SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA

YEARBOOK OF THE ISRAEL SOCIETY
FOR THE PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

VOLUME XLIV **2025**

ISSN 0334–4509 (PRINT)
2731–2933 (ONLINE)

The appearance of this volume has been made possible by the support of

Bar-Ilan University
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
The Open University
Tel Aviv University
University of Haifa

PUBLISHED BY
THE ISRAEL SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES
http://www.israel-classics.org

Manuscripts in the form of e-mail attachments should be sent to the e-mail address rachelze@tauex.tau.ac.il. For reviews, contact fassberg@tauex.tau.ac.il. Please visit our website for submission guidelines. All submissions are refereed by outside readers.

Books for review should be sent to the Book Review Editor at the following address: Book Review Editor, Dr. Teddy Fassberg, Department of Classics, Tel Aviv University, P.O. Box 39040, Tel Aviv, 6997801, Israel.

Price $50

Camera-ready copy produced by the editorial staff of *Scripta Classica Israelica*
Printed in Israel by Magnes Press, Jerusalem

SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA

YEARBOOK OF THE ISRAEL SOCIETY
FOR THE
PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

VOLUME XLIV **2025**

CONTENTS

Proemial Bridges: An Intratextual Association Activating an Intertextual Reference*

Christos Tsagalis

Abstract: On the basis of phraseological, contextual, and thematical considerations this article argues that there is an intratextual proemial allusion from *Od*. 13.90 to *Od*. 1.4 and that it operates as an intertextual allusion to an equivalent intratextual proemial allusion from *Il*. 11.55 to *Il*. 1.4. Unlike cases where intratextual parallelism reflects intertextual parallelism, an intratextual association between the *Odyssey*'s first and second proems is built on an analogous intratextual association between the *Iliad*'s first and second proems, which results in an intertextual relationship between the pair of first and second proems of the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*.

Keywords: Homer, *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, proem, intratextuality, intertextuality

INTRODUCTION

The proems of the two Homeric epics are, arguably, as famous as the poems they belong to. It is no exaggeration that they have left such a lasting imprint throughout both ancient and modern times that the mere reference of even their first word (μῆνιν 'wrath', ἄνδρα 'man') immediately and unequivocally tunes the audience to a Homeric key. The proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* have been mainly studied with respect to their similarities and differences, their relation to the plot of each Homeric poem, the issue regarding typology versus innovation, as well as the question concerning poetic authority that revolves around the singer or poet,[1] the Muse(s), and the audience. However, little attention has been paid to the function of the proems of Homeric epics as pivots for the creation of structural associations within each poem. This type of investigation is, I suggest, worth undertaking since it may disclose unobserved analogies between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, provided that the same structural association triggered by each proem operates in both Homeric epics. In view of this possibility, the question of deliberate allusion, which lies at the center of current research in early Greek epic, may be

* I would like to thank J. L. Ready for commenting on an early draft of this article and the two anonymous referees for their suggestions and comments. All translations (with spelling modifications) come from Lattimore (1951) for the *Iliad* and Rieu (2003) for the *Odyssey*.

1 I do not use the terms singer and poet interchangeably. The word 'or' simply refers to the two mainstream approaches in modern Homeric criticism concerning an oral tradition of Homeric singers or one or two individuals composing the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* by means of writing.

significantly enriched. This is because intratextual[2] and intertextual[3] associations are often treated as mutually exclusive.[4] The argument lurking in this kind of debate is putting into doubt the existence of any form of intertextual link, in view of the assumption that if a reference can be explained within a single poem, then its intertextual associations are weakened, if not annulled.

In this study, I will present a case in which the proem of the *Odyssey* does not operate only intratextually by means of activating a structural connection with another Odyssean passage, but also intertextually by responding to an analogous structural link created intratextually by the proem of the *Iliad* and another Iliadic passage. The thrust of my argument lies in that symmetrical forms of intratextual references belonging to different epics may be considered not typical manifestations of structural and/or narrative patterns but intentional allusions. It is suggested that intratextuality can go hand in hand with intertextuality, creating double allusion, which involves an extremely rich and rewarding nexus of semantical links that cover the full range of textual associations, from simple *imitatio* to sophisticated *aemulatio*. Seen from this vantage point, epic proems are especially suitable for this kind of allusive reference since the beginning of an epic,[5] in which the poem introduces itself to the audience and 'confronts its own poetic ghosts',[6] is one of the places where engagement with other poetry tends to nest.[7]

---

2 On intratextuality, see Sharrock (2018), 15: 'Intratextuality is the phenomenon and the study of the relationship between elements within texts: it is concerned with structures such as ring composition, continuities, discontinuities, juxtapositions, story arcs and other repetitions of language, imagery, or idea, including gaps both in the hermeneutic circle and in the form of absent presences and roads not taken'.

3 On intertextuality, see Tsagalis (2011a), 413: Intertextuality is 'a term in literary theory that designates the presence of one "text" in another, the meaning "text" being used in the broadest sense as it refers, in the case of Homeric epic, to an 'anonymous ensemble' (Todorov 1981) or what most oralists would call a song–tradition (intertraditionality)'; from the enormous bibliography on intertextuality I single out Pucci (1987); Usener (1990); Rutherford (2001), 117–46; Schein (1999, 349–56 = 2016, 81–91 and 2002, 85–101 = 2016, 39–54); Currie (2006), 7–13; Tsagalis (2008); Burgess (2011), 168–83.

4 Intratextual association does not exclude intertextual allusion. On the contrary, it may (occasionally) enhance it. See Currie (2016, 50) who argues that the correspondence between *Od*. 7.234–97 and 19.213–60 suggests that these scenes 'play off each other, but they may both play off a scene from earlier poetry, too' and that 'here, as elsewhere, intratextuality may go hand in hand with intertextuality'. On the putative complementarity of intratextuality and intertextuality, see also Currie's discussion in 17–18, 58–9, 181–218, 190–2. For other examples, see Tsagalis (2024b), 42 n. 114 and 79 n. 63.

5 For Homeric beginnings, see Bassett (1923), 339–48; van Groningen (1946), 279–94; Pucci (1982), 39–62 = (1998), 11–29; Pedrick (1992), 38–62; Satterfield (2011), 1–20; for proemial convention in early Greek epic, see Harden and Kelly (2013), 1–34.

6 I have slightly modified a similar expression used by Currie (2016, 53) for the *nekyiai*.

7 Other such places are the middle of the epic (Giannopoulou 2017, 137–58), and the *nekyiai* (Most 1992, 1014–26; Kullmann 1995, 50–1 = 2002, 154; Currie 2016, 26 with n. 166, 53 with n. 94; Tsagalis 2024b, 28 and 32).

