Lycophron's *Alexandra*: Vision and Voice

A thesis submitted to the University of Manchester for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Humanities

2016

Katherine H. Molesworth

School of Arts, Languages and Cultures

CONTENTS

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION....8

1.0 Summary 8

1.1 General Introduction to the Thesis 12

1.1.2 The Structure of the Poem and its Framing Device 20

1.1.3 The Style of the *Alexandra* 30

1.1.4 Summary Conclusion 33

1.2 An Overview of Vision as a Feature of the Poem 34

1.2.1 Speaking and Seeing: Cassandra's use of first person verbs of sight 34

1.2.3 Borrowed Sight 42

1.2.3 Vision Beyond the First Person 44

1.2.4 The Watching World and a Landscape that Looks Back 46

1.2.5 Interior and Invisible Spaces: Violation and Safety 52

1.2.6 Special Seers within the Prophecy 56

1.2.7 Vision and Desire: Violence, Revenge and Exchanges of the Gaze 59

1.2.8 Vision, Journeying and Travel 64

1.2.9 Ritual Time and Geographical Space 76

1.2.10 Making and Shaping: Changing Form and Metamorphoses 78

1.2.11 Conclusion 92

SECTION 2: Seeing Homeric Epic: Lycophron's 'Iliad', *Alexandra* 249-306. 93

2.1 The Whole 'Iliad' as a Part Within Cassandra's Prophecy 93

2.2 Making the End the Beginning and the Beginning the End 96

2.3 Time and the *Kleos* of Epic 114

2.4 Self-Depiction and Embedded *Ecphrasis*: Epic Visuality and Mise-en-abyme 116

2.5 Conclusion 119

SECTION 3: Cassandra, the Alexandra and Paris Alexandros: Failed Speaker and Seer..............123

3.0 Summary 123

3.1 Pairing Paris and Cassandra: Negative Characterization and the Failure to See 125

3.2 Contrafactual Pasts, Non-Existence and Invisibility 132

3.3 A Coda on Helen's Image 143

SECTION 4: Seeing and Speaking: Greek Epigram and the *Alexandra*...151

4.1 Subject and Object 151

4.2 Cassandra's Prison and Andromeda's Beauty 168

SECTION 5: The *Alexandra* as Material Monument 174

5.1 The *Alexandra* as Material Monument and Textual Object 177

5.2 Name-Play 193

SECTION 6.0 CONCLUSION: Hearing the *Alexandra* First 196

6.1 Thesis Conclusion 197

BIBLIOGRAPHY..199

Word Count: 79,993.

ABSTRACT:

This thesis is a literary study of the *Alexandra* of Lycophron that examines the phenomenon of vision in the poem as a complement to its complex narrative voice. It proceeds from the notion that it is the interaction between vision and voice that underpin how the poem works, through its main character Cassandra-Alexandra who both speaks and sees. It aims to generate new ways of reading the poem and suggest new interpretations that build on and develop recent work on the poem, particularly in the areas of speech, voice and identity. It details how vision plays a central role in the poem's structure, content, and style. Particular attention is paid to intertextual relationships with Homeric epic and Hellenistic ecphrastic epigram, as well as pointing out towards the *Alexandra*'s engagement with all sorts of Greek thinking about perception, communication and representation. Visual perception is brought to bear on key questions of characterization and style to show how the poem promotes an aesthetic of materiality, in which vision and voice together further reflect the central character's identity as a prophetess and sworn *parthenos*, and contribute to the idea of the poet as a craftsman and maker of words who stands outside the apparently autonomous work.

DECLARATION:

I declare that that no portion of the work referred to in the thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

i. The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns certain copyright or related rights in it (the "Copyright") and s/he has given The University of Manchester certain rights to use such Copyright, including for administrative purposes.

ii. Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts and whether in hard or electronic copy, may be made only in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (as amended) and regulations issued under it or, where appropriate, in accordance with licensing agreements which the University has from time to time. This page must form part of any such copies made.

iii. The ownership of certain Copyright, patents, designs, trade marks and other intellectual property (the "Intellectual Property") and any reproductions of copyright works in the thesis, for example graphs and tables ("Reproductions"), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions.

iv. Further information on the conditions under which disclosure, publication and commercialisation of this thesis, the Copyright and any Intellectual Property University IP Policy (see http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=24420), in any relevant Thesis restriction declarations deposited in the University Library, The University Library's regulations (see http://www.library.manchester.ac.uk/about/regulations/) and in The University's policy on Presentation of Theses

Thank-you to all the people that helped and supported me through the PhD process, especially my parents, family and friends, of whom the aptly named Alexandra Wilding gets a special mention. I am most grateful for the support I received from the University of Manchester, and am indebted to all of the staff in the Classics and Ancient History department for teaching, discussion and encouragement, and to Dr. Todd Klutz as panel member for all his suggestions. Thanks are due even more so to the co-supervisor, Professor Alison Sharrock and to the main supervisor Andrew Morrison for his unfailing good advice and encouragement. I would also like to thank the examiners of the thesis, Professor Roy Gibson and Professor Simon Hornblower for their attention to detail, generous comments and immensely useful guidance. My final thanks go to my partner Tom, without whom I would not have ever been able to undertake and complete this PhD.

Section 1: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Summary

This thesis takes a broadly literary critical approach to the *Alexandra* of Lycophron. It aims to generate new ways of reading the poem and suggest new interpretations that build on and complement recent work on the text, particularly that in the areas of speech, voice and identity. It does so both by examining the significance of the fact that as well as being the poem's central speaker, Cassandra/Alexandra is also a seer, and by investigating what role vision and visuality play in the poem alongside its complex narrative voice.[1] The main contention expressed throughout is that it is the interaction between speaking and seeing, voice and vision, that opens up the poem for the reader. By examining these features of the poem in tandem, it can be shown that interaction between vision and voice is central to the way the poem works, and that it engages in all sorts of ways with Greek thinking about perception, communication and representation. This also includes the fact that Cassandra has the ability to speak and to see at the same time,[2] and this is central to the pervasive sense in the *Alexandra* that voice alone is not ultimately adequate as a means of lasting communication as the poem moves from 'metaphorical immortality' through poetry to 'literal immortality' bestowed by cult,[3] which results in an aesthetic of materiality, in which mimesis, life-like likeness and representation are outdone by replication, 'reproduction' and 'replacement'.[4]

---

[1] Following the emphasis of Hummel (2006); Sbardella (2009) 51; cf. Cusset (2004) 56: a long prophecy 'qui se traduit par l'image d'images multiples jusqu'à la saturation'.

[2] Following and developing Cusset (2009) 128 on the opening of the poem and the contrast between the messenger and Cassandra's narration: 'Cassandre ... vit (et voit) cet episode d'abord en parfait simultanéité'.

[3] Biffis (2012) 110; 114ff; 129: 'potentially contemporaneous' to Lycophron's own time; cf. Salapata (2002) on the Laconian Alexandra cult; Sistakou (2008) 120; Mari (2009).

[4] See Steiner (2001) 3ff. on these terms in relation to ancient discourse on the origins of art and cult images.

The interaction between vision and voice means that the *Alexandra* addresses questions about truth, and the reliability and function of different modes of communication that aim to represent and preserve it; especially in relation to the experience of poetry and art, and the efficacy of song as a truthful medium. While it presents communication and signification as complex and mediated (with multiple ways of construing different speakers as author/reader figures), through its central character it also engages with (interlinked) moral and aesthetic questions about what should be seen and said; these are tied in particular to the poem's focus on the representation of women and the 'feminine perspective' of its main speaker, specifically as a wronged *parthenos* as Giulia Biffis has demonstrated.[5] Cassandra's identity and Lycophronian poetics are inextricably linked. While the poem also raises questions about the reliability of visual perception, it simultaneously exploits the idea that first-person eyewitness knowledge (associated both with the privileged vision of events ascribed to the figure of the seer and the messenger) is commonly appealed to in Greek discourse to authorize spoken report as true.[6] The introduction and the section that follows (1.1-1.2) give an overview of vision in the poem, discussing how it relates to its structure, and

---

[5]I am extremely grateful to Giulia Biffis for providing a copy of her UCL PhD thesis (2012), which is cited here by her kind permission in its unrevised and examined version. A full and revised monograph is to be published very shortly, detailing further the female perspective in the *Alexandra,* the identity of Cassandra as a wronged *parthenos*, and how this relates to the voice of the poet and the internal narrators of the poem.

[6] See e.g. Neblung (1997) 74: 'Typisch für die Legitimation eines Boten ist, daß Cassandra sich ausdrücklich als Augen – und Ohrenzeugen der Kriegsfolgen…bezeichnet' (citing *Alexandra* 251, 253).

Two main strands of myth explain how Cassandra became gifted with divine sight, one in which she and her brother are visited by snakes in Apollo's temple who lick their organs of perception bestowing this ability. The other (more familiar) story is the one known from Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 1202ff. and followed (although its telling delayed) in the *Alexandra* (1454-1458) where Cassandra's refusal of Apollo results in a second 'gift' following that of divine vision; the ring of untruth and the inability to convince her own people of the manifestly true (see A. *Ag.* 1212 for Cassandra's explanation: : ἔπειθον οὐδέν' οὐδέν, ὡς τάδ' ἤμπλακον. Several scholars stress the delayed and less open admission of fault on the part of the *Alexandra*'s Cassandra (see further Gantz (1993) 92-93; 561-563; 572; 647-66; Neblung (1997) 73-106). The two traditions perhaps embody a shift from an archaic prophetic *dichterweihe* where, rather as at the beginning of Hesiod's *Theogony*, the senses of mortals are transformed to supply a privileged connection to the divine, to a fifth-century version more concerned with the slipperiness of language and Cassandra's liminal status as the tragic genre develops apace. Thus it is the impossibility of grasping divine knowledge in a straightforward way that is emphasized. See e.g. Aeschylus *Suppliants* 93-95: δαυλοὶ γὰρ πραπίδων / δάσκιοί τε τείνουσιν πόροι /κατιδεῖν ἄφραστοι (cf. path imagery at *Alexandra* 9-12; ἄφραστος carries the meanings impossible to see, to describe, and to comprehend). On Attic tragedy and its interest in language and meaning see Goldhill (1986).

to the central character, as well as being a phenomenon more broadly that runs through the text, up until Cassandra/Alexandra's death and cultic heroization (1099-1140). The thesis then moves on to look at the role of vision in the presentation of Cassandra, Paris and Helen, and in terms of intertextuality and intermediality, with a particular focus on ecphrastic epigram and ideas about inscription and writing, and writing and the representation of female voice.[7] The notion of the poem as object, which as Cusset has argued progresses by bringing itself into existence, talking about itself (through *mise-en-abyme*), and identifying Cassandra-Alexandra with the *Alexandra* is crucial to the poem. In this way it presents itself as an autonomous artwork and material object that comes alive and somehow wrests control from its maker 'Lycophron'.[8] I aim to develop these ideas by examining vision and voice in tandem: Cassandra is both speaking subject and seen object in her own prophecy, an ambivalent position that is also fundamental to her important feminine identity.[9] In the latter half of the thesis this is discussed through appeal to written and inscribed text, and reader encounter with inscription as a physical visual object which gains a voice through written words; this aims to contextualise Cusset's analysis of the 'situation d' enonciation' within further Greek ideas about reading and encounter with art and text objects.[10] The poem points to itself as a written material object in terms that encourage the reader to think in terms of epigram and inscription, with shared connotations of physical and visible monument with an inscribed potential voice once encountered by a reader, or community of readers.[11] The tension in the poem between the spoken and the written can also be viewed as the

[7] Following Biffis' (2012); cf. Cusset (2004) 54 'ce déreglement discursive est complémentaire d'un déreglement des sens, proprement féminin, dans le cadre de l'inspiration divinatoire.'

[8] Cusset has stressed the importance of *mise-en-abyme* and the mirror-like way Cassandra and her words (the *Alexandra*) are identified. See especially (2009) 130-131 on the poem as containing a fragment that takes over what contains it, where 'le miroir de la scène initiale de poème deviant un reflet dans le miroir universel de la parole de Cassandre, qui se voit elle-même transformée à travers sa propre parole. Il n'est pas étonnant dès lors que le poème soit intutulé *Alexandra*: c'est bien Alexandra qui en est la voix principale, Alexandra … en tant qu'elle est passée par le filtre miroitant dans la mise en abyme'. Chauvin and Cusset (2008) 17-35; cf. Cusset (2009) 133.

[9] Biffis (2012).

[10] Cusset (2006) 49; cf. (2009). I try to approximate this term somewhat with the phrase 'communicative context'.

[11] Cf. Cusset (2009) on the *Alexandra* as 'récit spéculaire à l'oeuvre potentielle'; this thesis aims to develop and examine these ideas in more detail.

uppermost stage in the interchange between the seen and the heard and different sorts of signification and its interpretation in the poem.[12] The close of the thesis aims to better delineate how materiality, femininity and visuality are linked.

The final sections of the thesis consider how simultaneous seeing and speaking suggests an analogy with inscription, a monument that can be seen, and once read,[13] also speak. By speaking and seeing simultaneously Cassandra is both subject and object, just as Alexandra and *Alexandra* are identified.[14] The structure of the poem also suggests that voice and vision must be in tandem; not just song or live voice alone are enough, texts must be written and read to ensure remembrance and glory for their subjects, just as within the poem ritual actions and collective speech affirm individuals (and Biffis has shown the importance of lament in particular).[15] Voice is not enough on its own: for speech to be efficacious it must be accompanied by physical monument and ritual action, go beyond utterance and combine vision and voice; poetry must have a concrete, visual and written element.[16] However, this still probes the rivalry between voice and vision, autopsy and report, poetry and prophecy as authoritative sources of knowledge. This feeds into the way that epic poetry in particular is denigrated not only in its content, but as an effective medium for the transmission of *kleos* and truth, as McNelis and Sens have shown.[17] The poem draws on the agonistic relationship between the seen and the heard as reliable sources of knowledge, embodied in the juxtaposition of Cassandra's authoritative vision with her doubted voice.

---

[12] Cf. Squire (2009) 147-148: 'ancient writers and readers ... seem to have been highly sensitive to the visual aspects of written communication'.

[13] Following Cusset (2009).

[14] Cusset (2006); (2009).

[15] Biffis (2012).

[16] This suggests a reversal of Steiner (1992) 135-136 description of the 'process of utterance' as 'movement towards immateriality.'

[17] McNelis and Sens (2011b).

Introduction 1.1: General Introduction to the Thesis

By considering vision and voice together the reader is alerted to the poem's interest in representation and reality, particularly through Cassandra's attempts to project a true likeness of herself. To state that the *Alexandra* is about representation is hardly astonishing; that it is highly literate, and literary, poetry for its own sake has been part of the criticism levelled at the work attributed to Lycophron and post-classical poetry more widely, and the 'recovery' of Hellenistic poetry as 'quality' literature,[18] re-embedded in its specific context is now a well-worn but welcome *topos* in scholarship.[19] As Giulia Biffis (2012) has made clear in her emphasis on the 'feminine perspective' in the poem, the *Alexandra* also displays a particular interest in women, their voices, and the representation of women more widely; this thesis aims to support and demonstrate some further aspects of this view in terms of the *Alexandra*'s poetics in particular. Hummel as well as Cusset emphasise the connection

[18] For an overview of the changing fortunes of the *Alexandra* in particular, see West (1983), (1984).

[19] See e.g. the recent *Hellenistic Studies at a Crossroads* (Hunter et al. (2014)). It has now been shown amply that the *Alexandra* is much more than (the long-clung-to view of it as) Hellenistic curiosity alone; beginning a paper on the *Alexandra* with a gesture to its rehabilitation in scholarship looks soon to become a similar cliché. A raft of recent publications (one of which, McNelis and Sens (2016) regretfully appeared too late to be integrated into this thesis) demonstrate that the (until now) fairly disparate body of scholarship on the poem is being brought into dialogue and reaching new syntheses. Durbec (2014) has excellent notes on the recent history of scholarship; Hummel (2006) 9-13 is strong on printed editions; West (1984) on its reception and the date/authorship as a problem historically in English scholarship; Hornblower (2015) 1-114 now provides a concise yet detailed introduction to all major aspects; a useful online bibliography (maintained up to 2012) at https://sites.google.com/site/hellenisticbibliography/hellenistic/lycophron. This does not mean that there is no more work to be done, especially looking outside the context of third-century Hellenistic Alexandria (a down-dating and Southern Italian context for the *Alexandra* has recently been argued for by Hornblower (2015)). Widening the net in the study of Hellenistic poetry has led scholars to consider the fourth century in their analyses; most useful in terms of Lycophron is the upswing in scholarship on post-classical tragedy (esp. Kotlinska-Toma (2015)), Hellenistic historiography (e.g. Priestley (2014); Hornblower (2015) 21-25). Timotheus and expressive trends in the 'new-music' also need further attention.

between enigmatic and feminine speech,[20] and the metaphor of impenetrability and frustration that also informs the poem.[21] Biffis has taken this further by focussing on the construction of female speech by the messenger with reference to specific parallels in Greek literature, and showing the links between social isolation and over-attachment to the natal *oikos* that help to characterise Cassandra as a frustrated *parthenos*,[22] in addition to an oracular speaker with a difficult voice.[23] This thesis aims to support Biffis' conclusions on the characterization of Cassandra as an isolated *parthenos* and show how this underpins further aspects of the poetics or aesthetics of the poem. To switch this around, we might say that the fact of a central and problematic female speaker explores and reflects socio-cultural, philosophical and literary concerns about the written word as a means of communication in terms of its reliability and capacity for conveying the truth.[24] The thesis aims to take work on the genre and poetics of the *Alexandra* further, and describe and interpret the poem in more specific detail in these terms.

The argument progresses from the simple fact that the poem's main speaker sees and speaks simultaneously,[25] and aims to complement much recent work on the voice of the prophetess by showing how voice and vision are thoroughly interrelated and integral to the way the poem works, in terms of its overall structure and the poetics of the *Alexandra*. Rather than getting in philosophical knots about the precise process of Cassandra's sight, speech, and cogitation (i.e. the temporal priority of discourse and experience) this thesis follows Cusset's reflexive and specular model of the text where we can let this go and instead appreciate the

[20] Cf. Cusset (2004) 54: 'cette première caractéristique de la parole, prise en charge par des voix successive, est lieé intimement à un autre trait du discours prophétique'; Hummel (2006) 215ff; Biffis (2012) 176ff.

[21] Hummel (2006) 211ff.

[22] Biffis (2012) 78 (and in general).

[23] E.g. Cusset (2004) 55: 'le discours de Cassandre est obscure aussi parce qu'il est émis par un locateur féminin, qui ne participe pas au logos masculin de la cite.'

[24] Cf. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 439 on the poem's interest in generic origins; Cusset (2009) 132 on its interest in the origins of poetry itself: 'l'Alexandra se donne en meme temps à lire comme une enquête ou une proposition théorique sur les origins du discours poétique.'

[25] Cusset (2009) 128. I aim to track this observation beyond the opening frame of the poem.

dynamic relationship between speaking and seeing and the different voices in the text. This overlaps with the work of other scholars and their interpretively useful distinctions in modes of narration. Biffis has demonstrated that 'Cassandra becomes similar to an extradiegetic and omniscient narrator and this is mainly the reason why her persona seems to lose concreteness.'[26] However, as she states also 'external and internal point of view and diegetic and mimetic mode are constantly overcome'[27] and this is why we need to examine visuality as well as voice in the poem. While these categories are obviously overlapping, the choice of terms looks to capture not only modulations in narrative mode but the pose of the poem as something beyond speech and beyond poetry alone. I have also used the related concept of the narrating (seeing and speaking) and experiencing (seen and silent) 'I',[28] but we must continue to think about how one informs the other to appreciate the hall of mirrors effect.[29] For example, on the question of Cassandra's character, Biffis has convincingly shown how the most pessimistic readings of the poem are wrong-headed and that there is plenty of evidence to show that Cassandra is characterised through her own voice, the way she depicts herself and her important role in events.[30] Biffis also shows that the way that she speaks is not confined to the messenger's definition; for example, in lamenting her own family and (following West), she demonstrates (in more detail) that Cassandra's own experience colours the way she describes history.[31] In this case then, as she states, Cassandra is certainly not Apollo's puppet – in fact, Cassandra barely acknowledges his role (even if it is made present in the poem in other ways), another point of difference with Aeschylus' Cassandra.[32] This, as she

[26] Biffis (2012) 11.

[27] Biffis (2012) 10.

[28] See De Jong (1991) 2, 30 on the 'erzählendes Ich' and 'erlebendes Ich'; Nünlist (2009) 125 on *Odyssey* 9-12 with n.35 on Spitzer's terms ([1928], 1961: 448-449); De Jong (2014) 64-68.

[29] See Grethlein (2010) critiquing the assumed relationship between experience and narrative; Cusset (2009) on specularity.

[30] See Biffis (2012), with summary at 11ff.

[31] Biffis (2012) 88-89.

[32] See also Neblung (1997) 73-106.

acknowledges, is somewhat at variance with the view of Lowe, that it is not clear how much responsibility lies with Cassandra for the 'organization of raw history into a story.'[33] This is where we need to pause and consider that in part, for this so self-conscious narrator, in contact with the poet and their own epoch, much of this history is not exactly 'raw', having already been shaped into 'story' in previous texts. Cassandra's focalization has the additional feature of paralleling her submission to fated events with the poet's encounter with pre-shaped narrative and existing representation at the same time; when Cassandra speaks about and sees herself, she also sees a representation, a version of herself.[34] The way that this reading is open to us is explored and argued further in section 2 of the thesis.

It is all the more complicated in the *Alexandra,* where the Cassandra who narrates also experiences her prophetic vision at the same time (and in to what extent we see the experiences she goes through as embodied and sensory) and sees herself within it, having experiences that she narrates (even though they have not happened yet); now we are back in a knot! The most important thing is that this helps to generate the tense uncertainty that the *Alexandra* propagates in its reader and produces a convincing voice for a character who should be believed but is held in doubt and suspicion.[35] The phenomenon of borrowed voice where one speaker cedes control to another,[36] or the nested level of narration or quotation in the poem,[37] are paralleled by a pattern of 'borrowed' vision in Cassandra/Alexandra's prophecy itself when Cassandra adopts the eyes of others in the prophecy. The idea that Cassandra

---

[33] Biffis (2012) 70 on Lowe (2004). Biffis contrasts her view of the sharp division between the guard's speech and that of Cassandra, signalled by the αἰαῖ in line 31 and the idea that the similarity of the two characters' speaking style raises the question of who is actually speaking and how faithful the report is to her original utterance (as Lowe does).

[34] Stehle (1997) 71 (in relation to Alcman's *Partheneion* fr. 1): '...performers may go beyond representation of their "real" identity to idealized versions of themselves.'

[35] Amongst other things, not least the difficulty in identifying its actors and their state of being (see e.g. Sistakou (2009); (2012) 176ff; Sens (2014) on simile and metaphor).

[36] Cusset (2009).

[37] Lowe (2004).

experiences events through the gaze of another also goes some way to explaining features like her 'unexpected sympathy' for Odysseus at 815.[38] Here it seems that she is able to inhabit the body of another, seeing what they see, but more literally – seeing the events of their life as they will bear witness to them at a specific point in time in the future, and somehow, through this process, feeling what they will do too (although this differs in each case, and the extent and effect is varied). These switches in perspective made through seeing in the poem, are part of its 'dizzying' effect and mirror the lurches in person in the speaking voice. This is in a heterogeneous and complex way, with different acts of embedded focalization that carry markers of genre and can inform us about the poem's intertextuality and reception of the literary tradition as well as Cassandra's own character.[39] For example, I argue for the idea of 'generic' focalization or sensitivity, where the perspective deployed also reflects the intertexts the poet draws upon. As with voice, the visuality of the poem also raises questions of composition and interpretation; Cassandra both re-makes and re-presents the literary tradition known to the reader and predicts it.[40] Further, she is also its 'first' reader, encountering these pre-existing future representations within her own prophetic reality. This connection between quotation and *ecphrasis* (as 're-presentation' of representations) follows the work of Yacobi and others, where 'quotation' is extended to the material reality of the text itself as a further level of re-presentation of the words of another, a species of *ecphrasis*.[41] Studying visuality in the poem demonstrates that there is still more to say about the problems that the *Alexandra*'s structure and language poses in terms of how the ontological status of particular images in the poem. In Section 2, these effects are explored further, in terms of the special case of Homeric epic, and how this is achieved though the way narrating Cassandra-Alexandra borrows her own eyes within the canonical representation of

[38] Cf. Hornblower (2015) ad loc.

[39] See Hollis (2007); Durbec (2014).

[40] Lowe (2004); Sens (2010) 305; Biffis (2012) 128-129 on the view for internal and external narratees. On representation and 're-presentation' (Sternberg (1982; 1986); cf. Yacobi (2002) 192); see Section 2 below.

[41] Yacobi (1995); (2000); (2002).

the Trojan War.[42] The *Alexandra*, and its much-noted extreme intertextuality is also a history of reading, interpreting, experiencing and responding to canonical works of Greek literature.[43]

The latter part of the thesis develops the discussion of Cassandra's narration and the presentation of the central character by considering how Hellenistic epigram and the category of the visual, the inscribed and the written informs the *Alexandra*. In particular it aims to show how the writerly quality of the poem and its paradoxical notion of voice are linked through the tragic figure of Cassandra and the idea of the female voice as *potential* and writing as silent speaking, following the work of Jesper Svenbro (and others).[44] Cusset has already conceptualized the *Alexandra* as a potential work: as Cassandra's speech proceeds, the poem is brought into being.[45] The poem also promotes a particular notion of the creation of poetic voice as something concrete, inscribed, hard-worked and written, *poesis* as production not confined to poetry, voice and orality – but paradoxically silent. This poetic programme extends beyond the idea that the *Alexandra* preserves an otherwise futile voice by being written down and runs through many of the metapoetic images deployed in the poem.[46] *Poiesis* is shown to be more than speech or sound, but the making of art, leaving a visual marker, something concretized, tangible and visible; the aesthetic program of the poem runs in tandem both with the oft-noted concretization of metaphor by Cassandra in tragedy,[47] Euripidean poetics and the self-conscious project of searching for a means of expression to

---

[42] Section 2, below.

[43] Some relationships to Hellenistic poetry are explored but there is more emphasis here on the reception of earlier poetry, its effect on the reader and Cassandra's focalization. Happily, the scholar of the *Alexandra* interested in its context with Hellenistic poetry can now be referred to Durbec's (2014) *Lycophron et ses Contemporains*. See also Hollis (2007) for connections to Callimachus, Apollonius and Euphorion.

[44] Svenbro (1988); Stehle (1997) 22; 114ff.; 294ff.; Elmer (2005).

[45] Cusset (2009) 131.

[46] See Cusset (2009) on *mise-en-abyme*.

[47] E.g. Ferrari (1997).

react to disaster before the eyes,[48] and the overall broad movement in the *Alexandra* from destruction at Troy to creation, settling and building in the west, and from poetry to cult, [49] myth to history,[50] and speech to text.[51] That inscription and (especially ecphrastic) epigram already supply a locus for interaction between the said and seen, written and spoken, silent and potentially performed (by a reader) means that they are an excellent analogue for reading the *Alexandra* and the way it forces its reader to reflect on these paradoxes in a thoroughgoing way. This does not mean that the thesis claims to have uncovered a neatly unified reading that fully 'illuminates' the poem,[52] or denies the fact it can be frustrating and difficult, but instead tries to describe and explain these effects further. While recent readings are keen to stress that the poem is not completely disjointed chaos, there remain residual problems with concerns about organic wholeness, composition and characterization in the work featuring highly in the 'rehabilitation' of the *Alexandra.* The thesis stresses these ideals are best abandoned if we are to investigate the work freed from unnecessary anxieties about assumed literary 'quality'.

The question of the characterization of Cassandra has been central in interpreting the poem and some of the judgements made of its quality as a work of literature; is she a convincing character or not? In fact, we need to shift the discussion away from this implicit question of *convincing voice or not* – this is the very question that the figure of Cassandra embodies; it is her status in myth that poses these questions of language and its efficacy in

---

[48] E.g. Stieber (2011).

[49] Biffis (2012) 110; 114ff; 129. Cf. Sistakou (2008) 120; Mari (2009).

[50] West (2009).

[51] Cusset (2009).

[52] This mode of interpretation is another sort of attempt to control discourse that the poem resists (even as it promises understanding for the committed reader, 9-12) and we should also refuse to reify it or accept that there is one revelatory strategy for reading the poem. Comparison can be made with Hamilton's discussion of the scholarly interpretation of Pindar where he identifies a mode of criticism that attempts to 'disprove' Pindaric obscurity through belief in the possibility of 'total' interpretation, metaphorically figured as lucidity and illumination on the 'dark' text: A 'scheme ... [that] has become something of an academic convention: one begins by referring to Pindar's reputation for obscurity, and then proceeds to claim how the current [scholarly] work triumphantly and definitively disproves it' (Hamilton (2003) 1).

conveying the truth; it is her status as a violated *parthenos* that is linked to the lack of integrity of her voice in the poem.[53] Her ambivalent status as subject and object (that rests on the fact she can see as well as speak about herself) is part of her feminine identity. The interest in depiction of the self that Biffis has also emphasized has these epigrammatic qualities, which can be related to traditions of the representation of *parthenoi* in ancient Greece, and to the fundamental condition of women as both object and subject.[54]

It will be noted that the survey of methodology and theory employed in the thesis is broad; because of the complex nature of the text which demands careful unpacking, rather than creating yet more obscurity, I defer this discussion for the most part to exposition in the relevant part of each chapter, as it will not clarify anything here for the reader in a useful way.[55] This includes further remarks on authorship, authenticity and date. The thesis follows the view that the third-century Alexandrian scholar Lycophron of Chalcis is *not* the author of the *Alexandra*, and that the work as we have it comes to be attached to the 'deliberate pseudepigraphon' Lycophron, at a later date, most probably in a South Italian context, following the work of Fraser and Hornblower.[56] For the most part, the interpretation of the text offered in the thesis would not be affected by a change of date, location, and identity for the poet.[57]

---

[53] E.g. Hummel (2006); Biffis (2012); Mari (2009).

[54] See Stehle (1997); Swift (2016).

[55] Vision and visuality are broad concepts which have been the subject of a wide and varied clutch of recent publications in classics, as part of a wider investigation of embodiment and the senses; e.g. Lovatt (2013); Lovatt and Vout (2013); Butler and Purves (2013); technical terms and approaches are discussed where relevant in each chapter of the thesis. While visual metaphors in the poem are discussed further, I have found it impossible to expunge them fully from the discussion itself.

[56] See *OCD*[4] s.v. Lycophron; see Hornblower (2015) 36-41 (plus cumulative evidence gathered throughout the commentary for a thoroughgoing Italian interest; this moves against the possible case for interpolation as put forward by Stephanie West (1983); (1984) in her valuable work on the poem.

[57] And to assume this would fully elucidate every single aspect of the text would be false anyway.

1.1.2 The Structure of the Poem and its Framing Device (*Alexandra* 1-30 and 1461-1474):

The poem asks us to consider some broad strands of Greek thinking about sight, speech and their interrelationship from the very beginning. This stands upon the connection between sight and knowledge in Ancient Greek language,[58] and the pervasive metaphor of seeing as understanding; put simply, Cassandra's words are dark paths that the reader must apply the light of their intellect if they are to find their way through (*Alexandra* 9-12);[59] if that seems banal, it is because these visual spatial metaphors are so everyday (and of course the poem is not that glib, and these initial fifteen lines absurdly dense in allusion).[60] Nevertheless, as Biffis has suggested, it is this imagery that means that description of the cacophonous speech of the prophetess exceeds the 'auditory sphere'.[61] Secondly, the initial speaker is both a guard and a messenger, notionally functioning to both watch and speak,[62] but he returns from his duties watching over Cassandra with little to say in the way of autopsy, and much in the way of his long verbatim report of her speech, the spoken 'action' he is witness to.[63] This dynamic crossing of perceptual boundaries where the heard can be seen, and what we should expect to see is only heard, described and reported (much as is to be found in ecphrastic epigram, discussed in section 4 below), is a fundamental feature of the poem in terms of its structure, the presentation of its main speaker Cassandra-Alexandra, and its content. The interplay

---

[58] See esp. Prier (1989).

[59] Cusset (2004) 55 on spatialization; cf. Biffis (2012) 26-27 on the imagery of paths (and song) in the frame; Gigante-Lanzara (2000) ad 121-3 (Proteus travels ἀλλ' ἀστίβητον οἶμον, cutting new underwater paths on the rocky sea-bed) notes Callimachean metaphor. See below 4 on Looijenga's (2009) identification of the physical presence of a scroll here.

[60] Lakoff and Johnson (1980, repr. 1993); (1999) discuss spatial and visual metaphor and its links to embodied experience, its pervasiveness in western philosophy and how this sits with antipathy to the body in western thought.

[61] Biffis (2012) 26-27.

[62] Although his main function is to report as ἄγγελος, which can be read against the watchman of the *Agamemnon*'s opening: see esp. Porter (1990) 38: '...the Watchman's labours are defined by his semiotic competence...[it is] this very faculty of watchfulness, which in turn defines the Watchman: καὶ νῦν φυλάσσω λαμπάδος τὸ σύμβολον (8).'

[63] Cusset (2009).

between speech and sight emerges in the frame of the poem itself, and is part of the push-me-pull-you relationship between the two speakers, and will suffice as a first example of the interplay between vision and voice in the poem.

The very first word of the poem is λέξω, 'I shall speak, tell' and the messenger apologises for the length of his report to come (lines 2-3: ἀρχῆς ἀπ᾽ ἄκρας· ἢν δὲ μηκυνθῇ λόγος, σύγγνωθι δέσποτ᾽), with a conventional rhetorical claim to completeness and beginning at the very beginning (lines 1-2: ἅ μ᾽ ἱστορεῖς, ἀρχῆς ἀπ᾽ ἄκρας); this claim to being temporally prior, returning to absolute origins as a claim to total knowledge of the truth makes the messenger the speaker with the 'first claim' to it.[64] Dawn arrives (yet another sort of beginning) at line 16 (ἠώς μὲν...), and the shift in subject to more normative inceptive scene-setting, with a specific location and time, and literal rather than metaphorical journey, temporarily settles the reader in a brief moment of calm; perhaps a different sort of story entirely is to follow, with a familiar omniscient and anonymous narrator, and the promise of movement from dark to light and from the interior world of Cassandra's speech to the exterior visible one.[65] However, the messenger can only in fact claim total knowledge of Cassandra's speech, and as the poem continues his claim will be outdone by Cassandra's vision of the future which she *sees before* anybody else.[66] While the messenger seems to try and claim authority through his description of the sight of the ships, he does not make any explicit claim as to the truth of what he has seen as he does with the veracity of his own spoken report and so we are encouraged to dwell on the competing and interwoven authorities of speaking and seeing.[67] There are multiple metaphorical levels in play here, from the obvious fact that we are at the very beginning of the text, or that the connection between truth and origin (ἀρχῆς) is linked to notions of a high vantage point; that is while we would probably

---

[64] Lowe (2004) 312; Sens (2010) 301, 306; Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 441.

[65] For this process in terms of the unconscious see Sistakou (2012) 135ff. The pattern also recalls Cassandra's famous description of her own oracles as no longer veiled in Aeschylus (*Ag.* 1178-1183).

[66] Cf. Cusset (2009) 130-131 on how the 'fragment' takes over.

[67] Cf. Biffis (2012) 46.

translate ἄκρας as 'very' or 'utter' here, the word not only carries the meaning of the furthest point, but also the highest point, concretized by physical and geographical location as we move into the mountains in line 16.[68] As with voice, this is a claim to authority on the part of the messenger; De Jong has shown how Euripides positions his messengers to have a special view of events and credible autopsy.[69] However, his rather presumptious claims to speak and to see also raise doubt as to his trustworthiness, along with the sense that he is somehow already 'infected' by the prophetess' voice because of the overlap in style.[70]

We could posit a gradual transition overall from description of the aural to the visual scene-setting in neatly divided two-stage introductory words of the messenger (1-15; 16-30). However, this too is not clear-cut. Instead, the first part of the poem involves a startling mixture of the auditory and the visual as we move from the description of Cassandra's speech to the setting of the scene, before shifting back to her voice as the verbatim report of her words and the prophetess' direct speech begins.

Through the use of 'métaphore spatiale' to describe Cassandra's speech,[71] and the way her voice begins to intrude on the messenger's picture of Paris' ships leaving,[72] vision and voice are thoroughly intermixed. Words like αἰόλος (4), while primarily referring to Cassandra's changeable speech,[73] resist completely dropping their other connotations, not just the elaborate and varied nature of the *Alexandra,* but its status as a vision, alongside Cassandra's changeable 'face' or even character, the different versions of 'Cassandra' that have become

---

[68] Durbec's (2011) details the 'jeu' of inceptive words at the *Alexandra*'s outset, demonstrating that the description of Paris' ships recalls the onset of strife in *Iliad* 5.62-3, ἀρχεκάκους; 22.115-6 ... νεῖκεος ἀρχή).

[69] De Jong (1991) esp. 8,19ff.

[70] Another both/and situation. Cf. Looijenga (2009); Biffis (2012) 68-69.

[71] Cusset (2004) 55.

[72] Looijenga (2009) 76.

[73] Biffis (2012) 25.

attached to Alexandra in the temporal conceit of the poem, and the vision of its central character who wishes to depict her true and original self.[74]

The expectation of clarification and the promise of a rather plainer description of what can be seen swiftly returns to complex *periphrasis* (e.g. not sailors (ναῦται, 21) with their oars but 'centipede fair-faced stork-hued daughters of Phalacra' (22-24) that are showing metaphorically (φαίνουσι, 25) their 'white wings'. The disorder that Biffis has shown is emphasised in the messenger's description of Cassandra's words returns as we near Cassandra's breaking into speech.[75] The loosing of the cables recalls the loosing of Cassandra's oracles in line 4 in a newly noisy manner,[76] and the winds filling the sails and her voice are analogised as we approach the switch to her first person voice.[77] Note the cessation in the competition for authority from the promised control over the future in line one's λέξω to the third person indication that she will begin to speak, or indeed be the live speaker in the present (ἦρχ' … λόγων, 30), the one who in fact speaks first, from the beginning (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, 30), with all the same connotations of control, authority (e.g. a vantage point 29, ἄτης ἀπ' ἄκρων) and subjectivity.[78] At the same time, the picture of her god-inspired and frenzied mouth remain (28: ἔνθεον … βακχεῖον στόμα; cf. 4, στόμα); as Cusset has stated, the poem makes neither speaker in unambiguous full control of their speech.[79]

So, we should be a bit more sceptical about the messenger and his claims. While Biffis well demonstrates the stereotypical picture of monstrous and other female speech that he draws upon to argue that he can be analogised to a fearful 'one man chorus', and Lowe emphasizes that he gets to make the 'first claim to truth' (λέξω τὰ πάντα, *Alexandra* 1), with an

---

[74] On αἰόλος see Biffis (2012) 25, 29 n.46; on names Sistakou (2009).

[75] Biffis (2012) 18ff.

[76] Durbec (2006) 83

[77] Cusset (2009).

[78] Cf. Biffis (2012) 68-69 who also picks out these parallels in elucidating closely how the two speakers overlap, but with Cassandra's voice in 'filigree'.

[79] Cusset (2009) 124.

apology fof the length of his speech to come: ἢν δὲ μηκυνθῇ λόγος,/σύγγνωθι δέσποτ᾽ (2-3).[80] He has heard the speech already and is there to report it (and there has been a tendency in the past (also gendered) for this to slide into the assumption that the messenger is the one who shapes the speech, a stand in for the absent poet who brings the 'riot' of Cassandra's visionary spiel 'under the strictest control').[81] I do not dispute this entirely but suggest that we must plump for Cusset's reflexive model.[82] There is an equally available and concurrent reading available even in these very first lines; and it is tempting to give Lycophron a new epithet paraphrasing Hornblower's frequent common-sense remark, that Lycophron is a poet who likes to 'have it both ways'.[83] The use of the passive aorist subjunctive μηκυνθῇ (to ask 'if the story be extended') also retains uncertainty about which speaker in fact elaborates and lengthens, as if the messenger anticipates that Cassandra's voice will take over and take the matter out of his hands; this supports Cusset's position that neither speaker 'est vraiment maître du discours qu'il profère'.[84] We could also compare *Argonautica* 4.151 where μηκύνειν refers to the lengthening of the δράκων, once seduced by Medea's song: μήκυνε δὲ μυρία κύκλα, which could be read as a sign of not only Medea's growing control of the Argonauts' mission in the story, but perhaps, metatextually the submission of cyclic epic (and the masculine deeds it is expected to stand for) to magical female song, seduction, and the move towards the future tragedy that hangs over the story and is constantly foreshadowed in Apollonius' poem. The idea that epic 'unravels' in the face of such influence in a more threatening and disastrous sense is surely germane to the *Alexandra*.[85] Interestingly, the verb

[80] Lowe (2004); cf. Biffis (2012) 18-63.

[81] Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 441.

[82] Cusset (2009).

[83] Hornblower (2015) ad 110-112; cf. 1151.

[84] Cusset (2009) 124. A TLG search finds over a thousand instances of the verb μηκύνω, but only eight for the aorist subjunctive passive form in the third person singular (Lycophron, plus scholia and glosses, and a sentence picking up the phrasing of the *Alexandra* in an epistle of the Callimachus-loving and Lycophron-quoting Byzantine Michael Chroniates (Vol II: Ep.173, p.341.7: Ἢν δὲ μηκυνθῇ λόγος ὁ τῆς ἐπιστόλης σύγγνωθι…); see De Stefani and Magnelli (2009) 612; Hollis (2009) 38-40 on this scholar).

[85] See section 2 below on the 'cycle of woes' and epic phraseology (e.g. *Od.* 2.163: μέγα πῆμα κυλίνδεται).

is also found in Aristotle's *Poetics* to compare the *length* of epic and tragedy: ἐν μὲν οὖν τοῖς δράμασιν τὰ ἐπεισόδια σύντομα, ἡ δ' ἐποποιία τούτοις μηκύνεται.[86] Read against this, it is as if the messenger also realises he appears as a figure in what is apparently a tragic episode, which will soon be lengthened to epic proportions; a usual way for scholars to describe the poem.[87] In any case, the most usual referent of the verb is λόγος and its control, and is found in Plato's dialogues to refer mainly to the expansion of discourse on a topic, as well as in tragedy and elsewhere,[88] and in the *Alexandra* it appears in a context where the control of speech and μυθός is manifestly problematized.[89] Throughout the poem, just as Apollo controls some of what the prophetess sees, she too looks through the eyes of others (and cannot look away), mirroring the power of the god and the struggle for control on the level of speech (section 1.2, below).

While it is of obvious importance to how we understand the poem, particularly given the many points of reference between the frame and the rest of the poem, the framing device has rather dominated some discussions of the *Alexandra*; perhaps also suggesting some reticence about engaging with the rest of the poem, now somewhat overcome by the appearance of several new commentaries and monographs. The ever-expanding list of intertexts scholars have found so far in the opening could form the basis of an entire PhD thesis[90] (even more so

---

[86] Aristotle, *Poetics* 1455b16. He next remarks on the brevity of Odysseus' story.

[87] E.g. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 439.

[88] E.g. E. *Hypsipyle* fr.757 (line 832) Collard and Cropp; Soph. *El.*1484; *OC* 489. The latter resounds interestingly off the *Alexandra*; the chorus advise the blinded Oedipus (guarded by Antigone) how to pray ἄπυστα φωνῶν μηδὲ μηκύνων βοήν/ἔπειτ' αφέρειν ἄστροφος and he remarks on his own *lack* of strength and sight to make the journey in the face of the chorus' pleas to get him to tell story of his sufferings. The verb appears again at *OC* 1120 (this is not exhaustive). Cf. Call. *H. Ven.* 182, AR. 4.151, 4.961 (lengthened days); 4.1614 (Titan's tail).

[89] In Plato *Phaedrus* 114d7 Socrates refers to lengthening the *mythos* of the immortal soul's journey as it is so important, it is the sort of thing a man should repeat to himself (μῦθον ... μηκύνω).

[90] For example, in relation to the general acceptance that the form of the poem is, at least partly, an extended messenger speech, commentators (e.g. Looijenga (2009) 62ff., Sens (2010) 300-301) have found extensive allusions to *Prometheus Bound* as the god is about to prophecy at length to Io (609-611: λέξω τορῶς σοι πᾶν ὅπερ χρῄζεις μαθεῖν / οὐκ ἐμπλέκων αἰνίγματ'...); cf. Sens (2009) 19ff. on the *Alexandra* as an engagement with the prophecy of Io's travels. This sort of statement is already found in epic, e.g. *Od.* 4.485ff. when Menelaos reports his own request

if we countenance those texts we unfortunately do not know so much about, for example, lost *Cassandra* and *Alexandros* tragedies, the *Cypria*[91] or the fragmentary Pindaric *Paian* 8b, itself featuring a 'complex speech frame' around Cassandra's prophecy that Rutherford has discussed).[92]

The frame will resurface in the main discussion as its language does in the main body of the poem,[93] but I emphasize a few general points here that are most important for the readings of the poem that will be offered there. Even though the messenger begins the poem, we must regard its main character to be Cassandra; doomed to have her true oracles disbelieved because of her refusal of Apollo's sexual advances *after* he granted her the gift of prophecy. Though what she says *will* happen and she will be transformed into an authoritative and cult figure in the linear or teleological course of poem, just as she becomes identified with the *Alexandra* itself, which ultimately reveals the truth of her oracles as a monument to her, the

for information from Proteus about the relative success of the Greeks' *nostoi.* The promise to tell everything, clearly, leaving nothing out, before giving a narrative account of events becomes utterly conventional in the classical period in oratory (e.g. Lysias 1.5, 1.19) as well as tragedy. Theognis also advises Cyrnus that in his duties as *theoros* at Delphi he must report the Pythia's words back to his community exactly with no omissions or additions (1.805ff.; see Parke (1981) 101). Herodotean historiography is suggested by ἱστορεῖς in the first line (see Kortë (1929) 268, West (2009) 81ff. and Sens (2010) 302); see also kingly requests for advice in 'court poetry' (on Hesiod see Parke (1981) 106 with n.17; on 'inquirers' in Herodotus see Demont (2007)). This feature is also found in Egyptian prophetic texts (e.g. Strootman (2010)) with shared (and subverted) paratextual features in the *Alexandra* (e.g. the use of a single name as a title (cf. Hornblower (2015) 40) and the framing device to give a 'provenance' to the prophecy (See Looijenga (2009) 62 and Lange (2010) on these features of prophetic texts in general). The messenger can be read as the poet (usually learned and Alexandrian), about to give his latest offering to the Hellenistic ruler or patron (e.g. Kosmetatou (2000) 35-39), and making himself prominent (following Lowe (2004) 314, Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 441 and Sens (2010) 306) or perhaps indicating his new marginality in society as he cedes his voice. The athletic imagery of the 'runner' (13-15) mirrors Pindaric assimilation athletic and poetic achievement and the labouring of the hero/poet about to perform (see Nagy (1990) 146-7). Imagery of paths and guides recalls Callimachus as well as Pindar (e.g. *Pythian* 4.248, *Olympian* 9.46f. the opening of the *Aetia;* cf. Looijenga (2009) 72-74; Sens (2010) 308-309). Lines 9-12 in particular seem to have been picked up in Catullus 64.113 and the opening of *Aeneid* 6.30 (see Theodorakopoulous (2000) esp. 131-134; Catullus 64.1-15 and *Alexandra* 16-30, Looijenga (2009) 69 n.7. Looijenga also connects a line from Ennius' Annals 6 (*quis potis ingentis oras euoluere belli* (fr.164 Skutsch)) and discusses the 'associations' of *ora* and *os* (73-74). A further link begs investigation through the work of Katz (2013) 7ff., in which the *os* imagery of *Aeneid* 6 is discussed.

[91] See Sistakou (2008) on the poem and the epic cycle.

[92] Rutherford (2001) 235ff.: the antique debate as to whether this should be classified as a Paian also highlights perhaps the notion of Cassandra as a generically transgressive speaker because of her skewed attachment to Apollo (cf. A. *Ag.* 1074-1075 where the chorus think Cassandra mistakenly cries Apollo, not appropriate to lament).

[93] Cf. Lowe (2004) 308ff.

structure of the poem works to maintain an sense of unease and doubt about what she is saying, who is speaking and whether they are giving a true account of events. As Graziosi emphasizes, in *Odyssey* 8.63-4, the Muses take away the eyes of the divine bard as they give the gift of song; [94] a (sort of) opposite of Apollo's two gifts to Cassandra, who grants her sight, but then harms her voice by adding the ring of untruth.[95] The specifically visionary nature of Cassandra's original divine gift is why we must also engage with the huge metaphor of vision and knowledge (linked, as is well known in Greek via its Indo-European root), light and dark, fame and obscurity, the hidden and the revealed, that the poem operates along. And we could try on other models for size; the tragic mask with its eyes and mouth which looks out in the drama, and onto the audience, the actor concealed behind it.[96] In the thesis I try to explore this feature on the one hand, and on the other Cassandra and other characters' literal vision of events and the prominence of a feature I have called 'borrowed sight', which relates to the phenomenon of embedded focalization and how the pattern of report is matched through this looking through the eyes of others, posing similar questions about subjectivity and narrator omniscience and its limits. There is certainly comparison and contrast to be made with epic but the idea of visuality across different genres is also considered, and I argue for the idea of 'generic' focalization or sensitivity, where the perspective deployed reflects the intertexts the poet draws upon. Ideas about reading, interpreting and composing and persuading are all also brought in through this device and encourage the reader to reflect on the poem as object and piece of representation alongside its exploration of rhetorical persuasion and its failure. She is not a simple stand-in for the epic poet. Secondly, the juxtaposition of messenger and Cassandra sets up the questions of identity and the way the poem 'explores inherited dichotomies' (as succinctly expressed by Fantuzzi and Hunter).[97] That Cassandra is a Trojan or

[94] Graziosi (2013) 21.

[95] *Alexandra* 1454-1458.

[96] Rehm (1992) 39-40.

[97] Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 440.

a babbling barbarian,[98] a seer and oracular speaker, and a woman all have connotations for the way she speaks, and introduce questions about trust and truth, given the ambivalent attitudes towards such figures in Greek literature and society.[99] Finally, to reiterate, the juxtaposition and overlap of the two speakers emphasizes the sharp contrast between the authority of Cassandra's speech and that of her prophetic sight. While the thesis will explore models beyond that of the messenger speech, the frame also suggests some similarities between seers as mediums and messengers who share the difficulty of communicating what they see and know, mediated through their words, or spoken report. As Barrett has shown, the messenger speech in tragedy is already of interest as narrative in drama (as well as tragedy's possible origin, the 'whole' that has become a 'part'),[100]and has connotations of the relationship between epic and tragedy, the heard and the seen, voice and vision that the *Alexandra* interrogates.

The messenger can be read as poet and performer[101] who both sets up his 'text' (objectifying the prophecy to come) and at the same time becomes another speaker, putting on the 'mask' of Cassandra; like the reader of a funerary inscription, poised to perform, and shift from third-person description of a speaker to first-person adoption of the named speaker's words, enacting their memorialisation and proclaiming their identity in the process, becoming them.[102] The frame of the poem, like the masks of the ancient stage, permits a

[98] On Aristotle's classification of 'enigma on a par with barbarism' in *Poetics* 1458a-b see Struck (2004) 24.

[99] See Biffis (2012).

[100] Barrett (2002); cf. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 39 on the poem's interest in origins of tragic genre.

[101] Lowe (2004) 308ff.; Sens (2010) 309.

[102] Cf. Plato *Sophist* 267b: (Ξένος) ὅταν οἶμαι τὸ σὸν σχῆμά τις τῷ ἑαυτοῦ χρώμενος σώματι προσόμοιον ἢ φωνὴν φωνῇ φαίνεσθαι ποιῇ, μίμησις τοῦτο τῆς φανταστικῆς μάλιστα κέκληταί που. In section 5.1 we will see that while the messenger can be said to attempt this species of *mimesis*, Cassandra rejects this representation for replication in the extent that she becomes identified with the *Alexandra*, her own image and replacement (cf. Cusset 2009; Steiner (2001) 3ff.).

'bifocal' reading, with reader/spectator simultaneously aware of representation and drawn into it.[103]

In terms of audience and addressee, Biffis' useful delineation of how Cassandra's narration 'oscillates' between mimetic and diegetic modes, and homodiegetic and heterodiegetic narration, between the personal, first person, and lament,[104] and the 'detachment' of a third person, and 'oracular' mode overlap with the categories of subject and object, speech and text. Cassandra's appeals to audiences both inside and outside the representation that contains her owes an obvious debt to the *Oresteia*, where the Aeschylean Cassandra is poised between the action on stage and the world of the play, and the knowledge she shares with the external audience of the story to come. Cassandra-Alexandra is stretched to even greater extremes, aware of herself as material text as well as dramatic character. Thinking further about vision, performance and the reader as spectator also suggests that there is an analogue between the transition between voices and the conceptualisation of the πρόσωπον (mask) in Greek theatre from the perspective of the audience; it both simultaneously marks what is seen as representation, and helps transform the actor in the eyes of the audience into the character on-stage.[105] This simultaneous awareness of representation and reality, the willingness to accept a fiction, but nevertheless remain aware

[103] For the mask in tragedy see Rehm (1992) 39ff; further Wiles (2000) 147ff; further (2007); it is this aspect of *mimesis*, taking on the direct speech of another, that worries Plato's Socrates in the *Republic* (393a and following).

[104] Biffis (2012) 71 (and further for a detailed discussion of lament and prophecy). Prophecy and lament are also bound together in Egyptian oracular texts (see Dieleman and Moyer (2010) 435).

[105] Rehm (1992) 39-40; Wiles (2002); Ley (2010) on the conceptualization of the mask in classical Greek theatre. As Rehm has discussed, πρόσωπον does not just mean mask but face, person and character in Greek, as well as indicating frontage, something that faces the world. The mask is before the eyes of the actor, as well as the audience and puts the emphasis on the eyes and mouth, the eyes as the marker of personhood and the voice as the medium that crosses between interior and exterior. The interest in what is concealed and the true nature of character is often found in tragedy, for example, Cilissa's statement about Clytemnestra's front to the servants at *Libation Bearers* 737-40: πρὸς μὲν οἰκέτας / θετοσκυθρωπῶν ἐντὸς ὀμμάτων γέλων / κεύθουσ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἔργοις διαπεπραγμένοις καλῶς / κείνῃ. Helen's wish to wipe out her beauty in Euripides' play (262-3: εἴθ᾽ ἐξαλειφθεῖσ᾽ ὡς ἄγαλμ᾽ αὖθις πάλιν / αἴσχιον εἶδος ἔλαβον ἀντὶ τοῦ καλοῦ) may also be read as a wish to change her mask (a reference to the comic nature of the play?) as well as to sever the connection between how she appears and what is said about her (cf. Downing (1990)). Disjunction between appearance and reality, exterior and interior is gendered in the archaic model of the visually stunning *kalon kakon* (*Theogony* 585); however compare also Achilles' hatred of the archetypal devious speaker, Odysseus in *Iliad* 9.312-314: ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κεῖνος ὁμῶς Ἀΐδαο πύλῃσιν/ὅς χ᾽ ἕτερον μὲν κεύθῃ ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἄλλο δὲ εἴπῃ.

of the mechanics of the theatre at the same time seems to me one good way to think about the structure of the *Alexandra* (despite its obviously different status as a written poem). This idea of 'bifurcated' vision is also key to Wollheim's discussion of aesthetics and the mystery of how representation affects a viewer; or what happens in between the apprehension of what an artwork represents and the acceptance that it is representation.[106] With its staging of mediated perception and communication the *Alexandra* is certainly interested in this in-between space in the experience of the world and of art, and the idea of the reader as seer and spectator. The notion of 'seeing-as' also allows us to approach the idea of seeing parts of Cassandra's prophecy as representation; as well as a huge quotation, we can also think of the *Alexandra* as a sophisticated mode of *ecphrasis* (re-presentation) or one big act of embedded focalization (containing more such acts within it).[107]

1.1.3. The Style of the *Alexandra*: On Criticism, Visual Metaphors and Hellenistic Aesthetics:

The very density[108] of the language and intertextuality that the opening of the poem displays should be celebrated as what gives the poem its fascination, and there is nothing wrong with admitting that a poem so concerned with interpretation is intriguing *particularly* to scholars or that it admits an eclectic range of approaches.[109] That it has recently been described as a 'minor poetic masterpiece'[110] also reminds us of how its detailed, polished and compressed style fits into recent discussions of Hellenistic aesthetics that have a visual and metaphorical edge, such as Elsner's discussion of Posidippus' *Lithica* (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309) as a 'highly crafted miniature'.[111] In turn, it is the *Alexandra*'s polished, 'lithic' quality that also means the poem

[106] See esp. Budd (2008) 185-215; Wollheim (1980) 16-17, 205-226; Stewart (1997) 43ff; Davey (1999) 19ff; Steiner (2001) 19ff; Squire (2009) 224.

[107] See esp. Yacobi (1995); (2000). Below 2.4.

[108] Gigante-Lanzara (2000) often comments on this feature, e.g. ad 118-20.

[109] As demonstrated by Cusset and Prioux eds. (2009).

[110] Hornblower (2015) 1.

[111] Elsner (2014) 153-154: also reflecting an Achaemenid culture of elite collecting; the opening of the *Alexandra* seems to imply a rather more anxious desire to possess, know and catalogue *everything*. See section 6.0.

shines differently depending which angle one takes when shining a light into it, especially on the first few re-readings; the visual metaphors of understanding, interpretation and 'illumination' run throughout the poem and cannot easily be escaped.[112] Michael Squire's description of a 'poetics of scale' for poems like the *Alexandra* in terms of how its wide sweep of space and time is balanced with learned and worked references to specific places, peoples and versions of myth is useful,[113] as well as for thinking about some of the *Alexandra*'s topsy-turvy imagery, such as the paired shrinking and growing of Achilles and Hector (257ff.),[114]or the gradual realisation of the reader as they traverse the text and find themselves in the midst of Cassandra's vision, journeying with her through time and space, that the poem is bigger on the inside than it is on the outside.[115] Cusset, Kolde, and Fantuzzi and Hunter all point to the idea of an outsized fragment, an inside-out poem where the part becomes the whole, and vice versa thanks to the process of *mise-en-abyme*.[116] We will see throughout the thesis how some of the smallest details in the text reflect its overall themes, again elaborating on Cusset's findings, in terms of the relationship between vision and voice.[117] Interplay between interior and exterior space, scale, length and volume continues throughout the poem as we will see in the rest of the thesis.[118] We will keep returning to these ideas as acknowledged here in the attempt to further describe and explain the poem's effects. Like any text, but more so than many, the *Alexandra* can be chopped up and its structure set out in

---

[112] Cf. Hamilton (2003) 9: 'To read Pindar obscurely is .. not to practise obscurantism … it is to continue an honest philology that is still trying to extricate itself from an overly restrictive classicism in thrall to ideals of visibility […], a tradition that historically endorsed lucidity, clarity and trustworthy integrity', so that 'darkness had to be suppressed … Wilamowitz and Nietzsche both wanted to "discover" (*entdecken*) Greece, but Nietzsche 'knows behind each veil [there is] another concealment'. On the opposition of classicism and 'dark' romanticism see Sistakou (2012).

[113] Squire (2010) 273-274.

[114] See McNelis and Sens (2011b) 62ff.; below 2.

[115] Cf. Cusset (2009) 131; cf. Hummel (2006) 215ff.

[116] Cusset (2009); cf. Biffis (2012) 116ff. Cusset draws on the concept through the work of Dällenbach (1989); see esp. 14-15, 35, 164-166: 'The common root of every *mise en abyme* is clearly the idea of *reflexivity*'.

[117] Cusset (2009).

[118] Cf. Kolde (2009); Cusset (2009).

different ways (and not as a result of interpolation),[119] so vision will be the guiding principle in the section that follows to give an overview of the phenomenon in the poem. This aims to justify the focus on vision in the thesis and to demonstrate its prominence in a way that may suggest areas for future work on the poem, and to demonstrate better how a survey of the text in these terms prompts further investigation as it has in this project.

The seductive and metaphorical promise of total revelation in the poem through the way it presents itself as a message to be uncovered by the right readers must be kept separate from our interpretive work. It is part of the flattering construction of the reader in the text,[120] invited into the 'so called "dark-filter" notion of obscurity, an idealist mode whereby behind some screen there is said to lie a "pre-existent luminous meaning"' (for an elite of 'knowers', *ainoi*).[121] As a prophecy, the *Alexandra* is a progressive revelation[122] to a predestined future goal, and this means that in fact the poem does take the shape of an 'ultimate clarification',[123] seducing the reader to seek this in their reading and critical approach to the poem. In reality, the poem maintains its obscurity for the most part to furnish Cassandra with her alienating language, through the use of *hapax legomena* and hard-to-identify subjects, the 'wall' of words that surrounds her like a prison (another metaphor).[124] We need to differentiate between the way the poem presents itself as text and our expectations in interpretation of it; this may include the fact that some of its difficulty has been rather exaggerated. In Section 3 I will also

---

[119] For the view that the controversial passages of the poem are down to interpolation, thus raising the possibility that it is not confined to these lines see West (1983); (1984). This thesis follows Hornblower (2015) regarding the text as complete with a later second-century date.

[120] Looijenga (2009) 64.

[121] Hamilton (2003) 3 with n.1 citing White (1981) 18; cf. Looijenga (2009) 64 on the messenger's *captatio benevolentiae*.

[122] This is borne out by what Hornblower (2015) 52 has labelled 'the law of diminishing obscurity' where Lycophron's riddles become gradually less obscure, and can be read together to more easily identify individuals, peoples or places. Riddling description and disguised appearance are connected in Dolon's wolf disguise as he describes his plan in [Euripides], *Rhesus* 208-215.

[123] Hamilton (2003) 1ff.; cf. Porter (1990) 32ff. on 'interpretation as trope' and the struggle to express critically the workings of the imagery in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*.

[124] On the poem/prison metaphor see Cusset (2004).

argue that the pairing of Paris (Alexandros) with Cassandra (Alexandra) in the poem inscribes the potential for readers' failure to understand the poem, just as the poem promises that Cassandra some day will be validated by its existence.

1.1.4 Summary Conclusion:

Cassandra's vision and speech, and the tension between them are part of the way the poem works overall. By thinking about the reliability of vision in the poem, we are also made to think about the reliability and bases of our knowledge and the additional ways that the questions of representation and reality and different states of existence, or types of knowledge are at stake in the *Alexandra*, whether these are mythic, cultic, or poetic epistemologies. By shoehorning the world and its history into Cassandra's field of vision as an organising principle, the poet tries to give an answer and make new connections too in presenting the culmination of Cassandra's story as revealing her identity beyond and before poetry as the cultic Alexandra, and the climax of world history in the rise of a new ruler ushering in a new era of rule in the west.[125]

[125] Following especially Sistakou (2008) and Biffis (2012) in seeing a shift from poetry to cult in the poem.

Section 1.2: *An Overview of Vision as a Feature of the Poem*:

1.2.1: Speaking and Seeing: Cassandra's Use of First-Person Verbs of Sight

As argued in the previous section, the opening of the poem indicates that communication is mediated not only through different speakers but also through the poem's encouragement for its reader to consider both the juxtaposition of the visual and the verbal as well as the different and reflexive levels of perception, communication and interpretation that are set up.[126] Cassandra's immediate experience in the early part of the poem is marked by the first-person present tense use of λεύσσω,[127] a fairly common verb of sight used to refer to the perception of external objects and usually indicates a clear view of real events in time.[128] Although there are also some cases where the scene described is hallucinatory, the visions seen are real enough to the viewer who describes them.[129] Λεύσσω appears three times in the *Alexandra* in the first person and present tense only, on each occasion relating to the destruction of Troy. Sistakou has already stressed the present-ness and reality of Cassandra's visions.[130] For Biffis too, visuality is testament to the nature of Cassandra's speech act as an

[126] Cusset (2009) on reflexivity. Sight itself is conceptualized as both active and passive in the ancient world: see Prier (1989) 10ff.; Squire (2009) 84: 'In the ancient world in particular, there was no single theory of optics, so that the very issue of whether viewing centred around the human subject or the object seen was itself an open question.'

[127] Sistakou (2008) 105ff.; Hummel (2006) 13; Biffis (2012) 69-70; Hornblower (2015) 52. LSJ states that λεύσσω usually appears only in the present and imperfect in 'good' authors.

[128] LSJ: 'look, gaze upon, see'; Prier (1989) 68-71.

[129] See e.g. E. *Cyc.* 580: the Cyclops has a delirious vision of Zeus and the other gods. The Thracian messenger's speech at *Rhesus* 773 is also of interest as the messenger seems to be able to see in the dark (**λεύσσω** δὲ φῶτε περιπολοῦνθ' ἡμῶν στρατὸν /πυκνῆς δι' ὄρφνης·).

[130] Cf. Hummel (2006) 13: 'Le verbe λεύσσω dénote l'announce rationelle de la vision prophétique'; Biffis (2012) 69-70. Λεύσσειν is common in Homeric epic yet only two first-person forms occur. Both are an instance of Achilles exclaiming upon his simultaneous vision; the burning of the ships (*Il.* 16.127); and in amazement at Aeneas'

'ecstatic utterance' in which Cassandra 'can still choose how to articulate' her visions.[131] While the poem dramatizes Cassandra's lack of agency and control by implying forces from without, here, the first-person verbs of sight supports the conclusion that Cassandra can 'not just verbalize what she sees in front of her, but prophesies about the future, turning it into a proper story' that can take in past, present and future.[132] As the stance on the poem followed here is that of Cassandra's colouration of the narrative from her perspective, I hope to demonstrate further how vision plays a role in this.[133] This will involve also consideration of the way that vision complicates the question of how in control Cassandra is of what she sees and what she says (as even when she does seem in control of her words, the effect is often visual and eusynoptic).[134] We will see that making a sharp division between seeing and speaking is not always possible, corresponding to and overlapping with other slippage in the poem (such as that between diegetic and mimetic modes of narration,[135] and the status of imagery as simile and metaphor[136] (which we can also take as a literal vision of an omen, or even an image within another text.)[137] What I want to do now is examine the effects of Cassandra's subjective visualization in more detail.

On the first use, Troy is personified and directly addressed (52, λεύσσω σε, τλῆμον, δεύτερον πυρουμένην) as Cassandra moves from narrating the past destruction of Troy by

---

vanishing act at *Il.* 20.346. That is, his surprise at what he does not see and does not expect, rather in contrast with Cassandra's certain perception of the future. No instances of the first person are found in extant Sophocles; it appears three times in Aeschylus (*Supp.* 183; *Cho.* 10, *PV* 144); sixteen times in Euripides (*Cyc.* 580; *Alc.* 1124; *Hipp.* 1122; *Supp.*794; *Pho.* 1308; *IA* 821; *Rhesus* 773; *Hercules* 514; *Ion* 211; *Tro.* 201, 1257; *Ba.* 1232, 1280; *Orestes* 224, 385, 1549). Twice in A.R. *Arg.* 3.690-2, 4.1264. Although none of these are of especial significance to our discussion here, the *Bacchae* passages do illustrate that the verb usually applies to something manifestly present for the viewer, as sight confirms the truth for the speaker.

[131] Biffis (2012) 69-70.

[132] Biffis (2012) 69-70.

[133] See above for discussion.

[134] E.g. Sens (2014) 107-109.

