

Стаття надійшла до редакції 17.05.2025 р.

Перевірено на плагіат 19.05.2025 р.

унікальність – 92 %

<https://doi.org/10.17721/StudLing2025.26.121-132>

UDK 821.14. 84

THE IDEA OF FRIENDSHIP AND ENMITY IN THE “CYCLIC CORPUS”: FEATURES AND SPECIFICITY OF SEMANTICS

Vitalii E. Turenko, vitali_turenko@knu.ua,
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0572-9119>

Doctor of Science (Philosophy), Senior Researcher,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

*This article examines the concepts of friendship (philia, philotes, hetairios) and enmity (echthos, eris, neikos) in the fragments of the cyclic epic as key semantic categories of archaic Greek culture. The author argues that these notions serve both as narrative motifs and as conceptual tools that articulate social structure and legitimize knowledge, memory, and authority in heroic and pre-Socratic philosophical discourse. Friendship is presented as a multidimensional phenomenon, spanning from heroic **hetairia** (martial companionship) to pedagogical mentorship. It may even serve as an instrument of rhetorical manipulation or a mask for latent hostility. Particular attention is given to the figure of Kreophylos, who serves as a link between Homeric heritage and later philosophical traditions through the concept of **philia**.*

The analysis of the fragments reveals the ambivalence of social proximity in archaic thought: kinship, friendship, and hospitality possess both constructive and destructive potential. The cyclic corpus exhibits a dynamic shift from authentic philia to deceptive surrounding enmity, clearly traceable in the mythological variations concerning Medea, Pythagoras, Homer, and his successors. The author demonstrates that the cyclic corpus establishes a unique semantic interplay between friendship and enmity that retains cultural significance in later phases of ancient philosophical thought або, для більш формального академічного стилю: in subsequent stages of ancient philosophical discourse

In conclusion, the article demonstrates that the notion of friendship in the cyclic corpus transcends the private emotional sphere, emerging as an essential tool of cultural transmission, epistemological continuity, and normative legitimation of knowledge. Through the lens of philia, the author traces moral topos and the genealogy of intellectual communities of the time, in which friendship functions as a structural condition of

philosophical communication, the preservation of poetic canon, and the formation of an archaic model of truth.

Keywords: *cyclic epic, friendship, enmity, philia, Greek archaic period, early Greek literature, semantics.*

ІДЕЯ ДРУЖБИ І ВОРОЖНЕЧІ У «КІКЛІЧНОМУ КОРПУСІ»: ОСОБЛИВОСТІ І СПЕЦИФІКА СЕМАНТИКИ

Віталій Едуардович Туренко, vitali_turenko@knu.ua,

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0572-9119>

д-р філос. наук, ст. науковий співробітник,

Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка

Стаття присвячена аналізу понять дружби (φιλία, φιλότης, ἑταῖρος) і ворожнечі (ἔχθος, ἔρις, νεῖκος) у фрагментах кікличного епосу як ключових семантичних категорій архаїчної грецької культури. Автор показує, що ці поняття функціонують не лише як мотиви сюжетного розвитку, але й як концепти, які репрезентують соціальну структуру, легітимацію знання, пам'яті та авторитету в межах героїчного і натурфілософського дискурсу. Дружба виявляється багатовимірною: вона варіюється від героїчної гетерії (бойового побратимства) до освітньо-наставницької моделі, а також може бути інструментом риторичної маніпуляції або навіть прикриттям ворожнечі. Особливий акцент зроблено на постаті Креофіла як фігури, що поєднує гомерівську спадщину з пізнішими філософськими традиціями через мотивацію φιλίας.

Аналіз фрагментів демонструє амбівалентність соціальної близькості в архаїчній думці: родинність, дружба й гостинність можуть мати як конструктивний, так і деструктивний потенціал. У текстах кікличного корпусу розгортається динаміка переходу від справжньої φιλίας до зрадливої оточуючої ворожнечі, що особливо яскраво простежується у варіаціях міфів про Медею, Піфагора, Гомера і його наступників. Автор доводить, що кікличний корпус формує унікальну семантичну гру між дружбою і ворожнечею, яка зберігає культурне значення і в пізніших етапах античної філософії.

