6

The Sexual Politics of Myth

Rewriting and Unwriting Women in Byzantine Accounts of the Trojan War

Adam J. Goldwyn

+

As book 5 of the *Odyssey* opens, the messenger god Hermes departs from Olympus and arrives at the abode of the goddess Calypso on the island of Ogygia, an island so splendid that "there even an immortal, who chanced to come, might gaze and marvel, and delight his soul".[1] The two continue on to find the great hero Odysseus, and in one of the most anticipated moments of literature of any period, we finally see this famed character about whom we have heard so much and seen so little over the course of the first four books. When at last Hermes arrives at the cave where he expects to find Odysseus, the Ithacan is not there, "for he sat weeping on the shore, as his wont had been, racking his soul with tears and groans and griefs, and he would look over the unresting sea, shedding tears."[2] Later, the power dynamic is made more clear; when Calypso tells Odysseus he can leave, he says he will not believe her until she promises not to plot against him or bring him to harm, something that is only necessary because she holds the power of life or death over him, whether he is stranded on her island or on the sea far away.[3] The contrast between the divine woman and the mortal man is clear; she is powerful, lives in a beautiful paradise; he is powerless, sitting on the shore in tears, far away from a home

[1] Homer, *Odyssey* 5.73–74: ἔνθα κ' ἔπειτα καὶ ἀθάνατός περ ἐπελθὼν / θηήσαιτο ἰδὼν καὶ τερφθείη φρεσὶν ἦσιν.

[2] Homer, *Odyssey* 5.82–84: ἀλλ' ὅ γ' ἐπ' ἀκτῆς κλαῖε καθήμενος, ἔνθα πάρος περ, / δάκρυσι καὶ στοναχῇσι καὶ ἄλγεσι θυμὸν ἐρέχθων. / πόντον ἐπ' ἀτρύγετον δερκέσκετο δάκρυα λείβων.

[3] Homer, *Odyssey* 5.171–91.

that he alone, of all the surviving Achaeans, is unable to reach. This opening glimpse of the hero demonstrates the inversion of the typical gendered power dynamic in the ancient societies in which the Homeric poems were created and heard. Indeed, in her introduction to the *Odyssey*, Emily Wilson suggests that "the relationships of Odysseus with Calypso, Circe, and especially Athena give us glimpses of an alternative to the 'normal' mortal world, in which female characters are always less powerful than their male partners."[4] Wilson thus proposes that the storyworld of the *Odyssey* is at odds with the values of the patriarchal society in which it was produced and of the androcentrism of the subsequent societies in which its reception was formed. One of the defining elements of reception studies is the process of aligning texts created under different ideological valences into the overarching ideological and cultural frameworks of the reception culture, and, given the empowerment of women in the *Odyssey* and the disempowerment of women in the cultures into which it was received, it is no surprise that the domestication of the women of the *Odyssey* is a central element of the text's reception history.[5]

In Byzantium, the reception history of the Homer epics was no exception; Homer was at once among the central texts of the Byzantine education system and of Byzantine identity, yet was also culturally distant in ways that made it difficult for Byzantines to understand both linguistically and ideologically. Thus, alongside the domestication of the foreign and pagan elements of the texts' reception was a tradition of relatively values-neutral interpretive work.[6] For instance, Eustathios of Thessaloniki, one of the greatest Homeric exegetes of the twelfth-century, makes frequent mention in his *Parekbolai* (a collection of notes and commentary) on the *Iliad* and

[4] Wilson 2018, 37.

[5] Lorna Hardwick, for instance, argues in a general way that "the history of reception of ancient texts and ideas is to some extent shaped by the artistic forms and cultural politics of receiving traditions" (2003, 32). For allegory as a means to "domesticate the subversive aspects of [Homer's] poems" in seventeenth-century England, see Wolfe 2015, 492.

[6] The bibliography on the reception of Homer is extensive; for Homer and the Byzantine educational system, see Van den Berg 2022; for the reception of Homer in Byzantine literature, see Nilsson 2004, for the reception of Homer in the romance tradition, see Goldwyn and Nilsson 2019a.

the *Odyssey* of the strange customs a reader might encounter in the Homeric epics, explaining them in terms comprehensible to a Byzantine audience. For example, at *Od.*1.31–32, the Achaeans call a council, and Eustathios explains that "the reason for a common assembly is either that one wishes to clearly deliver some sort of news to the citizens [...] or that one wishes to declare some other public matter".[7] The explanation is necessary, since members of the Byzantine imperial court would not be familiar with the political practices of the ancient Greeks; Eric Cullhed notes that "the normal system of many *basileis* ruling over different parts of the Greek-speaking world was fundamentally different from the Imperial system of the Byzantines with its one single emperor (*basileus*)."[8] The Homeric epics were the central pedagogical texts in Byzantium, and thus, the purpose of the *Parekbolai* was to explain these unknown aspects to the aristocratic students who would form the future ruling class of the empire.

Indeed, Eustathios' glosses could be as simple as clarifying at the level of diction, as for instance, when Eustathios explicates a particular expression from *Od.*2.35, in which "Telemachus was delighted at this *phēmē*".[9] Eustathios then glosses this particular word, the specific context of which or its meaning may be unknown to his audience: "A *phēmē* is a speech that indicates a future event, stated spontaneously".[10] There is little ideological valence to such a gloss; it functions to explain an unfamiliar word and to train aspiring prose writers in effective style.[11] However, the very need for such a lexical gloss indicates that the language of the Homeric epics was not comprehensible to Byzantines reading it. In this sense, the *Parekbolai* and

[7] Eustathios, *Parekbolai β* 31–32 (Cullhed 2016, 352): Ὅτι αἰτία κοινῆς ἀγορᾶς ἤ τὸ ἀγγελίαν τινὰ ἐθέλειν σάφα εἰπεῖν τοῖς πολίταις [...] ἤ τὸ ἐθελῆσαι δήμιόν τι ἄλλο πιφαύσκεσθαι.

[8] Cullhed 2018, 294.

[9] As cited in Eustathios, *Parekbolai β* 32: χαῖρε δὲ φήμῃ Ὀδυσσῆος φίλος υἱός.

[10] Eustathios, *Parekbolai β* 33–37: ἔστι δὲ φήμη λόγος δηλωτικὸς μελλοντός τινος ἐξ αὐτομάτου λαλούμενος.

