to entail the "stripping" or "spoiling" of weapons from an opponent slain in battle, the verb mostly collapses semantically with *κτείνειν* in Homeric epic.[45]

Once more the close clustering of prepositional phrases near the participial phrases is a marked discursive feature of the man-slaying formulas in all their incarnations. Here the prepositional phrases follow Epeigeus' and the Aetolian's murders, and emphasize the eventual destination of the killers after they have committed their crime (*ἐς Πηλῆ'…ἐς Θέτιν*, *Il.* 16.574; *πολλὴν ἐπὶ γαῖαν…/ ἐμὰ πρὸς δώματ', Od.* 14.380-81). Murder in these cases entails movement to another location, and continues the trend of specific migratory data, expressed in prepositional phrases, being linked to particular participial formulations.

1.1.4 Subordinate Clauses

The man-slaying formula does not occur solely in participial form, but is often expanded more fully in subordinate clauses. Consider the following cases of Lycophron, Patroclus, and Cretan-disguised Odysseus:

---

[43] On the maintained semantic integrity of formulas, despite lexical renewal of one more components, see Watkins 1995: 10, 188, 309, 311, 326, 362, 375.

[44] Gates 1971: 23.

[45] Cf. LSJ, s.v *ἐξεναρίζω* and Beekes, s.v. *ἔναρα*. The etymology is not secure, but the verb can perhaps be connected with Sanskrit *śanoti*, "win," through psilosis. Of the 36 times *ἐξεναρίζειν* appears in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, only 10 instances have the sense of "strip": *Il.* 5.842, 5.844, 6.417, 7.146, 11.246, 11.368, 13.619, 17.537, 21.183, 22.331. Oedipus' murder of his father (*πατέρ' ἐξεναρίξας*, *Od.* 11.273) notably matches this description of Epeigeus killing his cousin. Both cases feature the participial phrase in the final position of the line.

Murderer	Victim and verb of killing	Line number
Lycophron	[...] *ὃ δ᾽ ἔπειτα Λυκόφρονα Μάστορος υἱὸν* *Αἴαντος θεράποντα Κυθήριον, ὅς ῥα παρ᾽ αὐτῷ* *ναῖ᾽,* ***ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα κατέκτα*** *Κυθήροισι ζαθέοισι* […] But then he (Hector) hit Lycophron, the son of Mastor, the attendant of Ajax from Cythera, who dwelt with him (Ajax), since he killed a man in holy Cythera.	*Il*. 15.430-32
Patroclus	*εὖτέ με τυτθὸν ἐόντα Μενοίτιος ἐξ Ὀπόεντος* *ἤγαγεν ὑμέτερόνδ᾽* ***ἀνδροκτασίης ὕπο*** *λυγρῆς,* *ἤματι τῷ* ***ὅτε παῖδα κατέκτανον*** *Ἀμφιδάμαντος,* *νήπιος, οὐκ ἐθέλων ἀμφ᾽ ἀστραγάλοισι χολωθείς·* *ἔνθα με δεξάμενος ἐν δώμασιν ἱππότα Πηλεὺς* *ἔτραφέ τ᾽ ἐνδυκέως καὶ σὸν θεράποντ᾽ ὀνόμηνεν·* […] when Menoitius, brought me, still little, from Opoeis to your home because of baneful manslaughter, on the day when I killed the son of Amphidamas, fool that I was, unwilling, angered over knuckle-bones. And having received me in his home, horseman Peleus reared me sweetly and named me your attendant.	*Il*. 23.83-88
Cretan-disguised Odysseus	*λιπὼν δ᾽ ἔτι παισὶ τοσαῦτα* *φεύγω,* ***ἐπεὶ φίλον υἷα κατέκτανον*** *Ἰδομενῆος,* *Ὀρσίλοχον πόδας ὠκύν,* And having left still so much to my children, I am a fugitive, since I killed the dear son of Idomeneus, swift-footed Orsilochus.	*Od*. 13.258-60
	αὐτὰρ ***ἐπεὶ δὴ τόν γε κατέκτανον*** *ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ,* *αὐτίκ᾽ ἐγὼν ἐπὶ νῆα κιὼν Φοίνικας ἀγαυοὺς* *ἐλλισάμην, καί σφιν μενοεικέα ληΐδα δῶκα·* But when indeed I killed him (Orsilochus) with sharp sword, I at once went to the ship and beseeched the glorious Phoenicians, and I gave them booty suiting their heart.	*Od*. 13. 271-73

These homicides match the other participial formulations of manslaughter with remarkably consistent lexical, morphological, and syntactic specification. The choice verb is still *κατακτείνειν,* which now appears in finite form in the aorist tense, but still in the typical Object-Verb word order. For Patroclus and Odysseus, whose murderous deeds are narrated by the heroes

themselves, *κατέκτανον* is the autobiographical verbal form of killing. It occurs only on these three occasions (*Il.* 23.85; *Od.* 23.259, 13.271), and always at the bucolic diaeresis.[46] For Lycophron, on the other hand, whose crime is narrated in one of the *Iliad*'s obituaries, the main verb is (*κατ*)*έκτα*, an archaic analogical form for **ἔκτεν*.[47] The overall subordinate clause, *ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα κατέκτα* (*Il.*15.432), is the *exact* syntactic realization of the formula *ἄνδρα κατακτάς*.

Another variant of the man-slaying formula – and in fact its nominal equivalent – can be observed in the prepositional phrase *ἀνδροκτασίης ὕπο* (*Il.* 23.86), which is used in Patroclus' homicide narrative. For its five other occurrences in Homer, *ἀνδροκτασία* refers to the slaughter of men in battle,[48] but the subsequent elaboration of the subordinate clause in this case (*ὅτε παῖδα κατέκτανον, Il.* 23.87) characterizes the nominal compound specifically as criminal homicide.

Although none of these passages employs the typical participial formula for manslaughter, place is still an important topic. A prepositional phrase of separation (*ἐξ Ὀπόεντος*, *Il.* 23.83), representing Patroclus' original home, and the subsequent allative form (*ὑμέτερόνδ'*, *Il.* 23.84), explaining his journey's end, both introduce the hero's childhood instance of *ἀνδροκτασία*. Odysseus' own pseudo-homicide is followed by motion towards a ship (*ἐπὶ νῆα*, *Od.* 13.272), which promises more destinations for the fugitive. Lycophron's murder likewise involves such movement, but it is merely implied in favor of highlighting the location of the murder itself. His ethnic identity as a man from Cythera (*Κυθήριον*, *Il.* 15.431; *Κυθήροισι ζαθέοισι*, *Il.* 15.432) frames the account of the murder to bring to light his former involvement in civil bloodshed. Thus the homicidal expressions formed by subordinate clauses or the prepositional phrase reinforce the emphuletic and migratory characteristics of homicide, which

---

[46] Its rigid metrical deployment there is perhaps meant to accommodate the following pentasyllabic names of Amphidamas and Idomeneus, the latter of which is substituted once with the common line-final formula *ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ* (*Od*. 13.271). The other autobiographical homicides that do not use *κατέκτανον* are Theoclymenus and Phoenix.

[47] Watkins 1995: 472n1, 488.

[48] Cf. *Il.* 5.909, 7.237, 11.164, 24.548; *Od.* 11.612.

were previously identified as essential, recurring features of the formula *ἄνδρα κατακτάς* and all its other variants.

1.1.5 The Function of the Man-Slaying Formula

All of the constructions discussed thus far – the participial syntagma, subordinate clause, and prepositional phrase – pointedly do not introduce the killings as a major event. The murders are instead syntactically and narratologically subordinate, and often presented as "a simple *fait accompli*" in the killer's biography.[49] The manner in which the murderous events are subordinated, however, also ascribes a circumstantial quality to them. The marked preference for *ἐπεί* as the introductory marker in the clausal expansion of the man-slaying formula generally classifies murder as a *cause* of action, which is supported by the causal use of the preposition *ὕπο* (*Il.* 23.86) in Patroclus' narrative.[50] Given the fact that the mention of murder is generally followed by prepositional phrases of motion or location, these constructions can be seen to introduce manslaughter as the impetus for a hero's movement. The primary function of the man-slaying formula thus offers a *causal circumstance of displacement*.

Murder triggers the fugitive status of Cretan-disguised Odysseus (*φεύγω*, *Od.* 13.259), Theoclymenus (*φεύγων*, *Od.* 15.224; *ἐγὼν ἐκ πατρίδος*, *Od.* 15.272), and the killer in Odysseus' generalization (*φεύγει*, *Od.* 23.118). The Aetolian similarly wanders (*ἀληθείς*, *Od.* 14.380) as a result of a murder he committed, and eventually comes to Eumaeus' home (*ἦλθεν*, *Od*. 14.381), although only temporarily. He is not at the house by the time Odysseus arrives, and is presumably still on the run. Significantly, all of these Odyssean homicides are fugitives who are

---

[49] Nünlist 2009: 634. The italicization is his.

[50] LSJ, s.v. *ὑπό*, A.II.

still in the process of naturalizing elsewhere,[51] and the depiction of their integration is, as Timothy Perry has previously observed, generally avoided.[52]

In the *Iliad*, murder accounts for the immigrant status of heroes such as Medon, who dwells in Phylake away from his original home (*ἔναιεν/ ἐν Φυλάκῃ*, *Il.* 13.695-6 = 15.334-5), and Lycophron, who dwells with Telamonian Ajax away from his native Cytherа (*παρ' αὐτῷ/ ναῖ'*, *Il.* 15.431-2). Patroclus counts among this type, as his father Menoetius brings him to live in Peleus' household (*ἤγαγεν ὑμέτερόνδ'*, *Il.* 23.84).[53] Epeigeus also finds a new home with Peleus, although the verb used to express his successful relocation is one of supplication (*ἱκέτευσε*, *Il.* 16.574). This same action, though not explicitly stated, is implied in the case of the simile, where a murderer who comes to a foreign deme (*ἐξίκετο*, *Il*. 24.481) is likened to Priam appearing before Achilles in order to supplicate him for Hector's body. The root **seik*- "reach, grasp (with the hand)" underlies both verbs *ἱκετεύω* and *ἐξικνέομαι*,[54] and the use of the latter in the simile evokes the former. The killer in the simile is on the verge of successfully reaching a new home by "reaching" his supplicandus. For these Iliadic cases, then, emphasis is placed on the permanent relocation of the killers as dependents in their new communities, rather than on their fugitive state.

As much as the man-slaying formula functions to express the cause of displacement, it also encapsulates the *condition of civil strife*. This is evident from each formula's concerted effort to identify the victim as either a kinsman of the murderer (e.g. Medon, Theoclymenus,

---

[51] Theoclymenus is perhaps on the verge of being fully integrated into the Ithacan community. See a fuller discussion of his circumstances further below.

[52] Perry 2010: 25. See also pp. 22-27 for his analysis of the *Odyssey*'s depiction of human movement more broadly.

[53] Patroclus' inability to convey himself in his own flight is presumably due to his young age when he committed the murder (*τυτθὸν ἐόντα*, *Il*. 23.83).

[54] Beekes, s.v. *ἱκέτης*, *ἵκω*. The verb *ἱκετεύω*, a denominative of *ἱκέτης*, comes from *ἵκω*. On the meaning, see van Herten 1934: 56-59.

Epeigeus)[55] or a fellow compatriot (e.g. killer in the simile, killer in Odysseus' example, Cretan-disguised Odysseus, the unnamed Aetolian, Lycophron, and Patroclus). In the latter cases especially, the location of the murder – or the ethnic identity of the murderer himself – is always presented as an integral context for the act. The issue is not just that these murderers killed a man, but that they initiated violence at home. And the fact that all types of killings – from the intra-familial to the intra-communal – result in the murderer's displacement alike strongly equates both emphuletic bloodshed to the horror of kin-killing and a private family conflict to a broader civic matter. Their conflation is marked by the consistent use, in both cases, of *κατακτείνειν*, which I take to be the verbal signature of such violence.

The verb *κατακτείνειν* functions as the choice 'kill' word in the context of exile at least twice more in the *Iliad* for Tlepolemus (*μήτρωα κατέκτα*, *Il.* 2.662) and Phoenix (*τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ βούλευσα κατακτάμεν*, *Il.* 9.458). Both heroes follow the Iliadic pattern of murderers successfully relocating elsewhere, and both also join the likes of Medon, Theoclymenus, and Epeigeus as kin-killers, although technically Phoenix is only a would-be kin-killer. But unlike all of the previously examined cases, their crimes are not subordinated in any syntactically incidental manner in order to highlight their exile status. Their killing acts rather serve as a central verbal component in the main, independent clause of their narratives, and act on par in grammatical importance with the other classifiable actions of flight and relocation in the fugitive-murderer story pattern. Since the usually highly compressed narrative complex of initial civil strife and subsequent flight finds its fullest expression in Tlepolemus and Phoenix, I will address the vocabulary and linguistic structure of their narratives in the next chapter.

[55] *Contra* Seaford 1994: 11-12, who believes there is a Homeric tendency to avoid intra-familial killing.

1.2 The Narrative Pattern of Murder and Exile

Now that we have defined the formulaic parameters and functions of Homeric manslaughter, it remains to explore the connection between homicide and displacement; that is, the connection between the initial condition of civil strife and the eventual consequence of the murderer's removal from that community. To elucidate this connection, I will turn to each element of the overall story pattern individually, examining in greater detail the defining characteristics of the murder, flight, and relocation of the exiled killer. Discussion of Tlepolemus and Phoenix, however, will be reserved for the second chapter. Their particular tales of murder and exile, which receive the most extensive narrative elaborations in Homer, demand independent analysis of their own.

1.2.1 Murder

Whom did the Homeric fugitives kill? How and why did they do it? For the first question, broadly speaking, the victims are those who engage in quite close and intense social interactions with the killer, which can be at the level of family (e.g. Medon, Theoclymenus, and Epeigeus) or at the level of community (e.g. the Aetolian, Lycophron, Patroclus, Cretan Odysseus, simile killer, and general killer). The second question is more difficult. Most of the homicide narratives under consideration compress the details of the killing act so much that they generally admit to nothing more than the fact that a death occurred at the hands of a Homeric hero. Only two fugitives, Patroclus and Odysseus, who pretends to be a Cretan exile, offer more explicit reasons for committing their crimes.[56]

[56] A very generalized cause for such violence is potentially suggested in the simile of the fugitive homicide as well, which explains, "when close blindness seizes a man" (*ὅτ᾽ ἂν ἄνδρ᾽ ἄτη πυκινὴ λάβῃ*, *Il.* 24.480). But as Richardson

The murder Patroclus commits, as he describes to Achilles in *Iliad* 23, is uniquely an instance of juvenile delinquency. A brawl over a children's game results in the apparently accidental death of an unnamed child.[57] The key line clarifying these circumstances is *Il.* 23.86:

νήπιος, οὐκ ἐθέλων ἀμφ' ἀστραγάλοισι χολωθείς·

(disconnected) fool that I was, unwilling, angered over knuckle-bones.

With the very first word, *νήπιος*, Patroclus establishes his 'disconnected' frame of mind,[58] which is consistent with his previous characterization of himself as a still little boy (*τυτθὸν ἐόντα*, *Il.* 23.83) at the time of the crime. His mental inadequacy due to his age is matched by his sudden emotional outburst of anger, *χολωθείς*, at line's end. The kind of anger designated by *χόλος* and its cognates in Homer typically focuses on the bodily experience of such a feeling,[59] and appropriately anticipates Patroclus' violent aggression against his childhood playmate. These mental and emotional states collectively contribute to the involuntary and unpremeditated nature (*οὐκ ἐθέλων*) of the overall homicide, which is rather more akin to what we would call, in modern legal terms, involuntary manslaughter or negligent homicide, or even a crime of passion.

Odysseus' pseudo-homicide is the complete antithesis of Patroclus' killing. This fabricated murder instead involves a fully mature killer who has suffered no sudden extreme mental or emotional disturbance. There is an immediate trigger, but ultimately the murder he

---

(1993 ad *Il.* 24.480-84) notes, the *ἄτη* here can also refer to the "disastrous consequences" of the murder. The ambiguity stems from a debate over interpreting *ἄτη* as a feeling that causes man to err (Dodds 1951; Mette 1955; Müller 1956; Stallmach 1968; Dawe 1968; Havelock 1978), or a feeling of remorse for an erroneous act (Wyatt 1982). I believe *ἄτη* encompasses all events; it is inextricably linked with the circumstances leading up to, including, and directly following, the murder.

[57] Unnamed here, but he was later identified as Cleitonymus (Apollod. 3.13.8), Cleisonymus (schol. D ad *Il.* 12.1; schol. T ad *Il.* 23.86; Eust. ad *Il.* 23.87), Clēsonymus (schol. D ad *Il.* 12.1, 16.14), Clysonymus (schol. D ad *Il.* 23.87), Aeanes (schol. D ad *Il.* 12.1; schol. T ad *Il.* 23.86; Eust. ad *Il.* 23.87; Strab. 9.4.2), or Lysander (schol. T ad *Il.* 23.86; Eust. ad *Il.* 23.87).

[58] I follow the etymology of *νήπιος* first proposed by Lacroix 1937: 261-63, who has since been followed by Nagy 2013: 689, Edmunds 1990, and Beekes, s.v. *νήπιος*. They reconstruct the adjective as **n̥-h^2p-*, from the negative prefix and the root **h^2ep-* "to join." Hence my translation of the term as "disconnected," literally "not joined."

[59] On the different terms and types of anger in Homeric poems, see Walsh 2005.

commits is the result of long-term and gradually escalating provocation:

> *λιπὼν δ᾽ ἔτι παισὶ τοσαῦτα*
> *φεύγω, ἐπεὶ φίλον υἷα κατέκτανον Ἰδομενῆος,*
> *Ὀρσίλοχον πόδας ὠκύν, ὃς ἐν Κρήτῃ εὐρείῃ*
> *ἀνέρας ἀλφηστὰς νίκα ταχέεσσι πόδεσσιν,*
> *οὕνεκά με στερέσαι τῆς ληΐδος ἤθελε πάσης*
> *Τρωϊάδος, τῆς εἵνεκ᾽ ἐγὼ πάθον ἄλγεα θυμῷ,*
> *ἀνδρῶν τε πτολέμους ἀλεγεινά τε κύματα πείρων,*
> *οὕνεκ᾽ ἄρ᾽ οὐχ ᾧ πατρὶ χαριζόμενος θεράπευον*
> *δήμῳ ἔνι Τρώων, ἀλλ᾽ ἄλλων ἄρχον ἑταίρων.*
> *τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ κατιόντα βάλον χαλκήρεϊ δουρὶ*
> *ἀγρόθεν, ἐγγὺς ὁδοῖο λοχησάμενος σὺν ἑταίρῳ·*
> *νὺξ δὲ μάλα δνοφερὴ κάτεχ᾽ οὐρανόν, οὐδέ τις ἡμέας*
> *ἀνθρώπων ἐνόησε, λάθον δέ ἑ θυμὸν ἀπούρας.* (*Od.* 13.258-70)

> "And having left still so much to my children, I am a fugitive, since I killed the dear son of Idomeneus, swift-footed Orsilochus, who in broad Crete surpassed in swift feet men who work for bread, because he wanted to deprive me of all of my Trojan booty, for the sake of which I suffered pains in my heart, cleaving through both the wars of men and painful waves, because not showing favor to his father, I was not serving as an attendant in the deme of the Trojans, but I was leader of other companions. I struck him with my bronze-tipped spear on his way back from the fields, lying in ambush near the road with a friend. Dark night held the sky, and no man took notice of us, and I took away his life unseen."

Odysseus' narrative attempts to justify the murder somewhat by outlining two perceived stressors, signaled by *οὕνεκα* (*Od.* 13.262, 265): the first, more immediate stressor cites a wrongful deprivation of war spoils by the greedy Orsilochus, while the second, chronologically earlier stressor indicates a longstanding political enmity between himself and his victim. The overall history of animosity between the two ultimately adds up to a clear case of homicide with malice aforethought, and the manner of execution corroborates that classification. The timing and method are all devised to evade detection and apprehension (*λάθον*, *Od.* 13.270): Odysseus elicits the help of an anonymous accomplice (*σὺν ἑταίρῳ*, *Od.* 13.268) to ambush his rival (*λοχησάμενος*, *Od.* 13.268) under the cover of darkness (*νύξ*, *Od.* 13.269).[60] These actions are not

[60] Haft (1984: 298) interestingly notes that the very name of the victim, Orsilochus, "Inciter of Ambush," seems to invite such an attack.

impulsive, but conducted with much premeditation and deliberation.

Despite the differences between Patroclus' homicide, which is filled with many mitigating factors, and Cretan Odysseus' fictitious one, which shows all the signs of a guilty mind (*mens rea*), at the heart of both examples is competition over wealth and status.[61] Odysseus' rivalry with Orsilochus manifests itself in the political sphere. A dynastic conflict over the leadership of Crete appears to be at the root of Odysseus' refusal to submit as an attendant to the royal Cretan family (*οὐχ ᾧ πατρὶ χαριζόμενος θεράπευον*, *Od.* 13.265), and prompts him to lead his own separate faction (*ἄλλων ἄρχον ἑταίρων*, *Od.* 13.266). This contest comes to a head with Odysseus being deprived of his share of Trojan spoils, which is tantamount to a deprivation of the hero's due portion of prestige. The context for Patroclus' rivalry, on the other hand, is a game of knucklebones (*ἀμφ' ἀστραγάλοισι χολωθείς*, *Il.* 23.86),[62] which is also a matter of honor and property for children. What is at stake now is the acquisition of the most bone pieces, and hence the distinction of being a winner,[63] both of which Patroclus presumably fails to achieve. In the two instances where a motive for murder is explicitly offered then, a rivalry strikingly lies behind it.

There is no example in Homer of a homicide occurring as a result of criminal activity, such as during a robbery, or as self-defense. Murder always occurs either within the family or when claims to pride and recognition are not satisfied, as we have just seen.[64] The resort to lethal violence is consistently presented as a reaction of frustration over a loss (of war spoils,

[61] A conflict that is in line with other heroic quarrels that arise over the proper division and allotment of meat at meals and sacrifices. Cf. Nagy 1979: 126-40.

[62] Schol. A ad *Il.* 23.88 records a variant reading that also attests to this context: *ἀμφ' ἀστραγάλῃσιν ἐρίσσας.*

[63] Cf. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 3.117-27, where a downcast Ganymede plays a game of knucklebones with Eros, and upon losing his final two pieces, departs in anger.

[64] Murder can be triggered, as we shall see in the next chapter, by disputes over women, where the same concerns about prestige and honor are at stake. In addition, Heracles' murder of Iphitus (Od. 21.22-30), Meleager's murder of his uncle (*Il.* 9.567), and Aegisthus' murder of Agamemnon, which spawns additional murders (see note 82 below), can be viewed in the same context of intra-elite competition.

knucklebones, standing, or the life or a relative). Given this particular context, homicidal inclinations appear to arise primarily from a desire, on the heroes' parts, to protect their dubious positions in their respective rivalries, to punish the slight to their own honor, or perhaps just to demonstrate symbolically their capacity to act. All three reasons are not mutually exclusive and may very well be at play simultaneously. Thus the Homeric evidence largely favors a situation of murder being provoked by intra-elite competition, which neatly represents a microcosm of the civil strife theme encoded in the man-slaying formulas.

1.2.2 Flight

We now come to the central concern of the story-pattern, the murderer's flight. The new question is: why does the murderer flee? Since the impulse to kill is largely the product of escalating feuds, as I argued in the previous section, I would suggest that the recourse to flight must similarly be viewed in the same contentious context. But before we turn to that explanation, let us first examine other possible factors.

It is most often suggested that the primary motivation of the murderer's flight is fear of vendetta.[65] This is in fact the very reason suggested by Theoclymenus, who, in his supplication to Telemachus, explains:

> *Οὕτω τοι καὶ ἐγὼν ἐκ πατρίδος, ἄνδρα κατακτὰς*
> *ἔμφυλον· πολλοὶ δὲ κασίγνητοί τε ἔται τε*
> *Ἄργος ἀν᾽ ἱππόβοτον, μέγα δὲ κρατέουσιν Ἀχαιῶν.*
> *τῶν ὑπαλευάμενος θάνατον καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν*
> *φεύγω, ἐπεί νύ μοι αἶσα κατ᾽ ἀνθρώπους ἀλάλησθαι.*
> *ἀλλά με νηὸς ἔφεσσαι, ἐπεί σε φυγὼν ἱκέτευσα,*
> *μή με κατακτείνωσι· διωκέμεναι γὰρ ὀΐω.* (*Od.* 15.272-78)

[65] Beye 1964: 358; Gagarin 1981: 10; Lloyd-Jones 1983: 73; Janko 1994 ad *Il.* 16.570-74; Perry 2010:13. Ruschenbusch (1960: 147) refers to the phenomenon as *Flucht vor der Fehde*. On the kinship group's responsibility to avenge the murdered man, see Bonner and Smith 1930: 117; Lacey 1968: 48; Svenbro 1984. Curiously, Gagarin (1981: 18), Parker (1983: 125-26), and Nünlist (2009: 633) argue that there is no evidence of vendetta occurring within Homeric epic, but the Atreid saga in the *Odyssey* would seem to counter this claim.

> Thus I too am away from my native land, because I killed a man, a kinsman. And many brothers and kinsmen of his are in horse-nourshing Argos, and they hold great sway over the Achaeans. Avoiding death and black fate from them I flee, since it is my lot, I think, to wander among men. But set me on board your ship, since in my flight I have come as suppliant to you, so that they do not succeed in killing me; for I think that they are in pursuit.

The driving factor here is death (*θάνατον καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν*, *Od.* 15.275) at the hands of the victim's avenging relatives, and the threat that they pose is considerable since there are many of them (*πολλοὶ δὲ κασίγνητοί τε ἔται τε*, *Od.* 15.273). According to Theoclymenus, then, his flight is really an externally compelled self-withdrawal – a form of self-help, which offers escape from certain execution at home.

Odysseus' generalization about murderers similarly suggests the fear of vendetta as a motivation of flight; however, it does not explicitly lay out death as a consequential risk for the murderer if he does not flee, nor does it play up the role of the victim's relatives in pursuing retribution:

> *καὶ γάρ τίς θ' ἕνα φῶτα κατακτείνας ἐνὶ δήμῳ,*
> *ᾧ μὴ πολλοὶ ἔωσιν ἀοσσητῆρες ὀπίσσω,*
> *φεύγει πηούς τε προλιπὼν καὶ πατρίδα γαῖαν·* (*Od.* 23.118-20)
>
> For in fact one, because he has killed one man in his deme, even if the man does not have many helpers in the future, flees, leaving both his kinsmen and native homeland.

There is an interesting bait-and-switch here, as the referent of the mentioned kinsmen (*πηούς*, *Od.* 23.120) can at first be assumed to be the victim's relatives, who serve as the direct object of the flight (*φεύγει*, *Od.* 23.120). But in the course of negotiating the rest of the line, we must revise that identification when we come to the next verbal form (*προλιπών*, *Od.* 23.120) and discover that the killer is really leaving behind both his *own* kinsmen and his native land. The actual domestic threat to the killer appears in the form of 'helpers' (*ἀοσσητῆρες*, *Od.* 23.119), which interestingly does not identify the victim's relatives as a particular source of vengeance

either. The Greek term refers more broadly to men who may very well come from outside the victim's kinship circle.[66] While Odysseus does create a tangential link between the killer's flight and potential retaliatory action for the murder, the undercutting of the threat posed by the slain man's helpers, who are quite few (*μὴ πολλοί*, *Od.* 23.119), deemphasizes that link.[67]

Odysseus' lying tale evokes an almost instinctual quality in his (fictitious) departure from Crete, and in fact offers a slight counterexample to Theoclymenus' explanation for his own flight. As I pointed out earlier, Odysseus' Cretan persona kills Orsilochus with an accomplice (*σὺν ἑταίρῳ*, *Od.* 13.268) and succeeds in doing so *without* any witnesses (*οὐδέ τις ἡμέας/ ἀνθρώπων ἐνόησε, λάθον δέ ἑ θυμὸν ἀπούρας*, *Od.* 13.269-70). The accomplice is never mentioned again, but upon committing the crime, Odysseus *immediately* flees the scene to seek help from the Phoenicians (*αὐτίκ' ἐγὼν ἐπὶ νῆα κιὼν Φοίνικας ἀγαυοὺς/ ἐλλισάμην*, *Od.* 13.272-73). This flight indicates no element of the compulsion that drove Theoclymenus. It is entirely voluntary, and is unlikely to be motivated solely by fear of retribution from Orsilochus' relatives, since there is no way for them to know that he is the killer. As the division of spoils was the cause of the murder in the first place, it may very well be that the preservation of wealth is the primary motivation of flight here. This is not to say that fear of retribution did not at all factor into Odysseus' decision to flee in his lying tale, especially given his past antagonistic history with Orsilochus; rather, I am merely proposing that there is something more to the underlying cause.

There are several more motivations that can and have been suggested. Robert Parker has

---

[66] Cf. *Il*. 15.254, 15.735, 22.333; *Od*. 4.165.

[67] The subsequent rhetoric in Odysseus' generalization (*Od.* 23.119-20) draws a direct comparison between the case of the *τις*-murderer and his own with the slaughter of the suitors, which serves to illustrate the seriousness of his own situation. While the comparison expresses some anxieties, I would still argue that it deemphasizes the fear of vendetta, since Odysseus is not afraid but merely acknowledging the need to be prepared to defend against retaliation. The implications of Odysseus' comparison of his own situation to that of this *τις*-murderer will be discussed further in the fourth chapter.

pinpointed pollution as one such underlying cause, describing it as the "imaginative vehicle" that drove killers into exile.[68] The stain of emphuletic bloodshed demands the killer's seclusion from his homeland, as his continued presence would otherwise bring even more harm to his community – perhaps in the form of a plague or some other cataclysmic event – than the harm he has already inflicted. Pollution, however, is famously an issue that is never mentioned in Homer, a fact that was first recognized by a Homeric scholiast.[69] The omission may mean that the concept did not yet exist in Homeric epic,[70] but as has rightly been pointed out on multiple occasions, that is not necessarily true: a concept or institution can exist despite a lack of textual evidence for it.[71] Accordingly, most scholars have sought to debunk or otherwise account for the abrupt literary interest in pollution after the 'Homeric Silence.'[72] For the likes of Parker, pollution can be tacitly presupposed in Homeric epic,[73] and doing so would easily explain the sudden withdrawal of Odysseus' fictitious persona. With this interpretation, the murderer's flight is really part of a process to resolve his pollution and to find purification elsewhere.[74]

Patroclus' situation complicates the assumption that pollution or the desire to be purified is the motivating factor for the murderer's exile. In Book 18 of the *Iliad*, Achilles recollects a

---

[68] Parker 1983: 125-26.

[69] Schol. T ad *Il.* 11.690: *καὶ παρ' Ὁμήρῳ οὐκ οἴδαμεν φονέα καθαιρόμενον, ἀλλ' ἀντιτίνοντα ἢ φυγαδευόμενον*.

[70] Bonner and Smith 1930: 15-16 and Gagarin 1981: 17-18. Adkins (1960a: 87) also believes that Homeric murderers were not considered polluted, at least in "the fifth-century sense."

[71] Nünlist (2009: 634) points out two post-Homeric analogues, Sophocles' *Electra* and the surviving homicide laws, which do not mention pollution, although his second example is somewhat debatable. On the relevance of pollution to the formation of the homicide laws, see MacDowell 1963: 140-50; Parker 1983: 104-43; Carawan 1998: 17-20; Arnaoutoglou 1993; Sealey 2006; Harris 2015.

[72] For comparisons between the treatments of pollution in Homer and later attitudes to it, see Dodds 1951: 35-50; Moulinier 1952: 58-61; Lloyd-Jones 1983: 70-78; Parker 1983: 66-70, 130-43; Hoessly 2001: 56-81; Osborne 2011: 167-8; Eck 2012: 89-129; Meinel 2015: 2-3; Harris 2015: 14-22.

[73] Parker 1983: 130-43. Nilsson 1955: 91-92 also believes that purification can be assumed to have taken place for killers such as Theoclymenus when they are no longer fleeing.

[74] Cf. schol. T ad *Il.* 24.480, which states that the killer in the simile has fled to a rich man's home so that he can be purified, although it also admits that this interpretation is perhaps anachronistic: *ὡς εἰ φυγάς τις φονεὺς πάντας λαθὼν εἰσέρχεται καθαρθησόμενος καὶ παρακάθηται τῇ ἑστίᾳ καὶ πάντες ὁρῶντες καταπλήσσονται.* | *ἴσως δὲ ἀναχρονισμός ἐστιν ὡς καὶ τὸ «ἴαχε σάλπιγξ»* (Σ 219).

promise he made to Menoetius that he would return Patroclus to his native Opoeis after the Trojan War:

> *ὢ πόποι ἦ ῥ᾽ ἅλιον ἔπος ἔκβαλον ἤματι κείνῳ*
> *θαρσύνων ἥρωα Μενοίτιον ἐν μεγάροισι·*
> *φῆν δέ οἱ εἰς Ὀπόεντα περικλυτὸν υἱὸν ἀπάξειν*
> *Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντα, λαχόντα τε ληΐδος αἶσαν.* (*Il.* 18.324-27)
>
> "Oh alas I cast out a vain word indeed on that day when, encouraging the warrior Menoetius in our halls, I said that upon having sacked Ilios I would bring back his son glorious to Opoeis with the share of the spoil falling to his lot."

The potential for Patroclus to return home, as expressed here, contradicts his past crime. His blood-guilt, incurred by his role in the death of Amphidamas' son (*Il.* 23.83-88), should technically forbid his reentry into Opoeis. The contradiction here is easily resolved if we exclude pollution and subsequent purification from the fugitive murderer's experience. It is equally possible, however, that Patroclus' pollution lessened with time, or that his purification, like his pollution, must be implied to allow his return home. But given the *Iliad*'s and *Odyssey*'s lack of overt interest in the issue of both pollution and purification, it seems more and more unlikely that the pollution barring the killer from his homeland was a significant consideration for the Homeric killers. Edward Harris is probably right that Homeric murderers were not considered polluted, although the root concepts of pollution, as he shows, can certainly be found in the Homeric poems.[75]

In an attempt to explain away the potential incongruity in Patroclus' situation, Walter Leaf suggested that the unintentional nature of Patroclus' crime merited only temporary, not permanent, exile.[76] The application of this sentence to Patroclus' crime, however, is

---

[75] Harris (2015: 21-22) identifies two basic notions behind the concept of pollution, which is rooted in the Homeric poems: 1) the concept that an individual's misdeeds can bring destruction on his associates; and 2) the concept that moral transgressions can disrupt the natural world.

[76] Leaf 1900-02 ad *Il.* 18.326. Roisman (1982: 39) also briefly entertains the possibility that Patroclus' fugitive-homicide status has been forgotten, which is a detail that will not be revealed until Book 23, but he quickly – and

inappropriate here. As many have already pointed out, the degree of intent, although an important factor in later Greek criminal law,[77] appears to have been irrelevant to the Homeric murderer's culpability and eventual fate.[78] Both Patroclus (an involuntary homicide) and Odysseus' Cretan persona (the quintessential deliberate killer), for instance, end up as fugitives. In Classical Athens, the former would have been tried at the Palladion and punished with exile until he received a pardon, while the latter would have been tried at the Areopagus and likely sentenced to death.[79] I should further add that the phrase used to describe Patroclus' involuntary homicide (*οὐκ ἐθέλων*, *Il.* 23.86) is repeated once more in reference to Odysseus' shooting of one of the suitors (*οὐκ ἐθέλοντα*, *Od*. 22.31). The suitors believe that Odysseus has accidentally slain one of their own, but they still intend to punish him with death (*Od.* 22.21-32). The inconsistency in the consequences of unintentional homicide suggests that such a distinction, although recognized and expressed, was not acted upon. The type of homicide committed must therefore not play a role in determining the outcome of exile. This is still proven true if we consider kinship as a potential mitigating or aggravating factor. Kin-killers Medon, Theoclymenus, and Epeigeus all flee like the other murderers, and their blood relations with the victim seem to have neither helped nor exacerbated their situation.[80]

My strategy in presenting the evidence for the murderer's flight up to this point has been

---

rightly – dismisses the idea.

[77] See the different discussions by MacDowell 1963; Stroud 1968; Loomis 1972; Gagarin 1981: 30-37; Carawan 1998: 33-41, 68-75, 223-27; Phillips 2013: 45-46.

[78] Bonner and Smith 1930: 21, Adkins 1960b, Cantarella 1976: 33-34, Gagarin 1981: 11, and Gagarin 1987 have previously discussed the unimportance of intention in the evaluation of Homeric homicide.

[79] Cf. Dem. 23.22, 65-72; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 57.3. Summaries of the different Athenian homicide courts and sentencing are provided in Sealey 1983 and Lanni 2006: 75-114. Phillips 2013: 44-84 also compiles a useful survey of ancient testimony on Greek homicide law.

[80] *Pace* Leaf 1887: 125 and Seaford 1994: 28, who both believe that kin-killers could avoid the full penalties (e.g. compensation) of their crimes. The one type of kin-killing that appears to have elicited more horror and potential punishment than others in Homer is that of a father, as evidenced by the pejorative use of *πατρόφονος* (*Il.* 9.461). I will revisit this issue in more detail in the next chapter.

one of negation, presenting argument and then its counterargument. This is designed not to show that the suggested factors are all entirely irrelevant, but rather to point out that they do not form a complete picture. Let us now return to the additional answer with which I prefaced this section: flight is motivated by an element of intra-elite competition. I previously showed that this motivation factored into the homicidal impulse, and its continuing influence on the fugitive impulse can be inferred as well from two specific features of Homeric murder and exile.

The first feature is that exile is not the sole possible outcome of homicide.[81] As is suggested in the very reasons provided by Theoclymenus and Odysseus, the crime can initiate a cycle of vengeance (*τίσις*). This is best exemplified by the Atreid saga in the *Odyssey*, at the end of which Orestes suffers no consequences, and is even praised for his participation in the violence (*Od.* 3.309-10).[82] No punishment is exacted for at least two other murderers in Homer: Oedipus gets to continue his rule over Thebes after killing his own father, albeit while suffering pains (*Od.* 11.273-80), and Heracles also appears to be left unpunished after killing his guest Iphitus (*Od*. 21.24-30). Finally, the most significant alternative available to the murderer – and the resolution somewhat at odds with exile – is settlement through monetary compensation (*ποινή*), which is famously depicted on the Shield of Achilles (*Il.* 18.497-508).[83] It is also suggested by Ajax to be the preferable method of resolving homicidal conflict (*Il.* 9.632-36).

---

[81] See Harris 2015: 28-30 and Gagarin 1981: 6-10 for a full list of homicide cases and consequences. Harris counts 21 instances, while Gagarin lists 31, but the latter includes examples drawn from Hesiod and the epic cycle. Both neglect to cite Meleager's murder of his maternal uncle (*Il.* 9.567), or Meleager's mother's role in the death of her son (*Il.* 9.571).

[82] The root source of the violence is Agamemnon's sacrifice of Iphigenia, which is never mentioned in the Homeric epics. What is told is that Agamemnon is killed by Aegisthus, while Cassandra is killed by Clytemnestra. Orestes kills both murderers in the end. Cf. *Od.* 1.29-30, 35-43, 298-300; 3.193-98, 234-35, 248-252, 255-57, 303-310; 4.91-92, 519-37, 546-47; 11.387-89, 409-34, 452-53; 13.383-84; 24.20-22, 96-97, 199-202.

[83] The nature of the conflict depicted on the Shield is variously interpreted, but the scene is generally believed to depict the arbitration of compensation rather than the arbitration of the homicide. For different views of what aspect of the compensation is being debated, see Wolff 1946: 34-49; Gagarin 1986: 26-33; Westbrook 1992; Thür 1996: 66-9; and Cantarella 2002: 155-56, which provides a useful summary of the different interpretations.

This practice, however, is rare and mentioned only for the two aforementioned instances,[84] while the flight of the killer remains "the most common result" of all the homicides committed or contemplated in the Homeric poems.[85]

None of the fugitive homicides, curiously enough, exercises the option of offering compensation to preclude his own exile, but the choice of one over the other can easily be explained, as Joseph Roisman has proposed, by "the killer's might and position vis-à-vis that of his victim's family."[86] Such an answer helps to account for the different consequences of homicide operating simultaneously within the same Homeric system of crime and punishment. In some cases, Roisman imagines, the family perhaps rejected the compensation and forced the killer into exile; in others, the killer perhaps chose to flee since he did not have the means to pay. For all of these scenarios, the family of the victim is considered the stronger party that dictates the outcome either directly or indirectly. It is their will, in Roisman's view, that matters most.[87] We should not, however, neglect or downplay the will of the killer himself, particularly in the example of Odysseus' lying tale. In that case, his fictitious Cretan persona could have gotten away with his crime, which went unwitnessed. Even if he could not, he had enough resources to make payment, which he instead offers to the Phoenicians to help him flee Crete, with still more money to spare (*Od.* 13.272-73, 283-84). Cretan Odysseus' own initiative to leave is a sign of

---

[84] Another instance of compensation being offered in the context of homicide perhaps occurs when Eurymachus offers "requital" (*τιμήν*, *Od.* 22.57) to Odysseus during the *mnesterophonia*. See my more detailed discussion of this passage in Chapter 4. The practice of offering compensation can perhaps be taken back to the Mycenaean period. In the landholding documents of the Pylos tablets, a man named *o-pe-te-re-u* holds a plot of land because of *a-no-qa-si-ja* (*e-ne-ka a-no-qa-si-ja*, Ea 805). Killen (1992: 378-80) has interpreted the phrase as "because of manslaughter," *ἕνεκα ἀνορκ*^{w}*hασίας* (< *anṛ-g*^{w}*hṇ-tiā*), and suggested that the tablet indicates compensation for murder of a family member. This proposal is based on a connection with another tablet that records the phrase, "having been compensated" (*qe-ja-me-no* < *k*^{w}*eiamenos*, Eb 294.1/Ep 704.1), which may also be taken as a reference to the plot of land being compensation for murder. If Killen's interpretation is correct, the practice of compensation is very old indeed.

[85] As was first observed by Gagarin 1981: 10.

[86] Roisman 1982: 39.

[87] Roisman 1982: 39.

his unwillingness to submit himself further to the community and environment that first embroiled him in violent discord. The killer's flight in this view, then, is not merely a show of deference to the injured party; it is also a matter of maintaining the killer's own position of honor and power.[88]

The second feature is that homicide is not the sole possible cause of exile.[89] Melampus, for example, flees Pylos due to a longstanding conflict with Neleus (*Od*. 15.226-40).[90] Bellerophon also has to leave Argos due to a conflict with the ruler Proetus (*Il.* 6.157-211).[91] In addition, Phyleus (*Il.* 2.627-29) and Polypheides (*Od*. 15.252-255) all depart their respective homes in anger at their fathers specifically (*ἀπενάσσατο πατρὶ χολωθείς*, *Il.* 2.629; *Od*. 15.254).[92] Phoenix (*Il.* 9.444-84) counts as another member of this last group. The consistent factor in all of these cases is that a hostile relationship with an authority figure forces the exile out of his community, although, statistically speaking, homicide remains the most common cause of

[88] This is consistent with Montiglio's (2005:13) statement that migration is generally a sign either of weakness or of aggression. An Argive myth recorded by Pausanias also illustrates this logic and corroborates the picture I have constructed. In the myth, a son of Apollo is killed by his maternal grandfather's sheepdogs. Apollo sends Vengeance (*Ποινή*), the personification of compensation and punishment, to the Argives, but Coroebus slays Vengeance to please the Argives and subsequently flees, founding the town of Tripodisci ("Little Tripods") at the Delphic Oracle's behest (Paus. 1.43.7; cf. Conon *Narr.* 19; Stat. *Theb*. 1.579). Although this myth includes elements of pollution and purification not highlighted in the Homeric cases of fugitive murderers, we have here the mythical representation of a murder that results in the refusal to pay respect to Compensation or Punishment – even her outright murder as well! – in order to gratify the guilty party.

[89] The most comprehensive list of cases and causes is compiled by Roisman 1981: 9-17 and Perry 2010: 152-53.

[90] An instance not listed by Perry 2010. The exact details of the conflict are unclear, but what is told is that Neleus wrongly seized Melampus' possessions when the latter was being imprisoned by Iphiclus. Hoekstra (1989 ad *Od.* 15.231-36) has reconstructed the salient points of the overall story from various fragments. Cf. also schol. V ad *Od.* 11.287.

[91] This is another case left unmentioned in the study by Perry 2010. Proetus' wife orchestrates the conflict, demanding that he kill Bellerophon, but Proetus sends the hero away instead. Curiously enough, Bellerophon appears to undergo a second exile: *ἤτοι ὃ κὰπ πεδίον τὸ Ἀλήϊον οἶος ἀλᾶτο* (*Il.* 6.201). His wandering movement (*ἀλᾶτο*) is underlined further by the similarly sounding name for the place of his wandering, the Aleian plain (*Ἀλήϊον*). See Chapter 2 for additional discussion of Bellerophon.

[92] No further details are provided about the nature of their disputes, but we know from later sources that Phyleus, at least, was the son of Epean Augeias, whom Phyleus blamed for cheating Heracles (Strabo 10.2.19).

exile.[93]

Since disputes and homicides serve as the only attested reasons for displacement in Homeric epic, Timothy Perry treats both as part of one broader exile motif.[94] There are certainly similarities between the two in how a confrontational encounter – fatal or otherwise – ultimately forms the core conflict of each and effects the same result of exile. And just as the homicide cases are split between kin-murders and broader emphuletic bloodshed, the dispute-induced exiles are split between those that involve fathers (Phoenix, Phyleus, and Polypheides) and those that involve rulers (Melampus, Bellerophon). The only difference between the two types is that the murderer demonstrates additional agency in a violent capacity and is partly responsible for his own exile, whether self-imposed or externally compelled by the prevailing members of his community, namely his victim's relatives. The line between homicide and private quarrel is especially blurred in the case of Phoenix, a discussion of whom I must postpone for now. But with just the cases I have discussed thus far, the similarities and close associations between murder and dispute strongly suggest that the exiled killer can also be viewed as a political exile, whose expulsion is interconnected with intra-elite tensions.[95]

All of the different results of homicide and causes of exile are dominated by conversations surrounding competitive social relations. The various outcomes are really solutions of an either cooperative (compensation) or uncooperative (exile and vendetta) nature,

---

[93] Of the 14 exile cases listed by Roisman (1981: 9-17), eight are caused by homicide. Disputes account for the remaining six cases. The last of these six cases involves the mass exodus of the Phaeacians, who leave Hypereia for Scheria due to the violent Cyclops (*Od*. 6.3-10). Perry (2010: 8n23) counts differently, stating that there are only 8 concrete instances of homicide-induced exile, and 3 instances of disagreement-induced exile.

[94] Perry 2010: 6-8.

[95] There are quite a few later historical examples of bloodguilt being attached to political exiles. A fifth century B.C.E. inscription found at Miletus (SIG[3] 58), for example, records that the sons of Nympharetus and Stratonax, as well as their descendants, were banished for homicide, although Glotz (1906) has shown that there are deeper political considerations behind their ousting. The expulsion of the polluted Alcmeonidae, following the Cylonian affair, similarly seems to have been politically incentivized. See Forsdyke 2005 for a discussion of political motives for the many violent expulsions that occurred in ancient Greece.

while the assimilation of homicide to disputes as a severative force further compounds the political issues intimately bound up with the fate of the killer. It is important to note, then, that the exile of the murderer is *not* a form of a punishment, as Athenian homicide law prescribes it,[96] but a measure voluntarily undertaken by the murderer as a means to avoid punishment and to re-secure a position in a more accommodating environment.[97] Given this crucial distinction, there is an agonistic framework within which we must view the flight of the murderer, whose situation is equally constrained by concerns about crime and punishment as by contests having to do with status and dominance.

1.2.3 Relocation

The final question to consider for the fugitive-murderer story pattern is: What does relocation ultimately offer all the exiled killers? One obvious answer, of course, is that it protects them against still-pursuing relatives of a victim, which is the very concern Theoclymenus expresses to Telemachus (*διωκέμεναι γὰρ ὀίω*, *Od.* 15.278).[98] But if, as I have discussed in the previous section, tensions over political power are part and parcel of the fugitive murderer's exclusion from his original community, his eventual relocation should also be seen as part of an effort to resolve such tensions. On the one hand, his departure restores order to his original community, which was disrupted by the violence he initiated in killing a kinsman/compatriot. On the other hand, his exile also creates opportunities for him to restore his own lost standing

[96] Draco's law (IG I^3 104, lines 11-13), for instance, indicates exile as the punishment for the involuntary killer.

[97] *Contra* Perry 2010: 6, who states, "voluntary exile is either very are or non-existent in Homeric epic." For additional discussion of the voluntary nature of the murderer's flight, see note 42 in Chapter 2.

[98] Curiously enough, no other homicide explicitly involves this scenario, and it remains unclear whether any political limitations restricted the pursuit of justice outside the bounds of a border for the Homeric fugitives, as often happens today. Perry (2010: 13) has raised the possibility that Theoclymenus exaggerated his situation to make his appeal more urgent to Telemachus, but it also would not be a stretch to imagine vendetta as a continuous imminent threat for the homicide in exile until he reintegrated into a new community.

elsewhere – the standing that was initially upset by whatever led him to commit the murder in the first place. Let us now turn more closely to the specific fates of the fugitive homicides to see if that is indeed the case.

The *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, as was observed earlier, each exhibit slightly different patterns of relocation: Iliadic murderers become successful expatriates, while Odyssean murderers, for the most part, maintain their fugitive status. A quick rundown of the trajectory of their journeys demonstrates additional trends peculiar to each epic. The Iliadic fugitives, for instance, show a propensity for northwest Greece, particularly Thessaly, as their preferred place of exile. And though I have not yet discussed the particulars of Tlepolemus' and Phoenix's exile narratives, I have included them in the list to demonstrate their participation in the trend:

Fugitive Murderer	**Native Land**	**Place of Exile**	**Line Number**
Tlepolemus	[Tiryns/Argos][99]	Rhodes	*Il.* 2.653-70
Phoenix	Hellas[100]	Phthia	*Il.* 9.444-84
Medon	[Locris][101]	Phylace	*Il.* 13.695-7 = 15.334-6
Lycophron	Cythera	[Salamis][102]	*Il.* 15.430-32
Epeigeus	Boudeum[103]	Phthia	*Il.* 16.572-74

[99] No location is specified in Homer, but Tlepolemus was traditionally from Argos, or more specifically Tiryns. See further discussion in Chapter 2.

[100] There is some confusion about the distinction between Hellas and Phthia in both geographical and political terms. They are lumped together in the formulaic expression (*Ἑλλάδα τε Φθίην τε*, *Il.* 9.395; *Od.* 11.496), and are paired again as part of Achilles' domain in the Catalogue of Ships (*Φθίην ἠδ' Ἑλλάδα*, *Il.* 2.683). If both belong to the same territory, then Phoenix never fully flees from his own land. The identification of Amyntor as ruler of Hellas at *Il.* 9.447, however, makes Hellas a separate kingdom from that of Phthia, which is indisputably controlled by Peleus, although the Phthians as a group represent the people of both Protesilaus' and Philoctetes' domains at *Il.* 13.693. Elsewhere in the *Iliad*, Phoenix' father Amyntor is located in Eleon (*Il.* 10.266), a Boeotian as opposed to Thessalian town (*Il.* 2.500). Pherecydes allegedly identified Amyntor as Boeotian as well (schol. T ad *Il.* 10.266). Strabo (9.5.18) and Eustathius (ad *Il.* 9.447) both mention other theories, such as Phoenix being a Phocian or a Thessalian from Oremenion, which led Demetrius of Scepsius to record an alternative reading for *Il.* 9.447: *οἷον ὅτε πρῶτον λίπον Ὀρμένιον πολύμηλον*. Van Thiel (1982: 319) proposed reading *οἷον ὅτε πρῶτον ἴδον Ἑλλάδα καλλιγύναικα* instead.

