

THE ΙΠΠΟΙ OF RHESUS*

Of the many difficulties associated with the ἵπποι of Rhesus which Diomedes and Odysseus used as means of transportation in the *Doloneia* (10.513.527.529f.)¹, none is as serious as that which results from the obscurity of the noun ἵπποι. "Ἴπποι do refer to Rhesus' horses that Odysseus seized, the reading of 10.498ff. readily establishes that. The term, however, encompasses more for in a number of instances it refers also to the chariot of Rhesus which was seized, as I argue in an earlier study². This argument, of course, is neither original nor of recent vintage nor is it free of controversy as Homerists versed with the literature relevant to ἵπποι very well know³.

* I am thankful to the Graduate School of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee for its generous financial support which made this study possible.

1. The text used is the T. W. Allen, ed., *Homeri Ilias*, II, III, Oxonii e typogr. Clarendoniano 1931.

2. G. Stagakis, Homeric Warfare Practices, *Historia* 34 (1985) 137ff.

3. Vid., *ibid.*, p. 131, n. 12. Among (a) include: H. Düntzer, Die Doloneia, *Philologus* 12 (1857) 54 = Idem, *Homeric Abhandlungen*, Leipzig 1872, p. 319. Idem, *Ἰλιάς. Homers Ilias*, II, Buch IX-XVI, Paderborn 1866, p. 57, n. 513f. A. Nitsche, *Untersuchung über die Echtheit der Doloneia*, Programm K. K. Staats - Gymnasiums in Marburg, (1877) p. 31. F. Ranke, *Die Doloneia*, Lipsiae 1881, p. 33. A. Pierron, *Homère Iliade*, chants I-XII, Paris 1883, p. 381, n. 513. P. Jahr, *De Iliadis libro decimo in XX Programm des Stadtgymnasiums zu Stettin Ostern 1889*, Stettin 1889, p. 4. J. La Roche, *Homers Ilias*³, III, Leipzig 1891, p. 78, n. 465-514. A. Lang, *Homer and his Age*, (1906), New York 1968, p. 270. M. H. A. L. H. van der Valk, Ajax and Diomedes in the Iliad, *Mnemosyne*, 4th ser., 5 (1952) 280, n. 2. B. Hellwig, *Raum und Zeit im homerischen Epos. Spudasmata. Studien zur klassischen Philologie und ihren Grenzgebieten*, Hildesheim 1964, p. 135. J. T. Sheppard, *The Pattern of the Iliad*, New York 1966, p. 89. Add to (b): K. F. Sichel, *Quaestionum Homericarum particula I. Programm der von der Familie von Witzleben gestifteten Klosterschule Rossleben*, Halle 1854, p. 12. L. Doederlein, *Homeri Ilias*, I. lib. I-XII, Lipsiae-Londini 1863, p. 237, n. 513. F. Eyssenhardt, *Homerisches*, *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik*, 109-110 (1874) 598. (W. Witte, *Studien zu Homer Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Königlichen Friedrichs-Gymnasiums zu Frankfurt a. Oder Ostern 1908*, Frankfurt a. Oder 1908, p. 6). J. G. Welcker, *Der epische Cyclus oder die homerischen Dichter*², II, Bonn 1882, p. 217, n. 77. V. Terret, *Homère Étude Historique et Critique*, Paris 1899, p. 232. G. Stier, *Ὀμήρου Ἰλιάς*², IV, Gotha 1902, p. 359. J. van Leeuwen, *Homericorum*, XXVII De heroum Homericorum curribus bellicis, *Mnemosyne* N. S., 34 (1906) 259. A. Shewan, *The Lay of Dolon (The Tenth Book of Homer's Iliad) Some Notes on its Language*

The view that Rhesus' chariot was taken imposes certain obligations on those who espouse it for, among other things, they are required to establish the identity of the hero who removed the vehicle from the Thracian encampment.

Scholars have searched the *Doloneia* and scrutinized the *Iliad* at large in hope of finding some clue(s) that will make the identification possible. Sickel produced μάστιξεν δ' ἵππους (10.530) and 10.500f. Relying on the latter, he maintained that Odysseus did not take a whip which was in the chariot of Rhesus. So when he noted that a whip was used to goad Rhesus' horses (530)⁴, he assumed that Diomedes, the associate of Odysseus, took the whip and with it the chariot of Rhesus⁵. Sickel also, among others, made use of 10.503ff. to assert that it was Diomedes who seized the vehicle⁶.

