

1. HOMERIC EXEGESIS AND ATHETESIS IN LUCIAN'S VERSIONS OF THE JUDGEMENT OF PARIS - NICHOLAS WILSHERE

Lucian (ca. AD 120-190), from Samosata in Roman Syria, is one of the more notable omissions from Philostratus' canon of sophists, although his diverse writings include numerous sophistic declamations. Indeed, the interest in 'princes and tyrants' that Philostratus specifically identifies as a characteristic of the 'second' Sophistic¹ is to the fore both in Lucian's pair of *Phalaris* speeches and in his *Tyrannicide*. But other typically sophistic concerns are found throughout this author's work: we can observe in particular the numerous occasions when he puts speeches in the mouths of mythological characters, not simply as a rhetorical exercise but as a means to serious satirical ends that connect the authority of literary tradition with the more subversive aims of Cynic philosophy.²

Throughout Lucian's work we also find a sophistic emphasis on the skills of reading and interpretation that make one truly literate, especially (as I show in this chapter) through polemic concerning the correct interpretation of the Homeric text. Notably, in *Against the Ignorant Book Collector* Lucian writes a sustained attack on a collector of *de luxe* editions who has enough skill to read aloud from them fluently but does not have the requisite level of education to pass muster in the analysis of the texts – something which sets him apart from the educated group of which Lucian considers himself a part.³

It is clear from the short piece *Prometheus es* that Lucian took special pride in his invention of a new literary genre through combination of the established forms of dialogue and comedy. Many of Lucian's shorter dialogues take the form of gently humorous conversations between mythological characters which dramatise events 'off-stage' or on the margins of stories that are well known from treatments in earlier authors, in particular Homer.⁴ This requires the author to have a thorough understanding of the Homeric characters, but also makes demands of the reader, who must be able to pick up the context and significance of the episodes being dramatised. As Kim has written, 'the pleasure of the dialogues arises from their "filling in" and commenting on Homeric episodes rather than from any attempt at parody or burlesque'.⁵

¹ *VS* 481. Translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

² Anderson 1986: 87-8 discusses the explanations that have been advanced for Lucian's exclusion by Philostratus. Eunapius (*Vit. Soph.* 454) does at least mention Lucian, as 'a man serious about raising a laugh' (ἀνὴρ σπουδαῖος ἐς τὸ γελασθῆναι), recalling Strabo's description (16.2.29) of the Cynic Menippus as 'the serio-comic' (ὁ σπουδογέλοιος).

³ What Lucian specifically identifies here (*Ind.* 2-3) is an ability to discuss the texts' good and bad features (τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ κακίαν ἐκάστου τῶν ἐγγεγραμμένων), in particular those relating to the correct usage of words and expressions. He asks, 'Do you say that you are knowledgeable, even though you have not learned the same things that we have?' (φῆς, καὶ ταῦτὰ μὴ μαθὼν ἡμῖν, εἰδέναι;).

⁴ For example, two dialogues show the responses of Ajax and Achilles in the Underworld immediately following Odysseus' visit in *Od.* 11 (respectively, *Dial. mort.* 23 Macl. = 29 vulg. and 26 Macl. = 15 vulg.).

⁵ Kim 2010: 160. As will be clear from what follows, the *Judgement of the Goddesses* contains a greater element of parody than many of the other mythological dialogues.

As it is one of the longest examples of this type, the dialogue *Judgement of the Goddesses* (Θεῶν Κρίσις, *Dearum Iudicium*) provides a fine illustration of the various ways in which Lucian responds to epic material as he combines humour with sophistic self-presentation. In this chapter I demonstrate how Lucian not only entertains his audience through the imaginative, parodic re-presentation of a familiar epic story, but also shows off the thoroughness of his learning through knowing allusions to other episodes in the story of Troy, details from the Homeric text and, in particular, debates about interpretative questions that appear in the Homeric scholia.⁶ I also consider briefly how this dialogue connects with two other places where Lucian alludes to the Judgement of Paris, and conclude with a discussion of the ways in which his approach to this story from the world of epic illustrates the different levels of knowledge and engagement that authors of the period anticipated in their audiences.

The text begins with Zeus dispatching Hermes, together with the three goddesses Hera, Athena and Aphrodite, to Gargaron in the foothills of Mount Ida. In a sensible attempt to avoid becoming involved in any acrimony, he says that he has no intention of awarding the golden apple himself, so Paris must make the decision (1-2). Lucian then presents the four gods' conversation on the journey (3-6); when they arrive they locate Paris, to whom Hermes explains the situation (7-8) before they negotiate the contest's ground-rules (9); the goddesses then disrobe (10) and present themselves naked, each trying to persuade Paris by offering their bribes (11-15). The dialogue ends when Paris agrees to award the fateful apple to Aphrodite after extracting a promise from her that he will marry Helen (16).

In its general outlines the dialogue seems to be based on the version of the story told in the *Cypria*:⁷

παραγενομένη δὲ Ἔρις εὐωχουμένων τῶν θεῶν ἐν τοῖς Πηλέως γάμοις νεῖκος περὶ κάλλους ἐνίστησιν Ἀθηνᾶ, Ἥρα καὶ Ἀφροδίτη· αἱ πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον ἐν Ἴδῃ κατὰ Διὸς προσταγὴν ὑφ' Ἑρμοῦ πρὸς τὴν κρίσιν ἄγονται. <αἱ δὲ ἐπαγγέλλονται δῶρα δώσειν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ· Ἥρα μὲν οὖν ἔφη προκριθεῖσα δώσειν βασιλείαν πάντων, Ἀθηνᾶ δὲ πολέμου νίκην, Ἀφροδίτη δὲ γάμον Ἑλένης.> καὶ προκρίνει τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἐπαρθεὶς τοῖς Ἑλένης γάμοις Ἀλέξανδρος.

As the gods are feasting at the wedding of Peleus, Strife appears and causes a dispute about beauty among Athena, Hera, and Aphrodite. On Zeus' instruction Hermes conducts them to Alexander on Ida for adjudication. <They promise Alexander gifts: Hera said that if she were preferred she would give him kingship over all, Athena promised victory in war, and Aphrodite union with Helen.> Alexander, excited by the prospect of union with Helen, chooses Aphrodite. (transl. West)

Cypria, Argumentum 1

⁶ This attention to minute detail of the Homeric text can be seen even in the extravagantly mendacious and iconoclastic *True Histories*, where we find 'authorial anxiety about altering Homer's story-world' (Ní Mheallaigh 2014: 244); compare Richter's observation that 'all good mimesis, and this is central for Lucian, begins with careful study' (2017: 341, discussing *Against the Ignorant Book Collector* 2).

⁷ Proclus, *Chrestomathy*, supplemented from Apollod., epit. 3. For the various alternative versions of the Judgement story, see Gantz 1993: 567-71; for Dio's response to it, see Tirrito's contribution in this volume.

Lucian's dialogue reproduces this version of events, although he has no parallel to the process of Aphrodite's beautification that appears in a pair of fragments that evidently describe the preparations for the contest.⁸ In Lucian's version the focus is much more on the satirical potential of the goddesses' objections to each other's adornments, as part of the short-tempered bickering with which Lucian characterises them. In any case, there is no need for such adornments since Paris cannot resist the temptation to see the goddesses naked. Their disingenuous questions to Hermes about Paris' marital status (3-4) create a similarly satirical feel.

When Lucian's Aphrodite first speaks, she is responding to Zeus' opening speech, which appointed Paris as judge. She says: 'As far as I am concerned, Zeus, even if you were to appoint Momus himself as our judge, I would go confidently to the exhibition. For what could he find fault with in me?' (2: ἐγὼ μὲν, ὃ Ζεῦ, εἰ καὶ τὸν Μῶμον αὐτὸν ἐπιστήσειας ἡμῖν δικαστήν, θαρροῦσα βαδιοῦμαι πρὸς τὴν ἐπίδειξιν· τί γὰρ ἂν καὶ μωμήσαιτό μου;). The most obvious reason for her to mention Momus here is that he is the personification of fault-finding, as her use of the verb μωμήσαιτο emphasises, so he is the most extreme possible example of a judge who is hard to please.

But the mention of Momus at the opening of the text signals its parodic, satirical nature: Lucian elsewhere uses Momus as shorthand for a certain type of humour, positioning both himself and Nigrinus as 'like Momus'.⁹ Lucian's Momus is also an advisor to the gods: at *Zeus the Tragedian* 19, Zeus encourages Momus to advise, as his παρρησία will be beneficial, and he speaks at length in *Parliament of the Gods*. Most significantly, readers who know the full background to the Judgement of Paris will recall that, in one version, Momus had an important role in changing Zeus' plans for reducing the world's population, in such a way as to create the circumstances that allowed the familiar story of Paris and Helen to happen.¹⁰ Here, then, readers with different levels of knowledge can read Aphrodite's words as a simple figure of speech, as a comment particularly appropriate to a divine debate, or as a more subtle allusion to another part of the story.

The fragmentary state of our knowledge about the *Cypria* makes further comparison difficult, although it seems likely that Lucian's dialogue is fundamentally a parody of the *Cypria* version.¹¹

⁸ *Cypria*, PEG fr. 4-5 = 5-6 West, on which see Brilllet-Dubois 2011: 110.

