This thesis is an examination of the abstract concept of nemesis together with its deity Nemesis that, with the exception of the archaeology in Chapter 4 which includes some pertinent Hellenistic material, stretches from the Archaic through to the Classical period. The thesis is organized along the lines of a chronological chapter approach which specifically avoids syncretic treatment, but adopts a diachronic analysis to reveal the development of the deity from its abstract, rather than taking as its starting point the goddess as an established cult figure of fifth-century Attika presented along thematic lines that stretch over the centuries. This has allowed me to explore and incorporate interesting nuances from different periods and genres of evidence, and make them relevant within their own time period. The evidence surrounding the development of the abstract nemesis from Homer onwards is discussed, analysed, and synthesized, together with Nemesis the deity, who was first personified by Hesiod and who went on to be worshipped at her own cult centre at Rhamnous, and elsewhere. Through the collection and extraction of what is deemed pertinent in the ancient literature, inscriptions, papyri, iconographical depictions, mythological traditions, and archaeological discoveries, I develop an interpretative argument that elucidates the phenomenon that is both nemesis and its embodiment, Nemesis, and which provides new insights into why the Greeks would worship a deity who was to epitomize retribution and punishment from the fifth century onwards. Other questions to be addressed are how and why did the concept of nemesis, as a mental state of being, i.e. an emotion lacking corporeality, become transformed into a goddess who later came to receive cult worship, and what was the nature of this worship?

From the literary evidence of the Archaic period, I conclude that the abstract concept of nemesis is Janus-like, comprising two facets that were part of the same entity. One facet of this abstract entity was concerned with overseeing
the just allocation, the ‘distribution of what is due’,\(^1\) or the deserved fate that a person is allotted at birth, as derived from the verb νέμω ‘to deal out’, ‘distribute’, from which the abstract’s name derives.\(^2\) The other facet involved the righteous punishment, indignation, or blame invoked against anyone who went beyond, or did not live up to, this allotted apportionment of fate, or who carried out a reprehensible act: punishments which logically became ‘righteous retribution’ in the Classical period. Once the abstract was deified it was then the goddess Nemesis who punished those guilty of reprehensible acts, or who had gone beyond their allocation of life’s fortune.

As individual segments, the ancient written sources, the archaeology, and the iconography can never be wholly sufficient to interpret comprehensively the social and religious thoughts surrounding both nemesis and Nemesis. Consequently, these sources have been used, wherever possible, in collaboration with each other in a way that allows each to add to and complement the other, thereby producing a more rounded synergistic exegesis. For example, Nemesis’ statue at Rhamnous is described by Pausanias as holding in her right hand a phiale adorned with Ethiopians;\(^3\) but without a corresponding iconographical representation Pausanias’ inadequate description leaves the reader to imagine how the phiale may have originally looked. Consequently, had it not been for the archaeological discovery at Panagyurishte in Bulgaria of a gold mesomphalos phiale adorned with African heads which is thought to be a copy of the one from Rhamnous, this difficulty would have persisted. Thus, archaeology and iconography have enabled Pausanias’ brief written description to be visually supplemented and posterity has the opportunity to picture Nemesis’ phiale.

With regard to iconography, the evidence from pottery is crucial. For example, the images and scenes on the Berlin amphoriskos, also known as the Heimarmene amphoriskos since it is thought to provide the only representation of this goddess, provide a pictorial dimension to supplement and enhance the established mythology, thus exemplifying a collaboration of sources. More

---

\(^1\) LSJ\(^6\) 1167, col. 1 s.v. νέμεσις.

\(^2\) LSJ\(^6\) 1167, cols 1-2 s.v. νέμω.

\(^3\) Paus. 1.33.3.
specifically, in using this vessel and others as evidence, I analyse features and interpret the constituent individual representations on each vessel, paying particular attention to the iconographic minutiae by stressing features which may not have been previously discussed or the significance of which not realised. Such an approach has enriched the understanding of Nemesis by incorporating these into a discussion which presents a wider insight into this goddess. In terms of the significance of a particular sub-set of pottery found at Rhamnous, namely the loutrophoroi, the images that adorn them have enabled me to establish a chthonic and funereal character for this goddess for at least the late seventh century and possibly earlier, whereas the literary evidence first secures this aspect of the goddess for the fifth century onwards. My thesis is the first to stress these points in English, drawing scholars’ attention to this important original aspect of the goddess.

My thesis is the first full-length treatment of N/nemesis. Studies stretching over more than one hundred years have produced a number of studies on deified personifications of abstract concepts. Despite this, a detailed analysis of N/nemesis, either as an abstraction or a personification, has, prior to the archaeological discoveries at Rhamnous, especially those under the auspices of Petrakos since the mid 1970s, proven elusive with few scholars advancing any real critical interpretational exegesis into the personification. What scholarship exists is often limited to short overviews such as is found in Nilsson who provides, without comment, two brief mentions concerning the goddess’ mythical role in Hesiod, and a remark about her appearance on the Berlin amforiskos.4 A slightly more in-depth discussion is provided by Farnell who more broadly discusses both the abstract and the personification,5 whilst Herter mainly focuses on her role as the mother of Helen.6 Foucart’s entry is limited to three lines in which he says she may sometimes be a personification, and incorrectly states she was a primitive goddess at Rhamnous.7 Hamdorf comprehensively discusses a wide range of personifications, but only briefly

More recently, the publication of the archaeological discoveries from Rhamnous combined with a renewed interest in personifications has resulted in several studies that enhance the previous scholarship. The dissertation by Kershaw examines Nemesis during the Hellenistic period with a short background discussion on the abstract concept and the goddess prior to this time to illustrate Nemesis’ reception during the Hellenistic period. Fisher’s seminal work on *hybris* discusses a variety of abstract concepts including *nemesis* where he draws out the meaning of the abstract as used in the literary sources. He goes on to discuss the relationship, if any, between *hybris* and *nemesis*, but concludes there are just two confirmed instances where such a dichotomy existed in the Classical literature. Hornum’s primary focus is Nemesis in the Roman Imperial period together with her relationship with the state and her connection to agonistic contests, for which he furnishes an extensive epigraphical and literary corpus. Included in his work is a fourteen-page chapter with documents and literary evidence for Nemesis in the Archaic and Classical periods. Parker discusses Nemesis in a general sense as part of thematic discussions to reinforce his arguments on issues such as temple building, sanctuary priestesses, and temple administration. Stafford’s book case-studies six personified abstract concepts, and presents a detailed and
comprehensive chapter on Nemesis in which she concludes that although artistic representations changed over time, the goddess’ core character remained constant. Her work is the most detailed prior to my own study, and she covers a wide range of genres, but since the subject is limited to one chapter the treatment is, of necessity, truncated. Shapiro’s study is an important analysis of the artistic representations of numerous personifications from the sixth and fifth centuries, but with such a wide range of personifications detail is limited, resulting in less than four pages on Nemesis. Smith presents a similarly themed book on the artistic representation of personifications which is supported by an extensive catalogue of document reliefs, paintings, statuary, iconography, and vase paintings. Her focus is Classical personifications of ‘civic or political phenomena’, and includes not only personified deities but also personifications of ‘things’ such as virtues, political institutions, festivals and geographical entities, and their relation to the Greek polis. An article by Schwarzmaler reports on the results of her forensic analysis of the aforementioned Berlin amphoriskos where she argues against an identification of the figure traditionally interpreted as Heimarmene. She also presents a close study of the other depicted figures, which is relevant to my own analysis of this amphoriskos. A recent article by Bonanno examines the use of nemesis in Homer where her focus is the nemesis felt by the gods towards both mortals and other gods. She sees no correlation between nemesis and divine justice nor any ‘sanctioning effects’, but rather as an emotion which ‘underlines the spheres of competence of a deity’, and for mortals as a tool which ‘instructs on the correct way to behave in a social context’. Whilst her latter statement is valid, I argue against the first since there is a link between nemesis and divine justice as well as sanctioning effects designed to temper mankind’s more violent deeds and behaviour.

---

19 D. Bonanno, ”She Suddered on Her Throne and Made High Olympus Quake.” Causes, Effects and Meanings of the Divine Nemesis in Homer,’ Mythos 9, 2014, 93-111.
The finest and most extensive archaeological scholarship is without doubt that of Petrakos and his team, who have published numerous monographs, books, and papers on their findings at Rhamnous since the commencement of the work in the mid 1970s. One which deserves to be singled out for especial mention is the indispensable two volume work by Petrakos entitled Ὅ δήμος τοῦ Ραμνοῦντος,\textsuperscript{20} which details the archaeological discoveries and provides an invaluable corpus of the hundreds of inscriptions found, beginning from the sixth century. The rest of the extensive material is too numerous to list in full here, but I have referenced the various publications throughout this thesis.

This is the current state of scholarship. Within my thesis I have acknowledged, discussed, and supplemented this previous scholarship at the relevant junctures. In addition, the reliability of the hypotheses reached by the previous scholarship is examined and, whilst cognisant of their conclusions, my thesis develops an independently reasoned approach to develop a substantive and original researched argument which reveals more completely the abstract concept of nemesis and its personification, Nemesis, together with a study of her nature, her roles and her reception at Rhamnous through the archaeological material found there. My thesis is a crucial seminal study with independent thought, analyses, interpretations, and conclusions that advances the topic to arrive at a more complete understanding.

In addition, my approach in this thesis has involved analyses of the various discussions or fleeting comments of N/nemesis in the primary sources of the Archaic and Classical periods together with an evaluation of the artistic intention behind what remains of the iconographical evidence.\textsuperscript{21} For the nemesis-words in Homer and Hesiod I indicate the extent of scholarship on the topic, before providing my own analysis of these nemesis-words which have all, for the first time, been collected into an appendix of Homeric and Hesiodic occurrences. My thesis is the first to undertake a holistic treatment of the wide spectrum of ancient sources in a variety of written and material genres.


\textsuperscript{21} An iconographical discussion on Nemesis through different time periods is found in: LIMC vi.1 Nemesis, commentary pp. 733-773, vi.2 images pp. 431-450 (P. Karanastassi).
Chapter 2 of this thesis commences with a lexical methodological analysis of Homeric *nemesis* where it was a purely abstract concept. Here its meaning equates to an emotion of ‘righteous indignation’ or ‘blame’ either towards another or as an internalized emotion of guilt at one’s own failures when connected with the fear of committing a culpable action that would result in censure. My analysis has involved all variations of Homeric forms of *nemesis* being collected, their context evaluated, and the intended meaning in each instance being determined, insofar as possible after a hiatus of *ca.* two-thousand six hundred years. The results are deliberated and are supplemented in Appendix 1 with lists of each Homeric occurrence of the different grammatical forms: the verbs νεμεσ(σ)ώ and νεμέσιζομαι, the adjective νεμεσητός, and the noun νέμεσις, together with the Loeb translation as a comparison to my own linguistic interpretations in the main body of the thesis. This appendix has proved an invaluable tool as a ready reference in convenient list form to facilitate quick and easy access to each occurrence of the word. My methodology in approaching *nemesis* in Homer through a study of the relevant vocabulary and different word combinations is a new departure in studies of *nemesis* and this methodology approach has yielded a clearer appreciation and understanding of archaic conceptions of *nemesis*. This lexicographical method reveals that Homeric *nemesis* could range in meaning from a mild sense of bashfulness through to wrathful anger, but it did not, at this stage, represent retributive punishment as such. It was also an emotion that could be experienced within oneself against oneself at behaviour enacted against a conscious knowledge of it being wrong, against societal norms, or beyond one’s allocation of place in society.

A similar linguistic analysis of Hesiod’s works is undertaken employing the same methodology, resulting in the conclusion that Hesiod employed the vocabulary of the abstract *nemesis* in a similar way to that of Homer. It was Hesiod who first personifies and deifies the abstract concept into the goddess Nemesis, and here I present a new interpretation of her moment of apotheosis. Chapter 2 concludes with a comprehensive critical analysis of Nemesis’ extended mythology as found in the *Kypria*, including the consequences of her involuntary role in Zeus’ plan for mankind, and as the mother of Helen. Such
a close-reading of the archaic authors was further employed in my examination of the writers of the classical age.

While the archaeological discoveries, for example the funereal loutrophoroi, indicate an archaic chthonic aspect of the goddess Nemesis at Rhamnous, this is not indicated in the literature of this period, but is evident in the study of the later fifth-century literary references to both Nemesis and nemesia. The chronological disparity here reflects the importance of my approach to the archaeology, and the importance of my method in not examining N/nemesis purely as a literary construct but examining the actual material evidence in conjunction with other sources of evidence. Thus, the written, archaeological, and iconographic material complement each other and validate my methodologies.

The iconographical and literary sources of the Classical period are the focus of Chapter 3. The images on the previously mentioned Berlin amphoriskos are discussed as well as those on two òons, all of which link Nemésis’ mythology in the Archaic Kypría with the Classical era. By means of a systematic analysis of the remaining fragmentary letter forms on the amphoriskos, I have determined that the identification possibilities of those whose names are lost is wider than has previously been argued in the scholarship. With regard to the written sources of this period, both the abstract concept and the goddess are viewed through the prism of the literary genres: tragedy, where she has a chthonic association, particularly in her role as the champion of the wronged dead in bringing retributive justice on their behalf, since they cannot; comedy, where Kratinos’ Nemesis presents a play full of religious satire and political ribald, although the actual target was the politician of the day, Perikles; and the historical sources, where the presence or absence of a hybris/nemesis dichotomy as cause and effect in Herodotos is discussed. The nature of the available evidence has meant that my discussions on comedy and history are reliant mainly on the literary evidence, while tragedy has the additional support of archaeology and inscriptive evidence to complement the literary sources.

The focus of Chapter 4 is the archaeological discoveries from Nemesis’ cult centre at Rhamnous in Attika, where domestic activity is evident from at least
the Mycenaean period. In this chapter I discuss not only the archaeology of the Archaic and Classical periods, but also that from the Hellenistic even though this period falls outside the chronological remit of this thesis. This has been deemed necessary due to the importance of the discoveries from this later era that provide a seamless continuity from Archaic, to Classical, to Hellenistic which all interrelate and illustrate the development of the goddess as more and more responsibilities fell within her sphere. Falling within this later period is the important festival known as the Nemeseia which had its genesis from at least the Classical period, although only fourth-century evidence is extant.

After first providing a short survey of the archaeological scholarship going back to the 1800’s with a strong focus on Petrakos’ more recent work, I then turn to interpreting important archaeological finds from Rhamnous, such as the loutrophoroi which confirm Nemesis’ chthonic nature, the sixth-century miniature votive wheel, the bronze helmet dated ca. 499 dedicated by Rhamnousians on Lemnos, as well as other iconographic material. The earliest secure attestation to the goddess Nemesis at Rhamnous is an inscribed perirrhanterion dated to the second half of the sixth century.

With regard to the votive wheel, Faraone has argued that its discovery provides evidence of a sixth-century date to associate Nemesis with retributive punishment and torture, an association not previously assigned to so early a date, and is a theory against which I argue. My analysis of this wheel commences with a study to contextualize it, something not undertaken by Faraone, by collecting examples of similar votive wheels dating to the Archaic and Classical periods from sacred sites throughout Greece and dedicated to various deities, the majority of whom have no connection to retribution or punishment. This comparative methodology of the evidence of votive wheels clearly indicates that these were relatively common votive offerings, and in fact constituted an independent genre of dedications. Nemesis was, therefore, never the sole beneficiary of such votives, and consequently the discovery of a single votive wheel at Rhamnous cannot assign a sixth-century date to her later retributive and punishing qualities. My methodological approach has been to
seek contexts – mythical, literary, iconographical, archaeological, and linguistic – for all the relevant material evidence.

I also discuss, in some detail, the remains of three main consecutive temples together with a small building or temple within the sanctuary precinct. The artefacts are closely examined and include a discussion on Nemesis’ cult statue together with the attributes of an apple branch in one hand and a phiale in the other. I have undertaken a study of the fifth-century frieze on Nemesis’ statue base and its relationship to the Trojan War story. I argue that the scene on the frieze, which includes depictions of the local heroes, Hippeus, Neanias, and Epocós, should be interpreted as allegorical representations of the horsemen of the Athenian cavalry (Ἰππεύς), the young men of the Athenian infantry (Νεανίας), and the sailors of the Athenian navy (Ἐποχος), i.e. all the Athenian armed forces, who will aid Nemesis in her defence of Attika whenever it is threatened. This interpretation has not previously been identified in the existing scholarship.

This thesis is an examination of the chronological development of the abstract concept of nemesis from an emotion of ‘righteous indignation’ in Homer, to a personified deity in Hesiod with an extended mythology in the Kypria until, in the fifth century, the term became synonymous with a sense of the divine retribution dispensed by Nemesis for those who went beyond their life’s allocation or who transgressed those areas of behaviour within the deity’s jurisdiction. Once her retributive quality was perceived to have thwarted the hybristic Persian invasionary force her renown spread and she was presented with a magnificent new temple at Rhamnous together with cult statue, temple personnel, and a festival held in her honour; privileges which signify the regard in which she was held. Nemesis had now achieved the ultimate transformation from nemesis as an abstract concept experienced by mortals and divinities, to a specific deity acting in her own persona to deliver retributive justice. Her renown spread throughout the Classical world and on into the Hellenistic and Roman where hymns sung to musical scores were written in her honour.

22 LSJ 833, col. 2 s.v. ἱππεύς (2) ‘horseman, rider, cavalryman’.
23 LSJ 1163, col. 2 s.v. νεανίας ‘young man’.
24 LSJ 677, col. 2 s.v. ἔποχος ‘mounted upon (horses, chariots, ships)’.
CHAPTER 2: THE ARCHAIC LITERARY EVIDENCE

The origins of Greek religious thought and beliefs are obscure, but the myths and stories that surrounded the divine world would have been generated and perpetuated through an interconnected complexity of oral myth which evolved and adapted over millennia.²⁵ The myths related the theogonies and genealogies of the gods, and promoted ideas of their personalities and behaviour in a way that was not only entertainment but also pedagogical. Once the written format became dominant the myths would gradually have become relatively fixed hierocracies, from where they would go on to influence poetry, epic, drama, comedy, artistic representation, even historical narratives.

Of particular interest to the study of any aspect of early Greek religion is the cache of fragmentary Mycenaean clay tablets found in ca. 1952 at Pylos, Mycenae, Knossos and Thebes. These were written in Linear B script, date to ca. 1400-1200, and provide a partial pantheon of the Mycenaean gods including familiar Olympian deities: Zeus, Poseidon, Ares, Artemis, Hermes, and Apollo (figure 1).²⁶ The tablets establish that a common core of deities

²⁵ Nagy argues that for as long as the oral tradition was still alive there was ongoing recomposition: G. Nagy, ‘Homerid Questions,’ TAPhA 122, 1992, 38, 41, 44.

²⁶ Figure 1 is a tablet from Knossos which reads: a-ta-na-po-ti-ni-ja I [e-nu-wa-ri-jo I pa-ja-wof ]po-se-da]: the first word, a-ta-na-po-ti-ni-ja, has generally been read as Athānā potnia ‘Mistress Athena’ (cf. Hom. Il. 6.305: πότνια Ἀθηνᾶ); the second word, e-nu-wa-ri-jo, as Enualios, another name for Ares; the third word, pa-ja-wof J, suggests the Homeric Paiēōn, originally Paiāwōn, and later Paiān, an alternative for Apollo; adding an ‘o’ at the end of the fourth word po-se-da] makes it Poseidāōn: J. Chadwick, The Mycenaean World, Cambridge, 1976, 88-89, fig. 37. Tablets found at Pylos record gods such as Poseidon, Zeus, Hera, Hermes and Potnia (used as an epithet for the primary goddess of a region): T. G. Palaima, ‘Sacificial Feasting in the Linear B Documents,’ Hesperia 73, no. 2, 2004, 219; J. Gulizio, K. Pluta & T. G. Palaima, ‘Religion in the Room of the Chariot Tablets,’ in R. Hägg & R. Laffineur (eds),
had existed from at least this period. Although it is not thought there were any personifications and/or deified abstract concepts on the tablets, these have been found on cuneiform tablets from the Near East; a region believed to have influenced Hellenic religious beliefs. These Near Eastern tablets record personifications such as: ‘Justice’, ‘Right Mind’, ‘Good Rule’, ‘Devotion’, ‘Prosperity’, ‘Immortality’, and ‘Discipline’, making it conceivable that such concepts may have existed as part of an early Hellenic belief system.

It was not until the eighth or seventh century that confirmed personified abstract concepts appear in the extant works of the Greek epic poets, Homer, Hesiod, and the author of the Kypria. It was these poets who were credited with influencing the cosmologies and genealogies of the ancient Greek gods.

---

Potnia: Deities and Religion in the Aegean Bronze Age, Belgium, 2001, 453-461, esp. 458-459; Burkert, Greek Religion, 43-46; M. Ventris & J. Chadwick, Documents in Mycenaean Greek, 2nd edn, Cambridge, 1973, 126, 311-312. Burkert gives Di-wet(i) as the Bronze Age version of Zeus, whose sanctuary was called the Di-wi-jo(n), and his priest was Di-wi-je-u(s); Dionysus was Di-wo-nu-so; the general term for goddess was Di-wi-ja; and the term ‘to all the gods’ was transcribed as pa-si-te-o-i (pansi theoihi, πᾶσι θεοῖς): W. Burkert, ‘From Epiphany to Cult Statue: Early Greek Theos,’ in A. B. Lloyd (ed.), What is a God? Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity, Swansea, 1997, 15-16. The similarities between the gods of the Linear B tablets and those of Homer are discussed in: B. C. Dietrich, 'From Knossos to Homer,' in A. B. Lloyd (ed.), What is a God? Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity, Swansea, 1997, 1-13.

---


28 Stafford, 'Personification in Greek Religious Thought and Practice,' 73.
Xenophanes, writing in the late sixth and early fifth century, speaks of the poems of Homer and Hesiod as having influenced Greek religious and philosophical thought over centuries: ‘From the beginning all have learned according to Homer’; while his younger contemporary, Herakleitos, states: ‘Hesiod is the teacher of most men’. 29 Herodotos, writing in the fifth century, embellishes these statements by saying it was Homer and Hesiod who were the ones responsible for formulating the written genealogies and cosmologies of the gods and providing all Greeks with their unique mythological past:

But whence each of the gods came into being, or whether they had all for ever existed, and what outward forms they had, the Greeks knew not till (so to say) a very little while ago; for I suppose that the time of Hesiod and Homer was not more than four hundred years before my own; and these are they who taught the Greeks of the descent of the gods, and gave to all their several names, and honours, and arts, and declared their outward forms. 30

Since gods of one sort or another were present in the consciousness of humanity from the very earliest times, Herodotos’ words are better interpreted as a statement that Homer and Hesiod fixed the gods into the consciousness of Greek minds by presenting the oral myths in a format that went on to dominate not only Greek but the world’s imagination to the present day. 31

29 Xenoph. DK 21 B 10: ἐξ ἀρχῆς καθ’ Ὀμηρὸν ἐπεὶ μεμαθήκοι πάντες; Herakl. DK 22 B 57: διάδοσα λόγος δὲ πλίστων Ἡσίοδος; cf. Xenoph. DK 21 B 11, 12: ‘Homer and Hesiod have attributed to the gods all that are matters of reproach and blame among men: theft, adultery, and mutual deceit’, and ‘… they sang of numerous illicit divine deeds: theft, adultery, and mutual deceit’.

30 Hdt.2.53: Ἐνθεν δὲ ἐγένοντο ἐκαστὸς τῶν θεῶν ἐτε ἀεὶ ἤσαν πάντες, ὡκοῦ τοι τινὲς τὰ ἐπιστήμην ἦν καὶ ὁ πρῶτος τὸς καὶ τὴν ἠμὲν ὡς ἠτεῖν λόγῳ. Ἡσίοδον γὰρ καὶ Ὀμηρὸν ἠλογῇ τετρακοσίων ἔτεσι δοκεῖ μετὰ πρεσβητέρους γενέσθαι καὶ ὡς πλέονν ὡς δὲ εἰσὶ οἱ ποίησαν θεογονίαν Ἑλληνικῆς τεταχθοῦ τῶν ἐπικοινωνίας ὀντες ταῦτα τοις τετέρας καὶ τετάρτας φυλάλοις καὶ ἠδοὶ αὐτῶν σημάνοντες.

31 Homer and Hesiod’s genealogies of the deities do not always correspond: Hesiodic Eris is a daughter of Night and has a host of unpleasant siblings but Ares is not one of them, but Homer’s Eris is a sister of Ares: Hes. Theog. 225; Hom. II. 4.440. Homer and Hesiod may have been influenced by their own local traditions, or perhaps they altered traditional stories for their own literary purposes, or possibly they were influenced by those genealogies, now lost, recorded by other authors. Hesiod’s genealogy is the oldest extant text, but others were attributed to Orpheus, Musaeus, Aristeas, Epimenides, Abaris, Pherecydes, Linus, Thamyris, and Palaephas. Acusilaus began his Genealogiai with a theogony, the ‘Epic Cycle’ began with one, as did the Titanomachy and Gigantomachy: West (ed.), Hesiod: Theogony, 12; cf. Hom. Hymn Herm., 4.426-433, where Hermes sings a theogony: ‘he spoke authoritatively of the immortal gods and of dark Earth, how they were born originally and how each received his portion’. Alkman’s fragmentary cosmology (with Thetis as a demiurge) provides another
The chronological relationship of these two poets is an ongoing debate with opinions varying as to whether they rightly belong in the ninth, eighth or the first half of the seventh centuries.\textsuperscript{32} The Kypria, another important Archaic text, is thought to post-date the other two. Whether Homer and Hesiod actually wrote down their poems, or whether they were simply oral bards who recounted the stories which were later written down, remains a vexed issue.\textsuperscript{33} Since Hesiod’s poems are written in the first person and he names himself as the author would suggest his poems were written down by him. What does emerge from their writing style, grammar, dialectic idiosyncrasies, and etymology is that Homer and Hesiod were most likely to have been among the first within their respective local communities of Ionia (Homer) and Boiotia (Hesiod) to have used the newly re-discovered medium of writing to record the oral traditions about the gods, the heroes, and the battles of long ago.\textsuperscript{34}


HOMER

Homer’s epic poems, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, are set in the Mycenaean Period or Greek Late Bronze Age, i.e. approximately 1250/1180, and were the *ca.* eighth or seventh century written versions of the myths and legends that surrounded the so-called Trojan War as transmuted from an older oral tradition. They narrate the capricious and manipulative deeds of the gods interwoven with the heroic exploits of the Greek and Trojan warriors.

Personifications of abstract concepts are found throughout Homer’s poems, in particular the *Iliad* but, as will be demonstrated, the concept of νέμεσις remains an abstract. To understand Homer’s use of νέμεσις-words the poems’ ethical values first require attention, since νέμεσις was part of this value system. Conversely, a world which embraced such interpretations of morality, ideals and social codes more than likely never actually existed outside the imagination of Homer and his contemporaries. In much the same way the Roman Emperor Augustus looked back to the idealism of the Roman Republic as the epitome of high moral values, or how later generations viewed the time of legendary King Arthur as an age of chivalry, I suggest Homer portrayed an idealism that appealed to his generation (and beyond) and who yearned for what they imagined was the glory of an age long past. It gave them a nostalgic link to a time of Hellenic greatness in which they believed brave men fought wars for principles of honour, personal glory, and friendship;

---


36 In this chapter on Homer I have omitted the ‘Hom.’ in references to his works, which are written simply as *Il.* or *Od.*. Homeric personifications include: *Il.* 2.2, 22: Dream (Ὅνειρος); *Il.* 4.440: Terror (Δείμων), Fear (Φόβος), Discord/Strife (Ἐρίς); *Il.* 5.740: Valour (Ἀλκή), Assault (Ἰωκή); *Il.* 14.215-217: Sexual Intercourse (Φιλότος), Desire (ἵμερος), Fond Discourse (Ὀαρίστως), Encouragement (Πάροφασις). Note that while the personifications in *Il.* 14.215-217 are written without capital letters in modern translations it is difficult to see how otherwise an image of these concepts could have been embroidered onto Aphrodite’s girdle. Burkert writes of these concepts as personifications with capital letters: W. Burkert, 'Hesiod in Context: Abstractions and Divinities in an Aegean-Eastern Koiné,' in E. Stafford & J. Herrin (eds), *Personification in the Greek World: From Antiquity to Byzantium*, Aldershot, 2005, 12. For a discussion on the difficulty of whether an abstract was purely an abstract or whether it was a personification, see: Scully, *Hesiod's Theogony*, 19-20.

it enabled them to recapture its glories – real or imagined. To them, as Mueller quotes: ‘… the present is inferior to an image of the past …’.  

**Abstract Qualities and the Homeric Hero**

With the exception of Homer’s story of Thersites, the Homeric Age was exclusively concerned with the exploits and ideology of an aristocratic elite, or ἄγαθοι. It was an era of heroes, warriors, and chieftains who lived by a warrior code of ethics and embarked on warfare for principles of honour. Its intrinsic value system was concerned with principles of ἀρετή (valour, excellence), νέμεσις (indignation, blame, censure), αἰδός (respect, shame), κλέος (fame, glory), ἀίσχος (disgrace), and τιμή (regard) which, together with valour, courage, physical strength, loyalty to friends and kinsmen, revenge, and hospitality to strangers, helped to define the ‘correct status’ for each individual, and the ‘proper order of things’ within their individual communities. As a collection, these principles were encapsulated by the

---


39 Thersites is discussed below, pp. 34–43. The word ἀριστος, of which ‘aristocrat’ is a derivative, is the superlative of ἄγαθος: *LSJ* 241, col. 1, s.v. ἄριστοκράτης; Cunliffe 55, col. 1, s.v. ἄριστος (1) ‘the most warlike or soldierly’, (2) ‘the best’ ‘pre-eminent’, (3) ‘the strongest or most powerful’, (4) ‘the highest in rank, dignity or power’; ἄγαθος: *LSJ* 4, col. 2, s.v. ἄγαθος: (1) ‘well-born, gentle’, (2) ‘brave, valiant’; Cunliffe 1, col. 2, s.v. ἄγαθος: ‘noble, warlike, soldierly, stout, skilful in flight, good and worthy’.

40 The Greek ἱρος is usually translated as ‘hero’, but in Homer can also mean ‘warrior’ – the one connected with and interchangeable with the other, as in: *Il. 7*.452–453: τοῦ δ’ ἐπιλήσοντο τ’ ἐγό καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων ἱρός Λαομένου πολίσσαμον ἀθλήσαντες (‘men will forget the wall that I and Phoebus Apollo toiled over making for the warrior/hero Laomedon’). ἱρος is used for ‘warrior’ extensively throughout Homer, e.g: *Od. 6*.303; *Il. 1*.4, 102; 2*.844; 23*.824. Cunliffe 183, col. 2, s.v. ἱρος; *LSJ* 778, col. 2, s.v. ἱρος.

41 Honour was paramount to the Homeric hero and was a central theme in the *Iliad*: it was because of honour that the Greek fleet set out against Troy to reclaim Helen; it was because of honour that Agamemnon took Briseis from Achilles; and it was a sense of his honour being slighted that caused Achilles to withdraw from the fighting. This warrior code of ethics primarily concerned the aristocratic ἄγαθοι: van Wees, *The Homeric Way of War*, 1-18, 131-155; cf. Mueller, *The Iliad*, 4, who speaks of a ‘warrior code’ that is found in many societies.

42 Cunliffe 53, col. 2, s.v. ἀρετή: (1) ‘manliness, valour, prowess’, (2) ‘excellence’, (3) ‘good, credible, serviceable qualities or character’, (4) ‘skill in manly exercises or pursuits’, (5) ‘majesty, dignity, rank’; Cunliffe 277, col. 1, s.v. νέμεσις: ‘righteous indignation or vexation, blame, censure, reproach’; Cunliffe 10, col. 2, s.v. αἰδός: ‘reverence, respect, regard’, (2) ‘sensitivity to the opinion of others, fear of what others may think or say, shame’; Cunliffe 229, col. 1, s.v. κλέος: (2) ‘good report or repute, fame, glory, honour, high reputation for skill in something, famous deeds, high achievements, notable conduct’; Cunliffe 14, col. 2, s.v. αίσχος: ‘shame, disgrace, a cause or occasion of shame or disgrace’, in plural ‘shameful deeds’; Cunliffe 383, col. 2, s.v. τιμή: (2) ‘the value or estimation in which a person is held, position in a scale of honour, estimation, regard’.

abstract concept of θέμις (a body of traditional rules that have been set in place) and δίκη (custom).44

This warrior or Homeric code of ethics was especially evident on the battle field where the emphasis, aside from victory, was the glory, military prowess, and bravery of the individual warrior. By successfully living up to this code and constantly striving for excellence the warrior demonstrated his ἀρετή, increased his κλέος and his τιμή; anything less would be cause for νέμεσις.45 Sarpedon’s speech to Glaukos emphasizes these principles as driving forces: why is it, he asks, that in Lykia he and Glaukos are given the best of food, possessions, estates of land, and revered as gods?46 The answer indicates it is on account of their peoples’ expectations of glorious exploits full of those traits associated with the quality of ἐσθλός – nobility, bravery, and supreme fighting skills.47 It is this which gives both him and Glaukos a greater obligation to prove their worth by making a stand and fighting amongst the foremost Lykians with such exceptional valour so that it might be said of them:

οὐ μᾶν ἀκλεέες Λυκίην κάτα κοιρανέουσιν ἥμετεροι βασιλῆς, ἔδουσί τε πίωνα μήλα οἶνόν τ’ ἐξαίτων μεληδέα: ἄλλ’ ἄρα καὶ ἵς ἐσθλή, ἐπεὶ Λυκίοις μέτα πρῶτοι σι μάχονται.48

Surely no inglorious men are these who rule in Lykia, our kings, and they eat fat sheep and drink choice wine, honey-sweet: but their might too is noble, since they fight among the foremost Lykians.

By their deeds Sarpedon and Glaukos prove their worth and meet the expectations of, and the obligations to, their people. It was through such accomplishments that warriors also looked towards their final reward – a

44 Cunliffe 187, col. 2, s.v. θέμις (1). From the aorist stem θε- of the verb τίθημι, ‘to put, set, place’: Cunliffe 382, col. 1, s.v. τίθημι. Cunliffe 95, col. 2, s.v. δίκη. An analysis of these Homeric terms is found in: N. Yamagata, Homeric Morality, Leiden, 1994, 61-87.
45 Cunliffe 277, col. 1, s.v. νέμεσις: ‘righteous indignation or vexation, blame, censure, reproach’.
46 Il. 12.310-328.
48 Il. 12.318-321.
glorious death, κλέος ἀφθιτον, and the triumph of renown in epic poetry, exemplified in Hektor’s words when he realizes he is about to die:

μὴ μὰν ἀσπουδαὶ γε καὶ ἀκλεώς ἀπολοίμην, ἄλλα μέγα ῥέξας τι καὶ ἐσσομένουςι πωθόθαι.\(^{50}\)

Not without a struggle let me die, nor ingloriously, but having done some great deed for men yet to be born to hear.

Sarpedon achieved his ‘glorious death’ by dying nobly in the midst of battle and having his deeds remembered.\(^{51}\) An Attic red-figure calyx-krater (figure 2)\(^ {52}\) depicts his fatally injured body being lifted up by Hypnos and Thanatos to be carried back to his home in Lykia.

---


\(^{50}\) Il. 22.304-305.

\(^{51}\) Il. 16.477-505.

\(^{52}\) Side A of the 45.7 cm high ‘Euphronios krater’, belonging to the Leagros Group, signed by Euxitheos (potter) and Euphronios (painter): LIMC vii Sarpedon 4 (von Bothmer); J. M. Barringer, The Art and Archaeology of Ancient Greece, Cambridge, 2015, 171-173, fig. 3.36b;
The feminine side of this Homeric code is characterized by Penelope who stood steadfast in her constancy to her husband, Odysseus. Despite accusations from her suitors, she exemplified familial loyalty, patience, and fidelity. She was the Homeric model of a heroine and the antithesis of unfaithful Klytemnestra, who broke the code through adultery and the murder of her husband, Agamemnon. Klytemnestra’s lack of ἀλήθεια, ἀδελφός, τιμή, and disregard of νέμοντας violated the principles θεμίς, resulting in Homer’s description of her as a κακή γυνή. Penelope is the only female to have her virtues described as ἄρετή by Homer. In a passage where Agamemnon’s ghost speaks to Odysseus he wistfully contrasts Penelope’s virtues to those of his own faithless wife, Clytemnestra: πολυμήχανον Ὅδυσσεός, ἣ ἄρα σὺν μεγάλῃ ἄρετή ἐκτήσατο ἄκοιτον. ὡς ἀγαθαί φρένες ἦσαν ἀμύμονι Πηνελοπείᾳ, κούρη Ἰκαρίων ὡς εἰ μέμνητον Ὅδυσσήος, ἀνδρός κουριδίου τῷ οἱ κλέος οὐ ποτ’ ὀλείται ἣ ἄρετῆς. (‘Odysseus of many devices, truly full of all excellence was the wife you won. How good of understanding was flawless Penelope, daughter of Ikarios! How well she kept before her the image of Odysseus, her wedded husband! Therefore the fame of her excellence shall never perish).

Ἀρετῆ was concerned with excellence in all things, of living up to one’s full potential, and especially pertinent to superlative masculine qualities, such as outstanding athletic ability, leadership, exceptional valour, bravery and ability in war. Unlike the term ἄγαθος (and despite Adkins’ assertion to the


Od. 2.90-92; 2.96-109: Penelope deceived the suitors with promises and messages.


55 Od. 11.384.

56 Od. 24.192-197. Cf: 2.205-6, when Eurymachos declares that they (the suitors) will continue their rivalry in Odysseus’ house in an effort to claim Penelope’s excellence (ἀρετῆ).

The Archaic Era

contrary), ἀρετή does not denote social class but is able to traverse social
groups, except slaves. This is clear in the following false tale told by
Odysseus to the swineherd Eumaios: ἐμὲ δ’ ὄντι θέκε μὴ παλαικίς …
ἡγαγόμην δὲ γυναῖκα πολυκλήρων ἀνθρώπων εἶνεκ’ ἐμῆς ἀρετῆς, ἐπει οὐκ
ἀποφῶλος ἦν οὐδὲ φυγοπτόλεμος (‘but the mother that bore me was bought,
a concubine … but I took to me a wife from a house that had wide possessions,
winning her by my ἀρετή; for I was no weakling, nor a coward in battle’). Had
Odysseus genuinely been the son of a concubine he would not have
been an ἄριστος nor an ἀγαθός yet, as the passage illustrates, he could claim a
reputable ἀρετή. Accordingly, ἀρετή was a quality that was earned.

The primary concern for an ἀγαθός was to constantly and consciously
endeavour to avoid censure and try to be seen attempting to maintain and to
increase his κλέος, ἀρετή and τιμή, since the loss of these qualities would,
according to Johnston, result in ‘social death’. Yet, despite all efforts by the
ἀγαθός, ultimately it was the gods, through their capricious and contrary
idiosyncratic whims, who could manipulate his ἀρετή and κλέος, as shown in
Aeneas’ words to Achilles: Ζεὺς δ’ ἀρετήν ἄνδρεσιν ὀφέλει τε μνήθω τε,
ὀπποῖς κεν ἐθέλησιν (‘but as for ἀρετή, it is Zeus who increases it for men or
diminishes it, just as he wishes’). On the other hand, for an ἀγαθός to reject
the principles of ἀρετή through some consciously enacted shameful deed he
would invoke the critical judgement or νέμεσις of others, as Stenger notes:
‘emotionale Reaktion … auf Handlungen anderer, die nicht den allgemeinen
moralischen Erwartungen entsprechen’ (‘an emotional reaction to the
behaviour of others who do not respond to general moral expectations’).

58 ‘Agathos and aretē also denote a social class’: Adkins, Merit and Responsibility, 36.
59 Od. 17.322-3: ‘Zeus the Thunderer takes away the half of a man’s aretē, when the day of
slavery comes upon him.’
63 Il. 20.242-243; also Od. 18.132-135.
64 J. Stenger, 'Nemesis,' in H. Cancik & H. Schneider (eds), Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der
THE HOMERIC CONCEPT OF NEMESIS

Cunliffe, in his lexicon of Homeric dialect, translates the noun νέμεσις as: (1) ‘righteous indignation or vexation, blame, censure, reproach’, (2) ‘something worthy of righteous indignation or of blame, censure or reproach’. The verb νεμεσάω he defines as: ‘to be righteously indignant or vexed, to conceive, feel or express blame or censure, utter reproach’. His definition of the verb in the middle and passive voice is: ‘to be dissatisfied or displeased with oneself’.65

The authors of the LSJ first describe the noun νέμεσις as: ‘distribution of what is due’ (the same definition they give for νέμησις).66 The LSJ authors go on to explain: ‘but in usage always retribution, esp. righteous anger aroused by injustice, not used of the gods in Hom.’. They describe the verb νεμεσάω as: to ‘feel just resentment, to be wroth at underserved good or bad fortune’, ‘to be wroth with a person or at a thing’, and in the middle and passive voice as: ‘to be displeased with oneself’, ‘feel shame’.67 These definitions show that the interpretation of nemesis can vary,68 as Cairns observes: ‘The range of nemesis is very wide; it is frequently employed in condemnation of violence or excess, and also in a number of minor social contexts, where it censures infringement of decorum. In some cases it seems to signify little more than anger, although … it always connotes anger in which the subject feels himself justified’.69

From these explanations, I would extrapolate a definition of nemesis as follows: ‘Homeric nemesis is the indignation or righteous anger felt by men or gods towards someone who consciously behaves in a manner that is, by the societal standards of the time, shameful, and which invites censure and criticism. This emotion can also be experienced towards oneself as a result of personal deeds thought worthy of blame’.

---

65 Cunliffe 277, col. 1, s.v. νέμεσις; 276-277, col. 2-1, s.v. νεμεσάω. Appendix 1 of this thesis details all 68 Homeric instances of νέμεσις-words.
66 LSJ 1167, col. 1, s.v. νέμησις.
67 LSJ 1166, col. 2, s.v. νεμεσάω.
68 Henceforth Greek words within English text will initially be written in Greek to show its form, but will then be transliterated, except when there is discussion on the Greek word itself.
The emotion can, therefore, be evoked through a variety of causes, all of which are discussed in detail below. It can result from a seemingly mild sense of personal bashfulness and social inappropriateness,\textsuperscript{70} to going beyond one’s given lot in life (exemplified by Thersites),\textsuperscript{71} to justified anger or righteous indignation where, according to Redfield: ‘a man not only feels it but feels himself correct in feeling it’,\textsuperscript{72} through to a reaction against the excesses of violence as seen in the behaviour of Penelope’s suitors, and the gods who threaten \textit{nemesis} against Achilles for his excessive violation of Hektor’s body.\textsuperscript{73} When used in the middle or passive voice the verb can be an emotion of shame directed against oneself at one’s own actions such as is experienced by Menelaos, Telemachos, and Helen (who acknowledges she is deserving of \textit{nemesis}).\textsuperscript{74} Conversely, some actions which might logically be considered worthy of \textit{nemesis} are somehow exempt when enacted under mitigating circumstances of social or personal expectations,\textsuperscript{75} such as the old men of Troy who consider there is \textit{οὐ νέμεσις} (no \textit{nemesis}) in waging war for a woman of such incomparable beauty as Helen.\textsuperscript{76}

Homeric \textit{nemesis} was potentially both a positive and a negative concept: action or behaviour that was contrary to \textit{themis} evoked \textit{nemesis} in an onlooker, caused censure, diminished the offender’s \textit{aretē}, and resulted in shame – this was its negative aspect. Such is implied in Nausicaa’s words concerning the blame an unmarried girl would receive if she consorted (\textit{μίσγηται}) with men, for indeed Nausicaa herself would blame such a girl: καὶ δ’ ἄλλῃ νεμεσᾶ, ἢ τις τοιωτά ὑμὶ, ἢ τ’ ἀέκητι φίλων πατρὸς καὶ μητρὸς ἐόντων, ἀνθράι μίσγηται, πρὶν γ’ ἀμφάδιον γάμον ἐλθείν\textsuperscript{77} (I, too, would blame another

\textsuperscript{70} Od. 4.158 detailed below: p. 46.
\textsuperscript{71} Il. 2.211-277, and discussed below: pp. 34-43.
\textsuperscript{73} The suitors: \textit{Od.} 1.228-9, 2.64, 17.481, 21.146-147 (below pp. 58-66); the gods: \textit{Il.} 24.43-54 (below pp. 50-58).
\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Il.} 17.93, below pp. 27-28 (Menelaos); \textit{Od.} 1.119, below p. 62 (Telemachos); \textit{Il.} 3.410, below p. 70 (Helen).
\textsuperscript{76} \textit{Il.} 3.156, and discussed below: pp. 67-68.
\textsuperscript{77} \textit{Od.} 6.286-288.
maiden who should do likewise, and in despite of her own father and mother, while they still live, should consort with men before the day of public marriage). To Nausicaa, her opinion of one guilty of such an act would be lessened and the person concerned would be shamed. The word μίσγηται in the passage infers something stronger than just ‘mixing’ since Nausicaa has herself already been in the company of Odysseus and his companions, and she does not seem to count that as an offence warranting censure. Consequently, μίσγηται in this context implies a sexual liaison for an unmarried girl, which would indeed invoke nemesis. Similarly, at Iliad 23.494, where the arguing Aias and Idomeneos are rebuked by Achilles who cautions them against reprehensible behaviour that they themselves would condemn in another: καὶ δ’ ἀλλω νεμεσάτων ὅτις τοιαύτα γε ῥέζων. These passages warn against doing that which would draw criticism, since the offender’s aretē would be shamed by the resultant nemesis. The positive aspect of the abstract is seen in a conscious personal desire to avoid inviting nemesis for fear of censure: it is then a subjective emotion that has a positive controlling influence. This positive controlling aspect is also evident in Pittakos of Mytilene, ca. 640-568. ὅσα νεμεσάτις τοῦ πληρίου, αὐτός μὴ ποίει (‘do not yourself do that which would be cause for nemesis in your neighbour’).

Importantly, and contrary to Munn’s assertion that nemesis ‘refers to a sense of scandal and reproach active only in a public setting’, an arousal of nemesis was not wholly dependant upon a shameful act being witnessed by another person, since it was believed that everything in the universe – the waters, the

78 LJ 446, col. 1, s.v. μίγνυμι: ‘mix, mingle’, II (2) ‘to have intercourse with’. Not in LSJ or Cunliffe.
80 Cf. a similar sense of nemesis as a judgement on others using one’s own sense of what is right and wrong as the benchmark, Od. 15.69: ἰὲμενον νόστοιο: νεμεσσῶμαι δὲ καὶ ἀλλ’.
82 Suda s.v. Pittakos (pi 1659), described as one of the seven sages and according to Fränkel his name is common to all lists of ancient sages: Arist. Pol. 1274b 19; Diod. 9.11; Strab. 13 2.3; Pl. Rep. 335e; H. Fränkel, Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy, trans. M. Hadas & J. Willis, Oxford, 1975, 239.
83 Pittakos F4 (DK 10 3 ε); Stob. Anth. Γ.1.172 ε (in: Hense vol. 3 120e). (Translation: author).
84 Also said by Thales but without nemesis, DL vol. I, 1.36: ἐὰν ἂν ὁ τοῖς ἀλλως ἐπτυμόμεν, ἀοτοί μὴ ὑπέρμεν (do not do yourself that which we blame in others). (Translation: author).
earth, the air, the trees, the mountains – were full of gods, daimones, spirits and Keres who saw and heard everything. There could never be escape from blame, for someone or something was always watching or listening.\textsuperscript{86} Sarpedon speaks of the multitude of Keres from which one can never escape: νῦν δ’ ἐμπίς γὰρ κῆρες ἐφεστάσιν θανάτου οὐρία, ἀς οὐκ ἔστι φυγεῖν βροτόν οὐδ’ ὑπαλλόξα,\textsuperscript{87} and Hesiod affirms that the earth and the sea are full of evil spirits: πλείη μὲν γὰρ γαία κακῶν, πλείη δὲ θάλασσα.\textsuperscript{88} Seventh-century Thales is quoted by Aristotle as having said: καὶ ἐν τῷ ὀλὼ δὴ τινες αὖτήν μεμίζχαι φασιν, δόθεν ἰσως καὶ Θαλῆς ὁμοθανή πάντα πλήρη θεῶν εἶναι\textsuperscript{89} (‘Some think that the soul pervades the whole universe, whence perhaps came Thales’ view that everything is full of gods’). An anonymous poet declared spirits were so plentiful that there was no room even for the air:\textsuperscript{90} τοιάδε θνητοίς κακὰ κακῶν ἀμφὶ τε κῆρες εἰλεύνται, κενεὶ δ’ εἴσσονες οὐδ’ αἰεθέρι: (‘Such woes of woes for mortal men, and round about the Keres throng close; there is no vacant pathway for the air?’)

Consequently, the guilt of doing something worthy of blame could potentially result in an internalized sense of nemesis, either because of personal shame or because of the consequential fear of knowing that some punishing god or daimon somewhere had witnessed the deed.\textsuperscript{91} This concept of an ‘all-seeing’ power later merged with other nuances of nemesis to become the personified and deified goddess Nemesis who saw everything, judged and punished.\textsuperscript{92}

\textsuperscript{87} \textit{Il}, 12.326-328.
\textsuperscript{88} Hes. \textit{WD} 101. Plutarch quotes this maxim almost verbatim: Plut. \textit{Mor.}, vol. ii, \textit{Letter of Condolence to Apollonius} 26: πλείη μὲν γαίας κακῶν, πλείη δὲ θάλασσα.
\textsuperscript{89} Arist. \textit{DA} A5, 411a8; DK 11 A 22. Thales has been connected with the phrase through his observation of the magnetic force of a lodestone which can move iron filings around at will if they have a life-force of their own: G. S. Kirk, J. E. Raven & M. Schofield, \textit{The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts}, 2nd edn, Cambridge, 2002, 95-97; M. Clarke, ‘The Wisdom of Thales and the Problem of the Word ΙΕΡΟΣ,’ \textit{CQ} 45, no. 2, 1995, 297-299. Also, DL vol. i, 1.24; Arist. \textit{DA} A2, 405a19.
\textsuperscript{92} This aspect of Nemesis is discussed in detail below, pp. 109, 114, 185, cf. p. 105. Cf. \textit{Hymn to Nemesis}, lines 2, 8: ‘Nemesis, I call upon you, goddess and greatest queen, whose all-seeing
**nemesis and aidōs**

The safety-net which kept one within the bounds of socially acceptable standards of behaviour and averted nemesis, was one’s personal sense of αἰδοῖς. The *LSJ* authors define αἰδοῖς: (1) ‘as a moral feeling, reverence, awe, respect for the feeling or opinion of others or for one’s own conscience, and so shame, self-respect, sense of honour’; (2) ‘regard for others, respect, reverence’, ‘regard for the helpless, compassion’; II: ‘that which causes shame or respect, dignity’. To these interpretations Cunliffe adds: (1) ‘fear of what others may think or say’; (4) ‘sense of propriety’, ‘delicacy’, ‘shamefacedness’. Aidōs was, therefore, a positive concept in that an awareness of, and a sensitivity to it and its sanction nemesis produced an inhibiting influence which enforced a mode of behaviour that avoided stepping outside the bounds of appropriateness.

