Recognizing Epiphany

Exploring the Theme of Epiphany in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Vergil

Kathryn Schulz

Trinity College

Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Oxford, Faculty of Classics

August 2018

Kathryn Schulz
Trinity College, Oxford
DPhil Classical Languages and Literature
August 2018

Abstract: *Recognizing Epiphany: Exploring the Theme of Epiphany in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Vergil*

This thesis explores the versatile theme of epiphany in the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, *Argonautica*, and *Aeneid*. Chapter 1 sets forth the major scene patterns to be adopted, arguing that an understanding of the traditional narrative elements of epiphany helps to enhance, rather than limit, the reader's appreciation of these scenes. Part I then considers how these motifs intersect with the themes of agency and recognition in the Homeric poems. Chapter 2 examines three scenes in which a mortal's usurpation of a divine motif challenges the epiphanic hierarchy. The *Iliad* represents such attempts as transgressive, whereas the *Odyssey* shows Athena willingly transferring a motif to Odysseus before casting him as a divine agent in her plot against the suitors. Chapter 3 explores the extent to which the Ithacan recognition scenes evoke the theme of epiphany as a result of Odysseus's "theoxenic" role. In Chapter 4, Nausicaa is discussed as a parallel example of a mortal who is authorised, as a divine agent, to appear temporarily as an epiphanic figure.

Part II turns to Apollonius and Vergil. As with other "typical" elements, Apollonius demonstrates his ability to reproduce Homeric narrative conventions of epiphany, but his interest in problematizing recognition leads him to reject any semblance of structural unity in his epiphanies. Chapter 6 examines how Vergil, by contrast, signals his intent to follow Homeric models through an excessive adherence to traditional motifs in his first epiphany. Chapter 7 explores questions of agency tied to Vergil's extension of epiphanic roles to figures on the margins between humanity and divinity, focusing on the epiphanies of Tiberinus, Juturna, and Anchises. Finally, Chapter 8 considers how Vergil evokes both Odyssean and Iliadic models of "mortal epiphany" in his treatment of Aeneas's future divinity, only to reject them in favour of a distinctly Roman model of apotheosis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have helped to make this thesis what it is. First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Richard Rutherford, for his expertise and patience in guiding me through my DPhil. I am grateful to Felix Budelmann, Denis Feeney, Gregory Hutchinson, Adrian Kelly, and Llewellyn Morgan for serving as examiners at various stages in the writing of this thesis. My thanks go to Tristan Franklinos for reading the text in its entirety and contributing many useful notes, and to Leah Stead and Catherine Teitz for their comments on individual chapters. Thank you also to Robin Wilson for first noting the relevance of the theme of agency and for challenging me to consider new perspectives.

I am grateful to Stephen Pearson and the Oxford-Pearson Graduate Scholarship for financial support of my studies; to Oxford's Faculty of Classics for its warm collegiality and for the use of its resources; and to Gail Trimble and the tutorial team at Trinity College for their training and encouragement. Thanks also to Joseph Pucci for his early and continuing guidance, without which I might never have considered graduate study in Classics.

Last but not least, I owe my gratitude to my family for their support and encouragement throughout my life and studies.

Kathryn Schulz
Trinity College, Oxford

I certify that this thesis and the work presented herein are my own, except where indicated by references. The research contained in this thesis has not been submitted, in whole or in part, in any previous application for a degree.
This thesis contains 92,114 words, excluding bibliography.

CONTENTS

Part I: Homer

1. Introduction: Meeting and Recognizing the Gods in Homeric Epic 1

2. Godlike Mortals: Challenging the Epiphanic Hierarchy 37

3. Mortal "Epiphanies" – Odysseus in Ithaca 56

4. Mortal "Epiphanies" – Odysseus in Scheria 105

Part II: Apollonius and Vergil

5. Apollonian Epiphanies and the Problem of Recognition 139

6. Vergilian Epiphanies and the Homeric Scene Pattern 164

7. Extraordinary Epiphanies: Local Gods, Deification, and Epiphanies from the Grave 189

8. Mortal Epiphanies? Tracing Aeneas's Divinity in the *Aeneid* 217

Appendices 236

Bibliography 243

PART I: Homer

1

Introduction:
Meeting and Recognizing the Gods in Homeric Epic

οὐ γάρ πως πάντεσσι θεοὶ φαίνονται ἐναργεῖς.

For in no way do the gods appear openly to all.
Homer *Odyssey* 16.161[1]

One of the major conceptual frameworks defining how the ancient Greeks saw their world, the cultural notion of epiphany influenced nearly every part of life in the ancient Mediterranean. As a means of defining the place of humanity in the cosmos, as well as of mediating contact between mortals and higher powers, it not only was a religious concern but also occupied a privileged position in the related spheres of politics, society, and artistic culture.[2]

For the ancient Greeks, the idea of epiphany paradoxically communicated a sense of both order and disorder. Mythical, religious, and literary sources frequently claim that the identities, attributes, and even the existence of certain major gods were originally revealed to mortals through epiphanies. Several of the Homeric Hymns, in particular, describe a deity's birth, acquisition of major spheres of influence, and earliest forays into the world of mortals. These encounters frequently led to the establishment of cults, through which worshippers sought to mediate their relationship with the god and to control the circumstances under which the divine might exert itself in their world in the future.[3] Yet, at the same time, literary descriptions highlight the unpredictable nature of epiphany. They reveal no actions which

[1] Primary texts are based on those of Mooney 1912 (*Argonautica*), Allen 1917 (*Odyssey*), Munro and Allen 1920 (*Iliad*), and Mynors 1969 (*Aeneid*). Translations are my own.

[2] Platt 2011 and Petridou 2015 *passim*.

[3] Richardson 1974 208-9; Rudhardt 1978 1-17; Clay 1989 15; Sowa 1984 238; Platt 2011 55-6; Petridou 2015 251-87.

consistently provoke an epiphany, no behaviour that ensures the percipient's safety or success, and no clear instructions on how to recognize an epiphanic god. Consequently, while epiphany is a means of revealing cosmic order, and in turn of producing and maintaining order in religion and society, it is also a warning against treating encounters with the divine as anything other than complex and variable.

The Homeric poems provide some of the earliest examples of epiphanic encounters in Greek literature, alongside Hesiod and the major Homeric Hymns. Yet while the latter approach epiphany primarily from an inspirational or divine perspective, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* explore epiphany from the perspective of their mortal heroes. Among numerous types of divine intervention,[4] epiphany has a prominent place in Homer as the most direct and intimate form of contact with the divine, capable equally of exalting heroes to almost godlike status and of sealing their fate with death. Even for these heroes, closer to the gods than men of the poet's age by descent and by ability, the gods are already more distant than in previous generations, and corresponding representations of epiphany are rarely straightforward.

As a result, ancient scholars of the Homeric poems were particularly interested in finding patterns within the epiphanies. Which gods interact with mortals, and why do they intervene at all? What do the gods look like when they appear in epiphanies? When do they appear in disguise, and how do they choose these disguises? Does the presence of a disguise influence how the god or mortal behaves? How do mortals recognize epiphanic gods?[5] Such questions reveal a keen ancient interest in the narrative conventions of Homeric epiphanies and an attempt to glean from them guiding principles by which to interpret individual scenes.

Building upon more recent scholarship, this thesis follows in the scholiasts' footsteps by taking up the question of the structure and recognizability of epiphany in Homer and his

---

[4] On divine intervention in Homer, see e.g. Dodds 1951 14; Chantraine 1952 45-94; Severyns 1966 83-103; Willcock 1970 1-10; Dietrich 1983 53-79; Mueller 1984 125-33; Kullmann 1985 1-23; Emlyn-Jones 1992 93-5; Kearns 2004 63-8; Louden 2005 90-6. I use "Homer" throughout this thesis to refer to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in their present form. While I do not discuss the dating of these texts, I do assume that the *Iliad* is the earlier of the two. For similar assumptions, see Rutherford 1993 37-54.

[5] On these and further questions in the Homeric scholia, see Nünlist 2009 267-81.

successors. This introduction will argue that the flexibility which scholarship has relatively recently embraced in its study of oral traditional scenes is essential to the Homeric representation of epiphany. Subsequent chapters then explore how the narrative patterns underlying epic epiphany scenes both reinforce the divide between mortal and divine and provide poets with opportunities to explore the grey areas surrounding this dividing line, where mortal characters may challenge and even, in some cases, surpass their subordinate position in this ontological hierarchy. The main aim of this study is not to rewrite our understanding of these basic narrative elements, which have been discussed at length by other scholars, but to explore the different directions in which the epiphanies of the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, *Argonautica*, and *Aeneid* push the boundaries of this flexible structure and how these efforts relate to the poems' general portrayal of the relationship between man and god.

This introduction will begin with a brief overview of scholarship on the meaning and etymology of "epiphany" before establishing a working definition for the present study. This will require some methodological explanation, as well as an acknowledgement of the broader cultural context against which this definition of epiphany must be understood. The chapter will then provide a more extensive survey of scholarship on Homeric epiphany as a formal narrative structure. Close readings of two scenes will be offered as illustrations of the narrative conventions which will be assumed in subsequent chapters. The introduction will close, finally, with an exposition of further questions and a summary of the rest of the thesis.

History of Scholarship: Definitions and Context

Modern studies of Homeric epiphany have, until recently, been relatively fragmented and tangential. One major concern in the twentieth century was to establish the definition, etymology, and typology of literary epiphanies and thus to determine the role of the word ἐπιφάνεια in Graeco-Roman, and later Judeo-Christian, religious thought. At the same time,

Arend's work on type-scenes inspired a major trend in Homeric studies, which progressed by further leaps and bounds with Milman Parry's groundbreaking work on the poems' origins in the oral tradition.[6] While the variability of the Homeric epiphany scenes led many scholars to despair of finding a consistent narrative pattern underlying all of them, subsequent scholarship acknowledging the flexibility of oral compositional techniques provided a much more fruitful approach. Finally, a wave of recent studies has refocused attention on the breadth and pervasiveness of the Graeco-Roman concept of epiphany and its influence not only on literary culture but also on religious and sociopolitical contexts.

To begin with basic vocabulary, the noun ἐπιφάνεια is based upon the verb φαίνω, "to bring to light, to make known, to show", or in the passive "to come to light, to appear."[7] This word, in turn, derives from the root **φᾱ* (IE **b^heh_2-* / PIE **b^hh_2-*) "to shine, to radiate, to startle", thus revealing an intimate connection between light and divine presence.[8] While the verb φαίνειν appears as early as Homer to describe the personal visit of a god, it is less common than might be supposed in this context, and only two of its Homeric occurrences take place within an actual epiphanic encounter.[9] The noun ἐπιφάνεια does not appear in literature until the fourth century BCE,[10] and not in the sense of a divine manifestation until the Hellenistic period, where it is first attested with this meaning in an inscription from 279/8 BCE.[11] In the study of the Homeric poems, therefore, the word "epiphany" is, in at least an

---

[6] Arend 1933; Parry 1971.

[7] *LSJ* φαίνω.

[8] Pax 1955 6; Lührmann 1971 187; Richardson 1974 208; Bremer 1975 5-6; Parisinou 2000 *passim*; Petridou 2015 3. See also Bierl 2004 51-6.

[9] *Il*. 1.198; *Od*. 16.159. The verb is used to describe potential or denied epiphanies at *Il*. 20.131; *Od*. 6.329, 7.201, 16.161. See Koch Piettre 1996 49n1; Pucci 1998 71n4. Cf. Bremer 1975 1.

[10] E.g. Democritus fr. 155 (Diels-Kranz 1952 2.173); Plato *Alcibiades* 124c; Isoc. *Enc. Helen* 17; Aristotle *De caelo* 286b-287b, *Categoriae* 4b-5b, *Metaphysica* 1029b, *Physica* 210a-b. In this period ἐπιφάνεια means "appearing," "visible," or by extension "what is widely visible (i.e. fame)." See Pfister 1924 278-9.

[11] *Syll*.[3] 398. On this inscription see Pfister 1924 78; Lührmann 1971 188; Platt 2011 15; Petridou 2015 123. In literature, ἐπιφάνεια refers to a divine manifestation in Diod. Sic. I 24.2-4; Dion. Hal. VI 13.4; Strabo VIII 374; Plut. *Them*. 30.

etymological sense, an anachronism. This has not, however, stopped many scholars from using the term in their analyses of literary sources that predate its semantic development.

Numerous primary sources pertaining to ἐπιφάνεια are collected by Friedrich Pfister in his 1924 encyclopaedia entry on "Epiphanie."[12] In addition to his discussion of the word's history, Pfister distinguishes among three forms of epiphany: 1) the personal, waking appearance of a supernatural being to a mortal; 2) dream visions; and 3) general revelations of divinity, which need not involve physical presence. He then distinguishes between epic, mythical, fairytale, and legendary epiphanies according to the role of the god in the narrative. In epic epiphanies, the main focus is on mortal characters, whose heroic status grants them access to divine assistance; mythical epiphanies feature the gods as main characters and form an essential part of their mythological cycles; fairytale epiphanies are set in a distant time when gods interacted freely with mortals; and legendary epiphanies tend to occur in historical times and are associated with cult worship. Pfister's typological approach proved highly influential in subsequent studies of the role of epiphany in Greek religion, for which his article provided a wealth of primary material.[13]

The most comprehensive study of the etymological origins and development of ἐπιφάνεια is that of Elpidius Pax.[14] Building upon material collected by Pfister, Pax defines epiphany as "das plötzlich eintretende und ebenso rasch weichende Sichtbarwerden der Gottheit vor den Augen der Menschen unter gestalteten und ungestalteten Anschauungsformen, die natürlichen oder geheimnisvollen Charakter tragen."[15] He distinguishes among mythic, epic, cult, and soteriological epiphanies and identifies eight forms in which they might occur: 1) the unexpected bodily appearance of a deity to an individual; 2) the intervention of a deity in a moment of crisis; 3) the manifestation of a

[12] Pfister 1924 227-323.

[13] See bibliography in Petridou (2015 7).

[14] Pax 1955; Pax 1962 832-909.

[15] Pax 1955 20.

deity's power; 4) the periodic return of a deity to a cult center (ἐπιδημία); 5) the manifestation of the ruler in a ruler cult (παρουσία); 6) the first appearance of a deity to men; 7) the dream vision (ἐπίστασις); and 8) the late antique theurgist's vision.[16] Pax follows Pfister in approaching epiphany as a problem of definition and typology, but his interest is primarily in the connotations of ἐπιφάνεια in biblical epiphanies. As a result, his discussion of Graeco-Roman epiphanies is brief and tends toward generalization of a single term which, as noted above, does not appear until a relatively late stage in Greek religious contexts.

Pfister's and Pax's equation of ἐπιφάνεια and "epiphany" drew criticism from Dieter Lührmann, who objected that their ideas about the modern term had contaminated their understanding of the ancient one.[17] Lührmann argues that ἐπιφάνεια had a much narrower meaning in antiquity than they admit, referring to the intervention of a god for the benefit of his worshippers, typically in a military context and often leading to the foundation of a cult to commemorate the event. Significantly, Lührmann claims that ἐπιφάνεια never appears in the sense of a god's visible, physical appearance, but denotes only the manifestation of divine power. This view has been answered by Versnel, and more recently Petridou's comprehensive study has highlighted that ἐπιφάνεια was only one of many terms used in antiquity to refer to the same basic concept (e.g. ἐπιφάνεια, δύναμις, ἀρετή, ἐνάργεια, ἐνέργεια, παρουσία, ἐπιδημία, ἐπίστασις).[18]

While there is no single word in Homeric Greek to denote the encounter between god and man, there are certain core concepts whose vocabulary is consistently adopted to convey the directness and power of such experiences. These include the language of meeting (συνάντεσθαι, συμβάλλεσθαι, ἀντιάαν, ἀντιβολεῖν), presence (παρουσία), proximity (σχεδόν, ἄγχι, ἐπιστῆναι), illusion or resemblance (δοκεῖν, ἔοικα, εἰδομένη, φάσμα, εἴδωλον),

---

[16] Pax 1955 15-16.

[17] Lührmann 1971 185-99.

[18] Versnel 1987 42-55. These terms often appear in distinct contexts, e.g. ἐπιδημία typically appears in crisis, theoxenic, or cult contexts, while ἐπίστασις corresponds more to dream epiphanies. See Petridou (2015 3-4) for further discussion.

perception (ὄψις, ἰδεῖν, νοεῖν, γνῶναι, ἐναργής), and emotion (θάμβος, ταρβεῖν, ἔκπληξις).[19] This vocabulary suggests a certain conceptual framework which unites and underlies these scenes, making it appropriate to discuss them as a distinct set of ideas even though Homer does not yet give an explicit name to the system as a whole.

For all these reasons, while keeping in mind that the ancient term ἐπιφάνεια conveyed at once more and less than the modern term "epiphany," the latter remains the most expedient and familiar way to identify these encounters to a modern audience. I therefore use the word "epiphany" throughout this study even when referring to scenes which predate the use of its cognate in Greek.

Having selected a word, it now remains to define it. Recent scholarship has revealed just how pervasive the idea of epiphany was in ancient Greek imagination. Verity Platt's 2011 monograph *Facing the Gods* examines verbal and visual representations of Graeco-Roman epiphany, carefully distinguishing between the conventions of various media. Treating epiphany as a cultural phenomenon which poses unique problems of interpretation for modern scholars, Platt explores how material and textual representations of the gods could evoke the actual experience of epiphany in ancient audiences, whether in preparation for an encounter with the god in a cult setting or as a means of inviting epiphany through verbal performance. Platt's study provides a much-needed discussion of non-verbal representations of epiphany and how these complement literary depictions in contributing to our understanding of such a broad, cultural-mediated phenomenon.

Complementing and expanding upon Platt's study is Georgia Petridou's 2015 *Divine Epiphany in Greek Literature and Culture*, which explores not only the cultural specificity of epiphany but also its sociopolitical repercussions, i.e. how individuals and communities used epiphany to "reinforc[e] old power structures and creat[e] new ones."[20] Petridou deals with an impressive range of material, which she binds together with a number of key themes such as

[19] Koch Piettre 2001 218. See also Petridou 2015 3-4.

[20] Petridou 2015 10.

the danger of epiphany and how percipients might prepare for this, the beauty of the epiphanic setting as well as of the gods themselves, and divine light and radiance as a key element of rituals.[21] She highlights "how essential epiphanies were as conceptual tools for underscoring the limitations of human nature and culture and the corresponding ability of the omnipotent divine beings to overcome them."[22]

Above all, Petridou's survey of textual and epigraphic sources spanning centuries of Greek history reveals that epiphany was a vast concept which included manifold types of encounters, settings, conventions, and appropriate responses. In this broad context, she defines epiphany as "the manifestation of a deity to an individual or group of people, in sleep or in waking reality, in a crisis or cult context."[23] The deity might appear in any number of forms, including anthropomorphic, enacted, *effigies*, *pars pro toto*, or zoomorphic forms; as a φάσμα; or as an unexpected or extreme natural phenomenon.[24] The epiphany might be perceived sensorially or intellectually by percipients human, animal,[25] or divine.[26]

Such a broad definition, when applied even to a single poem, would require a study of far greater length than the limits of this thesis will allow. Even within epic scholarship, there seem to be as many definitions of epiphany as there are studies. These range from the extremely broad, such as Bakker's use of the term to describe the evocation of any mythical character (mortal or divine) in the specific moment of performance, to the very narrow, such as Pucci's restriction of the word to direct divine interventions which end in the god's deliberate revelation of his identity.[27] Between these two extremes lies a spectrum of other definitions. Lenz, in his study of the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, includes not just the

---

[21] Review by Van der Ploeg 2016.

[22] Petridou 2015 11.

[23] Petridou 2015 2.

[24] See also Versnel 2011 37.

[25] Cf. *HAph* 68-74; *Il*. 13.23-31; Thgn. *El*. 1.5-10; Ap. *Arg*. 3.1211-24.

[26] Cf. *HAp* 2-4, 134-5.

[27] Bakker 1997 162; Pucci 1998 69-80.

goddess's appearance to Anchises as an epiphany, but also the revelation of her power to the poet's audience at *HAph* 68-74.[28] Perhaps the most common definition is the direct, personal interaction of a god with a mortal, regardless of whether the latter recognizes the former.[29]

While not depriving the term "epiphany" of any of the above meanings – indeed, based on Petridou's analysis, any or all might be considered epiphanic experiences depending on the context – the present study will adopt the following definition: *an epic epiphany is a personal interaction in which a god addresses a mortal directly, to which the mortal may or may not respond*. Within this, I include everything from the moment the god decides to intervene until the god leaves the percipient's presence. Although recognition is not always required for the scene to be identifiable as an epiphany, my discussion will focus on scenes in which the mortal percipient perceives the divinity of the performer. This is partly a matter of convenience, since it helps to provide a more manageable sample with which to work, and partly one of interest, as the narrative patterns and themes of epiphany can be most fully explored when recognition is achieved. In particular, it is only in these cases that the mortal's response to the superior agency of the visiting deity can be illustrated. I hope that, in confining my remarks to a small subset of literary epiphanies, I will nevertheless be able to contribute to an appreciation of the versatility of epiphany as an epic theme, as well as to enhance the understanding of individual scenes through interesting new readings.

History of Scholarship: Epiphany as a Formal Narrative Concept

Alongside the etymological and typological studies of Pfister, Pax, and Lührmann, another relevant strand of Homeric scholarship emerged in the mid-twentieth century. Its seminal work, Walter Arend's 1933 *Die typischen Scenen bei Homer*, observes that the *Iliad*

---

[28] Lenz 1975 19.

[29] E.g. Kullmann 1956 99-100; Kearns 2004 64-5.

and *Odyssey* are composed of numerous "typical" scenes. Each type-scene contains a series of required elements which always appear in the same order and use the same vocabulary. Within this basic framework, the poet has the option to elaborate by providing further descriptive detail. Arend analyzes scenes of arrival, sacrifice, journey by land and sea, arming, retiring to bed, μερμηρίζειν, assembly, oath-taking, and bathing. This list was supplemented by later scholars,[30] but always with the same general thesis: that the same elements must appear in the same order, and with the same vocabulary, in order for a scene to qualify as a type-scene.

Epiphany scenes, however, were often omitted from this list on the grounds that they are simply too variable to possess a common scheme. This is the conclusion of Seward, for example, who argues that it would be impossible to delineate a narrative pattern for epiphanies because the scenes are too variegated.[31] In her discussion of the semiotics of epiphany in literary and philosophical texts, Koch Piettre notes that several of Arend's type-scenes may involve divine characters. However, by arguing that a scene cannot represent two types at once, she concludes that no distinct epiphany type-scene could exist in Homer.[32]

Scholars who have attempted to identify a pattern for these scenes often focus on a small set of epiphanies, thus allowing for greater specificity in their search for common elements. Kullmann, for example, observes eight stages in the scene pattern for battlefield epiphanies: 1) a situation evolves which requires divine intervention; 2) the god becomes aware of the situation and 3) has an emotional response to it; 4) he makes his preparations on Olympus; 5) the god appears in an epiphany; 6) the god departs and 7) the mortal acts in accordance with the epiphany.[33] While technically accurate, Kullmann's exclusion of features

---

[30] E.g. Fenik (1968) on Iliadic battle scenes. For summaries of scholarship on Homeric type-scenes, see Edwards 1992 287-95; Clark 2004 126.

[31] Seward 1991 18.

[32] E.g. if a god interrupts a hero's μερμηρίζειν scene, the same scene cannot also be considered an epiphany type-scene. "Il n'existe donc pas de scène-type unique que l'on peut cataloguer comme 'épiphanie' chez Homère." Koch Piettre 1996 50. Cf. Edwards 1980 9-15; Fernández Contreras 1999 15-6.

[33] Kullmann 1956 44ff.

that do not appear in every scene means that he is able to provide only the broadest outline of their structure, and he does not relate these battlefield epiphanies to those that occur in other contexts. Edwards, on the other hand, discusses "divine visitation" scenes in his analysis of *Iliad* 1, noting that such encounters typically feature the god's journey to earth (possibly elaborated with a description of the god's preparations or a simile), arrival, conversation (usually initiated by the god), and departure.[34] This scheme can more easily be applied to a greater number of scenes, but it is once again extremely general and more descriptive than interpretative. For the most part, these studies are limited by the rigidity of their definition of the requirements for a "typical" scene.[35]

A key breakthrough was Nagler's introduction of the "motif" to the discussion of oral composition. His 1974 monograph *Spontaneity and Tradition* defines a motif as "an inherited preverbal Gestalt for the spontaneous generation of a family of meaningful details."[36] One traditional scene which he examines is that of a young woman descending from her chamber accompanied by maidservants.[37] By scrutinizing numerous variations on this event, Nagler shows that two traditional scenes which share their vocabulary and theme may have opposite meanings in context, while individual elements such as the κρηδέμνον or the "not alone" motif can be consistently used to evoke certain meanings even when expressed in different ways. The versatility of this approach can be seen in the application of allomorphs of the "not alone" motif not only to Penelope, Nausicaa, and Helen, but also to Telemachus and several Iliadic heroes who are said to be accompanied by attendants at key moments. Nagler's motif sequence offers a much more flexible way of discussing formulae and the traditional building

---

[34] Edwards 1980 9-15. Koch Piettre's pattern for epiphany (1996 64ff.) is similarly general: the god rests somewhere, decides to intervene, descends to the mortal world with supernatural speed, arrives, delivers a message, and departs.

[35] For this reason, Stevens (2003 53-60) objects to treating Homeric epiphany from the standpoint of typology, on the grounds that attempts to identify typical elements lead to the exclusion of scenes which do not fit a relatively simple paradigm.

[36] Nagler 1974 82-3.

[37] Nagler 1974 64-111.

blocks of Homeric poetry, recognizing that a particular concept may recur in a given context without necessarily involving verbal repetition.[38] While the recurring motif may be described differently every time it appears, its core function or meaning remains the same.

Nagler's faith in the ability of ancient audiences to recognize and understand such subtle variations is echoed in the methodology of scholars like Martin and Foley.[39] Through comparative work in modern oral poetry, they theorize that the Homeric audience possessed an encyclopaedic knowledge of traditional phrases and scenes. Such a knowledgeable audience enables each formula, however long or short, not only to convey its literal meaning but also to acquire further nuance from the sum of its uses throughout archaic epic. Since this audience can be expected to draw associations between different appearances of a particular formula or motif, it can also be supposed that they would understand the significance of more or less subtle variations on the elements – be they words, phrases, or underlying narrative patterns – of traditional scenes.

This method of analysis has proved to be key to our understanding of the epiphany scene as a formal narrative concept. In his 2003 dissertation *The Gods' Radiance Manifest: An Examination of the Narrative Pattern Underlying the Homeric Divine Epiphany Scenes*, Daniel Turkeltaub develops the fullest scene pattern to date. Building on Nagler's work, Turkeltaub identifies twenty-eight motifs that cluster around the epiphany scenes in the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and Homeric Hymns. None of these motifs is unique to the epiphanies, and many appear also in other type-scenes such as arrival and messenger scenes.[40] More importantly, though, no single motif is required in an epiphany, and the motifs may be arranged in any order. Each scene borrows from a reservoir of common elements, thus binding the epiphanies

---

[38] Cf. Fry (1968 53) on the type-scene in Old English poetry as "a recurring stereotyped presentation of conventional details used to describe a certain narrative event, requiring neither verbatim repetition nor a specific formula content." Cf. Hainsworth 1968 35-9, who argues for flexibility when dealing with formulae but continues to rely on exact verbal repetition.

[39] Nagler 1974 40; Martin 1993 227; Foley 1999 1-34. See also Nagy 1979 1-5; Rutherford 1993 42; Kelly 2007b *passim*. For a similar faith in Hellenistic audiences' ability to recognize subtle Homeric allusions, see Knight 1995 2-5.

[40] Cf. Reece (1993 5-8) on the elements of Homeric hospitality scenes.

within a narrative system, but each remains distinct through its unique combination of motifs. While each scene is therefore recognizable as part of a larger set, Turkeltaub's allowance for various arrangements and combinations of motifs offers greater opportunities for interpretative insight than earlier schemes.

While I have no desire to argue that Turkeltaub's is the only, or even the best, scene pattern for the Homeric epiphanies, I also have no intention of rewriting it. Many of the motifs he describes have been identified individually by other scholars as integral elements of Homeric epiphanies. In many ways, Turkeltaub's scene pattern represents a collation of narrative motifs which have previously been identified but never systematically linked to one another. For the purposes of this thesis, its degree of detail and emphasis on flexibility make Turkeltaub's work a useful starting point to approach the study of epiphany as a narrative structure which both defines the hierarchy between god and man and leaves it open to poetic exploration.

Since Turkeltaub's work is not widely published, the following paragraphs give an overview of his epiphany scene pattern.[41] Later chapters in this thesis will refer freely to the motifs defined below.[42] For organizational purposes, the motifs of this pattern are arranged in four groups. The first three (setting the stage, postponement, and recognition) are loosely based on the logical progression of an epiphanic encounter, although it is important to note that the application of the motifs within a particular scene need not follow this order. The fourth group contains motifs which pertain to the god's purpose for intervening and may belong to any phase of the epiphany.

The first group of motifs "sets the stage" for the encounter. The first part of an epiphany which the narrative can record is the moment when a god becomes aware of a situation requiring divine intervention (**awareness**).[43] S/he then makes any necessary

[41] These paragraphs borrow extensively from Turkeltaub 2003 19-35. The names of the motifs and their general definitions are all derived from Turkeltaub's study. The notes provide references to other scholars when relevant.

[42] For ease of reference, a complete list of motifs with definitions and examples can be found in Appendix 1.

[43] Kearns 2004 65.

preparations,[44] which might include asking for Zeus's permission to intervene (*Il*. 5.755-63), yoking a chariot (*Il*. 5.722-32, 13.23-26), or changing attire (*Il*. 5.733-47; *Od*. 1.96-7). Either the mortal or the god – although typically the latter – will travel to and arrive at the location where the epiphany will take place (**journey** and **arrival**).[45] The final pre-condition for an epiphany is what Turkeltaub calls the **dramatic isolation**. In most cases, a god will appear to a mortal who is already alone. There are, however, notable exceptions, such as Athena's appearance to Achilles at *Il*. 1.194-222 or Poseidon's epiphany to the Aiantes at *Il*. 13.40-80. In these instances, the narrative is manipulated to ensure that only one mortal participates fully in the scene.[46] In the former example, the poet provides the double assertion that Athena is visible only to Achilles (οἵῳ φαινομένη· τῶν δ' ἄλλων οὔ τις ὁρᾶτο, *Il*. 1.198), while the Achaean host fades into the background. In the latter, Poseidon interacts with both heroes but is recognized only by Locrian Ajax; Telamonian Ajax, while present throughout the encounter, responds solely to his renewed strength and seems not to notice "Calchas's" divinity. Clearly, the dramatic isolation in these cases is a poetic construct, but it is nevertheless a key aspect in setting up the necessary conditions for a divine epiphany. Of all the motifs in this scheme, this is treated as one of the most essential in the Homeric epics.[47]

Once the god and mortal are together, the scene may enter a "postponement" phase in which the mortal's recognition of the god is delayed. This is typically achieved through a

---

[44] Edwards 1980 9.

[45] Edwards 1980 9. Calhoun (1933 15n46) collects numerous examples of the journey motif. Kühn (1971 29n2) notes that the only occasion in the *Iliad* when the mortal percipient is on a journey when he encounters a god is at *Il*. 24.352, although Hermes's journey is also described at 24.340-8.

[46] Seymour 1887 25; Robert 1950 33; Chantraine 1952 59; Severyns 1966 99; Fenik 1968 75; Smith 1988 168; West 2011a 88. On the tendency for epiphanies in Minoan and Mycenaean traditions to be individual experiences, see Dietrich 1994 72.

[47] The only exceptions occur at *Il*. 11.715, where Nestor describes a group epiphany in which Athena warns the Pylians to prepare for battle, and at *Od*. 3.371-94, where the same hero recognizes Athena at a banquet. The former takes place within an internal narrative set in the remote past, while the public setting of the latter serves to confirm Telemachus's experience at *Od*. 1.320-3. For further discussion of the Odyssean scene, see p68-9. It is significant that the two epiphanies in which this motif is completely omitted are both perceived by Nestor, whose age sets his experience of epiphany apart from that of his younger companions.

divine **disguise**,[48] which may in some cases be supported by a **false biography**.[49] These motifs often emphasize a similarity or closeness between the god's assumed persona and the mortal, either because the disguise resembles someone dear to the percipient or because the false biography reveals traits or experiences which they supposedly share. The result of this pretended affinity is to make the mortal more willing to trust the god's instructions or advice. Despite these efforts, however, this phase often contains a **hint of divinity**[50] which suggests the god's true identity. This hint may be reflected in the god's appearance (e.g. radiant beauty or light), words, or actions.[51] The mortal generally experiences a **preliminary emotional response** to these hints, but does not yet achieve full recognition, thus heightening the **irony** of his treatment of the god, which may be unduly offensive or unintentionally deferential.[52]

The next stage in an epiphany is the "recognition" phase. At the **epiphanic moment**, the god's divinity is revealed by the shedding of his disguise or the working of a miracle, provoking the **moment of recognition** and an **intense emotional response** in the mortal percipient.[53] The **announcement** of the god's name further distinguishes his identity from that of other gods. Importantly, this motif is separate from the epiphanic moment, since it is possible for a mortal to recognize a god's divinity without perceiving his specific identity, as Hector does at *Il*. 15.247. While the motifs of the postponement phase tend to stress the apparent similarity between performer and percipient, the conversation following the epiphanic moment restores and highlights the hierarchical separation between mortal and

---

[48] Rose 1956 63-72; Severyns 1966 94-9; Smith 1988 161-78; Vernant 1991 41-5; Fernández Contreras 1999 8, 13-5; Kearns 2004 65; Aston 2011 313-4. See Clay 1974 for a discussion of whether these disguises are mere illusions or full transformations. Lavoie (1970 5-34) discusses the significance of the god's choice of disguise in several epiphanies. Nünlist (2009 272-7) highlights the scholiasts' interest in divine disguises and recognition.

[49] While not every disguised god will give a false biography, the latter only ever appears when a disguise has been specified. Cf. *Il*. 22.237-46, 24.389-404; *Od*. 1.178-93; 3.356-70; 7.27-9. Cf. *HDem* 118-44, *HAph* 108-41.

[50] Vernant 1991 43; Fernández Contreras 1999 13. For this device in *HDem*, see Thalmann 1984 94.

[51] E.g. *Il*. 3.396-8; *Od*. 1.127.

[52] De Jong 2001 16.

[53] The most typical emotional response to an epiphany is θάμβος (Ehnmark 1935 18; Richardson 1974 208; Clay 1983 167-70; Koch Piettre 2001 218; Buxton 2009 164-8; Platt 2011 14; Petridou 2015 88), but percipients may also experience fear (*HAph* 182; *Il*. 3.418; *Od*. 24.533).

god.[54] Following recognition, the mortal's behaviour typically includes an **affirmation of the god's divinity** and of his own subordinate status. The mortal may also express a **concern for his welfare**,[55] thus acknowledging the god's power over his future, to which the god may respond with an **assuagement** of the mortal's concerns.[56] The god may also assert the distinction between human and divine with an **insult** highlighting the mortal's initial lack of perception during the postponement phase of the scene.[57]

Most of the remaining motifs pertain not to a particular phase of an epiphany but to the god's "purpose" in intervening. In addition to its inclusion among the "setting the stage" motifs, the god's **awareness** may also be considered an important feature determining his purpose, as it establishes the need for an epiphany in the first place. Once the god has made contact with the mortal, at some point he will provide **instructions for present and/or future actions**. The former are to be fulfilled during the epiphany and may require a **change of setting** during the encounter, while the latter are intended for fulfillment after the god's **departure**. In order to facilitate the percipient's **fulfillment** of these instructions, the god may bestow some form of **divine inspiration**, the exact form of which is often linked with the god's specific identity. Aphrodite, for example, typically instills desire (*HAph* 143; *Il*. 3.395), while Athena grants courage or insight (*Il*. 5.2; *Od*. 1.320-1). Additionally, the god may choose to intervene still more directly by initiating **physical contact**. Perhaps surprisingly, this motif is a feature of nearly all Homeric epiphany scenes.[58] Whether intending to catch the percipient's attention, to ward off or inflict harm, or to alter a character's appearance, Homer's gods tend to enact their will through touch. Finally, the god may offer a **prophecy** revealing the long-term ramifications of the epiphany, such as Athena's

---

[54] See Thalmann 1984 93-5 for this emphasis in *HDem* and *HAph*.

[55] Griffin 1980 153-4; Thalmann 1984 95 (on *HAph*); Petridou 2015 36.

[56] Griffin 1980 153-4.

[57] E.g. *Od*. 13.299-300.

[58] *Il*. 1.197, 1.359, 3.385, 5.314-6, 5.335-40, 5.437, 5.799, 5.835-9, 5.858-9, 13.60, 16.702-4, 16.791-2, 18.71, 19.7, 21.286, 24.127, 24.361; *Od*. 4.454-5, 10.280, 13.288, 13.429, 16.172.

promise of reward if Achilles obeys her instructions at *Il*. 1.212-14 or Aphrodite's threat of disfavour following Helen's inappropriate behaviour at *Il*. 3.414-7.

In some cases, there is also the potential for a **responding epiphany** in the future.[59] This encounter will have its own set of motifs, but is closely linked to an earlier epiphany. This may occur if the god returns to facilitate the percipient's fulfillment of future instructions or to provide further direction once these have been completed.

Together, these twenty-eight motifs form a reservoir from which the poet may draw when crafting an individual epiphany scene.[60] All Homeric epiphany scenes – regardless of length, purpose, or context – draw to a greater or lesser degree upon these motifs. While the number, order, and form of the motifs are flexible, there is no epiphany scene which does not at least imply the existence of an awareness, journey, arrival, and conversation, and in most cases some form of instruction.[61] While there are examples of motifs which may be expressed by either character,[62] the hierarchical nature of epiphany demands that participating characters assume distinct roles as performer or percipient and consequently requires that certain motifs, especially "recognition" phase or "divine purpose" motifs, be differentially assigned to one or the other.

Recognizing the Divine

As mentioned above, the relationship between the postponement and recognition phases of an epiphany was of particular interest to ancient scholars. One of the questions

---

[59] E.g. *Il*. 5.793-909, 24.679-94; *Od*. 16.156-77.

[60] I have omitted two of Turkeltaub's original motifs. The first is the motif of conversation in the postponement and recognition phases, which seems to me to be implied by the spoken nature of the other motifs. The second is what Turkeltaub calls "displacement," which is by far one of his most nebulous motifs. While many epiphanic gods seek to correct some abnormality in their percipient's status or location, it adds little to our interpretation to say so. For the sake of clarity, I do not include this motif in my discussion of individual scenes.

[61] Turkeltaub 2003 35. On the importance of the dramatic isolation in Homer, see n47.

[62] See n45 on the journey motif. The announcement of the god's name may also be given by either party, depending on the circumstances of the percipient's recognition (see below, p19-21).

which concerned the scholiasts was how mortal percipients might see through divine disguises and perceive the identity of their epiphanic visitors. When Achilles recognizes Athena at *Il*. 1.199-200, the scholia attribute this to his status as a demigod: ὅτι τοῖς διογενέσι δηλοῦνται οἱ θεοί, ὡς τῇ Ἑλένῃ [*sc*. 3.396-7] καὶ "Αἰνείας δ' ἑκατηβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα / ἔγνω ἐς ἄντα ἰδών" [*sc*. 17.333-4].[63] Yet, while these demigods seem to possess the ability to recognize gods due to their own semi-divinity, they are far from the only characters to do so in the *Iliad*. How, then, do the rest of the heroes recognize the gods?

Several modern scholars have continued the scholiasts' investigation into this question. Fernández Contreras identifies five ways for a mortal to penetrate a divine disguise.[64] First, the god might deliberately reveal his identity after a period of delay, ensuring that his interference is efficient while still allowing the poet to maintain narrative tension (e.g. *Il*. 22.8-13, 24.460-1; *Od*. 13.298-301). Second, the god may choose not to reveal his name but allow his divinity to be perceived upon his departure (e.g. *Il*. 13.59-75). Third, there might be a bond of kinship between the god and the percipient, as is the case with half-sisters Helen and Aphrodite in *Il*. 3. Fourth, the god may be identifiable to members of a particular community with whom he is affiliated, as Apollo is recognized by the Trojan princes Hector (15.247) and Aeneas (17.333-4). Finally, a mortal's ability to recognize a god might be attributed to his own heroic or moral qualities, such as Odysseus's perception of Athena's voice at *Il*. 2.807.

Once again, however, it is Turkeltaub who has provided the most efficient system of organizing the evidence from the poems.[65] According to his analysis, while not every character who receives a visit from the gods will recognize this fact, those who do will achieve this by one of five modes of recognition. In the *Iliad*, these modes form a system of increasing proximity to the divine, thereby establishing a hierarchy among mortal characters

---

[63] Schol. bT *Il*. 1.199-200.

[64] Fernández Contreras 1999 13-4.

[65] Turkeltaub 2007 51-82.

based on their ability to recognize the gods. In the *Odyssey*, the same five modes represent the possible methods of recognizing epiphanic gods. However, since there are fewer epiphanies and far fewer percipients in the latter poem, emphasis falls more on whether a character recognizes a god at all than on the way in which this is achieved. I will begin by outlining the modes of recognition according to the Iliadic system identified by Turkeltaub and then offer some brief comments on how the *Odyssey* treats epiphanic recognition.

The first and lowest mode of recognition in the *Iliad* is that a mortal may deduce a disguised god's divinity only after the encounter has ended (*post factum*). This occurs three times in the *Iliad*: Locrian Ajax deduces that "Calchas" was really a god after noting Poseidon's ἴχνια at 13.68-75;[66] the dying Patroclus belatedly recognizes Apollo's role in his demise at 16.845; and Hector realizes too late that the vanished "Deiphobus" was really Athena (22.296-301). The unifying feature of these scenes is that the gods recognized thus are ultimately involved in their percipients' deaths: Patroclus and Hector perish shortly after these moments of recognition, while the *Odyssey* reveals that Ajax drowned during his return from Troy (*Od*. 4.499-511).

In the second mode, verbal recognition, the god announces his divinity. The percipient is granted a more privileged position than those of the previous group because the god has deemed him worthy not just of an epiphany, but of knowing this divine favour explicitly. This mode is evident in three Iliadic passages: Iris's message to Hector at 11.195-213, Iris's message to Priam at 24.160-88, and Hermes's assistance of Priam at 24.341-469. Apollo's epiphany to Hector at *Il*. 15.220-70 also falls partly into this mode, as Hector must be told Apollo's specific identity despite immediately recognizing his divinity. This mode might also apply to Agamemnon's dream at *Il*. 2.16-36, if one considers Oneiros a divinity rather than a

[66] While scholars have debated the meaning of *Il*. 13.71-2, Ajax's attention on Poseidon's ἴχνια fits into a long tradition of narratives and inscriptions in which a god's departure is marked at the last point of contact between his feet and the ground. Kötting 1983 197-201; Dunbabin 1990 85-109; Takács 2005 353-69; Petridou 2015 76-81.

personification. In most of these cases, the epiphanic god does not identify him- or herself by name, but simply as a messenger from Zeus, who never appears in an epiphany himself.[67]

The third mode, aural recognition, occurs through recognition of the god's voice, thus suggesting a degree of familiarity between mortal and deity.[68] The four characters who experience aural recognition all enjoy the favour of a particular god. Athena's patronage of Odysseus is well-known to other characters (*Od*. 3.219-22). When she finds him in the chaotic aftermath of Agamemnon's dream, she rebukes him and he ξυνέηκε θεᾶς ὅπα φωνησάσης (*Il*. 2.182). Beginning in *Il*. 5, the poem also highlights Athena's close relationship with Diomedes, and the same formula appears when she interrupts this hero's μερμηρίζειν scene in the Doloneia to facilitate his safe return to the Achaean camp (10.512). Hector experiences aural recognition twice, first when he recognizes Iris's voice at *Il*. 2.807 and again when he hears Apollo's voice at 20.380. Finally, there is the unique case of the seer Helenus, who overhears Apollo discussing with Athena their plan to provoke Hector to propose a duel, whereupon the seer advises Hector of this plan himself (*Il*. 7.43-53).

The fourth mode, visual recognition, is achieved only by demigods in the *Iliad*, and each case occurs at a key moment in the epic. Athena's sudden intervention at *Il*. 1.193-222 prevents Achilles from killing Agamemnon and leads to his withdrawal from battle. Aphrodite's appearance to Helen at 3.383-425 recreates the initial seduction that provoked the Trojan War. Apollo's encouragement of Aeneas (17.319-39) heightens the tension of the fight over Patroclus's corpse, which facilitates the transfer of Achilles's wrath and his return to battle. Perhaps more interestingly, each of these mortals experiences this mode of recognition while addressing a god who is not their parent, suggesting a general proximity to

---

[67] Schol. T *Il*. 13.18b.

[68] See Severyns 1966 99; Clay 1974 131-5. On the ancient commentators' distinctions between divine and human speech, see Nünlist 2009 276-7.

the divine among demigods. While they may still be deceived by disguised gods,[69] these three characters never experience a mode lower than visual recognition.

The fifth and highest mode occurs when a mortal's recognition of a god is so natural and effortless that its contributing factors are never stated by the poet. While this would seem to imply a particularly special relationship with the visiting deity, this mode of recognition occurs an astonishing seventeen times in the *Iliad*. The majority of these, however, occur in the context of a hero's *aristeia*, outside of which he returns to the mode appropriate to his status as outlined above. Twelve instances of an unspecified mode belong to four heroes and either incite or enhance this momentary display of superhuman prowess, during which the hero's strength and perception approach a semi-divine level.[70] Hector and Patroclus recognize Apollo thus at *Il*. 15.220-70 and 16.698-711 respectively, although Hector must ask the god's specific identity. Diomedes experiences this mode five times with Athena's help (Athena 5.114-34, 711-909; Aphrodite 330-52; Apollo 431-6; Ares 846-67). Achilles's *aristeia* also contains five such recognitions (Apollo 20.445-54, 21.595-22.23[71]; Scamander 21.211-382; Poseidon 21.272-304; Athena 22.166-277), which are achieved without divine assistance.

The only character to recognize gods so intuitively outside of his *aristeia* is Achilles, to whom the remaining five instances of this mode belong (*Il*. 1.351-430, 18.34-138, 18.165-202, 19.2-39, 24.103-42). While conversations with Thetis account for four of these passages, the scene with Iris (18.165-202) highlights his unusually close relationship with the gods more generally.[72] Unlike her epiphanies to other mortals, which involve verbal recognition and an immediate announcement of her role as a divine messenger, Iris begins

---

[69] Achilles pursues Apollo believing he is Agenor (*Il*. 21.595-22.13); there is no indication that Helen recognizes Iris at *Il*. 3.121-45; Aeneas fails to recognize that "Lycaon" is really Apollo (*Il*. 20.79-111). Among these, Achilles remains preeminent because his initial deception by Apollo is followed by his intuitive recognition of the god's identity (*Il*. 22.14-20). These failures need not diminish the characters' status in the eyes of the audience, as even the gods can be deceived by one another (*Il*. 5.844-45, 14.154-353).

[70] Mueller 1984 129. For further discussion, see Chapter 2.

[71] Achilles's delayed recognition of Apollo recalls the threatening implications of *post factum* recognition. It is fitting that the only difficulty he experiences in recognizing a god involves Apollo, who will guide the arrow that will take his life (Whitman 1958 237-8).

[72] For a fuller discussion of this scene, see Turkeltaub 2007 70.

immediately with her instructions to Achilles, apparently expecting that he will recognize her. His response confirms her assumption: Ἶρι θεά, τίς γάρ σε θεῶν ἐμοὶ ἄγγελον ἦκε; (*Il*. 18.182). This is the only time any mortal replies to Iris, and the scene develops into a full conversation. The familiarity and near-equality of their conversation reveal that Achilles's natural ease with the gods is not exclusively reserved for his relationship with his mother.[73]

The cumulative effect of these five modes of recognition is the arrangement of the Iliadic mortals into five groups.[74] At the highest level, Achilles tends, with few exceptions, to recognize the gods naturally and immediately. Other demigods may recognize the gods by sight, while seers and favoured heroes of mortal parentage may hear the gods' voices and be advised in their decision-making. Other heroes may experience epiphanies but are unable to recognize the gods without help, while the common soldiery never receive attention of this kind from the gods. The only opportunity for a hero in the lower modes to achieve a higher one is to participate in an *aristeia*. The result is a clearly structured paradigm in which the Iliadic heroes are distinguished from one another by their ability to recognize epiphanic gods.

In the *Odyssey*, mortals may recognize the gods through the same five modes of recognition. The Iliadic distinctions, however, are relatively unhelpful: the poem's only demigod, Helen, never encounters a god and the only *aristeia* belongs to Odysseus in *Od*. 22. Given the poem's thematic emphasis on disguise and ambiguity, the *Odyssey* attributes much greater importance to the fact that a mortal recognizes a god at all than to the method by which this is achieved.[75] The only characters who recognize gods by name are the Iliadic heroes Nestor (*Od*. 3.374), Menelaus (4.376), and Odysseus (5.333-53, 10.276-307,[76] 13.221-440, 16.156-77, 20.31-55, 22.205-50). Of these, Nestor recognizes Athena after her

---

[73] Cf. *Il*. 19.14-7, where Achilles is the only mortal who can bear to look at the divine armor.

[74] Turkeltaub 2007 75-6.

[75] Turkeltaub 2003 308, 312.

[76] Turkeltaub includes Odysseus's recognition of Hermes at 10.276-307 as an example of an unspecified mode, but this case is unclear. Odysseus does not tell his internal audience how he recognizes Hermes, but it is likely that this recognition is retrospectively based on Circe's outburst at 10.330. Cf. De Jong 2001 260.

departure (although without the sinister implications which this mode entails in the *Iliad*), while Menelaus's encounter with Eidothea is embedded in a secondary narrative which fails to account for his mode of recognition. Odysseus's encounters with Athena pivot around her verbal declaration in *Od*. 13, prior to which he never recognizes her interventions and after which he always recognizes her immediately. Consequently, the modes of recognition experienced by these heroes do not form any kind of hierarchy except for the preeminence of Odysseus, who experiences far more epiphanies than either of his former comrades.

The encounters of other Odyssean characters with the gods are conducted on less certain terms. Penelope's dream at *Od*. 4.795-841 is not a direct epiphany but an εἴδωλον sent by Athena, and Penelope expresses doubt as to the dream's divinity (4.831). Nausicaa, too, never explicitly recognizes that her dream is divinely motivated (6.13-47), despite her father's assertion that the gods' presence is always plain to the Phaeacians (7.198-206). Telemachus occupies a middle ground between these groups, encountering Athena more often than any other Odyssean mortal except his father but never recognizing her by name.[77]

These trends are in keeping with the *Odyssey*'s themes of deception and disguise. In the *Iliad*, only the gods assume disguises, while mortals never conceal their identities from one another. In the *Odyssey*, disguise and uncertainty are the norm when dealing with others, making most mortal characters at once more and less likely to assume a stranger's divinity.[78] This ambiguous thematic environment allows the poet great freedom in allowing the narrative patterns of epiphany to appear in meetings between mortal characters, creating the potential for pseudo-epiphanies which will be examined in detail in Chapters 3 and 4.

---

[77] For detailed discussion of Telemachus's method of recognizing gods, see p66-8. Two other characters are able to deduce the presence of a god outside of an epiphany by virtue of their loyalty to Odysseus's family: after giving his ship to Athena-Telemachus, Noemon realises that he has seen "Mentor" in two different places (4.653-6); Medon, spared from Odysseus's wrath, informs the suitors' families that their sons were killed with the help of a god and describes Athena's role in the *mnesterophonia* (24.442-9).

[78] For mortals assuming the divinity of another mortal, e.g. *Od*. 6.149, 7.199, 16.178-201, 17.484, 23.63-4. For assumptions of a divinity's mortality, e.g. 22.211-23.

Applications of the Epiphany Scene Pattern

At this point, it will be useful to consider two divine epiphanies in order to illustrate how these structural elements can provide interpretative insight into individual scenes. The following are basic sketches of how the epiphany scene pattern can be traced in the familiar epiphanies of *Il*. 1 and *Od*. 13. Athena's epiphany to Achilles at *Il*. 1.193-222 offers a prime example of how the Homeric poet draws selectively upon the motifs outlined above in order to craft a scene which is both a representative of a larger set and a unique creation. As the first epiphany in the poem, it signals that the primary focus of the Iliadic epiphanies will be not the divine perspective, as it is in the Homeric Hymns, but the exceptionality of its mortal heroes through their proximity to the divine.[79] Athena's epiphany to Odysseus in *Od*. 13 shows that the *Odyssey* draws upon the same motifs in crafting its epiphany scenes, but also reveals an even more flexible approach than that of the *Iliad* in terms of which situations may be considered to be epiphanies.

The early motifs of Athena's epiphany in *Il*. 1 indicate immediately that the scene will revolve around Achilles. Despite the setting in the midst of the Greek assembly, the dramatic isolation is established prior to the goddess's arrival as the narrative contracts into Achilles's μερμηρίζειν scene (*Il*. 1.188-92).[80] As Achilles begins to draw his sword to repay Agamemnon for his insults, Athena's sudden arrival (ἦλθε δ' Ἀθήνη, 1.194) cuts directly into the expected formula describing this motion.[81] The swiftness with which she has been forced to respond to Achilles's actions not only interrupts the traditional poetic diction but requires the description of her awareness (1.195-6) to be delayed until after her arrival, thus casting Achilles's movements as the determining factor of Athena's intervention and allowing the poet to keep his focus firmly on the scene's mortal percipient. The double assertion at 1.198

[79] Sowa 1984 241; Turkeltaub 2003 232-4. Cf. Pfister (1924 282) on the distinction between epic and mythical epiphanies.

[80] In subsequent analyses, I will not highlight the names of the motifs in bold, but line numbers will be provided whenever a motif is mentioned.

[81] Edwards 1980 13, esp. n31; Turkeltaub 2003 130. On Athena's haste, see also Smith 1988 169.

(οἴῳ φαινομένη· τῶν δ᾽ ἄλλων οὔ τις ὁρᾶτο) further emphasizes the dramatic isolation, the contrived nature of which singles Achilles out from the rest of the host as exceptional.

The postponement phase of the epiphany is extremely brief. Athena, in her haste to reach Achilles, does not adopt a disguise but is compelled to stop behind him (στῆ δ᾽ ὄπιθεν, 1.197). This prevents Achilles from recognizing her outright and therefore might be considered to function as a disguise motif. This stance also suggests that Athena's arrival comes at the last possible moment, requiring her to initiate physical contact in order to prevent Achilles from striking (1.197). This forceful gesture provokes amazement in Achilles (θάμβησεν, 1.199), which would typically indicate a response to a hint of divinity but in this case marks his shock that anyone would attempt to restrain him.[82] The hint of divinity is therefore absent, and Achilles's emotional response is directed against the general boldness of the perpetrator of this action.

As soon as Achilles turns around, he recognizes Athena immediately (αὐτίκα δ᾽ ἔγνω, 1.199) – the first of only three visual recognitions in the *Iliad*.[83] The rest of the encounter anomalously highlights Achilles's remarkable proximity to the divine world, rather than the distance between mortal and goddess which would typically enter the scene at this point. His instant recognition precludes the remaining postponement motifs and any hint of dramatic irony, and the lack of description about what Achilles sees effectively increases the dramatic isolation by rendering his epiphanic experience private even from the poem's audience. The only image is of shining eyes (δεινὼ δέ οἱ ὄσσε φάανθεν, 1.200), which are often assumed to belong to the goddess but may in fact belong to Achilles.[84] If this is the case, Achilles's brilliant eyes cause him to rival Athena's divine radiance at the moment of recognition.

---

[82] Seymour 1887 25. For θάμβος as a typical reaction to epiphany, see n53.

[83] See above, p20. The scholia link this recognition with Achilles's demigod status (e.g. bT *Il*. 1.199-200, T *Il*. 17.334a; Nünlist 2009 274-5). Cf. Severyns (1966 102), who argues that Athena has forgotten to conceal the brilliance of her eyes.

[84] Nörenberg 1972 251-4; Robertson 1999 1-7; Pulleyn 2000 179-80; Turkeltaub 2005 157-86. Cf. Rose 1956 66; Severyns 1966 102; Griffin 1980 159n30; Mueller 1984 117; Mussies 1988 9; Dietrich 1994 65; Fernández Contreras 1999 8 *inter alia*. The scholia *ad loc*. acknowledge both possibilities.

Upon recognizing Athena, Achilles moves to assume the dominant role in their conversation by speaking first (1.201-5) – the sole instance in which an Iliadic percipient does so – thus balancing Athena's authoritative act of physical contact and moving toward equalizing control of the scene.[85] Although he presupposes her support for his punishment of Agamemnon's ὕβρις,[86] Athena responds with a prophecy (1.212-4) promising gifts if Achilles chooses to follow her instructions (1.210-1) not to kill Agamemnon. The tone of her speech is surprisingly respectful, with the phrase αἴ κε πίθηαι (1.207) implying that she does not assume his obedience and the imperative πείθεο (1.214) highlighting her persuasive rather than commanding stance.[87] Achilles ultimately complies, but only after weighing the alternatives and deciding that obedience in this instance will lead to continued divine favour in the future (1.216-8) – an unparalleled example of a mortal bargaining with a recognized god. The epiphany ends as suddenly as it begins, with Athena's departure happening so quickly that the poet can only describe it through the pluperfect βεβήκει (1.221).[88]

The epiphany thus contains the following motifs: dramatic isolation (1.188-92, 198), arrival (194), awareness (195-6), disguise (197), physical contact (197), preliminary emotional response (199), moment of recognition (199), instructions (210-1), prophecy (212-4), fulfillment of instructions (219-21), and departure (221). Notable features are the rearrangement of the arrival and awareness motifs from their logical order; a preliminary emotional response in the absence of a hint of divinity; Achilles's immediate recognition of Athena upon seeing her; and the unusual dynamic of their ensuing conversation. The overall effect is to highlight the urgency of Athena's intervention and the specialness of Achilles at

---

[85] Edwards 1980 14-5. Even in the *Odyssey*, Edwards notes, the only occasions when a deity does not initiate conversation with a mortal is when the deity appears in the form of a guest, who must first be greeted by a host (e.g. *Od*. 1.122, 5.86), or as a child, who would naturally be addressed first by an elder (*Od*. 7.21, 13.227). See also Fernández Contreras 1999 12. For Achilles's exasperated tone, see Seymour 1887 26; Pulleyn 2000 74.

[86] For this speech as a directive which expects Athena to share Achilles's perspective, see Martin 1989 32. See also Ahrensdorf 2014 34. Cf. Lennox 1980 48 on *Arg*. 3.26.

[87] Guthrie 1950 120; Griffin 1980 160; Pulleyn 2000 185. Cf. Redfield 1975 78; Kirk 1985 75. Martin 1989 49 discusses the implications of this stance for Athena's position among the gods.

[88] Pulleyn 2000 187. Cf. Kirk 1985 76.

the start of the poem. His immediate visual recognition of the goddess and the degree of control which she allows him to assume cast Achilles as a mortal with an extraordinary relationship with the gods. As the first epiphany in the epic, it not only illustrates the exceptionality of its greatest hero but provides a clear demonstration of how the poet manipulates the available motifs according to the demands of individual contexts and character development.

An even greater degree of flexibility is evident in *Od*. 13, where the poem's only full-scale epiphany scene marks Odysseus's arrival in Ithaca, the end of his wanderings, and the start of his elaborate revenge plot. This scene is the longest divine epiphany in the Homeric epics and thematically the most intricately interwoven with the overall poem. Like *Il*. 1, this epiphany highlights the bond between the epic's titular hero and his patron goddess, setting the stage for the rest of the poem as they display their mutual capacity for deception and together plot the destruction of Odysseus's enemies.

The scene opens as Odysseus awakes on the shore of an apparently unknown island (*Od*. 13.187-8). Athena has cast a mist about him (13.189-93), concealing both Ithaca from Odysseus and Odysseus from the eyes of other men. This mist thus represents her preparations for the meeting to come and adds a dramatic element to Odysseus's physical isolation. While her awareness is not explicitly stated, the goddess's staging of the scene prior to Odysseus's awakening and her arrival (13.221) suggest a constant concern for the hero.

Unlike in the Iliadic scene above, nearly all of the postponement phase motifs are clearly represented. After Odysseus's outburst cursing the Phaeacians for abandoning him, he begins to count his treasures. While he does this, Athena arrives, disguised as a young shepherd-prince (13.222-5). She is described as wearing a fine cloak and sandals and carrying a spear – an accessory which hints at her true identity but provokes no emotional response in Odysseus. The latter, believing that he is addressing a young local, requests information and assistance in protecting his goods. His claim to appeal to the youth as to a god (σοὶ φὰρ ἐγώ γε / εὔχομαι ὥς τε θεῷ, 13.230-1) furnishes an ironic element, since he addresses the goddess

deferentially without recognizing the appropriateness of his words. Finally, when Athena complies with his request and reveals the identity of Ithaca, Odysseus responds with the first of many false tales (13.256-86). This surprising transference of the false biography motif to a mortal percipient highlights the flexibility with which the epiphanic motifs can be deployed in the *Odyssey* and will be discussed at length in a later chapter.[89]

In addition to intensifying the scene's dramatic irony, the relatively complex postponement phase also highlights the similar characters of man and goddess. Unlike in other epiphanies, though, where this affinity is manufactured by the god in order to gain the mortal's trust, this is a genuine similarity based upon instincts which performer and percipient naturally share. The pre-recognition conversation between Odysseus and Athena thus stages an agonistic exchange between the mortal and divine champions of μῆτις,[90] in which both attempt to control their meeting by concealing key information from the other while gaining it for themselves. While the audience knows that the goddess maintains complete control by virtue of her divine perspective, which allows her to see through Odysseus's pretences, the hero's instinctive response to her deception earns Athena's unqualified approval nonetheless.

In response to Odysseus's lying tale, Athena initiates physical contact by caressing him (13.288), and the epiphanic moment occurs as she transforms into a tall, beautiful woman skilled in handicrafts (13.288-9). She herself delivers the announcement of the divine name at 13.300. Mingled with her affectionate chiding about Odysseus's cunning nature is an insult motif as she highlights his failure to recognize his own divine patron (13.299-303).

The verbal mode of Athena's epiphany is a prime example of how the *Odyssey* breaks with the hierarchical paradigm of Iliadic recognition modes in favour of a more situational approach. Any higher mode (aural, visual, or unspecified) would have allowed Odysseus to recognize the goddess earlier, thus precluding their agonistic exchange during the postponement phase, while the cooperative plotting which follows the epiphanic moment

---

[89] See Chapter 2.

[90] Pucci 1987 105-6; Turkeltaub 2003 243.

negates the possibility of *post factum* recognition. In order to highlight both Odysseus's aptitude for deception and Athena's partnership in the revenge plot, the situation demands that recognition be verbal.

Odysseus's moment of recognition is remarkably devoid of strong emotion. His excuse for his failure to recognize Athena voices both an affirmation of her divinity and almost a reproach that she – a goddess characterized by her many physical forms[91] – should not insult his imperfect perception. Even after he realizes that Athena has won their contest of wits, Odysseus seeks to maintain as much equal footing as he can. However, his concern (13.324-8) that she is lying about their location demonstrates his real anxiety: not the deception of his divine protectress, but the hope of having truly reached home. To assuage these concerns Athena finally dispels the mist (13.344-52), and the revelation of his homeland at last provokes the emotional reaction which Odysseus has been holding in check (13.353-4).

The remaining motifs highlight the purpose of Athena's intervention: the revenge plot revealed in the divine assemblies of *Od*. 1.29-95 and 5.23-4, to which Odysseus only now becomes privy.[92] Warning of the many insults he must endure, she instructs him (13.307-10) not to reveal his identity to anyone. After hiding his Phaeacian gifts, which requires a change of setting to the nearby cave and then to the sacred olive-tree, they plot together against the suitors (13.372-440).[93] Athena's next set of instructions begins to move the major players into place for this plot as she orders Odysseus to seek information from Eumaeus while she fetches Telemachus from Sparta (13.404-15). A second physical contact motif then facilitates the divine inspiration as Athena alters Odysseus's appearance, enabling him to fulfill her instructions for secrecy (13.397-403, 429-38).

---

[91] Apart from Proteus, no other Homeric god takes as many forms as Athena, who in the *Odyssey* alone appears as Mentor, Mentes, the daughter of Dymas, a little girl, a competition judge, a shepherd-prince, a beautiful woman, and as birds (Turkeltaub 2003 259). See also Severyns 1966 97.

[92] Müller 1966 16-21, 66.

[93] N.B. the dual forms τὼ δὲ καθεζομένω ... φραζέσθην (*Od*. 13.372-3).

Athena's departure concludes the encounter (13.439-40), but she returns in no fewer than three responding epiphanies at key points in the revenge plot: at 16.155-77 she prompts Odysseus to initiate the first of his self-revelations and gain Telemachus as an ally; at 20.30-55 she calms his concerns about their plans; and at 22.205-98 she reiterates her support as their plot comes to fruition and Odysseus confronts the suitors openly.[94] The final phase of Athena's epiphany thus sets the stage for the themes and events of the entire rest of the epic.

Remarkably, there is also a second set of motifs woven into this scene. In keeping with the scene's focus on Odysseus's recognition of his homeland, these motifs are applied not to the revelation of a second divinity but to the identity of Ithaca itself, which is carefully controlled by Athena. By establishing the dramatic isolation with her mist, the goddess also deliberately postpones Odysseus's recognition of Ithaca by giving the island a disguise (13.188-91). Her description of the terrain (13.236-49) withholds the name of Ithaca until its final lines and is carefully crafted to resemble descriptions of other unfamiliar shores Odysseus has visited during his wanderings. Although technically accurate, this description further delays Odysseus's recognition and makes Ithaca appear to be something that it is not; this is essentially a false biography.[95] Odysseus's corresponding worry that the local inhabitants will mistreat him as a stranger (13.200-2) heightens the scene's irony, and he continues to doubt even after Athena names the island. Upon recognizing his homeland at last, he demonstrates the immense joy which Athena's own epiphany had apparently failed to evoke. Finally, where the affirmation of divinity would typically appear, Odysseus addresses his prayer to the local nymphs (13.356-60).[96]

Several of the major elements of an epiphany are present in this revelation: a dramatic isolation and disguise, false biography, moment of recognition, and affirmation of divinity. Importantly, however, these motifs remain under the control of Athena, and this close

[94] There are additional interventions (e.g. *Od*. 19.476-9) which contribute to the sense of Athena's constant support for Odysseus, but these are not visibly manifested as epiphanies.

[95] Clay 1983 194-5.

[96] See Larson (2001 25-6) for the nymphs' equation with the Ithacan landscape.

intertwining of two separate sets of motifs creates what Turkeltaub calls a "binary epiphany."[97] That this is even possible is an indication of the *Odyssey*'s attitude toward the conventions which it has adopted. The underlying narrative pattern remains recognizable from other epic sources, but its application demonstrates a more adaptable approach both to the assignment of roles between performer and percipient and to the fundamental nature of epiphany itself. Athena's role in creating the circumstances of this epiphany, and especially in facilitating the epiphany-like revelation of Ithaca to Odysseus, prefigures her part in managing Odysseus's self-revelations in subsequent books, in which he must, Athena-like, conceal his identity to test the loyalty of his people and make his preparations for the revenge plot she has helped him to devise.

Looking Ahead: Questions and Chapter Summaries

The scenes analysed above are among the most striking and highly manipulated arrangements of the epiphany motifs in their respective epics. However, it is possible to find the same motifs employed at a more basic level in all other epiphany scenes in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, as well as the Homeric Hymns and the works of certain epic successors who choose to model their epiphanies on this pattern. When compared with earlier attempts to describe the conventions of these scenes, the motifs identified by Turkeltaub provide a far more productive framework from which to begin to interpret Homeric epiphanies and their literary descendants.

The following chapters will explore these scenes from a number of interrelated perspectives. One approach is through the theme of recognition. How do epic mortals recognize that they are dealing with an epiphanic god, and what do their responses to this recognition reveal about their characters? Moreover, how do the narrative motifs outlined

[97] Turkeltaub 2003 244.

above help the poet's audience to recognize and decide what "counts" as an epiphany in each poem? The latter question produces interesting results when asked of Odysseus's self-revelations in Ithaca, which have often been described as theoxenic,[98] but it also becomes increasingly relevant when approaching later authors, whose engagement with the Homeric scene pattern varies according to their poetic goals.

The second major focus is on power dynamics within the structure of epic epiphanies. By its very nature, epiphany is a hierarchical form of encounter, with one character occupying an ontologically superior position in relation to the other. This hierarchy is built into the structure of epic epiphany scenes and is clearly evident in numerous motifs in the scene pattern adopted in this study. Given this structure, whom does each poet allow to perform an epiphanic role and how do the characters themselves understand and engage with their assigned roles? This thesis is particularly interested in mortal figures who challenge the seemingly straightforward division between man and god, whether by attempting to raise themselves above the typical position of a percipient or by appearing as epiphanic figures themselves.

Closely related to the theme of hierarchy is the concept of agency.[99] When mortal characters challenge the epiphanic hierarchy or find themselves performing a role to which they are unaccustomed in an epiphany, what is often at stake is their agency within these encounters. Thus, Iliadic mortals who attempt to adopt motifs which ought to be expressed by an epiphanic god do so in an effort to seize a greater share of agency than their mortal status would typically allow. When Odyssean mortals appear as epiphanic figures, it is because a god has temporarily extended divine agency to them in order to accomplish a specific task, after which the hierarchy between god and mortal is restored. In Vergilian epic, the

---

[98] E.g. Kearns 1982 2-8; Sowa 1984 250-7; Murnaghan 1987 11-20, 68-87; Reece 1993 181-7; De Jong 2001 332; Louden 2011a 30-56. For further bibliography see p58 with note.

[99] For anthropological discussions of agency and its relation to performance, knowledge, and control, see Duranti 2004 451-73; Kockelman 2007 375-401.

appearance of deified and deceased mortals as epiphanic figures in their own right illustrates an extension of divine agency to a new group of characters, albeit within new limitations.

This thesis will be divided into two parts. Part I explores the ways in which Homer engages with epiphany as a surprisingly versatile theme. Chapter 2 considers two divine epiphany scenes from the *Iliad* and one from the *Odyssey* in which the mortal percipient usurps a motif which should belong to the epiphanic god. In the Iliadic scenes, this is part of a deliberate response to the recognition of the divinity's presence and therefore constitutes a purposeful transgression of epiphanic roles. In the *Odyssey*, however, this usurpation occurs before the moment of recognition and so serves to highlight an innate quality which Odysseus shares with his patron goddess. Whereas the Iliadic goddesses must act immediately to reassert their control of the scenes in question, the Odyssean Athena actually creates the circumstances of her epiphany precisely in order to draw out this response from Odysseus, allowing her to establish a causal link between his attempted deception and the revelation of Ithaca and thereby to guide his behaviour during his homecoming.

Athena's transferral of a single motif to Odysseus in *Od*. 13 anticipates the events and themes of the following nine books, as she encourages the hero to perform the same role toward his family that she has just performed in her epiphany. Building on the work of Emily Kearns and others who have noted theoxenic undertones in Odysseus's revenge plot,[100] Chapter 3 will examine the Ithacan recognition scenes in detail. It will be shown that each of these scenes engages with the theme of epiphany in a unique way. Those self-revelations which Odysseus performs as part of his plot against the suitors contain the most overt ties to theoxeny, since Odysseus is acting not only on his own behalf but as the agent of a divine plan. Once this plot has reached its conclusion, his role as a divine agent ends and epiphany no longer represents an appropriate model for the reunions with his remaining family members. The recognition scenes with Penelope and Laertes both suggest this theme initially, only to reject it in favour of a more human register.

---

[100] See n98.

Having explored the complicated sequence of epiphany-like recognition scenes in the second half of the *Odyssey*, I turn in Chapter 4 to Odysseus's meeting with Nausicaa in *Od*. 6.[101] This scene illustrates Odysseus's brilliance not only at recognizing a situation in which an epiphanic response is needed, but also at simulating an appropriate response to an epiphany in the absence of a god. Despite the irony of Odysseus's address, its epiphanic theme is nevertheless appropriate to Nausicaa's role in the scene, as she is acting in Athena's stead to provide the information and material assistance which the goddess wishes Odysseus to receive before arriving in the Phaeacian capital. The meeting in *Od*. 6 thus depicts, in microcosm, the same temporary extension of divine agency to a mortal which can be seen later in the Ithacan books.

