

“THE CITY-SACKER ODYSSEUS” IN *ILIAD* 2 AND 10

ADELE J. HAFT

Hunter College

ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ μετάβηθι καὶ ἵππου κόσμον ἄεισον
δουρατέου, τὸν Ἑπειὸς ἐποίησεν σὺν Ἀθήνῃ,
ὃν ποτ' ἐς ἀκρόπολιν δόλον ἤγαγε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς,
ἀνδρῶν ἐμπλήσας οἱ Ἴλιον ἐξαλάπαξαν.

Odysseus to Demodocus, *Odyssey* 8.492–95

For masterminding and directing the stratagem that ended the Trojan War, Odysseus wins immortal fame in the *Odyssey*. The *Iliad*, by contrast, makes no mention of the wooden horse, nor do any of its heroes anticipate Odysseus' role in sacking Troy. Even Zeus predicts only that Ilion will fall “through Athena's contrivances” (*Il.* 15.71: “Ἀθηναίης διὰ βουλᾶς”), whereas in the *Odyssey* Athena expressly tells Odysseus, “Priam's city was taken by *your* contrivance” (*Od.* 22.230: “σῇ δ' ἤλω βουλῇ Πριάμου πόλιν εὐρύαγυια”; cf. *Od.* 13.388). Yet, as I shall demonstrate, the *Iliad* has its own ways of intimating that Odysseus will sack Troy, and that his *dolos* may even include an exceptional horse (cf. *Od.* 8.492–95).

The *Iliad*'s lack of overt reference to the Trojan Horse accords with “the *Odyssey*'s pretense of ignoring the *Iliad*—and vice versa.”¹ The *Iliad* celebrates the *kleos* of Achilles; the *Odyssey*, that of Odysseus. Within each epic, the encounters between Achilles and Odysseus highlight their vastly differing characters and outlooks in such a way as to allude to a traditional rivalry: Will Troy fall through Achilles' *biê* or Odysseus' *mêtis*? Demodocus' first song at *Odyssey* 8.72–82 and Odysseus' failed embassy to Achilles at *Iliad* 9.179–431 provide evidence of such a tradition.² Moreover, *Iliad* 10, following as it does

¹ P. Pucci, *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the “Odyssey” and the “Iliad”* (Ithaca, N.Y. 1987) 18: “It is likely that during the formative period some passages were intentionally revised to conform to corresponding passages in the other. Clearly, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* presume each other, border and limit each other, to such an extent that one, as it were, writes the other.” See also G. Goold, “The Nature of Homeric Composition,” *ICS* 2 (1977) 19, for earlier bibliography on the poems' reciprocity. Cf. G. Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore 1979) 1–21, esp. 20–21, and A. Edwards, *Achilles in the “Odyssey,”* *Beitr. zur klass. Philol.* 171 (Königstein/Ts. 1985) 6–8 and 40, who stress the poems' orality.

² Schol. ad *Od.* 8.75 (HQV) and 8.77 (BE); Eustathius 1586.25–80 ad loc.; Aristarchus, according to schol. ad *Il.* 9.347; P. Girard, “Comment a dû se former l'*Illiade*,” *REG* 15 (1902) 253; W. Marg, “Das erste Lied des Demodokos,” in *Navicula Chiloniensis: Festschrift für F. Jacoby* (Leiden 1956) 22–26; K. Rüter, *Odysseeinterpretationen*, ed. K. Matthiessen, *Hypomnemata* 19 (Göttingen 1969) 247–51; J. Clay, *The Wrath of Athena* (Princeton 1983) 97–112, 241–46; and especially Nagy (above, note 1) 22–59.

Achilles' suggestion that Odysseus and the others "plan another better *mêtin*" to keep the Greek ships safe (*Il.* 9.423), "preserves an instance of open rivalry between Odysseus and Achilles over the ambush and spearfight."³

The epics' pretense of ignoring one another need not imply that they have a "polemical" relationship, or that the *Iliad* "changes" Odysseus.⁴ After all, only 60 lines of the *Odyssey* detail his role in Troy's demise (*Od.* 4.271–89, 8.492–521, 11.523–33), yet each of its three accounts contributes inestimably to the hero's characterization. The *Iliad* also alludes to his unique feat on several occasions, two of which—Book 2.1–483 and Book 10—are the subject of this study.⁵ The night reconnaissance known as the *Doloneia* is remarkable because it associates the exceptional horse with Odysseus. The *Doloneia* also bears the same relationship to Book 9 as *Iliad* 2 does to its preceding book: the Embassy and *Iliad* 1 focus upon Achilles; in his absence, the *Doloneia* and *Iliad* 2 thrust his "rival" Odysseus into prominence. In Book 10, Odysseus uses his *mêtis* to win for himself and Diomedes a triumphant return from behind enemy lines. In Book 2, Odysseus single-handedly prevents the demoralized Greeks from leaving Troy in disgrace; by so doing, he not only averts the army's "fate-transgressing return" (*Il.* 2.155: ὑπέρμωρα νόστος), but helps pave the way for the various Odyssean *nostoi* after he has sacked Troy (*Od.* 1.1–2).⁶

Linking the two episodes still closer is the controversial article-epithet-name ὁ πολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς, "the (well-known) city-sacker Odysseus" (*Il.* 2.278, 10.363),⁷ with its implication that Homer expected his audience not only to be familiar with Odysseus' renown as the sacker of Troy, but to perceive the ways in which *Iliad* 2 and 10 foreshadow Odysseus' greatest war-time feat. To support this interpretation, I offer the following arguments. (1) The ultimate fall of Troy forms part of the background of Book 2, especially when Odysseus recalls the famous omen at Aulis. (2) His success in halting the Achaean flight and in silencing Thersites further evokes the role Odysseus and his *mêtis* will play in ending the war. (3) Therefore, the expression ὁ πολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς is proleptic in *Iliad* 2, especially since the article and epithet are unique to Odysseus. (4) The same can be said of ὁ πολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς in the *Doloneia*; for, as Fenik has shown, a tradition in which the death of Rhesus is essential to Troy's fall influences the narrative of *Iliad* 10 without being explicit

³ Edwards (above, note 1) 40, cf. 38–39.

⁴ Quotes from Pucci (above, note 1) 18 and 41, respectively; cf. Edwards (above, note 1) 1 and 15n. 1, for bibliography. I do agree with Pucci, however, that the poems influence one another with regard to Odysseus' role, and that "the *Iliad* insert[s] an Odyssean Odysseus (I mean the Odysseus of the Odyssean tradition) in its own atmosphere and style" (41).

⁵ Elsewhere, I have argued that *Iliad* 4.494–56 and 14.1–134 do as well; see my "Odysseus' Wrath and Grief in the *Iliad*: Agamemnon, the Ithacan King, and the Sack of Troy in Books 2, 4, and 14," *CJ* 85.2 (1989–90) 97–114.

⁶ Pucci (above, note 1) 37 notes that, in both *Iliad* 2 and the *Odyssey* generally, "Odysseus' choice and action are essential to the continuation of the epic song." Cf. W. B. Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme* (Oxford 1968²) 27.

⁷ All Greek passages, except where noted, derive from the *Oxford Classical Texts: Homeri Opera*, 1–5: 1–2 (*Iliad*) eds. D. B. Munro and T. W. Allen (Oxford 1920³); 3–4 (*Odyssey*) ed. T. W. Allen (Oxford 1917–19²); 5 (*Hymns*, etc.) ed. T. W. Allen (Oxford 1912).

there.⁸ In conjunction with other Homeric passages depicting Odysseus as the sacker of Troy, *Iliad* 2 and 10 offer not only a sympathetic portrayal of the hero,⁹ but an abiding testament to "the artistic unity of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* combined."¹⁰

(i)

Although the *Iliad* ends before the Greeks sack Troy, the poem repeatedly foreshadows the city's destruction. Numerous allusions to that event appear in Diomedes' *aristeia*, in Achilles' explosive return to battle, and in the final book with its burning of Hector's body. But the most notable cluster of allusions is found in *Iliad* 2. Like the other early books that form a bridge between Achilles' withdrawal in Book 1 and the beginning of the Trojan victories in Book 8, *Iliad* 2 contains glimpses of the past, transporting us back to the assembling of the troops ten years before: the extensive catalogues filling the second half of the book (484–760, 816–77) and Odysseus' recollection of the snake omen at Aulis (299–330).¹¹ Yet these flashbacks seem to have obscured the *prophetic* nature of *Iliad* 2, for the book inaugurates the poem's opening day of battle and describes Agamemnon's mistaken belief that he will capture Troy on that very day. In the 483 lines constituting the first half of *Iliad* 2, there are at least *fourteen references to Troy's destruction*. Nowhere else in the epic are so many allusions made in so brief a space to the ultimate fall of Troy.¹²

From the outset, *Iliad* 2 reveals its obsession with this theme. After Achilles' withdrawal, Zeus sends "destructive Dream" (6: #8) to inform Agamemnon that "νῦν γάρ κεν ἔλοι πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν / Τρώων" (12–13: allusion #1). Dream delivers Zeus' instructions almost verbatim (29–30: #2), leaving Agamemnon fooled by Zeus' intentions: *οἱ γὰρ ὃ γ' αἰρήσειν Πριάμου πόλιν ἤματι κείνῳ* (37: #3). Summoning his council, Agamemnon reiterates the message he heard in his sleep (68–69: #4), then tests his army by alleging that Zeus has gone back on his promises that Agamemnon will conquer Troy (112–13: #5). Since the Trojans' allies continually frustrate his desire

⁸ B. Fenik, "*Iliad*" X and the "*Rhesus*," Collection Latomus 73 (Brussels 1964) 5–6, 12–13, 26, and *passim*.

