

The University of Southern Mississippi
The Aquila Digital Community

Honors Theses

Honors College

Spring 5-11-2012

Variations in Myth: How Manipulations of Topos Create Morality

Joel Huber
University of Southern Mississippi

Follow this and additional works at: https://aquila.usm.edu/honors_theses



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Huber, Joel, "Variations in Myth: How Manipulations of Topos Create Morality" (2012). *Honors Theses*. 40.
https://aquila.usm.edu/honors_theses/40

This Honors College Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors College at The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu.

The University of Southern Mississippi

**VARIATIONS IN MYTH: HOW MANIPULATIONS OF *TOPOS*
CREATE MORALITY**

by

Joel Thomas Huber

A Thesis

Submitted to the Honors College of
The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Bachelor of Arts
in the Department of Foreign Languages

May 2012

Approved by

Dr. Mark Clark
Department of Foreign Languages

Dr. Leah Fonder-Solano, Chair
Department of Foreign Languages

David R. Davies, Dean
Honors College

VARIATIONS IN MYTH: HOW MANIPULATIONS OF *TOPOS* CREATE
MORALITY

Title Page	i
Signature Page	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Problems in Recent Methods of Analysis	5
Chapter 3 Creating a Method of <i>Topos</i> Analysis	14
3.1 Summaries of the Myths of Croesus	14
3.2 A Note on the Similarities and Differences about Croesus	17
3.3 Dating the Myth of Croesus	18
3.4 Why the Myths Vary	20
3.5 Categorizing the Myths (Parsing Out the <i>Topoi</i>)	21
Chapter 4 Applications of <i>Topos</i> Analysis	24
4.1 Meleager	24
4.2 Antenor	28
4.3 Antilochus	35
Chapter 5 Conclusion	38
Acknowledgments	41
Referenced Literature	42

I. Introduction

The Homeric epics have inspired the Western world for three thousand years. The *Iliad* especially is complex and compelling, while the author himself is enigmatic. Both poem and poet have sparked several libraries worth of scholarship. The poem is traditionally considered to be transmitted orally with numerous extant variations within the text itself. In the 6th century BC, by tradition, the Athenian tyrant Peisistratus redacted the poem into a standard performance so that it could be performed in order from A to Ω. The Alexandrian scholars such as Aristarchus and Zenodotus published numerous works in the 2nd and 3rd centuries BC analyzing the work of Homer, our greatest debt being to Aristarchus for preserving the poem in its entirety. What made Aristarchus' commentary on the *Iliad* so compelling and useful was his strict resolve to explain a problem in Homer using evidence within the Homeric corpus (Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὁμήρου σαφηνίζειν). Beginning with the Stoics and continuing into the Middle Ages, allegorical readings were very popular. For example, "The battle of the rest of the gods is more a matter of physics, 'for against Lord Poseidon stood Phoibos Apollo.' Homer matches fire against water, calling the sun Apollo and the element of water Poseidon," and so on describing the existential battle between those two of the four elements (Heraclitus 56). One of the prevailing problems with such allegorical readings is how badly they change the text or intent of the author. From this example alone, Heraclitus is conflating Apollo and Helios, which would have been contemporary theology in his day. However, Homer keeps the two deities separated with Apollo holding a silver bow instead of golden and lacking many of his later sun-like qualities, and in the *Odyssey*, the

cattle of the sun god belong to Helios, not to Apollo. It is clear, then, why these methods of analysis have fallen into disfavor since the whole crux of such arguments depend on flawed ideas. Over the past few decades, scholars such as W. Thomas MacCary and Thomas von Nortwick have proposed methods of analysis that are equally unreliable. I will first demonstrate how these methods are faulty before proposing a new method of analysis based on the old Alexandrian idea of *Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὁμήρου σαφηνίζειν*, but instead of “analyzing Homer from Homer,” I will be “analyzing Greek literature from Greek literature.” My method of analysis will be constructed from an examination of the “historical” myth of Croesus to produce a framework for analyzing the myths of Meleager, Antenor, and Antilochus in the *Iliad*.

In Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, he defines *topos* as being “that under which many enthymemes fall” (*Rhet.* 1403a18–19). He says that to form effective arguments, one must choose a *topos* that is fitting of the conclusion for which one is advocating. By manipulating *topoi*, an author may build an argument for particular morals and values. This manipulation of *topoi* is accomplished by focusing on different *praxeis* (actions, events) and developing a locus around a different *ethos*. By manipulating the *topoi* within well known myths that the audience would already know, new moralities or moral comments can be made. A modern day example is the film *Inglorious Bastards*, where an assassination plot against Hitler succeeds contrary to historical fact.

Northrop Frye, the late Canadian critic, revived many of Aristotle’s modes of analysis and provided a good summary of Aristotelian analysis:

“We are all familiar with the Aristotelian argument about the relation of poetry to action. Action, or praxis, is the

world of events; and history ... may be called a verbal imitation of action, or events put in the forms of words. The historian imitates action directly; he makes specific statements about what happened, and is judged by the truth of what he says. What really happened is the external model of his pattern of words, and he is judged by the adequacy with which his words reproduce that model. The poet, in dramas and epics at least, also imitates actions in words, like the historian. But the poet makes no specific statements of fact, and hence is not judged by the truth or falsehood of what he says. The poet has no external model for his imitation, and is judged by the integrity or consistency of his verbal structure. The reason is that he imitates the universal, not the particular; he is concerned not with what happened but with what happens.” (54)

Frye’s summary is adequate for the purpose of analyzing the “historical” myths of Croesus and the poetic myths of Meleager, Antenor, and Antilochus. That the poet is concerned “with what happens” is the basis of manipulating *topoi*, *praxis*, and *ethos*.

There is further precedence for this kind of analysis, because, while it is generally known and accepted that poets and tragedians would manipulate and change myths for their own purposes, recent scholarship has also tended this direction. Grethlein builds his book *The Greeks and Their Past* on a comparison of how memory crystallized differently for poets, orators, and historians. Kullmann, in his essay “The Homeric Catalogue of

Ships,” says that Homer probably omitted the Teuthranian expedition because it would have “impaired Homer’s conception of the Trojan War” (Kullmann 2012, 213). In this example of *topos* omission, Homer has changed the structure of the war to fit his version of events. Other familiar examples include the *Kypria* versions of Achilles and Odysseus being much crueler than in the *Iliad* and how Zeus is much kinder in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*. I hope to show similar manipulations of *topoi* in the myth of Croesus and in the lesser iliadic characters Meleager, Antenor, and Antilochus.

II. Problems in Recent Methods of Analysis

Both MacCary and Nortwick are psychoanalysts who try to analyze the poem devoid of the supernatural. Any supernatural occurrence is, for these two authors, a manifestation of some inner psychological phenomenon. Their methodology is further based on the idea of an oral tradition (where each episode connects with the broader story) that is more important than the individual poem. The issue with this approach, that the poem is a mishmash of songs, is how to go about explaining what is going on in the poem. How does one find and raise the issues present if the epic is simply sown together from smaller poems?

For Nortwick in particular, there are problems with making connections between the *Iliad* and *Gilgamesh*. These characters are not even fully human. The question is, into what kind of context is one trying to fit the *Iliad*? Is it so broad that it will encompass the whole Mediterranean tradition, or is it going to be determined by the goal of explaining homosexuality in later Greece, thus making Homer segue into later Greece instead of examining Homer in the literary context the *Iliad* assumes? Even the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* have different contexts and require different means of analysis. The literary context is not always known and there are particular things about the literary context that scholarship cannot know. For the Greeks, there was a justice system and system of laws, but each case was uniquely different and justice had to be defined in the terms of each individual case and differences had to be noted as well as similarities.