[11] For the varied (re)uses of Homer for Byzantine rhetoric, see Van den Berg 2021, according to whom "the linguistically and culturally competent student was expected to be familiar with the grammatical, rhetorical, and exegetical traditions connected with the poems as well as with a great deal of other ancient lore, whether literary, historical, mythological, or otherwise" (119).

other works in the scholarly and exegetical traditions are as much forms of translation as works in a more narrative vein. As the translator of modern Greek Karen Emmerich has noted, translations are not "like a freight train carrying a cargo of meaning to be unloaded on the far side of some clearly demarcated border."[12] Rather, "translations require a complex set of interpretive decisions that are conditioned by the particular context in which a translator (or translators) is working. [...] The[translator] decide[s] what a work means (to them), how it means (to them), and which of its features (diction, syntax, linguistic register, rhythm, sound patterning, visual or material aspects, typographic form, and so on) are most important for the particular embodied interpretation they hope to share with others. They also decide how to account for those features in the new text they are writing."[13] That is to say, translation is as much a cultural process as a linguistic one. While not conceding that Eustathios' *Parekbolai* had no political valence,[14] texts that 'translated' (however loosely we care to define that word) the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* from ancient Greek to medieval Greek offer far more radical and subtle reinterpretations of the Homeric world. Eustathios and the other scholars who served as intermediaries between the Homeric texts and their future ruling-class students thus went to great lengths to ensure that the difficult ideological moments encoded in the texts were reinterpreted in ways that did not challenge, but rather supported, the Roman, Christian, aristocratic environment in which they were taught.[15]

One of the defining elements of the reception of the poems, therefore, has been the undermining of those aspects of the Homeric world they depict that clash with the values of the Byzantine world into which they were received. This operated at a cultural level, to make a cultural authority as great as Homer more than a poet of frivolous tales by giving the epics a

[12] Emmerich 2017, 4.

[13] Emmerich 2017, 4.

[14] For Eustathios' interpretation of the Homeric texts in the *Parekbolai* as a way to anchor Byzantine identity in the ancient past in light of the rise of the Crusader states in former Byzantine territories, see Cullhed 2017, 296.

[15] By Roman, I mean those elements of the text that supported Byzantines as being intrinsically distinct from their neighboring contemporary cultures, such as described in Cullhed 2017. For Eustathios and Tzetzes as intermediaries, so Van den Berg 2020.

meaning deeper than simply stories of men at war. For Homer's Byzantine readers like Eustathios and his contemporary John Tzetzes, the mythical elements were fictional, and thus could be explained away through allegory as a means to get at the truth.

One result of this allegorical process was the domestication of the numerous mythological women in the epics who have power, agency, and are, to a degree, sexually liberated. If the relationships between Odysseus and the divine women of the *Odyssey* provide an "alternative to the 'normal' world," then two genres in the tradition of the reception of Homer in Byzantium, allegory and historiography, represent two modes by which Byzantines domesticated the ideologically dangerous parts of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. As Richard Hunter notes in his study of the ancient reception of Homer, "any attempt, however, to survey the ancient, even just the Greek, reception of Homer is bound to end up as just that, namely 'a survey,' and the material is so rich that it would be a very long survey indeed."[16] The same is true for the reception of Homer in any period, and Byzantium, with its long history and multifaceted reception culture, is no exception.

The overarching pattern of this diminution of women's experiences in Byzantine interpretations of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, however, can be seen in two representative examples: the chronicle of John Malalas, a sixth-century historian who traced the history of the world from the biblical story of creation to his own lifetime (with the narrative of the Trojan War comprising most of the fifth book), and the *Allegories of the Iliad* and *Allegories of the Odyssey* by the twelfth-century grammarian and Homeric scholar John Tzetzes. Though the methods each employed were different, both had a similar goal of offering rational, explicable, and culturally legible means of transmitting a narrative full of gods and monsters to a Byzantine audience.[17] Despite their differences in genre, however, the end result of these ideological revisions had similar consequences for the Byzantine understanding of the depiction of gender in the poems: a sustained diminution of the powerful women of the *Odyssey* through disenchantment, by divesting them of the magical and divine abilities with which they were imbued in Homeric

[16] Hunter 2018, vii.

[17] For the allegorical elements in Malalas' text, see Goldwyn 2015b.

myth. This was done in two ways, first, through rewriting—changing or reinterpreting the depiction or characterization of female characters to reduce their power and agency—and, second, through unwriting—narratological strategies that use summary or omission to write women out of the narratives altogether.

6.1 John Malalas and the Unwriting of Women in Byzantine Historiography

I have elsewhere argued that "reading Malalas' *Chronicle* as the product of a self-conscious writer of literature manipulating the traditional structure of the chronicle in new way" can allow readers of his work to move away from older hermeneutic models in which, as Jenny Ferber suggested in 1978, "the task of chronography [is] one of pure compilation"[18] and pointed to a growing trend of scholarship that rejects the idea that Malalas and other chroniclers "were to be seen as nothing more than illiterate and/or ignorant compilers complying with popular taste."[19] Instead, I argue that approaching the text from a narratological perspective "opens up new possibilities for appreciating the artistry of its composition and the innovative variety of its rhetorical devices."[20] While my focus in that piece was mostly devoted to what is gained by reading Malalas as a literary artist, an "author-compiler" in his own right,[21] it is as important to recognize what is lost from Homer's version in Malalas' account of the Trojan War.

For instance, Homer's treatment of Odysseus' stay on Calypso's island is markedly different from that same scene as narrated by Malalas. Whereas Homer's account of Odysseus' visit to Calypso comprises most of Book 5, Malalas' account is very brief: "On departing from Circe's island, Odysseus, driven by contrary winds, went on to the next island, where Calypso, Circe's sister, received him. She honoured him with many attentions and lived

[18] Goldwyn 2022, 58. The citation is from Ferber 1978, 32, drawing on a long debate about the literariness or lack thereof in "monk's chronicles."

[19] Tocci 2014, 61

[20] Goldwyn 2022, 58.