⁹ Cf. A. Lang, *Anthropology and the Classics*, ed. R. Marett (Oxford 1908) 60: "It would not be hard to show that Odysseus is really the hero of the *Iliad*, as well as of the *Odyssey*"; Stanford (above, note 6) 8–80 and 254 nn. 1–2, for earlier bibliography on Odysseus, beloved hero of *philodusseus* Homer (cf. Eustathius 1878.47 ad *Od.* 19.583); O. Cramer, "Odysseus in the *Iliad*" (diss. U. of Texas at Austin 1973); Goold (above, note 1) 1–34; M. Flaumenhaft, "The Undercover Hero: Odysseus from Dark to Daylight," *Interpretation: A Journal of Political Philosophy* 10 (1982) 9–41; Clay (above, note 2) 68–89.

¹⁰ Nagy (above, note 1) 15, 20.

¹¹ See, for instance, W. Leaf, ed. *The Iliad*, 2 vols. (London 1900–1902; rpt. Amsterdam 1960²) 1:76–77; E. T. Owen, *The Story of the Iliad* (Toronto 1946; rpt. Ann Arbor 1966) 20–26; A. Heubeck, "Zur inneren Form der *Ilias*," *Gymnasium* 65 (1958) 41, 46; C. Whitman, *Homer and the Heroic Tradition* (Cambridge, Mass. 1958) 260–64.

¹² I do not include the reference to Philoctetes' return, since it appears in the catalogues. To compare the fourteen references in *Iliad* 2.1–483 with the allusions in other Iliadic books, see my Appendix.

to sack the city (132–33: #6), Agamemnon claims that the Greeks have no choice but flight, “οὐ γὰρ ἔτι Τροίην αἰρήσομεν εὐρυάγυιαν” (141: #7).

Only Odysseus, with the aid of Athena, prevents the test from backfiring. After reassembling the troops, Odysseus reproaches them for neglecting their original promise to Agamemnon to return home only *after* he had sacked Troy (228: #8). The book’s fixation upon the destruction of Ilion reaches its climax as Odysseus recalls the famous prophecy Calchas made ten years earlier. To the Achaeans assembled at Aulis, Calchas had interpreted the terrifying portent of a snake devouring nine sparrows as Zeus’ sign that, after nine years of fighting, “τῷ δεκάτῳ δὲ πόλιν αἰρήσομεν εὐρυάγυιαν” (329: #9). Since nine years have already passed (134, 295–96), Odysseus urges the army to stay “εἰς ὃ κεν ἄστὺ μέγα Πριάμοιο ἔλωμεν” (332: #10).

Nestor then reminds the Greeks of the auspicious lightning Zeus displayed as they embarked for Troy (350–56: #11), and bids Agamemnon to marshal the troops so he may know why he is unsuccessful in taking Troy (“πόλιν οὐκ ἀλαπάξεις” 367: #12). Agamemnon immediately exclaims that, with ten such counselors, “τῷ κε τάχ’ ἡμύσειε πόλις Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος / χερσὶν ὑφ’ ἡμετέρησιν ἀλοῦσά τε περθομένη τε” (373–74: #13). But, though acknowledging his sorrow at Achilles’ withdrawal (375–80), Agamemnon prays that he may take Troy *and* slay Hector on that very day (412–18: #14). Coupled with the delusive hope he derived from his dream, Agamemnon’s final words before preparing for battle reveal his desire to sack Troy without Achilles.¹³ The deceptive dream and the near failure of his test,¹⁴ depending as they do upon Agamemnon’s inability “to see both before and behind him” (1.343), prepare us for the Achaean reversals promised to Achilles by Zeus (cf. 3–4, 37–40, 419–20).

¹³ The relationship between the dream and Agamemnon’s character is explored by Owen (above, note 11) 21–22; J. Russo and B. Simon, “Homeric Psychology and the Oral Epic,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 29 (1968) 489; W. Donlan, “Homer’s Agamemnon,” *CW* 65 (1971) 111–12; S. Reid, “The *Iliad*: Agamemnon’s Dream,” *American Image: A Psychoanalytic Journal* 30 (1973) 33–35; J. Roberts, “A Portrait of Neurosis: Agamemnon in Book IV of the *Iliad*,” *CO* 59 (1981–82) 34 and 37. For fuller bibliography, see A. Kessels, *Studies on the Dream in Greek Literature* (Utrecht 1978) 12–19, 67–69nn. 35, 37, and 138.

¹⁴ Many have recognized the ironies contributed by Dream to Agamemnon’s test of the troops: Owen (above, note 11) 17; Whitman (above, note 11) 261; Kessels (above, note 13) 35–44 and nn. 44–64, 67–73, and 138; J. Griffin, *Homer* (New York 1980) 36; G. S. Kirk, ed., *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. 1* (Cambridge 1985) 160, 261. Donlan (above, note 13) 111 notes that Agamemnon overinterprets the Dream and believes that he will sack Troy “on that day” (2.37: ἡματι κείνῳ), a phrase found in *none* of the dream formulations (cf. schol. bT ad *Il.* 2.38); for Agamemnon’s *atē* in Homer generally, see E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley 1951; rpt. 1973) 1–27. The extreme rarity of the dream’s three-fold repetition (2.11–15, 28–33, 65–70), and its corresponding importance, is examined by G. Bolling, *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford 1925) 66–67; G. Calhoun, “Homeric Repetitions,” *UCPCP* 12 (1933–34) 18–20 and n. 61.

(ii)

Yet Agamemnon *does* sack Troy without Achilles. Even as *Iliad* 2 sets the stage for the Achaean setbacks and the necessity of Achilles' return, it looks past the death of Achilles to the fall of Troy. Besides its numerous allusions to that event, Book 2 assigns a stunning role to Odysseus. Whereas Agamemnon sees only "that day" (2.37: ἡμαῖτι κείνῳ), Odysseus "characteristically...looks back in time to an incident at the beginning of the war [Aulis], to anticipate the future conclusion of the war."¹⁵ But Odysseus does not simply recollect the memorable prophecy of the war's duration, a prophecy whose fulfillment lies beyond the *Iliad*. Odysseus' very words and actions throughout Book 2 foreshadow his preeminent role in Troy's fall. For what Agamemnon does not recognize is precisely what the audience of the *Iliad* knows: that Agamemnon *will* destroy Ilion in the near future, but only with the aid and cunning intelligence of Odysseus.¹⁶

Though Agamemnon intended that his peers "protest" against his message and so prevent the army's flight from occurring (73–75; cf. 192–94),¹⁷ when Athena descends to avert the disgraceful departure, only Odysseus appears reluctant to embark for home (169–71):

εὔρεν ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆα, Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντον,
ἑσταότ'· οὐδ' ὃ γε νηὸς εὖσσέλμοιο μελαίνης
ἄπτειτ', ἐπεὶ μιν ἄχος κραδίην καὶ θυμὸν ἴκανε·

These first lines describing Odysseus in *Iliad* 2 are remarkable for several reasons. They contain a poignant irony, since Odysseus' initial reluctance to embark for Troy ten years earlier is obviously traditional (cf. *Od.* 24.118–19).¹⁸ Later in the poem, we are told that the Achaean assembly met in front of

¹⁵ Flaumenhaft (above, note 9) 12, who also notes that Odysseus, unlike most of the premier Iliadic warriors, consistently attempts to bring the war to an end.

¹⁶ We may assume the familiarity of Homer's audience with episodes from the Troy Cycle. See E. Bethe, *Odyssee, Kyklos, Zeitbestimmung* (Leipzig 1929²) 169ff.; E. Wüst, "Odysseus," *RE* 17.2 (1937) 1937–47; J. Kakridis, *Homeric Researches* (Lund 1949) 89–95; and M. Edwards, *Homer: Poet of the Iliad* (Baltimore 1987) 70, for some of the extensive neo-analytic literature on Homer's adaptation of myth.

¹⁷ Several scholars see Agamemnon's instructions as an attempt to shift responsibility onto his peers: e.g., J. Shepphard, *The Pattern of the Iliad* (London 1922; rpt. New York 1966) 27; Owen (above, note 11) 21; cf. Dion. Hal. *Rhet.* 9.5 (6:327–30 ed. Usener). Agamemnon's incompetence in *Iliad* 2 is emphasized by K. Reinhardt, *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter*, ed. U. Hölscher (Göttingen 1961) 107–113.