I will here argue against the flaws in the books of both authors and show that their methods are flawed.

MacCary

MacCary attempts to apply a Freudian analysis to Achilles, but there are fundamental problems with such a suggestion:

1) The problem with applying a psychological model is that you can make the poem say anything.

2) No scholar would dare suggest that Oedipus himself had an oedipal complex (Lazarsfeld). It was not Oedipus' unconscious desires that brought about the oracle. Rather, it was the *Moirai*, who made Oedipus choose the exit route from Corinth that would inevitably lead him to his father. The gods place anger into Oedipus and Laius to quarrel in order to bring about their fate (In the *Iliad*, Agamemnon and Achilles both posit that emotions come from the gods and are not generated internally. They also assert that no individual can be held accountable for an action which is harmful to himself).

Some of MacCary's most basic assertions are easily refuted. He claims that Patroclus and Hector are "second selves" of Achilles and that he sees himself in them. The problem with the assertion is that anyone in the poem could be a "second self" of Achilles by contrasting their characteristics. Agamemnon could easily be mapped as a "second self" of Achilles by associating their respective angers. Although MacCary desires to limit the "second selves" to those who don Achilles' armor (89), this definition seems a bit narrow considering it is the only *physical* element tying the three together.

MacCary here is ignoring the scholarship of Kakridis. The non-Homeric tradition considers only one set of arms for Achilles while the *Iliad* clearly shows Achilles in possession of two sets: the one made at his father's wedding (17.194-197, 18.82-85) and a second set after Hector wins the arms from Patroclus (18.369-79). The armor is what keeps Achilles from harm, not his being dipped in the Lethe, as evidenced by the deaths of Patroclus and Hector: the armor must be removed before they can be slain (16.844-6, 22.322-7). This is important to note, because MacCary claims that it is ironic that Achilles dies in the one place that his mother could not protect him.

MacCary insists that the *Iliad* is a narcissistic show, played out by a child on a stage set up by his mother. He misses that, while all the other heroes will gain *κλέος*, *kleos*, 'fame,' by *νόστος*, *nostos*, 'homecoming,' Achilles does not have this luxury. His fate is already measured out:

διχθαδίας κῆρας φερέμεν θανάτοιο τέλος δέ.
 εἰ μὲν κ' αὔθι μένων Τρώων πόλιν ἀμφιμάχωμαι,
 ὄλετο μὲν μοι νόστος, ἀτὰρ κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται
 εἰ δέ κεν οἴκαδ' ἵκωμι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,
 ὄλετό μοι κλέος ἐσθλόν, ἐπὶ δηρὸν δέ μοι αἰὼν
 ἔσσεται, οὐδέ κέ μ' ὄκα τέλος θανάτοιο κιχείη. (9.411-416)

He must choose between *kleos* or *nostos*, he cannot have both. It is not narcissism that drives Achilles. Aristotle even agrees that Achilles was acting in honor rather than self-interest. In his *Rhetoric*, he says:

[T]hose who praise or blame do not consider whether a man has done what is expedient or harmful, but frequently

make it a matter for praise that, disregarding his own interest, he performed some deed of honor. For example, they praise Achilles because he went to the aid of his comrade Patroclus, knowing that he was fated to die, although he might have lived. To him such a death was more honorable, although life was more expedient. (1.3.6)

As can be seen clearly, according to the Aristotelian view, Achilles is behaving honorably, because he went to help his friend despite the fated outcome. Achilles weighs the options of long life versus long glory in book 9, but these are forgotten when he receives word of Patroclus' death (book 18). We further see the loss of *kleos* when there is no *nostos* by the example of Ajax in the *Little Iliad*. He and Odysseus compete for the arms of Achilles and when Ajax loses, he goes insane before committing suicide. He is placed in a coffin without honor instead of immolated on a funeral pyre, and he lacks the homecoming, the *nostos*, that is required of a hero to gain glory, *kleos*.

MacCary insists at one point that Hector has devalued women in his speech in book 6, that "Andromache living in bondage will be a monument to the shame of Hektor after his death" (110). This is a clear misunderstanding of the text. The passage MacCary specifically cites is 6.454-65, and this is the translated text he uses:

... "when some bronze-armoured
Achaian leads you off, taking away your day of liberty,
in tears; and in Argos you must work at the loom of another,
and carry water from the spring Messeis or Hypereia,
all unwilling, but strong will be the necessity upon you;

and some day seeing you shedding tears a man will say of
you:

‘This is the wife of Hektor, who was ever the bravest fighter
of all the Trojans, breakers of horses, in the days when they
fought about Ilion.’

So will one speak of you; and for you it will be yet a fresh
grief,

To be widowed of such a man who could fight off the day of
your slavery.

But may I be dead and the piled earth hide me under before I
Hear you crying and know by this that they drag you
captive.”

Hector is not devaluing his wife in this passage. He is seeking *kleos* or *kudos*, “fame” or “glory,” by entering battle, and κλέος is shared with a wife and children. Hector even attests to this in line 460, where men associate her with him. Hector’s desire to be dead rather than alive if Andromache is captured is distorted by MacCary when he claims that Hector “so much ... see[s] her as an extension of himself, ... that we see emerge ... that ethos which ... is so pronounced in the *Iliad*. Women are valued only as proof of men’s prowess in battle” (110). Hector is not avoiding, in lines 464-5, seeing his prize stolen; rather, he is asserting how shameful it would be if he did not fight at all. In fact, MacCary cannot make the case at all that women are just ἐλώρια to be won. In *Iliad* 9.340-343, we see Achilles extol the love of his concubine to be equal to Agamemnon’s and Menelaus’ love for their wives.

ἢ μόνον φιλέουσ' ἀλόχους μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
 Ἀτρεΐδαι; ἐπεὶ ὅς τις ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἐχέφρων
 τὴν αὐτοῦ φιλεῖ καὶ κήδεται, ὡς καὶ ἐγὼ τὴν
 ἐκ θυμοῦ φίλεον δουρικτητὴν περ ἐοῦσαν. (9.340-3)

Are the only men in the world who love their wives the
 sons of Atreus? Any man of common right feeling will love
 and cherish her who is his own, as I this woman, with my
 whole heart, though she was but the prize of my spear.

Achilles is furious that the woman he loves is being stolen away from him despite her being just a concubine and not his wife. This fury is not born out of Agamemnon stealing treasure; it is born out of Achilles' endearment to Briseis.

Nortwick

Nortwick first defines the "second self" as a "vehicle for exploring the pain and the rewards of knowing and learning to live with our imperfect selves" (x), and he asserts that the second self "must die before the hero can grow up" as part of the heroic journey for the hero. On page 39, he asserts that *Iliad* 16.97-100 "captur[es] in brief the qualities in Achilles that will soon cost him his companion: ... above all, a stunning solipsism," and he proceeds to distort the ethics of the poem for another fifty pages. In this first supposition about the *Iliad* Nortwick has misconstrued the whole of the poem by imposing an ethical standard foreign to Homer. Contrary to Nortwick's proposal, Patroclus does not die in battle as a punishment to Achilles; he dies in battle due to his own hubris. He violated the rule set down by Apollo (*Il.* 16) by not knowing his place in life. Nortwick claims Patroclus is Achilles' second self until his death, when Hector

assumes the armor of Achilles and the role of second self. For Nortwick, Hector “represents Achilles to himself, and in particular the part of himself responsible for the death of Patroclus” (64).