ODYSSEY 1.4 AND 13.90

It has been argued that *Od*. 13.90 (ὃς πρὶν μὲν μάλα πολλὰ πάθ' ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμὸν) is an intentional reminiscence of *Od*. 1.4 (πολλὰ δ' ὅ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμὸν).[8] As soon as Odysseus lands on Ithaca, which is almost at a point nearly halfway between the beginning and end of the plot, the *Odyssey* alerts its audience to the fact that the wanderings of Odysseus have come to an end and that this is the beginning of the second part of the epic. This structural shift is spatially underlined by a radical change from multiple sea adventures in various places to a single narrative sequence taking place exclusively in Ithaca.[9] This intratextual association meets all the criteria for deliberate allusion: it is a marked iteration, it is interpretively meaningful, and it is dictionally exclusive since it is solely employed in *Od*. 1.4 and 13.90–1.

Moreover, and in addition to its intratextual aspect, 13.90–1 is placed in the middle of the epic that marks the end of the first part of the poem and the beginning of the second part.[10] The unique aspect of a "middle" (being both an end and a beginning) results in its acquisition of features pertaining to both the epic's proem and the epic's end. Middles[11] are not only the place in which tensions are resolved and episodes are completed but also the place in which the plot is reconfigured with a view to both the epic's beginning and end.[12] In view of this, the two parts of the intratextual association I have drawn attention to in the *Odyssey* (1.1–10 and 13.90–1) are situated in points rich in metapoetic load.[13]

All this may sound reasonable to the point that one is tempted to claim that this allusion operates only intratextually, which means within the *Odyssey*, and leave the matter to this. But what if an equivalent intratextual association constituting an intratextual allusion is observable in the *Iliad*? What if *Iliad* 11.55 (πολλὰς ἰφθίμους κεφαλὰς Ἄϊδι προϊάψειν) alludes intratextually to *Iliad* 1.3 (πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν)?

ILIAD 1.3 AND 11.55

Iliad 11 begins with a captivating image. At the crack of dawn, Zeus sends Eris to the ships of the Achaeans holding in her hands the portent of battle. She takes her place on the stern of Odysseus' ship that lays in the middle so that she can be heard at both ends of the Achaean camp, where the ships of Telamonian Ajax and Achilles are placed respectively. Eris cries out a terrible, loud cry that puts strength to the Achaeans to go and fight tirelessly. It is at this point that the narrator first says that 'now battle became sweeter

---

8 E.g. On *Od*. 1.4, see St. West (1988), 70–1; Bowie (2013), on *Od*. 13.88–92. On *Od*. 13.90, see Stanford (1959²) *ad loc*.; Rutherford (1985), 138; Dimock (1989), 175; Hoekstra (1989), on *Od*. 13.90.

9 See Tsagalis (2024a), 88–93.

10 The epic's middle is signaled by means of the joint of two thematic cycles, the wanderings and the return; see Eichhorn (1965), 83–4; Erbse (1972), 143. Pucci (1982, 41 with n. 8 = 1998, 13 n. 8) designates *Odyssey* 13 as 'a sort of sacred proemial book' of the epic.

11 On middles in archaic Greek epic, see a special issue edited by J. Ready and C. Tsagalis, *Yage* 1 (2017), 5–174.

12 See Kyriakidis and De Martino (2004), 12–13; Giannopoulou (2017), 139.

13 On meta-cyclic epic and Homeric poetry, see Finkelberg (2015), 126–38 = (2020), 169–81.

to them than to go back in the hollow ships to the beloved land of their fathers'[14] and then departs in a detailed presentation of the arming of Agamemnon expanded by an ekphrasis pertaining to what is depicted on his shield.

After the panic caused by Hector's advance in the plain in Book 8, the failed embassy and disappointment created by Achilles' refusal to return to the war in Book 9, and the night raid in Book 10 that produced no tangible results, the plot moves to a new stage. This phase will involve the wounding of many major Greek heroes, Hector's breach of the Achaean Wall and fight by the ships, thus paving the way for Patroclus' death and Achilles' return to the war. In fact, several of the features surfacing at the very beginning of Book 11 suggest that this is treated by the *Iliad* as the poem's "middle": a long night (that started at the end of Book 8) ends and a new day begins; Eris, the goddess closely associated with the beginning of the events that had led to the Trojan war[15] makes a majestic appearance and utters a shout that makes hostilities begin anew; the narrator's assertion that the battle became sweeter to the army than to go to Greece recalls the epic's beginning where the question of returning home or staying and fighting in Troy was at center stage;[16] Agamemnon's extended arming scene and ekphrasis reintroduces him to the plot as the great leader of the Achaeans, thus looking both back at the epic's beginning (that featured his conflict with Achilles and the *peira* of the army in Books 1 and 2 respectively) and to the epic's new beginning in Book 11 that involves his remarkable *aristeia*.

It is at this point and context that the narrator uses a highly suggestive mechanism referring to divine activity for indicating the epic's new beginning: Hera and Athena, the two goddesses involved in the episode with Eris and the Apple of Discord in the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, honor Agamemnon by causing a crash of thunder about him,[17] while Zeus casts from above dews dripping blood 'since he was minded to hurl down a multitude of strong heads to the house of Hades.'[18] Moreover, Agamemnon's *aristeia* is presented

---

14 *Il*. 11.13–14: τοῖσι δ' ἄφαρ πόλεμος γλυκίων γένετ' ἠὲ νέεσθαι | ἐν νηυσὶ γλαφυρῇσι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν.

15 Apple of Discord: see *Cypr*. arg. ll. 86–7 Severyns: παραγενομένη δὲ Ἔρις εὐωχουμένων τῶν θεῶν ἐν τοῖς Πηλέως γάμοις νεῖκος περὶ κάλλους ἀνίστησι Ἀθηνᾷ, Ἥρᾳ καὶ Ἀφροδίτῃ ('Eris, present among the gods who were banqueting at the wedding of Peleus, provokes a quarrel over beauty between Athena, Hera, and Aphrodite'). For an analogous case, see *Il*. 15.704–6; the first Achaean ship to be burnt after the Trojan assault on the Greek ναύσταθμος is that of Protesilaus who was slain first in the Trojan War. Through an external analepsis, the specific point of the Iliadic plot is connected to the beginning of the entire war. The underlying comment is that the current state of affairs resembles the beginning of the war, when the Achaeans were struggling to gain control of the coast and land on the Troad.

16 See *Il*. 2.1–454 (especially the concluding verses 2.453–4 which are reiterated in 11.13–14).

17 *Il*. 11.45–6: ἐπὶ δ' ἐγδούπησαν Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη | τιμῶσαι βασιλῆα πολυχρύσοιο Μυκήνης.