[135] On diegetic and mimetic modes of narration see Biffis (2012) 71ff.

[136] See Section 2 below, with reference to Sens (2014).

[137] Below 2.4.

Heracles which begins her prophecy, to the 'second' burning of Troy to come. It also introduces her vision of Paris as a symbol and omen of destruction at line 86 (λεύσσω θέοντα γρυνὸν ἐπτερωμένον) and a synthesizing image of the impending violence against Troy 'seen long since' at 216-218: λεύσσω πάλαι δὴ σπεῖραν ὁλκαίων κακῶν, / σύρουσαν ἅλμῃ κἀπιροιζοῦσαν πάτρᾳ / δεινὰς ἀπειλὰς καὶ πυριφλέκτους βλάβας. Each time the vision is filled with movement of increasing complexity in terms of the density of the imagery; from burning, to Paris' running (and implied flying, swooping as a γρυνὸν ἐπτερωμένον, 86), to a combination of pictorial and aural effects in the description of the threatening and hissing snake-like σπεῖρα of woes (emphasised by final sigmas in line 219 that finishes the image: δεινὰ**ς** ἀπειλὰ**ς** καὶ πυριφλέκτου**ς** βλάβα**ς**),[138] simultaneously implying the Greek ships turning for Troy and their pulling ashore with ropes. These different levels of meaning collapse into each other, as the scholia to the passage already discuss.[139] The notion of a cycle of troubles also anticipates the story of the Trojan War to come and Cassandra's control of this epic and cyclic material (see below section 2). The present vision (λεύσσω, 216) is also manifest πάλαι, and picks up on the fiery destruction of Troy prophesised earlier (πυριφλέκτους βλάβας 218; cf. 69) and the overall use of fire as 'a recurrent image of catastrophe'.[140] While the first two instances of a vision introduced by λεύσσω seem to suggest an embodied Cassandra, experiencing her vision as if in the moment of the actual action, the latter seems to reveal the ability to shape imagery into a condensed visualization that reflects on but also makes the whole past Trojan narrative to this point available at a glance; again considered noteworthy by the scholia.[141] These lines transform the former reactive statements and demonstrate that

---

[138] See Clayman (1987) for definitions of sigmatism and comparative discussion that includes Lycophron. Although Lycophron is labelled as the most sigmatic Hellenistic poet, which Clayman suggests may be down to a Hellenistic concern for euphony, the discussion at least does take into (limited) account that the analysis' results rely on the iambic *Alexandra* (so that there are no lyric sections, where less sigmatism is generally to be found).

ῥοιζέω also appears in a military context at *Alexandra* 1426 with the perspective of action coming from a long way off (although with more reference to space than time, rather than a combination of both as in the earlier passage) for the κύφελλα of arrows launched by Xerxes' army overhead (ἰῶν τηλόθεν ῥοιζουμένων ὑπὲρ κάρα στήσουσι).

[139] schol. Lyc. 216.

[140] Sistakou (2012) 187 n.90: especially in relation to Paris.

[141] Tzetzes ad Lyc. 216: λεύσω [sic] πάλαι δὴ ἀντὶ τοῦ προορῶ ταῦτα.

Cassandra's description of visual imagery is key to her narrative voice; she is both experiencing and embodied, yet also intermittently capable of this spatially wide and temporally long focalization and description of events that we would more readily associate with an omniscient, external and primary narrator-focalizer.[142] However, it is not the case that we can just assume that omniscient means objective; there is already a hint at Cassandra's experience to come in the use of σύρουσαν (217), which can carry the connotation of 'drag by force, hale' (LSJ I.2).[143] Because of the tendency in the *Alexandra* for connections, comparisons and contrasts to be made through a particular use and re-use of language across different parts of the poem (and different points in space and time), we should also consider the instances of λεύσσειν together.[144] These three instances of Cassandra's vision also connect the deep past of Troy to the soon-to-be woes and allow her past reflection on the future, testifying to the poem's temporal complexity. These three occasions (52, 86, 216) that tie together the vision of Troy burning, Paris as 'firebrand' and as cause of the war (drawing in the prediction of his role in Hecuba's dream, cf. 224-227) and Cassandra's reflective statement, turning back round (on events that are still to come!) bring past, present and future together and help create a picture of an eternally burning Troy, always at an end.[145] The statement at 216-218 leads into the presentation of the Trojan War as a culminating peak in history; how anticipation is built and how the prophetess explicitly understands and experiences future and past together in the present of her vision, also pointing to the undeniable existence of the *Iliad*, is discussed in more detail below.[146]

---

[142] See Lowe (2004); Biffis (2012) 11ff.

[143] Not really a poetic word; it only appears here in the *Alexandra* (LSJ s.v. σύρω I.2).

[144] This phenomenon is explored further throughout the thesis. Hornblower (2015) ad 823 raises the question of whether the interpreter with a whole range of electronic tools is too quick to seize on individual words, but ultimately justifies such as focus, and underlining that the care and attention of the ancient scholar should not be underplayed; our poet is also clearly obsessed by words. See also Steiner (1992) 312ff. on 'initiative trust', the leap of faith the reader takes in believing that the text that confronts him means *something*.

[145] Again this suggests the relationship with Euripides' *Trojan Women*, which ends with a beginning and dramatizes the characters coming to terms with the fact Troy is at an end, and it is this way that it will always be remembered: See Dunn (1993).

[146] Section 2.

Finally, two other appearances of λεύσσειν invite the reader to compare further experiences of visions of violence and death. At line 318 a present participle indicates Laodice's sight of her impending doom (ὧν τὴν μὲν αὐτόπρεμνον ἡ τοκὰς κόνις /χανοῦσα κευθμῷ χείσεται διασφάγος, /λεύσσουσαν ἄτην ἀγχίπουν στεναγμάτων...); at lines 998-992 (λεῦσσον, 990) it indicates why Athena's statue on Siris shuts her eyes when faced with the murder of the Ionians by Achaians, causing outrage in her temple, a mirror (but also contrasting) scene with the statue's reaction to Aias' attack on Cassandra in her temple at Troy earlier in the poem (361-364).[147] Given that the careful choice of words in the poem often recall the reader to an especially relevant intertext, a short survey of the verb restricted to first-person uses elsewhere in Greek literature adds further nuance. The nearest parallel with *Alexandra* 86 (i.e., instance two, above) is to be found in Euripides' *Trojan Women* (1256-9) where the chorus see and describe their view of Troy, describing how the army brandish torches on the walls, and seeing these signs, realize disaster is imminent: τίνας Ἰλιάσιν ταῖσδ' ἐν κορυφαῖς /λεύσσω φλογέας δαλοῖσι χέρας /διερέσσοντας; μέλλει Τροίᾳ /καινόν τι κακὸν προσέσεσθαι.[148] Thus, from their first-hand observation in the present (λεύσσω), the women predict what is about to come into existence (προσέσεσθαι). This capacity for feminine foreknowledge supports Biffis' claim that the poem's perspective may be linked to female focalization in ancient literature.[149] In this example, we have the tragic chorus; but we can also think of the 'watcher on the walls', or the *teichoskopia* high above the battle scene (*Iliad* 3.121-244).[150] This is also manifested in the preponderance of πύργοι in the poem (65, 81, 254,

[147] Below 4.1. The βλάβη threatened by the Achaians at Troy (218) now repeated again in Siris (989).

[148] Cf. E. *Tro.* 201 where the chorus describe the vision of its dead children (...σώματα λεύσσω) just after exclaiming on *how* this could be sung or lamented of (197-8 αἰαῖ αἰαῖ, ποίοις δ' οἴκτοις / τὰν σὰν λύμαν ἐξαιάζεις;). It is this self-conscious struggle to express the horror of the war and the aftermath of the city's final end in the Trojan women's voices in Euripides on which the *Alexandra* surely draws (see e.g. Ambühl (2010)). Cf. Steiber (2011) 12 on E. *Tro.*: 'the mind's eyes and ears are equally conscripted in the generation of imagined sensations evoked by the characters who are left to describe the city's final collapse.' Both 'building and destruction' are *Trojan Women*'s 'twin architectural themes' and the *Alexandra* moves from destruction to construction and creative action in the new world in the west (Stieber (2007) 104). There is perhaps an interest in *creatio ex nihilo*: Troy is remembered for its disappearance, its end; something new must be drawn forth from this anti-matter.

[149] Biffis (2012) 13ff.

[150] Below 2.4.

442, 526, 934, 971, 1007, 1255), which points to both the idea of a world on the look-out and a specifically feminine visuality in Greek literary tradition (noting also that πύργος comes to be associated with women's living quarters as well as more straightforwardly meaning tower in Greek).[151] The *paidagogos*' caution in Euripides' *Phoenician Women* exemplifies the issues at stake here when Antigone is allowed to leave her παρθενών to look over the battlefield beyond the walls of the interior. This vantage point grants the opportunity vision and knowledge; but there is a delicate balance between the privilege of seeing what others do without being seen oneself, and the danger that this places the girl in if she is seen by others.[152] We could also say that the recall of lyric passages and their heightened state of emotions and lament, which are transformed into trimeter lines in the *Alexandra,* reflect wider motifs of the poem, such as imprisonment (i.e. the way Cassandra's situation is thematized on every level), and the questioning of the efficacy of song as a medium for expression of one's own experience).[153] The choral and collective voice of tragedy becomes the property of one isolated speaker who must react to the palpable vision of Troy's disaster alone.[154] Interestingly, δαλός is only found in one other place in *Trojan Women*, in Helen's description of Paris at 922, when she blames his parents, Hecuba and Priam for the disaster by failing to prevent his birth. The blame placed on Paris and the link between him as the cause of the war, the cursed firebrand and the burning of the city, is also to the fore in the *Alexandra*.[155] That Helen in the same speech also places herself at the centre of relations between east and west, her marriage (through Paris' choice of Aphrodite and Helen's beauty over the world-rule offered by Hera, or the Pan-Asian rule and destruction of Greece that

[151] LSJ sv. πύργος I, III.

[152] After ensuring the coast is clear, the *paidagogos* will allow Antigone out in the open, annotating what Antigone sees on the basis of his own information already gathered, both seen and heard (*Pho.* 95-96: πάντα δ' ἐξειδὼς φράσω /ἅ τ' εἶδον εἰσήκουσά τ' Ἀργείων πάρα). The two processes remain neatly separated.

[153] Biffis (2012) 8: the author is 'hidden' behind the two speakers; we will see that the poem takes this conceit as far as it can by figuring the *Alexandra* as an autonomous object that speaks. The figure of the author is banausic and secondary to his characters. Cf. Cusset (2009) on the primacy of Cassandra's voice; (2004) on the prison metaphor.

[154] Biffis (2012) has emphasised the increased isolation of the prophetess in the *Alexandra* away from her people.

[155] See Sistakou (2012) 187 n.190; below section 3.

Athena apparently offered) as guarantor of Greek freedom also seems a model rhetorical precedent for Cassandra's centrality in world conflict and history in the *Alexandra*.[156]

However, the comparison also demonstrates what is different about the way imagery works in the *Alexandra*. In seeing omens before her eyes, Cassandra concretizes poetic imagery and condenses multiple actions to a visual symbol, a feature shared with Aeschylus' Cassandra in the *Agamemnon*, and often noted.[157] Euripides' Helen is happy to deal in appearances, where Paris is δαλοῦ πικρὸν μίμημ' (E. *Tro.* 922), an 'imitation', or representation of a firebrand, who *like* one, destroyed Troy. In the *Alexandra* he *is* a firebrand and the concrete symbol of his potential actions and the role he *will* come to play in the myth, a visually perceived sign rather than merely a figure of speech, the imitation that he has turned into in Euripides.[158] This does seem to encourage one to consider visualized prophecy as opposed to subsequent narration, as if the latter can only ever approximate to the truth. As a narrator, Cassandra deals not with *what seems* but with what *will be*, what is, and has been; below we will assess how the acts of seeing within her prophecy complicate the status of seeming and being, representation and reality within it.[159] Euripides is already playing on the interaction between the omen of Hecuba's dream and Helen's reference to Paris as a poetic image, an imitation of an object. The *Alexandra* goes beyond comparison and explanation and, through the use of imagery, lets the reader share in the idea of what it is like to actually see and understand the future through a sign and visual symbol which becomes shorthand for

---

[156] Already drawing on her weaving in the *Iliad* (see Elmer (2005) on her creativity in epic). Helen and Cassandra are already linked in the literary tradition, and the *Alexandra* picks up on this idea of the most beautiful woman/dangerous bride on Greek and Trojan side respectively, travelling in opposite directions to the east and west in epic and tragedy to bring down a royal household (cf. E. *Tro.* 356-358). On forging connections between the two beauties see below 3.3. Of course, the divine Helen gets off scot-free, whereas Cassandra will be brutally murdered.

[157] See esp. Ferrari (1997); Mitchell-Boyask (2006): n.2 has an excellent rundown of scholarship on the Cassandra scene; cf. also on how Cassandra's long scene takes over the work (as in the *Alexandra*) and the way her visions are also of a representation on-stage (of Apollo) as well as prophetic ('What Cassandra Sees' 284-288).

[158] On slippage between simile and metaphor in the *Alexandra* see now Sens (2014).

[159] Cassandra's use of the future indicative lends her divine and oracular authority. Consider how gods speak in tragic prologues, exploited in the *Bacchae*, where Pentheus attempts to approximate Dionysus in his sure knowledge of what will happen, marked this way in his speech, e.g. in his threats against the god (παύσω, 232, 240), with disastrous consequence.

Paris' role in the cycle rather like an extended epithet and a challenge to the power of speech.[160]

In the rest of the poem, first person uses of verbs of sight are rare. I will discuss the special case of the vision of Iliadic action προὐμμάτων (251ff.) and the worst day Cassandra 'shall see' (ἐπόψομαι φάος, 304) in Section 2. This paucity is not because vision is not important in the poem but because it also operates through a dynamic of cessation and seizing of control, looking through the eyes of others to represent and 'show' their future experiences, just as the god 'shows' Cassandra the truth, controls her perceptions, and implies his coercion, like a hand to the back of the head. On the one hand this removes Cassandra's subjectivity and control; on the other, it reflects accurately her experience at the mercy of the god and the way she is turned into an object by others.[161] The majority of the verbs of seeing in the poem are thus in the third person and refer to other viewers within the poem, as the reader is pin-balled around sets of different perspectives, and different 'modes of viewing'.[162] The reader is already well aware from the framed introduction that it is Cassandra's vision of events they are getting through (the report of) her words. This also allows the poet to create special effects when Cassandra sees herself, and the 'narrating I' and 'experiencing I' are pulled apart and called into question. However, when these visual elements of the poem ebb, the reader is also drawn back to their awareness of the poem as written object (another locus for tension between the heard and the seen, the written and the spoken.).

There are other contexts for thinking about the way the reader is shunted around the different focalizers within the prophecy. For example, an individual's constant eye-movement in Greek texts is often taken generally as an indication of madness, but more specifically that which comes from seeing what others cannot because of divine imposition, or

[160] Close to the heavy and interlinked imagery of the *Oresteia*, although with even less room for explanation and elaboration on images and omens that recur in Aeschylus' plays (see Porter (1990), and a more Euripidean self-consciousness about representation as well as communication and language (e.g. Goldhill (1986) 259-286).

[161] Below sections 4 and 5.

[162] Zanker's (2003) term and influence; cf. Goldhill (1996); (2012).

punishment (e.g. Electra's description of Orestes' mad eyes at Euripides *Orestes* 253); the rapid switches in subject in the poem could then also be taken a consequence of the speaker's *mania* and her roving, swivelling and fast-moving eyes.[163] However, the rest of the thesis will show that this is not a free-for-all, but the way events are presented through the eyes of others has a generic, intertextual basis as well as reflecting the structure of the poem and Cassandra's own experience of her altered senses. Stylistically they help to break up the monologue by offering the possibility of another's perspective, as Cassandra's gaze seems to enter into the sightline of others, whilst maintaining the lack of dialogue.[164] Sometimes the embedded focalization offered evokes sympathy also for the suffering of the characters Cassandra allies with herself, and makes her perhaps a more sympathetic figure (to a certain extent).[165] At the same time, the distance and detachment implied force the reader to reflect on their own reaction to tragic events as spectacle, entertainment and representation.

1.2.2: Borrowed Sight:

An example of the effects of the withholding of a sight, and the granting of vision to another is found the first extended example of embedded focalization in the poem, Oenone's experience of Paris' death (57-68).[166] This shares the themes of vision, desire and death, as McNelis and Sens have discussed for Troilos, but the effect here is different.[167] That Paris dies so early in the poem marks Cassandra's antipathy towards her brother as the cause of the war

[163] See Hummel (2006) 183ff on Cassandra's appearance.

[164] On the one exchange of glance between Paris and Helen see below 1.2.7.

[165] Hornblower (2015) 11 has discussed her affinity with other wronged and beautiful women in the prophecy.

[166] There are many versions of the myth and sexual relationships of Paris, Helen, Oenone and her son Corythos, whom she sends to guide the Greeks after being taunted by her father about Paris' faithlessness (cf. *Alexandra* 57-60; there is an extremely useful list and summary of sources in Sistakou (2012) 137ff.)). The theme is popular in the Hellenistic period and later (e.g. Ovid *Her.* 5, Parthenius *Erot.* 4, 34, Konon *Narr.* 22, Dictys of Crete v.5; later, Tennyson's *Oenone*). Cf. Stinton (1990) 47ff. on Euripides' avoidance of Oenone, who rather foregrounds Paris' isolation as a herdsman and the theme of *paideia*. The isolated Cassandra clearly believes that Paris should have been kept from his people, rather than herself facing solitary confinement away from her community in Lycophron.

[167] McNelis and Sens (2011b) 73-76, with other examples from the *Alexandra*. On sacrifice and marriage in the *Alexandra* see now Biffis (2012); 'marriage to death'; in tragedy, Rehm (1994), Seaford (2005); epigram, Gutzwiller (1998) 58-60.

and doer of futile actions.[168] There is no trace of Oenone's refusal to treat Paris here (known from other versions of the myth)[169] so that she remains a fully sympathetic character that Cassandra invites us to identify with, despite the overall picture she paints of her brother's worthlessness. Oenone (φαρμακουργός, 61) simply *on seeing* Paris' wounds (δρακοῦσα, 62, aorist aspect) instantly grasps their 'incurable' nature (οὐκ ἰάσιμον, 61)[170] and makes the decision to jump to her death (... ξυνὸν ὀγχήσει μόρον, 64).[171] As Sistakou suggests, the choice of language emphasizes the couple's entwined fates, with Oenone 'pierced' by her longing for her dead husband (πόθῳ δὲ τοῦ θανόντος ἠγκιστρωμένη, 67), analogous to the wound an arrow inflicts,[172] putting the focus on her endurance of suffering to come, granting her heroic and tragic status. This is emphasised by the visual effects as Cassandra crawls into the head of another character. Because the reader is forced to see with her, they are also led into following her own arrow-like fall (64-68), plummeting head-first downwards to Paris' still 'quivering' body, physicality further emphasized by the mention of the body twice at line-ends (66, δέμας; 68, νεκρῷ). By following the embodied and literal sight of Oenone's last moments (δρακοῦσα, 62), Paris is denied any tragic *pathos*, and the reader is encouraged to identify (metaphorically) with Oenone's emotional experience. This suggests the parallel made in ancient literary scholarship between visualization and the tragic emotions, and

---

[168] Below 1.2.2

[169] Hurst and Kolde (2008) ad loc.

[170] See Biffis (2012).

[171] This could be read in terms of Aristotelian *anagnorisis* (*Poetics* 1452a) and the idea of a whole tragic work is hinted at here (furnishing Oenone with a eusynoptic gaze). Durbec (2011) 95 has suggested line 57 (τὰ πάντα πρὸς φῶς ἡ βαρύζηλος δάμαρ (...) ἄξει) is susceptible to a metapoetic reading (presumably as it recalls the first line of the poem and the messenger's promise to tell everything) and underlines 'le rôle des penchants érotiques de Pâris dans la chute de Troie', while for Mooney ad loc it emphasizes the causal role of Oenone's jealousy in the fall (however, it is also a consequence of Paris' action and her father's blame (μομφαῖσιν, 59). Hornblower (2015) ad 445 notes Quintus' imitation of this line in his version of the Paris and Oenone episode (10.486-9; citing further Massimilla (2004)). Lines 57-60 compress many prominent themes and motifs (jealousy, blame, family strife (father and daughter), guidance toward and marking out of a new land, sex, jealousy and marriage), so perhaps the repetition of τὰ πάντα also draws attention to just how much material (enough for a whole tragedy) the poet squeezes into four verses, and is yet another example of *mise-en-abyme* in the poem (cf. Cusset (2009)).

[172] Hurst and Kolde (2008) ad loc. Sistakou (2012) 185 with n.183; with the metaphorical play also appreciated by Tzetzes (ad 67) as she notes. We may also note the use of the adjective νεόδμητος to qualify Paris' corpse, here 'newly slain' but also carrying the connotation of 'newly tamed', i.e. just married.

Aristotle's prescription for the poet to work holding the events of the plot πρὸ ὀμμάτων so that they can be effectively transferred to one's audience; a strategy of visual communication that Cassandra draws on through borrowing Oenone's eyes.[173] By entering her field of vision she can convince her listener despite her voice, communicating the interiority of another within the monologue form and without breaking the flow of her prophetic vision.[174] Following the 'two ends' pattern in the poem Paris' death is mentioned again later, but not to grant him any material or cult compensation, as the reference foregrounds his killers, Athena and Philoctetes, within the context of the latter's wanderings and foundings *post bellum*.[175] The intense focus on a point in time and space is tightened further and made literal here through the actual points of the arrows that bring down Paris, making a link between action and result across the poem with ἄρδισιν in line 63, and ἄρδιν in 914 where Philoctetes' killer shot is described (the singular focussing further on the divinely-guided action). Paris is denied the reader's spectatorship and sympathy, as we neither look on or with him and he is only felt physically present as a corpse, caught in the crossfire, and disappeared in the middle of these two points, reduced again to a symbol and the cause of a pointless war.[176]

1.2.3: Vision Beyond the First Person:

In the sections that follow we will look at some of the wider implications of the visuality of the poem and the way that third-person verbs of sight are used (troubling a neat distinction between voice and vision, and the diegetic and mimetic modes of narration).[177] Little can be said about the use of visual language alone without closer attention to context, as

---

[173] Aristotle, *Poetics* 1455a22-34. Cf. Nünlist (2009) 126-31, 134; De Jong (2014) on 'embedded focalization'.

[174] Gigante-Lanzara (2000) ad loc.

[175] Hornblower (2015) 911-929 ad loc: A long passage indicating its importance; see further on the evidence for cult in Kroton, and a suggested parallel between Philoctetes' isolation and Cassandra's.

[176] On Paris see Section 3. That φιτρός rather than γρύνος is used in 913 also suggests that the firebrand has burnt out (LSJ II cites this line for the meaning firebrand, but this seems to be inferred from the other references to Paris as firebrand in the *Alexandra* (86, 1362), plus Bacchylides 5.142 where Meleager recounts how his mother took out the log from her chest and burnt it so that he would no longer be immortal (i.e. what would have been the correct impulse in the case of Paris). Thus Paris φιτρός could also be the useless block of wood that LSJ I also defines.

[177] Cf. Biffis (2012) 10.

verbs of perception are often common, and also have their place in familiar tropes. While the metaphorical light of reputation and praise is found in those passages concerned with the *kleos* of Cassandra herself and the other Priamids and Trojans (e.g. 1230-1231 (Troy): …οὐδ' ἄμνηστον, ἀθλία πατρίς,/κῦδος μαρανθὲν ἐγκατακρύψεις ζόφῳ),[178] we should not be too quick to place this familiar trope as mere co-option of the language of epic or epinician; there is one further step we can take to suggest that the *Alexandra* suggests a preferred type of memorialisation that is manifestly and literally seen rather than heard. That Cassandra sees as well as speaks means that one day she will not only be heard, but seen as well, through the existence of the written text object, *Alexandra.* The *Alexandra*'s (be)coming into material reality is the final transition between voice and vision, as the spoken utterance of the embodied and subjective Cassandra are concretized in the words of the text to be seen and read in future.[179] We might contrast the idea of 'living *to see*' (for example, at *Al.* 1019 settlers in Bruttium are predicted to see a sorry life: ἔνθα πλανήτην λυπρὸν **ὄψονται** βίον) although this idea of remaining in existence (and the ability to see as a marker of that) is familiar from tragedy. In the *Alexandra*, the idea is usually of surviving only to suffer further, to see something negative, rather than one stemming from a desire for survival and life, to continue to look on the sun.[180] Self-blinding is not an option; the way that Cassandra's special sight is conceived leaves little room for the assertion of free will, and she sees although imprisoned and in the dark.[181] This idea of continuing to live to see only further horror is also taken to extremes in the Agamemnon scene (1099ff.), where Agamemnon lives just long enough to see the truth of what his treacherous wife has done to him and his household (1107), creating an intense moment of tragic recognition in a single final act of vision (λυπρὰν λεαίνης **εἰσιδοῦσ'**

[178] μαραίνω also implies visual satisfaction (LSJ II).

[179] Cf. Cusset (2009).

[180] E.g. S. *Ant.* 876-882 (lamenting her isolation and lost marriage); see Hall (2010) 2-3.

[181] There is not room to rehearse the arguments about what Oedipus' self-blinding signifies in terms of predestination and agency in Sophocles' play. Blinding is not as common in the *Alexandra* as we might expect given the breadth of tragic material that it encompasses; the only case for direct narration is Phoenix at 417-423, though still with reference to his previous sight (αὐγάσαι, 420). In *Oedipus Tyrannos* 1384-1389, sensory deprivation is *like* a prison, but Cassandra *still sees*, and cannot escape the pain of doing so.

οἰκουρίαν) as the king goes to his death (in a scene which is climactic in a number of ways in the *Alexandra* too, as well as in Aeschylus' play; it can be read as Cassandra's encounter with the *Agamemnon* too).[182] This tragic focus can be nicely contrasted with the picture painted of Odysseus, star of his own epic, who endures and endures only to see endless troubles in the *Alexandra*'s futile version of events,[183] and Cassandra's borrowing of the hero's eyes (esp. 812-814, doubly marked at line ends: χὠ μὲν τοσούτων θῖνα πημάτων **ἰδὼν** /ἄστρεπτον Ἅιδην δύσεται τὸ δεύτερον,/γαληνὸν ἦμαρ οὔποτ' ἐν ζωῇ **δρακών**). Cassandra's sympathy for the character[184] can perhaps be explained as sympathy for what the literary tradition can put a character through, though of course, unlike Cassandra-Alexandra, Odysseus accepts the lies of epic in return for *kleos*, even when he does get the chance to tell his own tale, as if Cassandra thinks he should have capitalized on the chance to wrest control from his creator by telling the truth.[185] By making Cassandra's prophecy pre-date and predict epic tradition, the *Alexandra* reveals (or at least tries to persuade the reader it reveals) the truth that tradition obfuscates. The shift to cultic identity in the latter half of the poem is not always just a development of history; the poem hints at a layer of truth that poetry obscures and implies that it is prior.

1.2.4: The Watching World and a Landscape that Looks Back (vision, space and time in the body of the poem).

Vision also shapes the way the world is portrayed (with its curious mixture of learned detail and fantastic features) as the poem moves from a gradually tightening focus on Troy (see section 2) and expands spatially outwards through the attempted *nostoi* of the Greek heroes

---

[182] I discuss this at greater length in a forthcoming chapter in the Hellenistica Groningana volume *Drama and Performance in Hellenistic Poetry*; cf. Sens (2014) 110-111.

[183] See McNelis and Sens (2011b) 76ff.

[184] Cf. Hornblower (2015) ad 815.

[185] On Odysseus and Cassandra as intradiegetic narrator/character see Cusset (2009) 134-138; Sens (2010) 306; Biffis (2012) 74ff.; Hurst (2012) 97-111. Schade (1999) for full commentary on 648-819.

and Aeneas' journey in the west.[186] Once in the prophecy, which we could take not only as oral quotation (reported speech) but as a visual one (an *ecphrasis*,[187] or one giant act of embedded focalization) as suggested above, the interest in vision is immediately noticeable in small and intricately-worked details in the text.[188] The first embedded viewer in the poem is Scylla staring out and spying from her watching-place across the sea at lines 44-46, enclosed in the description of Heracles' deeds: ὁ τὴν θαλάσσης Αὐσονίτιδος μυχοὺς / στενοὺς ὀπιπεύουσαν ἀγρίαν κύνα / κτανὼν ὑπὲρ σπήλυγγος ἰχθυωμένην. This can be taken as a paradigm case for the spatial and temporal set up of the poem and the way the ability to see creates the expectant nature of the world in the poem, as it waits for events to come; potential for now, but to be actualized in future. It also demonstrates well the intricacy of intertextual engagement specifically tied to embedded character vision. As Rengakos has stated, this (one-off) use of ὀπιπεύω in the *Alexandra* in effect rewrites the Homeric description of Scylla (*Od.* 12.85ff) replacing περιαιμώωσα (περιαιμάω 'seek round') at *Od.* 12.95 with a verb that Lycophron uses 'im Sinne von "ringsum (mit den Augen) suchen" und wohl nicht wie die Scholien z. St. als ἐνθουσιῶσα καὶ κινουμένη verstanden.'[189] Scylla becomes more like a look-out, a watcher, fishing from a vantage point over her cave, who despite her close attention will become a victim of Heracles. Although the reader may think of the extended description of Scylla as a far more monstrous hunter in the *Odyssey*, here her only action is looking around. The passivity of this is emphasized because, despite the animal designations applied to her, the main actions we hear about are those done to her; her killing by Heracles and her restoration by her father using fire.[190] Like Cassandra, her ability to see

[186] See West (1984). The poem also becomes less focused temporally as the prophecy accelerates towards the distant future.

[187] See Yacobi (2000).

[188] See Squire on this aesthetic Squire (2010) 273-274. See Hornblower (2015) 47-49 on the thoroughgoing western interest in the poem (shown further throughout the commentary).

[189] Rengakos (1994) 119 n. 37; *Odyssey* 12.95: αὐτοῦ δ' ἰχθυάᾳ, σκόπελον περιμαιμώωσα.

[190] Even in the later description of the fatal encounter of Odysseus' men with Scylla (648-655) the fact that she is a victim of Heracles is also stressed and the action of devouring the men is attributed to Hades. Again she is found in a 'lookout-place' (ναυτιλοφθόρους σκοπὰς, 650) and her and her actions are also part of the landscape. The description of Scylla as a bestial threat to men (μιξόθηρος) very much fits the stereotypical fearful characterization

endows no agency to change the future; she cannot prevent her own suffering, and she has no voice; in fact in the *Odyssey* account, her puppy-like whining is directly contrasted with her fearsome appearance and actions (*Od.* 12.85-87). Scylla represents another figure in the poem who sees but is deprived of voice, a voice that the *Alexandra* creates for Cassandra alone.[191] This trope of contrasting sight and silence to evoke helplessness is to be found also in the *Argonautica* (3.1137-8) where Medea's handmaids look on the situation determined by Hera but remain voiceless (ἤδη δ' ἀμφίπολοι μὲν **ὀπιπεύουσαι** ἄπωθεν /**σιγῇ** ἀνιάζεσκον· ἐδεύετο δ' ἤματος ὥρη). The same verb for seeing appears again in Homer at *Il.* 4.371 where Agamemnon rebukes Diomedes, asking him τί δ' ὀπιπεύεις πολέμοιο γεφύρας;.[192] The precise meaning of the formula πολέμοιο γεφύρας was debated by critics in antiquity and still is today; does it refer to the still open space between massed armies, in which the leader-heroes in the conflict would be expected to enter and act in, or to the men themselves fronting the battle-lines?[193] That Scylla watches over the μυχοὺς στενούς of the sea suggests a comment on this debate[194] leaning towards the notion of empty space about to be filled by action, and further creating the atmosphere of anticipation in a world that, like Cassandra, waits and watches.[195] Yet in that seeing, it is also as if events already are; we will see this effect again and again through the poem, chiming with ideas about writing and material poetics (section 5). Scylla is slightly different, in that, although a monstrous feature of the wilds, she is still a living being; however, inanimate elements of the landscape also have the ability to see attributed to them in the *Alexandra*, and again they watch and wait for events to unfold. Thus the sensate

---

of femininity, which Biffis has shown can be applied also to the messenger's description of Cassandra (Biffis (2012) 18ff.).

[191] Following Hummel (2006) 213.

[192] Rengakos (1994) 119 with nn.37-38 points out that the D scholia gloss it as ἐπιτηρεῖν and περισκοπεῖν.

[193] Full discussion in Reece (2009b) 301-314.

[194] See Rengakos (1994); McNelis and Sens (2011a) on Lycophron and Homeric *zetema*.

[195] Perhaps modelled on the watchful dragon in A.*R.* 2.405-7: .... δράκων, τέρας αἰνὸν ἰδέσθαι,/ἀμφὶς **ὀπιπεύει δεδοκημένος**: οὐδέ οἱ ἦμαρ, /οὐ κνέφας ἥδυμος ὕπνος ἀναιδέα δάμναται ὄσσε. The use of the (irregular) perfect participle of δέχομαι chimes with the way perfect participles indicate the odd temporal state of events in the *Alexandra*. See 2.2 on *Alexandra* 257; Cadau (2015) 148-149 notes the link between δέχομαι and δοκεύω (cf. *Alexandra* 509, 1168, 1326) 'the [passive/active] action of focussing on one thing only'.

landscape also reminds the reader of the odd temporal status of the poem, as natural features of the world also seems to be waiting for events to happen. In some cases these features are marked in some way by the passage of time, so that we do not only get a description of the landscape awaiting the future, but also how its features remain permanently altered by events, as time runs on past into the future in Cassandra's prophecy. The land is left with some sort of inscription, name or scar, which acts as testament to the events witnessed (just as the *Alexandra* will to Cassandra's visions). This takes the poem close to the poetics of 'leaving a trace' that Hunter delineates for the *Argonautica* and the Hellenistic predilection for offering *aetia* for the world known to the Hellenistic reader.[196] Sometimes this has a distinct metapoetic flavour, for example, the marks etched in the land by the huge raging Achilles-eagle-omen, his wings διαγράφων (261, 'marking out') the land suggesting epic scale and a large generalised space, a blank page which Homer will fill with the empty 'theatre' of a battlefield for Achilles and Hector's duel. The straight track traced by 'bandy' steps (262, ῥαιβῷ τυπωτὴν τόρμαν ἀγκύλῃ βάσει), raises further questions of priority and truth read against the messenger's advice at *Alexandra* 10-11. Does the *Alexandra* straighten the Iliadic account, or does it re-read it crookedly?[197] The staining of the land (αἱμάσσων, 266) also suggests that, from Cassandra's point of view, Hector's reputation has been tarnished by the Homeric tradition. Throughout the poem we see the image repeatedly of disordered paths being re-inscribed as neat and orderly lines which we may read metapoetically as newly neat (but hard-worked and strict) trimeter reworking past literature of all sorts of genres, or 'paths of song' into one monolithic written text. However, this is also tied to the poem's generative colonial imagery, for example Diomedes' descendant ploughing the land in furrows (624, αὔλακας),[198]as well as Achilles' (rather chilling and clinical) action as a ploughman that also suggests the inception of the literary tradition with the end of Troy (αὔλακος, 268).

---

[196] Hunter (2001) 100-101.

[197] Cf. 344 for ἀγκύλος; McNelis and Sens (2011a) on this *zetema*..

[198] This can also be linked to the colonial imagery of the poem (see on journeys and traces below 1.2.8), such as the neatly built nests of Diomedes' birds (metamorphosed men) at 600-604 (below 1.2.10). On the use of the 'path of

The future recognition of these signs that memorialize events are recognised within the text by their naming, hymning, and being spoken of, as are specific locations and people, often also by ritual actions.[199] At 550-3, the Spartan river (Κνηκιὼν πόρος) looks on the spectacle of the missiles hurled in the fight between the Dioscuri and their matched pair, Idas and Lynkeus (ἐπόψεται), something which for the (Messenian) people is ἄπιστα καὶ θαμβητὰ Φηραίοις κλύειν. This is another way that the visual and verbal interact, and show that the *Alexandra* is not confined to one particular idea of memorialisation, remembrance and the maintenance of reputation. The land is inscribed; as in the epigraphic practice, visual monument and spoken realisation of the written text is needed for full effect.

Another good example of this is the story of Setaea (1075-1082) whose suffering will result in re-naming of the landscape explicitly in her memory: σπιλὰς δ' ἐκείνη σῆς φερώνυμος τύχης / πόντον **προσαυγάζουσα φημισθήσεται** (1081-1082).[200] This is yet another instance of the ebb and flow between speech act, visual sign, and renewed speech act, suggesting collective voice and ritual activity.[201] Again, the landscape seeing is followed by a naming, as if it was waiting for this to happen all along. For example, at lines 401-2 Locrian Aias' remaining tomb guards or watches the seascape below (τύμβος … φυλάξει). The designation σκοπή is also found frequently in the poem (in addition to the instance describing Scylla's location at 650) so that the idea of anticipatory watching-out, and of having a vantage point from where events can be clearly seen is inscribed in the landscape of the poem and actors within it. These examples parallel the experience and sense perception of the main speaker, and the landscape and the body of Cassandra as it observes, senses and suffers in

song' metaphor in Lycophron see Gigante-Lanzara (2000) ad 121-123; Hurst and Kolde (2008) ad 118-127; Looijenga (2009) 72-75; Biffis (2012) 26-27.

[199] Mari (2009) 407; 427-430; 438-439.

[200] Biffis (2012) 100 n.141 on direct naming of female characters.

[201] The closest parallel is with Hecuba's transformation into the coastal *kunossema* in Euripides' play; a drama in which women's ability to take control of their representation and manipulate their own image is to the fore to the point where the play almost becomes a comment on women's suitability to tragic spectacle (see O' Sullivan (2008)). The key scene is Hecuba's appeal to Agamemnon to look on her as a pitiful painting (*Hec.* 807-808); 'parallel to aspects of ancient literary criticism that describe an emotive identity between poets and their works' (O' Sullivan (2008) 175ff.) On tragic aetiology and the *Alexandra*; see now Biffis (2012).

advance. Cassandra sees signs, speaks, and her words again become transformed to signs to be observed in the form of the written text. Land and body are marked and written suggesting the fluctuating identification between the written poem itself and the living voice of Cassandra, where textuality allows such a record of the passage of time and its consequences to exist. This also suggests, that Sophocles' famous metaphor of prospective wives as fields to be ploughed (*Antigone* 569) is developed through the link to the prophetic and colonial *telē* of the *Alexandra*. The landscape itself can be figured as feminine, something that is often singled out as a trope in readings of colonial/imperial literature, and that would extend Biffis' focus on the 'feminine perspective' in the poem,[202] and as ever the effect is mirror-like as the landscape stares back at Cassandra. Thus the political or colonial thrust of the poem cannot be separated from ideas about the female body and the implicitly feminine, unknown space that the central speaker embodies, as detailed in the reading of Hummel.[203] Cassandra and the land anticipate their conquering to come, increasing the feeling of manifest destiny both in terms of tragedy (the pain of having full (visual) knowledge of the suffering to come in advance and of being powerless to stop it) and the prophetic movement of the poem towards a period of settled world rule.[204]

Further instances of σκοπαί are distributed through the length of the poem too; from line 275 (one of the nymphs' favoured haunts on Olympus, ὕπερθε Πιμπλείας σκοπήν), to 574 (a simple reference to the Κυνθίαν ... σκοπήν in Delian landmark), 714 (the cliff top that the Sirens will throw themselves off, ἐξ ἄκρας σκοπῆς) and 1311 (the dragon guarding the golden

---

[202] See e.g. Stephens' (2003) discussion of Alexandrian literature in these terms. The *Alexandra* thus draws on and goes beyond the identification of the violated city and its women in tragedy. See Steiber (2011) 82 on body and city in Euripides (e.g. *Tro.* 1024); 5-6 (with n.17) citing Barlow (1974) 28, 117: 'Troy's rise and fall are synonymous with the presence or absence of her walls', a personified city whose invasion is 'symbolic and literal rape' (28; 117). Schein (1984) 9, 176 on how κρηδέμνα links Troy's battlements and the veil of married Trojan women in the *Iliad*; the link between the sack and rape is 'explicit' at 22.466-72 when Andromache throws away her veil. In the *Alexandra* (69-71) Troy is personified, terrified at its violation and failure to anticipate it happening, marked by visual language (1.2.5). Analogy between body and building is also explored in the description of Cassandra's prison (section 4).

[203] Hummel (2006) 215ff.

[204] For comparison of the suffering of the land under the mass of the Greek army at Troy in *Iliad* 2 and the way the war is portrayed in the *Alexandra* see below 2.2.

fleece, in a characteristically over-determined and emphatic three-word line: δρακοντοφρούροις ἐσκεπασμένην σκοπαῖς).[205] At 1326 we find Skyros πάλαι δοκεύει; this should also encourage us to see the debated grammatical subject of 1364 as Asia rather than Paris, ἐπεὶ Πελασγοὺς εἶδε Ῥυνδακοῦ ποτῶν.[206] In line with the poem's acceleration to its Herodotean and wide-scale view of east-west conflict as the shaping factor in world history, the anticipatory seer or watcher in the poem becomes a whole continent itself.

1.2.5. Interior and Invisible Spaces: Violation and Safety

Alongside the panoramic and large-scale figuring of the landscape are the numerous claustrophobic, enclosed, dark and interior spaces that appear in the poem, as Lambin has noted.[207] Cassandra's description of her prison and Athena's shrine are discussed in more detail below 4.1-2, but I will give another example here of how vision and the play between the seen and unseen are important here. At lines 69 and following, Cassandra laments Troy (in direct address), the seer showing readers the personified city looking for itself on a vision of fire and destruction as it falls. This takes us into an interior space (the 'halls' of the Trojan palace)[208] and what the personified Troy sees, as if looking outwards from somewhere in itself,

---

[205] Again note the revelation/obfuscation paradox appearing again (Cusset (2009) 119): the dragon covers and protects the fleece, making it invisible, and at the same time it keeps a keen eye on it. Hornblower (2015) ad 1311 for appreciation of this three-word line.

[206] See Holzinger ad loc. for debate.

[207] See Lambin (2009) 165-166; Rougier-Blanc (2009); Hornblower (2015) 316 ad loc.

[208] See Sistakou (2012) 146ff. on Trojan Household and family. 'Halls' is the translation of Mair (1921) for δόμων in line 70 (the word can mean 'chamber' as well as 'house'/'household' in tragedy (LSJ)), slightly preferable to 'homes' as it conveys the looking from within to without and the violation of the interior, fitted to the context of the Trojan sack and how events in the Alexandra are allied to Cassandra's own violation. The phrase καὶ διαρπαγὰς δόμων (i.e. δια-αρπαγή) emphasises the through-going movement of 'seizure, robbery, rape' that the English 'plunder' aims to capture (cf. e.g. Numbers 14:3 in reference to the plunder of women and children). This reading thus rests on and assumes a particular idea of Greek/Trojan space in Trojan War literature, especially as the familiarity of the way Greek/Trojan space is arranged in the *Iliad* (exterior camp and interior/domestic city/household) orientates one to think of this scene as outward-looking from within. On space in the *Iliad* see Strauss-Clay (2011); the 'Trojan perspective' in the *Alexandra,* Sistakou (2008) 112; 120; 149-157; and with reference to this feature in Euripides and Lycophron, Biffis (2012) 89ff.

Consider e.g. *Tro.* 511-567 where choral lyric functions in effect as messenger report, or lyric epic (511-2: ἀμφί μοι Ἴλιον, ὦ Μοῦσα...) detailing the Greeks' surprise ambush of Troy which ends with the enemies' heart-stopping penetration right into Trojan bedrooms (562-567). Hdt. 9.42.3 features the rare (in classical Greek)

mirrors the content of Cassandra's prophetic vision so far, and confirms its truth by being a future witness to her predictions. The reader is jettisoned into the future panic as Troy is penetrated and burned to cinematic effect, with no real difficult or de-familiarising language here in the direct address, so that the urgency of Cassandra's (present) and Troy's (future) sight is emphasized greatly, closing the desperate gap in between and emphasizing that Cassandra's words will effect no change. Thus, by aligning their sightlines across time *pathos* is increased. The jump into embedded focalization allows this mixing of points in time and imbues the scene with further significance. As the two moments converge, the contrast between the present prophetic sight of Cassandra and the tragic ignorance of the Trojan people who ignore her is emphasized; the fire destroys and makes Troy unseen[209] just at the moment that it is perceived by the personified city-victim in the future. Further intensity is achieved in line 71 by squeezing together the participle describing Troy's perception of the destruction and the description of the 'annihilating fire' itself (... πῦρ ἐναυγάζουσαν αἰστωτήριον).[210] The (unique) use of the adjectival form αἰστωτήριος[211] here to describe the

---

διαρπαγή (*and* two instances of the verb διαρπάζω) so it is interesting that the context is the *direct quotation* of Mardonius' speech as he *reports an oracle*: if the Persians come to Greece and plunder the temple at Delphi, they will all be destroyed (....Πέρσας ἀπικομένους ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα διαρπάσαι τὸ ἱρὸν τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖσι, μετὰ δὲ τὴν διαρπαγὴν ἀπολέσθαι πάντας). There is a satisfying switch-round that fits the Herodotean scheme of east-west counteraction if we think of the *Alexandra* passage together with the historian's. In the *Alexandra*, the Greeks will plunder a temple and suffer the consequence, prefiguring future conflict. The noun is common in the Septuagint and Diodorus Siculus, and appears four times in Polybius (7.18.9; 8.32.1; 10.16.6; 18.27.4) but is not found in poetry except here.

[209] The contrast between fire (69-71) and flood (72-85) here perhaps elevates the fires of Troy to the elemental and divine destruction that Zeus' flood denotes (and the war as Zeus-ordained global destruction as found in the epic cycle: schol. (D) *Il.* 1.5, West (2003) 80-83). However, the shift from the desperate state of Troy in time to the past deluge and the faintly amusing underwater imagery makes interpretation more difficult. It may be better to think in terms of traditions of apocalypse writing here (e.g. West (2001); Polański (2004)), or of the general idea of fire itself as revealer to be revealed, familiar from the Prometheus myth in Hesiod, and found elsewhere (e.g. Soph. *Phil.* 297).

[210] Although the verb αὐγαζω appears again in the poem (147, 420, 941) this compound, with its connotations of 'illuminate' as well as 'behold' (LSJ s.v. ἐναυγάζω 1-2), appears only here and suggests a more dynamic relationship between the act of seeing and the sense object itself as active, and ἐν- suggesting a looking within as well as manifestation without at the same time. The verb does not appear in extant Greek again until the writings of Philo and Plotinus. This meeting of sightlines across time here is different to those meeting *in time*, for example, the erotic and violent dimensions of the gazes exchanged (or not) between Troilos and Achilles that McNelis and Sens (2011b) 74-76 have discussed.

annihilating fire embodies the paradoxes of the poem in miniature; of interlinked destruction and creation; of illumination and visibility, or revelation at the same time carrying connotations of 'making unseen'. The fire illuminates the scene, revealing it as it is destroyed, and the prophecy moves swiftly on. Reuse of the imagery of the household alongside αἰστόω comes at line 281-282 (.... οἷον κίον' **αἰστώσεις δόμων**, ἔρεισμα πάτρας δυστυχοῦς ὑποσπάσας) where Cassandra laments how destiny (δαῖμον) will destroy Hector, 'pillar' of the Priamids, underlining the link between his death, the destruction of the household and lineage, and the fall of the city, suggesting an intratextual link through the choice of language to recall this earlier scene of destruction, the consequence of Hector's death. The use of different focalizers within the prophecy is also a way of pointing to characters' different levels of knowledge, in contrast with the authoritative sight of Cassandra, and further rendering the pain and frustration of her situation, as if she is a member of the audience of a tragedy who know the *telos* of the story all too well, on top of the status of the poem as a prophetic vision. This mirrors her mediating place on stage in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* where she knows more than the chorus, bringing her closer to the audience and their level of knowledge about what is about to happen, and the audience share in her frustration and failure to make herself understood to the chorus on-stage. The added oddity that this almost makes it seem as if she has knowledge that stretches outside of the representation on-stage somehow places her in the real world of spectators who do understand her, and aligns her emotional experience of events in the work, with the audience reaction in the external world. This feature is exploited in the *Alexandra* in two ways. Firstly, as Biffis has shown, Cassandra mediates across two groups of narratees, internal and external.[212] Secondly, it implies the character's self-

---

Cf. E. *Ba.* 596: πῦρ οὐ λεύσσεις, οὐδ' αὐγάζῃ...; [E.] *Rh.* 793, where the messenger describes his peering about and suffering unexpected violence in the dark. That he is careful to explain he hears the groaning of dying men first (787-9) perhaps indicates an interest already about whether seeing or hearing comes first in the Homeric scene of waking and reacting to horror in the *Doloneia,* discussed by the Homeric scholia (Schol. *Il.* 10.520-2 (Erbse)).

[211] As stated αἰστωτήριος (LSJ: 'destructive'; DGE: 'aniquilador') is a total hapax. For cognates see LSJ s.v. αἰστος ('unseen'); αἰστόω (GSD: 'to make unseen, annihilate'; Aut. *Hom.* (ἄϝιστος) 'put out of sight, annihilate' (e.g. *Od.* 10.259); Slater *Pindar* 'ravage, destroy (of fire)' (*Pyth.* 3.37, *Pae.* 6.97); *Mid.Lid.* 'formed from ἄιστος – to make unseen, to annihilate'; DGE ἀϊστόω ('hacer desaparecer, aniquilar'); ἡ αἰστοσυνη = ἀπωλεια – *EM* 43.21; LSJ: ὁ/ἡ αἴστορ (-ορος) ('unknowing, unaware').

[212] Biffis (2012) 128-129.

consciousness about her existence as a representation (the *Alexandra*) which guarantees the continued existence of her voice and the truth of her prophecies that will be understood by the poem's contemporary readers.[213]

Following on immediately from these three lines on the future burning of Troy during the close of the war, we make a fantastic hop back in time to another wholesale destruction of a city via the specific detail of a feature of the Trojan plain, Dardanus' tomb (72) as part of Cassandra's direct lament for Troy (69, στένω, στένω σε...; 72, στένω σε, πάτρα...). The city wiped out is that of Dardanus in Samothrace, this time by flood rather than fire, and a vision of the past rather than the future. Dardanos' journey to the Troad as he escapes the divine deluge is detailed and becomes part of the interest in the 'archaeology' of Troy early in the poem that Evina Sistakou has described.[214] Instead of the claustrophobic and fiery scenes within Troy's walls, looking from the inside out. Here we borrow the eyes of the people left behind and swimming away, looking on their towers falling from without and seeing that death is near at lines 81-82: ... τοὶ δὲ λοισθίαν/ νήχοντο μοῖραν προὐμμάτων δεδορκότες. Sight and the certain knowledge of 'doom' coincide (as commonly found in Attic tragedy), before the area is transformed into the peaceful but rather absurd habitat of peckish sea-mammals. The light ending of this episode seems rather odd considering the intense lament for Troy and Phrygia that precedes it, although there are comparable shifts in tone elsewhere in the poem; something that I emphasize is one of the challenges in interpreting it. It is of course Dardanus' journey that brings the Palladion to the Troad (and results in him founding a city), and through his son Tros, begins both the line that results in the Priamids and that which results in Aeneas.[215] This is not dwelt on in the text at all, but perhaps the reader who thought of this genealogy, and the pattern of city destruction and founding would also think

---

[213] Cf. Biffis (2012) 114ff.

[214] Sistakou (2008) 73ff.

[215] That is Dardanos, Tros, Ilus, Laomedon, Priam, Hector; Dardanos, Tros, Assaraeus, Capys, Anchises, Aeneas: see OCD[4] s.v. Dardanos (*Il.* 20.215; Apollod. 3.12.1).

forwards to the survival of Troy in its Roman descendants and the way the poem restores the Priamids to a Trojan future in the west.[216]

1.2.6: Special Seers within the Prophecy.

There are also other characters in the poem that seem to have some special ability in terms of sight and seeing, and who are able to operate outside the normal realms of mortal perception, approaching (but not surpassing) Cassandra's own ability. Several seers and oracles appear, especially in the early part of the poem, building tension as the Greek host approaches Troy, as Sistakou has demonstrated.[217] These figures usually meet sticky ends, contributing further to the theme of the futility of prophetic knowledge and prescient sight of events in the poem. As we have seen to some extent already, the former part of the *Alexandra* emphasizes the uselessness of foresight in the face of fate, divine punishment and of course the unsettling fact of Cassandra's inability to be heard and communicate what she sees to others means the trope of prophetic knowledge as futile is particularly intense.

This changes later on in the poem where a different aspect of seers and their oracles comes more to the fore and the poem moves broadly from destruction to creation, and from voice to text.[218] We could compare how the figure of Calchas is used to activate the narration of the Oracles of Asclepius in Daunia at 1047-51, his tomb of more use as an empty visual marker than his words when he was alive as a speaking prophet. The imagery of paths and the need for a guide that is found in the opening of the poem (9-12) is transformed into something more than Cassandra's words, as she prophesies about the signs and instructions that lay out the paths and physical journeys that must be taken, and the active tasks of settling, founding and building that must subsequently take place. The motif of ordained

---

[216] See McNelis and Sens (2011b). Again, this supports Hornblower's (2015) observations that the *Alexandra*'s interest in Rome and the west is not confined to the end of the poem but runs through it from the outset (see p.48 but cumulative evidence is numerous in the commentary). Note, however, that the poem does not seem to follow the Italian version of Dardanus' lineage, where Corythus is his father, rather than Zeus, through his relationship with Electra.

[217] Sistakou (2008) 103ff.

[218] Cf. Biffis (2012) on lament and oracle.

travel and settlement is taken further in the case of Aeneas (as we would expect of the pioneer-hero), where there is a clustering of the vocabulary of founding and physical building (e.g. Aeneas and Odysseus 1242, cf. 805ff. Odysseus buried in Etruria;[219] the prophecy at 1252 leads on to acts of establishment: 1253 κτίσει; 1259ff. e.g. ἀνθήσει, 1259; δωμήσεται 1272; ὑμνηθεῖσαν 1262, confirming Aeneas' status as active founder in collective utterance hymning him as most religiously correct).[220] The pattern of oracles within the vision, like Cassandra's prophecy itself, no longer points towards a future disaster but to building the future and Trojan-Roman success in uniting east and west.

Cassandra thus subsumes the words of some of these future speakers, that is, seeing, hearing, interpreting and reporting signs before they will in historical time, and laying prior claim to their authority and knowledge. We can also think of this as a metaphorical 'seeing in the dark', where what is hidden is revealed early to her eyes.[221] This pattern of revelation and hiding also applies to the past and retains this visual trope, as for example in the narration of Triton's gifting of a κρατήρ to the Greeks (886ff.) that will result in the founding of Cyrene; the Abystians try to prevent this by making the treasure hidden: κρύψουσ' ἄφαντον ἐν χθονὸς νειροῖς μυχοῖς (896).[222] However, these places are always still open to the prophetess' gaze, which penetrates to see the unseen.[223] These hidden objects, journeys, rivers and routes are also part of the knowledge of the seer who goes beyond normal sight, and this is of course analogised to reading too, where intellectual perusal also uncovers what is 'hidden' in Cassandra's words and the *Alexandra* itself. While Cassandra's extraordinary ability is obviously to the fore, there are in fact three figures in the poem that stand out for their

---

[219] Mooney 1242 ad loc. shows the ultimate source for this to be Hellanicus (*ap*. Dion. Hal. 1.72.2) which tells the story of them travelling together from Molossia to Italy and founding Rome there.

[220] See McNelis and Sens (2011b) on the renewal of Trojan glory at the end of the poem that Cassandra places herself and the Priamid line back at the heart of.

[221] On Lycophron and the Sibyl see Cusset (2004) and Biffis (2012) 176ff. Below 5.1.

[222] I have written about this part of the poem in an earlier MA thesis, so do not discuss the imagery of paths, guides and colonization and the intertextual relationship with the *Argonautica* and Pindar's *Pythian* 4 in detail here.

[223] See e.g. the hidden stream at Cumae (1277).

abilities to 'see in the dark' in particular. The first is Proteus (115ff.), a moral figure who travels unseen and without seeing by an underground path, praying efficaciously and berating Paris;[224] the second Perseus, whose story is full of seeing and not seeing, as well as the wronged Medusa (836-846);[225] the third is Nauplius. The latter may seem especially prominent to today's reader who tends to think of Homer before the rest of the epic cycle; however, to the well-read ancient, aware of the several tragedies named for, featuring and performed about Nauplius and his son Palamedes, and the link that his myth makes between the action at the Achaian camp at Troy and post-war revenge, his prominence in the *Alexandra* would make more sense.[226] It is Nauplius and family who persuade Greek wives to be unfaithful in revenge for the death of Palamedes at the hands of the Greeks persuaded by a scheming Odysseus, including the house of Agamemnon.[227] Further, as a character who makes a journey in the dark to commit revenge on the Greeks, he surely tallies with the way Cassandra's speech must be journeyed through by the reader if we are to understand the story of the Greeks' crimes and punishments as a whole. Issues of communication and trust in the reading of visual and written signs suffuse the stories of Palamedes (in some versions the inventor of writing, yet betrayed by letters through Odysseus' ruse)[228]and Nauplius, conceiving written text as something that can signify falsely, divorced from a speaker. It is this mistrust of writing which means (in part) that it becomes identified with the negative stereotypes of the female voice. However, it also this very separation of speaker and speech or sign that has the potential to grant women a public voice and associates femininity with

---

[224] Implying some parallels with Cassandra herself. See Sens (2010) 305-307 on Cassandra's (playfully intertextual) prayer that the Dioscuri will not be seen on the Trojan battlefield, making this detail in the *Iliad* the fulfilment of her wish. This also suggests that prayer may be thought of as a species of silent speaking, an utterance that reaches its addressee despite Cassandra's difficult voice. This may be because the addressee is a god, but it may also suggest prayer, like lament, is one of the types of utterance open to women to perform publically.

[225] Below 4.2.

[226] See also Hornblower (2015) ad 384-386; 771; 1090-1098; 1099.

[227] Although the dealings of Nauplius' (or his sons') with Clytemnestra are not found in the *Alexandra,* a reference to his revenge plot precedes the narration of Agamemnon's death at 1099ff. (cf. Hornblower (2015) 1090-1098 ad loc.). Cf. Biffis (2012) 99ff. on the importance of adultery, a counterpoint to rape, in the *Alexandra*. Nauplios' dealings with the wives of other Greeks do appear elsewhere in the poem (1217ff.).

[228] See Woodford (1994); Sommerstein (2000); Jenkins (2005).

textuality.[229] As ever, Lycophron exploits both sets of associations simultaneously. Nauplius' prominence in the *Alexandra* makes sense in these terms; his lights in the darkness, and the visual signs that appear as guides to salvation for the Greeks, subvert the usual metaphor of light-clarity-truth that the poem also challenges through the voice of its central speaker. The Greeks do not read the beacons correctly; Nauplius' trick succeeds and the Greeks are left shipwrecked, drowning in the dark sea at night (384-386). This also extends the motifs of the *Agamemnon* and *Trojan Women*, as answering fires to those that announce victory, but also mark the turning point to revenge and the reversal of victor and victim. Again and again in the poem, as we will examine below, different variations on this motif of reading and misreading, visual signs and appearances occur. Simply taking things as they appear can be mistaken, and straightforward trust in mimetic realism and verisimilitude cannot be trusted to convey reality and truth. Instead, the hard work of the poet to create a truthful voice is held to a different set of aesthetic values, and characterizes the struggle and frustration of Cassandra as she tries to convey the truth she sees before her.[230] This connection between the identity of Cassandra and the poetics of the *Alexandra* is considered in more detail below (Section 5).

1.2.7: Vision and Desire: Violence, Revenge and Exchanges of the Gaze.

The play of focalization also supports the conclusions of scholars who have stressed how important desire and its frustration is to the *Alexandra* on multiple levels.[231] Hummel's discussion in particular connects erotic and intellectual desire for consummation (also contextualized in terms of sacred marriage with the god); the desire to understand the

[229] Stehle (1997) 114ff; 311; Stevenson (2002) for Latin female-authored inscriptions.

[230] Following Hummel (2006) 215ff.

[231] Hummel (2006); Biffis (2012), esp. 101 on the 'three ill-omened nets of passion' in the poem that bring together Ajax, Agamemnon and Paris, following his excessively lustful and disastrous act.

unknown, hidden and feminine, and the frustrations encountered in the pursuit.[232] As Cusset has shown, this also maps onto the desire to communicate, and he presses the lack of dialogue (or the potential for dialogue) in the poem; not just because it is a monologue in the main, but because of the way the poem is set up.[233] Just as the frame suggests that Cassandra is not in complete control of her own voice, the repeated use of embedded focalization suggests that she is not in complete control of her own vision, but also (ever reflexive) that she inhabits and controls others.[234] And, in another parallel to the lack of 'dialogue' in terms of vision, exchanges of the gaze are rare in the poem and also reflect the pattern of thwarted desire and antipathy towards uncontained *eros*.[235] This, and ancient ideas about extramission and the eyes as actively desiring has already been explored somewhat in the discussion of Achilles' ambush of Troilos by McNelis and Sens (2011b).[236] It should not surprise us that the one place

---

[232] This is not in Plato's sense where the two are identical in their true state, but closer to this idea in modern critical analyses that press the connection between desire and reading.

[233] Cusset (2009).

[234] Cusset (2009); cf. Hummel (2006) 214ff; hence the inhabiting of multiple positions subject to but also analogous with Apollo or an omniscient narrator.

[235] In agreement with Biffis (2012) 94 that Cassandra is not simply 'anti-sex' (Sens (2010) 305) but concerned with the excesses of eros (and its mirror virginity), becoming a guarantor for the containment of relationships between men and women in their proper socially sanctioned and ritual place of marriage (in ancient society).

[236] On 'lover' Achilles see King (1987) in general; in Aeschylus' lost Achilles trilogy Michelakis (2002) 41ff.; and in Greek and Roman literature Fantuzzi (2012), including in the *Alexandra* (18ff., 42ff.). McNelis and Sens (2011b) 73-76 see the Troilus scene as part of a unified strategy to attack Achilles as sexually passive and 'elevate...Troilus' military status', in light of the description of Achilles on Lemnos a few lines earlier, subordinated to Hector's spear (276-80). The poet 'paradoxically [...] turns the epic version on its head' (although they note there is no trace of the relationship in the description of Troilus in the *Iliad* and that there is not much information in other early sources on the Troilus story (e.g. Proclus (*Cypria* Arg.11) records only that Troilus is killed). They argue this is the case 'whatever the source' (McNelis and Sens (2010) 248-9)). Further, there are also some differences with the earlier passage. While Achilles does lack success here, he is not made passive explicitly as the focus of our attention in the Lemnos passage; in fact, the focalization is utterly different. In the earlier passage, the reader's focus was placed firmly on the subdued Achilles. Here, the reader is first put on the receiving end of Troilus' dangerously seductive gaze, like Achilles (308-11), a short 'breather' for them, where, just as for Troilus his ability to attract Achilles seemed to keep him safe for a while. This is interrupted and followed by an abrupt switch to the scene of Troilus' blood all over the altar at his ambush (312-3). Whilst Troilus escapes without being sexually violated, Achilles eventually succeeds when it comes to his special skill of killing as alternative consummation; all he is good for in Cassandra's eyes. As McNelis and Sens have shown, outside the context of martial epic, this quality is far from praiseworthy and it is the visuality of the scene that gives it its erotic charge. Achilles, Cassandra and the reader do not get to enjoy their exchange with Troilus (compare also the passage on the eye of Penthesilea (999-1001, attracting Achilles and bringing about Thersites' death). Rather than 'downgrading the martial status of Achilles' as in the Lemnos scene (Sistakou (2008) 154) this scene retains and contrasts the way his swiftness in killing puts

in the poem where there is an exchange of gazes in a way revolves around Helen, in a catalogue of her male partners marked by visual language.[237] In line 147-148, Cassandra describes how Helen will clearly see two 'wolves' and return the sharp gaze of these 'eagles', Theseus and Paris (δοιὼ μὲν ἁρπακτῆρας **αὐγάσει** λύκους/ πτηνοὺς τριόρχας **αἰετοὺς ὀφθαλμίας).**[238] At line 168, her future vision of the fourth of her husbands, Deiphobus, Paris' brother, is described (τὸν δ' αὖ τέταρτον αὐθόμαιμον ὄψεται), then finally the fifth suitor, Achilles who is 'distracted by her phantom face in his dreams' (... ἐν δὲ δεμνίοις /τὸν ἐξ ὀνείρων πέμπτον ἐστροβημένον /εἰδωλοπλάστῳ προσκαταξανεῖ ῥέθει ...). The perspective switches here, so that while Helen sees the first four of her male partners, Achilles sees (some version) of her, and the great hero's desire and failure to consummate it becomes a major part of his characterisation in the poem, and its overall 'deheroization' of the Greek heroes at Troy which several scholars have already demonstrated.[239] As well as the brief scenes with the dream-Helen and the real (but soon-to-perish) Troilos (cf. Sens on Achilles, the Amazon Clete and Thersites (999-1000: ἧς ἐκπνεούσης λοῖσθον ὀφθαλμὸς τυπεὶς / πιθηκομόρφῳ πότμον Αἰτωλῷ φθόρῳ), the lines on Iphigenia (195-6) also furnish 'lovesick' Achilles with another insubstantial 'vanishing' woman (καὶ τὴν ἄφαντον εἶδος ἠλλοιωμένην / γραῖαν σφαγείων ἠδὲ χερνίβων πέλας) as the action of Artemis taken to save the young woman is also tied to Achilles' failure to see, know and grasp his objects of desire.[240] In this case then, the

---

him at a disadvantage in love, where the erotic encounter is over all too quickly (cf. Fantuzzi (2012); further Sistakou (2008) 57-58, 110 with n.173, 163ff.).

[237] This mini-catalogue of Helen's men can be compared to the repeated use of third-person future verbs of sight in the prediction of the wanderings of Odysseus and Helen's own husband Menelaos in his travels in search of her later in the poem (see 1.2.8). Perhaps we can also view it as a parodic 'catalogue of women' that Cassandra is forced to look upon through Helen's eyes.

[238] Contrast the lowered virginal eyes in Aeschylus frr. 242-3 from *Toxotides*, the story of Actaeon and Artemis: 242: †άδων ταῖς† ἁγναῖς παρθένοις γαμηλίων /Λέκτρων ταπεινὴ βλεμμάτων ῥέπει βολή (reading Walker's conjecture ταπεινὴ (*TrGF:* λέκτρων †αστειμη†). In 243 the speaker (Actaeon) claims he can also spot the eye and sense a *neas gunaikos* who has had male contact. See Sommerstein (2008) ad loc. who suggests similar details are to be found in Callimachus' *Bath of Pallas* (see further Morrison (2005)). Cf. Sophocles *Antigone* 759 for the bridal figure's eyes as sites of desire.

[239] McNelis and Sens (2011b); cf. Sistakou (2008).

