Iphigenia in the *Iliad* and the Architecture of Homeric Allusion*

Thomas J. Nelson

Summary: In this paper, I argue that the traditional narrative of Iphigenia's sacrifice lies allusively behind the opening scenes of the *Iliad* (1.8–487). Scholars have long suspected that this episode is evoked in Agamemnon's scathing rebuke of Calchas (1.105–8), but I contend that this is only one moment in a far more sustained allusive dialogue: both the debate over Chryseis and her eventual return to her father replay and rework the sacrifice story. The *Iliad* begins by recalling the start of the whole Trojan war.

Keywords: Allusion, Homer, *Iliad*, Iphigenia, Opening, Structure, Tradition

It has long been recognized that Homeric epic manipulates mythic time in complex and sophisticated ways, allusively re-enacting events beyond the strict confines of its narrative.[1] The start and end of the *Iliad*, in particular, abound with allusions to earlier and later moments of the Trojan war story. The first half of the poem closely replays the opening stages of the war: the catalogue of ships, the *teichoscopia*, the duel of Paris and Menelaus, the encounter of Paris and Helen, the marshalling of troops and Pandarus's truce-breaking—these all re-perform acts that logically 'fit' the first, rather than tenth, year of the conflict.[2] In the second half of the poem, meanwhile, the poet foreshadows what is to come: Patroclus's death presages Achilles' own, Hector's death serves as a metonym for the fall of Troy, and the funeral games of Book 23 prefigure many later episodes of the tradition.[3] Within its own narrow chronology, Homer's epic embodies the whole Trojan war story.

Iliad 1, however, is rarely—if ever—considered as part of this allusive scheme.[4] Most scholars focus on how this book looks forwards, not backwards, setting the stage for the events that follow: it introduces Achilles' anger and Zeus's promise to Thetis, two elements which together propel the internal Iliadic narrative. There seems to be an implicit scholarly assumption that it is only once the poem has been set on its own trajectory that echoes of earlier moments in the story begin.[5] In this paper, however, I will argue that such allusive analepsis is active from the *Iliad*'s very start. Already in Book 1 we can identify the allusive reworking of a specific episode from the larger Trojan war story: the sacrifice of Iphigenia. Scholars have long suspected that this event lies behind Agamemnon's scathing rebuke of Calchas (1.105–8), but this is usually considered an isolated and passing reference, without any larger significance for the book or poem as a whole.[6] Here, by contrast, I intend to demonstrate a far more extensive and sustained allusion to the episode than has previously been recognized. In particular, I will argue that both the debate over Chryseis and her eventual return to her father replay the tale of Iphigenia's sacrifice through a range of thematic and structural allusions.[7] This argument—if accepted—is of considerable significance for how we view the *Iliad*'s relationship to the wider epic tradition, as well as the allusive architecture of the poem as a whole.

Homeric allusion is, of course, a theoretical quagmire. Various methodological approaches compete in modern scholarship, especially surrounding the question of how meaning can be drawn from repetitions in an oral-derived, formulaic tradition. While neoanalysts have traditionally reconstructed specific lost poems as sources for the *Iliad*, oralists instead privilege the embedded resonance of specific words or phrases based on their various uses elsewhere in archaic poetry ("traditional referentiality").[8] Attempts have been made to combine these approaches,[9] and in recent decades scholarly attention has shifted away from old questions of

"textuality" to focus on the precise mechanics of reference.[10] But even so, considerable disagreements remain.

My aim in this paper is to pursue a middle road between neoanalysis and traditional referentiality, exploring how the *Iliad* alludes to what I propose was an established oral tradition of Iphigenia's sacrifice at Aulis. From an early date, the sacrifice story contained a number of core and stable elements that would have been integral to any telling. It is this mythical *fabula*—a distinctive and recognizable sequence of narrative events—to which a poet like Homer could allude.[11] I intend to demonstrate how the *Iliad* interacts with this *fabula* by means of "motif transference," adapting, reworking and distorting the original Iphigenia sequence.[12] I will use the language of "allusion" to refer to this process. By this, I do not mean to suggest that the *Iliad* is interacting with a "fixed" poem, a "written text," or even a specific "oral text";[13] my focus remains on the reworking of a sequence of mythological motifs. But I use "allusion" to acknowledge a sense of design in this process, even if it is only constructed at the level of audience reception: the opening scenes of the *Iliad* evoke the Iphigenia story as a parallel and foil, a carefully curated sequence for audiences to recognize.[14]

In what follows, I begin by outlining the core elements of the Iphigenia *fabula*, drawing on the evidence of the *Cypria* and other sources to highlight the crucial motifs of the tale (I). Using this framework as a key, I then turn to *Iliad* 1 and explore how the poem's opening allusively replays and reworks the *fabula* of Iphigenia's sacrifice (II). This detailed analysis will provide the groundwork for the final section, in which I ask what this sustained motif transference adds to our interpretation of the *Iliad* (III). As we shall see, this argument not only enriches our appreciation of the poem's opening, but it also expands our understanding of Homeric characterization, structure and allusion.

I. THE *FABULA* of IPHIGENIA

The sacrifice of Iphigenia was an old and well-established element of the Trojan war tradition. Although it is not mentioned directly in either Homeric poem, the story featured already in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (where she is called 'Iphimede': fr. 23a.17–26 M–W) and the cyclic *Cypria* (arg. 8 *GEF*).[15] Among archaic lyricists, it was treated by Stesichorus in his *Oresteia* (fr. 178 Davies–Finglass) and perhaps also by Simonides.[16] By exploring the details of these early accounts, as well as the evidence of later tradition, we can tentatively outline the *fabula* of the myth as it would have most likely been known to Homer and his archaic audiences.[17] Crucially, this is not an attempt to reconstruct a single poem that allegedly pre-existed the *Iliad* or to distil a pure, 'original' version of the myth (an impossibility in the context of flexible and multiform oral traditions). Rather, my aim is simply to identify the core recurring elements of the Iphigenia story. It is the repeated conjunction of these motifs in the same sequence that would have produced a distinctive and recognizable Iphigenia narrative.[18]

Of course, such an enterprise is complicated by our lack of direct access to pre-Homeric tradition. We can only make use of post-Homeric evidence and thus face the risk that our sources betray the influence of the Homeric texts themselves, or otherwise reflect post-Homeric developments in the myth.[19] This is a crucial problem that affects any attempt to situate Homeric poetry against its wider tradition. But even so, we should be wary of unduly exaggerating the primacy of Homer at an early date: the evidence of both art and literature suggests that it was only in the later sixth century that the Homeric poems began to dominate tradition.[20] Moreover,

as Jonathan Burgess has noted, limited possibilities for the diffusion of epics at an early date (either through performance or literary circulation) mean that "relatively late poems are not necessarily influenced by relatively early poems" and that chronologically "'late' poems may well represent mythological traditions that precede 'early' poems."[21] With appropriate caution, we can thus employ post-Homeric evidence as our best available guide for potential pre-Homeric traditions.[22] The remnants and testimonia of the Epic Cycle are particularly valuable in this regard; I follow those scholars who regard the Cyclic epics as manifestations of traditional material known to Homer and his audiences, even if they were textualized at a later date.[23] But in handling both this and other later material, we must still proceed with the utmost care and remain attuned to potential inventions or post-Homeric receptions. Ultimately, certainty remains impossible, but with sufficient circumspection—and with varying degrees of confidence—we can employ the evidence of the Cycle and other sources as a general guide for the pre-Homeric Iphigenia tradition.

Following this approach, I have identified six separate elements of the Iphigenia *fabula* (indicated below by the letters A–F), all of which—as we shall see—reverberate in the narrative of *Iliad* 1.

(A) Agamemnon offends a deity and is punished

Agamemnon's transgression

According to Proclus's summary of the *Cypria*, when the Greeks had gathered at Aulis after the aborted Teuthranian expedition, Agamemnon went hunting and killed a deer (καὶ τὸ δεύτερον ἠθροισμένου τοῦ στόλου ἐν Αὐλίδι Ἀγαμέμνων ἐπὶ θήρας βαλὼν ἔλαφον, arg. 8 *GEF*). This

alone may be no crime (cf. Odysseus's deer-hunting on Aeaea, *Od*. 10.156–71), but Agamemnon went on to boast that he surpassed even Artemis (ὑπερβάλλειν ἔφησε καὶ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν, arg. 8 *GEF*), a hubristic remark which stirred up the goddess's anger (μηνίσασα δὲ ἡ θεός, arg. 8 *GEF*). Many later accounts reflect this same combination of successful deer-shooting and insolent arrogance (Soph. *El*. 568–69; Callim. *Hymn* 3.262–63; Hyg. *Fab*. 98), and some even report the contents of Agamemnon's boast: "not even Artemis could have shot like that."[24] From Proclus's summary, Agamemnon's main transgression appears to have been his boastful claim to surpass Artemis's skill as a shooter.

However, a further aspect of Agamemnon's crime can be found in Sophocles' *Electra*, which renders the deer-shooting itself an act of sacrilege. Electra reports that her father came across the deer while sporting in Artemis's sacred grove (θεᾶς | παίζων κατ᾽ ἄλσος, Soph. *El.* 566–67). The beast was thus sacred to the goddess and by killing it Agamemnon committed an impiety.[25] This detail is recalled in a number of later versions.[26] It may simply be a post-Homeric accretion to the myth, but it could also date back far earlier: Electra's account certainly seems to signal a debt to an older source with the "footnoting" ὡς ἐγὼ κλύω ("so I hear," *El*. 566).[27] If so, it would have secured an underlying logic for the myth from an early date, offering a "close nexus of crime and punishment: '*pro cerva-virgo*' which is maintained in the *Cypria*'s account of Iphigenia's rescue: '*pro virgine-cerva*'" (see § I (E) below).[28]

In any case, the essence of Agamemnon's transgression is consistent across all sources: he offended Artemis through some combination of boastful arrogance and a sacrilegious disregard of the divine.[29]

Agamemnon's punishment

As a result of Agamemnon's impiety, Artemis was angry and—so the Proclan summary continues—stopped the Greeks from sailing by sending a storm (μηνίσασα δὲ ἡ θεὸς ἐπέσχεν αὐτοὺς τοῦ πλοῦ χειμῶνας ἐπιπέμπουσα, arg. 8 *GEF*), which not only delayed the expedition, but also risked its abandonment: total mission failure.[30] This detail of the storm is attested elsewhere as early as Hesiod's *Works and Days*, where the Greeks are said to have gathered a large army together at Aulis, waiting for a χειμών to pass (Αὐλίδος, ἧ ποτ' Ἀχαιοὶ | μείναντες χειμῶνα πολὺν σὺν λαὸν ἄγειραν, *Op.* 651–52),[31] and it might also have featured in the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, where a dramatic storm description follows the catalogue of Helen's suitors and Zeus' plan to annihilate the demigods (fr. 204.124–29 M–W).[32] In addition, it recurs in many other sources, including Aeschylus's *Agamemnon* (188, 198–99, 1417–18) and Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis* (88, 352, 1323–24). In the former, Aeschylus may even play with his audience's pre-existing knowledge of the episode: Calchas initially hopes that Artemis will not cause any adverse winds (147–49), a fruitless hope that resonates ironically against the backdrop of tradition.[33]

Few extant texts dwell on the effects of the Greek army's detainment, but the fuller description in Aeschylus's *Agamemnon* gives a sense of the storm's serious impact (*Ag*. 188–98):

εὖτ' ἀπλοίᾳ κεναγγεῖ βαρύ-
νοντ' Ἀχαιικὸς λεώς,
Χαλκίδος πέραν ἔχων παλιρρόχ-
θοις ἐν Αὐλίδος τόποις·
πνοαὶ δ' ἀπὸ Στρυμόνος μολοῦσαι
κακόσχολοι, νήστιδες, δύσορμοι,
βροτῶν ἄλαι,
ναῶν <τε> καὶ πεισμάτων ἀφειδεῖς,

παλιμμήκη χρόνον τιθεῖσαι
τρίβῳ κατέξαινον ἄνθος Ἀργεί-
ων·

... when the Achaean army was oppressed by bad sailing weather which emptied their stomachs, as they occupied the land opposite Chalcis, in the region of Aulis with its roaring ebb and flow; and winds came from the Strymon, bringing unwelcome leisure, starvation and bad anchorage, making men wander, and not sparing their ships or cables, but making time seem twice as long—those winds wore down and shredded the flower of the Argives.

The chorus of Argive elders paint a vivid image of the Greeks' mental and physical anguish: the winds cause famine (κεναγγεῖ, 188; νήστιδες, 193), physical decay to the boats (195), and psychological hardship as the days drag slowly by (παλιμμήκη χρόνον, 196).[34] The final image of the "flower of the Argives" being shredded and worn down (τρίβῳ κατέξαινον, 197) is particularly evocative of the distress inflicted by Artemis, which in at least one later version explicitly includes a plague (Dictys 1.19).

We cannot be sure that such a description of the stranded Greeks' suffering featured in the *Cypria* or other early traditions of the myth, but it would certainly not have been out of place in archaic epic. In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus and his men suffer similarly when they are trapped by adverse winds on the Island of the Sun (12.325–34),[35] as do Menelaus and his comrades on Pharos (4.351–69); in both cases, "hunger wore at their stomachs" (ἔτειρε δὲ γαστέρα λιμός, 4.369 = 12.332). Of course, the *Odyssey* is particularly preoccupied with food, hunger and feasting, but the provision of the Greek army is a recurring concern throughout the Trojan war tradition, even in the *Iliad*.[36] And the storm description of the *Catalogue*—whether or not it

refers directly to Aulis—similarly stresses the physical deterioration that the storm brings: it "wore down mortal strength and the fruit was diminished" (τρ̣ύ̣χ̣ε̣σ̣κεν δὲ μένος βρότεον, μινύθεσκε δὲ καρπός, fr. 204.128 M–W). In addition, famine appears to have been a major theme in a later episode of the *Cypria*, when the starving Greeks look to the help of Anius's daughters (fr. 26 *GEF*). This later famine in Troy and the earlier one on Aulis would have formed a natural narrative doublet, a common feature of Cyclic as much as Homeric mythmaking.[37] It is thus likely that Artemis's punishment not only frustrated the progress of the Greeks' mission, but also inflicted physical hardship upon them.

(B) Calchas discloses divine displeasure and proposes a solution: Agamemnon must give up a prized woman from his possession

When the Greeks could not resolve their predicament, they turned to the prophet Calchas for help. According to Proclus's *Cypria* summary, he "told them about the wrath of the goddess and instructed them to sacrifice Iphigenia to Artemis" (Κάλχαντος δὲ εἰπόντος τὴν τῆς θεοῦ μῆνιν καὶ Ἰφιγένειαν κελεύσαντος θύειν τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι, arg. 8 *GEF*). This detail remained a permanent fixture of the Iphigenia story: it appears in many other literary sources,[38] and is also reflected in the prominent position which the seer plays in the iconographic tradition.[39]

Early sources are far less forthcoming about how Agamemnon reacted to Calchas's prophecy. This is unsurprising: it is well known that Proclus's summaries of the Epic Cycle downplay the significance of character speech, making it very difficult to determine what role it played in any specific episode.[40] Yet even so, based on Agamemnon's characterization in the larger epic tradition and the inevitable emotions of such a fraught situation, it is plausible that he

would have reacted with an impulsive outburst of anger.[41] Later accounts provide some support for this hypothesis: Hyginus explicitly says that Agamemnon "began to refuse" as soon as he had heard the proposed solution (*re audita Agamemnon recusare coepit*, *Fab.* 98; cf. Dictys 1.19), and many other sources focus on his mental strain in the situation: the sons of Atreus could not hold back their tears (δάκρυ μὴ κατασχεῖν, Aesch. *Ag*. 204), while Agamemnon only acted "against his will, after much resistance" (βιασθεὶς πολλά τ᾽ ἀντιβὰς μόλις, Soph. *El*. 575) and "through much necessity" (διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀνάγκην, Σ A *Il*. 1.108–9b). Only Aeschylus's *Agamemnon* offers an alternative picture: the chorus claim that Agamemnon "blamed no prophet" (μάντιν οὔτινα ψέγων, *Ag*. 186). But this unique variant is most likely a pointed departure from earlier tradition, designed to downplay Agamemnon's individual imprudence and accentuate his role as a victim within the larger *Oresteia* narrative.[42] In any case, the emphatic assertion that Agamemnon "blamed no prophet" seems to presuppose pre-existing traditions in which he did precisely that.[43] Just as Aeschylus's Calchas hopes against tradition for no adverse winds (*Ag.* 147–49), so too here I believe it is better to take the chorus's statement as an attempt to rewrite the mainstream tradition. Even in this sole exception, we find a nod to Agamemnon's traditionally angry response.