18 *Il*. 11.53–5: κατὰ δ' ὑψόθεν ἦκεν ἐέρσας | αἵματι μυδαλέας ἐξ αἰθέρος, οὕνεκ' ἔμελλε | πολλὰς ἰφθίμους κεφαλὰς Ἄϊδι προϊάψειν. A version given by P. Oxy. 3829 ii 12 and Hyginus (*Fab*. 9.2.1–2) allows us to entertain the possibility that as in the *Cypria* Zeus not only excluded Eris from the wedding of Peleus and Thetis but also instructed her to cause the quarrel between Hera, Athena, and Aphrodite, so 'in *Il*. 1.3 he sends her forth to the Achaeans' ships to arouse battle-fury' (M.L. West 2013, 74). As for Hera and Athena, the fact that they perform an action (thundering) that is exclusively associated with Zeus suggests that they become part of his

in a way that recalls the beginning of the *Iliad* (11.55: πολλὰς ἰφθίμους κεφαλὰς Ἄϊδι προϊάψειν > 1.3: πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν) but introduces a crucial modification referring to the agent of this terrible act of death. By using the same phraseology that is now applied to Zeus (11.55) instead of Achilles' wrath (1.3), the *Iliad* gives a new twist to its initial claim that Achilles' wrath caused all these sufferings to the Achaeans. It does not reconfigure its initial assertion but it stresses the fact that the plan of Zeus is passing to a new phase. Thus, the two protagonists of the strife, Achilles and Agamemnon, are "reunited" in the epic's middle. In the epic's beginning, Zeus had set in motion these events by his plan[19] for the sake of Achilles; in the epic's middle, he reconfirms his determination to bring death to the Achaeans when Agamemnon leads them to battle.[20]

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS: TYPOLOGY, COINCIDENCE, ALLUSION

In the light of these two intratextual allusions operating between the Iliadic proem and a verse with reiterated phraseology[21] in the middle of the *Iliad* on the one hand, and the Odyssean proem and a verse with reiterated phraseology in the middle of the *Odyssey* on the other, is it possible to claim that this analogy is deliberate and that something more complex and, arguably, more interpretatively rewarding is going on? Are we allowed to entertain the possibility that the *Odyssey* is not only employing a backward intratextual association between 13.90 and 1.4 but also an intertextual reference to the *Iliad*'s backward intratextual association between 11.55 and 1.3?

Questions like the previous ones have important theoretical aspects that need to be examined before making assumptions and jumping to hasty conclusions. We are faced here with the well-known issue referring to the choice between typology and deliberate allusion that is so prominent in several recent studies on early Greek epic.[22] Are such analogies and/or repetitions typological, coincidental, or deliberate?

Regarding the typological explanation, we must examine whether the proemial phraseology that is reiterated in *Il*. 11.55 and *Od.* 13.90 respectively is formulaic. If so, we must consider whether the formulaic use points to a dictional reflex of the system or to planned and aimed repetition. This approach is conditioned by the fact that formulaic phraseology does not always and necessarily indicate a lack of intent with respect to its use in a particular context. There are cases when a formula is slightly modified or misused

---

plan: as in the episode of the Apple of Discord in which he sets in motion a course of events that will initially favor the Trojan side (Aphrodite winning the beauty contest), so in *Iliad* 11 he will give victory to Hector who will rout the Achaeans. It is interesting that Eris is holding a πολέμοιο τέρας, though its meaning is obscure (lightning, sword, torch: see Σ *Il*. 11.4), as she is holding an apple in the episode of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. In both cases, what she holds will bring war.

19 *Il*. 1.5: Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή.

20 *Il*. 11.54–5: οὕνεκ' ἔμελλε | πολλὰς ἰφθίμους κεφαλὰς Ἄϊδι προϊάψειν.

21 The fact that proemial verses are easily recognizable and noticed by the audience suggests that they represent a marked form of entextualized, portable utterances, which in turn makes them both coherent and cohesive, with beginnings and endings clearly demarcated; see Ready (2019), 18.

22 See Currie (2016), 9–11; Nelson (2023), 27–33; Tsagalis (2011b), 218–33 = (2023), 11–26.

to highlight a link with its standard use or with another passage in which it is also similarly modified or misused.[23] The syntagma 'hurl to Hades' (Ἄϊδι/Ἀϊδωνῆϊ + προϊάπτω) is attested 4x in the *Iliad* (1.3, 5.190, 6.487, and 11.55) always at verse-end. Since it is only in 1.3 and 11.55 that it is preceded by πολλὰς ἰφθίμους ψυχάς/κεφαλάς, it may be claimed that Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν/προϊάψειν shows in these two cases a particularity that suggests a specific link.

The expression πάθεν ἄλγεα constitutes a formula that is also employed in other contexts in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.[24] However, there are several phraseological and contextual features that, working cumulatively, suggest that *Od*. 1.4 and 13.90 are not just manifestations of a standard expression but two specifically linked formulaic uses. The formula "aor. of πάσχω + ἄλγεα"[25] is attested in the *Odyssey* 19x. Of these only in 1.4 and 13.90 it is preceded by μάλα πολλά[26] and followed by ὃν κατὰ θυμόν, and only in 13.90 and 13.263 it is followed by the verse ἀνδρῶν τε πτολέμους ἀλεγεινά τε κύματα πείρων. In view of these phraseological considerations (13.263 belongs to the same scene with 13.90), it may be argued that the formula "aor. of πάσχω + ἄλγεα" displays in 1.4 and 13.90 a specificity that suggests a pointed association. As far as the *Iliad* is concerned, the formula is attested in the form "aor. of πάσχω + ἄλγεα" in 9.321,[27] 13.670, 18.397, and 24.7. Of these four attestations only the last one (24.7) is followed by the verse ἀνδρῶν τε πτολέμους ἀλεγεινά τε κύματα πείρων (24.8), which is attested in *Od*. 13.91 and 13.264. However, since verses *Il*. 24.6–9 present special problems and they have been athetized by Aristarchus (Σ *ad loc*.), they will not concern us here.

In this vein, the scenario of a typological explanation seems rather weak and may well be left aside. We should now explore the other two scenarios, i.e., that of coincidence or deliberate allusion.

---

23 On highly nuanced and critically balanced discussion of issues regarding the extent and function of Homeric formularity, see Finkelberg (1989), 179–97 = (2020), 22–44, (1997), 1–8 = (2020), 45–52, (2004), 236–52 = (2020), 53–65.

24 This formula and its allomorphs are attested 8x in the *Iliad* (2.667, 2.721, 3.157, 9.321, 13.670, 18.397, 20.297, 24.7) and 19x in the *Odyssey* (1.4, 4.372, 5.13, 5.362, 5.395, 9.53, 9.121, 10.458, 11.275, 13.90, 13.263, 13.310, 13.418, 15.232, 15.487, 16.189, 19.170, 20.221, 22.177).

25 In this order.

26 In *Od*. 1.4 πάθεν ἄλγεα is preceded by πολλά within the limits of the same verse (πολλὰ δ' ὅ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα) but by μάλα πολλά given the first two verses of the proem (ὃς μάλα πολλά | πλάγχθη).