[21] See Tocci 2014, 64, where he argues that "the emphasis should fall on the term *author* rather than on its counterpart *compiler*."

with him in marriage. From there he continued on."[22] This example offers a clear case of the narrative technique of unwriting. One of the fundamental principles of narratology is that what an author does (or does not) narrate corresponds to how important (or unimportant) that element is. Narratologists calls this "rhythm," and it has been a central concern of Homeric narratology in particular;[23] elsewhere, I have explained the basic principle of narratology as that

> in real life, time moves at a static pace and everything, whether boring or exciting, important or insignificant, takes the same amount of time. In a literary representation of those events, however, the author can choose which events to include or exclude, which events to foreground or background, and which events to describe at great length and which to pass over quickly; how much narrative time (with how much text is devoted to a certain moment often used as a proxy) is determined by the author to emphasize or diminish certain events. That is, authors can slow down or even pause time through more detailed description, can narrate such that time moves (roughly) at the pace of real life (such as direct reported speech), or can speed up time through elision or omission.[24]

Classical narratology[25] began as a structuralist mode of investigation, analyzing the construction of narrative in ways that asserted a kind of universality of storytelling praxis that was, in the words of Roland Barthes, "international, transhistorical, transcultural,"[26] or, in the words of Gerald Prince, "not so much concerned with the history of particular novels or tales, or with their meaning, or with their esthetic values."[27] Post-classical narratologists,

[22] Malalas, *Chronicle* 5.51: Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς νήσου τῆς Κίρκης ἐξορμήσας ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀνήχθη εἰς τὴν ἄλλην νῆσον, ὑπὸ ἀνέμων ἐναντίων ἐκριφείς· ὄντινα ἐδέξατο καὶ ἡ Καλυψώ, ἡ ἀδελφὴ τῆς Κίρκης, καὶ πολλῆς θεραπείας ἠξίωσεν αὐτόν, συμμιγεῖσα αὐτῷ καὶ πρὸς γάμον. κἀκεῖθεν ἀνήχθη. I have regularized the translation of names from, e.g. Kirke to Circe and Kalypso to Calypso.

[23] See, for instance, de Jong 2001, xvi–xvii or de Jong and Nünlist 2007, xiii.

[24] Goldwyn 2021, 74.

[25] 'Classical' narratology as opposed to more recent 'post-classical narratology', not 'Classical' in the sense of the ancient Greek and Roman disciplinary archive.

[26] Barthes 1977, 79, as quoted in Page 2006, 2.

[27] Prince 2012, 5, as quoted in Page 2006, 3.

have argued that these universalizing systems obscure differences based on the positionality of narrators and that, indeed, narratology can shed light on, for instance, the depiction of gender in a text. Tory Young characterizes these "early objections to the idea of a feminist narratology [...] as a kind of contamination of the neutral descriptive system of classical narratology by ideologically motivated analysis."[28] Post-classical narratology, however, rejects the notion that this is a form of contamination, instead presupposing "that the assumption of universalism was not neutral, but founded on an androcentric bias."[29] From the perspective of a feminist (or broadly post-classical) narratology, these narrative decisions are not values-neutral, but instead represent the same array of ideological positions as other elements of texts that are widely accepted as conveyers of meaning (characterization, theme, genre). Young, for instance, critiques what she calls Prince's "call for narratologists to resist 'the interpretive temptation,'" instead asserting that "it no longer seems possible to regard narratology as a neutral linguistic science."[30] In this regard, post-classical narratology can be seen as a complement to the poststructuralist turn in general, with its attunement to issues of race, class, gender, ability, and other elements of subject positionality. Indeed, a vast body of feminist narratology has fundamentally altered the way in which gender is constructed; moving away from what the feminist narratologist Ruth Page calls the "narrow" view of structuralists like Barthes and Prince,[31] post-classical narratologists see an analysis of the construction of narrative as a way of elucidating the insights drawn from critical theory. Thus, Page argues that "feminist narratology is not then a separate set of feminist narrative models, but is better understood as the feminist *critique* of narrative theory."[32] Within a specifically Byzantine context, Matthew Kinloch summarizes this important as "Past women [...] exist continuously for a period of time, but female characters exist only momentarily, dropping in and out of existence as they are narrated (or not) in a story."[33]

[28] Young 2021, 2.
[29] Page 2006, 4.
[30] Young 2021, 2, citing Prince 1995, 82; also discussed in Page 2006, 48.
[31] For which, see Page 2006, 3, 4, 5, 13.
[32] Page 2006, 5.
[33] Kinloch 2020, 307.

Thus, a narratologist might look at Malalas' treatment of Calypso and ask what narratological strategies he employed to narrate this scene; a feminist narratology, however, would ask not just that we analyze what narrative decisions Malalas makes, but how these decisions shape the depiction of gender within the narrative. And, indeed, Malalas' omission of much of Homer's source material in his retelling of this episode represents a significant diminishment of one of the most powerful female figures in the text: Calypso's island is no longer a sight that inspires awe and wonder. From the perspective of a gendered power dynamic, Malalas' Calypso is never put in a position of power and dominance over Odysseus, and Odysseus is never reduced to a destitute refugee crying on the seashore. In making a narratological decision about how much space to give the episode of Odysseus' stay on Calypso's island (indeed, by narrating Calypso's life only insofar as it intersects with Odysseus'), Malalas is making decisions that have direct bearing on the depiction of powerful women, about what elements of a woman's life are or are not worth narrating.

In a Byzantine context, one of the major ways in which the Homeric epics were at odds with the worldview of the Byzantines was in their treatment of the divine; as Orthodox Christians, the Byzantines could not accept the enchanted elements of the pagan epics, so their revisions focused on removing the divine elements. Malalas' reception of the *Odyssey*, therefore, is defined by its rationalization of the text, that is, the removal of the divine, the pagan, the supernatural, the enchanted, but these imaginary alter-realities were also the only ones in which women could have power over men, and so rendering the story in more 'realistic' terms necessarily also rewrites the women of the *Odyssey* into gender roles more comprehensible to a Byzantine audience, ones in which they have no power.

The diminution of women's power through rationalizing or realistic historiographical narrative continues with the rest of Odysseus' journey as well: "From there he continued on to where there was a great lake, known as Nekyopompos".[34] Nekyopompos literally means "guide" (-πομπος) "of the dead" (Νεκυό-), which is Malalas' way of rationalizing the pagan underworld

[34] Malalas, *Chronicle* 5.51: κἀκεῖθεν ἀνήχθη, ἔνθα λίμνη ὑπῆρχε μεγάλη πλησίον τῆς θαλάσσης, λεγομένη ἡ Νεκυόπομπος.

Odysseus visits, another rationalizing element that effaces those elements of the text that are antithetical to the Christian worldview. Malalas continues: "When he left there a great storm took place and he was cast up from the sea on to the rocks known as the Serenidai, which produce a distinctive sound from the crashing waves".[35] Here, too, we can see the way in which unwriting operates at the intersection of narratology and gendered power dynamics. Just as Malalas' revision of Odysseus' experiences on Ogygia removed from the narrative a powerful and potentially dangerous divine female character, his description of the Sirens has a similar result. No longer women whose singing was both beautiful and dangerous, but a phenomenon entirely explicable through rational observation: instead of monsters, rocks; instead of singing, the sound of waves. Thus, in proposing a rational or natural cause for an un-Christian enchanted element of the text, Malalas also eliminates the possibility of dangerous sexually beguiling women.