У підсумку, стаття засвідчує, що поняття дружби в кікличному корпусі виходить за межі приватної емоційної сфери, перетворюючись на важливий інструмент культурної трансляції, епістемологічної спадкоємності й нормативної легітимації знання. Крізь призму φιλίας автор простежує не лише моральну топіку, але й історію становлення інтелектуальних спільнот доби, де дружба постає як

структурна умова філософської комунікації, збереження поетичного канону й формування архаїчної форми істини.

Ключові слова: кікличний епос, дружба, ворожнеча, φιλία, грецька архаїка, ранньогрецька література, семантика.

Purpose of the study

The relevance of the topic stems from the growing interest within contemporary humanities in the primordial forms of social and moral conceptualizations embedded in the archaic texts of the Greek tradition. Epic poetry – especially the texts of the Cyclic corpus – functions as a reconstruction of mythical events and a repository of fundamental notions such as community, honor, and solidarity. These texts preserve early models of social cohesion, mechanisms of alliance formation, and expressions of enmity that would later inform the conceptual foundations of ancient political philosophy, ethics, and legal thought.

The primary sources for this study are based on the two-volume critical edition of the fragments of the Cyclic corpus published by De Gruyter [*Early Greek Epic*, 2017, 2022].

Consequently, **the aim of our article** is to demonstrate that in the archaic era, friendship functioned not only as an emotional or interpersonal category but also served as a cultural code that shaped social and moral norms, and to explore how the concept of φιλίας provided the foundation for the formation of intellectual communities that underpinned pre-Socratic philosophical thought.

Research findings

It should be noted from the outset that, although the preserved fragments of the Cyclic poets do not prioritize the themes of friendship and enmity, the way these phenomena are conceptualized in this early stratum of Greek literature serves as a kind of “bridge” between the Homeric epic and pre-Socratic philosophy.

Our analysis begins with the fragments attributed to Creophylus. In the first of these, we read the following [Early Greek epic, 2022, p. 13]:

<p>ὁ γὰρ Κρεώφυλος, ὃ Σώκρατες, ἴσως, ὁ τοῦ Ὀμήρου ἑταῖρος, τοῦ ὀνόματος ἂν γελοιότερος ἔτι πρὸς παιδείαν φανείη, εἰ τὰ λεγόμενα περὶ Ὀμήρου ἀληθῆ. λέγεται γὰρ ὡς πολλή τις ἀμέλεια περὶ αὐτὸν ἦν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ</p>	<p>For Kreophylos, Socrates, the friend of Homer, would perhaps be even more ridiculous than his name with respect to culture and education, if what is said about Homer is true. For it is reported that Homer was much</p>
--	--

ἐκείνου ὅτε ἔζη.	neglected during his own lifetime by that man (i.e. Kreophylos)
------------------	---

This passage underscores that friendship in the Cyclic and post-Homeric tradition is not unambiguously positive: it may be subject to irony, deconstruction, or reinterpretation in light of behavior that contradicts the expectations associated with a “friend”. Accordingly, this example reveals the unstable boundary between *philia* and *ameleia*, between the title of a friend and the actual disposition or conduct. Here, the idea of friendship emerges as a semantically charged space for the critique of social norms, which is relevant both for the heroic narratives of the Cyclic corpus and for philosophical literature. Although Creophylus is mentioned as a friend, his figure becomes emblematic of a counterexample to genuine friendship, allowing us to interpret such figures as instruments for semantically refining the boundaries between friendship and enmity within the cultural consciousness of the ancient Greeks.

A kind of continuation of this reflection on the meaning of friendship and the role of the friend is found in another fragment attributed to Creophylus [Early Greek epic 2022, p. 15]:

Κρεώφυλος, Ἀστυκλέους, Χίος ἢ Σάμιος, ἐποποιός. τινὲς δὲ αὐτὸν ἱστόρησαν Ὅμηρου γαμβρὸν ἐπὶ θυγατρὶ. οἱ δὲ φίλον μόνον γεγονέναι αὐτὸν Ὅμηρου λέγουσι. καὶ ὑποδεξάμενον Ὅμηρον λαβεῖν παρ’ αὐτοῦ τὸ ποίημα τὴν τῆς Οἰχαλίας ἄλωσιν.	Kreophylos, son of Astykses, Chian or Samian, epic poet. Some related that he was Homer’s son-in-law, whereas others say that he was only Homer’s friend, and that after offering Homer hospitality he received from him the poem The Capture of Oichalia.
---	--

First, it should be noted that this fragment contains essential biographical material concerning Creophylus – a figure associated with both the Homeric tradition and Cyclic poetry. On the one hand (τινὲς δὲ αὐτὸν ἱστόρησαν Ὅμηρου γαμβρὸν ἐπὶ θυγατρὶ), he is portrayed as a relative of Homer, thus introducing a genealogical myth as a form of legitimizing succession. On the other hand (οἱ δὲ φίλον μόνον γεγονέναι αὐτῷ Ὅμηρου λέγουσι), there exists an alternative version that lowers the status from kinship to friendship. Yet even here, the designation *philos* carries significant weight in the context of authorship, tradition, and textual transmission.