The testimony adduced to claim that Diomedes took the chariot of Rhesus has been challenged. The contention that μάστιξεν, in 530, implies the use of a whip has been questioned⁷, wrongly I believe⁸. Sickel's interpretation of μάστιξεν is sound but reservations should be expressed about the view that Diomedes took the whip and the chariot. Even there is reason to doubt that 503ff. identify the hero who removed the vehicle⁹. In short, it is not certain that Diomedes seized the chariot.

Verse and Contents with Remarks by the Way on the Canons and Methods of Homeric Criticism. London 1911, p. 276. C. Voigt, *Überlegung und Entscheidung. Studien zur Selbstauffassung des Menschen bei Homer*, Berlin 1934, (Meisenheim am Glan 1972) p. 43, 61.

4. Sickel, p. 13.

5. *Ibid.*

6. *Ibid.*, p. 12f. Doederlein, p. 237f., n. 513. Welcker, p. 217, n. 77. Shewan, p. 276. Voigt, p. 43. Cf. Stagakis, p. 141f.

7. Düntzer, (1857) p. 55 = *Hom. Abh.*, p. 320. J. U. Faesi · F. R. Franke, *Homers Iliad*⁶, II, Berlin 1880, p. 139, n. 529f. Ranke, p. 35. Pierron, p. 382, n. 530. K. F. Ameis · C. Hentze, *Homers Ilias*⁶, I, 4 Berlin 1906, (Amsterdam 1965) p. 38, n. 530. J. van Leeuwen, *Ilias*, I, Lugduni Batavorum 1912, p. 374, n. 530f. É. Delebecque, *Le cheval dans l'Iliade suivi d'un lexique du cheval chez Homère et d'un essai sur le cheval pré-homérique*, Paris 1951, p. 117. A. Morard, Note sur le chant X de l'Iliade, *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, 22, 4, ser. no. 4 (1963) 393, 396. J. K. Anderson, Greek Chariot-Borne and Mounted Infantry. *AJA* 79 (1975) 182. Even it is proposed that 10.530 be *athetized*. Düntzer, (1857) p. 55 = *Hom. Abh.*, p. 320. *Idem.*, (1866) p. 57, n. 531. B. Perrin, Equestrianism in the Doloneia, *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 16 (1885) 114. J. van Leeuwen, *Ilias*, I, Lugduni Batavorum 1912, p. 530f. The text need not be *athetized*. Ranke, p. 35. W. Arend, *Die typischen Scenen bei Homer. Problemata. Forschungen zur klassischen Philologie*, Berlin 1933, p. 91, n. 4.

8. Stagakis, p. 138. Odysseus could have been on the chariot (cf. ἐκ + gen. 6.257, 14.154) yet he could have failed to notice the whip. Eventually, the whip was noticed and used (10.530).

9. Düntzer, (1857) p. 54 = *Hom. Abh.*, p. 319. *Idem.*, (1866) p. 57, n. 513f. Nitsche, p. 31f. Ranke, p. 33. Perrin, p. 112. Jahr, p. 4. G. Lafaye, Equitatio, *Dar-Sagl.*, II, 1 Paris 1892, (Graz 1963) p. 747. W. Leaf, *The Iliad*², I, London 1900, p. 460, n. 513. Arend, p. 112. H. Heusinger,

Apart from ascertaining who removed the chariot from among the Thracians, there is yet another task, that of determining who harnessed the horses to the vehicle for the chariot was used to transport Diomedes and Odysseus back to the Greek naval camp¹⁰. Was the harnessing of the horses to the vehicle carried out jointly by the two heroes or must credit for it be given to one of them? This matter has been somewhat neglected, perhaps because nothing is stated expressly about the harnessing. Yet scholars have not completely ignored it. Schulze¹¹ ascribes the yoking to Odysseus while Doederlein¹², Welcker¹³, and Stier¹⁴, credit Diomedes for it. These claims as presented are nothing more than conjectures.

The two major problems associated with the assumption that the chariot of Rhesus was seized¹⁵ have not been dealt with satisfactorily. The efforts to identify the hero who removed the vehicle from the Thracian encampment have not been successful. Generally, Diomedes is credited for this deed but he is nothing more than a suspect. Even the attempt to ascertain who harnessed the horses to the chariot has not resulted in anything convincing.

Much remains to be done to elucidate the circumstances surrounding the seizure of the chariot and the harnessing of the horses to the vehicle. In part, what is required is the careful re-examination of the materials that have been used to assign the removal of the chariot to Diomedes and the yoking to Diomedes or Odysseus.

