

DOLON, ODYSSEUS AND DIOMEDES IN THE *DOLONEIA*

As reported in 10,455 f.¹⁾, Dolon's slaying is presented with a marvelous economy of detail. A pathetic figure pleading in vain that his life be spared, Dolon is decapitated expeditiously by Diomedes. Shortly after this is reported, the killing of Dolon is mentioned again (10,478.526.561) and it is stated, in unmistakable terms, that Odysseus, Diomedes' companion in the nocturnal adventure narrated in the *Doloneia*, and Diomedes slew Dolon. This statement comes as a surprise for nothing that is related in 455 f. indicates that we should regard Odysseus and Diomedes as the killers. The claim made in 478.526.561 is inconsistent with the testimony of 455 f.

Homerists who have dealt with Dolon's slaying really have not come to grips with the materials relevant to the killing. Some, accepting what the *Doloneia* states and essentially assuming that the testimony requires no explanation, attribute the slaying now to Diomedes and now to Diomedes and Odysseus²⁾. Others, showing preference for one account over the other, indicate that Diomedes is the killer³⁾ or identify Odysseus and Diomedes as the

1) The text used in the study is the Th. W. Allen, ed., *Homeri Ilias*, vols. II, III (Oxonii e typogr. Clarendoniano, 1931).

2) K. Orszulik, Über das Verhältnis der *Doloneia* zu den übrigen Theilen der *Ilias* und zur *Odyssee*. Programm des K. K. Staats-Gymnasium in Teschen für das Schuljahr 1882/83 (Teschen, 1883) p. 5f. S. Laser, Über das Verhältnis der *Doloneia* zur *Odyssee*, *Hermes* 86 (1958) Heft 4, p. 413. F. Eichhorn, Die *Doloneia* (Garmisch-Partenkirchen, 1973) pp. 14, 16 f., 31. H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* (*Scholia vetera*), vol. III (Berolini, 1974) p. 114, 561c. Ø. Andersen, Die *Diomedesgestalt* in der *Ilias*, *Symbolae Osloenses*, Suppl. 25 (1978) p. 131. M. Van der Valk, *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, vol. III (Lugduni Batavorum, 1979) 813.10, 817.59 et 819.18 f., 820.55.

3) B. Perrin, *Equestrianism in the Doloneia*, *TAPA* 16 (1885) p. 106. K. F. Ameis – C. Hentze, *Homer's Ilias*, vol. I, viertes Heft (Leipzig u. Berlin, 1906, repr. Amsterdam, 1965) p. 33, V. 446–468. A. Shewan, *The Lay of Dolon* (*The Tenth Book of Homer's Iliad*). Some Notes on Its Language Verse and Contents with Remarks by the Way on the Canons and Methods of Homeric Criticism (London, 1911) pp. 155 f., 162. B. Fenik, "Iliad X" and the "Rhesus". *The Myth, Collection Latomus* 73 (1964) pp. 5, 21, n. 1. Erbse, p. 97, 460–1.

slayers⁴); unfortunately, none of the scholars in this group has troubled to give the reason for his choice. As the result, what each claims about the slayer(s) is nothing more than conjecture. Obviously, there is no consensus among scholars regarding the identity of Dolon's slayer(s). Whether any of the views expressed has any validity that remains to be seen.

The testimony bearing on Dolon's slaying has been treated rather summarily. Unquestionably, the evidence is far from being unequivocal and is subject to a surprisingly large number of interpretations. 10,455 f. and 10,478.526.561 could represent two inconsistent accounts concerning the identity of the slayer(s); perhaps two versions of the slaying, one identifying Diomedes as the slayer and another ascribing the deed to Diomedes *and* Odysseus have been brought clumsily together in the 10th book. What is suggested is plausible but it constitutes one of several possible interpretations of the testimony. 10,478.526.561 could be complementary to 455 f. by pointing out again the identity of the killer and by providing the added information that Odysseus must be considered an accessory to the killing. After all, Odysseus participated in the capture of Dolon (cf. 10,345 ff.354.359.363 ff.377.448 ff.) which led to Dolon's slaying. Or the report of 455 f. could be elliptic⁵). 10,478.526.561 may be providing a fuller account regarding the identity of the slayers. If this proved to be correct, the assumption that 455 f.478.526.561 constitute two versions of the killing, would be erroneous. Essentially then the *Doloneia* is providing one version of the slaying and those responsible for Dolon's death are Diomedes and Odysseus. A fourth interpretation of the testimony can be proposed: the claim in 478.526.561 is but a mere figure of speech⁶). If this were true, 478.526.561 must not be used to secure the identity of Dolon's slayer. Credit for the deed must be given to Diomedes. Finally, the possibility must not be overlooked that 478.526.561 represent a *lapsus memoriae*.