This unwriting can be seen in the remaining narrative of Odysseus' journey home as well:

> When he escaped from these [the Serenidai] he came to the place known as Charybdis, which is a wild precipitous region. There he lost all his remaining ships and his army, while he himself was left floating in the sea, on a plank from his ship, expecting a violent death. But some Phoenician sailors, however, were sailing by, saw him swimming in the water, and took pity on him. They rescued him and took him to the island of Crete, to Idomeneus, exarch of the Greeks.[36]

In this summary version of Odysseus' *nostos*, many of the most powerful women in the Homeric epic are written out entirely or degendered through rationalizing historiography. First, Charybdis is transformed from a female

[35] Malalas, *Chronicle* 5.51: καὶ ἀναχθεὶς ἐκεῖθεν χειμῶνος μεγάλου γενομένου θαλάσσης ἐκρίπτεται εἰς τὰς Σερενίδας οὕτω καλουμένας πέτρας, αἳ ἐκ τῶν κρουσμάτων τῶν κυμάτων ἦχος ἀποτελοῦσιν ἴδιον.

[36] Malalas, *Chronicle* 5.51: κἀκεῖθεν ἐξειλήσας ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν καλουμένην Χάρυβδιν, εἰς τόπους ἀγρίους καὶ ἀποτόμους· κἀκεῖ πάσας τὰς ὑπολειφθείσας αὐτῷ ναῦς καὶ τὸν στρατὸν ἀπώλεσεν, αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς μόνος ἐν σανίδι τοῦ πλοίου ἐν τῷ πελάγει ἐφέρετο, ἀναμένων τὸν μετὰ βίας θάνατον. τοῦτον δὲ ἐωρακότες τινὲς ἀποπλέοντες ναῦται Φοίνικες νηχόμενον ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν ἐλεήσαντες διέσωσαν, καὶ ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ Κρήτῃ νήσῳ πρὸς τὸν Ἰδομενέα, ἔξαρχον Ἑλλήνων.

sea-monster whose gulping creates a giant whirlpool that threatens to suck Odysseus and his ships into its maw into a toponym for a dangerous piece of land, while Scylla, the female sea-monster who in the *Odyssey* eats six of Odysseus' crew, is omitted entirely. In order to avoid the problem of Ino's magic veil, Malalas has Odysseus saved by Phoenician sailors, but in doing so, he also erases the powerful female nymph from his history; similarly, Odysseus is not taken to Phaiakia, which would have posed problems not just of immortal gardens always in bloom, but of female authority in the figure of Queen Arete, and so instead he is taken to Crete, and Idomeneus, a king.

In that Malalas was writing the entirety of world history as he understood it and that the return of one general of one war back to his home island is, in the grand scheme of world history, a small and fairly inconsequential event, we cannot blame Malalas for narrating these events in much less detail than Homer, for whom it was the organizing principle of an epic poem that covers only 42 days. Malalas, moreover, was himself working within a broader rationalizing tradition that limited his narrative options. Indeed, Malalas' narrative of the Trojan War is largely drawn from the work of two authors of the Second Sophistic, Dares the Phrygian and Dictys of Crete.[37] For the Byzantines writ large, Dares and Dictys were neither frequently read nor of particular interest as primary sources. Their importance was in their appropriation by select Byzantine authors, particularly Malalas, whose chronicle was highly influential, and thus indirectly spread Dares and Dictys into Byzantine ideas about the past. Their true import, particularly as regards their narrative of the Trojan War, however, was not in the events they told, but in the way they told them.[38] By the early first or second century CE when these authors were writing, historiography had long-since shifted away from the kind of poetry that Homer had composed; medieval authors excised what Dares' and Dictys' modern English translator Richard Frazer calls "the divine machinery typical of ancient epic," and replaces Homer's narratologically-sophisticated treatment of time in the text (analepsis, prolepsis) and

[37] For which, see Goldwyn 2016.

[38] Their influence was more widely felt in medieval western Europe, which had lost access entirely to the ancient Greek sources of the Trojan War and Homer in particular, for which, see Clark 2020, especially the first half, which covers the ancient and medieval reception of Dares.

his abbreviated time-frame (e.g. his narration of the ninth year of the war) with a day-by-day year-by-year chronological treatment of the Trojan War.[39] But, as I have argued elsewhere, "Malalas was not an uncritical copier of Dictys' *Journal*; rather, the skeletal frame of the earlier work became the literary superstructure onto which Malalas layered his own literary, aesthetic and ideological concerns."[40] He had, moreover, at least the claim to access to Homer, referencing the poet numerous times.[41] For Malalas, however, his references to Homer are often qualified: "the poet Homer tells this story poetically", he says, for instance, in discussing the adultery of Aphrodite and Ares,[42] where "poetically," as elsewhere in Malalas, is code for "lying" or "fictional."[43] Indeed, Malalas elsewhere notes that "the most learned Homer related poetically that through a magic potion she transformed the men who had been ensnared by her" by turning them into animals,[44] but he then follows the euhemeristic tradition of the Homeric scholar Phaidalos of Corinth in interpreting this allegorically: "the poet was referring to the habits of men in love.[45] Malalas, then, whether he had direct access to Homer or not, had access to a variety of mythological elements from the poems; his Circe, like his Calypso, could have been the "dread goddess" (δεινὴ θεός/ deinē theós) of Homer,[46] but he chose not to draw from the mythological elements that would characterize her as a powerful sovereign woman.

As with any summary, Malalas had to make decisions about what to include and what to exclude, and how to render those events in terms that would be comprehensible to his audience of sixth-century Byzantines. An-

[39] Frazer 1966, 6.

[40] Goldwyn 2015, 25.

[41] For an assessment of Malalas' claims to have used extensive sources, and the way in which he incorporated both those had had read and those he claimed to have read but had not, see Jeffreys 1990

[42] Malalas, *Chronicle* 2.2: περὶ οὗ ἱστορεῖ ποιητικῶς Ὅμηρος ὁ ποιητής.

[43] Malalas, *Chronicle* 2.2: ἱστορεῖ ποιητικῶς Ὅμηρος ὁ ποιητής. For which, see Goldwyn 2022.

