A COMMENTARY ON
HOMER'S ODYSSEY

VOLUME I
INTRODUCTION AND BOOKS I–VIII

ALFRED HEUBECK
STEPHANIE WEST
J. B. HAINSWORTH

CLARENDON PRESS · OXFORD
1988

18/88/14961(3)-1

Oxford University Press, Walton Street, Oxford OX2 6DP
Oxford New York Toronto
Delhi Bombay Calcutta Madras Karachi
Petaling Jaya Singapore Hong Kong Tokyo
Nairobi Dar es Salaam Cape Town
Melbourne Auckland
and associated companies in
Berlin Ibadan

Oxford is a trade mark of Oxford University Press

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press, New York

Originally published in Italian under the title Omero: Odissea
© Fondazione Lorenzo Valla

English edition © Oxford University Press 1988

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of Oxford University Press

Universitätsbibliothek
Freie Universität Berlin

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey.
Vol. 1: Introduction and books I–VIII
1. Homer, Odyssey
I. Heubeck, Alfred II. West, Stephanie
III. Hainsworth, J. B. IV. Homer, Odyssey
V. Omero, Odissea. English
883'.01 PA4167
ISBN 0–19–814037–1

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Heubeck, Alfred, 1914–1987
A commentary on Homer's Odyssey.
Revised English version of: Omero: Odissea.
Bibliography: p.
Includes index.
Contents: v. 1. Introduction and Books I–VIII.
1. Homer. Odyssey. 2. Odysseus (Greek mythology)
in literature. I. West, Stephanie. II. Hainsworth,
J. B. (John Bryan) III. Homer. Odyssey. IV. Title.
PA4167.H48 1988 883'.01 87–18509
ISBN 0–19–814037–1 (v. 1)

Set by H Charlesworth & Co Ltd, Huddersfield
Printed in Great Britain
at the University Printing House, Oxford
by David Stanford
Printer to the University

PREFACE

This volume is the first of three that aim to provide an introduction and commentary to the *Odyssey*. It is a revised version, without text and translation, of the first two parts of the six-volume edition commissioned by the Fondazione Lorenzo Valla and published by Mondadori. In keeping with the *Odyssey*'s wide geographical range this undertaking has involved Homerists of five nationalities, from both sides of the Atlantic Ocean, and it is hardly surprising if we have approached our task in different ways. Inevitably there is diversity of opinion and variation in emphasis; we do not think that, in principle, this lack of uniformity calls for apology, and, though we realize that at first it may seem disconcerting, we believe that a multifarious approach will in the end prove more stimulating than confusing.

There has been no complete commentary in English on the *Odyssey* since W. B. Stanford's compendious edition, first published forty years ago; a fuller treatment seems intrinsically desirable, and the intervening years have, in any case, seen major developments in Homeric scholarship on many fronts. The Valla commentary was accompanied by the luxury of our own text, but economy and the convenience of the user, we decided, would be better served if the reader were to have the text of the *Odyssey* before him in a separate volume; the lemmata of the commentary have accordingly been taken from T. W. Allen's Oxford Classical Text (second edition, 1917), but this should not present any difficulty for anyone using a different edition.

For the spelling of Greek proper names we have generally adopted the most familiar form.

αἱ δεύτεραί πως φροντίδες σοφώτεραι. In revising our manuscript we have been able to take advantage of the comments of reviewers and friends, and we welcome this opportunity to thank them; we are especially indebted to Professor J. Bremmer, Dr I. de Jong, Professor G. S. Kirk, Professor H. van Thiel, and Professor M. M. Willcock.

Our thanks are also due to the Delegates of the Press for accepting a work which, owing to its unconventional genesis, might be expected to cause peculiar problems. We should like to record our admiration for the unfailing courtesy and efficiency with which the staff of the Press have met all difficulties. It is a particular pleasure to thank John Cordy and John Waś, whose patient guidance has piloted our *Odyssey* from Rome to Oxford, and Daphne Nash, the Press's vigilant and forbearing copy-editor.

We deeply regret that Alfred Heubeck, the leader of our θίασος, did not live to see the publication of this volume.

Oxford
August 1987

J.B.H.
S.R.W.

CONTENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS viii

INTRODUCTION TO HOMER'S ODYSSEY
- General Introduction (A.H.) 3
- The Epic Dialect (J.B.H.) 24
- The Transmission of the Text (S.W.) 33

COMMENTARY
- Books I–IV (S.W.) 51
- Books V–VIII (J.B.H.) 249

INDEX 387

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations used for ancient authors correspond to those employed in the ninth edition of Liddell and Scott, *Greek–English Lexicon* (LSJ) and in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, for periodicals to those of *L'Année philologique*.

Editions of the *Odyssey* referred to in the Commentary:

Allen	T. W. Allen, *Homeri Opera*, iii^{2}, iv^{2} (Oxford Classical Text), Oxford, 1917, 1919.
Ameis–Hentze–Cauer	*Homers Odyssee* f. den Schulgebrauch erklärt von K. F. Ameis u. C. Hentze, bearbeitet von P. Cauer, i 1^{14}, 2^{13}, ii 1^{9}, 2^{10}, Leipzig, 1920, 1940, 1928, 1925.
Heubeck*	*Omero, Odissea, libri ix–xii; xxiii–xxiv: Introduzione, testo e commento* a cura di Alfred Heubeck, Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, Rome, 1983, 1987.
Hoekstra*	*Omero, Odissea, libri xiii–xvi: Introduzione, testo e commento* a cura di Arie Hoekstra, Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, Rome, 1984.
Merry–Riddell	W. W. Merry and J. Riddell, *Homer's* Odyssey*: Books i–xii*, Oxford, 1886.
Russo*	*Omero, Odissea, libri xvii–xx: Introduzione, testo e commento* a cura di Joseph Russo, Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, Rome, 1985.
Stanford	W. B. Stanford, *The* Odyssey *of Homer*^{2}, Macmillan, London, 1959.
von der Mühll	P. von der Mühll, *Homeri Odyssea*^{3}, Basel, 1961 (Stuttgart, 1984).

Works mentioned by abbreviated title:

Apthorp, *Evidence*	M. J. Apthorp, *The Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer*, Heidelberg, 1980.
Archaeologia	*Archaeologia Homerica: Die Denkmäler u. das frühgriechische Epos*, ed. F. Matz and H. G. Buchholz, Göttingen, 1967.
Arend, *Scenen*	W. Arend, *Die typischen Scenen bei Homer*, Berlin, 1933.

---

* The present volume is the first of three in the English edition (introductions and commentary only); the second (Books ix–xvi) and third (Books xvii–xxiv) volumes are forthcoming (also from OUP).

Austin, *Archery*	N. Austin, *Archery at the Dark of the Moon: Poetic Problems in Homer's* Odyssey, Berkeley–Los Angeles, 1975.
Bechtel, *Lexilogus*	F. Bechtel, *Lexilogus zu Homer*, Halle, 1914.
Besslich, *Schweigen*	S. Besslich, *Schweigen–Verschweigen–Übergehen: Die Darstellung des Unausgesprochenen in der Odyssee*, Heidelberg, 1966.
Bethe, *Homer*	E. Bethe, *Homer: Dichtung und Sage*, i–iii, Leipzig–Berlin, 1914, 1922, 1929^{2}.
—— *Odyssee*	vol. ii of the above.
Bolling, *Evidence*	G. M. Bolling, *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer*, Oxford, 1925.
Burkert, *Religion*	W. Burkert, *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, trans. John Raffan, Oxford, 1985.
Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*	P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris, 1968–80.
—— *Grammaire*	—— *Grammaire homérique*, i^{3}, ii^{2}, Paris, 1958, 1963.
Clay, *Wrath*	J. S. Clay, *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the* Odyssey, Princeton, 1983.
Companion	A. J. B. Wace and F. H. Stubbings (eds.), *A Companion to Homer*, London, 1962.
Delebecque, *Télémaque*	E. Delebecque, *Télémaque et la structure de l'Odyssée*, Annales de la Faculté des Lettres d'Aix-en-Provence, NS xxi, 1958.
Denniston, *Particles*	J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*^{2}, Oxford, 1954.
Dindorf, *Scholia*	G. Dindorf, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam*, Oxford, 1855.
Ebeling, *Lexicon*	H. Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum*, Leipzig, 1880–5.
Eisenberger, *Studien*	H. Eisenberger, *Studien zur Odyssee*, Wiesbaden, 1973.
Erbse, *Beiträge*	H. Erbse, *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Odyssee*, Berlin–New York, 1972.
Fehling, *Wiederholungsfiguren*	D. Fehling, *Die Wiederholungsfiguren u. ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias*, Berlin, 1969.
Fenik, Studies	B. Fenik, *Studies in the* Odyssey, *Hermes* Einzelschriften, xxx, Wiesbaden, 1974.
Finley, *World*	M. I. Finley, *The World of Odysseus* (second revised edn.), Harmondsworth, 1979.
Finsler, *Homer*	G. Finsler, *Homer* i. 1–2, ii, Leipzig, ^{2}1918, ^{3}1924.
Focke, *Odyssee*	F. Focke, *Die Odyssee*, Stuttgart–Berlin, 1943.
Fränkel, *Gleichnisse*	H. Fränkel, *Die homerischen Gleichnisse*, Göttingen, 1921.

Frisk, *GEW*	H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, 1954–73.
Germain, *Genèse*	G. Germain, *Genèse de l'Odyssée*, Paris, 1954.
Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death*	J. Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death*, Oxford, 1980.
Hainsworth, *Flexibility*	J. B. Hainsworth, *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*, Oxford, 1968.
Heubeck, *Dichter*	A. Heubeck, *Der Odyssee-Dichter und die Ilias*, Erlangen, 1954.
Hoekstra, *Modifications*	A. Hoekstra, *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes*, Amsterdam, 1965.
Hölscher, *Untersuchungen*	U. Hölscher, *Untersuchungen zur Form der Odyssee*, Leipzig, 1939.
Kirchhoff, *Odyssee*	A. Kirchhoff, *Die Homerische Odyssee und ihre Entstehung*, Berlin, 1879.
Kirk, *Commentary*	G. S. Kirk, *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*, i. *Books 1–4, Cambridge, 1985*.
—— *Songs*	—— *The Songs of Homer*, Cambridge, 1962.
Kühner–Gerth	R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, ii. *Satzlehre*^{3}, besorgt v. B. Gerth, Hanover etc., 1898–1904.
Kurt, *Fachausdrücke*	C. Kurt, *Seemännische Fachausdrücke bei Homer*, Göttingen, 1979.
Leaf, *Iliad*	W. Leaf, *The* Iliad^2, London, 1900–2.
Lesky, *Homeros*	A. Lesky, *Homeros*, *RE*, Supplementband xi, Stuttgart, 1967.
Leumann, *Wörter*	M. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter*, Basel, 1950.
LfgrE	*Lexicon des frühgriechischen Epos*, ed. B. Snell and H. Erbse, Göttingen, 1955– .
Lord, *Singer*	A. B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales*, Cambridge, Mass.–London, 1960.
Lorimer, *Monuments*	H. L. Lorimer, *Homer and the Monuments*, London, 1950.
Ludwich, *AHT*	A. Ludwich, *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik*, i, ii, Leipzig, 1884–5.
Marzullo, *Problema*	E. Marzullo, *Il problema omerico*^{2}, Milan–Naples, 1970.
Mattes, *Odysseus*	W. Mattes, *Odysseus bei den Phäaken*, Würzburg, 1958.
Meister, *Kunstsprache*	K. Meister, *Die homerische Kunstsprache*, Leipzig, 1921, repr. Darmstadt, 1966.
Merkelbach, *Untersuchungen*	R. Merkelbach, *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee*^{2}, Zetemata, ii, Munich, 1969.
Monro, *Homeric Dialect*	D. B. Monro, *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*^{2}, Oxford, 1891.

Moulton, *Similes*	C. Moulton, *Similes in the Homeric Poems*, Hypomnemata, xlix, Göttingen, 1977.
Nickau, *Untersuchungen*	K. Nickau, *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos*, Berlin, 1977.
Nilsson, *Geschichte*	M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*^{3}, i, Munich, 1967.
Onians, *Origins*	R. B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought*, Cambridge, 1951.
Pack^2	R. A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*^{2}, Ann Arbor, 1965.
Page, *Odyssey*	D. L. Page, *The Homeric* Odyssey, Oxford, 1955.
Palmer, *Interpretation*	L. R. Palmer, *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*, Oxford, 1963, 1969^2.
Parry, *Blameless Aegisthus*	Anne Amory Parry, *Blameless Aegisthus*, Leiden, 1973.
—— *Homeric Verse*	Adam M. Parry (ed.), *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*, Oxford, 1971.
RE	*Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, K. Mittelhaus, and K. Ziegler, Stuttgart, 1893– .
Risch, *Wortbildung*	E. Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*^{2}, Berlin, 1973.
Roscher, *Lexikon*	W. H. Roscher–K. Ziegler, *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen u. römischen Mythologie*, Leipzig, 1884–1937.
Rüter, *Odysseeinterpretationen*	K. Rüter, *Odysseeinterpretationen: Untersuchungen zum ersten Buch u. zur Phaiakis*, Hypomnemata, xix, Göttingen, 1969.
Ruijgh, *τε épique*	C. J. Ruijgh, *Autour de 'τε épique': Études sur la syntaxe grecque*, Amsterdam, 1971.
—— *Élément*	—— *L'Élément achéen dans la langue épique*, Assen, 1957.
Schadewaldt, *Welt*	W. Schadewaldt, *Von Homers Welt und Werk*^{4}, Stuttgart, 1965.
Schulze, *Quaestiones*	W. Schulze, *Quaestiones epicae*, Gütersloh, 1892.
Schwartz, *Odyssee*	E. Schwartz, *Die Odyssee*, Munich, 1924.
Schwyzer, *Grammatik*	E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, i–iii, Munich, 1939–53.
Severyns, *Homère*	A. Severyns, *Homère*, i^2, ii^2, iii, Brussels, 1944, 1946, 1948.
Shipp, *Studies*	G. P. Shipp, *Studies in the Language of Homer*^{2}, Cambridge, 1972.
Thompson, *Motif Index*	Stith Thompson, *Motif Index of Folk Literature*, Copenhagen, 1955–8.
Thornton, *People*	A. Thornton, *People and Themes in Homer's* Odyssey, London, 1970.

Touchefeu-Meynier, *Thèmes*	O. Touchefeu-Meynier, *Thèmes odysséens dans l'art antique*, Paris, 1968.
van der Valk, *Textual Criticism*	M. van der Valk, *Textual Criticism of the* Odyssey, Leiden, 1949.
van Leeuwen, *Enchiridium*	J. van Leeuwen, *Enchiridium dictionis epicae*, Leiden, 1918.
Ventris–Chadwick, *Documents*	M. Ventris–J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*², Cambridge, 1973.
von der Mühll, 'Odyssee'	P. von der Mühll, 'Odyssee', *RE*, Supplementband vii. 696–768, Stuttgart, 1940.
von Kamptz, *Personennamen*	H. von Kamptz, *Homerische Personennamen*, Göttingen, 1982.
Wackernagel, *Untersuchungen*	J. Wackernagel, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*, Göttingen, 1916.
Wathelet, *Traits*	P. Wathelet, *Les Traits éoliens dans la langue de l'épopée grecque*, Rome, 1970.
Webster, *Mycenae*	T. B. L. Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer*, London, 1958.
Werner, *H. u. ει vor Vokal*	R. Werner, *H u. ει vor Vokal bei Homer*, Fribourg, 1948.
Wilamowitz, *Heimkehr*	U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus*, Berlin, 1927.
—— *Untersuchungen*	—— *Homerische Untersuchungen*, Berlin, 1884.
Woodhouse, *Composition*	W. J. Woodhouse, *The Composition of Homer's* Odyssey, Oxford, 1930, repr. Oxford, 1969.
Wyatt, *Lengthening*	W. F. Wyatt, jun., *Metrical Lengthening in Homer*, Rome, 1969.

INTRODUCTION TO HOMER'S ODYSSEY

Alfred Heubeck's Introduction *was*
translated for this volume by
Yana Spence.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Alfred Heubeck

The two epic poems, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, which the ancient Greeks ascribed to a man named Homer, are the earliest examples of Greek poetry and thought we possess. They have shaped and influenced the whole development of Greek cultural life in all its varied aspects to an extent almost impossible to grasp today. The Greeks themselves were aware of this, adopting and honouring Homer as their instructor in every conceivable sphere of life; and later historians of Greek culture have been able to do no more than illustrate and confirm the fact. That the Homeric epic has also rightly held a position of unsurpassed esteem and influence in the history of Western thought can only be noted here in passing, as the primary object of this short introduction is to prepare the way for an understanding of the *Odyssey*, and little can be said about wider considerations.

Any attempt to understand a literary phenomenon of the distant past, that is, to discern behind the façade of the written word the individuality of the author, to grasp his intentions, and to identify his place in his own world, has unavoidable limitations. They are inherent in the conditions to which every interpreter of such a work is subject, namely his own position in space and time, and his own personality. Any statement about the nature and value, the subject-matter, and the importance of the Homeric epic is influenced by the point of view of the interpreter, which is in turn conditioned by his nationality and his cultural environment.

In view of all this it is not surprising that in the course of well over two thousand years of wrestling with the problem of Homer—debate has been continuous since at the latest the sixth century BC and is particularly lively today—opinions should have differed to a frightening extent. All a commentator can hope to achieve is to touch the periphery of the problem; he cannot reach its centre.

These considerations form the basis of our attempt here to elucidate Homer, and in particular the *Odyssey*. Some widely differing views will have to be mentioned, but the knowledge that no statement made about something which is ultimately impenetrable can avoid subjectivity gives one the right, even lays the duty upon one, to state the case openly for one's own position and not conceal it beneath the variety of other opinions. I shall therefore not merely report other views but will also put forward my own without shirking controversy where it is unavoidable.

It is obviously impossible to discuss everything that has been said in recent times about the *Odyssey*, considering the vast amount of material published by scholars on the central linguistic problems, not to mention the contributions to the better understanding of the poem made by linguistic and comparative studies, or by religious, mythological, mycenological, and historical research. There is another factor, too, which compels us to be brief and selective: the close relationship between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Because the problems raised by the two poems are similar, in fact to some extent the same, we have to keep the Trojan epic constantly in mind and not limit ourselves to the *Odyssey* alone.

In all the efforts of modern scholars to reach a proper understanding of the Homeric epics, the *Odyssey* has stood constantly in the shadow of the *Iliad*. This applies especially to a line of scholarship—somewhat arbitrarily summed up under the term 'Homeric analysis'—that has increasingly shaken the belief that both poems were the work of one poet, a belief which had endured almost unquestioned for some two thousand years. Homeric analysis began with a famous paper dealing exclusively with the *Iliad* by the Abbé François Hédelin d'Aubignac, published anonymously in 1715, long after the author's death in 1676.[1] Another work, also concerned solely with the *Iliad* and to some extent taking up the observations and conjectures of the Abbé, was the *Prolegomena ad Homerum* of F. A. Wolf, published in 1795. Its persuasive force was such that it started a movement the effects of which are still felt today. It is unnecessary to set out all the arguments by which Wolf and those who followed more or less faithfully in his footsteps tried to demonstrate that belief in the unity of the Homeric poems was ill-founded, or to list all the scholars involved or summarize their often widely differing conclusions. A rapid survey is available in books by G. Finsler[2] and J. Myres.[3]

Wolf had not worked on the *Odyssey* and it was only much later that it became the focal point of research, in the first instance by the great scholar G. Hermann[4] who believed that he recognized in it a combination of originally independent poems. In several articles published at about the same time as Hermann's book[5] K. L. Kayser expressed his conviction that in the poem as we have it a series of 'layers' can be isolated, and that these layers must be attributed to several successive poets. In his work we also find for the first time the notion of a 'redactor' who eventually combined these hypothetical thematically related poems into a single unit, the *Odyssey* as we know it.

In the chequered history of research on the *Iliad* the most diverse analytical solutions have been proposed, amongst which the so-called 'redactor hypothesis' is only one of many. In contrast, where the *Odyssey* is concerned, the concept of a final editor has predominated. Most scholars who were convinced by Kayser's pioneering work that the *Odyssey* must be explained analytically have argued in favour of this concept, whatever their differences in reconstructing the older poems and their sequence, and have thus understood the *Odyssey* as a consciously assembled unit. Where there are differences of opinion they occur mainly in the evaluation of this editor's poetic talent and extend over the whole range of possibilities: at one end of the scale he is seen as an incapable, uncritical bungler, at the other as a sensitive master of his art with a great poetic gift.

The redactor hypothesis also plays an important part in the ideas of A. Kirchhoff, who was the first scholar to treat the *Odyssey* comprehensively, making critical use of previous opinions and adding acute observations of his own.[6] His work is a landmark in the study of the *Odyssey*, and later research has found little to add to the critical observations on the text which served as the starting point for his analytical reasoning. It is only in the conclusions they have drawn from these observations that other scholars have differed from him.

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff[7] and E. Schwartz[8] in their seminal works on the *Odyssey* also accept the idea of a final redaction, although in very different ways, and modern analysis of the poem is indebted to them for the most important observations and suggestions since Kirchhoff.[9] Modern analysis in the true sense, however, begins with P. von der Mühll's valuable article 'Odyssee'[10] and continues with F. Focke,[11] E. Howald,[12]

---

[1] *Conjectures académiques ou dissertation sur* l'Iliade (Paris, 1715).

[2] *Homer* i. 1^{3}, 71–225 ('Die Homerkritik').

[3] *Homer and His Critics*, ed. D. H. F. Gray (London, 1958).

[4] *De interpolationibus Homeri* (Leipzig, 1832).

[5] Collected and published under the title *Homerische Abhandlungen* by L. Usener (Leipzig, 1881).

[6] *Odyssee* (Berlin, 1859); 2nd edn. 1879, with important additions. For the basic ideas and the importance of this work see Finsler, *Homer*, 145–7; A. Heubeck, *Die homerische Frage* (Darmstadt 1974), 8–9.

[7] *Untersuchungen*; *Heimkehr*.

[8] *Odyssee*.

[9] Reviewed by A. Heubeck, op. cit. 10–13.

[10] *RE*, Suppl. vii (1940), 696–768.

[11] *Odyssee*.

[12] *Der Dichter der Ilias* (Zürich, 1946), 166–81.

W. Schadewaldt,[13] W. Theiler,[14] R. Merkelbach,[15] and D. L. Page,[16] to name only the most important and influential. What characterizes most of these interpretations is the attempt to simplify the complex picture of the development of the *Odyssey* drawn in many earlier works. Von der Mühll and Focke, for instance, postulate only three poets. For von der Mühll the process began with poet 'A' as the creator of the 'Ur-Odyssey'; poet 'T' wrote a related shorter poem on the fortunes of Telemachus; and finally redactor 'B' fused epics 'A' and 'T' together. Focke believes that there was originally an ancient 'wanderings-saga', which poet 'O' set into the context of an extensive 'Homecoming of Odysseus', while poet 'T' enlarged this version by adding the deeds of Telemachus and a concluding piece, and made it into the *Odyssey* we know. Schadewaldt takes a further step towards simplification. He assumes a poet 'A', corresponding somewhat to von der Mühll's 'A' and perhaps identical with the author of the *Iliad*, and an editor 'B', who enlarged the older poem by adding the Telemachy (which was thus entirely his own work) and made all the consequent adjustments.

This wealth of analytical literature for a long time eclipsed the efforts of the 'unitarians' to achieve an understanding of the *Odyssey* as the creation of one single poet—works such as those of C. Rothe (of which the title, *Die Odyssee als Dichtung* (Paderborn, 1914), proclaims its intention), and W. J. Woodhouse,[17] a book which deserves attention even today, in spite of certain idiosyncrasies. But in recent decades the voice of the unitarians has at last become too strong to be ignored. This phase began in earnest with U. Hölscher's *Untersuchungen zur Form der Odyssee* (Berlin, 1939). Many contributions, substantial or brief, have followed since then, of which only those by G. Germain,[18] Lydia Allione,[19] G. Bona,[20] S. Besslich,[21] K. Rüter,[22] Agathe Thornton,[23] H. Erbse,[24] and H. Eisenberger[25] can be mentioned here. The findings of these and other unitarian works will

---

[13] *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus* (Berlin, 1946), now in *Welt*, 375–412; and several more recent articles, for which see the bibliography in A. Heubeck, op. cit. 289–90, and D. W. Packard and T. Meyers, *A Bibliography of Homeric Scholarship* (Malibu, 1974), 120–1.

[14] In several articles, now collected in *Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur* (W. Berlin, 1970).

[15] *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee* (Munich, 1951; 2nd edn., Munich, 1969).

[16] *Odyssey.* [17] *Composition.* [18] *Genèse.*

[19] *Telemaco e Penelope nell'Odissea* (Turin, 1963).

[20] *Studi sull'Odissea* (Turin, 1966). [21] *Schweigen.*

[22] *Odysseeinterpretationen.* [23] *People.* [24] *Beiträge.*

[25] *Studien.*

frequently be cited below (though not always with full references), the more so since I am myself fully committed to this school of thought.[26]

The line of enquiry pursued by the analysts has had the effect of putting the question of Homer himself (unhesitatingly accepted until modern times as the author of both poems) on to a different plane or pushing it into the background as in the end irrelevant or insoluble. But for modern unitarians too the question appears in a new form: if one believes that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were each created by a single poet, one must also ask—in view not only of the contrast in subject matter between the two epics, but also of the conspicuous differences in form and content, in linguistic and stylistic structure, and in human behaviour and intention—whether the poet of the *Iliad* (whom we follow the ancient tradition in calling Homer) can also have written the, undoubtedly later, *Odyssey*. This question was of course already being asked in antiquity. At that time the few scholars who denied a single authorship, and were therefore called 'chorizontes' ('separatists'),[27] failed to carry the day against their 'unitarian' colleagues. The anonymous author of the treatise *On the Sublime* (*Περὶ ὕψους* 9. 13) probably expressed the opinion of many of his contemporaries when he attempted to solve the problem by suggesting that Homer wrote the *Iliad* as a young man and the *Odyssey* in old age.

Modern unitarians for the most part adopt the more radical position and postulate two different authors. When they want to differentiate they use the name Homer only for the poet of the *Iliad*; the second poet—as there is no traditional name for him—has to be described as 'the Poet of the *Odyssey*', or, occasionally, 'Deutero-Homer'.[28] The view expressed in this introduction, and supported by observations of language, style, composition, and design, is that each of the Homeric epics is a poetic whole; and this view leads by necessity to the position of the 'chorizontes'—as F. Jacoby[29] first pointed out in an article which is still worth reading today. Since then other scholars have begun to see this with increasing clarity,[30] and it is in fact my own position.

---

[26] *Dichter.*

[27] See *J. W. Kohl, De chorizontibus*, Diss. Giessen (Darmstadt, 1917).

[28] G. Nebel, *Homer* (*Stuttgart*, 1959), *passim*.

[29] 'Die geistige Physiognomie der Odyssee', *Die Antike* ix (1933), 159–94 = *Kleine philol. Schriften*, i (Berlin, 1961), 107–38.

[30] Especially Rüter, *Odyseeinterpretationen*, 13–25, and R. Friedrich, *Stilwandel im homerischen Epos: Studien zur Poetik und Theorie der epischen Gattung* (Heidelberg, 1975).

But in commenting like this on recent research on the *Odyssey* we have hurried on too fast, since we have not yet dealt with an explanation of the nature of Homeric poetry which has been gaining ground steadily since the thirties, particularly (though not exclusively) in Anglo-American circles, where it now almost entirely holds the field. This is the so-called 'oral poetry' theory originated by Milman Parry and developed by his disciples.

It must suffice here to mention briefly the essential points of this approach. Parry based his first two works[31] on an observation which almost forces itself on any impartial reader: namely that the language of ancient Greek epic poetry is highly formulaic. Similar circumstances and events are, wherever possible, related in the same words; the same objects and persons have the same epithets, even when the context leads one to expect otherwise. It is clear that the formulaic combinations of name and adjective and their variants—to which Parry first turned his attention—follow certain fixed rules imposed by the metrical requirements of heroic verse. When the poet of the *Odyssey* speaks of his hero in the nominative he calls him *δῖος ’O., διογενὴς ’O., ἐσθλὸς ’O., πολύμητις ’O., πτολίπορθος ’O., πολύτλας δῖος ’O.*, while in the genitive he is *’Οδυσσῆος θείοιο, Λαερτιάδεω ’Οδυσῆος, ’Οδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος, ’Οδυσῆος ἀμύμονος*, and so on, as may be required by the form and length of what he wishes to say within the framework of the hexameter.

Considerations of this kind led Parry to distinguish between 'individual' and 'traditional' poetry and to classify the Homeric epics as 'early Greek traditional poetry', in which the freedom of the individual poet to formulate his own verses, though by no means removed, is closely circumscribed by the existence of a well-developed system of fixed modes of expression ('formulaic patterns'), serving at the same time to help and to constrain.

Observations of Yugoslav heroic poetry, the practice of which was still just alive before the Second World War, induced Parry to redraw the dividing line and to shift the emphasis slightly. The distinction he now made was between written poetry, which had its legitimate place in a literate world, and oral poetry, which was the mode of expression of totally or largely illiterate peoples or cultures; and he had no hesitation in classifying the Homeric epics as purely oral traditional heroic poetry. That this gave a new dimension to what we call the 'Homeric question' is beyond dispute. It does not matter that the literary, comparative, stylistic, and linguistic arguments used by Parry were not all new; that, in fact, their essential elements were founded on conjectures and discoveries of earlier researchers.[32] The important point is that he drew together considerations of various kinds from different fields of study and combined them into an impressive overall picture, the inner cohesion and balance of which could not fail to make an impact, particularly at a time when research had apparently come to a halt in well-worn and by now largely unrewarding paths.

In many important respects Parry's views were undoubtedly correct, and the description he and his successors, above all his pupil A. B. Lord,[33] and G. S. Kirk,[34] have drawn of oral poetry and its transmission seems to be valid. Modern research has shown how heroic poetry, orally composed, recited and handed on, has flourished among many illiterate cultures in different areas of the world at various periods, and how in form and content it displays striking similarities across the bounds of time and space.[35] Often the tradition is carried on by members of a guild who cultivate the art of poetry as a craft and hand it on from generation to generation by teaching, example, and practice. Guild members learn to use, in addition to their everyday speech, a special language which is appropriate in vocabulary and structure to the themes from myth and heroic tale the singer is called upon to unfold. It conforms to rules governing rhythm and metre and follows certain principles of economy, producing a ready supply of formulae or formulaic patterns to describe persons and objects, events and situations, of the kind which in epic poetry necessarily recur many times in the same or a similar form; the correct placing, varying, and combining of these formulae is important. A master of the art is able to extemporize fluently in this artificial language on any theme from heroic tale or myth, just as any man in the street is capable of recounting an actual event in the language of daily life.

The picture of the oral poet's art thus derived from a wide range of studies seems to fit the world of early Greek epic very well. When the poet of the *Odyssey* brings singers (*ἀοιδοί*) on to the scene at the princely courts of Ithaca and Scheria to delight their hearers with songs of gods and heroes, he is blending into the heroic world of which his story tells pictures of his own day: he has himself seen and heard singers like Phemius and Demodocus who can turn any given theme immediately into song, even if that theme has not previously been in the repertoire of the bards (a good example at viii. 487 ff.). For is he not himself a product of the training which shaped the oral singers of the eighth century BC? Does not the way in which he—like the poet of the *Iliad*—manages to give a formal shape to his tale clearly support this view? Both poets use an idiom which was certainly not spoken anywhere or at any time in any Greek house or market-place, in which a profusion of elements from different sources lies concealed behind a seemingly homogeneous façade. Embedded in a language with the basic structure of the Ionic dialect as it was perhaps spoken at the time of the poet we find words and forms which are either borrowed from the northern Aeolic dialect,[36] or preserve old Ionic forms, or are the result of a deliberate attempt to sound archaic. Others are more or less bold improvisations and neologisms.[37]

---

[31] *L'Épithète traditionnelle dans Homère: Essai sur un problème de style homérique* (Paris, 1928); *Les Formules et la métrique d'Homère* (Paris, 1928). Both works in English translation, together with all Parry's articles, now also in *Homeric Verse*.

[32] See e.g. the works of M. Murko for the study of Yugoslav heroic poetry; and on questions of language and metre the basic studies of C. Witte (1909–14), now collected in K. Witte, *Zur homerischen Sprache* (Darmstadt, 1972).

[33] *Singer*; 'Homer and Other Epic Poetry' in *Companion*, 179–214. Further works listed in D. W. Packard and T. Meyers, op. cit., 81; A. Heubeck, *Hom.Fr.* 274–5.

[34] *Songs*, 55–101.

[35] C. M. Bowra, *Heroic Poetry* (Oxford, 1951).

As we have shown above, a large part of this epic diction consists of phrases, figures of speech, and whole verses that not only operate as formulae but are obviously intended to do so. Both the extraordinary range of application of these formulaic elements and their linguistic character suggest that, like the mixed dialect, they were, at least in part, not the creation of the poets who used them, but traditional features of their craft. The artificial language of the epic[38] is the result of a continuous development over hundreds of years among a circle of bards who in post-Mycenaean times preserved and handed on the heritage of myths and legends in the form of oral poetry.[39] That the poets of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were both deeply rooted in this craft tradition and that their creativeness can only be understood against the background of an epic poetry which had been flourishing for a long time can hardly be doubted.

But does one do justice to the character and individuality of these

---

[36] The most recent full treatment of Aeolisms is Wathelet, *Traits*.

[37] Leumann, *Wörter*.

[38] In addition to the works already mentioned by K. Witte and M. Leumann, see also Meister, *Kunstsprache*, and Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i^{3}, ii^{2}.

[39] The case for the post-Mycenaean origin of hexameter epic poetry is convincingly argued by C. Gallavotti, 'Tradizione micenea e poesia greca arcaica', *Atti e Memorie del 1° Congresso Internaz. di Micenologia, Roma 27 Sept.–3 Oct. 1967* (Rome, 1968), ii 831–61. For the contrary–and perhaps more frequently expressed–view that the tradition of epic poetry goes back to Mycenaean or even earlier times, cf. most recently M. Durante, *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica greca*, i (Rome, 1971), ii (Rome, 1974).

poets by regarding them, and trying to understand them, as typical representatives of an ancient craft, even if far superior in quality to their predecessors and colleagues? Do the exponents of the oral poetry theory really get to the heart of the matter, and are they correct in classifying the Homeric epics as pure oral poetry? At this point opinions divide, and since clear proof of the rightness of one theory or another is now, and perhaps always will be, unattainable, it remains for the individual to stand by his own opinion, however reached. My own views ought not to be concealed, but as a detailed discussion would be impossible here, I shall just briefly state the main points of my position.[40]

The conclusion that the poets of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* took substantial elements of their work from the oral tradition of the bards seems to me no longer open to doubt, and I believe that the acceptance of this helps us to grasp an important, though not the decisive, aspect of their intentions and achievements. The fact that they dealt with material already exploited in oral poetry, and that they continued to shape this material by methods very like those of their predecessors and colleagues, seems to me of less relevance than other observations which force themselves on the interpreter. Even if our lack of precise knowledge of the pre-Homeric epic means that we cannot prove any particular claim, we can yet sense how enormous an advance Homer made on his predecessors.

All that we know suggests that the art of the oral poet consisted in his ability to turn any subject suggested by his audience into epic poetry on the spot. We are surely justified in assuming that the greatest applause was given to the singer who could do this in an especially original and exciting way, in a manner which was particularly well-suited to his listeners and their expectations; in short, a singer able to improvise with particular skill and effectiveness. But even a superficial glance at the Homeric epics shows that in their creation free improvisation has played only the smallest part, and the more one examines them the clearer this becomes. Their most important characteristic is the structure of form and content, the ordering of the material, which is planned precisely and in detail from the very beginning. Heroic events are not simply added one after the other; they are interrelated in many different ways and are given certain functions within the framework of the whole. A network of references to future or past events, extensive preparatory sections, expectations aroused and fulfilled, parallelisms, climaxes, and reversals: all these bind each of the poems together into a harmonious and balanced structure, in which each episode and scene has its proper place, in which nothing can change places and nothing can be added or left out. The strength of the Homeric poets lies in skilful composition, that of the oral poets in improvisation. The creations of oral singers are always new, as chance and the immediate situation dictate; their songs are for the moment and ephemeral. But there is nothing ephemeral about the Homeric epics: they are meant to be permanent and permanently valid, they are not creations of the moment, but reveal planning and careful arrangement. We can recognize how much mental effort and detailed polishing lie behind them, and how many preliminary attempts and drafts must have preceded the finished works.

---

[40] Of the scholars to whose work I am indebted the following shall be particularly mentioned: A. Parry, 'Have we Homer's *Iliad?*', *YClS* xx (1966), 177–216; Lesky, *Homeros*, 698–709; H. Patzer, *Dichterische Kunst und poetisches Handwerk im homerischen Epos*, Sitz.-Ber. d. Wiss. Ges. an d. J. W. Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt/Main, x.1 (Frankfurt, 1971); also A. Heubeck, *Gnomon* xlvi (1974), 529–34. The state of research is well summarized by Fenik, *Studies*, 133–42.

I believe we can even take the argument a step further. Not only were the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* products of long and careful planning and polishing; they could not have been created at all without the aid of writing. The new concept of epic poetry, destined to create out of traditional methods and possibilities something that would both continue the tradition and yet surpass it, could only be realized by using the art of writing,[41] which the Greeks had learnt at the beginning of of the eighth century BC from their Phoenician trading partners in the Near East and adapted to their own needs. In short, the poet of the *Iliad*, I believe, took the decisive step from oral poetry to written composition, a step of epoch-making importance whose effects cannot be overestimated.

This account takes us a lot further towards an understanding of the *Odyssey*, our main concern here. If we rightly see Homer as the one who broke out of the old oral tradition and became the creator of a new kind of heroic epic, and if the *Odyssey* (as we can hardly doubt) was composed somewhat later by a second poet who already knew the *Iliad*, then the implications of this poet's situation need to be pointed out. Undoubtedly he, too, was part of the old tradition and took from it important elements of his poetry, but side by side with

---

[41] This opinion has also lately been expressed by A. Lesky, 'Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im homerischen Epos', in *Festschrift f. D. Kralik* (Horn, 1954), 1–9 (also in *Gesamm. Schriften* (Berne–Munich, 1966), 63–71); *Homeros*, 698–709; F. Dirlmeier, 'Das serbo-kroatische Heldenlied und Homer', Sitz.-Ber. Heidelberg 1971, 1; Erbse, *Beiträge*, 177–88; Eisenberger, *Studien*, 327.

this tradition there was now a work which superseded it, the *Iliad*; and it would be absurd to suppose that this did not have at least as much influence on him. Indeed, it can be shown that in many ways the *Iliad* provided the inspiration for the *Odyssey*, whose poet to a great extent took his bearings from the earlier work and modelled his writing on it. F. Jacoby[42] aptly described this process as 'conscious rivalry' and 'creative mimesis'. The terms underline both the affinity between the two poems and their differences: while the *Iliad* set the standards against which the poet of the *Odyssey* felt obliged to measure himself, yet the latter's own creative ability lifted him far above the status of a mere imitator. In quality, importance, and intrinsic value his creation fully matches up to its exemplar.

There is no doubt that by comparing the two epics—in structure, language and style, and in the way the two poets conceived of the world, men, and gods—and by thinking of the younger poet as a creative imitator and rival of Homer, we open up important new approaches to an understanding of the later epic. Here it must suffice to mention only a few points.

The poet of the *Iliad* put a pre-eminent hero at the centre of his work. The deeds and sufferings of Achilles inform and direct all the events of the epic; everything in the tale refers to him, and he is present to a remarkable degree even when he remains in the background. By his passivity when absent and inactive he shapes events no less effectively than when he is active. In this respect, one assumes, Homer keeps within the framework of oral tradition, which no doubt frequently made the lives and deeds of outstanding warriors the subject of its songs. What is new is the limitation the poet has imposed upon himself by selecting a relatively short episode from the life of his hero—the wrath of Achilles and its consequences—and making it the kernel of his epic. We can only guess at the considerations which led to this bold and original scheme, but whatever they were they made it possible for him to present the total situation lying behind the selection of events he describes far more completely and vividly than he could have done in a chronologically ordered epic with a series of events covering a long period of time, of the kind we believe typical of the oral period of heroic poets. By this device he turns the Achilleis into the *Iliad*, into an impressive portrayal of the whole memorable war which kept the Greeks for ten years before their enemy's stronghold.

The influence of this new concept on the poet of the *Odyssey* can easily be seen. He, likewise, makes no attempt at a blow-by-blow account of his hero's adventures through the ten long years between his departure from Troy and his final home-coming, but merely projects the events of a short span of time; on a careful reckoning of the days barely six weeks elapse between the intervention of the gods with which the story starts and the slaying of the suitors. By limiting the time element, he, too, succeeds in bringing to life a picture of a whole mythical epoch, which could well be given the overall title 'The Victors' Return from Troy'—represented for us by a single outstanding example, Odysseus, the Lord of Ithaca.

---

[42] See above, n. 29.

Yet by much the same methods as in the *Iliad* the many events which occurred in the years before those last six weeks are included in the tale, mostly by indirect report. The participants recount what they themselves have seen and experienced or heard from others. From Odysseus' kin and from the suitors we hear of events in Ithaca since the end of the Trojan War—naturally from very different points of view. The accounts given by Nestor and Menelaus to Telemachus (iii–iv) and by the spirit of Agamemnon to Odysseus (xi) give a rounded picture of the fortunes of the other great warriors who set out for home with Odysseus. Lastly there is above all the long and detailed tale of his own wanderings that Odysseus tells to the spellbound Phaeacians, from his adventures in the land of the Cicones to his lucky rescue on the shore of Scheria. In this way the poet has created a clever network of retrospective information, particularly in the first part of the epic. The way in which this information is coordinated and added to—even after long digressions—to give a full picture of everything we need to know reveals careful planning on the part of the poet.

It is the use made here of the restricted time-span—though the device can hardly have derived from anywhere but the *Iliad*—that particularly highlights the creative freedom and independence of the imitation. The episode picked out by the poet of the *Iliad* to represent the entire campaign before Troy is only one of many, belongs to the middle of the action, and for the outcome of the war is almost irrelevant. The only effect it can have on the course of events is a short and ineffectual delay. But with the *Odyssey* the situation is quite otherwise: here the poet has selected the very last and decisive phase as the standpoint of his epic. The difference in subject-matter may have influenced his choice and may even have forced him to it. But the manner in which he has used the possibilities provided by this choice to unfold events of unparalleled drama deserves our utmost admiration.

