THE BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY OF HOMER: THE CASE OF THE ΔΙΟΣ ΑΠΑΤΗ*

The Διὸς Ἀπάτη or 'Deception of Zeus' in the *Iliad*'s 14th and 15th books (*DA* hereafter) was subject to an intense and varied scrutiny in the ancient period – moralising, disapproving, allegorical.[1] Though these judgements have found adherents as well as opponents in modern scholarship,[2] by far the most influential recent interpretations have been conducted from an 'orientalising' perspective, documenting the links between Greece and the other civilisations of the Mediterranean basin.[3] Features in the *DA* which

---

*) I would like to thank Bill Allan, Patrick Finglass, Sophie Gibson, Antonia Karaisl, Bernd Manuwald, Oliver Taplin, Stephan Schröder, Alan Sommerstein, and audiences in Nottingham, Oxford and Berlin for their help with this article and its material, and the Institut für Klassische Philologie der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin and the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung for their support. The remaining faults are my responsibility alone.

1) The title is strictly applied in ancient sources to the 14th book (Eustathios 963.22–5 [565 van der Valk]; cf. also Σ L ad Il. 14.135) but, for reasons which will become clear, it has come to be used also for the episode's sequel in the 15th book. For ancient commentary on the *DA*, cf., e. g., Plato, Rep. 3.390b–c; Eustathios 973.56 f. ad Il. 14.161–324 (598–9 van der Valk). For a review of modern opinions on the scene, cf. M. Schäfer, Der Götterstreit in der Ilias (Stuttgart 1990) 87–9, nn. 228–35.

2) Of the latter, cf., e. g., H. Erbse, Hera und Zeus auf dem Idagebirge, Antike und Abendland 16 (1970) 93–112; L. Golden, Διὸς ἀπάτη and the unity of *Iliad* 14, Mnemosyne 42 (1989) 1–11; Schäfer (as n. 1) 85–104; R. Janko, The *Iliad*; A Commentary, Volume IV: Books 13–16 (Cambridge 1992) 168–207.

3) Cf., e. g., W. Burkert, Oriental Myth and Literature in the *Iliad*, in: R. Hägg (ed.), The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century B. C.: Tradition and Innovation (Stockholm 1983) 51–6 (hereafter Burkert 1983); id., Die orientalisierende Epoche in der griechischen Religion und Literatur (Heidelberg 1984) (hereafter Burkert 1984); id., The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern influence on Greek Culture in the early Archaic period (Cambridge 1992) (hereafter Burkert 1992); id., Die Griechen und der Orient: von Homer bis zu den Magiern (Munich 2003) [tr. by author of id., Da Omero ai Magi (Venice 1999)] (hereafter Burkert 2003) = id., Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis: Eastern Contexts of Greek Culture (Cambridge [MA] 2004) (hereafter Burkert 2004); C. A. Faraone, Aphrodite's ΚΕΣΤΟΣ and apples for Atalanta: Aphrodisiacs in early Greek myth and ritual, Phoenix 44 (1990) 219–43; M. L. West, The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth (Oxford 1997).

once struck critics as difficult or faulty could now, according to this theory, be explained by reference to the fact that these motifs were shared with, or derived from, the traditions of the ancient Near East. These studies have proven so successful that a recent companion to the Homeric poems can describe the *DA* straightforwardly as 'an Oriental episode',[4] while Richard Janko's excellent volume in the Cambridge *Iliad* commentary constantly invokes Near Eastern material to assist the reader's interpretations of the narrative.[5]

This article proposes to argue the opposite case, but not by offering a radically new interpretation of the *DA*, for it is already the beneficiary of several extremely useful treatments.[6] Instead, I shall proceed by subjecting to detailed scrutiny the arguments behind the consensus view of an 'oriental' *DA*. I hasten to add that the purpose of this project is not to deny the utility of the Near Eastern material, the lasting value of which has been established by Walter Burkert and Martin West above all, but to incline the balance back towards the Greek side of the equation.[7]

Before engaging with the individual treatments and their arguments, it might be helpful to offer a brief characterisation of the orientalising methods we shall encounter. The first, relatively uncontroversial, step is the identification of parallels, though this is not without its perils, given that similarities can be overplayed. Of course, in order to suggest Greek textual or cultural dependence on the ancient Near East, it is not enough simply to point out similarities.[8] To rule out the possibility that the parallel is the result of coincidence or an independent use of the same material, orientalists deploy two tools: (1) the argument by isolation, and (2) the argument by association. The first of these seeks to separate the feature from its Greek context, showing that it is unusual, defective or

4) S. Morris, Homer and the Near East, in: I. Morris and B. B. Powell (eds.), A New Companion to Homer (Leiden 1997) 599–623: 602; cf. also Faraone (as n. 3) 202: "an episode which betrays several hallmarks of direct Near Eastern influence."

5) Cf., e. g., Janko (as n. 2) ad Il. 14.200–7, 181–2; ad 15.183–97, 247.

6) Cf., e. g., the works cited above, n. 2. It is, of course, to be hoped that some new insights on the *DA* will be offered during the course of the article, but that conclusion is the reader's.

7) For much the same purpose, cf., e. g., G. W. Most, Hesiod's myth of the five (or three or four) races, PCPhS 43 (1997) 104–27; J. Haubold, Greek epic: a Near Eastern genre? PCPhS 48 (2002) 1–19.

8) Cf., however, below, pp. 292 f., 301 f., for the attitude of West (as n. 3).

unique – something other than that which is to be expected in the text under examination. The second argument is a cumulative one; once one feature has been sufficiently isolated so as to bolster the likelihood of its derived status, other features in its vicinity can be linked with it. Thus, the number and localisation of derived features in any episode make it more likely that the poet was under the influence of his source text.[9] Not all orientalists proceed on this or, indeed, the same basis as one another,[10] but the description reflects the methodologies shown in the authoritative treatments of the *DA* with which this article is concerned.

The most significant of these is without doubt the work of Walter Burkert, whose foundational discussions have been reprinted and reworked on a number of occasions,[11] and have become so standard that they are cited even outside the confines of classical scholarship.[12] Because he structures his case so succinctly, and constantly uses the argument by association to link each of his points, my response will mirror the course of his discussion fairly closely, adducing the opinions of other scholars only when they augment or vary his central presentation.[13] To that end, this article is separated into four sections. The first two deal with the two most im-

---

9) These methods were of course inherited from earlier schools of Homeric scholarship, specifically the Analysts and Neoanalysts, both of whom look for inconsistencies or difficulties in the Homeric text, link them together, and argue either for Homer's dependence on older epics (Neoanalysts) or that the poems are a patchwork of different texts and authors (Analysts).

10) Cf. below, pp. 292 f., 301 f., for the differences between 'hard' and 'soft' versions of the methodology.

11) Of the works already cited (above, n. 3), I refer here to Burkert 1983, 53–4; 1984, 87–92 ~ 1992, 89–6; 2003, 36–42 = 2004, 29–37. The last two (the first in German, the second in English) were originally published in Italian (1999), French (2001) and Spanish (2002); I have limited the citations to the English and German editions for reasons of space.

12) Cf., e. g., S. Dalley, Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and others (Oxford 1989) 36 n. 4, referring to Burkert 1983 (as n. 3). His conclusions have even found their way into Wikipedia (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deception_of_Zeus) and have profoundly influenced public (mis)understandings of this issue; cf., e. g., R. Schrott, Der Kampf um Troja und seine realen Hintergründe (Munich 2008).

13) I structure my argument in accordance with his first two treatments, viz. Burkert 1983 and 1984 ~ 1992 (all as n. 3), discussing the divine lot (section 1 below) directly before the 'cosmogonic' Okeanos (section 2) and its supplementary parallels (section 3). Burkert 2003 = 2004 (as n. 3) reverses the order of the two main motifs, without substantive alterations to his thesis.

portant motifs for Burkert's case, the third with his supplementary parallels, and the fourth with several additional features pointed out by Martin West.

1. Poseidon's Triple lot and the Atrahasis *epic*

Burkert's first major motif consists of the similarities between Poseidon's reference to a threefold division of the earth (Il. 15.187–93) and the beginning of *Atrahasis* (OBV 1.1.11–16; c. 17th c. BC), set out below:

They took the box (of lots) …	τρεῖς γάρ τ' ἐκ Κρόνου εἰμὲν ἀδελφεοί, οὓς τέκετο Ῥέα,
cast the lots; the gods made the division.	Ζεὺς καὶ ἐγώ, τρίτατος δ' Ἀΐδης ἐνέροισιν ἀνάσσων.
Anu went up to the sky,	τριχθὰ δὲ πάντα δέδασται, ἕκαστος δ' ἔμορρε τιμῆς·
[And Ellil?] took the earth for his people (?).	ἤτοι ἐγὼν ἔλαχον πολιὴν ἅλα ναιέμεν αἰεὶ
The bolt which bars the sea	παλλομένων, Ἀΐδης δ' ἔλαχε ζόφον ἠερόεντα,
was assigned to far-sighted Enki.[14]	Ζεὺς δ' ἔλαχ' οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἐν αἰθέρι καὶ νεφέλῃσι. γαῖα δ' ἔτι ξυνὴ πάντων καὶ μακρὸς Ὄλυμπος.

Struck, and not unreasonably, by the resemblances between these passages, Burkert concludes:

> [t]here is hardly another passage in Homer which comes so close to being a translation of an Akkadian epic. Actually, it is not really a translation but a resetting, yet in a way that shows the foreign framework.[15]

In other words, the poet of the *Iliad* himself, or at best a recent predecessor, has reworked this passage from *Atrahasis*, and in such a way that it doesn't really fit with its Greek context. On the other hand, there is other early Greek evidence for this tradition of a triple lot,[16] so one could argue that the idea was typ-

14) *Atrahasis* is quoted from the translation of Dalley (as n. 12).

15) Burkert 2004, 37 (= 2003, 42); 1983, 53 ~ 1984, 87 (= 1992, 91) (all as n. 3).

16) Cf. HHDem. 85–7 (ἀμφὶ δὲ τιμὴν / ἔλλαχεν ὡς τὰ πρῶτα διάτριχα δασμὸς ἐτύχθη· / τοῖς μεταναιετάει τῶν ἔλλαχε κοίρανος εἶναι); Pi. Ol. 7.54–62 (φαντὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων παλαιαί / ῥήσιες, οὔπω, ὅτε χθόνα δατέοντο Ζεύς, / τε καὶ

ical by the time of Homer, thus reducing the chances of a single poet's 'translation' or 'resetting'. Nonetheless, however tempting, it would be unwise to rely on these (mostly much) later references, for there is at least some chance that they may all stem back to Poseidon's speech.

One can therefore begin by questioning the strength of the parallel, and the desirability of linking the two texts as directly as Burkert does: (a) the lot in Homer is between brothers, and not cross-generational as in *Atrahasis*;[17] (b) the Homeric passage di-

---

ἀθάνατοι, / φανερὰν ἐν πελάγει Ῥόδον ἔμμεν ποντίοι, / ἁλμυροῖς δ' ἐν βένθεσιν νᾶσον κεκρύφθαι. / ἀπεόντος δ' οὔτις ἔνδειξεν λάχος Ἀελίου· / καί ῥά νιν χώρας ἀκλάρωτον λίπον, / ἀγνὸν θεόν. / μνασθέντι δὲ Ζεὺς ἄμπαλον μέλλεν θέμεν. ἀλλά νιν οὐκ εἴασεν). The following (Hellenistic) references are included because they provide useful material for anyone seeking to reconstruct earlier traditions; cf. Kallimachos, Hy. 1.60–5 (δηναιοὶ δ' οὐ πάμπαν ἀληθέες ἦσαν ἀοιδοί· / φάντο πάλον Κρονίδησι διάτριχα δώματα νεῖμαι / τίς δέ κ' ἐπ' Οὐλύμπωι τε καὶ Ἄιδι κλῆρον ἐρύσσαι, / ὃς μάλα μὴ νενίηλος; ἐπ' ἰσαίηι γὰρ ἔοικε / πήλασθαι· τὰ δὲ τόσσον ὅσον διὰ πλεῖστον ἔχουσι. / ψευδοίμην γ' αἴοντος ἅ κεν πεπίθοιεν ἀκουήν); id. fr. 119 Pfeiffer (Μηκώνην μακάρων ἕδρανον αὖτις ἰδεῖν / ἦχι πάλους ἐβάλοντο, διεκρίναντο δὲ τιμάς / πρῶτα Γιγαντείου δαίμονες ἐκ πολέμου); Σ ad Apoll. Rhod. Arg. 1.308b [ἠὲ Κλάρον] (Νεάνθης δέ φησιν, ὅτι κατὰ κλῆρον ὁ Ἀπόλλων ἔλαχε τὴν πόλιν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κλήρου οὕτως αὐτὴν ὠνομάσθαι· ἢ διὰ τὸ αὐτόθι κληρώσασθαι Ποσειδῶνα Δία Ἀίδην); SH 990.3–9 (καὶ τὸν ἐν ἀθανάτοισ⟨ι⟩ θεοῖς μέσατόμ⟨ι⟩ ποτ' ἔθεντο / κλῆρον, τίς τίνα χῶρον ἀνάξει· / πρώτωι δ' ἦλθε λαχεῖν πόντον βαθὺν ἁλμυριδίνη / χερσὶ τρίαναν ἔχοντα Ποσειδᾶν / Ζεὺς δ' ἔλαχεν Κρονίδης μέγαν οὐρανὸν ἀσ⟨τερόεντα / ἀενίαν ἵν' ἔχηι βασιλείαν / Ἀγεσίλας δ' ἔλαχεν τὸν Τα[ρταρο); Apoll. Bibl. 1.1.1–2.1.1 = Theog. Orph. arg. 36 f. Bernabé (? ~ Eumelos, *Theogony*; cf. M. L. West, 'Eumelos': A Corinthian Epic Cycle? JHS 122 [2002] 109–33, esp. 114) (αὐτοὶ δὲ διακληροῦνται περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς, καὶ λαγχάνει Ζεὺς μὲν τὴν ἐν οὐρανῶι δυναστείαν, Ποσειδῶν δὲ τὴν ἐν θαλάσσηι, Πλούτων δὲ τὴν ἐν Ἅιδου) cf. also Orphica, fr. 56 Kern with M. L. West, The Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (Oxford 1985) 121–4; Alkman fr. 65 PMG (†οἴεθεν† πάλως ἔπαλε δαιμονάς τ' ἐδάσσατο).

17) Cf. West (as n. 3) 110: "[t]hese myths reflect actual use of the lot in the Near East to allocate shares of a man's estate to his sons, shares of temple income to different officials, or generally 'to establish a sequence among persons of equal status that would be acceptable, as divinely ordained, to all participants'" (citing A. L. Oppenheim, Ancient Mesopotamia [Chicago 1977] 208). For fuller examinations, cf. P. Steinkeller, Communications, Revue d'Assyrologie et d'archéologie orientale 78 (1984) 83–8, at 86 and (for later periods) W. Hallo, The first Purim, Biblical Archaeologist 46 (1983) 19–29; also J. Lindblom, Lot-Casting in the Old Testament, Vetus Testamentum 12 (1962) 164–178 on the motif in the Hebrew bible. The fact that the Greek lot is between brothers would seem to reflect 'actual use' much more closely than the intergenerational lot in *Atrahasis*, weakening further the conclusion that Homer derived it from the Near Eastern text.

vides the universe into four areas, not three,[18] with (c) a neutral area entirely foreign to the conception of both *Atrahasis* and the other Near Eastern texts which show this division,[19] and (d) a threefold division is also found in the Indo-European tradition.[20] The idea of 'translation' is, therefore, far from compelling.