[44] Malalas, *Chronicle* 5.50: ἀλλὰ ὁ δὲ σοφώτατος Ὅμηρος ποιητικῶς ἔφρασεν, ὅτι διὰ πόματος μαγικοῦ τοὺς συλλαμβανομένους πρὸς αὐτὴν ἄνδρας μετεμόρφου. τρόπον σημαίνων ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ἀντερώντων ἀνδρῶν.

[45] Malalas, *Chronicle* 5.50: ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ἀντερώντων ἀνδρῶν.

[46] E.g. Homer, *Odyssey* 11.8.

alyzing his principles of selection—what episodes to include or exclude—and the rationalizing processes by which he did so, however, reveals that in making these decisions, the enchanted and enchanting women who populate the *Odyssey* are erased from world history.

6.2 John Tzetzes and the Rewriting of Women's Lives

In looking over the course of Byzantine literary history, Malalas' erasure had consequences; his initial erasure reverberated through the ages in the works of other writers who followed his lead. John Tzetzes was one of the most famous Homeric scholars of the twelfth century, long recognized by scholars as a period which saw the resurgence of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as cultural touchstones in Byzantium. Tzetzes wrote two works of particular importance when considering the intersections of enchantment, narrative, and gender: the *Allegories of the Iliad* and *Allegories of the Odyssey*, works in which he sought to present the Homeric epics in terms comprehensible linguistically, theologically, and epistemologically, to his audience of twelfth-century Constantinopolitan elites and, in particular, to the German-born Princess Bertha of Sulzbach who almost by accident became the Byzantine Empress Eirene, and thus needed a crash course in her adopted country's most important texts. Where Malalas' narrative, with its generic mandate to cover vast swathes of time and space, used summary and omission to unwrite the enchanted and, by extension, the female, from the narrative of Odysseus' *nostos*, Tzetzes' poems, operating within a different genre, could not simply omit these objectionable elements, since the work was intended to have pedagogical value: the Empress Eirene needed to learn the plot of the Homeric epics, and she needed to learn how to properly interpret the confounding things she encountered there. Thus, where Malalas used unwriting as a narrative strategy for diminishing the role of women, Tzetzes uses a different strategy, rewriting, with the same result.

This can be seen, for instance, in how Tzetzes rewrites one episode of Odysseus' *nostos* that Malalas had unwritten. When Odysseus has lost all his crew and ship, Homer recounts how the goddess Ino had saved him by providing him with a magic veil that could help him swim to shore. Malalas omitted this entirely, instead proposing that it was Phoenician sailors who

saved him. Tzetzes takes a different tack, using allegory to offer a rational or naturalistic explanation, suggesting that Ino is a bird:

> Homer, playing with witticisms, as I said,
> calls the shearwater '*Ino,*' and her '*veil*' for you is
> that straight course of her wings, along which
> he swam and went ashore to the Phaiakians.[47]

Tzetzes' goal was to use allegory to explain a fantastical, magical, and pagan element of the Homeric text in terms that fit the worldview of his twelfth-century audience, but as in Malalas' *Chronicle*, these narrative and interpretive decisions have consequences for the representation of gender in the poem: powerful women are no longer the salvation of powerless men; instead, it is the hero who saves himself by following the course of a bird towards land; the woman is erased.

In each of these prior instances, the author's principal goal was rationalizing or disenchanting the *Odyssey*, with the consequent effects on the depiction of gender as a secondary, or perhaps incidental, result. But this was not always the case. Take, for instance, Tzetzes' narrative of Odysseus' visit to Circe's island of Aeaea. Tzetzes begins his narrative by summarizing the scene as depicted in the *Odyssey*:

> Homer says that Odysseus's friends were first turned into pigs
> and then turned into men again; but Odysseus himself,
> by the wishes of Hermes, did not suffer this misfortune.[48]

He then disagrees, and offers an allegorical interpretation of these events:

[47] Tzetzes, *Allegories of the Odyssey* 5.49–52: Παίζων χαριεντίσμασιν ὁ Ὅμηρος, ὡς εἶπον, / Ἰνὼ' λέγει τὴν αἴθυιαν, 'κρήδεμνον' δέ σοι ταύτης / γραμμὴν τὴν τοῦ πτερύγματος ἐκείνην τὴν ὀρθίαν, / καθ' ἥνπερ ἐκνηχόμενος πρὸς Φαίακας ἐξῆλθεν.

[48] Tzetzes, *Allegories of the Odyssey* 10.11–13: τοὺς φίλους Ὀδυσσέως μὲν πρῶτον ἐκχοιρωθῆναι, / πάλιν ἀνθρωπωθῆναι δέ· αὐτὸν τὸν Ὀδυσσέα / βουλαῖς Ἑρμοῦ τὸ δυσχερὲς ταυτὶ μὴ πεπονθέναι.

But Tzetzes says that Odysseus did turn into a pig
even more than his friends, by sleeping with Circe
for a whole year in her brothels.
For that is how Circe is said to turn men into pigs.
Ruling over the island which had few inhabitants
and fearing outbreaks of wars among the neighboring peoples,
she established brothels and thus made many
of those who sailed past dwell and make an alliance with her.[49]

Tzetzes thus offers a fundamental rewrite of Circe: she is no longer a powerful and divine ruler of an independent island, but an ordinary madame running a brothel. This allegorical rewriting allows Tzetzes to remove the enchanted or magical elements of the ancient pagan Homeric narrative, rewriting it in rational and human-centered terms that reflect the twelfth-century social and cultural context. But in rewriting the enchanted element, he also rewrites the gendered power dynamic and adds a layer of misogyny to the rewriting, casting Circe as a madame.

Indeed, elsewhere in his narrative of the *nostos*, Tzetzes transforms powerful women into prostitutes: Quoting Homer's "To the Sirens first you shall come, who beguile all men"[50] he offers the following allegory:

These were very famous prostitutes, who played music,
and Odysseus, terrified lest he be detained by them,
blocked his five senses that are dear to him.[51]

[49] Tzetzes, *Allegories of the Odyssey* 10.14–21: Τζέτζης τὸν Ὀδυσσέα δέ φησιν ἐκχοιρωθῆναι / πλέον τῶν φίλων τῶν αὐτοῦ, ἐφ' ὁλοκλήρῳ ἔτει / τῇ Κίρκῃ συγκαθεύδοντα πορνείοις τοῖς ἐκείνης. / Οὕτως ἡ Κίρκη λέγεται καὶ γὰρ χοιροῦν ἀνθρώπους. / Κατάρχουσα τῆς νήσου γὰρ οὔσης ὀλιγανθρώπου / καὶ συρραγὰς πολέμων δὲ τῶν πέριξ πτοουμένη, / πορνεῖα συσκευάσασα, πολλοὺς τῶν ἐκπλεόντων / οὕτως ἐποίει κατοικεῖν καὶ συμμαχεῖν ἐκείνῃ.