(C) Achilles loses a potential bride

Once Agamemnon agrees to the proposed sacrifice, the Greeks send for Iphigenia and justify the summons under the pretext that she is going to marry Achilles. This detail features already in the *Cypria* (arg. 8 *GEF*) and likely also appeared in Stesichorus's *Oresteia* (fr. 181a.25–27 Davies–Finglass).[44] Thereafter, it recurs frequently in art,[45] Attic tragedy,[46] and later sources.[47] Its fullest

exposition comes in Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis* (98–105, 358–65, etc.), where we also witness Achilles' response to Agamemnon's ploy: he criticizes the king's conduct (μέμφομαι, 899) and complains that he has committed hubris against him (ὕβριν ἐς ἡμᾶς ὕβρισ' Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ, 961).[48] Initially, he also refuses to accept the king's decision and plans to prevent the sacrifice, even threatening to kill Agamemnon and Menelaus with his sword (970–72; cf. 932–69, 1360–61, 1365, 1426–27). Agamemnon's actions not only deprive Achilles of a potential bride, but also frustrate and anger him. In Lycophron's *Alexandra*, Achilles reacts to the loss of his wife (δάμαρτα, 190) by lamenting alone on the seashore, a display of extreme grief (192–95). Given Achilles' propensity for anger and excessive emotion elsewhere in archaic epic, it is plausible that such reactions would have already featured in the traditional *fabula* of the story from an early date.

(D) Odysseus collects and brings this woman to her father

Proclus's terse summary of the *Cypria* does not specify who collected Iphigenia and brought her to Aulis: the Greeks simply send for her (μεταπεμψάμενοι, arg. 8 *GEF*). But in later tradition, this role is almost always assigned to Odysseus. In the prologue of Euripides's *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, Iphigenia herself reports that she was "taken from her mother through the wiles of Odysseus" (Ὀδυσσέως τέχναις | μητρὸς παρείλοντ', *IT* 24–25), and we know that this version was dramatized in Sophocles' *Iphigenia*, which included a conversation between Odysseus and Clytemnestra (fr. 305 *TrGF*). The same version is also found in the iconographic tradition and later literary sources, with Odysseus collecting Iphigenia alone or in partnership with another.[49]

Despite the near uniformity of tradition, however, two Euripidean plays offer slight variations, but as with Aeschylus's "no-prophet-blaming," these seem to be pointed divergences for rhetorical effect. In the *Electra*, Clytemnestra claims that her husband "went off, leading Iphigenia from home to the harbor at Aulis" (ᾤχετ᾽ ἐκ δόμων ἄγων | πρυμνοῦχον Αὐλιν, 1021–22); in defending her murder of Agamemnon (1011–50), it is rhetorically advantageous for her to focus solely on Agamemnon's culpability, without a diluting reference to the involvement of others.[50] In *Iphigenia at Aulis*, meanwhile, Clytemnestra escorts her daughter to the Greek camp herself (414–19, 454–59, etc.), but this is essential for the drama's larger plot: the emotional confrontation of husband and wife on stage would not be possible were Odysseus to play the middle-man.[51] These two outliers are thus fully accounted for by their context: in each case, Euripides has good reason to downplay Odysseus's usual role. Moreover, Euripides seems to signpost his innovation in *Iphigenia at Aulis*: Clytemnestra claims that it is "no wonder" (οὐ θαῦμα) that Achilles does not recognize her because they have not met "before" (πάρος, 823–24), a claim that metapoetically acknowledges the novelty of Clytemnestra's presence in Aulis.[52] The drama also allusively nods to Odysseus's expected participation: the hero is one of the few Greeks who has knowledge of Agamemnon's deception (107, 524), and Achilles still suspects that Odysseus will lead the group to bring Iphigenia to the altar (1362). Even this Euripidean exception thus seems to presuppose and allude to Odysseus's involvement.

The major difficulty here, however, is the fact that Odysseus's role is first explicitly attested only in fifth century Attic tragedy, a genre which frequently depicted the hero as a villainous trickster and demagogue.[53] One might thus wonder whether his involvement in the sacrifice was a tragic invention, designed to further blacken his character. We do not have the evidence to disprove this possibility outright, but even so, Odysseus's central role in collecting

Iphigenia fits very plausibly into wider patterns of the epic Trojan war tradition. From the evidence of the *Iliad* and Epic Cycle, it is clear that delegation is Agamemnon's usual *modus operandi*: within the *Iliad*, he sends the heralds Talthybius and Eurybates to take Briseis from Achilles (*Il*. 1.318–48), delegates the initial pre-war recruitment of Achilles to Nestor and Odysseus (*Il*. 9.252–59, 11.765–90; cf. *Cypr*. fr. 19 *GEF*), and has others speak on his behalf in the embassy to Achilles (*Il*. 9, cf. esp. 9.372–73).[54] The same process is also visible in the Cyclic tradition of the army's initial mustering: according to Proclus (*Cypr*. arg. 4–5 *GEF*), Menelaus, Nestor and Palamedes went to recruit Odysseus in the *Cypria*,[55] while Apollodorus later reports that Agamemnon sent a herald to recruit each king (*Epit*. 3.6).[56] Only in the Underworld scene of *Odyssey* 24 do we hear of Agamemnon's personal presence on such a mission (when recruiting Odysseus: 24.115–19), but this seems to be a pointed exception, designed to silence and efface Palamedes' traditional involvement in the episode.[57] Given the well-established pattern of Agamemnon's delegation, it is thus unlikely that the king was thought to collect his daughter himself in the archaic tradition.

Odysseus, by contrast, is frequently involved in such missions. In the embassy of *Iliad* 9, he emerges as the clear leader of the group: although Nestor had asked Phoenix to take the lead (ἡγησάσθω, 9.168), it is Odysseus who "leads the way" to and from Achilles' hut (ἡγεῖτο, 9.192; ἦρχε, 9.657), who speaks first on arrival (intercepting Ajax's nod to Phoenix: 9.223–24) and who is called upon to report the outcome of the embassy by Agamemnon (9.673). In addition, he is involved in many other missions that require cunning or deception, such as the *Doloneia* (*Il*. 10), his infiltration of Troy in disguise (*Od*. 4.240–58; *Il. Parv*. arg. 4b–d *GEF*), and the theft of the Palladium (*Il. Parv*. arg. 4e *GEF*). Odysseus was thus the natural agent to fulfil Agamemnon's will, especially given the trickery involved in the Iphigenia story.[58]

(E) Sacrifice is performed at the altar

Once she has been collected, Iphigenia is delivered to her father in Aulis and placed on the altar, the consistent site of her sacrifice throughout tradition in both literature and art.[59]

Proclus again does not specify who performs the sacrifice: the Greeks in general simply "try" to sacrifice her (ἐπιχειροῦσιν, arg. 8 *GEF*). Such imprecision is matched by our other earliest sources (Hes. fr. 23a.17 M–W; Pind. *Pyth*. 11.22–23), but in later tradition, it is almost always Agamemnon himself who performs the sacrifice, with Calchas assisting in the preliminary rituals.[60]

In many tellings of the story, however, Iphigenia is not actually sacrificed: she is replaced (usually by a deer) and instead whisked away to become immortalized or appointed as a priestess in Tauris. This version is already found in the *Cypria* (deer substitution and conveyance to Tauris: arg. 8 *GEF*), the Hesiodic *Catalogue* (replacement by an *eidolon* and immortalisation as "Artemis Einodia": fr. 23a.17–26 M–W) and Stesichorus's *Oresteia* (transformation into Hecate, fr. 178 Davies–Finglass).[61] The antiquity of the motif is further suggested by underlying parallels with the binding of Isaac in Semitic tradition and other Attic cultic traditions; such ritual substitution was not alien to ancient thought.[62] I thus consider it likely that Iphigenia's substitution was an integral part of the myth from the start. By contrast, in tragedy and other later sources, the lack of substitution seems to be a pointed departure to accentuate the horror of Agamemnon's actions, especially in the context of justifying his later murder by Clytemnestra.[63] Ultimately, however, whether she is killed or whisked away, the attempted sacrifice always has a grim outcome for Agamemnon and his family: the loss of Iphigenia.

(F) After the sacrifice, the Greeks receive a favorable wind from the offended deity and sail to Troy

After the sacrifice is complete, Proclus's summary of the *Cypria* continues by claiming that the Greeks "then sail to Tenedos," embarking on their journey to Troy (ἔπειτα καταπλέουσιν εἰς Τένεδον, arg. 9 *GEF*). The sacrifice succeeded in appeasing Artemis, who quelled her angry storm winds.

But Artemis did not just calm the storm; she also seems to have assisted the Greeks' onward journey to Troy. In some later sources, we explicitly hear that she provided a fair breeze. In *Iphigenia at Aulis*, for example, Calchas specifies that Artemis has gladly received the sacrifice and "grants us a fair voyage to attack Troy" (καὶ πλοῦν οὔριον | δίδωσιν ἡμῖν Ἰλίου τ᾽ ἐπιδρομάς, 1596–97), fulfilling Achilles' earlier prayer for safe sailing (1575–76).[64] This detail is not explicitly attested in any extant archaic source, but it fits well with Artemis's larger association with seafaring,[65] and it also seems to be reflected in one of the opening hymns of the *Theognidea* (11–14): the speaker calls on Artemis for protection from death (presumably on a sailing voyage: κακὰς δ᾽ ἀπὸ κῆρας ἄλαλκε, 13),[66] and recalls how Agamemnon dedicated a temple to her "when he was about to sail on his swift ships to Troy" (ὅτ᾽ ἐς Τροίην ἔπλεε νηυσὶ θοῇς, 12). Given the explicit Trojan war context, Aulis is the most likely setting for this dedication,[67] and the implication is that Artemis should protect the speaker's voyage just as she did Agamemnon's.

After all the hardship and suffering that she has caused, the appeased god thus assists the Greeks in their voyage to the Trojan shore. Artemis transitions from obstructing the Greek cause to actively supporting it.[68]

II. REPLAYING IPHIGENIA: THE RETURN OF CHRYSEIS

Now that we have outlined the key elements of the Iphigenia *fabula* (summarized in Table 1), it is time to turn to the *Iliad* and examine the reflections of this *fabula* in Book 1. As we shall see, all six elements are reflected in the same order in the opening phases of the poem.

Element	Details
(A) Agamemnon offends a deity and is punished	Ag. angers Artemis (kills deer/boasts) Suffers adverse storm and hardship [/plague?] Risk of mission failure
(B) Calchas discloses divine displeasure and proposes a solution: Agamemnon must give up a prized woman from his possession	Calchas reveals Artemis's anger Agamemnon must give up Iphigenia [Agamemnon's angry response?]
(C) Achilles loses a potential bride	Achilles loses Iphigenia Achilles responds angrily to Ag.'s actions

(D) Odysseus collects and brings this woman to her father by an altar	Odysseus brings Iphigenia to her father at the altar
(E) Sacrifice is performed at the altar	Agamemnon leads the sacrifice with Calchas Attempted human sacrifice
(F) After the sacrifice, the Greeks receive a favorable wind from the offended deity and sail to Troy	Artemis sends a favorable wind The Greek ships sail to Troy

Table 1: Core elements of the Iphigenia *fabula*

Before tracing this sequence, however, it is worth facing head-on a possible challenge to this thesis: the possibility that the Iphigenia story was not known to the Homeric tradition.[69] This is an issue that has been discussed before, but it is worth revisiting briefly given how crucial it is for my larger argument. It is true that the *Iliad* lacks any direct mention of Iphigenia, and to at least some scholars her sacrifice seems incompatible with Agamemnon's list of three marriageable daughters in Book 9: Chrysothemis, Laodice and Iphianassa (*Il*. 9.145, 287). The final name, Iphianassa, has been considered an alternative or substitute for Iphigenia, a possibility that receives support from the apparent flexibility of the sacrificed daughter's name elsewhere: she is called Iphimede in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* (Hes. fr. 23a.17 M–W), Iphigone in Euripides' *Electra* (*El*. 1023), and Iphianassa in Lucretius (1.85).[70] On this interpretation, if "Iphianassa" is still alive and available in the tenth year of the war, the sacrifice (or attempted sacrifice) cannot have taken place.

However, this logic is complicated by the evidence of the *Cypria*, which preserves a tradition in which Agamemnon had four daughters, the three of the *Iliad* plus Iphigenia (fr. 20 *GEF* = Σ Soph. *El*. 157). Some scholars suppose that this is simply a post-Homeric attempt to reconcile the *Iliad* with the sacrifice tradition,[71] but this is far from certain. Undoubtedly, the *Cypria*'s additional daughter "looks like an attempt to synthesize variants,"[72] but there is no reason that such synthesization could not have occurred in tradition prior to the *Iliad*.[73] After all, similar-sounding names of royal siblings are paralleled elsewhere in early Greek epic by three of Metaneira's daughters in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (**Calli**dice, Clisidice and **Calli**thoe, 109–10); such duplications were evidently not offensive to an ancient ear.[74] Moreover, the independent existence of both Iphigenia and Iphianassa is in no way inconsistent with—and could even be presupposed by—Agamemnon's claim in Book 9. Now that Iphigenia is dead (or whisked away to Tauris), it makes sense that Agamemnon only names his three surviving (or available) daughters as potential wives for Achilles (*Il*. 9.144–48).[75] Indeed, if anything, the shadow of Iphigenia's sacrifice only enriches our appreciation of this tense moment: if we recall that Agamemnon had previously "offered" Achilles another of his daughters at Aulis, the unfulfilled and unhappy nature of that "marriage" foreshadows how poorly this offer will go down in the present (cf. *Il*. 9.388–400).

Most significantly, however, the sacrifice seems to be presupposed earlier in the *Iliad* by Agamemnon's scathing rebuke of the seer Calchas (*Il*. 1.105–8):

> Κάλχαντα πρώτιστα κάκ᾽ ὀσσόμενος προσέειπε·
> "μάντι κακῶν, οὐ πώ ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγυον εἶπας·
> αἰεί τοι τὰ κάκ᾽ ἐστὶ φίλα φρεσὶ μαντεύεσθαι,
> ἐσθλὸν δ᾽ οὔτε τί πω εἶπας ἔπος οὔτ᾽ ἐτέλεσσας.

> First of all he spoke to Calchas with a menacing glare: "Prophet of evil, never yet have you told me anything good. It is always dear to your heart to prophesy evil, and never yet have you said a good word or brought it to fulfilment."

This outburst fits with Agamemnon's broader characterization in *Iliad* 1; indeed, he later criticizes Achilles in similar terms (1.177). But his emphasis on Calchas' repeated behavior presupposes a broader history of bad blood between the pair (note especially the string of temporal adverbs: οὐ πώ ποτέ, "never yet," 106; ἀιεί, "always," 107; οὔτε τί πω, "never yet," 108). Some ancient scholars understood a reference here to Calchas's prophecy that Troy would only be sacked after ten years, which is certainly a possibility.[76] But this alone does not seem to account for the emotional hyperbole of Agamemnon's rebuke. Moreover, the generality of Agamemnon's temporal adverbs suggests that he has more than one moment in mind here. It is thus very likely that this reproach also points to Iphigenia's sacrifice, the other major past occasion on which Calchas gave Agamemnon some terrible news.[77]

More generally, we have already noted that the Iphigenia story is found in many other archaic texts, including the *Cypria*, Hesiodic *Catalogue* and Stesichorus's *Oresteia*, which strongly implies that it was already firmly embedded in archaic mythological lore. But we can further add that the tale is also integral to the larger plot and narrative of the Trojan war, which makes it even more unlikely to be a late post-Homeric accretion. Not only does it play a key structural role, initiating the war with a sacrificed daughter, mirroring the sacrifice of Polyxena at its close;[78] but it also serves as a major motivation for Clytemnestra's later murder of her husband (cf. *Pyth*. 11.22–23). The *Odyssey* is already familiar with Clytemnestra's adultery, suggesting that the whole family drama was well established at an early date.[79] And indeed, Agamemnon immediately follows his rebuke of Calchas in *Iliad* 1 with an unflattering

assessment of his wife (1.112–15), hinting at the marital discord that arose from his daughter's sacrifice. The same unease may also be reflected in Chryses' pointed failure to appeal to Agamemnon's familial piety in his opening supplication (a common ploy in other supplication scenes: *Il*. 15.659–66, 22.338–43, 24.485–87, 503–4; *Od*. 11.66–68): with Iphigenia's sacrifice in the background, Agamemnon's paternal love is not an effective thing to appeal to.[80] Finally, Homer's direct avoidance of the myth fits with the *Iliad*'s more general suppression of immortalisation and killing within the family. In keeping with the poem's larger aesthetic priorities, the Iphigenia narrative is transplanted to the domain of indirect and allusive reference.[81]

Like many scholars, therefore, I believe that the Iphigenia story belonged to the wider mass of traditions and tales against which the *Iliad* situated itself. But rather than seeing the *Iliad*'s allusion to this story restricted primarily to Agamemnon's brief rebuke of Calchas, I contend that the *fabula* of the sacrifice underlies the whole opening of the poem. Agamemnon's words are not an isolated allusion, but rather a signpost to the wider motif transference at work in Book 1. I shall now trace this Iliadic reframing of the Iphigenia *fabula*, following the same lettered sequence as above; as we shall see, the *Iliad* mirrors the overarching Iphigenia sequence, but also reworks and distorts it at specific points—divergences that we shall consider further in section III.

(A) Agamemnon offends a deity and is punished

The *Iliad* begins with Agamemnon angering Apollo by dishonoring his priest Chryses, refusing to return his captive daughter Chryseis in exchange for an abundant ransom (1.8–42); as

punishment, the god inflicts a plague on the Achaeans, disrupting the war effort and causing much suffering (1.43–52).

