mean to be) can be considered independently of his general thesis. He has of course anticipated me in removing the οὖκ, and makes roughly the same point as I have about the scansion ὄτομαι vs. ὀτομαί; but γὰρ would produce a virtual non sequitur: the fact that Odysseus has already thought of a particular plan hardly constitutes a reason why they should all consider whether any plan is available. I would therefore prefer ἐγὼ δὲ ὃπτ᾽ ὄτομαι εἶναι.
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NOTES ON SOME HOMERIC ECHOES IN
HELIODORUS’ AETHIOPICA

Heliodorus’ indebtedness to Homer is conspicuous at many points, and a fair impression of its nature and extent may be gained from the commentary in the edition of Rattenbury, Lumb and Maillon (Paris, 1935–40; 2nd ed. 1960), or from the listings with occasional remarks by E. Feuillâtre, pp. 105–114 of Études sur les Éthiopiques d’Héliodore (Paris, 1966). A brief overall view is to be found, also, on pp. 77–78 of E. H. Haight’s Essays on the Greek Romances (Port Washington, N.Y., 1965). In these notes I have selected a handful of the more interesting adaptations for somewhat more detailed comment involving, also, an interpretation of their significance.

A series of stark contrasts colours ὅ δὲ πόλεμος ἠμῖν μελήσει (1. 28), which patently recalls Hector’s farewell to Andromache πόλεμος δὲ ἀνδρεσσι μελήσει/πάσι... (II. 6. 492–3). Hector and Andromache are, of course, the very prototype of conjugal devotion, and Hector here bids his wife go indoors to attend to her domestic tasks while he fights for Troy. But in Heliodorus the words are spoken by Thyamis the pirate chief whose main design is to wed Chariclea, the heroine of the novel, against her will. Being attacked by brigands he is bundling her off to be imprisoned in a cavern, and when the fight to which he here pledges himself goes against him he tries to kill her so that no one else may enjoy her. (In fact, he kills a different woman by mistake.)

A Homeric echo serves to introduce a touch of humorous irony at 2.19 where Cnemon gently mocks the appearance of Chariclea and her beloved Theagenes disguised as beggars. His words ἐμοὶ δοκεῖε τοιοῦτε ὄντες οὐκ ἀκόλουχος ἄλλος δορὰς τε καὶ λέβητας αἰτήσειν reverse Melanthius’ brutal taunt of Odysseus disguised as a beggar αἰτίζων ἀκόλουχος, οὐκ ἄρας οὐδέ λέβητας (Od. 17. 222). Though none too happy about their situation, Theagenes and Chariclea
are indulgent enough to force a faint smile in response to Cnemon’s somewhat insensitive joke, which, based as it is on epic, we may perhaps regard even as welcome relief from his but mildly humorous obsession elsewhere with the stage (e.g. 2.11; 2.23; 2.24; 3.1).

One of the most elaborate and well-conceived adaptations of a Homeric original occurs in the narrative of the sage Calasias. At 2.22 he tells how he has been deprived of his adopted children by brigands against whom he cannot fight even though he knows their identity. The conflict between his will and his actual capacity, as well as his uncontrolled grief and helplessness are admirably conveyed through his extended simile of the snake attacking nestlings before the eyes of their mother. She, having neither the courage to approach the snake nor the heart to fly away, vainly pleads for pity. Heliodorus has discerned the stuff of a simile in Homer’s description of an actual portent at II.2.308-20, where the snake devours not only the sparrow nestlings but also the mother, for all their twittering and wailing. There is no question here of inner conflict or resistance, as in Heliodorus’ adaptation, and it turns out that, apart from the graphic description with its inherent pathos, the significant factor in Homer is a numerical one, which Heliodorus naturally discards as being irrelevant to his own context. Nine birds are devoured in the portent, each representing, if Calchas is to be believed, one futile year of besieging Troy. Skilful as Heliodorus’ re-working of his model is, one may perhaps regret his inability to resist the condescension which has no basis in the original. (I take Homer’s δζοφ. . . δετό jingle in lines 312 and 313 as unintentional.)