But, after all this preliminary scepticism, there is still a striking correspondence between Poseidon's speech and *Atrahasis* – the divine lot dividing up the universe. In suggesting Homeric derivation of this motif from the older poem, Burkert deploys the first of two 'isolating' arguments[21] in order to separate this passage from the rest of early Greek epic:

> This is foreign to Hesiod, and isolated within the *Iliad*, whereas the corresponding passage is basic to the plot of the *Atrahasis*.[22]
>
> This is not normally the practice among the Greek gods: according to Hesiod, Zeus dethroned his predecessor – who was also his father – by force, and the other gods asked him to become their king.[23]

---

18) As Burkert 2003, 42 = 2004, 36 (as n. 3) realises. Both divisions, by the way, are common in early Greek poetry; cf. E. G. Schmidt, Himmel, Erde, Meer im frühgriechischen Epos und im Alten Orient, Philologus 125 (1981) 1–24; also below, p. 271 f.

19) Details in West (as n. 3) 109–11. For other Near Eastern examples of the triple division (without the lot), cf., e. g., Gilgamesh, Enkidu and the nether world 1–25 (J. Black / G. Cunningham / E. Robson / G. Zólyomi, The Literature of Ancient Sumer [Oxford 2004] 32–3); Debate between Bird and Fish 1–12 (J. Black et al. [above] 230–1). Both of these texts are c. 18th c. BC.

20) Details in M. L. West, Indo-European Poetry and Myth (Oxford 2007) 123–4. The significance of this point is underlined in another connection by N. Allen, review of West (above), BMCR 2007.10.53, with regard to the theme of "the motif of the overburdened Earth and her complaint to a supreme god. As has long been recognised, Ge's complaint to Zeus, which causes the Trojan war, parallels Prithivi's complaint to Brahma, which causes the central *Mahabharata* war. Since a third parallel occurs a millennium earlier in *Atrahasis* . . ., W. judges that the motif is not Graeco-Aryan but rather spread both west and east from Mesopotamia. However, the argument from chronology does not merit so much weight, and a Graeco-Aryan common origin remains likely."

21) Cf. above, p. 260 for the term, and below, p. 271 f., for the second example of its type deployed by Burkert in this connection (the apparent uniqueness of this triple division of the cosmos) and a concluding associative argument; also below, p. 272 f., for West's single supplementary.

22) Burkert 1983, 53 (as n. 3).

23) Burkert 1992, 90 (= 1984, 87); ~ 2003, 42 (= 2004, 36) (all as n. 3).

There are two planks to this case: (1) the disjunction between Homer and Hesiod; and (2) the isolation of the lot motif within the Greek tradition. Let us deal with these in reverse order, in order to begin with the more important element – the characterisation of Poseidon's κλῆρος as isolated, individual or inappropriate for Hellenic epic. However, a consideration of the traditional theme of division or δασμός – a term used by epic poets, their characters and modern scholars to denote the division of property or booty[24] – suggests that the lot was a well nigh indispensible feature in these contexts.[25]

A δασμός may take two forms, depending on the type of material involved and the situation itself. Either (1) an existing authority figure apportions out shares of booty from a military expedition or raid ('authority δασμός');[26] or (2) the beneficiaries in matters of property inheritance divide up that property in the absence or incapacity of a paternal figure ('inheritance δασμός').[27]

---

24) Cf. R. Führer, δασμός, LfrGE, 222.

25) The deployment of 'tradition' as an hermeneutic device in this article is grounded in the fact that both Hesiod and Homer were participants in the tradition of archaic Greek epic, a tradition witnessed primarily in the texts of these two authors, but also in the *Homeric Hymns* and the fragments of the so-called 'Epic Cycle'. The reconstruction, from these various sources, of the typical circumstances, structures and motifs behind the texts is essential to a proper understanding of their narratives, particularly (but not only) in filling out the silences, gaps and apparent inconsistencies in those narratives. For a brief introduction to the importance of tradition in these terms, which has been the primary object of study for the 'oralist' school of scholarship since the groundbreaking work of Milman Parry, cf. A. Kelly, A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Homer, *Iliad* VIII (Oxford 2007) 1–14 (with further bibliography).

26) In the list below (from H. van Wees, Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History [Amsterdam 1992] 305), the authority figure is named in brackets after the citation itself:

(1) Greeks v. Thebe (Il. 1.366–9) (Agamemnon); cf. also Il. 6.425–7, 9.188, 9.365–7, 16.152–3, 23.826–9;

(2) Greeks v. several communities around Troy (Il. 1.163–8) (Agamemnon); cf. also, e. g., Il. 2.226–8 (Agamemnon), 11.625–7 ('the Achaians' = Agamemnon), 9.128–30 (Agamemnon to Achilleus), 9.666–8 (Achilleus to Patroklos);

(3) Pylians v. Elis (Il. 11.696–706) (Neleus);

(4) Phaiakians v. Apeira (Od. 7.9–11) (Alkinoos);

(5) Ithakans v. Ismaros (Od. 9.40–2) (Odysseus);

(6) Ithakans v. Polyphemos (Od. 9.458–61) (Odysseus);

(7) 'son of Kastor' v. several communities (Od. 14.230–3) ('son of Kastor').

27) In the following citations, the parties to the lot are named in brackets after the citation: Od. 14.208–10 (legitimate sons of Kastor); WD 37–41 (Hesiod and Perses); cf. also Il. 5.158 ~ Theog. 606–7 (relatives dividing up intestate house-

Though these types are usually exclusive, the lot has an important place in both of them; in fact, it is so vital for the latter type that the word κλῆρος has come to be used for the inheritance itself.[28]

In the first circumstance, Hans van Wees has detected two types of material, the γέρας ('honour prize') and the μοῖρα ('portion'),[29] corresponding to the stages of the division itself: after taking out a γέρας for himself and distributing other γέρα to the principle leaders, the leader then takes part in the process of determining μοῖραι, where the vast bulk of the material is distributed by a mechanism able apparently to preserve group hierarchies whilst satisfying all its members that they have received their 'due portion'.[30] Herein the leader also receives a substantial amount of material, as we can see most clearly in Odysseus' fake speech (Od. 14.230–3). The precise nature of this mechanism is not particularly clear, but λαγχάνειν – a word naturally suggestive of the κλῆρος – is typically used to refer to the apportionment of μοῖραι (Il. 9.367; Od. 14.233).[31]

---

hold); and the curse laid on Eteokles and Polyneikes by Oidipous in the Theban cycle (Thebaid, frs. 2 and 3 Bernabé).

28) Cf. WD 37 with M. Schmidt, κλῆρος B 2, LfrGE, 1443–4.

29) Cf. van Wees (as n. 26) 299–310. The most important passages are Il. 9.365–9 ἄλλον δ' ἐνθένδε χρυσὸν καὶ χαλκὸν ἐρυθρὸν / ἠδὲ γυναῖκας ἐυζώνους πολιόν τε σίδηρον / ἄξομαι, ἄσσ' ἔλαχόν γε· γέρας δέ μοι, ὅς περ ἔδωκεν / αὖτις ἐφυβρίζων ἔλετο κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων (for the items constituting this μοῖρα from the sack of Thebe, cf. also 9.187–8 (a φόρμιγξ), 16.152–3 (trace-horse), 23.826–9 (iron weight)); Od. 11.534 μοῖραν καὶ γέρας ἐσθλὸν ἔχων ἐπὶ νηὸς ἔβαινεν; Od. 14.230–4 εἰνάκις ἀνδράσιν ἦρξα καὶ ὠκυπόροισι νέεσσιν / ἄνδρας ἐς ἀλλοδαπούς, καί μοι μάλα τύγχανε πολλά. / τῶν ἐξαιρεύμην μενοεικέα, πολλὰ δ' ὀπίσσω / λάγχανον. Other important passages include Od. 9.40–2 ἔνθα δ' ἐγὼ πόλιν ἔπραθον, ὤλεσα δ' αὐτούς. ἐκ πόλιος δ' ἀλόχους καὶ κτήματα πολλὰ λαβόντες / δασσάμεθ', ὡς μή τίς μοι ἀτεμβόμενος κίοι ἴσης; Od. 9.548–51 μῆλα δὲ Κύκλωπος γλαφυρῆς ἐκ νηὸς ἑλόντες / δασσάμεθ', ὡς μή τίς μοι ἀτεμβόμενος κίοι ἴσης. / ἀρνειὸν δ' ἐμοὶ οἴῳ ἐυκνήμιδες ἑταῖροι / μήλων δαιομένων δόσαν ἔξοχα; Il. 11.696–7 ἐκ δ' ὁ γέρων ἀγέλην τε βοῶν καὶ πῶυ μέγ' οἰῶν / εἵλετο, κρινάμενος τριηκόσι' ἠδὲ νομῆας; 703–5 τῶν ὁ γέρων ἐπέων κεχολωμένος ἠδὲ καὶ ἔργων / ἐξέλετ' ἄσπετα πολλά· τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἐς δῆμον ἔδωκε / δαιτρεύειν, μή τίς οἱ ἀτεμβόμενος κίοι ἴσης.

30) Cf., e. g., the way in which Odysseus distributes booty from the sack of Ismaros explicitly ὡς μή τίς μοι ἀτεμβόμενος κίοι ἴσης (Od. 9.42 ~ Od. 9.549 ~ Il. 11.705).

31) van Wees (as n. 26) 302–3 argues that the verb need not have anything to do with an actual lot. This is indeed true, but his need to reject the κλῆρος in the allocation of μοῖραι is because he assumes (with many others, e. g. W. Donlan, The Homeric Economy, in: I. Morris / B. B. Powell [eds.], A New Companion to Homer

Poseidon's story can be viewed in these terms without any difficulty. Zeus begins by dividing the γέρα, amongst which would be the claim or retention of things like the thunderbolt given him by the Kyklopes (Poseidon's γέρα might be the keeping of his own Cyclopean present, the τρίαινα[32]) and confirming at least some of

---

[Leiden 1997] 649–67, 658) that it is predicated on the equality of the candidates and their shares, in that the property or material is equally divided. This could hardly be the case in Poseidon's speech (as Kallimachos recognised; cf. above, n. 16), for the house of Hades is elsewhere in Homer 'hated by the gods' (Il. 20.65). Further, in Odysseus' story, the legitimate sons either exclude Odysseus' character from the lot (thus showing the preservation of hierarchy within the process) and allot him only a small portion of the inheritance (as claimed by W. Ridgeway, The Homeric Land System, JHS 6 [1885] 319–39), or he takes part in the process, but receives an uneven share from it. In either case, the property is n o t divided into equal parts (though one might argue, in the former eventuality, that the 'bastard's share' was taken out first, and then the land divided equally). The Hesiodic evidence is, of course, crucial, but Hesiod doesn't say that he and Perses received equal parts in the inheritance, simply that Perses is now taking more than he was originally allotted (WD 37–41). Indeed, if equal division were the rule, how did Perses persuade the 'gift devouring' kings to allow him to 'keep carrying off much extra' (37–8)? Possibly by quibbling over what was truly a half share, which interpretation could draw support from the shortly following proverb 'how much more is the half than the whole' (40). Yet the imperfect tense of the frequentative φορεῖν (38) suggests that Perses repeatedly did this; if he were arguing each time that his predations were aimed at an equal division, how many times would the same argument have worked? It seems to me that the quarrel is better explained on the basis of an inheritance system in which inequality was a possible, perhaps even a likely, result of the process. On the Near Eastern possibilities of structuring an inheritance lot so as to favour the eldest son, cf. J. N. Postgate, Early Mesopotamia (London 1992) 98–9 (specifically restricted to the period 3000–1500 BC). This could in fact strengthen Burkert's hypothesis, in that an ancient Near Eastern inheritance practice seems to reflect the situation and process which I have suggested pertained after the Titans' overthrow. Yet the actual Near Eastern circumstance has nothing to do with the *Atrahasis*, where the father (Anu) is still very much alive and a participant in the lot, so it seems a better hypothesis that the 'structured' lot, designed to preserve a preferential status in matters of inheritance, was a widespread Mediterranean phenomenon, with a mythological reflex o n l y in a Greek context.

32) Cf. Apoll. Bibl. 1.7.3–4 (καὶ Κύκλωπες τότε Διὶ μὲν διδόασι βροντὴν καὶ ἀστραπὴν καὶ κεραυνόν, Πλούτωνι κυνέην, Ποσειδῶνι δὲ τρίαιναν· οἱ δὲ τούτοις ὁπλισθέντες κρατοῦσι τούτων) (omitted by Bernabé). This gift could be an early feature of the story; after all, both Hades' cap (Il. 5.844–5), Poseidon's trident (Il. 13.27, Od. 5.292) and Zeus' thunderbolt (Theog. 141), all mentioned as Cyclopean gifts in the same passage of Apollodoros, are well evidenced in early epic, though only Zeus' weapon is explicitly linked with the Kyklopes; cf. also HHPos. (22) 4–5 (διχθά τοι, Ἐννοσίγαιε, θεοὶ τιμὴν ἐδάσσαντο· / ἵππων τε δμητῆρ' ἔμεναι σωτῆρά τε νηῶν) – might his γέρα have included the former province?

the promises he had made to his allies during the war against the Titans.[33] Next, Zeus causes the remaining μοῖραι and τιμαί to be divided through a κλῆρος (or κλῆροι) in (at least one of) which he takes part. The resulting settlement is still a manifestation of his authority, for the leader is always responsible for the entire process, both in allotting the material for the division,[34] and being concerned that no-one go away from the δασμός blaming him for its inequality.[35]

One might object that the division of the universe is too important a matter to be left to the vagaries of a lot. However, firstly, this mechanism can throw up the 'right' winner, as e. g. choosing the men whom Odysseus would have chosen himself to help him blind the Kyklops (Od. 9.334–5).[36] Secondly, van Wees has argued that the μοῖρα is routinely of greater material value than the γέρα,[37] so it is not incongruous that a lot should be used to settle such a weighty issue. Thirdly, it is actually typical for early Greek epic to use the language of the κλῆρος to denote the process by which the gods received their honours.[38]

---

33) E. g., to Styx (Theog. 389–403). We shall deal in a moment with the early Greek evidence for such a broader lot; cf. below, n. 38 and p. 270 f.

34) Cf., e. g., Il. 11.704–5 (Neleus) (above, nn. 26 and 29).

35) Cf. above, n. 30. On the question of authority in general, cf. van Wees (as n. 26) 301–2, answering the rather torturous suggestion of (inter al.) W. Donlan, Reciprocities in Homer, CW 75 (1982) 137–75, at 158–9, that influence is shared between βασιλεύς and λαός in the division of booty.

36) Cf. above, n. 31, for the argument that lots could have been structured in such a way as to favour one of the candidates.

37) van Wees (as n. 26) 300–1.