This whole episode closely parallels Agamemnon's offence against Artemis. Like on Aulis, the king hubristically offends a god of archery by both boasting and disrespecting what is sacred to him or her (Artemis's deer/Apollo's priest: cf. ἠτίμασεν ἀρητῆρα, 1.11).[82] He brusquely dismisses Chryses (κακῶς ἀφίει, 1.25), threatening him with violence (1.28, 32) and blasphemously disregarding the emblems of his office (the scepter and fillet: 1.28).[83] In addition, he gloatingly describes how Chryseis will share his bed in Argos (1.29–31), a malicious boast that Aristarchus even athetized as "unseemly" in the mouth of a king (ἀπρεπές, Σ A. *Il.* 1.29–31). Agamemnon impiously dismisses Apollo's divine authority, just as he had Artemis's on Aulis. The king, it seems, has not learned from his previous transgression. Indeed, Achilles' claim that Agamemnon does not know how to look to the past or the future (*Il.* 1.343) could be taken as an implicit gesture to his failure to learn from past mistakes.[84]

The consequences of Agamemnon's conduct are also parallel. Apollo grows angry, just like his sister (χολωθείς 1.9; χωόμενος 1.44; χωομένοιο 1.46; ἐχώσατο 1.64; μῆνιν 1.75; cf. μηνίσασα, *Cypr.* arg. 8 *GEF*). And he enacts an analogous punishment: the plague (νοῦσον ... κακήν, 1.10; λοιμός, 1.61; λοιγόν, 1.67, 97, 456) is a similarly violent upheaval of the natural world to Artemis's storm-winds, causing anguish (ἄλγεα, 1.96, 110) and delay to the Greeks' project.[85] Indeed, as Achilles goes on to say, the Greeks are "driven back" by this plague (παλιμπλαγχθέντας) and risk having to abort the whole expedition and "return home" (ἀπονοστήσειν), the same threat of mission failure that faced them at Aulis (*Il.* 1.59–61).[86] Moreover, there is also an underlying symmetry between this punishment and Agamemnon's

previous crime: Apollo's punitive archery (1.48–52) echoes and inverts Agamemnon's foolhardy deer-hunting.

Of course, it could be argued that these two episodes are simply two manifestations of a common story pattern found in Homer onwards: that of an arrogant mortal offending a deity and suffering as a result.[87] Indeed, Apollo and Artemis appear to have been particularly suitable for this kind of revenge pattern.[88] But in this instance, the similarities extend beyond the typological norm, especially since the same mortal is at fault in each case. Moreover, the two offended deities form a natural brother-sister pair, reinforcing the correspondence between the two incidents: Agamemnon offends a child of Leto once more. Homer's initial emphasis on Apollo's descent from Leto (1.9, 1.36) even foregrounds this familial connection at the outset.[89] In addition to the underlying symmetry between Agamemnon's hunting and Apollo's archery, these parallels thus establish the Iphigenia *fabula* as an underlying paradigm and foil for the *Iliad*'s opening, inaugurating—as we shall now see—a whole series of narrative interconnections.

(B) Calchas discloses divine displeasure and proposes a solution: Agamemnon must give up a prized woman from his possession

After nine days of Greek suffering, the *Iliad* continues with an assembly initiated by Achilles, who proposes that they ask a prophet about the cause of Apollo's anger (1.53–67). In response, the seer Calchas—after seeking reassurance and protection from Achilles—reveals that Apollo is angry with Agamemnon for his mistreatment of Chryses and will not relent until Chryseis is returned with a full hecatomb (1.68–100). Agamemnon reacts furiously, rebuking Calchas, but ultimately agrees to follow his instructions (1.101–17).

Here too, events map closely onto those at Aulis: in both cases, the divinely induced impasse is explained by the seer Calchas, and the solution which he proposes involves Agamemnon giving up a prized woman from his possession: his war-slave Chryseis and his daughter Iphigenia. This parallel is particularly striking: on no other occasion in myth is Agamemnon required to give anything up to appease a god, let alone a prized woman. Moreover, Chryseis and Iphigenia are similar figures, each primarily defined and identified through her relationship to her father.[90] In the *Iliad*, however, Homer has split Calchas's solution at Aulis into two: the sacrifice of Iphigenia here becomes Agamemnon's loss of Chryseis and a separate sacrificial hecatomb—though Achilles' later instruction that Agamemnon "give this girl up to the god" (and not "her father": σὺ μὲν νῦν τήνδε θεῷ προές, 1.127) could equally hint that Chryseis will be dedicated and entrusted to Apollo, just as Iphigenia was to Artemis.

Calchas's prominence in this episode is also significant. This is his only direct appearance in the Iliadic narrative, and he is only otherwise mentioned twice elsewhere: in *Iliad* 2 when Odysseus recalls his interpretation of the snake omen on Aulis (2.299–332) and again in *Iliad* 13 when Poseidon adopts his form as a mortal disguise (13.43–45).[91] From these mentions and Proclus's summaries, it is clear that Calchas is primarily associated in tradition with events on Aulis.[92] His very presence here at the outset of the poem would encourage an audience to recall his major previous contribution.

In addition, the *Iliad* assembly scene may even nod to Agamemnon's original offence at Aulis when Achilles suggests possible reasons for Apollo's anger: he wonders whether Apollo "find faults with a εὐχωλή or a hecatomb" (εἴτ' ἄρ' ὅ γ' εὐχωλῆς ἐπιμέμφεται εἴθ' ἑκατόμβης, 1.65). This line is most naturally understood to refer to a prayer or sacrifice which the Greeks have either omitted or wrongly performed.[93] But εὐχωλή, like its associated verb εὔχομαι, is a

polyvalent noun which can refer to a "boast" as much as a "prayer." In fact, the vast majority of the noun's Iliadic instantiations have this precise sense of a "boast" or "vaunt."[94] Its presence here alongside ἑκατόμβης inevitably foregrounds the meaning of "prayer," but Achilles' words may still hint at the possibility that Agamemnon's crime results, as before, from an arrogant boast. Ultimately, Calchas goes on to dismiss Achilles' suggestion (1.93), but the raised possibility invites a further connection with the earlier episode.[95]

Finally, we may also suspect that Agamemnon's outburst of fury against Calchas's revelation resembles his response at Aulis. We have already seen how the king's opening words invite an audience to recall Calchas's previous prophecy, looking back to an earlier occasion on which the seer had offered unwelcome advice (1.106–8), but the virulent character of these words also likely replays the king's earlier reaction.[96] Indeed, Calchas's expectation that he will anger a mighty king and cause lasting resentment (1.78–83) is likely based on his previous experience at Aulis.

(C) Achilles loses a potential bride

After Agamemnon has agreed to return Chryseis, he asks for a replacement γέρας ("war-prize") and threatens to confiscate that of another leader if he does not have his way (1.118–47). When Achilles objects, Agamemnon narrows his threat: he will take Achilles' own γέρας, Briseis (1.148–87). The escalating quarrel is eventually quelled—or at least deferred—through the interventions of Athena and Nestor, and Achilles reluctantly agrees to give up Briseis (1.188–307). After the assembly disperses, preparations begin to appease Apollo (1.308–17); Agamemnon sends his heralds to collect Briseis from Achilles (1.318–48); and Achilles

summons his mother, complains about what has happened, and asks her to supplicate Zeus on his behalf (1.349–430).

This section of *Iliad* 1 exhibits the least direct mapping onto the Aulis episode, as it begins to turn our attention to the larger consequences of Agamemnon's conduct, especially Achilles' withdrawal, an event which determines the trajectory of the whole poem. Yet even so, here too the Iphigenia episode resonates meaningfully in the background, now centered on the figure of Briseis: Achilles loses a potential bride through Agamemnon's actions, just like on Aulis.[97] In *Iliad* 9, the hero tells Odysseus that he loves Briseis from the depths of his heart (ἐγὼ τὴν | ἐκ θυμοῦ φίλεον, 9.342–43) and equates her to Helen as his own ἄλοχον θυμαρέα ("darling wife," 9.336). This is a rare formulaic phrase found only twice elsewhere in archaic Greek epic of Penelope (*Od*. 23.232) and Mestra (Hes. fr. 43a.20 M–W), two women who were sought after by many suitors.[98] Achilles presents Briseis as a desirable wife on a par with these prominent personalities of the mythical tradition. Indeed, this resonant phrase is well chosen for Achilles' immediate addressee, Odysseus: Achilles implies that Briseis is his equivalent of Penelope.[99]

Achilles' comments have often been dismissed as rhetorical exaggeration, simply designed to elevate Briseis to the level of Menelaus's Helen—especially since he later wishes that Artemis had killed Briseis on the very day that he chose her as his prize (19.59–60), hardly the sentiments of a doting lover.[100] But even this wish resonates pointedly with the Aulis episode (envisioning Briseis as a victim of Artemis just like Iphigenia), and in context it too has its own rhetorical purpose: heightening the pain and emotion that Achilles feels at the loss of Patroclus. Other moments in the poem, by contrast, do in fact hint at the sincerity of Achilles' feelings for Briseis: after losing her in Book 1, the hero withdraws from his companions in tears and sits on

the shore of the sea (1.348–50), a pose that the scholia at least recognize as that of a distraught lover.[101] Later in the poem, meanwhile, Briseis herself recalls how Patroclus had promised to make her Achilles' wedded wife back in Phthia (κουριδίην ἄλοχον, 19.297–99); the poem encourages us to see her as a potential future bride for Achilles, just as Iphigenia was on Aulis.[102] Achilles' loss of Briseis is thus analogous to his unfulfilled "marriage" to Iphigenia. In both cases, Agamemnon and the army take away what they had previously offered (cf. μ' ἀφέλεσθέ γε δόντες, 1.299).

Achilles' reaction to Agamemnon's conduct also parallels that on Aulis. He responds angrily (ὑπόδρα ἰδών, 1.148),[103] complaining of Agamemnon's hubristic behavior (ὕβριν, 1.203; ὑπεροπλίῃσι, 1.205; λωβήσαιο, 1.232; cf. ὕβριν, *IA* 961). He also verges once more on violence: without Athena's intervention, he would have drawn his sword against the king (1.188–94, 205), and he still ends the conversation by threatening to spill Agamemnon's blood around his spear (1.302–3; cf. *IA* 970–72). Like on Aulis, Agamemnon has "completely deceived and wronged" him (ἐκ γὰρ δή μ' ἀπάτησε καὶ ἤλιτεν, 9.375; cf. 9.371, 375–76), and he responds with similar venom. Indeed, Agamemnon may even subtly acknowledge this prior clash: he claims that "strife is always dear" to Achilles, alongside wars and battles (αἰεὶ γάρ τοι ἔρις τε φίλη πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε, 1.177), a remark that—like his similarly phrased complaint about Calchas (1.107) —could nod to this specific past conflict. If Achilles had indeed been caught up in the crossfire of Agamemnon's scheming on Aulis, that prior history of fraught relations adds extra depth to their latest quarrel.

(D) Odysseus collects and brings this woman to her father by an altar

While Achilles complains to his mother, Chryseis is on her way back to her father. After the assembly, we had already heard that the ship had set off with Odysseus as commander (1.308–12), and now it reaches Chryse; after mooring the ship, the Greeks bring out the hecatomb for Apollo and Odysseus leads Chryseis to the altar and places her in the arms of her father, who joyfully receives her (1.430–47).

These events closely correspond to the Aulis episode. There too, as we have seen, Odysseus appears to have been traditionally responsible for bringing Iphigenia to her father, just as he brings Chryseis to Chryses here.[104] The repeated emphasis on Odysseus's central role at this moment (1.311, 430, 440) invites an audience to recall the last time he played a similar role, while the repetition of the hero's epithet πολύμητις (1.311, 440) may also foreground his capacity for cunning, inviting us to recall the Aulian marriage trick.[105] Particularly suggestive of events on Aulis, however, are the two verses describing the transfer of Chryseis to her father (1.440–41):

> τὴν μὲν ἔπειτ᾽ ἐπὶ βωμὸν ἄγων πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεὺς
> πατρὶ φίλῳ ἐν χερσὶ τίθει, καί μιν προσέειπεν·
>
> Then Odysseus of many wiles led her to the altar, placed her in her dear father's arms, and spoke to him.

Taken out of context, these verses could just as well refer to events on Aulis, as those at Chryse. The altar is precisely where Iphigenia is delivered to Agamemnon (e.g., βωμῶ[ι], Hes. fr. 23a.18 M–W) and the vagueness of πατρί and τήν could evoke Agamemnon and Iphigenia as much as Chryses and Chryseis. We might even wonder whether such language was used elsewhere in the context of the Iphigenia *fabula*, redeployed here in a new but comparable context.[106] Such a

suggestion can only be speculation on available evidence, but it nevertheless highlights how similar these two mythical scenarios are.

If the Agamemnon and Iphigenia episode does lie behind this scene as I suggest, however, this moment really points up the difference between these events and those on Aulis. The father here "joyfully" receives his "dear" daughter in a moment of happy reunion (ὁ δὲ δέξατο **χαίρων** | παῖδα **φίλην**, 1.446–47, cf. φίλῳ, 1.441),[107] a stark contrast to events on Aulis, where Agamemnon's family is ultimately torn apart rather than reunited. Indeed, later descriptions of events at Aulis emphasized the misery of this moment: in *Iphigenia at Aulis*, for example, Agamemnon cries at his daughter's arrival (650, 683–84) and later groans aloud when he sees her led to the altar (ἀνεστέναξε, 1549), a foil to Chryses' joy here.[108] We shall consider the larger significance of these differences in the next section, but here we can note how the tragic frisson of the Iphigenia episode is evoked but negated.

(E) Sacrifice is performed at the altar

As soon as Chryses has received his daughter, sacrifice is performed: the hecatomb is set up and Chryses prays to Apollo (1.447–57); the slaughter and preparation of the sacrificial meat is described in intimate detail (1.458–66); and the ritual concludes with feasting and singing (1.467–74).

Here too, these events follow the general pattern of the Aulis *fabula*. The immediate transition from Chryseis's return to the sacrifice mirrors the same sequence on Aulis, where Iphigenia's arrival immediately precipitates her sacrifice. Indeed, the enjambement in line 447

positions the "dear daughter" (παῖδα φίλην) and the "hecatomb" (ἱερὴν ἑκατόμβην) in close proximity to one another, reinforcing the speed (ὦκα) with which the sacrifice is begun.

Chryses' prominent role in the sacrifice matches that of the paternal Agamemnon and priestly Calchas on Aulis, while his prayer to Apollo explicitly asks the god to "ward off the loathsome destruction from the Danaans" (Δαναοῖσιν ἀεικέα λοιγὸν ἄμυνον, 1.456), a very similar request to that which would have been made to Artemis on Aulis. Here too, the sacrifice performs the same function; indeed, the whole ritual is designed to "appease" the god (cf. ἱλάσκοντο, 1.472).

Of course, the ensuing sacrifice diverges significantly from that on Aulis: Chryseis is not sacrificed to the god (or supernaturally saved). Yet there may still be some underlying resonances. It is notable that this is the longest description of sacrifice in the whole of the *Iliad*, with a detailed description of the ritual procedure (1.458–61):[109]

> αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ᾽ εὔξαντο καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλοντο,
> αὐέρυσαν μὲν πρῶτα καὶ ἔσφαξαν καὶ ἔδειραν,
> μηρούς τ᾽ ἐξέταμον κατά τε κνίσῃ ἐκάλυψαν
> δίπτυχα ποιήσαντες, ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν δ᾽ ὠμοθέτησαν.
>
> When they had prayed and sprinkled the barley grains, they first drew back the [victims'] heads and slaughtered [them] and skinned [them]; and they cut out the thigh-bones and wrapped them in fat, folded double, and placed slices of raw meat on top of them.

These lines are formulaic building blocks of the sacrifice type scene, familiar from many other iterations. But it is perhaps significant that we begin in verse 459 with a string of verbs that lack a direct object, which has to be supplied by the larger context. This imprecision is not unique, but for audiences who have recognized the underlying Iphigenia pattern, the extra semantic space

could invite them to recall Iphigenia's own similar treatment at Agamemnon's hands: the verb ἔσφαξαν (1.459), in particular, resonates with the language regularly used of Iphigenia's sacrifice from Hesiod onwards.[110] Moreover, this whole verse only appears once elsewhere in archaic epic in the description of the sacrifice that precedes the Catalogue of Ships (1.459 = 2.422), an episode that itself resonates strongly with the gathering of the host at Aulis—perhaps this language was particularly associated with the Aulis episode in tradition.[111] Whether or not this was the case, however, it is clear that the sacrifice not only has the same goal as Agamemnon's (removing the divinely induced λοιγόν), but also leaves space for us to recall the original slaughter of Iphigenia. Yet as with the preceding reunion of father and daughter, there is once more a significant difference here: the (at least attempted) human sacrifice on Aulis is again defused, and we are instead presented with an archetype of orderly, civilized sacrifice—a point to which we shall return.

(F) After the sacrifice, the Greeks receive a favorable wind from the offended deity and sail to Troy

The day after the sacrifice, the Greeks receive a favorable wind from Apollo and set sail back to the Greek camp (1.477–83). On their arrival, they drag the boat onto the shore, set props beneath it and immediately disperse (1.484–87).