One passage crucial to the quest of identifying the warrior who removed the chariot is the rather obscure 10.499 [σὺν δ' ἤειπεν (*sc.* Odysseus the horses) ἰμάσσι καὶ ἐξήλαυνεν (ἵππους) ὀμίλου]¹⁶. It gives the impression that Odysseus *harnessed* the horses *to the chariot* and drove the team from the enemy encampment. In fact,

Stilistische Untersuchung zur Dolonie, Inaug. Diss., Leipzig 1939, p. 86f. Delebecque, p. 79. B. Fenik, «*Iliad X*» and the «*Rhesus*» the Myth, *Collection Latomus*, 73 (1964) 21, n. 4. J. Wiesner, *Fahren und Reiten in Archaeologia Homerica. Die Denkmäler und das frühgriechische Epos*, I, Kapitel F, Göttingen 1968, p. F 112. F. Eichhorn, *Die Dolonie*, Garmisch-Partenkirchen 1973, p. 16. Anderson, p. 183. M. van der Valk, *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes ad fidem codicis Laurentiani edidit*, III, Lugduni Batavorum 1979, 821. 29ff. Stagakis, p. 142.

10. Cf. 10.530 *et* Stagakis, p. 139ff.

11. G. Schulze, *Quaestiones epicae*, Gueterlohiae 1892, p. 420f. (Shewan, p. 237, 275). Also Stagakis, p. 139, 143.

12. Doederlein, p. 237, n. 513. (F. A. Paley, *The Iliad of Homer*, I, Bks I-XII, London 1866, p. 370, n. 513).

13. Welcker, p. 217, n. 77.

14. Stier, p. 359, n. 513.

15. Vid., n. 2.

16. 10.499 is not free from difficulties. The form of σὺν... ἤειπεν is uncertain. Moreover, the meaning of the verb and that of ἵππους in ἐξήλαυνεν (ἵππους) is not clear.

we could assume that this is what 499 reports. Ἴππους, the implied object of ἐξήλαυνεν, might mean «horses and chariot», a meaning not unusual for the noun in the *Doloneia*¹⁷. In that case, obviously, it was Odysseus who harnessed the horses to the chariot of Rhesus (σὺν ... ἤειρεν)¹⁸ and drove them from the encampment¹⁹. Attractive as all this may be, it has drawbacks. In the *Doloneia* ἵπποι mean horses and chariot but the noun also denotes horses and nothing more²⁰. That might be the meaning of the implied object of ἐξήλαυνεν.

The interpretation of ἵππους (= horses and chariot) and σὺν... ἤειρεν (= harnessed) would find support from 15.679ff. —(ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀνὴρ ἵπποισι κελητίζειν ἐὸ εἰδῶς, / ὅς τ' ἐπεὶ ἐκ πολέων πίσυρας συναίρεται²¹ ἵππους, /

17. Cf. 330 in view of 305.392f. Also 402 et 392f.

18. Vid., Schulze, p. 420f. (Shewan, p. 237, 275). Stagakis, p. 143. However, the majority of scholars ascribe the meaning of «bind together» to the verb. C. G. Heyne, *Homeri Carmina*, I, Lipsiae-Londini 1802, p. 571, n. 499. Idem, *op. cit.*, VI, Lipsiae-Londini 1802, p. 103, n. 529. F. H. Bothe, *Homeri Carmina Iliadis*, Lipsiae 1833, p. 74, n. 488-502. L. Friedlaender, *Aristonici Peri σημείων Ἰλιάδος reliquiae emendatiores*, (Göttingen 1853) (Amsterdam 1965) p. 183, 499. [H. Erbse, *Scholia graeca in Homeri Iliadem* (scholia vetera), III, Berolini 1974, p. 104f., 499a.]. Düntzer, (1857) p. 54 = *Hom. Abh.*, p. 319. Idem, (1866) p. 56, nn. 499ff. Paley, p. 369, n. 499. Faesi-Franke, p. 138, n. 499. Γ. Μιστριώτης, *Ὀμήρου Ἰλιάς*, II, α' ('Αθήνησι 1880) p. 232, n. 2. G. Giseke, in *Lexicon Homericum*, E. Ebeling, ed., II, Leipzig 1885, (Hildesheim 1963) p. 304, v. συναίρω. Perrin, p. 111, 114f. A. Fick, *Die homerische Ilias*, Göttingen 1886, p. 480. Pierron, p. 279, n. 499. J. van Leeuwen, *Enchiridium dictionis epicae*, II, Lugduni Batavorum 1894, p. 488, n. 2. Ameis-Hentze, p. 37, n. 499. Witte, p. 5. Leeuwen, (1912) p. 371, n. 499 et p. 327f., n. 513. A. T. Murray, *Homer the Iliad*, I (1924) (1971) p. 473. P. Mazon, et al., *Homère Iliade*^s, II (1937) (Paris 1965) p. 102. Heusinger, p. 83, 85. *LSJ*^s, (1940) (1973) p. 1692, v. συναίρω. Delebecque, p. 181. R. J. Cunliffe, *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect*, Norman: Univ. of Oklahoma Press 1963, p. 8, v. αἰρώ (5). D. B. Monro, *Homer Iliad*^s, Bks I-XII, Oxford at the Clarendon Press 1963, p. 199, n. 499c. Anderson, p. 183. Van der Valk, (1979) 820.56ff. But vid. Morard, p. 386, 389.