[101] No location is specified in Homer, but as he is the bastard son of Oileus, he was presumably from Locris.

[102] No location is specified in Homer, but as he becomes an attendant of Telamonian Ajax, he presumably relocated in Salamis.

[103] Like Phoenix, Epeigeus potentially does not flee very far. According to schol. bT ad *Il.* 16.572, Boudeum is a city of Phthiotis, named after a Boudeios, the son of Argos. If that is the case, Epeigeus runs directly to his own ruler Peleus while staying within his own territory. Olga Levaniouk has suggested to me that Epeigeus' relation to Peleus is perhaps analogous to that of Cretan Odysseus to Idomeneus, where two distinct leaders of separate factions

Patroclus	Opoeis	Phthia	*Il*. 23.83-88
Simile	N/A	House of a rich man	*Il*. 24.480-84

The Odyssean fugitives, however, tend to flock towards Ithaca as a place of transit, if not ultimate place of exile:

Fugitive Murderer	**Native Land**	**Places of Transit/Exile**	**Line Number**
Cretan Odysseus	Crete	Ithaca → [Pylos or Elis][104]	*Od*. 13.256-86
Aetolian	Aetolia	Crete → Ithaca → ?	*Od*. 14.380-83
Theoclymenus	Argos	Pylos → Ithaca	*Od*. 15.223-25, 272-78
Generalization	A deme	N/A	*Od*. 23.118-20

Unsurprisingly, perhaps, these different geographical focuses reflect preferences for the homelands of Achilles (Phthia) and Odysseus (Ithaca), and, as I will argue in the third and fourth chapter, have important implications for the thematic conflicts that drive the plots of each epic. Nonetheless, the divergent courses of the fugitive-murderer story pattern generally demonstrate a consistent underlying logic. Given the aforementioned narrative tendencies, it will be useful to examine each group of fugitives separately to see what relocation ultimately offers the fleeing killer, even if he has yet to achieve it.

The Iliadic murderers successfully relocate themselves by approaching other powerful, wealthy rulers. Epeigeus and Patroclus are both received by Peleus in Phthia, while Medon resettles in Phylace, a territory that falls under Protesilaus' control (*Il.* 2.695-99). Lycophron relocates in eastern Greece with Ajax and Teucer on the island of Salamis, making him the third fugitive, along with Epeigeus and Patroclus, to join an Aeacid household. Even the simile killer,

---

operate within the same territory. To avoid this situation altogether, the same scholion suggests that Boudeum instead refers to a Boeotian city. Eustathius (ad *Il.* 16.572) adds to the list of possible candidates, explaining that there is another Boudeum in Thessalian Magnesia and Phrygia as well. He is explicit in that Epeigeus does not come from the Phthian city in the Homeric case, but from somewhere further out, and not from a Thessalian location either. For the opposite view, see Janko 1994 ad *Il.* 16.570-74. Whatever the true location may be, the fact that Epeigeus is said to have ruled Boudeum (*ἤνασσε*, *Il.* 16.572) indicates that it was at least treated as politically distinct from Phthia in Homer.

[104] These are placed in brackets, as they are where Odysseus, according to his fictitious tale, asked to be taken to by the Phoenicians, and presumably represent his choice place of permanent exile.

though no geographical place is identified for his case, is said to flee specifically to a rich man (*ἀνδρὸς ἐς ἀφνειοῦ*, *Il.* 24.482). A scholiast suggested that the desire to find refuge with this type of figure was to seek purification, although, as discussed earlier, the importance of such religious concerns cannot be proven definitively for the Homeric killers.[105] What is clear from all of these cases, and especially from the example of the simile, is that wealth and power are important considerations for the fugitive when he regards the appeal of a host lord. These two factors clearly have some bearing on the eventual inclusion and standing of the murderer within his choice place of exile.

The attraction of powerful rulers largely stems from the fact that they can afford to offer secure protection, but they also have the additional benefit of enabling suppliant fugitives to gain rank and purpose through service to them. Indeed most of the exiled killers enter upon a quasi-feudal arrangement and serve well-established chieftains in return for their admission into the new community: Epeigeus, for example, goes to Troy at the behest of his receivers Peleus and Thetis to aid Achilles in the Trojan expedition (*Il.* 16.575-76), while Patroclus and Lycophron both serve as attendants (*θεράπων*) to Achilles (*Il.* 23.90) and Ajax (*Il.* 15.431) respectively.[106] These services that the fugitives render may very well account for why no Homeric chieftain ever rejects or otherwise indicates concerns about the reception of a criminal into his own household.[107]

---

[105] Cf. schol. T ad *Il.* 24.480.

[106] Patroclus is also identified as the *θεράπων* of Achilles at *Il.* 16.165, 244, 279, 653, 865; 17.164, 271, 388; 18.152.

[107] Naiden (2006: 140) has put forward two additional reasons why all Homeric murderers succeed in being taken in: “One is practical: they have already gone into exile and placed themselves beyond the reach of the victim’s relatives. The other is legal: they are not expressly said to have committed deliberate homicide.” Theoclymenus’ case, however, would seem to invalidate Naiden’s first explanation. The Argive seer is readily rescued by Telemachus, even though he has just explained to his supplicandus that he believes his victim’s avengers are still in close pursuit. As for Naiden’s second explanation, we have already seen that the type of murder committed has no direct bearing on the eventual fate of the killer in Homer. Lycurgus, interestingly enough, later corroborates the fact that exiles for murder were not met with enmity among their hosts in Greece, although he does not explain why: *οἱ μὲν γὰρ φόνον φεύγοντες εἰς ἑτέραν πόλιν μεταστάντες οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐχθροὺς τοὺς ὑποδεξαμένους* (Lycurg. 1.133).

The one former fugitive who does not immediately appear to occupy a subservient position is Medon, who completely transitions from his illegitimate status as the bastard son of Oileus (*νόθος υἱὸς Ὀϊλῆος*, *Il.*15.332-33) to a life of legitimacy and respect among the Phthians. According to the Catalogue of Ships, he marshals the people of Methone, Thaumacia, Meliboea, and Olizon as a temporary substitute for their true leader Philoctetes (*Il.* 2.716-28),[108] and later fights in their forefront (*Il.* 13.693, 698). Medon's ability to assume command of Philoctetes' contingent is suggested by his very name, 'Ruler,' which Richard Janko deemed "suspiciously common, like the motif of the bastard son,"[109] but the exiled killer's capacity to lead is not unique to Medon alone. Although he is not a ruler of his own territory, Patroclus also capably rallies the Achaeans in Achilles' absence (e.g. *Il.* 16.257-83), and is even charged with advising Achilles (*Il.* 11.785-90). Another sign of Patroclus' prestige is the fact that he retains his own attendant (*Il.* 16.279), not to mention the extensive funeral games that are accorded in his honor in *Iliad* 23. Fugitive murderers can therefore, somewhat paradoxically, enjoy a dual position of obliging subservience and respected authority.

Medon's and Patroclus' situations are representative of a broader tendency for exiled killers to be greatly valued and honored upon their successful integration into their place of exile. Quite a few of them even enjoy an almost familial connection with the rulers who receive them. Ajax states that he and his brother Teucer honored Lycophron like their own parents (*ἶσα φίλοισι τοκεῦσιν ἐτίομεν ἐν μεγάροισι*, *Il.* 15.439), while Patroclus's reception and rearing in Peleus'

---

[108] A curious replacement, since Medon's resettlement in Phylace would make him better suited to be a substitute leader for Protesilaus. That role, however, is instead filled by Podarkes, the younger brother of Protesilaus (*Il.* 2.695-710). Willcock (1984 ad *Il.* 13.696) has suggested that Medon was allowed a different place of residence from that of his troops, and it may perhaps be added that his recruitment was required since Philoctetes lacked a suitable replacement of his own. Regardless, Medon and Podarkes often operate closely together in the *Iliad* – they are only two entries apart in the Catalogue of Ships (*Il.* 2.695-710, 716-28) and they fight together in battle (*Il.* 13.693) – so Medon is never too far away from his adopted community. On the Medon – Podarkes – Phylace connection, see Janko 1994 ad *Il.* 694-97.

[109] Janko 1994 ad *Il.* 13.694-97.

household suggests that he was considered in similarly close, high regard (*με δεξάμενος ἐν δώμασιν ἱππότα Πηλεὺς/ ἔτραφέ τ' ἐνδυκέως*, *Il.* 23.87-88). The high esteem and familial bond conferred upon exiled killers when they successfully relocate may account for why the killers generally do not pose a threat to their benevolent host lords.[110]

There is one Iliadic instance in which the situation of the exiled killer is discussed in a disparaging manner, and that is when Achilles complains of being humiliated by Agamemnon as if he were a "dishonored migrant" (*ἀτίμητος μετανάστης*, *Il.* 9.648, 16.59). But in what way can he be considered dishonored if, as we have just seen, the fugitive is generally treated as the opposite within his new residence? Walter Leaf understood the figure to be an exile who could be abused with impunity as he has no blood money attached to himself,[111] while Bryan Hainsworth defined him as "a 'refugee', obliged to beg for his bread and abused by the more fortunate."[112] But Maureen Alden has interpreted him in a completely different, and I believe correct, light. Citing examples of heroes who undergo multiple expulsions, such as Bellerophon and Peleus,[113] she explains that the dishonored reputation of the metanast stems from a "material/social/sexual deprivation and alienation" inflicted by his host lord as punishment for perceived wrongdoing.[114] This sort of deprivation is the same kind that we saw prompts fugitive murderers to kill and flee in the first place. So the metanast is dishonored only in the moment

[110] There are a few attested recidivist murderers in Greek mythology. Peleus, for example, first kills Phocus and flees from Aegina to Phthia (Paus. 2.29.2). There he kills again, striking Eurytion accidentally during the Calydonian boar hunt, whereupon he flees to Acastus in Iolcus (Eur. *Tro.* 1127-28; Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.8.2). This plot corresponds quite closely to that of Adrastus in Hdt. 1.35.1-1.45.3, where the second offense is again accidental. More extensive discussion of Peleus' murderous background can be found in Chapter 2 (note 120) and Chapter 3.

[111] Leaf 1900-02 ad *Il.* 9.648.

[112] Hainsworth 1993 ad *Il.* 9.648, which was seconded by Janko 1994 ad *Il.* 16.59.

[113] Alden 2012: 120-21 provides a detailed survey of the multiple exiles and story correspondences between Bellerophon and Peleus.

[114] Alden 2012: 127.

that he is deprived and must depart (again).[115] None of the Iliadic homicides we have been discussing, however, experiences such treatment under the aegis of their new rulers, and each rather gets to maintain the life of an honored hero. Thus for the Iliadic fugitives, exile is by and large a positive experience that enables them to form new familial/communal ties, which in turn restore or even augment their former status.

For the Odyssean homicides, exile is a sorrier, more distressing condition.[116] They are often in mortal peril – or at least present themselves as such – and turn to others for rescue from their flight: Cretan Odysseus implores Athena to save him and his possessions (*ἀλλὰ σάω μὲν ταῦτα, σάω δ' ἐμέ*, *Od*. 13.230); the Aetolian finds brief protection in Eumaeus' home (*Od*. 14.381); Theoclymenus begs Telemachus to be brought on board his ship to escape death (*ἀλλά με νηὸς ἔφεσσαι, ἐπεί σε φυγὼν ἱκέτευσα/ μή με κατακτείνωσι*, *Od*. 15.277-78). All remain quite vulnerable until someone accepts them.

In the end, not one of the Odyssean fugitives securely joins his would-be protector's cortege as a retainer. The Aetolian who stayed briefly with Eumaeus, for example, proceeds on presumably outside of Ithaca to elicit the assistance of another in his wanderings, and for the killer in Odysseus' generalization, only the prospect of flight, rather than the hope of successful relocation, is emphasized. Odysseus' Cretan tale of murder and flight is, of course, a lie, but in his continued guise as a stranger to Ithaca, he is shunted from Athena's care to that of Eumaeus (*Od.* 13.362-415), and finally to Penelope and the suitors in his own home (*Od.* 17.508-11). Theoclymenus is also shuffled frequently among different Ithacans: Piraeus first receives him (*Od.* 15.545-46), but the seer then briefly enjoys Telemachus' hospitality (*Od*. 17.52-56, 84)

---

[115] I shall return to the question of how to read *ἀτίμητος μετανάστης* in Chapter 3.

[116] Odysseus best expresses the desperation of their situation when he says to Eumaeus, "There is nothing more evil than wandering for mortals" (*πλαγκτοσύνης δ' οὐκ ἔστι κακώτερον ἄλλο βροτοῖσιν*, *Od.* 15.343). For similar negative evaluations of the vagrant lifestyle in Homer, cf. *Od.* 20.188-207; *Il*. 9.648, 16.59.

before returning again to Piraeus' home (*Od*. 20.371-72). No further mention is made of Theoclymenus after that, and he perhaps achieves some permanent security with his first and last host; however, the fact that the Argive homicide is always addressed or referred to as a "stranger/guest-friend" (*ξεῖνος*)[117] suggests that he, though received, is never fully accepted into the Ithacan community. The instability of Ithaca, which was brought about by Odysseus' absence and by the suitors' exploitation of the palace, would also seem to preclude the possibility of his permanent integration there until Odysseus reinstates himself as king. So by constantly obtaining only temporary shelter and hospitality, the Odyssean fugitives, unlike their Iliadic counterparts, remain outsiders perpetually on the move.

The poor standing of most of the transitory hosts contributes to the prolonged flight of the Odyssean fugitives. Eumaeus, though the son of a Syrian king (*Od.* 15.403-92), is a swineherd (*ὑφορβός*, *Od*. 14.413; *συβώτης*, *Od.*14.420) and one of Odysseus' slaves (*ὅ οἱ βιότοιο μάλιστα/ κήδετο οἰκήων, οὓς κτήσατο δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς*, *Od.* 15.3-4), while Athena's disguise is a mere shepherd boy (*ἀνδρὶ δέμας εἰκυῖα νέῳ, ἐπιβώτορι μήλων*, *Od.* 13.221-25). Even Telemachus' status is apparently not established enough to ensure an exile permanent security, in spite of the fact that he is the heir apparent of Ithaca.[118] The suitors' overriding presence and influence render him incapable of receiving strangers himself,[119] and so he continually foists Theoclymenus on others. Indeed before the seer ends up with Piraeus, Telemachus first nominates one of his greatest opponents in Ithaca as his host:[120]

ἀλλά τοι ἄλλον φῶτα πιφαύσκομαι ὅν κεν ἵκοιο,

---

[117] Cf. *Od.* 13.266, 514, 536, 542, 546; 17.53, 72, 73, 84, 163; 20.360, 382.

[118] On the presentation of Ithacan kingship in the *Odyssey*, see Finley 1965: 74-113.

[119] On Theoclymenus as frustrated host throughout the *Odyssey*, see de Jong 2001 ad *Od.* 1.96-324, 1.130-35, and 15.513-17.

[120] Page (1955: 87) explained the curious recommendation as an allusion to a version of the *Odyssey* in which Theoclymenus did in fact stay with Eurymachus.

> *Εὐρύμαχον, Πολύβοιο δαΐφρονος ἀγλαὸν υἱόν,*
> *τὸν νῦν ἶσα θεῷ Ἰθακήσιοι εἰσορόωσι·*
> *καὶ γὰρ πολλὸν ἄριστος ἀνὴρ μέμονέν τε μάλιστα*
> *μητέρ' ἐμὴν γαμέειν καὶ Ὀδυσσῆος γέρας ἕξειν.* (*Od*. 15.518-23)

> But I will disclose to you another man to whom you may go, Eurymachus, the glorious son of wise Polybus, whom the men of Ithaca now look upon like a god. For he is by far the best man and the most eager to marry my mother and to have the honor of Odysseus.

Eurymachus, as Telemachus believes, is the most likely to take over Odysseus' position as king of Ithaca, and hence is the most qualified to receive a fugitive like Theoclymenus. But after the seer proclaims that Odysseus will soon reclaim his rule, Telemachus changes his mind and re-delegates the task of hosting to Piraeus (*Od.* 15.531-43). This last figure's position within Ithaca is not elaborated much, but what we are told is that he is a famous spearman, a trusty companion on the journey to Pylos (*Od.* 15.540-44), and clearly a subordinate who takes orders from Telemachus (e.g. *Od.* 15.508-49, 17.54-56). Thus none of the above would-be hosts qualify as the wealthy, powerful rulers that can afford to accept and protect fugitives permanently.

Despite their failure to find a permanent host lord of suitable standing, the Odyssean fugitives' continual dependence on those they encounter in their wanderings for assistance or deliverance is still in line with the behavior of the Iliadic fugitives finding refuge with other Homeric chieftains. I would even suggest that the Odyssean homicides are aspiring towards the same prosperous position of retainers that the Iliadic murderers hold with their new powerful rulers. Theoclymenus' supplication to Telemachus on Pylos is particularly instructive on this point. His first words are:

> *ὦ φίλ', ἐπεί σε θύοντα κιχάνω τῷδ' ἐνὶ χώρῳ,*
> *λίσσομ' ὑπὲρ θυέων καὶ δαίμονος, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα*
> *σῆς τ' αὐτοῦ κεφαλῆς καὶ ἑταίρων, οἵ τοι ἕπονται,*
> *εἰπέ μοι εἰρομένῳ νημερτέα μηδ' ἐπικεύσῃς·*
> *τίς πόθεν εἶς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες;* (*Od*. 15.260-64)

> O friend, since I find you making burnt offerings in this place, I beseech you by your

> offerings and by the god, and then by your own head and your companions who follow you, tell me truly as I ask, and do not hide it. Who are you among men, and from where? Where is your city, and where are your parents?

This series of questions is a standard Homeric formulation, used five more times in the *Odyssey*, but it is usually asked by a *host* requesting the identity of a guest or stranger.[121] For Theoclymenus to begin his supplication with these questions, as has been observed before, is a major faux pas, since epic custom demands that the supplicandus/host, Telemachus, take the initiative in asking a stranger's name and business.[122] Only upon hearing Telemachus' lineage and place of origin (*Od.* 15.266-70) does the seer outline his own fugitive status and make his official request to be saved, which suggests that the order of his speech, from his initial questioning (*Od.* 15.260-64) to his eventual life story and plea (*Od.* 15.272-78), is deliberately designed to ascertain the identity and ability of a potential savior.[123] And Theoclymenus apparently hopes to find one in Telemachus.

Even though the *Odyssey* will proceed to resist narrating fully the eventual, successful relocation of Theoclymenus – and the rest of the fugitive murderers for that matter – it still exhibits much of the same underlying reasoning as the *Iliad* about the mutually beneficial arrangement formed between fugitive and host lord when the former is admitted into a new community. Eurymachus, for instance, promises to feed, clothe, and house Odysseus, disguised as a beggar, in exchange for his work on an outlying farm (*Od.* 18.356-64), although he almost

[121] A meal is also usually shared before a stranger's name is asked. Cf. *Od.* 1.170 (Telemachus asks Athena who is in the form of Mentes); 10.325 (Circe asks Odysseus); 14.187 (Eumaeus asks Odysseus); 19.105 (Penelope asks Odysseus); 24.298 (Laertes asks Odysseus). Circe's case is unusual, as she, like Theoclymenus, is a suppliant and apparently answers her own question. On two more occasions, an abbreviated version of the questions, *τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν*, is asked: *Il.* 21.150 (Achilles asks Asteropaeus); *Od.* 7.238 (Arete asks Odysseus). The one Iliadic instance occurs in a battle confrontation. On the subject of Homeric guest-identification, see Webber 1989; Reece 1993: 25-28; de Jong 2001 ad *Od.* 1.169-77.

[122] Page 1955: 84. On the traditional supplication procedure, see Gould 1973; Naiden 2006: 29-104.

[123] Ameis and Hentze 1858-60 ad *Od.* 15.264 and Erbse 1972: 44-45 previously proposed this solution to unifying the two parts of Theoclymenus' speech.

immediately retracts that offer. A later complaint made by one of the anonymous suitors about accommodating strangers further illustrates the general *quid-pro-quo* expectation of the host in receiving outsiders:

> *Τηλέμαχ', οὔ τις σεῖο κακοξεινώτερος ἄλλος·*
> *οἷον μέν τινα τοῦτον ἔχεις ἐπίμαστον ἀλήτην,*
> *σίτου καὶ οἴνου κεχρημένον, οὐδέ τι ἔργων*
> *ἔμπαιον οὐδὲ βίης, ἀλλ' αὔτως ἄχθος ἀρούρης.*
> *ἄλλος δ' αὖτέ τις οὗτος ἀνέστη μαντεύεσθαι.*
> *ἀλλ' εἴ μοί τι πίθοιο, τό κεν πολὺ κέρδιον εἴη·*
> *τοὺς ξείνους ἐν νηὶ πολυκληῖδι βαλόντες*
> *ἐς Σικελοὺς πέμψωμεν, ὅθεν κέ τοι ἄξιον ἄλφοι.* (*Od.* 20.376-83)

> Telemachus, no one else is more unlucky in his guests than you, seeing that you keep such a filthy wanderer as this man here, wanting bread and wine, but practiced in neither works nor force, but a mere burden of the earth. And then this other man stood up to prophesy. No, if you would listen to me it would be far more profitable: upon having thrown these strangers on board a benched ship, let us send them to the Sicilians, whence it would yield a worthwhile gain to you.

This overwhelmingly negative evaluation of Telemachus' guests, namely Odysseus in the guise of a beggar and the seer Theoclymenus, is natural given that the suitors epitomize the bad-host type in the *Odyssey*.[124] But the fact that the suitor criticizes the two for their lack of obvious assets hints that there is an advantage as much for the host as there is for the stranger when the latter is taken in, and that advantage is contingent upon the fugitive's set of serviceable skills.

The Iliadic fugitives, acting as attendants and (substitute) leaders in the Trojan War, easily qualify as the type practiced in force (*ἔμπαιον* [...] *βίης*, *Od.* 20.379). The type of wanderer practiced in works (*ἔργων/ ἔμπαιον*, *Od.* 20.378-79) is a bit more vague, but Eumaeus specifies skilled craftsmen, literally "those who work for the people" (*δημιοεργοί*), as desirable vagabonds in a rhetorical question addressed to Antinous, who has just objected to the beggar's (Odysseus') presence:

---

[124] On the suitors' repeated perversions of the hospitality ritual, see Reece 1993: 165-87, esp. 173-78, and de Jong 2001 ad *Od.* 1.136-51.

> *τίς γὰρ δὴ ξεῖνον καλεῖ ἄλλοθεν αὐτὸς ἐπελθὼν*
> *ἄλλον γ', εἰ μὴ τῶν οἳ δημιοεργοὶ ἔασι,*
> *μάντιν ἢ ἰητῆρα κακῶν ἢ τέκτονα δούρων,*
> *ἢ καὶ θέσπιν ἀοιδόν, ὅ κεν τέρπῃσιν ἀείδων;* (*Od.* 17.382-85)
>
> For who indeed comes upon and invites a stranger from elsewhere, unless they are masters of some public craft, a prophet, or a healer of ills, or a carpenter, or even a divine singer, who gives delight by singing?

According to this list, Theoclymenus, a seer (*μάντις*, *Od.* 15.225) with a family history in the craft,[125] should number among these attractive guests. He even interprets omens or proclaims prophecies on three different occasions (*Od.* 15.531-34, 17.152-61, 20.364-70), and his very name translates as "he who hears divine things."[126] But as Irene de Jong has rightly pointed out, no one is ever informed directly of his status; only the narrator and audience are privy to that information.[127] This detail would explain the consistent reaction of disbelief that Telemachus, Penelope, and the suitors express in response to the interpretations or prophecies of Theoclymenus. The Aetolian is similarly met with a lukewarm reaction by Eumaeus when he predicts that Odysseus will soon return to Ithaca (*Od.* 14.378-89). The more distrustful attitude towards him and the other Odyssean fugitives, as opposed to the Iliadic ones, is perhaps yet another consequence of their *perceived* lack of assets.

To account for the dissimilarities between the *Odyssey*'s and *Iliad*'s presentation of the exiled killer, Charles Segal has claimed, "In the post-Iliadic world, such a man can no longer be absorbed into a hero's retinue, there to resume the life of warrior and nobleman."[128] I would, however, caution against seeing such a sharp, chronological divide in the treatment of the

---

[125] According to the Melampid genealogy at *Od.* 15. 225-55, Theoclymenus' father Polypheides was a seer (*Od.* 15.252). The grandfather's name Mantius is a *nomen loquens* that evokes the profession of a *μάντις* (*Od.* 15.242), and the great-grandfather Melampus is identified as one in the Nekyia (*Od.* 11.291). Another famous prophetic Melampid is Amphiaraus (*Od.* 15.244-47).

[126] Kanavou 2015: 149. Cf. Heraclit. *All.* 75.2: *Θεοκλύμενος . . . ὁ τὰ θεῖα κλύων.*

[127] De Jong 2001 ad *Od.* 15.222-58.

[128] Segal 1994: 175.

fugitive murderer between the two epics. What differences we have observed thus far merely reflect different emphases on different stages of the overall story pattern, which is still very much an ongoing process in the *Odyssey*. That is to say, the four instances of the pattern in the *Odyssey* are presented *in medias res*, with the fugitives still actively searching for a suitable site of permanent relocation. Their lack of success in doing so when we encounter them does not necessarily mean that it is an impossible feat for them. In fact, we shall see later that this 'incomplete' quality of the Odyssean pattern resonates meaningfully with Odysseus' own experiences in the *Odyssey*.[129]

The stark contrast between the revered status of homicides in the *Iliad* and the more disdainful attitude towards Odyssean homicides instead illustrates the two-fold position that *all* fugitive murderers must negotiate. They are, in one sense, marginalized figures dependent on the charity of others, but are, in another, (eventually) figures honored for the services they pledge to their new ruler.[130] This two-fold image of the exiled killer mirrors the dual aspects of the murderous act that initiates the fugitive-murderer story pattern. It first dissolves him of his native ties as a disgrace but simultaneously serves as the productive mechanism by which he forms other ties elsewhere. The newly formed alliance, which is quite political in nature, helps to rehabilitate his lost status and property, and often to great improvement. Thus the overall story pattern wavers between rupture and connection, as well as between adversity and prosperity. The fugitive murderer's successful absorption into another elite environment ensures that he ends with the latter.

This concludes my formal description of the fugitive-murderer pattern. Despite the high

---

[129] See Chapter 4.

[130] This high-low position is somewhat similar to that occupied by poets, who are greatly honored, like Demodocus (*λαοῖσι τετιμένον*, *Od.* 8.472; *λαοῖσι τετιμένος*, 13.28), but compelled to serve and depend on their patrons, like Phemius (*ὅς ῥ' ἤειδε παρὰ μνηστῆρσιν ἀνάγκῃ*, *Od.* 1.154 = 22.331 with *μετὰ* for *παρὰ*).

level of compression for each narrative of murder and exile, my examination has identified several key words and issues with major socio-political implications in the Homeric world. I will continue to explore these issues in the rest of the dissertation – in particular, the impact and interrelations of anger, violence, alienation, inclusion, family dysfunction, civil strife, and intra-elite competition.

Chapter 2. VARIATIONS ON THE FUGITIVE MURDERER: TLEPOLEMUS AND PHOENIX

Two Homeric exiles, Tlepolemus and Phoenix, have yet to be fully addressed. I have intentionally left these two out of the previous chapter's discussion, as they offer the most extensive narrative elaborations of the homicide-and-flight pattern while presenting significant variations on it. For Tlepolemus, the variation occurs in the nature of his exile, which operates within the framework of Greek colonization. For Phoenix, variation occurs in the cause of his exile, which is not even a murder, but only an unsuccessful parricidal attempt. Unique as these cases are, Tlepolemus' and Phoenix' exile narratives are still very much in accord with the typical fugitive-murderer pattern in Homer, and ultimately express the same thematic concerns we have already observed about civil strife and displacement, while shedding light on some new ones.

In this chapter, I continue to explore many of the issues raised in the previous chapter by examining first Tlepolemus and then Phoenix individually. My discussion of these two will reinforce my earlier observations about the two-fold conception of the fugitive murderer as a socio-politically disintegrative yet equally formative figure. It will also illustrate how the violent conflict at issue and the ensuing flight are not only matters of the mythical, religious, moral, or legal spheres of Homeric poetry, but also matters that bear significantly on the realm of the political, specifically the social hierarchy, contested authority, emergence of dissent, and struggle for leadership. This political focus has major implications for the larger drama of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, which I discuss more fully in my third and fourth chapter. In preparation for these later discussions, I will additionally discuss how Tlepolemus' and Phoenix' homicide narratives

meaningfully relate to their immediate contexts to give a demonstration of how attention to the fugitive-murderer pattern can be employed towards a broader understanding of Homeric poetry.

2.1 TLEPOLEMUS

Tlepolemus' tale of murder and exile is introduced within the Rhodian entry of the Catalogue of Ships, the eighteenth and longest entry in the Catalogue by virtue of the extensive biographical anecdote about its hero.[1] The digression largely follows the pattern presented by other Iliadic fugitive murderers, with Tlepolemus fleeing his home and successfully relocating on the island of Rhodes after killing his maternal uncle :[2]

> *Τληπόλεμος δ᾽ Ἡρακλεΐδης ἠΰς τε μέγας τε*
> *ἐκ Ῥόδου ἐννέα νῆας ἄγεν Ῥοδίων ἀγερώχων,*
> *οἳ Ῥόδον ἀμφενέμοντο διὰ τρίχα κοσμηθέντες*
> *Λίνδον Ἰηλυσόν τε καὶ ἀργινόεντα Κάμειρον.*
> *τῶν μὲν Τληπόλεμος δουρὶ κλυτὸς ἡγεμόνευεν,*
> *ὃν τέκεν Ἀστυόχεια βίῃ Ἡρακληείῃ,*
> *τὴν ἄγετ᾽ ἐξ Ἐφύρης ποταμοῦ ἄπο Σελλήεντος*
> *πέρσας ἄστεα πολλὰ διοτρεφέων αἰζηῶν.*
> *Τληπόλεμος δ᾽ ἐπεὶ οὖν τράφ᾽ ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ εὐπήκτῳ,*
> *αὐτίκα πατρὸς ἑοῖο φίλον* ***μήτρωα κατέκτα***
> *ἤδη γηράσκοντα Λικύμνιον ὄζον Ἄρηος·*
> *αἶψα δὲ νῆας ἔπηξε, πολὺν δ᾽ ὅ γε λαὸν ἀγείρας*
> *βῆ φεύγων ἐπὶ πόντον· ἀπείλησαν γάρ οἱ ἄλλοι*
> *υἱέες υἱωνοί τε βίης Ἡρακληείης.*
> *αὐτὰρ ὅ γ᾽ ἐς Ῥόδον ἷξεν ἀλώμενος ἄλγεα πάσχων·*
> *τριχθὰ δὲ ᾤκηθεν καταφυλαδόν, ἠδὲ φίληθεν*
> *ἐκ Διός, ὅς τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισιν ἀνάσσει,*
> *καί σφιν θεσπέσιον πλοῦτον κατέχευε Κρονίων.* (*Il.* 2. 653-70)

Tlepolemus, the good and great son of Heracles, brought from Rhodes nine ships of the

---

[1] On the uniqueness of this entry within the Catalogue of Ships, see Allen 1921: 102-03; Kullmann 1960: 106-07; Visser 1997: 623-25; Heiden 2008: 138-39, 142; Sammons 2010: 181-84.

[2] The location of the murder or of Tlepolemus' home is not mentioned in Homer, but according to other accounts, Tlepolemus fled from Argos (schol. ad Pind. *Ol*. 7.36; Diod. Sic. 4.58.7-8, 5.59.5-6 [5.59.5 = Zenon of Rhodes *FGrH* 523 F 1]; Paus. 2.22.8, 3.19.10) or more specifically from Tiryns (Pind. *Ol*. 7.49), where Licymnius was recognized as the eponym of its acropolis Licymna (Strabo 8.373).

> high-minded Rhodians, who dwelt in Rhodes arranged into three parts: Lindus, Ialysus, and bright Cameirus. These Tlepolemus, famed for his spear, led, whom Astyoche bore to mighty Heracles, whom he brought from Ephyra away from the Selleis river. And after Tlepolemus was raised in the well-built palace, he immediately killed his own father's dear maternal uncle, the already old Licymnius, the offshoot of Ares. At once he built ships, and having gathered many people, he went fleeing over the sea; for the other sons and grandsons of mighty Heracles threatened him. But in his wandering he came to Rhodes, having suffered pains. They settled, arranged into three tribes, and they were beloved of Zeus, who rules over both gods and men, and the son of Cronus shed wondrous wealth over them.

Two structural compositions organize the exile narrative in such a way as to highlight Tlepolemus' activities and their impact on communal integrity. In one structural framework, the homicidal act initiates the typical linear narrative sequence of murder (*μήτρωα κατέκτα*, *Il. 2.662*), flight (*βῆ φεύγων*, *Il.* 2.665; *ἀλώμενος*, *Il.* 2.667), and relocation (*ἷξεν*, *Il.* 2.667; *ᾤκηθεν*, *Il.* 2.668), but with one crucial difference: Tlepolemus does not reintegrate into Rhodes by receiving protection from another powerful chieftain; rather, he establishes himself there as its ruler and founder. From the perspective of this narrative structure, then, there is a teleological trajectory, where Tlepolemus' murderous act leads to a newly founded community, and a quite prosperous one at that.

Within the other structural framework shaping the Catalogue entry, the murder forms the center of a ring structure, which is meaningfully encompassed by the ringing phrases of mighty Heracles (*βίῃ Ἡρακληείῃ*, *Il.* 2.658; *βίης Ἡρακλείης*, *Il.* 2.666) and Rhodes' tripartite division (*διὰ τρίχα κοσμηθέντες*, *Il.* 2.655; *τριχθὰ δὲ ᾤκηθεν καταφυλαδόν*, *Il.* 2.668). The lexical repetition points to Tlepolemus' 'past' heritage as a Heraclid and his 'future' status as founder of Rhodes. And at the outer periphery of the entire entry, broadly speaking, the Rhodian contingent of the Trojan expedition (9 ships) formally opens the exile narrative, while the newly settled community (3 tribes) closes it. As is typical of most ring compositions, especially in Homer, this

structure creates emphasis and contrast.[3] The balanced external elements of the ring set up a parallel between Tlepolemus' leadership in the Trojan expedition setting out from Rhodes (*ἐκ Ῥόδου*, *Il*. 2.654) and his guidance of the colonial expedition heading to Rhodes (*ἐς Ῥόδον*, *Il*. 2.667). At the heart of the entry, then, is the criminal action of the lone individual, framed by the community at large. By forming the nucleus of these components, homicide is again depicted as the basis of Rhodes' activity and growth.[4]

Such are the structural details of Tlepolemus' exile narrative. Both the linear and annular arrangements of the narrative consistently isolate the activities of the Heraclid, particularly his initial violent act, and foreground them against the status of his people. This presentation raises questions about the position and influence of the individual, whom the Rhodian entry shows to have equal potential to disrupt and to compose an entire community. I will now expand upon this key idea with a more detailed analysis of the homicide and exile in Tlepolemus' narrative. The idiosyncratic features of the pattern adopted in Tlepolemus' case will be compared with previously examined Homeric fugitives as well as with alternative accounts of Tlepolemus' homicide narrative in order to provide a detailed conceptual map of his situation. I will then conclude with a discussion of how the Rhodian entry fits into the larger thematic design of the Catalogue of Ships, where many other entries also highlight problems of individual leadership in relation to the general wellbeing of Greek communities. The frequency with which such problems emerge throughout the Catalogue underscores the interpretive potential of the fugitive-murderer pattern as a model to evaluate the plot of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey.*

---

[3] On ring composition in Homeric poetry, see Stanley 1993: 6-13; Steinrück 1997. A more extensive bibliography about ring composition in Greek literature more broadly is provided in Stanley 1993: 307-08n21.

[4] Heiden (2008: 138-39, 142), who argues that the Catalogue of Ships expresses democratic commemoration, alternatively identifies the Rhodian people as the most important topic of the entry.

2.1.1 Murder and Intergenerational Strife

Tlepolemus' murder of Licymnius presents a particularly intricate and illuminating case of family dysfunction, which spans multiple generational and genealogical lines. It is a classic instance of emphuletic bloodshed that encompasses the full range of strife from the intra-familial to the intra-communal. In terms of the former, it must be acknowledged that the murder is technically a kin-killing. Licymnius is the bastard brother of Alcmene, Tlepolemus' grandmother.[5] But the crime extends to the other end of the strife spectrum because it incurs the wrath of different generations of Heraclids that constitute a community (*ἀπείλησαν γάρ οἱ ἄλλοι/ υἱέες υἱωνοί τε βίης Ἡρακληείης*, *Il.* 665-66). The magnitude of the event and its discord is reflected by its particular formulaic presentation, which, though it deploys the usual verb of criminal homicide in its typical Object-Verb word order, does not relate the act of manslaughter in a participial phrase or subordinate clause. Instead, the killing unusually serves as the main verb of the independent clause, and hence forms the main thought of the sentence.

The syntactical change to the presentation of the murder allows for more details in the way of circumstances to be attached to Tlepolemus' crime, as opposed to the other Homeric man-slaying formulas that ascribe a circumstantial quality to the homicide itself. The description of the murder in question, of course, does not directly reveal a motive or means,[6] and also omits mention of pollution and purification, which become standard elements of other post-Homeric fugitive-murderer narratives. But what the Homeric account does interestingly highlight is a contrast between Tlepolemus' recent transition to adulthood (*ἐπεὶ οὖν τράφ' ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ εὐπήκτῳ*,

[5] Licymnius was the illegitimate son of Elektryon and a Phrygian woman named Midea (Apollod. 2.4.5; schol. ad Pind. *Ol.* 7.36c, 49, 46-48, 49-54; schol. ad Lycoph. 932b). His wife Perimede, the sister of Amphitryon, also links him closely to Heracles' family line (Apollod. 2.4.6).

[6] Although Brügger et al. 2003 ad *Il.* 2.668-69 believes that Zeus' love for the Rhodians may imply that the murder was an involuntary act.

Il. 2.661) and Licymnius' old age (*ἤδη γηράσκοντα Λικύμνιον*, *Il.* 2.663). Each expression about the murderer's and victim's time of life immediately precedes or directly follows the line relating the murder. This enclosing juxtaposition clearly shows the murder operating within the idiom of kinship and generational difference, and suggests that the nature of Tlepolemus' and Licymnius' lethal encounter may involve a generational conflict over succession and related political or socio-economic ambitions. Before I press this point further, let us briefly examine some other variant myths about how Tlepolemus killed Licymnius, for they help to shed some light on this agonistic substructure of the killing.

There are many alternative accounts of Tlepolemus' homicide narrative, all of which detail different reasons and motivations for the murder.[7] Although Strabo (14.2.6) essentially follows Homer, quoting him nearly verbatim,[8] and Pausanias (2.22.8) also cites Homer as his source without adding any more new information, the majority of sources depict Licymnius' death as an accidental occurrence by using some form of *ἀκούσιος* or *ἄκων*.[9] The typical setup in this case involves a household slave who is charged with taking care of Licymnius in his old age but mistreats him. Outraged at the neglect, Tlepolemus hurls a club intended for the abusive slave, but accidentally deals a lethal blow to Licymnius instead.[10] In Apollodorus (2.8.2), however, Licymnius sees Tlepolemus beating his servant and attempts to intervene by running in between them. In still other versions, the domestic squabble is scrapped altogether, and

---

[7] Descriptions of Tlepolemus' crime outside of Homer appear in schol. ad *Il*. 2.662; Eust. ad *Il*. 2.658-70; Pind. *Ol.* 7.27-33; schol. ad Pind. *Ol*. 7.36c, 46-48, 49a (= Agias-Dercylus *FGrH* 305 F 9), 49b, 49-54, 50, 54; schol. vet. ad Ar. *Nub.* 1264-65a; Tzetz. schol. ad *Nub.* 1264; Apollod. 2.8.2; Diod. Sic. 4.58.7-8, 5.59.5-6 (5.59.5 = Zenon of Rhodes *FGrH* 523 F 1); Paus. 2.22.8, 3.19.10; Strabo 14.2.6.

[8] Strabo directly quotes bits of *Il.* 2.662-63, 664-64, 667, 668.

[9] *ἀκουσίως* (schol. ad *Il.* 2.662); *ἀκουσίῳ κακῷ*, *οὐχ᾽ ἑκών* (Eust. ad *Il.* 2.658-70); *ἄκων* (Pind. Ad *Ol.* 7.36c); *ἀκούσιον τὸν φόνον* (schol. ad Pind. *Ol.* 7.49a = Agias-Dercylus *FGrH* 305 F 9); *ἀκουσίως* (schol. ad Pind. *Ol.* 7.50); *οὐχ᾽ ἑκών* (Apollod. 2.8.2); *ἀκουσίως* (Diod. Sic. 5.59.5 = Zenon of Rhodes *FGrH* 523 F 1).

[10] Schol. ad *Il.* 2.662; Eust. ad *Il.* 2.658-70. The killing is characterized as involuntary without elaboration by Diod. Sic. 5.59.5 (= Zenon of Rhodes *FGrH* 523 F 1); schol. ad Pind. *Ol.* 7.50; Agias and Dercylus (schol. ad Pind. *Ol.* 7.49a = Agias-Dercylus *FGrH* 305 F 9).

Tlepolemus is said to have been aiming at a cow when he accidentally strikes Licymnius.[11]

Alternatively, a few other variant myths hint that something far more sinister transpired between Tlepolemus and Licymnius. According to Pindar, a club again serves as the murder weapon, which Tlepolemus uses in a fit of anger (*χολωθείς*, Pind. *Ol*. 7.32).[12] But anger over what? One Pindaric scholion clarifies that the cause of the slaying was "over certain honors" (*περί τινων τιμῶν*, schol. ad Pind. *Ol*. 7.49), while another adds that it was "over certain honors and rulerships" (*διὰ τιμάς τινας καὶ ἀρχάς*, schol. ad Pind. *Ol.* 7.54). A third scholion characterizes their disagreement in terms of stasis (*στασιάσας*, schol. ad Pind. *Ol.* 7.46). Finally, Diodorus Siculus similarly attests to an antagonism between Tlepolemus and Licymnius, explaining vaguely that they were quarreling over "something" (*ἐρίσαντα περί τινων*, Diod. Sic. 4.58.7). None of these sources explicitly describes the murder as intentional (*ἑκών*/*ἑκούσιος*) or unintentional (*ἄκων*/*ἀκούσιος*), but it is possible that the lack of qualification is an indication that the murder is an intentional act.[13]

In reviewing the different versions of Tlepolemus' crime, we are faced with essentially two groups of myths distinguished by hostility between the murderer and victim, or lack thereof. This divergence may easily be accounted for by the degree of guilt a myth wants to attach to Tlepolemus. The theme of Licymnius being accidentally struck, for instance, helps to absolve Tlepolemus on moral grounds. But as we saw in the last chapter, little weight is given to the consideration of intent in determining the culpability of the murderer in Homer. The non-accidental versions of the Tlepolemus myth, on the other hand, interestingly insinuate an

---

[11] Schol. ad Pind. *Ol.* 7.36c, 46-48.

[12] A scholion similarly emphasizes Tlepolemus' emotional state when the murder occurs, attributing another word for anger to Tlepolemus: *χολωθεὶς καὶ ὀργισθείς* (schol. ad Pind. *Ol.* 7.49-54). The detail of the angry outburst is one of several departures from the Homeric account, which does not elaborate on Tlepolemus' emotional state. Differences between Homer's and Pindar's account have been noted by Ruck 1968: 129-32; Young 1968: 82-83; Defradas 1974; Dougherty 1993: 120-35.

[13] In legal contexts, intentional murders were often left unspecified as such, on which see Gagarin 1981: 106-07.

underlying competitive social environment – the very context in which we observed anger (*χόλος*) and violence erupting for other Homeric homicides, such as Patroclus, who kills in a state of angry frustration over a game of dice.[14] Tlepolemus' and Licymnius' competition over honors additionally appears to intersect with a succession struggle (*ἀρχάς*, schol. ad Pind. *Ol.* 7.54), wherein the rule of elders is set in direct opposition to the rebellious assertiveness of the younger generation. Such conflict between patriarchal figures and ambitious sons in Greek myth often results in the son moving elsewhere to establish his own rule.[15] This intergenerational tension seems to be a relevant feature of the Tlepolemus myth, since one of the few consistent traditional details about the murder is that Licymnius is an old man when he dies. Even the myths heroicizing Tlepolemus as an involuntary killer incorporate generational difference by highlighting the vulnerability of the old man in the face of the vigor, strength, and aggressiveness of the young upstart.[16] And so, though the extenuating circumstances that led to Licymnius' death may help to clear Tlepolemus of malicious intent, the accidental slaying is still a kind of reckless criminal action, a social misbehavior that is a function of the killer's youthfulness. Tlepolemus' role in the murder, then, epitomizes the impulsive and insurgent brashness of the younger generation, which produces dire and lethal consequences for other people in the community.

We can now return to the Homeric focusing of the generational difference between

[14] See Walsh 2005 for a discussion of *χόλος* as an immediately visceral yet resolvable reaction. We will revisit this type of anger in more detail in our discussion of Phoenix below.

[15] This outcome is most heavily associated with cases of father-son hostility, e.g. Lycophron of Corinth vs. Periander and Tenes vs. Cycnus, although in Tlepolemus' case, Heracles is unavailable and substituted by Licymnius. See Sourvinou-Inwood 1979: 14-15 and 1988 for a fuller discussion of these examples and the father-son dynamic, as well as Querbach 1976 for generational conflicts specific to the *Iliad*. Another example can be seen in the case of Phoenix against his father Amyntor, which I will discuss further in the second half of this chapter. I should add that the human pattern of this intergenerational conflict interestingly presents the reverse of the myth of succession, which instead results in the son taking power among the gods. For a useful survey of the succession myth, see Harris 1992.

[16] Schol. ad *Il*. 2.662: *ἤδη γεραιὸν ὑπάρχοντα*; Eust. ad *Il*. 2.658-70: *ἐν γήρᾳ; τὸν δὲ γέροντα.*

Tlepolemus and Licymnius. As I mentioned earlier, murder (*Il.* 2.662) serves as the focal point of a contrast between Tlepolemus' recent coming of age (*Il.* 2.661) and Licymnius' twilight years (*Il.* 2.663). I submit that this deliberate opposition between their respective lifespans captures a highly compressed yet evocative snapshot of the generational strife and rivalry evident in the other variant myths of the homicide. The additional qualification of Licymnius as the "offshoot of Ares" (*ὄζον Ἄρηος*, *Il.* 2.663) in line-final position may support the agonistic characterization of their relationship,[17] since it is placed in direct antithesis to the domestic setting of Tlepolemus' upbringing (*ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ εὐπήκτῳ*, *Il.* 2.661), also placed in line-final position, as if to compare their differing domains and degrees of influence.[18] When he commits the murder, Tlepolemus is still an as yet untested young man with little to no experience outside of his home, while Licymnius is clearly a seasoned warrior and therefore superior to his younger counterpart in warlike spirit.[19] The contrast of experiences, though fairly subtle, feeds into their clash of ages, effectively contributing to the view that their violent encounter is emblematic of a youth testing a gerontocratic power structure in a bid to subvert the societal order and to rival his predecessor.

This generational tension over succession is compounded further by another kind of tense family hierarchy, specifically the contrasting family lines of the Heraclids: Heracles' direct line of descent, which is represented by Tlepolemus, and Heracles' maternal line, which is led by

---

[17] Interestingly enough, schol. ad *Il.* 2.663 glosses the phrase *ὄζον Ἄρηος* as *πολεμικόν*, "warlike; like an enemy, stirring up hostility," which was opposed to *φιλικός* "friendly" (LSJ, s.v. *πολεμικός*, III).

[18] It is interesting to note that in Pindar, Licymnius is coming specifically out of Midea's chambers (*ἐλθόντ' ἐκ θαλάμων Μιδέας*, *Ol.* 7.29) when he is killed. The nature of this setting has variously been interpreted as the habitations of a town named Midea, which is near Tiryns (Farnell 1965: 42; Willcock 1995 ad *Ol.* 7.27-30; cf. *Ol.* 10.66), or as the literal women's chambers of Midea, Licymnius' mother (Verdenius 1987 ad *Ol.* 7.29). Either way, explicit mention of Midea conjures up reminders of Licymnius' bastard lineage, and may hint that his dispute with Tlepolemus is one about rule, inheritance, and legitimacy.

[19] Cf. Eust. ad *Il.* 2.662: *οὐκ ἂν γὰρ τάχα ὁ Τληπόλεμος Λικύμνιον τὸν τοῦ Ἄρεος ὄζον οὕτω ῥᾳδίως ἀνεῖλεν, εἰ μὴ ἐγήρασκε.*

Licymnius. The latter branch apparently ends with Licymnius, since he was the only surviving (and illegitimate) son of Electryon,[20] and had no living heirs.[21] This may explain why no immediate relations of Licymnius pursue retribution on his behalf: there were none to do so. Instead, the other sons and grandsons of Heracles – Tlepolemus' own brothers and nephews – take up the avenging cause. And given the elimination of Licymnius' family line, it is possible that Heracles' other direct descendants threaten Tlepolemus not only in pursuit of justice for the murdered, but also in participation in the succession struggle.

A competitive effect arising from Licymnius' death – beyond the mere desire for retaliatory violence between murderer and victim's family – can certainly be discerned in the way it engenders more social disturbances. Tlepolemus' crime uniquely gives rise to divided opinion and split allegiances. On the one hand, he faces the threats of the other Heraclids (*ἀπείλησαν γάρ οἱ ἄλλοι*, *Il.* 2.665), but on the other hand, he is able to gather a great number of people in support of his own cause (*πολὺν δ' ὅ γε λαὸν ἀγείρας*, *Il.* 2.664). The emergence of these two distinct factions is again suggestive of the murder forming a metaphysical expression of civil strife. Tlepolemus' and Licymnius' conflict, even though it is deeply rooted in kinship differences, expressed through both lineal and generational divisions, is indicative of a broader axiological crisis, perhaps originating from an incompatibility of social or political interests between the two groups. This will become all the clearer from the way that Tlepolemus' crime leads to social change and to the formation of new political units.

[20] The other sons were slain during war against the Taphians (Apollod. 2.4.6).

[21] Licymnius had three sons: Oeonus, who was slain by the sons of Hippocoon in Sparta (Apollod. 2.7.3; Diod. Sic. 4.33.5; Paus. 3.15.4-5; Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 285E; schol. ad *Il.* 1.52; Eust. Ad *Il.* 2.581; schol. ad Pind. *Ol.* 10.78; schol. ad Clem. Al. *Portr.* 27.11), and Argeius and Melas, who were slain during the campaign against Eurytus (Apollod. 2.7.7).