⁹ At *Dionysus* 8, Lucian describes the text as a joke at his own expense 'in the style of Momus' (κατὰ τὸν Μῶμον); at *Nigrinus* 32, Nigrinus' satirical observation imitates Momus' manner of expression (ἀτεχνῶς τοῦ Μῶμου τὸν λόγον μιμησάμενος). Other passing mentions: *Icaromenippus* 31, *Hermostimus* 20.

¹⁰ Σ D II. 1.5: 'Zeus at first immediately brought about the Theban War, through which he destroyed a great many, and afterwards again, with Momus as his advisor – what Homer calls 'the plan of Zeus' – since he was able to destroy everyone with thunderbolts or floods. Momus prevented this and proposed two ideas to him, the marriage of Thetis to a mortal and the birth of a beautiful daughter; from these two things a war happened between the Greeks and barbarians, as a result of which it came about that the earth was lightened, since many were taken away. The story is told by Stasinus, the poet of the *Cypria*.' (τὸν δὲ Δία πρῶτον μὲν εὐθὺς ποιῆσαι τὸν Θηβαϊκὸν πόλεμον, δι' οὗ πολλοὺς πάνυ ἀπώλεσεν, ὕστερον δὲ πάλιν, συμβούλῳ τῷ Μῶμῳ χρησάμενος, ἦν "Διὸς βουλήν" Ὀμηρὸς φησιν, ἐπειδὴ οἷός τε ἦν κεραυνοῖς ἢ κατακλυσμοῖς πάντας διαφθεῖρειν· ὅπερ τοῦ Μῶμου κωλύσαντος, ὑποθεμένου δὲ αὐτῷ γνώμας δύο τὴν Θέτιδος θνητογαμίαν καὶ θυγατρὸς καλῆς γένναν, ἐξ ὧν ἀμφοτέρων πόλεμος Ἑλληνισί τε καὶ βαρβάροις ἐγένετο, ἀφ' οὗ συνέβη κουφισθῆναι τὴν γῆν πολλῶν ἀνααιρεθέντων. ἡ δὲ ἱστορία παρὰ Στασίνῳ τῷ τὰ Κύπρια πεποιηκότι.)

¹¹ Wright 2007 demonstrates that the causes of the Trojan War – especially the Judgement of Paris – were of special interest to the comedians. Parodic versions also appeared in art: see Kossatz-Diessmann 1994: 186 (nos. 108-113).

More promising is a study of the aspects of this text that show intertextual relations with Homer. The *Judgement of the Goddesses* is about something that happened long before the main action of the Homeric epics, so one should not be surprised that there are few obvious direct references to events in Homer. Indeed, the Loeb edition is conspicuously short of footnotes highlighting Homeric references here, compared to most of Lucian's other texts.¹² But this gives a misleading impression; in fact, the allusions are rather harder to find because they require a *πεπαιδευμένος*' knowledge of Homeric scholarship. To illustrate this, let us turn first to the most likely place to track down such exegetical material.

The Judgement of Paris makes only a brief appearance in Homer, who evidently assumes that his audience already know the story, since he merely alludes to it when explaining the antipathy of Athena and Hera towards Troy:

ὥς ὁ μὲν Ἔκτορα δῖον ἀείκιζεν μενεαίνων·
 τὸν δ' ἔλεάιρεσκον μάκαρες θεοὶ εἰσορόωντες,
 κλέψαι δ' ὀτρύνεσκον εὐσκόπον Ἀργεῖφόντην.
 25 ἔνθ' ἄλλοις μὲν πᾶσιν ἐήνδανεν, οὐδέ ποθ' Ἥρη
 οὐδὲ Ποσειδάων' οὐδὲ γλαυκῶπιδι κούρη,
 ἀλλ' ἔχον ὡς σφιν πρῶτον ἀπήχθετο Ἴλιος ἱρή
 καὶ Πρίαμος καὶ λαὸς Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔνεκ' ἄτης,
 ὃς νείκεσσε θεὰς ὅτε οἱ μέσσαυλον ἴκοντο,
 30 τὴν δ' ἦησ' ἢ οἱ πόρε μαχλοσύνην ἀλεγεινήν.

So in his rage did [Achilles] mistreat godlike Hector. But the blessed gods felt pity as they looked on him, and they roused keen-sighted Argeiphontes to steal him away. Then were all the other gods pleased, but never Hera, nor Poseidon, nor the bright-eyed maiden, but they remained just as when sacred Ilios and Priam and his people first became hateful to them, because of the rashness of Alexander, who insulted the goddesses when they came to his farmstead, and favoured her who granted his grievous lust.

Iliad 24.22-30

This was a controversial passage, with debate among ancient scholars concerning the necessity for, and extent of, athetesis.¹³ The scholia offer assorted arguments in favour of Aristarchus' view that at least some of the lines should be athetised. For example, evidence is presented to show that Homer cannot have known this story at all:

Σ Α ΙΙ. 24.25-30: τὴν τε περὶ τοῦ κάλλους ἔριν οὐκ οἶδεν· πολλαχῆ γὰρ ἂν ἐμνήσθη.

¹² Harmon 1921: 384-409.

¹³ Athetesis involved the marking of lines as in some way 'suspicious', for example because of their absence in some manuscripts, because of apparent inconsistency with another passage, or because they presented gods or heroes behaving in ways deemed inappropriate. In Aristarchus' view such factors suggested non-Homeric authorship. On this and other aspects of Aristarchus' critical procedure, see Schironi 2018, especially 3.6.B and, on the Judgement of Paris in particular, 663-5. Opinions differed on the number of lines requiring athetesis in this case, ranging from eight (23-30) to seven (24-30) to six (25-30). See the discussion in Erbse 1977: 519-22 and, for the full list of arguments, Richardson 1993: 276-8. For a modern analysis of the passage's role within the *Iliad* see Mackie 2013.

And [Homer] does not know the contest about beauty; for he would have mentioned it in many places.

Σ bT *Il.* 24.23: πῶς δ' ἂν τὰς ναῦς “ἀρχεκάκους” εἶπε καὶ οὐ τὴν κρίσιν;

And how would he call the ships ‘the start of trouble’ [5.63] and not the judgement?¹⁴

But the opening of the b-scholia’s essay on the Catalogue of Ships provides a glimpse of another view, where the Judgement of Paris is adduced as evidence of Homer’s propensity to allude fleetingly to parts of the story lying outside the main narrative – in other words, this scholar viewed the lines in *Il.* 24 as genuinely Homeric.¹⁵

Since this passage was a site of such controversy, it is unsurprising that Lucian quickly includes a nod to his more learned readers when he begins the dialogue by having Zeus explain that he would be hated by the losers in the competition if he were to judge it himself. He includes a clear reminiscence of the text of Homer, with Zeus employing the verb ἀπεχθάνεσθαι which pointedly recalls ἀπήχθετο in *Il.* 24.27: ‘Besides, it is inevitable that if I were to give the beauty-prize to one, I would be completely hated by the majority of you’ (ἄλλως τε καὶ ἀνάγκη, μῖα τὸ καλλιστεῖον ἀποδόντα πάντως ἀπεχθάνεσθαι ταῖς πλείοσιν). Zeus correctly identifies the nature of the goddesses’ reaction, even down to the vocabulary that describes it. This is a first hint both that Lucian is asking his audience to recall the Homeric background to the story, and that he will have in mind specifically this much-debated passage.

This type of allusion is easily missed if we think only in terms of direct quotation. As my earlier mention of the Loeb edition suggested, those modern scholars who have undertaken analyses of Homeric quotations, allusions and reminiscences throughout Lucian found little of interest in this text. In his statistical tables Householder records the number of ‘direct quotations’ from Homer as zero,¹⁶ while Bouquiaux-Simon identified quotations of the two epithets γλαυκῶπις and βοῶπις (10).¹⁷ Although epithets have their own special entries at the end of her index of Homeric passages, she is still only seeking verbatim direct quotation, or at least very close paraphrase. These two scholars’ approaches led to their shared failure to identify Zeus’ allusion to Homer through the choice of a differently inflected verb-form.

I shall return to these epithets shortly, but before they appear in Lucian’s text, Paris decides to undress the goddesses, with an eagerness which recalls not only a detail of the Book 24 passage but also a question of audience-response:

¹⁴ See too Σ bT *Il.* 24.23, which suggests that Zeus would not have asked Hera the question ‘In what way now do Priam and Priam’s sons do so many evil things against you that you rage unceasingly?’ at 4.31-2, since the answer would be obvious if the Judgement was the reason for Hera’s hatred. Σ T *Il.* 24.23 points out that Helen not only fails to take several obvious opportunities to mention the Judgement but even implies that Paris acted entirely on his own initiative.

¹⁵ Σ b *Il.* 2.494: ‘Marvellous is the poet, since he does not leave out anything at all of the subject-matter, but narrates everything by turning back at the appropriate moment, [such as] the quarrel of the goddesses, the rape of Helen, the death of Achilles.’ (θαυμάσιος ὁ ποιητής μὴδ’ ὅτι οὐκ ἀπαλείπει τῆς ὑποθέσεως, πάντα δ’ ἐξ ἀναστροφῆς κατὰ τὸν ἐπιβάλλοντα καιρὸν διηγούμενος, τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἔριν, τὴν τῆς Ἑλένης ἀρπαγὴν, τὸν Ἀχιλλέως θάνατον.)