At the same time, one should emphasize the presence of the act of hospitality (*xenia*) and its connection to the phenomenon of authorship since it was precisely this

act that served as the basis for the transmission of the poem. Significantly, in both the classical and archaic Greek worlds, *xenia* operated as a moral imperative and a foundational component of the social order.

It is, therefore, logical to conclude that the term *ξένος* cannot be rendered into modern languages with precision – except, perhaps, in context. The word is essentially untranslatable because it encompasses several distinct dimensions that, for the ancient Greeks, were integrated within the figure of the *guest*:

1. The *foreigner*: a stranger, outsider, barbarian, or mercenary;
2. The *traveler*: a passerby or newcomer;
3. The *strange one*: an unfamiliar, eccentric, alienated, or detached individual;
4. And yet, simultaneously, it refers to one bound by the ties of hospitality – a guest-friend. [Morozova 2024, p. 232]

Concurrently, *philia* functions as a bridge between personal relationships and authorial status, rendering it a key semantic concept in the Greek understanding of authorship. This fragment suggests that, within the Cyclic corpus, friendship and kinship function as interchangeable categories that confer legitimacy upon claims to authorship, textual authority, and cultural memory. Thus, in this passage, *philia* is not merely an ethical or psychological category but rather a rhetorical and semantic construct used to justify belonging to the epic tradition. This is fundamental to the Cyclic corpus: friendship or enmity does not merely describe interpersonal relations but redirects authority, memory, and even the canonical status of a text.

The semantics and conceptual scope of “friendship” are further expanded in another fragment of Creophylus, where the following is stated [Early Greek epic 2022, p. 19]:

<p>ὑποφουμένης δὲ ἄρτι τῆς Πολυκράτους τυραννίδος περὶ ὀκτωκαιδέκατον μάλιστα ἔτος γεγονῶς προοράμενός τε οἷ χωρήσει καὶ ὡς ἐμπόδιος ἔσται τῇ αὐτοῦ προθέσει καὶ τῇ ἀντὶ πάντων αὐτῶι σπουδαζομένηι φιλομαθείαι, νύκτωρ λαθὼν πάντας μετὰ τοῦ Ἑρμοδάμαντος μὲν τὸ ὄνομα, Κρεοφυλείου (sic) δὲ ἐπικαλουμένου, ὃς ἐλέγετο Κρεοφύλου (sic) ἀπόγονος εἶναι, Ὅμηρου ξένου τοῦ ποιητοῦ <οὔδῃ δοκεῖ></p>	<p>But after he (sc. Pythagoras) became eighteen years old, at the time when Polykrates' tyranny was beginning to grow, foreseeing both the direction it will take and that it will be an impediment to his purpose and love for knowledge, which he was pursuing with all his attention, he left unnoticed by all in the night with someone whose name was Hermodamas but was called 'Kreophylean', and who claimed to be</p>
---	--

γενέσθαι φίλος καὶ διδάσκαλος τῶν ἀπάντων, μετὰ τούτου πρὸς τὸν Φερεκίδην διεπόρθμευε καὶ πρὸς Ἀναξίμανδρον τὸν φυσικὸν καὶ πρὸς Θαλῆν εἰς Μίλητον, καὶ παραγενόμενος πρὸς ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἀνὰ μέρος οὕτως ὠμίλησεν, ὥστε πάντας αὐτὸν ἀγαπᾶν καὶ τὴν φύσιν αὐτοῦ θαυμάζειν καὶ ποιεῖσθαι τῶν λόγων κοινῶν.	a descendant of Kreophylos, who seemed to have been friend and teacher in all matters of the poet Homer, who had been his guest. Together with this man (sc. Hermodamas) he went to Anaximander the natural philosopher and to Thales of Miletos. After doing so he spent time alternately with each of them in such a way that all of them loved him and admired his nature and let him partake of their teachings.
---	--