The poet starts with the moment when Zeus puts the fate of Odysseus, who has clearly been away from home for all too long, before the gods for counsel and decision. At this point, hitherto separate strands of events begin to converge towards the now unavoidable crisis, in a way that is poetically acceptable though hardly comprehensible by reason.[43] This is not only the day when Odysseus frees himself from the fatal numbness which has overcome him in the house of Calypso; simultaneously events begin to move in Ithaca, where his son, resigned and powerless up to now, comes to himself and begins to act independently, responsibly, and courageously to put an end to an intolerable situation. This is also the moment, the poet ordains, when Penelope can no longer resist the pressure from the suitors. In despair and yet not without hope, of her own free will and yet following some inner compulsion, she sets the contest of the bow, which is to decide not only her own and her family's fate, but also that of the throne and the whole country.

The poem thus begins at a moment of great crisis, the *kairos*, when all the different strands come together and everything is at stake: Penelope very nearly has to honour her dreaded promise to the suitors, Telemachus' initiative very nearly finds a sudden and cruel end in the suitors' ambush, and Odysseus very nearly returns either not at all or a day too late. But the gods—and the poet—have arranged everything in the best possible manner: what very nearly happened does not, and when the crisis comes there is a relaxing of the tension, which might have become intolerable for the listener, had he not been able from the very beginning to hope that the gods would let justice triumph and bring everything to a satisfactory conclusion. In the end order rules again.

In this connection another remarkable feature should be mentioned. The poet's bold idea of compressing his narrative into a short time-span and his desire to give in the course of it a full and vivid picture of the hero's homeward journey compel him to explain at some point why Odysseus has not returned home earlier to take up his old privileges. By letting Odysseus himself relate his earlier adventures he turns poetic necessity into an opportunity to tell a tale which could hardly have found a place in the model 'Homeric' epic. The characters of the *Iliad* play their parts in a milieu which is familiar to the hearers from their own experience, a world that in every respect, good and bad, is a human one. Odysseus, however, passes beyond the limits of reality after the storm off Cape Malea and finds himself in a sphere where heroic and human standards fail utterly. Beyond this frontier, which is fortunately impassable for most mortals, there are still seas, lands, and islands, and the points of the compass still apply, but in this different world there exist beings and forms that cannot be comprehended by the human mind. It is a fantastic and imaginary world, irrational and unreal, a realm of magic and sorcery which bears no relation to human experience, a world (we should particularly note) that was shunned by the early Greek epic and more recently by the poet of the *Iliad* himself, so that only faint traces of it are visible. Within the set framework of the epic, the poet could not in his own person relate the occult and fabulous events of the world of magic and fairy-tale, but if they were recounted by a character in the poem who had himself experienced them, then these fabulous events were in a sense brought back into the known world and could be incorporated into the epic. It is significant that Odysseus is made to tell his adventures in front of the Phaeacians who by their nature and origin represent the slender bridge between the realm of fairy-tale and the world of man. In helping Odysseus the Phaeacians fulfil for the last time their task of mediating between the two worlds.[44]

---

[43] O. Seel, 'Variante und Konvergenz in der Odyssee', in *Studi in onoro di U. E. Paoli* (Florence, 1955), 643–57.

We have already mentioned how skilfully the poet creates a homogeneous whole from a colourful variety of mythical events which extend over a whole decade, occur in very varied localities, and involve a large number of characters. As we have seen, one of the devices he uses to achieve this is the restriction of direct narrative to an account of the brief period of the crisis. There is another device, however, that goes hand in hand with this and also involves a deliberate restriction: concentration on the main character. In everything that the poet says in his own person or lets the characters in his epic say, Odysseus is always the focus, even when he is not actually mentioned; there is nothing which does not in a wider or narrower sense refer to the hero.

The experiences of the other warriors exhaust almost all possible variations on the theme of 'home-coming'; yet they are all merely a foil for the return of the one who surpasses them in suffering but achieves the most glorious fulfilment in the end. In particular, throughout the *Odyssey* the fate of Agamemnon is kept vividly in front of the listener with its darker parallels and contrasts: on one side there are Agamemnon–Clytaemestra–Aegisthus–Orestes, on the other Odysseus–Penelope–the suitors–Telemachus. The similarity in the situations and the roles of the participants is remarkable, yet the final solution presents the greatest contrast. Agamemnon was one of the first, and Odysseus the last, to reach home. But against the background of Agamemnon's shameful end at the hands of a faithless wife and wicked rival Odysseus' happy fate stands out in full relief. The faithful waiting of Penelope in a situation which appears hopeless, her resistance to the suitors, and her good sense have spared him Agamemnon's doom, and at last brought fulfilment of his yearnings.[45]

A part of the epic which analytical criticism has frequently condemned as an interpolation in the 'pure', 'original' *Odyssey* and attributed to a later expansion is the so-called Telemachy, in which the actions and experiences of the hero's son are narrated. But this, too, is closely interwoven with the fate and character of Odysseus. Unlike the analysts,[46] I believe that the inclusion of the Telemachy in the epic is a master-stroke on the part of the poet,[47] since it allows him to start events in different places at the same time, and so to create from the beginning two strands of narrative which run parallel until he brings them together at the conclusion. The gods—and the poet—have carefully arranged that at almost the same moment as the father on a distant island embarks on the craft he has built himself, the son leaves his home to find news of his father in the world outside. We thus have here two opposite courses of action which are destined to come together and to culminate in common endeavour and achievement; in other words, they are two aspects of the same process: that of bringing Odysseus home.

This device was surely the poet's own invention, and he must have been delighted by it, all the more perhaps because he could have found no example of such virtuosity in construction either in the *Iliad* or the earlier oral epics. For epic before the *Odyssey*, we suppose, was characterized by its linear development, keeping strictly to a chronological sequence of events. This is even true to a large extent of the

---

[44] For Odysseus' wanderings (ix–xii) cf. Germain, *Genèse*; K. Reinhardt, 'Die Abenteuer des Odysseus', in *Von Werken und Formen* (Godesberg, 1948), 52–162 (also in C. Becker (ed.), *Tradition und Geist*, (Göttingen, 1960), 47–124); W. Suerbaum, 'Die Ich-Erzählungen des Odysseus', *Poetica* ii (1968), 150–277.

[45] For the function of the 'Atreidae-Paradigm' cf. E. F. D'Arms and K. K. Hulley, 'The Oresteia Story in the *Odyssey*', *TAPhA* lxxvii (1946), 207–13; H. Hommel, 'Aigisthos und die Freier', *SG* viii (1958), 237–45; U. Hölscher, 'Die Atridensage in der Odyssee', in *Festschrift f. R. Alewyn* (Cologne–Graz, 1967), 1–16.

[46] Above, p. 6.

[47] See esp. F. Klingner, *Über die ersten vier Bucher der Odyssee*, Sitz.-Ber. Leipzig xci.1 (Leipzig, 1944), (also in *Studien zur griech. und röm. Literatur* (Zürich–Stuttgart, 1964), 39–79); K. Reinhardt, 'Homer und die Telemachie', in *Von Werken und Formen*, 37–51 (also in *Tradition und Geist*, 37–46).

Iliad, although it occasionally allows glimpses of events occurring at the same time in different places.

The poet of the *Odyssey* still accepts the rules of epic narrative which forbid him to break out of the chronological sequence, to stop at a certain point and return to a moment his narrative has already passed. But he has a sure eye for seeing how to use the principles of presentation displayed in the *Iliad* for his own purpose and how to describe simultaneous events without breaking with formal tradition. In epic the sequence in which events occurring in different places are narrated represents an actual chronological sequence, and it is obvious that the poet keeps strictly to this rule. Yet we can also see how he manages to convey the simultaneity of two separate strands of events: through the assembly of the gods at the beginning of the *Odyssey* we are prepared for imminent action in Ogygia, and this expectation remains while we hear of the events in Ithaca and accompany Telemachus on his journey to Pylos and Sparta. Nor are we disappointed, for at the moment when the son is persuaded by the allure of royal splendour and hospitality to stay on there in idleness the gods take action again and put their plan into operation. Odysseus departs, and we follow him on his journey (which turns out to be longer than expected) till he finally spends his first night back in Ithaca. Now the time has come for the son's conscience to awaken and we are prepared for this, we have long expected it. During the days Odysseus spends with Eumaeus—it is unnecessary to enquire what he does during that time—Telemachus tears himself away from Sparta and reaches Ithaca after an uneventful journey. At last father and son meet at Eumaeus' farm; their journeys and their search are over. From now on the separate strands of the narrative are united, and father and son act together.[48]

So much for the poet's technique. I hope that we have not been too far off the mark in stressing its continuity with epic tradition and in trying to understand and interpret the *Odyssey* against the background of earlier oral poetry and in particular the *Iliad*. Tradition and progress, conservation and innovation, constraint and freedom—it is between such poles, whatever we may call them, that the richness and individual quality of the poet's epic technique unfolds.

What has been said about the epic technique also applies *mutatis*

---

[48] For these structural problems cf. G. M. Calhoun, 'Télemaque et le plan de l'Odyssée', *REG* xlvii (1934), 133–63; Heubeck, *Dichter*, 40–63; Delebecque, *Télémaque*; H. W. Clarke, 'Telemachus and the Telemacheia', *AJP* lxxiv (1963), 129–45; L. Allione, *Telemaco e Penelope nell'Odissea* (cit. n. 19), 7–59; G. Bona, *Studi sull'Odissea* (cit. n. 20), 189–226; Lesky, *Homeros*, 810–12.

mutandis to all other aspects of the work. What the poet tells us and how he arranges it, the way in which he makes his gods and heroes speak and act, the manner in which he re-creates in his poem the world in which Odysseus' fate was worked out—all this shows an individual cast of mind, with its own brand of sympathetic understanding of the world. It is not easy to put this 'mental physiognomy' (F. Jacoby) into words, but one can give examples to show how the old has been joined to the new and how tradition has been blended into the poet's own invention to construct a new, consistent whole from opposing elements.

There is, for instance, the hero at the centre of the epic, Odysseus himself. What kind of man is he, this man who, like his surviving comrades and peers, sets off for home with his contingent after the conquest of Troy, but then is separated from the others, suffers more adventures, is kept longest away from his loved ones, and can in the end only reclaim his own by the exertion of all his physical and mental powers? How did the poet want us to see him?

There are many answers to this question and we need not discuss them all individually. Most interpretations try to explain Odysseus from his origins, and this is certainly an important starting point.[49] There are many indications that Odysseus is a very ancient figure in Greek myth. Not only is there his name, which, like that of Achilles, cannot be explained from Greek and points back to older strata. There are also many adventures and situations which seem to be closely connected with our hero from the very beginning of literate tradition: encounters with witches and giants, monsters and cannibals, his journey to the underworld, his contacts with daemonic beings. All this suggests that Odysseus' roots lie in the world of fairy-tale, perhaps even in the realm of magic and shamanism.[50] No doubt there is some truth in this, but we should be cautious about going beyond what we know for certain or can deduce with a high degree of probability.

What is certain is that the figure of Odysseus as it appears in the *Odyssey* is shaped by what the poet found in the *Iliad* and took from there. In that epic he is one of the kings who take part in the retaliatory expedition of the Atreidae. He, too, rules over a sizeable kingdom, from which he brings twelve ships to join the Achaean host. In the circle of leaders he has few peers. Apart from Achilles and Ajax, few are his equal in valour and strength; in political astuteness and military judgement he is superior to most. In short, he is an ideal warrior in whom all the virtues of an aristocratic hero are harmoniously blended. We may even go a step further and suggest that this picture of Odysseus in all essential features already existed in pre-Homeric poetry. There are some indications which show that his place in the Trojan epic is of long standing. In particular, the epithet given him in the *Iliad*, 'Sacker of Cities', only makes sense if in pre-Homeric epic too it was Odysseus who used the ruse of the Trojan horse and made the conquest of Troy possible.

---

[49] F. Focke, 'Odysseus: Wandlungen eines Heldenideals', *Antike, alte Sprachen und deutsche Bildung*, ii (1944), 41–52; Paula Philippson, 'Die vorhomerische und die homerische Gestalt des Odysseus', *MH* iv (1947), 8–22; E. Wüst, 'Odysseus', *RE* xvii (1957), 1905–96.

[50] K. Meuli, 'Scythica', *Hermes* lxx (1935), 121–276, esp. 164 ff. = *Gesammelte Schriften* ii 817 ff. (Basle–Stuttgart, 1975); R. Carpenter, *Fiction, Folktale and Saga in the Homeric Epics* (Berkeley–Los Angeles, ^{1}1946; ^{2}1956), *passim*; Merkelbach, *Untersuchungen* (^{1}1951), 224.

This makes one wonder how it is that this warrior-king with his firm place among the heroes in both the pre-Homeric and Homeric epic becomes involved, for much of the *Odyssey*, in a world separated by a deep gulf from that of the heroes, and shows features which connect him rather with Sinbad the Sailor than with his noble peers and fellow warriors before Troy. Did the poet here follow an independent tradition running parallel to the epic, which preserved a more ancient picture? A different explanation, however, is perhaps more likely. It is possible that it was the poet of the *Odyssey* himself who sent the hero of the Trojan epic on his journey into fairyland, ascribing to him adventures which were originally connected with others, characters now nameless, perhaps from folk-tales, old seafarers' yarns, or even pre-Homeric poetry. Research has shown with great probability that some of the events and characters now connected with Odysseus originally belonged to the saga of the Argonauts.[51]

If it was indeed our poet who enriched the traditional picture of Odysseus with new elements which initially belonged somewhere else we can perhaps guess what led him to take this bold step. The plan of the poem required that Odysseus should return home very late, or almost too late, but a decade of wandering on a journey from Troy to Ithaca—which, though not without peril, is not an extraordinary undertaking—is only plausible if Odysseus strays into far-off lands, from which he cannot return to the world of men unless the gods give him their help.

On this journey, not only are the dimensions of space and time extended. Odysseus is faced with dangers nobody has faced before; all that he possesses and everything dear to him is taken from him bit by bit in the long wandering from the battle with the Cicones, where he is still the man the *Iliad* describes, to the point of deepest humiliation, when the last vestige of glory has gone, his friends and comrades have all perished, and of his fleet only the keel of his own ship is left.

But the loss of power and glory and possessions is perhaps not the bitterest experience. A remorseless fate has thrown him into an environment where the virtues of an aristocratic warrior reveal their fragility and lose their value, where heroic aims turn into empty posing and become ridiculous gestures, while the world into which he was born is unattainably distant and exists only in the longing of his memory.

I believe that we can detect in this the spirit of a young poet who has himself become conscious of the questionable and limited validity of those aristocratic values which for earlier heroic poetry had been the props of an idealized view of the world and the pillars of a healthy society. It is the spirit of a man who has a different answer to the questions of life and human existence from that of his predecessors. While they set an ideal picture of a fictitious world where life, battle, and death were worth while against the reality of a bitter, toilsome, and grievous existence, and took their audience into a realm of glory, our poet unmasks this ideal in its one-sided narrowness and relativity. He, too, takes his listeners into a mythical world of dreams, but it is a mirror-image of the real world, where there is want and grief, terror and suffering, and where man is helpless. Yet for the poet this grim perception is not the end of the matter: life in the real world must still be lived and mastered, its challenges must be accepted in the proper spirit.

In this changed view of man and his existence the aristocratic virtues of courage, valour, and honour, of wisdom and prudence do not lose their validity completely, but something has to be added: wisdom alone can achieve very little without subtle and calculating shrewdness. There are threats and dangers in life which cannot be overcome by courage and valour alone, there are situations in which clinging to rigid aristocratic ideals is senseless, and sometimes one must simply endure fate patiently or give up. Odysseus is the 'hero' who has learnt—perhaps in spite of himself—to adopt this outlook and to master whatever suffering and anguish life holds in store. He is equipped for this by virtues which are rooted in the old ideals of aristocratic life and conduct but transcend them in a new ability to plan and calculate shrewdly, to hide and dissemble, but also to endure with incredible patience. The common notion of Odysseus as the archetypal bold seafarer and restless adventurer, as an explorer whose world has become too small for him and who craves the new and unknown, misses the essential point, and has little place in what we believe to be the true picture of the hero.

---

[51] See especially K. Meuli, 'Odyssee und Argonautika' (Basle, 1921, = *Gesammelte Schriften*, ii 593 ff.).

Yet it is not by chance that, along with this disillusioned and pessimistic view of man and his situation, which later found its full expression in early Greek lyric poetry, there is also reconciliation and solace. In our epic all the toil and suffering comes to a happy end; Odysseus, reaching the Phaeacians at the nadir of his fortunes, recovers his strength; in Ithaca the destroyers of a time-honoured order get their deserts, while those who are loyal and god-fearing are rewarded. 'Eunomia', the condition under which everyone has his appointed place and follows his daily life in peace and security, spreads bright happiness over the land.

This prospect of harmony at the end, which puts the disastrous and terrifying events of the epic in a new light, is founded, I believe, in the poet's faith. Although he sees man's plight in a harsh existence with more clarity and fewer illusions than others, he is able to incorporate this awareness in a deeper and more comprehensive view of the world, which is both rooted in traditional ideas and yet shaped by an independent and strong-willed spirit.

The poet of the *Iliad* had shown the events of the Trojan War taking place as it were on a two-tiered stage. The fierce struggle for the city involves men and gods alike, earthly situations and events are mirrored in the realm of the Olympian gods, and often the two strands running side by side become inextricably interwoven, when the gods descend to earth and actively intervene in human affairs, protecting and helping, restraining, encouraging, joining in battle. At such times they are possessed by the same violent feelings and emotions, and entangled in the same situations, as the mortals they love or hate, help or harm. And over mortals and gods alike stands inscrutable and inescapable fate which sets strict terms for all who live under it: it limits the life of men, but it also limits the power of the immortals when they seek to help their mortal descendants, for the gods, too, are powerless to alter the frontiers of death.

The extent to which the poet of the later epic was influenced by this concept should not be overlooked and some divergences from it in the *Odyssey* may simply be due to the different subject-matter. For here it is not the destiny of peoples, but the fate of a single man that is at stake, and it suffices that a single divine enemy, Poseidon, should pile up obstacles to his return,[52] while a single divine helper, Athena,

---

[52] J. Irmscher, *Götterzorn bei Homer* (Leipzig, 1950), esp. 52–77.

should counsel and assist him on his way.[53] It is more significant that in the younger epic the gods intervene less frequently. Whereas in the *Iliad* the activities of gods and men are continuously entwined,[54] here single gods are content with single actions, though with more enduring consequences. Furthermore, their actions are at bottom no more than intervention on behalf of and under the guidance of the one highest god who knows how to ordain everything aright. Zeus himself has changed in the poet's vision. His actions are no longer directed by irrational impulses and emotions, and he no longer has any need to boast of his superior power. He is further removed from the world inhabited by men and controlled by the gods, and not only in the spatial sense. With perceptiveness and wisdom Zeus now directs the fate of the world according to moral principles, which alone create and preserve order. The father of the gods has only a little way to go to become the just ruler of the world.

Consistent with the ethical transformation of the gods is the poet's own conviction, put into the mouth of Zeus, that man can by his own conduct change the fate laid upon him. This human freedom is for now explicitly referred to only in negative terms: the wrongdoer must expect punishment and a shameful end 'before his time' (i 34–5.).[55] That there is a positive side, however, is expressed by the whole work: the man who holds to justice and order and honours the gods may expect the appropriate reward for his efforts. It seems to me that in this respect the *Odyssey* is farther removed from the *Iliad* than it is from Solon and Aeschylus.[56]

We have traversed a very wide field in different ways and from different points of view, and we are aware that we have seen only parts of it, never the whole, and those from a subjective point of view, but any study of poetry is subject to such constraints and limitations; nobody can escape them. Any statement about poetry, however intelligent and knowledgeable, can only be an aid to understanding; at best it can point a way to the poetry itself, and it is that alone which matters.

---

[53] Marion Müller, *Athene als göttliche Helferin in der Odyssee* (Heidelberg, 1966).

[54] Cf. A. Lesky, *Göttliche und menschliche Motivation im Homerischen Epos*, Sitz.-Ber. Heidelberg 1961: 4.

[55] For this much-discussed passage see esp. W. Jaeger, *Solons Eunomie*, Sitz.-Ber. Berlin 1926: 11, 69–85; also *Scripta Minora*, i (Rome, 1960) 315–37; Focke, *Odyssee*, 25–31; Rüter, *Odysseeinterpretationen*, 64–82.

[56] For the theology of the *Odyssey* as a whole see, among others, A. Lesky, Sitz.-Ber. Heidelberg 1961: 4, 35 ff.; W. Burkert, 'Das Lied von Ares und Aphrodite', *RhM* (1960), 130–44.

THE EPIC DIALECT

J. B. Hainsworth

The Homeric language is artificial, a *Kunstsprache*, but not in the way that the language of Apollonius or Nonnus is artificial. Theirs is a conscious artificiality: the poet of the *Odyssey* used as his natural idiom the language of ἀοιδή in its contemporary form. From our standpoint we may describe this as a special form of the Ionic dialect of the day. It was special in that it combined with the Ionic in simultaneous use a certain number of words and formations taken from other dialects, retained from earlier periods, or generated within the *Kunstsprache* itself. The principle that governed the creation of this special dialect was given definitive form by Witte, 1908–12;[1] it was to produce, for a given sense, the maximum metrical diversity from the least infusion of 'foreign' material. Thus the Aeolic forms of the first person plural pronoun ἄμμες, ἄμμε, and ἄμμι(ν) are admitted beside the metrically different Ionic ἡμεῖς, ἡμέας, and ἡμῖν, but never ἀμμέων beside the metrically identical ἡμέων:[2] likewise an archaic genitive singular -οιο beside -ου, but not an archaic accusative -ονς beside -ους.

Because it was a form of spoken Ionic, the *Kunstsprache* was not fixed from one generation of poets to another, but shared in the linguistic development of the vernacular. It could not do so, however, totally and at once, if the changes affected the metrics of words: otherwise the systems of formulae upon which the ἀοιδοί relied would have been disrupted.[3] Consequently, at any point in time, the *Kunstsprache* contained both archaisms and neologisms in respect of the same feature: the digamma, to quote a notorious example, is sometimes 'observed' (i.e. is notionally present in order to provide correct metre) and sometimes neglected. On the other hand, if metre were not affected, there was no reason why *Kunstsprache* and vernacular should not evolve *pari passu*: the Ionic η < α is (discounting forms classed as Atticisms) universal in words and forms that occurred, as we may judge, in contemporary Ionic. In a vernacular dialect, however, sound changes are typically rapid and complete, but in poetical speech the feeling of ἀοιδοί for the sound of their language, a factor now scarcely ponderable, might render sound laws less than absolute, or lead to a preference for dialect or archaism: Homer has the Aeolic -ά in θεά but the Ionic -ῆ- in θεῇσι, Hesiod a formula λαμπράν τε Σελήνην (for λαμπρήν).[4]

As the idiom of the ἀοιδοί the *Kunstsprache* had, like any other form of language, its own internal dynamism: but whereas anomalous innovations tend to be rejected by the vernaculars, in a tradition that evoked the heroic world by its exotic language anomalies were protected by their very oddity. The peculiar -δ- perfect ἐληλάδατο vii 86 < ἐλαύνω rests on forms such as ἐρηρέδατο vii 95 < ἐρείδω (itself a modification of *ἐρηρίδατο). Philology is not a warrant for the correction of either.

The evolution of the *Kunstsprache* was progressive throughout its existence as a living idiom. If the composition of the *Odyssey* is put at some point between the late eighth and mid-seventh centuries, then it had by that time been evolving for several centuries and was to continue its natural development for at least another century, for as long as ἀοιδή survived. Even after the *Kunstsprache* became a 'dead' language, enshrined in written texts, evolution did not entirely cease (see notes on ἐπιβήομεν—or -βείομεν—vi 262).[5] An editor's raw material is the final stage of this process, as contained in the papyri and the medieval MSS. Since Bentley's discovery of the digamma, many have preferred linguistically antecedent forms to those in the paradosis: κεδνὰ (ἔργα, λυγρὰ, πάντα) ἰδυῖα for κέδν' εἰδυῖα etc. Likewise the effects of contraction and metathesis, which are certain at some points, can be undone at others. One such restored form, ἦος for ἕως (or εἵως) is sanctioned by LSJ[9] (but see iii 126 n.), and it is easy to see that certain formulae, or certain habitual placings of words, are likely to have been established at a time when the older forms were in use, e.g. **ἠόα δῖαν* for *ἠῶ δῖαν*, **'Ωαρίωνος* for *'Ωρίωνος*, **ἀγαυόο* for *ἀγαυοῦ* (see v 1, v 274, vii 288 nn.) Linguistic development here resulted at most in an inelegance. The *ἀοιδοί*, who could offer *θυγατέρα ἥν* (*Il.* v 371 etc.) as –⏑⏑––, may have taken it in their stride. The paradosis offers no evidence that they did not. But it is conceivable that the older forms, with varying success, resisted replacement: *ἀγήραος* (v 136 etc.) is well attested in mid-verse, while the contracted *ἀγήρως* (v 218) coexisted at the verse-end. Editors print the older forms if there is evidence for them besides that of linguistic science, but the persistence of such forms, whether they survived Homer or predeceased him, cannot usually even be conjectured.[6]

---

[1] K. Witte, 'Zur homerischen Sprache', *Glotta* i (1909), 132–45; ii (1910), 8–22; iii (1912), 104–56: also 'Homerische Sprach- und Versgedichte', *Glotta* iv (1913), 1–21, and 'Ueber die Kasusausgänge -οιο und -ου, -οισι und -οις, -ῃσι und -ῃς im griechischen Epos', *Glotta* v (1914), 8–47. The results are summarised in *RE* viii, coll. 2213 ff. s.v. Homeros: 'Sprache', and brought to completion in Meister, *Kunstsprache*.

[2] The most comprehensive discussion of Aeolic forms in Homer is that of Wathelet, *Traits*. It is, or ought to be, debatable how 'foreign' forms entered the *Kunstsprache*. The conventional view that Aeolic forms reflect an antecedent Aeolic ἀοιδή (see e.g. M. Durante, 'La fase eolica della poesia omerica', in *Studia Classica et Orientalia A. Pagliaro oblata*, ii (Rome, 1969), 85–130) is contested by W. F. Wyatt, 'Homer's Linguistic Ancestors', Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς Θεσσαλονίκης xiv (1975), 133–47, who proposes the Aeolisms as a late importation.

[3] M. Parry, *HSPh* xliii (1932), 9–12 (= *Homeric Verse*, 331–3).

[4] Such abnormal phonology is rare, but it must not be supposed that ἀοιδοί were uncritical users of their language: there are striking anomalies in *Scutum* and *h.Merc.*, on which see Janko 1982 (n. 8), which betray a taste for archaism and interrupt the otherwise insensible assimilation of the *Kunstsprache* to the vernacular.

[5] For the broad direction of the development see Janko 1982 (n. 8), and for particular formulae A. Hoekstra, *The Sub-epic Stage of the Formulaic Tradition* (Amsterdam, 1969).

In the simplest terms our texts of Homer bear witness simultaneously to two stages in the evolution of the *Kunstsprache*: first, the stage reached when the text was first stabilized; second, the stage endorsed in the late classical and Hellenistic periods. To the second we owe the fact that the orthography of the paradosis is uniform: no manuscript or papyrus writes digamma, all show aspiration, if it is indicated, diectasis, the same odd flexion of *σπέος* (datives *σπῆι* and *σπέσσι*—see i 15 n.) and some other *s*-stems (see viii 73 n.), and *η* > *ει* in certain circumstances before vowels. Some accidents at this stage were actually attributed by Alexandrian scholars to a *μεταχαρακτηρισμός* from the Old Attic to the Ionic alphabet (see n. on *καιροσέων*, vii 107). In an age when many children were taught epic poetry from a written text by schoolmasters (cf. the school scene on the red figure cup by Douris; J. D. Beazley, *Attic Red Figure Vase Painting*² (Oxford, 1963), 431, 48), it is understandable that spelling pronunciations of obscure words became established and were reflected in subsequent forms of the text. For the most part, however, the orthography and even the accentuation of the transmitted text represents the tradition of the Homeric rhapsodes.[7] But how many features are actually due to the evolution of the language within that tradition? Aspiration almost certainly, since words which should be aspirated on etymological grounds but were absent from the Attic vernacular (e.g. *ἦμαρ*, *ἤμβροτε*) retain *spiritus lenis*: some *lectiones faciliores* (e.g. *τηλεθοῶσα* for *τηλεθάουσα* v 63, and some repairs to apparently bad metre (see v 34 n.). But we can detect, or suspect, these only when the tradition fluctuates. For contraction, diectasis, and similar phenomena belong generally to the first stage, the first stabilization of the text: only radical and unacceptable rewriting can eliminate them.

The form of the *Kunstsprache* found in the *Odyssey* may be defined first in relation to certain linguistic developments which are guaranteed by metre, then in relation to other early hexameter poetry. An attempt is often made to describe the language in quantitative terms, e.g. the rate of neglect of initial digamma is 17.2% in *Il.*, 17.9% in *Od.*, 33.7% in Hes. *Th.*, 37.9% in *Op.*, 27.7% in *Sc.*, 53.6% in *h.Merc.*, and 15.9% in *h.Ven.*[8] As a chronological argument a single criterion is deceptive: a poet may archaize—the author of *Scutum* diligently observed digamma, that of *h.Merc.* had a penchant for the *-οιο* genitive. More importantly, if the poet embarked on a topic where the tradition provided little formulaic diction, he naturally drew (for there was no other source) on his vernacular: similes in Homer are notoriously replete with neologism.[9] Thus the quantity of secondary linguistic features in a given block of verse chiefly reflects a fact of subject matter (see viii 266 ff. n.), the proportion of traditional to non-traditional material.[10] Where the material is very extensive, on the other hand, or where subject matter is comparable, R. Janko (1982, see n. 8) has shown that effective arguments can rest on quantitative premisses. It is useful, however, for the present purpose, to consider how deeply a given neologism has penetrated the *Kunstsprache*, rather than its absolute frequency. A linguistic development of the vernacular quickly penetrated the fluid and non-formular part of the *Kunstsprache* (where it differed least), or took effect at the junctions between formulae: next the development would appear in modified formulae, 'formulae by analogy', and other derivatives of primary formulae: last of all would the development be found attested among regular formulae. Thus (ϝ)*οἶνος* + epithet is a common turn of phrase in the *Odyssey* (41 times). Digamma is observed in 35 instances, mostly examples of frequent formulae. Three instances are ambiguous, *οἶνος* standing at the beginning of the verse. Two instances of neglect occur among derivative expressions, *ἡδέος οἴνου* and *μελιηδέος οἴνου*, by declension from the accusative or dative cases, and there is one unique expression *ἀθέσφατος οἶνος*. No regular noun–epithet formulae show neglect (but cf. *δαμασσάμενος* or *βεβαρηότα με φρένας οἴνω*, where the plural *φρένας* is supported by xxi 297 *ἐπεὶ φρένας ἄασεν οἴνῳ*). The loss of digamma, at this point, had hardly begun to affect the formulaic diction.

---

[6] For the prehistory of some aspects of the *Kunstsprache* see the two monographs of Hoekstra, *Modifications*, and *Epic Verse before Homer* (Amsterdam, 1981).

[7] Orthography: J. La Roche, *Die homerische Textkritik im Altertum* (Leipzig, 1866), has an invaluable account of the paradosis. Accentuation: Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i, 189–92—observe the 'archaisme remarquable' by which paroxytone words of trochaic shape receive an oxytone accent on the final syllable when followed by an enclitic: type *ἔνθά τε* (Allen's OCT prints the normal accents, however.) For other special accents see also Schwyzer, *Grammatik*, 384–5.

[8] Figures taken from R. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction* (Cambridge, 1982). He comments (p. 46), 'The important observation to be made is that *Od.* is slightly more advanced than *Il.*, but less than Hesiod and most Hymns, and that *Op.* is more advanced than *Th.*'. The pattern is recurrent. Janko's other criteria are: the gen. sgs. of *a*- and *o*-stems, the gen. pl. of *a*-stems, the dat. pl. of *a*- and *o*-stems, the acc. pl. of *a*- and *o*-stems, the declension of *Ζεύς*, and the movable *-ν*.

[9] Details in Shipp, *Studies*, 7–200. To similes may be added comments, anecdotes, and such like material standing to one side of the narrative proper.

[10] Janko (op. cit.) cites figures for individual books. Of interest also is K. A. Garbrah, 'A Linguistic Analysis of Selected Portions of the Homeric Odyssey' *Glotta* xlvii (1969), 144 ff., on the distinctive character of the Telemachy.

In addition to the loss of digamma Hoekstra (*Modifications*) has closely examined two other features from this point of view, the quantitative metathesis and the movable -*ν*; he has also animadverted on vowel contraction, loss of the dual, -*σαν* plural, and -*θη*-aorist. The general conclusion is the same in each case: the secondary features are established in the text (in the fluid part of the diction), but not in the formular system. The linguistic developments in the vernacular of Ionia probably antedate the end of the eighth century, though not by any long period of time.

The works of Hesiod and the Homeric *Hymns* give an impression of the epic dialect more deeply penetrated by secondary linguistic features. Much of this impression is due to the increased frequency of secondary features in the non-formular diction, for the features themselves usually have occasional parallels in Homer. Yet some of the increased frequency is found in areas which are very conservative in Homer: Hes. *Op.* neglects the digamma of *οἶνος* 3 times out of 7, *Od.* 8 times out of 88; *h.Merc.* that of *ἔργον* 3 times out of 13, *h.Cer.* 4 times out of 7, against only 5 times in *Od.* out of 129 examples.[11] Some new formulae appear, made possible by the evolving vernacular, e.g. *Κρονίδεω διὰ βουλάς* Hes. *Op.* 71, *Th.* 572; and in *h.Merc.* a complete system exploiting the contraction of *Ἑρμῆς* < *Ἑρμείας*:

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\textit{κύδιμος}\\ \textit{ἀγλαὸς}\end{array}\right\}\textit{Ἑρμῆς}\qquad\qquad \left.\begin{array}{l}\textit{Κυλλήνιος}\\ \textit{ἐριούνιος}\end{array}\right\}\textit{Ἑρμῆς}.$$

---

[11] The issue is complicated by the nature of the vernacular from which the poet was seeking to distinguish the *Kunstsprache*. 'He [Hesiod] neglected the digamma, therefore, in conscious imitation of the traditional poetic language; while the Ionian rhapsode did the opposite for the same reason.' (M. L. West, *Theogony* (Oxford, 1966), 91.) The Boeotian retained initial ϝ until a remarkably late date: East Ionic lost it before the earliest documentation

For an editor of Homer these facts have two important implications. First, he is strongly counselled not to correct the transmitted text in the face of a unanimous tradition. No doubt *ἀοιδοί* sometimes accepted a faulty but traditional rhythm for later generations to correct, but poets as much as rhapsodes must be granted a feeling for metre and the ability to use all the resources of *Kunstsprache* and vernacular to 'correct' it. Second, the text—the ultimate ancestor of our text—was stabilized at a very early date, earlier than the date of composition of *Hymns* and other early hexameter poetry.

In a strictly oral culture the *ἀοιδός* never completes his poem in the sense that he makes the last corrections to the final draft and lets it pass from his control. For him a poem is not a text, but a sequence of themes and incidents. These he endeavours to recreate as well as his talents permit and his audience deserve on the occasion of each performance. We should not expect in these circumstances that any version of a long poem would be precisely identical to any other version, or consistently of the highest standard. Modern comparative studies confirm this expectation. The divergences are not always substantial. On the lips of the same performer, working in similar circumstances, a poem may acquire a remarkable degree of stability. But such stability is unlikely, in an oral milieu, to survive the poet. For it is when the poem passes from one performer to another that the greatest deformation takes effect. The new poet adopts the story, the sequence of themes and incidents, but recreates those themes according to his own habits.[12]

It is important to realize that the transmutation of the poem at this stage is likely to be considerable. Even within one of the Homeric poems, where certain frequent themes, the so-called 'typical scenes' of arming, sacrificing, etc., tend towards a certain form and diction, uniformity is never actually achieved. In the closest instance the scenes of sacrifice at *Il.* i 458–68 and ii 421–31 share nine lines, but not the two for the roasting of the entrails. At the other extreme it is instructive to compare *h.Merc.* 1–9 and *h.* xviii 1–9.

h.Merc. *Ἑρμῆν ὕμνει Μοῦσα Διὸς καὶ Μαιάδος υἱόν,*
Κυλλήνης μεδέοντα καὶ Ἀρκαδίης πολυμήλου,
ἄγγελον ἀθανάτων ἐριούνιον, ὃν τέκε Μαῖα

---

[12] The doctrine is that of Lord, *Singer*, 68–98 (esp. 78 and 95–8): some of the material on which his generalizations are based may be read in *La Poesia Epica e la sua Formazione*, (Problemi Attuali di Scienza e di Cultura, cxxxix, Rome, 1970), 13–28 (esp. 16–18). For stability of an oral text see *Singer* 94–5 and G. S. Kirk, *CQ* x (1960), 271–81 (= *Language and Background of Homer* (Cambridge, 1964), 79–89 = *Homer and the Oral Tradition* (Cambridge, 1976), 113–28).

νύμφη ἐϋπλόκαμος Διὸς ἐν φιλότητι μιγεῖσα,
αἰδοίη· μακάρων δὲ θεῶν ἠλεύαθ' ὅμιλον
ἄντρον ἔσω ναίουσα παλίσκιον, ἔνθα Κρονίων
νύμφῃ ἐϋπλοκάμῳ μισγέσκετο νυκτὸς ἀμολγῷ,
ὄφρα κατὰ γλυκὺς ὕπνος ἔχοι λευκώλενον Ἥρην,
λήθων ἀθανάτους τε θεοὺς θνητούς τ' ἀνθρώπους.

h. xviii *Ἑρμῆν ἀείδω Κυλλήνιον Ἀργειφόντην,*
Κυλλήνης μεδέοντα καὶ Ἀρκαδίης πολυμήλου
ἄγγελον ἀθανάτων ἐριούνιον, ὃν τέκε Μαῖα
Ἄτλαντος θυγάτηρ Διὸς ἐν φιλότητι μιγεῖσα
αἰδοίη· μακάρων δὲ θεῶν ἀλέεινεν ὅμιλον
ἄντρῳ ναιετάουσα παλισκίῳ, ἔνθα Κρονίων
νύμφῃ ἐϋπλοκάμῳ μισγέσκετο νυκτὸς ἀμολγῷ
εὖτε κατὰ γλυκὺς ὕπνος ἔχοι λευκώλενον Ἥρην.
λάνθανε δ' ἀθανάτους τε θεοὺς θνητούς τ' ἀνθρώπους.

Both passages seem to recreate the same praise of Hermes, yet only three lines are shared, exactly, between them. *Ἀοιδή*, it is clear, could not conserve the special character of the text of Homer, if these two passages are in any way typical of different performances of the 'same' material.

Yet something important may have happened to the art of narrative poetry in the early seventh century and reduced the instability of the poems. It is clear that *ἀοιδή* was literally singing, and required the accompaniment of the lyre. Modern analogies suggest that the poet could not have performed without it.[13] Yet Hesiod's account of his 'call' (*Th.* 29 ff.) tells how the poet was given not a *φόρμιγξ* but a *σκῆπτρον*. In the epic the *σκῆπτρον* is the insignia of the orator; we meet it later as the staff of the unaccompanied reciter of verse, the *ῥαψῳδός*. Hesiod, accordingly was dubbed the first rhapsode (Nicocles, *FGrH* 376 F 8). It is permissible, when the lyre is discarded, to infer a change in the mode of performance of hexameter poetry, and therefore, in a tradition where composition and performance had been identical, in the mode of its recreation. The skills of the actor, in short, supplanted those of the bard; a version of the text was memorized, and so fixed.[14] Naturally it did not happen all at once, nor were the new skills invariably trustworthy. The celebrated François vase (J. D. Beazley, *Attic Black Figure Vase Painting* (Oxford, 1956), 76, 1) depicts the funeral games of Patroclus with a personnel quite different from that of *Il.* xxiii.

---

[13] Lord, *Singer*, 126–7.

[14] For an attempt to evaluate the scanty evidence for these crucial developments see R. Sealey, 'From Phemius to Ion', *REG* lxx (1957), 312–55.

The alternative would be to postulate a written text from a very early period. The expense and labour of such an enterprise, and the lack of materials, are grave obstacles to such a view. A graver obstacle is the lack of motivation. The earliest literacy did not confront the oral culture with the realization of its full potential: the reverse was true. In its perfection the oral culture was both subtle and satisfying, for audiences and for performers, and the written word offered no advantages. The motivation of a written text, therefore, had to be external to the tradition of *ἀοιδή*, something felt by those whose interest in epic poetry went beyond that attributed to Alcinous and his court in *Od.* viii. It is natural at this point to think of the bodies who called themselves 'Homeridae' and 'Creophyleioi', but what role they performed, if any, in the creation of a written text is entirely uncertain.[15] Evidence appears only with those who organized the recitations of Homer at the Panathenaea in the sixth century. Their action reflects and culminates that shift in attitude towards the epic which established Homer as the 'educator of the Greeks'. What distinguished the Athenians was their dissatisfaction with the material immediately available to them and their determination to make use of the complete poems.

As to the process by which the first written texts of Homer were produced, whatever their date and provenance, no information, obviously, exists. Modern investigators have distinguished (1) the actual performance (electronically recorded, and irrelevant to the present enquiry), (2) the autograph text, created by a poet who has acquired literacy, and (3) the dictated text.[16] The last has been thought the most probable origin of the first written texts, yet no study in depth exists of the effect of dictation on the text dictated. For the poets the situation, obviously, is novel. For most of them novelty is merely irksome: the pace is too slow, the 'audience' unresponsive and probably critical. But should a poet successfully adapt himself, the result is often *a more elaborate treatment both of the story and of the themes within it*. For the scribe the task bears some relation to that of an editor. At the least he adjusts language and diction to what he believes to be the norm; he corrects metre; he emends what he conceives to be mistakes, and ensures the match of repeated passages; if he botches his transcription, he must reconstruct the passage as best he can.[17] If the scribe is also a collector, his awareness of alternative versions may tempt him into a truly editorial role, the preparation, by conflation, of a 'consolidated' text. What seem to be echoes of this phase in the story of the text are found in the scholia to *Iliad* x, and might also have been heard, if the scholia were fuller, in the conclusion to the *Odyssey*. Its effects may also be suspected at the beginning of *Odyssey* v, and of course in innumerable other places where the hand of the *Bearbeiter* was detected during an older phase of Homeric criticism.