2.1.2 Exile and Colonization

We now come to the crucial point of innovation in Tlepolemus' form of the fugitive-murderer pattern. For Tlepolemus, murder does not entail solitary exile, but mass migration – an effort that explicitly involves gathering together people and building ships to transport them (*αἶψα δὲ νῆας ἔπηξε, πολὺν δ' ὅ γε λαὸν ἀγείρας*, *Il.* 2.664).[22] This detail, as Geoffrey Kirk humorously points out, "is mildly surprising since a hurried retreat is implied."[23] Furthermore, Tlepolemus does not attempt to reintegrate into a new community by supplicating a foreign, powerful lord. As leader of his own group of followers, he is already part of a community, and instead achieves relocation through colonization of the island of Rhodes, where his people enjoy Zeus' favor (*φίληθεν/ ἐκ Διός*, *Il.* 2.668-69). Tlepolemus' tale of murder and exile is thus not merely a pretext for displacement, as it was for all the other homicide examples discussed in the first chapter, but a pretext for *foundation*.

This kind of colonial narrative, where murder features as the impetus for resettlement, is quite common in ancient Greek literature.[24] Carol Dougherty has even suggested that colonial tales with murderous founders are influenced by the recurrent pattern of murder and flight that we have been examining.[25] The fugitive-murderer pattern certainly dovetails closely with the narrative pattern of colonization, which, as Dougherty outlines, begins with a crisis (e.g. drought, famine, overpopulation, murder, stasis),[26] and is followed by consultation of the Delphic oracle,

---

[22] Many other accounts of the migration identify specific individuals who shared in Tlepolemus' flight, such as Polyxo, Tlepolemus' wife (Paus. 3.19.10), and Butas, ruler of Rhodes during the Trojan War (Diod. Sic. 5.59.6).

[23] Kirk 1985 ad *Il*. 2.661-66. Similar sentiments are expressed by Brügger et al. 2003 ad *Il.* 2.664.

[24] Many myths featuring homicide as an instrumental element of foundation are listed in Parker 1983: 375-92 and Dougherty 1993: 31-44.

[25] Dougherty 1993: 38. Parker (1983: 392) also suggests the same: "The motif of the killer who, perhaps after consulting Delphi, founded a foreign colony, was a natural development of this: cf. Archias, Carnabas, Leucippus, Tlepolemus, Triopas."

[26] These kinds of crises, which literary (especially poetic) evidence provides, are in accord with many of the reasons

the foundation of a colony, and finally resolution to the initial crisis.[27] No oracle is mentioned in Homer's description of Tlepolemus' exile, but both his visit to Delphi and Apollo's authorization of the colony are significant components to Rhodes' foundation in other accounts.[28] What the Rhodian catalogue entry does attest to are commercial benefits, such as the procurement of wealth (*σφιν θεσπέσιον πλοῦτον κατέχευε Κρονίων*, *Il.* 2.670),[29] and an alteration in the social order of a society, such as the foundation of three new cities,[30] which are consistent with the aims and results of a colonial enterprise.[31] In addition, they resolve the tensions that uprooted Tlepolemus from his native homeland in the first place – for he achieves both honors and a rulership on Rhodes through colonization. Ultimately, then, the colonial nature of Tlepolemus' relocation offers an equally viable outlet for the social and political pressures observed to initiate the movement of the other Homeric homicides.

That a reviled murderous criminal can become a celebrated founding figure may be considered a curious and paradoxical phenomenon,[32] but we have already witnessed a similarly

---

identified from a historical and archeological perspective. See note 31 below.

[27] Dougherty 1993: 15-30.

[28] Pind. *Ol.* 7.27-37; schol. ad *Ol.* 7.46-48; Diod. Sic. 5.59.5-6 (5.59.5 = Zenon of Rhodes *FGrH* 523 F 1).

[29] That Rhodes was a wealthy island abounding in resources is corroborated by Pindar, who mentions that Zeus sent them a golden snowfall (*ἔνθα ποτὲ βρέχε θεῶν βασιλεὺς ὁ μέγας/ χρυσ<έα>ις νιφάδεσσι πόλιν*, *Ol.* 7.33-34).

[30] This number seems to be in specific reference to the three traditional tribes of the Dorians (Pamphyli, Hylleis Dymanes), in which case each of the three cities was perhaps understood as a settlement specific to one of the three Doric tribes. See Brügger et al. ad *Il.* 2.668.

[31] Discussions regarding the motivations of archaic colonial movements highlight land hunger, the phenomenon of diminishing resources to accommodate increasing populations (Gwynn 1918: 89, 91, 121; Graham 1964: 5; Graham 1982: 157). On a similar note, a climatic crisis is believed to have rendered the land unusable and prompted movement, perhaps as a result of an extensive drought in the late 8th and early 7th centuries (Camp 1979: 397-98) or a series of droughts (Cawkwell 1992: 297-98, 301-02). Still others emphasize trade, the procurement of raw materials, and related commercial interests as important incentives for colonization (Blakeway 1933: 170-71, 202; Boardman 1980: 162-63; Tandy 1997: 4, 75-76; Boardman 2001: 34, 36), although see the counterarguments of Graham 1982: 103, 158-59; Cawkwell 1992: 296-97; Treister 1996: 178-81. Finally, Dougherty 1993 has brought, correctly in my view, socio-political tensions into the discussion. No single explanation can necessarily account for the foundation of all colonies, but all of the considerations discussed above can perhaps be viewed as related factors that give rise to civic unrest and hence the impulse to leave one's homeland.

[32] A phenomenon that continues even today. Many murderers and serial killers, such as Charles Manson and Ted Bundy, are considered to exhibit captivating and awe-inspiring qualities, and thus achieve iconic celebrity status. It

positive conception and transformation of other exiled killers in the Homeric world. Fugitive murderers tend to achieve renewed and even augmented prestige as honored attendants (e.g. Lycophron, Epeigeus, and Patroclus) or as revered leaders in their own right (e.g. Medon and, as we shall see in the second half of this chapter, Phoenix). By becoming productive members of new communities, either through colonization, as Tlepolemus does, or through service to other powerful individuals, as the other Homeric homicides do, these fugitives can remedy and atone for their originally negative influence.

Addressing why a leading colonist can be – and often was – conceptualized as a killer, Dougherty explains, "Within colonial discourse, the murderous founder is made to shoulder the burden of the historical violence of settling foreign territory, and his purification as the story unfolds prefigures that of the colonists themselves."[33] Two important points in this statement are worth unpacking further in reference to Tlepolemus' situation. One point is that Greek colonial narratives tend to suppress historically disruptive or oppressive processes of colonization by emphasizing stories of cooperation and integration, while transposing stories of conflict primarily to the cause of a colonist's departure, e.g. in the form of murder.[34] This trend is clearly operative in the Homeric Rhodian colonial narrative, which gives no indication of Rhodes' occupation prior to Tlepolemus' arrival, although it would have included the Telchines and Heliadae.[35] There is also no suggestion of the island's settlement at the expense of these

---

is a thin line between notoriety and celebrity. On the history of the modern serial killer's empowerment and cultural value, see Tithecott 1997.

[33] Dougherty 1993: 41.

[34] On the historical contact between Greek colonists and indigenous populations, see the essays collected in Descoeudres 1990, esp. Ridgway 1990, as well as the essays collected in Donnellan et al. 2016. See also Mac Sweeney 2013: 44-89 for examples and a discussion of violent foundation stories. In her view, the presence of violence between migrants and indigenous populations in these stories is also indicative of a constructive form of interaction between the two groups.

[35] Cf. Pind. *Ol.* 7. For a full overview of the various Rhodian mythological traditions, especially those concerned with the pre-arrival of Tlepolemus, see Craik 1980: 149-67.

indigenous populations. The few interactions between Tlepolemus and the native Rhodians that are mentioned in some accounts are generally depicted as cooperative and conciliatory. Diodorus, for example, explains that Tlepolemus divides Rhodes into three parts in partnership with its inhabitants (*κοινῇ μετὰ τῶν ἐγχωρίων*, Diod. Sic. 4.58.8), and emphasizes, on another occasion, his kindly reception by them (*προσδεχθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγχωρίων*, Diod. Sic. 5.59.5). The one instance in which there is evidence of conflict at Tlepolemus' point of arrival can be found in Eustathius, who explains that Tlepolemus found the inhabitants of Rhodes embroiled in strife (*στασιαζομένους τοὺς Ῥοδίους εὑρηκώς,* Eust. ad *Il.* 2.658-70).[36] Even then, the hostilities do not seem to be directed to the newly arrived fugitive. Hints of resistance to the colonial process are glossed in the interest of emphasizing successful integration, continuity, and community solidarity. This issue will become relevant in the fourth chapter, where we will observe in more detail a similar impulse to address and disguise the violent terms of Odysseus' homecoming in the *Odyssey.*

The second point of Dougherty's statement to keep in mind is that colonial narratives tend to focus attention on the decision-making and actions of the individual oikist, although a colonial expedition is technically a collective endeavor. Tlepolemus, we have already seen, is singled out and made to bear responsibility for his individual display of violence. Another comparable Homeric example can be found in the figure of Nausithous, who founds Scheria, the new city of the Phaeacians:

> *οἳ πρὶν μέν ποτ' ἔναιον ἐν εὐρυχόρῳ Ὑπερείῃ,*
> *ἀγχοῦ Κυκλώπων ἀνδρῶν ὑπερηνορεόντων,*
> *οἵ σφεας σινέσκοντο, βίηφι δὲ φέρτεροι ἦσαν.*
> *ἔνθεν ἀναστήσας ἄγε Ναυσίθοος θεοειδής,*
> *εἷσεν δὲ Σχερίῃ, ἑκὰς ἀνδρῶν ἀλφηστάων,*
> *ἀμφὶ δὲ τεῖχος ἔλασσε πόλει καὶ ἐδείματο οἴκους*

---

[36] The hints of stasis at the beginning (*στασιάσας*, schol. ad Pind. *Ol.* 7.46) and end (*στασιαζομένους*, Eust. ad *Il.* 2.658-70) of Tlepolemus' fugitive-murderer pattern perhaps speaks to the transferability of signs of disruption.

καὶ νηοὺς ποίησε θεῶν καὶ ἐδάσσατ' ἀρούρας. (*Od.* 6.4-10)

> They (the Phaeacians) previously dwelt in spacious Hypereia, nearby the Cyclopes, overbearing men who used to plunder them and were mightier in force. Having removed them (the Phaeacians) from there, godlike Nausithous led and settled them in Scheria far from men who eat grain. He drew a wall around the city and built houses and made temples for the gods, and divided up farmlands.

Though this is an interesting case of a wholesale migration of a community, not the defection of a disenfranchised portion of the population,[37] the passage still bears many similarities to Tlepolemus' colonial narrative. In both cases, the hostilities of a dominant domestic or neighboring power (the Cyclopes and Heraclids) compel a substantial exodus, but only the initiatives of Nausithous and Tlepolemus are emphasized in the resettlement.[38] These parallels attest to, in Dougherty's words, "a strong tendency in Greek narrative of all kinds to personalize public action."[39] Just as the conflict between two individual members of the same family can be representative of a more generalized conflict within the community, so can the exile of a murderer mythologize an entire colonial movement.

In some sense, then, Tlepolemus (and perhaps all other fugitive murderers as well) functions something like the traditional figure of the scapegoat (*pharmakos*), whose fate resolves and preserves the memory of a formerly strife-ridden community. Like many of the fugitive murderers we have observed, the *pharmakos* was considered a vile yet valuable member of the

---

[37] It is on this basis that Robin Osborne (1998: 256-57) does not classify Scheria's foundation as an example of colonial activity. But Nausithous' actions (e.g. drawing up a wall, building homes and temples, apportioning land) certainly resemble those of a colonial founder, and so the details of Scheria's foundation are cited as characteristic of a colony by Graham 1964: 29; Vidal-Naquet 1986: 26; Malkin 1987: 138; Dougherty 1993: 23; Dougherty 2001: 128-29; Malkin 2016b: 290-92. On the validity of the concept of colonization and other terms (e.g. migration and settlement) to refer to ancient Greek migratory and settlement processes, see Malkin 2009: 373; Osborne 2016; Malkin 2016a.

[38] Interestingly enough, Osborne (1998: 254-57, 268) argues that individuals were likely responsible for the majority of early colonial settlements, but see the earlier discussions of Gwynn 1918: 100 and Graham 1964: 7-8 about the nature of historical Greek colonies being state-organized or private enterprises.

[39] Dougherty 1993: 17.

community.[40] He was typically an outcast (often a beggar, cripple, or criminal) designated during a time of crisis (natural, ritual, or otherwise), and physically expelled from the community.[41] His expulsion helped to resolve the initial crisis and reconstitute the community. Similarly, the removal of Tlepolemus' murderous presence helps to restore his native community to normalcy, while his unique émigré experience affords him and his supporters the opportunity to reconstitute themselves on Rhodes.[42] Thus like the marginalization of the *pharmakos*, the singular allocation of blame to Tlepolemus helps to channel all animosity towards him alone, while averting collective violence and prolonged civil crisis.

As we have seen thus far, Tlepolemus' particular presentation as a fugitive murderer also participates in a common colonial narrative pattern, which reflects struggles for leadership and for the containment of social disturbances. It additionally demonstrates how personal and private crises are magnified to the public and civic level. Though a mere individual can disrupt an entire system by violently agitating the community, the same individual can also contain the disruption by absorbing all criminal liability for the broader systemic conflict his crime represents. We will see this process of amplification at issue again in the private struggles that Achilles and

---

[40] On the best/worst dichotomy of the *pharmakos*, see Bremmer 1983: 303-07 and Compton 2006: 15, 17-18.

[41] On the *pharmakos* figure and ritual in ancient Greece, see Burkert 1979: 59-77; Vernant 1981; Bremmer 1983; Burkert 1985: 82-84; Seaford 1994: 130-31, 312-18; Compton 2006. Girard 1977 and Derrida 1981 also offer significant studies of the scapegoat more broadly. See Compton 2006: 3n1 for more extensive bibliography on the topic. Some contend that the *pharmakos* may have been sacrificed, but the evidence for human sacrifice in connection with the Greek scapegoat ritual is highly contested, on which see Murray 1934: 328-29; Vernant 1981: 200n41; Bremmer 1983: 315-18; Compton 2006: 7n30.

[42] Another feature of the *pharmakos* that potentially resembles Tlepolemus is the voluntary nature of their departures. Tlepolemus' exile is not overtly described as voluntary in the Rhodian entry, but is explicitly characterized as such by Diodorus (*ἔφυγεν ἑκουσίως*, Diod. Sic. 5.59.5 = Zenon of Rhodes *FGrH* 523 F 1). Some may dispute this classification, as his exile is technically the result of duress; the threats of the Heraclids are a compelling factor in his departure. But the ancient Greeks clearly had different legal and philosophical definitions of voluntariness, which, in their view, could be coerced or feigned, most notably in the case of sacrifice. On the voluntary element of sacrifice and the scapegoat's expulsion, see Bremmer 1983: 307-08; Burkert 1979: 71; Burkert 1983: 4; Burkert 1985: 56; Girard 1986: 63-67; Compton 2006: 12, 16. On the voluntary element of exiles, see Bowie 2007: 25-27, who believes that voluntary and involuntary exiles are not distinguishable categories in Homer, and Perry 2010: 5-6, who believes that voluntary exile is practically non-existent in Homer. See also my earlier discussion of exile in Chapter 1.

Odysseus face in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* respectively.

2.1.3 The Fugitive-Murderer Pattern within the Catalogue of Ships

Many of the details that I have highlighted about Tlepolemus anticipate my discussion of Odysseus in Chapter 4 in particular, but I believe that the Heraclid serves as a good interpretive model for Achilles as well, since his homicide narrative encapsulates many of the same experiences and anxieties Achilles deals with in the *Iliad*.[43] In conclusion to my discussion of the Rhodian founder, then, I would like to qualify that belief by considering briefly his fugitive-murderer pattern in relation to its immediate narrative context, the Catalogue of Ships (*Il.* 2.484-779). The Catalogue of course deserves more treatment than this section can offer, but as I intend to explore this episode more extensively in a later work, for now I would like to look at this one aspect of the Catalogue, since it confirms that the fugitive-murderer pattern can perform an interpretive function in the *Iliad*. More specifically, Tlepolemus' homicide narrative introduces the idea that the fugitive-murderer pattern serves as narrative metonymy for Achilles' own conflict with Agamemnon. Some may wish to doubt such a function for a relatively minor and marginal character of the *Iliad*, [44] but Tlepolemus proves to be distinctively striking and memorable precisely because of the lengthy elaboration – the lengthiest narrative elaboration in the Catalogue, in fact – of his murderous background. By viewing Tlepolemus' exile narrative in this context, many clear indications emerge of the homicide operating within a grander thematic scheme, which is meaningfully developed throughout the Catalogue. This scheme rehearses different types of social disruptions, which all converge as thematic and political commentary

[43] Martin 1989: 228-29 has also observed a connection between the two, drawing comparisons between their battle-boasts at *Il.* 5.638-42 and *Il.* 9.328-29.

[44] Powell 1978: 263, for example, believes "the epic stature of his father, Heracles," is the only reason why Tlepolemus receives so much attention for a character who "plays a small part in the rest of the poem."

concerned with the conflict between Agamemnon and Achilles, illustrating the ramifications of that conflict on the wellbeing of the Achaean army.

First, a few preliminary remarks about our current understanding of the form and structure of the Catalogue of Ships.[45] The Catalogue is a synthesis of twenty-nine entries detailing twenty-nine different contingents that constitute the Achaean army. Each entry always, as a minimum, names the leaders (43 in total) and lists the number of ships (1186 in total) of each contingent. The arrangement of these entries appears to be organized primarily by a contiguous geographical principle (with some exceptions),[46] beginning with the Boeotians and ending with the Magnetans (*Il.* 2.494-759). This geographical trajectory has generally been taken as an indication of the Catalogue's original function of relating the initial gathering of ships at Aulis, which is an explanation that would also account for the curious inclusion of ship information in a Catalogue ostensibly itemizing the participants of an imminent land battle.[47] But other scholars have also shown how the Catalogue's organization and data have artistic value and significant interpretive bearing on the Catalogue and the events immediately surrounding it.[48] Jim Marks, for instance, shows how its geography reflects and anchors key relationships among characters of the *Iliad*,[49] while Benjamin Sammons demonstrates how the dramatic impact of Achilles' near-end placement in the Catalogue corresponds to details of the Iliadic plot, most

---

[45] Scholarship on the Catalogue of Ships is extensive, but some of the more comprehensive studies include Allen 1921; Burr 1944; Jachmann 1958; Giovannini 1969; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970; Kirk 1985: 168-247; Visser 1997; Sammons 2010: 135-204. For a concise literature review of the topic, see Sammons 2010: 4-8.

[46] The two exceptions include a jump from the western Greek islands to the eastern Aegean islands, and subsequently a jump from there to Thessaly. On the logic of these transitions, see Sammons 2010: 136-37.

[47] Extensive bibliographic review of the Aulis theory is provided by Sammons 2010: 137, with notes 11 and 12. A completely different line of interpretation is taken by Giovannini 1969: 45-71, who argues that the Catalogue of Ships reflects the itineraries of Delphic pilgrimages (*θεωροί*), but see the criticisms raised by Kirk 1985: 183-86.

[48] That the Catalogue of Ships is a meaningful artistic construct has repeatedly been shown, e.g. by Crossett 1969; Stanley 1993: 13-26, 50-59; Heiden 2008; Sammons 2010: 135-204; Marks 2012.

[49] Marks 2012.

notably his withdrawal from the war efforts.[50] Through geography and the careful indexing of characters, then, the Catalogue produces meaningful clusters and juxtapositions that generally highlight the absence of Achilles and the preeminence of Agamemnon, essentially replicating the issues and outcomes of the conflict dramatized in Book 1.[51]

Numerous narrative digressions deployed throughout the Catalogue contribute to this design and inform the dramatic developments of the *Iliad*. Keith Stanley has discussed how these digressions offer telling thematic augments,[52] and since his analysis has been particularly instructive to my understanding of the Catalogue, I shall take some time to summarize a few of his major findings. Stanley detected a number of similar recurring situations in the biographical anecdotes of different Achaean leaders,[53] and from these isolated four key themes: seduction/disruption of marriage,[54] superiority/better leader,[55] angry withdrawal,[56] and absent leader.[57] All of these themes can be seen as analogues to the major events of the *Iliad* preceding the Catalogue: seduction/disruption of marriage relates to Agamemnon's procurement of Briseis from Achilles; superiority/better leader relates to the rivalry between Achilles and Agamemnon;

---

[50] Sammons 2010: 137.

[51] The Catalogue's reflection of Achilles' relationship with Agamemnon has also been discussed by Jachmann 1958: 185-86; Stanley 1993: 24; Benardete 2005: 35; Sammons 2010; Marks 2012: 99, with note 24.

[52] Stanley 1993: 13-26.

[53] See Chart 1.3 and schematic lists provided by Stanley 1993: 16, 21-22.

[54] In the entries of Ascalaphus and Ialmenus (*Il.* 2.513-15), Meneleus (*Il.* 2.588-90), Tlepolemus (*Il.* 2.658-60), Achilles (*Il.* 2.686-94), Polypoetes (*Il.* 2.742-44).

[55] In the entries of Locrian Ajax (*Il.* 2.527-30), Menetheus (*Il.* 2.553-56), Agamemnon (*Il.* 2.577-80), Nireus (*Il.* 2.671-75), Protesilaus (*Il.* 2.697-709). Though Stanley does not note it, this theme is attached to Achilles at *Il.* 2.769-79. Stanley also does not include Philoctetes in this list, but since his people are said to long for him though Medon serves as their substitute leader (*Il.* 2.726-27), I would be inclined to add him here as well. Perhaps one could add the digression about Thamyris' competition with the Muses in Nestor's entry (*Il.* 591-602) as an extension of the superiority theme, although Stanley (1993: 21) refers to the digression as a "reverse invocation." See also Sammons 2010: 179-80, who views the tale in connection with the poetic activity of cataloguing and as a cautionary tale informing Homer's relationship with the Muses.

[56] In the entries of Meges (*Il.* 2.628-29), Tlepolemus (*Il.* 2.661-66), Achilles (*Il.* 2.686-94). This theme is developed further for Achilles at *Il.* 2.769-79.

[57] In the entries of Thoas (*Il.* 2.641-43), Achilles (*Il.* 2.686-94), Protesilaus (*Il.* 2.697-709), Philoctetes (*Il.* 2.721-28). This theme is developed further for Achilles at *Il.* 2.769-79.

and angry withdrawal and absent leader both relate to Achilles' disaffection and estrangement from the Achaean army. The collection of these correspondences reinforces the Catalogue's deliberate calculation to raise recognition of its relevance to Achilles' conflict with Agamemnon.

Now how does Tlepolemus' homicide narrative fit into all of this?[58] Stanley identified it as a manifestation of the angry-withdrawal theme in particular, but it is clearly connected to the other themes in terms of cause (the theme of seduction/disruption of marriage and superiority/better leader can trigger homicide),[59] in terms of effect (homicide results in angry withdrawal and absent leaders), and, most tellingly, as a representative mode of disruption (all themes are comparable to homicide in disruptive impact). For this last point, we should bear in mind that these thematic variations on dysfunctional relationships and private conflicts are all buried within an extended excursus on the Achaean contingents, which foregrounds leaders and the personal against the masses and the communal.[60] Amorous intrigues, feuds, and vendettas, then, are all shown to be in the repertory of private disturbances that produce public disturbances, such as the absence of leadership, and thus have the potential to undermine an entire social order, just as we saw earlier with specific reference to homicide in our independent examination of Tlepolemus' narrative. The net effect of these themes within the Catalogue is to offer contrasting visions of disorderly private lives embedded within the orderly arrangement of

---

[58] Sammons (2010: 184) answers this question with an eye to Tlepolemus' character as a hero of local tradition who has been imported into the traditions of the Trojan War by Homer: "[…] the story of Tlepolemus' migration to Rhodes reflects his integration into the tradition as well as the poet's own progress through Greece and the mythological past. It also calls attention to the way in which the catalogue's very design conditions the poet's distribution of praise. Finally, the introduction of a perhaps unexpected figure calls attention to the catalogue's likely mixture of obscure and well-known heroes, and looks forward […] to an ironic play on presence and absence that characterizes the final portion of the catalogue." This interpretation may gain more ground from the fact that the fugitive-murderer pattern was often used to bridge different mythic traditions. See my earlier discussion of this issue in the introduction. For more on the local elements of Tlepolemus and his entry, see Kullmann 1960: 106-07, 164; Visser 1997: 623-25; Brügger et al 2003 ad 653, 661-70; Bertolín Cebrián 2006: 75.

[59] Stanley 1993: 22. The relevance of seduction/disruption in marriage to homicide will be elaborated on in my discussion of Phoenix further below and in my discussion of Achilles in Chapter 3.

[60] Heiden 2008 even argues that the Catalogue of Ships offers a unique occasion to celebrate common soldiers and communities in a poem that typically glorifies the heroic exploits of individual heroes.

the Achaean army, and thus strongly intimates that the stakes between winners and losers in private disputes, no matter how private, are quite high, since it is something that can strain entire communities. This is precisely the situation that we find in the *Iliad* with the Achaean army, whose welfare and success are endangered by the private quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon. Tlepolemus' homicide narrative, which almost immediately precedes Achilles' entry in the Catalogue, thus offers, together with the other thematically augmented entries of the Catalogue, a critical synoptic view of that crisis.

This overview of the Catalogue of Ships is admittedly rather swift and too sweeping, but my point in discussing ever so briefly how Tlepolemus' fugitive-murderer pattern functions in this contained context is to show that it does in fact function meaningfully in support of, and in cooperation with, other devices that help to form the Catalogue. In addition to revealing the hierarchy of relationships between people, the potential repercussions of any disruption to that hierarchy, and the anxieties associated with them, the Catalogue's thematic design offers proof of concept that Tlepolemus' homicide narrative is related to the overarching plot of the *Iliad*, and that the fugitive-murderer pattern is operative in Homer. I am postponing demonstration of the full impact and value of these implications for the next chapter, but until then, let us turn to another fugitive murderer whose homicide narrative is similarly connected to the situation of Achilles

2.2 PHOENIX

The final fugitive murderer in Homer to account for, Phoenix, emerges as perhaps the most interesting and yet most problematic example figure of the pattern, for he is sometimes

described as a murderer, and sometimes not.[61] This problem about Phoenix' criminal status is raised in his lengthy autobiographical narrative, which he relates to Achilles in *Iliad* 9:

> *ὡς ἂν ἔπειτ' ἀπὸ σεῖο, φίλον τέκος, οὐκ ἐθέλοιμι*
> *λείπεσθ', οὐδ' εἴ κέν μοι ὑποσταίη θεὸς αὐτὸς*
> *γῆρας ἀποξύσας θήσειν νέον ἡβώοντα,*
> *οἷον ὅτε πρῶτον λίπον Ἑλλάδα καλλιγύναικα,*
> *φεύγων νείκεα πατρὸς Ἀμύντορος Ὀρμενίδαο,*
> *ὅς μοι παλλακίδος περιχώσατο καλλικόμοιο,*
> *τὴν αὐτὸς φιλέεσκεν, ἀτιμάζεσκε δ' ἄκοιτιν,*
> *μητέρ' ἐμήν· ἡ δ' αἰὲν ἐμὲ λισσέσκετο γούνων*
> *παλλακίδι προμιγῆναι, ἵν' ἐχθήρειε γέροντα.*
> *τῇ πιθόμην καὶ ἔρεξα· πατὴρ δ' ἐμὸς αὐτίκ' ὀϊσθεὶς*
> *πολλὰ κατηρᾶτο, στυγερὰς δ' ἐπεκέκλετ' Ἐρινῦς,*
> *μή ποτε γούνασιν οἷσιν ἐφέσσεσθαι φίλον υἱὸν*
> *ἐξ ἐμέθεν γεγαῶτα· θεοὶ δ' ἐτέλειον ἐπαράς,*
> *Ζεύς τε καταχθόνιος καὶ ἐπαινὴ Περσεφόνεια.*
> ***τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ βούλευσα κατακτάμεν ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ·***
> ***ἀλλά τις ἀθανάτων παῦσεν χόλον, ὅς ῥ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ***
> ***δήμου θῆκε φάτιν καὶ ὀνείδεα πόλλ' ἀνθρώπων,***
> ***ὡς μὴ πατροφόνος μετ' Ἀχαιοῖσιν καλεοίμην.***
> *ἔνθ' ἐμοὶ οὐκέτι πάμπαν ἐρητύετ' ἐν φρεσὶ θυμὸς*
> *πατρὸς χωομένοιο κατὰ μέγαρα στρωφᾶσθαι.*
> *ἦ μὲν πολλὰ ἔται καὶ ἀνεψιοὶ ἀμφὶς ἐόντες*
> *αὐτοῦ λισσόμενοι κατερήτυον ἐν μεγάροισι,*
> *πολλὰ δὲ ἴφια μῆλα καὶ εἰλίποδας ἕλικας βοῦς*
> *ἔσφαζον, πολλοὶ δὲ σύες θαλέθοντες ἀλοιφῇ*
> *εὑόμενοι τανύοντο διὰ φλογὸς Ἡφαίστοιο,*
> *πολλὸν δ' ἐκ κεράμων μέθυ πίνετο τοῖο γέροντος.*
> *εἰνάνυχες δέ μοι ἀμφ' αὐτῷ παρὰ νύκτας ἴαυον·*
> *οἱ μὲν ἀμειβόμενοι φυλακὰς ἔχον, οὐδέ ποτ' ἔσβη*
> *πῦρ, ἕτερον μὲν ὑπ' αἰθούσῃ εὐερκέος αὐλῆς,*
> *ἄλλο δ' ἐνὶ προδόμῳ, πρόσθεν θαλάμοιο θυράων.*
> *ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ δεκάτη μοι ἐπήλυθε νὺξ ἐρεβεννή,*
> *καὶ τότ' ἐγὼ θαλάμοιο θύρας πυκινῶς ἀραρυίας*
> *ῥήξας ἐξῆλθον, καὶ ὑπέρθορον ἑρκίον αὐλῆς*
> *ῥεῖα, λαθὼν φύλακάς τ' ἄνδρας δμῳάς τε γυναῖκας.*
> *φεῦγον ἔπειτ' ἀπάνευθε δι' Ἑλλάδος εὐρυχόροιο,*
> *Φθίην δ' ἐξικόμην ἐριβώλακα, μητέρα μήλων,*
> *ἐς Πηλῆα ἄναχθ'· ὁ δέ με πρόφρων ὑπέδεκτο,*
> *καί μ' ἐφίλησ' ὡς εἴ τε πατὴρ ὃν παῖδα φιλήσῃ*
> *μοῦνον τηλύγετον πολλοῖσιν ἐπὶ κτεάτεσσι,*

[61] Allen 1921: 102, for instance, lists Phoenix among those whose movements were prompted by blood-guilt, while Merz 1953 does not count him among their number. The vast majority of scholars tend to recognize an affinity between Phoenix and fugitive murderers. Citations are provided in note 62 below.

καί μ' ἀφνειὸν ἔθηκε, πολὺν δέ μοι ὤπασε λαόν·
ναῖον δ' ἐσχατιὴν Φθίης, Δολόπεσσιν ἀνάσσων.
καί σε τοσοῦτον ἔθηκα, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ,
ἐκ θυμοῦ φιλέων, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἐθέλεσκες ἅμ' ἄλλῳ
οὔτ' ἐς δαῖτ' ἰέναι οὔτ' ἐν μεγάροισι πάσασθαι,
πρίν γ' ὅτε δή σ' ἐπ' ἐμοῖσιν ἐγὼ γούνεσσι καθίσσας
ὄψου τ' ἄσαιμι προταμὼν καὶ οἶνον ἐπισχών.
πολλάκι μοι κατέδευσας ἐπὶ στήθεσσι χιτῶνα
οἴνου ἀποβλύζων ἐν νηπιέῃ ἀλεγεινῇ.
ὣς ἐπὶ σοὶ μάλα πόλλ' ἔπαθον καὶ πόλλ' ἐμόγησα,
τὰ φρονέων, ὅ μοι οὔ τι θεοὶ γόνον ἐξετέλειον
ἐξ ἐμεῦ. ἀλλὰ σὲ παῖδα, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ,
ποιεύμην, ἵνα μοί ποτ' ἀεικέα λοιγὸν ἀμύνῃς. (*Il.* 9.444-95)

So, dear child, I would not want to be left away from you, not even if a god himself should undertake to strip from me my old age and render me strong in youth, such as when I first left Hellas, the home of fair women, fleeing the quarrels of my father Amyntor, son of Ormenus; For he was enraged with me because of his fair-haired concubine, whom he himself ever loved, while he held in no honor his wife, my mother. So she begged me by my knees continually, to sleep with his concubine, so that she would become hateful to the old man. I obeyed her and did the deed, but my father learned of this immediately and cursed me mightily, and invoked the dire Erinyes, that he should never set on his knees a dear child begotten by me; And the gods fulfilled his curses, Zeus of the nether world and dread Persephone. Then I plotted to kill him with a sharp sword, but one of the immortals checked my anger, putting in my heart the voice and the many reproaches of men, lest I be called a father-slayer among the Achaeans. Then the heart in my breast could no longer keep me living in the halls of my angered father. My kinsmen to be sure and my cousins stood around me and with many prayers tried to keep me there in the halls, and slaughtered many fat sheep and sleek cattle with rolling walk, and many swine, rich with fat, were being singed and stretched over the flame of Hephaestus, and much wine was drunk from the jars of that old man. For nine nights around me they watched the night through. They took turns keeping watch, and the fire was never quenched, one beneath the portico of the well-fenced court, and one in the porch in front of the door of my chamber. But when indeed the tenth dark night had come on me, then I burst the closely fitted doors of my chamber and left, and easily leapt the fence of the court, escaping the notice of the watchmen and the slave women. Then I fled far away through spacious Hellas, and came to deep-soiled Phthia, mother of flocks, to lord Peleus. And he welcomed me readily, and loved me as a father loves his own son, his only darling son who is heir to his many possessions. And he made me rich and gave many people to me, and I dwelt on the furthermost border of Phthia, ruling over the Dolopians. And I reared you to be such as you are, godlike Achilles, loving you from my heart, since with no other were you willing to go to the feast or take meat in the hall, till I had set you on my knees and given you your fill of the meat, cutting it first, and holding up wine for you. And you often wetted the tunic on my chest, spurting out some wine in your childish helplessness. Thus have I suffered much for you and toiled much, taking thought of these things, that the gods would in no way grant me a son born from me. But you, godlike Achilles, I sought to make my son, godlike Achilles, so that you may hereafter ward off loathsome destruction from me.

As Phoenix reveals in the bolded portion of the passage above (*Il.* 9.458-61), he is no murderer.

His intended victim, his father Amyntor, is still alive when he ultimately quits his homeland; however, his overall self-portrayal is still consistent, in many ways, with the profile of the other fugitive murderers we have examined thus far.[62] The attempted homicide clearly coincides with a suspension of normal social life, which imperils the wellbeing of himself and the community, just as an actual homicide does. Phoenix accordingly resorts to the same recourse that all other murderers take: flight after the homicidal event. In his own exile, he successfully finds permanent refuge in Phthia, joining the likes of Epeigeus and Patroclus as a dependent of Peleus. And like Tlepolemus, Medon, Lycophron, and Patroclus, Phoenix becomes a figure held in high esteem within his new community as ruler of the Dolopians and trusted adviser of Achilles. Many verbal correspondences between Phoenix' narrative and that of other fugitive murderers reinforce these similarities. Phoenix' homicide attempt, expressed with the usual verb of criminal homicide (*κατακτάμεν*, *Il.* 9.458), is followed by the usual verbs signaling flight (*φεύγων*/*φεῦγον*, *Il*. 9.448/9.478 ~ *Od*. 13.259, 15.224, 23.118) and relocation (*ἐξικόμην*, *Il.* 9.479 ~ *ἐξίκετο*, *Il*. 24.481; *ναῖον, Il.* 9.484 ~ *Il.* 13.695 = 15.334; 15.432) in accordance with the typical fugitive-murderer pattern.

Given this extensive set of correspondences, is it possible to view Phoenix as a killer, even though he has not literally killed his father? Does he count as an example of the fugitive-murderer pattern? For the remainder of this chapter, I attempt to solve these questions, answering yes on both counts, and conclude briefly by teasing the interpretive consequences of viewing Phoenix as a killer. I look first at his homicide narrative, and then at the semantics of Phoenix' name. Through both action and name, I argue, Phoenix was recognized as a fugitive murderer in

[62] Parallels between Phoenix and other homicides have also been recognized by Strasburger 1954: 30; Fenik 1968: 206; Schlunk 1976; Apthorp 1980: 96-97; Heiden 1981; Hainsworth 1993 ad *Il.* 7.479-84; Sale 1994: 50n59; Wilson 1996 ad *Il.* 9.458-61; Alden 2000: 223n120; Stoevesandt 2004: 135; Bowie 2007: 26; Nünlist 2009: 630n11; Perry 2010: 2-28. Apthorp's comparison (1980: 97) of Phoenix' relatives to the avenging relatives of a murdered victim seems to be an overreach. More on this further below.

the Greek imagination, and his role as such opens up new avenues of consideration with respect to both his speech in the embassy and his relationship with Achilles.

2.2.1 Attempted Homicide: An Option in Performance

There are two major difficulties with characterizing Phoenix as a murderous figure. The first difficulty arises from the fact that attempted homicide, by definition, is an incomplete and unsuccessful act of killing someone; therefore, Phoenix cannot be condemned explicitly as a killer.[63] The second difficulty delves into a popular problem of Homeric criticism regarding the authenticity of Phoenix' speech, not to mention his very character.[64] The verses directly pertaining to his parricidal impulse are often considered spurious, and so, in this case, the very occurrence of the attempt is at stake. These complications are closely connected issues, but I will begin by addressing the second, as it will subsequently help to resolve the first. Ultimately, I argue, the fact that the parricidal lines exist – lines that implicate Phoenix' actions in the activity of killing – invites recognition of a correspondence between Phoenix and the other fugitive murderers.

---

[63] On the many interesting legal and philosophical difficulties that inchoate crimes present, see Yaffe 2010.

[64] Phoenix is a famous point of contention in the age-old debate about what is originally Homeric and what is not. His character has been considered highly suspect on the basis of the notorious dual forms describing the activities of the embassy (*Il.* 9.182-98), which currently consists of three members (Odysseus, Phoenix, and Ajax), or even five members, if we include the messengers in their company (Odius and Eurybates). To account for the mathematical discrepancy, many scholars, particularly the Analysts, identified Odysseus and Ajax as the embassy's original members to whom the duals apply, and Phoenix as the innovation to the group (e.g. Noé 1940; Page 1959: 297-315; Kirk 1962: 217; Shipp 1972: 269-71; Köhnken 1975; March 1987: 33; Lynn-George 1988: 135-37; S. West 2001: 14). But just as many if not more scholars have shown, on the basis of key thematic parallels and other internal evidence, that Phoenix' character forms a coherent and meaningful part of the *Iliad*'s drama (e.g. Scott 1912; Bassett 1938: 199-200; Kakridis 1949: 11-42; Eichholz 1953; Ebel 1972: 87-104; Rosner 1976; Tsagarakis 1979; Nagy 2003: 49-71). Even Wilamowitz (1916: 66n2), oddly enough, defended the integrity of Phoenix. Another argument, first proposed by Thornton 1978 and followed by Gordesiani 1980, precludes the removal of any individual and retains all embassy members by understanding the duals as referring to two separate groups, the ambassadors and the heralds. A useful summary of these positions and arguments can be found in Hainsworth 1993 ad *Il.* 9.182 and, more recently, Scodel 2002: 161-66. As will become clear throughout the remainder of this chapter, I believe Phoenix is an integral and indispensable part of the tradition.

The crux of the problem concerning Phoenix' homicide attempt is this: none of the manuscripts or wild papyri preserves the four lines relating the murder plot (*Il.* 9.458-61);[65] rather, we owe their existence solely to Plutarch, who quotes them in their entirety or in part on three separate occasions (*Mor.* 26F, 72B; *Coriol.* 32.5).[66] In the instance where he quotes all four lines in question, he reveals that the passage was subject to an intriguing bit of Alexandrian censorship:

> *ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἀρίσταρχος ἐξεῖλε ταῦτα τὰ ἔπη φοβηθείς· ἔχει δὲ πρὸς τὸν καιρὸν ὀρθῶς, τοῦ Φοίνικος τὸν Ἀχιλλέα διδάσκοντος οἷόν ἐστιν ὀργὴ καὶ ὅσα διὰ θυμὸν ἄνθρωποι τολμῶσι, μὴ χρώμενοι λογισμῷ μηδὲ πειθόμενοι τοῖς παρηγοροῦσι.* (*Mor.* 26F)
>
> Now Aristarchus removed these words out of fear. But they are appropriate to the occasion as Phoenix teaches Achilles what anger is and what men venture to do because of temper if they do not use reason or yield to those who try to soothe them.

Plutarch's need to defend the inclusion of the lines in the *Iliad* suggests that they were absent from the vulgate MSS; however, his story accounting for their absence also appears to be apocryphal. Aristarchus has generally been shown to be a much more careful textual critic than Plutarch's explanation would allow.[67] Had Aristarchus been acquainted with the lines – and Michael Apthorp has firmly established that he could not have been[68] – he would have athetized them, marking them with an *obelus*, and the lines would still have remained in the standard text. Accordingly, most scholars believe that another critic must have deleted the lines, and Plutarch must have found them from another source.[69]

---

[65] See Apthorp 1998 for the papyrological evidence regarding Phoenix' autobiography.

[66] The text of *Mor.* 72B is provided below in note 81. Plutarch quotes *Il.* 9.459-60 together with other unrelated Homeric lines in *Coriol.* 32.5, but does not offer additional context or explanation. He also interestingly records *τρέψεν φρένας* in line 459 instead of *παῦσεν χόλον.*

[67] On Aristarchus' scholarly practice, see Bolling 1925 and Apthorp 1980. Plutarch's story is taken at face value by Wolf 1795; Van der Valk 1963: 462; Van der Valk 1964: 483-86; Cairns 1993: 51n13; Janko 1994: 27-28; Lynn-George 1998: 136.

[68] Apthorp 1998.

[69] Bolling 1925: 21; Apthorp 1980: 91-99; Hainsworth 1993 ad *Il.* 9.458-61; Griffin 1995 ad *Il.* 9.458-61; Apthorp 1998; West 2001: 208; S. West 2001: 3. West (2001: 208) suspects Seleucus is the editorial culprit, while S. West

Whatever the origins of the lines, the fear attributed to Aristarchus may very well reflect a real fear felt by some audiences. Though we can only guess at the motivating concerns, it is highly probable that, given the shocking content of Plutarch's passage, such a fear was based on moral considerations about the immoral nature of the crime that Phoenix plots.[70] Parricide was considered one of the most appalling acts in ancient Greece,[71] and it is not unlikely that the slanderous imputation of the deed was considered equally appalling.[72] Phoenix himself expresses intense revulsion at the very term and the idea of being thought of as a father-slayer (*ὡς μὴ πατροφόνος μετ' Ἀχαιοῖσιν καλεοίμην*, *Il.* 9.461), so the logic behind the removal of the attempted parricide may very well be explained by a desire to extricate a hero of Phoenix' caliber from a crime so unforgivable. A similar act of bowdlerization is attested for another portion of Phoenix' autobiography, where ancient commentators explain that Sosiphanes rewrote *τῇ πιθόμην καὶ ἔρεξα* (*Il.* 9.453) as *τῇ οὐ πιθόμην οὐδ' ἔρεξα*, thereby revising Phoenix' story so that he did not sleep with his father's concubine.[73]

This critical editorial impulse directed towards Phoenix' autobiographical narrative is one

---

(2001: 14) hypothesizes that the passage originally came from the *Aethiopis*, where Phoenix may have spoken the lines at Achilles' funeral. Apthorp (1980: 99) suggests a particularly creative *aoidos* as another possible source.

[70] See Apthorp 1980: 82-89 for a discussion of the ancient idealization of Homeric heroes as moral exemplars. Apthorp (1980: 94) adds two more potential grounds for moral objection: that the imputation of attempted parricide makes Phoenix an unfitting caretaker of Achilles, and that fear of public opinion rather than fear of blood-guilt restrained Phoenix' homicidal impulse. I do not believe Apthorp's second suggestion is relevant, since Achilles' affiliation with Epeigeus, a kin-killer, and Patroclus, another homicide, does not seem to have caused much alarm. As for the third suggestion, Cairns (1993: 51) has demonstrated that the consideration of reputation and popular opinion is a quite common and central motivation in the Homeric poems.

[71] On the horror of parricide in antiquity, see Parker 1983: 124.

[72] Words like murderer (*androphonos*) and father-beater (*patraloaias*) were later among the class of *aporrhēta*, the 'unsayable' things that were liable to legal action (Lys. 10). Though not expressly named in the law listing these words, the word father-slayer (*patrophonos*) combines the key elements of father (as the victim) and murder (as the crime), which may have qualified it as one of these actionable words. Even more recent scholars sometimes have trouble coming to grips with Phoenix' criminal history. Bassett (1938: 19), for instance, says, "Phoenix is ethically a low-grade character."

[73] Schol. A ad *Il.* 9.453; Eust. ad *Il.* 9.453. Both further explain that Aristodemus of Nyssa accepted the emendation in the interests of preserving Phoenix' pious character.

that has long persisted and continues even today. Though Friedrich August Wolf,[74] following the earlier judgments of Obertus Giphanius and Lodewijk Caspar Valckenaer,[75] officially restored Plutarch's passage to our current reading of the *Iliad*, the authenticity of the lines has continually been in dispute. Some critics, particularly those inclined toward the Analysts' perspective, condemn the lines as an interpolation, which is supported by their weak textual attestation.[76] Yet the verses are almost universally admitted, albeit grudgingly, to be "good enough to be genuine" in both language and style.[77] They consist of many well-attested Homeric formulas,[78] but are still distinctive enough, as Stephanie West points out, that they must not be a mere Homeric cento; *πατροφόνος*, for instance, is nowhere else attested in Homer.[79] Accordingly, many other critics have consistently demonstrated the lines' relevant thematic application to the *Iliad*, rehabilitating them on the basis of internal evidence.[80] An example of this kind of argument has already been seen in Plutarch's explanation above (*Mor.* 26F), which states that the lines are entirely relevant to Phoenix' speech, since it teaches Achilles what anger (such as Phoenix once felt in the past and such as Achilles now feels) can provoke men to do.[81] When understood in this way,

---

[74] Wolf 1795: 22n7.

[75] Giphanius 1572 ad *Il.* 9.457 and Valckenaer 1767: 274.

[76] Bolling 1925: 120-22; Apthorp 1980: 91-99; van Thiel 1982: 319; Griffin 1995 ad *Il.* 9.458-61; Haslam 1997: 79; West 2001: 208.

[77] Janko 1994: 27-28. Similar sentiments are expressed by Apthorp 1980: 95 and Hainsworth 1993 ad *Il.* 9.458-61.

[78] E.g. *ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ* (*Il.* 9.458 ~ 4.540; 5.132); *ἀλλά τις ἀθανάτων* (*Il.* 9.459 ~ *Od.* 23.63); *ὀνείδεα πόλλ'* (*Il.* 9.460 ~ 3.242); *καλεοίμην* (*Il.* 9.461 ~ 1.293; 14.210). Ameis and Hentze 1858-60 ad *Il.* 9.460 and Leaf 1900-02 ad *Il.* 9.458-61 both point out that the phrase *φάτιν καὶ ὀνείδεα πόλλ' ἀνθρώπων* (*Il.* 9.460) is reminiscent of the phrase *νέμεσίν τε καὶ αἴσχεα πόλλ' ἀνθρώπων* (*Il.* 6.351) in both language and sentiment.

[79] S. West 2001: 3.

[80] Wilamowitz 1916: 66n2; Murray 1934: 123; Pasquali 1952: 231-32; Van der Valk 1963: 462; Van der Valk 1964: 483-86; Lohmann 1970: 269n100; Mühlestein 1981: 90; Lynn-George 1988: 136. Full parallels and other discussions are enumerated further below. The authenticity of Plutarch's lines is additionally taken for granted by Bassett 1938: 199; Ebel 1972; Devereux 1973: 44; Köhnken 1975: 75; Rosner 1976; Schlunk 1976; Roisman 1981: 10, 16-17; Schein 1984: 111; Arieti 1986: 2; Alden 2000: 215-29; Bowie 2007: 26; Gwara 2007; Alden 2012: 123. Scodel 1982: 130 and Perry 2010: 60 are impartial as regards their authenticity.

[81] Plutarch again explains the relevance of the lines in terms of Phoenix' emotional connection to Achilles at *Mor.* 72B: *ὅθεν οὐχ ἁπλῶς ὁ Φοῖνιξ ἐνέβαλε τὰ περὶ αὑτὸν ἀτυχήματα, δι' ὀργὴν ἐπιχειρήσαντος ἀνελεῖν τὸν πατέρα καὶ*

Phoenix' words clearly connect with the quarrel at the beginning of the *Iliad*, where Achilles initially wanted to kill Agamemnon because of his anger at the loss of Briseis (*Il.* 1.188-98). With the inclusion of Plutarch's lines, then, Phoenix' autobiography looks strikingly like, in the words of Jasper Griffin, "a burlesque of Achilles' own story."[82] This is an important connection that I will revisit in more detail in the next chapter.

Following Milman Parry's fieldwork on a living oral epic tradition,[83] many scholars, including myself, have since recognized that questions about whether or not Plutarch's lines are an interpolation are moot. The process of composition-in-performance that ancient singers engaged in naturally produces many variations, i.e. epic multiforms, not only on the level of formula and diction, but also on the level of narrative and plot.[84] If viewed with the belief that the *Iliad* is primarily a textual product, then these variations may spawn debates over 'correct' and 'incorrect' readings.[85] But if we are instead sensitive to the original performance tradition behind the epic, and if we view these 'alternative readings' in the textual transmission as reflexes of oral tradition, as I believe we should, then what we have in the case of Plutarch's lines is evidence for an *option* in performance. On some occasions, we can imagine, the lines were performed in Phoenix' narrative; on other occasions, they were not. Either way, we should not prioritize one reading or performance over the other.

Let us briefly consider the case in which they were not performed. If they are left out, Phoenix' situation is quite comparable to four other Homeric exiles – political exiles, as opposed

---

ταχὺ μεταγνόντος, «ὡς μὴ πατροφόνος μετ' Ἀχαιοῖσιν καλεοίμην,» ἵνα μὴ δοκῇ νουθετεῖν ἐκεῖνον ὡς αὐτὸς ἀπαθὴς ὢν ὑπ' ὀργῆς καὶ ἀναμάρτητος.

[82] Griffin 1995 ad *Il.* 9.447ff. It is similarly characterized as "almost a parody of the heroic quarrel" by Scodel 1982: 133.

[83] Parry 1971. See also Lord 1960.

[84] On the performance traditions and multiformity of Homeric epic, see Lord 1960: 100; Bird 1994; Nagy 1996: 8-9; Dué 2001: 44n54.