19. Odysseus only came in contact with the chariot of Rhesus: 10.474ff. 498ff.

20. 10.305. 322. 392. 474. 498.

21. The vulgate reading συναγ. (είρεται) (cf. crit. app. 15.680. M. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter. Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft*, Heft 3, Basel 1950, p. 222. Van der Valk, (1979) 784, n. 45, 1037.44f., 1038.12ff. 54ff.) is not proper in 15.680. Neither συναγείρω nor any of its forms is construed with ἵππους in the *Iliad*: 11.687, 20.21, 24.802. Only the verb συναίρω (cf. the absence of the preposition with ἰμάσι in the *Doloneia*: 262.475. 499. 569) is construed with ἵππους (10.499). Accordingly, συναίρεται is correct in 15.680. B. Giseke, in *Lex Hom.*¹, I, Leipzig 1885, (Hildesheim 1963) p. 599, v. ἵππος. Idem, *Lex. Hom.*, II, p. 304. vv. συναγείρω et ξυναγ., συναίρω. Leeuwen, (1894) p. 488, n. 2. W. Leaf, *op. cit.*², II, London 1902, p. 148, n. 680. K. F. Ameis - C. Hentze, *op. cit.*⁴, II, 1, Leipzig u. Berlin 1905 (Amsterdam 1965) p. 124, v. 680. J. van Leeuwen, *Ilias*, II, Lugduni Batavorum 1913, p. 555, v. 680. P. Mazon, et al., *op. cit.*⁵, III, Paris 1937, (1967) p. 92, v. 679. *LSJ*^s, p. 1692, v. συναίρω, II. H. Erbse, *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien. Zetemata. Monographien zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, (München 1960) p. 30. Cunliffe, p. 369, v. † συναίρω. D. B.

σεύας ἐκ πεδίοιο μέγα προτὶ ἄστῳ δίηται / λαοφόρον καθ' ὁδὸν πολέες τέ ἐ
θηήσαντο / ἄνδρες ἤδ' ἑταίρους· δ' δ' ἔμπεδον ἀσφαλὲς ἄει / θρώσκων ἄλλοτ'
ἐπ' ἄλλον ἀμείβεται, οἳ δὲ πέτονται). F. Eyssenhardt commenting on the passage
remarked «denn der mann der mit vier pferden nach der stadt jagt... kann sie vor
einen wagen gespannt haben»²². He did not try to substantiate this remark through
the examination of 679ff. Had he persevered with the investigation of the text, he
would have found substantiation for his statement.

679ff. contain few references that can help to establish that the horses
referred to in this passage are harnessed to a vehicle²³. But those that are found,
i.e., (a) οἳ δὲ πέτονται (684) «they (the Ἴπποι) rush or dart on» and σεύας
(681) «urging on» with its implied object ἵππους are extremely helpful.

Σεύω is found once more referring to an ἵππος. In this instance, the ἵππος
described as σευόμενος is harnessed to a chariot (22.22). More impressive is the
testimony of πέτομαι since ἵπποι pictured as «darting on» are found often in the
Iliad: seven times in the expression τῷ δ' οὐκ ἀέκοντε πετέσθην²⁴, four times in
the phrases τοῖ δ' ἐπέτοντο, τοῖ δὲ πέτοντο (*bis*), οἳ δ' ἐπέτοντο²⁵, and thrice in
τῷ... πετέσθην (*bis*)²⁶, ἵπποι πετέσθην²⁷. In each case, the ἵπποι «darting on» are
horses *harnessed* to a chariot²⁸.

The materials relevant to the συναερθέντες ἵπποι of 15.679ff. are emphatic in
their message. The horses must be thought of as being harnessed to a vehicle. That
could be the case also with the συναερθέντες ἵπποι²⁹ of 10.499 provided that the
objections which the text of 10.498-506 raise can be dealt with.

In 10.498-506, the poet seems to be relating a series of events in chronologi-
cal order. This order is violated when it is assumed that the ἵπποι which Odysseus

Monro, *op. cit.*⁴, Bks XIII-XXIV Oxford at the Clarendon Press 1964, p. 66, v. 680. M. van der
Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*, II, Leiden 1964, p. 620. A. R. Sodano,
Porphyrus quaestionum Homericarum, I, Napoli 1970, p. 36, 29f. 37, 3ff. Van der Valk, (1979)
p. 784, n. 45.