[240] On Iphigenia in the *Alexandra* see Biffis (2014).

deployment of vision contributes to the devaluation of the Greek heroes and the demonstration of their sexual incontinence, their excess of desire that Biffis has shown so well is what is vehemently attacked in the poem, and also shows Achilles' lack of perception in contrast with Cassandra herself.[241] The connection made in Greek discourse between eyesight and erotic desire is another aspect of visuality that the poem explores, but it is made specific to its central character, who sees everything, but is forced to do so by the god. This invasion of her senses is also how Hummel construes Cassandra as an unwilling partner in a sacred marriage.[242] Indeed, once relation between marriageable girls is subordinated to ritual, as in the case of the Locrian maidens (1141ff.), the description is still underpinned by the language of vision and of watching and waiting for events to happen that have peppered our discussion thus far. However, the scene combines their fear of what will happen (1162, παπταλώμεναι)[243] with the men who watch and wait to act (1168: κόρας δοκεύσει, πέτρον ἐν χεροῖν ἔχων),[244] as the ritual brings past and future together as shown through these embodied verbs of sight. This ritual consummation, righting the wrong against Cassandra, will result in praise implied to be written and read (… ἐπαινέσει, / τεθμῷ **χαράξας**, τοὐπιλώβητον γένος, 1172-1173).

The rarity of exchanged gazes between two mortal characters expresses the rejection of *eros* by Cassandra, and can also be seen in parallel with the lack of context for spoken exchange and dialogue that Cusset has pinpointed, so that the only dialogue available is a

[241] See McNelis and Sens (2011b) on Achilles and below section 2. Hummel (2006) 215ff. has already shown how this theme of frustrated desire runs throughout the poem; Biffis (2012) 100-101 takes this further by examining the interconnected imagery of the net or trap and lust in the poem. Taking the bait of course results in divine punishment, following the paradigmatic case of the lesser Ajax.

[242] Hummel (2006) 215ff.

[243] Cf. Xerxes and Persian defeat, 1433 (παμφαλάω: reduplicated form like παιφασσω). This perhaps suggests the modesty of the maidens who are astonished by their undeserved and fearful fate, replicating the experience of Cassandra. That this simile makes Persian defeat like that of the maidens suggests a parallel between ritual consummation and the way the Asia/Europe conflict will eventually come to an end.

[244] δοκεύω cf. 509, 1126.

(perhaps silent, potential) one between reader and work.[245] Characters in the prophecy are depicted as isolated from their environment as Cassandra herself is from her community, suffering sensory deprivation and/or death. As we saw above in the case of personified Troy, the inability to communicate across time coupled with visions of the future can be used to striking effect. As well as the recurrent instances of being enclosed, buried and hidden that we see throughout the poem,[246] we stumble across instances of sight being forcibly prevented, for example in the story of Amyntor and Phoenix (421-3). Rather than blinding, we hear about the embodied deliberate blocking of sightlines between enemies, even beyond death, (e.g. 445-6 ὡς μὴ βλέπωσι, μηδὲ νερτέρων ἕδρας / δύντες, φόνῳ λουσθέντας ἀλλήλων τάφους), where the seer brothers, Amphilochus and Mopsus, are interred so that they cannot see each other's tombs after they are dead.[247] The story of Panopeus and Crisus, the brothers who hate each other, even in the womb, shares the theme of mutual strife also found in the earlier passage, and again demonstrates the extent to which Cassandra's prophetic vision can stretch (941: οὔπω τὸ Τιτοῦς λαμπρὸν αὐγάζων φάος), and the poet's interest in visual effect in itself.[248] Despite this, it is difficult to take the differences between Cassandra's unroofed prison and the Sibyl's roofed dwelling[249] in a way that is not literally symbolic of the character's respective, thwarted and achieved virginity (perhaps a sign that the Sibyl has more secrets to

---

[245] Cusset (2009).

[246] Lambin (2009) 165.

[247] That vision stops even for prophets in death is suggested by *Alexandra* 1372-3 where Cassandra when dead will only hear what she reports now; this seems to mark a point in the poem where the transformation to written text object is recalled to the reader, and certainly is in the oracular mode (cf. Biffis 176ff.). It is not surprising that these lines have been held in suspicion and the transition from vision does not settle the interpolation argument, unless you wanted to read only hearing as a sign that the following lines were an addition. I do not think that we do. Cf. 6.0-6.1 below.

[248] How this relates to a scientific or perhaps medical gaze needs more consideration and disentangling in regard to the assumptions of a modern used to the internal images of the body granted by X-rays and ultrasound. There is perhaps scope to extend this discussion in terms of the birth imagery of the poem and the psychoanalytic approach of Lambin (2009), but this is outside the remit of this thesis.

[249] 348-351: ἐγὼ δὲ τλήμων ἡ γάμους ἀρνουμένη, / ἐν παρθενῶνος λαΐνου τυκίσμασιν / ἄνις τεράμνων εἰς ἀνώροφον στέγην / εἱρκτῆς ἀλιβδύσασα λυγαίας δέμας; cf. 1278-1280: Ζωστηρίου τε κλιτύν, ἔνθα παρθένου / στυγνὸν Σιβύλλης ἐστὶν οἰκητήριον, / γρώνῳ βερέθρῳ συγκατηρεφὲς στέγης. Cassandra begins the poem high on a hill; the Sibyl is located on one, but safe, deep within it. Still some play in the fact her 'roof' is in fact a pit (i.e. non-material too).

reveal, while the *Alexandra* allows the reader a look in on what is now shown to be true, just as the existence of the poem affirms the reality of Cassandra's voice and the truth of her predictions).[250] Finally, within this set of imagery, the description of Cilla (319-322) buried alongside her just-born child is perhaps (certainly in my view) the most gruesome in the poem, with the tragic kicker that this will not prevent the war, and that it should have been Paris, the 'curse-child' who was despatched with by Priam after Hecuba's dream.[251]

1.2.8: Vision, Journeying and Travel.

For all these dark internal-focussed scenes, the poem nevertheless also engages with external-facing sights, what is manifestly *out there*. Again we can consider this focal level in terms of Squire's discussion of a Hellenistic 'poetics of scale', and the *Alexandra* as a poem of both close-up and panorama, just as it promises total subject matter and offers intricate detail.[252] The rewriting of epic spectacle in Cassandra's vision of the Trojan War is a special case and discussed in Section 2 below. But this 'looking out' is not confined to a relationship with Homeric epic alone, and the intensity, range and frequency of the prophetess' visions of the world also share in the well-known Hellenistic predilection for marvellous objects and *thaumata* and the cataloguing of the world found in Hellenistic prose and travel literature; in the case of the *Alexandra*, this displays a well-noted particular interest in cult too.[253] At 509, the θάμβος … μέγα of the Dioscuri's 'watching' seal (σφραγὶς δοκεύει) waits in their home ἄψαυστος, a marvel to others and becoming another sign that sees actively within the poem, and a guarantee of the twins' purity in death. More usually though, the embedded acts of vision of features of interest more readily recall the generic conventions of travel-writing and

[250] A familiar device in *ex eventu* prophecy: see West (2001). On the Sibyl see further Cusset (2004); Biffis (2012) 176ff.

[251] On Paris see below section 3.

[252] Squire (2010) 273-274.

[253] Mari (2009); Hornblower (2014).

historiography, becoming markers on the mapped journeys of the travelling Greeks post-war. This is not a matter of Lycophronian interest in the indiscriminately bizarre or fabulous, and is much closer to more sober prose than the flights of fancy we associate with the more purple paradoxography of later antiquity. In fact, by examining these phenomena across the poem, we can better pinpoint the selective focus and limits of the poem's interests, and track these changes throughout the poem, as part of its broader sweep from myth to history and movement away from Troy towards the contemporary Hellenistic *oikoumene*. Vision underpins the pattern of journey, survey, map and settlement that drives the poem and prophecy, something that is found elsewhere in Hellenistic poetry and other literature that offers explanation, justification and celebration of colonization;[254] that Cassandra is hardly the most obvious voice through which to develop such a worldview makes the poem all the more compelling as conquered victim of history writes herself into the victorious side of it in the future yet still reaches a prophetic calm as resolution between east and west is reached. The combination of a tragic voice with the vision (and knowledge) of renewal not limited to cult, but beyond into world history, from loss to gain, and victimhood to rule in a way that settles out into a prophetic calm is unique in its intensity of personal involvement combined with prophecy.[255]

The move from gazing on the world in stupefied wonder, or overcome passivity to actively changing the world are most clear in the parallel wanderings or travels of Odysseus and Menelaos in the middle and latter part of the poem (648-820; 820-876), which are both also marked by the repeated use of third-person future verbs of sight. In his recent commentary, Simon Hornblower notes this and further structural equivalences between these two sections of the poem.[256] Cassandra's competing pre-vision of Odyssean wanderings (648ff.) begins with the wily hero's soon-to-be-dispatched men (τούς, 648) rather than *the* man

---

[254] See Stephens (2002) for a reading of Hellenistic poetry in these terms.

[255] See esp. West (1983); (1984).

[256] Hornblower (2015) 23; ad 633-647; 648-819; 662: verbs of sight are "picked up three times in rapid succession in the Menelaos narrative; see 825, 834, 847. The effect is to compel the drawing of parallels between the two men.'

who begins Homer's epic.[257] However, it is next emphasized that Odysseus as a *lone messenger* will live to tell the tale (657: ἕνα φθαρέντων **ἄγγελον** λιπὼν φίλων) and to see the fantastic sights of the edges of the world for himself: the Cyclops (ὃς ὄψεται, 659); the (apparently sole surviving one of the) Laestrygones (ἐπόψεται δὲ λείψανον..., 662); and the whole lot of his encounters with (and subjection to) female monsters (668-675). This last summation comes in a series of rhetorical questions, recalling Cassandra's prophetic words in Euripides' *Trojan Women* 427ff.; cf. 673, Circe specifically (ποίαν δὲ θηρόπλαστον οὐκ ἐσόψεται). This reminds us of, without replicating, the actual direct speech of Odysseus as in the epic, and the handing-over of narratorial control, just as Cassandra begins her own self-contained 'Odyssey' and we learn what the hero *will see rather than tell* in the future.[258] That is, we might even half expect Odysseus to gain control of the poem here, but as always Cassandra's voice leaves no room for another's voice, only visions of their fate. That this draws on her prophecy in Euripides is not simply a matter of Lycophron 'basing' his poem on earlier texts, but playfully reminds the reader the Cassandra's version of events comes first in time, that she sees the events of Odysseus' life before he will, and that she is ultimately the more authoritative and knowledgeable, as we see *what he really sees* through his eyes, and acknowledges Euripides' own exploitation of *coming before* the events of the Homeric *nostos* in his Trojan play. Odysseus' autopsy thus functions to validate why his storytelling is markedly fabricated μυθοπλαστήν...γόον (764).[259] This again attests to the exploration of the murky area between vision and voice and the mediation of communication that the poem rests on, as well as to a further series of related challenges to the authority of poetry *vis-à-vis* prophecy and epic *vis-à-vis* tragedy, and the masculine Greek speaker extraordinaire versus problematic Trojan feminine speaker *par excellence*.[260] These oppositions are also troubled by the similarities

---

[257] On *Od*.1.1ff see the now classic discussion of Goldhill (1991) 1ff. in *The Poet's Voice*. This also fits better into the repeated introduction or catalogue of groups of wanderers in this half of the poem.

[258] Cf. Cusset (2009) 134-138; Sens (2010) 306; McNelis and Sens (2011b) 77-78; Biffis (2012) 74ff.; Hurst (2012) 97-111.

[259] See references in note above.

[260] Cf. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 440 on the *Alexandra*'s flaunting of its 'inherited dichotomies'. That Cassandra's prophecy has the capacity to enclose entire epics as a part within it is discussed in full in Section 2.

suggested between Odysseus and Cassandra; the problems they face as a lone eyewitness who must convincingly communicate to others what they alone see; the bi-directional doubt cast over their reliability;[261] and Odysseus' suffering itself, which is also suggestive of the violence epic tradition writes on his body in exchange for reputation.[262] This plays out in terms of visual signs as well as speech when the disguised Odysseus' approaches with κατασκόποις λώβαισι (785) that fool Priam, the hypallage referring to Odysseus' skill in disguise, or deception through visual tokens *as well as* words, perhaps even casting doubt on his 'true' identity if we think back to the *Odyssey* and the scar recognition scene in book 19.388ff. Unlike in the underworld scene, where we seemed to experience the *katabasis* with Odysseus (681-687; see below), here the reader is allowed to share in the way Cassandra (in her role as ignored 'warner')[263] sees straight through the ruse and identifies the false nature of these visual and oh-so-convincing signs: brazen wounds that are persuasive if merely looked on but that in fact spy out for themselves. Odysseus' focalization is borrowed temporarily by the main speaker but he does not get to share in her visions beyond everyday sight and sensorial experience; rather than the traveller convincing others that he has really seen what he reports, his tale is presented visually and the claim to truth remains Cassandra's, and rests on her seer's authority. Odysseus' watchman-wounds bring Cassandra's own unsettling experience of a world seething with signals alive for the reader, and again the aesthetic of mistrust of mimetic realism hovers, as what appears convincingly true and life-like, seen by others, is in fact a false disguise, and the truth far stranger.[264] In sections 4-5 we will take this argument much further in terms of the poetics of the poem.

There are several interesting elements in terms of visual perception and its relationship with the other senses, voice, messages, storytelling and song within the prediction of Odysseus' wanderings, such as his meeting with Tiresias, where he hears the

---

[261] Sens (2010) 306.

[262] McNelis and Sens (2011b) 77-78.

[263] For the borrowed term see Lattimore (1939) on the 'tragic warner' and 'wise adviser' in Herodotus.

[264] Sistakou's (2012) emphasis on the concept of 'the uncanny' is instructive here.

voice of ghosts (681-687); it seems significant that the first place we are told explicitly that Odysseus will 'come to' (ἥξει, 681) is the shadowy land of the dead (and in this case, Odysseus cannot see in the dark, Cassandra describing *his* embedded sensory experience in Hades).[265] Hornblower (2015) ad 653-654 has emphasized the importance of the extended story of the Sirens' death that we meet with here and its central position in the poem as a whole (712ff; n.b. 714, σκοπῆς (see above on landscape 1.2.4). We also meet with the blinded Cyclops (765), and find ἰδών at 775, stressing that Odysseus will *live to see* troubles even beyond those he saw at Troy and undergo further suffering; of course, those in his own besieged household, and further on to the destruction of his family in events known from Proclus' summary of the *Telegony* (812, χὠ μὲν τοσούτων θῖνα πημάτων ἰδών)[266] and ultimately his own death after an unceasingly unhappy life of suffering (814, γαληνὸν ἦμαρ οὔποτ' ἐν ζωῇ δρακών) and his future celebration as a seer (799ff.). However, here I am more concerned to show how visual perception shapes the account, and how this demonstrates what I have called generic sensitivity (that is, the way different parts of the poem are presented and focalized in visual terms and pick up on a set of cues and conventions that suggest a particular genre). As has been previously suggested, this reflects a particular interest in the poem in the origins of and relationships between genres, something that runs throughout the discussion in this thesis.[267] The repeated use of *opsesthai* here is also interesting in view of Priestley's (2014) observation that future tense verbs are used in *thauma* narratives to increase anticipation for the narration of *thaumata* coming up and, in the case of the Odyssean material, perhaps intensifies the reader's curiosity about what is to come next, and its unexpectedness.[268] The almost paradoxographical ring in the presentation of Odysseus' journey gives Cassandra some

---

[265] See esp. Gigante-Lanzara (2000) ad 681-687 on the sensory detail.

[266] In the *Telegony*, the child of Circe and Odysseus named Telegonus returns to Ithaka to find his father, but accidently slays him, resulting in his marriage to Penelope, and Telemachus' to Circe. Easily accessed in West (2003) 166-169.

[267] Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 439.

[268] See Priestley (2014) 75ff. for her analysis of paradoxography as part of the Hellenistic reception of Herodotus, including in poetry (esp. 88ff. on Callimachus' *Iambus* 6; 100 on Posidippos' *Lithika* and the relationship between the two texts). On Lycophron and Herodotus see West (2009); Priestley (2014) 125-127; Hornblower (2015) 19-20.

prosaic edge and authority over the material and is another way of using vision (in this case, the embedded experience of Odysseus) to bolster her version of events and reject the authority of epic poetry.

Menelaos' wanderings (820-876) help to mark a turning point in the poem between the fantastic experience of epic wanderers and travellers' narratives of the actual sight of places and things, and this is again marked by the use of third-person future verbs of sight (compounds of ὁράω): e.g. 825: ἐπόψεται μὲν πρῶτα Τυφῶνος σκοπάς (another looking on a look-out in the landscape); 828-9: ... ὄψεται δὲ τλήμονος/Μύρρας ἐρυμνὸν ἄστυ (breaking the pattern of the verb heading the line); 834: ἐπόψεται δὲ τύρσιας Κηφηίδας.[269] Menelaos continues to observe the world as he continues his search for Helen in Egypt (847): ἐπόψεται δὲ τοὺς θερειπότους γύας.[270] At 852 Menelaos is explicitly described as a wanderer, the only time the world ἀλήτης occurs in Lycophron; yet, at the same time, here the verbs of sight cease and there is a switch from ἐπόψεται to ἥξει just as the journey moves from east to west and the description of his search for Helen segues into his offerings to Athena, and the description of cult in Siris. Rather than emphasising the futility of the search for Helen (as, say, in the Achilles and Iphigenia passage 184-201) it is the ritual significance of his actions and the move to prophesying the existence of future cults that is more important than Menelaos himself. Menelaos does not just trace a journey, but points the poem towards a new phase of creation and action, also hinting at the true and prior divine cultic Helen and characters of epic that Cassandra reveals favourably in relation to the illusions of the poetry of the future. Priestley's discussion of the reader's reaction to *thauma* in Herodotus, appeals to Hunzinger's contention that marvels can draw out 'l'esprit critique' as well as 'l'emerveillement stupide' to conclude that 'the distinctively Herodotean combination of wonder alongside the enlightenment of knowledge reappears in [the] literature of the

[269] This part of the poem also contains within it (834ff) the story of Medusa and Perseus' literal borrowing of her 'stony-eyed' sight, as well as that of the Graea's eye/lamp; see 4.2 below.

[270] On Helen see 3.3 below.

Hellenistic period'.[271] In this case, the wanderings of Menelaos also mark a change in orders of knowledge in the poem, from visual wonder to active interpretation of the world and what is in it. This chimes with the visual language employed in the Hellenistic historiography and travelogue, that Priestley remarks presents the reader with a chance to use their discernment; autopsy (θε-) is linked 'etymologically' to seeing and is also used by historians to make claims to authoritative version of events.[272] By turning to the vision of others, Cassandra can also call witnesses to her account, as if trying to counter the god's imposition of unconvincing speech.

As mentioned above, it seems noteworthy in the way the poem works as a whole that Menelaos stops seeing, and starts doing, at the very moment his wanderings cross from east to west (852, ἥξει) and he gives up on Helen, offering her shoes to Athena (marked by preceding summary in the text, καὶ πάντα..., 850). Again, the smallest details reflect the broader trends of the poem through a movement from words to action in the new world that emerges post-Troy.[273] Rather than passive gazing in helpless wonder, captivated by objects, there seems to be a switch to the interpretive gaze and reading that the poem promotes, and to agency (most usually ritual action) that is worthwhile and efficacious in the world.[274] This shows that the movement is not confined from poetry to cult, or Greek to Trojan, but is part of a much wider interest in the move west, a differing conception of cultural artefacts, honour and memory, and – as I want to focus on – an interest in a visual understanding of the world through reading and travel in the Hellenistic period. While there is a move here between fiction (Homer's epic *Odyssey* and Odysseus' storytelling about his travels, what he claims to have seen and experienced), these overlap with reality: Menelaos' travels move away from the

[271] Hunzinger (1995) 71 quoted in Priestley (2014) 55.

[272] Priestley (2014) 58ff. See further Walker (1993) on *enargeia* in Thucydides and other Greek historiography; cf. Grethlein (2013) on relationship to time.

[273] See e.g. Hornblower (2015) for the view that the western interest of the poem is foreshadowed much earlier in the poem that has been noted hitherto, and is by no means confined to the latter part of the poem and the controversial 'Roman' passages.

[274] Mari (2009) 427-428, stressing the visual language in the attention lavished by the poet on these ritual scenes.

east and the Egyptian *logos* of *Odyssey* 4 through the search for a Helen who does not exist (820ff.), to a *periplous* around South Italy and Sicily that tours Aphrodite's cult sites.[275] The description of Menelaos' travels continues the travelogue mode as the poem roves further out round the world and beyond the fall of Troy, and contains a shift from observation and a search for the sources of the miseries of the past embodied by Helen, towards action that looks to the future, and is confirmed by the future audience of Croton's women in cult, who not only hear but act (859-865) in their lament for Achilles, fully transformed from the hero as met earlier in the poem (186ff.).[276]

The juxtaposition of Menelaos and Odysseus' travels and the notion of Odysseus as traveller have further ramifications for generic play and focalization in the poem.[277] It is also one of the ways the poem co-opts some of the generic norms of early travel writing, and ties it to the *Alexandra*'s attempt at truthful description over and above poetic fiction, embodied in Cassandra's antagonistic *Odyssey* in particular.[278] Odysseus' account of his travels, the mix of 'report and invention', is fundamental for discourses on the reliability of traveller (eyewitness) report in antiquity.[279] While we should not be so naïve so as to draw a sharp myth/history line in the case of an ancient text especially, there is no use denying that the *Alexandra* as a prophecy does move forward in time towards (f)actuality, and in doing so, raises questions about the relationship between poetry and prose, key to discussions of Hellenistic literature.[280] The engagement with epic through travel writing is yet another way

[275] Hornblower (2015) 48.

[276] 187, 822 ματεύων.

[277] There is perhaps something here of Goldhill's (1996) conception of epic seeing as wonder-focussed and non-contemplative, and the split between seeing and seeing coupled with thought put forward in Hellenistic philosophy.

[278] See McNelis and Sens (2011b).

[279] Pretzler opens the fourth chapter of her discussion of 'report and invention' in Pausanias with a quote from Lucian's *Verae Historiae* (1.3): ἀρχηγὸς δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ διδάσκαλος τῆς τοιαύτης βωμολοχίας ὁ τοῦ Ὁμήρου Ὀδυσσεύς (Pretzler (2007) 44).

[280] Pretzler (2007) 48: 'Strabo's summaries of scientific debates in the Hellenistic period demonstrate that the ancient scholars could hardly agree on which texts should be discarded as fiction' and this often centred on the

that the *Alexandra* explores the conundrum of a speaker who is a lone witness and their reliability. 'As Lucian suggests ... the tradition of ancient Greek travellers' accounts starts with Odysseus. As the only surviving eyewitness, the hero relates much of his own journey ... where the poem "listens in" on his dramatic report...' (that is, of things that no-one else can confirm sight of).[281] As Pretzler has discussed, Odysseus both shows and admits he is a liar, and even if the *Odyssey* legitimates his version,[282] it is through the Homeric narrator (whose Muse-given powers of storytelling permit the narrator to tell an accurate version of Odysseus' fictions!). Even the most accepting reader of Odysseus' narrative arc cannot completely ignore the troubling questions raised about the nature of the connection between the hero's Cretan tales and the main story. By contrast, the narrator of the *Alexandra* does not have this luxury, and authorizes Cassandra's version fully only as an object/text read in the future.

We have to be a bit careful here about some of our own presuppositions about the presentation of geographical information. As Pretzler discusses, a 'visual impression' is an expectation that comes easily to the modern reader, well-used to 'maps and images ... illustrations' so that '[t]he communication from travel writer to reader is heavily influenced by such habits of visual representation.'[283] However, it is also worth noting that this is a feature (an overtly visual catalogue marked by repeated use of verbs of sight) not easily paralleled in extant Greek texts:[284] Lycophron condenses his wanderings/travelogues into one place in the text to form these mini visual catalogues appropriate to Cassandra's all-encompassing focalization that encloses these inner acts of sight like dots on a map. Neither Odysseus' or Menelaos' reaction to what they see can be given in their own voice, so they remain the eyes on the ground, detached locations on the 'map'; their words will have to wait

---

location and veracity of the *Odyssey*'s geography. The relationship between prophecy and historiographical writing perhaps also needs further consideration in future.

[281] Pretzler (2007) 46.

[282] Pretzler (2007) 46.

[283] Pretzler (2007) 60.

[284] Perhaps the nearest is the very late Christodorus of Thebes ἔκφρασις τῶν ἀγαλμάτων τῶν εἰς τὸ δημόσιον γυμνάσιον τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Ζευξίππου that forms book 2 of the *Greek Anthology*: see De Vos (2014) 424.

until time catches up.[285] The poem's movement across a vast amount of time as well as space increases the feeling that these characters are just necessary stopping points in the bigger transformative plan of fate and history that Cassandra's god-given vision gives the reader access to. This is also a good example of the 'oscillation' in the poem between diegetic and mimetic modes of narration and how Cassandra's simultaneous speaking and seeing exceeds these categories as Biffis has suggested.[286] On the one hand, there is detachment; on the other, subjectivity creeps in. The ability of the hostile main speaker to use the Greek characters as mere ciphers, useful pairs of eyes that she is able to take possession of, just as Apollo is able to possess her, also fits into the cyclical revenge plot as Cassandra replicates the crimes against her in this sense. This recalls the reversal of victor and victim that characterises the post-Troy cycle of myth as expressed most explicitly in tragedy, by Clytemnestra in the *Agamemnon*, and in *Trojan Women*, by Cassandra herself.[287] As Pretzler has argued in the case of Pausanias, ancient travel writing had a greater affinity with historiography and was more interested in the collation of knowledge than the experiences of the traveller (what is now often referred to metaphorically as a 'journey'), or the details of the (literal) journey and notes that the visual/epistemological element of is reflected in the concept of *theoria*.[288] In Pretzler's view, Pausanias responds to the growing redundancy of the topos of autopsy and makes moves to authenticate his narrative in other ways too, elaborating previous texts' details by adding descriptions of more obscure sites, ethnographic information, and contemporary situations to 'give an impression of immediacy which would be difficult to achieve in a compilation from earlier texts'. The *Alexandra* also updates and combines the mythic, religious and physical landscape.

[285] Cf. Pretzler (2007) 111f. on Lucian and Pausanias and how the latter tends to focus on content rather than the reaction of the viewer.

[286] Biffis (2012) 10.

[287] A. *Ag.* 320ff.; E. *Tro.* 365ff.

[288] Pretzler (2007) 46-47.

Finally, Menelaos' περίπλοος is interesting because it is *periploi* or 'seafarer's logs' that probably began the tradition of 'written travellers' accounts'.[289] In this case, we may also have another instance of the poet's interest in using his speaker-seer who comes before the literary tradition as a way of exploring the origins of genre.[290] The *Alexandra* again explores objectivity and subjectivity in its relationships to other genres and the relationship between seen experience and spoken report; while the *periplous* was probably less often a specific voyage, and rather 'a coastal description listing places without reference to a particular voyage',[291] despite affinities with this style of reportage, the *Alexandra* also retains the possibility (and questions of) subjectivity and focalization, autopsy and accurate report through the use of the embedded viewers within the prophecy. Once attention switches in the poem to the journeys made post-war, the poem is more concerned with how landscape becomes text, and what features are selected and picked out in a given topography, as Pretzler discusses in the case of Pausanias.[292] The investigation of the relationship between experience and expression is given

[289] Pretzler (2007) 48 regards the genre as the development of simple descriptions. His interesting example is of Hanno's fifth-century περίπλοος along the African coast, thought to be a written Hellenistic version of an original Carthiginian votive inscription. As a journey to found colonies, the early travel narrative is also related to *ktisis* poetry, something which needs more attention in relation to Lycophron. For a grounding in *ktisis* poetry see Sistakou (2008b). Pretzler (2007) 50 also considers the (now lost) Alexander accounts and (52) the epithets in *Iliad* 2's catalogue of ships which although 'usually quite appropriate, are clearly not intended to provide a meaningful description of a place or landscape.'

[290] Surely taking on these sorts of explorations of time before an established tradition exists in Euripides' *Bacchae* and its staging of a city before tragedy, as *the* first tragedy. See e.g. Goldhill (1986) 259-286; it is also a play suffused with visual language (see Foley (1980); Gregory (1985); Zeitlin (1985)). Cf. Pretzler (2007) 68-72 on the contrast between *periploi* and Pausanias' travel on land, with only 'little interest in the spatial relationships between the places he is describing. It is not just a matter of describing what is there to be seen, but explaining what cannot be: 'the physical, visible landscape is just a framework for a much more complex topography of myth, history and sacred places'. However, we need to realise that these categories interact (e.g. as in 'sacred geography') and that the *Alexandra*, by looking both back and forward dramatises both action shaping the land and explains its pre-existing features to the Hellenistic reader because of its characteristic temporal play. See Kowalzig (2007) further on location and ritual time.

[291] Pretzler (2007) 52. See 52-53 on the fourth century Pseudo-Skylax's *Periplous of the Great Sea* and the persistence of the simple list style well into the second century AD. As well as epic catalogue (and use of epithets) see above on inscription as origin of these writings, fitting the idea of the *Alexandra* as a self-consciously *written* text-object and a thing seen but not (necessarily) heard.

[292] Pretzler (2007) 59. This could perhaps be expanded further by paying more attention to cartography in the relevant historical context. While we might see an obvious sharp division between say a map of Rome, and a narrative description of the city, in terms of their function, and the way we internally visualize and understand symbols as compared to text and narrative, this is less clear in the case of the ancient world. Pretzler (2007) 64 has

a generic twist, and further opportunity for the reader to consider the relationship between vision and voice. While here the deployment of sight raises questions of truth and fiction in the description of the world in a generically sensitive way (e.g. the value of autopsy in historiographical report and travel narratives), we will see this explored in other ways in the poem as discussed throughout the thesis (for example, as a way to reflect on the relationship between the arts and the position of poetry within them, drawing in particular on Hellenistic epigram).[293]

There is one last implication for the poem more broadly left to consider. In Goldhill's discussion of travel and ecphrastic writing, the role of the eyewitness and the play between actual travel and book-learning as sources of knowledge, and as sources of a pleasurable and enriching experience, are at stake.[294] Rather like a species of ecphrastic writing, some authors seem to hint that written travels are somehow superior and can go beyond the real thing.[295] The *Alexandra* itself seems to embody this tension – on the one hand, looking through the eyes of characters spread far and wide, focalized through a prophetess who can see everything, yet in its learnedness acknowledging that this is done through studious attention to texts.[296] There can be little doubt that the anxiety of the collector, the curator and the world traveller who hungers to miss nothing is strongly felt in the poem's opening declaration to 'say everything',[297] and this impulse of the librarian/curator has been much discussed in relation

---

highlighted the prevalence of spoken description of topography: 'more commonly, geography depended on verbal description rather than on maps.' Further, in literature, seers often function as guides to prospective journeys, describing features of land and sea that must be encountered, seen and overcome (e.g. the blind Phineus in A.R. 2.311ff.).

[293] Below Section 4.

[294] Goldhill (2012).

[295] ibid.

[296] Cf. Sens (2009) on geography in the poem.

[297] *Alexandra* 1. Cf. Pausanias 1.26.4: δεῖ δέ με ἀφικέσθαι τοῦ λόγου πρόσω, **πάντα** ὁμοίως ἐπεξιόντα τὰ Ἑλληνικά. In the *Alexandra* this can be read as adherence to a particular aesthetic choice of excess. In the ever-reflexive *Alexandra*, however, this 'control' is also obedience to an order (Cusset (2006) 56-58).

to Hellenistic poetry, as well as the *Alexandra*.[298] It is not necessarily helpful to unthinkingly devalue Lycophron the antiquarian collector over Callimachus the connoisseur and supreme aesthetic arbiter (and reflects certain prejudices that are not necessarily to be found in the ancient world itself). Having said that, the poet of the *Alexandra* does seem to rove further, for longer, and in desperation for comprehensiveness and completion, rather than particular choice dishes. Stylistic objections aside, this helps to characterise the special status of Cassandra as a narrator with access to divine vision, and we do not need to assume a particular mode of reading the poem either (dwelling on one word, one line, one small section is not the preserve only of scholars today as the poem's long history of readers show). Let us appreciate, rather than downplay, that while it is true on the one hand the poem displays selectivity through its central speaker (as Biffis has argued), that when we read the opening of the poem in a programmatic way, the encyclopaedic promise of the poem has to be acknowledged. Cassandra has a unique status as a mortal with 'everything' inside her head[299] and the gap between the desire to achieve this and anxiety about having the ability and reality of communicating is thus present from the outset of the *Alexandra*.

1.2.9: Ritual Time and Geographical Space

In her discussion of natural wonders in Pliny's *Natural History*, Mary Beagon shows how using a fixed point in space allows the writer to mix temporal levels to make each space 'multi-dimensional'.[300] It is perhaps worth using Pliny's focus on 'oddities' at the edge of the world and his interest in nature stretching to below the earth and in the skies as a comparison to

[298] More reflection is needed perhaps of how much this view reflects the anxieties of today's interpreter about the preservation of information about the past, and the relationship between knowledge and imperialism. See also Plato *Sophist* 233d-234a where the claim of being able to do and make everything μιᾷ τέχνῃ is dismissed as a joke by the *Xenos* (τί δέ; τὴν τοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι πάντα οἶδε καὶ ταῦτα ἕτερον ἂν διδάξειεν ὀλίγου καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ, μῶν οὐ παιδιὰν νομιστέον;), who goes onto say that there is no bigger joke than τὸ μιμητικόν. It is hard not to think of the *Alexandra* messenger's opening gambit.

[299] Lowe (2004) 308ff.

[300] Beagon (2007) 22.

Lycophron, where, on the whole, the objects described have cult significance. This means that the mixing of temporal levels not only connect past, present and future, but attest to a sort of ritual time where locations are foci for worship and the renewal of a particular individual, act or event.[301] The now of Cassandra's prophecy and its odd temporal status recreates the renewal of time in a particular space bounded off by ritual action.[302] As well as predicting the future significance of places, it draws the reader in and not only explains their significance but approximates the experience of ritual and the space and time it contains and renews.[303] As well as a geographical and political configuration of the natural world,[304] temporal and cultural patterns are invoked too as Beagon suggests in the case of Pliny.[305] The *Alexandra* seems less interested in the odd behaviour of natural wonders that Beagon describes as the 'stock features' of paradoxography (usually showing natural features behaving unexpectedly, prevalent in earlier instances of the genre (such as Callimachus, Philostephanus, Archelaus and Isigonus)), which can be seen as another sort of elite project of collecting objects of knowledge for display and learned perusal.[306] Instead, the landscape is imbued with vision and significance that reflects the special experience of the prophetess as well as the learning of the poet, and focuses more on putting back the extraordinary into the everyday. While Beagon reflects that Conte thought Pliny's work was 'indicative of an era reaching satiety and stagnation' where nothing new is to be known, through Cassandra's eyes, the world becomes and remains in a perfected state, akin to ritual time.[307] As Biffis has argued, this takes the aetiological bent of Hellenistic poetry far further, and represents most closely an intensification of the ritual remembrance and compensation for suffering found in Attic

---

[301] See Mari (2009) 427ff; 439-439. On ritual time in the ancient context see Kowalzig (2007b) 24ff. (with reference to Mircea Eliade's *illud tempus* or 'timeless period of origins.'

[302] Cf. Mari (2009).

[303] Cf. Mari (2009).

[304] The poet's interest in drawing borders is discussed by Sens (2009).

[305] Beagon (2007) 22ff: In *NH*, the *mirabilia* are a sort of 'other' to articulate identity through and against.

[306] See Beagon (2007) pp.23-4.

[307] Beagon (2007) 35 n.69: she argues that Pliny does in fact leave room for potential new discoveries.

tragedy.[308] The specificity of focus in the internal acts of vision helps to create and sharpen these effects.

1.2.10. Making and Shaping: Changing Form and Metamorphoses

The representation of metamorphoses always raises questions of external appearance and internal reality, and the prominence of metamorphoses in the *Alexandra* has recently been catalogued and emphasized.[309] This also reflects one of the main strands of questioning in the poem; how do we discern between the truth, or what is, and our perception of the way things appear, or seem? Do their external appearances conceal something else within?[310] The poem's 'bestiary', the use of animal designations for characters (with inconsistent identification), is well-known and also well-documented,[311] and Evina Sistakou has investigated the 'ontological mystery' this creates for the reader as to 'who' and 'what' they are faced with. The use of these designations underpins the 'prophecy-fiction' of the poem,[312] and the presentation of its actors within as *ainigma,* both riddles and signifying omens, which we can further connect to the simile and metaphor. In Peter Struck's view, *ainigmata* form the basis for the wider pattern of development of the literary symbol, and eventually allegory from omen.[313] Although the *Alexandra* is not an allegorical text, it does promote the idea of a

---

[308] Biffis (2012) 14ff.

[309] Hornblower (2015) 93; see ad 176 for a full list of 28 metamorphoses (excluding mixanthropy).

[310] On metamorphoses and metapoetics, analogising divine power to shape and change other beings to the power of creating fiction, and the power of the poet to similarly deceive the senses see e.g. Buxton (2009). As well as metamorphoses, the other loci for the question of appearance, or seeming and being, are similes (below 2.4). As McNelis and Sens have noted (2011b) 71; (2014) 97, similes are rare but significant in the *Alexandra.* This arises from the fact that similes engage with these questions of seeming/being, poetry/reality, and the two-way struggle to articulate spectacle in words that operates in the poem. This is perhaps because similes fit the paradox of simultaneous clarification and obfuscation; they aim at *enargeia* in the positive sense of bringing a scene to the reader's eye, but at the same time they do so by introducing something alien to the reality of events unfolding on the ground. *Enargeia* stirs the emotions, and convinces of a particular version of events by bringing it alive; if Cassandra 'fails' at producing *enargeia* as part of the way she 'fails' in being a persuasive rhetor (Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 443), this is part of her exposure of the way poetry works in contrast with her struggle to communicate the truth, as if Cassandra will not (or cannot) use poetry's 'tricks'.

[311] See esp. Cusset (2001); Lambin (2005) 233-260.

[312] Sistakou (2009) 254.

[313] See Struck (2004) on this process and the allegorist approach to ancient texts that arises from it.

hidden meaning to be revealed and unravelled by intellectual activity (as well as by the future, and the special vision of Cassandra). But the perception of metamorphoses in the poem raises further questions still about the relationship between what Cassandra sees and her expression of it. Because of the way Cassandra narrates what will happen and what results, it is hard to decide in some cases whether we should read the metamorphoses as process (in flux in the synchronic vision of Cassandra?) or result (narrated diachronic explanation), and consider the possibility that the poet strains to convey both. For example, in the prophecy (and founding story) recounting the river Crimisus' transformation into a dog, taking Aegesta as wife,[314] we could say that θηρομίκτῳ, a 'newly minted compound [that] neatly reverses the better-attested μιξόθηρ of 650' (where it refers to Scylla) 'does not mean "half-beast half-human at the same time", but refers rather to a metamorphic sequence, river-god and then beast.'[315] The comparison between Scylla as Cassandra sees her (650) already in her mixed form in the Odyssean part of the prophecy, as she is in *Odyssey* 12, makes it clear that straightforward mixanthropy is not intended.[316]

However, because Cassandra both speaks and sees, it is less clear whether we can talk only about sequential change. The fact of the hapax remains, and other language in the passage suggests the question of true form. The sequence of the sentence begins, unusually, with the river-god's name, then his new appearance, ἰνδαλθεὶς κυνί (961, cf. 597, Diomedes' sight of his transformed bird men, κύκνοισιν ἰνδαλθέντες) marked by an unusual use of the verb ἰνδάλλομαι, which carries additional questions about true resemblance versus seeming appearance in the eyes of the beholder, and delaying the agreeing ποταμός to the end of the main clause, so that the god's dog-like appearance briefly intrudes before his original form is revealed, squeezing the two forms together as tightly as possible. This also suggests that the poet's tight use of syntax and brevity also contributes to the visual effect of the poem even within a single scene. The following description of the god to whom Aegesta bears her child

[314] See Biffis (2012) 112; 135-136 on the lament that follows 968-977.

[315] Hornblower (2015) 963 ad loc.

[316] ibid.

Aegestes as θηρόμικτος in line 963 then does suggest the way the god will come to be perceived in his beastly form,[317] but placed after the explanation of the metamorphoses in reverse, reminds the reader of Cassandra's special capacity to see beyond the norm and reveal the truth behind appearances, and that Crimisus' form is nevertheless 'mixed' at the same time. Cassandra's ability to narrate these metamorphoses attests to and brings her knowledge of the truth to the fore in each narrative that a metamorphosed figure in the poem triggers, but as she both speaks and sees simultaneously, the reader gets the impression not only of a (poet's) knowledge[318] but of a person who can see through to what the everyday observer of the world cannot.

The metamorphoses in the poem are often marked by a -μόρφος suffix and a newly formed word by the poet as we saw above, almost as if the word itself also means to draw our attention to formations of *hapax legomena*, also attests to the *Alexandra*'s valuing of the physical and material as an aesthetic value. Shaping, making and form are also signalled by [τεύχω, -πλαστος] as well as the move to 'literal immortality' and the colonial drive to build and make and leave a mark on the world, at once a very detailed record of colonizing myth, and a set of metapoetic statements about the poet's own work as the maker of the *Alexandra*.[319] We might think of Circe (*Alexandra* 673-8), as θηρόπλαστον....δράκαιναν, as a model for Cassandra's beastly and metamorphic vision and its creation, when the prophetess asks what sort of creature will Odysseus not *see* on his travels to come (673).[320] The language of seeing,

[317] Mair (1921) ad 961 remarks that 'a dog, representing Crimisus, appears on the coins of (S)egesta'.

[318] Hornblower (2015) 93: 'it is the self-consciously clever and virtuoso poet who enjoys describing metamorphosis'.

[319] Discussed in more depth at section 5. Quotation from Biffis (cf. 1.0 above).

[320] 673-8: **ποίαν δὲ θηρόπλαστον οὐκ ἐσόψεται / δράκαιναν**, ἐγκυκῶσαν ἀλφίτῳ θρόνα, /καὶ κῆρα κνωπό**μορφον**; οἱ δὲ δύσμοροι /στένοντες ἄτας ἐν συφοῖσι φορβάδες /γίγαρτα χιλῷ συμμεμιγμένα τρυγὸς /καὶ στέμφυλα βρύξουσιν. Cf. 671 αἰόλῳ μέλει for the song of the Sirens, recalling the messenger's description of Cassandra's αἰόλος mouth, in line 4. This also indicates that Cassandra's prophecy will contain vision and voice. Of the seven total –πλάστος compounds in the poem, three relate to Odysseus' stories (or lies) and thus to the making of poetic fiction and self-representation; ἐν πλασταῖς γραφαῖς, *Alexandra* 432; cf. *Odyssey* 19.432, γραφαῖς perhaps indicating the *ecphrasis* in this Cretan tale (below 0/0); πλασταῖσι...μεχαναῖς, his pretended madness to try and duck the draft for Troy at 818); his μυθοπλάστην...γοόν on Phaeacia, 764. As Sens has suggested (2010) 306 this also raises the question of the status of Cassandra's own lament-poem. Cf. Cusset (2009) 132; Berra 2009: 274; Hornblower (2015) ad 432, 764: αἴθωνος αὐτάδελφον ἐν πλασταῖς γραφαῖς (*Od.*19.178-84 – Odysseus says he is Cretan Idomeneus' brother, Aithon);

shaping, and forming is also found in one of the great set-pieces of the poem, the prophecy of Diomedes' in Daunia, which contains his sight of his men transformed into birds: **ἰδὼν οἰωνόμικτον** μοῖραν, and appearing now as such **κύκνοισιν ἰνδαλθέντες εὐγλήνοις δομήν**.[321] In this scene the internal viewer is also aware like Cassandra of the original form of the subjects of the metamorphoses, this time birds who act like men, and contribute to the way that who passage brings together so many of the recurrent motifs of mark-making activity in the poem to 'predict' the success of the Dasii in Daunia at 623ff., reversing Diomedes' curse on the land as one of his own race, as they cultivate the land (623-624).[322] The journey of the representative individual is a return following a pre-existing track (627-629) justifying the place of the Dasii in the west, by a familiar technique of claiming mythic genealogy in the forging of ethnic identity in the widened *oikoumene*.[323] While the monologue form often means there is no indication of the metamorphosed beings' voice, here a touching sense of interiority is achieved in the birds whimpering as they remember their previous life (608-609).[324] Rather than dwelling on men as beasts, this transformation stresses the way the birds retain human features,[325] even building walls like those of Thebes, and the environment

---

πλασταῖς γραφαῖς as 'nicely ambiguous: it alludes both to Odysseus' mini-fiction ... and also generally to the entire *Odyssey* as unreliable, by comparison to Cassandra's alternative, more western version at 648-819.'

[321] A complex passage which cannot be discussed in full here: see Hornblower (2015) 592-632 ad loc. for comprehensive coverage. The interest in form (to be shaped) is indicated by δομή here (596; cf. 334, Hecuba's metamorphosis; 783 προσμάσσων δομῇ, Odysseus' disguise made by tolerating the whip (cf. 1.2.8). LSJ sv. δομή II states that this is the 'Alexandrian' version of the noun δέμας, also frequent in the *Alexandra* (41, 55, 66, 75, 160, 266, 351, 487, 689, 826, 1080, 1113, 1315). This perhaps reflects the topos of creation only being complete once voice is added; cf. Steiner (2001) 139 on Empedocles fr. 62 (Wright) that preserves a creation story where humans are originally 'inanimate *tupoi*. hollow mo[u]lds or outlines, before voice or language were added', just 'vacant objects'. εὐγλήνοις only here in the *Alexandra* (γλήνη at 362; 988 to refer to Athena's statues' eyes).

[322] Nausithoos' settling of the Phaeacians at *Odyssey* 6.9-10 is an early example of these motifs of founding that the *Alexandra* also ties to its written and material poetics.

[323] See Hornblower (2015) 623 on the Dasii, claiming Aitolian descent, with the individual example of Dasios (Appian *Hannibal* 31); Dasius Altinius (Livy 24.45.1).

[324] Hornblower (2015) 63; ad 609 on this colonial 'nostalgia' for Greekness in this passage, where the birds seek to eat bread (a marker of civilization) and perhaps a hint of their bewilderment as they try to re-inhabit Greek clothes as they did before (605-609). Alexandrian poetry, claims to ethnicity and the construction of kingship has been examined by Stephens (2002), and it would be interesting to probe the *Alexandra*'s construction of leadership within the later second-century context that Hornblower has argued for persuasively.

[325] Gigante-Lanzara ad loc. has an excellent discussion.

around them seems to resemble a human settlement, with Zethos, the grafter, as model (601-604): φερώνυμον νησῖδα νάσσονται πρόμου, /θεατρο**μόρφῳ** πρὸς κλίτει γεωλόφῳ /**ἀγυιοπλαστήσαντες** ἐμπέδοις πομαῖς /πυκνὰς καλιάς, Ζῆθον ἐκμιμούμενοι.[326] That the birds imitate a legendary craftsmen, but one who seems rather less refined than a Daedalus or an Epeius,[327] is relevant to the way the absent poet is designated and his work styled overall. This and the further appearance of –*plastos* compounds that also imply physical sculpting and making to build an aesthetic that suggests the *Alexandra* is more than poetry is discussed further below (Sections 4.2; 5.1).[328] Sylvia Rougier-Blanc has already investigated more specifically the use of architectural terminology and the descriptions of buildings, especially the domestic household in the *Alexandra*.[329] The specificity of and detail in of Cassandra's descriptions of Greek buildings and houses 'as if she knows them well' stems from her special power as a seer,[330] with an authority just as if she were really there (as the chorus also famously exclaim in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*).[331] Mary Stieber's study of the prevalent vocabulary of craft in Euripides is a starting point for analysing this feature of the *Alexandra*

---

[326] The favour of Zethos' physical work over the lyre-strumming Amphion again seems to express the downgrading of song as ethereal in favour of a poetics that as Stieber (2011) has argued for Euripides' borrows the language of craft and tangibility in order to express its permanence and the craft of the poet. Cf. Holzinger (1895) 602 ad loc on the contrast of 'Kraftsmensch' and ' Kunstler'; Fusillo, Hurst and Paduano (1991) ad 602: 'il contrasto tra vita contemplative e vita attiva, quest ultima rappresentata dalla forza fisica bruta di Zeto'; Hurst and Kolde (2008) ad 608: Zethos is named alone, and the passage recalls Euripides, *Antiope* (TrGF 5.1 = fr 179-227) where the brothers and lives of contemplation and activity as in *Argonautica* 1.735-741. Cf. Hornblower (2015) ad 602: 'Zethos is here more than a synonym for city-builder'; he looks forward to both the Boiotian section at 633-647 and perhaps … to the Daunian stelai.'

[327] Sistakou (2008) 159-163, 182 on Epeius.

[328] For the poem in terms of building and architecture see Rougier-Blanc (2009); Sistakou (2012) 147 on the poem as household and tomb. Some of the language of the *Alexandra*'s frame is picked up in the birds' activity here: πύκνος 602, cf. 10; ἐκμιμέομαι 602, cf. 7 (and Eur. fr. in above note, suggesting a type of *mimesis* that results in concrete, visible, and close-packed lines.

[329] Rougier-Blanc (2009).

[330] Stieber (2007) 13 with n. 56 for more examples from tragedy, most notably the use of specific terms by the Phrygian slave in *Orestes* 1473ff.

[331] Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 1197-1201.

further,[332] although extensive discussion will be restricted to the specific example of Cassandra's prison and Athena's shrine in relation to ecphrastic epigram in section 4.[333] The notion of a person, subject (who is nevertheless ignored) in tension with the idea of an object that sees and speaks (and thus commemorates) is central to the aesthetics of the poem, its interest in cult, and feminine expression and creativity. A study of visuality in the poem also prompts questions about the construction of the (absent) poet and how, as we may expect particularly in a Hellenistic piece of literature, the reflection on created objects and processes further functions on a metapoetic level. In sections 4 and 5 I will try to bring out some additional aspects of the way Cassandra (and Athena) are depicted in the *Alexandra* in terms of interaction between the visual and verbal arts, and how the poem is presented as a visual object as well as a living voice. That Cassandra-Alexandra is also a cult figure suggests the poem itself can be thought of in terms of divine image, both a conduit for some sort of living force and a real 'house', or new body that the supernatural power can inhabit.[334] Mari has already highlighted the way vision pulls our attention to scenes of cult and ritual in the poem,

---

[332] Of the specialist (often prosaic) vocabulary Stieber investigates in Euripides (2011) 24ff., many terms do not appear in the *Alexandra* (e.g. no instances of ἔμβυλον, εὐκίονες, εὐστυλῶν, θριγός, κρηδέμνον, ὀρθοστατης, παστάς, περικίων, στῦλος, τρίγλυφος, and nor is 'Cyclopean' used as an epithet). Words suggested by her study that do appear are κρηπίς (336, Priam's death at the altar; 883, Mopsus' tomb; 1191, the altar where Hector made sacrifices); βάθρον (770 Odysseus' house: see Rougier-Blanc (2009); κίων (281, Hector as a 'pillar'; 711, Odysseus pins his offering to a pillar); σταθμός (290, ships; 272, weight; 1371, homes); γεῖσον (292, metaphorical bees); τεῖχος (1418, wooden walls); ἐρεισμα (282, Hector, cf. Diomedes as colossal wall-builder 617ff). Most prominent is the use of the verb πυργόω (*Alexandra* 65, 81, 254, 442, 526, 934, 971, 1007, 1255) perhaps because it also recalls the theme of vantage points, and feminine space restored; as Stieber (2011) 104 comments of its 12 appearance in Euripides' *Trojan Women* it can evoke 'the idea of a city and what makes [it]..a civilized place for humans to dwell.' In the *Alexandra*, we also find χαράσσω (1173), frequently τεύχω (456; 532; 707; 857; 949; 1001; 1128; 1142; 1473) production with 'craft undertones', πλάσσω 'more exclusively associated with the plastic arts' (cf. 1379; Steiber (2011) 338ff.).

[333] The key passages are the description of the shrine housing Athena's statue that segues into the description of Cassandra's prison at 348ff, with Athena turning her eyes skyward at 360ff. Cf. 988 – 992, another 'Troy', another Athena statue – this time completely shutting its eyes in the face of the Ionians' attack (not just turning away: γλήναις δ' ἄγαλμα ταῖς ἀναιμάτοις μύσει,/στυγνὴν Ἀχαιῶν εἰς Ἰάονας βλάβην/λεῦσσον φόνον τ' ἔμφυλον ἀγραύλων λύκων…). Cf. 1134 cult worshippers embrace Alexandra's 'image'; 1176ff. for Hecuba's future (image?) in cult (above 1.2.10). In all three instances where it appears in the *Alexandra*, ἀγαλμα refers to statues of Athena (559, 988 and 1262; cf. ἵδρυμα, 1032 for her shrine). Cassandra refuses to be the gladdening bridal sight: below section 5.

[334] Steiner (2001) 80ff.; Squire (2009) 113ff.

no more so than in the case of Cassandra herself.[335] In that the poem is also an extended aition for the rites in Locris and Daunia, it is not surprising that many of the ways vision is deployed in the poem are brought together in these scenes, the inner climax of the poem and Cassandra's quest for reputation and the revelation of her identity.[336] If we look to her image in that scene, a physical object confirmed by the voices of her worshippers, she gives us an image of the *Alexandra* in miniature, the representation that stands in for the living prophetess.[337] The *Alexandra* itself then becomes like an cult object in itself, that brings Alexandra present for the reader.[338]

However, when it comes to each individual metamorphoses, as usual there is variation, and each needs to be taken in its context; there is not room to cover all of them in depth here. Similarity of description cannot be trusted to equate to a similar state of being as some examples of *morphos* compounds in the poem will show; compare the metamorphosis in the story of the Arcadians at 481-483, λυκαινομόρφων Νυκτίμου κρεανόμων,[339] with the indication of Thersites' appearance at line 1000 πιθηκομόρφῳ .... Αἰτωλῷ φθόρῳ. Interestingly, as well as *Iliad* 2, Hurst and Kolde have referenced Plato *Republic* 10.620c in connection with this line: πόρρω δ' ἐν ὑστάτοις ἰδεῖν τὴν τοῦ γελωτοποιοῦ Θερσίτου πίθηκον ἐνδυομένην. This section of the dialogue, (and that which follows) form the dialogue's concluding myth of Er, detailing the selection of outer bodily shapes by the souls of mythic

---

[335] Mari (2009).

[336] Following Biffis (2012).

[337] Steiner (2001) 3ff. The *Alexandra* promotes this idea of art objects as 'complete substitutes' rather than imitations alone.

[338] Replicating and standing in for an absent mortal also has obvious funerary connotations: see Vernant (1983). As Cassandra stands between divine and human, we can also see the replication as a (fictional) connection for the reader/viewer to a higher power.

[339] See Hornblower (2015) ad loc. for the competing 'ritual' and 'degrading' explanation of metamorphoses (with longer note at 176 on metamorphoses in the poem generally). The notion of degradation/dehumanization has often been applied to the transformation of characters in Euripides' *Hecuba*; see e.g. Burnett (1994); Mossman (1995); Gregory (1999); Hall (2010) 255ff. for further discussion on this and the *kunossema*.

The passive/active bind is present also in translation, e.g. 'wolf-shaped' or 'wolf-formed' could imply both in the form of/looking like a wolf and made/born from a wolf. Whether this is the reason the LSJ supplies 'she-wolf-shaped' (citing only Lyc.) I am not sure.

figures. It is also a reported catalogue of seeing within an expansive and otherworldly vision, taking it close to the *Alexandra*'s structure.[340] The souls' choices include those to become beasts according to their character, traits and actions in previous life, and the connection of outer appearance and ethos, is similar to the *Alexandra*'s parade of beastly heroes and bird-like tragic victims, suggesting the poem engages with ancient theories of representation interested in *ethopoiia*,[341] or how to accurately convey character (the locus of which was often said to be the eyes).[342] Other metamorphoses are completely different, for example the description of Io, βοῶπιν ταυροπάρθενον κόρην ('the bull-eyed bull-maiden girl'), first in the series of continental abductions at 1292, with the playful description of Europa over three-lines as πόριν … Σαραπτίαν (1298-1300) carried off by the Cretans ἐν ταυρομόρφῳ τράμπιδος τυπώματι (1299).[343] Lycophron is 'neatly ambiguous about Zeus' metamorphosis into a bull' where at 1299 the reference appears to be to the shape of the Cretan ship's prow, while 1298 'teases … with a word for "girl" … "heifer"' to make an 'elegant compromise'.[344] The use of the language of creation and shaping in these metamorphoses constructs visual images that also suggest the poet's work in the background, moulding and shaping language to accurately portray his subject, without ever intruding on the idea that the object that he makes has a life of its own. In line 1299, the –μόρφος suffix and the noun τυπώμα contain the ambivalence between the active and the passive that the poem embodies, between shaping and being shaped, and making and receiving an impression, creating and perceiving. The interaction between the visual perception of change of form and the formation of language to effect it, can be seen in a more complex way in Cassandra's account of her mother Hecuba's fated death

---

[340] This might suggest that an element of the struggle to describe what is seen and delivered by Apollo in the *Alexandra* is the impossibility felt of describing religious, and especially mystical experience. A good introduction to scholarly debate about the description of mystical experience and the limits of language is the work of Stephen Katz (e.g. Katz (1992)).

[341] Rossi (2002) 170.

[342] Rehm (1992) 40.

[343] On this 'rationalizing' (Bühler (1968)) see Hornblower's (2015) notes on 1296-1311, and for the point that these young women are emphasized further here than in Herodotus' version.

[344] Hornblower (2015) 1298-1299 ad loc.

and transformation,[345] related twice (330-334; 1174-1188). This also demonstrates further how conservation of name and memory through cult is underpinned by the notion that both audio and visual elements are necessary to effect a lasting result.

While it is true that the language of *kleos* is reserved for the Trojan line,[346] rather than some sort of rhetorical inversion of epic *kleos* alone,[347] the commemoration of Cassandra's family and Troy obeys the internal logic of the poem and is always linked to her own glory and her own experience, as Biffis has argued.[348] The aesthetic aspects of the poem and this process are linked, and Hecuba's end also displays interconnection between vision and voice and the differing modes of memorialization. Here is the text (330-334):

σὲ δ' ἀμφὶ κοίλην αἰχμάλωτον ᾐόνα

πρέσβυν Δολόγκων δημόλευστον ὠλένῃ

ἐπεσβόλοις ἀραῖσιν ἠρεθισμένῃ

κρύψει κύπασσις χερμάδων ἐπομβρίᾳ,

Μαίρας ὅταν φαιουρὸν ἀλλάξῃς δομήν.

[345] The most obvious intertext here is of course Euripides' *Hecuba* where the newly blinded Polymestor tries to put a dampener on Hecuba's revenge with his angry howl of a prophecy detailing Agamemnon's woes and Hecuba's transformation in dog and *kunossema* (E. *Hec*. 1273). See Hurst and Kolde (2008) 330-334 ad loc. for the full details of the Thracian story and comparison with Euripides; Hornblower comments 1187 ad loc. 'the stoning is not in Euripides', and the lack of iconography for this scene (Hornblower (2015) 1176 ad loc). This is taken further in the later Q.S. 14.346-351 where the metamorphosis and becoming stone sign are brought within 3 lines and it becomes a miraculous spectacle for the internal audience of Greeks: ἔνθα τέρας θηητὸν ἐπιχθονίοισι φαάνθη / οὕνεκα δὴ Πριάμοιο δάμαρ πολυδακρύτοιο / ἐκ βροτοῦ ἀλγινόεσσα κύων γένετ'· ἀμφὶ δὲ λαοὶ / θάμβεον ἀγρόμενοι· τῆς δ' ἄψεα λάϊνα πάντα / θῆκε θεός, μέγα θαῦμα καὶ ἐσσομένοισι βροτοῖσι· Most of interest for us is the metamorphosis into an object that straddles the world of the story and the external world of the spectators, a stone commoration to a tragic heroine: see esp. E. *Hec*. 1271: τύμβῳ δ' ὄνομα σῷ κεκλήσεται.

[346] McNelis and Sens (2011b).

[347] McNelis and Sens (2011b): see discussion section 2.

[348] Biffis (2012) 194ff.

In the initial vision of her mother's end Cassandra addresses her in the second person as if her mother is really before her as she speaks increasing *pathos*.[349] Like Cassandra, Hecuba is another isolated figure, as Gigante-Lanzara comments the vision of the stoning 'esprime l'uccisione colletiva, a furor di popolo, attuato col lancio delle pietre', with δημόλευστον picking up a rare term used in the *Antigone* by Ismene to describe Creon's threat to anyone who will tend to Polyneikes' corpse.[350] The Sophoclean intertext emphasizes the stoning as punishment of an isolated individual, and emphasizes the future impossibility of Cassandra's intervention in the death and funerary care of her mother. A close parallel, to be found in a fragment of Nicander that is usually assigned to his *Heteroeumena* (or *Metamorphoses*),[351] brings out the differing shifts of emphases:[352]

ἔνθ' Ἑκάβη Κισσηίς, ὅτ' ἐν πυρὶ δέρκετο πάτρην

Καὶ πόσιν ἑλκηθεῖσα παρασπαίροντα θυηλαῖς,

εἰς ἅλα ποσσὶν ὄρουσε καὶ ἥν ἠλλάξατο μορφήν

γρήιον, Ὑρκανίδεσσιν ἐειδομένην σκυλάκεσσιν.

While there are similarities, for example the use of the same verb of change (although here in the perfect) and the marking of the change of form (ἀλλάξῃς δομήν (Lyc.); ἠλλάξατο μορφήν (Nic.)), and more broadly to the theme of visual immediacy to which we could compare the scene of Oenone's suicide and Paris' death (Lyc. 61-68; δρακοῦσα, 62; cf. δέρκετο, Nic.). Lycophron's couple are of course estranged, and Nicander's wordplay perhaps suggests the

[349] Hornblower (2015) 330 ad loc. emphasises the use of the second person.

[350] Only in these 2 places (Lyc. 331;. S. *Ant.* 35-36: ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν τούτων τι δρᾷ, /φόνον προκεῖσθαι **δημόλευστον** ἐν πόλει; Gigante-Lanzara (2009) ad loc. with 110n.58 further rare terms from Sophocles that appear in the *Alexandra.*

[351] Hornblower (2015) 35 states that perhaps the poet's 'extraordinary fondness for tales of metamorphosis' is due to the lost Ἑτεριούμενα.

[352] See Hurst and Kolde (2008) ad loc. Nicander fr.62 Schneider (with notes in Gow and Schofield (1953) 145) = ΣM E. *Hec*. 3. On Nicander's shared aesthetic of Romantic darkness with our poem see Sistakou (2012). Some curious reminiscences of Nicander occur in Lycophron, e.g. the description of 'snake' Clytemnestra's violence to Cassandra (δράκαινα διθὰς...1114ff.) seems to owe something to Nicander's description of Helen's killing of a snake at *Theriaca* 309ff. See Hornblower (2015) 34-36 on the poets' relationship.

awful realisation for Hecuba that she can no longer turn to her husband for refuge, but must run into the sea independently instead (πόσιν…ποσσὶν). However, in both passages a wife focalizes the very last instant of husband's life (for Nicander's παρασπαίροντα, cf. περισπαίποντι, Lyc. 68). Both texts, as Euripides' play, reserve some agency for the Trojan queen, even in the most dire of situations.[353]

While Ovid's later version of the metamorphosis communicates the change through the sound of Hecuba's voice,[354] Lycophron's versions of the Thracian stoning and metamorphosis are visual.[355] This features typically a more ambiguous and static picture of something enclosed, changed and embellished from without, covered in stone (333) at the same time as the second person κρύψει suggests some agency from within on Hecuba's part to enact this mysterious transformation, as if the prophetess is able to lend her mother some of her power to control her own image, and the poet theirs to change and concretize new forms (334).[356] While Nicander's latter two lines run from the old woman who now appears like a dog, Lycophron begins line 338 with the new state of being: Μαίρας ὅταν φαιουρὸν ἀλλάξῃς δομήν. The change is rapid in both texts,[357] in the *Alexandra* some similarities between the two states remain; the metaphorical notion of the rocks as clothing[358] and the dark grey colour of Hecuba's tail suggests crossover between the two states. There are also signs in this first account of Hecuba's fate already of the future compensation on offer that Cassandra's prophecy will go on to commemorate. The second person future indicative ἀλλάξῃς also reads as a prophetic promise of exchange, cultic reciprocity and recompense rather than

---

353 We could also compare Cassandra's vision of Troy in flames more generally (see above 00), but hers is without the sacrificial imagery in Nicander of the dying Trojans as burnt offerings in the fire. Note use of παρασπαίροντα here; σπαίροντι for Paris' final breaths as seen by Oenone at *Alexandra* 68.

354 Buxton (2009) notes the prominence of voice in Ovid's gradual metamorphoses.

355 Ovid *Metamorphoses* 13.499-575.

356 At 1181 her tomb is described as ψευδήριον.

357 Cf. Gigante-Lanzara (2000) 333-334 ad loc.

358 Gigante-Lanzara (2000) 333-334 ad loc.; Hornblower (2015) 333 ad loc. note the model is Paris in *Iliad* 3.57 (λάϊνον ἕσσο χιτῶνα): again referring back to Paris as the ultimate cause of Troy's sufferings.

simply change of form. Cassandra will not leave only this image of her mother as a silent monument to her death, but will go on later in the prophecy to describe her existence beyond death as a special attendant of Hecate, a 'watchdog' (ἐπωπίδα, 1176) policing her those who err and μὴ σέβουσι λαμπαδουχίαις, 'torchbearing' in the way appropriate to the goddess (1179-1180). If we can consider metamorphoses as sites in the poem where the reader is prompted to be particularly alert to the poet's language changing work, we are then perhaps justified in further attention to some possible sound-effects here in the forging of a new *hapax*. The description of Hecuba's new canine form as φαιουρόν ... δομήν may contain a hint in the (dark) φαίος (tail) οὐρά of the light φαός watcher οὖρος into which Cassandra's mother will truly be transformed, or further as if the darker form conceals the reality of her cult role.[359]

As well severing again any straightforward connection between the way something appears outwardly and the capacity of Cassandra to see beyond this and prophesy the truth, it maintains the thoroughgoing idea that words themselves (like the poem and Cassandra), contain something more within, paradoxically hiding and making visible.[360] This adds to the plausibility of the 'prophecy fiction'[361] and the extended connection made between interpreting omens and their meaning, and interpreting the imagery and language of the poem. While simile and metaphor work by analogy, to illustrate a concept, image it in the mind, they also take the reader further from the reality of the thing described at the same time. The 'stone-clothing' that Hecuba receives makes Homeric metaphor literal;[362] that is, this imagery is used to suggest the poem goes beyond sound and poetry as if the voice could

[359] LSJ sv. οὖρος (B) notes also the use of the word as an epithet for a dog, and the I.E. connections to guarding and sight. Another cumulative detail meaning that interpolation is unlikely? Hornblower (2015) 1187 ad loc. sees a further link in that 'the stem λευ- recalls δημόλευστον at 331'.

[360] Cusset (2009) 119.

[361] Sistakou (2009) 254.