Arsace mad with love for Theagenes is to be associated more closely with the genre of tragedy than with epic — note especially her relationship with her confidante Cybele — and the Hippolytus echo marking her suicide τέθνηκεν Ἀρσάκη βρόχον ἀγχόνης ἀψωμένη (8.15; cf. Hipp. 802). But her promiscuity, scheming and vindictiveness deflect from her the sympathy that one may feel for Phaedra. All the more conspicuous, therefore, is the Homeric echo invoked by Heliodorus in his one sustained attempt to make the reader feel for her in her plight. When the sight of Theagenes has inflamed her with a passion not yet turned to bitterness, the intensity of her emotion causes sleeplessness which has the same manifestations as that of Achilles grieving over the dead Patroclus (cf. 7.9 and II.24.3-12). Occurring, like the reminiscence of Hector’s farewell, in a strangely altered context, this echo effectively contributes a solitary and unexpected note of pathos to a character described in that very chapter as γόνατον καὶ ἀλλοκ πρός ἄσεμνον ἰδονήν ἐπιφορον.

II.6.235-6 τεῦχ’ ἐμεῖβε/χρύσα ἀλκάτζων, that familiar passage in which Glaucus, bereft of his wits, exchanges golden armour for bronze, forms the basis of two quite ingeniously integrated variations in the Aethiopica. In the first (7.10) we have a reversal of the elements, here applied metaphorically to Arsace and Chariclea by Cybele, the former’s sinister attendant who is ever ready to flatter her mistress with any distortion of the truth that may please her.
The irony of representing the chaste Chariclea rather than the worthless Arsace as the brazen one, whose alleged characteristics are expanded in ἔταιρίδιον τὸ ἐθελάστειον ἐκεῖνο καὶ μάτην βρυστόμενον, is plain to see. Without entailing a metaphorical application, the second echo of Homer's phrase has a particularly surprising context. It occurs at 9. 12, after Theagenes and Chariclea have exchanged Persian captors for Ethiopian ones, and their chains of iron have been replaced by golden chains, since, according to Heliodorus, gold is the most common metal for the Ethiopians. When first the iron chains are removed the young couple conceive a brief hope of freedom, but Theagenes' wry comment ταῦτα ἡ τίχη τὰ μεγάλα φιλανθρωπεύεται. Χρυσὰ σιδηρὸν ἀμβλύομεν, καὶ φρουρὰν πλουτοῦντες ἐνεμότεροι δεσμῷται γεγέναμεν in the face of continuing adversity admirably typifies the indomitable spirit shown by one or other of the ill-starred lovers at various stages of their misadventures, a spirit which sustains not only them but also the reader, whose patience might, without it, sink to the low ebb of his credulity.

At 15. 10 Heliodorus clearly has in mind the Homeric passage in which blood staining Menelaus' thighs suggests the simile of a woman staining ivory with scarlet (II. 4. 141-7). When Chariclea is asked to furnish proof that she is the daughter of Hydaspes and Persinna she bares her arm on which a black device had been stamped in babyhood. At the final ἄναγνώστης, indeed part of the climax of the novel, Heliodorus writes ἡν τις άσπερ ἔβενος περίδορομες ἐλέφαντα τὸν βραχίονα μαίνον, which is in effect a neat double simile stripped of all superfluous detail. The emphasis on whiteness is more pointed in Heliodorus since Chariclea, the daughter of two swarthy parents, had been exposed, simply because she was white, by her mother who feared a charge of adultery. All the twists of the plot derive from the initial exposure. (Chariclea's whiteness is explained biologically by her mother's having, at the moment of conception, fixed her gaze on a picture of Andromeda, naked and white!) It is worth noting finally that although Heliodorus echoes Homer's simile he does not emulate the eccentric application of it with a personal subject to the deliberate process of dyeing.  