27 See Pucci (1982), 41–2 = (1998), 14–15, who suggests (on the basis of (a) the rare use of the word ψυχή in the sense of 'life' and its reference to the life of a specific hero, and (b) the fact that in both cases the word ψυχή is preceded by a pronoun) that *Od*. 1.4–5 intentionally uses a variant form of the diction employed in *Il*. 9.321. Such thematical and phraseological or stylistic oddities should not be seen as a sign of poetic failure but rather as a deliberate attempt of the *Odyssey* to signpost its allusion to the *Iliad* by creating a narrative rupture. This observation recalls the modern version of expanded neoanalysis, instead of its classical version. Narrative fissures are not explained as the result of the imperfect transference of a motif from a source-text to a target-text (classical neoanalysis) but as the intentional flagging of this transference as such by the target-text (expanded neoanalysis) itself. This is a sophisticated 'way of making reference by refusing reference' (Currie 2016, 71); see also Dowden (1996), 53; Cairns (2001), 36–7; Finkelberg (2015), 135 = (2020), 178.

The possibility of a coincidence seems to be remote. To work, it would require that multiple conditions are met: (a) two poets had decided, independently one from the other, to create the same type of intratextual association between a single line of the proem of their respective epics and another single line occurring thousands of verses later; (b) they had decided, again independently one from the other, to do so in order to achieve analogous narrative results; (c) they had, each one on his own, carried out this task by creating narrative situations that are also analogous; (d) they had done all the above without knowing each other's work. The cumulative force of these conditions seems overwhelming. It suggests that coincidence is an explanation that has few chances, if any, of being the right one.

This leaves us with the option of deliberate allusion. To make a case for it, we must not resort to the principle of *reductio ad absurdum* (being the sole explanation possible since we have eliminated typology and coincidence). From a methodological point of view, we need to use "positive" criteria which, if met, make a strong case in favor of deliberate allusion. This is because the choice between typology and deliberate allusion need not be absolute when we are examining the entire system of epic diction. There are instances in which (a) typology is exclusively at work and repetition is simply a reflex deprived of added meaning, (b) typology operates as a backdrop against which meaning is produced,[28] and (c) repetition on the level of phraseology, structure, content, or context amounts to deliberate allusion. In view of these considerations, I will use the criteria of markedness and meaningfulness to explore the possibility of deliberate allusion.

MARKEDNESS

The similarities between the two pairs of intratextual associations, one in the *Iliad* (1.3–11.55), another in the *Odyssey* (1.4–13.90) are the following:

1. They concern the proem of each epic and a later reference recalling the proem.
2. They are long-range, i.e., they are separated by several Books (10 in the *Iliad*, 12 in the *Odyssey*).
3. They pertain each to two verses (*Il*. 1.3–11.55 and *Od*. 1.4–13.90).
4. They are expressed by the main narrator.
5. The second reference (*Il*. 11.55 and *Od*. 13.90) is placed around the middle of the epic.

---

28 Typology may occasionally be employed *a negativo*, when a structure or pattern is misused, emphatically breached, partially reshaped, or elliptically presented. The stress laid, for example, on the fact that in the context of an arming scene Patroclus cannot use Achilles' Pelian ash-spear (*Il*. 16.140–4) exploits typology only to breach it and thus suggest that Patroclus will fall short of becoming a second Achilles (contrast the stress on the fact that Achilles *alone* is able to wield this ash-spear in *Il*. 19.387–91). Likewise, the reference to Hector's wearing of Achilles' armor (that he had taken from Patroclus' corpse) is so elliptical (*Il*. 17.194–5; the narrator annuls the arming scene) that its failure to meet the audience's expectations of an arming scene functions as a hint to the future demise of Hector, who will fail to be the Trojan Achilles (although he wears his armor; see the ensuing prophecy of Zeus in *Il*. 17.201–8 where this is explicitly stated).

6. The second reference (*Il*. 11.55 and *Od*. 13.90) is not placed at the beginning of a Book (as the first: *Il*. 1.3 and *Od*. 1.4) but at a relatively short distance from its beginning.
7. They signal a "new beginning": in the *Iliad*, the Achaeans have realized that they have to fight the Trojans without Achilles; Zeus' plan enters a new phase, as the principal Achaean heroes are wounded and will soon retreat behind their Wall; the Trojan invasion of the Achaean camp will finally lead to the death of Patroclus, Achilles' return to the war, and Hector's death at the hands of Achilles. In the *Odyssey*, the wanderings of Odysseus are over as he arrives in Ithaca. The second part of the poem that will lead to the killing of the suitors and the reinstitution of Odysseus on his throne of Ithaca is about to begin.
8. The diction used in both intratextual associations consists in a slight phraseological change of the proem's wording: *Il*. 11.55 virtually differs with respect to a single word from 1.3 (11.55: πολλὰς ἰφθίμους κεφαλὰς Ἄϊδι προϊάψειν – 1.3: πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν). Likewise, *Od*. 13.90 (ὃς πρὶν μὲν μάλα πολλὰ πάθ' ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμὸν is virtually the same but ἐν πόντῳ with respect to 1.4 (πολλὰ δ' ὅ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν).

It should be also noted that both pairs of passages are associated with the theme of anger. They constitute a reminder that it is still operating in each poem: in the *Iliad*, the theme of Achilles' *menis* begins after the proem; in 11.55 the audience is reminded that Achilles' wrath is still functional since the same proemial diction is reiterated after the failure of the Embassy in Book 9 and Agamemnon's initiative at the beginning of Book 11. In the *Odyssey*, the theme of Poseidon's anger is mentioned after the proem, when Athena tries to find a way to influence Zeus while Poseidon is visiting the Aethiopes; in Book 13, Poseidon staunchly expresses to Zeus his anger against Odysseus.

This extended list of similarities and analogies suggests an intentional association. It certainly meets the criterion of markedness that spans several aspects: size, frequency, placement within the plot, contextual framing, wording, and manner of dictional shift. Let us now use a second criterion, meaningfulness, that together with iterated markedness may be employed as a sign of deliberate allusion.

MEANINGFULNESS

At the heart of the discussion concerning meaningfulness is the direction of allusion, since it plays a decisive role in the creation of an interpretive surplus regarding the target-text/passage. Intertextual references in early Greek epic involve: (a) unidirectional reference between passage A and passage B belonging to two different texts or epic traditions; (b) bidirectional references between passage A and passage B belonging to two different epic traditions (not texts); (c) unidirectional split or divided references between passage A in one text or epic tradition and passages B, C and D in another text or epic tradition;[29] (d) unidirectional window or double reference between passage A in one text, passage B in another text, and passage C in a third text by means of a transitional, simultaneous and cumulative reference of A to B and B to C; (e) self-reflexive or meta-

[29] See Wills (1998), 283–5.

traditional intertextuality, in which a passage A in one text or epic tradition "glosses" the text's or epic tradition's position with respect to another text or epic tradition featuring a relevant passage B.[30]

However, of these forms of allusive reference that describe associations between single passages in different texts or epic traditions only (a), (b) and (e) are relevant to our case. The reason is that the situation concerning *Iliad* 1.3 and 11.55 and *Odyssey* 1.4 and 13.90 involves *pairs of intratextually associated passages*. We are, therefore, exploring a case of putative "intratextual intertextuality."[31] Given that the question referring to the direction of allusion is of paramount importance regarding the issue of meaningfulness of the allusion, we must establish specific criteria for determining whether we are dealing with unidirectional or bidirectional association. In this vein, I posit the following three criteria: (a) extent of motivation within the immediate narrative context, (b) extent of consequentiality for the plot,[32] and (c) dictional *auxesis*.