[50] Tzetzes, *Allegories of the Odyssey* 12.11, from Homer, *Odyssey* 12.39: Σειρῆνας μὲν πρῶτον ἀφίξεαι, αἵ ῥά τε πάντας.

[51] Tzetzes, *Allegories of the Odyssey* 12.12–14: Αὗται πόρναι περίφημοι καὶ ᾠδικαὶ ὑπῆρχον, / καὶ πτοηθεὶς ὁ Ὀδυσσεύς, μὴ συσχεθῇ καὶ ταύταις, / τὰς πέντε τῶν αἰσθήσεων ἐμφράττει τὰς καὶ φίλους.

Here, the same principles are at work: in considering how to render the mythological or the marvelous in the ancient pagan epic into human terms legible to an orthodox Byzantine audience, Tzetzes writes out the supernatural.

Considered in this way, Tzetzes' allegorical method reflects what the Byzantines considered believable, and this tells us about the horizons of possibility for women in Byzantium. In Book 1, for instance, Tzetzes considers that the "'deeds of men and gods which singers celebrate,' / means private individuals and wise ones, of commoners and kings."[52] In allegorizing in this way, Tzetzes opens up the possibility for many different possibilities in how the pagan gods and the semi-divine heroes could be rendered; there are many possibilities that he can imagine within the life of a man. Hephaistos can be "blacksmiths";[53] Zeus can be "a king and an astrologer, a diviner, a mage, wise in all things";[54] Hermes can be merchants;[55] and "Tantalos, being the high priest and ruler, was punished / for revealing the mysteries of the gods while he was alive".[56] Men can have a variety of positions, and those positions can range from ordinary professions (blacksmith, merchant) to high positions such as priest and ruler. Women, by contrast, are prostitutes.[57]

6.3 HOMERIC MONSTERS IN THE BYZANTINE WORLD

In his book *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*, Jeffrey Jerome Cohen "propose[s] by way of a first foray" what he defines as "a method of reading cultures from the monsters they engender."[58] That is to say, what a culture con-

[52] Tzetzes, *Allegories of the Odyssey* 1.320–21, from Hom.*Od*.1.338: "Ἔργ' ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, τά τε κλείουσιν ἀοιδοί·' / ἰδιωτῶν τε καὶ σοφῶν, κοινῶν καὶ βασιλέων.

[53] Tzetzes, *Allegories of the Odyssey* 1.233: τοὺς πυρεργάτας.

[54] Tzetzes, *Allegories of the Odyssey* 11.141: ἀστρολόγου, μάντεως, μάγου, σοφοῦ τοῖς πᾶσι.

[55] Tzetzes, *Allegories of the Odyssey* 1.202: ἐμπόρων.

[56] Tzetzes, *Allegories of the Odyssey* 11.136–37: Ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ ἄρχων δὲ ὁ Τάνταλος ὑπάρχων, / ζῶν τὰ θεῶν μυστήρια εἰπὼν ἐτιμωρήθη.

[57] Susan Lasner's suggestion that "what we choose to support, to write about, to imagine—even in narratology—seems to me as much a function of our own desire as of any incontrovertible evidence that a particular aspect of narrative is (im)proper or (ir)relevant" perhaps opens up further possibilities for reading into Tzetzes' instrumental use of female characters in the epics (2005, 396).

[58] Cohen 1996, 3.

siders monstrous is not something inherent within the monster itself, but is a social construct that reflects cultural assumptions: "the monster," he writes, is "an embodiment of a certain cultural moment—of a time, a feeling, and a place."[59] In this way, what Tzetzes chooses to allegorize, that is, what he considers a monstrous or incredible thing that needs to be recategorized as something recognizable to that culture, as something non-monstrous, reveals much about the culture that cannot tolerate its monstrousness. Cohen argues that "the monster is the harbinger of a category crisis"; in this case, what to do with women with magical powers, who, in Cohen's words, "refuse to participate in the classificatory order of things"; this is what allegory is: a way of rewriting unclassifiable things into the classificatory order of the reception culture. Cohen argues that "the monster polices the borders of the possible," and it is here that allegorizing can be seen as an ideological act.[60] Indeed, the cases of Malalas and Tzetzes represent an almost opposite method from the monsterization that Cohen describes. Rather than accepting the possibility of monsters who defy categorization, Malalas and Tzetzes recreate monstered worlds in which monsters cannot exist. That which was monstrous is domesticated, that which was beyond existing definitions is rewritten to be constrained. For those things (including both people and places) that cannot be recategorized, Malalas and Tzetzes simply erase them by not narrating their existence at all.

What was possible for women in the Homeric storyworld was not possible in the Byzantine version of their past; as Maria Mavroudi has argued: "we recognize that the attitude of a society regarding aspects of its past reveals its views about the present."[61] And, indeed, historiography in Byzantium amply demonstrates a broader unwriting of Byzantine women. Kinloch, for instance, has demonstrated how the thirteenth-century historian George Akropolites subordinated female to male characters through a variety of means ("first, by the manner in which they are grammatically signified, identified, and named; second, by what they are presented as doing in the story; and third, by how their actions are made meaningful within the broader nar-

[59] Cohen 1996, 4.
[60] Cohen 1996, 6.
[61] Mavroudi 2012, 53.

rative").[62] Similar narratological principles underlie the historiographical production of the elite imperial literary circles in twelfth-century Constantinople in which Tzetzes was operating. Rather than rewrite the boundary more capaciously to allow the complicated women of myth into the realm of the possible, he rewrote the women he found in the *Odyssey* to squeeze into the much narrower confines of the possible: prostitutes, for instance.