This fragment is a particularly valuable source for analyzing the semantics of friendship and enmity in the archaic Greek discourse while also illustrating a ritualized model of knowledge transmission framed through *philia* – a concept encompassing interpersonal relations as well as deeper cultural and ethical dimensions. The episode concerns the biography of Pythagoras, who departs from Samos to escape the tyranny of Polycrates and secretly leaves the city by night in the company of Hermodamas, who is referred to as a "Creophylean" – a descendant of that very Creophylus, "friend and teacher of Homer." In this fragment, Homer appears as a guest (*xenos*) in the house of Creophylus, which, within the Greek worldview, implies a profound sense of mutual responsibility and respect (*xenia*). This is yet another dimension of functional friendship, grounded in an ethical-ritual norm.

At the same time, his "descendant" Hermodamas (ὁ ἐλεγχθεὶς Κρεωφύλειος) is presented not merely as a bearer of a name but as the embodiment of a genealogy of knowledge and friendship. Such a "lineage-based" construction forms a sacralized chain of wisdom transmission in which *philia* constitutes the foundation of an educational and ethical continuum. In the ancient context, the phrase "*friend and teacher*" (φίλος καὶ διδάσκαλος) is not simply a compound designation but verges on tautology: within the epistemology of the archaic era, friendship is a necessary precondition for authentic teaching. This type of philosophical *philia* would later be echoed in Plato (e.g., in the *Lysis* or *Phaedrus*).

This passage illustrates a specific semantic model of friendship in the Cyclic and post-Cyclic traditions, where *philia* operates not merely as an interpersonal category, but as an institutional mechanism for the transmission of knowledge, authority, and status. Indeed, *philia* represents an affective state that arises from

sustained interpersonal closeness. He adopts anthropological terminology and defines it as an “achieved relationship,” that is, a relationship that does not exist by virtue of natural, familial bonds. By contrast, an ‘ascribed relationship’ is one that is based on status and can be passed down from generation to generation (e.g., in family relationships) [Kremmydas 2023, p. 4].

At the same time, when speaking of Pythagoras, we observe here the motif of flight from tyranny as a symbolic transition from *echthra* (hostility) to *philia* (friendship). The beginning of the fragment has a distinct political dimension: the philosopher leaves the city due to the threat of tyranny, which poses a danger to *philosophia*. In this context, tyranny is associated with *neikos* – a form of destructive enmity that stands in stark contrast to the community of scholars founded upon *philia*. It is precisely this opposition – between a form of power that obstructs truth and a fellowship that seeks it – that constitutes the ethical core of epistemic friendship.

Thus, the fragment presents a positive model of friendship as an ethical and cognitive alliance that resists the hostile sphere of tyranny, apathy, or knowledge divorced from morality. This third fragment is particularly valuable for philological analysis and is directly relevant to the investigation of the theme of friendship and enmity within the Cyclic corpus. It features a descendant of Creophylus, representing a canonical line of transmission within the poetic and philosophical tradition – beginning with Homer, through Creophylus and Hermodamas, and finally to Pythagoras himself. This lineage maps a trajectory from the epic tradition to pre-Socratic natural philosophy.

This fragment illustrates that *philia* is not merely a private or emotional experience but a semiotic carrier of culture and a means of legitimizing knowledge. Within it:

- philosophical friendship transmits not only texts but also the ethos of thinking;
- the poetic tradition (through Creophylus as Homer’s heir) is interwoven with natural philosophy;
- the image of the friend functions as a transmitter of authority.

Such a conception did not go unnoticed by the philosophers of ancient Greece. These relationships “regulated not only what we moderns would call friendships between companions, but also relationships with blood relatives, fellow citizens, and even the gods. They were ideals in the sense that they were overtly normative: they prescribed what friendships should be like, what they should be based on, and who could be considered true friends.” [Baltzly, D., & Eliopoulos 2009, p. 50].