Part II will consider some aspects of epiphany in the works of two of Homer's greatest epic successors, Apollonius and Vergil. Chapter 5 provides a brief survey of the epiphany scenes in the *Argonautica*, which engages with Homeric epic, and especially with the *Odyssey*, in a highly self-conscious manner. In his treatment of epiphany, however, Apollonius appears far less consistent than either of the Homeric epics. In the heavily Odyssean passages of *Arg*. 4 he reveals brief glimpses of scenes which resemble the Homeric model, but elsewhere he seems deliberately to avoid a consistent paradigm. The extreme degree of variation in Apollonius's epiphanies can be attributed, in part, to a particular interest in the topic of recognition. The *Argonautica* contains several group epiphanies, numerous encounters where recognition is implied but never explicitly described, and even one epiphany where recognition is expressly forbidden (3.1211-24). For the audience, as well, the recognizability of epiphany is challenged, as characters interpret certain encounters as epiphanic despite the absence of the most defining "divine purpose" motifs. The poet clearly demonstrates that he is able to produce epiphany scenes which adhere to Homeric

[101] While this order might seem counterintuitive, it seems most expedient to discuss the later books of the *Odyssey* first because their theoxenic undertones have already been established.

conventions, but also sets out to complicate his reader's understanding of the form and purpose of epic epiphany.

The remaining chapters will examine Vergilian epiphany scenes, which return to the familiar structure of the Homeric model. Chapter 6 discusses how Vergil's use of the scene pattern both acknowledges and diverges from Homeric usage, focusing particularly on changes in the frequency of particular motifs, the incorporation of influences from other literary and cultural sources, paradigms for recognition in the *Aeneid*, and the introduction of new motifs by Vergil. These features are illustrated through two scene analyses, the first discussing Aeneas's encounter with the ship-nymphs (10.215-59) and the second examining Venus's epiphany to her son at 1.314-417. Vergil's deliberate choice to adopt the conventions of Homeric epiphanies, and hence the appropriateness of analysing the *Aeneid* epiphanies according to this model, is suggested by the almost excessive number of Homeric motifs in the poem's first epiphany.

While Vergil chooses to structure his epiphany scenes on the Homeric model, his cast of epiphanic performers much more closely resembles that of Apollonius. The gods of the *Aeneid* are more distant than Homeric gods, and Olympian epiphanies are accordingly rare. In their place are local gods, recently-deified gods, and even deceased mortals. Chapter 7 considers an example of each of these types of epiphany, focusing in particular on questions of agency that arise from Vergil's use of the Homeric motifs to highlight the physically delineated sphere of Tiberinus's influence, the futility of Juturna's epiphany in light of her self-identification as the sister of a mortal man, and Anchises's remarkable role as the messenger of Jupiter.

Finally, the last chapter will function as a coda to the preceding sections. Examining parallels between Aeneas's meeting with Dido and Odysseus's epiphany-like encounter with Nausicaa, it will show that the *Aeneid*'s anticipation of Aeneas's future deification does not include featuring the hero as an epiphanic performer. Aeneas's behaviour during the first book of the poem makes it clear that he views his relationship to the gods as a difficult one,

while his own desire for openness in his interactions with others makes him incapable of maintaining the distance and ambiguity of Vergilian epiphanic gods toward their addressees. In a similar way, echoes of the Iliadic *aristeia* at Aeneas's entrance into battle in *Aen*. 10 are gradually rejected in favour of a more permanent, posthumous style of apotheosis.

2

Godlike Mortals: Challenging the Epiphanic Hierarchy

> δαιμονίη, τί με ταῦτα λιλαίεαι ἠπεροπεύειν; ...
> ἦσο παρ᾽ αὐτὸν ἰοῦσα, θεῶν δ᾽ ἀπόεικε κελεύθου,
> μηδ᾽ ἔτι σοῖσι πόδεσσιν ὑποστρέψειας Ὄλυμπον,
> ἀλλ᾽αἰεὶ περὶ κεῖνον ὀΐζυε καί ἑ φύλασσε,
> εἰς ὅ κέ σ᾽ ἢ ἄλοχον ποιήσεται, ἢ ὅ γε δούλην.
> κεῖσε δ᾽ ἐγὼν οὐκ εἶμι – νεμεσσητὸν δέ κεν εἴη.
>
> Strange goddess, why do you long to deceive me thus? ...
> Go and sit by his side, withdraw from the way of the gods,
> and no longer let your feet bear you back to Olympus,
> but ever suffer for him and watch over him,
> until he makes you either his wife or his slave.
> But thither I will not go, for it would be shameful.
>
> Homer *Iliad* 3.399, 406-10

In the Introduction, I showed how the motifs of the epiphany scene pattern can be applied to the interpretation of individual scenes in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. One key concept that emerged was that of an epiphanic hierarchy, which may be muted in the early stages of an epiphany but is always asserted after recognition is achieved by the percipient. Thus, many of the post-recognition motifs involve an acknowledgement of the difference in status between performer and percipient (the affirmation of divinity), highlighting discrepancies in both their degree of knowledge (the insult and prophecy) and their power over the percipient's future (the concern for welfare and assuagement).

Yet, as this chapter's opening quote reveals, mortals occasionally find themselves dissatisfied with this arrangement. When Aphrodite summons Helen after rescuing Paris, the ashamed Helen refuses to obey, issuing several commands of her own before being terrified into submission (*Il*. 3.383-420). Earlier, when Achilles is angered by Agamemnon, his response to Athena's epiphany contains an attempt to utter a prophecy, reflecting his

assumption that she has come to support his own goals (*Il*. 1.194-222). In both cases, the mortal expresses motifs which are typically reserved for epiphanic gods in an attempt to seize a greater share of agency over their situation. Both attempts are countered by the goddess, who immediately reasserts the traditional hierarchy and her own control of the scene. The formal structure of the epiphany scene thus becomes a mechanism whereby mortal and divine can negotiate and ultimately confirm their relative positions.

In order to highlight how exceptional these attempts are, this chapter will begin with a brief overview of some of the circumstances in which the *Iliad* allows mortals to assume godlike attributes, illustrating how tightly controlled such opportunities are within the poem's thematic framework. This will be followed by a discussion of the aforementioned epiphanies in *Il*. 1 and 3 as the only two occasions when an Iliadic mortal attempts to overstep the traditional role of an epiphanic percipient and challenges that of a deity. Finally, the *Iliad*'s response to such transgressions is contrasted with that of the *Odyssey*, in which Athena actually orchestrates her epiphany in *Od*. 13 so as to provoke and reward Odysseus's preemption of a divine motif.

Godlike Mortals in the *Iliad*

The *Iliad* is grounded in the mortality of its heroes. Clay encapsulates the relationship between Homeric gods and men when she writes:

> The Epic hero ... inhabits a precarious and unstable zone between men like us, *anthropoi*, and the immortals. Doomed on the one hand to a mortality common to all men, the heroes – the descendants of the gods – are all godlike as well. ... To be godlike demands divine assistance, yet the Epic *imitatio dei* is fraught with danger; for there exists a line, invisible and shifting, but nonetheless absolute, which separates gods from men. Only the moment of transgression reveals its presence.[1]

[1] Clay 1983 181. On the relationship between Homeric gods and men, see Ehnmark 1935 1-10; Dodds 1951 10; Lloyd-Jones 1971 3-4; Griffin 1978 1-22; Griffin 1980 81-102, 144-204; Thalmann 1984 82-92; Kullmann 1985 1-23; Emlyn-Jones 1992 91-103. See also Guthrie 1950 120.

Because the *Iliad* establishes this uncrossable gap between mortal and divine, the poem maintains careful control over the circumstances in which its heroes may exhibit divine attributes.[2] Any action which comes close to transgressing the boundary between mortal and divine must be quickly remedied, typically through an explicit reminder of the hero's mortality. This theme of transgression and correction recurs throughout the *Iliad* whenever the mortal world encroaches too closely upon the divine.

For most warriors in the *Iliad*, the *aristeia* is the only context in which they may surpass human limitations and approximate divine power, acquiring not only superhuman strength but also an enhanced ability to perceive and recognize the gods. As Turkeltaub has shown,[3] a hero in the midst of his *aristeia* gains the ability to recognize gods instantly, regardless of the mode whereby he normally recognizes them. So Diomedes recognizes Athena immediately at *Il*. 5.114-34 and 711-909, but perceives only her voice at 10.512. Patroclus recognizes Apollo at 16.698-711 but realises only belatedly the same god's role in his demise (16.845). Hector knows at once that Apollo is a god (15.220), but his encounters with Iris involve aural (2.182) and verbal (11.195-213) recognition. Achilles easily recognizes gods on five occasions during his *aristeia* (20.445-54, 21.211-382, 21.272-304, 21.595-22.23, 22.166-277) and a further five times outside of this context (1.351-430, 18.34-138, 18.165-202, 19.2-39, 24.103-42).[4]

In these moments of enhanced power, it is not uncommon for a hero's opponents to wonder whether he might be a god in disguise, or at least to remark that he enjoys divine protection.[5] During Diomedes's *aristeia*, Aeneas urges Pandarus to shoot and test whether the warrior is mortal (εἰ μή τις θεός ἐστι, *Il*. 5.177). Pandarus replies that he looks like the son of

---

[2] For reasons of space, I do not consider generic epithets (e.g. δῖος, ἰσόθεος) or similes in this assessment. For similes likening mortals to gods, see Fränkel 1921 96-7; Lee 1964 68. Griffin (1980 84-5) highlights the poet's tragic and pathetic use of the "godlike" epithet.

[3] Turkeltaub 2007 66-8.

[4] A complete list of epiphanies and corresponding modes of recognition can be found in Appendix 2.

[5] Petridou 2015 112.

Tydeus, but that he cannot rule out the possibility that he might be a god (σάφα δ' οὐκ οἶδ' εἰ θεός ἐστιν, 5.183). Even if it is Diomedes, he argues, one of the immortals must be fighting with him, since he is uninjured by Pandarus's arrows (5.184-7). Thoas (15.290) and Teucer (15.467-70) similarly observe that Hector is protected from enemy weapons by the gods. Aeneas comments to the disguised Apollo that Achilles is protected by one of the gods (20.98), while Agenor wonders whether the warrior's mortality might be mere rumour (θνητὸν δέ ἕ φασ' ἄνθρωποι, 21.569). When Scamander appeals to Simois for aid, he claims that Achilles means to make himself equal to the gods (μέμονεν δ' ὅ γε ἶσα θεοῖσι, 21.315).

Since such moments threaten to close the gap between human and divine, the hero's mortal status is always quickly reasserted. Hector's *aristeia* is immediately preceded by a prophecy of Zeus, which grants temporary glory to the Trojans while also foretelling Hector's death (*Il*. 15.65-8). Patroclus's entry into battle in *Il*. 16 is marked by the poet's reflection on his imminent death (16.47), which is repeated as his pursuit of glory leads him to abandon the limits set by Achilles for his intervention (16.686-7).[6] In Diomedes's case, Athena's complete removal of the mist from his eyes goes so far as to eliminate the epiphanic nature of his interactions with Aphrodite, Apollo, and Ares, with whom he interacts as if he were their equal.[7] Yet the wounded Aphrodite is comforted by the thought of his widow's future grief (5.406-15), and Diomedes is reminded directly of his mortality by Apollo (5.440-2), after which he becomes so cautious that Athena must appear in a responding epiphany to rebuke and fight alongside him (5.793-909).[8] References to Achilles's mortality are numerous and made both by other characters (20.332-9, 21.379-80) and by the hero himself (21.109-10, 21.223-6). When he engages Scamander in battle, blatantly defying the god's power over him, this arrogance is repaid as the river swells and Achilles fears that he will meet an even earlier death than was foretold to him (21.275-83). While his *aristeia* may bring him closest

[6] Whitman (1958 114) examines the connection between Patroclus's death and his divine epithets during his *aristeia*.

[7] Turkeltaub 2007 67. Pucci (1987 71n3) explicitly excludes these interactions from his discussion of epiphany.

[8] Petridou 2015 111-3.

to a divine level, this is permitted only because he is the hero whose mortality is most clearly expressed, ensuring that he poses no lasting challenge to the superiority of the gods.

The connection between the *aristeia* and a momentary transgression of mortal limitations is supported on a narrative level by the phrase δαίμονι ἶσος, which appears exclusively in this context.[9] While scholars have debated the phrase's precise meaning,[10] it seems to imply a direct comparison to the Olympians.[11] Most significantly, Daraki has analyzed this epithet as a unique marker of the most transgressive *aristeiai*, in which the hero's pursuit of glory temporarily places him at odds with the gods themselves.[12] Daraki draws a distinction between two types of heroes: *le héros à menos* and *le héros daimoni isos*. The former is typically a defensive figure; in response to his prayer for help, he receives μένος from the gods and is successfully able to rally his men.[13] The hero who is δαίμονι ἶσος, however, is an aggressor; he fights in pursuit of individual glory and tends to be isolated from his companions. Rather than being supported by divine intervention, this hero's *aristeia* sets him against at least one god, leading to failure.[14] Since the description δαίμονι ἶσος tends to occur at the most climactic moments of such an assault, it naturally occurs in close proximity to the requisite reminders of the hero's mortality.

By granting its greatest heroes temporary access to a superhuman plane, the *Iliad* honours them as greater than their fellow mortals and in some cases even compares them to gods, but it does so in a way which characterises such moments as transgressive and carefully

---

[9] 5.438, 5.459 = 5.884 (Diomedes); 16.705 = 16.786 (Patroclus); 20.447, 20.493, 21.18, 21.227 (Achilles).

[10] Ukert (1850 141), Lehrs (1875 143), Kröcher (1876 6, 15), and Chantraine (1952 51) favour divine associations. Cf. Porzig 1923 170; Leitzke 1930 47-8; Wilamowitz 1937 365. François (1957 327-9) argues that, while a hero's beauty or prestige may be compared to a θεός, the phrase δαίμονι ἶσος refers to his terrifying appearance.

[11] Fourteen of the eighteen occurrences of δαίμων are in character speech and follow "Jörgensen's law" (1904 362f.). When used by the narrator, it refers twice to the collective Olympians (1.222, 15.418), once to Aphrodite (3.420), and once to Hephaestus (19.188).

[12] Daraki 1980 1-24.

[13] For the simultaneously sub- and superhuman qualities of heroes inspired with μένος, see Dodds 1951 9-10.

[14] See Nagy (1979 143-4) for discussion of the heroes' confrontations with Apollo. See also Slatkin 2011 172.

ensures that the hero's mortal status is never lost in the moment. The *aristeia* thus becomes a statement about the inescapability of mortality, even for the most extraordinary heroes, rather than providing the prospect of attaining divinity.

Only Achilles, whose fate explicitly denies him any share of immortality, is able to maintain divine associations outside of his *aristeia*. On several occasions, he is treated almost as an equal by the gods. Unlike other mortals, who are typically aided by epiphanic gods only if they themselves fulfill some part of their instructions, Achilles is instructed simply to wait while both Thetis and Athena perform tasks for him (*Il*. 1.421-2, 18.134-7, 22.222-3).[15] Athena's respectful tone in her opening epiphany, which was noted above,[16] is matched by that of Poseidon at 21.293: αὐτάρ τοι πυκινῶς ὑποθησόμεθ', αἴ κε πίθηαι. In addition to adopting a persuasive rather than commanding stance, the god apparently assumes that the hero will recognize him, identifying Athena but omitting his own name (ἐγώ, 21.290). Achilles's relationship with Iris is particularly noteworthy, as he is the only mortal to whom Iris does not explicitly identify herself during an epiphany, with whom she holds a full conversation, and whose prayers she conveys in her capacity as a divine messenger.[17]

Even so, as for other heroes, Achilles's most divine moments are closely linked with his mortality. Before he enters the battle which will seal his fate, Athena extends to him the fiery aura of an immortal. Throwing the *aegis* around his shoulders, shedding golden mist (νέφος χρύσεον, *Il*. 18.205-6) about his head, and causing fire (φλόγα παμφανόωσαν, 18.206) to blaze forth from his figure, she echoes his cries as the Trojans reel in panic.[18] Unlike Athena's frequent alterations of Odysseus's appearance in the *Odyssey*, this light-filled enhancement of Achilles's voice and person is the most comprehensive transformation in the

---

[15] Turkeltaub 2003 230.

[16] See p26.

[17] Turkeltaub 2003 239. Mueller (1984 150) furthermore identifies Iris as the "epithet sister of Achilles." Cf. Coventry 1987 178-80.

[18] See Lord 1966 247; Nagler 1974 140; Griffin 1980 37-9; Schein 1984 137-40; Sowa 1984 270. On Achilles's associations with fire and divinity, see Moulton 1977 106-12; Mackie 1998 329-38.

Iliad and the closest that an Iliadic mortal ever comes to provoking an epiphany-like reaction.[19] Athena later returns at Zeus's behest to nourish Achilles with nectar and ambrosia (19.340-54), the latter of which is elsewhere only bestowed upon a mortal to preserve his corpse after death.[20] As he looks to his own death, therefore, Achilles is sustained by the very food of the immortals.

While Achilles represents a special case as a hero capable of recognizing, interacting with, and resembling the gods even outside of his *aristeia*, his exceptional nature nevertheless confirms the same distinction which exists for other heroes: Iliadic mortals cannot become gods, and any resemblance to divinity must be balanced by an assertion of the hero's mortality. Achilles's statuses as most divine and most mortal of heroes are intimately linked.

The only other circumstance in which an Iliadic hero's divinity may be suggested is when one mortal fails to recognize another. Since the *Iliad* recounts events in the tenth year of the war, most heroes are familiar with one another at least by sight, and even the gods typically adopt disguises of individuals who are already present at Troy. Situations when a mortal encounters someone he does not recognize are therefore rare. At *Il*. 6.123-9, Diomedes encounters an unfamiliar opponent and declares that he will only fight him if he is not a god. Glaucus responds promptly with a full account of his lineage, boasting of his heroic pedigree while denying any claim to divinity (6.144-211). Later, when Odysseus and Diomedes return from their night raid with the horses of Rhesus, Nestor supposes that the animals must be the gift of some god, since he has never seen their distinctive white coats on the battlefield before (10.543-53). As before, the answer he receives is clear: the horses are not divine. In fact, their master, a recent arrival to the war (νεήλυδες, 10.434), has been killed by Diomedes. Even so, in the brief interval between first sight and explanation, Nestor's failure to recognize the animals leads him logically to wonder whether they might be of divine origin.

---

[19] Cf. the fire Athena kindles about Diomedes at *Il*. 5.4-7, where the hero is likened to a star but the poet does not describe any other character's reaction. Murnaghan (1987 4-7, 11) argues that further transformation would too closely resemble disguise, which is antithetical to Iliadic heroism since it would amount to denying one's true identity and the κλέος associated with one's name.

[20] Cf. *Il*. 16.666-83, 19.38, 23.187. Mackie 1998 335-6.

The *Iliad* thus maintains strict control over the circumstances in which a hero may demonstrate divine attributes. The *aristeia* is the only context in which a hero may surpass his human limitations sufficiently to recognize and even challenge gods as an equal, but this same context is depicted as a transgression which must be remedied through the reaffirmation of the hero's mortality. Achilles is permitted to exist at a superhuman level even outside of his *aristeia* precisely because his clearly-defined fate makes his mortality one of the fundamental facts of the poem. The only other occasion when mortals may mistake one another for gods is when they fail to recognize one another. Since most heroes have been fighting at Troy for years, this is a rare occurrence, and any ambiguity is quickly resolved. While the gods may temporarily submit to appearing mortal during their interventions, mortals are never permitted to appear divine for more than a fleeting moment before their status is reaffirmed.

Challenging the Epiphanic Hierarchy

The extraordinary behaviour of Achilles and Helen during their epiphanies in *Il*. 1 and 3 should be considered against this thematic backdrop. The clear division between mortal and divine has important ramifications for epiphany scenes, where these two spheres come into direct contact. While the analysis of the Homeric scene pattern in the previous chapter indicated that some motifs may be expressed by either party, the hierarchical nature of the encounter means that many motifs are standardly assigned either to the performer or to the percipient. This is particularly true in the moments following recognition, when the differential statuses of god and man are confirmed.

Even more rare than mortals who display divine attributes are those mortals who attempt to take over specific aspects of a divine role in a face-to-face encounter with a god. The *Iliad* offers the possibility of such a transgression only to its most distinguished characters, and only briefly, before immediately requiring the epiphanic god to reassert the

encounter's proper hierarchy. The *Odyssey*, however, in keeping with its thematic emphasis on disguise and ambiguity, transforms Iliadic precedent by making Odysseus's preemption of a divine motif the very act which prompts Athena's first open declaration of support.

As the earliest example of an epiphany within Homer's internal timeline, Athena's intervention in *Il*. 1 serves not only to set the particular (in)action of the epic in motion but also to emphasize this hero's unusually high status from the poem's outset. Every major feature of the scene – including the narrative's constriction into Achilles's μερμηρίζειν scene prior to the epiphany, the suddenness with which Athena is forced to intervene, the resulting rearrangement of the scene's initial motifs from their logical order,[21] and Achilles's unparalleled move to take control of their conversation by speaking first[22] – functions to keep the narrative firmly focused on the mortal hero and the way in which he is treated almost as an equal by the immortal goddess.[23]

There is a brief moment, however, when Achilles goes beyond merely taking control of his conversation with Athena and nearly oversteps the traditional role of the mortal percipient in a divine epiphany: he tries to utter a prophecy (*Il*. 1.204-5).[24] Having inquired why Athena has come, he posits an expected answer to his own query, assuming that she is there ἵνα ὕβριν ἴδῃ Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρεΐδαο (1.203).[25] Achilles thus presupposes the goddess's agreement as he forcefully predicts the punishment of Agamemnon: ἀλλ᾽ ἔκ τοι ἐρέω, τὸ δὲ καὶ τελέεσθαι ὀΐω· / ᾗς ὑπεροπλίῃσι τάχ᾽ ἄν ποτε θυμὸν ὀλέσσῃ (1.204-5).[26] While his initial

---

[21] Athena arrives (*Il*. 1.194) before her awareness of the situation is explained (1.195-6), allowing the poet to keep his audience's attention on Achilles as he reaches for his sword.

[22] Edwards 1980 14.

[23] See p24-7.

[24] Turkeltaub 2003 140-1. On the general concision and forcefulness of Achilles's speech style, see Friedrich and Redfield 1978 263-88; Griffin 1986 50-6.

[25] For Achilles's opening question as a disguised directive, the nature of which Athena recognizes, see Martin 1989 32. See also Ahrensdorf 2014 143.

[26] The construction τάχ᾽ ἄν + [subjunctive] bears the force of a future indicative, or possibly even an imperative, and adds particular strength to Achilles's statement. See Monro 1891 251-3, 287, 333; Chantraine 1953 2.212; Kirk 1985 74-5; Pulleyn 2000 182-3; Willmott 2007 54-7, 77. See also schol. b(BCE³)T and Eustathius *ad loc*.

question regarding Athena's motives indicates some uncertainty on his part as to the epiphany's purpose, this speech nevertheless contains a motif which elsewhere always belongs to the epiphanic god.[27]

Achilles's opening address to Athena represents an effort to raise himself to the goddess's level through the appropriation of a motif which ought to be expressed by her. Such a breach of her traditional role requires that Athena act to reestablish the proper hierarchy of what must be, despite Achilles's high status among mortals, an unequal exchange. After issuing her instructions not to kill Agamemnon, Athena asserts the certainty of reward should Achilles choose to follow her advice: ἀλλ᾽ ἤτοι ἔπεσιν μὲν ὀνείδισον ὡς ἔσεταί περ· / ὧδε γὰρ ἐξερέω, τὸ δὲ καὶ τετελεσμένον ἔσται (*Il*. 1.211-2).[28] This assertion is carefully modeled on Achilles's words in line 204, with a shift in verb from the indefinite ὀΐω to the definitive ἔσεταί and the change of tense from τελέεσθαι to τετελεσμένον ἔσται.[29] Here is the true prophecy, uttered with a certainty which reflects the divine perspective, while Achilles's mortality is highlighted by the comparatively imperfect perspective revealed by his initial question and use of ὀΐω.[30] This repetition of the prophecy motif within a single epiphany scene thus marks both Achilles's attempt to adopt a role beyond what is appropriate for a percipient and the immediate restoration of the proper hierarchical relationship between mortal and divine. It is a sign of Achilles's special favour with the gods that Athena's reassertion of her position through the correction of this motif is so gently expressed.

Aphrodite's appearance to Helen at *Il*. 3.383-425 offers a more extreme and complex example of the same phenomenon. As in *Il*. 1, this epiphany features a mortal of special

---

[27] Other prophecies delivered during Iliadic epiphanies are made by Thetis (1.414-8, 18.95-6, 24.131-2), Aphrodite (3.414-7), Apollo (16.707-9), and Poseidon (21.291-2).

[28] = 8.401 (Zeus to Iris) = 23.672 (Epeius to the Achaeans). The phrase is not exclusive to gods, but still conveys a greater sense of certainty than Achilles's phrasing. Only here and at *Il*. 8.286 does such language reflect a promise of reward. Cf. the threatening contexts of *Il*. 2.257, 8.454, 9.310, and 23.410 (Seymour 1887 27).

[29] Turkeltaub 2003 143. Athena also echoes Achilles's description of Agamemnon's behaviour (ὕβριος 1.214, cf. ὕβριν 1.203), confirming it as a fair description (West 2011a 88).

[30] Pulleyn 2000 185.

status, since Helen, like Aphrodite, is a daughter of Zeus. Despite their kinship, Helen finds herself resentful of the goddess's control over her life. The hostility which she feels toward Aphrodite's interference causes Helen to anticipate the epiphanic moment and issue her own scornful commands, ultimately leading to confusion between the postponement and recognition phases of the epiphany and requiring the repetition of multiple interrelated motifs.

The exchange between Helen and Aphrodite contains not one but three sets of "instructions for present actions." Disguised as an old wool-worker, Aphrodite's first words reveal her purpose: δεῦρ᾽ ἴθ᾽· Ἀλέξανδρός σε καλεῖ οἶκόνδε νέεσθαι (*Il*. 3.390). Because the expression of her wishes precedes the epiphanic moment, it is delivered as a fictional message from Paris, but still functions as the "instructions" motif. When Helen recognizes her, she utters a scathing response (3.399-405) which serves as both the affirmation of Aphrodite's divinity, since it recalls the influence she has exerted over Helen in the past, and an expression of Helen's concern for her future welfare.[31] Helen proceeds to issue her own set of countermands with no fewer than four imperatives: ἧσο παρ᾽ αὐτὸν ἰοῦσα, θεῶν δ᾽ ἀπόεικε κελεύθου, / ... ἀλλ᾽ αἰεὶ περὶ κεῖνον ὀΐζυε καί έ φύλασσε, / εἰς ὅ κέ σ᾽ ἢ ἄλοχον ποιήσεται, ἢ ὅ γε δούλην (3.406, 407-9), and she refuses to obey the goddess (3.410).

Aphrodite responds with her second set of instructions, threatening to withdraw her favour and abandon Helen to the enmity of both armies. As in *Il*. 1, the goddess's response is carefully modeled on her percipient's opening address. While there is only a single imperative in Aphrodite's second speech, the four aorist subjunctives detailing her threats correspond precisely to the number of Helen's commands: μή μ᾽ ἔρεθε, σχετλίη,[32] μὴ χωσαμένη σε μεθείω, / τὼς δέ σ᾽ ἀπεχθήρω ὡς νῦν ἔκπαγλα φίλησα, / μέσσῳ δ᾽ ἀμφοτέρων μητίσομαι ἔχθεα λυγρά, / Τρώων καὶ Δαναῶν, σὺ δέ κεν κακὸν οἶτον ὄληαι (*Il*. 3.414-7). The vividness of these threats implies that Aphrodite's command (μή μ᾽ ἔρεθε, 3.414) is intended

[31] Turkeltaub 2003 171.

[32] On the attitudes conveyed by δαιμονίη (*Il*. 3.399) and σχετλίη (3.414), see Griffin 1986 40.

for both present and future adherence, and also suggests the motif of prophecy by implying the consequences if Aphrodite should withdraw her protection. Frightened, Helen complies, and Aphrodite seems placated. This constitutes what appears to be a second affirmation of divinity, which now acknowledges not just the goddess's former influence but her continuing power over Helen. The proper hierarchical relationship appears to be reestablished, but in a more extreme form, with Helen's initial astonishment (θάμβησέν, 3.398; cf. θάμβησεν, 1.199) being replaced by outright fear (ἔδεισεν, 3.418).

The repetition of both the instructions motif and the affirmation of divinity depends ultimately upon a more fundamental repetition which produces a confusion of phases in this scene: that of the epiphanic moment itself. As soon as Helen recognizes Aphrodite through her disguise, there unfolds a sequence of motifs which seems to confirm that this is the "moment of recognition" – an intense emotional response (*Il*. 3.398), followed by an affirmation of divinity and concern for welfare (3.399-405), albeit accompanied by Helen's shocking commands. Since the recognition is focalised through Helen, the poet does not comment on whether it is achieved against Aphrodite's wishes; Helen's words nevertheless indicate that this is her assumption (τί με ταῦτα λιλαίεαι ἠπεροπεύειν; 3.399).[33] Helen thus appears to have anticipated the epiphanic moment at 3.396-9.[34] However, her irreverent response causes the goddess to respond with a second, more powerful epiphanic moment which vividly establishes her superiority and elicits an even greater emotional response from Helen (ἔδεισεν, 3.418). The sequence is therefore less straightforward than it initially appears, since Helen, despite recognizing Aphrodite's identity, has failed to comprehend the full nature of their relationship. What at first seems to be a moment of recognition is only a hint of divinity which, uniquely, Helen interprets correctly.[35] Full recognition of Aphrodite's power comes only after the scene's second epiphanic moment, which has its own sequence of

[33] Cf. *Od*. 4.233-89, where Helen's ability to see through disguises is a major aspect of both her self-representation and Menelaus's characterization of her. Worman 2002 57-62.

[34] Turkeltaub 2003 164-9.

[35] *ibid*. 168-9. On Vergil's adaptation of this sequence of motifs, see p182-3.

responding motifs: an intense emotional response (3.418), followed by a change of setting which constitutes both the fulfillment of divine instructions and the affirmation of divinity (3.319-420). Helen's belief that she has provoked an epiphanic moment and her ensuing attempt to subvert the goddess's power over her have effectively created the need for the repetition of the entire recognition phase of the epiphany.

In addition to its complexity, there is another fundamental difference between this scene and that of Achilles and Athena. Helen issues her commands in response to Aphrodite's original directive, not preempting the goddess's motif as Achilles does but attempting to invert a motif which has already been expressed. Her speech thus constitutes a far more aggressive and blatant transgression of traditional epiphanic roles, grounded as it is in open contempt for the goddess rather than ambition for her own status.[36] In fact, Helen's semi-divinity is already subtly woven into the poetic fabric of this encounter, and thus requires no explicit emphasis from Helen herself. The garment which she wears is a ἐανός, an article mentioned four times in the *Iliad* – twice of Helen in this passage (*Il*. 3.385, 419), once of Hera (14.178), and once of Artemis (21.507).[37] The goddesses' robes are ἀμβρόσιοι, Helen's νεκτάρεος.[38] It is thus a divine garment that Aphrodite must tug to catch Helen's attention and which veils Helen's face as she complies. Significantly, it is at the moment when Helen recognizes her vulnerability that the poet refers to her as the daughter of Zeus: ἔδεισεν δ' Ἑλένη Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα (*Il*. 3.418).[39]

Furthermore, throughout the passage Helen's status is ironically elevated over that of Aphrodite.[40] Although the goddess manipulates Helen's actions, her servile disguise

---

[36] Cf. Reckford (1964 17), who finds Helen's refusal "tentative." The violence of Aphrodite's response, however, suggests that Helen's words carry more force than Reckford allows.

[37] Clader 1976 58-9.

[38] The only other occurrence of this adjective in the *Iliad* is at 18.25 (νεκταρέῳ δὲ χιτῶνι μέλαιν' ἀμφίζανε τέφρη), as Achilles mourns the death of Patroclus. The χιτῶν has no explicitly divine connections.

[39] Cf. Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα (*Il*. 3.199); κούρη Διός (3.426). The latter is also given to Athena, Artemis, and Aphrodite in the *Iliad*. See further Clader 1976 41.

[40] Kirk 1985 321; Turkeltaub 2003 158-60, 178-9.

outwardly places her in a subordinate position, and she must tug on Helen's gown to get her attention. After the epiphanic moment forces Helen to acknowledge Aphrodite's superiority, the goddess resumes the part of the servant by placing a chair for Helen across from Paris (*Il*. 3.424-5[41]) and then fades into the background as the scene focuses the audience's attention on the product of her interference, which itself recalls the initial seduction at the heart of the Trojan War. At this point, the epithets of goddess and mortal also seem to converge. Aphrodite has two metrically overlapping epithets from which the poet can choose: Διὸς θυγάτηρ and φιλομμειδής.[42] Here, a semantic variant of the more dignified and explicitly divine phrase is applied to Helen (κούρη Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο, *Il*. 3.426),[43] while the goddess is given her alternate epithet φιλομμειδής (*Il*. 3.424), which typically appears in erotic scenes or in scenes where her role as goddess of love is contrasted with more warlike characters.[44] The poet thereby avoids drawing the parallel between Aphrodite and Helen as daughters of Zeus, and the often lighthearted context of the epithet given to Aphrodite contrasts notably with the majesty of Helen's. This poetic elevation of Helen highlights both the dignity of her wishes and the fickleness of the goddess to whom she remains necessarily subjected.[45]

While Achilles is constantly aware of his near(ly-missed) divinity and acts to assert his higher claims, Helen's semi-divine status is a feature which is inseparable from her character but does not actively motivate it. Although Helen's history with Aphrodite attests to an unusually high status both among mortals (as the most beautiful of women) and in relation to the goddess herself (as a fellow daughter of Zeus), it is ultimately the fear of shame among

---

[41] Zenodotus rewrites *Il*. 3.423-6 on the grounds that it is ἀπρεπές for the goddess to place a chair for Helen. Aristarchus defends the lines on the basis of Aphrodite's disguise (schol. A *Il*. 3.423, bT 3.424).

[42] Friedrich 1978 60. On φιλομμειδής, see Bouchard 2015 8-16.

[43] See n39 above. Reckford (1964 12, 19) has a less complimentary view of the epithet's use here.

[44] Cf. *Il*. 4.10, 5.375, 14.211, 20.40. By contrast, Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη is used when the poem emphasizes her power or connection with Zeus: *Il*. 3.374 = 5.312, 5.131 = 5.820, 14.193, 14.224, 21.416, 23.185 (Boedeker 1974 23-26, 31-42; Kirk 1985 326-7; Turkeltaub 2003 178; West 2011a 137).

[45] Helen's impossible position is exemplified by the two epiphanies bracketing the Teichoscopia: Iris inspires longing for Menelaus, which remains even when Aphrodite forces her return to Alexander (Kirk 1985 321; Turkeltaub 2003 163-5; Breitenberger 2007 149). For Helen's relationship with Aphrodite in this scene, see Rutherford 2013 103-7. See also Collins 1988 51-7.

mortals which drives Helen to attempt to capitalize on this familiarity and assert her own agency over her life.[46] The violence of Aphrodite's response proceeds from the bitterness of Helen's tone, the utter impropriety of what she commands,[47] and the extreme degree to which her actions constitute a purposeful breach of the epiphanic hierarchy, even to the point of causing confusion in the very sequence of phases within the scene.

Thus, two of the most memorable Iliadic epiphanies are marked not only by the special circumstances of the recognitions involved and the *hemitheos* status of their percipients,[48] but by these characters' deliberate attempts to surpass the traditional boundaries of their human roles and the very different responses of the goddesses whose positions are momentarily challenged. In the *Odyssey*, a similar transgression occurs in Athena's epiphany at *Od*. 13.221-440, the only fully developed epiphany involving recognition by the percipient.[49] However, unlike in our Iliadic examples, it is not so much that Odysseus attempts deliberately to assume some part of Athena's role in the encounter as that she allows an entire motif to be transferred to him, thereby highlighting a shared aspect of their natures before rewarding him with her first open declaration of support in the poem.

In the Introduction we observed the binary structure of this epiphany, which features the revelations of both Athena and Ithaca and, remarkably, places greater emphasis on

---

[46] For the Iliadic Helen's associations with νέμεσις, see Ebbott 1999 3-20.

[47] Helen's picture of Aphrodite abasing herself out of love for Paris recalls a central theme of *HAph*, where her affair with Anchises is imposed by Zeus to teach her the bitterness of the passions she has hitherto inspired at will between other gods and mortal women. The hymn anomalously records the restriction of the goddess's power rather than celebrating it (Reinhardt 1961 514; Boedeker 1974 33; Lenz 1975 33-4; Thalmann 1984 109-11; Clay 1989 155; Allan 2006 29; Breitenberger 2007 49-50; Faulkner 2008 14-18; West 2011a 136).

[48] These scenes describe two of the three visual recognitions in the *Iliad*, where this mode is exclusively reserved for demigods (Turkeltaub 2007 64). In the third, Aeneas's speech at 17.334-41 also disrupts the scene pattern, as the shift in narrative focus obscures Apollo's departure. However, since this speech contains no infraction of the epiphanic hierarchy, there is no need for Apollo to reassert his status.

[49] Goldhill (1991 6-7) notes the scene's focus on (non-)recognition through the triple repetition of οὐδέ ... ἔγνω (*Od*. 13.188), ἄγνωστον (13.191), and μὴ γνοίη (13.192). See also Kleinknecht 1958 59-75; Clay 1983 191. The only other Odyssean epiphanies involving explicit recognition belong to Nestor (3.371-84) and Menelaus (4.364-6). The latter is part of a self-serving secondary narrative (cf. the unusual dynamics of 4.371-425, where Menelaus gives Eidothea little initiative of her own); the former will be discussed on p68-9 below. After *Od.* 13, Odysseus's meetings with Athena deemphasize their epiphanic nature in order to highlight their mutual cooperation. At *Od*. 24.516-22, Laertes does not explicitly recognize Athena, although the narrative's compression makes this far from certain.

Odysseus's recognition of the latter. The scene therefore accords great significance to his reaction to the gradual revelation of Ithaca. The false biography which he utters in response to Athena's delayed identification of the island is explicitly labelled a deceptive speech by the narrator: οὐδ' ὅ γ' ἀληθέα εἶπε, πάλιν δ' ὅ γε λάζετο μῦθον, / αἰεὶ ἐνὶ στήθεσσι νόον πολυκερδέα νωμῶν (*Od*. 13.254-5).[50] It is easy for an audience familiar with Odysseus's character to forget that this is the first time he delivers such a story,[51] and notably here to a goddess. Since this can be considered to represent the epiphanic motif of the "false biography," the scene becomes not just a dramatic staging of what will become one of Odysseus's defining features, but also a unique moment among the Homeric epiphanies, in which this motif is always elsewhere delivered by the epiphanic god.[52]

Yet unlike in the *Iliad*, Athena does not appear challenged or threatened by Odysseus's preemption of this motif, let alone by his attempt to deceive her; rather, she is pleased. The key is partly in the nature of the motif itself: the false biography is an element of the postponement phase of an epiphany, and thus necessarily precedes the moment when the percipient recognizes his companion's divinity. In the Iliadic scenes discussed above, the motifs usurped by Achilles and Helen follow immediately upon a moment of recognition, and thus form part of a conscious response to the god's presence – Achilles seeks to impose his will on one goddess, Helen to extricate herself from the influence of another. Yet Odysseus's veiled warning not to steal his treasures clearly assumes the mortality of his unknown interlocutor, as it depends on the parallel of Odysseus's Cretan character killing Orsilochus

---

[50] For the implications of Odysseus's stifling of the truth, see Pucci 1987 103-4.

[51] Cf. *Od*. 7.290-307, 9.364-7. In both cases, Odysseus's accounts are largely true but contain targeted alterations; the false tales of the Ithacan books resemble his real experiences, but systematically change names and details.

[52] Cf. *Il*. 22.237-46, 24.389-404; *Od*. 1.178-93; 3.356-70; 7.27-9. Cf. *HDem* 118-44, *HAph* 108-41. At *Il*. 3.385-9 Aphrodite's false biography is reported by the narrator, as Helen can be assumed to know it already. Although not every epiphany in which the god takes a disguise contains a false biography, the latter motif only ever appears when a disguise is explicitly indicated. Odysseus's disguises, by contrast, tend to be primarily verbal (Goldhill 1991 24).

for attempted theft (*Od*. 13.258-70).[53] Since he has not yet recognized Athena, there is no deliberately transgressive element in Odysseus's speech.

In fact, Odysseus's natural tendency to conceal his identity in uncertain circumstances lies at the heart of Athena's purpose. It has often been noted that the hero's name is typically held back by both the poet and his characters.[54] The testing element which occurs when Odysseus himself omits his name will become a major function of his false tales in Ithaca, but here contributes to the agonistic atmosphere in which both he and the disguised Athena attempt to control their encounter by withholding knowledge from the other while gaining it themselves.[55] Although Athena clearly "wins" this contest, since she enters it with full knowledge of the identity which Odysseus is attempting to conceal, Odysseus nevertheless emerges with the goddess's enthusiastic approval for his having attempted the contest at all.[56]

Odysseus's delivery of this false biography immediately prompts Athena to discard her original disguise[57] and declare her identity, praising him for his cunning and at last asserting her role in his homecoming. The hero's characteristic caution is thus rewarded with the goddess's first open appearance to him in the epic. When he continues to doubt even after Athena's epiphanic moment, she cites this natural suspicion as the reason for her continued support (13.331-2). Odysseus is rewarded a second time with the dispelling of the divine mist, which provides unequivocal proof that he is in Ithaca. Thus, while Athena is clearly cast as divine machinator, she is not the epiphany's central figure; the focus remains instead on Odysseus as he gradually recognizes his homeland. Since caution and disguise will be necessary tools for the expulsion of the suitors, Athena's concealment of herself and of Ithaca

---

[53] For this tale as a tactful warning against theft, see Most 1989b 132.

[54] E.g. Fenik 1974 18-55; Murnaghan 1987 5-8; Goldhill 1991 1-5, 24-35; De Jong 2001 127, 171, 214.

[55] Turkeltaub 2003 243. Pucci (1987 105-6) notes that, in addition to competing to deceive one another, they also vie to praise each other's shrewdness (*Od*. 13.291-5, 330-2, 383-91). Müller (1966 87-92) interprets the scene as invitation to an "*aristeia* of μῆτις." For the agonistic nature of modern Greek peasant cultures, see Walcot 1977 6-9.

[56] For a more sinister view of Athena's feelings, see Clay 1983 186-212.

[57] The poet never indicates whether Athena's new form is another disguise or her true appearance (Pucci 1987 112).

has created the ideal testing situation for Odysseus to prove these instincts. The complete transfer of the false biography motif to him represents his successful response to these conditions and suggests that this transferral is precisely Athena's goal in orchestrating the epiphany in this way.[58]

Rather than use her epiphanic moment to assert her own superiority, Athena has staged the scene entirely for Odysseus's benefit.[59] She cannot be unaware that he has retained his fundamental character, particularly given her many interventions in Scheria, which include facilitating the meeting where he utters his κερδαλέον μῦθον likening Nausicaa to Artemis (*Od*. 6.148). She therefore does not set this test in order to ascertain for herself how he will respond, but to impress upon Odysseus the importance of continuing this behaviour in Ithaca.[60] By establishing a causal relationship, first between Odysseus's false biography and her epiphanic moment, and then between his natural carefulness and the revelation of his homeland, Athena clearly signals her approval of this conduct and assures him of her constant support as he undertakes to reclaim his place as master of Ithaca and of his own household. Only then does Athena encourage him to make his plans, which he does in full partnership with her.[61] Ultimately, she will transfer the entire role of the epiphanic god to Odysseus as he carries out these plans, testing the members of his household and gathering his loyal supporters in preparation for his confrontation with the suitors.[62]

The transfer of the false biography motif to Odysseus in this scene is far more closely intertwined with the overall themes of the poem – effectively setting the agenda and major

---

[58] For Odysseus's homecoming as Athena's primary motivation throughout the poem, see Müller 1966 (*passim*); Murnaghan 2002 142.

[59] On Athena's initiative and Odysseus's response, see Müller 1966 91.

[60] Cf. *Od*. 13.303-10. See West 2015 233.

[61] *Contra* Stewart (1976 87-8), the cooperative nature of this moment is highlighted by the use of the dual at *Od*. 13.372-3: τὼ δὲ καθεζομένω ἱερῆς παρὰ πυθμέν' ἐλαίης / φραζέσθην μνηστῆρσιν ὑπερφιάλοισιν ὄλεθρον. Clay (1983 206) interprets Odysseus's use of γλαυκῶπι as a further sign of intimacy.

[62] For the theoxenic undertones of Odysseus's revenge against the suitors and the relationship with *Od*. 13, see Kearns 1982 2-8. See also Rutherford 1986 159; Murnaghan 1987 11-8, 82-7. The narrative's engagement with epiphanic themes in Odysseus's self-revelations in Ithaca will be explored in the next chapter.

themes for the epic's entire second half – than are the motifs usurped in the two Iliadic scenes discussed, which are depicted as isolated incidents after which the original hierarchy is swiftly restored. Athena's reaction to Odysseus's speech, by contrast, emphasizes the similarity between the goddess and her favourite. The scene portrays both parties' agonistic control of knowledge prior to the moment of recognition, a situation which is initiated by Athena's concealment of Ithaca and which will be repeated by Odysseus in the recognition scenes throughout the poem's second half. Odysseus's attempt to lie to the goddess is ultimately rewarded by her open declaration of support, and together they plot the destruction of his enemies. Essentially, Athena has created the specific circumstances of this epiphany – the mist preventing Odysseus from recognizing Ithaca outright, the ambiguous description of the terrain, the anonymity of her own disguise – precisely in order to provoke Odysseus's characteristic reaction and thereby to guide his preparations to face the trials at home.[63]

The *Odyssey* thus adopts a phenomenon which the *Iliad* depicts as a rare and transgressive act – the deliberate appropriation of a god's motif by a mortal during an epiphany – and transforms it into a reflexive action which elicits praise from the epiphanic goddess. Like Athena, who takes on all manner of forms (cf. *Od*. 13.312-3), Odysseus can adopt many identities, and he will soon be physically transformed by her.[64] His false biography during the epiphany scene of *Od*. 13 will be the first of many in Ithaca, where, like a disguised god, he will conceal his identity and control his encounters with those around him as he works to reclaim what is rightfully his. This remarkable situation, in which a goddess temporarily extends divine agency to a mortal by authorizing him to appear as an epiphanic figure, will be the subject of the next two chapters.

---

[63] For *Od*. 13 as a rehearsal for later events, see De Jong 2001 313.

[64] While the gods occasionally enhance the appearance of Iliadic heroes (e.g. *Il*. 18.202-18), no other hero is fully transformed by them. Even during the covert operations of *Iliad* 10, Odysseus and Diomedes make no attempt to hide their identities. Odysseus's willingness to endure anonymity and adopt alternate personae in the *Odyssey* is unique among Homeric mortals.

3

Mortal "Epiphanies" — Odysseus in Ithaca

> ἀλλοῖός μοι, ξεῖνε, φάνης νέον ἠὲ πάροιθεν,
> ἄλλα δὲ εἵματ᾽ ἔχεις, καί τοι χρὼς οὐκέθ᾽ ὁμοῖος.
> ἦ μάλα τις θεός ἐσσι, τοὶ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν.
>
> Stranger, you seem different to me now than you were before;
> you have new clothes, and your complexion is not the same.
> Surely you are one of the gods who hold broad heaven.
>
> Homer *Odyssey* 16.181-3

We have seen how Athena allows certain motifs to be transferred to Odysseus during her epiphany in *Odyssey* 13, where it was hinted that she will eventually transfer the entire role of an epiphanic god to the hero as he carries out her instructions to conceal his identity, test the members of his household, and thereby assemble his loyal supporters against the suitors. While the demigods Achilles and Helen attempt at times to usurp aspects of a divine role in the *Iliad*, Odysseus is the only mortal character who is granted the distinction of appearing repeatedly as an epiphanic figure in his own right. This is made possible by the thematic environment of the *Odyssey*, with its emphasis on disguise and ambiguity,[1] and on its hero's tendency to delay revealing his name.[2] Through his partnership with Athena, with whom he shares not only the goal of punishing the suitors but numerous personal characteristics which allow him to mirror her behaviour in his own self-revelations, Odysseus comes to perform the same function as a theoxenic god and is effectively cast as an agent, not only of personal vengeance, but of divine justice.

---

[1] See Murnaghan's comprehensive discussion (1987).

[2] On this delay by both Odysseus and the narrator, see Austin 1972 4-10; Fenik 1974 18-55; Segal 1983 32; Murnaghan 1987 5-8; Goldhill 1991 1-5, 24-35; De Jong 2001 127, 171, 214.

The potential to identify Odysseus as a pseudo-divine figure is introduced by other characters within the poem. When Antinous throws a footstool at Odysseus, the other suitors protest that the beggar might be some god in disguise:

> ... εἰ δή πού τις ἐπουράνιος θεός ἐστιν.
> καί τε θεοὶ ξείνοισιν ἐοικότες ἀλλοδαποῖσι,
> παντοῖοι τελέθοντες, ἐπιστρωφῶσι πόληας,
> ἀνθρώπων ὕβριν τε καὶ εὐνομίην ἐφορῶντες. (*Od*. 17.484-7)

Later, when Eurycleia announces Odysseus's return and the slaughter of the suitors, Penelope's joy is tempered by doubts, and she asserts that it must have been some god who exacted revenge on the suitors instead:

> ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἔσθ᾽ ὅδε μῦθος ἐτήτυμος, ὡς ἀγορεύεις,
> ἀλλά τις ἀθανάτων κτεῖνε μνηστῆρας ἀγαυούς,
> ὕβριν ἀγασσάμενος θυμαλγέα καὶ κακὰ ἔργα. (*Od*. 23.62-4)

Contained in both statements is a belief on the part of the characters that the gods interact with mortals in order to reward or punish their behaviour, as well as an acknowledgement that the beggar's behaviour allows him to be regarded by those around him as one such divine figure.[3]

The pivotal work of scholarship to expand upon this idea was a 1982 article by Emily Kearns titled "The Return of Odysseus: A Homeric Theoxeny."[4] Kearns draws many convincing parallels between Athena's epiphany to Odysseus in *Odyssey* 13 and Odysseus's self-revelation to Telemachus. In both scenes, one character (first Odysseus, then Telemachus) finds himself in the presence of someone important (Athena and Odysseus, respectively), whom he mistakenly believes to be of no significance. During their conversation, the former unknowingly passes some form of test, as Odysseus excels in

[3] Alcinous also comments that Odysseus might be a god in disguise, but remarks that this would be a departure from the idealised fellowship the Phaeacians have hitherto enjoyed with the gods (7.199-206).

[4] Kearns 1982 2-8.

qualities which Athena values and Telemachus exhibits qualities a father would hope for in a son. The unrecognized individual then undergoes a dramatic change in appearance, reveals his/her relationship to the baffled percipient, and gives counsel on how to overcome the suitors. While Odysseus is not a god and must deny his son's attempts to identify him as such, his actions are fully analogous to those of Athena during her epiphany, and Telemachus's understandable mistake looks forward to the whole subsequent development of the plot as Odysseus comes to perform the same function as a theoxenic god, testing his servants and the suitors not only as a precaution but with avenging justice in mind.

Kearns's arguments have since obtained the weight of scholarly consensus, with many scholars taking her conclusions as basic assumptions for their own work.[5] In her study of epiphany in the Homeric Hymns, Cora Sowa draws parallels between Odysseus's behaviour in Scheria and Ithaca with that of Demeter in *HDem*.[6] All three sequences describe progressive revelations representing what she calls the "God Welcomed by Maidens" theme, and Demeter's story is also a prime example of a theoxeny.[7] Sowa's approach of breaking down epiphanies into subtypes poses some problems when trying to understand Homeric epiphany in a broader sense, and I would like to complicate the association which she draws between epiphany and Penelope's recognition of her husband,[8] yet her discussion of the

---

[5] The survey above highlights the most relevant studies, but is far from comprehensive. Additional studies of Odysseus's godlike behaviour are listed here. Friedrich (1991 26-8) analyzes the Cyclops episode as an occasion when Odysseus assumes a theoxenic role without divine authorization. Reece (1993 181-7) includes Odysseus in his discussion of hospitality scenes. Scodel (1998 8-9) discusses narrative manipulation of audience expectations for direct divine punishment of the suitors. De Jong (2001 332) emphasizes the repeated use of the "test" motif and the perceptions of other characters. Bierl (2004 47-51) observes the relative absence of Athena's epiphanies in favour of assisting Odysseus, who features more prominently in this context due to recurring elements of disguise and recognition, the general aptness of the theoxeny model, and the hero's associations with light. Louden (2011a 30-56) considers the *Odyssey* alongside biblical parallels. Nieto Hernandez (2002 319-34; 2008 51) discusses Odysseus's connections to Apollo. While Apollo is not often associated with the theme of theoxeny, his bow is frequently used to exact punishment (cf. *Il*. 1.43-52, 24.605-9).

[6] Sowa 1984 70, 136, 250-7. Lord (1966 241-8) and Richardson (1974 32, 179-80, 187-90) note similarities between Demeter's false tale (*HDem* 122-32) and Odysseus's tale to Eumaeus (14.199-359), as well as parallels between the story of Demeter at the well and Odysseus's experiences with Nausicaa, Athena, and the daughter of the Laestrygonian king. For parallel themes of death and return in the *Odyssey* and *HDem*, see Foley 1994 93.

[7] Examples of theoxeny are collected by Flückiger-Guggenheim (1984) who, incidentally, recognizes some analogies in Odysseus's return but concludes that the variations are too great to merit labeling it a theoxeny (1984 62, 151). On *HDem*, *ibid*. 81-100. For further examples, see e.g. Hollis 1990 341-54.

[8] See p89-99.

parallels between Homer's Odysseus and the hymnic Demeter remains significant. Sheila Murnaghan's *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey* observes that disguise is a typically divine strategy in Homer and notes several similarities between Odysseus's self-revelations and divine theoxeny.[9] These include repeatedly ignored hints of Odysseus's true identity as well as his remarkable transformations, displays of special powers, and announcements of punishment or reward. The critical distinction is that, unlike that of a god, Odysseus's revenge is only possible with the aid of human accomplices. Finally, in his 2003 dissertation on divine epiphany in Homeric epic and the hymns, Daniel Turkeltaub acknowledges that Odysseus acts out a kind of theoxeny in Scheria and briefly traces the epiphanic resonances in the recognition scene between Odysseus and Telemachus.[10]

Each of these studies touches on the subject of Odysseus's godlike behaviour in the course of its primary discussion, but much remains to be explored in terms of how fully Odysseus comes to resemble a divine figure, the versatility with which each recognition scene engages with epiphanic themes, and, most importantly, the limitations which the narrative imposes on its hero's godlike role. The following chapter will consider these questions while examining the recognition scenes in the second half of the *Odyssey* for their engagement with the theme of epiphany.

Odysseus and Telemachus

When Telemachus mistakes Odysseus for a theoxenic god at 16.178-85, his error introduces the poem's most overt negotiation of the boundary between human and epiphanic recognition. Kearns's work on thematic and contextual parallels between *Od*. 13 and 16 opens the door for us to consider how the latter plays with the structural elements of

[9] Murnaghan 1987 11-20, 56, 68-87.

[10] Turkeltaub 2003 4, 243, 297-302.

epiphany. Turkeltaub's discussion of the scene provides only a brief sketch of the major motifs.[11] Given the scene's complex negotiation of recognition and epiphany themes, I shall expand upon his analysis below. Despite Odysseus's "godlike" tactic of disguise,[12] no specifically epiphanic elements appear prior to Telemachus's awestruck reaction to his father's transformation. Only then does his response introduce unambiguous epiphanic language, which his father must work to correct before recognition can be achieved.

The motifs prior to Athena's appearance at 16.155 are few and non-specific, centering around the concealment of Odysseus's identity and the development of dramatic irony. Above all, Athena's control of the scene is evident from the outset. Odysseus's disguise is residual from *Od*. 13, the result of the divine inspiration motif which now helps him to carry out the goddess's instructions for anonymity.[13] The most recent journey to have been narrated is that of Telemachus, who has been directed to Eumaeus's hut by Athena (15.284-300, 495-557). Up until the moment of his arrival, neither Odysseus nor Telemachus expects the meeting and the awareness motif belongs firmly to Athena, the divine orchestrator whose instructions (13.404-11, 15.38-40) have brought them together.[14]

As the scene progresses, some of Athena's awareness comes to be shared with Odysseus, who – following Eumaeus's appellation of Telemachus at 16.23 – becomes the only one of the three men to know the identities of both his companions, thereby granting him a uniquely informed perspective analogous to that of Athena at 13.222-89 prior to her epiphanic moment. Odysseus's awareness here, however, is passive; it develops only after Telemachus has arrived, and he does not immediately act on it. Instead, he obeys Athena's instructions and observes the conversation between his servant and his son, which exploits

---

[11] Turkeltaub 2003 298-301.

[12] Murnaghan 1987 11-19; Fernández Contreras 1999 13.

[13] For Odysseus's beggarly appearance as disguise or magical transformation, see Stanford 1977 ii.331; Clay 1983 162-3; Rutherford 1992 180-1.

[14] Eisenberger 1973 223. For Athena's role in directing the recognition scenes, see Louden 2011b 80. On her control of the plot more generally, see Müller 1966 *passim*; Murnaghan 1995 61-80; Murnaghan 2002 142.

the irony of his unrecognized status as Eumaeus greets Telemachus like a long-absent son (16.17-21)[15] and the youth addresses the swineherd affectionately as ἄττα (16.31).[16]

Such irony is the defining feature of the meeting's early moments, exploiting both the swineherd's presence and the characters' differing degrees of knowledge. The three men take their meal together and Telemachus, observing the rules of hospitality, refrains initially from asking about the stranger. After the meal, he directs his questions to Eumaeus (whom he again calls ἄττα, 57), whereupon the swineherd repeats the essential features of Odysseus's false biography from 14.199-359 and entrusts him to Telemachus as his suppliant. The false biography is thus placed in the mouth of a character who is neither the performer nor the percipient, and who does not himself know that the story is false. While this motif is often subtly suggestive of the performer's true identity,[17] this degree of removal and summarization strips the tale of any thematic resonances with Odysseus's true experiences.[18]

This brief false tale is followed by a hint of Odysseus's true identity as he declares:

> αἰ γάρ ἐγὼν οὕτω νέος εἴην τῷδ᾽ ἐπὶ θυμῷ,
> ἢ πάϊς ἐξ Ὀδυσῆος ἀμύμονος ἠὲ καὶ αὐτὸς
> ἔλθοι ἀλητεύων· ἔτι γὰρ καὶ ἐλπίδος αἶσα·
> αὐτίκ᾽ ἔπειτ᾽ ἀπ᾽ ἐμεῖο κάρη τάμοι ἀλλότριος φώς,
> εἰ μὴ ἐγὼ κείνοισι κακὸν πάντεσσι γενοίμην
> ἐλθὼν ἐς μέγαρον Λαερτιάδεω Ὀδυσῆος. (*Od*. 16.99-104)

This speech marks the first time that Odysseus has mentioned his own name in Telemachus's presence. In addition to the irony of his words at 16.100, the fervour of this speech comes close to revealing a greater degree of personal involvement than might be appropriate for a

---

[15] Moulton 1977 132-3; Beck 1998 126-7; Wöhrle 1999 133, 141.

[16] Telemachus reserves this affectionate term for Eumaeus, even after recognizing Odysseus (16.57, 16.130, 17.6, 17.599, 21.369). On the denomination of Odysseus as πατήρ, see De Jong 1993 305-6.

[17] Turkeltaub 2003 25.

[18] For these resonances in the original tale, see Fenik 1974 158-71. Ahl (2002 128) sees Eumaeus's summarization as an effort to trivialise what he suspects might not be a true account. On the idea that the false tales preserve older (more "true") versions of Odysseus's experiences, see Woodhouse 1930 126-36; West 1981 171; Reece 1994 157-73; Tsagalis 2012 309-46.

beggar unconnected with Odysseus's family.[19] Since this subtly suggests Odysseus's identity as the master of the house which has been so egregiously exploited, it functions in precisely the same way as a hint of divinity in a divine epiphany. Here, however, it is a hint of humanity. In order to preserve the irony of suggesting both the performer's true identity and the possibility of his divinity, the traditional hint motif can be observed in two complementary halves in this scene, one of humanity and one of divinity.

Telemachus responds appropriately to this hint with an account of his lineage, demonstrating sensitivity to the role he should play in evicting the suitors but also defending himself by providing details of the situation. This brings his thoughts naturally back to his reasons for returning to Ithaca and he sends Eumaeus to inform Penelope of his return, as Athena instructed him to do at 15.40-2. This postponement of the essential dramatic isolation motif until such a late moment is not just a literary ploy to exploit the scene's numerous ironies, but has created an opportunity for Odysseus to gather vital information not only on the situation in his home but on the characters of the two individuals whom Athena has recommended to him as allies (13.404-15).[20]

This delay and Odysseus's lack of initiative in the scene's early stages keep the audience in suspense as to how he will choose to reveal himself to his son, just as the irony of the simile at 16.17-21 raises the question of how Telemachus will recognize the father he has never known. Will it be like in Scheria, with its overtones of hospitality and where there are no tokens available because the Phaeacians, like Telemachus, have never met Odysseus before? Or will it be more like Athena's epiphany, which gave him the information and disguise to prepare for this moment? Strictly speaking, none of the motifs observed thus far requires a divine participant in the scene, and there has been little to suggest that the hero

---

[19] Monro 1901 76-7 ("Throughout this speech Ulysses is on the verge of using language only suited to his own character."); Cauer 1923 525; Stanford 1977 ii.267. The irony of Odysseus's words becomes even sharper if we follow Aristarchus's deletion of 16.101.

[20] The scholia contain a lengthy discussion on the order of Odysseus's self-revelations (Σ N *Od*. 13 *init*.; Dindorf 1885 789). The first explanation quotes Aristotle, who notes that Odysseus reveals himself first to those who can help him defeat the suitors, then to the rest of his family. For modern proponents of this explanation, see Kakridis 1971 158; Richardson 1983 225-6; De Jong 2001 387; Louden 2011b 82-3, 99.

might be playing an epiphany-like role. The only parallels to Athena's role in *Od*. 13 remain purely contextual, and the only "hint" motif has been one of humanity, not divinity. It is not until Eumaeus departs at 16.144-5 and the long-delayed dramatic isolation is established that the expectation of recognition is intensified and the motifs of epiphany begin to emerge.

Expecting the scene to turn at this point to recognition, the audience is surprised by the interruption of a true divine epiphany by Athena, who appears to Odysseus at 16.156-77. This epiphany is central to the unfolding of the surrounding recognition scene and functions both as a responding epiphany[21] to set in motion the events foreshadowed in Athena's original epiphany in *Od*. 13 and as the facilitator of what Telemachus will soon interpret as an epiphanic moment. Odysseus waits for this direct instruction from Athena before initiating the recognition scene with his son, and Athena's enhancement of his stature and clothing provides a hint of divinity to which Telemachus will exhibit an immediate and powerful emotional response, at last casting Odysseus's behaviour in explicitly epiphanic terms.

When Telemachus observes Odysseus's transformation, he is convinced that he must be a god and thus assumes that this hint of divinity is in fact a full epiphanic moment.[22]

> θάμβησε δέ μιν φίλος υἱός,
> ταρβήσας δ᾽ ἑτέρωσε βάλ᾽ ὄμματα μὴ θεὸς εἴη,
> καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
> "ἀλλοῖός μοι, ξεῖνε, φάνης νέον ἠὲ πάροιθεν,
> ἄλλα δὲ εἵματ᾽ ἔχεις, καί τοι χρὼς οὐκέθ᾽ ὁμοῖος.
> ἦ μάλα τις θεός ἐσσι, τοὶ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν·
> ἀλλ᾽ ἵληθ᾽, ἵνα τοι κεχαρισμένα δώομεν ἱρὰ
> ἠδὲ χρύσεα δῶρα, τετυγμένα· φείδεο δ᾽ ἡμέων." (*Od*. 16.178-85)

[21] Motifs in this scene are: awareness (16.155-6), dramatic isolation (159-66), present and future instructions (168-70), assuagement of concern (170-1), physical contact (172), divine inspiration (173-6), departure (177), and fulfillment of present and future instructions (188-9, 235f.). Other examples of responding epiphanies include *Il*. 5.793-909, 24.679-94.

[22] The irony of this misrecognition is enhanced by Telemachus's failure to perceive Athena moments before. On the different perceptions of Telemachus and Odysseus, see Bakker 2002 78.

In any other context, this reaction would appear to be a moment of recognition and intense emotional response. The end of Telemachus's speech voices a concern for welfare which reveals that he fears divine punishment for his behaviour leading up to this revelatory moment. His fear, averted eyes, and offer of gifts in exchange for safety are all strongly evocative of hymnic epiphany scenes – especially Anchises's reaction at *HAph* 182, where the hero responds with outright fear rather than the more common θάμβος of the Homeric epics and offers propitiation in exchange for mercy.[23] Telemachus thus seems to have experienced an epiphanic moment of recognition.

Odysseus's response immediately denies his divinity. His revelation that he is not a god is characteristically indirect, as he still does not name himself but declares simply πατὴρ τεός εἰμι (16.188).[24] He then sheds a tear as he kisses Telemachus in a gesture of physical contact which frequently follows moments of recognition between mortals.[25] This gesture and emotional release, as well as the succinctness of Odysseus's speech, indicate his assumption that his identity has been fully revealed and that the recognition scene is complete.[26]

Telemachus, however, continues to doubt,[27] and his next speech demonstrates an ironic insistence on following an epiphanic model for what he assumes to be a test of his character by an unknown god. Insisting once again that Odysseus must be a god intent on deceiving him, Telemachus attempts an affirmation of divinity:

---

[23] Sowa 1984 252; Reece 1993 184; Lateiner 1995 153. For θάμβος as a typical response to epiphany, see Ehnmark 1935 18; Richardson 1974 208; Clay 1983 167-70; Koch Piettre 2001 218; Buxton 2009 164-8; Platt 2011 14; Petridou 2015 88. For additional contexts for this emotion, see Hoffer 1995 522. Sowa (1984 253) observes that the relationship between Odysseus and Athena is like that of Iliadic gods and heroes, while the relationship between Odysseus and Telemachus here resembles that of a hymnic god and ordinary mortals.

[24] There is a nice irony in the parallel positions of οὔ τίς τοι θεός εἰμι (16.187) and ἀλλὰ πατὴρ τεός εἰμι (16.188). Ameis-Hentze 1895 106; Stanford 1977 ii.270; Kearns 1982 4; Goldhill 1991 10.

[25] Walter 1992 64; De Jong 2001 322, 386-7; Gainsford 2003 43, 51. No similar gesture ever takes place following a mortal's recognition of a god.

[26] De Jong 2001 395.

[27] "Odysseus is now the victim of the same suspicious circumspection that marks his own personality" (Beck 1998 129). See also Heath 2001 143.

οὐ σύ γ᾽ Ὀδυσσεύς ἐσσι πατὴρ ἐμός, ἀλλά με δαίμων
θέλγει, ὄφρ᾽ ἔτι μᾶλλον ὀδυρόμενος στεναχίζω.
οὐ γάρ πως ἂν θνητὸς ἀνὴρ τάδε μηχανόῳτο
ᾧ αὐτοῦ γε νόῳ, ὅτε μὴ θεὸς αὐτὸς ἐπελθὼν
ῥηϊδίως ἐθέλων θείη νέον ἠὲ γέροντα.
ἦ γάρ τοι νέον ἦσθα γέρων καὶ ἀεικέα ἕσσο·
νῦν δὲ θεοῖσιν ἔοικας, οἳ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσι. (*Od*. 16.194-200)

This second insistence forces Odysseus to work within an explicitly epiphanic model in order to correct his son's mistake. His response[28] begins with an inversion of the traditional insult motif (16.202-3) – Telemachus's continued awe demonstrates a failure to perceive Odysseus's human identity and an over-aptness to identify divinity. He then revisits both of Telemachus's speeches and repeats each of the motifs which were improperly attributed to himself, this time redirecting them to the proper deity. He at last identifies himself with the name of Odysseus (the announcement motif), albeit still only indirectly: οὐ μὲν γάρ τοι ἔτ᾽ ἄλλος ἐλεύσεται ἐνθάδ᾽ Ὀδυσσεύς, / ἀλλ᾽ ὅδ᾽ ἐγὼ τοιόσδε (16.204-5). The more emphatic place is given to his identification of Athena as architect of his miraculous transformation (16.207), which contains the true announcement of the divine name, and his assertion that it is easy for her to do as she wishes represents the correct affirmation of divinity (16.208-12).[29] The scene thus contains an ironic development of the phenomenon observed in the scenes from *Il*. 1 and 3 in the previous chapter,[30] where epiphanic goddesses must repeat motifs which have been anomalously performed by mortals in order to reassert their divinity. Here, instead, a percipient wrongly insists that his companion is a god, requiring the repetition of multiple motifs in order to confirm that Odysseus is merely a man acting with divine help.

---

[28] The structure of Odysseus's speech resembles Minchin's template for rebukes (1987 148). These typically begin with an address and words of reproach, followed by an account of the problem, generalization about the appropriate action, and a proposal for amends. They are an authoritative speech form in which the speaker assumes a dominant position over the addressee.

[29] Segal (1992 493) discusses Odysseus's phrasing here as "hymnic." On ῥεῖα and related words (here ῥηϊδίως 198, ῥηΐδιον 211) being typical of gods, see Dodds 1951 9; West 1978 139 (on Hes. *WD* 5ff.); Schein 1984 53-4.

[30] See p44-51.

Finally, the true moment of recognition is accompanied by Telemachus's even more intense emotional response to Odysseus's humanity than to his suspected divinity.[31] Throwing his arms around his father and weeping, Telemachus's repetition of the gesture initiated by Odysseus after his first speech symbolises his final acceptance of his father's human identity. After a period of weeping, Odysseus gives a true account of his history and turns the conversation to Athena's plan for the suitors. He demands information about the suitors' strength so that he can decide whether to involve additional allies (the instructions for present actions, 16.235-9).[32] He then issues his instructions for future actions, telling Telemachus to return home ahead of him (16.270-1) and uttering a prophecy that the suitors will not listen to his pleas for decorum (16.278-80). At his signal, then, Telemachus is to store away all the weapons in the house (16.282-98) and must help to conceal Odysseus's true identity even from his family and loyal servants (16.300-3).

The scene's careful treading of the line between recognition and epiphany depends largely on Telemachus's misidentification of the situation. His readiness to identify Odysseus as a god is ironic – even comical – and plays nicely into the scene's inversion of the traditional insult motif. Yet not only is it understandable that the youth would interpret such a dramatic transformation as an indication of divine presence, but it is part of a wider pattern of how Telemachus identifies divinity throughout the *Odyssey*.

While Nestor, Menelaus, and Odysseus are the only characters to recognize gods by name,[33] Telemachus falls somewhere between these Iliadic heroes – familiar with the gods through experience – and other Odyssean characters, who encounter the gods rarely and with greater uncertainty. He evidently shares his father's affinity with Athena, much as Diomedes benefits from her prior patronage of Tydeus in the *Iliad*,[34] and so experiences far more

---

[31] Cf. the emotional prioritization of Odysseus's recognition of Ithaca over his recognition of Athena in *Od*. 13.

[32] On the relationship of this passage to later events, see Olson 1995 145-8; Scodel 1998 5-9.

[33] Turkeltaub 2007 308.

[34] Allan 2006 20. While *Il*. 5.808 was rejected by Aristarchus, its echo at 5.828 highlights Athena's support for Diomedes as the son of her former favourite.

epiphanic encounters than any character in the *Odyssey* except Odysseus himself.[35] Yet Telemachus never recognizes Athena by name,[36] and his ability to recognize her at all appears at first glance to be inconsistent.

In fact, Telemachus relies on a very simple technique: he identifies divinity through visual cues. When Athena departs in *Od*. 1, she leaves ὄρνις δ' ὥς (1.320). However one wishes to interpret this phrase,[37] there is something inherently visual about it. Whether through the amazing swiftness of her movements, their direction toward the roof, or an actual metamorphosis, Athena's departure reveals her divinity through the medium of sight. When she returns to accompany Telemachus as "Mentor," her disguise is maintained throughout their journey (2.399-3.370). In the absence of any change or inconsistency, Telemachus has no reason to suspect that his companion is anyone other than who she claims to be. When Athena departs from Pylos in a similar bird guise (φήνῃ εἰδομένη, 3.372), Nestor's immediate response to her epiphany confirms that Telemachus's instinct in *Od*. 1 was correct, and that such a phenomenon is indeed a marker of divinity. Later, when Athena comes to hasten Telemachus's return (15.1-42, 66, 87-91), there is no mention of her appearance or that Telemachus perceives anything divine in his sudden thoughts of home.[38] Finally, as he and Odysseus clear the arms from the hall, Telemachus perceives a strange light surrounding them and concludes that a god must be present. Here, the visual nature of the evidence is even more explicit:

---

[35] See p22-3 for a list of these encounters.

[36] The scholia note that Telemachus's prayer at 2.262-6 is addressed to a god he has not identified (ὃ χθιζὸς θεὸς ἤλυθες ἡμέτερον δῶ, 2.262) but whom the poet identifies as Athena (2.261). Feeney 1991 85; West 2015 158.