In this, Tzetzes and Malalas are participants in a longer Byzantine tradition of the reception of powerful women. Mavroudi, for instance, describes how "the ancient sources read by the Byzantines offered a range of positive and negative evaluations for [the Classical Athenian] Aspasia ranging between a prostitute and a respectable woman."[63] Among these is "an elaborate negative portrayal" by Tzetzes, who "presents her as the cause of the Peloponnesian War" because the Megarians "had insulted his wedded wife, Aspasia, whom they had formerly known as a prostitute in their city."[64] Similarly, Procopius, a contemporary of Malalas, marked the Empress Theodora as a prostitute in his *Secret History*; Leonora Neville notes that Theodora "has two big scenes that figure prominently in any introductory course on Byzantine history. The first concerns her life before she married Justinian, in which she was a lowlife actress and prostitute."[65] This reputation has also been central to her popular reception through to the twenty-first century. While an academic work like David Potter's *Theodora: Actress, Empress, Saint* (2015) addresses this element of her life, Stella Duffy's historical novel, with only one word different, centers this element as one of the three things for which she should be known: *Theodora: Actress, Empress, Whore* (2011). Indeed, the novel opens by foreshadowing this future: "Theodora was not yet old enough to be required to do more than dance and tumble, but—like all the girls in the rehearsal room—she would be one day" (Duffy 2011, n.p.). For Tzetzes, then, the allegorization of the powerful women of the *Odyssey* as prostitutes is part of the oeuvre-spanning misogyny which

[62] Kinloch 2020, 303.
[63] Mavroudi 2012, 54.
[64] Mavroudi 2012, 55. The source is Tzetzes, *Chiliades* 360.943–61.
[65] Neville 2019, 14.

defines Tzetzes, who "is repeatedly sarcastic towards women renowned for their erudition."[66]

Beyond the confines of their own work, the treatment of women by Tzetzes and Malalas is part of a long tradition of medieval misogyny as embodied in the Matter of Troy. A century after Tzetzes, the Sicilian judge Guido delle Colonne wrote his Latin *Historia Destrutionis Troiae*, which simply features long misogynistic digressions.[67] Indeed, as Hilke Hoogenboom argues elsewhere in this volume, Guido's rejection of the fantastical was an ideological choice about how to tell history and what should be included: Guido felt that previous authors had "made a grave mistake by presenting its material in a fabulous manner. Guido creates a new and more truthful Trojan history than his predecessor by using the right kind of material."[68] Part of Guido's own practice of translation, then, was a rewriting for ideological purposes, and one such purpose was to portray (especially elite) women in a negative way. Guido's text, then, when translated into almost all the vernacular languages of Europe, also transported various misogynistic ideas across linguistic and cultural borders.[69] These medieval translations of Trojan War material featured rants against Medea's mutability, Helen's inconstancy in her affair with Paris, and other examples of women behaving in ways contrary to the patriarchal values of the time.

The misogyny of Malalas and Tzetzes is more subtle, though perhaps no less damaging, than Guido's, since it operates not through the open discourse of misogynistic tirade or digression, but is in a way obscured behind the seeming objective rhetoric of history or allegory. But what an analysis of the narratological decisions these authors made and the ways in which allegory operates as a mode of rewriting is that these decisions are informed by ideological concerns, particularly as they relate to the intersection of gender

[66] Mavroudi 2012, 56; she also cites further examples both from Tzetzes' own Homeric scholarship and as relates to references to the educated women he met in his own circles.

[67] For a brief over of the modern scholarly consensus on the text's misogyny, see Hilke Hoogenboom (chapter 7) in this volume.

[68] Hoogenboom, chapter 7.

[69] Hoogenboom focuses on the case of Penthesilea (chapter 7 in this volume); for a similar treatment of the various misogynist translations of the story of Medea, see Goldwyn 2019.

and power and the potentiality of women's lives. Allegory and historiography in Byzantium, broadly conceived, removed enchantment—the pagan, the divine—from the *Odyssey*, but in so doing not only removing the multiplicity of ways in which women's power and agency manifested themselves in the storyworld of the poem, but also limited the ways in which Byzantines could conceive of women's lives in their own culture.

Such writing practices existed across the broad spectrum of Homeric reception, indeed, from its very origins. In his *Histories*, Herodotus, among the first authors to engage in intertextually with the Homeric epics, begins by informing his audience that he is writing so that "the doings of mankind"[70] may not be lost to time, thus explicitly excluding from his account the role of gods through revision of the mythical past, where divine women such as Athena, Circe, and Calypso held such sway in the *Odyssey*. And though the *anthropon* in this context could include women, that he will focus on "that which caused them to war against one another"[71] unwrites them from history, since war was a principally male undertaking.

In surveying Akropolites' *Syngraphe Chronike*, Kinloch notes that "first and most obvious observation [...] about female characters in the text is quantitative; there are simply far fewer of them" and "large sections of the narrative—especially those with a military focus [...] are populated almost exclusively by men."[72] Not only does Akropolites minimize the number of women and omit narration of their lives, even when he does narrate female characters, "they are overwhelmingly marginal to the meaning that the actions in which they participate have for the wider narrative."[73] Within the context of Homeric reception, contemporary feminist authors have sought to recuperate or rewrite the lives of the unwritten Homeric women. Works such as Margaret Atwood's *Penelopiad*, Christa Woolf's *Cassandra*, Madeline Miller's *Circe*, and, entering into the Latin tradition of the Trojan War, Ursula Le Guin's *Lavinia* (a revision of Virgil's *Aeneid*) focalize the narratives through the eyes of Homeric women. Whereas, for an author like Malalas, in whose account of Odysseus' *nostos* women only appear when

[70] Herodotus, *Histories* 1.1: τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων. Translation my own.

[71] Herodotus, *Histories* 1.1: δι' ἣν αἰτίην ἐπολέμησαν ἀλλήλοισι.

[72] Kinloch 2020, 309.

[73] Kinloch 2020, 327.

they are narratologically proximate to him, in these works, the primary narrator-focalizer stays with the women regardless of their proximity to men. Though it is unlikely that Margaret Atwood ever read John Malalas or John Tzetes, the shade of Penelope who is the first-person narrator nevertheless obliquely rejects the tradition of male authorship about the Trojan War of which Malalas and Tzetzes were a part and that consistently undermined her achievements and autonomy:

> I realised how many people were laughing at me behind my back—how they were jeering, making jokes about me, jokes both clean and dirty; how they were turning me into a story, or into several stories, though not the kind of stories I'd prefer to hear about myself.[74]

Atwood's narrative of Penelope's life makes other narratological choices: she focalizes through different (predominantly female) characters than Tzetzes or Malalas and summarizes or omits different scenes entirely from her narrative. Indeed, in this context of female erasure, it is significant that while Atwood centers her entire narrative around Penelope, Malalas does not mention her at all. Though the fundamental plot remains the same, the narratological choices made by these authors show that the interpretive value of the Homeric epics, their meaning in the various historical, political, and cultural contexts in which they are told and retold, rest in large part not just on which story is told, but how it is told. In disenchanting the mythological elements of the Homeric poems, Tzetzes, Malalas, and other Byzantine writers in the rationalizing tradition either inadvertently or consciously diminished the power of the women who populated the world of the *Odyssey*, a pattern of interpretive misogyny which has only now begun to be overwritten.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Eustathios of Thessalonike, *Commentary on the Odyssey*, Books 1 & 2. Ed. E. Cullhed, *Eustathios of Thessalonike: Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. 1: *On Rhapsodies A–B*. Uppsala 2016.