Regarding (a), *Il*. 11.55 and *Od*. 13.90 are equally well motivated within their immediate narrative context. A comparison will make this clear. *Il*. 11.55 is tagged to Zeus' sending blood-rain 'as a portent of slaughter'.[33] Given that blood rain is used in the same manner in *Il*. 16.459–60 (when Zeus sends drops of blood before the fighting that will lead to the death of Sarpedon)[34] and that in both 11.55 and 16.459–60 Zeus' action symbolizes the honor he bestows on a hero (Agamemnon in the former case,[35] Sarpedon in the latter), it is plausible that the use of a verse of the poem's proem in 11.55 reflects a carefully planned strategy tied to a theme of paramount importance for the entire poem,

---

30 See Barchiesi (2001), 128–40; Tsagalis (2011a), 413, (2011b), 221–3 = (2023), 14–16; Spelman (2018) 93 n. 33; Nelson (2023) 20.

31 This deliberately oxymoronic form of reference designates an intertextual association that is created not between passage A in one text (this line of thought works both between texts composed by writing and between oral epic traditions that have reached a high level of fixity) and passage B in another text or between passages A > B and B > A belonging to two different epic traditions (not texts) but between an intratextual reference between passages A and B in one text and an equivalent intratextual reference between passages C and D in another text. In this type of reference one aspect of the intratextual link used in the target-text plays a double role: it functions both as a connecting device between passages A and B in the same text and as a vehicle for intertextual association to a pair of passages that are intratextually linked in the source-text. This aspect concerns structure: a long-range intratextual association on the level of the organization of a (source-) text is transferred to a target-text text in such a way that it replicates the structural intratextual association observed in the source-text. The lack of a thematical association between the two pairs of passages is accompanied by a more sophisticated method of allusion: by imitating the structural function of two intratextually connected passages in the source-text, the target-text re-uses the source-text's technique of building intratextual allusion and turns it into a type of intertextual reference.

32 See Currie (2016), 252–3.

33 Tatlock (1914), 442.

34 αἱματοέσσας δὲ ψιάδας κατέχευεν ἔραζε | παῖδα φίλον τιμῶν ('he wept tears of blood that fell to the ground, for the sake of his beloved son').

35 Agamemnon had been previously honored by Hera and Athena; see *Il*. 11.45–6: ἐπὶ δ' ἐγδούπησαν Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη, | τιμῶσαι βασιλῆα πολυχρύσοιο Μυκήνης ('and Hera and Athene caused a crash of thunder about him, doing honor to the lord of deep-golden Mycenae').

i.e., the "will of Zeus". Likewise, *Od*. 13.90 is also well motivated, since the immediate narrative context marks the completion of Odysseus' sufferings at sea. Although literally Odysseus' sufferings at sea were over when he arrived in Scheria, the Phaeacian episode is still an adventure, the last step before the hero's return to his homeland.

With respect to (b), *Il*. 11.55 is more consequential for the plot than *Od*. 13.90. In the former case, the major Achaean leaders will withdraw from the fighting after being wounded, which will cause Patroclus' intervention and a series of deaths (Sarpedon will be killed by Patroclus, Patroclus will be killed by Hector) that will ultimately bring Achilles back to battle. In this light, the 'multitude of strong heads (that) will be hurled down to Hades' (*Il*. 11.55) by Zeus prefigures in summary form the future sufferings, though without any hint whatsoever regarding Achilles' new wrath against Hector. Conversely, *Od*. 13.90 does not prefigure at all what will happen in the next Books of the epic. While 11.55 "looks forward" to the unraveling of the Iliadic plot, *Od*. 13.90 "looks backward" to Odysseus' past sufferings. In fact, the narrator recalls Odysseus' past sufferings (πρίν), using a cross-reference to the proem to mark a crucial structural moment of the epic.[36] Odysseus's peaceful sleep, paired with the oblivion of his troubles, will be soon followed by the new challenges he will face on Ithaca, the gravest of which will be the killing of the suitors.[37] Further support of the claim made here may be found in the fact that *Il*. 11.55 makes a step forward when compared to *Il*. 1.2 (μυρί' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε), while *Od*. 13.90 remains equally silent as *Od*. 1.4 (πολλὰ δ' ὅ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα) regarding what awaits Odysseus in Ithaca. Whereas both *Il*. 1.2 and *Od*. 1.4 make a statement that 'embraces only part of the poem's full scope'[38] (the former pertains to the wrath of Achilles against Agamemnon, the latter to the travels and homecoming sufferings of Odysseus), it is only *Il*. 11.55 that creates the more concrete image of Zeus[39] casting 'from aloft down dews dripping blood from the sky, since he was minded to hurl down a multitude of strong heads to the house of Hades'.[40] This image may well be a sophisticated Homeric treatment of a formula[41] used for Zeus' killing of the heroes in general,[42] thus "looking forward" to the continuation of the Iliadic plot.[43]

---

36 Nelson (2023), 251–2.

37 Bowie (2013), on *Od*. 13.88–92; Nelson (2023) 252.

38 Rutherford (2001) 128.

39 M.L. West (2011) 82, on *Il*. 1.3.

40 On προϊάπτειν + "Hades" + personal pronoun, see *Il*. 5.190 (μιν . . . Ἀϊδωνῆϊ προϊάψειν) and 6.487 (μ' . . . Ἄϊδι προϊάψει) the expression 'hurl down to Hades', the former case referring to Diomedes, the latter to Hector.

41 See [Hes.] *Cat*. fr. 204.118–19: π]ολλὰς Ἀΐδη κεφαλὰς ἀπὸ χαλκὸν ἰάψ[ειν] ἀν]δρῶν ἡρώων ἐν δηϊοτῆτι πεσόντων; Σ on *Il*. 1.3: ψυχάς· Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Ῥόδιος γράφει (fr. 13 M.) «κεφαλάς».

42 Scodel (1982), 47; see also Currie (2016), 2: 'it might be conjectured that such phrasing was already used in hexameter poetry before the *Iliad* in the context of a plan of Zeus to annihilate "the heroes"'.

43 I disagree with Redfield (1979, 103 = 2001, 466–7) who suggests that ψυχάς, a Homeric innovation of κεφαλάς in the expression ἰφθίμους κεφαλὰς Ἄϊδι προϊάψειν, 'looks forward to the last third of the epic' because *Il*. 1.2 (μυρί' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε) makes it clear that ψυχάς refers exclusively to the Achaeans; see Rutherford (2001, 128: 'the proem gives no hint on the prominence of the Trojans in the *Iliad*'; also Clarke (1999), 169.