38) Cf. Theog. 203–4 (Aphrodite) ταύτην δ' ἐξ ἀρχῆς τιμὴν ἔχει ἠδὲ λέλογχε / μοῖραν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι καὶ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι; Theog. 412–13 (Hekate) Ζεὺς Κρονίδης τίμησε· πόρεν δέ οἱ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα / μοῖραν ἔχειν γαίης τε καὶ ἀτρυγέτοιο θαλάσσης; Theog. 421–5 (Hekate) ὅσσοι γὰρ Γαίης τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἐξεγένοντο, / καὶ τιμὴν ἔλαχον, τούτων ἔχει αἶσαν ἁπάντων· / οὐδέ τί μιν Κρονίδης ἐβιήσατο οὐδέ τ' ἀπηύρα, / ὅσσ' ἔλαχεν Τιτῆσι μέτα προτέροισι θεοῖσιν, / ἀλλ' ἔχει, ὡς τὸ πρῶτον ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἔπλετο δασμός; Theog. 789 (Styx) δεκάτη δ' ἐπὶ μοῖρα δέδασται; HHDem. 85–7 (Hades) ἀμφὶ δὲ τιμὴν / ἔλλαχεν ὡς τὰ πρῶτα διάτριχα δασμὸς ἐτύχθη· / τοῖς μεταναιετάει τῶν ἔλλαχε κοίρανος εἶναι. These passages indicate that not only is a lot of some sort envisaged for the other gods' honours, but Zeus' control over this process is also assumed; the stories of Aphrodite, Hekate and Styx suggest an ability to apportion them the same τιμαί they had held since the beginning, independently of any broader δασμός. One should probably not seek to impose too strict a differentiation between γέρα and μοῖραι here (or in trying to sort out the precise stages by which the lot was taken), partially because the language is

These three observations apply primarily to the circumstance of the authority δασμός, but it should not be forgotten that we have to do here also with the second ('inheritance') type of δασμός. A post-Titanic κλῆρος is actually necessary according to the norms of the early Greek epic world, because the inheriting sons – Zeus, Poseidon and Hades (Theog. 453–7) – are dividing up the κλῆρος of their absent, incapacitated father – Kronos. This situational mixture, viz. where the division of a private κλῆρος between several contenders is combined with the inheritance of more generalised power over and within the community, was probably something like that pertaining in the case of Polyneikes and Eteokles,[39] but is otherwise rare in the remains of early Greek epic. The unusual combination of these two δασμοί makes it difficult to determine precisely what were the τιμαί, γέρα and μοῖραι involved, but the parameters of the δασμός as a whole render such a precise accounting unnecessary. What matters most of all is that any such process would, according to the social practices of early Greek epic, naturally contain something like the lot to which Poseidon makes reference. Far from being unusual or isolated in that context, as Burkert has suggested, Poseidon's post-Titanic κλῆρος has excellent Hellenic precedent.

---

to some degree interchangeable, but it is not hard to see Zeus removing certain functions from the general 'pot', as it were, and assigning them as he willed; cf. also above, n. 29, for the link between μοῖρα and λαγχάνειν in mortal δασμοί.

39) It is not actually clear from the existing summaries and fragments precisely what role Oidipous had in sorting out the succession issue, beyond delivering the curse(s) on his sons (frs. 2 and 3 Bernabé); cf. J. March, The Creative Poet: Studies on the Treatment of Myths in Greek Poetry (London 1987) 125–6. The position of Laertes in Ithaka might suggest that it was typical for the leading βασιλεύς in a community to retire from pre-eminence once his son was of age, so Oidipous (even without considering his special circumstance) need not have had a determinative role in sorting out the division between his sons. The earliest (relatively) full treatment of the matter is found in the Lille Papyrus of Stesichoros (fr. 222[b] *PMGF*), in which the solution proposed by their mother (unnamed, but either Iokaste or Euryganeia) is to divide the κλῆρος into two portions – the throne on one hand, and the flocks (cf. WD 163) and gold on the other (220–4). The one to win the lot gets the worse portion (cf. above, n. 31, for the lot between Hesiod and Perses); cf. P. Parsons, The Lille 'Stesichorus', ZPE 26 (1977) 7–36, esp. 24–6. Because of Stesichoros' penchant for epic recomposition and recombination (cf. A. Kelly, Stesikhoros and Helen, MH 64 [2007] 1–21, at 2–11), it is difficult to know how far this reflects the pre-Homeric story.

On the strength of this reconstruction, we can now return to the first of Burkert's 'planks' on this issue – the disjunction between Hesiod and Homer. Let us set out the Hesiodic passage (Theog. 881–5):

> αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥα πόνον μάκαρες θεοὶ ἐξετέλεσσαν,
> Τιτήνεσσι δὲ τιμάων κρίναντο βίηφι,
> δή ῥα τότ' ὤτρυνον βασιλευέμεν ἠδὲ ἀνάσσειν
> Γαίης φραδμοσύνησιν Ὀλύμπιον εὐρύοπα Ζῆν
> ἀθανάτων· ὁ δὲ τοῖσιν ἐὺ διεδάσσατο τιμάς.

The first thing to note is that Hesiod's narrative of the division is confined to a single verse (885),[40] but that it clearly expresses Zeus' control over the δασμός. As we saw above, authority figures of this sort are indispensible for early epic δασμοί, since they are the ones responsible for keeping the parties to the division content and properly rewarded for their services and loyalty. It was also seen that the typical casting of lots in these circumstances is not a challenge to that authority: a κλῆρος is in fact only possible because someone governs and guarantees the process.[41] So, although Hesiod does not state positively that there was a lot in this instance, his narrative does not actually preclude it.[42] His story, in other

40) The passage is interesting, for several reasons. At first sight its sequence of events seems quite clear, but the progression is a trifle misleading, for διεδάσσατο (885) cannot only refer to settlements made after the 'election' in 883; after all, Zeus had already made several promises about τιμαί before the defeat of the Titans, e. g. to Styx (389–403) and Hekate (421–5), and took the lead in freeing and directing the Hundred Handers (501, 624 and 643). Indeed, Zeus' own statement before the final battle (389–403), where he promises not only to allow the Titans who fight with him (esp. 392 μετ' εἶο) to retain their former honours, but also to allot τιμαί and γέρα to anyone previously ἄτιμος ὑπὸ Κρόνου ἠδ' ἀγέραστος (395), makes it clear that his pre-eminence and authority were established well before whatever process is denoted at Theog. 883. Instead of an 'election', therefore, I suggest that Theog. 883 only means that the gods ratified or confirmed Zeus' right to lead them, much as, e. g., the Phaiakian βασιλεῖς urge Alkinoos to send Odysseus home (Od. 13.47–8 πάντες ἐπήινεον ἠδ' ἐκέλευον / πεμπέμεναι τὸν ξεῖνον, ἐπεὶ κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπεν) well after he had already stated his intention to do so.

41) Cf. above, pp. 266–268 and n. 35.

42) This observation may perhaps be pressed further, for Hesiod frequently uses the language of the lot when speaking about this and previous divine divisions elsewhere in the poem; cf. above, n. 38, for the citations. Indeed, I would go so far as to suspect strongly that Hesiod did know of a κλῆρος between the brothers, but

words, does not rule out Poseidon's. Accordingly, one should not suggest that the Homeric and Hesiodic versions are mutually exclusive, as Burkert does. But this is actually secondary to, and does not affect, the most important response to Burkert's argument on Poseidon's story – a κλῆρος is in no way inappropriate or alien to the Greek conception of the divine δασμός.

Is there, therefore, any reason to hypothesise the influence of the *Atrahasis* on Homer? An orientalist could reply that my demonstration has only shown that the lot motif has been adapted from *Atrahasis* and so thoroughly assimilated and internalised that it has become fundamental and widespread to the early Greek view of Zeus' rise to power, as witnessed also in all the post-Homeric cases in which a divine κλῆρος is mentioned.[43] That conclusion is indeed possible, but (1) this could have happened at any point from the 17th century onwards, for the Homeric text certainly gives us no reason to think that any such adaptation was a recent phenomenon;[44] and (2) this is neither the aim nor the conclusion of the standard orientalist treatment of this passage.

The second of Burkert's isolating arguments on the motif can be answered more quickly:

> [a]lso, from another point of view, this passage is unique in Greek epic: elsewhere, when the parts of the cosmos are enumerated, there is either a triad of heaven – earth – underworld or of heaven – sea – earth, or even heaven – earth – sea – underworld, but not the triad heaven – sea – underworld, which is here assigned to the three brothers.[45]

---

did not narrate it in the *Theogony* simply because he had no need for it. For him, the important point was simply Zeus' control over the process as a whole, for which the lot was neither here nor there, simply an understood and conventional part of the process.

43) Cf. above, n. 16.

44) This objection will recur several times in the course of this article, especially when addressing the parallels posed by West (below, pp. 292–302). It is one of the basic problems with the orientalist discussions of the *DA* that, in their search for isolated foreign elements, they do not properly address the probability that the feature in question is actually typical and thoroughly concordant with its immediate and traditional context. Consequently, even where an inheritance might reasonably be hypothesised, one must always reckon with the diachronic depth of the Greek tradition; cf. also below, p. 284 and n. 84, for Burkert's hasty rejection of the Bronze Age.

45) Burkert 2004, 36 (= 2003, 42); = 1992, 90–1 (= 1984, 87); cf. also 1983, 53 (all as n. 3).

It is indeed true that the divided realms are three in number, but the cosmos according to Poseidon comes in four parts (sea – underworld – sky – earth), or even five, if Olympos is separated from earth (Il. 15.193). This is far from an isolated or unique phenomenon; such four (and five) part divisions are quite common, and deployed only in the contexts of divine narratives (Theog. 678–83 [sea – earth – sky – Olympos – underworld], 736–7 (= 807–8) [earth – Tartaros – sea – sky], 839–41 [earth – heaven – sea and Okeanos – underworld], HHDem. 33–5 [earth – sky – sea – underworld[46]]).[47] The conception of the cosmos in Poseidon's speech is not at all unusual in early Greek epic, and no evidence for the intrusion of a 'foreign' element into the text of Homer.

After these two isolating arguments, Burkert concludes his case with an associative argument, namely, that this motif occurs in the context of the 'unique' *DA*. This is a bit of a leap in logic, as the κλῆρος has no necessary connection with the deception narrative,[48] but much more revealing than mere proximity is the importance with which Burkert imbues it:

> Might this also be coincidence? There is the context to be taken into account, which has indeed a unique status within the *Iliad*. This passage still belongs to the 'Deception of Zeus'.[49]
>
> One might still believe this to be a deceptive coincidence, were it not for the special context of the *Dios Apate* where many different clues come together to point to the oriental tradition; in this case, the coincidence hypothesis becomes the most improbable option.[50]

In other words, Burkert admits that the parallel by itself is not strong enough, without the support of the rest of the *DA*, to establish his thesis. If the argument of the next section against the cosmogonic status of Okeanos is even vaguely cogent, then the whole case begins to look very weak.

As a final, supplementary argument in favour of Burkert's thesis, and concerning the way in which Poseidon refers to the triple division, West suggests that

---

46) The underworld is not actually part of the narrative, but it is obviously assumed by the circumstance.

47) Cf. Schmidt (as n. 18) 6–9.

48) Cf. above, n. 1.

49) Burkert 1983, 53 (as n. 3).

50) Burkert 2004, 37 (= 2003, 42); ~ 1984, 87–8 (= 1992, 90) (all as n. 3).

> the tone of the outburst recalls *Atrahasis* II 266–74 = 280–8 = 332–40, where Enlil finds that mankind has survived the famine he ordained; he points out that the gods had agreed on a plan, and that it has not been kept to.[51]

Indeed it does, but it also recalls the 'tone' and circumstance of Poseidon's invocation of the 'agreement' to sack Troy in the very same speech (Il. 15.213–17), to which Here refers when she directs her complaint to Zeus over the same matter (Il. 4.23–9); and to Athene's not entirely mock outrage at Zeus over keeping Odysseus away from home for so long (Od. 1.63–79, 5.21–7); or to Poseidon's disturbance at the thought that his absence has caused the gods to 'change their minds' about Odysseus (Od. 5.286 μετεβούλευσαν). All of these deities react to the fact that an apparently settled course of action is no longer being adhered to, which type of situation obviously has something to do with the common divine caution about getting in one another's way.[52] One hardly needs to look very hard in order to see how pervasive this theme is in early Greek epic. As with the motif of the lot, the possibility presents itself that any putative (and I stress this word) inheritance is to be placed very far in the Homeric past.

In summing up this section, it can be said that there is nothing in Poseidon's invocation of the divine κλῆρος which does not make perfect sense – in terms both of its meaning and its origins – within the conventions and parameters of early Greek epic. Burkert's attempt to isolate this motif from that context should be considered unsuccessful.

---

51) West (as n. 3) 385.

52) For many parallels, this time responding to a very similar point which West (as n. 3) 384 seeks to make about Hypnos' reference to Zeus' anger over Herakles (Il. 14.256), cf. below, pp. 294–296. Of course, West is not generally seeking to make precisely the same point as Burkert (i. e., more or less direct derivation), but he is trying to bolster Burkert's position (cited and quoted approvingly at West [as n. 3] 180 in this very context), and in any case the qualifications which we shall advance to his other parallels (below, esp. pp. 292–293) operate just as well here.

2. *The 'Cosmogonic' Okeanos and Tethys and the* Enuma Elis

Moving on from the divine lot in the associative manner mentioned above, Burkert begins with a general characterisation of the *DA*, for which he relies on Albrecht Dihle's linguistic and stylistic arguments about the 'post-oral' and therefore 'late' nature of this passage as a whole.[53] Dihle's methods, and his conclusion that the passage belongs to a late, written phase in the epic tradition, have found no favour with subsequent scholarship, but they afford Burkert both an isolating description and a reason to downdate the process of inheritance:

> [w]e are dealing with a text which is linguistically unusual, isolated in its content, and, in a way, quite 'modern'.[54]

It is misleading to introduce the *DA* in this way, for none of the scholars cited for this view could today be invoked without serious qualification,[55] but it sets the direction of the entire discussion.

---

53) Burkert 1983, 54 ~ 1984, 88 (= 1992, 90–1); ~ 2003, 36 (= 2004, 29) (all as n. 3), referring to A. Dihle, Homer-Probleme (Opladen 1970) esp. 83–93. Dihle's method is largely to point out the apparent divergences from 'normal' Homeric usage; cf. the reviews by M. Edwards, AJP 95 (1974) 68–71, esp. 70–1, and J. B. Hainsworth, CR 22 (1972) 316–18, esp. 316–7. Hainsworth is particularly devastating on this aspect of Dihle's book, pointing out that the passage chosen is too short for proper statistical analysis, and that it is a 'leap of logic' to argue from a rather subjective list of oddities that they are the result of literary interference with the oral style. I will not deal in detail with his arguments, except to add that almost any section of Homeric poetry will throw up exceptional or unusual features. This type of analysis is an uncertain foundation for a separative argument, as shown by the fate of Page's list of anomalies at the end of the *Odyssey* (D. L. Page, The Homeric *Odyssey* [Oxford 1955] ch. 5); cf. H. Erbse, Beiträge zum Verständnis der *Odyssee* (Berlin 1972) esp. 189–229.

54) Burkert 1992, 91 and n. 9 (= 1984, 88 and n. 9); ~ 2003, 36 and n. 33 (= 2004, 29 and n. 33); cf. also 1983, 53–4 (all as n. 3). Only in 1983 and 2003 – surprisingly, as he does qualify it in 2004 – does he fail to mention the fortunes of Dihle's argument, which has not, however, stopped him from using it; cf., e. g., Burkert 1992, 91 (= 1984, 88); ~ 2004, 29, where he prefaces the quote above with "[t]his result has not been generally accepted; but it must ("should": 2004, 29) be acknowledged that in this part of the *Iliad*" etc. It is not at all clear why Dihle's unaccepted impressions or conclusions "must be acknowledged"; the entire inference of these sentences must be rejected, particularly in light of Richard Janko's excellent study (above, n. 2).

55) Aside from Dihle, who is the only scholar invoked in Burkert 2003, 36 and 38 (= 2004, 29 and 32), and an obiter from Wilamowitz – increased to two in 1992, 201 n. 9 (as n. 3) – Burkert 1983, 53 n. 27 (all as n. 3) invokes the analytical tri-

Hence it is no surprise when, at the conclusion of this section in his treatments, Burkert returns to Dihle as the linguistic and structural confirmation of his own study.[56]

After this somewhat partial introduction, Burkert proceeds immediately to speak about the *DA*'s 'alternative cosmogony': Okeanos is called the 'origin of gods' (Il. 14.201 = 302) and the 'origin for all' (Il. 14.246), a status which apparently does not fit the Hesiodic conception of the universe's creation, where Gaia and Ouranos are the first couple.[57] Burkert argues that this is the "only

---

partition of the *Iliad* by W. Theiler, Die Dichter der Ilias, in: Festschrift für Edouard Tièche, ehemaligen Professor an der Universität Bern, zum 70. Geburtstag (Bern 1947) 126–56, esp. 135–9 (= id., Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur [Berlin 1970] 1–47, esp. 21–6), though with a qualification ("also the *Berückungsdichter* has been placed 'late' in the development of the epic by Homeric analysts; but it is clear that the Διὸς ἀπάτη is an indispensible element in the overall structure of the *Iliad* as we have it") which is trying to have it both ways, by invoking the arguments – though not the conclusions – of an old style Analyst.