The outcome of the sacrifice is thus the same as on Aulis: the offended deity is appeased and allows for smooth sailing. Of course, the favorable wind here is far more incidental to the immediate plot than it was at Aulis, where fair weather was the main goal of the ritual. Yet this

only makes it all the more striking that Homer devotes so much attention to it here, with the *Iliad*'s only proper account of seafaring (1.479–83):

> τοῖσιν δ' **ἴκμενον οὖρον** ἴει ἑκάεργος Ἀπόλλων·
> οἱ δ' ἱστὸν στήσαντ' ἀνά θ' ἱστία λευκὰ πέτασσαν,
> ἐν δ' **ἄνεμος** πρῆσεν μέσον ἱστίον, ἀμφὶ δὲ κῦμα
> στείρῃ πορφύρεον μεγάλ' ἴαχε νηὸς ἰούσης·
> ἡ δ' ἔθεεν κατὰ κῦμα διαπρήσσουσα κέλευθον.
>
> And Apollo who works from afar sent them **a favorable wind**. They set up the mast and spread the white sails, and the **wind** filled the belly of the sail. The dark wave hissed loudly around the keel's stem as the ship went: and it sped over the waves, accomplishing its route.

By contrast, the poem makes no explicit statement that the plague has ended, despite it being the embassy's primary objective—an absence that seems to have troubled ancient commentators.[112] Its resolution is only implied by the passing comment that Apollo "heard" and thus "granted" Chryses' initial prayer (τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων, 1.457).[113] Conversely, the double mention of wind (οὖρον, 1.479; ἄνεμος, 1.481) foregrounds an outcome of the sacrifice which directly parallels that on Aulis: the appeased deity sends a favorable wind.[114] Such Apolline involvement in the winds is very unusual: even in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, it is Zeus, not Apollo, who sends a tailwind for the Cretan sailors (Διὸς οὔρῳ, 427; ἄνεμος ... ἐκ Διὸς αἴσης, 433). Apollo's control of the winds in *Iliad* 1 thus departs significantly from his usual practice and aligns him even more closely with the appeased Artemis of Aulis.[115]

The envoys' concluding actions also match what the Greeks would have done on their first arrival to Asia Minor from Aulis: setting their ships up on props to preserve them (1.484–

86). This final element of the Chryseis story closes the replay of Iphigenia's *fabula* at a structurally significant moment, echoing the Greeks' first arrival in Troy. The episode concludes at a moment of transition and new beginning.

	Iphigenia	***Iliad* 1**
(A) Agamemnon offends a deity and is punished	Ag. angers Artemis (kills deer/boasts) Suffers adverse storm and hardship [/plague?] Risk of mission failure	Ag. angers Apollo (insults priest/boasts) Suffers adverse plague Risk of mission failure
(B) Calchas discloses divine displeasure and proposes a solution: Agamemnon must give up a prized woman from his possession	Calchas reveals Artemis's anger Agamemnon must give up Iphigenia [Agamemnon's angry response?]	Calchas reveals Apollo's anger Agamemnon must give up Chryseis Agamemnon's angry response

(C) Achilles loses a potential bride	Achilles loses Iphigenia Achilles responds angrily to Ag.'s actions	Achilles loses Briseis Achilles responds angrily to Ag.'s actions
(D) Odysseus collects and brings this woman to her father by an altar	Odysseus brings Iphigenia to her father at the altar	Odysseus brings Chryseis to her father at the altar
(E) Sacrifice is performed at the altar	Agamemnon leads the sacrifice with Calchas *Attempted human sacrifice*	Chryses leads the sacrifice *Proper orderly sacrifice*
(F) After the sacrifice, the Greeks receive a favorable wind from the offended deity and sail to Troy	Artemis sends a favorable wind The Greek ships sail to Troy	Apollo sends a favorable wind The Greek ship sails to Troy

Table 2: The parallel sequences summarized

III. THE ARCHITECTURE OF HOMERIC ALLUSION

The opening moves of the *Iliad* thus map closely onto the Iphigenia *fabula*. In the previous section, we have established an underlying symmetry between the events of *Iliad* 1 and the traditional Aulis story (summarized in Table 2). The debate over Chryseis and her eventual return to her father replay and rework Iphigenia's sacrifice through a sustained sequence of narrative connections. Each reader will no doubt have found some correspondences more convincing than others. But given the sheer accumulation of parallels and the shared overarching sequence, the overall connection is difficult to deny.[116] In this final section, I want to move beyond this point-by-point comparison and dwell on the larger significance of this allusive pattern: what does it add to our understanding of *Iliad* 1 and to Homeric poetics more generally?

On a local level, the allusive background of Iphigenia's sacrifice adds further depth to the opening scenes of the *Iliad*, reinforcing the characterization of key protagonists by echoing and recalling their past behavior. Agamemnon, in particular, repeats the same hubristic actions as before, angering both a god and Achilles; he has clearly not learnt from his past mistakes. Moreover, when we recall his own past losses as a parent, his maltreatment of Chryses appears even more heartless. Against the shadow of tradition, Agamemnon emerges as a callous ruler. More generally, Agamemnon's fraught relationships with both Calchas and Achilles also reverberate pointedly against their prior history. These opening scenes are not an isolated occurrence, but rather a repeated—and repeatable—scenario. Indeed, Agamemnon's complaint against Calchas at 1.105–8 stresses this continuity (esp. αἰεί, "always," 1.107); and Agamemnon goes on in the next line to emphasise the parallel between Calchas' past and present conduct: the seer is behaving in the same way "now **too**" (**καὶ** νῦν, 1.109).[117] There is a strong sense of déjà

vu as events at Aulis are replayed on the Trojan shore. Agamemnon's critique of Calchas indexes the larger motif transference at work in Book 1.

The parallel motifs are not only grounded in continuity, however. There is also significant divergence, especially between the fathers Agamemnon and Chryses. As the sequence progresses in the *Iliad*, we have noted an increasing contrast between the pair, as Chryses' joyful reunion with his daughter serves as a foil to Agamemnon's past loss: Iphigenia's tragic fate is defused and reframed in a more positive light. As we noted above, this fits with the *Iliad*'s general downplaying of human sacrifice and immortalization, reducing the supernatural elements of Iphigenia's story to a lingering shadow. But there may also be more at stake here: the *Iliad* begins by implicitly distancing itself from this prior tradition of (attempted) filicide and barbaric human sacrifice. The elaborately described ritual at Chryse (1.458–74) becomes a programmatic archetype of proper orderly sacrifice, a demonstration of how sacrifice should be done—and indeed will be done in the remainder of the poem. Through its divergence from the Iphigenia tale, the *Iliad* begins by underlining that it is not a tale of such perverted violence, but one which rather models the proper ritual conduct of Homer's own audiences.[118]

The comparison of Agamemnon and Chryses also highlights a further aspect of this allusive sequence: the prominence within it of allusive doublets, whereby one traditional character's role is split between two different figures. The Agamemnon of the Iphigenia *fabula* is replayed in the *Iliad* by both Agamemnon himself (abusing Calchas, losing a female possession) and Chryses (facing the loss of a daughter, performing the sacrifice). Such doubling is also apparent in the reworking of Iphigenia: she shares features in common with both Chryseis (a possession of Agamemnon) and Briseis (a potential bride of Achilles). Such a lack of one-to-one mapping between the mythical *fabula* and the *Iliad* could perhaps be thought to undermine my

overall argument for this allusive scheme, but such splitting of a single character's *fabula* can be readily paralleled in other cases of Homeric allusion. Elsewhere in the *Iliad*, both Diomedes and Ajax play the role of the absent Achilles, while both Patroclus and Achilles allusively reflect later events of Achilles' own life and death.[119] Moreover, in the case of Chryseis and Briseis, the two are already close doublets of each other: besides their onomastic similarity (each formed as a patronymic adjective), both are war-prizes of prominent Greek warriors, captured in Achilles' sack of Thebe and Lyrnessus (1.366–69, 2.688–93), and both are described with a similar array of epithets, especially καλλιπάρῃον ("fair-cheeked": Chryseis: 1.143, 310, 369; Briseis: 184, 323, 346).[120] They are thus an apt pair to adapt and recalibrate different aspects of Iphigenia.

Overall, this Iphigenia pattern thus offers further insight into Homeric allusive practice. In its totality, it serves as a parallel for the large-scale motif transference surrounding Achilles' death in the second half of the *Iliad*. As Jonathan Burgess has demonstrated, "many transferred motifs concerning Achilles' death ... occur in extended narrative patterns," reworking traditional sequences of narrative in order, a practice which he has plausibly grounded in archaic modes of performance: ancient rhapsodes and performers appear to have picked up a story in sequence, a custom already reflected in the series of Demodocus's songs in *Odyssey* 8.[121] The Iphigenia pattern of Book 1 parallels this phenomenon, complementing the closing Iliadic prolepsis of Achilles' death with an opening analepsis of Iphigenia's sacrifice. In addition, it inaugurates a whole series of retrospective replays of tradition in the following books, initiating an ongoing allusive pattern.[122] Contrary to common scholarly assumptions, these analeptic patterns are active from the very start of the poem.

However, the presence of this Iphigenia allusion at the very start of the *Iliad* also has a greater significance for the structure of the whole poem. We should note that the Iphigenia myth

has a particularly inceptive aspect: the sacrifice is a key moment of beginning, initiating the expedition against Troy. Of course, there are multiple important "beginnings" in the Trojan war story (including the Judgement of Paris and Paris's theft of Helen), but events on Aulis were crucial for the commencement of the war itself and later tradition certainly considered the sacrifice an important moment of beginning. Lucretius begins the *De Rerum Natura* with a description of the sacrifice (1.82–101), while Statius's *Achilleid*, which promises to lead Achilles through the "whole Trojan story" (*tota ... Troia*, 1.7), begins with the gathering of the Greeks at Aulis and may well have continued in Book 2 with Iphigenia's sacrifice, as Alessandro Barchiesi has argued.[123] Such an initiatory resonance also seems to be presupposed by the likely allusion to Aulis in one of the introductory hymns of the *Theognidea*, framing the episode as a moment of beginning (11–14: see § I (F) above). In *Iliad* 1, then, Homer similarly exploits the story's introductory aspect, aligning the structure of his poem to that of the larger war. By looking back to the sacrifice story, the start of the *Iliad* replays the start of the whole Trojan war. The larger structure of the whole expedition is mapped onto the narrow contours of our epic.

To conclude, however, I would like to suggest that this Iphigenia allusion is only the most extended and elaborate instance of a broader allusive strategy at the start of the *Iliad*. Homer's opening also looks to other major beginnings of the war. The proem's "plan of Zeus" seems to evoke and rework the foundational moment of the whole story: Zeus's "plan" to relieve the overburdened earth by destroying the race of heroes (familiar from the *Cypria* and Hesiodic *Catalogue*). Here too, the *Iliad* looks back to this inaugural moment and incorporates it into its own beginning, redirecting the god's "plan" to focus specifically on Achilles' wrath.[124] Similarly, at a more thematic level, Agamemnon's "theft" of Briseis also parallels Paris's initial abduction of Helen, another major catalyst of strife: like the whole war, the *Iliad* begins with an

episode of contested "bride stealing."[125] The start of the poem thus echoes and reworks multiple key "beginnings" of the larger story: Zeus's plan, the theft of Helen, and the sacrifice of Iphigenia.

With these various inceptive allusions, *Iliad* 1 is thus thoroughly integrated into the broader analeptic replays of the poem's first half, evoking and embracing the wider tradition. But more than that, it also exhibits an alert self-awareness about its own place in that tradition. It was always a challenge to commence an epic poem because there were so many possible different starting points available—a challenge that is explicitly recognized in the *Odyssey*'s instruction for its Muse to begin "from any point" (ἀμόθεν, *Od*. 1.10). The start of the *Iliad* equally faces up to this challenge, but comes to a rather different solution: it legitimizes its opening by incorporating and reworking the war's earlier major starting points. In a way, the *Iliad* is restarting the song of Troy, and to do so most effectively, it both acknowledges and appropriates multiple other beginnings.

WORKS CITED

Ahl, F. M. 1976. *Lucan: An Introduction*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Alden, M. 2017. *Para-Narratives in the* Odyssey*: Stories in the Frame*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Allan, W. 2008. "Performing the Will of Zeus: The Διὸς βουλή and the Scope of Early Greek Epic." In Revermann, M. and Wilson, P. eds. *Performance, Iconography, Reception: Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 204–16.

Anderson, M. J. 1997. *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Apergis, C. 2017. *Τα* Κύπρια *και η μυθική παράδοση Ελλάδας και Ανατολής: συγκριτικές αναγνώσεις*. MA Diss. University of Athens.

Aretz, S. 1999. *Die Opferung der Iphigenia in Aulis: Die Rezeption des Mythos in antiken und modernen Dramen*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Arft, J. 2019. "*Agnoēsis* and the Death of Odysseus in the *Odyssey* and the *Telegony*." *YAGE* 3: 158–79.

____. Forthcoming. "Repetition or Recurrence? A Traditional Use for ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει in Archaic Greek Poetry." In Beck, D. ed. *Repetition, Communication, and Meaning in the Ancient World*. Leiden: Brill.

Armstrong, D., and Ratchford, E. A. 1985. "Iphigenia's Veil: Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 228–48." *BICS* 32: 1–12.

Bachvarova, M. R. 2018. "Formed on the Festival Stage: Plot and Characterization in the *Iliad* as a Competitive Collaborative Process." In Ready, J. L. and Tsagalis, C. C. eds. *Homer in Performance: Rhapsodes, Narrators, and Characters*. Austin: University of Texas Press. 151–77.

Bakker, E. J. 2013. *The Meaning of Meat and the Structure of the* Odyssey. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Barchiesi, A. 2020. "Testo e frammento nell'*Achilleide* di Stazio." In Papini, M. ed. *Opus Imperfectum: Monumenti e testi incompiuti del mondo greco e romano*. Scienze dell'Antichità 25.3. Rome: Quasar. 287–300.

Barker, E.T.E. 2008. "Momos Advises Zeus: Changing Representations of 'Cypria' Fragment 1." In Cingano, E. and Milano, L. eds. *Papers on Ancient Literatures: Greece, Rome and the Near East.* Padova: S.A.R.G.O.N. Editrice e Libreria. 33–73.

____. 2009. *Entering the* Agōn*: Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography and Tragedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barker, E.T.E., and Christensen, J. P. 2008. "Oedipus of Many Pains: Strategies of Contest in the Homeric Poems." *LICS* 7: 1–30.

____. 2020. *Homer's Thebes: Epic Rivalries and the Appropriation of Mythical Pasts*. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies.

Beck, D. 2005. *Homeric Conversation*. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies.

Blickman, D. R. 1987. "The Role of the Plague in the *Iliad*." *ClAnt* 6: 1–10.

Blundell, M. W. 1987. "The Moral Character of Odysseus in *Philoctetes*." *GRBS* 28: 307–29.

Bonnechère, P. 1994. *Le sacrifice humain en Grèce ancienne*. Athens: Centre international d'étude de la religion grecque antique.

Bouvier, D. 2002. *Le sceptre et la lyre. L'*Iliade *ou les héros de la mémoire.* Grenoble: Éditions Jérôme Millon.

Bowie, A. M. 2019. *Homer:* Iliad *Book III*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bowra, C. M. 1930. *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bremmer, J. N. 2002. "Sacrificing a Child in Ancient Greece: The Case of Iphigenia." In Noort, E. and Tigchelaar, E.J.C. eds. *The Sacrifice of Isaac: The Aqedah (Genesis 22) and Its Interpretations*. Leiden: Brill. 21–43.

Brown, R. 2019. "Lucretius' Use of the Name Iphianassa (*De Rerum Natura* 1.85)." *CQ* 69: 715–24.

Burgess, J. S. 2001. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

____. 2005. “The Death of Achilles by Rhapsodes.” In Rabel, R. J. ed. *Approaches to Homer, Ancient & Modern*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales. 119–34.

____. 2006. “Neoanalysis, Orality, and Intertextuality: An Examination of Homeric Motif Transference.” *Oral Tradition* 21: 148–89.

____. 2009. *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

____. 2012. “Intertextuality without Text in Early Greek Epic.” In Andersen, Ø. and Haug, D.T.T. eds. *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 168–83.

____. 2017. “The Tale of Meleager in the *Iliad*.” *Oral Tradition* 31: 51–76.

____. 2019. “The Corpse of Odysseus.” *YAGE* 3: 136–57.

Cairns, D. L. ed. 2001a. *Oxford Readings in Homer’s* Iliad. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

____. 2001b. “Introduction.” In Cairns, ed. 1–56.

Cameron, A. 2004. *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Carpenter, T. H. 1994. “The Terrible Twins in Sixth-Century Attic Art.” In Solomon, J. ed. *Apollo: Origins and Influences*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press. 61–79.

Casabona, J. 1966. *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec, des origines à la fin de l’époque classique*. Aix-en-Provence: Éditions Ophrys.

Cèbe, J.-P. 1975. *Varron, Satires ménippées: édition, traduction et commentaire*. Vol. 3: *Caprinum proelium – Endymiones*. Rome: École française de Rome.