Denys Page discusses at length the representation of responsibility and retribution by the epic poet, citing the embassy with Phoenix as the main source for the misunderstanding of heroic ethics and dismissing it as a late addition to the narrative (301). Page’s thesis is summarized thus: “It was only in exceptional circumstances ... that questions of responsibility arose; and the question was answered in uncommonly clear and consistent terms. ... The ultimate responsibility for all actions lies not with man but with the agency which assigned his destiny to him” (301-302). Another scholar tells us that the “Homeric man does not possess the concept of will, ... and therefore cannot possess the concept of free-will” (Dodds). Agamemnon attests to this version of ethics, that the gods place emotions into a man to make him error, in *Il.*19.86 when he says it was not himself, but Zeus, Moira, and Erinys, who put blindness in his heart, which Achilles does not contradict. This concept of a deity placing emotion within a human is still alive today in our cliché “the Devil made me do it.” Page further posits that “the code of honour may – and probably does – require that Achilles accept the apology; if he does not accept it, it must be because the gods have put Madness into his heart, just as they had put it into Agamemnon’s” (302). It will here suffice to say that, were Phoenix omitted, there would never be mention of Achilles’ anger in relation to Patroclus’ death. Nortwick overlooks this well cited textual problem and cannot appreciate that his ethical standard has no place in the heroic world of the *Iliad*.

Nortwick begins developing his “separated Achilles” idea by suggesting that Achilles cannot see himself as part of a larger picture because he “brushes aside three different but compelling arguments for why the holdout ought to be ended,” and he suggests that Patroclus has “the ability to see himself as part of a larger picture and so ... to put off the interests of others before his own honor” (53). He then complains of Achilles that he will allow Patroclus to fight in his place, which Nortwick deems as a petty decision on Achilles’ part, but he will not allow Patroclus to “deprive Achilles of his glory” (57). Nortwick again presupposes that Achilles will act according to an ethical standard imposed on the poem instead of the standard that is intrinsic to the poem. In 16.83-87:

“But obey to the end this word I put upon your attention
so that you can win, for me, great honour and glory
in the sight of all the Danaans, so they will bring back to me
the lovely girl, and give me shining gifts in addition.
When you have driven them from the ships, come back.”

We see here that Achilles intends to require the Greeks to need him, so that the final glory in battle against Troy will be given to Achilles. Part of the will of Zeus is to give Achilles glory by allowing the Trojans to push the Achaeans back to their ships. In 1.602, Achilles’ mother Thetis beseeches Zeus to give glory to her son, which Zeus agrees to do. Achilles is not staying out of the fray because he is petty and childish, as Nortwick would have us believe; Zeus has placed anger into Achilles to keep him out of the battle until such a time as the Greeks can give Achilles the honor Zeus has promised to give to him. One alternative theory for why Achilles stays out of the fight is that Zeus

intends to relieve the human weight on Gaia (*Kypria*) and give glory to Achilles (*Il.* 1.602) at the same time (Wilson 153). In this case, Achilles is still not being childish; it is simply Zeus fulfilling a plan of destruction through the absence of Achilles. This seems more plausible than Nortwick's psychological idea that Patroclus must die in order for Achilles to man up and rejoin the fight.

III. Creating a Method of *Topos* Analysis

Since these two recent models of analysis by and large fail to produce meaningful results, it becomes necessary to create a new model of analysis that is more satisfactory. The manipulation of *topos* in a story seems to be a strong source for determining worldview and, by this manipulation of *topos*, creating different moralities. Further, the way in which an author manipulates *topoi* will necessarily depend on his literary context, precluding modern interpretations distorting the poem and meaning. For these reasons, “analyzing Greek literature from Greek literature” will be a productive model.

The historical myth of Croesus provides ample material for developing this *topos*-manipulation analysis due to the four attestations of the myth, the similarity of elements used, and the clear differences evoked.

Summaries of the Myths of Croesus

The account of Croesus given by Bacchylides tells of the events immediately after his defeat at the hands of Cyrus. Croesus has retreated to Sardis and constructs a funeral pyre to immolate his wife, daughters, and himself. He exhorted Olympus,

“ὑπέρβιε δαῖμον, ποῦ θεῶν ἔστιν χάρις; ποῦ δὲ Λατοΐδας
ἄναξ;” (Bacc. 3.37-39)

“Where are the thanks of the gods? Where is Lord Apollo?”

The attendant then lights the pyre, and Zeus douses the flames with a storm. Apollo intervenes next by whisking Croesus and his family to the far north with the Hyperboreans because of his *εὐσέβεια*, his piety towards the gods (Bacc. 3.61).

Herodotus' version is perhaps better known, and so a brief summary should suffice. Croesus first speaks with Solon about who is the happiest man, to which Solon credits several other individuals, displeasing the Lydian king. His son Atys is then killed after a prophetic dream. When he hears word that the Persians are gathering power, Croesus sends out messengers to gather oracles. The oracle at Delphi indicated that if Croesus attacked Cyrus, he would *μεγάλην ἀρχὴν μιν καταλύσειν*, destroy a great empire. Croesus interprets this as a positive omen and goes to war. Cyrus routs the Lydians and captures Croesus, placing him on a funeral pyre. Herodotus speculates this may have been to offer him as a sacrifice to some god, but at this instance, Croesus recalls the story of Solon with some grief, and Cyrus is moved to free him. When the attendants are unable to put out the fire, Apollo sends a rain storm to douse the funeral pyre, and Croesus is made an advisor in Cyrus' court and that of his son. The wife of Croesus is wholly omitted by Herodotus, so "it may be supposed ... that he thought of her as already dead at this time" (Law 457).

Xenophon records in *Cyropaedia* 7.1 that Cyrus captured Croesus and treated him well, wholly omitting the funeral pyre episode. The conversation between the two is lengthy, with Croesus asking that Cyrus not to pillage but to demand only tribute, and that in a year's time, the city would prosper again. Cyrus accepts this wisdom and continues accepting Croesus' advice by making him an advisor in his court. Xenophon does mention the sons of Croesus, indicating he had some familiarity with Herodotus.

According to Ctesias, Croesus gave his son to Cyrus as a hostage, but because of trickery in the negotiations, Cyrus had the son killed. The wife of Croesus commits suicide by throwing herself from the walls of Sardis because of her son's death. Croesus

flees to the temple of Apollo and is cornered by the Persian army. They place him in chains three times, and three times, his chains loosen by divine intervention. Cyrus witnessed the third loosening of chains, which was accompanied by lightning and thunder, and so he honored Croesus by giving him the city of Barene and receiving future counsel from him. Helen Law tells us that the “accusation of trickery contrasts strikingly with the uncritical admiration which the Greeks and ... the Lydians had for him” (457).

The red-figured amphora G 197 in the Louvre depicts a version of Croesus more in line with Bacchylides than Herodotus. Jones describes the amphora scene in this way:

"Croesus, attired in royal robes, holding a scepter in one hand, and pouring a libation from a *phiale* with the other, is seen seated upon a throne which is placed on an elaborately constructed pyre of logs (the ξύλινες δόμος of Bacchylides). A servant (Greek, not Persian in attire) is apparently kindling the pyre with two torches." (Jones 84)

The description of this scene is entirely similar to Bacchylides' description of Croesus' suicide attempt. Notably missing are the daughters and wife of Croesus, who, according to Bacchylides, were on the pyre with him. While we can only speculate on the preceding and proceeding events, it would not be a significant leap to suggest that Croesus escapes death as he does in all future versions of the myth and that he arrived in this position by *μεγάλην ἀρχὴν μιν καταλύσειν*. It is worth noting that in the amphora version, Croesus, by his pouring out a libation, seems to be offering one final sacrifice of himself, which is what Herodotus supposed Cyrus was doing.