4) H. Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum*, vol. I (Leipzig, 1885, repr. Hildesheim, 1963) p. 317, v. Δόλων. E. Wüst, *Odysseus*, RE XVII 2 (1937) col. 1932 f. H. Heusinger, *Stilistische Untersuchungen zur Dolonie*. Inaug. Diss. (Leipzig, 1939) pp. 75, 99.

5) Concerning this practice cf. 8,4.18.20 *et* 8,17; 15,650 *et* 651; 18,395 *et* 405.

6) Cf. 22,393 *et* Eustathii Archiep. Thessal. commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem ad fidem exempli Romani editi, vol. IV (Leipzig, 1830, repr. Hildesheim - New York, 1970) 1275.48 ff. P. Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique*, vol. II (Paris, 1963) p. 33. Erbse, *op. cit.*, vol. V (Berolini, 1977) p. 341, 393-4 b. K. J. Atchity, *Homer's Iliad. The Shield of Memory* (Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1978) p. 216.

Perhaps 10,455 f. 478.526.561 are parts of a single version of the killing of Dolon. Maybe the report of 455 f. is elliptic while 478.526.561 could be providing the names of Dolon's slayers. What is stated sounds plausible but is there objective support for it?

Let us look at the relevant testimony. There can be no doubt whatsoever that Dolon's end came as the result of being decapitated by Diomedes (cf. 10,454 ff.). Then what is the purport of 478.526.561? Do these passages mean that Dolon was *mortally* wounded by Odysseus and that Diomedes decapitated a dying man? 478.526.561 cannot signify anything else if we maintain that the report of 455 f. is elliptic.

The reconstruction of the slaying sketched above takes account of the testimony bearing on the killing. Moreover, it represents the only reconstruction possible which fully meets the constraints of the interpretation that we are testing. However, neither the reconstruction nor the explanation on which it is based find support: a number of heroes, besides Dolon, are known to have been decapitated in the *Iliad*⁷⁾. Two⁸⁾, Ilioneus⁹⁾ and Deucalion¹⁰⁾ had the added misfortune of being wounded before being decapitated. Each, this is crucial, was wounded *by the warrior* who subsequently carried out the decapitation¹¹⁾. In view of this practice, the assumption that Dolon was wounded *mortally* by Odysseus and decapitated by Diomedes is not correct. The hypothesis, therefore, that 455 f. 478.526.561 represent a single version of the slaying and that, within this account, the report of 455 f. is elliptic while 478.526.561 give the names of the killers must be rejected. The materials bearing on decapitation leave us no choice.

Moreover, the practice exemplified by 10,478.526.561 cannot result from a *lapsus memoriae* of that stated in 455 f.; the phenomenon illustrated by these texts recurs and is noted in contexts which preclude the explanation of a *lapsus* for it¹²⁾. What 10,455 f. and 478.526.561 reveal occurs so frequently in the

7) 11,146 f. 261; 13,202 f.; 14,465 f. 497 f.; 16,339 ff.; 18,336; 23,22 et 23,175 f.; 20,481 f.

8) In 11,145 f., it appears that *following* the slaying of Hippolochus, the χεῖρες were severed and the corpse was decapitated.

9) 14,493 f.

10) 20,478 f.

11) 14,493 f. et 497 f.; 20,478 f. et 481 f.

12) Cf. 7,8.11 ff. et 17 f.; 11,320 f. et 323.326; 11,328 et 333 f.; 16,317 ff. 321 ff. et 326; 24,605 f. et 609.

*Iliad*¹³) that the practice must be regarded as a legitimate epic device whatever the explanation(s) for it may be.

Taken at face value, the claim made in 478.526.561 asserts that Dolon was slain by Diomedes *and* Odysseus. It should be pointed out that, despite what 478.526.561 and other similar texts indicate¹⁴), not one passage can be found in the *Iliad* in which we can witness how a slaying by a specific warrior *and* some other mortal associate(s) is perpetrated. This sort of omission, however, does not justify us in discounting, without adequate grounds, 10,478.526.561 and other passages like them. By the way, in texts in which a killing is attributed to two or more slayers, the practice is invariably to report the slaying summarily as a *fait accompli*¹⁵). Not infrequently, this is the case also when a killing is ascribed to a warrior or a deity¹⁶). Consequently, 10,478.526.561 which report a slaying in this fashion should not be ignored because of the particular type of documentation employed. But how valid is the testimony of 478.526.561 and of passages like them?

10,478.526.561 and texts similar to them cannot be taken literally. Serious difficulty results when this fact is ignored, as it becomes dramatically obvious from 22,393.