¹⁶ Householder 1941: Table II.I.C.

¹⁷ Bouquiaux-Simon 1968: Table 3 (with 13-14). She lists this dialogue in the traditional way as number 20 of the *Dialogues of the Gods*.

ΠΑΡΙΣ: ἐκεῖνο δὲ πρότερον εἰδέναι βούλομαι, πότερ' ἐξαρκέσει σκοπεῖν αὐτὰς ὡς ἔχουσιν, ἢ καὶ ἀποδῦσαι δεήσει πρὸς τὸ ἀκριβὲς τῆς ἐξετάσεως;

ΕΡΜΗΣ: τοῦτο μὲν σὸν ἂν εἴη τοῦ δικαστοῦ, καὶ πρόσταττε ὅπη καὶ θέλεις.

Π.: ὅπη καὶ θέλω; γυμνὰς ἰδεῖν βούλομαι.

Ε.: ἀπόδυτε, ὧ αὐταί· σὺ δ' ἐπισκόπει· ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπεστράφην.

Paris: But first here's something I want to know: will it be sufficient for me to look at them as they are, or will they need to undress for precision of examination?

Hermes: This should be your decision, as you're the judge. Give an order in the manner you wish.

P.: In the manner I wish? I want to see them naked.

H.: Undress, you ladies. Make your inspection, Paris; I have turned away.

Lucian, *Judgement of the Goddesses* 9

Here Paris is showing that *μαχλοσύνη* of which he is accused in *Il.* 24.30, and which the scholia gloss as 'madness for women' (*γυναικομανία*, Σ *A Il.* 24.25-30) and 'things concerning prostitution, hair and beauty' (τὰ πρὸς πορνείαν, τὴν κόμην καὶ τὸ εἶδος, Σ *bT Il.* 24.30*b*). Aristarchus seems to have had particular objection to the usage of this word (Σ *A Il.* 24.30*a*): 'Aristarchus athetises the line because of the word "lust" (ἀθετεῖ γὰρ Ἀρίσταρχος διὰ τὴν "μαχλοσύνην" τὸν στίχον).

But Paris is also succumbing to a temptation that the scholia are alert to. They say that when Hera is preparing for the *Dios apatē*, Homer very properly avoids any hint of nudity:

καίτοι δὲ τῶν περὶ ταῦτα δεινῶν γυμνὰς γραφόντων ἢ πλασσόντων τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ πρὸς ἀπάτην, ὁ ποιητὴς παραλιπὼν γυμνουμένην αὐτὴν δεῖξαι, ἵνα μὴ εἰς αἰσχρὰν ἐνέργειαν τὴν τῶν ἀκροωμένων διάνοιαν προκαλέσῃται, κοσμηθεῖσαν ἐνεφάνισε, καὶ λόγοις πλείονων χρωμάτων αὐτὴν διετόπωσε.

Although those who are skilled in these things draw or sculpt women naked so as to beguile, the poet, forbearing to show [Hera] naked, lest he prompt the audience's thoughts into shameful activity, has shown her adorned, and with words has fashioned her [to be] of many colours.

Scholia *bT Iliad* 14.187

Without the restraining hand of such a wise poet, Paris' thoughts are indeed prompting themselves into 'shameful activity' when confronted by the temptation of seeing three naked goddesses.

However, when Sistakou examines this passage in the context of erotic epigrams on the Judgement of Paris she concludes that Lucian's version is actually quite restrained: 'Lucian in his parodic *The Judgment of the Goddesses* vulgarizes the Paris' episode, mainly by insisting on the nakedness of the three candidates, ... but is never straightforwardly obscene.'¹⁸ In particular

¹⁸ Sistakou 2011: 199 n. 21.

it does not contain anything like the detailed description of buttocks that Sistakou notes in an epigram of Rufinus:

πυγὰς αὐτὸς ἔκρινα τριῶν· εἴλοντο γὰρ αὐταὶ
δείξασαι γυμνὴν ἀστεροπὴν μελέων.
καὶ ῥ' ἢ μὲν τροχαλοῖς σφραγιζομένη γελασίνοις
λευκῇ ἀπὸ γλουτῶν ἦνθεεν εὐαφίη·
τῆς δὲ διαιρομένης φοινίσσετο χιονέη σὰρξ
πορφυρέοιο ρόδου μᾶλλον ἐρυθροτέρη·
ἢ δὲ γαληνιώσα χαράσσετο κύματι κωφῶ,
αὐτομάτη τρυφερῶ χρωτὶ σαλευομένη.
εἰ ταύτας ὁ κριτῆς ὁ θεῶν ἐθεήσατο πυγὰς,
οὐκέτ' ἂν οὐδ' ἐσιδεῖν ἤθελε τὰς προτέρας.

I judged the buttocks of three; they themselves chose me, showing me the naked lightning of their limbs. The first marked with round dimples, were white and soft to touch. The flesh of the second, when stretched apart, from snow-white shaded into red – a purple red brighter than the colour of the crimson rose. The third, calm and tranquil, was furrowed by the soundless wave of the delicate skin, as it wavered by itself. If Paris who judged the goddesses had seen such buttocks, he would not have wished to look again on the former ones.

Anthologia Palatina 5.35, trans. Paton, rev. Sistakou

It is significant that by the time of both these later authors, the idea that the beauty contest took place in the nude was evidently well-established, both in literature and art.¹⁹ This might well prompt a reader of Homer to reinterpret the very brevity of Homer's allusion to the Judgement as a further attempt to restrain his own audience's erotic imagination. In Lucian, Paris displays *μαχλοσύνη* – which Aristarchus felt constituted an argument against the Homeric lines – while Hermes' reaction shows the god observing exactly the kind of propriety that the text of Homer models.

As the goddesses are in the process of undressing for inspection by Paris, the two epithets appear. Aphrodite says:²⁰

καλῶς, ὦ Πάρι· καὶ πρώτη γε ἀποδύσομαι, ὅπως μάθης ὅτι μὴ μόνας ἔχω τὰς ὠλένας
λευκὰς μηδὲ τῶ βοῶπις εἶναι μέγα φρονῶ, ἐπ' ἴσης δέ εἰμι πᾶσα καὶ ὁμοίως καλή.

Very well, Paris. I'll undress first, so you can learn that it's not just white arms that I have, and that I'm not just proud of being 'ox-eyed', but I'm totally and completely beautiful all over.

¹⁹ Kossatz-Diessmann 1994: 176 writes 'That the goddesses appear before Paris naked, in order to put their beauty on show, is an accepted version in the Hellenistic period.' ('Daß die Göttinnen nackt vor Paris auftreten, um ihre Schönheit zur Schau zu stellen, ist wohl eine im Hellenismus aufgekommene Version').

²⁰ The manuscripts attribute this speech to Hera, misled by the epithets; the true attribution was restored by Hemsterhuis. See MacLeod 1991: 254.

Aphrodite teases Hera by suggesting that the Homeric epithets ‘white-armed’ and ‘ox-eyed’ are a kind of damning with faint praise by Homer, who draws attention to them because they are the only parts of Hera that are attractive, whereas Aphrodite is beautiful all over. She then goes on to suggest that Athena’s famously γλαυκός eyes are terrifying: as I show below, it is clear from elsewhere in Lucian that by his time the word had acquired negative connotations. She says: ‘Or are you afraid that the brightness of your eyes might cause you to be criticised, if it’s seen without the terrifying object [i.e. your helmet]?’ (ἢ δέδιας μή σοι ἐλέγχηται τὸ γλαυκὸν τῶν ὀμμάτων ἄνευ τοῦ φοβεροῦ βλέπόμενον;).

In two of these three examples Aphrodite does not quote the Homeric epithet directly, but stays close enough to the Homeric vocabulary that it is easy for even a fairly inexperienced reader of Homer to see how Homer is being used. Similarly, when Momus calls Anubis ‘dog-face’ (κυνοπρόσωπε) at *Parliament of the Gods* 10, this is a form of abuse familiar from Homer although the precise phrasing (κυνῶπις, *Il.* 1.159, 3.180, 18.396 etc.) is again varied.²¹

But once more there is a deeper significance, since Aphrodite is weaponising this vocabulary in a fashion that seems inspired by Achilles’ allegedly mocking use of an epithet. When Achilles responds to Ajax and the embassy from Agamemnon, the scholia raise and answer an interpretative question: why does Achilles use an epithet (‘godlike Hector’, Ἑκτορα δῖον) that seems to express approval of his enemy Hector? The answer is that this is part of the characterisation of Achilles, who is deliberately using the word, because he wants to annoy his audience.²² Lucian’s reasonably obvious reminiscence on the verbal level therefore signals a further awareness of the way that such details were interpreted, which his more learned readers can observe with satisfaction.

This conversation is already showing Lucianic characters as unmistakably Homeric, with the jealous, suspicious immortals acting just as one would expect from their appearances together in Homer. Indeed, it seems from this text that Lucian would agree with Reinhardt’s argument that there are allusions to the origins of their enmity in the less-than-cordial meeting of the three goddesses at *Il.* 21.415-34, and similarly the passage (5.422-5) in which Athena (in cahoots with Hera) makes fun of Aphrodite’s wound.²³

ἦ μάλα δὴ τινα Κύπρις Ἀχαιϊάδων ἀνιεῖσα
 Τρωσὶν ἄμα σπέσθαι, τοὺς νῦν ἔκπαγλα φίλησε,
 τῶν τινα καρρέζουσα Ἀχαιϊάδων εὐπέπλων
 425 πρὸς χρυσῆ περόνη καταμύξατο χεῖρα ἀραιήν.