22. Eyssenhardt, p. 598. Erroneously, he refers to O 673 (*vid.*, p. 597).

23. *Ibid.*, p. 598 «aus den Worten des Dichters geht nichts darüber hervor» and Stagakis, p.
142 «It is unfortunate that 15.679ff. tell us nothing about the horses being or not being yoked to
a vehicle», are incorrect and prematurely stated.

24. 5.366 = 8.45, 5.768 = 10.530 = 11.519, 11.281, 22. 400.

25. 10.514, 13.29, 23.372.449.

26. 16.149, 23.506.

27. 23.377ff.

28. *Cf.* 5.363f. *et* 5.366; 5.768ff. *et* 5.775f.; 8.41ff. *et* 8.45; 10.514.530 *et* n. 2; 11.273 *et*
11.281; 11.512ff. *et* 11.519; 13.26ff. *et* 13.29; 16.148f.; 22.399f. *et* 22.400; 23.291 *et*
23.377ff. 449.506. 509; 23.369ff. *et* 23.372.

29. *Re. συνήειπεν* (ἵππους) *vid.*, n. 18.

drove (ἐξήλαυνεν) from the Thracian encampment were yoked to the chariot of Rhesus. To clarify the problem, I should provide a chronological overview of the events set forth in 498ff: Odysseus, we are told, (a) untied the horses of Rhesus from the ἐπιδιφριάς of the chariot (498 *et* 474f.), (b) σὺν δ' ἤειπεν ἱμᾶσι (*sc.* the horses) (499), (c) drove the ἵπποι from the encampment (499), and (d) whistled, giving a signal to Diomedes (502). *After this*, it is stated Ἀὐτὰρ δ (*sc.* Diomedes) μερμήριζε μένων ὅ τι κύντατον ἔρδοι, / ἧ ὅ γε δίφρον ἐλών, ὄθι ποικίλα τεύχε' ἔκειτο / ῥυμοῦ ἐξερούοι ἧ ἐκφέροι ὑψόσ' ἀείρασ, / ἧ ἔτι τῶν πλεόνων Θρηγκῶν ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἔλοιτο (503ff.).

It would be absurd to claim that ἵππους (*impl. obj.* of ἐξήλαυνεν) are horses yoked to Rhesus' chariot, if the events in 10.498ff. are presented chronologically. But are they set forth in chronological order? The poet is known to arrange events in a manner that does not reflect the actual order in which they occurred³⁰. This could be the case also in 10.498-506 with the result that the location of 503ff. within the context of 498-506 might not be correct. The deliberation of Diomedes (503ff.) might have occurred *before* 10.499 or contemporaneously with 499. The latter arrangement would not change much for it would reintroduce the same objection against the view that the συναερθέντες ἵπποι in 499 are horses harnessed to a chariot as that which 503ff. placed after 499 raise. However, were we to place 503ff. before 499, that would make possible the inference, based on the evidence of 15.679ff., that the συναερθέντες ἵπποι in 10.499 σὺν δ' ἤειπεν ἱμᾶσι are horses yoked to the chariot of Rhesus³¹ provided that neither 10.503ff. nor 10.500f. state that Diomedes removed the vehicle. Then the credit for removing the chariot and harnessing the horses to it can be given to Odysseus, the subject of σὺν... ἤειπεν and ἐξήλαυνεν in 499.

Relying on 10.500f., Sickel related that the chariot of Rhesus was removed by Diomedes: since Odysseus «neglexisse scuticam auferre e curru, a Diomede currum extractum vel exportatum esse necesse est»³². What Sickel provides is a mixture of conjecture and misleading information. It is conjectural to assume, on the basis of 500f., that Diomedes removed the chariot. And it is misleading to state that Odysseus «neglexisse scuticam auferre e curru» without apprising the reader that this is a possible construction of οὐ μάστιγα... ἐκ δίφροιο νοήσατο (*sc.* Odysseus) χερσὶν ἐλέσθαι. Equally well the passage could mean that Odysseus, being on the

30. 1.6f. *et* 1.10 considering 1.44ff. 53.101ff.; 10.3ff. *et* 10.25 in view of 10.124; 10.109 *et* 10.137.150; 10.285f. *et* 10.287; 11.660 *et* 11.661 in light of 11.251f. 376f. 436ff. 456ff.; 14.429ff. *et* 14.440; 15.478ff. *et* 15.484 *per* 15.462f.; 17.588f.

31. *Vid.*, n. 11.

