The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

On *Iliad* E 127 *sqq.*

R. M. Henry

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 05 / June 2004, pp 240 - 241

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00990127, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00990127

How to cite this article:

R. M. Henry (1904). On *Iliad* E 127 *sqq.*. The Classical Review, 18, pp 240-241 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00990127

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ON *ILIAD* E 127 *sqq.*

IT is not too much to say that no satisfactory explanation of these lines has yet been offered. The ἀχλὺς ἣ πρὶν ἐπῆεν still remains a standing puzzle. Discreet commentators like La Roche pass by with a reference to Virgil: others refer desperately to O 668, II 567, etc., but the nature of the allusion is as much of a riddle as the original difficulty. The true solution, it seems to me, is to be found in the explanation of another difficulty in this much discussed Διομήδους ἀπιστεία.

Diomedes, wounded by Pandaros, prays to Athene for vengeance on his adversary: Athene appears, heals him, but without noticing his prayer for vengeance, and promises her aid in the fight. 'Lo (she says) I have again taken from thine eyes the mist that was aforesaid upon them, that thou mayest rightly discern both a god and a man: wherefore now if perchance a god come hither to tempt thee, in no wise do thou fight face to face with immortal gods—with any other of them, but only if the daughter of Zeus, Aphrodite, come into the fight, her shalt thou wound with the sharp bronze.' (E 127–132)

Now where does the idea of 'the mist that was aforesaid' upon Diomedes' eyes come from? It is quite unlike anything else in the poem. Of course the gods can prevent men from seeing them if they please; but the fact that they are unseen appears to be due to the will of the god, not to any special disability attaching to mortality. When Athene appears to Diomedes he knows her at once; when she appears to Achilles in A 194 *sqq.* he recognizes her immediately. She appears *only to him* (198): but that is her own choice. Besides Diomedes had not met any god in battle yet: what is the force of the *πρίν*?

Let us consider another difficulty. In 311 *sqq.* Aeneas has been brought to his knees by Diomedes. Aphrodite first rescues him in a fold of her robe that none of the Δαναοὶ ταχύπαλοι may strike him. Diomedes attacks Aphrodite 'knowing that she is an unwarlike goddess' (331) and wounds her. In her terror she drops her son, who is then picked up by Apollo and hidden in a dark cloud from the Danaoi. Diomedes after driving Aphrodite from the field turns his attack upon Aeneas and Apollo until the god warns him to desist; he does so in a fright and Aeneas is conveyed from the field in safety.

Now in 129 *sqq.* Diomedes is forbidden by Athene to fight with any god but Aphrodite and in 815 *sqq.* (cf. Z 128 *sqq.*) he assures Athene that he has done her bidding. Most people see a contradiction between these words and the narrative in 432 *sqq.* Robert (*Studien zur Ilias*, p. 184) argues that it is not Apollo, but Aeneas that Diomedes attacks: but ll. 438 and 440 seem decisive against his view.

But there is another important discrepancy in the narrative. Apollo (l. 345) rescues Aeneas in a dark cloud that none of the Danaoi may see him. Yet Diomedes rushes at Aeneas, minded to slay him (432 *sqq.*). Clearly the *κτανέη νεφέλη* has been a poor covering. It cannot be said that this is covered by Athene's promise in l. 127: there she promises only that he shall be able to distinguish between a man and a god, presumably a god in disguise or unseen by others.

Now there can be little doubt that the narrative of the rescue of Aeneas has reached us in a double recension (cf. Erhardt, *Die Entstehung der Hom. Ged.* p. 67). The repetition of 316, 7 in 345, 6 (a favourite device of a redactor) points this way, as does the inordinate length of the episode 347–431 breaking in on the narrative. The question is, which of the two is the earlier.

I shall try to show that the hypothesis of the rescue by Apollo being the earlier explains more than one difficulty in the narrative.

It is evident that the lines 432–442 are closely modelled upon II 702 *sqq.* In the latter passage Patroklos attacking the walls of Troy is mysteriously driven off by Apollo and, persisting, is warned by the god to desist. Here the situation is similar except for lines 433–5 which state positively that Diomedes recognized Apollo. If we omit these lines (a reason for their insertion will be given later) the parallel between the passages is complete and convincing. Assuming then that the narrative ran 310, 432, 436 *sqq.*, we have a complete episode in which Aeneas is rescued miraculously by Apollo and Diomedes is baffled.

Now if Diomedes and Aeneas meet at all the exigencies of the legend required that Aeneas should get off with his life somehow: but this particular method was felt to be too humiliating to Diomedes, and specially out of place in an ἀπιστεία. Another version

accordingly is composed. In it Aphrodite, not Apollo, rescues Aeneas, and Diomedes voluntarily abandons his human prey to fly at the divine quarry. He attacks the goddess, wounds her, and drives her from the field, and Apollo is utilized to rescue him in a cloud from the other Danaoi. This version contains 310-431. This new version is now 'vorbereitet' by ll. 129-132, and completed by the insertion of 817-821. Further the author of the new episode, thinking of the mistake Diomedes had been under with regard to Apollo in the older version, inserts 127, 8: the *πρίν* in ἢ *πρίν* ἐπῆεν is in the older version. The writer forgets that with his own version there is no longer any *πρίν*; but he is thinking of the Diomedes known up to his time without any miraculous power of discrimination.