[37] The line's meaning was already disputed in antiquity, with Aristarchus reading ἀνόπαια (a type of bird) while Krates read ἀν' ὀπαῖα ("through the vent in the roof"). For a range of views, see Severyns 1966 63-4; Nilsson 1967 349 with n4; Lavoie 1970 29-33; Moulton 1977 138-9; Stanford 1977 ii.229, 262; Pucci 1987 114-21; Mussies 1988 3; Richardson 2006 351; Buxton 2009 29-36; Buxton 2010 82; Petridou 2015 87-90. Many interpret this as an actual metamorphosis, e.g. Kirchhoff 1860 330-1; Otto 1929 268; Bannert 1978 29-42; Erbse 1980 259-74; Dietrich 1983 59; Heubeck *et al*. 1988 115-6, 183-4. Dirlmeier (1967 22-4) reads these lines as simile only.

[38] De Jong (2001 364) discusses the lack of information regarding Athena's appearance in this scene and concludes that she appears as Mentor. It is unlikely that Athena appears undisguised (Müller 1966 106). Pucci (1987 112) has questioned whether Athena's appearance can ever be identified as her natural form.

Ὦ πάτερ, ἦ μέγα θαῦμα τόδ᾽ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρῶμαι.
ἔμπης μοι τοῖχοι μεγάρων καλαί τε μεσόδμαι
εἰλάτιναί τε δοκοί καὶ κίονες ὑψόσ᾽ ἔχοντες
φαίνοντ᾽ ὀφθαλμοῖς ὡς εἰ πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο.
ἦ μάλα τις θεὸς ἔνδον, οἳ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσι. (*Od*. 19.36-40)

It is unsurprising, therefore, that when faced with another striking transformation in *Od*. 16 Telemachus concludes immediately that he is in the presence of a god.[39] Yet this experience is different from his previous epiphanies, which were signs of special favour and revealed only as Athena departed. This time, the transformation has occurred in the middle of the encounter, a fact which, along with the setting in the swineherd's hut, suggests a different kind of epiphany: theoxeny.[40] Having expressed his unwillingness to entertain this stranger in his own home just moments before (16.69-89), Telemachus fears he has offended a theoxenic god and that this revelation is a prelude to punishment. He must therefore proceed carefully and respond appropriately to this epiphany, refusing to be taken in by further tests when the god denies his divinity and offering splendid gifts in exchange for mercy.

Telemachus's response to this perceived epiphany is largely based on his observation of Nestor in Pylos. Here is another scene which fits the pattern of theoxeny: a disguised god partakes of a mortal's hospitality and rewards her hosts by fulfilling prayers for κῦδος and χάρις (3.55-62). The episode raises many questions about who the epiphany is meant for. Athena begins with Telemachus, whom she encourages and advises but keeps ignorant of her identity; yet she is ultimately recognized by Nestor in a public setting. Essentially, the scene pattern switches percipients once Telemachus and Athena arrive in Pylos. This allows Nestor – the first Iliadic hero we meet in the *Odyssey* and the first character with prior experience of epiphany[41] – to provide Telemachus with confirmation of what he surmised in *Od*. 1: that he

[39] Telemachus hints at a similar misapprehension upon seeing the splendour of Menelaus's palace, which he likens to the house of Zeus himself (4.71-5). See Clader 1976 24-5.

[40] Kearns 1982 5-6.

[41] Nestor's only epiphany in the *Iliad* is recounted by himself as he recollects his youth in the heroic age (*Il*. 11.706-62). Both the absence of dramatic isolation and the epic diction employed by Nestor in its retelling contribute to its location in the distant past.

enjoys divine support in his quest to find his father and evict the suitors. Indeed, Athena has sent him to Pylos not only to seek word of his father but to learn about heroism in preparation for the role he must play upon his return.[42] As the son of Odysseus, one might expect the recognition of epiphanies to form an integral part of Telemachus's heroic education.[43]

Not only does Nestor confirm Telemachus's general experience of epiphany, but he provides him with a model response to it. After recognizing Athena, Nestor utters an immediate declaration of recognition, an affirmation of divinity, and a concern for welfare accompanied by promises of sacrifices (3.375-84). This is precisely the template which Telemachus follows the next time he witnesses a dramatic transformation: a declaration of recognition (16.183), concern for welfare and promise of sacrifices (16.184-5), and repeated affirmations of divinity (16.183, 194-200). Unfortunately, not only does he reproduce this behaviour in the wrong setting (albeit otherwise correctly), but this is a fundamentally inappropriate model for Telemachus's world.[44] As his experiences with Odysseus later will show, and as his first epiphany has already hinted, such an extravagant and open response to divinity is dangerous in Ithaca. The suitors can hardly be expected to respond as favourably as Nestor's Pylians to an enthusiastic revelation that a god has come to encourage Telemachus to seek news of his father's return. Thus Nestor, the hero whose sole epiphanic experience in the *Iliad* was located in the remote past (*Il*. 11.706-62), can be seen in a similar light here, where his experience of epiphany is markedly different from that of the characters around him. As Odysseus's instructions at 16.300-7 and 19.42-3 show, Telemachus must

---

[42] On the educational function of Telemachus's journey, see Scott 1917/8 423-7; Woodhouse 1930 210-2; Jaeger 1939 29-34; Reinhardt 1948 47; Delebecque 1958 137; Kirk 1962 359; Clarke 1963 129-45 (esp. n16); Müller 1966 17; Clarke 1967 31-2; Rose 1967 398; Jones 1988 501-3; Wöhrle 1999 129-31; De Jong 2001 4, 69; Heath 2001 140-3; Murnaghan 2002 144-51. Cf. Olson 1995 65-90. On Athena's epiphany in *Od*. 1 as an early lesson in discernment, see Austin 1969 53.

[43] On Odysseus providing this education to Telemachus, see Segal 1992 492-3.

[44] For the parallel depiction of Nestor's hospitality as initially exemplary but ultimately excessive, see Reece 1993 59-69. On this point, however, Telemachus has already demonstrated proper sensibilities as a host and does not require Nestor's guidance (*ibid*. 47-57).

abandon Nestor's model and return to his initial instinct to conceal the knowledge of recognition – an instinct which he shares only with his father.[45]

Odyssey 16 is thus a point of convergence for numerous strands relating to the theme of epiphany. Yet perhaps its most significant aspect is the degree of consciousness which the characters themselves seem to possess, if not about a scene pattern *per se*, then at least that there exist certain conventions which ought to be followed in an epiphany. Odysseus's self-revelation to Telemachus unfolds in a scene in which the characters believe they are participating in two different scene types: Odysseus believes it will be a recognition scene, while Telemachus concludes that it must be an epiphany. Both men act accordingly, only to encounter a fundamental flaw in their assumptions. Following his misattribution of the scene's divine elements to Odysseus, Telemachus follows a model of epiphany which has no place in Ithaca, and as long as he persists in the belief that he must appease the stranger as a theoxenic god he will be unable to recognize his father. Odysseus, on the other hand, believes that a simple declaration will be sufficient for recognition to be achieved, but in the absence of a prior relationship between father and son the scene lacks any tokens (σήματα) which might facilitate that recognition.[46] As long as each persists in acting out the scene type he has initially adopted, the two characters will remain at an impasse. The situation can only be remedied – and thus recognition achieved – when Odysseus switches frameworks and adopts the language of epiphany to correct his son's mistaken interpretation. Ironically, the very speech act which establishes Odysseus's humanity places him in a role analogous to the

---

[45] Austin (1975 205) argues that Odysseus's recognition scenes are all based on a fundamental *homophrosyne* with each percipient. In many ways, Telemachus is still learning to embrace the traits that he shares with his father, and Odysseus's instructions at the end of their reunion are one such lesson in discretion. On Telemachus's Odysseus-like tendency to conceal information, see Austin 1969 45-63; Jones 1988 503-5; Lateiner 1995 152-66; Beck 1998 132-5; Heath 2001 144; De Jong 2001 41, 72, 409.

Twice Odysseus recognizes a god's presence but says nothing (19.42-3, 22.205-9). The fact that Odysseus's recognition of Athena is allowed to go unstated highlights how close and cooperative their roles are in the epic.

[46] Woodhouse 1930 77; Stanford 1977 ii.271; Alden 1987 135; De Jong 2001 395. Cf. Kearns (1982 4-5) who, following Müller (1966 109-10), sees the miraculous transformation as the σῆμα since, once Telemachus rejects the hypothesis that the stranger is a disguised god or divine trick, no other conclusion is possible but that he is truly Odysseus, backed by divine aid. Interestingly, Telemachus still seems unable to grasp the importance of σήματα when he rebukes Penelope at 23.97-103.

epiphanic goddesses of *Il*. 1 and 3, who, by repeating and correcting each of the motifs which their percipients have incorrectly expressed, thereby reassert their divinity.

Odysseus and the Herdsmen

As Odysseus continues his preparations to test and punish the suitors, echoes of these epiphanic elements resurface in the scenes with his servants. His interactions with Eumaeus and Philoetius demonstrate many of the same themes which link Telemachus's recognition of Odysseus to Athena's epiphany in *Od*. 13: a hierarchical relationship masked by disguise, a continuous undercurrent of irony, and a revelation of identity which is performed not only to restore a personal relationship[47] but with a further purpose in mind. The swineherd's hut is also the setting for an agonistic exchange of stories in which Eumaeus proves himself a fitting ally for his master in much the same way that Odysseus won Athena's favour in the previous book. Yet while the scene's hierarchical elements and the overarching "divine purpose" which Odysseus shares with Athena accord with an epiphanic model, the development of Odysseus's interactions with the herdsmen strongly emphasizes human themes. The result is a series of scenes which depict Odysseus acting in precisely the manner of a theoxenic god, but without any overt element of divinity.

When Odysseus arrives at Eumaeus's hut, the early motifs of their conversation lend themselves equally well to human and divine recognition paradigms, although the extended postponement phase and Odysseus's intentions to test the swineherd's loyalty and hospitality combine again to suggest the theme of theoxeny. As in the later scene with Telemachus, the poet marks the opening steps in Odysseus's plan with an explicit reminder of Athena's role in shaping them. The hero's awareness of the swineherd as a potential ally has been imparted by the goddess at 13.404-11, the book closes as Athena provides him with his disguise

[47] Gainsford (2003 55-6) identifies this as the primary goal of human recognition scenes.

(13.429-38), and *Od*. 14 opens with his journey from the harbor ᾗ οἱ Ἀθήνη / πέφραδε δῖον ὑφορβόν (14.2-3). At his arrival, we are immediately inclined to trust Athena's endorsement of the swineherd's character, as we observe along with Odysseus the yard which Eumaeus has painstakingly built in his master's absence.[48]

The ensuing postponement phase, while lengthy, involves only a few motifs: disguise, ironic treatment, false biography, and prophecy. The efficacy of Odysseus's disguise is evident as Eumaeus addresses him consistently as γέρον and ξεῖνε.[49] Yet the dramatic irony is by far the most pervasive motif. From the moment of Odysseus's arrival, the poet highlights the swineherd's failure to recognize that the ἀντίθεος ἄναξ (14.40) for whom he mourns is right before him (ὁ δὲ προσέειπεν ἄνακτα· / ὦ γέρον, 14.36-7).[50] The irony of Eumaeus's role in *Od*. 16, where he and Telemachus enact a surrogate father-son relationship as Odysseus silently observes, was noted above.[51] Later, as Eumaeus reluctantly leads Odysseus to the palace, Melanthius's insults prompt Eumaeus to pray that Odysseus's return will restore order in Ithaca (17.238-45). While irony is a prominent feature in recognition scenes throughout Greek literature,[52] Eumaeus's frequent expressions of grief over Odysseus's fate, constant praise of his (presumed) absent master,[53] and deferential treatment of the disguised hero are analogous to the positive form of ironic treatment which is found in some divine epiphanies, in which a mortal treats a god with proper deference despite failing to recognize him/her.[54]

The testing element of theoxeny is far more pronounced in Odysseus's interactions with Eumaeus than with Telemachus. Kearns has discussed how Odysseus's theoxeny-like

---

[48] On the characterization of Eumaeus through this description, see Austin 1975 165-8; Race 1993 95-6.

[49] E.g. γέρον 14.37, 122, 166, 508; ξεῖνε 14.56, 80, 402, 15.326, 352, 390, 17.185, 350; δειλὲ ξείνων 14.361; δαιμόνιε ξείνων 14.443; ξεῖνε πάτερ 17.553.

[50] On periphrastic references to Odysseus as ἄναξ and the resulting ironies, see De Jong 1993 291-7.

[51] See p61.

[52] Cf. Eur. *Helen* 528-624; Eur. *Ion* 1282ff.; Soph. *Electra* 1098-1231. See Rutherford 2012 326-9.

[53] Stanford (1977 ii.222) notes the irony of παρεόντα at 14.145.

[54] Cf. *Il*. 17.560-74; *Od*. 3.41-62.

plan casts him as an instrument of divine justice, although he himself is motivated by personal goals: the eviction of the suitors and the restoration of his political and domestic positions.[55] The tests which he administers to Eumaeus similarly operate on multiple levels. To satisfy Odysseus's personal motivations, the swineherd must prove that he has remained loyal, and this is clearly evident in the examples of dramatic irony listed above. On the thematic level of theoxeny, Eumaeus must also pass a series of tests to prove his hospitality, which is taken as an index of his general worthiness to be incorporated into his master's plot.[56] While both themes are closely intertwined throughout the encounter, that of hospitality naturally dominates the earlier parts of the sequence in *Od*. 14, while loyalty – Odysseus's real concern – is emphasized more strongly as the recognition scene approaches in *Od*. 21.[57]

While the themes of testing and hospitality are closely linked with the concept of theoxeny, another element links this postponement phase more specifically with Athena's epiphany in *Od*. 13. Ahl has interpreted the initial exchange between Odysseus and Eumaeus as an agonistic scene, in which the two men compete with wordplay as they battle over the truth of Odysseus's various false tales and prophecies.[58] Their opening conversation is dominated by Odysseus's lengthy false biography (14.191-359). This account is carefully tailored to his conversation with Eumaeus, emphasizing themes of hospitality and the changes of fortune before supporting his earlier prophetic statement (14.148-64) with a claim to possess a recent report of Eumaeus's master.[59] Eumaeus, despite accepting the rest of this

---

[55] Kearns 1982 7-8. Rutherford (1986 159-61) argues that the moral side of Odysseus's character as a divine agent never totally displaces his instinctive qualities of curiosity, greed, and vanity.

[56] Parry (1972 21) argues that the repeated apostrophization of Eumaeus when responding to Odysseus's tests is used to convey a sense of Eumaeus's general character rather than to mark special emotion, as it does in the *Iliad*. On Eumaeus's hospitality, see Rose 1980 286; Reece 1993 145-64; Olson 1995 122-3.

[57] On the positive correlation between hospitality and recognition, see Murnaghan 1987 91-117.

[58] Ahl 2002 117-32. On the agonistic implications of "*pseudo*-words" (e.g. 14.125, 296, 365, 387), see Carlisle 1999 77-83.

[59] For other instances of Odysseus tailoring his narrative to his audience, see Walcot 1977 9-19; Ondine Pache 1999 23-30; De Jong 2001 262, 282, 327; Tsagalis 2012 344. More generally, see Emlyn-Jones 1986 3-8; Most 1989a 131; Most 1989b 19; Worman 2002 43. Odysseus's emphasis on hospitality is noted by Trahman 1952 38; Walcot 1977 14-5.

tale as true,[60] counters with his own story of an Aetolian who once brought false hope of Odysseus's return (14.378-85), prompting Odysseus to reassert the truth of his prophecy.[61]

Odysseus is not the only character capable of subtle speech, and throughout the scene Eumaeus demonstrates his ability to match words with his master. His account at 14.120-47 contains an elaborate pun on the last word of Odysseus's speech when he suggests that wanderers, in his experience, do not always tell the truth: ἀλήθην (14.120), ἀλαλήμενος (122), ἀλῆται (124), ἀληθέα (125), ἀλητεύων (126).[62] Later, echoing Odysseus's play on the similarity between the dative form Ἰδομενῆι and ναῦς (14.237-9), Eumaeus's story of the Aetolian seizes a rhetorical advantage by adding a further play on traditional associations between Idomeneus's name and the ἰδ- root: Ἰδομενῆι ἰδέσθαι νῆας (14.382-3).[63] Ultimately, Odysseus responds by placing his pretended persona on par with Odysseus himself as co-leader of an ambush at Troy (14.470-1). This rhetorical sparring presents Eumaeus as a worthy match for Odysseus, one who demonstrates not just the loyalty his master requires but also a character which suggests a deeper sympathy and fitness for participation in his plot.[64] Yet the use of clever speech to control how much information one reveals while sounding out the truth of another's tales was also a critical component of Odysseus's conversation with Athena in *Od*. 13, where man and goddess competed first in deception and then in praise.[65] Eumaeus has proven himself capable in hospitality, loyalty, and even the qualities of suspicion and wordplay which link Odysseus with Athena. His position in relation to his master is therefore analogous to that of Odysseus in relation to his patron goddess.

---

[60] Olson 1995 131n27; Doherty 2002 59-60.

[61] On the theory that Odysseus's tales reflect his original return narrative, and that the account of Eumaeus's Aetolian about Odysseus in Crete was therefore true, see Woodhouse 1930 132-5; Tsagalis 2012 313-5.

[62] Goldhill 1991 38.

[63] Ahl 2002 123-7.

[64] This similarity is also hinted at by Eumaeus's reluctance to utter his master's name at 14.144-7, for which see Austin 1972 8-9; Fenik 1974 29, 41-2; Goldhill 1991 27-8. On the delay of Odysseus's name generally, see n2 above. For *homophrosyne* as a key component of Odyssean recognition scenes, see Austin 1975 205. On Eumaeus as Odysseus's "servile double," see Olson 1995 137-8.

[65] Turkeltaub 2003 243; Pucci 1987 105-6. See p53.

The other major element which recalls the theme of epiphany is that of hierarchy. The scene exploits numerous ironies in the contrast between Odysseus's appearance as a beggar, and thus the equal or even inferior of Eumaeus, and his true identity as master.[66] Once again, the events of the previous book furnish a proximate parallel, in which Odysseus is unable to recognize his divine patroness when she appears to him in disguise. Additionally, Reece notes that ξενία is traditionally depicted as a relationship between those of equal social status (typically kings) and that the swineherd's participation in a hospitality scene is anomalous.[67] While Odysseus's disguise as a beggar who, like Eumaeus, has fallen from a position of privilege provides an illusion of equality between them, the seemingly unusual provision of hospitality in such a humble setting provides a further link with theoxeny, in which the divine concern is not the establishment of a reciprocal relationship between equals (as in the case of ξενία) but the moral testing of an inferior.

Yet there is also a hierarchy among Odysseus's allies, which is evident in the differences between his interactions with Telemachus and Eumaeus. Telemachus, while he has not yet fully developed the qualities which link him with his father, is permitted to recognize Odysseus early on. He is entrusted with keeping the secret of the "beggar's" identity and becomes an active participant in the plot to test the suitors. Eumaeus, on the other hand, demonstrates on numerous occasions that he shares Odysseus's suspicious and clever nature, but is not permitted to recognize his master until moments before his part in the revenge scheme. The lengthy postponement phase is separated from the recognition scene by several books and interrupted by that of Telemachus, which is initiated by Athena only after Eumaeus has left the hut.[68] Thus, while he is consistently depicted as a worthy ally, Eumaeus

---

[66] On narratorial periphrases highlighting this irony, see De Jong 1993 293-5, 297.

[67] Reece 1993 146-64.

[68] On the various tempos (immediate, delayed, postponed) of the *Odyssey* recognition scenes, see Louden 2011b 79. For similarities between Eumaeus's and Penelope's recognition scenes as the two examples of a "postponed" tempo, *ibid*. 85-7. See also Fenik 1974 155; Winkler 1990 146.

is not afforded the same trust as Telemachus, effectively preserving the hierarchical distinction between servant and master.[69]

In fact, Eumaeus's protracted ignorance of Odysseus's true identity is one of his principal functions within his master's "theoxeny" among the suitors. The swineherd proves to be an ideal ally precisely because his lowly status reflects that of Odysseus's disguise. Until he recognizes his master, he genuinely accepts his guest as an equal and is therefore able to support Odysseus's disguise even more securely than Telemachus. This grants Odysseus the opportunity to observe not just the suitors' abuse of his home but their treatment of guests, as well as to interact freely with his household servants in order to ascertain their loyalties. Eumaeus even assumes the role of intermediary between Odysseus and his family, conveying Telemachus's invitation for him to approach the suitors (17.342-55), defending Odysseus from Antinous's abuse (17.380-91), and arranging his meeting with Penelope (17.507-90). As a loyal servant, Odysseus's family evidently trust him to treat the stranger well, but they also consider Eumaeus to be of appropriate status to deal with him.[70] The extended delay of Odysseus's self-revelation to Eumaeus is therefore a practical element of his plan. Throughout this postponement phase Eumaeus's behaviour confirms Athena's recommendation of his character, but he is used by Odysseus more as an instrument in his plot than as an ally.

With the introduction of Philoetius, the poet recapitulates the much lengthier sequence with Eumaeus.[71] Although similarly "postponed" in tempo, the initial scene with Philoetius (20.185-239) finally introduces motifs which begin to anticipate recognition. Despite subtle

---

[69] Cf. Olson (1995 6, 126-9) and De Jong (2001 340), who theorise that Odysseus delays revealing himself to Eumaeus because he fears that the herdsman might give him away with his enthusiastic response. For a similar theory concerning Penelope, see Richardson 1983 226.

[70] Since Penelope has not recognized Odysseus, she believes him to be a beggar and Eumaeus's companion. Telemachus's use of Eumaeus as a messenger is an element of the role he plays to conceal his knowledge of Odysseus's identity.

[71] On why Odysseus reveals himself to both herdsmen together, Hoffer (1995 520) offers the interesting suggestion that Eumaeus and Philoetius are replacing the two gods, Zeus and Athena, who Odysseus thought would suffice to help him overcome the suitors with Telemachus (cf. 16.261, 263-7).

reminders of Odysseus's disguise,[72] Philoetius remarks immediately on the stranger's likeness to his master (ἔοικε δέμας βασιλῆϊ ἄνακτι, 20.194). He then describes his initial reaction upon seeing the stranger:

> ἴδιον, ὡς ἐνόησα, δεδάκρυνται δέ μοι ὄσσε
> μνησαμένῳ Ὀδυσῆος, ἐπεὶ καὶ κεῖνον ὀΐω
> τοιάδε λαίφε᾽ ἔχοντα κατ᾽ ἀνθρώπους ἀλάλησθαι,
> εἴ που ἔτι ζώει καὶ ὁρᾷ φάος ἠελίοιο. (*Od*. 20.204-7)

The beggar's likeness to Odysseus is so striking that Philoetius has experienced a preliminary emotional response to a hint of identity. His ensuing lament over the suitors' arrogance, his assertion that he would have left long ago if not for his remembrance of Odysseus, and his hope that his master might return to destroy the suitors all combine in a moving echo of Eumaeus's ironic statements in *Od*. 14. Philoetius's unsolicited avowal of loyalty in the presence of his unrecognized master recommends him, like Eumaeus, as an ideal ally.

With the earlier emphasis on hospitality now absent, it becomes clear that such personal loyalty is precisely the quality for which Odysseus is testing. Whereas in *Od*. 13 it is Odysseus's clever and suspicious nature which Athena rewards with her epiphanic moment,[73] Eumaeus's demonstration of these qualities throughout *Od*. 14 was insufficient to provoke a similar revelation from Odysseus. Instead, recognition is granted after one final test of loyalty. Taking place in the midst of the bow contest, the concise revelation to the herdsmen forms part of the ever-quickening pace leading into the *mnesterophonia*[74] and shows Odysseus, Athena-like, manipulating the conversation in order to create a direct correlation between his servants' professions of loyalty and the revelation of his identity.

---

[72] E.g. Eumaeus's and Melanthius's addresses as ξεῖνε (20.166, 178) and references to Odysseus's begging (αἰτίζων 20.179, αἰτίζεις 182).

[73] See p53-4.

[74] At 42 lines, this is the shortest recognition scene to feature multiple "moves" in Gainsford's scene pattern (2003 50).

Finally, Odysseus's self-revelation relies primarily on human methods, as he declares his homecoming (although characteristically without an announcement of his name) and confirms his identity through the revelation of his distinctive scar. This token functions as a symbolic removal of his disguise as it reveals the only physical feature which remains visible through the divine transformation.[75] The two men immediately throw their arms around their master and embrace him in the typical gestures of a mortal recognition scene.[76]

Throughout the scenes with the herdsmen, there are no explicitly divine motifs such as a hint or affirmation of divinity, but only their human corollaries. These scenes therefore lack the tension of the dual treatment of Odysseus as god and man which exists in Telemachus's recognition scene. The dramatic irony is consistently applied to the herdsmen's respectful treatment of the stranger and their repeated prayers for Odysseus's return, rather than to the latter's apparent godlikeness. Unlike Telemachus, whose fear of failing a theoxenic test contrasts with the herdsmen's instinctive provision of hospitality, both servants react correctly to their master's revelation and therefore have no need to frame their experiences in epiphanic terms.

Even so, there remains a crucial difference between this episode and human recognition scenes: the presence of a "divine purpose." Odysseus reveals himself to his herdsmen not simply to reestablish their relationship, but to acquire allies for an immediate purpose. This purpose was communicated to him by Athena in *Od*. 13, where they jointly devised the plan to punish the suitors. Cutting short the embraces, then, Odysseus issues instructions to both men. First, they are to suppress their emotions so as not to alert the suitors to his presence (21.228-30). Then, when the suitors refuse to allow him to try the bow, Eumaeus is to bring it to Odysseus and have the maids lock themselves in their hall

[75] On the scar's preservation through Odysseus's disguise, see Rose 1956 64. Goldhill (1991 13-9) discusses the various uses of the scar as token. Richardson (1983 223), discussing Aristotle, finds Odysseus's use of the scar here artificial when compared with Eurycleia's more natural recognition, but the hasty use of the scar might also be attributed to the fact that it has already been used more extensively earlier in the poem (a "decreasing doublet") and to the narrative's more rapid pace in *Od*. 21. On doublets in epic poetry, see Fenik 1974 133-232; Reece 1993 197-201; Kelly 2007a 374-82.

[76] See n25.

(21.234-9); at the same time, Philoetius is to fasten the courtyard gate, trapping the suitors inside (21.240-1). These instructions induct Eumaeus and Philoetius into the plan which Odysseus devised with Athena, allowing them to take part in the culmination of the theoxenic plot even while highlighting Odysseus's humanity through his need for mortal allies.[77]

Thus, the lengthy sequence between Odysseus and the herdsmen culminates in a recognition scene which uses human methods, but which also plays an important part in a larger theoxenic plot. Although it continually emphasizes Odysseus's humanity, numerous aspects recall the theme of theoxeny, while contextual elements furnish links with Athena's epiphany in *Od*. 13. Ultimately, this is a sequence of scenes between characters in a clear hierarchical relationship, in which the higher-status individual appears in disguise to test the hospitality and loyalty of the lower, whom he rewards with recognition, promises future benefits, and gives clear instructions on how to secure continued approval. This is the very model of theoxeny, in which the only missing element is an explicit aspect of divinity.

Odysseus and Eurycleia

The importance of Athena in allowing Odysseus's behaviour to appear godlike is confirmed by Eurycleia's recognition scene in *Od*. 19, where the epiphanic elements of the above scenes are almost entirely absent. Notwithstanding Odysseus's ability to incorporate Eurycleia into his plans, the scene's general elements of hierarchy and irony are insufficient to identify it as an epiphany in its own right. In fact, the scene's closest parallel is Eumaeus's recognition of Telemachus – a very human moment whose purpose is the restoration of a close personal bond. Unlike Odysseus's "theoxenic" self-revelations to Telemachus and Eumaeus, Eurycleia's moment of recognition is beyond Odysseus's control, requiring him to scramble to channel it into an appropriate course of action. Rather than epiphany, the scene is

[77] Murnaghan 1987 20.

dominated by the themes of memory and lament which consistently define Eurycleia's mistress, whose own recognition scene will similarly lack epiphanic associations.

Just as Telemachus's recognition scene interrupts that of Eumaeus, so Eurycleia's recognition interrupts a longer sequence with Penelope.[78] I hope to have shown by now how the former scenes share certain key elements both with one another and with Athena's epiphany in *Od*. 13, which sets up those scenes through the goddess's recommendation of their percipients as allies in Odysseus's revenge plot. The swineherd's scenes are pervaded by the theoxenic elements of disguise, testing, and an agonistic exchange of stories designed to highlight the similar characters of master and servant. Telemachus's scene features a more ironic development of this theme due to the youth's mistaken identification of Odysseus as a god and resulting fear of having failed a theoxenic test. In both cases, the theoxenic elements look forward to the roles which Eumaeus and Telemachus will play as allies in Odysseus's plot against the suitors.

Similarly, Eurycleia's recognition scene shares its themes predominantly with that of Penelope. I shall shortly discuss why epiphany is not an appropriate model for the latter, but even in *Od*. 19 it is clear that Eurycleia's scene is different from those around it. Recognition is mediated by a very personal token – a scar whose appearance would only be familiar to those with whom Odysseus shares an intimate connection. This is precisely the kind of token which was missing for Telemachus, making the extreme form of epiphany the only available paradigm for his experience in *Od*. 16. Unlike Odysseus's rhetorical maneuverings in Eumaeus's hut and very deliberate revelation to his son, Odysseus's apparent lack of foresight in *Od*. 19 is highlighted by the accidental nature of the recognition.[79] While it is beyond the

---

[78] See n68. Also Emlyn-Jones 1984 146; Rutherford 1992 179; Gainsford 2001 4-6; Louden 2011b 87. For *Od*. 19 as a single recognition sequence, the realization of which is displaced from Penelope onto Eurycleia, see Gainsford 2003 51. See also Büchner 1931 129-36; Murnaghan 1987 46-52.

[79] For a range of reactions to Odysseus's apparent blunder, see Monro 1901 165-6; Woodhouse 1930 75-8; Büchner 1931 129-36; Merkelbach 1951 4-5; Erbse 1972 72-97; Fenik 1974 43-5; Stanford 1977 ii.329-30; Finley 1978 12-3. Odysseus's request was already considered problematic in antiquity (Schol. M V *ad* 19.345: ἀθετοῦνται οἱ τρεῖς, πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι αἱρεῖται τὴν δυναμένην ἐπιγνῶναι...). Eisenberger (1973 267) argues that Eurycleia's recognition is motivated by the poet's, rather than Odysseus's, desire to include her among his allies.

scope of this chapter to speculate on Odysseus's motives in requesting an aged attendant, it is evident that he does not demonstrate the same confident control in this scene as he does in those for which he was prepared by Athena.[80]

The tone of the conversation between Odysseus and Eurycleia is one of lament, the same theme which dominates Odysseus's conversation with Penelope for much of the book.[81] As she instructs Eurycleia to attend the beggar, Penelope highlights the parallels between him and Odysseus, prompting the nurse to lament her master's fate:

> ... γρηῢς δὲ κατέσχετο χερσὶ πρόσωπα,
> δάκρυα δ' ἔκβαλε θερμά, ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυδνὸν ἔειπεν·
> Ὤ μοι ἐγὼ σέο, τέκνον, ἀμήχανος· ἦ σε περὶ Ζεὺς
> ἀνθρώπων ἤχθαιρε θεουδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντα ...
> νῦν δέ τοι οἴῳ πάμπαν ἀφείλετο νόστιμον ἦμαρ. (*Od*. 19.361-4, 369)

This outburst is particularly striking for the ambiguity of its addressee, as the audience is led to believe that Eurycleia is addressing the stranger until she turns her attention to him at 19.372.[82] She goes on to declare that she will care for him because of his resemblance to Odysseus (19.380-1). While the sentiment is similar to that of Philoetius, who also comments on the beggar's likeness to Odysseus (20.194, 204-7),[83] the tone is markedly different. Both herdsmen follow up their frequent expressions of grief with hopes for Odysseus's return,[84] allowing them to demonstrate their continuing loyalty in response to Odysseus's probing questions. Yet Eurycleia's spontaneous expression of grief, like her mistress's (19.312-6),

---

[80] Goldhill 1991 13-4; Rutherford 1992 12.

[81] Throughout the *Odyssey*, Penelope's perpetual state of lament is an index, to both herself and the audience, of her fidelity. When Penelope tests the beggar's claims to have seen Odysseus, she describes her predicament as one of constant sorrow (19.509-17), and her ruse with the shroud relies on her role as primary mourner for the members of Odysseus's family. Her later reference to the nightingale (19.518-34) further casts her as a figure of lament (Stanford 1977 ii.337; Levaniouk 1999 102-5). More generally, see Nagy 1979 97-8; Minchin 1987 273; Hölscher 1967 30; Nickel 2010 36-8, 45-51. On Penelope's situation as a tragic one, see Foley 1995 93.

[82] Stanford 1977 ii.330; Rutherford 1992 179-80.

[83] Fenik 1974 22-3; Rutherford 1992 180. On the tendency of characters to speak about Odysseus in his presence, see Goldhill 1991 29; Reece 1993 81.

[84] Despite Eumaeus's initial despair (14.68, 133-47, 167), he seems less certain at 14.42-4, 14.371 and openly prays for Odysseus's return at 17.240-46, 20.238-9, and 21.204-5. Philoetius is uncertain of Odysseus's fate (20.204-10) but still hopes for his return (20.224-5, 21.200-2).

admits no possibility of Odysseus's return. This lack of hope informs his response: rather than utter a prophecy like those with which he primes Eumaeus and Philoetius (cf. 14.149-64, 20.227-34), Odysseus concedes that he has often been compared with Eurycleia's master and allows her to proceed with her work. He has not tested her in any way, has made no suggestion that her grief might be unwarranted, and has given no indication that he intends either to be recognized or to incorporate her into his plans.

Indeed, the closest parallel for Eurycleia's recognition of Odysseus is not one of his self-revelations, by which the scene might be linked with the theoxenic aspects of his behaviour, but Eumaeus's recognition of Telemachus at 16.11-29. Rather than focus on how the newcomer will choose to reveal himself, both scenes emphasize the servant's spontaneous recognition and immediate emotional response.[85] Eumaeus leaps up in amazement, dropping his mixing bowl, and addresses his young master with paternal affection (φίλον τέκος, 16.25). Eurycleia drops Odysseus's foot into the bronze basin with a clang, weeping and embracing him as a φίλον τέκος (19.474). Both men, in turn, address their servants with filial language (ἄττα 16.31, μαῖα 19.482). Even the simile marking Eumaeus's recognition of Telemachus at 16.17-21, which seems so ironic in that context given Odysseus's undisclosed presence, would be appropriate for the aged nurse's recognition of her former charge: to Eurycleia, Odysseus is indeed like her own son, returned now from years of wandering.

From the perspective of Odysseus's revenge plot, and consequently his present intention to reveal himself only to potential allies, Eurycleia is an anomaly. After all Odysseus's efforts to postpone Penelope's recognition with false tales, he realises too late that he has created a situation in which his recognition by a servant might derail the entire plot. While Aristotle praises the scene for its natural use of *anagnorisis*,[86] the very fact that recognition is achieved through circumstance rather than deliberate action by Odysseus

---

[85] Eurycleia's joy is so untempered that it requires divine intervention to prevent others from noticing (19.479). On the scene's transition from leisurely digression to rapid movement following recognition, see Stanford 1977 ii.334; Rutherford 1992 189.

[86] *Poetics* 1454b.

highlights the inappropriateness of reading the scene as an epiphany. Yet since the recognition has occurred before the fulfillment of the revenge plot, Odysseus hastily incorporates Eurycleia into his plans, thus imparting some improvisatory links with the "purpose" motifs of the scenes discussed above. These include his forceful reassertion of the hierarchy between himself and Eurycleia, his instructions for discretion (19.486),[87] and his threat to punish her if she should fail to conceal his identity (a prophecy, 487).[88] Only after she professes her willingness to obey and ventures to offer advice, thus casting herself as an ally, does Odysseus seem satisfied that Eurycleia poses no threat to his plans.

In the absence of a "divine purpose" bestowed by Athena, who made no mention of Eurycleia as a potential ally in *Od*. 13, Odysseus's lack of control over this scene highlights his humanity in the midst of so many "theoxenic" sequences.[89] As in the parallel scene in *Od*. 14, this recognition occurs spontaneously, and unlike the relatively concise reunions in *Od*. 16 and 21 it dwells at length on the shared memories of the two participants.[90] The scene is an entirely human one, which only acquires something resembling an epiphanic "purpose" when Odysseus regains sufficient control to issue instructions and enlist Eurycleia's aid in concealing his identity from the suitors. A similar lack of control – and of epiphanic themes – will be observed in Penelope's recognition scene.

---

[87] Unlike Eumaeus's reluctance to identify his master, Eurycleia's affirmation of Odysseus's identity gives unusual primacy to his name (19.474), further suggesting the threat which her recognition poses to his concealment.

[88] Odysseus's threat is introduced by the same language with which Achilles and Athena discuss Agamemnon's punishment at *Il*. 1.204-14. See p46n28 for other Iliadic occurrences. In the *Odyssey* the phrase tends to be used by mortals (esp. the suitors and their associates) and precedes threats of punishment or challenges to authority (2.187, 16.440, 17.229, 18.82). Penelope's use of the phrase at 21.337 introduces her permission for the beggar to try the bow in spite of the suitors' protests.

[89] These include not only the recognitions of Telemachus and Eumaeus, but also Odysseus's testing of the suitors, during which the suitors themselves have raised the possibility that he might be a theoxenic god (17.484-7).

[90] For differing views on whether the scar's history represents Eurycleia's memories or Odysseus's, see De Jong 1985 517-8; Köhnken 2003 394-5. On the digression as a possible interpolation, see Wilamowitz 1884 59; Monro 1901 168; Stanford 1977 ii.332. See also Rutherford 1992 182-4.

Odysseus and the Suitors

Odysseus's theoxenic associations in *Od*. 14-22 are directly tied to his self-revelation to the suitors. As the culmination of the revenge plot which has been co-orchestrated by Odysseus and Athena, this is the moment which all epiphanic elements in the previous recognition scenes anticipate. With its pervasive emphasis on disguise, testing, hospitality, and dramatic irony leading to a climactic revenge scene, this sequence portrays Odysseus performing the same function as a theoxenic god, and Athena's frequent interventions and understated epiphanies demonstrate clear divine support for his assumption of this role.[91] Since these aspects of the scenes with the suitors have been highlighted by previous scholars, especially Kearns and Murnaghan,[92] I shall focus my remarks primarily on the sequence's climax in *Od*. 21-22, where the various strands of Odysseus's theoxeny-like plot converge as he arrives at the moment when he no longer needs to rely on the divine tactics extended to him by Athena and may instead reassert his own identity.

In the long build-up to his revelation to the suitors, Odysseus relies on the godlike tactic of disguise, both verbal and physical, in order to gather information and allies without detection.[93] These preparations are by far the most complex application of this motif in the Homeric poems, as each of the earlier "epiphanies" in which Odysseus has participated contributes to the structure of the final confrontation. Athena's epiphany in *Od*. 13 stages the goddess's bestowal of agency upon Odysseus to carry out their joint plot as she encourages him to express motifs and perform a role typically reserved for an epiphanic deity. Odysseus's self-revelation to Telemachus allows him to gain assistance in accessing weapons

---

[91] *Od*. 16.155-77, 18.155-6, 18.346-8, 19.33-5, 20.30-55, 20.284-6. Cf. Friedrich (1991 26-8) on Odysseus's behaviour during the Cyclops episode. For parallels between this episode and the situation in Ithaca, see Newton 1983 137-42; Reece 1993 173-5, 199; Olson 1995 51n21. On the understated nature of Athena's epiphanies as she promotes Odysseus's goals, see Bierl 2004 47-8. On the ambiguous morality of Odysseus's revenge in response to tests which Athena sets the suitors up to fail, see Saïd 1977 9-49, esp. 28.

[92] Kearns 1982 7-8; Murnaghan 1987 13, 56-90. See also Reece 1993 181-7.

[93] For disguise as a divine strategy, see n12 above. Goldhill (1991 24) observes that Odysseus's disguises are usually verbal, concealing his identity by concealing his name. Murnaghan (1987 3-8) discusses the significance of Odysseus's willingness to endure even temporary obscurity.

and maintaining his disguise while in his house. The extended postponement of recognition by Eumaeus and Philoetius further supports his disguise and ends with each servant receiving individualised instructions to establish the conditions of the battle. Every time he has chosen to reveal his identity,[94] Odysseus has also issued a set of instructions, carefully and deliberately moving his allies into place in preparation for the moment of revenge.

Odyssey 21 contains the last of Odysseus's preparations. With his self-revelation to Eumaeus and Philoetius, Odysseus puts the final pieces of his plan into place, capitalizing on the opportunity provided by Penelope's bow contest.[95] When Penelope is promptly sent away by Telemachus (21.343-53), the dramatic isolation at last establishes the necessary conditions for a self-revelation. This dramatic isolation works rather differently than in true divine epiphanies, in which the god is typically alone with a single mortal. Although the suitors are treated collectively, much as they are treated as a single offending character throughout the poem,[96] the presence of allies on Odysseus's side highlights that, despite the plot's theoxenic undertones, he remains fundamentally human.[97] Nevertheless, Penelope's absence ensures that the only people present in the hall are either those to whom Odysseus intends to reveal himself or those to whom he already has.

Following Penelope's departure (21.354-8), Odysseus's allies begin to fulfill the instructions which they received in their respective recognition scenes. The hero's status as a divine agent is evident in the knowledge and control he possesses over these events, as each

---

[94] Eurycleia's recognition scene stands outside this set. Since Odysseus has not been led to expect that she will serve a role in the revenge plot, he is unprepared for her recognition. In the absence of the clear sense of purpose and emotional composure which Odysseus demonstrates in the scenes with Telemachus and the herdsmen, Eurycleia's recognition scene is patterned on an exclusively human model of recognition. See p79-83.

[95] Numerous studies have debated Penelope's motives in setting this contest, whether she has already recognized Odysseus, and whether Odysseus is aware of this plan in advance. For a range of views, see Merkelbach 1951 6-8; Amory 1963 117; Stewart 1976 85; Russo 1982 11; Emlyn-Jones 1984 2; Winkler 1990 143; Foley 1995 104; Felson-Rubin 1996 169; Louden 2011b 99; Vlahos 2011 49.

[96] Cf. Athena's intervention at 18.155-7.

[97] Murnaghan 1987 20.

ally performs his part without knowing the involvement of the others.[98] Eumaeus places the bow in his master's hands (21.378-9; cf. 21.234-9) as Philoetius locks the gates (21.388-9; cf. 21.240-1). Since the stringing of the bow is an act so closely connected with Odysseus's identity, the accomplishment of this feat provides the final hint of identity.[99] The event is portentously marked by the thundering of Zeus (21.413), eliciting a strong emotional response from the suitors: μνηστῆρσιν δ' ἄρ' ἄχος γένετο μέγα, πᾶσι δ' ἄρα χρὼς / ἐτράπετο (21.412-3). Yet this extreme reaction does not lead to recognition, and the book ends with the culmination of the postponement motifs rather than the anticipated epiphanic moment.[100] Odysseus continues his charade with one final speech, addressing Telemachus as his host and recommending that the feast continue. Finally, at his father's signal, Telemachus arms himself in fulfillment of Odysseus's last outstanding set of instructions (21.431-4; cf. 16.282-98).

At this climactic moment, Odysseus's theoxenic agency is supported by subtle links to divine characteristics. The ease with which he strings the bow recalls the ease of divine life, although it is expressed elliptically with the phrase ἄτερ σπουδῆς (21.409) rather than ῥεῖα, which is more closely associated with the gods.[101] The accompanying simile likens Odysseus's testing of the bowstring to an artist tuning his lyre (21.404-9), recalling his thematic ties to Apollo throughout the epic.[102] Rather than suggest a hint of divinity, however, these elements combine to strengthen the already dramatic hint of identity by highlighting the

---

[98] E.g. Eumaeus is instructed by Odysseus to have the maids lock themselves in their hall, but, not realizing that Eurycleia has already recognized their master, says that the order comes from Telemachus (21.380-5).

[99] For the bow as the token by which Odysseus reveals himself to the suitors, see Amory 1966 51. The first hint that Odysseus might be more than the beggar he resembles occurs at 18.66-70.

[100] While the book divisions are generally considered to be later than the poem's composition (West 2011b i. 182-7), the current division between *Od*. 21 and 22 augments the theme of delayed recognition very effectively.

[101] Six of the eleven occurrences of ῥεῖα in the *Odyssey* describe the life of the gods: 3.231, 4.805, 5.122, 6.108, 10.573, 23.188. It is applied once to the suitors (2.322), who arrogantly believe they can enjoy a similar level of luxury. Cf. Kelly 2018 3-4 on a similar extension of the formula χολώσατο κήροθι μᾶλλον to Antinous and Eurymachus. For the divine associations of ῥεῖα and related forms, see n29 above.

[102] Odysseus shares Apollo's associations with both archery (8.215-28, 21.11-41, 21.404-11) and poetry (Rüter 1969 237-8; Moulton 1977 145-53; Thalmann 1984 157-84; Murnaghan 1987 148-75; Goldhill 1991 94; Lowenstam 1993b 171; Reece 1993 1780; Segal 1994 85-109; Schein 1996 19; Richardson 2006 337-8. Cf. Biles 2003 204; Beck 2005 213-27). He also enjoys a close relationship with Apollo's priests, most significantly when he spares Maron at Ismarus and receives the wine which will incapacitate Polyphemus (9.193-215; Nieto Hernandez 2002 323-7). See also Levaniouk 1999 117-8.

unique connections between Odysseus and the gods at precisely the moment to which all theoxenic themes have been leading.

Following an intensely prolonged sequence of postponement motifs, Odysseus's theoxenic role culminates at the start of *Od*. 22. As he makes his first kill, the stunned suitors think it an accident and continue to address him as a ξεῖνος (22.27). His answer, that they have wasted his property and courted his wife, functions as the revelation of his identity, characteristically omitting his name in favour of his relationship to his addressees (22.35-41). His charge that they have acted without fear either of gods or of men (22.39-40) further highlights Odysseus's dual role as both personal avenger and agent of divine justice.[103] This, finally, is the epiphanic moment to which the epic's entire second half has been building. The slow pace of the previous books suddenly accelerates and the final epiphany motifs proceed in rapid succession. Fear grips the suitors in an intense emotional response (χλωρὸν δέος, 22.42)[104] and Eurymachus expresses his concern for their welfare, offering recompense if Odysseus will spare them (22.45-59). While he at last uses Odysseus's name, the moment of recognition remains stubbornly elusive as he continues to express doubt as to Odysseus's true identity: εἰ μὲν δὴ Ὀδυσεὺς Ἰθακήσιος εἰλήλουθας (22.45).[105]

Following Eurymachus's speech, the scene's epiphanic framework collapses. Since Odysseus cannot accept this offer of recompense, he can provide no assuagement of Eurymachus's concern and issues no further instructions. The prophecies which have repeatedly foretold his return have all been ignored,[106] and there is no need for him to elaborate on the consequences of the suitors' behaviour. Now that he has revealed his true

---

[103] Merry (1882 *ad* 22.412) and Stanford (1977 ii.387) interpret Odysseus's later comment to Eurycleia (22.411-6) as evidence that he considers himself even more the latter than the former.

[104] The same emotion is experienced by the suitors' families at Athena's intervention at 24.528-33. Due to the condensed nature of the narrative in the final scene, it is unclear whether anyone besides Odysseus recognizes the goddess, but her words have a dramatic effect on all present. Cf. Metaneira's response to Demeter's hint of divinity at *HDem* 190.

[105] On the suitors' persistent failure to recognize the signs of Odysseus's return, see Murnaghan 1987 68-78.

[106] *Od*. 2.161-76, 18.130-50, 20.345-70.

identity to those who have wronged him, Odysseus has no need to conceal himself behind the theoxenic tactics of disguise and testing. The traditional roles of mortal and divine are instead restored as Odysseus and his allies battle openly against the suitors while Athena looks on from above, occasionally appearing beside Odysseus to offer encouragement but largely refraining from direct involvement in the slaughter.

As his role as theoxenic agent comes to an end, Odysseus's *aristeia*-like performance combines Iliadic and Odyssean components of heroism. Commentators have highlighted numerous resemblances to Iliadic lines in the *mnesterophonia*.[107] Several scholars discuss Odysseus's rejection of Eurymachus's and Leiodes's supplications as a reflection of Achillean qualities,[108] and Müller interprets Athena's actions as a reprisal of her Iliadic role as *aristeia*-goddess.[109] In a battlefield epiphany, Athena rebukes Odysseus much as she did Diomedes at *Il*. 5.800-13, and Odysseus's instantaneous recognition recalls the heightened perception of Iliadic heroes during their *aristeiai*.[110] Yet these elements remain embedded within an Odyssean context. The use of the bow is a clear departure from the Iliadic preference for close combat.[111] Not only does Odysseus recognize Athena immediately, but he conceals the knowledge of her identity in a move characteristic of the hero and the *Odyssey*'s themes more generally. Finally, Athena does not inspire Odysseus with the traditional μένος when promising support,[112] but only partially enhances his strength so as to test Odysseus's abilities (22.236-8). Athena has now resumed the testing role which she temporarily relinquished to Odysseus in *Od*. 13-21. Meanwhile, this fusion of Iliadic and Odyssean qualities fittingly accompanies Odysseus's reassertion of his own, human identity. Since Athena's goals throughout the epic have been the safe return of Odysseus and the punishment of the suitors

[107] E.g. Russo *et al*. 1992 228ff.

[108] Pucci 1987 128-38; Russo *et al*. 1992 232, 275-6; Barker 2009 125.

[109] Müller 1966 136-44. See also Russo *et al*. 1992 256-7; Scodel 1998 7.

[110] E.g. *Il*. 5.114-34, 5.711-909, 16.698-711, 20.445-54, 22.166-277. See p21.

[111] Stanford 1983 59; Rutherford 1992 7.

[112] See Daraki (1980 1-14) on the connection between μένος and divine support for an *aristeia*.

(1.81-92), the achievement of these goals marks the fulfillment of her divine plan, and thus the end of Odysseus's role as divine agent. From this point on, epiphany will no longer be an appropriate model of recognition for Odysseus and his family.

Odysseus and Penelope

No discussion of the *Odyssey* recognition scenes would be complete without considering Odysseus's reunion with Penelope. In many ways, this scene is set up as a second and equally dramatic climax following the *mnesterophonia*. While scholars have rightly noted similarities between *Od*. 23 and the recognition scenes that precede it, particularly that of Eumaeus,[113] the structural and thematic elements of epiphany which underlie Odysseus's earlier self-revelations are absent from his reunion with his wife. Theoxenic undertones are certainly present during their conversation in *Od*. 19, when Odysseus is still occupied with his plot against the suitors, but in the following pages I would like to challenge the assumption that Penelope's eventual recognition scene can, or even should, be interpreted as an epiphany.

The character of Penelope has generated some of the most widely varying interpretations in Homeric scholarship. This is largely due to the fact that much of what the audience hears of her is told by other characters, each with their own assessment of her situation, while the narrator largely remains silent on her true thoughts.[114] At 1.245-51 Telemachus laments Penelope's refusal to make a decision, bitter at the loss of his inheritance. Despite Anticleia's testimony to her fidelity (11.181-3), Agamemnon warns that even the sensible Penelope cannot be trusted (11.441-56), recalling her unfaithful cousins,

---

[113] Fenik 1974 155; Winkler 1990 146; Louden 2011b 79. On the Ithacan recognition scenes generally, see Gainsford 2003 41-59; Emlyn-Jones 1984 6.

[114] Minchin 1987 273; Murnaghan 1987 52; Murnaghan 1988 104; Suzuki 1989 89, 91; Winkler 1990 130; Peradotto 2002 3, 9. On narratorial insight into characters' thoughts, see De Jong 1994 27-48.

Clytemnestra and Helen.[115] While they hope to win her, the suitors alternately reproach Penelope for giving them hope (2.87-128)[116] and praise her for her wisdom (18.245-9), and in defeat they cast her as a willing collaborator in their deaths (24.125-90). Athena effects Telemachus's departure from Sparta with rumors that Penelope has already chosen a suitor (15.16-23) but tells Odysseus that his wife still weeps constantly for him (13.336-7).[117] Because her own thoughts are as much an enigma to the audience as to these characters, Penelope's actions have long been scrutinized for hints of her true feelings. Much of the debate has centered on her motivation in appearing before the suitors at 18.158-303, with particular attention on Odysseus's interpretation of the situation and the significance of 18.283 (νόος δέ οἱ ἄλλα μενοίνα);[118] the ambiguous feelings about the suitors which seem to be revealed by her dream in *Od*. 19;[119] and the extent to which she is truly seeking remarriage when setting the bow contest.[120]

One of the more extreme debates surrounding Penelope is the question of when she recognizes her husband. In response to what they perceive to be Penelope's inexplicable behaviour during her conversation with the "beggar" in *Od*. 19, some scholars have argued

---

[115] On Helen and Clytemnestra as foils for Penelope, see Segal 1983 31-2; Murnaghan 1988 107-8; Suzuki 1989 57-91; Olson 1990 65-6, 70; Nieto Hernandez 2002 320; Louden 2011b 86; Reece 2011 104.

[116] See Marquardt 1985 32-7; Felson-Rubin 1996 172-3.

[117] See Nickel 2010 29-54 on Athena's role in maintaining the uncertainty surrounding Penelope's loyalty.

[118] Many analysts consider the scene an interpolation, e.g. Kirchhoff 1879 517-9; Wilamowitz 1884 30; Monro 1901 132-3; Focke 1943 309-15; Page 1955 124-9. Merkelbach (1951 15) believes it originally followed the bath scene in *Od*. 19. Others seek to account for its difficulties without excision, e.g. Woodhouse 1930 201-2; Büchner 1940 137-46; Schadewaldt 1959a 396-7; Müller 1966 118-23; Hölscher 1967 27-33; Erbse 1972 79-90; Fenik 1974 116-20; Nagler 1974 64-84; Austin 1975 208-10; Stanford 1977 ii.308; Nortwick 1979 269-76; Emlyn-Jones 1984 11; Byre 1988 159-73; Murnaghan 1988 109; De Jong 1994 40-2; Felson-Rubin 1996 173-5; Heitman 2005 43-9; Richardson 2007 139-40; Steiner 2010 27-8, 199.

[119] E.g. Harsh 1950 16-7; Devereux 1957 381-2; Rankin 1962 617-24; Clader 1976 37-8; Russo 1982 4-18; Murnaghan 1988 109; Katz 1991 146-7; Pratt 1994 147-52; Felson-Rubin 1996 175-7; Karakantza 1997 173-4; Rozokoki 2001 1-4; Heitman 2005 74-5.

[120] E.g. Woodhouse 1930 80-91; Merkelbach 1951 6-7; Amory 1963 117; Thornton 1970 96-108; Stewart 1976 85-90; Finley 1978 4, 20; Russo 1982 11; Combellack 1973 32-40; Murnaghan 1988 110-1; Doherty 1995 33-51; Foley 1995 104; Felson-Rubin 1996 169-70.

that she recognizes him here, at least subconsciously, as her husband.[121] Yet this would contradict both the surface meaning of the text and what the narrative pattern tells us has happened: Penelope does indeed participate in the early stages of a recognition scene, but recognition is ultimately achieved by Eurycleia in her place.[122] Furthermore, as Louden notes, the Homeric narrator does not lack the vocabulary to describe a recognition which takes place but is not openly expressed, as is clear on two occasions when a mortal conceals his recognition of a divine visitor (*Od*. 1.420, 22.205-10).[123]

It is nonetheless true that the poet frequently teases his audience with the possibility of Penelope's recognition. Certainly in *Od*. 19 she already feels a strong affinity for the stranger, speaking freely with him and praising his understanding, but her failure to take the final step toward recognition is what endows the scene with its many poignant ironies.[124] A notable example is Penelope's instructions to Eurycleia, where the audience momentarily hears Odysseus's wife utter the phrase νίψον σοῖο ἄνακτος... only to have the expected "feet" replaced by "age-mate" (19.358).[125] A cluster of tantalizing hints also appears just prior to the reunion scene in *Od*. 23. Eurycleia's announcement of Odysseus's identity suggests that the recognition scene may end before Penelope even sees him.[126] When Penelope declares her intention to leave her chamber, the audience is momentarily tempted to hear ὄφρα ἴδωμαι / ἄνδρας μνηστῆρας τεθνηότας (23.83-4) as ὄφρα ἴδωμαι / ἄνδρα. Then, as she descends to the

---

[121] On Penelope's early recognition, see Harsh 1950 1-21; Merkelbach 1951 1-15; Page 1955 122-9; Kirk 1962 245-7; Stewart 1976 100-45; Suzuki 1989 76-87; Winkler 1990 129-61; Ahl-Roisman 1996 152-7, 217-38; Vlahos 2011 1-75; Floyd 2011 131-58. For subconscious recognition, see Whitman 1958 303-4; Amory 1963 100-21; Beye 1968 178; Austin 1975 205-38; Russo 1982 4-18; Yamagata 2011 122-30. See also Murnaghan 1987 46-52; Murnaghan 1988 111-3; Doherty 1995 31-63, 143; Richardson 2006 352. Seneca *Epistles* 88.8 shows that the question was already debated in antiquity.

[122] Austin 1975 214-8; Gainsford 2003 45, 51. A similar pattern is found in *Od*. 14 and 16, where Odysseus converses with Eumaeus at length but reveals himself to Telemachus. On similarities between these sequences, see n68.

[123] Louden 2011b 99.

[124] Emlyn-Jones 1984 8, 14; Rutherford 1992 35. See also Louden 2011b 77-8; Reece 2011 105; Richardson 2011 118-21.

[125] On narratorial misdirection in this scene, see Richardson 2006 344-5.

[126] Katz 1991 161-2; Kelly 2012 9-10.

hall, she ponders whether to question *her dear husband* (φίλον πόσιν, 23.86) or to embrace him at once. Scholarship remains divided on whether the phrase belongs to Penelope's focalization or the narrator's,[127] but De Jong has highlighted how the prominence of this periphrasis in *Od*. 23 tracks the progression of the recognition scene.[128] Finally, as Penelope still wavers between recognition and doubt at 23.88-95, the passage is marked by repeated words of perception: ὀρόων (91), ἴδεν (92), ὀφθαλμοῖσι (92), ὄψει (94), ἐσίδεσκεν (94).[129]

While acknowledging the ambiguity of the narrator's portrayal of Penelope, there are compelling reasons not to deprive *Od*. 23 of its status as the moment of recognition. Linguistically, there are clear signals that this occurs at 23.206-8, where the poem's main verb of recognition is deployed (ἀναγνούσῃ, 23.206) and where this recognition is underscored by the sudden preponderance of Odysseus's name (23.206, 208, 209).[130] Structurally, the emotional release and mutual embrace which elsewhere represent the concluding motifs in recognition scenes occur only at 23.207-8 (by Penelope) and 231-2 (by Odysseus).[131] Finally, contextually, the *Odyssey* makes it clear that Penelope is to be excluded from knowledge about Odysseus's return until after the expulsion of the suitors.[132] Ancient and modern scholars alike have explained the order of Odysseus's self-revelations in terms of his revenge plot, which leads him to prioritise those who will assist him as allies.[133] Not only does Athena explicitly exclude Penelope from Odysseus's plot (13.192-3), but she also

---

[127] Ameis-Hentze (1895 130) and Russo *et al*. (1992 321) favour the former interpretation while Van Leeuwen (1917 624) and Stanford (1977 ii.394) favour the latter. De Jong (1994 42-3) considers the words Penelope's focalization but argues that this need not imply recognition.

[128] De Jong 1993 297-8; De Jong 2001 545.

[129] Goldhill 1991 16.

[130] De Jong 1993 301; Louden 2011b 97.

[131] Penelope's response to the description of Odysseus's clothing is described in identical terms to her response to the sign of the bed (19.250 = 23.206). In the former scene, she weeps alone and continues to address the stranger as ξεῖνε (19.253); in the latter she rushes to embrace him and addresses him as Ὀδυσσεῦ (23.209). On the repetition of ἀναγνούσῃ in these two scenes, see Floyd 2011 134-8. See also Emlyn-Jones 1984 8.

[132] *Od*. 13.192-3, 16.303. See Murnaghan 1988 105-9; De Jong 1994 39-40; Murnaghan 1995 73; Zeitlin 1995 138-9; Louden 2011b 81, 84.

[133] See above, n20.

restores his disguise at 16.457-9 in order to prevent Eumaeus from carrying word to Penelope and intervenes directly to maintain her ignorance at 19.478-9. Even if Penelope senses some affinity with the stranger, she does not follow through and complete the process of recognition until the suitors are dead and Odysseus's words prove unambiguously that he is her husband.[134]

Among those who locate Penelope's recognition in *Od*. 23, it is not uncommon to find references to this moment as an epiphany.[135] Indeed, one of the speeches quoted at the start of this chapter as internal support for Odysseus's theoxeny-like role is Penelope's at 23.63-4, where she voices her belief that a god, and not her husband, has killed the suitors. This line of analysis is particularly tempting in light of their conversation in *Od*. 19, where Odysseus's behaviour is still governed by the theoxenic plot with which Athena has equipped him. Here, the themes of disguise, testing, and hospitality which dominate the other pre-revenge recognition scenes are similarly prominent. Odysseus tests his wife's affections by pretending to have seen her husband alive years before, reveling in his superior knowledge as Athena does in *Od*. 13.[136] Yet, however much these early scenes might prepare the audience for an epiphany-like revelation of identity in *Od*. 23, this is not how recognition is achieved.

The issue is one of definition. The applicability of the term "epiphany" to Penelope's recognition depends ultimately on its specificity. As outlined in the Introduction, this study defines epiphany as a direct encounter between god and mortal rather than as a mere flash of insight. At its heart, this kind of encounter is fundamentally hierarchical, with one character recognizing not just the other's identity but a difference in their respective statuses. During

---

[134] Murnaghan 1987 43-4; Gainsford 2001 3-4, 14.

[135] Sowa (1984 70, 252) views Odysseus's actions in Ithaca as a single epiphany-like sequence with multiple percipients: he is discovered and taken in by Eumaeus, to whom he tells a false biography; he addresses his denial of divinity to Telemachus and is mistreated primarily by the suitors; and he is recognized through tokens by Eurycleia and Penelope. Winkler (1990 130) argues that the poet's silence regarding Penelope's thoughts makes possible "the extraordinary epiphany of Book 23 in which Odysseus and we the audience simultaneously realize that we had underestimated Penelope." Austin (1975 224-5) describes what he believes to be Penelope's early recognition in *Od*. 19 as an epiphany in the general sense of a special revelation of information.

[136] Fenik 1974 37-40. See Murnaghan (1995 73-4) for further parallels with *Od*. 13.

his self-revelations to Telemachus, the herdsmen, and the suitors, Odysseus is permitted to appear in this kind of role on a narrative level (although not consciously on the part of the character) because of his close partnership with Athena, who has made him an agent of divine justice and who facilitates his "godlike" transformations. In each of these sequences, the hierarchical nature of epiphany is present: with Telemachus, it is a hierarchy of knowledge and experience analogous to that of *Od*. 13; with the herdsmen, it is a social hierarchy between master and servants; and with the suitors, Odysseus occupies the social and moral high ground.

This hierarchical element is absent in the relationship between Odysseus and Penelope. While he may temporarily possess more knowledge than Penelope, the reunion scene and the poem in general emphasize the striking equality of mind that exists between them.[137] During her husband's absence, Penelope has depended on qualities which she shares uniquely with him. She uses her abilities with deceptive speech to keep the suitors complacent as she delays rendering a decision (2.87-92), and her ruse with the shroud is recounted no fewer than three times (2.93-5, 19.137-56; 24.128-146).[138] On a narrative level, Odysseus and Penelope are frequently linked through similes. A series of lion similes highlights their bond throughout the epic;[139] Odysseus himself compares Penelope to a just king (19.109-14); and their reunion is marked by the striking reverse simile of 23.233-40, through which Penelope's trials at home are likened to Odysseus's struggles abroad.[140] The most celebrated example of their likemindedness is Penelope's reference to their marriage

---

[137] Austin 1975 214-21; Foley 1978 7-21, esp. 19ff.; Arthur 1984 15-6; Goldhill 1988 1-8; Doherty 1991 31-44; Lowenstam 1993b 218-9; Schein 1995 22-3; Schein 1996 26-7. Thalmann (1984 212n25) traces a shared language of suffering. Murnaghan (1988 103-15) highlights Penelope's ignorance as a direct result of Odysseus's deception which does not negate her reputation for intelligence. Bolmarcich (2001 205-13) discusses the uniqueness of Odysseus's use of *homophrosyne* to describe a married couple, arguing that it typically refers to relationships between members of the same sex, who are more likely to be likeminded than man and woman.

[138] On variations in these retellings, see Lowenstam 2000 333-48.

[139] Podlecki 1971 83-4; Moulton 1977 123-4; Foley 1978 10; Magrath 1982 205-12; Doherty 1991 34.

[140] Moulton 1977 129-30; Foley 1978 17; Murnaghan 1988 103; De Jong 1993 301; Schein 1995 22.

bed, by which she tests Odysseus's identity and affection.[141] In doing so, she becomes the only mortal to get the better of her husband and shows the same cautious character for which Athena praises Odysseus at 13.330-2.[142] At every turn, Penelope reveals herself to be a match for her husband in intelligence, speech,[143] and even suspicion. Consequently, since the relationship being restored in *Od*. 23 is one between equals (thematically if not socially), epiphany is not an appropriate theme with which to frame it.

Even setting aside the concept of hierarchy, though, the scene in which Penelope achieves and declares her recognition of Odysseus is not structured as an epiphany. As in *Od*. 19, the focus is not on how Odysseus will choose to reveal himself. In fact, despite his apparent desire to be recognized, he volunteers no clues which might bring this about.[144] Instead, Penelope has already been told that the stranger is her husband (23.25-31),[145] and the scene's primary focus is therefore on what she will do with this information. Through Odysseus's passive silence, it is Penelope who sets the terms of the recognition.[146] Declaring that there are σήματα known only to her and Odysseus (23.107-10), she demands that recognition be achieved through the human medium of tokens, which testify to the unique relationship being restored. Even those tokens which have convinced her servants (cf. 23.73-6) will not suffice to convince her of the stranger's identity.[147] In a moment when it is her own fidelity which keeps her from embracing Odysseus at once, she will require a very

---

[141] Rutherford 1986 160; Russo *et al*. 1992 333; Zeitlin 1995 120.

[142] Compare Athena's praise of Odysseus on the grounds that any other man would have run straight to his wife (13.333-6) with Telemachus's rebuke that no other woman would stand so aloof from her husband (23.100-3). See Russo *et al*. 1992 319. For Athena and Penelope as foils for Odysseus through their shared characteristic of cunning intelligence, see Doherty 1991 31-44. For Penelope's test surpassing even Athena's deception, see Rutherford 1992 12-3.

[143] On Penelope's mirroring of Odysseus's speeches, see Minchin 1987 171-3, 218; De Jong 2001 556.

[144] Pucci 1987 93.

[145] Kelly (2012 8-9) identifies not one but two complete recognition sequences in this opening conversation.

[146] Foley 1978 17; Kelly 2012 15-6.

[147] See Kelly 2012 10-11.

personal proof, of a kind which signifies the closeness between spouses and belies the distance which traditionally separates god and man.

Not only does Penelope seek proof that the stranger is no other man than Odysseus, but her test also provides proof of his very humanity. As she reveals to Eurycleia (23.63-4), Penelope is emotionally on guard lest the suitors' killer be revealed as a god rather than as her husband. In the puzzling apology of Helen which she offers as a defense for her aloofness, Penelope attributes Helen's infidelity to the work of a god: τὴν δ' ἦ τοι ῥέξαι θεὸς ὤρορεν ἔργον ἀεικές· / τὴν δ' ἄτην οὐ πρόσθεν ἐῷ ἐγκάτθετο θυμῷ / λυγρήν (23.222-4).[148] Having remained steadfast against her human suitors for years, Penelope claims, she also needs to take care that she is not tricked into infidelity by a god as her cousin was.[149] By posing the test of the bed, Penelope tests not just Odysseus's knowledge of their secret but his response to the thought of its having been shared with another.[150] His immediate loss of the emotional composure which he has maintained throughout the Ithacan books betrays a very human insecurity regarding the potential truth of Penelope's words. A god masquerading as Odysseus, on the other hand, might be expected to respond to the test rather differently, since Homeric gods may be deceived by one another but never by mortals.[151] When Odysseus himself attempts to deceive Athena at 13.254f., the goddess knows at once that he is lying and responds not to the speech's content but to its false intent. Odysseus's unthinking surge of emotion at 23.181-204, by contrast, provides immediate proof of his human fallibility.[152]

---

[148] This passage has been considered by many as an interpolation. Van der Valk defends it but provides a summary of arguments for athetesis (1949 194-5). For additional defense, see Stanford 1977 ii.401; Morgan 1991 1-3. For interpretations that assume authenticity, see Devereux 1957 384-5; Marquardt 1985 44-5; Murnaghan 1987 141-2; Roisman 1987 59-68; Katz 1991 185; Russo *et al*. 1992 337; Schein 1995 25; Felson-Rubin 1996 170-1; Fredricksmeyer 1997 487-95.

[149] Odysseus hints at the same theme when he remarks that only a god could have facilitated Penelope's infidelity by moving the bed (23.185-6).

[150] See Zeitlin 1995 121-37.

[151] Rutherford 1986 160. For gods deceiving gods, cf. *Il*. 5.844-5, 14.154-351. Menelaus is able to capture Proteus only with Eidothea's help (*Od*. 4.437).

[152] Finley 1978 23; Rutherford 1986 160; Doherty 1991 40; Yamagata 2011 128.

In the discussion above, it was noted that recognition is achieved by the herdsmen and Eurycleia through human tokens, so that these passages depict human recognition scenes fitted within a theoxenic context. The recognition scenes with Telemachus and the suitors, which lack the traditional tokens of recognition, are also the scenes with the most overt ties to theoxeny. The postponement stage of Odysseus's interactions with Penelope similarly bears echoes of his theoxenic plan. It is not until the final recognition scene, which necessarily takes place after Odysseus's plot against the suitors has been carried out, that this theme is fully abandoned.[153] Here Penelope seizes control of her own recognition, refusing to accept the testimony of others and challenging Odysseus to satisfy her requirements for σήματα. Their reunion is also distinct in terms of its purpose. Whereas the earlier recognition scenes have enabled Odysseus to gain allies against the suitors, his recognition by Penelope focuses on the restoration of their relationship. Emlyn-Jones's "on to business" motif[154] does not take the form of commands or deliberation on how to confront the suitors, as in all previous recognition scenes, but of the reunion of husband and wife in their marriage bed and the sharing of what each has experienced during their separation.

The need to reestablish his relationship with Penelope hints at one final reason why Odysseus should not appear as an epiphanic figure for their reunion. Underlying his desire to resume his role as Penelope's husband is another very human motivation: the hero's desire for κλέος. This is ultimately why Odysseus chooses to leave Calypso, the "concealer," since by remaining with her he will gain immortality at the cost of his eternal fame.[155] Sultan has shown how the hero's reputation is managed by the women in his life.[156] The hero's wife is

---

[153] "Penelope's recognition in book 23, like Laertes's in book 24, is distinct from all the others in coming *after* the destruction of the suitors. Consequently they best typify the consummation of a romance, whereas all the other recognitions are partly hybrids, romance type-scenes with elements of the *Odyssey*'s larger theoxeny ... mixed in." Louden 2011b 88.

[154] Emlyn-Jones 1984 7. "On to business" is the last motif identified in Emlyn-Jones's typology of the *Odyssey* recognition scenes, highlighting that the restoration of a relationship is always secondary to a more immediate purpose. Cf. Kelly 2012 18-9.

[155] Anderson 1958 7-10; Vernant 1982 13-19; Slatkin 1991 42-3; Rutherford 1993 47; Schein 1996 22-3.

[156] Sultan 1999 2-4.

responsible both for managing his return from exile and for ensuring the perpetuation of his κλέος after death by ritually commemorating his great deeds in her funerary lament.[157] She can only do this if she remains loyal in his absence *and* if she accepts him back upon his return. Throughout Odysseus's absence, Penelope has faithfully maintained her role as chief mourner for her husband's family, citing her duty to provide Laertes's burial shroud in her effort to resist the suitors (19.141-7). She even shows a wish to control her husband's epic tradition when she bids Phemius not to sing a song which does not allow for Odysseus's successful νόστος (1.336-44).[158]

Odysseus is unique as a hero who lives to hear songs of his κλέος and controls the transmission of his own νόστος-story.[159] In the *Odyssey*, only the greatest heroes achieve both fame in war and a successful homecoming.[160] Odysseus's κλέος in the Trojan War has already been established by the start of the *Odyssey*, but in order to secure the κλέος earned during his wanderings he must leave Calypso's island – so distant that even the gods rarely visit[161] – and return to mortal society to share his story. This he does as soon as he declares himself to the Phaeacians, reasserting his identity after years of obscurity.[162] Yet in Scheria his νόστος is not yet complete, and the Phaeacians are unlikely to be efficient conveyors of his κλέος because of their remoteness from human society. The only way for Odysseus to ensure the survival of his story is to entrust it to the person who will canonize it upon his death: his wife. For this reason, it is not enough that Penelope has remained faithful for twenty years. If she does not recognize Odysseus, in terms of both personal cognition and public affirmation, then

---

[157] On the connection between lament and epic, see Nagy 1979 94-117; Easterling 1991 145-9; Murnaghan 1999 203-18; Pantelia 2002 23. Cf. Derderian 2001 39-52.