32. Sickel, p. 13.

chariot³³, did not think of taking the whip in his hand and that is quite different from what Sickel claims.

10.500f. is equivocal and this imposes restrictions on the way the text is translated. The translation of 500f. must be consistent with that which the evidence pertinent to the chariot of Rhesus indicates about the removal of the vehicle. Should the testimony establish that it was Odysseus who seized the chariot, as one interpretation of 10.499 states, then the translation of 500f. must reflect this fact. Conversely, should it be ascertained that 499 cannot be construed to mean that Odysseus removed the chariot, 10.500f. must not be translated in a fashion that contradicts this finding.

The exegetical difficulties of 10.500f. and those of 10.499 would end were we to find that 10.503ff. indeed attest the removal of the chariot by Diomedes as Sickel and others maintain.

10.503ff. is a crucial piece of testimony. *Per se*, it indicates nothing about the chariot being removed or being taken by Diomedes. But does the text establish, as alleged, that Diomedes removed the vehicle when elucidated through the relevant *μερμηρίζειν* passages of the *Iliad*? This must be ascertained although the legitimacy of an inquiry of this nature is questioned. It is claimed that 503ff. set forth a process of deliberation concerning three items while other *μερμηρίζειν* passages of the *Iliad* entail the consideration of two alternatives³⁴. That objection is not valid. A tripartite schema results from 503ff. only if it is assumed that 505 states two alternatives of action. Actually, in 503ff., Diomedes was deliberating whether to kill more Thracians or to remove the chariot of Rhesus: ἦ ὃ γε δίφρον ἐλών... / ῥυμοῦ ἐξέρυοι ἦ ἐκφέροι ὑψόσ' αἰείρας (505) are the means of realizing the second objective³⁵. A schema of two alternatives is operative in 503ff.

While Diomedes was pondering what to do, Athena appeared and addressed him with νόστου δὴ μνήσαι μεγαθύμου Τυδέος υἱὲ / νῆας ἐπι γλαφυράς, μὴ καὶ πεφοβημένος ἔλθης, / μὴ πού τις καὶ Τρῶας ἐγείρησιν θεὸς ἄλλος (509ff.). Athena's words are somewhat vague, and it is not clear what effect they had on Diomedes. Certainly, he did not slay more Thracians (10.488.495.559f.) but did

33. Vid., n. 8.

34. Düntzer, (1857) p. 54 = *Hom. Abh.*, p. 319. Also cf. Doederlein, p. 237, n. 503. Eichhorn, p. 16.

35. Heyne, VI, p. 99, n. 505. Friedlaender, p. 138, 505. [Erbse, (1974) p. 106, 505a.]. V. H. Koch, *Homers Iliade*, III, Hannover 1870, p. 68, n. 504. Nitsche, p. 31. J. C. Lawson, *The Iliad of Homer*, Bks IX-X, Cambridge at the Univ. Press 1902, p. 93, n. 506. Ameis-Hentze, (1906) p. 37, n. 504. Shewan, p. 276. Leeuwen, (1912) p. 372, n. 504-506. Arend, p. 108, n. 1. Voigt, p. 61. Heusinger, p. 85. Monro, (1963) p. 360, n. 506. Erbse, (1974) p. 106, 504-506. (Μιστριώτης, p. 231, n. 7).

he refrain from taking the chariot? The *Doloneia* is ambiguous about this matter but perhaps 1.188ff., 5.671ff., 8.167f. and 16.712ff. which are relevant to 10.503ff. provide the answer.

In each of the texts, bearing on 503ff., a hero is presented considering two courses of action³⁶. Invariably a deity, Zeus (8.251), Athena (1.194ff., 5.676) or Apollo (in the guise of Asius, 16.715ff.) is introduced who influences the deliberation in a particular way: Athena in 5.671ff. and Apollo in 16.724 select the alternative that Odysseus (*cf.* 5.673 *et* 5.676ff.) and Hector (*cf.* 16.713 *et* 16.724.728) respectively adopt, while Athena in 1.188ff. identifies the option that Achilles must forgo (1.210). And, perhaps not unlike in 10.509f., the goddess recommends a course of action that Achilles had not considered (*cf.* 1.191f.). Given that advice, Achilles did not carry out the alternative that the goddess proscribed (220). Even he rejected the second option he had considered (*cf.* 1.192.224). But, he *did adopt* the new option that Athena offered (1.223ff.).

In 8.167f. Zeus' influence on Diomedes, certainly after 8.251, was not unlike Athena's on Odysseus and Apollo's on Hector. As the result of an omen that Zeus sent (8.251), Diomedes, rejecting the option of continuing in retreat, adopted the alternative of turning to face the enemy. Earlier, influenced again by an omen from Zeus (8.170f.), Diomedes had chosen the option of continuing in flight.