Concerning (c), 13.90 is preceded by a verse (13.89) containing two features that in view of ὃς πρὶν μὲν μάλα πολλὰ πάθ' ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμὸν echo the proem of the *Odyssey*: ἄνδρα φέρουσα θεοῖς ἐναλίγκια μήδε' ἔχοντα. Although the accusative ἄνδρα is also attested in verse-initial position in *Od*. 10.74, 16.89, 24.266, its use in this context reiterates the theme of anonymity that is interwoven with the *Odyssey*'s famous first word (ἄνδρα). Furthermore, the designation of this "man" as θεοῖς ἐναλίγκια μήδε' ἔχοντα amounts to a novel designation of πολύτροπον, the first proem's trademark description of Odysseus. This designation aims to "correct" an earlier designation of Odysseus by Aeolus in *Od*. 10.74 (τόν, ὅς κε θεοῖσιν ἀπέχθηται μακάρεσσιν)[44] and "restore" Odysseus to the status he had when he was first introduced in the *Odyssey* (1.1). This seems to be a *proemial auxesis* that builds on an analogous 'exercise of *auxesis*'[45] observed in the *Odyssey*'s first proem upon the pattern of anaphora of πολύς (*Il*. 1.2: μυρί';[46] 1.3: πολλάς – *Od*. 1.1: μάλα πολλά; 1.3: πολλῶν; 1.4: πολλά) that is used in the Iliadic first proem.[47] Seen from this vantage point, the expansive and highly sophisticated *auxesis* of the *Odyssey*'s second proem that presupposes the first proem's *auxesis* on the first Iliadic proem suggests a unidirectional association from the *Odyssey* to the *Iliad*.[48]

WIDENING THE INTERPRETIVE LENS

Of the arguments presented above (b) and (c) allow us to claim that the direction of allusion is from the Iliadic pair 1.3–11.55 to the Odyssean pair 1.4–13.90.[49] We may now move on and evaluate the broader intertextual function stemming from the Odyssean reproduction and adaptation to its structure of an Iliadic intratextual association. The crucial role is played here by the *Odyssey*'s ability to sense the paramount importance of an intratextual association involving the proem of the *Iliad*. This is because an epic proem is an extremely rich field for poetological statements. It does not simply mark the beginning of an epic; it becomes the point of departure for the type of plot that the specific epic tradition has decided to unfold. It reflects several choices made as regards the central theme of the poem, the protagonists, the range of events to be covered, and most of all the impact the epic aspires to have. Epic proems are not tables of contents or summaries in verse. By offering a hint to the type of poem that the audience will hear, they function as

---

44 'A man detested by the blessed gods'.

45 Pucci (1982), 40 = (1997), 13.

46 I take μυρί' as synonymous with πολλάς.

47 The alliteration of π in *Od*. 1.1.–1.4 (ἔννεπε . . . πολύτροπον ... πολλά | πλάγχθη . . . πτολίεθρον ἔπερσεν | πολλῶν . . . | πολλὰ . . . πόντῳ πάθεν) strengthens the function of this anaphora; see Gigante (1993) 21–2.

48 See Rutherford (2001), 146.

49 See also *Od*. 13.5–6 (τώ σ' οὔ τι πάλιν πλαγχθέντα γ' ὀΐω | ἂψ ἀπονοστήσειν, εἰ καὶ μάλα πολλὰ πέπονθας) that recasts *Il*. 1.59–60 (νῦν ἄμμε πάλιν πλαγχθέντας ὀΐω | ἂψ ἀπονοστήσειν, εἴ κεν θάνατόν γε φύγοιμεν) in Odyssean terms. Kullmann (1960, 195–96) argued that Alcinoos speaks to Odysseus in a way that iterates so pointedly what Achilles said to Agamemnon in *Il*. 1.59–60 that 'one is inclined to use it to interpret the *Iliad*'. The γ' after πάλιν πλαγχθέντα seems to be an attempt to eliminate the hiatus, which was created by the transfer of this couplet from *Il*. 1.59 where the plural πάλιν πλαγχθέντας was used; see Hennings (1903), 391.

afterthoughts or poetic comments on the epic's subject matter. It seems reasonable that the *Odyssey* not only observed the association between *Il*. 1.3 and 11.55 but also deciphered its function. It, therefore, created an analogous association and applied it to its own structure by creating a link between 1.4 and 13.90. This amounts to a refined poetic *aemulatio* by means of a literary *imitatio*.

In tune with the *Odyssey*'s systematic engagement with both the Iliadic tradition[50] and the Trojan War myth at large, the association described above was carried out in such a way that it did not simply replicate the function it had in the *Iliad* (i.e., commenting on the programmatic function of the proem) but aimed at superseding it by suggesting a more elaborate association that transcends the *Odyssey*'s plot and extends to the Trojan saga of Odysseus. This is strongly suggested by *Od*. 13.91 (ἀνδρῶν τε πτολέμους ἀλεγεινά τε κύματα πείρων 'cutting through men's wars and painful waves'). This verse glosses the sufferings of Odysseus in terms that combine his Trojan War adventures and his Odyssean wanderings. The same verse has been already used by Odysseus in *Od*. 8.183 (preceded by πολλὰ γὰρ ἔτλην) in the context of the athletic games in which he participated in Phaeacia. In that context, the speaker is Odysseus who tells the Phaeacian Euryalus that despite his sufferings in war and sea he will take part in the games. In this way, the *Odyssey* makes a bold step towards a comprehensive reference to Odysseus' sufferings, implying that its emblematic hero spans the entire Trojan War tradition that includes the actual war and the tradition of the *nostoi*.

This line of interpretation is consonant with the larger picture we usually see when discussing the *Odyssey*'s intense preoccupation with poetic identity. In view of this, metapoetic references and self-reflexivity are high priorities of Odyssean poetics. This epic systematically attempts not only to carve a place for itself among other epic traditions but also to voice claims of poetic superiority.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

I have argued that an intratextual proemial allusion from *Od*. 13.90 to *Od*. 1.4 operates as an intertextual allusion to an equivalent intratextual proemial allusion from *Il*. 11.55 to *Il*. 1.4. This is a case where phraseological, contextual, and thematical considerations support the claim for intratextual allusion, while markedness and meaningfulness make a case for intertextual allusion. On the basis of the extent of motivation within the immediate narrative context and the extent of consequentiality for the plot, I have also maintained that the direction of the intertextual allusion is from the *Odyssey* to the *Iliad*. According to this line of interpretation, there is nothing to rule out the possibility of complementarity between intratextual and intertextual allusion. The importance of this suggestion must be stressed. This is not a case where intratextual association or parallelism reflects intertextual association or parallelism, as is the case with the intratextual parallelism between Antilochus and Patroclus in the *Iliad* that reflects the intertextual relationship

[50] See, e.g., Pucci (1979), 121–32 = (1998), 1–9, (1987); Maronitis (1983), 279–91 (= 2004, 133–46); Usener (1990); Di Benedetto (2001), 7–14 = (2007), 691–799; Rutherford (1992), 2–7, (2001), 117–46 (an expanded version with new material of 1991–3, 47–54); Saïd (2011), 373–9; Currie (2016), 39–47.

between the *Iliad* and the **Memnonis*,[51] but a reverse scenario in which an intratextual proemial association in the *Odyssey* is built on an analogous intratextual proemial association in the *Iliad*, thus creating an intertextual proemial relationship between the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*.