56) Cf. Burkert 1983, 54; 1992, 93 (= 1984, 90) (as n. 3): "[t]his argument accords with Albrecht Dihle's observations from the other side on the 'young' character of this Homeric piece"; also Burkert 2004, 32 = 2003, 38 (as n. 3): "[t]his (i. e. his arguments) confirms from the other side Albrecht Dihle's observations on the late character of this piece."

57) Burkert 1983, 54; 1984, 88–9 (= 1992, 91–2); ~ 2003, 36–8 (= 2004, 29–30) (all as n. 3). Of course, he is not alone here, for the 'cosmogonic' Okeanos could now be considered almost the orthodox position on this passage; cf., e. g., A. Bonnafé, Eris et Eros: Mariages divins et mythe du succession chez Hésiode (Lyon 1985) 185–6; J. S. Clay, Hesiod's Cosmos (Cambridge 2003) 16, 22. For Burkert's modern predecessors, cf., e. g., A. Lesky, Thalatta: Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer (Vienna 1947) 58–87; J. Germain, Genèse de l'Odyssée (Paris 1954) 529–32. For the ancients, cf., e. g., Plato, Crat. 402B, Theaet. 152E, Tim. 40D–E; Aristotle, Met. 983b27–984a3; also G. S. Kirk, J. E. Raven and M. Schofield, The Presocratic Philosophers (Cambridge 1983) 13–33 for discussion and full references, esp. their conclusion at 16: "[t]he evidence does not show that there existed in Greece at a comparatively early date a systematic doctrine of the cosmogonical priority of Okeanos. Hesiod gives no indication of it, and later suppositions seem to be based on two unusual Homeric passages, which are left as the only direct evidence for any such cosmogonical theory." [my emphasis]

Aside from the arguments against the cosmic reading of these passages offered above, it is notable that Aristotle, Met. 983b27 f., expresses himself very cautiously when describing those who interpret the Homeric text in this way: εἰσὶ δέ τινες οἳ καὶ τοὺς παμπαλαίους καὶ πολὺ πρὸ τῆς νῦν γενέσεως καὶ πρώτους θεολογήσαντας οὕτως οἴονται περὶ τῆς φύσεως ὑπολαβεῖν· Ὠκεανόν τε γὰρ καὶ Τηθὺν ἐποίησαν τῆς γενέσεως πατέρας, καὶ τὸν ὅρκον τῶν θεῶν ὕδωρ, τὴν καλουμένην ὑπ' αὐτῶν Στύγα [τῶν ποιητῶν]· τιμιώτατον μὲν γὰρ τὸ πρεσβύτατον, ὅρκος δὲ τὸ τιμιώτατόν ἐστιν. εἰ μὲν οὖν ἀρχαία τις αὕτη καὶ παλαιὰ τετύχηκεν οὖσα περὶ τῆς φύσεως ἡ δόξα, τάχ' ἂν ἄδηλον εἴη,

passage in the Homeric canon where, quite unexpectedly, a cosmogonic theme comes to the fore",[58] whose most suggestive parallel is the mingling of the waters at the beginning of the Akkadian creation epic, the *Enuma Elis* (1.1–5), where Apsu and Tiamat play the cosmogonic role attributed in the *DA* to the two Greek deities:

> When skies above were not yet named
> nor earth below pronounced by name,
> Apsu, the first one, their begetter
> and maker Tiamat, who bore them all,
> had mixed their waters together …[59]

Then, pointing to the rather isolated position of Tethys within later Greek mythology, Burkert argues for a linguistic equation between Tiamat / Taw(a)tu and Tethys.

This entire nexus of isolating argumentation stems from the identification of the two sets of figures as cosmogonically equivalent, but the Homeric passages need not be interpreted to make Okeanos and Tethys the 'original couple'. In a brief and apparently little known article, Panchenko has argued that Homer refers here, in an admittedly elliptical manner, only to the birth of rivers and bodies of water.[60] Let us review the relevant passages:

Θαλῆς μέντοι λέγεται οὕτως ἀποφήνασθαι περὶ τῆς πρώτης αἰτίας (Ἵππωνα γὰρ οὐκ ἄν τις ἀξιώσειε θεῖναι μετὰ τούτων διὰ τὴν εὐτέλειαν αὐτοῦ τῆς διανοίας). Certainly this does not suggest that the cosmogoners were either numerous or reflective of general opinion, or that Aristotle followed them in their interpretation of the passages; contra Kirk et al. (as above) 17, but they do not quote the emphasised sentence εἰ μὲν οὖν … ἄδηλον εἴη, which makes Aristotle's uncertainty clear, as noted by W. D. Ross, Aristotle's *Metaphysics* Volume 1 (Oxford 1924) ad loc., 130: "the suggestion has no great historical value, as Aristotle himself admits (984a2)." Nor is Met. 1091b4 contrary evidence, for, though Aristotle speaks there of the ancient poets explaining how Zeus is in charge rather than 'the first' gods (τοὺς πρώτους), he lists as their examples those figures (Night, Chaos, Ouranos and Okeanos) who are so linked at Theog. 20 and 106–7. Furthermore, Plato "is obviously not entirely serious in his treatment of Homer as forerunner of the flux-idea assigned to Heraclitus, so we cannot be sure of the precise value he attached to the Homeric Okeanos-passage" (Kirk et al. [as above] 15). In sum, whilst there was indeed an ancient strand of the cosmogonic reading, it was by no means an inevitable or unanimous interpretation.

58) Burkert 1992, 91 (= 1984, 88); ~ 2003, 36 (= 2004, 30) (all as n. 3).

59) *Enuma Elis* is cited according to the translation of Dalley (as n. 12).

60) D. Panchenko, Γένεσις πάντεσσι: the *Iliad* 14.201 and 14.246 reconsidered, Hyperboreus 1 (1994) 183–186. In this he was preceded, with some (eventu-

14.200–1 (~ 301–2):
εἶμι γὰρ ὀψομένη πολυφόρβου πείρατα γαίης,
Ὠκεανόν τε θεῶν γένεσιν καὶ μητέρα Τηθύν …

14.244–6:
ἄλλον μέν κεν ἐγώ γε θεῶν αἰειγενετάων
ῥεῖα κατευνήσαιμι, καὶ ἂν ποταμοῖο ῥέεθρα
Ὠκεανοῦ, ὅς περ γένεσις πάντεσσι τέτυκται …

The first of these is delivered by Here to Aphrodite (and then to Zeus 301–2), the second by Hypnos to Here when attempting to refuse participation in her scheme. In the latter passage, the crucial question concerns the noun to which the phrase γένεσις πάντεσσι in v. 246 refers. Most scholars have taken it with θεῶν from v. 244, or made it refer simply to 'all things'; however, Panchenko suggested that it refers to ῥέεθρα, thus implying that Okeanos is merely the origin of all rivers. This may seem on first sight a rather cramped reading, with πάντεσσι amplifying one noun from a formulaic phrase,[61] but the Homeric poet himself seems to understand the matter in this way in a later passage in the *Iliad*, where Achilleus compares the progeny of Zeus with that of the rivers (21.194–7):

---

al) scepticism, by Kirk et al. (as above, n. 57) 14. However elliptical the reading may seem, is it any more difficult than to follow a cosmogonical reading and suppose that Homer has in these two passages forgotten his earlier description of the Titans as 'sons of Ouranos' at Il. 5.898 (cf. J. Latacz et al., Homers *Ilias*; Gesamtkommentar Band I. 2: 1. Gesang [Munich 2000] ad Il. 1.570, 176)?

61) It might be preferable, as Alan Sommerstein suggests to me, to refer πάντεσσι to ποταμοῖο. For substantival πᾶς in the plural expanding a previous substantive in the singular, cf., e. g., Il. 8.238–40 (οὐ μὲν δή ποτέ φημι τεὸν περικαλλέα βωμόν / νηὶ πολυκλήιδι παρελθέμεν ἐνθάδε ἔρρων / ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι βοῶν δημὸν καὶ μηρί' ἔκηα); Il. 17.670–2 (νῦν τις ἐνηείης Πατροκλῆος δειλοῖο / μνησάσθω· πᾶσιν γὰρ ἐπίστατο μείλιχος εἶναι / ζωὸς ἐών); Od. 8.166–8 (ἀτασθάλωι ἀνδρὶ ἔοικας / οὕτως οὐ πάντεσσι θεοὶ χαρίεντα διδοῦσιν / ἀνδράσιν [the cumulative enjambment hardly disqualifies the parallel]); Od. 8.552–4 (οὐ μὲν γάρ τις πάμπαν ἀνώνυμός ἐστ' ἀνθρώπων / οὐ κακὸς οὐδὲ μὲν ἐσθλός, ἐπὴν τὰ πρῶτα γένηται, / ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τίθενται, ἐπεί κε τέκωσι, τοκῆες); Od. 11.185–7 Τηλέμαχος τεμένη νέμεται καὶ δαῖτας ἐίσας / δαίνυται, ἃς ἐπέοικε δικασπόλον ἄνδρ' ἀλεγύνειν· / πάντες [i. e. οἳ ἄλλοι δικασπόλοι ἄνδρες] γὰρ καλέουσι); Theog. 156–7 (καὶ τῶν μὲν ὅπως τις πρῶτα γένοιτο, / πάντας ἀποκρύπτασκε); cf. also WD 694 (καιρὸς δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄριστος), where πᾶσιν generalises the circumstances of which the *Nautilia* is one illustration.

τῶι οὐδὲ κρείων Ἀχελώιος ἰσοφαρίζει,
οὐδὲ βαθυρρείταο μέγα σθένος Ὠκεανοῖο,
ἐξ οὗ περ πάντες ποταμοὶ καὶ πᾶσα θάλασσα
καὶ πᾶσαι κρῆναι καὶ φρείατα μακρὰ νάουσιν.

This is a suggestive complement to Hypnos' description of Okeanos in Il. 14.246. Firstly, consider the generic similarity between the passages; in both speeches, Zeus' superiority is emphasised by reference to the fact he is even more powerful than Okeanos, whose source of strength (and suitability for the comparison) is underlined by his genealogical status. To this end, Achilleus' emphatic anaphora of πάντες, πᾶσα, and πᾶσαι should be compared with πάντεσσι in Il. 14.246, and could be considered a fuller version of the rhetorical ellipse in that earlier passage. This gives at least some justification to interpret πάντεσσι in the limited manner Panchenko does.

The ellipse could still be considered difficult, however, and not only because of the proximity of Il. 14.201 (to which we shall return). Nonetheless, consider the semantics of Homeric πᾶς, specifically the fact that its universalism can be qualified by its circumstance.[62] Artur Ludwich drew attention to this quality when discussing the famous crux of Il. 1.5, where an ancient v. l. (δαῖτα) arose because πᾶσι was interpreted literally, i. e. implying that every bird eats flesh, or that every bird in the world swooped down on the plains of Troy.[63] It only means that every bird present and appropriate did so, just as the fulfilment of Poseidon's proposal for equipment exchange (Il. 14.376–7) does not result literally in 'everyone' (πάντας 381) receiving new equipment, simply those who were subject to the circumstance set out in Poseidon's speech. So Homeric πᾶς can denote the entirety of a group considered

62) I am indebted to Alan Sommerstein for discussion and clarification on this point. Of course, even in the ancient world, it was well known that Homeric or, indeed, poetic πᾶς need not be taken literally; cf. Aristotle, Poetics 1461a19: τὸ γὰρ πάντες ἀντὶ τοῦ πολλοί κατὰ μεταφορὰν εἴρηται· τὸ γὰρ πᾶν πολύ τι (citing Il. 2.1–2 in mistake for Il. 10.1, and then juxtaposing it to 10.13–14).

63) A. Ludwich, Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik nach den Fragmenten des Didymos; Zweiter Teil (Leipzig 1885) 89 n. 55, discussing ἠρώων, αὐτοὺς δὲ ἑλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν / οἰωνοῖσί τε πᾶσι (Ar. Ω; δαῖτα Zen.) Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή (Il. 1.4–5); cf. Janko (as n. 2) 23: "(δαῖτα is) surely an early emendation to remove the 'problem' that not all birds eat flesh"; cf. also Il. 22.354 (ἀλλὰ κύνες τε καὶ οἰωνοὶ κατὰ πάντα δάσονται); contra Latacz et al. (as above, n. 60) ad Il. 1.5, 19–20.

appropriate to an action or circumstance.[64] In line with this principle, πάντεσσι at Il. 14.246 would refer only to those deities usually understood to have their origin in Okeanos.[65] Who they were – the rivers and water courses – is evident from Homer's own description of Okeanos in Iliad 21, and of course from Hesiod's catalogue of his offspring at Theog. 337–70. I suggest, therefore, that an alternative cosmogony is the last thing on Homer's mind at Il. 14.246: Okeanos is here the origin of all water deities, as he is everywhere else in Homer and the rest of early Greek epic, and nothing more.

Turning back now to the first, apparently cosmogonic, expression Ὠκεανόν τε θεῶν γένεσιν καὶ μητέρα Τηθύν (Il. 14.201), one could argue that the only sense in which Tethys is a 'mother' is the usual one of having divine children, whilst Okeanos is the 'origin' only of those gods listed by Achilleus at Il. 21.194–7 and

64) Cf., for some other (substantival) cases, Il. 6.15 (πάντας γὰρ φιλέεσκεν ὁδῶι ἔπι οἰκία ναίων); Il. 17.356 (Αἴας γὰρ μάλα πάντας ἐπώιχετο πολλὰ κελεύων); Il. 24.775 (πάντες δὲ πεφρίκασιν); Od. 11.216 (ὤ μοι, τέκνον ἐμόν, περὶ πάντων κάμμορε φωτῶν); Od. 12.323 (Ἠελίου, ὃς πάντ' ἐφορᾶι καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούει [= 11.109], but cf. 12.374 f.); Od. 13.312–13 (ἀργαλέον σε, θεά, γνῶναι βροτῶι ἀντιάσαντι / καὶ μάλ' ἐπισταμένωι· σὲ γὰρ αὐτὴν παντὶ εἴσκεις); Od. 23.28 (ὁ ξεῖνος, τὸν πάντες ἀτίμων ἐν μεγάροισι); WD 80–2 (ὀνόμηνε δὲ τήνδε γυναῖκα / Πανδώρην, ὅτι πάντες Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες / δῶρον ἐδώρησαν).