(Cf. the ποτε of © 108, referring to what in our *Iliad* has taken place only the day

before, but is to the author of this line one of the data of the story.)

The old version and the new are now fused—perhaps by the same poet. Lines 433-5 are an attempt to do away with the contradiction between the blind attack on Apollo and Athene's promise that he should be able to recognize a god, and to give some appearance of truth to Diomedes' later assurance to the goddess: but they are only a clumsy attempt, and the contradiction with 435 remains.

This theory seems to explain two difficulties by the one hypothesis. It gives an explanation of l. 127 and furnishes a solution of the contradiction between Diomedes' acts and his words which has not yet been forthcoming.

R. M. HENRY.

BELFAST, January 21, 1904.

NOTES ON AESCHYLUS.

Pers. 638 Dealing with this passage in a paper on Ghost-raising in *C.R.* 1902, p. 56, I quoted among many similar descriptions of magic incantations Lucian i. 465 ἐπίτροχόν τι καὶ ἀσαφεὶς ἐφθέγγετο . . . παραμυγνὺς ἅμα καὶ βαρβαρικά τινα καὶ ἀσημα δνόματα καὶ πολυσύλλαβα, and yet omitted to make the correction βάρβαρ' ἀσαφηνῇ for βάρβαρα σαφηνῇ. For ἡ παντάλαν' ἄχη διαβοᾶσω; add Ben Jonson *Masque of Queens* and Goethe *Faust* I scene 3.

893 schol. 'Ἰκάριον κλύδωνα' as ἥκιον κλύδωνα *O.T.* 197.

1005 schol. γρ. καὶ ἀκρόται· ἐξ οὗ ἔσται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄκρον. Read γρ. καὶ ἀκρόται· ἐξουσιασταί, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄκρον. The word is used by schol. rec. on οἰακοστρόφος *P.V.* 515 and δεσπότης *Theb.* 27.

1053 (ἀμ)μεμίξετ' οἶμοι for μεμίξεταί μοι?

P.V. 445 αἰὲν ὃς οὐράνιον πόλον. For Ἄτλαντος cf. *Orph. hymn.* i. 28.

580 πείθων may be an interpolation: cf. *Apoll. Rhod.* i. 977, ii. 239.

738 γύπδοσ in *M* possibly through glosses τύπους and πόδας on ἴχνος or ἴχνη, as in schol. *Hecub.* 1059, *Hesych.*

Theb. 55 schol. ἐτάξαντο?

109 δοχμολόφων κύμα γὰρ καχλάζει | περὶ πόλιν would correspond.

151 τλήμονες, συναιχμάλωτον?

299 schol.: read Ἀργείους.

473 schol.: read τῇ Αἰγυπτίων φωνῇ: this, not Αἰγυπτία, is regular.

547 ἡ ἔωθεν . . . μέμψεται: cf. *Ar. Nub.* 1433 μὴ τύπτ'· εἰ δὲ μὴ, σαντόν ποτ' αἰτιάσει. *Eubulus* 14 μὴ παρατίθει . . . ἡ σεαντὴν αἰτιῶ.

624 ἀτμαστήρ' ὡς ἀνδρὸν ἀτμήν· or at least banish him, φυγῇ γοῦν τίσασθαι: cf. 1006, *O.C.* 1306, *Nonn. D.* 40, 68.

788 schol. written on νεόκροτον? The same on νεόκτιστον in *Hesych.*

Supp. 121 The construction may be ζωσα γόοις με τιμῶ, ἠιλέμοισιν ἐμπρεπῇ: cf. *Soph. El.* 1187, *Cho.* 11, 17.

171 γαμετᾶν οὐλιονεικῶν? cf. 302. Νεῖκος οὐλόμενον was the epithet used by *Empedocles*.

249 'In this point only will the theory of a Greek land for your origin harmonise': *Callim. Ep.* 18' ὡς τῶργ' τοῦνομα συμφέρεται.

327 δοκεῖτ' ἐμοὶ <μὲν> So *Eur. Ion* 644 εἶη δ' ἐμοὶ <μὲν>

568 λειμῶνα χιονόβοσκον, οὗ τ' ἐπέρχεται Τυφῶ μένος ἵδωρ τὸ Νεῖλον νόσοις ἄβικτον 'where the diseaseless water of the Nile proceeds against the power of drought and pestilence': see *Plut. de Is. et Osir.* p. 363 D—364 B, 366 B—367 B, 371 A, 376 F. ὅν τ' ἐπέρχεται Τυφῶ μένος would be no