[362] Hornblower (2015) 333 ad loc. the metaphor is that of the desired stoning of Paris in *Iliad* 3.57 (λάϊνον ἕσσο χιτῶνα): 'putting on a stone coat'; cf. Gigante-Lanzara (2009) 114: 'cement coat' with 333-4 ad loc: 'grandiosa metafora omerica'. It is Hurst and Kolde 333 ad loc. on the'métaphore Homerique' who see the image as literalizing the figurative language of Homer; also Gigante-Lanzara (2008) 330-332 ad loc. 'sul litorale riccoro'.

be plastered round and given other dimensions that are visual and physically material. This is why speaking and seeing at the same time is crucial to the poem as it allows this aesthetic to unfold, by suggesting the poem goes beyond the medium of poetry; in the latter sections of the thesis we will see that this is not unrelated to Cassandra's 'feminine perspective' in the poem, with reference to ecphrastic epigram and the idea of inscription and sculpture in the representation of voice. Each utterance in the poem is also concretized word, written expression and visual sign encoding memory. If we read the two visions of Hecuba together, we see the silent form given voice just as the *Alexandra* does for Cassandra. It is this constant valence between described *seen* object and active speaking subject that characterizes the poem, and that movement across temporal levels rests upon: this is what helps create the 'achronic dimension, in which the prophecy functions for a learned readership, which reads and understands the written text' and for Biffis, reflects on the ability of poetry to transcend time.[363] There is a particular conception of *poiesis* as written or inscribed that allows this to happen and that also reflects the feminine voice of Cassandra; a figure that should be the most silent speaker as in fact the most excessively verbose.[364]

At 1174-1188 Hecuba's future is prophesied again in apostrophe and now Hecuba will be given a noisy voice by a divine παρθένος, as Hecate is referred to here: ὦ μῆτερ, ὦ δύσμητερ, οὐδὲ σὸν κλέος / ἄπυστον ἔσται, Περσέως δὲ παρθένος / Βριμὼ Τρίμορφος θήσεταί σ᾽ ἐπωπίδα / κλαγγαῖσι ταρμύσσουσαν ἐννύχοις βροτούς, / ὅσοι μεδούσης Στρυμόνος Ζηρυνθίας /δείκηλα μὴ σέβουσι λαμπαδουχίαις, /θύσθλοις Φεραίαν ἐξακεύμενοι θεάν. /ψευδήριον δὲ νησιωτικὸς στόνυξ /Πάχυνος ἕξει σεμνὸν ἐξ ὀνειράτων / ταῖς δεσποτείαις ὠλέναις ὠγκωμένον /ῥείθρων Ἑλώρου πρόσθεν ἐκτερισμένης· / ὃς δὴ παρ᾽ ἀκταῖς τλήμονος ῥανεῖ χοάς, / τριαύχενος μήνιμα δειμαίνων θεᾶς, / λευστῆρα πρῶτον οὕνεκεν ῥίψας πέτρον / Ἅιδῃ κελαινῶν θυμάτων ἀπάρξεται. In line with the discussion above as to the designation of Hecuba as newly φαίουρος, and of the surveillance landscape hanging in the temporal balance

---

[363] Biffis (2012) 208.

[364] Cf. Cusset (2002). Schol. Lyc. 3: ἥσυχος κόρη ἡ ἡσυχεστάτη· ὡς ἁρμόδιον γὰρ ἡ σιωπὴ καὶ γυναιξί, μήτοιγε μόνον παρθένας, ὡς *καὶ* φησι Σοφοκλῆς ["] γύναι, γυναιξὶ κοσμον ἡ σιγὴ φέρει ["] (Αι. 293). ἀλλως. διχῶς ταῦτα. ἢ οὕτως *οὐ γὰρ* ἡσυχος ὑπάρχει ἡ κόρη καὶ στίζεις ἐνταῦθα ἢ οὕτως...'

in the *Alexandra*, the reading ἑπωπίδα ('watcher') is to be preferred to ἑπωίδα ('attendant, companion') here, although neither are without sense.[365] The notion here is clearly that the transformed Hecuba looks out for non-believers almost as if she were a part of the δείκηλα that the torchbearing worshippers approach (1179),[366] an unexpected and terrifying voice, more terrifying than a mere 'attendant', but more that of a watcher in the dark. Odysseus begins the stoning, but also the compensation for the act, as the ψευδήριον (1181) is created, and Hecate appeased, acting on his dream productively (ἐξ ὀνειράτων /ταῖς δεσποτείαις ὠλέναις ὠγκωμένον; cf. empty arms of Paris not grasping the insubstantial Helen-*eidolon* at 113-114: κἀξ ὀνειράτων /κεναῖς ἀφάσσων ὠλέναισι δέμνια).[367] Hecuba receives a man-made monument and through this act, is granted a difficult but efficacious voice as part of her cult role as guardian of her mistress' images. Hecuba's own disembodied voice will come to attest to not just her past suffering but her connection to the goddess and the preservation of her memory in the future.[368] As Cassandra promises at 1174-75, her mother's glory will not be

[365] Cf. Hornblower (2015) ad loc: 'ἑπωίδα [*sic*]: a hapax word formed from ἕπομαι. This is preferable to the alternative reading ἐπ-. 'watcher' (Scheer, Mascialino, Hurst/Kolde). Σ does not comment, but Tzetzes explains the different meanings with rough and smooth breathings, and prefers the rough.' Mooney (1921) 1176 ad loc. says that ἑπωπίδα (= ἀκόλουθον) & ἐπωπίδα (= ἐπίσκοπον) are both known to the scholia and cites Holzinger's (1895) derivation of the word from ἕπω & ὤψ 'because the hound follows every movement of the master with its eyes'.

[366] Hornblower (2015) ad 1179: cf. 1259 'A Herodotean word for a (theatrical) representation: 2.171.1; AR 4.746 Aphrodite on the cloak; IG 14.1301 'closest to the present sense...perhaps, but that is very late.' Cf. Stieber (2011) 155ff. on occasions in Euripides' where ἄγαλμα does not always indicate beauty, citing E. fr. 62h = 968 TrGF (*Alexandros*) where Cassandra calls her mother κύων: Ἑκάτης ἄγαλμα φωσφόρου κύων ἔσῃ. This suggests that the concept of worthwhile representation in the *Alexandra* is tied to cult image, rather than to mimesis of beauty. Cf. Hornblower (2015) ad 1176 for the Hecuba/Hecate association.

[367] 1181-1184: ψευδήριον δὲ νησιωτικὸς στόνυξ / Πάχυνος **ἕξει** σεμνὸν **ἐξ ὀνειράτων** /ταῖς δεσποτείαις **ὠλέναις** ὠγκωμένον /ῥείθρων Ἑλώρου πρόσθεν ἐκτερισμένης. Compare Achilles futile vision of Helen (172, ἐξ ὀνείρων), or Paris' encounter with Helen (113, κἀξ ὀνειράτων, with ὠλέναισι appearing in the following line too). Hornblower (2015) ad loc. cites Syll.^{3} 663 (Delos 200 BC) 'for another Hellenistic text attesting the building of a cult place as the result of a dream.' Syll = Dittenberger, W. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* (1915-24) volume III. For full discussion of this latter scene in terms of cult see Biffis (2012) 110-111, stressing in n.176 there is no evidence for a cult in Sicily to match the evocation of Hecuba's tomb.

[368] See Biffis (2012).

unheard (οὐδε σὸν κλέος / ἄπυστον ἔσται), through Hecuba's own eerie howls in the dark, as well as the *Alexandra*'s own strange and disembodied voice.[369]

1.2.11: Conclusion

Taken cumulatively, this preliminary survey of vision in the poem should convince us that there is more than one kind of seeing in the poem and that we are justified in making further analysis of individual cases as well as broader thematic concerns. Although the thesis concentrates mainly on specific examples of focalization, there are some steers to wider questions of whether a particular aesthetic, philosophy, or physical/scientific idea of vision is to be found. While there is scope here for further work, this thesis focuses on questions about characterization, structure and genre. The *Alexandra* does have a shape and a structure, but it is also generically eclectic, which means the visual dynamics of the poem are far from uniform, as well as frequently 'generically sensitive'. That is, the acts of seeing are intertextual which is a specific part of the way the reader is forced to consider material in a new way through Cassandra's prophetic narrative.

[369] A parallel with Cassandra's predictions for her own future in cult (see Biffis (2012) 107ff. on the juxtaposition of these passages making Cassandra the central paradigm for the commemoration of her own kin and Trojan *kleos* at 1174, 1212 and 1226; esp. 110: 'My view is that Cassandra's own glory reverberates through Hector's cultic celebration thanks to the fact she is also a Trojan and will enjoy her own cult.'

Section 2: Seeing Homeric Epic : Lycophron's *Iliad* (*Alexandra* 249-306)

This chapter examines the intertextual relationship between the *Alexandra* and Homeric epic and the way that focalization and imagery create optical 'frames' that mirror the nested voices in the poem, further expressing interaction between vision and voice, prophetic truth and poetic representation.[370] In Cassandra's prophetic vision she 'n'est pas seulement spectatrice, mais actrice' who *sees* the future and herself within it in a way that draws on her single appearance in book 24 of the *Iliad*.[371] This can be read as Cassandra's experience of the future's canonical works of literature *before anybody else*. Consideration of simile and the verb ἰνδάλλομαι further examine how the effects in this passage that cause the reader to question the status of what Cassandra sees hinge on the relationship between vision and voice.[372]

2.1: *The Whole 'Iliad' as a Part within Cassandra's Prophecy*

The text of the *Alexandra* encourages the reader to view lines 249-306 of the poem as a marked whole with a clearly signalled beginning and end that represents and re-presents Homer's *Iliad* in an overtly visual way.[373] While these lines recast the finale of the *Iliad* from Cassandra's point of view, they are also about usurping the priority of Homeric epic as first and best. The later poet must tackle his predecessors, but in the *Alexandra* this is through

[370] Lowe (2004) 308ff. Biffis (2012) 181-182 has suggested how we get the impression of call and answer, chorus and soloist, between the lone voice of Cassandra and the Trojan women's lament, crossing temporal boundaries.

[371] Cusset (2009) 129; Hornblower (2015) ad 254-256: 'Kassandra here virtually listens to her own future self': she also *sees* her. On *Iliad* 24 see below.

[372] See Sens (2014) and discussion below.

[373] Sens (2014) 107-109 on the scene as *eusynoptic*.

Cassandra's encounter with and experience of the canonical works of the future.[374] Here, a character from epic sees themselves at the heart of it and reconstructs the idea of epic as a genre at the same time, as if Cassandra's future vision lets her wrest control of her readers past; at the same time she cannot change her future, and the status of the *Iliad* as *the* story of Troy's end.[375] Through the compression of Homeric material, technique and language in these fifty-seven lines of trimeter,[376] we are also invited to see the *Iliad* as a distinct representation within Cassandra's prophecy, another part within a whole, frame within a frame, and a visual 'quote' paradigmatic of how the poem plays with levels of representation and fiction.[377] The effect here is linked to the the idea of epic specifically through the *Alexandra*'s 'attachment to the principle of cyclicity', as an 'experiment on the idea of the cycle...[and] the possibility of including the whole...Trojan myth within the framework of ... a large scale prolepsis'.[378] By provisionally[379] viewing Lycophron's '*Iliad*' as a self-contained 'whole' within the *Alexandra*,[380] we have a useful site to explore the poem's intertextual relationship to Homeric epic and ideology, developing especially the work of McNelis and Sens.[381] This does not mean that from

---

[374] The poet remains 'hidden' in this sense although external control of the text is always implied (cf. Cusset (2009)).

[375] Hinds' model of intertextuality (1998, see esp. 123-124): we might ask how the poet actively reconstructs these 'master texts' (and the idea of epic as a genre) in the process and makes his own text prior (re-shaping our re-reading or recall of these texts in the process). This approach is helpful as it allows room to stress addition, creativity and innovation as well as ideas of deviation, subversion and re-writing. On the *Alexandra*'s 'historical sense' of 'generic form' see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 439.

[376] See e.g. Hurst and Kolde (2008) ad 252-3 highlighting this effect; cf. Durbec (2008); Sistakou (2008) 108ff.; McNelis and Sens (2011b).

[377] I use the terms of Yacobi (2000), herself drawing on Sternberg (1982); (1986).

[378] Sistakou (2008) 118-120; 180.

[379] Silk (2001) 41.

[380] Following Sharrock (2000) on part and wholes; see especially on parts of texts and boundaries and how the interpreter negotiates which 'part' to give emphasis to (26ff.). On Lycophron's 'Odyssee' see Schade (1999), McNelis and Sens (2011b) 76-78; on his 'Argonautica' Schmakeit-Bean (2006) and West (2007). Hinds (1998) 103ff. discussion of 'Ovid's *Aeneid* (and Virgil's *Metamorphoses*)' in which he examines *Metamorphoses* 13.626-14.582 and the *Aeneid* as a 'whole' has been influential here.

[381] See McNelis and Sens (2011b) on 'Trojan *kleos*' in the *Alexandra*; also to be developed in their (2016) monograph which unfortunately appeared too late to be incorporated into this thesis. Cf. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 441-443; Sistakou (2008) 25; McNelis and Sens (2010) on Virgil and Lycophron. We might see the *Alexandra* as preceding

here we have to assume the relationship of the *Alexandra* to Homer is uniform across the entire poem. The *Alexandra* aims to go beyond epic and presents itself as including *everything* in the prophecy of Cassandra,[382] but in doing so, the focus and boundaries of the *Iliad,* how Achilles and Hector are depicted there, and the fact that it is through Homer's depiction of Troy that they are known must nevertheless be acknowledged.[383] In her prophesying of the events at Troy, Cassandra also envisions a future audience for the *Iliad*, in contrast to the futility of her own speech.

The way this is done exploits the (well-noted) fact, that while, for the reader, this poem comes after Homer[384] and the Greek literary tradition, within the *Alexandra*, Cassandra's prophecy

---

later novelistic accounts of 'what really happened' at Troy from alternative character perspectives, e.g. the accounts of Dictys (See Merkle (1994), Michelakis (2002) 137-138, Dowden (2009)), Dares, or the Trojan novel of Philostratus which also uses a framing device (as provenance to authorize its version of events): see Bowie (1994) 184ff.).

There could also be lots more consideration than I have given here of how this draws on Stesichorus' and the construction of the poet whose authority is granted by the character whose story he tells, recovering the 'truth' along with his eyesight. See Blondell (2013) 199-120 on how Helen 'appropriates the role of the epic Muse' and thus allows Stesichorus to 'directly contradict' Homeric tradition. On Stesichorus and Lycophron see Hornblower (2015) 12-13.

[382] The promise to tell everything in the opening lines of the poem can be taken as a statement of this. Sistakou (2008) 25 has suggested a particularly Hellenistic interest in episode, the ordering of material and the possibilities of creating new ways to connect the epic cycle together, which the *Alexandra* both participates in and goes beyond. For another re-presentation of the mustering of forces at Troy see Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis* where the chorus are full of girlish wonder at swift Achilles racing against horses on the beach at 207ff. (λαιψηροδρόμον, cf. λαιψηρός *Alexandra* 245); this scene seems to be another interesting re-presentation of '*Iliad* 2' with its own catalogue of ships and a totally different atmosphere of playful happiness in anticipation of Troy. The application of this term to Achilles is a nice example of the poet's intricate work on a major theme: here the switching places with Hector that McNelis and Sens have discussed (2011b)). In the *Iliad* λαιψηρός is more usually found in a formulaic phrase for the swiftness of Hector's knees and feet or other Trojan speediness (10.358; 15.269, 22.144, 22.204; 14.17 (simile of Hector and Trojan advance); 20.93 (Aeneas); 21.278 (Apollo's missiles). In the two cases where it does describes Achilles it refers to his defeat by a divine opponent *despite* his speed (21.278: Scamander overtakes him; 22.24: Apollo rebukes Achilles for thinking he could out-run him).

[383] While in agreement with Fantuzzi (2012) 18; 42-43; that 'the prophetess reels off an unconventional interpretation for the past war of Troy' and 'cannot rewrite the story of the war or the death of Hector' but only 'acrimoniously re-read...with an anti-*Iliad* and anti-Greek perspective', this cannot simply be explained by the fact that she is a seer 'accustomed to manipulating the presentation of events' (cf. McNelis and Sens (2011b) on her programme of rebalancing Trojan/Greek *kleos*; Biffis (2012) on her interest in her own reputation).

[384] Following Hunter (1998) 122, Lowe (2004), Sens (2010) 305, McNelis and Sens (2011b) 56.

stands before the events of the Trojan war that she foresees.[385] Through this, the differences between prophecy and poetry and the authority, knowledge and vision of the epic bard and the seer are further explored. While Homer and epic tradition are acknowledged, this is a two-way street: the *Alexandra* shows us that Cassandra can do things that the epic poet cannot. As McNelis and Sens have argued, this amounts to 'a direct confrontation with the authority of Homeric poetry'[386] but it is also a way to acknowledge its status *and* the barrier it poses to the reader in simply accepting the prophetess' account and the value of the *Alexandra* as a different sort of *poiesis*.

Section 2.2: Making the Beginning the End and the End the Beginning.

Lycophron's '*Iliad*', like Homer's, begins with Achilles and ends with Hector. The passage as a whole shows the poet's interest in the boundaries of the *Iliad* and its famous intense focus on this particular part of the Trojan War cycle.[387] This has now also been discussed in brief by Sens, who describes (243ff.) as 'a synoptic overview of the Trojan War that is framed by allusions to the beginning and end of the fighting in the *Iliad*' so that 'the overview of the war is framed by references to the beginning of Trojan conflict and to the aftermath of the last battlefield death.'[388] This is examined in more detail below, along with arguments for

[385] See Proclus' summary of the *Cypria* (*Chrestomathia* 1): καὶ Κασσάνδρα περὶ τῶν μελλόντων προδελοῖ. Sistakou (2008) 104ff., has discussed in detail Lycophron's use of episodes found in the epic cycle and argued that the *Cypria* provides the setting for the *Alexandra*.

[386] McNelis and Sens (2011b) 55; as they have shown in this article, in Lycophron, Hector is praised while Achilles is blamed (cf. Durbec (2008a)), drawing on Cassandra's rhetorical claims of Trojan victory over Greek in Euripides' *Trojan Women* (365ff.); this also reflects and exploits the mutually linked fates between the two characters in the *Iliad* (see Redfield (1994)). However, we should be a bit careful not to limit the relationship between the *Alexandra* and Homer as necessarily or simply oppositional, as this risks reifying both. That Hector does in fact receive *kleos* and sympathy in the Homeric account then becomes something *also deliberately occluded* as part of Cassandra's narration (cf. McNelis and Sens (2011b)).

[387] Lycophron shows a particular interest in *Iliad* books 1-2 and 22-24; cf. Sens (2014).

[388] Sens (2014) 107-109. Hornblower (2015) 42-44 on the evidence from epigrams that women performed sections of epic, especially Troy's fall: 'Might the *Alexandra* have been an unusually long recited poem of this evidently popular type?' If so, we have more play here with parts and wholes, especially if we also think about the entire poem as a giant ecphrastic epigram (4.1). That she has 'three articulate but anguished lines' (*Il.* 24.704-6) also

identifying the end of Lycophron's 'Iliad' at *Alexandra* 306. A short passage at 243-248 provides the transition to its beginning, moving from the description of events in Achilles' life prior to Troy[389] and preparing the reader for what is to follow:

καὶ δὴ στένει Μύρινα καὶ παράκτιοι 243

ἵππων φριμαγμὸν ᾐόνες δεδεγμέναι, 244

ὅταν Πελασγὸν ἅλμα λαιψηροῦ ποδὸς 245

εἰς θῖν' ἐρείσας λοισθίαν αἴθων λύκος 246

κρηναῖον ἐξ ἄμμοιο ῥοιβδήσῃ γάνος, 247

πηγὰς ἀνοίξας τὰς πάλαι κεκρυμμένας. 248

As Sistakou has shown, anticipation is built by a sequence of references to oracles about Troy[390] as well as the repeated use of καὶ δή to introduce 'steps' in the Greek advance.[391] Thematic emphases of the passage to come are introduced; the special status of Achilles as the ultimate Greek hero and killer of Hector which will become the subject of epic poetry. The landscape of Troy is figured as awaiting his presence and precisely this moment in time (to come). The land 'groans' (στένει, 243) under his single foot as it does under the weight of the whole army in the *Iliad* (2.94-8, 780-5).[392] The *Alexandra* riffs on the idea of the singularity of the Homeric hero and the size of the Greek army found in the *Iliad*[393] and in doing so Achilles

suggests epigrammatic form within the epic (Hornblower (2015) 254-256), something that the Homeric scholia suggest for Helen in the *Iliad* (see Elmer (2005) with discussion below in this chapter).

[389] Lycophron clears the way for the climax by making the Cycnus episode uniquely pre-Troy (*Alexandra* 232-242) unlike in other versions (e.g. *Cypria* Arg.1; Pindar *Isthmian* 5.39, *Olympian* 2.82).

[390] Sistakou (2008) 108: *Alexandra* 200-204 (Calchas), 219-23 (Pryles), 224-31 (Aesacus).

[391] Hurst and Kolde (2008) 249 ad loc. – the fourth passage introduced this way (cf. 32, 43, 229); cf. Gigante-Lanzara (2009) 99-100.

[392] Mooney (1921), Hurst and Kolde (2008) on line 243 note that the detail of Myrina is taken from *Iliad* 2.811-14 and may reflect the poet's interest in 'divine langue' and alternative names; cf. Sens (2014) 107-109 with n. 27 on Myrina as another reference to *Iliad* 24.780 again joining beginning and end.

[393] E.g. *Iliad* 2.119ff.

is made the sole representative of Greek aggression at Troy.[394] Hector's death is the climax of this action as in the *Iliad* and of uppermost importance to Cassandra. The passage is also notable for its lack of difficult language as Troy comes clearly into view.[395] These lines move quickly from the Greeks' arrival in Troy to introducing the war in full swing through a large-scale image of Ares:

καὶ δὴ καταίθει γαῖαν ὀρχηστὴς Ἄρης, 249

στρόμβῳ τὸν αἱματηρὸν ἐξάρχων νόμον. 250

ὀρχηστὴς Ἄρης sets alight this 'Iliad' along with its exploration of the relationship apparently from birth of war and poetry. These lines 'summarize the martial aspect of the *Iliad*' and war and song are clearly allied through the description of Ares to suggest that martial epic will follow.[396] 'Dancer' Ares is, for Durbec, one of a poet-conductor beginning, leading and singing (ἐξάρχων) a bloody 'war song', τὸν αἱματηρὸν.... νόμον.[397] He even has some sort of extra-archaic shell instrument (στρόμβῳ, 250), predating the trumpet as a call to arms.[398] Νόμος

394 Durbec (2008) 22.

395 Hornblower (2015) ad 251-7: 'One of the least difficult sections of the poem to understand: in particular, 251-252, ἅπασα ... κεῖται consists entirely of words in common poetic use. Why should this be? The fall of Troy is central, all else is either "prequel" or sequel. The switch to simple language may be intended to emphasize this centrality.' Cf. ad 249 on the lack of periphrasis for Ares, also contributing to this move towards verbal and visual clarity.

396 Sistakou (2008) 109. Hurst and Kolde (2008) 137 observe that at lines 249-57 'le style de la narration change: le tissue dense des myths se voit remplacé par des tableaux plus suggestifs'.

397 Durbec (2008) 22 with L.S.J. s.v. νόμος II.1-2. The αἱμάτος νόμος will be answered by the bloodying of the land with Hector's body (αἱμάσσων δέμας, 266) and the Greek bodies in the dust at 297 (αἱμάξουσιν). As so often in Lycophron, whilst the imagery rapidly changes, it is transformed by the use of related imagery subsequently, encouraging the reader to reflect back and make new connections between the material, just as Cassandra's prophecy does. Cf. Hornblower (2015) 49-53); Cusset and Kolde (2013) 177-180 also on this cross-reading strategy for determining identity as a species of γρῖφοι, in a wider 'game of both intratextual and intertextual allusions'; Sistakou (2008) 118 on the scattered '*leitmotifs*' of the poem.

398 Tzetzes remarks ad loc. that Homer knew the trumpet. See shout of Achilles 18.221-222, like a σάλπιγξ (cf. cries of 'eagle' Achilles at *Alexandra* 260ff. Compare the Alexandra's imagery with the common topos of the noise of war in the *Iliad* (e.g. 8.60-5, 14.413) and to Ares' starting-gun scream (*Iliad* 5.859-861: ὃ δ' ἔβραχε χάλκεος Ἄρης / ὅσσόν τ' ἐννεάχιλοι ἐπίαχον ἢ δεκάχιλοι / ἀνέρες ἐν πολέμῳ ἔριδα ξυνάγοντες Ἄρηος). Of course, it is extremely unlikely that our scholarly poet was not aware of Homeric trumpets (as Tz. comment hints). It may be the case that στρόμβος is not a reference to shell, but to a different sort of device. The scholia on Pindar *Olympian* 13.93ff. explaining the use of ῥόμβος is suggestive of a network of associations with στρόμβος (and perhaps στρέφω) that may mean some other spiralling instrument or object is intended, perhaps one used during the celebration of the

(250) suggests a type of early lyre accompaniment attributed to Terpander, famed originator of *nomes*: 'settings' or 'preludes' which accompanied or formed part of the performance of epic; we are both at the beginning of Lycophron's 'Iliad' and of the epic genre itself.[399] The originary marriage of war and poetry means Ares is more than a straightforward allegory for conflict,[400] also representing war as the inspiration for and subject of song. Durbec has suggested this almost makes Ares into a 'Homer' figure inaugurating this new horrific combination of war song, music and dance.[401] In this context ὀρχηστής may remind the reader of Priam's insults to his remaining children after Hector's death, as 'heroes of the dancefloor' (ψεῦσταί τ᾽ ὀρχησταί τε χοροιτυπίῃσιν ἄριστοι) at *Iliad* 24.261.[402] The image of Ares thus also suggests that war *is* but a dance once it becomes the subject of trivialising epic poetry (and the warriors of epic its cowardly ballerinas).[403] Ares indicates the beginning of the war, but his inceptive role is made particularly incendiary[404] and creative; both war and poetry start with the *Iliad*.

---

mysteries (see L.S.J. s.v. ῥόμβος I.1-3 and II, s.v. στρόμβος; also in view of Euripides (as mentioned below), although cf. *Iliad* 14.413 where Aias sends Hector 'spinning like a top') rather than a curly κόχλος (murex shell) used by fishermen and Triton in the sources commonly cited for this meaning (Theocritus *Idyll* 9.25-7 and Ovid *Metamorphoses* 1.332-342; cf. Gigante-Lanzara (2000) ad. 249-250; Hurst and Kolde (2008) ad. 250). A Bacchic whirler would fit with Hurst and Kolde's comments on the frenzy of war and such imagery in tragedy (e.g. Euripides, *Phoenician Women* 103-92). Both conch and whirler would still contribute to accumulation of imagery of cyclicity.

[399] L.S.J. s.v. νόμος II.2; Howatson (2011) s.v. Terpander. She notes that while Terpander's work was lost by the Hellenistic period, his legendary status persisted.

[400] Cf. Sistakou (2008) 109: 'metonymic use of Ares for the broader notion of war in the Homeric manner'.

[401] Durbec (2008) 22ff.

[402] Esp. as Ares is mentioned in the previous line as the perpetrator of Priam's worthy sons' deaths. Further reflecting the interest in the either end of the epic. Cf. *Il.*16.617 where Aeneas calls Meriones an ὀρχηστής; while this remark could refer to Meriones' skill, its main thrust seems to be an insult. Cf. Hornblower (2015) ad 249 (as different to *Il.* 16.617).

[403] Exploiting the way war is opposed to dance, and described as a dance elsewhere in the literary tradition. Cf. *Il.*7.241 where Hector says he knows Ares' dance: οἶδα δ᾽ ἐνὶ σταδίῃ δηΐῳ μέλπεσθαι Ἄρηϊ); 15.504-8 for the opposition of war to dance in Aias' 'invitation' to the Trojan troops: οὐ μὰν ἔς γε χορὸν κέλετ᾽ ἐλθέμεν, ἀλλὰ μάχεσθαι. In the *Alexandra* the Greeks are the dancers (a further 'reversal'; cf. McNelis and Sens (2011b). Cf. Segal (1993) 19 on Euripides, *Suppliant Women* 679-83: μηδέ τις ἀνδροκμὴς /λοιγὸς ἐπελθέτω /τάνδε πόλιν δαΐζων, /ἄχορον ἀκίθαριν /δακρυογόνον Ἄρη /βοάν τ᾽ ἔνδημον ἐξοπλίζων ('[w]ar is the enemy of song').

[404] Another possibility is reference to a special 'war-dance' associated with Achilles and Neoptolemus. Durbec (2008) 22 with n. 47 notes that καταίθει (249) links Achilles αἴθων λύχος (245) and Ares, with reference to Nagy's

The image of the land so full of spears like 'fields of corn' is familiar from Homer (e.g. 2.147-9, 11.67-71) and again stresses the size of the Greek host as we find in *Iliad* book 2;[405] It plays off the previous description of the land as δῃουμένη (i.e. in the process of being laid waste)[406] if this is also seen to refer to the cutting down, or slaughter of the 'cornfield of men', recalling the Homeric use of δηϊόω (e.g. *Iliad* 13.675), and the now well-recognized juxtaposition of the agricultural and martial in the imagery of the *Iliad*.[407] As Sens has stated the wheat simile in this 'highly "Homeric" context [...] underscores the vividness with which the images of the fall ... appear in [Cassandra's] perceptions.'[408]

However, the subsequent lines introduce a contrast between the present vision of the future seen by Cassandra and the use of Iliadic imagery in the ὥστε clause. This also confronts the difference between Cassandra's prophetic sight and the narration of events by the epic bard, a real vision of the battlefield and a representation of it, as we will see further below.[409] The reader is also recalled to the prophetic nature of Cassandra's description, surpassing the bard's Muse-given gifts by describing chronologically dispersed events happening all at once.[410] The land lies ravaged, with the war in full swing,[411] yet reading linearly, the army has

(1979) 331-332 (with n.11) on the Pyrrhic 'war dance' and its association with the 'Trojan leap.....that apparently served to signal the capture of Troy' in later texts. As Nagy suggests, the tradition that this 'dance' was invented by Achilles is probably alluded to by Lycophron in the Πελασγὸν ἅλμα of line 245 (cf. schol. Lyc. ad loc.). In Euripides' *Andromache* 1135-39, Pyrrhus/Neoptolemus' death at Delphi, both leap and dance appear so that his fighting moves 'are actually designated as *purrhíkhai'*. The idea of an unusual war-dance, special to Troy, Achilles and Homer is perhaps introduced into the *Alexandra* in this way. On Achilles' and fire imagery see Mackie (1998).

[405] *Il.2.*119ff.

[406] L.S.J. s.v. δηϊόω II; the use of the verb to refer to the destruction of land is later than Homer.

[407] The literature is too vast to discuss fully here. See e.g. Porter (1972) in general, King (1987) 24ff. and Redfield (1994) 186ff.

[408] Sens (2014) 107-109; Hornblower (2015) ad 251-257.

[409] That is, while Homeric epic would have it that an accurate vision is granted by the Muses, the *Alexandra* challenges this claim.

[410] Cf. Sens (2014) 107-109.

[411] Recalling the way the *Iliad* plunges *in medias res*, mid-war (and weaves the rest of the story in).

only just arrived and assembled and the war has only just been set in motion by Ares,[412] the god stuck frantically moving and waiting to move at the same time.

The scene Cassandra describes herself in also recalls the end of the *Iliad* and her only extended appearance in it, 'foreshadowing' Hector's death in the *Alexandra,* as already noted by Holzinger.[413] In the *Alexandra*, Cassandra depicts herself *in* the action here (251-257) and thus *in* the *Iliad*,[414] *as* the way she is presented by the Homeric narrator, where she is the first to see Hector's body lying on the bier and alerts the rest of Troy to his death (*Iliad* 24.697-709):

.... οὐδέ τις ἄλλος

ἔγνω πρόσθ' ἀνδρῶν καλλιζώνων τε γυναικῶν,

ἀλλ' ἄρα Κασσάνδρη ἰκέλη χρυσῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ

Πέργαμον εἰσαναβᾶσα φίλον πατέρ' εἰσενόησεν

ἑσταότ' ἐν δίφρῳ, κήρυκά τε ἀστυβοώτην·

τὸν δ' ἄρ' ἐφ' ἡμιόνων ἴδε κείμενον ἐν λεχέεσσι·

κώκυσέν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα γέγωνέ τε πᾶν κατὰ ἄστυ·

ὄψεσθε Τρῶες καὶ Τρῳάδες Ἕκτορ' ἰόντες,

[412] Cf. Sistakou (2008) 118 this 'reflects...oracular discourse'.

[413] See esp. MacLeod (1982) 24.699 ad loc. on how Cassandra is 'spotlighted by the syntax'. Her unique viewpoint is underlined further by the fact the Greek army have no idea that Priam is leaving with Hector's body in line 691 (οὐδέ τις ἔγνω), just before her scene begins. Holzinger (1895) s.v. 255; Sistakou (2008) 109n. 169; thinks that the *threnos* also recalls *Iliad* 22.405ff. where Priam and the Trojan people react to Hector's death and Achilles' mistreatment of the corpse; for Durbec (2008) 22-23 this relationship to *Iliad* 22 also 'prépare le lecteur de Lycophron à l'annonce de la mort du héros troyen', (cf. Gigante-Lanzara (2000) 249-50 ad loc., who connects it more generally to Homeric scenes of the battlefield.). Hornblower (2015) 6 n.17 notes that schol. *Il.* 22.62-64 'detected a specific reference to the assault on Cassandra and the killing of Astyanax', citing Nünlist (2009) 259 n.9 on how such passages 'triggered others in post-Homeric poems'. Sens (2014) 107-109 connects its focus on laments to both *Il.* 22 and 24.

[414] Cassandra is only mentioned in one other place in the *Iliad* (13.361ff.) as the beautiful bride (her beauty mentioned in both passages; 24.699) promised to Othryoneus if he manages to drive the Greeks from Troy; he is killed in the following lines by Idomeneus. Her rejection of marriage also results in a rejection of beauty in the *Alexandra* and the expected image of herself as a delighting *agalma* like 'golden Aphrodite' here.

εἴ ποτε καὶ ζώοντι μάχης ἐκνοστήσαντι

χαίρετ᾽, ἐπεὶ μέγα χάρμα πόλει τ᾽ ἦν παντί τε δήμῳ.

ὣς ἔφατ᾽, οὐδέ τις αὐτόθ᾽ ἐνὶ πτόλεϊ λίπετ᾽ ἀνὴρ

οὐδὲ γυνή· πάντας γὰρ ἀάσχετον ἵκετο πένθος·

ἀγχοῦ δὲ ξύμβληντο πυλάων νεκρὸν ἄγοντι.

Alexandra 252-257:

....., πέφρικαν δ᾽ ὥστε ληίου γύαι	252
λόγχαις ἀποστίλβοντες, οἰμωγὴ δέ μοι	253
ἐν ὠσὶ πύργων ἐξ ἄκρων ἰνδάλλεται,	254
πρὸς αἰθέρος κυροῦσα νηνέμους ἕδρας,	255
γόῳ γυναικῶν καὶ καταρραγαῖς πέπλων,	256
ἄλλην ἐπ᾽ ἄλλῃ συμφορὰν δεδεγμένων.	257

The 'hapax' of Cassandra's appearance in the *Iliad* is thus used by the poet as the very basis of his version of the events included in the epic.[415] Akin to the overall structure of the *Alexandra*, we also have Cassandra, Priam and a herald (messenger) figure in one scene.[416] Here, Cassandra encounters a representation of herself and re-presents it.[417] Lycophron pulls the end of the *Iliad* to the beginning of his version of events through Cassandra here, and the reader is drawn to imagine themselves hearing and seeing as Cassandra does at this point *in*

[415] This is followed by the laments of Andromache, Hecuba and Helen (24.723ff.). On the selection of a moment cf. Sistakou (2008) 185 on how Hellenistic poets 'emphasized the smallest episode, the impression, the "moment" within the mythological cycle'; although she sees this more as an aesthetic 'desideratum' that reflects a general rejection of the 'genres which created it'.

[416] We could also say that Cassandra usurps the herald's authority here in the *Iliad* as she informs the 'whole city' of Hector's death, in parallel with the way she takes over from the messenger in the *Alexandra*.

[417] Yacobi's terms; (1995); (2000).

the *Iliad.* This also exploits the tragic dimension of Homer's closing book by inviting the reader to share in her pain through this focalization in the following lines, again exploiting the special connection between Cassandra and spectator/reader, and implying the epic's own emotional impact on them.[418] This does not need to be viewed as a vague combination of tragedy and epic, epic through tragedy, or a way of incorporating epic elements into tragedy,[419] rather, as a means of acknowledging that these elements are already present in the *Iliad* itself, and that perhaps they are of greater importance.[420] As Redfield has stated in his influential reading of the *Iliad*, in Hector's story 'the end is present at the beginning'.[421] Again we have 'less a "mixing of genres" than an explanation of their relationship and history'.[422] Through folding the end of the *Iliad* into the beginning of the account of its events the author of the *Alexandra* also insists that this is what the *Iliad* is about; fate and the death of Hector.[423] While it is to be expected that Cassandra will lament her brother,[424] the way that her account is presented also reminds the reader that it is Homer who made Hector's death famous by ending his epic with it. Just as the land will await Achilles (δεδεγμέναι, 244) as seen earlier,[425]

[418] That what she hears is lament is also significant. Cf. Biffis (2012) 181.

[419] Cf. e.g. Fusillo (1984); Sistakou (2008) 100; Sens (2009) 29-30, (2010) 300; McNelis and Sens (2011b) 56.

[420] See Biffis (2012) 176ff.

[421] Redfield (1994) 126ff. His reading of the *Iliad* asks to what extent the poem is about the death of Hector, and Achilles (by extension; e.g. 27). On Achilles' death in Greek literature and the scarcity of sources see Burgess' (1995); Cameron (2009) 1.

[422] Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 440 with reference to Kroll's Kreuzung der Gattungen.

[423] Focus noted by Sistakou (2008) 109ff.; Sens (2009) 19.

[424] More play with parts and wholes, and the priority of different genres and modes to think about here. As Papaioannou (2007) 212 has discussed, the *Iliad*'s closing laments already seem to be 'themselves epic poems'; Euripides also mixes the epic material of Troy with lyric lament; lament is particularly important in the *Alexandra* as a mode of efficacious female song; see Biffis (2012) 176ff. As Ambühl (2010) has shown, lament is an alternative form of *kleos* to heroic song already in the *Iliad*, raising questions about their relative authority in both epic and tragedy. Lament and prophecy are also found together in Egyptian texts (see further Dieleman and Moyer (2010) 435) suggesting further study of the *Alexandra* alongside non-Greek texts could prove be fruitful in understanding how it proceeds as an imitation of prophetic texts.

[425] Cf. 248, πάλαι: Troy has been waiting a long time for the appearance of Achilles, and within the prophecy *is still stuck waiting*, reflected in the use of the perfect participle here. Compare the depiction of the death of Paris and his spurned wife Oenone, unable to heal Paris' wounds, throws herself from the towers of Troy onto his still quivering body (61-68), a '"love and death" *snapshot*' where 'spasms of love (*visualized* as spasms experienced by a fish which

the women of Troy apparently await (δεδεγμένων, 257) reception of 'sorrow upon sorrow'; it is the single sorrow of Hector's death that is prophesized next.[426] These participles leave the scene hanging in suspense, not just of the disaster to come but in anticipation of the future arrival of the *Iliad* and the way the events of the Trojan war will come to be seen because of its existence. The fact of Homer's poem remains, even as Cassandra attacks Achilles' reputation in giving her account of its events;[427] does Cassandra 'borrow' authority from Homer here?[428] As has been more strongly suggested for Lycophron's depiction of Odysseus[429] and the *Odyssey* as well as a concern of the poem in general[430] this also questions the fictional nature of the Homeric account and troubles the reader's trust in Cassandra's own version of events. Is Hector's death really her 'crowning woe' or this only the case *in* the *Iliad*?[431] In the *Alexandra*, as Biffis has shown, Cassandra's own suffering and future glory through Ajax's rape and the institution of the Locrian and Daunian cult are her uppermost concern, and the reputation

---

gets caught by a hook) alternate with spasms of death' (Sistakou (2012); 185 with n. 183, my italics). While these lines employ straightforward future indicatives as main verbs in the prediction of the future (ὀγχήσει, 64; φυσήσει 68) the effect of movement or action suspended in time is created by the perfect aspect of the participle, here describing Oenone as 'snagged on a fish-hook' (ἠγκιστρωμένη) by her yearning for the dead Paris (67). The suspension of the downward motion combined with the image of being caught, pulled upwards in an opposing motion, just before she exhales and reaches the body on the ground (65-68) again captures the 'perfected' temporal status of actions in the poem as continuing but completed, recalling the *Alexandra* itself as paradoxically linear and cyclic, endless and complete (see below). Cf. Squire (2010) 202f. on Sperlonga, the Faustinus epigram and the use of perfect participles (222) to 'break down past narrative events into present time so that successive events are presented all at once.' On Paris and Oenone as a popular Hellenistic theme, and a darkly Romantic 'ultimate example of morbid aestheticism' see further Sistakou (2012) 156 with n. 85.

[426] Cf. Sens (2014) noting the repetition of the perfect participles here.

[427] For similar thoughts on the *Alexandra*'s relationship to the *Agamemnon*, see Easterling (2005) 33 n.37..

[428] McNelis and Sens (2011b) 57ff.

[429] McNelis and Sens (2011b) 77ff.

[430] Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 441.

[431] cf. McNelis and Sens (2011b) 56ff.

Cassandra is most concerned with is her own.[432] In any case, in this specific context, her own account *and* the Homeric one have doubt cast over them.[433]

The narration of the heroes' face-off continues with the pursuit (260-1), killing (262-5) and mistreatment of Hector's body by Achilles (266-69) using a series of linked images,

---

[432] In agreement with Biffis (2012) 114ff.; cf. Sistakou (2008) 117.

[433] Helping to create her doubtful voice. This point also draws on the discussion of Apollonius and Herodotus in Morrison (forthcoming).

Compare Idomeneus, another figure who both sees and speaks simultaneously in giving his account of the in-progress chariot race in *Iliad* 23.448-498 (with a varied outcome in epic tradition: Ahl (2002) 125-6 on the *Cretan eyewitness*, raising yet more questions of reliable report and autopsy). The passage is replete with references to sight and speech (too many to list here; see Prier (1989) 175ff.) which also includes the rarer verb ἰνδαλλομαι (*Il.*23.460; *Alexandra* 254). There are some interesting parallels and contrasts with Cassandra's brief moment 'centre of stage' in *Iliad* 24 (MacCleod (1982) 24.699 ad loc.) before the assembled Trojans and Idomeneus' popping up in similar fashion for the Greek crowd (*Iliad* 23.448-451): Ἀργεῖοι δ' ἐν ἀγῶνι καθήμενοι **εἰσορόωντο /** ἵππους· τοὶ δὲ πέτοντο κονίοντες πεδίοιο. **/πρῶτος δ' Ἰδομενεὺς Κρητῶν ἀγὸς ἐφράσαθ' ἵππους·/ἧστο γὰρ ἐκτὸς ἀγῶνος ὑπέρτατος ἐν περιωπῇ·** Similarly, attention is drawn to the speaker's elevated vantage point as an eyewitness and isolation (*Id*omeneus' name also of visual significance: Ahl (2002)); both are a figure who *sees first* and speaks simultaneously: *Il.* 24.697-700: (...οὐδέ τις ἄλλος / ἔγνω πρόσθ' ἀνδρῶν καλλιζώνων τε γυναικῶν, /ἀλλ' ἄρα Κασσάνδρη ἰκέλη χρυσῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ/ Πέργαμον εἰσαναβᾶσα...); cf. πρῶτος δ' Ἰδομενεὺς Κρητῶν ἀγὸς ἐφράσαθ' ἵππους· / ἧστο γὰρ ἐκτὸς ἀγῶνος ὑπέρτατος ἐν περιωπῇ· (*Il.*23.450-451). Idomeneus gives an accurate account of events based on his interpretation of both what he hears and what he sees: one alone is not enough (23.452-455; esp. 454-55: ... ἐν δὲ μετώπῳ / λευκὸν σῆμα τέτυκτο περίτροχον ἠΰτε μήνη) and deciphers both to work out who is *winning the race.*

The scene dramatizes questions of the reliability of immediate eyewitness report as the direct speech of Idomeneus begins (*Iliad* 23.457-60): 'ὦ φίλοι Ἀργείων ἡγήτορες ἠδὲ μέδοντες / **οἶος ἐγὼν ἵππους αὐγάζομαι ἦε καὶ ὑμεῖς; /** ἄλλοι **μοι δοκέουσι** παροίτεροι ἔμμεναι ἵπποι, / ἄλλος δ' ἡνίοχος **ἰνδάλλεται** ....'. As Idomeneus speaks audiences internal and external are explicitly invited to share in his view, yet he also stresses his isolation. While the *Iliad*ic Cassandra is immediately listened to by all of Troy (23.697ff.), Idomeneus occupies a position more like that of the *Alexandra*'s prophetess. Idomeneus is attacked by Aias for his blustering speech, and doubt cast over his account forging an interesting parallel that helps to discredit the *Alexandra*'s messenger vis-à-vis Cassandra's visual report. Idomeneus' report eventually turns out to be accurate, as those Greeks who less hastily watch and wait find out (Achilles ends the quarrel, telling the pair to εἰσοράασθε, 23.495), and Aias is shown to be the hasty speaker that he wrongly categorizes Idomeneus as. The motif of being the first and only to see in these passages where a character sees and speaks at the same time, taking over the epic from the narrator, demonstrate how the *Alexandra* borrows different strategies of epic visuality in creating Cassandra's authoritative view of events. There are lots of further implications we could tease out, such as the fact that Idomeneus and Lycophron's Cassandra are in a sense awaiting the outcome of a race to become the best man; in the *Alexandra*, the events are the 'race for Hector's life', the disastrous spectacle of Hector's death (*Iliad* 22.157-66) and the infamous 'drag' behind the chariot of Achilles. Idomeneus is right in identifying that Diomedes will go on to win (23.499ff.), leaving metapoetic traces in the dust as he does so if we read this through the *Alexandra*, as affirming the Homeric version. Cassandra's lines will go on to prove that Hector is *aristos* too (cf. McNelis and Sens (2011b). That Achilles states that the best man has lost, and awards Eumelos a prize out of pity (*Il.* 23.534) suggests added interest in the conception of mutually linked fates and reversals, pertinent to the *Alexandra*; cf. *Iliad* 22.158-159 Hector and Achilles' compete as runners in a race).

followed by the ransom of Hector's body (269-70) and Achilles own funeral (271-5).[434] '[T]he trajectory of [Cassandra's] account is striking', as after these eighteen lines, we move to Achilles' cross-dressing on Skyros (276-80), something entirely absent from the *Iliad*,[435] used by Cassandra to shrink the previously vast and violent eagle-Achilles and introduce her praise of Hector, bringing him back to life from a tiny preyed-upon corpse to a giant burning the Greek ships, praised in a balancing seventeen lines (281-297). In the eyes of the reader, Cassandra's 'resurrection' of Hector (286f.) after his memorably described death in the text (258ff.) is an obvious 'rhetorical' distortion of chronology because it reads a canonical text backwards, raising the reader's suspicions.[436] It exploits the prophetic form to stand Lycophron's 'Iliad' before Homer[437]and through this temporal setting sway the reader to view Lycophron's version as the 'master text'.[438] As McNelis and Sens have argued this forms part of the character Cassandra's 'rhetorical strategy' to praise Hector and conversely, to attack Achilles' heroism and the source of his *kleos*.[439] Indeed, as they themselves note, Cassandra's technique seems to bring into question whether epic *kleos*, specifically, the songs of Homer are enough compensation for the suffering the heroes undergo.

Yet if Cassandra undoes the capacity of song fully to compensate for suffering how can she herself use the tools of epic poetry for 'awarding' and 'denying' *kleos* to those whose reputation she wishes to destroy or commend?[440] Leaving aside for now the fact that this is hardly unexplored in the Homeric epics themselves,[441] it also seems Cassandra is not so sure

---

[434] Cf. McNelis and Sens (2011b) 66ff.

[435] McNelis and Sens (2011b) 69.

[436] McNelis and Sens (2011) 248; (2011b) 55ff. thinking of the poem as the 'rhetorical strategy' of Cassandra.

[437] Hunter (1998) 122: a 'familiar technique of Hellenistic poetry' where 'we are pushed back before *kleos*'.

[438] See Hinds (1998) 103ff. raising questions of emphasis and introducing the model of a dialogic relationship between texts (107) in a 'field of influence' (129).

[439] McNelis and Sens (2011b) 57ff.

[440] Cf. McNelis and Sens (2011b) 55-56.

[441] On Achilles and epic mortality see King (1987) 32ff.; Redfield (1994); Graziosi and Haubold (2005) 125. For Sistakou (2008) 58ff., this 'tragic' mortality is generally rejected in Hellenistic poetry via privileging the epic cycle and fantastic, erotic or unusual elements of the Trojan myth, which also means the characters become 'de-

about the effect her 'rhetorical strategy' will have at this stage in the *Alexandra*. Despite the fact these glorious acts of Hector will stand (and let us not forget these acts are explicitly drawn from the *Iliad*, which itself does grant Hector *kleos*)[442] - this is not compensation enough for Cassandra (*Alexandra* 302-306):

ἐγὼ δὲ πένθος οὐχὶ μεῖον οἴσομαι, 302

τὰς σὰς στένουσα καὶ δι᾽ αἰῶνος ταφάς. 303

οἰκτρὸν γάρ, οἰκτρὸν κεῖν᾽ ἐπόψομαι φάος 304

καὶ πημάτων ὕψιστον, ὧν κράντης χρόνος, 305

μήνης ἑλίσσων κύκλον, αὐδηθήσεται. 306

Despite Cassandra's praise of Hector as a warrior during his burning of the ships (284-97, drawing on *Iliad* 15),[443] his burial will still remain the most painful event in her life, and the cosmogonic imagery suggests, perhaps all time, with Cassandra mourning her brother's burial seemingly for eternity. Hector's burial of course, is also what closes *Iliad* 24 and what Hector will be remembered for in the very last line of the epic (*Iliad* 24.804: ὣς οἵ γ᾽ ἀμφίεπον τάφον Ἕκτορος ἱπποδάμοιο, cf. ταφάς, *Alexandra* 303).[444] This, along with a broadly chiastic structure,[445] nods to ring composition[446] and signals that the Iliadic part of the text is being

heroized' (though see 100ff. on how Lycophron's poem is 'different' to the other poets' handling of the Trojan war cycle). Again though, we might also consider that 'fame is conceptualized differently in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*' and 'directly contrasted in the poems themselves' (Graziosi and Haubold (2005) 134-137). In the *Alexandra* we are not just concerned with poetry as *kleos*, but also the *kleos* of Homeric poetry, as it were.

[442] E.g. During the duel with Aias in book 7.

[443] Hector's attack is also 'predicted' (interestingly) by Odysseus during the embassy to Achilles (*Il.* 9.232-243).

[444] Some MSS have an alternative last line to the *Iliad*, probably to link it to Arctinus' *Aethiopis* and ensuing episodes (Murray (1993 repr.) *Iliad* 24.804 ad loc.). Sistakou (2008) 269-97 has explored how Lycophron uses the *Cypria* and the *Aethiopis* in this section of the poem. On tombs, burial and *kleos* in Homer, including the use of 'closural imagery', see De Jong (2001) 566-569, Graziosi and Haubold (2005) 138.

[445] Roughly structured as: generalised introduction of the war beginning and in full swing with mourning (249-57), Achilles from *aristeia* to funeral (258-75), the diminution of Achilles on Lemnos as a central 'turning-point' (276-80); *aristeia* of Hector (281-97), closing with general scene of fighting, mourning and mention of Hector's burial (298-306).

bounded off here. Cassandra again personally laments the 'crown of all my woes', πημάτων ὕψιστον (305) echoing the πημάτων ὑπέπτατον beginning her account (259). πῆμα (305) appears eleven times in the poem to refer to a range of sufferings (at lines 206, 478, 611, 763, 812, 1215, 1350, 1409) but only in one other place with a related descriptive adjective to the two given above (ὑπέπτατον 259, ὕψιστον 305) at line 787 to refer to Odysseus as the ὕψιστον … πῆμ' of the Trojans.[447] This also indicates that the reputation of Homeric epic is also being referred to in these phrases, as well as the emotional toll on Cassandra and the Trojans.[448] Addressing her heart and *daimon* respectively, she states she will be mourning her brother's burial for the rest of her life.[449] The summation of the nameless Greeks who will perish at Hector's hands during the war (298-301),[450] echoes the large scale image of the 'cornfield' of spears which introduced the passage (249-253), drawing the section to a close before a new one begins (with a series of laments for young Trojan victims, 307ff.).[451] The poet's choice of

---

[446] There is a greater amount of near repetition in proximity within Lycophron's '*Iliad*' than elsewhere in the *Alexandra*: e.g. δεδεγμέναι 244, δεδεγμένων 257; ποδὸς 245, πόδα 275; λοισθίαν 246, λοῖσθος 279; πέπλων 256, πέπλον 277; 258 and 281 share ὦ… in address; αἰχμητὴς 260, αἰχμῇ 299 (see also λόγχαις 253, δόρυ 280); πικρῶν 283, πικράς 289; ἀμφὶ 277 and 286; πτεροῖσι 261, πτέρυξ 291; φόνῳ 267 and 301). This perhaps evokes the formulaic epic style generally, as well more specific repetition of images already found in Homer (e.g. 266-7: ὄνυξι γαμφηλαῖσί θ' αἱμάσσων δέμας, ἔγχωρα τίφη καὶ πέδον χραίνῃ φόνῳ, 296-7 ἐξ ἑδωλίων πηδῶντες αἱμάξουσιν ὀθνείαν κόνιν, see e.g. *Iliad* 16.796, 22.405).

[447] Mair's (1921) translations.

[448] See also *Odyssey* 2.163: a μέγα πήμα κυλίνδεται for the suitors; the epic revenge plot.

[449] On how this self-address indicates Cassandra's personal perspective see Biffis (2012) 179ff. See also Apollonius *Argonautica* 3.451-461 for another description that condenses diachronic events into synchronic visual experience, with a profound emotional effect (Jason's appearance on young Medea), with use of the verb ἰνδάλλομαι (cf. *Alexandra* 254): ….πολλὰ δὲ θυμῷ /ὥρμαιν', ὅσσα τ' Ἔρωτες ἐποτρύνουσι μέλεσθαι. /προπρὸ δ' ἄρ' **ὀφθαλμῶν** ἔτι οἱ **ἰνδάλλετο πάντα**, /αὐτός θ' οἷος ἔην, οἵοισί τε φάρεσιν ἕστο,/οἷά τ' ἔειφ', ὥς θ' ἕζετ' ἐπὶ θρόνου, ὥς τε θύραζε /ἤιεν: οὐδέ τιν' ἄλλον ὀίσσατο πορφύρουσα /ἔμμεναι ἀνέρα τοῖον: ἐν οὔασι δ' αἰὲν ὀρώρει /αὐδή τε μῦθοί τε μελίφρονες, οὓς ἀγόρευσεν. /τάρβει δ' ἀμφ' αὐτῷ, μή μιν βόες ἠὲ καὶ αὐτὸς /Αἰήτης φθίσειεν: ὀδύρετο δ' ἠύτε πάμπαν /ἤδη τεθνειῶτα …. Cf. *Arg.* 3.811-12, where Medea plans to commit suicide, but fear leaves her speechless with her life flashing before her: ἔσχετο δ' ἀμφασίῃ δηρὸν χρόνον, ἀμφὶ δὲ πᾶσαι / θυμηδεῖς βιότοιο μεληδόνες **ἰνδάλλοντο**.

[450] A nameless catalogue, showing Cassandra can see but refuse to give detail, reflecting her subjective shaping of the narrative (see West (1983), (1984); Biffis (2012)). Summation is also used to compress countless events into a few lines of verse, to signal time is moving on and some sort of transition to a different subject is about to happen (e.g. 216-8 past sufferings of Troy; 1435-7 battles between east and west). The Greeks lives explicitly do not alleviate or offer adequate compensation for the death of her brother, even as Cassandra praises Hector's heroism at the same time; cf. McNelis and Sens (2011b) 71-72.

[451] The passage that follows depicts Achilles as the passive and unsuccessful lover of Troilus continuing the attack on his masculinity (McNelis and Sens (2011b) 73-76). This is a notably extra-*Iliad*ic episode and makes the

κράντης (305) as an epithet for χρόνος ('time')[452] seems to have been specially adapted for this use from ὁ κραντήρ; 'one that accomplishes' or completes an action.[453] This feeling of closure, coupled with the mention of Hector's burial, echoes the *telos* of the *Iliad.* Again, this evokes Cassandra's role as represented in the closing book of the *Iliad* and what she will be remembered for. Cassandra is stuck overlooking Hector's burial and trapped in this Iliadic scene forever, a picture with herself at the centre of it, and one that the narrating Cassandra is well aware of.[454] There is a momentary let up in the forward motion of her prophecy and a narrative pause, as she reflects on her sorrow, echoing the temporary suspension of the war promised by Achilles to Priam at the end of the *Iliad*[455] that leaves the audience with both a sense of closure and a sense that an unstoppable chain of events has been set in motion.[456] As Cassandra contemplates an eternity of grief from which she will never escape, the poet seems to ask how it can be possible to move on from not just the events of the *Iliad*, but its existence as a piece of literature, beyond the authority and closed cycle of Homer's account. This is achieved through the visual and verbal framing of the events within Cassandra's vision.

However, Cassandra's prophecy, time and the narrative of the poem will move on and bring change as we leave *this* Cassandra and the subject matter of the *Iliad* behind in the rest of the *Alexandra*, of which these events are but a part within. As well as a static picture, the imagery of time employed indicates both the completion of a period and the continued movement of

---

juxtaposition with what has come before sharper (McNelis and Sens (2010) 249; cf. Sistakou (2008) 19 on 'contrast' as an ancient literary value). As Sistakou has stated (2008) 110, the scene is also a transition, recalling what has come previously (the frustrated Achilles seeking Helen and Iphigenia (171-3, 184-201), but a lead into the catalogue of laments for Trojan characters (307ff.) and the 'history-repeating' tale of Neoptolemus and Polyxena's sacrifice (323-329)).

[452] This can be read as the personification of Time too, as in Mair's (1921) translation.

[453] L.S.J. s.v. κραντήρ I, (from κραίνω); Gigante-Lanzara (2008) ad 304-6 explains that for this reason wisdom teeth were termed *oi krantēres*; the teeth that 'complete the set' (cf. use for 'tusks', *Alexandra* 833).

[454] Again, an acknowledgement of the way female characters in epic get *kleos* and express *kleos* in a different way.

[455] Hurst and Kolde (2008) 302-6 ad loc. read moving tragic pathos in these lines; this is an event Cassandra will be a physical eyewitness to as well as through her vision in advance, and as such she must suffer it before, during and after.

[456] Events in the future with relation to the story of the *Iliad*.

time.[457] This is achieved through alluding to the beginning of the *Iliad* and the existence of the rest of the epic cycle through specific language in line 306:

...............................ὧν κράντης χρόνος, 305

μήνης ἑλίσσων κύκλον, αὐδηθήσεται. 306

The 'moon', μήνης[458] will continue ἑλίσσων, 'wheeling' on, and time 'will be said to bring about' these events.[459] Despite the momentary suspension of the narration of events here, Cassandra's prophecy, time, history and the rest of the epic cycle extend linearly in both directions outside the bounds of the *Iliad*.[460] That the future existence of Homer's epic in literary history is also what is being signalled here is strengthened by some suggestive vocabulary. This is the only place the word κύκλος appears in the entire *Alexandra* and in its use, the poet seems to refer both to the the *Iliad* in particular, as well as the continuation of the *epikos kuklos*.[461] Within the context of the *Alexandra,* the choice of the verb ἑλίσσω is also significant if we accept the interpretation made by Looijenga of the cognate verb τυλίσσω which appears in the opening of the poem (11). The messenger, in his address to the king, describes the nature of Cassandra's speech, advises its interpretation, and makes clear his role, with many metapoetic implications, not least the abundance of 'hodological meta-poetic imagery':[462]

τῶν ἅσσα θυμῷ καὶ διὰ μνήμης ἔχω, 8

---

[457] In agreement with Sistakou (2012) 137 on mixed diachronic and synchronic planes.

[458] Gigante-Lanzara (2000) 304-306 ad loc. notes it may refer to the way μῆνες were worked out from it. The moon is also used to express length of time, and describe the antiquity of the Arcadians at 482 (πρόσθε μήνης) cf. Mooney ad loc: a people proverbially προσέληνοι.

[459] Tr. Mair (1921) for clarity.

[460] See Sistakou (2012) 137: '...at once diachronic and achronic, *Alexandra*'s vision offers a panorama of myth and history but also the wider connections linking the various events to each other [that] may be viewed simultaneously' (cf. also pp.144-5); Hummel (2006) 14: 'la narration repose sur un principe d'achronie'.

[461] See Sistakou (2008) 4ff. on the term's development.

[462] See on this further Looijenga (2009) 74 and Lowe (2004).

κλύοις ἄν, ὦναξ, κἀναπεμπάζων φρενὶ 9

πυκνῇ διοίχνει δυσφάτους αἰνιγμάτων 10

οἴμας τυλίσσων, ᾗπερ εὐμαθὴς τρίβος 11

ὀρθῇ κελεύθῳ τἀν σκότῳ ποδηγετεῖ. 12

ἐγὼ δ' ἄκραν βαλβῖδα μηρίνθου σχάσας, 13

ἄνειμι λοξῶν εἰς διεξόδους ἐπῶν, 14

πρώτην ἀράξας νύσσαν ὡς πτηνὸς δρομεύς. 15

He argues that τυλίσσω, 'probably a hapax in literary Greek' (with only one secure attestation),[463] is used by Lycophron as a cognate of ἑλίσσω, which can have the meaning to 'roll a scroll', or 'read a book'.[464] The poem presents itself as a scroll, 'something linear that can be unrolled and followed' from beginning to end; the poem's metapoetic cyclic imagery extends beyond the relationship with epic.[465] At the same time, the frame introduces the idea of linearity: the messenger, striking a Pindaric pose as a runner at the start of a poetic race (13-15), whom also at the end of the poem, believes he has fulfilled his task (1467-1471; see use of ἐγώ 13 and 1467). The messenger 'finishes the race' as champion and master of memorialisation from his perspective, far from aware of his status as mere medium for Cassandra's speech, an object that she speaks through rather than a subject in himself, as trapped in the poem as she is.[466] This is underscored by the way the end sends the reader back

[463] Schol. *Od.* 6.53, to explain the winding of wool around Arete's distaff (ἠλακης); this may also equate to the winding of a message around a staff, as well as to scrolls more generally as Looijenga concentrates on. Perhaps also an image of female authorship if we also think of Erinna's distaff? On Hellenistic female poets see De Vos (2014); on the question of female authorship of the *Alexandra* see Hornblower (2015) 42-47.

[464] Looijenga (2009) 71 with L.S.J. s.v. ἑλίσσω or ἐλίσσω, more generally having connotations of turning, winding and rotation or movement round something in a variety of contexts.

[465] Looijenga (2009) 71-75.

[466] On poem as prison see Cusset (2004). Contrast Cassandra's self-conscious awareness of herself as mediating instrument and the implication of the poem that it is through the external existence of the *Alexandra* and not the internal existence of the messenger that her voice will be heard.

to the beginning as Looijenga has suggested; ἄψορρον.....τρόχιν (1471) employs the rare τρόχις with its basis in the verb τρέχω, exploiting its meaning as both to run and to turn, creating a 'pleonastic' expression labelling the messenger as a 'returning returner', which 'marks the closing of the circle (and the book)'.[467] This endlessness is kept up in line 15 where νύσσαν can be taken in reference to both the 'starting-block' and 'turning-post' in *Iliad* 23.[468] Looijenga's discussion brings out how the Alexandra brings together in paradox[469] the linear and the cyclic with particular attention to the way that this implies constant re-reading of the text.[470] This is replicated as we come to the end of Lycophron's *Iliad* as we may see the participle in line 306, μήνης **ἑλίσσων** κύκλον, as referring not only to time passing and bringing about events (i.e. 'rotating the moon's orb') but also to 'unrolling' some kind of cyclic poem.[471] On one level, this may be seen to refer generally to the *epikos kuklos* that succeeds and precedes the events of the *Iliad* and which Cassandra's prophecy will further encompass and exceed as part of the poem's totalising aesthetic.[472] Yet, in addition, given the narrative context, we can read some deliberate sound-play on μήνης here (306) and see this as the 'unrolling' of a 'cycle' of μῆνις too; the 'wrath' of Achilles that so famously begins the *Iliad*. It is this, the cycle of Homer, which will be 'said' in the future (αὐδηθήσεται), and continuously resonant, being

---

[467] Looijenga (2009) 75-6.

[468] Hornblower (2015) 15 ad loc: *Il.*23.758; 23.332.

[469] i.e. How can something complete never end?

[470] Looijenga (2009) 72-3. Through the occurrence of this verb in Callimachus and Posidippus, Looijenga argues this is a way for all three to characterize themselves as 'contemporary literate poet[s]' and their work as specifically for reading. Here, it is not so much the poet's 'self-fashioning' that I want to concentrate on, but we will return to Looijenga's arguments and the way the *Alexandra* presents itself as a written text to be read and perhaps recited in later sections. His argument is based on Callimachus fr.468 and 1.5-6 Pf. (which, as he states, is a conjecture). He foregrounds the opposition of spoken and literate poetry in the prologue, and suggests that the messenger and Cassandra become reading objects. He does not assess the participial use of ἑλισσω at 306, but his arguments strengthen the reading of this use as metapoetic too. The occurrence of the verb in Posidippus' *Sphragis* also shows that the distinction between the oral and the written is not absolute; the poet there 'unrolls' a written scroll, nevertheless for a publicly read and heard performance in the *agora*.

[471] Looijenga (2009) 73.

[472] Sistakou (2008) 4 notes the use of the term *kuklos* in rhetoric to denote a 'closed, harmonious, syntactical period, which begins and ends with the same word'.

read and performed endlessly as the best-known representation of her brother's death.[473] While it is Homer's particular cycle of rage that is closed off here, it also continues through the existence of his great work.

Through these devices, the author of the *Alexandra* brings the beginning and the end of the *Iliad* together over the last four lines of his 'Iliad', joining up Hector's burial and Achilles wrath, the end and beginning of Homer's epic and of exploring of the linked characterization of the two heroes therein.[474] The cycle is closed – but only by ending where it starts – exploring the idea of narrative itself being cyclic, and using the fact that Cassandra can see the entire cycle at once in her prophecy as a whole.[475] The parallel with Cassandra's imprisonment in the *Alexandra*, that is, a version of the story where she is isolated, and metaphorically enclosed in its frame suggests another way the poem replicates itself through this theme of being trapped in a representation.[476] By seeing the *Iliad*, Cassandra can see

[473] Cf. Barchiesi (1996) who has argued that Simonides and Horace use references to *Odyssey* 24 to declare 'it was Homer who made memorable the short-lived heroes'; On the idea of the 'closed circle of [Achilles'] rage' in *Iliad* 9 see Redfield (1994) 7.

Hornblower (2015) ad 630, αὐδηθήσεται (cf. 164; n. 192-3; 306; 630, 1124) on the 'connection between this habit and Lyk.'s equally noticeable fondness for indicating a cult continues to the poet's own time' in a particular place; 1140 (Cassandra, named in ritual by her adherents, a different sort of future audience); see note there on a 'favourite word ... usually (as here) in the metrically convenient third pers. sing. of the future passive', although this also seems to points to the theme of the need for another's voice to activate/recite the text in order to speak efficaciously in the *Alexandra*. Compare Svenbro (1988) 17-18; cf. 14 on κεκλήσομαι in the Phrasikleia *kore* inscription (*CEG* 24).