Finally, the fourth fragment associated with Creophylus attests to the following [Early Greek epic 2022, p. 22-23]:

<p>Δίδυμος δὲ (p. 244 Schmidt) ἐναντιοῦται τούτῳ (sc. Παρμενίσκῳ fr. 13 Breithaupt) καὶ παρατίθεται τὰ Κρεωφύλου ἔχοντα οὕτως: τὴν γὰρ Μήδειαν Οἰχαλίας ἄλωσις λέγεται διατρίβουσαν ἐν Κορίνθῳ τὸν ἄρχοντα τότε τῆς πόλεως Κρέοντα ἀποκτεῖναι φαρμάκοις. δέισασαν δὲ τοὺς φίλους καὶ τοὺς συγγενεῖς αὐτοῦ φυγεῖν εἰς Ἀθήνας, τοὺς δὲ υἱούς, ἐπεὶ νεώτεροι ὄντες οὐκ ἠδύνατο ἀκολουθεῖν, ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν τῆς Ἀκραίας Ἥρας καθίσει νομίσασαν τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν φροντεῖν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν. τοὺς δὲ Κρέοντος οἰκείους ἀποκτείναντας αὐτοὺς διαδοῦναι λόγον ὅτι ἢ Μήδεια οὐ μόνον τὸν Κρέοντα ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἑαυτῆς παῖδας ἀπέκτεινε.</p>	<p>Didymos offers a different version from him (sc. Parmeniskos) and cites Kreophylos' version in the following manner. For it is said that, while Medeia was in Corinth, she killed with poison Kreon, who at that time was the leader of the city. Fearing his friends and relatives, she fled to Athens, but she placed as suppliants her sons, who could not follow her because of their young age, by the altar of Hera Akraia, thinking that their father would see to their safety. Those who were close to Kreon killed them and spread a rumor that Medeia killed not only Kreon but also her own children.</p>
--	--

This fragment represents an exceptionally compelling example of the variational tradition in Greek literature concerning the myth of Medea. It features the figures of the *friend* (*philos*) and the *household members* (*oikeioi*), who may become agents of conflict – even to the point of falsifying the narrative (*hyposkepsamenous logon*). As a result, in the archaic Greek imagination, the boundary between friendship and enmity is unstable – the "inner circle" can transform into a source of mortal threat. Thus, it is not surprising that *philo*i (friends) and *syngeneis* (relatives) emerge here as hostile forces. Remarkably, this rare construction portrays *friends* and *kin* not as allies but as the very source of danger, forcing Medea into flight.

This illustrates that in the archaic conception of social proximity, the terms *friend* and *relative* possess an ambivalent semantics – they denote not only intimacy but also a potential source of betrayal, jealousy, and revenge. The narrative even includes manipulative distortions, wherein the friendly circle (*oikeioi* – those closest, of the household) not only murders Medea's children but also spreads disinformation, claiming that she was the perpetrator. In the semantic field of *philia*, this marks the transformation of friendship into enmity through deception – an illustrative case of

anti-philosophical behavior in the Platonic sense of friendship as genuine communal life.

In this way:

- friendship becomes a mask for enmity;
- enmity gains public and legitimate expression through *logos* (opinion or discourse), i.e., through narrative control.

In the work of another representative of the Cyclic corpus, Minyas, we encounter a rather mystical, chthonic fragment that reveals new dimensions of friendship in the consciousness of archaic Greeks. In the first fragment, this epic poet writes the following [Early Greek epic 2017, p. 297]:

<p>τὸ δὲ ἕτερον μέρος τῆς γραφῆς ... ἔστιν Ὀδυσσεὺς καταβεβηκῶς ἐς τὸν Ἄϊδην ὀνομαζόμενον ... ἔχει δὲ οὕτω τὰ ἐς τὴν γραφήν. ὕδωρ εἶναι ποταμὸς ἔοικε, δῆλα ὡς ὁ Ἀχέρων, καὶ κάλαμοί τε ἐν αὐτῶι πεφυκότες καὶ ἀμυδρὰ οὕτω δὴ τι τὰ εἶδη τῶν ἰχθύων· σκιάς μᾶλλον ἢ ἰχθύς εἰκάσεις. καὶ ναῦς ἐστὶν ἐν τῶι ποταμῶι καὶ ὁ πορθμεὺς ἐπὶ ταῖς κώπαις. ἐπηκολούθησε δὲ ὁ Πολύγνωτος ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν ποιήσει Μινυάδι· ἔστι γὰρ δὴ ἐν τῆι Μινυάδι ἐς Θησέα ἔχοντα καὶ Πειρίθουν· ἐνθ' ἦτοι νέα μὲν κεκράμβατον, ἣν ὁ γεραῖός πορθμεὺς ἦγε Χάρων, οὐκ ἔλλαβον ἐνδοθεν ὄρμον. ἐπὶ τούτῳ οὖν καὶ Πολύγνωτος γέροντα ἔγραψεν ἤδη τῆι ἡλικίαι τὸν Χάρωνα.</p>	<p>The other part of the picture ... shows Odysseus, who has descended into what is called Hades ... What is depicted is as follows. There is water in the like of a river, being clear that it refers to Acheron, with reeds growing in it and fish the forms of which are very faint; they look like shadows rather than fish. And there is a boat in the river and the ferry-man at the oars. It seems to me that Polygnotos followed the poem Minyas. For in the Minyas there are verses referring to Theseus and Peirithoos: <i>There the boat that the dead board, which the old ferryman Charon steered, they did not find at its berth.</i> For this reason, then, Polygnotos too painted Charon as already advanced in age.</p>
--	---