Chong-Gossard, J.H.K.O. 2008. *Gender and Communication in Euripides’ Plays: Between Song and Silence*. Leiden: Brill.

Christensen, J. P. 2019. “Revising Athena’s Rage: Cassandra and the Homeric Appropriation of *Nostos*.” *YAGE* 3: 88–116.

Clark, M. 1998. “Chryses’ Supplication: Speech Act and Mythological Allusion.” *ClAnt* 17: 5–24.

Clark, M. E. 1986. “Neoanalysis: A Bibliographical Review.” *CW* 79: 379–94.

Clay, J. S. 2005. “The Beginning and End of the *Catalogue of Women* and Its Relation to Hesiod.” In Hunter, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 25–34.

Clément, P. 1934. “New Evidence for the Origin of the Iphigeneia Legend.” *AC* 3: 393–409.

Cole, S. 2008. “Annotated Innovation in Euripides’ *Ion*.” *CQ* 58: 313–15.

Collard, C., and Morwood, J. 2017. *Euripides:* Iphigenia at Aulis*. Edited with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary.* 2 vols. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Cunningham, M. L. 1984. “Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 231–247.” *BICS* 31: 9–12.

Currie, B.G.F. 2006. “Homer and the Early Epic Tradition.” In Clarke, M. J., Currie, B.G.F., and Lyne, R.O.A.M. eds. *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1–45.

____. 2015. “*Cypria*.” In Fantuzzi and Tsagalis, eds. 281–305.

____. 2016. *Homer’s Allusive Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Danek, G. 1998. *Epos und Zitat: Studien zu den Quellen der Odyssee*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Danek, G. 2010. “Agamemnon’s Ancestors and Ruža’s Bridegroom: *Il*. 2.99–109 and a Bosnian Parallel.” *Trends in Classics* 2: 225–38.

____. 2016. “Modes of Intertextuality in Homer and Bosnian Epic.” In Gallo, F. ed. *Omero: quaestiones disputatae*. Milan: Biblioteca ambrosiana. 123–45.

Davidson, J. F. 1990. “The Daughters of Agamemnon (Soph. *El*. 153–63).” *RhM* 133: 407–9.

Davies, M. 1989. *The Epic Cycle*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.

____. 1991. *Sophocles:* Trachiniae. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

____. 2010. “‘Sins of the Fathers’: Omitted Sacrifices and Offended Deities in Greek Literature and the Folk-tale.” *Eikasmos* 21: 331–55.

____. 2019. *The* Cypria. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies.

Davies, M., and Finglass, P. 2014. *Stesichorus: The Poems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Debiasi, A. 2013. “*POxy* XXX 2513: Ifigenia nei *Korinthiaká* di Eumelo.” *ZPE* 184: 21–36.

Dowden, K. 1989. *Death and the Maiden: Girls’ Initiation Rites in Greek Mythology*. London: Routledge.

____. 1996. “Homer’s Sense of Text.” *JHS* 116: 47–61.

____. 2008. “Diktys of Crete (*BNJ* 49).” In Worthington ed. *Brill’s New Jacoby*: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj_a49.

Draper, P. A. 2002. Iliad*, Book 1: Homer. With Notes and Vocabulary*. Ann Arbor: University Press of Michigan.

Dué, C. 2002. *Homeric Variations on a Lament by Briseis*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Dürrbach, F. 1926. *Inscriptions de Délos: comptes des hiéropes (N^{os} 290–371)*. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion.

Edmunds, L. 2016. “Intertextuality without Texts in Archaic Greek Verse and the Plan of Zeus.” *SyllClass* 27: 1–27.

Edwards, M. W. 1980. “Convention and Individuality in *Iliad* 1.” *HSCP* 84: 1–28.

____. 1987. *Homer: Poet of the* Iliad. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Else, G. F. 1957. *Aristotle’s Poetics: The Argument*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Erbse, H., ed. 1969–1988. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia Vetera)*. 7 vols. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Fantuzzi, M. 2012. *Achilles in Love: Intertextual Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fantuzzi, M. and Tsagalis, C. C. eds. 2015. *The Greek Epic Cycle and Its Ancient Reception: A Companion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Faraone, C. A. 1992. *Talismans and Trojan Horses: Guardian Statues in Ancient Greek Myth and Ritual*. New York: Oxford University Press.

____. 2016. “On the Eve of Epic: Did the Chryses Episode in *Iliad* 1 Begin Its Life as a Separate Homeric Hymn?” In Kliger, I. and Maslov, B. eds. *Persistent Forms: Explorations in Historical Poetics*. New York: Fordham University Press. 397–428.

Farrell, J. 2005. “Intention and Intertext.” *Phoenix* 59: 98–111.

Fenik, B. 1974. *Studies in the* Odyssey. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Finglass, P. J. 2007a. *Pindar: Pythian Eleven*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

____. 2007b. *Sophocles: Electra*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Finkelberg, M. 2002. “The Sources of *Iliad* 7.” *ColbyQ* 38: 151-61 [= Finkelberg 2020: 140–49].

____. 2015. “Meta-Cyclic Epic and Homeric Poetry.” In Fantuzzi and Tsagalis, eds. 126-38 [= Finkelberg 2020: 169–81].

____. 2020. *Homer and Early Greek Epic: Collected Essays*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Foley, H. P. 1982. “Marriage and Sacrifice in Euripides’ *Iphigenia in Aulis*.” *Arethusa* 15: 159–80.

Foley, J. M. 1991. *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

____. 1999. *Homer's Traditional Art*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Foley, J. M., and Arft, J. 2015. "The Epic Cycle and Oral Tradition." In Fantuzzi and Tsagalis, eds. 78–95.

Ford, A. L. 1992. *Homer: The Poetry of the Past*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Forte, A.S.W. 2017. *Tracing Homeric Metaphor*. PhD Diss. Harvard University.

Fowler, R. L. 1987. *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Fraenkel, E. 1950. *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Franko, G. F. 2005. "The Trojan Horse at the Close of the *Iliad*." *CJ* 101: 121–23.

Frazer, J. G. 1921. *Apollodorus: The Library*. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Friedrich, R. 2002. "'Flaubertian Homer': The *Phrase Juste* in Homeric Diction." *Arion* 10: 1–13.

Gagné, R. 2013. *Ancestral Fault in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gantz, T. 1996. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gow, A.S.F., and Scholfield, A. F. 1953. *Nicander: The Poems and Poetical Fragments. Edited with a Translation and Notes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graf, F. 2009. *Apollo*. London: Routledge.

Griffin, J. 1977. "The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer." *JHS* 97: 39–53.

____. 1995. *Homer:* Iliad *Book 9. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Griffin, J., and Hammond, M. 1982. “Critical Appreciations VI: Homer, *Iliad* 1.1–52.” *G&R* 29: 126–42.

Griffith, M. 1990. “Contest and Contradiction in Early Greek Poetry.” In Griffith, M. and Mastronarde, D. J. eds. *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer*. Atlanta: Scholars Press. 185–207.

Gurd, S. A. 2005. *Iphigenias at Aulis: Textual Multiplicity, Radical Philology*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Haft, A. J. 1990. “‘The City-Sacker Odysseus’ in *Iliad* 2 and 10.” *TAPA* 120: 37–56.

Hainsworth, J. B. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 3: *Books 9–12*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hansen, W. F. 2002. *Ariadne’s Thread: A Guide to International Tales Found in Classical Literature*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Heath, M. 2002. *Interpreting Classical Texts*. London: Duckworth.

Henrichs, A. 1981. “Human Sacrifice in Greek Religion: Three Case Studies.” In Rudhardt, J. and Reverdin, O. eds. *Le sacrifice dans l’antiquité*: *huit exposés suivis de discussions*. Geneva: Fondation Hardt. 195–242.

Heslin, P. J. 2011. “Achilles”: Review of Burgess (2009). *CR* 61: 356–57.

Heubeck, A. 1992. “Books XXIII–XXIV.” In Russo, J., Fernández-Galiano, M., and Heubeck, A. eds. *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey*. Vol. 3: *Books XVII–XXIV*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 311–418.

Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holmberg, I. 1998. “The Creation of the Ancient Epic Cycle.” *Oral Tradition* 13: 456–78.

Holoka, J. P. 1983. "'Looking Darkly' (ὑπόδρα ἰδών): Reflections on Status and Decorum in Homer." *TAPA* 113: 1–16.

Hooker, J. T. 1987. "Homeric φίλος." *Glotta* 65: 44–65.

Horn, F. 2021. "The Death of Achilles in the *Iliad*: Motif Transference and Poetic Technique." *Mnemosyne* 74: 1–28.

Hughes, D. D. 1991. *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*. London: Routledge.

Hunter, R. L. ed. 2005. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

____. 2018. *The Measure of Homer: The Ancient Reception of the* Iliad *and the* Odyssey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Janko, R. 1982. "P.Oxy. 2513: Hexameters on the Sacrifice of Iphigeneia?" *ZPE* 49: 25–29.

Jenkins, I. 1983. "Is There Life after Marriage? A Study of the Abduction Motif in Vase Paintings of the Athenian Wedding Ceremony." *BICS* 30: 137–45.

Jensen, M. S. 2009. "Artemis in Homer." In Fischer-Hansen, T. and Poulsen, B. eds. *From Artemis to Diana: The Goddess of Man and Beast*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press. 51–60.

de Jong, I.J.F. 2007. "Homer." In de Jong, I.J.F. and Nünlist, R. eds. *Time in Ancient Greek Literature*. Leiden: Brill. 17–37.

Jouan, F. 1966. *Euripide et les légendes des* Chants cypriens*: des origines de la guerre de Troie à l'* Iliade. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

____. 1984. "Autour du sacrifice d'Iphigénie." In *Texte et image*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. 61–74.

Jouanna, J. 2012. “Air, Miasma and Contagion in the Time of Hippocrates and the Survival of Miasma in Post-Hippocratic Medicine (Rufus of Ephesus, Galen and Palladius).” In *Greek Medicine from Hippocrates to Galen: Selected Papers*. Tr. by N. Allies. Ed. by P. van der Eijk. Leiden: Brill. 121–36.

Kahil, L., and Linant de Bellefonds, P. 1990. “Iphigeneia.” In *LIMC V, Herakles – Kenchrias*. Zurich: Artemis Verlag. I 706–29, II 466–80.

Kakridis, J. Th. 1971. “The First Scene with Chryses in the *Iliad*.” In *Homer Revisited*. Lund: Gleerup. 125–37.

Kelly, A. 2007a. *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to* Iliad *VIII*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

____. 2007b. “How to End an Orally-Derived Epic Poem.” *TAPA* 137: 371–402.

____. 2008. “The Ending of *Iliad* 7: A Response.” *Philologus* 152: 5–17.

____. 2012. “The Mourning of Thetis: ‘Allusion’ and the Future in the *Iliad*.” In Montanari, Rengakos and Tsagalis, eds. 221–65.

____. 2015. “Stesichorus’ Homer.” In Finglass, P. J. and Kelly, A. eds. *Stesichorus in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 21–44.

Kirk, G. S. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 1: *Books 1–4*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kovacs, D. 2003. “Toward a Reconstruction of *Iphigenia Aulidensis*.” *JHS* 123: 77–103.

Kullmann, W. 1955. “Ein vorhomerisches Motiv im Iliasproömium.” *Philologus* 99: 167–92 [= Kullmann 1992: 11–35].

____. 1960. *Die Quellen der Ilias (Troischer Sagenkreis).* Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

____. 1965. “Die Töchter Agamemnons in der Ilias.” *Gymnasium* 72: 200–203 [= Kullmann 1992: 64–66].

____. 1968. “Vergangenheit Und Zukunft in der Ilias.” *Poetica* 2: 15-37 [= Kullmann 1992: 219–42; tr. as Kullmann 2001].

____. 1984. “Oral Poetry Theory and Neoanalysis in Homeric Research.” *GRBS* 25: 307–23 [= Kullmann 1992: 140–55].

____. 1991. “Ergebnisse der motivgeschichtlichen Forschung zu Homer (Neoanalyse).” In Latacz, J. ed. *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung: Rückblick und Ausblick*. Stuttgart: Teubner. 425–55 [= Kullmann 1992: 100–34].

____. 1992. *Homerische Motive: Beiträge zur Entstehung, Eigenart und Wirkung von Ilias und Odyssee*. Ed. by R. J. Müller. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

____. 2001. “Past and Future in the *Iliad*.” In Cairns, ed. 385–408 [tr. of Kullmann 1968].

____. 2015. “Motif and Source Research: Neoanalysis, Homer, and Cyclic Epic.” In Fantuzzi and Tsagalis, eds. 108–25.

Labarbe, J. 1993. “Une prière de Théognis (11–14).” *AC* 62: 23–33.

Langholf, V. 2010. “φίλος.” In Snell, B. ed. *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos. 24. Lieferung: φή – χαλκός*. Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht. cols. 929–52.

Latacz, J., Nünlist, R., and Stoevesandt, M. 2009. *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar. Band I: Erster Gesang (A). Faszikel 2: Kommentar*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Latte, K., and Cunningham, I. C. 2020. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon.* Vol. 2a*: Epsilon – Iota.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Lévi-Strauss, C. 1955. “The Structural Study of Myth.” *The Journal of American Folklore* 68: 428–44.

____. 1958. *Anthropologie structurale*. Paris: Librairie Plon.

LIMC = 1981–2009. *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*. Zurich: Artemis Verlag.

Lloyd-Jones, H. 1983. "Artemis and Iphigeneia." *JHS* 103: 87–102.

Louden, B. 2006. *The* Iliad*: Structure, Myth, and Meaning*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lowenstam, S. 1993. "The Arming of Achilleus on Early Greek Vases." *ClAnt* 12: 199–218.

____. 1997. "Talking Vases: The Relationship between the Homeric Poems and Archaic Representations of Epic Myth." *TAPA* 127: 21–76.

Löwy, E. 1929. "Der Schluß der Iphigeneia in Aulis." *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien* 24: 1–41.

Lübeck, M. H. 1993. *Iphigeneia, Agamemnon's Daughter: A Study of Ancient Conceptions in Greek Myth and Literature Associated with the Atrides*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. 1978. *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, D. J. 1997. *Gender and Immortality: Heroines in Ancient Greek Myth and Cult*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

March, J. R. 1987. *The Creative Poet: Studies on the Treatment of Myths in Greek Poetry*. London: University of London, Institute of Classical Studies.

Marcotte, D. 1982–1984. "Eine fromme Stiftung des Agamemnon." *Acta Ant. Hung.* 30: 45–55.

____. 1990. *Le poème géographique de Dionysios, fils de Calliphon: édition, traduction et commentaire*. Leuven: Peeters.

Marks, J. 2003. "Alternative Odysseys: The Case of Thoas and Odysseus." *TAPA* 133: 209–26.

Masters, J. 1992. *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's* Bellum Civile. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mastronarde, D. J. 2002. *Euripides: Medea*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mazon, P. 1914. *Hésiode: Les travaux et les jours*. Paris: Hachette.

McDermott, E. A. 1987. "*Medea* Line 37: A Note." *AJP* 108: 158–61.

____. 1991. "Double Meaning and Mythic Novelty in Euripides' Plays." *TAPA* 121: 123–32.

Medda, E. 2017. *Eschilo:* Agamennone*. Edizione critica, traduzione e commento*. 3 vols. Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei.

Merkelbach, R., and West, M. L. 1967. *Fragmenta Hesiodea*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Miliett, P. 2007. "Isaac and Iphigeneia." *European Judaism: A Journal for the New Europe* 40: 116–31.

Mitsis, P. 2010. "Achilles *Polytropos* and Odysseus as Suitor: *Iliad* 9.307–429." In Mitsis, P. and Tsagalis, C. C. eds. *Allusion, Authority, and Truth: Critical Perspectives on Greek Poetic and Rhetorical Praxis*. Berlin: De Gruyter. 51–76.

Monro, D. B., and Allen, T. W. 1920. *Homeri opera*. *Tomus I: Iliadis libros I–XII continens. Tomus II: Iliadis Libros XIII–XXIV continens*. 3rd edn. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Montanari, F., Rengakos, A., and Tsagalis, C. C. eds. 2012. *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Montiglio, S. 2011. *From Villain to Hero: Odysseus in Ancient Thought*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Mossman, J. 2011. *Euripides:* Medea*, with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Oxford: Aris & Phillips.

Most, G. W. 2018. *Hesiod*. 2 vols. 2nd edn. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Muellner, L. C. 1976. *The Meaning of Homeric εὔχομαι Through Its Formulas*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Nagy, G. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Revised ed. 1999. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

____. 1990. *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Nelson, T. J. Forthcoming a. *Markers of Allusion in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

____. Forthcoming b. "Talk and Text: The Pre-Alexandrian Footnote from Homer to Theodectes." In Kelly, A. and Spelman, H. L. eds. *Texts and Intertexts in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ormand, K. 2017. "Helen's Phantom in Fragments." In Tsagalis, C. C. ed. *Poetry in Fragments: Studies on the Hesiodic Corpus and Its Afterlife*. Berlin: De Gruyter. 115–34.