[85] E.g. Finkelberg 2000, who firmly believes the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are not multiform in nature.

to fugitive murderers – who were forced out of their homes due to a hostile relationship with an authority figure: Melampus (*Od*. 15.226-40), Bellerophon (*Il.* 6.157-211), Phyleus (*Il.* 2.627-29), and Polypheides (*Od*. 15.252-255).[86] I classify these figures as political exiles since their departures from home clearly work as a political remedy, relieving their political rivals of their subversive presence, while simultaneously relieving themselves of the pressures of a hostile home environment. Phoenix shares perhaps the most obvious affinity with Phyleus and Polypheides, since, like them, he departs from home because of a quarrel with his father. All three cases thus exhibit disputes arising from the disposition of the family, as well as hints of intergenerational tensions such as those seen in the example of Tlepolemus.[87] But Phoenix' situation is equally a product of intra-elite tensions, paralleling the situations of Melampus and Bellerophon, who were both forced to leave their homes due to conflicts with their respective rulers, Neleus and Proetus.[88] These conflicts, like Phoenix' own with Amyntor, involve the taking of women: the daughter of Neleus, whom Melampus took for his brother to have as wife (*Od.* 15.233, 237-38), and Proetus' wife Anteia, who falsely claimed that Bellerophon had attempted to force himself on her (*Il.* 6.160-65). Additional points of contact between Phoenix and Melampus specifically include the presence of Erinyes (*Ἐρινύς*, *Il.* 9.454; *Od*. 15.234) as well as brief incarcerations (*Il.* 9.462-77; *Od*. 15.231-32)[89] in consequence of their disputes.

---

[86] See also my earlier discussion of these figures in Chapter 1.

[87] The scholiasts emphasize the hostility between Phoenix and Amyntor in terms of generational difference: *ῥᾷστα γὰρ ἀνδρὸς ἀφίσταται γέροντος γυνὴ νέα πειραθεῖσα νέου καὶ ἰσχυροτέρου ἀνδρός· ἧττον γὰρ οἱ γέροντες ἀφροδισιάζειν δύνανται* (schol. bT ad *Il.* 9.452).

[88] It is interesting to note that Bellerophon was regularly recognized as a murderer because of his name (-*φόντης* > *g^w*hen*-, "to slay"), and was generally believed to have slain a Corinthian nobleman named Bellerus (schol. bT ad *Il.* 6.155; Eust. ad *Il.* 6.157-60; Tzetz. schol. ad Lycoph. 17; *Etym. Magn.* s.v. *Βελλεροφόντης*; *Etym. Gen.* s.v. *Ἀλήϊον*; Zen. 2.87). On the etymology of Bellerophon, see White 1982: 120-21 and Watkins 1995: 357-58. Bellerophon's murder victim was alternatively identified as his own brother, named variously as Deliades, Piren, or Alcimenes (Apollod. 2.3.1; Tzetz. schol. ad Lycoph. 17; Plut. *De Prov. Alex*. 16). Bellerophon, then, forms a group with Tydeus and Peleus, whose statuses as fugitive murderers are all suppressed in Homer.

[89] It may be argued that Phoenix is not technically imprisoned, but I believe that the watchful supervision of his relatives and the great efforts he makes to escape his home (*Il.* 9. 464-77) are all indications of the prison-like

Since both Melampus' and Bellerophon's disputes involve women closely affiliated with their respective opponents, and since they consequently incur the wrath of their rulers, it seems to me that the actions of Melampus and Bellerophon were taken by their respective rulers as implicit challenges to their authority and hence as forms of political dissent. Possession of, or marriage to, a woman in Greek myth is often tantamount to a claim to rule.[90] Phoenix' dalliance with his father's concubine can similarly be construed as an action that, from a political point of view, attempts to usurp the ruler.[91] An insurgent quality to Phoenix' actions is clearly manifest in his show of allegiance to his mother over the father (*Il.* 9.451-53), and to judge from the resulting retaliation, Amyntor almost certainly undrstands his son's behavior in this way. The enraged ruler curses Phoenix with childlessness (*Il.* 9.453-57), which, as George Devereux and Stephanie West have suggested, implies not only impotence, but also full-blown castration.[92] By stripping Phoenix of the ability to procreate, Amyntor effectively deprives him of his right to inherit the kingdom and to be its ruler. Both losses are ultimately resolved by Phoenix' later acquirement of a surrogate father in Peleus (*καί μ' ἐφίλησ' ὡς εἴ τε πατὴρ ὃν παῖδα φιλήσῃ*, Il. 9.481), who subsequently grants him a surrogate kingdom in the Dolopians (*Δολόπεσσιν ἀνάσσων*, *Il.* 9.484) and a surrogate son in Achilles (*ἀλλὰ σὲ παῖδα, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ,/ ποιεύμην*, *Il.* 9.494-95). But in addition to rulership, prestige is another one of the major stakes in the quarrel. The name

---

environment he experiences.

[90] See S. West 2001: 5, with notes 15-17 for a list of other Greek and biblical parallels. White 1982: 123-24, with notes 16-18, observes additional Greek and biblical parallels, to which I would add Irish examples compiled by McCone 1990: 109-17. See also the illuminating discussions of Atchity and Barber 1987 and Finkelberg 1991 on the women-sovereignty question.

[91] The "political potential" of Phoenix' act have similarly been recognized by S. West 2001: 5 and Gwara 2007: 310.

[92] Devereux 1973: 43-44 and S. West 2001: 8. Both discussions also note that in some traditions, Phoenix' punishment was blindness (Apollod. 3.13.8; *Anth. Pal.* 3.3; schol. ad Pl. *Leg.* 931b; schol. ad Lycoph. 421), which was a punishment heavily associated with sexual transgressions in Greek myth. It is surely no coincidence that another hero famously blinded for his transgressions, Oedipus, was a parricide. On the connection between blindness/lameness, parricide, and incest or other sexual crimes, see Detienne and Vernant 1978 and Vernant and Vidal-Naquet 1988.

of the concubine that pitted father against son was allegedly Clytia (*Κλυτία*), "Renown." Such a telling name reinforces the characterization of their conflict as one over honor and recognition.[93] Seen against this background, Phoenix' actions against his father, specifically his involvement with the concubine, are those of a political dissident – even insurgent – but ultimately a political loser, which is why he must go into exile.

Setting these observations temporarily aside, let us now consider the case in which Plutarch's parricidal lines were performed. I have already discussed a number of implications of such a performance, most notably the close correspondence between Phoenix and the fugitive murderer, so I will instead use this opportunity to address the other main difficulty with characterizing Phoenix as a murderer. As I pointed out earlier, the condition of the homicide being successful (i.e. the *actus reus* element, in modern legal terminology) is not fulfilled for Phoenix; however, his intent to commit the crime (i.e. the *mens rea* element) is well established by his own confession (*τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ βούλευσα κατακτάμεν*, *Il.* 9.458). It is unclear at what stage Phoenix is in his plot to kill his father from this statement alone, but Michael Apthorp has evidently understood it as a mere intention of the mind: "Phoenix' thoughts of parricide are never put into effect but pass quickly from his mind."[94] This summary of the attempt, I believe, gravely underestimates Phoenix' level of commitment to the conspiracy, for the disgruntled would-be parricide additionally mentions the use of a specific murder weapon to complete the deed: a sharp sword (*ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ*, *Il.* 9.458). At this point a god intercedes and checks his anger (*παῦσεν χόλον*, *Il.* 9.459), thereby preventing the murder. This situation is almost exactly parallel to Achilles' attempt to kill Agamemnon, thwarted by Athena's intervention (*Il.* 1.188-222). In

[93] Schol. ad *Il.* 9.448; schol. T ad *Il.* 9.449; Eust. ad *Il*. 9.448-52; Eust. ad *Il*. 9.453-56; schol. ad Lycoph. 417; schol. ad Lycoph. 421. Both scholia to Lycophron also mention Phthia as another possible name for the concubine. Interestingly enough, the identity of Patroclus' victim is similarly identified as Cleitonymus, Cleisonymus, or Clysonymus, "of famed name." See note 57 in Chapter 1.

[94] Apthorp 1980: 94.

that case, Achilles is just on the verge of killing, with hand drawing sword (*ἢ ὅ γε φάσγανον ὀξὺ ἐρυσσάμενος παρὰ μηροῦ*, *Il.* 1.190), when the goddess physically grabs the murderous hero by his hair (*στῆ δ' ὄπιθεν, ξανθῆς δὲ κόμης ἕλε Πηλεΐωνα*, *Il.* 1.197) and checks his anger (*παύσουσα τὸ σὸν μένος*, *Il.* 1.207). The similarities of emotional state and need for divine intervention suggest that Phoenix' murder plot was just as imminent as Achilles' own, and was perhaps in the process of being implemented when the god intervened. Phoenix' plan to use a sword in service of a murderous intention thus constitutes more than just a passing fancy or homicidal attempt; it also is, in my opinion, overt enough an act to constitute the crime of murder itself, since it results in the same consequence of flight.[95] His intent to kill, even in the absence of a resulting death, and his eventual exile both establish him as a murderous type. Phoenix fits into the killer mold so well that it does not really matter that his father is still alive.

Examination of Phoenix' homicide narrative thus exposes two slightly different but equally authentic variant performances: one in which Phoenix' parricidal attempt was narrated, and one in which it was not. These performances show that Phoenix can fit into one of two patterns: the pattern of a fugitive murderer and the pattern of a political exile. His suitability to both categories raises again a point I made in the first chapter, namely that the exiled killer can also be viewed as a political exile. In both cases, Phoenix is an equally disruptive and treasonous figure who must leave. Given this conceptual assimilation between homicide and political dissidence, we may view Phoenix' attempt on his father's life as a more pronounced and physical

---

[95] An interesting parallel can be found in Draco's homicide law (IG I^3 104, lines 11-13), which establishes equal liability for killing with one's hand and for conspiracy to kill. I do not of course mean to apply Draco's law – or any historical legal practice, for that matter – to the Homeric poems, but I do find Draco's law to be a useful comparandum, which illustrates a logic that I believe to be similarly present in the *Iliad*. I should add, however, that there is an intense debate among Greek legal scholars about liability for different levels of conspiracy to kill, and about the charges brought against an ultimately unsuccessful homicide attempt. See the different discussions of Stroud 1968; Loomis 1972; Gagarin 1988; Carawan 1998: 33-41, 68-75, 223-27, 255-70; Phillips 2007.

form of dissent.[96] The addition of the parricidal plot just presents Phoenix much further along the political continuum, making him effectively a murderer, at least from the poetic point of view.

2.2.2 Seeing Red: The Killer in Phoenix' Name

It is possible that Phoenix additionally registered as a killer not only in the context of the *Iliad*, but also in the Greek imagination more broadly through the meaning of his name. Phoenix (*Φοῖνιξ*) is connected to the Homeric adjective and noun of the same spelling (*φοῖνιξ*),[97] defined as "purple or crimson."[98] This in turn derives from the adjective *φοινός*, meaning "blood-red."[99] Before I demonstrate how this etymology reinforces Phoenix' killer image, let us review other possible etymological interpretations of his name.[100]

The red-connection is not in dispute, but the way in which Phoenix embodies the color is variously interpreted. The most obvious way to link the color to him is to understand it as a reference to a certain physical characteristic of his, such as red hair or a dark tanned complexion, but as Nikoletta Kanavou points out, the *Iliad* does not offer many indications of his physical features.[101] The reddish sunburnt skin of the Phoenicians purportedly gave the people their name,[102] and it is with this ethnic understanding that Dietrich Mülder,[103] followed by Martin

---

[96] See also Sourvinou-Inwood 1979: 14-15, who views parricide as a psychological rivalry between father and son.

[97] Chantraine, s.v. *φοῖνιξ*; Beekes, s.v. *Φοινῖκες*.

[98] LSJ, s.v. *φοῖνιξ*, B. As a noun, *φοῖνιξ* means "date-palm, palm-tree" (LSJ, sv. *φοῖνιξ,* II.) and occurs at *Od.* 6.163. This use of the word is understood to derive from the eastern origin and Phoenician trade of the date-palm (Beekes, *φοῖνιξ*, s.v. 1.).

[99] LSJ, s.v. *φοινός*, A.

[100] Kanavou 2015: 67-71 also provides her own etymological survey of Phoenix' name.

[101] Kanavou 2015: 68.

[102] Chantraine, s.v. *φοῖνιξ*, 2. The color red was believed to have received its name from the Phoenicians, because they were credited with its discovery and earliest use (LSJ, s.v. *φοῖνιξ*, B.).

[103] Mülder 1910: 55.

West,[104] deemed Phoenix' name as appropriate for his role as a pedagogue. Their logic behind their explanation would be in keeping with the ancient practice of naming slaves by their ethnicity, like Syros for a Syrian slave.[105] But Phoenix was the name he bore, it seems, even before he went into exile. Though identified as an attendant of Peleus (*Φοίνικα ὀπάονα πατρὸς ἑοῖο*, *Il.* 23.360.), he is not a slave, and it is highly questionable whether he is intended to be understood as a pedagogue.[106] What is more, he flees from Hellas,[107] not from the land of the Phoenicians. There is another Phoenix in the poem, who is the eponym for the Phoenician people and appears as a completely separate character, the grandfather of Minos and Rhadamanthys (*Il.* 14.321-22). In light of these complications, I find it very difficult to link the Phoenix of *Iliad* 9 to the Phoenicians, or to any red physical or somatic feature in general.

The etymological significance of Phoenix' name is most meaningfully explored in connection with the speech he delivers to Achilles in *Iliad* 9. To this end, Hugo Mühlestein has connected Phoenix to the Meleager myth in particular, likening him to Oineus, who approaches Meleager in entreaty (*Il.* 9.581-83) just as Phoenix approaches Achilles.[108] On the basis of a formula peculiar to Oineus' family (*γέρων ἱππηλάτα Οἰνεύς*, *Il.* 9.581; *ἱππηλάτα Τυδεύς*, *Il.* 4.387), Mühlestein surmised Phoenix' name was invented to fit the meter of the same formula (*γέρων ἱππηλάτα Φοῖνιξ*, *Il.* 9.432, 16.196), and thus to reinforce the similarities between the two characters.[109] This interpretation assumes a connection between the name Phoenix and the red

---

[104] West 2011 ad *Il.* 9.168.

[105] On stock slave names of the *ethnikon*-type, see Robertson 2008: 85-87 and Wrenhaven 2012: 33-36. Cf. Strabo 7.3.12.

[106] See the reservations raised by Lohmann 1970: 247-52. Tsagarakis 1979 also discusses Phoenix' social status. Devereux (1973: 43) describes him as "more a nurse than a paidagogos or mentor," although the aged hero was already recognized as such in antiquity: *τὸν τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως παιδαγωγὸν Φοίνικα* (Pl. *Rep.* 390E).

[107] On the political and geographical problems posed by the location of Phoenix' homeland and of Hellas, see note 100 in Chapter 1.

[108] Mühlestein 1969: 81-86. Mülder 1910: 53 records parallels between Phoenix and Oineus as well.

[109] Mühlestein 1969: 85. The formula is also used of Peleus: *γέρων ἱππηλάτα Πηλεύς* (*Il.* 7.125, 9.438, 18.331).

color of wine, which forms Oineus' name (*Οἰνεύς*, "Wine Man" > *οἶνος*, "wine"). Wine is certainly featured as a significant component of Phoenix' relationship with Achilles. After his homicide-and-flight narrative, Phoenix emphasizes how he gave wine to Achilles as a child, who would then throw it back up on him (*Il.* 9.489-91).[110] Phoenix' redness is thus, in Mühlestein's view, a reflection of the wine-ness of Oineus, and hence a marker of his derivative character. The phonological dissimilarity of the names, however, seriously hinders an acceptance of Oineus as the poetic antecedent of Phoenix, much less a semantic correlation between the two. And prioritizing Oineus' character over Phoenix' own, not to mention prioritizing the Meleager myth over the other components of Phoenix' speech, such as his autobiography and allegory of the Prayers (*Λιταί*), is completely unnecessary.[111] Phoenix is prominent enough a figure in the *Iliad* and in Greek myth more broadly that he need not have derived from another mythical figure, particularly one whose story he narrates. More problematically still, *φοῖνιξ* and *φοινός* are never used to describe wine in Homer.[112] The connections between Phoenix, the color red, and wine are therefore quite tenuous.

Words we find linked to *φοῖνιξ*/*φοινός*, or other related adjectives in Homer (e.g. *δαφοινός, φοινήεις, φοινικόεις, φοινικοπάρηος*), offer clues as to the type of redness underlying Phoenix' name and where in his speech we should seek its significance. Greek adjectives displaying the *φοιν-* element are applied to beasts, such as jackals (*Il.* 11.474), a war horse (*Il.* 23.454), a lion (*Il*. 10.23), and serpents (*Il.* 2.308, 12.202, 12.220), as well as to clothing and

---

[110] Mühlestein (1969: 85) also notes the importance of wine in the Meleager myth, e.g. *Il.* 9.579.

[111] West 2011 similarly tends to locate the inspiration for Phoenix' character in the Meleager myth he narrates. For example, he suggests that the father's curse in Phoenix' autobiography is influenced by the mother's curse in the Meleager myth (ad *Il.* 9.447-57), a view Mühlestein (1969: 86) also expressed, while adding that the nine days Phoenix' relatives keep watch on him derives from the nine days spent on the Calydoniant hunt (Apollod. 1.69). Still, Mühlestein and West, so far as I can tell, have not laid out clear or objective criteria for establishing the primacy of one character, or one myth, over another.

[112] A fact Mühlestein (1969: 86) himself admits. The adjectives used to describe the color of wine include: *ἐρυθρός* (e.g. *Od.* 5.165, 9.163); *αἶθοψ* (*Il.* 1.462, 4.259); *μέλας* (*Od.* 5.265, 9.196).

equipment, such as a leather thong (*Od.* 23.201), the plume of a helmet (*Il.* 15.537-38), belts (*Il.* 6.219, 7.305), cloaks (*Il.* 10.133; *Od.* 14.500, 21.118), and ships (*Od.* 11.124, 23.271). The "red" adjective is also paired frequently and emphatically with blood: *φοίνικι μιήνῃ (Il.* 4.141), *αἵματι φοινόν* (*Il.* 16.159), *δαφοινεὸν αἵματι* (*Il.* 18.538), *αἵματι φοινικόεσσαι* (*Il.* 23.717), *φοίνιον αἷμα* (*Od.* 18.97).[113] Almost all of these associations, particularly the last one, imbue the color red with a violent quality.[114] The beasts listed are aggressive and predatory ones, while the pieces of equipment are those found typically worn or used by a warrior. In almost all cases, the color red is a menacing feature. We should therefore look to the violent aspects of Phoenix' speech to uncover the violent redness of his own character.

Following this conceptual link, Nikoletta Kanavou has raised the possibility that the red of Phoenix' name alludes to the blood and wound incurred by the castration he implicitly suffered from his father's curse.[115] That his name is merely a reflection of his eunuch status, however, is a rather disappointing interpretation, and one that reverses the general direction of violence implied by *φοῖνιξ/φοινός*. As we saw earlier, these adjectives are primarily attributed to predators and warriors – things that draw blood. Kanavou's interpretation, however, understands Phoenix' name in the passive sense as 'one from whom blood has been drawn,' going against the aggressive connotations generally attributed to the adjective. Though Kanavou is, I believe, right in looking to Phoenix' self-presentation to elicit the meaning of his name, we should interpret his redness differently, as a signal of his own role as the agent of violence and aggression, rather than as the victim.

I submit that the etymological significance of Phoenix' name consists in the sense of an

[113] It was probably in light of this close connection that the LSJ defined *φοινός* as "blood-red."

[114] Even today and in many other cultures, the color red is heavily associated with anger, hostility, and danger, among other things. See Fetterman et al. 2012.

[115] Kanavou 2015: 70-71. On the loss of Phoenix' manhood, see earlier comments above.

angry blood-red – a *murderous* red. The color is an indicator of his hostile, killer aspects. In fact, the "red" adjective *φοινός* was extended to mean "deadly or murderous."[116] It was closely linked to the noun *φόνος*, "murder" (from the unrelated root *$*g^{w}hen$-*, "to smite, slay"), and was even frequently interpreted as a variant of it.[117] This folk etymology, popular throughout antiquity, is already apparent in the *Iliad*:

> […] *οἳ δὲ λύκοι ὣς*
> *ὠμοφάγοι, τοῖσίν τε περὶ φρεσὶν ἄσπετος ἀλκή,*
> *οἵ τ' ἔλαφον κεραὸν μέγαν οὔρεσι δηώσαντες*
> *δάπτουσιν· πᾶσιν δὲ παρήϊον αἵματι φοινόν·*
> *καί τ' ἀγεληδὸν ἴασιν ἀπὸ κρήνης μελανύδρου*
> *λάψοντες γλώσσῃσιν ἀραιῇσιν μέλαν ὕδωρ*
> *ἄκρον ἐρευγόμενοι φόνον αἵματος· ἐν δέ τε θυμὸς*
> *στήθεσιν ἄτρομός ἐστι, περιστένεται δέ τε γαστήρ·* (*Il.* 16.156-63)
>
> And they (the Myrmidons) rushed out like flesh-eating wolves, in whose hearts is an unspeakable might – wolves that have slain in the hills a great horned stag, and devour him. And the jaws of all are red with blood; and in a pack they go to lap with their slender tongues the black water from a spring of dark water, belching out murderous gore and blood, the heart in their breasts unflinching, and the belly full.

In each of the phrases I have underlined above, *αἵματι φοινόν* (*Il.* 16.159) and *φόνον αἵματος* (*Il.* 16.162), the phonologically similar *φοινόν* and *φόνον* are placed directly next to the Greek word for blood. The striking and deliberate parallelism between the two pairs communicates a perceived relation between the words for red, blood, and murder.[118]

Mühlestein later revised his etymology of Phoenix in 1981, and similarly came to understand Phoenix' name as denoting murder.[119] Discarding his earlier Oineus-Phoenix scheme, Mühlestein argued that the hero's name was a compound of *φοινός* and *ἱκέτης*, created in the

---

[116] E.g. Nic. *Ther*. 146, 675. LSJ, s.v. *φοινός*, 2.

[117] Beekes, s.v. *φοινός*. Watkins (1995: 373) has also seen in the phrase *φοινήεντα δράκοντα* (*Il.* 12.202 = 12.220) an echo of the formula *δράκαιναν *πέφνεν*. This echo would hinge on an assumption that *φοινός* is related to *φόνος*.

[118] In a similar vein, Mühlestein suggested that Phoenix' name referred to the blood-red of the firebrand Althaea uses to kill Meleager (*δαφοινὸν/ δαλόν*, Aesch. *Cho*. 607-08), but this interpretation, again, relies on the priority of the Meleager myth over Phoenix' character. Similar objections are raised by Kanavou 2015: 71n247.

[119] Mühlestein 1981.

image of Peleus, who had twice been a murderer, and twice a suppliant.[120] Phoenix, in this revised view, is designed to evoke the fatherly role of his poetic model Peleus. This suggestion is "unconvincing," as Kanavou has already commented,[121] and incorrect linguistically. The base of *ἱκέτης* (> **seik*-, "to reach, grasp") has a short iota, and cannot account for the long iota of Phoenix' name, which instead seems to reflect a common pre-Greek suffix -*īκ*-.[122] As if anticipating such criticism, Mühlestein further explained, "Der Dichter war ja nicht an die Wortbildungsregeln gebunden, welche erst die moderne Sprachwissenschaft festgestellt hat."[123] But would a native Greek speaker and the original audiences of Homeric poetry truly have heard Phoenix' name and thought *ἱκέτης*? I find this highly improbable given the host of other Greek words that resemble the formation of Phoenix' name, e.g. *πέμφιξ*, *πέρδιξ*, *ῥάδιξ*. Mühlestein would then have to concede that these are suggestive of *ἱκέτης* as well.[124] And there still remains the problem I highlighted earlier about presupposing that Phoenix must derive from another mythological figure. Nonetheless, even with his new etymology Mühlestein again denies that Phoenix' name characterizes himself, but the existence of the homicide attempt in his backstory suggests precisely the opposite: Phoenix can in fact work as a speaking name.

The opposition of Phoenix to his father, Amyntor, underscores the murderous role taken

---

[120] Peleus murdered his half-brother Phocus in Aegina, and was purified by Eurytion, Eurytus, or Actor in Phthia. There he again killed (accidentally during a boar-hunt) his purifier, and fled to Iolcus to receive purification from Acastus. For the events of the first murder, see Apollod. 3.12.6-13.1; Diod. Sic. 4.72.6-7; Paus. 2.29.2, 2.29.9-10; schol. D ad *Il.* 16.14; Eust. ad *Il.* 2.684; schol. ad Pind. *Nem*. 4.95, 5.16, 5.25; schol. ad Pind. *Ol.* 8.40; schol. ad Eur. *Andr*. 687; schol. vet. ad Ar. *Nub*. 1063; Tzetz. schol. ad Ar. *Nub.* 1067a; schol. ad Ap. Rhod. 1.90-94a; schol. ad Callim. *Aet.* fr. 24; Ant. Lib. 38; Tzetz. schol. ad Lycoph. 175; Hyg. *Fab*. 14; Ov. *Met*. 11.266-70; Lact. Plac. ad Stat. *Theb*. 2.113, 7.344. For the events of the second murder, see the aforementioned citations, as well as Apollod. 1.8.1, 3.13.2-3; schol. ad *Il.* 23.86; Tzetz. schol. ad Lycoph. 901. Alden 2012: 119-22 has also provided a detailed summary and list of sources for Peleus' murderous history. I discuss Peleus again in the next chapter.

[121] Kanavou 2015: 69n238.

[122] See Beekes 2004: 181-84. This non-IE suffix is particularly associated with the names of peoples in northwestern Greece, e.g. the *Αἴθικες*, *Τέμμικες,* and *Θρήϊκες*. Cf. note 124 below.

[123] Mühlestein 1981: 91.

[124] The -*īκ*- suffix appears to be heavily associated with plant names in particular (e.g. *σκάνδιξ*, "wild chervil," and *σπάδιξ*, "bough"), but is attached to many other classes of words, on which see Chantraine 1933: 382-83.

up by Phoenix and signaled by his name. The name Amyntor is clearly related to the verb *ἀμύνειν*, "to keep off, ward off, defend," and evokes the role of a defender.[125] In his own attempt to tease out the broader implications of this etymology, Mühlestein suggested that his name be taken together with his patronymic, son of Ormenus (*Ἀμύντορος Ὀρμενίδαο*, *Il.* 9.448), from *ὄρνυμαι*, "to rise up."[126] Their names, "Defender" and "One Who Rises," in Mühlestein's understanding, advise Achilles on his duty to rise up and defend his people in battle.[127] If the names of Phoenix' ancestors are so strikingly instructive, we should expect to see Phoenix' name functioning in a similar capacity, but Mühlestein's scheme does not allow it.[128] I therefore view the opposition between Phoenix' and Amyntor's names to be a reflection of how each figure was perceived and how each figure functions in Phoenix' autobiographical narrative: defender and murderer. The father Amyntor defends himself against his murderous son Phoenix.[129] Taken this way, the contrasting representation of their roles coheres nicely with our earlier observations about Homeric homicide, which is heavily associated with political dissension in form and effect.

Phoenix' name is thus a political warning. Like the red of animals in biological contexts (e.g. the strawberry poison-dart frog), or the red of objects in symbolic contexts (e.g. stop signs),

---

[125] Eust. ad *Il.* 10.266: *Δῆλον δ' ὅτι ὅθεν ὁ Ἀμύντωρ, ἤγουν ἐκ τοῦ ἀμύνειν, ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ὁ παρὰ τοῖς ὕστερον Ἀμύντας καὶ ὁ Ἀμυνίας τὰ κύρια, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ὁ ἀμυνίας θυμὸς παρὰ τῷ Κωμικῷ*. The name is used once more of another figure at *Il.* 10.267, a victim whose helmet is stolen by Autolycus. Mühlestein (1969: 82-83) points out that this Amyntor, 'defender,' ironically fails to defend himself and his helmet.

[126] Mühlestein 1969: 81-83, 86. Kanavou 2015: 71 suggests that Ormenus' name may instead be related to Ormenion, contributing to the Thessalian provenance of Phoenix' character. See note 100 in Chapter 1.

[127] This interpretation is followed by Scodel 2002: 165 and Kanavou 2015: 70, the latter of which additionally notes that the verb *ἀμύνειν* is used eight times in Phoenix' speech.

[128] Mühlestein 1969: 83: "So offensichtlich durch seine Aufforderung an Achill die Namen Amyntor und Ormenos motiviert sind, von seinem eigenen Namen gilt das nicht, wie auch immer man das mehrdeutige Wort *φοῖνιξ* mit der Intention seiner Rede zu verbinden sucht."

[129] Kanavou 2015: 71 admits to this possibility for Amyntor's role.

which all signal potential danger,[130] the red of *Φοῖνιξ* alerts us to the harm he can inflict – and has inflicted – in a social setting. His name specifically conveys the defiance of an insurgent and the violence of a murderer.

This image of Phoenix has significant repercussions for our understanding of the unfolding drama of the *Iliad*. The most immediate of these repercussions can be observed in Phoenix' speech to Achilles in the embassy, where he begins his appeal to the withdrawn hero by identifying himself as a fugitive murderer. I am not quite yet in a position to discuss the full set of implications, but suffice it now to observe that numerous similarities become apparent between Phoenix and Achilles. In particular, Phoenix' attempt on his father's life remarkably parallels Achilles' own attempt on Agamemnon's at the beginning of the *Iliad* (*Il.* 1.188-98). Like the unnamed god who prevents Phoenix from killing his father, Athena intervenes and prevents Achilles' murder of Agamemnon. The fallout of this event is enough to initiate a withdrawal, on Achilles' part, that is comparable to Phoenix' own exile. And so just as Phoenix plans on murdering his father, is restrained by a divinity at the last moment, but cannot bear to live in his father's community any more and goes into exile, so Achilles narrowly avoids killing Agamemnon but cannot remain part of Agamemnon's community. Given this remarkable set of correspondences, it seems that Achilles can be viewed as something of a fugitive murderer himself in the *Iliad*.

Phoenix' autobiographical narrative is thus the second occasion, after Tlepolemus' homicide narrative in the Catalogue of Ships, where the fugitive-murderer pattern resonates deeply with the situation of Achilles. As we will see, this connection is persistent – Patroclus' homicide narrative in *Iliad* 23 and the simile of the fugitive homicide in *Iliad* 24 intersect with

---

[130] On the 'alarming' associations of the color red in these different settings, see Fetterman et al. 2012: 1454-55 and Elliot and Maier 2007.

key moments of Achilles' story as well – and its ramifications great. Since my observations on Phoenix' connection with Achilles are pertinent specifically to the struggles Achilles faces throughout the *Iliad*, I will reserve my full discussion of Phoenix' embassy speech for the next chapter.

I have now surveyed all possible Homeric fugitive murderers and investigated their underlying conflicts in all their possible incarnations. The variations presented by Tlepolemus and Phoenix develop further many key themes and issues that were already observed in the first chapter, obliquely, to be encoded within the fugitive-murderer pattern. All versions of the pattern are emblematic of the way political dissent unfolds and is resolved within the Homeric world. With this significant conceptual foundation established, we are finally in a position to apply these findings to a more extended examination of the fugitive-murderer pattern's engagement with the broader narrative fabric of the Homeric poems. I shall turn to such an endeavor for the remainder of this dissertation.

Chapter 3. ACHILLES: FROM MURDEROUS INSURGENT TO HONORED HOST

I have thus far examined the fugitive-murderer pattern in isolation, and shown that it consistently reifies a remarkable connection between violence, exile, and the political dynamics of a community. In the process of that examination, I have also frequently alluded to the fact that Achilles' actions in the *Iliad* can be – and often are – framed within the fugitive-murderer pattern. I finally substantiate that intuition fully in this chapter.

The *Iliad* as a whole can be seen to reflect many of the same issues underpinning the fugitive-murderer pattern, since the structure of its plot remarkably parallels that of murder, flight, and relocation. The epic's overriding narrative sequence includes the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles, Achilles' withdrawal from the Achaean army, and his gradual process of rehabilitation. This dramatic scheme has traditionally been characterized in terms of the well-established story pattern of withdrawal-devastation-return, as first identified by Albert Lord,[1] but the similar segmentation of the narrative also points to the fugitive-murderer pattern, so that Achilles' withdrawal can be conceptualized as the flight of a murderer.

Almost all of the fugitive murderers of the *Iliad* contribute to this correlation of Achilles' experiences with those of the fugitive murderer by appearing in close association with the character and actions of Achilles specifically. Half of the fugitives (Phoenix, Patroclus, and Epeigeus), for instance, are dependents of his household. To these I also tentatively add Lycophron, who serves as an attendant of another closely related Aeacid, Ajax. In addition, the fugitive-murderer pattern consistently surfaces during scenes of heightened emotion for Achilles,

---

[1] A. B. Lord 1960: 186-97. Other discussions of this story pattern, especially in the *Iliad*, include M. L. Lord 1967; A. B. Lord 1969; Nagler 1974: 131-66; Foley 1990: 359-87; Foley 1999: 115-67; Nickel 2003.

thereby focalizing a considerable portion of his story. As we saw in the last chapter, Tlepolemus' homicide narrative in the Catalogue of Ships offers a kind of political commentary of Achilles' conflict with Agamemnon, while Phoenix' autobiography in the embassy encourages a direct correspondence between his former transgressions and Achilles' own. These two narratives notably suggest Achilles as a fugitive-murderer-type, assimilating his disruptive behavior to murder and his subsequent isolation to the marginalization of a murderer. The Homeric paradigm of this figure, however, also involves rehabilitation and reintegration into society. It is this aspect of the pattern, as we shall see later in this chapter, that Patroclus' homicide narrative in Book 23 and the simile of the fugitive homicide in Book 24 emphasize in reference to Achilles' situation. In these cases, Achilles is figured as a host-type: Patroclus relates his murderous background to Achilles in a way that asks him to repeat his previous role as a receptive figure, rescuing him from a life of exile. Now, however, Achilles must receive Patroclus' body and rescue him from the fate of an improper burial. Likewise, the simile of the fugitive homicide unequivocally casts Achilles as a would-be savior of a fugitive, whose role is taken on by Priam.

Thus the emphatic clustering of the Iliadic fugitive murderers around Achilles exerts a persistent and considerable analogical influence on the presentation of his character, insisting on an examination of his story through the lens of their story pattern. In light of these initial observations, I consider the fugitive-murderer pattern as a model to evaluate Achilles' own experiences throughout the *Iliad*, since such a consideration helps to trace the conceptual evolution of the hero from his first hostile encounter with Agamemnon to his final conciliatory interaction with Priam. I specifically explore how the epic variously envisions and reconfigures Achilles' status as the titular figure of the pattern, for as I highlighted above, there is a split in his presentation as either a fugitive or a host. This split, I believe, can be attributed to two different

perceptions of the quarrel and of Achilles' conduct towards Agamemnon. From the perspective of Agamemnon and his followers, Achilles is an aggressor and violent insurgent – a fugitive murderer, as it were. His subsequent withdrawal from the fighting is correspondingly perceived as the exile of such a figure. From Achilles' own perspective, however, he is the victim of an assault (on his heroic prestige) by Agamemnon. Consequently, the rehabilitation of his character cannot be achieved through a fugitive murderer's process of relocation, as that would confirm Agamemnon's perception of him. The full restoration and reintegration of Achilles at the end of the *Iliad* is instead achieved through his transformation into a figure who facilitates such reintegration: a host like his father Peleus.

In order to demonstrate this changing projection of Achilles' heroic identity, I will proceed with my analysis in three parts, each of which corresponds to an episode of the *Iliad*: the quarrel in Book 1, the embassy in Book 9, and Priam's ransom of Hector's body in Book 24. These three scenes converge with key elements of the fugitive-murderer pattern, and are pivotal moments in the progression of Achilles from murderous insurgent to honored host.

Before delving directly into my analysis of Achilles and the *Iliad*, one final disclaimer is in order. My approach in this chapter may easily be misconstrued as overly reductive and schematic, but my intent in bringing to light the fugitive-murderer pattern as an interpretive consideration for the *Iliad* is not to produce a direct one-to-one correlation. My prioritization of this pattern purely aims to demonstrate a new productive vantage point to address the complex poetic and sociopolitical dynamics of the epic. I certainly do not mean to focus attention on this one aspect of the poem to the exclusion of all other considerations. The *Iliad* encompasses many other patterns and monumental themes of vast compositional scope. Some of the themes that

other scholars have effectively highlighted as an interpretive key to the poem include anger,[2] supplication,[3] compensation,[4] father-son relations,[5] conflict and consensus,[6] and many more.[7] The same topics are crucially relevant to the thematic consistency of the fugitive-murderer pattern,[8] and so I will regularly draw upon the contributions of scholars in these areas. Thus, although my primary argument in this chapter focuses on Achilles' engagement with the fugitive-murderer pattern, I will also show that an exploration of this engagement can complement studies of the other fundamental themes of the *Iliad*, while additionally distilling many thematic subtleties within the poem.

3.1 THE QUARREL: COMPETING VISIONS OF VIOLENCE AND DISSENT

The quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon forms a perfect storm of civil strife that first triggers Achilles' assimilation to a fugitive murderer in the *Iliad.* His conceptualization as such is even, I believe, a critical component of the quarrel – as both a cause and an issue of the conflict. But in order to show how this opening scene of discord fits into the pattern, it will be useful to review the various factors that bring the hostilities between the two heroes to a head in the first place.

Even before the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles first erupts, there are already signs of a community in crisis. A plague, sent by Apollo to punish Agamemnon's refusal to

---

[2] Muellner 1996. Walsh 2005 is another important study of anger in Homeric epic.

[3] Whitfield 1967; Gould 1973; Pedrick 1982; Thornton 1984; Crotty 1994.

[4] Wilson 2002.

[5] Felson 2002.

[6] Lowenstam 1993: 59-143; Barker 2009: 40-88; Allan and Cairns 2011; Elmer 2013.

[7] Maronitis 2004 has additionally highlighted war, *homilia*, and homecoming as significant "megathemes" in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

[8] *Contra* Wilson 2002: 8: "the theme of compensation does not overlap significantly with that of manslaughter."

accept the priest Chryses' ransom for his daughter, wreaks havoc on the Achaean army's beasts and troops (*Il.* 1.50-52), and thus functions as a symptom of the sociopolitical turmoil the Achaean army faces in consequence of Agamemnon's failure in leadership. To address and resolve the essentially man-caused biological disaster, Achilles convenes an assembly, where Calchas correctly pinpoints Agamemnon as the ultimate root of their problems. The solution: return Chryseis. But the ruler cannot abide such a loss without some compensation. He thus threatens to take Ajax' or Odysseus' personal prizes (*Il.* 1.135-39), before finally settling on Achilles' Briseis (*Il.* 1.182-87).

It is within this set of increasingly aggravated sociopolitical circumstances that the great quarrel arises. Suddenly an assembly meant to address a military crisis creates a new one by setting up the conditions for an intense private conflict with even more devastating ramifications for the entire Achaean army.[9] This conflict, on its most basic level, is about the concubine Briseis (*εἵνεκα κούρης*, *Il.* 1.298, 336; 2.377; 9.637; 19.58), but as many scholars have previously shown, it also extends far beyond the matter of her possession.[10] One major component of it involves the distribution of *γέρα*, "prizes of honor," of which Briseis forms a part, amounting to a material dispute over wealth and status.[11] Thus it is frequently understood that by robbing Achilles of his prize, Agamemnon devalues his heroic prestige and creates a crisis of reciprocity.[12] A woman, however, also frequently serves as an emblem of power, as we saw, for

[9] See the interesting contrasting discussions of Barker 2009: 40-88, who views the opening assembly as the beginning of institutionalizing dissent in Homer, and Elmer 2013: 63-85, who views the same scene as an exception to the norms of political action.

[10] Literature about the quarrel is extensive, but some of the more prominent discussions include Beidelman 1989; Collins 1988; Donlan 1993; Lowenstam 1993; Mackenzie 1978; Martin 1989; van Wees 1992; Seaford 1994; von Reden 1995; Muellner 1996; Wilson 2002.

[11] See Donlan 1993 and von Reden 1995: 18-44 for a view of the conflict in the material context of gift-exchange.

[12] Seaford 1994.

example, in the case of Phoenix' dispute with his father.[13] Therefore another aspect of the quarrel that must be considered is the political. Most scholars who give weight to this consideration view the conflict as one between ruler and foremost warrior of the Achaean army,[14] but William Allan and Douglas Cairns have additionally shown that by taking Briseis in the way he does, Agamemnon oversteps his powers as king.[15] As the first book of the *Iliad* repeatedly emphasizes, it is the responsibility of the Achaean people to confer *γέρα* (e.g. *Il.* 1.118, 123, 135-36, 162). Agamemnon, however, violates the procedure of this distribution process with his unprecedented show of initiative in unilaterally claiming Briseis as his own (*ἑλὼν γὰρ ἔχει γέρας αὐτὸς ἀπούρας*, *Il.* 1.356, 507; 2.240). That he takes such action against Achilles in particular, a hero who considers himself an equal to Agamemnon (*τὸν ὁμοῖον*, *Il.* 16.53), only exacerbates the level of misconduct demonstrated by the king. Political anxiety over obedience, authority, and the limits of both thus emerges as another central concern of the quarrel.[16]

It should be noted that all of the above considerations are not mutually exclusive, and are generally unified by the fact that they consistently pinpoint Agamemnon as the wrongdoer. Three additional discussions, however, have significantly enriched the conversation about the quarrel by characterizing it as one fueled by a fundamental disagreement about the nature of the quarrel itself. As Leonard Muellner observes in his study of the wrath of Achiles, the experience of *μῆνις*, "anger," is strikingly attributed to both Achilles (*μήνι'*, *Il.* 1.422; *μήνιε*, 1.488; et passim) and Agamemnon (*ἐμήνιε*, *Il.* 247).[17] This kind of anger is more than just a feeling; it is an anger

---

[13] See note 90 in Chapter 2.

[14] Interestingly enough, this is how Nestor perceives the conflict at *Il.* 1.277-79. Modern scholars following this view include Mackenzie 1978; Beidelman 1989; Collins 1988: 69-103; Van Wees 1992: 122-24; Lowenstam 1993: 59-69; Hammer 2002. Dumézil 1956 has taken this opposition between ruler and warrior as indicative of a broader pattern of conflict evident in Indo-European myth between the military and society.

[15] Allan and Cairns 2011: 113-21.

[16] See especially the discussion of Hammer 1997b on this issue.

[17] Muellner 1996, esp. 94-132.

that threatens action in response to a disturbance in the hierarchy of the world, particularly the social or religious order. Although it is Achilles' anger that is most fully explored in the *Iliad*, both heroes are shown to have a grievance with the other. Both believe they have a reason and right to be angry. Their conflict can accordingly be framed as one over who gets to have *μῆνις*. But what right does Agamemnon have to feel *μῆνις*?

Donna Wilson has put forward one potential answer that emphasizes differences in opinion about the sources and values of heroic identity.[18] She casts the quarrel specifically as a contrast between two different systems of evaluating status and social organization: a fixed system that Agamemnon upholds and a fluid *timē*-based system championed by Achilles.[19] Wilson's analysis makes it clear that while Achilles obviously suffers an abuse of his own fluid model by Agamemnon, Agamemnon also perceives an attack from Achilles on his own social system.

Alternatively, William Allan and Douglas Cairns have viewed the quarrel primarily as a clash of differing claims to recognition and leadership.[20] By interrogating the different communal norms and values that inform the position of each quarreler, they show that each side's claims have some validity to them. Though Achilles, as discussed earlier, is the victim of an illegal maneuver performed by Agamemnon, Achilles himself is guilty of endangering the community by diminishing Agamemnon's ability to ensure the safety of the army: "[Achilles] has moved, from concern for the people and focus on Agamemnon's failure to consider their interests, to a willingness to see the people suffer for their failure to support his opposition to

---

[18] Wilson 2002: 54-55.

[19] Similarly, Gouldner 1965: 14 and Donlan 1979 have asserted that the quarrel exemplifies tensions between those claiming privilege on the basis of established social rank and those who base their standing on military ability and achievement.

[20] Allan and Cairns 2011.

Agamemnon's rule."[21] Achilles is perceived as betraying the army's interests to secure his own vendetta. This kind of behavior is unacceptable and, as Nestor later notes, anyone who wishes for violence among his own people is liable to be expelled from the group and to become wanderers (*ἀφρήτωρ ἀθέμιστος ἀνέστιός ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος/ ὃς πολέμου ἔραται ἐπιδημίου ὀκρυόεντος*, *Il.* 9.63-64). Given Achilles' disregard for the Achaean army's welfare, Agamemnon is somewhat justified in his anger at Achilles.

These three discussions of the conflict in *Iliad* 1 that I have just highlighted demonstrate the same interpretive tactics of allowing for the perspectives on responsibility and culpability to be flipped. Though the narrative logic of the *Iliad* clearly favors Achilles as the protagonist, there is also considerable room to explore Agamemnon's take on the events, which casts him as the victim and Achilles as the primary offender. Achilles' perspective on the quarrel has already been well remarked upon by others, and in general I am most in agreement with Allan and Cairns' analysis of the issue, as I summarized it above. For the remainder of this section, I would like to suggest an additional answer about why Agamemnon feels *μῆνις*. Here, then, my application of the fugitive-murderer pattern will finally become apparent.

From Agamemnon's point of view, Achilles is not the only hero to have suffered an affront to his own honor or to have been forced to give up a woman. Agamemnon was in fact the first to do so as a result of the bid to take Chryseis from him – initially by Calchas' recommendation (*Il.* 1.93-100) and subsequently by Achilles' more forceful insistence (*Il.* 1.127-29). The stakes involved in this case are generally the same as those I mentioned earlier in specific reference to the issue of Briseis: possession, prestige, and power. The loss of Chryseis is an enormous blow to Agamemnon's privileged position on all three fronts. This is something Achilles appears to recognize, and so he accordingly offers Agamemnon compensation to offset

[21] Allan and Cairns 2011: 117.

the loss (*ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν νῦν τῆνδε θεῷ πρόες· αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ/ τριπλῇ τετραπλῇ τ' ἀποτείσομεν, Il.* 1.128-29). In a bout of paranoia, however, Agamemnon misinterprets the proposal, accusing Achilles of deception (*μὴ δ' οὕτως ἀγαθός περ ἐὼν θεοείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ/ κλέπτε νόῳ, ἐπεὶ οὐ παρελεύσεαι οὐδέ με πείσεις*, *Il.* 1.131-32), and rejects the offer. Ironically, it is this act of rejection that brings his worst fears of loss to fruition, essentially causing the event in which he suffers a more personal and actionable offense inflicted against him by Achilles.

The second offense occurs when Agamemnon officially declares his intent to take Briseis and Achilles reacts by making an attempt on his king's life:

> *Ὣς φάτο· Πηλεΐωνι δ' ἄχος γένετ', ἐν δέ οἱ ἦτορ*
> *στήθεσσιν λασίοισι διάνδιχα μερμήριξεν,*
> *ἢ ὅ γε φάσγανον ὀξὺ ἐρυσσάμενος παρὰ μηροῦ*
> *τοὺς μὲν ἀναστήσειεν, ὃ δ' Ἀτρεΐδην ἐναρίζοι,*
> *ἦε χόλον παύσειεν ἐρητύσειέ τε θυμόν.*
> *ἧος ὃ ταῦθ' ὥρμαινε κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν,*
> *ἕλκετο δ' ἐκ κολεοῖο μέγα ξίφος, ἦλθε δ' Ἀθήνη*
> *οὐρανόθεν· πρὸ γὰρ ἧκε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη*
> *ἄμφω ὁμῶς θυμῷ φιλέουσά τε κηδομένη τε·*
> *στῆ δ' ὄπιθεν, ξανθῆς δὲ κόμης ἕλε Πηλεΐωνα*
> *οἴῳ φαινομένη· τῶν δ' ἄλλων οὔ τις ὁρᾶτο·* (*Il.* 1.188-98)
>
> So he spoke, and grief came upon the son of Peleus, and within his shaggy breast his heart was divided in counsel, whether he should draw his sharp sword from his side and rouse the men to action, and kill the son of Atreus, or whether he should check his anger and curb his spirit. While he pondered this in his mind and heart, and was drawing his great sword from its sheath, Athena came from heaven. For the goddess, white-armed Hera, sent her, because in her heart she loved and cared for them both alike. She stood behind him, and caught the son of Peleus by his tawny hair, showing herself to him alone. No one else could see her.

Some, perhaps, would dispute that this scene constitutes a homicide attempt, since Achilles' murderous urge is presented within a well-known Homeric type-scene of deliberation between alternatives, introduced by the verb *μερμηρίζειν*.[22] In such deliberations, the second alternative is usually chosen. Here, Achilles at first seems genuinely split between the two possible courses of action he contemplates (*διάνδιχα*, *Il.* 1.189), but there are also clear indications that the angry

[22] Arend 1933: 106-15; Voigt 1934: 30-32; Edwards 1992: 317-18; Pucci 1987: 69-75; Pelliccia 1995: 126-35.

hero is leaning towards the first option.[23] He draws his sword, with the imperfect tense of the verb highlighting the ongoing imperfective aspect of the action (*ἕλκετο δ' ἐκ κολεοῖο μέγα ξίφος*, *Il.* 1.194). Only Athena's physical manhandling of him stops him in his tracks, preventing the murder (*στῆ δ' ὄπιθεν, ξανθῆς δὲ κόμης ἕλε Πηλεΐωνα*, *Il.* 1.197).[24] We are later reminded how dangerously close Achilles was to satisfying his homicidal urge after Athena's speech, when he ultimately agrees to the goddess' terms and resheathes his sword (*ἂψ δ' ἐς κουλεὸν ὦσε μέγα ξίφος*, *Il.* 1.222). Though it is difficult to prove how committed Achilles was to killing Agamemnon, the fact that Athena has to pull him back by his hair suggests that his intent to kill was amounting closely to a fully formed and enacted criminal attempt.

I submit that this attempt was understood as a homicidal event that initiates the fugitive-murderer pattern. Achilles plays the fugitive murderer murderer and Agamemnon his would-be victim. The regicidal attempt is certainly consistent with what we have observed in previous chapters about how and why homicide occurs in Homer.[25] For one thing, the language of Achilles' killing activity (*Ἀτρεΐδην ἐναρίζοι*, *Il.* 1.191), though it does not employ the usual verb of criminal homicide, *κατακτείνειν*, closely parallels the man-slaying formula used of an exiled killer in Achilles' retinue, Epeigeus (*ἀνεψιὸν ἐξεναρίξας*, *Il.* 16.573).[26] In addition, the cause of Achilles' attempt aligns his situation with that of the fugitive murderer. Murder, as I showed in previous chapters, is generally triggered by intra-elite competition, and is thus an action that

---

[23] Differences between Achilles' actions here and the usual outcome of the deliberation type-scene have been noted by Scully 1984: 18; Wilson 2002: 60; Elmer 2013: 75.

[24] Athena's interaction with Achilles is so remarkably physical that I cannot believe that her intervention is merely a metaphorical expression of Achilles' internal hesitation and ultimate decision not to kill Agamemnon, as argued by Kirk 1985 ad *Il.* 1.188-22. Compare to Apollo's physical attacks against Patroclus at *Il.* 16.703, 791-93, where it is especially difficult to argue the god's treatment as merely a manifestation of the hero's psyche. West 1997: 350 has also found an Oriental parallel in the Ugaritic Baal Cycle, where two goddesses prevent Baal from succumbing to his murderous rage.

[25] Rabel 1988: 477 agrees that Achilles' reaction is "in accord with the heroic reflex."