	Bacch.	Herod.	Xeno.	Ctes.
Funeral Pyre	Mounts self	Mounted by Cyrus		
Capture		Captured in Sardis	Captured in Sardis, surrounded	Captured at temple to Apollo, chained
Rescue	Whisked to far north by divine providence	Released from pyre divinely; made advisor	Made advisor	Chains divinely loosened, made advisor
Storm	To save Croesus' life	To save Croesus life		To signify divine blessing

Table 1. The elements of the Croesus myth

A Note on the Similarities and Differences about Croesus

By examining the similarities of these four authors, we can determine what they all believed to be true and what probably was true about Croesus. Each author obviously agrees that Croesus was a king of Lydia and that he lost a battle with Cyrus the Great. No other single detail is carried through all four authors, not even the providential storm of salvation (which Xenophon omits). The four cannot seem to agree on Croesus' wife, children, method of capture or attempted execution, or even his fate after the war. While one could assert that the funeral pyre element is probably true given that our three earliest sources (Bacchylides, Herodotus, and the amphora) all attest its veracity, we must remember that the Greeks probably did not know the truth of what occurred. What we can safely state is that the funeral pyre episode was influential and pervasive in the Greek consciousness.

In lines 33-4, Bacchylides says that Croesus would not await “tearful slavery.” This seems to indicate more than any other line that Bacchylides did not believe that Cyrus actually captures Croesus at any point. Herodotus, Xenophon, and Ctesias all three record that Croesus served as an advisor in Cyrus' court. While being an advisor is

certainly not “tearful slavery,” it is slavery and it is lesser than the monarchy Croesus once had. Any sort of capture would, for Bacchylides, not maintain the *quid pro quo* mentality that the Greeks clung to so strongly.

It is also worth noting that Lucian, in his *True History*, thought little of Herodotus and Ctesias, placing them on an evil island to suffer the greatest misfortune due to their fabricated histories.

Dating the Myth of Croesus

Jones also offers some indication of the age of the amphora by his own examination of the pot scene:

“[T]he ends of the logs in the alternate layers of the pyre were painted in a purple ‘engobe’ over white, a survival of black-figured techniques pointing to a relatively early date. It is therefore anterior by some decades at least to the poem of Bacchylides.” (85)

Since Bacchylides is our earliest text attesting the Croesus myth, we might assume that, in conjunction with the amphora, the original myth did involve Croesus mounting the funeral pyre of his own accord. The servant’s name on the amphora is given as ΕΥΘΥΜΟΣ (Jones 85), which of course means “well souled” or as in *Odyssey* 14.63 “kind.”

Herodotus helps us date the fall of Croesus to a historical time period. We know that Croesus sent many rich gifts to the oracle at Delphi, including “a figure of a lion made of refined gold, weighing ten talents.” (*Hist.* 1.50.3) The lion was damaged in the fire at Delphi, though, giving us a fixed point after which Croesus could not have

mounted the pyre. Pausanias dated the fire at Delphi to 548-7 B.C. during the archonship of Erxicleides (*Hist.* 10.5.13). Herodotus also offers the Pisistratus consolidation of power in relation to Croesus. He asserts that Pisistratus ruled for 36 years in Athens until he was overthrown in 511-0, meaning that he came to power around 546-5 B.C. (Rhodes 224). These data points form a “low date” and allow us to grant Croesus two to four years of war preparation.

A “high date” may be established by Herodotus’ Persian history (Evans 36). Cyrus became king in 558 by overthrowing Astyages, according to Herodotus. Croesus, upon learning of the fall of Astyages, ceased mourning for Atys to stop the increasing power of the Persians (*Hist.* 1.46.1). Since Herodotus believed Croesus to have assaulted the Persian military not long after Cyrus took the throne, we can establish the “high date” of 557-5. However, Herodotus overlooks the fact that Cyrus did not immediately overthrow Astyages

to become king; rather, Cyrus succeeded Cambyses I and in 550 overthrew Astyages. David Henige suggests a tradition that simultaneous rulers would be listed successively in a list of kings (42-6), which would explain what seem to be errors in Herodotus’ history. If we accept Henige’s explanation, we can safely adjust the “high date” being closer to



Illustration 1: Red-figured amphora G 197 in the Louvre

the “low date.” This almost certainly places the Croesus mythology between 550 and 545 B.C.

C.W.J. Eliot notes the base of a statue with the name “Kroisos” engraved dates to around the mid-sixth century B.C., though this Kroisos was an Athenian warrior, not a Sardinian king.

Why the Myths Vary

It is well attested in the Greek plays that authors and poets would change a myth to fit their needs or make their point. Literature arises out of a current context based on worldview and the available literary corpus. By reading the myths proposed by Bacchylides and Herodotus, one sees the clear bias to present Croesus as a pious and just man. Herodotus in particular is trying to show Croesus as learning through suffering, *πάθει μαθος*. Opposed to this are Ctesias and Xenophon, who only wish to build up the Persians and especially Cyrus, using Croesus to make their moralizing comments. For this reason, the latter authors omit or change the reason that Cyrus captures Croesus so that he utilizes clemency effectively, and, in fact, Herodotus tells us that Cyrus was known for his clemency long before Julius Caesar ever was (*Hist.* 1.130.3).

One might understand the vast number of myths attributed to Croesus by, first, understanding that he was a significant ruler and, second, by understanding that popular or significant figures would often have myths spring up and be attributed to them. For example, King Solomon entertained far-travelled foreign rulers (1 Kings 10), and one myth tells of his capturing demons and taking counsel with them (“The Testament of Solomon”). Croesus is not wholly unlike Solomon, since he took counsel with the Seven Sages and with Solon, and he was involved in the spiritual conflict with Apollo.

It might also be noted that Croesus' question, "Is this how you repay one who has served you so well," is a very old thought and present in other cultures, being prominently featured in the Book of Job.

Categorizing the Myths (Parsing Out the *Topoi*)

By examining each case with the evidence at hand, that evidence which comes about from a particular *topos* and how that particular *topos* arose, we can determine how it is manipulated by the poet or storyteller and what themes arise. It will be useful to note the distinguishing characteristics of each author's version of the Croesus myth and to define categories based on these characterizations.

Bacchylides has what might be referred to as the Heroic motif, since in his view, Croesus was pious (61), miraculously rescued by the gods (54-58), can seek audiences with the gods (37-47), and "dies" in his moment of highest glory similar to Hector or Patroclus. I say "dies" because we never hear from Bacchylides on the further fate of Croesus. We can presume that the Greeks did not really know what had happened to Croesus and that his immolation was his death, except that their *quid pro quo* relationship with the gods had to be maintained, and so this worldview was edited into their myth, similar to how the Job redactor added a prose account giving Job double his original possessions (Job 42:12-13). We can presume, then, that the Greek consciousness assumed that Croesus did not die but was rescued, since he had sent such good gifts to Delphi, and since he was not rewarded in battle, he must have been rewarded in another fashion, namely, salvation. Indeed, to preserve the *quid pro quo* relationship, the Greeks *had* to believe that Croesus was saved by Apollo. We find these traits present in other heroes throughout mythology because divine providence works miracles and wonders for

the pious, since “nothing is unbelievable which is brought about by the providence of the gods” (57-8).