[74] Atwood 2005, 3.

Herodotus, *Histories*. Tr. A.D. Godley, *Herodotus: The Persian Wars: Volume I: Books 1–2*. Cambridge, MA 1920.

Homer, *Odyssey*. Tr. A.T. Murray, rev. G.E. Dimock, *Homer, Odyssey*. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA 1919.

Malalas, John. *Chronicle*. Ed. J. Thurn, *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*. Berlin, New York 2000. Tr. E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys & R. Scott. *The Chronicle of John Malalas. A Translation*. Melbourne 1986.

Tzetzes, John. *Allegories of the Iliad*. Tr. A.J. Goldwyn & D. Kokkini. Cambridge, MA 2015.

Secondary Sources

Atwood, M. 2005. *Penelopiad*. Edinburgh.

Barthes, R. 1977. *Image, Music, Text*. Tr. S. Heath. New York.

Cheney, P. & P. Hardie (eds) 2015. *The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature*, vol. 2. Oxford.

Clark, F. 2020. *The First Pagan Historian: The Fortunes of a Fraud from Antiquity to the Enlightenmen*t. Oxford.

Cohen, J. 1996. "Monster Culture (Seven Theses)" in Cohen (ed.) 1996, 3–39.

———(ed.) 1996. *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*. Minneapolis.

Cullhed, E. 2017. "Achaeans on Crusade", in Pontani, Katsaros and Sarris (eds) 2017, 285–98.

de Jong, I. 2001. *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge.

de Jong, I. & R. Nünlist (eds) 2007. *Time in Ancient Greek Narrative*. Leiden.

Duffy, S. 2011. *Theodora: Actress, Emperor, Whore. A Novel*. New York.

Emmerich, K. 2017. *Literary Translation and the Making of Originals.* New York, London.

Ferber, J. 1978. "Theophanes' Account of the Reign of Heraclius", in Jeffreys et al. (eds) 1978, 32–42.

Frazer, R. 1966. *The Trojan War: The Chronicles of Dictys of Crete and Dares the Phrygian*. Bloomington.

Gengler, O. & M. Meier (eds). 2022. *Der Chronist als Zeithistoriker*. Stuttgart.

Goldwyn, A. 2015a. "Theory and Method in John Tzetzes' Allegories of the Iliad and Allegories of the Odyssey" *Scandinavian Journal of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 3, 141–71.

———2015b. "John Malalas and the Origins of the Allegorical and Novelistic Traditions of the Trojan War in Byzantium" *Troianalexandrina* 15, 23–49.

———2016. "The Trojan War from Rome to New Rome: The Reception of Dictys of Crete's Ephemeris Belli Troiani in

Ioannes Malalas' Chronicle", in P. Marciniak (eds) 2016, 9–34.

———2022. "John Malalas' Chronicle as Collage: Generic Variation, Allegorical Interpretation, and the Polyphony of History", in O. Gengler & M. Meier (eds) 2022, 57–75.

Goldwyn, A. & I. Nilsson (eds) 2019. "Romancing Troy: Homeric Motifs in Palaiologan Romances", in Goldwyn & Nilsson (eds) 2019, 188–210.

———2019. *Reading the Late Byzantine Romance: A Handbook*. Cambridge.

Hardwick, L. 2003. *Reception Studies*. Oxford.

Hoffman, M. & P. Murphy (eds). 2005. *Essentials of Theory and Fiction*. Durham.

Hunter, R. 2018. *The Measure of Homer: The Ancient Reception of the Iliad and the Odyssey*. Cambridge.

Jeffreys, E. 1990. "Malalas' Sources" in E. Jeffreys, B. Croke & R. Scott (eds) 1990, 167–216.

Jeffreys, E., B. Croke & R. Scott (eds) 1990. *Studies in John Malalas*. Sydney.

Jeffreys, E. et al. (eds) 1978. *Byzantine Papers: Proceedings of the First Australian Byzantine Studies Conference*. Canberra.

Jevtcić, I. & I. Nilsson (eds) 2021. *Spoliation as Translation: Medieval Worlds of the Eastern Mediterranean*. Turnhout.

Kinloch, M. 2020. "In the Name of the Father, the Husband, or Some Other Man" *DOP* 74, 303–28.

Lasner, S. 2005. "Queering Narratology", in M. Hoffman and P. Murphy (eds) 2005, 387–98.

Marciniak, P. (ed.). 2016. *Miscellanea Byzantina I*. Silesia.

Neville, L. 2019. *Byzantine Gender*. Croydon.

Nilsson, I. 2004. "From Homer to Hermoniakos: Some Considerations of Troy Matter in Byzantine literature" *Troianalexandrina* 4, 9–34.

Page, R. 2006. *Literary and Linguistic Approaches to Feminist Narratology*. New York.

Pizzone, A (ed.) 2014. *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature: Modes, Functions, and Identities*. Berlin.

Pontani, F., V. Katsaros & V. Sarris (eds) 2005. *Reading Eustathios of Thessalonike*. Berlin & Boston.

Prince, G. 1995. "On Narratology: Criteria, Corpus, Context" *Narrative* 3.1, 73–84.

———2012. *Narratology: The Form and Function of Narrative*. Berlin.

Tocci, R. 2014. "Questions of Authorship and Genre in Chronicles of the Middle Byzantine Period: The Case of Michael Psellos' *Historia Syntomos*", in Pizzone (ed.) 2014, 61–76.

van den Berg, B. 2020. "John Tzetzes as Didactic Poet and Learned Grammarian", *DOP 74, 285–302.*

———2021. "Eustathios' Homeric commentaries: translating Homer and spoliating ancient traditions" in I. Jevtcić and I. Nilsson (eds) 2021. Turnhout, 116–31.
———2022. *Homer the Rhetorician: Eustathios of Thessaloniki on the Composition of the Iliad*. Oxford.
Wilson, E. 2018. *Homer, Odyssey* (introduction). New York, 1–80.
Wolfe, J. 2015. "Homer", in Cheney & Hardie (eds) 2015, 487–502.
Young, T. 2021. "Introduction: Futures for Feminist Queer Narratology", in T. Young (ed.) 2021, 1–9.
———(ed.) 2021. *Queer and Feminist Theories of Narrative*. New York.