Since aidōs and nemesis can both be construed as a sense of shame, interpretational nuances can be subtle. Leaf saw the concept of nemesis as objective and expressed by the indignation of others, with aidōs as the shame felt by the offender and so subjective. Murray gives a short, yet clear, explanation of their differences: ‘aidōs is what you feel about an act of your own: nemesis is what you feel for an act of another. Or, most often, it is what you imagine others will feel about you’. Scott interprets the use of nemesis as acting partly as a sanction enforcing aidōs, while Dickie explains: ‘nemesis is the indignation which men or gods feel when they observe unrighteous conduct’. Redfield calls aidōs and nemesis ‘a reflexive pair’; and, ‘the inner and outer aspects of the same thing’, such that personal failures of aidōs provoke the nemesis of others and ‘the nemesis of others evokes aidōs eye looks upon the lives of man’s many races’: A. N. Athanassakis & B. F. Wolkow, *The Orphic Hymns*, Baltimore, 2013, 50, Hymn 61.

---

93 *LSJ* 36, col. 2, s.v. αἰδοῖς; Cunliffe 10, col. 2, s.v. αἰδοῖς, adds: ‘fear of what others may say’; sense of propriety’; ‘delicacy’, ‘shamefacedness’.


96 Scott, 'Aidos and Nemesis in the Works of Homer', 25.

97 M. W. Dickie, 'Dike as a moral term in Homer and Hesiod,' *CPh* 73, no. 2, 1978, 93-94.
in oneself’. Konstan expresses *nemesis* and *aidōs* as the external and internal responses to a violation of customary rules.\(^9^9\) To Fränkel, *aidōs* and *nemesis* are the positive and negative elements of justice.\(^1^0^0\) Turpin defines *aidōs* as: ‘*dans l’usage courant, un ordre des conduites «honorable» dont le non-respect peut provoquer une réaction d’indignation exprimée par l’autre terme, *νέμεσις*’ (‘in common usage, an order of “honourable” conduct, a breach of which can cause a reaction of indignation expressed by another term, *νέμεσις*’).\(^1^0^1\) Stanford adds a touch or humour by explaining *nemesis* and *aidōs* as two complimentary qualities that restrained the fierce self-centred heroes.\(^1^0^2\) Cairns, in his exhaustive study on *aidōs*, defines the emotion as: ‘let *aidōs* be an inhibitory emotion based on sensitivity to and protectiveness of one’s self-image, and let the verb *aideomai* convey a recognition that one’s self-image is vulnerable in some way.’\(^1^0^3\) Cairns further explains that although *aidōs* is often translated into English as ‘shame’, it is not ‘shame’ *per se* since this is a negative connotation with ‘guilt’ associations;\(^1^0^4\) rather *aidōs* is a positive force that inhibits negative behaviour.

With these interpretations in mind, and from an analysis of the ancient sources to be discussed, I propose the following explanation of *nemesis* and *aidōs*: ‘Homeritic *nemesis* is the indignation or righteous anger felt by men or gods towards someone who consciously behaves in a manner that is, by the societal standards of the time, shameful, and which invites censure and criticism. This emotion can also be experienced towards oneself as a result of personal deeds thought worthy of blame. Conversely, respect for *aidōs* is an inhibiting emotion that keeps one within the bounds of socially acceptable standards by

---


100 Fränkel, *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, 531, Index A [5.6-1.1].

101 J.-C. Turpin, ‘L’expression *αἰδώς καὶ νέμεσιν* et les “actes de langage”,’ *REG* 93, 1980, 352, also his discussion on the two terms in combination: 352-367. (Translation: author.)


103 Cairns, *Aidos*, 2; see his further discussion on this topic at: 51-54, 56, 84-86, 98.

104 Cairns, *Aidos*, 14-26, 98.
strengthening resolve to adhere to those values epitomized by *themis* for fear of loss of *kleos* and *aretē*, and cautions against committing a discredible deed lest one arouse *nemesis*, either in one’s self or in another. Consequently, *aidōs* is an objective emotion, but *nemesis* can be both objective and subjective.’

This relationship between *aidōs* and *nemesis* is seen in Poseidon’s fiery words to the Achaians: ἀλλ’ ἐν φρεσὶ θάςθε ἐκαστὸς οἴδοκαὶ νέμεσιν105 (‘but place into your hearts, each of you, (a fear of) shame (in yourselves) and reproach (from others)’. Poseidon’s objective was to bully the Achaians into fighting, which is doubly emphasized when he also calls them ‘weaklings’ (ὦ πέπονες).

Correspondingly, Telemachos explains that it was *aidōs* (personal shame) and *nemesis* (indignation/blame from others) that prevents him from sending his mother away to her father’s house: αἰδέμαι δ’ ἀέκουσαν ἀπὸ μεγάροι δięσθαι μύθῳ ἀναγκαῖῳ, and νέμεσις δὲ μοι ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐσσεται106 (‘but I am ashamed to drive her forth from the hall against her will by a word of compulsion’, and ‘since I shall have blame, too, from men’).

The concern for publically maintaining one’s *kleos* and *aretē*, and the fear of being thought to lack personal *aidōs* and respect for *nemesis*, is seen in the following predicament facing Menelaos, which simultaneously draws out the fine line between one’s duty and one’s self-interest in the face of fear:

ὂ μοι ἔγών, εἰ μὲν κε λίπω κάτα τεύχεα καλά
Πάτροκλόν θ’, δς κεῖται ἐμῆς ἕνεκ’ ἐνθάδε τιμῆς,
μὴ τίς μοι Δαναών νέμεσιςτει, δς κεν ἰδέται
εἰ δὲ κεν Ἐκτορι μοῦνος ἐὼν καὶ Τροσὶ μάχομαι
αιδοθεῖς …107

Ah me! If I leave behind the exquisite armour, and Patroklos, who lies here because of my honour, I fear that some of the Danaans may hold me blameworthy, whoever sees it. But if from a sense of shame I do battle alone with Hektor and the Trojans …

Menelaos’ dilemma involves either following his natural instinct and arousing *nemesis* for retreating and leaving Patroklos’ body and armour behind (the

106 *Od.* 20.343-344; 2.136-137.
107 *Il.* 17.91-95, (translation: author.)
Trojans would abuse the body and the armour would represent a trophy), or to heed his personal internal sense of *aidōs* and *nemesis* and fight for Patroklos’ body. Cairns describes Menelaos’ mental wrestle as *aidōs* anticipating and attempting to prevent *nemesis*, if only he will listen to it. In his self-conscious dilemma Menelaos vainly tries to rationalize his options by saying to himself that since Hektor has divine help surely none would feel *nemesis* against him if he retreats and leaves the body. If Menelaos were to flee he would fail his *aretē*-standards and would be seen as exhibiting cowardice; he will be haunted by his failure of *aidōs*; and, he will have *nemesis* within himself and from others. Ultimately, his sense of *aidōs* prevails and his *time* and *kleos* remain intact. Such was the power of *aidōs* and *nemesis* on the psyche of the *agathoi* that even Menelaos feared losing the respect of others.

Similarly, purposefully avoiding danger would invariably evoke *nemesis*. In the following passage Agamemnon, whose personal desire is to flee, demonstrates a lack of *aidōs* (implied) and argues against *nemesis* by saying that to do so would mean living to fight another day:

> For it is *οὐ νέμεσις* to flee from ruin, even by night. Better it is if one flees from ruin and escapes than if he be taken.
> Then with an angry glance Odysseus of many wiles addressed him: ‘Son of Atreus, what a word has escaped the barrier of your teeth! Accursed man, I wish that you were in command of some other, inglorious army, and not king over us, to whom Zeus has given, from youth right up to age, to wind the skein of gruesome wars till we perish, every man of us’.

---

109 The Homeric ideal was to die *καλὸς θάνατος*, 'a beautiful death’, with eternal glory, but to defile a body was to deprive it of this. See, Vernant: ‘It is no longer enough to triumph in a lawful duel, to confirm one’s own *aretē* over another’s; with the opponent dead, one attacks his corpse, as a predator does its prey’, which deprives the body of all honour and makes it ugly and not whole: Vernant, 'A “Beautiful Death” and the Disfigured Corpse in Homeric Epic,’ 332-333. For *agathoi* to make no attempt at recovery represented a failure of their *aretē*-standards resulting in a personal sense of *aidōs* and an evocation of *nemesis* from others.
112 Il. 14.80-102: οὐ γὰρ τὶς νεμέσεις φυγένει κακὸν, οὐδ’ ἀνὰ νόκτα. Δέλτερον δὲ φεύγων προφύγη κακὸν ἥ Άλλοι. Τὸν δ’ ἄρ’ ὑπόδρα ἢδ’ προσήφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσείς· ‘Ατρείδη, ποίον σε ἐπὸς φυγεν ἢρκας ὀδόντων· οὐλόμεν’, αὖθ’ ὄφειλές ἀνικέλου στρατεύ άλλον.
Agamemnon’s argument of withdrawing to gain a future military advantage is contemptuously rejected by Odysseus, who sees Agamemnon’s proposal as nothing more than a breach of his aretē-standards and deserving of nemesis.

Figure 3 depicts Aias demonstrating right-thinking aidōs, despite the dangers of the battle-field, as he retrieves Achilles’ body so it can be given the customary rites, and to prevent it from being abused by the Trojans.114 Reprehensible actions or behaviour which would cause a sense of aidōs in a person at performing will result in an evocation of nemesis towards that person by anyone who observes the action or behaviour. The consequence would be the latter’s opinion of the former being lessened, and the former experiencing a feeling of ‘loss of face’ from the latter’s indignation, condemnation and judgement, or nemesis. It is this fear of being shamed, censured, thought ‘lesser’, and thereby not living up to the expectation of one’s aretē, that drives the Homeric hero to avoid those situations or actions which might invoke a feeling of nemesis in man or god against him – although the degree to which this emotion should be interpreted as some sort of personal ‘conscience’ felt by the Homeric heroes is arbitrary.115

114 Painted by Kleitias: ABV 76.1, 682; Beazley Archive no. 300000; Woodford, Images of Myths in Classical Antiquity, 76 fig. 50, 191 fig. 152; S. Woodford & M. Loudon, “Two Trojan Themes: The Iconography of Ajax carrying the body of Achilles and of Aeneas carrying Anchises in Black-Figure Vase Painting,” AJA 84, no. 1, 1980, 26, pl. 3.3; B. Cohen, “Polyxena’s Dropped Hydria: The Epic Cycle and the Iconography of Gravity,” in A. Avramidou & D. Demetriou (eds), Approaching the Ancient Artifact: Representation, Narrative, and Function, Berlin, 2014, 21 fig. 2.

115 Cairns sees a relationship between ‘aidōs’ and ‘conscience’: ‘Aidōs, then, is, or perhaps better springs from, an internal state of conscience which is based on internal standards and an awareness of the values of society; these standards will have become internal to the individual precisely because of their uniformity and of the power of popular opinion to enforce them, and

---

σημαίνειν, μηδ’ ἄμμιν ἀνασάμεν, ὡσιν ἄρα Ζεύς ἐκ νεότητος ἐδωκε καὶ ἐς γῆρας τολμέων ἄργαλός πολέμους, ὠφει φθορίῳ ἔκκαστος.

Figure 3: Aias carrying the body of Achilles from the battlefield; Attic black-figure volute krater; ca. 570-560; Museo Archeologico Florence 4209 (source: Cohen).
Fearing *aidōs* and *nemesis*, and failing one’s personal standards of *aretē* could even be an emotion greater than death itself, as exemplified by Hektor’s mental wrestle immediately before the climax of his final battle with Achilles:

> ὧ μοι ἔγών, εἴ μὲν κε πῦλας καὶ τείχεα δῶο, 99
> Πουλυδάμας μοι πρώτος ἐλεγχείην ἀναθήμει, 100
> ὡς μ’ ἐκέλευσε Τροσί ποτὶ πτόλιν ἡγήσασθαι 101
> νύχθ’ ὑπὸ τήνδ’ ὁλοίην, ὅτε τ’ ὀρετο δῶος Ἀχιλλέες, 102
> ἄλλ’ ἔγω οὐ πλῆθος’ ἢ τ’ ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον ἤχν. 103
> νῦν δ’ ἔπει ὀλέσα λαὸν ἀτασθαλίσθην ἐμήσιν, 104
> αἰδόσμα λατάς καὶ Τρομάδας ἐκλεσιπέλους, 105
> μὴ ποτὲ τις εἴησθι κακότερος ἄλλος ἐμείο’ 106
> Ἐκτὸς ἢξι βῆσι τεῦχας ὀλέσα λαὸν’. 107
> ὡς ἔρευσιν’ εμοῖ δὲ τότ’ ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον ἐχι 108
> ἄνθην ἢ Ἀχιλῆας κατακτεῖναντα νέσασθαί, 109
> ἧ κεν αὐτῷ ὀλέσθαι ἔκκλειδις πρὸ ἄλλῃς.’ 110
> … βέλτερον αὐτ’ ἐριὸν ἐξυνέλαυνεν ὅτι τάχιστα’ 111
> εἶσομέν όπποτέρω κεν Ὀλυμπιος εἶχος ὅρεξ. 130
> … μὴ μᾶν ἀσποῦντ’ ὑνὶ κακελείως ἀπολοίμην, 304
> ἄλλα μέγα ἐξέτας τι καὶ ἐσσομένοις πυθέσθαι. 305

Ah me, if I go inside the gates and the walls, Polydamas will be the first to put reproach on me, since he told me to lead the Trojans to the city during that fatal night when noble Achilles rose up. But I did not listen – surely it would have been far better! But now, since I have brought the army to ruin through my blind folly, I feel *aidōs* before the Trojans and the Trojan’s wives with trailing robes, lest perhaps some other, baser than I, may say: ‘Hektor trusting in his own might, brought ruin on the Trojans to the city during that fatal night when noble Achilles rose up. But I did not listen – surely it would have been far better! But now, since I have brought the army to ruin through my blind folly, I feel *aidōs* before the Trojans and the Trojan’s wives with trailing robes, lest perhaps some other, baser than I, may say: ‘Hektor trusting in his own might, brought ruin on the city.

... It would be better to clash in strife as quickly as possible; let us know to which of us the Olympian will grant glory.

... Not without a struggle let me die, nor ingloriously, but having done some great deed for men yet to be born to hear.

Although *nemesis* is not used in the passage it is implicit in the word *ἐλεγχείη* (shame, disgrace, reproach from others). Like Menelaos before him, Hektor’s dilemma is whether to flee or to stand, and his quandary reveals the power of the controlling duo, *nemesis* and *aidōs*. Hektor’s overriding concern is what even the women of Troy will say of him, and those lowly κακότερος – that

will have been imparted early in the process of socialization.’ Also, ‘So while the operation of *aidōs* in Homer does presuppose a minimal sort of conscience, this does not coincide with our concept of conscience’: Cairns, *Aidos*, 144-145; cf. Redfield who argues that a concept of conscience is post-Homeric: Redfield, *Nature and Culture in the Iliad*, 116.

116 II. 22.99-110.
individuals such as these should have *nemesis* for him is to Hektor an untenable situation. His words: ἐμοὶ δὲ τὸτ’ ἄν πολὸν κέρδιον εἴῃ ἀντὶν ἡ Ἀχιλῆα κατακτεῖνα τὲ νέεσθαι, ἥ κεν αὐτῷ ὀλέσθαι ἐνεκλειδίως πρὸ πόλης (‘but for me it would be far better to meet Achilles man to man and slay him and so return home, or myself perish gloriously before the city’), reveal that his sense of personal *aretē*, his fear of *aidōs* and *nemesis*, and his dread of what people will think of him, his *time*, his *aretē*, and his *kleos*, are of a greater concern to him than any fear of death. Yet, although the opinion of others was important to Hektor, it was his *kleos* that was closest to his heart. This is brought out at the end of the passage at line 110: ‘or myself perish gloriously before the city’; later at line 130 where he says: (‘that we might see to which of us the Olympian will grant glory’), and; significantly towards the end of his speech at lines 304-305 where he asks that he not die without glory (ἀκλειδιῶς ἀπολοίμην). For Hektor, death was acceptable so long as it came with glory.

Hektor would have learnt since childhood to live up to his full potential, to be one of the most prominent, to strive for excellence, and to win glory. This meant holding on to the values represented by *themis*, to have respect for the inhibiting strength of personal *aidōs* and to fear *nemesis* from others. Although the abstract is not used, the following passage implies *nemesis* in Hektor’s desire to avoid shame within himself and being thought a κακός (here ‘coward’) or one who wants to ἀλύσκω (shirk, shun, skulk) from the fighting:

> ἀλλὰ μᾶλ’ αἰνῶς αἰδέσωμι Τρῶικαὶ Τριφῶδας ἔλκεσπέπλους,
> αἱ κε κακὸς ὡς νόσφιν ἀλυσκάξα γολέμοι·
> οὐδὲ με θυμὸς ἄνωγεν, ἐπεὶ μάθον ἐμμενεν ἐσθλὸς·
> αἰεὶ καὶ πρῶτοισι·
> ἀρνύμενος πατρὸς τε μέγα κλέος ἦ’, ἐμὼν αὐτοῦ.

But I dreadfully feel shame before the Trojans, and the Trojans’ wives with trailing robes, if like a coward I skulk apart from battle. Nor does my spirit command it, since I have learnt to

---


118 Cunliffe 350, col. 1, s.v. πρῶτος: (4. b) ‘the most prominent in some sphere of activity; c) ‘the first in social rank’, ‘the leading men’; d) ‘the most distinguished’, ‘the first’.

119 Il. 6.441-446.
excel always and to fight among the foremost Trojans, striving to win great glory for my father and myself.

Again, it is a desire for personal excellence and glory on the battlefield that are greater concerns to Hektor than the preservation of his life without these.

The fear of being thought lacking in personal aidōs and evoking nemesis from others were potent tools which are seen in other poets. By way of comparison, it is worth a look at the following fragmentary didactic poem by seventh-century Tyrtaios, where he tries to rouse the Lakedaimonians before battle by encouraging them to eschew cowardice, to fight valiantly in the front-lines, and not to shirk the battle by putting the older warriors in the front-lines:

\[\text{αἰσχροῦ γὰρ δῆ τοῦτο, μετὰ προμάχουσι πεσόντα κείσθαι πρόσθε νέων ἄνδρα παλαιότερον, ἢ δὴ λευκόν ἔχοντα κάρη πολλόν τε γένειον, θυμόν ἀποπνεῖοντ’ ἄλκιμον ἐν κοινῇ, αἰματόεντ’ αἰδοῖα φίλαις ἐν χερσίν ἔχοντα αἰσχρά τά γ’ ὀφθαλμοί καὶ νεμεσητὸν ἵδειν, καὶ χρόα γυμνωθέντα.}\]

For this brings shame, when an older man lies fallen among the front ranks with the young men behind him, his head already white and his beard grey, breathing out his valiant spirit in the dust, clutching in his hands his bloodied genitals – this is shameful to the eyes and evokes nemesis to see his body naked.

For ‘shame’ or ‘shameful’ Tyrtaios uses αἰσχρὸς; a word which imparts the stronger emotion of ‘shame mixed with disgrace’, appropriate in this hypothetical situation. For the sense of αἰδός note Tyrtaios’ use of its

---

120 Suda s.v. Tyrtaios (tau 1205-1206). Tyrtaios is variously described as Spartan, Athenian, or Milesian: Diod. 15.66.3 (Athenian); Suda (Lakonian or Milesian); Pl., Laws 629a-b (Athenian); Paus. 4.15.6 (Athenian then Lakonian); TT 1-8 in: J. M. Edmonds (ed.), Elegy and Iambus, vol. 1, London, 1931, 50-58; D. E. Gerber (ed.), Greek Elegaic Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC, Cambridge, MA, 1999, 25-33. Tyrtaios is noted by the Suda as one of the seven sages but, as Fränkel points out the list varied: Fränkel, Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy, 239.

121 The natural assumption for the older men to fight towards the rear is reinforced by implication in: Thuc. 5.72.3-4; Hom. Il. 22.71-76; cf. comments in: Fränkel, Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy, 155-156, nn. 10, 11.


123 LSJ' 43, col. 2, s.v. αἰσχρὸς; Cunliffe 14, col. 2, s.v. αἰσχρὸς.
neuter plural αἰδώνα, i.e. genitals. By linking αἰδώνα back to its root, αἰδώς, it can translate as ‘shameful parts’ or ‘bashful parts’, adjectives derived from αἰδώς. By extension, the customary practice of covering these parts in everyday life expresses a sense of αἰδώς, here ‘self-respect’. The emotion evoked by the scene described, were it to happen, would be a true sense of righteous indignation, of nemesi, towards those who could allow an old man to fight in the front ranks and to end up dead or wounded with his bloodied genitals, his self-respect, exposed, and not to have died a ‘glorious death’.

In certain contexts αἰδός can also be construed as corresponding to ‘shrinking back,’ ‘self-restraint’, or ‘modesty’; emotions inspired by respect, reverence, or perhaps even fear for some superior power or person. For example, Patroklos’ words when speaking of Achilles: αἰδόιος νεμεσητὸς ὃ με προήηκε ποθέσθαι (‘respected and to be dreaded is he who sent me out to learn’). Aidōs can also express a feeling of ‘bashfulness’ or ‘reticence’ in a youth or an inferior in the presence of one more senior either in rank, social standing, or age, evidenced when Telemachos says: αἰδός δ’ αὖ νέον ἄνδρα γερατέρον ἐξερέσθαι (‘and moreover a young man has shame to question an elder’), where aidōs is seen as ‘embarrassment’ or ‘shyness’ on the part of a youth in the presence of an older man. It is these nuanced interpretations of aidōs that can inhibit nemesi which, under normal circumstances, would have been invoked at one guilty of reprehensible behaviour. This interpretation is demonstrated when Diomedes is rebuked and chastised by Agamemnon and he naturally feels shame and embarrassment. Nevertheless, any feeling of nemesi towards Agamemnon as the cause of his humiliation is inhibited by a feeling of aidōs in the company of his basileus, and in this Diomedes demonstrates social appropriateness:

124 LSJ 36, col. 1, s.v. αἰδώνα; Cunliffe 10, col. 2, s.v. αἰδώνα.
125 Cf. Hes. WD 733-734: μηδ’ αἰδώνα γονὴ πεπαλαγμένοις ἐνὸθη οἴκου ἱστῇ ἐμπελαῖον παραφανίμενοι, ἄλλ᾽ ἀλάσθαι (‘do not reveal your genitals besmirched with intercourse near the hearth, but avoid this’).
127 Il. 11.649.
128 Od. 33.24.
129 Telemachos in the presence of Menelaos: Od. 4.158.
Thus he spoke, and mighty Diomedes did not answer anything, though he was shamed by the rebuke of the revered king … “I have no resentment for Agamemnon, shepherd of the people”.

In its relationship to aidōs Homeric nemesis operated through a voluntary code of conduct; one could choose to embrace or to ignore one’s personal sense of aidōs at the risk of evoking nemesis from others, exemplified by the shameful behaviour of Penelope’s suitors, discussed in more detail below. It would be some centuries later, ca. the fifth century, that this personal choice would be taken from the individual and any sense of aidōs would not be called into action since nemesis would fall under the guardianship of a goddess with this function. It would be she who would become an independent watchdog that operated by distributing punishment where she saw fit, regardless of any individual qualms about personal behaviour, an aspect discussed below.

**nemesis and the common man**

Thersites was one of those who chose to ignore any personal sense of aidōs whilst in the presence of elders or superiors, and who had a unique

---

130 Il. 4.401-402, 413, (translation: author). Although Diomedes overlooks Agamemnon’s reproach at this juncture for the reason mentioned, he later rebukes Agamemnon when the latter shows signs of mental weakness: Il. 9.32-7.

131 In the sub-chapter: nemesis and the Suitors on pp. 58-66.


connection with *nemesis*. He is described as the ugliest man to come to Troy: ‘Ugly was he beyond all men who came to Ilios: he was bandy-legged and lame in one foot, and his shoulders were rounded, hunching together over his chest, and above them his head was pointed, and a scant stubble grew on it’.\(^{134}\)

His deformities and ugliness are matched by his vile mind and behaviour. Indeed, his contemptible language and conduct towards superiors seemingly knows no bounds as he publically vilifies Agamemnon in the assembly.\(^{135}\)

There is no introspective *aidōs* in Thersites, and even his name represents that which is objectionable as it probably derives from *theros* (θέρσος), appropriately translating as ‘over-confidence’ or ‘audacity’.\(^{136}\)

Thersites’ ugliness, deformities, and behaviour,\(^{137}\) are forcefully emphasized as a potent contrast to the Homeric ideal of the physical and spiritual beauty of the Homeric *agathos* who aspires to achieve perfection in *aretē*, *time*, *aischros*, and *kleos*, and who is ever mindful of *aidōs* and *nemesis*. Thersites represents all that was ugly in the Homeric world both physically and psychologically, and his presence acts as a foil to underscore those Homeric opposites: beauty epitomized by the Iliadic warrior versus ugliness in its basest ignoble form. He is a pictorial statement that anything or anyone that does not exhibit excellence of mind or body is sordid, with Whitman describing Thersites as: ‘the aristocratic ideology: Adkins, *Merit and Responsibility*, 34, 173; a scapegoat: Murray, *The Rise of the Greek Epic*, 212-214.

\(^{134}\) Il. 2.216-219: ἀσχίστος δὲ ἀνήρ ὑπὸ Ἰλιῶν ὤψε: φολκός ἦν, χολὸς δ’ ἔτερον πόδα· τὸ δὲ οἷον κυρίον ἑκάτερον συνοχωκότε: αὐτὸ ὑπέρθε φοξὸς ἡν κεφαλῆν, ψευδὴ δ’ ἐπενίνυθε λάχνη: cf. Lykop. 1000, where Thersites is described as: πιθηκομόρφῳ πότμον Ἀιτωλῶ φηόρῳ (‘death to the ape-formed Aetolian pest’).


\(^{137}\) Kirk comments that Thersites is ‘a monstrosity by heroic standards’: Kirk, *The *Iliad*: A Commentary*, 140.
incarnation of the ugly truth’, and Jaeger as: ‘the only true malicious caricature in the whole of Homer’, and as: a ‘vulgar and hideous agitator’. Thersites’ one appearance in the Iliad makes him an enigmatic creature since he is the sole orator about whom Homer provides no information as to rank, class, patrimony, or place of origin. (Homer’s omission to provide identifying information may have been deliberate – in its absence he is free to exaggerate Thersites in all his gross ugliness, both physical and mentally, without insulting any one group of people, or polis.) Usually such omissions indicate a person of low rank whose antecedents are so insignificant they are not deemed worthy of mention. Yet, Thersites speaks out in the assembly, and he insults and mocks Agamemnon to his face: surely not the actions of someone of low rank, especially if he valued his life? It is this strange behaviour which has led some to suggest Thersites was an agathos, possibly even Agamemnon’s equal. If correct, why does he sit among the common soldiers with whom he seems to share a rapport, and why do they, in turn, laugh with apparent impunity at his later misfortunes and call him a ‘scurrilous foul slanderer’ (λωβητήρα ἐπεσβόλον)? The overtly familiar and insolent manner in which they speak to Thersites is, in my opinion, an indication that he was their equal, a commoner with whom they felt free to engage in mocking banter.

When Thersites rises on his bandy and deformed frame to speak in the assembly, the speech that spews from his mouth exhibits a lack of decorum, respect or personal aidōs. He is so deficient in social propriety that he berates, ridicules, and heckles his basileus, Agamemnon, in the presence of the common soldiers. Significantly, he delivers his tirade without the authority of the speaker’s sceptre.

138 Whitman, Homer and the Heroic Tradition, 261.
141 Hom. Il. 2. 211-216, 2.270-277.
142 Il. 2.212-242.
143 The sceptre was important within the Homeric political structure. The evidence contradicts Combellack’s view that its importance was over-rated and its use limited: F. M. Combellack,
authority, but also a metaphysical representation of ‘right order’ (themis) which was given, usually by the herald, to each speaker as his authority to talk. Without this sceptre Thersites had no right to speak regardless of his rank and in doing so he violated themis both actually and metaphysically.

In his outburst Thersites’ taunts and mocks Agamemnon for his greed of spoils and his lust for young girls:

ἔχθιστος δ’ Ἀχιλῆι μάλιστ’ ἦν ἦδ’ Ὀδυσῆι
τῷ γὰρ νεικεῖσκε: τότ’ αὖτ’ Ἀγαμέμνονι δίω
δέξα κεκλήγον λέγ’ ὅνειδεα. τῷ δ’ ἀρ’ Ἀχιλοῖ
ἐκπαγόως κοτέοντο γεμέσησθεν τ’ ἐνι θυμῷ.
αὐτάρ ὁ μακρὰ βοῶν Ἀγαμέμνονα νείκει μῦθῳ
‘Αρτέμις τέο δὴ αὖτ’ ἐπιμέμφει ἤδ’ χατίσεις;
μελεῖ τοι χαλκοῦ κλίσια, πολλαι δὲ γυναῖκες
εἰσιν ἐνι κλίσις ἐξαίρεται, ἦς τοι Ἀχιλοὶ
προτίστιο δίδομεν, εὐτ’ ἄν πτολείθρον ἔλωμεν.
ἡ ἔτι καὶ χρυσοῦ ἐπιδεῦεαι, ...
ἡ γυναίκα νέην ἴνα μίσγεαι ἐν φιλότητί,
ἣν τ’ αὐτὸς ἀπονόσφι κατίσχεαι; 145

Hateful was he to Achilles above all, and to Odysseus, for those two he was in the habit of reviling, but now with shrill cries he uttered abuse against noble Agamemnon. With him were the Achaian exceeding resentful, and indignant in their hearts.

'Speakers and Scepters in Homer,' CJ 43, no. 4, 1948, 209. The sceptre’s importance is given in: Σ (A, bT) who comment on II. 23.568 (and II. 10.321, 18.505): πρὸς τούς δημιουργοῦντας ὅτι σκῆτρα ἔλαβον (‘to speak to those in the assembly the sceptre must be held’ [translation: author]); cf: Σ (A, bT) on II. 2.186, who give the same reason as to why Odysseus takes Agamemnon’s sceptre when he speaks in the assembly, since he could not have done so without it; similarly Eustathios on Od. 2.37: ‘The herald Pisenor put the sceptre into Telemachos’ hand, because it was not permissible for the kings to address the assembly otherwise’: Eust., Odysseam 1432; Cunliffe 361, col. 2, s.v. σκῆτρον: (3) ‘a staff in the custody of a herald and handed by him to one wishing to speak in an assembly in token of his right to a hearing’; Finley, The World of Odysseus, 112. Cf. Hes. Theog. 30-34, where the Muses give Hesiod a staff as authority to talk, or sing (below p. 78).

144 II. 23.566-569 describes the sceptre’s use as an instrument of authority to speak when Menelaos rose to challenge Antilochos: ‘then among them rose up also Menelaos, grieved at heart, furiously angry at Antilochos, and a herald placed the sceptre in his hand and ordered silence among the Argives’; cf. II. 2.206; Hes., Theog. 30-34: ‘and they (the Muses) plucked a σκῆτρον, a branch of luxuriant laurel, a marvel, and gave it to me; and they breathed a divine voice into me, so that I might glorify what will be and what was before’.

145 II. 2.220-233.

146 Marks uses this example to argue that Thersites’ previous behaviour of abusing Odysseus and Achilles indicates rivalry between soldiers of the same aristocratic class, i.e. each vying for supremacy: Marks, ‘The Ongoing Neikos’, 5-6. I would suggest that Homer mentioned Thersites’ previous abuses as further evidence of his disrespect for social barriers.

147 The translation is Murray’s, but see my discussion on this sentence below. p. 45, where I offer alternative translation.
what are you unhappy about this time, or what do you lack? Your huts are filled with bronze, and there are many women in your huts, chosen spoils that we Achaians give you first of all, whenever we take a city. Or do you still want gold also … or is it some young girl for you to know in love, whom you will keep apart for yourself?"

Regardless of any truth in his words, as a common soldier it was not Thersites’ place to speak out or to challenge his basileus. He could never have hoped to gain anything from such an attack nor could he have expected to escape unscathed. For not upholding the ‘correct status’ of his position within the social hierarchy, for his lack of introspective aidōs, his disregard for the nemesis of others, Thersites was thrashed by Odysseus (an act which would be unusual between peers; another indication Thersites was not the equal of Agamemnon, Odysseus, or Achilles):

So he [Odysseus] spoke, and with the sceptre struck his [Thersites] back and shoulders; and Thersites cowered down, and a big tear fell from him, and a bloody welt rose up on his back from the golden sceptre. Then he sat down, and fear came on him and, stung by pain, he wiped the tear away with a helpless look.

Here is no hero, no warrior, no agathos! Thersites cries at pain; he feels the shame of public humiliation; he presents as helpless; his lack of manliness is revealed in his tears – this is an inferior being. It is an ironical symbolism and, I believe, probably not a coincidence that Odysseus’ choice of weapon with which to punish Thersites was that symbol of authority and themis – the speaker’s sceptre. The physical symbol of themis had become an instrument of enforcement and a restorer of those concepts represented by its abstract concept ‘right order’, which were in turn made manifest as the welts on Thersites’ back through the agency of Odysseus.

148 II. 2.265-268.
149 II. 2.265. As a symbol of authority, the Homeric sceptre is today represented by an army officer’s staff, a royal sceptre, a military baton, and perhaps in the term ‘staff of office’.
There is debate as to whether τῷ at 2.222: τῷ δ’ ἄρ’ Ἀχαιοὶ ἐκπάγλος κοτέντο νεμέσσηθέν τ’ ἐνι θυμῷ (‘with him were the Achaians exceeding resentful, and indignant in their hearts’), refers to Agamemnon or to Thersites as the recipient of the Achaians’ *nemesis*, since grammatically τῷ could apply to either.¹⁵⁰ The Achaians had justification to feel resentment and anger towards Agamemnon since he had deliberately misled them into believing they were going home; he had been the cause of a deadly plague after he dishonoured the priest, Chryses;¹⁵¹ and, it was Agamemnon who, because of his quarrel with Achilles and his stubborn refusal to concede to Achilles demands over the captive girl Briseis, was the cause of Achilles and his men withdrawing from battle thereby weakening the fighting capability of the combined force resulting in a higher death toll than would otherwise have been the case. Their bitter feelings are tersely summed up by Odysseus (holding the sceptre): Ἀτρεΐδη, νῦν δὴ σε, ἀναξ, ἐθέλουσιν Ἀχαιοὶ μᾶςιν ἐλέγχοστον θέμεναι μερόπτεσσι βροτοῖσιν¹⁵² (‘son of Atreus, now truly, O king, the Achaians are minded to make you the most despised among all mortal men’).

Nevertheless, the more compelling argument is for τῷ to apply, not to Agamemnon, but to Thersites. Had Homer been speaking of the Achaians’ *nemesis* towards Agamemnon I suggest a verb more akin to ‘rage’ would have been used to better express the depth of their ongoing feelings of angst and bitterness against him, such as χόλος, μῆνις or even λύσσα.¹⁵³ Furthermore,


¹⁵¹ II 1.9-12, 25, 93-100.

¹⁵² II 2.284-285

¹⁵³ Cunliffe 420, col. 2, s.v. χόλος: (2) ‘anger’, ‘ire’, ‘wrath’, ‘rage’; 269, col. 2, s.v. μῆνις: (1) ‘wrath’, ‘ire’; 252, col. 2, s.v. λύσσα: ‘rage’, ‘fury’, ‘lust for battle’. Interestingly, Kirk argues the words in the passage are too violent to be directed against Agamemnon and therefore τῷ refers to Thersites: Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, 140. Although his conclusion is deemed correct his supporting argument is not, especially in view of the fact that the men had already
nemesis as an aorist in the passive voice (νεμέσσηθέν) indicates the Achaeans collectively felt ‘shame’ or ‘indignation’ towards either their own behaviour or a member of the group. Given the situation, had Agamemnon been their target it would not have been an emotion of the moment that was let loose, but rather an ongoing feeling of sustained resentment over a period of time warranting, not the aorist tense but the imperfect as it does for κοτέω in the same passage: τῷ δ’ ἄρ’ Ἀχιαὶ ἐκπάγλως κοτέοντο νεμέσσηθέν τ’ ἐνί θυμῷ. Homer’s use of the aorist signifies the Achaeans’ nemesis occurred at the same time as Thersites’ abuse of Agamemnon, while the imperfect κοτέω reflects their continuous feelings towards Thersites’ most of the time, i.e. he was far from liked. Despite their bitter feelings towards Agamemnon, the Achaeans’ nemesis is, in this instance, directed towards Thersites, not only for his behaviour towards a superior but also because his tirade had the dangerous potential to bring shame and punishment on them all. Their fears created a highly emotionally charged atmosphere which is relieved only when they are able to laugh and applaud the thrashing Thersites receives from Odysseus:

But the Achaeans, though they were troubled at heart, broke into merry laughter at him, and one would turn to his neighbour and say: ‘Surely Odysseus has before this performed good deeds without number as leader in good counsel and setting battle in array, but now is this deed far the best that he has performed among the Argives, since he has made this scurrilous babbler cease from his harangues. Never again, I think, will his proud spirit set him on to rail at kings with reviling words’.

been fighting for nine long years with no end in sight, in which case the ‘violence of the language’ is actually not strong enough had τῷ implied Agamemnon.

154 Cf. Seymour who sees τῷ as a reference to Agamemnon and κοτέοντο as an imperfect to express ‘a continued state of feeling’, whereas νεμέσσηθέν is an aorist because it ‘refers to the occasion which caused their anger’: T. D. Seymour, The First Three Books of Homer’s Iliad: with Introduction, Commentary and Vocabulary, Boston, 1898, 67. Seymour’s reasoning does not address the use of the passive voice for νεμέσσηθέν, which I argue is indicative of a feeling towards one of their own group, or towards themselves. Cf. Anthen who supports Seymour’s arguments for the imperfect and aorist tenses but who nevertheless judges τῷ as a reference to Thersites. C. Anthen, The First Three Books of Homer’s Iliad, New York, 1844, 210-211.

155 Cunliffe 235, col. 1, s.v. κοτέο: ‘to bear resentment, cherish wrath, be in wrath’.

156 II. 2.270-277: ὁ γὰρ θύμος τοῦ ἀντικυρέου ἀρχηγοῦ πᾶσιν ἔλεγεν· ὅταν γὰρ τὸ κρατεῖν ὅταν γὰρ τὰς ὑπούςς ἔγειρεν ἔστι υἱὸς ἦν ἀρχηγός ὑπεκύριος ἢ ἄρχον τὰς ὑπούςς ἢ ἔπεσεν ὅταν ἀνδρὸς ἔστι υἱὸς ἢ ἄρχον ἢ ἧμας ἢ ἔκτενος ἢ ἠπείθειας ἢ ἔστι υἱὸς ἢ ἅρπαξ. ἢ ἔστι υἱὸς τὸς τοῦ ἀνδρός ἡμερῶν ἢ ἔστι υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνδρός ἢ ἅρπαξ. ἢ ἔστι υἱὸς τοῦ ἀρχηγοῦ ἢ ἅρπαξ. ἢ ἔστι υἱὸς τοῦ ἀρχηγοῦ ἢ ἅρπαξ.
Thersites’ characteristics confirm the arrogance of his over-confidence: he has ‘measureless speech’ (ἀμετροεπής), ‘many disorderly words’ (ἐπεα ἄκοσμά πολλά), he is insultingly disrespectful to his superiors, and the fact that he speaks in the assembly without the authority of the sceptre demonstrates his arrogance. He is boastful by implying he is a soldier with foresight and a leader amongst his peers: ὅν κεν ἐγὼ δήσας ἀγάγω, and suggests he has captured Trojans ransomed by Agamemnon. All his boasts are unlikely to be true given his severe physical handicaps which would have rendered him a liability both to himself and to the whole Achaian contingent, and precluded him from military activities. Despite this, he alleges personal participation by using inclusive terms such as ‘we give’ (δίδομεν), ‘we seize’ (ἔλωμεν), ‘let us return’ (νεώμεθα), ‘let us leave him alone’ (ἐδομεν), ‘we defend’ (ἡμεῖς προσάμυνομεν). He tries to be ‘one of the boys’ by ingratiating himself with his fellow soldiers by humorously mocking and reviling his superiors, which he thinks increases his public persona at the expense of those whom he ridicules. In addition, he sees himself as a self-appointed spokesman in his use of the second person plural: ὦ πέπονες, κἂν ἔλέγχε, Ἀχαιῶς, οὐκέτ’ Ἀχαιοι.

At this juncture, and with his characteristics in mind, I propose a further nuance: that Thersites is more than the representation of ‘ugliness’, violator of themis, and negative epitome of the noun thersos, i.e. ‘over-confidence’, ‘reckless persistence’, ‘audacity’. I suggest Thersites is the embodiment of these abstractions and a metaphor of all that is objectionable in the conceptual demos exemplified by the collective Achaian soldiers. Such abstract negativities are usually wisely suppressed through an introspective aidōs, particularly in the presence of a superior. But, for the Achaians, their acute disappointment at having their hopes of returning home dashed is felt deeply, and their frustrated anger is let loose in an uncontrolled embodied

157 Il. 2.212, 213.
158 Il. 2.231.
159 Il. 2.228, 236, 238, 231.
160 Il. 2.235.
161 Il. 2.289-290: ‘For like little children or widow women they wail to each other in longing to return home’.
form to revile and abuse the author of their misery. The intensity of their emotions is so intense that its innate power takes on an independent and unpredictable life of its own by becoming the embodiment of Thersites, Brazen Audacity. Yet, as soon as this virago is unleashed, the Achaians realize its inappropriateness, and instantly feel *nemesis* that they were unable to control their emotions through a keener sense of *aidōs*.

This interpretation finds support in a re-examination of the grammatical structure of *νεμέσησθεν* at 2.223 as an aorist in the passive voice. In this form I conclude that the *nemesis* felt by the Achaians came upon them at a single given moment (aorist) and was directed towards behaviour of their own making or from within themselves (passive); i.e. it is the *nemesis* they intuitively feel towards their recklessly unleashed Brazen Audacity. The instant it is let loose they recognize the potential danger, so that when the highly-charged tension of the moment passes with Odysseus thrashing Thersites as Brazen Audacity, they are able to laugh and jeer with relief and thankful the punishment had not been more severe.

What excludes Thersites from humanity and separates him from the other soldiers is his ugliness, his deformities, his handicaps, his total unsuitability as a soldier, and his lack of patronym. Lack of patronym and ethnicity is unique but Thersites as a representation and embodiment of the objectionable behaviour of the common soldiers, who all come from diverse tribes, *poleis*, and regions, can have no one place of origin or one family line. He is what Stuurman, although for different reasons, describes as, ‘the allegorical representation of a cultural stereotype.’

Beauvoir, Stuurman sees in Thersites an agitator for equality of the masses and the representative of an eighth-century political crisis, in which the stirrings of a democratic mentality was emerging along with a challenge to the Homeric aristocratic values: Stuurman, ‘The Voice of Thersites’, 184, 189.

Cf. Redfield: ‘Those who are dishonourable deserve ugliness and dirt as well; Thersites, who speaks without measure or order, is appropriately ugly, lame, and deformed. Odysseus inflicts upon him an appropriate humiliation by making him bleed and cry’: Redfield, *Nature and Culture in the Iliad*, 161.
It was Thersites’ social class which sealed his punishment at Odysseus’ hands, confirmed by the impunity with which Achilles is able to abuse Agamemnon verbally in book i.\textsuperscript{164} Agamemnon’s suggestion of a retreat at \textit{Il}. 14.80-95: ό γάρ τις \textit{νεμέστις} φυγέειν κακόν, οὔδ’ ἀνά νύκτα (‘for it is no shame to flee from ruin, even by night’), is met with verbal abuse from Odysseus, which goes unpunished. Similarly, high-born Nestor is able to propose a rebuke of Menelaos, and although he suggests some may feel \textit{nemesis} for him, he speaks in the knowledge that as an equal he is free to make such comments:

\[ \text{άλλα φίλον περ ἔόντα καὶ αἴδοιον Μενέλαον νεικέσω, εἴ πέρ μοι νεμεσίσθησαι, οὔδ’ ἐπικεύσω ὡς εὐδεί, σοι δ’ οὐφ ἐπέτρεψεν πονέσθαι.}\textsuperscript{165}

But Menelaos I will reproach, dear though he is and respected, even if you should be indignant with me, nor will I hide my thought, since he is sleeping and has allowed you to toil alone.’

\[ \text{oὔτως οὔ τίς οἱ νεμεσίσται οὔδ’ ἀπιθήσαι Ἀργεῖον, ὅτε κέν τιν’ ἐπιτρύνη καὶ ἀνόγη.}\textsuperscript{166}
So will no man be indignant at him or disobey him of all the Argives, when he urges any man on and commands him.

As \textit{agathoi}, the verbal abuse meted out by Achilles, Odysseus and Nestor commits no offence against \textit{themis} or the ‘correct status’ of Homeric aristocratic society. In contrast, Thersites was no \textit{agathos} and his attack on Agamemnon violated all Homeric concepts of ‘right order’, so that the \textit{nemesis} he received was rightly earned for his lack of retrospective \textit{aidōs}.

\section*{nemesis and the thumos of man}

Abstract concepts such as \textit{nemesis} are given added strength when felt within the \textit{θυμός}; a word combination which adds potency and intensity to the emotion experienced.\textsuperscript{167} The lexicographical definition of \textit{θυμός} includes various multifaceted nuances such as: ‘soul’, ‘spirit’, ‘heart’, ‘mind’, ‘breath’,

\begin{itemize}
\item Konstan argues that the norms of socially acceptable behaviour is different between social classes: Konstan, ‘Nemesis and Phthonos,’ 77.
\item \textit{Il}. 10.114-115.
\item \textit{Il}. 10.129-130.
\end{itemize}
The Archaic Era

‘desire’, ‘will’, ‘courage’, ‘strong feeling and passion’, the seat of ‘anger’,168 ‘thought’, and the principle of ‘life’.169 This broad spectrum of definitions demonstrates the fluidity of the word’s interpretational nuances.170 As a result, the complexities and idiosyncratic vagaries in meaning are liable to change at every use, or as Caswell argues: ‘Generations of classicists and readers of Homer … have been making do with approximations in meaning which range from ‘soul’ to ‘anger’.171 He goes on to explain his definition of θυμός:

the basis of consciousness and thus of all internal experiences … its strength is closely connected with the physical condition of the body and also helps determine how the individual functions intellectually and emotionally … θυμός came to refer only to the inner functions of the living person, whereas ψυχή came to refer to the entity which survives death.172

According to Cornford, Caswell’s two ‘entities’, θυμός and ψυχή, are two ‘souls’ within Homeric man: ψυχή (and here Cornford includes ‘εἴδωλον’ as synonymous with ψυχή)173 which escapes through the mouth at the moment of death but survives in the afterlife; and, θυμός which contains the vital life-force and manifests itself in the individual’s blood, but which does not survive death.174 Cornford adds that θυμός: ‘is the soul as the principle of force and motion.’175 To these two ‘souls’ Snell includes a third, νόος,176 and adds: ‘what we interpret as the soul, Homeric man splits up into three components

168 In Homer thumos is never anger itself only a seat of emotions such as anger and nemesis, or as Cains argues, a ‘psychic force’: Cains, 'Ethics, ethology, terminology: Iliadic anger and nemesis,' 21. By the fifth century thumos could mean anger: W. V. Harris, 'The Rage of Women,' in S. Braund & G. W. Most (eds), Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen, Yale Classical Studies, vol. XXXII, Cambridge, 2003, 123. In the Roman era it was associated with ‘thumokatocha’ or spells for restraining anger: C. A. Faraone, 'Thumos as masculine ideal and social pathology in ancient Greek magical spells,' in S. Braund & G. W. Most (eds), Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen, Yale Classical Studies, vol. XXXII, Cambridge, 2003, 144.

169 LSJ 810, col. 1, s.v. θυμός: Cunliffe 192-193, cols 1-2, 1, s.v. θυμός.


171 Caswell, A Study of Thumos in Early Greek Epic, 1.

172 Caswell, A Study of Thumos in Early Greek Epic, 1, 62-3.


174 Clarke, Flesh and Spirit in the Songs of Homer, 54.


176 LSJ 1180, col. 2, s.v. νόος: (1) ‘mind, as employed in perceiving and thinking, sense, wit’. (2) ‘to have sense, be sensible’, (5) ‘reason, intellect’; similarly Cunliffe 281, col. 1, s.v. νόος.
each of which he defines by the analogy of physical organs. Our transcription of *psyche*, *noos* and *thymos* as ‘organs’ of life, of perception, and of (e)motion are, therefore merely in the nature of abbreviations’.\(^{177}\) Clarke, on the other hand, sees νόος as similar but distinct from θυμός.\(^{178}\) Redfield understands θυμός as: ‘the seat of the affective life – of passions, wishes, hopes, and inclinations’, and he associates it with ‘breath’.\(^{179}\) He adds that: ‘*thumos* is the seat of the whole practical consciousness, from instant rage and pain to planning and deliberation on the basis of lessons laboriously learned’.\(^{180}\)

These interpretations show that θυμός can be spiritual, physical and/or emotional, and is made manifest by blood and/or breath (which as proof of its existence would be seen in physical ‘breath’ visible in the moving diaphragm). It can be involved in all aspects of human consciousness: a desire to eat or drink, πιέειν ὑπὲρ θυμός ἄνόγοι (II. 4.263); a knowledge of kindliness, θυμός ἐνι στήθεσσι φίλοισιν ἥπα δήνεα οἴδε (II. 4.360-361); firm resolve, θυμός ἐπέσυνα τοῖς ἐπαμύνω (II. 6.361, 1.173); an ability to feel terror, ὀρίθην θυμός (II. 5.29); a capacity for sorrow, ἀλγος ἰκάνει θυμόν ἐμόν (II. 3.97-8); to sense pain, κῆδε δὲ θυμόν (II. 5.400); rouse spirits, Τρωσὶν θυμὸν ἐγείρσοι (II. 5.510), and, ὅτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστου (II. 5.470, 5.792, 6.72).