Herodotus describes a Fateful motif. Croesus receives three prophecies: one by Solon (“It is necessary to see how the end of every affair turns out”), one regarding his son (death of Atys), and one regarding the Persians (the destruction of a great kingdom, his own). Each of these prophecies is fulfilled in their own time, and Croesus is sorrowful at the fulfillment of each one: the death of Atys in 1.44-45; the destruction of his empire in 1.85.3; and the fulfillment of Solon’s warning in 1.86.3-5 and 1.90.2. There was no escaping these dire warnings given to him. His fate was already measured out and cut. Herodotus had a larger purpose for Croesus: to demonstrate Athenian values. *Agos*, an accursed person, and *pathei mathos*, learning through suffering, are both evidenced popularly by Sophocles in the Theban Cycle. For Herodotus, Croesus has been cursed, because the gods have given him a mute son, an untimely death of Atys, the fall of his kingdom, and his own lack of happiness. After all this suffering because of his *agos* status, Croesus is shown to have gained wisdom and is promoted in Cyrus’ court to an advisory capacity. This event demonstrates the Athenian value of *pathei mathos*, and so Herodotus has successfully manipulated the *topoi* of the Croesus narrative to bring about a different conclusion than Bacchylides did. The Croesus story was extremely important for Herodotus, because it demonstrates how the gods operate, and he later applies this to Xerxes.

Xenophon builds a Romantic motif throughout the *Cyropaedia* by extolling the virtues of Persia and of Cyrus in particular. The myth of Croesus is, for Xenophon, one more example of the clemency of Cyrus and how strong an empire he constructed

through this political tool. The Croesus myth is not, for Xenophon, related in the least to the gods nor philosophies of happiness. The entire story is one more opportunity to announce the power and majesty of Cyrus the Great, and this is how Xenophon uses it. Croesus is more of a periphery figure than the protagonist. The comment that Xenophon is making here is, if Croesus was so pious with all his good gifts to the gods, how much more pious Cyrus must have been!

Ctesias believes in the divinity that Xenophon rejects while also supporting Persia. Unfortunately, his texts are wholly unreliable, making “Herodotus seem [like] a model of accuracy” (Burn). We can therefore refer to Ctesias’ motif as the Propaganda motif. He allows Croesus to escape death like the other three authors, but only after the dramatic scenes at the temple of Apollo and the storm announcing to Cyrus that this man should be allowed to remain free. He emphasizes Cyrus’ reputation as a righteous man instead of Croesus, the latter taking a periphery position in the narrative again. This version has no evidence in antiquity, and so we may presume it was entirely made up both to bolster Persian pride and to discredit the main detractor, Herodotus. Indeed, this latter purpose is how Ctesias’ *Persica* was used in antiquity.

Heroic	Fateful	Romantic	Propaganda
piousness	<i>agos</i>	announces glory	vastly different myth
death in moment of highest glory	<i>pathei mathos</i>	does not diminish said glory	used to create or destroy ethos
divine intervention			

Figure 2. The motifs created in myth

IV. Applications of *Topos* Analysis

Now that a model of analysis has been constructed on “Greek literature from Greek literature,” Homer may be examined using this method. I hope to show that, by using *topoi* manipulation analysis, Homer changes myth and uses myth to make moralizing comments.

Meleager

The myths that revolve around Meleager are two-fold: first, that he participated on the hunt of the Calydonian Boar; and second, the myth of the log that must burn up in the hearth before his death. This second narrative has his mother Althaia overhear the *Moirai* discussing Meleager’s fate and so she preserves the log in question by dousing it in water. When Meleager kills one or more of his uncles, depending on the version of the myth, Althaia burns the log herself, killing Meleager. Tradition holds that Meleager kills his uncles on the boar hunt in a dispute over the spoils, thus connecting the two myths.

Surely this story of Meleager is not new to Achilles, because his father Peleus went on the Calydonian boar hunt too (Ovid, Pausanius, Hyginus)! Nevertheless, Phoenix tells the story of Meleager in an attempt to convince Achilles to rejoin the battle, to an Achilles apparently unfamiliar with the story. Scholarship agrees that there was probably a *Meleagris* that supplied Homer with this story (West 226, Howald 119-21). This *Meleagris* hypothesis is helpful in understanding how Homer manipulates myth. According to West, the *Meleagris* is summarized thus: the dispute over the spoils of the hunt is elevated beyond the men on the hunt but to two prominent cities: Pleuron and

Calydon. No log is mentioned in connection to Althaia; instead, she curses Meleager to die in the same way that her brothers did. Meleager withdraws from battle allowing the battle to come up to the gates of Calydon. In the nick of time, Meleager's wife convinces him to rejoin the battle because of what would happen to her if the city was taken. Meleager goes out to save his wife and city despite the fated death awaiting him (West 226-227).

It is worth noting, the *Meleagris*, in its reconstructed form, aligns itself with the Fateful motif. The two themes within the Fateful motif are *agos* and *pathei mathos*. We see Meleager is cursed by his mother and will die if he does return to the battle (*agos*), and we see Meleager's wife using the predicted suffering (*pathei*) in order to instruct Meleager in how he should be acting (*mathos*).

Homer has Phoenix tell the story a little differently in order to make the myth more applicable. One, Phoenix does not mention why Meleager is sulking away from the battle, only saying that he is angry with his mother Althaia. Two, he has personal friends of Meleager plead with him to return to battle instead of just the old men of the city (the young men should have been fighting in the battle).

Homer has effectively made the original *Meleagris* story into a more propaganda tale by vastly changing the myth wherein he suppressed the more divine elements (omitting the boar hunt, omitting the magical log, omitting the curse), removed familial interests (mostly), and not mentioning the death of Meleager. Naturally, by removing these binding elements from the story of Meleager, plot holes are created that Homer must now fill, which he does so by placing one *topos* of his Achilles onto Meleager, namely, Achilles' anger is mapped to Meleager as the reason for Meleager withdrawing

from battle (instead of the curse of his mother). Instead of a death, Meleager suffers embarrassment because the many gifts promised to him are ultimately denied due to his refusal to return to the battle immediately. Homer uses the Propaganda motif to draw comparison between a known hero of great valor, Meleager, and his own hero, Achilles. The story is intended to build up Achilles.

Let us note the major dissimilarity now between Meleager and Achilles. While Meleager is denied his rewards in the Phoenix tale, Achilles is given many prizes. Agamemnon promised a great deal to Achilles (9.122-56, 264-98). When we have the reconciliation between Agamemnon and Achilles, the king gives Achilles everything originally promised (19.140-1)! What explanation does scholarship offer for Homer saying that Achilles' tardiness in returning to war will be punished and then proceeding to give Achilles everything promised? Scholarship states that Phoenix is a later addition to the poem (Page, West, Fick), though the scholarship is divided over whether he was added by Homer himself or a later editor. What they agree on, though, is that Achilles was promised gifts in the original Embassy (without Phoenix) and, in the original *Iliad* poem, given those prizes when he returned to battle. Unconcerned for whatever textual problems may be created (West), Homer later inserts Phoenix into the Embassy with the Meleager story. Aristotle tells us that the young are "hot-tempered, and quick-tempered, and apt to give way to their anger; bad temper often gets the better of them, for owing to their love of honor they cannot bear being slighted, and are indignant if they imagine themselves unfairly treated. While they love honor, they love victory still more; for youth is eager for superiority over others, and victory is one form of this. They love both more than they love money, which indeed they love very little, not having yet learnt what it

means to be without it” (*Rhetoric* 2.12). The Achilles of book 19 fits this mold very well. He is unconcerned with prizes and gifts and only wishes to rejoin the battle. What is surprising about the whole reconciliation is, Achilles receives his prizes. Homer knows that his character will soon die, “straight after Hector” (18.95-6), so what good are these rewards?