---

[15] Homeridae: P. *N.* ii 1–3 with schol.; Pl. *Ion* 530 d, *Phdr.*, 252 d, *R.* 599 e; Isoc., *Helena* 65 with Harpocration, *Lex.*, s.v. *Ὁμηρίδαι* from which it appears they were a *γένος* in Chios who performed (or were supposed to have performed) Homer's poems, and were the custodians of arcane information and even of *ἀνέκδοτα*. There are notes on modern controversies in H. T. Wade-Gery, *The Poet of the Iliad* (Cambridge, 1952), 19–21. Creophyleioi: Arist., fr. 611 Rose, Neanth. *FGrH* 84 F 29, Plu. *Lyc.* 4, Iamb. *VP* 11: discussion in W. Burkert, 'Die Leistung eines Kreophylos', *MH* xxix (1972), 74–85.

[16] C. M. (Sir Maurice) Bowra, *Homer and his Forerunners* (Edinburgh, 1955), 8–13, favoured the literate poet: cf. his *Heroic Poetry* (London, 1952), 240; A. A. Lord, 'Homer's Originality: Oral Dictated Texts', *TAPhA* lxxxiv (1953), 124–34, the dictated text. For the subsequent controversy (not much of which rested on firsthand knowledge of oral literature) see Lesky, *Homeros*, coll. 17–23, and A. Heubeck, *Archaeologia* X, 126–84.

---

[17] Lord, *Singer*, 124–8. Some of the consequences of dictation as the method of recording are outlined by M. Skafte Jensen, *The Homeric Question and the Oral-Formulaic Theory* (Copenhagen, 1980), 81–95.

THE TRANSMISSION OF THE TEXT

Stephanie West

The history of the Homeric text in antiquity is at many points obscure and controversial, but discussion of the two epics is hardly possible without some understanding of the way in which they were handed down from the time when they were first recorded in writing until the text was set on a relatively secure footing in the Hellenistic age. The following brief sketch, offered simply as background to the commentary, is intended to alert the reader to the critical phases and the major hazards in the *Odyssey*'s transmission.[1]

Our starting-point is a manuscript of the *Odyssey* produced by (or at least with the co-operation of) its author. The study of contemporary oral epic traditions in many cultures over the last century does not encourage us to suppose that without a written text long and complex poems like the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* could be reproduced beyond the lifetime of their composers in what, by the standards of a literate society, would seem even an approximately accurate form; fluidity and constant reconstitution of its materials are characteristic of oral heroic poetry, and the extraordinary powers of memorization demonstrated by those who have mastered its traditional techniques are accompanied by a facility in improvisation fatal to the accurate transmission of a work of any length or elaboration. Nor does either of the Homeric poems seem quite as well suited to the normal conditions of oral epic performance as a cycle of short, self-contained lays would have been; the composition of a long, carefully structured, poetic narrative might in itself be thought to suggest a seminal appreciation of the advantages of script.

The composer of the *Iliad* appears to have heard of the revived greatness of Egyptian Thebes under the pious Nubian kings of Dyn. XXV (715–663); the reopening of Egypt to the Greeks at this period seems to be reflected in the *Odyssey*'s penchant for Egyptian adventures.[2] These are the most definite indications which the two epics offer of a *terminus post quem*, while the general ancient belief that they came at, or near, the beginning of Greek literary history discourages hypotheses which would put the date of their composition later than the seventh century. The first surviving examples of Greek alphabetic writing belong to the second half of the eighth century. Some controversy surrounds the date of its invention (i.e. of the adaptation of Phoenician script to Greek),[3] but certainly even rudimentary literacy must have been extremely restricted in Greek lands before 700, and it seems most unlikely that anyone would have attempted to record a long poetic text in writing before the seventh century. The resumption of regular contacts with Egypt in the reign of Psammetichus I (663–610) brought the advantage of direct access to supplies of papyrus, destined to be the most popular material for Greek books throughout antiquity. Increased contact with their Near Eastern neighbours perhaps stimulated awareness of the advantages of recording poetry in writing.[4] At all events, by the last third of the seventh century the practice was well established; Archilochus, Hesiod, and Tyrtaeus are all to be dated before then, and their precisely worded compositions could not long have survived their authors without a written record.

---

[1] An excellent introduction to the subject is given by Lesky, *Homeros*, 145 ff.; see also G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*^{2} (Florence, 1952), 201 ff., J. A. Davison in *Companion*, 215 ff.; still useful, though somewhat eccentric at times, is the section on transmission in T. W. Allen, *Homer: The Origins and the Transmission* (Oxford, 1924), 202 ff.; on the early stages see also R. Sealey, 'From Phemios to Ion', *REG* lxx (1957), 312 ff.

We should not underestimate the difference between setting down a poem of fifty (or even five hundred) lines and committing to writing a long heroic epic; perhaps the poet of the *Iliad* was not the first to attempt adapting the traditional techniques of formulaic composition to the slow pace of the pen, but had himself benefited by observing the less successful experiments of earlier pioneers. At all events the feasibility of this application of script had been satisfactorily demonstrated by the time that the poet of the *Odyssey* conceived the idea of a monumental epic on Odysseus in emulation of his great predecessor. How long elapsed between the composition of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* we cannot hope to say; scholarly convention favours a generation.

---

[2] *Il.* ix 381–4; see further W. Burkert, 'Das hunderttorige Theben u. die Datierung der Ilias', *WSt* NF x (1976), 5 ff., A. Heubeck, *Gymnasium* lxxxix (1982), 442–3. On the *Odyssey*'s fascination with Egypt see below p. 192.

[3] See further L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (Oxford, 1961), *CAH* iii² i 819 ff., A. Heubeck, *Archaeologia* X, A. Johnston, 'The Extent and Use of Literacy: The Archaeological Evidence', in R. Hägg (ed.), *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century BC: Tradition and Innovation* (Stockholm, 1983), 63–8.

[4] See further W. Burkert, *Die orientalisierende Epoche in der griechischen Religion u. Literatur*, SHAW 1984, 1, esp. 29 ff., 85 ff.

Some time before 600, then, we may with reasonable confidence assume that a poem recognizable as our *Odyssey* was set down in writing. The existence of a written text did not, however, by itself offer much protection against deliberate alteration. We know that the text of tragedy has suffered extensively from actors' interpolations;[5] rhapsodes,[6] on whom for some generations the transmission of the Homeric poems depended, had equally powerful motives for 'improving' the text. The poet of the *Odyssey* himself thought novelty important in song (i 351–2), and no doubt very many of those who recited his work agreed. While oral poetry was still a living art it must have been common for rhapsodes to elaborate and embroider the text, to glorify a patron's heroic ancestors, and to add extra episodes; the study of contemporary oral poetry in Yugoslavia has shown the liberties which a poet may take with a written (even a printed) text.[7] Such individual enterprise would normally be ephemeral in its effects, but the prestige and initiative of an influential rhapsode might secure a longer life for his additions.[8] The looseness of Homeric narrative and the traditional formulaic style made minor alteration simple even for bards with no pretensions to creativity.

---

[5] See D. L. Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1934), M. D. Reeve, 'Interpolations in Greek Tragedy', *GRBS* xiii (1972), 247 ff., 451 ff.; xiv (1973), 145 ff.; A. Dihle, *Der Prolog der 'Bacchen'*, SHAW 1981, 2. The arguments are strong for regarding most interpolations in tragedy as histrionic in origin, rather than as products of the period of purely literary transmission. That the ancients were well aware of the danger is shown by the decree of Lycurgus in 330 regarding the three tragedians ([Plut.] *Vit. X Orat.* 841 f.): *τὰς τραγῳδίας αὐτῶν ἐν κοινῷ γραψαμένους φυλάττειν καὶ τὸν τῆς πόλεως γραμματέα παραναγινώσκειν τοῖς ὑποκρινομένοις· οὐκ ἐξεῖναι δὲ ἄλλως ὑποκρίνεσθαι.* But considerable damage had already been done.

[6] The term *rhapsodos* came to denote mere reciters like Plato's Ion, but even in the fourth century the verb *rhapsodein* could be used of original composition: cf. Pl. *R.* 600 d (of Homer and Hesiod). The tendency to restrict these terms to those who declaimed the works of others must have come with the decline of oral technique; contrast Hes. fr. 357, 1–2 *ἐν Δήλῳ τότε πρῶτον ἐγὼ καὶ Ὅμηρος ἀοιδοὶ | μέλπομεν, ἐν νεαροῖς ὕμνοις ῥάψαντες ἀοιδήν*, Pi. *N.* ii 1–2, *Ὁμηρίδαι ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων . . . ἀοιδοί.*

[7] Well illustrated by Avdo Međedović's version of 'The Wedding of Smailagić Meho', in M. Parry, A. B. Lord, D. Bynum (eds.), *Serbo-Croatian Heroic Songs*, iii (Cambridge, Mass., 1974). This song was dictated by the singer Ahmed Isakov Šemić in 1885 and published the following year by Friedrich Krauss; reproduced in various popular editions it became widespread among singers. The version dictated by Međedović in 1935 was considerably expanded and seems artistically more effective; though Međedović was himself illiterate, he learned the song from hearing it read.

[8] Compare what we are told about the rhapsode Cynaethus of Chios (schol. Pi. *N.* ii 1 c): *Ὁμηρίδας ἔλεγον τὸ μὲν ἀρχαῖον τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὁμήρου γένους, οἳ καὶ τὴν ποίησιν αὐτοῦ ἐκ διαδοχῆς ᾖδον· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ οἱ ῥαψῳδοὶ οὐκέτι τὸ γένος εἰς Ὅμηρον ἀνάγοντες. ἐπιφανεῖς δὲ ἐγένοντο οἱ περὶ Κύναιθον, οὓς φασι πολλὰ τῶν ἐπῶν ποιήσαντας ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν Ὁμήρου ποίησιν. ἦν δὲ ὁ Κύναιθος τὸ γένος Χῖος, ὃς καὶ τῶν ἐπιγραφομένων Ὁμήρου ποιημάτων τὸν εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα γεγραφὼς ὕμνον ἀνατέθεικεν αὐτῷ. οὗτος οὖν ὁ Κύναιθος πρῶτος ἐν Συρακούσαις ἐραψῴδησε τὰ Ὁμήρου ἔπη κατὰ τὴν ξθʹ Ὀλυμπιάδα, ὡς Ἱππόστρατός φησιν* (*FGrH* 568 F 5).

In these circumstances the epics might have been expected to develop along diverging paths in different parts of the Greek world. Yet when, in the third and second centuries BC, copies from as far apart as Marseilles and Sinope were collated at Alexandria,[9] the text, despite a vast range of trivial variants, was substantially the same.[10] This essential uniformity is the more remarkable inasmuch as each of the two epics has absorbed a substantial body of material regarded in antiquity as alien to the original conception (*Od.* xxiii 297–xxiv, *Il.* x), and yet, so to speak, canonical.[11] Many great popular heroic epics impose on their editors a choice between different recensions;[12] but the history of the Homeric text, as far back as it can be traced, shows only a very slight degree of redactional freedom.

This strongly suggests that something was done to standardize the text and inhibit the proliferation of variants, and it is reasonable to connect this standardization with the tradition of what has come to be known, rather grandiosely, as the Pisistratean recension.[13] In the Hellenistic age it was widely believed that Pisistratus or Solon had tampered with the text of Homer, permanently imposing a version in accordance with Athenian interests; legend subsequently magnified yet further Pisistratus' role in the redaction of the poems. It was long

fashionable to dismiss this as a Hellenistic invention, but already in fourth-century sources there is some evidence pointing in this direction, though Pisistratus is not actually named. The most important testimony is [Pl.] *Hipparch.* 228 b: *Ἱππάρχῳ . . . ὃς ἄλλα τε πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ ἔργα σοφίας ἀπεδείξατο, καὶ τὰ Ὁμήρου ἔπη πρῶτος ἐκόμισεν εἰς τὴν γῆν ταυτηνί, καὶ ἠνάγκασε τοὺς ῥαψῳδοὺς Παναθηναίοις ἐξ ὑπολήψεως ἐφεξῆς αὐτὰ διιέναι, ὥσπερ νῦν ἔτι οἵδε ποιοῦσιν.* The specific attribution of these measures to the relatively unromantic figure of Hipparchus inspires confidence. We should not infer that the author of this dialogue supposed the Homeric poems to have been unknown at Athens before Hipparchus; more probably he believed that, though the epics themselves were familiar from recitation, no text was available in Attica until Hipparchus acquired one and established it as the version to be followed at the Panathenaea. This Panathenaic regulation is also mentioned by Lycurgus (*in Leocr.* 102): *οὕτω γὰρ ὑπέλαβον ὑμῶν οἱ πατέρες σπουδαῖον εἶναι ποιητὴν* [sc. *Ὅμηρον*], *ὥστε νόμον ἔθεντο καθ' ἑκάστην πεντετηρίδα τῶν Παναθηναίων μόνου τῶν ἄλλων ποιητῶν ῥαψωδεῖσθαι τὰ ἔπη.*[14] The vagueness of Lycurgus' ascription of this measure to *ὑμῶν οἱ πατέρες* may be due to genuine uncertainty, but more probably reflects reluctance to mention one of the Pisistratids in a context which would set him in a favourable light.

The introduction of Homeric recitation to the programme of the Pisistratean Panathenaea would have quickly revealed the need for an agreed form of the text if the competition was to run smoothly. While no one was likely to be troubled by slight verbal discrepancies between one rhapsode's version and another's, administrative difficulties would have been inevitable if there were disagreement about the inclusion or omission of interesting episodes (such as the Doloneia). If the Athenian authorities decided to insist on a particular text (as they surely must have done), we should expect them to have chosen one deemed to be of respectable provenance, but we should not imagine that anyone in the sixth century would have undertaken a systematic comparison of the various versions available, or that the copy selected must have been what we should judge the best, much less that it had preserved the original composition with complete fidelity. Once an official Athenian version had been prescribed, rhapsodes who intended to perform in Attica would have wanted copies for themselves; outside this fairly restricted professional group there can hardly have been much demand for some time. Rhapsodic acceptance, hastened, no doubt, by the increasing importance of Athens at this period, would have ensured the success of the Attic text over potential rivals.

---

[9] On the so-called 'city editions' see below pp. 44–5.

[10] At an earlier date Herodotus' manner of referring to Homer implies that he, at least, was unaware of significant regional differences.

[11] Schol. *Od.* xxiii 296: *Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος πέρας τῆς Ὀδυσσείας τοῦτο ποιοῦνται.* M, V, Vind. *τοῦτο τέλος τῆς Ὀδυσσείας φησὶν Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης.* H, M, Q. Cf. Eust. ad loc. (This note is sometimes taken as an aesthetic comment, to the effect that the *Odyssey*'s story has now reached its consummation, but it seems to me much more likely to represent textual criticism; I hope to deal with this question at greater length elsewhere. For more detailed discussion (and a rather different view) see Heubeck on xxiii 297 ff., introduction to xxiv, xxiv 205 ff.) Schol. *Il.* x 1: *φασὶ τὴν ῥαψῳδίαν ὑφ' Ὁμήρου ἰδίᾳ τετάχθαι καὶ μὴ εἶναι μέρος τῆς Ἰλιάδος, ὑπὸ δὲ Πεισιστράτου τετάχθαι εἰς τὴν ποίησιν.* (See further Lesky, *Homeros*, 105–6.)

[12] There is an obvious danger of over-simplification in attempting comparisons, but it is clear that editors of the *Nibelungenlied*, the *Chanson de Roland*, the medieval Greek epic of Digenis Akritas, and, outstandingly, the *Mahabharata* face a far more complex task than the editor of Homer. See further H. Brackert, *Beiträge zur Handschriftenkritik des Nibelungenliedes* (Berlin, 1963), 169 ff., J. Bédier, *La Chanson de Roland commentée* (Paris, 1927), 65 ff., S. Impellizieri, *Il Digenis Akritas* (Florence, 1940), 87 ff., M. Winternitz, *Geschichte der indischen Literatur* (Leipzig, 1908), i 397 ff., V. S. Sukthankar, *The Mahabharata for the First Time Critically Edited* (Poona, 1933), i Introduction.

[13] The Pisistratean recension has been restored to scholarly respectability as a result of R. Merkelbach's careful study of the ancient testimony (*RhM* lxxxxv (1952), 23 ff. (= *Untersuchungen*, 239 ff.). See also M. Skafte Jensen, *The Homeric Question and the Oral Formulaic Theory* (Copenhagen, 1980), 128 ff.

[14] Cf. Isoc. *Paneg.* 159 (even vaguer). To this fourth-century testimony we should perhaps add that of the Megarian historian Dieuchidas, cited by DL (i 57): *τά τε Ὁμήρου ἐξ ὑποβολῆς γέγραφε* [sc. Solon] *ῥαψῳδεῖσθαι, οἷον ὅπου ὁ πρῶτος ἔληξεν, ἐκεῖθεν ἄρχεσθαι τὸν ἐχόμενον. μᾶλλον οὖν Σόλων Ὅμηρον ἐφώτισεν ἢ Πεισίστρατος· ⟨ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ἦν ὁ τὰ ἔπη εἰς τὸν κατάλογον ἐμποιήσας καὶ οὐ Πεισίστρατος*, suppl. Leaf⟩ *ὥς φησι Διευχίδας ἐν πέμπτῳ Μεγαρικῶν* (*FGrH* 485 F 6). *ἦν δὲ μάλιστα τὰ ἔπη ταυτί· 'οἳ δ' ἄρ' Ἀθήνας εἶχον' καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς* (*Il.* ii 546 ff.). But Dieuchidas' date is not entirely certain: see further J. A. Davison, *CQ* liii (1969), 216 ff.

It may be thought unlikely that an Athenian version could have won such acceptance if it had been extensively reworked and revised. But a few obviously Athenocentric passages must certainly belong to this phase. References to Athens are not of course in themselves suspect, but in some instances the desire to appeal to an Athenian audience seems blatant: the most striking is the Attic entry in the Catalogue of Ships (*Il.* ii 546–56).[15] No doubt it was common for local colour to be added in recitation; but such insertions would not normally have been long lasting or widespread in their effects, and the perpetuation of this Attic material is not adequately explained by Athenian domination of the nascent book trade in the fifth and fourth centuries. We are not, however, entitled to assume that the only additions which a Pisistratean editor would have thought proper will betray themselves by their obvious patriotic intent. More drastic interference is certainly implied by the tradition which ascribes the insertion of the Doloneia to Pisistratus.[16]

---

[15] The equation of Attica with Athens, ignoring the other Attic towns, is in itself suspicious; the details of cult-practice have no parallel in the Catalogue, and the fulsome praise lavished on the obscure Menestheus justifiably excited the suspicions of Zenodotus. In the *Odyssey* it is tempting to connect the reference to Orestes' sojourn at Athens (iii 307) with the Pisistratean recension; but in Zenodotus' text Orestes' exile was spent in Phocis, and it would be rash to dismiss his reading as a conjecture: see n. ad loc. However, the description of Athena's visit to Athens (vii 80–1) is of little interest to anyone except an Athenian, and was suspected in antiquity: see schol. ad loc. The third-century historian Hereas of Megara (*FGrH* 486 F 1) believed that Pisistratus had inserted xi 631 *Θησέα Πειρίθοόν τε, θεῶν ἀριδείκετα τέκνα*; he was surely right in thinking that the selection of these two heroes for special mention points to Athens. It has also been suggested that the part played by Nestor and his family has been expanded, by way of compliment to Pisistratus, who claimed descent from them: see further below, iii 36 n. The orthography has undoubtedly assumed an Attic appearance, but this could adequately be explained by the prominence of Athens in the early development of the book trade and the tendency of scribes to replace unfamiliar forms with Attic ones. Irreducible Atticisms are very few, and there is in any case no reason why metrically convenient Atticisms (like ἐπέκειντο for ἐπεκείατο *Od.* vi 19) should not have entered the epic language before Pisistratus.

[16] If (as I believe) the end of the *Odyssey* was added at this period (see above, n. 11), there must also have been alterations earlier in the poem to prepare for the concluding episodes.

This sixth-century Athenian recension must be regarded as the archetype of all our Homeric MSS and of the indirect tradition represented by ancient quotations and allusions; we can only speculate about what preceded it.[17] It would of course have lacked such aids to the reader as word-division, accentuation, punctuation, and the distinction between capital and small letters; these sophistications, which would have resolved many of the perplexities which beset Homeric scholarship, were not to be introduced to Greek book production for many centuries. We should also expect a scribe working in Attica in the sixth century to use the Attic alphabet, which differed from the Ionic (officially adopted at Athens in 404/3) in making no distinction between the three *e*-sounds (ε, ει, η) or between the three *o*-sounds (ο, ου, ω) and in failing to use double letters; no doubt to Attic scribes these refinements seemed merely a nuisance. Cut off as we are from the living tradition of Homeric recitation, we must regret the fact that the Attic alphabet denied to the orthography of unfamiliar words a protection which Ionic script would have afforded. But in the archaic and classical periods these disadvantages would have seemed unimportant; people knew the Homeric poems primarily from hearing them, and anyone with a sufficiently serious interest to acquire (or even consult) a text must generally have had a clear enough idea of how it was supposed to sound.[18]

The familiar twenty-four-fold division of the two epics very probably goes back to this period; at all events it is almost certainly pre-Alexandrian.[19] The use of the term *rhapsodia* for what we call a book indicates that the system was based on rhapsodic practice. Panathenaic regulations must in any case have prescribed the length of a rhapsode's stint.

---

[17] The point was well stressed by Erich Bethe (*Homer* i, 52–3): 'Für die Überlieferung der Ilias kommt also nur eine einzige attische Handschrift aus der Zeit des Peisistratos in Betracht. Ebenso für die Odyssee . . . Das kann nicht oft, nicht scharf genug betont werden. Denn nach keiner Richtung hin ist diese unbestreitbare Tatsache hinlänglich beachtet oder ausgenutzt worden, weder für die Analyse noch für die Textkritik. Ihr Ziel kann kein anderes sein als die Rekonstruktion dieser attischen Mutterhandschrift des sechsten Jahrhunderts für Ilias wie Odyssee . . . Dieser attische Homertext des sechsten Jahrhunderts ist das einzige Objekt aller Homerforschung. Er ist und muss für uns Homer schlechthin sein, denn es gibt keinen andern als diesen einen'.

[18] We sometimes find it suggested in the scholia that mistakes have arisen in the course of transliteration from the old Attic alphabet: e.g. schol. *Od.* i 52 Ἄτλαντος θυγάτηρ ὀλοόφρονος: ἣ ἐγέγραπτο κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν γραφὴν ⟨ολοοφρον⟩, εἶτά τις μὴ νοήσας προσέθηκε τὸ ος, schol. i 275 μητέρα δ' εἴ οἱ θυμὸς ἐφορμᾶται γαμέεσθαι, ἂψ ἴτω: τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ συνηθείᾳ ἐγέγραπτο μετερ ἀντὶ τοῦ μητηρ. τοῦτο ἀγνοήσας τις προσέθηκε τὸ α; see also schol. *Il.* vii 238, xi 104, xiv 241, xxi 363. This theory is in accordance with Aristarchus' belief that Homer was an Athenian (see schol. *Il.* xiii 197), but it unrealistically presupposes a solitary reader deciphering an unfamiliar text, and none of the examples put forward in the scholia is intrinsically convincing (though some good modern conjectures presuppose similar misunderstandings); see further Cauer, *Homerkritik*, 105 ff., Hainsworth vii 107.

This sixth-century standardization of the text could not prevent the proliferation of superficial variation. Fourth-century quotations, particularly in Plato and Aristotle, show a high proportion of variants. This evidence is not, by itself, entirely reliable, since we have to allow for inaccurate quotation from memory. But it is confirmed by the earliest surviving fragments of Homeric MSS, papyri of the third and second centuries BC, which contain many trivial variants, often evidently intended to remove difficulties of one sort or another, and numerous additions, flaccid and inorganic lines or groups of lines.[20] It is uncertain whether rhapsodes are to be held entirely responsible for this diversification; it may to some extent be due to the misplaced creativity of copyists. Certainly papyrological discoveries during the last century have made possible a much more accurate view of the work accomplished by the great Homeric scholars of the Hellenistic age.

Homeric scholarship did not of course begin with the foundation of Alexandria. Rhapsodes, sophists, and schoolmasters had long had a professional interest in the interpretation of Homer.[21] The poet

---

[19] The twenty-four-fold scheme, which works reasonably well for the *Iliad*, appears to have been imposed on the *Odyssey* to make it correspond, and results in some very short books, some of which might easily have been combined (e.g. vi + vii = 678 lines, xx + xxi = 828 lines). If the division had been Alexandrian, we should expect something more severely rational; if it were the work of Aristophanes or Aristarchus, xxiii 297–xxiv would surely have been relegated to a separate book (cf. n. 11). It is true that the only ancient writer to discuss the book division ascribes it to the school of Aristarchus: [Plu.] *Vita Hom.* ii 4 (xxv 22–25 Wil.): *εἰσὶ δὲ αὐτῷ ποιήσεις δύο, Ἰλίας καὶ Ὀδύσσεια, διῃρημένη ἑκατέρα εἰς τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν στοιχείων, οὐχ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ ποιητοῦ, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῶν γραμματικῶν τῶν περὶ Ἀρίσταρχον.* But in view of the ancient tendency to attribute to Aristarchus any innovation connected with the Homeric text (cf. Plu. *de aud. poet.* 26–7, Ath. 180 c), we should view this testimony with some scepticism, though there may be some substance to the writer's belief that the practice of designating the several books by the letters of the Ionic alphabet originated under the influence of Aristarchus.

[20] See further S. West, *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer* (Papyrologica Coloniensia, iii, Cologne and Opladen, 1967); subsequent papyrus discoveries have only confirmed the general picture.

[21] Rhapsodes were expected not only to recite but also to explain Homer (Pl. *Ion*, *passim*, Xen. *Smp.* iii 6), and indeed it would hardly have been possible for them to recite it effectively unless they at least believed that they understood it. A famous fragment of Aristophanes' *Daitaleis* (233 *PCG*) suggests that instruction in recondite

Antimachus of Colophon, who was probably born about the middle of the fifth century, produced a text from which readings are sometimes cited in the scholia (e.g. on i 85).[22] Aristotle discussed Homeric problems with some shrewdness, and is even said to have produced a text of the *Iliad* for his pupil Alexander, though this may be a myth; certainly it left no trace in subsequent Homeric scholarship.[23]

It is unlikely that anyone realized how much variation existed among current Homeric manuscripts before the foundation of the great library at Alexandria brought together vast numbers of texts.[24] The production of critical editions for the use of the library was an important aspect of this great Ptolemaic enterprise; it fell to Zenodotus of Ephesus, the first librarian, to attempt to produce order out of the chaos of contemporary Homeric texts.[25]

Modern scholars have differed widely in their estimate of Zenodotus' work; he has been regarded by some as cautious and conservative, by others as irresponsible and freakish. This disagreement results largely from the unsatisfactory nature of our sources. Almost everything we know about Zenodotus' work on Homer comes from the scholia, marginal notes culled from what were originally elaborate commentaries composed by the pupils of Aristarchus, and our information about his text is very incomplete, particularly for the *Odyssey*. While he composed monographs on particular problems, he

Homeric vocabulary was a regular part of Athenian education (the speaker is a father, apparently engaged in an altercation with his son): *πρὸς ταῦτα σὺ λέξον Ὁμήρου ἐμοὶ γλώττας, τί καλοῦσι κόρυμβα; . . . τί καλοῦσ' ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα*; Two stories in Plutarch's *Alcibiades* (vii 1) indicate that the quality of teaching was rather variable: in the one case Alcibiades rebuked a schoolmaster who had no text of Homer, in the other he expressed his admiration for a colleague who used one 'corrected' by himself. The interpretation of early poetry played an important part in sophistic education, illustrated (no doubt a little unfairly) by the exposition of Simonides which Plato puts in the mouth of Protagoras (*Prt.* 338 e 6 ff.). Protagoras also turned his attention to Homer; he was dissatisfied with the opening of the *Iliad* (DK 80 A 29, 30). See further H. I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité* (Paris, 1965), 39 ff.

[22] *Antimachi Colophonii reliquiae*, ed. B. Wyss (Berlin, 1936), xxix–xxxi, frr. 129–42; see also R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, i (Oxford, 1968), 93–5.

[23] Plu. *Alex.* viii. Aristotle published six books on Homeric problems (*Ἀπορήματα Ὁμηρικά*, frr. 142 ff. Rose); *Poetics* 25 is devoted to such difficulties and their solutions.

[24] On the rise of scholarship at Alexandria see Pfeiffer, op. cit. 88 ff., 105 ff., 171 ff., P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford, 1972), i 320 ff., W. J. Slater, *CQ* xxxii (1982), 336–49 (a slightly deflationary view).

[25] The old edition of H. Duentzer, *De Zenodoti studiis Homericis* (Göttingen, 1848 (Hildesheim, 1981)) is still useful, though somewhat antiquated; see further *RE* x A 23 ff. s.v. Zenodotos (3) (Nickau), K. Nickau, *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methoden des Zenodotos von Ephesos* (Berlin, 1977).

left no commentary to accompany his text,[26] and though anecdotal tradition may occasionally have transmitted his interpretation of disputed passages, it seems that on the whole later scholars could only guess his reasons for adopting readings which differed from those of Aristarchus. We should try to dissociate ourselves from the Aristarchean bias of our informants. It is clear that Aristarchus and his pupils did not understand the principles on which Zenodotus had worked, and we should not accept the assumption implicit in our sources that where he differed from Aristarchus he necessarily knew the reading which Aristarchus was to prefer. It must be emphasized that we have no idea how many manuscripts Zenodotus consulted, how he evaluated them, or whether he was consistent in his use of them.

The most interesting feature of his work was the use of a marginal sign, the obelos (—), to mark lines which he regarded as suspect. This procedure was called athetesis (rejection); it was an important element in Alexandrian Homeric scholarship, not properly appreciated by modern scholars until Ptolemaic papyri revealed how widespread was the tendency to expand the text, often by borrowings from elsewhere in the poems (sometimes termed 'concordance interpolation'). In many cases, given enough manuscripts, interpolation could be established with reasonable certainty on external evidence alone; an inorganic formulaic line found in only one out of ten manuscripts could safely be disregarded. But an editor had to face the possibility that an interpolation might have spread to all the manuscripts available to him, and might accordingly suspect the authenticity of material attested by all his sources if it seemed to him somehow to deviate from what he regarded as the Homeric norm; athetesis reflects such suspicions. Excision evidently presented a further, though less frequent, threat to the integrity of the text, and it would not have been a safe editorial rule of thumb to ignore any line which did not enjoy unanimous manuscript support, though it must often have been hard to assess the significance of omission in a particular copy (cf. *Od.* i 99–101, 356–9, with nn.). The marginal obelos alerted the user to a doubt about authenticity.

Modern discussions of Zenodotus' work have centred on the question of whether, and, if so, to what extent, he introduced his own conjectures. Some of his readings seem to us blatant conjectures, but it cannot be shown that they originated with him. Stated in general terms the question may seem of slight importance: we can hardly

---

[26] Or, if he wrote one, it was lost by the time of Aristarchus; but this seems unlikely.

argue that an ancient editor was never entitled to include his own emendations in his editions, though undoubtedly the possibility makes it harder for us to gain a clear view of the transmission. We shall do better to consider a particular case.

According to the scholia on *Od.* iii 313 Crete, not Sparta, was mentioned as the terminus of Telemachus' journey in Zenodotus' text at i 93, 285: *οὗτος ὁ τόπος ἀνέπεισε Ζηνόδοτον ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῆς ἀποδημίας Τηλεμάχου διόλου τὴν Κρήτην ἔναντι τῆς Σπάρτης ποιεῖν· οἴεται γὰρ ἐκ τούτων τῶν λόγων κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον ἀκηκοέναι τὸν Νέστορα παρὰ τοῦ Τηλεμάχου ὅτι καὶ ἀλλαχόσε περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς πευσόμενος παρεσκεύαστο πλεῖν, διὸ καὶ ἐν τῇ α′ ῥαψωδίᾳ ἔγραψε "πέμψω δ' ἐς Κρήτην τε καὶ ἐς Πύλον ἠμαθόεντα"* (i 93) *καὶ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ ἀλλαχοῦ* (284–6) *"πρῶτα μὲν ἐς Πύλον ἐλθὲ, κεῖθεν δ' ἐς Κρήτην τε* [*δὲ Κρήτηνδε* Buttmann] *παρ' Ἰδομενῆα ἄνακτα· | ὃς γὰρ δεύτατος ἦλθεν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων."* Despite the dogmatic tone of this note, what is alleged about Zenodotus' reasoning can be no more than a guess, and the absence of corresponding Cretan variants where Sparta is mentioned as Telemachus' destination in ii (214, 327, 359)[27] implies that Zenodotus was not systematically altering the text in accordance with some private theory.

These readings are generally dismissed as arbitrary and eccentric conjectures; yet they are so glaringly inconsistent with the subsequent narrative that they might be thought to deserve serious consideration as *lectiones difficiliores*. If Zenodotus, having found these readings in a manuscript to which (rightly or wrongly) he attached importance, judged them too odd to be conjectures, we should respect his reasoning. It is tempting to speculate that we might have here an authentic relic of an earlier design for the Telemachy; certainly Odysseus' cover-stories reveal a keen interest in Crete,[28] and it would not be surprising if the poet had contemplated taking Telemachus to visit Idomeneus but changed his mind before he was far advanced. Yet even if the poet himself had failed to notice the anomaly, we should expect it to have been eradicated in the course of transmission. Was Zenodotus perhaps deceived by an alteration designed to gratify a Cretan audience? If these readings are in fact conjectures (whether Zenodotus' or another's), our failure to discern the reasoning behind them is worrying; if they are his own conjectures, they suggest an approach to the text so high-handed as to create a strong prejudice against his peculiar readings elsewhere.[29]

---

[27] Cf. schol. ii 359 *οὐδ' ἐνταῦθα μνήμη τίς ἐστι τῆς Κρήτης.*

[28] xiii 256 ff., xiv 199 ff., xix 172 ff.; cf. the (quite unnecessarily) precise topographical detail of iii 291 ff.

[29] As e.g. at iii 216 ff., 296, 307, iv 366.

This curious puzzle serves at any rate to illustrate how little we know about the sources of Zenodotus' text and the principles on which he constituted it. Tempting as it is to try to extrapolate general rules for evaluating Zenodotean variants, the hope is almost certainly illusory. Even if we were completely informed as to Zenodotus' text (and even in Aristarchus' day there appears to have been some uncertainty about his readings (see schol. *Il.* xiv 37)), we could not deduce his critical principles without knowing what he found in the manuscripts available to him. As it is, the attempt to evaluate his work is further complicated by the suspicion that he paid insufficient attention to the preparation of a fair copy of his text; certainly it is hard to believe that if he had given the matter any thought he would have sanctioned such modernisms as *οὐθέν* for *οὐδέν* (xviii 130), *ἐκαθέζετο* (*Il.* i 68), *ἐκάθευδε* (*Il.* i 611), and we should hesitate to infer from the presence of such forms that his sources were all of relatively late date.

Though Zenodotus' systematic work represents a new development in Homeric scholarship, it is unlikely that his text, intended to serve as a work of reference for scholars rather than to meet the needs of the reading public (itself very much a creation of the Hellenistic age), had much influence outside the Library. Homeric reminiscences in Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes show certain affinities with Zenodotus' text (e.g. *Od.* iv 1: see n.), but these may well reflect readings widespread in pre-Aristarchean manuscripts.[30]

Before considering the two other great Alexandrian Homeric scholars something should be said about a group of texts occasionally cited in the scholia which may or may not have been among Zenodotus' sources, but which were certainly used by Aristophanes and Aristarchus. These are the so-called 'city-editions' (*αἱ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων, αἱ κατὰ πόλεις, αἱ πολιτικαί* (scil. *ἐκδόσεις*)). The *Iliad*-scholia mention texts from Argos, Chios, Crete, Cyprus, Marseilles, and Sinope; for the *Odyssey* texts from Argos and Marseilles are cited, and also one designated as Aeolic.[31] It is uncertain whether these titles merely indicate provenance, or whether they imply that these were in some sense official texts, copies which had been carefully checked and were kept for reference in public libraries or city archives. But in general the variants for which they are cited (e.g. at *Od.* i 38, 424) are not of great interest or apparent antiquity. It is significant that these

---

[30] See H. Erbse, 'Homerscholien u. hellenistische Glossare bei Apollonios Rhodios', *Hermes* lxxxi (1953), 163 ff., Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 12. 6.

[31] For a detailed account of these texts see Allen op. cit. (n. 1) 283 ff.

texts are never called in evidence in connection with alleged Athenian interpolations.

Another third-century edition of some interest was that of the Cretan epic poet Rhianus.[32] We do not know whether he ever visited Alexandria (though in view of his interests we should expect him to have been attracted there), and his relationship to Alexandrian scholarship is uncertain. The Scholia record his readings in forty-five places, thirty-three of these being from the *Odyssey*, a remarkably large number in view of the scantiness of our *Odyssey*-scholia; they suggest good sense and acute observation of Homeric usage.

The second of the great Alexandrian Homeric scholars was Aristophanes of Byzantium, said as a boy to have been the pupil of Zenodotus.[33] As well as producing a text of Homer, he composed many lexicographical works, but he left no commentary. It is not altogether easy to form a clear picture of his achievement, or to distinguish it from that of his pupil Aristarchus. The two were evidently on the whole in harmony, and it is likely that Aristarchus' critical methods very largely derive from his master; for an interesting difference of opinion see *Od.* iii 71–4 (with n.).

The evidence of contemporary papyri suggests that the labours of Zenodotus and Aristophanes had little if any effect on the book trade. But from about 150 BC a change is observable, as 'wild' texts, characterized by a high proportion of variants and additions, die out; later papyri offer a text which differs little from that of the medieval manuscripts. Given the date of this development, it must surely be connected, directly or indirectly, with the activity of Aristarchus.[34] Quite apart from this change, it is clear that his work enjoyed an authority denied to his predecessors, and indeed there was a tendency to ascribe to him innovations relating to the Homeric text for which he cannot have been responsible; for antiquity he came to epitomize the serious, scholarly critic.[35] Undoubtedly he built on foundations laid by his predecessors, and it would be futile to try to demarcate his individual contribution to the detailed knowledge of Homeric usage on which his text was founded. But certainly the subsequent tradition would have looked very different without his work.

---

[32] See C. Mayhoff, *De Rhiani Cretensis studiis Homericis* (Leipzig, 1870), Pfeiffer, op. cit. (n. 22), 122, 148–9.

[33] For the fragments of Aristophanes' work on Homer see *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*, ed. W. J. Slater (Berlin, 1986); see also Pfeiffer, op. cit. (n. 22), 171 ff.

[34] The fundamental study of Aristarchus is K. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis*^{3} (Leipzig, 1882); see also A. Ludwich, *Aristarchs homerische Textkritik* (Leipzig, 1884), and, for a useful brief account, Pfeiffer, op. cit., 210 ff.

[35] See above, n. 19. Aristarchus' prestige may be illustrated from schol. *Il.* iv 235, where discussion of a point of accentuation is concluded thus: *καὶ μᾶλλον πειστέον Ἀριστάρχῳ ἢ τῷ Ἑρμαππίᾳ, εἰ καὶ δοκεῖ ἀληθεύειν.*

We are fairly well informed about his principles and methods, since he composed both commentaries to accompany his text and monographs on particular problems, and his arguments are often recorded in the scholia. It is easy to get the impression that he was preoccupied with what seem to most people rather trivial points of textual criticism, but in fact his main concern was to produce a text which, without omitting genuine material, was free from subsequent accretions. We tend to overlook this much more important aspect of his work because we take for granted the standardization of the text which resulted from it.

Our most serious difficulty in assessing his work is a lack of information about the MSS which he used and the relative importance which he attached to them. The scholia divide them into two classes, χαριέστεραι and κοιναί (κοινότεραι, εἰκαιότεραι, δημώδεις). The first group comprises carefully prepared texts, including the 'city-editions' as well as those associated with individual scholars, and it is very uncertain whether we know the names of all the texts of this group used by Aristarchus. It is generally assumed that when such a text is mentioned it was a text of the whole epic, but this goes beyond the evidence. The second group might be regarded as ordinary commercial copies; we have no idea how large a stock of these Aristarchus used. It is impossible to say whether a modern scholar, given the same range of MSS, would assess their merits in much the same way as Aristarchus did.[36] Hellenistic scholars could not use palaeographical criteria, and the lack of anything like an *apparatus criticus* meant that the distinction between conjecture and variant was not kept clear. The importance attached to the χαριέστεραι might be interpreted as reflecting a preference for texts of known provenance and (approximate) date, though no doubt other factors were involved. But we should certainly reject the theory that an official Athenian copy, never mentioned because everywhere taken for granted, provided the basis for Aristarchus' text; his method of argument would look very different if he had proceeded in this way.

Aristarchus' general principles emerge most clearly from the discussion of athetized lines. Occasionally external evidence is adduced (as e.g. at *Od.* i 97–8, 171 ff., 185–6, iv 285 ff.), but usually the

---

[36] A story told about the philosopher Timon suggests that some in antiquity might not have rated the χαριέστεραι so highly (D.L. ix 113): φασὶ δὲ καὶ Ἄρατον πυθέσθαι αὐτοῦ [Timon] πῶς τὴν Ὁμήρου ποίησιν ἀσφαλῆ κτήσαιτο, τὸν δὲ εἰπεῖν, εἰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἀντιγράφοις ἐντυγχάνοι, καὶ μὴ τοῖς ἤδη διωρθωμένοις.

arguments are subjective. In general his critical assumptions do not seem much different from those of a modern scholar dealing with a great poet whose text may be supposed to have suffered interpolation. To us his arguments sometimes appear strange because they make few, if any, concessions to the difference between traditional, oral poetry and written literature (though Aristarchus himself might well have objected that modern scholars are too easily satisfied with the second-rate). But it should be emphasized that the practice of athetesis was based not only on a belief in the splendour of Homeric epic but also on extrapolation from what might be observed in contemporary manuscripts. Evidence that the text had been exposed to alteration and expansion was everywhere to hand in current copies, and it would have been naïve to suppose that the full extent of the damage could be revealed by industrious collation. Such alteration might be observed commonly to follow certain trends, recognition of which was bound to give rise to corresponding prejudices. Thus, what may at first sight seem a rather arbitrary dislike of repeated passages (see e.g. schol. *Od.* i 185–6, 356 ff., iii 72 ff., 199–200) should be viewed in relation to the widespread practice, revealed by our earliest papyri, of expanding the text with lines taken from elsewhere in Homer; in these circumstances a degree of prejudice against repeated passages not wholly appropriate to their context is a sensible critical reaction.