Since there is no interpretational consistency, with a nuanced meaning varying according to circumstances or situations, to better understand *thumos* as an intensifier of the abstract nemesis I have analysed each occurrence within its context. First, II.2.223: τῷ δ’ ἄρ’ Αχαιοὶ ἐκπάγλως κοτέντο νεμέσσιθεν (aor. ind. pass. 3rd pl’) τ’ ἐνι θυμό, is a sentence charged with a passionate intensity of emotion felt by the Achaians towards Thersites who has verbally abused Agamemnon. To exclude ἐνι θυμό would leave the Achaians experiencing mere indignation, but its inclusion reveals the greater depth of their nemesis, so that: ‘they were shamed within their hearts’.\(^{181}\) Two further examples, fraught

---

177 Snell, *The Discovery of the Mind*, 15.
178 Clarke, *Flesh and Spirit in the Songs of Homer*, 53.
179 Cf. II. 5.696-8: ‘his breath (ψυχή) left him, and down over his eyes a mist was shed. But he caught his breath again (ἐπινυκόθεν), and the breath (πνοή) of the North Wind as it blew on him (ἐπιπνείοντο) made him live again after he had painfully breathed out his spirit (θυμόν)’.
181 Translation: author.
with emotional intensity, concern the recovery of comrades’ bodies: II. 16.544: ἄλλα, φίλοι, πάρστητε, νεμεσσήσθητε (aor. imperat. pass. 2nd pl.) δὲ θυμῶ, is spoken by Glaukos who is fervently urging Aineias and Hektor to fight with him to recover Sarpedon’s body to prevent the Myrmidons from mutilating the corpse and stripping it of its armour. Instead of mere indignation, the inclusion of θυμῶ has Glaukos saying: ‘but friends, take a stand and feel appalled in the breath of your very soul’;182 and, at II. 17.254: ἄλλα τις αὐτός ἵτω, νεμεσιζέσθω (pres. imp. mid/pass 3rd sg.) δ’ ἐν θυμῷ Πάτροκλον Τροήσε τοιν μέλπηρα γενέσθαι, the potency of the imperative νεμεσιζέσθω results in an urgent and heartfelt appeal of: ‘be scandalized at heart’, by Menelaos to the Achaians to prevent Patroklos’ body from being mauled and torn apart by Trojan dogs.183 At Od. 1.119: νεμεσσήθη (aor. ind. pass. 3rd sg.) δ’ ἐν θυμῷ. Telemachos is ashamed of the disrespectful manner in which his mother’s suitors treat a stranger in his father’s house. Although the situation is beyond his control he still feels an introspective heartfelt nemesis (‘utter shame in his heart’) since the stranger’s treatment is a reflection on the household and a violation of the guest/host friendship custom. A different nuance is understood at Od. 4.158: ἄλλα σαόφρων ἔστι, νεμεσσόται (pres. subj. mid/pass 3rd sg.) δ’ ἐν θυμῷ, where Peisistratos speaks of Telemachos as feeling nemesis (respect or awe) in the presence of an elder (Menelaos).184 The inclusion of ἐν θυμῷ emphasizes Telemachos’ feelings of awkwardness and embarrassment. Consequently, when a stronger and more intensified emotion is needed the verb νεμεσάω or νεμεσίζομαι is given added potency by being combined with θυμός, is possibly an imperative, and/or is in the passive or middle voice.

Consider the following words spoken by Poseidon towards the Achaians whom he thinks are not doing their best in the fighting: ὥμιν δὲ νεμεσσόματι περὶ κήριν.185 Here κῆρ,186 the physical heart where visible physical changes such as

---

182 Translation: author.
183 Cairns comments that nemesis is the result of a breach of aidōs (implied): Cairns, Aidos, 85.
184 The feeling is similar to some cultural observances of keeping ones’ eyes cast down in the presence of a superior as a mark of respect or humility, or the expected gesture from a female in the presence of a male.
185 II. 13.119. This is Homer’s sole use of the combination of nemesis with κήρ.
186 LSJ 948, col. 1, s.v. κήρ: the heart. According to LSJ authors the emphatic dative κῆρ intensifies the emotion and is used in Homer as an adverb ‘with all the heart, heartily’. In
a faster heartbeat occur, adds strength, so that περί κήρι profoundly increases the emotional strength of the nemesis being expressed.\(^\text{187}\) Since Poseidon intended to shock the Achaians into action: υμίν δὲ νεμέσσωμαι περί κήρι, may well be expressed as: ‘but with you I have scornful contempt at heart’. His whole speech rings with the disdain he feels towards the Achaians who, in his opinion, have not lived up to their full potential as agathoi, and he contemptuously ridicules their aretē by calling them πέπονες (weaklings),\(^\text{188}\) and νεοτ (youths; used here in a derogatory sense as in ‘call yourselves men, you are nothing but boys’). His diatribe continues with another word for physical heart, φρήν: άλλα’ εν φρεσι\(^\text{189}\) θέσθε ἕκαστος αἰδῶ καὶ νέμεσιν (‘but put into your hearts, each of you, shame and (fear of) nemesis’).\(^\text{190}\) Poseidon’s contemptuous comments spring not only on account of the Achaians’ lack of enthusiasm for fighting, but also because any weakness shown by them would reflect badly against him as their champion, making him look ineffectual and invoke nemesis from the other gods towards him, an aspect discussed in more detail below.\(^\text{191}\)

Other strengthening word combinations include the adverbs, κρατερός and ύπερφιόλως.\(^\text{192}\) While κρατερός ἐνεμέσσα at II. 13.16 and 13.353 can be rendered as ‘m mightily indignant’, the addition of ύπερφιόλως elsewhere in Homer can affect the intensity of the nemesis experienced from a relatively mild emotion to one of fierce anger. This is demonstrated in Idomeneos’ speech to Meriones: άλλ’ ἥγε, μηκέτι ταῦτα λεγόμεθα νηπίτουι ὡς ἑσταότες,
μή ποῦ τις ὑπερφιάλως νεμέσησιν193 (‘but come, no longer let us loiter here and talk in this way like children, lest perhaps some man reproach us excessively’), and again in connection with Penelope’s suitors as an emotion against one of their own for ill-treating a beggar (Odysseus in disguise): οἱ δ’ ἄρα πάντες ὑπερφιάλως νεμέσησαν194 (‘but they all were filled with exceeding indignation’).195 Yet, when this same ‘beggar’ asks to string Odysseus’ bow the suitors react with ‘offended fury’ (‘οἱ δ’ ἄρα πάντες ὑπερφιάλως νεμέσησαν’).196 The difference between the two situations involving the suitors is that in the first the emotion is felt by agathoi towards a fellow agathos, in the second it is as a reaction against an insult to their aretē by a ‘beggar’ who had the effrontery to suggest he might succeed in stringing the bow when they had failed, and as such demanded a far more extreme emotional response.

While the emotional intensity of nemesi can, under certain circumstances and in certain word combinations, be something more akin to anger even rage, the opposite is true for its negation οὔ, which can be an apology for a strong emotion. For example: τῶν μή σο γε μοῦ ἔλεγξης μήδὲ μόδας· πρὶν δ’ οὔ τι νεμέσησιν κεχολόσθαι197 (‘do not scorn their words, nor their coming here, though before now no man could blame you for being angry’); μήτερ ἐμή, τό μὲν οὔ σε νεμεσῶμαι κεχολόσθαι198 (‘my mother, I do not blame you for being angry’); πρὶν δ’ οὔ τι νεμέσησιν κεχολόσθαι199 (‘but till then no one could blame you for being wrathful’); αὐτὰρ μή νῦν μοι τὸδε χόει μηδὲ νεμέσσα200 (‘but do not now be angry with me for this, nor full of indignation’), οὐ μὲν γάρ τι νεμέσησιν βασιλῆα ἀνδρ’ ἀπαρέσσασθαι ὅτε τις πρώτερος χαλεπῆν201 (‘there is no shame for a basileus to make amends to another man, when he is the first to became angry’). These examples illustrate

193 Il. 13.292-293.
194 Od. 17.481.
195 Cf. below p. 61, where this passage is discussed further.
197 Il. 9.523.
198 Od. 18.227.
199 Od. 22.59.
200 Od. 23.213.
201 Il. 19.182-183.
the way in which a softening of the perceived, although recognized as justifiable, anger of another is achieved through the addition of *nemesis’* negation, οù.

![Figure 4: Rhapsode and accompanying aulos-player; Attic red-figure amphora; ca. 480-490; BM 1843,1103.34 (source: museum).](image)

Such complexities as to the extent to which different word combinations might intensify the emotions in Homer’s poems pertain solely to modern-day readers; Homer’s audiences would have had no such difficulty since the epics were performed orally. For example, in *figure 4* a rhapsode (with a staff/sceptre of authority) recites an epic which begins: ΗΟΔΕΠΟΤΕΝΤΥΠΙΝΘΙ (Ωδε ποτέ Τύρινθι) ‘As once in Tiryns ...’ whilst accompanied (on the other side) by a *aulos* player. With the fluctuations in the rhapsode’s voice, or at some crucial moment of the story being reached, the musician could vary the pace, pitch and melody of his tune to coincide with an emotional moment in the tale. In this way, all the dramatic subtleties and emotional nuances would have been

---

203 Attributed to the Kleophrades Painter: *ARV* 183.15, 1632; CVA British Museum 3, iii 1 c pl. 8, 2a-d (173). The rhapsodes’ words may be the beginning of a line from Euripides’ lost tragedy *Bellerophon*, in which Tiryns was prominent: (cf. *Il.* 6.144-221 about Bellerophon); R. Graves, *The Greek Myths*, revised edn, 1992, Harmondsworth, 1955, 252-256.
easily perceived in the different sounds, pitches and tenors of the rhapsode’s voice as he sang the epic tales. Without a rhapsode’s melodious voice and musical accompaniment, modern-day readers are left with differing personal interpretations of the emotions originally intended.

The Loeb translator, Murray, has at times sought to add multifaceted meaning in the texts, including personal interpretations of *thumos* in combination with *nemesis* which further illustrate the diversity of interpretational nuances. At *Od* 2.138 he suggests *thumos* as ‘conscience’: ὑμετέρος δ’ εἰ μὲν θυμὸς νεμεσίζεται αὐτῶν (‘and for you, if your own conscience is offended at these things’); and, *II.* 15.211 where he sees *thumos* as the seat of ‘wrath’: ἀλλ’ ἢ τοι νῦν μὲν κε νεμεσοθείς ὑποίειξον ἀλλο δὲ τοι ἐρέω, καὶ ἀπειλήσω τὸ γε θυμὸ (‘but in fact I will yield for now, despite my indignation; but another thing will I tell you, and make this threat in my wrath’). In looking beyond the narrower interpretations of the lexicographers, Murray’s individualistic readings have, through textual means, gone some small way to parallel the sounds, pitches and emphasis of the rhapsode’s voice.

**nemesis and the gods**

As an emotion *nemesis* was not the sole prerogative of mankind – it could also be experienced by the gods towards mortals and non-mortals alike. In the divine realm *nemesis* could, in common with mortals, be aroused at witnessing inappropriate behaviour, but more usually it resulted when their rights, power, status, or authority were thought to have been slighted or threatened. It was also an emotion which could be directed towards the god’s *philoi* (those beloved and championed by him/her) if it was thought they were showing weakness or cowardice, since this behaviour reflected adversely on the god as an indicator of the god’s inability or lack of power to support his *philoi*.

Poseidon’s previously discussed emotive outburst towards the Achaians when he considers their fighting commitment to be waning, and where he berates them to listen to their internal *aidōs* lest they have *nemesis* from others,

---


205 *LSJ* 1939, col. 1, s.v. φίλος.
emphasizes the intensity of Poseidon’s emotions – he was livid with them: ὑμῖν δὲ νεμεσσόμαι περὶ κήρτι’.\textsuperscript{206} Poseidon hoped the strength of his words would anger and rouse the Achaians into action for fear of being shamed. Poseidon’s motive was two-fold: not only did he want the Achaians to fight and win glory, but he had an additional personal concern – if the gods thought the Achaians showed weakness this would reflect against him as their champion, making him look ineffectual and invoke nemesis (here ‘disdain’ would be appropriate) from the other gods towards him. Ultimately, the Greeks heeded Poseidon, god of the sea, and they fought to protect the ships that sailed on that sea as true philoi of Poseidon.

Similarly, Apollo has nemesis towards the Trojans whom he chastises as they give ground to the Argives: νεμόσησε δ’ Ἀπόλλων Περγάμου ἐκκατιδών, Τρώεσσι δὲ κέκλετ’ ἀώςας: ‘ὄρνυσθ’ ἰππόδαμοι Τρώες, μηδ’ εἴκητε χάρμης Ἀργείως’.\textsuperscript{207} (‘And Apollo, looking down from Pergamos, was indignant, and called with a shout to the Trojans: ‘rouse yourselves, horse-taming Trojans, give not ground in fight before the Argives’). Apollo feared a Trojan defeat or retreat would be seen by the other gods as a reflection on his inability to aid them as their champion, and he would be the recipient of nemesis from his peers. Bonanno sees Apollo as the: ‘protector of doors and city walls’, and the nemesis he threatens against the Trojans is because they: ‘leave free space for the enemy, putting the city at risk that he contributed to build’.\textsuperscript{208} I do not think this was uppermost in Apollo’s mind; more likely he feared being the recipient of nemesis from the other gods if his philoi showed weakness because their fighting skills were a reflection on his capacity to support them.

In a slightly different nuance, Hera, champion of the Achaians, has nemesis towards Hektor for boasting to his kinsmen that as they have Zeus’ support they cannot fail.\textsuperscript{209} His words and the way in which they are delivered were

\textsuperscript{206} Il. 13.119. Discussed above, pp. 46-47.
\textsuperscript{207} Il. 4.507-509.
\textsuperscript{208} Bonanno, "She Suddered on her Throne", 100. In any event, Apollo (together with Poseidon) is said to have built the walls of Troy not the city of Troy itself: Il. 7.452.
\textsuperscript{209} Il. 8.170-176: ‘from the mountains of Ida Zeus the counsellor thundered, giving the Trojans a sign and victory to turn the tide of battle ... and Hektor shouted aloud and called to the Trojans: “I recognize that the son of Kronos has readily assented to victory and great glory for me, and for the Danaans woe.”’
offensive to Hera: 'Ὡς ἔφατ’ εὐχόμενος, νεμέσητε δὲ πότνια Ἡρη'210 ('so he spoke boastfully, and queenly Hera was indignant'). The strength of her reaction is so acute that she: ‘shuddered on her throne and made high Olympus quake’. A reaction, no doubt, given added impetus by Zeus’ apparent indication to Hektor of a Trojan triumph, which she would see as yet another slight by her brother-husband towards her as she adds this to her mental list of personal affronts in their incessant agon. Yet, their quarrels were of such long-standing that when Zeus has cause for nemesis against Hera he simply shrugs it off:211 Ἡρη δ’ οὐ τὶ τόσον νεμεσίζωμα οὐδὲ χολοῦμαι: αἰεὶ γὰρ μοι ἐσθὲν ἐνυκλάν ὅτι κεν ἔπω212 ('but against Hera I have not such great indignation or wrath, since she is always in the habit of thwarting me in whatever I have decreed').

The gods could also feel nemesis towards each other, usually as a reaction to a perceived challenge to their personal status, power, or authority. For example, Hera, in a pique at her son Ares’ successful killing of many of her Achaian philoi, asks Zeus if he does not have nemesis for Ares’ violence and disregard for themis: Ζεῦ πάτερ, οὐ νεμεσίζη Ἀρη τάδε καρτερὰ ἔργα ... ὃς οὖ τίνα οἴδε θέμιστα.213 Equally, when Athena wounds Ares in punishment for his interference he, after first bellowing and wailing like a baby, asks Zeus if he does not have nemesis for her violence against him: Ζεῦ πάτερ, οὐ νεμεσίζη ὥρων τάδε καρτερὰ ἔργα.214 Both Hera and Ares act like juveniles as each sought to ‘tell tales’ on the other, and Zeus appropriately answers Ares by calling him a ‘renegade’ (ἄλλοπρόσαλλε) who ‘whines’ (μινύριζε).

Even Zeus could invoke nemesis from the other gods. Twice Poseidon uses the same phraseology to express his nemesis towards Zeus when the latter’s interference gives the Trojans the advantage: ἐλέασε δ’ Αχιλλεύς Τροσίν δαμναμένους, Διὶ δὲ κρατερὸς ἐνεμέσσα215 ('and he had pity on the Achaians that they were being overcome by the Trojans, and against Zeus he was

---

210 Il. 8.198.
211 Il. 8.381-408; Hera was plotting with Athena to give armed assistance to the Achaians.
212 Il. 8.407; cf. also: 8.421 where the 3rd person νεμεσίζεται is used in a similar context.
213 Il. 5.757-761.
214 Il. 5.872.
mightily resentful’). When Zeus orders Poseidon out of the battle Poseidon reluctantly obeys, but with strong feelings of nemesis towards Zeus: ἀλλὰ ἦ τοι νῦν μὲν κε νεμεσθείς ὑποείξοι216 (‘but in fact I will yield for now, despite my indignation’). Poseidon’s nemesis for his brother Zeus is due almost certainly to his resentment of Zeus’ persistent assumption of authority over him and all the other gods.217 Similarly, when Hera carries an ultimatum to the other gods from Zeus, she feels nemesis towards him for his assumption of authority over them all and his expectation that they will all give in to his whims, which they generally do for fear of the consequences: ἥ δὲ γέλασε κεφάλι, οὕδὲ μετέπασε ἐπ’ ὀφρώις κυανέμησιν ἰάνθη· πάσιν δὲ νεμεσθείσα μετημόδα218 (‘and she laughed with her lips, but her forehead above her dark brows relaxed not and, moved with indignation, she spoke among them all’).

In this example nemesis is a visible and physical expression on Hera’s brow.

The gods might also feel nemesis towards one of their own for conduct considered inappropriate. This is Ares’ fear when, on hearing of the death of his son Ascalaphos, says to the gods: μὴ νῦν μοι νεμεσθῆσῃ, Ὀλύμπια δόματ’ ἔχοντες, τί σα σθαι φόνον ὑπὸ ἰόντ’ ἐπὶ νήμας Ἀχαιῶν (‘do not blame me now, you who have dwellings on Olympus, when I go to the ships of the Achaians and avenge the slaying of my son’).219 Ares is aware his intentions would normally warrant blame or indignation from the other gods, so in order to deflect their nemesis he argues the extenuating circumstances and asks them not to judge him since his planned actions are appropriate in the circumstances. His words show the gods felt a need to justify themselves to avoid judgement.

Just as an agathos was expected to always maintain his aretē-standards, the gods were also expected to maintain their aretē (here interpreted as dignity or majesty),220 particularly in the presence of a mortal. When Priam is guided by Hermes to Achilles’ tent to beg for Hektor’s body the god, for fear of compromising his dignity, refrains from entering because, as he explains, for a

216 Il. 15.211.
217 Il. 13.355.
218 Il. 15.101-103.
219 Il. 15.115; cf. Od. 4.195, 19.264, for examples concerning mortals.
220 Cunliffe 53, col. 2, s.v. ἀρετή, (5) ‘majesty, dignity, rank’.
god to be entertained by mortals would be an act that would evoke *nemesis* (from the other gods): ἀλλ’ ἦ τοι μὲν ἐγὼ πάλιν εἴσομαι, οὐδ’ Ἀχιλῆος ὀρθαλμοῦς ἐσείμι: νεμεσσητόν δὲ κεν εἰη ἀθάνατον θεόν ὥσσε βροτοῖς ἠγαπαζέμεν ἄντην

(*but, now I will go back, and not come into Achilles’ sight; it would be a shameful thing that an immortal god should thus openly be entertained by mortals’*).

To be the subject of divine gossip may also invoke *nemesis*. Certainly, this is Hera’s artful excuse when she refuses her brother-husband Zeus’ ‘desire to lie in love’ out in the open on Mt. Ida in the day-time. She claims that such behaviour would be a justifiable cause for *nemesis* from the other gods, since, if their act was witnessed, the other gods would hear of it and be shocked. Hera argues they would be a subject of gossip and the gods would be scandalized by their choice of time and place for such an activity, and she would be shamed: νεμεσσητόν δὲ κεν εἰη (*that would be a shameful thing*). Here the ‘shameful thing’ is both the ‘indignation’ of the gods if their act were carried out so blatantly in contempt of normal conventions and thus *themis*, and the ‘embarrassment’ to them both if found in such a mortifying situation. That the gods had a fear of invoking *nemesis* demonstrates they were constrained by very human weaknesses, traits, and flaws.

An important use of divine *nemesis* as an appraisal on the behaviour of a mortal (albeit semi-divine) who has broken the ethical code for an *agathos*, signals the genesis of *nemesis* as a moral and ethical judgement of condemnation by the gods on mortals. The occasion involves Achilles and

---

221 *Il.*, 24.462-464. Hermes has revealed himself to Priam as a god and is not in disguise as a mortal, in contrast to Athena who accepts Telemachos’ hospitality in the *Odyssey* where she is in disguise and not recognized as a goddess, and so cannot be held blameworthy by the other gods: Scott, ‘Aidos and Nemesis in the Works of Homer’, 28.


223 ‘Inappropriateness of place’ is also Cairns’ suggestion for Hera’s (feigned) reason to refuse Zeus: Cairns, *Aidos*, 123; see also, Scott, ‘Aidos and Nemesis in the Works of Homer’, 28.

his incessant and inappropriate abuse of Hektor’s body, which results in Apollo threatening a collective divine nemesis against him unless he ceases.\textsuperscript{225}

There is a sense of hybris in Achilles’ conduct and possibly an early implied hybris/nemesis dichotomy, although this is not articulated:

\begin{quote}
αὐτῷ ὁ γ’ Ἑκτὸρα διὸν, ἐπεὶ φίλον ἦτορ ἀπηύθυν, ἔπον ἐξάπτων περὶ σῆμ’ ἔταρχοι φιλοίο ἐλέξει· οὐ μὴν οἳ γε κάλλιον οὐδὲ τ’ ἄμεινον, μὴ ἀγαθὸν περ ἑώρην γεμεσιθέωμεν οἱ ἰμεῖς· κοσφήν γὰρ ἐρὴ γαῖαν ἀεικίζει μενεαίνων.\textsuperscript{226}
\end{quote}

But this man (Achilles), when he has deprived noble Hektor of life, ties him behind his horses and drags him about the grave-mound of his beloved comrade; surely this will bring neither honour nor benefit for him. He should beware lest we have nemesis for him agathos though he is; for in his rage he disfigures the silent earth.\textsuperscript{227}

Previously, in book nine, Achilles had seemingly abandoned societal standards of behaviour (themis) in his dismissal of heartfelt appeals for pity (ἐλέαρε!) and to aidōs,\textsuperscript{228} but in books twenty-three and four he reaches an epitome of savagery in his treatment of Hektor’s body that stretches over twelve days, in revenge for Patroklos’ death.\textsuperscript{229} The intense grief felt by Achilles disposed him to defile Hektor’s body vengefully, and to intend the body to be consumed by dogs, despite Hektor’s dying pleas that this not be his fate.\textsuperscript{230}

From a twenty-first century AD perspective it is easy to use words such as ‘savagery’ and ‘barbarity’ to describe Achilles’ actions against Hektor, but seemingly Homer’s gods also viewed him with abhorrence in their various descriptions of him as ‘murderous’ (ὀλοῦ), ‘has known savagery like lions’ (λέων δ’ ὄς ἄγρια οἶδεν), ‘has lost pity’ (ἔλεον μὲν ἀπώλεσεν), and ‘has no audacity or insolence’. Konstan, The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks, 117; Konstan, ‘Nemesis and Phthonos,’ 77. Another potential indication of divine moral judgement is found at, Od. 14.284, when Zeus feels nemesis for the kaka erga of mortals, although here the emotion is likely to be subjective since it refers to bad deeds done to strangers or guests and violates the prerogatives of Zeus Xenios.\textsuperscript{225}

Not all the gods support this threat against Achilles. Those who do not are: Poseidon, Athena, and Hera who are opposed to any compassion for Hektor: \textit{Il}. 24.21-63.

\textsuperscript{225} Not all the gods support this threat against Achilles. Those who do not are: Poseidon, Athena, and Hera who are opposed to any compassion for Hektor: \textit{Il}. 24.50-54.

\textsuperscript{227} Translation: author.

\textsuperscript{228} \textit{Il}. 9.302, 640.


\textsuperscript{230} \textit{Il}. 22. 337-360.
shame’ (οὐδὲ οἱ αἰδῶς γίγνεται). These and phrases such as: ἀεικέα μὴ δετο ἔργα (‘he devised unseemly acts’) and κακὰ δὲ φρεσὶ μὴ δετο ἔργα (‘he devised bad deeds in his mind’), infer a divine moral judgement on Achilles’ behaviour, despite Bassett’s argument to the contrary. Significantly, the gods’ outrage against Achilles did not arise because of his treatment of Hektor’s body prior to Patroklos’ funeral, nor from his intention to feed the body to the dogs, since such acts were customary and would have been Achilles fate had he been killed first. What was offensive to the gods was Achilles’ prolonged and relentless abuse of the body after Patroklos’ funeral, as Bassett states: ‘no law of Greek chivalry in the Heroic Age was broken by Achilles’ treatment of Hektor’s body until Patroklos was buried … but his persistence in dragging the body after the funeral of Patroklos was unknightly.’ Achilles raged too long, and the gods, angered at his lack of self-control, judged him and threatened nemesis.

The inspiration for the scene in figure 5 was Homer’s story, which depicts a condensed compilation of Achilles’ defilement of Hektor’s body. Hektor’s

231 II. 24.39-45.
232 II. 22.395, 23.24, 176.
233 Bassett argues against moral judgement, citing other instances of similar phraseology where, in his opinion, the poet is not expressing moral criticism of either the perpetrator or the act: S. E. Bassett, ‘Achilles’ Treatment of Hector’s Body,’ TAPA 64, 1933, 44. He may be correct at: II. 7.478 (used by Zeus), Od. 14.243 (spoken by Odysseus), and Od. 3.166 (spoken by Nestor), but a moral inference is evident at: Od. 3. 265, 11.429 (infidelity of Klytemnestra), Od. 16.107 (of Helen), Od. 23.222 (suitors’ behaviour), and in the passages quoted above.
235 II. 16.836, 17.226. Enemy bodies left for dogs and birds to devour: II. 1.1-5: ‘wrath … made the men themselves to be the spoil for dogs and birds of every kind’; II. 3.259: ‘the dogs and birds would have torn him as he lay on the plain’; II. 4.237, ‘their tender flesh vultures will surely devour’; II. 11.394: ‘while he, reddening the earth with his blood, rots away, more birds around him than women’; II. 11.452: ‘the birds that eat raw flesh will rend you’; II. 11.818: ‘thus then were you destined, far from your friends and your native land, to glut the swift dogs in Troy’; II. 13.831: ‘you will glut the dogs and birds of the Trojans’; II. 17.150: ‘Sarpédon … you left behind to the Argives to be their prey and booty’; II. 17.254: ‘Patroklos should become a plaything to the dogs of Troy’; II. 18.271: ‘many of the Trojans will the dogs and vultures devour’. Bassett argues such forms of revenge for the death of a kinsman was an accepted aspect of the time and was demanded of the agathos as part of his code of honour: Bassett, ‘Achilles’ Treatment of Hector’s Body’, 41-65, esp. 41, 49, 60. Conversely, Murray sees Achilles’ behaviour as extreme even for its time: Murray, The Rise of the Greek Epic, 141.
236 There are examples of mutilations of bodies in the Iliad, but these are of short duration and do not drag on for days: II. 11.146, 13.202-203, 14.496-500.
238 Attributed to either the Antiope Group (Vermeule) or the Leagros Group (Beazley): LIMC i Achilles 586 (A. Kossatz-Deissmann), LIMC v Iris 1, 142 (A. Kossatz-Deissmann), LIMC vii
despairing parents, Priam and Hekabe, stand to the left at one of the gates of Troy, with Priam leaning for support on his staff and Hekabe wailing and tearing at her hair, as Homer describes: ‘so was his head befouled with dust; but his mother tore her hair and from her flung far her gleaming veil and uttered a cry exceeding loud at sight of her son. And a piteous groan did his father utter.’ 239  At centre, Achilles mounts his chariot with the intention of dragging Hektor’s body around Patroklos’ tumulus.  To the far right is Patroklos’ tumulus complete with bearded chthonic snake and the winged fully armed eidolon of Patroklos emerging in apparent delighted anticipation at the mutilation of Hektor’s body.  Hastily running towards Achilles and Hektor’s parents is the messenger goddess Iris who, in her turmoil throws up her hands in despair at Achilles’ pitiless violation of Hektor’s corpse beyond the acceptable time-frame. 240  Iris’ body language reveals the urgency of the warning message she brings to Achilles lest he suffer the gods’ nemeses, their judgemental righteous indignation that hints at future retribution.  Seemingly unperturbed, Achilles ignores the anxious goddess, intent only on acting out his wrath and vengeful hatred on dead Hektor as he glances back towards Hektor’s parents, unmoved by their grief. The story told in the scene on this hydria has, of necessity, been condensed. The sequence in the Iliad is more complex: here it is the goddess Iris who is sent by Zeus to summon Thetis. Once Thetis arrives in Zeus’ presence she is requested to persuade her son, Achilles, to return Hektor’s body to Priam. Zeus then sends Iris to Priam to tell him to go to Achilles as a suppliant to ransom Hektor’s body. 241

Ultimately the divine nemeses threatened against Achilles is unfulfilled with no actual consequence or resolution, despite his continued abuse of Hektor’s body. The passage illustrates a hint of the shifting milieu of nemeses as it began to have a judgemental influence in moral assessments by gods on mortals.

---

239 Il.22.405-429; 24.14-18.
240 She is unlabelled but identified as Iris: LIMC v Iris 1, 142 (A. Kossatz-Deissmann).
241 Il. 24.74-77; 24.105-116; 24.143-158.
The Archaic Era

nemesis and the suitors

Lack of regard for aidōs and nemesis is epitomized by the excesses and dissipations in the behaviour and attitude of Penelope’s debauched and egotistical suitors, who behaved with reckless disregard for aidōs within themselves and exhibited no fear of nemesis from men or gods. Their behaviour demonstrates that the fundamental principle of a personal awareness of aidōs and nemesis was wholly dependant on the individual’s own sense of what constitutes honour and shame, and the importance that individual laid on themis.242 Penelope’s suitors displayed none of the aretē-virtues expected in an agathos and had no consideration for any such principles, and so failed society’s predetermined standards of aretē.243

242 Murray’s comments regarding aidōs apply equally to nemesis: ‘Aidōs [nemesis] is a mere emotion, and therefore incalculable, arbitrary, devoid of principle. A man may happen not to feel the emotion, and then you have nothing to appeal to. Or again, if he has the emotion, there is no way of judging its strength’. Murray, The Rise of the Greek Epic, 89.
243 Examples at: Od. 1.250, 2.52-58, 64-65, 16.106, 17.124, 21.147, 22.40.
The suitors were arrogant, licentious, and parasitic pests who are described by Menelaos as ἄναλκιδες (impotent, unwarlike). They spent their time enjoying extravagant feasts, making free with Odysseus’ provisions and possessions, and pursuing their unwilling hostess: violations of decent social behaviour by the standards of any age. The feelings of nemesis aroused in others towards them was not solely for their bad behaviour and their lack of aidōs, but also for their failure to exhibit any regard for the convention of reciprocity in regard to the Homeric custom of guest-friendship, seen in their extravagant consumption of the household provisions without recompense; their omission to offer the customary courtship-gifts as suitors for Penelope’s hand; and, their ‘lack of a sense of the need for restitution’.

Consequently, the suitors, as well as those members of the Ithacan assembly who failed to condemn their excesses, become the recipients of Odysseus’ son, Telemachos’, wrath. His anger at their wanton and destructive behaviour spills over in his heartfelt, yet ultimately futile, address to the assembly (note the multiple use of imperatives reinforcing Telemachos’ emotional feelings):

νεμεσσήθητε καὶ αὐτοῖ, ἄλλους τ’ αἰδέσθητε περικτίωνας ἄνθρωπους, οἱ περιναετῶσι θεῶν δ’ ὑποδείσατε μὴν, μὴ τι μεταστρέψωσιν ἀγασσάμενοι κακὰ ἔργα.

Feel nemesis yourselves, and aidōs before your neighbours who dwell round about, and fear the wrath of the gods, lest it happen that they turn against you in anger at evil deeds.

The verb νεμεσσήθητε is an aorist passive imperative, and is used by Telemachos to implore the assembly to feel introspective nemesis for allowing the situation in his father’s household to continue. Despite his appeal

---

244 Od. 4.334; 17.125. LSJ 911, col. 2, s.v. ἄναλκις: ‘without strength, impotent, feeble, of unwarlike men’; Cunliffe 33, col. 1, s.v. ἄναλκις: ‘incapable of offering defence or resistance, spiritless, cowardly’.

245 Their arrogant behaviour is illustrated throughout the Odyssey, for example: Od. 1.91-92; 250, 2.52-58; 16.106-111; 21.312-13; 22.413-416; 23.65-57; cf. Odysseus’ accusations against them: Od. 22.35-41; their improper conduct went as far as plotting to kill Telemachos and Odysseus should he return: Od. 4.771; 16.371-272, 383-386, 421, 448; 17.79-80.


248 Od. 2.64-67.

249 Telemachos is appealing to the three main Homeric forces of restraint against bad behaviour, nemesis, aidōs, and a fear of the gods.
Telemachos finds just one supporter, Mentor, who also censures the assembly but to no avail: νῦν δ’ ἄλλῳ δήμῳ νεμεσίζομαι οἶδον ἄπαντες ἦσθ’ ἄνεφο, ἀτὰρ οὗ τι καθαπτόμενοι ἐπέεσσι μαύρους μνηστήρας καταπαύετε πολλοὶ ἐόντες250 (‘rather, it is with the rest of the people that I am indignant, that you all sit thus in silence, and utter no word of rebuke to make the suitors cease, though you are many and they but few’). No-one, it seems, will condemn the suitors.

Telemachos’ mention of ‘the wrath of the gods’ (θεῶν δ’ ὑποδείσατε μὴνιν) suggests the emergence in Homer of a belief that the gods take an interest in human morality; although any interest might be restricted to those transgressions impinging on a particular gods’ prerogatives, in this instance the suitors’ abuse their obligations as guests, the prerogative of Zeus Xenios.251 Telemachos warns that since the Ithacans feel no aidōs at their inaction nor any introspective nemesi̇s then, in the gods’ eyes, their failure to act would count amongst the collective κακὰ ἔργα. He warns that deliberately motivated human transgressions enacted with indifference to moral justice and conscious failures of ‘right order’, or themis, have the potential to provoke divine anger and punishment. His words make clear it was not only inappropriate deeds that brought a judgement of nemesi̇s from others, nemesi̇s could also be evoked by inaction in the face of ‘evil deeds’ (reminiscent of the adage: ‘all that is needed for the forces of evil to triumph, is for good men to do nothing’).

The juxtaposition of ‘nemesi̇s’, ‘aidōs’, ‘fear of the gods’, and ‘evil deeds’, feasibly introduces a hint of an Homeric awareness of cause and effect, two elements of a single concept which would evolve into the hybris/nemesi̇s cycle in ca. fifth century, to be discussed.252 While the concept was yet to evolve it is evident there was a conviction the gods punished hybris,253 as evident in Odysseus’ words to Eumaios concerning the suitors:

250 Od. 2.239-241.
251 Zeus as the avenger of suppliants and strangers: Od. 9.270; cf. Il. 13.623-627.
253 LSJ 1841, cols 1-2, s.v. ὑβρις: ‘wanton violence’, ‘insolence’; Cunliffe 393, col. 1, s.v. ὑβρις: ‘wanton disregard of decency or of the rights or feelings of others, an overbearing or
Ah, Eumaios, would that the gods might take vengeance on the outrage with which these men in their insolence devise wicked folly in another's house, and have no sense of shame.

Yet, despite their licentiousness, there was seemingly some behaviour that even the suitors deemed inappropriate. When Antinoos physically and verbally abuses Odysseus disguised as a beggar, the others are filled with nemesis: 255 οἱ δ’ ἀρα πάντες ὑπερφιάλως νεμέσσαν 256 (‘and they were all were filled with exceeding indignation’). Later it becomes clear that their nemesis was not indignation on account of Antinoos’ treatment of the ‘beggar’, nor was it anger at unseemly behaviour in a fellow agathos, rather it was self-interested indignant disapproval of Antinoos borne of a collective fear that the ‘beggar’ may perchance be some god in disguise, since this is what gods do in order to observe: ἀνθρώπων ὑβρίν τε καὶ εὔνομήν ἐφορὸντες 257 (‘the hybris and the righteousness of men’), and they might all consequently suffer some divine punishment for Antinoos’ behaviour. 258

At another time, Leiodes, who is spoken of as having nemesis for his fellow-suitors most of the time: πᾶσιν δὲ νεμέσσα μνηστήρεσσιν, 259 rises to try and string Odysseus’ bow. Upon failing to do so he declares no-one can manage it; a statement which invokes a reciprocal arousal of nemesis:

Ἀντίνοος δ’ ἐνένιπεν ἔπος τ’ ἐφατ’ ἐκ τ’ ὀνόμαξ’; ’Λειόδεξε, ποῖον σε ἔπος φύσεν ἐρκος ὀδόντων,
Antinoos rebuked him, and spoke, and addressed him: ‘Leiodes, what a word has escaped the barrier of your teeth, a dread word and grievous! I am angered to hear it.

Antinoos’ *nemesis* is the result of Leiodes implying that if he could not string the bow then no-one could. His words are both an indirect insult on the self-perceived *aretē* skills of the other *agathoi* and a hybristic self-compliment since it insinuates Leiodes regards himself to be superior in bow-stringing.

The suitors’ lack of *aidōs* and disdain for *nemesis* reflected badly not only on them but also, by association, on those who were more right-thinking and who considered the suitors had shamed Odysseus’ house. Telemachos, who, in his father’s absence is the host, feels this *nemesis* when a stranger (Athena in disguise) is ignored by the suitors and left standing at the door: *νεμεσσήθη δ’ ἐνὶ θυμῷ ξείνον δηθὰ θύρησιν ἔφεστάμεν.* Telemachos’ deep shame is felt within his very heart (*νεμεσσήθη δ’ ἐνὶ θυμῷ*) at the insult to the stranger, and senses that his father’s house has been disgraced by the suitors’ behaviour. Yet, as he attends to the guest’ needs he asks the stranger not to have *nemesis* for him, as he is about to list his grievances concerning the suitors, ever mindful that a good host does not criticize his guests: *ξεῖνο φιλ’, ἥ καὶ μοι νεμεσήσει τοῖς κεν ἐπικο.* This significant use of *nemesis* is an early example of a fear of *nemesis* not related to deeds but to inappropriate speech, an aspect discussed in more detail below.

*Athena’s response is meaningful:*

```
δὸς τὲ μοι ὑβρίζοντες ὑπερφιάλως δοκέουσι δαίνεσθαι κατὰ δόμα. νεμεσσήσωτο κεν ἀνήρ αἴσχεα πάλλ᾽ ὀρόσων, δὲ τὶς πινυτὸς γε μετέλλοι.
```

with such outrageous arrogance do they seem to me to be feasting in your palace. Full of *nemesis* would a man be at seeing these many shameful deeds, some prudent one who should come among them.

---

262 *Od.* 1.119.
263 *Od.* 1.158.
264 Inappropriate speech as a cause of *nemesis* is evident in Herodotos: pp. 175-176.
265 *Od.* 1.227-229.
266 Translation: author.
Athena reveals she understands human emotions, and she empathizes with those victims of the αἴσχα πόλλα’ ὀρών committed by the suitors. Her words are a divine affirmation that the suitors’ hybristic behaviour is worthy of nemesis (here ‘blame’) and she tacitly infers sanction for any future retribution. Just as there was a hint of a cause and effect scenario in the juxtaposition of the words nemesis and aidōs in Telemachos’ speech to the assembly discussed above, it is tempting to conclude a hybris/nemesis cycle in Athena’s speech from the close proximity of hybris and nemesis. Yet, as a duality this concept, although implicit, is not yet a verbalized fact and it would be pre-emptive to suppose that it was.

The punishment which ultimately befell the suitors was doubly deserving for an additional reason: their behaviour was insidious, in that it encouraged disobedience, immorality, and disrespectful behaviour from those who observed it – the servants. The suitors, as agathoi with social standing were in a position of regard, were looked up to as leaders of the community, and their behaviour should have been the model for others to follow. Yet their conduct displayed none of the aretē-virtues; on the contrary it lowered the moral tone within the palace environment. So, instead of viewing the suitors’ behaviour with abhorrence some, including Melanthios the goatherd and twelve of the fifty female servants, became insolent (ἀτιμάζουσι and ἄεικα μηχανόωντο) and fell in with the suitors, a crime for which they were all later put to death.

It was these deaths for which the suitors were directly culpable since it was they who had set the example by encouraging a belief amongst the household staff that licentiousness went unpunished.

For their crimes and their lack of regard for the principles of nemesis and aidōs, Odysseus verbally assaults them before taking his murderous revenge:

---

267 Above pp. 59-60.
268 Od. 22.417-418, 462-464.
269 Od. 22.440-445, 474-477.
270 Od. 22.35, 39-40.
You dogs! … having no fear of the gods, who hold broad heaven, or that any nemesis (blame/outrage) of men would follow. Now over you one and all have the cords of destruction been made fast.

With Telemachos and Athena at his side, Odysseus’ vengeance was unleashed, with Zeus confirming this had been Athena’s plan: ‘did you not yourself devise this plan, that Odysseus well and truly should take vengeance on these men at his coming?’

Athena was operating not only with the tacit sanction of Zeus: ‘do as you will, but I will tell you what is fitting’, but more specifically of Zeus Xenios for affronts committed against the social and religious obligations of hospitality applicable to host and guest, as well as the moral law of such obligations. Odysseus, as her retributive instrument, was acting out a: ‘role as a guardian of society and an instrument of divine justice dispensing … punishment on those who have subverted the basic institutions that define civilization: marriage, inheritance, property rights, the agora, sacrifice, supplicancy, and most pertinent here, guest-friendship or ξενία.'
The suitors died without *kleos*, *time*, or glory.\(^{276}\) Theirs was a shameful death by arrows (*figure 6*),\(^{277}\) not an heroic manly death by spears or sword on some battlefield. The cause of their humiliation was the result of their disregard for the conventions of their society, aptly summed up by Odysseus and Penelope: τούσδε δὲ μοῦρ’ ἐδάμασσε θεῶν καὶ σχέτλα ἔργα· οὖ τινα γὰρ τίσκον ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων (‘these men here has the fate of the gods destroyed and their own reckless deeds, for they honoured no one of men upon the earth’).\(^{278}\) It was the suitors’ wanton behaviour, their lack of a personal sense of *aidōs*, and their indifference to *nemesis* from others which sealed their fate.

The motif of the suitors is presented in a way that highlights the extremity of their *hybris*, enabling their ultimate fate to be seen as justified retribution, which is recognized by Penelope as the work of some anonymous deity:

\[
\text{άλλα τις θανάτων κτείνε μνηστήρας ἁγαυοῦς, ὃριν ἁγασσάμενος θυμαλέγει καὶ κακὰ ἔργα.}\(^{279}\)
\]

some one of the immortals has killed the lordly suitors in wrath at their grievous insolence and their evil deeds.

This passage illustrates Penelope’s conviction that one of the gods has enacted vengeance against the suitors for their evil deeds,\(^{280}\) and confirms that divine

---

\(^{276}\) *Od*. 22.416: ἀεικέα πότιμον.


\(^{278}\) *Od*. 22.413-414, 23.65. The suitors are given a last mention in the underworld where they follow Hermes, ‘gibbering like bats’: *Od*. 24.5-9. Paris also violated the laws of respect and reciprocity when he abducted Menelaos’ wife and palace treasures, actions which similarly resulted in an untimely end.

\(^{279}\) *Od*. 23.63-65.

\(^{280}\) Other examples of the belief that the gods punish human *hybris* include: *Od*. 1.368-380: μητρὸς ἡμᾶς μνηστήρας ὑπάρχουν ὅριν ἔχοντες ... ἔγω δὲ θεός ἐπιβίωσε μαίνοντας αἰῶν ὀλντας, αἱ καὶ ποθὰ Ζεὺς δόσῃ παλίντα ἔργα γενέσατα· νησιονοι κεν ἔσται δόμον ἐντουθεν ἄλλοθεν. (‘Suitors of my mother, arrogant in your insolence ... but I will call upon the gods that are
punishment for acts of *hybris* was a recognizable concept in the Homeric poems. (Homer uses *hybris* a total of twenty-eight times in the Odyssey and of these twenty involve the suitors; the *Iliad* employs the word just four times.) It will be in the fifth century that such justified retribution will be termed *nemesis*, and when the concept will represent a far more powerful force. At this later time still to come, the punishment that flows will be dispensed by the goddess Nemesis, authorized to exact retribution for reprehensible acts. 281

**nemesis and Helen**

Helen is a complex character who has received extensive attention from Homer to the present era. 282 Indeed, it is her very complexity that reinforces the mystery which continues to surround her: was she forcibly abducted against her will; 283 did she willingly abandon her home, her husband and her daughter Hermione for the sake of Trojan Paris; 284 was she the unwitting tool of some god with a hidden agenda, for even Priam seems to place the blame for the war not on her but the gods: οὐ τί αἰτή ἔσσι, θεοὶ νῦ μοι αἰτιοι εἰσίν; 285 or more enigmatically, was she even in Troy at all since Herodotos speaks of her as being safely in Egypt during the war? 286 Helen’s culpability as the human catalyst for the war, although implied by herself and others, 287 is not discussed forever, in hopes Zeus may grant that deeds of requital occur. Without atonement, then, would you perish within my halls.’); Od 20.367-370; 24.351-353. It is only Od. 2.64-67 that a want of *aidōs* and *nemesis* is ranked amongst the *kaka erga* that can result in the gods’ punishment.

---

281 Below, p. 109.
282 Helen and Nemesis (the goddess) is discussed extensively later in the thesis at various points. The current discussion pertains solely to Helen’s representation in Homer.
283 Hdt. 2.113, 5.94.
284 Sappho F16; Alcaeus FF44, 283.
285 Il. 3.164.
287 Il 2.161, 177: Ἀργεῖιν Ἐλένην, ἥς εἶναικα πολλοὶ Αχαῖοι ἐν Τροίῃ ἀπόλουντο (‘Argive Helen, for whose sake many Achaeans have perished in Troy’); Il. 9.337-339: τί δὲ δεῖ
in any detail by Homer. Instead, fragmentary details of her complicity, real or imagined, are found in other literary works such as the *Kypria*, to be discussed.

If a character called Helen was the cause of war, I would argue she was the indirect pretext, the real reason being ‘righteous indignation’: a collective *nemesis* consequent upon Helen’s abduction by Paris who demonstrated no *aidōs* nor any fear of *nemesis* from others, and who had violated the institution of guest-friendship, *χενία*. His actions left the Greeks humiliated and dishonoured, and they demanded justice for the wrong done to them: τῶν τε ἀδικημάτων δίκας αἰτέειν. Paris’ action brought Greeks together to fight for a common goal, the redemption of their pride and honour by punishing Paris, his family, and Troy itself, since he had embroiled his whole society in his wrong-doing through their failure to censure him or to offer restitution.

Helen’s allure is expressed by the Trojan elders, who speak of her mesmerizing physical beauty: οὗ νέμεσις Τρώδας καὶ ἑωκημίδας Ἀχαιοὺς τοιῷ’ ἀμφι γυναικὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἄλγεα πᾶσχειν’ αἰνός ἀθανάτησι θής εἰς ὀπα ἔοικεν (‘there is no blame/shame that the Trojans and well-greaved Achaians should for such a woman long suffer woes; she is dreadfully like immortal goddesses to look on’). The words of the old men suggest that, although Helen is a dreaded (αἰνός) harbinger of death, she is a prize and a possession worth the consequences of war, and as such there can be no *nemesis* (blame) in wanting to possess her whatever the cost. In their opinion her beauty and sexual

---

288 Hdt. 2.118.
289 Cf: Isok. 10.67.
292 Suzuki sees Helen as objectified as a duality by the warriors: ‘they read her as an emblem of doubleness, whose dual significance as a goddess like beauty and a scourge of war reflects their ambivalence toward the war which brings them both glory and death’: M. Suzuki, *Metamorphoses of Helen: Authority, Difference, and the Epic*, Ithaca, 1989, 43. That there is no *nemesis* in desiring Helen is described by Stimilli as: ‘the redemption of beauty from guilt’: D. Stimilli, *The Face of Immortality: Physiognomy and Criticism*, New York, 2005, 120.
allure transcends all mortal mores and just as victory in war is a beautiful goal, so too is Helen a beautiful prize worthy of the sacrifice of war; confirming her as nothing more than objectified war-booty to be possessed, exploited, and have done with what the victor will. She is, as Clader describes: ‘a divine manifestation of both the chilling fear of death in war and the goal or prize to be won at the end of it’. The old men speak of Helen’s exceptional and incomparable beauty as the epitome of men’s fantasy of female physical perfection, but fantasy is an illusion, an eidos.

The personality of Homer’s Helen is in direct contrast to her more common portrayal as a wanton, shameless woman without a conscience. In Homer she seems to have ethical self-awareness, to feel her shame, and to feel aidōs at what she is: she curses that she had been born at all, she wishes that death had been her lot before she could have betrayed Menelaos, she is full of guilt, self-blame, and acknowledges she is deserving of blame from others. The insulting self-abuse she hurls at herself, such as: στυγερή (loathsome), and: κυνὸς κακομιχάνου ἀκροφοσσης (‘a cold bitch of evil machinations’) followed by a wish for death, expresses the aidōs she feels and the nemesis she believes is her due. An interesting uniqueness of Homer’s Helen is that she is the only protagonist to feel nemesis against herself.

293 Clader sees Helen as: ‘Homer’s personification of the Cause of War’, and as a constant victim of rape: L. L. Clader, Helen: The Evolution from Divine to Heroic in Greek Epic Tradition, Leiden, 1976, 23, cf. 71 for Helen and rape.

294 Σ Eur. Orest. 249: ‘Stesichoros writes that when Tyndareos was sacrificing to the gods he forgot Aphrodite: the goddess was angered and made his daughters twice-wed and thrice-wed and husband-deserters’; Stesich. F223; Hes. F247; Alk. F283: ‘and crazed by the Trojan man [Paris], the deceiver of his host, she accompanied him over the sea in his ship, leaving in her home her desolate(?) child and her husband’s bed with its rich coverlet, (since) her heart persuaded her (to yield?) to love (through the daughter of Dione?) and Zeus [lacunae] laid low on the Trojans’ plain for that woman’s sake, and many chariots (crashed?) in the dust, and many dark-eyed (warriors) were trampled, and (noble Achilles rejoiced in?) the slaughter …’; cf. Alk. F42; Aischyl. Ag. 1455-1461: ‘Io Io, demented Helen, who alone brought death to so many, so very many souls at Troy, now you have adorned yourself with a final adornment, never to be forgotten, through the shedding of blood that nothing can wash away!’


296 Il. 6.344-348.

297 Il. 3.173-175.

298 Il. 3.410; 24.761-775. The only other mortal (semi-divine) character to abuse Helen is Achilles when he describes her as: ἐνεδανή Ἐλένη (‘Helen at whose name one shudders’).

299 Il. 3.404.

300 Il. 6.344.
Helen uses the term κύων (bitch) of herself four times, and in each it is an inference to her shame as the cause of war. Lattimore and Hammond translate κύων as ‘slut’ or ‘whore’. Others go further by explaining Helen through the behaviour of dogs, in particular the ‘unabashed sexual and excremental interests’ of dogs, and the behaviour of bitches on heat; wanton traits they see in Helen, although Graver argues against the connection. Clader suggests Helen’s reference to herself as a ‘bitch’ has a direct association to the fear Homeric warriors held of being denied burial and being thrown to enemy dogs to be eaten, i.e. Helen as a devourer of men.