[474] Redfield (1994) 27ff.

[475] Looijenga (2009) 64-65 has demonstrated that the language of the frame also recalls language from the end of *Prometheus Bound*; cf. Sens (2010) 300-301. *Alexandra* 304-6 may also allude to the beginning and end of (probably) Aeschylus' tragedy, dizzyingly, in a place where within the *Prometheus Bound* itself, the beginning and end of the tragedy also echo each other. Prometheus' opening appeal and call on 'the orb of the sun' (90-1: παμμῆτόρ τε γῆ, καὶ τὸν πανόπτην **κύκλον** ἡλίου καλῶ) bears some resemblance to *Alexandra* 304-306, as do the words of Prometheus which constitute the end of Aeschylus' play: 1092-3: ὦ μητρὸς ἐμῆς σέβας, ὦ πάντων αἰθὴρ κοινὸν φάος **εἱλίσσων**, ἐσορᾷς μ' ὡς ἔκδικα πάσχω).[475] Griffiths (1983) ad 1091-1093 comments on how Prometheus' last words (1091-3: a characteristic tragic appeal to the elements to witness his suffering), echo his opening words as a lone speaker addressing the sky (88-92). Prometheus is another revelatory speaker giving a monologue apparently to no audience that they themselves are aware of, other than the implied spectator/reader. Hence, another intertextual relationship suggests the beginning and end of a whole work being brought together in these lines, in elaborately concentric circles.

[476] See Cusset (2004) 53 ad. 1461-71: 'La gardien tout d'abord l'enfermement de la jeune femme, au moment précis où la prophétie s'achève et où le texte se renferme sur lui-même...'; (2009) on mise-en-abyme; cf. Biffis (2012) 120.

herself imprisoned in its boundaries too, mirroring her fate and the later author's inheritance of tradition.

2.3: Time and the *kleos* of epic

Although Cassandra stands 'before epic', her sight runs on into the distant future and seems to crane its neck back round to 'see' the reception of Homeric song. This seems to be far enough into the future that, as Redfield has suggested in his discussion of *kleos* in Homeric epic, a sort of 'reversal' takes place, where 'it seems that the event took place in order that a song could be made of it'.[477] The *kleos* of characters in epic makes them a subject for future song and in the *Alexandra*, we actually get to see that once this future is eventually reached, this *kleos* is transferred to the very poetry that represents these characters. Poetry itself *is kleos* and stands in front of the now 'distant' events of epic. This could be read as part of the 'self-conscious prominence' given to the poet and his poetry in the *Alexandra*,[478] giving his own work *kleos,* and complementing the idealised readers who will understand his scholarly poetry.[479] However, as we have seen the notion of *kleos* and of poetry as a medium for conveying the truth are also held in question, and overall the *Alexandra* suggests individual speech and song are not enough. The status of epic as uttered and heard again and again is in sharp contrast with the way Cassandra describes the reception of her own words at the close of her prophecy, which will not be understood until an even more distant future, when the

[477] Redfield (1994) 38; Sistakou (2008) 63 contextualises this within the wider interest in the reception of epic in Hellenistic poetry.

[478] Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 441.

[479] Redfield (1994) 38-39. See Sistakou (2008) 61, 100 on the 'fossilization' of the Trojan war myth in Hellenistic poetry and the 'different' poem of Lycophron.

whole order of the world has changed.[480] That the death of Hector will be said and heard in the future may be seen to refer to the ongoing existence of the *Iliad* as epic song. This further hinges on the interplay between vision and voice; the use of the future-passive form αὐδηθήσεται indicates the story which *will be said by others* in the future, while Cassandra also claims that she will be a physical eyewitness (ἐπόψομαι). We see Troy with her as part of her prophecy and as poetic representation; the effect is 'bifocal'.[481] On one level, the reader sees through the eyes of Cassandra in the *Iliad*; as elsewhere in her prophecy, Cassandra seems to see through the eyes of another,[482] the complexity here being these are her own eyes, in a specific literary representation as well as a point in space and future time. The embedded act of seeing in 254 creates this reflexive visual effect, so that Cassandra looks out from the poem as well as on herself in one. We will further consider how the way the impression of a visualised whole artwork has ramifications for the poem as a whole in section 4. The identification of Cassandra with the *Alexandra* means too that the poet can explore the irony that while epic will persist for future audiences, Cassandra's admission of the futility of her own words can also be taken as casting into doubt the worth and status of the *Alexandra* as poetry. Through the focus on what is said, rather than seen in future, the poet suggests that the cruel irony of Cassandra's special perception is merged with the potential of his own work to fail to reach an appreciative audience until it is too late.

[480] 1451ff.; words which immediately have doubt cast on them by the messenger in following remarks which end the poem.

[481] Stewart (1997) 43ff.

[482] E.g. Oenone (61ff.), Helen (147), Palaemon (299).

2.4 Self-Depiction and Embedded Ecphrases: Epic Visuality and *Mise-en-abyme.*

There are further reasons to take Cassandra's description of what she sees here as both prophetic prediction and an instance of 'seeing-as', a vision of a representation, with the further complication that what she sees contains another act of sight within it: her own.[483] This parallel also comes from the *Iliad* itself, where just before Helen's *teichoskopia* begins (another wide scale view of the battlefield, although in contrast with Cassandra, giving clear labels to what she sees by name)[484] she is found at work on her weaving of a picture of the scene of the fighting (*Il*.3.125-128): τὴν δ' εὗρ' ἐν μεγάρῳ· ἣ δὲ μέγαν ἱστὸν ὕφαινε / δίπλακα πορφυρέην, πολέας δ' ἐνέπασσεν ἀέθλους /Τρώων θ' ἱπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων,/οὕς ἑθεν εἵνεκ' ἔπασχον ὑπ' Ἄρηος παλαμάων·.[485] As Elmer has pointed out this 'web' is a representation of the epic story within it, and it implies further that Helen creates a work that she is also central within, and a visual version of her famous self-

---

[483] On *mise-en-abyme* see Cusset (2009); Biffis (2012).

[484] On this 'captioning' effect and the scholia's labelling of Helen's speech as epigrams within the epic see Elmer (2005); section 2.4. Elmer (2005) 25: Helen's 'words' on the walls, that the scholia also refer to as epigrams 'could [also] ... easily refer to her own construction of that scene, a crafted object in its own right.' On this reading, in a direct parallel with the *Alexandra*, the speaking Helen expresses herself in a way that suggested to the scholia an inscription accompanying the visualization of the battlefield. At the same time Helen is also an commenting on a representation in which she is in a object; Homer's epic, and her own (silent) woven picture of the scene with herself at the centre.

[485] The phrase ὑπ' Ἄρηος παλαμάων also suggests a Homeric precedent for the image of creative Ares discussed above; cf. Il.15.410-413 for use of παλαμή in the carpenter simile; LSJ I-II notes the phrase both refers to works of violence and of art in Homer. Again the poet has a special interest in words that express this doubt about the line between reality and representation, seeming and being and their use in Homeric simile. For discussion of this simile, others and scholia on Homeric simile see Nünlist (2009) 295; 282-298; cf. Sens (2014) on how the line between simile and 'narrative context' is blurred further in Lycophron. That Helen's weaving depicts both sides οὕς ἑθεν εἵνεκ' ἔπασχον implies her self interest and also raises the question of whether this is narrator comment or a description of Helen's thought and artistic program (on the debate of Helen as 'poetess' here see Elmer (2005) 22ff.; Nünlist (2009) 132 n.51 in his discussion of narrator/character focalization as debated in the Homeric scholia notes that these points of breakdown were not limited only to speech but also to thought and emotion; however he stresses the need to separate explicit and implicit instances of 'self-referentiality' with reference to schol. bT Il. 3.126-127 in particular.

awareness in the *Iliad* about her own capacity to become a subject of future song (*Il*.3.357-8).[486] Helen and Cassandra both seem to have a share in the capacity for women in epic to craft a visual representation of themselves, but Helen's self-portrait will remain silent, unlike Cassandra's who will take over and not give an external narrator a word in the *Alexandra*.[487] The points of contact between the narrative and the *ecphrasis* are already complex in the *Iliad* and the later poet is particularly interested in this sort of epic visuality and ecphrastic effect. Iris, 'a mere four verses later' (3.130-31) 'equate[s] the woven images specifically with the spectacle which Helen is about to see from the walls (δεῦρ' ἴθι νύμφα φίλη, ἵνα θέσκελα ἔργα ἴδηαι/ Τρώων θ' ἱπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων)'.[488] Elmer argues that read against the use of the phrase θέσκελα ἔργα elsewhere in Homer there is further 'correspondence of crafted image and epic "event"...';[489] raising exactly the sort of questions the *Alexandra* does about where representation begins and ends through the play of character focalization.

This nesting of visualized self-representations in epic is also found in the *Odyssey*, alongside an attestation of ἰνδαλλομαι, the same verb used at *Alexandra* 254 to describe what Cassandra seems to hear.[490] As Prier has discussed in his phenomenological study into visual language in epic, this verb (in the middle voice) treads the line of active outward signification (being revealed to be) and inner perception (seeming).[491] Hellenistic scholars and poets also engaged with a debate as to its meaning; this along with its rarity suggests our poet's interest and attention. It is used when the disguised Odysseus is *describing himself* in his 'Cretan tale' to Penelope in Book 19.224f. : '................ἤδη γάρ οἱ ἐεικοστὸν ἔτος ἐστὶν/ἐξ οὗ κεῖθεν ἔβη καὶ

[486] Elmer (2005) 22ff.

[487] Following Cusset (2009).

[488] Elmer (2005) 24-25.

[489] Elmer (2005) 24-25: *Od*. 11.371 (description of heroes' *eidola*); 11.610 (Herakles' belt, a two verse 'micro-version of the Aspis' (n.83)) where the θέσκελα ἔργα marks ring composition and 'creates a kind of *mise-en-abîme*' with 'an equivalence between Odysseus' narration and the crafted artefact'. The crossing of the visual and verbal and intermedial connotations are to be found already in Homer; the *Alexandra* magnifies these effects through its detailed engagement with epic.

[490] See below.

[491] Prier (1989) 22ff.

ἐμῆς ἀπελήλυθε πάτρης· / αὐτάρ τοι ἐρέω **ὥς μοι ἰνδάλλεται ἦτορ**.' This creative inner vision of (another) fictional version of himself also contains another visualization: an *ecphrasis* of Odysseus' brooch, a manifestly true visual sign, and an almost alive art-object that is met with the appreciative wonder of men.[492] Stewart has discussed *Odyssey* 19.224 as exemplification of the distinction from aesthetics of 'seeing-in' and 'seeing-as' that results in a 'bifurcated reaction' from the reader/viewer, both accepting and aware of representation.[493] We should also note that another internal audience of women in the scene (19.235) look admiringly on Odysseus, as the character-narrator also parallels and objectifies himself as another ecphrastic subject, the object of an internal audience's gaze. This seems to be a precedent for the *Alexandra* in terms of the way nested visual descriptions pose questions about the truthfulness of the narrative voice, in tandem with self-description as object. This works two ways in this context; firstly, prompting to reader to wonder if what Cassandra describes can also be 'seen-as' the representation (of Homeric epic fiction) and secondly, the *Odyssey* passage suggests how visual self-depiction creates a parallel between character-narrators and the existence of the work that they appear in as a created object.[494]

When Cassandra describes her vision of the Iliadic scene and the sounds she hears in it (*Alexandra* 251ff.), we are both faced with the Homeric resemblance of Cassandra and the ongoing revelation of her 'true' prophetic self.[495] Compare a final example of ἰνδάλλομαι in epic and also Homer's unmarried girl, 'beautiful as golden Aphrodite' (ἰκέλη χρυσέῃ

---

[492] *Od*. 19.229 (τὸ δὲ θαυμάζεσκον ἅπαντες….); Stewart (1997) 43-44: 'Here Odysseus describes the brooch twice, first from his own perspective as an eyewitness, then from that of the crowd around him. He first notes its material, construction, and design, then records the crowds amazement' at the crafted object that seems to be alive.

[493] Stewart (1997) 43-44 (citing Neer on Wollheim (1980) 16-17): 'that is ….“seeing an image as the object it represents….is really just a species of error, missing as it does the distinction between [for example] looking at a real lion and…looking at a picture of one', in 'seeing in' by contrast “one sees the object in the image” – the bifurcated experience of viewing a representation.

[494] Blanchot (1982) 59: 'What would happen if Ulysses and Homer, instead of being two distinct characters, shared their roles and became one and the same person? … If Homer could only tell his story in so far as he journeyed, in the name of Ulysses … towards the point where he may perhaps acquire the ability to speak and narrate on the one condition that, at this point, he vanish?' While Cassandra sees herself, it is her utterance that she refers to and that constitutes the *Alexandra* (cf. Cusset (2002); (2009)).

[495] Cf. Sistakou (2012) 133ff.

Ἀφροδίτῃ, *Iliad* 24.699) with the 'golden Aphrodite' (πολυχρύσου, *Hymn to Aphrodite* 1) who has spent the first half of the poem appearing to Anchises just like a perfectly ripe *parthenos.* Once the couple have consummated their 'marriage', Anchises sleeps, to be roused by the goddess at 177-179 who demands that Anchises considers whether she appears to be the same to him now as when he *first saw* her: ὄρσεο, Δαρδανίδη· τί νυ νήγρετον ὕπνον ἰαύεις; / καὶ φράσαι, εἴ τοι ὁμοίη ἐγὼν **ἰνδάλλομαι** εἶναι, /οἵην δή με τὸ πρῶτον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι νόησας;' Dropping the disguise, Aphrodite appears and is revealed to Aeneas' father as she really is, inspiring fear. Similarly, the *Alexandra* asks readers to ponder (φράσαι) the epic representation of Cassandra that they 'first saw' her in as mere appearance, as a new Cassandra is revealed. As they progress through the poem, perhaps they will look on and even admire the transformation.[496]

2.5 Conclusion

Cassandra's use of the ὥστε clause to shift to a Homeric-style simile and unexpectedly poetic expression is because the reader can also read this as a representation of the *Iliad.*[497] With the ancient scholia, we can agree to take the similes 'as a lens into the poet's artistic project',[498] where there importance in *Alexandra* is related to the more 'permeable' boundary between 'simile' and 'narrative context', and the 'blurring ... between comparison and metaphor that

[496] This may also be indicated in the description of the messenger of a Cassandra who does not 'speak quietly, as before' in the opening of the poem (*Alexandra* 3: cf. Aias' claim that Idomeneus has been 'blustering' on long since, πάρος *Iliad* 23.474). The *Hymn to Aphrodite* is interesting in relation to the *Alexandra* for many other reasons, not least the 'unparalleled length' of her prophecy on the future life of Aeneas (see Walcot (1991)148, Faulkner (2008) 254).

[497] This is a consequence of the fact that 'unlike all but a few similes in Homer, the similes in the *Alexandra* are explicitly focalised by a particular speaker ... rather than by an anonymous narrator' (Sens (2014) 107-109). Character use of simile in epic as a problem for delineating character and narrator speech (and thought, as the ancient commentator did not make the author/narrator distinction as in contemporary narratology) is found in discussed in the Homeric scholia as Nünlist (2009) 116-134 has shown, in a way that prefigures the idea of focalization. Character use of simile is then also part of the ambivalent hetero- and homodiegetic modes of narration that Biffis has shown the *Alexandra* rests on and can overturn (Biffis (2012) 70ff.).

[498] Sens (2014) 109; cf. McNelis and Sens (2011b) 70-72. On the importance of simile to the *Alexandra* more generally see See Sens (2014) 97: 'the few... that do appear in the poem are heavily freighted' (list at n.4); 101 on Diomedes' bird-men (596ff.) mixing simile, metamorphoses, and questions about exterior and interior; 101-102 on Ajax (387ff.); 102-103 on the dense use of simile at 1426-1434; 109-111 on the woodcutter simile in the Agamemnon death scene (1099ff).

runs through the whole poem'.[499] Sens has also suggested that similes in the *Alexandra* may tap into 'one of the roles that ancient scholarship ultimately ascribed to its Homeric predecessors', bringing vividness (*enargeia*) and encapsulating spectacle in language.[500] Cassandra's sight of the Iliadic battlefield contains an audio-visual simile within it (251-4: ἅπασα δὲ χθὼν προὐμμάτων δηουμένη / κεῖται, πέφρικαν δ' ὥστε ληίου γύαι /λόγχαις ἀποστίλβοντες, οἰμωγὴ δέ μοι / ἐν ὠσὶ πύργων ἐξ ἄκρων ἰνδάλλεται), another whole within a part, used to condense and represent the *Iliad* in miniature.[501] The play between vision and sound in these lines, and the use of the verb ἰνδάλλομαι here exemplifies the centrality of the interaction between visual and verbal communication and optic and aural perception in the *Alexandra*.[502] At first Cassandra *seems* to allow the reader to share in her sight: ἅπασα δὲ χθὼν **προὐμμάτων** δηουμένη / κεῖται (251-252). These lines, inviting the reader to share in Cassandra's vision also go on to include sound, and have already been described as 'synesthésique'[503] while Hornblower notes of ἰνδάλλεται that 'it is bold to use it of sounds (as Σ remarks, οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ τῆς ὄψεως, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκοῆς τέταχε).'[504] Just as the *Alexandra* begins with a messenger reporting nothing he has seen, but something he has heard (the richly described

[499] Sens (2014) 100, 103. In fact it also demonstrates the instability of these categories in the way we communicate.

[500] Sens (2014) 100-103; Sens (2014) 98: for contextualization of Lycophron's similes in ancient scholarly consideration of the function and worth of simile. Sens concludes that Lycophron's similes are closer in style to those found in Attic tragedy and 'the short εἰκόνες of epic', showing (as we would expect) 'familiarity with the ancient exegetical discussion of them'. The associative connection between simile and mirror (εἰκών both) seems to be in play in the context of Cassandra's self-depiction.

[501] These ideas in relation to tragedy and *Alexandra* 1099ff. (Agamemnon's death) are also explored in my chapter in the (forthcoming) Hellenistica Groningana volume *Drama and Performance in Hellenistic Poetry*.

[502] The cognate noun το ἴνδαλμα (*to indalma*) is defined as 'form', 'appearance', 'mental image' and in the plural, in some later texts, as 'hallucinations' (on Cassandra's visions as hallucination and 'phantasmagoria' see now Sistakou (2012)); LSJ s.v. ἰνδάλλομαι, ἴνδαλμα. Related cognates (ἰνδαλματίζομαι, ἰνδαλμός, ἰνδαριον) do not yield much useful information as they are attested late, infrequently and sometimes with dubious sense. It is not found in extant tragedy, but does appear in the later Syrian or Alexandrian *Oracula Sibyllina* 13.71 (c. 265 CE, and probably Jewish rather than Christian authorship, according to Collins (1983) 453) but it is in reference to the regular appearance of the stars, rather as in Aratus' *Phaenomena* 194, 901, 939 (stars' arrangement; (in)visibility; clouds as signs of rain).

[503] E.g. Durbec (2008) 22, Hurst and Kolde (2008) 253-4 ad loc. See further Holmes (2007) 48ff. on sound, vision and embodiment in epic.

[504] Hornblower (2015) ad 254-256.

speech of Cassandra, *Alexandra* 3-7, 13-15 and 1461-1466, 1468), at 251ff. there is the oddness of the verb ἰνδάλλομαι, usually associated with vision, used to describe a sound.[505] As we have seen above the verb appears in epic in a range of contexts that suggest self-conscious self-depiction and dizzying levels of framed representations. That ἰνδάλλομαι changes and has its disputed meaning explored by Hellenistic poets[506] also suggests that we get both a true perception of future lament here, and see another sound; the sound of the *Iliad*. We both share in Cassandra's prophetic vision and in seeing what is heard also identify the embedded representation, compressed into six lines (251-257); a spectacular vision of Homeric song that almost makes the whole *Iliad* into a simile nested within Lycophron's 'Iliad'. We should be reminded of the tradition of the mistrust of Homer and the Muses of the *Theogony* (26-28) who can choose to sing lies or truth and make them appear either way; by seeing and speaking, Cassandra can comprehend both at once, and the *Alexandra* explores the difficulty of disentangling the two. In the next sections we will examine the importance of the perspicuity

[505] The verb is connected through the Indo-European root (-*vid*) to the Greek verb of sight (εἴδω): LSJ s.v. ἰνδάλλομαι, *εἴδω and thus knowledge (through the irregular perfect form οἶδα).

[506] For ἰνδάλλομαι in Homer see also *Od.* 3.246, Nestor manifestly appears to Telemachus like an immortal but he of course only seems so (ὥς τέ μοι ἀθάνατος **ἰνδάλλεται εἰσοράασθαι).**

As well as the choice of a verb poised along the lines of external appearance and actual reality, seeming to be and being revealed as (see Prier (1989) 10ff.), the *Alexandra*'s engagement with the debate over the verb's meaning centred on *Il.*17. 212-5 (μετὰ δὲ κλειτοὺς ἐπικούρους / βῆ ῥα μέγα ἰάχων: **ἰνδάλλετο** δέ σφισι πᾶσι / τεύχεσι λαμπόμενος μεγαθύμου Πηλεΐωνος. / ὄτρυνεν δὲ ἕκαστον ἐποιχόμενος ἐπέεσσι) where Aristarchus read the dative μεγαθύμῳ Πηλεΐωνι (215; cf. LSJ 2) raising the question of whether the later Hellenistic meaning of 'similitude' (Sens (2014) 101) can be found also in Homer is complex. As Sens notes of *Alexandra* 594-597 'though used in early epic of perception and expectation, [it] comes in Hellenistic poetry to mark similitude' and Hellenistic poets do play on the question the verb raises of all sorts of (overlapping) boundaries; between simile and narrative (as he concentrates on), poetry and prophecy, as well as vision and voice. Sens (1997) 108 has suggested that Theocritus enters the dispute in *Idyll* 22.39 (εὗρον δ' ἀέναον κρήνην ὑπὸ λισσάδι πέτρῃ / ὕδατι πεπληθυῖαν ἀκηράτῳ: αἱ δ' ὑπένερθεν /λάλλαι κρυστάλλῳ ἠδ' ἀργύρῳ ἰνδάλλοντο /ἐκ βυθοῦ...); see also Zanker (2003) 33ff. Hector's appearance in the glittering armour of Achilles poses the question of how much he is revealed or seems to be like him (*Il.* 17.214) that the *Alexandra* also engages with. Again, the later text draws on themes in epic of visuality and brings them to the fore in the prophecy. In terms of this specific scene, in the *Iliad* Hector's confidence that he does in fact resemble Achilles is highly misplaced and an emphatically visual sign of Hector's tragic death to come. This is not understood by the internal Trojan spectators but it is obvious to Zeus' omniscient vision (a parallel with the internal/(implied) external narratees of the *Alexandra*). Does the lament in *Alexandra* 253-4 only seem to Cassandra to be ἐν ὠσὶ, a sound that seems like a picture, or are we looking on a picture of the sound of the end of Homer's epic? Vision and voice, reality and representation are placed within each other, and the reader is faced with paradox.

of the onlooker further through the figure of Paris,[507]and how the poet draws on visuality in the *Iliad* to create an aesthetic of materiality as the guarantor of truth.

[507] Allied to the reader; see Sistakou (2012) 176: '"who and what are you?" is a question with which the addressees of the *Alexandra* are constantly faced because it reflects not only the obscure identity of the characters but primarily the ontological mystery surrounding them.'

3. Cassandra, the *Alexandra* and Paris Alexandros: Failed Seer and Speaker

3.0 Summary

Where Paris features in the *Alexandra*, his perception of events and his failure to see what he is doing and what the consequences will be (literally and metaphorically) is contrasted sharply with Cassandra's powerful vision and her painful awareness of the cause and effect of mortal actions through history. This feature of the poem demonstrates further the preoccupation with sight and discernment, and exploits the traditional contrast between vision and speech as reliable sources of knowledge.[508] Rather like Achilles and Hector, the paired and mutually-linked fortunes of Cassandra-Alexandra and her brother Paris-Alexandros are of special interest to the poet. Therefore, at the same time that their visual perspicuity is contrasted, the structure of the *Alexandra* and specific intratextual echoes in its language parallel Paris' futile actions with Cassandra's own ineffective speech.

This pairing of Paris and Cassandra also has some metapoetic consequences.[509] Paris will never 'see', or 'read' the significance of his actions as Cassandra will, or see them confirmed for herself, as Cassandra does as her speech comes to be existent in the form of the *Alexandra*.[510] Paris is not transformed in the second half of the poem along with the other

[508] On the traditional contrast see e.g. Herodotus 2.99.1; 2.148.6. A further interesting discussion of this distinction in Grethlein (2007) 104-109 on Mimnermus fr. 14MW^2, concluding that through the emphasis Mimnermus puts on actually seeing the hero (Diomedes) that is his subject, he 'draws on the common juxtaposition between the senses of sight and hearing to mark elegy as different from epic'; citing both Heraclitus fr. 101a DK and Herodotus 1.8.2 to suggest that Mimnermus 'anticipates the historian's emphasis on autopsy', in his case 'grounded in methodological reflection'.

[509] Prioux (2014) has recently noted the triangulation between Cassandra, Paris and Helen in the poem. Visual language is to the fore in texts that are interested in Paris and Helen's culpability and their love affair, for example Gorgias' show defence of Helen (Steiner (2001) 280ff; Blondell (2013) 165ff.) as well as much later authors such as Colluthus (see Cadau (2015)).

[510] Cusset (2009) 131.

prominent Priamids (and Greek characters) into a new existence in cult either.[511] The reader is not encouraged to see with him,[512] and thus neither to sympathize with what happens to him; the *Alexandra* engages with the idea already expressed in the *Iliad* that it would have been better if Paris were never born, consigned to obscurity away from the eyes of men, never seen, nor brought into material existence.[513] Unlike Cassandra, her prophecies and the *Alexandra*,[514] the way Paris is presented suggests that he does not contain the potential to become understood differently by audiences in the future. Through the pairing of the two characters, we can also read this as an acknowledgement by the poet that their own poem may prove to be a problem. Through the parallels suggested in the poem between the voices of Cassandra and Paris, the poem preserves the possibility that the *Alexandra* may remain misunderstood, unread, and never reach the posterity it should. Paris will receive no *kleos* or compensation in the epic, tragic or cultic sense or in the form of a written text object that brings *its* subject into material existence as is the case for Cassandra. Through Paris' own failure to see and to read what is happening, he also may represent a poor reader and critic. As such, Paris represents an opposing set of aesthetic values that the *Alexandra* attacks, of empty beauty and immateriality, both as viewing subject, seduced by appearances and failing to understand, and as object within Cassandra's prophecy with an ineffectual voice. This suggests that despite the certainty of the prophecy, the door remains slightly ajar for alternative versions of the future, not only for the characters but for the poem itself, but ultimately affirming the fact of the *Alexandra* and the special qualities of the prophetess through the play of speech and sight. Finally, the lack of a future for Paris further explores the link between poetry and cult in the poem.

---

[511] E.g. Hecuba (1174ff.), Hector (1189ff.), Cassandra/Alexandra (1126ff.); Diomedes (630-633), Achilles (859f.), Odysseus (799f.), Agamemnon (1123-5).

[512] On the debate as to whether Paris is the subject of εἶδε at 1364 see Holzinger (1895) ad loc, and n.582 below.

[513] See below.

[514] See line 1458-60: Apollo will make Cassandra's prophecies 'true' in the future.

3.1. Pairing Paris and Cassandra: Negative Characterization and the Failure to See.

The connection between Paris and Cassandra is present from the very beginning of the poem, and not only through their names (Alexandros/Alexandra).[515] The setting for Cassandra's original direct speech is the departure of Paris' ships.[516] Cusset and Durbec have already shown how a parallel is forged between Paris' actions and Cassandra's speech at the beginning of the poem, both actions emanating from the same point in time, unfolding simultaneously,[517] heard and seen, and underpinned by similarities in description. This underlines the affinity between Cassandra's speech-act and Paris' disastrous action.[518] Along with the fact Paris receives the longest apostrophe of any character in the poem (146ff.),[519] this prominence 'suggère l'importance de Pâris au sein du dispositif narrative de l'*Alexandra*',[520] foregrounded in the early part of the poem as the cause of the war, and made representative of the link between overt sexual desire and fruitless wrongdoing.[521] at the

---

[515] On the name Alexandra and suggested etymologies see Wathelet (2009) 333, Hornblower (2014) 118.

[516] A setting probably taken from the *Cypria* and traditional to the epic cycle; see Sistakou (2008) 103-4: 'as [Paris' ships] depart, the prophetic mania of Cassandra is aroused [...] Three episodes from the beginning of the Cypria are merged into a single scene'.

[517] Drawing especially on Cusset (2009) 128-129: 'Cassandre vit (et voit) cet episode d'abord en parfaite simultanéité' bringing 'le couple fraternel' closer together; cf. Durbec (2011) 89. This again indicates the interest in the poem in the problem of *how* simultaneous events *can* be narrated.

[518] See also 1.1.2; 1.2.1 above.

[519] The nearest thing to Cassandra's lengthy passages of self-address and self-depiction, a key indicator of her self-interest and personal perspective as stated by Biffis (2012) 87ff.

[520] Durbec (2011) 89 and 94.

[521] The language used to describe Paris tends makes clear the links between sexual rapacity and more general acquisitiveness (e.g. 169,538-541); see Biffis (2012) 97ff. further on the use of hunting imagery and the negative depiction of Paris as sexual predator and how this fits into the poem's presentation of male sexual desire more widely as linked to the case of Ajax and Agamemnon. Achilles is 'blown up' in the ensuing lines, where he comes to

same time the poem works to express his personal inconsequentiality as part of the negative characterization of the prince.

The antipathy towards Paris is underlined by the narration of his death very early on in the poem (61ff.), in this sense making him the first victim of the Trojan War.[522] His early dispatch in the *Alexandra* is a way of suggesting that he merely exists to motivate the action, the γρυνός that sparks the war (86),[523] and after this is useless; even as part of the Herodotean series of abductions of women (1362f.), he merely forms a motivating link in the chain of events, as Durbec has stated.[524] In the wider tradition of cyclic epic, this is hampered by his role in Achilles' death, which is not at all prominent in the *Alexandra* (and our sources). As the poem continues, the description of Paris is varied but remains completely negative.[525] The identification of Paris as a γρυνός, the 'firebrand' of Hecuba's prophetic dream identifies his causal role (52ff.) in the destruction of Troy.[526] A touch of characterization occurs in the

---

represent the entire Greek aggression and army (cf. Durbec (2008b)); Paris has no facet of cult persona though, unlike Peleus' son (in Croton, 859 ff.).

[522] Line 62. Cassandra's speech (31ff.) begins by recounting Herakles' past destruction of Troy. The traditional first victim, Protesilaos, appears at line 530ff. described (with some dark humour) as the Γραικῶν ἄριστος); the best of the Greek *laos* for Cassandra is, of course, the first one to die.

[523] See above, Section 2.

[524] Durbec (2011) 97, cf. Gigante-Lanzara (2000) 1362-3 ad loc.

[525] This also demonstrates that the poet exploits the prophetic form not just to explore how particular mythic figures are characterized in different texts, but at different stages in their life-cycles in myth; this is particularly the case for Achilles and Paris in the *Alexandra*. For this biographical impulse elsewhere see Cameron (2009) 9, on mythography and the stated desire in Statius to 'traverse the whole hero…not stopping at Hector's drag, but singing the warrior through Troy's whole story' (*Achilleid* 1.3ff., tr. Cameron). An adolescent Achilles appears in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis* (see Michelakis (2002) 91ff., emphasising Achilles' 'failure' to fulfil his heroic role; cf. McNelis and Sens (2011x) on the denigration of Achilles in Lycophron). Paris is not just made problematic, but rendered completely negatively (compare e.g. Hunter (1988) on Apollonius' Jason). There is no reference made to parts of his background which may rouse some sympathy for him. Paris (probably) fled the plots of his family members to murder him in the tragedies of Euripides and Sophocles, (perhaps) fleeing to the altar of Zeus (Collard and Cropp (2008) 35ff.). Again this is in contrast with the *Alexandra*, where Cassandra's pleas at the altar of Athena are studiously ignored (361ff.)

[526] Sistakou (2012) 166; See Euripides' *Trojan Women* 922 (where Helen recounts the story, although some editors mark this as interpolation; see Collard and Cropp (2008) 34 for summary); Sophocles' and Euripides' *Alexandros* (esp. E. fr. 55) plays (where Cassandra also plays a role in fr. 46); Pindar *Paean* 8a 15-20 (Snell) = fr. 52i (A); see Hurst and Kolde on lines 86ff. and 224-8 ad loc. Herakles as an earlier 'burner of Troy', 31ff.; cf. Philoctetes and Herakles 916ff.

petulant and oversized child-figure who rouses wasps (the Greek army) from their nests so nonchalantly and thoughtlessly at lines 180-182[527] and who does not really understand the easy life he has abandoned through his action, even in death (90ff.).[528] Aside from the initial abduction of Helen (86-87 ; 147-148),[529] he goes on to appear as a foolish and failed lover, seduced by appearances (110-114), chastised also within the prophecy by Proteus (128-131) [530] and as a serious offender against *xenia* (132-138); a catalogue of errors that are compressed and juxtaposed so as to crash into one other.[531]

The only time Paris does seem a credible sexual threat it is from Helen's point of view, as she sees Theseus and Paris 'most clearly' (αὐγάσει), as lascivious abductors with 'sharp eyes' (πτηνοὺς τριόρχας αἰετοὺς ὀφθαλμίας, 147-8) as Biffis has shown (with Helen also fluctuating between passive victim and active seductress, mirroring Cassandra's ambivalent subject/object status).[532] Paris only sees in this acquisitive sense, and the only time a verb of sight does directly apply to him, it is negated. Paris will not get to 'see love' (οὐκ ὄψει Κύπριν, 112), and Paris and Helen's initial encounter 'beyond Scandeia' (110-111) 'serves to reject the version of the story according to which that island was the locus of [their] first lovemaking', also setting up the expectation that Paris will reach Troy successfully with Helen, as in Homer

---

[527] Hurst and Kolde (2008) 81-82 ad loc; Kolde (2009) 47-48 who relates this to the Myrmidon 'wasps' of *Iliad* 16.259-67, stating that the replacement of the Homeric παῖδες with κοῦρος in the *Alexandra* 'met en exergue le comportement infantile et la responsabilité de Pâris'.

[528] Cf. Sistakou (2012) 53.

[529] In line 86 θέοντα suggests Paris' speed and short-sightedness in contrast with Cassandra. There may also be a shade of meaning from θέω (LSJ sv. θέω 2) that suggests the gleam of the firebrand in Cassandra's line of vision, and Paris' desirous eyes, picked up in the image of the 'eagles' (Theseus and Paris) who see Helen at 148 (αὐγάζει). See the hymn to Eros and Aphrodite in Sophocles *Antigone* 795-800 for the idea that desire is visible in the eyes (νικᾷ δ' ἐναργὴς βλεφάρων ἵμερος εὐλέκτρου /νύμφας...).

[530] Proteus' words to Paris also seem to be abusive (ἐπεσβολήσας, 130) and effective; see West (2009) 82ff. on how Proteus' 'harangue' in Herodotus is 'embroidered and elaborated in Cassandra's mouth'. I have bracketed out investigating the role of insult, iambic tradition and *aischrologia* further here, which would sit well with Biffis' work on female ritual lament (who does mention *aischrologia* at page 178).

[531] Another example of the poem's abrupt shifts in tone.

[532] Biffis (2012) esp. 97-99 and following. The visual element takes pride of place in later rhetorical examinations of who was to blame, especially Gorgias' show defence of Helen as powerless in the face of Paris' good looks.

at the same time, only for this to be confounded by the poet in the next line.[533] Cassandra pauses over these details: (112-114): τὴν δευτέραν ἕωλον οὐκ ὄψει Κύπριν, / ψυχρὸν παραγκάλισμα κἀξ ὀνειράτων / κεναῖς ἀφάσσων ὠλέναισι δέμνια. Even if we take this as meaning that Paris does have one night with the real Helen, before she is replaced by an *eidolon*, the poem works hard to keep this ambiguous and to suggest the falsity of Paris' adulterous marriage.[534] This makes the act of vision slightly different, as we stay with Paris initially, but go on to hear from Cassandra what he will not see. Although metaphorical in expression[535] this still underlines the gap between Cassandra's perception of what is really happening in the scene and Paris failure to grasp (literally and metaphorically) that is the image of Helen in his arms. It also presents Paris to the reader as a laughable spectacle to look upon, with the second person preserving the feeling of insult.[536] The ambiguous εἴδωλον motif here implies that Paris' night with Helen will remain a teenage dream,[537] frustrated even further by Proteus' intervention (131-132), ἐκχέας πόθον (110) in this context suggesting also fruitless waste, with clear sexual undertones. This is compounded further if we compare the scene of another pursuer of invisible women,[538] Achilles' vision of dream-Helen,[539] which

---

533 Sens (2009) 22.

534 Hornblower (2015) ad 110-112 states that in the depiction of Helen 'Lyk[ophron] has it both ways: Paris has intercourse with Helen' on the one hand but she is also a Steisichorean *eidolon* and 'the key is in 112: there is a single night of sex but no second morning of love'.

535 I.e. as referring to love/sex. There may be a hint here that Kypris herself is literally not here to aid Paris this time, and the general duplicitousness of her gifts.

536 See below.

537 Cf. Achilles at *Alexandra* 171-3. On Achilles 'choice' between love and war in Euripides' *Scyrians* (frr. 682-6) and the anonymous *Epithalamion for Achilles and Deidamia* (c.100 BCE) see Sistakou (2012) 172ff.; further Fantuzzi (2012).

538 Achilles pursuit of the disappeared Iphigenia takes up lines 186-201 of the poem; he searches but does not find the vanished girl (τὴν ἄφαντον, 195), however his hunt for her does affect the landscape (αὐδηθήσεται, 192), named through his connection to Iphigenia. On Iphigenia, myth and cult in the *Alexandra* see Biffis (2014).

539 Achilles' desire to see and thus to be with Helen is familiar from the *Cypria (*Proclus *Arg.* 11): καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα Ἀχιλλεὺς Ἑλένην ἐπιθυμεῖ θεάσασθαι, καὶ συνήγαγεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ Ἀφροδίτη καὶ Θέτις. Tzetzes ad Lyc. 174 also spells out the sight-desire connection in his exegesis, fashioning a version of the story where Thetis' involvement results in a dream version of Helen visiting Achilles to assuage or compensate his frustrated passion for her: κατ' ὄναρ ὁ Ἀχιλεὺς μιγεὶς τῇ Ἑλένῃ ἰδεῖν αὐτὴν ἐπεθύμησεν ἐρωτικῶς ἔχων ἄπο τοῦ ὀνείρου καὶ ἠξιωσεν ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ τεῖχος, ἱνα αὐτην θεάσηται· πεισθέντες οἱ Τρῶες προσήγαγον ἐπὶ τῷ τείχει, ὁ δὲ ἰδὼν ἐπὶ πλείω ἔρωτα διετέθη αὐτῇ. οἱ δὲ οὕτως ὅτι ἰδὼν αὐτὴν πρῶτον ἐπὶ τῷ τείχει ἔρωτι συνεσχέθη καὶ ἠξίωσε τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ

shares these connotations of arousal without a pay-off in the dark of the night: ἐν δὲ δεμνίοις /τὸν ἐξ ὀνείρων πέμπτον ἐστροβημένον /εἰδωλοπλάστῳ προσκαταξανεῖ ῥέθει (171-173).[540] To return to Paris, several commentators have noted that the phrase ψυχρον παρακαλισμα in line 113 is taken from Sophocles *Antigone* 650,[541] where Cleon instructs to Haemon to obey, with familiar exhortation to self-control, to value reason over pleasure as lust soon turns to a 'cold and brittle embrace', and succumbing to female allure results in failure.[542] Yet while the Sophoclean passage concentrates on male resistance to desire of the γυνὴ κακή (*Antigone* 651), the Lycophronian one revels in Paris' thwarted groping in the dark (ἀφάσσων, 114, again with the appearance of a form of κενός, cf. below on lines 139 and 1453)[543] for a woman who is not just ψυχρός metaphorically towards her partner but is also literally, in the sense that she is not really there at all.[544] It also underlines the analogy in the *Alexandra* between morals and aesthetics, the dislike of naturalistic realism, where Helen is all seductive appearance and nothing beyond, γυνὴ κακή and καλὸν κακόν, the object of others' erotic gaze.[545] The idea of

---

συμπράξαι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ συμμιγῆναι αὐτῇ. ἡ δὲ κατ' ὄναρ ἐποίησεν ὡς δοκεῖν αὐτὸν αὐτῇ συνέρχεσθαι καὶ οὕτω παρεμυθήθη. εἰδωλοπλάστῳ δὲ τῷ δι' ὀνείρων ἔρωτι καὶ τῷ εἰδωλοπλάστῷ κάλλει αὐτῆς ἐκπυρώσει αὐτόν.

[540] ἐστροβημένον (172) is suggestive, given the connotations of στροβεω of twirling about physically, as well as being in a state of disturbance or distress in general (LSJ sv στροβέω), and being used in reference to fantasies that disturb sleep (e.g. Aeschylus, *Libation Bearers* 1052; Aristophanes *Clouds* 700). προσκαταξαίνω recalls wool-work as proverbial feminine activity in vain (e.g. ξαίνω, esp. Plato, *Laws* 780c; cf. 806a for opposition of trivial and active life). The double prefix suggests movement to/out and down, reinforcing the double-entendre, and implying futile activity beside, or close against something (as *proskata-* usually implies). There may also be some sort of pun on the unusual singular use of ῥέθος as face (implying 'limb'); LSJ sv. ῥέθος.

[541] Cusset (2002) 151 n.79; Gigante-Lanzara (2000) 112-114; Hurst and Kolde (2008) ad 110-111; Hornblower (2015) ad 113.

[542] Sophocles, *Antigone* 649-54: ... εἰδὼς ὅτι / ψυχρὸν παραγκάλισμα τοῦτο γίγνεται,/**γυνὴ κακὴ** ξύνευνος ἐν δόμοις. τί γὰρ /γένοιτ' ἂν ἕλκος μεῖζον ἢ φίλος κακός;/ἀλλὰ πτύσας ὡσεί τε δυσμενῆ μέθες /τὴν παῖδ' ἐν Ἅιδου τήνδε νυμφεύειν τινί. (tr. Jebb).

[543] On this episode in 'haptic Herodotus', including its sexual undertones and the implications for the 'hands' of the historian, see Purves (2013). For other (suggestive) uses in poetry cf. Apollonius' *Argonautica* 2.710 (Orpheus sings of how Leto alone may 'fondle' Apollo's hair), 4.181 (Jason enjoys stroking the golden fleece), 4.428 (the robe that Hypsipyle gave Jason - so beautiful one can never satiate their desire for it (οὔ μιν **ἀφάσσων**, οὔτε κεν εἰσορόων γλυκὺν ἵμερον ἐμπλήσειας) - becomes a dangerous lure and 'deceitful message' for the doomed Apsyrtus) ; Callimachus fr.317 (a fountain that is unexpectedly cold to the touch). See n.554 below.

[544] Perhaps, ὠλέναισι plays on the empty name, image, or signifier of Ἑλένη?

[545] Hesiod, *Theogony* 585: the first woman as created by Hephaistos.

Helen as an art object is common in Greek literature but here this notion is also underpinned by the reminiscence of Admetus' replacement of his wife, Alcestis, with a statue in Euripides' play of that name.[546] Admetus swears off the pleasures of music and song (*Alcestis*, 343-347)[547] further foregrounding that Paris here carries on regardless and unawares. Admetus will clutch at the replica of his wife (ψυχρὰν ... τέρψιν, 353) knowing deep down she is not really there (348-352),[548] and actually laying his hands (περιπτύσσων χέρας) on the carefully crafted replica of her form. At least Ademetus' replica wife is substantial,[549] but Paris' Helen is even further removed from reality, and the 'cold pleasure' that the statue of Alcestis offers, or the stark reality of Cassandra's corpse (ψυχρὸν δέμας, 1113).[550] By combining the *eidolon* tale with these motifs from tragedy, the *Alexandra* goes further in suggesting Paris' failure to achieve anything concrete, and reject the notion of pleasure in beautiful, but ultimately empty and voiceless beautiful works of art.[551] This does not mean that the *Alexandra* stands against the visual arts, but more against the assumption that realistic appearances are representative of

---

[546] See Segal (1993) 37ff. discusses *Alcestis* 348-54 and the arts as 'cold pleasure'; Stieber (2011) 163ff. on Admetus' description of what is (in effect) a funerary statue 'tinged perhaps by ... guilt' and 'the erotic nature of Admetus' promise' in a description where the 'language is more suggestive than is warranted.' She notes further interesting parallels with the life-sized marital couplings in Etruscan sarcophagi and the 'marginally more demure version of the "body part to body part" locution familiar from lyric...like Archilochus fr. 119 (West), where its sexual nature is made explicit', perhaps inverted by Paris' failure to make any contact at all in the *Alexandra.*

[547] Euripides, *Alcestis* 343-347: παύσω δὲ κώμους συμποτῶν θ' ὁμιλίας /στεφάνους τε μοῦσάν θ' ἣ κατεῖχ' ἐμοὺς δόμους./οὐ γάρ ποτ' οὔτ' ἂν βαρβίτου θίγοιμ' ἔτι/οὔτ' ἂν φρέν' ἐξάραιμι πρὸς Λίβυν λακεῖν αὐλόν

[548] Euripides, *Alcestis* 348-352: σοφῇ δὲ χειρὶ τεκτόνων δέμας τὸ σὸν /εἰκασθὲν ἐν λέκτροισιν ἐκταθήσεται, ᾧ προσπεσοῦμαι καὶ περιπτύσσων χέρας /ὄνομα καλῶν σὸν τὴν φίλην ἐν ἀγκάλαις /δόξω γυναῖκα καίπερ οὐκ ἔχων ἔχειν·

[549] Cf. Stieber (2011) 163: in Gorgias' *Encomium of Helen* 18, paintings and statues are labelled a νόσον ἡδεῖαν 'with desire being thought of as a kind of pleasurable affliction'.

[550] Euripides, Alcestis 353-356: ψυχρὰν μέν, οἶμαι, τέρψιν, ἀλλ' ὅμως βάρος /ψυχῆς ἀπαντλοίην ἄν. ἐν δ' ὀνείρασιν / φοιτῶσά μ' εὐφραίνοις ἄν: ἡδὺ γὰρ φίλους/κἀν νυκτὶ λεύσσειν, ὅντιν' ἂν παρῇ χρόνον. It is these lines that recall *Antigone* especially. Admetus' hopes for a dream; even Paris' dream is empty of real feeling.

[551] Stieber (2011) 170 cites a scholiast on Aristides 1.131 who claims Paris was left a painting of Helen 'with which to stoke his love', a possible parallel to the account of Menelaos left with only her beautiful lifeless statue.

the truth,[552] and more concretely that both visual and vocal elements are needed to create a worthwhile work of art.[553]

Sens has shown further how the reference to the location of the couple's meeting on Acte in the *Alexandra*, νήσῳ δ' ἐνὶ δράκοντος (110) recalls the Homeric Paris' phrasing at *Iliad* 3.345: νήσῳ δ' ἐν Κραναῇ so that the empty-armed Paris in Lycophron (114) 'looks back pointedly' to the triumphant Paris of the *Iliad* (3.445-6) reminiscing about his conquest of Helen (with the line ending ἐμίγην φιλότητι καὶ εὐνῇ). In the *Alexandra*, Paris' efforts are pointless even in the sphere of Aphrodite where he should succeed. His sensorial ineptitude even extends to the tactile realm, shown especially if we compare the use of the verb αφάσσω[554] in the Otanes episode in Herodotus 3.69, when Phaidime, following her father's instructions, must feel in the dark to see if her bedfellow has ears and discover whether he is the *real* Smerdis (and heir to the throne). Her touch confirms their fears; 'Smerdis' has no ears and is confirmed as an impersonator. This suggests Paris, unlike Phaidime also fails to perceive what is going on through the sense of touch too, the usual standby when one cannot see in the dark, as Cassandra in fact can. His failure in making any sort of fulfilling sexual conquest is tied to the futility of his actions overall, marked by the complete lack of material compensation for his actions, and the literalized visual ἄτη in this passage of the *Alexandra*.[555]

[552] Broadly Platonic; but there is not a wholesale rejection of the pleasures of *mimesis* in the *Alexandra*. Rather mimesis is recast as the imitation necessary for creating an efficacious feminine voice through written poetry, representing the voice so that it can be sounded or recited by another (below 5.1).

[553] That this suggests inscription, or sculpture plus epigram in tacked in more detail below.

[554] More common in prose: see LSJ sv. ἀφάσσω.

[555] Cf. *Il.* 24.30 for Paris' ἄτη at the judgement. Failure to marry is also failure to procreate. The result of Paris' ongoing existence and Cassandra's failure to persuade the Trojans results explicitly in empty marriage beds and no children in Euripides' *Andromache* 307-308 λέχη τ' ἔρημ' ἂν οὔποτ' ἐξελείπετο,/ καὶ τεκέων ὀρφανοὶ γέροντες. As a *parthenos*, Cassandra cannot receive immortality through her children, but will do so eventually through the materialization of her words.

3.2 Contrafactual Pasts, Non-Existence and Invisibility

After Cassandra has predicted Paris' return home with the phantom Helen, she infers (139-141): τοιγὰρ ψαλάξεις εἰς κενὸν νευρᾶς κτύπον, / ἄσιτα κἀδώρητα φορμίζων μέλη· /κλαίων δὲ πάτραν τὴν πρὶν ᾐθαλωμένην... He will not have a real material wife either and Helen, in any case, will have five 'husbands' in total as the fates have decreed (141-46). The wistful tone of these lines seems a little incongruous coming after the morally charged anger of Proteus' judgement previously and Paris cuts a rather pathetic, beggarly figure, without bride, food, or payment.[556] These verses also recall Hector's insults of *Iliad* 3.38ff.,[557] which helps to explain the use of the second person to Paris by Cassandra as with other Trojan characters (whom he is otherwise contrasted with) by introducing him as the object of blame and preserving the immediacy of the insult,[558] as if Cassandra too speaks in immediate reaction to her vision of the shameful Paris.[559]

This has its roots in *Iliad* 3.43-45 when Hector imagines a hostile Greek audience for Paris on the battlefield 3.43-45 who will look on his empty attractiveness and say he is a joke; ἦ που καγχαλόωσι κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ /φάντες ἀριστῆα πρόμον ἔμμεναι, οὕνεκα καλὸν / εἶδος ἔπ', ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι βίη φρεσὶν οὐδέ τις ἀλκή.[560] Then, Hector goes on to stress how

---

[556] Cf. Gigante-Lanzara (2010) 261: 'L'ingannevole fluidità dell'eidolon incarna le fantasie 'romantiche' intorno all'amore perduto, l'illusione del sogno, ma anche il sapore del disinganno avvertito prima ancora che la realtà si disveli, perché nel tornare alla sua patria, abbracciando l'immagine fantasma, Paride piange.'

[557] So Durbec (2011) 98. McClure (1999) 375 notes Paris is feminized further by the fact Helen's challenge to him in the *Iliad* at 3.428-36 recalls Hector's words 'as if from a male perspective', a borrower of voice and perspective of others like Cassandra.

[558] As Biffis (2012) 88 notes, it is not sympathetic as in Homer.

[559] This picks up the situation in terms of vision and voice in *Iliad* 3 itself. *Il.*3.38 introduces Hector's words and emphasizes how Hector's sight of Paris (and his cowardly action) immediately prompts him to speech shaming him (τὸν δ' Ἕκτωρ νείκεσσιν ἰδὼν αἰσχροῖς ἐπέεσσιν), just as the man afraid of the snake in the simile describing Paris immediately before shrinks away in reaction to the sight (3.33, δράκοντα ἰδων), making Hector's response correct and natural.

[560] Is this the poet's way of hinting that writing pretty poems is not the way to compete with epic and handle its material in a new way? It is tempting to read this within the context of the construction of Cassandra's feminine voice as one that rejects social norms and thus poetic themes apparently expected of women, at least in the way

hopeless Paris would be if he did go on and confront Menelaos now instead of shrinking away as he just has, lines that are clearly recalled in Paris' woeful lyre lament in the *Alexandra* (139-141), cf. *Il.* 3.54-55: οὐκ ἄν τοι χραίσμῃ κίθαρις τά τε δῶρ' Ἀφροδίτης / ἥ τε κόμη τό τε εἶδος ὅτ' ἐν κονίῃσι μιγείης.[561] When Paris is disappeared from the battlefield by Aphrodite (*Il.*3.380-3), we might expect some reaction, but none is given, as if even the Homeric narrator is indifferent.[562] Instead, the response is deferred until the end of the book where the narrator tells us that he cannot be located (3.448ff.) and pointed out by any of the Trojans (δεῖξαι Ἀλέξανδρον, 451) to Menelaos,[563] and that no-one would help him to hide because he is hated by everybody is explained specifically by the narrator (3.453-4: οὐ μὲν γὰρ φιλότητί γ' ἐκεύθανον εἴ τις ἴδοιτο· /ἶσον γάρ σφιν πᾶσιν ἀπήχθετο κηρὶ μελαίνῃ). Aphrodite has returned effeminate Paris to his 'fragrant vaulted chamber' (3.380-2) and away from the eyes and realm of men (3.451ff). There is not room to assess all of the language of sight found in the *Iliad* passage, but the play of visible and invisible as well as Paris' escape turning on a contrafactual 'as if' moment, where it is only Aphrodite's attention that saves him from Menelaos (*Il.* 374-375), seems to be developed in the *Alexandra*.[564] Read against the *Alexandra*,

---

that a tradition of female poetry seems to have been constructed in ancient scholarship with Sappho at its head (De Vos (2014)). It is sometimes tempting to take a metapoetic reading too far, but the parallel Hornblower (2015) ad 928-929 finds between Cassandra, the Sirens (720-21) and Philoctetes (isolation; special powers or artistry; 'in both places "god" (θεόν, θεάν) is used loosely to indicate hero cult') may also suggest some kind of opposition to the type of meaningless but outwardly attractive sounding *melos* or euphony that the *Alexandra* attempts to kill off with its own cacophonous voice. This also raises the question of whether we can place the *Alexandra* as reacting to or related in some way to a particular school of euphonist critics. See Morrison (2007) 25-26 on Heracleodorus, a euphonist critic (probably of the later third-century BC) noting that the 'collapsing of generic distinctions by Heracleodorus and the embracing of obscurity' have been connected with Callimachus and Lycophron as "antecedent" (Janko (2000) 164) to this particular style (before going on to reject that this is the case for Callimachus; cf. n.155). While the *Alexandra* is interested in sound effect, it might be better to see it as a later text reacting to these ideas, *sui generis* and obscure but noisily defiant when it comes to attractive-sounding meaninglessness in poetry and literary criticism (!). Cf. Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 456-457 on Philodemus' *On Poems* and euphony. Even if it was argued that the *Alexandra* presents itself as cacophony, in order to display the quality of euphony, I would still reject the idea that this is its prevailing stylistic feature to the expense of all else.

[561] Cf. Durbec (2008) on Paris.

[562] Compare Achilles' amazement when Poseidon restores his sight to see a wondrous nothing, when Aeneas has been vanished at *Iliad* 20.344: ὢ πόποι ἦ μέγα θαῦμα τόδ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρῶμαι·

[563] Menelaos seems tasked with tracking invisibilities in the shape of Helen as well as Paris (*Alexandra* 800ff.).

[564] Cf. De Jong (2001b) on 'as if-not' moments (e.g. ad *Il.* 528-548).

Paris in the *Iliad* already shares some of the features of Cassandra's characterization that have been stressed by Biffis, of isolation, incarceration and removal from her community, but most pointedly this reads in sharp contrast with Athena diverting her eyes away from Cassandra and failing to prevent Ajax's assault in the temple (*Alexandra* 361-363). Aphrodite notices Paris is in danger and protects her acolyte and whisks him off to the bedroom (*Il*.3.380-382: τὸν δ' ἐξήρπαξ' Ἀφροδίτη /ῥεῖα μάλ' ὥς τε θεός, ἐκάλυψε δ' ἄρ' ἠέρι πολλῇ, /κὰδ δ' εἶσ' ἐν θαλάμῳ εὐώδεϊ κηώεντι), which resonates with Cassandra's maiden prison (348ff.); paralleled with Athena's shrine where the rape takes place) and her wish to remain unseen.[565]

If we compare this with Hector's insulting speech to Paris (*Il*.3.38ff.) as a contrafactual wish for the past, we can appreciate how the *Alexandra* foregrounds the connections between sight and material existence in these contrafactual pasts and alternative futures for Paris. This rests on the mythical tradition of Paris as a prophesied 'curse-child', whose birth it is desperately sought to avoid and whose life is plotted against in a variety of (often contradictory) versions of the myth once his identity is revealed often by Cassandra,[566] with some details appearing in the *Alexandra*.[567] At lines 224-227 Cassandra makes a contrafactual wish for the past that Priam had not ignored Aesacus' χρησμῶν (225) and killed Hecuba and Paris when he had the chance, on the evidence of Hecuba's dream of giving birth to the fire brand.[568] As Paris is the cause of Troy's troubles, the *Alexandra* foregrounds the way the literary tradition can be read as a past contra-factual wish for his non-existence and his invisibility.[569] The past wish for Paris' death is also developed in the second strophe of

---

[565] On how this feminizes Paris see McClure (1999) 375.

[566] See Collard and Cropp (2008) on this story pattern with reference to the fragments of Euripides' *Alexandros* (plus useful summary of sources for the myth). On the *Alexandra* see Durbec (2011) 92; Sistakou (2012) 150 on the 'common association' of Paris with the 'archaeology of Troy' and as a 'catastrophic figure'.

[567] At 314ff. Cassandra refers to the tomb of Cilla and (here, the new born) Munippus' horrific fate, killed by Priam on the same day Hecuba gave birth to Paris; Mair (1921) ad loc.; Cf. Durbec (2011) 91-3 and Sistakou (2012) 147 and 175.

[568] Significantly a wish in Lycophron too.

[569] See above on *Iliad* 3.30ff and Hector's insult (3.38-42); 3.324ff. for the duel and Aphrodite's rescue concealing him (3.380ff.). For other aspects of his negative characterization in the *Iliad*, where we learn Paris is hated by both sides (3.453-54; cf. Achilles in *Aeneid* 1.458) see also at the end of book 6 where Paris (ever the show-pony) is compared in

Euripides' *Andromache* (293-308), where the chorus' report of Cassandra's inset speech pleading for his death is introduced in a way that is clearly recalled in the opening and structure of the *Alexandra,* (*Andromache* 293-298): ἀλλ' εἴθ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλὰν ἔβαλεν κακὸν / ἁ τεκοῦσά νιν μόρον / πρὶν Ἰδαῖον κατοικίσαι λέπας, / ὅτε νιν παρὰ θεσπεσίῳ δάφνᾳ /βόασε Κασάνδρα κτανεῖν, / μεγάλαν Πριάμου πόλεως λώβαν). Stinton has discussed how this is a 'more specific form of the ἀρχή topos' found in tragedy, where 'the pattern "would that there had been no ἀρχή...then these disastrous results would never have come about"' which creates the pattern as the song continues that if Paris had been killed (and Cassandra listened to) she could have saved the city (299-308), the link between speech and action that the *Alexandra* also foregrounds.[570]

At *Alexandra* 141 Paris, like Cassandra, laments for Troy, recalling Troy's burning at very beginning of Cassandra's speech (31-32f. ... κεκαυμένη/καὶ πρόσθε μὲν ...), but Paris' song is only for the Troy 'burnt of old' (πάτραν τὴν πρὶν ᾐθαλωμένην), rather than a realization of his role in its future destruction.[571] This is also a lament for himself, if we follow Holzinger in reading this scene as the place where Paris' finally recognizes that he only possesses a phantom Helen,[572] continuing his portrayal as a self-interested lover, blind to the cause and effect of his actions, as Cassandra is left to explain (τοιγὰρ, 139).[573] Unlike

---

simile to an escaped stallion, eager to visit his favourite bathing spot (and ending up in the mares' pasture) as he goes to meet Hector, which helps to imply cowardice as well as his mania for women as he apologizes for his lateness to Hector (6.503ff.). See *Il.* 24.25-30 for the gods' hatred, his ἄτη, and μαχλοσύνην ἀλεγεινήν. The gods involvement (or 'double motivation 'of epic) is played down in the *Alexandra* making Paris seem all the more irresponsible.

[570] Stinton (1990) for full discussion of Paris in Euripides, including Hecuba 629-656; I.A. 573-85 which also include imagery of beginning on Ida and are critical of Paris.

[571] Durbec (2011) 98; see with n.326 on the theme of Paris consoling himself with music for the loss of Helen as a well-known topos in Hellenistic poetry. Paris is also similar to Achilles, withdrawn after losing Briseïs, strumming his lyre alone in *Iliad* 9.185f., suggesting again that the *Alexandra* poet forges links between the figure of Paris and Achilles in order to deheroize the latter. Lycophron's Paris gets no comfort from his song as Achilles does in the *Iliad* (τῇ ὅ γε θυμὸν ἔτερπεν, ἄειδε δ' ἄρα κλέα ἀνδρῶν, *Il.* 9.189); the description of Achilles' lament for Iphigenia at 200-201 remains higher register.

[572] Holzinger (1895) 139 ad loc.

[573] Thus Paris' is 'blind' to his fate in a different way to characters at the mercy of dramatic irony; the implication is that Paris really should have known what he was doing was wrong.

Cassandra, he can only remember the past of Troy and cannot see into the future; everything he has done has been pointless. Let us recall lines 139-141 again in full:

τοιγὰρ ψαλάξεις εἰς κενὸν νευρᾶς κτύπον,

ἄσιτα κἀδώρητα φορμίζων μέλη·

κλαίων δὲ πάτραν τὴν πρὶν ᾐθαλωμένην

Now compare verses 1451-1453, at the close of her speech where Cassandra asks (herself) a question:

τί μακρὰ τλήμων εἰς ἀνηκόους πέτρας,

εἰς κῦμα κωφόν, εἰς νάπας δασπλήτιδας

βαύζω, κενὸν ψἀλλουσα μάστακος κρότον;

The passages are linked by close parallels in the use of language; the use of forms of ψάλλω (139 and 1453) and κενός (in the same two lines, with the εἰς κενόν phrase multiplied in further repetition of εἰς phrases denoting Cassandra's unresponsive audience in lines 1451-3) and by the overall similarity of the image.[574] The off-putting noisiness of Paris' bow-lyre[575] and Cassandra's speech are emphasized by the nouns close in sound and meaning, κτύπος[576] and κρότος respectively; it seems however loud a sound is produced neither will reap any

[574] Hornblower 1191 ad loc. remarks that εἰς κενόν is usually a prose phrase, though notes a relevant line from Menander's *Monostichoi* (51 Meineke): ἀνὴρ ἄβουλους εἰς κενὸν μοχθεῖ τρέχων. κενός cf. *Alexandra* 114 (Paris and Helen); 139 (Paris, above); 194 (Achilles' fruitless search for Iphigenia); 366 (unmarked Greek tombs); 1191 (Hector's death οὐκ εἰς κενόν); 1453 (Cassandra's speech, above).

[575] The connotations are hardly positive for Paris' sexual prowess either.

[576] As noted by Gigante-Lanzara 141 ad loc. The LSJ sv. κτύπος states 'crash, bang, din' with examples of its use for loud noises in Homer, but also cites its use for a varied range of sounds, from thunder to knocking on a door, in tragedy as well. As the poet links the two passages it may be better to translate something like 'rattling' (the LSJ also cites the noise of chariot wheels, *Il.*10.535) to render better the parallel with the sound of Cassandra's lips or jaw here as κρότος (and translate ψάλλω similarly on both occasions). κρότος is also used of Achilles' weaving noisily at 278, implying the pointlessness of his fated short-life, and perhaps of noisy epic poetry. It may also be that feminine activity is ascribed to men in the poem to devalue them through the link between typical activitities and and wasted or futile effort in Greek literature; see 3.3 on Achilles' wasteful dreams of Helen and (solo) sexual failure at *Alexandra* 173 ff..

benefit or reach an attentive audience. The implication is that the sound is unpleasant; Paris is a 'mauvais poète : objet de blame lui-même, il ne saurait conférer le *kleos*, ni meme charmer ses auditeurs'.[577] The similarity in sound to Cassandra's speech again casts doubt over the status of the *Alexandra* as song, and its future appreciation.[578] Sheer futility is underlined further by another parallel use of language to describe Athena's success in guiding Philoctetes' arrow straight to its target (εὐθυνεῖ) and the successful 'twanging' release of the bowstring, which resonates rather cruelly by contrast with the failed 'twanging' of Paris (lines 914-15):[579] αὐτὴ γὰρ ἄκραν ἄρδιν εὐθυνεῖ χεροῖν / σάλπιγξ ἀποψάλλουσα Μαιώτην πλόκον· The use of σάλπιγξ to designate the goddess emphasizes triumphal sound in a martial context and the compound form of ἀποψάλλω underlines the outward movement of the action when read against the other two instances where Paris and Cassandra fruitlessly twang away to themselves.[580] Paris, the failed bowman, is opposed to the success of another archer, his 'adversary' (προς ἀνθοπλίτου, 64) Philoctetes, as is made clear through the intertextual linkage and we get the characterization of useless Paris once again (as well as the similarity indicating a shared role in bringing Troy to its knees).[581] Again, when viewed against the transformation of other characters beyond their epic selves, or the celebration in epic language of Hector's immortality in cult, Paris is granted no real life beyond his 'epic' role and even his love-making comes to nothing. He remains seemingly unaware of what his actions

---

577 Durbec (2011) 98.

578 Biffis also reads this in the context of Cassandra's forced isolation from her community, both as a frenzied prophet and a dangerous *parthenos*.

579 In contrast with Paris, Cassandra's prophecy also records the Doloncians' tomb construction for Philoctetes, granting him some remembrance (for consideration of whether tombs can be considered to signify the establishment of cult or not see Biffis (2012) 109 with n.174).

580 Cf. *Alexandra* 407, where it indicates the death 'snares' or trap of the Erinyes. For trumpet sound, see Achilles' shout clear and loud like a trumpet (σάλπιγξ) at *Iliad* 18.219 (see n.398 above). The unusual use of κτῦπος for musical sound in Bacchylides fr. 3, a paean to Peace opposes it to the trumpet sound of war: 'Peace ... who brings wealth to mortals and...the flowers of honeyed song' in a time when shields are covered in spiders' webs 'sharp-pointed spears and two-edged swords are a prey to rust, no blast of bronze trumpets (σαλπίγγων) is heard' (tr. Jebb (1905) 411).

581 Compare also Hornblower 342 ad loc. on the related hapax ἀναψαλάσσω and the imagery of birth in relation to the Trojan Horse in a passage 'full of virtuouso double meanings'.

have caused.[582] Here, although Paris will still produce μέλος (140; cf. Cassandra 1463)[583] he will not receive the material items he craves, including Helen, as he travelled to Sparta to procure.