¹⁸ After all, Odysseus was familiar with Halitherses' prophecy that the Ithacan king would not return from Troy until the twentieth year (*Od.* 2.170–76); cf. my forthcoming "'τὰ δὴ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται': Prophecy and Recollection in the Assemblies of *Iliad* 2 and *Odyssey* 2," *Arethusa* 25 (1992) for the resemblances between the second books of both epics. See also Proclus' summary of the *Cypria* in Allen, *Homeri Opera* 5:103.25–26, where Odysseus feigns madness in the hope of evading the draft. Odysseus' longing for Penelope is clear when he empathizes with the Achaeans' impatience to return home to their wives (*Il.* 2.291–97); cf. schol. b ad *Il.* 2.292, and Stanford (above, note 6) 44, 252n. 4.

Odysseus' ships at Troy (*Il.* 11.806–808); yet, despite the proximity to his own ships, Odysseus does not attempt to run home to his beloved wife and family. For equally characteristic of Odysseus is his belief that “it is a disgrace in any event to remain a long time and return empty-handed” (*Il.* 2.298; cf. *Od.* 11.355–61, 14.323–30, 19.293–99). Odysseus' vision of how to combine his duties to family and to the Achaeans (as well as his ability to effect that compromise) immediately distinguishes him from Achilles, whose first words in *Iliad* 1 are about returning home (1.59–60), ironically foreshadowing the threat he will hold over the Achaeans until Book 9. And Book 2.171 specifically names Odysseus, alone among all the Greeks in the *Iliad*, as experiencing *akhos*, “grief,” *not* over the loss of a friend or prestige, but because of the army's near abandonment of Troy.¹⁹

These lines also inaugurate the earliest of Athena's interventions on behalf of Odysseus in the Homeric poems. Her choice of Odysseus to avert the Greek departure reveals the affection and like-mindedness of the goddess and her mortal counterpart.²⁰ Their shared *mêtis* is evident at 2.169, when Athena descends to find “Odysseus, equal to Zeus in cunning intelligence.” Yet our familiarity with their Odyssean relationship should not obscure the uniqueness of the *Iliad* 2 episode, which represents Athena's *sole* epiphany to Odysseus in that poem (vs. 5.676, 10.274–96, 11.437–38, 23.771–72). Athena comes not on a personal mission but on a matter of state—as expeditor of Hera's wish to keep the Greeks at Troy (2.156–65) and as the deity who, along with Hera, is most concerned to see Ilion topple (cf. 15.711–18, 20.313–17, 24.25–30). Athena seeks out Odysseus, then stands quietly at his side while he delivers the speech that inspires the Greeks to remain and sack Troy (2.278–83). Here, together and in action for the first time, is the divine/mortal team primarily responsible for Troy's demise (cf. *Od.* 13.388, 22.230).

Without diminishing Achilles' prowess, Homer permits us to view in *Iliad* 2 the qualities that make Odysseus successful in effecting the sack of Troy. Most important is the fact that Odysseus keeps the Greeks at Troy so that they have the opportunity to sack the city. He literally transforms the demoralized and flight-happy soldiers into a unified army; their thunderous applause at his urging them to remain until they have sacked the town of Priam indicates both their enthusiasm and their potential to do just that (333–35). Lest we take Odysseus' role in *Iliad* 2 for granted, we need only recall that the *Cypria* not only names Achilles as the hero who prevented the Achaeans' sudden departure, but places this event earlier in the war.²¹ In Achilles' absence, Homer could have chosen Nestor or Diomedes to reassemble the troops. As we have seen, Nestor offers advice praised by Agamemnon in Book 2 (370–74). At *Iliad* 9.32–51, Diomedes persuades the panicked Agamemnon not to return home, thus winning the acclaim of the grief-stricken Achaeans; later, Diomedes is one of the select few concealed inside the Trojan Horse (*Od.* 4.272–84). Yet Homer

¹⁹ See Haft (above, note 5) 99–100 and n. 8.

²⁰ M. Willcock, ed., *A Commentary on Homer's "Iliad": Books I–VI* (London 1970) 48.

²¹ See Proclus' summary in Allen, *Homeri Opera* 5:105.7–10. See also J. Griffin, “The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer,” *JHS* 97 (1977) 44.

assigns both heroes secondary roles in Books 2 and 9,²² and selects Odysseus for the crucial role in *Iliad* 2 because of the Ithacan king's unique abilities and character.

Odysseus' solitary courage enables him to single-handedly prevent the Achaeans from boarding their ships. Combined with his courage is his willingness to use all possible means to achieve his ends. In his hands, Agamemnon's scepter becomes a symbol and weapon designed to shame the Greeks into remaining at Troy. Odysseus uses this symbol of Agamemnon's authority to remind his peers of the king's original plan in "staging" the test (185–97) and to remind his subordinates, by word and blow, of their inferior status (198–206, 265–69). Yet the brunt of his reproach falls upon one man, Thersites. Though Thersites' mutinous words no doubt reflect the feelings of many soldiers toward Agamemnon for his part in Achilles' withdrawal (225–42),²³ Odysseus treats Thersites as if he alone had such shameful thoughts, then "banishes" the railer, like a scapegoat, from the community. Odysseus' action wins him more than the unanimous praise of the Achaeans: οἱ δὲ καὶ ἀχνύμενοί περ ἐπ' αὐτῷ [Thersites] ἡδὺν γέλασσαν (270). The Greeks actually refer to Odysseus' treatment of Thersites as "his greatest deed": "νῦν δὲ τόδε μέγ' ἄριστον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔρεξεν" (274)! Odysseus blends a keen understanding of his men, moreover, with a genuine concern for Agamemnon's reputation (254–56, 284ff.). Throughout *Iliad* 2, Odysseus repeatedly acts as Agamemnon's

²² Nestor directs his influential counsel more toward Agamemnon than toward the troops in *Iliad* 2 (360–68, 433–40). When he does address the army, Nestor's speech mimics that of Odysseus, his exhortation beginning with a reproach and the recollection of a prophecy (336–56); but Nestor's threat to kill any shirker (357–59) reveals none of Odysseus' identification with the soldiers (esp. 291–97). Kirk (above, note 14) 15 notes too: "Nestor's failure to refer to the earlier and more striking portent, and to the graphic account of it by Odysseus, is remarkable." In Haft (above, note 5) 102, I suggest that *Homer* magnifies Odysseus at Nestor's expense, although *Agamemnon* gives Nestor the credit. For the resemblance in the parts played by Odysseus and Nestor in *Iliad* 2, as well as for the superiority of Odysseus' wisdom and ethics, see D. Lohmann, *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias*, Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 61 (Berlin 1970) 51–58, and Cramer (above, note 9) 126–28.

Diomedes takes the tack that Agamemnon can go home if he wants (9.45–46). Yet the resemblance between his words and Odysseus' exhortation at 2.331–32 disappears when Diomedes boasts that he and Sthenelus will fight, even without the other Achaeans, until Troy falls (9.47–49); for Diomedes' boast contains not a little of the wounded pride and self-interest behind Achilles' prayer at *Iliad* 16.97–100. For the resemblance in the parts played by Odysseus and Diomedes in *Iliad* 2, 9, and 14, see R. M. Frazer, "The Crisis of Leadership Among the Greeks and Poseidon's Intervention in *Iliad* 14," *Hermes* 113 (1985) 3–8; and Haft (above, note 5) 111–12 and n. 59. Note also that in *Iliad* 14, when Odysseus contrasts himself with Agamemnon, he identifies himself with the entire army, not with an individual—like Sthenelus or Patroclus (84–102); yet Odysseus, like Achilles in Book 1 and Diomedes in Book 4 (370–400), has suffered the abuse of Agamemnon (4.338–48).

²³ Note the ambiguity of *Iliad* 2.222–23, τῷ δ' ἄρ' Ἀχαιοὶ / ἐκπάγλως κοτέοντο νεμέσσηθ' ἐν τ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ, where τῷ may refer to Thersites (cf. Kirk [above, note 14]) or to Agamemnon (cf. Leaf [above, note 11]).

spokesman for the benefit of them all (185–86, 221–56, 284–335),²⁴ thus demonstrating his obvious difference from the equally charismatic Achilles.

The qualities of Odysseus shown in *Iliad* 2 appear, to varying degrees, throughout the *Iliad* (esp. Books 1, 4, 9–11, 14, 19) and the *Odyssey*. All these qualities contribute to and evoke his traditional μέγ' ἄριστον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν, the sacking of Troy—a feat Odysseus accomplishes while serving under Agamemnon and apparently without alienating his temperamental leader. Other details link *Iliad* 2 with the Odyssean descriptions of his masterminding of the stratagem of the Trojan Horse. First is their emphasis on his cleverness in handling all situations. In addition to his actions and words in Book 2, Odysseus is *thrice* called Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος/ον, an Iliadic epithet applied to him only four times in the entire poem (169, 407, 636; cf. 10.137). The Trojan Horse is a *dolos* (*Od.* 8.494; cf. 3.118–22) and a *lokhos* (*Od.* 4.277, 8.515, 11.525), symbolic of Odysseus' cunning intelligence and its decisive triumph over *biē*. Odysseus not only lays the subtle trap (*Od.* 8.502, 22.230); once inside the walls, he prevents his companions from betraying themselves to Helen (*Od.* 4.271–89), then determines the exact moment for their escape from the horse (*Od.* 11.524–25). Demonstrating his *mētis* still further is the aid he receives from Athena (*Od.* 4.289, 8.520, 13.388, 22.230; cf. 13.293, 303). On both occasions, Odysseus directs the men under his command: Menelaus, Diomedes, Neoptolemus, Anticlus, and others unnamed, all referred to as “the best of the Argives” in the wooden horse (*Od.* 4.272–73, 8.512–13; cf. 4.278–79, 11.524–26); and, for the time Odysseus holds the scepter of command in *Iliad* 2, the entire Greek army heeds his counsel. Foils for Odysseus in *Iliad* 2, Agamemnon and Nestor are conspicuous by their absence from the Trojan Horse.