The testimony of 22,393 is highly significant. However, the employment of this evidence brings added complications to our

13) Cf. 5,576 *et* 578; 5,757f. *et* 5,703ff.711f.; 7,8.11ff. *et* 17f.; 10,481ff.487f.495 *et* 524f.; 11,320ff. *et* 323.326; 11,328 *et* 333f.; 13,170f. 362f. 387ff. 396ff. 438ff. 467.506ff. 545ff. 567ff. 610ff. 650ff. *et* 674ff.; 13,185ff. 411f. (cf. crit. app. 13,423) 518ff. 541ff. 576ff. 671f.; 14,47f. 450ff. 476ff.; 15,248f. 291. 329. 332. 339ff. 440.515: 518. 638 *et* 16,546f.; 21,133ff.; 13,387ff. 567ff. *et* 762f.; 16,317ff. 321ff. *et* 326; 16,827f.; 17,187.204.427f.; 18,82f. 102f. 114f. 334f.; 20,426; 21,95f.; 22,323; 24,756 *et* 16,849f.; 16,827f. *et* 17,2; 18,460f.; 18,454ff.; 19,413f. *et* 16,849f.; 22,326ff.; 24,50.151 = 180.500f. 638. 754 *et* 22,393; 24,605f. *et* 609. Also cf. 13,668 *et* 671; 15,65; 16,649f. *et* 18,10f.; 21,277f. *et* 19,416f.; 22,359f.; 22,270f. 445 *et* 22,216ff. The following also show the practice noted in 10,478.526.561: 1,61; 2,352; 4,415f.; 5,465; 5,703ff. 711f.; 6,70.107; 9,593; 12,226f.; 15,2; 16,560f.; 17,495f.; 18,119; 18,529; 19,61f.; 20,94; 22,62ff.; 24,243f.

14) 5,465.576; 6,70.107; 7,17f.; 9,593; 10,524f.; 11,323.326. 328f.; 13,674ff. 762f.; 15,2; 16,326.546f. 849f.; 17,2; 18,460f. 529; 19,61f.; 21,133ff.; 22,62ff.393. Cf. also 2,352; 4,415f.; 12,226f.; 13,668; 16,560f.; 17,495f.; 18,10f.; 24,243f. Several passages listed in n.13 have been omitted because they are not really relevant: 1,61 expresses the possibility that *war and pestilence* will overcome the Argives in Troy. Three texts identify the slayers as *deities* (16,849; 18,119; 24,609) and six associate a mortal with a *deity* (5,703ff. 711f. Cf. also 19,416f.; 20,94; 22,216ff. 359f.).

15) Cf. *ibid.*

16) Cf. 5,608f. 677ff.842.848; 6,20.29; 7,8; 8,341f.; 18,454ff.; 19,413f.

inquiry for 393 itself is not free from problems. The verse has been athetized on the grounds that the remark expressed in it is unworthy of Achilles¹⁷). The passage cannot be expunged on these grounds: Achilles' boast in 393 ἠράμεθα μέγα κῦδος: ἐπέφνομεν Ἐκτορα δῖον is justifiable. Achilles cannot be faulted for being elated at the death of Hector whom he regards as the cause of woes to the Greeks (cf. 22,271 f.). 22,393 has a legitimate place in the *Iliad*¹⁸).

Another problem related to 22,393 concerns ἐπέφνομεν. None has questioned the form of the verb; it is the first plural aorist of φένω. Is the verb, however, used as a plural in sense or is it employed with a singular reference? A number of Homerists have expressed preference for the latter view¹⁹). It is not unusual for a plural to be used with a single reference in the *Iliad*. Achilles specifically is known to have used the plural in this fashion²⁰). However, this is not the case in 393²¹). The very context of

17) Cf. Eust., 1275.20 ff. L. Friedlaender, *Aristonici Περὶ σημείων Ἰλιάδος reliquiae emendatiores* (Göttingen, 1853, repr. Amsterdam, 1965) p.324, 393.394 (Erbse, V, p.340, 393-4a). Nauck (*non vidi*) also athetized 393. Cf. K.F. Ameis – C. Hentze, *Anhang zu Homers Ilias, Erläuterungen zu Gesang XXII-XXIV, Heft VIII* (Leipzig, 1886) p.15 f. Nauck apparently gives no reason for the *athetesis*. G. P. Shipp, *Studies in the Language of Homer*, sec. ed. (Cambridge, 1972) p.310 admits the validity of the *athetesis*.

18) Cf. also W. Leaf, *The Iliad*, vol. II, sec. ed. (London, 1902) p.458, n.393-94. M. Van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*, part II (Leiden, 1964) p.398. Eust., 1275.20 ff. gives other reasons for rejecting the *athetesis*.