In contrast, what Cassandra craves here is to be listened to as, she goes onto explain, her oracles are true and guaranteed by Apollo (1453f.) despite being implanted with the ring of falsity by him. The characterisation of the rocks as ἀνηκόους ('unheeding') and the sea as κῦμα κωφόν ('deaf surf') draws on the motif of the senselessness of the natural landscape,[584] not yet transformed and inscribed as later in the poem, just as we wind down from the most overtly diegetic and textual part of the poem (1369-1450), where the language of sight no longer features so prominently,[585] a jolt for the reader from page to living utterance and back to the impression of the speaker set over a vantage point before she returns to her prison,[586] before we return again to the messenger's voice (16ff). The mention of her own mouth (μάστακος, line 1453) also recalls the description of her by the messenger at the opening of the poem (στόμα .... δαφνηφάγων in lines 4-6) and thus her status as a divinely-inspired prophet. By returning to the unhearing and uncomprehending present time of the speech, the contrast with the future is heightened. That certain types of speech (i.e. not confined solely to Cassandra's own prophetic words) are only to be heard and understood by those in the future is also found in the poem itself, e.g. cf. μάσταξ in line 1453 with its sole appearance earlier at 687, where Cassandra predicts Odysseus' visit to the underworld to seek Tiresias'

---

[582] Whether Paris is the grammatical subject of εἶδε at 1364 has been debated (see Holzinger (1895) ad loc.; I do not think that this is the case given the presentation of the character in terms of his sight. If insisted upon, his glance at the Argonauts' only seems to motivate an action in return, rather than a realisation of his place in the wider scheme of history and the consequences that will follow.

[583] Cf. 1463 for the messenger's description of Cassandra's song as such.

[584] E.g. the famous 'dumb earth' of *Iliad* 24.54. The trope is also used often to describe a character's indifference, either through their wilfulness or distractedness through extreme emotion, for example, when Patroklos tells Achilles he is like a child of the cliffs at the beginning of *Iliad* 17, or Medea remains senseless to her friends advice, ὡς δὲ πέτρος ἢ θαλάσσιος κλύδων, in Euripides' *Medea* 29-30. A closer parallel is with Hera's pitilessness towards Leto, so that the personified river Peneios does not hear (ὁ δ' ἀνήκοος, 116, cf. *Alexandra* 1451) her prayers 'in vain' (μάτην, 108) in Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos* 116, so that we have not an individual indifferent to the world, but a world indifferent to the individual.

[585] See below 6.0.

[586] Cf. Hummel (2006) 14, 213ff. on the idea that the *Alexandra* restores living utterance to the written text.

prophecies and guidance, where he will hear the voice of ghosts (686-687: πήλας ἀκούσει κεῖθι πεμφίγων ὄπα / λεπτὴν ἀμαυρᾶς μάστακος προσφθέγμασιν); perhaps an indication of quiet voices from beyond the grave being heard eventually, or λεπτός some indication of Callimachean poetics, now distant, or the way the *Alexandra* claims to magnify the voice of Cassandra οὐ γὰρ ἥσυχος (3), transforming traditions of the feminine voice so construed.

To return and reflect on some final and wider implications of the connection between Paris and Cassandra made in the poem, we need to consider the wider background to their stories. The idea that Paris fails at his marriage successively is also a lighter strand of the broader theme of marriages gone horribly wrong in the *Alexandra*, but still attests to the warning about excessive desire for and against marriage that results in adultery and rape, which these two characters embody as Biffis has shown.[587] Like Cassandra herself, Paris fails to make the transition to adulthood properly[588] and will leave no heir to the Priamid line, or have an *Alexandra* left in his place.[589] In book three of the *Iliad,* Hector also wishes Paris had stayed unborn and ἄγονός τ'...ἄγαμος (3.40), unmarried until his death. In the *Alexandra* Cassandra aims but fails to remain a life-long *parthenos* (see *Al.* 352ff.), while Paris' has his relationship with Helen called into question, so that he is even worthless in the special realm of Aphrodite.[590]

This is achieved, in part, through the manipulation of a gendered discourse of praise and blame in Greek literature. This can again be seen particularly well in the lines we have been discussing above (*Al.* 139-145 and 1451-1453), which are close in form to a fragment of

[587]Biffis (2012) 99ff. in agreement that the poem does not represent a wholesale rejection of marriage and sex but warns of going too far either way (as Cassandra and Ajax do, p. 169) and thus bringing about disaster through excessive desire.

[588] Key to Biffis' (2012) analysis of Cassandra's characterization. Collard and Cropp (2008) 38 state that they can 'sense from the fragments of [Euripides' *Alexandros*] how the characters of Hecuba, Priam and Paris will have been portrayed as elements of the fulfilment in Troy's fate'.

[589] There were of course *Alexandros* tragedies: see Stinton on Euripides (1990) 66ff., with interesting remarks on how Cassandra's prophetic madness is associated with immodesty in later authors.

[590] Biffis (2012) demonstrates how these themes, familiar from Attic tragedy, occur again and again in the poem in a way that reflects Cassandra's worldview as a frustrated *parthenos.*

Euripides' now lost *Melanippe Desmotis* (fr. 499² Nauck = 13.2 Page), 'a play apparently full of invective against women' and reaction to a 'male discourse of blame.[591] The lines read: **μάτην** ἄρ' εἰς γυναικος ἐξ ἀνδρῶν ψόγος / **ψάλλει**, **κενὸν** τόξευμα, καὶ κακῶς λέγει. The figuring of (epic) poetry as masculine, as a place for praising the actions of men, and the questioning of its verisimilitude and fairness is a *topos* already in Euripides' *Medea*;[592] and the *Alexandra* draws on this in its indication of the pointless inefficacy of song, its ability to distort the truth, and its inadequacy as compensation for suffering, allied directly to the futility of her own speech.[593] Paris' actions should be as ineffectual as this slander; yet, the *Alexandra* suggests, the effect can be disastrous.[594] As Redfield reminds us,[595] Cassandra's mistake lies in the rejection of a divine gift and the importance of not rejecting the gifts of the gods is expressed in the *Iliad* through Paris' own words as he replies to Hector's outburst (*Iliad* 3.64-7): μή μοι δῶρ' ἐρατὰ πρόφερε χρυσέης Ἀφροδίτης· / οὔ τοι ἀπόβλητ' ἐστὶ θεῶν ἐρικυδέα δῶρα / ὅσσά κεν αὐτοὶ δῶσιν, ἑκὼν δ' οὐκ ἄν τις ἕλοιτο. Yet, in contrast with Paris' claim in his own words, the Homeric narrator tells us explicitly later in the epic that Paris chose 'gave his choice for dangerous lust' (*Iliad* 24.30)[596] when he encountered the three goddesses when he still lived as a shepherd. Both Cassandra and Paris, it seems, make a choice when it comes to these divine gifts on offer and Cassandra's rejection and Paris' acceptance both have their

---

[591] McClure (1999) 378, in her article exploring Euripides' *Medea* as a 'tragedy of discourse' through examining Medea's use of 'blame language' and invective against women as well as the literary and ritual background to female use of invective.

[592] See for example, the chorus in *Medea* 421-430, with McClure (1999) 389 on the epic elements of it; she states these may also allude to a non-Homeric hexameter blame poetry' or alternately, the use of Ionic dialect may recall the iambics of Hipponax, Archilochus and Simonides.

[593] Cf. Biffis (2012) 207-208 on Cassandra's cultic *kleos*. This goes further than just an attack on epic, but to the point of calling into question song and sung poetry in general.

[594] This also highlights that the effeminate Paris himself is subject to abuse in the epic tradition and this in turn forms the basis (as McNelis and Sens have shown) for attacking Achilles in particular, by turning him into a cowering, passive and feminized figure, terrified of Hector's 'spear', through transposition of the Skyros episode into his heroic and *Iliad*ic exploits: McNelis and Sens (2011b) 69-70.

[595] Redfield (2003) 138.

[596]*Iliad* 24.29-30: ὃς νείκεσσε θεὰς ὅτε οἱ μέσσαυλον ἵκοντο,/τὴν δ' ᾔνησ' ἥ οἱ πόρε μαχλοσύνην ἀλεγεινήν. *L.S.J.* sv. μαχλοσύνη notes Aristarchus rejected the word as one 'peculiar to women, but used of Paris as effeminate.'

own disastrous price for the Priamid line, in both cases related to physical beauty, Paris seduced by it, Cassandra attracting the unwanted 'seductions' of others. The presence of the bow and the lyre in the images discussed above, in the connection made between the two also hints at Apollo's presence, the worth of the spheres of prophecy and song that he presides over (and gives as gifts),[597] and the role of the gods in events. However, the playing down of divine roles in terms of motivating the action overall in the *Alexandra* gives emphasis to the possibility of culpability in Paris' and Cassandra's choices too. As Durbec has stated, the episode of the judgement of Paris where the gods' *neikos* is roused[598] is only mentioned in passing in the *Alexandra*.[599] The scene is the *Alexandra* (93) is noteworthy for its lack of visuality, and has no word for divinity appearing ὡς πρόσθε, κάλλους τὸν θυωρίτην τριπλαῖς, but it is the only place in the poem where a form of κάλος appears. This is rather different to the interest in much Hellenistic literature with staging this episode as a paradigm of aesthetic judgement as Zanker has discussed.[600] That the *Alexandra* skirts over and does not make Paris an aesthete but more of an acquisitive bean-counter of beauty (τὸν θωρίτην) suggests not just Durbec's bad poet, but a bad critic, reader, or judge of poetry too, as if only judging a poem for its beauty is mistaken, and that poems that are beautiful but meaningless (the love poetry expected of a feminine speaker?) are ultimately ineffectual, and compare less than favourably with the intensity of the *Alexandra*. The pursuit of beauty (and realism) in art is thus also implicitly critiqued as a fool's errand, that will not in fact succeed or lead to the truth, legitimizing the particular style of poetic expression, as we will see further in section 4.2.

Paris' acceptance of Aphrodite's gifts could never ensure him success as a warrior and as we have seen, the *Alexandra* even denies he will be a success as a lover too, seduced by

---

[597] Cf. Looijenga (2009) 69 on the implicit rendering of Apollo's presence.

[598] Cf. Nagy (1979) 62.

[599] Durbec (2011) 93.

[600] Zanker (2003) 57-59. On the judgement becoming an 'erotic topos' in Hellenistic literature see Sistakou (2012) 52ff; cf. Stinton (1990) 26ff. on Euripides' *Alexandros*, suggesting the play explores that Paris cannot really judge beauty in this context, but rather the value of the gifts, *failing to see* what beauty conceals (with further reference to Euripides, Theocritus and Lycophron).

appearances, but failing to do anything concrete and procreative. Both characters' choices in respect of the divine gifts on offer is shown to be flawed, with the fall of Troy, its cause and the possibility of its prevention both lying at their feet as a consequence of their respective embrace and rejection of beauty and *eros*. As Redfield states, a divine gift cannot be taken back, and so in addition to clairvoyancy, Cassandra receives a second, the failure to persuade rhetorically.[601] Cassandra's rejection of Apollo guarantees her failure as a speaker and removes the possibility that her prophecies might prevent the consequences of Paris' foolish actions.

Finally, in his analysis of Alexandra cults in the Greek world, Farnell suggested that the identification of Cassandra with the older goddess was probably the result of the dissemination of Panhellenic epic and the Homeric character gradually becoming allied to an older goddess through the assumption of the brother-sister, male-female pairing Alexandros-Alexandra being related to the Alexandros of Homer and his sister Cassandra.[602] Whether this is really the case or not,[603] we can perhaps see the pairing of the two characters in Lycophron's poem as an exploration of this idea, or a suggestion of the process by which cult and poetry interact,[604] as the two characters become linked and defined against each other; another way that the poem presents itself as in existence long before epic. On this reading Paris becomes an epic upstart who only really exists in poetry, with no future as a consequence of the events of the Trojan war as Cassandra herself has, a stage in east-west conflict, rather than playing a role in its eventual resolution. A poet whose knowledge of female cults takes into account that the Spartan cult of Alexandra gradually became identified

[601] Redfield (2003) 138.

[602] It seems there was no major cult of Paris-Alexandros in the Hellenistic world; the existence of a Hera Alexandros (i.e. protector of men) has now been ruled out (Hornblower (2014) 118n.121). Strabo 13.1.29-32 records the tombs of Protesilaus, Paris, Memnon, Hector, Ajax, Achilles, Patroclus and Antilochus at Ilion, but with cults attached only to the last four (Redfield (2003) 128).

[603] Cf. Hornblower (2014) 120 on the proliferation of 'place-specific *epikleiseis*' in the poem, that testify to its 'truly Mediterranean-wide flavour' which 'emphasizes the exuberant variety of local Greek cults alongside the Panhellenic'.

[604] cf. Biffis (2012) 111ff.

with Cassandra through pan-Hellenic epic, because of the assumption that she is Alexandros' sister, writes this into their poem by throwing into relief the linked fates of the duo as the character reveals *her* true identity through the *Alexandra*, and the limited extent of Paris' existence is suggested in turn.[605]

3.3: A Coda on Helen's Image.

The way Helen is presented underscores Paris' (and Achilles') lack of perspicuity. The idea of Helen's image and its degree of autonomy (like a painting, or a sculpture, it cannot speak), or conversely, the amount of control and responsibility she is granted over her image and its effects is present as a varied and rich seam in all sorts of ancient writings and their own exploration of the causes of the Trojan war.[606] This provides a parallel with Cassandra's voice in the *Alexandra*, the question of who controls and makes it, and its existence independently in and as the text of the poem.[607] The *Alexandra* effaces Helen and her beautiful appearance in contrast with the way Cassandra's voice is inscribed; Helen is confirmed to be anti-matter, whereas Cassandra is materialized into being. The Homeric Cassandra, 'beautiful as golden Aphrodite' is occluded in the *Alexandra*, a contrast better appreciated if we recall

[605] Paris remains tied to Troy's end, rather than becoming further involved in the triangulation in the poem between Sparta, Asia Minor and the new Graeco-Roman west.

[606] See now Blondell (2013) for full discussion of Helen's appearances across ancient literature, including Stesichorus, Euripides, Herodotus, and Gorgias.

[607] See Blondell (2013) 198 on visual versus verbal persuasion in the *agōn* between Hecuba and Helen in Euripides' *Trojan Women* (969ff.), where Helen's speech is not 'the seductive equivalent of her beauty' (cf. 890-895 where Hecuba appeals to Menelaos not to look at Helen: αἰνῶ σε, Μενέλα', εἰ κτενεῖς δάμαρτα σήν. /ὁρᾶν δὲ τήνδε φεῦγε, μή σ' ἕλῃ πόθῳ. /αἱρεῖ γὰρ ἀνδρῶν ὄμματ', ἐξαιρεῖ πόλεις, /πίμπρησιν οἴκους· ὧδ' ἔχει κηλήματα. /ἐγώ νιν οἶδα, καὶ σύ, χοἱ πεπονθότες). Instead her 'alienating' and arrogant voice 'stands in tension with [her] visual impact'. This is different to the *Odyssey*, where Helen's deceptive voice is every bit as dangerously persuasive as her appearance (4.271ff.; cf. *Odyssey* 4.486; Doherty (1995) 86ff.); women need to mimic or imitate to communicate effectively, paradoxically making them untrustworthy. On Helen's mimickry and deceptive feminine speech in the messenger's characterization of Cassandra see Biffis (2012) 48ff.

that by the fifth century the idea of her 'as an unattainable beauty [had] developed to the point that she has an unfortunate love affair of her own'. The idea of Cassandra as dangerously beautiful is attested elsewhere by the regular pairing of Helen and Cassandra on vase paintings, beauty queens of west and east.[608] The choral description of the contest in Euripides' *Andromache* underlines the beginning of conflict for the sake of beauty (ἔριδι στυγερᾷ κεκορυθμένον εὐμορφίας, 279), so that events on the divine plane (the goddesses' contest) and the mortal (the Trojan war) both arise from Paris' lust for beauty.

The *Alexandra* goes even further than Euripides in the treatment of Helen's autonomous image, removing the real referent and suggesting she was perhaps never there at all, turning her into image completely.[609] Just as the treatment of Paris can be read as a culmination of the tradition that wishes for his non-existence and invisibility, Helen may also be seen in terms of the trajectory where she is gradually 'rubbed-out' and moves towards the utter self-effacement she herself wishes for (*Iliad* 6.345-8): ὥς μ' ὄφελ' ἤματι τῷ ὅτε με πρῶτον τέκε μήτηρ /οἴχεσθαι προφέρουσα κακὴ ἀνέμοιο θύελλα / εἰς ὄρος ἢ εἰς κῦμα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης, /ἔνθά με κῦμ' ἀπόερσε πάρος τάδε ἔργα γενέσθαι. In Euripides' *Helen*, its central character does not quite wish away her existence, but nevertheless the way she appears to the world, through her troublesome good looks (262-3): εἴθ' ἐξαλειφθεῖσ' ὡς **ἄγαλμ'** αὖθις πάλιν /αἴσχιον εἶδος ἔλαβον ἀντὶ τοῦ καλοῦ, explicitly referring to herself as an art object.[610] While

---

[608] Redfield (2003) 138.

[609] Gigante-Lanzara (2010) 261-262; Prioux (2014) 3-18.

[610] Burian (2008) ad 262-236: 'the traditional interpretation' of ἄγαλμα here is as painting, rather than the more usual use of the word for 'works of art [where it]...otherwise always refers to sculpture', because of the notion of wiping away contained in ἐξαλείφω. This is based on parallels in Aeschylus ([*Peleus* fr.618], *Agamemnon* 1327-9) which also suggest painting. However, there are several reasons to maintain the reference here is to sculpture, especially if we recall the Hesiodic woman as divinely crafted *kalon kakon* whose inner and outer state, or appearance and reality, do not match (*Theogony* 585; see e.g. Blondell (2009) 16). Given the context of Euripides' drama, we are encouraged to think of Helen and her image as a separate and realistically mimetic one, an exacting, equivalent facsimile, to which sculpture better approximates (see Stieber (2011) whose analysis of Euripides' language of craft demonstrates that mimesis of beauty tends to be thought of in terms of sculpture in ancient Greek discourse). However, the parallel with *Agamemnon* 1327-9 (from Cassandra's famous last words on the precariousness of mortal fortunes) has much more in common with the theme in the Euripidean passage of the sudden change in reputation that 'wiping away', or muddying the picture/plaster would enact. As Cassandra's words are metaphorical there is no reason to assume the use in *Helen* must necessarily refer to painting rather than sculpture; the link also emphasizes that Helen's looks *are* her unchangeable fortune. Thus, painted sculpture seems

ἄγαλμα here is usually assumed to refer to painting, Kannicht argued that the allusion is rather to painted sculpture, so Helen speaks of herself as 'a statue stripped of polychrome features, unfinished and unsatisfactory in appearance', an option which, in Burian's weighing of the evidence, cannot be ruled out.[611] The notion of painted sculpture better reflects the disjunction between the embodied Helen and her control over her name and autonomous image in the play.[612] Helen's wish for her beauty to be removed is also a wish for the recovery of her innocence;[613] in the *Alexandra*, the absence of reference to Cassandra's beautiful appearance performs this sort of removal for her through the way she is hidden away and 'covered' by the poet's creation of her ornate voice, which takes on these connotations of adornment instead.[614] This is signalled through the language of sculptural beauty and creative work to further suggest interaction between visual and verbal representation, and the move to materiality in the poem. If read against Euripides' *Helen*, and her failure to escape her own appearance, we can better appreciate how Cassandra, granted a voice, can (re)make hers, and also through the existence of the *Alexandra* as her voice and material replication of herself, convey the truth.

Helen stands for the ephemeral and insubstantial beauty without meaning that the *Alexandra* rejects and attacks her spectators for being so unthinkingly and desirously in thrall to. In her appearance to Achilles in a dream, she is described in a way that signals visual deception, drawing on the tradition of her *eidolon* (*Alexandra* 171-173): ... ἐν δὲ δεμνίοις /τὸν

to be the best solution, as the connotations of adornment also add bridal connotations. Euripides' Helen wishes to distance herself not only from her beauty, appearing more virginal than bridal (cf. Hephaistos' newly created woman at *Theogony* 571ff.; Downing (1997)) but also as less acquisitive and desirous of eastern luxuries than elsewhere in Euripides (cf. Hecuba's insults in *Trojan Women* 994-997, or the picture of Helen and Menelaus in the *Orestes* overall). Finally consider that the verb ἐναλείφω carries the meanings of 'anoint with', and 'paint within the lines' which suggests the addition of something further to an object (L.S.J. s.v. ἐναλείφω I-II).

[611] Burian (2009) 262 ad loc.

[612] Following Downing (1990).

[613] Downing (1990) outlines Euripides' interest in the tension between beauty and virginal innocence through allying Helen to the figure of a παρθένος in his play. This tactic to recover her reputation ultimately fails as in the end 'the aesthetic perfection remains to confront the ethical perfection....the result is a hybrid....an impossible paradox'. Lycophron's Cassandra refuses to make her beauty definitive of her.

[614] Further below 4.2; 5.1.

ἐξ ὀνείρων πέμπτον ἐστροβημένον /εἰδωλοπλάστῳ προσκαταξανεῖ ῥέθει. The compound adjective εἰδωλοπλάστος combines ideas of vision and creative action; it has been variously translated (often with differing emphases),[615]recently by Prioux as 'une image fabriquée' (εἰδολοπλάστῳ, vers 173).[616] We are reminded of Hesiod's 'fabricated woman' (*Theogony* 513: ... πρῶτος γάρ ῥα Διὸς **πλαστὴν** ὑπέδεκτο γυναῖκα παρθένον).'[617] However, while Pandora *is* granted elements that do make her 'distinct from a lifeless clay statue', such as strength, a voice, and eyes (*Works and Days* 60-3), with Hermes' role in this perhaps suggesting a parallel with the messenger's function in activating Cassandra's voice in the *Alexandra*. In the *Alexandra*, Helen remains *only* a voiceless image, affective on others purely through the way she looks.

The related connotations of insubstantiality, falsity and created-ness, visuality and idealization of form found in Helen's image as created, sculpted, moulded, replicated, imagined and even fantasized are all combined in εἰδωλοπλαστός,[618] and the formation of this new compound brings the ideas of making and seeing together in a highly concentrated way.[619] Note the way a potentially tactile, hands-on root (the verb πλάσσω) comes at the very

---

[615] E.g. Holzinger (1895), '...in einer Scheingestalt erblicht'; Mair (1921) ,'phantom face'; Mooney (1921), 'phantom beauty'; Lambin (2008), 'contre un corps fantasmique elle fera se frotter'; Hurst-Kolde (2008), 'usant contre lui son corps moulé de songes'; Hornblower (2015) 'phantom form' etc. See also Lord Royston's translation (1806): 'Round her the fifth/in dream created joys/shall clasp his visionary arms, whose bride/Cytaean Maenad, on the stranger forms/shall gaze with frantic eyes.'

[616] Prioux (2014) 5.

[617] Cf. Hesiod, *Works and Days* 70-1 for Hephaistos following Zeus' orders to fabricate Pandora: αὐτίκα δ' ἐκ γαίης πλάσσεν κλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυήεις /παρθένῳ αἰδοίῃ ἴκελον Κρονίδεω διὰ βουλάς...; Aeschylus fr. 207b (369: *Prometheus Purphoros)*: ἐκ πηλοπλάστου σπέρματος θνητὴ γυνή (description of Pandora).

[618] As stated above, the noun is a *hapax*, only appearing in Lycophron and the relevant scholia. The verb, εἰδωλοπλαστέω is also rare, first appearing in the writings of the allegorical interpreter of Homer, Heracleitus' *Homeric Questions* (66) to explain the meaning of Proteus and Eidothea's names and the allegorizing 'truth' behind the fantastic narrative found in *Odyssey* 4, as part of his overall mission to rehabilitate the gods of Homer. Heracleitus is 'tentatively dated' to circa 100 C.E (*OCD*[4]) and thus any attempt to attach significance to the use of allegorical language will have to tread carefully, but there may be some scope here for further work. A search of the full corpus of the T.L.G. finds five instances in total, two in editions of the *Odyssey* scholia (apparently citing Herakleitus' view) and two much later occurrences in the 13th C Byzantine writers Joannes Stauracius and Georgius Pachymeres.

[619] On the 'pregnant' and dense nature of Lycophron's language, see esp. Gigante-Lanzara (2009), Lambin (2009).

moment her ethereal, dreamlike and intangible appearance is also stressed, as the former part of the verb reminds us of visual perception. We can also see further play with these ideas in the reference to Helen's birth. In a familiar technique, the back-story or prehistory of a character is brought in as part of another episode.[620] Here, Helen's birth is framed by Cassandra's vision of Paris speeding hungrily to abduct his desired prize:

λεύσσω θέοντα γρυνὸν ἐπτερωμένον 86

τρήρωνος εἰς ἅρπαγμα Πεφναίας κυνός, 87

ἣν τόργος ὑγρόφοιτος ἐκλοχεύεται, 88

κελυφάνου στρόβιλον ὠστρακωμένην. 89

Even at the moment of her coming into existence, there are still some questions about Helen's true nature as she remains covered and hidden from sight in a shell that has grown hard around her, repeating the pattern of a space, object, or person occluded from the outside at the same moment it is revealed;[621] consider the line endings (… ἐκλοχεύεται; … ὠστρακωμένην) and the bringing forth signalled by the ἐκ- prefix of the compound when in fact she remains 'ἐν'.[622] As several commentators have noted, the pleonastic description puts the emphasis on the covering layers of the egg, rather than what is inside it.[623] Because this is

[620] E.g. *Alexandra* 115ff. (Proteus), 171ff. (Achilles), 232ff. (Cycnus). This perhaps exploits heroic identification in Homer.

[621] Cf. Cusset (2009) 119; Lambin (2009) 163; Hornblower (2015) 89 ad loc. explains that the accusative στρόβιλον is one of dress after the verb (ὠστρακωνένην), 'thus [it] means literally "encased by a shell, as to a round thing of covering"'.

[622] How to take the subject of the unusual compound verb here has been debated, but I follow Gigante-Lanzara (2000) ad loc. and the general consensus here in seeing no problem in it referring to Zeus.

[623] E.g. Gigante-Lanzara (2000) ad 89; cf. Prioux (2014) 3; Tzetzes ad loc also explains the layers of the egg and emphasizes the roundness that the pleonastic language insists on: κυρίως δὲ κελύφανιν λέγεται τὸ ἔσωθεν τοῦ ὄστρακου τοῦ ᾠοῦ λεπτότατον δέρμα. Στρόβιλον, στρογγύλον, στροβιλοειδές. Στρόβιλος γὰρ τὸ περιφερές.

Helen's actual birth, the motif of creation from material obfuscation is particularly striking and further emphasized if we look to the Euripidean intertext (*Helen* 255ff.):[624]

φίλαι γυναῖκες, τίνι πότμῳ συνεζύγην;

ἆρ' ἡ τεκοῦσά μ' ἔτεκεν ἀνθρώποις τέρας;

[γυνὴ γὰρ οὔθ' Ἑλληνὶς οὔτε βάρβαρος

τεῦχος νεοσσῶν λευκὸν ἐκλοχεύεται,

ἐν ᾧ με Λήδαν φασὶν ἐκ Διὸς τεκεῖν.]

And, as Burian has highlighted, the doubts about her origins are also voiced by Helen herself when she introduces herself at the outset of the play (*Helen* 16-22):

ἡμῖν δὲ γῆ μὲν πατρὶς οὐκ ἀνώνυμος

Σπάρτη, πατὴρ δὲ Τυνδάρεως: ἔστιν δὲ δὴ

λόγος τις ὡς Ζεὺς μητέρ' ἔπτατ' εἰς ἐμὴν

Λήδαν κύκνου μορφώματ' ὄρνιθος λαβών,

ὃς δόλιον εὐνὴν ἐξέπραξ' ὑπ' αἰετοῦ

δίωγμα φεύγων, **εἰ σαφὴς οὗτος λόγος**:

Ἑλένη δ' ἐκλήθην.

Burian further notes that in the reception of the play, that the uncertainty comes from Helen herself here 'has seemed "curious and a little upsetting" to many readers.'[625] That

[624] Noting that the lines featuring the rare verb ἐκλοχεύω (cf. *Alexandra* 88) are deleted by some editors, (as if they do not exist either): see Burian (2008) ad loc.

[625] Burian (2009): Euripides *Helen* 21 ad loc. citing Dale's view and Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis* 793ff. where the chorus express their scepticism about Helen's origin; is the story true or a poet's fabrication? (διὰ σέ, τὰν κύκνου δολιχαύχενος γόνον, /εἰ δὴ φάτις ἔτυμος ὡς /ἔτυχεν, Λήδα ὄρνιθι πταμένῳ /Διὸς ὅτ' ἠλλάχθη δέμας, εἴτ' /ἐν δέλτοις Πιερίσιν /μῦθοι τάδ' ἐς ἀνθρώπους /ἤνεγκαν παρὰ καιρὸν ἄλλως).

the *Alexandra* transforms these rumours into part of Cassandra's all too lucid vision (λεύσσω, 86) perhaps suggests that the true Helen is *really* fantastically unreal, and it is the stories that grow around her, like an outer shell, and the image of her beauty, are all that exist of her. In the Platonic *Sophist*, the compound εἰδωλοποιικός (active 'image-making') appears seven times[626] and while the formation from πλάσσω in Lycophron shares the connotations of creative control of material, the notion of sculpting something (from εἰδώλα?) for the eye, or being made to be looked at, suggests mimetic realism and striving for visual beauty, in contrast with a poiesis geared to sculpting Cassandra's voice and the *Alexandra*.[627] At the same time, because of the metaphorical sense of the verb as 'fabrication'[628] the new compound underlines even further the idea of fashioning falsehood, and the Platonic connection between representation and tricksiness.[629] This also suggests an attempt to contrast Helen as a beautiful, seductive, visual, yet ultimately false appearance with the reality of Cassandra and her difficult voice as represented in the poem. The idea of Helen's empty image becomes something to define the aesthetics of the *Alexandra* against, just as the two 'most beautiful' women are paired and contrasted implicitly too. The εἴδωλ- part of Lycophron's compound adjective, coined for its aptness in condensing the reference to the version of the story where

---

[626] Plato, *Sophist* 235b8, 236c6, 239d3, 260d9, 264c4, 266a10-d4, 268d1. See 219a (πλαστόν) which here refers to pottery, the making of vessels.

[627] Powers (2002) discussion of atomist theory in Apollonius may suggest a similar interest in the *Alexandra*. The relationship with Hellenistic science and philosophy needs more investigation.

[628] See L.S.J. sv πλάσσω 2.V.

[629] Plato's *Sophist* has some features of interest in relation to the *Alexandra*. Whether and how closely the poem can be said to engage with the Platonic dialogue form and ideas needs further investigation. For example, the juxtaposition of *enthusiasmos* and *techne* in the *Alexandra*, or ideas about recital and writing in the *Phaedrus*, or the differing types of madness discussed in that dialogue. In the *Sophist* the *xenos* from Elis must decide whether he will proceed in dialogue, or choose to take over with a monologue, a *makros logos* of his own (217c). The initial subdivision of the arts into the ποιητικὴ τέχνη and κτητικὴ τέχνη are suggestive, along with the hunting imagery used to define particular types of men, especially the idea of the lover as hunter (222c-d) in view of the way Paris is portrayed in the *Alexandra* (114-115; see Biffis (2012) 87ff.). Seeming and being, and the paradoxical existence of non-being are discussed at 236d and following (Ξένος: ὄντως, ὦ μακάριε, ἐσμὲν ἐν παντάπασι χαλεπῇ [236ε] σκέψει. τὸ γὰρ φαίνεσθαι τοῦτο καὶ τὸ δοκεῖν, εἶναι δὲ μή, καὶ τὸ λέγειν μὲν ἄττα, ἀληθῆ δὲ μή, πάντα ταῦτά ἐστι μεστὰ ἀπορίας ἀεὶ ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνῳ καὶ νῦν.), which may have some relevance to Cassandra's speaking of not-being, and how to speak at all if it comes out as falsehood (e.g. 237e Ξένος: τὸν δὲ δὴ μὴ τὶ λέγοντα ἀναγκαιότατον, ὡς ἔοικε, παντάπασι μηδὲν λέγειν); although note Theaetetus' remark: Θεαίτητος: τέλος γοῦν ἂν ἀπορίας ὁ λόγος ἔχοι.

Helen exists as a fashioned-double, also suggests further rejection of surface beauty and a purely decorative visual object.[630] Cassandra's personal rejection of the expected visual conventions of the beautiful bride that the *parthenos* should inhabit is suggested,[631] and there is a suggestion of moral character and aesthetic choice coming together in her refusal to be seen this way. If her highly embellished voice compensates for these adornments, then the *Alexandra* can also be seen as her final transition to a material representation of the idealized *kore*. These ideas are explored further in the final sections.

[630] It is the persuasive speaker, the Sophist, who fashions appearances at 239d, and who will want to know next what 'image' means. For their deceptiveness see e.g. 234d, 240d, 259c, 259e (καὶ μὴν ἀπάτης οὔσης εἰδώλων τε καὶ εἰκόνων ἤδη καὶ φαντασίας πάντα ἀνάγκη μεστὰ εἶναι).

[631] See Swift (2016) on *partheneion*.

Section 4: Seeing and Speaking: Greek Epigram and the *Alexandra*

4.1: Subject and Object

In section 2, I argued that there are parts of the *Alexandra* that we may regard as 'synoptic' wholes within the flow of Cassandra's prophecy,[632] and that these not only re-play the events of previous literature but represent those works in a generically sensitive way, both in the deployment of visual perception within them and as they are presented to the reader through Cassandra's gaze or focalization.[633] In this chapter, we will continue this discussion by moving away from epic poetry to discuss the very Hellenistic genre of literary epigram. We begin our discussion with a later anonymous epideictic epigram describing the *Alexandra* itself, (perhaps) found affixed at the head of the text, which will allow us to consider some connections already made between Lycophron's poem and the genre, even if these at first seem slight (*Palatine Anthology* 9.191):[634]

Οὐκ ἂν ἐν ἡμετέροισι πολυγνάμπτοις λαβύρινθιος

ῥηιδίως προμόλοις ἐς φάος, αἴ κε τύχῃς·

τοίους γὰρ Πριαμὶς Κασσάνδρη φοίβασε μύθους,

ἄγγελος οὓς βασιλεῖ ἔφρασε λοξότροχις.

[632] Cf. Kolde (2009).

[633] Cf. Männlein-Robert (2007) 252: epigrams that have a work of art as their subject, do not have as their 'concern ... poetic imitations of art imbued with a stirring *enargeia* (clarity) but ... the poetic identification of a work of art and the poetic *mise-en-scene* of an important interpretive pronouncement on it.'

[634] According to Neblung (1997) 92; see further for brief discussion of the recall of Lycophronic language and style in the epigram. We might note in particular among these that the related uses of language which Looijenga (2009) 69 has shown hint at Apollo's presence are both retained here (e.g. φοίβασε, λοξοτροχίς); Other uses of Lycophronic vocabulary are found in Berra (2009) 278 who examines a satirical epigram; De Stefani and Magnelli (2009) 593 discuss the use of λοφνίδας (cf. *Alexandra* 48) in *A.P.* 11.20 (Antipater) and Callimachus fr. 755 Pf; further 600-1 on a Byzantine epigram of Leo the Philosopher (*A.P.* 9.578).

εἰ δέ σε φίλατο Καλλιόπη, λάβε μ’ ἐς χέρας · εἰ δὲ

νῆις ἔφυς Μουσέων, χερσὶ βάρος φορέεις.

Firstly, we can simply add this to the growing list of texts that have been discussed in relation to the *Alexandra*'s opening frame; in fact, Berra has already termed the epigram a 'redouble en quelque-sorte le monologue-cadre de Lycophron.'[635] It forms another layer of commentary that raises certain expectations in the reader, just as Looijenga has discussed (as we saw above) in his reading of the messenger as akin to a speaking scroll, who introduces and describes the text he contains to the reader, a sort of *captatio benevolentiae* in Looijenga's view.[636] This is rendered more explicitly in the epigram's request for the suitable reader to take up the text in line 5 (... λάβε με’ ἐς χέρας) as 'The Alexandra' speaks for itself.[637]

Loosely, in the way epigram is used here to stand in for a literary work, it also objectifies, describes and contains it (just as we find for the plastic arts), much as the messenger's framing description of Cassandra's speech does too.[638] The epigram retains the slippage between Cassandra's speech as content and the poem itself as object, as well as hinting at the messenger speech form (ἄγγελος, line 4). This suggests that the way epideictic epigram 'reports' and describes its subject has a direct parallel in the structure of the *Alexandra*, despite the disparity in length,[639] and that the genre may be very useful in pursuing the

[635]Berra (2009) 298; See further 298-301 for his comments on this epigram in particular reference to the poem's obscurity and similar verses in Tzetzes and the scholia.

[636] Looijenga (2009). Cf. Elmer (2005) 12-14 on *Beischrift* inscriptions [Raubitschek 1968: 21]: 'the caption or legend, which has as its goal the explanation or identification of an object. No longer a necessary component of the object, the *Beischrift* is merely a supplement which serves to specify, condense, or otherwise "capture" the meaning of an object: a *captio* in the true sense. In captioning a visual object, the speaker loses subjectivity, as is the case with the messenger and Cassandra.

[637] Cf. Looijenga (2009). As he sees it, the learned reader is flattered by the invitation to - like Priam - peruse the difficult text; Neblung (1997) 90 reads the epigram as more of a challenging warning to the reader; Cusset and Prioux (2009) 647 briefly discuss the relation to the muses. See now Lóio (2014) 387-9 on this epigram in her chapter on this phenomenon in Flavian literature, particularly on the notion of the poem as βάρος.

[638] See e.g. Lowe (2004); Cusset (2004), (2009); Looijenga (2009).

[639] Biffis (2012) 121 has already observed that 'excluding...epigram, Lycophron appears to be the sole example of the identification of poet and character for almost the entire length of the poem itself.'

analogue in the poem between Cassandra as a particularized speaker (subject) and as a representative object; Lycophron's poem and style of poetry.[640] In the following chapter, we will pursue the suggestive relationship between the *Alexandra* and epideictic epigram in a number of more specific ways and set the discussion within the current discourse on Hellenistic epigram and visuality that has flowered since the Milan Posidippos emerged.[641]

Michael Squire's discussion of epideictic epigram and the way the genre engages with well-known visual artworks is especially useful in thinking about the way the *Alexandra* re-runs and encounters its literary models and presents its central character, Cassandra, as a sort of speaking (silent) object.[642] Cusset has emphasized the paradoxes of speech and silence in the *Alexandra*, with its central character who speaks at length, but as a reported speaker, or an extended quotation, also does not speak at all. This interplay between silence and speech is central to Cassandra's character already, for example, in her extended entrance in Aeschylus' tragedy.[643] We can set this alongside the dramatized tension at the centre of epideictic epigrams between the silent objects that are seen and the need for voiced description.[644] On this reading 'the phenomenology of poetic voice is the *sine qua non* of ecphrastic epigram. However believable the supposed visual impression of an image, the question is whether (and indeed how) the statue, portrait or painting can actually talk'.[645] Further, objects, particularly statuary, which contain the promise of speech because of life-like appearance and the artist's skilled replication of reality makes 'mimetic verisimilitude ... the single most important topos

---

[640] E.g. Cusset (2009): that is according to a process of *mise-en-abyme*, the poem is always about itself, so there is always a parallel between how the poet fashions his poem and how Cassandra expresses herself.

[641] Squire (2011) 17; 276-278.

[642] On 'speaking' objects in literary epigram see further e.g.: Meyer (2007) 192 on a fourth century BCE Herm *stele* where the statue of the messenger god has an inscribed base and the god introduces himself in 'iambic verses reminiscent of dramatic prologues' before giving a list of names; cf. Männlein-Robert (2007) 259 on 'failure of voice' in statues.

[643] Cf. Cusset (2009).

[644] Squire (2011) 86; cf. Männlein-Robert (2007).

[645] Squire (2011) 274ff.

within extant ecphrastic epigram'.[646] I wish to explore in greater depth and detail how these issues of creating a voice and realism and truth in representation play out in the poem concerning (in this section) its central character in more depth. Like epigram, the *Alexandra* does 'actively interrogate... what it means to view, and what it means to represent viewing through words' and must be set 'within a much larger Greek tradition of ecphrastic writing ...and...Greek epistemologies of viewing'.[647] The paradoxes that are shoved under the nose of the reader from the outset of the *Alexandra*, that is, the fact the whole poem stages the question of how truth, figured an instance of visual perception, is reacted to, interpreted and described accurately and convincingly in words. Further, the doubt introduced through the figure of Cassandra, directly confronts the possibility that this simply cannot succeed, and in turn means the parallel with epigram is particularly helpful in dealing with a poem which though it engages with the long tradition of 'Greek thinking about words visualizing pictures'[648] can also be described as 'a total failure of *enargeia*' as its central character struggles to get her 'view' (literally and metaphorically) across, sharing her knowledge and convincing her listener.[649] While Cassandra's vision reveals, her voice struggles to replicate the picture.[650]

---

[646] Squire (2011) 274ff. Of these sorts of epigrams (found in book 9 of the *Palatine Anthology*) he has stressed that 'the fissure between absent visual object and present verbal text served as a meta-literary gauge for measuring the proximity and distance between physical monument and graphic representation.' The dialogue in the *Alexandra* between poetry and the plastic arts is discussed below 4.2; 5.1. Barkan (2013) 28-33 further discusses the 'appealing phrases' of Horace (*ut pictura poesis*) and Simonides as not 'a very good definition of poetry'; they both express a 'rhetorical community between the arts...while in fact demonstrating that that neither of the arts can explain the other or itself. His discussion also evaluates Plato's devaluation of representation and ultimately, of visual perception as a source of true knowledge.

[647] Squire (2011) 77. This follows the well-known article of Goldhill (1994) that ends with the hope for a 'necessary rewriting of the history of *ecphrasis* not merely as a history of a rhetorical *topos* but as the *history of the formations of a viewing subject'* (his italics).

[648] Squire (2011) 276 for description of this strand in philosophy and rhetoric; see further his detailed discussion of *ecphrasis* in Theon of Alexandria's *Progymnasmata* and Hermogenes' at 326ff.

[649] Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 443.

[650] Cf. Cusset (2009) 119; cf. Pliny 35.68 on Parrhasius' dictum that the artist should *ostendat etiam quae occulatat*.

To illustrate his discussion of this struggle between vision, voice and silence, and thus the plastic arts and poetry in epigram, Männlein-Robert outlines how an ecphrastic epigram usually attributed to Theocritus, concerned with a sculpture of the poet Anacreon, stresses the need for spoken detailed description in accurately portraying its subject, affirming the worth of the poetic voice (and thus the epigram itself too, *Palatine Anthology* 9.599 = 15 GP):[651]

θᾶσαι τὸν ἀνδριάντα τοῦτον, ὦ ξένε,

σπουδᾷ, καὶ λέγ', ἐπὰν ἐς οἶκον ἔνθῃς,

"Ἀνακρέοντος εἰκὸν' εἶδον ἐν Τέῳ,

τῶν πρόσθ' εἴ τι περισσὸν ᾠδοποιοῦ."

προσθεὶς δὲ χὤτι τοῖς νέοισιν ἅδετο,

ἐρεῖς ἀτρεκέως ὅλον τὸν ἄνδρα.

If we read the final line of the epigram with the opening one of the *Alexandra* in mind - λέξω τὰ πάντα νητρεκῶς – it seems this same contestation is present in the messenger's 'first claim to truth';[652] styling his speech not just as a feat of memory and accurate recital, but also a claim to (poetic) speech as the guarantor of total description, as the speaker of the epigram does here. More tentatively, this may raise the expectation that a description of the silent and beautiful Cassandra is about to follow.

Yet of course, from line 3 (οὐ γὰρ ἥσυχος κόρη...) the long description of Cassandra's noisy oracular speech follows, with no visual description of her at the outset of the poem. Instead, the parallels between the description of her utterance and the pictorial description of Paris' ships leaving make it seem as if the prophetess now blows life into image as one voice gives way to another.[653] As the prophetess' direct speech comes to dominate she is no longer

---

[651] Männlein-Robert (2007) 264-5; cf. the parallel discussion of portraits of orators in Barkan (2013) 14ff.

[652] Lowe (2004) 308ff.

[653] *Alexandra* 26-30.

merely a voice to be described, but a speaker who describes her own visual experience, and she also resembles the epigrammatic speaker, the poet *as* viewer; as Meyer has stated explicitly, epigrams 'include not only the role of a reader but also that of a viewer in the text.'[654] As the central narrator in the *Alexandra*, Cassandra too, not only speaks, but sees at the same time.[655] This does not mean she does not shape, reflect on and interpret the content of her speech (as merely a puppet or mouthpiece of the god and/or the poet),[656] nor however that she is fully in control of it; who controls what is seen and heard remains contested throughout.[657] In any case, we do have a speaker who is also a viewer and a clear parallel with the positioning of the poet's voice found in ecphrastic epigram.[658]

This becomes even more complex when Cassandra appears in her own prophecy and we consider the reflexive nature of the poem and the process of *mise-en-abyme*.[659] As much as Cassandra controls and constructs her own image, she is also the product of an artist/poet's hand (and those of earlier poets); as she herself seems to be aware.[660] We will examine these ideas further through turning to another part of the poem where Cassandra herself is central to the action she describes (*Alexandra* 348ff.):[661]

ἐγὼ δὲ τλήμων ἡ γάμους ἀρνουμένη, 348

ἐν παρθενῶνος λαΐνου τυκίσμασιν 349

---

[654] Meyer (2007) 189.

[655] Cf. Hummel (2006) 216: 'Cassandra ne raconte pas: elle décrit plûtot ce qu'elle voit: le déplacement, ou plûtot le report, se fait ainsi de la diégèse à la mimèse.'; Cusset (2009) on the frame.

[656] Cf. Biffis (2012).

[657] Following Lowe (2004); Cusset (2009); Hummel (2006).

[658] Meyer (2007) 196f. Meyer also singles out Lucillius' epigram on an empty tomb (*A.P.* 11.312) as typical 'play with the different media of speech, writing and image' where there is constant question of whether the objects represented are real or not.

[659] Following Cusset (2009).

[660] cf. Biffis (2012) 114ff. on the 'shared knowledge' between character and poet.

[661] Aias' attack on Cassandra is central to her story and explains the Greeks failed *nostoi* as a direct result of Aias' λωβή (365) in the temple of Athena at Troy, after he dragged Cassandra from Athena's statue.

ἄνις τεράμνων εἰς ἀνώροφον στέγην 350

εἱρκτῆς ἁλιβδύσασα λυγαίας δέμας, 351

ἡ τὸν Θοραῖον Πτῷον Ὡρίτην θεὸν 352

λίπτοντ᾽ ἀλέκτρων ἐκβαλοῦσα δεμνίων, 353

ὡς δὴ κορείαν ἄφθιτον πεπαμένη 354

πρὸς γῆρας ἄκρον, Παλλάδος ζηλώμασι 355

τῆς μισονύμφου Λαφρίας Πυλάτιδος, 356

τῆμος βιαίως φάσσα πρὸς τόργου λέχος 357

γαμψαῖσιν ἅρπαις οἰνὰς ἑλκυσθήσομαι, 358

ἡ πολλὰ δὴ Βούδειαν Αἴθυιαν Κόρην 359

ἀρωγὸν αὐδάξασα τάρροθον γάμων. 360

ἡ δ᾽ εἰς τέραμνα δουρατογλύφου στέγης 361

γλήνας ἄνω στρέψασα χώσεται στρατῷ, 362

ἐξ οὐρανοῦ πεσοῦσα καὶ θρόνων Διός, 363

ἄνακτι πάππῳ χρῆμα τιμαλφέστατον. 364

ἑνὸς δὲ λώβης ἀντί, μυρίων τέκνων 365

Ἑλλὰς στενάξει πᾶσα τοὺς κενοὺς τάφους ... 366

At the very least, as the scene of Aias' attack is extremely common in iconography, rather as in ecphrastic epigrams concerned with well-known artworks, the reader would think of the scene as visually depicted and supplement and compare their knowledge of the details with

description offered to their ears.[662] Moreover, there are further useful analogies to be made here with the knowing games of visuality in ecphrastic epigram in the way we see and do not see Cassandra here. In other words, this instance of self-depiction also contains the paradox of Cassandra's simultaneous presence and absence in the text, just as Cusset has discussed, inscribed in visual terms (to paraphrase – we see with her, but do not see her) and aptly, this scene is full of frustration as a consequence.[663] Cassandra is hidden in her prison – we *cannot* see her as we do elsewhere in the poem. Rather like the way the messenger's report confounds our expectations at the outset of the poem, in line 348 (following ἐγώ) it seems as if we might get a straightforward narration of Cassandra's personal experience of events in the first person, but instead, she tells us first about her prison, with characteristically pleonastic expression[664] that works hard to hide and imprison Cassandra, barring her from the reader's vision.

At the same time, we learn of Cassandra's own frustration too. She had 'called' on Athena repeatedly (360) in the past; compare the form of αὐδάω in line 360 (αὐδάξασα) with the use at verses 1139-1140 for the woman who knows in future she 'shall long be called a goddess' by her Daunian cult acolytes (κείναις ἐγὼ δηναιὸν ἄφθιτος θεὰ / ῥαβδηφόροις γυναιξὶν αὐδηθήσομαι).[665] In the later passage, as often in the poem, a sort of future audience is marked by use of a future passive at the end of the line[666] and here, these ritual speakers who will keep alive and worship Cassandra/Alexandra (1140, αὐδηθήσομαι (here in a unique use of the 1st person, emphasized by ἔγω in line 1139) with her immortality as an ἀφθιτος θεα

---

662 See Zanker (2003) 72ff. on the process of 'supplementation' in relation to Hellenistic art. See also Pausanias' ecphrastic description of one of Polygnotus' paintings featuring Aias' attack on Cassandra. Biffis (2012) 77 with n.40 points out that Ajax usually predominates over a 'tiny' Cassandra.

663 Cusset (2009).

664 Following e.g. Gigante-Lanzara (2000) ad 610-611.

665 See her aim too (ὡς δὴ κορείαν ἄφθιτον) in verse 354; these parallels are already discussed by Gigante-Lanzara (2000) ad loc.; cf. Biffis (2012) 37ff.

666 See now Hornblower (2015) ad 192-193; 306; 630; 1052; 1124.

(immortal goddess) stressed in strong and epic terms; something that McNelis and Sens have shown holds for the transformed Trojan characters in the poem.[667]

The palpability of her image to the Daunian girls, placed at the centre of their worship, is made clear; unlike us, they don't just get to see, but get to touch, and embrace it. This then also draws the reader into the scene as they identify with the sensory experience of the ritual participants hugging her statue (ἐμὸν περιπτύξουσιν ὠλέναις βρέτας, 1135).[668] The use of possessive adjectives (ἐμός, 1124), accusative ἐμόν (1135), then the nominative pronoun (ἐγώ, 1139) on the one hand recalls the reader to Cassandra's personal and active role in her self-depiction; yet the accusative forms also put the reader in the position of her future worshippers; rather than just looking at the image, we revere and touch it. So, while the Daunian girls can grasp this solid image of the heroized Cassandra and we are, on the one hand, positioned with them in the scene, Cassandra does not look through her own image, but hovers over it, divinized, and the poem's distancing *mise-en-abyme* effect affirms the new status of Cassandra, as we look at Cassandra with her, at herself, and what we see is the wooden image.[669] The reader too, in switching between the mortal perception of the image and the divine vision of its veneration, confront the paradox in the action of the worshippers (περιπτύξουσιν), as something is revealed to be true at the same time it is hidden from sight in a covering gesture. The first person statement that ends the passage (κείναις ἐγὼ δηναιὸν ἄφθιτος θεὰ ῥαβδηφόροις γυναιξὶν αὐδηθήσομαι, 1139-40), then effectively fulfils the prophetic promise at the beginning that (οὐ μὴν ἐμὸν νώνυμνον ἀνθρώποις σέβας ἔσται, 1126-7) Cassandra's 'worship will not remain nameless'.[670] Her fame will be spoken of and

---

[667] McNelis and Sens (2011b).

[668] Exploiting the meaning of περιπτύσσω as the process of wrapping, enshrouding or hiding in the poem (e.g. as indicated at *Alexandra* 10-12; for this meaning see esp. περιπτύσσω in Kreon's instructions, Sophocles *Antigone* 886) seems to be replaced not by visual revelation but real objects that can be touched and embraced. Cf. Mari (2009).

[669] Cf. Bennett (1917a; 1917b) and Arafat (1992) who both emphasize that Pausanias' catalogue of sixty ξόανα emphasizes the wooden images' antiquity. Perhaps the poet also implies this as another way of *coming before* poetry with the βρέτας here. Hellenistic poets are interested in holy images and their provenance (a motif that the *Alexandra* extends). See e.g. Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos* for Theseus' dedication of Aphrodite's ἱρὸν ἄγαλμα.

[670] It has been suggested to me that this is an ironic epiphany showing the unwillingness to break with the representational games and inset images of the poem. However, the scene combines vision, voice and confirms the

carried forth by these collective future voices, not through the re-performance of song, like a Pindaric victor, but by the actions of the Daunians, attesting to the movement from poetry to cult remembrance in the *Alexandra* that Sistakou and Biffis have demonstrated.[671]

However, to return to the scene in Troy, unlike the Daunian followers who will call on her, Cassandra is neither heard, nor seen by the goddess. Athena's statue turns its eyes (γλήνας, 362) upward away from Aias' disgraceful behaviour and Cassandra's victimhood, as she is also hidden from the goddess who does not heed her calls. Cassandra's explanation of her motivation for the rejection of Apollo follows, stemming from her desire to remain a life-long virgin, in imitation of Athena (in lines 354 and following).[672] Cassandra's frustration is on two levels then – her voice is ignored and her desire for lifelong virginity is too. This follows Hummel, Cusset and Biffis[673] in their metaphorical readings of Cassandra's prison or 'maiden chamber' (349); as representing both her unheard and ineffective voice that alienates her as well as her desire to retain her virginity. For Hummel, her total but hidden knowledge is linked to her virginity, penetrable only to the god Apollo (in a sacred marriage).[674] Just as the

palpability of Cassandra's image to the Daunian girls, justifying itself as more than poetry because of the poem's valuation of material object over purely visual or verbal representations, and the only way that Cassandra can truly ever imitate Athena. That is, an imitation, but a meaningful one that results in substitution (see Steiner (2001) 3ff.) and reflects that 'the represented is not just in the image, the represented is the image' in cult viewing (Elsner (2007b) 45. As Mari (2009) suggests we need to think about religious experience as well as literary/philosophical theories of representation. Cf. ὠλέναις in respect of βρετάς (1135; cf. 1183) versus 114: Paris and Helen's insubstantial *eidolon.*

[671] As Biffis states (2012) 126, 'the burden of truth' passes from voice to historical facts or actions and events, and 'literal immortality'; this is underpinned by the material aesthetics of the poem. Cf. Detienne (1996) 77 on the link between truth, trust and persuasion (ἀληθεια, πίστις, πειθώ) and Cassandra's speech 'defect…so serious that even if her speech is efficacious, [she] seems capable of producing only "vain"… or even "untrustworthy" words' 'condemn[ing her] to "non-reality"'. The *Alexandra* then reflects the two-fold and 'inseparable meanings' of ψευδής that Detienne delineates in 'archaic Greek thought' as it means both 'speech that aims to deceive [or trick]' and 'speech… [that] presents the "appearances" of reality without, however, being reality, it can also mean speech without "fulfilment", devoid of efficacy, never to be realized.' This is transformed by the existence of Cassandra's speech as written text.

[672] See Elsner (2007) 11 on religious images in the ancient world where it 'was not always possible to differentiate the deity from his or her statue' just as the reader of the *Alexandra* is coerced into seeing the poem and its speaker converging.

[673] Biffis (2012) 38, 75, 198.

[674] Hummel (2006) 215f.

framed structure of the poem, Cassandra contains more inside her human body.[675] A comparison with Oedipus' speech explaining the lack of pleasure his vision gave him also suggests the suffering that Cassandra's total knowledge, trapped in a mortal body, like a prison, brings (Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannos*, 1384-1389):

τοιάνδ' ἐγὼ κηλῖδα μηνύσας ἐμὴν

ὀρθοῖς ἔμελλον ὄμμασιν τούτους ὁρᾶν;

ἥκιστά γ'· ἀλλ' εἰ τῆς ἀκουούσης ἔτ' ἦν

πηγῆς δι' ὤτων φραγμός, οὐκ ἂν ἐσχόμην

τὸ μὴ ἀποκλῇσαι τοὐμὸν ἄθλιον δέμας,

ἵν' ἦ τυφλός τε καὶ κλύων μηδέν:

Cassandra wants to be heard and understood but not seen, desired, and conquered;[676] this means the paradox between voice and vision are at the centre of this scene and directly map on to the observation made by Cusset that the poem conceals and reveals information at the same time.[677]

There are some interesting questions presented here as to how the reader feels themselves positioned by the way events are presented, particularly in light of the preceding description of Cassandra's dark prison and the similarities suggested between Athena and Cassandra/Alexandra in these passages.[678] What I want to try and show is how vision is also

[675] Hummel (2006) (190): 'L'heroïne oscille constamment entre humanité et divinité', the *Alexandra* asks - is she is a fallen goddess or a heroized ancient mortal?

[676] Translating Hummel (2006) 215: '...car les hommes ne veulent pas voir: la prophétesse incarne la paradoxe vivant d'un désir de partage qui ne rencontre aucun echo.'

[677] Cusset (2009) 119.

[678] Biffis (2012) 141-142.

important to this identification between the two, for example, in the similar description of Athena's shrine and Cassandra's prison;[679]

ἐγὼ δὲ τλήμων ἡ γάμους ἀρνουμένη, 348

ἐν παρθενῶνος λαΐνου τυκίσμασιν 349

ἄνις τεράμνων εἰς ἀνώροφον στέγην 350

εἱρκτῆς ἀλιβδύσασα λυγαίας δέμας, 351

.....

ἡ δ' εἰς τέραμνα δουρατογλύφου στέγης 361

γλήνας ἄνω στρέψασα χώσεται στρατῷ, 362

Despite the similarity between the maiden goddess and the prophetess, there is also difference, much like the way Lyons has outlined for the 'ambivalent relations' between goddesses and heroines, 'played out in myths and metaphors of doubling and exchange, as heroine and goddess compete with, and ultimately replicate one another'.[680] While Athena looks away and up to the wooden roof of her shrine, Cassandra's stony prison has no roof.[681] If we follow in reading the prison metaphorically, as discussed above, we can perhaps add another layer of meaning to those discussions to in terms of ideas about control of the gaze and vision here. Athena is free to look away from events to the roof of her shrine, or later in the poem to 'shut her bloodless eyes'[682] in another violation in a temple, in the second 'Ilium',

---

[679] Gigante-Lanzara (2000) ad loc. has already noted bringing this part of the text alongside Cassandra's later appearance as a cult image or figure (βρέτας, 1135) means that we can see better the contrast and transformation from the woman who grasps the wooden image of Athena for protection, to the deified heroine whose own wooden image is embraced by her followers.

[680] On relationship between goddesses and heroines see especially Lyons (1997) 134ff. on the 'reciprocity and exchange' that characterises the 'goddess and her doubles.'

[681] Compare the description of the Sibyl's pit as nevertheless roofed at line 1280 (στέγης).

[682] Gigante-Lanzara (2000) 988 ad loc. (γλήναις ... ἀναιμάκτοις) also notes the texts discussed below to conclude that the sense here is new.

Siris.[683] Cassandra cannot stop seeing, either in the dark of her prison, where her visions take place, nor it seems if we were to imagine her trying to turn away from them, only to see light and sky; she cannot blind herself. Some ambivalence about the relationship between divinity and their image found in Greek culture seems to be retained, perhaps given the crucial causal role that Athena's anger plays in the Greek suffering that will follow and form a large part of the *Alexandra*'s content.[684]

More likely, it is because the description of Athena also evokes the Palladion, the divinity's travelling replica, bringing the goddess' own image closer to the travelling βρετάς of Cassandra/Alexandra that appears later in the poem, in the attempt to connect the two as closely as possible.[685] As Gigante-Lanzara has stressed, by bringing these passages together, we can see better the contrast and transformation from the woman who grasps the wooden image of Athena for protection, to the heroized goddess whose own wooden image is embraced by her followers.[686] Later in the poem, Cassandra's image at the centre of her cult is referred to by βρέτας, the usual term for a wooden image, which is also commonly used in classical tragedy to refer specifically to the Palladion.[687] Further the switch from ἐγώ to the use of the feminine article/demonstrative pronoun, ἡ, which, while it indicates Cassandra in lines 352 and 359 becomes the Palladion in 361 with little warning. While it may be contested that the rapid change of subject and reference by articles is common throughout the poem,

---

[683] See below on the term γλήνας for the statue's eyes found only once again in the *Alexandra* (with further replay of language), in relation to another statue of Athena brought from Troy to another 'Troy' in Siris (984-992): πόλιν δ' ὁμοίαν Ἰλίῳ δυσδαίμονες/δείμαντες, ἀλγυνοῦσι Λαφρίαν κόρην/σάλπιγγα, δηῷσαντες ἐν ναῷ θεᾶς /τοὺς πρόσθ' ἕδεθλον Ξουθίδας ᾠκηκότας. /γλήναις δ' ἄγαλμα ταῖς ἀναιμάτοις μύσει,/στυγνὴν Ἀχαιῶν εἰς Ἰάονας βλάβην /λεῦσσον φόνον τ' ἔμφυλον ἀγραύλων λύκων, /ὅταν θανὼν λῄταρχος ἱρείας σκύλαξ /πρῶτος κελαινῷ βωμὸν αἱμάξῃ βρότῳ. See on these events see Strabo *Geography* 6.1.14 (cf. 13.1.41).

Though note the use of εὔγληνος to describe the appearance of Diomedes' men as metamorphosed into swans at v.597.

[684] On immanence and cult images see Steiner (2001) 87; Elsner (2007b) 39ff., 45; Squire (2009) 113ff.

[685] See Vernant (1983) 305 on the movable 'portable idols' *bretas* and *xoanon* (as opposed to *kolossoi*).

[686] Playing with 'poetics of scale': see Squire (2011) 273-274.

[687] E.g. In Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Tauris* (887; 112; 273; 978; 997; 1000; 1014; 1038; 1158; 1176; 1316; 1385; 1441; 1448; 1465; 1480) it also almost always refers to the Palladion (cf. Aeschylus, *Eumenides* 55; 920).

the use after the first person ἐγώ is noteworthy, and also represents a special case in the shifts between first and third person.[688]

The use of γλήνας for Athena's eyes also works to connect the two in a different way, if we see it as indicating, or playing on, the idea of a dead-eyed statue and the contrast between Cassandra's constant plaguing with divine visions versus the goddess' power to choose a sort of blindness in the face of suffering. The word itself is not particularly common and usually seems to mean eyeball, or eyes that are no longer functioning. This is most obvious in the *exaggelos*' report in Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannos* (as packed with visual language as the rest of the play is), where in verse 1277, the king's βλεφάρα of the previous line become bloody γλήνας in the aftermath of his self-blinding whose description begins here.[689] Again it is the last book of the *Iliad* that is also important. At 24.191-192, Priam goes down to his treasure chamber or *thalamos*, wooden and high-roofed, and stuffed with treasures, with the related neuter noun γλῆνος used to mean 'playthings', 'trinkets': αὐτὸς δ' ἐς θάλαμον κατεβήσετο κηώεντα / κέδρινον ὑψόροφον, ὃς γλήνεα πολλὰ κεχάνδει.[690] The description of the chamber, enclosing trinkets attractive to the eye, perhaps tells us what we are missing. The most curious attestation occurs at *Iliad* 8.164[691] when Hector shouts after Diomedes in insult as he reluctantly turns to flight: ἔρρε κακὴ γλήνη, ἐπεὶ οὐκ εἴξαντος ἐμεῖο/ πύργων ἡμετέρων ἐπιβήσεαι, οὐδὲ γυναῖκας/ἄξεις ἐν νήεσσι.[692] This is usually rendered by something

---

[688] Biffis (2012) 74ff; 87ff; 201.

[689] Severed or damaged eyeballs are also the referents in *Iliad* 14.494 (the bloody Peneleos scene) and *Odyssey* (9.390, the attack on Polyphemos), and seems to lie behind the use in book four of Apollonius' *Argonautica* for the Epirean king's cruel blinding of his daughter (4.1093). The other use there (*Argonautica* 2.255) refers to the 'empty' or 'useless' eyes of the seer Phineus, blinded by Zeus for revealing too much (κενεὰς....γλήνας). See also *A.P.* 5.56, 9.134, 14.7, 14.132, 15.51.

[690] LSJ sv. τὸ γλνος II. Both LSJ and DGE note Hesychius (γ 631) glossed the word as τὸ ποικίλον suggesting a changeable, attractive and possibly deceptive visual object; cf, use for 'eyeball' (γλήνη I) in Nicander, *Theriaca* 228. Whether this means some affinity between the two poets (also suggested by section 1.2.10 above), an 'Attalid connection' (Kosmetatou (2000); it would make sense to think of a poet who had travelled from Asia Minor to the west?), or a shared interest in these words is harder to say.

[691] Lines athetized by Aristarchus; Kirk (1990) ad loc.

[692] Just previously to this, Nestor has persuaded Diomedes that flight is the correct course of action, and will not affect his future reputation in the way he is concerned about, because Hector's speech will not be believed by his people, in Cassandra-like fashion (*Iliad* 8.153-156: εἴ περ γάρ σ' Ἕκτωρ γε κακὸν καὶ ἀνάλκιδα φήσει,/ἀλλ' οὐ

like Hammond's 'off with you, you poor puppet!', and the entry in the L.S.J. (II s.v. γλήνη) suggests 'perh[aps] doll, plaything (since figures are reflected small in the pupil)' and (intriguingly) to confer with connected meanings of κορή (L.S.J. s.v. III-IV).[693] There may be a connection here with the (reflective) glass eyes of *korai* statues and the iconographic conventions used to portray Athena.[694] The rather puzzling nature of how these linked meanings come about aside, we might note that this notion of maiden clutching maiden, and image reflected within image and eyes is present too in Pausanias' ecphrastic description of Polygnotus' painting of the scene (*Description of Greece* 10.26.3):[695]

.... Αἴας δὲ ὁ Οἰλέως ἔχων ἀσπίδα βωμῷ προσέστηκεν, ὀμνύμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐς Κασσάνδραν τολμήματος: ἡ δὲ κάθηταί τε ἡ Κασσάνδρα χαμαὶ καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα ἔχει τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, εἴγε δὴ ἀνέτρεψεν ἐκ βάθρων τὸ ξόανον, ὅτε ἀπὸ τῆς ἱκεσίας αὐτὴν ὁ Αἴας ἀφεῖλκε.

In the *Alexandra*, Cassandra wants to reflect Athena – but when the goddess turns her eyes away, this replication ends. Athena's refusal to allow the tiny image of Cassandra to reflect in her eyes comes at the exact moment that Cassandra's own imitation of the goddess is brought to a violent end.[696]

Finally, the analogy with epigram brings together Cusset's 'specular' reading of the poem and Biffis' emphasis on the changing modes of narration.[697] These switches between

---

πείσονται Τρῶες καὶ Δαρδανίωνες/καὶ Τρώων ἄλοχοι μεγαθύμων ἀσπιστάων,/τάων ἐν κονίῃσι βάλες θαλεροὺς παρακοίτας). However, the Trojans already have proof that Hector is wrong (the Trojan corpses Diomedes has left in his wake); Cassandra's predictions, unlike Hector's, will prove to be true.