As *Odyssey* 11.523–30 and *Iliad* 2.169–332 attest, both episodes also call for great courage. In the Iliadic episode, Odysseus alone stands in the way of the Achaean masses sweeping toward the ships (*Il.* 2.169–210; cf. 87–100, 119–30); while the Odyssean accounts suggest that the Trojans vastly outnumber the small group of select men led by Odysseus into Ilion. When a single member of that force threatens to destroy the venture for them all, Odysseus is quick to punish the offender: Thersites in *Iliad* 2, Anticlus in *Odyssey* 4 (286–88). So successful is Odysseus that he not only penetrates the otherwise unbreachable Trojan walls to destroy the city from within, but returns from that dangerous enterprise with all the famous warriors who accompanied him.²⁵ And, by the time the Greeks applaud his suggestion that they remain at Troy in *Iliad* 2, Odysseus has twice succeeded in overriding their own inclination to leave: first by reassembling them (207–11; cf. 142–55), then by making them laugh “despite their grieving” for their long-desired return (270). Within that very year,

²⁴ Flaumenhaft (above, note 9) 11: “[In *Iliad* 2, 9, and 19, Odysseus] acts less on his own behalf than as the representative of a group.” Cf. Stanford (above, note 6) 17, 39, and passim for Odysseus' actions *pro bono publico*.

²⁵ The *Odyssey* says nothing about the number or fates of the unnamed men; even Odysseus' accidental strangulation of Anticlus is not explicit at *Od.* 4.286, despite the tradition recorded by others: e.g., *Ilias Parva*, fr. X in Allen, *Homeric Opera*, 5:131–32; Ovid, *Ib.* 569–70.

intriguingly, Odysseus will trick the Trojans into believing that the Achaeans have embarked for home in disgrace (cf. *Od.* 8.500–13).²⁶

(iii)

That *Iliad* 2 foreshadows Odysseus' role in the destruction of Troy is no more evident than in the expression ὁ πολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς (278). To suggest this means tackling three issues and demonstrating their relation: (1) that the article with the epithet appears to be unique to Odysseus in the Homeric poems; (2) that the epithet is proleptic when applied to Odysseus in the *Iliad*; and (3) that it means "the sacker of *Troy*" specifically.

The *Odyssey* provides an introduction to our consideration because the epithet πολίπορθος or πολίπόρθιος is used frequently and *exclusively* of Odysseus (8.3; 9.504, 530; 14.477; 16.442; 18.356; 22.283; 24.119). Just because the *Odyssey* assigns the epithet to Odysseus alone, however, πολίπορθος/πολίπόρθιος need not be interpreted as "sacker of Troy." Stanford, in fact, asserts that the adjective refers only to Odysseus' piratical raids, not to his ending the Trojan War; and, as evidence, cites Odysseus' own description of how he sacked Ismarus, the city of the Cicones—"ἐνθα δ' ἐγὼ πόλιν ἔπραθον" (*Od.* 9.40; cf. *Od.* 9.165: "Κικόνων ἱερὸν πολίεθρον ἐλόντες").²⁷ Stanford's interpretation is further supported by the epithet's application to Achilles in the *Iliad* (see below). The weight of the evidence, however, favors the opposite interpretation—that the *Odyssey* expects its audience to equate πολίπορθος/πολίπόρθιος with the sack of Troy: for, of the remaining 17 Odyssean references to the actual sacking of a city, 16 refer to Troy itself.²⁸ The epithet, moreover, could hardly refer to a failure: the Cicones episode is, in the end, a defeat. Surely Odysseus' reputation as a city-sacker depends on his sack of Troy. Most important for the *Odyssey*, Odysseus' sacking of Troy is basic to defining the epic, as the proem shows: Odysseus "saw the cities of many people" (*Od.* 1.3: πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα) "after he had sacked Troy's holy citadel" (*Od.* 1.2: ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πολίεθρον ἔπερσε: emphasis mine).

But we must return to the *Iliad* to confront a more serious objection: that "city-destroyer" must signify "sacker of *cities*" since πολίπορθος is not exclusive to Odysseus in Homer generally.²⁹ After all, the *Iliad* assigns the epithet to Odysseus on only two occasions (2.278, 10.363), and requires him to share it with five other characters: the war gods, Enyo (5.333: οὐτ' ἄρ' Ἀθηναίη οὔτε

²⁶ See Haft (above, note 5) 111–13 for how *Iliad* 14.1–134 foreshadows Odysseus' trick. His identification with the Greeks is especially evident at 14.84–102.

²⁷ W. B. Stanford, ed., *The Odyssey of Homer*, 2 vols. (London 1965²) 1.331 ad *Od.* 8.3–4 and 1:350 ad *Od.* 9.39–40.

²⁸ See *Od.* 1.2; 3.85, 118–19, 130; 5.105–108; 8.495, 511–13, 514–15, 516; 9.265; 11.533; 13.316, 388; 14.241, 368; 22.230. The other exception is Laertes' youthful capture of Nericus (*Od.* 24.377), an exploit that cements the association between father and son just before their final victory over the suitors' fathers.

²⁹ Translation by Stanford (above, note 27) 1:331 ad *Od.* 8.3–4 and 2:312 ad *Od.* 18.356, respectively (emphasis mine).

πτολίπορθος Ἐννῶ) and Ares (20.152: ἀμφὶ σέ, ἥϊε Φοῖβε, καὶ Ἄρηα πτολίπορθον); the earlier heroes, Oileus (2.728: τὸν ῥ' ἔτεκεν Ῥήνη ὑπ' Ὀϊλῆϊ πτολιπόρθῳ) and Otrynteus (20.384: ὃν νύμφη τέκε νῆϊς Ὀτρυντῆϊ πτολιπόρθῳ);³⁰ and Achilles, who receives the epithet on four occasions (8.372=15.77: λισσομένη τιμῆσαι Ἀχιλλῆα πτολίπορθον; 21.550: αὐτὰρ ὃ γ' ὥς ἐνόησεν Ἀχιλλῆα πτολίπορθον; 24.108: Ἑκτορος ἀμφὶ νέκυι καὶ Ἀχιλλῆϊ πτολιπόρθῳ). For Milman Parry, therefore, πτολίπορθος implies no more than "a man who, being a hero, was capable of sacking cities"; nor could Odysseus be 'Sacker of Troy' since he "has not yet sacked Troy."³¹

Parry's tables of epithets, however, fail to show that the Iliadic Odysseus is not simply πτολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς, but ὁ πτολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς (emphasis mine).³²

Ἦς φάσαν ἡ πληθὺς· ἀνὰ δ' ὁ πτολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς
ἔστη σκῆπτρον ἔχων· παρὰ δὲ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη... (2.278–79)

ὡς τὸν Τυδείδης ἡδ' ὁ πτολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς
λαοῦ ἀποτμήξαντε διώκετον ἔμμενές αἰεῖ. (10.363–64)

Not only did Aristarchus favor δ' ὁ, but his reading ὁ πτολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς remains the vulgate (the variants—δέ for δ' ὁ at 2.278, ἡδέ for ἡδ' ὁ at 10.363—having been prompted, in all probability, by the desire to avoid the article).³³ What then does ὁ πτολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς mean? At *Iliad* 2.278–79, Kirk offers a way to interpret "the unusual occurrence of two *near-definite-articles* in the same verse":³⁴

³⁰ Oileus may get the epithet by transference from his son, according to W. A. Oldfather, "Oileus," *RE* 17.2 (1937) 2184. Otrynteus is obscure, but his name is mentioned three times (20.383, 384, 389) to his son's one (20.382: Iphition). He must have had some epic reputation, used here to give his son enough importance to be worth Achilles' killing.

³¹ *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*, ed. A. Parry (Oxford 1971) 146 and 148, respectively; cf. 149.

³² Ibid., 39, 90, and 277n. 2. Cramer (above, note 9) 47 and 66–67 also fails to make a numerically accurate and, hence, adequate distinction, despite his useful listing and discussion of Odysseus' epithets (34–73).

³³ On the vulgate reading, see Didymus in bT ad loc. (Erbse 1:245); Munro and Allen, *Homeri Opera*, ad loc.; *Homeri Ilias*, ed. T. W. Allen, 3 vols. (London 1931) ad loc., where ὁ is a demonstrative; Kirk (above, note 14) 145 at *Il.* 2.278–79. For Aristarchus' instruction that Homer "customarily lacks the articles," see F. A. Wolf, *Prolegomena to Homer, 1795*, trans. A. Grafton, G. Most, J. Zetzel (Princeton 1985) 177n. 76.