²¹ Here there is an additional joke, since Anubis really does have a dog’s face. On the Homeric insult see Graver 1995. For another example of a sophistic character’s awareness of his own Homeric epithets, see the conclusion to Koning’s contribution in this volume.

²² Σ bT *Il.* 9.651: ‘The epithet is not Homer’s, but Achilles has used it as he is annoying the Achaeans’ (οὐχ Ὀμηρικὸν τὸ ἐπίθετον, ἀλλ’ ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς πεποίηκεν αὐτὸ λυπῶν τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς).

²³ Reinhardt 1938.

Yes, Cypris has definitely been urging one of the Achaean women to follow after the Trojans, whom she loves exceedingly; as she was stroking one of these fair-dressed Achaean women she has scratched her slender hand on a golden brooch.

Iliad 5.422-5

In Lucian this mutual suspicion has already been felt when Athena objects to Hermes' private discussion with Aphrodite as they are travelling from Olympus:

ΑΘΗΝΑ: παραπρεσβεύεις, ὃ οὔτος, ἰδίᾳ πάλαι ταύτη κοινολογούμενος.

ΕΡΜΗΣ: οὐδέν, ὃ Ἀθηνᾶ, δεινὸν οὐδὲ καθ' ὑμῶν, ἀλλ' ἤρετό με εἰ ἄγαμος ὁ Πάρις ἐστίν.

Athena: Hey, you! You're being a biased negotiator, talking with her for a long while in private.

Hermes: It's nothing to get indignant at, Athena, nothing against you two. She was asking me if Paris is unmarried.

Lucian, *Judgement of the Goddesses* 4

Lucian's audience knows perfectly well that Aphrodite's questions have an ulterior motive, as will become explicit at the end of the dialogue; here Hermes is being either diplomatic or naive.²⁴ The *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (97-106) shows that such underhand tactics are a real concern, since Hera is there tricked by Iris through secret bribery of Eileithyia.

Earlier, at the first opportunity (2), Hera has teased Aphrodite for having been discovered in a compromising position with Ares, alluding to *Od.* 8.267-369²⁵ – 'We're not afraid either, Aphrodite, not even if the judgement is turned over to your friend Ares.' (οὐδ' ἡμεῖς, ὃ Ἀφροδίτη, δέδιμεν, οὐδ' ἂν ὁ Ἄρης ὁ σὸς ἐπιτραπῆ τὴν δίαίταν) – and again with her visits to Anchises at *Il.* 2.819-21 and in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*:

ΗΡΑ: ὦρα σοι, ὃ Ἀφροδίτη, προῖέναι καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι ἡμῖν τῆς ὁδοῦ· σὺ γὰρ ὡς τὸ εἰκὸς ἔμπειρος εἶ τοῦ χωρίου πολλάκις, ὡς λόγος, κατελθοῦσα πρὸς Ἀγχίσην.

ΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΗ: οὐ σφόδρα, ὃ Ἥρα, τούτοις ἄχθομαι τοῖς σκώμμασιν.

Hera: You ought to go in front and lead the way for us, Aphrodite; you're probably familiar with the region, since (as the story goes) you often used to come down to visit Anchises.

Aphrodite: I'm not particularly vexed by these jibes, Hera.

Lucian, *Judgement of the Goddesses* 5

Aphrodite's reply clearly signals the humour (σκώμματα being 'jokes, jests'), but what is happening here is more than a simple joke. The characters amusingly demonstrate the least appetising features of Homer's immortals (so that this dialogue is to some extent indebted to those thinkers, going back at least to Xenophanes,²⁶ who criticised Homer for the gods'

²⁴ Much of the dialogue's humour comes from its making explicit what is implicit in Homer, namely that outright cheating was involved. Gumpert 2001: 64 notes that later tellings 'tend to emphasize the way in which the contest was fixed'.

²⁵ This episode is the subject of Lucian's *Dialogues of the Gods* 21 Macl. = 17 vulg.

²⁶ DK 21 B11-B12.

anthropomorphic immorality); and this humour is clear without the reader's recognition of verbatim quotations or specific allusions. As Householder acknowledged, one of the reasons why Lucian consistently alludes to Homer throughout his *oeuvre* – in particular, to well-known passages – is that Homer, alongside Euripides, is so widely familiar to his readership: 'anyone with any education at all had read Homer'.²⁷ So the reader who knows in a very general way that these goddesses are always sniping at each other in Homer will see a similarity in their characters here. Furthermore, the goddesses' use of epithets as part of their squabble shows that Lucian expects the reader to pick up on the vocabulary of their standard descriptions in Homer, first by a mild paraphrase (ἔχω τὰς ὠλένας λευκάς, rather than e.g. λευκώλενός εἰμι), and then by literal quotation (βοῶπις).

The connection with Achilles' use of epithets is a more subtle one, but contributes an extra level of satisfaction for the reader who identifies it. Hera also deploys a weaponised 'Alexandrian footnote' ('as the story goes', ὡς λόγος), which alludes in particular to the main part of the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*. The attempt to shame Aphrodite proves the truth of Aphrodite's own prediction in the *Hymn* (247-55), where she says to Anchises that their relationship will cause her to suffer 'great shame among the immortal gods' (μέγ' ὄνειδος ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν, 247).²⁸ Hera's πολλάκις could either be a malicious exaggeration, or may mean 'many times [in literature]', since the hymn actually describes only a one-night (or rather one-afternoon) stand.²⁹

The goddesses' argument continues with an allusion to the girdle used by Hera in the *Iliad*'s *Dios apatē* episode:³⁰

ΑΘΗΝΑ: μὴ πρότερον ἀποδύσης αὐτήν, ᾧ Πάρι, πρὶν ἂν τὸν κεστὸν ἀπόθηται – φαρμακίς γάρ ἐστιν – μή σε καταγοητεύσῃ δι' αὐτοῦ. καίτοι γε ἐχρῆν μηδὲ οὕτω κεκαλλωπισμένην παρεῖναι μηδὲ τοσαῦτα ἐντετριμμένην χρώματα καθάπερ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐταίραν τινά, ἀλλὰ γυμνὸν τὸ κάλλος ἐπιδεικνύειν.

ΠΑΡΙΣ: εὐ λέγουσι τὸ περὶ τοῦ κεστοῦ, καὶ ἀπόθου.

ΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΗ: τί οὖν οὐχὶ καὶ σύ, ᾧ Ἀθηνᾶ, τὴν κόρυν ἀφελούσα ψιλὴν τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐπιδεικνύεις, ἀλλ' ἐπισείεις τὸν λόφον καὶ τὸν δικαστὴν φοβεῖς; ἢ δέδιας μή σοι ἐλέγχεται τὸ γλαυκὸν τῶν ὀμμάτων ἄνευ τοῦ φοβεροῦ βλεπόμενον;

ΑΘ.: ἰδοῦ σοι ἡ κόρυς αὕτη ἀφήρηται.

ΑΦ.: ἰδοὺ καὶ σοι ὁ κεστός.

Athena: Don't let [Aphrodite] undress, Paris, until she takes off the girdle – because she's an enchantress and otherwise she might cast a spell on you with it.³¹ And indeed she shouldn't come before you beautified like that and daubed with all those colours, just as if she were really a courtesan. But she should show her beauty without dressing it up.

Paris: They've got a good point about the girdle. Take it off.

²⁷ Householder 1941: 64. The words of Cadau 2015: 82, apply just as much to Lucian as to her subject, Colluthus: 'the choice of such a well-known story ... guaranteed high expectations in the readers in terms of content, characterisation and ethical interpretation.'

²⁸ On Aphrodite being 'shamed' in the hymn see Furley 2011: 220-1.

²⁹ The story also appears at Hes. *Th.* 1008-10.

³⁰ *Il.* 14.214-20.

³¹ The fear is justified, since the girdle 'steals even wise men's reason' (217).

Aphrodite: So why don't you take off your helmet, Athena, and show your head bare, rather than shaking your plume and terrifying the judge? Or are you afraid that the brightness of your eyes might cause you to be criticised, if it's seen without the terrifying object?

Ath.: Look, there's the helmet for you. I've taken it off.

Aph.: And look, there's the girdle for you.

Lucian, *Judgement of the Goddesses* 10

The alert reader will recall that the Homeric passage implicates not just Hera (who uses the girdle) but Aphrodite (who provides it for her), so that Athena is cleverly using a single passage to attack both of her rivals at once.