Perhaps if one considers the other detail suppressed by Homer in the Meleager tale, a fuller picture will emerge of how Homer manipulated his available *topos*. It has already been noted that Meleager does not gain the promised treasure when he rejoins the fight while Achilles does; let us recall that Homer has suppressed the death of Meleager while the mortality of Achilles ever hangs in the balance. The death of Achilles is so being looked forward to, it is hard to deny passages setting up for his end: Apollo going to Troy (21.515-20), preparing to guide the arrow of Paris; or Achilles stripping the corpse of Hector then telling the Greeks to help him attack the city (22.376); or when the Trojans are in rout on the battlefield *before* Hector has been slain (21.224-6, 294-7). If we can accept that, in an earlier version or in another song Homer likely sang, Achilles died “straight after Hector,” then we come up with two major differences between Achilles and Phoenix’s Meleager. First, that Achilles receives the bounty Meleager does not; and second, that Achilles dies while Meleager does not. This is the crux of Achilles’ mortal dilemma in book 9: either he gains nothing and lives (Phoenix’s Meleager), or he gains everything and loses his own life. Homer is presenting Achilles with two possibilities: fate (*agos, pathei mathos*) or heroism (piety, divine graces, glorious death), where the former is told by Phoenix and the latter would have been known to Homer’s audience in the form of the *Meleagris*.

Antenor

Homer uses the manipulation of *topoi* not just to create morality, he also uses the *topoi* to discuss morality, as in the ransoming of Helen. The embassy to Troy is summarized in the *Kypria* and later recalled in the third book of the *Iliad*. In the *Kypria*, the embassy fails and they attack the city, but in the *Iliad*, the Trojans were planning to kill the embassy before Antenor stops them. This is the clearest example we have of Homer building on an older tradition. We know that Antenor was present at the embassy because of *Iliad* 3, and this is an example of Homer being forced to conform to preexisting stories. Kullmann tells us:

Daß Antenor selbst eine vorhomerische Sagengestalt ist, ist ohne weiteres deutlich. Er wird in der Ilias bei seinem ersten Auftreten Γ 148. 203 ff. nicht exponiert. Die Ilias spielt auf seine Rolle in AH an. Seine Rolle in der Kleinen Ilias und in Nostensagen *kann* nicht aus der Ilias abgeleitet sein. Auch seine Rolle im Zusammenhang der Ἑλένης ἀπαίτησις ist höchstwahrscheinlich nicht aus der Ilias herausentwickelt. (Kullmann 1960, 177)

That Antenor is a pre-homeric figure is obvious. His first appearance in the *Iliad* is 3.148. 203ff is not exposed. His role in the Little *Iliad* and the *Nostoi* *can* not have been derived from the *Iliad*. His role in the context of the *demanding back of Helen* is most likely not an invention of the *Iliad*.

We know that Homer is building from a larger corpus because of epithets like “king of Tenedos” for Apollo (*Il.* 1.38). This epithet pays homage to the *Kypria*, where Philoctetes is bitten by a venomous snake on the island of Tenedos. It is not unreasonable, then, to agree with Kullmann that the ransoming of Helen is pre-Homeric and probably the role of Antenor also. Homer is using Antenor to make moralizing comments about Helen and the Trojans, and it is through his manipulation of *topoi* that he creates these moralizing comments.

The passages that relate the ransoming of Helen are related in part in the *Kypria*:

The Greeks take up their dead and send envoys to the Trojans demanding the surrender of Helen and the treasure with her. The Trojans refusing, they first assault the city, and then go out and lay waste the country and cities round about.

From the *Iliad*, we have the description given by Antenor himself in Book 3:

“Lady, this verily is a true word that thou hast spoken, for erstwhile on a time goodly Odysseus came hither also on an embassy concerning thee, together with Menelaus, dear to Ares; and it was I that gave them entertainment and welcomed them in my halls, and came to know the form and stature of them both and their cunning devices. Now when they mingled with the Trojans, as they were gathered together, when they stood Menelaus overtopped him with

his broad shoulders; howbeit when the twain were seated Odysseus was the more royal. But when they began to weave the web of speech and of counsel in the presence of all, Menelaus in truth spake fluently, with few words, but very clearly, seeing he was not a man of lengthy speech nor of rambling, though verily in years he was the younger. But whenever Odysseus of many wiles arose, he would stand and look down with eyes fixed upon the ground, and his staff he would move neither backwards nor forwards, but would hold it stiff, in semblance like a man of no understanding; thou wouldest have deemed him a churlish man and naught but a fool. But whenso he uttered his great voice from his chest, and words like snowflakes on a winter's day, then could no mortal man beside vie with Odysseus; then did we not so marvel to behold Odysseus' aspect." (3.204-24)

We receive a fuller image of the embassy that falls more in line with the *Kypria* passage in book 11 of the *Iliad*:

...wise-hearted Antimachus, who above all others in hope to receive gold from Alexander, goodly gifts, would not suffer that Helen be given back to fair-haired Menelaus. (11.123-125)

“If ye are verily the sons of wise-hearted Antimachus, who on a time in the gathering of the Trojans, when Menelaus had come on an embassy with godlike Odysseus, bade slay him then and there, neither suffer him to return to the Achaeans, now of a surety shall ye pay the price of your father's foul outrage.” (11.138-143)

After the first day of battle (after the embassy has been rejected), the Trojans are less sure of their ability to hold out against the Greeks.

wise Antenor was first to speak, saying: “Hearken to me, ye Trojans and Dardanians and allies, that I may speak what the heart in my breast biddeth me. Come ye now, let us give Argive Helen and the treasure with her unto the sons of Atreus to take away. Now do we fight after proving false to our oaths of faith, wherefore have I no hope that aught will issue to our profit, if we do not thus.” (11.348-53)

It is unclear if this passage indicates whether Antenor always advocated for the return of Helen or if he has had a change of mind. Paris is not willing to give up Helen, even calling Antenor dimwitted, but he is willing to pay back the stolen property and then some.

goodly Paris, lord of fair-haired Helen; he made answer, and spake to him winged words: “Antenor, this that thou sayest is no longer to my pleasure; yea thou knowest how to devise better words than these. But if thou verily

speakest this in earnest, [360] then of a surety have the gods themselves destroyed thy wits. Howbeit I will speak amid the gathering of horse-taming Trojans and declare outright: my wife will I not give back; but the treasure that I brought from Argos to our home, all this am I minded to give, and to add thereto from mine own store.” (11.355-64)

One further detail is offered in the form of a Corinthian amphora depicting the Greeks having just arrived in Troy on their diplomatic mission. They are greeted by Antenor’s wife Theano and by Priam.

We have a rough sketch, then, of how the ransoming of Helen went from these passages. Meneleus and Odysseus were sent to request the return of Helen and the treasure, greeted by Priam and Antenor’s wife; Antimachus recommends they be murdered immediately, but Antenor entertains the guests and prevents their murder. Despite the good orations of the Greeks, the Trojans refuse to negotiate with them. A battle ensues which leads to the Greeks destroying nearby crops and raiding neighboring towns as the beginnings of a siege. The Trojans then counsel again, Antenor recommending the return of Helen and Paris advocating for a return of merely the treasures. The Greeks are miffed at this lesser offer and reject it equally.