[158] Moulton 1977 147-52; Murnaghan 1987 155; Nieto Hernandez 2008 47.

[159] Murnaghan 1987 148-75; Goldhill 1991 94-107; Mackie 1997 92.

[160] Cf. the stories of Nestor and Menelaus in *Od*. 4 and 5 and Odysseus's interactions with the Achaean heroes in the underworld, esp. Achilles (who achieved the greatest fame at Troy but did not return) and Agamemnon (whose return was negated by his wife's treachery).

[161] *Od*. 5.85-8, 95-102.

[162] Notably, Arete is the only Odyssean example of a faithful wife besides Penelope, and these are the only women explicitly named as an internal audience for Odysseus's story (Doherty 1995 22).

his νόστος and victory against the suitors will be for nought.[163] This is the "business" which is facilitated by the recognition in *Od*. 23: Odysseus's faithful wife becomes the first audience of her husband's completed νόστος so that she may continue to guard his κλέος until his death.[164] Odysseus has left a life of divine ease with Calypso in favour of his mortal wife, who may not rival the goddess in beauty but who nevertheless represents for him something greater than immortality. It is fitting, therefore, that the reunion for which he rejected immortality should be achieved through the revelation of Odysseus's human vulnerability.

Odysseus and Laertes

This emphasis on Odysseus's human imperfection continues in the final recognition scene, where his return to his former tactics of disguise and testing proves to be a mistake. In yet another scene with numerous links to *Od*. 13, Odysseus indulges in one final test which requires him to maintain an emotional distance from his addressee.[165] From Laertes's devastated response, Odysseus learns at last that such godlike tactics are too extreme to be continued now that the extraordinary circumstances in his house have been resolved; he must once more embrace the mutual vulnerability of human relationships.

The reunion between Odysseus and Laertes (24.220-361) has long been deemed problematic. A common approach has been to question the scene's authenticity both on stylistic grounds and by interpreting the scholiasts' comments on 23.296 as an indication that

---

[163] Thus Odysseus reproaches Penelope because her refusal to recognize him denies him his due honour (ἀτιμάζει, 23.116).

[164] As the longest instance of indirect speech in the *Odyssey*, this is a truly private initiation of Odysseus's story. On these lines see Stanford 1977 ii.406-7; De Jong 2001 562. I take the thematic necessity of this retelling to be convincing evidence against the conclusion of the poem at 23.296. On the debate over the poem's ending, including proposals for different endpoints, see n166 below.

[165] Doherty (1991 37-40) discusses how Odysseus's emotional detachment links him with Athena, who is generally indifferent to the emotions of others.

everything after this point is a later interpolation.[166] Even those who accept the scene as genuinely Homeric still struggle to explain Odysseus's behaviour. It has been noted that, unlike in previous recognition scenes, his false story implies that Laertes's son will *not* return soon, thus robbing the scene of the hopeful ironies which might make an audience enjoy such testing.[167] Attempts to rescue the hero from charges of callousness, or at least to lend coherence to his actions, have achieved little consensus. Many see Odysseus's desire to test Laertes as simply a part of his character, which either he or the poet is unwilling to abandon in this final scene.[168] Others suggest that Odysseus is annoyed at having been outwitted by Penelope and wants to experience one last reunion over which he enjoys perfect control.[169] Still others propose that he is trying to elicit a display of paternal love,[170] that he is trying to protect his father from the emotional shock of an immediate revelation,[171] or that he is attempting to draw Laertes out of his self-imposed exile and revive his heroic instincts before the confrontation with the suitors' families.[172]

While it is beyond the scope of this thesis to discuss these issues at length, a few comments should make my position clear. I think it probable that several factors are at play. On the one hand, the reunion with Laertes and the confrontation with the suitors' kinsmen do

---

[166] On the final book as an interpolation, see Allen 1924 218-24; Mühll 1939 765-6; Focke 1943 375-82; Merkelbach 1951 153-5; Page 1955 101-12; Schadewaldt 1959b 25; Kirk 1962 248-52; Müller 1966 153-68; Fenik 1974 47-50; West 1989 113-43. Supporters of its authenticity include Scott 1917 397-405; Woodhouse 1930 233; Stanford 1965 5-20; Wender 1965 274-6; Besslich 1966 123-5; Erbse 1972 97-109, 166-244; Moulton 1974 153-69; Stössel 1975 153-72; Wender 1978 1-64; Heubeck 1981 73-83; Russo *et al*. 1992 342-5, 353f.; Scodel 1998 1-17. Bury (1922 1-15) attributes anomalies to the poet's death, arguing that the book was completed by someone who knew the intended ending. Further bibliography in Heubeck 1981 73n1-2.

[167] Woolsey 1941 179-80; Fenik 1974 49-50.

[168] For Odysseus's behaviour as a product of habit, see Focke 1943 378; Kakridis 1971 160-1; Stanford 1977 ii. 420-1; Finley 1978 32; Wender 1978 56-7; Rutherford 1986 161; De Jong 2001 576; Richardson 2007 143; West 2015 301. Winkler (1990 135-6) suggests it might be a family practice of teasing. For the poet's reliance on a traditional theme, see Lord 1960 175-8; Fenik 1974 47-53; Most 1989b 19. Erbse (1972 101-2) concurs but also emphasizes the emotional satisfaction of delayed recognition.

[169] Rutherford 1986 161. Erbse (1972 97-109) approaches the reunion with Laertes as a reworking of motifs from Penelope's scenes in *Od*. 19 and 23.

[170] Woolsey 1941 179-80. Cf. also Breed 1999 147-59.

[171] Thornton 1970 118-9; Heubeck 1981 73-83; Richardson 1983 227-8; Russo *et al*. 1992 396-7. The scholia on 24.420 explain Odysseus's behaviour as reflecting his concern that Laertes might, like Argus, die of shock.

[172] Scodel 1998 10-5.

seem to be linked in Odysseus's mind.[173] The shock of seeing his father's condition might well cause him to wonder whether Laertes is capable of assisting him in the coming conflict, thus providing an incentive to test him as Odysseus tested his other allies. This would seem to link Odysseus's actions with the theoxeny-like role he was performing during the pre-revenge recognition scenes. Yet the divine intervention at 24.472ff. makes it clear that Odysseus does not enjoy the same divine sanction in his conflict with the suitors' families as he did against their sons. Now that he has reached the conclusion of the plot which he devised with Athena, it is no longer appropriate for Odysseus to appear in such a role. As a result, while there are suggestions that he may be reprising pre-revenge tactics because Laertes will serve an analogous function as an ally against the suitors' families, the theoxenic theme with which this behaviour was previously associated is eventually contradicted by the poem's conclusion. On the other hand, Odysseus also acts under the force of a habit which has allowed him to indulge his preference for circumspection throughout the Ithacan books. His failure to recognize that such behaviour is no longer appropriate highlights his human imperfection. In the following paragraphs, I will examine how these explanations are related.

In the last fifty years, scholars have frequently noted associations between Odysseus's testing of Laertes in *Od*. 24 and Athena's deception of Odysseus in *Od*. 13.[174] Fenik calls Odysseus's self-revelation "pointlessly delayed" and argues that neither Odysseus nor Athena has any reason to deceive because neither is in danger or has reason to doubt their addressee's loyalty. Walcot, citing Fenik's arguments, writes: "Both torment and tease, and teasing is cruel and only possible when its victim is in an inferior position, as the mortal Odysseus is in relation to the goddess Athene and the triumphant Odysseus is in relation to his delapidated [sic] and despairing parent."[175] The critical point of these arguments is that Odysseus's

---

[173] Odysseus mentions visiting Laertes just before advising Penelope on what to do when news of the suitors' deaths spreads (23.359-65). He also brings his armor and weapons to Laertes's farm and is accompanied by the three men who fought alongside him in the *mnesterophonia* (23.366-70).

[174] Besslich 1966 123-5; Erbse 1972 104-5; Fenik 1974 47-50; Moulton 1974 163-4; Walcot 1977 18-9; Wender 1978 57; Winkler 1990 135-6; Rutherford 1992 70.

[175] Walcot 1977 18.

behaviour, like Athena's, serves no practical purpose but results entirely from the indulgence of habit, without regard for the feelings of his addressee.

It is useful to invoke *Od*. 13 as a parallel to Odysseus's reunion with Laertes, but not, I believe, in the way that Fenik does. In the previous chapter I argued that Athena's deception in *Od*. 13 does in fact serve a practical purpose.[176] By concealing herself and the island, Athena makes Odysseus believe that he is in a situation like many he has faced during his wanderings.[177] As a result, he responds with the kind of behaviour which he has relied upon for the last ten years: he attempts to gain as much information as possible from the "shepherd" while concealing his own identity. For his caution, Odysseus is rewarded with Athena's first open appearance to him in the epic. When he continues to question Athena's assurances, she rewards him a second time with the revelation of Ithaca. By establishing a causal relationship between these revelations and Odysseus's instincts to conceal and question, Athena shows him that this is precisely the kind of behaviour which he must continue to display in Ithaca. Athena's epiphany in *Od*. 13 effectively communicates divine encouragement for Odysseus to engage in such behaviour toward his family and servants.[178]

In *Od*. 24, for the first time, this behaviour no longer seems appropriate. In earlier cases of testing, Odysseus's false tales and pointed self-references are designed to ascertain his household's loyalty prior to the *mnesterophonia*, while his delayed identification serves the practical purpose of maintaining his disguise long enough to complete these preparations. By the final book, the situation has changed and the conditions implied by Athena – the presence of the suitors and the need to maintain Penelope's ignorance – are no longer relevant. For the first time he hesitates, but he continues to behave in a way which is at once reflective of his character and a long-indulged habit sanctioned by his patron goddess.

---

[176] See p53-5.

[177] Compare Odysseus's outburst at 13.200-4 with 6.119-26, 9.173-6. Stanford 1977 ii.206.

[178] Wender 1978 57.

Over the course of the *Odyssey*, Odysseus has had to learn and relearn how to interact with those he meets. During his wanderings, he learns that the heroic code of facing one's foes openly does not always work. The meeting with Polyphemus is the most painful illustration of this fact, as Odysseus brilliantly indulges his cunning nature by claiming to be "No Man" but undoes his triumph when his boast gives the Cyclops the means to curse him. When he arrives in Ithaca, Athena's deliberately-withheld epiphanic moment teaches him to remain cautious because he is not yet safe from the threat that a premature revelation of his name might bring. His continued reliance upon disguise allows him to triumph against his enemies at home. Now, seeing his father's broken response to his tests provides Odysseus with one final lesson: that there is also a time for trust and openness.[179] Now that he is safely home and recognized by his family and society, he must cease to rely solely on the divine tactic of disguise and relearn the balance between his natural character and the proper code of human interactions. The scene thus shows Odysseus continuing to act in a manner which was appropriate when he was engaged in a theoxeny-like plot against the suitors, but which he must learn to temper now that he is no longer acting as an agent of the gods.

Another remarkable feature of Laertes's recognition is that he acknowledges both Odysseus's human identity and his symbolic role as an instrument of divine justice. When Odysseus realises his mistake and hastens to identify himself, he declares that he has taken revenge on the suitors (24.321-6). While characteristically omitting his own name, he also makes no mention of allies, human or divine. After receiving the σήματα he requests – the generic token of the scar and the specific token of the trees[180] – Laertes responds with a prayer, thanking Zeus not for his son's return but for the existence of divine justice (24.351-2). While Laertes rejoices in the tokens of his son's return, he also recognizes that

[179] Rutherford 1986 152-3, 161-2

[180] Henderson 1997 87-116.

Odysseus's personal revenge has made him an instrument of the gods and prays accordingly.[181]

Laertes's recognition of this fact contrasts notably with the assumptions of Odysseus's other family members. Telemachus and Penelope approach the stranger with an "either/or" mentality: he must be either Odysseus or a god.[182] Only after a lengthy process of recognition can Odysseus make clear to both that he is a man acting with divine help. Laertes, however, responds to the revelation of his human identity with an acknowledgement of his part in a divine plan. Thus the final recognition scene is the first in which the percipient recognizes the full nature of Odysseus's role in the Ithacan books, helping to untangle the web of recognition and epiphany themes that characterises his earlier self-revelations. While Odysseus has continued to rely on the behaviour which previously gave his actions a theoxenic quality, he now learns that this is not an appropriate way to continue. He can finally move forward, leaving behind the godlike elements which were extended to him temporarily by Athena as his presence is declared publicly in Ithaca and he is reintegrated into family and society.

---

[181] Cf. Odysseus's prayer to the local nymphs after recognizing Ithaca (13.356-60). As in *Od*. 13, the displacement of Laertes's address preserves the distinction between the scene's mortal and divine elements. Cf. 19.363-9, 20.201-3 for prayers which wrongly assert the gods' hatred of Odysseus. For prayers similar to Laertes's in later literature, cf. Aes. *Ag*. 1577-82, Eur. *Supp*. 731-3, Men. *Dysk*. 639.

[182] *Od*. 16.178-212; 23.35-8, 63-8.

4

Mortal "Epiphanies" — Odysseus in Scheria

> Γουνοῦμαί σε, ἄνασσα· θεός νύ τις ἦ βροτός ἐσσι;
> εἰ μέν τις θεός ἐσσι, τοὶ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν,
> Ἀρτέμιδί σε ἐγώ γε, Διὸς κούρῃ μεγάλοιο,
> εἶδός τε μέγεθός τε φυήν τ᾽ ἄγχιστα ἐΐσκω·
> εἰ δέ τίς ἐσσι βροτῶν, τοὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ ναιετάουσι,
> τρίς μάκαρες μὲν σοί γε πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ.
>
> I beseech you, oh queen: are you a goddess, or a mortal?
> If you are a goddess, one of those who hold broad heaven,
> I liken you most to Artemis, daughter of great Zeus,
> in beauty and stature and form.
> But if you are one of the mortals who dwell on earth,
> then thrice-blessed are your mother and father.
>
> Homer *Odyssey* 6.149-54

The Ithacan recognition scenes illustrate masterfully how the *Odyssey* poet allows epiphany motifs to cluster for an extended period of time around Odysseus, who owes this unique status to a combination of his natural reluctance to identify himself, his reliance on the "godlike" tactic of disguise during his pursuit of personal vengeance, and, most importantly, his temporary role as Athena's agent within a larger divine plan to punish the suitors. This theoxenic role is particularly remarkable because it is not consciously assumed by the hero, but willingly extended by the goddess. In part due to the obvious arc of the revenge plot and its related recognition scenes, many scholars who comment on Odysseus's godlike behaviour in the *Odyssey* focus their attention on the second half of the epic.[1] The most notable exceptions are Sheila Murnaghan, who examines the delay of Odysseus's self-revelation to the Phaeacian court, and Cora Sowa, who considers Odysseus's meeting with Nausicaa as a

[1] E.g. Kearns 1982 2-8; Turkeltaub 2003 297-302. Friedrich's comments (1991 26-8) are limited to the Cyclops episode. See p58n5.

parallel to two kinds of epiphany she identifies in the *Hymn to Demeter*, the "God Welcomed by Maidens" and "Maiden Abducted While Dancing" subtypes.[2]

As this chapter will show, the meeting between Odysseus and Nausicaa in *Od*. 6 plays dramatically with the theme of epiphany. In his delicate handling of a potentially awkward encounter, Odysseus shows the same ability to control his interactions with others which he later demonstrates in Ithaca, and his beautification by Athena even prompts Nausicaa to compare him to a god. In this sense, Odysseus's sudden appearance will cause Nausicaa to respond as if to an epiphany. Yet in Scheria, the vulnerability which will later be a divinely-enhanced illusion is a true condition. Consequently, Athena, who is unable to help her favourite directly due to the continuing wrath of Poseidon, must entrust her role to another agent. Her attention to Odysseus's needs leads her to select Nausicaa, a princess with semi-divine associations of her own, whose social status and family ties enable her to provide him with precisely the information and garments that will allow him to make a successful petition in the Phaeacian court.

This remarkable scene, in which both Odysseus and Nausicaa are cast as epiphanic figures, is bracketed by two divine epiphanies. In the first, Athena sends Nausicaa to the river with clothing and food, setting her up to assist Odysseus in the goddess's place without making her aware of this role. In the second, Athena takes her cue from Nausicaa's parting words and resumes her role in guiding Odysseus to the Phaeacian palace. In neither scene does the goddess allow herself to be recognized, but her control of the narrative remains clear as she brings the two mortals together and heightens the tone of their meeting through her interventions. The result is a sequence of three intertwining epiphany scenes in which Athena, Odysseus, and Nausicaa each perform aspects of an epiphanic role. As in the Ithacan books, Nausicaa's epiphanic agency ends as soon as she has completed the task for which it was granted. The epiphanic undertones of Odysseus's actions remain muted due to his present

[2] Sowa 1984 250-60; Murnaghan 1987 91-7. Murnaghan (*ibid*. 55) comments that it is only in Ithaca that Odysseus can "count on being able to play the central part in a godlike scenario" because he is among people who are naturally subordinate to him by age, gender, or social status.

lack of agency, but nevertheless highlight the innateness of the behaviours which will make him an appropriate agent for Athena in Ithaca.

The present chapter will analyze the three scenes in this sequence, highlighting in particular the ways in which the narrative both facilitates and limits the epiphanic agency of its mortal characters. It will conclude with some brief remarks on epiphanic elements during the rest of Odysseus's stay in Scheria.

Athena's Epiphany to Nausicaa (*Od*. 6.2-47)

Odyssey 6 opens with Athena's appearance to Nausicaa in a dream, in which she inspires the girl with thoughts of marriage and sends her to the shore to wash her wedding clothes. This dream sets the stage for Nausicaa's meeting with Odysseus by bringing the two mortals to the same location by the river and introduces the major themes of epiphany and marriage which pervade their encounter. Both themes will help Odysseus to make a favourable impression on the young princess by provoking her admiration, even as they simultaneously mark Nausicaa as an unsuitable match for Odysseus due to her connections with other goddess-figures who have delayed his νόστος.[3] This will eventually require the hero to tactfully nullify Nausicaa's (and her father's) thoughts of their potential union, but addresses his more immediate need to obtain information and secure a welcome at the Phaeacian palace,[4] which will in turn lead to his successful reintroduction into human society and the promise of conveyance home.

As Odysseus sleeps under an olive bush on the shore, Athena goes to the Phaeacian capital. Her gradual progression ἐς Φαιήκων ἀνδρῶν δῆμόν τε πόλιν τε (6.3), then to the house of Alcinous (6.13), into his daughter's chamber (6.15), and finally to her position

[3] See below, p125.

[4] Gross 1976 313.

above the sleeping Nausicaa (6.20-1) suggests the route of her journey, while her method of travel is described like the flight of a breath of wind (ἀνέμου ὡς πνοιὴ ἐπέσσυτο, 6.20). The dramatic isolation is achieved partly through the mention of the chamber's closed doors (6.19), which seclude Nausicaa and her handmaids from the rest of the palace, but primarily through the dream setting, in which the goddess may address Nausicaa alone despite the physical proximity of the sleeping attendants.[5] Her awareness of the girl is focused through her concern for Odysseus, and the poet marks her arrival at the house of Alcinous with an explicit statement of her intentions: τοῦ μὲν ἔβη πρὸς δῶμα θεά γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη, / νόστον Ὀδυσσῆϊ μεγαλήτορι μητιόωσα (6.13-4). This poetic insight signals to the audience that the epiphany will fit into a larger plan,[6] granting them the ability to observe discrepancies between Athena's actual purpose and the information she will impart to Nausicaa.

Upon reaching Nausicaa's bedside, Athena assumes the form of the girl's age-mate, the nameless daughter of Dymas, as her disguise (6.22). She rebukes Nausicaa for neglecting her marriage clothes, saying that her reputation depends upon proper care for such things (6.25-30). From this point on, there are no further motifs pertaining to either the postponement or recognition phases, and the divine purpose takes precedence over any need Athena might feel to make her involvement known. The goddess moves directly into her instructions, telling Nausicaa to obtain a wagon and drive it to the washing pools outside the city (6.36-40). The girl's compliance will bring about the change of setting required by Athena's larger plan. Athena's immediate departure for Olympus ends the encounter and is accompanied by an elaborate description of the gods' idyllic home (6.42-6).

When Nausicaa wakes, she wonders at the dream (ἀπεθαύμασ', 6.49), but does not explicitly acknowledge it as divine. She nevertheless obeys the goddess's instructions, requesting the wagon from her father but shyly altering her professed motives by speaking of

---

[5] The motif of the two handmaids is a symbol of modesty adapted from the context of a lady descending from her chamber into the company of men (Nagler 1974 44-60). Its attribution to Nausicaa even when sleeping prefigures the combination of youthful innocence and grace which defines her behaviour toward Odysseus.

[6] Müller 1966 70-1.

her brothers' marriages rather than her own.[7] Once the cart is loaded, Nausicaa drives it to the river, where she and her attendants wash their clothes and bathe. Having fulfilled Athena's instructions, Nausicaa's task by the river is seemingly complete and she begins to prepare for her homeward journey. Athena must now intervene a second time to bring her together with Odysseus – the true purpose underlying Athena's actions which has not been communicated to Nausicaa.

Clearly this scene is only a partial epiphany, which entirely omits the recognition phase. Yet while Athena may not have given even a hint of divinity, much less any motif which might lead to recognition, the divine purpose which governs her appearance to Nausicaa becomes one of the driving forces of the entire Phaeacian episode. For the first time, the audience sees her intervening in mortal affairs in a way that will relate directly to Odysseus's homecoming,[8] yet her actions are conducted behind the scenes. This is allegedly due to her reluctance to offend Poseidon, who persists in his anger against Odysseus (6.329-31), but the same overwhelming concern for Odysseus's needs that can be observed in the Ithacan books is already establishing itself for the reader to appreciate in this scene, negating any need the goddess might feel to assert her personal involvement through a completed epiphany.

The careful distance Athena maintains paves the way for epiphany motifs to resurface during Nausicaa's meeting with Odysseus. Nausicaa's muted emotional response to her dream leaves room for her to demonstrate an even greater emotional response to Odysseus's appearance at 6.229-46. This device is similar to other scenes considered above, particularly in *Od*. 13 when Odysseus shows little emotion after Athena's epiphanic moment but great joy at the revelation of Ithaca, thus subordinating the goddess's identity to that of Odysseus's

---

[7] Nausicaa's youth is further highlighted by the *homophrosyne* she shares with her father, who understands all that she has omitted (6.67), rather than with a husband as Odysseus wishes for her (6.181).

[8] Her visit to Telemachus evidently plays some role in her plans, as it features in her scheme during the divine assembly at 1.88-95, but it is unclear at this early stage how the Telemachy will relate to the larger plot. The divine command to Calypso is conveyed by Hermes (1.84-7, 5.43-115).

homeland.[9] Similarly in *Od*. 16, Odysseus's self-revelation to Telemachus is developed at far greater length than Athena's brief epiphany, and his human identity elicits a much stronger reaction in Telemachus than his suspected divinity.[10] Nausicaa's greater response to the anonymous Odysseus than to the unrecognized Athena creates yet another "increasing doublet" of epiphany-like experiences.[11] It is typically Odyssean that here, as in *Od*. 13 and 16, the true divine epiphany which occurs first is subordinated in the narrative to the fuller, more dramatic revelation of a non-divine identity.[12] The result is that Odysseus's sudden appearance to Nausicaa will seem more epiphany-like to her, despite his vulnerable state, than the actual epiphany of Athena in her dream.

At the same time, the scene also begins to establish Nausicaa as a goddess-like character. As Athena enters her chamber, the room is defined by the likeness of its occupants to divine beings:

> βῆ δ' ἴμεν ἐς θάλαμον πολυδαίδαλον, ᾧ ἔνι κούρη
> κοιμᾶτ' ἀθανάτῃσι φυὴν καὶ εἶδος ὁμοίη,
> Ναυσικάα, θυγάτηρ μεγαλήτορος Ἀλκινόοιο,
> πὰρ δὲ δύ' ἀμφίπολοι, Χαρίτων ἄπο κάλλος ἔχουσαι,
> σταθμοῖϊν ἑκάτερθε. (*Od*. 6.15-9)

Od. 6.16 is a unique line, but it bears some resemblance to the description of Aphrodite's disguise at *HAph* 82: παρθένῳ ἀδμήτῃ μέγεθος καὶ εἶδος ὁμοίη.[13] There, Aphrodite adopts the appearance of a maiden so as not to frighten Anchises with her true form, but it is on the basis of these same features that Anchises believes she must be a goddess (εἶδός τε μέγεθός τε καὶ

---

[9] See p29-30.

[10] See p63-6.

[11] On doublets in epic poetry, see Fenik 1974 133-232; Reece 1993 197-201; Kelly 2007a 374-82.

[12] "[The increasing doublet] encourages an interpretative primacy ... for the second element, by enabling a completion of the themes or actions exhibited in the first sequence, and so binding the narrative together." Kelly 2007a 382.

[13] Cf. also *HAph* 201: εἶδός τε φυήν τε.

εἵματα σιγαλόεντα,[14] *HAph* 85). In the *Odyssey*, the situation is slightly different: Nausicaa is truly a mortal girl, but one who is so like immortal goddesses in φυή and εἶδος that she will eventually be likened to Artemis by both the poet and Odysseus.

This description of Nausicaa draws upon language which traditionally distinguishes gods from mortals in Homeric epic. Some of the major distinctions between mortal and divine forms are εἶδος, μέγεθος, δέμας, and φυή,[15] two of which characterise Nausicaa at her introduction into the narrative. Φυή furthermore suggests nature or growth, and therefore describes an innate quality rather than an external form.[16] Whereas Nausicaa's features are intrinsic, the beauty of her two attendants has been granted by the Graces and can be separated from their identities in a way that Nausicaa's semi-divine characteristics cannot be. Furthermore, her status as the "daughter of great-hearted Alcinous" reminds the audience of the description of the king only a few lines earlier at 6.12, which is the only occasion on which a mortal is said to derive μήδεα directly from the gods.[17] Nausicaa is therefore close to the gods in lineage, character, and physical appearance.

While Athena's plan overshadows all the major action of the book, she cannot yet appear directly to Odysseus. By calling attention to Nausicaa's almost divine qualities, the opening scene of *Od*. 6 sets her up as Athena's unwitting agent, who will act on the goddess's behalf to receive Odysseus when he wakes and provide him with the materials and information he needs to accomplish his goal of getting home. In many ways, Nausicaa's role will come to resemble that of Athena in *Od*. 13, where Athena reveals the name of Ithaca and

---

[14] Cf. Athena's reproach that Nausicaa's εἵματα ... σιγαλόεντα are lying unkempt (6.27). On the apparent discrepancy between the clothes' brightness and their need for laundering, see Bassett 1938 163; Stanford 1977 i.309; Garvie 1994 88.

[15] Clay 1974 129-30; Mussies 1988 4-7.

[16] Cf. Calypso's argument that it is unfitting for mortal women to equal goddesses in δέμας or φυή (5.212). Clay (1974 129-30) distinguishes among εἶδος (subjective visible appearance), φυή (implying growth or development, thus a continuative essence), and δέμας (objective physical form) in the context of divine disguises. Nausicaa possesses both the appearance and innate character of a goddess, but not the actual form. See also Stanford 1977 i.299.

[17] The emphasis on Alcinous's wisdom suggests a potential affinity with Odysseus, who is πολύμητις and θεοῖς ἐναλίγκια μήδε᾽ ἔχοντα (13.89). Garvie 1994 84.

instructs Odysseus to conceal his identity, equipping him with a disguise to enable him to make his plans in relative safety. Nausicaa, too, will reveal the name of the local people and instruct Odysseus on how best to accomplish his goals, providing clothing that will enable him to capture Arete's attention. We might even go so far as to compare Athena's appearance as a tall, beautiful woman (13.288-9) to the description of Nausicaa's beauty, although the two passages do not share the same vocabulary, and to set Athena's earlier guise as the young shepherd-prince (13.222-5) alongside the Nausicaa-like prince who rescues, clothes, and guides the shipwrecked Odysseus to the Thesprotian palace in his false tale to Eumaeus (14.316-20).

Yet Nausicaa remains subordinate both to Athena's plan and to the unknowing Odysseus, for whom this plan has been designed. Consequently, her response to Odysseus's sudden appearance and transformation will also bear some resemblance to Telemachus's role as percipient in *Od*. 16.[18] While Odysseus is genuinely vulnerable in Scheria as he only pretends to be in Ithaca, he retains his ability to manipulate others through cunning words, and Nausicaa herself has not been made aware either of their potential meeting or of her "divine" role in it. As discussed above,[19] a marked difference in knowledge in *Od*. 13 creates an agonistic atmosphere in which Athena retains clear supremacy even as Odysseus proves himself worthy of her support. In *Od*. 6, the differences in knowledge engineered by Athena as she keeps her distance allow both Odysseus and Nausicaa to take on certain aspects of an epiphanic role, each acting simultaneously as performer and percipient. Thus, by prioritizing Odysseus's needs, Athena creates a situation in which the epiphanic motifs are transferred simultaneously to two mortals – to Nausicaa so that she can be a figure of authority and assistance for the vulnerable Odysseus, and to Odysseus so that he can make a favourable impression on the princess in spite of this vulnerability.

---

[18] For connections between Nausicaa and Telemachus, see Delebecque 1958 138-9; Belmont 1967 1-9; Lang 1969 164; Rüter 1969 221-4; Austin 1975 201-2; Besslich 1981 103-16; Reece 1993 114.

[19] See p53.

Odysseus's Pseudo-Epiphany to Nausicaa (*Od*. 6.110-320)

Sowa compares Odysseus's meeting with Nausicaa to the *Hymn to Demeter*, in which the disguised goddess is met on the road by local girls and taken to their home.[20] Yet the connections with epiphany go beyond the parallels between these isolated literary descriptions. Although it is Nausicaa who acts on behalf of a goddess in this scene, the princess has been primed by Athena's dream-visitation to respond to Odysseus's sudden appearance as if to an epiphanic experience. While Odysseus is arguably at his lowest level of agency, his approach to their meeting hints at the characteristics which will allow him to act as Athena's agent in the second half of the poem: his reluctance to reveal his identity, his masterful use of language to control his interactions with others, and his propensity for deception.[21] The epiphanic undertones of these behaviours remain only hints, however, which primarily highlight their innateness in the hero in anticipation of the themes of the poem's second half. Nausicaa's response, in turn, will emphasize her human naïveté, providing a counterbalance to her seemingly "divine" role in the scene.

The scene also plays with the theme of epiphany by evoking two mutually exclusive models. As will be the case in Ithaca, Odysseus's apparently reduced circumstances and dramatic physical transformation after the bath scene (6.211-37) lend themselves well to a theoxenic tone, and the thematic environment surrounding the meeting will heighten expectations of an epiphany-like revelation. However, resemblance to wider cultural notions of erotic epiphanies is also supported by the thoughts of marriage which Athena has inspired in Nausicaa. A tension therefore arises between two potential epiphanic models – the erotic epiphany and the theoxeny – so that Odysseus must steer the scene away from the former and toward the supplicatory themes of the latter.

---

[20] Sowa 1984 250-60.

[21] Müller (1966 72-3) describes the scene as an *aristeia* of μῆτις.

In keeping with Odysseus's vulnerable state, the "setting the stage" motifs are arranged by the goddess. The arduous journey Odysseus has endured in *Od*. 5 has little to do with this scene from an epiphanic perspective, since it is not preceded by any awareness of Nausicaa or the Phaeacians.[22] Much more prominent are Nausicaa's preparations and journey from the palace to the river, which she does in fulfillment of Athena's instructions. We have seen already that some motifs in an epiphany may be fulfilled by either party, which achieves its greatest effect in the three scenes analyzed in Chapter 2.[23] Only at 6.112-4 does Athena intervene to bring about Odysseus's awareness of the girl's presence when the ball she is playing with falls into the river. Odysseus wakes and is instantly wary:

> ὤ μοι ἐγώ, τέων αὖτε βροτῶν ἐς γαῖαν ἱκάνω;
> ἦ ῥ᾽ οἵ γ᾽ ὑβρισταί τε καὶ ἄγριοι οὐδὲ δίκαιοι,
> ἦε φιλόξεινοι καί σφιν νόος ἐστὶ θεουδής; ...
> ἦ νύ που ἀνθρώπων εἰμὶ σχεδὸν αὐδηέντων; (*Od*. 6.119-21, 25)

In Odysseus's experience, these questions have been uttered once before on the shore of the Cyclops's island (9.175-6), and they will be asked again when he fails to recognize the shores of Ithaca (13.201-2).[24] In the first appearance of these lines within the poem, they hold for their speaker the apprehension of a potentially dangerous repetition of experiences which will only be revealed to his audience two books later.[25] As with the discrepancy between Athena's instructions to Nausicaa and her true intentions, the contrast between Odysseus's fears and the audience's knowledge of Nausicaa's character throws his lack of awareness into sharp

---

[22] Odysseus's destination when leaving Ogygia is never stated. Calypso merely bids him keep the north star on his left as he sails (5.276-7). Although Poseidon indicates that Odysseus is destined to find help from the Phaeacians (5.288-9), Odysseus is unaware of this fact.

[23] See p44-55.

[24] Clay 1983 192-3; Heubeck *et al*. 1988 301; Garvie 1994 111.

[25] N.B. αὖτε (6.119).

relief. Odysseus remains ultimately (and unknowingly) dependent upon Athena's plan for him, and the goddess is the only character who fully understands the situation at hand.[26]

As Odysseus emerges from his shelter beneath the olive bush (his own short journey), he breaks off a branch to hide his nakedness in what might be considered both a muted preparation and a disguise. In keeping with the passage's emphasis on his vulnerability, his nakedness is in fact the opposite of a disguise in physical terms, but is also a physical reflection of the anonymity which has temporarily stripped him of his heroic identity.

At his arrival at 6.127-36, the maidens flee in fear. The effect of this arrival is heightened, not by any divine attributes, but by its suddenness; the accompanying simile describes his wild and threatening appearance as being like a lion's (ὥς τε λέων ὀρεσίτροφος, ἀλκὶ πεποιθώς, 6.130).[27] Only Nausicaa, to whom Athena gives courage, stands before him (6.139-41). It is thus Athena who prevents her from joining her handmaids in flight and thereby creates the necessary dramatic isolation surrounding the two mortals. Her guiding hand continues to feature throughout the encounter, facilitating the most obvious epiphanic motifs. So far, the only motif Odysseus himself has initiated is that of disguise, which our analysis of *Od*. 13 revealed as one of the behaviours he shares with his divine patroness.[28]

The dominant tension in the scene arises from its erotic undertones.[29] Scholars have long pointed to this episode as a variant of the well-known folktale in which a stranger arrives to compete for the hand of a local princess.[30] Yet there is clearly more at play than redirecting folktale expectations. As Petridou has demonstrated,[31] liminal natural surroundings (e.g.

---

[26] Cf. Odysseus's gradual acquisition of knowledge in Eumaeus's hut as he comes to share Athena's knowledge of his companions' identities. See p60.

[27] See Podlecki 1971 83; Magrath 1982 207-8; Garvie 1994 115-6; Glenn 1998 107-16; Watrous 1999 166-71; Karakantza 2003 16-7.

[28] See p53-4.

[29] On erotic elements throughout the Nausicaa episode, see e.g. Garvie 1994 117; Olson 1995 178-81; Shapiro 1995 159-60; Glenn 1998 111-6; Watrous 1999 166-8.

[30] E.g. Van Leeuwen 1911 24-33; Paton 1912 215-6; Woodhouse 1930 54-65, 102-5; Vallillee 1955 175-9; Gross 1976 317; Garvie 1994 29-30.

[31] Petridou 2015 232-34. On the particular association of nymphs with such landscapes, see Larson 2001 8-11.

mountains, caves, or the water's edge) are common settings for epiphanic encounters. They offer an idyllic landscape removed from centers of civilization, providing both privacy for, and an unspoiled environment befitting, a divine visitor. Such liminal locations feature frequently in the *Odyssey*, such as in *Od*. 13 where Athena's epiphany begins on the shore and moves toward the cave of the nymphs, and to some extent in Odysseus's pseudo-epiphanies to Telemachus and the herdsmen, which are conducted at the edge of his city and the threshold of his palace, respectively.

In erotic epiphanies, emphasis is also placed on the liminality of the percipient's age.[32] Nausicaa's charming combination of feminine beauty and youthful innocence places her precisely at the point between childhood and womanhood. The setting of her meeting with Odysseus lends itself well to Greek cultural notions of epiphanic locations, and the knowing audience will also recall Odysseus's propensity to have affairs with female figures who welcome him on unfamiliar shores. Add to this the fact that the meetings between Odysseus and Nausicaa tend to take place when they are alone together,[33] and the emphasis on Nausicaa's marriageable status creates a strong expectation that any encounter between her and Odysseus may easily become an erotic one. Indeed, while the audience does not observe Nausicaa's initial response to Odysseus's arrival, her reaction to his rejuvenated form at 6.242-5 gives voice to this theme.

Yet it is precisely this kind of encounter which Odysseus takes pains to avoid, modulating his behaviour to put the princess at ease in spite of his physical appearance.[34] Debating whether to take her knees as a suppliant or keep his distance, he decides explicitly against initiating this gesture of physical contact, which he reserves for his supplication of Arete at 7.142. Instead, he opts for cunning words (κερδαλέον μῦθον, 6.148), ironically asking if Nausicaa herself is a goddess and begging for her assistance. By manipulating his

[32] Petridou 2015 333. One might think of the abduction and eternal youth of Ganymedes by comparison.

[33] Gross 1976 312.

[34] Jones 1989 351-2.

language as he requests information about the local people, he demonstrates his mastery at influencing others with speech even when in a near-helpless state. Through this contrast of mature cunning and innocent trust, something of the unequal hierarchical relationship required for an epiphany appears to favour Odysseus, despite the apparent contradiction in social status.

Having cast himself in the role of a suppliant, Odysseus utters his instructions: ἄστυ δέ μοι δεῖξον, δὸς δὲ ῥάκος ἀμφιβαλέσθαι (6.178). In accordance with the laws of hospitality which he has invoked, as well as the conventions of epiphany which the approaching hint of divinity will suggest, Nausicaa immediately grants his request, instructing her handmaidens to bathe and clothe him and promising that her people will receive him kindly. As Odysseus puts on the clothes she has given him, Athena beautifies him for the first time, enhancing his height, strength, and attractiveness. Nausicaa reacts with wonder (θηεῖτο, 6.237) and comments that he seems like the gods,[35] wishing that she might have such a man for her husband. Her wonder takes on the appearance of a preliminary emotional response to a hint of divinity, although she continues to speak of him as a mortal man (ἀνήρ, 6.241). This statement may also be seen as an expression of the ironic treatment motif which appears in the Ithacan recognition scenes, where characters acknowledge divine features in Odysseus's person following a transformation by Athena.[36] Far more ironic, however, is Nausicaa's desire to marry Odysseus, since, although this makes her more likely to welcome him, it is also contrary to his status as a married man and his wish to return home to his wife.[37] Thus, Nausicaa has not entirely abandoned the erotic potential which Odysseus has attempted to replace with themes of supplication and hospitality – she, it seems, does not find them mutually exclusive.

---

[35] Cf. Telemachus's attempt to affirm Odysseus's divinity at 16.200.

[36] E.g. *Od*. 16.181-5, 199-200.

[37] Sowa 1984 254.

From this point, the encounter quickly approaches its conclusion. Nausicaa fulfills Odysseus's instructions by leading the way to the city, where she leaves him (6.316-20). Their only subsequent meeting responds to the themes which have been invoked in the first. Following Demodocus's song of Ares and Aphrodite, the first round of Phaeacian gifts, and another bath scene, Nausicaa once again wonders (θαύμαζεν, 8.459) at Odysseus's rejuvenated appearance and asks him to remember her. In epiphanic terms, her request voices a concern for her welfare, expressing care for the encounter's effect on her future. In this final exchange, Nausicaa invokes the language of obligation; she has at last agreed to the terms with which Odysseus initially attempted to define their relationship – one in which she plays the role of saviour and host. The assuagement of her concern rewards her acceptance of this role with Odysseus's promise to pray to her as if to a goddess when he reaches home (8.467-8). This parting promise returns to the theme of his very first address, now without hyperbolic irony, and expresses genuine gratitude for her protection.

The epiphanic motifs surrounding Odysseus in these scenes are certainly muted. When compared with his role in *Od*. 16-22, there is a clear difference in Odysseus's level of agency. The vulnerability which in Ithaca is merely a divinely-bestowed disguise is a true condition in Scheria, and Odysseus is so far the beneficiary of Athena's designs rather than their agent. Nearly every motif – including the "purpose" motifs – can be traced ultimately to Athena's influence; only the disguise is entirely Odysseus's, and it is a poor shadow of what this motif will become in later books. Even so, his response to the situation underscores the innateness of the qualities which will later make him a fitting agent for the fulfillment of Athena's plans in Ithaca, but which are for now his only defense against destitution.

Nausicaa has thus had two epiphanic experiences in less than a day – the first from an Olympian goddess, who takes care that Nausicaa does not recognize her and deliberately omits revealing to the girl her role in a larger plan, and the second from Odysseus, who similarly defers recognition but provokes a more explicit emotional response from her. Yet few scholars have discussed Nausicaa's potential to appear as an epiphanic figure. The most notable exception is Cora Sowa, who, in addition to considering Odysseus's "epiphany" as a parallel to *HDem*, also identifies parallels with what she calls the "Maiden Abducted While Dancing" theme.[38] In epiphanies where this theme appears, a group of nymphs is typically found engaged in idyllic activities in a natural landscape, typically on a mountain, in a meadow, or beside a spring.[39] One maiden is identified as outstanding above all the others. The group continue to sing, dance, or pick flowers until a male figure intrudes, which may facilitate a transition into a rape-narrative if he abducts the preeminent maiden.

These parallels link Nausicaa's early activities by the river to other erotic and epiphanic contexts, but they are confined to the part of the narrative which precedes her actual interaction with Odysseus. As this section will argue, however, Nausicaa's epiphanic connections continue throughout *Od*. 6. As the agent of Athena, Nausicaa is unconsciously performing a role which the goddess cannot perform herself at this time. The scene thus possesses another, independent set of motifs which reflect a rather more complete "epiphany" of Nausicaa to Odysseus.

Athena's rebuke at 6.25-30 imparts an awareness of a situation requiring Nausicaa's presence by the river – the clothing for her marriage lies unkempt and requires washing. As

---

[38] Sowa 1984 136-40. Sowa identifies other examples of this theme in *HDem* 4-20, *HAph* 117-42 (a fictitious abduction), and the tale of Europa and the bull (possibly recounted by Hesiod in the Ἠοῖαι). A related theme, "Nymphs Dancing," can be found at *HAph* 189-203, 281-5; *HH* 19.3-47; *Cypria* fr. 4 & 5. See also Lord 1966 241-8; Richardson 1974 32, 179-80.

[39] Cf. Petridou 2015 195, 232.

discussed above,[40] this is a flawed awareness on Nausicaa's part, since she remains unaware of her approaching meeting with Odysseus. The discrepancy between Nausicaa's expectations when leaving the city and her actual experience by the river is highlighted by the poet's explication of Athena's intentions, which have not been communicated to Nausicaa in her instructions. In contrast to Athena's constant awareness of Odysseus's needs, Nausicaa will not become aware of his presence until 6.137-40, or of his needs until he expresses them at 6.175-9. The imperfection of Nausicaa's awareness highlights both her mortality and Athena's control of the scene.

Similarly, the other "setting the stage" motifs can be detected in the narrative, but Nausicaa is unaware of their function in a wider "divine purpose." When she wakes from her dream, she fulfills Athena's instructions by requesting a wagon from her father and loading the clothes to be washed (6.48-80). While she does not know that these garments will allow her to assist Odysseus, Athena's instructions have ensured that Nausicaa makes the necessary preparations for their encounter.[41] She and her handmaids then journey to the river's idyllic setting (6.81-4) and complete the tasks which Athena has commanded. At this point, just as Nausicaa has seemingly fulfilled any obligation associated with her dream, the poet reaffirms her divine beauty:

> τῇσι δὲ Ναυσικάα λευκώλενος[42] ἄρχετο μολπῆς.
> οἵη δ᾽ Ἄρτεμις εἶσι κατ᾽ οὔρεα ἰοχέαιρα,
> ἢ κατὰ Τηΰγετον περιμήκετον ἢ Ἐρύμανθον,
> τερπομένη κάπροισι καὶ ὠκείῃς ἐλάφοισι·
> τῇ δέ θ᾽ ἅμα νύμφαι, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο,
> ἀγρονόμοι παίζουσι· γέγηθε δέ τε φρένα Λητώ·
> πασάων δ᾽ ὑπὲρ ἥ γε κάρη ἔχει ἠδὲ μέτωπα,
> ῥεῖά τ᾽ ἀριγνώτη πέλεται, καλαὶ δέ τε πᾶσαι·
> ὣς ἥ γ᾽ ἀμφιπόλοισι μετέπρεπε παρθένος ἀδμής. (*Od*. 6.101-9)

---

[40] See p108.

[41] Cf. schol. *ad* 6.28.

[42] Nausicaa shares this epithet with her mother (7.233, 7.335) and with Hera, the goddess of marriage (22 of 24 occurrences in the *Iliad*).

Nausicaa is described as παρθένος ἀδμής and her beauty once again likened to a goddess among nymphs (cf. 6.15-9), but this time to a specific goddess: Artemis, the virgin patron of unmarried girls. Ironically, by expressing Nausicaa's connections to divinity in terms of virginity, the narrative intensifies the scene's erotic potential, since maiden goddesses engaged in such activities are often vulnerable to abduction.[43] Once again, the description of Aphrodite's disguise at *HAph 82 (*παρθένῳ ἀδμήτῃ ... ὁμοίη) offers a striking parallel.

The liminal surroundings in both simile and reality also combine to inspire an uneasy apprehension for Odysseus when he awakes. Since the poet's assurances of Nausicaa's character are tendered only to the audience, Odysseus's fears about the local inhabitants express a very real concern for welfare, not just generally[44] but in an epiphanic sense when he claims to have heard a θῆλυς ἀϋτή, / νυμφάων, αἳ ἔχουσ᾽ ὀρέων αἰπεινὰ κάρηνα / καὶ πηγὰς ποταμῶν καὶ πίσεα ποιήεντα (6.122-4).[45] In the wider Greek imagination, such figures are both alluring and dangerous, and numerous myths warn of the dangers to men of approaching maiden goddesses as they bathe or hunt – heroes like Actaeon, or even Teiresias's accidental glimpse of Athena.[46] For the naked Odysseus, any interaction might have similarly dangerous consequences, suggesting a further reason for his attempt to negate expectations of an erotic encounter.[47] Thus the elaborate simile not only furthers Nausicaa's associations with divine beauty, but also suggests a very real hint of divinity to which, despite not being privy to the poet's description, Odysseus demonstrates an immediate emotional response. The expression of the concern for welfare motif at this early moment both intensifies his emotional response

---

[43] Gross 1976 316; Nortwick 1979 271; Shapiro 1995 159-60; Watrous 1999 168; Karakantza 2003 13-4, 21n2. See also n38.

[44] Cf. Odysseus's disastrous meeting with a human girl drawing water from a spring, who turns out to be the daughter of the king of the cannibalistic Laestrygonians (10.105-32). Vidal-Naquet 1970 1294; Crane 1988 140.

[45] On νυμφάων as an indication that Odysseus does not expect this isolated location to host mortal women, see Stanford 1977 i.312-3.

[46] Cf. Call. *Bath of Pallas*, in which Athena comforts Teiresias's mother by recalling the more extreme punishment of Actaeon (*H* 5.96-130). On the converse danger of men being carried off by amorous nymphs, see Crane 1988 16-7; Larson 2001 64-71.

[47] Jones 1989 351. Sowa (1984 140) and Petridou (2015 234) show how easily the scene might transition into a rape narrative, featuring both Nausicaa as an abducted nymph and Odysseus as a divine abductor.

and allows a sincere expression of this motif in a scene conducted between two mortals, where it would be inappropriate if placed after his recognition of Nausicaa's mortal status.

After Odysseus has weighed the risks and benefits of approaching the maidens, his sudden appearance causes them all to flee except for Nausicaa, who is divinely emboldened to face him. The dramatic isolation is therefore not of Nausicaa's making, but Athena's. Following all the richness of the previous simile, the audience is reminded that Nausicaa is simply a human maiden, who might have fled at the sight of the imposing stranger but for the goddess's intervention.

In order to reassure Nausicaa of his good intentions, Odysseus decides to simulate an epiphanic moment of recognition.[48] This is a brilliant tactic on his part, since, by treating her as a goddess and invoking post-recognition motifs, he implicitly acknowledges an uncrossable barrier between them.[49] Addressing her first as ἄνασσα (6.149), he uses a term which is elsewhere used only of goddesses.[50] Claiming to be overwhelmed by Nausicaa's beauty, he pretends to interpret it as a hint of divinity,[51] likening her to Artemis or to a young palm tree, possibly the tree at Delos under which Artemis was born.[52] His emphasis on her beauty (εἶδος), stature (μέγεθος), and form (φυή, 6.152) dwells on three of the features which typically distinguish divine forms from mortal ones. Or if she is mortal, he says, then τρὶς μάκαρες are her parents and brothers, and μακάρτατος the man who will be her husband, picking up not only on the theme of marriage but on further language typically used to

---

[48] Müller (1966 89) links this speech with Odysseus's attempt to lie to Athena at 13.256-86. Richardson (1974 208) calls it a "pseudo-epiphany."

[49] Nortwick 1979 272.

[50] Stanford 1977 i.314; Heubeck *et al*. 1988 303; Garvie 1994 120; De Jong 2001 161. Cf. *Od*. 3.380; *HAph* 92; *HDem* 75, 440, 492. Odysseus ends his speech with the same title (6.175).

[51] There is no reason to conclude that Odysseus is serious in his identification of Nausicaa as divine (cf. Sowa 1984 254; Mussies 1988 9; Garvie 1994 120; Larson 2001 31). In addition to the narrator's description of the speech as κερδαλέον (6.148), Odysseus has spent seven years in the exclusive company of a goddess who is, by his own admission, superior to mortal women in appearance. Even if Nausicaa is described in terms that recall divinity, it is doubtful that a man with Odysseus's experience of goddesses would mistake her for one. See also Jones 1989 352-3, who rightly sees Odysseus's speech as a shrewd attempt at self-preservation.

[52] Stanford 1977 i.314.

describe the gods. This is the only occasion in the *Odyssey* when this adjective is applied definitively to mortals,[53] and its use here recalls the ironic treatment motif in Hermes's epiphany to Priam at *Il*. 24.374-7, where the king is unaware of his comrade's divinity but similarly says that his parents must be μάκαρες.[54]

Even in his human description of Nausicaa, then, Odysseus describes her as goddess-like. The result is a moment in which the hero consciously manipulates his addressee by reacting as though he has correctly interpreted a hint of divinity, with the added irony that the deity to whom he likens her is the same one to whom the poet compared her 49 lines earlier.[55] The scene's greatest irony thus derives from the relationship between Odysseus's actions and his words. The hint of divinity which he pretends to discover is an artificial one, entirely separate from the very real one to which he reacts upon first awakening. Perhaps even more than in *Od*. 16, where he is responding to specific motifs already expressed by Telemachus, this scene displays Odysseus's familiarity with epiphanic conventions and his ability to simulate an appropriate response to divinity even when one is not required.

The rest of Odysseus's speech continues its parody of a mortal percipient's response to an epiphany, expressing his dependence upon Nausicaa's goodwill, be she goddess or royal (6.172-9). As with the hint of divinity, this concern for welfare is also a repetition. Its first iteration was a sincere fear for his safety which has as yet received no specific assuagement; the second occurs where the audience would normally expect to find it, shortly after a mortal's apparent recognition of a goddess, but here it is deployed ironically. While it still reflects a genuine dependence upon Nausicaa's goodwill, it is uttered as part of a speech which only pretends to respond to an epiphany.

---

[53] The superlative μακάρτατος is used elsewhere only by Odysseus of Achilles, who, he says, was honoured as a god among men (11.483) and who declines to accept the compliment. Telemachus wishes he could be the son of a man blessed to spend his years at home (μάκαρος, 1.217).

[54] Turkeltaub 2003 199-200.

[55] Moulton 1977 120-1; Goldhill 1988 25; De Jong 2001 161.

Nausicaa's answer, on the other hand, contains no hint of irony, but finally offers her sincere assuagement of Odysseus's concerns by promising clothing and hospitality and by revealing the information which Odysseus lacked at the moment of awakening. He is, she reveals, among a people called the Phaeacians, who respect the gods and will receive him kindly (6.187-97).[56] Here, as it will be in *Od*. 13, the critical revelation is not of the speaker's identity but of the place and its inhabitants. Nausicaa replaces the announcement of her own name with those of the Phaeacians and Alcinous, whom she claims as her father in a subtle reference to her mortal status.[57] Her rebuke to her handmaidens confirms this when she emphasizes that the Phaeacians, while dear to the gods, are not gods themselves (6.203-5).

Nausicaa's response also alludes to the motifs of insult and prophecy. Her rebuke corresponds well to the former motif, whereby a divinity emphasizes the difference between herself and a human percipient by calling attention to the latter's lack of clear perception.[58] However, this rebuke is addressed to her handmaidens rather than to Odysseus, so that the breaking of the dramatic isolation adds a further distinction between this scene and a true divine epiphany. Likewise, Nausicaa's assurance that no mortal enemy will ever reach Scheria offers a prophecy-like assertion, denying the need to fear any repercussions from interacting with this stranger. While this statement is technically true, it is only just so – it is Poseidon who will destroy the Phaeacian ship, but his wrath will be provoked by their reception of Odysseus. Nausicaa's confidence in facing Odysseus is justified, but reveals a lack of understanding of the divine dynamics operating behind the scene.

From the moment Odysseus begins to speak, Nausicaa's "epiphany" almost exclusively features post-recognition motifs: the concern for welfare, assuagement of concerns, announcement, insult, and prophecy. Prior to his speech, he responds to a hint of

---

[56] The Phaeacians' piety and hospitality are confirmed both by Nausicaa's reference to Zeus as the giver of good and ill and by her assertion to her handmaidens at 6.207-8: τὸν νῦν χρὴ κομέειν· πρὸς γὰρ Διός εἰσιν ἅπαντες / ξεῖνοί τε πτωχοί τε, δόσις δ' ὀλίγη τε φίλη τε.

[57] Webber (1989 5-6) locates Nausicaa's withholding of her name within a larger Odyssean pattern.

[58] The phrase ἦ μή που + [indic.] intensifies the incredulity of Nausicaa's questions at 6.199-200 (Denniston 1934 286; Chantraine 1953 2.331; Stanford 1977 i.315; Garvie 1994 133).

divinity with a very real concern for welfare. Yet there has been nothing that truly resembles an epiphanic moment. Nothing in Nausicaa's appearance or behaviour suggests such a transformative moment. Recognition of her as a goddess is entirely contained within Odysseus's speech. Even so, the divine attributes which he "recognizes" are a very real part of her character.

The connections to other goddess-figures become more specific after these speeches have concluded. As Nausicaa fulfills her promise of hospitality, she commands her handmaidens to provide clothing and a bath to the stranger. As we have already seen, Athena's beautification of Odysseus and Nausicaa's corresponding desire fulfil the motifs of hint of divinity, preliminary emotional response, and ironic treatment in Odysseus's pseudo-epiphany.[59] For Nausicaa's part, the provision of a bath and fine clothing is her most direct parallel with Circe and Calypso, both of whom perform similar services elsewhere in the poem.[60] Such actions correspond in each case to Homeric conventions of proper hospitality, which typically require a bath scene to be followed by dressing and meal scenes.[61] In the cases of Circe and Calypso, these lead eventually to affairs which delay Odysseus's journey home, thus intensifying the erotic potential of the scene with Nausicaa for the knowing audience.

However, Nausicaa's behaviour deviates from these parallels in a way which links her more strongly with Athena, for whom she is acting as agent. When Odysseus finishes his meal in *Od*. 6, rather than initiating an affair, Nausicaa ἄλλ' ἐνόησεν (6.251). This phrase is strongly associated with Athena elsewhere in the *Odyssey*, fittingly introducing Nausicaa's delivery of instructions which will shortly be echoed by the goddess herself (7.30-1, 54-77).[62]

---

[59] See p117.

[60] Cf. 5.264, 10.360-5. Woodhouse (1930 46) identifies this as the "nymph and shipwreck" motif. See also Fenik 1974 127; Pedrick 1988 91-3.

[61] Arend 1933 124-6; Pedrick 1988 85-91; Garvie 1994 327.

[62] The phrase is applied five times to the goddess's interventions in Odysseus's νόστος and revenge scheme (5.382, 6.112, 18.187, 23.242, 23.344) and three times in the Telemachy (2.382, 2.393, 4.795).

Nausicaa instructs Odysseus first to follow her to the edge of the city and wait (6.258-62), and then to address his petition to her mother (6.289-315). The first of these instructions is explained as an attempt to avoid gossip, highlighting both Nausicaa's interest and availability, and implicitly likens the Phaeacian men to rival suitors in a subtle nod to the scene's parallels with Odysseus's situation in Ithaca.[63] The last contains a prophecy motif which implies the potentially favourable consequences of this encounter if Odysseus does as she says.

Finally, when Odysseus reaches the Phaeacian court and approaches the queen, whose name he will only learn from a disguised Athena in the next scene, it will be the clothes provided by Nausicaa which will arouse Arete's curiosity. Since these will directly aid Odysseus in fulfilling her instructions to petition the queen, the clothing will come to resemble a divine inspiration motif. While this is the only occasion on which a mortal "epiphany" contains this motif, this clothing is precisely what Athena could not provide for Odysseus in anything short of a direct intervention. The transfer of agency to the mortal Nausicaa is nowhere better warranted than in these final motifs, in which her own behaviour, without specific guidance from the goddess, succeeds in providing for Odysseus everything that Athena wishes him to gain before he enters the Phaeacian court.

After Nausicaa's departure (6.316-20), her role as Athena's agent is ended.[64] In her only other appearance at 8.457-68, her sudden intrusion into the normal progression of type-scenes catches both Odysseus and the audience by surprise.[65] Her entrance is accompanied by one last reminder of her divine beauty: Ναυσικάα δὲ θεῶν ἄπο κάλλος ἔχουσα (8.457). However, this description more closely resembles those of her handmaids (6.18) and father

---

[63] Murnaghan 1987 97. See also Lang 1969 165; Rose 1969 391. There have been many rich analyses of these lines and their parallels to Odysseus's earlier speech (e.g. Gross 1976 313-4). Cairns (1990 263-6) discusses the euphemistic undertones of μίσγεσθαι (6.288). I will venture no further comment beyond the suggestion that these parallels may indicate some degree of shared cleverness in speech and thus intensify the potential that Nausicaa may tempt Odysseus where Circe and Calypso failed, particularly given the proximity of Odysseus's praise of *homophrosyne* at 6.182-5. Cf. Penelope's mirroring of Odysseus's speech at 23.166-80.

[64] "Athene hat Nausikaas Funktion darauf begrenzt, nur die *Vorbedingungen* für den Helden selber zu schaffen, das weitere bleibt ihm überlassen." Müller 1966 74.

[65] Nausicaa's arrival at 8.457 interrupts the normal sequence of bath-dressing-meal type-scenes. See n61.

(6.12) than the elaborate similes of her earlier appearance, thus restoring her to the plane of the extraordinary but emphatically mortal Phaeacians now that her role as divine agent is over. And yet, the surrounding passage is the only one in which Circe, Calypso, and Nausicaa are mentioned in close proximity,[66] suggesting one last time the almost parallel roles of these three figures. Odysseus's address continues the epiphanic themes of his earlier speech, promising to pray to Nausicaa as a goddess when he reaches home. This meeting resembles a kind of responding epiphany, in which Odysseus expresses something like an affirmation of divinity without any trace of the irony of his first address, but this time in full knowledge of Nausicaa's mortality. In speaking as he does, Odysseus gracefully acknowledges his debt to her and transforms his initial κερδαλέον word into a sincere and moving farewell.

Unlike the other "epiphanies" in *Od*. 6, Nausicaa's is relatively complete. Nearly every motif from the setting-the-stage and recognition phases is present, and the only "purpose" motif which is not at least suggested is that of physical contact. The postponement motifs, however, are notably absent. The only exception is the ironic treatment, which is introduced by Odysseus's speech. Significantly, Nausicaa's "epiphany" omits any motif relating to deception. By contrast, Athena and Odysseus both conceal their identities in order to accomplish a common purpose, and it is out of this practice, rather than any divine qualities of his own, that Odysseus's behaviour acquires an epiphanic aura. While Nausicaa's role is only temporarily extended to her by Athena and then withdrawn once the goddess resumes it herself, this is due not only to her semi-divine beauty but to an innate character to which willful deceit is foreign. This befits the role which Athena wishes her to perform, but is also one of the greatest indicators of her lack of compatibility with Odysseus, whose ideal partner Penelope matches him not only in powers of speech but in cunning and deception.[67]

Throughout this scene, the motifs attributed to each character overlap in time and, on occasion, the same word or line. The focus on each as an epiphanic figure, however, shifts as

---

[66] *Od*. 8.448, 452, 457. Gross 1976 316.

[67] See p94-5.

the scene progresses. For Odysseus, it is important to make a strong initial impression. Nausicaa's muted experience of epiphany at the start of the book primes her to respond most to the hint of divinity, which earns her goodwill, and to the instructions detailing what Odysseus needs, which she immediately fulfills. On the other hand, Nausicaa's epiphanic role is one of protection and assistance, in which the most important motifs are consequently the assuagement, announcement, inspiration, and instructions. Significantly, none of these motifs are found in Odysseus's ironic speech; they are in fact the only motifs performed by Nausicaa herself. The effect is a natural but unconscious "epiphany" in which Nausicaa plays the role of a goddess in sheltering Odysseus and preparing him for the challenges ahead.

Athena's Epiphany to Odysseus (*Od*. 7.14-81)

The final epiphany in this cluster begins at the start of *Od*. 7, when Athena leads Odysseus through the Phaeacian city to the palace. In many ways, this scene is a continuation of Nausicaa's "epiphany," this time performed by the goddess behind the entire exchange.[68] Athena thus closes the circuit which she opened at the start of the previous book, where the narrator highlighted her plan as she handed over to Nausicaa her role in facilitating Odysseus's homecoming. Now, she steps through the opening made by Nausicaa's parting words and resumes the role which she was temporarily compelled to entrust to a mortal agent.

As Odysseus complies with Nausicaa's instructions to delay his entrance into the city, he prays to Athena that he will be received favourably by the Phaeacians (6.321-7). Athena hears his prayer, but αὐτῷ δ' οὔ πω φαίνετ' ἐναντίη· αἴδετο γάρ ῥα / πατροκασίγνητον (6.329-30). Yet *Od*. 7 opens with a direct meeting between Odysseus and the goddess, now disguised as an anonymous young girl. The key to reconciling these two scenes is the fact

[68] For this scene as a doublet of Nausicaa's scene with Odysseus, see Garvie 1994 167. For this kind of repetition in general, see Kilb 1973 40, Fenik 1974 153-71. For parallels with Hermes's epiphany and Priam's supplication in *Il*. 24, see Müller 1966 77-80.

that, as in Nausicaa's dream, the epiphany sequence at the start of *Od*. 7 involves no motifs pertaining to recognition. While Athena has obtained permission from Zeus to facilitate Odysseus's homecoming (1.63-79), she still refrains from doing so openly until he reaches Ithaca, the natural endpoint of Poseidon's wrath (6.329-30). As a result, she works to help Odysseus from a distance, first by sending Nausicaa to him and heightening the register of their meeting, and now by providing confirmation of the information that he has obtained and by delivering him directly to Arete.

Although her epiphany once again omits the recognition phase, the motifs that are present are relatively straightforward. Athena approaches Odysseus alone at the edge of the city (7.19). The dramatic isolation requires no poetic manipulation, but is nevertheless intensified by the thick mist which she casts about Odysseus (7.15-7). As ever in the *Odyssey*, her awareness, preparations, and journey are omitted, implying her constant concern for Odysseus. Her arrival and chosen disguise are simply stated: ἔνθα οἱ ἀντεβόλησε θεά γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη, / παρθενικῇ ἐϊκυῖα νεήνιδι, κάλπιν ἐχούσῃ (7.19-20). This disguise recalls Nausicaa's statement that a child could lead Odysseus to the palace (6.300-3). Once Nausicaa has satisfied Odysseus's immediate needs for clothing and information, the goddess can at last step in herself. The critical item which Nausicaa has been able to provide which Athena could not is the clothing, with its specific ties to Arete's handiwork, contributing to its unique status as a "divine inspiration" bestowed by a mortal character.

When Odysseus sees the disguised Athena approaching, he asks whether she might lead him to the house of Alcinous,[69] to which Athena responds: τοιγὰρ ἐγώ τοι, ξεῖνε πάτερ, δόμον ὅν με κελεύεις, / δείξω, ἐπεί μοι πατρὸς ἀμύμονος ἐγγύθι ναίει (7.28-9). In addition to addressing Odysseus as a stranger, this claim that Alcinous's palace is near her father's house

[69] In the introduction it was noted that Achilles's address to Athena at *Il*. 1.201-5 is the only occasion on which a mortal percipient speaks first in conversation with a recognized god (see p26). Since the present scene lacks a recognition phase, Odysseus's assumption of control is appropriate given Athena's disguise as a young girl (Edwards 1980 14).

functions subtly as a false biography, since it supports Athena's disguise as a young maiden of the city.

While she models her disguise on Nausicaa's words at 6.289-315, Athena provides slightly different information. Her instructions demand that Odysseus follow her in silence (7.30-1) because the Phaeacians are not welcoming toward strangers (οὐ ξείνους ἀνέχονται, 7.32) – an ominous departure from Nausicaa's reassuring invocation of Zeus as the protector of suppliants and her immediate promise of hospitality.[70] While the divine mist prevents others from seeing Odysseus, Athena's warning prevents him from prematurely revealing his own presence before he reaches Arete. Odysseus fulfills these instructions by following quickly (7.37-8), and the mist functions as the divine inspiration motif since it, like the clothing from Nausicaa, allows Odysseus to fulfil Athena's instructions.[71]

The epiphany is then interrupted by a lengthy description of the Phaeacian city. Fenik has noted the common Homeric practice of using such digressions to delay important moments and so to heighten suspense.[72] Here, in the absence of any hint of divinity from Athena, it serves the added purpose of redirecting Odysseus's wonder (θαύμαζεν, 7.43) toward the Phaeacian harbours, ships, and assemblies – the securing of which resources has been the point of the elaborate series of epiphanies initiated by Athena.

Upon arriving at the palace, Athena issues her instructions for future actions (7.54-77). These, like Nausicaa's, direct Odysseus to approach the queen first, but the goddess replaces Nausicaa's homely description of her mother weaving by the fire with Arete's name and lineage. This account of the queen subtly reveals Athena's true status by adopting a divine perspective, defining Arete by her descent from Poseidon and detailing Rhexenor's death at Apollo's hands (7.54-66). Whereas Nausicaa emphasized her father's

---

[70] Rose 1969 387-406; Gross 1976 311-2; de Vries 1977 113-21. Cf. Athena's seemingly excessive warning against allowing Penelope to learn of Odysseus's return, despite her allowance of her fidelity (13.335-8).

[71] Notably, every divine inspiration in the *Odyssey* epiphanies pertains to Odysseus's physical appearance, beginning with the clothing from Nausicaa and Athena's mist in Scheria and culminating in the divinely-enhanced beggar disguise in Ithaca. On gifts of clothing as an Odyssean motif, see Rutherford 1992 176.

[72] Fenik 1974 61-104.

position as ἀθάνατος ὥς (6.309), Athena says that it is Arete who is honoured θεὸν ὥς (7.71). She concludes with a prophecy:

> εἴ κέν τοι κείνη γε φίλα φρονέῃσ᾽ ἐνὶ θυμῷ,
> ἐλπωρή τοι ἔπειτα φίλους τ᾽ ἰδέειν καὶ ἱκέσθαι
> οἶκον ἐς ὑψόροφον καὶ σὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν. (7.75-7)

The implied future-more-vivid conditional softens the language of the prophecy, since Athena is still posing as a mortal girl, and repeats Nausicaa's words at 6.313-5 with only a single substitution (ὑψόροφον for εὐκτίμενον). Athena then departs for Marathon (7.78-81) and Odysseus is left to enter Alcinous's palace alone. He is now in possession of everything he needs to make a favourable impression on the Phaeacians: clothing to cover his nakedness and capture Arete's attention, the knowledge to direct his appeal to the queen, and safe passage into the palace hall thanks to the divine mist. He completes his fulfillment of Nausicaa's and Athena's instructions and goes directly to Arete to make his supplication (7.139-43). From this point on, he must rely on his own powers to win over his hosts.[73]

Taking a step back from minute examination of these scenes, the clustering of epiphany motifs around these three characters is striking for multiple reasons. Despite the subtly epiphanic tone which pervades these early meetings in Scheria, none of these sequences describes a full epiphany. Two are divine epiphanies which omit any form of recognition, while two combine to create a unique dual pseudo-epiphany, vividly demonstrating how the broader scene pattern can be adapted to other contexts. The most interesting insights, however, arise from the comparison of the individual epiphanies. Each represents a unique combination of motifs suggesting the performer's fundamental qualities – Odysseus's cunning and propensity for disguise, Nausicaa's innocently divine grace, and, above all, Athena's careful planning, to which any assertion of her own involvement is subordinated and which enables divine motifs to be extended to two mortal characters as they

[73] Cf. 22.236-8, where Athena lends Odysseus strength to sustain him, but not enough to make his victory over the suitors an easy one.

unwittingly enact her plan. As Athena intends, the total effect of these interlaced epiphany-like encounters is to move Odysseus from his helpless position on the shore to the Phaeacian palace, where he is equipped with both the appropriate appearance and the knowledge to approach Arete and request his passage homeward – the first of many testing situations along his return to home and family.

Coda: Odysseus in the Phaeacian Court

Aided by Athena's interventions, Odysseus's behaviour continues to elicit epiphany-like responses from the Phaeacian court. As others have shown, the lengthy delay before the revelation of Odysseus's name is critical in allowing him to demonstrate qualities which will make his eventual self-identification believable.[74] While he slowly reclaims his identity as a heroic warrior and the consummate clever speaker, Athena's interventions help Odysseus to make a favourable initial impression on his hosts. The effect is therefore strongest when his identity is least certain. When Odysseus emerges from the divine mist, the Phaeacians react with wonder (θαύμαζον δ' ὁρόωντες, 7.145) and Alcinous attempts to understand Odysseus's arrival in terms of previous theoxenic encounters (7.199-206).[75] As Odysseus begins to demonstrate his characteristic skills in athletics and speech, Athena merely draws attention to his impressive appearance and discus throw (8.14, 193-200). By the time he is ready to declare himself and assume control over his self-presentation, Athena disappears and Odysseus's narrative reveals how he defines himself: as a hero of extraordinary resourcefulness and experience, a man who has been offered immortality and refused it in favour of his mortal wife and κλέος. The great moment of revelation to which the Phaeacian

[74] Mattes 1954 123ff.; Rose 1969 391; Fenik 1974 13-18; Webber 1989 1-13, esp. 12-13.

[75] Clay (1983 168) discusses Odysseus's sudden appearance as an epiphany. Cf. Clausen 1987 27. The ease of recognition which Alcinous claims is called into question by Nausicaa's apparent failure to recognize the divine nature of her dream (6.2-47). His claim that the gods always come openly (ἐναργεῖς, 7.201) contrasts with other character' statements that the gods are not easy to recognize (cf. 3.420, 4.841, 10.140, 16.161).

episode has been building therefore features an emphatically human identity, which can at last be asserted independently of any divine intervention.

Since this is the revelation upon which Odysseus's supplication will ultimately depend, it is fitting that Arete's role should closely parallel that of Penelope. These are the only examples of faithful wives in the *Odyssey*, the only women explicitly identified as an internal audience for Odysseus's tale, and the two listeners whose acceptance of his identity is most critical to his homecoming.[76] More significant to this study, though, is the fact that both revelations follow lengthy sequences which play with epiphanic themes but are ultimately designed to confirm Odysseus's humanity. While her husband compares their mysterious guest to a god, Arete withholds her approval until Odysseus's name and mortal status have been revealed. Penelope, too, initially entertains the notion that Odysseus might be a god, but is only prepared to accept him once she determines his humanity.[77] As in the Ithacan books, then, Athena intervenes to impress Odysseus's percipients with his godlike qualities only as long as his own identity remains obscure. As soon as he is able to assume control over his situation and declare himself, she leaves him to win his own battles.[78]

Conclusions

The sequence of scenes between Athena, Odysseus, and Nausicaa in *Od*. 6-7 reveals more clearly and concisely than the Ithacan books the precise context within which the *Odyssey* allows its mortal characters to assume the role of an epiphanic god. Throughout the episode, there is a very present divine power whose controlling influence directs the events to

---

[76] For parallels between Arete and Penelope, see Lang 1969 165; Rüter 1969 240-1; Fenik 1974 61-3; Doherty 1992 161-77; Reece 1993 114-5; Doherty 1995 22.