The emotional content of the reunion between Chariclea and her parents gains in depth and stature through association with a meeting of Odysseus and Penelope. Penelope, not recognising her husband, bewails his absence, and he, though affected by her plight, checks his emotion: ὅφθαλμοι δ' ὧς εἴ κέρα, ἡπτομον ἴσικονος/ἀτρέμως ἐν βλεφάροισι (Od. 19. 211-12). The reaction of Persinna acknowledging her long-lost daughter is a mixture of intense joy

1. Cf. also H. 15. 101-2. For another example of the combination of different sources consider Petosiris. His reluctance to fight recalls that of Irus (cf. 7. 5 and Od. 18. 75-7), while the details of his pursuit are based on those of the pursuit of Hector (cf. 7. 6 and II. 22. 136f.). Such combinations may involve more than one author: while the sorceress' libations at 6. 14 closely reproduce those of Odysseus (Od. 11. 24f.), one must look as far as Lucan's Erichtho in the sixth book of the Pharsalia for the likely source of the macabre section that follows.
and lamentation, and one aspect of Hydaspes' temporarily checking both his own feelings of pity for her and his natural instinct to accept Chariclea is expressed in τό δύμα δὲ οἰνοτήτι κέρας ἢ σιδῆρον εἰς τὰ ὀρέμυνα τέλων (10.16). Close as the imitation is, there is still a marked contrast in that Hydaspes immediately afterwards gives way altogether to his stifled emotion, whereas Odysseus characteristically continues to dissemble with his distraught wife. It should be added that this is not an isolated instance of Heliodorus' seeking to enhance the stature of his characters or to add depth to his situation through direct association with the central characters of the Homeric epics. The most obvious instance is Theagenes' alleged descent from Achilles—see 2.34–5 and 4.3 for his genealogy and Achillean air, and 4.7 where the love-sick Chariclea's only reply to the doctor questioning her is ὡ Ἀχιλλεῖ, Ἡμῆς φέρσε τὸ Ἀχιλλον, the words of Patroclus grieving (II. 16.21). Chariclea herself is descended from Memnon (4.8), and her lusty development, like Achilles', gives rise to a brief plant simile: τάχυστα δὲ εἰς ἀκμὴν καθάσπερ ἔρνος τι τῶν εὐθαλῶν ἀνέδραμεν (2.33) and ὡ δ’ ἀνέδραμεν ἔρνεῖ ἱσος (II. 18.437).

A final note on Homeric words and expressions, which Heliodorus tends to use without notably altering their application, e.g. ἐμφύη (4.10); ἀπράστη (5.15); ἀναιμίτη (5.24); πυκρόγαιμος (5.30); οὐκ ἀθηεί (6.4); ἀπηνής and ἀμείλητος (8.5). But at 1.9 ἀρχέκακος, ἀπαξ λεγόμενον in Homer at II.5.63 where it describes ships, reappears a little surprisingly as a woman's epithet; at 2.20 Heliodorus finds it necessary to expand Homer's χάλκεον ὕπον (II. 11.241) into χάλκεον τινα καὶ πόμοιν ὕπον; and at 9.22 ζελόδωρος, stripped of its ὄρωρα, qualifies an altogether different element. It is applied to the Nile, and it combines with Horus to form yet another jingle.
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2. Another simile (II. 21.493–5) appears to lie behind Heliodorus' description of the Troglodytes at 8.16: cf. κόλπην εἰσέπετο πέτρην, χρυσόν, and ἀπερεμένους τῇ ποδοκίᾳ σπετδότες, καὶ εἰς ὅπες τινας βορειοστόμοις καὶ χρυσόμους κρυφίοις πετρίν καταδιομάνους. Evasion by flight is the general theme linking the two passages. Cf. also μὴ μοι σύγχει τὸν θυμὸν ὀδυρμένης (10.16), Hydaspes' words to Chariclea a little later when it appears that she must be sacrificed by burning, and Achilles' μὴ μοι σύγχει θυμὸν ὀδυρμένος. (II. 9.612). Achilles here rejects Phoenix' plea that he desist from wrath and save the ships from burning. There is a possible deliberate contrast in the fact that Hydaspes uses in an appeal to Chariclea's nobility of spirit the very words that Achilles had used in rejecting Phoenix' appeal to his heroic qualities.
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