[693] LSJ and DGE both cite the first-century Rufus *Onomasticon* 24 (γλήνην τὸ εἴδωλον τὸ ἐν τῇ ὄψει φαινόμενον καλοῦσιν). Cf. Hornblower (2015) ad 361-362; 362; 658; 659-660; 985.

[694] Stieber (2004) 13; 25; 45-48; cf. Siapkas and Sjögren (2014).

[695] Interesting perhaps that this is paired in the following lines by an image within an image – the snake omen from Aulis on Menelaos' shield. Characteristic elasticity with scale in the *Alexandra* scene, to suggest the interchangeability of maiden and maiden-goddess; in some vase paintings, Cassandra is tiny compared to the huge statue or image of the goddess, whereas here the opposite is the case. Cf. Burnett (1983) 198-205 on Alcaeus' version of the attack.

[696] On *agalmata* and reciprocity between heroines and goddesses see Lyons (1997) 126ff.

[697] Cusset (2009); Biffis (2012).

goddess/heroine and their (living?) images,[698] coupled with the changes from 'I' to 'she' outlined above, may also remind us of further features of epigram, especially the 'you and I' "fictive dialogues" and their "riddling" use of vision and perspective to position the reader that Meyer has discussed. He uses a nice example of the "riddle of the mirror" from the *Palatine Anthology* (Anon, *A.P.* 14.56 = 27 GP = 49 Pf.) in which 'the mysterious relationship' of 'object and viewer' are 'its only subject':[699]

> Ἄν μ'ἐσίδης, καὶ ἐγὼ σέ. οὐ μὲν βλεφάροισι δέδορκας,
>
> ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐ βλεφάροις· οὐ γὰρ ἔχω βλέφαρα.
>
> ἂν δ' ἐθὲλες, λαλέω φωνῆς δίχα· σοὶ γὰρ ὑπάρχει
>
> φωνή, ἐμοὶ δὲ μάτην χείλε' ἀνοιγόμενα.

These scenes in the *Alexandra* then with their visual *mise-en-abyme* effects[700] so that we look on an image that cannot speak, also attest to the poem's presentation as a giant riddle (of Cassandra/Alexandra's true appearance and identity) or a series of riddles that are also visual images.[701]

The juxtaposition of the description of Cassandra's dark prison with the temple scene still needs further attention however. Firstly Cassandra's 'hidden-ness' in this way also breeds anxiety about her own culpability; the tragic figure whom is imprisoned and rejected by her people, but who also wants to be ἁλιβδύσασα by her own volition, if we read her prison as a metaphor both for her desire for virginity and the barrier to her being believed.[702]

---

[698] Lyons' term (1997).

[699] Cusset (2009); Meyer (2007) 196; 189: "The riddle of the mirror can only be solved if one takes the position of the fictive speaker and tries to see what he sees", focus is on the "reader's encounter with the inscribed object" – a different sort of *ecphrasis* – perhaps also suggesting Cassandra's struggle to persuade.

[700] Cusset (2009).

[701] The *Greek Anthology* is also full of riddles; see Squire (2011) 83 on a 'symbolist hermeneutics' in the unravelling of epigrammatic images; Cf. Biffis (2012) 69-70 on her visions.

[702] Cusset (2004); Hummel (2006) 215ff.; Biffis (2012) 36ff.

Several scholars stress the way the Cassandra of Lycophron's poem omits the details of her broken promise to Apollo.[703] On these readings, the second 'gift' of the god, the veiling of her voice, or the addition of a wall of doubt around it, will result also in the removal of her metaphorical veil, or this protective wall, as her wish for lifelong *parthenia* is crushed. Both the image of the prison, and the closeness of its description to the scene of Aias' λωβή make this as simultaneous as possible. The switch between the two perspectives (Cassandra not being seen by the goddess/the refusal of the readers' gaze by Cassandra) also positions the reader, as on the one hand potentially empathetic and on the other potentially threatening.[704] It has been noted fairly frequently that the great beauty of Cassandra that we hear about already in the *Iliad*,[705] is absent from Lycophron's poem and Cassandra's self-depiction refuses any sort of desiring gaze here too.

This is thrown into relief further if we allow consideration of some further possible intertextual relationships in these lines, beginning with a fragment of Euripides' *Andromeda* (with reference to Mary Stieber's work on the language of craft in the tragedian).[706] This also demonstrates the way the poet follows Euripides in particular in creating the impression of his poem as a material object, in tandem with Cassandra's own devaluation of poetry and her own speech.

---

[703] See e.g. Neblung (1997) 73-106.

[704] See below section 5.1 on how this picks up motifs in archaic parthenaic song.

[705] Homer, *Iliad* 13.365-366; 24.699. See 3.3 above.

[706] Stieber (2011).

4.2 Cassandra's Prison and Andromeda's Beauty

That Euripides' *Andromeda* was staged alongside *Helen*, in 412,[707] intriguingly suggests a particular interest in visual perception in these plays (and Euripides' *Helen*, Helen, Perseus and the eyes of the Medusa and the Graeae in the *Alexandra* will be discussed below). Other features of the *Andromeda* itself are suggestive in terms of reading it alongside the *Alexandra*: it began with a 'monodic lament' in which 'some use was made of the conceit that [Andromeda] had no companion but the echo of her own voice'; the chorus too was made up of young maidens.[708] Given that one way the 'feminine perspective' operates in the poem is in the interest overall in the lives of female characters,[709] it is no surprise that this is also tied up in issues of visuality and the gaze, and that the poem explores the conventions of representing women. Squire's statement about the way ecphrastic epigram 'teased out the relationship between the seeable and the sayable'[710] takes on an ethical dimension here, as questions are raised as to what should be seen and said 'on-stage', as we already find discussed in some readings of Greek tragedy.[711] The question of Cassandra's identity as a woman, can be considered not only in terms of voice, but also more widely in terms of how women can be represented and their capacity to represent themselves in the way that they look and speak.

Two of the fragments that survive preserve the scene where Perseus encounters his future wife for the first time, where she has been left chained to the rocks to appease Poseidon's anger, and at first, the beautiful young woman appears like a statue in Perseus' eyes (fr. 125):

---

[707] Gibert (1999/2000) 75 with n.1-2.

[708] ibid.

[709] Biffis (2012) 00.

[710] Squire (2011) 74.

[711] Hutchinson (1988) 257-64, Sens (2010) 300 on the *Alexandra* bringing 'off-stage' material on 'on-stage'.

ἔα · τίν’ ὄχλον τόνδ’ ὁρῶ περίρρυτον

ἀφρῷ θαλάσσης, παρθένου δ’εἰκὼ τίνα,

ἐξ αὐτομόρφων λαΐνων τυκισμάτων

σοφῆς ἄγαλμα χειρός;[712]

Statues cannot speak, and the shorter fragment which is usually placed just after, Perseus' question implies his hope and desire that this beautiful object will come to life: σιγᾷς; σιωπὴ δ’ ἄπορος ἑρμηνεὺς λόγων (recalling the theme of silence and delayed speech discussed above). As Stieber has shown (with specific reference to Euripides) the language of sculpture and statuary is often employed in classical tragedy to signal great beauty and 'when bodily beauty and lifelikeness coincide in a work of art, the erotic potential increases exponentially' as '*êros* invariably follows'.[713] In the *Alexandra*, the exact language employed here of the image of a maiden's beautiful body, cut out of the rock, is applied to Cassandra's prison and 'maiden chamber' instead (Euripides fr. 125.3, ἐξ αὐτομόρφων **λαΐνων τυκισμάτων;** cf. *Alexandra* 349, ἐν παρθενῶνος **λαΐνου τυκίσμασιν**) and the work of the skilled sculptor in creating an exact likeness, revealing it from (ἐξ) his material is replaced with a maiden hidden (ἐν) from sight, and the poet's hard work in creating his difficult subject is evoked metapoetically. That αὐτομόρφος is a complete hapax also suggests a play on the meaning of natural versus created form (cf. LSJ) and the identification between Cassandra and work, as she shapes herself.[714]

Although the 'eroticism' in the display of a maiden's body couched in sculptural language appears elsewhere in Greek tragedy, and is rightly foregrounded in Stieber's discussion, the recall of the language of the *Andromeda* here is particularly pointed if we consider it further.[715]

---

[712] Collard and Cropp (2008) note Ovid's version *Met.* 4.673-5.

[713] Stieber (2011) 163.

[714] Cf. Cusset (2009).

[715] Stieber (2011) 148, 162ff. for discussion of 'the perceived unseemliness of the playwright' in inducing erotic response in the spectators on 'so tragic an occasion' developing the interpretations of Scodel and Rabinowitz. The loci for these discussions in relation to tragedy are the sacrifice of Iphigenia πρέπουσα ὡς ἐν γραφαῖς (A. *Ag.* 242) and Polyxena (E. *Hec.* 560-561: μαστούς τ’ ἔδειξε στέρνα θ’ ὡς ἀγάλματος / κάλλιστα), and while scholars disagree

The scene of Perseus' sight of Andromeda for the first time and his reaction is subsequently parodied by Aristophanes, and later often developed in lengthy and highly eroticized descriptions.[716] While there is some debate about the way Andromeda appeared in the play, Stieber concludes on the basis of the *Thesmophoriasuzae* (1105-1124) parody that Andromeda must have appeared naked on-stage.[717] Whether this was the case, it seems clear Andromeda is imagined as fully displayed, and that it is this that is turned into Cassandra's total concealment in the *Alexandra*, with the rocky prison veiling her beauty (that Andromache's comparison to a statue by Perseus denotes) and her focalization (and wish for virginity) replacing a desiring gaze, and Andromeda's promise of marriage (and possibly more!) to Perseus when she finally speaks (frr. 129-132):[718]

Πε.: ὦ παρθέν', εἰ σῶσαιμί σ', εἴσῃ μοι χάριν;

Ἀν: ἄγου δέ μ', ὦ ξεῖν', εἴτε πρόσπολον θέλεις

εἴτε ἄλοχον εἴτε δμωΐδ' ...

Gibert shows how the immediacy with which Perseus falls in love with Andromeda on the basis of his vision seems to introduce the idea of 'love at first sight' into ancient literature as he reviews the reception of the poem in Old Comedy and elsewhere. The intertext perhaps

---

on how vision and speech interact in these scenes, they along with questions of propriety, and the use of the language of art, are at their heart (cf. O'Sullivan (2008)). Below section 5.

716 See Elsner (2007b) 3ff.; Gutzwiller (2002) 101 on erotic desire in ecphrastic epigram, e.g. AP 16.146 (Anon. on sleeping Ariadne): ξεῖνοι, **λαϊνέας** μὴ ψαύετε τᾶς Ἀριάδνας, /μὴ καὶ ἀναθρώσκῃ Θησέα διζομένη.

717 Stieber (2011) 146f. with n.96 summarizing recent views; Collard and Cropp believe that she was dressed as a bride based on a *krater* that shows the princess in 'elaborate Eastern dress and headgear'; most images show her clothed but only one post-dates Euripides (and there is a missing Sophocles' *Andromeda*). As Steiber concludes it is hard to determine what was on-stage based on this evidence.

718 Euripides frr. 129-132; Gibert (1999/2000) 82-83 with n.23 on placement of the fragments. Stieber (2011) 146: '....comparing someone to a statue is tantamount to acknowledging that he or she is exceptionally beautiful, yet is far more resonant than simply stating the obvious... the comparison opens up possibilities for additional discretional imagery'. Contrast Hummel's reading (2006) 189 of Cassandra and Medusa as ambivalent figures and the shared themes of desire and sexual violence that surround them; *their* potential lovers must inevitably face death ('désirer Cassandra, c'est vouloir sa propre mort'); cf. 215 'si la prophétesse paraît effrayante parfois, c'est à la manière de Meduse. Ce que les hommes voient en elle, c'est eux-mêmes et leur aveuglement, et ce spectacle au miroir de leur obtusité les effraie'; Sistakou (2012) on these dark and romantic themes in Hellenistic literature.

also underlines the danger involved in the impulsive behaviour desire in the face of beauty provokes, and as Aias' λώβη proves.[719] The emergence of Andromeda's image caressed by ἀφρῷ θαλάσσης certainly hints at the presence of Aphrodite in contrast with the prominence of Athena in the *Alexandra* scene. Haynes stresses that the love goddess is 'marked by her visual irresistability' in Greek literature, often employing 'disguises that are always ineffectual'; Cypris gazes on herself with pleasure with 'the reflective mirror as her attribute.'[720] Haynes also emphasises how 'panoptic' the view offered of Aphrodite frequently is; in the Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite*, Anchises promises to build her altar on a high peak with a view all around (100-102: σοὶ δ' ἐγὼ ἐν σκοπιῇ, περιφαινομένῳ ἐνὶ χώρῳ, / βωμὸν ποιήσω, ῥέξω δέ τοι ἱερὰ καλὰ / ὥρῃσιν πάσῃσι); a sharp contrast with Cassandra's high dark prison that conceals her from mortal eyes from every angle.[721]

That the poet's labour is allied to the building of a wall that obscures Cassandra parallels Apollo's infection of the prophetess' voice with the ring of untruth that renders his first gift of sight useless; as Fantuzzi and Hunter remark, *enargeia* is not possible and nothing can appear simply before our eyes.[722] Throughout the poem, there are many points where this sort of thought recurs, that is, of hidden-ness not as a given, but of something created and imposed from the outside.[723] This means, in addition, we can push a metapoetic reading further, that anticipates how some of the (visual) conventions of parthenaic beauty are realigned to the speaking voice of the *Alexandra*. The poet's labour hinted at in description of the walls of Cassandra's prison seems to suggest mainly the creation of a voice that is plausibly mimetic; a

---

[719] *Alexandra* 365; see the chorus' summary of the effects of Eros in Sophocles' *Antigone* 781ff. (with λώβη appearing in line 792).

[720] Haynes (2013) 73.

[721] Haynes (2013) 74f. (as part of a brilliant discussion of vision in Lucian's *Erōtes*). Cf. Osborne (1994) 82; Stieber (2011) 162: until the Hellenistic period, 'figural sculpture in-the-round is concentrated exclusively on beauty, both male and female, both of form and content'. Cf. how the σκοπία of the landscape in the *Alexandra* suggest seeing rather than being seen (above 1.2.4).

[722] Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 441.

[723] Cf. Lambin (2009) 165 on enclosed spaces in the poem.

voice that convinces as her own must paradoxically raise doubt.[724] As Hummel has commented 'la profération de Cassandre depuis l'origine semble tendue vers la recherché d'une voix qui lui permettrait de se faire entendre.' The solution the poet finds results in paradox, like Perseus later in the poem who makes life-like images of men by somehow coating them in stone with the eyes of the Medusa (ὃς ζῳοπλαστῶν ἄνδρας ἐξ ἄκρου ποδὸς /ἀγαλματώσας ἀμφελυτρώσει πέτρῳ, 844-845).[725] Yet the poet's surrender of authorial control to Cassandra, means that unlike the bound Andromache, helpless on the shore, Cassandra can wrest control of her own image through her ownership of the narrative voice and the poet no longer gets to choose how he displays his subject.[726] This returns us to the antagonistic dialogues in epigram discussed above in Squire and Meyer's terms, where the debates over the proficiency of visual image and voiced description in accurately portraying truth and the real nature of a subject are played out; in the *Alexandra*, this is balanced with the capacity of the poet to furnish his subject with a voice. This tension is possible because of the special nature of Cassandra's vision and voice (and we will examine how and if this is resolved in the final section). In line with Hummel's reading, the walls of the prison, the labour of image creation, suggest that the attempt to describe truth (figured as visual experience) in words (Cassandra's speech) will always result in further frustration and the fundamental conception of language as containing hidden meaning within it, signifying more, that the poem reflects. There is disruption here in the power dynamics involved in seeing and being-

[724] Hummel (2006) 213.

[725] A 'hidden' image of the poet in the poem, also borrowing the eyes of another? The language of *andriantopoiia* here further suggests the affinity with ecphrastic epigrams.

[726] We could also compare the relationship between Cassandra and Apollo. As Hummel (2006) 215ff. has shown, in the *Alexandra* the idea of sacred marriage with the god remains, and he does exercise control over her, but this is forced consummation – rape in place of marriage, the very thing that underpins the whole poem and its focus. However there is also not true consummation/marriage because Cassandra also resists and frustrates the god. Rather than working in tandem, or creating a hymn together under his inspiration, the *Alexandra* results. If the *Alexandra* were a hymn to Apollo, it is a perverse one, a hymn gone very wrong, just like the encounter between Cassandra and the god.

seen, the creativity of the poet and the expression of those ideas.[727] Following Biffis, in as much as the poet and Cassandra's voice are identified, the poet's truthful description can only succeed by failing; no wonder the poem has so often sent readers round in circles.

More widely, when examined within this nexus, the fact that the sculptural language used to describe beauty, and the correlation of the female body to created and crafted objects (from Hesiod onwards),[728] through its application to the prison in Lycophron, can be related to the developing of ideas about realism in representation and truth and illusion that come to a head in the Hellenistic period.[729] It is sculpture and statuary that are usually used in ancient discussions of beauty in art and nature (as opposed to painting) and it is sculpture that 'competes' with reality.[730] By refusing the Platonic critique of all representation as seductive and dangerous illusion, the poet and the prophetess finally justify their voice. In the final section, we will examine further the consequences of the identification of Cassandra with the *Alexandra* itself, and the absence of the poet's voice.[731]

---

[727] Inspiration and the figure of the poet/artist; Cassandra is also self-conscious about image-making and creativity. See further Barkan (2013) on Vasari's opposition of 'frenzy' and labour, and Montaigne's view of his 'monstrous' creations.

[728] *Theogony* 560ff.

[729] See Elsner (2007) 1ff. for discussion.

[730] Steiber (2011) 162.

[731] Cf. Cusset (2009).

Section 5: The *Alexandra* as Material Monument

In the *Alexandra*, the voice of the prophetess is also tied to the *Alexandra* itself, and this extends to its existence as a written and material text object. The poem's intensely learned style, and its 'written-ness' can also be subsumed under the notion that the poem as object is also a specific representation of the feminine voice, and of a carefully crafted portrait of an individual.[732] The refusal of the expected mimesis of beauty evokes an idea of the poem as 'aniconic', like an archaic cult statue and ritual object, more concerned with substitution and making present, than the representation of appearances.[733]

As previously stated, the framed structure of the poem can be read in a number of ways (with numerous intertextual relationships operating) as we would expect for a poem that is 'both ... multi-genre and ... one-genre'.[734] However, this does not prevent us from drawing out some new and specific strands out of the complex web that introduces the poem, and from suggesting some new contexts for its interpretation in light of previous discussion

---

[732] That women and materiality are linked in western thought and culture has long-formed part of feminist analyses in the humanities, and the study of the ancient world is no exception, where several studies have looked at the particular idea of the conception of women as created objects in ancient discourse. See in general Warner (1983) on 'monuments and maidens'; 63 on materiality and embodiment constructed as feminine in western culture, and related to procreation: '*Meter* ... *mater* ... and *materia* ... share the same root, *ma*-, source or origin'; Holmes (2012) 41ff., 63 on the matter/form distinction as gendered from antiquity onwards, with reference to Irigaray and Butler's work in connection with the metaphysics of Plato and Aristotle. Cf. Sharrock (1991); Stehle (1997) 322 on women as 'empty sign' or 'subject position' that men can 'co-opt', so that parthenaic 'scripted denial of subjectivity in public speech is in part a way to preserve' this; Blondell (2013) 15 on this issue with specific reference to Helen and Hesiod *Theogony* 572 and *Works and Days* 71, where woman/Pandora is moulded from clay-like earth (*Theogony* 570ff., *Works and Days* 59ff). See also Steiner (2001) 198ff. Thinking about the poet and Cassandra may suggest a gendered distinction of maker/object, form-giver and matter along these lines; however we may also want to think about her self-awareness as more radical.

[733] Steiner (2001) 3ff; 80ff; 87: These images were often covered, so we can think of Cassandra in this 'divine mode of "self-display"'.

[734] Hornblower (2015) 26.

in terms of object-hood and gender identity. The messenger's description of Cassandra's speech recalls a construction of the female voice (familiar from epic and tragedy in particular) as slippery, changeable, and deceptive.[735] Set alongside Cassandra's sure prophetic knowledge, this also generates fear, and Biffis has also detailed the links made at the outset of the poem and within it between its central speaker and monstrous female figures like the Sphinx (7) and the Sirens (1463).[736] Her analysis considers the link between a particular strain of dark and oracular speech and figures like the Sphinx to argue that the messenger both fears and believes the prophecy he reports (with an analogy made between the messenger and the male chorus of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*).[737] Thus, the added kicker to the mix of self-conscious textuality in the *Alexandra* is that we can connect it to a broader discourse in Greek culture that upholds a connection between writing and the potential for the female voice to make itself heard in public. This is in part through the topos of writing as silent speaking. Elmer cites Antiphanes' representation of Sappho 'when he has her relate the riddle of a φύσις θήλεια ... where the solution is the *epistolē* whose *grammata* 'speak' even though they are *aphōna',* so that '[i]nscribed letters traditionally compensate women for the congenital condition of being *aphônoi*'.[738] This leads to the phenomenon of female-authored epigram and is also 'how Greek culture in general conceived the poetic potential of women.'[739] The idea that the written word embodies the paradox of, and is an outlet for female and public expression in the ancient world has been much discussed.[740] This results in a graphic

---

[735] Biffis (2012) 44ff. She also goes on to consider the possibility of superior feminine knowledge and the connections between Cassandra and other female prophetic figures: the Pythia and the Sibyl. The connections between the Sibyl as she appears in the *Alexandra* itself and its main speaker are already the topic of an article by Christophe Cusset (2004).

[736] Biffis (2012) 44ff; on the importance of the Sirens, occupying a central place in the poem's structure see Hornblower (2015) ad 712-737.

[737] The messenger's eagerness to function as speaker in relay in the *Alexandra* contrasts with the watchman of the *Agamemnon* 1-39 who describes his own watchfulness, but censors his speech. This is perhaps an intertextual expression of the reversals of vision and voice in the poem, that draw on the theme of communication and the concept of heavily signifying *semata* of all sorts in Aeschylus' trilogy (following Porter (1991)).

[738] Elmer (2005) 33.

[739] ibid.

[740] e.g. Stehle (1997) 114ff., 311.

presentation of language that on the one hand can be read and (potentially) understood in the public context sometimes denied to female speakers and on the other, as a material text and visual sign, that does not perform or possess an audible voice; it remains *aphonos*. Jesper Svenbro's now classic and influential discussion of this issue has its basis in a reading of the Phrasicleia inscription:[741] σῆμα Φρασικλείας. / κόρε κεκλέσομαι / αἰεί, ἀντὶ γάμο / παρὰ θεῶν τοῦτο / λαχους' ὄνομα.[742] This is an interesting parallel with the most arresting act of self-depiction in the whole *Alexandra* (one of its multiple *telē,* 1139-1140) of Cassandra's future honour in cult: κείναις ἐγὼ δηναιὸν ἄφθιτος θεὰ /ῥαβδηφόροις γυναιξὶν αὐδηθήσομαι. There is no beautiful sculpture to accompany Cassandra's words, but we do see her image in cult, affirmed by the women's voices. The notion, however, of an absent visual depiction of a *kore* is evoked, always pushing the idea that something is missing, the beautiful visual object that is expected when a *kore* speaks for herself. Instead Cassandra remakes her appearance, not as a willing bride-to-be, but as an eternal figure in cult.[743] If the voice of the poem is Cassandra's adornment, this suggests the idea of the poem itself as the last step in the speaker's transformation into an object. As Tueller says of the Phrasicleia *kore* 'it is not actually possible to tell from the first line who is speaking: Is the σῆμα saying that it will be called a κούρη, or is the κούρη saying she will be called a σῆμα?'. The consideration of the poem as material object also supports Biffis' conclusions about the commemorative function of the *Alexandra* and the way it preserves the prophetess' identity and name for the future,[744] the notion of inscribed text is necessary for the *Alexandra* to stand as monument to its subject by concretizing the prophetess' voice in writing.

---

[741] To my knowledge at time of writing, the inscription has not yet been discussed at length in relation to the poem; it is however cited by Biffis (2012) 95 n. 123 in the context of her discussion of marriage, death and *kleos.*

[742] *CEG* 24.

[743] Cf. Mari (2009); Biffis (2012).

[744] Biffis (2012) 102ff; 104ff.

We will consider this in relation to the idea of inscription and material monument in the *Alexandra*, and the deployment of vision and voice in earlier poetry especially concerned with *parthenoi*, to better grasp how the making of a (convincingly) unconvincing voice presents an accurate picture of the poet's subject. As usual, there is no perfect fit, especially in a poem that tries on so many genres for size, but this concluding discussion will show how consideration of vision and voice together opens up some new ways of interpreting the poem.

Section 5.1: The *Alexandra* as Material Monument and Textual Object

As discussed previously in the introduction (1.1), the *Alexandra* with its framing device has most often been considered in terms of Greek tragedy and messenger speech. As we have seen, this usefully emphasises the theme of mediated communication in the poem, and invites us to think about the similarities between the figures of messengers and seers in tragedy, who must as eyewitnesses convince others through their report of what they see.[745] The connection to tragedy also suggests some explanation for the absent author in the poem. Torrance has detailed the 'motif of writing' in Euripides, arguing for a construction of the poet where tragedians are 'not *aoidoi* 'singers' but *poiētai* 'makers', whose craft was written down with text becoming voice in performance.'[746] Like the tragedian, 'Lycophron' as name refers to his work composing speeches for his characters, while the poet's voice is hidden, his writing enacted by the speakers on-stage.[747] However, while this model works, and nicely captures the messenger's take over by another persona,[748] it does not quite capture the

[745] Section 1.1.2 above.

[746] Torrance (2010) 213 and 236. Cf. also Stieber (2011) 192 on epigrams and statues as they appear in poetry: 'when an inscribed statue...demands...to be taken as both word and image, the two communicative functions, reading/speaking/singing and looking, coalesce. The word is ... petrified, made permanent, by being inscribed [...] for Euripides, merely to speak of stone ... seemingly makes the poetry itself more solid and durable, as if transforming it into a kind of metaphor for a scripted work of plastic art.'

[747] Segal (1993) 22. When Diomedes' birds set up their stall on a θεατρόμορφος hillock (600) perhaps the poet points to his work as theatre-shaped, and shaped by tragedy. I suppose a possible objection to this separation of author and work is that sometimes tragedians acted in their own dramas.

[748] Section 1.1.2 above.

(excessive) autonomy of Cassandra's voice. While in no way wishing to dismiss any of these ideas about dramatic performance, I will argue that to understand the poem fully we have to think beyond this paradigm, following our earlier discussion of ecphrastic epigram.

The very best parallel for the communicative context[749] of the *Alexandra* is that of a commemorative monument, comprised of inscription plus (absent) visual object, and a voice that shifts from anonymous third person description to first person subjectivity, with a craftsman (poet) standing outside the text. There are many connotations here which we have already met in the course of the thesis, but are by no means limited to), for example the impression of a tomb or funerary inscription; a prison; an oracular text; plus the linked themes of marriage and death that *thalamos* embodies, particularly markers that take the place of the young bride who dies before marriage as common in epigram.[750] But what all of these ideas tell us is that successive readers of the poem have been struck by the way that it alludes to some sort of object outside of itself, other than (but allied to) the fact of the poem itself. This sort of feature in texts has recently come to be termed as cross- or inter-medial, and while the literature on this is vast, it has found special application in the literature of the ancient world *because* of the phenomenon of epigraphy, which combines elements of the visual and the verbal arts. That is, the structure of the poem, and the language of statuary and its creation suggest another medium to the reader, one that is visual and concrete. The synaesthesia of the poem nevertheless remains as part of this conceit: the poet-maker 'sculpts' a voice, not a beautiful or visual physical form; Cassandra is presented as depicting herself visually as she chooses, with the voice she is given.[751]

---

[749] Cf. Cusset's 'situation d'enonciation'; (2004) 56.

[750] This suggests the medium of inscribed stone to the reader. This can be contextualised further within discussions of structural equivalences found in the study of Greek mythology; e.g. of stoning and imprisonment (e.g. Seaford (1990), (2005); connections to burial and the *thalamos* as marriage and/or funerary chamber (e.g. Rehm (1992); Steiner (2001); on deaths of young women in epigram (Rossi (2002) 152; 160-162; De Vos (2014) 417) and 'marriage to death' in *Antigone*, tragedy and elsewhere see Rehm (2002); Biffis (2012) 76ff. on Cassandra's isolation from her natal family and a people who fear her in the *Alexandra*.

[751] Cf. Hummel (2006) 213.

In the *Alexandra*, the two speakers are allied in their description and enaction of a commemorated and named subject ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΑ, as well as one of the crafted object that does so: *Alexandra*.[752] If we think of that crafted object in terms of an inscribed text particularly we can understand the 'virtual' nature of the communicative exchange that takes place in those terms, with the emphasis on the reader who recites and activates Cassandra's voice, joining past to present as both the poem and the prophecy it contains do.[753] In Cusset's analysis, Cassandra talks to herself, with no dialogue with others, far removed from her people, but closer to god, with no question and answer, or real addressee 'immédiat ou patent, en dehors du gardien qui n'écoute pas pour lui-même ni ouvertement, mais espionne en cachette pour le compte de Priam.' This gives 'la double statut de la parole', where the poem is 'never a direct speech'.[754]

Cusset's contention that the *Alexandra* progresses by talking itself into existence is true: object and subject, *Alexandra* and Alexandra cannot ever be disentangled, but are always identified to a greater or lesser extent.[755] Reflexive and dynamic as always, the poem is not just about the futility of feminine voice, but also the capacity of writing to facilitate an audience for feminine expression, through providing a situation where speech-act can be separated from speaker and turned into written words.[756] Because of the interaction between vision and voice in the poem, the idea of an encounter with a physical object comes to the fore. The notion of intermediality inherent in inscription of a visual object thus provides an ancient context for the creation of a non-dialogic and 'virtual' context for communication, which informs the poem in terms of content, tone and structure.[757] The scholarly and literary

[752] Cf. Cusset (2009).

[753] Cf. Elmer (2005) 10-11.

[754] Cusset (2004) 54.

[755] Cusset (2009).

[756] E.g. Stehle (1997) 114ff.

[757] See Elmer (2005) 10-11 contrasts 'a real, living speech situation in which two interlocutors are present and interact with each other; and on the other, an inscriptional situation, in which the interlocutors are only notionally (virtually) present.' Cf. Dintner (2013b).

style of the *Alexandra* can on the one hand be thought of as threatening the integrity of the prophetess' voice, but on the other as metapoetic allusion to text as inscribed object run throughout, it is not remote from her identity but part of the poem's exploration of the representation of women. As much as Cassandra is the *Alexandra*, a voice that becomes efficacious as written and read text, the *Alexandra* is also an expression of the idea of a seen object that 'comes to life' as embodied utterance, with a speaker that sees and feels, as well as records and preserves information and reputation. As well as probing the origins of genre[758] there is a sense that in its ultimate trump card of existing 'before' poetry, the *Alexandra* not only explores the origins of poetry,[759] and the transition between the spoken and written word in itself as an interaction between visual perception and spoken voice, it does so through the model of an encounter with an object that in the ancient world gave women a public voice.[760] Cusset has also spelt out how the poem functions as a prison for its speaker, but thinking about inscription better describes the way it also offers the main speaker release, following the reflexive model he proposes.[761]

'Lycophron' remains absent, and the metapoetic imagery and aesthetic programme of materiality suggested in the poem itself encourage us to think of the author as a banausic worker (I have suggested particularly a sculptor in section 4.2) who stands outside the text, perhaps also a marker for a particular style that is written, and concerned particularly with the sculpting of new word-forms. As well as ramifications for 'Lycophron' as the (pseudepigraphic) author of the poem, in turn it also offers a particular set of aesthetic

[758] Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 439.

[759] Cusset (2009) 132: 'l'*Alexandra* se donne en meme temps à lire comme une enquête ou une proposition théorique sur les origins du discours poétique.' Cusset (2004). 53: 'Cet étrange poème est donc, du point de vue de sa construction, un enchâssement de deux voix…' – the central voice of Cassandra on the one hand, uninterrupted and imprisoned by Priam, on the other, the voice of the guard who frames the poem 'et par lequel passe en fait la voix de Cassandre.'

[760] See esp. Stehle (1997) 114ff; Steiner (2000) 311ff. (and on self-representation).

[761] Cusset (2009).

desiderata.[762] We have seen this feature above in section 1.2 and 4 and also in particular coinages, such as -*plastos* and -*morphos* compounds,[763] or images of inscribing, marking, building and setting up monuments.[764] At 1172-1173 the men who watch and wait for the Locrian maidens will be praised in speech and inscribed by law: δῆμος δ' ἀνατεὶ τὸν κτανόντ' ἐπαινέσει, / τεθμῷ χαράξας, τοὐπιλώβητον γένος.[765] That is not just written about or spoken about, but both, combined and made permanent in an object that is both a visual marker and has the potential for speech within it; an inscription, and one imbued with ritual significance in the prophecy.[766] This pattern is made obvious by looking at its converse within the poem at line 370 (ἀλλ' οὔνομ' οἰκτρὸν καὶ κενηρίων γραφὰς) where the Greeks will have a pitiful name written on an empty tomb; but Cassandra refuses name or detail leaving the Greek families' *threnos* as impermanent and uninscribed sound; both elements (that I have analogised to the visual and verbal) are needed.[767] Compare too verse 1031 where the Sicilian coast will eventually bear the name of Odysseus, although he is not named directly in the text. It is the future in the west where he will have a new sort of visual marker with his name written (γράφων) on it. The description here is otherwise odd, as if the waves themselves apply or plaster (προσμάσσεται, 1029) the coast, but also wear it down to inscribe the name around the

---

[762] Hornblower (2014) investigates the *Alexandra* through epigraphy, particularly its varied and prominent use of *epikleseis.*

[763] See Buxton (2009) 22-23 on the linguistic field of metamorphosis and visual effect.

[764] See above 1.2.4 on Achilles (διαγράφων, 261) and on Diomedes; στήλη at 625 (the magic ballast); 883 (Tiphys). In the outset of the poem, we could perhaps think about the written lines of inscription through the contrast of the winding imagery and the straight paths that lead through (ὀρθῇ κελεύθῳ, 12), as well as to scrolls and re-reading, linear and cyclic time as we have already discussed. In lines 20-22 the ναῦται release the ropes from the rock (χερμάδος, 20) which is described as γρώνης, hollow and empty, but shaped at the same time. Cf. Sistakou (2008) 159-163 on Epeius *Hippotekton*. His skill is stressed, but this is in ultimately creating an empty vessel that aims to deceive.

[765] χαράσσω, cf. 859.

[766] See Mari (2009); Biffis (2012) 130ff. on ritual in the prophecy.

[767] At 432 Odysseus tale of Aethon (*Od.*12.181ff.) is described as being ἐν πλασταῖς γραφαῖς; as this is also one of Odysseus' 'Cretan' tales within the Odyssey the levels of truth/falsehood are muddled and left in doubt again.

cape, following the now familiar pattern of instantaneous concealment and revelation.[768] Again, the work of a 'sculptor' of words is hinted at.

Investigating this sort of language in the poem poses an interesting set of (metapoetic) questions if we return to the image of the disguised Odysseus at 779-785, although I do not want to push it too far. Perhaps we can read Odysseus' rejection of foreign stripes of the whip (οὐ γὰρ ξέναι μάστιγες), especially if we read οὐ γὰρ (cf. 3-4) as a statement of poetic choice as his decision as character to reject the alternative lines of the female and foreign speaker in the *Alexandra* (and perhaps the later poet?) for the σφραγὶς of a Greek maker-poet figure (779-785): μενεῖ Θόαντος ἐν πλευραῖς ἔτι, /λύγοισι τετρανθεῖσα, τὰς ὁ λυμεὼν/ ἐπεγκολάπτειν ἀστένακτος αἰνέσει, /ἑκουσίαν σμώδιγγα προσμάσσων δομῇ, / ὅπως παλεύσῃ δυσμενεῖς, κατασκόποις /λώβαισι καὶ κλαυθμοῖσι φηλώσας πρόμον. Odysseus then plumps for a different sort of stylistic allegiance, not just choosing to take his part in Troy's fall but also to accept the lasting marks of epic tradition (and all the pain that it puts him through) and his subordination to the epic author/narrator.[769] The moulding of character and form is different again for Paris at 138, who seems to have had his nature affected by his time in the countryside (ἄρκτου τιθήνης ἐκμεμαγμένος τρόπους), whereas the Sirens at 713 have been impressed with the paths of song, of and from their mother: οἴμας μελῳδοῦ μητρὸς ἐκμεμαγμένας (with ἐκμάσσω, suggesting physical shaping and moulding but perhaps also that the Sirens are of special value in female traditions of song, with interesting connotations of matrilineal instruction and inheritance). This must catch the eye given the Sirens' prominence and centrality in the poem that Hornblower has demonstrated.[770]

This also means the poem sits rather differently within existing discussions of the creation of poetic voice and narratorial 'persona' in Hellenistic poetry, because it is not a poet's voice that is created. By thinking of the structure in a slightly different way, we can

---

[768] See Mair's (1921) notes ad loc (a-d) on the Ὀδύσσεια ἄκρα (Ptolemy the Geographer 3.4.7).

[769] Cf. McNelis and Sens (2011b) 77ff.

[770] Hornblower (2015) ad 712-737.

dispel our (Alexandrian) expectations about the prominent place of the (constructed) poet's voice in the poem. As Hummel has suggested the poet creates a special language and voice for his character.[771] We must deny any cross-over between author/narrator voice; the poet-craftsperson ('Lycophron') is allied to the moulding and making of a text-object (the *Alexandra*), as an accurate representation of Cassandra's true voice, not to expressing a voice in the persona of a named poet. This is shown in particular at the end of the poem where Cassandra is aware of the future truth of her words being confirmed by others, not only Apollo's truthmaking but by the implied existence of the readers of the poem itself, as a future understanding audience (1458-1460). That Cassandra's voice *is* writing is pointed to in the poem by the description of her voice as imitative of other sounds, a feature which may otherwise be found puzzling.[772] Not only is her voice reported, it is then written, and *this is its primary and efficacious form of existence*.

This suggests a particular concept of writing as a form of mimesis, that can transform the verbal to the visual and back again. The word ἄφωνος does not appear in the *Alexandra*, and we learn from the messenger from the outset that Cassandra will speak οὐ γὰρ ἥσυχος κόρη / ἔλυσε χρησμῶν, ὡς πρίν (3-4), instead (ἀλλ', 5) loosing them from her mouth in noisy disorder (in his opinion at least).[773] We have already seen that the idea of the prophetess' voice as unpleasant noise resurfaces throughout the poem, as something to turn away from, ignore, and as something that is also difficult to understand (3.2). Between the messenger's objectification, and the switch from third person description, to first person voice is the idea of an object bursting into life. Within Cassandra's prophecy, as we have seen, we also get the the impression of 'living images' (4.1-2) and as a whole her prophecy displays an interest in shape, form (1.2.10) and the capacity to perceive and discern between representation and reality (2; 4.2).

---

[771] Hummel (2006) 213.

[772] *Alexandra* 7, 1462-1466. Cf. Looijenga (2009) 68-69 who goes some way to explaining this through the analogy of Cassandra with the reporter of oracles.

[773] Biffis (2012) 40ff.; cf. also her discussion of lament and oracle as female forms of expression, also with connotations of the spoken and the written 176ff..

The *aphonos* voice of inscriptions seems to be a clear precedent for the paradoxical voice of Cassandra, both there and not there at all.[774] The Sibylline voice has often been compared to Cassandra's,[775] but let us just consider one contrasting example that brings out further the uniqueness of the Lycophronian Cassandra's voice. Herophile is described in Pausanias' later (second-century CE) account of Ozolian Locri as born into a Sibylline line, a chanter of oracles, also said to have composed a hymn to Apollo, inspired whilst coupled with him in a sacred marriage.[776] These oracles include an account of the Trojan War, attributed to the foresight of the earlier Sibyl, whose line Herophile follows in. The lines could almost pass (if you like) as a brief summary of the *Alexandra* (Pausanias 10.12.2):[777] ἡ δὲ Ἡροφίλη νεωτέρα μὲν ἐκείνης [sc. The earlier Sibyl], φαίνεται δὲ ὅμως πρὸ τοῦ πολέμου γεγονυῖα καὶ αὕτη τοῦ Τρωικοῦ, καὶ Ἑλένην τε προεδήλωσεν ἐν τοῖς χρησμοῖς, ὡς ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ Εὐρώπης τραφήσοιτο ἐν Σπάρτῃ, καὶ ὡς Ἴλιον ἁλώσεται δι' αὐτὴν ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων.[778] This part of Pausanias' account also gives us the elegiac verse inscription found on the Sibyl's final resting place in the Troad, in the grove of Apollo Smintheus (Pausanias 10.12.6):

τὸ μέντοι χρεὼν αὐτὴν ἐπέλαβεν ἐν τῇ Τρῳάδι, καί οἱ τὸ μνῆμα ἐν τῷ ἄλσει τοῦ Σμινθέως ἐστὶ καὶ ἐλεγεῖον ἐπὶ τῆς στήλης:

"ἅδ' ἐγὼ ἁ Φοίβοιο σαφηγορίς εἰμι Σίβυλλα

τῷδ' ὑπὸ λαϊνέῳ σάματι κευθομένα,[779]

---

[774] Cf. Elmer (2005) 39ff.; Cusset (2009).

[775] Cusset (2004); Biffis (2012) 176ff.

[776] Pausanias 12.1-3. See Hummel (2006) 215ff. on the concept of sacred marriage in the *Alexandra.*

[777] As Biffis (2012) 59 n.205 has noted, in Euripides' *Andromache* 296-300 the diviner is Cassandra.

[778] Herophile herself (or in the oracles attributed to her) claims an additional link to Trojan Ida in this passage (Pausanias 10.12.2ff.; cf. the Erythrian's counter-claim that this is not a geographical *epiklesis* at 10.12.7).

[779] κευθομένα is Meineke's conjecture; Page ad loc reads πυθομένα, commenting that 'others may say that a corpse rots; it is most eccentric for the corpse to say this of itself'. 490. If we read the later text alongside the *Alexandra* (349-351: ἐν παρθενῶνος λαΐνου τυκίσμασιν / ἄνις τεράμνων εἰς ἀνώροφον στέγην / εἱρκτῆς ἁλιβδύσασα λυγαίας δέμας) as evidence for a representational tradition (though not, of course, sure knowledge of theearlier text), Meineke's reading is to be preferred.

παρθένος αὐδάεσσα τὸ πρίν, νῦν δ᾽ αἰὲν ἄναυδος,

μοίρᾳ ὑπὸ στιβαρᾷ τάνδε λαχοῦσα πέδαν.

ἀλλὰ πέλας Νύμφαισι καὶ Ἑρμῇ τῷδ᾽ ὑπόκειμαι,

μοῖραν ἔχοισα κάτω τᾶς τότ᾽ ἀνακτορίας.

"ὁ μὲν δὴ παρὰ τὸ μνῆμα ἕστηκεν Ἑρμῆς λίθου τετράγωνον σχῆμα:[780] ἐξ ἀριστερᾶς δὲ ὕδωρ τε κατερχόμενον ἐς κρήνην καὶ τῶν Νυμφῶν ἐστι τὰ ἀγάλματα.

The *Alexandra* presents the conventions of the female and oracular voice operating here in the depiction of Cassandra/Alexandra by suggesting that it is the 'voiceless' written (and recited) text that in fact has a true voice. By bringing the figure of the reader and onlooker in via the framing device, the potential for the continued existence of Cassandra's voice through that of another is introduced. Compare Pausanias' παρθένος αὐδάεσσα τὸ πρίν, νῦν δ᾽ αἰὲν ἄναυδος… with the messenger's description of the nature of the prophetess' speech he is about to describe at *Alexandra* 3b-4: … οὐ γὰρ ἥσυχος κόρη / ἔλυσε χρησμῶν, ὡς πρίν, αἰόλον στόμα. This comparison with the later text helps to bring out the special situation of Cassandra as a speaker in the *Alexandra* and her fraught relationship to Apollo in myth that lands her with superannuated vision but an accursed voice, unlike the σαφηγορίς Sibyl, who is also Φοίβοιο. In the *Alexandra*, the relationship between written words and spoken voice, invisible in the case of the Sibyl here, is deliberately made more complex and instead the gulf between the written and spoken, seen and heard is thrown into relief. The Sibyl similarly is hidden and imprisoned by the tomb that represents her voice (τῷδ᾽ ὑπὸ λαϊνέῳ σάματι κευθομένα)

[780] The central prophetic speaker is flanked by the messenger god, who seems to be depicted in an archaic manner (τετράγωνον σχῆμα) and although present in the main in his role as psychopomp and bridge between the living and dead, the figure of Hermes underpins the connection between seer, as communicator and conduit between mortals and gods and messenger more generally, and border-crossing whilst conveying something else, whether a stolen object or a verbatim message (Steiner (2001) 134. (2004) 53 already points out that Cassandra is the carrier of Apollo's voice, an intermediary just like the Sibyl. See Pritchett (1988) 136-7 on the image of Hermes and 'quadrangular images', citing the 4th century C.E. writer Themistius (*Orationes* 15.316a) on the 'pre-Daedalian' tradition of all statues as squared; is the mathematically 'quadrangular' structure of the *Alexandra* (cf. Hornblower (2015) 49ff.) another conscious archaism concerning the arts? Cf. Steiner (2001) 42-3 on *tetragōnos* composition and morality.

fettered to her fate (μοίρᾳ ὑπὸ στιβαρᾷ τάνδε λαχοῦσα πέδαν). Cassandra, identified with the *Alexandra*, may be 'imprisoned' in the frame in the poem, but it is also the words of the *Alexandra* that set her free. She is always a written imitation of herself, but it is only the mimesis of her speech by the poet/maker, being 'of Lycophron', that mean she can be heard, possessed, seen (read) and understood.

As part of his discussion of the topos of voiceless text as feminine voice, Elmer also cites a late (second to third century AD) 'Galatian' inscription 'to a *korē* standing over the grave of a male corpse.'[781] The full text from the Sebastopolis (Salusaray) *stele* can be found in the publication of Guen-Pollet (1989), including the (now lost) lines 8-13, that identify the memorialized 'Maximus the Grammarian':[782]

Γαῖά με τίκτεν ἄφω[ν]-

ον ἐν οὔρεσιν παρθέν[ο]-

ν ἁγνήν, ἥσυχιον τ[ὸ π]-[783]

άροιθεν, νῦν αὖ λαλέ[ου]-

σαν ἅπασιν, σμιλιγλ[ύ]-

[781] Cf. Elmer (2005) 33: 'the stone, *aphônos* in its natural state "in the mountains" … now speaking by virtue of the inscription, has been carved to represent a *parthenos* – who is also voiceless according to cultural norms, able to speak (as Philomela) only through writing.' The opening of the *Alexandra* implies the novelty of Cassandra's voice/the *Alexandra* (in agreement with Durbec (2006) 83 on ὡς πρίν, line 4, but perhaps this reads against a tradition of silent *parthenoi*, rather than previous literary versions of Cassandra (as Biffis (2012) 24n.30 takes issue with as Cassandra is most often noisy). At 1463 Cassandra sings her λοίσθιον μέλος silently to herself according to the messenger that serves to remind the reader of the power of writing to give an outlet to voices that are silent, unheard and private otherwise.

[782] Both Peek (1955) and Guen-Pollet (1989) agree on this date; see also line drawing and photograph of the 1972 squeeze in Mitford (1991). Previous editions listed by Guen-Pollet (1989) *Epigraphica Anatolia, Heft 13*: 71, no. 15 (Inscriptions funéraires): Damon, *Syllogos* 7 (1874) 2; (Röhl, J. Gymn. 19, no. 7); Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca* no. 402; IGR III, 118 (v.1-11); Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*, no. 1184) = sepulchral epigrams in the new appendix to the *Greek Anthology* 652.3. A little further discussion in the later publication of a study of *grammatikoi* in inscriptions by Agusta-Boularot (1994) 703 (No.46 = IGRR, III, 118) and the mystery of a 'Maximus' in 'une province pourtant hellénophone.' She also raises the possibility that the stone may not refer to a grammarian as such, but to the highly educated nature and interests of the deceased. A fascinating object.

[783] Guen-Pollet (1989) 72 comments 'on pourrait envisage l'hypothesis que 'Ησύχιον était le nom proper de la jeune fille.' A quick PHI search confirms that this is more usually the case, but seems an unnecessary assumption here.

[φ]οις τέχνῃσιν κῆρ' ε[ἰ]-

[π]οῦσα θανόντος·

ἐνθάδε Μάξιμον γραμ-

ματικῆς ἐπιίστορα τέχν-

ης, ἀνέρα σεμνόν, γῆ [μ]-

ήτηρ ἐκάλυψε θανόντ[α]

[χαίρετε δ' ὦ πάροδοι],

γνόντος δὴ τέρμα β[ίοιο].

While of course no direct relationship is assumed, there is something pleasing in finding another connection between a *grammatikos* and a maiden, along with a penchant for hapax (σμιλιγλ[ύφ]οις). As Guen-Pollet comments the lessons seem to have paid off: 'si l'on en juge par cette épitaphe rédigée en hexameters dactyliques parfaitement réguliers.'[784] This imagines a connection between the dead grammarian and the lines that commemorate him through the representation of the *kore* and the inscription of her voice, another craftsman who provides an eternal speaking voice which commemorates his hard work in turn.

As Laura Swift has stated, the study of Parthenaic song suffers from the tiny amount that has survived, to the point where some scholars dispute whether it can be properly called a genre. However, she makes the case for regarding material together if 'we can accept that songs performed by young girls may be united by a shared social function.[785] Of course, that function, of displaying readiness for marriage is the very thing that Cassandra rejects, and as

[784] Guen-Pollet (1989) 72. Unfortunately the other inscription cited to a grammarian from another Turkish site has only three? lines remaining (Guen-Pollet (1989) 72 n. 40: Studia Pontica III, 1, no. 276 and 145a). Agusta-Boularot (0000) also notes the regular metre, 'recherché' vocabulary and hapax. In line 4, Kaibel's reading (αὐδήε[σ]|σαν) in place of Peek's restoration of λαλέ[ου]-σαν would give a nicer parallel to favoured passive perfects in the *Alexandra*, but Guen-Pollet states that 'on lit encore très nettement sur la pierre ΑΥ ΛΑΛΕ. Mitford (1991) has more detail on on variant restorations.

[785] Swift (2016) 255-256.

Biffis has shown, is part of her characterisation that predominates in the *Alexandra*. Eva Stehle has already shown how the *parthenoi* chorus of Alcman fr.1 sing of their own ineffectual voices as a counterpoint to the way that they draw attention to their beauty, as if this compensates for the danger that this brings, deprecating their agency to enchance their social value as potential brides in the eyes of a '(male) audience'.[786] 'Female display' means danger, and in myth it is when girls are out in the open, often in terms of (ritual) performance that they are 'seen or abducted by the gods'.[787] Note that even the revelation of Alexandra's image in cult (1135) is confined to a closed group of women; her voice and image only becomes fully revealed and public in the shape of her voice as written in the *Alexandra.* Biffis' analysis of the *Alexandra* highlights the connections between marriage, rape and adultery (or excessive lust) in ancient Greek culture and connects them to the poem, so there is no need to retread ground that has already been well-covered.[788] All I want to draw attention to is the fact that the way Cassandra depicts herself in Lycophron's poem has much in common with what we know about these archaic texts and choral self-depiction, and that the visual aspect of the poem also connects to the themes of rape, marriage and virginity.[789]

Swift's comparison of male and female choral song concludes that 'visual language is a feminine speciality' and that in other types of lyric too, a 'widespread feature' is visuality and the tendency to self-depict.[790] Further 'visual self-referentiality is … singled out as a distinctive feature of parthenaic performance, and becomes an easy "short-cut" for evoking this kind of song.'[791] This suggests that in the overtly visual way that Cassandra depicts

---

[786] Stehle (1997) 36-37.

[787] Swift (2016) 277, citing *Iliad* 16.181-5 (Hermes and Polymela) and the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* 117-120 (Hermes again!). Hermes (a messenger figure) often seems to be nearby maidens.

[788] Biffis (2012); an expanded and more detailed monograph is also imminent.

[789] For the debate about their performance see Stehle (1997) 30ff.; Swift (2016) 276 who argues that public performance is likely.

[790] Swift (2016) 255-256. 264ff. on male 'self-reference and deixis' which is common but has 'none of the visual focus of parthenaic lyric.'

[791] Swift (2016) 256; 257-263 for close reading of Alcman PMGF1 and the 'densest clustering of visual language'.

herself in parts of the poem (as I have tried to demonstrate) the poet also engages with a broader intertextual web to suggest parthenaic song in particular.[792]

By putting Stehle's idea of ineffectual voice and Swift's of inherent visuality in the self-depiction of *parthenoi*, we can see that the *Alexandra* as a whole plays with this. The imagery of light and bright objects that Swift finds in parthenaic song and lyric is certainly not shared with the famously dark *Alexandra* but it is applied to the messenger's description of her voice.[793] As we have (not) seen Cassandra in fact draws attention to herself only to hide again, or duck from the readers view somehow, receding in a framework of representations within representations, just as the complex voice of the poem can be regarded as quotes within quotes, reports within reports. At the same time, it uses the fact of Cassandra as the ultimate ineffectual speaker in myth[794] to draw on the trope of feminine voice (and other types of Other voice; the enigmatic babbling barbarian seer) but ultimately she does speak, and will, through the written words of the poem, eventually be heard. While the text itself may be regarded as visual and material, the embodied Cassandra still seems to get her wish, and stay hidden, or buried, in the *Alexandra*.[795] If so, this would also contribute to the ever-present undercurrent of frustration in the poem,[796] if we see the poem as tapping into the tradition where the expectation is of 'self-reference' and revelation of beauty; something which Cassandra-Alexandra refuses.[797]

---

[792] As well as perhaps the notion that the visual is somehow the realm better manipulated by women, even if that is primarily to persuade and seduce.

[793] Swift (2016) 269ff.

[794] Rather than utterly silenced, as say Philomela.

[795] I suppose a possible objection to this is the scene of Cassandra's death at 1099ff. That not just violence but nudity was assumed in representations of Cassandra and Agamemnon's murder is perhaps implied by Plutarch's remarks about the lack of suitability of *Odyssey* 11.421ff, for young men (*Quomodo Adolescens Poetas Audire Debeat* 8). However, the focus in Lycophon is very much on Clytemnestra's violence, and the framing of the scene also suggests an inset representation, another seeing-as incident as we saw above with the re-presentation of the *Iliad.* This does not have to be regarded as a replay of Aeschylus' play in particular (although I have argued elsewhere that this is a possibility) but more a set of cues, a shorthand for drama. That along with the oddness of Cassandra seeing, describing, and experiencing her own death (in a sense) at the same time, adds to the feeling of unreality.

[796] Following Hummel (2006) 215ff.

[797] Above 4.2. See Swift (2016).

Let us consider the relationship with Attic tragedy, and traditions of female poetics within this context of rejecting the expected themes as an expression of Cassandra's identity. As Swift has shown, in Euripides' *Trojan Women* (338-339) it is Cassandra who tries to change the song to a wedding hymn, and fit herself with a chorus of *parthenoi*.[798] That the poem engages with questions of what can be said and shown on stage has already been suggested by Hutchinson's remark that it brings off-stage violence before the eye, and we could extend this perhaps to the common discourse in genre about how and whether *to deinon* can indeed be spoken of and looked on.[799] However, the enthusiasm for seeing the *Alexandra* as especially violent and bizarre has tended to set up a bit of a false mutual definition against the (supposedly higher register and meaningful?) presentation of violence in drama. One does not have to delve far into Attic tragedy to find much there that is dark, violent and strange. This is not to say that there are no differences, but that to jump to this conclusion is not particularly helpful (and to some extent perpetuates now dull generalisations about the quality of Hellenistic poetry that I think it is safe to say have been vanquished over the past thirty-five years or so). However, turning to *partheneia* may provide new connections to the visual and verbal aspects of propriety and the way that this plays out in the *Alexandra*.[800] The revelation/concealment paradox of the *Alexandra*[801] is thus especially found in relation to the heroization of *parthenoi*; In the *Hecuba* Polyxena κρύπτουσ᾽ ἃ κρύπτειν ὄμματ᾽ ἀρσένων χρεών (570), yet becomes like the most beautiful statue; in turn this draws on the story of Iphigenia and the choral passage of the Agamemnon that describes her sacrifice at her father's hands (A. *Ag.* 227ff.), silent and **πρέπουσά** θ' ὡς ἐν γραφαῖς. It as if the power of silence and beauty

[798] Swift (2016) 274. Also interesting in that Cassandra almost tries to change the genre; again Euripides demonstrates interest in rapidly changing gears from lament, to hymenal, to prophecy all in the voice of Cassandra.

[799] Hutchinson (1988) 257-274.

[800] That what is said must be policed is already explicitly paired in Pindar's *partheneion* (33-5): ἐμὲ δὲ πρεπει / παρθενήϊα μὲν φρονεῖν / γλώσσαι τε λέγεσθαι. See Swift (2016) 266-7. The competing Greek (masculine) and Trojan (feminine) perspectives on Polyxena's sacrifice and death in Euripides fill the play with questions about the veracity of report and whose view of events we are getting, and why they choose to frame it that way, especially Hecuba's worries about a voracious Greek mob gawping at the spectacle of her corpse (604ff.) versus Talthybius' report of the admiring Greek crowd's treatment of her as a hero (571ff).

[801] Cusset (2009) 119.

usually expected are inverted in the *Alexandra*.[802] As well as Hutchinson's contention that the author of the *Alexandra* is interested in what can be shown and seen on-stage, we can perhaps say that this more specifically applies to the presentation of young women in terms of vision and voice.[803]

The idea of sculpture or statues *in* classical and archaic literature has been discussed at book-length by Deborah Steiner.[804] In her discussion of the Phrasicleia inscription (*CEG* 24) the substitution or replication at stake is that of the young woman who dies before marriage can take place; replaced by a visual representation of a *kore*[805] and given voice through written inscription that can 'speak' into the future and beyond death.[806] Lycophron's poem engages with traditions of the representation of the *kore* or *parthenos* and replicates and subverts the conventions to particularise the special status of Cassandra. As well as being funerary monuments, *korai* were made as votive objects as gifts to the gods;[807] but the *Alexandra* cannot be the poet's offering to Apollo (even if it tacitly acknowledges his inspiration),[808] or a substitution in return for what he was denied in the living body of the prophetess, in fact it offers a form for her final escape from his clutches, when her words as text become independent of their speaker, and believed to be true by the external audience of readers. As

[802] On these passages see esp. O'Sullivan (2008); on Iphigenia in the *Alexandra* see Biffis (2014); on πρέπω and the visual, aesthetic and ethical elements that feed into the concept of τὸ πρέπον see Pohlenz (1965); Nünlist (2009) 12, 250.

[803] Hutchinson (1988) 00; Swift (2016).

[804] Steiner (2001).

[805] This hovering on the cusp of womanhood is also emphasised in the iconography of *korai* sculptures, as discussed by Steiner (2001) 14, the details representing 'a blossoming into womanhood even as they affirm the *floraison* is yet to occur'.

[806] On this in relation to the Phrasicleia inscription see Svenbro (1988) 17ff; Stehle (1997) 314; Steiner (2000) 154ff; Stieber (2004) 146ff; cf. Biffis (2012) 95n.123.

[807] Steiner (2001) 14.

[808] Looijenga (2009) 69; Sens (2010) 300.

Steiner has stated, the offering of a votive object presupposes reciprocity, where the 'object['s]...visual and verbal demonstration ... is commensurate in value to what has been (or will be) received'; as Cusset's readings of the *Alexandra* lean towards, the poem is a negation in a sense, a refusal of this reciprocal relationship as it is of dialogue. It represents and stands in for the living body that Apollo was denied, even as it documents the results, and Apollo's original actions (gift and punishment). Again, this mode of thought may be supported by the avoidance of depicting the beauty of Cassandra as an *agalma*, bride or gift herself, and the poem presents Cassandra herself refusing to be an object, offering or bride - the *kalon agalma* for Apollo,[809] rather wishing to replicate Athena. The poem as a whole represents what Apollo grants to Cassandra and the result of her refusal of any 'reciprocal' relationship of exchange, as she refuses to offer herself in return, and her truthful voice is made futile through Apollo's contamination of her voice. She refuses both to be the beautiful (and socially sanctioned) bride-to-be and cannot ever be the lifelong virgin that Athena embodies and that she wishes to emulate while she lives. She remains as a cult figure, in between mortal and immortal.[810] However, that Cassandra is embellished from without by the poet's work to adorn her with a voice, suggests on the other hand that the *Alexandra* also represents her coming to be an object in cult, as if the poem were a cult object itself, summoning the figure it represents and allowing Cassandra to inhabit it, like a cult image or statue. This is suggested within the poem, when at 364, the Palladion is decribed as a χρῆμα, one that is ἄνακτι πάππῳ ... τιμαλεφέστατον. Thus we can see the poem in terms of this exchange, as Alexandra becomes *Alexandra,* the of ὦναξ of line 9 is recalled, suggesting that the *Alexandra* will become a dear

[809] On this motif see Steiner (2001) 16, e.g. on *CEG* 334 (Boiotia).

[810] Cf. Hummel (2006) 190, 211ff.

possession to the reader too.[811] It is as object rather than subject that Cassandra will gladden her family as a maiden should.[812]

5.2: Name-play

Thinking in terms of inscription also suggests that the relationship between vision and voice extends to 'peritextual' levels, that is the features of the text that also give the reader generic cues.[813] As Simon Hornblower has shown, the idea of a prophetic text, or a female-authored text, indicated by the name of the oracular speaker (which the poem may be seen to imitate), faces somewhat of an obstacle in the use of the name 'Lycophron' in addition to the name of the putative prophet/authoress,[814] along with the delegitimizing introduction of the messenger/guard.[815] The analogy with inscribed artworks suggests rather that 'Lycophron' becomes the signature of the artist and craftsman who creates the object and inscribes its voice, a maker and doer of *poiesis* in a more basic sense. Perhaps 'much like the poets of the late archaic and early classical ages, the artist leaves his *sphragis* on the image that he carves, using his skill not so much to persuade the viewer of the reality of what he sees as to create an *agalma*, an object whose virtuosity and pleasing appearance delight and dazzle its audience'.[816] The avoidance of the word *agalma* in Cassandra's description of her religious image (*xoanon*) is significant, maintaining the distinction between goddess and mortal, as well as engage with the refusal of her beauty in the poem (thus upholding the pairs

[811] Of course, this can be read on multiple levels. This would also be neat for those whose wish to see the messenger as the poet before Ptolemy (or other royal ruler) proferring his potentially prizewinning poetry (e.g. Lowe (2004)).

[812] See esp. *Od*. 6.29-30; cf. Biffis (2012) 76 on Nausicaa. This suggests that the poem itself becomes Cassandra's elaborate bridal clothing; interesting then that the Nausicaa's chamber at the opening of *Odyssey* 6 suggests a sculpted vignette while the princess maiden sleeps with an attendant either side of the door, until Athena brings it to life like a breath of wind.

[813] Whitmarsh (2009) 37ff. has discussed how 'peritextual' features offer readers a set of cues (following Genette). Lambin sees the title as pseudonym (2005) 38.

[814] Hornblower (2015) 40.

[815] Cf. Lange (2010) 6. The *Alexandra* rather subverts the use of frames in prophetic texts by undermining Cassandra's authority as an oracular voice.

[816] Steiner (2001) 27.

Helen/Aphrodite and Athena/Alexandra, and the idea of representations of beauty as dangerous).[817] Rather than Cassandra's visual appearance (as expected), the attraction of the poem all lies in her elaborate voice.[818]

Some interesting questions are also suggested if we proceed head-first into the long-running debate over the poet's identity, location, and the date and integrity of the poem. As stated previously, one can side-step this question to a degree by considering this of lesser importance for a literary analysis of the poem. However, here the view taken follows (most recently) Hornblower in *not* identifying the *Alexandra* poet with the Alexandrian tragedian Lycophron of Chalcis.[819] The poem's game of coming first, of being *before poetry* in a sense, and revealing cult identities as more true than poetic ones requires us also to think of how the use of a 'deliberate pseudepigraphon' fits with the archaic practice of traditions being attached to an individual (and often meaningful) name.[820] That is, not just in the sense of attaching a famous name in view of a lucrative book trade in Rome, or a case of mistaken identity, but thinking about it in terms of the games played with authorship and identity in Hellenistic poetry and connections to archaic tradition.[821] The author's name is clearly important in a poem obsessed by names, but it might also help to think in terms of other media again; Squire's recent work on the *Tabulae Iliacae* has suggested the use of the name Theodorus may in fact be an indication of style, belied by the 'archaizing possessive adjective, "Theodorean" being signed 'on each and every surviving inscription'; less a 'simple' artist's signature and more of a 'tag' referring in each case to their *techne*.[822] A particular style of communication is already attached to the name Lycophron, the sophist whose style comes in for criticism in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (3.3.1; DK 83 fr. 5). Many elements under attack – compound words,

---

[817] Cf. Biffis (2012) 46.

[818] See above 4.2.

[819] Hornblower (2015) 36-49.

[820] *OCD*^{3} s.v. Lycophron (Fraser).

[821] See Morrison (2007).

[822] Squire (2011) 290. See 291ff on 'pseudonyms and pen names'.

strange words, long epithets, excessive metaphor – are those stylistic ones familiar to the reader of the *Alexandra*. What if the identification with the Lycophron of the Ptolemaic court, who chances to become *the* Lycophron in the time in between Aristotle's text and the creation of the *Alexandra* sometime in the second century is the red-herring? Or that the author of the *Alexandra* exploits this coincidence in their selection of pen-name and artistic identity as one of stylistic choice? This of course, remains speculative, but if we sever the connection with Alexandria, new lines of thought may be generated. Thinking of the poem in terms of epigram and inscription in terms of sculpted image plus inscription (a speaking object), facing an onlooker and reader, would also fit a three-way model of artist's signature/stylistic allegiance, third-person description of speaker/label, and first-person speaker, both subject, *and* object given voice. In this case, Lycophron becomes the 'sculptor' and stylist of the artwork 'Alexandra', and the prophetess' own words, the 'inscription' that shifts to the first person, letting the sculpture speak for itself, in a way that is particularly pertinent not just to the games or competitions played with the limitations of the visual and literary arts in Hellenistic ecphrastic epigrams, but also to the roots of the representation of the female voice via inscription. This would also fit into the broader trend of the interest in the origins of genre in Hellenistic poetry, as Fantuzzi and Hunter have discussed specifically in the case of the *Alexandra*, and, that the interest in the representation of women goes beyond tragedy and epic, as well as beyond literature, right to roots of the question of how the female voice *can be* expressed, and the voice represented in writing.[823]

[823] Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 439; cf. Biffis (2012) 136ff.

Section 6.0 Conclusion: Hearing the *Alexandra* First (the end of the prophetic vision and turning into text).[824]

In the last 100 lines or so of the *Alexandra* many of the visual phenomena that we have examined drop off somewhat; the last main verb of sight is at 1364, the last metamorphosis at 1393[825] and Cassandra no longer looks on herself after the final vision of her image (post-death) in Daunian cult. This change seems to be signalled when Cassandra makes reference to her own speech when she briefly re-visits (and sees past) her own death alongside Agamemnon in these time-bending lines at 1371-2: σὺν ᾧ θανοῦμαι, κἀν νεκροῖς στρωφωμένη / τὰ λοίπ' ἀκούσω ταῦθ', ἃ νῦν μέλλω θροεῖν. This would seem to tell us that we are as close as can be to the future text as object, and at the point where voice turns into text and written object, as Cassandra hears the future in her afterlife (as the *Alexandra*).