[77] See p95-6. For general parallels between the Phaeacian and Ithacan episodes, see e.g. Lang 1969 162-5; Rüter 1969 228-46; Fenik 1974 55; Bader 1976 23, 31; Heubeck *et al*. 1988 290-1; Rutherford 1992 11; De Jong 2001 150.

[78] Cf. *Od*. 22.236-8.

which the characters are responding.[79] While circumstances constrain this deity to act from a distance, she selects the most appropriate agent for the accomplishment of her goals and entrusts to that individual the role which Athena herself might have played if she were to act through a direct intervention. The goddess resumes this role as soon as her mortal agent has accomplished the appointed task, at which point the traditional distinctions between mortal and god are restored. As in Ithaca, the goddess acts only to provide her favourite with the tools he needs to succeed; even after all the assistance provided by Athena and Nausicaa, Odysseus must still use his own abilities to achieve his goal.

In addition to being in a position to bring about the desired action, the mortal agent must also possess qualities which make this quasi-divine role appropriate. Nausicaa is not only perfectly placed to provide the clothing and information which Athena wishes to secure for Odysseus, but her goddess-like associations make her a worthy stand-in. Her youthful naïveté, meanwhile, ensures that she never rivals the goddess's authority, but remains instead subordinate to it. Odysseus, on the other hand, is at his lowest point of agency in Scheria, so that Nausicaa's epiphany-like response to their meeting highlights no divine characteristics of his own, but rather her own impressionability in the face of Athena's active patronage of the hero. Even so, the same qualities which make Odysseus an appropriate agent for Athena later in the poem are already on display in his behaviour toward Nausicaa.

Like Athena's epiphany to Nausicaa, Odysseus's initial appearance contains a fairly compact set of motifs which avoids any definitive treatment of the recognition phase. Yet unlike Athena, who can afford to remain unrecognized, the hero's situation depends upon a climactic moment of recognition which will persuade his hosts of his merits and win their assistance. He merely defers this moment until it will serve the most good, rather like his deferral of physical contact until he can make his supplication to the proper authority. The meeting with Nausicaa is a prelude, which prepares Odysseus for his true test in the Phaeacian court, and his associations with epiphany continue subtly for as long as his status

[79] Hölscher 1939 85; Müller 1966 71.

among the Phaeacians remains in doubt. During this time, Athena frequently intervenes to conceal or augment Odysseus's appearance and to enhance the impression he makes on his hosts, but only until the moment when he can stand independent of such assistance.

Compared with the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* is remarkably flexible in its treatment of the theme of epiphany. Whereas the former maintains strict control over the circumstances in which its mortal heroes may even be said to resemble the gods, the thematic environment of the latter allows for greater ambiguity, as its hero not only resembles the gods thanks to divine beautifications but more importantly comes to perform the role of a theoxenic god over a significant portion of the narrative. However, while approaching epiphany as a much more versatile theme than it was in the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* still maintains a careful distinction between mortal characters who are temporarily authorised as divine agents and the goddess who retains fundamental control over the situation. It is only Athena's overwhelming concern to bring about Odysseus's return to Ithaca, where he may punish the suitors and attempt to reclaim his place at home, which leads her to entrust her plans to mortal agents. It is therefore a sign of the special relationship between the goddess and her favourite that such "mortal epiphanies" are possible at all.

PART II: Apollonius and Vergil

Having examined how Homer uses the traditional structural motifs of epiphany to explore the boundary between mortality and divinity, where issues of recognition and agency are of key concern, it is time now to consider how these themes are developed in the epiphanies of two of his greatest successors.

As an Alexandrian scholar of the Homeric poems, Apollonius engages closely with Homeric language, structures, and themes in his *Argonautica*. His epic is a remarkably self-conscious poem which highlights its own status as a post-Homeric prequel. Belonging to the generation before the Trojan War, Apollonius's heroes live in a time when, according to Homer's Nestor (*Il*. 11.706-62), the gods interacted more freely with mortals. Indeed, like Nestor's description of Athena's epiphany to the collective Pylians during his youth, there are numerous group epiphanies in the *Argonautica*. Yet, on the whole, the gods of Apollonius's epic are more remote than those of Homer's, and his heroes have greater difficulty in recognizing and understanding their epiphanic experiences than their Homeric counterparts. Chapter 5 will provide a survey of the major epiphany scenes in the *Argonautica*, tracing in particular Apollonius's interest in the theme of recognition and the effect it has on his engagement with the Homeric epiphany motifs.

The remaining chapters will focus on Vergil's treatment of epiphany in the *Aeneid*. Continuing the story of the Trojan refugees, Vergil's epic assumes as its starting point the world of the Homeric heroes, which Aeneas gradually leaves behind as he moves toward a

new future in the west. Chapter 6 will demonstrate Vergil's deliberate choice to craft his epiphanies on the Homeric model and will identify the most notable conventions of the *Aeneid* epiphanies. Chapter 7 will then consider how the theme of agency is developed in these scenes, focusing in particular on three epiphanic performers whose effectiveness is somehow limited by the nature of their ties to divinity. Chapter 8 will function as a kind of coda to the rest of the thesis, considering how Vergil's portrayal of Aeneas engages with both Odyssean and Iliadic models for representing heroes as godlike, only to reject these in favour of a more Roman form of apotheosis.

Limitations of space mean that these chapters are far from comprehensive. Scenes have been selected for discussion based on how well they represent the topics at hand, but in many cases the conclusions drawn can be applied to other scenes as well. Whenever possible, these have been noted in the footnotes. It is my hope that these chapters will provide new insights, not only into how Apollonius and Vergil engage with the specific narrative patterns of Homeric epiphany, but into the nuances of their construction of individual scenes and their treatment of the theme of epiphany more broadly.

5

Apollonian Epiphanies and the Problem of Recognition

τοῖσι δὲ Λητοῦς υἱός, ἀνερχόμενος Λυκίηθεν
τῆλ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀπείρονα δῆμον Ὑπερβορέων ἀνθρώπων,
ἐξεφάνη ...
τοὺς δ᾽ ἕλε θάμβος ἰδόντας ἀμήχανον· οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
ἀντίον αὐγάσσασθαι ἐς ὄμματα καλὰ θεοῖο.
στὰν δὲ κάτω νεύσαντες ἐπὶ χθονός· αὐτὰρ ὁ τηλοῦ
βὴ ῥ᾽ ἴμεναι πόντονδε δι᾽ ἠέρος.

To them the son of Leto, as he passed from distant
Lycia to the countless people of the Hyperboreans,
appeared ...
Helpless wonder seized them when they saw him; none dared
to gaze directly into the fair eyes of the god.
They stood with heads looking down at the ground; but he, far off,
went on his way through the air to the sea.

Apollonius *Argonautica* 2.674-6, 681-4

The relationship between the *Argonautica* and the Homeric epics is one of the oldest concerns in modern Apollonian scholarship. Once seen as a clumsy attempt to combine Homeric language with Alexandrian poetic ideals, the *Argonautica* was often treated as a text of interest only in relation to other poems, as either a successor to Homer or an antecedent for Vergil's engagement with Homer.[1] Only in the last forty years or so has Apollonius's epic come to be appreciated as a work of value in its own right. Scholars like Richard Hunter have made great strides in revealing the independent artistry of Apollonius's poetry and the skill with which he engages with a wide range of sources.[2]

Given the tremendous progress which Apollonian scholarship has made in recent decades, this chapter might seem to represent a step backward. In confining my remarks to

[1] Carspecken 1952 35-7.

[2] E.g. Hunter 1986, 1988, 1989, 1993, 2001, 2015. For a useful survey of twentieth-century scholarship, see Glei 2001 1-26.

Apollonius's engagement with the traditional epiphany scene pattern which is best exemplified in the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and Homeric Hymns, I am aware that this will provide only a limited appreciation of what are undoubtedly complex scenes, which take their influence from numerous textual and cultural traditions.[3] My approach has been adopted partly due to the constraints of this thesis, which will not permit an exhaustive study, and partly due to Apollonius's compositional methods in these scenes.

In his use of Homeric themes and material, Apollonius is extremely creative. In his seminal work on Homeric type-scenes, Arend notes that Apollonius includes one example of each identified type in his *Argonautica*.[4] Whereas Arend criticized Apollonius for his clumsy imitation of Homeric models, Knight has since argued that such allusions are as functional a device as simile in Apollonius's poetry.[5] Examining scenes of sacrifice, shipwreck, and boxing, Knight shows that Apollonius's single examples of these typical scenes invite his readers to compare his epic with Homer, as their sibling-scenes are to be found not within the *Argonautica* but in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.[6] Yet this tactic also illustrates Apollonius's lack of interest in systematically reproducing typical structures in his own poem. A classic example cited by Händel is scenes of embarkation or disembarkation, which occur so frequently as to lend themselves to the establishment of a pattern, but which Apollonius takes pains to vary.[7]

So too for his epiphany scenes. Unlike the Homeric epiphanies, which are bound together by a narrative pattern that provides both structure and flexibility, Apollonius's epiphanies seem to defy any search for a consistent pattern. Perhaps due to this lack of a unifying framework, Apollonius's epiphanies seem to have fallen victim to a similar neglect to that formerly suffered by the *Argonautica* itself: they tend to be discussed individually or

---

[3] On, e.g., tragic models for Apollonius's representation of the gods, see Hunter 1993 xxii, xxvii; Knight 1995 191, 288; Hunter 2015 5.

[4] Arend 1933 127-8. See also Fränkel 1968 70-1; Fusillo 1985 62; Fantuzzi 2001 180.

[5] Knight 1995 2-5.

[6] Knight 1995 49-121.

[7] Händel 1954 92. For Alexandrian avoidance of repetition more generally, see Fantuzzi 2001 176.

only as they arise in surveys of the poem's contents, and their primary interest to scholars usually seems to be in relation to some other literary purpose rather than as epiphanies *per se*.

The present chapter will survey the epiphany scenes of the *Argonautica* in an attempt to highlight some of the ways in which Apollonius both evokes and distances himself from the patterns of the Homeric epiphany scenes. By approaching his epiphanies from the perspective of an audience well-versed in the Homeric tradition,[8] it is possible to identify key themes around which Apollonius builds his variations. Above all, the ways in which he crafts his epiphanies reveal a keen interest in the theme of recognition, not only in terms of how his heroes recognize that they are dealing with a god but in terms of how the reader can recognize that a particular scene is an epiphany. At times, the conclusions of character and reader are different, prompting the question of what counts as an epic epiphany at all. As a study of one of the ways in which later epic poets incorporated Homeric conventions into an expanded definition of epiphany, this chapter will provide an important point of contrast to Vergil's systematic engagement with the Homeric epiphany motifs in subsequent chapters.

The Gods in the *Argonautica*

In choosing to write an epic *Argonautica*, Apollonius inherits two major traditions concerning the gods.[9] The first is their role in the legends surrounding the Argonauts' journey. This tradition gives prominent roles to Hera and Athena as the principal tutelary deities of the crew and their ship, respectively, which Apollonius largely preserves.[10] Although his Argonauts pray most often to Apollo, it is the goddesses who take a far more active part in

---

[8] Knight (1995 3-5) asserts that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* occupied such a privileged position in Greek education, and that the technique of allusion was so fundamental to classical literature, that an ancient reader would have been unable to read the *Argonautica* without being sensitive to its treatment of Homeric material.

[9] On the gods in the *Argonautica* generally, see Feeney 1991 57-98. For surveys of the appearances of various gods, see de la Ville de Mirmont 1894; Faerber 1932 79-89.

[10] Wilamowitz 1924 2.181n4; Klein 1931 19-27; Faerber 1932 82; Herter 1973 33; Lennox 1980 47.

securing the voyage's success.[11] The second is the Homeric style of representing the gods in epic. Here scholars have been less in agreement as to the extent of Apollonius's conformity with epic convention, with several nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholars finding in his gods a portrait of the Ptolemaic court.[12] However, while there are undeniably Alexandrian touches, such as an interest in pictorial and everyday details,[13] the majority of scholars favour the view that Apollonius's gods are essentially consistent with their Homeric counterparts.[14] Hunter sums up the issue when he writes that Apollonius, having inherited Homeric gods whose portrayal had since been condemned as amoral and defended allegorically, has designed his gods so as not to conceal the problems raised by their presentation in epic, but to foreground those problems as an integral part of a self-conscious text.[15]

One feature that scholars do consistently agree on is that Apollonius's gods are more distant than those of Homer.[16] Despite the memorable Olympian scenes at 3.6-166 and 4.753-841, the Olympian gods appear rarely, not only in the mortal sphere but even among themselves. The only Olympian to interact directly with the Argonauts is Iris, who appears in an epiphany to the Boreads (2.284-300); Apollo is seen on two occasions (2.669-719, 4.1701-30) but takes no active interest in them. In perhaps the most famous set of interventions, Athena provides a final push as the Argonauts struggle through the Symplegades (2.537-606) and Hera orchestrates an elaborate intervention to steer the ship through the Planctae (4.753-981). The variations in Apollonius's representation of these

---

[11] Faerber 1932 80-2; Carspecken 1952 95-6; Fränkel 1968 631; Vian 1980 11-2; Clare 2002 161-2.

[12] Hémardinquer 1872 41-3; Croiset 1938 5.234; Carspecken 1952 78; Beye 1982 125-8; Natzel 1992 144-60. Gaunt (1972 124-5) sees them as Homeric gods occupying a new Alexandrian context.

[13] Carspecken 1952 77; Hunter 1986 51; Zanker 1987 47-8, 65-78. Scholars comment on these features particularly at *Arg*. 3.6-166, e.g. Lennox 1980 46; Gaunt 1972 124-5; Zanker 1987 70.

[14] de la Ville de Mirmont 1894 730; Visser 1938 60-4; Fränkel 1968 630-3; Herter 1973 33; Lennox 1980 46-72; Hunter 1989 25; Goldhill 1991 312; Knight 1995 9-12.

[15] Hunter 1993 xxvi. See also Feeney 1991 80.

[16] E.g. de la Ville de Mirmont 1894 731; Klein 1931 225; Visser 1938 62; Gaunt 1972 120; Herter 1973 34; Lennox 1980 47; Hunter 1986 52; Feeney 1991 69-70; Hunter 1993 xxvi; Knight 1995 267; Clare 2002 33; Louden 2005 103-5; Thalmann 2011 4-7. Others distinguish varying levels of divine involvement, which generally increases through the poem (e.g. Händel 1954 114; Hutchinson 1988 130). Cf. Byre 1997 110-11.

parallel events highlight the principle that his description of divine intervention is more subject to the poetic goals of a particular episode than to any sense of a need for internal consistency.[17]

More often, the Olympians work at a distance, preferring to communicate with mortals through lesser gods (1.1310-25), prophets (2.407), omens (3.545-51, 4.294, 4.508), or animals (1.1088, 3.931).[18] Furthermore, far fewer Olympians feature as characters in the *Argonautica*, with prominent roles being granted only to Hera, Athena, Apollo, and Iris.[19] Zeus, though frequently mentioned, is conspicuously absent. Famed in antiquity for never appearing in a Homeric epiphany,[20] Apollonius's Zeus works at a distance not only from men but also from the other gods. His isolation makes him a shadowy figure, whose will is revealed in partial glimpses by minor gods and prophets but is not clearly tied to an overall plan for either the Argonauts' journey or the poem itself.[21]

The relative absence of Olympian deities is partially compensated for by an increased prominence of minor gods. Among these, the most significant group are marine deities, including Glaucus (1.1310-29), Thetis (4.842-84), the Nereids (4.930-63), and Triton (4.1551-1622).[22] These marine divinities are complemented by local gods affiliated with the

---

[17] On these episodes, see Händel 1954 92. Hunter (1993 xxix) notes that the basic unit of Apollonius's composition is the individual scene, so that any overarching notion of character is subordinated to the particular concerns of individual scenes. Fränkel (1968 632) also observes that Apollonius shows no tendency toward systematizing his theology. Divine unity is instead expressed through the absence of gods opposed to the progress of the Argonauts (Klein 1931 247; Herter 1973 34; Lennox 1980 69). On the implications of this unanimity for the reader's appreciation of Jason, see Carspecken 1952 104-7.

[18] Fränkel 1968 632-3. On Hera using other deities to accomplish her wishes, see Hutchinson 1988 130.

[19] On Hera's motivations and role as divine protectress, see Klein 1931 226-39; Faerber 1932 82-3; Fränkel 1968 631; Lennox 1980 53; Vian 1980 12; Campbell 1983 53-5; Feeney 1991 62-4; Mori 2012 319-36. On Athena's role as a reduction of her traditional association with the Argonauts' journey, see Klein 1931 27; Faerber 1932 81-2; Fränkel 1968 631. On Apollo, see Faerber 1932 80-1; Feeney 1991 75-7; Williams 1991 295-316; DeForest 1994 9, 37-9; Clare 2002 159-65.

[20] See Nünlist 2009 271 on schol. T *Il*. 13.18b.

[21] On Zeus in the *Argonautica*, see de la Ville de Mirmont 1894 161-218; Faerber 1932 85-7; Hunter 1989 25; Feeney 1991 58-69; DeForest 1994 12; Louden 2005 103. On the ambiguity of the proem regarding which divinity's plan will determine the action, see Feeney 1991 58-9. Cf. the early emphasis on the will of Zeus in *Il*. 1.5 and on *fatum* (generally equated with Jupiter; see p166n6) at *Aen*. 1.2.

[22] For the importance of marine deities, see de la Ville de Mirmont 1894 658-727; Clare 2002 125; Hunter 2015 193.

major land components of the Argonauts' journey, such as the Libyan heroines (4.1305-36). Although these minor deities interact more frequently with mortals, there is a continuing feeling of disjunction, as their interventions are often isolated from the will of the Olympians or any larger divine plan.[23] Finally, there is also a class of deified mortals, as Heracles's early departure from the Argonauts' quest is required in order for him to complete the tasks which will secure his own apotheosis.[24] Already during his life, his self-sufficiency and social isolation single him out as a godlike figure.[25]

While the crew of the Argo is composed primarily of demigods, their kinship with the gods does not grant the Argonauts greater ease in recognizing divinities at work.[26] With some exceptions (2.686-8, 4.1702-30, 4.1597-9), Apollonius's mortals are remarkably unsuccessful at recognizing divine action. Tiphys, for example, attributes their safe passage through the Symplegades to Athena, but in a way that denies her direct involvement in the episode (2.612-4),[27] and it is unclear to what extent they perceive the Nereids at 4.930-63.[28] In a related phenomenon, the narrator at times uses language which seems more appropriate to his mortal characters, describing the gods in vague terms or failing to specify which divinity is acting (e.g. 1.1088, 3.540), making it difficult for the reader to recognize them, as well.[29]

Recognition is therefore a problem closely associated with Apollonius's representation of the gods. Despite their semi-divinity, the heroes rarely recognize the divine at work, and when they do they often get it wrong. Perhaps the most blatant discrepancy is between their identification of Apollo as the principal tutelary deity of their journey and the

---

[23] Carspecken 1952 105; Feeney 1991 71.

[24] Vian 1974 43; Feeney 1991 96-7; Clare 2002 88-104.

[25] Clauss 1993 196; Thalmann 2011 47-9.

[26] Herter 1973 34; Hunter 1989 25; Feeney 1991 84-9.

[27] Faerber 1932 82; Feeney 1991 84.

[28] For differing views, see Hutchinson 1988 132n82; Feeney 1991 86.

[29] Feeney 1991 87-8.

fact that it is Hera who is most concerned with their success.[30] Even for the reader, recognition is often an ambiguous thing. Throughout the poem, the reader recognizes Homeric gods and contexts, but finds their prominence strangely reduced. They are replaced by less familiar gods, whose interventions are sudden and unexpected, or by gods whose identities are never specified. Readers thus find themselves uncertain of how effective their own perspective is, located as it is somewhere between that of a narrator who might know more than he reveals and that of mortal characters whose understanding of the poem's divine elements is clearly flawed. These conflicting perspectives become most evident during epiphanies, when the divine and mortal spheres come into direct contact.

Epiphanies in the *Argonautica*

In keeping with the distance which Apollonius establishes between the mortal and divine spheres, epiphany is relatively rare in the *Argonautica*. Whereas the *Iliad* contains thirty-six direct epiphanies and the *Odyssey* nine,[31] there are only four epiphany scenes prior to the final book of the *Argonautica* (1.1310-29, 2.284-300, 2.669-719, 3.1211-24). For much of the first book, it is unclear to what extent epiphany will feature at all, as the reader must wait until 1.1310 for the first epiphanic encounter.

Modern scholarship has shown relatively little interest in the *Argonautica* epiphanies as a group.[32] This lack of attention is encouraged by their role in the narrative, where the epiphanic nature of a scene is almost never given priority over the themes of the immediate context. Thus scholars who analyse Glaucus's epiphany at *Arg*. 1.1310-29 do so with a view

[30] This perhaps prefigures the odd prominence of Apollo, rather than the expected Venus, in *Aen*. 3.

[31] See Appendix 2. The smaller number of Odyssean epiphanies can be attributed in part to the poem's focus on a single hero and his patron goddess, rather than the collective focus of the *Iliad*.

[32] Those who do discuss all of these scenes often subdivide them by types of deity, thus losing any sense of unity (e.g. Klein 1931 225-45).

to establishing Heracles as the central figure of the Hylas episode.[33] Hecate's epiphany, if it is even discussed as such, is mentioned as an element of magic associated with Medea's protection of Jason.[34] Thetis's epiphany to Peleus and the intervention of the Nereids is discussed as emblematic of the distance between mortals and gods, as a clear example of Hera's patronage of the Argonauts, and as a parallel to Athena's intervention at the Symplegades.[35] Apollo's aetiological epiphanies, too, are often considered more remarkable for the insights they might provide into Apollonius's relationship with Callimachus than for their links to other epic epiphanies.[36]

Another factor which makes Apollonian epiphany difficult to study is its lack of narrative consistency. The epiphany scenes in the *Argonautica* are so different, both from one another and from Homeric epiphanies, that they seem to defy the possibility that Apollonius might be relying upon a consistent model. As in so many other aspects of his poetry, Apollonius's aversion to repetitive narrative forms and vocabulary seems to place his reader in the same position as his mortal characters: even if one can identify when a scene is an epiphany, how can one know what to expect during the encounter? As the following sections will argue, this is precisely Apollonius's goal. In his effort to foreground rather than gloss over the problems of representing the gods in an epic poem, Apollonius's epiphanies are bound together not by a recognizable structure but by a keen interest in manipulating the circumstances of recognition for both characters and readers.

The following survey has been divided into three sections. In the first, the four epiphanies of *Arg*. 1-3 (1.1310-29, 2.284-300, 2.669-719, 3.1211-24) are used to illustrate

---

[33] Händel 1954 27; Fränkel 1968 152; Vian 1974 42; Clauss 1993 202-4; DeForest 1994 67-8; Kyriakou 1995a 81; Clare 2002 95-8.

[34] de la Ville de Mirmont 1894 116, 140-4; Gillies 1928 xxxviii; Klein 1931 244; Hutchinson 1988 113; Thalmann 2011 154; Schaaf 2014 195-222.

[35] Klein 1931 34-7; Fränkel 1968 539; Clare 2002 139-44; Hunter 2015 193. On the relationship to the Symplegades episode, see Klein 1931 34-6; Händel 1954 92; Gaunt 1972 117-26; Hutchinson 1988 130-2; Hunter 1993 xxiii; Thalmann 2011 186.

[36] Hunter 1986 50-60; Zanker 1986 120; DeForest 1994 81; Harder 2012 1.4, 32-4; Hunter 2015 21-5.

how Apollonius introduces his reader to the theme of ambiguous recognition and his expansion of the types of encounter which may constitute an epic epiphany. Just as the reader begins to acclimate to these conditions, Apollonius provides his fullest account of an epiphanic encounter, drawing on the Odyssean context of *Arg*. 4 and the Iliadic pedigree of Thetis's relationship with Peleus (4.842-84). This scene still features Apollonian elements, such as a prominent role for a minor marine goddess and the ellipsis of certain motifs, but nevertheless represents the most comprehensive reworking of Homeric narrative conventions in the *Argonautica*. As such, it might be considered Apollonius's one "typical" epiphany. Finally, the remaining epiphanic encounters (4.1305-36, 1551-1622, 1701-30, 1731-64) are linked to one another by their context, by an interlocking series of percipients, and, above all, by a gradual departure from the Homeric tone of Thetis's epiphany and a corresponding return to the Apollonian motifs of aetiology and ambiguity.

Argonautica 1-3: The Ambiguities of Epiphanic Recognition

Despite the presence of several divine interventions in *Arg*. 1,[37] the first direct encounter between a mortal character and a god is Glaucus's epiphany at 1.1310-29. As the heroes belatedly discover the absence of Hylas, Heracles, and Polyphemus, they begin to quarrel (1.1289-1309).[38] Glaucus, introduced as divine Nereus's ὑποφήτης (1.1311),[39] appears to them from out of the sea (arrival, 1.1310). Rising up from the water, he must act forcefully to intervene, seizing the ship's keel (physical contact, 1.1313-4) and shouting at the heroes.[40] His speech heavily emphasizes the motif of prophecy as he reveals that Heracles is

[37] 1.109-14, 300-2, 524-6, 547-58, 614-5, 721-4, 850-2, 915-21 *inter alia*.

[38] For this quarrel as a struggle between different models of heroism, see DeForest 1994 67-8.

[39] On ὑποφήτης as an allusion to poetic figures in Theocritus's poetry, see Kyriakou 1995a 111-2.

[40] Clauss (1993 202-3) notes the appropriateness of Glaucus's grip on the stern, discussing an alternate tradition that he was the helmsman of the Argo.

not fated to continue with the Argonauts, but must resume his own interrupted quest if he is to be rewarded with immortality.[41] The only instruction which the god gives is that the heroes feel no remorse in leaving their comrade behind (present instructions, 1.1320). This is accompanied by a further prophecy relating the fates of Polyphemus and Hylas to local aetiological legends. As Glaucus departs beneath the waves (1.1326), the water is stirred up and pushes the ship farther out to sea (divine inspiration, 1.1327). The heroes collectively rejoice (emotional response, 1.1329) and are reconciled.

While the motifs are easy to identify, they are also few. With the exception of the heroes' emotional reaction, all the rest resemble the Homeric "divine purpose" motifs. Yet beyond settling a quarrel and confirming the scene's emphasis on Heracles, the epiphany serves little purpose and the god gives no further instructions.[42] More remarkable still is the fact that, in the total absence of any postponement motifs, there are also no explicit recognition motifs. The heroes' emotional response is more closely tied to their relief that their quarrel may be resolved and their concerns for Heracles set aside than it is to the fact that they have encountered a god. The narrative seems to assume that the heroes recognize Glaucus's divinity, but it devotes no space to this recognition.[43]

Another feature stands out immediately to an audience familiar with Homeric convention: the blatant lack of dramatic isolation. The line describing Glaucus's appearance is introduced by τοῖσιν (1.1310), the god appears to all the Argonauts and addresses them collectively (ἐσσυμένοισιν, 1.1314), and the heroes in turn react collectively (γήθησαν, 1.1329). While perhaps a nod to Iliadic precedent, where such "mass" epiphanies are located in the remote past (i.e. the heroic generation to which the Argonauts belong),[44] Glaucus's

---

[41] On parallel quests in the *Argonautica*, see Clare 2002 84-118.

[42] The absence of instructions is strangely prevalent in the early epiphanies of the *Argonautica*: cf. 2.669-84, 3.1211-24.

[43] It is unclear whether the heroes recognize Glaucus specifically or only his divinity.

[44] Cf. Nestor's account of Athena's epiphany to the Pylians during his youth (*Il*. 11.714-7).

appearance also evokes something of the tragic *deus ex machina* in its suddenness, purpose, and audience.[45]

In most studies where Glaucus's epiphany is discussed, it is in the context of its relationship to the scene of Hylas's abduction (1.1207-39), as the god's intervention provides resolution to the strife which ensues from Heracles's necessary departure from the primary action.[46] There is, however, another intriguing connection: in another context, the encounter between Hylas and the nymph might also have been cast as an epiphany. Yet Apollonius's Hylas seems unaware of the nymph's presence until it is too late, and she herself, inspired by Aphrodite, may be no more in control of her passions than the Medea of *Arg*. 3. As in Theocritus's account of the apotheosis of Hylas,[47] the scene's emphasis is on a character upon whom divinity will be bestowed, but here it is not Hylas. Only by motivating the removal of Heracles from the Argonauts' story and returning him to his own can Hylas's abduction lead to a true apotheosis.

Traditionally identified as a deified mortal himself,[48] Glaucus is an appropriate figure to reveal this information. However, as the first epiphany in the epic, his appearance has also hinted that epiphanic encounters in the *Argonautica* will not follow a straightforwardly Homeric model. Unlike the Olympian epiphanies which provide early motivation in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*,[49] this scene has featured a minor sea divinity appearing in a relatively purposeless encounter to a group audience, whose recognition is neither deliberately postponed nor openly expressed.

---

[45] Knight 1995 288; Kyriakou 1995a 111; Hutchinson 2006 120, 125. Cf. the aetiological prophecies of Artemis (Eur. *Hipp*. 1416-30) and Medea (Eur. *Med*. 1378-88).

[46] For the necessity of Heracles's departure, see n24-5 above; Knight 1995 131. On Heracles's continuing importance in the *Argonautica*, see Beye 1982 117; Feeney 1986 56-7; Feeney 1991 95-8; Fusillo 1985 51; Galinsky 1972 111-2; Goldhill 1991 314-5; Händel 1954 28-9; Kyriakou 1995a 82; Clare 2002 98.

[47] On the difficulty of determining a relative chronology for the Alexandrian poets, esp. with reference to this scene, see Gillies 1928 x-xii; Köhnken 1965 26-31; Fraser 1972 789; Vian 1974 39-43; Zanker 1987 85; Hutchinson 1988 88-9, 165, 192-8; DeForest 1994 11-5; Glei 2001 22-3.

[48] See Clauss 1993 202-3. Glaucus's deification is attested in Aeschylus (*Glaucus* fr. 28-9 Radt).

[49] *Il*. 1.194-222; *Od*. 1.95-324.

In Apollonius's second epiphany, Iris's appearance to the sons of Boreas (2.284-300) continues to highlight ambiguities in the heroes' relationship to the gods and their ability to recognize the divine. As the Boreads pursue the Harpies, aided by μένος from Zeus (2.275), the narrator says that they might even have torn the Harpies to pieces ἀέκητι θεῶν (2.284) had not Iris become aware of the situation (2.286) and intervened.[50] Journeying down from heaven (2.286-7) seemingly of her own accord,[51] the goddess asserts that it is not permitted for the heroes to strike the Harpies with their swords (instructions, 2.288-9). She promises to swear an oath that the creatures will henceforth leave Phineus in peace (prophecy, 2.289-90) and pours a libation from the Styx. The heroes yield and return to the Argo (change of setting, 2.295-6), providing the opportunity for a brief *aetion* on the name of the Strophades islands (2.296-7). Meanwhile, the Harpies depart to Crete and Iris to Olympus (departure, 2.298-300), and the narrative resumes its focus on Phineus and the Argonauts.

As in Glaucus's epiphany, the scene seems to assume the heroes' recognition of the goddess, or at least the fact of her divinity, without indicating precisely when or how this happens. Iris's invocation of Styx might serve as a hint of divinity which leads the heroes to assume her identity; on the other hand, some aspect of her arrival or appearance might have suggested her divinity, or the demigods might simply have recognized her as a goddess immediately. The text is unclear. Once again, while there have been no postponement motifs, there have also been no explicit recognition motifs.

By the time the Boreads have rejoined the Argonauts, however, recognition is assumed to have taken place. Making their own rather supernatural entrance (2.426-8), they inform their comrades ὅσσον ἄπωθεν / ἤλασαν, ἠδ' ὡς Ἶρις ἐρύκακε τάσδε δαΐξαι, / ὅρκιά τ' εὐμενέουσα θεὰ πόρεν ... (2.431-3). As in Glaucus's epiphany, the heroes rejoice rather at the

[50] On such "if ... not" situations in epic, see De Jong 1987 68-81; Nesselrath 1992 5-48. There is also a perplexing interaction between the Boreads' inspiration with μένος by Zeus and the allegation that Iris must intervene to stop the demigods from acting against the will of the gods. On the connection between μένος and divine support in Homer, cf. Daraki 1980 4-5.

[51] Paśkiewicz (1981 79) argues that Apollonius leaves his reader to imagine a conventional Olympian scene in which Iris receives orders from Zeus in order to avoid interrupting the Boreads' exciting pursuit, but it is typical that the poet omits this information (cf. Hunter 1986 51-2).

news than at their comrades' epiphanic experience (γηθόσυνοι ... ἀγγελίῃ, 2.435-6), and Jason affirms to Phineus that he enjoys the care of a god (affirmation, 2.438-40). In all of this, it is unclear whether the reference to Iris's specific identity represents the Boreads' focalization or the narrator's. Such imprecision in both the timing and extent of recognition is a marked departure from Homeric epiphanies, where the audience is always informed of the precise moment of recognition.[52] Once again, Apollonius has based the ambiguity of an epiphany on issues of perception and recognition.

This emerging theme continues in Apollo's epiphany to the Argonauts at Thynias (2.669-719), where Apollonius's interest in the aetiological function of epiphany comes to the fore. Within the immediate encounter, the god shows no awareness of the crew, gives no instructions, no prophecy – there is not a single "purpose" motif which might help to orient the reader to the scene's contextual function. Yet, remarkably, this is the only epiphany prior to *Arg*. 4 which involves a distinct moment of recognition.

The encounter is brief. As the Argonauts reach the island of Thynias just before dawn, Apollo arrives at the same location (2.674). Rather than marking the τέλος of his journey, however, this is only a waypoint as he travels from Lycia to the land of the Hyperboreans (2.674-5).[53] His golden hair, the silver bow and quiver, and the trembling of the island as he walks all combine in a vivid epiphanic moment (2.676-80) as the heroes experience an intense emotional response (θάμβος ... ἀμήχανον, 2.681) and avert their eyes before the god's splendour. Without a word or glance, Apollo continues on his way and departs (2.683-4).

The scene contains a mere five motifs (arrival, journey, epiphanic moment, intense emotional response, departure), only two of which specifically suggest the concept of

---

[52] Cf. *Od*. 1.420, 19.42-3, 22.205-9, where the moment of recognition is explicitly stated even though the percipient conceals it from those around him. Vergil employs this kind of ambiguity only once to illustrate the closeness between Turnus and his divine sister (see p198-9). Claiming to have recognized Juturna already at 12.222, Turnus does not explicitly acknowledge her until 12.632.

[53] This detail alone has sparked controversy among scholars. Some take it to imply that Apollo has no awareness of or purpose toward the Argonauts (e.g. Feeney 1991 76-7; Thalmann 2011 101), to which Hunter (1986 51-2) and Clare (2002 164) object. DeForest (1994 80-2, 137-8) argues that it signals Apollo's disregard for the Argonauts' journey altogether – a shocking attitude for the god to whom the Argonauts pray most often.

epiphany. As seems by now to be typical in Apollonian epiphanies, there is no dramatic isolation; all the heroes perceive Apollo's presence equally. For the first time, the reader is presented with an epiphanic moment and a clear moment of recognition. Strangely, though, while Apollo later provides the Argonauts with a sacrificial animal for their rites, the god shows no awareness of the Argonauts during their actual encounter and no intention of engaging with them directly. As an epiphany, it is an extraordinary scene in which the god's purpose has nothing to do with his percipients.[54] The resulting disjunction between Apollo's apparent lack of regard for the Argonauts, the reader's uncertainty about whether such an encounter might even be called an epiphany,[55] and the Argonauts' clear and immediate conclusion that it does brings the *Argonautica*'s problematization of recognition to a new level, where it becomes not only a question of recognizing when a character is experiencing an epiphany but of reconciling differing perspectives when the definitions of the same encounter by performer, percipient, and reader are so divergent.

The reader's disorientation becomes even more acute in the final epiphany of this section, in which Jason summons Hecate but is instructed by Medea to depart without allowing himself to see the goddess (3.1211-24). Usually discussed in passing as a sacrifice or as a further development of Medea's chthonic affiliations,[56] Hecate's approach acquires an epiphanic tone through its effect on the natural world, by which Jason is able to sense the goddess's approach without ever perceiving it directly. As she emerges κευθμῶν ἐξ ὑπάτων (journey, 3.1213), the goddess's physical description, along with the flashing torches and baying hounds (3.1214-7), all suggest her specific identity.[57] Indeed, nature reacts to her

---

[54] Hunter (1986 51) notes the potential danger of catching a god unaware (cf. Call. *Bath of Pallas* 100-2). See also Teufel 1939 167-88.

[55] Some (e.g. Clare 2002 163) have even interpreted Apollo's appearance as a poetic description of the sunrise, thus reducing the physicality of the god's presence to mere metonymy.

[56] de la Ville de Mirmont 1894 113-44; Gillies 1928 xxxviii, 59, 116-8; Beye 1982 134-5; Thalmann 2011 154. For epiphanic models (e.g. *HAp*, *HDem*), see Vian 1980 145; Hunter 1989 231-2. The scene also appears to have been influenced by tragic representations of necromancy (e.g. Aesch. *Persae* 681-702).

[57] Hunter 1989 231.

approach as if to a clear epiphanic moment, as the meadows shake and the nymphs wail (intense emotional response, 3.1218-20). Jason, too, is gripped by fear (3.1221), but this must be a reaction to a very different set of perceptions – not the sight of Hecate's approach, but the sounds and lights and frightening response of nature itself.[58] To Jason, these can only suggest Hecate's presence, which he assumes based on Medea's information. As such, it is difficult to determine whether they can represent an epiphanic moment from his perspective or merely a vivid hint, but this is precisely the point: the encounter is not meant to fit a clear framework whereby the reader might comfortably define it.

This, then, is the reader's experience of epiphany in the first three books of the *Argonautica*. Each scene is brief, containing only a minimal number of motifs.[59] Apollonius's use of Homeric narrative elements is sufficient in the first two scenes to lend them a familiar aura, which serves primarily to highlight where he has diverged from tradition. These divergences revolve around two themes: the ambiguous circumstances of recognition and a striking expansion of epic epiphany to include local and infernal deities, the dramatic *deus ex machina*, and the aetiological encounter. By the time the reader begins to accept Apollonius's variations upon these themes, s/he arrives at the epiphanies of Apollo and Hecate, where recognition has become not only ambiguous but problematic and the gods act without any apparent "purpose" motifs.

Apollonius's "Homeric" Epiphany: Peleus and Thetis, *Arg*. 4.842-84

Having begun to acclimate to the ambiguous conditions of Apollonius's epiphanies, the reader arrives at the final book. By now, it seems reasonable to expect epiphanies to be sudden and brief, group epiphanies and aetiologies to feature prominently, and recognition to

[58] Cf. *HAph* 68-74; *Il*. 13.23-31; Thgn. *El*. 1.5-10. For the natural world as a possible percipient of epiphany, see Petridou 2015 2.

[59] Hunter (1986 51-2) also emphasizes the suddenness of most epiphanies, as Apollonius tends not to prepare his readers by describing the god's awareness and intentions in an introductory divine scene.

be either elliptical or problematic. As the Argonauts begin to encounter dangers familiar from the *Odyssey*, however, the tone and style of the narrative change. Commentators have often remarked on the decidedly Homeric character of the episodes that take place on the journey from the Planctae to Libya,[60] which is marked not only by the notable absence of *aetia* in these passages[61] but also by the exchange of the magical elements of *Arg*. 3 for a more traditional reliance upon divine intervention.[62] In this new thematic context, Apollonius's treatment of epiphany takes a turn toward a more recognizably Homeric form in a scene already enriched by the reader's knowledge of Homer: the visit of Thetis to her mortal husband as he sits alone on the shore.

After so many strange and brief epiphanies, Thetis's appearance to Peleus is part of a remarkably detailed series of divine interventions. Introduced by the lengthy preparations of Hera, the scene anticipates the striking passage in which the Nereids toss the Argo through the Planctae like Nausicaa's handmaidens their ball.[63] In its own right, though, the scene is significant for its relatively full engagement with the Homeric epiphany motifs. It is the first epiphany in the poem to contain all of the "setting the stage" motifs, including an unambiguous indication of dramatic isolation. There is also a nearly complete complement of "divine purpose" motifs, of which only the divine inspiration is absent. The absence of postponement motifs is by now typical of Apollonius, but here at least the reader may find a logical explanation in the intimate, if strained, relationship between spouses. Since Thetis appears only to her husband, it seems natural that recognition can be assumed and that an epiphanic moment may be omitted.

Thetis's awareness of the Argonauts' situation comes from Hera (4.789-90, 822-32), who in turn has been informed of it by Iris at 4.753-6. When Thetis agrees to assist Hera in

---

[60] Vian 1974 xxvii-xxviii; Dufner 1988 56-244; Hutchinson 1988 101-4; Knight 1995 123, 152-60; Kyriakou 1995a 21-33, 60-80; Clare 2002 124-59; Hunter 2015 14-21.

[61] Hunter 2015 16-7.

[62] Knight 1995 159.

[63] Gaunt 1972 121; Hunter 2015 17, 213.

protecting the Argo,[64] she enlists the help of her fellow Nereids (preparations, 4.838-46) before approaching the heroes (journey, 4.847-52). Upon arriving at their camp, Thetis appears to Peleus alone (arrival and dramatic isolation, 4.852-4), touching his hand to get his attention (physical contact, 4.852-3). Her speech informs him that the Argonauts should set sail at dawn, aided by the Nereids in their course past the Planctae, and instructs him not to acknowledge her to his comrades when she returns (present and future instructions, 4.856-63). If he should fail to fulfill these instructions, she will become even more angry than when he intervened to stop her from making Achilles immortal (prophecy, 4.863-4). She then departs (4.865), and Peleus is stricken with grief (intense emotional response, 4.866) as he recalls the events to which Thetis refers. Despite these painful reminiscences, he relates her commands to the rest of the crew, and they set sail the following morning (fulfillment of instructions and change of setting, 4.885f.). Eventually, Thetis returns with the Nereids in a responding epiphany (4.930-67) to guide the Argo past the Planctae. Peleus's absence from the narrative at this stage suggests his fulfillment of Thetis's instructions for discretion.

The reader's appreciation of the whole scene is coloured by a knowledge of Homer – of the contrast between Thetis's affectionate interactions with her son, similarly isolated from his comrades on the beach, and her coldness toward his father. Embedded within a distinctly Odyssean context and featuring a relationship of Iliadic pedigree, this scene appropriately contains Apollonius's fullest engagement with the conventions of Homeric epiphany. Even so, it also epitomizes many Apollonian features. While the omission of the postponement and recognition phases of the encounter can be attributed to the nature of Thetis's relationship with her percipient, it is also typical of Apollonius's elliptical style of epiphany. The poem's most elaborately narrated epiphany features a minor sea goddess and uses the formality of the Homeric motifs to represent her aloofness from her mortal husband.[65]

---

[64] On this exchange, see Herter 1959 40-54; Natzel 1992 153-8; Hunter 1993 97-100; Mori 2012 319-36.

[65] On Thetis's emotional distance, see Klein 1931 33; Händel 1954 79-80. On parallels between Thetis's situation and that of Aphrodite in *HAph*, see Mirto 2011 279-305.

Arg. 4.1313-1781: A Gradual Decrescendo

In the four remaining epiphanies of *Arg*. 4, this detailed and formal representation of epiphany gradually subsides as the Argonauts travel farther from the Odyssean world and enter uncharted territories, where the pathless terrain and potential for aetiology bring the treatment of epiphany gradually back to the patterns of the first three books.

When the heroes find themselves stranded in Libya, they nearly perish but for the help of the local heroines.[66] Closely associated with multiple Odyssean episodes,[67] this encounter maintains a surprisingly formal register in its description of Jason's recognition. The goddesses meet him at midday[68] (arrival, 4.1313-4). As they gently lift away his cloak (physical contact, 4.1314), Jason averts his eyes out of reverence and fear (intense emotional response after an apparent moment of recognition, 4.1315-6), and they appear to him alone (dramatic isolation, 4.1316). Their speech contains the motifs of epiphanic moment (4.1322-3), announcement (4.1323), present instructions (4.1324-5), and future instructions (4.1325-8). They depart (4.1330) before their voices fade away. Jason responds with a prayer and affirmation of divinity (4.1333), but then admits that he is mystified by the heroines' future instructions. He fulfills their present instructions by rising and calling together his comrades (4.1337-8), to whom he relates the encounter in full. Hunter has highlighted the combination of repetition, variation, and new material in Jason's account, by which he argues that the hero attempts to make sense of this riddling encounter by assimilating it to "familiar" epic conventions of epiphany.[69] The Argonauts react to this account with astonishment (ἐθάμβεον, 4.1363). When a marvelous portent appears, Peleus is finally able to interpret the

---

[66] On this scene generally, see Hunter 2001 101-4. On Greek heroine cults, see Larson 1995; Lyons 1997.

[67] Odyssean models for the heroines include Ino, Calypso, the Sirens, and Teiresias. See Livrea 1973 372-3; Hunter 1988 440; Feeney 1991 92; Hunter 1993 126; Knight 1995 78; Kyriakou 1995b 260; Clare 2002 154-9; Thalmann 2011 80; Hunter 2015 259-60.

[68] For midday as a common time for epiphanic encounters in remote locations, see Petridou 2015 211-4.

[69] Hunter (2015 263-4) notes that Jason's use of ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς (4.1350, cf. 1313-4) and ἀχλύς and νέφος (4.1361-2) seem to be "translations" of the actual event into standard epic language.

goddesses' future instructions, which the heroes fulfill at once (4.1383-92) by carrying the Argo across the Libyan desert until they arrive at Lake Triton (change of setting).

Like Thetis's epiphany, this scene contains a relatively full set of motifs, with the characteristic omission of the postponement phase. Continuing the book's Homeric style, there is a clear statement of dramatic isolation and a verbal declaration of identity which implies an epiphanic moment, and Jason's retelling of the encounter shows him trying to understand it based on what he thinks ought to occur in an epiphany. However, these nods to convention contain subtle Apollonian twists. Although Jason is the sole percipient of the heroines' epiphany, he must consult all his comrades in order to interpret their instructions. While the heroes express the typical emotional reaction of θάμβος, it is not Jason but Peleus who provides the correct interpretation for their collective course of action.[70]

The scene once again reflects Apollonius's preoccupation with the theme of recognition. Unlike in the poem's earliest epiphanies, though, it is not the absence of motifs which is striking, but their pace and relative formality. When the heroines approach Jason, he averts his eyes in fear. He has clearly recognized their divinity and thus experiences an immediate moment of recognition. Such an early response is unusual in the *Argonautica*. Even in hymnic and Homeric precedents, this kind of reaction typically follows a lengthy postponement phase, when the percipient fears he has offended the visiting (usually Olympian) god with his ignorance.[71] The result is a somewhat naive picture of Jason who, when faced with local goddesses on his own, is able to recognize their divinity immediately but reacts with unusual intensity and is unable to understand their instructions without help.[72] Furthermore, Jason's fear and downturned eyes are more appropriate to a hymnic encounter

---

[70] For Jason's failure to understand as a potential breakdown of epic structures and a danger to the Argonauts' return, see Hunter 2001 101-3. On Peleus's characteristic role of calm composure, see Carspecken 1952 116-7; Hutchinson 1988 136; Griffiths 2012 3-6, 18-21; Hunter 2015 266. Griffiths (2012 6) and Hunter (2015 266) note that Peleus, as the recipient of divine horses from Zeus, is a logical interpreter of this omen.

[71] Cf. *HAph* 181-3, *Od*. 16.179.

[72] For criticism of Jason as an epic hero, see e.g. Bowra 1933 221; Carspecken 1952 99-111; Lawall 1966 119-69; DeForest 1994 9-11, 47-69. Cf. Beye 1969 31-55; Herter 1973 36; Vian 1980 32-8; Zanker 1987 202-4; Hutchinson 1988 85; Natzel 1992 181-96. Further bibliography in Hunter 1988 436; Glei 2001 6-13.

than an epic setting,[73] yet the aetiological and cult aspects of hymnic epiphanies do not feature in this scene, despite Apollonius's interest in these elements elsewhere.

Having fulfilled the heroines' instructions and reached Lake Triton, the Argonauts struggle to find the sea. When Orpheus advises them to leave a propitiatory gift to the local gods,[74] Triton arrives (4.1551-2) disguised as a young man (1551). Picking up a clod of earth, he offers it to them. His speech contains his present instructions (4.1554) and the epiphanic moment (1558-60). In response, Euphemus comes forward to receive the clod of earth (divine inspiration and fulfillment of present instructions, 4.1562-3) and asks the way to the sea.[75] Triton instructs them how to proceed (future instructions, 4.1578-85), and the Argonauts immediately comply (fulfillment, 1586-8). The god, meanwhile, takes the offered tripod and disappears beneath the waves (departure, 4.1589-90), whereupon the heroes rejoice that they have met a deity (intense emotional response, 1591-2) and affirm his divinity with sacrifices (1593-4, 1597-1600). Triton soon returns in his own form in a responding epiphany (4.1602-19). Grasping the Argo's keel (physical contact, 4.1609-10), he guides the ship to the open sea (divine inspiration and change of setting, 1617-18) before disappearing once more.

This scene continues the relatively detailed development observed in the previous two epiphanies, but resumes still more of the distinctly Apollonian features of the first three books. This intermediate status is illustrated by the close focus on Triton's interaction with Euphemus, which resembles the typically one-on-one encounters of Homeric epic,[76] surrounded by references to the larger group as percipients. While these components were separated from one another in the heroines' epiphany, they have begun to merge back into a single scene. On the issue of perception, Feeney highlights this scene as Apollonius's most

---

[73] See Sowa (1984 241), who notes that hymnic epiphanies feature interactions between gods and ordinary mortals, while epic features those between gods and heroes. Cf. *HAph* 182; *Od*. 16.178-85 (see p64).

[74] On Orpheus as a religious expert, see Carspecken 1952 118; Clare 2002 238-40; Hunter 2015 272.

[75] On Euphemus's importance in the *Argonautica*, see DeForest 1994 139-42. On his role in *Arg*. 4, see Knight 1995 41; Hunter 2015 291. See also Köhnken 2005 70-5.

[76] Feeney (1991 79) identifies as Homeric Triton's assumption of a human name, his swift disappearance, and the heroes' recognition of the fact that they have encountered a disguised god.

extended play on the nature of the gods and their representation in poetry, for the god appears first like a sturdy man (αἰζηῷ ἐναλίγκιος, 4.1551) and then returns in his own form, which is compared to a man whose body is exactly like the immortals (1603-12).[77] Finally, the clod of earth looks forward to the heavily aetiological context of the poem's final epiphanies.[78]

Having now left behind situations with any Odyssean parallels, the Argonauts' next epiphanic encounter returns to the brief and prominently aetiological treatment which featured in *Arg*. 1-3. When the Argonauts lose their way on the sea,[79] their prayers summon Apollo to their aid. Unlike in his previous epiphany,[80] Apollo now appears deliberately to the Argonauts, with his awareness, journey, and arrival being described at 4.1706-8. The light which gleams from his bow (4.1709) might be considered a hint of divinity, an epiphanic moment, or a divine inspiration enabling the crew to find their way. However, it might just as easily be interpreted as a portent or miracle rather than as an epiphanic motif.[81] Apollo's appearance at Anaphe functions almost solely as an *aetion*, as his light illuminates the island where the Argonauts construct his shrine[82] and he still does not interact directly with the heroes. Once again, it is not their recognition of the god which is problematic, but the reader's uncertainty as to how to define this encounter.

Finally, Euphemus's dream of the divine clod of earth functions as a kind of responding epiphany to that of Triton, partly because it builds upon the god's gift and partly because it allows the Argonauts to determine his specific identity at last (4.1752, cf. 4.1597). It also maintains the prominent function of aetiology to the end of the poem, forming part of a

---

[77] Feeney 1991 79. For Homeric parallels in these lines, see also Campbell 1981 87-8.

[78] See below for discussion.

[79] On parallels with the Libyan episode, see Clare 2002 159; Thalmann 2011 82-3.

[80] On the relationship between Apollo's two epiphanies, see e.g. Pfister 1924 284-6; Faerber 1932 89; Händel 1954 39n1; Hunter 1986 50; DeForest 1994 137-8.

[81] Cf. Call. *Hymn to Apollo*, which emphasizes the god's epiphanic role. See Bremmer 2005 20.

[82] There is an etymological play on the island's name at 4.1717-8 (Ἀνήφην δέ τε λισσάδα νῆσον / ἴσκον, ὃ δὴ Φοῖβός μιν ἀτυζομένοις ἀνέφηνεν). The cult of Apollo Aigletes is attested from the late sixth century (*IG* XII 3, 259-60, 412). Bremmer 2005 19-27; Hunter 2015 311.

"diptych" of island creation alongside Apollo's appearance at Anaphe.[83] In this final episode, the Argonauts' journey thus acquires a new scale of significance, as Apollonius attributes both the creation of Greek islands and the Greek presence in North Africa to their journey.[84] The aetiological function of epiphany is once again its primary motivation.

As the Argonauts leave Anaphe, Euphemus recalls a dream from the previous night. While nursing the clod of earth, he saw it transform into a young woman (disguise, 4.1736). Filled with desire, he made love to her (physical contact, 1737), but was gripped by powerful regret. The woman comforted him by declaring herself the daughter of Triton and Libya (epiphanic moment, 4.1741) and instructed him to entrust her to the Nereids near Anaphe (future instructions, 4.1743-4). In exchange, she would return to nurse his descendants (prophecy, 4.1744-5). When Euphemus recounts these things to Jason, the latter recalls his knowledge of Apollo's prophecies. It was Triton, he says, who gave Euphemus the clod of earth (announcement, 4.1752), thus bequeathing a portion of Libyan territory to his descendants. Rejoicing, Euphemus fulfills the nymph's instructions by casting the clod into the sea (4.1756-7). From that place arises the island of Calliste (*aetion*, 4.1757-64).

Unusually for an epic epiphany, but more like dreams in ancient drama, this encounter is not narrated as it happens but is recalled after the fact.[85] As a dream it naturally involves a dramatic isolation, but the nature of its retelling breaks that isolation by relating it to the reader at the same time that Euphemus relates it to Jason. Like Jason earlier in *Arg*. 4, the dream's percipient must rely on another to interpret its meaning. Over the course of the final book, there has thus been an interlocking series of percipients as each fails to comprehend his own encounter but is able to interpret that of another. Peleus's usual calm is momentarily disrupted by the emotional turmoil of Thetis's visit; he goes on to interpret the heroines' instructions. Jason is at a loss to understand these goddesses, but resolves Euphemus's doubts

[83] Hunter 2015 312.

[84] Hunter 2015 14. See Jackson (1987 23-30) for an alternate theory of the episode's function.

[85] Cf. Aes. *Persae* 176-200; Eur. *IT* 44-55.

about the meaning of his dream. Euphemus, in turn, features prominently in the epiphanies of both Triton and his daughter. This interrelationship helps to link the final epiphanies of the *Argonautica* to one another in a way that distinguishes them from the contextual isolation of earlier encounters, yet in a way which still foregrounds the issue of recognition.

Conclusions

Having surveyed the major Apollonian epiphanies, a few trends have become apparent. In his treatment of traditional motifs, Apollonius is extremely selective. Drawing almost exclusively from the "setting-the-stage" and "divine purpose" motifs, Apollonius systematically omits all motifs that pertain to the postponement phase.[86] Despite the gods' apparent lack of interest in concealing their identities, very few scenes include an explicit moment of recognition, although several assume that it has taken place when the heroes go on to utter post-recognition motifs. From a structural perspective, then, Apollonius's epiphanies are generally brief and highly elliptical, leaving the reader to infer critical information.

Apollonius's method of describing these encounters varies across the poem in a sort of arc. Beginning with the epiphanies of Glaucus and Iris, he introduces his major themes of ambiguous recognition and purpose, which are taken to an extreme in those of Apollo and Hecate; the tone rises to its most formal and Homeric in Thetis's epiphany before gradually subsiding over the course of the remaining encounters. This treatment parallels the Argonauts' journey, as the heroes move from relatively familiar terrain into a world of magic and danger; they then return via a self-consciously Homeric path, only to find themselves in places devoid of direction which allow their every move to make its mark on the landscape. Apollonius thus resists any tendency toward systematizing his representation of epiphany,

[86] The sole exceptions are the disguises of Triton and his daughter (4.1551, 1736). See Chew 2011 213.

acknowledging Homeric convention when it is contextually appropriate but showing clearly that he has not made this the usual mode of epiphany in the world of the *Argonautica*.

The resulting lack of narrative consistency across the epiphany scenes is emblematic of Apollonius's treatment of the gods more generally, which aims to highlight rather than ignore the problems of representing divinity in a narrative context. Thus, there is no typical encounter between man and god from which either character or reader might acquire a template to understand subsequent scenes. The arc traced above foregrounds the arbitrariness of the poet's choice of representation, and there is even a sense of arbitrariness in the choice to include an epiphany in a passage at all. This becomes particularly striking when the poet's narrative purpose overrides any sense of internal purpose, as in the case of the purely aetiological epiphany at Thynias, where the god takes no notice of his percipients and has no "divine purpose" toward them. This obvious divergence from the Homeric narrator's openness about the motivations of his epiphanic performers is one of the ways in which Apollonius works to expand the definition of epic epiphany (and the scope of the genre itself), as he includes in his poem a *deus ex machina*, erotic dreams, infernal sacrifices, and, most frequently, the aetiological epiphany.[87]

Above all, the epiphanies are linked by a keen interest in problematizing recognition. Over the course of the poem, the reader encounters epiphanies in which recognition is assumed to have happened but never explicitly stated. The Argonauts clearly recognize Apollo's appearances as epiphanic, but the god's indifference leads the reader to question this conclusion. Although Jason summons Hecate, he is forbidden to perceive her presence and recognition is displaced onto the natural world. Peleus recognizes his divine wife instantly, but their reunion is conducted with the most formal conventions of the poem. In the final book, an interlocking series of percipients highlights the disorienting effect of contact with the gods, while clarity is to be found in mortals not party to the original encounter. Jason's

[87] Pfister (1924 284-5) notes that Apollonius features epiphanies from several of his categories, including examples of what he identifies as epic, legendary, and fairytale epiphanies.

recognition of the heroines is immediate and formal, but does not help him to interpret their instructions. Instead, Peleus interprets them with the help of an omen, and Jason goes on to identify Triton by interpreting Euphemus's dream. Triton's epiphany is described in language which seems designed to assist in visualizing the god's appearance, but which provides the reader with no real information about the god who looks like a man who looks like a god.

While this interest in recognition is only one aspect of these scenes, it is clearly a guiding principle in Apollonius's treatment of epiphany. The absence of a consistent narrative pattern illustrates this principle on the broadest scale, as Apollonius evokes but does not systematically adopt the conventions which make Homeric epiphanies so recognizable as a group. As the reader struggles alongside the Argonauts to understand their encounters with the gods, it gradually becomes clear that many of the irregularities in these scenes have been designed as part of Apollonius's exploration of the ways in which epiphanic recognition may be complicated. Once the reader recognizes this, the scenes can begin to make sense as a set, unified by their deliberate lack of unity.

6

Vergilian Epiphanies and the Homeric Scene Pattern

> *... avertens rosea cervice refulsit,*
> *ambrosiaeque comae divinum vertice odorem*
> *spiravere; pedes vestis defluxit ad imos,*
> *et vera incessu patuit dea*.
>
> ... As she turned away, her rosy neck gleamed,
> and her ambrosial hair exuded a divine scent
> from her head; her dress fell down to her feet,
> and the true goddess was revealed by her step.
>
> Vergil *Aeneid* 1.402-5

In many ways, Vergil's *Aeneid* is a natural successor to be considered alongside the analysis of the Homeric poems in Part I. Continuing the story of the Trojan refugees in a time which is mythologically parallel to the wanderings of Odysseus, Vergil makes use of many of the same characters, both human and divine, as his predecessor. These characters, for the most part, resemble their Homeric counterparts, now blended with new Roman identities. While in the course of the *Aeneid* its hero must move gradually away from the Homeric world of *Aen*. 2 and 3 and toward a new style of leadership, the poem assumes as its starting point the world of the Homeric heroes.

In his treatment of epiphany, too, Vergil signals his intention to begin from a Homeric framework. While the previous chapter's analysis of Apollonius's *Argonautica* has shown that there were a variety of new ways in which Vergil might choose to represent epiphany, the extreme formality of Venus's epiphany to her son at 1.314-417 overloads the reader with Homeric motifs in a scene where they might not otherwise be expected, given the familial relationship between performer and percipient. More than anything else, this almost excessive adherence to the conventions of Homeric epiphany suggests to the reader that these

motifs will provide the framework for all subsequent epiphanies in the *Aeneid*. The present chapter will examine how Vergil engages with this framework, highlighting his adoption of Homeric narrative patterns and infusion of elements from other literary genres, material culture, and contemporary Roman ritual and philosophy.

Subsequent chapters will build on this analysis by considering the range of characters to whom Vergil extends an epiphanic role and the extent to which their agency may be limited by ties to the mortal sphere. Chapter 7 will explore three scenes which feature Vergil's expanded cast of epiphanic deities: one a local god, whose agency is limited by the physical boundaries of his sphere of influence; one a recently-deified nymph, whose continuing attachment to her mortal family reduces the effectiveness of her epiphany; and one a deceased mortal, whose death grants him access to divine knowledge but restricts his ability to share this with the living. Finally, Chapter 8 will briefly explore how (indeed, whether) the *Aeneid* allows Aeneas's future divinity to be expressed in terms of epiphany.

The Gods and Epiphany in the *Aeneid*

The subject of the gods in the *Aeneid* has filled countless pages of scholarly research.[1] For some, Vergil's gods represent the various aspects of the Stoic supreme deity;[2] others have offered interpretations of certain gods in symbolic or psychological terms,[3] while still others see them as distinct beings, with individual wishes and abilities as in Homer.[4] By far the most prevalent line of analysis comments on Vergil's deft blending of literary, philosophical, and religious influences in his portrayal of the Olympians who help or hinder Aeneas's progress

[1] For general introductions to the gods and religion in the *Aeneid*, see Heinze 1915 291-318; Bailey 1935; Boyancé 1963; Camps 1969 41-50; Kühn 1971; Coleman 1982; Feeney 1991 129-87.

[2] Heinze 1915 291-2; Bailey 1935 204-40.

[3] Heinze 1915 304-10; Pöschl 1950 29-41 *et passim*. (on Allecto); Klingner 1967 514 (on Amata and Allecto); Quinn 1968 316-20; Hardie 1986 *passim*. Horsfall 1995 138 considers Iris's alternating status as goddess and meteorological phenomenon. Cf. Feeney 1991 129-55.

[4] Heinze 1915 298; Camps 1969 41; Häußler 1976 270-1; Coleman 1982 144-68.

toward Italy.[5] Particular attention has been paid to Jupiter's relationship to the Stoic concept of *fatum*[6] and to Venus's ambiguous character and relationship with her son.[7] Vergil's approach to his varied source materials is famously established in the opening lines of the poem, where key terms of Stoic determinism (*fatum*, 1.2) and Epicurean free will (*casus*, 1.8) frame the epic wrath of Juno before the poet poses the provocative question *tantaene animis caelestibus irae?* (1.11)[8] The result of this confluence of seemingly opposing systems is immediately to disarm those readers who seek to find specific views supported by a central meaning of the *Aeneid* and to challenge them from the start to evaluate possible intersections (or divergences) among poetic, philosophical, and religious portrayals of the gods.[9]

It has also been observed that Vergil's gods, like Apollonius's, keep themselves at a greater distance from mortals, intervening less often than their Homeric counterparts and refraining from participating directly in the events they seek to influence.[10] Consequently, and in part also due to more contemporary influences such as that of Stoic philosophy, the *Aeneid* depicts a wide array of methods for the communication of divine will: direct visitations, dream visions, oracles, omens, portents, and prodigies.[11] Of these, the direct visitations and

---

[5] Heinze 1915 292; Bailey 1935 1-4; Lee 1979 23-9; Coleman 1982 143-4; Perret 1985 333-5; Hardie 1986 *passim*; Williams 1987 130-3; Parker 1989 181-90; Feeney 1991 129-42, 178-80; Horsfall 1995 138-42; Braund 1997 204-21. See also Lyne 1987 61-94. Thornton (1976 *passim*) argues for the physical, moral, and religious coherence of the *Aeneid* cosmos. Pötscher (1977 *passim*) emphasizes Stoic and contemporary religious influences. On the humorous effect of such juxtapositions, see Lloyd 1976/7; Ahl 2012.

[6] Heinze 1915 293-4, 241-42; Otis 1964 225-6; Kühn 1971 23-5; Häußler 1976 269-70; Pötscher 1977 138; Lee 1979 24; Coleman 1982 157-61; Wlosok 1983 197-202; Hardie 1986 143; Lyne 1987 71-99; Parker 1989 183; Feeney 1991 140-1, 154-5; Horsfall 1995 139-40; Schmidt 2000 167-8.

[7] Anderson 1955 233-8; Wlosok 1967; Block 1981 27-61; Reckford 1995 1-42; Leach 1997 347-71; S. J. Harrison 2007 226-9. Cf. Quinn (1968 106), who finds *Aen*. 1.315-417 unsatisfactory compared with the episodes surrounding it and devotes less than a paragraph to Venus's epiphany.

[8] Coleman 1982 143; Ahl 2012 15. While *casus* does not have direct Epicurean resonances, it is used by Cicero (*DND* 1.91) to describe the happenstance inherent in an Epicurean understanding of the cosmos. For additional Platonist and Pythagorean influences, especially in *Aen*. 6, see Braund 1997 210; Ahl 2012 14-5.

[9] Block 1981 19-20; Ahl 2012 15.

[10] Segal 1968 429-30; Highet 1972 26-7; Coleman 1982 145; Lyne 1987 65; Feeney 1991 182-3; Leach 1997 364. On further distinctions between men and gods in the *Aeneid*, see Feeney 1983 213-4.

[11] On dreams in the *Aeneid*, see Stearns 1927; Steiner 1952. On prodigies, see Kleinknecht 1963; Grassmann-Fischer 1966; Stockinger 1969 99-109.

dream visions (whether of gods or of deceased mortals[12]) follow the Homeric paradigm for epiphany as a private experience; the remaining categories represent more public manifestations of divine will familiar from Roman cult and philosophy, capable of reaching large groups of percipients but also allowing the possibility of misinterpretation.[13]

Despite many attempts to distinguish the various types of divine communication in the *Aeneid*[14] and otherwise general efforts to identify parallel scenes in Homeric epic,[15] there have been relatively few discussions of the epiphany scenes as part of their own internal system. Kühn surveys every scene in which at least one god participates, but these are not limited to divine interactions with mortals.[16] Kidder discusses the six mortal likenesses assumed by gods during such encounters, noting that the identities are deliberately selected to facilitate the giving of advice and that the revelation of the god's divinity is portrayed differently each time.[17] Lesueur notes that disguise is essentially reserved for gods who hinder Aeneas's mission, especially in connection with Juno, and that direct interaction with a disguised god tends to have grave consequences for the mortals involved, regardless of whether recognition occurs.[18]

However, the simultaneous flexibility and formality which defines the Homeric epiphany scene pattern seems particularly well-suited to Vergil's method of engaging with traditional material, prompting the question of how much he has opted to preserve of this archetypal pattern and how much he may have altered. It is evident from Vergil's writing that

---

[12] According to Heinze (1915 313), these are almost the same thing ("fast gleich steht").

[13] Cf. Coleman (1982 145), who distinguishes among internal motivation (private dreams and visions), interventions in the external world, and an intermediate category of oracles and portents, which belong to the external world but affect the mind of the percipient directly.

[14] See Heinze 1915 311-8 for a comprehensive survey.

[15] E.g. Knauer 1964 76 on Aeneas's dream of Tiberinus; Coleman 1982 152 on Juno's rescue of Turnus.

[16] Kühn 1971.

[17] Kidder 1937 33-7.

[18] Lesueur 1988 92-4. Cf. the effects of Cupid's undetected presence at 1.657-722. On Venus's disguise in *Aen*. 1, Lesueur argues that this encounter takes place when Aeneas is an exile without a clear vision of his mission and that she will appear openly to him once he has reached Italy as a great leader (1988 98-9).

he was intimately familiar with both the Homeric poems and the scholarly tradition surrounding them.[19] The latter was concerned with Homer's representation of epiphany from an early date, and particularly with the circumstances of recognition and its immediate aftermath.[20] Yet, as the previous chapter's survey of Apollonian epiphanies reveals, there were also new ways to portray epic epiphanies by Vergil's time.

Upon examination, it becomes clear that Vergil has deliberately opted to build his epiphany scenes on the Homeric model, which he keeps largely intact. This can be illustrated through two exemplary scenes, discussed below.[21] First, though, an understanding of some general trends in Vergil's deployment of this inherited pattern can offer insights into where epiphany stands in relation to the many forms of divine intervention modeled in the *Aeneid*.

As in Homer, each epiphany in the *Aeneid* places emphasis on a different part of the encounter, and no two scenes involve the same combination of motifs. In the thirteen divine epiphanies during which recognition takes place,[22] every motif identified in the Homeric scenes appears at least once. Every epiphany details the god's arrival and establishes the dramatic isolation,[23] and nearly all involve divine instructions and their fulfillment by the percipient. The heaviest emphasis is placed on the "recognition" and "purpose" motifs, which tend to dominate the scenes; at the other extreme, only six "postponement" motifs appear in the entire poem excepting a complete set in Venus's disguised appearance to Aeneas outside

---

[19] Schlunk 1974 *passim*.

[20] Nünlist 2009 267-81.

[21] For reasons of space, I will not discuss every Vergilian epiphany scene. Instead, I have selected those epiphanies which seem to me to be most representative of the topics discussed in each chapter.

[22] 1.314-417 and 2.589-623 (Venus to Aeneas), 3.147-91 (Penates to Aeneas), 4.238-78 and 4.554-70 (Mercury to Aeneas), 6.185-211 (Venus's doves to Aeneas), 7.406-74 (Allecto to Turnus), 8.28-67 (Tiberinus to Aeneas), 8.608-16 (Venus to Aeneas), 9.1-24 (Iris to Turnus), 9.638-63 (Apollo to Ascanius), 10.215-48 (ship-nymphs to Aeneas), 12.468-886 (Juturna to Turnus). Additional divine interventions which go unrecognized include 1.695-722. (Cupid in Carthage), 5.604-85 (Iris and the Trojan women), 10.633-52 (Juno rescuing Turnus), and 12.222-67. (Juturna urging the Rutulians to break the truce). When Venus heals Aeneas at 12.411-29, Iapyx acknowledges divine assistance but does not recognize the goddess.

[23] For a possible exception, see below p181.

Carthage (1.314-417).[24] The only major exception to these trends is the meeting between mother and son in *Aen*. 8; in keeping with the scene's primary focus on the divine armor and the future of Rome represented on it, Venus's preparations in commissioning this armor are recounted in detail, but her appearance to her son is described without reference to any "postponement" or "recognition" motifs, and the only "purpose" motifs are those of divine inspiration (the armor itself) and physical contact (8.615).

In addition to these trends, there are a few key differences in frequencies between Vergilian and Homeric usage of the scene motifs. Unlike in Homeric epiphanies, where physical contact is surprisingly ubiquitous,[25] it is extremely rare in the *Aeneid*. The only two clear examples of this motif are when Venus first restrains Aeneas in Troy (2.592-3) and later embraces him after providing the divine armor (8.615), although she notably makes no such gesture in their first meeting, where Aeneas accuses her of remaining coldly aloof (1.408-9).[26] Allecto's arousal of Turnus's fury is expressed in the violent gesture of hurling a firebrand at him (7.256-7), but also represents the divine inspiration motif. Similarly Cymodocea pushes Aeneas's ship to speed it along (10.246-7), but this contact might also more properly be considered a form of inspiration, as it enables Aeneas to carry out her instructions for speed. This general lack of physical contact is in keeping with scholars' comments on the distance between divine and mortal spheres in the *Aeneid* – even when the gods do intervene, they tend to rely more on spoken directives than on physical action and usually depart before the percipient has uttered a word in reply.[27]

---

[24] Outside this scene, the motifs are 7.415-19 (Allecto's disguise), 7.427-8 (possible false biography by Allecto), 7.435-44 (Turnus's ironic treatment of Allecto), 8.33-4 (Tiberinus's physical appearance as a possible hint of divinity), 9.646-51 (Apollo's disguise), and 12.472 (Juturna's disguise, reiterated at 12.623-4, 783-5). The absence of a postponement phase is a typical Apollonian feature, and the only epiphanies in the *Argonautica* which feature a disguise motif are those of Triton and his daughter (4.1551, 1736).