Athena claims that Hera is wearing make-up, which is probably a lie, since the reply of Paris ignores it while acknowledging that the girdle is a valid point of contention; more subtly, there is no indication that Aphrodite uses any make-up in the *Cypria* fragments, or in *Homeric Hymn* 6 (in which she is adorned by the Horai, and where *Il.* 14.187 is repeated verbatim). However, Lucian does use the word *χρώματα*, emphasising the importance of colour in these beautification-scenes – as highlighted in the scholium on *Il.* 14.187 discussed above. So Athena may be accidentally-on-purpose forgetting that the colours in these Homeric passages are flowers and clothes, rather than the make-up implied by *ἐντετριμμένην*, a word used specifically of cosmetics.³²

Aphrodite herself then responds by attacking Athena for wearing her helmet and thereby frightening Paris; she tells her to remove it. Here the whole situation, including the detail that it is specifically the helmet's *plume* that is frightening, is a strong evocation of the famous scene in which Hector's helmet, with its *λόφος*, frightens the baby Astyanax.³³ This makes Aphrodite's objection at once a comic misappropriation of the text of Homer and a poignant anticipation of the death of Hector which will result from Paris' imminent decision – just the kind of narrative foreshadowing picked up in the final example in Σ b *Il.* 2.494 cited above.

Next Aphrodite alleges that the reason for Athena wishing to conceal her eyes with the helmet, even though it is frightening, is that they are even more terrifying. The word she uses is *γλαυκός*, another allusion to an epithet – *γλαυκῶπις* – which appears in the phrase *γλαυκώπιδι κούρη* at *Il.* 24.26, one of Aristarchus' athetised lines. She is deliberately understanding the word in a negative way: 'The word with which Homer describes the eyes of Athena had an uncomplimentary sense in Lucian's time,' writes Harmon.³⁴ Lucian and Aphrodite are exploiting this semantic uncertainty, raised by the gloss at Σ D *Il.* 1.206: 'beautiful, or else with eyes that are gleaming and striking/terrifying' (*καλή, ἢ γλαυκούς καὶ καταπληκτικούς τοὺς ὄπας ἔχουσα*).

³² LSJ s.v. *ἐντρίβω*. A possible further intertext here is Callim., *Hymn* 5.13-22, where Aphrodite's toilette contrasts with Athena's (and Hera's) lack of concern for such things, even at the Judgement of Paris (*ὄκα τὰν Ἴδα Φρὺξ ἐδίκασεν ἔριν*), because she is always beautiful. This point is made, in connection with Colluthus' version of the story, by Cadau 2015: 124.

³³ *Il.* 6.466-96, esp. 469.

³⁴ Harmon 1921: 399 n. 3, citing parallels in *Dialogues of the Courtesans* 2.1.1 and *Dialogues of the Gods* 13 Macl. = 8 vulg. Stewart (2006), 327: 'The poetic interpretation of *glaukos* implies reverberations of "odd, uncertain, uncanny"'. This Lucianic moment is a good example of the 'synchronic intertextuality' identified by Machacek 2007: 525.

A second scholium makes this plainer (Σ D *Il.* 2.166): ‘gleaming-eyed, beautiful, terrifying, or astonishing to see’ (γλαυκόφθαλμος, καλή, φοβερά, ἢ καταπληκτικὴ τὴν πρόσωπον).³⁵

There is a further irony in Lucian’s focus on this epithet in particular, since Σ T *Il.* 24.23 uses Homer’s descriptions of the goddesses’ eyes as a (not entirely convincing) way of arguing that they could not have quarrelled:

πῶς δὲ οὐκ ἄτοπον Ἀθηνᾶν, περὶ ἧς φησι “δεινὸν δὲ οἱ ὄσσε φάνθεν”, ἐρίζειν Ἀφροδίτῃ, περὶ ἧς φησι “καὶ ὄμματα μαρμαίροντα”, ὡς εἰ καὶ Ἡρακλῆς ἀγωνίζοιτο πρὸς Ἄδωνιν;

And how is it not absurd that Athena, about whom he says ‘terrible did her eyes shine’ [1.200], should quarrel with Aphrodite, about whom he says ‘and her gleaming eyes’ [3.397], as if Heracles were to compete with Adonis?

The goddesses’ combative use of epithets is thrown into relief by the conspicuous lack of guile or malicious intent when, in the presence of Hermes, Paris (presumably unconsciously) alludes to Hermes’ own regular epithet ἀργειφόντης ‘the slayer of Argus’, which, like γλαυκῶπις, appears in the group of athetised lines (*Il.* 24.24). Paris says: ‘I am sad that I can’t look at [the goddesses’ beauty] with my whole body, as Argus did’ (8: ἄχθομαι, ὅτι μὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ὡσπερ ὁ Ἄργος ὅλῳ βλέπειν δύναμαι τῷ σώματι). In a significant contrast to the goddesses, Paris fails to use this epithet’s potential for attacks on Hera or Hermes, both of which would be possible since Hermes killed Argus at Zeus’ behest in order to frustrate Hera’s plans.³⁶ But of course this does not necessarily imply any lack of education or knowledge about the story; rather, being (at this point at least) an unbiased judge and a mere terrified mortal, Paris has no reason to attack them.

But these examples nonetheless suggest Paris’ rustic simplicity, as does his wide-eyed incredulity at the very concept of stealing someone else’s wife:

ΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΗ: εἰ δὴ θέλοις, ἐγὼ σοὶ καταπράξομαι τὸν γάμον.

ΠΑΡΙΣ: πῶς φῆς; τὸν τῆς γεγαμημένης;

A.: νέος εἶ σὺ καὶ ἀγροῖκος, ἐγὼ δὲ οἶδα ὡς χρὴ τὰ τοιαῦτα δρᾶν.

Aphrodite: If you’d like I shall arrange the marriage for you.

Paris: What do you mean? Marriage with a married woman?

A.: You’re young and rustic, but I know how this sort of thing ought to be done.

Lucian, *Judgement of the Goddesses* 14

This leads on to another scholarly debate, since Paris’ rusticity is yet another issue raised in connection with the Book 24 passage. Lucian not only makes Paris a simple, uneducated rustic, but emphasises this repeatedly, with references in the following places:

1: Zeus says Paris is ‘royal’ (βασιλικός) and related to Ganymede, but otherwise ‘a simple mountain-dweller’ (ἀφελῆς καὶ ὄρειος).

³⁵ Lucian might possibly intend a reference to poor sight through glaucoma or cataracts, which ancient doctors did not clearly distinguish: Boudon-Millot 2012: 562 n. 47.

³⁶ Apollod. 2.1.3.

3: Hermes says Paris has a wife who is ‘a countrywoman and terribly mountainy’ (ἀγροΐκος ... καὶ δεινῶς ὄρειος).

4: He is referred to as ‘herdsman’ βουκόλος by Athena (and is addressed thus by Hermes in 7).

5: Paris first appears by a cave, running out from rocks, holding a crook, chasing his herd.³⁷

7-8: Paris protests that he can judge between she-goats but not ‘women who aren’t the sort to roam mountains, being so beautiful’; he says he is ‘a countryman’ (ἀγροΐκος) and ‘herdsman’ (βουκόλος), and that one of the ‘townfolk’ (ἀστικοί) would judge better.

13: Aphrodite says that Paris should not be satisfied with living in the countryside with a wife who is ‘some rustic peasant woman’ (ἀγροΐκόν τινα καὶ χωρῖτιν).

14: Aphrodite too calls him ‘countryman’ (ἀγροΐκος).

Among the various arguments in support of Aristarchus’ athetesis of the lines referring to Judgement of Paris is one based on an inconsistency between this passage and the earlier words of Paris’ older brother Hector (3.39-57) which appear to indicate that Paris was brought up as an effete, lyre-playing ἀστικός rather than a rugged countryman:

καὶ ἡ μέσσαλος σημαίνουσα τὴν ἐν ὄρει οἴκησιν, Ὀμήρου παραδεδωκότος ἐν ἄστει τεθράφθαι τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ μουσικὴν πεπαιδεῦσθαι. “οὐκ ἂν τοι χραΐσμη κίθαρις τὰ τε δῶρ’ Ἀφροδίτης, ἢ τε κόμη τό τε εἶδος”, ἃ ἐστὶν οὐδαμῶς ἀγροΐκῳ ἀρμόζοντα.

And μέσσαλος (‘inner courtyard’ / ‘farmstead’ [24.29]) means his residence on the mountain, although Homer has told us that Alexander was brought up in the city and learned μουσική: ‘Your lyre-playing and the gifts of Aphrodite will be of no help to you, nor your hairdo and your appearance’ [3.54-5], things which are not at all in harmony with being a rustic.

Scholia bT *Iliad* 24.23-30

This helps to explain why Lucian makes Hermes allude to Ganymede (already named by Zeus in the opening speech) as a pipe-player, immediately before addressing Paris, who has no musical instrument:

καὶ ὅποτε γε ἤδη ἐν τῷ ἀετῷ ἦν, συμπαριπτάμην αὐτῷ καὶ συνεκούφιζον τὸν καλόν, καὶ εἶ γε μέμνημαι, ἀπὸ ταυτησὶ τῆς πέτρας αὐτὸν ἀνήρπασεν. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἔτυχε τότε συρίζων πρὸς τὸ ποιμνιον, καταπτάμενος δὲ ὀπισθεν αὐτοῦ ὁ Ζεὺς κούφως μάλα τοῖς ὄνυξι περιβαλὼν καὶ τῷ στόματι τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ τιάραν ἔχων ἀνέφερε τὸν παῖδα τεταραγμένον καὶ τῷ τραχήλῳ ἀπεστραμμένῳ εἰς αὐτὸν ἀποβλέποντα. τότε οὖν ἐγὼ τὴν

³⁷ Zeus’ mention of Gargaron (1), and Hermes’ direction of Hera’s gaze towards Paris, ‘not at the top of the mountain, but on the side’ (5: μὴ πρὸς ἄκρῳ τῷ ὄρει, παρὰ δὲ τὴν πλευράν) could also be a polemical correction of an alternative view: contrast Strabo 13.1.51, where the Judgement happened on the mountain Alexandreia, and *Ov. Her.* 16.53-4, where Paris says that it happened in ‘a place in the middle of the valleys of wooded Ida’ (*locus in mediis nemorosae vallibus Idae*).