19) J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*, 1. Reihe, (Basel, ²1926, repr. 1950) p.98 f. (F. Slotty, *Die Stellung der griechischen und anderer idg. Sprachen zu dem soziativen und affektischen Gebrauch des Plurals der ersten Person*, IF 45 [1927] p.352).

20) 21,60. E. D. Floyd, *The Singular Uses of Ἡμέτερος and Ἡμεῖς in Homer*, *Glotta* 47 (1970) p.122 f. also identifies 16,244; 19,73; 24,567. In these passages, it is not clear whether Achilles uses the plural with a single reference.

21) Cf. E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von K. Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*, vol. II (München, ²1959) p.243. Chantraine, p.33. Floyd, p.134. Atchity, p.216. The poet is known to make abrupt, unannounced transitions. Can this be the case in 22,393? The context precludes this kind of practice in 393. Floyd, p.135 is correct stating "even if Achilles is... presenting Hector's death as the reason for the Achaians to rejoice, we ought still to take them" (sc. ἠράμεθα, ἐπέφνομεν) "thus" (sc. as plurals in sense) "since lines 391-392 have already linked the army in general with Achilles' own personal accomplishment".

22,391–393 requires that we identify αείδοντες²²), νεώμεθα, ἄγωμεν, ἡράμεθα, and ἐπέφνομεν as plurals in function.

Verse 22,393 can be employed in our inquiry. It is part of that large group of passages to which 10,478.526.561 belong and has the virtue, as it has been stated, of being well suited to demonstrate the impossibility of taking literally 478.526.561 and other texts similar to them.

Before we proceed with the investigation one more thing needs to be established. The κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν (22,391) addressed by Achilles refer to the Greek host assembled in battle before Troy. Achilles, in his address, attributes the slaying of Hector not only to himself but to them as well; he and κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν are the subject of ἐπέφνομεν. This needs to be underscored.

Considering the nature of the subject of ἐπέφνομεν, the statement ἐπέφνομεν Ἔκτορα cannot be taken literally. To do so places an impossible tax on our credulity. At best ἐπέφνομεν Ἔκτορα represents a figure of speech²³); it has no corroborative value in establishing the identity of Hector's slayer(s). To identify the killer(s), we must rely on evidence other than that of 22,393.

Results similar to those obtained through the investigation of 22,393 are secured also through the examination of 16,547 (τοὺς ἐπὶ νηυσὶ ... ἐπέφνομεν ...). Glaucus who is speaking to Poulydamas, Agenor, Aeneas and Hector, is referring to incidents reported in 13,185 ff.–15,638. Specifically, Glaucus is referring to the twenty Greek warriors slain during the battle by the Greek ships²⁴).

22) The text of 22,391–394 in which the cited verbs are found needs comment. To begin with, the reading ἡράμεθα has been questioned: cf. Leaf, p. 458, n. 393–94. Ameis – Hentze, Anhang, p. 33. Shipp, p. 310. Secondly, Naber (cf. Ameis – Hentze, Anhang, p. 16) takes offense at τὸνδε δ' ἄγωμεν. I find the reason stated for it insufficient. Finally, vv. 391–393 have been athetized by Nauck; cf. Ameis – Hentze, Anhang, p. 15 f. As it is noted „Nauck hat sich über die Gründe, welche ihn zu seiner Athetese bestimmt haben, nicht ausgesprochen“. As far as I know, there exist no compelling grounds to reject 22,391–93.

23) Cf. Eust., 1275.48 ff. R. Kühner – B. Gerth, Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. 2. Teil, 1. Band (Hannover u. Leipzig, 1898, repr. Darmstadt, 1966) p. 83.3. Wackernagel, p. 98 f. (Slotty, p. 352). Schwyzer, p. 243. Chantraine, p. 33. Floyd, p. 135. Erbse, V, p. 341, 393–4 b. Atchity, p. 216.

24) Twenty are identified by name: 13,185 ff. 411 f. (cf. crit. app. 13,423) 518 ff. 541 ff. 576 ff. 671 f.; 14,450 ff. 476 ff.; 15,329. 332.339 ff. 440.515.518.638. The number of Greeks killed, however, must have been greater: cf. 15,249 in the light of 13,185 ff.

The claim made in 16,547 is not consistent with the particulars of the slayings presented in 13,185 ff.–15,638; on the basis of the information provided by 13,185 ff.–15,638, we must credit Hector with six of the slayings²⁵). Three killings apiece must be attributed to Aeneas²⁶) and Poulydamas²⁷). Two apiece must be ascribed to Deiphobus²⁸) and Paris²⁹), while one slaying apiece must be credited to Acamas³⁰), Agenor³¹), Helenus³²) and Polites³³). Nothing is stated in 13,185 ff.–15,638 about a killing or killings by Glaucus. Yet his inclusion among the slayers in 16,547 comes as no surprise, being familiar with 10,455 f. *et* 478.526.561.