[25] See p16.

[26] Feeney (1983 210-4) notes the lack of intimacy and reciprocity in familial relationships among mortals in the *Aeneid*. On denied embraces see Belfiore 1984 19-30. Highet (1972 31-2) discusses the lack of speech between Aeneas and Ascanius.

[27] Cf. 2.621, 3.172-8, 4.276-8, 4.570, 8.66-8, 9.14-7, 9.656-60, 10.246-50. There are only three epiphanies which feature conversation: 1.314-417 (Venus and Aeneas, pre-recognition only), 7.406-74 (Allecto and Turnus, pre-recognition only), and 12.468-785 (Juturna and Turnus).

The motif of prophecy is also surprisingly rare in Vergilian epiphanies, despite the fact that all divine visitations to Aeneas occur at key moments in his journey to establish a new Troy in Italy.[28] The only instances of prophecy during an epiphanic encounter are at 2.620, 3.158-9, 8.43-8, and 10.244-5. Of these, two relate to the future of Rome (3.158-9, 8.43-8), the latter of which merely repeats information already given by Helenus at 3.374-462. The remaining two occasions pertain more directly to the motif's role in the Homeric pattern, as they relate the god's presence to an immediate outcome (Aeneas's safe return to his house, 2.620; the impending deaths of many Rutulians, 10.244-5). More often, prophecies are obtained not through epiphany but through oracles (3.90-8) or mortal seers (2.246-7, 3.245-57, 3.374-462, 6.83-97, 12.258-64; cf. Venus's pretended role as a mortal interpreting an omen at 1.392-400).[29] These are usually only partial revelations, and Aeneas must piece together information from multiple sources as he attempts to comprehend both his mission and the trials he must undergo on the way to fulfilling it.[30] The most comprehensive prophecies are reserved for conversation among the gods and withheld from mortals altogether (1.256-96, 5.813-5, 9.641-4, 12.794-5; Vulcan's prophetic vision at 8.626-728 is shared with the audience, but Aeneas remains *ignarus*).[31]

In making this contextual distinction, the poet lessens the association between prophecy and the poetic register of the epiphany pattern and brings the former into the context of contemporary ritual and cult. The existence of divine prophecies which define the fate of the mortal world but remain largely hidden from human knowledge is consistent with Stoic determinism, which recognizes the supremacy of fate and uses omens and oracles to

---

[28] On general features of *Aeneid* prophecies, see O'Hara 1990 54-60.

[29] There are also two prophecies made by deceased mortals: 2.778-84 (Creusa foretells a new homeland and second marriage for Aeneas) and 6.756-892 (Anchises introduces the future Romans).

[30] On deliberate inconsistencies in *Aeneid* prophecies, see O'Hara 1990 *passim*, 2007 78-82. See Seider (2013 28-67) for how Aeneas manipulates his comrades' memories of these prophecies.

[31] On two distinct types of prophecy in the *Aeneid* – one referring to a brief timespan and given to mortals to help them cope with present difficulties, the other seemingly aimed at a Roman audience and covering centuries but confined to conversations among the gods – see Michels 1981 146. See also Duckworth 1933 34-5; Block 1981 116.

gain insight into its design. Critically, the ambiguity of these signs creates the possibility that the group (or its mediator) may reach the wrong interpretation. Thus Turnus interprets the transformation of Aeneas's ships according to his own wishes (9.123-34)[32] and Tolumnius prophesies the Trojans' retreat from Italy (12.257-64). Such misinterpretations may result in disastrous consequences for the larger community, such as the plague visited upon the Trojans when Anchises mistakenly identifies Crete as the *antiquam matrem* mentioned by Apollo's oracle (3.96). In this particular case, the importance of the message requires the form of communication to be made more direct, and a follow-up epiphany occurs in which Aeneas privately receives clarification from the Penates (3.147-91). The misinterpretations of Turnus and the Rutulian augur, however, are met with no such consequences and fail even to draw explicit comment by the poet.

The concern for welfare and assuagement motifs are also less common in post-recognition moments, and the insult motif is almost entirely absent from the *Aeneid*, with only one suggestive exception (7.452-4). While these motifs do not occur in every Homeric epiphany either, these observations are nevertheless indicative of a different perception of epiphany in the world of the *Aeneid* than in that of the *Iliad* or, more particularly, the *Odyssey* and Homeric Hymns. The concern and insult motifs both serve to highlight – from either side of the encounter – the difference between god and mortal, as the mortal acknowledges the god's power over his welfare and the god calls attention to the mortal's initial lack of perception. These motifs feature especially prominently in the Homeric Hymns, which aim to emphasize the superior position of the celebrated deity, but they are also prevalent in the *Odyssey*, where several mortals voice the assumption that the gods go among them to test their piety and hospitality.[33] In the *Aeneid*, this testing function is entirely absent from the epiphanies, and percipients do not often verbalize a concern for their safety as a result of

---

[32] See O'Hara 1990 74-8 for Turnus's misinterpretation as part of a pattern of divine deception and for analogies to Aeneas's interpretation of portents at 8.522-40.

[33] *Od*. 7.199-206, 17.484-7, 23.62-4. Cf. Hes. *Op*. 249-55.

contact with the divine.[34] While they may experience intense emotional responses to the revelation of the divine, nothing suggests that they feel threatened by such encounters or that they suspect the purpose of the god's errand to be anything other than to advise or instruct.[35] Furthermore, the percipient's need for guidance is usually sufficient to highlight his inferiority to his divine visitor without requiring additional motifs to that effect.[36]

Finally, perhaps because there are fewer percipients of divine epiphany in the *Aeneid* even than in the *Odyssey*, the motifs also become elements of characterization. Aeneas, for example, demonstrates a fairly consistent pattern of behaviour whenever he recognizes a deity: he affirms the god's divinity, utters a prayer for continued favour, and promises sacrifices. This response illustrates Aeneas's conception of his relationship to the gods as that of priestly intermediary, especially after the death of his father.[37] Turnus, on the other hand, finds that epiphanies often stand in the way of his own goals. Unlike Aeneas, his response to such encounters tends to reflect his resentment of the interference rather than his hope for continued divine interest.[38]

Recognition in Vergilian Epiphanies

In important contrast to the *Argonautica*, Vergil increases the recognizability of his epiphanies for both his readers and his characters. Since Aeneas's heroism is in part based on

---

[34] This is partly due to the gods' hasty departures following delivery of their messages, which necessarily limits the number of post-recognition motifs which can occur. Even when mortals do voice concerns, there is often no corresponding assuagement motif, e.g. 1.330-4, 4.578-9, 6.196.

[35] A clear exception is Turnus's fear at Allecto's transformation (7.446-50). On the Dira's intervention at 12.853-86, see p201-2.

[36] This is further suggested by the fact that Vergilian epiphanies usually compel percipients to adopt a course of action contrary to their wishes, prevailing upon a moral obligation to obey the gods. Homeric gods, by contrast, advise mortals who choose to obey (cf. Achilles's extreme example at *Il*. 1.216-8; see p26) and tend to reinforce behaviour the percipient would naturally be inclined to demonstrate. Heinze 1915 301-2.

[37] Camps 1969 44. On Anchises's role as interpreter of divine will, see Lloyd 1957 48-9; E. L. Harrison 1985 159-62; Panoussi 2010 55.

[38] Block 1981 126-9.

his fulfillment of a divine mission, Vergil must ensure that his hero is able to recognize the divinity and messages of the gods who appear to help him on his way. While Aeneas's relationship with visiting gods is not always an easy one, as revealed most vividly by his interactions with his divine mother, the encounter always leaves him with at least a general impression of his visitor's divinity.

When it comes to patterns of recognition, the *Aeneid* adopts a tactic more Odyssean than Iliadic in that, rather than create a hierarchy of characters based on the mode of recognition, the poem instead limits the number of heroes who interact with and recognize the gods at all. In the first half of the poem, Aeneas is the only character to experience a direct epiphany, of which there are six; in the second half, Aeneas and Turnus each experience three epiphanies, while Ascanius's future heroic status is signalled by a single encounter with Apollo. Aeneas is also the only mortal to be visited by deceased loved ones in dreams or visions within the primary narrative.[39] As in the *Odyssey*, there is a geographic component to Aeneas's epiphanies; in contradistinction to the lack of open epiphany prior to Odysseus's arrival in Ithaca, all of Aeneas's interactions with Olympians (excepting his mother, 8.608-16) take place prior to his arrival in Italy, and he receives no divine visitors of any kind after entering battle at 10.260.[40]

Rather than rank Aeneas, Turnus, and Ascanius against one another based on how each tends to perceive the divine, Vergil instead seems to use the recognition modes in different ways for each percipient. Aeneas, for example, experiences visual recognition four times: twice recognizing Venus (1.405-6, 2.589-92), once her doves (6.192-3),[41] and once the Penates (3.173-4). These represent divine beings with whom the hero has close personal connections. At 8.608-16, his final open meeting with his mother, recognition is assumed and

---

[39] The only exception is Dido's dream of Sychaeus, of which we are informed by Venus (1.353-9).

[40] Block (1981 169-70) observes that, as other characters become involved in perceiving divine manifestations, Aeneas's involvement decreases. At 7.117-47 Aeneas seeks to ratify Ascanius's interpretation of the portent of the tables, in *Aen*. 8 he dreams of Tiberinus and receives armor from Venus, at 10.215-48 he is addressed by the ship-nymphs, and in *Aen*. 12 he is aided three times by Venus but never visited in person.

[41] See Petridou 2015 87-97 for zoomorphic epiphanies in Greek thought, esp. 87-90 on avian epiphanies.

the entire phase is omitted from the narrative. Aeneas also experiences three verbal epiphanies, one of which corresponds to the conventions of Homeric messenger epiphanies (Mercury, 4.268) while the other two involve deities with whom he is unfamiliar (Tiberinus, 8.62-5; ship-nymphs, 10.230-5).[42] For Aeneas, therefore, the mode of recognition seems to suggest his degree of personal familiarity with the visiting divinity.

In Turnus's case, traces of the same theme might be detected in his recognition of Juturna. This familial interaction is placed in a similarly "high" mode, as it is left unspecified in the narrative until 12.632, at which point he claims to have recognized his sister long since (*dudum*). However, it is more difficult to place Allecto's verbal epiphany (7.452-5) and Turnus's visual recognition of Iris (9.16) within this paradigm. Instead, each of Turnus's epiphanic experiences involves a higher mode than the previous one. This "ascending" sequence of modes begins with Allecto's verbal declaration, which instills in Turnus an Iliadic fury; next, his visual recognition of Iris is strongly reminiscent of Achilles's recognition of the same goddess at *Il*. 18.165-202, but the effect is muted by the displacement of Turnus's recognition and response until after the goddess's departure;[43] finally, as Turnus reaches his greatest heights in battle and the moment of his death becomes increasingly imminent, his recognition of his sister takes place in an unspecified, natural manner,[44] recalling how this mode is reserved in the *Iliad* for heroes in the midst of an *aristeia* and strongly associated with reminders of their mortality. The effect is gradually to associate Turnus ever more strongly with the Iliadic tradition and the world Aeneas has been forced to leave behind in order to take up a new kind of leadership.

---

[42] Aeneas's dream of the Penates actually contains a mixture of these two types of recognition, as the gods offer the usual verbal announcement of Apollo's name but Aeneas recognizes the divine messengers by sight.

[43] See p21-2 for details of Achilles's recognition of Iris. For Turnus as an Achillean figure, see Coleman 1982 152; Moskalew 1982 153n39.

[44] Juturna takes the reins of Turnus's chariot at 12.468 following the description of her brother's *aristeia* at 324-83. When she addresses him at 625-30, Turnus replies that he recognized her from her first interference at 222f. and asks whether she has come to see him die (632-6). Praying that the shades will receive him kindly now that the Olympians have abandoned him (646-7), he goes to his final duel with Aeneas.

Ascanius, finally, never responds at all to Apollo's presence at 9.638-58. While Apollo's words and visit mark him out as a worthy successor to Aeneas,[45] it is actually his Trojan comrades who rely on visual and aural cues to recognize Apollo following his departure (9.659-60). This lack of response and recognition from the primary percipient suggests that Ascanius has not yet assumed his full heroic role, and that the epiphany – like the battle it interrupts – is a kind of initiatory moment for the youth, in which he first begins to test his potential. By allowing the dramatic isolation to be broken by the presence of the Trojans, therefore, Vergil is able simultaneously to single out Ascanius as the heroic figure of the next generation and to highlight his youth and inexperience by requiring others to provide him with an example of how divine visitors can be recognized.

Distribution of Epiphany Scenes

There is a balance in the distribution of epiphanies across the two halves of the epic, as well as in the division of characters. Other than his mother, Aeneas interacts with Olympians only prior to his arrival in Italy, after which he is addressed by local deities like Tiberinus and the nymphs who were once his Trojan fleet. This is in keeping with the generally teleological aspect of his early epiphanies, which are designed to help bring him safely to Italy. Turnus, on the other hand, recognizes three different deities, all of whom have ties to Juno and whose Iliadic wrath instills in him an Achillean quality. All the gods who intervene are strictly partisan – no god appears to both Aeneas and Turnus in the course of the poem. With the exception of Mercury, whose second epiphany is an extension of his first, Venus is the only divinity to be recognized in multiple unrelated epiphanies.

[45] For this theme in the preceding battle, see Moskalew 1982 145-50.

The first epiphanies in each half of the epic tend to be highly detailed and set the tone of the ensuing books.[46] In *Aen*. 1, the conversation between Venus and Aeneas acknowledges its debt to the Homeric epiphany pattern even as it breaks from purely epic conventions and redefines Aeneas as a hero of piety, whose relationships with the gods – even his own mother – are nevertheless frustrating and unclear.[47] In the dream epiphanies of *Aen*. 7 and 8, the ominous epiphany of Allecto to Turnus contrasts sharply with Tiberinus's encouraging message to Aeneas, highlighting the very different characters and prospects of these individuals before they ever meet in battle.

Scene Analyses: *Aen*. 10.215-59 and 1.314-417

Having briefly surveyed the major trends in Vergil's use of the Homeric scene pattern, let us now consider a few of these scenes in greater depth. I do not treat these in the order in which they appear in the text, but have instead selected those which provide the most representative illustrations of key points.

The scene in which Aeneas encounters his vanished fleet, transformed into nymphs by Cybele, offers a good example of how Vergil applies the familiar scene pattern to unusual circumstances and blends even his own categories of epiphany. In terms of the sequence of motifs employed, there is little to surprise the reader. As the moon rises and Aeneas sits alone at the helm, lost in thought, the dramatic isolation is established (10.215-8). The suddenness of the nymphs' arrival is marked by the poet's *ecce* (219), and in the description of their journey (222-3) their resemblance to the former fleet is clear. Cymodocea speaks for the

[46] N.B. 1.314-417 and 7.406-74 are two of only three epiphany scenes in which the mortal percipient converses with the god, and the only such scenes where the dialogue occurs before recognition. They are also the only two scenes in the epic to contain multiple postponement motifs. On the characterization of Turnus in Allecto's epiphany, see Alden Smith 2005 36-9.

[47] For Aeneas's frustration during epiphanies as a recurring motif, see Fratantuono-Alden Smith 2015 650.

group, being *doctissima fandi*,[48] and addresses the *ignarum* (228) Aeneas. Her speech contains the motifs of present instructions (*vigila et velis immitte rudentis*, 229), a biography (230-5) which doubles as the epiphanic moment and moment of (verbal) recognition, future instructions (*surge age ... iube et ... cape*, 241-3), and prophecy (244-5). Her gesture of pushing the ship to speed it along constitutes the divine inspiration (246-7), and her departure is typically sudden (247-8). Aeneas's intense emotional response is one of stunned silence (*stupet inscius ille*, 249), but he is said to take courage from the encounter (*animos ... tollit*, 250); this emotion is then channeled into prayer as he affirms Cybele's divine power (252-3) and requests her goodwill in fulfilling her promise (an evocation of the concern for welfare motif, 254-5). At first light, he fulfills Cymodocea's future instructions and bids his captains prepare for war (258-9).

In many ways, this scene represents a typical example of how the epiphany motifs might be deployed. The only exceptional use of a motif is that the biography given by Cymodocea is true. In this case, however, the story serves one of the same functions as a false biography in other contexts, which is to establish an apparent bond between god and percipient in order to ensure that the latter will be receptive to the former's message.[49] Here, this bond can be much more effectively established by the revelation of the nymphs' origins as the ships which conveyed Aeneas to Italy from Troy.[50] In manipulating the motif in this way, Vergil has preserved one of its basic functions within the epiphany.

Despite the apparent consistency with the Homeric scene pattern, however, Vergil plays with the terminology used to describe this encounter. The scene is structured as a private experience, in which the narrative remains centered around a single mortal percipient and a single divine speaker. Yet Aeneas is said to be cheered by the omen (*omine*, 250) and

---

[48] Cf. Homer's description of Leucothea's former mortality as βροτὸς αὐδήεσσα (*Od*. 5.334) and Odysseus's emphasis on Circe's and Calypso's skill with human speech (*Od*. 10.136, 11.8, 12.150, 12.449). Clay 1974 131-3. On the ancient commentators' distinctions between divine and human speech, see Nünlist 2009 276-7.

[49] Cf. *Il*. 24.371; *Od*. 1.187-93. Since Venus is the only deity to appear before Aeneas in disguise (1.315-20; see below), the deceptive function of the false biography is much reduced elsewhere in the *Aeneid*.

[50] Cf. a similar emphasis on closeness to Aeneas in the Penates's speech at 3.156-9.

his prayer asks Cybele to fulfill her *augurium* (255) – both of which suggest a more public, portentous or ritual setting which is out of place with the event as it is described by the narrator. This may in part be a response to the visual apparition of nymphs swimming toward him in ranks like ships, which might well seem portentous, but is more strongly linked to Aeneas's preoccupation with his role as mediator between his people and the gods.[51] This self-assumed role causes him to interpret the event as a favourable omen for his present endeavors, and he responds by uttering a prayer intended to secure Cybele's continued blessing for his people more generally (255). The terms *omen* and *augurium* are therefore focalised through Aeneas's subsequent interpretation of the event, while his initial reactions (*ignarum*, *stupet*) are consistent with those of other mortals in epiphanic encounters.

Furthermore, the Homeric epiphany is not the only model for this scene, and Vergil's application of these motifs – especially the (false) biography – to the former inanimate fleet opens the door for resonances with additional genres in a way that would not be possible in an Olympian epiphany. As Harrison has shown,[52] Cymodocea's unsolicited autobiography contains an echo of the words of speaking artefacts in epigram, where objects often explain their origins, as well as speaking images in other genres of Hellenistic and Augustan poetry.[53] In each case, the autobiography has three key features: it is spoken in the first person, the object lists its two states of existence, and the transition from one state to the other is marked by temporal terms. Cymodocea's tale contains all these features, but goes further in describing not one but two transformations – first from pine to ship, then from ship to nymph.

In Harrison's view, this resonance allows the scene to offer light relief between the portentous catalogue of Etruscans (10.163-214) and the dramatic battle of 10.249ff., while the

---

[51] Camps 1969 44. See also Highet 1972 106; O'Hara 1990 41.

[52] S. J. Harrison 2007 222-5.

[53] Cf. esp. *AP* 9.131 (a ship recounts its metamorphosis from tree to ship), but also *AP* 6.113 by Simmias of Rhodes (a bow) and the anonymous *AP* 9.162 (a pen). In other genres, cf. Callimachus *Iambus* 9, Horace *Sat*. 1.8, Tibullus 1.4. For Vergil's incorporation of other genres in the *Aeneid*, cf. e.g. his engagement with epitaph at 7.1-4. On Vergil's methods of indicating the literary tone of a passage (Homeric, tragic, Alexandrian, old Roman, antiquarian), see Horsfall 2016 95-110.

object's divinity here adds an element of epic miraculousness akin to the speaking of Achilles's horse at *Il*. 19.404-23. It is true that the scene provides a charming moment of calm in an otherwise threatening sequence of events, yet the narrative structure goes beyond the miraculous to the epiphanic. In crafting the scene thus, Vergil has expertly blended the defining conventions of two different traditions by making them dependent upon the same narrative element. The sole alteration he has made to a Homeric motif – the exchange of a false biography for a true one – not only strengthens the scene as an epiphanic encounter but also creates the possibility for resonance with additional genres.

The combination of Homeric epiphany motifs and later literary and cultural influences is perhaps most clearly seen in the first epiphany of the poem, where Venus, disguised as a huntress, apprises Aeneas of the situation in Carthage (1.314-417). This scene has attracted much scholarly attention focusing on the relationship between Venus and Aeneas and the implications of her apparent intent to deceive him,[54] the ironies and complexities of Venus's chosen disguise,[55] and the scene's relationship to both the Dido episode[56] and earlier Homeric (primarily Odyssean) models.[57] As the first epiphany in the epic, this richly detailed encounter immediately declares a programmatic choice to adopt the general conventions of Homeric epiphany scenes even as it distinguishes itself from those models. From this early stance there arise important consequences for the reader's expectations of epiphany in later books.

---

[54] Anderson 1955 236; Wlosok 1967 87; E. L. Harrison 1972-3 13-8; Block 1981 60; Lesueur 1988 98-9; Reckford 1995 21-7; Leach 1997 *passim*, esp. 369.

[55] Anderson 1955 234-5; Wlosok 1967 76-7; Lloyd 1976/7 252; Reckford 1995 20-2; Alden Smith 2005 27-8; S. J. Harrison 2007 222; Ahl 2012 14.

[56] Kühn 1971 29; E. L. Harrison 1972-3; Highet 1972 109; Thornton 1985 620-2.

[57] Homeric parallels identified have included Thetis's relationship with Achilles in the *Iliad*, Helen's recognition of Aphrodite at *Il*. 3.383-420, Odysseus's meeting with Nausicaa (*Od*. 6.110-320), Athena's disguised epiphany at *Od*. 7.14-81, Athena's epiphany at *Od*. 13.221-440, and the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite. On Odyssean parallels especially, see Anderson 1955 235-6; Anderson 1963 2; Williams 1963 270-2; Knauer 1964 158-61; Austin 1971 118-45; Kühn 1971 29-35; E. L. Harrison 1972-3 10-11; Highet 1972 271-2; Williams 1972 184-91; Schlunk 1974 49-58, esp. 55-8; Williams 1987 11-24; Reckford 1995 9-15; S. J. Harrison 2007 225-6. For parallels with *HAph*, see Reckford 1995 16-22; Leach 1997 370; S. J. Harrison 2007 226-9; Gutting 2009 50; Olson 2011. Austin 1971 121-4 identifies parallels with Roman comedy, e.g. Plaut. *Rud*. 313ff., and posits several Hellenistic influences. For tragic influences, see e.g. E. L. Harrison 1972-3 20; Hardie 1998 78.

As Aeneas and Achates make their way through the forest, Venus appears suddenly before them. No mention is made of her initial awareness, preparations, or journey, but her complaint to Jupiter at 1.227-53 attests to her concern for the ultimate success of Aeneas's efforts. Her arrival (1.314) is immediately followed by a description of her disguise (1.315-20). Adopting the likeness and clothing of a young woman, she carries weapons like those of Spartan girls or of Harpalyce, the wolf-like Thracian maiden who grew up alone in the woods, stealing lambs from sheepfolds when hungry. These comparisons are followed by specific details of Venus's appearance:

> *Namque umeris de more habilem suspenderat arcum*
> *venatrix dederatque comam diffundere ventis,*
> *nuda genu nodoque sinus collecta fluentis.* (1.318-20)

These lines have drawn much attention, both for the irony that Venus should be linked with athletic Spartan girls and the wild Harpalyce and, more strikingly, for their marked associations with her opposite, the goddess Diana.[58] Not only has Venus chosen to appear in the guise of a maiden huntress with bow and quiver, but the details of her dress are such that they can reasonably be compared with specific sculptural images of Diana.[59] This single detail at the start of the scene represents a skillful combination of probable influences from Greek literature and Graeco-Roman material culture, and is further highlighted not only by the anomalous situation of a divine mother disguising herself before her son,[60] but by the fact that this is the only occasion when any god appears before Aeneas in disguise.[61]

---

[58] The description of Harpalyce's upbringing further resembles that of Camilla, another maiden huntress devoted to Diana. On the reference to Harpalyce and Spartan girls, see Anderson 1955 234; Austin 1971 118-9. On the resemblance to Diana, see Anderson 1955 235-6; E. L. Harrison 1972-3 11-6; Reckford 1995 20; S. J. Harrison 2007 227.

[59] Cartault 1926 112 suggests that a sculptured original provided Vergil's inspiration. Austin 1971 120-2 identifies her as the "Versailles" Artemis now in the Louvre. Cf. E. L. Harrison 1972-3 20, who likens Vergil's depiction instead to that found on the temple-frieze at Pergamum on the basis of her footwear.

[60] Kühn 1971 29; Gutting 2009 48. Thetis never disguises herself before Achilles, and even Aphrodite is undisguised when she rescues Aeneas at *Il*. 5.311-8, although he does not explicitly recognize her. Cf. also Cyrene's exchanges with Aristaeus in *Georgics* 4.333ff. In the *Aeneid*, even epiphanies between family members are evidently subject to a certain degree of distance (cf. Juturna's disguise, 12.472).

[61] E. L. Harrison 1972-3 12.

The final motif of the "setting-the-stage" group is that of the dramatic isolation, which is adhered to less strictly here than in later scenes. In addition to Aeneas and Venus, Achates is present and mentioned alongside his leader at 1.312, and Venus's words are twice addressed to both men (*iuvenes ... monstrate ... vidistis*, 1.321-2; *vos ... venistis ... tenetis*, 1.369-70). Achates then fades away for most of the encounter, but his presence is again implied by the plural verb forms when Venus veils her son in mist (*gradientes*, 1.411) and in the line following the goddess's departure (*ascendebant*, 1.419).[62] Most tellingly, in his only speech in the poem,[63] Achates refers back to Venus's words at 1.582-5. Even so, the poet does maintain the narrative's focus on Aeneas and Venus throughout the scene, and Aeneas is the only mortal to address or explicitly recognize his mother during the encounter. While epiphanies later in the poem will adhere more closely to the conventional requirement for isolation, the ambiguous deployment of the motif here suggests that divine communications may no longer be as private and individualistic as they were in Homeric epic.

Vergilian epiphany can be an ambiguous experience even for the poem's central heroes, and Venus's entire intervention is based upon an extensive, deliberate postponement of recognition.[64] The goddess's opening speech supports her disguise with a false biography, from the colloquial *heus*[65] to her claim to be one of a group of mortal huntresses, and extending even to the remarkable level of detail she provides when describing her lost companion's dress (1.321-4). Aeneas's response nevertheless indicates that he has perceived in her appearance and voice a hint of divinity: *haud tibi vultus* / *mortalis, nec vox hominem sonat; o, dea certe* (1.327-8). In an ironic twist, he identifies her as Diana – a correct

---

[62] At 6.34, Achates's presence similarly intrudes upon a scene in which Aeneas is expected to meet an otherworldly figure alone. E. L. Harrison 1972-3 13 proposes Achates's presence as one reason for Venus's disguise.

[63] See Highet 1972 27.

[64] As noted above (n24), the full use of the postponement motifs in this scene is unusual. In addition to the marked imbalance in knowledge between Venus and her son, her control of the encounter is further illustrated by the fact that she is first to speak.

[65] For the colloquial – even comic – tenor of this address, see Anderson 1955 235; Austin 1971 121. For the word as an element of Venus's disguise, see Mensching 1970 269-71; E. L. Harrison 1972-3 13.

interpretation of her disguise, yet the furthest from her true identity. Confident that he is addressing a goddess, he immediately prays for her continued favour and requests information about his surroundings (concern for welfare, 1.330-3), promising many sacrifices in exchange for her assistance (affirmation, 1.334). So certain is he of having correctly interpreted a hint of divinity that he behaves as if he has actually reached the moment of recognition and begins to utter the post-recognition motifs of concern and affirmation.

This confident response introduces numerous parallels to epiphanic scenes in Greek epic. On the surface, the closest correspondence is with Anchises's response to the hint of divinity at *HAph* 94-106 and his reiteration of this certainty at *HAph* 185-6. Scholarship has noted the intense irony of Aeneas's resemblance to his father when faced with a situation recalling the circumstances of his own conception, and even Venus's virginal disguise retains a degree of appeal.[66] Aeneas's immediate identification of his interlocutor as Diana also evokes Odysseus's opening address to Nausicaa (*Od*. 6.149-52), although the contrast between Odysseus's manipulative intentions and Aeneas's guileless manner in such a situation firmly establishes the latter's independent character.[67]

Yet there are also connections, less fully developed in modern scholarship, between this first speech of Aeneas to Venus and that of Helen to Aphrodite at *Il.* 3.396-412. Some have noted similarities between the visual nature of Helen's recognition and Aeneas's response to the same physical features at 1.402-9,[68] but an analysis of the underlying scene pattern reveals that both scenes also involve a correctly-interpreted hint of divinity, which leads the percipient to assume that recognition has taken place and to express post-recognition motifs prematurely. The response of Aphrodite/Venus reveals a flaw in this initial recognition and a much more powerful epiphanic moment follows. In the *Iliad*, Helen

---

[66] Reckford 1995 20-2; S. J. Harrison 2007 228; Gutting 2009 50. While the hymnic Aphrodite similarly disguises herself as a young, unmarried girl, the decadence of her costume is much more provocative than that of Vergil's Venus. Maidens devoted to Artemis/Diana, however, are frequently the objects of sexual pursuit in the mythological tradition (Shapiro 1995 160).

[67] Anderson 1963 3-5; Williams 1963 273-4; Austin 1971 122; Schlunk 1974 55-8; Olson 2011 60.

[68] Kühn 1971 32n14. Knauer 1964 gives only an index listing and reference to Ursinus 1568.

correctly identifies Aphrodite by her περικαλλέα δειρὴν / στήθεά θ᾽ ἱμερόεντα καὶ ὄμματα μαρμαίροντα (*Il*. 3.396-7) and immediately reproaches her for deceit;[69] Aphrodite grows angry and reasserts her power over Helen, who acquiesces and obeys in silence. The scene places Helen among a select group of mortals who are able not only to recognize the gods by sight but to challenge the epiphanic hierarchy.[70] In the *Aeneid*, Aeneas initially follows his father's lead by responding respectfully, only reproaching Venus later in the encounter when his observation of her rosy neck and ambrosial hair enables him to recognize her true identity.

By allowing Aeneas to interpret his mother's hint of divinity correctly but withholding knowledge of her true identity, Vergil builds on the structural pattern of the Iliadic epiphany to enhance the irony of this scene. He also places Aeneas in a different position in relation to the gods. Like Helen, Aeneas is able to recognize divinity immediately, despite feeling himself ever the object of manipulation by those same gods. However, unlike Helen, Aeneas does not use his powers of recognition to claim authority over the gods. Instead, when faced with an unknown deity, he assumes the role of priestly intermediary in an anxious attempt to secure divine favour for his people and for his efforts more generally. This is therefore the first occasion on which the reader observes what will become one of the defining features in the way Aeneas perceives his relationship to the gods.[71]

Rather than acknowledge Aeneas's recognition of her divinity or correct his misidentification, Venus's response adds further detail to her false biography (1.336-7). This insistence by a divine figure on a mortal identity is unusual, mainly because the percipient almost never interprets the hint of divinity correctly. The only correct interpretation of such a hint in Homer belongs to Helen, where it is followed not by the denial of divinity but by a frightening confirmation of it. The sole denial of this kind is that of Odysseus to Telemachus

---

[69] Cf. *HAph* 181, where it is Aphrodite's δειρήν τε καὶ ὄμματα κάλ᾽ that lead Anchises to deduce her divinity at last, leading to his own (more gentle) protestation that he has been deceived in spite of his initial instincts.

[70] See Part I for full analysis of this scene.

[71] See p172. Aeneas's definition of himself as *pius* (1.378), modeled on Odysseus's self-identification based on his κλέος (*Od*. 9.20), further develops this characterization.

at *Od*. 16.186-9, where the denial of divinity leads directly to the revelation of Odysseus's parental identity. Yet Venus uses her denial to further postpone her son's recognition. Her claim to kinship with the Tyrian settlers at Carthage provides a pretext for her to unfold Dido's story in response to Aeneas's request for information,[72] allowing her to highlight instead the similarities between Aeneas and Dido and thus to strengthen his affinity for the mortal queen.[73] She concludes with a final insistence on her disguise by asking Aeneas his identity, to which he replies (in a definitively un-Odyssean manner[74]) with a full account of his name and situation. Like Anchises (and Telemachus, although here correctly), he persists in addressing her as a goddess (*o dea*, 1.372), yet the dramatic irony remains prominent as he unknowingly recounts to his mother her own assistance in his wanderings (1.382).[75]

After such a prolonged postponement of recognition, the remaining purpose and recognition motifs proceed rapidly. At last Venus interrupts her son to issue her instructions: *perge modo atque hinc te reginae ad limina perfer* (1.389). The false biography which merged with Dido's own story has effectively prepared him to obey, and thus fulfills its usual purpose – priming the percipient to be receptive to the god's instructions – in a thoroughly unusual way. Revealing that his comrades are safe, Venus pretends to interpret an augury in a suggestion of the prophecy motif[76] and then reiterates her instructions: *perge modo et, qua te ducit via, dirige gressum* (1.401).

Only at the moment of her departure does Venus finally allow recognition to take place, and her epiphanic moment at 1.402-5 is every bit as sensuous as the description of her

---

[72] Cf. Athena's claim to be a Phaeacian girl whose father lives near Alcinous's palace (*Od*. 7.29), which naturally allows her to assume the role of Odysseus's guide.

[73] Highet 1972 109; Nelis 2001 77; Gutting 2009 47. For this as the motivating factor behind Venus's epiphany and disguise, see E. L. Harrison 1972-3 18; Alden Smith 2005 28.

[74] Doherty 2002 55n3.

[75] On possible annalistic and historiographical influences in Aeneas's account, see Horsfall 2016 96.

[76] See above, p170-1. On deceptive undertones in Venus's prophecy, see O'Hara 1990 9-13.

disguise was visual.[77] Vergil's description of the goddess's radiant neck and sweet scent evokes *Il*. 3.395-8, where Helen similarly recognizes these features and berates Aphrodite for attempting to deceive her. Aeneas's moment of recognition is described at 1.405-6,[78] and his ensuing speech reveals his intense emotional response (1.407-9). Seeing Venus's disguise as a betrayal, he focuses not on her divine name but on her relationship to him (*natum*, 1.407),[79] and he reproaches her that there has been no gesture of physical contact (1.408-9).[80] Significantly, Venus leaves without responding to her son's recognition; there can be no further post-recognition motifs, and therefore no assuagement of the pain she has caused him. Aeneas, however, does not seem to expect a response, and he fulfills her instructions by proceeding toward the city (the desired change of setting, 1.410).[81] Wordlessly shrouding both men in mist in a clear nod to Athena's divine inspiration at *Od*. 7.40-2, Venus departs for Paphos in a final ambiguous echo of *HAph* 58-63 and *Od*. 8.362-3.

This analysis has been perhaps more detailed than the scene's familiarity requires, but its survey of epiphanic motifs has yielded several important insights into Vergil's relationship to Homeric scenes. In addition to general parallels noted by Knauer and others,[82] structural similarities are apparent between this scene and the confusion of epiphanic phases in Helen's recognition of Aphrodite at *Il*. 3.383-420. In both scenes, the percipient's special status is marked by his/her early recognition of the goddess's divinity, which leads to an overconfident response, accusations of deception, and the premature expression of post-recognition motifs.

---

[77] Wlosok (1967 84-100) discusses this scene in detail. Austin (1971 142) notes the profusion of light, colour, and scent in Venus's transformation. See Reckford 1995 3-4 for the *double entendre* of 1.404. E. L. Harrison 1972-3 12-3 discusses the many cult elements recognizable in this transformation and, noting the continued resemblance to sculpture, likens Venus's undisguised form and posture to the Venus Genetrix in the Louvre.

[78] Austin 1971 143 suggests that Aeneas's moment of suspense before recognizing his mother is captured in the unusual hiatus following *dea* (1.405).

[79] Achates's affirmation at 1.582-5 similarly identifies Venus as Aeneas's mother, acknowledging her divinity only indirectly when he addresses Aeneas as *nate dea*.

[80] See above, p169. See Belfiore 1984 20. Cf. the affectionate caresses of Thetis (*Il*. 1.361, 24.127) and Athena (*Od*. 13.288).

[81] Cf. Helen's silent acquiescence at *Il*. 3.419-20. Here, it is Venus's silence, rather than an angry response, which impresses upon Aeneas the futility of protest.

[82] See n57 above.

Subtle differences in the ordering of these elements in Vergil's narrative contribute to the characterization of Aeneas and his relationship to the gods. Venus's false biography is also unusual for many reasons, not least of which are the striking contrast to mother-son relationships in the *Iliad* and in *Georgics* 4, and the ironic ties to her affair with Aeneas's father in *HAph*. Yet, as an epiphanic motif, it seems initially to perform the opposite of its normal function, as it is used by Venus to keep her son at a greater distance from herself. When she then turns this distance to advantage by emphasizing Aeneas's similarities with Dido, she nevertheless returns to one of the motif's fundamental purposes by making him more likely to approach the queen as instructed. In one sense, this manipulation may even offer a further subtle hint of Venus's true identity, pertaining as it does to her role as goddess of love[83] – a role which has often been identified as being at odds with her maternal role in the *Aeneid*.[84] Finally, Aeneas's persistence in addressing Venus as a goddess resembles not only Anchises's response in *HAph*, but also Telemachus's insistence on Odysseus's divinity. In the latter case, the correction of this error leads directly to the revelation of his parent's identity, whereas Vergil ironically uses this device to achieve the opposite effect.

By manipulating the traditional motifs as he has in this first scene, Vergil also signals certain significant departures from Homeric precedent. These have important ramifications for the reader's expectations of how epiphany will operate within the *Aeneid* as a whole. In particular, frequent reminders of Achates's presence offer an immediate break with the Homeric requirement that the narrative establish a kind of artificial isolation surrounding god and percipient when other characters are physically present. While later epiphanies in the *Aeneid* follow this convention, the presence of a silent observer here hints at a shift in balance, as epiphanies contribute less to the poem's overall scheme of divine communication and reliance on public omens and portents becomes proportionally more prevalent.

---

[83] For *amor* as a leitmotiv of Venus's account of Dido's history, see Kühn 1971 31. See also Nelis 2001 78; Gutting 2009 45-7.

[84] Reckford 1995 9-14, 16; S. J. Harrison 2007 227.

The significance of this breaking of isolation extends beyond internal trends to the audience's access to the scene. This is perhaps Vergil's most significant divergence from Homeric uses of the scene pattern. In Homer, epiphany is a private affair. Every Homeric model scene for this one offers only vague details about the god's physical appearance, and even in the visual epiphanies of *Iliad* 1 and 3 it is unclear what exactly the percipient sees.[85] The first epiphany of the *Aeneid*, however, is characterised by an extreme visuality. The description of Venus's disguise is so detailed as to conjure up images of specific sculpture types, plausibly familiar to the reader. Her description of her invented companion's disguise is meticulous, and Anderson calls Venus's departure "a rarely beautiful description of the revelation of divinity."[86] In providing such vivid detail, Vergil has shattered the invisible barrier which prevents the audience from seeing the goddess precisely as she appears to Aeneas.[87] Whereas Homer exalts his heroes for their ability to recognize the gods by means unknown to the audience, thus distancing the world of his characters from that of his listeners, Vergil grants his readers a more active role, allowing them to participate in the epiphany alongside his hero even as he extends to them the poet's omniscience as to his characters' true identities.[88]

This emphasis on epiphany as a visual experience shared between character and audience represents a broader trend in the *Aeneid*.[89] The striking appearance of nymphs swimming in ranks like ships (10.222-3) has been noted above.[90] In the course of the poem

---

[85] Helen sees something in Aphrodite's neck and breasts which lead her to apprehend her real identity. Likewise, Achilles recognizes Athena upon sight, but the audience is not told what features contribute to this recognition. Homer's relative lack of visual detail is striking compared with, e.g., *HDem* 275-80; *HAph* 161-81.

[86] Anderson 1955 236.

[87] The scene's reliance on such visual imagery recalls a similar focus in *HAph*, which focuses on Aphrodite's accessories as Anchises removes them. This makes the audience sympathetic to Anchises's view of the encounter, but also heightens the anticipation of intimate contact. In *Aen*. 1, this imagery is designed to suggest the opposite – that open contact with Venus is forever out of reach for Aeneas.

[88] Feeney (1991 183) observes that the poem's "fundamental tragic irony" requires that its readers possess superior knowledge of the gods' involvement in the plot compared with that of Vergil's mortal characters.

[89] On visuality as a theme in the *Aeneid*, see e.g. Alden Smith 2005, esp. 24-51.

[90] See p178.

we see the Penates like mortal men bathed in moonlight (3.147-52, 172-4), Tiberinus's grey-green cloak and reedy hair (8.33-4), Allecto's fiery eyes and coiled hair of hissing snakes (7.445-51),[91] and Iris's departure like a rainbow leaping from cloud to cloud (9.14-5). Even the Dira's shriveled form and shrieking cries are described to us in her terrifying intervention at 12.861-8, despite the fact that neither of these is directly perceived by Turnus. Some scenes are accompanied by additional sensory details, such as the rattling of Apollo's quiver as he disappears (9.660) or the visceral reactions of Aeneas at 3.175-6 or Turnus at 7.446-66. When Venus appears to Aeneas at 8.608-16, all visual detail of the epiphany is deferred to the description of the armor, including the ekphrasis of the splendid shield. In each case the sensory element is different, but it remains nevertheless a fundamental feature of the scene in such a way that it invites the audience to share in the percipient's experience – in this sense, it might be considered a new motif which Vergil has added to his inherited scene pattern.

What seems clear based on these analyses is that Vergil has made a deliberate decision to model his epiphany scenes on a Homeric structure even as he incorporates allusions to other genres and cultural contexts. Like Apollonius, Vergil expands his cast of epiphanic divinities, in part as a consequence of the distance which he creates between his Olympians and the mortal world, in part as a result of new cultural practices concerning the divinity of the dead, and in part as a reflection of the poem's emphasis on location throughout Aeneas's quest. The Roman poet also combines Apollonius's Alexandrian interest in visual representation with the formal structure of the Homeric narrative. This return to a reliance on a familiar narrative pattern allows Vergil not only to appropriate the authority of the epic tradition for his own project, but also to lend his epiphanies greater coherence by connecting them both to one another[92] and to a larger purpose: the divine effort to bring about the foundation of Rome.

---

[91] Cf. Allecto's maddening of Amata, where the reader's gaze follows as one of these same snakes insinuates its way into the queen's heart and becomes (*fit*) the twisted gold about her neck, the ends of her headband, the ribbons in her hair (7.351-3). For the "supernatural physicality" of these lines, see Feeney 1991 165-7.

[92] Cf. p144, 161 on the highly individual and isolated contexts of most Apollonian epiphanies.

7

Extraordinary Epiphanies:
Local Gods, Deification, and Epiphanies from the Grave

> *o soror, et dudum agnovi, cum prima per artem*
> *foedera turbasti teque haec in bella dedisti,*
> *et nunc nequiquam fallis dea. sed quis Olympo*
> *demissam tantos voluit te ferre labores?*
> *an fratris miseri letum ut crudele videres?*
>
> Sister, I recognized you long ago, when first you
> upset the truce with guile and involved yourself in this war,
> and now in vain do you hide your divinity. But who wished
> for you to bear such toils, sent down from Olympus?
> Was it so that you would see your wretched brother's cruel death?
>
> Vergil *Aeneid* 12.632-4

We have seen in the previous chapter how Vergil adapts the Homeric motifs in his treatment of divine epiphany. Our analysis of Aeneas's encounter with the ship-nymphs (10.215-59) also demonstrated the poet's willingness to apply these motifs to encounters with immortal beings who do not typically feature in Homeric epiphanies. While Vergil chooses to structure his epiphany scenes on the Homeric model, his cast of epiphanic performers much more closely resembles that of Apollonius through the relative prominence of local and minor deities.[1] As in the *Argonautica*, the *Aeneid*'s Olympians are more distant than Homer's and appear in epiphanies relatively rarely. In their place, a new set of divine figures comes to prominence, including local gods, recently-deified gods, and even the shades of the dead.

When Vergilian epiphanies feature such non-Olympian performers, the motifs of the scene pattern tend to dwell on unique aspects of the god's divinity. In the scene with the ship-nymphs, for example, the need to establish a bond with Aeneas requires a true biography

[1] While the *Iliad* is selective of gods who appear as characters, largely omitting Demeter and Dionysus, nearly all Olympians who appear as characters are also featured in epiphanies. The major exception is Zeus, who famously never appeared in epiphanies (schol. T *Il*. 13.18b). The *Odyssey* epiphanies are dominated by Athena.

acknowledging their identity as his lost ships, but this motif's generic links with epigram also highlight their status as former inanimate objects, recently transformed and immortalized.[2]

This chapter examines three further examples of such scenes, each featuring an epiphanic performer from one of the categories outlined above. Aeneas's arrival at the future site of Rome is marked by Tiberinus's dream visitation (8.28-67). In order to emphasize the end of the hero's travels, the motifs most strongly associated with dream contexts have been altered to highlight the river god's fixed locality. In the final book of the poem, nearly every aspect of Juturna's epiphany to her brother (12.468-886) illustrates the close relationship between them. The nymph's inability to accept that immortality has separated her from Turnus leads her to issue commands and prophecies which the reader knows will be ineffective. In turn, this emphasis on their familial relationship enables Turnus to refuse to obey her instructions and to decide instead on a course of action which vividly reestablishes the epiphanic hierarchy. Ultimately, further divine intervention must take place to remove Juturna from Turnus's side, resulting in the unique epiphany of one immortal to another. Finally, Aeneas's vision of his father's shade at 5.721-45 shows Anchises continuing to perform the role of divine interpreter which he fulfilled in life and foreshadows his remarkable prophetic powers in *Aen*. 6. Closely linked with numerous Vergilian epiphanies, the scene is structurally indebted to the Homeric messenger epiphanies so as to cast Anchises in the role of an epiphanic performer.

These three scenes have received relatively little attention from commentators beyond notation of obvious parallels to other Homeric and Vergilian scenes. By investigating how each represents a unique moment within the broader set of the *Aeneid* epiphanies, this discussion seeks to enhance appreciation of these scenes as more than mere assemblies of borrowed elements, but as carefully designed episodes. Moreover, the theme of agency also comes to the fore as Vergil uses the traditional epiphany motifs to highlight the physically delineated sphere of Tiberinus's influence, the futility of Juturna's epiphany in light of her

[2] See p176-9.

continuing self-identification as the sister of a mortal man, and the deceased Anchises's role as a messenger of Jupiter. The following pages will examine these scenes in further detail.[3]

Aeneas and Tiberinus, 8.31-67

Aeneas's dream of Tiberinus marks the end of his physical journey. All essential information imparted by the god has already been given by Helenus (3.374-462) and the Sibyl (6.96-7).[4] The scene therefore serves less to provide Aeneas with new information than to lend significance to his arrival at a particular place.[5] Consequently, the scene's motifs revolve closely around the theme of locality. Yet this emphasis on the god's physical location also highlights his status as a local god, identified with a specific place in a way which does not define the Olympians and which places a geographical limit on his sphere of agency.[6]

The scene is introduced by the dramatic isolation, as night falls and Aeneas lies down to sleep on the riverbank (8.26-30).[7] This arrangement keeps the beginning of the epiphany focused on Aeneas, whereas in most Homeric dreams the dramatic isolation is preceded by

---

[3] The connections which emerge from close study of these scenes make it useful to take them out of their textual order. This chapter will follow the order outlined in the above paragraph so as to allow the discussion to proceed smoothly from the recently-deified Juturna to the mortal Anchises and, finally, to Aeneas in Chapter 8.

[4] Block 1981 119. On Helenus and Tiberinus, see Gransden 1976 87; O'Hara 1990 32. On the Sibyl, see Steiner 1952 67; Putnam 1965 117-28; Gransden 1976 81. On Vergil's reworking of Apollonian prophecies in Tiberinus's speech, see Nelis 2001 329-30. For general features of Vergilian prophecy, see O'Hara 1990 54-60.

[5] Steiner (1952 68-72) and Kühn (1971 115-6) observe that this is the last in a series of dreams directing Aeneas toward Italy and discuss the significance of Tiberinus's role as *deus loci*. See also Stearns 1927 27. On parallels to Odysseus's homecoming and encounter with Athena (*Od*. 13.221-440), see Knauer 1964 246-7.

[6] Coleman (1982 146) identifies the scene as a rare instance of internal motivation (i.e. private encounters with the divine) not attributed to an Olympian god. See also Parker 1989 182. Homeric gods may be associated with cult sites (*Il*. 1.37-8, 4.51-3, 5.445-6, 8.47-8; *Od*. 7.80-1) but are not bound to these locations (Kearns 2004 61). Odyssean goddesses who reside on earth (Circe, Calypso) are associated with hospitality scenes rather than epiphany. Local deities feature more prominently in Apollonian epiphanies (4.1305-36, 1551-1622, 1731-64), which is consistent with the poem's interest in aetiology.

[7] These lines combine elements from the nocturnal dream-visitation and the traditional contrast between sleeping nature and wakeful hero (Gransden 1976 82). Cf. a similar ambiguity between sleep and wakefulness at 3.150-1, 173-4 (Heyworth-Morwood 2017 132).

the god's journey.[8] The god's sudden arrival (31-3) is accompanied by a detailed account of his physical appearance (33-4). While he does not adopt a disguise, the intricacy of the poet's description is in keeping with the broader theme of visuality in Vergilian epiphanies.[9]

Tiberinus's speech revolves around the motifs of present instructions, prophecy, future instructions, and divine inspiration. When the god begins to speak, his words are said to soothe Aeneas's unspoken cares: *curas his demere dictis* (35).[10] Assuring him that he has at last reached his destination, Tiberinus instructs Aeneas not to fear the threat of war (39-40). The god then promises an omen in which the thirty piglets of a white sow will mark the location of Alba Longa's foundation in as many years' time (42-8).[11] This prophecy, it has been noted already, does not follow the traditional Homeric conventions for this motif, as it concerns the future of Rome rather than any direct outcome of the epiphany itself;[12] however, the motif is sufficiently rare in Vergilian epiphanies that its presence here is noteworthy, and its focus on the empire that will rise on the river's banks is appropriate to the scene. The god's future instructions then direct Aeneas to ally himself with Evander (49-56). To facilitate his compliance, Tiberinus's stream will guide Aeneas's ships to Evander's city (divine inspiration, 57-8). A second set of present and future instructions follows, directing the ritual observances which must accompany these actions: first, in order to be kept safe in war, Aeneas must pray immediately to Juno (59-61); then, once he has been victorious with Evander's help, he is to pray to the god himself (61-2). This leads naturally to the epiphanic

---

[8] Cf. *Il*. 2.1-19; *Od*. 6.2-19. The only dream epiphany in which the dramatic isolation takes precedence is *Od*. 4.793-4, where the audience is similarly concerned more with Penelope's reaction than with the god's message.

[9] See p187-8. Also Alden Smith 2005 47-9.

[10] Cf. 2.775 and 3.153, where Aeneas similarly experiences prophetic visions in times of distress (Kühn 1971 115; Gransden 1976 83).

[11] For further discussion of this prodigy, see Grassmann-Fischer 1966 54-63.

[12] See p170.

moment (62-5), and the speech concludes as Tiberinus declares his name (the announcement motif, 64)[13] and departs (66-7).

When Aeneas awakes, there is no description of an intense emotional response. Instead, he immediately voices his affirmation of Tiberinus's divinity and utters a prayer promising sacrifices in exchange for the god's continuing support (69-78). He then fulfills his instructions by sacrificing the prophesied sow to Juno (84-5) and proceeding upriver to seek Evander (97f.).

Each motif in the sequence leads seamlessly to the next, and the scene features many tendencies characteristic of Vergil's adaptation of the scene pattern. The god's departure, for example, is typically sudden and provides no opportunity for Aeneas to respond within the dream.[14] The description of Tiberinus's poplar-encircled hair of reeds and grey-green linen mantle has already been mentioned in the context of visuality. This motif is further strengthened by *visus* at 8.33, which emphasizes that the reader is experiencing Aeneas's perception of the dream rather than an objective narratorial account.[15] Aeneas's response, in turn, is similarly typical, as he utters his usual prayer for continued favour in exchange for sacrifices (71-8).[16]

Vergil also exaggerates certain elements adopted from Homer. For example, the divine inspiration motif typically shows the god assisting a mortal percipient by providing some gift linked to his sphere of influence. In Vergil's scene, this motif depends not just on Tiberinus's

---

[13] The mode of recognition is thus verbal, which is consistent with Aeneas's lack of familiarity with the god and the landscape he represents (see p173-4). On the significance of variations in the river's names (Tiber, Tiberinus, Thybris, Albula), see Momigliano 1966 2.609-39; Jenkyns 1998 401-2, 2013 198-9.

[14] This is not unusual in dream epiphanies more generally. Cf. *Il*. 2.35-6, *Od*. 6.41-7. The only Homeric dream epiphany in which the mortal speaks is *Od*. 4.795-841, where the εἴδωλον (not Athena herself) pointedly refuses to answer Penelope's questions.

[15] This method of description differs significantly from Homeric precedent, where dream epiphanies are always introduced as objective events rather than subjective experiences (e.g. *Il*. 2.16-22; *Od*. 4.795-803, 6.13-24). Cf. similar introductions to nighttime visitations when the percipient is awake (*Od*. 15.1-9, 20.30-1). The closest Homeric parallel occurs when Odysseus wakes to hear Penelope weeping in her chamber and seems to feel her presence near him (δόκησε δέ οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν / ἤδη γιγνώσκουσα παρεστάμεναι κεφαλῆφι, *Od*. 20.93-4). On the objectivity of Homeric dreams, see Dodds 1951 104-9.

[16] See p172. On Aeneas's preoccupation with his role as priestly intermediary, see Camps 1969 44. On the formality and emotion of this speech, see Gransden 1976 90-1. For possible literary conventions of following dreams with religious ceremonies, see Stearns 1927 17.

general function as a river god, but on the ambiguity of his identity as both the river itself and the god who represents it.[17] This, in turn, influences the departure motif, as Tiberinus does not truly depart but simply shifts from his god-persona to his river form, remaining visible as the *flumen* (69) and accompanying Aeneas on the next part of his journey (57, 86-9).

The most anomalous feature of the scene is the relationship between the epiphany's location and its nature as a dream. Homeric dream epiphanies are usually introduced by an account of the mortal falling asleep, which is preceded or followed immediately by the god's journey and disguise as s/he moves to a position beside the dreamer's bed. This arrangement often involves an explicit distance between the god's previous or habitual location and that of the dreamer. Thus, Oneiros receives his commission on Olympus, travels to the Achaean camp, makes his way to Agamemnon's tent, and stops beside his bed (*Il*. 2.16-9). Athena journeys to the land and city of the Phaeacians, then to the house of Alcinous, and finally to the chamber and bedside of Nausicaa (*Od*. 6.13-21). More indirectly, Athena fashions an εἴδωλον of Penelope's sister, who lives far away in Pherae, and then sends (πέμπε, 4.799) the image to the house of Odysseus.

In *Aen*. 8, however, Aeneas lies down to sleep on the very banks of the river whose resident god will shortly appear to him. When Tiberinus manifests himself, he appears undisguised and rises up from the waters, not to look down on Aeneas as he sleeps, but to face him directly.[18] The god's opening words dwell on the fact that Aeneas, not Tiberinus, has travelled far (journey motif, 36-8), and the future instructions depend on the physical boundaries of the god's influence. Despite the seemingly natural progression of motifs, the dream has been developed in a thoroughly unorthodox way.

---

[17] For a more complex example of this kind of ambiguity, cf. Poseidon masquerading as a river god to seduce Tyro (*Od*. 11.235-52). Cf. Horsfall 1995 138 on Iris's alternating status as goddess and meteorological phenomenon.

[18] Similarly, the Penates appear directly before Aeneas in his dream at 3.150. Many of the themes which mark Tiberinus's epiphany at the site of Aeneas's destination also distinguish the Penates' epiphany. Not only are the latter local gods who represent Aeneas's former home, but their physical location is further limited to wherever Aeneas carries them along his journey.

We cannot account for this divergence using the epiphanic trends outlined in the previous chapter. While one might argue that the dream setting allows Tiberinus to deliver his message to the hero privately, Aeneas's solitary wakefulness at 10.215-8 shows that this is not the only way to establish the dramatic isolation in a nighttime epiphany. Vergil has made a deliberate choice to structure the encounter as a dream. In doing so, he ensures that the motifs most closely associated with dream epiphanies – the journey, the god's position relative to his percipient, the (lack of) disguise – call the reader's attention to Tiberinus's status as a local god (*deus ipse loci*, 8.31), bound to the place where Aeneas finds himself in a way which distinguishes him from epiphanic gods in Homeric dreams.

This emphasis on locality reveals the epiphany's narrative purpose. It would hardly be as significant if Tiberinus were to travel to meet Aeneas at another location. Rather, it is the unusual fact that the god has waited for Aeneas to come to him that underscores the hero's arrival at the shores of the long-sought Tiber River, foretold to him as far back as Creusa's prophecy at 2.782. An Olympian epiphany would also prove less effective here. The recognizability and fixedness of the divine river provide a tangible link between Aeneas's world and that of the reader which can only be achieved if the god is bound to a particular place in the world. Remarkably, this also imposes a geographical limit upon Tiberinus's sphere of agency: the god must wait for Aeneas to arrive before addressing him and can only give instructions or assistance insofar as they relate to the course of his own waters. Aeneas's arrival at the future site of Rome is therefore marked by a local god who gives him little new information, but whose very locality anchors the scene.[19]

[19] The thematisation of place remains important later in *Aen*. 8, most notably in Evander's tour of Pallanteum (8.306-58). The links provided by Vergil between Pallanteum and the contemporary city of Rome are foregrounded programmatically by the importance given at the start of the book to the localisation of Tiberinus's epiphany.

Turnus and Juturna, 12.468-886

The final epiphanic encounter of the *Aeneid* similarly features a local, non-Olympian deity,[20] but Juturna's divinity is also distinguished by its recency. The nymph's intervention (12.222-886)[21] spans much of the final book and raises important questions concerning her agency and relative position among the gods. First, far from recreating the invincible campaign of Athena and Diomedes in *Iliad* 5, the increasing certainty of Turnus's death suggests to the reader that the goddess's efforts are destined to fail. Indeed, her entire intervention is preceded by Juno's assertion that it will be futile (135-60). Second, Juturna's actions reveal an excessive attachment to her human brother which is in tension with her new immortal status. As Juturna refuses to acknowledge the uncrossable gap between them, it falls to Turnus to reestablish the scene's epiphanic hierarchy.[22] Ultimately, the encounter is ended by the Dira's intervention, which is itself modeled on an epiphanic structure. The result is an unprecedented scene: the epiphany of one immortal to another.

While Juturna does not approach Turnus until 12.468, the motifs of this encounter look back to her actions at 12.222-65. Juturna's epiphanic role has been facilitated by Juno,[23] who makes her aware of Turnus's circumstances but also, unusually, asserts the futility of divine interference (135-60). Juturna's first intervention is then introduced by an awareness motif (222) as she overhears the soldiers' doubts about Turnus's survival. Adopting the likeness of Camers[24] for her disguise (224-6), Juturna arrives (227) among the Rutulians and

---

[20] Heinze 1915 245; Kühn 1971 161; Horsfall 1995 141.

[21] Her earlier appearance at 10.439 is extremely brief and omits even her name.

[22] This is a narrative necessity of which Turnus need not be aware. Epiphany is by nature an unequal interaction. While the initial phases may temporarily highlight affinities between the percipient and the disguised god, the post-recognition motifs always reestablish a hierarchical relationship (see p15-6).

[23] For Juno as the ultimate source of all Turnus's epiphanic encounters, see Block 1981 170. On Juno's role here, see Kühn 1971 153-4.

[24] Like Homer's Athena, Juturna adopts a male disguise. This depends primarily on the martial context, which would make a disguise of her own sex inappropriate, but may also suggest that she is assuming a more active role than would normally be proper for her. On the tendency of Iliadic gods to maintain their own sex when adopting disguises, see Turkeltaub 2003 21; Nünlist 2009 274.

addresses them collectively. Her instructions to renew the fighting (233) are followed by an assertion of certain victory for themselves and immortal glory for Turnus if they succeed. She supports this implied prophecy (234-7) by fabricating an omen with Jupiter's eagle (244-56), further kindling the Rutulians' resolve. As a collective encounter with no dramatic isolation, it is fitting that the scene should contain no recognition motifs; nevertheless, the augur Tolumnius interprets the omen as Juturna intends and utters a general affirmation of divinity (260) before fulfilling her instructions and casting the first spear to break the truce (266-7).[25]

The episode serves as an elaborate prelude to the nymph's epiphany. While Juturna has not yet intervened directly with Turnus, her brother will later claim to have recognized her at this stage (632-3). Through its imitation of Athena's interaction with Pandarus in *Il*. 4,[26] the passage primarily suggests Juturna's desperation. While Athena targets an individual and persuades him with false hopes, Juturna has appealed to all the Rutulians, making prophecies and implying divine support through omens. This divine support, however, is only an illusion. Unlike Athena, who receives Zeus's permission to disrupt the truce (*Il*. 4.62-74), Juturna is acting against both fate and divine will. While her overarching purpose lends her actions greater coherence than the separate interventions of Athena in *Il*. 4 and 5 upon which they are modelled, the futility of Juturna's efforts to save her brother is established early on.

Juturna's epiphany to Turnus begins with another awareness motif (*hoc concussa metu mentem*, 468), highlighting her constant care for him. Observing Aeneas's fury on the battlefield, she pushes Turnus's charioteer aside in a rare gesture of physical contact (469-70; cf. *Il*. 5.835-41) which again suggests her desperation.[27] She then adopts the charioteer's voice, form, and weapons (471-2). The inclusion of weapons in this disguise illustrates the

---

[25] On the attribution of the omen to the gods in general, see Grassmann-Fischer 1966 98. On Tolumnius's correct interpretation but wrong predictions, see O'Hara 1990 85-7; Tarrant 2012 154-6. More generally, see Anderson 1971 49-58. Grassmann-Fischer (*op. cit*. 98-9) suggests that Juturna herself is seduced by the hope of victory and falls prey to the omen's promise just as the Rutulians do. For an analogous instance of a mortal "correctly" interpreting a goddess's deception, cf. Aeneas's recognition of his mother as Diana at 1.329.

[26] Schlunk 1974 85-7; Tarrant 2012 145, 148.

[27] Although surprisingly common in Homer (see p16), physical contact is extremely rare in Vergilian epiphanies (see p169). On links to *Il*. 5, see Schlunk 1974 22-3.

more active role Juturna is attempting to play in this epiphany than is typically undertaken by Vergil's gods, who remain for the most part aloof from the events they seek to influence.[28] The early motifs surrounding the nymph's epiphany have therefore diverged from the usual Vergilian form – the recurrent awareness motifs illustrating her constant care for Turnus, her forceful replacement of Metiscus, and even the details of her disguise. Each of these features foregrounds her close attachment to her mortal brother.

It is not until 12.623 that the scene establishes the dramatic isolation and begins to focus on the interaction between Turnus and Juturna. In the intervening lines, the nymph's attention has been directed outwards, with her attempts to keep Turnus away from Aeneas facilitating the unusual dual *aristeia* at the heart of *Aen*. 12. However, once Turnus resolves to face his enemy, Juturna must break her silence. After an additional reference by the poet to her disguise (623-4),[29] she delivers her instructions that Turnus leave Aeneas to others and attack his Trojan comrades (625-9). As before, her desperate plea is followed by a wishful attempt at prophecy as she asserts the glory he will receive for adhering to this plan (630).

The moment of recognition follows immediately as Turnus addresses Juturna:

> *o soror, et dudum agnovi, cum prima per artem*
> *foedera turbasti teque haec in bella dedisti,*
> *et nunc nequiquam fallis dea.* (12.632-4)

There are several notable features in these lines. First, this is one of the rare epiphanies in the *Aeneid* in which the mortal percipient is permitted to respond to the god, and it is the only one of these to feature conversation after the moment of recognition.[30] Second, there is Turnus's claim that he recognized his sister as early as 222-65, making this the only Vergilian

---

[28] See p166n10. Tarrant (2012 213) argues that *virago* (12.468) further underscores Juturna's boldness, corresponding to Homer's ἐμμεμαυῖα θεά (*Il*. 5.838) and Ovid's *belli metuenda virago* (*Met*. 2.765).

[29] Cf. the extensive postponement phase in Venus's epiphany at 1.315-401. Neither goddess makes an explicit move toward recognition before her relative identifies her and comments on her attempted deception.

[30] The other epiphanies containing conversation are 1.314-417 (Venus and Aeneas) and 7.406-74 (Allecto and Turnus). In both cases, the mortal's response occurs before the moment of recognition, and the goddess departs almost immediately thereafter. Heinze (1915 312n2) observes that Juturna is the only divinity recognized significantly before her departure and attributes this to her sibling relationship with Turnus.

epiphany to feature a truly unspecified mode of recognition. While such ease of recognition is not unexpected within the context of Turnus's *aristeia* and his kinship with Juturna,[31] it is nevertheless extremely unusual for the audience to be unaware of the exact moment when recognition takes place.[32] Finally, the last part of Turnus's statement can be viewed as an inversion of the traditional "insult" motif – instead of the goddess highlighting her percipient's inability to see through her disguise, Turnus implies that the goddess's disguise was never effective. Once again, each anomaly focuses the reader's attention on the closeness between brother and divine sister.

Indeed, rather than the post-recognition motifs which would typically precede the fulfillment of instructions, Turnus's emphasis on his familial relationship with Juturna (*soror*, 632) prevents the establishment of any hierarchical relationship between them and allows him to refuse to obey her commands. His pointed questions at 634-7 suggest a kind of alternate prophecy to the one put forward by Juturna, revealing the same foresight in Turnus that defines the speeches of Patroclus and Hector in the moments leading up to their deaths (*Il*. 16.844-54, 22.297-305). The concern for welfare which Turnus subsequently utters is addressed not to his sister, but to the divine dead: *vos o mihi, Manes, / este boni, quoniam superis aversa voluntas* (646-7). The outcome which Juturna's intervention was intended to avert has at last become unavoidable as Turnus declares: *ad vos ... descendam* (648-9).

Thus, the moment which typically defines the distance between god and mortal has been altered to emphasize, initially, their closeness. Turnus recognizes his sister immediately, even before she comes to his side. However, while Juturna's emotional ties to her mortal brother have led to a struggle against the demands of fate, Turnus's acceptance of that fate grants him greater insight than his goddess sister. Although his manner toward her denies the existence of any hierarchical relationship between them (or at least one in which Juturna

---

[31] See p21 and p174. On the link between *aristeia* and ease in recognizing gods, see Turkeltaub 2007 66-8.

[32] There are characters in the *Odyssey* who recognize a god but conceal this knowledge from other characters (*Od*. 1.323 & 420, 22.205-10), but each time the audience is informed of this recognition when it happens. Such ambiguity surrounding epiphanic recognition is far more characteristic of Apollonian epiphanies (see Chapter 5) than of either Homeric or Vergilian scenes.

enjoys a higher status than Turnus), his acceptance of his mortality nevertheless reestablishes the ontological divide between himself and the immortal nymph. Despite Juturna's best efforts, she cannot escape the fact that her brother's condition is fundamentally different from her own, and the epiphanic hierarchy is restored.

Juturna's care for Turnus can be compared with that of Hercules for Pallas at 10.464-5. While the latter is not based on a familial bond, it is a parallel example of a recently-deified god unable to avert the demise of someone he knew in life. Here, we find the new god embracing his divinity and accepting his separation from the mortal sphere. While Hercules's tears testify to his prior humanity,[33] he makes no effort to help Pallas. Instead, he heeds the advice of Jupiter, who counsels him on the divine perspective he must now adopt: all mortals – even those loved by the gods – must die, and the best to be hoped for is that they will earn fame by dying well (467-72). Recalling his own inability to save Sarpedon, Jupiter averts his gaze from the war in Italy (473), and Hercules disappears from the narrative without a word. The poetic trope of the long-suffering Hercules weeping has highlighted the god's former humanity and the recency of his ascension to Olympus, but his tacit response to Jupiter's words also shows him learning and accepting the boundaries of his new status.[34]

Juturna, however, is unable to accept these boundaries. Rather than resign herself to her brother's fate, she keeps close and constant watch over him. First she intervenes indirectly, disrupting the truce in an effort to avert the proposed duel; then, as Aeneas's fury escalates to the point that he denies himself a Homeric *aristeia* in his pursuit of Turnus,[35] she takes the reins herself in a moment characterized by rare points of physical contact between

---

[33] "The closeness to humanity of the creature who was famous as the tearless one is marked by the fact of his weeping" (Feeney 1991 156-7). Hercules's tears in this scene resemble what Currie calls "pregnant" tears in Homeric epic, which blur the worlds of character and audience by playing upon their respective memories of mythology (Currie 2016 105-6). See also Barchiesi 1994 10.

[34] Barchiesi 1994 11.

[35] The Iliadic *aristeia* involves extreme but random violence against enemy warriors, whereas Aeneas initially refrains from engaging any other opponent in his single-minded pursuit of Turnus: *ipse neque aversos dignatur sternere morti / nec pede congressos aequo nec tela ferentis / insequitur: solum densa in caligine Turnum / vestigat lustrans, solum in certamina poscit* (12.464-7). It is only when Aeneas is thwarted by the unseen Juturna and attacked by Messapus that he turns to indiscriminate slaughter (12.494-592).

mortal and deity. The entire episode is framed by motifs which emphasize her familial bond with Turnus and the limitations of her divine powers in this context. The goddess's excessive attachment to a relationship which defined her former humanity leads her even to regret her divinity, and she finds herself separated from both worlds.[36]

This ambiguous position – divine yet still self-defined by a mortal identity – creates the narrative space for Vergil to introduce another innovation to his treatment of epiphany: the epiphany of one divine figure to another. When Jupiter sends the Dira to recall Juturna, we are not presented with a messenger scene such as we would typically find between gods,[37] but with an encounter structured on an epiphanic model. The Dira's awareness derives from Jupiter's instructions at 853-4.[38] Her journey is described as having the swiftness of a whirlwind (855) and likened to the fateful shot of a poisoned arrow from a bow (856-9). As she arrives, she transforms herself into a small, *importuna* bird (disguise, 861-5) and attacks Turnus, who experiences a horrifying kind of "divine inspiration" as terror and numbness sweep over him.[39] It is Juturna, however, who recognizes the Dira from afar (moment of recognition, 869)[40] and experiences an immediate, intense emotional response: *infelix crinis scindit Iuturna solutos* / *unguibus ora soror foedans et pectora pugnis* (870-1). After a tragic final address to her brother,[41] Juturna affirms the Dira's intervention as a mandate from

[36] Juturna's eternal mourning for her brother exempts her from the divine prerogative of ultimate invulnerability (Feeney 1991 183). In this sense, she is parallel to Thetis in the *Iliad* (see Slatkin 1991). For Thetis's separation from the gods because of her grief, cf. *Il*. 24.91-2.

[37] E.g. *Il*. 8.397-438, 15.168-217; *Od*. 5.28-148. On this scene, see Hübner 1970 12-42; Tarrant 2012 306-16.

[38] On Jupiter's role in this scene, see Lyne 1987 92-3.

[39] While it seems unusual to identify such a negative response as the result of divine inspiration, its ties to the Dira's sphere of influence make terror a fitting "gift." It is also an inversion of a common Iliadic form of inspiration, that of instilling μένος prior to battle (e.g. *Il*. 5.2, 13.60, 15.262, 16.529, 20.80). Since μένος is associated with defensive, collective, successful fighting in the *Iliad* (Daraki 1980 4-5), its negation by the Dira adds further emphasis to Turnus's isolation and inability to defend himself. See also Hübner 1970 27-8.

[40] In a final echo of the bond between Turnus and Juturna, the Dira uses her attack on Turnus to achieve her purpose toward Juturna. While Turnus never perceives the Dira as a divine figure, he nevertheless shares in his sister's recognition of the message's content (12.895).

[41] On tragic elements in this address, see Barchiesi 1994 95-113. On links to Anna's farewell to Dido, see Heinze 1915 270; Putnam 2011 88-9. This is the first speech Juturna delivers in her own voice, having previously spoken in the guise of Camers (12.229) and Metiscus (12.625-30). Her impassioned rhetorical questions resemble her brother's speech patterns (Tarrant 2012 313), further highlighting their kinship. For full discussion of Juturna's lament, see Perkell 1997.