The scorn Helen pours on herself occurs when she is bemoaning her fate and wishing she had not left home – a home for which she now pines, and she has begun to feel the inadequacy of Paris as a warrior, a husband, and as a moral human being, especially when compared to Menelaos. Helen has come to realize Paris is not the man she thought, he is lacking in personal aidōs and has invoked nemesis from many whilst remaining seemingly impervious to such feelings against him. She also doubts his aretē, especially since it was necessary for Aphrodite to rescue him when defeat and death at the hands of Menelaos seemed imminent. Her bitter disenchantment, together with a hint she has actually come to dislike Paris, comes through in her plaintive words: ἄνδρος ἐπετ’ ὀφιέλλον ἀμείνονος εἶναι ἄκοτος, δέ ήδη νέμεσιν τε καὶ αἵρεσα πόλλα ἄνθρωπον (‘I wish that I had been the wife of a better man, one who could perceive the censure and the many revilings of men’).

---

301 Il. 3.180, 6. 344, 356; Od. 4.145. Lykoph. 87 similarly refers to her as ‘a bitch’.
305 Clader, Helen, 17-18.
306 Il. 3.176, 180; cf. 3.139.
307 Il. 6. 344-354. Cf. Cairns, who suggests the sight of Paris and Menelaos on the battle-field causes Helen to regret leaving her home: Cairns, Aidos, 123.
308 Il. 3.381.
309 Il. 6.350-351, (translation: author). Homer relates that Paris was ‘hated by all like the black death’: Il. 3.454-455.
of sympathy: she has abandoned everything: home, husband, child, and security, for a sexual whim perhaps not of her own making, and now she despises Paris as the cause of her present situation, as she longs for those dear things left behind. On the other hand, it is wondered if she protests too much and whether her self-denunciation is purely self-indulgent, vain, self-pitying, and perhaps a means of attracting sympathy and deflecting blame.

Paris’ attraction as a sexual partner has similarly lost any appeal for Helen since she refuses to agree to Aphrodite’s demand to participate in sex with him: κείσε δ’ ἐγὼν οὐκ ἐμι—νεμεσιτῶν δέ κεν ἐι — κείνου πορσανέοσα λέχος· Τρωιά δέ μ’ ὀπίσω πᾶσαι μωμήσουνται· ἐξο δ’ ἀχε’ ἀκρίτα θυμῶ(‘There I will not go — it would be shameful — to share that man’s bed; all the women of Troy will blame me afterwards; and I have measureless griefs at heart’). At first it is difficult to see a reason for nemesis in this context since what Aphrodite is proposing is within the bounds of marriage and would not offend against themis. On the other hand, for an agathos to indulge in a sexual act in his ‘vaulted, scented bed-chamber’ when he should be fighting for the survival of his city and its people is deserving of censure and blame. The passage also shows Helen as anxious not to incite further feelings of criticism or contempt from the Trojan wives who would condemn her for participating in sex with Paris when he should be out defending Troy. She believes it is on her account these women have lost husbands, sons, fathers and lovers, and here she is, the cause of all their woes, a harlot in their eyes, fornicating with her lover while they suffer the grief of their losses. Despite her misgivings, Helen is ultimately persuaded to comply with Aphrodite’s demand.

---

310 Il. 2.356 together with ἄρπάξας (snatch away) at Il. 3.444 suggest Helen may have been a victim of rape.
311 Il. 6. 344, 356; Od. 4.145. Helen’s words to Hektor at Il. 6.344-358, where she twice uses ‘bitch’ of herself, may be an attempt to woo or seek attention from Hektor. Karanika suggests Helen’s self-reproach is a clever way of insinuating and manipulating blame onto others: A. Karanika, Voices at Work: Women, Performance, and Labor in Ancient Greece, Baltimore, 2014, 26-27.
312 Il. 3.410-412.
313 Il. 3.382: θαλάμῳ εὐδοκεὶ κηρύνει.
The krater in figure 7 depicts Hektor’s poignant farewell to Andromache before departing for battle. Behind Hektor is Kebriones mounted on a horse while holding the reigns of Hektor’s horse. To the left are Helen and Paris with winged shoes, possibly a visual inference to Paris’ recent rescue by Aphrodite from certain death. There are two additional noteworthy aspects to the scene: Helen, who stands with her right hand on her hip while turning her head away from Paris as he takes his leave – clearly she has tired of him, is disillusioned, no longer respects him, and she turns away in scornful contempt; and, Paris himself, who is armed with, not the manly spears to fight heroically in close combat, but the coward’s bow and arrow enabling him to be removed from relative danger and shoot off his arrows towards the enemy from afar.

314 The Inscription Painter: LIMC i Alexandros 68 (R. Hampe), LIMC iv Helene 193 (L. Kahl/N. Icard), LIMC i Andromache I, 4 (O. Touchefeu-Meynier), LIMC iv Hektor 13 (O. Touchefeu-Meynier); Woodford, Images of Myths in Classical Antiquity, 16 fig. 6; Schefold, Gods and Heroes in Late Archaic Greek Art, 220, fig. 271; E. Simon, Führer durch die Antikenabteilung des Martin von Wagner Museums der Universität Würzburg, Mainz, 1975, 83-87, pl. 17. Source: http://pages.uoregon.edu/klio/im/gr/br-age/hect&andro.jpg.
At *Il.* 3.141-142 a remorseful Helen veils herself:  

\[ \text{αὐτίκα δ’ ἀργεννήσι καλυψαμένῃ ὀθόνῃσιν ὀρμὰτ’ ἐκ θαλάμωιο τέρεν κατὰ δόκρυ χέουσα} \] (`and immediately she veiled herself with shining linen, and started out of her chamber, letting fall her tears`). The words are spoken when she is feeling homesick for Sparta, her husband Menelaos, and her parents. She is no longer enamoured of Paris, she feels the shame of what she is and the war she has caused. She drapes herself in a shining white linen veil, symbolic of her *aidōs* (shame and humility), leaves the palace and approaches the Scaean gates of Troy, the symbolic boundary between Paris and her new life in Troy and Menelaos and her old life in Sparta. Later, to escape the notice of the Trojan women she again puts on her bright shining mantle (*κατασχομένη ἑανῶ ἀργήτι φαείνῳ*). As is discussed below, these shining white garments parallel Hesiod’s concept of Aidōs and Nemesis who, having been rejected for the principles they embody have despaired of humanity and depart for the heavens, ‘covering their beautiful skin with white mantles’: *λευκοὶσι φάρεσσι καλυψαμένῳ χρόᾳ καλὼν,* leaving mankind to its own evil. So, Helen, wraps herself in a white veil, the symbol of her *aidōs* and her *nemesis*, as she symbolically leaves Priam’s palace to its own devices.

**Troy – Priam’s nemesis**

Troy and Priam had been closest to Zeus’ heart because of the plentiful sacrifices made to him on the Trojan altars. Nevertheless, he is clear when he says that in spite of his affection they must die: ‘you know the plan in my heart Earth-Shaker, the reason I gathered you here; I care for them, even

---


317 *Il.* 3.419.


319 *Il.* 4.44-49; note Zeus’ use of the past tense of his affections for Troy: περὶ κήρυ *πιθώκητο*. Pausanias tells of an ancient wooden statue of Zeus at Larisa which had originally stood in Priam’s palace, and that it was to this statue’s altar that Priam vainly fled when Troy was sacked: Paus. 2.24.4-5.
though they die’, and echoed by Dream: ‘and sorrows have been attached to the Trojans by Zeus’. Zeus planned for the destruction of Priam and Troy:

[Zeus to Hera] And from then on I will cause a constant and continuous falling back [of Trojans] from the ships, until the Achaians capture towering Ilion through the counsels of Athena. But, until that time I will neither cease my anger (χόλον) nor allow any of the other immortals to defend the Danaans here, at least until the wish of Peleus’s son has been fulfilled, just as I promised by a nod of my head on that day when the goddess Thetis grasped my knees beseeching me to honour Achilles, sacker of cities.

The passage cites two reasons for the fall of Troy – Zeus’ anger and Achilles’ honour. Achilles’ honour is explained as a promise Zeus made to Thetis. Zeus’ anger is seen as a primordial anger directed against mankind for their hybristic breeding, and their neglect of sacred duties towards the gods, for which he deems they must be punished through death. Zeus’ choice of war at Troy to carry out his punishment was driven by two reasons. Firstly, Priam, with his scores of wives, concubines, and more than seventy children, had been a major contributor to mankind’s hybristic breeding which was personally insulting to Zeus and represented the attempt of a mortal to rival the gods in sexual activity. Secondly, by not reproaching Paris for his violation of the norms of guest-friendship through his seizure of Menelaos’ possessions and his disrespect for the state of marriage in abducting his host’s wife, Priam and the city of Troy itself demonstrate apathy to Paris’ crimes. The collective

322 Hom. II. 15.69-77: ἐκ τοῦ δ’ ἄν τοι ἔπειτα παλιὼν παρὰ νηνόν ἐγὼ τεῦχοιμι διαμπερές, εἴς ὃ κ’ Ἀχαιοί ἢλον αὐτῷ ἐλον Ἀθηναύῃς διὰ βουλὰς, τὸ πρὸν δ’ οὔτ’ ἂρ’ ἐγὼ παῖον χόλον οὔτε τινὲς ἀθανάτων Δαναόστιν ἀμωνέμνεν ἐνθάδε’ ἐκεῖο, πρὸν γε τὸ Πηλέδοσο τελευτῆθαι ἔελλοιρ ὡς οἱ ὑπέκτην πρῶτον. ἐμὼ δ’ ἐπένευσα κάρῃ, ἠμετά τοῦ δ’ ἐμεῖο θεῷ Θέτις ἠματο γούνων, λασσομένη τιμήσα τιμήσα Αχιλλῆ πτολίκοιρον (translation: author).
323 Hom. II. 1.524-530.
324 I. 1.5; Kypria F1. Zeus’ anger and his plan is discussed in the chapter on the Kypria below.
325 Hom. II. passim; Apollod. Bibl. 3.12.5; Hyginus, Fab. 90; cf. Hes. Theog. 886-944 for a partial list of Zeus’ numerous consorts and children.
326 I compare Priam’s prolific breeding to that of Niobe, who boasted to Leto of her superior fertility, whereupon Niobe’s children were all killed as punishment for their mother’s hybris. Just as Niobe was left childless this was also to be Priam’s fate: Hom. II. 24.602-617.
morality of Paris, Priam, and the people of Troy was weak and apathetic, so Zeus punished them to demonstrate, as Herodotos believes: ‘the divine was contriving matters so that the Trojans, through their utter destruction, would make it absolutely clear among human beings that the punishments the gods impose on great wrongdoings are also great’. Hence, Zeus turned against Priam: ‘for now has the son of Kronos come to hate the race of Priam’.

Priam’s offences and those of his progeny impinged on Zeus’ prerogatives. Paris violated the implicit rules regarding the custom of guest-friendship and consequently Zeus Xenios (protector of strangers and hospitality); his abduction of Helen offended against Zeus Teleios (protector of marriage); and with his seizure of Menelaos’ household treasures he dishonoured Zeus Ktēsios (protector of property), clearly evident in the words of Menelaos:

“You rash Trojans, insatiate of the dread din of battle. And other outrage and shame you do not lack, with which you have done outrage to me, you treacherous cowards, and had no fear in your heart of the harsh wrath of loud-thundering Zeus, the god of hospitality, who will one day destroy your high city. For you carried away wilfully over the sea my wedded wife and with her much treasure, when it was with her that you had found hospitality.”

only Homeric reference to the Judgement of Paris as mentioned in the Kypria. Castriota suggests Troy’s wealth and prosperity made Paris arrogant and contemptuous of the customary laws concerning the sanctity of marriage and of other people’s property, which he says is typical of the hybris of the wealthy and powerful: D. Castriota, Myth, Ethics, and Actuality: Official Art in Fifth-Century B.C. Athens, Wisconsin, 1992, 165.

Hdt. 2.120: τοί δ’ αυτομονίᾳ παρασκεκυμένοις, δόκει γαρ Πράξις γενεθή Κρονίων.

Suda s.v. Ξενήτων (ξι 57); καὶ Ξενήτως Ζεύς; Suda s.v. Ξένιος (ξι 37): ὁ τῆς ξενίας ἐφόρος. λέγεται καὶ Ξένιος ὁ Ζεύς; Soph., Oed. Kol. 813-814: ἀλλὰ τοσοῦτον μαρτύρομεθ’, ὡς οὐτ’ ἀφικοῦμεν Ξενίου Δίος χάροι; cf. Aischyl. Ag. 60-62: ‘the sons of Atreus were sent against Alexander by the mightier power, Zeus god of hospitality (Zeus Xenios)’ (trans. Sommerstein).

Suda s.v. Τελεία (tau 271): Ἡρα Τελεία καὶ Ζεύς Τέλειος ἐπιμόντο ἐν τοῖς γάμοις, ὡς προυάνοις ὄντες τῶν γάμων.

Paus. 1.31.4; Suda s.v. Κτήσιος (καρπα 2522): ὁ Ζεύς; Suda s.v. Κτησίου Δίος (καρπα 2523): τὸν Κτήσιον Δία ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις ἱδρύοντο; Suda s.v. Ζεὺς Κτήσιος (καρπα 2523): ὁ Κτήσιος Δίος ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις ἱδρύοντο; μὲν λοιπές διαθέσεις ὁμοίως ἐνεπέλθησαν κακὰ καὶ κόντες, οὐδέ τι θυμόν Ζηνοῦ ἐρμηνευόμενος χυλεῖτο ἔδεισαν μην ἄλλουν. ἐδοθεὶς δὲ ποτ’ ὑμίη διαφθέρεσα πῶλον αὐτήν; οὐ μεν κοινωνίαν ἄλογον καὶ κτήματα πολλὰ μόνω αὐξηθ’ ἀνάγοντες, ἐπεὶ φιλείσθη παρ’ αὐτῇ.
Zeus could not ignore the insults especially after Menelaos’ impassioned plea for him to punish Paris.334 The Achaians believed their cause was just,335 and Menelaos’ faith in the retributive power of Zeus Xenios and Zeus Ktésios is seemingly justified, given Diomedes’ words to Agamemnon: ‘for with the aid of a god have we come [to Troy]’,336 implying that their purpose was divinely inspired, and victory would be theirs.

When Pandaros shoots Menelaos the oath swearing a truce was broken.337 With his shot Pandaros insulted Zeus Horkios (protector of oaths and punishes their violation),338 and Agamemnon declared their victory was now assured:

Argives, do not relax your furious valour; for father Zeus will be no helper of lies; but they who were the first to work violence in defiance of their oaths, their tender flesh vultures will surely devour, and moreover we shall carry away in our ships their dear wives and little ones, when we have taken their citadel.339

Troy and its people would be destroyed because of Zeus’ wrath: they were complicit in Paris’ disrespect for the property of another; his contempt for the sanctity of marriage; his disregard for the social obligations of guest-friendship; and for Pandaros’ breaking of oaths sacred to the gods.340 Priam, because of his challenge to the gods in going beyond his mortal life’s portion with his prolific progeny would be left with no city to rule, no sons to rule after him, and ultimately no life. This looming violence would eventually assuage Zeus’ anger, and justify the measures upon which he had resolved, as will be discussed below as part of ‘Zeus’ Plan’.

334 II. 2.350-354.
335 Cf. II. 2.350-353: Nestor speaks: ‘For I declare that Kronos’ son, supreme in might, promised with a nod of his head on that day when the Argives went on board their swift-faring ships, bringing death and fate to the Trojans; for he lightened on our right weighing of a god have we come [to Troy]’, implying that their purpose was divinely inspired, and victory would be theirs.
336 Also, Neoptolemos to Philoktetes: Soph. Philok. 1338-1341: καὶ πρὸς τοῖσον ἐπιφανῆς θερών Τρόιαν ἀλλόν χάριν θανάτου τοῦ παρασκευότος ἰδίον (‘besides it is destined within this present summer that Troy will be completely destroyed’). (Translation: author.)
HESIOD

According to Tzetzes the Greeks developed the idea that the implicit strength of abstracts operated with the authority of the gods, and as such their potency was a manifestation of divine emotion. Consequently, powerful abstracts such as ‘love’, ‘persuasion’, ‘pity’, and ‘nemesis’ ultimately demanded acknowledgement of this divine energy in the form of personification and often deification, as exemplified in Hesiod’s mention of the power of Φήμη or Talk, and which Nilsson gives as the first deified abstraction:

onthē oú tis pámpan apóléluntai, ἥτινα πολλοὶ λαοὶ φημίζουσιν θεός νῦ τίς ἔστι καὶ αὐτή.

Act this way. Avoid the wretched talk of mortals. For Talk is evil: it is light to raise up quite easily, but it is difficult to bear, and hard to put down. No Talk is ever entirely got rid of, once many people talk it up: it too is some god.

Homer’s extensive use of the abstract concept of nemesis and its etymological derivatives is not mirrored by his contemporary, Hesiod, who uses the term infrequently. Hesiod’s more significant contribution is in his personification of the concept and ultimate deification of her into the goddess, Nemesis, and surrounding her in myth.

Hesiod’s abstract Nemesis has a similar meaning to that of Homer, namely, public and/or divine disapproval, righteous indignation or censure towards those who act without regard to aidōs and contrary to the concept of themis. This correlation is borne out in the following homily directed towards Hesiod’s

341 Σ (Tzetz.) on Hes. WD 279-282 (pp. 36-37): Ἰστέον, ὅτι πάντα οἱ Ἑλληνες, ἄ δύναμιν ἔχουσα ἑώρον, οὐκ ἄνευ ἐπιστασιάς θεῶν τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν ἐνέργειάν ἐνόμιζον.

342 Hornum, Nemesis, The Roman State, and the Games, 9.


344 Hes. WD 760-764. Φήμη is also ‘common report’ or ‘rumour’: LSJ 9 1925, col. 2, s.v. φήμη. My capitalization of ‘Talk’.

345 A list of Hesiod’s nemesis-words is listed in Appendix 1.
wayward brother, Perses, in an attempt to reform him: Ἄμφος γὰρ τοι πάμπαν ἀλεγγὸ σύμφορος ἄνδρι, τό δὲ θεοὶ νεμεσός καὶ ἀλήρος (‘for famine is entirely the companion of a lazy man; and gods and men feel righteous indignation towards him’). This interpretation is reinforced by two fragments from Hesiod’s *Catalogue of Women*, although their precise context is not known: ἀνθανάτων τὰ τεῶν νέμεσιν θνητον τ’ ἀνθρώπων (‘the indignation of the immortal gods and of mortal humans’); and: Ζ[εὺς δὲ ιδὸν νεμέσησαι ἀπ’ αἰγλήντος Ὀλύμπου (Zeus seeing this) from Olympus, felt indignation). Just as the Homeric gods feel nemesis towards one who would dishonour them, so it is with the Hesiodic gods. This is borne out in the following warning against making fun of the sacred rites, since: θεος νυτε καὶ τὰ νεμεσσά (‘a god has nemesis for this also’). Another homily advises Perses to always behave in accordance to the rules set by the gods: ὃς ποταμὸν διαβῇ κακότητι ἵδε χείρας ἀνιπτος, τό δὲ θεοὶ νεμεσός καὶ ἁλγεα δόκαν ὁπίσσω (‘whoever crosses a river, unwashed in evil and in his hands, the gods have nemesis towards him, and they give him troubles afterwards’).

The following fragment illustrates nemesis as an emotion experienced by mortals, although its very fragmented state leaves the context unclear: [.... .... νέμεσις τ’ ἄνθρωπον] (‘the nemesis of men’). Another fragment has Tyndareos, Helen’s step-father, command her suitors to swear an oath to punish anyone who might carry her off against her will. Such an oath, says Tyndareos, involves putting aside personal feelings of nemesis or aidōs in order to exact punishment against any abductor: ὃς δὲ κεν ἀνδρῶν αὐτὸς ἐλοιτὸ βῆ, νέμεσιν τ’ ἄποθετο καὶ αἰδός, τόν μέτα πάντας ἀνογεν ἄστατας ὀρμηθήνα (ποιήνει τεσσυμένους (‘any man who would seize her by force, and set aside indignation and shame, he commanded all of them together to set out against him to exact punishment’). Tyndareos demands the suitors ignore

---

346 Hes. WD 302-303. (Translation: author.)
347 Hes. F41.27 (Most). (Translation: author.) The *Catalogue of Women*, ca. eighth century, was ascribed to Hesiod in antiquity although it may not have been written by him.
348 Hes. F10.90. (Translation: author.)
349 Hes. WD 756. (Translation: author.)
350 Hes. WD 740-741. (Translation: author.)
351 Hes. F154b8. (Translation: author.)
352 Hes. F155.81-84.
society’s standards and to seek out and physically punish (perhaps even kill) any would be abductor. Since the suitors are not related to Helen, nor involved in war, it would, under normal circumstances, be a dishonourable act of violence deserving of nemesis to acquiesce to such a demand. Tyndareos is implying that exacting revenge for Helen’s abduction, should it occur, is a far greater honour than maintaining the norms bounded by themis; he is transposing the heroic honour of maintaining aretē-standards by converting an act of violence normally worthy of nemesis into an act of honour.

**The Personification of Nemesis**

According to Hesiod it was the Muses who commanded him, a Boiotian shepherd, to record the tales of the gods.353

And they plucked a staff (σκῆπτρον), a branch of luxuriant laurel, a marvel, and gave it to me; and they breathed a divine voice into me, so that I might glorify what will be and what was before, and they commanded me to sing of the race of the blessed ones who always are, but always to sing of themselves first and last.354

And sing he does. In the *Theogony* Hesiod gathers together an inordinate number of ‘blessed ones’, and fashions them into an intricate interconnecting divinely inspired genealogy. Furthermore, he arranges and organizes the material within the overall structure for maximum dramatic and didactic effect with an unbroken invisible thread of purposeful authorial intent running through the entirety. This conclusion is not universally accepted, with some commentators describing Hesiod’s methodology as ‘haphazard’, and as ‘lacking cohesion’;355 opinions against which I argue.

---

354 Hes. *Theog.* 30-34: καί μοι σκῆπτρον ἐδὸν δόρυν ἔρυθρὸς ἐρυθρός ὀξύν ὀρέγασα, θηρτόν ἐνέπνευσαν δὲ μοι αὐθὴν θέσσαν, ἵνα κλείσαζο τὰ τ’ ἔσσομεν πρὸ τ’ ἑόντα, καὶ μ’ ἐκέλονθ’ ὑμεῖν μακάρων γένος αἰὲν ἑόντων, σφᾶς δ’ αὐτὰς πρῶτόν τ’ καὶ ἱερατον αἰὲν ἀείδειν. The σκῆπτρον (staff or sceptre) was a token of authority to speak and the Muses’ action tells it was they who authorized Hesiod to tell his tales. Cunliffe 361, col. 2, s.v. σκῆπτρον: (3) ‘a staff in the custody of a herald and handed by him to one wishing to speak in an assembly in token of his right to a hearing’. See the discussion above on the sceptre and Thersites, pp. 36-38 with notes.
355 Scully calls Hesiod’s style ‘didactic’: Scully, *Hesiod’s Theogony*, 19. Mondi and others reject any organized purpose behind Hesiod’s juxtaposition of events and see the whole as
To understand the origins of the Hesiod’s personified Nemesis it is necessary to first consider her parentage and siblings. Nemesis’ mother was Night, and Hesiod’s catalogue of Night’ offspring starts with the birth of Aether and Day:

And from Chasm, Erebos and black Night came to be; and then Aether and Day came forth from Night, who conceived and bore them after mingling in love with Erebos. 356

In this passage Night bears ‘nice’ children fathered by Erebos (note the emergence of the simultaneous existence of the negative and positive in one entity: Bright Sky (Αἰθήρ) and Day produced sexually from their opposites Darkness and black Night). 357 Then, the catalogue is abruptly interrupted with a lengthy account of the first event of cosmic violence which appears to have little relevance to Night’s children and looks carelessly placed and disjointed enough to be worthy of Mondi’s view of what he calls Hesiod’s ‘gaucheries’. 358 However, a closer reading reveals a relevance that is central to the theme of Night’s subsequent children – a largely unpleasant brood of negative forces: Doom, Fate, Death, Sleep, Dreams, Blame, Distress, the Hesperides, Moirai, Keres, Nemesis, 359 Deceit, Affection, Old Age, and

haphazard and lacking cohesion: Mondi, ‘The Ascension of Zeus and the Composition of Hesiod’s Theogony’, 330. Most accuses Hesiod of contradictions in the Theogony which he attempts to correct or modify in Works and Days: Most (ed.), Hesiod, xxii-xxii. Cf. Clay, who sees synchronism between Hesiod’s two works which are complementary and mutually dependent: ‘One could well imagine that from the beginning Hesiod conceived of the poems as a diptych, and as he composed, he continually revised and reworked the one in the light of the other’: J. Strauss Clay, Hesiod’s Cosmos, Cambridge, 2003, 6.

356 Hes. Theog. 123-125: έκ Χάμως δ’ Έρεβος τε μέλανα τε Νύξ εγένοντο· Νυκτός δ’ αὐτ’ Αἰθήρ τε καὶ Ἡμέρη ἐξεγένοντο, οὕς τέκε κυσμαμένη Ἐρέβεια φιλότητι μιγήσα. (Translation: author.)

357 Similarly found elsewhere in Hesiod: Strife is an odious entity in the Theogony (225-230) with no redeeming features, but is presented more positively in Works and Days (11-26, 804), hence the one thing can be both a curse and a blessing. Hesiod’s statement in Works and Days at line 11 that: ‘there was not just one birth of Strifes after all, but upon the earth there are two Strifes’, which I deduce as Hesiod arguing for one Strife with two aspects – a positive and a negative. Cf. Strauss Clay, Hesiod’s Cosmos, 7, 143-144; A. N. Athanassakis, Hesiod: Theogony, Works and Days, Shield, 2nd edn, 2004, Baltimore, 1983, xv-xvi, 42, 86.


359 Later authors give alternative parentage for Nemesis: Hyginus Fab. Preface 9.4-6 (first century AD) has Erebos and Nyx as the parents of Nemesis; Nonnus Dionysiaca (ca. fourth century AD) 48.375, and Tzetz. Σ on Lykophr. 88 (twelfth century AD) name Okeanos as a parent of Nemesis; Pausanias (second century AD) quotes two possibilities, Okeanos and Nyx and leaves the reader to decide: 1.33.3 (Okeanos), 7.3.1 (Okeanos and Nyx). Since these are very much later than Hesiod their suggestions may have been influenced by later local regional adaptions.
Strife. These latter children were born parthenogenically and thus without love and are themselves loveless: factors which are a direct consequence of Hesiod’s placing them after the intervening cosmic violence story.

This cosmic violence myth acts as a pivotal divide between Night’s ‘nice’ and ‘not nice’ children. It tells of Ouranos’ hatred of his children born of Gaia, his cruel acts against them, his delight in his evil, and of Gaia’s revenge in persuading their son Kronos to sexually mutilate his father. To this whole dark episode n/Night is a witness: ἥλθε δὲ Νύκτ’ ἐπάγων μέγας Οὐρανός (‘And great Ouranos came, bringing n/Night with him’; my capitalization of ν in Νύκτ’). The capital letter is far more logical since the story abounds with personifications, and because the narrative of Night’s children, having been interrupted, seamlessly follows this violent episode. It was personified Night who witnessed Kronos’ violent deed, and not lower-case primordial night as claimed by Clay. The interjective myth of cosmic violence ends at line 210 with Ouranos foretelling that there would, at some future date, be payback and vengeance for this act of his emasculation: τοῦ δ’ ἔπειτα τίσιν μετόπισθεν ἔσεσθαι. Ouranos utterance of the word τίσις releases the first concept of retribution into the world, and pre-empts the birth immediately following of the personification which was to come to represent this abstract, Nemesis.

I do not believe it was an accident, or carelessness, or a clumsy insertion that Hesiod interrupted his account of Night’s children with this tale of violence and mutilation. On the contrary, it was a crucial interruption which served to account for, and give meaning to, the subsequent birth of Night’s more unlikable offspring, and a raison d’être as to why negative forces exist in the world. Those dark abstract emotions aroused in the events leading up to and during the brutality witnessed by Night were so strong, so intense, and had a

---

360 Hes. Theog. 211-225; for Night’s grandchildren, Strife’s children: Hes. Theog. 226-232. It is assumed that mankind has already been created because of the attributes of Night’s children. Since the gods cannot die or feel hunger and toil they cannot be affected by Death or Old Age, nor can they be affected by Strife’s children, Toil and Hunger. Although it was the divinities Gaia and Kronos who inflicted the injuries on Ouranos it is mankind who suffers the consequences of the children of Night.

361 Strauss Clay, Hesiod’s Cosmos, 17.

362 LSJ, 1798, col. 2, s.v. τίσις: ‘payment by way of return, recompense, retribution, vengeance’.

---
power so potent that they demanded, and ultimately receive, life. ³⁶³ They are all there as abstract concepts during the violence, directly or indirectly: strife, deceit, distress, the spirits of violence and hatred, seduction, suffering, fate, nemesis, ³⁶⁴ and the doom and destiny of future vengeance, all having witnessed the violence and subsequently given loveless parthenogenical life by an appropriate mother, black Night, and who are destined to roam the universe evermore as generally unpleasant personified forces. ³⁶⁵ It was from amongst this brood that Nemesis was born: τίκτε δὲ καὶ Νέμεσιν πῆμα θνητοῖσι βροτόσι Νῦξ ὀλοῆ (‘and deadly Night gave birth to Nemesis also, a bane for mortal human beings’). ³⁶⁶

Night, whom Hesiod calls ‘black Night’ (Νῦκτα μέλαιναν) ³⁶⁷ and ‘deadly Night’ (Νῦξ ὀλοῆ), is a dark force associated with negative deeds, but which has the potential for positivity: love and tenderness can occur at night; and restful sleep releases the day’s worries. So it was for Nemesis; in Hesiod’s Theogony she is described as a ‘bane’ but in his Works and Days she becomes a more positive force with an expanded mythology incorporating deeper philosophical and moral significance.

THE DEIFICATION OF NEMESIS

Though not entirely typical, Hesiod’s Works and Days falls within the genre of ‘wisdom literature’: a body of written work which had its origins in the oral tradition and was characterized by strong moral and didactic themes for living a good and hard-working life, usually passed from a father to his son. The evidence from surviving ancient texts and fragments discovered in various parts of the world indicates that as a genre it was widespread. ³⁶⁸ The wisdom

³⁶³ See comments on p. 76 above concerning the Greek belief in the ‘power’ of abstract emotions that demand personification and often deification.
³⁶⁴ Not mentioned by name but implied at line 210: ‘that at some time there would be vengeance for this’.
³⁶⁵ There are striking similarities in this story to that of Pandora: Hes. WD 90-105.
³⁶⁷ Hes. Theog. 20, 757; also 107: Νυκτός τε δινοφερής; 744, 758: Νυκτός ἔρεμηνες; Hes. WD 17: Νῦξ ἔρεβευνη.
³⁶⁸ The earliest known work in this genre is a Sumerian poem known as the ‘Instructions of Šuruppak’, with fragments dating to ca. 2500. Others examples include, ‘Instructions of Ninurta’, ‘The Father and his Misguided Son’, ‘Counsels of Wisdom’, ‘Advice to a Prince’.
or moral lessons in Hesiod’s work are in the form of exhortations directed at his wayward brother, Perses, to encourage him to mend his errant ways and to become diligent, hardworking, and follow religious and social guidelines. The lessons instruct that by adhering to the rules and techniques as laid down by Hesiod, Perses can be successful in matters agricultural, nautical, economic, social, and religious, whilst simultaneously leading a morally sound life.

Hesiod’s homilies are not solely pertinent to Perses: mankind generally is self-absorbed with tendencies that incline towards indulgent and feckless ways combined with self-interested views on justice, and Hesiod’s moral themes are equally appropriate to a wider audience. Given the didactic and moralistic nature of his writings it is to be expected that moral concepts (personified, deified or simply abstracts) play appropriate and instrumental parts. From this perspective, Nemesis’ one short appearance as the personification of an abstract moral concept is full of meaningful and symbolic significance.

To illustrate his moral lessons Hesiod conjures up descriptions of five successive races of men, γένοι ἄνθρωπων. The first genos was a golden race who lived without toil and distress, and lacked the ability for evil; they were followed by the silver genos who were wicked and dishonoured the gods; next came the violent bronze genos, whom Zeus made from μελία (Ash wood); after them the genos of heroes who fought at Thebes and Troy; and finally the fifth – the genos of iron. This was a vile and evil genos, the one in which Hesiod placed himself, and which still exists today:

---

West (ed.), Hesiod: Works and Days, 3-4. Wisdom literature has also been found written in Egyptian, Aramaic, Hebrew, and other ancient languages: Most (ed.), Hesiod, xlv-xlvi.

369 Hes. WD 109-126, 127-142, 143-155. It has been suggested the μελία here and at Hes. Theog. 187, 563-4 refers to the genesis of man: Σ Theog. 563; Most (ed.), Hesiod, 18-19 n. 9; V. Yates, 'The Titanic Origin of Humans: The Melian Origin of Nymphs and Zagreus,' GRBS 44, 2004, 185-187; G. W. Most, 'Hesiod's Myth of the Five (or Three or Four) Races,' PCPS, 1998, 109-110; J. Strauss Clay, 'What the Muses Sang: Theogony 1–115,' GRBS 29, 1988, 329-330; West (ed.), Hesiod: Works and Days, 187 n. 23. Things made from Ash wood were considered to possess magical power: Chiron crafted and gave an Ash wood sword to Peleus as a gift at his wedding to Thetis (Apollod. Bibl. 3.13.5); this same sword Achilles took with him to the Trojan war (II. 16.140-144); 'with the verdigris he scraped from it [the sword] he healed Telephus' (Apollod. Ep. 3.20).

370 Hes. WD 156-173. The ‘genos of heroes’ may be interpolation: Most, 'Hesiod's Myth of the Five (or Three or Four) Races', 104-127, esp. 109-111.

371 Hes. WD 174-200.

372 Hes. WD 174: μηκέτ’ ἐπειτ’ ὄφελλον ἐγὼ πέμπτοις μετείναι ἄνδράσιν.
Fathers will not be like-minded with sons, nor sons at all, nor guest with host, nor comrade with comrade, nor will the brother be dear, as he once was. They will dishonour their aging parents at once; they will reproach them, addressing them with grievous words – cruel men, who do not know of the gods’ retribution (οὐδὲ ἥθὲν ὁπιν εἰδότας)! – nor would they repay their aged parents for their rearing. Their hands will be their justice, and one man will destroy the other’s city. Nor will there be any grace for the man who keeps his oath, nor for the just man or the god one, but they will give more honour to the doer of evil and the outrage of man. Justice will be in their hands, and reverence will not exist, but the bad man will harm the superior one, speaking with crooked discourses, and he will swear an oath upon them. And, Envy, evil-sounding, gloating, loathsome-faced will accompany all wretched human beings.

This is a time in which standards of morality reach such depths of depravity that hatred, discord, and violence are the measure of mankind. It is a time where there is no longer respect for that inhibitor of inappropriate behaviour, aidōs, nor fear of the resultant blame of nemesi from man or gods, nor is there regard for themis. It is a time of such wickedness that, unless there is reform, it will be destroyed by Zeus (line 180: Ζεὺς δ’ ὀλέσει καὶ τοῦτο γένος μερόπων ἄνθρωπον).

Hesiod’s evil iron genos was a familiar theme throughout successive generations. Theognis, writing in the sixth century, is full of warnings against a denigrated society full of ‘base’ (ἄνδρα κακῶς) individuals who have no respect for principles of honour. An example is his caution against those so blackened by corruption that they give no heed to justice, nor nemesis, and live how they will without reference to man or gods.

εἰκὸς τὸν κακὸν ἄνδρα κακῶς τὰ δίκαια νομίζειν, μηδὲ γὰρ κατόπισθ’ ἄξιομενον νέμεσιν δειλῶ γάρ τ’ ἀπάλαμα βροτῷ

---

371 Theog. 271-278, for a similar description of children not honouring their aged parents.
372 Hes. WD 182-196.
373 Cairns, Aidos, 152.
374 Ca. 544/541; Suda s.v. Theognis (theta 136); Pl. Laws 630a; Harp. s.v. Θεόγνις. For a modern discussion, see: T. J. Figueira & G. Nagy (eds), Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis, Maryland and London, 1985, 1-3.
375 Yet, in another fragment Theognis seemingly condones murder as a means of disposing of an offensive tyrant: δημοφάγον δὲ τύραννον, ὅπως θέλεις, κατάκλινοι οὐ νέμεσις πρὸς θανὸν γίνεται οὐδεία (‘to lay low the tyrant who devours the people, by whatever means you wish, does not evoke nemesis (judgement/retribution) from the gods’): Theog. 1181-1182. (Translation: author.)
It is natural for the corrupt man to consider justice basely, and have no fear of subsequent nemesis (censure/disapproval), since it is possible for a base man to have ready access to many criminal acts and to consider that everything he does is fine.

The world is plunged into depravity, and it is at this appropriate juncture, when rejected for the moral principles they embody and no longer thought necessary to mankind’s moral psyche, that Hesiod’s personified pair, Aidōs and Nemesis, prepare to leave mankind to its own evil machinations and inevitable consequences, and depart to the gods on Olympus:

καὶ τότε δὴ πρὸς Ὄλυμπον ἀπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυδείης λευκοῖσιν φάρεσσι κολυψαμένω χρόα καλὸν ἀθανάτων μετὰ φύλον ἵπτον προλιπόντ’ ἀνθρώπως Αἰδώς καὶ Νέμεσις.

Then indeed will Aidōs and Nemesis cover their beautiful skin with white mantles, leave human beings behind and go from the broad-pathed earth to the race of the immortals, to Olympus.

With their departure go those controlling factors of moral responsibility, nemesis and aidōs, whose rejection signifies the end of hope for redemption, and ‘there will [be] no possible respite against wrongdoing, hybris and eventual destruction.’ The scene is vividly reiterated by Plutarch, writing some seven or eight hundred years after Hesiod, but who imparts a sense that the event, although near, is yet to come:

---

378 Theog. 279-280 (translation: author); cf. this same didactic theme in: Theog. 39-52, 53-68, 271-278.

379 There is absolutely no evidence to support Neer’s statement that Hesiod saw Nemesis and Aidōs as sisters, unless he means their attributes were similar: Neer, The Emergence of the Classical Style in Greek Sculpture, 162. Cf. Hom. II. 13.121-122, 17.93-95, where the abstract concepts aidōs and nemesis are spoken of as a complementary pair.


381 Hes. WD 197-200.

382 Cf. Plut. Mor. F31.1: ἀθανάτων μετὰ φύλον ἵπτον προλιπόντ’ ἀνθρώπως Αἰδώς καὶ Νέμεσις ('Then Shame [Αἰδώς] and Indignation [Νέμεσις] will forsake mankind, and seek the nation of the gods').

This is the extremity of evil. For when shamelessness and jealousy rule men, shame and indignation leave our race altogether, since shamelessness and jealousy are the negation of these things.

Conversely, another of Plutarch’s quotations conveys a sense of it as having already happened:

θαυμαστὸν γὰρ ἐστιν, εἰ τοσαύτης κακίας ὑποκεχύμενης μὴ μόνον, ὡς προείπεν Ἡσιόδος. Ἀιδῶς καὶ Νέμεσις τὸν ἀνθρώπινον βίον ἀπολελοίπασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρόνοια θεῶν συσκευασμένη τὰ χρηστήρια πανταχόθεν οἴχεται.

Is it indeed a wonder, when so much wickedness has been disseminated upon the earth, that not only Aidōs and Nemesis, as Hesiod said so long ago, have deserted the life of Mankind, but that Divine providence also has gathered up its oracles and departed from every place.

Then, as Hesiod informs: τὰ δὲ λείπεται ἄλγεα λυγρὰ θνητοὶς ἀνθρώποις, κακοὶ δ’ οὐκ ἔσσεται ἄλκῃ (‘baleful pains will be left for mortal human beings, and there will be no safeguard against evil’). At what precise point is it possible to postulate that Nemesis and Aidōs achieved apotheosis? The archaeology from Rhamnous confirms Nemesis as a goddess from at least the six century, and Aristotle, writing in the late fifth century, confirms she was believed to be a goddess before his time:

μέσος δὲ τούτων ὁ νεμεσητικός, καὶ δ’ ἐκάλουν οἱ ἄρχαιοι τὴν Νέμεσιν, τὸ λυπεῖσθαι μὲν ἐπὶ ταῖς παρὰ τὴν ἄξιαν κακοπαραγιας καὶ εὐπαραγιας, χαίρειν δ’ ἐπὶ ταῖς ἄξιαις' διὸ καὶ θεῶν οἴονται εἶναι τὴν Νέμεσιν.

384 Plut. Mor. F31.2-5; Σ (Tzetz.) on Hes. WD 200-201.
385 Plut. Mor. 413A 5-9.
387 The earliest reference to a cult belonging to Aidōs is the fourth century: Dem. 25.35. Cf. Paus. 3.20.10-11 for her shrine on the road between Sparta and Arkadia; but see discussions on this passage in Pausanias: N. Richer, ‘Aidōs at Sparta,’ in S. Hodkinson & A. Powell (eds), Sparta: New Perspectives, Swansea, 2009, 93-97; Stafford, Worshiping Virtues, 78.
388 Evidenced from an inscribed six-century perirrhanterion (pp. 202-203), and a helmet dedication (pp. 216, 221-223).
389 Arist. EE 3.1233b.24-25.
And midway between them [envious and malicious man] is the righteously indignant man, and what the ancients call Righteous Indignation – feeling pain at undeserved adversities and prosperities and pleasure at those deserved; hence it is believed that Nemesis is a deity.  

That apotheosis moment might logically occur at the point when the two personifications no longer had any part in humanity’s moral consciousness and were rejected as superfluous to its egocentric way of life: at that precise rejection point Nemesis and Aidōs would be embraced as goddesses by the divinities. Yet, in this divine state, they continue on earth as agents of the gods and the abstracts they embrace, and will do so for as long there exists any spark of hope for the redemption of the human race. Vernant is correct to point out that Aidōs and Nemesis are today still present on the earth and are yet to leave: at line 176 νῦν γὰρ γένος ἐστι σιδῆρεον (for now the race is indeed one of iron) the νῦν, meaning now at this present time, is contrasted to τότε at line 197 καὶ τότε ὃ ὀλύμπον ἀπὸ χθόνος ἐνυφωδείης (then indeed, [will Aidōs and Nemesis cover their beautiful skin with white mantles, leave human beings behind and go] from the broad-pathed earth [to the race of the immortals], to Olympos). It will be ‘at that time’, sometime in the future that Aidōs and Nemesis will depart and take with them ‘all that remains divine in this world’.  

Once all hope is deemed futile then their purpose will have no earthly meaning, and they will leave the wretched earth crossing over into the realm of the gods abandoning mankind forever. At that point, a time yet to come, humanity will be doomed to an apocalyptic future, societies will break down further, evil will become pandemic, and Zeus will destroy this hopeless evil iron genos remorselessly.

At line 198, Hesiod describes Nemesis and Aidōs leaving the earth ‘covering their beautiful skin with white mantles’ (λευκοῖς φάρσεσι καλυψάμενο χρόα καλὸν) as they ascend to Mt. Olympos. To me, the ‘white mantles’ (λευκοῖς

---

390 My translation of ‘οἴονται’. Rackham has ‘idea’, but ‘believed’ is a more appropriate interpretation of the Greek verb: LSJ’ 1208, col. 2, s.v. οἴομαι: III ‘think, suppose, believe’.


392 Vernant sees Aidōs and Nemesis as about ‘to re-join’ the gods, i.e. they were there before and are now going back: Vernant, Myth and thought among the Greeks, 80.
φάρεσσι) symbolically representing shrouds that wrap the dead,\textsuperscript{393} because those scorned moral principles of nemesis and aidōs which Aidōs and Nemesis embody are ‘dead’ to the human race, and shrouds delineate life from death, or earthly from the divine. (Compare the discussion above concerning Helen, who veils herself in shining linen, representative of Helen’s sense of grief, disgrace, aidōs (implied) and nemesis.)\textsuperscript{394}

The Nemesis of the Theogony is ‘a bane to mankind’, and it is this aspect which the people of the iron genos in Works and Days see in both her and the concept she embodies: a bane and an irritation. As personifications Nemesis and Aidōs represent and symbolize those ethical attributes epitomized by themis. But, such principled qualities hold little value to the iron genos; to them N/nemesis is a negative baneful concept since adherence to her values would be a hindrance to the way in which they wish to live, and so they reject her. Conversely, to those who would uphold those attributes encompassed by themis, Aidōs, and N/nemesis, Nemesis and her abstract are positive concepts that act as inhibiting factors cautioning against sinful behaviour, which in turn imbibes self-respect through encouraging righteous and positive living.

Whether Hesiod’s iron genos should be assigned to some point in the distant past, or whether it is our present, or possibly it is a time yet to come, is a moot point. What is certain is the lesson Hesiod’s N/nemesis teaches every age: that the point at which society rejects all that is good and moral and chooses evil and depravity in its place is a point of no return, for at that very instant every spark of decency will be extinguished, redemption will be beyond hope, and evil will perpetuate.

---

\textsuperscript{393} LSJ\textsuperscript{1} 1918, col.1, s.v. φάρος: II, ‘a wide cloak or mantle’, ‘a shroud or pall’.

\textsuperscript{394} Hom. Il. 3.139-142, 3.419, discussed above, p. 72.
THE KYPRIA

The fragmentary *Kypria* is an important work which supplements the Hesiodic mythology that surrounds Nemesis. As a complete text it is no longer extant but, according to Proklos who summarized the work, it originally comprising eleven books, and was part of a collection of poems known today as the ‘Epic Cycle’. This ‘Epic Cycle’ comprised three central themes: the origins of the gods; the Theban war; and the events before, during and after the Trojan War. The *Kypria* belongs to this latter group, being the first poem in the following sequence: the *Kypria*, (the *Iliad*), the *Aethiopis*, the *Ilias Mikra*, the *Iliou Persis*, the *Nostoi*, (the *Odyssey*), and the *Telegonia*. Taken together the poems augment Homer and broaden his chronology producing a

---


396 The identity and date of Proklos is not known. He may have been a little-known grammarian of the second century AD, or a better-known Neo-Platonist scholar of the fifth century A.D: J. S. Burgess, *The Non-Homeric Cypria*, *TAPhA* 126, 1996, 81 n. 19. Of interest is Pausanias’ statement that he had personally read the original *Kypria: ἐπιλεξάμενος ἐν ἔκεισιν οἶδα τοῖς Κυπρίοις*; Paus. 10.31.2; *EGF*, *Kypria* F20; West, *Kypria* F27.

397 Inverted commas are used to indicate the probable artificiality of the modern day title ‘Epic Cycle’. The earliest known reference to the title is Arist. *APo* 1.12: Burgess, *The Non-Homeric Cypria*, 80, n. 16; Davies, *The Greek Epic Cycle*, 1; cf. what Athenaios said of Sophokles: ‘Sophokles took great pleasure in the ‘Epic Cycle’ and composed whole dramas in which he followed the Cycle’s version of myths’: *EGF*, *Kypria* T4 (Athen. 7.227e). Davies questions Athenaios’ accuracy since, in his opinion, Sophokles would not have known of the poems by this title in his time: Davies, *The Greek Epic Cycle*, 1. Possibly Sophokles was referring not to a body of work titled ‘The Epic Cycle’ in capital letters but a collection of epics that were part of a cyclic story loosely termed ‘the epic cycle’.

398 The first known reference to a ‘Trojan War’ (ὢποκάν πόλεμον) dates to the fifth century: Hellanik. *FGrH* 4 F84.5.

399 The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are in brackets to show where their plots fit in the sequence of the story line – they themselves are not categorized as being amongst the ‘Epic Cycle’ poems.

400 When read together the poems make up a complex continuous epic: I. Holmberg, *The Creation of the Ancient Greek Epic Cycle*, *Oral Tradition* 13, no. 2, 1998, 474; Burgess, *The Tradition of the Trojan War*, 12, 198 n. 31; who argues for an Hellenistic date for the poems as a collection in their current format: Burgess, *The Tradition of the Trojan War*, 16-17.
clearer understanding of the events surrounding the Trojan War, and the consequences of Troy’s defeat which is only briefly mentioned in Homer.

Unlike Homer’s poems, which were copiously copied over the centuries, the ‘Epic Cycle’ poems exist today only as fragments or as highly revised and edited summaries. What sources there are include references and quotations in the scholia to ancient manuscripts, especially Homer, Hesiod and the Attic tragedians; a few quotations by other authors, such as Athenaios, Plutarch, and Pausanias; the Bibliotheca of Apollodoros; incomplete abstracts or plot summaries by Proklos from his work, the Khrestomathia, attached to two ca. tenth-century AD manuscripts of the Iliad; and, a further summary of this same Khrestomathia which survives only as an outline in the work of the ninth-century AD Patriarch Photios’ Bibliotheca or Myriobiblon. Since the surviving texts were written at a considerable chronological distance from the originals, comparisons will inevitably reveal inconsistencies and contradictions; although the various authors may not all have been referring to the exact same canon of ‘Epic Cycle’ poems as known today.


402 Homer briefly mentions the wooden horse, and the slaughter of Trojans: Od. 4.271-289, 8.492-520, 11.523-432.


404 Burgess, The Tradition of the Trojan War, 17. For further discussion, see: Davies, ‘Prolegomena and Paralegomena’, 101-105.

405 Burgess, The Tradition of the Trojan War, 12.

406 For example, Hdt. 2.117 tells that in the Kypria Alexander sailed from Sparta with Helen under good weather conditions and reached Troy within three days, yet Proklos’ summary has Hera sending a storm which carried Helen and Alexander off-course to Sidon where they stayed for a period before continuing to Troy: EGF, Procli Cyriorum Enarratio 25-27; Kypria Arg. 2; cf. G. L. Huxley, ‘A Problem in the Kypria,’ GRBS 8, 1967, 25-27. Homer omits the prophecies given by Helenos and Cassandra about the outcome of Paris’ trip to Greece mentioned in the Kypria: Kypria Arg.1; EGF, Procli Cyriorum Enarratio 13-16.