σύριγγα λαβών, ἀποβεβλήκει γὰρ αὐτὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ δέους – ἀλλὰ γὰρ ὁ δαιτητὴς οὕτοσι πλησίον, ὥστε προσεῖπωμεν αὐτόν. χαῖρε, ὦ βουκόλε.

And in fact when [Zeus] was in the eagle I flew with him, by his side, and helped lift the handsome chap. And if my memory serves, it was from this rock here that Zeus took him up. For at that moment he happened to be piping to his herd, and Zeus, flying down behind him, very lightly enfolded him with his talons, held in his beak the cap on the boy's head, and carried him upwards, agitated and looking at him with neck turned back. So then I took the panpipe, for he had dropped it because of his fear – but here's your umpire close by, so we can speak to him. Hello, herdsman!³⁸

Lucian, *Judgement of the Goddesses* 6

Here Paris is not playing the allegedly urban and anti-heroic lyre – but neither is he playing the bucolic pipe.³⁹ Lucian therefore seems not to be taking a position on whether Paris is educated in μουσική, but is quietly showing his awareness of the debate through the contrast with Ganymede. Similarly, when Hermes says (3) that Paris pays little attention to his countrywoman-wife (unnamed but presumably Oenone), the reader might wonder whether this hints that he is not entirely at home in the countryside.

An unequivocal allusion to Homeric exegesis comes when Lucian answers the question 'Can Homeric heroes read?'.⁴⁰ This issue is debated in the scholia, where different answers are given in relation to the story of Bellerophon. In this episode, with the phrase 'baneful signs' (σήματα λυγρά), Homer has appeared to imply that a message was communicated in writing. The scholia offer numerous explanations of the phrase, suggesting that the 'signs' are letters of the alphabet (Σ b *Il.* 6.168-9), or not writing at all but a kind of wordless comic-strip (Σ A *Il.* 6.169), or, more vaguely, 'certain signs and symbols' (σημεῖα τινὰ καὶ συμβόλαια, Σ D *Il.* 6.169) since 'the heroes do not know letters' (τοὺς γὰρ ἥρωας μὴ ἐπίστασθαι γράμματα). By contrast with the D-scholia's straightforward claim, we read in the T-scholia a strong assertion that the otherwise knowledgeable Homeric heroes must be able to read, so the 'signs' must be some form of writing:

ἄτοπον γὰρ τοὺς πᾶσαν τέχνην εὐρόντας οὐκ εἰδέναι γράμματα. τινὲς δὲ ὡς παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις ἱερὰ ζώδια, δι' ὧν δηλοῦται τὰ πράγματα.

For it is absurd if those who discovered every skill do not know letters. But some say that they are like the holy images of the Egyptians, through which things are made known.

Scholium T *Iliad* 6.168

Lucian's answer comes when he makes Hermes ask Paris to read the writing on the golden apple:

ΕΡΜΗΣ: τοῦ δὲ ἀγῶνος τὸ ἄθλον εἴση ἀναγνοὺς τὸ μῆλον.

³⁸ Hermes follows the version in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* 202-17, rather than *Il.* 20.232-5, where 'the gods' rather than Zeus take Ganymede.

³⁹ See *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* 80 with Faulkner 2008: 160-1 on the (non-)heroic implications of Anchises' lyre-playing on Ida; Paris' pipe-playing is prominent in other texts such as Eur. *IA* 573-89 and Colluthus 108-26, and his lyre makes appearances in art (Kossatz/Diessmann 1994: 186).

⁴⁰ On reading and writing in Homer see also Bassino in this volume.

ΠΑΡΙΣ: φέρ' ἴδω τί καὶ βούλεται. “ἡ καλή,” φησὶν, “λαβέτω.”

Hermes: You'll know the prize of the contest if you read the apple.

Paris: Come, let me see what meaning it has. ‘Let the beautiful one take me’, it says.

Lucian, *Judgement of the Goddesses* 7

There is no need for Hermes to do this: in his opening speech, Zeus has already explained to Hermes what the contest is about, so this information could have been passed on orally together with the other information that he gives to Paris. Instead, Hermes carefully engineers a situation where Paris successfully reads the writing, thereby solving the problem we find raised in the scholia.⁴¹ Even Paris, whose uneducated rusticity Lucian has been at such pains to emphasise, knows how to read – *a fortiori*, the other Homeric heroes must also have this skill.

But the words that he reads from the apple are not quite what we are most familiar with in modern tellings of the story. It reads not ‘For the fairest’, or ‘Let the fairest take me’, but ‘Let the fair one take me’ (ἡ καλή λαβέτω). The superlative would seem to make better sense, since the winner of the contest will necessarily have to be the most beautiful of the three goddesses. They are each καλή, so the question to be decided is about their degree of κάλλος.

A reason for this apparent oddity can again be found in ancient discussions of Homer, this time concerning a problem relating to superlatives and how to interpret them. The potential for confusion is well illustrated by a nineteenth-century joke:

‘My dearest Maria,’ wrote a recently-married husband to his wife. She wrote back, ‘Dearest, let me correct either your grammar or your morals. You address me, “My dearest Maria.” Am I to suppose you have other dear Marias?’⁴²

Superlatives can be used in either an absolute, ‘elative’ sense or a relative, true ‘superlative’ sense; Maria’s husband used ‘dearest’ as an elative (‘very dear’) in a context where Maria can interpret it as a superlative (‘most dear [of all]’), implying favourable comparison with other Marias.

A number of scholia show ancient readers wrestling with just this problem, which occurs when Homer appears to contradict himself by calling multiple characters ‘the most beautiful’.⁴³ But the scholia suggest that careful reading can solve the problem:

Σ A *Il.* 13.365a: ὅτι νῦν μὲν τὴν Κασσάνδραν “εἶδος ἀρίστην”, ἐν ἄλλοις δὲ τὴν Λαοδίκην, καὶ οὐ μάχεται.

Here [Homer calls] Cassandra ‘best / very good in appearance’, but in other places [he says the same about] Laodice [*Il.* 6.252], and does not contradict himself.

Σ bT *Il.* 13.365b: αὕτη τῶν ἀγάμων ἀρίστη, τῶν δὲ γαμηθειῶν Λαοδίκη.

⁴¹ This elegant answer to the problem recalls the ease with which even the most burning Homeric questions are easily solved when Lucian meets and questions the poet himself in *True Histories*, to the extent that he does not even need to ask whether Homer is blind, since it is obvious that he is not (2.20).

⁴² *The Illinois Farmer*, June 1863: 186.

⁴³ On this specific phenomenon see Nünlist 2009: 301-2, and the whole of chapter 15 more generally on the ancient interpretation of Homer’s use of epithets.

She is the best of the unmarried women, but Laodice [is best] of the married ones.⁴⁴

One further example has special relevance to the *Judgement of the Goddesses*, since it both involves a form of the word *καλός* and is important in another of Lucian's mini-dialogues. In the *Iliad* Homer refers to Nireus as *κάλλιστος*:

Νιρεύς, ὃς κάλλιστος ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθε
τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα·
675 ἄλλ' ἀλαπαδνὸς ἔην, παῦρος δέ οἱ εἶπετο λαός.

Nireus, the most beautiful man who came beneath Troy, of all the other Danaans after the unimpeachable son of Peleus. But he was feeble, and only a few troops followed him.

Iliad 2.673-5

The addition of line 674 narrows down the interpretation: he is only *κάλλιστος* i) of all the Danaans, ii) except for Achilles. A scholium reports Zenodotus' concerns about this description:

ἐκ τῶν τριῶν τοὺς δύο ἠθέτηκε Ζηνόδοτος, τὸν δὲ μέσον οὐδὲ ἔγραφεν, τοῦ Ὀμήρου φιλοτιμουμένου ἐν πᾶσι τὸν Ἀχιλλεῖα προτεροῦντα στῆσαι.

Of the three lines Zenodotus athetised two [673, 675], and did not write the middle line [674], since Homer aspires to set up Achilles as superior in all respects.

Scholium A *Iliad* 2.673-5

Lucian alludes to these lines in a gruesome parody of the Judgement of Paris (*Dialogues of the Dead* 30 Macl. = 25 vulg.), when the dead Nireus and Thersites appear together along with Menippus, whom they have called in as judge for a beauty contest, on the face of it a ludicrous event since Homer calls Nireus *κάλλιστος* and Thersites 'very ugly' (*Il.* 2.216: *αἴσχιτος*).⁴⁵ It is therefore a surprise that the result is a draw; but, in Menippus' words, 'Neither you [sc. Nireus] nor the other is handsome; for in Hades there is equality of honour and everyone is alike' (οὔτε σὺ οὔτε ἄλλος εὐμορφος· ἰσοτιμία γὰρ ἐν Ἅδου καὶ ὅμοιοι ἅπαντες).