65) That such an ellipse was possible depends, of course, on the assumption that Okeanos was a well-known character in the epic tradition before Homer (and Hesiod). This, I think, may be inferred inter al. from his genitive case noun-epithet formulae, extending from the two major boundary positions within the verse to the verse-end, and showing the Parryan principles of economy and extension: βαθυρρόου Ὠκεανοῖο (Il. 7.422, 14.311, Od. 11.13, 19.434) and ἀψορρόου Ὠκεανοῖο (Il. 18.399, Od. 20.65, Theog. 776); cf. also the solely Hesiodic κλυτοῦ Ὠκεανοῖο (Theog. 215, 274, 288, 294). The 'economy' here is clear, but for the 'extension', cf. M. Parry, L'Épithète traditionelle dans Homère (Paris 1928) 69–9 (also in: A. Parry [ed.], The Making of Homeric Verse: the collected papers of Milman Parry [Oxford 1971] 55–63). An individual poet is unlikely to come up with even a small system exhibiting these features; cf. Parry (as above) 17–18 (also in: A. Parry [as above] 18). βαθυρρόου and ἀψορρόου are, moreover, 'special epithets' – i. e., confined to Okeanos – which are generally used for "divine or, with some exceptions, … major characters in the story" (J. B. Hainsworth, The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula [Oxford 1968] 10). The exceptions listed by Parry (as above) 111–13 (also in: A. Parry [as above] 88–93) concern single examples of one special epithet; the only characters in that list to have two such epithets are major players (Achilleus, Odysseus, Agamemnon, Hektor, Herakles). Not too much can be made of that last fact, because the gods are frequently provided with special epithets, as even a quick glance at J. H. Dee, Epitheta Deorum apud Homerum (Hildesheim 2001) will show.

Hesiod in the *Theogony*.[66] Thus, Il. 14.201 has no more (and no less) significance than Zeus' epithet πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε (Il. 1.544 etc.), which does not imply that Zeus is the father of all the gods or all men, any more than calling Ide the 'mother of flocks' means that Phrygia is the origin of species.[67] In short, the hypothesis of an alternative cosmogony in these two Homeric passages is an unnecessary one.[68] Given the importance of this parallel to Burkert's entire equation between the *DA* and the *Enuma Elis*, the case for Homeric dependence on a Near Eastern source must be weakened.

Nonetheless, on this basis Burkert proceeds to make two further arguments – the first thematic, the second linguistic. Neither is persuasive when examined by itself, let alone when deprived of its cosmogonic support. The former is of the isolating sort, and runs as follows:

---

66) There is, of course, the signal phenomenon that no other divine parent is denoted with the word γένεσις in early Greek epic; cf. M. Schmidt, γένεσις, LfrGE, 130. I suggest this is another (cf. previous note) traditional particularity in the diction applicable to Okeanos, reflecting the fact that his relationship with his children assumes a physical contiguity, and a constant process of renewal, which is not replicated in other divine generative contexts. Interestingly, γένεσις as a scientific term seems to have been used in early Presocratic thought to denote the (frequently neverending) process of 'coming-to-be'; cf., e. g., Anaximander B 1 DK, with W. K. C. Guthrie, A History of Greek Philosophy I: The Earlier Presocratics and the Pythagoreans (Cambridge 1962), 77 n. 1 (the term / concept was somewhat discredited by Parmenides [B 8.21 DK] before its rehabilitation by Plato and Aristotle; cf. F. Solmsen, Aristotle's System of the Physical World [Ithaca NY 1960] chs. 2 and 4). Such a notion is particularly appropriate to a figure described as ἀψόρροος 'flowing back on itself' and who constantly feeds the waters of the world, i. e., his children (Theog. 790–1, with M. L. West, Hesiod *Theogony* [Oxford 1966] ad loc., 374); cf. A. Kelly, ΑΨΟΡΡΟΟΥ ΩΚΕΑΝΟΙΟ – A Near Eastern expression? CQ 57 (2007) 280–2 (with bibliography). In any case, Okeanos' status as origin of all rivers and water courses makes him a unique figure in divine genealogy, so we should not be surprised to hear him described in a unique way.

67) Cf. Il. 8.47, 14.283, 15.151; also Il. 11.222, where μητέρι μήλων is applied to Thrace. Of course, Hesiod refers to Ge as πάντων μήτηρ (WD 563), but this shows how loosely the word could be used in a cosmogonic context. In Hesiod's own narrative, Gaia is only the direct mother of a relatively small number of deities, and cannot be linked genealogically, e. g., with the children of Chaos and Night (Theog. 123–5), but such precision is hardly the point in these expressions.

68) That all other ancient references to this interpretation are to be sourced back to precisely these two passages, and have no earlier or wider currency, is argued cogently by Kirk et al. (as n. 57).

> The very climax of this song of Homer – Zeus and Here making love within a golden cloud on the summit of Mount Ida, from which resplendent drops are falling – shows divinity in a naturalistic, cosmic setting which is not otherwise a feature of Homeric anthropomorphism.[69]

It has often been remarked that the *DA* refers to a number of 'cosmic' events, including the first sexual activity of Zeus and Here (Il. 14.295–6) and the enmity between Zeus and Kronos (Il. 14.203–4), but in what sense are these stories more 'cosmic' than, e. g., the references to Zeus' conflict with Typhaon (Il. 2.781–3) or the insurrection of the Olympians, which would have undermined the divine order (Il. 1.397–406)? Whilst the activity on Ide might well re-enact a (rather vague notion of the) original ἱερὸς γάμος, is this more 'cosmic' in its suggestions than Zeus' threat to hurl disobedient deities into Tartaros, with his unpleasant descriptions of its environs (Il. 8.13–16; repeated with reference to Iapetos and Kronos themselves at 8.477–81), or (much better) the Theomachy of Book 21?[70]

Furthermore, a 'naturalistic' setting or description is typical for divine narratives in early Greek epic, whether the poet is describing the effect on the natural surroundings of the gods' activities, or simply locating them there.[71] Consider the depiction of Kalypso's cave (Od. 5.63–73), the blasting of nature by Hephaistos in his attack on Skamandros (Il. 21.350–5), the progress of Poseidon over the water (Il. 13.27–30), the shuddering of the earth as the gods face off before the Theomachy (Il. 20.59–66), the blooming of vegetation as Aphrodite reaches Kypros (Theog. 194–5), the ani-

---

69) Burkert 1992, 91 (= 1984, 88); ~ 2003, 36 (= 2004, 30) (all as n. 3).

70) Moreover, L. Slatkin, The Power of Thetis (Berkeley 1991) has argued that there is a cosmological undercurrent to the entire *Iliad*, centred around the unsettling generative potential of Thetis for the hegemony of Zeus.

71) West (as n. 3) 384 notes: "[t]his (burgeoning nature) appears simply to serve their comfort and pleasure, but behind it probably lies the idea that the activity of the love-goddess makes the vegetation burgeon." [my emphasis] He points to Hesiod, Theog. 194 as a parallel, before invoking a Sumerian prayer to Ishtar, where however the goddess is herself said to cause these things actively, rather than having them simply spring up in reaction to her presence. Aside from West's cautious phrasing, note also that this verdancy is known to Homer in the *DA*, to Hesiod and to the poet of the *HHAphr*. (see the discussion above). Once more this motif, if it is not coincidental, has been thoroughly hellenised and epicised, suggesting a general inheritance or interaction rather than a specific and late source.

mals fawning on the same deity and making love as she approaches Mount Ide (HHAphr. 69–74), or those around the house of Kirke (Od. 10.212–19), or the catalogue of flowers amongst which Persephone plays (HHDem. 5–14). As Janko comments, "[t]he sympathy of nature is normal in the heroic world,[72] and our awareness of it is fundamental to the beauty of that world",[73] so it is simply incorrect to say that the setting of the love-scene in the *DA* is 'not elsewhere a feature of Homer's anthropomorphism', let alone that of the other early epic texts.

Burkert's second, linguistic argument also faces considerable objections. He suggests an equation between *Taw(a)tu* and Τηθύς, on the analogy of Greek Μῆδοι from Persian *Mada*, but the analogy takes insufficient account of the consonant *-w-* in *Taw(a)tu*. Assuming (with Burkert) that the translation occurred during the Archaic period, the resulting word would be subject to the usual phonological changes consequent on the loss of intervocalic digamma, but in Ionic at this period (i. e. well after the early change to η of inherited long α) the result of a contraction from the cluster -α*f*α- is not η but α, as ἄτη < *ἀ*f*άτη < *ἀ*f*άτα, whilst Aeolic would show -αυα-, as Lesb. αὐάτα < *ἀ*f*άτα (cf. also ναῦος < να*f*ός).[74] One might also doubt that these linguistic changes would have been mirrored by an epic poet, if he were responsible for the translation in the first place, for the 'Kunstsprache' is more than able to resist contraction after the loss of intervocalic digamma (e. g., ἀαγής < ἀ*f*αγεσ-, ἀείδω < ἀ*f*είδω, ἀοιδή < ἀ*f*οιδή, ἀασίφρων < ἀ*f*άσαι + φρεν-)[75] and creates without linguistic 'justifica-

72) Cf., e. g., Odysseus' description of Goat Island (Od. 9.116–51) or Laertes' garden (Od. 24.336–44).

73) Janko (as n. 2) ad Il. 13.27–31, 45.

74) As a general rule "αα ergibt bei Kontraktion überall auch α" (E. Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik I 1: Lautlehre und Wortbildung. Flexion [Munich 1953] 248); cf. P. Chantraine, Grammaire Homerique I: phonétique et morphologie (Paris 1958) §14, 30; A. Sihler, A New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin (New York 1995) § 86.5, 81; also § 190.2, 185; also K. Meister, Die Homerische Kunstsprache (Leipzig 1921) 181, 193–4 (κρᾶτος < κράατος) and 193 (for examples of short vowels followed by long vowels which are generally left uncontracted). An Ionic poet would therefore have reduced *Τα*f*αθύς to *Ταθύς (or *Ταυθύς), an Aeolic poet to *Ταυθύς, which is intriguingly close to the actual translation Ταυθέ made by the Peripatetic Eudemos of Paros (F 150 Wehrli).

75) Cf. J. Nuchelmans, ἀαγής, LfgrE, 3; R. Philipp, ἀείδω, LfgrE, 155–9; J. Grimm, ἀοιδή, LfgrE, 976–80; H. J. Mette, ἀασίφρων, LfgrE, 4–5.

tion' -αα- in both adjectives (e. g., ἄαπτος < ἆπτος < ἄεπτος < ἄ*f*επτος)[76] and verbs (e. g., ὁράασθαι < ὁρᾶσθαι < ὁράεσθαι) by metrical distension.

In any case, West has poured cold water on the entire equation, pointing out that the spelling *Taw(a)tu* is an apparent archaism for the much commoner *T(i)amat* (which would make the idea of a late borrowing virtually impossible) and was probably never a spoken form, and so he returns to Szemerényi's derivation of Tethys from *Tiamat / Tamtu*.[77] This could have occurred at any point from the sixteenth century BC onwards, given that the *Enuma Elis* is to be dated to the Middle Babylonian period.[78] If there was a translation or adaptation, then it occurred well before the Homeric poet came to his composition.[79] Indeed, Burkert's point about the isolation of Tethys could be invoked here, but against his conclusion, to support a very early date for such a process:

> … there is the name of that primeval mother, Tethys, a purely mythological name for Greeks, as far as we see, not connected with any living cult (quite in contrast to Thetis) and known to everyone just from this very passage of Homer.[80]

> Tethys is in no way an active figure in Greek mythology. In contrast to the sea goddess Thetis (with whom she was sometimes confused even in antiquity) she has no established cults, and no one had anything further to tell about her. She apparently exists only by virtue of the Homeric passage.[81]

---

76) Cf. H. Erbse / S. Laser, ἄαπτος, LfrGE, 3.

77) West (as n. 3) 147–8 n. 200 (to which Burkert 2004, 149 n. 39 = 2003, 141 n. 39 [as n. 3] refers with a laconic "a phonetic problem remains"); O. Szemerényi, The origins of the Greek lexicon: Ex Oriente Lux, JHS 94 (1974) 144–57, at 150. I am not competent to comment on the Semitic equation, though I note that West expresses himself with caution, i. e. "might have been taken over".

78) Cf. West (as n. 3) 67–8, esp. 68 n. 20; Dalley (as n. 12) 228–30 favours an early date (probably pre-Kassite) against the increasingly popular claims of Nebuchadnezzar I (1125–1104 BC); cf. also H. Hunger / D. Pingree, Astral Sciences in Mesopotamia (Leiden 1999) 62.

79) This also applies to West's (as n. 3) 148 cautious revival of a theory (advanced earlier by Germain [1954] 531–2) that the genitive expression ἀψορρόου Ὠκεανοῖο (Il. 18.399, Od. 20.65, Theog. 776), might contain a reference to the Babylonian deity Apsu (i. e. < *Ἀψο, ῥόου Ὠκεανοῖο; cf. Kelly [as n. 66]). Even in the extremely unlikely event that Apsu is concealed here, the derivation proposed could have occurred at any point from the Kassite period onwards (cf. above, n. 78).

80) Burkert 1983, 54 (as n. 3).

81) Burkert 1992, 92 (= 1984, 89); ~ 2003, 37 (= 2004, 31) (all as n. 3).

This is considerably overstated, for Tethys is a well-established figure in Hesiod (Theog. 136, 337, 362, 368) and the days are surely gone when it could be argued that Hesiod derives his genealogical knowledge only and directly from Homer. In these terms, Tethys' mythological as opposed to cultic 'Lebendigkeit' could just as easily be explained as a very early inheritance which survived the collapse of the Mycenaean world – with all its contraction of the contacts between Greece and the surrounding civilisations – only in epic narrative. Such 'against the odds' transmission through the Dark Ages into a world where it was no longer widely understood, or indicative of broader belief, can be easily paralleled in Homeric language[82] and geography.[83]

To sum up the results of this section: (1) there is no need to conclude that the *DA* contains a unique or alternative cosmogony, for the crucial passages and expressions admit of a much simpler explanation, which chimes with the rest of Homer's text and, indeed, early Greek epic; (2) the naturalistic and 'cosmic' (?) setting of the *DA* is entirely typical of early Greek poetry, and no proof of external influence on the Homeric poet; (3) the linguistic origin of the name Tethys is extremely conjectural and, if drawn from the Near East, should be located much earlier than Burkert allows.[84] In short, there is no support here for the theory that the *DA* is a Near Eastern derivation.

---

82) Cf., e. g., A. Bartonek, Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch (Heidelberg 2003) 464.

83) Cf., e. g., J. Latacz, Troia und Homer (Munich 2001) 282–94.

84) Thus it shows how misplaced is the confidence with which Burkert dismisses the Bronze Age as a likely period for any moment or process of transfer. Initially, Burkert 1983, 54–5 (as n. 3) relied solely on Dihle's work to rule out the Mycenaean period but, given the lack of success his theories have had, Burkert 1984, 89–90 (= 1992, 93 ~ 2003, 37–8 = 2004, 31–2 [all as n. 3]) contended that oral transmission would have changed the story too much, and doubted whether the *Enuma Elis* was to be dated that early. On the latter point, cf. above, n. 78, for the views of Near Eastern specialists. The worth of the former point depends entirely on accepting the parallels which Burkert offers. As I hope to have demonstrated, this is no firm basis on which to rule out Mycenaean interaction. Indeed, it has already been suggested that several motifs, e. g., the name of Tethys, could have been inherited from Near Eastern traditions, but the crucial point is that, by the time we witness these motifs in a Greek setting, they are thoroughly harmonised within that context (so much so, in some cases, that one doubts whether it was a question of inheritance at all). This point shall be made again.

When combined with the conclusion of the first section of this article, the entire case that the *DA* is derived from the Near East must be severely undermined, for these are the two main props of the whole structure:

> It is the specific motif of the primordial water gods, and the motif of the gods casting lots for the three portions of the universe, that must be judged 'a neo-Oriental element' in the text of Homer, as Martin West has put it.[85]

> Thus the proof seems complete that here, right in the middle of the *Iliad*, the influence of two Akkadian classics can be detected down to a mythical name.[86]

These motifs can bear no such weight.

3. Supplementary Parallels (Burkert et al.)

Moving forward from the cosmogonic Okeanos, Burkert proceeds to identify several other oriental elements within the *DA*, opening the account with an associative argument:

> Once an orientalizing background is established for the 'Deception of Zeus', further observations are bound to follow.[87]

Obviously, then, the validity of these parallels depends first and foremost on the two major motifs discussed above, so it is not surprising that in isolation they do not stand up to scrutiny. I will discuss the three strongest of these features here, omitting only the most speculative.[88]

---

85) Burkert 1983, 54 (as n. 3).