The reason why these summaries of the ‘Epic Cycle’ poems survived was not necessarily because of any literary value, but because they are able to supplement and enhance Homer’s stories.\textsuperscript{408} This much is confirmed by Photios who wrote that although the poems of the ‘Epic Cycle’ were studied and valued, this was not so much for their literary merit, as for the sequence of the events (surrounding the Trojan War) contained within them.\textsuperscript{409}

**The Origins of the Kypria**

Evidence suggests that as a poem the Kypria is the written compilation of a traditional oral myth which had passed down through generations.\textsuperscript{410} It is thought to have first been written down in some form in the seventh or sixth century, and later collated with other ‘Epic Cycle’ poems into something approaching the current sequential format possibly in the Hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{411}

\textsuperscript{408} Criticism over the literary merits of the ‘Epic Cycle’ poems accusations of poor plot depth, having a penchant for the fantastic and the bizarre and being inferior to Homer Modern scholars who label the ‘Epic Cycle’ poems as inferior include: J. Griffin, 'The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer,' \textit{JHS} 97, 1977, 40-42, 44, 52-53; H. Lloyd-Jones, 'Stasinus and the Cypria,' Στασίνος 4, 1973, 115-122; G. L. Huxley, Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis, Cambridge, MA, 1969, 141; D. B. Monro, 'The Poems of the Epic Cycle,' \textit{JHS} 5, 1884, 1-2. Griffin comments: 'The strict, radical, and consistently heroic interpretation of the world presented by the \textit{Iliad} made it quite different from the Cycle, still content with monsters, miracles, metamorphoses, and an un-tragic attitude towards mortality, all seasoned with exoticism and romance, and composed in a flatter, looser, less dramatic style': Griffin, 'The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer', 53. Davies expands the aesthetic prejudice: ‘Why, for instance, publish literal translations of those tiny portions of confessedly second-rate epics that happen to have survived?’: Davies, \textit{The Greek Epic Cycle}, iv. On the other hand, Burgess believes the poems have been unfairly devalued: Burgess, The Tradition of the Trojan War, 5-6, 18-33; Barker discusses the difficulty of judging the poems from fragments: Barker, ‘Momos Advises Zeus: Changing Representations of 'Cypria' Fragment 1,’ 35-36; and, Holmberg is similarly balanced: Holmberg, 'The Creation of the Ancient Greek Epic Cycle', 459-461; Dowden thinks the simpler style of the poems may have influenced Greek epic tradition more than the heavier Homeric poems: K. Dowden, 'The Epic Tradition in Greece,' in R. Fowler (ed.), \textit{The Cambridge Companion to Homer}, Cambridge, 2004, 203-204; cf. H. Parry, 'The Apologos of Odysseus: Lies, All Lies?,' \textit{Phoenix} 48, no. 1, 1994, 1-20.


\textsuperscript{410} Burgess, The Tradition of the Trojan War, 5, 10-11; G. Nagy, \textit{Poetry as Performance}, Cambridge, 1996, 109-111. Huxley cites the phrase ‘\textita\deltaω’ (‘I sing’), at the beginning of the \textit{Ilias Mikra} (\textit{EGF}, \textit{Ilias Mikra} F1; \textit{PEG}, \textit{Ilias Mikra} F28; West, \textit{Ilias Mikra} F1) as evidence that the poem was originally an oral composition: Huxley, Greek Epic Poetry, 151-152.

\textsuperscript{411} The scarcity of original fragments from which to study datable stylistic nuances makes dating difficult: Burgess, 'The Non-Homeric Cypria', 1, esp. n. 2. Janko inclines towards a seventh-century date: R. Janko, Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction, Cambridge, 1982, 200, 228-231; West and Davies suggest the sixth century:
The *Kypria*’s unknown author has been variously given as Hegesias of Salamis in Cyprus, Stasinos of Cyprus, Kyprias of Halikarnassos, and Homer.\(^{412}\) Dismissing Homer as unlikely,\(^{413}\) the first two names might suggest the poem was named for the author’s place of origin, whereas the third that the poem was named for its author, Kyprias.

The linguistic study undertaken by Wilamowitz in 1884 and Wackernagel in 1916 resulted in their identification of apparent late sixth-century Atticisms in several fragments, perhaps even as late as *ca.* 500, which led them to suggest the poem’s author was Attic.\(^{414}\) While their dating is considered late, West, Davies, and Stafford are amongst those who consider the possibility in a positive light, with Stafford arguing the author may have been influenced by the myths surrounding Nemesis from her sanctuary at Rhamnous, such as Helen as Nemesis’ daughter.\(^{415}\) Against this late date is the evidence from seventh-century illustrations of the Judgement of Paris, a story, insofar as is known, found only in the *Kypria*, although Homer refers to it briefly.\(^{416}\) These illustrations are found on a *ca.* 700-660 ivory comb from the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta (*figure* 8),\(^{417}\) and the *ca.* 650 Chigi *olpe* from

\(^{412}\) Aelian proposed Homer: Ael. *VH* 9.15; Aristotle supplies an anonymous ‘the author’: Arist. *Poet.* 1459a37; Athenaios gives Hegesias, Stasinos, or Kyprias: Athen. 2.35c, 8.334b, 15.682e; *EGF*, *Kypria* TT1, 3, FF4, 7, 15; *PEG*, *Kypria* FF9, 17; West, *Kypria* TT, FF5, 10, 18; Photios, quoting Proklos, suggests Kyprias of Halikarnassos, or Hegesias of Salamis: Phot. *Bibl.* 319a34; see comments in: J. S. Burgess, ‘Kyprias, the ”Kypria”, and Multiformity,’ *Phoenix* 56, no. 3/4, 2002, 234-235.

\(^{413}\) Hdt. 2.117: Κατὰ τὰ πάντα δὲ τὰ ἑπεδα καὶ τόδε τὸ χωρίον οὐκ ἦκε καὶ ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον δὴλοὶ ὅτι οὐκ ὁμήρου τὰ Κύπρια ἑπεδα ἐστὶ ἄλλα ἄλλου τινὸς (‘these verses and this passage prove most clearly that the Cyprian poems are by the hand not of Homer but of another’).


Corinth, both of which indicate a date prior to Wilamowitz and Wackernagel’s sixth-century date for the *Kypria* or for the myths it contains.

Since the *Kypria* is the one poem which provides a more extensive account of Nemesis’ extended mythology, and directly links her to Zeus as his unwitting tool to achieve his plan (to be discussed), it is worth considering the origin of its name. Photios, quoting Proklos, suggests *Kypria* should not be read with a proparoxytone accent (Κύπρια), i.e. not as a neuter plural adjective as ‘the Kyprian epics’ relating to the island of Cyprus as in Herodotos’ τὰ Κύπρια ἔπεις. West believes Proklos to be wrong and that ‘the Kyprian epics’ with a

---


proparoxytone accent is the way it should be read. If correct, it is curious that of all the action within the poem as it exists, none actually takes place on or has any clear connection to Cyprus, leaving it in the seemingly unique position of possessing a title that bears little relevance to the story within it.

Proklos’ denial of a proparoxytone accent would, by default, indicate either an oxytone (Κυπριά) or paroxytone (Кυπρία) accent, with the latter producing the genitive singular of Кυπρίας, possibly a reference to the poem’s author, i.e. ‘by Kyprias’. Interestingly, an inscription from Halikarnassos seems to support this hypothesis, quoted here in part:

"Ἡρόδοτον τὸν πεζὸν ἐν ἰστορίαις Ἐμηρὸν ἣροες, Ἀνδρόνως θρέψε κλήτην δύναμιν, ἔπειρεν Πανάσσαιν ἐπον ἄρτημαν ἀνάκτα, Ἰλιάκῶν Κυπρίαν τίκτεν αὐτοθέτην."

She [Halikarnassos] brought forth Herodotos, the prose Homer in the realm of history; she nourished the renowned power of Andron, she was the mother of Panyassis, the glorious lord of verse, she gave birth to Kyprias, the poet of the tale of Ilium.

On the other hand, had a Kyprias of Halikarnassos been the author, it is strange that Herodotos, a native of that town, failed to mention this when he talks about the poem.

---


423 Cyprus is mentioned just twice in Apollodoros’ summary of Proklos’ Kypria: Apollod. Ep. 3.4.9. For a more in-depth discussion on the possibility of Cyprus as the source of the title, see: Franklin, ‘Cyprus, Greek Epic, and Kypriaka: Why Cyprus Matters,’ 234-237.

424 Other eponymous epics, such as the Iliad, the Thebaid, and the Korinthiaka, all show that their titles have a connection to the place where the majority of the drama or action took place.

425 As a 1b type noun, e.g: Κυπρία (nom.) Κυπρίαν (acc.) Κυπρίας (gen.) Κυπρία (dat.).

426 A name suggested by Athenaios: Athen. 15.682e; West, Kypria F5. A detailed discussion on Kyprias of Halikarnassos is in: Burgess, ‘Kyprias, the "Kypria", and Multiformity’, 234-244.


429 Hdt. 2.117.
three lines addressed to Aphrodite using her epithet, Kypris (from her connection to the island of Cyprus):  

εννεπε μοι, Σχοινίτη, φυλον τιθάσε[υμα μεριμνόν,  
Κύπρι, μορφνεόστων ἐμπελάτεια Πόθων,  
τής Ἀλικαρνάσσου τί τὸ τίμιον;  

Tell me, Schoinitis, dear tamer of our cares, you, Kypris, who bring close to us Desires scented with myrrh, what is it that brings honour to Halikarnassos? 

Accordingly, the title Kypria (Κυπρία with paroxytone accent) may be a reference to the Cyprian goddess, with the genitive giving the title as ‘of Kypris’; and by stretching the hypothesis even further, as: ‘the counsels of Kypris’. Aphrodite has a significant part in the Kypria, which is also mentioned by other authors. Compare the following poem by Ibycus, writing in the sixth century) which sings of ‘the Kyprian’ in reference to Aphrodite and links her to the Kypria, (Ibycus wrote the majority of his poetry in Doric Greek which accounts for the Greek variants here):

…]αι Δαρδανίδα Πράμου μέ-  
γ’ ἄστι το περικλεές διήθιον ἣνάρον  
Ἄργο[ο]θεν ὄρνυμένοι  
Ζη[νός μεγάλου βουλαίζ  
ξα[ρθάς Ελένας περὶ εἰδέα  
δή][ριν πολύμυνον ἔχ[ο]ντες

430 Kypris as a reference to Aphrodite is found in: Hom. Il. 5.330, 442, 458, 760, 883; Sapph. 4.1, 5.11; Hom. Hymn Aph. 5.2, 5.292; Theog. 1320; Pind. Ol. 1.75; throughout Aischylos and Euripides; Aristoph. Ach. 989, Eccl. 972; Anth. Pal. 5.263.5-6, 6.293.1-2, 7.218.1-3, 7.221.5-6. The epithet comes from her connection to Cyprus where she was born and had several cult centres: Virgil, Aen. 10.51, where Aphrodite claims ownership of the Cyprian Amathous, Mount Paphos, Idalia, and the island of Kythera; Ovid, Met. 10.220-242, where she claims the whole island of Cyprus and at 10.530-532 reference is made to her possession of Kythera, Paphos, Cnidos and Amathous; Paus. 9.41.2; cf. B. Graziosi, Inventing Homer: the early reception of epic, Cambridge, MA, 2002, 188.


432 Suggested by: Scaife, 'The Kypria and its Early Reception', 173; Severyns, Recherches, 96-98; F. G. Welcker, Der epische Cyclus: oder Die homerischen Dichter, vol. 1, Bonn, 1865, 286-287, nn. 506, 507. Huxley notes the possibility of an Aphrodite connection or that the name relates in some way to the island of Cyprus, but does not commit himself either way: Huxley, Greek Epic Poetry, 128-129; and Burgess argues against Kypris: Burgess, 'Kyprias, the "Kyperia", and Multiformity', 235-236 n. 6.
... destroyed the great, glorious, blessed city of Priam, son of Dardanus, setting off from Argos by the plans of great Zeus, enduring much-sung strife over the beauty of auburn Helen in tearful war; and ruin mounted long-suffering Pergamon thanks to the golden-haired Kyprian.

The fragment not only connects Kypris with Helen and the destruction of Troy, but significantly associates her with Zeus’ plans, a central theme in the Kypria, discussed below.

Other connections include two Hymns to Aphrodite which tell of Aphrodite’s fragrant temple and altar at Paphos, and describe her being anointed and dressed by the Graces, descriptions found in two Kypria fragments:

Her body was dressed in garments that the Graces and Horai had made for her and steeped in all the spring flowers that the seasons bring forth, in crocus and hyacinth, and springing violet, and the rose’s fair, sweet, nectarine bloom, and the ambrosial buds of narcissus [...] So Aphrodite was dressed in garments scented with blossoms of every kind.

and:

And she with her attendants, smile-loving Aphrodite [...] They wove fragrant garlands, the flowers of the earth, and put them on their heads, those goddesses with glossy veils, the Nymphs and Graces, and golden Aphrodite with them, as they sang beautifully on Mount Ida of the many springs.

Aphrodite has a strong presence in the Kypria, where she carries on with purposeful intent to skilfully control both gods and mortals. Not only does she directly influence Paris to abduct Helen, she manipulates the actions and decisions of Zeus, Peleus, Menelaos, and Achilles. She instructs Aeneas to

---

433 P.Oxy. XV 1790; PMG, Ibycus F1a.9; Campbell, Ibycus F282a.9. Κύπριδα (acc.) is an alternative form of Κύπρις (nom.): LSJ 1012, col. 1, s.v. Κύπρις.


435 EGF, Kypria F4; PEG, Cypria F4; West, Kypria F5; Athen. 15.682e.

436 EGF, Kypria F5; PEG, Kypria F5; West, Kypria F6; Athen. 15.682f. The Odyssey also describes Aphrodite being adorned: Od. 8.362-6.

437 Σ on Iliad 8; Kypria Arg. 1-2.

438 Kypria Arg. 1, 2, 11.
accompany the expedition to Troy, and prompts Phereklos to build the ships for Paris to travel to Sparta – the start of the troubles. Her controlling influence was not just peripheral or incidental, it was fundamental to the plot and affected the decisions and actions being undertaken by misguided mortals who erroneously thought they controlled their own minds and actions, as she wove her web of intrigue into every corner of the poem. Aphrodite, as the inspiration behind the Kypria’s title, holds merit. Her manipulative influence justifies an eponymous poem in her honour. As goddess of love and ‘passion’, she inspires and manoeuvres the many players in the drama to eventually fulfil Zeus’ plan by means of his necessarily reluctant tool, Nemesis.

ZEUS’ PLAN

Homer’ Iliad was written ca. eighth century at the time of the re-emerging Mediterranean economies after a period of cataclysmic devastations during the late Bronze Age ca. twelfth century: a destruction period described by Drews as ‘the worst disaster in ancient history’. The events surrounding the devastations, together with the resultant collapsed economies, famines, disintegration of societies, massacres from the invading so-called Sea-Peoples, and disintegration of previously well-defended and wealthy citadels such as Mycenae, Pylos, Tiryns, and Troy, would have been topics for bardic song down through the centuries. As a way to understand the destruction, the people would have rationalized it as a divine plan of systematic punishment for some offence. Hence, Διὸς βουλή (the plan of Zeus) and the events surrounding it became the subject of mythical tales, resulting in epics such as the Iliad and the Kypria.

439 EGF, Procli Cypriorum Enarratio 12; West, Kypria Arg.1.
440 ‘After that, at Aphrodite’s instigation, ships are built <by Phereklos>:’ West, Kypria Arg.1; ‘He [Phereklos] was the one who'd made well-balanced ships for Paris at the start of all the trouble, bringing disaster on the Trojans and on Paris too, for he was ignorant of what gods had decreed’: Hom. Il. 5.59-64.
442 Homer’s mortals believed the war was started by the gods: Priam (Il. 3.164-5), Helen (Il. 6.349), Achilles (Il. 24.547-548), Telemachos (Od. 1.348, 17.119), Alkinous (Od. 8.579-80), and Sirens (Od. 12.189-90).
The Kypria and Iliad reveal that Zeus had a ‘plan’. The Kypria mentions it at the beginning and end of Proklos’ summary. The first has Zeus deliberating or consulting with Themis about initiating a war at Troy to punish mankind: Zeus bouleúmeta metá tís Thémídos perí toû Troîkoû polémou. This counsel of war, which is about to set the whole Trojan epic in motion and ending with the total destruction of Troy, is the inspiration for the scene on the fourth-century pelike illustrated in figures 9 and 10.

---


444 This pivotal consultation was a familiar theme throughout the ancient Greek world in both art and literature. One unusual artistic example was the theme’s depiction intricately woven into the cloth of a himation from Sybaris dating to ca. sixth or fifth century and described by several ancient sources: P. Jacobsthal, ‘A Sybarite Himation’, JHS 58, 1938, 206; for an archaeological discussion on Sybaris, see: N. K. Rutter, ‘Sybaris – Legend and Reality,’ G&R 17, no. 2, 1970, 168-169, 173. It has also been suggested that the north metopes 29-32 of the Parthenon at Athens represent Zeus and Themis plotting about Troy, but their damaged state defies firm identification: K. Schwab, ‘Celebrations of Victory: The Metopes of the Parthenon,’ in J. Neil (ed.), The Parthenon: From Antiquity to the Present, Cambridge, 2005, 167, 183-190, figs. 56-57; J. M. Camp, The Archaeology of Athens, New Haven and London, 2001, 78; Castriota, Myth, Ethics, and Actuality, 173.

445 Attributed to the Eleusinian Painter: ARV² 1476.2, 1695; Beazley Archive no. 230432; Para. 496.2; Add. 381; LIMC ii Aphrodite 1416 (A. Delivorrias); LIMC viii Suppl. i Themis 17 (P. Karanastassi); LIMC v Hermes 778 (G. Siebert); LIMC vi Momos 3 (E. Simon); LIMC vi Peitho 9 (N. Icard-Gianolio); LIMC viii Suppl. i Zeus add. 185 (P. Karanastassi/W. Felten); Smith, Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art, 158 VP 71, fig. 4.6; Shapiro, Personifications in Greek Art, 223, fig. 183; P. D. Valavanis, Παναθηναϊκοί αφορεις απο την Εράτη: Συμβολή στην αρχαϊκή αγγειογραφία του 4ου π.Χ. αι., Athens, 1991, 282 no. 2, pl. 124; K. W. Arafat, Classical Zeus: A Study in Art and Literature, Oxford, 1990, 124-128, fig. 6, 199 no. 6.5; Boardman, Athenian Red-Figure Vases: The Classical Period, 393; E. Simon, ‘Neue Deutung zweier eleusinischer Denkmäler des vierten Jahrhunderts v. Chr.’, AntK 9, no. 2, 1966, 73, pl. 19.3; H. Metzger, Les Representations dans la ceramique attique du IVe siècle, Paris, 1951, 123, pls. 13.2-3, 15.1, 36.1; Jacobsthal, ‘A Sybarite Himation’, 208, 210; K. Schefold, Untersuchungen zu den Kertscher Vasen, Berlin and Leipzig, 1934, 42-43, no. 369.
which has captured all the emotional intensity and iconographical significance of the conspiracy. While the other deities shown are not specifically mentioned as being present during the conspiracy, most take active parts in the events surrounding the Trojan War as described by the Kypria.

The central scene shows Themis, personification of ‘right order’ and ‘divine law’, sitting on an egg-shaped stone covered with a knotted net or binding, called an ἀγρηνόν.446 This ἀγρηνόν was traditionally worn by Bacchanals and soothsayers, and is appropriate for Themis given her reputation for interpreting oracles, her seer-like ability to reveal the ‘will of the gods’, and her role as one of the original Pythiai at Delphi, second only to Gaia.447 I see the egg-shaped ‘stone’ on which Themis sits as representing the Delphic Omphalos with

---


447 Before Apollo Themis and Gaia both gave oracles at Delphi (Eur. *Iph. Taur.* 1259; Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.4.1; Paus. 10.5.6); cf. Aischyl. *Eum.* 1-8. Themis’ oracular connection is shown by the use of the plural ‘themistes’ for ‘oracles’ and ‘decrees of the gods’, and ‘themistoein’ ‘to give an oracle’: *LSJ* 789, col. 1, s.v. θέμις; cf. West, *Hesiod’s Titans*, 74-75.
Themis as the Pythia, which may be an artistic devise to insinuate that the deliberations took place at Delphi. More cryptically, it could also be a deliberate visual clue to the future, i.e. the egg-shaped stone as predicting the future birth of Helen from the egg soon to be laid by the goddess Nemesis who was to be a tool in the plan being plotted here.

The artist has Themis acting as Pindar’s ‘goddess of wise counsel’ to Zeus.448 He has captured this attribute superbly as she leans forward towards Zeus with her left hand gesturing as if to reinforce a point with her serious upturned face looking directly at Zeus, who sits on his throne with his arm supporting his slightly tilted head as if in deep contemplation at Themis’ words. Zeus and Themis are involved in an intense discussion and although Themis is doing most of the talking she has Zeus’ full attention.449 The scene is reminiscent of the following lines from the Homeric Hymn to Zeus:

Of Zeus, best and greatest of the gods, I will sing, the wide-sounding ruler, the one that brings to fulfilment, who consults closely with Themis as she sits leaning towards (ἔγκλιδὸν) him.450

Standing close by are some of the other divine protagonists who will be instrumental in the execution of Zeus’ plan of war at Troy between the Greeks and the Trojans, as told by the Kypria. Next to Zeus an armed and helmeted Athena, goddess of wisdom in war and peace, stands like an adjudicator in the discussions and decisions that are being reached between Zeus and Themis. Her attention is fixed on Themis and she appears to be wholly engaged by the conversation taking place. Above Athena a winged Nike is about to adorn Athena with a wreath, perhaps signifying Athena’s advocacy in the current deliberations are meritorious, or possibly suggestive of something more portentous – that Athena, whose beauty is soon to be scorned by Paris, will ultimately prevail in the annihilation of his homeland. To Zeus’ right stands


449 Cook’s theory that Zeus and Themis are discussing the glorification of Athens based on the figure of Nike about to crown Athena, is not supported: Cook, Zeus, vol. 2.1, 258-261.

450 Hom. Hymn Zeus 23.1-4: Ζῆνα θεῶν τὸν ἄριστον ἰδίσσομαι ἢδὲ μέγιστον, εὐφόρα κραίοντα τῆλεσφόρον, ὡς τε Θέμιστῃ ἔγκλιδὸν ἔξομένη πυκνοὐς ὄμορφος ὀλρίζετο. I have substituted West’s ‘against’ for ἔγκλιδὸν with ‘towards’, as a better interpretation of both the scene and the LSJ 472, col. 2 s.v. ἔγκλιδὸν: ‘leaning’, ‘bent down’. 
the messenger-god Hermes, who will play a part in the impending ‘Judgement of Paris’. Behind Themis sits Aphrodite with Peitho in attendance: both will have significant roles to play. Next to Athena is Selene, goddess of the moon, complete with billowing cloak as she rides side-saddle on a white horse. It is her presence, together with that of Hesperos, the evening star, that symbolically indicates the scene is taking place at night. This night-time tryst is significant for two reasons: night is the time when dark deeds and intrigues are contrived; and Night (Nyx) is, according to Hesiod, the mother of Nemesis who will play a major part in Zeus’ plan.

The second reference to Zeus’ plan occurs at the end of Proklos’ summary where it is revealed Achilles is involved:

καὶ Δίως βουλῇ ὅπως ἐπικουφίση τοῦς Τρῶας Αχιλλέα τῆς συμμαχίας τῆς Ἑλλήνων ἀποστίπας; and the plan of Zeus was to relieve the Trojans by removing Achilles from the Greek alliance

This passage has close correlations to the opening lines of the *Iliad* which tells Zeus plans many deaths:

Μὴνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηλημάδεω Αχιλλῆος οὐλομένην, ἥ μυρί’ Ἀχιμοῖς ὅλγε’ ἔθηκε, πολλὰς δ’ ἱρθίμους ψυχὰς Ἀδίδ προϊόμενον ἤρωιν, αὐτοῦς δὲ ἔλωρα τεῦχε κύνεσιν οἰωνοισὶ τε πάσι, Δίως δ’ ἐτελείετο βουλή. Sing of the wrath of Peleus’ son Achilles, goddess, the accursed wrath which brought countless sorrows upon the Achaians, and sent down to Hades many valiant souls of warriors, and made the men themselves to be the spoil of dogs and birds of every kind; and the will of Zeus was being brought to fulfilment.

The passages relate that Achilles was a vital element in Zeus’ plan. The *Kypria* explains this as Achilles withdrawing from battle; an action which would allow the Trojans to gain the upper-hand, the war to be prolonged and

---

453 EGF, Procli Cypriorum Enarratio 87-88; West, *Kypria Arg.* 12.
454 Hom. *Il.* 1.1-5.
455 Although the reason given in the *Iliad* is that Achilles removes himself on account of his anger against Agamemnon who had taken his ‘prize’, the girl Briseis: Hom. *Il.* 1.130-347.
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The death toll to rise. The *Iliad* describes Achilles’ wrath as the means by which there will be countless sorrows and many deaths.

Why was it that Zeus was bent on a war at Troy to punish mankind? The clue is found in three additional fragmentary texts. The first, by an author known as ‘Mythographus Homericus’, is preserved in the Homeric D-scholia, as well as in a number of papyri, who explains the phrase: Διός δ’ ἐπελείετο βουλή, at *Iliad* 1.5, as Homer referring to the myth found in the *Kypria* which reveals Earth was being weighed down by the race of mortals and that Zeus took pity on her and resolved to relieve her burden (omitted in Proklos’ summary):

There was a time when the countless <of men> roaming <constantly> over the land were weighing down the <deep-breasted> earth’s expanse. Zeus took pity when he saw it, and in his complex mind he resolved to relieve the all-nurturing earth of mankind’s weight by fanning the great conflict of the Trojan War, to void the burden through death. So the warriors at Troy kept being killed, and Zeus’ plan was being fulfilled (οἱ δ’ ἐν Τροίῃ ἣρωες κτείνοντο, Διὸς δ’ ἐπελείετο βουλή).

Secondly, from the same scholia, it is not Themis advising Zeus, but another of Night’s parthenogenic offspring and thus a sibling of Nemesis, Momos:

Earth, being oppressed by the multitude of men, since there was no piety in men, asked Zeus to be lightened of this burden. And first Zeus caused at once the Theban War by which he destroyed many men thoroughly. Afterwards he caused again the Trojan War, consulting with Momos – this is called the ‘decision of Zeus’ (Διὸς βουλή) by Homer; he could have destroyed them all with bolts of lightning or floods, but Momos prevented this and suggested rather two measures to him, to marry Thetis to a human and to generate a beautiful daughter.

And, thirdly from a fragmentary papyrus:

---

456 The concept of Earth being oppressed by human over-population goes back to at least the eighteenth-century Babylonian *Atrahasis*: Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution*, 100-101, n. 4.

457 West, *Kypria* F1; Σ (A) II. 1.5, EGF F1; Σ (D) II. 1.5. The bracketed words are additions found in Apollodoros’ account.

458 Hes. *Theog.* 214. The scholia on Hom. II 1.5 has Zeus planning with Momos, while *Kypria*, Arg. 1, and *P.Oxy.* LVI 3829 ii 9 give Zeus’ adviser as Themis. Burkert suggests the counsellor of Apsu, ‘Mummu’, of the *Enuma Elish* may have transferred to the Greek myth as ‘Momos’: Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution*, 103; his theory is discussed only to be dismissed by: Barker, ‘Memos Advises Zeus: Changing Representations of ‘Cypria’ Fragment 1,’ 62.

---

~101~
Zeus, finding the race of heroes guilty of impiety, conferred with Themis about destroying them completely.\(^{459}\)

The impiety of man and its oppression of Earth exemplified a lack of \emph{aidōs} and \emph{nemesis} through unconscionable multiplying; so Zeus’ resolved to punish them by reducing their numbers through war and violence. To achieve his goal he was persuaded by Themis (or possibly Momos) to employ subtle guile: the marrying of the goddess Thetis to the mortal Peleus which would result in the birth of Achilles; and, to father a beautiful daughter. Hence, Achilles and the beautiful daughter were to be Zeus’ ‘weapons of mass destruction’: the beautiful daughter, Helen, as the destroyer and weakener of men through her ability to inspire lust; Achilles as the destroyer of men through violent warfare. Zeus’ own words confirm his plan as he tells it is something in which he will take delight:

You know, Earth-Shaker, the plan in my mind, for which I gathered you here; I care for them, even though they will die. Yet for myself I will remain here sitting in a fold of Olympus, from which I will look on and take pleasure in my heart.\(^{460}\)

An additional and important causal factor to be considered is the significance of Zeus’ co-conspirator and advisor, Themis, goddess of ‘right order’ and ‘divine law’. He could have had no-one more appropriate, since the impiety of man had violated both her attributes, and had exacerbated Earth’s suffering by multiplying to excess. As Earth’s daughter, Themis would have a personal interest in the abatement and atonement of her mother’s distress. So, with his plan laid out in his mind, Zeus initiated its implementation with an act of violence – the rape of Nemesis.

**The Rape of Nemesis**

Nemesis’ rape is found in several fragments and commentaries; the oldest being a passage from the \emph{Kypria} quoted by Athenaios, where he uses it to illustrate a discussion on fish:

\(^{459}\) \textit{P. Oxy.} LVI 3829 ii 9-12: ο Ζεὺς άσέβειαν καταγγειλα το ήρωικό γένους βουλεύονται μετά Θεμίδος άρδην αύτούς άπολέσαι. The papyrus gives only the impiety of mankind as the reason for its destruction, making no mention of Earth asking Zeus to be relieved of her burden. But impiety and/or over-population could be one and the same thing. i.e. mankind was impious by not moderating its birth-rate and thus offended the gods.

\(^{460}\) \textit{Hom.} II. 20.20-23. (Translation: author.)
toûs de métâ tritáthn 'Elénnh têke, thâdha brotôstîn' 

'thn potê kallîkômos Nêmesis philósthi mygeîsa 

Zhîni thêdon bâsilhê têke krateîrhês ùp' ânâghkhs. 

feûge gâr, òud' êthelên mîkthêmên en philôstî 
patri Diê Krônion' epteîretî gâr phrênsa aîdôi 
kaî gêmêsei: kathâ yîn de kai âtrûgêstôn mèblan 
ûdôr 

feûge, Zêus ð' edîoke – labeîn ð' èlêlaitêto 

ûmôî – 

ándlôste mên kathá kûma poluvloîsboio thalâsshs 
içhûi eidoûmênh, pûnton polôn exorôthûnh, 

ándlôt' an' òkewânòn potamôn kai peîrata gaihês, 

ándlôt' an' ëpeirov poluvôlakha: 'gîneto ð' aieî 
ûthri', ðs' êpeirov aînâ trêfei, òôrha fûgyoi mn. 462

Third after them she gave birth to Helen, a wonder to mortals; 

whom lovely-haired Nemesis once bore after copulation 463 with 

Zeus, the king of the gods, under harsh compulsion. For she ran 

away, not wanting to join in fornication with father Zeus, the son 

of Kronos, tormented by aidôs and nemesis: across land and the 

dark barren water she ran, and Zeus pursued her, eager to 

possess her; sometimes in the noisy sea’s wave, when she had 

the form of a fish, as he stirred up the might deep; sometimes 

along Ocean’s stream and the ends of the earth; sometimes on 

the loam rich land; and she kept changing into all the fearsome 

creatures that the land nurtures, so as to escape him. 464

Another comes in a passage from Apollodoros in his retelling of the Kypria 

which continues the story of Nemesis’ violation and her attempts to escape:

lêgousai de ènnoi Nêmèseos 'Elênnh èînai kai Diôs. 
tâuthn gâr 
tîn Diôs feûgousan sînuosian eis ùînh tînh mofhîn 
mêtabalein, òmowethênta de kai Día kûkhn sînuîleînh: tîn 
dè 

ùôn ék tîs sînuosias âpotêkein, tôsto de èn tôis âlîseih 
êîrônâ tînâ poîmêna Lîða kômîantas dôunai, tînh 

461 Welcker and Gantz suggest Athenaios may have omitted a few of the Kyprian lines at this point since he was talking about fish and wanted to emphasize Nemesis changing into this creature: T. Gantz, Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources, Baltimore, 1993, 319; F. G. Welcker, Der epische Cyclus: oder Die homerischen Dichter, vol. 2, Bonn, 1849, 514; cf. Huxley’s counter argument: Huxley, Greek Epic Poetry, 133-134. The lacunae is included in: EGF (Davies), but ignored by: PEG (Bernabê), West, Evelyn-White.

462 Athen. 8.334-c; PEG, Kypria F9; EGF, Kypria F7; West, Kypria F10.

463 Φιλότητι in line 2 of the Greek is another of Night’s children and a sibling of Nemesis, but there is no indication the personification is meant: the LSJ translates the word as: ‘friendship’, ‘love’, or ‘sexual love’, ‘intercourse’: LSJ 1941, col. 1, s.v. φιλότης. Since the passage contains no ‘love’ only violence, I have translated φιλότητι more appropriately and coarsely as ‘copulation’ or ‘fornication’.

464 The translation is West’s with my emendations indicated by italics.
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καταθέμενην εἰς λάρνακα φυλάσσειν, καὶ χρόνω καθήκοντι γεννηθεῖσαν Ἑλένην ὡς ἐξ αὐτῆς θυγατέρα τρέφειν. 465

But some say that Helen was a daughter of Nemesis and Zeus, 466 for that she, flying from the arms of Zeus, changed herself into a goose, but Zeus in his turn took the likeness of a swan and so enjoyed her; and as the fruit of their intercourse she laid an egg, 467 and a certain shepherd found it in the groves and brought and gave it to Leda; and she put it in a chest and kept it; and when Helen was hatched in due time, Leda brought her up as her own daughter. 468

Apollodoros’ version is repeated in a fragment by Philodemos: 469

And the author of the Ky[pria] says that Zeus pursued [Nemesis] after changing himself too into a goose, and when he had had union with her she laid an egg, from which Helen was born.

Scodel suggests the nemesis and aidōs felt by Nemesis (ἐπείρετο γὰρ φρένας αἰδοὶ καὶ νεμέσσει) in the Athenaios text are prospective emotions, in that she is identifying herself with the nemesis or judgement she will potentially receive from others as a consequence of Zeus’ violation of her. 470 In my opinion Nemesis’ emotions are not prospective but very immediate, real and relative to her present situation: she has been raped and dishonoured despite her attempts to escape – there was no acquiescence, and she is not deserving of society’s nemesis, since, as previously discussed, nemesis was a censorial emotion.

465 Apollod. Bibl. 3.10.7. After first discussing the variant version of Leda and Zeus as Helen’s parents, Apollodoros turns to the older myth involving Nemesis.
466 Tzetz. Σ on Lykop. 88; Eust., Iliadem 1321.30; Eratosth. 25.
467 The ancient authors were divided on what form, goose or swan, was taken by Nemesis and Zeus: Asclep. FGrH 12 F11 and Eratosth. 25 decide on swans for both; Philodem. De Piet. B 7369 has both as geese; Apollod. Bibl. 3.10.7 has Nemesis as a goose; Ps. Clem., Homil. 5.13.7.1, suggests either a swan or a goose for Zeus. Luppe thinks Zeus would have chosen the same bird as Nemesis, either goose or swan, and that the Apollodoros text is corrupt at the critical point when describing the birds: W. Luppe, ‘Zeus und Nemesis in den Kyprien: Die Verwandlungssage nach Pseudo-Apollodor und Philodem,’ Philologus 118, 1974, 192-202; see also: Gantz, Early Greek Myth, 319-320. According to Paus. 3.16.1, and no doubt in support of the Spartan variant of Leda as Helen’s mother (discussed below), this egg was still to be seen hanging by ribbons from the roof of the temple of Hilaire and Phoebe at Sparta.
468 Trans. Frazer, but I translate μονοποίων as ‘intercourse’ instead of Frazer’s ‘loves’ in line 4 of the Greek, again for the reason that there was no ‘love’ involved in the act.
469 Philodem. De Piet. B 7369; West, Kypria F11; PEG, Kypria F10; EGF, Kypria F8 with apparatus for variant restorations.
against a person deemed worthy of reproach because of a consciously and voluntarily enacted unmeritorious deed.\textsuperscript{471} Moreover, the \textit{nemesis} aroused in Nemesis is not word-play on her name, as some suggest.\textsuperscript{472}

The \textit{aidōs} Nemesis suffers is the deep humiliating mortification and anguish of her present desperate situation. It is a personal sense of shame that is, because of her helplessness and lack of free will, incapable of acting as the aforementioned inhibitory emotion against behaviour normally deserving of \textit{nemesis} from others. Her emotion of \textit{nemesis} is not a self-judgement, nor a fear of being blamed; rather it is as an objective emotion of righteous indignation against the reprehensible actions of Zeus who has unjustly and unconscionably wronged her.

For Zeus it was necessary to consciously and wantonly violate Nemesis (Righteous Indignation) to provoke within her the extremes of her attributes of ‘righteous indignation’ and ‘anger aroused by injustice’, to enable this resultant emotive force, once born, to emerge and boil with intensified hurtful resentment and transform into a new incarnation. In this he was successful, for the aroused righteous anger, the indignation, the blame, the \textit{aidōs}, and the \textit{nemesis}, were at her moment of violence so strong, so intense, and so potently powerful, just as in those parthenogenic children of Nyx who witnessed the first cosmic violence,\textsuperscript{473} that a new manifestation was demanded to encapsulate these emotions, Nemesis as Divine Retribution.\textsuperscript{474}

Helen, the subsequent daughter of this forced union was destined to unconsciously engender the newly emerged retributive potency of her mother and the vengeful power of her father, so that ‘Helen born of violence’ would be his innocent tool in his plan. Her innocence is confirmed by the fact that she received no punishment for her supposed causal role in the Trojan War, and

\textsuperscript{471} See above pp. 25-27, 21-22, for a discussion on this sense of \textit{aidōs} and \textit{nemesis}.


\textsuperscript{474} I do not see the difficulty in assuming Nemesis was a divine being at the time of her rape, as some have: Davies, \textit{The Greek Epic Cycle}, 35-39; cf. Smith, \textit{Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art}, 42.
through her ultimate reward of an afterlife on the Isle of Blessed. This was Helen’s tragedy: the product of violence, conceived without love from an unwilling mother who abandoned her to be reared by another, and to be unwittingly manipulated in adulthood by her father.

Nemesis was also an innocent participant in Zeus’ plan. A passage in Eratosthenes’ *Katasterismi* describes her attempts to protect her virginity. It names Zeus as the perpetrator of her violation, tells of Helen’s birth, and links Zeus’ transformation into a swan with the star constellation ‘Cygnus’.

It is said that Zeus, enamoured of Nemesis, transformed himself into this bird when she changed her shape and assumed the form of a swan in order to protect her virginity. Zeus changed himself into a swan and flew down to Ρχαμνούς in Ἀττικα, where he ravished her. She bore an egg, from which Helen was hatched, as the poet Kratinos recounts. Because he did not change his shape but flew away thus to heaven, Zeus placed the image of a swan among the stars. The swan is represented as it was at that time, in flight.

A variation in Hyginus tells of Zeus’ lust for Nemesis, but on being rejected Aphrodite persuades him to change into a swan whereupon she, in the form of an eagle, would chase him. The plan has the desired effect: Nemesis feels sorry for the bird, offers it sanctuary in her lap, whereupon she falls asleep and is raped by Zeus. The resultant egg was given to Leda by Hermes for safe keeping. To symbolize his conquest Zeus created the star constellation ‘Cygnus’.

---

476 Eratosth. 25. *Καταστερισμός* survives in a collection dating to the end of the first century AD, and based on a lost original doubtfully attributed to Eratosthenes.
479 Hyginus *Astron.* 8. Illustrations of this mythical scenario of Helen either still in the egg or emerging from it include: *LIMC* iv Helene 1-13 (L. Kahl/N. Icard); *LIMC* vi Leda 28-32 (L. Kahl/N. Icard-Gianolio); ARV² 1142.1, ARV² 1171.4, ARV² 1174.2 and 4, ARV² 1185.10, ARV² 1334.17; cf. an image of this scene and a discussion on a previously unidentified Helen and the Dioskouroi emerging from the egg (Museum of London, no. 3374), in: R. Ling, ‘A Relief from Duke Street, Aldgate, now in the Museum of London,’ *Britannia* 24, 1993, 7, 9.
An alternative version has Leda as Helen’s mother, who was similarly chased by Zeus, transformed into a swan or goose, was raped, and laid the egg from which Helen emerged.\textsuperscript{480} Since this version was first mentioned by Euripides \textit{ca. 412} it is construed as having derived from a later tradition,\textsuperscript{481} possibly Lakanian in order to claim Helen as their own through Leda.\textsuperscript{482} Perhaps Euripides used the variant, or modified the original, for his own authorial purposes to suit his plot.\textsuperscript{483} Isokrates picks up the variant but then mentions both Nemesis and Leda as the receivers of Zeus’ insatiable lust:

κύκνος δὲ γενόμενος εἰς τούς Νεμέσεως κόλπους κατέφυγε, τούτω δὲ πάλιν ὁμοιωθεὶς Λήδαν ἐνύμφευσεν.\textsuperscript{484}

and having become a swan he took refuge in the bosom of Nemesis, and again in this form he espoused Leda.

A fragment from Philodemos, writing in the first century, indicates he was similarly aware of both versions. He mentions the story of Nemesis as told in the \textit{Kypria} and then continues: Zeus ‘in like manner’ transformed himself into a swan when he desired Leda.\textsuperscript{485} Norwood caustically dismisses the Helen myth as a ‘bungling travesty’, and suggests the myth of Nemesis and Leda as Helen’s mothers, i.e. one her true mother and the other her adoptive or step-mother, is: ‘a laughably stupid notion’ and is an invention of the fifth-century comic author, Kratinos. Since Norwood categorically gives the \textit{Kypria’s}

\textsuperscript{480} Luk. \textit{DG} 20.14; \Sigma Hom. \textit{Od.} 11.298; Hyginus \textit{Fab.} 77; Apollod. \textit{Bibl.} 3.10.7. A fragment from Kratinos’ \textit{Nemesis} (discussed below, p. 162) implies Leda was Helen’s step-mother, as someone is telling her to sit on an egg for it to hatch: \textit{PCG} iv F115; also: Paus. 1.33.7; DNP, vol. 6, 817. There are various myths about the egg and its contents: older versions mention just Helen, later accounts have Helen and Klytemnestra, or give two eggs (one containing Helen and Klytemnestra and the other the Dioskouroi, or Helen and Polydeukes in one egg, and Klytemnestra and Kastor in the other). Hom. \textit{Il.} 3.328 gives the same mother for Helen and the Dioskouroi, but Hom. \textit{Od.} 11.298 has Leda as the mother of the Dioskouroi alone. The oldest evidence for Nemesis as Helen’s mother is the \textit{Kypria}. See discussion in: P. Jackson, \textit{The Transformations of Helen: Indo-European Myth and the Roots of the Trojan Cycle}, Dettelbach, 2006, 34-39; Ling, ‘A Relief from Duke Street’, 8-9. Zeus is given as Helen’s father, in the passages discussed, plus: Hom. \textit{Il.} 3.199, 418, 426; \textit{Od.} 4.184, 219; 23.218. Cf. \Sigma on Pind. \textit{Nem.} 10.150a which quotes Hesiod as saying Helen’s mother was neither Nemesis nor Leda but Okeanos: Hes. F21.

\textsuperscript{481} Eur. \textit{Hel.} 16-22, 257-259; \textit{Iph.} 49-51, 794-800.

\textsuperscript{482} Hdt. 6.61; Paus. 3.7.7.

\textsuperscript{483} Cf: \textit{OCD}\textsuperscript{4} 837 s.v. Leda; Arafat, \textit{Classical Zeus}, 58, no. 96.

\textsuperscript{484} Isok. 10.59.

\textsuperscript{485} Philodem., \textit{De Piat.} B 7369: ὀδ[π]ε[ρ] (ον, ὡς δὲ) [Λήδας ἐπισφοδὸς [ἐγ]ύνομεν κύκος; \textit{PEG}, \textit{Kypria} F10; however, because of its fragmented state, instead of ὀδ[π]ε[ρ] (Crönert) others have restored ὡς δὲ, but the meaning is roughly the same; see apparatus on p. 51 in \textit{PEG}.  

\textcopyright 2021
unknown author as Stasinos, and seems to find spatial variations in myth implausible, his jibes are dismissed. Similarly his statement that Leda’s role in this version of the myth was not known in any source before Kratinos clearly ignores the evidence of a fragmented verse by seventh century Sappho:

φασὶ δὴ ποτα Λῆδαν ύακίνθινον ... ὁιον εὐρην πεπυκάδμενον ...

they say that Leda once found an egg of hyacinth colour, covered ...

The egg Leda finds is confidently, although not positively, assumed to be the one from which Helen hatched. The fragment imparts an essential additional piece of information – the colour of the egg. Swan and goose eggs are white or cream with just one exception – *Cygnus Olor* or the Mute Swan, which lays bluish/greenish/greyish coloured eggs, which poetical could be called, hyacinth. The identification of Nemesis as a Mute Swan adds poignancy to the myth since in this form she cannot cry out at her moment of greatest humiliation and degradation, but can only internalize her distress along with the *aidōs* and *nemesis* mentioned by Athenaios.

The *Kypria* records that Nemesis shape-shifted into several creatures in her attempt to escape Zeus. First various sea-creatures, yet still she was pursued; next, land-creatures, which was similarly futile; and, finally a creature of the sky – a swan. Her shape-shifting had drawn her closer and closer to the gods on Olympus – sea, land and sky – yet there was no help for her there and her tactical manoeuvres proved no barrier to Zeus. Nemesis’ ultimate choice of a swan was unwise: not only was this a bird whose long, sensual, and invitingly strokable neck hints at a phallic analogy, but the bird was also an

487 Sapph. F166.
490 Athen. 8.334d; *PEG*, *Kypria* F9; *EGF*, *Kypria* F7; West, *Kypria* F10.
attribute of Aphrodite, and as such Nemesis had innocently placed herself in Aphrodite’s control (the iconography frequently depicts Aphrodite and her swan (or goose) attribute, for example the *kylix* in figure 11.)

Nemesis was doomed. Now under the manipulative power of Aphrodite there would be no escape for Nemesis: Zeus would violate her in order to produce a fatally beautiful daughter for the furtherment of his plan. As his tool Helen, the produce of this union, would be manipulated to punish humanity for its impiety and its excessive breeding by bringing their numbers to within proper limits through violent warfare, while her mother Nemesis, now Divine Retribution, would henceforth punish excesses wherever found to restore natural order and balance on the earth.

Figure 11: Aphrodite riding one of her attributes, the goose or swan; Athenian white-ground *kylix*; ca. 460; BM 1864,1007,77 (source: museum).

491 Attributed to the Pistoixenos Painter: ARV² 862.22, 1672; LIMC ii Aphrodite 916 (A. Delivorrias); Beazley Archive no. 211350; Para. 425; M. Robertson, The Art of Vase-Painting in Classical Athens, Cambridge, 1992, 159, fig. 166; Boardman, Athenian Red-Figure Vases: The Classical Period, 38, no. 3, fig. 67; P. Mingazzini, Greek Pottery Painting, trans. F. B. Sear, London, 1969, 96-97, fig. 39; Pfühl, Masterpieces of Greek Drawing and Painting, 56, fig. 70; Pfühl, Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen, fig. 498.
Through the *aidōs* and *nemesis* suffered by Nemesis as a white Mute Swan, an analogy can be drawn with Hesiod’s account of how, when mankind has become so debauched and so evil with no regard for *aidōs* and *nemesis* that these personified forces will leave the earth ‘covering their beautiful skin with white mantles’ to join the gods on Olympus. The ‘white mantles (λευκοὶσιν φάρεσσι)’ mentioned by Hesiod suggest the white feathers of Nemesis’ poignant Mute Swan and a symbol of her innocence.

With one part of his plan secured, Zeus, with the co-operation of Aphrodite, moved on to the next step, the judgement of Paris as told in the *Kypria*.

**Aphrodite and ‘The Judgement of Paris’**

Another of Nyx’s offspring destined to play a part in Zeus’ plan was Eris, or Strife. It was Eris, according to *Kypria* Arg. 1 and other fragmentary texts such as *P.Oxy.* LVI 3829 who, in a fit of pique, threw an apple into the crowd at the banquet of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis because she had not been invited. The apple she threw was inscribed: τῇ καλλίστῃ (‘for the fairest’), and of the wedding guests Hera, Athena and Aphrodite, each thought such a trophy should be her exclusive property as testament to her personal beauty. Eris’ ‘apple of Discord’ (μῆλον τῆς Ἔριδος) was to spark a vanity-fuelled scene between the three goddesses and would prove to be the catalyst that initiated a series of unstoppable events that culminated in the Trojan War.

In order to calm the inflamed situation Zeus instructed Hermes to escort the squabbling goddesses to Paris and for him to judge the one worthy of the apple. Upon their arrival the goddesses each offered Paris inducements, or bribes: Hera offered kingship over all, and Athena offered victory in war, both of which amounted to the previously discussed prized qualities of the Homeric
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493 Nemesis as a swan and her emotions of *nemesis* and *aidōs* led Harrison to interpret Hes. *WD* 198 as the personified goddesses, Aidōs and Nemesis, departing the earth as birds: ‘their fair flesh hidden in white and feathery raiment, to the kingdom of the deathless ones – the birds’: Harrison, *Themis*, 116; cf. Eur. *Rh.* 618: ‘and near him his white horses are tethered to his Thracian chariot, easy to see in the darkness; they shine like the plumage of a river swan’.
495 Hyginus *Fab.* 92; Apollod. *Ep.* 3.2.
Bronze Age hero, namely aretē, time and kleos. Yet Paris, in a decision which reveals the weakness of his character, went with his baser emotion of lust and chose Aphrodite’s gift of Helen. The word γάμος used here (Ἀφροδίτη δὲ γάμον Ἑλένης) is commonly translated as ‘marriage’ but can also be rendered as ‘rape’. Since Helen was given no choice as to whether she wanted to be a ‘gift’, I believe ‘rape’ is the more fitting interpretation. A closer reading of following passage from the Kypria confirms this reading: καὶ προκρίνει τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἐπαρθείς τοῖς Ἑλένης γάμοις Αλέξανδρος (West translates the passage as: ‘Alexander, excited by the prospect of union with Helen, chooses Aphrodite’). But, as the aorist passive participle of the verb ἐπαίρω, ἐπαρθείς can also read ‘to be roused’, ‘swell up’, in which case Paris was physically and sexually aroused at the prospect of γάμος with Helen.

The debate over whether Helen went willingly with Paris or was forcibly abducted has no clear consensus. The literary and artistic evidence argues for both sides. Homer’s Nestor implies she was forced: ‘so let no-one make haste to return home, until he has slept with the wife of some Trojan, and has avenged Helen’s struggles and her groanings (στοναχίς)’; but, Sappho has

496 That Paris was driven by lust is evident in the words he uses when speaking to Helen at Hom. II. 3.445: φιλότητι καὶ εὖς. In Homer this phrase is invariably used to indicate strong sexual desire: Hom. II. 6.25, Od. 23.219; cf. II. 2.232, 13.636, 14.207, 237. 353, Od. 8.313. Cf. my comments on the word φιλότητα at p. 103 n. 465 where I translate the word as ‘copulation’ or ‘fornication’ as better suited in the context of Nemesis’ rape, and which is better suited in the passage above. His was not ‘love’ or ‘fondness’ for Helen, it was lust for fornication with a beautifully desirable woman.