Thersites has only one speech of any substance, in which he expresses his delight that Menippus cannot immediately tell who is who. In particular, he makes a snide suggestion that 'that blind Homer' (Ὀμηρος ἐκεῖνος ὁ τυφλός) was in no position to make a pronouncement on Nireus' handsomeness, which explains why it is not so outstanding as Homer had suggested.

Nireus confidently cites his own description in Homer, quoting line 673 verbatim:

ΘΕΡΣΙΤΗΣ: ὄρα δὲ σὺ, ᾧ Μένιππε, ὄντινα καὶ εὐμορφότερον ἡγήῃ.
ΝΙΡΕΥΣ: ἐμέ γε τὸν Ἀγλαΐας καὶ Χάρουπος, "ὃς κάλλιστος ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθον".

Thersites: But you, Menippus, have a look to see which you consider the more handsome.

⁴⁴ Similarly Σ A *Il.* 20.233a on a description of Ganymede: 'He uses "most beautiful" as would be appropriate for his eulogy. For he calls others "most beautiful" too.' (ὅτι, ὡς ἂν ἀρμόζη πρὸς τὸ ἐγκώμιον, τίθησι τὸ "κάλλιστος"· καὶ γὰρ ἄλλους καλλίστους λέγει.)

⁴⁵ On this dialogue see too Kim 2010: 159-60, who observes 'not only that Nireus and Thersites are Homeric characters, defined and embodied by Homer's verses, but also that they are fully conscious of that fact'.

Nireus: Me, the son of Charops and Aglaea, ‘the most beautiful man who came beneath Troy’!

Menippus ignores this, pointing out that they have not come ὑπὸ Ἴλιον now; all that matters is whether Nireus is the handsomest man who has come beneath the earth (ὑπὸ γῆν). In fact, by the criteria of the fleshless Underworld, Thersites is preferable because Nireus’ skull is fragile and not manly. This line of argument draws on another part of the Homeric description, with Menippus using the same word to describe the skull as Homer uses to describe Nireus (ἀλαπαδνός, 675).

Lucian’s Nireus is effectively entering a debate with Zenodotus here – but hardly as an impartial observer. He approves of 673, which credits him with being κάλλιστος, but would excise 675, which makes him ἀλαπαδνός. He would be happy to follow Zenodotus in removing completely line 674, which puts him as second after Achilles. He therefore partly agrees and partly disagrees with Zenodotus.

That other dialogue clearly shows Lucian’s awareness of difficulties about Homer’s beauty-related superlatives. The lack of a superlative on the golden apple should therefore be read as an allusion to this, an interpretation supported by one further piece of evidence.

At the beginning of the text, Zeus gives instructions to Hermes, including a speech that he is to report verbatim, Homeric-fashion. But Hermes makes some slight changes when he actually gives Paris these instructions (7); the parts of Zeus’ speech that Hermes actually delivers are underlined:

Ἑρμῆ, λαβὼν τουτὶ τὸ μῆλον ἄπιθι εἰς τὴν Φρυγίαν παρὰ τὸν Πριάμου παῖδα τὸν βουκόλον – νέμει δὲ τῆς Ἰδης ἐν τῷ Γαργάρῳ – καὶ λέγε πρὸς αὐτόν, ὅτι “σέ, ὦ Πάρι, κελεύει ὁ Ζεὺς, ἐπειδὴ καλὸς τε αὐτὸς εἶ καὶ σοφὸς τὰ ἐρωτικά, δικάσαι ταῖς θεαῖς, ἥτις αὐτῶν ἢ καλλίστη ἐστίν· τοῦ δὲ ἀγῶνος τὸ ἄθλον ἢ νικῶσα λαβέτω τὸ μῆλον.”

Hermes, take this apple, go off to Phrygia, to Priam’s son the herdsman – he’s using the pasture on Gargaron in the foothills of Ida – and say to him, ‘Zeus orders you, Paris, since you are beautiful yourself and wise in matters of love, to judge for the goddesses which of them is the most beautiful. And as the prize for the contest, let the winner take the apple.’

ΕΡΜΗΣ: κελεύει δέ σε δικαστὴν γενέσθαι τοῦ κάλλους αὐτῶν· “ἐπεὶ γάρ,” φησι, “καλὸς τε αὐτὸς εἶ καὶ σοφὸς τὰ ἐρωτικά, σοὶ τὴν γνώσιν ἐπιτρέπω.” τοῦ δὲ ἀγῶνος τὸ ἄθλον εἶση ἀναγνοῦς τὸ μῆλον.

ΠΑΡΙΣ: φέρ’ ἴδω τί καὶ βούλεται. “ἢ καλή,” φησὶν, “λαβέτω.”

Hermes: [Zeus] orders you to be the judge of their beauty; he says ‘since you are beautiful yourself and wise in matters of love, I entrust the decision to you.’ You’ll know the prize of the contest if you read the apple.

Paris: Come, let me see what meaning it has. ‘Let the beautiful one take me,’ it says.

As we have already seen, Lucian has made Paris read the apple to demonstrate that Homeric heroes can read. But what is Hermes’ motivation for not passing on Zeus’s words? If he is aware

of the Homeric problems about superlative beauty, just as the goddesses are aware of their Homeric epithets,⁴⁶ Hermes is staying scrupulously impartial and encouraging Paris to make the interpretation himself, just as he will leave to him the decision about nudity.⁴⁷

But there is a surprise, since Paris actually reads out the positive form of the adjective: ἡ καλὴ λαβέτω. Even as Lucian demonstrates Paris' literacy, he causes the reader to wonder about the level of this literacy; if he has bungled the reading of a fairly straightforward text, Paris is not such a good reader after all. Indeed, he is an even worse reader than the Ignorant Book Collector, who could at least read fluently, despite his lack of deeper knowledge. Here, then, Lucian is again hedging his bets: this Homeric hero *can* read, but not especially well.⁴⁸

A reader familiar with Lucian's other dialogues will recall that exactly the same wording, with the positive form of the adjective, is used in his other reference to the apple (*Dialogues of the Sea-gods* 7.1 Macl. = 5.1 vulg.), when Panope says: 'Eris threw into the feast an all-beautiful apple, completely golden, Galene. On it was written "Let the beautiful one take me".' (ἡ Ἔρις δὲ... ἐνέβαλεν ἐς τὸ συμπόσιον μῆλόν τι πάγκαλον, χρυσοῦν ὄλον, ᾧ Γαλήνη· ἐπεγέγραπτο δὲ "ἡ καλὴ λαβέτω"). Bartley's interpretation here is that the wording implies that Aphrodite – the very personification of 'beauty' if anyone is – will inevitably win the contest.⁴⁹ If this is the case, then Paris' poor reading could even be something of a Freudian slip, as he has unconsciously awarded the apple to Aphrodite already. In just the same way Panope (who may have only heard, not read, the text) has prejudged the judgement: 'No one other than Aphrodite will win, if she competes' (οὐκ ἄλλη κράτησει τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἀγωνιζομένης). By contrast, Zeus is able to preserve an Olympian detachment, having recused himself from the decision, and this allows him to read the apple without such bias.⁵⁰

I have argued that in more than ten places the text of Lucian's dialogue prompts its readers to delve into the traditions of Greek poetry and, in particular, the tradition of Homeric exegesis in order to gain access to a fuller, richer reading experience. This experience ranges from a simple awareness of the outlines of the story being parodied, through the humorous (mis)use of epic-style vocabulary and allusions to other Homeric episodes, to full-blown and longstanding academic debate about controversial interpretative issues. The text's apparent flippancy conceals its cunning deployment of serious ideas about what it means to be a truly literate reader.

In his preface to *True Histories*, Lucian initiates the reader into his approach to parody and allusion in that work, saying that it will be amenable to readers for several reasons, but for one in particular:

⁴⁶ In Colluthus, Hermes describes the apple: 'Come here and decide the more excellent beauty of face; to the fairer lady give this apple, a delightful fruit' (δεῦρο διακρίνων προφερέστερον εἶδος ὀπωπῆς / φαιδρύτερη τότε μῆλον, ἐπήρατον ἔρνος, ὀπάσσαις, 130-1). Hermes' use of these unexpected comparatives perhaps plays with the same problem as Lucian's text does.

⁴⁷ The combination of verbatim repetition and tactful omission in Hermes' speech has Homeric precedent; it is reminiscent of Odysseus' omission of the intemperate lines *Il.* 9.158-61 in his otherwise literal report of Agamemnon's speech to Achilles – cf. 9.299-306.

⁴⁸ It is likely that Lucian's point would be clearer if we had the *Cypria* and could read the text of the apple there – if indeed it was quoted.

⁴⁹ Bartley 2009: 105.

⁵⁰ I am grateful to the anonymous reader for a very helpful suggestion about the interpretation of this passage.

καὶ τῶν ἱστορουμένων ἕκαστον οὐκ ἀκωμωδῆτως ἦνικται πρὸς τινὰς τῶν παλαιῶν ποιητῶν τε καὶ συγγραφέων καὶ φιλοσόφων πολλὰ τεράστια καὶ μυθώδη συγγεγραφότων.