³⁴ (Above, note 14) ad loc. (emphasis mine). Kirk's terminology—"near-definite-articles" and "quasi-demonstratives"—reflects the difficulty of distinguishing the demonstrative ὁ from the article ὁ in Homer, since, as Smyth has shown (*Greek Grammar*, revised by G. Messing [Cambridge, Mass. 1920] section 1099, cf. 1102), "the beginnings of its use as the article are seen even in Homer"; cf. W. W. Goodwin, *A Greek Grammar* (London 1894; rpt. 1977) sections 935–36, and P. Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique*, 2 vols. (Paris 1942) 1:276, section 129 and 2:165, section 245. R. Cunliffe goes further, listing among examples of ὁ "passing into the definite article" subsets that he labels "the article of contrast" and "the defining article" (*A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect* [London 1924; rpt. Norman, Oklahoma 1963] 284).

Each of these, in its own way, has some emphatic or demonstrative force: (i) ἡ πλῆθὺς, 'the multitude', i.e. that one sitting there; (ii) ὁ πολίπορθος 'Ὀδυσσεύς, 'the [i.e. that famous] ravager-of-cities Odysseus'. In addition the quasi-demonstratives contribute to the antithesis between the two parties: *here* the multitude, *there* Odysseus.

The "antithesis" between ἡ πλῆθὺς and Odysseus highlights the hero's solitary stand as he begins to address the entire force. Nevertheless, δέ would serve as well as δ' ὁ to express this tension (cf. 279: παρὰ δὲ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη, emphasis mine). We can assume, therefore, that the article does something more at *Iliad* 2.278 and 10.363.

Though rare, other ὁ + epithet phrases occur in Homer. One of these, the expression ὁ τλήμων 'Ὀδυσσεύς, is particularly noteworthy. It appears only in the *Iliad*—specifically at 10.231 and 498, where it brackets the equally Iliadic ὁ πολίπορθος 'Ὀδυσσεύς. 'Ὁ τλήμων 'Ὀδυσσεύς is the *second* of four article-epithet phrases applied to Odysseus in the Homeric poems (cf. *Od.* 10.436: ὁ θρασὺς... 'Ὀδυσσεύς; *Od.* 23.306: ὁ διογενὴς 'Ὀδυσσεύς). Furthermore, if we translate τλήμων as "enduring/suffering," the entire expression is used proleptically.³⁵ And Chantraine not only cites ὁ τλήμων 'Ὀδυσσεύς as exemplifying the type of usage in which ὁ has the most attenuated demonstrative form, but states that the word order article-adjective-name is *latest and closest to the Attic-Ionic usage*.³⁶ Given this evidence, it appears that Homer, by means of elision at *Iliad* 2.278 and 10.363, has employed the unusual phrase ὁ πολίπορθος 'Ὀδυσσεύς in place of the frequently attested epithet + name formula involving (merely) πολίπορθος 'Ὀδυσσεύς. The article, unnecessary in the *Odyssey* because of the adjective's sole identification with Odysseus, serves in the *Iliad* to differentiate him from all the others called πολίπορθος. If we assume the

³⁵ Puzzled as to why the Iliadic Odysseus should already be characterized by his "suffering," Parry admits that the epithet may, perhaps, indicate the individuality of the poet or poets ([above, note 31] 80, 82). It should be noted that πολύτλας "much-enduring/much-suffering," Odysseus' exclusive epithet in both the *Odyssey* (x33) and the *Iliad* (x5: *Il.* 8.97; 9.676=10.248; 23.729, 778), immediately follows the first appearance of ὁ τλήμων (*Il.* 10.231, 248). For πολύτλας, see Parry (above, note 31) 131 and 145; that epithets can be used proleptically is good Parryite doctrine, although he seems to have forgotten that at times.

Whereas Odysseus has two Iliadic *and* Odyssean ὁ-adjective-name expressions, other heroes have only *one* such expression in the Homeric epics. ὁ (Τυδείδης) κρατερὸς Διομήδης at *Il.* 10.536 (cf. *Il.* 8.532, 11.660, and 16.25) serves to contrast Diomedes' strength with Odysseus' endurance/suffering throughout the *Doloneia*; incidentally, the translation "daring" for τλήμων (e.g. Cramer [above, note 9] 59–60) would suggest, erroneously, I believe, that Diomedes is (merely) "strong". At *Il.* 16.358, Ajax Telamonian is referred to as Αἴας δ' ὁ μέγας. Finally, with regard to the exceptional ὁ κλυτὸς (ὥκὺς) Ἀχιλλεύς at *Il.* 20.320, D. Shive concludes that it "may be unique, equivalent, or nonexistent" (*Naming Achilles* [Oxford 1987] 29). For the ὁ + name-epithets in Homer generally, see A. Shewan, *The Lay of Dolon* (London 1911) 77–89.

³⁶ Chantraine (above, note 34) 2:165, sections 245 and 246 (emphasis mine).

primacy of the emphatic or defining force of ὁ, Odysseus is "the (well-known) πολίπορθος 'Οδυσσεύς."³⁷

With its conventional rendering "sacker of cities," πολίπορθος aptly describes war gods, earlier heroes whose exploits belong to the past, and Achilles. The only contemporary of Odysseus to share the epithet, Achilles is the Iliadic "sacker of cities" *par excellence*. Yet the poem reiterates that Achilles, despite his previous conquests of 23 cities (9.328–29), will never sack Troy (16.707–9; 21.544–45; 22.15–20, 359–60, 381–91). That honor goes instead to Odysseus. As if to emphasize this, the *Iliad* (and epic tradition in general) recollects no earlier campaigns directed by Odysseus, but nevertheless announces that he is "the (well-known) πολίπορθος 'Οδυσσεύς." For Odysseus, the epithet must have some implication for the future. Combined with the fact that Book 2.278 provides the *first* Iliadic occurrence of πολίπορθος + (any) hero's name, ὁ πολίπορθος 'Οδυσσεύς appears to foreshadow what the *Odyssey* recalls: Odysseus' traditional reputation as Troy's destroyer, for πολίπορθος can as easily mean "sacker of (one) city" as "sacker of (many) cities." Since Odysseus is the only Iliadic hero called πολίπορθος who has not yet conquered a city, the expression ὁ πολίπορθος 'Οδυσσεύς must foreshadow his sacking of Troy.³⁸

Parry insisted that the usages of πολίπορθος were determined exclusively by meter: Even the exceptional Odyssean form 'Οδυσσῆα πολίπορθιον (*Od.* 9.504, 530), an alternative for the expected 'Οδυσσῆα πολίπορθον (*Od.* 18.356, 24.119; cf. Ἀχιλλῆα πολίπορθον: *Il.* 8.372, 15.77, 21.550), he regarded as merely the product of "chance" and the unavailability of another phrase having the "same metrical value."³⁹ Recent Homeric scholarship, however, has greatly modified Parry's original formulation by showing in detail how many exceptions are found to his rigid rules of economy and extension, and how much theme determines diction.⁴⁰ It is now well-established doctrine that

³⁷ Liddell and Scott, *Greek Lexicon*⁹, not only recognizes the defining article in Homer (1194: B), but says that even as a demonstrative pronoun ὁ can "define and give emphasis" (1194: A; emphasis mine). At this point, then, the demonstrative pronoun becomes indistinguishable from the definite article.

³⁸ Cf. Aristonicus ad *Il.* 2.278 (Erbse 1:245).

³⁹ (Above, note 31) 173n. 2, cf. 171–74. Like all name-epithets with πολίπορθος, 'Οδυσσῆα πολίπορθον, occupies the end of the line; 'Οδυσσῆα πολίπορθιον, by contrast, has a different metrical shape and occupies the *center* of the verse. The *OCT* reads *Od.* 9.530 as δὲς μὴ 'Οδυσσῆα πολίπορθον οἶκαδ' ἰκέσθαι. Although it does not affect my argument, I have chosen (below) to retain the equally problematic but better attested 'Οδυσσῆα πολίπορθιον (emphasis mine); see Stanford (above, note 27) 1:364–65 ad loc.

With regard to the other πολίπορθος usages, no doublet exists, and the formula is paired in the nominative with the far more frequent πολύμητις 'Οδυσσεύς beginning with a single consonant (cf. πολίπορθιον/μεγαλήτορα); see Parry 39 and 90. Yet, even he admits that meter is "less exigent" in this position (i.e., after the hephthemimeral caesura) and that many major figures have only a single-consonant or double-consonant form; see Parry 51–52.