An indirect confirmation of this line of thought that gives us enough leeway for the possibility of intertextual allusion is offered by Virgil, who places the second proem of the *Aeneid* in 7.37–44 instead of the very beginning of Book 7.[52] By using the same technique that we have observed in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, i.e., that of delayed proemial response to the *Aeneid's* initial proem, Virgil may have understood what the *Odyssey* was doing regarding the *Iliad* on both an intratextual and an intertextual level and departed on a sophisticated *aemulatio* in the *Aeneid*. After all, what Virgil seems to have done with the two proems of his epic is consonant with the fact that the *Aeneid*'s "Odyssey" that is followed by an "Iliad" may have been based on his realization that 'the *Odyssey* itself contains an "Odyssey" followed by an "Iliad".'[53] It is also possible that he had understood that the Odyssean intertextual proemial relationship to the *Iliad* involved a poetic rivalry,[54] a claim according to which the target-text surpassed the source-text. This is perhaps why he employed in the second proem in 7.37–44 of the *Aeneid* poetological diction that asserts the supremacy of the second part of the *Aeneid* with respect to the first[55] (7.43–4: *maior rerum mihi nascitur ordo, | maius opus moveo*).[56] In this vein, Virgil appears to have used an intertextual proemial relationship between the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* to create an intratextual proemial relationship between the "Iliadic"

---

51 See Currie (2016), 58–9.

52 In what follows I limit my observations to Virgil's proemial relationship to the Homeric proems. The second proem of the *Aeneid* with its invocation of the Muse Erato (7.37: *Nunc age, qui reges, Erato, quae tempora, rerum*) alludes to the invocation of Erato at the beginning of the second part of Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica* (3.1: εἰ δ' ἄγε νῦν, Ἐρατώ; see Hunter 1989, 95). Thus, the second proem of the *Aeneid* not only combines Homeric and Apollonian features but also creates an intertextual palimpsest in which the meticulous arrangement of the proemial material leaves room for the premeditated mismatch of the delayed invocation; see *OCD* s.v. 'books, poetic'.

53 Dekel (2012), 31. Dekel argues that Virgil was able to make this discovery by comparing the two Homeric epics because he realized that 'the *Odyssey* is … an interpretation, or perhaps even a rendition, of the *Iliad*. Characters, themes, and conflicts from the war are evaluated and reconfigured as an authoritative account of central Iliadic concerns' (1).

54 In oral poetry, competition to outdo one's peers often consists in the transformation of *topoi* and patterns; see Edwards (1987), 47–60.

55 See Grandsen (1991, 1–2), who suggests that the *horrida bella* that Virgil will narrate (7.41) echo Sibyl's prophecy in *Aen*. 6.86–9: *bella, horrida bella, | et Thybrim multo spumantem sanguine cerno. | nec Simois tibi nec Xanthus nec Dorica castra | defuerint; alius Latio iam partus Achilles* ('Wars, grim wars I see, and the Tiber foaming with streams of blood. You will not lack a Simois, nor a Xanthus, nor a Doric camp. Even now in Latium a new Achilles has been born'; translation by Fairclough 1916, revised by Gould, 1999).

56 However, the adjectival pair *maior … maius* recalls the Odyssean proem, in which a similar adjectival pair is used consecutively (1.3–4: **πολλῶν** δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω, | **πολλὰ** δ' ὁ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν); on such adjectival pairs, see Wills (1996), 282–5.

and the "Odyssean" part of his own epic, thus opting for an intertextual mode of interpretation *more Homerico* instead of a juxtatextual one.[57]

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barchiesi, A. (2001). *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets*, London: Duckworth.

Bassett, S. (1923). 'The Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*', *AJPh* 44, 339–48.

Bowie, A.M. (2013). *Homer:* Odyssey *(Books XIII and XIV*), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burgess, J.S. (2011). 'Intertextuality without Text in Early Greek Epic', in Ø. Andersen and Dag T.T. Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 168–83.

Cairns, D.L. (2001). 'Introduction', in D.L. Carins (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Homer's* Iliad. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1–56.

Clarke, M. (1999). *Flesh and Spirit in the Songs of Homer*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

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

Currie, B. (2016). *Homer's Allusive Art*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dekel, E. (2012). *Virgil's Homeric Lens*, New York and London: Routledge.

Di Benedetto, V. (2001). 'Reuses of Iliadic Patterns in the *Odyssey*', *RCCM* 43, 7–14 (= 2007, II. 691–700. V. Di Benedetto, *Il richiamo del testo: contributi di filologia e letteratura*. Pisa: Edizioni ETS).

Dimock, G.E. (1989). *The Unity of the* Odyssey, Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.

Dowden, K. (1996). 'Homer's Sense of Text', *JHS* 116, 47–61.

Edwards, M.W. (1987). 'Topos and Transformation', in J.M. Bremmer, I.J.F. de Jong, and J. Kalff (eds.), *Homer; Beyond Oral Poetry (Recent Trends in Homeric Interpretation)*. Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner Publishing Company.

Eichhorn, F. (1965). *Homers Odyssee: ein Führer durch die Dichtung*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Erbse, H. (1972). *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Odyssee*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Fairclough, H.R. (1916). *Virgil:* Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I–VI *(revised by G.P. Goold, 1999)*, Cambridge, Mass. and London, England: Harvard University Press.

Finkelberg, M. (1989). 'Formulaic and Nonformulaic Elements in Homer', *CPh* 84, 179–97 (= 2020, 22–44. *Homer and Early Greek Epic: Collected Essays*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter).

Finkelberg, M. (1997). 'Homer, A Poet of an Individual Style', *SCI* 16, 1–8 (= 2020, 45–52. *Homer and Early Greek Epic: Collected Essays*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter).

57 See Dekel (2012), 13.

Finkelberg, M. (2004). 'Oral Theory and the Limits of Formulaic Diction', *Oral Tradition* 19.2, 236–52 (= 2020, 53–65. *Homer and Early Greek Epic: Collected Essays*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter).

Finkelberg, M. (2015). 'Meta-Cyclic Epic and Homeric Poetry', in M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds). *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception. A Companion*. Cambridge, 126–38 (= 2020, 169–81. *Homer and Early Greek Epic: Collected Essays*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter).

Giannopoulou, Z. (2017). 'Middles and Prophecy in the *Odyssey*', *Yage* 1, 137–58.