From about 150 BC a change is observable in Homeric papyri, which henceforth offer a text very little different from the medieval tradition; the contrast to what had preceded is very striking. In the number of their lines these papyri conform very closely to Aristarchus' text, though they offer too wide a range of variants to allow the hypothesis that they might all be copies of a single edition. This purification of ordinary commercial copies is most plausibly ascribed to the book trade.[37] Many readers must by now have been aware that scholars had established a text relatively free from spurious accretions, and a popular demand for copies is readily understandable. But the common reader was unlikely to be interested in the minutiae of textual criticism, particularly since the choice of one reading rather than another would seldom much affect the sense. Booksellers and proprietors of *scriptoria* could thus easily fall in with popular demand by cancelling lines omitted by Aristarchus, without needing to alter the wording of their texts extensively. Copies so corrected would become commercially fashionable, while any alter-

---

[37] See further P. Collart, 'Les Papyrus de l'*Iliade*', *RPh* vii (1933), 52 ff.

FREIE UNIVERSITÄT BERLIN
UNIVERSITÄTS

native would die out naturally. This process may be seen as part of a general rise in standards of book-production at this period. The Alexandrian scholars did not impose a single specialist's version on the tradition, but effected a general purge of extraneous material and an increase in knowledge which afforded some permanent protection.

Even this second standardization of the text did not altogether stop interpolation by copyists, which continued, on a fairly modest scale, until the first printed editions. Such post-Aristarchean additions are practically limited to borrowings from other parts of Homer (e.g. i 148, 148a, ii 393, 407, 429, iii 19); their absence from papyri of the Roman period has often revealed such lines as later additions even though they are found in all the medieval manuscripts.[38] But the basic text was now firmly established.

The vicissitudes of its transmission are clearly relevant to any serious study of the *Odyssey*. Its original excellent workmanship enabled it to withstand much later tinkering but we should not approach it as if its textual history were as secure as that of the *Aeneid*. Purely mechanical copying errors appear to have affected it very little; the dangers to which it was exposed were more insidious. Many of the inconcinnities which seemed to the analysts to indicate multiple authorship, and are now more commonly defended as the natural licences of oral composers, may in fact result from tampering designed to produce an *ad hoc* effect without regard to its implications for the poem as a whole, and the modern critic ought not to ignore the threats to authenticity of which the ancient scholars were well aware.

[38] Much useful work on this subject was done by G. M. Bolling, *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford, 1925), 3 ff.; Bolling's tendency to exaggerate the significance of his observations perhaps explains why they seem not to receive as much attention as they deserve; see also M. J. Apthorp, *The Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Heidelberg, 1980).

BOOKS I–IV

Stephanie West

PREFATORY NOTE

An unexpectedly early death cut short the work of the scholar to whom these four books were originally entrusted. From Douglas Young, *ποιητὴς ἅμα καὶ κριτικός*, we might with good reason have looked for something quite out of the ordinary in Homeric criticism, the product of his characteristic style of wide-ranging and lively-minded scholarship. I have often found myself wondering what he would have said; but this pointless speculation serves only to heighten regret for the loss of a peculiarly distinctive contribution to our understanding of the *Odyssey*. What I have written will often seem a poor and pedestrian substitute.

In the preparation of this commentary I have incurred many debts which it is a pleasure to acknowledge. I should like to thank Dr S. P. Brock, Professor A. E. Davies, Professor J. Gwyn Griffiths, Mr C. G. Hardie, Dr A. Robson, Dr C. Walters, and Dr P. Wernberg-Møller for the help with various problems. I have frequently derived both pleasure and profit from discussion with Dr Hainsworth. But my greatest debt is to my husband, Martin, whose patience, learning, and lucidity have repeatedly extricated me from difficulty. For the errors which remain the responsibility is mine alone.

S. R. W.

INTRODUCTION

I

The first four books of the *Odyssey* are centred not on Odysseus but on Telemachus. Telemachus shines by reflected light; though an interesting and attractive poem might be composed with him as its hero, his significance derives from his father. His importance for the *Odyssey* as a whole should not be underestimated; he speaks more than anyone else except Odysseus, and his presence does much to unify the poem.[1] That he was not invented by the poet of the *Odyssey* is clear from the *Iliad*, where Odysseus twice refers to himself as *Τηλεμάχοιο πατήρ* (ii 260, iv 354); the name reflects his father's distinction as an archer. The prominent part which he plays in our *Odyssey* leaves Penelope little more than an onlooker, though vestiges remain of an earlier version in which she was Odysseus' accomplice in exacting vengeance from the suitors (the more obvious conception if her loyalty were above suspicion).[2] The development of Telemachus' role was a natural corollary of the prolongation of Odysseus' wanderings. Familiarity makes us take for granted the fantastic *nostos* recounted in the *Odyssey*, but the story clearly evolved, and we may still perhaps discern, in the prologue and in Odysseus' cover-stories, traces of a more realistic and less time-consuming alternative.[3] The poet's decision to extend Odysseus' *nostos* to nearly ten years, to equal the length of the Trojan War, made it necessary for the son whom he had left as a baby to play a prominent part if he were not to be judged a milksop.

---

[1] See further *RE* v A 1, 325 ff. s.v. Telemachos (Herter).

[2] As the ghost of the suitor Amphimedon alleges (xxiv 149 ff.). Penelope's behaviour at xviii 158 ff., Odysseus' reaction to it, and her decision to arrange the competition which will settle her future husband, despite indications that Odysseus will soon be home (xix 555 ff.), all suggest that she not only knows he is back but is acting in concert with him; see further Page, *Odyssey* 122 ff.

[3] On the prologue see below, i 1–10 nn. An itinerary is perhaps deducible in outline from the constant elements in the autobiographies which Odysseus devises on his return to Ithaca, when he is masquerading as a Cretan (xiii 256 ff., xiv 199 ff., xvii 419 ff., xix 172 ff., 270 ff.; see further Woodhouse, *Composition*, 25 ff., 126 ff., S. West, *LCM* vi (1981), 169 ff.). A briefer *nostos* appears to be indicated by the chronology of the suitors' endeavours; if we are to understand that, when the poem opens, Penelope has been under pressure to remarry for nearly four years (ii 89, 106–7 (=xix 151–2, xxiv 141–2), xiii 377), this implies a period of six years during which she was left in peace, though an unexplained delay of a year would be quite long enough to make it unlikely that Odysseus would ever return.

The plan of the *Odyssey* is extremely ambitious, and we must not underestimate the problems of organizing the material. The decision to begin the story of Odysseus' adventures near the end complicates the structure of the poem. The theme of Telemachus' efforts to restore his family's fortunes is used as a kind of prelude, to be developed when father and son unite in vengeance. It is not surprising, given this sophisticated plan, that we find certain inconcinnities at the points where Telemachus' story is linked with his father's. Undeniably there is some awkwardness in the division of the divine council, which starts the action, between the beginning of i and the beginning of v, and in the bisection of Telemachus' leave-taking at Sparta, interrupted at iv 621 to be resumed in xv; the reflective reader may well be puzzled, when Athena chides Telemachus for dallying at Sparta (xv 10 ff.), as to whether his absence from Ithaca has lasted less than a week or (as the timetable of Odysseus' homeward journey demands) a month.[4] It has often been suggested that the Telemachy[5] was either an originally independent poem incorporated rather mechanically into the *Odyssey* or simply a late addition. But Telemachus' story is not as easily detachable as the earlier analysts supposed, and it is not surprising that the 'problem' of the Telemachy came to be regarded as crucial for the analysis of the *Odyssey*. The awkwardness observable at the points of junction with Odysseus' story result from the poet attempting something more elaborate than was quite feasible. Without the Telemachy the *Odyssey* would fall into two rather disparate parts, the deep-sea stories and the revenge; as it is, Odysseus' adventures form a centre-piece framed by two Ithacan sections. The Telemachy also serves to link the *Odyssey* with the larger heroic world and to bridge the gap of nearly a decade since the end of the *Iliad*. It must be regarded as integral to our *Odyssey*.

It was noted in antiquity that Telemachus' journey is ill-timed and inadequately motivated.[6] Penelope is under constant pressure from the suitors, and her son's attempt to assert himself might reasonably be expected to induce them to terminate the current stalemate, hitherto, from their point of view, highly satisfactory. In Telemachus' absence there is an obvious risk that Penelope might be compelled to remarry. Telemachus' mission is not justified by its results; the information which he brings back is, as might have been expected, inconclusive. The imprudence of the project did not escape the poet, as may be seen from Nestor's warning against the dangers of prolonged absence from home (iii 313 ff.).[7] Athena, who knows that Odysseus will soon return independently of any efforts on Telemachus' part, explains that she sent the boy out to give him the chance to win distinction (xiii 422, cf. i 95). This sounds a little thin; the poet was clearly more interested in the venture itself than in its motivation; Odysseus' journey to Hades is similarly both dangerous and inadequately motivated.[8]

It would be otherwise if the poet had laid less stress on the increasing danger from the suitors. Telemachus' natural concern to end the long uncertainty about his father's fate provides sufficient reason, and the mere presence of the suitors does not make his journey ill-advised, so long as they have no reason to suspect a threat to their security. Telemachus' public denunciation of the suitors in ii is an important preliminary if Odysseus' vengeance is to appear fully justified, but it creates a situation in which we should think it essential for him to remain at his mother's side.

It is tempting to suppose that Telemachus' journey was originally conceived as an independent narrative,[9] a framework for the popular theme of the *nostoi*,[10] of central importance in iii and iv. The returns of all the major heroes are dealt with, in a manner suggesting that the poet saw them not simply as a sequence of stories, but as an ordered whole consisting of comparable, related destinies, the quarrel between Agamemnon and Menelaus after the sack of Troy (iii 141 ff.) being central to the structure. The division of the narrative between Nestor and Menelaus is masterly. It was a happy coincidence for the poet that Nestor, whose tendency to reminiscence is well established in the *Iliad*, was geographically the most accessible of the returned heroes. Nestor's information is incomplete, and it is left to Menelaus to supplement it by relating his own adventures, including Proteus' account of those whose fates would otherwise be mysterious, the lesser Ajax, Agamemnon, and Odysseus. As it now stands, Proteus' account of Odysseus (iv 555–60) is extraordinarily cursory, though the immediately following prophecy of Menelaus' translation to Elysium distracts us sufficiently to avoid an anticlimax (just as Telemachus' unexpected encounter with the seer Theoclymenus (xv 222 ff.) diverts our attention from the inconclusive outcome of his journey). But we might wonder whether a brief account of Odysseus' adventures was once the climax of Proteus' narrative, culminating, since Proteus is a prophet, in a prediction of the hero's imminent return. We find elsewhere in the *Odyssey* this mannerism of postponing an expected dénouement; thus we are disappointed in our expectation that Odysseus will make himself known to the Phaeacians after Demodocus' first recital (viii 83 ff.) and to Penelope in xix. It might be regarded as a rather unsophisticated method of heightening suspense, but to some extent its employment is likely to reflect the combination of alternative versions.

---

[4] See Hoekstra on xv 1 ff., M. J. Apthorp, 'The Obstacles to Telemachus' Return', *CQ* xxx (1980), 1 ff.

[5] The first to use this term appears to have been P. D. C. Hennings, 'Über die Telemachie', *Jahrbücher f. klass. Philologie*, Suppl. iii (1858), 135 ff. It has become convenient to treat it simply as a title for i–iv, but no one could imagine that this section might form an independent poem without some alteration, and the precise demarcation of the Telemachy is the analysts' fundamental problem. For a lucid survey of the controversy see F. Klingner, *Über die vier ersten Bücher der Odyssee*, Ber. sächs. Akad. Leipzig. xcvi. 1 (Leipzig, 1944), Lesky, *Homeros*, 123 ff., where references to earlier discussions may be found; see also K. A. Garbrah, 'A Linguistic Analysis of Selected Portions of the Homeric Odyssey', *Glotta* xlvii (1969), 144 ff., Eisenberger, *Studien*, 1 ff., H. van Thiel, 'Telemachie u. Odyssee', *MH* xxxvi (1979), 65 ff.

[6] Schol. i 93, 284.

[7] Cf. ii 363 ff., xiii 417, xiv 178 ff.

[8] See Page, *Odyssey*, 27 ff.

[9] This view of iii and iv is much indebted to Bethe, *Odyssee*, 7 ff., esp. 29 ff., and Merkelbach, *Untersuchungen*, 36 ff.

[10] Cf. i 326–7, x 15. The Epic Cycle (the corpus of early epic dealing with the Trojan War, its causes and aftermath) included a poem on the returns of the Greek heroes, in five books, known to us largely from a summary by the fifth-century neoplatonist Proclus; it was evidently a later composition than the *Odyssey*, which it presupposed; see Bethe, *Homer*, ii^2 2, 184 ff. (= *Der troische Epenkreis* (Darmstadt, 1966), 36 ff.).

Whether the poet incorporated, with modifications, a theme already familiar to him as an independent poem (whether the conception was his own or another's) or first developed this *Rahmenerzählung* in its present position cannot be established with any certainty, but the former seems to me much the more probable. At all events, we should not underestimate what this section contributes to the epic as a whole. Both in space and time it greatly extends the *Odyssey*'s range. Menelaus' adventures neatly complement (and to some extent foreshadow) those of Odysseus, and the narrative of the *nostoi* takes the story back to the end of the Trojan War. We are also offered a unique, and attractive, view of the heroic world at peace; at Pylos and at Sparta we see heroic excellence find its scope in hospitality, and the picture is the more attractive for its contrast with the lawlessness of Ithaca, a contrast which serves to emphasize the sad consequences of Odysseus' long absence. Many critics, from antiquity onwards, have seen the Telemachy as a *Bildungsroman*: wider experience of the heroic world is to make Telemachus a more

effective ally to his father.[11] But the real psychological change in Telemachus comes in i (320 ff.), and after his public denunciation of the suitors he could hardly be regarded as too immature to assist his father adequately.

What he learns about his father at Pylos and Sparta is important. No one in Ithaca could tell him about Odysseus' achievements in the Trojan War, and the general respect in which Odysseus is held (cf. iii 126 ff., 218 ff., iv 105 ff., 169 ff., 240 ff., 267 ff., 333 ff.) enhances the picture of the father whom he has yet to meet, while heightening our expectations in preparation for the moment when Odysseus actually appears. Moreover, Telemachus' journey demonstrates to the suitors that he is in earnest (iv 638 ff.) and that his public protest was not merely an adolescent outburst; it thus precipitates counter-measures, while removing him from the immediate consequences of the suitors' increasing hostility.

The poet does not suggest that there is any causal connection between the failure of Telemachus' ultimatum to the suitors in ii and his journey. Athena-Mentes gives him no reason to suppose that his denunciation will have any immediate practical effect (i 272 ff.), nor does Telemachus seem much surprised by its ill success; but his journey does not depend on the outcome of the assembly, and is not to be regarded as a compromise or a second-best solution. His public protest looks forward to the latter part of the poem; if Odysseus' vengeance is to appear justified, the suitors must have fair warning. The poet has taken some pains to link the journey with the assembly; hence, exceeding Mentes' specific instructions, Telemachus publicly asks for a ship (ii 212 ff.), and the lack of any immediate response effectively demonstrates his isolation and want of resources. But the omen which Halitherses interprets as a sign that Odysseus is already at hand (ii 146 ff.) makes nonsense of this request; the poet was evidently at this point more interested in Odysseus' forthcoming revenge than in Telemachus' mission.

The suitors and the question of Penelope's remarriage loom large in the first two books.[12] The situation is somewhat illogical, but the poet avoids exposing its oddities by simply taking the suitors' presence in Odysseus' palace for granted. We are nowhere given anything like a systematic account of what is going on in Odysseus' home, though it would be quite natural for Nestor or Menelaus to question Telemachus further about his unwelcome guests (e.g. at iii 211 ff., iv 333 ff.), or for Odysseus himself to ask Athena for more details than she gives him (xiii 376 ff.).

---

[11] The idea that Telemachus' journey constitutes a παιδεία was already suggested by Porphyry (schol. i 284); this conception is reflected in the novel of the seventeenth-century Abbé Fénelon, *Les Aventures de Télémaque* (1699); cf. W. Jaeger, *Paideia* i (Berlin–Leipzig, 1934), 55 ff. (= English ed. (Oxford, 1939), 27 ff.). Wilamowitz is to be regarded as the most formidable opponent of this still very popular view (*Heimkehr*, 106, 118).

[12] Particularly helpful on this topic are W. Allen, 'The Theme of the Suitors in the *Odyssey*', *TAPhA* lxx (1939), 104–24, F. Wehrli, 'Penelope u. Telemachos', *MH* xvi (1959), 228–37, N. Matsumoto, 'Die Freier in der Odyssee', *Gnomosyne: Festschrift f. W. Marg* (Munich, 1981), 135–41.

Two folk-tale motifs are combined in the story of Odysseus' return and vengeance. The first of these, the tale of the husband's return,[13] has for its theme a husband (or lover) who comes home after long absence, often in disguise or otherwise unrecognizable, just as his wife (or intended bride) has married, or is about to marry, another; the subsequent development of the plot varies considerably. This story, a *Weltmärchen* if ever there was one, is found all over the world, repeatedly gaining new life from actual instances; in the *Odyssey* we find the same theme developed rather differently in the account of Agamemnon's return. In the story of Odysseus' home-coming it is united with another type of folk-tale, that of a contest between suitors with a bride as the prize.[14] Familiarity with the *Odyssey* might lead us to suppose this to be the natural denouement of the first type of story; certainly the two themes combine very easily. It is normally thought that these tales had been connected with Odysseus before our *Odyssey*, and this view is supported by indications that the poet was not altogether happy about the ethical implications of the hero's savage vengeance, but felt unable to modify a traditional element in the story. To forestall the objection that Odysseus' revenge was out of all proportion to the suitors' crimes he constantly emphasizes that they were wicked men who fully deserved their fate, but does not make explicit the charge against them until we are fully persuaded of their guilt.

Odysseus' indictment of the suitors (xxii 35 ff.) centres on their offences against his property; they have treated his house as if it were

---

[13] N 681 in Thompson's *Motif Index*. See further W. Splettstösser, *Der heimkehrende Gatte u. sein Weib in der Weltliteratur* (Berlin, 1898), W. Crooke, 'The Wooing of Penelope', *Folklore* ix (1898), 97 ff., D. B. Monro, *Homer's* Odyssey, *Books xiii–xxiv* (Oxford, 1901), 301 ff., L. Radermacher, *Die Erzählungen der Odyssee*, *SAWW* clxxviii. 1 (1915), 47 ff.

[14] Thompson, *Motif Index*, H 331. A curious, and surely significant, parallel to the culmination of the *Odyssey* is found in the widespread central Asiatic tale of the hero Alpamysh; here too the returned hero has to compete with suitors and wedding guests in shooting an arrow from a mighty bow which he alone, its owner, can wield; see further V. Zhirmunsky, 'The Epic of "Alpamysh" and the Return of Odysseus', *PBA* 1966, 267 ff. Parallels from Indian epic are studied by Germain, *Genèse*, 11 ff., who plausibly argues that the theme must have originated on the steppes of central Asia.

their own, and their wooing of Penelope is simply one aspect of this abuse. He does not even mention their conspiracy to murder Telemachus (iv 669 ff.), which to a modern reader appears the most obvious argument in defence of this massacre, though he is aware of it (xiii 425 ff.). The poet has prepared the ground so well that we are unlikely to question the justification of Odysseus' revenge. From the outset it is stressed, not by authorial comment but indirectly and through the reactions of the various characters, that the suitors' actions cry out to heaven for vengeance. The point is firmly established in i by Athena-Mentes; particularly remarkable is the calm assumption (i 294 ff.) that justice and honour require the death of the suitors, where the implied analogy with Aegisthus, guilty of murder and adultery, diverts attention from the justification of the death-penalty. Athena's condemnation is echoed by other right-minded people, Halitherses (ii 161 ff., xxiv 454 ff.), Nestor (iii 210 ff.), Menelaus (iv 332 ff.), Eumaeus (xiv 81 ff.), Penelope (xvii 499 ff., xxiii 63 ff.), Philoetius (xx 215), Theoclymenus (xx 367 ff.), and Laertes (xxiv 282 ff.).

The attempt to win Penelope should not be regarded as in itself improper or unconventional. When the *Odyssey* opens, Odysseus' return is no longer a serious possibility, and there is a general assumption that sooner or later Penelope must marry again. We should not ask whether the poet imagined that she might, in principle, have absolutely refused to consider a second marriage; certainly that option is no longer open to her. But the presence of suitors in such numbers calls for some explanation, and it is significant that the poet never offers one, but simply underlines the point that they have been there for three years (ii 89, 106–7 (= xix 151–2, xxiv 141–2), xiii 377), thus inducing us to take their presence for granted. Yet, though they may now be hard to dislodge, it is scarcely possible to imagine that they could have established themselves in the first place without an invitation.

Stories involving a concurrence of suitors are not uncommon in Greek legend. The outstanding example is the wooing of Helen, as related in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (frr. 196–204); a similar procedure was followed by Cleisthenes, tyrant of Sicyon, *c.*575, in arranging a match for his daughter Agariste (Hdt. vi 126 ff.).[15] Such stories require a formal announcement by the bride's *κύριος* (normally her father) to ensure that the best candidates learn of the opportunity.[16] In the case of a woman whose husband's death was merely presumed, there would be the more need for such a formal declaration. An invitation to prospective suitors would surely imply hospitality; Cleisthenes, who entertained his daughter's suitors for a year, clearly thought so. But the implications of such an invitation are awkward in the *Odyssey*. If the suitors have been encouraged to assemble, they have a right to generous entertainment, and the point at which they go beyond what convention might entitle them to expect is hard to determine. They have, moreover, a legitimate grievance against Penelope for her failure to co-operate with their reasonable aspirations.

---

[15] Probably to be seen as imitation of heroic practice, rather than as independent evidence for the custom; Cleisthenes had strong views about the contemporary relevance of traditional epic (Hdt. v 67. 1). We may also compare the foot-races organized by Danaus and Antaeus to dispose of their respective daughters' hands (Pi. *P.* ix 105 ff.); according to Spartan legend Penelope's father Icarius had adopted the same selection procedure (Paus. iii 12. 1).

Penelope's heroic constancy and unswerving loyalty to her absent husband are qualities better suited to epic than to folk-tale. In the end her stance is triumphantly justified, against all probability, and results are what matter in the success-orientated heroic world. But her attitude conflicts with the reasonable expectations of almost everyone else involved. She herself says (xviii 257 ff.) that Odysseus at his departure told her to take a second husband if he had not returned by the time Telemachus had grown up; though this detail of Odysseus' farewell looks like *ad hoc* invention, it shows that there could be no objection to a bona fide suitor, and we should not attach too much weight to references to gossip (*δήμοιο φῆμις* xvi 75, xix 527) as a deterrent. Elsewhere she admits that both her son and her parents wish her to decide on a second husband (xix 158 ff., 530 ff.). Her attempt to postpone indefinitely an apparently inevitable decision is bound to cause problems, as the suitors' spokesman, Antinous, points out (ii 87 ff.).

The suitors' behaviour makes it entirely intelligible that Penelope should be reluctant to choose a second husband from among them. Their speeches in ii show them to be not merely unmannerly and extravagant but also brutal and unscrupulous. They make no attempt to commend themselves to Penelope, though her ruse with Laertes' shroud (ii 89 ff., cf. xix 137 ff., xxiv 128 ff.) has made plain her reluctance to marry again. Like the conventional villains of melodrama, they continue to press their claims even after Penelope has revealed that she knows of their plot to murder her son.

---

[16] Compare Cleisthenes' advertisement (Hdt. vi 126. 2): *Ὀλυμπίων ὦν ἐόντων καὶ νικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖσι τεθρίππῳ ὁ Κλεισθένης κήρυγμα ἐποιήσατο, ὅστις Ἑλλήνων ἑωυτὸν ἀξιοῖ Κλεισθένεος γαμβρὸν γενέσθαι, ἥκειν ἐς ἑξηκοστὴν ἡμέρην ἢ καὶ πρότερον ἐς Σικυῶνα ὡς κυρώσοντος Κλεισθένεος τὸν γάμον ἐν ἐνιαυτῷ, ἀπὸ τῆς ἑξηκοστῆς ἀρξαμένου ἡμέρης.*

From Penelope's point of view there is in fact some advantage in their numbers; a single determined wooer would have been much harder to put off. The principle on which she might select her second husband is variously represented.[17] It is implied that the decision rests wholly with her, even if technically a male *κύριος* is involved, either her father Icarius or, once he is grown up, Telemachus (cf. xv 20, xvi 391, xviii 270, xix 528–9). Personal preference appears to be, on the whole, irrelevant, though it might seem to be implied by her tactic of surreptitiously encouraging individuals (ii 91–2, xiii 380–1). The usual assumption is that she will marry the suitor who gives most gifts (xv 17–18, xvi 76–7, xix 528–9, xx 335): compare Hesiod's account of the wooing of Helen (frr. 198–204), in which Menelaus wins *πλεῖστα πορών* (204, 85–7). The contest with the bow, a much more primitive idea, introduces an alternative criterion.

It is usually assumed that, once married to her second husband, Penelope would leave Odysseus' house, allowing Telemachus to enjoy his inheritance undisturbed (xi 177–9, xvi 33–4, xviii 258 ff., xix 528, xx 337 ff., xxi 77 ff., 114 ff.). As a corollary it is sometimes suggested that, before remarrying, she should return to her father's house (i 275–8, ii 195 ff.), and that the suitors should apply to Icarius as the competent authority. All this is in accordance with classical practice. Yet the story of the test with the bow requires that the returned husband should find his rivals in his house, and occasionally, in other contexts, the poet envisages Penelope's second marriage being celebrated in Odysseus' palace (iv 769–71, xxiii 149–51), which must imply that this would remain her home.

Potentially there is also a political aspect to Penelope's remarriage, as Antinous sees when Telemachus first attempts to assert himself (i 386–7).[18] In theory no one disputes Telemachus' right to succeed his father, but in a crisis calling for qualities of leadership Penelope's husband would be in a strong position. Certainly if Telemachus were dead, his mother's husband could confidently hope to enjoy the power which had once been Odysseus',[19] and this, we are told, was Antinous' aim (xxii 50 ff.). But generally the threat to Odysseus' house represented by the suitors is treated as a purely private problem.

---

[17] 'The marital fortunes of Penelope are indeed a constant embarrassment to those who believe in a consistent social pattern in Homer' (A. M. Snodgrass). See further W. K. Lacey, 'Homeric *ἔδνα* and Penelope's *κύριος*', *JHS* lxxxvi (1966), 55–68, A. M. Snodgrass, 'An Historical Homeric Society?', *JHS* xciv (1974), 115–25, G. Wickert-Micknat, *Archaeologia* R, 89 ff., M. I. Finley, *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece* (New York, 1981; Harmondsworth, 1983), 233–45, 290–7.

[18] See further S. Deger, *Herrschaftsformen bei Homer* (Vienna, 1970), 132 ff.

[19] Thus Aegisthus gained the throne at Mycenae (iii 304–5), Oedipus at Thebes (xi 273 ff.), and Gyges in Lydia (Hdt. i 11–12).

The implied analogy between Aegisthus and the suitors is, as I have said, one of the means by which the poet persuades us that the latter were wicked men who fully deserved their punishment. But this is only one aspect of the recurrent leitmotif of Agamemnon's return and its consequences.[20] The theme is introduced almost at the start of the poem (i 29 ff.), and is particularly prominent in i–iv (cf. i 298 ff., iii 193 ff., 306 ff., iv 512 ff.), though the poet returns to it elsewhere (xi 409 ff., xiii 383 ff., xxiv 193 ff.). It offers both analogy and antithesis. The poet can exploit the parallelism between Aegisthus and the suitors, Orestes and Telemachus, and the contrast between Clytaemestra and Penelope, between the imprudent Agamemnon's speedy but disastrous return and the long-delayed but ultimately happy home-coming of the circumspect Odysseus. Orestes' matricide does not fit the pattern, and is therefore ignored. The development of this theme in relation to Odysseus' story is made possibly by the *Odyssey*'s extended time-scale; the story of Orestes' vengeance requires an interval in which the boy grows up, and the prolongation of Odysseus' absence makes it possible to link the two. Reflection on the circumstances of Agamemnon's death and Orestes' vengeance probably suggested the idea that Menelaus' return must somehow have been greatly delayed (cf. iii 248–9), leading the poet to devise his far-flung travels.

Only Athena's warning, Odysseus says, saved him from a fate like Agamemnon's (xiii 383 ff.); the general principle is sound, though his own innate caution and Penelope's unwavering loyalty would have prevented his falling so easy a victim. The action of the *Odyssey* depends on the special relationship between Odysseus and Athena, whose support extends not only to Telemachus but also to Penelope. Divine favour for an individual hero is a motif familiar from the *Iliad*; for its extension from father to son there is an Iliadic parallel in Athena's relationship with Tydeus and Diomedes (*Il.* v 800 ff.). The bond of sympathy between Athena and Odysseus is, as she herself makes clear, their common intelligence (xiii 296 ff.); a somewhat similar affinity existed between Odysseus' grandfather Autolycus and Hermes (xix 395 ff.). Nestor speaks of the favour shown by Athena to

---

[20] See further S. Bassett, 'The Second Nekyia', *CJ* xiii (1918), 521–6, E. F. D'Arms and K. K. Hulley, 'The Oresteia Story in the *Odyssey*', *TAPhA* lxxvii (1946), 207–13, H. Hommel, 'Aigisthos u. die Freier', *Studium Generale* viii (1958), 237–45, U. Hölscher, 'Die Atridensage in der Odyssee', *Festschrift f. R. Alewyn* (Cologne–Graz, 1967), 1–16, A. Lesky, 'Die Schuld der Klytaimestra', *WS* lxxx (1967), 5–21.

Odysseus at Troy as unparalleled (iii 218 ff., cf. viii 520, xiii 388), but though this judgement may have been justified by stories to be found in some of the Cyclic epics, such as the ὅπλων κρίσις, it is not borne out by the *Iliad*. There, despite Ajax's petulant complaint of favouritism (xxiii 782–3), Odysseus is only one among several heroes who receive Athena's support, and certainly there is no suggestion of any intellectual bond between them. In the *Iliad* Athena is primarily a warrior-goddess, giving practical help more often than counsel; her reputation for wisdom seems to have developed with her connection with Odysseus.

It is entirely due to Athena that the long deadlock is broken, and Odysseus' home-coming and triumph over his enemies would alike be impossible without her repeated intervention. Her prominence in the opening scene on Olympus prepares us for her supremely important role in the epic as a whole. She controls the complex action almost as if the characters were marionettes and she the puppet-master. We have here a clear contrast with the *Iliad*, where the Olympians are collectively involved in the action. To some extent this difference corresponds to that between a world war and the troubles of a single family. But the Odyssean Zeus is more dignified and remote; though he approves of Odysseus (i 65 ff.), he leaves it to Athena to contrive his home-coming. Though the wrath of Poseidon is repeatedly mentioned, it has little effect; the poet deliberately avoids conflict between Poseidon and Athena over Odysseus (cf. xiii 341 ff.). The goddess's paramountcy in the *Odyssey* must have considerably enhanced the poem's appeal to Athenians; perhaps that partly explains its selection for performance at the Panathenaea.[21]

In the first four books the poet laid the foundations of his monumental narrative; repeated rereading can only strengthen our admiration for the skill with which he solved the problems inherent in his grand design. Here we have the mature work of one who had long reflected on his subject and experimented with its several parts. Analytic critics have often expressed themselves as if the poet was working with fixed, i.e. written, texts of earlier short poems from which he compiled his epic rather mechanically. This picture requires some modification if it is to fit the now generally accepted view of the *Odyssey* as the product of a long tradition of oral poetry.

---

[21] See further M. W. M. Pope, 'Athena's Development in Homeric Epic', *AJP* lxxxi (1960), 113–35, Marion Müller, *Athene als göttliche Helferin in der Odyssee* (Heidelberg, 1966), M. M. Willcock, 'Some Aspects of the Gods in the *Iliad*', *BICS* xvii (1970), 1–10, M. Skafte Jensen, *The Homeric Question and the Oral-Formulaic Theory* (Copenhagen, 1980), 167 ff.

Whether or not the *Odyssey* itself was composed with the aid of writing, the poet's sources must have been very largely (and indeed most probably entirely) oral, and therefore fluid and mutable. Many of the difficulties to which critics have adverted arise from the poet's tendency to sacrifice overall consistency for short-term effect by combining striking elements from different versions of his story. It is relatively easy to detect and censure such inconsistency, but much that is memorable (including Telemachus' journey) would very likely have been lost for ever if the poet had concentrated on a tidier story-line. This rather hospitable attitude towards incompatible elements is an interesting aspect of the *Odyssey*, and we should admire the skill which allows us at times to benefit from alternative narrative possibilities rather than feel the need to defend or explain away discrepancies which, though they may slightly disconcert the reflective reader, would not be noticed by a listening audience. Only long experience could show how far logically incompatible elements might be combined without confusing the listener, and the poet's practice provides better evidence of what would work than we can ever hope to find elsewhere.

II

Frequent change of scene is characteristic of the first half of the *Odyssey*, and the Telemachy covers a very wide range geographically. From the Western Isles we move to the Peloponnese, and the narratives of Nestor and Menelaus extend our view to include most of the Levant and even Africa. The poet's topographical conceptions are often a source of difficulty to the commentator, and various oddities collectively leave the impression that neither he nor his audience was acquainted with many of the places prominent in the narrative. In an age before maps were familiar even a relatively well-travelled man would find it hard to retain much information of this sort,[22] and the transmission of heroic epic in places far from the scenes described would constantly tend to confuse and obscure topographical detail. While it is often possible to explain away individual difficulties, the accumulation of examples suggests that this may be wasted ingenuity. This topic has received relatively little

attention, though its implications should effectively discourage the more popular pastime of locating Odysseus' adventures in ix–xii on the map of the Mediterranean. The following remarks are confined to what is relevant to i–iv.

First, Ithaca. The difficulties presented by the poem's references to its hero's kingdom were already a subject of controversy in antiquity; Strabo opens his discussion thus (454): *οὐ γὰρ εὐκρινῶς ἀποδίδωσιν ὁ ποιητὴς οὔτε περὶ τῆς Κεφαλληνίας οὔτε περὶ τῆς Ἰθάκης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πλησίον τόπων, ὥστε καὶ οἱ ἐξηγούμενοι διαφέρονται καὶ οἱ ἱστοροῦντες.* The most important and perplexing passage is ix 21–7, where Odysseus describes his home to Alcinous.[23] Ithaca, he says, is one of a numerous group of islands lying close together, among which are Doulichion, Same, and Zacynthus. It is natural to identify Ithaca and Zacynthus with the islands which still bear those names, but Doulichion and Same are not so easy; the most probable explanation is that they are both parts of Cephallenia.[24] Further details about Ithaca follow: *αὐτὴ δὲ χθαμαλὴ πανυπερτάτη εἰν ἁλὶ κεῖται | πρὸς ζόφον, αἱ δέ τ' ἄνευθε πρὸς ἠῶ τ' ἠέλιόν τε.* We should naturally take this to mean that Ithaca is low-lying (*χθαμαλή*) and situated furthest west (or north-west) of the whole group (cf. xxi 347). But Ithaca is in fact mountainous, with steep-to coasts, and lies east of Cephallenia. A radical solution to these difficulties was attempted by Dörpfeld, who suggested that the Homeric Ithaca was the classical Leucas (modern Lefkas), which could reasonably be described as *πανυπερτάτη πρὸς ζόφον*, if this is understood as 'furthest to the north-west'; following a suggestion of Strabo, he interpreted *χθαμαλή* as 'close to the mainland', a sense for which it would be hard to find a parallel. But the other islands do not lie 'around' or 'on either side of' Leucas (*ἀμφὶ δὲ νῆσοι πολλαί*), and the standard epithets of Odysseus' homeland, *κραναή, τρηχεῖα, παιπαλόεσσα* (cf. iv 605 ff.), are peculiarly appropriate to Ithaca and do not suit Leucas nearly as well; in any case, the transfer of the name has not been convincingly explained. Corfu (Corcyra) and Cephallenia have also been proposed. But Merry was surely right when he wrote[25] 'The most probable view, in our opinion, is that Homer intended to make the home of his hero in the actual island of Ithaca; but in the absence of any personal acquaintance with the scene, the poet could only draw upon such vague information as might be accessible, as to the geographical position of the place; the details being only a poet's conception of the natural scenery common to many Greek islands, and probably reproduced with more or less similarity in many places with which he was actually familiar.'[26]

---

[22] Greek tradition credited Anaximander of Miletus (*c.*610–546) with the first map of the inhabited world (DK 12 A 6); Aristophanes (*Nu.* 206 ff.) extracts a joke from Strepsiades' bewilderment when shown a local map. The earliest map we have is in fact Babylonian, a clay tablet map of northern Mesopotamia, dating to the dynasty of Sargon of Akkad (2400–2200).

[23] See Heubeck's n. on ix 21–7.

[24] See i 246–7 n.

[25] Merry–Riddell 561. See further *Companion*, 398 ff. Lorimer, *Monuments*, 494 ff.

With the end of ii the scene moves southward to Nestor's Pylos. Its identification was disputed in antiquity: see Strabo 339 ff., 349 ff. The name was common, and Nestor's narrative at *Il.* xi 670 ff. implies that his home lay further north than the famous Pylos in Messenia. Strabo believed that Nestor came from an obscure place of the same name in Triphylia, and this theory seemed to be confirmed by Dörpfeld's discovery in 1907 of Mycenaean remains near Kakovatos in Triphylia. However, excavations in 1939 revealed a great Mycenaean palace among the foothills of Mount Aegialon, on the high ridge now called Epano Englianos, about six miles north of Messenian Pylos; it is now generally agreed that this is the historical counterpart of Nestor's home.[27] The data in the *Odyssey* merely indicate the western coast of the Peloponnese. At first sight the speed of Telemachus' journey from Ithaca might seem to suggest a more northerly situation than Messenian Pylos: a single night brings him to his destination, whereas the journey from Ithaca to Navarino Bay, even in ideal conditions such as Telemachus enjoys, would take a small sailing-ship at least twenty-four hours, and more probably thirty. But we should not treat these data as a reliable indication of distance. It was artistically appropriate that the journey should be speedily accomplished and Telemachus arrive in the early morning rather than at suppertime. Realistically regarded, such a voyage, through coastal waters and among islands, would be extremely foolhardy at night.

Telemachus' two-day chariot-journey from Pylos to Sparta (iii 485–97) is even less realistic. The poet was more interested in providing Telemachus with a suitably dignified form of transport. But an extended journey by chariot would be intolerably uncomfortable, even over level ground, and Telemachus would have to traverse some very mountainous country. Two days would scarcely be enough for the distance, whether on foot or mule-back;[28] a traveller from Messenian Pylos to Sparta would need to allow a day for crossing Mount Taygetus and two days for the journey from Pylos to Pherae. Even on Dörpfeld's hypothesis that Nestor's home lay in Triphylia, the distance and the rugged terrain would make it difficult to reach Sparta in two days.[29]

The poet's unfamiliarity with the Peloponnese creates more obvious difficulties in his account of Agamemnon's home-coming. When Telemachus hears how Agamemnon was killed he asks (iii 249 ff.) *ποῦ Μενέλαος ἔην; τίνα δ' αὐτῷ μήσατ' ὄλεθρον | Αἴγισθος δολόμητις; . . . ἦ οὐκ Ἄργεος ἦεν Ἀχαϊκοῦ, ἀλλά πῃ ἄλλῃ | πλάζετ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους;* His question implies that the two brothers are envisaged living together, or at any rate close to one another (cf. 256–7, 311). Yet in reality Mycenae, Agamemnon's city (iii 304), is *c.*80 kilometres, as the crow flies, from Menelaus' city of Sparta (iv 1). The use of *Ἄργος* to mean both 'the Argolid' and 'the Peloponnese' no doubt fostered misconception.[30] Even odder is the detail that Agamemnon was blown off course on his homeward journey while trying to round Cape Malea, the most southerly point of the Peloponnese (iv 514 ff.), an incomprehensible route if he was making for the Argolid; but this passage presents several strange features, and may well be interpolated.[31]

Menelaus' *nostos* greatly extends our horizons. He thus describes his route (iv 83–5): *Κύπρον Φοινίκην τε καὶ Αἰγυπτίους ἐπαληθείς, | Αἰθίοπάς θ' ἱκόμην καὶ Σιδονίους καὶ Ἐρεμβοὺς | καὶ Λιβύην.* He was blown southward to Egypt while trying to round Cape Malea (iii 286 ff.), and it would be sensible to return via Phoenicia and Cyprus. But the rest of the list appears to represent travel undertaken for its own sake, and it is hard to suggest a reasonable route; the separation of *Σιδονίους* from *Φοινίκην* is rather disconcerting. The poet was concerned to account for Menelaus' seven-year journey, but seems not to have had a definite conception of his itinerary. We should certainly not overestimate the real geographical knowledge involved.

Egypt is prominent in Menelaus' *nostos*.[32] The poet was obviously interested in the land of the Nile, though perhaps not very knowledgeable. He has heard of the town of Thon (iv 228) at the Canopic mouth of the Nile, though the place has become a person. He knows of Egypt's river (iv 477, 581), but appears not to know its name.[33] Thebes (iv 126) was surely no more than a name to him; the rather casual way in which it is mentioned suggests that he had no idea of its distance from the coast. His error over the location of Pharos (iv 355–7) has attracted a good deal of attention, but is not really very significant; the story demands a desert island, and Pharos has been made to fill that role.[34]

By contrast with this catalogue of topographical vagueness and inaccuracy we may note that the poet is strikingly well informed about Crete. He indicates with remarkable precision the point on the coast where most of Menelaus' company made landfall (iii 291–6), irrelevant as it is for the narrative. This is only a detail: his knowledge is displayed more fully when Odysseus, in support of his alias as a Cretan nobleman, describes the island to Penelope (xix 172 ff.)[35]—a splendid example of early Ionian ethnography.

---

[26] See also Hoekstra on xiii 103–7, 217–18, xiv 335, xv 33.

[27] See further *Companion*, 422 ff. and iii 4 ff. n.

[28] See *Guide Bleu*, ed. 1911, 436–7, 454.

[29] See further iii 484 ff. n.

[30] See i 344, iii 251. nn.

[31] See iv 514–20 n.

[32] See further p. 192.

[33] See iv 477 n.

[34] See iv 354–9 n.

---

[35] Crete figured even more extensively in Zenodotus' edition: see i 93 (with n.) and introduction p. 43.