In the passages pertinent to 503ff., the hero deliberating does not act consistently, but his behavior is not totally unpredictable. He will translate into action, at least, *one* of the options he had considered provided a deity does not interdict the one and offer a substitute for the other. When this occurs, the hero will act but to do what the deity proposed.

This means that the question of whether Diomedes seized the chariot hinges on the meaning of νόστου δὴ μνησθαι (10.509), that is, on Athena's instruction to Diomedes. If Athena is offering Diomedes a substitute for the options he had considered³⁷, then, in contradiction to what others allege, 10.503ff. provide no support for the view that Diomedes removed the vehicle³⁸. We can insist on this,

36. In 1.188ff. each alternative is compound. In part, this is the case also with 8.168. In 8.167f., one option is stated while the other must be secured from 8.157f.

37. Commentators are not in agreement about the meaning of 509. They assume that Athena advised Diomedes against (a) killing more Thracians (Welcker, p. 217, n. 77. Shewan, p. 276. Voigt, p. 43, 62), (b) removing the chariot of Rhesus (Lafaye, p. 747. Delebecque, p. 79. Wiesner, p. F 112), (c) implementing the options listed in 503ff. [Düntzer, (1857) p. 54 = *Hom. Abh.*, p. 312. Nitsche, p. 31. Perrin, p. 112. Also *cf.* Ranke, p. 33. Sheppard, p. 89. Fenik, p. 53. Eichhorn, p. 16. Van der Valk, (1979) 821.40f.] and (d) Athena's remark has nothing to do with the alternatives presented in 503ff. (Heusinger, p. 89. Also Arend, p. 112).

38. Contrary to what those listed in n. 6 claim.

despite the absence of a statement that the goddess, consistent with her *modus operandi*, interdicted one of the alternatives that Diomedes thought about. The interdiction was made but κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον. This is a warrantable conclusion.

With 10.503ff. contradicting rather than supporting the claim that Diomedes removed the chariot of Rhesus, another obstacle against the inference, based on the testimony of 15.679ff., that the συναερθέντες Ἴπποι of 10.499 are horses harnessed to the chariot of Rhesus is eliminated. Yet, reservations about this conclusion remain. If Odysseus removed the chariot in 10.499, why did Diomedes linger among the Thracians when, along with Odysseus, he could have made a speedy retreat from the enemy encampment on Rhesus' car? Was it to make sure that Odysseus made a safe exit from the encampment, a necessary precaution after Athena's ominous words in 10.511? This is a possibility although it necessitates a major rearrangement of the text of 10.498-511. But if Athena was dissuading Diomedes from the alternatives he considered because of the danger that each entailed was it not as imprudent for Odysseus to take the chariot as it would have been for Diomedes? This cannot be denied. Perhaps Odysseus was not aware of Athena's words to Diomedes —there is no evidence to the contrary— and besides he might not have realized the dangers associated with the activities he was pursuing.

The assumption that Odysseus took the chariot is defensible, as long as νόστου δὴ μνησαί is construed to be a warning to Diomedes to desist from carrying out what he was thinking. It must be regarded, however, as a *possible* interpretation of the evidence bearing on the vehicle for there is also another interpretation of νόστου δὴ μνησαί which reports that Diomedes was instructed by Athena to remove the chariot rather than slay more Thracians.

Substantiation for this interpretation is not to be found in those texts that specifically report the effect which Athena has on the deliberative process: whenever the goddess *urges* a hero to accept one of the two options he did consider, she recommends that he carry out the second of the two. To think that Athena is urging Diomedes to take the chariot, that is, to realize the first alternative he thought about, runs counter to what is known about the *modus operandi* of the goddess. Nor is there substantiation for the interpretation to be found in what some Homerists call a «Homeric practice» by which they mean that when a hero is considering two courses of action, generally, he does carry one or the other he had thought about³⁹. As 1.188ff. patently demonstrate, this is erroneous.

Nevertheless, there is reason to think that Diomedes was instructed to seize

39. This is overlooked by Sickel, p. 12. (Shewan, p. 276). Also Düntzer, (1857) p. 54 = *Hom. Abh.*, p. 319. Nitsche, p. 31. Arend, p. 112. (Heusinger, p. 86). Voigt, p. 72.

the chariot in view of 16.715ff. concerning Apollo and Hector. The poet could be ascribing to Athena in 10.503ff. the *modus operandi* of Apollo. The argument can be made that Athena was instructing Diomedes to seize the chariot⁴⁰ which in fact he did. But is it tenable? It depends on whether the problems that 10.503-513 and 10.516ff. present can be solved.