The context of 16,547 makes it clear that ἐπέφνομεν is used as a plural in sense. Here, we do not have to deal with the sort of problem which we faced in 22,393 associated with ἐπέφνομεν. The interpretation of 16,547, however, is not a simple matter. The

25) 13,185 ff.; 15,329.440.515.638.

26) 13,541 ff.; 15,332.

27) 14,450 ff.; 15,339.518.

28) 13,411 f. (cf. crit. app. 13,423) 518 ff. The materials relevant to Hypsenor are controversial. There are those who deny that Hypsenor was slain: W. Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien* (Darmstadt, 1966) p. 103, n. 1. G. Petersmann, *Die monologischen Reden der homerischen Epen*, Inaug. Diss. Graz (1969) p. 59, n. 1 *et* p. 62. C. Michel, *Erläuterungen zum N der Ilias* (Heidelberg, 1971) p. 89 *et* n. 105. Hypsenor was slain. A wound to the liver, in the *Iliad*, is fatal: cf. 20,463 ff. This conclusion is not precluded by the pertinent testimony of 11,579 = 17,349. The weight of the evidence supports the claim that Hypsenor was slain and justifies the rejection of the reading στενάχοντα in 13,423. Some Homerists state that Hypsenor was killed: Ebeling, *op. cit.*, vol. II (Leipzig, 1885, repr. Hildesheim, 1963) p. 396, v. Ὑψηῶος 2). Leaf, p. 33, n. 420–23. Ameis – Hentze, *Homer's Ilias*, vol. II, 1. Heft (Leipzig u. Berlin, 1905, repr. Amsterdam, 1965) p. 29, n. 421–423. J. Van Leeuwen, *Ilias, pars altera* (Lugduni Batavorum, 1913) p. 474, n. 421–423. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin/Zürich/Dublin, 1920, repr. 1966) p. 48, n. 1. B. Fenik, *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad. Studies in the Narrative Techniques of Homeric Battle Description*, *Hermes Einzelschr.*, Heft 21 (Wiesbaden, 1968) p. 132. Erbse, III, p. 484, 423 a¹, a²/b² *et* n. 423 b¹. Van der Valk, (1979) 940.22 f.

The problem concerning Hypsenor has resulted because of the Zenodotean reading στενάχοντα in 13,423. This reading either has been accepted (e.g., Leeuwen, p. 474, n. 421–423. Allen, ed. III, p. 20, v. 423. Schadewaldt, p. 103, n. 1. Petersmann, p. 59, n. 1. Michel, p. 89) or rejected (e.g., Leaf, p. 33, n. 420–23. Ameis – Hentze, II, II, 1^a, p. 29, n. 421–423. Erbse, III, p. 484, 423 a¹, a² *et* n. 423 b¹. Van der Valk, (1979) 940.24).

29) 13,671 f.; 15,341.

30) 14,476 ff.

31) 15,340.

32) 13,576 ff.

33) 15,339.

subject of ἐπέφρονεμεν could be Glaucus and the four Trojans to whom he is speaking³⁴). A second interpretation of the verse would establish something else. In the light of the practice observed in 10,478.526.561 and in 22,393, Glaucus could be speaking about the nine Trojans who are identified in 13,185–15,638 and he is including himself among their number.

16,547 is subject to two interpretations, both legitimate³⁵). What each interpretation asserts, however, is hardly defensible. It is implausible to think that each of the twenty Greeks slain by the ships was dispatched by ten Trojans. Even the argument that each of the twenty was slain by five Trojans produces a schema which fails to inspire confidence. When everything is taken into account, it becomes clear that 16,547 cannot be taken literally. When an attempt is made to identify those involved in the slayings of the twenty Greek warriors during the battle by the Argive naval camp, the testimony of 16,547 must be discounted.

The results of the examination of 16,547 and 22,393 have a bearing on 10,478.526.561 and those passages related to the texts of the *Doloneia*. The conclusion that must be drawn from 16,547 and 22,393, namely, that the testimony of a passage, in the *Iliad*, attributing the slaying of a hero(-es) to two or more killers must not be taken literally is applicable to 10,478.526.561 and to those other passages similar to them. An inference of this sort is reasonable and warrantable; in fact, there is information within the *Doloneia* itself that fully substantiates the validity of our conclusion³⁶).