BOOK I: COMMENTARY

The beginning of the *Odyssey* posed peculiar difficulties for the poet because of the work's complicated structure; it starts when the hero's wanderings are almost over, and his earlier adventures are not related until a third of the poem has been completed. The poet has first to set in motion two series of events which are designed to coalesce in their final stages, and to achieve this he has to disturb the apparently stable situation on Ithaca and break the deadlock on Calypso's island. The *Iliad* starts with a definite event, Agamemnon's outrageous treatment of Chryses; the *Odyssey* begins in stalemate. The poet rapidly outlines the main features of the background, and then fills in more detail once the action is under way.

We cannot tell how much of the story the poet might assume to be, in its general outlines, familiar to his audience, and how far he was consciously innovating; but there are signs that he knew more than one way of telling the story, and the relative importance of the various people and themes introduced in this book may have differed greatly in different versions. Characters are firmly but economically delineated; we do not feel we need to know more about them than the poet tells us. From their behaviour and conversation we realize the cumulative misery produced by Odysseus' long absence, and though the hero of the poem does not appear till v, he is the centre of interest from the outset. Telemachus' 'awakening' is an important element in this book; though many critics, from antiquity onwards, have seen an educational purpose in his journey, the real change in him occurs in i, and a series of scenes in this book and the next demonstrates that he has come of age. Many details in this book gain an added significance from the subsequent unfolding of the story. Above all, we notice the poet's concern, from the outset, to justify Odysseus; the savage tale of vengeance is to assume a strongly moral slant, so that the massacre of the suitors appears as the will and work of heaven.

1–10. The proems of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are strikingly similar, particularly at the beginning. The theme comes first (*ἄνδρα/μῆνιν*; cf. *Il. parv.* fr. 1 Allen *Ἴλιον ἀείδω*, *h.Cer.* 1, *hMerc.* 1), next the invocation (*μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα/ἄειδε, θεά*), then a four-syllable adjective characterizing the theme (*πολύτροπον/οὐλομένην*), expanded by a relative clause (*ὃς μάλα πολλὰ πλάγχθη/ἣ μυρί' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε*), further elaborated by two *δέ*-clauses (*πολλῶν δ', πολλὰ δ'/πολλὰς δ', αὐτοὺς δέ*). In both the poet refers to the vast possibilities of the theme (*μάλα πολλά, πολλῶν δ', πολλὰ δ'/μυρί'*) and sorrows to be described (*πάθεν ἄλγεα/ἄλγε' ἔθηκε*). Both openings presuppose in the listener a general familiarity with the legendary framework; the poet, as Horace puts it (*AP* 148–9), 'in medias res | non secus ac notas auditorem rapit'. The general effect is well summed up by Quintilian (x 1. 48): 'Age vero, non utriusque operis ingressu in paucissimis versibus legem prohoemiorum non dico servavit sed constituit? Nam et benivolum auditorem invocatione dearum quas praesidere vatibus creditum est et intentum proposita rerum magnitudine et docilem summa celeriter comprensa facit.' The resemblance between the two proems may partly reflect a traditional pattern for beginning a long heroic narrative, but the parallelism is so close as to suggest that the poet of the *Odyssey* modelled his opening on that of the *Iliad*. See further S. E. Bassett, 'The Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*', *AJPh* xliv (1923), 339 ff., B. A. van Groningen, 'The Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*', *Mededeelingen der koninklijke nederlandsche akademie van wetenschappen* NR ix. 8 (1946), 279 ff., Rüter, *Odysseeinterpretationen*, 28 ff., A. Lenz, *Das Proöm des frühen griechischen Epos* (Bonn, 1980), esp. 49 ff., 71 ff.

The proem begins and ends with an invocation of the Muse. Such an appeal was clearly conventional for epic narrative; but what is the significance of the convention? The invocation of the Muses at the beginning of the Catalogue of Ships (*Il.* ii 484 ff.) is of great importance for understanding the poet's view of their role. There the poet is about to embark on a long, circumstantial enumeration of the various contingents fighting at Troy; whether or not this is, in essentials, true, it is of little interest unless it is believed to be. The poet looks to the Muse to supply knowledge of what lies outside his own experience: *ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε, πάρεστέ τε, ἴστέ τε πάντα*. A similar view of the Muses' function emerges very clearly from Odysseus' praise of Demodocus (viii 487 ff.). The goddess provides the singer's material and validates his narrative. By thus invoking the Muse the poet gives us to understand that his account of events which, as he and his audience well know, happened long ago, does not depend on his own invention, but is sanctioned by a divinity whose mouthpiece he is; whatever stories we have previously heard about Odysseus, what we are about to hear is what really happened. See further Lenz, op. cit., 27 ff., M. Skafte Jensen, *The Homeric Question and the Oral-Formulaic Theory* (Copenhagen, 1980), 62 ff., Clay, *Wrath*, 9 ff.

Despite the care which has obviously been bestowed on its composition, this is, as has often been pointed out, an odd opening for our *Odyssey*. It covers only a third of the poem (v–xii), not very accurately, and gives disproportionate emphasis to a single incident. The stress laid on the sacrilegious gluttony of Odysseus' comrades no doubt reflects the poet's concern to anticipate the charge that his hero failed to bring home his men (cf. xxiv 426–8), but his censure is not altogether borne out by his narrative in xii (see below, 7–9 n.); in any case, the suitors' sins are of far more importance for the poem as a whole than those of Odysseus' comrades. Moreover, though the prominence afforded to the Phaeacians may prevent us noticing the oddity, Odysseus' wanderings do not take him much among the cities of men (3), but far from human society. None of the *speciosa miracula* which we associate with Odysseus—Polyphemus, Aeolus, Circe, the Sirens, Scylla and Charybdis—is mentioned. We do not expect a

comprehensive summary of what is to come; but if the poet's purpose was, as it would be natural to suppose, simply to indicate enough of his theme to catch his audience's attention, his choice of detail is strange. It is a natural conjecture that this opening was composed for a poem devoted to Odysseus' wanderings, related in a less fantastic form, and the outlines of such a *nostos*, bringing him back by way of Crete, Egypt, and Thesprotia, may be discerned behind the cover-stories which Odysseus tells to Eumaeus, Antinous, and Penelope (xiv 199 ff., xvii 419 ff., xix 172 ff., 270 ff.); see further p. 51. It is understandable if the poet was anxious to preserve this splendid and carefully constructed proem, even though he must have realized that it no longer quite fitted a narrative which was to culminate in Odysseus' heroic vengeance, already in prospect in i.

Horace produced two versions of the opening of the *Odyssey*: *AP* 141–2: 'Dic mihi, Musa, virum, captae post tempora Troiae | qui mores hominum multorum vidit et urbes'; *Epp.* i 2. 19 ff.: '[Ulixen] qui domitor Troiae multorum providus urbis | et mores hominum inspexit, latumque per aequor, | dum sibi, dum sociis reditum parat, aspera multa | pertulit, adversis rerum immersabilis undis.'

1. Cf. Livius Andronicus' famous translation (*poet.* 1): 'virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum'. **ἔννεπε**: the archaic verb imparts a certain solemnity to what follows. It is uncertain whether the *-νν-* is original or due to metrical lengthening: see further Wyatt, *Lengthening*, 94 ff. **Μοῦσα**: the poet invokes the Muse emphatically at the outset (cf. 10), but not thereafter; contrast *Il.* ii 484 ff., xi 218, xiv 508, xvi 112. The Muses are the daughters of Zeus (cf. 10, *Il.* ii 491, Hes. *Th.* 52, etc.) and, according to Hesiod, Memory (*Th.* 54); in Hesiod's catalogue they are nine (*Th.* 76 ff., cf. *Od.* xxiv 60 (with Heubeck's n.)), but probably they were generally regarded as a vague plurality, without individual identities; see further Hainsworth on viii 63, M. L. West on Hes. *Th.* ll. c. **πολύτροπον**: the meaning was disputed in antiquity: 'turning many ways, of many devices, ingenious' or 'much wandering'. The epithet recurs in only one other place in Homer, at x 330, where either sense would be suitable. Later writers evidently understood it as 'ingenious' (e.g. *h.Merc.* 13, 439, Pl. *Hi. Mi.* 364 e, Th. iii 83. 3, cf. *πολυτροπίη* Hdt. ii 121 ϵ 3), a synonym for the epithets more commonly applied to Odysseus, *πολύμητις*, *πολύφρων*, *πολυμήχανος*, *ποικιλομήτης*, etc., and corresponding to the self-characterization of ix 19–20 *εἴμ' Ὀδυσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν | ἀνθρώποισι μέλω*. Thus, from the outset, the poet stresses the importance of intelligence. The alternative explanation, that *πολύτροπος* is equivalent to *πολύπλαγκτος* and glossed by the following clause (just as *πατροφονεύς* is glossed at 299–300), is less attractive. Such exegesis is out of place here, and alien to the rather summary style of the proem; moreover, Odysseus' travels resulted from accident rather than *Wanderlust*, and a reference to something genuinely characteristic of him is more appropriate. The scholia on Ar. *Nu.* 260 indicate a variant *πολύκροτον* (cf. Eust. on this line); in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* Odysseus is described as *υἱὸς Λαέρταο πολύκροτα μήδεα εἰδώς* (fr. 198. 3).

2. **πλάγχθη**: in epic language, as in Vedic and Avestan, the syllabic augment is optional. It used to be generally accepted that such optional augmentation, as against the mandatory augmentation of prose texts in Greek and Indo-Iranian languages, represented a characteristic of Indo-European poetic style, reaching back to the period before the separate IE languages came into existence. But the fact that the augment is normally omitted from Mycenaean texts, which in view of their essentially non-poetic nature would have been expected to show augmented verb-forms, seriously undermines this theory, though it is not clear how the facts should be explained. See further L. Bottin, 'Studio dell'aumento in Omero', *SMEA* x (1969), 69–145, Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 478 ff., §§ 230 ff. **Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον**: a unique designation for Troy, but cf. *Τροίης ἱερὰ κρήδεμνα* (*Il.* xvi 100), *Κικόνων ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον* (*Od.* ix 165). *ἱερός* is a frequent epithet for Troy (normally in the formula *Ἴλιος* (*-ον, -ου*) *ἱρή* (*-ήν, -ῆς*)); as often in Homer, it is used to convey a sense of something solemnly impressive, without obvious religious connotations. For non-Trojan examples of *ἱερός* with toponyms cf. iii 278 (Sunium), ix 165 (Ciconian city), xi 323 (Athens), xxi 108 (Pylos), *Il.* i 366 (Thebe), ii 506 (Onchestus), 535 (Euboea), 625 (the Echinades), iv 103 (= 121) (Zeleia). See further P. Wülfing-v. Martitz, '*Ἱερός* bei Homer u. in der älteren griechischen Literatur', *Glotta* xxxviii (1959–60), 272–307, C. Gallavotti, 'Il valore di "hieros" in Omero e in Miceneo', *AC* xxxii (1963), 409–28, J. P. Locher, *Untersuchungen zu ἱερός* hauptsächlich bei Homer (Bern, 1963), esp. 36 ff., O. Szemerényi, *SMEA* xx (1979), 207 ff. *πτολίεθρον* seems to be a poetic coinage; the Ionic equivalent, **πολίεθρον*, is not attested. **ἔπερσε**: cf. xxii 230; Odysseus is the real conqueror of Troy because he devised the stratagem of the Wooden Horse.

3–4. **πολλῶν . . . πολλά**: anaphora with expressions of number is common in Greek, and there are many Homeric examples with *πολύς* (e.g. iii 273, iv 230); see further Fehling, *Wiederholungsfiguren*, 199. **ἴδεν ἄστεα**: Bentley's *ἴδε* would allow the lost initial digamma (*ϝ*, corresponding to English *w*) of *ἄστεα* to be metrically effective, but such changes are pointless in view of the many places where this phoneme is neglected. Digamma in initial prevocalic position seems to have disappeared from epic diction at the same time as it was lost in the Ionian vernacular, and cannot have been pronounced even where it was metrically feasible. See further Palmer in *Companion*, 100–1, Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 116 ff., §§ 50 ff., R. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the* Hymns (Cambridge, 1982), esp. 42 ff. **νόον**: 'attitude, outlook, disposition, way of thinking', cf. iv 267, vi 121, ix 176; see further K. v. Fritz, '*ΝΟΟΣ* and *ΝΟΕΙΝ* in the Homeric poems', *CPh* xxxviii (1943), 79 ff., G. Bona, *Il 'ΝΟΟΣ' e i 'ΝΟΟΙ' nell'Odissea* (Turin, 1959), S. M. Darcus, *Glotta* lviii (1980), 33 ff. Zenodotus read *νόμον*, which is surely implied by Horace's translation 'mores' (quoted in 1 n.), since 'mentem' would have been the obvious rendering of *νόον*. This reading has found some distinguished supporters: see Bona, op. cit., 8 n. 20. But *νόμος*, though common in Hesiod (*Op.* 276, 388, *Th.* 66, 417, frr. 280. 14, 322), does not occur elsewhere in Homer, *δίκη* and *θεσμός* being preferred, though *εὐνομίη* is found once (*Od.* xvii 487); in any case, the sg. is awkward. Zenodotus' text was not provided with accents, and it is conceivable that what he intended was, as Nauck suggested, *νομόν*, 'their range, dwelling places' (cf., perhaps, *Il.* xx 249), but this seems a strange expression.

4. The antithesis with the preceding line is highly effective, but in fact Odysseus does not spend more than sixty days at sea from the time when he leaves Troy. xiii 90 looks like a conscious reminiscence. **ὅ γ'**: often in Homer where the subject of two successive clauses is the same, it is picked up in the second clause by a pronoun strengthened with *γε* or *δέ*.

5. 'Trying to secure his own life and the home-coming of his companions.' Except (significantly) in his encounter with the Cyclops (ix 170 ff.), Odysseus is not represented as seeking his adventures; he is well aware of the obligations of a leader to his followers and of a king to his subjects (cf. ii 230 ff. (= v 8 ff.), xix 107 ff.). The *Wanderlust* of Tennyson's Ulysses derives from Dante (*Inferno* xxvi), not Homer: see further W. B. Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme* (Oxford, 1954), 175 ff. **ἑταίρων**: companions, especially companions in arms. The term, which often implies a high degree of mutual trust, has nothing to do with kinship; the heroes at Troy are *ἑταῖροι* to one another regardless of family and nationality: cf. e.g. *Il.* iv 266, xvii 150, xxiii 252. For *ἑταῖροι* used to describe the whole following of a hero cf. *Il.* xvi 204, xxiii 5, of Achilles' Myrmidons. See further A. Andrewes, *Hermes* lxxxix (1961), 134–7, H. T. Kakridis, *La Notion de l'amitié et de l'hospitalité chez Homère* (Thessaloniki, 1963), 51 ff., M. L. West on Hes. *Op.* 183.

6. **οὐδ' ὧς**: 'not even so, not for all that'. The accentuation of *ὡς* is uncertain; ancient grammarians in fact prescribe a circumflex accent in this expression and in *καὶ ὧς*, *μηδ' ὧς* and *κἂν ὧς*. **ἱέμενός περ**: 'eager though he was'.

7–9. The emphasis given to this episode (on which see Heubeck on xii 260 ff.) is striking. In fact this severe condemnation of Odysseus' companions is not borne out by the narrative. Eleven of his twelve ships are destroyed by the Laestrygonians, through no fault of the victims, and even on board Odysseus' own ship there are several casualties before Thrinacia is reached (ix 288 ff., 311, 344, x 551–2, xii 245 ff.). The men are driven to their sacrilegious act by the gods who punish them for it. Their decision to avoid the dangers of sailing by night by landing on Thrinacia is sensible (xii 279 ff.), but Zeus forces them to stay by sending a contrary wind (313), which blows for a month (325) until their supplies are exhausted (329). When at last they decide to eat the cattle as the only alternative to starvation (341 ff.), they do all they can to mitigate the offence; meanwhile Odysseus, who might have restrained them, has been sent to sleep by the gods (338). The significance of this discrepancy, not as to the facts but in their interpretation, is controversial: see further Fenik, *Studies*, 212 ff. For a historical case of trouble over a sacred herd see Hdt. ix 93.

7. The moral of the whole poem, to be echoed in Eurylochus' justified censure of Odysseus' foolhardiness in Polyphemus' cave (x 437), *τούτου γὰρ καὶ κεῖνοι ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο*. **αὐτῶν . . . σφετέρῃσιν**: the word-order, genitive *before* possessive adjective, is quite abnormal; presumably this reflects the modification of a formulaic prototype like *Il.* iv 409 *κεῖνοι δὲ σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο*: see further J. Wackernagel, 'Indogermanische Dichtersprache', *Philologus* lxxxxv (1943), 12–13 (= *Kl. Schr.* (Göttingen, 1953), i 197–8). **ἀτασθαλίῃσιν**: *ἀτασθαλίη* is an important word in the *Odyssey* and recurs shortly in Zeus' speech on human perversity as a cause of suffering (34). It is mainly used with reference to the suitors' conduct; it denotes behaviour for which men not only suffer but deserve to suffer, culpable recklessness implying a selfish disregard for the decencies of social life. See Hainsworth on viii 166, *LfgrE* s.v. *ἀτασθαλίη*, *ἀτασθάλλω*, *ἀτάσθαλος*, D. M. Jones, *Ethical themes in the Plot of the* Odyssey (Inaugural lecture, London, 1954).

8. **κατά**: to be taken adverbially with *ἤσθιον*. **Ὑπερίονος**: for Homer *Ὑπερίων* is simply a title of the Sun-god; it is usually joined with *Ἠέλιος*, but can stand alone (i 24, *Il.* xix 398); *Ὑπεριονίδης* (xii 176) is apparently regarded as equivalent. But in Hesiod Hyperion is a Titan and father of Helios (*Th.* 374). The etymology is uncertain, but it is probably best taken as equivalent to Latin *superior*: see H. Usener, *Götternamen* (Bonn, 1896), 19–20.

9. **αὐτάρ**: the coexistence of Achaean *αὐτάρ* and Ionic *ἀτάρ* within the formulaic system should be noted; despite the frequency with which *αὐτάρ* occurs, its second syllable is never in arsis: the few apparent exceptions can be eliminated by adopting the variant *ἀτάρ* given in every instance. On *αὐτάρ* and its place in the formulaic system see further Ruijgh, *Élément*, 29 ff. **νόστιμον ἦμαρ**: *ἦμαρ*, already an archaism, but metrically far more convenient than *ἠμέρη* of contemporary Ionic, is often so used in Homer with an adjective (cf. *δούλιον*, *νηλεές*, *αἴσιμον ἦμαρ*) to denote a state or condition, such periphrases being used particularly in connection with what does not in fact happen: see H. Fränkel, 'Die Zeitauffassung in der frühgriech. Literatur', *Wege u. Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*² (Munich, 1960), esp. 5–6, R. A. Santiago, 'Observaciones sobre algunos usos formularios de *ἦμαρ* en Homero', *Emerita* xxx (1962), 139–50. *ἠμέρη* is not used in this way in Homer.

10. The poet no doubt took pride in his flashback technique; he did not need to begin at the beginning, but could start at a point relatively near the end, and thus concentrate the action within a period of approximately forty days. He does not specify a particular event as his starting-point, and there is a smooth and natural transition to the description of Odysseus' circumstances. **τῶν ἁμόθεν γε**: 'from some point, from whatever point you will, in this story'; cf. viii 500 *ἔνθεν ἑλών*. Nowhere else in Homer does any form of **ἁμός* occur. It is disputed whether it is an Atticism (cf. Pl. *Grg.* 492 d etc. *ἁμόθεν γέ ποθεν*) or an archaism, but if it were a genuine archaism we might expect to find more examples: see Shipp, *Studies*, 314 n. 2. **εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν**: the force of *καί* is not quite clear: is it 'Tell us too, share your knowledge with us' or 'Tell us as well as others', an appeal to precedent? The former seems more likely; for the general idea cf. *Il.* ii 485 ff., and for the use of *καί* cf. *Od.* ix 16–17 *νῦν δ' ὄνομα πρῶτον μυθήσομαι, ὄφρα καὶ ὑμεῖς | εἴδετ'*, 'in order that you may know it as well as me' **ἡμῖν**: the poet and his audience.

11–21. A brief sketch of the conflict of divine interests over Odysseus' return to Ithaca.

11. **ἔνθ'** marks the point in time at which the *Odyssey* opens; we are not given a more precise indication until ii 175, where we learn that it is the twentieth year since Odysseus left home for Troy; see below, ii 174–6 n. **ὅσοι . . . ὄλεθρον**: the *nostoi* of the other Greek survivors are related by Nestor and Menelaus in iii and iv. **αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον**: *αἰπύς* is similarly used metaphorically with *φόνος*, *δόλος*, *πόνος*, and *χόλος*; though it is not quite clear what metaphor is presupposed, the general sense seems to be 'merciless, hard to overcome': see further Hoekstra on xvi 379, W. J. Verdenius, 'The Metaphorical Use of *ΑΙΠΥΣ*', *Mnemosyne* Ser. 4, vi (1953), 115, *LfgrE* s.v. *αἰπά*, H. J. Koch '*αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος* and the Etymology of *ὄλλυμι*', *Glotta* liv (1976) 216 ff.

13. Odysseus' preference for his middle-aged wife over Calypso in her earthly paradise (v 63 ff.) is rightly stressed at the outset.

14. We learn more about Calypso at 51 ff. Her father is Atlas, and she has nothing but her name in common with Hesiod's *ἱμερόεσσα Καλυψώ*, listed among the daughters of Tethys and Oceanus in the *Theogony* (359); she has no place in myth independent of the *Odyssey*. She has much in common with Circe (as Odysseus himself is aware (ix 29 ff.)), who may well have served as her model. But Calypso represents a much more serious temptation to Odysseus. Though we cannot be certain, it looks as if Calypso was invented at a late stage in the development of the story, when the poet, having decided to extend Odysseus' *nostos* to ten years, had to devise a means of detaining his hero for a long period without implying any weakening in his resolve to get home. Her name underlines her function in the story. See further Hainsworth, introduction to v and v 57 n. Heubeck on x 133 ff., *RE* x 1772 ff. (Lamer), Woodhouse, *Composition*, 46–53, 215–17, F. Dirlmeier, 'Die "schreckliche" Kalypso', *Lebende Antike: Symposion f. Rudolf Sühnel* (Berlin, 1967), 20 ff. **πότνια**: a title of honour, applied to mortal women as well as goddesses, in origin fem. of *πόσις*; see further Russo on xx 61, Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*. **δῖα θεάων**: the partitive gen. might be expected to imply distinction within the group, as it clearly does in *δῖα γυναικῶν*, almost certainly the model for this formula (cf. Hainsworth on v 159). But the expression is used without regard to pre-eminence in the divine hierarchy, and was evidently regarded as appropriate to any goddess.

15. σπέσσι: the declension of *σπέος*, an archaic word of unknown etymology, presents several problems: see Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 88 § 105 (5), Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 7 § 1, Ruijgh, *Elément*, 126–7, Werner, *H u. ει vor Vokal*, 36–40. *σπέσσι* occurs only in the Odyssean formula *ἐν σπέσσι γλαφυροῖσι* (7 times, always at the beginning of the line); it may have replaced *σπέεσι*, which is sometimes given as a variant and would be morphologically more satisfactory (cf. *ἔπεσι*). An alternative form, *σπήεσσιν*, occurs four times, but no other part of the pl.

16. ἔτος . . . ἐνιαυτῶν: the use of these words in Homer indicates that they were regarded as equivalent, though originally *ἐνιαυτός* meant 'anniversary, the day on which the year's cycle is completed': see C. J. Emlyn-Jones, '*ἔτος* and *ἐνιαυτός* in Homeric Formulae', *Glotta* xlv (1967), 156–61, R. S. P. Beekes, ibid., xlvii (1969), 138 ff. **περιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν:** cf. Verg. *A.* i 234 'volventibus annis'.

17. ἐπεκλώσαντο: 'spun to, assigned by spinning', i.e. appointed, ordained. *κλώθω* and its cpds. are regularly used of the spinning of fate (cf. vii 197 ff., with Hainsworth's n.), but here the verb seems to be used rather loosely. The following dialogue between Zeus and Athena does not suggest that anything had previously been determined about the date of Odysseus' return, yet according to common belief a man's destiny, not in precise detail, but as regards the time of his death and the general balance of good and ill, was fixed for him at birth (vii 196 ff., *Il.* x 70–1, xx 127–8, xxiii 79, xxiv 209 ff., Hes. *Th.* 218–19 = 905–6).

18–19. οὐδ' ἔνθα . . . φίλοισι: there is some doubt about the interpretation and punctuation. Is this the apodosis to *ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ κτλ*; a reference to the difficulties which delayed his return ('not even then was he safe out of danger or among his friends')? Or is it a parenthesis foreshadowing the latter part of the poem ('though even there and among his own people he was not free from trials'), with *θεοὶ δ'* beginning the apodosis? The second interpretation was evidently adopted by Aristarchus (see schol. *Il.* xvi 46), but this isolated allusion to subsequent events is rather awkward. It is probably better to adopt the first interpretation, though it is somewhat flat. Either way, the passage seems clumsy.

20–1. The cause of Poseidon's anger is explained more fully at 68 ff.; on the importance of divine wrath in the *Odyssey* see J. Irmscher, *Götterzorn bei Homer* (Leipzig, 1950), 52 ff. Poseidon is not of course directly responsible for Odysseus' enforced sojourn with Calypso, but the static condition of Odysseus' affairs is due to his hostility. **ἀντιθέῳ 'Οδυσῆϊ:** *ἀντίθεος* refers to physical qualities such as beauty or strength, not to moral superiority; it is even used of the Cyclops (i 70) and of the suitors (xiv 18). We have long realized that Odysseus was meant, but the name adds a certain emphasis to the conclusion of this section.

22–95. The stage being now set, the action opens. Athena takes advantage of Poseidon's absence to raise with Zeus the question of Odysseus' long-delayed home-coming, and, being encouraged by her father's response, outlines her plan for restoring Odysseus' fortunes. The episode is often

described, over-formally, as a divine council, but though its function in initiating action is analogous (cf. Hainsworth on v 1 ff.) the tone is rather that of casual conversation, which provides a natural medium for conveying further details of the background to Odysseus' predicament, above all, the grounds for Poseidon's hostility.

22. A visit to the Ethiopians similarly explains the absence from Olympus of Zeus and the other gods at *Il.* i 423 ff., cf. xxiii 205–7. They are normally located in the far east (cf. Mimn. fr. 12. 9 West, [A.] *Pr.* 809), Memnon their king being the son of Eos (Hes. *Th.* 984–5). The identification of the Ethiopians with the people living south of Egypt is not certainly attested before Hecataeus (*FGrH* 1 F 325–8, with Jacoby ad loc.), though *Od.* iv 83 ff., Hes. fr. 150, 17–19 might be taken as evidence of this conception. But for the poet of the *Odyssey* they are clearly a mythical race, and some vagueness about their homeland is not surprising.

Αἰθίοψ is a properly formed Greek cpd., and, despite some uncertainty about its derivation, the interpretation 'with burnt face' is the most probable; there is no reason to regard it as a foreign word distorted by popular etymology; see further Schwyzer, *Grammatik*, i 447, *LfgrE*, Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*. As a personal name it has been found on tablets from Pylos, in the form *Ai-ti-jo-qo*, though the significance of this is debatable: see Ventris–Chadwick, *Documents*, 243–4 (PY 115), 248 (PY 121), 250–2 (PY 131, 133). Negroes are depicted in frescoes from Cnossus and Thera; see Sir Arthur Evans, *The Palace of Minos* (London, 1921), ii 755 ff., pl. xiii, iv 886–7, fig. 869, S. Marinatos, 'An African in Thera', *AAA* ii (1969), 374–5, D. L. Page, 'The Miniature Frescoes from Acrotiri, Thera', *PAA* li (1976), 135 ff. So the Mycenaeans must have had a word for 'negro', and there is nothing against supposing this to have been the original meaning of *Αἰθίοψ*. But we do not know how the poet and his audience understood the word. Neither in Homer nor in Hesiod is there any suggestion that Ethiopians were dark-skinned, though Hesiod refers (*Op.* 527) to *κυανέων ἀνδρῶν δῆμόν τε πόλιν τε*, and in the *Catalogue* (fr. 150, 17–19) *Αἰθίοπες* are associated with *Μέλανες*, *Κατουδαῖοι*, *Πυγμαῖοι*, and, probably, *Λίβυες* (all, incidentally, descended from Poseidon). The concept of this just and pious race, whose righteousness won them the friendship of the gods, retained its attraction throughout antiquity, culminating in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*; it is against this background that we should set the New Testament story of Philip's encounter with the Ethiopian courtier (Acts 8: 26 ff.). See further E. H. Berger, *Mythische Kosmographie der Griechen* (supplement to Roscher's *Lexikon*, 1904), 22–4, A. Lesky, 'Aithiopika', *Hermes* lxxxvii (1959), 27 ff. (= *Gesammelte Schriften* (Berne–Munich, 1966), 410 ff.), A. Dihle, *Umstrittene Daten* (Cologne, 1965), 65 ff., F. M. Snowden, *Blacks in Antiquity* (Cambridge, Mass., 1970), esp. 101 ff., *Before Color-Prejudice* (Cambridge, Mass., 1983), esp. 46 ff.

23–4. This partition of the Ethiopians is new, western Ethiopians being apparently a product of Ionian speculation. The geographical detail is distracting, as we naturally wonder which group Poseidon is visiting and are not told until v 283, where we infer from the fact that his return journey brings him via Cilicia that he must have been east. Herodotus (vii 69–70) interprets this conception of Ethiopians divided between east and west in terms of Indians and Africans. **Αἰθίοπας**: for epanalepsis used to introduce supplementary information cf. 50–1, *Il.* ii 671–3, 837–8, 849–50, 870–1, vi 153–4, 395–6, xii 95–6, xxi 85–6, 157–8; see further Fehling, *Wiederholungsfiguren*, 184–5. **ἔσχατοι ἀνδρῶν**: 'remote from men', like the Phaeacians (vi 204–5). *ἔσχατος* is not in origin a superlative (*pace* LSJ), but a local adjective meaning 'situated outside'; see further Leumann, *Wörter*, 158 n. 1. **δυσομένου**: cf. Hes. *Op.* 384 (where *δυσομενάων* is contrasted with *ἐπιτελλομενάων*); in both places *δυσόμενος* is evidently used with present sense. Though it looks like a fut., it should probably be regarded as the participle corresponding to *δύσετο*, a so-called 'mixed aorist'. These forms were regarded by ancient scholars, and apparently by Homer and Hesiod, as imperfects: see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 416–17 § 199, Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 43 § 41, and below, 330 n. **Ὑπερίονος**: see above, 8 n.

25. ἑκατόμβης: as ancient scholars realized, *ἑκατόμβη* is derived from *ἑκατόν* and *βοῦς* (see Chantraine, *Dictionnaire* s.v. *ἑκατόν*, Frisk, *GEW*, *LfgrE*), but where the number of beasts is specified it is always much smaller than a hundred, and the victims need not include cattle: cf. *Il.* vi 115 (cf. 93) (twelve oxen), xxiii 147 (fifty sheep).

26. γε τέρπετο: here, as often, our MSS are divided between augmented and unaugmented forms, and there is no obvious reason for preferring one to the other. Aristarchus appears to have avoided the syllabic augment at certain places in the line (cf. e.g. iii 461) but we do not know his reasons: see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 481–2 § 231. **δαιτὶ παρήμενος**: for Homer it is normal to sit at table (cf. iii 389, xx 136, *Il.* ix 199 ff., xxiv 472 ff.), and similarly for Phocylides (fr. 13 West). At Athens, at least, the custom of reclining begins *c.*600; Crete still followed the ancient practice in the Hellenistic period (Heraclid. Lemb. fr. 15 Dilts, Pyrgion *FGrH* 467 F 1).

27. ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν: initial *λ*, *μ*, *ν*, *ρ*, and *σ* may make a long syllable of a preceding short vowel (normally only in arsis except in the first foot). Our MSS sometimes mark this by doubling the initial consonant, and this orthography was preferred by Aristophanes; the evidence of contemporary papyri indicates that it was normal practice.

29–31. Cf. iv 187–9. This sounds like the opening of an Oresteia; the poet surely intended us to be surprised. Orestes' vengeance is the latest important event, and, in heaven as on earth, naturally forms a topic of conversation: cf. i 298 ff., iii 194 ff. There is nothing artificial or contrived about the way in which the poet introduces the leitmotif of Agamemnon's return and its consequences, a theme important throughout the poem but particularly so in the first four books: see above, pp. 16–7, 60. Here the emphasis on Aegisthus is important; the poet implies a close parallel between his case and that of the suitors, and though this conception will not stand up to logical analysis, it contributes significantly to the presentation of the suitors as wicked men whose crimes provoked the just wrath of heaven.

Aegisthus, son of Thyestes (and therefore Agamemnon's cousin), is not mentioned in the *Iliad*. The etymology of the name is uncertain, but it is more likely to be pre-Greek than a short form of **Αἰγισθένης*: see further *LfgrE*.

29. ἀμύμονος: traditionally explained as 'blameless', from privative ἀ- and the stem found in *μῶμος*, cf. Hsch. *μῦμαρ· αἶσχος, φόβος, ψόγος*. This derivation is questionable, and the translation 'blameless' is scarcely ever natural in Homer, where the primary meaning seems to be rather 'beautiful, handsome', from which develops the sense 'excellent, expert'; see further Parry, *Blameless Aegisthus*; for an ingenious attempt to defend the conventional interpretation see F. M. Combellack, *AJPh* ciii (1982), 361 ff. (The article in *LfgrE* is unsatisfactory.) At iii 310 Aegisthus is given a different, but metrically equivalent, epithet, *ἀνάλκιδος*.

30. Ἀγαμεμνονίδης: the honorific force of the patronymic is unmistakable. Homeric epic preserves an extremely ancient usage in its extensive employment of patronymics; on their use see further W. Meyer, *De Homeri patronymicis* (Göttingen, 1907), J. A. Scott, 'Patronymics as a Test of the Relative Age of the Homeric Books', *CPh* vii (1912), 293–301. They are much less common in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*.

32 ff. The theology implied by Zeus' speech has received much attention, and it should be stressed that its main function is to start the action. This would not be a natural point to introduce unfamiliar ideas, and there is in fact nothing new in Zeus' moralizing. The emphasis lies on the particular case of Aegisthus, which suggests the opening generalization (not vice versa); we are all familiar with the conversational mannerism which dignifies items of gossip with prefatory remarks about people who go looking for trouble, and this is not very different. Aegisthus' story, foreshadowing the fate of the suitors, is told in such a way as to sharpen the antithesis between his well-merited punishment and Odysseus' largely undeserved sufferings. The passage seems to have been in Solon's mind when he composed his elegy on *Eunomia* (fr. 4, cf. fr. 11 West): see W. Jaeger, 'Solons Eunomia', *SPAW* 1926, xi 69–85 (= *Scripta Minora*, i (Rome, 1960) 315–37). On the speech as a whole see further Wilamowitz, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, ii (Berlin, 1932), 116 ff., E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley–Los Angeles, 1951) 32, 52 n. 21, D. M. Jones, *Ethical Themes in the Plot of the* Odyssey, 15 ff., Rüter, *Odysseeinterpretationen*, *64 ff.*, Fenik, *Studies*, 208 ff., L. Allione, *Telemaco e Penelope nell'Odissea* (Turin, 1963), 39 ff. Nilsson, *Geschichte*, 363.

32–3. Zeus refers to the practice of attributing to a god (often himself) any misfortune for which there is no obvious cause. This is a standard feature of Homeric conversation, sometimes serious and sincere, sometimes a way of disclaiming responsibility: e.g. i 347–9, vi 188–90, xi 558–60, xii 371–2, *Il.* iii 164–5, xix 86–8. A certain degree of suffering is part of the human condition, since men are exposed to forces outside their control, and for this, in terms of Homeric theology, the gods must be held responsible. Zeus does not attempt to deny this; his point is that men bring further troubles upon themselves by their own folly and perversity. The thought requires us to supply *πάντα* with *κακά*; cf. viii 167.

34–5. ἀτασθαλίῃσιν: see above, 7 n. **ὑπὲρ μόρον:** at first sight this looks like a theological paradox, but if the poet had meant that wicked men can frustrate or circumvent destiny, he would surely have explained so abnormal a view in greater detail. Contrast the consolatory commonplace of *Il.* vi 487–8: *οὐ γάρ τίς μ' ὑπὲρ αἶσαν ἀνὴρ Ἄϊδι προϊάψει· | μοῖραν δ' οὔ τινα φημὶ πεφυγμένον ἔμμεναι ἀνδρῶν*. Though we find several times in the *Iliad* the idea that something nearly happened contrary to destiny, *ὑπὲρ μοῖραν, ὑπὲρ μόρον* (ii 155, xx 30, 336, xxi 517, cf. *ὑπὲρ Διὸς αἶσαν* xvii 321), these expressions are to be regarded as a way of increasing tension, emphasizing a critical point in the narrative. Even Zeus himself will not try to override destiny (*Il.* xvi 431 ff., xxii 167 ff.), and what is contrary to fate simply cannot happen. But *αἶσα* and *μοῖρα* are both used in a looser sense of what is fitting, right, or reasonably to be expected, and in this sense there is nothing paradoxical in an action *ὑπὲρ αἶσαν* or *οὐ κατὰ μοῖραν*: e.g. ii 251 *σὺ δ' οὐ κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες*; viii 397, ix 352, *Il.* iii 59, vi 333 *ἐπεί με κατ' αἶσαν ἐνείκεσας οὐδ' ὑπὲρ αἶσαν*; xvi 367 *οὐδὲ κατὰ μοῖραν πέραον πάλιν*, 'they crossed in disorder'; xvi 780 *ὑπὲρ αἶσαν Ἀχαιοὶ φέρτεροι ἦσαν*, 'the Greeks were victorious beyond their share, beyond what might reasonably have been expected' (cf. Leaf, *Iliad*, ad loc.). *ὑπὲρ μόρον* here is to be interpreted similarly; the phrase is not used in quite the same way in 34 as in 35, but in both there is the idea of going beyond the normal limit, of getting more than one's due share of something. We may compare the analogous, weakened, use of its adjective *μόρσιμος* at xvi 392 (= xxi 162) *ἡ δέ κ' ἔπειτα | γήμαιθ' ὅς κε πλεῖστα πόροι καὶ μόρσιμος ἔλθοι*, where it means little more than 'suitable, well-qualified'. The poet was no doubt not unaware of a certain rhetorical effectiveness in using *ὑπὲρ μόρον* in this way.

36. μνηστήν: 'wooed', i.e. lawfully wedded.

37 ff. Hermes' mission to Aegisthus is surely an *ad hoc* invention, intended to underline the latter's criminal folly, and perhaps partly suggested by Hermes' forthcoming mission to Calypso (cf. 84 ff.); it is not found in any later treatment of the story; cf. iii 266–71, with nn., and on similar inventions in the *Iliad* see M. M. Willcock, 'Mythological Paradeigma in the *Iliad*', *CQ* xiv (1964), 141 ff. Here too the fate of Aegisthus foreshadows that of the suitors, who similarly ignore divine warnings (cf. ii 146 ff., with nn.), warnings which are not arbitrary prohibitions but simply reminders of what should be obvious to any right-minded person.

In the *Iliad* Iris acts as messenger of the gods, but Hesiod's view of Hermes as *θεῶν κῆρυξ* (*Op.* 80, cf. *Th.* 939, fr. 170) is unlikely to derive solely from the *Odyssey*,[1] and we should not imagine that the poet was innovating in assigning this role to Hermes.

---

[1] Not only because the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days* are very probably earlier than the *Odyssey* (see M. L. West, *Hesiod, Theogony* (Oxford, 1966), 46–7).

Hermes, the son of Zeus and Maia, was always reckoned among the major Olympians, but in Homer his role is normally subordinate (though at x 275 ff. he appears to act on his own initiative in preparing Odysseus against Circe's magic arts). According to the Hesiodic *Catalogue* (fr. 64) he was the father of Odysseus' maternal grandfather, the sinister Autolycus; this is unlikely to be post-Homeric invention, but though the poet of the *Odyssey* knows of a special relationship between the god and Autolycus, he explains it in terms of the latter's particular devotion to Hermes' cult (xix 395–8). The derivation of *Ἑρμείας* is uncertain, but there is much to be said for a connection with *ἕρμα*, in the sense of 'cairn', the ancient means of marking a boundary or path. 'That a monument of this kind could be transformed into an Olympian god is astounding. In effecting this transformation, narrative poetry combined two motifs: the widespread mythical figure of the trickster who is responsible for founding civilization, and the epic role of the messenger of the gods, which was already familiar in Near Eastern epic.' (W. Burkert). See further Nilsson, *Geschichte*, i 501 ff., Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*, W. Burkert, *Griechische Religion der archaischen u. klassischen Epoche* (Stuttgart–Cologne–Mainz, 1977), 243 ff. (= *Greek Religion* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1985), 156 ff.), H. Herter, 'Hermes: Ursprung u. Wesen eines griechischen Gottes', *RhM* cxix (1976), 193 ff. **ἀργειφόντην:** like many of Hermes' distinctive titles, obscure and evidently very ancient (cf. *ἀκάκητα, διάκτορος, ἐριούνιος, σῶκος*). It is used as if it were an alternative name (and therefore would be better printed with a capital); it designates Hermes alone, and only rarely occurs, as here, in apposition to the name. Ancient scholars offer various wild guesses about its meaning; the usual interpretation was 'slayer of Argus', recalling Hermes' role in the story of Io, an obviously ancient tale, even though the first surviving references to it come from the pseudo-Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* and *Aegimius* (Hes. frr. 122 ff., 294 ff.). It seems fair to infer that the poet and his audience understood *ἀργειφόντης* thus; certainly the second element was already interpreted as 'killer' when the *Iliad* was composed, since it must have provided the model for *ἀνδρειφόντης* (*Il.* ii 651 etc., cf. *Πολυφόντης Il.* iv 395). This, however, can hardly have been the original meaning; we expect a standing epithet to refer to a permanent or recurrent function or characteristic, not to a single exploit, and the change from **ἀργο-* to *ἀργει-* has not been satisfactorily explained. Some ingenious derivations have been proposed by modern scholars: 'dog-killer' (J. Chittenden, *AJA* lii (1948), 24 ff., see also M. L. West, *Hesiod, Works and Days* (Oxford, 1978), 368–9), 'shining in splendour' (A. Heubeck, *BN* v (1954), 19 ff., cf. H. Koller, *Glotta* liv (1976), 211 ff.), 'shining at Argos' > 'killer at Argos' (W. Burkert). None of these seems immediately convincing, and the difficulty of finding a satisfactory Greek etymology lends force to Chantraine's view that the word is pre-Greek. See further Hainsworth on v 43, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*, Frisk, *GEW*, *LfgrE*, W. Burkert, *Homo Necans* (Berlin, 1972), 185 n. 18 (= Engl. ed. (Berkeley–Los Angeles, 1983), 165 n. 18).