Olympus (877-8), acknowledging her subordinate position when she recalls how her own immortality was a gift from Jupiter – a gift she now regrets but cannot give back (882-4).[42] At last she veils her head in a gesture of mourning, obeys Jupiter's will, and departs (886).[43]

Far more extreme than a messenger scene, this encounter provokes a vivid emotional response in its divine percipient, who acknowledges not just the superiority of Jupiter but the portentous nature of the vision (*monstrum*, 874).[44] Also unlike the divine messenger scenes at *Il*. 8.409-25 and 15.168-217, the Dira never interacts directly with Juturna and there is no dialogue between the goddesses. Vergil's scene is clearly structured as an epiphany, and it is equally clearly directed toward Juturna (*omen Iuturnae occurrere iussit*, 854).[45] Significantly, despite the fact that Juturna's epiphany has involved multiple interventions, 12.886 contains the only departure motif found in any of them. It has taken divine intervention – in the extreme and hierarchy-based form of epiphany – to remove Juturna from her brother's side. This is only possible because her own epiphany emphasized so strongly the nymph's attachment to her former life and her resulting lack of agency as an epiphanic performer.

Aeneas and Anchises, 5.721-45

Throughout the *Aeneid*, Anchises is defined by his relationship to the gods. When Aeneas carries his father out of Troy, it is Anchises who carries the Penates (2.717-20). Even

---

[42] For Juturna's reproach of Jupiter, cf. Thetis's speech denouncing Apollo in Aeschylus fr. 350.

[43] Cf. *Il*. 24.93-4.

[44] The Dira's message is similar to that of Iris at 9.803-4, "but she resembles Juno's agent Allecto [at 7.323f.] more closely than a normal divine messenger" (Tarrant 2012 306-7). On the Dira and Allecto, see Hübner 1970 34-42; Hershkowitz 1998 114-5; Tarrant 2012 306-7. Juturna's reaction is based primarily on her grief for Turnus but also implies an emotional response to the Dira herself (*ne me terrete timentem*, 12.875). At *Il*. 8.427 and *Od*. 5.116-44 goddesses demonstrate an emotional response to a message's content but not the messenger's presence.

[45] On the bringing of omens to *mortals* as a primary function of the Dirae, see Hübner 1970 13-4. On the mixing of divine, human, and infernal realms in this passage, see Hershkowitz 1998 112-4.

the decision to flee is left to Anchises,[46] who demands two expressions of divine favour before agreeing to the plan (2.689-91). For the rest of his life, his primary role is as the interpreter of divine will; while not free from human error, he remains the authority to whom Aeneas defers in all matters of interpretation.[47] Following his father's death, Aeneas assumes his role as priestly intermediary and Anchises becomes the communicator of divine will, serving as Jupiter's messenger at 5.721-45.[48] Finally, Anchises is responsible for revealing the future of Rome in *Aen*. 6, a role which is significant not just for the representation of Anchises as a figure set apart from the other shades of Elysium, but because such sweeping prophecies are normally restricted to conversations among the gods in the *Aeneid*.[49] Having been characterized in life as a religious authority, in death Anchises becomes not only the messenger of the gods but also a partaker of the divine perspective on history.

Scholars have frequently commented on Anchises's godlike associations after his death, particularly in the context of *Aen*. 5.[50] Bailey's analysis of the rites performed at Anchises's tomb notes their close resemblance to Greek hero cult, while the presence of *altaria* infuses an element of Roman religious worship of the *di superi*.[51] Richardson states that "[Anchises] is even deified, and as a minor divinity may be attended by his own *famulus*."[52] Lloyd writes that "the funeral rites ... accomplish a kind of apotheosis, signalled

---

[46] Aeneas is prepared to reject his new mission and die in battle when his father refuses to leave Troy with him (2.651-72). On Anchises's early leadership of the Trojans, see Pease 1935 4, 20; Nelis 2001 25.

[47] While all divine directives in *Aen*. 3 are delivered to Aeneas, they are submitted to Anchises for interpretation. These include the *monstrum* at Polydorus's grave (3.57-9), the words of the Delian oracle (102), Aeneas's dream of the Penates (178-9), and Helenus's specific instructions (472-9). Lloyd 1957 48-9; Panoussi 2010 55.

[48] On Anchises as Jupiter's mediator in the epic, see E. L. Harrison 1985 159, 161-2.

[49] On Anchises transcending his position in Elysium, see Lloyd 1957 52. On prophecies, see Duckworth 1933 34-5; Block 1981 116; Michels 1981 146.

[50] In addition to the studies listed above, see Lee 1979 55, 183n17; Belfiore 1984 22, 26; Horsfall 1995 141. Others see the funeral rites as an antecedent for the Roman festival of *parentalia*, when offerings were left to deceased loved ones but carried little connotation of actual worship (Bailey 1935 282, 291-2; Klingner 1967 471-3; Holt 1979 116-9). Cf. Swallow (1953 178) and McGlashan (2003), who pass over Anchises's apparition with little comment.

[51] Bailey 1935 291-5. Servius *ad Ecl*. 5.66 notes that *altaria* is only ever used of altars to the *di superi*, whereas *arae* is a more general term. On altars near tombs in the *Aeneid*, see Bailey 1935 281.

[52] Richardson 1940 88-90.

by the almost immediate appearance of his ghost in the exalted role of messenger of Jove." In Lloyd's view, unlike Hector and Creusa who merely gain prophetic abilities by virtue of their deaths, Anchises becomes "a *divinus* in the full sense", although "we might not wish to go so far as Servius and say that he has become a god, but [only that] he has been honoured as more than human."[53] Kühn includes Aeneas's dream (5.721-45) in his discussion of divine scenes, stating "[sie] zeigt alle typischen Zeichen einer Götterszene,"[54] and Fratantuono and Alden Smith call it an epiphany.[55]

While the language and rites at his tomb seem to surpass those of the Greek hero cults,[56] there was no major tradition of Anchises's divinity in Roman mythology, and all his post-mortem appearances in the *Aeneid* – remarkable as they are – continue to emphasize his residence in the underworld. Even so, Aeneas's dream of Anchises bears numerous links to both Vergilian and Homeric epiphanies. Internal associations fall into two groups: dream revelations directing Aeneas's progress toward Italy and encounters between Aeneas and his divine mother. Structural similarities also link Anchises's visit with Homeric messenger epiphanies, which form a distinct subset in the Homeric epics and whose conventions appear to be familiar to Vergil.[57] The result of this network of associations is a fusion of the traditional messenger epiphany structure – one of the most "formal" types of epiphany in epic sources – with the contrasting emotional and teleological aspects of Aeneas's interactions with his mother and deceased loved ones.

In its purpose and general framing, Anchises's visitation is closely linked with other dream revelations in the *Aeneid*. Supernatural, prophetic dreams tend to come to Aeneas at

---

[53] Lloyd 1957 51-2, 55.

[54] Kühn 1971 84.

[55] Fratantuono-Alden Smith 2015 640.

[56] In addition to the mention of *altaria* (see n51), Anchises is addressed as *sancte parens* (5.80, 5.603) and *divinus* (5.47). Bailey 1935 293-5; Lloyd 1957 51-2.

[57] See below, p207-8.

moments of emotional turmoil to soothe his cares and guide him toward Italy.[58] His dreams of the Penates and Tiberinus are respectively prompted by worries about consulting the Delian oracle for direction (3.143-6) and troubled thoughts of war upon reaching Italy (8.29), and these divinities' words are introduced by the same line: *tum sic adfari et curas his demere dictis* (3.153 = 8.35).[59] Aeneas's vision of Anchises occurs as he is similarly torn by indecision following the destruction of his ships by his own followers (5.720). At the end of the encounter, as in numerous epiphanies and in every dream encounter, Anchises disappears before Aeneas has a chance to respond (5.740). While Anchises's identity makes Aeneas's usual prayer-response inappropriate, the rituals which he performs are nevertheless the same as those performed after his dream of the Penates.[60] The framework and contextual significance of Anchises's appearance, therefore, link it closely with Aeneas's other dreams of local or personal gods. The Penates gave Aeneas his first indication that Italy was his destination; Anchises provides the final encouragement to reach that goal;[61] Aeneas's arrival will be marked, finally, by Tiberinus's epiphany, which will assure him that the Trojan Penates are now secure (*certi, ne absiste, penates*, 8.39).

A second major set of internal parallels exists between Anchises's dream-visitation and Aeneas's experiences with Venus. On a general level, Venus's epiphany at 2.589-621 and Anchises's appearance at 5.721-45 function as divine confirmation of advice previously given to Aeneas by a mortal but not heeded by him. In *Aen*. 2, Aeneas is made aware of Troy's dire state by Hector's shade, who urges him to leave and turn his attention to the future; yet it is only Venus's revelation of the divine forces at work that finally convinces him to obey. The sensible advice of Nautes provokes a similar conflict between Aeneas's fated journey and his

---

[58] Heinze 1915 313-5; Stearns 1927 27; Webb 1978 42-7; Block 1981 118; O'Hara 1990 69. For comparison of Anchises's comforting role with that of Tiberinus, see Kühn 1971 84 with note.

[59] The same line also introduces Creusa's speech at 2.775. When Aeneas attempts to embrace her, she flees *volucrique simillima somno* (2.794).

[60] Page 1938 437; Kühn 1971 85; Williams 1972 446.

[61] See Stearns 1927 27; Lloyd 1957 52.

sense of obligation to his followers,[62] and Anchises comes to affirm Jupiter's approval of the seer's plan. The message's attribution to Jupiter links the advice directly to the demands of fate, while the use of Anchises as messenger recalls his critical role in interpreting the Jovian omens which governed Aeneas's departure from Troy.

More specifically, Aeneas's objection to Venus's departure at 1.407-9 is echoed at 5.741-2: *quo deinde ruis? quo proripis? inquit, / quem fugis? aut quis te nostris complexibus arcet?* In both scenes, Aeneas focuses not on the critical information imparted by his parent, i.e. the safety of his companions and the sympathy of the local people (1.338-70, 397-401) or the impending war in Italy and need to visit his father in the underworld (5.728-33), but on the lack of conversation and embrace – that is, he focuses not on the divine mission but on the familial relationship which has been superseded.[63]

Finally, Anchises's instructions (5.731-7) set up his reunion with Aeneas in the next book, an encounter which anticipates many of the details of Venus's final epiphany in *Aen*. 8. Both meetings take place *in valle reducta* (6.703, 8.609). Venus provides Aeneas with a visual representation of *famamque et fata nepotum* (8.731) just as Anchises gives a spoken description of *carosque nepotes / fataque fortunasque virum* (6.682-3). Anchises's speech dwells on the wars to come, for which Venus will arm Aeneas physically.[64]

There is thus a web of associations connecting all supernatural encounters between Aeneas and his parents. Once dead, Anchises can no longer provide the closeness which Aeneas desires from him.[65] He becomes, like Venus, a figure who flees his son's embrace and whose only interactions with Aeneas are meant to ensure that he accomplishes his mission.

---

[62] Swallow 1953 177-9.

[63] Belfiore 1984 20, 22. Page (1938 437) highlights the excited tone of Aeneas's questions to Anchises, taking *deinde* as a mark of indignation at his father's swift departure. Cf. Servius *ad loc*.

[64] Belfiore 1984 26; Armstrong 2006 141n19.

[65] Ironically, the only conversations Vergil reports between Aeneas and Anchises take place after the latter has died (Highet 1972 214). While the reader is not privy to their earlier conversations, they are frequently implied (e.g. 2.650-4, 3.57-9, 3.102, 3.178-9). Lyne (1987 170) observes a similar irony in Aeneas's relationship with Creusa: "when Creusa is dead, Aeneas displays in abundance ... the love and emotion which, for one reason or another, he did not display when she was alive." See also Feeney 1983 214-5.

Unlike the goddess, though, this distance does not reflect Anchises's wishes (5.738-9). Venus, by her very nature as a goddess, is generally remote from Aeneas. Anchises, when raised to semi-divine status in death, is able to maintain at least an emotional connection with his son. He is, however, unable to cross the barrier between life and death at will, but must be sent by Jupiter with a specific mission and then await his son in the underworld. He does not have a god's freedom to move independently between the mortal and supernatural spheres, and even when in his son's presence his status as a shade makes physical embrace impossible. Whereas Venus has the means but not the inclination to be close to her son, and the deified Hercules and Juturna must relinquish former relationships in order to act effectively as gods, it is seemingly Anchises's lack of agency to interact with his son freely that allows him both to intervene effectively and to maintain their emotional bond. Internal associations thus give Anchises's dream-visitation the aura of an epiphany while using the theme of agency to create a subtle distinction between his status and that of the gods.

Structurally, Anchises's appearance is based on the Homeric messenger epiphany.[66] Like Homer's Zeus, Vergil's Jupiter does not intervene directly in mortal affairs, but conveys his wishes through omens or supernatural messengers.[67] In the *Iliad*, scenes of the latter type follow a consistent pattern. Zeus entrusts a message to another god, who promptly travels to meet the designated mortal. Upon arrival, the divinity declares his/her role as a messenger of Zeus. This statement functions as the epiphanic moment, the moment of (verbal) recognition, and the announcement of the divine name, which is notably that of Zeus rather than that of the messenger. There is no conversation by the percipient, and the messenger departs at once as the mortal prepares to obey the divine instructions.[68]

---

[66] Cf. *Il*. 11.195-213; 24.128-58; 24.160-88.

[67] Lesueur 1988 95; Parker 1989 182.

[68] The notable exception to these conventions is Iris's epiphany to Achilles at *Il*. 18.165-202. Here she is sent by Hera without Zeus's knowledge, Hera's original message is omitted, and Iris does not introduce herself as a divine messenger. As discussed in Chapter 1 (p21-2), this allows the poet to highlight Achilles's immediate recognition of the goddess. Interestingly, Nelis (2001 192) has identified verbal parallels between Iris's errand at *Aen*. 4.701-2 and the sudden appearance of the snake at Anchises's grave at 5.88-9, providing an additional link between Anchises and messenger gods. See also Galinsky 1968 171-2.

Vergil adheres to these conventions in Mercury's first epiphany at 4.238-78. After his opening rebuke, Mercury identifies himself as a messenger from Jove (238-9). He never gives his own name, and that Aeneas never perceives his identity is evident in his prayer following the god's second appearance (*sancte deorum, / quisquis es*, 576-7). After delivering his message, he disappears (277). Of course, the scene is not an exact copy of its Homeric template, and scholars have long noted that Mercury diverges from Homeric precedent in one important respect: he does not repeat Jupiter's message exactly as it was given to him.[69] This avoidance of direct repetition is characteristic of Vergil's style, however, which is careful to give individual flavour to repeated elements and type-scenes.[70] While later messenger scenes in the *Aeneid* typically omit either the original message or its report,[71] the inclusion of both speeches in the first such scene contributes to its relatively lengthy development and attests to Vergil's likely awareness of the conventions regarding this particular form of epiphany.

Anchises's appearance to his son at 5.721-45 bears all the hallmarks of a messenger epiphany. After an initial expression of affection and sympathy, he announces that he has come at Jove's command (726). Anchises's name is given once by the narrator (723) but is never uttered by either character. Like Mercury and the Homeric messengers, Anchises disappears as soon as he finishes speaking (738-40). The only element which is absent is one which Vergil omits systematically after *Aen*. 4: the repetition of the message within the scene.

As in the divine epiphanies discussed above, Vergil uses these typical elements to highlight the performer's uniqueness. Anchises's descent from heaven (722) is balanced by his residence in the underworld (733-5). While the prioritization of Jupiter's name is typical of messenger epiphanies, the revelation of Anchises's name is unnecessary due to the nature of his relationship with his percipient. This relationship is foregrounded by Anchises himself, who repeats the vocative *nate* three times (724, 725, 733). Finally, Anchises's immediate

---

[69] On the significance of Mercury's changes to the message's content, see Duckworth 1933 74; Highet 1972 123-4 (Mercury, as "the god of eloquence," chooses not to repeated Jupiter's words verbatim).

[70] Heinze 1915 462-3. Cf. p140n7 on Alexandrian avoidance of such repetitions.

[71] Moskalew 1982 109-10. Cf. 5.606-40, 9.12-3.

departure not only recalls the general tendency of Vergilian gods to avoid prolonged contact with mortals, but also provokes Aeneas's echo of 1.407-9, highlighting parallels between these family encounters. Just as the dream motifs highlighted Tiberinus's status as a local god and those of Juturna's epiphany emphasized her former mortality, so the messenger epiphany motifs of Anchises's visitation emphasize his parental role and status as a deceased mortal.

Finally, it is worth noting Apollonian influences in this scene. While there are no formal messenger epiphanies of the Homeric type in the *Argonautica*, Nelis has highlighted a significant analogy between Anchises's visit to Aeneas and that of Thetis to Peleus at *Arg*. 4.842-84 – arguably the most Homeric of the Apollonian epiphanies.[72] Like Circe's discussion with Odysseus about his journey to the underworld (*Od*. 10.472-4, 488-95),[73] each of these scenes emphasizes the hero's departure and journey ahead. Anchises tells Aeneas to obey Nautes just as Thetis tells Peleus to obey Hera (Ἥρῃ πειθόμενοι, ἐπαρηγόνι, *Arg*. 4.858). Both Anchises and Thetis mention future guides (the Sibyl and Nereids, respectively), who will conduct the hero to the underworld.[74] Both also disappear abruptly, and Anchises's departure recalls the moment when Thetis vanishes from Peleus's sight after their quarrel over Achilles, with *ceu fumus* echoing Apollonius's πνοιῇ ἰκέλη (*Arg*. 4.877).[75] Finally, both Aeneas and Peleus report what they have heard to their companions and begin preparations for departure. These correspondences with the *Argonautica* provide further emphasis on the journey Aeneas must complete while also recalling yet another familial relationship – this time a marriage – which has been frustrated by the gap between mortal and divine.[76]

---

[72] Mehmel 1940 40; Hügi 1952 76; Nelis 2001 200-1. On the Homeric nature of Thetis's epiphany, see p153-5. Notably, this scene provides a template for both Anchises's dream-visitation and the messenger epiphany of Mercury at 4.238-78 (Nelis 2001 157), further linking the two Vergilian scenes.

[73] For Circe's second speech as a model for Thetis's speech, see Livrea 1973 251.

[74] On the Planctae as an entrance into the underworld, see Kyriakou 1995a 19; Nelis 2001 201. On the Argonauts' journey as a catabasis, see Meuli 1935 166; Lindsay 1965 1-74; Vian 1974 125; Clare 2002 167-8.

[75] Cf. *Il*. 23.100; *Georgics* 4.499-500. Thetis's departure at *Arg*. 4.877-8 (αὐτὴ δὲ πνοιῇ ἰκέλη δέμας, ἠύτ' ὄνειρος, / βῆ ῥ' ἴμεν ἐκ μεγάροιο θοῶς ...) also serves as a model for Anchises's disappearance at 6.702 (*par levibus ventis volucrique simillima somno*). Livrea 1973 875; Knauer 1964 398; Nelis 2001 201.

[76] Vergil adapts the same model to describe Aeneas's separation from Creusa (Briggs 1981 974; Nelis 2001n64).

These structural and thematic links to other epiphanies, both within the *Aeneid* and in the wider epic tradition, make it possible to justify analysing Anchises's appearance at 5.721-45 using the epiphany scene pattern.

As in Tiberinus's dream epiphany, the dramatic isolation is established first as night falls (5.721) and the scene is focalised through Aeneas's mental turmoil.[77] Anchises's gentle descent from heaven (*dehinc caelo ... delapsa*, 722) represents his journey,[78] and the emphasis on Aeneas's perception (*visa*) recalls similar uses of *visi* (3.150) and *visus* (8.33) in other epiphanic contexts.[79] Both the focalisation of the scene through Aeneas and Anchises's lack of disguise (*facies ... parentis*, 722) imply an immediate moment of recognition.

When he arrives (723), Anchises's remarks highlight his continued affection for his son, using the address *nate* twice in as many lines (724-5).[80] Like the Penates and Tiberinus, he too emphasizes Aeneas's difficult journey (cf. 3.156-7, 8.36-8). Anchises then proceeds with the announcement of Jove's name (726), which is appropriate both to the scene's structure as a messenger epiphany and to the fact that Jove is the divinity facilitating this "mortal epiphany."[81] Anchises's instructions direct Aeneas to take the advice of Nautes (728-30) and then to seek his father's counsel in the underworld (731-7), anticipating the remarkable encounter in which a shade, in the realm of the dead, will utter a sweeping prophecy the likes of which are elsewhere only uttered by Jupiter himself.[82] Having delivered his message, Anchises bids farewell and departs, disappearing like smoke (738-40).

---

[77] That Aeneas is alone is also suggested by the fact that he must call together his comrades at 5.746.

[78] The phrase appears elsewhere only of Juno (7.620). Fratantuono-Alden Smith 2015 640.

[79] On 5.722 Servius suggests that both *visa* and the contradiction between Anchises's descent from heaven and his residence in Elysium might indicate that some supernatural power has been sent by Jupiter and has merely adopted the likeness of Anchises. However, the use of *visa* is a general trope in Vergilian dream epiphanies which need not imply that Anchises is not himself. See Fratantuono-Alden Smith 2015 640.

[80] Fratantuono-Alden Smith 2015 641. Cf. Cat. 64.215. See also Jenkyns 1998 437-8. Cf. the Penates' and Tiberinus's greetings, which address Aeneas first by his role in his mission (3.156-9; 8.36-8). Fantham 2009 56.

[81] Cf. Odysseus's attribution of his apparent godliness to Athena, *Od*. 16.207-12.

[82] Cf. 1.257-96 (to Venus), 10.11-4 (to the assembled gods), 12.834-40 (to Juno). The only other prophecy of comparable scale is engraved by Vulcan (8.626-728).

As discussed above, Aeneas's protest echoes his disappointment in his mother's lack of openness in *Aen*. 1, revealing that his attention is on denied intimacy rather than the divine import of his father's message. Nevertheless, as in *Aen*. 1, Aeneas seems not to expect an answer; even as he vents his frustration (indicated by the tense of the participle *memorans*, 743), he stokes the fires and worships Vesta and the Trojan Lar (743-5). The ritual suggests the affirmation of divinity motif, which he usually expresses in the form of prayers and offered sacrifices. Since Anchises is not a god, it is fitting that the divinities which Aeneas worships after this encounter should be the very gods his father carried out of Troy.

Finally, Aeneas summons his comrades and reveals *Iovis imperium* (747), his mind now resolved. Without delay, they found a town for the Trojan women and elders in fulfillment of Anchises's first set of instructions (749-61). The episode culminates in the dedication of shrines to both of Aeneas's parents: a temple to Venus and a priest assigned to the sacred grove of Anchises. The latter serves as an additional affirmation motif, as Aeneas now publicly establishes cult honours for Anchises.[83] Aeneas will fulfill his future instructions in the next book as he seeks the Sibyl, performs sacrifices, and travels to the underworld to seek his father's prophecies.

A Note on Hector and Creusa

Having devoted so much attention to Anchises's epiphanic role in *Aen*. 5, it seems appropriate to offer some brief observations on Aeneas's encounters with the shades of Hector and Creusa in *Aen*. 2. Kühn argues that these can also be considered divine scenes, both because the information they bring seems to transcend human knowledge and because they accord with Roman beliefs about the divinity of the dead.[84] However, the scenes do not

[83] See p203-4 for a summary of views regarding these honours as elements of divine worship or hero cult.

[84] Kühn 1971 41, citing Otto 1923 53; Bömer 1943 12-49; Boyancé 1963 144-74.

contain the same sustained references to epiphany that were observed in Anchises's case. While both prove to be vividly supernatural experiences, neither can stand on its own as an epiphany, and neither shade's advice proves effective until it is later repeated by a god.

Aeneas's dream of Hector (2.268-97) draws closely upon Roman ideas about the Di Manes.[85] Aeneas's gruesome description of Hector's appearance (270-9) makes it clear that his shade reflects the condition of his corpse at the moment of death, a common literary device which reflects the liminality required for a shade to return and commune with the living.[86] This emphasis on Hector's appearance also links the scene with Achilles's dream of Patroclus in *Il*. 23, in which the dead Patroclus berates his comrade for neglecting his funeral rites and looks forward to the moment when Achilles will join him in death. This funereal tone continues in the Vergilian scene, where Hector sounds the death knell for Troy but indicates that Aeneas is not to be buried along with his city. Furthermore, unlike Anchises, Hector gives no indication that his instructions reflect the will of a higher being, but simply speaks prophetically of Aeneas's fate. The entire scene, therefore, revolves around images of death and claims no higher authority for its vision of the future.

Creusa's shade appears larger than life and is as ethereal as Anchises's shade when Aeneas tries to embrace her (2.773, 792-4). On the size of her *imago*, Servius writes: *et per hoc mortuam vult ostendere, aut ex homine deam factam* (*ad* 2.773). However, while Creusa might show the divinity of the dead by revealing knowledge of fate, Aeneas's reaction to the *imago* is more typical of a man who has seen a prodigy.[87] Compare, for example, his reaction at 2.774 (*obstipui, steteruntque comae et vox faucibus haesit*) with his response to the portentous moans of Polydorus at 3.29-30 (*mihi frigidus horror / membra quatit gelidusque coit formidine sanguis*). While the lines do not share vocabulary, the sense of physical horror

[85] On Vergil's varying engagement with Roman ideas of the *manes*, see Bailey 1935 256-62.

[86] Karamalengou 1987 14; Savva 2017 124.

[87] Kühn 1971 49.

is the same.[88] Creusa's scene does share some similarities with the dream epiphanies of the Penates and Tiberinus,[89] but it lacks systematic links to formal epiphany structures.

While both interventions share certain features with Anchises's dream epiphany, most notably the personal significance of the performer and their role in facilitating Aeneas's journey, there is one difference which seems especially important. Hector's injunction to flee and Creusa's indication of Aeneas's destination are both forgotten until repeated by divinities.[90] It is Venus who finally prevails upon Aeneas to remove himself from the battle for Troy, while his attempt to settle in Crete causes the Penates to confirm Creusa's revelation that Italy is his true destination. Thus, while Aeneas reacts to both initial encounters as if to prodigies, he does not consider either as possessing sufficient authority to command his immediate compliance. In *Aen*. 5, on the other hand, it is the advice of the human seer Nautes which Aeneas hesitates to heed, and Anchises appears from out of heaven as the voice of divine confirmation. Anchises, as the messenger of Jupiter, is given the role performed by Venus and the Penates in the earlier sequences.

Aeneas's forgetfulness is largely due to the timing of the encounters. When Hector shatters Aeneas's illusion of victorious peace, the hero is not yet ready to abandon his city and comrades – nor should he be, if the reader is to respect him as a heroic figure so early in the poem.[91] It is only when he has done everything in his power short of giving his life that divine intervention can compel him to abandon Troy. Likewise, Aeneas is gradually shaped into a leader by the trials of his wanderings. Creusa's prophecy provides the necessary sense of teleology for the reader, but is not effective enough to shorten Aeneas's journey. Her prophecy is like Cassandra's (3.183-7): neither is heeded until Anchises interprets the Penates' words to his son.

---

[88] While Turnus reacts to Allecto's epiphany and the Dira's attack with similar horror, Aeneas never responds to a god in this way.

[89] 2.775 = 3.153 = 8.35. See p205 and n59 above.

[90] Kühn 1971 42-3, 49-50. On memory and forgetting in Aeneas's characterisation, see Herzog 1993 81-116.

[91] Lloyd 1957 46-7. Cf. 2.431-4.

Vergil thus uses Hector and Creusa to convey vital instructions to Aeneas because of their personal connections to the messages' content, but prematurely. As such, their appearances form part of a series of supernatural interventions designed to facilitate Aeneas's transition in *Aen*. 2 from an Iliadic warrior to a hero capable of accepting a mission which requires him to flee. These supernatural encounters lend heroic and teleological significance to the moments when Aeneas receives the first hints of his fate, but they are never accorded an authority of their own. They are only the messengers of fate, which they are able to glimpse by virtue of their deaths.[92] Unlike in Anchises's case, there is no implication that they have achieved anything beyond the prophetic insights of the dead.[93]

Conclusions

The three scenes discussed in this chapter provide illuminating insight into Vergil's treatment of epiphany, which looks back not only to specific details of Homeric and Apollonian epiphany scenes but also to the underlying structure of the former. This adherence to a consistent narrative framework binds the *Aeneid* epiphanies into a system, contributing to their critical part in the poem's teleology by creating a network of structural, thematic, and contextual links. This structure also enables the reader to recognize epiphanic contexts even (or especially) when they involve unique circumstances. Thus Juturna's epiphany to her mortal brother proves remarkably ineffective, and is only ended when the goddess herself experiences an epiphany. Internal links also combine with inherited structural patterns to identify Anchises's dream-visitation as an epiphany.

Throughout, Vergil does not simply reproduce Homeric conventions, but invokes them in ways that are completely appropriate to immediate contextual and thematic concerns.

---

[92] In this respect I subscribe to Lloyd's interpretation (1957 55) that Hector and Creusa gain limited prophetic abilities by virtue of their status as shades, whereas Anchises attains something more in death.

[93] See Herzog 1993 107 on the collective memory of the dead which spans the mythological past, the poem's present, and Rome's future.

Thus the narrative motifs which are typically associated with dream epiphanies also serve to highlight the locality of Tiberinus's apparition; the conventions of Homeric messenger epiphanies highlight Anchises's statuses as both Aeneas's father and a deceased mortal; and deviations from Vergil's own epiphany conventions in *Aen*. 12 help to emphasize Juturna's former mortality. Similar insights might be gleaned by applying the same approach to any of the *Aeneid* epiphanies.

These scenes also reveal the range of characters whom Vergil allows to assume the role of epiphanic performer. In particular, each of those discussed above is in some way a marginal figure between the mortal and divine spheres. Inseparable from the river he represents, Tiberinus is physically bound to a place inhabited by mortals. Juturna (along with her counterpart Hercules) is unique within the epics discussed in this thesis as a mortal who has been deified within the living memory of the poem's mortal characters. It seems that the greatest temptation for these newly-made gods is to appear in epiphanies to those they knew in life, only to find that such contact is now inappropriate. Juturna, especially, is torn between loyalty to a former relationship and the reality of her new status, and so finds herself isolated from both spheres. Lastly, the mortal Anchises, characterized in life as an intermediary between his people and the gods, is permitted in death to assume the role of an epiphanic deity and to speak across the divide to his living son.

Finally, this marginal status has intriguing consequences for the performer's agency in each epiphany. As a local god, Tiberinus's powers reach only as far as his waters flow. Emphasis on Juturna's former mortality helps to account for the ineffectiveness of her efforts, while also paving the way for her to assume the subordinate role of an epiphanic percipient. Anchises, while able to maintain a stronger emotional bond with a living loved one than Juturna or Hercules, is nevertheless prevented from interacting freely with his son by his shade's confinement in the underworld. While his intervention is much more effective than that of Juturna, he can only approach Aeneas when commissioned by Jupiter and must wait to reveal the most significant information until his son comes to him in the realm of the dead.

While often neglected by modern commentators, each of these scenes is clearly a unique and significant moment. By recognizing Vergil's engagement with the narrative patterns of the Homeric epiphany scenes, the reader gains a new appreciation of these passages, carefully crafted within a system of scenes connected by inherited epic conventions yet also transforming and giving new purpose to familiar literary motifs.

8

Mortal Epiphanies? Tracing Aeneas's Divinity in the *Aeneid*

> *Vix ea fatus erat cum circumfusa repente*
> *scindit se nubes et in aethera purgat apertum.*
> *Restitit Aeneas claraque in luce refulsit*
> *os umerosque deo similis ...*
>
> Scarcely had he said these things, when suddenly
> the encircling cloud parted and melted into thin air.
> Aeneas stood forth and shone in the clear light,
> like a god in his face and shoulders ...
>
> Vergil *Aeneid* 1.586-9

The latter part of the previous chapter has brought us back once again to the concept of mortal epiphany. At various points in the *Aeneid*, the newly deified Hercules and Juturna are confronted with opportunities to intervene on behalf of former companions, the shades of the dead appear in portentous circumstances to deliver prophecies and advice, and the deceased Anchises is elevated to the privileged position of messenger of Jupiter in an epiphany-like encounter with his living son. In each of these cases, the performer's life among mortals has ended prior to the assumption of any epiphanic role. This observation leads to an important final question: what about Aeneas? As the only character who is represented as mortal during the events of the poem but destined for apotheosis, is Aeneas's future divinity ever evoked through the concept of epiphany?

Without attempting to be comprehensive, this chapter will begin with a brief overview of the major developments in Graeco-Roman thought which permitted mortals, both mythological and historical, to be represented as divine. It will then review the most marked ways in which the *Aeneid* signals its hero's future divinity before focusing on two scenes. First, as a continuation of Vergil's exposition of epiphanic conventions in Aeneas's encounter

with Venus (1.314-417), the meeting between Aeneas and Dido (1.494-630) makes a significant statement about the extent to which the theme of epiphany may (or even can) be used to illustrate Aeneas's divine destiny. While the poem will frequently highlight his godlikeness in other ways, epiphany is incompatible with both his personality and his current humanity. This theme must therefore be reserved for after his death and apotheosis.

Second, Aeneas's entrance into battle at 10.470-5 is marked by a multidirectional simile which simultaneously evokes the Homeric *aristeia*, the only context in which Iliadic heroes may surpass their human limitations and approach the level of the gods, and aligns Aeneas with his deified Julian descendants. By recalling and then rejecting the temporary godlike associations of the Iliadic *aristeia*, Vergil emphasizes that Aeneas's character is once again incompatible with Homeric models of mortal pseudo-divinity. Reflections of Julius Caesar and Augustus, however, indicate that his deification will instead be full and permanent, but only bestowed after the fulfillment of the mission which will guarantee his city's future.

From Mythological Hero Cult to Contemporary Apotheosis

One of the major functions of epiphany in Homeric epic is to help define the relationship between the mortal and divine spheres. The *Iliad* depicts a world whose mortals emphatically cannot become gods.[1] This is one of the underlying themes behind persistent references to the mortality of heroes during their *aristeiai*, the emphasis on Achilles's mortality in particular, and statements like *Il*. 18.117-9 where Achilles asserts that even Heracles – a hero who was later the recipient of divine honours in Greek cult – was unable to escape death.

[1] See Chapter 2.

The *Odyssey* plays with the thematic boundaries between mortal and divine, but continues to represent these as distinct spheres. There is an idea of the shade's continued existence after death (*Od*. 11.34-635), and heroes like Menelaus may even look forward to an idyllic afterlife in the Isles of the Blessed (*Od*. 4.561-9), but there is no change of status which might bestow divinity. While Odysseus is allowed to appear as a theoxenic figure throughout the Ithacan books, this is only within the context of a particular task, for which he has been designated as an agent by his patron goddess.[2] Even when offered immortality by Calypso, there is no real possibility that he might accept it, since this would require him to abandon his hopes, not only of νόστος, but of κλέος.[3] Consequently, the existence of the *Odyssey* is, to some degree, predicated on Odysseus's rejection of immortality.

Long before Apollonius, the cultural understanding of the boundary between mortal and divine had become blurred by the evolution of the Greek hero cult tradition. Mythological heroes associated with particular places could receive divine honours in death, and cult activities were frequently (though not always) centered around the hero's tomb.[4] By the Hellenistic period, these honours could also be extended to historical mortals, such as deceased statesmen and even, in some cases, private citizens.[5] This tradition is reflected more than once in the *Argonautica*, including when Apollo commands the Boeotians and Nisaeans to worship the fallen Idmon at the site of his tomb (2.843-50) and when the shade of Sthenelus is sent forth by Persephone to demand libations from the passing Argonauts

---

[2] See Chapter 3.

[3] Anderson 1958 70-10; Vernant 1982 13-19; Schein 1996 22-3.

[4] Among the many studies of hero cult, see Farnell 1921; Burkert 1977 312-30; Kearns 1989; Antonaccio 1993 389-410; Hägg 1999; Ekroth 2007 100-14; Parker 2011 103-23. On the range of cult locations, see Ekroth 2007 108-11. While cults were not always centered around tombs, death was a prerequisite for heroization. On Hellenistic objections to deifying living men, see Plut. *Demetrios* 12, *Apoph.* 210d (Farnell 1921 368).

[5] Hughes 1999 167-75; Parker 2011 112-3; Habicht 2017.

(2.911-29).[6] Heracles represents a special case of a hero destined for apotheosis if he can leave the Argonauts' quest and accomplish his own.[7]

By the time of the *Aeneid*'s composition, this boundary had become even more permeable. The Romans built on the Greek hero cult tradition when they deified mythological founding heroes like Aeneas and Romulus,[8] but emphasis shifted farther away from the tomb of the deceased hero to the apotheosis of the living hero.[9] In the course of Vergil's lifetime, Julius Caesar had joined the ranks of deified mortals,[10] and poets were already beginning to hint at a similar destiny for Augustus.[11] Additionally, Platonic, Epicurean, and Stoic teachings began to move beyond earlier promises of blessed posthumous existence for the elect[12] and to offer the promise of immortality to those who could achieve philosophical perfection.[13] The belief that certain men might transcend mortality and attain divinity through their service to

---

[6] On Apollonius and hero cults, see Hunter 1993 128-9.

[7] Feeney 1991 96-7; Clare 2002 88-104.

[8] Aeneas's deification is attested from the time of Cato (see Servius *ad* 4.620) and the annalist Cassius Hemina. See Cornell 2013 2.253, 3.69 (with bibliography). This aspect of the legend received renewed attention from the first century (*CIL* X.808, Tibullus 2.5.43-4, Dion. Hal. 1.64.4, Diodorus 7.5.2). Romulus's divinity is attested in fragments of Ennius and in Livy *Hist*. 1.16, Plut. *Rom*. 27.3-28.3. Devallet 1989 107; Beard *et al*. 1998 1.31, 2.17, 2.50-1; Cornell 2013 2.119.

[9] Fishwick 1987 39-41 notes that Greek divinization tended to be "declarative not constitutive" in that it recognized an individual's divinity with honours but did not focus on making that individual into a god. Unlike the Greek hero cults, Roman religion did not acknowledge an intermediate state between men and gods, and so assimilated its heroes to full divine status (Schilling 1980 137-52). For the duality of the Roman hero's body, with a *pars mortalis* which disappears from earth at the moment of death and a *pars optima* which survives as a god, see Devallet 1989 112. See also Cole 2013 6. For additional ways in which the Romans adapted the Graeco-Hellenistic concept of deification, see Pötscher 1977 106-12. On Vergil's blending of Greek and Roman cults of the dead, see e.g. Bailey 1935 241-301.

[10] Julius Caesar was the first historical Roman to be deified, an honour granted by senatorial decree, by law (probably the *lex Rufrena* of 42 BCE), and by popular consensus following the appearance of a comet at his funeral games (Suetonius *Div. Iul.* 88). Cicero refers to divine honours, including a temple and a priest, accorded to Caesar even before his assassination (*Philippic* 2.110-11: *... ut haberet pulvinar*, *simulacrum*, *fastigium*, *flaminum*). See Wardle 2009 105-7 for the progression of these honours during Caesar's life. See also Weinstock 1971; Beard *et al*. 1998 2.222-3; Gradel 2002 54-72, 265; Cole 2013 6.

[11] E.g. Horace *Odes* 3.3.9-12, where Augustus is placed alongside Hercules and Pollux. Ovid's *Fasti* 4.951-4 offers another, slightly later example. Feeney (1998 108-14) provides a historical survey of Roman attitudes toward the deification of the living. On the subsequent development of the ruler cult, see Taylor 1931; Price 1984; Gradel 2002.

[12] E.g. for those initiated into mystery cults (cf. *HDem* 380-2). Such promises were also sometimes associated with Orphism. See also Pindar *Olympian* 2.68ff., on which Lloyd-Jones 1985 245-83.

[13] Hardie 1986 173-4; Hardie 1998 83.

either the Roman state or philosophical ideals[14] is one of the most significant differences in thought concerning the nature of divinity between Homeric and Vergilian times.

Deification in the *Aeneid*

The theme of mortal deification is prominent in the *Aeneid*. Here, Hercules resumes his role as an archetypal figure, now as the fully deified hero.[15] That Hercules's deification is a recent one is illustrated by Pallas's prayer to him at 10.460-3, which begins by invoking his former status as mortal guest-friend. The god's tears acknowledge his former humanity, yet he heeds Jupiter's advice on the divine perspective he must now adopt (10.466-72).[16] Juturna's deification, too, is presumably a recent one, since her mortal brother is still a young man. The apotheoses of future Romans feature as well, as Anchises looks forward to the deifications of Romulus and Julius Caesar (6.781, 790), Hephaestus's representation of Augustus portrays his presence at Actium as a godlike one (8.678-81),[17] and Apollo addresses Ascanius as *dis genite et geniture deos* (9.642).

While the reader sees almost nothing of Julius Caesar as a character and knows little of Juturna prior to the rape which led to her immortalisation, the mortal lives of Hercules and Augustus are described in terms which already point to their eventual divinity. While Evander's account of the Cacus episode (8.184-275) is influenced by his desire to explain the rites he is celebrating (8.185-9), it describes Hercules's wrath and strength through the lens of

---

[14] Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* shows how Roman philosophy could absorb the idea of divinisation as a reward for statesmanship. This is also a prominent theme of Anchises's speech on metempsychosis and the virtues of Aeneas's descendants (6.713-886).

[15] Feeney 1991 155-62; Hardie 1998 83. Camps 1969 50 interprets Hercules's presence in the *Aeneid* as providing "the hope of a saviour god" in the face of the often arbitrary and harsh nature of Vergil's pantheon. On how the cult of Heracles more closely resembled Olympian ritual than other Greek hero cults, see Burkert 1977 319-24; Verbanck-Pierard 1989 43-65; Larson 2009 36. See also Galinsky 1972 126-7.

[16] See p200.

[17] Propertius seems to have noted this aspect of Augustus's representation and inserts Apollo into this image (4.6.29-30).

his newly-attained divinity (esp. 8.200-1).[18] Likewise, while the reader never has an opportunity to observe Augustus's behaviour directly, the image forged by Hephaestus emphasizes his godlike presence even in life: supported by the Penates and all the gods, he blazes with flame as the star of Divus Julius shines from his head (8.678-81). The battle-lines are filled with gods and demonstrate a clear alignment of Augustus with the Olympians and Antony and Cleopatra with the monstrous gods of Egypt.

Against this cultural and literary backdrop, the *Aeneid* reveals that Aeneas, through his service to the future Roman state, will likewise earn immortality.[19] His future divinity is signalled in a number of ways. First and foremost, the epic is bracketed by two prophecies in which Jupiter explicitly foretells Aeneas's deification after his death (1.259-60, 12.794-5). These direct statements are supported by sustained thematic links between Aeneas and Hercules, including their persecution by Juno, the persistent use of *labor* to describe Aeneas's task (e.g. 1.372-4, 1.241, 4.233, 6.892, 8.30), the Sibyl's mention of Hercules's catabasis immediately prior to that of Aeneas (6.122-3), and echoes of the Hercules-Cacus episode in Aeneas's struggle against Turnus.[20] Finally, Aeneas is also closely associated with Augustus, adopting a stance similar to that of his descendant's image on the divine shield when he surveys the battlefield at 10.260-75.[21]

Thus, the *Aeneid* clearly anticipates Aeneas's deification through Jupiter's prophecies, thematic parallels with the figures of Hercules and Augustus, and the strikingly portentous imagery as Aeneas enters battle at 10.270-5. However, Aeneas's divinity is always in the future, and Jupiter's prophecies hint that Aeneas will have to wait until the end of his life before being raised to the level of the gods.

---

[18] Cf. also the aretalogy of 8.287-305.

[19] For Aeneas's status as intermediate between gods and men, see Liebing 1953 22; Highet 1972 43.

[20] Gilmartin 1968 41-7; Galinsky 1972 131-49; Feeney 1986 47-85; Hardie 1986 154-6; Galinsky 1990 278-92; Feeney 1991 158-61.

[21] See p233-4 below.

In his discussion of Aeneas's Herculean associations, Feeney[22] writes, "Hercules and Aeneas are straining out of their human status, yet Aeneas remains a human for the poem, and like the other humans must live in a world occupied also by the gods." This distinction between Aeneas's future divinity and his current mortality features prominently in the first book of the *Aeneid*. Shortly after eliciting Jupiter's promise of her son's apotheosis, Venus appears to Aeneas in an epiphany. Aeneas's experience of this encounter, as we have seen,[23] illustrates both his frustration at his mother's emotional distance and his understanding of his relationship to the gods more generally. In addition to preparing the reader for Vergil's close engagement with Homeric narrative patterns of epiphany, the scene indicates that Aeneas views his status not in terms of rights bestowed by his semi-divine heritage, but rather as that of a human intermediary, whose constant prayers for divine favour and promises of sacrifice reveal an anxiety about his position relative to the gods which contrasts significantly with Helen's attitude toward Aphrodite in the similarly-structured epiphany of *Iliad* 3.[24]

Having established that his hero views himself as a mortal whose encounters with the gods are ambiguous and frustrating, Vergil rounds off this sequence of scenes by recalling the prominent Odyssean theme of mortal epiphany. Venus, having advised her son to go to Carthage, shrouds him in a divine mist. This mist conceals him from view as he approaches the city, surveys the images on the temple of Juno, and observes Dido's interactions with the Trojan refugees. When it finally dissipates, it reveals an Aeneas shining with light, beautified by his divine mother so that he appears *os umerosque deo similis* (1.589).[25]

---

[22] Feeney 1991 162.

[23] See p179-86.

[24] See p182-3.

[25] N.B. the use of *refulsit* of Aeneas (1.588) and of Venus at the moment when he recognizes her (1.402). On light as a hallmark of epiphany, see p4n8.

This sequence recalls several moments in *Od*. 6-8 during which the theme of epiphany features prominently. First, the concealing mist recalls that with which Athena surrounds Odysseus during his journey into the Phaeacian capital, as he too marvels at the city's buildings and wealth (*Od*. 7.14-143).[26] Aeneas's interaction with Dido after the mist's dissolution represents a conflation of two further scenes: Odysseus's encounter with Nausicaa at *Od*. 6.127-331[27] and his sudden emergence from Athena's mist to supplicate Arete (*Od*. 7.139-52).[28] In both scenes, a character responds to Odysseus's appearance by likening him to a god (*Od*. 6.242-3, 7.199-206).

Vergil hints initially that his sequence will involve an even more overt epiphanic moment than the Odyssean scenes. One technique he uses to achieve this is the rearrangement and fusion of the Nausicaa and Arete scenes, which in the *Odyssey* are separated by the intervention of Athena (*Od*. 7.14-141). By placing a divine epiphany between Odysseus's two "epiphanic" moments, Homer reminds his audience that the godlike aspects to which Nausicaa and the Phaeacians respond are ultimately attributable to Odysseus's patron goddess. In *Aen*. 1, however, Venus conceals Aeneas at the conclusion of her epiphany and leaves. The two pseudo-epiphanic Odyssean sequences are then joined without interruption, thus sustaining the reader's anticipation that Aeneas's dramatic revelation before Dido will cast him even more strongly as an epiphanic figure.[29]

In creating these expectations, Vergil exaggerates many of the epiphanic undertones of his Odyssean models. The divine mist, for example, does not dissolve immediately upon Aeneas's arrival before Dido, but he is permitted to linger within its protection long enough

---

[26] Conway 1935 82; Page 1938 180; Knauer 1964 163; Austin 1971 144; Clay 1988 198; Armstrong 2006 143. The mist also resembles that of *Od*. 13.189-352, which prefigures Athena's disguisement of Odysseus so that he, too, may gather information from those around him in secrecy.

[27] Conway 1935 103-4; Williams 1963 271; Armstrong 2006 142-4. On Vergil's adaptation of the Nausicaa-Artemis simile, see Conway 1935 94; Austin 1971 166-7; Thornton 1985 615-22. On Apollonian influences in this episode, see Nelis 2001 75-93.

[28] Anderson 1963 2-3; Knauer 1964 164; Clausen 1987 26-8.

[29] Aeneas's frustration during his mother's epiphany prior to this sequence does not immediately undermine the reader's expectations that he may appear godlike in the Dido episode, considering that Odysseus is entirely ignorant of Athena's presence in the analogous sequence in *Od*. 7.

to overhear her promise of assistance before he makes his presence known. This remarkable perspective, which allows Aeneas to gather information invisibly and to initiate his conversation with the queen with some degree of certainty as to her response, approaches that of the gods.[30] Given the supernatural atmosphere, the reader might be tempted to liken this perspective to a divine "awareness" which precedes an epiphanic intervention. If so, this would immediately surpass the limitations which are carefully imposed on mortal epiphanies in the *Odyssey*, where "purpose" motifs like the awareness are always controlled by divinities who take an active part in shaping the encounter.[31] In *Od*. 6 and 7, in particular, Odysseus's dependence upon Athena is highlighted by the gap between their levels of awareness, as he questions the goodwill of the strangers into whose care she has delivered him (*Od*. 6.119-26) and makes his appeal to Arete without any assurances of her answer (7.139-45).

Aeneas's godlike appearance is also emphasized more strongly than that of Homer's Odysseus. Aeneas's beautification by Venus occurs immediately after his emergence from the divine mist, compounding the moment's visual effect for both the reader and the characters who perceive his sudden materialisation. In the *Odyssey*, by contrast, this beautification is repeatedly delayed, first until the bath scene at *Od*. 6.229-35 and then until the start of the Phaeacian games at 8.16-23. At the moment of initial contact, Odysseus is unaided by godlike looks, and his appearance and gestures emphasize not only his humanity but his vulnerability.

Furthermore, the light-filled[32] description of Aeneas's appearance and the accompanying simile *deo similis* provide a more explicit level of narratorial comment than anything found in the *Odyssey*, where such comments are voiced only by characters. Feeney describes Vergil's language at this moment as "like that of epiphany," noting especially its elaboration by the comparison with statuary (1.592-3), a medium often used to convey the

---

[30] Austin (1971 144) interprets Aeneas's delay within the mist as a device to increase his appreciation of Dido's character and thereby to strengthen his emotional inclination toward her.

[31] Cf. discussion of *Od*. 16, p60; of *Od*. 6, p120.

[32] On *purpuream* (1.591) as "radiant," see Page 1938 194; Austin 1971 186. For light as a characteristic feature of epiphany, see Lührmann 1971 187; Richardson 1974 208; Petridou 2015 3.

image of divinity.[33] Vergil has thus borrowed elements which form the core of the epiphanic undertones in *Od*. 6-8 – the hero's sudden materialisation out of a divine mist, his beautification by a goddess, and the awed responses of those present – and subtly altered them so as to suggest an even stronger treatment of the theme of mortal epiphany.

However, just as the reader's expectations reach their highest point and Aeneas bursts forth in godlike beauty, the theme dissipates as suddenly as the mist. Despite the tone of its prelude, nothing about the meeting between Aeneas and Dido resembles an epiphany. As soon as he appears, Aeneas declares his identity,[34] negating any thoughts of his potential divinity before his percipients can process them: *coram, quem quaeritis, adsum, / Troius Aeneas* (1.595-6). Dido, in turn, immediately accepts his self-identification. Her response, while acknowledging his semi-divine parentage (1.615-8), dwells not on his godlikeness but on their shared experience of human suffering.[35] Her speech recalls the theme of Venus's unusual false biography (1.335-68), which has already highlighted the similarity of Aeneas's and Dido's experiences of bereavement, flight, and the sudden burden of leadership. Out of these will grow a mutual love which, as in the case of Penelope and Odysseus, renders the hierarchical nature of epiphany an inappropriate theme for their first meeting.[36]

Structurally, too, there are very few motifs which might be identified as epiphanic. Those that are present invariably occur prior to Aeneas's opening speech, and even these motifs are not quite right. Alternating between Aeneas's grateful address to Dido and his emotional reunion with his men, the scene lacks the narrative focus on a single interaction

---

[33] Feeney 1998 97-8. Feeney further links this allusion to the state cult of the Caesars through the verbal cues of *caesariem* and *genetrix* (1.590). See also Reckford 1995 15.

[34] Cf. his openness when Venus asks his identity at 1.372-85, which likewise distinguishes him from Odysseus when facing a similar situation. Highet 1972 188-91; Schlunk 1974 49-58; Doherty 2002 55n3; Olson 2011 60.

[35] Austin (1971 185) notes that Aeneas's beautification helps to further Dido's appreciation of him as a mortal hero, not as a potential god: "Aeneas has long been an idealised hero to Dido, and the Goddess of Love shows him to her on his first appearance as beautiful and godlike, fulfilling her highest hope." For a more pessimistic view of Dido's response, cf. Horsfall 1973 6.

[36] See p94-5.

which is characteristic of Homeric and Vergilian epiphanies.[37] Aeneas seems to enjoy access to a godlike perspective on the scene due to his mother's intervention, but even within the divine mist he retains his own imperfect perspective when he surveys the images on the temple of Juno (1.441-93).[38] There is also no indication that Aeneas has any control over this mist, as both he and Achates are said to be eager to break out of it (1.580-1) before the mist dissolves of its own accord (1.586-7). At this point, there is a dramatic arrival and a beautification which might suggest a hint of divinity, but everything thereafter declares Aeneas's human identity. Finally, there is no real sense of epiphanic "purpose." Thanks to the apparently exceptional presence of an awareness motif, Aeneas has already heard Dido's promise of assistance before he speaks; he therefore issues no instructions or requests, but merely thanks her profusely for her kindness.

The abandonment of the theme of epiphany helps to characterise the relationship between Aeneas and Dido by its contrast to that of Odysseus and Nausicaa. Faced with a potentially erotic encounter which would make him a threat in Nausicaa's eyes, Odysseus uses epiphanic language to establish an uncrossable boundary between them and to gain her trust as he makes his appeal. Vergil introduces the Dido episode with the same two themes, artfully combined in the epiphany of Venus, whose machinations as goddess of love appear to supersede her maternal role.[39] Aeneas's approach to Carthage continues the epiphanic tone of the previous encounter, only to be replaced fully by erotic themes as his relationship with Dido is allowed to flourish into the mutual love which was impossible for Odysseus and Nausicaa. In this regard, at least, the scene is more closely related to the reunion with Penelope in *Od*. 23,[40] where the epiphanic theme of Odysseus's previous self-revelations is

---

[37] See p168.

[38] Stanley 1965 276-7; Horsfall 1973 7-8; Johnson 1976 99-105; Clay 1988 195-205; Leach 1988 311-8; O'Hara 1990 35-9; Lowenstam 1993a 37-49. Cf. Fowler 1991 32.

[39] See p186.

[40] Vergil's *deo similis* marking the moment of Aeneas's self-revelation recalls Homer's δέμας ἀθανάτοισιν ὁμοῖος (*Od*. 23.163) prior to Penelope's test of the bed.

rejected in favour of a mode of recognition which highlights the equality of the two participants.

Vergil's enhancement of the epiphanic tone leading up to this meeting thus carries the reader to the moment of Aeneas's materialisation and beautification, suggestively punctuated by the phrase *deo similis*, but is followed by a deliberate and immediate abandonment of this theme in the hero's subsequent conversation with Dido. While he has made explicit the epiphanic elements which are only subtly hinted at in *Od*. 6-8, Vergil does not allow the theme to linger as it does in the Phaeacian episode, where Odysseus's reluctance to identify himself allows his status to remain ambiguous for nearly two days. As we have already seen, this fits into a pattern in *Aen*. 1 where Vergil represents his hero in distinctly Odyssean situations, but reacting very differently according to his unique personality.[41] Aeneas's character prevents him from concealing his identity even for a moment, thereby denying the opportunity for him to enact his own pseudo-epiphany at any point in the poem.

This episode thus forms part of a sequence which helps to establish Vergil's approach to epiphany, both mortal and divine, at the start of the poem.[42] First, Jupiter's prophecy (1.259-60) reveals that Aeneas will be granted, not just a temporary semblance of divinity like Odysseus, but full divinity after death. For the present, however, his humanity is highlighted by Venus's epiphany at 1.314-417, whose extreme adherence to formal epiphanic conventions belies the expected dynamic between mother and son, prefiguring Aeneas's difficulty in understanding divine will throughout the *Aeneid*. Through Aeneas's progressive recognition, first of Venus's divinity and then of her true identity, the reader is also able to appreciate his general response to divinity, which reveals that he perceives his status to be more like that of a mortal, dependent upon the ambiguous will of the gods, than of a demigod destined for divinity. This attitude determines not only the structure of his interactions with

---

[41] See p182 and n34 above. See also Armstrong 2006 142-3.

[42] The integrity of this sequence is further strengthened by Vergil's use of the same passages in *Od*. 6-7 as models throughout the entire episode from Venus's epiphany to Aeneas's meeting with Dido (1.305-756). See Knauer 1964 152-65.

the gods, but also the ways in which he expresses himself to mortals like Dido. Finally, having established the possibility of mortal apotheosis, the relative formality of epiphanic interactions between gods and mortals, and that his hero is subject to the same uncertainties concerning divine will as any other mortal character, Vergil addresses the question of whether Aeneas's current mortality and future divinity may ever intersect in the context of a mortal epiphany. By evoking Odyssean themes, he builds up his reader's expectations with ever more suggestive hints, only to reveal that neither the situation nor Aeneas's personality will permit such a development.

Looking to the Future: Iliadic and Roman Echoes at 10.270-5

As we have seen, much of Aeneas's relationship to the gods and to his own future divinity is set up by Venus's epiphany and Aeneas's pseudo-epiphany in *Aen*. 1, yet the poem continues to look forward to his deification in other ways. Perhaps the most striking of these moments is 10.270-5, where Aeneas blazes with supernatural light as he surveys the scene:

> *ardet apex capiti tristisque a vertice flamma*
> *funditur et vastos umbo vomit aureus ignis:*
> *non secus ac liquida si quando nocte cometae*
> *sanguinei lugubre rubent, aut Sirius ardor*
> *ille sitim morbosque ferens mortalibus aegris*
> *nascitur et laevo contristat lumine caelum.* (10.270-5)

These lines evoke the imagery of the Iliadic *aristeia* by combining two famous similes. In the first, Athena makes Diomedes's armor shine like a star at the start of his *aristeia* (*Il*. 5.4-8); in the second, Achilles is likened to Sirius as he charges toward the city of Troy (22.25-32). By fusing these similes into a single description, Vergil uses them to convey both Aeneas's actual, light-filled appearance and the reactions of the Rutulians.[43] A further

[43] Schlunk 1974 30-3. For heroes radiating light in this way during Iliadic *aristeiai* more generally, see Mueller 1984 129.

Iliadic element is added by the resemblance to Achilles's similarly portentous appearance on the Achaean walls at *Il*. 18.203-31, where Athena covers him with the aegis and kindles fire about his head and shoulders. This enhancement, which provokes a terrified response in the Trojans, is the closest that an Iliadic mortal ever comes to resembling an epiphanic deity.[44]

Thus, on the verge of battle, Aeneas is linked with the two Iliadic heroes whose *aristeiai* allow them to challenge even the gods. Just as Vergil introduces the Dido episode by treating the Odyssean theme of mortal epiphany, so he sends Aeneas into battle with a clear image of the only Iliadic context in which a hero may surpass the limits of his humanity and approach, temporarily, the level of the gods. This vivid image prepares readers familiar with the Homeric epics to expect similarly glorious and godlike elements in Aeneas's *aristeia*.

However, the subsequent thematic development of the *aristeiai* in *Aen*. 10-12 challenges the extent to which we can read this comparison as a positive one. Expanding upon the transgressive aspect of these *aristeiai* in the *Iliad*, Vergil transforms this context into one of descent, to a world just as extreme and supernatural as in Homer, but chaotic and infernal rather than glorious and divine. The *aristeia* is still transgressive, not because it represents a hero aspiring and failing to equal the gods, but because it casts the hero in the role of a Titan or Giant, immortal opponents of Olympian order.

Following the death of Pallas in *Aen*. 10, the primary model for Aeneas becomes the Iliadic Achilles, interspersed with brief moments when his own character reasserts itself.[45] As Quint[46] says, "we may feel that Aeneas is acting like his old Homeric self – or the self he would have liked to have been." Yet, despite many Homeric resonances in his *aristeia* and those of the other Vergilian heroes, one feature is notably missing: the divine associations of

---

[44] See p42-3. On Achilles's associations with fire and divinity, see Moulton 1977 106-12; Mackie 1998 329-38.

[45] E.g. his words to the deceased Lausus (10.821-30). See Anderson 1957 25-8; MacKay 1957 11-16; Highet 1972 32-3; Burke 1974 207; Nortwick 1980 308-14; King 1982 32; Putnam 2011 19-30 *et passim*.

[46] Quint 2001 48-50.

this context have been stripped away. There are no similes likening a hero to a god,[47] no divine interventions, no direct epiphanies, and no equivalent to the Homeric epithet δαίμονι ἶσος.[48] In fact, the only reference to the gods is Pallas's encouragement to his men that they are *not* fighting against gods (10.375-6). Even when reworking the Homeric episode of Apollo rescuing Agenor (*Il*. 21.595-22.23), during which Achilles is momentarily deceived by the god's disguise but quickly recovers and recognizes him, Vergil denies Aeneas the opportunity to experience the same kind of epiphany. The *umbra* is used instead to deceive Turnus, who fails to recognize Juno's role in it.

One simile stands out in *Aen*. 10 for its extremity. Aeneas is likened not to an animal or a god, as would be customary in Homer, but to Aegaeon (10.565-70).[49] In a notable departure from previous versions of this figure's story,[50] Vergil's Aegaeon fought not with but against Jupiter. Under his alternate name, Briareus, he can also be found at the entrance to the underworld (6.287). Such imagery is consistent with Aeneas's savagery in taking prisoners for human sacrifice, but it also links him to the catalogue of infernal monsters at 6.285-94. While the simile compares Aeneas with an immortal being, then, the chthonic associations of Vergil's Aegaeon render this a very different kind of link than those found in the *Iliad*. Although the Homeric phrase δαίμονι ἶσος implies that the mortal hero is transgressing a fundamental boundary, it is always accompanied by a reminder that he is mortal and thus poses no lasting threat to the superiority of the gods.[51] Here, Aeneas is cast as an immortal agent of chaos, whose struggle against the gods threatens cosmic order far more significantly

---

[47] Though see Burke 1974 206 for the Mezentius-Orion simile (10.763-8), which portrays him as a huge and irresistible giant but also contributes elements of monstrosity and horror through similarities to Polyphemus.

[48] While these elements do not appear in all Homeric *aristeiai*, they are closely associated with those of Diomedes, Patroclus, and Achilles (see Chapter 2), all of whom serve as key models for the Vergilian heroes in these books.

[49] See Highet 1972 32; Hardie 1986 154-6.

[50] Cf. *Il*. 1.401-6; Hes. *Theog*. 713-35 (as Briareus); Eumelus *Titanomachy* fr. 3. On Aegaeon in Greek mythology, see Gantz 1993 2, 45, 59.

[51] See p40-1.

than the fleeting exploits of the Iliadic heroes. This is a shocking image of the hero who has hitherto been characterized, by both himself and others, as a champion of piety and order.

This inversion of the hero's proper role and character culminates in the simultaneous *aristeiai* of Aeneas and Turnus in *Aen*. 12. Leigh has identified Turnus's intended role in the treaty as a form of Roman *devotio*, the sacrifice of a leader to the gods of the underworld in exchange for victory.[52] It is his willingness to participate in the duel that guarantees the stability of the peace treaty; when this treaty is broken by Juturna's futile attempt to save him, Turnus's voluntary self-sacrifice appears to be the only means to restore the disrupted ritual. Yet, at the first hope of life, he calls for weapons and throws himself into the fighting. Despite his eventual determination to face Aeneas,[53] by the final scene Turnus no longer seems entirely willing to submit to his fate and asks for clemency. This change of heart makes Aeneas the active agent of Turnus's death, rather than the recipient of his self-sacrifice. When Aeneas, in turn, attempts to justify his actions by invoking the language of his self-designated priestly role, he does so within an already perverted ritual.[54]

Meanwhile, Aeneas has gradually descended from his characteristic self-restraint into an ever deeper and more uncontrollable rage. He clings at first to his role as priestly and diplomatic intermediary by begging combatants to honour the treaty (12.311-7); once wounded, he rages wildly to rejoin the battle (387-90); he then pursues Turnus with terrifying determination (464-7). Only when he feels thwarted by Juturna's efforts to keep her brother away does Aeneas turn to indiscriminate violence and threaten to destroy the entire city (494-9).[55] Finally, through the corruption of his use of ritual language, he attempts to use his privileged position as the gods' intermediary in order to justify his thirst for vengeance. At each step, Aeneas is goaded to move farther from the kind of leadership he has had to adopt

---

[52] Leigh 1993 89-110. See also Panoussi 2009 27, 56-77. N.B. *devovi* (11.442), *se devovet* (12.234).

[53] See p199-200.

[54] On Aeneas's use of ritual language when speaking of Turnus's death, see Putnam 1965 195-6; Hardie 1993 21, 28; Panoussi 2009 56; Tarrant 2012 21-2.

[55] On the representation of Aeneas, refugee and Roman founder, as a destroyer of cities, see Putnam 2011 67-84.

in the *Aeneid* and closer to the Iliadic style of heroism he was compelled to abandon in the ashes of Troy.[56]

As in *Aen*. 10, the supernatural associations of these *aristeiai* link the heroes not with gods but with Titans, Giants, and monsters.[57] The single exception is a simile likening Turnus to Mavors, accompanied by Terror, Wrath, and Treachery, just as he calls for his weapons (12.331-40). In light of the distance between men and gods which the poem has hitherto guarded, Turnus's likeness to the god of war can be seen as a further infraction marking his ill-fated campaign to escape his death.

Thus, despite the glorious imagery with which Aeneas enters battle, the connotations of the Vergilian *aristeia* have changed dramatically from those of the Iliadic type which it initially evokes. Denying his heroes any opportunity to test themselves against the gods, Vergil reworks this theme by aligning his two greatest warriors with the monsters who fought against the gods in primordial times and setting them against one another. In this way, Aeneas is ironically cast as the very opposite of what he is, as a challenger to divine order rather than a hero performing the gods' will. Just as the theme of mortal epiphany is evoked by Odyssean resonances in *Aen*. 1 only to be rejected, so the seemingly divine associations of the Iliadic *aristeia* are recalled at Aeneas's entrance into battle only to be perverted.[58]

However, if we return to the same passage at 10.270-5, there is another image which restores our ability to connect Aeneas's actions on the battlefield with his divine destiny. In addition to Diomedes and Achilles, the hero is associated with a distinctly Roman model of deification. Blazing with fire like a star, Aeneas's stance clearly evokes the images of Augustus and Julius Caesar (*patriumque ... sidus*) on the divine shield which he holds aloft (8.678-81). While he does not yet understand these images (8.730), they hold clear meaning

---

[56] See p213-4.

[57] See Hardie 1986 85-156 for Titanomachy and Gigantomachy in Turnus's characterisation and struggle with Aeneas.

[58] Vergil's Diomedes even recants the extremity of his actions during his *aristeia* (11.269-77) in terms reminiscent of Dione's words at *Il*. 5.406-15.

for Vergil's readers, so that Aeneas is unknowingly cast as the precedent for the already-deified Julius Caesar and the already-godlike-in-life Augustus.[59]

Here the reader is presented not just with the godlike mortal of Homeric epic, who wavers momentarily between mortal and divine in a way which must ultimately confirm his mortality, but with full and certain apotheosis at a future date. Although Aeneas's return to Iliadic heroism in the subsequent books involves the abandonment – whether temporary or lasting, the final scene does not tell us – of those qualities which have hitherto defined him and which Anchises has named as the desired basis of Roman might and right (6.851-3),[60] it also leads ambiguously to the final conquest which will guarantee the future of Rome in Italy. In doing so, it will also secure Aeneas's place among the gods.

Conclusions

Following from the previous two chapters' discussions of the recognizability of Vergilian epiphany scenes and the problems of agency which arise when deceased or deified mortals assume an epiphanic role, this chapter began with the question of whether Aeneas ever appears in an epiphanic role in the *Aeneid*. Analysis of Aeneas's journey to Carthage and his self-revelation to Dido in *Aen*. 1 revealed Vergil's assertion that the Odyssean theme of mortal epiphany is inappropriate, not only to this situation, but to Aeneas's character generally. In a similar way, one of the poem's most evocative moments signalling Aeneas's future divinity engages with Iliadic models of pseudo-divinity, only to reveal that these are antithetical to his most distinctive qualities as a leader. More importantly, though, the Iliadic model represents the wrong kind of divinity for Aeneas, whose deification is inextricably

---

[59] 10.261-2 (*stans celsa in puppi*) explicitly recalls the depiction of Augustus at 8.680, while the mention of the shield (*clipeum cum deinde sinistra / extulit ardentem*) points the reader in the direction of this passage. Cf. the reminder of these associations as Aeneas arrives to formalize the treaty at 12.166-7 (*hinc pater Aeneas, Romanae stirpis origo, / sidereo flagrans clipeo et caelestibus armis*). See Clausen 1987 81-2.

[60] See Putnam 2011 115-7, esp. on the ending's emphasis on Aeneas's human passions rather than his role in the wider fate of Rome.

bound up with the future of Rome and will, like those of his descendants, be a full and permanent apotheosis. While this destiny may be secure for him, though, Aeneas is still bound by the limitations of his world, and he will not be permitted to perform the role of a god until his task is accomplished and his life of service has ended.

Appendix 1: Motifs of the Epiphany Scene Pattern[1]

Setting the Stage
- Awareness
- Preparations
- Journey
- Arrival
- Dramatic Isolation

Postponement
- Disguise
- False Biography
- Hint of Divinity
- Preliminary Emotional Response
- Ironic Treatment

Recognition
- Epiphanic Moment
- Moment of Recognition
- Intense Emotional Response
- Announcement of the God's Name
- Affirmation of Divinity
- Concern for Welfare
- Assuagement
- Insult

Divine Purpose
- Awareness
- Instructions for Present Actions
- Instructions for Future Actions
- Fulfillment of Present Instructions
- Fulfillment of Future Instructions
- Divine Inspiration
- Physical Contact
- Prophecy
- Change of Setting
- Departure
- Responding Epiphany

Awareness: The god becomes aware of a situation requiring divine intervention.

Preparations: The god prepares for the epiphany, e.g. by asking permission from Zeus to intervene (*Il*. 5.755-63), altering his/her dress (*Il*. 5.733-47; *Od*. 1.96-7), or yoking a chariot (*Il*. 5.722-32, 13.23-26).

Journey: Either the mortal or the god, though usually the latter, travels to the location where the epiphany will take place.

Arrival: The god and mortal arrive at the same location.

Dramatic Isolation: In most cases, a god will approach a mortal who is already alone. However, in a few notable exceptions there are others present (e.g. the Achaean host at *Il*. 1.188f., Telamonian Ajax at *Il*. 13.46f.; the suitors at *Od*. 1.113f.). In these cases, recognition is achieved by only a single percipient or the narrative constricts to focus only on the god and a single mortal.

Disguise: The god may adopt a disguise in order to delay or avoid recognition. The adopted guise is usually that of a person closely connected with the percipient in order to facilitate conversation and increase the percipient's willingness to accept advice.

---

[1] Adapted from Turkeltaub 2003 19-35. See p12-17 for further bibliography.

False Biography: The god may give a false account of him-/herself, usually in support of a disguise. The biography typically gives an account of who the god pretends to be, how s/he came to be present at the site of the encounter, and/or how s/he obtained the information s/he imparts to the percipient. It often stresses apparent similarities between the disguised god's persona and the percipient, but may also subtly reveal traits of the god's true identity.

Hint of Divinity: Elements in the god's appearance, speech, or behaviour may point subtly to the god's divinity without provoking recognition.

Preliminary Emotional Response: The mortal percipient experiences an emotional response to hints of divinity, but does not achieve recognition. This preliminary response is less extreme than the Intense Emotional Response which follows the Moment of Recognition.

Ironic Treatment: The mortal percipient's treatment of the disguised or otherwise unrecognized god may unconsciously be either properly deferential or inappropriately disrespectful.

Epiphanic Moment: The god reveals his/her identity, usually by either removing the disguise or working a miracle.

Moment of Recognition: The Moment of Recognition usually occurs at the same time as the Epiphanic Moment, though not always. This is the moment when the mortal percipient recognizes the god's divinity. It need not imply recognition of the god's specific identity.

Intense Emotional Response: The mortal experiences an intense emotional reaction to the recognition of the god. This is more intense than any Preliminary Emotional Response to a Hint of Divinity the mortal may have experienced already.

Announcement of the God's Name: By revealing the god's specific identity, this motif distinguishes him/her from all other deities.

Affirmation of Divinity: The mortal acknowledges in speech or action the visiting god's divinity and therefore superiority.

Concern for Welfare: The mortal expresses concern that s/he will experience consequences after the conclusion of the epiphany, perhaps in retaliation for inappropriate treatment of the god prior to recognition or as a result of close contact with the divine. In doing so, the mortal implicitly acknowledges the god's power over his/her well-being.

Assuagement: The god assures the mortal of his/her good intentions and comforts the percipient that the epiphany will not have negative consequences.

Insult: The god further distinguishes between his/her divine status and that of the mortal percipient by calling attention to the latter's initial lack of perception during the postponement phase.

Instructions for Present Actions: The god will typically issue some kind of instructions during an epiphany. The "present instructions" are intended to be completed by the percipient immediately, often while the god is still present.