497 Apollod. Ep. 3.2; West, Kypria Arg. 1.
498 LSJ 337, col. 2, s.v. γάμος, 337, col. 1, s.v. γαμέω, suppl. 74, col. 2, s.v. γαμέω.
499 West, Kypria Arg. 1.
500 LSJ 604, col. 1, s.v. ἐπαίρω.
501 An abduction is suggested by: Hom. II. 3.443-444: οὐδ᾽ ὅτε σε πρῶτον Λακεδαιμόνιος ἢ ἡρατεῖας ἡράς ἐλευθεράς εἰς ποιητήρας νέεσσα (‘not even when I snatched you from lovely Lacedaemon and sailed with you on my seafaring ships’); West Kypria F19: ‘When Alexander stole (ὑπόπαντος) Helen’; Hdt. 2.113 (Ἀλέξανδρον ὑπόπαντον Ἑλένην ἐκ Στάρτης), 5.94 (Ἑλένης ὑπόπαντος) The underlined words are derivatives of ὑπάντω (ὑπάντων) The noun στοναχιός is feminine, accusative, plural indicating Helen’s ‘groanings’. But, Murray interprets a masculine noun and shifts the struggles and groanings from Helen to the Achaians and translates: ‘so let no man make haste to depart homewards until each has lain with the wife
her going willingly: ‘Helen, left her most noble husband and went sailing off to Troy with no thought at all for her child or dear parents, but (love) led her astray’.  

The irony for Paris was that this prize for whom he lusted, once won, soon began to view him with contempt and nemesis (blame/reproach) upon realizing his character was devoid of those manly characteristics of aretē, time or kleos, the scorned gifts offered by Hera and Athena. Homer explicitly illustrates Helen’s distain for Paris in her words: ‘I wish that I had been the wife of a better man, who could perceive the nemesis and the many revilings of men’. Similarly: ‘You have come back from the war; I wish you had died there, vanquished by a mighty man who was my former husband’. So Paris’ beautiful prize came to despise him, and he, for his wanton behaviour, which lacked aidōs and nemesis, in taking the wife of another would be the cause of the utter destruction of himself, his family, his people, and his city, and so Zeus’ plan triumphs.

**CONCLUSION**

The abstract concept of nemesis in this Archaic period was a sense of indignation covering a range of emotional strengths, from mild resentment to extreme anger. It was an emotion felt by the witnesses of shameful behaviour towards those who carried out such deeds, but it could also be an internal emotion felt by the protagonist; thus it could be experienced objectively or subjectively. The nemesis felt by the witness or protagonist did not necessarily manifest itself in retributive punishment since the punishment primarily lay in the personal shame or blame incurred. Such shame that would arise from behaviour warranting an invocation of nemesis was meant, together with a sense of aidōs, to be the decisive factors which would prevent any nemesis of some Trojan, and has got requital for his strivings and groanings over Helen’. *LSJ* 1650, col. 1, s.v. στοναχή, ‘groan’ ‘sigh’.

503 *Sapph. F16.*

504 *Hom. II. 6.350-351: ἀνδρὸς ἔσειτ’ ὄφελλον ἀμείνονος εἶναι ἵκοιτις, ὡς ἱδὴ νέμεσιν τε καὶ ἄσχεα πόλλ’ ἀνθρώπον.*

505 *Hom. II. 3.428-429: ἡλθες ἐκ πολέμου ὡς ὑφῆς εὑράς αὐτόδ’ ἀλέσθαι, ἄνθρι δαμιᾶς κρατερή, ὡς ἄμας πρότερος πόσις ἦν.*

506 *Troy’s end is in found in another of the ‘Epic Cycle’ texts: West, *Iliou Persis, Arg. 2-4.*
inducing behaviour or the committing of an action which would result in *nemesis*. Those individuals who did not fear the potential shame, and thus an invocation of *nemesis*, being brought about through their actions, for example Paris and Penelope’s suitors, continued to act as they desired. Ultimately, the result of their consciously enacted reprehensible deeds was their destruction by those who acted as agents of the gods, for example Odysseus’ action in killing the suitors.

This chapter has also introduced an additional, and original, interpretation of the abstract *nemesis* in the episode involving Thersites, where I have argued Homer has transformed the abstract into the embodiment of the concept as experienced by the Achaeans. This is an original interpretation of the Homeric material, and one made from a close reading of the Greek text together with an analysis of the grammatical structure of the word within both its sentence and its context. Homeric *nemesis* is not a personified concept, as many other abstract concepts are, but in this Thersites’ sketch Homer comes close, perhaps a halfway measure, to such personification.

In many instances the threat of an invocation of *nemesis* against another would be heeded, for example the threat made by Poseidon and Apollo towards their *philoi* if they did not rouse themselves. Yet, if the unconscionable behaviour continued despite a threat of *nemesis* it seems the threat was not necessarily executed and the perpetrator remained unpunished. This scenario is evident in Achilles’ prolonged abuse of Hektor’s body beyond an acceptable time frame, and although the gods threatened a collective shaming or blaming (*nemesis*) if he did not stop abusing the body, Achilles persisted and the gods’ threat remained unfulfilled. In the first two examples it was the god whose pride was at risk through the behaviour of his *philoi*, but in the Achilles’ episode the gods were making a threat based on their observance of human moral behaviour, so that what was emerging in this latter example was the *genesis* of a divine judgement on mortals, an aspect which evolves further in the Classical period.

A new dimension to the abstract concept is added with Hesiod’s personification and deification of the emotion into the goddess Nemesis, but who will, together with deified Aidōs, leave mankind to its own devices when
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it has become so evil that it no longer takes heed of the moral abstracts they embody. Later, in the Kyprian mythology the goddess becomes ‘Nemesis as Divine Retribution’ as a consequence of the intense emotional force that generated within her during her violation by Zeus, and she now takes on the role of a moral judge and a punisher of consciously enacted human iniquities, and punishes excesses wherever found to restore natural order and balance on the earth, to restore themis. Helen, the daughter of that forced union, was brought about as a mortal embodiment of her mother’s retributive quality and Zeus’ plan for humanity, and although she is one of the major agents in the destruction of Troy, she does not suffer any consequential nemesis for her complicity in starting a war that killed many, because she was an innocent tool. Helen was merely the passive agent of Zeus’ plan, suggested to him by the goddess Themis as a means to bring about the death of thousands at Troy, to reduce the world’s population, and to punish mankind for its impiety to the gods and to lessen the burden upon Earth.
CHAPTER 3: THE CLASSICAL EVIDENCE

Ἐλπίδα καὶ Νέμεσιν Εὔνους παρὰ βωμὸν ἐτευξά, τὴν μὲν, ἵν’ ἐλπίζῃς τὴν δ’, ἵνα μηδὲν ἔχῃς.

Eunus made [statues of] Hope and Nemesis by an altar: the one, so that you might have hope; the other that you might have none.

Anonymous

The majority of the discussion in this chapter revolves around the literary evidence, but I commence with an in-depth discussion of an image painted onto a fifth-century red-figure pointed amorphiskos, which hints at future retribution. The significance of this particular amorphiskos, and why it is deserving of its prominent position at the commencement of the chapter, is because its imagery provides another rare link between Nemesis of the Archaic Kypria and Nemesis of the Classical era. An additional unique feature lies in the fact that, with the exception of Nemesis’ statue and sculptured base at Rhamnous, the scene depicts the only known painted representation of not only Nemesis but also Nemesis with Helen, her mythological daughter. Consequently, the artist’s skill draws together chronological facets of the goddess: Nemesis in the Archaic literature, Nemesis in the Classical literature, and Nemesis in the archaeology of various eras at Rhamnous, topics which are discussed in this and the next chapter. I also include in this chapter a discussion on the possibility of two further representations of Paris’ seduction of Helen as told by the Archaic Kypria painted onto two ca. 450-410 Attic red-figured egg-shaped vessels known as ὄον.

The Classical literature introduces a chthonic aspect to Nemesis, which is seen through the lens of her traditional role amongst the living as a restorer of balance, the upholder of principles of themis, the punisher of those who violated these principles, and the chastiser of blame-worthy acts emanating

1 Anth. Gr. 9.46. Translation: author.
2 One other is the scene on the kylix discussed above pp. 97-99.
from a lack of respect for *aidōs*. In this light, I argue that perpetrators who had wronged the dead should expect Nemesis to restore balance by enacting punishment on their behalf since they cannot, and their righteous cause is now under divine guardianship. Although there are compelling indications of a connection between Nemesis and death in the archaeology of the seventh and sixth centuries, to be discussed in the following chapter, the earliest known literary evidence is found in the fifth-century tragedians.

Comedy is a surprising genre in which to find Nemesis, given her reputation for retribution and punishment. Yet, in Kratinos’ play *Nemesis* she is the subject of sexual ribald where the playwright turns her Kyprian mythology into a parody full of satirical mockery and sexual innuendo. Although the play is not intact, the fragments are able to impart, with some certainty, that the main protagonists were the politician of the day, Perikles, and his courtesan, Aspasia. The play’s humour revolves around Perikles as seducer extraordinaire, and in this role he is portrayed as Zeus with his reputation for paramours. The play imparts political humour in the form of mythological comedy and is set at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War where it revisits the rape of Nemesis and the birth of Helen as told in the *Kypria*. The myth is recast to give Perikles a double identity with Zeus where he is mocked and ridiculed throughout the play. Whether it was Aspasia who was given a double identity with Nemesis is not clear, especially since she is far from a victim of Perikles’ advances. Kratinos expertly adapted the more serious traditional mythology by turning it into a play lampooning the current political events of his day; an indication the myths were being taken more light-heartedly.

Herodotos is the only known fifth-century historical writer to use the abstract concept *nemesis*, albeit just once. Its sole use is in the story he tells of Kroisos and where it implies a *hybris/nemesis* dichotomy as cause and effect. It is interesting to speculate why Herodotos limited himself to just this one use of the abstract, especially since it has been claimed that an unspoken *nemesis* is everywhere implicit in his work. If accepting this point it can be further argued that besides the importance of Herodotos’ *Histories* as an historical treatise it also works as a didactic tool for future generations to learn from the
mistakes of their forebears for fear of nemesis or retribution. Since this is a huge subject in itself I have limited my discussion in this thesis to the abstract’s sole use in the narrative concerning Kroisos, and to the story of Polykrates which is sometimes quoted as an example of an implicit nemesis.

These four genres illustrate N/emesis of this period, chosen because they link some of the strongest motivating emotional forces: persuasion, death, sex, and prosperity.

**NEMESIS, HELEN, AND PERSUASION**

**The Berlin Amorphoriskos**

The ca. 430 red-figured pointed amorphoriskos in figure 12 stands eighteen centimetres high, and is important for its unique pictorial image of the mythology surrounding Nemesis and her relationship with her daughter Helen. Although, Helen, Paris, and Trojan war themes were popular with

---

Classical era artists, the scene illustrated here has no known close parallel, which has led Stafford, Shapiro and others to suggest the artist was copying from an earlier, now lost, image, possibly a large wall or panel painting. The attributed artist is 'the Heimarmene painter' and for reasons which will become clear Ghali-Kahil has aptly described the scene as 'La Persuasion d’Hélène'.

Figure 12: ‘The Persuasion of Helen’; red-figure amphoriskos; ca. fifth century; Berlin Antikensammlung inv. 30036; (source: museum)


The scene has been expertly executed and through the genius of the artist the full intensity of the emotional passions at play are still clearly visible. The composition of the scene expansively and imaginatively develops upon the epic story as found in the *Kypria*, with the representation of Nemesis and Helen confirming a contemporaneous belief in the legitimacy of the epic tradition of Nemesis as Helen’s true mother.6

Although the names of Helen and Paris are not inscribed or are lost, the milieu of the scene is so assuredly that of Helen being persuaded by Aphrodite with Paris in attendance that their identification is secure. Of the inscribed names [ΝΕ]ΜΕΣΙΣ is confirmed, as is ΠΕ[ΠΙ]ΘΩ (Peitho), ΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΕ (Aphrodite), ΙΜΕΡΟΣ (Himeros) and until recently ΕΙΜΑΡΜΕΝΗ (Heimarmene), with Schwarzmaier’s study throwing doubt on this last name.7 This leaves two unknown female figures.

In *figures* 12 and 12a Nemesis stands with one of these females. Her name, although it once existed, now consists of negligible fragments (visible only with specialist equipment), an apparently restored Greek Υ (upsilon) and a possible Ε (epsilon). Zahn, who saw the *amphoriskos* in the late 1920s was undecided even on the Ε since it was: ‘ein undeuticher Rest’ (a vague remainder).8 This provisional identification has encouraged Shapiro, Beazley, Wiliamowitz, and others to restore the name as [Τ]Υ[Χ]Ε,9 goddess of

---

6 This statement holds true for Attic Greeks but Lakedaimonian Greeks believed in the later tradition of Leda, husband of the mythical Spartan king Tyndareos, as Helen’s mother.
7 Schwarzmaier, ‘Wo ist Heimarmene?’, 26, 28.
Fortune, with Neumann suggesting [E]Y[TYXIA] (Good Fortune).\textsuperscript{10} Shapiro discusses the possibility of Eutychia but ultimately decides on Tyche as the most likely candidate.\textsuperscript{11} The precedent of a link between Tyche and Nemesis on an altar inscription from Olympia of \textit{ca.} the same date, which reads\textsuperscript{12}: Τύχας [Νεμ]έσεος (for Tyche Nemesis), possibly adds support to an identification of Tyche in this instance, although the connection is tenuous given the altar inscription is the only verified artistic evidence for the two goddesses as a complementary pair. Conversely, the scarcity of representations of Tyche on Attic vases (Shapiro notes only one)\textsuperscript{13} inclines Smith to view Tyche as unlikely, whereas [E]Y[KΛ]ΕΙΑ (Good Repute) is, in her opinion, more feasible, especially since Helen is on the point of forsaking her ‘good repute’.\textsuperscript{14} Indeed, Shapiro speaks of Helen’s recklessness with her ‘good repute’, because she had ‘trampled most heavily this very virtue’.\textsuperscript{15} Puzzlingly, Smith’s restoration is not consistent throughout her book: after first suggesting the letters be restored as [E]Y[KΛ]ΕΙΑ with two intervening letters between the remaining fragments, she later writes the name as [E]Y[KΛΕΙΑ] by restoring a \textit{kappa} immediately after the \textit{upsilon}, and leaving the possible \textit{Ẹ} unrestored.\textsuperscript{16} Ghali-Kahil suggests the female may be [O]Y[ΠΙΣ], a later epithet of Nemesis dating to the Roman Imperial era, which does not fit chronologically with the \textit{amphoriskos}.\textsuperscript{17} Since the letter fragments are not visible to the naked eye, I have included a specialist photograph (figure 13a) to show the supposed Y and the possible Ẹ.

\textsuperscript{11} Shapiro, ‘Origins of Allegory in Greek Art’, 12.
\textsuperscript{12} \textit{IG iv²}, 1 311; Peek, \textit{Asklepieion} 134. This inscription is discussed below, pp. 148-149.
\textsuperscript{13} An unpublished \textit{lekythos} viewed by G. Körte in the nineteenth century, Shapiro, ‘Origins of Allegory in Greek Art’, 12, n. 51.
\textsuperscript{15} Shapiro, \textit{Personifications in Greek Art}, 77.
\textsuperscript{16} Smith, \textit{Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art}, 45, 154 VP 16.
\textsuperscript{17} Ghali-Kahil, \textit{Les Enlèvements et le retour d’Hélène}, 60; for a conjectural dating of Nemesis-Oupis see Hornum, \textit{Nemesis, The Roman State, and the Games}, 7, 80, 240.
Schwarzmaier’s recent microscopic study of the amphoriskos concludes, from the wide-spaced letters labelling the other figures, that the second letter fragment would have followed immediately after the restored upsilon.\footnote{Schwarzmaier, ‘Wo ist Heimarmene?’, 26.} This wide spacing is evident in the letters of other figures including the ΜΕΞΙ of Nemesis’ name in figure 13b (note the traces of the unusual sigma). Schwarzmaier further argues the second letter fragment belonging to the unknown female is a tau, and not the previously presumed epsilon, and she

\footnote{Schwarzmaier, ‘Wo ist Heimarmene?’, 26.}
identifies the figure as [E]YT[YXIA], a suggestion first posited by Neumann. In this case the fragmented \(\mathbb{T}\), perhaps originally similar to the one labelled 2 or S2 from Immerwahr’s chart below, is truncated to \(\mathbb{r}\) after having lost the left hand side of the cross stroke and possibly half of its down stroke.

With all these suggestions in mind and by studying the remaining letter forms, are there any other possibilities? It would not be unreasonable to identify her as \(\Lambda\eta\delta\alpha\) (AHΔΑ), Helen’s adoptive mother, especially in view of her role in introducing Helen to her real mother, Nemesis: a subject sculpted on Nemesis’ statue base at Rhamnous, discussed in detail in the Archaeology chapter below. Since Leda’s name clearly starts with a \(\lambda\eta\delta\alpha\) she would seem disqualified by the apparently restored \(\upsilon\eta\sigma\lambda\nu\) as the first or second letter of the fragmented name. Yet, the remains of the two surviving letters under consideration are so fragmented that what has been interpreted as an \(\upsilon\eta\sigma\lambda\nu\) could be the remains of an Attic \(\lambda\eta\delta\alpha\), such as that labelled 2 or S4 below, which are very similar in shape to the \(\upsilon\eta\sigma\lambda\nu\) labelled 3, S2, S3 or S5.

Even assuming a \(\lambda\eta\delta\alpha\) as the initial letter, does an \(\eta\tau\) work as the next letter fragment? This is certainly plausible since the letters were widely spaced, and the obliterated strokes of the fragment have resulted in \(\eta\tau\) being reduced from
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19 Schwarzmaier, ‘Wo ist Heimarmene?’, 26; Neumann, Gesten und Gebärden in der griechischen Kunst, 21-23.
20 All the following Greek lettering examples are found in Immerwahr. The amphoriskos is not discussed by him, but see his comments regarding the commonality of the \(\lambda\eta\delta\alpha\) form at number 2 on Attic vases: H. R. Immerwahr, Attic Script: A Survey, Oxford, 1990, 147-149.
21 Below, pp. 247-260.
H to ρ with the loss of the second upright and the top of the first resulting in a shape which roughly corresponds to the letter in *figure* 13a. In addition, because of the shape similarity between *eta* and *epsilon* it is easy to account for the presumption of *epsilon* by Shapiro and others, i.e. a restoration of E from ρ especially when compared to some of the variants in the *epsilon* chart below.

Alternatively, it is observed in *figure* 13a that the first of the visible letters under discussion may flatten out slightly on the bottom in a curve, which could indicate the letter was not *lambda* nor even *upsilon* but another letter altogether, possibly the bottom remnant of a letter such as *theta*. If correct, then Nemesis’ companion could credibly have originally been either ΘΕΜΙΣ the personification of divine law, or ΘΕΤΙΣ the mother of the hero Achilles. Either of these two goddesses could have a place in a scene concerning the ‘persuasion of Helen’: Themis as the goddess with whom Zeus originally plotted to bring about his plan and who appropriately shares a sanctuary with Nemesis at Rhamnous; or Thetis, the mother of Achilles who was, together with Helen, a pivotal tool in the fulfilment of Zeus’ plan for mankind’s punishment, discussed previously.22 If either of these readings is correct then the second letter would correctly be identified as the *epsilon* restored by Shapiro and others. While none of these suggestions may be correct, and others could similarly be postulated, I present these alternatives from a close

---

22 Above pp. 100-102.
study of the epigraphy to demonstrate that the diverse identification options are wider than has previously been argued.

What is incontrovertible is that these two goddesses, Nemesis and her companion, are a unique and remarkable pair, with Nemesis in particular striking an arresting and fascinating pose. She stands with one hand on her companion’s shoulder, while her right arm and hand stretch forward as she points in a intensely reproachful and forceful fashion. The forward thrust of her body intimates the vehemence of the emotions which pulsate within her. Her body language speaks of her passion, and despite the age of the amforiskos her facial expression exhibiting anger can be clearly read: the pupil of her visible eye is fully dilated with intense emotion and one can see aggression, anger, and blame in her face as she stares widely and glaringly towards the object of her wrath. There is little doubt that Nemesis exudes nemesis towards the object of her wrathful indignation, both in the form of the Homeric ‘blame’ or ‘indignation’, as well as what is by this time the ‘divine retribution’ which will surely follow as a consequence of the actions being played out on the other side of the amforiskos. Of all the figures depicted, that of Nemesis is the most dramatic, vital, and emotionally charged. Stafford interprets the scene allegorically, with Nemesis pointing towards the future retribution that will be brought to bear against the Persians for their audacity in attempting to steal property that belongs to Greeks.23

What has so inflamed Nemesis is the sight of her daughter Helen sitting pensively on the lap of Aphrodite whilst calmly contemplating taking the irrevocable step of committing adultery

---

and abandoning her husband and infant child (figure 12b).24 Aphrodite has her arm around Helen’s shoulders in a somewhat supportive and confiding fashion as she gazes fixedly at Helen.25 Nearby and slightly behind Helen stands an attentive Peitho (Persuasion),26 ready to give her own persuasive support. Peitho holds a small box in her hand, identified by Stafford as a bridal gift-chest,27 or possibly a bride’s wedding toilet-basket,28 both of which are fitting in a pre-wedding scene.

In contrast to the tradition of Helen being abducted by Paris, this is no abduction scene: Peitho’s presence and the tenderness being portrayed bears this out. Helen, although she may have doubts about the moral ethicity of the course of action on which she is about to embark, is having her fears gently put aside through the persuasive and coercive powers of Aphrodite and Peitho. Yet, while there may be no abduction neither is there free will, for where Aphrodite is concerned there is never freedom of choice. So, despite any misgivings Helen will be persuaded to elope with Paris and thereby unwittingly initiate a series of unstoppable events that will culminate in the

24 Conversely, Wilamowitz’s interpretation does not include Nemesis as the wrathful mother who is pointing in an accusatory manner towards her daughter, but simply as personified Vengeance who is indicating that the crime about to be committed by Helen and Paris will be punished in the future, just as it would be for anyone committing a similar crime. In this context Wilamowitz describes Nemesis as: ‘die strafende Vergeltung der Entführung’ (the punishing Vengeance of abduction). Buxton agrees with Wilamowitz’ interpretation, but Ghali-Kahil correctly has Nemesis acting purely as Helen’s mother: Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, ‘Lesefrüchte’, 485; Buxton, Persuasion in Greek Tragedy: A Study of Peitho, n. 63, 202; Ghali-Kahil, Les Enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène, 59-61, pl. VIII, 2-3.

25 For a discussion on lap-sitting as a motif, see: Robertson, The Art of Vase-Painting in Classical Athens, 237, n. 9, 239, 146-147 for Helen and Aphrodite on the amporiskos above.

26 Aphrodite and Peitho as ‘Love’ and ‘Persuasion’ have a long association stretching back to at least Hesiod: Hes. WD 78-79; Stafford, ‘Plutarch on Persuasion,’ 163-164. The two goddesses are often together in art and literature: LIMC vii Peitho i (N. Icard-Gianolio); Shapiro, Personifications in Greek Art, 186, n. 412; Buxton, Persuasion in Greek Tragedy: A Study of Peitho, passim. For the role of Peitho and Aphrodite together in regards to marriage and sex, see: Stafford, ‘Plutarch on Persuasion,’ 162-172. Peitho also shared an early fifth-century temple with Aphrodite at Athens on the south-west slopes of the acropolis: Paus. 1.22.3; E. Simon, Festivals of Attica, Madison, 1983, 49-51.

27 Stafford, ‘A Wedding Scene? Notes on Akropolis 6471’, 200; Stafford, ‘Plutarch on Persuasion,’ 166-167; see further comments on this lekythos in: Shapiro, ‘Origins of Allegory in Greek Art,’ 11, n. 42. Other examples include: ARV 1175.11; LIMC ii Aphrodite 210 (A. Delivorrias); cf. ARV 1133.196, a pyxis by the Washing Painter ca. 420; Stafford has found similarities in the pose, position and attendant deities on this amporiskos with those of a later lekythos ca. 420 from the acropolis, leading her to conclude it is another ‘persuasion of Helen’ in connection with a pre-wedding scene.

The Classical Era

Trojan War and the inevitability of the climatic end with the fulfilment of Zeus’ plan for a decrease in the numbers of mankind.

But this is the future, for the present Helen is represented in an expressive and quietly poignant manner which demonstrates the dilemma she faces as she sits with downcast eyes, head bent forward and wearing a veil such as worn by a bride. She rests her chin on her hand and is in deep thought; she appears to have much on her mind and to be struggling with her thoughts. Aphrodite allows her to ponder her options whilst in reality she has none. Enigmatically, Helen’s pose is iconographically the same as that of a woman in mourning as seen on several grave reliefs, for example, the strikingly similar pose of the veiled woman in figure 14. As such, I see Helen’s pose as her intuitively mourning for her future, or even the future, since she unconsciously recognizes the step she is about to take will result in consequences that will be dire and widespread.

To the right of Aphrodite and Helen in the scene are Himeros (Sexual Desire, Longing) inscribed ΙΜΕΡΟΣ and Paris (figure 12c). Himeros, along with Peitho and Eros, is mentioned by Hesiod as a companion of Aphrodite, with all four frequently depicted together in literature and art.

---

29 For more on this artistic representation see: Neer, The Emergence of the Classical Style in Greek Sculpture, 164-168.
30 Scenes of Himeros and Paris, and Aphrodite and Helen were popular themes. A first-century relief in Naples (Mus. Naz. 6682) is strikingly similar, although without the inclusion of Nemesis: here Helen and Aphrodite are seated close together with the goddess draping her arm around Helen in what appears to be a gesture of comfort. Peitho sits above them, and the figures of Himeros and Paris (inscribed ΑΛΕΧΑΝΔΡΟΣ) strike an almost identical pose to their counterparts on the Berlin amphoriskos: LIMC i Alexandros 55 (R. Hampe).
31 Around the shoulder of the amphoriskos fly two Erotes; for their link with Aphrodite, see: Sapph. F194; Pind. Eulogies F122, F128. Representations together: Hes. WD 78-79; Hes.
Paris stands casually naked whilst supporting a spear and carrying a *khlamys* over his left arm with his sword in a scabbard hanging on a strap across his chest from his right shoulder to his left hip. Paris’ head is appropriately adorned with a victor’s wreath since he has won Helen and is about to claim his prize. Grasping Paris’ right arm and gazing up into his eyes is Himeros. The fixed intensity of Himeros’ hypnotic eyes look mesmerizingly into those of Paris whereby he seemingly instils an urgent Desire and Longing for Helen into Paris. Of interest are Paris’ weapons of war, his sword and spear; the sword is attached to a strap which hangs across his body with the spear casually resting in the crook of his arm. His weapons, symbols of masculine *aretē*, lie disregarded on the left (wrong) side of his body whilst personified Longing and Sexual Desire is to his right, indicative of what he holds more immediately important. This may also be an artistic visual affirmation of Paris’ choice of Aphrodite’s gift of Helen over Hera’s gift of kingship over all and Athena’s of victory in war, discussed previously.  

Standing behind Paris and Himeros is a female figure who, with the exception of Schwarzmaier, has been identified as Heimarmene EIMAPM[ENH] (*figures 12d and 13c*). Schwarzmaier’s close study of the remaining letter forms has inclined her to read them as *epsilon*, *upsilon*, *kappa*, *lambda*, *epsilon*, *iota*, *alpha*, *omicron*, *nu*, *omicron*, *lamdba*, *omegta*, *omicron*, *nu*, *omicron*, *lambda*, *kappa*, *f*.

*Theog.* 201; Paus. 1.43.6; Sapph. F194; many in *LIMC* for example: Himeros v 10, 11, 13 (A. Hermary).  

32 Compare other instances of weaponry being held in the left arm or hand when the warrior’s attention is distracted: ‘Achilles and Aias playing a board-game’: *LIMC* i Achilleus 394 (R. Hampe); Vatican 344, *ABV* 145.13; Conservatori 6, *ABV* 671.3; London B211; *ABV* 256/14; Woodford, *Images of Myths in Classical Antiquity*, 117 fig. 83L; Immerwahr, *Attic Script: A Survey*, 136, fig. 29; 299, fig. 73; 309, fig. 74; 448, fig. 94; Mingazzini, *Greek Pottery Painting*, 42, fig. 15; Pfuhl, *Masterpieces of Greek Drawing and Painting*, 26-28 and fig. 21.  

33 Above, pp. 110-111.
alpha, i.e. EΥΚΛΕΙΑ. Her interpretation should remain tentatively possible even though her apparent epsilons, the second of which she describes as ‘ein Klecks’ (a blob), bear little resemblance to the confirmed epsilon in Nemesis’ name in figure 13b. Despite this, her analysis and conclusions are original and inspired. A point worth noting is her suggestion of kappa in place of the previously restored mu owing to the stroke differences when compared to the mu in figures 13b and 13d.34

Heimarmene, as personification of Fate, Destiny, or Inevitability, would be an appropriate addition to the scene.35 If her identification is correct, as the previous scholarship suggests, then her presence is important for what she adds to the story being told, and also because this depiction is the only surviving

35 The word εἵμαρμένη (destiny) is the feminine participle of μέρομα ‘to receive as one’s portion’, or ‘one’ due’: LSJ9 1093, col. 2, s.v. μέρομα. In turn, μέρομα is a verbal form of μόρα: LSJ9 1140-1141, cols 2-1, s.v. μόρα: ‘one’s portion in life, lot, destiny’.
visual representation of her as a personification on any artistic work. To the figure’s right is another female who has a bird perched on her right index finger, and since this bird is the only non-human living object shown anywhere on the amphoriskos its presence would seem to indicate it is in some way significant. The letter fragments from this female’s name are largely lost, in fact prior to Schwarzmaier’s study it was thought no fragments from her name remained at all. Schwarzmaier analysis has encouraged her to suggest three letters, namely a mu, an iota, and an alpha, leading her to identify the female as [EYO]MIA (Good Order or Law). However, as figure 13d illustrates, with the exception of the mu, these letters are far from certain.

In this thesis I have followed the traditional path of accepting the figure generally identified as Heimarmene to be correct, but I acknowledge the possibility of Schwarzmaier’s original identification of EYKAELIA. Thus, Heimarmene and her companion stand facing each other, and despite the emotional intensity of the events unfurling elsewhere these two seem oblivious to everything but themselves and the bird with which they both seem engrossed. Their singular behaviour could be interpreted in two ways – either their presence bears no relevance to the rest of the scene and they are simply there to provide artistic balance or, far more likely, their roles in the emotive

---

36 Stafford, Worshipping Virtues, 90.
37 Shapiro, ’The Judgment of Helen in Athenian Art,’ 52; Shapiro, ’Origins of Allegory in Greek Art’, 11-12.
38 Schwarzmaier, ’Wo ist Heimarmene?’, 26.
proceedings have already been played out. It is this latter scenario which
seems logical especially since Heimarmene, goddess of destiny and in
particular preordained destiny, would have already played her part in
predetermining Helen and Paris’ fate, and now she has nothing further to
contribute. Schwarmaier’s identifications could similarly be appropriate and
valid, in that, since Helen is about to forsake her ‘good repute’ and the ‘good
order’ of a legal marriage, the two goddesses who embody these principles
now turn their backs to her as a lost cause.

If Heimarmene is the correct
identification what of her companion
and the bird? The identification of
the other personifications and deities
depicted thus far have been shown to
add some significant emotional or
influential element to the visual
narrative being acted out. The bird is
in all probability not there purely for
decoration, in which case it must
have some meaning – either as an
attribute of the unknown female or to
the scene as a whole. Smith and
Shapiro share the view that
Heimarmene’s companion is Themis,39
an assessment possibly supported by
Harrison’s identification of the female figure represented by the letter ‘L’ on
the east pediment of the Athenian Parthenon (a seated female in whose lap
female ‘M’ lies, thought to be Aphrodite) as Themis by her customary
shoulder-cord,40 an item which is visible here on the left shoulder of
Heimarmene’s companion, standing to the right in figure 12d. On the other

39 Smith, Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art, 44-45, 154 VP 16; Shapiro,
Personifications in Greek Art, 192-195; Shapiro, ‘Origins of Allegory in Greek Art’, 11-14.
40 O. Palagia & D. Lewis, The Ephesia of Erechtheis, 335/2 BC and Their Dedication, ABSA
(eds), Festschrift für Frank Brommer, Meinz, 1977, 155-156. This shoulder-cord is also
evident on Khairestratos’ statue of Themis’ found at Rhamnous, see figure 56 below.
hand, since the shoulder-cord is also associated with Artemis and is seen being worn by numerous other females to prevent their *chitons* from slipping off their shoulders,\(^{41}\) and since Themis has no firm association with any bird it would perhaps be better to widen the search for a clue to her identity.

At first glance the bird appears to be fairly generic, but there are two possibilities. The bird’s plumage, illustrated in *figure* 12f, might indicate the dusky turtle-dove which, according to Aelian was sacred to the Moirai:

White turtle-doves are often to be seen. These, they say, are sacred to Aphrodite and Demeter, while the other kind [i.e. the more common dusky turtle-dove] is sacred to the Moirai and the Erinyes.\(^{42}\)

Aelian’s statement provides a credible clue given the whole milieu of the scene with many representations and personifications of some form of fate or destiny. For that reason Heimarmene’s companion may be one of the Moirai,\(^{43}\) either Klotho (the spinner of the thread of destiny for each individual), Lachesis (who measures out this thread), or Atropos (who cuts the thread at death),\(^ {44}\) or perhaps she is simply Moira – the personification of all three,\(^ {45}\) and whose initial *mu* would correspond to Schwarzmaier’s identification of this letter,\(^ {46}\) as shown in *figure* 13d. Moira would be appropriate since, not only does she also represent a form of Fate but, in common with Heimarmene, her work has already been done: the inescapable Fate of both Helen and Paris has


\(^{42}\) Ael. *NA* 10.33: λευκὰς τρυγόνας φανήναι πολλάκις· λέγουσι δὲ αὐτάς ιεράς εἶναι Ἀφροδίτης τε καὶ Λήμετρος, Μοῦρόν δὲ καὶ Ἐρινύων τὰς ᾠλᾶς.

\(^{43}\) Μοῖρα means ‘one’s portion in life’, ‘lot’, ‘share’, ‘destiny’; *LSJ* 9.1140-1141, cols 2-1, s.v. *μοῖρα*. It was thought that this was apportioned to each individual at their birth by the goddess.

\(^{44}\) Hes. *Theog*. 218: the Moirai where, in common with Nemesis, born of Nyx; but, Hes. *Theog*. 904 has them as the daughters of Zeus and Themis. Their names Κλωθῆς, Λάχεσις, Ἄτροπος translate as ‘Spinner’, ‘Portion’, and ‘Inflexible’; *LSJ* 963, col. 2, s.v. Κλωθῆς; 1033, col. 1, s.v. Λάχεσις; 273, col. 1, s.v. Ἄτροπος.


\(^{46}\) Schwarzmaier, ‘Wo ist Heimarmene?’, 26.
already been determined and settled, i.e. their ‘threads’ of life’s portion were
spun at birth, have been measured during their lives, and will finally be cut
once their pre-determined destiny has been accomplished.

Against the bird’s identification as a dusky turtle-dove is the artist’s portrayal
of the bird as small and light as it sits gracefully on the female’s finger, and
while the dusky turtle-dove is smaller than others of its species it is still a
weighty bird.\(^{47}\) Another possibility, and one which has relevance to the
amphoriskos scene, is that the bird is an \(iunx\)-bird (ιυνξ/ιυγξ), known as a
[Eurasian] wryneck (\(jynx\ torquilla\)).\(^ {48}\) The name ‘wryneck’ comes from the
bird’s ability to elongate its neck and to almost turn its head around in a circle
during its mating dance.\(^ {49}\) It was this unique dexterity, which the Greeks saw
as magically or divinely inspired, which resulted in the \(iunx\)-bird’s association
with magic, especially in the casting of spells to inspire passion and sexual
desire by means of its song.\(^ {50}\) Such inspiration was generally ill-fated as it
invariably led to the ruin or destruction of the one affected by its charm,
for example Medea who, according to Pindar, had been charmed by the \(iunx\-
bird.\(^ {51}\)

The \(iunx\)-bird’s attributes are appropriately suited to the scene being played out
on the amphoriskos. The bird’s task has, at this point, already been

\(^{47}\) Depending on the exact species and sub-species turtle-doves can range in length from 19-
25cms, i.e. about 7.5-10 inches.

\(^{48}\) Arnott, \textit{Birds in the Ancient World from A-Z}, 79-81. Lewis also speculates whether the bird

\(^{49}\) Aristotle describes the physical characteristics of the bird: \textit{PA} 695a23-24, and its unique
dexterity: \textit{HA} 504a11-19, which is also mentioned by Pliny \textit{NH} 11.256; see also: Arnott, \textit{Birds
in the Ancient World from A-Z}, 79; D. Ogden, \textit{Magic, Witchcraft, and Ghosts in the Greek and
in Boston,’ \textit{AJA} 44, no. 4, 1940, 447.

\(^{50}\) Ogden, \textit{Magic, Witchcraft, and Ghosts in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A Sourcebook}, 240-
242; E. Böhr, ‘A Rare Bird on Greek Vases: The Wryneck,’ in J. H. Oakley, W. D. E. Coulson,
et al. (eds), \textit{Athenian Potters and Painters}, Oxford, 1997, 116-120; C. A. Faraneo & D.
Obbink (eds), \textit{Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion}, Oxford, 1991, 241 n. 84;
Pollard, \textit{Birds in Greek Life and Myth}, 48-49, 130-131; Thompson, \textit{A Glossary of Greek Birds},
124-128. In antiquity the wryneck bird was a symbol of passionate and restless love as seen in
Pind. \textit{Pyth.} 4.211-250, where Aphrodite binds the bird to a wheel and gives it to Jason as a
magic charm to use against Medea. Other ancient sources referring to the magic of the \(iunx\)
include: Anon., \textit{Anth. Gr}, 5.205, where its persuasive magic powers are mentioned in
conjunction with Aphrodite; Anon. \textit{HE} 35; Aischyl. \textit{Pers.} 989; Ar. \textit{Lys.} 1110, \textit{Heroes (PCG
iii.2 F315)}; Eupolis \textit{Baptai (PCG v F83)}; Apuleius \textit{Apol.} 30.13; Laevius \textit{F27 (FPL)}; Pind.
\textit{Nem.} 4.35, F128a, possibly F52i; Soph. F474; Theok. 2; \textit{Σ Theok.} 2.17; Xen. \textit{Mem}. 3.11.18.

accomplished through the casting of its spells to instil a desire for Paris’ love into Helen and conversely a lust for Helen into Paris. Now it is the mission of Aphrodite, Himeros, and Peitho to reinforce the fateful inevitable destiny already spun by Heimarmene and the powerful erotic-instilling magic of the *iunx*-bird.

Yet, how convincing is this bird as an *iunx*-bird? A comparison between it (*figure 12f*) and a confirmed wryneck (*figure 12e*) indicates a strong probability it is a wryneck, especially when the similarity in size and speckled plumage is noted.\(^{52}\) If correct, then the female upon whose finger it perches could be the Oreiad nymph Iunx who, because she tried to seduce Zeus or encouraged Io to do so, was turned into the ‘Iunx’ bird by Hera.\(^{53}\) Yet, even if the bird is an *iunx* the female’s identification remains speculative since other females (even males) are depicted with *iunx*-birds in Greek art.\(^{54}\)

---

\(^{52}\) Photograph source: http://www.birding.in/birds/Piciformes/Picidae/eurasian_wryneck.htm.

\(^{53}\) Suda s.v. Ἴυγξ (iota 759); Σ Theocrit. 2. 17; Σ Pind. Pyth. 4.380; Nem. 4. 56; Tzetz. Σ on Lykoph. 310; Kallim. F685.

\(^{54}\) Several examples of *iunx*-birds accompanying mortals or immortals are found in the British Museum: those dated to the fifth century include: a bell-*krater* depicting Pan with an *iunx* perched on his right index finger, BM1836,0224.175; a *hydria* showing an *iunx* in flight, BM1867,0508.1319. Taverner, contrary to the ancient evidence and modern interpretations, considers *iunx*-birds (and the related *iunx*-wheel) as having been misinterpreted and are merely pet objects, toys, or gifts: E. Taverner, Iynx and Rhombus; TAPA 64, 1933, 120-123. I do not agree with Taverner, especially since the discovery within two late fifth-century graves belonging to males (T 286 and T 299) from Archontiko in Makedonia of bronze rings showing a standing Aphrodite holding an *iunx* (identified as *iunx torquilla*) in her right hand: M. Lilibaki-Akamati, I. M. Adamatis, A. Chrysostomou, et al. (eds.), The Archaeological Museum of Pella, Athens, 2011, 315.
The significance of a credible identification of the bird as an *iunx* leads on to the bird’s relationship with persuasive love and passion through the chanting of magic spells, and what significance this might have in the *amphoriskos* scene. The bird clearly has its beak open (figure 12f) as if the artist has captured it mid-song or mid-chant as it weaves its eternal spell into the emotions of the *dramatis personae* represented on the other side. Since it inspired ill-fated passion, its presence here is as a portent of the ills that are to come, an aspect which is mirrored by Nemesis (on the other side) representative of future divine retribution.

The term *iunx* was a name given not only to the nymph and the wryneck bird but also to a small wheel-mechanism. When spun on two twisted pieces of string threaded through two central holes (much like a button) this wheel emitted a noise which was thought to replicate the magical sound of the bird from which it acquired its name, and its resonance was consequently associated with the casting of spells of passion. The almost indivisible...
relationship between the bird and the wheel is demonstrated in the following quotation from an ode by Pindar where the bird is bound to the wheel followed by the incantation of magical spells:

But the Cyprus-born queen of sharpest arrows bound the dappled ἰυγγα [bird] to the four spokes of the inescapable κόκλος and brought from Olympos that bird of madness for the first time to men, and she taught the son of Aison to be skilful in prayers and charms, so that he might take away Medea’s respect for her parents, and so that desire for Hellas might set her mind afire and drive her with the whip of Persuasion.⁶⁰

Whoever stands with Heimarmene she, along with all the other personifications, adds a pictorial commentary on the emotions in this representation of ‘The Persuasion of Helen’. Hence, Aphrodite and Peitho are the persuaders who over-ride any nemesis or aidōs that Helen may be experiencing as she grapples with the moral implications of her proposed flight with Paris; meanwhile Paris stands with Himeros, the representative of the desire in his mind and lust in his heart at the prospect of possessing Helen; Heimarmene and her companion (Moira, Iunx, Eunomia, or another) are oblivious to all but themselves since they have already sealed the fate of the

---

⁶⁰ Pind. Pyth. 4.213-219: πότνια δ᾽ ὀξυτάτων βελών ποικίλαν ἰυγγα τετράκναμον οὐλημόθεν ἐν ἁλίστο ξεξείσαις κόκλος μανιάδ᾽ ὅρνιν Κυπρογένεια φέρεν πρώτον ἀνθρώποις λιτάς τ᾽ ἐποιοῖς ἐκδώδακησαν σοφὸν Αἰασῶν, δῆρα Μηδείας τοικάς ἄφελτοι ἀδύδο, ποικίλα, λεκάνα δ᾽ Ἐλλάς αὐτάν ἐν φρασί καιομέναν δονοῦσι μάτητι Παθοῦς. The ‘madness’ is attributed to the bird on account of the intensely passionate nature of its mating instinct and desire: Nelson, ‘A Greek Votive Iynx-Wheel in Boston’, 448. A discussion of the individual metaphorical aspects in the poem is in: C. A. Faraone, The Wheel, the Whip and Other Implements of Torture: Erotic Magic in Pindar Pythonian 4.213-19, CJ 89, no. 1, 1993, 1-19, and his further reference sources at n. 2. Faraone interprets Pindar’s ‘fire’ and ‘whip’ as forms of torture; an idea dismissed by Johnston as an over interpretation and who quotes several references to ‘fire’ and ‘whip’ where no torture is implied; Johnston also suggests the last two words, μάτητι Παθοῦς, could refer not to a whip but to the string with which the iunx-wheel is spun like a top: Johnston, The Song of the Iynx’, 179, 190. Johnston’s interpretation is preferred to Faraone’s, especially as she rightly points out, the phrase ‘burning love’ is metaphorical and not a form of torture, for example: Sapph. F48.2: ‘my heart [was] burning with longing’ (ἐμαυ φρένα καιομέναν πόθως).
main characters;\textsuperscript{61} and, finally Nemesis and her companion (Eutychia, Tyche, Eukleia, Leda, Thetis, or another) stand as the accusatory representatives of the future fate that is to come.\textsuperscript{62}

Shapiro interprets Nemesis’ presence as the retribution that Helen will suffer as a consequence of her actions.\textsuperscript{63} But Helen does not experience any retribution. On the contrary she is forgiven by Menelaos and taken back to reign as Sparta’s queen in the years after the Trojan War until finally after death she goes to the Isle of the Blessed.\textsuperscript{64}

**Two ōons Depicting Paris’ Seduction of Helen?**

Two *ca.* 450-410 Attic red-figured egg-shaped vessels, or ōons (figures 15 and 16) were discovered together in the same Athenian female burial where they would have been left as grave goods in honour of the deceased female.\textsuperscript{65} They are small and measure approximately 5.8 centimetres tall by 4.8 centimetres wide, about the size of a large hen’s egg. The artistic depictions on the ōons are scenes from mythology, and each has a four-spoke wheel painted on its underside (reflected in the mirror in figure 16), where it is hidden from general view. As eggs produce new life, and given their find spot, these ōons are probably the symbolical representation of a new existence or new beginnings in the afterlife, and I suggest the wheel-motifs represent the fate that has finally spun for the deceased and the wishes of good fortune in the afterlife. Since the motifs were placed underneath each ōon, and thus not immediately visible may be a reminder that fate and fortune are imperceptible, intangible, and unpredictable forces that constantly change and turn.

In interpreting the scene on each ōon it is argued that since Helen was hatched from an egg after her mother, Nemesis, was violated by Zeus, the shape of

\textsuperscript{61} For further comments on Heimarmene, see: Shapiro, *Personifications in Greek Art*, 193-194; Shapiro, ‘Origins of Allegory in Greek Art’, 11-14.

\textsuperscript{62} Shapiro reads the scene allegorically with Nemesis pointing to the future: Shapiro, ‘Origins of Allegory in Greek Art’, 10-14, esp. 14.

\textsuperscript{63} Shapiro, ‘Origins of Allegory in Greek Art’, 13.


\textsuperscript{65} Eggs were known chthonic offerings: K. Friis Johansen, *The Attic Grave-Reliefs of the Classical Period: an essay in interpretation*, Copenhagen, 1951, 83-84; cf. the ōon or αὐγό found at Rhamnous in the grave area along the road: V. Petrakos, ‘Νέας Ἐρευνάς στὸν Ραμνοῦντα,’ *Æph* 118, 1979, 39 no. 16.
each vessel is highly appropriate to support the argument that the mythological scenes are Paris’ seduction and abduction of Helen.66

The first ðon (figure 15) has been interpreted as a mythological abduction scene.67 This is a logical conclusion, especially as the presence of a crowned Aphrodite leaning against a pillar with Eros playing with a iunx-wheel is on the other side; this whole scene and the story it imparts is unambiguously connection with love and passion. The artwork in figure 15 shows a chariot being drawn by three galloping horses. A male, holding two spears, and a female occupy the chariot, and another male runs to remove himself from their path (out of view). The male in the chariot holds the reins in his left hand and has his arm drawn around the female in an attempt to either hold her safely or to ensure she does not escape him. Although several mythological abduction stories could

---


be suggested, Paris’ abduction of Helen is a strong possibility, especially given the vessel’s egg-shape and the motif of the egg in the mythology surrounding Helen.

The image on the õon in figure 16 is not an obvious abduction, but something more subtle. It shows some sort of activity or game taking place between the various figures (see ‘roll-out’ in figure 17). Lezzi-Hafter suggests a game to decide the fate of the young couple who stand to the extreme right, while Stafford and Ghali-Kahil explain the scene as girls playing a game known as morra, and Beazley proposes an ancient form of ‘knuckle-bones’. The most compelling argument is that the activity involves a game of morra. Ifrah and Blümmer’s description of this game closely corresponds to the õon scene. They explain it as a fast moving guessing game usually played by two contestants thrusting out a varying number of fingers of the right-hand whilst each simultaneously holding the end of the same stick in their left-hand; a point was won by the one who first correctly called out the sum of the fingers thrust out. The action in figures 16 and 17 has two females each grasping

---


71 ARV² 1257.2.

the end of a stick in their left hand and holding up a different number of fingers, which appears identical to Ifrah and Blümner’s description of *morra*. Metzger, on the other hand, doubts it is *morra* since this game is not mentioned either by name or description in the sources, and in support of his argument he quotes its omission in Pollux’ *Onomasticon* as confirmation.74 Conversely, an argument from silence does not mean the game never existed, and Cahn gives at least twelve examples of *morra*-type game illustrations on ceramics.75

It is worth noting Hoffman’s interpretation of *morra* as having derived from the Greek word μόρος or death, and that all the known depictions of this game have ‘mortuary’ associations. Conversely, Lewis argues against Hoffman’s conclusion, and despite the fact that vessels illustrated with games of *morra* have been found in burial situations she does not believe it follows that the game was necessarily funereal.76 In support of Lewis, I would argue that depictions on funereal pottery of games being played could also be read as the deceased, especially a young person, continuing to play those games in the afterlife that he or she enjoyed in life.

73 The game is similar to the modern ‘paper, scissors, rock’ game, and note Hoffman’s description of a game of his youth called ‘odds’ or ‘evens’ which corresponds very closely to the description of *morra* given by Ifrah and Blümner: Hoffman, *Sotades*, 141 n. 2.

74 Poll. 9.94-130; Metzger, ‘Ôon à figures rouges’, 169.


76 Lewis, *The Athenian Woman*, 155; Hoffman, *Sotades*, 141-143, n. 10. An interesting possibility, outside the scope of this study, is that the ôon indicates a concordance in religious belief between the Greeks and the Etruscans, who connected eggs not only with fertility, birth, and renewal, but with death and the afterlife. Several eggs made from stone, terracotta, or alabaster, have been found in Etruscan burials. For a discussion on this aspect and further references, see: A. Carpino, ‘The Delivery of Helen’s Egg: An Examination of an Etruscan Relief Mirror,’ *EtrStud* 3, 1996, 40-41; see also: N. T. de Grummond, *Etruscan Myth, Sacred History, and Legend*, Philadelphia, 2006, 128; cf. Frii Johansen, *The Attic Grave-Reliefs of the Classical Period*, 83-84.
Whatever the game a degree of skill and luck on the part of each player would be required. Hence, the hidden, though visible if sought, presence of the wheel secreted underneath the ôon quite possibly represents a good luck charm for those playing the game, but would also have been a symbol of fate or destiny, perhaps an amulet, to protect the deceased on her way to the underworld.

Ghali-Kahil has drawn similarities between the scene on this ôon to that on the Berlin amorphiskos.\(^77\) If correct, Aphrodite would logically be the seated figure attended by Eros who rests on her knees and gazes fixedly up into her eyes. Ghali-Kahil suggests the other seated figure is ‘the goddess of destiny’, and that they are playing for the fate of Paris and Helen standing on the right. The two standing figures to the left she labels as Nemesis and Tyche, the same identifications she gives to the two females on the Berlin amorphiskos, one of whom is confirmed as Nemesis.\(^78\) Metzger argues against Ghali-Kahil but offers no alternative; Algrain and Oakley interpret the two seated players as Aphrodite and the mother of the (unknown) bride standing to the far right playing a game, the purpose of which is to decided if the girl stays with her mother or she goes off with Aphrodite, i.e. she weds the youth standing in front of her; while Piccard interprets the game players as Aphrodite and Demeter.\(^79\)

---

\(^{77}\) Discussed above, pp. 117-136.