The Greek virtue of *philoxenia*, literally “friend of the stranger” or hospitality, is ultimately the cause of the war and the reason Antenor survives. Paris, and Helen through her collaboration, break *philoxenia* while Paris is a guest in Meneleus’ house (3.388). The Trojans are also implicated by receiving Paris and Helen into Troy after their misdeed. By the unwritten code, the Greeks are bound to pursue and right this insult

to Zeus' authority, since he was god of travelers. Antenor, by accepting the guests and treating them well, is performing *philoxenia*, obligating Meneleus and Odysseus to spare him later in the sack of Troy.

Antenor is contrasted with Helen, who is characterized as guilty of leaving her husband (*Il.* 3). His pious wisdom is contrasted with her impious behavior, which ultimately leads to Aphrodite throwing her in bed with Paris (3.382-3).

In particular, Helen is inconsiderate of her familial obligations, leaving her husband and daughter without much consideration for others (impiety to Zeus). In 3.399-412, Helen is disrespectful to Aphrodite herself (impiety to Aphrodite). Antenor, on the other hand, is hospitable to the Greek embassy (3.207) and apparently counsels the Trojans against lynching the enemy (11.123-141) since the embassy survives. Diplomatic missions are sacred to Zeus through *philoxenia*. The particular point of comparison between the two is highlighted most obviously in 7.347, when Antenor characterizes the Trojans as oath-breakers, and that they will surely lose the war because of this. Just as the Trojans are oath-breakers, so too has Helen broken her oaths to her husband Meneleus.

The Roman poet Horace makes similar comments about Troy and the adultery, and, in particular, about the impiety of Paris and of Helen (3.3.18-68). He claims that adultery once destroyed a city, it could do so again, since Rome is descended from Aeneas. This would indicate that even in antiquity, Homer's moralizing comments about the Trojans were understood from his epic.

By contrast, Antenor's family survives the war akin to Rahab in Jericho: he hangs a leopard skin from his house to mark it as his own, and it and his family are spared from

the sack of Troy. Like Rahab, Antenor has demonstrated the virtue of *philoxenia*, and in this way, he has honored Zeus (piety). This falls in line with the Heroic motif already outlined. His descendants go on to found a city (Pindar) or at least populate another great city (Strabo). Because of his piousness, for Antenor the gods worked miracles. Thus, while Antenor is heroic, the Trojans are anti-heroic.

Antilochus

Antilochus is the son of Nestor. After Patroclus, who is dear to Achilles, is killed in battle, Antilochus, who is dear to Achilles (23.556), fills his role. Indeed, where it is the death of Patroclus that drives Achilles back to battle in the *Iliad*, in the *Aethiopsis* it is the death of Antilochus that drives Achilles to fight to the gates of Troy. So equal in valor to Achilles are both men that the ashes of all three are placed under the same mound (Strabo *Geography*, Homer *Odyssey* 24). In *Odyssey* 24, the spirits of Achilles, Patroclus, and Antilochus are all held as the best Danaans after Agamemnon. In *Iliad* 18.2, Antilochus bears the news of Patroclus' death to Achilles. The parallel event in the *Aethiopsis* is unfortunately lost. We cannot know if a human or god brought the news of Antilochus to Achilles.

The poet's choice of whom to elevate in the *Aithiopsis* to the position that Patroclus filled in the *Iliad* is not obvious. The choice of Nestor or Achilles' own father Peleus would have been sufficiently fitting, since 1) Patroclus himself was older than Achilles, like Nestor and Peleus, 2) both Nestor and Peleus were battle-hardened like Patroclus, and 3) they were probably dearer to Achilles than some young upstart. The usual reason for dismissing any elder is his age, but in Pindar's summary, Antilochus dies defending his father Nestor in battle. While age may keep an elder out of battle usually, this did not seem to be the case with Nestor. Whatever the case may be, Antilochus was chosen by the poet and it is he who must be analyzed.

Before the death of Patroclus, Antilochus is the first to slay a Trojan (4.457), leaps upon enemies (5.584, 13.550, 13.554, 15.579, 15.582), is an excellent spearman

(5.580, 13.396, 16.318), takes spoils from his slain (13.554, 14.513, 15.585), and is otherwise shown engrossed in combat (5.565, 5.570, 5.589, 6.32, 13.400, 13.545, 13.554). He is not shown to be dear to Achilles until after he brings the news of Patroclus to him.

If one is looking for an *alter ego* of Achilles, Antilochus would be a fitting choice. Both he and Achilles are called “swift of foot” (Achilles *Il.* 18.181, Antilochus *Il.* 18.2) both exceed their peers (Achilles *Il.* 1.287, Antilochus *Il.* 23.756); both are considered to be favored of Zeus (Achilles *Od.* 24, Antilochus *Il.* 17.685). It is held by scholars that the death of Antilochus in the *Aethiopsis* is a lesser event than the death of Patroclus in the *Iliad* (Löwy, Bethe, Reinhardt, West), but nonetheless, it is his death that propels Achilles towards his own end. If we presuppose that the original *Iliad* did conclude with Achilles’ death (Kullmann, West, Wilamowitz), then we might also presuppose that Antilochus was always just another Greek who happened to be tasked with bearing news to Achilles. There is no scholar who doubts the authenticity of Antilochus bearing the news to Achilles. If we accept that the funeral games for Patroclus are too grandiose (Willcock, Heubeck) and were originally the funeral games for Achilles (West 399), we might allow a comparison of Antilochus in the *Iliad* and in the *Aithiopsis*.

It seems evident that, Antilochus is two different characters. The illiadic Antilochus is the battle-ready warrior we see in books 4 to 17 and the skillful athlete we see in book 23. The aithiopic Antilochus is more wizened and heroic. Every virtue of Antilochus Secundus is elevated to be on par with Achilles while Antilochus Primus is just a valiant hero. Just as it is important for Achilles to face off against opponents of

equal valor (West 2003), it is important for Achilles to have comrades that match him. Patroclus was quite the seasoned warrior on the battlefield, and up to book 18, Homer has developed Antilochus' own prowess in battle.

It seems clear to me that Antilochus Primus is part of the Romantic motif, being built up by our poet as a great warrior without any fault being found. Indeed, these are the two elements of the Romantic motif as I outlined and summarized in Table 2.

Antilochus Secundus is almost certainly played out in the Heroic motif. He is pious and receives divine aid ("favored of Zeus," *Il.* 17.685) and he dies in his moment of highest glory (*Aith.*). It can also be assumed that he was privy to divine intervention when he was in the heat of combat in the *Aithiopsis* because Patroclus receives divine aid in the *Iliad*. This satisfies the elements for a heroic motif outlined earlier.

The purpose for altering the character of Antilochus between the *Iliad* and the *Aithiopsis* is almost certainly intrinsic to the role the character plays. While in the *Iliad* he is supposed to be the *philos hetairos* of Achilles (23.556) and a valiant hero-son of Nestor, his role in the *Aithiopsis* is the same as that of Patroclus in the *Iliad*: to die and thus provoke Achilles to battle. One of the chief goals of the *Aithiopsis* poet is to give Memnon some glory to make him a worthy opponent of Achilles (West). It can be presumed that he similarly gives Antilochus greater glory to make him more heroic which would provide more reason for Achilles to be enraged all over again at his death.