However, with the cessation of Cassandra's vision we are also at the point where she seems to be fully in control of the information before her eyes in the largest scale catalogue in the poem, detailing the entire history and cessation of the east-west conflict at breakneck speed, with eusynpotic pause allied to this aim as Xerxes and the Persians fail in Attica (1412-1431), their fearful glances introducing a complex simile that recalls the Locrian maidens and Cassandra's own experience, as if the prophetess now has full control over this device and its content.[826] The last metamorphosis, of Mestra παντόμορφος suggests mastery of every vision, every shape, condensed into this final universal prophecy, while the question as to how to

[824] Or perhaps 'hearing as'?

[825] Hornblower (2015) ad 1393, and one that is linked to (1397) 'a sequence which is clearly unfolding through time'; ad 176 'a less marked feature of the last 500 lines'.

[826] *Alexandra* 1433-1434. Durbec (2006) 369-372 has suggested 1410-1411 introduce the voice of the author; instead we can take this as a symptom of Cassandra's accelerating control now she is no longer embodied and in control of the god, reporting the *Alexandra* as she hears it (first!) herself.

hymn Ares at 1409-1411 suggests finally full power to choose over what and how she narrates.[827]

This does not mean that vision and voice simply become separate, but it does suggest that now Cassandra comes closest to a Muse that speaks, with visual knowledge of everything and how to put it into words, and unlike the Homeric narrator of *Iliad* 2, she can combine both vision and voice for herself in an immense catalogue of world history.[828]

Section 6.1: Thesis Conclusion

This thesis has aimed to demonstrate that vision is essential to understanding the way the Alexandra works, in tandem with, and mirroring its complex narrative voice. In doing so, it has outlined the prominence and variety of visual language and phenomenon of embedded focalization in the poem, as well as its presentation of its central speaker's extraordinary visual power and how the ability to depict herself as both object and subject underpins the narrative voice. That Cassandra both speaks and sees is essential to the questions the reader is faced with about the truth of her prophecy and its status as representation, in one of the most highly intertextual texts to survive from the ancient world. The relationship between vision and voice is essential to the poem's overall structure as a reported account of a prophetic vision, but also plays out in far more complex ways in the text. The visuality of the prophecy is also part of the way the poem devalues epic poetry and the impermanence of song, in favour of a material poetics that promotes objects that are both seen and heard in the future of Cassandra's prophecy. This can be contextualized within ideas about inscription and epigrammatic presentation of the visual arts that also explore the relationship between seeing and speaking through a voice that can do both simultaneously. This is tied to the feminine identity of the main speaker who can only become a full subject in identification with the poem that represents her voice. This results in a poet who is figured as a banausic

---

[827] Cf. Durbec (2006) 369-372.

[828] *Iliad* 2.484-493. Elmer (2005) 7ff. on the 'visual totality' of catalogues; this suggests that even the least eusynoptic and most overtly diegetic parts of the prophecy still have a visual component.

stylist of words that tries to present an accurate portrait of his subject without a conception of mimesis as deceptive seduction, that represents Cassandra's wish to remain an untouchable parthenos, unseen but heard through the written text of the *Alexandra* which finally facilitates its main speaker's voice and the freedom to depict herself as an idealized object of cult that the poem itself can also be analogized to.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acosta-Hughes, B. (2002). *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*. Berkeley.

Acosta-Hughes, B. and Stephens, S.A. (2012). *Callimachus in Context: from Plato to the Augustan Poets.* Cambridge.

Agócs, P., Carey, C. and Rawles, R. (2012). 'Introduction', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles, (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode,* (Cambridge), xxvi-xxxiv.

Ahl, F. (2002). 'Wordplay and Apparent Fiction in the *Odyssey*', *Arethusa* 35.1: 117-132.

Ambühl, A. (2010). 'Trojan Palimpsests: The Relation of Greek Tragedy to the Homeric Epics', in P.S. Alexander, A. Lange and R.J. Pillinger, (eds.), *In the Second Degree: Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near-Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Culture and its Reflections on Medieval Literature,* (Leiden), 99-121.

Amiotti, G. (1982). 'Lico di Reggio e l'Alessandra di Licofrone', *Athenaeum* 60: 452-460.

André, L-N. (2013) '"Storm Landscape": From the Reality Effect to the Moralized *Mimesis*. The Examples of Apollonius Rhodius and Quintus Smyrnaeus', *Aitia* 3: online.

Annas, J. (1994). *Hellenistic Philosophy of Mind*. California. 157-173.

Arafat, K.W. (1992). 'Pausanias' Attitude to Antiquities', *Annual of the British School at Athens* 87: 387-409.

Armstrong, D. & Ratchford, E.A. (1985). 'Iphigenia's Veil: Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 228-48', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 32: 1-14.

Arnott, W.G. (1993). 'Double the Vision: A Reading of Euripides Electra', in I. McAuslan and P. Walcot, (eds.), *Greek Tragedy*, (Oxford), 204-217.

Bal, M. (1996). 'The Gaze in the Closet', in T. Brennan and M. Jay, (eds.), *Vision in Context: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Sight*, (London), 141-153.

Barchiesi, A. (1996). 'Simonides and Horace on the Death of Achilles', *Arethusa* 29.2: 247-253.

Barchiesi, A. (2001). 'The Crossing', in S.J. Harrison, (ed.), *Texts Ideas and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory and Classical Literature*, (Oxford University Press), 144-163.

Barkan, L. (2013). *Mute Poetry, Speaking Pictures*. Princeton.

Barlow, S.A. (1986). 'Chapter IV: The Messenger Speech; Factual Landscapes', in *The Imagery of Euripides: A Study in the Dramatic Use of Pictorial Language,* (Bristol Classical Press), 43-78.

Barrett, J. (2002). *Staged Narrative: Poetics and the Messenger in Greek Tragedy.* Berkeley.

Bauckman, R. (1993). *The Climax of Prophecy; Studies on the Book of Revelation.* Edinburgh.

Beagon, M. (2007). 'Situating Nature's Wonders in Pliny's *Natural History* 1', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 50: 19-40.

Beerden, K. and Naerebout, F.G. (2013). ''Gods Cannot Tell Lies': Riddling and Ancient Greek Divination', in J. Kwapisz, D. Petrain and M. Szymanski, (eds.), *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry,* (Berlin), 121-147.

Benediktson, D.T. (2000). *Literature and the Visual Arts in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Norman, Oklahoma.

Bennett, F.M. (1917a). 'Primitive Wooden Statues Which Pausanias Saw', *Classical Weekly* 10.11: 82-86.

Bennett, F.M. (1917b). 'A Study of the Word ΞΟΑΝΟΝ', *American Journal of Archaeology* 21.1: 8-21 (1917b).

Berra, A. (2009). '*Obscuritas Lycophronea*. Les Témoinages anciens sur Lycophron', in C. Cusset & E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Éclats d'obscurité,* (Sainte-Étienne), 259-318.

Biffis, G. (2012). *Cassandra and the female perspective in Lycophron's Alexandra*, (Doctoral dissertation), UCL (University College London)). Unpublished.

Biffis, G. (2014). 'Lycophron's Rewriting of Myth: Iphigenia and Childbirth', in J. Virgilio García and A. Ruiz, (eds.), *Poetic Language and Religion in Greece and Rome*, (Cambridge), 230-242.

Bing, P. (2002). 'The Un-read Muse? Inscribed Epigram and its Readers in Antiquity', in P. Bing and J.S. Bruss, (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram,* (Leiden), 39-66.

Blanchot, M. (1982). 'The Siren's Song', in G. Josipovici, (ed.), *The Siren's Song: Selected Essays by Maurice Blanchot (Edited with an Introduction by Gabriel Josipovici; Translated by Sacha Rabinovitch)*, (Brighton, Sussex), 59-65.

Bleeker, M., 2011, *Visuality in the Theatre: The Locus of Looking*. New York.

Bloomer, W.M. (2005). "Introduction", in W.M. Bloomer, (ed.), *The Contest of Language: Before and Beyond Nationalism,* (Indiana), 1-12.

Boehmer, E. (2005). *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature.* Oxford (2nd Edition, reprinted 2009). 1-92.

Borthwick, E.K. (1967). 'Trojan Leap and Pyrrhic Dance in Euripides' *Andromache* 1129-41', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 87: 18-23.

Bowie, E. (1994). 'Philostratus; Writer of Fiction', in J.R. Morgan and R. Stoneman, (eds.), *The Greek Novel In Context,* (London), 181-199.

Brennan, T. (1996). '"The Contexts of Vision" from a Specific Standpoint', in T. Brennan and M. Jay, (eds.), *Vision in Context: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Sight*, (London), 217-230.

Bruss, J.S. (2005). *Hidden Presences.* Leuven.

Budd, M. (2008). *Aesthetic Essays*. Oxford.

Burgess, J. (1995). 'Achilles' Heel: The Death of Achilles in Ancient Myth', *Classical Antiquity* 14.2: 217-244.

Burian, P. (2007). *Euripides: Helen.* Oxford.

Burnett, A.P. (1983). *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho*. London.

Burnett, A.P. (1994). 'Hekabe the Dog', *Arethusa* 27.2: 151-164.

Burnett, A.P. (2005). *Pindar's Songs for Young Athletes of Aigina.* Oxford.

Buxton, R.G. (1980). 'Blindness and Limits: Sophokles and the Logic of Myth', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 100: 22-37.

Buxton, R. (2000). 'Les Yeux de Médée: Le Regard et La Magie dans *Les Argonautiques* d' Apollonios de Rhodes', in A.M. Moreau, J-C. Turpin, (eds.), *La Magie: actes du colloque international de Montpellier, 25-27 mars 1999, Tome 1: Du Monde babylonien au monde hellénistique*, (Université Paul Valéry, Montpellier), 265-275.

Buxton, R. (2009). *Forms of Astonishment: Greek Myths of Metamorphosis*. Oxford.

Cadau, C. (2015). *Studies in Colluthus'* Abduction of Helen. Leiden.

Calame, C. (1998). 'Vision, Blindness and the Mask: The Radicalization of the Emotions in Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*', in M. Silk, (ed.), *Tragedy and the Tragic*, (Oxford), 17-37.

Calame, C. (2012). 'Metaphorical Travel and Ritual Performance in Epinician Poetry', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles, (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode,* (Cambridge), 303-320.

Cameron, A. (2004). *Greek Mythography in the Roman World.* Oxford University Press. vii-xii, 68-69, 82, 136-139, 172.

Cameron, A. (2009). 'Young Achilles in the Roman World', *Journal of Roman Studies* 99: 1-22.

Chauvin, C. and Cusset, C. (2008). *Lycophron, Alexandra: Texte Établi, Traduit, Présenté at Annoté*. Paris.

Ciaceri, E. (1901). *La Alessandra di Licofrone. Testo, traduzione e commento*. Catania: N. Giannotta. Reprinted with a supplement: Napoli: G. Macchiaroli, 1983 (Biblioteca La parola del passato 13).

Ciani, M. G. (1975). *Lexikon zu Lycophron*. Hildesheim.

Cingano, E. (2009). "The Hesiodic Corpus", in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos and C. Tsagalis, (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hesiod,* (Leiden), 91-130.

Clay, J. S. (2011). *Homer's Trojan Theater: Space, Vision, and Memory in the IIiad*. Cambridge.

Clayman, D. L. (1987). 'Sigmatism in Greek Poetry', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 117: 69-84.

Coles, R.A. (1968). 'A New Fragment of Post-Classical Tragedy from Oxyrhynchus', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 15: 110-118, plate VII.

Coo, L. (2006). 'Four Off-Stage Characters in Euripides' *Hecuba*', *Ramus* 35.2: 103-128.

Cook, J.M. (1959). 'Bath-tubs in Ancient Greece', *Greece and Rome* 6.1: 31-41.

Cornell, T. (1997). 'Ethnicity as a Factor in Early Roman History', in T. Cornell and K. Lomas, (eds.), *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy,* (London), 9-21.

Cropp, C. and Collard. M. (2008). *Euripides. Fragments Vol.I: Aegeus-Meleager*. Harvard.

Cusset, C. (2001). 'Le Bestiare de Lycophron: Entre Chien et Loup', *Anthropozoologica* 33-34: 61-72.

Cusset, C. (2002). 'Tragic Elements in Lycophron's *Alexandra*', *Hermathena* 173: 137-153.

Cusset, C. (2004) 'Cassandre et/ou la Sibylle. Les voix dans l'Alexandra de Lycophron', in M. Bouquet and F. Morzadec, (eds.), *La Sibylle. Parole et representation*, (Rennes), 53-60.

Cusset, C. (2006). 'Dit et Non-Dit dans L'Alexandra de Lycophron', in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker, (eds.), *Beyond the Canon,* (Leuven), 43-60.

Cusset, Christophe. (2007). 'Les détournements du nom propre: l'exemple de Lycophron', *Lalies: Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature, 27, Aussois, 21-25 août 2006*, (Paris), 199-212.

Cusset, C. (2009). 'L'Alexandre dans l'*Alexandre*: du Récit Spéculaire à l'Oeuvre Potentielle', in C. Cusset and E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Éclats d'obscurité*, (Sainte-Étienne), 119-139.

Cusset, C. and Prioux, E. (eds.) (2009). *Lycophron: Éclats d'obscurité*. Sainte-Étienne.

Cusset, C. and Kolde, A. (2013). 'The Rhetoric of the Riddle in the *Alexandra* of Lycophron', in J. Kwapisz, D. Petrain and M. Szymanski, (eds.), *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry,* (Berlin), 168-183.

Cyrino, M.S. (1998). "Heroes in D(u)ress: Transvestism and Power in the Myths of Herakles and Achilles", *Arethusa 31.2:* 207-241.

Dällenbach, L. (1989: tr. J Whiteley and E. Hughes). *The Mirror in the Text*. Cambridge.

Davey, N. (1999). 'The Hermeneutics of Seeing', I.Heywood and B. Sandywell, (eds.), *Interpreting Visual Culture: Explorations in the Hermeneutics of the Visual*, (London and New York), 3-29.

Day, J. (2010). *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication: Representation and Reperformance*. Cambridge.

Davies, M. and Finglass, P.J. (eds.) (2014). Stesichorus: The Poems, Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary. Cambridge.

De Jong, I. J. (1991). *Narrative in Drama: the Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech*. Leiden.

De Jong, I.J.F. (2001). 'The Anachronical Structure of Herodotus' *Histories*', S.J. Harrison, (ed.), *Texts Ideas and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory and Classical Literature*, (Oxford University Press), 93-116.

De Jong, I.J.F. (2001b). *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey.* Cambridge.

De Jong, I.J.F. (2014). *Narratology and the Classics*. Oxford.

De Stefani, C. and Magnelli, E. (2009). 'Lycophron in Byzantine Poetry (and Prose)', in C. Cusset & E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Éclats d'obscurité,* (Sainte-Étienne), 593-620.

De Vos, M. (2014). 'From Lesbos She Took Her Honeycomb: Sappho and the "Female Tradition" in Hellenistic Poetry', in J. Ker and C. Pieper, (eds.), *Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman World*, (Leiden), 410-434.

Demont, P. (2007). 'Figures of Inquiry in Herodotus' *Inquiries*', *Mnemosyne* 62: 179-205.

Détienne, M. (1996, tr. J. Lloyd). *The Masters of Truth in Archaic Greece*. London.

Dickey, E. (2007). *Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Oxford.

Dickson, K. (1992). "Kalchas and Nestor: Two Narrative Strategies in *Iliad* 1", *Arethusa* 25.3: 327-358.

Dieleman, J. and Moyer, I.S. (2010). 'Egyptian Literature', in J.J. Clauss and M. Cuypers, (eds.), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature,* (Oxford), 429-447.

Dintner, M. (2013b). 'Inscriptional Intermediality in Latin Literature', in P. Liddel and P. Low, (eds.), *Inscriptions and Their Uses in Greek and Latin Literature*, (Oxford), 303-316.

Dintner, M.T. (2013a). 'Intermediality in Latin Epic – *en video quaecumque audita*', in H. Lovatt and C. Vout, (eds.), *Epic Visions: Visuality in Greek and Latin Epic and its Reception*, (Cambridge),122-138.

Dobrov, G.W. (2001). *Figures of Play: Greek Drama and Metafictional Poetics*. Oxford.

Doherty, L. E. (1995). 'Sirens, Muses, and Female Narrators in the Odyssey', in B.Cohen, (ed.), *The Distaff Side*, (Oxford), 81-89.

Dowden, K. (2009). 'Reading Diktys: The Discrete Charm of Bogosity', in M. Paschalis, S. Panayotakis and G. Schmeling, (eds.), *Readers and Writers in the Ancient Novel,* (Groningen), 155-168.

Downing, Eric. (1990). 'Apatê, Agôn, and Literary Self-Reflexivity in Euripides' *Helen*', *Department of Classics, UCB. UC Berkeley*: Retrieved from: http://escholarship.org/uc/item/0hx979f5

Dozier, C. (2013). ‘Blinded by the Light: Oratorical Clarity and Poetic Obscurity in Quintilian’, in S. Butler and A. Purves, (eds.), *Synaesthesia and the Ancient Senses,* (Durham), 141-153.

Dunn, F. M. (1993). ‘Beginning at the End in Euripides' "Trojan Women"’, *Rheinisches Museum Für Philologie* 136.1: 22–35.

Dunn, F. (2002). ‘Rethinking Time: From Bakhtin to Antiphon’, in R. Bracht Branham, (ed.), *Bakhtin and the Classics*, (Evanston), 187-219.

Dunn, F. (2009). ‘Sophocles and the Narratology of Drama’, in J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos, (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, (Berlin), 336-355.

Durbec, Y. (2006). ‘Lycophron, *Alexandra* 1099-1119: la mort d'Agamemnon et de Cassandre’, *Theatrographies* 14*:* 6-14**.**

Durbec, Y. (2008a). ‘Le Pire des Achéens: le Blâme d’Achille dans L’Alexandra de Lycophron’, *Appunti Romani di Filologia* 10: 13-30.

Durbec, Y. (2008b). ‘L’*Alexandra* de Lycophron, Un Drame en Cinq Actes: Questions de Structure’*, Parola del Passato* 63: 429-436.

Durbec, Y. (2009). ‘Ajax et le Naufrage de la Flotte Grecque: L’*Alexandra* de Lycophron v. 365-416’, *Parola del Passato* 64: 128-36.

Durbec, Y. (2009b). ‘Représentations de la mort et de l’au-delà dans l’*Alexandra* de Lycophron’, in C. Cusset & E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Éclats d’obscurité,* (Sainte-Étienne), 393-402.

Durbec, Y. (2011). ‘Pâris’ in *Essais sur l' "Alexandra" de Lycophron*, (Amsterdam), 89-100.

Easterling, P.E. (1997). “Constructing the Heroic”, in C. Pelling, (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian,* (Oxford), 21-37.

Easterling, P. (2005). ‘*Agamemnon* for the Ancients’, in F. Mackintosh et al., (eds.), *Agamemnon in Performance 458 BC to AD 2004,* (Oxford), 23-36.

Eidinow, E. (2011). *Luck, Fate and Fortune: Antiquity and Its Legacy.* London.

Eidinow, E. (2007). *Oracles, Curses, and Risk Among the Ancient Greeks*. Oxford.

Elmer, D.F. (2005). ‘Helen *Epigrammatopoios*’, *Classical Antiquity* 24.1: 1-39.

Elsner, J. (2007a). ‘Philostratus Visualizes the Tragic: Some Ecphrastic and Pictorial Reception of Greek Tragedy in the Roman Era’, in C. Kraus et al. (eds), *Visualizing the Tragic*, (Cambridge), 309-337.

Elsner, J. (2007b). *Roman Eyes: Visuality and Subjectivity in Art and Text*. Princeton.

Elsner, J. (2014). ‘Lithic Poetics: Posidippus and his Stones’, *Ramus* 43.2: 152-172.

Fantuzzi, M. (2012). *Achilles in Love: Intertextual Studies.* Oxford.

Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. (2004). *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry.* Cambridge.

Farnell, L.R. (1933). 'The Paradox of the *Prometheus Vinctus*', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 53.1: 40-50.

Faulkner, A. (2008). *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: Introduction, Text and Commentary.* Oxford.

Fearn, D. (2012). 'Bacchylidean Myths', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles, (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode,* (Cambridge University Press), 321-346.

Ferrari, G. (1997). 'Figures in the Text: Metaphors and Riddles in the *Agamemnon*', *Classical Philology* 92.1: 1-45.

Ferrari, F. (2012). 'Representations of Cult in Epinician Poetry', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles, (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode,* (Cambridge University Press), 158-172.

Ferrari, G. (1997). 'Figures in the Text: Metaphors and Riddles in the Agamemnon', *Classical Philology* 91.1: 1-45.

Foley, H. P. (1980). 'The Masque of Dionysus', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 110: 107–133.

Ford, A. (2006). 'The Genre of Genres: Paeans and Paian in Early Greek Poetry', *Poetica* 38.3-4: 277-295.

Fountoulakis, A. (1992). *Violence in Euripides.* University of Manchester M.Phil. Thesis. Unpublished.

Fountoulakis, A. (1995). *Violence and Theatricality: Studies on Violence as a Dramatic Element in Classical and Post-Classical Greek Tragedy.* University of Manchester PhD Thesis. 140, 175, 186-189. Unpublished.

Fountoulakis, A. (2002). 'Herondas 8.66-79: Generic Self-Conciousness and Artistic Claims in Herondas' Mimes', *Mnemosyne* 55.3: 301-319.

Fountoulakis, A. (2009). 'Λυκόφρων: διερευνώντας τα όρια και τα συστατικά της τραγικής ποιησης', in F. Manikidou and K. Spanoudakis, (eds.), *Αλεξανδρινή Μούσα. Συνέχεια και νεωτερισμός στην ελληνιστική ποίηση*, (Athens): 417-439.

Fountoulakis, A. (2014). 'The Poet and the Prophetess : Lycophron's *Alexandra* in context', in M.A. Harder et al, (eds.), *Hellenistic Poetry in Context*, (Leuven), 103-124.

Fraenkel, E. (1950). *Agamemnon: edited with a commentary by Eduard Fraenkel*. Oxford.

Franke, W. (2011). 'On Doing the Truth in Time: The *Aeneid*'s Invention of Poetic Prophecy', *Arion* 19.1: 53-63.

Fraser, P. (1996). 'Lycophron', in S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth, (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary: Third Edition*, (Oxford), 895-97.

Fusillo, M. (1984). 'L'Alessandra di Licofrone. Racconto epico e discorso drammatico', *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 14: 495-525.

Fusillo, M., Hurst, A. and Paduano, G. (1991). *Licofrone, Alessandra. Introduzione, testo, traduzione & commento.* Milano.

Gibert, J. (1999/2000). 'Falling in Love with Euripides' "Andromeda"', *Illinois Classical Studies* 24/25: 75-91.

Gigante-Lanzara, V. (1995). 'I Vaticini di Cassandra e l'Interpretazione Trasgressiva del Mito', *Studi Classici e Orientale* 45: 85-98.

Gigante-Lanzara, V. (2000). *Licofrone: Alessandra*. Milano.

Gigante-Lanzara, V. (2009). 'ἔστι μοι...μυρία παντᾷ κέλευθος (Pind. Isthm. IV 1)', in C. Cusset and E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Eclats d'Obscurite,* (Sainte-Etienne), 95-115.

Gigante-Lanzara, V. (2010a). 'Echi dell'*Elena* Euripidea nell' *Alessandra*', *Parola del Passato* 65: 257-64.

Gigante-Lanzara, V. (2010b). 'Stace, *Achilleide*, 20-51 et l'*Alexandra* de Lycophron', *Parola del Passato* 65: 208-212.

Glazov, G.Y. (2001). *The Bridling of the Tongue and the Opening of the Mouth in Biblical Prophecy*. Sheffield.

Goff, B. (1990). *The Noose of Words : Readings of Desire, Violence and Language in Euripides' Hippolytos.* Cambridge.

Golder, H. (1996). 'Making A Scene: Gesture, Tableau and the Tragic Chorus', *Arion* 4.1: 1-19.

Goldhill, S. (1986). *Reading Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge.

Goldhill, S. (1994). 'The Naive and Knowing Eye: *Ecphrasis* and the Culture of Viewing in the Hellenistic World', in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne, (eds.), *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture,* (Cambridge), 197-223.

Goldhill, S. (1991). *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek literature*. Cambridge.

Goldhill, S. (1996). 'Refracting Classical Vision: Changing Cultures of Viewing', in T. Brennan and M. Jay, (eds.), *Vision in Context: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Sight*, (London), 17-28.

Goldhill, S. (2000). 'Placing Theatre in the History of Vision', in N.K. Rutter and B.A. Sparkes, (eds.), *Word and Image in Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh), 161-179.

Goldhill, S. (2012). 'Forms of Attention: Time and Narrative in *Ecphrasis*', *Cambridge Classical Journal* 58: 88-114.

Goward, B. (1999). *Telling Tragedy: Narrative Techniques in Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides.* Bristol. 1-27, 35-83.

Gowers, E. (2005). 'Virgil's Sibyl and the "Many Mouths" Cliché (*Aeneid* 6.625-7)', *Classical Quarterly* 55.1: 170-82.

Graziosi, B. and Haubold, J. (2005). *Homer: The Resonance of Epic.* Bristol.

Graziozi, B. (2013). 'The Poet in the *Iliad*', in A. Marmodoro and J. Hill, (eds.), *The Author's Voice, In Classical and Late Antiquity*, (Oxford), 9-38.

Gregory, J. (1985). 'Some Aspects of Seeing in Euripides' "Bacchae"', *Greece & Rome,* 32.1: 23–31

Grethlein, J. (2007). 'Diomedes redivivus: A New Reading of Mimnermus fr. 14 W^2', *Mnemosyne* 60.1: 102-111.

Grethlein, J. (2010). 'Experientiality and "Narrative Reference" with Thanks to Thucydides', *History and Theory* 49: 315-335.

Grethlein, J. (2013). *Experience and Teleology in Ancient Historiography: Futures Past from Herodotus to Augustine*. Cambridge.

Griffith, M. (1983). *Aeschylus: Prometheus Bound*. Cambridge University Press.

Griffiths, J. G. (1986). 'Lycophron on Io and Isis', *Classical Quarterly* 36.2: 472-477.

Guen-Pollet, B. (1989). 'Sebastopolis du Pont (Sulusaray). Documents littéraires et inscriptions déjà publiées de la cité', *Epigraphica Anatolica* 13: 51-86.

Guichard, L.A. (2006). "Simias' Pattern Poems; The Margins of the Canon", in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, and G.C. Wakker, (eds.), *Beyond the Canon,* (Leuven), 83-103.

Guilleux, N. (2009). 'La Fabrique des Hapax et des Prôton Legomena dans L'Alexandra, entre Connivence et Cryptage', in C. Cusset & E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Éclats d'obscurité,* (Sainte-Étienne), 221-236.

Gurd, S.A. (2005). *Iphigeneias At Aulis.* Cornell. 23-27.

Gutzwiller, K. J. (1998). *Poetic garlands: Hellenistic epigrams in context.* California.

Gutzwiller, K. (2002). 'Art's Echo: The Tradition of Hellenistic Ecphrastic Epigram', in, A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker, (eds.), *Hellenistic Epigrams*, (Leuven), 85-112.

Hall, E. (1989). *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-definition Through Tragedy*. Oxford.

Hall, E. (2010). *Greek Tragedy: Suffering Under the Sun*. Oxford.

Hamilton, J.T. (2003). *Soliciting Darkness: Pindar, Obscurity and the Classical Tradition*. Harvard.

Hammond, M. (tr.) (1987). *Homer: The Iliad*. London.

Harder, M.A. (2014). 'Travel Descriptions in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius', in Z. Von Martels, (ed.), *Travel Fact and Fiction: Studies on Fiction, Literary Tradition, Scholarly Discovery and Observation in Travel Writing*. Leiden.

Harrison, S.H. (2001). 'Picturing the Future: The Proleptic *Ecphrasis* from Homer to Virgil', in S.J. Harrison, (ed.), *Texts Ideas and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory and Classical Literature*, (Oxford), 70-92.

Harrison, T. (2000). *The Emptiness of Asia.* Duckworth. 18, 66-75.

Haynes, M. (2013). 'Framing a View of the Unviewable: Architecture, Aphrodite, and Erotic Looking in the Lucianic *Erōtes*', *Helios* 40.1: 71-95.

Heslin, P.J. (2005). 'Introduction', in P.J. Heslin, *The Transvestite Achilles; Gender and Genre in Statius' Achilleid,* (Cambridge), xi-xx.

Hinds, S. (1998). *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.

Hollis, A. (2007). "Some Poetic Connections of Lycophron's *Alexandra*", in C. Collard, P.J. Finglass and N.J. Richardson, (eds.), *Hesperos: Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry,* (Oxford University Press), 276-293.

Hollis, A.S. (2009). *Callimachus, Hecale. Revised second edition*. Oxford.

Holmes, B. (2007). 'The *Iliad*'s Economy of Pain', *Transactions of the American Philological Society* 137.1: 45-84.

Holmes, B. (2012). *Gender: Antiquity and its Legacy*. London and New York.

Holzinger, C.v. (1895, repr. 1973). *Lykophron's Alexandra: Griechisch und Deutsch mit Erklärenden Anmerkungen*. Leipzig.

Hopkinson, N. (1988). 'Commentary XXIII: Lycophron, *Alexandra* 348-65', in N. Hopkinson, (ed.), *A Hellenistic Anthology,* (Cambridge).

Hordern, J.H. (2002). *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus*. Oxford.

Hornblower, S. (2010). 'Lykophron's *Alexandra* and the Cypriote Name Praxandros', in R.W.V. Catling and F. Marchand, (eds.), *Onomatologos: Studies in Greek Personal Names Presented to Elaine Matthews*, (Oxford), 84-90.

Hornblower, S. (2014). 'Lykophron and Epigraphy: The Value and Function of Cult Epithets in the *Alexandra*', *Classical Quarterly* 64.1: 91-120.

Hornblower, S. (2015). *Lykophron: Alexandra. Greek Text, Translation, Commentary and Introduction*. Oxford.

Hornblower, S., Spawforth, A. (eds.) (2012). *The Oxford Classical Dictionary, Fourth Edition.* Oxford.

Horsfall, N. (2005). 'Lycophron and the *Aeneid* Again', *Illinois Classical Studies* 30: 35-40.

Howatson, M. (ed.), (2011). *The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature*. Oxford.

Hummel, P. (2006). *Lycophron, Cassandre: Traduction, Notes et Commentaire de P. Hummel*. Chambéry.

Hunter, R. L. (1988). '"Short on Heroics": Jason in the *Argonautica*', *Classical Quarterly* 38.2: 436-453.

Hunter, R. (1998). "Before and After Epic: Theocritus (?), *Idyll* 25", in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker, (eds.), *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry,* (Berlin), 115-132.

Hunter, R. L. (2001) 'The Poetics of Narrative in the *Argonautica*' in *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*, in T. Papanghelis and A. Rengakos, (eds), Leiden, 93-125.

Hunter, R. (2003). *Theocritus, Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus: Text and Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. University of California Press. 95-119.

Hunter, R. (2005). "Speaking in *Glossai*; Dialect Choice and Cultural Politics in Hellenistic Poetry", in W.M. Bloomer, (ed.), *The Contest of Language: Before and Beyond Nationalism,* (Indiana), 187-206.

Hunter, R. (2011). "The Reputation of Callimachus", in D. Obbink and R. Rutherford, (eds.), *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons,* (Oxford), 220-238.

Hunter, R. et al. (eds.). (2014). *Hellenistic Studies at a Crossroads: Exploring Texts, Contexts and Metatexts.* Berlin.

Hurst, A. and Kolde, A. (2008). *Lycophron,* Alexandra*: Texte Établi, Traduit et Annoté*. Paris.

Hurst, A. (2009). 'Étincelles dans l'ombre?', in C. Cusset & E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Éclats d'obscurité,* (Sainte-Étienne), 195-208.

Hurst, A. (2012). *Sur Lycophron: Recherche et Rencontres*. Genève, Droz.

Hutchinson, G.O., 1988, *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford.

Hutchinson, G.O. (2012). 'Image and World in Epinician Poetry', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles, (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode,* (Cambridge), 277-302.

Janko, R. (2000). *Philodemus: On Poems (Book 1).* Oxford.

Jay, M. (1996). 'Introduction – Vision in Context: Reflections and Refractions', in T. Brennan and M. Jay, (eds.), *Vision in Context: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Sight*, (London), 3-11.

Jebb, R.C. (1966). *The Antigone of Sophocles*. Cambridge.

Jenkins, T. E. (2005). 'Palamedes'" Writing Lesson": On Writing, Narrative, and Erasure', *Classical and Modern Literature* 25: 29-53.

Johansen, T.K. (1997). *Aristotle on the Sense Organs*. Cambridge.

Jones, K. (2014). 'Lykophron's *Alexandra*, the Romans and Antiochus III', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 134: 41-55.

Kalospyros, N.A.E. (2009). 'Literary Syntactic Patterns in Lycophron's Alexandra', in C. Cusset & E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Éclats d'obscurité,* (Sainte-Étienne), 209-219.

Katz Anhalt, E. (1995). 'Barrier and Transcendence: The Door and the Eagle in *Iliad* 24.314-321', *Classical Quarterly* 45.2: 280-95.

Katz, J.T. (2013). 'The Muse at Play: an Introduction', in J. Kwapisz, D. Petrain and M. Szymanski, (eds.), *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry,* (Berlin), 1-30.

Katz, S.T. 'Mystical Speech and Mystical Meaning', in S.T. Katz, (ed.), *Mysticism and Language*, (Oxford), 3-41.

King, K.C. (1987). *Achilles: Paradigms of the War Hero from Homer to the Middle Ages.* Berkeley.

Kirk, G.S. (1990). *The Iliad: A Commentary (Volume 2, Books 5-8).* Cambridge.

Knox, B.M.W. (1972). 'Aeschylus and the Third Actor', *American Journal of Philology* 93.1: 104-24.

Kolde, A. (2009). 'Parodie et Ironie Chez Lycophron: un Mode de Dialogue Avec la Tradition?', in C. Cusset & E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Éclats d'obscurité,* (Sainte-Étienne), 39-57.

Kortë, A. (1929). *Hellenistic Poetry.* Columbia. 262-276.

Kosmetatou, E. (2000). 'Lycophron's "Alexandra" Reconsidered: The Attalid Connection', *Hermes* 128.1: 32-53.

Kosmetatou, E. (2004). 'Vision and Visibility: Art Historical Theory Paints a Portrait of New Leadership in Posidippos' Andriantopoiika', in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach, (eds.), *Laboured In Papyrus Leaves*, (Harvard), 187-211.

Kossaifi, C. (2009). 'Poétique messager. Quelques remarques sur l'incipit et l'épilogue de l'*Alexandra* de Lycophron', in C. Cusset & E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Éclats d'Obscurité,* (Sainte-Étienne), 141-159.

Kotlińska-Toma, A. (2015). *Hellenistic Tragedy: Texts, Translations and a Critical Survey*. London.

Kowalzig, B. (2007a). 'Aetiology Overseas; From Epic to Ethnic Identity in *Megale Hellas*', in *Singing for the Gods*, (Oxford), 267-327.

Kowalzig, B. (2007b). *Singing for the Gods*. Oxford.

Laird, A. (1999). *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power: Speech Presentation and Latin Literature.* Oxford.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought.* New York. 4-5, 19, 53-57, 236-241, 364-367, 372, 390-403.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980, repr. 2003). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago.

Lamari, A.A. (2009). 'Knowing a Story's End: Future Reflexive in the Tragic Narrative of the Argive Expedition Against Thebes', in J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos, (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, (Berlin), 399-419.

Lambin, G. (2005). *L'Alexandra de Lycophron. Étude et traduction*. Rennes.

Lambin, G. (2009). 'L'Auteur dans le *Alexandra*', in C. Cusset and E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Éclats d'Obscurité,* (Sainte-Etienne), 161-169.

Lange, A. (2010). 'In The Second Degree: Ancient Jewish Paratextual Literature in the Context of Greece and Rome and Ancient Near-Eastern Literature', in P.S. Alexander, A. Lange and R.J. Pillinger, (eds.), *In The Second Degree: Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near-Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Culture and It's Reflections in Medieval Literature,* (Leiden), 3-40.

Langue, A. (2007). 'Greek Seers and Israelite-Jewish Prophets', *Vetus Testamentum* 57.4: 461-82.

Larson, J. (1995). *Greek Heroine Cults*. Wisconsin.

Lacey, S. and Lawson, R. (eds.). (2013). *Multisensory Imagery*. Berlin.

Lessing, G.E. (1766; tr. 1962 E.A. McCormick). *Laocoön: An Essay on the Limits of Painting and Poetry*. Indiana.

Le Ven, P. (2013). 'The Colours of Sound: *Poikilia* and its Aesthetic Contexts', *Greek and Roman Musical Studies* 1: 229-242.

Ley, G. (2010). *The Theatricality of Greek Tragedy Playing Space and Chorus*. Chicago.

Lightfoot, J.L. (2007). *The Sibylline Oracles.* Oxford.

Livrea, E. (1989). 'P.Oxy.2463: Lycophron and Callimachus', *Classical Quarterly* 39.1: 141-147.

Lomas, K. (1993). *Rome and the Western Greeks: 350 BC – AD 200.* London and New York.

Long, A.A. (1986). *Hellenistic Philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*. Duckworth.

Lonsdale, S.H. (1989). 'Hesiod's Hawk and Nightingale (*Op.*202-12): Fable or Omen?', *Hermes* 117.4: 403-12.

Looijenga, A.R. (2009). 'Unrolling the *Alexandra*: The Allusive Messenger-Speech of Lycophron's Prologue and Epilogue', in C. Cusset and E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Éclats d'Obscurité,* (Sainte-Étienne), 59-80.

Lovatt, H. (2013). *The Epic Gaze: Vision, Gender and Narrative in Ancient Epic*. Cambridge.

Lovatt, H. and Vout, C. (eds.), (2013). *Epic Visions: Visuality in Greek and Latin Epic and its Reception*. Cambridge.

Lowe, N.J. (2004). 'Lycophron', in I. De-Jong, R. Nunlist, and A. Bowie, (eds.), *Narrators, Narratees and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature; Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative Volume One,* (Leiden), 307-314.

Luz, C. (2013). 'What Has It Got in its Pocketses? Or What Makes a Riddle a Riddle?', in J. Kwapisz, D. Petrain and M. Szymanski, (eds.), *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry,* (Berlin), 83-99.

Lyons, D. (1997). 'The Goddess and Her Doubles', in, *Gender and Immortality: Heroines in Ancient Greek Cult and Myth*, (Princeton), 134-170.

Mackie, C.J. (1997). "Achilles' Teachers: Chiron and Phoenix in the *Iliad*", *Greece and Rome* 44.1: 1-10.

Mackie, C.J. (1998). 'Achilles in Fire', *Classical Quarterly* 48.2: 329-338.

MacLeod, C. W. (ed.). (1982). *Homer: Iliad, Text and Commentary*. Cambridge.

Mair, A.W. (1921). 'Lycophron' (with introduction and English translation), in *Callimachus Hymns and Epigrams, Lycophron, Aratus (Translated by A.W. Mair and G.R. Mair),* (Harvard), 303-443 (1989 reprinted edition).

Männlein-Robert, I. (2007). 'Epigrams on Art: Voice and Voicelessness in Ecphrastic Epigram', in P. Bing and J.S. Bruss, (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram,* (Leiden), 251-271.

Mari, M. (2009). 'Cassandre et le altre: rite del donne nell'Alessandra di Licofrone', in C. Cusset & E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Éclats d'obscurité,* (Sainte-Étienne), 405-440.

Mason, P.G. (1959). 'Kassandra', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 79: 80-93.

Massimilla, G. (2004). 'Echi Ellenistichi nell'Episodio di Paride e Enone presso Quinto Smyrneo', in G. Indelli et al., (eds.), *Mathesis e Mneme: Studi in Memoria di Marcello Gigante*, (Naples), 213-227.

Mazzoldi, S., 2002, "Cassandra's prophecy between Ecstasy and Rational Mediation". *Kernos* 15: 145-54.

McCall, M.H. (1969). *Ancient Rhetorical Theories of Simile and Comparison*. Harvard.

McClure, L. (1999). '"The Worst Husband": Discourses of Praise and Blame in Euripides' *Medea*', *Classical Philology* 94.4: 373-394.

McNelis, C. and Sens, A. (2010b). '*Quasi indignum hero carmine*: Lycophron, *Alexandra* 258-313 and Dido's Temple of Juno (Verg. *Aen.* 1.145-493)', *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 2: 247-255.

McNelis, C. and Sens, A. (2011a). "Lycophron 261-2 and Homeric αγκυλοχηλης", *Classical Quarterly* 61.2: 754-755.

McNelis, C. and Sens, A. (2011b). 'Trojan Glory: *Kleos* and the Survival of Troy in Lycophron's *Alexandra*', *Trends in Classics* 3.1: 54-82.

McNelis, C. and Sens, A. (2016). *The Alexandra of Lycophron: A Literary Study*. Oxford.

Meen, H. (1800). 'Remarks on the Cassandra of Lycophron, A Monody', digital e-book via http://books.google.co.uk/books/about/Remarks_on_the_Cassandra_of_Lycophron_a.html?id=XCMUAAAAQAAJ&redir_esc=y

Meijering, R. (1987). *Literary and Rhetorical Theories in the Greek Scholia*. Groningen.

Melville, S. (1996). 'Division of the Gaze, or, Remarks on the Colour and Tenor of Contemporary Theory', in in T. Brennan and M. Jay, (eds.), *Vision in Context: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Sight*, (London), 101-116.

Merkle, S. (1994). 'Telling the True Story of the Trojan War: The Eyewitness Account of Dictys of Crete', in J. Tatum, (ed.), *The Search For The Ancient Novel,* (John Hopkins), 183-196.

Meyer, D. (2007). 'The Art of Reading and Act of Writing in Hellenistic Epigram', in P. Bing and J.S. Bruss, (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram,* (Leiden), 187-210.

Michelakis, P. (2002). *Achilles in Greek Tragedy.* Cambridge.

Mikalson, J.D. (1991). *Honor Thy Gods: Popular Religion in Greek Tragedy.* North Carolina.

Mitchell-Boyask, R. (2006). 'The Marriage of Cassandra and the *Oresteia*: Text, Image, Performance', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 136.2: 269-297.

Mitford, T.B. (1991). 'Inscriptiones Ponticae: Sebastopolis', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 87: 181-243.

Molesworth, K.H. 'Watching Tragedy in Lycophron's *Alexandra*', Forthcoming in M.A. Harder et al. (eds.), *Drama and Performance in Hellenistic Poetry* (Hellenistica Groningana 23), Leiden.

Momigliano, A. (1939). 'The Locrian Maidens and the Date of Lycophron's *Alexandra*', *Classical Quarterly* 39: 49-53.

Momigliano, A. (1942). 'Terra Marique', *Journal of Roman Studies* 32: 53-64.

Mooney, G.W. (1921). *The Alexandra*. London.

Morrison, A. D. (2005). 'Sexual Ambiguity and the Identity of the Narrator In Callimachus "Hymn To Athena"', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 48.1: 27-46.

Morrison, A.D. (2007). *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge.

Morrison, A.D. (2012). 'Performance, Re-performance and Pindar's Audiences', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles, (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode,* (Cambridge), 111-133.

Morrison, A.D. [*Clio and Calliope: Apollonius, Herodotus and Historiography*]. Forthcoming.

Most, G. (2012). 'Poet and Public: Communicative Strategies in Pindar and Bacchylides', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles, (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode,* (Cambridge), 249-276.

Muir, J.V. (2001). *Alcidamas: The Works and Fragments*. Bristol.

Murray, A.T. (1993 repr.). *Homer: The Iliad (Vol.II), Books XIII-XXIV with Translation and Notes.* (Harvard University Press: LCL 171)

Mylonas, G.E. (1946). 'The Eagle of Zeus', *Classical Journal 41.5:* 203-207.

Nagy, G. (1990). *Pindar's Homer.* Baltimore.

Nagy, G. (1979). *The Best of the Achaeans*. Baltimore.

Neblung, D. (1997). 'III. Die Gestalt der Kassandra in der Hellenistischen Literatur', in *Die Gestalt der Kassandra in der Antiken Literatur*, (Leipzig), 73-106.

Nikiprowetzky, V. (1970). *La Troisième Sibylle.* Paris. 3-6, 197, 346.

Nünlist, R. (2009). *The Ancient Critic At Work*. Cambridge.

Obbink, D. (2011). 'Vanishing Conjecture: Lost Books and Their Recovery from Aristotle to Eco', in D. Obbink and R. Rutherford, (eds.), *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons,* (Oxford), 20-49.

Onians, R.B. (1951). *The Origins of European Thought, About the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time and Fate: New Interpretations of Greek, Roman and Kindred Evidence also of some basic Jewish and Christian Beliefs.* Cambridge.

Osborne, R. (1994). 'Looking On – Greek Style. Does the sculpted girl speak to women too?', in I. Morris, (ed.), *Classical Greece: Ancient Histories and Modern Ideologies*, (Cambridge), 81-96.

O'Sullivan, N. (1992). *Alcidamas, Aristophanes and the Beginning of Greek Stylistic Theory*. Stuttgart.

O' Sullivan, P. (2008). 'Aeschylus, Euripides and Tragic Painting: Two Scenes from *Agamemnon* and *Hecuba*', *American Journal of Philology* 129.2: 173-198.

Papaioannou, S. (2007). *Redesigning Achilles; 'Recycling' the Epic Cycle in the 'Little Iliad' (Ovid, Metamorphoses 12.1 – 13.622).* Berlin. 1-23, 209-212.

Parke, H.W. (1981). 'Apollo and the Muses, or Prophecy in Greek Verse', *Hermathena* 130/131: 99-112.

Parke, H.W. (1988). *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity*. London. 71-9.

Pavlou, M. (2011). 'Past and Present in Pindar's Religious Poetry', in A.P.M.H. Lardinois, J.H. Blok and M.G.M. Van der Poel, (eds.), 'Sacred Words: Orality, Literacy and Religion', (Leiden), 59-78.

Peek, W. (1955). *Griechische Vers-Inschriften I, Grab-Epigramme*. Berlin.

Pelling, C. (1997). "Aeschylus' *Persae* and History", in C. Pelling, (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian,* (Oxford), 1-19.

Peradotto, J. (2002). 'Bakhtin, Milman Parry, and the Problem of Homeric Originality' in R. Bracht Branham, (ed.), *Bakhtin and the Classics*, (Evanston), 59-70.

Perkell, C. (2008). 'Reading the Laments of *Iliad* 24', in A. Suter, (ed.), *Lament: Studies in the Ancient Mediterranean and Beyond,* (Oxford University Press), 93-117.

Peters, J.D. (1999). *Speaking Into the Air: A History of the Idea of Communication*. Chicago.

Podlecki, A.J. (1967). 'Omens in the *Odyssey*', *Greece and Rome* 14.1: 12-23.

Podlecki, N. (1986). 'The *Phrēn* Asleep: Aeschylus, *Eumenides* 103-5', in M.Cropp, E. Fantham and S.E. Scully, (eds.), *Greek Tragedy and its Legacy: Essays Presented to D.J. Conacher*, (Calgary), 35-42.

Pohlenz, M. (1933, repr. 1965). 'τὸ πρέπον: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des griechischen Geistes', in *Kleine Schriften (Vol.I),* (Hildesheim), 100-39.

Polański, T., 2004, "Loan Words, Fables and Prophetic Writings; Oriental Mimesis in the Alexandra of Lycophron". *Folia Orientalia* 40, 233-57. Translated by T. Bałuk-Ulewiczowa, available via www.academia.edu.

Porter, D.H. (1972). 'Violent Juxtaposition in the Similes of the *Iliad*', *Classical Journal* 68.1: 11-21.

Porter, J.I. (1990). 'Patterns of Perception in Aeschylus', in M. Griffith and D. Mastronarde, (eds.), *The Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer*, (Atlanta), 31-56.

Porter, J.I. (2013). 'Why Are There Nine Muses?', in S. Butler and A. Purves, (eds.), *Synaesthesia and the Ancient Senses,* (Durham), 9-26.

Powell, J.U. (1929). 'Later Epic Poetry in the Greek World', in E.A. Barber and J.U. Powell, (eds.), *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature: Second Series*, (Oxford), 35-46.

Powers, N. (2002). 'Magic, Wonder and Scientific Explanation in Apollonius, *Argonautica* 4.1638–93', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 48: 87-101.

Prauscello, L. (2009). 'Wandering Poetry, "travelling" music: Timotheus' Muse and Some Case-studies of Shifting Cultural Identities', in R. Hunter and I. Rutherford, (eds.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture*, (Cambridge), 168-194.

Press, J. (1958). *The Chequer'd Shade: Reflections on Obscurity in Poetry.* Oxford.

Pretzler, M. (2007). *Pausanias: Travel Writing in Ancient Greece*. London.

Prier, R. A. (1989). *Thauma Idesthai: The Phenomenology of Sight and Appearance in Archaic Greek*. Florida.

Priestley, J. (2014). *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture*. Oxford.

Prioux, É. and Pouzadoux, C. (2014). 'Entre histoires de familles et histoire universelle : liens générationnels, parentés et mariages dans la représentation de la trame temporelle entourant le conflit troyen', *Aitia* (On-line) 4.

Pritchett, W. (1998). *Pausanias Periegetes*. Amsterdam.

Pucci, P. (2009). "The Poetry of the *Theogony*", in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos and C. Tsagalis, (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hesiod,* (Leiden), 37-70.

Purves, A. (2013). 'Haptic Herodotus', in S. Butler and A. Purves, (eds.), *Synaesthesia and the Ancient Senses,* (Durham), 27-41.

Redfield, J.M. (1994). *Nature and Culture in the* Iliad*: The Tragedy of Hector*. Durham NC.

Redfield, J.M. (2003). *The Locrian Maidens: Love and Death in Greek Italy*. Princeton.

Reece, S. (2009a). 'Homer's Winged and Wingless Words', *Classical Philology* 104.3: 261-71.

Reece, S. (2009b). *Homer's Winged Words: The Evolution of Early Greek Epic Diction in the Light of Oral Theory*. Leiden.

Rehm, R. (1992). *Greek Tragic Theatre*. Princeton.

Rehm, R. (1994). *Marriage to Death*. Princeton.

Rengakos, A. (1994). 'Lykophron als Homererklärer', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 102: 111-130.

Richardson, N.J. (1980). "Literary Criticism in the Exegetical Scholia to the *Iliad*", *Classical Quarterly* 30.2: 265-87.

Rossi, L. (2002). 'Composition and Reception in AP 9.1-583: Aphegheseis, Epideixeis and Progymnasmata', in M.A. Harder et al, (eds.), *Hellenistic Epigrams*, (Leuven), 151-174.

Rougier-Blanc, S. (2009). 'Espaces, Architecture et Métaphores dans l'*Alexandra* de Lycophron', in C. Cusset and E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Éclats d'obscurité*, (Sainte-Étienne). 539-558.

Rutherford, I. (2001). *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*. Oxford.

Rutherford, R. (2011). "The Use and Abuse of Irony", in D. Obbink and R. Rutherford, (eds.), *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons,* (Oxford University Press), 84-103.

Salapata, G. (2002). 'Myth into Cult. Alexandra/Kassandra in Lakonia', in V.B. Gorman and E. Robinson, (eds), *Oikistes: Studies in Constitution, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World Offered in Honor of A.J. Graham*, (Leiden), 132-159.

Sbardella, L. (2009). 'L'Alessandra di Licofrone come esperimento di un genere epico-tragico: alcune considerazioni generali', *Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca* 12: 37-60.

Schade, G. (1999). *Lykophron's Odyssee: Alexandra 648-819.* Berlin.

Schade, G. (2011). 'Some Notes on Lycophron's Readers in Late Eighteenth- and Early Nineteenth-Century England', *Notes and Queries* 58.4: 496-503.

Schade, G. (2012). 'Obsurité, Préciosité, Stérilité – Von Lykophron über Mallarmé zu Quignard und Auster', *Hermes* 240.2: 246-261.

Scheer, E. (ed.), (1881). *Lycophronis Alexandra: Vol. I.* Berlin.

Scheer, E. (ed.), (1908). *Lycophronis Alexandra: Vol. II. Scholia Continens*. Berlin.

Schein, S.L. (1994). *The Mortal Hero*. Berkeley.

Schmakeit-Bean, I.A. (2006). 'Ein Beitrag zur Entschlüsselung Eines Rätsels: Die Argonauten in Lykophron's *Alexandra*', in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker, (eds.), *Beyond the Canon,* (Leuven), 271-286.

Schmitz, T.A. (2007). *Modern Literary Theory and Ancient Texts*. Oxford.

Schur, D. (2004). 'A Garland of Stones: Hellenistic *Lithika* as Reflections on Poetic Transformation', in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou and M. Baumbach, (eds.), *Laboured In Papyrus Leaves*, (Harvard), 118-122.

Scodel, R. (2002). 'Review: James Barrett, *Staged Narrative: Poetics and the Messenger in Greek Tragedy.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002. Pp. 250 + xxiv. ISBN 0-520-23180-5.', *Bryn Mawr Classical Review 2002.12.05.*

Seaford, R. (1990). 'The Imprisonment of Women in Greek Tragedy', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 110: 76-90.

Seaford, R. (2005). 'Death and Wedding in Aeschylus' *Niobe*', in F. McHardy et al., (eds.), *Lost Dramas of Classical Athens: Greek Tragic Fragments*, (Liverpool), 113-127.

Segal, C. (1971). 'The Two Worlds of Euripides' *Helen*', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 102: 553-614.

Segal, E. (1983). 'Euripides: Poet of Paradox', in E. Segal, (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Classical Tragedy*, (Oxford), 244-253.

Segal, C. (1993). *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow: Art, Gender and Commemoration in Alcestis, Hippolyta and Hecuba*. Durham and London.

Sens, A. (1997). *Theocritus: Dioscuri (Idyll 22): Introduction, Text and Commentary.* Göttingen.

Sens, A. (2005). 'The Art of Poetry and the Poetry of Art: The Unity and Poetics of Posidippus' Statue-Poems', in K. Gutzwiller, (ed.), *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, (Oxford), 206-225.

Sens, A. (2009). 'Lycophron's *Alexandra*, The Catalogue of Ships and Homeric Geography', in C. Cusset and E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Éclats d'Obscurité,* (Sainte-Étienne), 19-37.

Sens, A. (2010a). 'Hellenistic Tragedy and Lycophron's *Alexandra*', in J.J. Clauss and M. Cuypers, (eds.), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature,* (Oxford), 297-313.

Sens, A. (2014). 'Narrative and Simile in Lycophron's *Alexandra*', in R. Hunter et al., (eds.), *Hellenistic Studies at a Crossroads*, (Berlin), 97-111.

Sharrock, A. (2000). 'Intratextuality: Texts, Parts and (W)holes in Theory', in A. Sharrock and H. Morales, (eds.), *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations,* (Oxford), 1-39.

Sharrock, A. (2013). 'Arachne and Thersites: Genre and Social Class', (Handout and Seminar Paper Presentation, University of Manchester Classics and Ancient History Departmental Research Seminar, 26/09/13).

Siapkas, J. and Sjögren, L. (2014). *Displaying the Ideals of Antiquity: The Petrified Gaze*. London.

Sider, D. (1978). 'Stagecraft in the *Oresteia*', *American Journal of Philology* 99.1: 12-27.

Silk, M. (2001). 'Pindar Meets Plato: Theory, Language, Value and the Classics', in S.J. Harrison, (ed.), *Texts, Ideas and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory and Classical Literature*, (Oxford), 26-45.

Silk, M. (2012). 'Reading Pindar', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles, (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode,* (Cambridge), 347-364.

Sistakou, E. (2008a). *Reconstructing the Epic: Cross-Readings of the Trojan Myth in Hellenistic Poetry*. Leuven.

Sistakou, E. (2008b). 'Beyond the *Argonautica*: In Search of Apollonius' Ktisis Poems', in T.D. Papanghelis and A. Rengakos, (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*, (Leiden), 311-340.

Sistakou, E. (2009). 'Breaking the Name Codes in Lycophron's *Alexandra*', in C. Cusset and E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Eclats d'Obscurite,* (Sainte-Etienne), 237-257.

Sistakou, E. (2012). *The Aesthetics of Darkness: A Study of Hellenistic Romanticism in Apollonius, Lycophron and Nicander*. Leuven.

Snell, B. (1953, tr. Rosenmeyer). 'Homer's View of Man', in B. Snell, *The Discovery of the Mind*, (Oxford Basil Blackwell), 1-22.

Sommerstein, A. (1996). *Aeschylean Tragedy*. Bari.

Sommerstein, A. (2000). 'The Prologue of Aeschylus' *Palamedes*', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, Neue Folge 143 Bd. H2*: 118-127.

Sommerstein, A. (2008). *Aeschylus: Fragments*. Harvard.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1997). 'Tragedy and Religion; Constructs and Readings', in C. Pelling, (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian,* (Oxford), 161-186.

Sprague-Becker, S. (1991). 'Review: *Thauma Idesthai – The Phenomenology of Sight and Appearance in Ancient Greece*, by R.A. Prier', *American Journal of Philology* 112.3: 395-399.

Squire, M. (2009). *Image and Text in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*. Cambridge.

Squire, M. (2010a). 'Reading A View: Poem and Picture in the Greek Anthology', *Ramus* 39: 73-103.

Squire, M. (2010b). 'Texts on the Tables: The *Tabulae Iliacae* in their Hellenistic Literary Context', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 130: 67-96.

Squire, M. (2011). *The Iliad in a Nutshell: Visualizing Epic in the Tabulae Iliacae*. Oxford.

Stehle, E. (1997). *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece: Nondramatic Poetry in its Setting*. Princeton.

Steiner, D. (2001). *Images in Mind: Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought*. Princeton.

Steiner, D. (2007). 'Feathers Flying: Avian Poetics in Hesiod, Pindar and Callimachus', *American Journal of Philology* 128.2: 177-208.

Steiner, G. (1992, repr.). *After Babel.* Oxford.

Stephens, S.A. (2003). *Seeing Double.* Berkeley.

Stephens, S. (2011). "Remapping the Mediterranean: The Argo Adventure in Apollonius and Callimachus", in D. Obbink and R. Rutherford, (eds.), *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons,* (Oxford), 188-207.

Sternberg, M. (1982). 'Proteus in Quotation-Land: Mimesis and the Forms of Reported Discourse', *Poetics Today* 3.2: 107-156.

Sternberg, M. (1986). 'The World from the Addressees' Viewpoint: Reception as Representation, Dialogue As Monologue', *Narrative Poetics* 20.3: 295-318.

Stevenson, J. (2002). 'An Introduction to Epigraphic Poetry', in L.J. Churchill et al., (eds.), (2002). *Women Writing Latin: From Roman Antiquity to Early Modern Europe (Volume 1: Women Writing Latin in Roman Antiquity, Late Antiquity and the Early Christian Era)*. London.

Stewart, A. (1997). *Art, Desire and the Body in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.

Stieber, M. (2004). *The Poetics of Appearance in the Attic Korai*. Texas.

Stieber, M. (2011). *Euripides and the Language of Craft*. Leiden.

Stinton, T.C.W. (1990). 'Euripides and the Judgement of Paris', in *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy*, (Oxford), 17-75:

Stoneman, R. (2011). *The Ancient Oracles: Making the Gods Speak*. Yale.

Strauss-Clay, J. (2009). "Works and Days: Tracing the Path to *Arete*", in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos and C. Tsagalis, (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hesiod,* (Leiden), 71-90.

Strauss-Clay, J. (2011). *Homer's Trojan Theatre: Space, Vision, and Memory in the IIiad*. Cambridge.

Strootman, R. (2010). 'Literature and the Kings', in J.J. Clauss and M. Cuypers, (eds.), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature,* (Oxford), 30-45.

Struck, P.T. (2004). *Birth of the Symbol.* Princeton.

Suter, A. (2008). 'Introduction', in A. Suter, (ed.), *Lament: Studies in the Ancient Mediterranean and Beyond,* (Oxford), 3-17.

Svenbro, J. (1988: tr. J.Lloyd 1993). *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*. Cornell.

Swift, L. (2016). 'Visual Imagery in Parthenaic Song', in V. Cazzato and A. Lardinois, (eds.), *The Look of Lyric: Greek Song and the Visual (Studies in Archaic and Classical Greek Song)*, (Leiden), 255-287.

Taplin, O. (1977). *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus: The Dramatic Uses of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford.

Thalmann, W. (2011). "Colonial Spaces", in *Spaces of Hellenism*, (Oxford), 77-114.

Thalmann, W.G. (1980). 'Xerxes' Rags: Some Problems in Aeschylus' Persians', *American Journal of Philology* 101.3: 260-282.

Theodorakopoulos, E. (2000). 'Catullus 64: Footprints in the Labyrinth', in A. Sharrock and H. Morales, (eds.), *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations,* (Oxford), 115-141.

Thomas, R. (2012). 'Pindar's Difficulty and the Performance of Epinician Poetry: Some Suggestions From Ethnography', in P. Agócs, C. Carey and R. Rawles, (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode,* (Cambridge), 224-245.

Thompson, D.J. (1994). 'Literacy and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt', in A.K. Bowman and J.K. Woolf, (eds.), *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World,* (Cambridge), 67-83.

Tigerstedt, E.N. (1970). 'Furor Poeticus: Poetic Inspiration in Greek Literature before Democritus and Plato', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 31.2: 163-178.

Torrance, I. (2010). 'Writing and Self-Conscious *Mythopoiēsis* in Euripides', *Cambridge Classical Journal* 56: 213-258.

Trachsel, A. (2009). 'Le Paysage Troyen dans l'*Alexandra*', in C. Cusset & E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Éclats d'obscurité,* (Sainte-Étienne), 527-537.

Tueller, M.A. (2008). *Look Who's Talking: Innovations in Voice and Identity in Hellenistic Epigram*. Leuven.

Tsagalis, C.C. (2008). *Inscribing Sorrow: Fourth-Century Attic Funerary Epigrams*. Berlin.

Vahtikari, V. (2014). *Tragedy Performances Outside Athens in the Late Fifth and the Fourth Centuries BC*. Helsinki.

Van Hook, L. (1919). 'Alcidamas versus Isocrates: The Spoken Versus the Written Word', *Classical Weekly* 12.2: 89-94.

Vernant, J.P. (1983). 'The Representation of the Invisible and the Psychological Category of the Double: The Colossos', in J.P. Vernant, *Myth and Though Among the Ancient Greeks*, (London), 305-320.

Volk, K. (2012). 'Letters in the Sky: Reading the Signs in Aratus' *Phaenomena*', *American Journal of Philology* 133.2: 209-240.

Walcot, P. (1991). 'The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: A Literary Appraisal', *Greece and Rome* 38.2: 137-155.

Walker, A.D. (1993). 'Enargeia and the Spectator in Greek Historiography', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 123: 353-377.

Walsh, G.B. (1990). 'Surprised by Self: Audible Thought in Hellenistic Poetry', *Classical Philology* 85.1: 1-21.

Warner, M. (1985). *Monuments and Maidens*. London.

Wathelet, P. (2009). 'L'apport de Lycophron à la connaissance des myths troyens', in C. Cusset and E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Éclats d'Obscurité,* (Sainte-Étienne), 331-345.

West, M.L. (1997). *The East Face of Helicon*. Oxford.

West, M.L. (2000). '*Iliad* and *Aethiopis* on the Stage: Aeschylus and Son', *Classical Quarterly* 50.2: 338-352.

West, M.L. (2003). '*Iliad* and *Aethiopis*', *Classical Quarterly* 53.1: 1-14.

West, M.L. (2011). 'Pindar as a Man of Letters', in D. Obbink and R. Rutherford, (eds.), *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons,* (Oxford), 50-68.

West, S. (1983). 'Notes on the Text of Lycophron', *Classical Quarterly* 33.1: 114-135.

West, S. (1984). 'Lycophron Italicised', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 104: 127-151.

West, S. (1984b). 'Lycophron on Isis', *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 70: 151-154.

West, S. (2001). ‘Lycophron’s *Alexandra:* “Hindsight as Foresight Makes No Sense”’, in M. Depew and D. Obbink, (eds.), *Matrices of Genre,* (Harvard), 153-166.

West, S. (2003). 'Crete in the *Aeneid.* Two Intertextual Footnotes’, *Classical Quarterly* 53: 302-8.

West, S. (2004). ‘Lycophron’s Alexandra. Something Old and Something New’, in J. Antonio López Férez, (ed.), *Mitos en la literatura griega helenística e imperial*, (Madrid), 79-95.

West, S. (2006). ‘Lycophron’, in N. Wilson, (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Ancient Greece,* (Routledge), 433-435.

West, S. (2007). ‘Lycophron’s Argonautica’, *Phasis* 10 (I): 204-214.

West, S. (2009). ‘Herodotus in Lycophron’, in C. Cusset and E. Prioux, (eds.), *Lycophron: Éclats d’Obscurité,* (Sainte-Étienne), 81-93.

White, H. (2000). ‘Textual Problems in Lycophron’, *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 66.3: 125-131.

Whitmarsh, T. (2009). ‘Divide and Rule: Segmenting Callichoe and Related Works’, in M. Paschalis, S. Panayotakis and G. Schmeling, (eds.), *Readers and Writers in the Ancient Novel,* (Groningen), 36-50.

Wiles, D. (2000). *Greek Theatre Performance: An Introduction.* Cambridge.

Wiles, D. (2007). *Mask and Performance in Greek Tragedy: From Ancient Festival to Modern Experimentation*. Cambridge.

Wilson, J.R. (1986). ‘Territoriality and its Violation in the *Persians*’, in M. Cropp, E. Fantham and S.E. Scully, (eds.), Greek Tragedy and its Legacy: Essays Presented to D.J. Conacher, (Calgary), 51-57.

Wollheim, R. (1980). *Art and its Objects (Second Edition).* Cambridge.

Woodford, S. (1994). ‘Palamedes Seeks Revenge’, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 114: 164-9.

Wright, M. (2007). ‘Comedy and the Trojan War’, *Classical Quarterly* 57.2: 412-431.

Yacobi, T. (1995). ‘Pictorial Models and Narrative *Ecphrasis*’, *Poetics Today* 16.4: 599-649

Yacobi, T. (2000). ‘Interart narrative:(Un) Reliability and *Ecphrasis*’, *Poetics Today* 21.4: 711-749.

Yacobi, T. (2002). ‘*Ecphrasis* and Perspectival Structure’, in E. Hedling, E. and U. Laggeroth, (eds.), *Cultural Functions of Intermedial Exploration*, (Amsterdam and New York), 189-202.

Zanker, G. (2003). *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art.* Wisconsin.

Zeitlin, F. I. (1994). ‘The Artful Eye: Vision, *Ecphrasis* and Spectacle in Euripidean Theatre’, in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne, (eds.), *Art and text in Ancient Greek culture,* (Cambridge), 138-196.

Zeitlin, F.I. (1985). ‘Playing the Other: Theater, Theatricality, and the Feminine in Greek Drama’, *Representations* 11: 63-94.