This fragment – a depiction of Odysseus's descent into Hades, accompanied by elements from the epic *Minyad* – serves as an exceptional source for analyzing the semantics of enmity and friendship within the Cyclic corpus, particularly in the context of the underworld, where friendship and hostility often intertwine in symbolic forms. The passage describes an otherworldly river resembling Acheron, inhabited by

indistinct figures of fish that resemble shadows (*skiai*) more than real beings (*ichthys*). This is highly symbolic: in the realm of the dead, even natural entities lack fullness – directly evoking the loss of friendship, connection, and corporeality. The river, as a liminal space, and the *skiai* – markers of absence or remnants – can be interpreted as a semantic antithesis to the bonds sustained by friendship among the living.

Simultaneously, within the context of the friendship between Theseus and Pirithous, alluded to in the phrase “*Minyadi es Thēsea echonta kai Peirithoun*”, we encounter the archetype of heroic friendship expressed through joint action even in death. In both versions of the myth, they descend together into the underworld. In this case, friendship emerges as a unifying force that preserves subjectivity even in the shadowy realm of Hades – semantically opposed to the state of the fish-shadows.

It is particularly noteworthy that the Cyclic tradition (*Minyad*) forms the conceptual basis for literary and imagistic reconstructions of the underworld. This testifies to the enduring semantic value of friendship in the archaic consciousness – one that survives even death.

Finally, in the last fragment important for our analysis, from the *Naupactia*, we observe the following [Early Greek epic 2017, p. 358]:

δὴ τότ' ἄρ' Αἰήτηι πόθον ἔμβαλε δῖ' Ἄφροδίτη Εὐρυλύτης φιλότῃτι μιγήμεναι, ἧς ἀλόχοιο, κηδομένη φρεσὶν ἧσιν, ὅπως μετ' ἄεθλον Ἰήσων νοστήσει οἰκόνδε σὺν ἀγγεμάχοις ἐτάροισιν.	Then divine Aphrodite cast desire upon Aietes to unite in love with his wife Eurylyte. She was concerned inside her mind with how Jason, after his trial, would return home with his combative comrades
--	--

This fragment contains a synthesis of erotic force, concern for the heroes, and a profound thread of comradely solidarity, classically expressed through the term *hetairoi*. The phrase *Aphroditē pathos embale* has clear Homeric roots (cf. *Il.* 3.139), where the goddess of love governs not merely desire but often the very dynamics of narrative tension. This is closely linked with a philologically significant “overloading” of the term *philotes* – encompassing love, closeness, and unity. In this case, however, the passion is not imposed upon a young hero, but upon King Aeëtes for his wife, Eurylyte, which may be interpreted as a stabilization of the familial union—a counterpoint to the heroic turbulence of the Argonauts’ voyage. The central semantic node here is *philotes*, which in the epic context covers a broad spectrum of meaning: it refers to bodily intimacy, alliance, and the fusion of souls.

In this context, it is relevant to recall the use of this lexeme in *Iliad* 3.73, where the expression *philotēta tamnō* ("to make friendship") denotes an agreement between the Trojans and the Greeks – that is, a pact between warring states. Notably, the noun *philia* is absent from Homer; instead, *philotes* is employed, a term which denotes not only the bond of love between man and woman but also hospitality and the sacred ties of alliance [Konstantinopoulos 2023, p. 200]. Це якраз те, що пише Е. Бенвеніст, підкреслюючи, що філія не завжди означає дійсно інтимні взаємозв'язки між людьми в сенсі довіри [Benvenist 2016, p.275].