34) 17,2 *et* 18,460 f. (ἑταῖρος sc. Patroclus / Τρωσὶ δαμείς) provide support for this interpretation. According to available information, Patroclus was slain by Hector (16,828.850) and/or Apollo (16,849; 18,454 ff.; 19,413 f.), Moira (16,849), Euphorbus (16,850). 17,2; 18,460 f. exclude Apollo and Moira but, by inference, include Hector and Euphorbus. In the light of this practice, we can argue that, in 16,547, Glaucus is referring only to some of the slayers named in 13,185–15,638.

35) A third interpretation to 16,547 claiming that Glaucus is speaking about himself and other Trojans among whom neither the warriors identified in 13,185–15,638 nor Poulydamas, Agenor, Aeneas and Hector are included finds no support. Cf. *ibid.* *et* n. 14.

36) Cf. 10,524 f. (θηεῦντο δὲ μέμερα ἔργα / ὅσος ἄνδρες ὄξεντες ...). The poet is referring to several incidents that took place in the camp of Rhesus. Prominent among them was the killing of Rhesus and twelve of his companions by Diomedes (10,483.487 f. 494 f.). Detailed information about these events is provided by 10,483–500. There can be no doubt that too much has been compressed in 524 f. Under these circumstances, the claim, based on 524 f., that Rhesus and his men were slain by Diomedes *and* Odysseus must be received with scepticism; at

16,547 and 22,393 also are of service in testing the assumption that 10,478.526.561 identify Odysseus as accessory to Dolon's slaying. After all Odysseus was involved in the capture of Dolon, a deed that culminated in Dolon's decapitation by Diomedes.

In 22,393, it is incorrect to assume that the Greek warriors assembled along with Achilles before Troy are to be regarded as accessory to the slaying of Hector. The Greek host was nothing but a passive spectator to the struggle between Achilles and Hector (22,143 ff. 157.172 f. 188.326 ff. 369 f.). In fact, the host was instructed by Achilles to refrain from striking at Hector (22,205 f.). Unquestionably, in 393 the Greek warriors are identified as the slayers of Hector. It would be incorrect to take the statement at face value for, beyond doubt, Hector was killed by Achilles³⁷).

best, what is claimed *may be* correct. Judged, however, by reliable evidence (10,483.487 f. 494 f.) the assumption that the slayings were perpetrated by the *two* Greeks proves to be erroneous; the information provided by 524 f. is unreliable and must be disregarded. Can we generalize the result of our examination of 524 f.? That is, can we conclude that the testimony of any passage in the *Doloneia* (i. e. 478.526.561) in which the practice noticed in 524 f. recurs similarly must be discounted? To the best of my knowledge this can be done; the inference that the evidence of 478.526.561 has no validity is reasonable and warrantable.

There exists no consensus among Homerists concerning the slayer of Rhesus and his men. Some ascribe the deed to Diomedes: G. A. Koch, *Homeri Ilias*, ed. stereotypa, pars I (Lipsiae, 1849) p. IV. B. Giseke in *Lexicon Homericum*, H. Ebeling, ed., vol. II (Leipzig, 1885, repr. Hildesheim 1963) p. 262, v. Ῥήσοϛ. F. Klingner, *Über die Dolonie*, *Hermes* 75 (1940) pp. 356, 361. *Laser*, p. 415. Erbse, III, p. 114, 559–60. Cf. Eichhorn, p. 15. D. M. Gaunt, *The Change of Plan in the Doloneia*, *Greece and Rome* 18 sec. ser., No. 2 (1971) p. 195 f. states that Odysseus slew Rhesus. Fenik (1964) p. 54, n. 2 commenting on 10,463 f. writes "this... prayer does not justify the credit given to Athena in 497 for the slaying of Rhesus". Gaunt, of course, is not correct. The meaning of Fenik's comment is not clear to me. Is he attributing the slaying to Athena? If this is the case, Fenik is wrong. Others regard Diomedes *and* Odysseus as the slayers: H. Düntzer, *Homeri Ilias*, 2. Heft, Buch IX–XVI (Paderborn, 1866) p. 55, n. 469–514. Orszulik, p. 5. Wüst col. 1932 f. Heusinger, p. 74. D. B. Monro, *Homer Iliad*, Books I–XXI, fifth rev. ed. (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1963) p. 353. Fenik (1968) p. 197. H. Froning, *Zum Rhesosmythos*, *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 86, Heft 1 (1971), p. 35. Also cf. Bethe, *Diomedes* 1, *RE* V 1 (1903) col. 817. G. Kurz, *Darstellungsformen menschlicher Bewegung in der Ilias* (Heidelberg, 1966) p. 133. Even those are met who attribute the killings now to Diomedes and now to Odysseus and Diomedes: Shewan, p. 2 *et* pp. 155 f., 159, 226, 274. Fenik (1964) p. 5 *et* pp. 12, 45, 51. Van der Valk, *Eust.*, 817.27 f., 819.4 f. 39, 820.38 *et* 821.64. It is correct to attribute the killings to Diomedes. As we have argued, the testimony which ascribes the slayings to Diomedes *and* Odysseus must be discounted.