Another form of 38 was widely current in antiquity: *Ἑρμείαν πέμψαντε διάκτορον ἀργειφόντην.* This was the reading of Zenodotus and Aristophanes, and the line is quoted in this form in the learned *Iliad*-commentary of *P.Oxy.* 1087 (Pack^2 1186), col. i 31–2 (first century BC) and in Epictetus (iii 1. 39). This version is not obviously inferior to that preferred by Aristarchus and given in all the medieval MSS; the use of the dual is easily defended, since the poet here concentrates on Zeus and Athena, and the common tendency of scribes to replace duals with plurals would argue in favour of its priority. But *διάκτορον ἀργειφόντην* is so much commoner than *ἐΰσκοπον ἀργειφόντην* that a mechanical error in the second half of the line would have been very easy, entailing the alteration of *πέμψαντες* to *πέμψαντε* to restore the scansion. A further ancient variant is recorded from the Massaliot edition (on which see above, introduction p. 44), *πέμψαντες Μαίης ἐρικυδέος ἀγλαὸν υἱόν*, untraditional in its language and an obvious modernization.

40. The change from indirect to direct speech underlines the importance of this part of Hermes' message, but seems extraordinarily abrupt; *Il.* iv 301 ff., xxiii 855 ff. offer partial parallels. **Ἀτρεΐδαο:** with *τίσις*, 'vengeance for Atreus' son', not with *Ὀρέσταο*; it is abnormal in Homer to use the grandfather's name as a patronymic, except for Achilles.

41. **ἱμείρεται:** epic aor. subj.

43. **ἀπέτισε:** the medieval MSS invariably offer this orthography for the aor. of *τίνω* instead of the philologically correct *ἔτεισα* given in early inscriptions; similarly we regularly find *ἔμιξα, ἔφθισα* instead of *ἔμειξα, ἔφθεισα.* (Papyri sometimes give the correct spelling, but probably only by accident.) See further Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 13 § 5, 412 § 195, LSJ. (But cf. Hoekstra on xiii 15.)

44. **γλαυκῶπις:** obviously parallel to *βοῶπις*, a standing epithet of Hera in the *Iliad*. These epithets have been connected with a (putative) theriomorphic phase in Greek religion, but Athena is never in Homer associated with the owl, as she is with other birds (vulture iii 372, *Il.* vii 59, swallow xxii 240, dove *Il.* v 778), and *γλαῦξ* does not occur in Homer, though *σκώψ*, the little horned owl, is mentioned (v 66). Presumably the poet connected *γλαυκῶπις* with *γλαυκός* (cf. *Il.* xvi 34), and understood it as 'with gleaming, flashing, eyes'. See further *LfgrE*, Kirk, *Commentary* on *Il.* i 551, C. J. Ruijgh, *Mnemosyne* S. iv, xxxvii (1984), 156–7.

47. Athena's imprecation foreshadows the death of the suitors; it is said to have been quoted by Scipio Africanus on the death of Tiberius Gracchus (Plu. *TG* xxi. 4).

48–9. Note the repeated syllables *δαΐφρονι δαίεται, δὴ δηθά* and alliteration in *δ* and *π*. Such effects are not unusual in Homer: see further L. P. Rank, *Etymologiseerung en verwante verschijnselen bij Homerus* (Assen, 1951). **δαΐφρονι:** it is uncertain what meaning the poet attached to this adjective. In the *Iliad* it is a conventional epithet of warriors (including Odysseus (xi 482)); the first element was evidently connected with *δάϊς*, 'battle'. In the *Odyssey* *δαίφρων* is used much more widely, to describe the Phaeacian

craftsman Polybus (viii 373) and Odysseus' mother (xv 356, cf. Hoekstra's n.) as well as Telemachus (iv 687) and Alcinous (viii 8, 13, 56), neither of whom is particularly warlike; the poet apparently connected the first element with *δαῆναι*, 'to learn', and interpreted it as 'sensible, prudent', a sense in which it seems to be used already in the *Iliad* occasionally (vi 162; xi 123, 138). The fact that it is metrically interchangeable with *περίφρων* and *πολύφρων* has probably fostered confusion about its specific meaning; at i 83 the MSS are divided between *δαΐφρονα* and *πολύφρονα*, while the scholia on xv 356, which refer to *δαΐφρων* as a frequent epithet of Penelope, imply its presence in places where our MSS are unanimous in reading *περίφρων*. For a detailed discussion see Parry, *Blameless Aegisthus*, 25–6 n. 1, B. Snell, *Glotta* lv (1977), 41–3, *LfgrE*. **δαίεται:** presumably 'is torn, distracted', from *δαίομαι*, not 'burns', from *δαίω*; as is observed in the scholia *τὸ καίεται ἐπ' ἐρώσης.*

50–1. The punctuation of the OCT with a stop at the end of 50 produces a very clumsy asyndeton. It is better to punctuate with a comma after *θαλάσσης* and take *νῆσος δενδρήεσσα* as in apposition to *ὀμφαλός*: the tree-covered island stands out from the sea like the navel from the body or the boss from the surface of a shield. For the anaphora cf. 22–3 *Αἰθίοπας* and n. Taken strictly *ὀμφαλὸς θαλάσσης* presupposes a landlocked sea, and hence a location in the Mediterranean, but the poet stresses that Calypso's island lies in the far west (cf. iv 498, v 100 ff., 278, xii 447–8), and attempts to identify it with any Mediterranean island are misguided; on ancient theories about its situation see Hainsworth on v 55.

52–4. These details are in a sense gratuitous, but they lend substance to the newly invented Calypso, and by thus linking her with a malign giant in the depths of the sea the poet effectively evokes a sense of incalculable menace. But inconsistent cosmological conceptions have been conflated, to the bewilderment of anyone who tries to visualize what Atlas actually does. In Hesiod (*Th.* 509, 517–20, 746–8) this stout-hearted (*κρατερόφρων*) son of the Titan Iapetus stands in the far west (or in the underworld), supporting the sky by Zeus' command: *Ἄτλας δ' οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχει κρατερῆς ὑπ' ἀνάγκης, | πείρασιν ἐν γαίης πρόπαρ' Ἑσπερίδων λιγυφώνων | ἑστηώς, κεφαλῇ τε καὶ ἀκαμάτῃσι χέρεσσι· | ταύτην γάρ οἱ μοῖραν ἐδάσσατο μητίετα Ζεύς*. In the *Odyssey* this picture is combined with the idea, widespread in the ancient Near East, of pillars supporting the sky (cf. Ibyc. 55 (336)). The resulting conception of Atlas as a kind of buttress is partly reflected in [A.] *Pr.* 348 ff.: (*Ἄτλας*) *πρὸς ἑσπέρους τόπους | ἕστηκε κίον' οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ χθονὸς | ὤμοιν ἐρείδων, ἄχθος οὐκ εὐάγκαλον*; there, however, Atlas has only one pillar to support,[2] and appears to be based, as in Hesiod, on land. Lesky threw light on the *Odyssey*'s location of Atlas in the sea by comparing the partly parallel situation of the giant Upelluri of Hittite/Hurrian myth ('Hethitische Texte u. griech. Mythos', *AAWW* 1950, 148–55 (= *Gesammelte Schriften* (Berne, 1966) 363–8); Upelluri, according to the *Song of*

---

[2] *κίον'* could conceivably be dual, but the sg. is surely much more natural.

Ullikummi, lives in the sea and has heaven and earth built upon him. The poet has evidently combined elements selected from various current views on the difficult questions of what holds up the sky and what supports the earth; our perplexities arise partly because we are prepared to study these lines more minutely than the poet could have envisaged anyone doing. (There would be no problem if *ἔχει* (53) could be interpreted as 'has charge of', but *αὐτός* establishes its sense to be physical (like *ἔχουσι* 54)). We do not know why Atlas is described as *ὀλοόφρων*, 'malignant, destructive, bent on mischief', an epithet restricted to dangerous animals in the *Iliad* and reserved in the *Odyssey* for a formidable trio, Atlas, Aietes (x 137), and Minos (xi 322), each of whom is introduced apropos of a female relative, daughter or sister. Aietes' dealings with the Argonauts and Minos' with Theseus are recalled by the epithet, but it is not clear why Atlas is so described; the probability that the duties imposed on him would have soured his temperament is insufficient explanation. The epithet was evidently found strange in antiquity: Cleanthes read *ὁλοόφρονος*, i.e. *περὶ τῶν ὅλων φρονοῦντος*, and the scholia record a further variant, *ὀλοόφρων*, which must likewise be a conjecture. *ὀλοόφρονος* is for us all the more impressive because of this uncertainty, but I doubt if the poet intended mystification. **ὅς τε θαλάσσης πάσης βένθεα οἶδεν:** the same phrase is used of Proteus (iv 385–6), who, however, is highly mobile. On Atlas see further *RE* ii 2119 ff. (Wernicke), M. L. West on Hes. *Th.* ll. c., *LfgrE*.

56–7. Calypso's efforts to beguile Odysseus seem to have had some initial success, to judge by v 153 *ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι ἥνδανε νύμφη*. **αἱμυλίοισι λόγοισι:** exemplified by v 206 ff. *αἱμύλιος* is not found elsewhere in Homer, but is applied to *λόγοι* by Hesiod who associates it with feminine wiles (*Th.* 890, *Op.* 78, 374, 789); its etymology is uncertain: see Frisk *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*, *LfgrE*. *λόγος* occurs in only one other place in Homer, *Il.* xv 393, where it is used of soothing speech to a wounded man. **θέλγει:** the verb's connotations are well explored by Heubeck on x 213. **ὅπως . . . ἐπιλήσεται:** the only Homeric instance of *ὅπως* with indic. in a purpose clause (at *Il.* i 136 *ἄρσαντες κατὰ θυμόν, ὅπως ἀντάξιον ἔσται, ὅπως* has rather the meaning 'how'); there are a few examples of *ὄφρα* used thus with the fut.: see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, ii 273 § 402.

58–9. Odysseus wishes to die because his longing to see Ithaca again seems hopeless; cf. v 151–8 (but the idea at vii 224–5 is rather different). Penelope too feels she would rather die than continue to live in perpetual mourning for Odysseus (xviii 202–5, xx 61 ff.). **καί:** 'were it but'.

59–62. The use of *νυ* to introduce three successive questions underlines Athena's impatience. **οὐδέ:** connective, 'yet . . . not.'

60. φίλον ἦτορ: attributive *φίλος* in Homer is hardly to be distinguished from a reflexive (direct and indirect) possessive, used predominantly of what may be regarded as inalienable property (parts of the body, relatives etc.): see further M. Landfester, *Das griechische Nomen 'philos' u. seine Ableitungen* (Spudasmata xi, Hildesheim, 1966), 3 ff. The usage is imitated by Horace, 'cuncta . . . amico quae dederis animo' (*O.* iv 7. 19–20). **'Ολύμπιε:** the vocatives here and in 62 express strong feeling and make the reproach more forceful. **τ':** probably better taken as *τε* than as *τοι*; for *οὔ νύ τ'* cf. 347; see further Ruijgh, *τε épique*, 842–3.

61. A similar consideration almost induces Zeus to spare Hector (*Il.* xxii 170–1); cf. also *Il.* iv 44 ff.

62. τί νύ οἱ τόσον ὠδύσαο Ζεῦ: the ending of Athena's speech was perhaps suggested by *ἐπεὶ μέγας ὠδύσατο Ζεύς* (*Il.* xviii 292). For the implied derivation of Odysseus' name from **ὀδύσσομαι* ('doomed to odium' Stanford) cf. xix 406 ff. (his grandfather Autolycus named him in remembrance of the hatred he had incurred (by his crimes) on the way to Ithaca), v 340, 423, xix 275, S. fr. 965 (with Pearson's n.); see further E. Risch, 'Namensdeutungen u. Worterklärungen', *Eumusia: Festgabe f. Ernst Howald* (Zurich, 1947), 72 ff. = *Kl. Schr.* (Berlin–New York, 1981), 294 ff., L. P. Rank, *Etymologiseerung en verwante verschijnselen* (Assen, 1951), 51–63, W. B. Stanford, 'The Homeric Etymology of the Name Odysseus', *CPh* xlvii (1952), 209–13. The name is clearly non-Greek, and probably non-Indo-European, and its true etymology is mysterious; though the form *'Οδυσσεύς* was canonized by epic, *'Ολυσσεύς* (cf. Lat. *Ulixes*) is widely attested and may be older: see further *RE* xvii 2, 1906 ff. (Wüst), Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*, von Kamptz, *Personennamen*, 355–60.

63–4. = v 21–2. **νεφεληγερέτα:** see Hainsworth on v 21. **ποῖόν σε ἔπος φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων:** the teeth are regarded as a barrier which should have prevented the words from escaping. Constructions like this, with a double acc., 'of the whole and part', are very common in Homer: see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, ii 42 § 51, Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 134–5 § 141. See also Hainsworth on v 22.

65. Zeus indignantly rejects the imputation of personal hostility. **ἔπειτ':** 'after all this', i.e. 'in these circumstances (of which you speak)'. **θείοιο:** 'godlike'; see further Hainsworth on v 11.

66. The first *περί* is to be taken with *ἐστί*, governing *βροτῶν*, 'he surpasses all men in wisdom'; the second is adverbial, equivalent to *περισσῶς*, 'beyond all other men'.

68–75. If we compare Odysseus' own account of his dealings with Polyphemus (ix 105–566) we may be surprised by Zeus' dispassionate tone: the Cyclops blatantly defies Zeus (ix 275 ff.) and Odysseus sees himself as the agent of divine vengeance (ix 477–9). Poseidon (like Helios: see 7–9 n.) takes no account of mitigating circumstances, nor does Zeus think them worth mentioning here.

68. γαιήοχος: in Homer this title is Poseidon's alone. Its origin and meaning are controversial, mainly because of uncertainty about *-οχος*. The poet and his audience, like the tragedians (cf. A. *Supp.* 816, S. *OT*, 160), probably connected it with *ἔχω* and understood the compound as 'earth-holding, the Earth Sustainer', but Laconian *Γαιάϝοχος* (*IG* v 1. 213, 9, etc.) rules out this etymology. The usual assumption that the second element is related to *ὀχέω*, Lat. *veho* etc., leaves the interpretation of the compound debatable: 'he who rides (as a river) beneath the earth (and thereby shakes it)' Nilsson, 'husband of Gaia' Borgeaud. Meillet's suggestion that the root is **wegh-* 'shake', cf. Lat. *vexare*, is attractive. Cf. Hainsworth on viii 322 and see further Frisk *GEW* s.v. *γαιάοχος*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*, s.v. *γῆ*, *LfgrE*.

69. The poet's failure to mention that Polyphemus had only one eye should be noted (contrast Hes. *Th.* 142 ff.); it is not satisfactorily explained by the assumption that everyone took it for granted that Cyclopes were one-eyed. Here, in this rather summary account, the omission of any explicit reference to Polyphemus' abnormality is understandable; but it is not made good in ix, where it would be natural to alert the audience to this essential precondition for Odysseus' stratagem. On this and some related problems see R. Mondi, *TAPhA* cxiii (1983), 17 ff.

70. ἀντίθεον: a somewhat surprising epithet; though it well serves Zeus' attempt to justify Poseidon's anger, it is probably best explained as imitation of *Il.* i 264, where it is applied to a different Polyphemus; it should not be taken as referring to Polyphemus' divine parentage (see *LfgrE*). **ὅου κράτος ἐστὶ μέγιστον:** a similar formula applied to Zeus (v 4, *Il.* ii 118, ix 25) refers to supreme authority, but we can hardly envisage Polyphemus as a recognized leader ruling over a community of Cyclopes, and the phrase surely means simply that Polyphemus is the strongest among them (cf. *Il.* xiii 484); see further G. Bona, *Studi sull'Odissea* (Turin, 1966), 72 ff. The variant ἔσκε looks like a conjecture intended to meet the objection that Polyphemus would have had difficulty in maintaining his position after being blinded by Odysseus. **ὅου:** this form is also found at *Il.* ii 325 (*ὅου κλέος*). A single MS gives *ὅο*, probably by accident, though this must have been the original form of the gen. in such phrases. In several places in Homer metre indicates an original gen. in *-οο* even though this has virtually vanished from the MS-tradition and may indeed never have stood in any written text: see further Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 45 § 18, 82 § 34, Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 83 § 98.

71–3. Polyphemus' mother Thoosa seems to be an *ad hoc* invention, her name recalling the swift movement of the waves; cf. the Phaeacian Thoon (viii 113). For Phorcys cf. xiii 96, 345, and see iv 349 n. Polyphemus' parentage was already a source of perplexity in Aristotle's time (fr. 172 Rose); since neither his father nor his mother is a Cyclops, in what sense can he be said to be one? Nothing is said about the lineage of the other Odyssean Cyclopes, and it is left unclear whether they too are regarded as sons of Poseidon (cf. esp. ix 412). The Hesiodic Cyclopes, who forge Zeus' thunderbolts, are children of Uranus and Gaia (*Th.* 139 ff., 501 ff.). **ἀτρυγέτοιο:** in Homer applied only to the sea, except at *Il.* xvii 425, where it qualifies *αἰθήρ*. Etymology and meaning are quite uncertain, though the initial *ἀ-* is generally taken as privative. The scholia offer the (philologically impossible) explanation 'sterile, infertile, unharvested', from *τρύγη*; Herodian connects it with *τρύω* and interprets it as 'unwearied, indefatigable'—apt enough for the incessantly moving sea, but not for *αἰθήρ*; a derivation from *τρύξ*, 'lees of wine, dregs', has also been suggested, giving the sense 'pure'. See further *LfgrE*.

73. σπέσσι: see above, 15 n.

74. ἐκ τοῦ δή: probably temporal, 'from that time forward', rather than 'for that reason'.

75. οὔ τι κατακτείνει: this may be taken either as a conative present, or as parenthetic, 'though he does not kill him'.

76. ἡμεῖς οἵδε: 'we who are here'. The agreement of the other gods, in the absence of Poseidon, is assumed without discussion.

81–95. Athena outlines her programme, thus providing us with some guidance as to the course which this complicated narrative is to follow. Her first proposal (84 ff.) is almost predictable, but nothing has prepared us for her second suggestion (88 ff.). The first part of her plan is postponed until the second has been carried out; the poet proceeds to what is foremost in his mind, and Hermes is not dispatched until v 28 ff. This inverted order is quite common in Homer when a twofold instruction or proposal is related: see further S. E. Bassett, '*Ὕστερον πρότερον Ὁμηρικῶς*', *HSPh* xxxi (1920), 39 ff. In this instance there is an unusually long stretch of narrative before the poet returns to the first item on the agenda, and Athena is therefore made to reopen the question of Odysseus' return at the beginning of v; this quasi-recapitulation is better suited to the needs of a listening audience than to those of a reflective reader, who may be puzzled by Athena's apparent failure to take account of what has already been decided; see further Hainsworth, introduction to v.

83. ὅνδε δόμονδε: Hoekstra on xiv 424 considers the implications of the fact that the ending *-δε* is found with possessive *ὅς* only in this formula.

84. As a genealogical curiosity we may note that Hermes is Calypso's nephew (his mother Maia being like Calypso a daughter of Atlas, though not by the same mother), but the relationship is quite irrelevant here, as is the tradition that he was the father of Odysseus' maternal grandfather, Autolycus (schol. xix 432). **διάκτορον:** another of Hermes' peculiar titles, in the *Iliad* invariably, in the *Odyssey* usually, combined with *ἀργειφόντης* (on which see 38 n.). Etymology and meaning are mysterious; of the various suggestions offered by ancient scholars the only one worth taking seriously is the derivation from *διάγω*, with the apparent meaning 'conductor, guide' (of travellers in general and of souls on their way to Hades, as at xxiv 1 ff.), though *διάκτορος* is not a normally formed agent noun from *διάγω*. R. Janko (*Glotta* lvi (1978), 192–5) argues for derivation from the rare *διάκτωρ* known from Bianor (*AP* x 101. 3 = *Garland* Gow–Page 1751), *βούταν διάκτορα* (*διώκτορα* cj. Buttmann), and Hesychius' gloss *διάκτορσι· ἡγεμόσι, βασιλεῦσι*; for earlier theories see Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*, *LfgrE*.

85. Ὠγυγίην: cf. vi 172, vii 244, 254, xii 448, xxiii 333. It is not clear whether this is to be regarded as the name of Calypso's island or as an epithet, as it is in Hesiod, who uses it to describe the water of Styx (*Th.* 806), and in later poets. Its derivation and meaning are quite uncertain, but ancient scholars interpreted it as 'very old, primeval'. See further Hainsworth on vi 172, Roscher, *Lexikon*, iii 690–4, Wilamowitz, *Untersuchungen*, 16–17, Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*. Antimachus (see introduction pp. 40–1) read *Ὠγυλίην*, evidently identifying Calypso's island with Ogylus, which is located by Stephanus of Byzantium between the Peloponnese and Crete and is probably Anticythera. **ὀτρύνομεν:** short vowel aor. subj.

86. ἐϋπλοκάμῳ: see Hainsworth on v 58. **νημερτέα:** 'sure', i.e. that will not fail to be put into force.

87. νόστον: in apposition to *βουλήν*.

88. Ἰθάκην ἐσελεύσομαι: *Ἰθάκηνδε ἐλεύσομαι* is probably to be preferred here, the other variants being best explained as conjectures intended to eliminate the hiatus, though this is not uncommon at the main caesura; for similar variants cf. xvii 52, *Il.* vi 365.

89. μᾶλλον ἐποτρύνω: Athena will reinforce a mood already present in Telemachus (cf. 115–17).

90. καλέσαντα: with *οἱ* in 89. **κάρη κομόωντας Ἀχαιούς: Ἀχαιοί** is often used when in fact only the people of Ithaca are meant: cf. ii 7, 265, 306; similarly *Κεφαλλῆνες*: see Heubeck on xxiv 355. The poet was clearly hampered by the metrical intractability of *Ἰθακήσιοι* (and apparently unfamiliar with the alternative form of the ethnic, *Ἴθακος*). Homeric gods (cf. *Il.* i 529, xx 39, *h.Ap.* 134) and heroes alike wear their hair long; though nothing is said about non-aristocratic hairstyles, there would be little point in this formula if long hair was supposed to be normal for everyone. It remained the fashion for the wealthy until well into the fifth century; the palaestra finally led to the prevalence of a shorter style. See further Marinatos, *Archaeologia* B, 1 ff., *RE* vii 2110 ff. (Bremer).

91. μνηστήρεσσιν: the suitors are introduced as if they were a familiar part of the story. **ἀπειπέμεν:** 'speak out, give notice'.

92. ἀδινά: 'thick-thronging'. **εἰλίποδας:** in Homer this epithet is restricted to cattle (while sheep are *ταναύποδα* (ix 464) and horses *ἀερσίποδες* (*Il.* iii 327, xviii 532, xxiii 475)). In antiquity the first element was connected with *εἴλω, ἑλίσσω*; the failure to observe an initial *ϝ* is against this explanation, but may only mean that the word is a late formation; the word would then mean 'rolling their feet as they walk, shambling'. See further Hainsworth on viii 60, Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*, *LfgrE*. **ἕλικας:** an epithet likewise restricted to cattle in Homer and very often combined with *εἰλίποδας*, of uncertain meaning. In antiquity it was generally explained as referring to twisted horns (cf. *h.Merc.* 192–3 *βοῦς . . . κεράεσσιν ἑλικτάς*), or else to their shambling gait; in either case it must be regarded as an abbreviated cpd. (**ἑλικόκραιρα, *ἑλικόπους*); a third explanation, 'black', is surely merely a scholiast's guess. See further Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*, *LfgrE*.

93. The inadequate motivation of Telemachus' journey, involving as it does considerable risk without obvious advantage, was criticized in antiquity, as we learn from the scholia here and on 284; the question is discussed above, p. 53. **Σπάρτην:** Zenodotus read *Κρήτην*, and at 285, correspondingly, *δ' ἐς Κρήτην τε* [*δὲ Κρήτηνδε* cj. Buttmann] *παρ' Ἰδομενῆα ἄνακτα* for *δὲ Σπάρτηνδε παρὰ ξανθὸν Μενέλαον*; these are the strangest and perhaps the most significant of Zenodotean variants, and raise important questions about his methods: see further introduction pp. 43–4. Some MSS give two extra lines after 93, *κεῖθεν δ' ἐς Κρήτην τε παρ' Ἰδομενῆα ἄνακτα· | ὃς γὰρ δεύτατος ἦλθεν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων* (cf. 285–6), a rather clumsy attempt to combine both versions. **Πύλον:** on the location of Nestor's Pylos see below iii 4 n. **ἠμαθόεντα:** a standing epithet of Pylos, applied to no other place in Homer, and evidently created by analogy with *ἠνεμόεις*; *ἀμαθόεις* does not occur, but cf. the Cypriot town *Ἀμαθοῦς*. *ἠμαθόεις* and *ἠνεμόεις* have similar functions, both being used to describe places and appearing in the same position in the line; see further Wyatt, *Lengthening*, 106. Epithets formed with the suffix *-ϝεντ-* are commonly treated as having two terminations: see K. Witte, *Glotta* iii (1912), 109–10.

95. Telemachus will be praised for his exertions.

96–143. Athena in the guise of the Taphian Mentes is welcomed by Telemachus.

96–101. 96: cf. v 44, xvii 2, *Il.* xxiv 340; 97–8 = v 45–6, *Il.* xxiv 341–2; 99 = *Il.* x 135, xiv 12, xv 482; 100–1 = *Il.* v 746–7, viii 390–1. The characteristic preparations for departure (cf. xv 550–1, xvii 2–4) have been elaborated to suit a god; however, doubts were cast on this elaboration in antiquity. Aristarchus and earlier, unnamed, critics questioned the authenticity of 97–8, as being more appropriate to Hermes; the lines' absence from the Massaliot edition probably reflects similar critical doubts rather than genuine tradition. Aristarchus also athetized 99–101 as borrowed from the *Iliad*. To many modern scholars such objections seem simply to betray a failure to appreciate the techniques of oral composers, who habitually elaborate their work with passages originally devised for other contexts. Yet if we allow that the poet of the *Odyssey* appears to expect us to recognize verbal allusions to the *Iliad*, we should not immediately dismiss this ancient expression of disquiet, engendered by a sense of inappropriate pastiche combined with some knowledge of the practices of scribes (and, no doubt, rhapsodes) who, as our papyri show, were given to expanding the text with lines borrowed from other parts of Homer.

97. ἀμβρόσια χρύσεια: there is a clear semantic connection between the two adjectives; gold, being imperishable, is symbolic of immortality, and the gods' possessions are characteristically of gold or silver, however inconvenient or impractical this might seem. **ὑγρήν:** this substantival use of the fem. adjective to mean 'the sea' is already established in the *Iliad* (x 27, xiv 308, xxiv 341); Hesiod uses *γλαυκή* similarly (*Th.* 440).

101. κοτέσσεται: short vowel aor. subj.

102. = xxiv 488, *Il.* ii 167, iv 74, vii 19, xxii 187, xxiv 121. Here Olympus is clearly a mountain (very probably the original meaning of this evidently pre-Greek word), but this earlier conception (cf. Nilsson, *Geschichte*, i 353) is losing ground in the *Odyssey* to the tendency, already observable in the *Iliad* (viii 18 ff.), to equate it with *οὐρανός*. See further Hainsworth on vi

42–7. **Οὐλύμποιο:** as often the metrical lengthening reflects convenience rather than necessity: see further Wyatt, *Lengthening*, 90.

103–4. Athena's arrival is dealt with rather abruptly; we might have expected some description of Odysseus' palace, but the poet evidently wished to introduce the suitors without delay. **'Ιθάκης ἐνὶ δήμῳ:** as often in epic *δῆμος* is used in a predominantly local sense, of the land belonging to a community. **ἐπὶ προθύροις . . . οὐδοῦ ἐπ' αὐλείου:** 'in the outer porch at the entrance to the court'; the only entrance to the house lies through the courtyard. Various more or less plausible reconstructions of Odysseus' home have been proposed, but we cannot hope to establish in detail what the poet had in mind (if indeed he himself had a clear overall conception). He certainly ascribed to the heroic age a more imposing style of building than was feasible in Greek lands in his own day, but the elements in his picture which seem to reflect the realities of Late Helladic palaces, as revealed by excavation at Mycenae, Pylos, and Tiryns, do not justify the inference that he was accurately enough informed about Mycenaean architecture to allow us to supply the deficiencies of his account by reference to the archaeological evidence (or vice versa). The observable ruins of Mycenaean palaces and the traditional stock of formulae and narrative motifs could often have perpetuated the memory of features which had no counterpart in the architecture of the Geometric age, but some distortion would have been inevitable. Contact with the Near East may also have contributed some details (particularly to the splendours of Menelaus' and Alcinous' palaces). See further Hainsworth on vi 303, 304, H. Plommer, 'Shadowy megara', *JHS* xcvii (1977), 75 ff., H. Drerup, *Archaeologia* O. **παλάμῃ . . . ἔγχος:** it is normal for a traveller to carry arms, even when he is going only a short distance (cf. ii 10, Th. i 6. 1), and to lay down his weapons when he is received as a guest (121, cf. xv 282, xvi 40).

105. ξείνῳ: here best translated 'stranger, foreigner'; contrast 176, where it is 'guest, guest-friend'. **Ταφίων ἡγήτορι Μέντῃ:** cf. *Il.* xvii 73 *Κικόνων ἡγήτορι Μέντῃ* (where Mentes merely provides an alias for Apollo). The Taphians are mentioned elsewhere in the *Odyssey*, generally in rather an unfavourable light, as slave-traders and raiders (xiv 452, xv 427, xvi 426, cf. [Hes.] *Sc.* 19 (where they are coupled with the Teleboai)). Mentes' speeches indicate commercial interests and a certain lack of scruple (181 ff., 260 ff.); his reference to the Trojan War as if it were no concern of his (210 ff.) seems to imply that the Taphians are not Greeks. The ancients located Mentes' kingdom on Meganisi, a small island about nine miles from Ithaca, lying immediately east of Leucas, from which it is separated by a strait only half a mile wide; in Strabo's time it was called Taphious (Str. 456). Whether the poet had any definite locality in mind is obviously debatable, but since Mentes is supposed to be quite unknown to Telemachus and the suitors, the poet must have imagined his kingdom to lie some distance away. See further N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (Oxford, 1967), 378–9.

Wilamowitz was probably right in arguing (*Untersuchungen*, 6–7) that Mentes is modelled on Mentor, the elderly Ithacan in whose guise Athena subsequently appears to Telemachus (ii 268 ff. etc.). The resemblance of their names, probably to be understood as 'adviser' (from **men-* 'think', as in *μέμονα*) can hardly be coincidence, and was presumably intended to underline the similarity of their roles (cf. Eurycleia/Eurynome/Eurymedusa, Melanthius/Melantho). But while it may be that Mentor-Athena had a more deep-rooted connection with the story of Odysseus' return (cf. xxii 205 ff., xxiv 502 ff.), Mentes is not to be dismissed as a colourless, insufficiently motivated *Doppelgänger* of Telemachus' other adviser. Mentes' part could be played only by a stranger with a fresh view of the situation. Athena's purpose is to goad Telemachus into action, and one of the chief obstacles to be overcome is the general Ithacan acquiescence in the suitors' outrageous conduct. The shocked reaction of a stranger is far more effective than any words which could be put in the mouth of Mentor who, however reluctantly, has accepted the situation hitherto. Telemachus' exposition of the problem throws light on his own character, and provides a natural vehicle for background information which needs to be conveyed to the audience. In this episode we may also see a foreshadowing of the later part of the poem, when Odysseus himself appears as a stranger in his own home.

In the *Iliad* the gods quite often appear on earth in the guise of mortals, to urge individual heroes to action and to give an unexpected turn to the development of events. But the alias is not normally maintained for a long conversation; Hermes' dealings with Priam (*Il.* xxiv 346 ff.) offer the closest parallel for Athena's procedure here.

106. δ' ἄρα: the particles mark a new and interesting stage in the story. **ἔπειτα:** apparently otiose; contrast the same formula at 144. We must take it as indicating the next thing which Athena observed, not the next thing to happen.

107. πεσσοῖσι: pebbles used for playing a board-game, counters; the commonly favoured translation 'draughts' is misleading. Such pastimes have no place in the *Iliad*. Sophocles (frr. 429, 479) is the earliest authority for the tradition which associated the invention of board-games with Palamedes; representations of Achilles and Ajax thus occupied were popular with black-figure vase-painters, and presumably reflect an episode in one of the Cyclic epics. In fact the Greeks probably owed their board-games to the Near East (cf. Pl. *Phdr.* 274 d); see further *RE* xiii 1900 (Lamer), H. J. R. Murray, *A History of Board-games other than Chess* (Oxford, 1952), 24 ff.

108. οὓς ἔκτανον αὐτοί: the brief phrase well conveys the wickedness of the suitors, who waste another's substance; like Odysseus' comrades (7–9), they have killed cattle to which they have no right.

109–12. The meal being prepared here is not consumed until 149 ff.; further preliminaries are described at 136 ff. *κήρυκες* and *θεράποντες* are free-born subordinates; since the same man may be both *κῆρυξ* and *θεράπων* (cf. xviii 424, *Il.* i 321), we should not follow the scholia in interpreting *οἱ μέν* (110) and *οἱ δέ* (111) in terms of a demarcation of duties between two distinct groups. Even in the *Iliad* we occasionally find a *κῆρυξ* employed in the preparations for feasting (*Il.* ix 174, xviii 558), a natural enough extension of the herald's duties in connection with sacrifices (e.g. *Il.* iii 245 ff., 268 ff.); this is very much commoner in the *Odyssey*. The conception of the herald as an official envoy or representative (e.g. xix 135, *Il.* i 334, vii 274 ff.) merges rather uncomfortably with his role as a kind of personal assistant, and we may wonder how far the Homeric picture corresponds to reality at any period. For a survey of the miscellaneous duties of the Homeric *κῆρυξ* see Ebeling, *Lexicon*. *θεράπων* is a more general term, 'assistant, attendant, follower, companion'; it denotes a non-kinsman of noble, but dependent, status (Patroclus was Achilles' *θεράπων* (*Il.* xviii 152)). *θεράποντες* must be prepared to turn their hands to many tasks which might also be done by slaves, according to the needs of the moment. See further G. Ramming, *Die Dienerschaft in der Odyssee* (Erlangen, 1973), 23 ff., 91 ff., 133 ff., P. A. L. Greenhalgh, 'The Homeric *Therapon* and *Opaon* and their Historical Implications', *BICS* xxix (1982), 81 ff.

110. ἄρ' οἶνον: it is tempting to follow Bentley in deleting *ἄρ'*, and thus allow its proper force to the original initial *ϝ* of *οἶνος*: see above, 3 n. Particles have often been wrongly inserted to remedy what were regarded as metrical defects.

111–12. τραπέζας . . . πρότιθεν: individual tables were regularly used at Greek banquets; they did not form part of the room's permanent furnishing, but were brought in for the guests and cleared away at the end of the meal. The common Odyssean formula *παρὰ δὲ ξεστὴν ἐτάνυσσε τράπεζαν* (i 138 etc.) seems to imply some kind of folding table, a type known from Hittite monuments, though no Greek example has been found; see further S. Laser, *Archaeologia* P, 56 ff., G. M. A. Richter, *The Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans* (London, 1966), 63 ff. **πρότιθεν, τοὶ δέ:** this was the reading of Aristarchus; the alternative word-division, *προτίθεντο ἰδέ*, found in all our medieval MSS, surely represents an attempt to eliminate the unique *πρότιθεν* (impf., = *προὐτίθεσαν*), comparable with *μέθιεν* (xxi 377) and *ξύνιεν* (*Il.* i 273): see Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 5 § 5.

113 ff. There is a typical schema in Homer for scenes describing the reception of a visitor, whether friend or stranger; details may vary according to circumstances, but there emerges very clearly a general picture of what is regarded as the proper conventional treatment to be accorded to a *ξεῖνος*. A particularly good example is Nestor's description of the welcome accorded to him and Odysseus when they came to the palace of Peleus (*Il.* xi 765 ff.); it corresponds closely to what we find here. (1) The new arrival waits at the entrance until (2) one of the company notices him, (3) gets up from his seat and hastens to the doorway, (4) takes the visitor by the hand, (5) leads him in, (6) offers him a seat, (7) fetches food and invites him to eat; (8) after a meal come questions. There are many examples of such scenes in the *Odyssey*: well worth comparing are the descriptions of Telemachus' reception at Pylos (iii 5 ff.) and at Sparta (iv 20 ff.), and of Odysseus' welcome by Eumaeus (xiv 29 ff.). The emphasis or variation of particular details within the conventional framework serves to convey an impression of the household to which the visitor has come; here we should notice the way in which the poet underlines Telemachus' conscientiousness and his isolation among the crowd of potentially hostile suitors. See further W. Arend, *Scenen*, 34 ff., M. W. Edwards, 'Type-scenes and Homeric hospitality', *TAPhA* cv (1975), 61–7.

Telemachus' welcome marks the start of the first of the *Odyssey*'s many scenes of hospitality, the sphere in which the virtues of the heroic world most distinctively manifest themselves in peacetime (a rare condition). Generosity in feasting kinsmen and friends is natural enough, but hospitality towards strangers involves an element of risk and may be deemed a fair index of morality in general. The ambivalence of *xeinos*, both 'stranger' and 'guest, host, guest-friend', indicates the tensions inherent in such relationships; as Menelaus learnt to his cost, a host might occasionally have grounds to regret admitting even an apparently respectable stranger to his home, even though abuse of hospitality exposed the offender to the wrath of Zeus Xenios. But under normal circumstances such entertainment established a tie of guest-friendship which could be regarded as hereditary (cf. 175 ff.), its implications well illustrated by the behaviour of Glaucus and Diomedes, who consider themselves bound to refrain from fighting one another because their grandfathers had exchanged hospitality, and give each other valuable gifts instead (*Il.* vi 119 ff.). A well-established etiquette guides the dealings of host and guest until the latter has been set on his way to his next destination; its most noteworthy features, from the modern reader's point of view, are the practice of allowing the new arrival to remain incognito until he has eaten (potentially rather hazardous) and the custom of presenting him with a keepsake on departure. Though the material lavishness of Homeric hospitality can hardly correspond to historical reality, the poet's own world is surely reflected in the high value attached to the proper entertainment of strangers and in the system of manners deemed appropriate to such encounters; the experiences of modern travellers have repeatedly demonstrated the prevalence of similar customs in places where the provision of temporary accommodation has not been put on a business footing. See further Finley, *World*, 99 ff., Thornton, *People*, 38 ff., H. J. Kakridis, *La Notion de l'amitié et de l'hospitalité chez Homère* (Salonika, 1963), 86 ff.

113. Telemachus is named here for the first time in the *Odyssey*, but he is twice mentioned by name in the *Iliad* (ii 260, iv 354), and the detail should have been familiar to the poet's first audience. His name reflects his father's characteristic method of fighting; for Odysseus' skill at archery cf. viii 215 ff. (with Hainsworth's n.), xxi 393 ff., xxii 1 ff. The children of many Homeric heroes bear names which recall some aspect of their fathers' lives—Eurysaces (Ajax), Astyanax (Hector), Megapenthes (Menelaus), Iphianassa, Chrysothemis, and Laodice (Agamemnon), Pisistratus

(Nestor); the story of how Odysseus was named by his grandfather involves the same principle (xix 407–9; see above, 62 n.). See further von Kamptz, *Personennamen*, 31–2.

115–17. Telemachus' abstraction sets him apart from the suitors, intent on their diversions; he is already in a receptive frame of mind for Athena's plan, but the idea of taking the initiative against his unwanted guests has not occurred to him.

116. Cf. xx 225; *ἔκλησιν θέωμεν* xxiv 485. **μνηστήρων τῶν μέν**: for the article with *μέν* following the noun cf. *Il.* vii 461; the expression is strange, but probably results from the adaptation of a formulaic pattern, cf. 151 *μνηστῆρες, τοῖσιν μέν*

119–20. νεμεσσήθη . . . ἐφεστάμεν: the detail suggests Telemachus' hospitable instincts. We note that the poet does not envisage either a porter or any means for a visitor to announce his arrival.

121. See 104 n.

122. A common, but slightly puzzling, formula, used to introduce 125 speeches of very different content and length, when the character who is to speak has been the subject of the last verses. The metaphor of *πτερόεντα* more probably derives from archery than from ornithology; the feathers of an arrow help it to fly straight (for *πτερόεις*, 'well-feathered', applied to arrows cf. *Il.* iv 117, v 171), and the image of utterance as an arrow is common in Greek (e.g. A. *Supp.* 446, *Eu.* 676, Pi. *O.* ix 11–12, E. *Supp.* 456, fr. 499 N., Pl. *Smp.* 219 b, Luc. *Nigr.* 36). Some have held that *ἔπεα πτερόεντα* are apt, well chosen words, flying straight to the listener's comprehension, but in view of the variety of utterance so described the epithet is probably better understood as expressing an essential characteristic of the thing to which it is applied (cf. *λαμπρὸν φάος, νὺξ ἐρεβεννή*); the poet who coined the phrase was attempting to answer the question how words pass from speaker to listener, and any word, once uttered, is *πτερόεν*. See further Hainsworth on viii 346, Hoekstra on xiii 165. Russo on xvii 57, M. Parry, 'About Winged Words', *CPh* xxxii (1937), 59 ff. (= *Homeric Verse*, 414 ff.), M. Durante, '"Epea pteroenta": La parola come "cammino" in immagini greche e vediche', *RAL* xiii (1958), 3–14 (= R. Schmitt (ed.), *Indogermanische Dichtersprache* (Wege der Forschung, clxv, Darmstadt, 1968), 242–60), J. Latacz, '*ἄπτερος μῦθος—ἄπτερος φάτις*: ungeflügelte Worte?', *Glotta* xlvi (1968), 27 ff. **φωνήσας**: intrans., both *μιν* and *ἔπεα* being governed by *προσηύδα*.