Page, D. L. 1934. *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy: Studied with Special Reference to Euripides'* Iphigeneia in Aulis. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

____. 1962. *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Papaioannou, S. 2007. *Redesigning Achilles: "Recycling" the Epic Cycle in the "Little Iliad" (Ovid, Metamorphoses 12.1–13.622)*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Parker, L.P.E. 2016. *Euripides:* Iphigenia in Tauris*. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Perutelli, A. 1998. "Ifigenia in Lucrezio." *SCO* 46: 193–207.

Poltera, O. 2008. *Simonides lyricus: Testimonia und Fragmente. Einleitung, kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Basel: Schwabe.

Porter, A. E. 2019. *Agamemnon, the Pathetic Despot: Reading Characterization in Homer*. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies.

Prag, A.J.N.W. 1985. *The Oresteia: Iconographic and Narrative Tradition*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

Pulleyn, S. 2000. *Homer:* Iliad*, Book I. Edited with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

____. 2019. *Homer:* Odyssey*, Book I. Edited with an Introduction, Translation, Commentary, and Glossary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Purves, A. C. 2010. "Wind and Time in Homeric Epic." *TAPA* 140: 323–50.

Rabel, R. J. 1988. "Chryses and the Opening of the *Iliad*." *AJP* 109: 473–81.

____. 1990. "Apollo as a Model for Achilles in the *Iliad*." *AJP* 111: 429–40.

Radding, J. 2015. "Clytemnestra at Aulis: Euripides and the Reconsideration of Tradition." *GRBS* 55: 832–62.

Radif, L. 2002. *L'Iliade al quadrato: retorica dell'allusività e miti concorrenti*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Raeburn, D. A., and Thomas, O. 2011. *The* Agamemnon *of Aeschylus: A Commentary for Students*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ready, J. L. 2019. *Orality, Textuality, and the Homeric Epics: An Interdisciplinary Study of Oral Texts, Dictated Texts, and Wild Texts*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Reece, S. 2011. "Penelope's 'Early Recognition' of Odysseus from a Neoanalytic and Oral Perspective." *College Literature* 38: 101–17.

Reinhardt, K. 1938. *Das Parisurteil*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann [= Reinhardt 1960: 16–36; tr. in Jones and Wright 1997: 170–91].

____. 1960. *Tradition und Geist: Gesammelte Essays zur Dichtung*. Ed. by C. Becker. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Rengakos, A. 2004. "Die *Argonautika* und das 'kyklische Gedicht'. Bemerkungen zur Erzähltechnik des griechischen Epos." In Bierl, A., Schmitt, A., and Willi, A. eds. *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung. Festschrift für Joachim Latacz anlässlich seines 70. Geburtstages*. Munich: K. G. Saur. 277–304.

____. 2007. "The Smile of Achilles, or the *Iliad* and Its Mirror-Image." In Païsi-Apostolopoulou, M., Rengakos, A., and Tsagalis, C. C. eds. *Contests and Rewards in the Homeric Epics*. Ithaca: Centre for Odyssean Studies. 101–10.

____. 2020. "Neoanalysis and Oral Poetry: A Historic Compromise?" In Rengakos, A., Finglass, P. J., and Zimmermann, B. eds. *More than Homer Knew – Studies on Homer and His Ancient Commentators*. Berlin: De Gruyter. 37–49.

____. Forthcoming. *Homeric Poetry and Neoanalysis*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Richardson, N. J. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

____. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 6: *Books 21–24*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robbins, E. I. 1986. "Pindar's *Oresteia* and the Tragedians." In Cropp, M., Fantham, E., and Scully, S. E. eds. *Greek Tragedy and Its Legacy*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press. 1–11 [= Robbins 2013: 217–28].

____. 2013. *Thalia Delighting in Song: Essays on Ancient Greek Poetry*. Ed. by B. MacLachlan. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Robinson, D. 1990. “Homeric φίλος: Love of Life and Limbs, and Friendship with One’s θυμός.” In Craik, E. M. ed. *Owls to Athens: Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 97–108.

Rutherford, I. C. 2005. “Mestra at Athens: Hesiod Fr. 43 and the Poetics of Panhellenism.” In Hunter, ed. 99–117.

Saladino, V. 1990. “Kalchas.” In *LIMC V, Herakles – Kenchrias*. Zurich: Artemis Verlag. I 931–35, II 601–2.

Sammons, B. 2017. *Device and Composition in the Greek Epic Cycle*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schein, S. L. 1984. *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer’s* Iliad. Berkeley: University of California Press.

____. 2002. “Mythological Allusion in the *Odyssey*.” In Montanari, F. and Ascheri, P. eds. *Omero tremila anni dopo*. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura. 85–101 [= Schein 2016: 39–54].

____. 2016. *Homeric Epic and Its Reception*. New York: Oxford University Press.

____. Forthcoming. *Homer:* Iliad *Book I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schironi, F. 2018. *The Best of the Grammarians: Aristarchus of Samothrace on the* Iliad. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Scodel, R. S. 2002. *Listening to Homer: Tradition, Narrative, and Audience*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

____. 2012. “Hesiod and the Epic Cycle.” In Montanari, Rengakos and Tsagalis, eds. 501–15.

Seaford, R. 1987. “The Tragic Wedding.” *JHS* 107: 106–30.

____. 1989. “Homeric and Tragic Sacrifice.” *TAPA* 119: 87–95.

Séchan, L. 1967. *Études sur la tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique*. 2nd edn. Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion.

Selle, H. 2008. *Theognis und die Theognidea*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Severyns, A. 1928. *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque*. Liège: H. Vaillant-Carmanne.

Slatkin, L. M. 1991. *The Power of Thetis: Allusion and Interpretation in the* Iliad. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Snell, B., Kannicht, R., and Radt, S. L. 1971–2004. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. 5 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Snodgrass, A. M. 1998. *Homer and the Artists: Text and Picture in Early Greek Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Solmsen, F. 1981. "The Sacrifice of Agamemnon's Daughter in Hesiod's *Ehoeae*." *AJP* 102: 353–58.

Stanford, W. B. 1963. *The Ulysses Theme: A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Stephens, S. A. 2015. *Callimachus:* The Hymns*. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Stocking, C. H. 2017. *The Politics of Sacrifice in Early Greek Myth and Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Suzuki, M. 1989. *Metamorphoses of Helen: Authority, Difference, and the Epic*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Taplin, O. 1992. *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of the* Iliad. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Taylor, B. 2016. "Rationalism and the Theatre in Lucretius." *CQ* 66: 140–54.

van Thiel, H. 2014. *Scholia D in Iliadem: Proecdosis Aucta et Correctior*. Cologne: Universitäts- und Stadtbibliothek Köln.

Torrance, I. 2013. *Metapoetry in Euripides*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tsagalis, C. C. 2008. *The Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics*. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies.

____. 2011a. "Intertextuality." In Finkelberg, M. ed. *The Homer Encyclopedia*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. II 413–14.

____. 2011b. "Towards an Oral, Intertextual Neoanalysis." *Trends in Classics* 3: 209–44.

____. 2014. "γυναίων εἵνεκα δώρων: Interformularity and Intertraditionality in Theban and Homeric Epic." *Trends in Classics* 6: 357–98.

van der Valk, M.H.A.L.H. 1971–1987. *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill.

Welcker, F. G. 1865–1882. *Der epische Cyclus, oder die homerischen Dicter*. 2 vols. 2nd edn. Bonn: E. Weber.

West, M. L. 1978. *Hesiod: Works & Days. Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

____. 1979. "The Parodos of the *Agamemnon*." *CQ* 29: 1–6 [= West 2011–2013: II 215–22].

____. 2003. *Greek Epic Fragments: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

____. 2011. *The Making of the* Iliad*: Disquisition and Analytical Commentary*. New York: Oxford University Press.

____. 2011–2013. *Hellenica: Selected Papers on Greek Literature and Thought*. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

____. 2013. *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

____. 2014. *The Making of the* Odyssey. New York: Oxford University Press.

Whitman, C. H. 1958. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Willcock, M. M. 1973. "The Funeral Games of Patroclus." *BICS* 20: 1–11.

____. 1978–1984. *The Iliad of Homer. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. 2 vols. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Worman, N. 1999. "Odysseus *Panourgos*: The Liar's Style in Tragedy and Oratory." *Helios* 26: 35–68.

Worthington, I. ed. 2007–. *Brill's New Jacoby*: http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/brill-s-new-jacoby.

Wright, G. M., and Jones, P. V. 1997. *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Zieliński, T. 1925. *Tragodumenon libri tres*. Kraków: Gebethner et Wolff.

---

* For useful feedback on earlier versions of this paper, I am very grateful to seminar audiences in Cambridge and many generous readers. I am particularly indebted to Justin Arft, Elton Barker, Jonathan Burgess, Olivia Elder, Alex Forte, Richard Hunter, Talitha Kearey, Adrian Kelly, Max Leventhal, Henry Spelman, Henry Tang, Matthew Ward, Alan Woolley, and the editors and referees of *TAPA*.

The *Iliad* is cited from Monro and Allen 1920; the Iliadic scholia from Erbse 1969–1988 and van Thiel 2014; epic fragments from West 2003 (*GEF*); Hesiodic fragments from Merkelbach and West 1967 (M–W); tragic fragments from Snell, Kannicht and Radt 1971–

2004 (*TrGF*); and fragments of "Greek historians" from Worthington 2007– (*BNJ*). All translations are my own.

[1] Schein 1984: 19–28; Kullmann 2001: 388–89; Burgess 2006: 167–69; de Jong 2007. This phenomenon was already recognized by Aristotle (*Poet*. 23.1459a34–36; Else 1957: 585–86) and Eustathius (Rengakos 2004: 292). On my use of "allusion," see below.

[2] Bowra 1930: 110–13; Whitman 1958: 265, 269–70; Edwards 1987: 188–97; Taplin 1992: 83–109; Bowie 2019: 9–12. Paris and Helen: Reinhardt 1938; Hunter 2018: 71–75. Cf. too Finkelberg 2002 on *Iliad* 7.

[3] Achilles' death: e.g., Burgess 2009: 72–97; Horn 2021. Hector's death: e.g., Schein 1984: 24–25, 176; Papaioannou 2007: 210–12. Funeral games: e.g., Whitman 1958: 263–64; Kullmann 1960: 333–35, 350, 356; Willcock 1973; Richardson 1993: 202–3; Rengakos 2007: 107–8; Forte 2017: 65–104. For allusions to the Trojan horse at the end of the poem, see too Franko 2005.

[4] See, e.g., Tsagalis 2011a: 413, who specifies "*Iliad* 2–7" as the books which contain "indirect reverberation" of the earlier parts of the war; cf. Whitman 1958: 269 ("Books III to VII"); Schein 1984: 19 ("Books 2–4"); Finkelberg 2002: 158 ("Books 2–7").

[5] The most notable exception remains Slatkin's analysis (1991) of how *Iliad* 1 alludes to the wider relationship of Thetis and Zeus, the role of Briareus, and possible traditions about Achilles' birth (esp. *Il*. 1.394–406), although her focus is more on cosmic history and the divine succession myth than the immediate events of the Trojan war. Some scholars also see a possible allusion to Zeus's initial motivation for the war in the Iliadic proem (see § III below with n124), but this is rarely considered part of the broader analeptic pattern of the following books.

[6] See n77 below. Some of the further parallels that I explore here have been noted in passing by Aretz 1999: 51, Scodel 2002: 106 and Currie 2015: 291–92, but no previous scholar has acknowledged the whole pattern or considered its larger significance.

[7] Throughout, I employ the phrase "Iphigenia's sacrifice" as a shorthand to refer to the myth of Agamemnon's attempted sacrifice of his child, whether or not she was ultimately killed: see § I (E) below.

[8] Neoanalysis: e.g., M. E. Clark 1986; Kullmann 1991; Currie 2016; Rengakos forthcoming. Traditional Referentiality: e.g., J. M. Foley 1991; 1999; Kelly 2007a; Barker and Christensen 2008; 2020; J. M. Foley and Arft 2015; Arft forthcoming.

[9] E.g., Kullmann 1984; Danek 1998; 2016: 142 ("oral traditional intertextuality"); Reece 2011 ("neoanalysis with an oral twist"). Cf. Rengakos 2020.

[10] Key recent interventions in the debate include: Burgess 2006; 2009: 56–71; 2012; Tsagalis 2008; 2011b; 2014; Kelly 2012; Bakker 2013: 157–69; Currie 2016: 1–38, 259–62; Edmunds 2016; Barker and Christensen 2020: 11–43.

[11] For this use of *fabula*, see Burgess 2006: 160 with n30; 2009: 27; 2017: 53–55; Christensen 2019: 94–98. Cf. too the concept of a *Faktenkanon* ("canon of facts"): Kullmann 1960: 12–13; Dowden 1996: 51–52. For ease of expression, I use "Homer" throughout to refer to the constructed author of the *Iliad*, even if there are grave uncertainties regarding the historicity of this figure; cf. Hinds 1998: 50 on the "intention-bearing author" as "a discourse which is good to think with."

[12] On Homeric "motif transference," see esp. Burgess 2006; 2009: 64–71; Kullmann 2015.

[13] For the concept of "oral texts," see Ready 2019: 15–74.

[14] My use of "allusion" is thus comparable to Slatkin 1991 and Schein 2002. Contrast Currie 2016, who is more inclined to see direct interaction with other "passages" and "texts." On allusion and intention more generally, see Hinds 1998: 47–50; Heath 2002: 59–97; Farrell 2005. For fuller discussion of my approach to early Greek allusion, see Nelson forthcoming a: § I.2.

[15] Other possible references to events on Aulis have been identified in Hesiod fr. 204.105–39 M–W (Clay 2005: 32–34) and in some exiguous hexameter fragments preserved by *P. Oxy*. 2513, which might come from the *Cypria* (Janko 1982) or Eumelus's *Corinthiaca* (Debiasi 2013).

[16] See Simon. 315a Poltera = 608 fr. 1+2 *PMG* = *P. Oxy*. 2434, a papyrus fragment of what may be a Simonidean commentary (cf. ὁ Σιμῳ[νίδης, l. 2) which mentions a female sacrificial victim (τὴν σφαζομέν[ην], l. 10), maternal grief (ll. 13–16), a group of mourners (ll. 22–23), a killing conducted "to honor a deity" (ἐπὶ τιμῇ τοῦ | δαιμ[ονίο]υ, ll. 24–26), and a "grievous hurricane" (βαρεῖα λᾳί-|λαψ, ll. 29–30); these details all plausibly map onto the Iphigenia myth: March 1987: 93–98; Poltera 2008: 562; contrast Finglass 2007a: 95. The myth might also have been treated by the lyric poet Xanthus, an apparent source for Stesichorus's *Oresteia* (699–700 *PMG*).

[17] For a similar approach to the *fabula* of Achilles' death, see Burgess 2009: 27–42, developed further by Horn 2021.

[18] Compare Lévi-Strauss's concept of "mythemes," the "constituent units" of a mythic narrative (1958); cf. already Lévi-Strauss 1955.

[19] Cf. Barker 2008: 46–55; Heslin 2011: 356; West 2013: 18–20.

[20] Cf. Burgess 2006: 150; 2009: 2, citing his important 2001 study, esp. 35–44, 53–114. Art: Snodgrass 1998; Lowenstam 1993; 1997; Cairns 2001b: 6–7. Literature: Fowler 1987: 20–39; Burgess 2001: 114–31; Kelly 2015.

[21] Burgess 2009: 3, cf. 2006: 153; 2019: 137–38.

[22] Cf. the pragmatic assessment of Marks 2003: 223: post-Homeric evidence "still offers our best approximation of the kinds of stories that would have been known to poets [...] and to their audiences."

[23] E.g., Nagy 1990: 72; Holmberg 1998; Burgess 2001; Finkelberg 2015: 127. Few fragments of the Cyclic epics remain extant, so we are largely dependent on Proclus's far later prose summaries: see Barker 2008: 46–55; Currie 2016: 229–33. Yet despite their selectivity, these summaries still seem a generally reliable guide to the original poems: Sammons 2017: 225–38.

[24] Σ A *Il*. 1.108–9b; Σ Eur. *Or*. 658. Apollodorus's *Epitome* features an elliptical form of the same expression: "not even Artemis..." (οὐδὲ ἡ Ἄρτεμις, *Epit*. 3.21), which was apparently misunderstood and incorrectly expanded by the Sabbaitic scribe: Frazer 1921: II 191n1; Davies 2019: 143.

[25] Cf. Finglass 2007b: 268–69 on *El*. 566–67.

[26] Cf. *IA* 185–86, 1544 (suggestive mentions of "Artemis's grove"); Hyg. *Fab*. 98. The same detail is found in the Homeric scholia (Σ A *Il*. 1.108–9b = Dictys *BNJ* 49 F 5, cf. Dictys 1.19), though with a she-goat in place of a deer, an Imperial adaptation: cf. Ptol. 150b; Cameron 2004: 148–49.

[27] Thus Currie 2016: 140n183 (suggesting a reference to the *Cypria*). For the pervasiveness of such "footnotes" in archaic and classical Greek poetry, see Nelson forthcoming a; forthcoming b.

[28] Thus Davies 2019: 143–44; cf. Hansen 2002: 55. I suspect that Agamemnon's sacrilege featured in the *Cypria* and was simply omitted from Proclus's terse summary: cf. Zieliński 1925: 245–46; Fraenkel 1950: II 98n2; Jouan 1966: 266; Davies 2010: 334–35; 2019: 144.