37) Cf. 22,326 ff.; 24,50.151 = 180.500 f. 638.754. Also 22,445 f. There is no reason to take 22,270 f. at face value. Cf. 22,273 ff. 319 f.; 24,254 ff. must mean nothing more than that Hector was slain in battle.

And it would be conjectural to interpret 393 to mean that the host was accessory to Hector's slaying.

16,547 as well leads to the conclusion that a passage which identifies a particular hero and an associate as slayers of some warrior cannot be construed to mean that the associate must be regarded as an accessory to the killing committed by the hero. In 547, Hector and Poulydamas, among others, are identified as subjects of ἐπέφνομεν (16,535 f.). In accordance with the interpretation of 10,578.526.561 that we are testing, we would expect 16,547 to mean that of the two Trojans one is the killer of a specific warrior and the other an accessory. This is not entirely borne out by the facts. Certainly while in battle, Poulydamas did slay the Greek Prothoënor (14,449 ff.)³⁸). However, Hector cannot be thought of as an accessory to that slaying. Hector was not present during that incident (cf. 14,429 ff.–15,279). Wounded by Ajax Telamonius, Hector had been removed from the battlefield. He was lying unconscious (14,438 f.–15,240) helpless to play any part at all in the incidents leading to Prothoënor's death. In view of these facts, it is wrong to maintain that 16,547 identifies Hector as an accessory to the slaying of Prothoënor³⁹).

In the light of the analysis of 16,547 and 22,393, it is not correct to claim that 10,478.526.561 identify Odysseus as accessory to the killing of Dolon. On the basis of the role that Odysseus played in the capture of Dolon, we assumed that Odysseus was an accessory to Dolon's death and claimed that 478.526.561 expressed that reality. 16,547 and 22,393⁴⁰) indicate that we were wrong in interpreting the passages of the *Doloneia* in this fashion.

38) Giseke, p. 219, v. Πουλυδάμας et p. 228, v. Προθοήνωρ. V. Gebhard, Prothoënor 1), RE XXIII 1 (1957) col. 976. Fenik (1968) p. 127. Cf. also Ameis-Hentze, II., II, 1⁴, p. 82, n. 472. Ch. R. Beye, Homeric Battle Narrative and Catalogues, HSCPh 68 (1964) p. 361.

39) Regardless of the interpretation of 16,547 we adopt, the passage cannot be construed to mean that those warriors who are identified as the killers of some hero, besides the actual killer of the hero, must be regarded as accessories to the slaying: Hector certainly was not continuously with Deiphobus, Helenus, and Paris (cf. 13,674 ff. 725 ff. 758 ff. 765 ff. 778 ff.). Hector was not present when Hypsenor and Ascalaphus were slain by Deiphobus (13,411 f. 518 ff.) or when Helenus slew Deipyros (13,576 ff.) or Paris Luchenor (13,671 f.). Nor were Deiphobus, Helenus, and Paris involved in the slaying of Amphimachus by Hector (13,185 ff.). Moreover, Hector was absent from the battlefield when Acamas killed Promachus (cf. 14,429 ff.–15,279 et 14,476 ff.). Also notice must be made of the fact that Deiphobus wounded (13,527 ff.) had left the battlefield since 13,535 ff. (also 13,770.781 f.).

40) Also cf. 10,524 f. et 10,481.482 f. 487 f. 494 f.

There is, however, another side to the coin as it were. One additional fact needs to be considered in interpreting 478.526.561. The concept of accessoriness is not alien to the *Iliad*. A hero who plays a part in the incidents immediately preceding the slaying of a particular warrior can be identified as the slayer of the warrior; this simply means that the hero is accessory to the killing⁴¹). In view of this practice, 478.526.561, in part, could be identifying the accessory to Dolon's death.

In summary, our investigation has shown that 10,478.526.561 must be discounted in determining the identity of Dolon's slayer. The identification of this man must be secured by means of some other testimony. The only evidence available is 10,455 f. which reports that Dolon was dispatched by Diomedes. This claim, as far as I know, cannot be expunged.

10,478.526.561 also identify Odysseus as a killer but this testimony cannot be taken at face value. However, it is possible that Odysseus is identified as a slayer in order to indicate that he was an accessory to the slaying. Odysseus did play a part in the capture of Dolon, as we have pointed out. On the basis of that action, Odysseus can be regarded as an accessory to Dolon's death. Our investigation has underscored the existence of this sort of practice. It is this accessory role which explains why Odysseus is identified as a killer of Dolon in 10,478.526.561. This explanation of 478.526.561 is reasonable and well suits the phenomena⁴²).