⁴⁰ See, for instance, A. B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, Mass. 1960) 30–65; G. S. Kirk, *The Songs of Homer* (Cambridge 1962) 95–98; J. Russo, "A Closer Look at Homeric Formulas," *TAPA* 94 (1963) 235–47, and "The Structural Formula in Homeric Verse," *YCIS* 20 (1966) 219–40; J. Hainsworth, *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula* (Oxford 1968) esp. 30–35; M. Nagler, *Spontaneity and Tradition* (Berkeley 1974); N. Austin, *Archery at the Dark of the*

the formulaic system is flexible and serves the poet's ends. After all, the exceptional Ὀδυσσῆα πολυπόρθιον occurs only twice in the Homeric poems, both times during Odysseus' critical encounter with Polyphemus: Odysseus identifies himself to the Cyclops with this epithet (*Od.* 9.504: "φάσθαι Ὀδυσσῆα πολυπόρθιον ἐξάλαῶσαι"), and Polyphemus promptly curses Odysseus with the same epithet (*Od.* 9.530: "δὸς μὴ Ὀδυσσῆα πολυπόρθιον οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι"). Odysseus' decision to call himself "city-sacker" has been recognized as deliberate. Charles Segal astutely links the hero's boast with his introduction to Polyphemus earlier in *Odyssey* 9, when Odysseus informed the one-eyed monster that he and his men were Greeks under the command of Agamemnon, who had just sacked Troy (265: "διέπερσε πόλιν").⁴¹ Dimock reflects that Odysseus' "cry of defiance is...a case of deliberate self-exposure for the purpose of being somebody rather than nobody."⁴² What neither has suggested is that Odysseus claims to be much more than "Laertes' son from Ithaca" (*Od.* 9.505=531): He identifies himself to Polyphemus by his most notable achievement thus far, *his sacking of Troy*.

Pucci tackles a similar situation at *Odyssey* 8.3, the single Homeric description of Odysseus as διογενῆς...πολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς. "Parry explains this exceptional rarity by analogy with other formulaic patterns; yet this explanation does not prevent our adding that the text shows the will to have Odysseus named as *ptoliporthos*, "sacker of cities," and that this naming of course forecasts Demodocus' description of Odysseus as the destroyer of Troy in the same book (*Od.* 8.499ff.)."⁴³ Finally, it is no longer necessary to argue that all 18 examples of Homeric πολίπορθος/πολυπόρθιος must be meaningful in context to demonstrate that a given example is. Of the many scholars who have discussed this point, Nagler is most explicit: "There does not seem to be a one-to-one relationship between any unit of diction—simple word, compound, or phrase—and its poetic signification, any more (in fact, it would seem, considerably less) than there is between word and meaning in ordinary spoken

Moon (Berkeley 1975) 25, cf. 11–80 and 261–64nn. 38–52; B. Peabody, *The Winged Word* (Albany 1975); A. Edwards, "ΚΛΕΟΣ ἈΦΘΙΤΟΝ and Oral Theory," *CQ* 38 (1988) 28; and, arguing for a literate Homer, Shive (above, note 35). Cf. R. Finnegan, *Oral Poetry* (Cambridge 1977) 69–87 and 160–69, who demonstrates how experimentation, repeated performance, memorization, and even writing aid in the progressive fixation of an oral poet's text.

It would have been simple, furthermore, for Homer to substitute ἀνὰ δ' ὁ πολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς / ἔστι σκῆπτρον ἔχων with *ὁ δ' ἀνέστη δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς / σκῆπτρον ἔχων at *Il.* 2.278–79 on the analogy of *Il.* 1.145, 3.205, 23.759, and especially 18.305 (cf. *Od.* 6.117, 13.187, 22.81, and especially 13.56), since δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς is the most common generic epithet for Odysseus in this position.

⁴¹ "Kleos and its Ironies in the *Odyssey*," *AC* 52 (1983) 34–35; Segal, however, feels it is inappropriate for Odysseus, given his present circumstances, to adopt the epithet πολυπόρθιον, since it associates the hero with Agamemnon's glory and the Iliadic values of "martial prowess."

⁴² G. E. Dimock, Jr., "The Name of Odysseus," in *Essays on the "Odyssey,"* ed. d. C. H. Taylor (Bloomington, Indiana 1963) 58.

⁴³ (Above, note 1) 21n. 10, with reference to Parry (above, note 31) 77. Cf. Nagy (above, note 1) 15–41 for the rival claims of Odysseus and Achilles as evinced in Demodocus' first song.

discourse.”⁴⁴ Evidence for the contextual relevance of the exceptional Odyssean Ὀδυσσεῖα πολίπορθιον and διογενῆς...πολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς, in other words, supports my argument about *Iliad* 2.278: that the exceptional Iliadic ὁ πολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς reveals the influence of theme upon diction in Book 2 *and*, as I hope to demonstrate as well, in Book 10.

By emphasizing that the war has already consumed nine of its ten predicted years, then, Book 2 supplies the first clue as to how late in the conflict the *Iliad* is set; at the same time, the book takes us back to Aulis. For Lord, this “modulation back to the beginning of the war is accomplished...by the assembling of the troops, leading to the catalogues”—a theme that ought to belong to the war’s outset.⁴⁵ As the past becomes telescoped with the present, both intersect with the future in the book’s obsessive concern for the destruction of Troy. In the middle of *Iliad* 2.1–483 stands Odysseus, whose reassembling of the troops climaxes the assembly theme every bit as much as his recollection of Calchas’ prophecy climaxes the destruction-of-Troy motif. As Odysseus rises to deliver the speech ensuring that the Greeks will remain at Troy, Homer identifies him as ὁ πολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς “the Troy-sacker Odysseus.” Clustered around this epithet at *Iliad* 2.278 are elements associated with Troy’s destruction, notably: the aid of Athena (279–82), the goddess whose “contrivances” helped sack Troy; Odysseus’ intrepid leadership of the army while serving under Agamemnon, as symbolized by the scepter he bears (279); the Greeks’ agreement that Odysseus’ action against Thersites is “his greatest deed among the Argives” (274). Not coincidentally, *Iliad* 2 finds Odysseus engaged in what is without doubt his most significant achievement within the poem itself. As Odysseus prevents the Greeks from leaving Troy and urges them to remain, he makes it possible for the army to sack Troy and for himself to earn the title ὁ πολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς.

(iv)

At *Iliad* 10.363, the expression ὁ πολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς reappears for the last time as Odysseus and Diomedes chase their Trojan counterpart, Dolon: ὥς τὸν Τυδείδης ἦδ’ ὁ πολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς. Once again the article+epithet is

⁴⁴ (Above, note 40) 60. Shive (above, note 35) 77–78 and 99–100 argues that πολίπορθος can be considered a significant epithet for Achilles at *Il.* 21.544 and 24.108, but ornamental at 8.372=15.77. Unfortunately, he feels compelled to reject the accepted reading at *Il.* 2.278 and 10.363 in order to do so (28n. 26); it should also be noted that his “significant” πολίπορθος epithets for Achilles appear in an ironic context, since on both occasions the epithet is accompanied by descriptions of Apollo’s hostility toward Achilles *and* either that hero’s failure to sack Troy (*Il.* 21.536–50) or his imminent death (*Il.* 24.32–63 and 85–86; cf. 22.359–60).

In addition, there is a particular aptness to at least two other Odyssean uses of πολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς: “at 22.283 Odysseus, as he is striking Eurydamas, is...the destroyer of citadels, here the suitors’ citadel” (Austin [above, note 40] 27); and at 24.119, where the shade of Agamemnon recalls how difficult it was for him to persuade Ὀδυσσεῖα πολίπορθον to join the expedition to sack Troy (cf. *Il.* 2.169–71, 291–97).

⁴⁵ (Above, note 40) 192, cf. 187.

used proleptically, for the artistic unity of the Homeric poems is no more evident than in the *Doloneia*'s uncanny resemblance to the Sack of Troy as recounted in the *Odyssey*.⁴⁶

Both *Iliad* 10 and the Odyssean accounts feature Odysseus as part of a small, select group that enters hostile territory. Just as Odysseus and Diomedes are among the those who penetrate the Trojan walls (*Od.* 4.280), so the pair sneak into the enemy camp at night and immediately capture Dolon, the Trojan whom Hector sent to spy on the Greeks after his victory in Book 8 (*Il.* 10.272–381). Whether in the wooden horse or on the night raid of *Iliad* 10, Diomedes and Odysseus are called "the best of the Argives" (*Od.* 11.524, *Il.* 10.539: Ἀργείων οἱ ἄριστοι; cf. *Od.* 4.272–73, 8.512–13: πάντες ἄριστοι / Ἀργείων). Both adventures take the form of an ambush. The wooden horse is a "hollow" or "cunningly-devised ambush" (κοῖλον λόχον: *Od.* 4.277, 8.515; πυκινὸν λόχον: 11.525); during *Iliad* 10, Odysseus and Diomedes ambush Dolon, then King Rhesus and his Thracians. Both victories entail the defeat of an isolated but much larger enemy, the massacre of baffled victims, and the lamentation of helpless survivors. Tricked into believing the wooden horse to be a "delight to enchant the gods" (*Od.* 8.509), the Trojans lose their city and their lives; those who live have nothing left but tears (cf. *Od.* 8.521–31). Despite their numbers, the Thracians in the *Doloneia* are newly arrived at Troy, unprotected, and separated from the rest of their allies (*Il.* 10.413–35); when Odysseus and Diomedes discover the Thracians sleeping, Diomedes effortlessly massacres 13 of them, including the king himself. Before the lamentation of Rhesus' surviving cousin wakens the Trojans to the slaughter (*Il.* 10.503–25), the Greek pair have abandoned the Thracian camp.