86) Burkert 1992, 93 (= 1984, 90); ~ 2003, 38 (= 2004, 32) (all as n. 3).

87) Burkert 1992, 93 (= 1984, 90); ~ 2003, 38 (= 2004, 32) (all as n. 3).

88) Amongst them, the idea that Zeus and Here on the top of the mountain is reflected on Near Eastern seals where the storm god and his wife ride on their dragons (no dragons anywhere in sight in the *DA*), that the marriage of heaven and earth are known in Akkadian literature (no fecundity in the *DA*), and the link between clay deities in Akkadian (*titu*) and the Titans as the defeated deities (of which Burkert 1992, 95 [= 1984, 91; ~ 2003, 40 = 2004, 34] [all as n. 3] says "[t]his daring hypothesis … lacks specific material for verification"); cf. Burkert 1983, 54–5; 1984, 90–1 (= 1992, 94–5); ~ 2003, 38–40 (= 2004, 32–4). His further argument to this last point, that the Titans are mentioned in three of their five total Homeric occasions in the *DA* (Il. 5.898, 8.478–80, 14.274,279, 15.225), indicates nothing whatsoever, for they appear consistently in the *Iliad* in the context of divine strife and contention,

They begin with the κεστός of Aphrodite (Il. 14.214–17), which "seems to be oriental in a particular way", and which is described as having various qualities appropriate to Aphrodite fashioned or present on it (τέτυκτο 14.215), including φιλότης, ἵμερος, ὀαριστύς, and indeed θελκτήρια πάντα.[89] It has long been known that a description of a 'saltire' around the chest (or a girdle of some sort around the waist)[90] is a typical feature in the iconography of Ishtar / Ashtarte / Atargatis / Aphrodite from early in the third millennium BC,[91] and several scholars have enthusiastically endorsed and developed Burkert's rather bald statement.

For instance, starting from the indistinct nature of these qualities and their presence on the κεστός, Faraone argues that magical spells from the Neo-Assyrian period (c. 1000 BC) offer the most suggestive parallel for an item which increases the (not only sexual) attractiveness of the wearer as he or she attempts to get something out of the addressee, so to speak. The way he links this to the *DA* is, however, all rather indirect:

> [Here's] prayers to Aphrodite and Sleep are perhaps connected with the other religious overtones of the scene on Mt. Ida, which seems to reflect aspects of the ἱερὸς γάμος of Zeus and Hera. Perhaps a prayer

---

as illustrations of what happens to those who oppose Zeus, which concords perfectly with Hesiod's picture as "an older generation of gods … no longer active in the world" (West [as above, n. 66] ad Theog. 133, 200).

89) Burkert 1992, 93 and n. 18 (not in 1984; ~ 2003, 38 and n. 44 [= 2004, 32 and n. 44]) (all as n. 3) refers to C. Bonner, ΚΕΣΤΟΣ ΙΜΑΣ and the saltire of Aphrodite, AJP 70 (1949) 1–6, and Faraone (as n. 3) esp. 220–9, both of whom are much more cautious about both the fact and the time of any Near Eastern inheritance; cf. Bonner (as above) 6: "[t]he argument for identifying the κεστὸς ἱμάς with the saltire of the ancient goddess of fecundity deserves to be considered; no more is claimed for it"; Faraone (as n. 3) 240: "[s]uch direct influence is, however, more difficult to document when we shift from the rich archaeological record to the paltry remains of early Greek literature and myth"; id. 241: "we have no way of proving conclusively that the Near Eastern material was borrowed by the Greeks during the eighth century, or for that matter at any particular point in time … Although my guess would be that these rituals were in fact borrowed at some point from the older and more sophisticated societies of the Near East, there is simply no way to prove it or to disprove a competing claim that such magical rituals evolved independently in many traditional societies in the circum-Mediterranean basin."

90) Cf. Janko (as n. 2) ad Il. 14.214–17, 184–5 for discussion of the nature and appearance of the κεστός.

91) Bonner (as n. 89) 1–3; F. Brenk, Aphrodite's girdle: No way to treat a lady, CB 54 (1977) 17–20; Faraone (as n. 3) 220–9; also Janko (as n. 90).

> similar to Hera's prayer to Aphrodite, used in conjunction with the κεστός, comprised a traditional ritual performed by newly-wed brides to ward off any future discord in their marriage. Such a ritual may itself have been borrowed from the east, for scholars have long suspected Near Eastern influence in Greek celebrations of this sacred wedding.[92] [my emphasis]

The caution in this language is warranted, for Faraone attempts to read a ritual or religious 'Ur'-narrative beneath a series of Homeric features which are not in themselves unparalleled or remarkable.[93] Secondly, each step in the process is deeply conjectural: A may be linked with B, which may be linked with C, and so on, so it is no surprise when he associatively invokes the 'other' Near Eastern feature of the episode, namely the cosmogonic Okeanos,[94] without the support of which his case can hardly be considered persuasive.

But perhaps the most important reason why this is so may be found, once more, through considering the Greek context. Faraone argues that the qualities present on the κεστός are inherent in the item, which would render it a magic amulet of the sort one finds in the Near East.[95] Yet the endowing of an item with qualities can be widely observed in the early epic art of ekphrasis, as Faraone himself points out, alluding to the presence Ἔρις, Ἀλκή and Ἰωκή (and the Gorgon's head) on the αἰγίς (Il. 5.740–1), and (more purely pictorial) Ἔρις, Κυδοιμός and Κήρ on Achilleus' shield (Il. 18.535) or

92) Faraone (as n. 3) 229. It is only fair to note the caution with which he expresses his general conclusions (above, n. 89), though his language about the κεστός sometimes approaches certainty about derivation; cf. below, n. 94.

93) For the 'prayer-like' language of Here's request to both Aphrodite and Hypnos, e.g., cf. Thetis' request to Zeus (Il. 1.500–16). Similarly speculative is J. O'Brien, The Transformation of Hera: A Study of Ritual, Hero and the Goddess in the *Iliad* (Boston 1994) chs. 4 and 5, though she links these features with Mycenaean and Archaic cultic narratives.

94) Faraone (as n. 3) 229: "[t]he suggestion of influence is grounded in the important fact that it is uniquely here (in all early Greek literature) that Oceanus and Tethys appear as the progenitors of the gods. In any event, it need not surprise us to find a Near Eastern form of erotic magic in a section of the poem which betrays other important hallmarks of such influence" [my emphasis]; id. 242: "the Homeric κεστός … is embedded in an episode of the *Iliad* which betrays several hallmarks of direct Near Eastern influence." [my emphasis]

95) Cf. also West (as n. 3) 383–4: "The idea that the love-goddess wears these abstractions about her body is a striking one, hardly typical of Greek theology or poetic fancy."

Γοργώ, Δεῖμος and Φόβος on Agamemnon's (Il. 11.36–7).[96] Though the depiction of actual figures in these last two cases is not the same thing as the presence of those qualities appropriate to Aphrodite's power, certainly the figures on the αἰγίς, which is also worn (or carried) by the deity,[97] correspond to the qualities which the holder wishes both to possess and arouse in the character(s) seeing them.[98] Note that Athene (Il. 5.740–1, 18.203–5, Od. 22.297) and Apollo (Il. 15.229–30, 15.308–11, 24.20–1) deploy this item (for a range of purposes), usually with at least the tacit permission of its owner, Zeus (Il. 4.167–8). In all these ways, the αἰγίς is an excellent comparandum for Aphrodite's magical love-strap,[99] and provides Greek epic precedent for a divinely-made and worn item to be conceived and described in this way.

Furthermore, some type of strap is also, as both Brenk and Bielefeld point out, a feature in personal decoration from the Minoan period right into the Geometric age,[100] while the word itself

96) Cf. also [Hes.] Aspis 154–5.

97) Cf. Janko (as n. 2) ad Il. 15.308–11, 261; G. S. Kirk, The *Iliad*; A Commentary, Volume 1: Books 1–4 (Cambridge 1985) ad Il. 2.446–51, 161–2; J. Latacz et al., Homers *Ilias*; Gesamtkommentar Band 2. 2: 2. Gesang (Munich 2003) ad Il. 2.446b–454, 130.

98) The common effect of its deployment in battle is to rout (cf. Φόβος and Ἰωκή Il. 5.749–40) the opposing side (cf. Il. 15.318–27, Od. 22.297–9), just as the κεστός is assumed to inspire the feelings of love in its audience.

99) It should also be pointed out that the αἰγίς seems to have an Indo-European heritage, for PIE **aig-* or **aik-* denotes the oak, the Thunder God's tree; cf. P. Friedrich, Proto-Indo-European Trees (Chicago 1970) 132–3, 133–49; M. van der Valk, LfgrE, 253–5, at 253; G. Nagy, Perkúnas and Перунъ, in: M. Mayrhoffer, W. Meid, B. Schlerath and R. Schmitt (eds.), Antiquitates Indogermanicae: Gedenkschrift für Hermann Güntert (Innsbruck 1974) 113–32, esp. 122–8; T. V. Gamkrelidze / V. V. Ivanov, Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans: A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-Language and a Proto-Culture (Berlin 1995) 527–31; West (as n. 20) 240, 242, 248, 250, 267 n. 96. The Thunder God (from Perkúnas to Thor) is also associated with goats in a number of traditions, leading M. L. West, Hesiod: *Works and Days* (Oxford 1978) 366–8, 384, to propose that Zeus' epithet αἰγίοχος, conventionally interpreted as 'aegis-bearer', originally meant something like 'goat rider', though Janko (as n. 2) ad Il. 15.18–31, 230, explains it as 'driver / holder of the thunderbolt'. The line of development is not clear, but the Indo-European context provides several possible lines of enquiry, with words from this stem being linked variously with the god's conveyance, weaponry and natural symbols.

100) Cf. E. Bielefeld, Schmuck (Archaeologia Homerica I C) (Göttingen 1968) 17–18, 56–7.

has a good Greek etymology (< κεντέω)[101] and even appears in the Homeric compound πολυκεστός (Il. 3.371). None of this decisively rules out a Near Eastern inheritance or borrowing but, given the assimilation of this item into its Greek context (and its own probable Indo-European heritage), one cannot argue that it is a recent adaptation which the Homeric poet is trying to fit into a new setting.

Secondly, Burkert suggests that Zeus' catalogue of his lovers (Il. 14.315–28) "has its counterpart in Gilgamesh's enumeration of the lovers of Ishtar."[102] Yet the contexts and purposes of these two catalogues are entirely different: whilst Zeus lists his previous affairs to illustrate his current desire for Here, Gilgamesh enumerates to an eager Ishtar her previous lovers and their rather unfortunate fates as reasons for him not to become involved with her (SBV 6.2.7–3.10).[103] As such, a much better comparison in Greek epic would be Kalypso's list of goddesses with mortal lovers who have come to a bad end (Od. 5.118–29), but even then it is not a precise parallel for the *Gilgamesh* passage, since Kalypso complains about the preclusive attitude of the male gods in preventing or punishing such episodes, whilst Gilgamesh is refusing to get involved in the type of action demanded.

Perhaps, however, it is quibbling to ask that the parallel be so precise, rather than seeking a common principle behind the passages, as West does:

> [t]hey have in common the principle of collecting together a number of separate mythical events of a particular type and ordering them in a series.[104]

But this is true of, and basic to, all early Greek epic poetry; on this particular theme alone, and aside from Kalypso's list, consider the concluding catalogues of the *Theogony* (886–1022), Odysseus' cat-

---

101) P. Chantraine, κεντέω, Dictionnaire etymologique de la langue grecque (Paris ²1999) 515; also H. Nordheider, κένσαι, LfgrE, 1381; W. Beck, κεστός, LfgrE, 1391.

101) Burkert 1992, 93 (not in 1984); ~2003, 38 (= 2004, 32) (all as n. 3); cf. also 1992, 93 n. 18 (= 1984, 95 n. 13), though here Burkert links the catalogue with the Near Eastern antecedents of the Dione episode from Iliad 5.

103) *Gilgamesh* cited according to the numeration and translation of Dalley (as n. 12).

104) West (as n. 3) 384. His purpose in invoking parallels is slightly different from Burkert's, as we shall see; cf. below, pp. 292 f., 301 f.

alogue of heroines (Od. 11.235–327) and, of course, the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, which (though dated to the 6th century) obviously depends on much older stories.[105] If *Gilgamesh* influenced Greek epic on this point, and there is to my mind no compelling reason to believe this, then it must have happened at a very early date indeed, for the catalogue form on every level has been completely integrated into that tradition, and provides one of its most basic structural imperatives.

Much the same point is to be made about the last of Burkert's supplementary cases, Here's cosmic oath by Earth, Heaven and Styx, which she makes on Zeus waking and threatening her with serious damage (Il. 15.36–8), and which is, in fact, paralleled in several Near Eastern traditions:

> It is precisely such a cosmic formula which concludes the enumeration of divine witnesses in the only Aramaic treaty text which has survived from the eighth century: 'Heaven and earth, the deep and the springs, day and night'.[106] [my emphasis]

One wonders what the word "precisely" is doing here,[107] for the differences between these texts are tremendous. Firstly, the Iliadic formula is the list of divine witnesses – not the conclusion of a larger list. Secondly, how is Styx a parallel for "the deep and the springs", and what of the absence of "day and night" in the *Iliad*, or the fact that Here goes on (Il. 15.39–40) to swear by their marriage bed? Perhaps more importantly, the 'parallel' utterly disregards the dynamics of the oath in Greek epic, which is one of the most well-recognised typical scenes in Homeric poetry.[108]

---

105) Cf. West (as n. 16) 125–71. One must also, e. g., consider the *Apologoi* as 'separate mythical events of a particular type [ordered] in a series'; cf. esp. G. W. Most, The Structure and Function of Odysseus' *Apologoi*, TAPA 119 (1989) 15–30; S. Tracey, The Structures of the *Odyssey*, in: I. Morris / B. B. Powell (eds.), A New Companion to Homer (Leiden 1997) 360–79.

106) Burkert 1992, 93–4 and n. 19 (= 1984, 90 and n. 19) ~ 2003, 38 and n. 46 (= 2004, 32 and n. 46) (all as n. 3).

107) "precisely": Burkert 1992, 93 = 2004, 32; "eben": 2003, 32 = 1984, 90 (all as n. 3).

108) Cf. W. Arend, Die typischen Szenen bei Homer (Berlin 1933) 122–4; Janko (as n. 2) ad Il. 14.271–9, 194–5. For material on oaths in Archaic literature (and more generally), A. Sommerstein et al., The Oath in Archaic and Classical Greece (http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/classics/oaths) (Nottingham 2004–7) is an invaluable resource; cf. also West (as n. 20) 199–200 for Indo-European parallels.

This typicality opens up several avenues. First of all, Here's oath by Gaia, Ouranos and Styx is repeated verbatim in the *Odyssey* (5.184–6) and again in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (85–6).[109] Unless we propose a stemmatic relationship, or that they are all drawing on the same Near Eastern exemplar, then the concatenation of these three figures in this context is a traditional Greek one. Secondly, Gaia and Ouranos are also coupled in another oath from the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (334–6),[110] this time together with the Titans,[111] whilst the formulaic expression used in all four of these oaths (γαῖα καὶ οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ὕπερθε) is also found outside an oath context (Theog. 702).[112] Thirdly, the invocation of Styx is not only foreshadowed by Hypnos' request that Here swear by this river (Il. 14.271–4),[113] but her typical presence in such oaths,[114] which is of course justified by her description in Hesiod (Theog. 383–403, 775–806).[115]

So, once more, the motif is thoroughly embedded in its Hellenic epic context, though again this need not imply some hermetically sealed culture. Indeed, Burkert et al. make it clear that these sorts of oaths are found in a large number of separate Near Eastern traditions, including the Aramaic, Hebrew and Sumerian, stretching from the late Bronze Age to the Archaic period and later.[116] We would do better to think of the broad tradition, con-

---

109) Cf. A. Heubeck, S. West and J. B. Hainsworth, A Commentary on Homer's *Odyssey*, Volume I: Introduction and Books I–VIII (Oxford 1988) ad Od. 5.184, 271 (Hainsworth).