Instructions for Future Actions: Like the present instructions, except that the prescribed action is to take place at a later time after the god's departure.

Fulfillment of Present Instructions: The mortal fulfills the god's present instructions.

Fulfillment of Future Instructions: Following the god's departure, the mortal fulfills the future instructions.

Divine Inspiration: The god bestows some gift which enables the mortal to fulfill his/her instructions. The exact form of this inspiration is usually linked with the specific identity of the god. For example, Aphrodite typically instills desire (*Il*. 3.395) while Athena grants courage or insight (*Il*. 5.121-32).

Physical Contact: Homeric gods tend to manipulate the world through touch. For example, Athena must physically push Sthenelus from Diomedes's chariot (*Il*. 5.835-6) and touches Odysseus with her staff when altering his appearance (*Od*. 13.429).

Prophecy: The god utters a prophecy indicating the long-term ramifications of the epiphany.

Change of Setting: During the course of the encounter, the god and mortal may move to a new location, often in order to facilitate fulfillment of the god's instructions.

Departure: The god departs.

Responding Epiphany: The god may return in a second encounter which is demonstrably linked to an earlier epiphany, typically either to assist the mortal in fulfilling the future instructions or to provide further direction once these have been completed.

Appendix 2a: The Homeric Epiphany Scenes and Modes of Recognition

Iliad

Unspecified		
	1.351-430	Achilles and Thetis
	5.114-134	Diomedes and Athena
	5.330-352	Diomedes and Aphrodite
	5.431-436	Diomedes and Apollo
	5.711-909	Diomedes and Athena
	5.846-867	Diomedes and Ares
	16.698-711	Patroclus and Apollo
	18.34-138	Achilles and Thetis
	18.165-202	Achilles and Iris
	19.2-39	Achilles and Thetis
	20.445-454	Achilles and Apollo
	21.211-382	Achilles and Scamander
	21.272-304	Achilles and Poseidon
	22.166-277	Achilles and Athena
	24.103-142	Achilles and Thetis
Visual		
	1.193-222	Achilles and Athena
	3.383-425	Helen and Aphrodite
	17.319-339	Aeneas and Apollo
Aural		
	2.16-26	Agamemnon and Oneiros
	2.182	Odysseus and Athena
	2.807	Hector and Iris
	7.43-53	Helenus and Apollo/Athena
	10.512	Diomedes and Athena
	20.380	Hector and Apollo
Verbal		
	11.195-213	Hector and Iris
	24.160-188	Priam and Iris
	24.341-469	Priam and Hermes
Post Factum		
	13.68-75	Ajax and Poseidon
	16.845	Patroclus and Apollo
	22.296-301	Hector and Athena
Mixed Mode: Verbal and Unspecified		
	15.220-70	Hector and Apollo
	21.595-22.23	Achilles and Apollo

Odyssey

Unspecified		
	4.376	Menelaus and Eidothea
	16.156-177	Odysseus and Athena
	20.31-55	Odysseus and Athena
	22.205-250	Odysseus and Athena
Verbal		
	5.333-353	Odysseus and Ino/Leucothea
	13.221-440	Odysseus and Athena
Post Factum		
	1.323	Telemachus and Athena
	3.374	Nestor and Athena
	10.276-307	Odysseus and Hermes

Appendix 2b: Divine Performers Recognized in Homeric Epiphany Scenes

Iliad

Apollo		
	5.431-436	Diomedes
	7.43-53	Helenus
	15.220-70	Hector
	16.698-711	Patroclus
	16.845	Patroclus
	17.319-339	Aeneas
	20.380	Hector
	20.445-454	Achilles
	21.595-22.23	Achilles
Athena		
	1.193-222	Achilles
	2.182	Odysseus
	5.114-134	Diomedes
	5.711-909	Diomedes
	7.43-53	Helenus
	10.512	Diomedes
	22.166-277	Achilles
	22.296-301	Hector
Thetis		
	1.351-430	Achilles
	18.34-138	Achilles
	19.2-39	Achilles
	24.103-142	Achilles
Iris		
	2.807	Hector
	11.195-213	Hector
	18.165-202	Achilles
	24.160-188	Priam
Aphrodite		
	3.383-425	Helen
	5.330-352	Diomedes
Poseidon		
	13.68-75	Locrian Ajax
	21.272-304	Achilles
Oneiros		
	2.16-26	Agamemnon
Ares		
	5.846-867	Diomedes
Scamander		
	21.211-382	Achilles
Hermes		
	24.341-469	Priam

Odyssey

Athena		
	1.323	Telemachus
	3.374	Nestor
	13.221-440	Odysseus
	16.156-177	Odysseus
	20.31-55	Odysseus
	22.205-250	Odysseus
Eidothea		
	4.376	Menelaus

Odyssey, cont.

Hermes		
	10.276-307	Odysseus
Ino/Leucothea		
	5.333-353	Odysseus

Appendix 2c: Mortal Percipients in Homeric Epiphany Scenes

Iliad

Achilles			
	1.193-222	Athena	Visual
	1.351-430	Thetis	Unspecified
	18.34-138	Thetis	Unspecified
	18.165-202	Iris	Unspecified
	19.2-39	Thetis	Unspecified
	20.445-454	Apollo	Unspecified
	21.211-382	Scamander	Unspecified
	21.272-304	Poseidon	Unspecified
	21.595-22.23	Apollo	Mixed
	22.166-277	Athena	Unspecified
	24.103-142	Thetis	Unspecified
Diomedes			
	5.114-134	Athena	Unspecified
	5.330-352	Aphrodite	Unspecified
	5.431-436	Apollo	Unspecified
	5.846-867	Ares	Unspecified
	5.711-909	Athena	Unspecified
	10.512	Athena	Aural
Hector			
	2.807	Iris	Aural
	11.195-213	Iris	Verbal
	15.220-70	Apollo	Mixed
	20.380	Apollo	Aural
	22.296-301	Athena	Post factum
Patroclus			
	16.698-711	Apollo	Unspecified
	16.845	Apollo	Post factum
Priam			
	24.160-188	Iris	Verbal
	24.341-469	Hermes	Verbal
Aeneas			
	17.319-339	Apollo	Unspecified
Agamemnon			
	2.16-26	Oneiros	Verbal
Ajax			
	13.68-75	Poseidon	Post factum
Helen			
	3. 383-425	Aphrodite	Visual
Helenus			
	7.43-53	Apollo, Athena	Aural
Odysseus			
	2.182	Athena	Aural

Odyssey

Odysseus			
	5.333-353	Ino/Leucothea	Verbal
	10.276-307	Hermes	Post factum
	13.221-440	Athena	Verbal
	16.156-177	Athena	Unspecified
	20.31-55	Athena	Unspecified
	22.205-250	Athena	Unspecified
Telemachus			
	1.323	Athena	Post factum
Nestor			
	3.374	Athena	Post factum
Menelaus			
	4.376	Eidothea	Unspecified

Appendix 3: Epiphanies in Apollonius's *Argonautica*

1.1310-29	Glaucus to the Argonauts
2.284-300	Iris to the Boreads
2.669-719	Apollo to the Argonauts
3.1211-24	Hecate to Jason
4.842-84	Thetis to Peleus
4.1305-36	Heroines to Jason
4.1551-1622	Triton to the Argonauts
4.1701-30	Apollo to the Argonauts
4.1731-64	Nymph to Euphemus

Appendix 4: Mortal Percipients in Vergilian Epiphany Scenes

Aeneas		
	1.314-417	Venus
	2.589-623	Venus
	3.147-91	Penates
	4.238-78	Mercury
	4.554-70	Mercury
	6.185-211	Venus (doves)
	8.28-67	Tiberinus
	8.608-16	Venus
	10.215-48	Ship-nymphs
Turnus		
	7.406-74	Allecto
	9.1-24	Iris
	12.468-886	Juturna
Ascanius		
	9.638-63	Apollo

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahl, F. 2002. "Wordplay and Apparent Fiction in the *Odyssey*." *Arethusa* 35: 117-32.

Ahl, F. 2012. "Humour, Chance and Choices: Human and Divine in the *Aeneid*." In T. Baier (ed.), *Götter und menschliche Willensfreiheit. Von Lukan bis Silius Italicus*. Unter Mitarbeit von Ferdinand Stürner. *Zetemata* 142: 13-27.

Ahl, F. and H. Roisman. 1996. *The Odyssey Re-Formed*. Cornell University Press.

Ahrensdorf, P. 2014. *Homer on the Gods and Human Virtue*. Cambridge.

Alden, M. J. 1987. "The Role of Telemachus in the *Odyssey*." *Hermes* 115: 129-37.

Alden Smith, R. 2005. *The Primacy of Vision in Virgil's* Aeneid. University of Texas Press.

Allan, W. 2006. "Divine Justice and Cosmic Order in Early Greek Epic." *JHS* 126: 1-35.

Allen, T. W. 1917. *Homeri Opera III-IV*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Allen, T. W. 1924. *Homer: The Origins and the Transmission*. Oxford.

Ameis, K. F. and C. Hentze. 1895. *Homers Odyssee*. Leipzig.

Amory, A. 1963. "The Reunion of Odysseus and Penelope." In C. Taylor, Jr. (ed.), *Essays on the* Odyssey*: Selected Modern Criticism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. pp. 100-21.

Amory, A. 1966. "The Gates of Horn and Ivory." *YCS* 20: 1-57.

Anderson, W. 1955. "Venus and Aeneas. The Difficulties of Filial *Pietas*." *CJ* 50: 233-8.

Anderson, W. 1957. "Vergil's Second *Iliad*." *TAPhA* 88: 17-30.

Anderson, W. 1958. "Calypso and Elysium." *CJ* 54: 2-11.

Anderson, W. 1963. "On Vergil's Use of the *Odyssey*." *Vergilius* 9: 1-8.

Anderson, W. 1971. "Two Passages from Book Twelve of the *Aeneid*." *CSCA* 4: 49-65.

Antonaccio, C. M. 1993. "Contesting the Past: Hero Cult, Tomb Cult, and Epic in Early Greece." *AJA* 98: 389-410.

Arend, W. 1933. *Die typischen Scenen bei Homer*. Berlin: Weidmann.

Armstrong, R. 2006. "The *Aeneid*: Inheritance and Empire." In M. J. Clarke, B. 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. pp. 130-57.

Arthur, M. B. 1984. "Early Greece: The Origins of the Western Attitude Toward Women." In J. Peradotto and J. P. Sullivan (eds.), *Women in the Ancient World: The Arethusa Papers*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Aston, E. 2011. *Mixanthrôpoi: Animal-Human Hybrid Deities in Greek Religion*. *Kernos* Supplement 25.

Austin, N. 1969. "Telemachos Polymechanos." *CSCA* 2: 45-63.

Austin, N. 1972. "Name Magic in the *Odyssey*." *CSCA* 5: 1-19.

Austin, N. 1975. *Archery at the Dark of the Moon: Poetic Problems in Homer's 'Odyssey.'* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Austin, R. G. 1971. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus*. Oxford.

Bader, F. 1976. "L'art de la fugue dans l'*Odyssée*." *REG* 89: 18-39.

Bailey, C. 1935. *Religion in Virgil*. Oxford.

Bakker, E. J. 1997. *Poetry in Speech*. Cornell University Press.

Bakker, E. J. 2002. "Remembering the God's Arrival." *Arethusa* 35: 63-81.

Bannert, H. 1978. "Zur Vogelgestalt der Götter bei Homer." *WSt* 91: 29-42.

Barchiesi. 1994. *Homeric Effects in Vergil's Narrative*. Princeton.

Barker, E. T. E. 2009. *Entering the Agōn: Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography and Tragedy*. Oxford.
Bassett, S. E. 1938. *The Poetry of Homer*. Berkeley.
Beard, M., J. North, and S. R. F. Price. 1998. *Religions of Rome*. Cambridge.
Beck, D. 1998. "Speech Introductions and the Character Development of Telemachus." *CJ* 94: 121-41.
Beck, D. 2005. "Odysseus: Narrator, Storyteller, Poet?" *CPh* 100: 213-27.
Belfiore, E. 1984. "*Ter Frustra Comprensa*: Embraces in the *Aeneid*." *Phoenix* 38: 19-30.
Belmont, D. 1967. "Telemachus and Nausicaa: A Study of Youth." *CJ* 63: 1-9.
Besslich, S. 1966. *Schweigen – Verschweigen – Übergehen: Die Darstellung des Unausgesprochenen in der Odyssee*. Heidelberg.
Besslich, S. 1981. "Nausicaa und Telemach: Dichterische Funktion und Eigenwert der Person bei der Darstellung des jungen Menschen in der Odyssee." In *Gnomosyne: Menschliches Denken und Handeln in der frühgriechischen Literature. Festschrift für Walter Marg zum 70. Geburstag*. Munich. pp. 103-16.
Beye, C. R. 1968. *The Iliad, the Odyssey and the Epic Tradition*. London.
Beye, C. R. 1969. "Jason as a Love Hero in Apollonios' *Argonautika*." *GRBS* 10: 31-55.
Beye, C. R. 1982. *Epic and Romance in the Argonautica of Apollonius*. Carbondale and Edwardsville.
Bierl, A. 2004. "'Turn on the Light!' Epiphany, the God-Like Hero Odysseus, and the Golden Lamp of Athena in Homer's *Odyssey* (Especially 19.1-43)." *ICS* 29: 43-61.
Biles, Z. 2003. "Perils of Song in Homer's *Odyssey*." *Phoenix* 57: 191-208.
Block, E. 1981. *The Effects of Divine Manifestation on the Reader's Perspective in Vergil's* Aeneid. Monographs in Classical Studies. New York.
Boedeker, D. 1974. *Aphrodite's Entry into Greek Epic*. Leiden: Brill.
Bolmarcich, S. 2001. "ΟΜΟΦΡΟΣΥΝΗ in the *Odyssey*." *CPh* 96: 205-13.
Bömer, F. 1943. *Ahnenkult und Ahnenglaube im alten Rom*. Leipzig: Druck & Teubner.
Bouchard, E. 2015. "Aphrodite *Philommêdês* in the *Theogony*." *JHS* 135: 8-18.
Bowra, C. M. 1933. *Ancient Greek Literature*. London.
Boyancé, P. 1963. *La religion de Virgile*. Paris.
Braund, S. M. 1997. "Virgil and the Cosmos: Religious and Philosophical Ideas." In C. Martindale (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. Cambridge. pp. 204-21.
Breed, B. 1999. "Odysseus Back Home and Back from the Dead." In M. Carlisle and O. Levaniouk (eds.), *Nine Essays on Homer*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. pp. 137-61.
Breitenberger, B. M. 2007. *Aphrodite and Eros: The Development of Erotic Mythology in Early Greek Poetry and Cult*. London: Routledge.
Bremer, D. 1975. "Die Epiphanie des Gottes in den homerischen Hymnen und Platons Gottesbegriff." *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 27: 1-21.
Bremmer, J. N. 2005. "Anaphe, Aeschrology and Apollo Aigletes." In A. Harder and M. Cuypers (eds.), *Beginning from Apollo: Studies in Apollonius Rhodius and the Argonautic Tradition*. Leuven: Peeters. pp. 18-34.
Briggs, W. W. 1981. "Virgil and the Hellenistic Epic." In H. Temporini and W. Haase (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* ii. 31. 2. Berlin/New York. pp. 948-84.
Büchner, W. 1931. "Die Niptra in der Odyssee." *RhM* 80: 129-36.
Büchner, W. 1940. "Die Penelopeszenen in der Odyssee." *Hermes* 75: 137-46.

Burke, P. 1974. “The Role of Mezentius in the ‘Aeneid.’” *CJ* 69: 202-9.
Burkert, W. 1977. *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche*. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer.
Bury, J. B. 1922. “The End of the *Odyssey*.” *JHS* 42: 1-15.
Buxton, R. G. A. 2009. *Forms of Astonishment: Greek Myths of Metamorphosis*. Oxford.
Buxton, R. G. A. 2010. “Metamorphoses of Gods into Animals and Humans.” In J. N. Bremmer and A. Erskine (eds.), *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations*. Edinburgh. pp. 81-91.
Byre, C. S. 1988. “Penelope and the Suitors before Odysseus: *Odyssey* 18.158-303.” *AJPh* 109: 159-173.
Byre, C. S. 1997. “On the Departure from Pagasae and the Passage of the Planctae in Apollonius’ *Argonautica*.” *MH* 54: 106-14.
Cairns, D. 1990. “Mixing with Men and Nausicaa’s Nemesis.” *CQ* 40: 263-6.
Calhoun, G. M. 1933. “Homeric Repetitions.” *UCPCP* 12.1: 1-26.
Campbell, M. 1981. *Echoes and Imitations of Early Epic in Apollonius Rhodius. Mnemosyne* Suppl. 72. Leiden.
Campbell, M. 1983. *Studies in the Third Book of Apollonius Rhodius’ Argonautica*. Hildesheim.
Camps, W. A. 1969. *An Introduction to Virgil’s Aeneid*. Oxford.
Carlisle, M. 1999. “Homeric Fictions.” In M. Carlisle and O. Levaniouk (eds.), *Nine Essays on Homer*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. pp. 55-91.
Carspecken, J. F. 1952. “Apollonius Rhodius and the Homeric Epic.” *YCS* 13: 33-143.
Cartault, A. 1926. *L’Art de Virgile dans l’Énéide*. Paris.
Cauer, P. 1921-3. *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*. 3rd edition, 2 vols. Leipzig.
Chantraine, P. 1952. “Le divin et les dieux chez Homère.” *Entretiens sur l’Antiquité classique*. Vandoeuvres-Genève. pp. 45-94.
= 1954. “Le divin et les dieux chez Homère.” In F. Hardt (ed.), *La notion du divin depuis Homère jusqu’à Platon*. Geneva. pp. 47-96.
Chantraine, P. 1953. *Grammaire Homérique*. 2 vols. Paris: Klincksieck.
Chew, K. 2011. “Eyeing Epiphanies in Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit Texts.” *Phoenix* 65: 207-37.
Clader, L. L. 1976. *Helen: The Evolution from Divine to Heroic in Greek Epic Tradition*. Leiden.
Clare, R. J. 2002. *The Path of the Argo: Language, Imagery and Narrative in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius Rhodius*. Cambridge.
Clark, M. 2004. “Formulas, Metre, and Type-Scenes.” In R. Fowler 2004: 117-138.
Clarke, H. W. 1963. “Telemachus and the Telemacheia.” *AJPh* 84: 129-45.
Clarke, H. W. 1967. *The Art of the Odyssey*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.
Clausen, W. 1987. *Virgil’s Aeneid and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry*. Berkeley/Los Angeles.
Clauss, J. J. 1993. *The Best of the Argonauts: The Redefinition of the Epic Hero in Book One of Apollonius’* Argonautica. Berkeley/Los Angeles.
Clay, D. 1988. “The Archaeology of the Temple of Juno in Carthage (*Aen*. 1.446-93).” *CPh* 83: 195-205.
Clay, J. S. 1974. “*Demas* and *Aude*: The Nature of Divine Transformation in Homer.” *Hermes* 102: 129-136.

Clay, J. S. 1983. *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the* Odyssey. Princeton.
Clay, J. S. 1989. *The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns*. Princeton.
Cohen, B. (ed.) 1995. *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey*. Oxford.
Cole, S. 2013. *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome*. Cambridge.
Coleman, R. 1982. "The Gods in the *Aeneid*." *G&R* 29: 143-68.
Collins, L. 1988. *Studies in Characterization in the* Iliad. Frankfurt.
Combellack, F. 1973. "Three Odyssean Problems." *CSCA* 6: 17-46.
Conway, R. S. 1935. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus*. Cambridge.
Cornell, T. (ed.) 2013. *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*. 3 vols. Oxford.
Coventry, L. 1987. "Messenger Scenes in *Iliad* XXIII and XXIV (23.192-211, 24.77-188)." *JHS* 107: 178-80.
Crane, G. 1988. *Calypso: Backgrounds and Conventions of the* Odyssey. Frankfurt.
Croiset, A. and M. Croiset. 1938. *Histoire de la Littérature Grecque*. 5 vols. Paris.
Currie, B. 2016. *Homer's Allusive Art*. Oxford.
Daraki, M. 1980. "Le Héros à 'MENOS' et le Héros 'DAIMONI ISOS': Une Polarité Homérique." *Annali della Scuola Superiore di Pisa. Classe di Lettere e Filosofia*. Serie III, Vol. 10: 1-24.
DeForest, M. M. 1994. *Apollonius'* Argonautica*: A Callimachean Epic*. Leiden: Brill.
De Jong, I. 1985. "Eurykleia and Odysseus' Scar: *Odyssey* 19.393-466." *CQ* 35: 517-8.
De Jong, I. 1987. *Narrators and Focalizers. The Presentation of the Story of the Iliad.* Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner.
De Jong, I. 1993. "Studies in Homeric Denomination." *Mnemosyne* 46: 289-306.
De Jong, I. 1994. "Between Word and Deeds: Hidden Thoughts in the *Odyssey*." In I. De Jong and J. P. Sullivan, *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature*. Leiden: Brill. pp. 27-50.
De Jong, I. 2001. *A Narratological Commentary on the* Odyssey. Cambridge.
Delebecque, E. 1958. *Télémaque et la Structure de l'Odyssée*. Aix-en-Provence.
Denniston, J. D. 1934. *The Greek Particles*. Oxford.
Derderian, K. 2001. *Leaving Words to Remember: Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy*. Leiden: Brill.
Devallet, G. 1989. "Apothéoses romaines: Romulus à corps perdu." In A. F. Laurens (ed.), *Entre Hommes et Dieux: Lire les Polythéismes* 2, Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Besançon, Paris. pp. 107-15.
Devereux, G. 1957. "Penelope's Character." *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 26: 378-86.
Diels, H. and W. Kranz. 1952-4. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. 2 vols. 6th edition. Berlin: Weidmann.
Dietrich, B. C. 1983. "Divine Epiphanies in Homer." *Numen* 30: 53-79.
Dietrich, B. C. 1994. "Theology and Theophany in Homer and Minoan Crete." *Kernos* 7: 59-74.
Dindorf, W. 1885. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam*. Oxford.
Dirlmeier, F. 1967. *Die Vogelgestalt homerischer Götter*. Heidelberg.
Dodds, E. R. 1951. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Doherty, L. 1991. "Athena and Penelope as Foils for Odysseus in the *Odyssey*." *QUCC* 39: 31-44.

Doherty, L. 1992. “Gender and Internal Audiences in the Odyssey.” *AJPh* 113: 161-77.
Doherty, L. 1995. *Sirens Songs: Gender, Audiences, and Narrators in the Odyssey*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Doherty, L. 2002. “The Narrative ‘Openings’ in the *Odyssey*.” *Arethusa* 35: 51-62.
Doherty, L. (ed.) 2009. *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Homer’s Odyssey*. Oxford.
Duckworth, G. E. 1933. *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius and Vergil*. Princeton.
Dufner, C. M. 1988. *The Odyssey in the Argonautica: Reminiscence, Revision, Reconstruction*. Diss. Princeton.
Dunbabin, K. 1990. “*Ipsa deae vestigia* ... Footprints Divine and Human on Graeco-Roman Monuments.” *JRA* 3: 85-109.
Duranti, A. 2004. “Agency in Language.” In A. Duranti (ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 451-73.
Easterling, P. 1991. “Men’s κλέος and Women’s γόος: Female Voices in the *Iliad*.” *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 9: 145-51.
Ebbott, M. 1999. “The Wrath of Helen.” In M. Carlisle and O. Levaniouk (eds.), *Nine Essays on Homer*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. pp. 3-20.
Edwards, M. 1980. “Convention and Individuality in *Iliad* 1.” *HSCP* 84: 1-28.
Edwards, M. 1992. “Homer and Oral Tradition: The Type-Scene.” *Oral Tradition* 7: 284-330.
Ehnmark, E. 1935. *The Idea of God in Homer*. Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksels Botruckeri.
Eisenberger, H. 1973. *Studien zur Odyssee*. Wiesbaden.
Ekroth, G. 2007. “Heroes and Hero-Cults.” In D. Ogden (ed.), *A Companion to Greek Religion*. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 100-14.
Emlyn-Jones, C. 1984. “The Reunion of Penelope and Odysseus.” *G&R* 31: 1-18.
Emlyn-Jones, C. 1986. “True and Lying Tales in the *Odyssey*.” *G&R* 33: 1-10.
Emlyn-Jones, C. 1992. “The Homeric Gods: Poetry, Belief and Authority.” In C. Emlyn-Jones, L. Hardwick, and J. Purkis (eds.), *Homer: Readings and Images*. London: Duckworth. pp. 91-103.
Erbse, H. 1969. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*. 3 Vols. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Erbse, H. 1972. *Beiträge zum Verständnis der* Odyssee. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Erbse, H. 1980. “Homerische Götter in Vogelgestalt.” *Hermes* 108: 259-74.
Faerber, H. 1932. *Zur dichterischen Kunst in Apollonius Rhodios’ Argonautika (Die Gleichnisse)*. Berlin.
Fantham, E. 2009. *Latin Poets and Italian Gods*. University of Toronto Press.
Fantuzzi, M. 2001. “‘Homeric’ Formularity in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius of Rhodes.” In T. Papanghelis and A. Rengakos (eds.), *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*. Leiden: Brill. pp. 171-192.
Farnell, L. R. 1921. *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Faulkner, A. 2008. *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford.
Feeney, D. 1983. “The Taciturnity of Aeneas.” *CQ* 33: 204-19.
Feeney, D. 1986. “Following After Hercules, in Virgil and Apollonius.” *PVS* 18: 47-85.
Feeney, D. 1991. *The Gods in Epic*. Oxford.
Feeney, D. 1998. *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs*. Cambridge.
Felson-Rubin, N. 1996. “Penelope’s Perspective: Character from Plot.” In Schein 1996: 163-83.

= Expansion of 1987. In J. M. Bremer, I. De Jong, and J. Kalff (eds.), *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*. Amsterdam. pp. 61-83.
Fenik, B. 1968. *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
Fenik, B. 1974. *Studies in the Odyssey*. *Hermes* Einzelschriften 30. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
Fernández Contreras, M. A. 1999. "Las epifanías en la épica homérica." *Habis* 30: 7-17.
Finley, J. H. 1978. *Homer's* Odyssey. Harvard University Press.
Fishwick, D. 1987. *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West*, Vol. 1. Leiden.
Floyd, E. 2011. "Linguistic, Mycenaean, and Iliadic Traditions Behind Penelope's Recognition of Odysseus." *College Literature* 38: 131-58.
Flückiger-Guggenheim, D. 1984. *Göttliche Gäste. Der Einkehr von Göttern und Heroen in der griechischen Mythologie*. Peter Lang.
Focke, F. 1943. *Die Odyssee*. Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 37. Stuttgart-Berlin.
Foley, H. P. 1978. "'Reverse Similes' and Sex Roles in the *Odyssey*." *Arethusa* 11: 7-26.
Foley, H. P. (ed.) 1994. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Princeton.
Foley, H. P. 1995. "Penelope as Moral Agent." In Cohen 1995: 93-115.
Foley, J. M. 1999. *Homer's Traditional Art*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
Fowler, D. P. 1991. "Narrate and Describe: The Problem of Ekphrasis." *JRS* 81: 25-35.
Fowler, R. (ed.) 2004. *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Cambridge.
François, G. 1957. *Le polythéisme et l'emploi au singulier des mots dans la littérature grecque d'Homère à Platon*. Paris.
Fränkel, H. 1921. *Die homerischen Gleichnisse*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Fränkel, H. 1968. *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios*. Munich.
Fraser, P. M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols. Oxford.
Fratantuono, L. and R. Alden Smith. 2015. *Virgil,* Aeneid *5*. Leiden: Brill.
Fredricksmeyer, H. 1997. "Penelope *Polutropos*: The Crux at *Odyssey* 23.218-24." *AJPh* 118: 487-97.
Friedrich, R. 1978. *The Meaning of Aphrodite*. Chicago.
Friedrich, R. 1991. "The Hybris of Odysseus." *JHS* 111: 16-28.
Friedrich, R. and J. Redfield. 1978. "Speech as a Personality Symbol: The Case of Achilles." *Language* 54: 263-88.
= 1999. I. De Jong (ed.) *Homer: Critical Assessments*, Vol. 4. Routledge. pp. 231-261.
Fry, D. 1968. "Old English Formulaic Themes and Type-Scenes." *Neophilologus* 52: 48-54.
Fusillo, M. 1985. *Il tempo delle Argonautiche. Un' analisi del racconto in Apollonio Rodio*. Rome.
Gainsford, P. 2001. "Cognition and Type-scenes: The *Aoidos* at Work." In F. Budelmann and P. Michelakis (eds.), *Homer, Tragedy, and Beyond: Essays in Honour of P.E. Easterling*. London. pp. 3-21.
Gainsford, P. 2003. "Formal Analysis of Recognition Scenes in the Odyssey." *JHS* 123: 41-59.
Galinsky, G. K. 1968. "Aeneid V and the Aeneid." *AJP* 89: 157-85.
Galinsky, G. 1972. *The Herakles Theme. The Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century*. Oxford.
Galinsky, G. K. 1990. "Hercules in the *Aeneid*." In S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Vergil's* Aeneid. Oxford. pp. 277-94.

Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
Garvie, A. F. 1994. *Homer Odyssey Books VI-VIII*. Cambridge.
Gaunt, D. M. 1972. "Argo and the Gods in Apollonius Rhodius." *G&R* 19: 117-26.
Gillies, M. 1928. *The* Argonautica *of Apollonius Rhodius: Book III*. Cambridge.
Gilmartin, K. 1968. "Hercules in the *Aeneid*." *Vergilius* 14: 41-7.
Glei, R. F. 2001. "Outlines of Apollonian Scholarship 1955-1999." In T. Papanghelis and A. Rengakos (eds.), *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*. Leiden: Brill. pp. 1-26.
Glenn, J. 1998. "Odysseus Confronts Nausicaa: The Lion Simile of *Odyssey* 6.130-36." *CW* 92: 107-16.
Goldhill, S. 1988. "Reading Differences: The *Odyssey* and Juxtaposition." *Ramus* 17: 1-31.
Goldhill, S. 1991. *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*. Cambridge.
Gradel, I. 2002. *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*. Oxford.
Gransden, K. W. 1976. *Virgil: Aeneid Book VIII*. Cambridge.
Grassmann-Fischer, B. 1966. *Die Prodigien in Vergils Aeneis*. Munich: Fink.
Griffin, J. 1978. "The Divine Audience and the Religion of the *Iliad*." *CQ* 28: 1-22.
Griffin, J. 1980. *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford.
Griffin, J. 1986. "Homeric Words and Speakers." *JHS* 106: 36-57.
Griffiths, F. T. 2012. "Claiming Libya: Peleus and the Ptolemies in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*." In C. Cusset, N. Le Meur-Weissman, and F. Levin (eds.), *Mythe et pouvoir à l'époque hellénistique*. Leuven. pp. 1-35.
Gross, N. 1976. "Nausicaa: A Feminine Threat." *CW* 69: 311-7.
Guthrie, W. K. C. 1950. *The Greeks and Their Gods*. Boston.
Gutting, E. 2009. "Venus' Maternity and Divinity in the *Aeneid*." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 61: 41-55.
Habicht, C. 1956. *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*. Munich: Beck.
= J. H. Dillon (trans.). 2017. *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities: The Early Cases*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Hägg, R. (ed.) 1999. *Ancient Greek Hero Cult*. Stockholm.
Hainsworth, J. B. 1968. *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Händel, P. 1954. *Beobachtungen zur epischen Technik des Apollonios Rhodios*. Munich.
Harder, A. 2012. *Callimachus: Aetia*. Oxford.
Hardie, P. 1986. *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford.
Hardie, P. 1993. *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*. Cambridge.
Hardie, P. 1998. *Virgil*. Oxford.
Harrison, E. L. 1972-3. "Why Did Venus Wear Boots? – Some Reflections on *Aeneid* 1.314f." *PVS* 12: 10-24.
Harrison, E. L. 1985. "Foundation Prodigies in the *Aeneid*." *PLLS* 5: 131-64.
Harrison, S. J. 2007. *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. Oxford.
Harsh, P. W. 1950. "Penelope and Odysseus in *Odyssey* XIX." *AJPh* 71: 1-21.
Häußler, R. 1976. *Das historische Epos der Griechen und Römer bis Vergil. Studien zum historischen Epos der Antike* I. Teil: *Von Homer zu Vergil*. Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften Neue Folge, 2. Reihe, 59. Heidelberg.
Heath, J. 2001. "Telemachus ΠΕΠΝΥΜΕΝΟΣ: Growing into an Epithet." *Mnemosyne* 54: 129-57.
Heinze, R. 1915. *Virgils epische Technik*. Leipzig/Berlin.

Heitman, R. 2005. *Taking Her Seriously: Penelope & the Plot of Homer's* Odyssey. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Hémardinquer, M. 1872. *De Apollonii Rhodii Argonauticis*. Paris.
Henderson, J. 1997. "The Name of the Tree: Recounting *Odyssey* XXIV 340-2." *JHS* 117: 87-116.
Hershkowitz, D. 1998. *The Madness of Epic*. Oxford.
Herter, H. 1959. "Hera spricht mit Thetis." *Symbolae Osloenses* 35: 40-54.
Herter, H. 1973. "Apollonios." *RE* Suppl. 13: 15-56.
Herzog, R. 1993. "Aeneas' episches Vergessen: Zur Poetik der Memoria." In A. Haverkamp, and R. Lachmann (eds.), *Memoria. Vergessen und Erinnern*. Poetik und Hermeneutik 15: 81-116.
Heubeck, A. 1981. "Zwei homerische πεῖραι." *Živa Antika* 31: 73-83.
Heubeck, A., S. West, and J. B. Hainsworth. 1988. *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey. Oxford.
Heyworth, S. J. and J. H. W. Morwood. 2017. *A Commentary on Vergil Aeneid 3*. Oxford.
Highet, G. 1972. *The Speeches in Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford.
Hoffer, S. E. 1995. "Telemachus' 'Laugh' (*Odyssey* 21.105): Deceit, Authority, and Communication in the Bow Contest." *AJPh* 116: 515-31.
Hollis, A. S. 1990. *Callimachus: Hecale*. Oxford.
Hölscher, U. 1939. *Untersuchungen zur Form der Odyssee*, *Hermes Einzelschr*. 6. Berlin.
Hölscher, U. 1967. "Penelope vor den Freiern." *Lebende Antike. Symposium für R. Sühnel*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag. pp. 27-33.
Holt, P. 1979. "*Aeneid* V: Past and Future." *CJ* 75: 110-21.
Horsfall, N. M. 1973-4. "Dido in the Light of History." *PVS* 13: 1-13.
Horsfall, N. M. 1995. *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*. *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 151. Leiden.
Horsfall, N. M. 2016. *The Epic Distilled: Studies in the Composition of the* Aeneid. Oxford.
Hübner, W. 1970. *Dirae im römischen Epos. Über das Verhältnis von Vogeldämonen und Prodigien*. Hildesheim.
Hughes, D. 1999. "Hero Cult, Heroic Honors, Heroic Dead: Some Developments in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods." In Hägg 1999: 167-75.
Hügi, M. 1952. *Vergils Aeneis und die hellenistiche Dichtung*. Noctes Romanae 4. Bern.
Hunter, R. 1986. "Apollo and the Argonauts: Two Notes on Ap. Rhod. 2, 669-719." *MH* 43: 50-60.
Hunter, R. 1988. "'Short on Heroics': Jason in the *Argonautica*. *CQ* 38: 436-53.
Hunter, R. 1989. *Apollonius of Rhodes: Argonautica, Book III*. Cambridge.
Hunter, R. 1993. *Jason and the Golden Fleece*. Oxford.
Hunter, R. 2001. "The Poetics of Narrative in the *Argonautica*." In T. Papanghelis and A. Rengakos (eds.), *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*. Leiden: Brill. pp. 93-125.
Hunter, R. 2015. *Apollonius of Rhodes: Argonautica, Book IV*. Cambridge.
Hutchinson, G. 1988. *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford.
Hutchinson, G. 2006. "Hellenistic Epic and Homeric Form." In M. J. Clarke, B. Currie, and R. O. A. M. Lyne (eds.). 2006. *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils*. Oxford. pp. 105-29.
Jackson, S. 1987. "Apollonius' *Argonautica*: Euphemus, a Clod and a Tripod." *ICS* 12: 23-30.
Jaeger, W. 1939. *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*. 2nd edition. New York.
Jenkyns, R. 1998. *Virgil's Experience*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Jenkyns, R. 2013. *God, Space, and City in the Roman Imagination*. Oxford.
Johnson, W. R. 1976. *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's* Aeneid. University of California Press.
Jones, P. V. 1988. "The Kleos of Telemachus: *Odyssey* 1.95." *AJPh* 109: 496-506.
Jones, P. 1989. "*Odyssey* 6.209-223: The Instructions to Bathe." *Mnemosyne* 42: 349-64.
Jörgensen, O. 1904. "Das Auftreten der Götter in den Büchern ι-μ der Odyssee." *Hermes* 39: 357-82.
Kakridis, J. 1971. *Homer Revisited (Publications of the New Society of Letters at Lund* 64). Lund.
Karakantza, E. D. 1997. "*Odysseia* or *Penelopeia*?: An Assessment of Penelope's Character and Position in the *Odyssey*." *Métis* 12: 161-79.
Karakantza, E. D. 2003. "The Semiology of Rape: The Meeting of Odysseus and Nausicaa in Book 6 of the *Odyssey*." *Classics Ireland* 10: 8-26.
Karamalengou, H. 1987. *The Dei Penates in the Aeneid and Augustus. Parousia V, Suppl. 3*. Athens.
Katz, M. 1991. *Penelope's Renown: Meaning and Indeterminacy in the* Odyssey. Princeton.
Kearns, E. 1982. "The Return of Odysseus: A Homeric Theoxeny." *CQ* 32: 2-8.
Kearns, E. 1989. *The Heroes of Attica*. Bulletin Supplement 57. University of London, Institute for Classical Studies.
Kearns, E. 2004. "The Gods in the Homeric Epics." In R. Fowler 2004: 59-73.
Kelly, A. 2007a. "How to End an Orally Derived Poem" *TAPhA* 137: 371-402.
Kelly, A. 2007b. *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to* Iliad *VIII*. Oxford.
Kelly, A. 2012. "The Audience Expects: Penelope and Odysseus." In E. Minchin (ed.), *Orality, Literacy and Performance in the Ancient World*. Leiden: Brill. pp. 3-24.
Kelly, A. 2018. "'Intraformularity' in *epos*." *Paper Given at SCS Annual Meeting, Boston*.
Kidder, G. V. 1937. *The Description of Characters in Vergil's* Aeneid. Diss. University of Chicago.
Kilb, H. 1973. *Strukturen epischen Gestaltens im 7. und 23. Gesang der Odyssee*. Munich.
King, K. C. 1982. "Foil and Fusion: Homer's Achilles in Vergil's Aeneid." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 9: 31-57.
Kirchhoff, A. 1860. "Homerische Excurse. 4." *RhM* 15: 329-66.
Kirchhoff, A. 1879. *Die homerische Odyssee*. Berlin.
Kirk, G. S. 1962. *The Songs of Homer*. Cambridge.
Kirk, G. S. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. 1: Bks. 1-4*. Cambridge.
Klein, L. 1931. "Die Göttertechnik in den Argonautika des Apollonius Rhodius." *Philologus* 86: 18-51, 217-31.
Kleinknecht, H. 1958. "Platonisches im Homer." *Gymn*. 65: 59-75.
Kleinknecht, H. 1963. "Laokoon." *Wege zu Vergil*. Darmstadt. pp. 426-88. Reprinted from *Hermes* 79 1944: 66-111.
Klingner, F. 1967. *Virgil*. Zürich/Stuttgart.
Knauer, G. N. 1964. *Die Aeneis und Homer*. Göttingen.
Knight, V. 1995. *The Renewal of Epic: Responses to Homer in the Argonautica of Apollonius. Mnemosyne* Suppl. 152. Leiden.
Koch Piettre, R. 1996. *Le corps des dieux dans les épiphanies divines en Grèce ancienne*. Thèse de doctorat "nouveau régime." École Pratique des Hautes Études.

Koch Piettre, R. 2001. “Images et perception de la présence divine en Grèce Ancienne.” *MÉFRA* 113: 211-24.
Kockelman, P. 2007. “Agency: The Relation between Meaning, Power, and Knowledge.” *Current Anthropology* 48: 375-401.
Köhnken, A. 1965. *Apollonios Rhodios und Theokrit: die Hylas- und Amykosgeschichten beider Dichter und die Frage der Priorität*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Köhnken, A. 2003. “Perspektivisches Erzählen im homerischen Epos: Die Wiedererkennung Odysseus: Argos.” *Hermes* 131: 358-96.
Köhnken, A. 2005. “Der Argonaut Euphemos.” In A. Harder and M. Cuypers (eds.), *Beginning from Apollo: Studies in Apollonius Rhodius and the Argonautic Tradition*. Leuven: Peeters. pp. 70-5.
Kötting, B. 1983. “Fußspuren als Zeichen göttlicher Anwesenheit.” *Boreas* 6: 197-201.
Kröcher, J. 1876. *Der homerische Dämon*. Progr. Stettin.
Kühn, W. 1971. *Götterszenen bei Vergil*. Heidelberg.
Kullmann, W. 1956. *Das Wirken der Götter in der* Ilias. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
Kullmann, W. 1985. “Gods and Men in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.” *HSCP* 89: 1-23.
Kyriakou, P. 1995a. *Homeric Hapax Legomena in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius: A Literary Study*. Palingenesia Band 54. Stuttgart.
Kyriakou, P. 1995b. “Κατάβασις and the Underworld in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius.” *Philologus* 139: 256-64.
Lang, M. L. 1969. “Homer and Oral Techniques.” *Hesperia* 38: 159-68.
Larson, J. L. 1995. *Greek Heroine Cults*. University of Wisconsin Press.
Larson, J. L. 2001. *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore*. Oxford.
Larson, J. L. 2009. “The Singularity of Herakles.” In S. Albersmeier (ed.), *Heroes: Mortals and Myths in Ancient Greece*. Yale University Press.
Lateiner, D. 1995. *Sardonic Smile*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Lavoie, G. 1970. “Sur quelques métamporphoses divines dans l’*Iliade*.” *L’Antiquité Classique* 39: 5-34.
Lawall, G. 1966. “Apollonius’ *Argonautica*: Jason as Anti-Hero.” *YCS* 19: 119-69.
Leach, E. W. 1988. *The Rhetoric of Space: Literary and Artistic Representations of Landscape in Republican and Augustan Rome*. Princeton.
Leach, E. W. 1997. “Venus, Thetis and the Social Construction of Maternal Behavior.” *CJ* 92: 347-71.
Lee, D. J. N. 1964. *The Similes of the Iliad and the Odyssey Compared*. Melbourne.
Lee, M. O. 1979. *Fathers and Sons in Virgil’s* Aeneid*. Tum Genitor Natum*. Albany, NY.
Lehrs, K. 1875. *Populare Aufsitze aus dem Altertum*. Leipzig.
Leigh, M. 1993. “Hopelessly Devoted to You: Traces of the Decii in Virgil’s *Aeneid*.” *PVS* 21: 89-110.
Leitzke, E. 1930. *Moira und Gottheit im alten griechischen Epos*. Diss. Göttingen.
Lennox, P. G. 1980. “Apollonius, Argonautica 3.1ff., and Homer.” *Hermes* 108: 45-73.
Lenz, L. 1975. *Der homerische Aphroditehymnus und die Aristie des Aineias in der Ilias*. Bonn: R. Habelt.
Lesueur, R. 1988. “Les déguisements des dieux dans l’Énéide.” *IL* 39: 199-206.
Levaniouk, O. 1999. “Penelope and the *Pênelops*.” In M. Carlisle and O. Levaniouk (eds.), *Nine Essays on Homer*. Rowman & Littlefield. pp. 95-136.
Liebing, H. 1953. *Die Aeneasgestalt bei Vergil*. Diss. Kiel.

Lindsay, J. 1965. *Clashing Rocks*. London.
Livrea, E. 1973. *Apolloni Rhodii Argonauticon Liber Quartus*. Florence.
Lloyd, R. B. 1957. "The Character of Anchises in the *Aeneid*." *TAPhA* 88: 44-55.
Lloyd, R. B. 1976/7. "Humor in the *Aeneid*." *CJ* 72: 250-7.
Lloyd-Jones, H. 1971. *The Justice of Zeus*. Berkeley.
Lloyd-Jones, H. 1985. "Pindar and the After-Life." *Entretiens sur L'Antiquité* 31: 245-83.
Lord, A. 1960. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA.
Lord, M. L. 1966. "Withdrawal and Return: An Epic Story Pattern in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter and in the Homeric Poems." *CJ* 62: 241-8.
Louden, B. 2005. "The Gods in Epic, or the Divine Economy." In J. Foley (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epic*. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 90-104.
Louden, B. 2011a. *Homer's Odyssey and the Near East*. Cambridge.
Louden, B. 2011b. "Is There Early Recognition between Penelope and Odysseus? Book 19 in the Larger Context of the 'Odyssey.'" *College Literature* 38: 76-100.
Lowenstam, S. 1993a. "The Pictures on Juno's Temple in the *Aeneid*." *CW* 87: 37-49.
Lowenstam, S. 1993b. *The Scepter and the Spear*. Lanham.
Lowenstam, S. 2000. "The Shroud of Laertes and Penelope's Guile." *CJ* 95: 333-48.
Lührmann, D. 1971. "Epiphaneia: Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte eines griechischen Wortes." In G. Jeremias, H. W. Kuhn, and H. Stegemann (eds.), *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt*. Göttingen. pp. 185-99.
Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1987. *Further Voices in Vergil's 'Aeneid.'* Oxford.
Lyons, D. J. 1997. *Gender and Immortality: Heroines in Ancient Greek Myth and Cult*. Princeton.
MacKay, L. A. 1957. "Achilles as a Model for Aeneas." *TAPhA* 88: 11-6.
Mackie, C. J. 1998. "Achilles in Fire." *CQ* 48: 329-38.
Mackie, H. 1997. "Song and Storytelling: An Odyssean Perspective." *TAPhA* 127: 77-95.
Magrath, W. 1982. "Progression of the Lion Simile in the *Odyssey*." *CJ* 77: 205-12.
Marquardt, P. 1985. "Penelope 'Polutropos.'" *AJPh* 106: 32-48.
Martin, R. 1989. *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the* Iliad. Cornell University Press.
Martin, R. 1993. "Telemachus and the Last Hero Song." In H. Roisman and J. Roisman (eds.), *Essays on Homeric Epic*. Special Issue, *Colby Quarterly* 19. pp. 222-40.
Mattes, W. 1954. *Odysseus bei den Phäaken*. Würzburg.
McGlashan, L. 2003. "Reversal and Epiphany in the Games of Anchises." *Vergilius* 49: 42-68.
Mehmel, F. 1940. *Virgil und Apollonius Rhodius: Untersuchungen über die Zeitborstellung in der antiken epischen Erzählung*. Hamburg.
Mensching, E. 1970. "Die Interjection *Heus* in der Aeneis (1.321, 7.116)." *RhM* 113: 265-71.
Merkelbach, R. 1951. *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee*. Munich: Beck.
Merry, W. 1882. *Odyssey, Books XIII-XXIV*. 2nd edition. Oxford.
Meuli, K. 1935. "Scythica." *Hermes* 70: 164-76.
Michels, A. K. 1981. "The Insomnium of Aeneas." *CQ* 31: 140-6.
Minchin, E. 1987. *Homeric Voices: Discourse, Memory, Gender*. Oxford.
Mirto, M. S. 2011. "Il nome di Achille nelle *Argonautiche* tra intertestualità e giochi etimologici." *RFIC* 139: 279-309.

Momigliano, A. 1966. “Thybris Pater.” In A. Momigliano, *Terzo Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici e del Mondo Antico*. Vol. 2. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura. pp. 609-39.
Monro, D. B. 1891. *Homer* Iliad: *Books I-XII*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Monro, D. B. 1901. *Homer's* Odyssey: *Books XIII-XXIV*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Mooney, G. W. 1912. *The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.
Morgan, K. 1991. “*Odyssey* 23.218-24: Adultery, Shame, and Marriage.” *AJPh* 112: 1-3.
Mori, A. 2012. “Reconciliation and Ceaseless Wrath: Paradoxical Hera in Apollonius and Callimachus.” In C. Cusset, N. Le Meur-Weissman, and F. Levin (eds.), *Mythe et pouvoir à l'époque hellénistique*. Leuven. pp. 319-36.
Moskalew, W. 1982. *Formular Language and Poetic Design in the* Aeneid. Leiden: Brill.
Most, G. 1989a. “The Stranger's Stratagem: Self-Disclosure and Self-Sufficiency in Greek Culture.” *JHS* 109: 114-33.
Most, G. 1989b. “The Structure and Function of Odysseus' *Apologoi*.” *TAPhA* 119: 15-30.
Moulton, C. 1974. “The End of the *Odyssey*.” *GRBS* 15: 153-69.
Moulton, C. 1977. *Similes in the Homeric Poems*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Mueller, M. 1984. *The Iliad*. Unwin Critical Library. London: G. Allen & Unwin.
Mühll, P. von der. 1939. *Odyssee*. Stuttgart.
= 1940. *Odyssee*. *RE* Suppl. 7: 696-768.
Müller, M. 1966. *Athene als göttliche Helferin in der Odyssee*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
Munro, D. B. and T. W. Allen. 1920. *Homeri Opera I-II*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Murnaghan, S. 1987. *Disguise and Recognition in the* Odyssey. Princeton.
Murnaghan, S. 1988. “Penelope's Agnoia: Knowledge, Power and Gender in the *Odyssey*.” *Helios* 13: 103-15.
Murnaghan, S. 1995. “The Plan of Athena.” In Cohen 1995: 61-80.
Murnaghan, S. 1999. “The Poetics of Loss in Greek Epic.” In M. Beissinger, J. Tylus, and S. Wofford (eds.), *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World: The Poetics of Community*. University of California Press. pp. 203-20.
Murnaghan, S. 2002. “Trials of Telemachus: Who Was the *Odyssey* Meant For?” *Arethusa* 35: 133-53.
Mussies, G. 1988. “Identification and Self-identification of Gods in Classical and Hellenistic Greece.” In R. van den Broek (ed.), *Knowledge of God in the Graeco-Roman World*. Leiden: Brill. pp. 1-18.
Mynors, R. A. B. 1969. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Nagler, M. 1974. *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study of the Oral Art of Homer*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Nagy, G. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Baltimore.
Natzel, S. A. 1992. *Κλέα γυναικῶν: Frauen in den* Argonautika *des Apollonius Rhodius*. Diss. Bochum University.
Nelis, D. 2001. *Vergil's* Aeneid *and the* Argonautica *of Apollonius Rhodius*. Leeds.
Nesselrath, H.-G. 1992. *Ungeschehenes Geschehen: Beinahe-Episoden im griechischen und römischen Epos von Homer bis zur Spätantike*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
Newton, R. M. 1983. “Poor Polyphemus: Emotional Ambivalence in *Odyssey* 9 and 17.” *CW* 76: 137-42.

Nickel, R. 2010. “Athene, Penelope, and the Vengeance Plot Against the Suitors.” *QUCC* 96: 29-54.
Nieto Hernandez, P. 2002. “Odysseus, Agamemnon, and Apollo.” *CJ* 97: 319-34.
Nieto Hernandez, P. 2008. “Penelope’s Absent Song.” *Phoenix* 62: 39-62.
Nilsson, M. P. 1967. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. 3rd edition. Munich.
Nörenberg, H.-W. 1972. “Zu Homer, Ilias, A 200.” *Hermes* 100: 251-4.
Nortwick, T. van. 1979. “Penelope and Nausicaa.” *TAPhA* 109: 269-76.
Nortwick, T. van. 1980. “Aeneas, Turnus, and Achilles.” *TAPhA* 110: 303-14.
Nünlist, R. 2009. *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*. Cambridge.
O’Hara, J. J. 1990. *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy*. Princeton.
O’Hara, J. J. 2007. *Inconsistency in Roman Epic*. Cambridge.
Olson, S. D. 1990. “The Stories of Agamemnon in Homer’s Odyssey.” *TAPhA* 120: 57-71.
Olson, S. D. 1995. *Blood and Iron: Stories and Storytelling in Homer’s* Odyssey. *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 148. Leiden.
Olson, S. D. 2011. “Immortal Encounters: *Aeneid* 1 and the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*.” *Vergilius* 57: 55-61.
Ondine Pache, C. 1999. “Odysseus and the Phaeacians.” In M. Carlisle and O. Levaniouk (eds.), *Nine Essays on Homer*. Rowman & Littlefield. pp. 21-33.
Otis, B. 1964. *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*. Oxford.
Otto, W. F. 1923. *Die Manen*. Berlin.
Otto, W. F. 1929. *Die Götter Griechenlands*. Bonn.
Page, T. E. 1938. *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books I-VI*. London: Macmillan and Co.
Page, D. 1955. *The Homeric Odyssey*. Oxford.
Panoussi, V. 2009. *Greek Tragedy in Vergil’s* Aeneid. Cambridge.
Panoussi, V. 2010. “Aeneas’ Sacral Authority.” In J. Farrell and M. C. J. Putnam, *A Companion to Vergil’s* Aeneid *and its Tradition*. John Wiley & Sons. pp. 52-65.
Pantelia, M. C. 2002. “Helen and the Last Song for Hector.” *TAPhA* 132: 21-7.
Parisinou, E. 2000. *The Light of the Gods: The Role of Light in Archaic and Classical Greek Cult*. London: Duckworth.
Parker, G. 1989. “The Divine Machinery of the *Aeneid*.” *Akroterion* 34: 181-90.
Parker, R. 2011. *On Greek Religion*. Cornell University Press.
Parry, A. 1972. “Language and Characterization in Homer.” *HSPh* 76: 1-22.
Parry, M. 1971. *The Making of Homeric Verse*. Oxford.
Paśkiewcz, T. M. 1981. *A Commentary on the Second Book of the Argonautica by Apollonius of Rhodes*. Diss. Oxford.
Paton, W. R. 1912. “Book VIII of the *Odyssey*.” *The Classical Review* 26: 215-6.
Pax, E. 1955. *ΕΠΙΦΑΝΕΙΑ: Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur biblischer Theologie.* Munich.
Pax, E. 1962. “Epiphanie.” *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*. Stuttgart. pp. 832-909.
Pease, A. S. 1935. *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
Pedrick, V. 1988. “The Hospitality of Noble Women in the *Odyssey*.” *Helios* 15: 85-101.
Peradotto, J. 2002. “Prophecy and Persons: Reading Character in the *Odyssey*.” *Arethusa* 35: 3-15.
Perkell, C. 1997. “The Lament of Juturna: Pathos and Interpretation in the *Aeneid*.” *TAPhA* 127: 257-86.

Perret, J. 1985. “Les dieux de l’Énéide.” *AFLNice* 50: 331-7.
Petridou, G. 2015. *Divine Epiphany in Greek Literature and Culture*. Oxford.
Review by G. Van der Ploeg, 2016. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*.
Pfister, F. 1924. “Epiphanie.” *RE* Suppl. 4: 277-323.
Platt, V. 2011. *Facing the Gods: Epiphany and Representation in Graeco-Roman Art, Literature and Religion*. Cambridge.
Podlecki, A. J. 1971. “Some Odyssean Similes.” *G&R* 18: 81-90.
Porzig, W. 1923. “S. v. daimon dans Indogerm.” *Forschungen* 41: 169-73.
Pöschl, V. 1950. *Die Dichtkunst Virgils. Bild und Symbol in der Äneis*. Innsbruck/Wien.
Pötscher, W. 1977. *Vergil und die göttlichen Mächte: Aspekte seiner Weltanschauung*. Spudasmata 35. Hildesheim.
Pratt, L. 1994. “*Odyssey* 19.535-50: On the Interpretation of Dreams and Signs in Homer.” *CPh* 89: 147-52.
Price, S. R. F. 1984. *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge.
Pucci, P. 1987. *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the* Odyssey *and the* Iliad. *Cornell Studies in Classical Philology* 46. Cornell University Press.
Pucci, P. 1998. *The Song of the Sirens: Essays on Homer*. Lanham, MD.
Pulleyn, S. 2000. *Iliad: Book 1*. Oxford.
Putnam, M. C. J. 1965. *The Poetry of the Aeneid*. Harvard University Press.
Putnam, M. C. J. 2011. *The Humanness of Heroes: Studies in the Conclusion of Virgil’s* Aeneid. Amsterdam University Press.
Quinn, K. 1968. *Virgil’s* Aeneid*: A Critical Description*. London.
Quint, D. 2001. “The Brothers of Sarpedon: Patterns of Homeric Imitation in *Aeneid* 10.” *Materiali e discussioni per l’analisi dei testi classici* 47: 35-66.
Race, W. H. 1993. “First Appearances in the *Odyssey*.” *TAPhA* 123: 79-107.
Radt, S. L. 1986. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Rankin, A. V. 1962. “Penelope’s Dreams in Books 19 and 20 of the *Odyssey*.” *Helikon* 2: 617-24.
Reckford, K. J. 1964. “Helen in the *Iliad*.” *GRBS* 5: 5-20.
Reckford, K. J. 1995. “Recognizing Venus I: Aeneas Meets his Mother.” *Arion* 3: 1-42.
Redfield, J. 1975. *Nature and Culture in the* Iliad: *The Tragedy of Hector*. Chicago.
Reece, S. 1993. *The Stranger’s Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Reece, S. 1994. “The Cretan Odyssey: A Lie Truer Than Truth.” *AJPh* 115: 157-73.
Reece, S. 2011. “Penelope’s ‘Early Recognition’ of Odysseus from a Neoanalytic and Oral Perspective.” *College Literature* 38: 101-17.
Reinhardt, K. 1948. *Von Werken und Formen*. Godesberg.
Reinhardt, K. 1961. *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
Richardson, L. J. D. 1940/41. “Facilis Iactura Sepulcri, with a Note on the Character of Anchises in the *Aeneid*.” *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy: Archaeology, Culture, History, Literature* 46: 85-101.
Richardson, N. J. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Richardson, N. J. 1983. “Recognition Scenes in the *Odyssey* and Ancient Literary Criticism.” *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 4: 219-35.
Richardson, S. 2006. “The Devious Narrator of the *Odyssey*.” *CJ* 101: 337-59.
Richardson, S. 2007. “Conversation in the *Odyssey*.” *College Literature* 34: 132-49.

Richardson, S. 2011. “The Case for the Defense.” *College Literature* 38: 118-21.
Robert, F. 1950. *Homère*. Paris.
Robertson, G. I. C. 1999. “The Eyes of Achilleus: *Iliad* 1.200.” *Phoenix* 53: 1-7.
Roisman, H. 1987. “Penelope’s Indignation.” *TAPhA* 117: 59-68.
Rose, G. 1967. “The Quest of Telemachus.” *TAPhA* 98: 391-8.
Rose, G. 1969. “The Unfriendly Phaeacians.” *TAPhA* 100: 387-406.
Rose, G. 1980. “The Swineherd and the Beggar.” *Phoenix* 34: 285-97.
Rose, H. J. 1956. “Divine Disguisings.” *Harvard Theological Review* 49: 63-72.
Rozokoki, A. 2001. “Penelope’s Dream in Book 19 of the *Odyssey*.” *CQ* 51: 1-6.
Rudhardt, J. 1978. “À propos de l’hymne homérique à Déméter.” *Mus. Helv*. 35: 1-17.
Russo, J. 1982. “Interview and Aftermath: Dream, Fantasy, and Intuition in *Odyssey* 19 and 20.” *AJPh* 103: 4-18.
Russo, J., M. Fernández-Galiano, and A. Heubeck. 1992. *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey, Vol. III*. Oxford.
Rüter, K. 1969. *Odysseeinterpretationen: Untersuchungen zum ersten Buch u. zur Phaiakis. Hypomnemata 19*. Göttingen.
Rutherford, R. B. 1986. “The Philosophy of the *Odyssey*.” *JHS* 106: 145-62.
Rutherford, R. B. 1992. *Homer. Odyssey. Books 19 and 20*. Cambridge.
Rutherford, R. B. 1993. “From the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*.” *BICS* 38: 37-54.
Rutherford, R. B. 2012. *Greek Tragic Style: Form, Language, and Interpretation*. Cambridge.
Rutherford, R. B. 2013. *Homer*. Cambridge.
Saïd, S. 1977. “Les crimes des prétendants, la maison d’Ulysse et les festins de l’Odyssée.” *Cahiers de l’Ecole Normale Supérieure*.
Savva, E. 2017. “Cynthia’s Ghost in Propertius’ IV, 7: A Re-Examination.” *Vita Latina* 195-6: 122-36.
Schaaf, I. 2014. *Magie und Ritual bei Apollonios Rhodios: Studien zu Ihrer Form und Funktion in den Argonautika. Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten*. De Gruyter.
Schadewaldt, W. 1959a. *Von Homers Welt und Werk*. Stuttgart.
Schadewaldt, W. 1959b. *Neue Kriterien zur Odyssee-Analyse*. Heidelberg.
Schein, S. 1984. *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer’s* Iliad. University of California Press.
Schein, S. 1995. “Female Representations and Interpreting the *Odyssey*.” In Cohen 1995: 17-27.
Schein, S. 1996. *Reading the* Odyssey. Princeton.
Schilling, R. 1980. “La déification à Rome, tradition latine et interférence grecque.” *REL* 58: 137-52.
Schlunk, R. R. 1974. *The Homeric Scholia and the* Aeneid. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Schmidt, E. A. 2000/1. “The Meaning of Vergil’s *Aeneid*: American and German Approaches.” *CW* 94: 145-71.
Scodel, R. 1998. “The Removal of the Arms, the Recognition with Laertes, and Narrative Tension in the *Odyssey*.” *CPh* 93: 1-17.
Scott, J. A. 1917. “The Close of the *Odyssey*.” *CJ* 12: 397-405.
Scott, J. A. 1917/18. “The Journey Made by Telemachus and Its Influence on the Action of the *Odyssey*.” *CJ* 13: 420-8.

Segal, C. 1968. “Circean Temptations: Homer, Vergil, Ovid.” *TAPhA* 99: 419-42.
Segal, C. 1983. “*Kleos* and its Ironies in the *Odyssey*.” *L’Antiquité Classique* 52: 22-47.
Segal, C. 1992. “Divine Justice in the *Odyssey*: Poseidon, Cyclops, and Helios.” *AJPh* 113: 489-518.
Segal, C. 1994. *Singers, Heroes and Gods in the Odyssey*. Cornell University Press.
Seider, A. 2013. *Memory in Vergil’s* Aeneid*: Creating the Past*. Cambridge.
Severyns, A. 1966. *Les Dieux d’Homère*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
Seward, D. 1991. *Divine Disguise in Homer’s* Iliad. Diss. Pittsburgh.
Seymour, T. D. 1887. *Homer’s* Iliad, *Books I-III*. Boston: Ginn.
Shapiro, H. A. 1995. “The Coming of Age in Phaiakia: The Meeting of Odysseus and Nausikaa.” In Cohen 1995: 155-64.
Slatkin, L. 1991. *The Power of Thetis: Allusion and Interpretation in the* Iliad. University of California Press.
Slatkin, L. 2011. *The Power of Thetis and Selected Essays*. Harvard University Press.
Smith, W. 1988. “The Disguises of the Gods in the *Iliad*.” *Numen* 35: 161-178.
Sowa, C. 1984. *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns*. Chicago: Bulchazy-Carducci Publishers.
Stanford, W. B. 1965. “The Ending of the *Odyssey*.” *Hermathena* 94: 5-20.
Stanford, W. B. 1977. *The Odyssey of Homer*. 2nd edition. St. Martin’s Press.
Stanford, W. B. 1983. “The Untypical Hero.” In H. W. Clarke (ed.), *Twentieth Century Interpretations of the Odyssey*. Prentice-Hall. pp. 52-71.
Stanley, K. 1965. “Irony and Foreshadowing in *Aeneid* 1, 462.” *AJPh* 86: 176-7.
Stearns, J. B. 1927. *Studies of the Dream as a Technical Device in Latin Epic and Drama*. Diss. Princeton.
Steiner, D. 2010. *Odyssey: Books XVII-XVIII*. Cambridge.
Steiner, H. R. 1952. *Der Traum in der Aeneis*. Noctes Romanae 5. Bern.
Stevens, A. 2003. *Telling Presences: Narrating Divine Epiphany in Homer and Beyond*. Diss. Cambridge.
Stewart, D. J. 1976. *The Disguised Guest. Rank, Role, and Identity in the Odyssey*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.
Stockinger, H. 1969. *Die Vorzeichen im homerischen Epos*. St. Ottilien.
Stössel, H.-A. 1975. *Der letzte Gesang der Odyssee*. Diss. Erlangen/Nuremberg.
Sultan, N. 1999. *Exile and the Poetics of Loss in Greek Tradition*. Rowman & Littlefield.
Suzuki, M. 1989. *Metamorphoses of Helen: Authority, Difference, and the Epic*. Cornell University Press.
Swallow, E. 1953. “The Strategic Fifth Aeneid.” *CW* 46: 177-9.
Takács, S. 2005. “Divine and Human Feet: Records of Pilgrims Honouring Isis.” In J. Elsner and I. Rutherford (eds.), *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity. Seeing the Gods*. Oxford. pp. 353-69.
Tarrant, R. 2012. *Commentary on Aeneid XII*. Cambridge.
Taylor, L. R. 1931. *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*. Middletown, CT: American Philological Association.
Teufel, M. 1939. *Brauch und Ritus bei Apollonius Rhodius*. Diss. Tübingen.
Thalmann, W. G. 1984. *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Thalmann, W. 2011. *Apollonius of Rhodes and the Spaces of Hellenism*. Oxford.

Thornton, A. 1970. *People and Themes in Homer's Odyssey*. London.
Thornton, A. 1976. *The Living Universe: Gods and Men in Virgil's Aeneid*. *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 46. Leiden.
Thornton, M. K. 1985. "The Adaptation of Homer's Artemis-Nausicaa Simile in the *Aeneid*." *Latomus* 44: 615-22.
Trahman, C. R. 1952. "Odysseus' Lies (*Odyssey*, Books 13-19)." *Phoenix* 6: 31-43.
Tsagalis, C. 2012. "Deauthorizing the Epic Cycle: Odysseus' False Tale to Eumaeus (*Od*. 14.199-359." In F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric Contexts. Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry (Trends in Classics*, Suppl. 12). Berlin. pp. 309-346.
Turkeltaub, D. 2003. *The Gods' Radiance Manifest: An Examination of the Narrative Pattern Underlying the Homeric Divine Epiphany Scenes*. Diss. Cornell.
Turkeltaub, D. 2005. "The Syntax and Semantics of Homeric Glowing Eyes: *Iliad* 1.200." *AJPh* 126: 157-86.
Turkeltaub, D. 2007. "Perceiving Iliadic Gods." *HSCP* 103: 51-82.
Ukert, F. A. 1850. "Über Damone, Heroen und Genien, Abhandl. der K. Sachs." *Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Philos-hist.* Classe 1: 139-219.
Ursinus, F. 1568. *Virgilius Collatione Scriptorum Graecorum Illustratus*. Antwerp.
Vallillee, G. 1955. "The Nausicaa Episode." *Phoenix* 9: 175-9.
Van der Valk, M. 1949. *Textual Criticism of the* Odyssey. Leiden.
Van Leeuwen, J. 1911. "Homerica (Continued)." *Mnemosyne* 39: 13-50.
Van Leeuwen, J. 1917. *Odyssea*. Leiden.
Verbanck-Pierard, A. 1989. "Le double culte d'Héraklès: légende ou réalité?" In A. F. Laurens (ed.), *Entre Hommes et Dieux: Lire les Polythéismes* 2, Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Besançon, Paris. pp. 43-65.
Vernant, J.-P. 1982. "Le Refus d'Ulysse." *Le Temps de la réflexion* 3: 13-19.
Vernant, J.-P. 1991. *Mortals and Immortals: Collected Essays*. Princeton.
Versnel, H. 1987. "What Did Ancient Man See When He Saw a God? Some Reflections on Greco-Roman Epiphany." In D. van der Plas (ed.), *Effigies Dei: Essays on the History of Religions*. New York. pp. 42-55.
Versnel, H. 2011. *Coping with the Gods: Wayward Readings in Greek Theology.* Leiden: Brill.
Vian, F. 1974. *Apollonios de Rhodes. Argonautiques Tome I: Chants I-II*. Paris.
Vian, F. 1980. *Apollonius de Rhodes. Argonautiques Tome II: Chant III.*. Paris.
Vidal-Naquet, P. 1970. "Valeurs religieuses et mythiques de la terre et du sacrifice dans l'*Odyssée*." *Annales* 25: 1278-97.
de la Ville de Mirmont, H. 1894. *Apollonios de Rhodes et Virgile: La mythologie et les dieux dans les Argonautiques et dans l'Eneïde*. Diss. Paris.
Visser, C. E. 1938. *Götter und Kulte im ptolemäischen Alexandrien*. Diss. Amsterdam.
Vlahos, J. 2011. "Homer's Odyssey: Penelope and The Case for Early Recognition." *College Literature* 38: 1-75.
de Vries, G. J. 1977. "Phaeacian Manners." *Mnemosyne* 30: 113-21.
Walcot, P. 1977. "Odysseus and the Art of Lying." *Anc. Soc*. 8: 1-19.
Walter, H. 1992. "Die Wiedererkennungsszenen in Homers Odyssee. Überlegungen zur Wirkungsweise des Anagnorismos." *RPL* 15: 61-9.

Wardle, D. 2009. “Caesar and Religion.” In M. Griffin (ed.), *A Companion to Julius Caesar*. Oxford. pp. 100-11.
Watrous, J. 1999. “Artemis and the Lion: Two Similes in *Odyssey* 6.” In M. Carlisle and O. Levaniouk (eds.), *Nine Essays on Homer*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. pp. 165-76.
Webb, N. C. 1978. “Direct Contact Between the Hero and the Supernatural in the *Aeneid*.” *PVS* 17: 39-49.
Webber, A. 1989. “The Hero Tells His Name: Formula and Variation in the Phaeacian Episode of the Odyssey.” *TAPhA* 119: 1-13.
Weinstock, S. 1971. *Divus Julius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Wender, D. S. 1965. *The Last Scenes of the Odyssey: A Defense*. Diss. Harvard. Summary in *HSCP* 70: 274-6.
Wender, D. 1978. *The Last Scenes of the Odyssey*. *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 52. Leiden: Brill.
West, M. L. 1978. *Hesiod Works and Days*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
West, M. L. 2011a. *The Making of the Iliad*. Oxford.
West, M. L. 2011b. *Hellenica: Selected Papers on Greek Literature and Thought*. Oxford.
West, M. L. 2015. *The Making of the Odyssey*. Oxford.
West, S. 1981. “An Alternative *Nostos* for Odysseus.” *LCM* 6: 169-75.
West, S. 1989. “Laertes Revisited.” *PCPhS* n.x. 35: 113-43.
Whitman, C. 1958. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge, MA.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1884. *Homerische Untersuchungen*. Berlin: Weidmann.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1924. *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*. Berlin: Weidmann.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1937. *Der Glaube der Hellenen*. Berlin: Weidmann.
Willcock, M. M. 1970. “Some Aspects of the Gods in the *Iliad*.” *BICS* 17: 1-10.
Williams, M. F. 1991. *Landscape in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius. Studien zur Klassischen Philologie* 63. Frankfurt-am-Mainz.
Williams, R. D. 1963. “Virgil and the *Odyssey*.” *Phoenix* 17: 266-74.
Williams, R. D. 1972. *The Aeneid of Virgil: Book 1-6*. Macmillan: St. Martin’s Press.
Williams, R. D. 1987. *The Aeneid*. Unwin Critical Library.
Willmott, J. 2007. *The Moods of Homeric Greek*. Cambridge.
Winkler, J. 1990. *The Constraints of Desire*. London.
Wlosok, A. 1967. *Die Göttin Venus in Vergils Aeneis*. Heidelberg.
Wlosok, A. 1983. “Vergil als Theologe: Iuppiter—Pater Omnipotens.” *Gymn*. 90: 187-202.
Wöhrle, G. 1999. *Telemachs Reise: Väter und Söhne in Ilias und Odyssee oder ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Männlichkeitsideologie in der homerischen Welt*. Hypomnemata 124. Göttingen.
Woodhouse, W. J. 1930. *The Composition of Homer’s Odyssey*. Oxford.
Woolsey, R. B. 1941. “Repeated Narratives in the Odyssey.” *CPh* 36: 167-81.
Worman, N. 2002. *The Cast of Character: Style in Greek Literature*. University of Texas Press.
Yamagata, N. 2011. “Penelope and Early Recognition: Vlahos, Harsh, and Eustathius.” *College Literature* 38: 122-30.
Zanker, G. 1987. *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry*. London.
Zeitlin, F. I. 1995. “Figuring Fidelity in Homer’s Odyssey.” In Cohen 1995: 117-52.