If engaging in speculative identification, I suggest the two figures on the left may be Nemesis and Leda, given that figure A is in Attic dress hence Rhamnousian Nemesis mother of Helen, and figure B dressed in Doric fashion is Leda wife of Tyndareos and Helen’s step-mother. Thus, Helen’s mother and step-mother stand to the left whilst a game of morra between Aphrodite and perhaps Heimarmene, goddess of destiny (to put a name to Ghali-Kahil’s suggestion), with Peitho (or perhaps one of the Moirai) looking on, decides the fate of Helen and Paris to the right. This scenario is supported by the setting: the padded seating and fillet hanging on the wall indicate the events are taking place inside a house, almost certainly within the women’s quarters. If so, why is a lone male standing amongst this group of unchaperoned women within their own quarters if he is not bent on mischief, such as a clandestine meeting with Helen? Surely he is Paris, whose traveller’s petasos announces him as newly arrived from Troy, and whose moral sense was no inhibitor to impropriety.

Whether the scene is one of anonymous girls playing innocently at a game of morra, or whether the scene depicts a scene from mythology, the presence of

---


81 Paris is at times depicted iconographically with the typical accoutrements of the traveller – a petasos and two spears. A few examples include: *LIMC* 1.2 Alexandros 46, 47, 63 (two spears), *LIMC* 1.1 Alexandros 505, 506, 511 (two spears); BM1814.0704.573, *ARV*² 259.4 (petasos), *ARV*² 258.1 (two spears and petasos).
the wheel hidden under the öon is a reminder that fate and luck in life are dependant on the turn of the wheel of providence which constantly, but indiscernibly, moves forward towards ones’ destiny.82

**NEMESIS, TRAGEDY, AND DEATH**

Evidence of Nemesis’ chthonic attributes are evident in the Rhamnous archaeology, and include shards from a funereal sphinx, along with chthonic *chimaira* fragments, and a large quantity of funerary-*loutrophoroi*.83 This archaeological material is discussed in greater detail in the following chapter on the archaeology at Rhamnous.

That Nemesis had a connection with death and the dead should not be surprising given that her mother, according to Hesiod, was Nyx and one of her siblings was Thanatos.84 Whilst the precise nature of this chthonic connection is unclear,85 the extant literature, votive, altar, and grave-*stelai* inscriptions, all indicate that part of her appeal was in her role as a champion of the dead and an avenger of the wrongs done to them. This aspect of the goddess was distinct from that of the Erinyes who, as ugly chthonic powers of death and avengers of oath-breakers, inspired dread.86

At the risk of anachronism I revisit a previously discussed Homeric passage to demonstrate how the Archaic myths and legends were still relevant to writers in the Classical era. The passage concerns the abstract *nemesis* acting as a potential instrument to punish the wrong done to the dead in book twenty-four of the *Iliad*. Here Apollo threatens a collective divine *nemesis* against Achilles for his inappropriate treatment of Hektor’s body – an early indication of a divine *nemesis* as a moral and ethical judgement of condemnation on mortals:87

82 Cf. Hdt. 1.207; and his comments on the vagaries of prosperity and greatness: 1.5; 7.18; 7.203.
85 Fisher argues for a close association between *nemesis* and the dead, although simultaneously conceding that the exact relationship is veiled in obscurity: Fisher, *Hybris*, 300.
86 *OCD*3 556 s.v. Erinyes.
87 Discussed above pp. 54-56.
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αὐτὰρ ὁ γ’ Ἑκτόρα διὸν, ἔπει φίλων ἢτορ ἀπηύρα, ἵππων ἐξάπτων περὶ σήματε ἐτάρειον φίλων ἐλκείν οὐ μήν οἱ τὸ γε κάλλιον οὐδὲ τ’ ἄμεινον. μὴ ἀγαθὸ περ ἐόντι νεμεσισθεωμένοι οἱ ἰμεῖς. 88

But this man (Achilles), when he has deprived noble Hektor of life, ties him behind his horses and drags him about the grave-mound of his beloved comrade; surely this will bring neither honour nor benefit for him. He should beware lest we have nemesis for him agathos though he is. 89

Apollo’s threat of nemesis is the result of Achilles’ blame-worthy behaviour. Achilles has lost control, his agathos principles have been discarded in his frenetic lust for revenge against Hektor, and Apollo warns he needs to control himself and begin to act in line with his agathos values lest he be considered an oūτις, a no-body devoid of principles, and receive divine blame/shame. The emotive energy of this passage, the descriptions of the graphic brutality of Achilles’ treatment of Hektor’s body, and the later scene of Priam’s appeals to Achilles’ humanity to release his son’s body, provided inspiration to Aischylos, who went on to write his now fragmentary play, Phrygians or Hektoros Lutra. 90 In this play Nemesis has the potential to bring retributive justice to assuage the wrath of the wronged dead:

καὶ τοὺς θανόντας εἰ θέλεις εὑρεγετείν εἰτ’ οὖν κακουργείν, ἀμφιδεξίως ἔχει < > καί ἢμιν γε μέντοι νέμεσις ἐσθ’ ὑπερτέρα, καὶ τοῦ θανόντος ἡ Δίκη πράσσει κότον. 91

Sommerstein completes the lacuna as: τεθνηκότας γὰρ ἄσθενειν τε μοὶρ’ ἔχει, and translates as follows:

And if you want to do good to the dead, or again to do them harm, it makes no difference; for <the lot of> mortals <when they die is to have no sensation> and feel neither pleasure nor

88 Il. 24.50-54.
89 Translation: author.
90 The collected fragments are found in: Aischyl. FF263-267 (Sommerstein); FF147-149 (Smyth); Stob. Anth. Δ.57.6 (in: Hense vol. 5 1138.6); FF263-273 (TrGF 3); FF242-259 in: H. J. Mette (ed.), Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos, Berlin, 1959, 86-92.
91 Smyth uses τὸ here but mentions the alternative in his apparatus.
92 φθιτοῦς is used here by Smyth but he gives the alternative.
93 Aischyl., F266 (Sommerstein); F148 (Smyth); F266 (TrGF 3 [Radt]); Stob., Anth. Δ.57.6 (in: Hense vol. 5 1138.6); F244, in: Mette (ed.), Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos, 87.
pain. Our indignation, on the other hand, is more powerful, and Justice exacts the penalty for the wrath of the dead.

After translating that the dead have ‘no sensation’ and that they ‘feel neither pleasure nor pain’, Sommerstein goes on to say in the last line that personified Dike ‘exacts the penalty for the wrath of the dead’, i.e. that they have wrath. So, do the dead feel wrath or do they not? Sommerstein’s contradictory interpretation needs discussion.

Both Radt and Sommerstein use a small letter for νέμεσις and a capital for Δίκη, whereas Smyth has capitals for both although inexplicably translates Νέμεσις as ‘our righteous resentment’, all in lower case. Against an interpretation of the abstract nemesis are Hornum and Mette who think the goddess is meant and consequently assign capital letters to both Νέμεσις and Δίκη. Since the execution of justice on behalf of the wronged dead lies within Nemesis’ sphere I propose to assign the capital letter to Nemesis and to downgrade Dike to the abstract, thus: ἡμῶν γε μέντοι Νέμεσις ἐσθ’ ύπερτέρα, καὶ τοῦ θανόντος ἡ δίκη πράσσει κότον. The one speaking, probably Hermes, rails against the outrage being done to Hektor’s body and Achilles’ intention to refuse the body burial but to leave it for the dogs to consume. Achilles’ savage violence against Hektor’s body demands a divine response that is a forceful reminder of Nemesis’ retributive anger dispensed through the invocation of justice and a dispensation of inescapable punishment, exactly as emphasized in the last two lines of the passage, which I translate as:

nevertheless, our Nemesis (i.e. our fellow goddess) is mightier, and her justice exacts vengeance on behalf of the dead.

94 Radt F266 (TrGF 3); F266 (Sommerstein); F148 (Smyth). Stob. Anth. Δ.57.6 (in: Hense vol. 5 1138.6) uses two capital letters; 95 Hornum, Nemesis, The Roman State, and the Games, 91-92; Mette (ed.), Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos, F244.4-5.
A seemingly puzzling detail in the first three lines of the passage is Aischylos’ statement that the dead feel neither joy nor grief (μὴ τε χαίρειν μὴ τε λυπεῖσθαι) at good or bad deeds done to them (καὶ τοὺς θανόντας εἰ θέλεις εὕροντεῖν εἰτ’ ὀὖν κακοουργεῖν). Yet, in a another of his plays, *Choephoroi*, the chorus describe the dead as not only possessing consciousness, but able to feel wrath and anger against those who wronged them in life.\(^{100}\) Although consistency should not be expected in the dramatists and allowances need to be made for varying plot idiosyncrasies, the apparent anomaly is still interesting. I see the crucial point of variance between the passages as the difference between life and death itself: deeds done to the dead before death and deeds done after death. The fragment from *Hektoros Lutra* speaks of the deeds done after death which have no effect on the dead; the reason being that ‘living’ passions and emotions cannot be given birth within a dead corpse, since the corpse’s living essence, its *thumos*, left the body at the moment of death. On the other hand, deeds done to a living person before death, even if only by seconds, have the ability to generate passions and emotions that survive death because their genesis was within a still living *thumos* and at the moment of death pass to the *psyche* to survive in the afterlife.\(^{101}\) The emotional response of one wronged before death still has the ability to build up into an intense and fervent anger desiring retribution which then has the ability to continue after death. Yet ultimately, whether the one dead had been wronged before or after death makes little difference since the Greeks believed that eventually appropriate retributive justice would be brought to bear on the perpetrator regardless of whether the dead was conscious of the evil done to them or not.

In this role as champion of the dead, Nemesis has a heartfelt plea made to her by Elektra in Sophokles’ play of the same name when Elektra lets out an anguished cry at the graveside of her (supposed) dead brother, Orestes:\(^{102}\) ἀκοῦε, Νέμεσι τοῦ θανόντος ἀρτίως (‘Listen! Nemesis of the newly dead!’). Fisher uses a small ‘n’ for *nemesis* although he speculates whether Elektra is actually appealing to the personified chthonic power of the gods’ *nemesis*.

---

\(^{100}\) Aischyl. *Choe*. 37-41, 324-328; Aischyl. *Choe*. 278.

\(^{101}\) See the discussion on *psyche* and *thumos* above, pp. 44-45.

\(^{102}\) Aischyl. *Elekt*. 792.
outraged at violations to the dead. Finglass and MacLeod interpret a personified Nemesis although the former evaluates the word as ‘a degree of personification’. In my opinion, Elektra’s plea of ‘listen!’ signifies it is made to something which has the ability to listen, i.e. the goddess Nemesis, and not the emotion of nemesi

Immediately prior to her outburst Elektra had accused her scheming and pitiless mother of hybris:

105 oĩμοι τάλαινα· νῦν γάρ οἰμοῦξα πάρα, Ὄρεστα, τήν σήν ξυμφοράν, δό’ ὄδ’ ἔχων πρός τῆσ’ ὑβρίζη μητρός. ἃρ’ ἔχω καλός (‘Oh, wretched me! For now, Orestes, I can mourn for your misfortune, when in this plight you are abused by this mother of yours’). According to Fisher, this speech in combination with Elektra’s plea to Nemesis above is one of only two instances where there exists an argument for any hybris/nemesi

Klytemnestra’s joy at the news of Orestes’ supposed death exposes her as a mother devoid of aidōs and nemesi in her dealings with her children, and thus deserving of divine retributive punishment. Elektra implores Nemesis to judge Klytemnestra’s unnatural and callous behaviour towards Orestes; but a merciless Klytemnestra replies saying Nemesis has already judged, not against her, but against Orestes for his disobedient filial behaviour towards her, and the proof lies in the ground before them – Orestes’ dead body. Her
perverted logic is seemingly based on Plato’s writings which give disobedience and disrespect of one’s parents as punishable by Nemesis.109

παρὰ δὲ πάντα τὸν βίον ἔχειν τε καὶ ἐσχηκέναι χρή πρὸς αὐτοῦ γονέας εὐφημίαν διαφερόντως, διότι κούφων καὶ πτηνὸν λόγων βαρυτάτη ἐτέλεσθα – πάσι γὰρ ἐπίσκοπος τοῖς περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἔτοχθῃ Δίκης Νέμεσις ἀγγέλος – θυμομαίνεις τε ὑπὸν ὑπεικεῖν δὲ καὶ ἀποπιμπλάσαι τὸν θυμὸν, ἐὰν’ ἐν λόγοις ἐὰν’ ἐν ἔργοις ὑποῦς τὸ τοιοῦτον, συγγιγνάσκοντα, ὡς εἰκότος μάλιστα πατὴρ ὑπὲ δοξάζων ἀδικεῖσθαι θυμοῖτ’ ἂν διαφερόντως.

And throughout all his [a son’s] life he must diligently observe reverence of speech towards his parents above all things, seeing that for light and winged words there is a most heavy penalty – for over all such matters Nemesis, messenger of Justice, is appointed to keep watch; wherefore the son must yield to his parents when they are wroth, and when they give rein to their wrath either by word or deed, he must pardon them, seeing that it is most natural for a father to be especially wroth when he deems that he is wronged by his own son.

Yet later, when as a consequence of the pain of her children’s anger Klytemnestra is ultimately murdered (figure 18) it is, according to Aristotle’s definition, not an act of hybris on her children’s part since revenge following on from pain of righteous anger is justifiable, but revenge for revenge’s sake and done with a sense of pleasure can only then be called an act of hybris.110

Again, a wanton outrage (ὑβρίζει) gives pleasure to the doer, never pain, whereas an act done in anger always causes him a feeling of pain. If then things are unjust in proportion to the justice of the anger they arouse in the victim, unrestraint arising from desire is more unjust than that arising from anger; for anger contains no element of wanton insolence (ὑβρις).

Figure 18 shows Orestes murdering his mother, Klytemnestra, with Elektra looking on from the left and a fearful Aigisthos running away to the right. Klytemnestra had wronged her children; Nemesis heard Elektra’s plea, judged Klytemnestra guilty of hybris, and sanctioned the retributive punishment being carried out in figure 18.

109 Pl. Laws 717c-d.
110 Arist. EN, VII 6.4.
An altar inscription from the sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidaurus of this period which refers to Nemesis consists of just two words: Τύχας Νεμέσος\(^{111}\) (‘for Tyche Nemesis’).\(^{112}\) These two deities together as a pair in extant inscriptions and literary works is rare, but the previously discussed *amphoriskos* may be another example if it is indeed Tyche who stands with Nemesis. Although the meaning of the inscription is unclear, I would speculate it to mean: ‘for good fortune but not too much’, with Tyche representing ‘good fortune’ and Nemesis as the ‘balancer’ of fortune. In his lexicon, written in the fourth-century AD, Hesychios gives the definition for the term ἀγαθὴ τύχη as: ἢ

\(^{111}\) IG iv\(^2\), 1 311; Peek, Asklepieion 134; Hornum, Nemesis, The Roman State, and the Games, 196 no. 79; C. M. Edwards, ‘Tyche at Corinth,’ Hesperia 59, no. 3, 1990, 535; cf. a similar inscription from Pautalia (Kyustendil) in modern day Bulgaria dating to the Roman era: ἀγαθῆ τύχη. Νεμέσοι ἐπὶ Ἀδριαστεία Σῆλ(?)· Πρόκλα χαριστήριον: *IGBulg* iv 2140.

\(^{112}\) Translation: author.
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Nέμεσις καὶ ἙΘέμις,¹¹³ which establishes a close interpretational connection between Nemesis, Themis, and Tyche in his time. Whether this was its interpretation in the fifth century remains speculative.

The Funeral Oration or Epitaphios by Gorgias, writing in the late fifth to early fourth century, mentions divine nemesis and mankind’s envy as emotions he wishes to avoid invoking through his praise of the dead:

τί γὰρ ἀπῆν τοῖς ἀνδρᾶσι τούτοις ὡν δὲ ἀνδράσι προσέιναι; τί δὲ καὶ προσῆν ὡν οὐ δὲ προσέιναι; εἰπὲν δυναίμην ἃ βούλομαι, βουλοίμην δ᾽ ἃ δεῖ, λαθὼν μὲν τὴν θείαν νέμεσιν, ψυχὸν δὲ τὸν ἀνθρώπινον φθόνον. οὕτοι γὰρ ἐκέκτηντο ἐνθεοὶ μὲν τὴν ἄρετὴν, ἀνθρώπινον δὲ τὸ θνητὸν.¹¹⁴

What quality was there absent in these men which ought in men to be present? And what was there present that should not be present? May I have the power to speak as I would, and the will to speak as I should, avoiding divine nemesis and escaping the envy of men. For these were divine in their valour, though human in their mortality.

Although Gorgias affirms his desire to avoid divine nemesis and human envy, this is exactly what he implies will occur since he continues his speech with effusive praise extolling the virtues of the dead in a manner that has sometimes been described as full of bombastic expressionism and ostentatious rhetoric.¹¹⁵ Through such inflated praise of the merits of the dead, the living cannot fail to be envious, especially when hearing of exploits beyond their own ability, as Thucydides and Demosthenes verify in their funeral orations.¹¹⁶ On the other hand, while such praise of the dead may lead to mankind’s envy, it is unlikely it would also lead to a divine nemesis against Gorgias, even though he describes the dead as ‘divine in their valour’, although it may, according to Pindar invoke the gods phthonos.¹¹⁷ Gorgias is, I believe, speaking in a manner that demonstrates his own standing and authority, and the esteem in which he holds himself, factors which might well, at some time in the future, lead to a divine nemesis descending upon him.

¹¹³ Hesych. vol. 1, 11.45 (Schmidt) s.v. ἀγαθὴ τύχη; vol. 1, 11.46 (Latte) s.v. ἀγαθὴ τύχη.
¹¹⁴ Gorgias F6.10-13 (DK 82 B 6.10-13).
¹¹⁶ Thuc. 1.35; Dem. 60.23.
¹¹⁷ Pind. Isth. 7.39.
Boastfulness (exemplified by Kroisos) or going beyond one’s ordained limits (such as Thersites) or trying to emulate the gods (Priam, with his large progeny) were all sins punishable by Nemesis. Hippon, a fifth-century philosopher, although Aristotle refused to list him as such ‘because of the paltriness of his thought’, took these offences to the extreme by reputedly ordering his grave-stele to be inscribed with the following epitaph, according to Clement of Alexandria:

οὐ νέμεσις τοῖνον οὐδὲ Ἱππων άπαθανατίζοντι τὸν θάνατον τὸν ἑαυτὸν: ὁ Ἰππων οὗτος ἐπιγραφήναι ἐκέλευσεν τῷ μνήματι τῷ ἑαυτοῦ τόδε τὸ ἐλεγέιον:

"Ηππωνος τόδε σῆμα, τὸν ἀθανάτοσι θεοίσιν ἴσον ἐποίησεν Μοῖρα καταφθίμενον."

We must not be angry (have nemesis), therefore, even with Hippon, who represented his death as a deification of himself. This Hippon ordered the following couplet to be inscribed on his monument:

Behold the tomb of Hippon, whom in death Fate made an equal of the immortal gods.

Tantalizingly, there is a possibility that a stele fragment found in Athens may have come from Hippon’s grave, since it mentions this name. The remaining letters read:

"Ηππων Α[—?—] Κυδαθηναιείς"121

In reality, of course, there would have been more than one person with the name of Hippon, but it would be nice to connect this discovery to the philosopher himself.

Although mankind may or may not have nemesis for the arrogance of Hippon’s words the gods surely would, since they represent a direct challenge to them and their dignity. In ordering this inscription, if he actually did, Hippon

---

118 Kroisos, pp. 169-179; Thersites, pp. 34-43; Priam, pp. 72-75.
119 Arist. Meta. i.3.984a3.
120 Clem. iv. 55; DK 38 B 2.
121 SEG 29.210. Κυδαθηναιείς or Κυδαθηναίοι is an area of Athens roughly corresponding to the current-day Plaka.
demonstrates arrogance by going beyond the ordained limits appropriate to mortals, as he tries to emulate the gods in his description of himself as having now become their equal. His words are those of a hybristic man. Little is known of Hippon’s life and death and, of his works, all that remains is one verbatim fragment.\textsuperscript{122} Perhaps this is how divine nemesis punished him: his works banished to obscurity and his name to distant memory.

Although Hellenistic and Roman grave-stelai evoke nemesis as a protector of tombs or as a warning to those who would violate the dead, such invocations are absent from Archaic and Classical grave inscriptions, which is curious. It is possible the reforms attributed to Solon in 594 and Kleisthenes ca. 508/507 prohibiting ostentatious funeral ritual and monuments, or the so-called post aliquanto law mentioned by Cicero of the 480s or 470s,\textsuperscript{123} may have been contributory factors. Certainly there was a decline in grave-stelai generally around this time, but after ca. 425 they again started to became more popular.\textsuperscript{124}

**NEMESIS, COMEDY, AND SEX**

The most complete surviving comedies of the fifth century are those written by Aristophanes. His plays belong to the so-called ‘Old Comedy’ genre, an early form of Greek comedy full of political and personal satire together with a profusion of sexual and scatological innuendo. It is to this genre that the playwrights Kratinos and Platon belong, and their style is typical of the Old Comedy categorization. Although their plays are no longer extant, they exist in fragmentary form, and from these sources it is known that both wrote about Nemesis. But, while Platon briefly mentions the goddess and the abstract in

---

\textsuperscript{122} DK 38 B 2; cf: OCD\textsuperscript{\textregistered} 711-712 s.v. Hippon.


\textsuperscript{124} M. M. Miles, 'A Reconstruction of the Temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous,' Hesperia 58, no. 2, 1989, 234 n. 189.
the available fragments, it was Kratinos who wrote a complete play called *Nemesis*.

**Kratinos (ca. 519 – ca. 422)**

Despite being named as one of the three canonical comic poets, along with Eupolis and Aristophanes, not one of Kratinos’ approximately twenty-one comedies remains whole and intact today: something which should not be seen as evidence for Norwood’s view of an inferior talent, but rather as an accident of epigraphical history. What does remain are the titles of his plays together with over five-hundred fragmentary passages which have been passed down via secondary sources. Even in this state Kratinos’ considerable talent is apparent, and proven by his success in winning the comic section of the City Dionysia six times and three times at the Lenaia, with his *Pytine* awarded first prize in the Dionysia of 423 and Aristophanes’ *Clouds* third.

Kratinos was a comedic innovator whose broad thematic grasp encompassed a wide spectrum of genres including satyr, epic, iambic, and didactic poetry, all composed using what Revermann calls ‘macro-level plot construction’. Even Norwood, despite his opinion on the superiority of Aristophanes, praises him: ‘… the Old Comedy owes its literary manner to Cratinus: the rich vigour, the poetical power, the zestful fun, the command of idiom, are all exemplified even in our fragments … he offers a superb blend of great intellect and uproarious good-humour …’. Without fear of religious repercussions or

---

125 Ancient authors who write of Kratinos’ ability or quote him as part of the comic canon include: Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.1; Persius, *Sat.* 1.123-4; Vell. Pat. 1.16.3; Quint. 10.1.66. The subject is discussed by: E. Bakola, *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy*, Oxford, 2010, 2; S. D. Olson, *Broken Laughter: Select Fragments of Greek Comedy*, Oxford, 2007, 408 s.v. Cratinus; M. Heath, ‘Aristophanes and His Rivals,’ *G&R* 37, no. 2, 1990, 143. A list of sources who mention Kratinos both positively and negatively is found in: Storey, vol. 1, 308-324; *PCG* iv 112-121. The *Suda* assigns him twenty-one plays although twenty-nine titles exist, but some may have had two titles, for example: *Dionysuses* is probably confused with the better known *Dionysalexander*: Storey, vol. 1, 234-237.

126 Bakola, *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy*, 1-3.


128 Revermann, *Comic Business*, 103, 106.

129 Norwood, *Greek Comedy*, 144.
political backlash Kratinos used comic burlesque to lampoon political themes and personalities, generally with a ruthless invective which exhibits a: ‘close relationship between the abusive, metaphorical satire and plot [that] is central to Cratinus’ comic technique.’ He shamelessly parodied the familiar and previously time-honoured myths and turned them into mythological mockeries, all of which is evident in his play Nemesis.

The play’s fragments suggest the plot centred on the mythology surrounding the goddess Nemesis taken from the Kypria, and confirmed by Eratosthenes’ mention of Kratinos’ name in relation to the myth, which was previously discussed above in relation to Nemesis’ rape as told by the Kypria.

It is said that Zeus, enamoured of Nemesis, transformed himself into this bird when she changed her shape and assumed the form of a swan in order to protect her virginity. Zeus changed himself into a swan and flew down to Rhamnous in Attika, where he ravished her. She bore an egg, from which Helen was hatched, as the poet Kratinos recounts.

---

130 Ruffell, 'A Total Write-Off', 154.
131 Deities were not immune to parody and ridicule: Kratinos’ Thraittai made a mockery of the cult of Bendis; Aristophanes’ Horai attacked the foreign god, Sabazios; J. Henderson, 'Pherekrates and the Women of Old Comedy,' in D. Harvey & J. Wilkins (eds), The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy, London, 2000, 137.
132 There is debate over whether Kratinos the elder or younger was the author, but the main consensus seems to incline towards Kratinos the elder: J. T. M. F. Pieters, Cratinus: Bijdrage tot de Geschiedenis der Vroeg-Attische Comedie, Leiden, 1946, 119-121; F. R. B. Godolphin, 'The Nemesis of Cratinus,' CPh 26, no. 4, 1931, 423-426; E. Capps, 'The "Nemesis" of the Younger Cratinus,' HSPh 15, 1904, 61-75.
133 PEG, Kypria F9; EGF, Kypria F7; West, Kypria F10-11 (Athen. 8.334b).
134 Above, p. 106.
135 Eratosth. 25; DNP, vol. 6, 817. The manuscript has: ὡς φησι Κράτινος ὁ ποιητής, but restored to Κρατίνος by Valckenaer: H. Grotius (ed.), L.C. Valckenaer: Euripidis Tragoedia Phoenissae, Leiden, 1802, 259, vs. 447. Note his comment on p. 259 that in place of Kratinos, Krates was often used: ‘Istum Cratini locum respicit Eratosthenes Cataster. c. xxv, ubi vulgatur, ut alibi saepenumero pro Cratino, Krátpος.’
136 Trans: Condos, Star Myths, 93.
Kratinos’ name in the passage survives only in the scholiast on the Germanicus text,\(^\text{137}\) with other texts restoring ‘Krates’. An explanation for the anomaly may be the fact that originally Krates was an actor in Kratinos’ plays, although he later became a comic author in his own right.\(^\text{138}\) Krates’ two-fold role may have been the cause of the confusion.

Although the specific plot details of the play *Nemesis* are unknown the broad outline, taken from the myth, has Nemesis attempting to flee from an over-sexed Zeus. It also includes her transformations, her final change into a swan whereupon she is captured by Zeus in similar form, raped, and in due course produces an egg from which Helen was born.\(^\text{139}\) According to Eratosthenes, these events took place at Rhamnous. This, the spatial birthplace of the myth, is where the goddess Nemesis’ divine status was elevated and a new temple built *ca.* 436-432 consequent upon the imagined inherent sanctity of the location, and the role she was perceived to have played in the defeat of the Persians in 490.\(^\text{140}\) Such a new-found celebrity status no doubt tempted an irreverent Kratinos in *ca.* 431,\(^\text{141}\) to take the mythical story, add some contemporary political elements (then as now people delight in seeing politicians ridiculed),\(^\text{142}\) to produce a comic *quasi*-political

\(\text{137}\) Σ Germanicus, 405 lines 9-15; cf. Edmonds i 57 note b: ‘these words now only occur in the Scholiast on Germanicus whose Latin is based on Eratosthenes' Greek'.

\(\text{138}\) Σ Ar. Eq. 537a: ‘Krates was a comic poet, who was first an actor in the plays of Kratinos and later became a poet himself'; Edmonds i 153: ‘Crates: He was an Athenian who is said to have begun as an actor allotted to Cratinus’.

\(\text{139}\) Hyginus Astron. 8; Apollod. Bibli. 3.10.7; Σ Kallim., *Hymn to Artemis* 3.232; Philodem. *De Piet.* B 7369; Paus. 1.33.7; Σ, *Kypria* F9; EGF, *Kypria* F7; West, *Kypria* F10 (Athen. 8.334b-d); Tzetz. Σ on Lykoph. 88; Eust., *Iliadem* 1321.30; Eratosth. 25; W. Luppe, 'Die 'Nemesis' des Kratinos: Mythos und politischer Hintergrund,' *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift Halle* 23, no. 4, 1974, 51.

\(\text{140}\) Discussed below, pp. 223-228.


burlesque/mythological parody with plenty of literary licence, satirical mockery, sexual innuendo, and invective inferences. As subject matter, Kratinos was treading fearlessly on religious beliefs by turning the myth into burlesque: a modern day analogy would perhaps be a satire such as Monty Python’s *Life of Brian* which parodies Christian religion.

Whilst Perikles’ name, if it existed, does not survive, there is no doubt the political parody of *Nemesis* centres around this statesman. His identification is deduced from a comic reference to historical Perikles’ reputedly abnormal head which was well-known and mentioned by several ancient authors. Kratinos provokingly and sarcastically insinuates this ‘abnormality’ in a reference which simultaneously distinguishes Perikles as the double-identity Zeus/Perikles, something the sources indicate was not an uncommon association: ‘μόλ’ ὃ Ζεό ξένε καὶ καραίε’ (‘Come, Zeus of strangers and of heads’). Whilst ‘[god] of strangers (or foreigners)’ was a common epithet for Zeus, in this instance it almost certainly functioned as a snide double- *entendre* at Perikles’ taste for mixing with and befriending foreigners, such as his lover Aspasia from Milesia and the Clazomenian philosopher Anaxagoras. The comic insinuation would have been well received by the appreciative Athenian audiences. Although ‘[god] of heads’ (καραίε) was

---

143 Wright objects to this terminology: M. Wright, ‘Comedy and the Trojan War,’ *CJ* 57, no. 2, 2007, 431.
144 Revermann suspects but remains undecided as to whether Kratinos’ *Nemesis* was a political comedy disguised as mythological burlesque; Revermann, *Comic Business*, 306; Bowie agrees with the suggestions of political allegory but is uncertain as to how far this went: A. Bowie, ‘Myth and Ritual in the Rival of Aristophanes,’ in D. Harvey & J. Wilkins (eds), *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*, London, 2000, 325.
145 Plut. *Per.* 3.3-5 suggests Perikles misshapened head was the reason why he was depicted wearing a helmet: ‘His physical features were almost perfect, the only exception being his head, which was rather long and out of proportion. For this reason almost all his portraits show him wearing a helmet, since the artists apparently did not wish to taunt him with this deformity’; Telecleides (*PCG* vii F47); Eupolis *Demoi* (*PCG* v F115).
146 Ar. *Ach.* 528-531: ‘Then Perikles, aflame with ire on his Olympian height, let loose the lightning, caused the thunder to roll’; Diodoros 12.40.5-6: ‘… his [Perikles] great ability as an orator, which is the reason he has been called, ‘The Olympian’; Plut. *Per.* 8.2-3; Kratinos *Thraittai* F73 (Storey, vol. 1, F73; Edmonds i F71), *Kheirones* F258 (Storey, vol. 1).
147 *PCG* iv F118 (Edmonds i F113). Plut. *Per.* 3.5 quotes this line from Kratinos as a mocking reference to Perikles.
148 Bakola gives this quotation as an example of a prayer-parody and translates: ‘Come, oh Zeus, patron of foreigners and head of state’: Bakola, *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy*, 173.
relevant to Zeus as a Boiotian epithet\(^{150}\) in the context of the play it would have been construed as a clever sarcasm aimed at Perikles’ irregular cranium. The audiences would have enjoyed the pun about Perikles’ physical big-head and his reputation for ‘big-headedness’ more befitting of the Olympian god with whom he shares a double-identity in the play. Plutarch says of him:

The poet Ion, however, says that Perikles had a presumptuous and somewhat arrogant manner of address, and that into his haughtiness there entered a good deal of disdain and contempt for others.\(^{151}\)

Mockery of Perikles’ head is also found in other comedies by Kratinos: in *Thraittai* where Perikles is not only named but clearly identified as the double-identity Zeus/Perikles: ὁ σχινοκέφαλος Ζεύς δό δι προσάρχεται <ὁ> Περικλέης, τῷ δεῖον ἐπὶ τοῦ κρανίου ἕχων, ἐπειδὴ τοῦ στρακον μαθετέται\(^{152}\) (‘Here comes Perikles, the onion-headed Zeus, with the Odeion on his head, now that the ostracon has gone away’);\(^{153}\) in *Kheirones* the gods call Perikles κεφαληγερέταιν (‘head-gatherer/compeller’),\(^{154}\) a pun on Zeus’ Homeric epithet νεφεληγερέτης (‘cloud-gatherer/compeller’).\(^{155}\)

The Athenians of the day clearly saw Perikles as egotistical, opinionated, and arrogant; a leader who considered himself above the rest of mankind and somewhere on a level with the gods. Consequently, Kratinos’ statement as a reference to Perikles: μόλ’ ὁ Ζεῦς ξένιε καὶ καραίε, might more aptly be translated as: ‘Come, Zeus of strangers and of swollen-heads’, making it

---

\(^{150}\) A Boiotian cult epithet for Zeus: *LSJ*\(^{9}\) 877, col. 1, s.v. καραίος; (cf. *LSJ*\(^{8}\) 878, col.2, s.v. κάριος); Hesych. vol. 2, 410.65, 412.63 s.v. καραίος; *IG* vii 3208, [Δι] Καραιο (Orchomenos); *SEG* 32.478, [Δι] Καραιο. Possibly the epithet meant ‘statuesque Zeus’, or more remotely it may have been a reference to the birth of Athena from Zeus’ head; cf. A. B. Cook, *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion*, vol. ii, Cambridge, 1925, 874 n. 2. Kock quotes not καραιο but μακροκαραιε (‘big-head’): *PCG* iv F118.

\(^{151}\) Plut. *Per*. 5.3.

\(^{152}\) *PCG* iv F73 (Storey, vol. 1, F73; Edmonds i F71); Plut. *Per*. 13.6.

\(^{153}\) This may refer to Perikles’ successful ostracism of his rival Thucydides, son of Melesias, in 444/3. τῷ δεῖον ἐπὶ τοῦ κρανίου ἕχων implies Perikles’ head is so swollen the Odeion theatre would fit in it; cf. Androtion *FGrH* 324 F37; Philokhoros *FGrH* 338 F120; Theopompos *FGrH* 115 F91. Cf: Vickers on the roof of the concert hall (Odeion) being built to represent Perikles’ head: M. Vickers, *Pericles on Stage: Political Comedy in Aristophanes’ Early Plays*, Austin, 1977, 65.

\(^{154}\) Plut. *Per*. 3.4; *PCG* iv F258 (Storey, vol. 1, F258; Edmonds i F240).

appropriate that Perikles’ arrogant behaviour should evoke a play called *Nemesis* with him as protagonist. It was thought that as a result of Perikles’ citizenship law which saw foreign wives and children of mixed parentage without rights,\(^{156}\) Perikles brought *nemesis* down upon himself when his legitimate sons died leaving him with just his νόθος or bastard son by Aspasia. When Perikles sought to make an exception to the law in order to legitimize this son Plutarch notes that the people agreed since they considered he had suffered *nemesis* for passing such a law in his arrogance:

> καὶ δόξαν τες ἀὑτὸν νεμεσητά τε παθεὶν ἄνθρωποιν τε ἐδίσθαι συνεχόρησαν ἀπογράψασθαι τὸν νόθον εἰς τοὺς φράτορας.\(^{157}\) (‘They thought that what he suffered was by way of retribution, and that what he asked became a man to ask and men to grant, and so they suffered him to enrol his illegitimate son in the phratry-lists’).

Although a degree of caution should be exercised in quoting Plutarch, writing in the first century AD, to support claims about fifth-century views on Perikles, his sources may have included the Athidographers,\(^{158}\) or perhaps even Kratinos’ play *Nemesis*,\(^{159}\) although this is purely conjecture.

Another character, not named in the fragments but assumed by association, is Perikles’ concubine/hetaira/pallake/whore, Aspasia.\(^{160}\) With Perikles as the

\[^{157}\text{Plut. Per. 37.5. Legitimacy and illegitimacy in ancient Greece is discussed by: D. Ogden, Greek Bastardy In the Classical and Hellenistic Periods, Oxford, 1996, 5-6, 59-82, 151-166, 277-279; cf: Vickers, Pericles on Stage, 32, 92.}\n
\[^{159}\text{Ogden, Greek Bastardy, 61; although Carawan is dubious: Carawan, ‘Pericles the Younger and the Citizenship Law’, 388.}\n
\[^{160}\text{Aristophanes claimed Aspasia was a whore and ran a brothel: Ar. Ach. 516-539; Plutarch says she ran a house of ill-repute, and that she modelled herself on the Ionian courtesan Thargalia, but he concedes Perikles loved her dearly: Plut. Per. 24.2-3, 24.6; Plutarch quotes from Kratinos’ Kheirones where she is called a ‘bitch-faced pallake’: PCG iv F259 (Storey, vol.1, F259; Edmonds I F241). Henderson calls the ancient tradition surrounding Aspasia ‘scurrilous’; and Henry that Perikles’ citizenship law of 450/451 did not recognise the foreign Aspasia as a legitimate Athenian wife (Plut. Per. 24.2) but he lived with her unmarried: Henderson, ‘Pherekrates and the Women of Old Comedy,’ 140; M. M. Henry, Prisoner of History: Aspasia of Miletus and Her Biographical Tradition, Oxford, 1995, 21, 138-139 n. 9; Loraux questions the accuracy of the ancient writers in describing Aspasia as a whore or courtesan: N. Loraux, ‘Aspasie, l’étrangère, l’intellectuelle,’ Clio: Histoire, Femmes et Societes}\n
\[^{157}\text{~157~}\]
double identity Zeus/Perikles, Aspasia’s part in this mythological parody may have been as another double identity. Ogden thinks Nemesis/Aspasia appropriate, but given there was no necessity for Zeus/Perikles to violate Aspasia as she was sexually his for the asking, this seems unlikely. Possibly Aspasia is Helen, or Leda, or perhaps she was Aphrodite. That she had a role in the play seems certain given the snide references concerning Perikles and his association with ‘strangers’ and hints at his sexual appetite.

The first fragment to suggest the play’s borrowing from the Kypria is an instruction, possibly given by Hermes or Aphrodite to Zeus/Perikles to change into a bird: ὄρνιθα τοίνυν δεῖ σε γίγνεσθαι μέγαν, (‘and now you must become a large bird’). Having undertaken the change Zeus/Perikles clearly enjoys his new form since it not only enables him to copulate with Nemesis but also to enjoy the accompanying new diet appropriate to ὄρνιθες:

ὅς ἐσθίων τοῖς στίφουσιν ἰδομαι:
ἀπαντα δ’ εἶναι <μοι> δοκεῖ ῥοδονιά
καὶ μῆλα καὶ σέλινα καὶ σισύμβρια

How I take pleasure in partaking the food.
Everything seems to me to be rose-beds and apples and celery and bergamot mint.

The words are not as innocent as first appears. In keeping with the general milieu of Old Comedy and its inclination towards overt sexual obscenity the passage keeps faith with such thematic preoccupations. The foods mentioned: ῥοδονιά (rose-beds), μῆλα (apples), σέλινα (celery), and σισύμβρια (bergamot mint) are each used as a double-entendre with a sexually suggestive alternate...
meaning.\textsuperscript{165} The scholiast on Theokritos gives ρόδιον, ροδωνιάν, μῆλα, σέλινα, σισύμβρια as terms used to indicate τὸ γυναικεῖον, i.e. the female genitalia;\textsuperscript{166} terms used by other Old Comedy writers in similar contexts.\textsuperscript{167} Hesychios defines ροδωνιά: ὁ τόπος ἔνθα φύεται τὰ ρόδα. καθάπερ καὶ ἱονιά, ὤποι τὰ ἵω φύεται καὶ κρινονιά, ἔνθα τὰ κρίνα. ὰηλῳ δὲ καὶ τὸ ἄναιδες,\textsuperscript{168} (‘rose-bed: the place where the roses grow; exactly like a violet-bed where the violets grow; and a lily-bed where there are lilies; and they also reveal their shamelessness’).\textsuperscript{169} Up until last few words this definition could be taken as a description of the purpose of a rose-bed, but what has shamelessness to do with roses, or violets, or lilies? Using the double-entendres intended, the following translation is proposed: ‘rose-bed: the place where their roses [labia maior] bloom; exactly like a violet-bed where their violets [labia minora] grow; and a lily-bed where there are lilies [vagina], and they [females] reveal their shamelessness). Hesychios similarly uses the word σέλινον to refer to τὸ γυναικεῖον,\textsuperscript{170} while μῆλον in the plural is linked to eroticism and female breasts.\textsuperscript{171} The noun σισύμβριον is a type of mint, but its close association with these other sexually explicit double-meaning nouns defines it as another

\textsuperscript{165} Henderson, ‘Pursuing Nemesis: Cratinus and Mythological Comedy,’ 6; Edmonds i F111 n., quoting Σ Theok. 11.10.

\textsuperscript{166} Σ on Theok. 11.10-11: ρόδιον δὲ τῆς γυναικείας ἕβης, ὅτι τὸ γυναικεῖον μόριν καὶ ρόδιον καὶ ροδωνιάν φασιν ὡς Κρατίνος ἐν Νεμέσε, ‘άς γ’ ἐκθήνος τοῖς στητοῖς ἔμοικον ἄπαντα δ’ ἐίναι <μοῖ> δοκεί ροδωνιά καὶ μῆλα καὶ σέλινα καὶ σισύμβρια (‘the roses of the female pubic-area, that they name the female parts a ‘rose’ or a ‘rose-bed’, as Kratinos in Nemesis: ‘How I take pleasure in partaking the food; everything seems to me to be rose-beds and apples and celery and bergamot mint’), (translation: author); LSJ\textsuperscript{9} 1127, col 1, s.v. μῆλον (‘girl’s breasts); LSJ\textsuperscript{9} 1573, col. 2, s.v. ρόδιον iii (‘pudenda muliebria’, quoting Pherekr. 108.29); LSJ\textsuperscript{9} 1590, col. 1, s.v. σέλινον II (‘pudenda muliebria’, quoting Σ Theok.11.10). Henderson comments that ρόδιον and ροδωνιά were used as slang terms for the vaginal orifice and/or the labia maior: Henderson, ‘Pursuing Nemesis: Cratinus and Mythological Comedy,’ 5, 8; J. G. Younger, Sex in the Ancient World from A – Z, Abingdon, 2005, 95; J. Henderson, The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy, 2nd edn, New York, 1991, 135 no. 126.

\textsuperscript{167} The words were used extensively but a few examples include: Ar. Lys. 155, Ekkl. 903; Pherekr. 108.29, 131.2, 3. A longer list of obscene words in Old Comedy is found in: Henderson, The Maculate Muse, 253-254.

\textsuperscript{168} Hesych. vol. 3, 243.404 s.v. ροδωνιά (Hansen); vol. 3, 432.4 (Schmidt) s.v. ροδωνιά.

\textsuperscript{169} Translation: author.

\textsuperscript{170} Hesych. vol. 4, 19.84, s.v. σέλινον (Schmidt), vol. 3, 277.384 (Hansen); Σ on Theok. 11.10; PCG iv F116; cf. Henderson, The Maculate Muse, 46, 136 no. 137, 144 no. 169, 151.

\textsuperscript{171} Aristophanes uses the term to refer to Helen’s breasts when he has Lampito tell how Menelaoos dropped his ξίφος (another word with an obscene double-entendre referring to the penis) at the sight of τὰς Ἑλένας τὰ μῆλα: Ar. Lys. 155; see also Ekkl. 903; Theok. 27.50; LSJ\textsuperscript{9} 1127, col. 2, s.v. μῆλον; Henderson, The Maculate Muse, 122 no. 58, 149 no.202.
lew'd word relative to τὸ γυναικεῖον, specifically a term for pubic hair.\textsuperscript{172} Appropriate to the fragment under discussion, in Aristophanes’ \textit{Birds} ‘mint’ (σισύμβριον) is found with ‘white sesame’ (λευκὰ σήσαμα), ‘myrtle’ (μύρτα), and ‘poppies’ (μήκωνα), as food for birds.\textsuperscript{173} This discussion demonstrates that Kratinos’ \textit{Nemesis} was typical of its genre with sexual suggestiveness not only expected, but eagerly anticipated, and the audience would have found the overt sexual innuendo of the comedic phraseology titillating.

So Zeus/Perikles enjoys his new bird-form as he delights in the arousingly attractive Nemesis/Aspasia(?). In light of the string of double-\textit{entendres} I suggest that when Zeus was instructed to: ὀρνίθα τοίνυν δεῖ σε γίγνεσθαι μέγαν, the passage would probably have been understood by the audience as: ‘and so, you must become a large ‘cock’, with ὀρνίθα\textsuperscript{174} as an innuendo for Zeus/Perikles’ penis in an erect state (μέγαν) which is aroused at the anticipation of the forthcoming enjoyment of the ῥοδωνία, μῆλα, σέλινα, and σισύμβρια of Nemesis/Aspasia(?).

Another fragment appropriate at this point is: ἐν τῷ κύφωνι τὸν ὀψέν’ ἔχων\textsuperscript{175} (‘having his neck in the stocks/pillory’). Given the sexual milieu of the play, and with Henderson suggesting ἀψιθὴ as a double-\textit{entendre} for a \textit{phallos},\textsuperscript{176} I propose that the seemingly innocuous words were most likely to have been interpreted by the audience as: ‘having his penis in her vagina’.\textsuperscript{177} This interpretation correlates with Aristophanes’ \textit{Lysistrata} 680-681: ἠλλὰ τούτων χρῆν ἀπασοῦν εἰς τετρημένον ξύλον ἐγκαθαρμόσαι λαβόνας τούτοι τὸν ἀψίθην, which, by utilizing double-meanings for ξύλον and ἀψίθην, Henderson translates as: ‘we should get hold of this here cock and put it into the vaginas

\textsuperscript{172} Henderson, \textit{The Maculate Muse}, 46, 136 no. 138.

\textsuperscript{173} Ar. \textit{Av.} 159-160. These foods were connected to Aphrodite and weddings, and suggestive of eroticism and fertility: Stesich. F187; Bacchyl. 17.116; Men. \textit{Rhet.} 409.9; Ovid, \textit{Fast.} 4.869; Athen. 3.81d; Henderson, \textit{The Maculate Muse}, 20, 46, 122, 134-135 no. 125, 248 no. 125.

\textsuperscript{174} \textit{LSJ} 1254, col. 2, s.v. ὀρνίς III. I suggest ὀρνίθα is used here by Kratinos as a double-\textit{entendre} for cock-penis.

\textsuperscript{175} \textit{PCG} iv F123 (Storey, vol. 1, F123; Edmonds i F115).

\textsuperscript{176} Henderson, \textit{The Maculate Muse}, 114 no. 15. The authors of \textit{LSJ} 285, col. 1, propose a meaning of ‘cervix uteri’, ‘pars vaginalis’, s.v. ἀψίθην II.4. Given the word’s usual meaning of ‘neck’ a double-\textit{entendre} for ‘penis’ is envisaged.

\textsuperscript{177} \textit{LSJ} 1015, col. 1, s.v. κύφων II; cf. Eur. \textit{Cyc.} 184, where ἀψίθην is used in a crude scene full of sexual inference spoken by the chorus leader when referring to Helen’s appetite for multiple sexual partners.
(my more euphemistic emendation of Henderson’s translation) of all these women’.\textsuperscript{178}

The result of Zeus/Perikles’ lustful encounter was the egg produced by Nemesis, with another fragment telling Leda to sit on the egg so it will hatch:\textsuperscript{179}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Λήδα, σὸν ἔργον ἰ ἕι σ’ ὅπως εὐσχήμονος ἀλεκτρυόνος μηδὲν διοίεις τοὺς τρόπους, ἐπὶ τῶδ’ ἐπώζουσ’, ὡς ἂν ἐκλέγης καλὸν ἠμῖν τι καὶ θαυμαστὸν ἐκ τοῦδ’ ὀρνεον.}\textsuperscript{180}
\end{quote}

Leda, this is your task: you must carry on just like a graceful/elegant hen and raise this egg, so that you may hatch for us a beautiful and wonderful chick.

\textsuperscript{178} Henderson, \textit{The Maculate Muse}, 114 no. 15. The words κυφων and ξύλον can both be interpreted as ‘stocks’ or ‘pillory’: \textit{LSJ}\(\textsuperscript{a}\) 1015, col. 1, s.v. κυφων II, \textit{LSJ}\(\textsuperscript{a}\) 1192, col. 1, s.v. ξύλον 3b.

\textsuperscript{179} Cf. Sappho F166: φα
ξεὶ δὴ ποινα Λήδαν ὑακίνθινον ... ὅιον εὐρην πεποκάρµενον ... (they say that Leda once found an egg of hyacinth colour, covered ...); Athen. 2.57d.