[26] Oedipus' murder of his father is described in similar terms: *πατέρ' ἐξεναρίξας (Od.* 11.273).

heroes resort to in the face of some loss. Murderous inclinations are then a matter of (re)asserting oneself – perhaps even expressing one's superiority – in the sociopolitical realm. Similarly, Achilles' regicidal attempt, though ultimately prevented, functions as such a political maneuver. And since Achilles' particular situation involves committing violence against a king, his attempt can additionally be construed as the beginnings of a coup d'état, which is corroborated by the fact that he contemplates rousing the Achaeans to revolt at the same time as killing Agamemnon (*τοὺς μὲν ἀναστήσειεν, ὁ δ' Ἀτρεΐδην ἐναρίζοι*, *Il.* 1.191).[27]

Achilles of course cannot be an actual murderer, as tradition holds that Aegisthus will be Agamemnon's killer, and so the angry hero instead continues his assault symbolically with violent words, just as Athena suggests (*ἀλλ' ἦ τοι ἔπεσιν μὲν ὀνείδισον ὡς ἔσεταί περ*, *Il.* 1.211). He delivers a vehement character assassination of Agamemnon, wherein he again makes an implicit threat against Agamemnon's life and kingly position by declaring that if the other Achaeans were not a bunch of complacent nobodies (*ἐπεὶ οὐτιδανοῖσιν ἀνάσσεις*, *Il.* 1.231), Agamemnon would have already committed his last outrage (*ἦ γὰρ ἄν, Ἀτρεΐδη, νῦν ὕστατα λωβήσαιο*, *Il.* 1.232).[28] The implied threat here is that Agamemnon can be – and should have been – overthrown. This show of mutinous defiance does not go unnoticed by Agamemnon, who clearly interprets the challenge as an attempt on Achilles' part to aspire to all the privileges he holds as king:

> *ἀλλ' ὅδ' ἀνὴρ ἐθέλει περὶ πάντων ἔμμεναι ἄλλων,*
> *πάντων μὲν κρατέειν ἐθέλει, πάντεσσι δ' ἀνάσσειν,*
> *πᾶσι δὲ σημαίνειν, ἅ τιν' οὐ πείσεσθαι ὀΐω·* (*Il.* 1.287-89)

But this man wants to be above all others, he wants to hold sway and to rule over all, and

---

[27] I understand the verb *ἀναστήσειεν* in the sense of "rouse to action" (LSJ, s.v. *ἀνίστημι*, II.). Achilles is rallying his fellow Achaeans to join him in his assault against Agamemnon. Alternatively, Latacz et al. 2000 ad *Il.* 1.191, believes that the people are meant prevent Achilles from killing Agamemnon, and thus interprets the verb as "to chase away."

[28] See Allan and Cairns 2011's excellent discussion of this passage.

to bear command over all, although there is someone, I think, who will not obey.

Because Achilles is guilty of challenging Agamemnon's authority and of inciting dissention among the ranks of the Achaean army, Achilles' role is pushed further along the spectrum of political dissidence from mere vocal dissenter to a treasonous insurgent, like an actual murderer.

This, then, is why Agamemnon has *μῆνις*: From his own perspective, he is the victim of a virtual homicide that threatens to disturb the communal order of the Achaean army. It does not necessarily matter that no actual murder took place, as we saw in the case of Phoenix in the last chapter. Since Achilles' hostile confrontation with Agamemnon bears so many resemblances to other cases of homicide, it is possible to conceptualize this occasion as a homicidal event as well. Thus as the murderous assailant, Achilles carries primary responsibility for the disastrous results of their encounter and must answer for his actions. His conduct is accordingly the one that becomes subject to the intense scrutiny of the Achaean army. And by ultimately withdrawing from the army after the regicidal attempt, Achilles in effect becomes a fugitive murderer.

One major setback to this correlation is the fact that Achilles expresses his intent to defect before his insurgent activities became subject to criticism – and even before Agamemnon officially proposes to take Briseis from him:

> *νῦν δ᾽ εἶμι Φθίην δ᾽, ἐπεὶ ἦ πολὺ φέρτερόν ἐστιν*
> *οἴκαδ᾽ ἴμεν σὺν νηυσὶ κορωνίσιν, οὐδέ σ᾽ ὀΐω*
> *ἐνθάδ᾽ ἄτιμος ἐὼν ἄφενος καὶ πλοῦτον ἀφύξειν.* (*Il.* 1.169-71)
>
> Now I will go to Phthia, since it is far better to return home with my beaked ships, nor do I intend, while being without honor here, to heap up riches and wealth for you.

Achilles' flight is thus not a matter of dealing with the consequences of his own mutinous activity, but is in itself a continuing form of defiance, parallel in aim to the regicidal attempt.[29]

---

[29] Interestingly enough, Walter Benjamin (1986 [1927]) similarly classified such actions that are not overtly physically violent (e.g. a hunger strike) as a form of violence for the symbolic damage they do to a sovereign power or establishment.

For this reason, Achilles would not have considered himself a fugitive murderer.

The presentation of the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles thus presents two divergent narrative perspectives. As their exchange and the immediate results of the quarrel show, both heroes believe they are the injured party, and so part of their quarrel involves a fundamental disagreement about who is the cause of, and hence at fault for, the conflict in the first place. A new way, then, to frame the issue is: Is Achilles a fugitive murderer or is he not? This is the question the scene of the quarrel in Book 1 leaves us with, but the *Iliad* will continue to bring it up and repeatedly conceptualize and treat Achilles as a fugitive murderer, even though technically he is not one.

3.2 The Embassy: Competing Visions of Compensation

That Achilles' behavior towards Agamemnon was recognized as characteristic of a fugitive murderer becomes clearest during the embassy scene in *Iliad* 9. Though the three members of the embassy, Odysseus, Achilles, and Ajax all attempt to recompense Achilles on behalf of Agamemnon, they inadvertently reignite Achilles' anger and prolong the crisis they are seeking to resolve. Why Achilles ultimately becomes angry again and refuses the compensation being offered is subject to much debate in Homeric criticism,[30] but I suggest that part of the answer lies in how the ambassadors treat the withdrawn hero throughout the exchange. They treat him, as I will demonstrate in this section, as if he were a fugitive, which Achilles makes clear when, following the speeches of the embassy, he indignantly declares:

> *ἀλλά μοι οἰδάνεται κραδίη χόλῳ ὁππότε κείνων*
> *μνήσομαι ὥς μ᾽ ἀσύφηλον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔρεξεν*

[30] For extensive bibliographic review on this issue, see Wilson 2002: 3-4.

> *Ἀτρεΐδης ὡς εἴ τιν᾽ ἀτίμητον μετανάστην.* (*Il.* 9.646-68)[31]
>
> But my heart swells with anger when I remember this, how the son of Atreus has worked an indignity on me among the Argives, as if I were some dishonored migrant (*metanastên)*.

As Maureen Alden has pointed out, "the *metanast* is usually a *metanast* because he has messed up at home,"[32] such as a fugitive murderer. Achilles clearly does not agree with this assessment of his own status, and it is his resentment at this continuing attitude shown towards him that causes him to refuse Agamemnon's compensation. To demonstrate how this attitude is manifest throughout the speeches of the embassy, I will proceed to discuss the different approaches taken by each of the speakers as he takes the stage, and then return at the end to consolidate the collective approach of the embassy. Generally speaking, all three cast, or inadvertently signal the miscasting, of Achilles as a fugitive-murderer type.

Odysseus is the first the speaker to step forward, and officially presents the terms of Agamemnon's compensation (*Il.* 9.260-306). The offer is overwhelming and more than sufficient to redress the wrong done to Achilles, at least in the opinion of Nestor (*Il.* 9.163-64). Yet Achilles immediately rejects it. Modern analyses of Agamemnon's catalogue of gifts suggest that the offer fails because it is *too* generous; it amounts to a kind of "gift-attack,"[33] which "aggrandizes the king while belittling or subjugating Achilles."[34] But the insult may very well run deeper than that. In her monumental study of the compensation theme in the *Iliad*, Donna Wilson observed two types of exchanges that occur in the event of an injury and loss.[35] These exchanges are signaled by the words *ἄποινα*, "ransom," and *ποινή*, "reparation or revenge,"

---

[31] *Il.* 9.648 = 16.59.

[32] Alden 2012: 125.

[33] Donlan 1993.

[34] Sammons 2008: 366. Redfield (1975: 15-16, 105) has similarly understood Agamemnon's act of recompense as a (re)assertion of his authority over Achilles.

[35] Wilson 2002. See pages 71-108 for her discussion of the embassy in particular.

which entail very different processes. In exchanges of the *apoina*-type, the injured party recompenses the offender to secure what was lost. This transaction occurs between an individual and someone outside his social unit. Exchanges of the *poinē*-type, on the other hand, occur among *φίλοι*, and involve the offender recompensing the injured party to restore an equilibrium disrupted by his original offense. Agamemnon notably offers *ἄποινα* to Achilles (*Il.* 9.120), thereby signaling a wholesale denial of any wrongdoing on his own part. Apparently aware of the potential repercussions of that characterization, Odysseus changes *ἄποινα* to *ἄξια δῶρα*, "worthy gifts" (*Il.* 9.261) in his official presentation to Achilles. But Achilles in turn proves equally cognizant and perceptively declares:

> *ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κεῖνος ὁμῶς Ἀίδαο πύλῃσιν*
> *ὅς χ' ἕτερον μὲν κεύθῃ ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἄλλον δὲ εἴπῃ.* (*Il.* 9.312-13)
>
> For hateful to me as the gates of Hades is that man who hides one thing in his mind and says another.

Despite the lavishness of the gifts, Achilles recognizes that to accept to the offer would be to accept all liability for the quarrel.[36] This is something Achilles cannot abide, since it would continue to maintain his pointed exclusion from the honor and respect due to him.

The second speaker in the embassy, Phoenix, attempts to approach Achilles from a place of sympathy and familiarity, but ultimately commits the same mistake as Odysseus in that he also implicitly alleges that Achilles is at fault for the situation they are in. Here the identification of Achilles as a fugitive murderer becomes most apparent. Phoenix begins his appeal to the withdrawn hero by reminding him of his own status as a fugitive murderer, which is in fact the basis for his formative relationship with Achilles. In the process of relating his background, then,

---

[36] And even if he did not recognize that Agamemnon was offering him *ἄποινα* then, Achilles certainly does so later when Agamemnon explicitly urges him to accept his ransom (*Il.* 19.138).

numerous similarities between the two begin to emerge.[37] I have already mentioned some of these at the end of Chapter 2, but it will be useful to reiterate them now, and I will add further significant parallels that have been observed by others.

As I mentioned earlier, the similarities between Achilles' experiences and the events narrated in Phoenix' story suggest that the conflict between Phoenix and Amyntor may be likened to that between Achilles and Agamemnon.[38] Like Phoenix, Achilles is involved in a quarrel[39] over a woman,[40] which provokes his anger[41] and an instinct to kill.[42] And just as in Phoenix' case, a god, Athena, intervenes and prevents the murder.[43] This event is enough to initiate a self-withdrawal, on Achilles' part, that is comparable to Phoenix' solitary confinement and exile.[44] Their respective periods of isolation both ultimately prompt supplications to be made to the withdrawn hero.[45]

The effect and persuasive function of these parallels have been interpreted in various ways. They are generally viewed as a *captatio benevolentiae*, which aims to establish emotional ties between the speaker and listener and thereby grants Phoenix the credentials, so to speak, to

---

[37] A few maintain, however, that Achilles and Phoenix are not comparable (e.g. Bannert 1981: 72), or the similarities not persuasive (e.g. Apthorp 1980: 98).

[38] Rosner 1976: 315-17; Scodel 1982: 131; Schein 1984: 111; Brenk 1986: 84; Lowenstam 1993: 93-94.

[39] Rosner 1976: 316; Schein 1984: 111; Brenk 1986: 84; Alden 2000: 215; Perry 2010: 55; Alden 2012: 124.

[40] Rosner 1976: 316; Scodel 1982: 131; Schein 1984: 111; Lowenstam 1993: 34; Stanley 1993: 115; Griffin 1995 ad *Il.* 9.447ff.; Gwara 2007: 308; Perry 2010: 59; Alden 2012: 124.

[41] Rosner 1976: 317; Scodel 1982: 131 (she also correlates their anger with that of Meleager); Lowenstam 1993: 93; Gwara 2007: 308.

[42] Ebel 1972: 87; Rosner 1976: 317; Scodel 1982: 130; Heubeck 1984: 134-35; Schein 1984: 111; Brenk 1986: 84; Lowenstam 1993: 93; Alden 2000: 221-22; Gwara 2007: 308; Perry 2010: 60.

[43] Ebel 1972: 87; Rosner 1976: 317; Schein 1984: 112; Lowenstam 1993: 93; Alden 2000: 221; Gwara 2007: 308.

[44] Achilles' withdrawal is correlated with Phoenix' situation in two separate ways. It is likened either to Phoenix' virtual imprisonment (Ebel 1972: 86; Rosner 1976: 317; Perry 2010: 59) or to his self-imposed exile following the imprisonment (Rosner 1976: 316; Schein 1984: 112; Arieti 1986: 2-3; Lowenstam 1993: 93; Gwara 2007: 308).

[45] Ebel 1972: 86; Scodel 1982: 131 (she also correlates the supplications with those made to Meleager); Lowenstam 1993: 93; Gwara 2007: 309.

appeal to Achilles.[46] By this view, Phoenix' autobiographical narrative merely lays the groundwork for the other 'more important' speech components, such as the allegory of the Prayers (*Λιταί*) and the Meleager myth.[47] But the extent of parallels that we have just seen suggests that Phoenix' autobiography is also an integral part of his overall strategy of drawing Achilles back into the Achaean fold, and even operates in tandem with the other two components of the speech.[48]

I suggest that while Phoenix' discussion of *Λιταί* and Meleager work as allegory and paradigm respectively,[49] his autobiography serves as an analogy. This function of Phoenix' autobiography has already been demonstrated considerably by Judith Rosner, although her line of analysis has fallen somewhat out of favor as of late.[50] In light of all the parallels summarized above, Rosner observed a series of character correspondences between Phoenix' backstory and Achilles' current situation. The most obvious correspondence, which we have already well established, is that between Phoenix and Achilles, who both share the same role of a fugitive murderer. Other character equivalences, however, are more flexible. For example, though Rosner linked the concubine in Phoenix' story to Briseis, an opinion followed by most scholars,[51] Scott Gwara interestingly has connected the concubine to Chryseis instead.[52] If we consider these correspondences as operative simultaneously, then there is an intriguing reduplication of the

---

[46] Wiesmann 1948; Lesky 1952: 40; Boskos 1974: 11; Scodel 1982: 130; Hainsworth 1993: 119; Griffin 1995 ad *Il.* 9.447ff.; Wilson 1996 ad *Il.* 9.488-91; Alden 2000: 215.

[47] There is a general tendency to examine Phoenix' speech in a way that ignores the argumentative function of Phoenix' autobiography, e.g. Hainsworth 1993 ad *Il.* 9.447-77: "The narrative of Phoinix's story is rather inconsequential." Others who similarly disregard the value of Phoenix' homicidal background include Kakridis 1949: 11-42; Eichholz 1953; Tsagarakis 1971; Yamagata 1991.

[48] Scodel 1982, Yamagata 1991: 6, and Alden 2000, for instance, have all effectively demonstrated a link to the Meleager myth Phoenix narrates.

[49] For extensive bibliographic review of the scholarship on the *Λιταί* and Meleager, see Alden 2000: 179-290.

[50] Rosner 1976.

[51] Rosner 1976: 316; Schein 1984: 111; Alden 2000: 220.

[52] Gwara 2007: 308. I do not agree with his assessment that this is the *only* possible correspondence. The concubine-Briseis connection can work at the same time as the concubine-Chryseis connection.

situation I discussed in the previous section about two women, Chryseis and Briseis, being concurrent concerns in the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles. The specific female figure to whom Phoenix' concubine corresponds is perhaps meant to be deliberately ambiguous, in which case there is a parallel to Agamemnon's general strategy of implying shared responsibility for the quarrel, and even of locating more blame on Achilles.[53] More significantly, Rosner noted that Agamemnon could simultaneously be correlated with both Amyntor and Peleus in Phoenix' story, thereby presenting two distinct paternal models: the hostile kind (Amyntor and Agamemnon in the heat of the quarrel) and the supportive kind (Peleus and Agamemnon as he is being represented in the embassy).[54] This is, I believe, an ingenious move, since it effectively recasts Agamemnon as a Peleus, a bestower of gifts and potential host lord that can harbor the fugitive Achilles has become. The net effect of these fluid correspondences is that Phoenix' backstory ultimately serves as a model for what he wants Achilles to do: to reintegrate, as it were, and accept Agamemnon's offer and hospitality, just as Phoenix himself did by accepting the gifts of his benefactor Peleus.

Alternatively, Timothy Perry views Phoenix' homicide narrative as a negative exemplum,[55] designed to dissuade Achilles from leaving for Phthia, for if he does so, then he will become an exile like Phoenix. I, however, view Achilles as an exile already, whose task is to relocate. Phthia is one potential site of relocation, which Achilles presently intends to pursue, but Phoenix attempts to entice Achilles with another option, wherein he is to be (re)absorbed into Agamemnon's retinue. This alternative would be in keeping with the general fate of Iliadic

---

[53] On this general strategy, see Rosner 1976: 816; Scodel 1982: 131; Gwara 2007: 310.

[54] Schol. bT ad *Il.* 9.449 interestingly suggests an analogy between Achilles and Peleus instead, where Phoenix is asking Achilles to forgive Agamemnon for taking his woman, just as Peleus forgave Phoenix for his past transgressions: *<ὅς μοι παλλακίδος πέρι χώσατο:> οἰκείως ταῦτα πρὸς τὸν ἕνεκα τῆς Βρισηΐδος χαλεπαίνοντα, ὅτι συγγνωστέος ἁμαρτήσας περὶ κόρην Ἀγαμέμνων, εἴ γε καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτὼν συγγνώμης ἠξίωται παρὰ Πηλέως.*

[55] As does Scodel 1982, to a certain extent.

fugitive murderers, who all achieve relocation by becoming dependents of powerful lords in their new communities. Phoenix' biography thus suggests, by analogy, that Agamemnon is extending an offer of a quasi-paternal relationship,[56] such as the one Phoenix received from Peleus, which can effectively rehabilitate Achilles' status and resolve his experience as a fugitive without ties to a community (i.e. the Achaean army).

Two objections have been raised against this kind of scheme. First, Ruth Scodel finds it "too complicated."[57] She specifically takes issue with Agamemnon being split into two figures. There are, however, good parallels for equivalences of character-types being adjustable elsewhere in Homeric poetry,[58] so exclusivity in the identification of correspondences is unnecessary. The second objection that has been raised similarly betrays overly reductive tendencies: Scott Gwara emphasizes that Agamemnon is not actually Achilles' father, and so their relationship cannot be considered parallel to that of Phoenix and Amyntor.[59] The conflict between the latter two, however, is not solely a matter of a father-son dispute. Amyntor is a king, and if we recall, as I discussed in Chapter 2, the political potential of their dispute, the parallels to Achilles and Agamemnon become all the stronger. Rosner's scheme can then be slightly revised so that Agamemnon's transformation from an Amyntor-type into a Peleus-type reflects not only two kinds of paternal figures, but also two kinds of kings and the relationships they hold with their subjects.

So why is Phoenix' recommendation ultimately unimpressive to Achilles, when Phoenix has effectively proven through his own figure that the kind of arrangement he received – the kind

---

[56] Agamemnon in fact offers to make Achilles his son-in-law and to honor him like his own son Orestes (*Il*. 9.142, 284). On the role of Agamemnon as Achilles' 'third father,' see Avery 1998.

[57] Scodel 1982: 132.

[58] The Oresteia myth in the *Odyssey*, for instance, regularly encourages multiple character correspondences simultaneously, so that Odysseus can look, at one time, to be an Agamemnon, but look, at another time, to be an Orestes. See further discussion in Chapter 4.

[59] Gwara 2007: 309-10.

of arrangement Agamemnon is offering – is acceptable and even honorable? As I suggested earlier, it is because Phoenix signals an underlying assumption that Achilles is the criminal. His proposal only works if Achilles is perceived as a fugitive murderer attempting to reintegrate elsewhere. What is more, the terms of the resettlement emphatically place Achilles in a subordinate position as a dependent and 'son' of Agamemnon. And though Achilles has become estranged from the Achaean army, he will not stoop to accept an offer that only superficially improves his position while technically reaffirming his inferiority to Agamemnon.[60] By approaching Achilles as the desperate figure that fugitive murderers are when they are still on the run, then, Phoenix ultimately sets himself up for failure from the very outset of his speech.

In the wake of all these failures in persuasion, the final speaker, Ajax, steps forward and admits immediate defeat in the embassy's task. Nonetheless, he makes one last attempt to convince Achilles of the reasonability of Agamemnon's offer in terms that tellingly relate Achilles' situation, once again, to a case of homicide:

> *καὶ μέν τίς τε κασιγνήτοιο φονῆος*
> *ποινὴν ἢ οὗ παιδὸς ἐδέξατο τεθνηῶτος·*
> *καί ῥ' ὃ μὲν ἐν δήμῳ μένει αὐτοῦ πόλλ' ἀποτίσας,*
> *τοῦ δέ τ' ἐρητύεται κραδίη καὶ θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ*
> *ποινὴν δεξαμένῳ·* (*Il.* 9.632-36)
>
> Even a man whose brother or son has been killed accepts compensation from the murderer,[61] and the murderer remains in his own land upon paying the price, while the kinsman's heart and proud spirit are restrained by the acceptance of compensation.

Ajax' example here is designed to make Achilles question his own judgment about Agamemnon's offer. Worse crimes than the one Agamemnon has committed have effectively been resolved through compensation, which allows for the inclusion of both the offending and the injured party within a community. By this same analogy, however, Ajax inadvertently

[60] Interestingly enough, Hammer 1997a similarly sees Achilles in the role of a vagabond who will not beg.

[61] Van Thiel 1996 alternatively reads *φόνοιο*, in which case the passage reads as the man accepting compensation "for the murder of his brother."

exposes the fundamental flaw in the entire embassy's approach to Achilles, rendering Agamemnon's offer unacceptable. The key word in Ajax' speech exposing that flaw is *ποινήν* (*Il*. 9.633, 636), which, as was discussed earlier, is a form of compensation among *philoi* where an offender offers compensation to the injured party. This is the only occasion in which this word is used in reference to Agamemnon's offer, and not even directly – the application of *ποινή* to Agamemnn's gifts is slightly removed since it is presented within the analogy of homicide. By bringing up this example, then, Ajax technically casts Achilles as the victim who has suffered an immense loss, and Agamemnon in the subordinate position of an offender offering compensation. This is what the embassy should have offered Achilles all along.[62] But as we have seen throughout this section, they repeatedly do exactly the opposite, offering *ἄποινα* instead and approaching Achilles as if he were the perpetrator. The embassy has thus offered Achilles the wrong sort of redress.

This is why, I suggest, Achilles indignantly exclaims that he is being treated like a "dishonored migrant" (*ἀτίμητος μετανάστης*). It is because the embassy has only allowed him the voice of a migrant – of a fugitive murderer that Agamemnon perceives him to be. But the means by which a fugitive murderer normally resolves his situation (i.e. through relocation under the protection of another host lord) has no efficacy for Achilles, since he does not see himself in this way. The offer presented by the embassy therefore marks Achilles' continued conceptualization as a fugitive and hence his continued alienation from his due rights and position in the Achaean army. Achilles' rejection of Agamemnon points out that injustice, and accordingly signals his unconditional refusal to accept the coercive structures that Agamemnon wishes to impose on him.

---

[62] Wilson 2002: 106 alternatively views his mistake as the same one that Odysseus and Phoenix commit: all three ignore the preexisting hostility between Achilles and Agamemnon.

3.3 PRIAM'S RANSOM: THE MURDERER TRANSFORMED

The quarrel finally reaches a conclusion at the beginning of *Iliad* 19, as Achilles publicly announces the end of his wrath. In the aftermath of Patroclus' death, Achilles has little interest in securing the proper compensation due to him (*ποινή*) from Agamemnon, although he is also careful not to accept the *ἄποινα* (*Il.* 9.138) that the king reoffers to him. But while the hostilities between the two may have ceased, Achilles' estrangement from the Achaean army has not. Achilles finds little solace in the resumption of his place within the Achaean army without Patroclus, nor does his anguish appear to abate when he slays Hector. The first stirrings of Achilles' reintegration only become apparent at *Iliad* 23, where a few scholars have identified Patroclus' funeral games as the specific occasion in which Achilles is fully reincorporated into the army.[63] His reemergence from isolation is largely anticipated by the visit of Patroclus' shade, who pleads for Achilles to give him a proper burial. Significantly, Patroclus makes his plea on the basis of his own background as a fugitive murderer:

> *μὴ ἐμὰ σῶν ἀπάνευθε τιθήμεναι ὀστέ', Ἀχιλλεῦ,*
> *ἀλλ' ὁμοῦ, ὡς τράφομέν περ ἐν ὑμετέροισι δόμοισιν,*
> *εὖτέ με τυτθὸν ἐόντα Μενοίτιος ἐξ Ὀπόεντος*
> *ἤγαγεν ὑμέτερόνδ' ἀνδροκτασίης ὕπο λυγρῆς,*
> *ἤματι τῷ ὅτε παῖδα κατέκτανον Ἀμφιδάμαντος,*
> *νήπιος, οὐκ ἐθέλων ἀμφ' ἀστραγάλοισι χολωθείς·*
> *ἔνθα με δεξάμενος ἐν δώμασιν ἱππότα Πηλεὺς*
> *ἔτραφέ τ' ἐνδυκέως καὶ σὸν θεράποντ' ὀνόμηνεν·*
> *ὣς δὲ καὶ ὀστέα νῶιν ὁμὴ σορὸς ἀμφικαλύπτοι*
> *χρύσεος ἀμφιφορεύς, τόν τοι πόρε πότνια μήτηρ.* (*Il.* 23.83-92)

> Do not lay my bones apart from yours, Achilles, but lay them together, just as we were reared in your house, when Menoitius brought me, still little, from Opoeis to your home

[63] Collins 1988: 102 identifies the games as such since they afford Achilles the opportunity to act as pan-Achaean chief, while Lowenstam 1993: 120 believes it is because the games allow Achilles to practice reciprocity again. Donlan 1993: 170 has further pinpointed *Il.* 23.890-91 as the exact moment of Achilles' full return.

> because of baneful manslaughter, on the day when I killed the son of Amphidamas, fool that I was, unwilling, angered over knuckle-bones. And having received me in his home, horseman Peleus reared me sweetly and named me your attendant. So too let one urn cover our bones, a golden urn with two handles, which your queenly mother gave to you.

As Nicholas Richardson has pointed, the opening and closing verses of the plea form a ring composition around the homicide narrative.[64] By foregrounding his status as a fugitive murderer, Patroclus highlights the twin experiences of exile and reintegration he has previously undergone, and relates them to his current experiences of death and hoped-for burial.[65] He, in effect, asks Achilles to receive his body just as Peleus had before him. This instance of the fugitive-murderer pattern is the first occasion in which Achilles is conceptualized as a host – the opposite of the fugitive-murderer image that has been imposed on him up until then. Patroclus' manner of approach marks a significant turning point in the *Iliad*, catalyzing the reemergence, so to speak, of Achilles through the funeral games.

While Patroclus' speech goes a long way toward inducing Achilles to change his conduct and to return to his place within the Achaean army, it is clear in the opening scene of *Iliad* 24, following the conclusion to the games, that all is still not quite right. Achilles weeps as he remembers his fallen companion and cannot sleep.[66] He still has found no real resolution to his alienation and private anguish, and will not find one until his famed encounter with Priam. Now the final fugitive murderer – the one all previous fugitive murderers appear to have been looking forward to[67] – makes his appearance in one of the most memorable scenes of the *Iliad*.[68] This is

---

[64] Richardson 1993 ad *Il.* 23.69-92. Verbal parallels reinforcing the ring composition include: *ὀστέ'* (23.83) ~ *ὀστέα* (23.91); *τράφομέν* (23.84) ~ *ἔτραφέ* (23.90); *ὁμοῦ* (23.84) ~ *ὁμή* (23.91).

[65] Perry 2010: 73-103 has a similar interpretation of this passage, and sees Patroclus relating his exile narrative in order to justify his burial. Patroclus wants Achilles to replicate in death the companionship they enjoyed in life. I do not, however, agree with Perry's view that Patroclus is leveraging his self-presentation as an exiled killer to better reach, on an emotional level, a forgetful and uncaring Achilles.

[66] See Wilson 2002: 109-26 for a full review of how Achilles remains excluded from the normal rhythms of the Achaean community.

[67] As Schlunk 1976: 200 notes, the fugitive murderers intensify in frequency from Book 9 to the conclusion.

the moment, I suggest, that marks the full and final rehabilitation of Achilles' character in the *Iliad*.

As Priam approaches Achilles to offer ransom for his son Hector's corpse, his entrance is evocatively compared to that of a murderer:

> *ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἄνδρ' ἄτη πυκινὴ λάβῃ, ὅς τ' ἐνὶ πάτρῃ*
> *φῶτα κατακτείνας ἄλλων ἐξίκετο δῆμον,*
> *ἀνδρὸς ἐς ἀφνειοῦ, θάμβος δ' ἔχει εἰσορόωντας,*
> *ὣς Ἀχιλεὺς θάμβησεν ἰδὼν Πρίαμον θεοειδέα.* (*Il.* 24.480-84)
>
> And just as when close blindness seizes a man, who because he killed a man in his native land, comes to the deme of others, to the house of a rich man, and marvel holds those who look upon him, so Achilles marveled at the sight of god-like Priam.

What is remarkable about this simile likening Priam to this figure is that it operates as a "reverse simile." The relationship between the tenor and vehicle ultimately proves to be exactly the opposite of what is suggested in the comparison, effectively reversing the actual situation. Multiple conspicuous reversals created by the simile here have already been well documented,[69] and they include the following: the fugitive comes to a foreign land although Priam is in his native Troy; the fugitive enters a supposedly hospitable environment while Priam enters a clearly hostile one; the fugitive approaches a rich man to seek his support although Priam himself is the rich man offering his wealth;[70] wonder results from the entrance of a fugitive murderer although, in reality, incredulity arises from the fact that Priam supplicates his son's slayer.[71] Achilles is the one whose murderous actions are at issue, not Priam, for he is not guilty of manslaughter.

The fugitive murderer's application in this final book of the *Iliad* is a meaningful one that

---

[68] As Richardson 1993 ad *Il.* 24.480-84 says: "This must be the most dramatic moment in the whole of the *Iliad*, and its character is marked by a simile which is extremely individual."

[69] For discussions of "reverse similes" and reversals specific to the simile of the fugitive homicide, see Moulton 1977: 128-34; MacLeod 1982 ad *Il.* 24.480-84; Nannini 2003: 93-120, esp. 101-08; Beck 2005: 136-38; Morrison 2005: 79.

[70] Cf. *Il.* 24.398; 543-6.

[71] Cf. *Il.* 24.519-21. This contrast is pointedly highlighted by Priam's kissing of Achilles' "manslaying hands" just before the simile (*κύσε χεῖρας/ δεινὰς ἀνδροφόνους, αἵ οἱ πολέας κτάνον υἷας*, *Il.* 24.478-79).

recalls previous scenes and episodes I have discussed, specifically the events leading up to and including the opening quarrel, the embassy, the visit of Patroclus' shade, and all the other fugitive murderers that populate the epic. The simile conjures up reminders of all these elements to draw upon them as interpretive guides and to signal key developments and transformations that have since occurred, helping to resolve the private struggles and discontent Achilles dealt with following those prior events.

As has been well established, Priam's tearful supplication of Achilles for Hector's body clearly recalls the opening scene of supplication by another father figure for his child – Chryses' supplication to Agamemnon in *Iliad* 1.[72] Like Chryses, Priam offers *ἄποινα* to Achilles for his son's body (*Il.* 24.501-02), which Achilles ultimately accepts (*Il.* 24.560-61). The success of this exchange thus rights the injustice of Chryses' own failed supplication. In addition, the nature of the exchange Priam asks for responds to another occasion in which *ἄποινα* was offered but rejected, specifically in the embassy to Achilles in *Iliad* 9. The parallels and contrasts between these two scenes highlights additional reversals activated by the simile of the fugitive homicide. Both Priam and Agamemnon attempt to transact the same kind of exchange that implies they are the injured party while Achiles is the offending one. But as Claude Brügger has pointed out, Priam's personal approach to Achilles is in sharp contrast to that of Agamemnon, who sent the embassy to represent his own interests.[73] In the case of the embassy, the wrong sort of compensation is offered (*ἄποινα* instead of *ποινή*), a mistake exacerbated by the fact that they approach Achilles in the wrong manner as well, treating him as if he were a fugitive murderer. But now in the case of Priam's supplication, Priam makes his approach as the fugitive murderer himself, offering *ἄποινα*, which is also the proper form of exchange to be requested here. This

[72] Sheppard 1922: 208; Whitman 1965: 259-61; Owen 1966: 242-44; Jackson Knight 1968: 150-52; Schlunk 1976: 201.

[73] Brügger 2017 ad *Il.* 24. 477-51.

supplication scene therefore not only rights the wrong committed with the rejection of Chryses' supplication, leading to Achilles' quasi-exile; by casting him in the role of the host it also rights the wrong committed when Achilles was mistreated as a fugitive murderer. Indeed following his acceptance of Priam's request, Achilles fulfills his duties as host and is thereby reawakened to the normal social life of the Achaean community, reparticipating in the activities of eating (*Il.* 24.509-27) and sleeping (*Il.* 24.673-76). The reversal of roles that the simile of the fugitive homicide initiates thus helps to restore the disequilibrium Achilles has experienced throughout the *Iliad* until this final scene of supplication. Achilles' transformation is a marker of his character's vindication and rehabilitation.

By transitioning from the role of a fugitive murderer into that of a host, Achilles also, in Robin Schlunk's words, "fulfills the legacy of his father by uplifting the suppliant before him."[74] Peleus, as the *Iliad* repeatedly highlights, is the quintessential host of fugitive murderers, taking in nearly half of those that appear in the *Iliad.* Priam appears to be well aware of this bit of family history, as he tellingly begins his speech to Achilles by asking him to remember his father in this moment of supplication (*μνῆσαι πατρὸς σοῖο*, *Il.* 24.486).[75] But the recall of Peleus here also, as Bruce Heiden has shown, draws upon an additional aspect of Peleus' background, which is not expressed in Homeric poetry.[76] Peleus himself was, according to tradition, formerly a fugitive murderer (twice).[77] His figure therefore offers a precedent for Achilles' transformation from the fugitive he was initially treated as into the host-figure he has become in front of Priam. By extension, Achilles is upgraded from the status of a son (as Agamemnon and Phoenix

---

[74] Schlunk 1976: 206.

[75] On father-son relationships in the *Iliad*, see Mills 2000 and Felson 2002.

[76] Heiden 1998.

[77] On Peleus' history as a fugitive murderer, see note 120 in Chapter 2.

repeatedly attempted to make him out to be) into a father figure himself, which is the ultimate show of recognition due to him and his authority.

As we have seen, elements of the fugitive-murderer pattern are carefully interwoven into the very core of the *Iliad* plot revolving around Achilles' anger, withdrawal, and return. By the end of the epic, especially when the simile of the fugitive homicide in *Iliad* 24 occurs, the fugitive-murderer pattern effectively facilitates a transformative process. The same pattern that narrates the exile of a figure and that was superimposed onto Achilles' narrative of anger and withdrawal simultaneously provides the conceptual means for Achilles to return and to be reintegrated into the Achaean army. By encoding so many thematic and mythic associations that both encapsulate and transcend the immediate narrative of the *Iliad*, the various fugitive murderers of the epic serve as effective gauges for the development and progress of Achilles.

Chapter 4. ODYSSEUS: FROM FUGITIVE MURDERER TO MURDEROUS FOUNDER

In the previous chapter, I showed how the various fugitive murderers in the *Iliad* help to shape, on a conceptual level, the terms of Achilles' reintegration into the Achaean army, as well as the rehabilitation of his prestige by the epic's end. There the experience of the fugitive murderer was related to that of Achilles in such a way as to transition him from the status of excluded dissident (equated with a fugitive murder) to inclusive host. Now I turn to the issue of the Odyssean fugitive murderers and how they influence our understanding of the *Odyssey*.

As I argued in the case of the *Iliad*, I believe that we can better understand the *Odyssey*, particularly the *mnesterophonia*, by viewing it against the background of the fugitive-murderer pattern. Similar to what was observed in the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* ends with action that reverses audience expectations by asserting Odysseus' role as one of a fugitive on the brink of reintegration rather than as a murderer on the verge of exile. This reversal is one that plays out both on an immediate narrative level, confined to the plot as presented by the *Odyssey* that we have, and on an enlarged metapoetic level, which concerns other non-Homeric traditions that considered Odysseus as a typical exiled-killer-type. In order to demonstrate how the transformation of Odysseus' status is achieved on both levels, I will compare the general pattern of the fugitive murderer to the narrative arc of Odysseus' own homecoming while also considering "the external, non-Homeric framing" of the issue at hand.[1] The experiences of the fugitive murderer help to answer two critical questions that the *Odyssey* repeatedly raises: (1) how can Odysseus get away with the slaughter of the suitors? And (2) how can the *Odyssey* get away with Odysseus' slaughter of the suitors?

[1] Burgess 2014: 339.

Before I discuss how the fugitive-murderer pattern offers an answer to these two questions, it will be useful to review briefly the four different figures exemplifying the pattern in the *Odyssey.* The first fugitive murderer to emerge is Odysseus himself, who takes on the guise of a Cretan exile (*Od*. 13.256-86). Upon learning that he is back in Ithaca, the returned hero explains to Athena, also in disguise as a young shepherd boy, that he is a fugitive because he has killed Orsilochus, the dear son of Idomeneus. The next two figures to demonstrate the pattern appear in the forms of an unnamed Aetolian (*Od.* 14.380-83) and the seer Theoclymenus (*Od.* 15.223-25, 272-78). Both, like Odysseus, eventually arrive in Ithaca, and predict the imminent return of Odysseus to their respective hosts.[2] Finally, Odysseus again offers the last example of the fugitive murderer in the *Odyssey*, comparing the situation of a homicide who must go into exile to his own precarious situation after the slaughter of the suitors (*Od.* 23.118-20). Ithaca thus emerges as a popular transit hub for murderers,[3] who all help to shape the interpretation of Odysseus' return and violence against the suitors.

All four murder-and-flight narratives consistently intertwine with the primary narrative of Odysseus' homecoming in such a way that invites identification of Odysseus with the figure of the fugitive murderer. A correlation between the two is particularly encouraged by the very first and last example of the murder-and-flight pattern, where Odysseus self-identifies as a fugitive murderer: explicitly with his first Cretan lie and implicitly with his generalization about the outcome of homicide. In the case of his first Cretan lie, the details Odysseus provides about his

---

[2] The Aetolian predicts Odysseus' return at *Od.* 14.384-85, while Theoclymenus prophesies at *Od.* 15.525-38; 17.152-61; 20.351-57, 367-70. Odysseus is the most prolific source of his own homecoming: *Od.* 14.149-64, 321-33; 18.145-56, 384-86; 19. 300-07, 546-50, 555-58, 585-87; 20.230-34. Back in Lacedaemon, Helen also utters a remarkable prophecy about Odysseus at *Od.* 15.172-78. For a full list of prolepses of Odysseus' return or revenge, see de Jong 2001 ad *Od.* 2.143-207.

[3] That Ithaca regularly entertains many strangers is unsurprising, since it lay on the principal route taken by early proto-colonial explorers heading northward along the main coast and westward to Italy and Sicily. The location of Odysseus' landfall in Polis Bay seems to have been a significant port-of-call for these travelers as well. See Malkin 1998: 62-93 for a compelling discussion of Ithaca's historical background and maritime influence, and 94-119 for his argument on how this context bears on the proto-colonial outlook and dating (early to mid-9th c.) of the *Odyssey*.

murder of Orsilochus serve as a sort of rehearsal for the actual slaughter of the suitors.[4] As he explains to Athena, Cretan Odysseus killed Orsilochus in an ambush with the help of an accomplice (*λοχησάμενος σὺν ἑταίρῳ*, *Od.* 13.268). Odysseus will similarly carry out the slaughter of the suitors with the help of Telemachus, as well as Eumaeus and Philoetius. This assault, much like an ambush, catches the suitors off-guard and without any means to defend themselves.[5] Even the justificatory claims Odysseus' Cretan persona offers for killing Orsilochus resemble his own motivations for killing the suitors. The major stakes of their respective struggles both include wealth (Trojan spoils or resources of Ithaca) and power (leadership of Crete or of Ithaca).[6] Since the details of the fictitious murder and the slaughter of the suitors correspond so closely, the expectation seems to be that Odysseus will undergo exile for essentially the same crime that his Cretan counterpart committed. This expectation is pressed even more in Odysseus' comparative generalization about homicide. The difference in scale between the murder of one, which results in exile, and the murder of an entire generation of elite Ithacan men establishes an "*a fortiori* argument" for Odysseus to suffer a similar if not worse punishment.[7] Odysseus' lie and generalization thus reveal the hero to be highly attuned to the possibility that he will be banished permanently from his home, even though in the moments he expresses this self-awareness, Odysseus has already ceased from his wanderings and technically achieved his homecoming.

---

[4] Many of Odysseus' lying tales look like "thinly disguised allomorphs of Odysseus' real adventures" (de Jong 2001: 327). On the mixture of fact in Odysseus' fictions, see Trahman 1952: 38 and de Jong 2001 ad *Od.* 13.253-86.

[5] Although technically the suitors are able to acquire weapons at *Od.* 22.139-49, making the slaughter of the suitors an all the more triumphant feat. On the "ambush" quality of the *mnesterophonia,* Edwards 1985: 35-38; Nagler 1990: 341; Auffarth 1991: 516-23; Cook 1995:149-50.

[6] Sometimes the suitors' goals and interests seem to be oriented more towards sexual desire for Penelope, but marriage to her would also be tantamount to a claim to rule. On the different aspects of the suitors' aims, see Scodel 2001. Scodel views the competition as a "winner-take-all" game (312), with the payoff including a desirable woman, wealth, and power.

[7] De Jong 2001 ad *Od.* 22.118-22.

The unnamed Aetolian and Theoclymenus likewise set up a delicate balance between the antithetical themes of homecoming and exile with respect to Odysseus' story. As sources of news about Odysseus' return, the Aetolian and seer both play a very particular role, played otherwise only by Odysseus himself, in his guise as a beggar, throughout the second half of the *Odyssey*. All three correctly predict to the people of Ithaca the return of their rightful king, although their various interlocutors frequently react to the news with distrust or disbelief.[8] All three are also shunted from one host to another as each struggles to reintegrate into a community.[9] Just as the Aetolian briefly passes through Eumaeus' home, and Theoclymenus shuffles between Piraeus' and Telemachus' hospitality, so Odysseus, in his disguise as a beggar, passes through the hands of many intermediary hosts: Eumaeus, Penelope, and the suitors. Given these similarities, the Aetolian and Theoclymenus appear something like proleptic Odysseuses.[10] Each fugitive murderer's episode anticipates the real Odysseus' own actions and treatment in Ithaca, and so these persons in exile, figures emblematic of expulsion and frequent displacement, ironically become representatives of Odysseus' successful return.

Thus the situation of the fugitive murderer focalizes a significant portion of the *Odyssey*'s second half, and encourages us to view Odysseus' homecoming through the prism of the fugitive-murderer story pattern. The pattern is habitually associated with Odysseus in a way that

---

[8] Eumaeus calls the Aetolian a liar (*ἐξήπαφε μύθῳ*, *Od.* 14.379), and identifies him as the reason why the swineherd no longer cares to hear of news of Odysseus any more. Likewise, each of Theoclymenus' prophetic announcements is met either with lukewarm acceptance, as by Telemachus (*Od.* 15.536-38) and Penelope (*Od.* 17.163-35), or with much ridicule and resistance, as by the suitors (*Od.* 20.358-62). Odysseus' predictions are similarly received in these two ways by Eumaeus (*Od.* 14.166-67, 361-70), Eurymachus (*Od.* 387-96), Penelope (*Od.* 309-16, 650-69), and Philoetius (*Od.* 20.236-37). Notably, exactly the same language used for Telemachus' and Penelope's responses to Theoclymenus (*Od.* 15.536-38; 17.163-65) is used again for Penelope's response to Odysseus (*Od.* 19.309-11).

[9] See my earlier discussion of this issue in Chapter 1.

[10] The fugitive murderers might even be seen to serve as "anticipatory doublets," which familiarize the audience with a particular narrative pattern and prepare for a more elaborate iteration of that pattern. Theoclymenus, for example, has frequently been dubbed a doublet or "duplication" of Odysseus, most notably by Lord 1960: 170. I will return to the case of Theoclymenus in more detail at the end of the chapter. For examples, definitions, and functions of a doublet in Homeric poetry, see Fenik 1968; Kelly 2007 ("increasing doublets"); and most recently Sammons 2013.

sets him up to be an exiled killer, but, as I will now show in the following sections, ultimately renders him as exactly the inverse: a killer reintegrated into his original home community. These diametrically opposed trajectories of the fugitive-murderer pattern represent two distinct points of view presented in the *Odyssey*. From the point of view of the suitors and their relatives, the violence committed by Odysseus is one that demands his permanent removal from the Ithacan community. But from the point of view of the gods and Odysseus, the suitors themselves are guilty of the crime they condemn Odysseus for, while the slaughter of the suitors is instead a kind of violence conceptualized within a colonial framework, which allows and even validates Odysseus' permanent reinstatement as king of Ithaca. To demonstrate how this latter paradigm ultimately overruns the former, I will first examine the suitors' perspective and show how their expectations of Odysseus' fate betray a crucial miscalculation, on their part, of the violence committed by him. The violence of the *mnesterophonia* occurs not within the context of political insurrection, as homicide normally does in Homeric poetry, but as part of Odysseus' endeavor to re-found Ithaca. This colonial endeavor is authorized by the gods, especially Apollo who, as a god particularly involved in Greek colonization, occupies a special position in resituating Odysseus' homecoming within a colonial framework and legitimizing his rule of Ithaca. After showing how the suitors' expectations are ultimately frustrated by their own misconceptions of the violence, I will then address how the colonial and Apolline coloring of the slaughter of the suitors allows for the tension between Odysseus' tenuous homecoming and expected exile to be resolved. This resolution in turn, as I discuss in conclusion to the chapter, helps to resolve the second tension I mentioned earlier between the *Odyssey*, with its harmonious ending, and other mythological traditions, which frequently envisioned Odysseus as an exiled killer. We will soon see that Odysseus' very transformation from fugitive murderer to murderous founder, dramatized

throughout the second half of the *Odyssey*, also helps to mediate the sources, movements, and endpoints of the highly mobile Odysseus and his mythologically diverse story.

4.1 The Death of Antinous: Reversal of the Murder-and-Flight Pattern

For a starting point of comparison between Odysseus and the fugitive murderer from the suitors' perspective, let us skip directly to the moment our hero claims his first victim. In the opening act of the *mnesterophonia*, Odysseus shoots Antinous down, spurring the rest of the unsuspecting suitors into panicked action. Together they angrily characterize the shooter as a kind of murderer that typically goes into exile:

> "*ξεῖνε, κακῶς ἀνδρῶν τοξάζεαι· οὐκέτ' ἀέθλων*
> *ἄλλων ἀντιάσεις· νῦν τοι σῶς αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος.*
> *καὶ γὰρ δὴ νῦν* ***φῶτα κατέκτανες*** *ὃς μέγ' ἄριστος*
> *κούρων εἰν Ἰθάκῃ· τῷ σ' ἐνθάδε γῦπες ἔδονται.*"
> *ἴσκεν ἕκαστος ἀνήρ, ἐπεὶ ἦ φάσαν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα*
> ***ἄνδρα κατακτεῖναι****· τὸ δὲ νήπιοι οὐκ ἐνόησαν,*
> *ὡς δή σφιν καὶ πᾶσιν ὀλέθρου πείρατ' ἐφῆπτο.* (*Od.* 22.27-33)
>
> "Stranger, evilly do you shoot at men; no longer will you take part in other contests; now is your utter destruction certain. For indeed now you have killed a man, who was far the best of the youths in Ithaca; therefore vultures will devour you here." So would each man say, since they thought that he had killed the man unwillingly; but the fools did not know that already the cords of destruction had been made fast over them all.

The suitors' description of Odysseus' murderous act is reminiscent of the other man-slaying formulas discussed in the first chapter. Essentially the same information structure is presented in the typical Object-Verb word order, and with the killing verb *κατακτείνειν* in the aorist tense (*φῶτα κατέκτανες*, *Od.* 22.29). Antinous' designation as *φῶτα*, perhaps used here to emphasize his former illustrious status,[11] is then meaningfully expanded in a relative clause that highlights

[11] See my earlier discussion in Chapter 1.

his civic identity as an Ithacan (*κούρων εἰν Ἰθάκῃ*, *Od.* 22.30). The emphatic enjambment of the prepositional phrase calls attention to the overall formulation's resemblance to the *φῶτα κατακτείνας* formula (*Il.* 24.481; *Od.* 23.118),[12] which is also closely grouped with prepositional phrases initiated by *ἐνί* (*Il.* 24.480; *Od.* 23.118).

Much of this information structure is conveyed and packaged again only a few lines later in another emphatic enjambment: *ἄνδρα κατακτεῖναι* (*Od.* 22.32), which is a more explicit articulation of the primary man-slaying formula *ἄνδρα κατακτάς*. On this second occasion, the formulation of Antinous' murder is part of an indirect statement that elaborates how the suitors assumed the attack occurred: unintentionally (*φάσαν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα*, *Od.* 22.31). But as we have seen previously in the case of Patroclus, the only other explicitly involuntary killer in Homer, intent seems to have been considered an irrelevant determinant of liability.[13] In both speech and thought, the suitors clearly perceive Odysseus to be guilty of homicide, and will make him pay for it.

The suitors' portrayal of Antinous' death, with their repeated use of the *κατακτείνειν* verb, reveals a particular understanding on their part of the homicide as a socially fractious event: a political insurgency against the suitors. This kind of event, expressed by *ἄνδρα κατακτάς* and the other man-slaying formulas, as I discussed in the first chapter, encodes a highly compressed narrative complex of initial civil strife and subsequent displacement of the murderous insurgent.[14] Certainly the condition of civil strife, specifically one born from intra-elite competition, is applicable to our understanding of the eruption of violence here. Ithaca is a hostile elite environment, consumed by the suitors' struggle over the division of Odysseus'

---

[12] There is also a striking phonetic similarity in the particular sequence of sounds (*φῶτα κατ...κτ...ν...ς*).

[13] See my earlier discussion in Chapter 1.

[14] The suitors tellingly use *κατακτείνειν* once more in reference to Odysseus' slaughter of the entire group of suitors (*ἄμμε κατακτείνῃ*, *Od.* 22.73).

property and acquisition of kingship.[15] The suitors even locate the death of Antinous in the context of competition by stressing that Odysseus will no longer be able to participate in contests (*οὐκέτ' ἀέθλων/ ἄλλων ἀντιάσεις*, *Od.* 22.27-28). This judgment notably "stresses profit and loss, not moral considerations,"[16] and immediately rules on Odysseus' exclusion from their communal activities as punishment.