[29] For other later variants, see Eur. *IT* 15–25 on Agamemnon's unfulfilled promise to sacrifice the most beautiful thing born in a given year (cf. Cic. *Off.* 3.95) and Apollod. *Epit*. 3.21 on Atreus's failure to sacrifice the golden lamb (cf. Bremmer 2002: 26). Both appear to be later adaptations, but both still foreground the impiety of Agamemnon's household.

[30] For Artemis's anger, cf. too Soph. *El*. 570 (μηνίσασα Λητῴα κόρη); Ov. *Met*. 12.28–9 (*iram ... deae*); Hyg. *Fab*. 98 (*ira Dianae*); Apollod. *Epit*. 3.21 (τὸ μηνίειν τὴν θεόν); Nonnus, *Dion*. 13.106 (θεὰ βαρύμηνις). Artemis's capacity for anger is visible elsewhere in the *Iliad*: she angrily kills Bellerophon's daughter Laodameia (χολωσαμένη, 6.205), sends the boar against Oeneus's orchards for his failed sacrifice (9.533–42: χωσαμένη, 534; χολωσαμένη, 538), and kills Niobe's daughters, while her brother angrily kills her sons (χωόμενος, 24.605–7).

[31] Cf. Scodel 2012: 504–5; Davies 2019: 145, citing Mazon 1914 ad loc. Contrast West 1978: 320 on *Op.* 652; Most 2018: I 141.

[32] Cf. Clay 2005: 33. Note especially the violent wind (π]ν̣είο̣ν̣τος Βορέαο περιζαμενές, v. 126) and swelling sea (ο]ἴδ̣εσκεν δὲ θάλασσα, v. 127).

[33] Other mentions of Artemis's storm include Callim. *Hymn* 3.228–32; Verg. *Aen*. 2.116; Ov. *Met*. 12.24–25; Sen. *Suas.* 3.2; Apollod. *Epit*. 3.21; Paus. 8.28.4, 9.19.7; Σ A *Il*. 1.108–9b; Σ

Or. 658. Some late sources talk of a windless calm rather than a storm, but this likely results from a misunderstanding of earlier texts and interpreters' "confusion between the holding back of the winds and the holding back of the fleet at Aulis": Davies 2019: 144–46 (quotation 146).

[34] The dragging, syncopated rhythms of 188 and 196 reflect this lingering malaise: Raeburn and Thomas 2011: 89–90 ad loc. A similar scene may have featured in Sophocles' *Iphigenia*: one fragment complains of "useless leisure" (εἰκαία σχολή, fr. 308 *TrGF*; cf. κακόσχολοι, *Ag*. 193).

[35] Cf. Medda 2017: II 137, 139–40.

[36] See *Il*. 7.467–75, 9.71–72; *Od*. 9.163–65; cf. Kelly 2008: 10–12. Later, cf. Thuc. 1.11.

[37] See Sammons 2017: 101–25, esp. 101–2 on another instance in the *Cypria*: the paired prophecies of Helenus and Cassandra (arg. 1d *GEF*). On Homeric doublets, see Fenik 1974: 131–232; Kelly 2007b.

[38] Aesch. *Ag.* 198–204; Eur. *IT* 16–24, *IA* 89–93, 358–60, 879–81, 1262; Ov. *Met*. 12.27–9; Sen. *Suas.* 3.4; Hyg. *Fab.* 98; Apollod. *Epit*. 3.21; Σ A *Il*. 1.108–9b. Only Dictys contradicts this tradition: an inspired woman—not Calchas—reveals the need to sacrifice Iphigenia (*mulier quaedam deo plena*, 1.19). This Imperial innovation recurs in George Cedrenus's *Synopsis of Histories* (1.219), combined with the traditional story: Calchas initially proposed the sacrifice, but Agamemnon refused to act until an inspired woman agreed with him; this may well represent Dictys's original version: Dowden 2008 on F 5.

[39] See Saladino 1990.

[40] Sammons 2017: 230–31.

[41] Cf. West 1979: 5 = West 2011–2013: II 221: "we may take it as certain that Calchas' exposition of the cause and cure of Artemis' anger in that epic [sc. the *Cypria*]—in any epic—was followed by a speech from Agamemnon similar in tone to *Il*. 1.106 f." For Agamemnon's Homeric characterization, cf. Porter 2019.

[42] Aeschylus's *Oresteia* trilogy foregrounds the theme of inherited "ancestral fault," rather than the individual sins of Agamemnon: Gagné 2013: 394–416.

[43] For this allusive acknowledgement of a rejected variant, cf. Pind. *Ol*. 1.55 (the metaphor of "digesting" evokes the traditional version of the Pelops myth that Pindar rejects: Griffith 1990: 200); Eur. *El*. 518–47 (Electra pointedly snubs the recognition tokens of Aeschylus's *Choephoroi*: Torrance 2013: 14–33); *Ciris* 484–86 (Amphitrite explicitly dismisses a variant version of Scylla's metamorphosis [into a fish]: Lyne 1978: 299 on 484ff.).

[44] See Bonnechère 1994: 42n106; Davies and Finglass 2014: 502, 510 ad loc.

[45] See, e.g., a *lekythos* by Douris (Palermo, c. 470 B.C.E.; *LIMC* s.v. Iphigeneia, no. 3): Iphigenia is led forward by the hem of her cloak and lifts her veil in a familiar bridal gesture: cf. Jenkins 1983: 141; Prag 1985: 61; Kahil and Linant de Bellefonds 1990: 709–10. See Jouan 1984: 65–66 for other artistic echoes of the promised marriage.

[46] Soph. *Iphigenia* fr. 305 *TrGF*; Eur. *El*. 1020–22, *IT* 24–25, 213–17, etc. See too the allusions at Aesch. *Ag*. 227, 239 and 1523–24 (Cunningham 1984; Armstrong and Ratchford 1985; Chong-Gossard 2008: 229n31; Raeburn and Thomas 2011: 92 on 227, 227 on 1523–24). This narrative detail resonates with the common tragic motif of "marriage to Hades" (Seaford 1987: 108–10).

[47] Petr. *Satyr*. 59.5; Hyg. *Fab*. 98; Apollod. *Epit*. 3.22; Dictys 1.20; Nonnus, *Dion*. 13.109–12. Lycoph. *Alex*. 186–201 pictures Achilles as a doting husband who spends five years searching for Iphigenia after her disappearance.

[48] See H. P. Foley 1982 on the drama's blurring of marriage and sacrifice. The authenticity of many parts of is hotly debated (see Page 1934; Kovacs 2003; Gurd 2005). I approach this issue with a cautious tolerance (cf. Collard and Morwood 2017: I 58–59) and treat the whole extant play as evidence for the Iphigenia tradition.

[49] Odysseus alone: Dictys 1.20; Nonnus, *Dion*. 13.109–12; *LIMC* s.v. Iphigeneia 39. With Talthybius: Apollod. *Epit*. 3.22 (cf. Ταλθύβιε κῆρυξ, adesp. fr. 663.4 *TrGF*). With Diomedes (a common partner in crime): Hyg. *Fab*. 98; *LIMC* s.v. Iphigeneia 38 (as commonly identified). Douris (n45 above) pictures Teucer (identified by an inscription) leading Iphigenia alongside at least one other man (perhaps Odysseus?); Gantz 1996: 584 suggests that Teucer's presence symbolizes the whole army's support for the sacrifice.

[50] In any case, the emphasis on Agamemnon's agency is in fact fully compatible with Odysseus acting on his instructions: cf. the insistence in *Iliad* 1 that Agamemnon took Briseis from Achilles "himself" (αὐτός: 1.137–39, 184–85, 324–25, 356, 507), although he actually sent Talthybius and Eurybates to do the dirty work (1.318–48).

[51] Cf. Parker 2016: 60; Collard and Morwood 2017: I 4. For other Euripidean adaptations of tradition in *IA*, see Radding 2015.

[52] Cf. too Agamemnon's emphasis on the "reasonableness" of Clytemnestra's presence (εἰκότως), despite the fact that she was not summoned (ἄκλητος), which both flags and justifies this innovation (*IA* 457–58). For such signposting of innovation in (especially Euripidean) tragedy, cf. McDermott 1987; 1991; Cole 2008; Torrance 2013: 222–27.

[53] See Stanford 1963: 102–117; Blundell 1987; Worman 1999; Montiglio 2011: 3–12.

[54] Nestor ultimately chooses the members of the embassy (9.167), although Phoenix later claims that Agamemnon did himself (κρινάμενος, 9.521).

[55] Cf. Heubeck 1992: 372–73; West 2013: 102.

[56] Cf. Apollod. *Epit*. 3.9: Menelaus, Odysseus and Talthybius go to Cyprus to recruit Cinyras, the local king who offers a gift of breastplates to the pointedly "absent" Agamemnon (Ἀγαμέμνονι ... οὐ παρόντι); cf. *Il*. 11.20–23 for this gift. The episode likely featured in the *Cypria*: cf. Frazer 1921 II 179 n3; Sammons 2017: 90.

[57] Cf. West 2014: 299 with n244; Nelson forthcoming a: § III.2.3. For Palamedes' involvement elsewhere, see *Cypr*. arg. 5b *GEF*; Accius, *Ajax* 109–14 (= Cic. *Off*. 3.98); Ov. *Met*. 13.34–42; Lucian, *De Domo* 30; Philostr. *Her*. 33.4; Σ Soph. *Phil*. 1025; Serv. *ad Aen*. 2.81; Σ Stat. *Achil*. 1.93–94; Myth. Vat. 1.35; Myth. Vat. 2.228; Tzetz. *ad* Lycoph. *Alex*. 384–86, 815.

[58] Later accounts frequently stress Odysseus's wiles: Ὀδυσσέως τέχναις (*IT* 24); *astu* | *decipienda* (Ov. *Met*. 13.193–94); Ὀδυσεὺς ... δολοπλόκος (Nonnus, *Dion*. 13.110); cf. δολίαν ἄτην (Aesch. *Ag*. 1523).

[59] E.g., βωμῶ[ι] (Hes. fr. 23a.17 M–W), ὕπερθε βωμοῦ (Aesch. *Ag.* 232; cf. βωμοῦ, 210–11), ὑπερτείνας πυρᾶς (Eur. *El*. 1022), ὑπὲρ πυρᾶς (*IT* 26), πρὸς βωμὸν θεᾶς (*IA* 1555), βωμοῦ θεᾶς (*IA* 1568), *Triviai virginis aram* (Lucr. 1.84; cf. *ante aras*, 1.89; *ad aras*, 1.95), *ante aram* (Ov. *Met*. 12.31), τῷ βωμῷ (Apollod. *Epit*. 3.22), παρὰ βωμῷ (Nonnus, *Dion*. 13.106). In iconography, the presence of the altar distinguishes Iphigenia's sacrifice from that of Polyxena (on Achilles' tomb): Prag 1985: 61, 65. See, e.g., *LIMC* s.v. Iphigeneia 1, 3 and 4 (Timanthes of Cynthus's lost painting: *ad aras*, Plin. *NH* 35.73).

[60] Thus Séchan 1967: 372–74; Bremmer 2002: 30–31; contrast Robbins 1986: 2, 8–9nn13–14. Agamemnon: Aesch. *Ag*. esp. 209–10, 224–25; Eur. *El*. 1020–23; *IT* 360, 565, 784–85; possibly adesp. fr. 73 *TrGF*; Varro, *Sat. Men.* frr. 94–95 (cf. Cèbe 1975: 433–34); Lucr. 1.99; Cicero *Off.* 3.95; Hor. *Sat*. 2.3.199–207; Apollod. *Epit*. 3.22; *LIMC* s.v. Iphigeneia 11, 37. For Calchas's involvement, see *P. Oxy.* 2513.16 (where Agamemnon seems to be sitting to one side: ἦστ[ο ἄν]αξ ἀνδρῶ[ν Ἀγαμέμνων]); *LIMC* s.v. Iphigeneia 4, 38, 40–47 (Calchas cutting Iphigenia's hair before the sacrifice: Löwy 1929: 35). At *IA* 1578–89, the sacrifice is accomplished by a priest, although it is earlier assumed that Agamemnon would kill Iphigenia himself (e.g., *IA* 873, 1177–78), perhaps "a reminder of the common tradition" ("un souvenir de la tradition commune": Jouan 1984: 63; cf. Séchan 1967: 374: "un témoignage de la persistance de la tradition ancienne").

[61] For discussion, see Lyons 1997: 143–68. I am unconvinced by Solmsen 1981, who considers the *Catalogue* verses an interpolation (cf. the caution of Hughes 1991: 84–85; Lyons 1997: 142n26); compare and contrast Ormand 2017. The Hesiodic description of Artemis as [ἐλαφηβό]λο̣ς ("deer-shooting," v. 21) may also evoke the deer substitution: cf. March (1987) 89. For other mentions of the substitution, see Eur. *IA* 1581–89, *IT* 28–30, fr. 857 *TrGF*; Lycoph. *Alex*. 190–91; Ov. *Met*. 12.32–34, *Trist*. 4.4.67–68, *Ep. Pont*. 3.2.61–64; Hyg. *Fab*. 98; Juv. 12.119–20; Nonnus, *Dion*. 13.104–19; Σ A *Il*. 1.108–9b; *LIMC* s.v. Iphigeneia 11, 12, 13, 50, 51. Cf. too other late variants involving a young bull (μόσχον, Nicander *Heteroeumena* fr. 58 Gow–Scholfield), bear (ἄρκτον, Phanodemus *BNJ* 325 F 14), and even an old woman (γραῦν, Tzetz. *ad* Lycoph. *Alex*. 183, cf. *Alex*. 196). Dictys 1.22 rationalizes the substitution.

[62] Attic cults at Brauron and Mounychia: cf. Henrichs 1981: 198–208; Lloyd-Jones 1983: 91–96; Dowden 1989: 9–47; Bonnechère 1994: 38–48. Isaac (*Genesis* 22): Miliett 2007; Apergis 2017: 63–113. The *Iliad* itself may presuppose such ritual substitution with the language of the θεράπων: Nagy 1979: 33, 292–93.

[63] E.g., Aesch. *Ag*. 104–249, 1525–29, 1555–59; Pind. *Pyth*. 11.22–23; Eur. *El*. 1020–23. Cf. the apparent tragic innovation of Medea's filicide, whether by Neophron or Euripides: Mastronarde 2002: 50–53, 57–64; Mossman 2011: 9, 23–28. Lucretius also deploys the myth to emphasize the impiety of religion (1.82–101: Perutelli 1998; Taylor 2016: 145–49; Brown 2019). Notably, even Aeschylus's account leaves open the possibility of substitution: the chorus claim they did not see what happened next (*Ag*. 248–49).

[64] Cf. too Ov. *Met*. 12.35–38 (*ventos a tergo*); Paus. 9.19.7 (sacrifices to Artemis in thanks for the favouring wind); Nonnus, *Dion.* 13.113 (πομπὸς ἀήτης); Eust. *Il*. 59.45 = 1.95.25 van der Valk (εὔπλοιαν).

[65] Artemis's connection with the wilds extended to the "fishy sea" (πόντός τ' ἰχθυόεις, *Hom. Hymn* 27.9). Besides Thgn. 11–14, the evidence for her association with seafaring is most clear in Hellenistic sources: Callimachus describes her as a "guardian of harbours" (λιμένεσσιν ἐπίσκοπος, *Hymn* 3.39; λιμενοσκόπε, 3.259) and Neleus's guide on his voyage to found Miletus (*Hymn* 3.226–27); Apollonius calls her a "protector of ships" (Νηοσσόος, *Argon*. 1.570); and one Delian inventory from 229 B.C.E. includes "steering oars and an old anchor" among gifts at the "Artemision on the Island" (πη]δάλια καὶ ἄ[γκυρα] παλα[ιά, *ID* 320 B.75 Dürrbach). Hesychius preserves local cult titles that also evoke seafaring, such as Ἐκβατηρία at Siphnos ("Goddess of disembarkation," ε 1288 Latte–Cunningham) and Εὐπορία at Rhodes ("Goddess of fair travel," ε 7079 Latte–Cunningham).

[66] Cf. Labarbe 1993: 32–33, noting that κήρ can refer to death at sea already in Homer (*Od*. 11.398–400), and that other passages of the *Theognidea* evince a fear and suspicion of the sea (Thgn. 175, 667–82, 1375–76).

[67] Cf. Dion. Calliphon. 88–90; Marcotte 1982–1984; 1990: 145. Other proposed locations include Megara (Paus. 1.43.1) and Amarynthos (Σ Ar. *Av*. 873): Selle 2008: 252–53. But neither well fits the detail of v. 12: Agamemnon's dedication in Megara is linked with the recruitment of Calchas, an earlier episode which accords poorly with the inceptive or conative significance of the imperfect ἔπλεε. Callimachus also situates a dedication to Artemis at Aulis: Agamemnon dedicated the rudder of his ship to the goddess "when she had checked the winds for him" when the Achaean ships were similarly "about to sail" (ἔπλεον) to Troy (*Hymn* 3.228–32).