In both cases, the Greeks' triumphant return with enemy spoils depends in large part upon the aid of Athena (*Od.* 4.289, 8.492–93 and 520, 13.188; *Il.* 10.245, 274–96, 460–64, 482–83, 497, 507–17, 552–53, 570–79) and upon the cunning intelligence of Odysseus. In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus masterminds, directs, and receives credit for the Trojan Horse stratagem. In the *Doloneia*,

⁴⁶ Long excised by the Analysts as being too "Odyssean," *Iliad* 10 can be viewed as a "test case:...the consensus about the *Doloneia* [i.e., that it was added to a complete text] is an acknowledgement of sorts that the assumption of a single author working over a lifetime is the most plausible hypothesis to account for the co-existence in the *Iliad* of narrative discontinuities with an overriding coherence of voice, design, and purpose": M. M. Mueller, *The Iliad* (London 1984) 176. For similar recent views, see M. van der Valk, "Formulaic Character of the Homeric Poetry and the Relation Between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*," *AC* 35 (1966) esp. 27–35: "In composing K it was the poet's chief aim to create an episode which might counterbalance the previous defeats of the [Achaeans]"; and Fenik (above, note 8). Intriguingly, many Analysts also believed *Iliad* 2 to be an interpolation because of its "Odyssean" elements, particularly the paedonymic "father of Telemachus" (*Il.* 2.260, cf. 4.354); see W. Geddes, *The Problem of the Homeric Poems* (London 1878) 46–51, and Leaf (above, note 11) 2:xi and 1:179.

Aspects of my discussion overlap those of K. Klingner, "Über die Dolonie," *Hermes* 75 (1940) 362–63, reprinted in *Studien zur griechischen und römischen Literatur* (Zürich 1964) 32–33; Fenik (above, note 8) 5–6, 12–13, 26; A. Edwards (above, note 1) 38–40 for the ambush theme; and Flaumenhaft (above, note 9) 24–25 for Odysseus' relationship to the horse. For other parallels to the *Odyssey*, see above (final paragraph before section iii).

however, Odysseus must share the credit with two other heroes. Nestor suggests the night reconnaissance in which Odysseus plays such a large role (*Il.* 10.204ff.); while Diomedes earns the material rewards by being the first to volunteer for the dangerous mission (10.211–26), then wins Rhesus' steeds after killing the Trojan spy as well as Rhesus and the Thracians (446–57, 566–69). Yet the success of the mission depends on Odysseus' *mêtis*. The first hero Nestor awakens in *Iliad* 10 is Odysseus (137–49, cf. 108–110); and, when he does so, Nestor addresses Odysseus as Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντον (137: emphasis mine). No sooner has Diomedes volunteered, than he expressly requests that Odysseus accompany him, since one man's *mêtis* is "restricted" (226: λεπτή δέ τε μῆτις; cf. 242–47).⁴⁷ Odysseus not only has Athena's love (245), Diomedes asserts, but "τούτου γ' ἐσπομένοιο καὶ ἐκ πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο / ἄμφω νοστήσασμεν, ἐπεὶ περίοιδε νοῆσαι": "with him along, we both could return even from blazing fire, *since he is highly skilled at contrivances*" (246–47: emphasis mine)—an evocative statement, considering that Odysseus and Diomedes will later escape from the blazing city of Troy. Once out of the Greek camp, it is *Odysseus* who becomes aware of Dolon's presence, who confuses the Trojan into believing that his friends have come to turn him back (339–59), and who cleverly wheedles information from the captured spy (382–445). Just as the Trojan horse is a *dolos* (*Od.* 8.494), so Dolon's name "Trickster" emphasizes that aspect of Odysseus, whose proverbial skill at *doloi* defeats his Trojan counterpart. Odysseus subsequently points out Rhesus to Diomedes (475–81), extricates the king's horses from the midst of the bloodshed, then signals to Diomedes in time for them to escape (448–502). Odysseus with his cunning, in other words, protects and complements Diomedes in his role as killer.

Then there is the relationship between Rhesus' death and Troy's destruction. According to Fenik, the *Doloneia* betrays its awareness and adaptation of a tradition in which Rhesus was prophesied to become invincible *if he survived his first night at Troy* and, along with his horses, drank the waters of Scamander: Troy's capture demanded the death of the Thracian king.⁴⁸ Traditionally, of course, Odysseus is prominent in other exploits that make Troy's sack inevitable: his theft of the Palladium with Diomedes, his recovery of Philoctetes from Lemnos, his capture of the prophet Helenus, his bringing Neoptolemus to Troy from Scyros, even his entry into Troy on the occasion of his recognition by Helen. But, besides his ambush of Rhesus, the *Homeric* Odysseus is said to take part in only the last two of these exploits: (*Od.* 4.242–64, 11.506–9). Neither the theft of the Palladium nor Helenus' capture receive

⁴⁷ The epithet Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντον appears only in *Iliad* 2 and in *Iliad* 10. Cramer (above, note 9) 48–49 observes: "That this expression is a metrical doublet of δαίφρονα ποικιλόμητιν and that it occurs only in the *Iliad* suggests immediately that its use is not conditioned by metrics alone...I conclude that this epithet is used very particularly to point out Odysseus' prowess as a counsellor at B.169, 407, and X.137" (cf. 2.636; four examples total). Nagy (above, note 1) 47 connects the epithet with the rival claims of Achilles' *biê* and Odysseus' *mêtis*. Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντον echoes πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς, the only epithet employed in the Homeric narrative previous to *Iliad* 2 (1.311, 440).

⁴⁸ (Above, note 8); and schol. A at *Il.* 10.435 for the "Pindaric version."

any mention in the Homeric epics; furthermore, we search the *Odyssey* in vain for any suggestion that the other two exploits are necessary to ensure Troy's end.⁴⁹ But while *Iliad* 10 minimizes that aspect of the Rhesus myth linking his fate to that of Troy, traces of the tradition remain. Odysseus emphasizes the need for haste (248–53) and Agamemnon is visibly terrified of what the night may bring (1–127).⁵⁰ In fact, Agamemnon voices a fear that seems incongruous given what we know of Homeric warfare: that Hector may be planning to attack the Greek force *at night* (*Il.* 10.100–101; cf. 14.77–79). Yet, not only does the *Doloneia* take place at night, but night is the traditional setting for the Greeks' escape from the wooden horse and for the bloody battle that culminated in Troy's sacking.⁵¹ On the Trojan side, meanwhile, Hector wonders whether the Greeks, in their despair, may be planning to flee Troy under cover of night (10.310–12=10.397–99; cf. 8.196–97, 510–16, 526–31 and 10.326–27). Yet it is under cover of night that the Greeks will later *pretend* to flee Troy (cf. *Od.* 8.500–502).⁵²

The *Doloneia* is the only *Iliadic* adventure to present Odysseus and Diomedes together as heroes of a clandestine operation involving a horse. Although the Greek and Trojan spies are charged with ascertaining enemy plans (36–41, 204–10, 308–12, 394–99), the night reconnaissance quickly degenerates into a horse raid. First, Hector promises to reward the successful volunteer with the finest chariot and team beside the Greek ships (303–12)—presumably the immortal and surpassingly swift horses of Achilles (esp. *Il.* 23.274–86; cf. 16.149–51, 19.415–17). Certainly that is what Dolon assumes, since he immediately demands Achilles' team in return for his services as spy (313–32). When captured, Dolon complains that Hector lured him on by promising Achilles' stallions (390–99), an excuse which prompts Odysseus' response that

⁴⁹ By contrast, see Proclus' summary of Lesches' *Ilias Parva* in Allen, *Homeri Opera* 5:107.5–6, which describes Odysseus as entering Troy in order to communicate with Helen regarding Troy's destruction. Sophocles' *Phil.* 114ff. and 345ff. emphasizes Neoptolemus' role in the sack of Troy. For the other exploits, see Fr. IX in *Homeri Opera* 5:131 (cf. Fenik [above, note 8] 12–13), Soph. *Phil.* 617ff., and *Homeri Opera* 5:106.23–24, respectively.

⁵⁰ Fenik (above, note 8) 61.

⁵¹ Cf. *Ilias Parva*, fr. XII, in Allen, *Homeri Opera* 5:132–33; see R. G. Austin, *Aeneid: Book II* (Oxford 1964) 118–19 for other citations.

⁵² Explicit in *Ilias Parva* 231, in A. Severyns, *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus* (Paris 1963) 4. See also Haft (above, note 5) 111–13, especially nn. 62 and 64.