V. Conclusion

Because some recent methods of analysis to Greek poetry, and especially to that of Homer, have been untenable, new models of analysis must be constructed. The goal of any such model must be applicability and meaningful results. As has been shown with the historical myth of Croesus, poets and authors change elements of stories, *topoi*, in order to create a different moral or worldview. Analyzing Greek literature by the manipulation of the *topoi* is a keen way to derive conclusions about what an author intends to say and when and why he was writing. This was shown through the four authors on Croesus as well as with the supporting evidences of archeology.

I have argued here that Homer manipulates *topoi* to his own devices as well. Because of the *topos* manipulation model previously constructed, the changes Homer made could be analyzed. With the Meleager myth, Homer omitted details and suppressed other to change a myth about fate into a persuasive tale to convince Achilles to rejoin the battle. While Meleager's original tale, as in the reconstructed *Meleagris*, had him fighting against his cursed fate and learning through suffering, the revised Homeric version, in the mouth of Phoenix, is much more about creating a particular morality, specifically, a morality in which Achilles will be held morally accountable for his inaction and will be punished for his wrath. Moreover, he demonstrates what half of Achilles' fate could be through the Meleager narrative while showing us through the rest of the poem (along with the *Aithiopsis*) the other half, the half Achilles chooses, by manipulation of two particular *topoi*.

With Antenor, I have argued that Homer did not moralize Antenor but instead used Antenor to make moralizing comments about Helen and the Trojans similarly to

how Xenophon used Croesus to make comments about Cyrus. The heroic Antenor's piety was especially contrasted with the impiety of the Trojans through specific acts. For Antenor, protecting the embassy in *philoxenia* demonstrated his reverence for the gods while Helen and Paris dishonored the gods by breaking *philoxenia* and marital vows. After the embassy, the Trojans also made an oath that whoever won the single combat between Paris and Menelaus, he would win Helen and all the treasure. When Paris loses, the Trojans do not give up their prize, further characterizing them as oath-breakers and as a barbaric people.

In the character of Antilochus, we see changes between the *Iliad* and the *Aithiopsis*, rather drastic changes at that. It seems as though the battle-ready warrior of the *Iliad* matures into the seasoned hero's dear friend by the *Aithiopsis* in order to fill the large void that was Patroclus in what was the original, for lack of a better term, *Achillesleid*, in which Achilles perished "straight after Hector." By building Antilochus up continually in the *Iliad*, Homer both announced Antilochus' own glory and that of his father Nestor, but it is in the *Aithiopsis* that Antilochus inherits a befitting heroic death.

By analyzing how an author changes myth, one can discern purpose and intent more easily and with more tenable results than with recent psychoanalytic models. This model based on the manipulation of *topos* could be expanded with future research to refine its shortcomings and create a more universally applicable model. There are certainly further deviating myths and alternate readings of Homer worth analyzing. This model can also be usefully applied to discern why particular myths became more popular, such as why Achilles' immortality crystallized as the dipping in the River Styx rather than the burning away of his mortal parts in a fire. By comparing the similar and

dissimilar elements within such stories, scholarship may produce new views on the variations that exist and why certain variations were more popular.

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend a special thanks to the following individuals who helped make this thesis possible:

Dr. Mark Clark

Dr. Prof. Wolfgang Kullmann

Dr. Prof. Øivind Andersen

Jefferson Rogers

Laura Sumrall

Mark and Leslie Henderson

Hugh Donohoe

The University of Southern Mississippi Honors College

Works Cited

- Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. Trans. J.H. Freese. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926. N. pag. Print.
- Bethe, Erich. *Homer Dichtung und Sage. Erster Teil: Ilias*. Leipzig and Berlin: n.p., 1914. Print.
- Burn, A.R. *Persia and the Greeks*. Duckworth. London: n.p., 1984. Print.
- Dodds, E.R. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. N.p.: University of California Press, 1951. 7, 20 n. 31. Print.
- Eliot, C.W.J. "Where did the Alkmaionidai Live?" *Historia* 16 (1967): 279-286. Print.
- Evans, J.A.S. "What Happened to Croesus?" *The Classical Journal* 74.1 (1978): 34-40. Print.
- Fick, August. *Die homerische Ilias nach ihrer Entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt*. Göttingen. 1886. Print.
- Frye, Northrop. "New Directions from Old." *Fables of Identity: Studies in Poetic Mythology*. N.p.: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1963. 52-68. Print.
- Grethlein, Jonas. *The Greeks and Their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Print.
- Henige, David. *The Chronology of the Oral Tradition*. Oxford: n.p., 1974. Print.
- Heraclitus. *Homeric Problems*. Trans. Stephen M. Trzaskoma, R. Scott Smith, Stephen Brunet. Hackett Publishing Co. 2011. N. pag. Print.
- Herodotus. *The Histories*. Trans. A.D. Godley. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920. N. pag. Print.
- Heubeck, Alfred. "Studien zur Struktur der Ilias (Retardation, Motivübertragung)." *Gymnasium Fridericianum*: 17-36. Rpt. in *Homer. Die Dichtung und ihre Deutung*. By J. Latacz. Darmstadt: n.p., 1991. 450-74. Print.
- Homer. *The Iliad*. Trans. A.T. Murray, Ph.D. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1924.

N. pag. Print.

Howald, Ernst. *Der Dichter der Ilias*. Erlenbach-Zürich: n.p., 1946. Print.

Jones, H. Stuart. "Bacchylides and the Fate of Croesus." *The Classical Review* 12.1 (1898): 84-85. Print.

Kakridis, Phanis J. "Achilleus' Rüstung." *Hermes* 89.3 (1961): 288-297. Print.

Kullmann, Wolfgang. *Die Quellen Der Ilias*. N.p.: n.p., 1960. Print.

---. "The Homeric Catalogue of Ships." *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*. N.p.: Cambridge University Press, 2012. 210-223. Print.

Law, Helen. "Croesus: From Herodotus to Boccaccio." *The Classical Journal* 43.8 (1948): 456-462. Print.

Lazarsfeld, Sofie. "Did Oedipus Have an Oedipus Complex?" *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 14.2 (1944): 226-9. Print.

Löwy, E. "Zur Aithiopsis." *Neue Jahrbücher* 33 (1914): 81-94. Print.

MacCary, W. Thomas. *Childlike Achilles: Ontogeny and Phylogeny in the Iliad*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982. Print.

Nortwick, Thomas Van. *Somewhere I Have Never Travelled*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. Print.

Page, Denys. "Multiple Authorship in the Iliad." *History and the Homeric Iliad*. N.p.: University of California Press, 1959. 297-324. Print.

Reinhardt, Karl. *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter*. Göttingen: n.p., 1961. Print.

Rhodes, P.J. "Pisistratid Chronology Again." *Phoenix* 30 (1976): 219-233. Print.

West, Martin. "Iliad and Aethiopsis." *Classical Quarterly* 53 (2003): 1-14. Print.

---. *The Making of the Iliad: Disquisition and Analytical Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford

University Press, 2011. Print.

Wilamowitz, Ulrich Von. *Die Ilias und Homer*. Berlin: n.p., 1916. Print.

Willcock, M.M. "The Funeral Games for Patroclus." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 20 (1973): 1-11. Print.

Wilson, Joe. "Homer and the Will of Zeus." *College Literature* 34.2 (Spring, 2007): 150-173. Print.