10.503-513 indicate that Diomedes, upon leaving the encampment, ascended a vehicle ready to transport him and Odysseus to the Greek camp. Already, the horses were harnessed to the vehicle⁴¹. This testimony would have been a serious blow to the contention that the chariot was seized by Diomedes were it not for the possibility that the report of 503-513 is compressed and elliptic⁴² with the result that activities occurring between the chariot's removal by Diomedes and his ascending a vehicle to which horses are yoked are not detailed. It is this possibility which militates against using 503-513 as evidence that the chariot was not removed by Diomedes.

The problem which the other passage 10.516ff. presents is also one of exegesis particularly of the text of 516. As 516ff. show, Apollo entered the Thracian encampment and roused the warrior Hippocoön ὡς ἴδ' Ἀθηναίην μετὰ Τυδέος υἱὸν ἔπουσαν (516). It is not immediately clear whether Apollo appeared in the midst of the Thracians «as he saw Athena going towards (μετὰ... ἔπουσαν) the son of Tydeus» or «as he saw Athena following (μετὰ... ἔπουσαν) the son of Tydeus». Both interpretations are possible but their effects on the assumption that Diomedes seized the chariot are different. The first would establish that there would have been *no* time for Diomedes to remove the chariot or for the horses to be harnessed to it. Besides, Diomedes himself would have been caught among the Thracians. This interpretation, however, must be rejected. The critical reading of 10.506ff. indicates that Diomedes was no longer among the enemy when Apollo entered the encampment. Moreover, as 10.513f. shows the chariot with the horses already yoked to it⁴³ was on its way to the Greek camp. The interpretation of 516 which satisfies the phenomena is the second one and this is so vague that neither 516 nor the rest of 516ff. can be used to argue that Diomedes did not seize the chariot of Rhesus.

In summary, neither 10.516ff. nor 10.503-513 necessitate the rejection of that construction of 503ff. which relates that Diomedes removed the chariot. In

40. Obviously, in disagreement with those listed in n. 37.

41. Stagakis, p. 139ff.

42. Readily, the *Doloneia* provides evidence of this practice: 32ff.; 53.125ff. 228ff.; 479ff.; 499. Even if 499 reports that the horses were harnessed to the chariot, the specifics are not provided. 10.525ff. 530.

43. Vid., n. 41.

that case, who harnessed the horses to the vehicle? The *Doloneia* is not altogether silent concerning this matter. One interpretation of 499 relates that the yoking of the horses to the vehicle was the work of Odysseus. If this interpretation is rejected, even then the *Xth* Bk. leaves no doubt that the harnessing must be credited to either Diomedes *and* Odysseus or to one of them.

The number of choices can be reduced by recourse to those materials of the *Iliad* which report the harnessing of horses to some chariot by two or more heroes or deities⁴⁴. This is the kind of testimony relevant to us. These materials show that either none of those involved in the harnessing or just one ascended the vehicle as a passenger, after the yoking was completed⁴⁵. Consequently, the yoking of the horses to the chariot *cannot* be credited to both Diomedes and Odysseus for the two are found on the vehicle (*cf.* 10.513f.527). Credit must be given to either Diomedes *or* Odysseus. Nothing more specific is possible for the testimony concerning harnessing is equivocal.

The inability to choose between Odysseus and Diomedes is aggravating although the experience is not new considering the results of this investigation. One body of testimony stated that it was Odysseus who harnessed the horses to Rhesus' chariot and drove it out of the enemy encampment while another reported that it was Diomedes who removed the vehicle. And to incorporate the findings just obtained, the horses were yoked to the car either by Diomedes or Odysseus.

After what others reported about the identity of the man responsible for the seizure of Rhesus' chariot and the harnessing of the horses of Rhesus to the vehicle, the results of this inquiry came somewhat as a surprise. Few gave credit for both deeds to Odysseus⁴⁶. The rest, a majority of respectable proportions, attributed the removal and the harnessing to Diomedes. And none gave a hint that the materials concerning the two activities were as equivocal as we found them. As the result; it was impossible to single one of the two Greek heroes as being responsible for the seizure of the vehicle and the harnessing.

University of Wisconsin

GEORGE STAGAKIS

44. 3.259f., 5.720ff., 19.392f., 24.279. 15.119f. is not considered for there is no reason to think that the deities mentioned here *did* harness horses to the chariot of Ares.

45. None on the chariot: 24.248ff. 279 *et* 24. 323.440f. 691. And 3.259f. *per* 24.279. Only one on the vehicle: 5.720ff. *et* 5.745.748; 19.392f. *et* 19.396f.

46. *Vid.*, n. 11.