Exile, which we have previously seen is the default consequence of the kind of homicide the suitors describe, now appears imminent and inevitable for Odysseus. This particular outcome of Odysseus' crime is in fact suggested on multiple other occasions throughout the second half of the *Odyssey*. For example, as Odysseus plots the slaughter with Athena, he asks the goddess where he should escape and flee after he successfully kills the suitors (*εἴ περ γὰρ κτείναιμι Διός τε σέθεν τε ἕκητι,/ πῇ κεν ὑπεκπροφύγοιμι;*, *Od.* 20.42-43). And once the deed is done, Eupeithes, the father of the slain suitor Antinous, exhorts the other relatives of the suitors to pursue Odysseus, expressing an expectation that the Ithacan king will try to flee to Pylos or Elis (*ἀλλ' ἄγετε, πρὶν τοῦτον ἢ ἐς Πύλον ὦκα ἱκέσθαι/ ἢ καὶ ἐς Ἤλιδα δῖαν, ὅθι κρατέουσιν Ἐπειοί,/ ἴομεν·*, *Od.* 24.434-36). Exile is notably expected only of Odysseus, even though Telemachus, Eumaeus, and Philoetius all participated in the carnage as well. The choice to fault Odysseus alone is consistent with the general trend in the homicide-flight pattern of assigning responsibility for more widespread violence to a single individual, whose singular expulsion prevents further violence from intensifying and spreading beyond the situation that triggered it.[17]

As we have seen thus far, Odysseus has fulfilled nearly every criterion of the fugitive-murderer pattern. But, of course, he ultimately does not flee and thus fails to meet the most

---

[15] See note 6 above.

[16] Fernández-Galiano 1992 ad *Od*. 22.27.

[17] See my previous discussion of the phenomenon in Chapter 2.

crucial criterion of all. The suitors' evaluation of Odysseus is flawed in some way, and the flaw, I submit, is highlighted in the same passage with which I began my comparison between Odysseus and the fugitive murderer. Following the initial speech and thoughts of the suitors about the death of Antinous, the Homeric narrator's voice ominously intrudes, stating, "but the fools did not know" (*τὸ δὲ νήπιοι οὐκ ἐνόησαν*, *Od.* 22.32). They did not know "that already the cords of destruction had been made fast over them all" (*ὡς δή σφιν καὶ πᾶσιν ὀλέθρου πείρατ' ἐφῆπτο*, *Od.* 22.33), a sentiment that Odysseus himself repeats aloud shortly afterwards (*Od.* 22.41). The narrator's commentary points out that the suitors have somehow misrepresented the death of Antinous, and it will be their last mistake in a whole series of misrepresentations they consistently make about Odysseus' status and actions in the contest of the bow.[18]

The suitors' most obvious mistake is not realizing that Antinous' death was intentional, but Odysseus' comparative generalization about murder and exile illustrates another way in which the suitors have misrepresented the situation. In his comparison, Odysseus expresses a slightly different formulation of the suitors' deaths as a kind of correction to their own characterization of the homicide:

> *καὶ γάρ τίς θ'* ***ἕνα φῶτα κατακτείνας*** *ἐνὶ δήμῳ,*
> *ᾧ μὴ πολλοὶ ἔωσιν ἀοσσητῆρες ὀπίσσω,*
> *φεύγει πηούς τε προλιπὼν καὶ πατρίδα γαῖαν·*
> *ἡμεῖς δ'* ***ἕρμα πόλησς ἀπέκταμεν****, οἳ μέγ' ἄριστοι*
> *κούρων εἰν Ἰθάκῃ·* (*Od*. 23.118-22)
>
> For in fact one, because he has killed one man in his deme, even if the man does not have many helpers in the future, flees, leaving both his kinsmen and native homeland. But we killed the stay of the city, who are by far the best of youths in Ithaca.

As was discussed earlier, the comparison made here hinges on a difference in scale between the *τις*-murderer's murder of one, and Odysseus and his helpers' murder of many. But another

[18] De Jong (2001 ad *Od*. 22-26-32) rightly points out that the suitors mistakenly believe 'beggar' Odysseus to be drunk (*Od.* 21.287-310) and a thief (*Od.* 21.396-400) in the lead-up to their own slaughter. He is of course neither.

crucial difference emerges with the variation in the killing verb. Instead of redeploying the same verb performed by the *τις*-murderer in his comparison, *κατακτείνειν*, Odysseus uses a different but related verb in reference to his own actions, *ἀποκτείνειν*, which is never used of a homicide resulting in exile. Instead, it is generally used of killings that occur in battle.[19] The verbal alteration here also plays off the suitors' earlier accusatory remarks against Odysseus (*φῶτα κατέκτανες ὃς μέγ' ἄριστος/ κούρων εἰν Ἰθάκῃ*, *Od.* 22.29-30). Odysseus mimics the suitors' emphatic expansion and enjambment of his victims' civic identity (*ἀπέκταμεν, οἳ μέγ' ἄριστοι/ κούρων εἰν Ἰθάκῃ*, *Od.* 23.121-22), but again corrects the suitors' choice verb *κατέκτανες* to *ἀπέκταμεν*. Therefore in terms of the nature of the suitors' slaughter, Odysseus consistently offers a significant lexical substitution, suggesting that his murderous actions are not an insurgent nor fractious kind of violence that the *κατακτείνειν* verb encodes; rather, it is more akin to the killing of *ἀποκτείνειν*, which does not necessarily result in any retributive or punitive actions against the killer. In keeping with this portrayal, no other description of the suitors' slaughter, or at least not those descriptions made by the suitors, uses the verb *κατακτείνειν*.[20]

As it happens, the suitors themselves are guilty of the kind of violence they attribute to Odysseus. And this is something that Eurymachus partially admits aloud, once he realizes that Antinous' shooter is Odysseus returned:

> *εἰ μὲν δὴ Ὀδυσεὺς Ἰθακήσιος εἰλήλουθας,*
> *ταῦτα μὲν αἴσιμα εἶπας, ὅσα ῥέξεσκον Ἀχαιοί,*
> *πολλὰ μὲν ἐν μεγάροισιν ἀτάσθαλα, πολλὰ δ' ἐπ' ἀγροῦ.*
> *ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἤδη κεῖται, ὃς αἴτιος ἔπλετο πάντων,*

[19] The verb *ἀποκτείνειν* occurs only 21 times in Homer, and is deployed in the context of a hunt, sacrifice, and the suitors' own intentions against Telemachus (twice each). It later acquires the sense of "condemn to death" or "put to death" in a legal sense (LSJ, s.v. *ἀποκτείνω* 2), and that sense is perhaps manifest here in Odysseus' description of the *mnesterophonia*.

[20] Some of the killing verbs used throughout or in reference to the slaughter of the suitors include: *βάλε* (*Od*. 22.82); *ἀποκτείνω* (*Od.* 22.167); *ἐξεναρίξαι* (*Od.* 22.264); *ἔπεφνε* (*Od.* 22.268); *βεβλήκει* (*Od.* 22.286); *οὖτα* (*Od*. 22.994); *τύπτον* (*Od.* 22.308); *ἔλασσε* (*Od.* 22.328); *ἔκτεινεν* (*Od.* 23.8); *κτεῖνε* (*Od.* 23.63); *ἔκτανον* (*Od.* 23.363); *δαμέντων* (*Od.* 24.100); *κατέπεφνον* (*Od.* 24.325); *ἐνήρατο* (*Od.* 24.424).

Ἀντίνοος· οὗτος γὰρ ἐπίηλεν τάδε ἔργα,
οὔ τι γάμου τόσσον κεχρημένος οὐδὲ χατίζων,
ἀλλ' ἄλλα φρονέων, τά οἱ οὐκ ἐτέλεσσε Κρονίων,
ὄφρ' Ἰθάκης κατὰ δῆμον ἐϋκτιμένης βασιλεύοι
αὐτός, ἀτὰρ σὸν ***παῖδα κατακτείνειε*** *λοχήσας.*
νῦν δ' ὁ μὲν ἐν μοίρῃ πέφαται, σὺ δὲ φείδεο λαῶν
σῶν· ἀτὰρ ἄμμες ὄπισθεν ἀρεσσάμενοι κατὰ δῆμον,
ὅσσα τοι ἐκπέποται καὶ ἐδήδοται ἐν μεγάροισι,
τιμὴν ἀμφὶς ἄγοντες ἐεικοσάβοιον ἕκαστος,
χαλκόν τε χρυσόν τ' ἀποδώσομεν, εἰς ὅ κε σὸν κῆρ
ἰανθῇ· πρὶν δ' οὔ τι νεμεσσητὸν κεχολῶσθαι. (*Od.* 22.45-59)

"If you are indeed Odysseus of Ithaca come home, these things you have said, all that the Achaeans have done – many reckless deeds in the halls and many in the field – are right. But already dead lies the one who was to blame for everything, Antinous; for this one brought to pass these deeds, not so much through desire or need of the marriage, but with other purposes, which the son of Cronus did not bring to pass for him, that in the land of well-ordered Ithaca he might be king, and might lie in wait for your son and kill him. But now he lies slain, as was his due, so spare your own people; and hereafter we will make amends in the land for all that has been drunk and eaten in your halls, and will bring requital worth twenty oxen, each man for himself, and will pay you back in bronze and gold, until your heart is warmed; but before that no one could blame you for being angry."

Eurymachus interestingly denounces Antinous alone for all wrongs done against Odysseus' household, just as the suitors' relatives place blame solely on Odysseus for the slaughter of the suitors. Even more tellingly, Eurymachus ascribes to his slain companion a slightly modified but still characteristic man-slaying formula (*παῖδα κατακτείνειε*, *Od.* 22.53). In using this language, he exposes Antinous as the one guilty of treasonous (attempted) homicide, not Odysseus. Antinous' alleged motivations and desire for kingship certainly cohere well with the typical picture of civil strife and intra-elite competition that prompts such murderous intentions. But Eurymachus and the rest of the suitors are of course technically complicit in these activities as well. Medon, for instance, reports to Penelope that the suitors all long to kill Telemachus, using the telling *κατακτείνειν* verb (*Τηλέμαχον μεμάασι κατακτάμεν ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ/ οἴκαδε νισόμενον*, *Od.* 4.700-01). And throughout the rest of the *Odyssey*, the suitors as a whole are frequently said to

lie in wait for Telemachus, eager to kill him (*ἱέμενοι κτεῖναι*, *Od.* 4.823; 13.426; 15.30).[21] Eurymachus acknowledges shared fault only for his and the other suitors' consumption of Odysseus' resources, offering collective compensation for that crime. But, as we know, Odysseus does not accept Eurymachus' argument that Antinous is the sole author of Ithaca's strife-ridden community, and all the suitors ultimately come under the scrutiny of the vengeful Odysseus.

Since the suitors are the ones initiating violence of the *κατακτείνειν*-type, the details of Odysseus' first Cretan lie now look to be more aligned with the suitors' crimes instead of with Odysseus' own.[22] Like Odysseus' Cretan persona, Antinous sets up an ambush for Telemachus (*αὐτὸν ἰόντα λοχήσομαι*, *Od.* 4.670).[23] The ambush in both cases is, or would have been, a group effort rather than an individual one against the son of the reigning figures of Crete and Ithaca: Orsilochus, son of Idomeneus, and Telemachus, son of Odysseus. Antinous also strikingly links the suitors' murderous plot to their own political ambitions and desire to divide his property, just as Odysseus had in his lie:

> *ἀλλὰ φθέωμεν ἑλόντες ἐπ' ἀγροῦ νόσφι πόληος*
> *ἢ ἐν ὁδῷ· βίοτον δ' αὐτοὶ καὶ κτήματ' ἔχωμεν,*
> *δασσάμενοι κατὰ μοῖραν ἐφ' ἡμέας, οἰκία δ' αὖτε*
> *κείνου μητέρι δοῖμεν ἔχειν ἠδ' ὅς τις ὀπυίοι.* (*Od.*16.383-86)

> But let us be first in seizing him in the field far from the city, or on the road; and let us ourselves keep his livelihood and possessions, dividing them fairly among us, but as for the house, we should give it to his mother to have, and to whoever weds her.

This and other frequent reminders of the suitors' murderous plot against Telemachus invite

---

[21] Other references to the suitors' murderous intentions occur at *Od.* 4.669-72, 842-43; 13.425-26; 14.180-82; 15.28-30; 16.369-72, 400-03, 421-22; 17.79-81; 20.240-47.

[22] Cf. Haft 1984: 383 and Perry 2010: 120-21, who both believe Orsilochus' murder to be reminiscent of the *Doloneia* (Perry 121, Haft 1984: 303). Though I earlier compared the Cretan lie to Odysseus' actions in particular, I do not believe that this precludes the possibility of the narrative evoking the behavior of the suitors as well. The narrative can be thematically flexible enough to encompass both situations simultaneously.

[23] *Od.* 13.425; 14.181; 15.28; 16.369; 22.53.

critical reflection on the question of who is truly subject to the fugitive-murderer pattern in the *Odyssey*: Odysseus or the suitors? Both are guilty of plotting murder, but only the suitors are guilty of attempting it in the context of a political insurgency, which was the specific context in which murderers typically suffered exile.[24] Appropriately enough, during Odysseus' direct confrontation with the suitors, the suitors are made to be the primary defendants subject to the threat of exile, eclipsing the precarious standing of Odysseus, who had been on trial just moments before. The vengeful hero presents the suitors with the choice of fight or flight for their crimes (*νῦν ὑμῖν παράκειται ἐναντίον ἠὲ μάχεσθαι/ ἢ φεύγειν*, *Od.* 22.65-66),[25] and thus projects the murder-and-flight pattern onto them. The offer, however, is rather disingenuous, as Odysseus admits immediately afterwards when he states that the suitors' doom is inescapable (*ἀλλά τιν' οὐ φεύξεσθαι ὀΐομαι αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον*, *Od.* 22.67). The suitors are going to die, and it seems they have to die.[26] Not even Amphinomus, the 'good suitor,' whom Odysseus warns after being treated kindly by him (*Od.* 18-119-57), is exempt from the slaughter.[27]

We may ask why the *Odyssey* insists on this outcome, and a possible answer appears in Odysseus' enumeration of the suitors' various transgressions:

> *"ὦ κύνες, οὔ μ' ἔτ' ἐφάσκεθ' ὑπότροπον οἴκαδε νεῖσθαι*
> *δήμου ἄπο Τρώων, ὅτι μοι κατεκείρετε οἶκον*
> *δμῳῇσίν τε γυναιξὶ παρευνάζεσθε βιαίως*
> *αὐτοῦ τε ζώοντος ὑπεμνάασθε γυναῖκα,*
> *οὔτε θεοὺς δείσαντες, οἳ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν,*
> *οὔτε τιν' ἀνθρώπων νέμεσιν κατόπισθεν ἔσεσθαι.*
> *νῦν ὔμιν καὶ πᾶσιν ὀλέθρου πείρατ' ἐφῆπται."* (*Od.* 22.35-41)

[24] See my earlier discussion in Chapters 1 and 2.

[25] Antinous also admits to the fact that their actions, if revealed to the public, would deservedly result in their own expulsion (*Od.* 16.376-82).

[26] Penelope (e.g. *Od.* 17.494) and Athena (e.g. *Od.* 17.364; 18.156) are the ones particularly hell-bent on the suitors' destruction. See note 63 below for further discussion about Athena. It may be that the emotional and violent impulse against the suitors is primarily located in the women in order to portray Odysseus as applying controlled violence to enforce civic justice, and not mere private vengeance.

[27] Telemachus slays him at *Od.* 22.89-98, as was predicted earlier at 18.155-56.

> "Dogs, you thought that I would never again come home from the land of the Trojans, seeing that you wasted my house, lay with the maidservants by force, and secretly wooed my wife while I was alive, showing fear neither of the gods, who hold broad heaven, nor of any retribution of men coming hereafter. Now the cords of destruction have been made over you all."

The indictment does not include the suitors' murder plot against Telemachus,[28] but each of the three charges laid out here similarly pertains to treason: Laying waste to the household betrays the interests of Odysseus, to whom the suitors owe their allegiance; sleeping with the servants undermines ties to the king by redirecting loyalty of these servants to the suitors; and wooing Penelope works to usurp the throne, since it is marriage to the queen that authorizes kingship.[29] These last two charges add a sexual component to the suitors' crimes, and may be what definitively condemns them to death, for the suitors are not merely insurgents, for which exile is sufficient as punishment; they are also would-be paramours of Penelope. This adulterous element helps to justify – and perhaps even necessitate – their summary execution.[30] A comparable analogue can be found in Aegisthus, who is also not offered, as far as we know, the option of exile for killing Agamemnon and usurping Mycenae (*Od.* 3.230-312). There are many sustained parallels between the suitors and Aegisthus in the *Odyssey*, which I will discuss further in the next section, but for our purposes here, I only point out that sexual passions (for Agamemnon's wife, Clytemnestra) similarly seem to exacerbate the heinous quality of Aegisthus' treachery, and are perhaps why no doubts or questions, on moral grounds, are ever raised about Orestes slaying him in the *Odyssey*. Death is the only justice that can be served for such transgressions.

With Odysseus' own presentation of the *mnesterophonia* and Eurymachus' open

---

[28] Eurycleia includes the threat to Telemachus' life in her own summary of the suitors' crimes at *Od.* 23.9-10: *μνηστῆρας δ' ἔκτεινεν ἀγήνορας, οἵ θ' ἑὸν οἶκον/ κήδεσκον καὶ κτήματ' ἔδον βιόωντό τε παῖδα.* We should also recall that Eurymachus confesses to Odysseus this murder plot at *Od.* 22.53.

[29] On this last point, see Finkelberg 1991.

[30] Olga Levaniouk has suggested to me that the case may be compared to Euphiletus' execution of Eratosthenes in Lys. 1, which was justified in the case of adultery.

admission of guilt, the *Odyssey* depicts two antithetical codes of behavior, and thereby signals a sharp reversal of culpability for the civil violence in Ithaca. Contrary to the initial view of Odysseus as the principal criminal, he is shown to be entirely justified in using lethal force, while the suitors prove to be the offenders, not victims, who must be punished for their licentious and treacherous infringement of communal norms. Thus the suitors' insurgent actions cast them as the truly murderous criminals subject to censure, exile, and ultimately death for their crimes against the Ithacan community.

4.2 *MNESTEROPHONIA* REINTERPRETED: COLONIZATION AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF VIOLENCE

If the suitors' actions are a reflection of their treasonous wrongdoings, then how should Odysseus' own slaughter of the suitors be viewed differently? At times, the *Odyssey* still seems unable to excuse completely the violence committed by Odysseus.[31] For as much as Odysseus turns the tables on the suitors, the returned hero still faces the persistent threat of being expelled himself by the suitors' relatives, and Odysseus' decision to stand his ground against these vengeful families now leaves him just as susceptible to the same violent end he brought upon the suitors. Contrary to what one might expect, I suggest that Odysseus avoids this fate by actively taking on the role of a fugitive murderer, specifically of the murderer-turned-founder variety, and his deliberate self-fashioning as such ultimately helps to transform the destructive aspect of his violence against the suitors into a constructive one. In contrast to the insurgent violence of the suitors, the brutality of the *mnesterophonia* is really a function of Odysseus' process of reintegration into Ithaca through a kind of colonial expedition, which erases all prospects of his

[31] See Burgess 2014 for a discussion of how the *Odyssey* raises questions about the ethical implications of the slaughter of the suitors.

exile with an affirmation of his sovereignty.

Before I discuss how Odysseus negotiates such a role for himself, let us briefly review the defining features of the fugitive murderer that eventually becomes a founder. We have already encountered an example of the type in the figure of Tlepolemus in Chapter 2. Instead of being absorbed into the retinue of another prominent lord, like all other Homeric exiled killers, Tlepolemus leads a mass migratory movement to the island of Rhodes, which he founds. As this exile narrative demonstrates, blame for a kind of violence that reflects a more systemic civil strife is projected onto the individual, who then harnesses that blame as an impetus to leave, redirecting the violence externally toward more productive activities, such as founding a city or colony. This kind of colonial narrative – a quite common one in ancient Greek literature – conflates the figure of the murderer-in-exile with that of the colonial founder.[32] The conflation allows the murderous founder, as Carol Dougherty argues, "to shoulder the burden of the historical violence of settling foreign territory."[33] It blends and erases differences to reform the inception of a community formerly fraught with conflict. Now there is no suggestion of Tlepolemus' foundation of Rhodes being a violent endeavor, at least according to his exile narrative, nor is there a hint of violent resistance from the indigenous Rhodians to his eventual occupation of the island.[34] But as Dougherty further explains, many Greek narratives tend to underplay the violence of colonial expeditions in order to obliterate all traces of disruption and to emphasize successful integration and continuity.[35] The violence latent in the colonizing process is instead displaced back onto the cause of a colonist's departure from his homeland in the form

[32] On colonial narratives with a murderous founder, see Dougherty 1993: 31-44.

[33] Dougherty 1993: 41.

[34] According to Pindar (*Ol.* 7), the indigenous population of Rhodes consisted of the Heliadai.

[35] The foundation of Syracuse is an illuminating example. Thucydides explains that Archias left Corinth for Syracuse, and expelled the Sicels when he arrived there (Thuc. 6.3.2); however, Plutarch records an elaborate homicide plot that induces Archias' exile, while eradicating all traces of violence against the Sicels in the colonial expedition (*Mor.* 772e-773b).

of murder.

It is in this same narrative context of foundation and colonization, both of which often exhibit murderous undertones, that I believe Odysseus' slaughter of the suitors can be distinguished entirely from the suitors' own seditious violence. Odysseus' revenge, despite the mass destruction it wreaks on an entire generation of Ithacans, is clearly a formative force that endows Odysseus with a distinct sovereign capacity to found – or refound, as it were – the political order of Ithaca.[36] A few scholars have already recognized the foundational frame of Odysseus' return and the *mnesterophonia*.[37] Michael Nagler, for instance, has suggested that the slaughter of the suitors is "an aitiological myth for the use of violence to maintain even domestic order – in modern terms, for the foundation of the state."[38] In addition, as we have already seen Dougherty has persuasively shown that Odysseus' activities as a founder-figure resemble those of an oikist in the process of resettlement.[39] Like a colonial founder, Odysseus arrives on unfamiliar shores (Ithaca has been made unfamiliar to him, *Od.* 13.187-96), rids the land of its savage inhabitants (the suitors), and eventually marries the local queen (he remarries Penelope). Each of these activities corresponds to the major elements of the traditional narrative pattern of Greek colonization, and is highly suggestive of Odysseus' *nostos* being represented as a colonial foundation.

---

[36] Many modern political thinkers in fact define the state by its use of violence, which is often argued to found and sustain political or legal order. For discussions of violence, the political, and their definitions in terms of each other, see Weber 1921 [1919]; Benjamin 1986 [1927]; Schmitt 1996 [1932].

[37] On foundation as a significant narrative framework underlying the second half of the *Odyssey*, see Nagler 1990; Cook 1995: 145-70; Dougherty 2001: 161-83. I should add that many other patterns and interpretive frames have been seen to structure the end of the *Odyssey* as well, e.g. the Rājasūya (Jamison 1999), *tisis*-narratives (Loney 2010), and the international tale of the Homecoming Husband (Ready 2014), among others. I do not believe that any one organizing principle is more important than the other, and I certainly do not mean to valorize the fugitive murderer over other such patterns. They all can – and do – coexist, operating in tandem and collaboratively to great poetic effect, as I will soon show, for example, with the Oresteia myth further below. My focus on the fugitive murderer aims solely to bring to light a new, previously unutilized, interpretive scheme in the study of the *Odyssey*.

[38] Nagler 1990: 351.

[39] The colonial features of Odysseus and the *Odyssey* have previously been commented on by Finley 1978: 61-63; Hall 1989: 49-50; Rose 1992: 120-21; Dench 1995: 36-38; Dougherty 2001: 161-83.

Irad Malkin has, however, explained Odysseus' travels and return as separate from the colonial movement altogether, and has even gone so far as to claim, "Nothing that Odysseus does in the *Odyssey* even remotely resembles the foundation of a colony."[40] He instead argues that Odysseus functions as a hero of protocolonization, which is distinct from colonization in that it "evokes a situation of sailing *and returning* rather than sailing in order to settle overseas."[41] Odysseus' homecoming is of course not a literal colonial foundation, but still, I believe there is a concerted effort in the *Odyssey* to depict Odysseus coming home to an unfamiliar environment, and hence to cast him conceptually as an outsider and prospective colonist within his own home. Also, many heroes of *nostoi*, myths of return, as Malkin himself shows, frequently "function as *archegetai* (founders) and progenitors in the eastern Mediterranean, in Greece, and west."[42] If their colonial foundations can be framed as a kind of return, is it really so difficult to imagine the reverse: a return framed as a kind of colonial foundation?

Thus in spite of Malkin's objections, I think it is possible to take previous observations about the colonial outlook of the *Odyssey*, and especially Dougherty's analysis, even further by taking into consideration the narrative implications of Odysseus' first Cretan lie, where Odysseus asserts his identity as that of a fugitive murderer. This is, in fact, the only Cretan lie in which Odysseus adopts the role of an exile.[43] More significantly, the performance of the lie occurs at a critical turning point in the *Odyssey*: Odysseus has finally ceased from his wanderings and physically returned to his homeland. At that moment of transition, he chooses to situate himself

---

[40] Malkin 1998, with quotation from page 21. Perry (2010: 22, 104, 121) similarly discusses the *Odyssey*'s attention to human movement independently from colonization.

[41] Quotation from Malkin 1998: 14, with further elaboration at 3-5, 10-14, 20-21. The italicization is his.

[42] Malkin 1998: 154.

[43] In the other lying tales, Odysseus' personas include: a Cretan veteran of the Trojan War, who leaves home again, of his own accord, to raid Egypt (*Od.* 14.192-359); a rich Cretan man who leaves home, at Zeus' urging, to raid Egypt (*Od.* 17.419-44); Aethon, a Cretan prince, who, for reasons not given, travels to Thesprotia and Ithaca (*Od.* 19.165-299); Eperitus of Alybas, who is driven off course by a god during his travels (*Od.* 24.244-97, 303-14).

in the socially marginal position of a fugitive murderer, and in explaining his arrival in Ithaca in this way, Odysseus sets up his return to correspond with the final phase of the fugitive murderer's story pattern: reintegration, particularly through colonization.[44] When viewed in this light, Odysseus is not merely the long-delayed hero who, upon finally coming home, faces the threat of a more permanent exile for the strife he causes; he is already a quasi-exile who has now potentially reached a suitable place of relocation.[45] Accordingly, the challenge Odysseus must confront is a community already embroiled in a political crisis, which can only be resolved by his own colonial enterprise.[46]

The other narratives of homicide and flight in the *Odyssey* contribute to this structural conceit. As I discussed in the first chapter, the Odyssean paradigm of the fugitive murderer does not narrate cases of successful resettlement; rather, it emphasizes the continued exilic status of all the fugitives, as they struggle to find suitable communities to join permanently. Odysseus similarly resists settling in other communities, such as the Phaeacians, throughout his travels.[47] Remarkably, then, Odysseus – both the real Odysseus and his Cretan counterpart – emerges in Ithaca and behaves in the same way as the other fugitive murderers when we first encounter them, including the Aetolian, Theoclymenus, and the killer in Odysseus' generalization. The 'incomplete' quality of the fugitive-murderer pattern in the *Odyssey* thus triggers, I believe,

[44] See Dougherty 2015 for a discussion of how Odysseus' various disguises allow him to forge a new identity for himself. In Erbse's (1972: 154-55) and de Jong's (2001 ad *Od.* 13.253-86) opinions, Odysseus' decision to present himself as an exiled killer has been influenced by Athena's formidable appearance as an armed shepherd, whom he attempts to intimidate through his choice of persona. On the relevance of Odysseus' immediate audience to specific details of his Cretan lies, see Haft 1984. Perry (2010: 126) alternatively views the narrative as indicative of Odysseus' belief that he will be a wanderer forever.

[45] See Perry 2010: 133-37 for a discussion of Odysseus' wanderings being presented as a sort of exile in punishment for his hostile encounter with Polyphemus.

[46] See Cook 1995: 146-52 for how the suitors have created an "anti-Paradise" in Ithaca. Many of their transgressions are reflected by their perversion of the standards of hospitality, on which see Reece 1993: 173-78.

[47] See Dougherty 2001: 122-42 for a discussion of how the Phaeacian episode sets up a positive model of colonial settlement, which Odysseus rejects, but will ultimately replicate in Ithaca. See also Perry 2010: 147-51, who believes that the first lying tale, in conjunction with the other lies and a few more key passages, express Odysseus' resistance to *nostos* more broadly.

significant recognition of Odysseus as a comparable exiled killer who is on the search for – and is perhaps just on the verge of – reintegration.

This role as a non-integrated exile is not one that Odysseus takes on merely for the duration of his interaction with Athena, to whom he narrates his fictitious Cretan biography. His non-integrated status correlates with his prolonged incognito status, which he maintains, as the Homeric narrator points out, from the first moment he wakes up in Ithaca all the way to the conclusion of the *mnesterophonia*:

> *ὁ δ' ἔγρετο δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς*
> *εὕδων ἐν γαίῃ πατρωΐῃ, οὐδέ μιν ἔγνω,*
> *ἤδη δὴν ἀπεών· περὶ γὰρ θεὸς ἠέρα χεῦε*
> *Παλλὰς Ἀθηναίη, κούρη Διός, ὄφρα μιν αὐτὸν*
> *ἄγνωστον τεύξειεν ἕκαστά τε μυθήσαιτο,*
> *μή μιν πρὶν ἄλοχος γνοίη ἀστοί τε φίλοι τε,*
> *πρὶν πᾶσαν μνηστῆρας ὑπερβασίην ἀποτεῖσαι.*
> *τοὔνεκ' ἄρ' ἀλλοειδέα φαινέσκετο πάντα ἄνακτι,*
> *ἀτραπιτοί τε διηνεκέες λιμένες τε πάνορμοι*
> *πέτραι τ' ἠλίβατοι καὶ δένδρεα τηλεθάοντα.* (*Od.* 13.187-96)
>
> But noble Odysseus awoke out of his sleep in his native land, and did not recognize it, having been so long away. For the goddess Pallas Athena, daughter of Zeus, shed a mist around, so that she might make him unrecognizable and tell him each of these things, that his wife would not know him, nor his townsfolk, nor his friends, until the suitors pay the full price of their transgression. Therefore all things seemed strange to their ruler, the long paths, the bays offering safe anchorage, the sheer cliffs, and the luxuriant trees.

Odysseus is enshrouded in mist to make him unrecognizable to his own people, but ancient and modern commentators have identified another object of Athena's veil of mist. According to the scholia, Aristophanes read *αὐτῷ* for *αὐτόν* at line 190, which supports the idea that Ithaca was made unrecognizable to Odysseus, and that Ithaca rather than Odysseus was concealed.[48] This is the interpretation taken by Irene de Jong, who explains that by preventing Odysseus from recognizing Ithaca immediately, Athena also prevents the hero from immediately rushing home

---

[48] Schol. H ad *Od.* 13.190.

and prematurely ruining his own homecoming.[49] Her view is supported by the fact that Athena later lifts the misty veil to reveal the land (*Od.* 13.352); however, grammatically speaking, this is impossible since the land is feminine (*γαίῃ πατρωΐῃ*, *Od.* 13.188) and cannot agree with the masculine object of Athena's concealment (*μιν αὐτὸν*, *Od.* 13.190). Nonetheless, an ambiguity of the referent was clearly perceived, and may very well be the point here. Identities must be disentangled and negotiated at both the grammatical and narrative level. Odysseus is just as unrecognizable to Ithaca as Ithaca is to Odysseus, and so both man and land must equally come to terms with each other. The Homeric narrator emphasizes the reciprocal level of unfamiliarity through a triple declaration of Odysseus' inability to recognize or be recognized: *οὐδέ μιν ἔγνω* (*Od.*13.188); *ἄγνωστον* (*Od.* 13.191); *μή* […] *γνοίη* (*Od.* 13.132). Recognition is achieved only once Odysseus successfully exacts his revenge against the suitors (*πρὶν πᾶσαν μνηστῆρας ὑπερβασίην ἀποτεῖσαι*, *Od.* 13.193). Until then, Odysseus remains a stranger to the Ithacan community. The *mnesterophonia* is thus the pivotal moment Odysseus can shed his outsider status and reintegrate into Ithaca, as well as the moment when Ithaca in turn can recognize his claim to the land.

The sustained presentation of Odysseus as a stranger to his native land until this violent event is significant and meaningful, since it transforms his status as a murderer from that of an internal threat to civic stability into an external force – even source – of foundation.[50] Because Odysseus is already cast as an outsider, the bloodshed he causes does not erupt internally within the community, as it does in the traditional setup to the fugitive-murderer pattern, but instead is

[49] De Jong 2001 ad *Od.* 13.189-352.

[50] Alternative explanations for Odysseus' prolonged incognito status emphasize either dramatic irony (Fenik 1974: 53-55; de Jong 2001 ad *Od.* 13.187-358) or the ongoing tension between truth and falsehood that runs throughout the *Odyssey* (Russo 1974; Pucci 1987; Peradotto 1990). For the most extensive study of the pattern of disguise and recognition in the *Odyssey*, see Murnaghan 1987.

part of an invasive assault, which is even invested with the glamor of heroic achievement.[51] The slaughter of the suitors is accordingly not only to be viewed as a symptom of civil strife, which necessitates the removal of the violent agent, but also as an aspect of Odysseus' colonial endeavor, which affirms his permanent settlement.

Multiple crucial differences between the suitors' violence against Odysseus' household and Odysseus' violence against the suitors have now emerged, and can be summarized as follows: The suitors' violence, committed from within the community, is subversive and destabilizing, since their intent to remove the ruling family of Ithaca, being borne of individuals' desires, works to damage communal interests; Odysseus' violence against the suitors, implemented from without the community, is constructive and stabilizing, since the elimination of the suitors establishes a better polity for Ithaca by relieving it of their destructive political machinations. These dissimilarities in the direction and dynamics of violence are why, as I discussed earlier, *κατακτείνειν*, the verb *par excellence* of murderous civil violence, is never used to describe Odysseus' actions, except mistakenly by the suitors.

As a coda to this section, I would now like to turn our attention briefly to the Oresteia myth that runs throughout the *Odyssey*, since it provides such a suggestive parallel to the situation of Odysseus.[52] The essential elements of the myth, as presented in the epic, involve Aegisthus and Clytemnestra killing her husband Agamemnon when he returns home from the war, and Orestes also returning home to avenge his father's death by killing Aegisthus and

---

[51] See Cook 1995: 164 for a discussion of how the *mnesterophonia* is organized as an *aristeia*.

[52] References to or narrations of the Atreid myth occur at: *Od.* 1.29-43, 46-47, 298-300; 3.193-98, 230-312; 4.512-47; 11.385-464; 13.383-85; 24.19-34, 96-97, 199-202. This myth has long been seen as a significant foil to Odysseus' own homecoming, and the bibliography for this topic is substantial. Some of the more prominent studies include: D'Arms and Hulley 1946; Hommel 1955; Lord 1960: 159-60; Hölscher 1967, 1989: 297-310; Clarke 1967: 10-12; Friedrich 1975: 86-87; Sternberg 1978: 68-73; Clay 1983: 215-28; Erbse 1986: 237-41; March 1987: 81-98; Katz 1991: 29-53; Olson 1990; Felson-Rubin 1994: 95-107; Olson 1995: 24-42; Cook 1995: 21-28, 32-37; Louden 1999: 90-94; Marks 2008: 17-35, 67-72.

Clytemnestra. Similar to the case of Odysseus against the suitors in the *mnesterophonia*, the Odyssean Oresteia sets up an analogous dichotomy of violence, juxtaposing the murders committed by Aegisthus against those committed by Orestes. The gods and other internal narrators of the Atreid myth (Nestor, Menelaus, and Agamemnon) always condemn Aegisthus for his horrendous deed (e.g. *Od.* 1.46-47),[53] while Orestes wins fame for essentially the same violent crime (*οἷον κλέος ἔλλαβε δῖος Ὀρέστης*, *Od.* 1.298). In fact, the ethical implications of Orestes' retributive violence are never so much as raised or questioned in the *Odyssey*. The differing evaluations of Aegisthus' and Orestes' actions can again be explained by the different kinds of violence that each killer enacts. On the one hand, Aegisthus causes violence to erupt from within the community, demonstrating an endogenous process for the murders. His crime is an insidious domestic plot for illegitimate kingship, devised at home (*ταῦτ' Αἴγισθος ἐμήσατο οἴκοθι λυγρά*, *Od.* 3.303) and executed through an ambush (*εἷσε λόχον*, *Od.* 4. 534). On the other hand, Orestes arrives from abroad (*ἤλυθε δῖος Ὀρέστης/ ἂψ ἀπ' Ἀθηνάων, Od.* 3.306-07) in a community that is already in crisis, and thereby transforms his own display of murderous violence into an exogenous event, which seeks to eliminate the corrupt reign of the usurper Aegisthus and to restore the Mycenaean kingdom.[54] All of these differences manifest themselves at the lexical level as well: the classic verb of murderous civil violence is applied to Aegisthus (*κατέπεφνεν*, *Od.* 4.543; *κατέκτανε*, *Od.* 4.535; 11.411),[55] while more neutral killing forms are

[53] The gods' disapproval may also be in reaction to the show of human disobedience to their commands, since they had sent Hermes to forbid Aegisthus from committing the crime (*Od.* 1.37-39).

[54] Similarly, Orestes' act of vengeance is described as *coming* (*Ὀρέσταο τίσις ἔσσεται Ἀτρεΐδαο*, *Od.* 1.40).

[55] The verb *κατέκτανε* is technically deployed in a simile likening Aegisthus' murderous deed to the slaying of a ox at the manger. Nonetheless, the comparison still implicates Aegisthus in the context of civil strife. Other killing forms used by Aegisthus include: *ἔκτανε* (1.36); *πατροφονῆα* (1.299; 3.197, 308); *ἔκτα* (1.300; 3.198, 309); *κτάνε* (3.250); *κτείνας* (3.306); *ἔκτα* (11.410). His co-conspirator Clytemnestra kills with the following verbs: *κτεῖνε* (11.422); *πέφνε* (11.453); *κτείνασα* (24.200).

applied to Orestes,[56] signalling that the one is a treasonous insurgent, whereas the other is a positive external agent of justified violence.[57]

To return to the colonial characterization of Odysseus' activities, the slaughter of the suitors is comparable to Orestes' slaying of Aegisthus, which, according to other Oresteia narratives, resulted in Orestes' exile and his eventual founding of a colony.[58] Of course, neither hero resettles elsewhere in the *Odyssey*, but the successful return of both to their original home communities is meaningfully conceived as the reintegration of an exile.[59] Similar phrases describing their longing for their homeland (*ἧς ἱμείρεται αἴης*, *Od.* 1.41 ~ *ἱέμενος.../ἧς γαίης*, *Od.* 1.58-59) and their eventual homecoming after an extended period of time (*τῷ δέ οἱ ὀγδοάτῳ κακὸν ἤλυθε δῖος Ὀρέστης*, *Od.* 3.306 ~ *ἐλθόντ' ἐξ ἀπίης γαίης δεκάτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ*, *Od.* 16.18) reinforce the parallels between their initial exilic statuses. What is more, their repatriation comes through the elimination of their respective opponents, which is a situation comparable to an oikist's establishment of a colony through the subjugation or displacement of native

[56] Orestes only kills with the unprefixed verb *κτείνειν*: *ἔκταν*' (1.30); *ἔκτανε* (1.299; 3.308); *κτείνας* (3.309); *κτεῖνεν* (4.547).

[57] See Loney 2010, who argues that the principal way the *Odyssey* justifies its hero's violent acts is through references to mythic examples of *tisis*.

[58] Strabo (7.7.8) records a tradition in which Orestes takes possession of Orestias during his exile, and founds a city called Argos Oresticum. Leo Diaconus (*Hist*. 8.2) also says Orestes built Orestias. Many other sources testify to Orestes leaving and seeking purification elsewhere: at Three Rivers in Thrace, where he built a city after his own name (Lampridius *Heliogabalus* 7; Pseudo-Symeon *Chronographia* P. 686; Theophanes *Chronographia* P. 387); at Mt. Amanum or Melantium in Cilicia (Steph. Byz., s.v. *Ἄμανον*; Tzetz. schol. ad Lycoph. 1374); at Comana in Cappadocia, where he introduced rites in honor of Artemis Tauropolus and provided the city's namesake by depositing tresses, *κόμην*, there (Strabo 12.2.3). Pausanias variously explain that he founds a sanctuary of the Eumenides in Ceryneia (Paus. 7.25.7), moves his home from Mycenae to Arcadia (Paus. 8.5.4), and changes the name of the town Oresthasium to Oresteum (8.3.2). The majority of traditions place Orestes in Arcadia: he is killed by a snake-bite at Oresteum (Apollod. *Epit.* 6.28); he retires, at Apollo's bidding, to Parrhasia, a district of Arcadia, for a year (schol. ad Eur. *Or.* 1645); the Dioscuri tell him to leave Argos in order to found a city in Arcadia (Eur. *El.* 1273-75).

[59] Interestingly enough, the *Odyssey* is not explicit about Orestes' ultimate fate, making no mention of either his subsequent exile for killing Clytemnestra or Aegisthus, or of his successful permanent reestablishment in Mycenae. The epic is perhaps being deliberately vague so as to evoke the suspenseful terms of Odysseus' own process of reestablishment in Ithaca. Olga Levaniouk has also suggested to me that the vagueness works on another level. As discussed in the previous note, Orestes was frequently imagined as a colonial figure. If that is an implicit connection to be made in the *Odyssey*, then perhaps his parallel to Odysseus also serves to create expectations of the latter (re)founding a city as well.

inhabitants.[60] Just as the death of Aegisthus is the starting point for the restoration of Agamemnon's kingdom, so the *mnesterophonia* is the foundation for a new peaceful state under Odysseus' kingship. Thus like his avenging counterpart in the Oresteia, Odysseus is crucially an outsider – a colonial figure, as it were – when he externally applies violent measures to the insurgent crisis he encounters in Ithaca. His initial remoteness from and subsequent arrival upon the scene *before* he unleashes his violent aggression against the suitors, then, makes all the difference between his being a murderer of the Aegisthus-type, who is condemned and demands retributive violence, and a murderer of the Orestes-type, who is celebrated and obliterates any questions or reservations about his brutality.

My comparison has automatically assumed a primary correlation between Odysseus and Orestes in the *Odyssey*'s repeated narration of the Oresteia myth, but of course many other equivalences of character-types between the two stories can be – and have been – established. "As a rule," Irene de Jong notes, "Agamemnon parallels Odysseus, Clytemnestra Penelope, Orestes Telemachus, and Aegisthus the suitors; the story is 'a warning to Odysseus, an inspiration for Telemachus, and a vindication of Penelope.'"[61] Odysseus certainly expresses a self-awareness of this parallel, acknowledging the possibility that he will be an Agamemnon-type, slain by a usurper upon his return home, when he first arrives back in Ithaca (*Od.* 13.383-85). This statement notably occurs when Odysseus first begins preparations to reclaim Ithaca. At that moment, comparisons to the Atreid myth, which dominate the first half of the *Odyssey*, cease and are essentially displaced by the pattern of the fugitive murderer in the epic's second

---

[60] See my previous discussion of this issue in Chapter 2, as well as notes 35 above and 116 below. This portrayal of colonial violence is consistent with settler colonialism, which is characterized by an invasive settler society arriving and replacing the indigenous population. For definitions and examples of this phenomenon, see Balandier 1951 and Wolfe 1992.

[61] De Jong 2001: 12-13. The embedded quotation is from Clarke 1967: 10. Marks (2008: 20) also correlates Aegisthus with the Cyclops, Odysseus' crew, and the Phaeacians, who "all suffer after failing to heed divine admonition."

half. The change of emphasis is meaningful. By the time the Atreid myth is reintroduced for the last time in Book 24, Odysseus proves himself to be an Orestes instead of an Agamemnon, as well as a murderous founder instead of a fugitive murderer. The reversal of expectations about Odysseus' Oresteian role parallels the reversal of expectations about Odysseus' status as a killer, contributing to his reformed image as a reintegrated exile and founder-figure.

4.3 A DIVINE RESOLUTION: THE APOLLINE SUBTEXT OF THE *MNESTEROPHONIA*

A crucial omission in my treatment of Odysseus as a fugitive murderer thus far has been the role the gods play in all of the events, which I will now address. The gods' participation in the violence of the *mnesterophonia* reinforces the depiction of the slaughter of the suitors as a positive exogenous event. Indeed, in sharp contrast to their behavior in other cases of Homeric homicide, the gods sanction the excesses of the murders instead of stopping or preempting them.[62] Divine support for the massacre is so clearly manifest that Odysseus portrays the suitors' deaths as an act of divine punishment (*τούσδε δὲ μοῖρ' ἐδάμασσε θεῶν καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα, Od.* 22.413), and Penelope hypothesizes that 'some god' must have killed the suitors (*ἀλλά τις ἀθανάτων κτεῖνε μνηστῆρας ἀγαυούς*, *Od.* 23.63). Zeus and Athena are particularly implicated in the slaughter in a way that reveals them to be the primary orchestrators of its execution and eventual resolution.[63] But no god is more instrumental to, and yet more covertly involved in, the

---

[62] Contrast Athena's attitude towards the suitors, whom she explicitly has no intention of saving (*Od.* 17.364), with Athena's and Hera's prevention of Achilles killing Agamemnon (*Il.* 1.188-98), and an unnamed god's prevention of Phoenix killing his father (*Il.* 9.458-61). Similarly, the gods forbid Aegisthus from killing Agamemnon (*Od.* 1.37-39). In the case of Odysseus' plot, however, Athena often provokes the suitors' wrongs to ensure their destruction (e.g. *Od.* 18.346-48 = 20.284-86; 20.345-46).

[63] Odysseus sporadically alludes to their roles in supporting his revenge against the suitors (*Od.* 16.233-320; 20.42, 98-121; 21.413-15), while Zeus exposes Athena outright as the principal instigator of the plot (*οὐ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτον μὲν ἐβούλευσας νόον αὐτή/ ὡς ἦ τοι κείνους Ὀδυσεὺς ἀποτείσεται ἐλθών;*, *Od.* 5.23-24 = 24.479-80). The various eagle omens predicting the doom of the suitors (*Od.* 2.146-76; 15.160-81; 19.535-69) also appear to convey Zeus'

success of the *mnesterophonia* than Apollo. He legitimizes much of Odysseus' display of colonial violence, and offers another important point of contact between Odysseus and the fugitive murderer.[64] In what follows, I will first focus on how Apollo's involvement contributes to Odysseus' positive portrayal as a murderous founder, and then discuss how the Apolline subtext of the slaughter of the suitors informs the unique political resolution arranged by Zeus and Athena to conclude the *mnesterophonia* and the *Odyssey* as a whole.

Apollo's appearances in the epic are quite limited, and often not appearances at all,[65] but his presence is generally strongest in the scenes leading up to the slaughter.[66] As the suitors feast for their last time before the lethal bow-contest, an assembly and sacrifice take place in the sacred grove of Apollo, revealing that it is also the day of his festival (*Od*. 20.156, 276-78).[67] Odysseus therefore slays the suitors and achieves his homecoming under the aegis of Apollo. The concurrence is fitting since the day consecrated to the archer-god provides the occasion for the bow-contest, while the contest in turn furnishes, somewhat unexpectedly, Odysseus with the god's principal means of dispensing punishment: the bow.[68] But the context of the festival as the

---

approval for the slaughter of the suitors. On the importance of Zeus in instigating and resolving the terms of Odysseus' revenge, see Marks 2008 and Yamagata 2014. On Athena's own role in devising the events, see Clay 1983 and the extensive bibliography provided in Marks 2008: 19n4.

[64] He also serves, perhaps, as another point of contact between Orestes and Odysseus. Though the god's role is not highlighted in the Odyssean Oresteia, it was certainly important in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*, where Apollo is shown to have prompted Orestes to kill his mother Clytemnestra (*Cho.* 269-77, 1030-33; *Eum.* 202-05), but later purified him for his crime (*Eum.* 576-81).

[65] Apollo's name occurs 29 times in the *Odyssey*: 8 instances involving the god in real action, shooting down mortals (*Od.* 3.279; 7.64; 8.227; 11.319; 15.410) or laughing at Hephaestus (*Od.* 8.323, 334, 339); 1 instance in connection with music (*Od.* 8.488); 9 instances in connection with his oracular activity and worship (*Od.* 6.162; 8.79; 9.198, 201; 15.245, 252, 526; 20.156; 21.267); 11 instances in an invocation (*Od.* 4.341; 7.311; 17.132, 251, 494; 18.235; 19.86; 21.338, 364; 22.7; 24.376).

[66] All references to Apollo in connection with the *mnesterophonia* occur at *Od.* 15.525-8; 17.494; 18.235-42; 19.86; 20.156, 276-78; 21.38, 257-68, 338; 22.7.

[67] On the festival of Apollo as the ritual setting for the *mnesterophonia*, see Austin 1975: 239-53; Hölscher 1989: 252-58; Auffarth 1991: 409-10; Cook 1995: 150-52. See also Levaniouk 2011 for how the festival functions as a poetic occasion, which is evoked by and resonates with Penelope and Odysseus' mythmaking dialogue in book 19.

[68] Technically we are never explicitly told when Odysseus realizes the bow-contest is an opportunity to kill the suitors with the bow. Even after Penelope has already decided on the bow-contest and Odysseus has approved the

setting for all the events of the day (the contest, slaughter, and Odysseus' homecoming) proves to be relevant and meaningful in several other important ways as well.

The nature of Apollo's festival in the *Odyssey* is never fully made clear, perhaps as a result of the panhellenic character of the epic,[69] but its alignment with certain important liminal occasions highlighted during the *mnesterophonia* helps to illuminate some of its darker corners. As Odysseus announces to Eumaeus and Penelope, the timing of his return on this day also coincides with the *lukabas* (*Od.* 14.161; 19.306). The *lukabas* is a somewhat obscure term, but, according to Odysseus' own gloss (*τοῦ μὲν φθίνοντος μηνός, τοῦ δ' ἱσταμένοιο*, *Od.* 14.162; 19.307), it appears to refer to the period of the 'dark of the moon,' the final days of the lunar cycle immediately preceding the new moon.[70] Since this interlunar period culminates in the festival of Apollo, the festival tends to be identified as that of Apollo Neomenios, Apollo of the New Moon.[71] But in addition to marking the beginning of a new month, this festival may also celebrate the changeover between the seasons of winter and spring, and has accordingly been characterized as a New Year festival.[72] This timing is consistent with the fact that the majority of Apollo's festivals fall in spring, the season in which his birthday occurs.[73] The appearances or

---

plan (*Od.* 19.572-87), Odysseus still wonders how he should go about slaying the suitors (*Od.* 20.38-40). It seems, though, that a decision is made about the slaughter's implementation by at least *Od.* 21.232-41.

[69] That the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were significantly conditioned by a panhellenic trend was first deduced by Anthony Snodgrass (1971: 421, 435), and extended further by Greg Nagy (1979). On the modification of local details in Homeric epic to accommodate its panhellenic scope, see Levaniouk 2000; Levaniouk 2011.

[70] Ancient commentators frequently glossed *lukabas* as a synonym for 'year' (*ἐνιαυτός*), but most scholars now, following Austin 1975: 244-46, understand the term as designating the interlunar period. Extensive bibliography on the etymology of the word is provided by Russo 1992 ad *Od.* 19.306-07; Levaniouk 2011: 203-05 with notes 15-16; and most recently West 2013. The last of these believes *lukabas* was a qualification of *μείς*, meaning 'the moon going to the daylight.'

[71] As was identified by schol. V ad *Od.* 20.155. Alternatively, van Windekens (1954: 31-34) proposed that the *lukabas* referred to the festival of Apollo Lykeios or Lykios; however, that idea, given the gloss provided in the *Odyssey*, seems doubtful.