123–4. Χαῖρε: cf. iv 60; 'welcome', 'greetings', do less than justice to the meaning; in such contexts the imperat. expresses a wish for the other's general physical and mental well-being. See further J. Latacz, *Zum Wortfeld 'Freude' in der Sprache Homers* (Heidelberg, 1966), 50. **φιλήσεαι**: the emphasis is on the outward expression of *φιλία*, 'you will be treated kindly'. **αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα κτλ**: similarly Nestor (iii 69–70), Menelaus (iv 60–2), and Eumaeus (xiv 45–7) postpone questions until their guests have eaten. Breaches of this convention may however be observed: Calypso asks Hermes to state his business before she feeds him (v 85 ff.), but does not get an answer until he has finished (95 ff.), and Alcinous is snubbed by Odysseus for questioning him before he has satisfied his hunger (vii 215 ff.). **ὅττεό σε χρή**: this construction of *χρή* (originally a noun) with acc. of the person and gen. of the thing needed is peculiar to the Epic dialect; see further Chantraine, *Grammaire*, ii 40 § 49 (F).

125. Παλλάς: see Hainsworth on vi 328.

128. δουροδόκης: the word occurs nowhere else, nor any later synonym. The ancients supposed that the spear-shafts rested in the flutings of the columns; alternatively, we might envisage a rack or a large jar (like an umbrella-stand) set against the pillar. The detail is added, it seems, for the sake of the reference to the absent master of the house. **ἄλλα**: 'as well, besides'.

130. θρόνον: the grandest type of Greek chair, generally provided with a straight back and armrests: cf. Ath. 192 ef (evidently quoting from earlier sources): *ὁ γὰρ θρόνος αὐτὸ μόνον ἐλευθέριός ἐστιν καθέδρα . . . ὁ δὲ κλισμὸς περιττοτέρως κεκόσμηται ἀνακλίσει. τούτων δ' εὐτελέστερος ἦν ὁ δίφρος.* This type of chair is regularly offered to guests as a mark of honour: cf. iv 51, v 86, 195, vii 162–3, *Il.* xviii 389, xxiv 522, 553. Telemachus himself sits on a *κλισμός* (132), described by ancient scholars as a light easy chair with a sloping back. But the distinction between the two is not always kept clear and the two terms are sometimes used as if they were synonyms: cf. *Il.* xi 623, 645, xxiv 515, 597. See further G. M. A. Richter, *Furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans* (London, 1966), 13 ff., S. Laser, *Archaeologia* P, 38 ff. **λῖτα**: 'fine cloth' (not necessarily linen, *pace* LSJ); it is uncertain whether this form should be regarded as acc. sg. masc. or n. pl.; cf. *Il.* xviii 352, xxiii 254 *ἑανῷ λιτί:* see further Heubeck on x 353, Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire* s.v. *λίς*.

131. θρῆνυς: it is undoubtedly comfortable to have a rest for the feet when sitting in a high chair; in addition, and perhaps more important, a footstool would keep the feet clear of the general mess, including puddles of wine from libations, inevitable during a Homeric banquet.

132–3. ποικίλον: the epithet suggests wood of contrasting colours, or a contrast of materials, e.g. wood and ivory. **ἔκτοθεν ἄλλων | μνηστήρων**: 'apart from the others, the suitors'; *ἄλλος*, as often, is followed by an epexegetic noun. Telemachus is constantly aware of the problem presented by the suitors.

134. ἁδήσειεν: the MSS are divided between this form and *ἀηδήσειεν*; the meaning is not affected. If *ἁδήσειεν* is sound, it must come from the same verb as the rather puzzling pf. ptcp. *ἁδηκότες* (xii 281 (see Heubeck's n.), *Il.* x 98, 312, 399, 471) and is presumably to be explained by reference to *ἅδην* as 'become sated, disgusted with'. *ἀηδήσειεν* seems more natural, though *ἀηδέω*, the denominative of *ἀηδής*, is not otherwise attested until Hesychius. Confusion probably arose when the contracted Ionic form *ἀδέω* replaced *ἀηδέω*. See further *LfgrE* s.v. *ἀηδέω*, Wackernagel, *Kl. Schr.*, i 613–4. **ὑπερφιάλοισι**: an epithet frequently applied to the suitors, even by their leader, Antinous (xxi 289); it implies violence and insolence. Its derivation is uncertain; it is generally connected with *ὑπερφυής*, but this is not wholly convincing, and the ancient derivation from *ὑπὲρ φιάλην*, 'running over the cup', has found some recent supporters: see further Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*.

135. ἀποιχομένοιο ἔροιτο: a very unattractive hiatus; Bentley's conjecture *ἀποιχομένοι' ἐρέοιτο* eliminates this, and avoids neglect of *ϝ* in *ἔρ(ϝ)οιτο*: but cf. 405, iii 77.

136 ff. Descriptions of meals are common in the *Odyssey*; the emphasis lies on the details of preparation, and hospitality rather than gastronomy is the keynote; the food itself is not regarded as interesting. Conversation among the company after the meal provides a natural context for many of the stories told in the *Odyssey*, above all Odysseus' account of his adventures (ix–xii); it foreshadows the later popularity of the symposium as a literary genre. See further Arend, *Scenen*, 68 ff., and on practical details G. Bruns, *Archaeologia* Q, 45 ff.

136–40. = iv 52–6, vii 172–6, xv 135–9 (and x 368–72, but the passage must be a late interpolation, being absent from a papyrus and many medieval MSS). This stereotyped description of a meal is normally an element in the welcome extended to a guest; exceptionally, in a different context at xv 135 ff. Here it merges into the description of the feast which was being prepared when Athena-Mentes arrived (109–12).

136. The heroes of the *Iliad* do not wash their hands before meals, but the custom is general in the *Odyssey*, and observed even if the diner has just emerged from the bath (iv 48 ff., xvii 86 ff.); this suggests that it has, at least in part, a religious significance: see further R. Ginouvès, *Balaneutikê* (Paris, 1962), 151–2.

138. παρὰ . . . τράπεζαν: see above, 111 n.

139–40. The scholia on iv 55–6 note that Aristarchus regarded these lines as suspect: *εἰκότως δὲ νῦν τὰ περὶ τῆς ταμίας παράκειται· οὐ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ξενίζεσθαι παρὰ Τηλεμάχῳ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν· ἐπεισεληλύθασι γὰρ οὗτοι* [Telemachus and Pisistratus] *τοῖς περὶ τὸν Μενέλαον, ἐξ ἀρχῆς δὲ παρὰ τῷ Τηλεμάχῳ πάρεστιν ὁ Μέντης*. Ath. (193 b) also criticizes the passage: *εἰ γὰρ εἴδατα παρέθηκεν ἡ ταμίη, δῆλον ὡς κρεάτων λείψανα τυγχάνοντα, τὸν δαιτρὸν οὐκ ἔδει παρεισφέρειν*. 139 is inoffensive, though it duplicates 147, but 140 is pointless, if not positively misleading: it is appropriate where a meal is produced at short notice, but Mentes has arrived just as the feast was about to be served, and it would be absurd to feed the visitor on a combination of left-overs and freshly roasted meat. The couplet has surely been inserted to increase the resemblance to similar passages elsewhere; in the same way 141–2 have been added after iv 56, where they are equally unsuitable (see n.).

141. κρειῶν: this form has perhaps replaced an earlier *κρεάων*; but see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 109–10 § 89. **πίνακας:** 'plates' (of wood or metal), not, as has been suggested, 'slices of meat'.

143. αὐτοῖσιν: Telemachus and Mentes.

144–324. While the suitors are intent on feasting and song, Telemachus and Athena-Mentes talk. The latter identifies himself, gets Telemachus to explain the situation, and advises measures for dealing with the suitors. He then departs; his sudden disappearance leads Telemachus to suspect that his visitor was divine.

144. Cf. xx 160. The suitors enter while Mentes and Telemachus are being served.

145. κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε: on this common Odyssean formula see Hoekstra on xv 134; on the difference between *θρόνος* and *κλισμός* see 130 n. *ἑξείης* perhaps implies some order of precedence, so that those of higher rank occupy the *θρόνοι*.

147. Cf. xvi 51 *σῖτον δ' ἐσσυμένως παρενήνεεν* [*-ον*] *ἐν κανέοισιν*, the only other place where the cpd. *παρανηνέω* occurs; cf. *ἐπενήνεον* (*Il.* vii 428); at *Il.* xxiii 139 *νήνεον* is a weakly attested variant for *νήεον*. *-νήνεον* is hard to explain, and has often been altered to *-νήεον*, *νηέω* being the Homeric form of *νέω*; but the unanimity of the MSS suggests that if *-νήνεον* is a mistake, it is an early one, and may go back to the poet. See further Hoekstra on xvi 51, Frisk, *GEW* s.v. *-νέω*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire* s.v. *νηέω*. **δμῳαί:** women slaves; see further 398 n. **κανέοισι:** normally translated 'baskets', but 'bowls' might be better, as they are sometimes said to be of metal (x 355, *Il.* xi 630).

148. = iii 339, xxi 271, *Il.* i 470, ix 175. A first-century papyrus (P. 106 = Pack² 1024) and a few medieval MSS omit the line; its position varies, some MSS putting it after 146, a few after 149. The external evidence thus strongly suggests post-Aristarchean interpolation. Moreover, the mixing of the wine was described earlier (110), and since Telemachus and his guest have already been served (143), this stage in the preparations should now be over. Some MSS actually add a further line (148a = iii 340, xxi 272, *Il.* i 471, ix 176). The passage thus well illustrates the common tendency to assimilate typical scenes and partially parallel passages by interpolation, which often imports details inappropriate to the particular context; cf. 139–40. For the convention that *κοῦροι*, boys or young men of noble birth, serve the wine cf. also xv 141, *Il.* xx 234 (with schol.); see further H. Jeanmaire, *Couroi et Courètes* (Lille, 1939), 30–1. **ἐπεστέψαντο:** 'they filled to the brim', cf. ii 431, *Il.* viii 232 *κρητῆρας ἐπιστεφέας οἴνοιο*; Alcm. 19. 1–2 *τραπέσδαι μακωνιᾶν ἄρτων ἐπιστεφοίσαι*: cf. schol. on *Il.* i 470 *ἐπεστέψαντο· ὑπὲρ τὸ χεῖλος ἐπλήρωσαν, ὧς δοκεῖν ἐστέφθαι τῷ ὑγρῷ*; references to other ancient discussions of this expression are collected by Erbse ad loc. Vergil evidently found the phrase suggestive: cf. *G.* ii 528 'cratera coronant', *A.* i 724 'vina coronant', iii 525–6 'magnum cratera corona | induit'; there is no reason to suppose he misunderstood its meaning.

149. οἱ: includes Telemachus and Mentes as well as the suitors.

150. This very common formula marks the conclusion of the first part of the meal; conversation is postponed until hunger and thirst are satisfied and the company relaxes over their wine. **ἐξ:** with *ἕντο*, 'they had put from them, dismissed, i.e. satisfied.'

152. Cf. xxi 430. **μολπή:** dance or rhythmical movement (including ball games, cf. vi 101) combined with song. Aristarchus denied this musical element to *μολπή* and *μέλπομαι*, athetizing *Il.* i 474 where *μέλποντες* must include singing; but this is arbitrary, and a general survey of the other contexts where *μολπή* and *μέλπομαι* occur strongly suggests that singing is involved. Here *μολπή* would be tautologous with *ὀρχηστύς* if it did not imply song. See further M. Wegner, *Archaeologia* U, 42–3. **τά:** attracted to the gender of its predicate. **ἀναθήματα δαιτός:** a puzzling expression, perhaps 'proper accompaniments of feasting'; similarly the lyre is *δαιτὸς συνήορος* (viii 99) and *δαιτὸς ἑταίρην* (xvii 271). See further *LfgrE* s.v. *ἀνάθημα*.

153–4. The professional bard is an important figure in the *Odyssey*, by contrast with the *Iliad*, where the musicians are gifted amateurs, Apollo and the Muses on Olympus (*Il.* i 603–4), Paris (iii 54) and Achilles (ix 186 ff.) on earth (though the legendary Thamyris (ii 595 ff.) sounds like a professional). The outstanding practitioner is Demodocus in viii, and we cannot fail to observe the respect and sympathy shown to him by Odysseus; hence Alcinous' comparison of Odysseus himself to a skilled bard (xi 368–9) is peculiarly apt. We should also note the curious responsibility which Agamemnon assigns to a minstrel (iii 267 ff.), and the poet's interesting choice of a simile drawn, unusually, from his own craft at perhaps the most critical moment in the story (xxi 406 ff.). It is obviously debatable how far any historical reality is reflected in the Odyssean picture. The place (if any) of professional bards in the Mycenaean world must be a matter for conjecture, but the position of Hesiod, whose poetry was a sideline to his smallholding, was very likely nearer to life as the poet knew it than that of Phemius or Demodocus. See further Hainsworth on viii 62 ff., Schadewaldt, 'Die Gestalt des homerischen Sängers', *Welt*, 54 ff., H. Maehler, *Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum bis zur Zeit Pindars* (Hypomnemata, iii, Göttingen, 1963), 21 ff. Demodocus is blind (viii 62 ff.), as Homer himself was supposed to have been (cf. *h.Ap.* 172–3),[3] but there is no reason to think that Phemius is; 153 does not mean that he could not have found his instrument for himself, but represents a way of conveying an order to sing (rather than a courteous gesture). The poet emphasizes, both here and in xxii (351 ff.), that Phemius is not among the suitors' henchmen.

153. κίθαριν: in Homer *κίθαρις* and *φόρμιγξ* are treated as synonymous, cf. 155 *φορμίζων*, *Il.* xviii 569–70. The instrument had a body of wood and a sound-box made of, or shaped like, a tortoise's shell, with ox-hide stretched over the face and two curved horns rising from it, joined by a cross-bar carrying the pegs, to which strings of gut were attached. Phemius' lyre should be the four-stringed instrument often represented on Geometric vases; the Greeks regarded this as the original form, though seven- and eight-stringed lyres had in fact been in use among the Minoans and Mycenaeans. The traditional date of the change to seven strings, associated with Terpander's victories at the Spartan Carneia some time in the seventh century, receives some support from vase-paintings; but though the poet of the *Odyssey* may thus himself have known the seven-stringed instrument, he could hardly fail to be aware that it was an innovation. The early lyre had a very limited compass, and its music was simply an adjunct to song; significantly Homer has no separate noun for a cithara-player: the musician is the *ἀοιδός*. Phemius' manner of delivery should probably be imagined as a recitative over a range of four notes (one for each string). See further Wegner, *Archaeologia* U, 1 ff., M. L. West, 'The Singing of Homer', *JHS* ci (1981), 113 ff.

---

[3] On the interpretation of these lines cf. W. Burkert (*Arktouros: Hellenic Studies Presented to B. M. W. Knox* (Berlin–New York, 1979), 57): 'Most modern interpreters ... seem to acquiesce in the assumption that this is some anonymous Chian poet speaking, accidentally blind, otherwise unknown. This overlooks the implications of verse 173, with the poet "all of whose songs are the very best among posterity". What a strange claim for an obscure, anonymous author! The very best poet of all times, the absolute classic: this is meant to be Homer.'

154. Φημίῳ: 'the man who spreads report, the rich in tales'; like many Homeric minor characters Phemius bears a name indicating the conception which the poet wished to arouse in the listener's mind. On this important aspect of Homeric style see further H. Mühlestein, *SMEA* ix (1969), 67–94, von Kamptz, *Personennamen*, 25 ff.

155. ἦ τοι: better *ἤτοι*, an emphatic equivalent of preparatory *μέν*; see further Ruijgh, *τε épique*, 198–200. **ἀνεβάλλετο:** for this use with *ἀείδειν* to mark the beginning of a recitation cf. viii 266, xvii 262. The scholiast on viii 266 glosses it with *ἀνεκρούετο, προοιμιάζετο*, 'struck up, played some preliminary notes as a prelude'; we should not envisage anything elaborate.

156. Telemachus takes advantage of the fact that the rest of the company are concentrating on Phemius' song, which thus provides some privacy for his conversation.

157. = iv 70, xvii 592. According to the scholia on iv 70 Aristarchus read *πευθοίατο ἄλλοι*; this produces an unusual hiatus at the end of the fifth foot (see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 91–2 § 39), but cf. iv 236 (*ἄλλοτε ἄλλῳ*) and n. There is nothing unhomeric in this use of the article with *ἄλλος*: see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, ii 162 § 242, Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 228 § 260.

158 ff. Telemachus' words reflect his embarrassment at the suitors' behaviour (cf. 119–20, 132–4), and are evidently intended to forestall any reproach at his allowing such disorder in his house. He obviously behaves somewhat unconventionally in speaking so freely to his guest before he knows whom he is entertaining, but some apology is called for, since the suitors behave as if the place belonged to them, and yet ignore the visitor. His reluctance to name his father is noticeable.

163. Some editors punctuate with a strong stop at the end of this line, but it seems simpler and smoother to treat it as a conditional protasis which takes on the force of a wish from its context: see further D. Tabachovitz, *Homerische εἰ-Sätze* (Lund, 1951), 60 ff.

164–5. ἐλαφρότεροι . . . ἀφνειότεροι: the only Homeric example of the use of the double comparative where two qualities are contrasted in the same subject: see Kühner–Gerth, ii 312 § 541 (5).

166–8. Telemachus denies what he most wishes: cf. 413–16, iii 241–2; similarly Eumaeus tells of hopes raised only to be disappointed (xiv 122 ff., 372 ff.). **μόρον**: cognate acc., cf. ix 303 *ἀπωλόμεθ' αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον*. **εἴ περ**: 'even if', a common Epic use; cf. ii 246, xiii 138, 143, *Il.* ii 597, iii 25, x 225, xi 116, xii 223, 245, xxii 389. **φῇσιν**: elsewhere (xi 128 = xxiii 275) *φήῃ* is used; on this and similar forms see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 426 § 219. The use of the pure subjunctive with *εἰ* to express the idea that the contingency envisaged is indefinite, one which may happen repeatedly or not at all, is quite common in Homeric Greek, though it has disappeared from Attic-Ionic: see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, ii 279 § 410, Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 266 § 292 (b).

169–70. The request to a stranger to introduce himself, generally after a meal, is a typical feature of the *Odyssey*'s many scenes of hospitality: e.g. iii 71 ff., viii 550 ff., xiv 187 ff., xvi 57 ff. The nearest counterpart in the *Iliad* occurs when warriors on the battlefield recount their family history, e.g. vi 121 ff., xxi 150 ff.

169. εἰπὲ καὶ ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξον: formulae consisting of a pair of virtual synonyms are an important feature of Homeric style, well studied by K. O'Nolan, 'Doublets in the *Odyssey*', *CQ* xxviii (1978), 23–7.

170. = x 325, xiv 187, xv 264, xix 105, xxiv 298. **τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν**: often taken as 'Who are you and where do you come from?', though the following question is then superfluous. It is better to take *πόθεν* closely with *ἀνδρῶν*, referring to descent: cf. xvii 373 *πόθεν γένος εὔχεται εἶναι*, xix 162; the meaning then is 'Who are you and who was your father?' See further J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*^{2}, i (Basel, 1926), 299–300, who notes that precisely this type of question is found in Sanskrit epic and in the oldest parts of the *Avesta* (cf. 30 n.).

171–3. = xiv 188–90, cf. xvi 57–9, 222–4. The lines were absent from some ancient editions and regarded as suspect by Aristarchus who argued that while these were proper questions for Eumaeus to put to the ragged Odysseus, whose appearance would make it surprising that he had found a passage, they were out of place here (see schol. on xiv 188). Aristarchus thus postulated an interpolation of a common type (see 148 n.), and there is much to be said for this view. The point of Eumaeus' interrogation is obscured if we have been led to suppose that these enquiries are normal Ithacan custom, and it would better express Telemachus' preoccupation with his missing father if he proceeded without delay to ask if his visitor had known Odysseus. 185–6, likewise suspected in antiquity, answer the questions put here; the two passages stand or fall together.

171. ὁπποίης: indirect interrogative, as if *κατάλεξον* had immediately preceded; the direct question is resumed with *πῶς*.

172. εὐχετόωντο: the range of meanings conventionally ascribed to *εὔχομαι* and its cognates (see LSJ) is a long-standing source of difficulty, and much ingenuity has been expended in explaining how the same verb can mean both 'boast' and 'pray'. The problem seems to have been solved by L. C. Muellner (*The Meaning of Homeric εὔχομαι through its Formulas* (Innsbrücker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, xiii, Innsbruck, 1976)), who argues that it is 'a functionally marked word for "say" '; in secular contexts (as here) it means 'say (proudly, accurately, contentiously, as the case may be)', in sacral 'speak, say sacredly'.

173. Usually taken as a rather naïve joke, except by proponents of the view that Homer's Ithaca is really Lefkas (see above pp. 63–4) which, according to Strabo (451–2), was a peninsula until *c.*650 when the Corinthians severed the isthmus connecting it to the mainland.

175–7. Not a conventional question.

176. ἴσαν: better taken as impf. of *εἶμι* than as plupf. of *οἶδα*; for the construction with acc. and no preposition cf. xviii 194 *εὖτ' ἂν ἴῃ . . . χόρον*. **δῶ**: this word, which clearly functions as a substantive, occurs 23 times in Homer, always at the end of the line with a sg. adj. or gen. and always acc. sg., except at i 392, where it is nom. sg. (cf. Hes. *Th.* 933: acc. pl.). Ancient scholars interpreted it as an abbreviation of *δῶμα* (like *κρî* for *κριθή*). It has been argued that it was originally a directional suffix, meaning 'to', as the parallelism between *ἡμέτερόνδε* and *ἡμέτερον δῶ* might suggest, but this theory has come to seem less attractive with the discovery of Mycenaean *do-de* evidently meaning 'to the house' in Linear B tablets from Thebes. See further Hoekstra on xiii 4, Heubeck on xxiv 115, Szemerényi, *SMEA* xx (1979), 224–5, Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*, *LfgrE*. On Homeric vocabulary for houses see M. O. Knox, ' "House" and "palace" in Homer', *JHS* xc (1970), 117–20.

177. ἐπίστροφος: a puzzling Homeric *hapax*, though it was read by Aristophanes at viii 163 instead of *ἐπίσκοπος*, and *Ἐπίστροφος* is a popular name for minor characters in the Catalogue of Ships (*Il.* ii 517, 692, 856). The scholia offer various explanations: concerned, respectful, hospitable; respected and attracting men to him; inclined to go around visiting (*ἐπερχόμενος καὶ ἐπιδημῶν*); the last seems the most attractive. Aeschylus (*Ag.* 397) evidently understood the word as 'conversant with' (though we cannot be sure that he had this passage in mind), but this rendering, though commonly adopted, is not quite satisfactory here, unless we take it as a litotes.

179 ff. Mentes' cover-story is obviously comparable with the fictions which Odysseus himself devises (xiii 256 ff., xiv 199 ff., xvii 419 ff., xix 172 ff., xxiv 304 ff.); note, in particular, the reference to a meeting with Odysseus himself long ago (cf. xix 185 ff., xxiv 265 ff.).

180. Ἀγχιάλοιο: cf. viii 112, *Il.* v 609; the compound might be thought slightly inept as a personal name, but cf. *Ἀμφίαλος*, *Ὠκύαλος*, *Εὐρύπυλος*, *Ὑψιπύλη*; see further von Kamptz, *Personennamen*, 10. **δαΐφρονος**: see above, 48–9 n. **εὔχομαι**: see above, 172 n.

181. ἀτάρ: see 9 n. **Ταφίοισι**: see 105 n.

182. ὧδε: 'so, just as you see'.

183–4. Trading is evidently not regarded as dishonourable; a rather different attitude seems to be implied at viii 159–64, though perhaps the objection is to an obsession with profits rather than to trade as such. **πλέων:** monosyllable by synizesis; the formula *πλέων ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον* elsewhere (iv 474, *Il.* vii 88) occupies the second part of the line. **οἴνοπα:** a puzzling epithet, frequently applied to the sea and twice to oxen (xiii 32, *Il.* xiii 703, in both places in the dual). The conventional rendering 'wine-dark' follows the interpretation of ancient scholars; though it does not inspire complete confidence, it is more convincing than alternative suggestions. See further Hainsworth on v 132. **ἐπ' ἀλλοθρόους ἀνθρώπους:** cf. iii 302, xiv 43, xv 453.

184. Τεμέσην: an ancient variant *Τάμασιν* (or *-σον*) is recorded. Mentes' destination was variously identified in antiquity with Tempsa in Bruttium and Tamassos in Cyprus. Strabo (255–6) favours Tempsa, but though it might have been an entrepôt there is no evidence of copper-workings (see *RE* V A 459–60 (Philipp)), while Cyprus was famous for its copper (cf. Lat. *cuprum* = *aes Cyprium*). It is not a serious difficulty that Tamassos (Politiko) lies in the centre of the island, whereas Mentes' words would more naturally suggest a port; the poet simply named a place which he associated with copper. (K. Hadjioannou (*AA* lxxxi (1966), 205–10) sees a reference to the important Cypriot town of Alasia, and would read *ἔς τ' Ἄλασιν* but the *τε* is awkward, and emendation unnecessary). **αἴθωνα:** the epithet seems to have been extended to iron from copper; against the conventional interpretation 'flashing' R. J. Brown (*Glotta* lxi (1983), 31 ff.) argues persuasively that *αἴθων* is properly 'brown', its metaphorical use arising from the association between a sunburnt skin and manly, spirited behaviour; see also Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire* s.v. *αἴθω*, *LfgrE* s.v. *αἴθοπ-*. On Homeric metallurgy see further D. H. F. Gray, 'Metal-working in Homer', *JHS* lxxiv (1954), 1 ff., R. J. Forbes, *Archaeologia* K.

185–6. 185 = xxiv 308. The lines were athetized by Aristophanes and Aristarchus, and omitted in some ancient editions; they are evidently intended to answer 171–3. The rest of the poem throws no light on the topography of 186. The harbour Rheithron is not mentioned elsewhere; the Attic *ῥεῖθρον*, instead of the normal Ionic *ῥέεθρον*, is noteworthy. Neion may represent a misunderstanding of the obscure epithet *ὑπονήϊος* applied to Ithaca at iii 81. Odysseus speaks of Mount Neriton as the outstanding feature of his island (ix 22, cf. xiii 351, *Il.* ii 632); the names are oddly alike.

187–8. With Mentes' claim to a longstanding relationship of guest-friendship with Odysseus we may compare the (disguised) Odysseus' own claim to have entertained Odysseus twenty years before (xix 185 ff.), which leads Penelope, once she has tested it, to treat the stranger as a confidant (253 ff.).

188–93. Mentes' detailed knowledge of Laertes' circumstances no doubt implies a long-standing interest in Odysseus' family supporting his claim to be a *πατρώιος ξεῖνος*, but the main purpose of this passage (incidentally noteworthy for its extensive use of enjambment) is to reveal that Laertes, familiar as Odysseus' father from the frequent use of the hero's patronymic in the *Iliad*, is still alive. This must surprise us, since already in the *Iliad* Odysseus is one of the senior chieftains (cf. *Il.* xxiii 790–1); we shall presently learn that Odysseus was already ruling in Ithaca before the Trojan War (ii 47). No doubt physical as well as mental vigour is needed for the exercise of power in the heroic world; but a chief who is supported by a loyal and competent son could, like Nestor and Priam, retain his position until an advanced age,[4] and we may be puzzled to account for Laertes' retirement, particularly since he is still active, despite the lapse of a further twenty years and the austerities to which he has subjected himself. Moreover, even a very frail old man might be expected to offer advice and moral support in the face of the problems which beset Penelope and Telemachus; yet Laertes' presence in the neighbourhood is not allowed to affect our sense of their isolation (though the arguments by which Eurycleia dissuades her mistress from seeking her father-in-law's help may strike the reader as hardly cogent (iv 735 ff., 754 ff.)). Conversely, Telemachus does not react to Mentes' words as if he were aware of an implied reproach for neglecting his grandfather; Laertes' misery is not treated as any direct concern of his. The poet has had to strike a delicate balance to account both for Laertes' non-involvement and for his continued survival. This improbable longevity is best explained as a device to avoid the awkward dilemma which his death would have created in the Nekuia: Odysseus could hardly have foregone all converse with his dead father, but such an episode would have greatly weakened the impact of the scenes with Anticleia and Tiresias. The reunion in xxiv (205 ff.) exploits this prolongation of Laertes' life, but should not be regarded as motivating it.

Unlike the fathers of other major Homeric heroes Laertes is an obscure figure; his name is unique, and its etymology mysterious: see further *RE* xii (1) 424 ff. (Lamer). His austere way of life is self-imposed, an expression of his grief for his son; cf. xi 187–96, xvi 138–45.

188. ἐξ ἀρχῆς: 'from of old', cf. ii 254, xi 438, xvii 69.

189. ἥρωα: *ἥρως* is applied very generally to men of noble birth: cf. 272 *ἥρωας Ἀχαιούς*.

190. ἐπ' ἀγροῦ: 'in the country'.

192. παρτιθεῖ: = *παρατίθησιν*, cf. *Il.* xiii 732; the accentuation is disputed: see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 298–9 § 138, Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 18–19 § 18. **κατά:** with *λάβησιν*.

193. γουνόν: an obscure word, possibly to be connected with *γόνυ* and understood as 'hill, high ground'; see Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*,

---

[4] We find parallels in Euripides for the situation implied here. In *Alc.* Admetus rules in Pherae though his father Pheres is still alive; in *Hipp.* Theseus rules in Troezen in the lifetime of his grandfather Pittheus, the former king; similarly in *Ba.* Pentheus has taken over from his grandfather Cadmus at Thebes; at *Andr.* 22–3 it is implied that Neoptolemus might have driven his grandfather Peleus to abdicate at Pharsalus. But we do not know whether Euripides had any grounds, apart from the evidence of the *Odyssey*, for regarding this as common practice in the heroic age.

LfgrE. **ἀλωῆς**: it is odd that the same word can mean both 'cultivated ground, vineyard, orchard' (as here) and 'threshing floor'. Possibly its original sense was rather more general, so that it could be used of any plot of land unoccupied by buildings; or two different words may be involved. See further Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*, *LfgrE*.

194. ἔφαντ': the subject is left vague.

195. βλάπτουσι κελεύθου: 'hinder him from his journey', cf. iv 380 *πεδάᾳ καὶ ἔδησε κελεύθου*, A. *Ag*. 120 *βλαβέντα λοισθίων δρόμων*.

196. Odysseus is here named for the first time in this conversation; we have been expecting this for some time, and it surely adds emphasis to Mentes' confident assertion. **δῖος**: see Hainsworth on v 171.

198–9. An interesting mixture of truth and falsehood.

200 ff. The first of many predictions that Odysseus will soon be home: cf. ii 160 ff., xiv 158 ff., xv 172 ff., xvii 154 ff., xix 303 ff., 535 ff. Telemachus evidently regards it as no more than a confident expression of hope, and is not markedly cheered by it.

201. ἀθάνατοι: the lengthening of the first syllable of this common epic term reflects (as often) metrical convenience rather than necessity; Homeric language has synonyms in *αἰὲν ἐόντες* and *αἰειγενέται*. See further Wyatt, *Lengthening*, 79–80.

202. There is a nice irony in this disclaimer. In the *Iliad μαντική*, the gift of Apollo (*Il*. i 87), is restricted to the quasi-rational technique of inductive divination from omens, especially from the behaviour of birds in flight; the *Odyssey* also admits ecstatic prophecy in the symbolic vision of the hereditary Apolline seer Theoclymenus (xx 351 ff.).

204. ἔχῃσι: the subject must be *δέσματα*, and the lack of an expressed object is awkward; Cobet's cj. *ἕ* for *τε* is attractive.

205. The asyndeton adds weight to Mentes' words.

207–9. Telemachus' resemblance to his father is a recurrent theme: cf. iii 122–5, iv 141–6. It appears that he now looks more like Odysseus as the latter's friends remember him than Odysseus himself does, if we may judge by the ease with which Odysseus escapes recognition on his return to Ithaca. **τόσος**: cf. 296–7. **αἰνῶς**: 'strangely, uncannily'; cf. Nestor's reaction (iii 123) *σέβας μ' ἔχει εἰσορόωντα*. **ἐπεί** introduces the reason why he can observe the likeness; there is a slight, but natural, ellipse. **τοῖον** emphasises *θαμά*.

213. πεπνυμένος: a standing epithet of Telemachus, restricted to occasions when he is about to speak; it is unlikely that *πέπνυμαι* is cognate with *πνέω*, though the two were easily confused; see further Hainsworth on viii 388, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*.

215–16. Telemachus' reply is slightly surprising, but Mentes has practically answered his own question. For 216 cf. Men. fr. 227 *αὑτὸν γὰρ οὐθεὶς οἶδε τοῦ ποτ' ἐγένετο, | ἀλλ' ὑπονοοῦμεν πάντες ἢ πιστεύομεν*. The idea must already have been a commonplace, and the tone is surely mildly ironical, though Telemachus might well be somewhat diffident in asserting that the hero whom his visitor knows so much better and so much admires is in fact

his father. **γόνον**: for the sense 'parentage, stock' cf. xi 234, xix 166. **ἀνέγνω**: 'gnomic' aor., used in general truths irrespective of time: see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, ii 185 § 273, Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 67 § 78.

219. Cf. v 105 ff., xx 33.

222–3. 'Yet (sad as your father's fate is, and yours too at present), fame is assured to your race because of your own excellence'. **ὀπίσσω**: 'in the future'. **Πηνελόπεια**: here named for the first time; she is not mentioned in the *Iliad*. Her name is probably derived from *πηνέλοψ*, a particoloured duck. The theory that she was originally a bird-goddess has found some support, but is extremely speculative. Germain (*Genèse*, 468 ff.) has drawn attention to the monogamous habits of ducks which, whether wild or domesticated, remain inseparably paired with a single partner throughout their lives, so that in Chinese and Russian folklore the duck has become a symbol of marital fidelity; though there is no evidence of this notion in Greek, it is possible that the choice of such a name for an ideally faithful wife reflects the influence of a people whose folklore employed the symbolism of the duck thus. However, women's names were quite commonly derived from birds' names in Greek (see F. Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen* (Halle, 1917), 591), and the poet does not encourage us to attach any particular significance to Penelope's name. An alternative etymology was current in antiquity, from *πήνη*, 'thread'; this is quite unconvincing in itself, but it is possible that the story of Penelope's web (ii 93 ff. etc.) arose from false etymology from *πήνη* and *λέπω* or *ὀλόπτω* 'strip off', though it should be noted that none of these words is used in the account of Penelope's weaving. See further *RE* xxxvii 461 ff. (Wüst), Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*, von Kamptz *Personennamen*, 275–6, M.-M. Mactoux, *Pénélope: Légende et mythe* (Paris, 1975), 233 ff.

224 ff. Mentes now raises the questions which Telemachus had earlier tried to forestall (158 ff.). He approaches the subject rather abruptly, as if he had only just noticed what was going on, and Telemachus cannot avoid explaining the situation in much more detail, and thus providing us with a clearer picture of the background. The topic is obviously painful to him, but Athena's purpose is to overcome his resignation and goad him into action, and she cannot achieve her ends without causing him some distress.

225. δαί: so Aristarchus; almost all our MSS read *δέ*. *δαί* is a colloquialism, frequent in Ar., but not found in formal prose, adding liveliness to the question: see further Denniston, *Particles*, 262–3; for the parechesis *τίς δαίς, τίς δαί* cf. 48 *δαΐφρονι δαίεται* and n. It has, however, been suspected that *δαί* is merely a conjecture, intended to eliminate the (relatively rare) hiatus *δὲ ὅμιλος*; whether *δαί* is properly to be regarded as Homeric is debatable, since in neither of the two other places where it was read by Aristarchus (xxiv 299, *Il*. x 408) does it have unanimous MS-support. See further Heubeck on xxiv 299, Erbse, *Beiträge*, 212–13. **τίπτε δέ σε χρεώ**: cf. *Il*. x 85; the phrase is slightly elliptical: understand e.g. *ἱκάνει*. It is used somewhat loosely: 'What has this to do with you?' The syntax of *χρεώ* is confused; its usage has to be compared with that of both *χρείω* and *χρή*, which though originally a noun came to be regarded as a verbal form: see further Chantraine, *Grammaire*, ii 40 § 49 (F), Shipp, *Studies*, 31.

226. For the three types of feast cf. xi 415. **εἰλαπίνη ἠέ**: the last vowel of *εἰλαπίνη* is amalgamated with the initial vowel of *ἠέ* to make one long syllable. Synecphonesis of this type is otherwise almost confined in Homer to the monosyllables *δή*, *ἦ*, *μή*, with a following long vowel or diphthong, and *ἐπεὶ οὐ*; other examples comparable to this are xxiv 247 *ὄγχνη οὐ*, *Il.* ii 651 *Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντῃ*, xvii 89 *ἀσβέστῳ οὐδ'*, xviii 458 *ἐμῷ ὠκυμόρῳ* (v. l.); see further Erbse, *Beiträge*, 206–7. The metrical oddity, along with the absence of any opening interrogative particle (cf. iv 140, vi 149), contributes to the staccato effect of the questions. **γάμος**: a wedding-feast: cf. iv 3 ff., xxiii 131 ff., *Il.* xix 299. **ἔρανος**: a dinner to which all contribute (cf. iv 621 ff.), ruled out by the general extravagance and lack of restraint.

227–9. Cf. 133–4. The poet has not actually described the suitors doing anything which could be so regarded; he presents them through the eyes of his characters, and avoids a direct description of drunkenness and gluttony.

Some editors put a comma at the end of 226, and take *τε* in 227 as connective. But the use of *τε*, 'and', to co-ordinate clauses with different subjects is relatively rare in Homer, and particularly awkward here since the second clause is quite long. It is impossible to take *ὥς τέ μοι κτλ·* as a result clause; it does not suit the context, and this construction of *ὥστε* with a finite verb does not occur in Homer. It seems best to take *ὥς τε* as introducing a comparison, the participle here functioning like the substantive *ὑβρισταί*: cf. viii 491, x 295, 322. The sentence elucidates what has just been said, and asyndeton is normal with such an explanation. See Ruijgh, *τε épique*, 597–8 § 488, Chantraine, *Grammaire*, ii 325 § 473. **αἴσχεα**: 'disgraceful deeds', an unusual use of *αἶσχος*.

232. μέλλεν: 'was likely to be', i.e. presumably was. **ἀμύμων**: 'fine, beautiful': see above, 29 n.

233. κεῖνος ἀνήρ: Telemachus continues to refer to his father rather obliquetly.

234 ff. Cf. xiv 366 ff., where Eumaeus develops the same theme.

234. ἑτέρως ἐβόλοντο: cf. *Il.* xv 51 *βούλεται ἄλλῃ*. For *ἐβόλοντο* cf. xvi 387 (with Hoekstra's n.), *Il.* xi 319; this form is attested also in Arcadian, and must be old. In many MSS the more familiar *ἐβούλοντο* has replaced it; *ἐβάλοντο*, recorded as an ancient variant, is also found.

235–6. περὶ πάντων | ἀνθρώπων: 'above all other men', cf. iv 231; the construction is not quite logical with *ἄϊστος*.

237–40. Cf. v 306 ff., xxiv 30 ff., A. *Ch.* 345–53, E. *Andr.* 1182 ff.

238. = iv 490, xiv 368. The logic of this passage is much improved if we follow Hennings in deleting this line. *τῷ*, 'in that case', in 239 must refer to 237: if Odysseus had died in Ithaca, the *Παναχαιοί*, dispersed after their return from Troy, could not have celebrated his funeral. The same illogicality has been imported into Eumaeus' speech in xiv, where this line is in place, but 369–70 (= i 239–40) must be a late interpolation, since they are absent from many MSS. On the tendency to increase the correspondence between similar passages, see above, 139–40 n. **φίλων**: 'those near and dear to him, his family', contrasted with *ἑταῖροι*, his comrades in arms. **ἐπεὶ πόλεμον τολύπευσε**: 'when he had finished winding the thread of war'. For the metaphor cf. 17. From Ar. *Lys.* 585–6 *κἄπειτα ποῆσαι | τολύπην μεγάλην κᾆτ' ἐκ ταύτης τῷ δήμῳ χλαῖναν ὑφῆναι* it seems clear that *τολύπη* is a ball of spun thread, not wool ready for spinning.

239–40. = xxiv 32–3; in the *Odyssey Παναχαιοί* occurs only in this formula. The dead are normally cremated in Homer; a barrow is raised over the pyre to keep alive the dead man's memory for generations to come: cf. iv 584 (a cenotaph), xi 74 ff., xii 13, xxiv 80 ff., *Il.* iv 176 ff., vi 419, vii 86–91 (a very clear exposition of the idea), 336, xvi 457, xxiii 245–8, xxiv 797–801. The idea is not peculiar to heroic poetry: cf. Plato Com. fr. 183 (Kock), (of Themistocles' tomb): *ὁ σὸς δὲ τύμβος ἐν καλῷ κεχωσμένος | τοῖς ἐμπόροις πρόσρησις ἔσται πανταχοῦ, | οὓς ἐκπλέοντάς τ' εἰσπλέοντάς τ' ὄψεται | χὠπόταν ἅμιλλ' ᾖ τῶν νέων θεάσεται.* The words of the dying Beowulf (*Beowulf* 2802 ff.), curiously close to *Od.* xxiv 80 ff., should remind us that it was not a peculiarly Greek idea. See further M. Andronikos, *Archaeologia* W, 32 ff., 107 ff.

240. ἦρατ': aor. of *ἄρνυμαι*, an artificial form which seems to have been substituted for *ἤρετο* by confusion with aor. of *ἀείρω:* see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 387–8 § 185, *LfgrE.*

241. = xiv 371 (see Hoekstra's n). **ἀκλειῶς**: 'without report, so that there is no news of him' (cf. *ἀκλέα* iv 728); the verbal antithesis with *κλέος* in 240 can scarcely be reproduced in English. (Shewring's 'ingloriously' is not really satisfactory, since it suggests 'ignominiously' rather than 'obscurely'.) **ἅρπυιαι ἀνηρείψαντο**: cf. xx 66, 77, where *ἀνέλοντο θύελλαι* and *ἅρπυιαι ἀνηρείψαντο* describe the same event. *ἅρπυιαι* are personified storm-winds; their genealogy is given by Hesiod (*Th.* 265 ff.); for further details see *LfgrE. ἀνηρείψαντο* is probably a cpd. of *ἐρέπτομαι;* though the simple verb is attested only in the sense 'devour', comparison with cognates in other languages suggests an earlier meaning 'snatch, seize'; see further Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire* s.v. *ἐρέπτομαι*. Confusion with *ἐρείπω* appears to have affected its spelling in Homeric MSS; on the MS-evidence for its spelling elsewhere see M. L. West on Hes. *Th.* 990. The obvious similarity between noun and verb in this formula suggests that the verb was intended to indicate the etymology of *ἅρπυιαι*; for similar glosses on the names of fabulous creatures cf. xii 85–6 (Scylla), 104 (Charybdis), Hes. *Th.* 252–3, 775–6, 901–3. The form *ἀρέπυιαι*, attested in the *EM* and found on a vase from Aegina (P. Kretschmer, *Griech. Vaseninschriften* (Gütersloh, 1894), 208) increases the resemblance; *ἀνηρέ(ι)ψαντ' ἀρέπυιαι*, which some would read here, would incidentally improve the metre by removing a rare word-break after the trochee of the fourth foot (violation of Hermann's Bridge).