At the same time, we encounter here a form of heroic friendship – *angemachoi hetairoi*, "together with their battle-companions" – a high-register Argonautic term in which *hetairoi* are not merely companions but comrades-in-arms, members of the same *phyle*, united by the principle of hoplitic solidarity. The epithet *angemachois* (lit. "those who fight side by side in formation") introduces a military-ethical connotation of friendship, linked to discipline, mutual trust, and shared risk.

This fragment offers yet another manifestation of the ambivalent semantics of friendship in the Cyclic corpus:

- *Philotes* between man and woman (Aeëtes and Eurylyte) represents a domestic, stabilizing type of bond;
- *Hetairoi* signify an extra-domestic, martial, and heroic form of friendship that binds a group of men together in journey, trial, and battle.

There exists a tension between these two modes of connection: one draws the hero back toward peace and home, the other drives him forward into conflict and ordeal. This tension lies at the core of many narratives within the Cyclic epic and points to the semantic branching of friendship between familial and heroic loyalties.

The fragment confirms that friendship in the Cyclic corpus operates along two principal semantic axes:

1. Erotic/familial *philotes*, which stabilizes the subject within the *oikos*;
2. Heroic/martial *heteria* pulls the hero beyond the private sphere and casts him into the turmoil of conflict;

Both forms of friendship possess normative force, yet their trajectories diverge. This divergence precisely gives rise to both the heroic feats and the tragic outcomes that structure the Argonautic cycle.

Conclusions

In summary, the analysis reveals that the concepts of friendship and enmity in the Cyclic corpus are not only key social and moral constructs of archaic Greek consciousness, but also deeply semanticized structures that shaped perceptions of

authority, memory, canonicity, and even truth. The polysemy of terms such as *philia*, *hetairoi*, *philotes*, *ameleia*, *echthos*, and others reflects a broad spectrum of meanings – from martial solidarity and pedagogical mentorship to betrayal, manipulation, and latent conflict. In this sense, friendship in the epic discourse of the archaic period functions not merely as an interpersonal category but as a universal code of social legitimacy, while enmity acquires a symbolic dimension as the force that destroys norms, memory, and integrity.

Particular attention should be paid to how friendship is represented in the Cyclic corpus as a transhistorical mechanism – from Homer and Creophylus to Hermodamas and Pythagoras – which not only structures the transmission of knowledge but also establishes the normative framework of epistemic legitimacy. This transforms *philia* into something more than an emotional category: it becomes a semiotic marker of authority and cultural memory, passed down across generations.

At the same time, the emergence of false friends, the semantic ambivalence of kinship and proximity, and the transformation of friendship into a mask for enmity all point to the complex nature of social structures in the ancient Greek world, where even the closest ties could become sources of danger, distortion of truth, or moral collapse. Thus, the analysis of fragments from the Cyclic corpus allows us to see how, in archaic Greek culture, friendship and enmity function not only as thematic poles but as the foundation of a semantic game that continues to hold significant heuristic and interpretive value today.

References:

1. Baltzly, D., & Eliopoulos, N. (2009). The classical ideals of friendship. In B. Caine (Ed.), *Friendship: A history, critical histories of subjectivity and culture* (pp. 1–65). Routledge.
2. Benveniste, É. (2016). *Philos*. In E. Palmer (Trans.), *Dictionary of Indo-European concepts and society* (pp. 273–288). Hau Books.
3. Konstantinopoulos, V. L. (2023). Friendship in the relations between the cities in Thucydides. In *Friendship in ancient Greek thought and literature* (pp. 196–211). Brill.
4. Kremmydas, C. (2023). Introduction: Exploring *philia* in ancient Greek thought and literature. In *Friendship in ancient Greek thought and literature* (pp. 1–30). Brill.
5. Morozova, D. (2024). Chuzhyj [The Stranger]. In *Yevropejs'kyj slovnyk filosofij: Ukrains'kyj kontekst [European dictionary of philosophies: The Ukrainian context]* (Vol. 5, pp. 232–237). Kyiv: Dukh i Litera. (In Ukr.).
6. Tsagalis, C. (Ed.). (2017). *Early Greek epic fragments I: Antiquarian and genealogical epic*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
7. Tsagalis, C. (Ed.). (2022). *Early Greek epic fragments II: Epics on Herakles: Kreophylos and Peisandros*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.