[72] Wilamowitz 1931: II.29n3; Austin 1975: 246; Auffarth 1991: 398-410; Cook 1995: 128-70. In addition, see further below.

[73] Farnell 1907: 258; Versnel 1993: 290, 297 with note 27. According to Plutarch, Apollo's birthday is on the seventh day of Bysios (*Quaest. Graec.* 9), approximately equivalent to February in the Gregorian calendar. In Delos,

mention of spring birds, such as the nightingale (*Od.* 19.22.301) and swallow (*Od.* 21.411; 22.240), and multiple other seasonal references, such as Penelope's virtual snow-like melting (*Od.* 19.205), support the vernal setting of Odysseus' return.[74] Apollo's festival in the *Odyssey*, therefore, primarily serves to inaugurate a new period, where the return of the god of light appropriately heralds both a new moon and the arrival of spring.

The close association between Apollo's festival and these transitional occasions is, I believe, connected to the god's own moderating personality as a god of transitions. Apollo of course presides over a diverse set of offices (e.g. light, healing, archery, prophecy, music, poetry, purification, and colonization),[75] but in a brilliant article surveying Apollo's major attributes, Henk Versnel helped to contextualize his many features by linking them to his major function as the god of ephebic initiation; that is, as "the god of transition from the old to the new."[76] Versnel's insights are an extension of Jane Harrison's own observation of the god as the arch-ephebos,[77] and Walter Burkert's interpretation of the original Apollo (Doric Apellon) as the reflection of the ephebos, based on an etymological connection with the month of *Apellaios* and its corresponding *Apellaia*, a Delphic festival of family groups that introduced ephebes into the community.[78] The etymology has been reaffirmed by Alfred Heubeck,[79] and developed further

---

however, Apollo's birthday is on the seventh of Thargelion, approximately equivalent to May-June (Diog. Laert. 3.2). Both dates, in any case, occur in or at just the start of the warm season. See Trümpy 1997 for a survey of the Greek calendar.

[74] For a complete accumulation of evidence for and discussion of the spring season in the *Odyssey*, see Austin 1975: 239-53; Borthwick 1988; Levaniouk 2011: 106-07. The Aetolian's prediction that Odysseus will return in summer or at the harvest (*καὶ φάτ' ἐλεύσεσθαι ἢ ἐς θέρος ἢ ἐς ὀπώρην*, *Od.* 14.384) seems to validate Eumaeus' estimation of his guest as a liar, but perhaps there was a variant tradition in which Odysseus did return at such a time.

[75] On the many offices of Apollo, see the essays assembled in Solomon 1994; Detienne 1998; Graf 2009.

[76] Versnel 1993, with quotation from page 316.

[77] Harrison 1927. On the Greek concept of the ephebe, see Vidal-Naquet 1968 and 1986.

[78] Burkert 1975. In Sparta, the *Apellai* was an assembly of people, which reinforces Apollo's connection with communal gatherings and initiation.

[79] Heubeck 1987. Heubeck shows that the earliest reconstructed from of Apollo, **apeliōn*, derives from **apelya*, meaning "he of the assembly."

by Gregory Nagy, who links the god's name to the noun *ἀπειλή*, "boastful promise," and its corresponding verb *ἀπειλέω*, "to promise, threaten."[80] In lieu of this connection, Nagy proposes that Apollo's name helps to reflect his very essence as a god who is perpetually on the brink of fulfillment: "The god of eternal promise, of the eternity of potential performance, he is the word waiting to be translated into action."[81] This is why we find Apollo officiating over many boundaries and mediating the divide between many different worlds, such as adolescence and adulthood, darkness and light, sickness and health, falsehood and truth, ignorance and knowledge, divine will and human action, impurity and purity, exile and colonization. As the very embodiment of the force of such transitions, Apollo is well suited to preside over – and his festival to enact – the passages of time and the aforementioned transitional occasions of the New Moon and the New Year in the *Odyssey*.

This understanding of the nature of Apollo and his festival has much in common with, and could very well be used to corroborate, one of two significant myth-and-ritual complexes often believed to condition the *Odyssey*: either the New Year complex, which encodes the ritual pattern of the dying and rising god/king,[82] or the initiatory complex, which narrates the induction of youths into their roles as full-standing members of society.[83] Given Apollo's prominence in the *Odyssey*, the initiatory complex seems more likely; however, the basic plots of dissolution and restoration, emphasized by the New Year complex, and of exclusion and incorporation, emphasized by the initiatory complex, both correspond closely to that of wandering and

---

[80] Nagy 1994. Nagy's understanding still intersects with the *apellai*, which provides an occasion for the authoritative speech-act that *ἀπειλή* constitutes.

[81] Nagy 1994: 7.

[82] In addition to the works cited in note 72 above, other major proponents of the New Year complex in the *Odyssey* include Raglan 1936 and Auffarth 1991. All owe their ideas to Frazer 1890 and Harrison 1927. See Versnel 1993: 20-48 for a useful review of scholarship on this line of inquiry.

[83] The initiatory complex is upheld by Bremmer 1978 and Houston 1992. Auffarth 1991 restricts secure initiatory elements in the *Odyssey*, with the exception of Odysseus' scar and the bow test, almost exclusively to Telemachus. For a survey of scholarship on initiation, see Versnel 1993: 48-88; Padilla 1999; Graf 2003.

homecoming in the *Odyssey.* They are also structurally comparable to the fugitive-murderer pattern of exile and reintegration, and to the tripartite structure of Arnold van Gennep's rites of passage: *rites de séparation, rites de marge, rites d'agrégation*.[84] All of these schemes essentially involve a period of marginality from and eventual return to the normal rhythms of society, and so what we have here is a problem of over-determinism. The structural affinity of all these patterns and their general applicability make it difficult to identify a single, exclusive ritual scheme that the *Odyssey* reflects specifically, or any other sole dominant pattern for that matter.[85] As a result of fair criticisms about the overly reductive impulse to derive the *Odyssey* (and all myths) from a single myth-and-ritual complex, both lines of interpretation – the New Year complex and the initiatory complex – fell out of favor as quickly as they arose throughout the twentieth century. And though I do not believe that the objections to these analyses necessarily preclude the possibility of some aspects of Odysseus' story being a poetic reflection of a New Year celebration, initiation, or some other ritual, I, too, do not subscribe to a specific ritual scheme to interpret the *Odyssey* or Apollo's involvement in the *mnesterophonia*. Instead, I find it more advantageous to view the god and his festival, which are both heavily associated with change, as facilitating and operating within the situation of transition more broadly.

Apollo's festival celebrates the crossing of many boundaries – both real and symbolic – that all converge during the *mnesterophonia*. In addition to the lunar and seasonal changes discussed above, shifts in physical,[86] aesthetic,[87] and social[88] states can be discerned. This last

[84] Van Gennep 1977. We could also add Joseph Campbell's outline (1949) of the "adventure of the hero" – departure, initiation, return – into the mix for good measure.

[85] See Versnel's excellent discussion of this very issue. Versnel follows Walter Burkert in viewing the similarities of all the schemes as a natural development of variations on a biological-cultural program of action, which potentially carried over into all complexes.

[86] Odysseus physically crosses the threshold of his own hall (*οὖδος*, *Od.* 22.2), which parallels his movement from being a beggar to an avenging host (Nagler 1990: 348). Dougherty 2001: 166, 174 also observes a significant "technology transfer," wherein nautical tools are converted into the instruments of Odysseus' revenge.

kind of transition is enacted by a personal transition that Odysseus himself undergoes: that from non-integrated exile to an integrated one (of the colonial founder variety). As I discussed earlier, the slaughter of the suitors is the pivotal moment when Odysseus sheds his outsider status and reintegrates into Ithaca as founder and king. A new social period then begins with his reintegration in this violent manner, mirroring the new period that begins with the coming of Apollo in his festival. The setting of the *mnesterophonia* during Apollo's festival thus reinforces the slaughter's characterization as a foundational event, and casts Odysseus as an Apolline hero when he slays the suitors.[89] Through this violent deed, Odysseus assumes and demonstrates many of Apollo's key aspects. It is of course difficult to segment and correlate all of Apollo's functions, given his many-sided nature, but as a man of many turns himself, Odysseus particularly seems to project Apollo's different capacities as an archer, singer, and murderous founder when he kills the suitors. I shall now explore, in more detail, the shared affinity between the hero and the god in these respects to leverage my broader argument about Apollo's facilitation of the fugitive-murderer pattern in the *Odyssey*.

Odysseus first emerges as a mirror of Apollo at the juncture between the bow-contest's conclusion and the slaughter's commencement, when he takes his first shot at the suitors:

> *οὗτος μὲν δὴ ἄεθλος ἀάατος ἐκτετέλεσται·*
> *νῦν αὖτε σκοπὸν ἄλλον, ὃν οὔ πώ τις βάλεν ἀνήρ,*
> *εἴσομαι, αἴ κε τύχωμι, πόρῃ δέ μοι εὖχος Ἀπόλλων.* (*Od.* 22.5-7)
>
> This clear contest is at an end. And now another mark, which no man has yet struck, I shall see if I shall hit, and may Apollo grant my prayer.

By wielding Apollo's characteristic weapon and invoking the god as his ally, Odysseus shapes

---

[87] Segal 1994: 98-100.

[88] Cook 1995: 128-70.

[89] Odysseus was first identified an "Apollinische Held" by Wilamowitz 1884: 114. Many correspondences between the two have subsequently been observed in the spheres of war, poetry, and religion, on which see Cook 1995: 149-52; Nieto Hernández 2002; Maronitis 2009.

his climactic self-revelation as something of an Apolline epiphany.[90] He specifically assumes the god's role as an archer, slaying his rivals and enemies with his shafts, just as the archer-god himself does when he appears in real action throughout the *Odyssey*.[91] Like Apollo shooting down Eurytus for vying with the gods in archery (*Od*. 8.226-28), or Otus and Ephialtes for warring against the gods and breaching their abodes (*Od.* 11.307-20), Odysseus takes aim at the suitors in retribution for their insurgent actions against his household. Both hero and god alike operate as champions against rebellion, who punish the guilty by administering the penalty of death. In his capacity as an archer, then, Odysseus embodies Apollo the destroyer,[92] who utterly terminates men – even entire generations or communities[93] – with the bow to reaffirm his own authority and prestige. It is worth noting, too, that the nature of the suitors' crimes aligns Odysseus' situation with the pattern of a theoxeny, where a god in disguise visits mortals to test their hospitality and punishes poor hosts.[94] In similar fashion, Odysseus deals out punishment for the abuse he suffered at the hands of the suitors when he was disguised as a beggar, only his revealed identity proves to be the role of the archer-avenger Apollo.[95]

At the same time, Odysseus' performance in slaying the suitors displays Apollo's other

---

[90] That Odysseus' epiphany is characteristic of Apollo was first pointed out by Thomson 1914: 232-35. Cf. also *Od.* 18.343-44, 353-55, where the light issuing from Odysseus' head and body is also suggestive of a divine epiphany.

[91] Victims of Apollo's shafts in the *Odyssey* include: Phrontis (*Od.* 3.279-82), Rhexenor (*Od.* 7.64-65), Eurytus (*Od.* 8.226-27), Otus and Ephialtes (*Od.* 11.318-20), and the old residents of Ortygia (*Od.* 15.409-11). Archery is not a skill Odysseus was particularly known for, but the *Odyssey* provides many indications of Odysseus' experience with the bow in preparation for his final role as an archer in the *mnesterophonia*. See *Od.* 1.255-65; 8.215-28; 9.156-68; 10.262; 14.225; 21.11-41.

[92] A popular folk etymology even linked Apollo's name to the verb *ἀπόλλυμι*, 'to destroy' (Aesch. *Ag.* 1080-82).

[93] Apollo shoots down the Niobids (*Il.* 24.602-09) and tribes of old Ortygians (*Od.* 15.409-11) with his sister Artemis.

[94] On Odysseus' return as a theoxeny, see Kearns 1982; Murnaghan 1987: 11-14; Reece 1993: 181-87; Olson 1995: 218-23. The history behind the bow that Odysseus uses contributes to the theme of hospitality underlining the *mnesterophonia.* Odysseus received the weapon from Iphitus as a gift, an emblem of their guest-friendship (*Od.* 21.11-41), which then functions as a fitting instrument to exact revenge against the suitors, transgressors of hospitality. On the significance of the bow as Odysseus' choice of weapon, see Clay 1983: 91-96; Segal 1994: 53-57; Crissy 1997; Danek 1998b.

[95] Contributing to the image of Odysseus as a disguised divine figure is the fact that he is assimilated to a god at *Od.* 16.177-85; 17.481-87; 23.62-68.

key aspect as a singer, that of the citharode,[96] whose activity is assimilated to that of the archer. In a memorable simile describing Odysseus' first handling of the bow for the contest, he strings the weapon as if it were a lyre:

> […] *ἀτὰρ πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς,*
> *αὐτίκ' ἐπεὶ μέγα τόξον ἐβάστασε καὶ ἴδε πάντῃ,*
> *ὡς ὅτ' ἀνὴρ φόρμιγγος ἐπιστάμενος καὶ ἀοιδῆς*
> *ῥηϊδίως ἐτάνυσσε νέῳ περὶ κόλλοπι χορδήν,*
> *ἅψας ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐΰστρεφὲς ἔντερον οἰός,*
> *ὣς ἄρ' ἄτερ σπουδῆς τάνυσεν μέγα τόξον Ὀδυσσεύς.*
> *δεξιτερῇ δ' ἄρα χειρὶ λαβὼν πειρήσατο νευρῆς·*
> *ἡ δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν ἄεισε, χελιδόνι εἰκέλη αὐδήν.* (*Od.* 21.404-11)
>
> But as soon as Odysseus, the man of many wiles, lifted the great bow and looked at it on every side, just as when a man skilled in the lyre and in song easily stretches the string about a new peg, fastening at both ends the well-twisted gut of a sheep, so without effort Odysseus strung the great bow. And taking it in his right hand, he tried the string, which sang sweetly beneath his touch, like a swallow in tone.

As the simile highlights here, the act of wielding the bow is similar to playing the lyre. Both, with their similar bent shapes, require the plucking of strings and produce sweet sounds.[97] The bow even "sings" (*ἄεισε*, *Od.* 21.411), glorifying Odysseus' ensuing use of the weapon, as a singer does with his lyre (*ἔργ' ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, τά τε κλείουσιν ἀοιδοί*, *Od.* 1.338). And like its musical counterpart, as Charles Segal first pointed out, the bow elicits various emotions from its immediate target audience.[98] Just as Phemius' song of the Achaeans' *nostos* brings delight to the general audience (*τέρπειν*, *Od.* 1.347; *τέρποντο*, *Od.* 1.422) but arouses grief in Penelope (*πένθος*, *Od.* 1.342), so Odysseus' handling of the bow separately brings grief (*ἄχος*, *Od.* 21.412) to the suitors and rejoicing to Odysseus (*γήθησέν*, *Od.* 21.414).[99]

---

[96] The god's association with music and the lyre is highlighted in Homer at *Od.* 8.488 and *Il.* 1.601-04. Odysseus is likened to a singer again at *Od.* 11.368.

[97] Heraclitus similarly compared the bow to the lyre: *παλίντροπος ἁρμονίη ὅκωσπερ τόξου καὶ λύρης* (51 DK).

[98] Segal 1994: 98-100. He discusses the bow further as an emblem of the settled community at 53-57.

[99] Compare also the scene where Demodocus' songs delight the Phaeacians, but cause Odysseus to weep (*Od.* 8.83-92, 536-43).

Despite the divisive emotional responses it can draw, the lyre's use still exercises a unifying power in a social dimension, which stems from the audience's shared experience of the performance. Songs hold an audience enthralled together, and so the singer often acts as a focus of community solidarity.[100] Therefore in contrast to the archer aspect of Apollo that destroys, the singer role creates; it forges social ties.[101] The singer also establishes and regulates social conduct, since his poetic repertoire reflects a tradition that, in recording human action, offers much instructive value for its listeners.[102] By recalling and transmitting such a tradition, the singer additionally serves as a "constructor of his community" who helps to constitute its social values.[103] This function of the singer is highlighted in the figure of an unnamed singer, whom Agamemnon entrusts with the task of protecting Clytemnestra in his absence (*Od.* 3.267-72).[104] His eventual dismissal by Aegisthus coincides with the disorder that overruns Agamemnon's kingdom, suggesting that it is the singer's presence that maintains law and order and guarantees a sense of continuity and stability. Assimilation of Odysseus' bow to the lyre in the contest thus endows Odysseus with the same function. For Odysseus to be likened to the player of a lyre announces his role as an important and constructive one in the life of the Ithacan community.

This two-fold presentation of Odysseus as a destructive and constructive personality when he confronts the suitors may seem contradictory, but it is actually made uniform and

---

[100] Odysseus even remarks on the greatest sense of fulfillment that arises from a singer's captivation of his audience at a feast (*Od.* 9.5-11).

[101] Elsewhere in the *Odyssey*, the singer's functions also include entertaining, soothing, and glorifying (e.g. *Od.* 1.337-52). On the role of singers in Homeric poetry, see Bartol 2007.

[102] The advisory or didactic function of the singer is not made explicit in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*, but many ancient commentators certainly took this view about the value of their profession (e.g. Ath. 14b; Eust. ad *Od.* 3.267).

[103] Scully 1981: 78.

[104] This singer-guardian is found in no other version of the Oresteia, and has consequently inspired many different interpretations about his role in the *Odyssey*. Unlike Scully's view (1981) of the singer as a source of social normalcy, Page 1972 argues that the singer is the remnant of an earlier tradition in which he also acted as prophet or priest. West 1988 ad *Od.* 3.267, following Hesychius, entertains the possibility that the unnamed singer is a eunuch, while de Jong 2001 ad *Od.* 1.254-316 believes his position resembles that of Mentor in Odysseus' palace. Alternatively, Stanford 1967 ad *Od.* 3.259 and Andersen 1992 take up a propagandistic view, seeing him merely as another instance of Homer promoting his own craft.

coherent by his simultaneous possession of Apollo's two key physical attributes, the bow and the lyre.[105] The god embodies the complementary nature of this dichotomy by taking both objects to hand. In the *Iliad*, for example, his possession of the bow at the beginning (*Il.* 1.9-12) and the lyre at the end (*Il.* 1.603) of the first book frames the destruction of the Achaeans.[106] The acts of killing men and playing music similarly converge in the *mnesterophonia*, where Odysseus effectively mirrors the Iliadic Apollo's movement from destruction to celebration:

> *αὐτὰρ θεῖος ἀοιδὸς ἔχων φόρμιγγα λίγειαν*
> *ὑμῖν ἡγείσθω πολυπαίγμονος ὀρχηθμοῖο,*
> *ὥς κέν τις φαίη γάμον ἔμμεναι ἐκτὸς ἀκούων,*
> *ἢ ἀν' ὁδὸν στείχων ἢ οἳ περιναιετάουσι·* (*Od.* 23.133-36)
>
> Then let the divine singer with his clear-toned lyre lead us in the very sportive dance, so that anyone who hears from outside, a passer-by or our neighbors, will take it for a wedding celebration.

The improvised wedding celebration here disguises the slaughter, but also oddly blends in with it so that they are nearly indistinguishable, as Odysseus intends.[107] Both are different but closely related events that operate in tandem, not in contradiction, to effect Odysseus' successful reintegration into the Ithacan community. The slaughter of the suitors is, in a sense, Odysseus' (re)courtship of Penelope, which he effectively wins, and leads directly to their reunion, a colonial (re)marriage of sorts.[108] Accordingly, the slaughter conducted by the bow can be equated with the celebratory dance led by the lyre.[109] Given these correspondences, the harmonious quality of the musical bow in the simile does not so much mitigate the brutality of the weaponized bow as it validates it. Their assimilation implies that violence can be a legitimate

---

[105] *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 131: *εἴη μοι κίθαρίς τε φίλη καὶ καμπύλα τόξα.*

[106] The framing of the book by Apollo's activities was first pointed out by Dumézil 1982: 60.

[107] See Seaford 1994: 31-38 for a view of a wedding and wedding feast pattern organizing the reunion of Odysseus and Penelope. He sees the ending of this pattern as the ending of an earlier version of the poem.

[108] See Pucci 1987: 91 and Dougherty 2001: 167 for a discussion of the slaughter of the suitors as a prelude to Odysseus' and Penelope's (re)marriage.

[109] Odysseus in fact announces the ensuing slaughter in the metaphorical terms of a celebration at *Od.* 21.425-30.

solution to civic problems. An instrument of death can be a musical instrument that authorizes heroic exploits, even brutal ones. Odysseus' act of destruction, in turn, can be an act of foundation. Thus the two different aspects of Apollo as singer and archer merge seamlessly together in Odysseus' slaughter of the suitors, effectively fusing contradictions of violence and order as well. As an Apolline hero who wields the bow and lyre alike, Odysseus proves to be a figure who both destroys and constructs a community in the same moment within the *mnesterophonia*.

I have embarked on this extended excursus on Odysseus' various associations with Apollo because the fugitive murderer also embodies the same tensions between the destructive and constructive. As a criminal and non-integrated exile on the one hand, and as a reintegrated exile or founder figure on the other, the fugitive murderer must similarly straddle and mediate these different, conflicting realms. In fact, I believe that Odysseus' performance as a murderous founder can also be correlated with another aspect of the god in the same capacity, which merges the contrasting qualities of the archer and singer in this single role. Apollo was frequently recognized as a fugitive murderer and celebrated as a founder bearing the cult titles of *archēgetēs*, *ktistēs*, and *oikistēs*.[110] These roles are not highlighted explicitly in Homer, but many other myths preserve portrayals of the god in these ways. Cyrene's foundation, for example, is frequently attributed to Apollo,[111] and the god's portrayal as a murderous criminal emerges in myths concerning his slaying of the Delphic serpent and the Cyclopes. After slaying the Python,

---

[110] *Archēgetēs* is Apollo's usual title in connection with colonization. On these titles of Apollo, see Lampros 1873: 8-20 and Malkin 1986.

[111] There are many different colonial narratives concerning Cyrene with Battus typically identified as the oikist, but Apollo is always integral to its foundation. Cf. Hdt. 4.150-58; Pind. *Pyth.* 4.4-8, 59-63; *Pyth*. 5.85-95; *Pyth.* 9. Leschhorn (1984: 367-72) lists 28 other instances in which Apollo is identified as a founder. Apollo is also celebrated in this specific role in Callim. *Hymn* 2.55 and Justin. *Apol.* 8.2.11.

Apollo fled to Tempe or Crete for purification,[112] while he was sentenced to a year of serving Admetus for killing the Cyclopes.[113] In these examples, then, we again find Apollo involved in somewhat conflicting activities as a violent transgressor who helps to chart the constitution of a city, and as a figure of frequent marginalization who also promotes the unity of a city.

Apollo is drawn further into these fields of action through his capacity as a god of oracular guidance and as a sponsor of colonial enterprises. In both myth and in historical reality, his oracle at Delphi frequently appointed oikists and sanctioned acts of settlement.[114] This same oracle also facilitated Apollo's close relations with murderers seeking purification, and entrusted them with the founding of new cities or colonies.[115] Such foundation oracles often implicitly authorized the use of violent force against native populations to support the colonial endeavors, much like other oracles given in response to inquiries about wars.[116] An example of Apollo granting such lethal authorization in Homer is perhaps present in Demodocus' first song, where Agamemnon stops at Pytho and learns from the oracle that a quarrel between Achilles and Odysseus will arise (*Od.* 8.79-82).[117] We are not told when or why Agamemnon makes this visit, but there are a few indications that it occurred on his way to Troy so that he could seek the god's

---

[112] Paus. 2.7.7, 2.30.3; Plut. *Mor*. 417f-418c, 421c.

[113] Hes. fr. 54 b-c M-W; Eur. *Alc.* 1-8; Apollod. 3.10.4; Diod. Sic. 4.71.3; Hyg. *Fab*. 49; *Poet. astr*. 2.15; Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 35a. Anaxandridas *FGrH* 404 F 5, however, records that Apollo's temporary servitude to Admetus was punishment for killing the Delphic dragon.

[114] For the nature and scope of Apollo's role, particularly his oracle at Delphi, in the historical practice of archaic Greek colonization, see Forrest 1957; Gierth 1971; Defradas 1972; Malkin 1987: 17-91. On the importance of the god and his oracle in narratives of Greek colonization, see Schmid 1947: 148-43 and Dougherty 1993: 31-44.

[115] Prominent examples of murderers who consulted the oracle and became founders include Alcmaeon (Thuc. 2.102.5-6; Apollod. 3.7.5; Paus. 8.24.8-9; *FGrH* 70 F 123), Orestes (see note 58 above), and Coroebus (Paus. 1.43.7-8; Conon *Narr.* 19). In Apollodorus' account, the oracle remarkably bids Alcmaeon to kill his mother. See Dougherty 1993: 31-44 for a discussion of purification as a conceptual analogy for colonization. A folk etymology linking Apollo's name to the Greek verbs "to wash, cleanse" (*ἀπολούων*) or "to deliver (from evil)" (*ἀπολύων*) reinforces Apollo's conceptualization as a cathartic deity (Pl. *Cra*. 405b).

[116] The foundation oracles for Taras and Miletus, for example, imply justification for the conquest or expulsion of native populations, on which see Malkin 1987: 47-52.

[117] This is the only mention of consultation of the Delphic oracle in Homer. Three more references to Delphi occur at *Il.* 2.519; *Il.* 9.401-03; *Od.* 11.581.

favor in the Trojan expedition.[118] Demodocus pinpoints this consultation as the beginning of evils for the Trojans and Greeks (*Od.* 8.81-82), suggesting that the war has just begun. And since it makes Agamemnon happy to see the oracle's prophecy about the quarrel come true (*χαῖρε νόῳ*, *Od.* 8.88), the other content of the oracle may very well have identified this event as the moment when Agamemnon would conquer Troy. So as a god intimately linked with oracles, homicide, colonization, and foundation, Apollo legitimizes violent initiatives – both military and colonial ones. The oikist in turn can be viewed as the human mirror of the god, who uniquely facilitates and participates in the same experience of the fugitive murderer.[119]

Given this additional aspect of Apollo, I believe that Odysseus' presentation as an Apolline hero also reflects the god's aspect as a violent founder, and therefore reinforces the *Odyssey*'s conceptualization of Odysseus' homecoming as part of the fugitive-murderer pattern. As a reflection of the god in this capacity, Odysseus possesses the authority to transgress and slay the suitors in the same way that oikists and other kinds of military leaders receive moral sanction from the Delphic Apollo to appropriate territories and oust the resistant inhabitants. Like Apollo and the oikist, Odysseus functions as a leader guiding a community in crisis into a settled one. And by mediating this turbulent transition through his success in the slaughter of the suitors, he reintegrates himself as an essential member of the Ithacan community as its founder.

As I have shown thus far, the *mnesterophonia* is bound by a set of Apolline themes and transitional situations, which underline the re-contextualization of Odysseus' actions as a colonial foundation at the end of the fugitive-murderer pattern. Apollo's background presence throughout the massacre therefore proves to exert a greater formative influence on the terms of

---

[118] Demetrius Phalereus, who is quoted by schol. E.H.M.Q.R. ad *Od.* 3.267, corroborates a tradition where Menealaus and Odysseus traveled to Delphi to ask Apollo about the Trojan expedition.

[119] Lampros 1873 was the first to consider the oikist a mirror of Apollo. Malkin (1987: 89), on the other hand, views the oikist as more of a mediator: "It could be said that the oikist, in religious terms, is to the colonists what Apollo is to the oikist – an expounder of what is to be done."

Odysseus' homecoming than previously observed. That Apollo's role is integral to Odysseus' successful repatriation is confirmed by the fact that, in his final mention in the *Odyssey*, he is invoked together with Zeus and Athena in the context of bringing about the suitors' doom (*αἲ γάρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἄπολλον*, *Od.* 24.376).[120] So with this enlarged understanding of Apollo's relevance to and the colonial aspects of Odysseus, let us now turn to the final act of the *mnesterophonia* to consider how all the gods together help to secure Ithaca's re-foundation and conclude Odysseus' particular form of the fugitive-murderer pattern.

In the end, Eupeithes and other relatives of the slain suitors naturally do not view Odysseus' actions as constructive, or Odysseus himself as a desirable former exile to be brought into the community. They pursue him as a would-be fugitive and gear up to fight a civil war that threatens to perpetuate an endless cycle of violence and vengeance. Only a veritable *deus* (*et dea*) *ex machina* decisively allows for Odysseus' permanent reinstatement as king in Ithaca. Closure is achieved through Athena's direct intervention (*Od.* 24.528-48), which fulfills Zeus' earlier proposal to consign the murders of the suitors to oblivion:

> *ἐπεὶ δὴ μνηστῆρας ἐτίσατο δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς,*
> *ὅρκια πιστὰ ταμόντες ὁ μὲν βασιλευέτω αἰεί,*
> *ἡμεῖς δ' αὖ παίδων τε κασιγνήτων τε φόνοιο*
> *ἔκλησιν θέωμεν· τοὶ δ' ἀλλήλους φιλεόντων*
> *ὡς τὸ πάρος, πλοῦτος δὲ καὶ εἰρήνη ἅλις ἔστω.* (*Od*. 24.482-86)
>
> Since indeed noble Odysseus has taken vengeance on the suitors, after sure oaths have been sworn, let him always be king, and let us bring about a forgetting of the murder of their sons and brothers; and let them love one another as before, and let there be wealth and peace in plenty.

This unique political resolution is reminiscent of historical treaties between warring Greek

---

[120] The three are invoked together again in a similar context at *Od.* 4.341; 17.132; 18.235. One more occasion in which this Olympian triad is invoked is when Alcinous wishes for Odysseus to be his son-in-law (*Od.* 7.311). Interestingly enough, this is another situation in which a colonial settlement is at stake.

communities,[121] but its syntax is strange. The peculiarity here revolves around the contrasting *μέν* and *δέ* clauses, which elaborate the subjects and terms of the oath. As Eustathius notes, we should expect to find the Ithacans in contrast to Odysseus – something to the effect of: *ὅρκια πιστὰ ταμόντες, ὁ μὲν Ὀδυσσεὺς βασιλευέτω, οἱ δὲ Ἰθακήσιοι βασιλευέσθωσαν εὐπειθῶς*.[122] Instead, the apodosis names the gods as equivalent subjects (*ἡμεῖς*, *Od.* 24.484) and hence highlights them, together with Odysseus, as co-authors of the *Odyssey*'s narrative of redemptive violence, colonial transformation, and Ithaca's re-foundation.

The removal of Eupeithes' faction altogether from the terms of the oath ultimately serves to elide attention to legacy and loss in the Ithacan community. Their erasure as the opposing party allows for a reconstructed narrative of continuity, in which the Ithacans almost seem never to have been at variance with their own king. This is reinforced by Zeus' proposal for general amnesia, which does not necessarily call for the Ithacans to forget the final conflict, but only to forget the memory of the slaughter of their sons and brothers (*παίδων τε κασιγνήτων τε φόνοιο*, *Od.* 24.484). It encourages severance of familial and social ties to the slain suitors, which would then allow the community to move forward peacefully and to accept Odysseus' divinely sanctioned kingship.

Only one more figure cannot be accommodated into this arrangement: Eupeithes, who, as the *Odyssey* makes clear, would not have accepted those terms anyway (*Od.* 24.426-37). The continued danger he poses to Ithaca is suggested by his very name, the 'good persuader,' which reflects his rhetorical skill and ability to mobilize forces against Odysseus.[123] Significantly, this

---

[121] Marks 2008: 76 with note 24.

[122] E.g. Eust. ad *Od.* 24.482-86.

[123] His persuasive ability is emphasized by the clever wordplay at *Od.* 24. 465-66: *Εὐπείθει πείθοντ'*, "they were persuaded by Eupeithes, the good persuader." This skill seems to have been inherited by his son Antinous, who also proves adept at persuading crowds and winning their approval, e.g. *Od.* 2.84-128; 4.660-73; 18.42-50. On the etymology of Eupeithes, see Mühlestein 1971: 46-47; Peradotto 1990: 111; de Jong 2001 ad *Od.* 24.465-66; West

is not the only occasion in which Eupeithes has been shown to rally groups hostile to Ithaca. As Penelope reminds Antinous, Eupeithes was formerly a fugitive because he had betrayed the Ithacans by joining Taphian pirates and harassing the Thesprotians, one-time allies of Odysseus (*Od.* 16.424-30). Eupeithes therefore is something of a recidivist insurgent, who represents the root of a socially disintegrative impulse. This is why he must die in the final battle; his desire to pursue revenge poses the final threat to the wellbeing of the community.[124] But in order to circumvent the perpetuation of another cycle of vengeance, a renewed pattern of murder and flight, his death is significantly displaced back onto the older generation. Laertes, father of Odysseus, kills Eupeithes, father of Antinous (*Od.* 24.517-25), thus absolving Odysseus' generation of responsibility and definitively sealing the terms of Ithaca's re-foundation.

Zeus and Athena's political resolution to the slaughter of the suitors, then, is analogous to the aim of many Greek colonial narratives, which attempt to obliterate traces of disruption or otherwise disguise the violent aggression involved in settling a new land.[125] In similar fashion, but moving in the opposite direction, Odysseus' violent return is framed as a restorative endeavor of re-foundation. Thus a crucial reversal is established here. While colonial tales displace the violence of expeditions back onto the cause of displacement, the *Odyssey* thrusts forward the murderous aggression into Odysseus' act of reclaiming Ithaca. Murder of the suitors serves as the means by which the returned hero ultimately reestablishes himself at home. This narrative reversal of the fugitive-murderer pattern validates Odysseus by recasting manslaughter

---

2014: 304; Kanavou 2015: 132, with note 250.

[124] See Marks 2008: 78-81 for a compelling discussion of Eupeithes as a scapegoat figure.

[125] One famous example of this tendency can be seen in the so-called Dorian invasion, which was mythologized as the return of the Heracleidae. For a detailed overview of this period of mythological history, see Fowler 2013: 334-46. Zeus' proposal for *ἔκλησις* has alternatively been interpreted as a "substitute for the destruction of the Ithakans themselves" (Marks 2008: 78), "the abolition of the law of the blood-feud" (Heubeck 1992 ad *Od.* 24.482-85), or "das Zitat einer Sackgasse" (Danek 1998a: 505). On this last view of Zeus' plan functioning in response to other Odyssean traditions, see Marks 2008 and my own discussion further below.

– a kind of violence that typically severs ties between individual and community – as an important mechanism for political reconciliation. In this way, the *Odyssey* can end with both murder and the successful reintegration of Odysseus.

4.4 Fugitive Murderers as Figures of Reconciliation: The *Odyssey* and Post-*Odyssey* Tales

As I have shown thus far, the fugitive murderers in the *Odyssey* help to negotiate the terms of the epic's end within the internal frame of its narrative. To conclude, I would now like to address how the fugitive murderers operate on another level beyond the immediate narrative frame of the *Odyssey*. This additional level encompasses non-Homeric traditions in which Odysseus' exile did occur in consequence of the slaughter of the suitors. Both external and internal evidence indicates that this outcome was by far the more common one, and has even led to many speculations that the Homeric ending with Athena and Zeus' intervention is an interpolation.[126] There are also, however, many indications in our *Odyssey* that the epic is well aware of these other traditions, and yet still deliberately strove for the conclusion that we have inherited.[127] The issue with the political resolution that Athena and Zeus have arranged, then, is not only the restoration of civic unity, but also the negotiation of mythological complexity. I have already discussed the former issue at length, but as for the second, I suggest that the fugitive murderers of the *Odyssey*, again, help the epic to confront the competitive set of alternative post-*Odyssey* tales by incorporating them into the very narrative fabric of Odysseus' homecoming and re-foundation of Ithaca. That is to say, I believe that the fugitive murderers also

[126] According to schol. ad *Od.* 23.296, Aristarchus and Aristophanes of Byzantium identified the "end" (*πέρας/τέλος*) of the *Odyssey* at 23.96: *ἀσπάσιοι λέκτροιο παλαιοῦ θέσμον ἵκοντο*. For a review of the concerns and positions of this debate, see Heubeck 1992 ad *Od.* 23.297 and Seaford 1994: 38-42.

[127] See the discussion of Marks 2008: 62-82 on this point.

function as key meta-poetic elements, which link the *Odyssey* to alternative post-*Odyssey* tales and to other Odyssean homecoming narratives. In helping to resolve Odysseus' struggle against the suitors and the suitors' relatives, the fugitive murderers additionally mediate the *Odyssey*'s rivalry with these non-Homeric traditions. Before I pursue this point further, let us first review the evidence for traditions that narrated Odysseus' exile from Ithaca.

The majority of extant post-*Odyssey* tales attest to Odysseus leaving Ithaca again, and localize his exilic adventures primarily in western regions.[128] Apollodorus records a version in which Odysseus is sentenced to exile by Neoptolemus, and subsequently relocates to Aetolia (Apollod. 7.40). Plutarch also has Neoptolemus exile Odysseus,[129] who then departs to Italy (*Quaest. Graec.* 14 = Arist. fr. 507 Rose).[130] Hellanicus and Theopompus place Odysseus in Italy as well, and notably depict him in the role of the murderous founder. Hellanicus relates that Odysseus went to Italy with Aeneas from the land of the Molossians, helping to found Rome (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 1.72),[131] while Theopompus reports that Odysseus founded Cortona and died there (Tzetz. schol. ad Lycoph. 806 = *FGrH* 115 F 354). A scholion of Lycophron's

---

[128] In Hyg. *Fab.* 127, however, Odysseus does not leave Ithaca. The alternative post-*Odyssey* traditions are discussed by Malkin 1998: 120-55; Tsagalis 2007: 63-90; Marks 2008: 83-111.

[129] Interestingly enough, different motivations are attached to Neoptolemus' judgment. In Plutarch's version, Neoptolemus was sent for by the two warring parties of Ithaca to serve as arbitrator. In Apollodorus' version, however, Neoptolemus became involved for more nefarious reasons, banishing Odysseus as part of his bid to gain possession of Cephallenia. This is another clear-cut case of exile being linked to intra-elite competition.

[130] During a lively Q&A session for the Nostoi SCS panel on January 8, 2017, Ruth Scodel memorably remarked that these post-*Odyssey* tales involving Neoptolemus "smack of Euripidean tragedy." She inferred a Euripidean quality specifically from the legal resolution provided by Neoptolemus, and thus cautioned against regarding these accounts as authentically traditional. The same could be said, however, of the ending we have inherited with Athena's intervention, which de Jong (2001 ad *Od.* 24.528-48) even notes "may be seen as the prototype for the *deus ex machina* of later drama, especially Euripidean drama." Following Gregory Nagy's (1981) "evolutionary model" of Homeric poetry, I believe that understanding the Homeric poems as products of a culture and of a continuously fluid oral tradition – and hence as poems continually shaped and reshaped by long and diverse movements of composition and reception – helps to address Scodel's concerns. It is not beyond the realm of possibility to imagine that Neoptolemus' arbitration was influenced by contemporary legal procedure and thus filtered into Odysseus' story as Homeric poetry continued to be refashioned during and throughout the classical period. I therefore consider the Neoptolemus-tales to be authentic variants (on the enlarged level of plot and substance) of Odysseus' story, and I thank Christopher Baron for pushing me on this point.

[131] There is a textual problem here: Aeneas came to Italy either with Odysseus (*μετ'Ὀδυσσέως*) or after him (*μετ' Ὀδυσσέα*). See the discussions of Horsfall 1979 and Solmsen 1986.

Alexandra, however, speaks of a reference in Aristotle's *Constitution of the Ithacans* (schol. vet. ad Lycoph. 799 = *FGrH* 840 F 13 = Arist. fr. 508 Rose)[132] to an oracle of Odysseus among the Aetolian Eurytanes, while another scholion states that an oracle brought Odysseus to the Epirote Eurytanes (Tzetz. schol. ad Lycoph. 815). Finally, summaries of the *Telegony* and *Thesprotis*,[133] two lost poems of the Epic Cycle, do not explicitly record that Odysseus suffered exile as punishment for the slaughter of the suitors, but their plots still apparently revolved around Odysseus leaving Ithaca temporarily. Following the slaughter of the suitors, he sailed to Elis to look over his herds, and then returned back to Ithaca to complete the sacrifices directed by Tiresias in the Nekyia of *Odyssey* 11 (Procl. *Chrest*. 306 Severyns). After this, Odysseus purportedly left Ithaca again, journeyed through Epirus, came to the Threspotians, and married their queen Callidice. Again, he returned to his homeland, where he was eventually killed by his son Telegonus (Apollod. 7.34-36).

In addition to this host of external evidence, the *Odyssey* implies its own sequel a few times. Perhaps the most famous citation of Odysseus' post-*Odyssey* life is the scene where he consults Tiresias in the underworld. The blind prophet commands the hero to take an oar and travel inland until the oar is misidentified as a winnowing fan by whomever he encounters. Then he should plant his oar in the site of that encounter and offer sacrifices to Poseidon there (*Od*. 11.119-34 ~ 23.266-81). Tiresias' prophetic narrative not only corroborates elements of the *Telegony*'s plot, but also plays out like that of many other fugitive murderers in Greek mythology, whose departure, post-murder, provides the etiology for a cult's establishment or a

[132] Note that Plutarch (*Quaest Graec.* 14 = fr. 507 Rose), summarized above, alternatively presents Aristotle as placing Odysseus in Italy. Malkin (1998: 125) is likely right that the *Constitution of the Ithacans* was "a compendium of conflicting traditions."

[133] These two titles are frequently believed to refer to the same poem. The *Thesprotis*, however, is attested as distinct from the *Telegony* in Clem. Al. *Strom.* 6.2.26.1. See Malkin 1998: 126-27 and Davies 1988: 156. Marks (2008: 104n44) is perhaps right in distinguishing the *Thesprotis* as an epichoric poem and the *Telegony* panhellenic one.

city's foundation.[134] In relating his directions to Odysseus, Tiresias is cast in the role that the Delphic oracle frequently plays, while Odysseus is projected to be a founder-figure and culture hero, spreading the cult of Poseidon.

Another allusive example of Odysseus' post-*Odyssey* experiences can be seen when Eupeithes expresses his resolve to punish Odysseus before he can escape to Pylos or Elis (*Od.* 24.434-36). Elis, of course, is where Odysseus departed to immediately after the slaughter of the suitors in the *Telegony*, but the specific pairing of Pylos and Elis additionally recalls the two choice places of exile identified by Odysseus while he was pretending to be a Cretan fugitive (*Od.* 13.274-75). This striking correspondence suggests not only that Odysseus' false stories incorporate references to other accounts of Odysseus' homecoming, as many scholars have already shown,[135] but also that the fugitive murderers themselves can be understood as potential allusions to non-Homeric Odyssean traditions as well.

Theoclymenus in particular, though previously subject to much censure as an interpolative character, has been discussed extensively and fruitfully in such a light.[136] Steve Reece, for instance, believes that the enigmatic figure represents a surviving vestige of an alternative homecoming narrative, where Odysseus reunited with Telemachus on Crete and

[134] See Dougherty 1993: 147-49 for a list of such examples, and Dougherty 2001: 172-74 for her demonstration of Tiresias' prophecy reinforcing the colonial themes of Odysseus' homecoming in the *Odyssey*. Meyer 1895: 263-64 and Hartmann 1917: 73-75, 91 were the first to emphasize the prophecy's furnishing of an etiology for an inland shrine of Poseidon. Such discussions have been significantly augmented by the recognition that the prophecy preserves a mythological reflex of the folktale of the Sailor and the Oar, to which the story of St. Elias also bears witness. For discussions of this folktale, see Halliday 1914; Hansen 1976 and 1977. Other prominent treatments of Tiresias' prophecy include Pucci 1987: 148-50; Peradotto 1985: 65-70; Ballabriga 1989; Segal 1994: 187-94; Malkin 1998: 120-26; Tsagalis 2007: 69-76.

[135] Merkelbach 1969: 224-26; Reece 1994; Danek 1998a; Steiner 2010 ad *Od.* 17.53; Tsagalis 2012. For other allusions in the *Odyssey* to other aspects of Odysseus' mythic life, see the citations in note 128 above, as well as Lord 1960: 174; S. West 1981; Ahl and Roisman 1996; Marks 2003; Tsagalis 2007: 30-92; Alwine 2009; Haller 2013.

[136] Theoclymenus' authenticity has been questioned, or his character otherwise denounced, primarily by Bethe 1922: 40; Page 1955; Kirk 1962; West 2014. But the majority of scholars now recognize and demonstrate the meaningful and integral role that the seer plays in the *Odyssey*, e.g. Beye 1966: 168; Fenik 1974: 233-44; Thornton 1970: 58-62; Erbse 1972: 42-54; Hansen 1972: 3447; Race 1993: 98-99; Reece 1994; de Jong 2001 ad *Od.* 15.222-78. For a thorough review of previous scholarship on Theoclymenus, see Reece 1994: 162n7.

returned to Ithaca to achieve his homecoming in the guise of the fugitive seer.[137] In support of this view, Reece notes many similarities in action between the two: both men arrive in Ithaca as strangers (or in the guise of one), suffer vicious abuse from the suitors, and predict Odysseus' imminent return to Penelope. But especially telling with regard to Theoclymenus' status as a "virtual doublet" of Odysseus is the fact that the two never interact with one another in the *Odyssey*.[138] To Reece's set of evidence, I add that the manner in which they are first introduced in the epic, as well as their subsequent treatment as highly transient travelers and guests, reinforce the close alignment between the two characters. I have already remarked on the latter detail, but as for the former, I point out that both figures similarly encounter and supplicate an Ithacan (Telemachus and the shepherd-disguised Athena) in desperate states as fugitive murderers (feigned or otherwise). And like Odysseus' introduction at the very beginning of the *Odyssey*, Theoclymenus is initially identified obliquely as a man (*ἀνήρ*, *Od.* 15.223 ~ *ἄνδρα*, *Od.* 1.1), and his name withheld for a considerable number of verses afterwards. Just as Odysseus' name is not revealed for another twenty lines at *Od.* 1.21, so the announcement of Theoclymenus' identity is delayed for thirty-three lines until *Od*. 15.256.[139] These similarities reinforce the analogous and highly elusive character of their figures, whose identities tend to be concealed, questioned, or otherwise suppressed throughout the *Odyssey*.

Given that Odysseus and Theoclymenus share so many correspondences, it seems to me not entirely impossible that the seer's role dramatizes elements of another Odyssean tradition – or even other Odyssean traditions in the plural. He may reference an alternative version of Odysseus' return, as Reece suggests, but since his backstory involves homicide and escaping

---

[137] Reece 1994. Page (1955: 88), however, was the first to suggest such a possibility.

[138] Reece 1994: 163-65. Quote from page 163.

[139] The Homeric narrator notably names Theoclymenus for the audience. The seer never officially identifies himself by name to Telemachus.

retaliation from his victim's family in a way that is reminiscent of Odysseus' own struggle with the backlash of the *mnesterophonia*, I believe that the seer may also allude to variant traditions that capitalized on Odysseus suffering the consequence of the slaughter of the suitors. Similarly, the unnamed Aetolian fugitive in Book 14 may gesture to Aetolian epic multiforms regarding Odysseus,[140] a couple of which are evident in the extra-Homeric traditions listed above, and may furthermore refer, together with the other two self-referential fugitives (Odysseus' first Cretan persona and the murderer in his generalization), to tales depicting Odysseus as a fugitive murderer in the final phase of his mythic life.

Prior discussions of the *Odyssey*'s engagement with such variant Odyssean traditions generally characterize the relationship between the two antagonistically and negatively. The panhellenic epic, which our received *Odyssey* represents, is conceived of as deauthorizing or preempting the numerous other epichoric Odyssean traditions. Georg Danek, for example, has argued that the *Odyssey* generally acknowledges those accounts, only to impose on them a negative value judgment, labeling them as poetically inferior compositions.[141] Similarly, Reinhold Merkelbach and Irad Malkin have viewed the Cretan lies as arguments against other versions of the *Odyssey*.[142] Informed by these views, Jim Marks and Christos Tsagalis have also observed a strategy in the epic of deauthorization and disassociation from these alternative traditions.[143] They take the narratives of the Aetolian fugitive and Odysseus' Cretan tale to Eumaeus in Book 14 as case examples that seem to allude to variant performances, but infer a devaluation of these alternative performances from the fact that they are presented as lies by

---

[140] On Aetolian themes in the *Odyssey*, see Marks 2003, esp. pages 214-17 for a discussion of the Aetolian fugitive in particular, and Marks 2008: 104-08. Marks notes that Aetolian references generally project a negative tone.

[141] Danek 1998a.

[142] Merkelbach 1969: 224-26 and Malkin 1998: 123-34.

[143] Marks 2008: 83-111. He believes that Zeus specifically establishes a boundary between the *Odyssey* and other Odyssean traditions.

those who, because of their lying nature, are "negatively-valorized characters."[144] All of these antagonistic interpretations of the relationship between the *Odyssey* and non-Odyssean epics follow in the footsteps of Richard Martin's argument that the entire body of Homeric poetry is a speech-act (*muthos*), inherently overpowering and undermining other epic traditions in poetic competition.[145]

This antagonistic model, while persuasively operative in Homeric epic, may not be the only way to view the interaction between panhellenic and local epic traditions. The *Odyssey* is seemingly in constant dialogue with epichoric traditions, giving renewed poetic life to local themes, even though the *Odyssey,* as a panhellenic poem with a particular homecoming narrative to present, cannot officially narrate them as part of its main plotline. Odysseus' first lying tale, for instance, though presented as a lie, allows for Odysseus to temporarily perform the role of the fugitive murderer. This example, along with all of the other fugitive murderers, may be an "easter egg," to borrow a term from modern media, which is an intentional inside joke acknowledging other possibilities, perhaps a particularly popular local epic variant, and even paying homage to them.[146] Let me therefore put forward another suggestion different from the view of the *Odyssey* employing a strategy, in Marks' words, "of denying the authority of, and of severing links to," non-Homeric Odyssean traditions, particularly those where Odysseus' exile is a concern.[147] The *Odyssey* is not merely separating itself from epichoric traditions; it is also incorporating some of them into the very narrative fabric of its panhellenic outlook with the help

---

[144] Marks 2008: 94.

[145] Martin 1989: 238-39.

[146] I cannot help but think of *The Flash* (Arrowverse), a 2014 and still ongoing tv adaptation of the comic series, as a modern analogue for the type of interaction I am describing. The show constantly delves into parallel universes and alternative timelines that reimagine the life of the superhero the Flash. Some of these Flash doppelgängers are openly denounced as false ones, but other ones are warmly received. These latter cases always seem to pay homage to popular incarnations of the Flash throughout the decades of his comic series.

[147] Marks 2008: 109. Tsagalis (2012: 345) similarly speaks of the "Panhellenic phenomenon" erasing and downplaying epic local traditions.

of its cast of fugitive murderers, whom I have already shown are partially put in service of facilitating, on a conceptual level, Odysseus' homecoming. In the same way that Odysseus, by donning the mantle of a fugitive murderer, reintegrates himself into Ithaca, the *Odyssey*, by repeatedly foregrounding the fugitive-murderer pattern in the second half of the epic, integrates into itself the alternative accounts of Odysseus' life, post-slaughter-of-the-suitors. This understanding is consistent with the popular opinion that the fugitive murderer's story regularly functions as what Albin Lesky has called a "Lokomottionssaga," a kind of myth invented to explain the movement of heroes from one setting to another.[148] This convention allows for separate accounts of a hero to coexist. Likewise in the *Odyssey*, the fugitive-murderer pattern offers a broad appeal to Greeks familiar with differing versions of Odysseus' story, incorporating and rehearsing epichoric traditions while still propelling its own homecoming narative steadily forward and maintaining a panhellenic vision and stance.