110) And, as West (as n. 3) 385 points out, in *Deuteronomy* (4.26, 30.19, 31.28). It's not hard to see such a natural and common duality arising in the context of an oath.

111) Styx's replacement by the Titans presumably has something to do with the fact that Here's oath there concerns the overthrow of Zeus, in which context Styx, Zeus' earliest ally in the *Theogony*, was not particularly useful.

112) Cf. also Theog. 838–9 for an expansion of the formula.

113) Cf. below, p. 296 f., on West's treatment of this episode.

114) Aside from Il. 15.37–8 (= Od. 5.185–6, HHAp. 84–6), cf. HHDem. 259–61, HHHerm. 519.

115) Cf. West (as n. 66) ad locc., 272–6, 371–8. For other concatenations, cf. Il. 3.276–9 (Zeus, Helios, Gaia, rivers and 'those above' who punish those who make false oaths), Il. 19.258–60 (Zeus, Ge, Helios, Erinues).

116) Cf. esp. M. Weinfeld, The Common Heritage of Covenantal traditions in the Ancient World, in: L. Canfora, M. Liverani and C. Zaccagnini (eds.), I trattati nel mondo antico. Forma, ideologia, funzione (Rome 1990) 175–91, esp. 190–1 (with further references), for their widespread diffusion in the ancient worlds, both east and west.

text and significance of Mediterranean civilisation as a whole, rather than the *DA's* direct copying from one or more 'sources'.

In concluding this section, and my critique of Burkert's treatments of the *DA*, it should be remembered that the three parallels discussed above are of secondary importance to the divine lot and the cosmogonic Okeanos; if those features cannot show the *DA* to be an 'oriental' episode, the supplementals are unlikely to do the job. Nonetheless, by themselves, they are hardly compelling evidence that the Homeric poet was under more or less direct Near Eastern influence in his composition of the *DA*. As with the divine lot, the typicality of these features within the context of early Greek epic implies evolution in an Hellenic tradition, increasing to probability the likelihood that any such adaptation occurred so long before the Homeric poet as to have become, for all intents and purposes, a native element. Add to this the need to avoid exaggerated or misidentified parallels, and it becomes clear that Burkert's 'hard'[117] orientalism is too blunt a tool adequately to capture the complexities of the early epic tradition.

4. Miscellanea Orientalia (West)

Aside from several points shared with Burkert's treatments (and referred to in the footnotes above), West's monumental *East Face of Helicon* adds quite a few more parallels for our consideration.[118] However, although he concludes that the *Iliad* poet was familiar with a certain recension of *Gilgamesh*, he is generally much more cautious than Burkert in explaining similarities between the *DA* and the texts of ancient Near East:

> [i]t is not that the Greek poet is drawing capriciously from models in different countries; it is rather that there is a broad stream of international tradition, the present evidence for which is somewhat fragmented.[119]

---

117) This term, coined on the analogy of 'hard' and 'soft' oralism (or 'Parryism'), denotes the practice of using Near Eastern sources as more or less direct 'Quellen' for the early Greek epic texts; cf. below, pp. 292f., 301f., for West's 'soft' orientalism.

118) West (as n. 3) 382–5.

119) West (as n. 3) 401. This has long been a characteristic of his treatments of Near Eastern literature; cf. id. (as n. 66) 14: "[The *Theogony*'s] contents are un-

This welcome qualification is unavoidable, given the enormous range of West's comparanda, which range from the Sumerian *Descent of Ishtar* and *Gilgamesh*, to the Akkadian *Atrahasis*, the Hebrew bible, and Egyptian stories of the Middle Kingdom. Since, therefore, West is not trying to make a case for more or less direct derivation of the *DA* from a Near Eastern text or texts,[120] he places less weight on any single parallel, and is not really concerned with the question of how these similarities arose.[121] Indeed, one wonders in many cases what the purpose of the parallel is, beyond making the very general – and indisputable – point that ancient Greek poets used many of the same motifs as poets in a number of cultures around the Mediterranean basin from the Bronze Age onwards.

Nonetheless, the kind of criticisms directed earlier against Burkert can also be applied here, firstly because his conclusions about the *DA* are invoked with approval, but also because West's arguments are essentially associative in nature. Though there are no more isolating points, he still deploys a 'Parallelismus' which overplays similarities with Near Eastern features to the same extent it underplays the position of the feature within ancient Greek epic. Therefore, each of his parallels needs to be examined just as those discussed earlier. But now to the specifics.

---

mistakably Greek, or at least hellenized, … the most reasonable view is that theogony was a traditional genre with a long history before Hesiod." For the 'hard' conclusion about the *Iliad* and *Gilgamesh*, cf. West (as n. 3) 401: "[b]ut in the case of Achilles we are faced with the inescapable fact of a special relationship with one particular oriental text: the Gilgamesh epic. The parallels are too numerous and specific to allow of another explanation … We can even say what recension of the Gilgamesh epic it must have been." Like Burkert (cf. above, n. 12), West's methods and conclusions are enjoying public currency.

120) For a similar conclusion about the Hittite *Song of Release*, cf. M. Bachvarova, The Eastern Mediterranean Epic tradition from *Bilgames and Akka* to the *Song of Release* to Homer's *Iliad*, GRBS 45 (2005) 131–54, esp. 153: "although Greek epic could have had the opportunity to draw on Anatolian versions of Mediterranean epic, there is no reason to assume that Homer or one of his ancestors directly imitated the *Song of Release*, any more than we should assume that they directly imitated a version of *Gilgamesh* preserved for us. All of these songs are drawing on a wider tradition of which only a few examples are preserved, whether from the Mycenaean period or from the Archaic period."

121) Though he devotes the last chapter of the *East Face* to the question, it is of course necessary that he close with a disclaimer about the processes hypothesised, which are in any case of secondary importance for his purpose; cf. below, p. 301 f.

To begin with, the scene of Here's preparations for the *DA* (Il. 14.161–86) "stands in a well-established oriental literary tradition",[122] on which West says:

> Just as (Greek and NE traditions) only register significant nights, so they only attest to significant dressing. There is one particular context, common to the Mesopotamian, Hurro-Hittite, and Greek traditions, in which this occurs, namely when a goddess dresses and adorns herself in order to meet her lover or seduce or impress someone. This goes back to the Sumerian cult of Inanna and Dumuzi.[123]

Regardless of the many external parallels, the toilet in question is a narrative pattern of some frequency in early Greek epic poetry; aside from Here's preparations, consider the beautification of Penelope (Od. 18.192–7), of Aphrodite (Od. 8.362–6; HHAphr. 58–66), either Aphrodite and / or Helen before the seduction of Paris (Kypria frs. 4 and 5 Bernabé) and Pandora (Theog. 573–84, WD 63–8). This multiplicity of examples, and their essential structural similarity, argues for a typical 'seduction' scene, the female equivalent of the hero's arming sequence, one of the earliest recognised tools in the oral poet's inventory, and so something which is (again) thoroughly assimilated and integrated within a Greek context.[124] If Hellenic epic copied or adapted this motif from a Near Eastern tradition, this happened well before Homer, for whose scene(s) the invocation of Near Eastern parallels explains little.

Next, Here's[125] promise of an Hephaistian footstool and chair to Hypnos (Il. 14.238–41) is paralleled in Ugaritic epic (terminus ante quem 1180 BC) where Baal instructs Kothar to make a seat and footstool in order to win the support of Athirat. The passages are indeed very close, for they combine divine bribery and the nature of the gift, viz. a chair and footstool made by the craftsman god. Again, however, the similarity is not quite exact, for the gift is promised but not delivered in the Greek text,[126] because Hypnos

---

122) West (as n. 3) 382.

123) West (as n. 3) 204.

124) Cf. N. Forsyth, The Allurement Scene: a Typical Pattern in Greek Oral Epic, Classical Antiquity 12 (1979) 101–20.

125) Not Aphrodite's, as West (as n. 3) 384 says.

126) Hypnos' refusal of the gift is also well-paralleled in Homer; cf., e. g., Il. 9.379–87, 19.145–53 (though the offer there is actually enforced), 24.429–31, Od. 22.60–7. For other inappropriate gift-offers in the *Iliad*, cf. Kelly (as n. 25) § 147, 280–1.

is after a nymph instead. More importantly, the association between these two items of furniture is extremely common in Homeric epic,[127] whilst there is even a direct parallel in the *Odyssey* for someone making a fine chair and adding a footstool to the package (Od. 19.55–8 τῆι παρὰ μὲν κλισίην πυρὶ κάτθεσαν, ἔνθ' ἄρ ἐφῖζε / δινωτὴν ἐλέφαντι καὶ ἀργύρωι· ἦν ποτε τέκτων / ποίησ' Ἰκμάλιος καὶ ὑπὸ θρῆνυν ποσὶν ἧκε / προσφυέ' ἐξ αὐτῆς). In that case, the craftsman is the otherwise unknown Ikmalios[128] but, in a divine context, who else should construct the chair but Hephaistos? His role is also suggested by his relationship with Here, who elsewhere exhibits a powerful influence over him,[129] whilst making such an offer to an interlocutor in order to secure adherence is extremely common.[130] All of these factors lead me to suggest that independent generation of the same motif is as likely an explanation as even a shared inheritance.

Thirdly, it may well be true that the motif of the "chief god's anger on discovering that his plans have been thwarted"[131] (Il. 14.256) occurs several times in *Atrahasis* (and other Near Eastern texts) yet outbursts on this basis from frustrated gods – and not just the chief – are a dime a dozen in Greek epic, as West notes.[132]

---

127) Cf. Il. 18.389–90 (Thetis received by Hephaistos); Od. 1.130–1, 4.136, 10.314–15 = 10.366–7 (1.131 ~ 10.314 = 10.366), 19.55–8 (κλισίη). For the link between a θρῆνυς and εἰλαπινάζω, cf. Od. 17.409–10.

128) Cf. J. A. Russo, M. Fernández-Galiano and A. Heubeck, A Commentary on Homer's *Odyssey*; Volume III: Books XVII–XXIV (Oxford 1992) ad loc., 77–8 (J. A. Russo), citing the arguments of L. Lacroix that Ikmalios (perhaps derived from ἰκμάς 'sweat' and referring to glue) was "the earliest Greek furniture craftsman".

129) He is summoned to battle in the Theomachy by Here (Il. 21.330–42), who also calls him off (367–76), and he rescues the worsening situation between Zeus and Here in their opening confrontation (Il. 1.571–94; cf. also 15.18–24), reminding his mother of a previous occasion when he came to her defence and was cast out of heaven for his pains. This paradigm probably gave rise to the story of a second fall (Il. 18.394–9; cf. M. Edwards, The *Iliad*; A Commentary, Volume V: Books 17–20 [Cambridge 1991] ad Il. 18.394–409, 192–3), where their relationship is considerably less rosy.

130) Cf., e. g., Il. 8.289–91, 10.212–17, 10.304–7, 24.429–31; also Kelly (as n. 25) § 147, 280–1.

131) West (as n. 3) 180 n. 37; also 385 for Enlil angry at the survival of men (and above, n. 52).

132) Cf. also above, p. 272 f., for West's similar argument about Poseidon's complaint in Il. 15.184–95.

A cursory list would include Zeus' reactions to Prometheus' defence of mankind (WD 53–9; Theog. 565–70) and his ἐτεροζήλως division (Theog. 542–61); Here's fury at Zeus, because of his apparent opposition to their previous agreement to destroy Troy (Il. 4.24–9), which is also at the root of Poseidon's behaviour in Il. 13–15, where he threatens open conflict should the plan not be fulfilled (Il. 15.212–17); and Apollo's anger at Telphouse for her deception (HHAp. 375–87). Furthermore, Athene avoids helping Odysseus explicitly in order to avoid Poseidon's wrath lest he know that she has thwarted him (Od. 6.328–31, 13.341–3), which eventuality Zeus himself seems to feel some reluctance to bring about (Od. 1.68–79). When Here remonstrates with Zeus' bitter statements about the re-emergence of Achilleus on these terms (Il. 18.360–7), the theme of closely and jealously guarded divine plans seems to be buried deep within the conventions of the epic and the motivations of its divine characters.

Fourthly, West notes that one deity making another swear an oath (Il. 14.270–82) is found also in *Atrahasis* (2.383–8):

> The injured innocence of [Enki's] response (viz. to a demand for an oath from Ellil) . . . may recall that of Hera when she swears a solemn oath to Zeus that it is not through any intention of hers that Poseidon has been attacking the Trojans and helping the Achaeans: it must have been his own idea.[133] [my emphasis]

The qualification in West's language is warranted, for the parallel is just not that close; Enki is refusing to swear an oath for which Ellil has asked (utterly unparalleled in divine contexts in early Greek epic), whilst Here proffers one to Zeus entirely unsolicited. Nor is it much closer to Hypnos' request to Here, for the status of the gods involved is inverted, and Here is readily persuaded to give the oath, because she is after all guaranteeing thereby a suggestion she herself had made (Il. 14.267–9). Aside from this, consider also the importance and pervasiveness of oaths among the gods in early Greek epic.[134] There are the direct parallels of Here demanding an oath from Zeus in Agamemnon's parable of Ate

133) West (as n. 3) 384, with swift reference to "pp. 181" (sic), from which the following quote is taken, though there he discusses only Here's oath to Zeus at Il. 15.36–46.

134) Cf. also above, pp. 290–292 and n. 108, for my response to Burkert's version of this argument, specifically about Here's oath at Il. 15.36f.

(Il. 19.108–13),[135] or Odysseus (though not a god, of course) extracting one from Kalypso (Od. 5.177–91) and another (on Hermes' advice) from Kirke (Od. 10.342–6), Delos from Leto (HHAp. 79–90), and Apollo from Hermes (HHHerm. 518–23), but we also find deities offering unsolicited oaths when they are under threat: Here to Zeus (Il. 15.36–46), Skamandros to Here (Il. 21.373–6), Hermes to Apollo (HHHerm. 274–7) and so on. If this pattern is inherited from the Near East, and West's case is just not strong enough to make that conclusion compelling, then the responsible party was not the poet of the *Iliad*, for the divine oath is typical in the Greek context,[136] and deeply assimilated within its tradition.

Fifth, the very large fir tree on which Hypnos alights (Il. 14.286–8) is compared by West to the biblical tower of Babel (Genesis 1.1.4), but also to the cedar in *Gilgamesh* whose 'crown pierces the sky' (5.6.6). West also points out another similarly gargantuan fir tree at Od. 5.239–40, from which inter al. Odysseus shapes his craft. The fir is generally lofty in real life and in Homer (and elsewhere),[137] but two developed examples in Homeric epic cannot be much of an argument for typicality. Nonetheless, other physical features are described as 'coming into heaven' vel sim. – an expression more commonly used with sights and sounds etc.[138] – from the pillars of Atlas which hold the earth apart (Od. 1.53–4), to Skylla's rock which οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἱκάνει / ὀξείῃ κορυφῇι (Od. 12.73–4), and the combination of Pelion and Ossa

135) West (as n. 3) 181 links this episode with the oath in the Akkadian *Descent of Ishtar* (c. 1100 BC) which Ereshkigal is made to swear, unwittingly, about allowing Ishtar out of the Underworld (Dalley [as n. 12] 158). Again, however, the parallel is not that strong, for the characters and circumstances are different, and the number of Greek comparanda for requesting an oath, when taken together with the duplicitous nature of the relationship between Zeus and Here in early Greek epic, make it unlikely that an external source is required to explain the origin of Here's trick here. For another example of her interference in the birth of one of Zeus' (illicit) children, cf. HHAp. 95–106.