\textsuperscript{180} \textit{PCG} iv F115 (Edmonds i F108); Athen. 9.373e.
Helen was the ‘beautiful and wonderful chick’ born from this egg, as told in the *Kypria*. Helen emerging from the egg was a popular theme on vase paintings, and the Apulian bell-krater in figure 19 is one example painted as a comic scene, appropriate to Kratinos’ play. Here the egg has lain in a wicker basket with incubating material; no doubt Leda’s ‘nest’ in her role as a ‘hen’. To the left in a doorway stands a black-haired Leda or elderly nurse wearing an ugly woman’s snub-nosed mask. She is seemingly unconcerned at the proceedings taking place and watches with little more interest than a bystander, perhaps because as Helen’s step-mother she has no overly strong maternal feelings. Having presumably already given the egg a blow with his double axe a caricatured bearded old man with short nose, wispy white hair and scant beard, stands to the left of the egg about to attempt a second blow. He may be Leda’s husband Tyndareos, possibly Hephaistos (given the

---

181 Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.10.7. The story of Nemesis’ rape by Zeus, both in the forms of swans or geese, and the resultant egg is discussed above, pp. 103-110.
184 Neiendam suggests Hephaistos because: ‘his right leg is noticeable shorter than his left’, i.e. the lame Hephaistos: Neiendam, *The Art of Acting in Antiquity*, 49. An examination of the vase shows that if anything the character's left leg may be shorter, not the right, and even this is debatable; Bieber also suggests Hephaistos because he had used an axe to cleave the head of Zeus to facilitate the birth of Athena: Bieber, *The History of Greek and Roman Theater*, 135.
latter’s skill in axe-swinging in the myth concerning the birth of Athena from Zeus’ head), or perhaps the figure is Zeus, the egg’s father.\footnote{185} To the right stands another parodied male (perhaps Tyndareos or a slave)\footnote{186} who holds up his hand in a firm protest against the blow about to occur. With the exception of Helen there is little consensus on the identification of the various figures.\footnote{187}

The figures are depicted in the typical manner of Old Comedy – ridiculously ugly, stub noses, protruding jaws, fat stomachs, large visible dangling phalloi, and gangling limbs.\footnote{188} The only figure not parodied is baby Helen emerging from the egg with outstretched hand in greeting who, because she appears normal, contrasts with the other characters. The action on the vase takes place on an elevated stage platform with hangings below. The play is burlesque and the source material would have come from one of the Old Comedy plays, possibly even Kratinos’ \textit{Nemesis}.\footnote{189} If so, Leda had clearly failed her instructions to act like a graceful hen, which now necessitate the drastic measures being here enacted to hatch the egg. This comic scene contrasts with the more serious artistic versions of Helen’s birth from an egg.\footnote{190}

In view of the play’s conjectured date of 431, on the eve of the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War when relationships between Athens and Sparta were at a low ebb, it is possible Kratinos is mocking Sparta with an instruction to the Spartan queen to act like a hen. Two further fragments from the play extend the insult against Sparta in phrases of belittling undertones: Ψύρα τε τὴν Σπάρτην ἄγεις (‘you regard Sparta as Psyra’);\footnote{191} and: Σπάρτην λέγω γε

\footnotesize{The double-axe is seen on a number of vases depicting Hephaistos, for example: BM 1836.0224.10; 1837.0609.27; 1849.0620.14; 1839.1109.1.
\footnote{185} The double-axe had previously been a symbol of the Minoan sky-god, then Kronos, and later Zeus: Cook, \textit{Zeus}, vol. 2.ii, 548-554, 559, 573-574, 593.
\footnote{186} See Neiendam’s discussion on the options on the identity of this character: Neiendam, \textit{The Art of Acting in Antiquity}, 50.
\footnote{188} Revermann, \textit{Comic Business}, 149.
\footnote{189} Other suggestions include: Aristophanes’ \textit{Daidalos}, and Euboulos’ \textit{Lakones} or \textit{Leda}: Taplin, \textit{Comic Angels}, 83.
\footnote{190} \textit{LIMC} iv Helene 1-4, 6-10 (L. Kahlil/N. Icard); \textit{LIMC} vii Leda 28-32 (L. Kahlil/N. Icard-Gianolio); ARV\textsuperscript{5} 1142.1, 1171.4, 1174.2, 1185.10, 1334.17, 1344; Taplin, \textit{Comic Angels}, 82, pl. 19.114; Arafat, \textit{Classical Zeus}, 188, pl. 16a.
\footnote{191} Steph. Byz. s.v. Ψύρα 704.5; \textit{PCG} vi F119 (Storey, vol. 1, F119; Edmonds i F112).}
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σπαρτίδα τὴν σπάρτινον ('by Spartiad I mean Sparta and not sparto-grass').

Although the context is unclear, I would propose that the first insults Sparta by putting into the mouth of one of the actors a questioning statement as to whether Sparta is no more important than the tiny insignificant and barren island of Psyra. The second fragment exhibits a play on words between ‘spartiad’ (σπαρτίδα), ‘Sparta’ (Σπάρτην), and ‘sparto grass’ (σπάρτινον). Sparto grass was useful as a food crop, while the dried stalks and leaves were used for making rope and stuffing mattresses. Although Kratinos’ meaning is lost, I suggest the fragment may have been a reference to some local Athenian joke about Sparta being tied up in knots, or that it was good for nothing except ‘stuffing’.

A further fragment reads: τάλλα πάντ’ ὀρνίθια ('all the other little birds'), which may be a reference to the play’s chorus as ‘little birds’. With the addition of yet another fragment referring to birds: ὀρνίθα φοινικόπτερον ('a bird with wings of flame'), it seems that birds figured prominently in one form or another throughout the play. This latter fragment recalls the allegedly sexually rapacious iunx-bird (discussed previously in relation to the Berlin Amphoriskos) which, according to Faraone, was bound to a wheel and burned with fire whilst spells were chanted to instil an insatiable and burning sexual longing into a desired female for the male’s pleasure. The objective conjures up scenes of an unfortunate female struck with a passionate and voracious desire for male sexual gratification, an aspect that aptly fits with the milieu of the play, and which may have been interpreted by the audience as a penis, or vagina, burning with fiery-passion. This interpretation seems to have

---

192 PCG iv F117 (Storey, vol. 1, F117; Edmonds i F112). Storey comments that σπαρτίδα is not a known word and its only known use is in this fragment. It is not found in any of Theophrastos’ works on plants.

193 LSJ 2026, col. 2, s.v. Ψύρα.

194 LSJ 1624, col. 2, s.v. σπάρτην and σπαρτός; cf. Ar. Av. 815.

195 PCG iv F120 (Edmonds i F107); Athen. ix 373c.

196 PCG iv F121 (Edmonds i F109); Athen. ix 373d.

197 Above pp. 132-135 with notes

198 Faraone, Ancient Greek Love Magic, 58, 64-69; Faraone, ‘The Wheel, the Whip and Other Implements of Torture’, 2.
been picked up by Edmonds when he translates the fragment as: ‘a red-wing’ed cock-bird’. 199

There remain three further fragments from Nemesis but their context is obscure and their meanings unfathomable. The first: μεθυστέρῳ ἐν χρόνῳ (‘in time to come’), sounds very like the modern: ‘Once upon a time’, and may indicate the beginning of the play, perhaps the finale, or possibly neither. The second concerns a drinking game called kottabos but its relevance in the play cannot be conjectured: 201

Κρατίνος ἐν Νεμέσει· τὸ δὲ κοττάβῳ προθέντας ἐν πατρικοῖς νόμοις τὸ κείνου δρυμάθας βάλλειν μὲν τὸ πόντῳ δὲ βάλλοντι νέμω πλείστα τύχης τὸ δ’ ἀθλον. 202

Kratinos in Nemesis: after setting out the kottabos following our ancestral rules the [corrupt] to strike with cruets, but to the sea (?) that strikes I apportion the most luck, but the prize. 203

Finally, an apt and fitting finale to Kratinos’ Nemesis – a fragment that consists of just one word: ἀπόκινον, 204 which is a comic dance of an obscene and indecent nature euphemistically called: ‘the bugger-off dance.’

Platon (late fifth century)

Platon, another Old Comedy writer, 205 uses N/nemesis as a caution in a unique fashion – the correct way to prepare and cook different kinds of fish for

---

199 Edmonds i F109. (Author’s italics.)
200 PCG iv F122 (Edmonds i F11).
201 A description of this drinking game is found in: Athen. 15.665a-668e; Olson, Broken Laughter, 311 H13, 312 H14. It is easy to visualize this ‘game’ descending into drunken disorder as more and more wine was drunk.
202 PCG iv F124 (Storey, vol. 1, F124; Edmonds i F116).
203 Athen. xv.667f.
204 Story, vol. 1, F127 (Edmonds i F120); LSF 202, col. 1, s.v. ἀπόκινος; Suda s.v. ἀπόκινος (alpha 3354); Ar. F275; Poll. 4.101; Athen. 14.629c; cf. Ar. Eq. 20 where Aristophanes incorporates the word into a debate about masturbating.
205 Although younger, Platon was writing at the same time as Kratinos (Suda s.v. Πλάτων [pi 1708]) and wrote at least twenty-eight comedies. His plays tended towards political themes but amongst his corpus was at least one mythological burlesque, Zeus Kakoumenos: OCD 1193 s.v. Plato (2); Edmonds i 489. Platon had success with at least one play which is listed amongst the competition winners in the 410s: IG ii 2325.63; Olson, Broken Laughter, 415 s.v. Plato Comicus. Rosen saw the play as a transition between Old and Middle Comedy: R. M. Rosen, ‘Plato Comicus and the Evolution of Greek Comedy,’ in G. W. Dobrov (ed.), Beyond Aristophanes: Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy, Atlanta, 1995, 132.
maximum pleasure, although as is to be expected within this genre, all is not so seemingly innocent. A dialogue begins between two characters:

(A) It’s a brand-new cookbook by Philoxenos.
(B) Give me a sample of what it’s like.
(A) Listen here: “I shall begin with bulb and conclude with tunny fish.”
(B) With tunny fish? In that case [corrupt] it’s by far the best thing to be posted here in the last ranks.
(A) “Subdue the bulbs with hot ash, soak them with sauce, and munch down as many as you can, for then a man’s body stands straight up. So much for that. I shall now pass on to the children of the sea.”

“Not that a stewing dish is bad, but the frying pan is better, in my opinion.”
[missing lines]
“And do not slice up the sea perch, or the speckle fish or sea bream or shark, lest Nemesis from the gods breathe upon you (μὴ σοι νέμεσις θεόθεν καταπνεύσῃ), but roast and serve them whole. They’re much better that way. If you … of an octopus in the right season, it is much better boiled than roasted, if it’s a large one. But if there are two roasted ones, then I say to the boiled one ‘get lost’. The red mullet does not tend to be helpful to the penis, for she belongs to the maiden Artemis and hates erections. Now the scorpion fish …”
(B) I hope, will creep up and sting you in the ass.”

The passage is from Platon’s Phaon written ca. 391, and whose eponymous hero is a ferryman who, because of a service rendered to Aphrodite was given a magic salve which would ensure that all women, including the goddess herself, would find him irre sistible. The resultant heavy demands made for his sexual favours were physically exhausting and he sought a way to fulfil and satisfy the ever-present and urgent pleas. The solution is sought in a cookery

---

206 This exact phrase was used by fourth-century Archestratos of Gela in his Hedupatheia (Life of Luxury). A discussion on sexual innuendo in Archestratos and on his ‘borrowings’ from Platon is found in: C. A. Shaw, ‘σκορπίος or σκόρπιος πέφως? A Sexual Joke in Archestratus’ Hedupatheia,’ CQ 59, no. 2, 2009, 634-639.
207 PCG vii F189 (Storey, vol. 3, F189; Edmonds i F173.3-22); Athen. 1.5b. The sexual innuendos are discussed in some detail by: Rosen, 'Plato Comicus and the Evolution of Greek Comedy,’ 10-13.
208 Edmonds i 491. The play is a profusion of sexual double-entendres used to comic effect: C. A. Shaw, ‘Genitalia of the Sea’: Seafood and Sexuality in Greek Comedy,’ Mnemosyne 67, no. 4, 2014, 567-569.
209 PCG iv F370; Storey, vol. 1, F370.
book by Philoxenos in the hope of foods that: ‘will make a man stand up straight’ (τὸ γὰρ δέμας ἀνέφος ὁρθὸι) i.e. achieve and maintain a phallic erection. The recipes that have attracted attention involve the preparation of a first course of hyacinth bulbs, with instructions for the preparation of a main course of fish. It is this latter dish which, if not prepared correctly, has the potential to bring down the wrath either of the goddess, Nemesis or the nemesis of the (collective) gods.

The potential for comedy is irresistibly evident especially when all the fragments are examined together, which attest to similarly sexually suggestive double-entendres, so that the imprecation of μὴ σοι νέμεσις θεόθεν καταπνεύσῃ is in no way meant as a serious warning but demonstrates that the deities or their attributes could be, and were, invoked disrespectfully in a light-hearted manner. The intended implication is that if the fish was prepared incorrectly then Phaon would be thwarted in his hopes for increased sexual abilities, but if correctly prepared then this desire would be met. In a practical sense it is not difficult to see that if any dish is prepared incorrectly then the desired result would be disappointing, but whether one could blame ‘the gods’ for the failure is debatable although it makes for good comedy.

The obvious genre of the play, full of double-entendres, absolves any serious intent or caution, and no actual Nemesis was seriously considered about to descend upon anyone’s sexuality whether the fish was prepared correctly or not. What is highlighted is that as a standard for correct and moral living the strength of the abstract emotion of nemesis had by this time diminished to the point that comic authors considered themselves immune from any retributive forces emanating from any deity and felt free to parody such issues with impunity.

---

210 PCG vii F189.4; Storey, vol. 3, F189.4; Athen. 1.5b, 4.146f.
211 Considered a sexual stimulant: Athen. 2.64a-b.
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NEMESIS, HISTORY, AND PROSPERITY

It has been suggested that as a representation of divine causality an unspoken nemesis hangs over the whole of Herodotos’ Histories. Like an unseen but inescapable dimension in the presence of which all human crime and folly are played out, or as Harrison puts it: ‘The moral of divine retribution is a moral of the Histories as a whole’. Can such statements be an accurate interpretation of Herodotos’ Histories or even of his intentions? Did Herodotos, as some argue, write his Histories as a lesson for present and future generations to learn from the consequences of the sins of their forebears in order to avoid such follies in their own times, for fear of nemesis or retribution?

Indeed, can such statements be upheld when, in spite of a

212 Herodotos is the only ancient historical writer to use the term nemesis; it is found nowhere in Thucydidès or Xenophon.


perceived all-pervading aura of nemesis, Herodotos employs the term just once.\footnote{216}

**Kroisos**

Metá ὃς Ἀθηναίου ὢν εἰκόνη, ὡς ἔκλεισεν ἢτοι ἀνθρώπων ἀπάντων ὥμωτον.

But after Solon's departure [a] great N/nemesis from [a] god fell heavily on Kroisos, as I guess, because he supposed himself to be the most fortunate of all men.\footnote{218}

According to Herodotos it was Kroisos’ ‘inescapable predetermined fate’ (1.91: τὴν πεπρωμένην μοίραν) to suffer divine revenge (1.13: τίσεις) for the sins of his ancestor, Gyges,\footnote{219} five generations before, as foretold by an oracle (1.91). This fate, something beyond Kroisos’ control or ability to remedy, was moirai-driven; but crucially a separate nemesis-driven fate would also befall Kroisos as a consequence of his own personal sins, since N/nemesis remedies or balances those iniquities that are personally committed.\footnote{220}

Prior to discussing the passage as a whole, it is worth considering some of its individual anomalies. The word νέμεσις: as an abstract noun Evans judges Powell’s translation of ‘divine vengeance’ too strong and suggests ‘indignation’ instead.\footnote{221} In light of the magnitude of nemesis-driven suffering that subsequently descended on Kroisos, I believe something more than dispassionate divine ‘indignation’ is warranted, but rather an emotion of ‘righteous anger’ manifested as divine retribution aimed to punish Kroisos and

\footnote{217} Hdt. 1.34.1.
\footnote{218} Translation: author.
\footnote{220} [Nemesis is] ‘a personal punishment for a personal sin’: Shimron, ‘Politics and Belief in Herodotus’, 35.
to turn him from his self-satisfied, conceited, and self-congratulatory ways, towards a more moderate way of thinking, towards *themis* and ‘right-order’.

A further point to consider is the correct interpretation of ἐκ θεοῦ νέμεσις μεγάλη. As Vandiver rightly points out ἐκ θεοῦ could be translated either as ‘from god’ or ‘from a god’, since Greek has no indefinite article.

From her examination of the passage she has determined upon the latter understanding of ‘from a god’, but concedes that had Herodotos intended the more definite ‘from god’ then Apollo is indicated. Since Apollo was specifically concerned in Kroisos’ inescapable moirai-driven fate, and Herodotos has *nemesis* ἐκ θεοῦ fall on Kroisos for his personal wrong-doing, in my opinion some another god was responsible for Kroisos’ *nemesis*-driven fate. If Herodotos had intended ‘*nemesis from a god*’, then Nemesis, acting on her own behalf, could plausibly be the deity meant, i.e. ‘But after Solon’s departure a great *nemesis* [from Nemesis] fell heavily on Kroisos’. But, if the intended reading was ‘*from god*’, then Zeus, who was more typically identified simply as ‘god’, would be meant. In this case the

---

222 That this objective was successful is evident in Kroisos’ later reputation as a wise man and his appointment as a counsellor to his captor, Kyros: Hdt. 1.89-90.

223 Vandiver, 'Strangers are from Zeus: Homeric *Xenia* at the Courts of Proteus and Croesus,’ 156 n. 49.

224 A conclusion drawn, no doubt, because of the prominent role played by Apollo elsewhere in the Kroisos *logos*. Note Mikalson’s statement that this is another example of Herodotos using the generic term, ‘the divine’, to indicate a generalization of divinity and not any specific god related to cult: Mikalson, *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars*, 150. Other examples of the generic use of ὁ θεός include, but are not limited to, the following passages: Hdt. 1.31; 1.64; 3.35; 4.79, 119; 6.27, 98; 7.10, 8.13, 60.

225 Hdt. 1.13, 91 mentions Apollo (Loxias) and the Delphic oracle in relation to Kroisos’ moirai-driven misfortunes.


'nemesis' visited upon Kroisos would come from Zeus by means of his agent Nemesis: 'great Nemesis [sent] from Zeus'.

Whatever Herodotos' meaning, ultimately there is little difference between the two readings since in each the personified goddess Nemesis potentially looms as a pivotal protagonist in the *nemesis*-driven set of misfortunes about to descend on Kroisos, because he boasted that he was the most fortunate of all men. Kroisos' boast emanated from his pride in his excessive wealth and good-fortune, both of which transgressed the boundaries of his life's allocation and demonstrated an aspiration to emulate the gods; all of which must find redress and 'balance' through N/nemesis. It is important to emphasize that it was the realignment of 'balance' that needed to be addressed and not, as some would suggest, *nemesis* consequent upon any *hybris* committed by Kroisos, a term which is nowhere used in the Kroisos *logos*. The story of Kroisos and his misfortunes has traditionally been quoted as the inevitable *nemesis* resulting from an act or acts of *hybris*, a view strongly disputed by Fisher and Gould. Cairns agrees with their conclusion in principle but qualifies his view by saying Kroisos’ prosperity inclined him to believe himself to be higher than others which, in his opinion, equates to *hybris*; a statement which effectively aligns him with the *hybris*/nemesis theorists.

---


229 Herodotos uses *hybris* just once: 1.89 (ὀμφρανταί), in Kroisos’ description of the Persians; cf. Kindt’s interpretation of Herodotos’ accusation of *hybris* (implied) against Kroisos as ruler of his nation in regards to his attitude towards the divine and the oracles: J. Kindt, 'Delphic Oracle Stories and the Beginning of Historiography: Herodotus’ Croesus Logos,' *CPh* 101, no. 1, 2006, 47.


232 Cairns, 'Hybris, Dishonour, and Thinking Big', 18, n. 80.
Fisher’s definition of hybris is worth examining at this point: ‘the serious assault on the honour of another, which is likely to cause shame, and lead to anger and attempts at revenge. Hybris is often, but by no means necessarily, an act of violence; it is essentially deliberate activity, and the typical motive for such infliction of dishonour is the pleasure of expressing a sense of superiority, rather than compulsion, need or desire for wealth …. Hybris thus most often denotes specific acts or general behaviour directed against others, rather than attitudes.’ Ober defines hybris as: ‘the propensity for and the act of deliberately seeking to disrespect or dishonour another person through outrageous speech (gross verbal insult) or action (physical violence)’.

There is no doubt that Fisher and Ober have effectively explained hybris, although I would add the following from Aristotle: ἔτι οὐδεὶς ὑβρίζει λυπούμενος, ὁ δὲ ὀρηὴ ποιῶν πᾶς ποιεῖ λυπούμενος, ὁ δὲ ὑβρίζων μεθ᾽ ἡδονῆς (‘that a wanton act of outrage done for its own sake alone, and done with a sense of pleasure, can only then be called an act of hybris’).

By these definitions Kroisos had not committed hybris; the misfortunes that ultimately beset him were not the natural consequence of any personal hybris-act, but were the penalties for two distinct sets of offences: those of his ancestor punishable by the moirai, and his personal wrongs punishable by N/nemesis.

The occasion prompting Herodotos to mention nemesis comes at the end of a visit by the Athenian sage, Solon. After a tour of Kroisos’ sumptuous palace with all his vast wealth, Kroisos boastfully asks Solon: νῦν ὃς ἐπειρέσθαι με ἰμερός ἐπηλθή σε εἰ τινα ἡδη πάντων εἰδες ὁλβιώτατον (‘Now therefore I am fain to ask you, if you have ever seen a man more blest than all his fellows [than I’]); or according to Plutarch: Κροῖσος εἰ τινα οἴδεν ἀνθρώπων ἀωτοῦ

---

234 Arist. EN VII 6.4.
235 Translation: author.
236 Hdt. 1.30-33. It is highly unlikely that the two actually ever met, despite Miller’s argument that dates the meeting to the year 560: M. Miller, ‘The Herodotean Croesus,’ Klio: Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte 41, 1963, 86. Herodotos’ purpose would have been to use the motif of the scorned wise man to illustrate his didactic purpose as a warning against arrogance.
237 The word ἰμερός is used six times by Herodotos and in each case it reflects the excessive desires of a tyrannical despot or invading peoples: Hdt. 1.30, 1.73, of Kroisos; 5.106, of the Ionians; 6.137, of the Athenians; 7.43, of Xerxes; 9.3, of Mardonios; cf. 3.123, ἰμαρέτο (from the verb ἰμαρομαι), of Polykrates’ desire for money; and, Aischyl. Pers. 233, where Atossa speaks of Xerxes’ desire to take Athens.
μακαριώτερον (‘Kroisos asked him if he had ever known a happier man than he’).\(^{238}\) Kroisos expected to hear his own name in reply and was piqued when Solon named others.\(^{239}\) Solon explains his choice by saying that no man can call himself truly fortunate until he had reached the end of his life when that life might be judged in retrospect, since the vagaries of the gods could change a man’s fortune in an instant.\(^{240}\) This philosophy is aptly illustrated in the words Herodotos puts into the mouth of the Persian, Artabanos:

> You see how the god smites with his thunderbolt creatures of greatness more than common, nor suffers them to display their pride, but such as are little move him not to anger; and you see how it is ever on the tallest buildings and trees that his bolts fall; for it is heaven’s way to bring low all things of surpassing bigness. Thus a numerous host is destroyed by one that is lesser, the god of his jealousy sending panic, fear or thunderbolt among them, whereby they do unworthily perish; for the god suffers pride in none but himself.\(^{241}\)

This philosophical argument is similarly echoed by ca. sixth-century Aesop:

> τάλλα δὲ πάντα φόβοι τε καὶ ἀλγεία· κῆν τι πάθη τις ἐσθλῶν, ἀμοιβαίνην ἐκδέχεται Νέμεσιν (‘but everything is fear and pain, and if some good occurs to someone, an answering Nemesis then comes’).\(^{242}\) Similarly, Theognis speaks of the whims of divine nemesis:

> For the gods have nemesis (θεοὶ γὰρ τοι νέμεσίον’) and the ending depends on them … good comes from bad and bad from

---

\(^{238}\) Plut. Solon 27.

\(^{239}\) Solon gives two examples of men whom he would count as most fortunate since they lived happy and fulfilled lives, died nobly, and were esteemed by their peers after death: Tellos the Athenian (Hdt. 1.30); and, Kleobis and Biton from Argos (Hdt 1.31). Solon’s philosophy on this point is discussed by Aristotle: *EN* I.x.1-3; and quoted by the three tragedians: Aischyl. Ag. 928-929; Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 1528-1530; Eur. *Andr.* 100-101. A discussion on Kleobis and Biton is found in: C. C. Chiasson, ‘Myth, Ritual, and Authorial Control in Herodotus’ Story of Cleobis and Biton,’ *AJPh* 126, no. 1, 2005, 41-64, 51-52; cf: T. Harrison, ‘The Cause of Things,’ in D. Konstan & N. K. Rutter (eds), *Envy, Spite and Jealousy: The Rivalrous Emotions in Ancient Greece*, Edinburgh, 2003, 160.

\(^{240}\) Cf. Hdt. 1.32 where Solon speaks of the jealousy of the gods towards mankind: Ὡ Κροῖσος, ἐπιστάμενον μὲ τὸ θεῖον πᾶν ἀπὸν φθονῷ τοῖς τις τὰ παραρεῖσθεν θεραιπηθέν προγράμματων πάρι (‘Kroisos, you ask me about the affairs of men, I know that the divine are full of jealousy and troublesome to us’), (translation: author). Chiasson uniquely translates τὸ θεῖον as ‘divine essence’: Chiasson, ‘The Herodotean Solon’, 259, n.33. I interpret φθονῷ in this passage as the jealousy the gods have in relation to their realm, i.e. they guard their prerogatives and privileges jealously.

\(^{241}\) Hdt. 7.10; cf. Mikalson, *Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars*, 150.

good; a poor man suddenly gets very rich, and he who has acquired a great deal suddenly loses it all.\textsuperscript{243}

Kroisos’ pride as the cause of his \textit{nemesis}-driven punishment is confirmed in a fragment from Euripides that reveals \textit{nemesis} (from Nemesis) as a retributive force against self-exultation:

\begin{quote}
\text{Ὅτ’ ἂν ἴδης πρὸς ὑψος ἠρμένον τινά λαμπρῷ τε πλούτῳ καὶ γένει γαρφούμενον, ὁφρὸν τε μεῖζῳ τῆς τύχης ἐπηρκότα, τούτου ταχεῖαν Νέμεσιν εὐθὺς προσδόκα.}\textsuperscript{244}
\end{quote}

Whenever you see someone lifted to the heights, and exulting in splendour of wealth or birth, with brows raised in pride too great for his fortunes, immediately expect swift \textit{Retribution} for him.

Solon continues his explanation to Kroisos by saying: ‘we must look to the conclusion of every matter, and see how it shall end, for there are many to whom heaven has given a vision of blessedness, and yet afterwards brought them to utter ruin’. Far from being impressed by Solon’s perceptive wisdom Kroisos thought him a fool (ἀμαθέα) and was angered.\textsuperscript{245} Kroisos’ reaction exposed the weakness of his values by highlighting the greater importance he laid on riches, power, and personal standing. He was an example of the contrast between wisdom (Solon) and arrogance (Kroisos).\textsuperscript{246}

It is at this point, with Kroisos’ contemptuous dismissal of Solon and his wisdom, that Herodotos employs his sole use of the noun \textit{nέμεσις}:

\begin{quote}
Μετὰ δὲ Σόλωνα οἰχόμενον ἔλαβε ἐκ θεοῦ νέμεσις μεγάλη Κροῖσον, ὡς εἰκάσαι, ὃτι ἐνόμισε ἑωυτὸν εἶναι ἀνθρώπον ἀπάντων ὀλβιώτατον.\textsuperscript{247}
\end{quote}

But after Solon’s departure [a] great N/nemesis from [a] god fell heavily on Kroisos, as I guess, because he supposed himself to be the most fortunate of all men.

\textsuperscript{243} Theog. 659-660. I have replaced Gerber’s translation of ‘for the gods are resentful’ with ‘for the gods have \textit{nemesis}’.

\textsuperscript{244} Eur. Collard/Cropp F1113a (Eur. \textit{TrGF} vol. 5.2 F1113a; Eur. \textit{TGF} F1040); Stob. \textit{Anth.} Γ.22.5 (in: Hense vol. 3 584.5). Author’s capitalization of Νέμεσιν.

\textsuperscript{245} Hdt. 1.32-33. A valid point posited by Miller suggests that Kroisos, a proud Lydian, would not have tolerated advice from any Greek: Miller, ‘The Herodotean Croesus’, 88-89.


\textsuperscript{247} Hdt. 1.34.
Until the moment Kroisos voiced his presumptuous question to Solon as to whether he was not the most fortunate of men, his words had remained mute, inactive, and inanimate thoughts; but once voiced they were given life.248 Words evidence emotions by making them manifest; a tenet implied by first-century AD Antiphilos of Byzantium: οὐδὲ τὰ μικρὰ λήθη τὴν γλῶσσης ἀντίπαλον Νέμεσιν (‘not even little things are unnoticed by the Nemesis that is the foe of our tongues’).249 Having issued from Kroisos’ mouth, his verbalized arrogance had sprung into being and extended a challenge to that godess who punishes boastful and unbridled speech – Nemesis. Kroisos’ nemesis-driven fate was now set in motion to prove the lie to his boast:250 εἶναι ἀνθρώπων ἁπάντων ὀλβιώτατον. As punisher of boastful or imprudent speech Nemesis is likewise evident in Euripides, when Antigone warns:251

O Nemesis and loud-roaring thunder of Zeus, and blazing lights of lightning-bolts, you put to sleep excessive boasts.253

Similarly, Plato: κούφων καὶ πτηνὸν λόγων βαρύτατη ζημία – πάσι γὰρ ἐπίσκοπος τοῖς περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐτάχθη Δίκης Νέμεσις ἄγγελος (‘for vain

249 Antiphilos of Byzantium, who uses the capital ‘N’ in Nemesis: Anth. Gr. 7.630.
250 Vandiver argues that Kroisos was not so much guilty of active wrongdoing ‘but of an attitude that predisposes an autocrat towards wrongdoing’: Vandiver, ‘Strangers are from Zeus: Homeric Xenia at the Courts of Proteus and Croesus,’ 164; similarly, Pelling claims Kroisos had attitudes that: 'lead to or accompany hybristic behaviour': Pelling, 'Educating Croesus', 150; with Gammie saying Kroisos’ pride would be followed by divine punishment: Gammie, 'Herodotus on Kings and Tyrants', 176-177; de Romilly is incorrect to say the gods punish thoughts, not situations: J. de Romilly, The Rise and Fall of States according to Greek Authors, Michigan, 1977, 42-43; de Romilly, 'La Vengeance Comme Explication Historique Dans L'oeuvre d'Herodote', 315.
251 Cf: Ausonius, Personal Poems 5.45-55: ‘mitibus audi auribus hoc, Nemesis’ (‘hear this, Nemesis, with an indulgent ear’), spoken after boasting of how important he was and how his honours have increased. The appeal was said to avert any nemesis from Nemesis for his audacity; also: Ausonius, The Epistles xxvii.51-57; Epigrams on Various Matters xlii.1-4.
252 Eur. Phoen. 182. This is one of only two instances in Greek tragedy that Fisher argues for a direct connection between hybris and nemesis (the other is Soph. Elekt. 792): Fisher, Hybris, 427-428, n. 79.
254 Pl. Laws, 717c-d.
and idle words there is a very heavy penalty – for Nemesis, messenger of Justice, is appointed to watch over all these things').

Kroisos was an example of a life lived contrary to the maxim attributed to the historical Solon: μηδὲν ἀγαν (‘nothing in excess’), and: τίκτει γάρ κόρος ὃμιλον, ὅτως πολὺς ὁλυμπος ἔπται ἀνθρώπως ὁπόσος μή νός ἄπτος ἦ (‘for excess breeds insolence, whenever great prosperity comes to men who are not sound of mind’). Kroisos’ wealth emboldened him with arrogance along with other faults: Herodotos mentions he was the first man he knew to have done harm to the Greeks through the subjugation of those in Asia Minor, demands for tribute payments, and his plans to attack the islands; and, he had his half-brother killed because he perceived this brother as a threat to his supreme sovereignty.

The Nemesis which ultimately befall Kroisos was the result of his own conceited and boastful talk, which was itself the consequence of his prosperity. The punishment demanded of Kroisos was something that was precious and irreplaceable to him – the death of his son and heir, Atys (Ἀτύς), brought about through the agency of a human intermediary, Adrastos (Ἀδράστος), a guest at Kroisos’ court whom Kroisos had cleansed of blood-guilt for the accidental killing of his brother in his homeland of Phrygia.

Although the names, Atys and Adrastos, were not unique, the fact that these two were pivotal instruments in Kroisos’ Nemesis-Logos, has led to debate on whether any hidden etymological meanings was intended by Herodotos.

---

255 Translation: author.
256 Suda s.v. Σόλων (sigma 776); also attributed to Chilon: Suda s.v. Θσλής (theta 17).
258 Hdt. 1.6, 26-28.
259 Hdt. 1.92; see comments in: Miller, The Herodotean Croesus', 82-84.
260 Mortals acting as intermediaries or agents of the gods is implied in a speech for the prosecution in an accidental killing trial at Athens: Ant. Tetr. 2 3.7-8. Without mentioning Nemesis, Harrison gives examples of divine retribution operating through human agency: Harrison, Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus, 111-112.
Asheri and Immerwahr interpret Άτυς as correlating to the Greek άτη262 (‘he who cannot flee’, ‘delusion’, ‘reckless’, ‘folly’, ‘ill-fated’),263 with or without its personification άτη,264 and often associated with hybris.265 One suggestion, probably an over-interpretation, has Άτυς as a Greek corruption of the Lydo-Phrygian sun-god Attis or Attes associated with Kybele, who according to legend was killed by a boar, an animal which looms forebodingly in the Kroisos-logos.266 The name ‘Adrastos’ possibly has a double meaning:267 it translates as ‘inescapable’ and the feminine ‘Adrasteia’ (‘the relentless one’, ‘the one from whom none can escape’),268 was an Eastern goddess with whom Nemesis was sometimes linked in the Hellenistic and Roman eras. Adrastos, whose own fate was inescapable and who, as an unwitting agent of Nemesis brings nemesis to Kroisos, ultimately came to recognize this aspect in himself: συγγινωσκόμενος ἀνθρώπων εἶναι τῶν άτός ἤδεε βαρυσυμφόρωτας (‘recognizing that of all the men that he himself knew he carried the heaviest...’).262

262 Asheri translates Άτυς as ‘Misfortune’, i.e. άτη personified: Asheri, Lloyd & Corcella, A Commentary on Herodotus: Books I-IV, 104; Immerwahr also interprets ‘misfortune’ from άτη, and ‘blindness’ as an alternative, i.e. Kroisos’ blindness to his lifestyle: Immerwahr, Form and Thought in Herodotus, 158 n. 25; and that άτη led Kroisos to destruction: H. R. Immerwahr, ‘Aspects of Historical Causation in Herodotus,’ TAPA 87, 1956, 257.

263 LSJ 270, col. 1 s.v. άτη.  Άτη was, along with her sister Νέμεσις, a parthenogenic daughter of Νοξ: Hes. Theog. 211-232; in Homer she is a daughter of Zeus: Hom. II. 9.504, 19.92; in the tragedians, especially Aischylus, άτη has a role similar to that of Νέμεσις in avenging evil: Aischyl. Choe. 382-283, Ag. 386, 771, 1433, Seven 954.

266 Paus. 7.17.9-13; F. Mora, Religione e religioni nelle Storie di Erodoto, Milan, 1986, 139-142; J. A. K. Thomson, The Art of the Logos, London, 1935, 82-84. Άττας was also a mystical formula recited by the priests of Cybele: LSJ 273, col. 2 s.v. Άττας.


burden of misfortune’). Whether Herodotos had intended any hidden significance in the etymology of ‘Adrastos’ and ‘Atys’, remains hypothetical.

Adrastos arrived at Kroisos’ court with blood-guilt, which may have been his inescapable and predetermined destiny. In purifying Adrastos, I believe Kroisos acted presumptuously by interfering in the prerogative of some god, possibly Zeus Katharsios whom Kroisos later invoked (ἐκάλεκ) on hearing of his son’s death. As a result, the god whose prerogative had been violated would reject Adrastos’ purification and require that he commit further blood-sin to reinstate his destiny, this time with the accidental killing of Kroisos’ son, Atys. Again Kroisos forgives Adrastos by putting the blame on one of the gods (in much the same way that Agamemnon blamed the gods, and not Helen, for his disasters):

Friend, I have from you all that justice asks, since you deem yourself worthy of death. But it is not you that I hold the cause of this evil, save in so far as you were the unwilling doer of it: rather it is, I suppose, the work of one among the gods (ἀλλὰ θεῶν κού τις), the same who told me long ago what was to be.

With his burden so great, Adrastos finds the only atonement in that from which he can never escape, further blood-sin, this time through suicide.

Adrastos was the ill-fated cog in Kroisos’ wheel of fate; an image Herodotos voices: ‘men’s fortunes are on a wheel, which in its turning suffers not the

---

269 Hdt. 1.45. Powell notes that this is Herodotos’ sole use of the superlative, and translates it as ‘ill-starred’: Powell, A Lexicon to Herodotus, 58 s.v. βαρυσυμφορώτατος. (Translation: author.)

270 LSJ 866, col. 2, s.v. καλέω; ‘invoke a god’, Powell, A Lexicon to Herodotus, s.v. καλέω, 181; Vandiver, ‘Strangers are from Zeus: Homeric Xenia at the Courts of Proteus and Croesus,’ 161; cf. Long, who describes Kroisos’ ἐκάλεκ as ‘a blasphemous imprecation against Zeus’: T. Long, Repetition and Variation in the Short Stories of Herodotus, Frankfurt am Main, 1987, 75; Immerwahr, Form and Thought in Herodotus, interprets it as Kroisos accusing Zeus.

271 Kroisos invoked: Zeus Katharsios (of purification), Zeus Epistios (of the hearth), and Zeus Hetaireios (of comradeship): Hdt. 1.44.

272 Hdt. 1.45: ἔχως δ’ ἔχεις παρὰ σει πάσαν τὴν δίκην, ἐπιθρόη σεωστοῦ καταδικάξεις θάνατον. ἔδει οὗ τῷ μοι τούτῳ τοῦ κακοῦ ἀέτῳ, εἰ μὴ δέσθω ἄδικον ἔξεργάσιον, ἄλλα θεῶν κοῦ τις, δὲ μοι καὶ πάλιν προσήμανε τὰ μέλλοντα ἑσεσθαι; cf. Hom. II. 1.164-165. These two passages reinforce Helen and Adrastos as instruments of ‘some god’. See other parallels between the two in: Vandiver, ‘Strangers are from Zeus: Homeric Xenia at the Courts of Proteus and Croesus,’ 162-163, n.68.

273 Godley uses the singular ‘a god’ but since the Greek is clearly plural I have amended the translation by including κοῦ which Godley leaves untranslated.

274 Hdt. 1.45.
same man to prosper for ever’. Adrastos brought nemesis upon Kroisos through the death of his son Atys: a nemesis-driven punishment for his personally committed sin of boastfully articulating his conviction that he was the most fortunate of all mankind. Eventually, Kroisos would lose the empire over which his line, the Mermnadai, had reigned for 170 years; he would lose his blood-line; and almost his life after being nearly burnt to death on a pyre on Kyros’ instructions but who later relented. These later adversities were not nemesis-driven, but distinct and separate: they were inescapably predetermined and the seeds had been sown five generations previously as his moirai-driven destiny, of which he was later reminded by the Pythia:

Τὴν περιφρομένην μοίραν ἀδύνατα ἠστι ἀποφυγεῖν καὶ θεῶ· Κροίσος δὲ πέμπτου γονέος ἀμαρτάδα ἐξέπλησε.

None may escape his destined lot, not even a god. Kroisos hath paid for the sin of his ancestor of the fifth generation.

This philosophical tenet is echoed in the words of an un-named Persian prior to the battle at Plataia: ‘that which a god wills to send no man can turn aside … although a man takes thought rationally for many things, he controls nothing’.

**Polykrates**

I include the Polykrates logos in this chapter even though no nemesis-words are found in the story. My justification for this is the fact that, because of the extreme punishment that befell Polykrates, the story is sometimes quoted as an example of an unspoken nemesis in Herodotos. While I believe there are cautionary tales throughout Herodotos, it does not necessarily follow that an unarticulated nemesis is evident everywhere.

---

275 Hdt. 1.207. The image is reminiscent of the iunx-wheel and its credible connection to Nemesis discussed above, pp. 134-135 with notes, and the wheel that was to become her attribute in a later age.


278 Hdt. 1.91. Cf. comments on Kroisos’ belief he could alter this predetermined fate by challenging the line between mortal and immortal spheres: Kindt, ‘Delphic Oracle Stories and the Beginning of Historiography: Herodotus’ Croesus Logos’, 41-42. Parker puts this rather uniquely: ‘Croesus … was merely being asked to hand back, after a generous period of usufruct, what his ancestor had wrongfully acquired’: Parker, *Miasma*, 202.

279 Hdt. 1.91.

280 Hdt. 9.16; cf. Hdt. 1.207.
Polykrates was like Kroisos in many aspects: he loved wealth and power (καὶ κος ἰμεῖρετο γὰρ χρημάτων μεγάλως), of which he had an over-abundance with a desire for more; he had committed crimes in the pursuit of his obsession including the murder of one brother and the banishment of another; and he aggressively sought territorial expansion. In all his endeavours he appeared to be ever successful and fortunate. But, such constant good fortune breeds arrogance and imparts a sense of entitlement. So it was for Polykrates, until eventually a heavy divine phthonos fell him, and he was punished by gods.

According to Herodotos, Polykrates’ fortunate life together with his amassed wealth troubled Amasis of Egypt. His concern prompted him to write and caution Polykrates that his good fortune could not continue indefinitely, since: τὸ θεῖον ἐπισταμένῳ ὡς ἐστὶ φθονερόν (‘I know how jealous are the gods’). Amasis’ letter counselled Polykrates to suffer some misfortune to detract from his good luck in the hope of placating the gods, and thereby avoid evil and utter destruction (κακῶς ἐτελεύτησε πρόρριζος). His suggestion was that Polykrates voluntarily throw away something which he considered ranked amongst his most precious treasures.

Unlike Kroisos’ rejection of Solon’s wisdom, Polykrates heeded Amasis’ advice up to a point: where Amasis advises Polykrates to cast away something the loss of which would cause suffering to his soul (τὴν ψυχὴν ἁλγῆσεις), Polykrates repeats Amasis’ terminology while considering his options but instead of ἁλγῆσεις (from ἁλγέω, to suffer) he uses the term ἁσθείη (from ἁσῆ, vexation). Polykrates has downgraded the amount of ‘suffering’ he should endure to appease the gods’ phthonos; this was a mistake. His decision may have resulted from arrogance, or perhaps he did not think the danger was
that great since his previous run of good fortune may have led him to believe he was a favourite of the gods, especially after he had chained the island of Rheneia to nearby Delos and dedicated it to Apollo.\textsuperscript{286} What Polykrates failed to realize was that the prosperity and success he had enjoyed would inevitably arouse the gods’ \textit{phthonos} because of their perception of him trying to emulate the gods and cross the line between mortal and divine.\textsuperscript{287} Consequently, of all his vast wealth, power, and extensive lands, the thing Polykrates chose as his dearest and most valued possession and the thing which would apparently cause him the greatest grief to lose, was a ring – albeit gold with an emerald. Nevertheless, having made his choice, and with great aplomb, Polykrates makes an ostentatious public display of throwing the ring into the sea in an attempt to appease the gods’ \textit{phthonos}, whereupon he returns home to grieve its loss.\textsuperscript{288}

Unsurprisingly, Polykrates’ sacrifice does not appease the gods, and the reason is not difficult to discover: his loss was not that great and probably did not really distress him. The personal value of the ring could not rate above his empire with all its incumbent power; it could not rate above relationships in personal and emotional value; nor could it rate with the sum of all his vast wealth. Polykrates had not effected a genuinely heartfelt attempt at humility especially considering how he managed to stage the event to be witnessed by the crew of a fifty-oared ship in order to pretentiously demonstrate his artificial (I deduce) humility and his false (I conclude) piety: \textit{περιελόμενος τὴν σφρηγίδα πάντων ὀρώντων τῶν συμπλόων ῥίπτει ἐς τὸ πέλαγος}\textsuperscript{289} (‘he took off the seal-ring in sight of all on the ship and cast it into the sea’). Since the ring was subsequently found in the stomach of a fish and returned to him, his sacrifice was clearly rejected by the gods.\textsuperscript{290} At this point Polykrates should have heeded the second part of Amasis’ advice:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{286} Thuc. 3.2.
\item \textsuperscript{287} Konstan, ‘Nemesis and Phthonos,’ 83.
\item \textsuperscript{288} Hdt. 3.41.
\item \textsuperscript{289} Hdt. 3.41.
\item \textsuperscript{290} Cf: Shapiro, ‘Herodotus and Solon’, 354 n. 33; van den Veen, ‘The Lord of the Ring’, 433-457, esp. 448.
\end{itemize}
if, after that, you do not find that success alternates with failure, then go on using the remedy I have advised.

The translation is de Sélicourt’s, but Godley imparts the same sense: ‘then, if after this the successes that come to you be not chequered by mishaps, strive to mend the matter as I have counselled you.’ Amasis had counselled that if Polykrates’ first attempt failed he must keep on trying to bring balance into his life by alternating good fortune with bad. This part of Amasis’ advice was ignored by Polykrates. Once the ring was returned to him as a sign of its rejection by the gods he should, according to Amasis’ assessment, have persisted in his attempts to bring about personal misfortunes, to appease the gods: he did not. The gods’ rejection of the ring, and Polykrates’ failure to keep trying to suffer some loss, signified his impending doom, and his life now raced towards its final destiny.

The gods’ phthonos became an implicit righteous anger (nemesis) aroused by Polykrates’ ineffectual and half-hearted attempts at bringing balance to his life, and perceived as dishonouring them. In this, Polykrates was guilty of an unarticulated hybris: ‘he had committed an assault on the honour of another’ (the gods), and his subsequent punishment would be both phthonos-driven and nemesis-driven. Polykrates exhibited a lack of shame and aidōs by not acknowledging or recognizing the dishonour and the insult to the gods, and he invoked a divine nemesis. As a result the gods ensured he would pay by means of a worthy sacrifice – they took away all that he deemed of value: his life, his empire, his power, his wealth, and his family. Polykrates meets a miserable end, which is evaluated in the words of his successor, Maiandros: Πολυκράτης μὲν νῦν ἔξεστι σέ μοίραν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ (‘So now Polykrates has fulfilled his destiny by himself’).

---

291 Hdt. 3.40.
293 Fisher, Hybris, 1.
294 On this point and in relation to Greek thought generally, see: Kaster, ‘Invidia, νέμεσις, φθόνος and the Roman Emotional Economy,’ 262.
295 Hdt. 3.142. (Translation: author.)
Polykrates and Kroisos were both prosperous, and in spite of Lateiner’s argument that disproportionate prosperity such as enjoyed by Kroisos and Polykrates is the moral equivalent of *hybris*, this was not their sin. Rather, it was their conduct and attitude as a result of that prosperity; it was this which the gods found lacking.

What of the question initially posed at the beginning of this discussion: ‘did Herodotos write his *Histories* as a lesson for future generations to learn from the divinely inspired consequences of the sins of their forebears in order to avoid such follies in their own times, for fear of *nemesis* or retribution’? In answer it can be said that Herodotos was surely inviting the reader to reflect on the fates of these and other characters in his *Histories*, to ponder their own personal lives, and avoid making those same mistakes. Kroisos acknowledges he has learnt from his *nemesis*-driven misfortunates and is therefore best able to answer the question himself, this time without boastful and self-congratulatory words but more thoughtfully: τὰ δὲ μοι παθήματα ἔσται ἀχάριτα μαθήματα γέγονε ... ἐκεῖνο πρῶτον μάθε, ώς κύκλος τῶν ἀνθρωπειῶν ἐστὶ πρημιμάτων, περιφερόμενος δὲ οὐκ ἐὰν αἱ τῶν αὐτούς εὐτυχεῖν (‘my sufferings, being bitter, have become lessons … then I must first teach you this: men’s fortunes are on a wheel, which in its turning suffers not the same man to prosper forever’). That wheel of which he speaks is slowly rotated by those personified forces, and parthenogenic daughters of Nyx, that temper humanity’s arrogance, its selfish, self-indulgent desires and its imprudent, boastful speech from one generation to the next – the Moirai and Nemesis, each in their different ways either by themselves or through the abstract concepts they represent. For Herodotus, Kroisos and Polykrates act as moral lessons: Kroisos comes to recognise his former arrogance and repents, but Polykrates is denied the opportunity.

---

296 Lateiner, ‘A Note on the Perils of Prosperity in Herodotus’, 97-101. It is not correct that the gods were offended by prosperity *per se*, as suggested by: Evans, *Herodotus, Explorer of the Past*, 48.

297 Hdt. 1.207.
CONCLUSION

This chapter illustrates the changing nature of both the abstract *nemesis* and the deity herself. In the Archaic period *nemesis* was a sense of righteous indignation either within oneself or towards another, but in the Classical period, this interpretation strengthens to become something less vague. This developmental change in the concept and its personification can be seen in the different genres of the period: the artistic; the literary fields of tragedy, comedy, history, and; epigraphy in the form of funerary and votive inscriptions. It was to this period that the goddess was thought to be increasingly concerning herself with punishment for acts of consciously enacted deeds of *hybris*, i.e. a *hybris/nemesis* dichotomy, and where Pindar appropriately calls her ‘strictly-judging Nemesis’.  

The fifth-century red-figure *amphoriskos* has, through the skill of the artist, effectively linked the Nemesis of the Archaic *Kypria* with the Nemesis of the Classical era, making the myth that surrounds her timeless. The scene painted on the *amphoriskos*, together with all the various personifications of fate and destiny, is a pictorial commentary of the emotions being played out in the theme of Aphrodite tenderly persuading Helen to elope with Paris. Helen’s mother, Nemesis, stands as the accusatory representative of the future fate, not only of Helen but also of mankind, that will inevitably result from the actions Helen is about to embark upon. The wheel motifs on the two *δόντια*, hidden as they are underneath and not immediately visible, are reminders that fate and luck in life are dependant on the turn of the wheel of providence which constantly, but indiscernibly, moves forward towards ones’ destiny.

In the literature Aischylos takes up the Homeric theme of Achilles and the gods’ threatened *nemesis* against him for his continued violation of Hektor’s body, and positions Nemesis as a punisher of those who wrong the dead. Sophokles further articulates this role through Elektra’s reference to Nemesis’ direct link with the living and the dead in her evocation to ‘Nemesis, of the dead’. In everyday life (and death), this protective and vengeful role inherent

---

in the Classical Nemesis is seen as the threat against those who would violate those now dead or did wrong to them in life; since the dead cannot avenge themselves, the personified goddess will act on their behalf.

In comedy, Kratinos’ play, Nemesis, the myth of Nemesis’ rape and Helen’s birth from the egg are dramatized but with the principal roles being transferred to Perikles and Aspasia as a means to ridicule Perikles’ political prominence and Aspasia’s non-citizenship by means of parody full of satirical mockery and sexual innuendo. Kratinos’ satirized use of the mythology and the goddess specifically demonstrates that by this time the traditional stories were being taken in a more light-hearted manner.

Herodotus’ one use of the word nemesis in the Kroisos narrative relates to the punishment brought upon Kroisos through his unwise articulation that he was the most fortunate of men. My analysis of this sole use of nemesis, together with the discussion of the Polykrates’ logos (considered an example of nemesis consequent upon the hybristic actions or non-actions of Polykrates, although the term is not used), exemplifies Herodotos’ standpoint that man needs constant warnings that human arrogance blinds individuals to the potential danger of future ruin brought about through their own actions. This is a caution which permeates Herodotos’ work in the form of a pervading all-seeing yet unseen retributive force. For, just as those Homeric heroes believed, the universe is full of gods, daimones, spirits, and Keres who see and hear everything, and who will watch, listen, wait, judge and punish unconscionable acts committed by mankind. Whether this be nemesis through Nemesis, or some other avenging force, retributive punishment will always result from consciously enacted reprehensible actions and articulated self-satisfied thoughts; mankind is responsible and answerable for his own deeds, whether these be good or bad, but if bad he needs to acknowledge and recognize there must always be consequences.

These genres demonstrate that fifth-century Nemesis had become a goddess of balance in all aspects of life and death. She was now associated with divine

---

punishment occasioned by the righteous indignation/anger aroused by deeds of wanton and conscious wrong-doing, with the perpetrator of such acts being pursued, hunted down, and punished.