41) Athena was involved in the events preceding Hector's slaying by Achilles (cf. 22,226 ff.247.276 f.299). She is identified as a slayer (22,216 ff.445 f.) which can only mean that Athena was an accessory. Cf. also 13,434.438 ff.: Poseidon was involved in the incidents preceding the slaying of Alcaethous by Idomeneus (13,434 f.). The testimony introduced above offers an explanation as to why Apollo is identified as a slayer of Patroclus (16,849; 18,454 ff.; 19,413 f.). Patroclus was slain by Hector (16,827 ff.; 17,187.204.427 f.; 18,82 f.102 f.114 f.334 f.; 20,426; 21,95 f.; 22,323; 24,756). Concerning Apollo's role, cf. 16,793.804 f. Apollo was an accessory to the slaying. In the light of this, cf. 16,850 regarding Euphorbus. He, *a mortal*, was an accessory as well to the death of Patroclus. For the part played by Euphorbus cf. 16,806 ff.; 17,14 f.

42) The examination of 16,547 shows that a third interpretation of 10,478.526.561 needs to be considered. According to 16,547, a warrior who slew one or more of the enemy is associated with another warrior who also killed some hero(-es). Both warriors are identified as the slayers of those dispatched. A similar practice is evident in 5,711 f. *et* 703 ff., 7,17 f. *et* 7,8.11 ff.; 11,323 *et* 320 ff.; 13,674 ff. *et* 13,170 f.362 f.387 ff.396 ff.438 ff.467.506 ff.545 ff.567 ff.610 ff.650 f.; 13,762 f. *et* 13,387 ff.567 ff.; 16,326 *et* 16,317 ff.321 ff.; 24,609 *et* 605 f. However, there are no grounds to think that something like that is at work in 10,478.526.561.

Others have attributed Dolon's slaying to Diomedes so what we report about Diomedes is not new. But as it is to be recalled, those who made a similar claim did not present justification for discounting 478.526.561. Hopefully our work has provided the grounds for disregarding the testimony of these texts when an attempt is made to identify Dolon's *killer*. Yet, 478.526.561 do not represent a mere figure of speech as it had been claimed. They restate the fact that Diomedes slew Dolon and identify Odysseus as an accessory. This is done by identifying Odysseus as a slayer. Failure to recognize this leads us to attribute the killing of Dolon now to Diomedes *and* Odysseus and now to Diomedes (on the basis of 10,455 f.).

University of
Wisconsin-Milwaukee

George Stagakis

KRITISCHE NOTIZEN ZU EURIPIDES, MEDEA 709–756

Zu Vs. 710

Diesen Vers hat Usener¹⁾, von niemandem ernstgenommen, als Interpolation eines Theatermannes entdeckt: „amplificatio cum otiosa tum vitiosa expungenda est. duplicem solutionem trimeter Medeae non fert²⁾ neque verba ἰκέσῖα τε γίγνομαι³⁾ habent quo

1) H. Usener, *Variae lectionis specimen primum*, Jahrb. f. klass. Philol. 139, 1889, 371.

2) Eine einzige Parallele für aufgelöste Hebung und Senkung in demselben Trimeter ist mir begegnet: Andr. 333. Nicht nur wegen des Metrums (vgl. P. T. Stevens' Komm., Oxford 1971) hat v. Wilamowitz den Vers für unecht erklärt. Der Schaden ist freilich ausgedehnter. Im H. f. 458 hat v. Wilamowitz ἐτέκομεν hergestellt. E. B. Ceadel, *Resolved Feet in the Trimeters of Euripides and the Chronology of the Plays*, CQ 35, 1941, 66–89, hat die Komplikation mehrfacher Auflösung nicht in Betracht gezogen. Zufällig gefundene Beispiele, Med. 324, Alc. 159, Ba. 8 (vgl. R. Prinz/N. Wecklein, *Euripidis Tragoediae I*, Leipzig ²1899, E. R. Dodds, *Euripides Bacchae*, Oxford ²1966, 64, A.2), Ba. 262, I. A. 466 (drei aufgelöste Arseis in Serie), weisen Auflösungen nur in den Hebungen auf. Der Text der drei letztgenannten Stellen wird aus anderen als metrischen Gründen kritisiert. Vgl. noch J. Rumpel, *Philol.* 24, 1866, 407–421.

3) Die Periphrase ist seltsam. ἰκέσῖος wird (11 Zeugnisse bei Euripides, 4 bei Aischylos, 2 bei Sophokles) nur in Antigone 1230 prädikativ verwendet.