136) Cf. above, n. 108.

137) Cf. Il. 5.560; J. O'Sullivan, ἐλάτη B, LfgrE, 513–14; also S. Fellner, Die Homerische Flora (Vienna 1897) 44: "[i]n der That wird sie (ἐλάτη) bis 57 m hoch …" It seems to be common in special contexts, as the weapon of the Lapithai and Kentauroi (Aspis 188–90), and abode of the nymphs (HHAphr. 264). For a summary treatment of Homer's trees, cf. E. S. Forster, Trees and Plants in Homer, CR 50 (1936) 97–104.

138) Cf. Kelly (as n. 25) §§ 103–103a, 212–14; also § 206, 357–8.

(Od. 11.316–17). Such features are invoked exclusively in a divine context, where enormousness is a good and common thing, and so the generation of the motif is once more plausible within the Greek context. Finally, the very notion of the 'world tree', so tall that its branches reach into the sky or heaven, is such a common one in so many different traditions (and evidenced in the Indo-European tradition in the Norse Ash of Yggdrasil)[139] that it would be unwise to use the motif for evidence of even the most indirect Near Eastern influence.

As for West's sixth case, the similarity between the simile at Joel 2.5 and Il. 14.394–401, a comparison of the texts reveals some rather notable differences:

As with the noise of chariots they dance on the mountain tops,	οὔτε θαλάσσης κῦμα τόσον βοάαι ποτὶ χέρσον, ποντόθεν ὀρνύμενον πνοιῇι Βορέω ἀλεγεινῆι,
as with the noise of a flame of fire devouring the stubble,	οὔτε πυρὸς τόσσος γέ ποθι βρόμος αἰθομένοιο οὔρεος ἐν βήσσηις, ὅτε τ' ὤρετο καιέμεν ὕλην,
like a mighty host drawn up for battle.[140]	οὔτ' ἄνεμος τόσσον γε περὶ δρυσὶν ὑψικόμοισιν ἠπύει, ὅς τε μάλιστα μέγα βρέμεται χαλεπαίνων, ὅσση ἄρα Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ἔπλετο φωνὴ δεινὸν ἀυσάντων, ὅτ' ἔπ' ἀλλήλοισιν ὄρουσαν.

In these two similes, the comparison is being made to different things (dancing in the Hebrew text, battle[-shouting] in the Greek) and to different groups (one in the Hebrew, two in Homer). Secondly, there is no mention of chariots in the Greek text, which uses many more similes. Thirdly, the Hebrew does not link the fire with the mountain tops, as Homer does with the mountain glades in Il. 14.396–7. Instead, the location of the fire in *Joel* is actually part of the main narrative ('they dance on the mountain tops'), and so separated from the second simile concerned with fire ('as with the noise of a flame of fire devouring the stubble'). This is not

139) Cf. West (as n. 20) 345–7; also, e. g., M. Eliade, Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy (New York 1964) 269–74.

140) *Joel* is quoted as in West (as n. 3) 384.

such a close parallel after all. Consider also that such cumulated similes are typical in Homeric narrative and so a traditional feature,[141] as is the image of a fire in the hills,[142] and the location of simile activity οὔρεος ἐν βήσσηις (Il. 14.397).[143] Inheritance, even influence, on this point is most unlikely.

Similarly explicable, i. e. primarily within the 'Gleichnistypik' of Greek epic, is the simile describing Here's journey (Il. 15.80–3), West's severely qualified[144] seventh case, for comparison of journeys to dreams and / or thought is well exampled in early Greek epic,[145] and usually confined to the journeys of deities, with the special abilities of the Phaiakian ship in the *Odyssey* not being much of an exception, given their somewhat ambiguous status on the margins of human society. The Egyptian story, by contrast, uses the simile in the mouth of Sinuhe to explain to the Pharaoh why he had fled Egypt. The differences between the examples, as well as the theme's traditionality within the Greek setting, surely render it unlikely that the image is derived directly or indirectly from this Egyptian text, or indeed any other.

Eighth, the mission pattern for Here's despatch to Olympos is apparently found in Akkadian epic, but West has slightly mischaracterised the Homeric passage:

> [t]he father of the gods tells god B to fetch god C, who is then sent as a messenger with instructions for god D.[146]

However, in the *DA* Zeus sends Here (B) to fetch Iris and Apollo (C^a and C^b), each of whom is then despatched on separate missions, Iris to Poseidon (D^a) and Apollo to Hektor (D^b). The pattern is repeated in Book 24 when Zeus sends Iris (B) to summon Thetis (C) to Zeus on Olympos, so that he can instruct her to journey to the Greek camp and give instructions to Achilleus (D).[147] In

141) Cf. Il. 2.455–83 for a particularly egregious example, and W. C. Scott, The patterning of the similes in Book 2 of the *Iliad*, in: R. J. Rabel (ed.), Approaches to Homer: Ancient and Modern (Swansea 2005), for the most recent discussion.

142) Cf. Il. 2.455–6, 15.605–6, 20.490–2.

143) Cf. Il. 3.34, 11.87, 16.634, 16.766; cf. also Il. 17.283, 18.588, 22.190.

144) West (as n. 3) 385: "… something of a parallel …".

145) Cf. Od. 7.36, HHAp. 186–7, 448–50, HHHerm. 43–6.

146) West (as n. 3) 385.

147) One might also compare the complex interaction (Il. 10.72–179) between Agamemnon and Menelaos (B^a) and Nestor (B^b), both of whom are des-

other words, of the three examples of this pattern in the *Iliad*, two are instructions for a mortal character. In the only cited Near Eastern parallel passage – from the Standard Babylonian Version of *Anzu* (7th c. BC) – the pattern is confined to gods and happens once (III 40f.).[148] A readier explanation for these Homeric loci is that they are a variation of Homer's usual ABC pattern, in which Zeus sends a god (B) directly either to another god or, more usually, a mortal (C).[149] The extra step (D) is required in the *DA* because of Zeus' absence from Olympos, i. e. the poet's decision to focus on the separation of Zeus from the other gods,[150] and in Iliad 24 because Achilleus is to be afforded the signal and individual honour of being informed of the gods' will by his mother.[151] In other words, the particular requirements of the Homeric situations suggest the addition of another figure to the ABC pattern. I suggest, then, that the 'parallel' with *Anzu* is entirely coincidental, given that there is an excellent reason within the conventions of Greek epic for Homer to have varied his usual practice in these three places.

Finally, there seems little point in comparing Athene's rebuke to Ares (on the grounds that ἦ νύ τοι αὖτως οὔατ' ἀκουέμεν ἐστί Il. 15.128) with the proverbial 'ears to hear' in the Hebrew prophets, because (aside from the fact that the Bible postdates Homer) there are ready and numerous Homeric parallels for a character's bewildering failure to use a physical facility or opportunity. Consider Odysseus' comment that Antinoos does not show the sense which should go with his physical form (Od. 17.454 ὦ πόποι, οὐκ ἄρα σοί γ' ἐπὶ εἴδει καὶ φρένες ἦσαν), or Diomedes' rebuke of Agamemnon's unleaderly behaviour despite the grant of his authority from Zeus (Il. 9.37–9 σοὶ δὲ διάνδιχα δῶκε Κρόνου

patched to fetch other heroes, but the narrative only follows Nestor as he summons Odysseus (C^a) and then Diomedes (C^b), who are then sent on the same mission to summon others (D).

148) Cf. Dalley (as n. 12) 218–19.

149) Cf. Il. 2.3–36, 4.69–104, 11.185–210 (Zeus is similarly absent from Olympos here, but Iris is always assumed to be at his beck and call; cf. Kelly [as n. 25] § 180, 322–4), 16.666–83, 17.544–73, 18.166–202, 19.340–56, 22.167–86, 24.143–88, 24.333–467; Od. 1.76–320, 5.21–148; HHDem. 314–24, 334–79.

150) We should also consider the individual advantages of this choice. Here is depicted as initially compliant to Zeus' wishes, but her arrival on Olympos still manages to foment Ares to an almost suicidal act of rebellion.

151) Cf. Il. 24.110–11; also 59–61, 66, 71–3.

παῖς ἀγκυλομήτεω· / σκήπτρωι μέν τοι δῶκε τετιμῆσθαι περὶ πάντων, / ἀλκὴν δ' οὔ τοι δῶκεν, ὅ τε κράτος ἐστὶ μέγιστον),[152] whilst to describe a failure of this sort as possession αὔτως can be seen in Glaukos' rebuke of Hektor (Il. 17.143 ἦ σ' αὔτως κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἔχει φύξηλιν ἐόντα) and Artemis' scolding of Apollo for his refusal to fight (Il. 21.474 νηπύτιε, τί νυ τόξον ἔχεις ἀνεμώλιον αὔτως;).[153] Crucially, Theoklymenos deploys to the suitors precisely the same motif as Athene did to Ares, but to the opposite conclusion, linking his own possession of these faculties directly with his good sense (Od. 20.365–8 εἰσί μοι ὀφθαλμοί τε καὶ οὔατα καὶ πόδες ἄμφω / καὶ νόος ἐν στήθεσσι τετυγμένος, οὐδὲν ἀεικής· / τοῖς ἔξειμι θύραζε, ἐπεὶ νοέω κακὸν ὔμμιν / ἐρχόμενον). Again, the Greek context explains the origin of this motif, and so argues against recent derivation from the Near East, or indeed any observable trace of this process whatsoever.

This litany of pedantry has gone on long enough, particularly because West's (usual) refusal to make Burkert's claims of a more direct interference or influence prevents his general conclusions from being totally undermined by the type of counterargument deployed here. Indeed, it is impossible to challenge the broader form of his basic thrust, that early Greek poetry is suffused with motifs and themes to be found in many other texts and cultures, from a wide range of periods and places, and that they are all witnesses to an interlocking nexus of traditions whose contents and dynamics are largely irrecoverable.

Yet caution is required even in this 'soft' version of contemporary orientalism. Many of the parallels are simply not close enough to warrant the term; many others can be explained as independent generations of similar motifs; and the remainder argue for a very indirect form of influence, in which the antiquity of any putative inheritance has allowed the motif to be thoroughly assimilated to its Hellenic context. This last point, of course, actually helps to demonstrate the interrelatedness of these Mediterranean and West Asiatic traditions, so I am far from asserting that there is

152) Cf. also, e. g., Il. 3.44–5; 6.521–3 (both on Paris' inability to live up to his natural gifts and position as leader of the Trojans); Od. 8.165–77, esp. 176–7: ὡς καὶ σοὶ εἶδος μὲν ἀριπρεπές, οὐδέ κεν ἄλλως / οὐδὲ θεὸς τεύξειε, νόον δ' ἀποφώλιός ἐσσι (~ Il. 15.129b νόος δ' ἀπόλωλε καὶ αἰδώς).

153) Cf. Il. 17.143, 21.474.

no relationship to be discovered. But I am not convinced that vast lists of parallels are actually that useful or illuminating, without some methodological consideration or categorisation of those features and the dynamics which produced them. It is perhaps unfair to criticise West for not doing everything for us, and the *East Face* will remain an indispensible reference work for every Homerist, but his own preferences in the exercise are clear from the concluding sentences of his book:

> The testy critic may complain that there are too many 'might haves' and not enough indisputable 'must haves'. But mathematically rigorous demonstrations cannot be expected in these matters. It is a question of defining and weighing possibilities and probabilities. Each reader must judge, case by case, which of the various situations suggested as | favourable for transmission are merely remotely conceivable hypotheses, and which are to be admitted as historically likely to have arisen. I hope to have shown that some, at least, fall into the latter category. In the final reckoning, however, the argument for pervasive West Asiatic influence on early Greek poetry does not stand or fall with explanations of how it came about. A corpse suffices to prove a death, even if the inquest is inconclusive.[154] [my emphasis]

This testy critic wonders whether the analogy cannot be put to better use; two corpses may bear an essential and important similarity to one another, but their deaths may well be completely unrelated. Inquests remain important.

5. Conclusion

In the course of this article, we have encountered both 'hard' and 'soft' forms of orientalism applied to the relationship between the *DA* and the traditions of the ancient Near East. The former, principally followed by Burkert, seeks to use the Near Eastern texts in much the same way that, e. g., Neoanalysts use the fragments of the epic cycle, focusing on apparent problems or individualities in the *DA* as evidence of the poet's (or at the most a very near ancestor's) dependence on external sources. The latter, exemplified in this case above all by the catalogues of West, compiles overwhelming lists of parallels, from a vast range of texts, in order

154) West (as n. 3) 629–30.

to show that the Homeric tradition was one of a range of interrelated poetic traditions which flourished in Greece and the ancient Near East from the early Bronze Age into the post-classical period. On the arguments presented in this article, Burkert's strategy is indefensible, while West's conclusion is so general as to render it extremely probable.

Nonetheless, there are several reasons to approach both deployments of Near Eastern material with caution. Firstly, what looks like a parallel need not be one at all, as with the case of cosmogonic Okeanos.[155] In order to avoid such misidentifications in the future, each feature therefore needs to be located properly within its own tradition. If the feature can be situated within the Greek context, and I submit that there is nothing in the *DA* which cannot, there arises in every case the possibility that the parallel is fortuitous, and can be explained as well or even better by reference to the dynamics of that context, as e. g. with the divine lot, Hypnos' Hephaistian stool or the divine ABCD pattern.[156] Indeed, even when a plausible case for adaptation can be advanced, the contextualisation of the feature will suggest that any such moment or process was of such antiquity that it explains very little about the form or function of the motif in the Homeric setting, as e. g. with the dressing scene, or the catalogue of Zeus' lovers (and perhaps the divine lot).[157]

In short, this review of the orientalist arguments on this portion of the poem suggests that there is no reason to believe that the *DA* is a foreign element within the *Iliad*, or that it requires or even asks for the invocation of non-Greek material in order to make sense of its narrative. The communis opinio on this passage is therefore mistaken, and the *DA* should no longer be described simply as 'an oriental episode'. It is certainly no more 'oriental', and no less Homeric, than any other section of the *Iliad*, or indeed early Greek epic poetry in general.

Such a conclusion might lead the reader to infer that, in the opinion of the author, there is no utility in invoking or even study-

155) Cf. above, pp. 274–280.

156) Cf. above (in order), pp. 262 ff., 294 f., 299 f.

157) Cf. above (in order), pp. 294, 289 f., 262 ff. If the reader remains unconvinced by the alternative explanations offered for the other features discussed above, this last qualification would still apply, for the contextualisation of the feature should at least have shown how meaningful it is in a Greek setting.

ing the ancient Near East in an Homeric context. On the contrary, there is an important purpose to comparative studies, in that they can illuminate the entirety of the poetic nexus within which the Greek epic tradition developed. But we cannot use our very partial picture of the Near Eastern traditions as an excuse for an exercise in direct – or even indirect – 'Quellenforschung'.

For all the criticisms advanced in this article, it is a lasting achievement of orientalism to have shown that the Greeks were not autochthonous; that many of the patterns, themes and aspirations which strike us so powerfully about early Greek culture were part of a broader current of civilisation in the Mediterranean basin whose roots stretch back well into the Bronze Age. We can no longer treat Hellenic culture in a vacuum, but we should not for that reason throw out every appliance hitherto at our disposal. If, because of our new respect for the Near Eastern traditions, we do not treat the Greek texts with the respect they deserve, then we run the risk of oversimplifying them both.

Warwick / Berlin Adrian Kelly