Gigante, M. (1993). 'Il proemio dell'Odissea', in M. Paizi-Apostolopoulou (ed.), *Σπονδές στον Όμηρο (Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on the Odyssey, 2–5 September 1990, Ithaki)*. Ithaki: Center for Odyssean Studies, 11–28.

Grandsen, K.W. (1991). *Virgil:* Aeneid *(Book XI)*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harden, S. and Kelly, A. (2013). 'Proemic Convention and Character Construction in Early Greek Epic', *HSCPh* 107, 1–34.

Hennings, P.D.Ch. (1903). *Homers Odyssee: Ein kritischer Kommentar*, Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.

Heubeck, A. and A. Hoekstra (1989). *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey*: vol. II (Books ix–xvi)*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hoekstra: see Heubeck (1989).

Hunter, R. L. (1989). *Apollonius of Rhodes:* Argonautica *(Book III)*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kullmann, W. (1960). *Die Quellen der Ilias (Troischer Sagenkreis)*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Kullmann, W. (1995). 'The Two Nekyiai of the *Odyssey* and their Oral Sources', in M. Païsi-Apostolopoulou (ed.), *Εὐχὴν Ὀδυσσεῖ (Proceedings of the 7th Conference on the* Odyssey*,* 3–8 September 1993, Ithaki, 41–53 (= 2002, 147–55. W. Kullmann, *Realität, Imagination und Theorie. Kleine Schriften zu Epos und Tragödie in der Antike*, ed. By A. Rengakos. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag).

Kyriakidis, S. and F. De Martino (2004). 'Introduction', in S. Kyriakidis, and F. De Martino, (eds.), *Middles in Latin Poetry*, Bari: Levante, 9–24.

Lattimore, R. (1951). *The* Iliad *of Homer*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Maronitis, D.N. (1983). 'References latentes de l'Odyssée à l'Iliade', in *Melanges Edouard Delebecque* (Aix-en-Provence), 279–91 (= 2004, 133–46. D.N. Maronitis, *Homeric Megathemes: War-Homilia-Homecoming*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books).

Most, G. (1992). 'Il poeta nell'Ade: catabasis epica e teoria dell'epos tra Omero e Virgilio', *SIFC* 10.1–2, 1014–26.

Nelson, T.J. (2023). *Markers of Allusion in Archaic Greek Poetry*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pedrick, V. (1992). 'The Muse Corrects: The Opening of the *Odyssey*', in F.M. Dunn and T. Cole (eds.), *Beginnings in Classical Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 39–62.

Pucci, P. (1979). 'The Song of the Sirens', *Arethusa* 12, 121–32 (= 1998, 1–9. *The Song of the Sirens: Essays on Homer*, Lanham, MD: Lexington Books).

Pucci, P. (1982). 'The Proem of the *Odyssey*', *Arethusa* 15.1–2, 39–62 (= 1998, 11–29. *The Song of the Sirens: Essays on Homer*, Lanham, MD: Lexington Books).

Pucci, P. (1987). *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the* Odyssey *and the* Iliad (1995, with a New Afterthought), Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Ready, J.L. (2019). *Orality, Textuality, & the Homeric Epics: An Interdisciplinary Study of Oral Texts, Dictated Texts, and Wild Texts*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Redfield, J. (1979). 'The Proem of the *Iliad*: Homer's Art', *CPh* 74.2, 95–110 (= 2001. In D.L. Cairns, ed., *Oxford Readings in Homer's* Iliad. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 456–77).
Rieu, E. V. (2003). *Homer: The* Odyssey (*translation by E. V. Rieu; revised translation by D.C.H. Rieu, with Introduction by P. Jones)*, London: Penguin Books.
Rutherford, R.B. (1985). 'At Home and Abroad: Aspects of the Structure of the *Odyssey*', *PCPhS* 31, 133–50.
Rutherford, R.B. (1992). Odyssey *XIX and XX*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rutherford, R.B. (2001). 'From the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*', in D.L. Cairns (ed.), *Oxford Reading in Homer's* Iliad. Oxford, 117–46 (shorter version published in *BICS* 38 [1991–3] 47–54).
Saïd, S. (2011). *Homer and the* Odyssey (first published as *Homère et l'Odyssée*, Paris 1998), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Satterfield, B. (2011). 'The Beginning of the *Iliad*. The "Contradictions" of the Proem and the Burial of Hector', *Mnemosyne* 64, 1–20.
Schein, S.L. (1999), 'Homeric Intertextuality: Two Examples', in A. Rengakos and J. Kazazis (eds.), *Euphrosyne: Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Demetrios N. Maronitis*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 349–56 (= 2016. In S. L. Schein, *Homeric Epic and Its Reception: Interpretive Essays*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 81–91).
Schein S.L. (2002), 'Mythological Allusion in the *Odyssey*', in F. Montanari (ed.), *Omero tremila anni dopo*. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 85–101 (= 'Mythological Allusion in the *Odyssey*: Herakles and the Bow of Odysseus', 2016. In S.L. Schein, *Homeric Epic and Its Reception: Interpretive Essays*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 39–54).
Scodel, R. (1982). 'The Achaean Wall and the Myth of Destruction', *HSCPh* 86, 33–50.
Sharrock, A. (2018). 'How Do We Read a (W)hole?: Dubious First Thoughts about the Cognitive Turn', in S. Harrison, S. Frangoulidis, and Th.D. Papanghelis (eds.), *Intratextuality and Latin Literature*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 15–31.
Spelman, H.L. (2018). *Pindar and the Poetics of Permanence*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Stanford, W.B. (1959[2]). *The* Odyssey *of Homer*, London: Macmillan.
Tatlock, J.S.P. (1914). 'Some Mediaeval Cases of Blood-Rain', *CPh* 9.4. 442–7.
Tsagalis, C. (2008). *The Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics*. Washington DC: Harvard University Press.
Tsagalis, C. (2011a). 'Intertextuality', in M. Finkelberg (ed.), *The Homer Encyclopedia*, 413–14.
Tsagalis, C. (2011b). 'Towards an Oral, Intertextual Neoanalysis', *TiC* 3.2, 209–244 (= 2023, 3–33. *Early Greek Epic: Language, Interpretation, Performance*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter).

Tsagalis, C. (2024a). 'Space and Story: The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*', in E. Greensmith (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 81–103.

Tsagalis, C. (2024b). *The Homeric* Doloneia*: Evolution and Shaping of* Iliad *10*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Usener, K. (1990). *Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis der Odyssee zur Ilias*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

van Groningen, B.A. (1946). 'The Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*', *Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde* 9.8, 279–94.

West, M.L. (2011). *The Making of the* Iliad: *Disquisition and Analytical Commentary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

West, M.L. (2013). *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

West, St., A. Heubeck, and J.B. Hainsworth (1988). *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey*: vol. I (Books i–viii)*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wills, J. (1996). *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wills, J. (1998). 'Divided Allusion: Virgil and the Coma Berenices', *HSCPh* 98, 277–305.