Fugitive murderers, though violent figures who display a divisive quality by virtue of the experiences they undergo, are also figures of reconciliation. In the *Odyssey*, as we have seen, they operate in a way that facilitates foundation and brokers compromise on two separate levels. Just as the fugitive murderer facilitates Odysseus' reclaiming of Ithaca on a thematic level, it also facilitates and embraces, on a metapoetic level, much of the rivaling traditions surrounding his eventual fate.

[148] Lesky 1966: 32. See also my earlier discussion of this practice in the introduction.

CONCLUSION

Fugitive murderers in Homer, as I hope to have effectively shown, are extremely adaptable and variable figures. They are, on the one hand, emblematic of violence and political dissidence; on the other hand, they are also productive facilitators of exchange, compromise, and restoration. This polarity can be observed from the diverse set of roles they can assume (insurgent, scapegoat, host, oikist) and from the diverse set of conceptual functions they can fulfill (restoring a community, facilitating the transformation of a hero, and bridging different mythological traditions).

Upon examining these aspects of fugitive murderers in Homeric epic, I correlated them with the major thematic conflicts that Achilles and Odysseus each face in the elaborated realms of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. In both cases, the fugitive-murderer pattern proves to be a useful model to address the sociopolitical fissures in a community, as well as the mythopoetic fissures in a tradition. The regular deployment of the fugitive-murderer pattern consistently facilitates a certain conceptual transformation of the hero: from fugitive murderer to host in the case of Achilles, and from fugitive murderer to murderous founder in the case of Odysseus. These transformations in turn help to resolve the attendant crises of community cohesion (within the Achaean army and in Ithaca) that prompted the need for the transformation in the first place.

As such remarkable figures of sophistication and narrative power, then, fugitive murderers are an invaluable interpretive construct with which to address the complex relationships, political ideologies, and mythological complexities in Homeric poetry. Just as the fugitives find new opportunities for themselves within the narrative economy of the pattern they represent, they likewise open up new areas of study for us to consider.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adkins, A. W. H. 1960a. "'Honour' and 'Punishment' in the Homeric Poems." *BICS* 7: 23-32.

-----------. 1960b. *Merit and Responsibility*. Oxford.

Ahl, F. and H. M. Roisman. 1996. *The Odyssey Re-Formed.* Ithaca.

Alden, M. 2000. *Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the Iliad.* Oxford.

-----------. 2012. "The Despised Migrant (*Il.* 9.648 = 16.59)." In F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, C. Tsagalis, eds., *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry.* Berlin. 115-31.

Allan, W. and D. Cairns. 2011. "Conflict and Community in the *Iliad*." In N. Fisher and H. van Wees, eds., *Competition in the Ancient World.* Swansea. 113-46.

Allen, T. W. 1921. *The Homeric Catalogue of Ships*. Oxford.

Alwine, A. T. 2009. "The Non-Homeric Cyclops in the Homeric *Odyssey.*" *GRBS* 49: 323-33.

Ameis, K. F. and K. Hentze. 1858-60. *Homers Odyssee: Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von Karl Frieder.* Leipzig.

Andersen, Oe. 1992. "Agamemnon's Singer (*Od.* 3.262-372)." *SO* 67: 5-27.

Apthorp, M. J. 1980. *The Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer.* Heidelberg.

-----------. 1998. "Double News from Antinoopolis on Phoenix's Parricidal Thoughts (*Iliad* 9.458-61)." *ZPE* 122: 182-88.

Arend, W. 1933. *Die typischen Scenen bei Homer.* Berlin.

Arieti, J. A. 1986. "Achilles' Alienation in *Iliad* 9." *CJ* 82.1: 1-27.

Arnaoutoglou, I. 1993. "Pollution in the Athenian Homicide Law." *RIDA* 40: 109-37.

Atchity, K. and E. J. W. Barber. 1987. "Greek Princes and Aegean Princesses: The Role of Women in the Homeric Poems." In K. Atchity, R. Hogart, and D. Price, eds., *Critical Essays on Homer*. Boston. 15-36.

Auffarth, C. 1991. *Der drohende Untergang: "Schöpfung" in Mythos und Ritual im Alten Orient und in Griechenland am Beispiel der Odyssee und des Ezechielbuches.* Berlin.

Austin, N. 1975. *Archery at the Dark of the Moon.* Berkeley.

Avery, H. C. 1998. "Achilles' Third Father." *Hermes* 126.4: 389-97.

Balandier, G. 1951. "La situation colonial: approche théorique." *Cahiers internationaux de sociologie* 11: 44-79.

Ballabriga, A. 1989. "La prophétie de Tiresias." *Métis* 4: 291-304.

Bannert, H. 1981. "Phoenix' Jugend und der Zorn des Meleagros." *Wiender Studien* 94: 69-94.

Barker, E. T. E. 2009. *Entering the Agon: Dissent and Autority in Homer, Historiography, and Tragedy.* Oxford.

Barker, E. T. E. and J. P. Christensen. 2016. "Odysseus's Nostos and the *Odyssey's* Nostoi: Rivalry within the Epic Cycle." *Philologia Antiqua* 7: 85-110.

Bartol, K. 2007. "The Voice of Tradition: Representations of Homeric Singers in Athenaeus 1.14a-d." *CQ* 57.1: 231-43.

Bassett, S. E. 1938. *The Poetry of Homer*. Berkeley.

Beck, D. 2005. *Homeric Conversation*. Cambridge, MA.

Beekes, R. S. P. 2004. "Kadmos and Europa, and the Phoenicians." *Kadmos* 43: 167-84.

Beidelman, T. 1989. "Agonistic Exchange: Homeric Reciprocity and the Heritage of Simmel and Mauss." *Cultural Anthropology* 4.3: 227-59.

Benardete, S. 2005. *Achilles and Hector: The Homeric Hero*. South Bend.

Benjamin, W. 1986 [1927]. "Critique of Violence." In P. Demetz, ed., *Reflections: Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writings.* New York. 277-300.

Bertolín Cebrián, R. 2006. *Singing the Dead: A Model for Epic Evolution.* New York.

Bethe, E. 1922. *Homer, Dichtung und Sage II: Odyssee, Kyklos, Zeitbestimmung.* Leipzig.

Beye, C. 1964. "Homeric Battle Narrative and Catalogues." *HSCP* 68: 345-73.

-----------. 1966. *The Iliad, the Odyssey and the Epic Tradition.* New York.

Bird, G. D. 1994. "The Textual Criticism of an Oral Homer." In V. J. Gray, ed., *Nile, Ilissos and Tiber: Essays in Honour of Walter Kirkpatrick Lacey*. Prudentia 26. Auckland. 35-52.

Blakeway, 1933. "Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Commerce with Italy, Sicily and France in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C." *ABSA* 11: 170-208.

Blickman, D. R. 1986. “The Myth of Ixion and Pollution for Homicide in Archaic Greece.” *CJ* 81: 193-208.

Boardman, J. 1980. *The Greeks Overseas: Their Early Colonies and Trade*. New York.

-----------. 2001. “Aspects of ‘Colonization.’” *BASO* 322: 33-42.

Bolling, G. M. 1925. *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer*. Oxford.

Bonner, R. and G. Smith. 1930. *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle.* Chicago.

Borthwick, E. K. 1988. “Odysseus and the Return of the Swallow.” *G&R* 35.1: 14-22.

Boskos, A. 1974. *Μελέαγρος - Ἀχιλλεὺς καὶ Φοῖνιξ: Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἔρευναν τῆς ἑνότητος τῆς Ἰλιάδος*. Nicosia.

Bowie, A. M. 2013. *Homer: Odyssey Books XIII and XIV.* Cambridge.

Bowie, E. L. 2007. “Early Expatriates: Displacement and Exile in Archaic Poetry.” In J. F. Gaertner, ed., *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond.* Leiden. 21-49.

Bozzone, C. 2016. “The Mind of the Poet: Cognitive and Linguistic Perspectives.” In C. Gallo, ed., *Omero: Quaestiones Disputatae.* Milan. 1-19.

Bremmer, J. 1978. “Heroes, Rituals and the Trojan War.” *Studi Storico Religiosi* 2.1: 5-28.

-----------. 1983. “Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece.” *HSCP* 87: 299-320.

Brenk, F. E. 1986. “Dear Child: The Speech of Phoinix and the Tragedy of Achilleus in the Ninth Book of the *Iliad*.” *Eranos* 84: 77-86.

Brügger, C. 2017. *Homer’s Iliad: The Basel Commentary. Book XXIV.* Boston/Berlin.

Brügger, C., M. Stoevesandt, and E. Visser. 2003. *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar.* Vol. 2.2. München.

Burgess, J. S. 2014. “Framing Odysseus: The Death of the Suitors.” In M. Christopoulos and M. Païzi-Apostolopoulou, eds., *Crime and Punishment in Homeric and Archaic Epic. Proceedings of the 12th International Symposium on the Odyssey. Ithaca, September 3-7, 2013.* Centre for Odyssean Studies. 337-54.

Burkert, W. 1975. “Apellai und Apollon.” *RhM* 118: 1-21.

-----------. 1979. *Structure and History in Greek Mythology*. Berkeley.

-----------. 1983. *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*. Berkeley.

-----------. 1985. *Greek Religion*. Cambridge, MA.

Burr, V. 1944. *ΝΕΩΝ ΚΑΤΑΛΟΓΟΣ: Untersuchungen zum homerischen Schiffskatalog*. Klio 36. Leipzig.

Cairns, D. 1993. *Aidōs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford.

Camp, J. 1979. "A Drought in the Late Eighth Century." *Hesperia* 48: 397-411.

Campbell, J. 1949. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces.* New York.

Cantarella, E. 1976. *Studi sull'omicidio in diritto greco e romano.* Milan.

-----------. 2002. "Dispute Settlement in Homer: Once Again on the Shield of Achilles." In *Mélanges en l'honneur Panayotis Dimakis: Droits antiques et société.* Athens. 147-65.

Carawan, E. 1998. *Rhetoric and the Law of Draco*. Oxford.

Cawkwell, G. L. 1992. "Early Colonisation." *CQ* 42.2: 289-303.

Chantraine, P. 1933. *La formation des noms en grec ancien.* Paris.

Clarke, H. W. 1967. *The Art of the Odyssey*. Englewood Cliffs.

Clay, J. S. 1983. *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey*. Princeton.

Collins, L. 1988. *Studies in Characterization in the Iliad.* Frankfurt.

Compton, T. 2006. *Victim of the Muses: Poet as Scapegoat, Warrior and Hero*. Hellenic Studies 11. Washington, D. C.

Cook, E. 1995. *The Odyssey in Athens: Myths of Cultural Origins.* Ithaca.

Craik, E. M. 1980. *The Dorian Aegean*. London.

Crissy, K. 1997. "Herakles, Odysseus, and the Bow: *Odyssey* 21.11-41." *CJ* 93.1: 41-53.

Crossett, J. 1969. "The Art of Homer's Catalogue of Ships." *CJ* 64.6: 241-45.

Crotty, K. 1994. *The Poetics of Supplication: Homer's Iliad and Odyssey*. Ithaca.

Danek, G. 1998a. *Epos und Zitat. Studien zu den Quellen der Odyssee.* Vienna

-----------. 1998b. "Odysseus and the Bow." In M. Païsi-Apostolopoulou, ed., *Homerica: Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on the Odyssey (1-5 September 1996).* Ithaca. 151-62.

D'Arms, E. F. and K. K. Hulley. 1946. "The Oresteia-Story in the *Odyssey*." *TAPA* 77: 207-13.

Davies, M. 1988. *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta.* Göttingen.

Dawe, R. 1968. "Some Reflections on Ate and Hamartia." *HSCP* 72: 89-123.

Defradas, J. 1972. *Les themes de la propaganda delphique.* Paris.

-----------. 1974. "ΔΙΟΡΘΩΣΑΙ ΛΟΓΟΝ: La Septième Olympique." In J. Heller and J. K. Newman eds., *Serta Turyniana. Studies in Greek Literature and Palaeography in Honor of Alexander Turyn*. Urbana/Chicago/London. 34-50.

De Jong, I. J. F. 2001. *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey.* Cambridge.

Dench, E. 1995. *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of Peoples of the Central Apennines.* Oxford.

Derrida, J. 1981. *Dissemination.* Chicago.

Descoueudres, J.-P. 1990. *Greek Colonists and Native Populations: Proceedings of the First Australian Congress of Classical Archaeology Held in Honour of Emeritus Professor A. D. Trendall, Sydney, 9-14 July 1985*. Oxford.

Detienne, M. 1998. *Apollon le couteau à la main: Une approche expérimentale du polythéisme grec.* Paris.

Detienne, M. and J.-P. Vernant. 1978. "The Feet of Hephaestus." In *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society.* Trans. by J. Lloyd. Atlantic Highlands, NJ. 259-75.

Devereux, G. 1973. "The Self-Blinding of Oidipous in Sophokles: *Oidipous Tyrannos*." *JHS* 93: 36-49.

Dodds, E. R. 1951. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley.

Donlan, C. 1993. "Duelling with Gifts in the *Iliad*: As the Audience Saw It." *Colby Quarterly* 29.3: 155-72.

Donnellan, L., V. Nizzo and G.-J. Burgers. 2016. *Conceptualising Early Colonisation*. Brussels.

Dougherty, C. 1993. *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece.* Oxford.

-----------. 2001. *The Raft of Odysseus: The Ethnographic Imagination of Homer's Odyssey*. New York.

-----------. 2015. "Nobody's Home: *Metis*, Improvisation, the Instablisty of Return in Homer's *Odyssey*." *Ramus* 44: 115-40.

Dué, C. 2001. "Achilles' Golden Amphora in Aeschines' *Against Timarchus* and the Afterlife of Oral Tradition." *CPh* 96: 33-47.

Dumézil, G. 1956. *Aspects de la fonction guerrière chez les Indo-Européens.* Paris.

-----------. 1982. *Apollon sonore et d' autres essais. Vingt-cinq esquisses de mythologie.* Paris.

Ebel, H. 1972. *After Dionysus: An Essay on Where We Are Now*. Cranbury, NJ.

Eck, B. 2012. *La mort rouge: Homicide, guerre et souillure en Grèce ancienne*. Paris.

Edmunds, S. T. 1990. *Homeric Nēpios.* New York.

Edwards, A. T. 1985. *Achilles in the Odyssey: Ideologies of Heroism in the Homeric Epic*. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 171. Königstein.

Edwards, M. W. 1992. "Homer and Oral Tradition: The Type Scene." *Oral Tradition* 7.2: 284-330.

Eichholz, D. E. 1953. "The Propitiation of Achilles." *AJP* 74.2: 137-48.

Elliot, A. and M. Maier. 2007. "Color and Psychological Functioning." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 16: 250-54.

Elmer, D. 2013. *The Poetics of Consent: Collective Decision Making and the Iliad*. Baltimore.

Erbse, H. 1972. *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Odyssee.* Berlin.

-----------. 1986. *Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Götter im homerischen Epos.* Berlin.

Erteschik-Shir, N. 2007. *Information Structure: The Syntax-Discourse Interface.* Oxford.

Farnell, L. R. 1907. *The Cults of the Greek States*. Oxford.

-----------. 1965. *Critical Commentary to the Works of Pindar*. Amsterdam.

Felson, N. 2002. "*Threptra* and Invisible Hands: The Father-Son Relation in *Iliad* 24." *Arethusa* 35.1: 35-50.

Felson-Rubin, N. 1994. *Regarding Penelope: From Courtship to Poetics.* Princeton.

Fenik, B. 1968. *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad: Studies in the Narrative Technique of Homeric Battle Description.* Wiesbaden.

-----------. 1974. *Studies in the Odyssey*. Wiesbaden.

Fetterman, A. K., M. D. Robinson, and B. P. Meier. 2012. "Anger as 'Seeing Red': Evidence for a Perceptial Association." *Cognition and Emotion* 26.8: 1445-58.

Finkelberg, M. 1991. "Royal Succession in Heroic Greece." *CQ* 41.2: 303-16.

-----------. 2000. "The Cypria, the Iliad, and the Problem of Multiformity in Oral and Written Tradition." *CPh* 95: 1-11.

Finley, M. I. 1965. *The World of Odysseus.* Revised ed. New York.

-----------. 1978. *Homer's Odyssey*. Cambridge, MA.

Flaig, G. 1994. "Das Konsensprinzip im homerischen Olymp: Überlegungen zum göttlichen Entscheidungsprozeß *Ilias* 4.1-72." *Hermes* 122: 13-31.

Foley, J. M. 1990. *Traditional Oral Epic: The Odyssey, Beowulf, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song.* Berkeley.

-----------. 1999. *Homer's Traditional Art.* University Park.

Forrest, W. G. 1957. "Colonization and the Rise of Delphi." *Historia* 6: 160-75.

Forsdyke, S. 2005. *Exile, Ostracism, and Democracy: The Politics of Expulsion in Ancient Greece.* Princeton.

Fowler, R. L. 2013. *Early Greek Mythography Volume 1: Commentary*. Oxford.

Frame, D. 2008. *Hippota Nestor.* Hellenic Studies 37. Washington, D. C.

Frazer, J. 1890. *The Golden Bough.* Volumes I-II. London.

Friedrich, R. 1975. *Stilwandel in homerischen Epos. Studien zur Poetik und Theorie der epischen Gattung.* Wiesbaden.

Gagarin, M. 1981. *Drakon and Early Athenian Homicide Law.* New Haven and London.

-----------. 1986. *Early Greek Law*. Berkeley.

-----------. 1988. "Bouleusis in Athenian Homicide Law." In G. Nenci and G. Thür, eds.,

Symposion 1988: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte. Cologne and Vienna. 81-99.

Garland, R. 2014. *Wandering Greeks: The Ancient Diaspora from the Age of Homer to the Death of Alexander the Great.* Princeton.

Gates, H. P. 1971. *The Kinship Terminology of Homeric Greek.* Berkeley.

Geertz, C. 1973. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." In *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selective Essays.* New York. 3-30.

Gierth, L. 1971. *Griechische Gründungsgeschichten als Zeugnisse historischen Denkens vor dem Einsetzen der Geschichtsschreibung.* Freiburg.

Giovannini, A. 1969. *Étude historique sur les origines du Catalogue des vaisseaux.* Berne.

Giphanius, O. 1572. *Homeri Ilias seu potius omnia eius quae extant opera*. Strassburg.

Girard, R. 1977. *Violence and the Sacred*. Baltimore.

Glotz, G. 1906. "Une inscription de Milet." *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 50: 511-29.

Gordesiani, R. 1980. "Zur Interpretation der Duale im 9. Buch der Ilias." *Philologus* 125: 163-74.

Gould, J. 1973. "HIKETEIA." *JHS* 93: 74-103.

Gouldner, A. W. 1965. *Enter Plato.* New York.

Graf, F. 2003. "Initiation: A Concept with a Troubled History." In D. B. Dodd and C. A. Faraone, eds., *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives: New Critical Perspectives.* London and New York. 3-24.

-----------. 2009. *Apollo. Gods and Heroes of the Ancient World.* London and New York.

Graham, A. J. 1964. *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece.* Manchester.

-----------. 1982. "The Colonial Expansion of Greece." In J. Boardman and N. G. L. Hammond, eds., *Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. III.3. Cambridge. 83-162.

Griffin, J. 1980. *Homer on Life and Death.* Oxford.

-----------. 1995. *Homer: Iliad Book Nine*. Oxford.

Gwara, S. 2007. "Misprison in the Para-Narratives of Iliad 9." *Arethusa* 40.3: 303-36.

Gwyn, A. 1918. "The Character of Greek Colonization." *JHS* 38: 88-123.

Haft, A. 1984. "Odysseus, Idomeneus and Meriones: The Cretan Lies of *Odyssey* 13-19." *CJ* 79: 289-306.

Hainsworth, B. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Vol. III: Books 9-12. Cambridge.

Hall, E. 1989. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy.* Oxford.

Haller, B. S. 2013. "Dolios in *Odyssey* 4 and 24: Penelope's plotting and Alternative Narratives of Odysseus' νόστος." *TAPA* 143.2: 263-92.

Halliday, W. R. 1914. "Modern Greek Folk-Tales and Ancient Greek Mythology: Odysseus and Saint Elias." *Folklore* 25.1: 122-25.

Hammer, D. C. 1997a. "Achilles as Vagabond: The Culture of Autonomy in the *Iliad*." *CW* 90.5: 341-66.

-----------. 1997b. "'Who Shall Readily Obey?': Authority and Politics in the *Iliad*." *Phoenix* 51.1: 1-24.

-----------. 2002. *The Iliad as Politics: The Performance of Political Thought.* Norman, OK.

Hansen, W. F. 1972. *The Conference Sequence: Patterned Narrative and Narrative Inconsistency.* Berkeley.

-----------. 1976. "The Story of the Sailor Who Went Inland." In L. Dégh, H. Glassie, and F. Oinas, eds., *Folklore Today: A Festschrift for Richard M. Dorson.* Bloomington. 221-30.

-----------. 1977. "Odysseus' Last Journey." *QUCC* 24: 27-48.

Harris, E. M. 2015. "The Family, the Community and Murder: The Role of Pollution in Athenian Homicide Law." In C. Ando and J. Rüpke, eds., *Public and Private in Ancient Mediterranean Law and Religion.* Berlin. 11-35.

Harris, R. 1992. "The Conflict of Generations in Ancient Mesopotamian Myths." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 34.4: 621-35.

Harrison, J. 1927. *Themis: A Study in the Social Origins of Greek Religion.* Cambridge.

Hartmann, A. 1917. *Untersuchungen über die Sage vom Tod des Odysseus.* München.

Haslam, M. 1997. "Homeric Papyri and Transmission of the Text." In I. Morris and B. Powell, eds., *A New Companion to Homer.* Leiden. 55-100.

Havelock, E. A. 1978. *The Greek Concept of Justice: From its Shadow in Homer to its Substance in Plato*. Cambridge.

Heiden, B. 1998. "The Simile of the Fugitive Homicide, *Iliad* 24. 480-84: Analogy, Foiling, and Allusion. *AJP* 119.1: 1-10.

-----------. 2008. "Common People and Leaders in *Iliad* 2: The Invocation of the Muses and the Catalogue of Ships." *TAPA* 138.1: 127-54.

Heubeck, A. 1984. "Das Meleagros-Paradeigma in der Ilias." In B. Forssman, S. Koster, and E. Pöhlmann, eds., *Kleine Schriften zur griechischen Sprache und Literatur.* Erlangen. 128-35.

-----------. 1987. "Noch Einmal zum Namen des Apollon." *Glotta* 65: 179-82.

Heubeck, A., S. West, and J. B. Hainsworth. 1988. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey.* Vol. I: Books I-VIII. Oxford.

Heubeck, A. and A. Hoekstra. 1989. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey.* Vol. II: Books IX-XVI. Oxford.

Higbie, C. 1995. *Heroes' Names, Heroic Identities.* New York and London.

Hoessly, F. 2001. *Katharsis: Reinigung als Heilverfahren.* Göttingen.

Hölscher, U. 1967. "Die Atridensage in der *Odyssee*." In H. Singer and B. von Wiese, eds., *Festschrift für Richard Alewyn.* Cologne. 1-16.

-----------. 1989. *Die Odyssee. Epos zwischen Märchen und Roman.* München.

Hommel, H. 1955. "Aigisthus und die Freier." *Studium Generale* 8: 237-45.

Hope Simpson, R. and J.F. Lazenby. 1970. *The Catalogue of the Ships in Homer's Iliad*. Oxford.

Horsfall, N. 1979. "Some Problems in the Aeneas Legend." *CQ* 29.2: 372-90.

Houston, J. 1992. *The Hero and the Goddess: The Odyssey as Mystery and Initiation.* New York.

Jachmann, G. 1958. *Der homerische Schiffskatalog und die Ilias*. Köln and Opladen.

Jackson Knight, W. F. 1968. *Many-Minded Homer.* New York.

Jamison, S. 1999. "Penelope and the Pigs: Indic Perspectives on the *Odyssey*." *ClAnt* 18.2: 227-72.

Janko, R. 1994. *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Vol. IV: Books 13-16. Cambridge.

Kakridis, J. T. 1949. *Homeric Researches*. Lund.

Kanavou, N. 2015. *The Names of Homeric Heroes: Problems and Interpretations.* Berlin.

Katz, M. A. 1991. *Penelope's Renown: Meaning and Indeterminacy in the Odyssey*. Princeton.

Kearns, E. 1982. "The Return of Odysseus: A Homeric Theoxeny." *CQ* 32: 2-8.

Kelly, A. 2007. "How to End an Orally-Derived Epic Poem." *TAPA* 137: 371-402.

Killen, J. T. 1992. "Observations on the Thebes Sealings." In J.-P. Olivier, ed., *Mykenaïka. Actes du IXe Colloque international sur les textes mycéinens et égéens, Centre de l'Antiquité Grecque et Romaine de la Fondation Helléniques des echerches Scientifiques et École française d'Athènes.* Paris. 365-80.

Kirk, G. S. 1962. *The Songs of Homer*. Cambridge.

-----------. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. I: Books 1-4. Cambridge.

Köhnken, A. 1975. "Die Rolle des Phoinix und die Duale im I der Ilias." *Glotta* 53: 25-36.

Kullmann, W. 1960. *Die Quellen der Ilias*. Wiesbaden.

Lacey, W. 1968. *The Family in Classical Greece.* Ithaca.

Lacroix, L. 1937. "Ἤπιος — Νήπιος." In *Mélanges offerts à A.-M. Desrousseaux par ses amis et ses élèves: en l'honneur de sa cinquantième année d'enseignement supérieur (1887-1937).* Paris. 261-72.

Lampros, S. P. 1873. *De conditorum coloniarum graecorum.* Leipzig.

Lanni, A. 2006. *Law and Justice in the Courts of Classical Athens.* Cambridge.

Latacz, J., R. Nünlist, and M. Stoevesandt. 2000. *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar.* Vol. 1.2. München.

Leaf, W. 1887. "The Trial Scene in *Iliad* XVIII." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 8: 122-32.

-----------. 1900-1902. *The Iliad*. 2nd ed. London.

Leschhorn, W. 1984. *Gründer der Stadt: Studien zu einem Politisch-religiösen Phänomen der griechischen Geschichte.* Stuttgart.

Lesky, A. 1966. "Der Mythos im Verstandnis der Antike." *Gymnasium* 73: 23-44.

Levaniouk, O. 2000. *Odyssean Usages of Local Traditions.* Harvard University. Dissertation.

-----------. 2011. *Eve of the Festival: Making Myth in Odyssey 19*. Washington, D. C.

Lloyd-Jones, H. 1983. *The Justice of Zeus.* 2nd ed. Berkeley.

Lohmann, D. 1970. *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias*. Berlin.

Loney, A. C. 2010. *Narrative Revenge and the Poetics of Justice in the Odyssey: A Study of Tisis.* Duke University. Dissertation.

Loomis, W. T. 1972. "The Nature of Premeditation in Athenian Homicide Law." *JHS* 92: 86-95.

Lord, A. B. 1951. *Serbo-Croatian Folk Songs.* New York.

-----------. 1960. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge.

-----------. 1969. "The Theme of the Withdrawn Hero in Serbo-Croatian Oral Epic." *Prilozi za knjizevnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor* 35: 18-30.

-----------. 1995. *The Singer Resumes the Tale.* Ithaca and London.

Lord, M. L. 1967. "Withdrawal and Return: An Epic Story Pattern in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter and in the Homeric Poems." *CJ* 62.6: 241-48.

Louden, B. 1999. *The Odyssey: Structure, Narration and Meaning.* Baltimore.

Lowenstam, S. 1993. *The Scepter and the Spear*. Lanham.

Lynn-George, M. 1988. Epos: *Word, Narrative and the Iliad*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ.

MacDowell, D. M. 1963. *Athenian Homicide Law in the Age of the Orators.* Manchester.

Mackenzie, M. M. 1978. "The Tears of Chryses: Retaliation in the *Iliad*." *Philosophy and Literature* 2.1: 3-22.

MacLeod, C. W. 1982. *Homer: Iliad Book XXIV.* Cambridge.

Mac Sweeney, N. 2013. *Foundation Myths and Politics in Ancient Ionia*. Cambridge.

Malkin, I. 1986. "Apollo Archegetes and Sicily." *ASNP* 16.4: 958-72.

-----------. 1987. *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece.* Leiden.

-----------. 1998. *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity*. Berkeley.

-----------. 2009. "Foundations." In K. Raaflaub and H. van Wees, eds., *A Companion to Archaic Greece*. Oxford. 373-94.

-----------. 2016a. "Greek Colonisation: The Right to Return." In L. Donnellan et al., eds., *Conceptualising Early Colonisation.* Brussels. 27-50.

-----------. 2016b. "Migration and Colonization: Turbulence, Continuity, and the Practice of Mediterranean Space (11th-5th centuries BCE)." In M. Dabag et al., eds., *New Horizons: Mediterranean Research in the 21st Century.* Paderborn. 285-308.

March, J. R. 1987. *The Creative Poet: Studies on the Treatment of Myths in Greek Poetry*. BICS Supplement 49. London.

Marks, J. 2003. "Alternative Odysseys: The Case of Thoas and Odysseus." *TAPA* 133.2: 209-26.

-----------. 2008. *Zeus in the Odyssey*. Hellenic Studies 31. Washington, D. C.

-----------. 2012. "Ἀρχοὺς αὖ νεῶν ἐρέω: A Programmatic Function of the Iliadic Catalogue of Ships." In F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis, eds., *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry*. Berlin/Boston. 101-12.

Maronitis, D. N. 2004. *Homeric Megathemes: War-Homilia-Homecoming.* Lanham.

-----------. 2009. "Apollo and Odysseus: From the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*." In L. Athanassaki, R. P. Martin, and J. F. Miller, eds., *Apolline Politics and Poetics.* Athens. 81-90.

Martin, R. P. 1989. *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad.* Ithaca.

McCone, K. 1990. *Pagan Past and Christian Present in Early Irish Literature.* Maynooth.

Meinel, F. 2015. *Pollution and Crisis in Greek Tragedy.* Cambridge.

Merkelbach, R. 1969. *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee*. München.

Merz, F. 1953. Die *Heldenbiographie als Stilmittel Homers*. Muri.

Mette, H. J. and B. Snell. 1955. *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos.* Göttingen.

Meyer, E. 1895. "Der Ursprung des Odysseusmythus." *Hermes* 30: 241-88.

Mills, S. 2000. "Achilles, Patroclus and Parental Care in Some Homeric Similes." *G&R* 47: 3-18.

Montiglio, S. 2005. *Wandering in Ancient Greek Culture.* Chicago.

Morrison, J. 2005. "Similes for Odysseus and Penelope: Mortality, Divinity, Identity." In R. J.

Rabel, ed., *Approaches to Homer Ancient and Modern*. Swansea. 73-89.

Moulinier, L. 1952. *Le pur et l'impur dans la pensée des Grecs d'Homère à Aristote.* Paris.

Moulton, C. 1974. "Similes in the *Iliad*." *Hermes* 102.3: 381-97.

Muellner, L. 1996. *The Anger of Achilles: Menis in Greek Epic.* Ithaca.

Mühlestein, H. 1969. "Redende Personennamen bei Homer." *SMEA* 9: 67-94.

-----------. 1971. "Sieben Personennamen aus der Odyssee." *ZAnt* 21: 45-48.

-----------. 1981. "Der homerische Phoinix und sein Name." *ZAnt* 31: 85-91.

Mülder, D. 1910. *Die Ilias und ihre Quellen*. Berlin.

Müller, G. 1956. "Der homerische Ate-Begriff und Solons Musenelegie." In *Navicula Chiloniensis. Studia philologa F. Jacoby professori Chiloniensi emerito octogenario oblata.* Leiden. 1-15.

Murnaghan, S. 1987. *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey*. Lanham.

Murray, A. T., trans. 1995. Rev. by G. E. Dimock. *Odyssey: Books 13-24.* Cambridge, MA.

Murray, G. 1934. *The Rise of the Greek Epic.* 4th ed. Oxford.

Nagler, M. *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer.* Berkeley.

-----------. 1990. "Odysseus: The Proem and the Problem." *ClAnt* 9: 335-56.

Nagy, G. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry.* Baltimore.

-----------. 1981. "An Evolutionary Model for the Text Fixation of Homeric Epos." In J. M. Foley, ed., *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord.* Columbus. 390-93.

-----------. 1994. "The Name of Apollo: Etymology and Essence." In J. Solomon, ed., *Apollo: Origins and Influences.* London. 3-7.

-----------. 1996. *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond.* Cambridge.

-----------. 2003. *Homeric Responses*. Austin.

-----------. 2013. *The Ancient Greek Hero in 24 Hours.* Cambridge, MA.

Naiden, F. S. 2006. *Ancient Supplication.* Oxford.

Nannini, S. 2003. *Analogia e polarità in similitudine. Paragoni iliadici e odissiaci a confronto.* Amsterdam.

Nickel, R. 2003. "The Wrath of Demeter: Story Pattern in the *Hymn to Demeter. QUCC* 73.1: 59-82.

Nieto-Hernández, P. 2002. "Odysseus, Agamemnon and Apollo." *CJ* 97: 319-34.

Nilsson, M. P. 1955. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. 2nd ed. München.

Noé, M. 1940. *Phoinix, Ilias, und Homer*. Leipzig.

Nünlist, R. 2009. "The Motif of the Exiled Killer." In U. Dill and C. Walde, eds., *Antike Mythen: Medien Transformationem und Konstruktionem.* Berlin. 628-44.

Olson, D. 1990. "The Stories of Agamemnon in Homer's *Odyssey*." *TAPA* 120: 57-71.

-----------. 1995. *Blood and Iron: Stories and Storytelling in Homer's Odyssey*. Mnemosyne Supplement 148. Leiden.

Osborne, R. 1998. "Early Greek Colonization? The Nature of Greek Settlement in the West." In H. van Wees and N. R. E. Fisher, eds., A*rchaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*. London.

-----------. 2011. *The History Written on the Classical Greek Body.* Cambridge.

-----------. 2016. "Greek 'Colonisation': What was, and What is, at Stake?" In L. Donnellan et al., eds., *Conceptualising Early Colonisation.* Brussells. 21-26.

Owen, E. 1966. *The Story of the Iliad*. Ann Arbor.

Padilla, M. W. 1999. *Rites of Passage in Ancient Greece.* Lewisburg.

Page, D. 1955. *The Homeric Odyssey.* Oxford.

-----------. 1959. *History and the Homeric Iliad*. Berkeley.

-----------. 1972. "The Mystery of the Minstrel at the Court of Agamemnon." *Studi classici in onore di Quintino Cataudella.* Catania. 127-31.

Parker, R. 1983. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion.* Oxford.

Parry, M. 1971. *The Making of Homeric Verse*. Oxford.

Pasquali, G. 1952. *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*. 2nd ed. Florence.

Pedrick, V. 1982. "Supplication in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey.*" *TAPA* 112: 125-40.

Pelliccia, H. 1995. *Mind, Body, and Speech in Homer and Pindar.* Göttingen.

Peradotto, J. 1990. *Man in the Middle Voice: Name and Narration in the Odyssey*. Princeton.

Perry, T. 2010. *Exile in Homeric Epic*. University of Toronto. Dissertation.

Phillips, D. D. 2007. "*Trauma ek Pronoias* in Athenian Law." *JHS* 127: 74-105.

-----------. 2013. *The Law of Ancient Athens. Law and Society in the Ancient World.* Ann Arbor.

Powell, B. B. 1978. "Word Patterns in the Catalogue of Ships (B 494-709): A Structural Analysis of Homeric Language." *Hermes* 106: 255-64.

Pucci, P. 1987. *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey*. Ithaca.

Querbach, C. A. 1976. "Conflicts Between Young and Old in Homer's *Iliad*." In S. Bertman, ed., *The Conflict of Generations in Ancient Greece and Rome.* Amsterdam. 55-64.

Rabel, R. 1988. "Chryses and the Opening of the *Iliad*." *AJA* 109: 473-81.

Race, W. 1993. "First Appearances in the *Odyssey.*" *TAPA* 123: 79-107.

Raglan, L. 1936. *The Hero: A Study in Tradition, Myth and Drama.* London.

Ready, J. L. 2011. *Character, Narrator, and Simile in the Iliad.* Cambridge.

-----------. 2014. "ATU 974 *The Homecoming Husband*, the Returns of Odysseus, and the End of *Odyssey* 21." *Arethusa* 47.3: 265-85.

Redfield, J. M. 1975. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad*. Chicago.

Reece, S. 1993. *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene.* Ann Arbor.

-----------. 1994. "The Cretan Odyssey: A Lie Truer than Truth." *AJP* 115.2: 157-73.

Richardson, N. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. VI: Books 21-24. Cambridge.

Ridgeway, D. 1990. "The First Western Greeks and their Neighbours 1935-1985." In J.-P. Descoueudres, ed., *Greek Colonists and Native Populations: Proceedings of the First Australian Congress of Classical Archaeology Held in Honour of Emeritus Professor A. D. Trendall, Sydney, 9-14 July 1985*. Oxford. 61-72.

Robertson, B. 2008. “The Slave-Names of IG 1032 and the Ideology of Slavery at Athens.” In C. Cooper, ed., *Epigraphy and the Greek Historian*. Toronto. 79-116.

Roisman, J. 1981. *Exile and Politics in Early Greece: From the Time of Homer to the End of the Archaic Period.* University of Washington. Dissertation.

-----------. 1982. “Some Social Conventions and Deviations in Homeric Society.” *AClass* 25: 35-41.

Rose, P. 1992. *Sons of the Gods, Children of Earth.* Ithaca.

Rosner, J. 1976. “The Speech of Phoenix: *Iliad* 9.434-605.” *Phoenix* 30: 314-27.

Ruck, C. 1968. “Marginalia Pindarica.” *Hermes* 96: 129-42.

Ruschenbusch, E. 1960. “ΦΟΝΟΣ: Zum Recht Drakons und seiner Bedeutung für das Werden des athenischen Staates.” *Historia* 9: 129-54.

Russo, J. 1974. “The Inner Man in Archilochus and the *Odyssey*.” *GRBS* 15: 139-52.

Russo, J., M. Fernández-Galiano, and A. Heubeck. 1992. *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey*. Vol. III: Books XVII-XXIV. Oxford.

Sale, W. M. 1994. “The Government of Troy: Politics in the Iliad.” *GRBS* 35: 5-102.

Sammons, B. 2008. “Gift, List & Story in *Iliad* 9.115-61.” *CJ* 103.4: 353-79.

-----------. 2010. *The Art and Rhetoric of the Homeric Catalogue*. Oxford.

-----------. 2013. “Narrative Doublets in the Epic Cycle.” *AJP* 134.4: 529-57.

Schein, S. 1984. *The Mortal Hero*. Berkeley.

Schlunk, R. 1976. “The Theme of the Suppliant-Exile in the *Iliad*.” *AJP* 97.3: 199-209.

Schmid, B. 1947. *Studien zu griechischen Ktisissagen.* Freiburg.

Schmitt, C. 1996 [1932]. *The Concept of the Political.* Chicago and London.

Scodel, R. 1982. “The Autobiography of Phoenix: *Iliad* 9.444-95.” *AJP* 103.2: 128-36.

-----------. 2001. “The Suitors’ Games.” *AJP* 122.3: 307-27.

-----------. 2002. *Listening to Homer: Tradition, Narrative, and Audience*. Ann Arbor.

Scott, J. A. 1912. "Phoenix in the *Iliad*." *AJP* 33.1: 68-77.

Scully, S. P. 1981. "The Bard as the Custodian of Homeric Society: *Odyssey* 3.263-272." *QUCC* 8: 67-83.

-----------. 1984. "The Language of Achilles: The ΟΧΘΗΣΑΣ Formulas." *TAPA* 114: 11-27.

Seaford, R. 1994. *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State.* Oxford.

Sealey, R. 1983. "The Athenian Courts for Homicide." *CPh* 78.4: 275-96.

-----------. 2006. "Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia* 57.4: Trial of Animals and Inanimate Objects for Homicide." *CQ* 56.2: 475-85.

Segal, C. 1971. *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the Iliad*. Mnemosyne Supplement 17. Leiden.

-----------. 1994. *Singers, Heroes and Gods in the Odyssey.* Ithaca and London.

Seibert, J. 1979. *Die politischen Flüchtlinge und Verbannten in der grieschischen Geschichte von den Anfängen bis zur Unterwerfung durch die Römer.* Darmstadt.

Sheppard, J. 1922. *The Pattern of the Iliad*. London.

Shipp, G. P. 1972. *Studies in the Language of Homer*. 2nd ed. Cambridge.

Snodgrass, A. 1971. *The Dark Age of Greece: An Archaeological Survey*. New York.

-----------. 1974. "An Historical Homeric Society?" *JHS* 94: 114-25.

Solmsen, F. 1986. "Aeneas Founded Rome with Odysseus." *HSCP* 90: 93-110.

Solomon, J. 1994. *Apollo: Origins and Influences.* London.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1979. *Theseus as Son and Stepson: A Tentative Illustration of the Greek Mythological Mentality.* BICS Supplement 40. London.

-----------. 1988. "'Myth' and History: On Herodotus III.48 and 50-53." *OAth* 17: 167-82.

Stallmach, J. 1968. *Atē: Zur Frage des Selbst- und Weltverständnisses des frühgriechischen Menschen*. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 18. Meisenheim am Glan.

Stanford, W. B. 1967. *The Odyssey of Homer*. 2nd ed. London.

Stanley, K. 1993. *The Shield of Homer: Narrative Structure in the Iliad*. Princeton.

Steiner, D. 2010. *Homer: Odyssey Books XVII and XVIII*. Cambridge.

Steinrück, M. 1997. *Kranz und Wirbel: Ringkompositionen in den Büchern 6-8 der Odyssee*. Spudasmata 64. Hildesheim.

Sternberg, M. 1978. *Expositional Modes and Temporal Ordering in Fiction*. Baltimore and London.

Stoevesandt, M. 2004. *Feinde – Gegner – Opfer: Zur Darstellung der Troianer in den Kampfszenen der Ilias.* Basel.

Strasburger, G. 1954. *Die kleinen Kämpfer der Ilias*. Frankfurt.

Stroud, R. S. 1968. *Drakon's Law on Homicide.* Berkeley.

Svenbro, J. 1984. "Vengeance et société en Grèce archaïque. A propos de la fin de l'Odyssée." In R. Verdier and J. Poly, eds., *La vengeance, etudes d'ethnologie, d'histoire et de philosophie.* Vol. III. Paris. 47-63.

Tandy, D. 1997. *Warriors into Traders: The Power of the Market in Early Greece*. Cambridge.

Thompson, S. 1960. *Motif-Index of Folk Literature.* Bloomington.

Thomson, J. A. K. 1914. *Studies in the Odyssey*. Oxford.

Thornton, A. 1970. *People and Themes in Homer's Odyssey.* Dunedin.

-----------. 1978. "Once again, the Duals in Book 9 of the Iliad." *Glotta* 56: 1-4.

-----------. 1984. *Homer's Iliad: Its Composition and the Motif of Supplication.* Hypomnemata 81. Göttingen.

Thür, G. 1996. "Oaths and Dispute Settlement in Ancient Greek Law." In L. Foxhall and A. D. E. Lewis, eds., *Greek Law in its Political Setting: Justifications not Justice.* Oxford. 57-72.

Tithecott, R. 1997. *Of Men and Monsters: Jeffrey Dahmer and the Construction of the Serial Killer.* Wisconsin.

Toporov, V. N. 1981. "Die Ursprünge der indoeuropäischen Poetik." *Poetica* 13: 189-251.

Torgerson, T. P. 2006. "The ΕΙΔΩΣ ΦΩΣ and the Traditional Dichotomy of Divine and Mortal Epistemology." *RPhA* 24.1: 25-43.

Trahman, C. R. 1952. "Odysseus' Lies (*Odyssey*, Books 13-19)." *Phoenix* 6.2: 31-43.

Treister, M. Y. 1996. *The Role of Metals in the Ancient Greek World*. Leiden.

Trümpy, C. 1997. *Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Monatsnamen und Monatsfolgen.* Heidelberg.

Tsagalis, C. 2004. *Epic Grief: Personal Laments in Homer's Iliad*. Berlin and New York.

-----------. 2007. *The Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics*. Washington, DC.

-----------. 2012. "Deauthorizing the Epic Cycle: Odysseus' False Tale to Eumaeus (*Od*. 14.199-359)." In F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, C. Tsagalis, eds., *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry.* Berlin. 309-45.

Tsagarakis, O. 1971. "The Achaean Embassy and the Wrath of Achilles." *Hermes* 99.3: 257-77.

-----------. 1979. "Phoenix's Social Status and the Achaean Embassy." *Mnemosyne* 42: 221-42.

Ulf, C. 1990. "Die Abwehr von internem Streit als Teil des 'politischen' Programms der homerischen Epen." *Grazer Beiträge* 17: 1-25.

Valckenaer, L. C. 1767. *Diatribe in Euripidis perditorum dramatum reliquias*. Leipzig.

Van der Valk, M. 1963-64. *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*. Leiden.

Van Gennep, A. 1977. *The Rites of Passage.* London.

Van Herten, J. C. A. 1934. *Θρησκεία Εὐβάλεια Ἱκέτης. Bijdrage Tot de Kennis der Religieuze Terminologie in het Grieksch.* Amsterdam.

Van Thiel, H. 1982. *Iliaden und Ilias*. Basel.

-----------. 1996. *Homeri Ilias*. Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York.

Van Wees, H. 1992. *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History.* Amsterdam.

Van Windekens, A. J. 1954. "Lykabettos." *BN* 5: 31-34.

Verdenius, J. 1987. *Commentaries on Pindar*. Mnemosyne Supplement 97. Leiden.

Vernant, J.-P. 1981. "Ambiguity and Reversal: On the Enigmatic Structure of Oedipus Rex." In J.-P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet, eds., *Tragedy and Myth in Ancient Greece*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ. 87-119.

Vernant, J.-P. and P. Vidal-Naquet. 1988. "The Lame Tyrant: From Oedipus to Periander." In *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece.* Trans. by J. Lloyd. New York. 207-36.

Versnel, H. S. 1993. *Transition and Reversal in Myth and Ritual*. Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion Volume II. Leiden.

Vidal-Naquet, P. 1968. "Le chasseur noir et l'origine de l'éphébie athénienne." *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 23: 947-64.

-----------. 1986. *The Black Hunter: Forms of Thought and Forms of Society in the Greek World.* Trans. by A. Szegedy-Maszak. Baltimore.

Visser, E. 1988. "Formulae or Single Words? Towards a New Theory of Oral Verse-Making." *WJA* 14: 21-37.

-----------. 1997. *Homers Katalog der Shiffe*. Stuttgart and Leipzig.

Voigt, C. 1934. *Überlegung und Entscheidung: Studien zur Selbstauffassung des Menschen bei Homer*. Berlin-Charlottenburg.

Von Reden, S. 1995. *Exchange in Ancient Greece.* London.

Walsh, T. 2005. *Fighting Words and Feuding Words: Anger and the Homeric Poems*. Lanham.

Watkins, C. 1970. "Language of Gods and Language of Men: Remarks on some Indo-European Meta-Linguistic Traditions." In J. Puhvel, ed., *Myth and Law among the Indo-Europeans.* Berkeley. 1-17.

-----------. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics.* Oxford.

Watson, P. A. 1995. *Ancient Stepmothers; Myth, Misogyny and Reality.* Mnemosyne Supplement 143. Leiden.

Webber, A. 1989. "The Hero Tells his Name: Formula and Variation in the Phaeacian Episode of the *Odyssey*." *TAPA* 119: 1-13.

Weber, M. 1921 [1919]. "Politik als Beruf." In *Gesammelte Politische Schriften.* München. 396-450.

West, M. L. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry.* Oxford.

-----------. 2001. *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*. Münich-Leipzig.

-----------. 2011. *The Making of the* Iliad*: Disquisition and Analytical Commentary*. Oxford.

-----------. 2013. "λυκάβας, λυκηγενής, ἀμφιλύκη." *Glotta* 89: 253-64.

-----------. 2014. *The Making of the Odyssey*. Oxford.

West, S. 1981. "An Alternative Nostos for Odysseus." *LCM* 6: 169-75.

-----------. 2001. "Phoenix's Antecedents: A Note on *Iliad* 9." *SCI* 20: 1-15.

Westbrook, R. 1992. "The Trial Scene in the *Iliad*." *HSCP* 9: 53-76.

White, J. A. 1982. "Bellerophon in the 'Land of Nod': Some Notes on *Iliad* 6.153-211." *AJP* 103.2: 119-27.

Whitfield, G. K. 1967. *The Restored Relation. A Study of the Supplication Theme in the Iliad*. Columbia University. Dissertation.

Whitman, C. 1965. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition.*

Wiesmann, P. 1948. *Die Phoenix-Novelle. Interpretation von Ilias IX*. Chur.

Wilamowitz, U. von. 1884. *Homerische Untersuchungen.* Berlin.

-----------. 1916. *Die Ilias und Homer*. Berlin.

-----------. 1931. *Der Glaube der Hellenen.* Berlin.

Willcock, M. M. 1984. *The Iliad of Homer.* Vol. I-II. London.

-----------. 1995. *Pindar: Victory Odes: Olympians 2, 7, 11; Nemean 4; Isthmians 3, 4, 7*. Cambridge.

Wilson, C. H. 1996. *Homer: Iliad Books VIII and IX.* Warminster.

Wilson, D. F. 2002. *Ransom, Revenge, and Heroic Identity in the Iliad.* Cambridge.

Wolf, F. A. 1795. *Prolegomena ad Homerum*. Berlin.

Wolfe, P. 1992. *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology*. London.

Wolff, J. H. 1946. "The Origins of Judicial Litigation among the Greeks." *Traditio* 4: 31-87.

Wrenhaven, K. 2012. *Reconstructing the Slave: The Image of the Slave in Ancient Greece*. London.

Wyatt, W. F., Jr. 1982. "Homeric ἎΤΗ." *AJP* 103.3: 247-76.

Yaffe, G. 2010. *Attempts: In the Philosophy of Action and Criminal Law*. Oxford.

Yamagata, N. 1991. “Phoenix's Speech - Is Achilles Punished?” *CQ* 41.1: 1-15.

-----------. 2014. “The Justice of Zeus Revisited.” In M. Christopoulos and M. Païzi-Apostolopoulou, eds., *Crime and Punishment in Homeric and Archaic Epic. Proceedings of the 12th International Symposium on the Odyssey*. *Ithaca, September 3-7, 2013.* Centre for Odyssean Studies. 47-56.

Young, D. 1968. *Three Odes of Pindar: A Literary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3, and Olympian 7*. Leiden.

VITA

Eunice Seungyeon Kim was born in Urbana, Illinois, but raised primarily in Barrington, Rhode Island. She holds a B.A. in Classics (Greek and Latin) with honors and *magna cum laude* from Brown University, which she attended from 2007 to 2011. During her time there, she spent her junior year abroad reading the Classical Tripos at Pembroke College, Cambridge University in 2009-2010. She then entered the graduate program in Classical Languages and Literature at the University of Washington, where she earned her M.A. in 2012 and Ph.D. in 2017.