Each of the matters I relate hints, in a way which is not un-comic, at one or other of the ancient poets, historians and philosophers who have written many prodigious and mythical things.⁵¹

Lucian, *True Histories* 1.2

This explicit invitation to the reader can be applied to Lucian's whole oeuvre: the reader is constantly, though usually more implicitly, invited to spot 'hints' (as suggested here by the verb ἦνικται). The reader's reward for successfully doing so is an added element of amusement (οὐκ ἀκωμωδῆτως).

The level of knowledge required for Lucian's intertextual play in this dialogue argues strongly against older views about this author's 'short cuts to culture',⁵² since, although some allusions do appear on the surface to be simply rehashings of the most famous and hackneyed scenes from Homer, they are merely the point of departure for novel approaches to old questions. Part of the fun of reading this dialogue is working out just what questions Lucian is asking of the Homeric text.

My analysis therefore illustrates how well the *Judgement of the Goddesses* fits into Korenjak's tripartite typology of Imperial Greek audiences, which he divides into 'Der ungebildete Hörer', 'Der gebildete Hörer' and 'Die Experten: Sophisten und Rhetorikschüler'.⁵³ In this he follows the lead of Lucian himself, who contrasts audiences comprising the scholars (πεπαιδευμένοι) who are private readers and will keep referring back to the text, and the crowd (πληθύς) who hear the text just once at the first performance.⁵⁴

In his discussion of ancient and modern parody, Dentith singles out this dialogue for special mention as an example of Lucian's use of a parodic mode as a means of displaying his learning:

Parody here [i.e. 'in a period known as the Second Sophistic'] becomes almost a manner of learning; certainly this was a period which was very conscious of its belatedness in relation to a past golden age. ... What is perhaps remarkable is that the old Greek pantheon has survived long enough to give the demystifying spirit of parody some continued leverage.⁵⁵

⁵¹ On parody and allusion throughout *True Histories* see Georgiadou and Larmour 1988: 22-44.

⁵² e.g. Anderson 1976, from the title of which I take the quoted phrase.

⁵³ 'The uncultured listener', 'The cultured listener', and 'The experts: sophists and students of rhetoric'. Korenjak 2000: 52-65.

⁵⁴ *Apologia* 3; Korenjak 2000: 53. On Lucian's evident fascination with the oral and written mediums through which his work was disseminated, see Ní Mheallaigh 2014: 144-51. In a modern context, Gray 2006 presents an analysis of the different levels of humour that are designed to appeal to a wide range of audiences in the animated television series *The Simpsons*, which combines slapstick humour with satirical jokes and specific, detailed parodies of cultural artefacts. See especially ch. 5, 'Parody and/as interpretive community'; in Part III Gray reports on responses to the show's parody and humour by 35 viewers 'in the chaotic realm of the audience' (120), each bringing their own 'DIY cultural citizenship' consisting of their personal experience of media texts.

⁵⁵ Dentith 2000: 49.

With the abundance of Homeric allusions that I have identified, some of them obvious, some much more concealed, this dialogue is an excellent example of the lengths to which the ‘educated men’ – the *πεπαιδευμένοι* – of Lucian’s age would go to signal their learning. Furthermore, they show this off not only to the general public but also to those fellow-*πεπαιδευμένοι* who were in a position to appreciate an allusion and to understand that within it there could be lurking a further polemical allusion to well-established debate about details of the text. What makes this possible is not simply the survival of the Homeric pantheon, but also the survival of Homer’s poems themselves as artefacts considered worthy of exhaustive study, which therefore continue to be susceptible to meaningful parody even for Imperial sophistic authors.

Lucian’s use of the dialogue form has allowed him to create disarmingly informal conversations between Homeric characters, which contrast with the formal *suasoriae* and *controversiae* more often put in their mouths.⁵⁶ Furthermore, by focusing on the backstory to Helen’s abduction, he takes a sidelong approach to a character who was of special interest to the sophists. It is no accident that at the end of the dialogue Paris feels himself being overcome by Aphrodite’s power of bewitchment as he thinks about Helen, whose bewitching words were of such interest to Gorgias.

As the *Judgement of the Goddesses* demonstrates, Lucian’s versions of Homeric characters are acutely aware of their own presentation in epic, even down to the details of each other’s epithets. But this literary knowledge is wielded as a weapon, just as Lucian’s own obsessive interest in minuscule details of language gives rise to his lengthy and vitriolic attack on an unfortunate fellow-sophist in *Pseudologistes*. The Homeric expertise of Lucian’s gods brings out the contrast with the naive and uneducated Paris who is out of his depth and easily manipulated when he finds himself suddenly thrust into the world of epic and forced to find the best way to interpret the written word. By contrast, Lucian’s own readers are encouraged to feel at home in Lucian’s text: by approaching it in the manner of a set of riddles they can not only find rewarding additional readings beneath the surface but also reinforce their sense of belonging to the sophistic in-group from which an Ignorant Book Collector, whose focus is solely on a superficial kind of reading, is excluded.⁵⁷

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, G. 1976, ‘Lucian’s classics: some short cuts to culture’, *BICS* 23: 59-68.

Anderson, G. 1986, *Philostratus: Biography and Belles Lettres in the Third Century A.D.*, London.

Bartley, A. 2009, *Lucian’s Dialogi Marini*, Newcastle upon Tyne.

⁵⁶ On these see the earlier chapters in this volume.

⁵⁷ This chapter is an expanded version of material from my doctoral thesis. I am grateful to the AHRC for funding that research; to my supervisors Judith Mossman and Patrick Finglass, at the University of Nottingham, for guidance; and to my examiners Oliver Thomas and Tim Whitmarsh, for detailed comments. Earlier versions were read at the Classical Association Annual Conference in 2014, at Nottingham’s research seminar and at the Winchester conference. My thanks to those audiences for thought-provoking questions and suggestions.

- Boudon-Millot, V. 2012, 'Vision and vision disorders: Galen's physiology of sight' in Horstmanshoff, M., King, H. and Zittel, C. (eds), *Blood, Sweat and Tears: The Changing Concepts of Physiology from Antiquity into Early Modern Europe*, Leiden: 551-567.
- Bouquiaux-Simon, O. 1968, *Les lectures homériques de Lucien*, Brussels.
- Brillet-Dubois, P. 2011, 'An erotic aresteia: The *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* and its relation to the Iliadic tradition' in Faulkner, A. (ed.), *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays*, Oxford: 105-132.
- Cadau, C. 2015, *Studies in Colluthus' Abduction of Helen*, Leiden.
- Dentith, S. 2000, *Parody*, Abingdon.
- Erbse, H. 1969-88, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, 7 vols, Berlin.
- Erbse, H. 1977, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, vol. 5, Berlin.
- Furley, W. 2011, 'Homeric and un-Homeric hexameter hymns: A question of type', Faulkner, A. (ed.), *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays*, Oxford: 206-231.
- Gantz, T. 1993, *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*, Baltimore.
- Geordiadou, A. and Larmour, D. 1998, *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel True Histories: Interpretation and Commentary*, Leiden.
- Graver, M. 1995, 'Dog-Helen and Homeric insult', *CLAnt* 14: 41-61.
- Gray, J. 2006, *Watching with The Simpsons: Television, Parody, and Intertextuality*, New York-London.
- Harmon, A. 1921, *Lucian*, vol. 3, Cambridge MA.
- Householder, F. 1941, *Literary Quotation and Allusion in Lucian*, New York.
- Kim, L. 2010, *Homer between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature*, Cambridge.
- Korenjak, M. 2000, *Publikum und Redner: Ihre Interaktion in der sophistischen Rhetorik der Kaiserzeit*, Munich.
- Kossatz-Diessmann, A. 1994, 'Paridis iudicium', in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, vol.7, Zurich: 176-188.
- Machacek, G. 2007, 'Allusion', *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 122: 522-536.
- Mackie, C. J. 2013, 'Iliad 24 and the Judgement of Paris', *CQ* 63: 1-16.
- MacLeod, M. D. 1991, *Lucian: A Selection*, Warminster.
- Ní Mheallaigh, K. 2014, *Reading Fiction with Lucian: Fakes, Freaks and Hyperreality*, Cambridge.
- Nünlist, R. 2009, *The Ancient Critic at Work*, Cambridge.
- Reinhardt, K. 1938, *Das Parisurteil*. Wissenschaft und Gegenwart, vol. 11, Frankfurt.

- Richardson, N. J. 1993, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 6, *Books 21-24*, Cambridge.
- Richter, D. S. 2017, 'Lucian of Samosata', in Richter, D. S. and Johnson, W. A. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*, New York: 327-44.
- Schironi, F. 2018, *The Best of the Grammarians: Aristarchus of Samothrace on the Iliad*, Ann Arbor.
- Sistakou, E. 2011, 'Mock epic in the *Greek Anthology*', in *Homère revisité: parodie et humour dans les réécritures homériques*, Acosta-Hughes, B., Cusset, C., Durbec, Y. and Pralon, D. (eds), Besançon: 193-210.
- Stewart, S. 2006, 'The "blues" of Aratus' in *Beyond the Canon*, Harder, A., Regtuit, R. and Wakker, G. (eds), Leuven: 319-44.
- van Thiel, H. 2014, *Scholia D in Iliadem. Proecdosis aucta et correctior 2014. Secundum codices manu scriptos*, Cologne.
- West, M. L. 2003 (ed.), *Greek Epic Fragments*, Cambridge MA.
- Wright, M. 2007, 'Comedy and the Trojan War', *CQ* 57: 412-431.