Other similarities link the *Doloneia* and the Sack of Troy. Each exploit involves some sort of disguise: the wooden horse in which the men conceal themselves becomes a communal disguise; during the *Doloneia*, each of the spies wears an animal disguise in place of his metallic armor, lest the reflected light of the moon or of enemy campfires betray his presence (*Il.* 10.177, 257–65, 334–35). And once the night reconnaissance begins, it is the Trojan Dolon who shows all the classic signs of fear—paleness (*Il.* 10.376: *χλωρός ὑπαὶ δειούς*), tears (377: *ὁ δὲ δακρύσας*), and trembling limbs (390: *ὑπὸ δ' ἔτρεμε γυῖα*)—precisely the symptoms Odysseus claims at *Odyssey* 11 were experienced by most of the Greeks inside the wooden horse, except the brave Neoptolemus (paleness, *Od.* 11.529: *οὐτ' ἀχρήσαντα χροά κάλλιμον*; tears, 529–30: *οὔτε παρειῶν / δάκρυ' ὁμορξάμενον*; vs. the other Greeks, 527: *δάκρυά τ' ὠμὸργνυντο*; trembling limbs, 527: *τρέμον θ' ὑπὸ γυῖα ἐκάστου*).

Achilles' team is difficult to master (400–404). Odysseus then asks Dolon where Hector and his horses are to be found (406–7). The Trojan spy not only answers this query but suggests that his Greek counterparts might easily capture Rhesus' team (432–45). But, whereas Odysseus and Diomedes succeed in stealing the Thracian team, Dolon's greed for the horses of Achilles kills him. For though the possession of an enemy's horse by capture or by theft forms an important motif in the *Iliad* (especially by Diomedes at 5.25–26, 260–330; cf. 11.680–81 and 696–703, 13.384–401, 17.483–506 and 614–25), the Trojans *never* succeed in bringing Greek-owned horses back to their citadel. Only once in the Homeric epics are the Trojans successful, and their success spells ruin (e.g., *Od.* 8.504). In the ruse that topples Ilion as well as in the *Doloneia*, the exceptional horse proves fatal to the Trojans who aspire to its possession. In terms of composition by theme, then, the horse is a sign constituting a link between the two exploits.

So is Odysseus' role. The Homeric poems never describe Odysseus as owning a horse or driving into battle on a chariot. The *Odyssey* insists that few islands, least of all Odysseus' Ithaca, are suitable for raising these animals (*Od.* 13.242); Telemachus even refuses Menelaus' parting gift of a chariot and team for this reason (*Od.* 4.589–608). Diomedes, by contrast, has already demonstrated his horsemanship during his *aristeia* in *Iliad* 5–6 and by his rescue of Nestor in *Iliad* 8. Yet, while Diomedes concerns himself solely with slaughtering the enemy in the *Doloneia*, Odysseus learns about the horses of Rhesus and sees them in the darkness (*Il.* 10.474–76), then masters the horses and *uses a bow* (513–14, cf. 260) to whip them into the Greek camp (479–502, 526–31, 544–63). In *Iliad* 10, it is *Odysseus* who, in a typically quirky manner, controls the horses.

And what exceptional horses they are. The only white steeds in either epic, they are “whiter than snow” (437) and “bear a frightening resemblance to the sun's rays” (547).⁵³ Though Rhesus' steeds bear little apparent resemblance to the oversized model that destroys Troy, they do share some unique characteristics in the Homeric epics. Both are remarkable in terms of their size: Dolon calls Rhesus' team the “*largest* and most beautiful horses” he has ever seen (436: “καλλίστους ἵππους... ἢ δὲ μεγίστους”); Demodocus refers to the “*large* wooden horse” (*Od.* 8.512: “δουράτεον μέγαν ἵππον,” emphasis mine). Because these horses have not been seen before, they cause confusion among those seeing them for the first time. Nestor fails to identify Rhesus' horses (*Il.* 10.550); and the Trojans debate what they should do with the wooden horse (*Od.* 8.504ff.). Finally Nestor suggests that the steeds may be a god's gift (*Il.* 10.546, 551), while the Trojans decide to offer the wooden horse as a gift to the

⁵³ E. Delebecque, *Le Cheval dans l'Iliade*, Etudes et Commentaires 9 (Paris 1951) 242, speculates that they may recall some form of horse worship associated with solar cults. That the horses may have originally been immortal is indicated by the demi-god status of Rhesus in other sources. See Fenik (above, note 8) 32–35; D. Frame, *The Myth of Return in Early Greek Epic* (New Haven 1978) 145–52, 155–62. Another detail makes the episode with the horses unique: Odysseus and Diomedes appear to be the only Homeric heroes who actually ride on horseback. See Shewan (above, note 35) 180, 274–78; Delebecque 78–86, 116–28; Fenik 55–57.

gods (*Od.* 8.509). Ironically, Nestor implies that Rhesus’ steeds may be a gift from *Athena*, the deity who not only favors both Diomedes and Odysseus (*Il.* 10.551–53), but aids in the construction of the wooden horse (*Od.* 8.492–93). Certainly gods train and give horses to their favorites: thus the Iliadic Apollo helps raise Eumelus’ steeds (*Il.* 2.713–15), Zeus grants Tros immortal horses in exchange for Ganymede (*Il.* 5.265–69), and Poseidon gives Peleus and Achilles their immortal horses (*Il.* 23.271–86). But the *Doloneia* is the only Iliadic episode to insinuate that Athena is the divinity responsible for the gift of an exceptional horse.

The many motifs that the *Doloneia* shares with the Odyssean accounts of Troy’s sacking, then, suggests that Homer expected his audience to sense the relationship between the Iliadic and Odyssean exploits. As theme and diction harmonize, the epithet ὁ πτολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς at *Iliad* 10.363 resonates with the role of the horse in the destruction of Ilion.

By equating the death of Hector with the fall of Troy, the *Iliad* honors its primary hero, Achilles.⁵⁴ Yet, below the surface, Homer foreshadows the role Odysseus will play in the sack of Troy. At *Iliad* 24, as the Trojans prepare to burn Hector’s body in flames presaging those that will one day sweep over Troy, Priam tries to assure the Trojans (778–81: emphasis mine):

ἄξετε νῦν, Τρῶες, ξύλα ἄστυδε, μηδέ τι θυμῷ
 δείσῃτ’ Ἀργείων πυκινὸν λόχον· ἡ γὰρ Ἀχιλλεύς
 πέμπων μ’ ὧδ’ ἐπέτελλε μελαινάων ἀπὸ νηῶν,
 μὴ πρὶν πημανέειν, πρὶν δωδεκάτῃ μόλῃ ἡῶς.

Soon the truce will end, Achilles will be dead, and Priam’s Troy will have fallen to the πυκινὸν λόχον of Odysseus⁵⁵ (*Od.* 11.525; cf. *Od.* 4.277, 8.515: κοῖλον λόχον).⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Cf. W. Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien* (Darmstadt 1966³) 156–57n. 4.

⁵⁵ A. Edwards (above, note 1) 15–41 also lists *Il.* 24.779 as an example of the use of λόχος in the *Iliad*. Valuable as his individual insights are, his conclusion—that ambush is treated from a totally different perspective in the two epics—is marred by his restricting his focus to only the three most negative of the eight examples of λόχος in the *Iliad* (cf. 24).

⁵⁶ Research for this paper was supported by the PSC-CUNY Research Award Program of the City University of New York (Grant 6–65021) and by a Hunter College: CUNY Intramural Faculty Development Award. I owe special thanks to Lois V. Hinckley, Nancy Moore, and Jordan Zinovich, to my family, to my colleagues at Hunter College, Princeton University, and University of Victoria, as well as to Ruth Scodel and the anonymous readers for their helpful comments and generous suggestions.

APPENDIX: ALLUSIONS TO THE SACK OF TROY IN THE *ILIAD*

| ALLUSIONS | | LINE REFERENCES |
|-----------|-----|---|
| Book 1 | x2 | 19, 127–29 |
| Book 3 | x1 | 298–301 |
| Book 4 | x6 | 32–36, 158–68, 235–39, 269–71, 288–91, 415–17 |
| Book 5 | x2 | 487–89, 714–17 |
| Book 6 | x6 | 57–60, 94–101, 275–78, 309–10, 331, 447–65 |
| Book 7 | x4 | 30–32, 70–72, 350–53, 401–2 |
| Book 8 | x4 | 164–66, 240–41, 286–91, 551–52 |
| Book 9 | x9 | 18–25, 28, 45–46, 48–49, 135–56, 277–99, 401–3, 417–20, 684–87 |
| Book 12 | x1 | 11–16 |
| Book 13 | x4 | 379–80, 620–25, 772–73, 814–16 |
| Book 15 | x3 | 69–71, 213–17, 557–58 |
| Book 16 | x4 | 91–100, 698–99, 702–9, 830–32 |
| Book 17 | x3 | 144–55, 406–11, 737–39 |
| Book 18 | x7 | 207–13, 219–21, 265, 278–83, 326–27, 455–56, 510–12 |
| Book 20 | x2 | 30, 316–17 |
| Book 21 | x11 | 128–35, 308–10, 359–60, 374–76, 432–33, 458–60, 515–17, 522–25, 536, 544, 584 |
| Book 22 | x3 | 60–76, 381–84, 410–11 |
| Book 24 | x5 | 25–30, 244–46, 383–85, 499–500, 728–39 |