[68] Artemis's pro-Trojan positioning in the *Iliad* does not impede this narrative detail. Other gods are similarly variable in their acts of support and allegiance: e.g., Apollo sides with the Trojans despite the abuse he received from Laomedon (*Il*. 21.441–60; Graf 2009: 10–13), yet he still assists the Greeks' sailing in Book 1 (see § II (F) below with n115).

[69] This was apparently the view of Aristarchus, as preserved in the Homeric scholia (Σ A. *Il*. 1.108–9b); cf. Σ A *Il*. 9.145a (ὅτι οὐκ οἶδε τὴν παρὰ τοῖς νεωτέροις σφαγὴν Ἰφιγενείας, "because he does not know the slaughter of Iphigenia from the later poets"); Σ T *Il*. 1.106b (τὸ γὰρ Ἰφιγενείας ὄνομα οὐδὲ οἶδεν ὁ ποιητής, "for the poet does not know the name of Iphigenia"). See Severyns 1928: 295–8; Currie 2016: 124n115; Schironi 2018: 666.

[70] Cf. the variation in the name of Oedipus's mother/wife (Epicaste/Jocasta) and the apparent identity of Homer's "Laodice" and the daughter whom the tragedians call "Electra": Σ D *Il*. 9.145. Xanthus claims that Laodice was renamed Electra when she grew old "unwedded"

(ἄλεκτρον, 700 *PMG*). Cf. Eur. *Or*. 22–23 where Electra specifies three daughters: Chrysothemis, Iphigenia and herself.

[71] Willcock 1978–1984: I 273 on 9.144–45; Hainsworth 1993: 77 on 9.145.

[72] Currie 2015: 292.

[73] Cf. Kullmann 1965; Burgess 2001: 150–51; Currie 2015: 291–92. The *Cypria*'s variant is later followed in Sophocles' *Electra*, where Iphianassa is a separate sister who is still alive (ζώει) long after Iphigenia's death (*El*. 157, *pace* Davidson 1990). The assumption that the *Cypria*'s version responds directly to the *Iliad* falls foul of the documentary fallacy WYSIATI ("What you see is all there is"): cf. Kelly 2015: 22.

[74] Thus Burgess 2001: 150. Cf. Richardson 1974: 184–85 ad loc. and Lyons 1997: 51–58 on the "naming of heroines."

[75] Thus March 1987: 85n30; Currie 2015: 292.

[76] Σ bT *Il*.1.106b. Odysseus presents Calchas's ten-year revelation favorably in the next book (*Il*. 2.301–32), but specifically in an attempt to stop the Greeks from leaving Troy (2.299–300), and even he admits how difficult the long campaign has been (2.291–8).

[77] Cf. Eust. *Il*. 59.42–46 = 1.95.21–26 van der Valk. This interpretation is widely accepted by modern scholars: e.g., Zieliński 1925: 242–43; Clément 1934: 394; Kullmann 1960: 198–99, 267–68; 2001: 395–96; Kirk 1985: 65 on *Il*. 1.108; Dowden 1989: 12; 1996: 53; Taplin 1992: 86; Lübeck 1993: 3–4; M. Clark 1998: 21–22; Pulleyn 2000: 156–57; Bouvier 2002: 305–8; Draper 2002: 52; Radif 2002: 47–48; Barker 2009: 43–45; Jensen 2009: 51; Latacz, Nünlist, and Stoevesandt 2009: 66; West 2011: 86; Porter 2019: 111; Schein forthcoming ad loc. Contrast Welcker 1865–1882: II 144 n79; Davies 1991: xxi; Davies and Finglass 2014: 482.

[78] Cf. Anderson 1997: 59–61. Given the centrality of doublets to the construction of archaic epic and myth, it is likely that this Iphigenia–Polyxena parallel has an archaic pedigree.

[79] Cf. Kirk 1985: 127 on *Il*. 2.101–8, supposing that Homer also knew the Atreus/Thyestes quarrel (another topic of scholiastic debate: see n81 below).

[80] Thus M. Clark 1998: 22–23.

[81] Thus, e.g., Griffin 1977: 44; Davies 1989: 44; Seaford 1989; Aretz 1999: 49–50; Scodel 2012: 509; Davies and Finglass 2014: 484. Compare ancient debates over whether Homer knew of the conflict between Atreus and Thyestes: Aristarchus considered Homer ignorant of the tale (<οὐ> γινώσκει τὴν ἔχθραν Ἀτρέως καὶ Θυέστου, Σ A *Il*. 2.106a), whereas Licymnius believed that the poet was aware of the conflict but suppressed it "to avoid blaming the family," instead offering only a "hidden hint" (Λικύμνιος δὲ παραδηλοῦσθαί φησι τὴν ἔχθραν λεληθότως, ἵνα μὴ βλασφημήσῃ τὸ γένος, Σ bT *Il*. 2.106b): cf. Danek 2010: 227. Compare too the *Odyssey*'s suppression of Orestes' matricide (Alden 2017: 84–85 with n34) and perhaps also of Telegonus's patricide (Arft 2019).

[82] Achilles' later criticism of Agamemnon's "deer-heart" (κραδίην δ' ἐλάφοιο, 1.225) may even subtly recall his original crime on Aulis (cf. ἔλαφον, *Cypr.* arg. 8 *GEF*); it is the only occasion in the poem where ἔλαφος is directly applied to a person (cf. Beck 2005: 216–17).

[83] These emblems had already been foregrounded in Homer's initial introduction of Chryses, as the climax of a rising tricolon (1.13–15): Kakridis 1971: 125–26. This opening emphasis on Chryses' priestly status renders Agamemnon's ensuing hostility all the more culpable.

[84] Cf. Griffin and Hammond 1982: 132–33 on Agamemnon's "triumphant egotism"; and Faraone 2016: 405–10 on Agamemnon as *theomachos*.

[85] This parallel would have been even stronger if plagues were already associated with changes in wind and air, as they were later in Hippocratic medicine (e.g., Jouanna 2012). For the larger significance of this plague in the *Iliad*, see Blickman 1987.

[86] παλιμπλαγχθέντας is itself evocative of adverse sailing, like at Aulis (cf. παλιμπλαγχθέντα, *Od*. 13.5).

[87] Cf. Thamyris and the Muses, *Il*. 2.594–600; Oeneus and Artemis, *Il.* 9.533–42; Niobe and Leto, *Il*. 24.602–9; Oilean Ajax and Poseidon, *Od*. 4.502–11; Eurytus and Apollo, *Od*. 8.226–28; Phorbas and Apollo, *Aeth*. fr. 4 *GEF*: Sammons 2017: 190n44.

[88] Cf. Faraone 1992: 59–66; Carpenter 1994: 67–70.

[89] Callimachus later picks up on this brother/sister parallel in his description of Artemis's punishment of the unjust with arrows and pestilence (*Hymn* 3.117–28), which closely echoes Apollo's behavior from *Iliad* 1: Stephens 2015: 137–39.

[90] Chryseis's name is a patronymic, while her double description as a κούρη (1.98, 111) foregrounds her status as a daughter (cf. Dué 2002: 52–55 for the noun's traditional resonance). Iphigenia's key mythical role is determined by her status as Agamemnon's daughter.

[91] The Aulis episode in *Iliad* 2 relates to the other gathering at Aulis, mentioned in Proclus's *Cypria* summary before the Teuthranian expedition (arg. 6 *GEF*; the Iphigenia Aulis episode features after it: arg. 8 *GEF*). These allusions to the two different Aulis episodes in consecutive books of the *Iliad* (the first implicit, the second explicit) could perhaps be taken to presuppose Homeric awareness of the Teuthranian expedition.

[92] Taplin 1992: 86n9 attractively suggests that even Poseidon's choice of Calchas in *Iliad* 13 may recall Aulis, since "he rallies the Achaians in terms that do Agamemnon no credit" (cf. 13.111–13).

[93] Cf. Kirk 1985: 60; Pulleyn 2000: 143; Draper 2002: 44; Latacz, Nünlist, and Stoevesandt 2009: 52.

[94] Beyond *Il*. 1.65 and 1.93, the word is used of verbal boasting (8.229), a cry of triumph (4.450 = 8.64), and the source of a boast (2.160 ≈ 2.176 ≈ 4.173; 22.433). Only at *Il*. 9.499 does it refer to a "vow" or "prayer" (although this usage is attested in other epics: *Od*. 11.34, 13.357; Hes. *Scut*. 68). For the various meanings of εὔχομαι, see Muellner 1976.

[95] For this framing of another tradition in hypothetical terms, cf. *Il*. 11.794–97 ≈ 16.36–39, where Nestor and Patroclus raise the possibility that Achilles has been forewarned by Thetis. Like Calchas, Achilles dismisses the possibility (16.50–51). This seems to acknowledge but negate an episode familiar from the *Aethiopis* in which Thetis does foretell Achilles' fate (πρόλεγει, arg. 2b *GEF*: cf. Currie 2006: 30; 2016: 62) and which the *Iliad* allusively replays in Achilles' following warning to Patroclus (Burgess 2009: 75–76).

[96] Cf. West 1979: 5 = West 2011–2013: II 221.

[97] For the substitutability of Chryseis and Briseis, and their shared role as doublets of Iphigenia, see § III below.

[98] Penelope's suitors totaled 108, with 10 further attendants (*Od*. 16.245–53); *Od*. 23.232 derives from her happy reunion with Odysseus. Mestra was sold to a whole series of husbands by her desperate father Erysichthon (Hes. fr. 43a–c M–W; Rutherford 2005).

[99] Cf. Taplin 1992: 214–15; Mitsis 2010: 55–56; Fantuzzi 2012: 108.

[100] Hainsworth 1993: 106–7 on 9.336, 108 on 9.342; Griffin 1995: 114 on 9.336, 115 on 9.343; Fantuzzi 2012: 109–13, and 99–185 more generally on the later tradition of Achilles and Briseis.

[101] ἄκρως δὲ ἐρῶντα χαρακτηρίζει, "[Homer] perfectly characterizes the lover," Σ bT *Il*. 1.349b; cf. Σ bT on 1.346; Fantuzzi 2012: 102–5. Cf. Achilles' similar responses to the death of Patroclus (*Il*. 24.3–13) and the disappearance of Iphigenia in Lycophron's *Alexandra* (188–95).

[102] Cf. Dué 2002: 67–81 on Briseis's adoption of the role of "lamenting wife" in *Iliad* 19, a role that she might have also played after Achilles' death (later, cf. Prop. 2.9.9–14; Quint. Smyrn. 3.551–81). See too Taplin 1992: 212–18 for the sincerity of Achilles' feelings for Briseis.

[103] For the resonance of ὑπόδρα ἰδών, cf. Holoka 1983. See too Friedrich 2002: 2–6 on the indignation expressed by Achilles' three untypical full-verse addresses to Agamemnon.

[104] In his summary to his mother, Achilles claims that the Ἀχαιοί as a whole are sending Chryseis back (πέμπουσιν, 1.389–90), a vagueness that matches Proclus's *Cypria* summary (μεταπεμψάμενοι, arg. 8 *GEF*).

[105] Of course, πολύμητις is, a common formulaic epithet for Odysseus, occurring 18 times in the *Iliad* alone. But it is still significant that Homer avoids the metrically identical πτολίπορθος, "city-sacking," which appears in the same *sedes* elsewhere (*Il*. 2.278, 10.363; *Od*. 8.3, etc.) and would carry a rather different resonance here (cf. Haft 1990: 48–50).

[106] Cf. Burgess 2012 for such "textless intertextuality."

[107] Homeric φίλος may sometimes act like a possessive adjective, but it can also convey affection and dearness: see Hooker 1987; Robinson 1990; Langholf 2010; Pulleyn 2019: 125 on *Od*. 1.60.

[108] Cf. too artistic representations where Agamemnon veils his face in dismay: e.g., *LIMC* s.v. Iphigeneia 4, 38 (cf. *IA* 1550). Chryses' joy also serves here as a foil to Achilles' loss of Briseis: Rabel 1988.

[109] Cf. Edwards 1980: 21; Rabel 1990: 434. Only the sacrifice at Pylos in the *Odyssey* offers a longer version of this type scene (*Od*. 3.418–76).

[110] Cf. σφάξαν (Hes. *Cat*. fr. 23a.17 M–W), σφαχθεῖσα (*Pyth*. 11.23), σφαζομέν[ην] (Simon. 315a.10 Poltera), σφαγάς (Soph. *El*. 568), ἔσφαξεν (Eur. *IT* 8; cf. σφαγεῖσαν, 20), σφάγιον (*IA* 135; cf. ἐπὶ σφαγάς, 1548; σφαγῇ, 1560), σφάγι' (*Or*. 658), σφάζοντες, σφάζειν (Eur. fr. 857.2–3 *TrGF*), σφάγιον (Apollod. *Epit*. 3.21, cf. σφάζειν, 3.22), σφαγιάσῃ (Σ A *Il*. 1.108–9b). On the meaning of σφάζω and its derivatives, see Casabona 1966: 155–96.

[111] The second half of the line appears on only one further occasion at *Od*. 12.359 (καὶ ἔσφαξαν καὶ ἔδειραν).

[112] Some rationalize the absence by suggesting that Apollo's wind would have dispersed the plague (Σ AbT *Il*. 1.479). Others explain why the returned expedition does not report its success to Agamemnon: this would have been obvious from the ending of the plague (Σ bT *Il*. 1.487).

[113] Cf. West 1978: 334 on *Op*. 726: "κλυεῖν is the regular epic word for a god 'hearing' a prayer in the sense of heeding it."

[114] This is the only favorable wind that features directly in the Iliadic narrative; the other two instances of οὖρος appear in similes (*Il*. 7.5, 14.19): cf. Purves 2010: 329 with n17.

[115] Like Artemis, Apollo's support here also goes against his general pro-Trojan stance in the poem: cf. Faraone 2016: 401: "Apollo ... seems to forget about the ongoing war at Troy and reacts purely as a local deity."

[116] Some ancient readers certainly seem to have detected a connection between Iphigenia and Chryseis, perhaps in response to the *Iliad*'s maneuvers. See Sophocles' fragmentary *Chryses*, which includes a meeting of the two: Iphigenia comes face-to-face with her allusive doublet (frr. 726–30 *TrGF*).

[117] For adverbial καί as a marker of allusive iteration, cf. *Od*. 11.618 (καὶ σύ: Odysseus ~ Heracles): Nelson forthcoming a: § IV.2.2.

[118] Cf. Barker 2009: 31–88 for a similar "foundational" aspect to the assembly at the start of the *Iliad*. On the broader politics of sacrifice in early Greek myth and poetry, see Stocking 2017 (who does not, however, mention Iphigenia).

[119] Diomedes/Ajax: Louden 2006: 14–52. Patroclus/Achilles: Burgess 2009: esp. 93–97. Cf. too Currie 2016: 69–70 on Hector and Sarpedon both reflecting Memnon, and Antilochus and Patroclus both reflecting Antilochus.

[120] Cf. Dué 2002: 42–43, 49–52; Ov. *Rem*. 475–76. The pairs' "fair cheeks," though a formulaic quality, might also provide another link with Iphigenia (cf. λευκὴν ... παρηίδα, Eur. *El*. 1023).

[121] Burgess 2009: 93–97 (quotation 94); cf. Burgess 2005. On *Odyssey* 8, cf. Ford 1992: 110–18. Cf. too Bachvarova 2018 on how this practice may influence Homeric plot construction.

[122] Cf. n2 above.

[123] Barchiesi 2020. Cf. too Lucan's use of *Aulin* (*Bellum Civile* 5.236), which has been interpreted as a reference "back to what was the beginning—the very beginning—of it all, the Greek expedition against Troy" (Masters 1992: 149; cf. Ahl 1976: 129).

[124] See Currie 2016: 1–4; Edmunds 2016; and already Kullmann 1955. The "plan of Zeus" recurs elsewhere (e.g., *Od*. 8.82, 11.297; *Hom. Hymn Dem*. 9; etc.) and so may be a traditional motif

(cf. Allan 2008), but it is the proem's combination of other phrases relating to Zeus's annihilation plan that makes the allusive connection attractive: note especially Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή, *Il*. 1.5 = *Cypr*. fr. 1.7 *GEF*; **πολλὰς** δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς **Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν** | **ἡρώων**, *Il.* 1.3–4 [NB **κεφαλάς** for ψυχάς, Σ bT *Il*. 1.3b1] ~ **π]ολ̣λὰς Ἀΐδῃ κεφαλὰς** ἀπὸ χαλκὸν **ἰάψ[ει]ν** | ἀν]δ̣ρ̣ῶν **ἡ̣ρ̣ώων**, Hes. fr. 204.118–19 M–W; ἐρίσαντε, *Il*. 1.6 ~ ἔριν, *Cypr.* fr. 1.5 *GEF*. The mention of strife (ἐρίσαντε, *Il*. 1.6) alongside Peleus (in the patronymic Πηληϊάδεω, *Il*. 1.1) might also evoke Strife's original intervention at the wedding of Thetis and Peleus (*Cypr*. arg. 1b *GEF*), another inaugural element in the larger story.

[125] As we have seen above, Achilles explicitly draws this analogy at *Il*. 9.339–41; cf. Suzuki 1989: 21–24. Herodotus picks up on the inceptive resonance of "bride stealing" at the start of his *Histories*: 1.1–5.