242. ἄϊστος, ἄπυστος: an impressive asyndeton; for the use of co-ordinated adjectives with negative prefix in asyndeton cf. iv 788 *ἄσιτος, ἄπαστος*, *Il.* ix 63 *ἀφρήτωρ ἀθέμιστος ἀνέστιος ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος*, *h.Cer.* 200; see also Shipp, *Studies*, 11–12.

245–51. = xvi 122–8, cf. xix 130–5.

246–7. Cf. ix 21–6 (with Heubeck's n.), *h.Apoll.* 428–9. Same (Samos) is identified by Strabo (453) with Cephallenia, where there is still a town of that name; this well suits the location of the suitors' ambush (iv 671) *ἐν πορθμῷ Ἰθάκης τε Σάμοιό τε παιπαλοέσσης*. Doulichion is more difficult. Unlike Same, it is not part of the realm assigned to Odysseus in the Catalogue of Ships (*Il.* ii 631 ff.), but is said to be ruled, together with the Echinades, by Meges (625 ff.). Strabo (458) identifies it with Dolicha, one of the Echinades, a small, desolate island; but Doulichion in the *Odyssey* is rich in grass and grain (xvi 396 *πολυπύρου ποιήεντος*, cf. xiv 335) and sends almost as many suitors as Same, Zacynthus, and Ithaca (xvi 247–53), implying that it was both large and prosperous; the size of Meges' contingent at Troy (forty ships to Odysseus' twelve) supports this inference. These data suit Leucas well, and this identification is indirectly supported by Strabo's testimony (452) that the island had once had a different name and was renamed by Corinthian settlers. The only difficulty with this identification arises from xiv 334–5, where Odysseus speaks of breaking a journey from Thesprotia to Doulichion at Ithaca, which should imply that Doulichion lies south of Ithaca; but given the poet's generally imprecise conception of his hero's homeland (see above, pp. 63–4) this is not serious. The Odyssean data would also fit Cephallenia, but this identification (advocated by Hoekstra on xiv 335) creates difficulties for the *Iliad*; a mainland situation, in Acarnania or Elis, has also been suggested. See further *Companion*, 398 ff., R. Hope Simpson and J. F. Lazenby, *The Catalogue of the Ships in Homer's* Iliad (Oxford, 1970), 101, *LfgrE*. **ὑλήεντι Ζακύνθῳ:** cf. ix 24 *ὑλήεσσα Ζάκυνθος*; *ὑλήεις* is often treated as an adjective of two terminations. For the retention of a short final vowel before ζ with a name which could not otherwise be accommodated in the hexameter cf. *Il.* ii 824 *δὲ Ζέλειαν*, iv 103; see further Wyatt, *Lengthening*, 183 n. 1.

247. Cf. xv 510, xvi 124, xxi 346; see 388 ff. n.

249–50. Cf. xxiv 126. **ἀρνεῖται:** 'decline, refuse'. **στυγερὸν γάμον:** so Penelope herself describes it (xviii 272). **τελευτὴν | ποιῆσαι:** 'make an end', i.e. through marriage to one of the suitors.

251. Telemachus' exposition of the situation is now complete; his prediction sounds alarmist, but prepares us for the suitors' plot to murder him (iv 669 ff.). **οἶκον:** i.e. substance; cf. iv 318 *ἐσθίεταί μοι οἶκος*. **τάχα:** 'soon'; the meaning 'perhaps' is not Homeric.

252–305. This speech forms the centre-piece of i and sets in motion the subsequent train of events; it is the means by which Athena achieves her purpose in coming to Ithaca. Telemachus has to be convinced that he must, and can, act to restore order in his household, and he needs some guidance towards the ultimate solution of the problem presented by the suitors. The first part of the speech (253–69) is intended to make Telemachus more receptive to the instructions which follow; the poet was surely conscious of the oddity of Telemachus taking seriously such drastic advice from a complete stranger. Mentes does not spare the boy's feelings; sympathetic though his visitor is, Telemachus is left in no doubt that he is not half the man his father was, and that the advice he receives is based on a realistic assessment of his capabilities. In the second part (269 ff.) the plan which Athena outlined earlier (90 ff.) is further elaborated.

252. ἐπαλαστήσασα: presumably 'in indignation, deeply moved'; the sound effect *ἐπαλαστησασα* . . . *Παλλάς* no doubt partly influenced the poet's use of this rare verb (not found again until A.R. (iii 369, 557)).

254. δεύῃ: 'you stand in need of'; the ancient variant *δεύει*, given by a few MSS, is to be understood as an impersonal 3rd pers. sg., equivalent to *δεῖ*.

255 ff. Athena's wish echoes Telemachus' own thoughts (115–17). The incomplete protasis is taken up again at 265.

256. δύο δοῦρε: the Homeric warrior is commonly, though not invariably, equipped with a pair of throwing spears.

257 ff. The first of a series of reminiscences preparing Telemachus for the father he is to meet in xvi; like Nestor (iii 120 ff.) and Helen (iv 240 ff.), Mentes emphasizes Odysseus' resourcefulness and the devotion which he inspired in his friends. It is not clear whether this disquieting story of Odysseus' quest for arrow-poison, so much at odds with the normal Odyssean conception of the god-fearing hero, is meant to be taken as a real episode in Odysseus' biography or as Athena's *ad hoc* invention. Odysseus does not use a bow for fighting in the *Iliad*, where it is evidently regarded as no proper weapon for a major hero; nor does he even compete in the archery contest at Patroclus' funeral games (*Il.* xxiii 850–83), though Telemachus' name presupposes that Odysseus took pride in this skill (see 113 n.). In the *Odyssey* his normal weapons are spear and sword, and he is presented as an archer in only two other places, among the Phaeacians, to whom he boasts of, but does not demonstrate, his prowess (viii 214–33: see Hainsworth on 215–18), and when he exacts his revenge from the suitors (xxi, xxii). Nowhere else in Homer is arrow-poison explicitly mentioned, even in connection with hunting, though its use may be implied at *Il.* iv 218, where Machaon sucks out Menelaus' arrow-wound, the result of a gross violation of the solemnly agreed truce, and thus peculiarly likely to raise suspicions of a tactic normally deemed illicit. Heracles uses arrows poisoned with the blood of the Hydra against Geryon (Stesich. *SLG* S 15 (*LGS* 56 E) ii 1 ff.) and against the centaurs (Apollod. ii 85–6, 152), but these are monsters, not men. Mentes indicates that this early application of chemical warfare might be thought unethical (264), and the detail calls to mind the unscrupulous Odysseus of Attic tragedy. In the scholia it is suggested that the poet was here preparing the ground for Odysseus' slaughter of the suitors, since the use of arrow-poison would make it much easier for every shot to prove fatal; this may well be right. In the event the poet preferred a more heroic conception, and Odysseus achieves his victory by nerve and superb marksmanship. See further F. Dirlmeier, 'Die Giftpfeile des Odysseus', *SHAW* 1966, 2, Clay, *Wrath*, 71–2.

Only relatively few plants are suitable sources for arrow-poison, which must not only be lethal in small quantities but also rapid in its effect on the heart or nervous system. Though several plants grow in Greece which a modern toxicologist, even with relatively primitive apparatus, could use for this purpose, their poisonous properties were in general not appreciated in antiquity, and the only possibility seems to be black hellebore (*Helleborus orientalis*). See further O. Schmiedeberg, *Über die Pharmaka in der Ilias u. Odyssee* (Strasburg, 1918), 14–25, where details of the manufacturing procedure may be found.

Ephyra is also mentioned as a source of poison at ii 328–9. It was a fairly common place-name (cf. Str. 338), but only two towns need to be considered here, both in western Greece: Thesprotian Ephyra, later called *Κίχυρος* (cf. Th. i 46. 4), and a town in Elis. If the Taphians' home is indeed Corcyra (see above, 105 n.), it seems more likely that Thesprotian Ephyra is meant; though Corcyra is not on the direct homeward route from Thesprotian Ephyra to Ithaca, both places lie well north of Ithaca, whereas Odysseus' route would be rather circuitous if he came from Elis.

259. Ἴλου: a nonentity, not mentioned elsewhere; his father Mermerus, son of Jason and Medea, has connections with both Elis and Ephyra.

260. θοῆς: the commonest Homeric epithet for ships; see further C. Kurt, *Seemännische Fachausdrücke bei Homer* (Göttingen, 1979), 47 ff.

261–2. ὄφρα . . . χαλκήρεας: 'in order that he might have it for anointing his bronze-tipped arrows', cf. ix 248–9, *ὄφρα οἱ εἴη | πίνειν*.

263. Ilus' conscientious scruples may seem strange, since it might be thought equally as impious to possess poison as to let someone else have it, but there could be no objection to the use of arrow-poison in hunting (cf. Verg. *A*. ix 772–3, [Arist.] *Mir*. 837 a 13). **νεμεσίζετο:** 'stood in awe of, had regard to the wrath of'; only here is this verb used with an acc., and the sense is rather strained; we might have expected *ὀπίζετο*.

264. In view of the Taphians' reputation as pirates (see above, 105 n.), it is perhaps not surprising that Anchialus did not share Ilus' scruples. But the important point is Anchialus' overriding affection for Odysseus.

265–6. = iv 345–6, xvii 136–7. **τοῖος** picks up 257.

267. Cf. i 400, xvi 129, *Il*. xvii 514, xx 435. It is not quite clear what image is involved, but it is tempting to connect this expression with the notion of the gods spinning what is to be (cf. i 17 and n.); spinning is generally a sedentary task, and the thread as it is being spun passes over or lies on the spinner's knees. See further Hainsworth on vii 197 ff., Onians, *Origins*, 303 ff., B. C. Dietrich, *Death, Fate and the Gods* (London, 1965), esp. 289 ff.

268. ἀποτίσεται: see above, 43 n.

269 ff. Mentes' instructions fall into three main parts (271 ff., 279 ff., 293 ff.), the first two of which are of crucial importance for motivating Telemachus' subsequent actions. Since Kirchhoff's fundamental discussion (238 ff.) various oddities have exposed this section, the vital link between Telemachus' adventures and the rest of the narrative, to the assaults of analytical critics, who have seen in its alleged incoherence and in certain other inconcinnities the hand of a redactor welding a separately conceived Telemachy onto an essentially complete poem about Odysseus' return: see further Page, *Odyssey*, 52 ff., 73 ff. (though his own interpretation of the data is idiosyncratic). But there has undoubtedly been a tendency to exaggerate difficulties and to discount alternative explanations, without due allowance being made for the effect on Athena's counsels of background information which Mentes cannot be permitted to reveal. She knows, as does the audience, that the gods have determined on Odysseus' return in the near future, and her plan of action for Telemachus makes sense only in the light of this knowledge. The audience could reasonably be expected to find nothing strange in all this, and it would be captious to complain that Telemachus ought to have been more alert to inadequacies in the advice offered by this authoritative stranger. From the last part of Mentes' speech we realize that Athena's plan includes vengeance on the suitors; the poem's scope is thus shown to be more extensive than has previously been indicated. See further F. M. Combellack, *Gnomon* xxviii (1956), 413 ff. (review of Page, *Odyssey*), Rüter, *Odysseeinterpretationen*, 148 ff., Eisenberger, *Studien*, 37 ff., E. Siegmann, 'Die Athene-Rede im ersten Buch der Odyssee', *WJA* NF ii (1976), 21 ff.

269. φράζεσθαι: 'consider'.

271. This line may seem fussy so soon after 269 (cf. 279), but Mentes needs to appear tactful and aware that the position of a stranger offering gratuitous advice is delicate. **εἰ δ' ἄγε:** 'come now'; on this interjectional use of *εἰ* see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, ii 274 § 404, Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 291–2 § 320.

272–4. Cf. 90–1.

272. Cf. *Il*. xix 34 *ἀλλὰ σύ γ' εἰς ἀγορὴν καλέσας ἥρωας Ἀχαιούς*. The poet seems slightly at a loss for the right words for an Ithacan assembly; see above, 90 n.

273–4. This public denunciation of the suitors before gods and men is Athena's object in arranging the assembly: see introduction to ii. No time is wasted over the possibility that the suitors might actually accede to Telemachus' request, and Mentes' subsequent instructions (295–6) presuppose that they will take no notice of it. Some critics have seen a difficulty in this, but Telemachus can reasonably be expected to share the assumption that nothing will come of it; indeed, the suitors would seem less formidable if it appeared worth considering the possibility that they would peaceably depart if formally requested to do so. **πέφραδε:** redupl. aor. imper. of *φράζω*. **ἐπὶ μάρτυροι:** or *ἐπιμάρτυροι*? It is hard to decide; cf. *Il*. vii 76 *Ζεὺς δ' ἄμμ' ἐπιμάρτυρος* [v.l. *ἐπὶ μάρτυρος*] *ἔστω*. For the cpd. form cf. e.g. *ἐπίουρος*, *ἐπιβουκόλος*, *ἐπιβώτωρ*. Zenodotus appears to have consistently read *(ἐπι)μάρτυρες*, the form in more general use, where Aristarchus preferred *(ἐπι)μάρτυροι*: cf. schol. *Il*. ii 302.

275–8. Cf. ii 195–7 (part of the speech by the suitor Eurymachus). This is the least satisfactory part of Mentes' speech, being both irrelevant and confusing. Telemachus has already said that Penelope does not want to marry again (249–50); this is not a casual detail, but an essential part of his dilemma, and it is hard to see why Mentes should be made to overlook it. Mentes offers Penelope no advice applicable to her actual situation, though he might, without any loss of verisimilitude, at least have counselled qualified optimism, or prayer; the absence of any alternative suggestion makes it seem as if he supposes that Penelope really does wish to remarry. Moreover, it would be ridiculous for her father to start negotiating a second marriage before Telemachus returns from the journey which Mentes is about to propose, and thus to set in hand arrangements which might have to be cancelled a few weeks later, with considerable loss of face, if Telemachus heard that Odysseus was still alive; 277–8 are simply a distraction and create confusion in relation to 292. Furthermore, the presence of these lines here diminishes their effectiveness in the mouth of Eurymachus; in particular, what would otherwise strike us as a rather mercenary detail (277 = ii 196) is reduced to a commonplace. This directive for Penelope thus creates several difficulties without any compensating advantages, and there is much to be said for Hermann's view that it is a later interpolation, modelled on the corresponding passage in ii and presumably inserted for the sake of a meretricious comprehensiveness.

It would be hard to find a Homeric parallel for the abrupt change of construction in 275–6 (*μητέρα . . . ἄψ ἴτω*), corresponding to the straightforward *μητέρ' ἑὴν ἐς πατρὸς ἀνωγέτω ἀπονέεσθαι* of Eurymachus' speech, but this anomaly is irrelevant to the question of authenticity; it could easily have been avoided with *μήτηρ* for *μητέρα* or *ἴμεν* (Bentley's cj.) for *ἴτω*.

Although the question of Penelope's remarriage is frequently raised, it is left unclear what roles are to be played by Telemachus, her father Icarius, and Penelope herself in arranging it. Telemachus' words at ii 52 ff. suggest that he regards Icarius as responsible, while Antinous (ii 113–14) seems to contemplate an arrangement involving all three; yet later (iv 769 ff., xxiii 135 ff.) it is assumed that Penelope's marriage would be celebrated in Odysseus' palace, and it is hard to see how Icarius could then be involved. The marriage-settlement of 277–8 raises related, but more complex, problems. Since *οἱ δέ* (277) can only be Penelope's kinsmen, *ἔεδνα* (*ἕδνα*) must be understood (as also at ii 196) as gifts from the bride's family, a dowry; cf. ii 53, where *ἐεδνώσαιτο θύγατρα* is most naturally interpreted as referring to the provision of a dowry. However, in the twelve other places in Homer where the term is used, it denotes presents from a suitor to the bride's kin, as it invariably does in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*; the word is rare outside early epic, and must already have been obsolete in normal usage when the *Odyssey* was composed. Terminologically, then, this passage is anomalous, though there are other Homeric references to what sounds like a dowry (the clearest being ii 132, iv 736, xx 341–2, xxiii 227–8, *Il.* xxii 51) to set against the many references to valuable gifts from a suitor to the bride or her kin (e.g. viii 318, xi 282, xv 16 ff. (Penelope), 367, xvi 391–2 (P.), xix 529 (P.), xxi 161–2 (P.), *Il.* xi 243 ff., xiii 365 ff. (where the suitor undertakes military service instead), xvi 178, 190, xxii 472), and the implications of such heroic names as *Ἠερίβοια* (*Il.* v 389) and *Περίβοια* (*Od.* vii 57) (cf. *παρθένοι ἀλφεσίβοιαι Il.* xviii 593, *h.Ven.* 119). There have been many ingenious attempts to construct a consistent system from what appears to be evidence of two quite different types of marriage-settlement; much, but not everything, might be harmonized by positing the not uncommon practice of indirect dowry, whereby the bridegroom pays over property which will be used to endow the newly established household. But it is most probable that Homeric marriage-customs represent an amalgam of practices from different historical periods and different places, further complicated, perhaps, by misconception: see further A. M. Snodgrass, 'An Historical Homeric Society?', *JHS* xciv (1974), 114 ff. (where references to earlier discussions may be found) and above, p. 59 f. **δυναμένοιο:** on the rather surprising lengthening of the first syllable (cf. xi 414) see Wyatt, *Lengthening*, 120–1.

278. φίλης ἐπὶ παιδὸς ἕπεσθαι: the force of *ἐπί* is not quite clear: possibly indicating purpose, 'towards,', i.e. in order to get; see Chantraine, *Grammaire* ii 107 § 152; or perhaps it should be taken more closely with the verb and *φίλης παιδός* interpreted as a gen. of price. The phrase is a little odd applied to a middle-aged widow.

279–92. Cf. 93–5. This second suggestion does not depend on the result of the first; however the suitors react, Telemachus ought to be concerned to find out what has happened to his father. Significantly, when he goes to bed at the end of the day it is this journey which occupies his thoughts (444), not the more immediate prospect of the assembly.

280. Mentes assumes that Telemachus will have no problem about getting hold of a ship; in fact, without divine assistance it would have been difficult (cf. ii 265–6, 319–20). The relatively carefree manner in which this voyage is proposed and undertaken is inconsistent with the indications later in the poem that it is winter (xiv 457, 529 ff., xvii 25, 191, xix 319). **ἄρσας:** aor. participle of *ἀραρίσκω*, 'equipping, fitting out'. **ἐρέτῃσιν ἐείκοσιν:** a modest size; the Phaeacian ship which brings Odysseus home has a crew of 52 (viii 35) and this was probably the size of the normal 'capital' ship of this period: see J. S. Morrison and R. T. Williams, *Greek Oared Ships* (Cambridge, 1968), 46–7.

282–3. ὄσσαν . . . ἐκ Διός: a rumour of which the origin cannot be traced: cf. S. *OT* 43 *εἴτε του θεῶν | φήμην ἀκούσας εἴτ' ἀπ' ἀνδρὸς οἶσθά που.* **κλέος:** 'report, news', cf. *ἀκλειῶς* in 241.

285. On Zenodotus' reading *κεῖθεν δ' ἐς Κρήτην τε* [*δὲ Κρήτηνδε* Buttmann] *παρ' Ἰδομενῆα ἄνακτα* (cf. 93) see above, introduction pp. 43–4.

286. ὅς: demonstrative. **δεύτατος:** 'last', an illogical but natural meaning for the superlative in view of the use of *δεύτερος* to mean 'later' (e.g. *Il.* x 368, xxii 207). **'Αχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων:** a very common formula in the *Iliad.* The poet and his audience probably understood the epithet as 'armed with bronze', but most likely it originally referred to the use of a metal-plated tunic; see further Lorimer, *Monuments*, 208 ff., D. L. Page, *History and the Homeric* Iliad (Berkeley–Los Angeles, 1959), 245 ff., 284 ff.

287–92. Mentes reviews alternative possibilities, the first happy (and relevant), the second unhappy (and irrelevant). This apparent uncertainty adds verisimilitude, but the instructions given in 293 ff. in fact ignore the second alternative. This section is parenthetical; **ταῦτα** in 293 must refer to Telemachus' journey. Mentes' advice is not as comprehensive as it looks; it does not cover the most likely contingency, that Telemachus might fail to get any definite information about his father's fate.

288. The sense is 'you could endure even for as long as a year'; **τρυχόμενος** refers to the troubles Telemachus would suffer from the suitors. It is not suggested that he should stay away for a year (as some interpreters have supposed).

289. τεθνηῶτος: this was the form adopted by Aristarchus, and is certainly to be preferred to *τεθνειῶτος*, given by most of the medieval MSS. In this and similar cases *-ηώς*, *-ηότ-*, *-ηῶτ-* are original, while *-ειώς*, *-ειότ-*, *-ειῶτ-* could have been produced under the influence of the quantitative metathesis which produced *-εώς*, *-εῶτος*: see further Werner, *H u. ει vor Vokal*, 51–6.

291 ff. χεῦαι, κτερεΐξαι, δοῦναι, φράζεσθαι: infinitives used with imperatival force: see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, ii 316–17 § 460, Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 206–7 § 241.

291. σῆμα: a monument, cenotaph; cf. iv 584. **κτέρεα κτερεΐξαι:** 'honour the dead by performing the proper funeral rites'; whatever the original meaning of these terms they are used in Homer very generally of gifts and honours offered to the dead: see M. Andronikos, *Archaeologia* W, 27, R. Arena, 'Osservazioni su alcune parole greche risalenti ad una comune radice "*κτερ*" ', *RIL* lxxxxviii (1964), 3 ff. This kind of *schema etymologicum* is quite common in Homer, e.g. iii 140 *μῦθον μυθείσθην*, ix 108 *φυτεύουσιν . . . φυτόν*, x 518 *χοὴν χεῖσθαι*.

If Odysseus is dead, Penelope must resign herself to remarriage; Telemachus' own position would thus become highly precarious (cf. ii 332–6, xvi 371 ff., xx 241 ff.), but Mentes wastes no time on this depressing contingency, which we know will not arise.

293 ff. Mentes' instructions now go beyond the programme outlined at 90 ff., and look forward to the second half of the poem. Telemachus' greatest task is still to come when he returns from his journey (293). This section is slightly confusing at first sight because Mentes takes Odysseus' survival for granted and discounts the possibility of his death mentioned in the immediately preceding lines, together with its corollary, Penelope's remarriage; obviously the suitors would leave Telemachus' halls if Penelope had made her choice among them. A listening audience, sharing Athena's knowledge of the true state of affairs, would hardly have been troubled by Mentes' curious confidence on a point which he should still regard as uncertain, but this apparent oddity has led to some raising of eyebrows among analytical critics.

Mentes also takes it for granted that Telemachus will want revenge on the suitors, and that no peaceful settlement will satisfy him; only the means to this end require further deliberation. This assumption might shock us if we were not so familiar with the story, but the fact that the goddess of wisdom herself is the first to advocate this massacre stifles at the outset our qualms about its justification. The appeal to Orestes' example (298 ff.) is significant; the force of this paradigm lies largely in the implication that the suitors are as guilty as Aegisthus. The obvious objection that Telemachus faces more serious opposition than Orestes did stimulates our curiosity about the method to be adopted.

293. ἐπήν: the contraction of *ἐπεὶ ἄν* is thought by many scholars to be post-Homeric; nearly all instances of *ἐπήν* can easily be replaced by *ἐπεί* or *ἐπεί κ(εν)*: see further Chantraine, *Grammaire*, ii 259 § 381, Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 329 § 362. **ταῦτα:** the journey to Pylos and Sparta. **ἕρξῃς:** ancient grammarians recommend a rough breathing for *ἕρδω*, *ἕρξα*, though perhaps this is based merely on the convenience of distinguishing the aor. of *ἕρδω* from that of *ἐέργω*.

295–6. Cf. xi 119–20.

297. νηπιάας ὀχέειν: 'to continue, keep on with, childish ways' surely suits the context better than 'to put up with folly'. The idea that Telemachus has just reached manhood and now for the first time realizes that he must think and act independently is reflected in Penelope's repeated surprise at his behaviour (i 360–1, xviii 217 ff., xxi 354–5); compare his own comments at ii 313, xviii 229, xx 310, xxi 132. **νηπιάας:** cf. *νηπιέῃ* (*Il.* ix 491), *νηπιέῃσι* (xxiv 469, *Il.* xv 363, xx 411). What we should expect as the abstract noun corresponding to *νήπιος* is **νηπιίη* or **νηπῑ́η*; the forms given in our MSS probably represent an artificial re-expansion (diectasis) of **νηπίη*, and have the advantage of avoiding confusion with *νήπιος*. See further Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 83 § 34, Wackernagel, *Untersuchungen*, 67–9, Risch, *Wortbildung*, 33.

298 ff. Cf. 29–31, and n.

299. πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους: for *ἐπί* meaning 'throughout, among' cf. xxiii 124–5 *σὴν γὰρ ἀρίστην | μῆτιν ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους φάσ' ἔμμεναι*, xix 334, xxiv 94, *Il.* x 213. **πατροφονῆα:** 'murderer of his father' (not 'parricide'); 300 provides a much needed explanation. This passage was probably in Aeschylus' mind when he made Orestes address Clytaemestra as *πατροκτονοῦσα* (*Ch.* 909, cf. 974, 1015, 1028); cf. also S. *Tr.* 1125, E. *Or.* 193.

300–2. = iii 198–200. **ὅ . . . ἔκτα:** for this kind of gloss cf. ii 65–6 *περικτίονας . . . οἳ περιναιετάουσι*, iii 383 *ἀδμήτην, ἣν οὔ πω ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἤγαγεν ἀνήρ*, xviii 1–2 *πτωχὸς πανδήμιος, ὃς κατὰ ἄστυ | πτωχεύεσκ' Ἰθάκης*, xx 56–7, *Il.* ii 212–13, v 63, ix 124. *ὅ*, the reading of Aristarchus, is certainly to be preferred to *ὅς* of our MSS, since *ὅς* results in neglect of the digamma of *οἱ*, which is normally respected in early epic: for details see M. L. West on Hes. *Op.* 526. Aristarchus must have had other reasons for adopting this reading, since no ancient scholar was aware of the relevance of the digamma to Homeric language. It is hardly possible to say whether *ὅ* should be regarded as the neut. of the relative pronoun, used, as often, with the sense of a conjunction, 'because', or as the definite article functioning as a relative pronoun; see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, ii 284 § 417. **ἔκτα:** the last syllable is short, cf. xi 410, *Il.* xv 432; on this athematic aor. of *κτείνω* see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 380–1 § 181. **ἔσσ':** *ἔσσο*, imper. of *εἰμί*.

304. Telemachus offers a similar excuse at iv 598. **με:** with *μένοντες*, not with *ἀσχαλόωσι*.

305. ἐμῶν ἐμπάζεο μύθων: an emphatic echo of 271.

307–8. ἦ τοι μέν (better *ἤτοι*, see 155 n.) mark an emphatic asseveration: see Denniston, *Particles*, 389. **ὥς τε πατὴρ ᾧ παιδί:** the simile reminds us of the close relationship between Athena and Odysseus; later Telemachus uses it ironically in conversation with Antinous (xvii 397).

309. ἐπειγόμενός περ ὁδοῖο: 'though eager to be on your way'; the gen. is often so used with verbs expressing the idea of aiming at something: see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, ii 53–4 § 64, Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 144–5 § 151 (c).

310. λοεσσάμενος: bath-water normally has to be heated specially, and often some time elapses before a visitor is offered a bath: cf. iii 464 ff., viii 426 ff. It is no doubt an indication of Menelaus' very high standard of living that his guests can be provided with baths on arrival (iv 48 ff.). **τεταρπόμενος:** reduplicated aor.; see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 395 ff. § 189, Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 39–40 § 36.

311–13. There are many references in Homer to presents given by hosts to their guests: cf. iv 125 ff., 589–619, viii 389 ff., xiii 135 ff., xv 83 ff., xxi 13 ff., xxiv 273 ff., *Il.* vi 218 ff., x 269. This is not represented only as Greek practice: Egyptians, Phoenicians, Lycians, and Phaeacians likewise make lavish gifts to their visitors, and even the Cyclops is aware of the custom (ix 356–65) (though Calypso and Circe appear not to be, unless their generous provision of stores for the next stage of their guests' journeys is supposed to meet this conventional obligation). Such gifts are not of merely sentimental value; precious metal and metalwork are favoured for this purpose, as are elaborately woven textiles; livestock might also be given, at least in theory (iv 589 ff., xv 85). Apart from their intrinsic worth, such presents serve as a material indication of the esteem in which a guest is held and as a reminder of the link with a former host, though (oddly to our minds) there appears to be no objection to giving them away again (iv 617–19). There seems nothing against supposing that the custom existed in the poet's own day among the relatively few Greeks who had the resources to travel: see further J. N. Coldstream, 'Gift Exchange in the Eighth Century BC', in R. Hägg (ed.), *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century BC: Tradition and Innovation* (Stockholm, 1983), 201 ff. On the general importance of gifts in the Homeric world see Finley, *World*, 73 ff. (Pelican ed. 61 ff.) and for a wider sociological perspective M. Mauss, *The Gift* (London, 1954; English translation of *Essai sur le don* (1925)). **κειμήλιον:** something to be stored up. **οἷα:** generalizing pl. in apposition to a sg.; a common Homeric usage. **φίλοι:** *φίλος* in Homer is rarely active in sense, and attributive *φίλος* is normally a reflexive possessive (see above, 60 n.). The epithet seems altogether better suited to the recipient than to the donor, and there is much to recommend Düntzer's *φίλοις* (*Jahrbücher f. class. Philol.* viii (1862), 754). **ξεῖνοι ξείνοισι:** polyptoton expressing reciprocity; cf. iii 272, v 97, vii 120–1, ix 47, x 82, xvii 217, *Il.* ii 363, xiii 130–1, xvi 111, Hes. *Op.* 23 ff. See further Fehling, *Wiederholungsfiguren*, 222 ff.

315 ff. Athena has no more to say to Telemachus for the moment, and any further conversation might lessen the impact of what has preceded.

315. περ: intensive.

317. αὖτις ἀνερχομένῳ: i.e. on the way back from Temesa (184). Similarly, Nestor does not give Telemachus a present when he leaves Pylos because it is taken for granted that he will stay there again on his return from Sparta.

318. σοὶ δ' ἄξιον ἔσται ἀμοιβῆς: apparently 'it will be worth a return to you, it will bring you its full value in the shape of a return', sc. if Telemachus visits Mentes. The act of giving is normally the first half of a reciprocal action; the donor expects a counter-gift in due course, though with parting-gifts of this sort there is clearly an element of risk: cf. xxiv 283 ff. The scholia are surely wrong in interpreting the phrase to mean that Mentes, when he revisits Telemachus, will bring him a present. It is generally made quite clear that it is only the host who makes a gift at leave-taking; at *Il.* vi 218–20, where an exchange of presents is described, it is reasonable to suppose that two separate occasions are involved. Telemachus might be expected to assume, without anything being said on the subject, that, if their positions were reversed, he would receive an adequate counter-gift; Mentes' words are meant for reassurance rather than information. In societies where gift-giving plays as important a part as it does in Homer, the refusal of a gift is an awkward breach of convention, liable to cause grave offence: 'One does not have the right to refuse a gift . . . To do so would show fear of having to repay and of being abased in default . . . Failure to give or receive, like failure to make return gifts, means a loss of dignity' (Mauss, *The Gift*, 39–40). Mentes thus emphasizes that he is not refusing Telemachus' gift, merely postponing it.

320. ὄρνις δ' ὣς ἀνοπαῖα διέπτατο: the scholia show that the meaning and accentuation of *ἀνοπαια* were disputed in antiquity (see also *LfgrE*). Aristarchus thought *ἀνόπαια* was the name of a species of bird; this is clearly a guess, as is the suggestion that *ἀνοπαῖα* is an adverb meaning 'unseen' or 'upwards'. Crates and others saw a reference to the hole in the roof-tiles (*τὴν τετρημένην κεραμίδα*) commonly called *καπνοδόκη*, 'smoke-vent'. This interpretation, which calls for *ἀν' ὀπαῖα*, receives some support from the Attic use of *ὀπαῖον* for a structure on the roof of a temple, probably a kind of lantern (*IG* i^3 476, 112–22 (408/7); cf. Plu. *Per.* xiii 7). The rarity of the term may leave us wondering whether it was a familiar part of the local builder's vocabulary; it is conceivable that a Homeric word (or what was taken to be one) was adopted to dignify an architectural innovation intended for rather grand buildings. But even on the latter hypothesis we should be entitled to infer that Crates' view of the passage was already current in the fifth century, and it is surely the most probable interpretation; various explanations might be offered for its failure to gain general acceptance in antiquity. The poet appears to have deliberately chosen (or perhaps coined) a term less specific than the self-explanatory *καπνοδόκη* (which surely already existed in his day) and we are perhaps guilty of over-translating in rendering *ἀν' ὀπαῖα* 'by the smoke-vent'; but it is difficult to suggest an alternative which would not be at least equally misleading. Any such feature of course precludes an upper storey to the megaron.

On this interpretation it is difficult to avoid the inference that Athena is supposed to be transformed into a bird, not merely, as some have thought, compared to one. Though *διέπτατο* might be used of swift movement other than literal flying (cf. *Il.* xv 83, 172), it is absurd to imagine Mentes suddenly levitating towards the roof and squeezing out through a chink in the tiles; we are surely meant to suppose that he suddenly vanished and Telemachus saw instead a bird flying overhead, like the sparrow whose flight through a nobleman's banqueting-hall seemed to an Anglo-Saxon audience an apt analogue for human existence (Bede, *Hist. eccl.* ii 13). Athena similarly takes her departure from Pylos in the guise of a lammergeyer (iii 371–2: see n.).

320–1. τῷ . . . θάρσος: this was Athena's purpose, cf. 89; the effect of her visit is illustrated in the confrontations which follow.

323. Even the suitors find it a natural supposition that a stranger may be a god (xvii 483 ff.).

325–66. Telemachus asserts himself against his mother.

325–7. Phemius began at 156, and has apparently been singing all the time that Telemachus has been talking with Mentes; his song forms the connecting link with the next episode. In view of the suitors' general rowdiness (cf. 133, 365), their continued silence is to be construed as a remarkable tribute to the power of song and the fascination of Phemius' theme. The *nostoi* of the other Greek heroes form the background to Odysseus' story; their various fates must raise questions about Odysseus and, for Telemachus, Phemius' song reinforces the effect of Athena's visit. The sophisticated way in which the poet treats the various home-comings (iii 130–98, 254–312, iv 351–586) implies that the *nostoi* were a familiar theme; Penelope testifies to its popularity (341–2, cf. x 15). The *Odyssey* is reticent as to the reason for Athena's wrath, though the way in which Nestor and Menelaus allude to it (iii 132 ff., iv 502) shows that the poet knew the story, related in the Cyclic *Iliou Persis* and used by Alcaeus as a political parable (*SLG* S 262 (*LGS* 138)), of the lesser (Locrian) Ajax's attempt to rape Cassandra in Athena's own temple at Troy; the Greek army as a whole incurred the goddess's anger for failing to punish this sacrilege adequately. There is obvious dramatic irony in the fascinated attention with which the suitors listen to the tale of Athena's vengeance, oblivious to the goddess's actual presence; as we recall the disapprobation with which she viewed their conduct, we realize that their apparent security is terribly precarious. Such irony is very characteristic of the poet's treatment of the suitors; see further A. F. Dekker, *Ironie in de Odyssee* (Leiden, 1965), 64 ff.

326. ἤατ': a 'correction' of *εἵατ'*, the form consistently given by our MSS for the simple verb (though they are divided over *καθείατο/-ήατο*). But these 'incorrect' forms are likely to be old, and it may be wrong to alter them; see further Werner, *H u. ει vor Vokal*, 58 ff., Wyatt, *Lengthening*, 147–8.

328 ff. Penelope's appearance before the suitors, the first of four such scenes (cf. xvi 409 ff., xviii 206 ff., xxi 63 ff.), has been judged insufficiently motivated (cf. Wilamowitz, *Heimkehr*, 123–4); but it is hypercritical to ask why, given her aversion to the suitors, she could not retire to a room where she would not hear Phemius' song. It seems to be normal heroic convention for the mistress of the house to join the men as they drink in the *megaron* after supper (thus Helen (iv 121 ff.), Arete (vi 304–5, vii 140 ff.)); Penelope's appearance at this late stage draws attention to her previous absence and reminds us how uncongenial she finds the company. But, more important, her protest (337 ff.) provokes unexpected opposition from Telemachus, a rapid demonstration of the newly won self-confidence resulting from Athena-Mentes' visit.

328. ὑπερωϊόθεν: 'from upstairs', where Penelope spends most of her time, being forced to withdraw from the *megaron* by the suitors' outrageous behaviour (cf. xv 515–17, xvii 569–72, xxiii 302). The poet imagines sound travelling very easily in Odysseus' palace; thus Penelope from her room gains a clear idea of the indignities suffered by Odysseus at the hands of the suitors (xvii 492 ff.) and Odysseus in the *megaron* hears her weeping in her room (xx 92). **θέσπιν**: shortened form of *θεσπέσιος*, used only in this formula.

329. Lines of this pattern, consisting of name, father's name, and an epithet qualifying one or the other, are common: e.g. vi 17 *Ναυσικάα, θυγάτηρ μεγαλήτορος Ἀλκινόοιο*, xv 554 etc. *Τηλέμαχος, φίλος υἱὸς Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο.* They are particularly effective used, as here, when a character is first introduced. **περίφρων**: a standing epithet of Penelope, applied only to women in early epic.

330. κλίμακα: 'staircase' (not 'ladder'); the case is to be understood as a kind of internal acc. expressing the space traversed; cf. iii 71 *πλεῖθ' ὑγρὰ κέλευθα.* **κατεβήσετο**: the forms *ἐβήσετο*, *ἐδύσετο*, so-called 'mixed aorists', are found in several places in some MSS, and were preferred by Aristarchus to the *lectio facilior* given by the majority, *ἐβήσατο*, *ἐδύσατο*. They were regarded by ancient grammarians as imperfects (see schol. on *Il.* i 496) and it seems best to interpret them as past tenses of the desideratives *βήσομαι* and *δύσομαι* which served as futures: see further Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 416–17 § 199, Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 43 § 41, C. P. Roth, 'More Homeric "Mixed Aorists" ', *Glotta* lii (1974), 1 ff.

331–5. = xviii 207–11; 332–5 = xxi 63–6; 332–4 = xvi 414–16. Noble-women are usually attended by maids when they go where they might meet men: cf. iv 123 ff. (Helen), vi 84 (Nausicaa), *Il.* iii 143 (Helen), xxii 450 (Andromache); Penelope herself says (xviii 184) *οἴη δ' οὐκ εἴσειμι μετ' ἀνέρας· αἰδέομαι γάρ*. The masc. counterpart of this formula provides dogs instead (ii 11).

332. **δῖα γυναίκων:** cf. 14 *δῖα θεάων* and n.

333. The formula is used only of women (viii 458 (Nausicaa), xvi 415, xviii 209, xxi 64 (Penelope), cf. *h.Cer.* 186 (Metaneira) *ἧστο παρὰ σταθμὸν κτλ.*). *σταθμός*, as a feature of Homeric houses, usually denotes a door-post (though at xvii 96 it must refer to a bearing-pillar of the megaron) and it is tempting to picture Penelope, who never associates with the suitors more than she must, staying as near the doorway as possible; a similar stance would suit the modest Nausicaa in the presence of her father's guests. But this interpretation requires us to take *τέγος* loosely as 'building', not in its usual meaning 'roof', and does not suit *h.Cer.* 186, since Metaneira would not have chosen to sit at the doorway with her baby. We should probably therefore imagine Penelope standing beside one of the central pillars in her vain attempt to impose her will on the banqueters. See also Hainsworth on viii 458, Hoekstra on xvi 415.

334. **λιπαρὰ κρήδεμνα:** the *κρήδεμνον* is a veil, mantilla, or shawl worn over the head and shoulders: see *Companion*, 501–2, S. Marinatos, *Archaeologia* A, 13, 46, Hoekstra on xiii 388. It is not clear why the pl. is used, since the sg. would scan equally well and is used of the *κρήδεμνον* which Ino gives to Odysseus (v 346 etc.). *λιπαρά* implies treatment with oil: cf. vii 107 (with Hainsworth's n.). That Penelope goes veiled in the presence of the suitors even in her own home is probably to be interpreted as a gesture advertising her aversion to any familiarity and discouraging any notion that they are her guests. See also Russo on xviii 209–10.

335. On the connotations of *κεδνός* see Hoekstra on xiv 170.

336. **δακρύσασα:** Penelope's tears are a visible reminder of her constancy.

337. **γάρ:** anticipatory; this clause gives the reason for what follows, a common arrangement in Homeric speeches. **βροτῶν θελκτήρια:** cf. xi 334, xii 40, 44, xvii 521. **οἶδας:** found only here in Homer for *οἶσθα*, which it started to replace in Ionic fairly early: e.g. Hippon. fr. 177 West, Hdt. iii 72. 1, cf. *h.Merc.* 456, 467; see further F. Solmsen, 'Zur griechischen Verbalflexion', *ZVS* xxxix (NF xix) (1906), 207. Presumably the poet chose this form so that the ending of this line would echo those of 336 and 338; cf. 48–9 and n. Zenodotus read something else, variously reported as *ᾔδεις* or *εἴδεις*, on which the scholia add that Aristarchus had no objection to this reading (*καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος οὐ δυσχεραίνει τῇ γραφῇ*). If Aristarchus took Zenodotus' reading to be the plpf. of *οἶδα*, this is a surprising comment; the normal Homeric forms are *ᾔδησθα* (xix 93) and *ἠείδης* (*Il.* xxii 280), and the sense is relatively feeble. It is worth considering Schwartz's suggestion that what Zenodotus in fact read was *θελκτήρι' ἀείδεις*, which is unobjectionable.

343. **τοίην … κεφαλήν:** the head is in a sense the person; this form of expression in Homer is generally associated with the dead: cf. x 521, 536, xi 29, 49, 549, 557, *Il.* xi 55, xviii 114, xxi 336, xxii 348, xxiii 94, xxiv 276, 579.

344. **καθ' Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἄργος:** cf. iv 726, 816, xv 80 (cf. Hoekstra's n.); the meaning is evidently 'throughout the whole of Greece'. In the *Iliad* *Ἑλλάς* is the name of the city and kingdom of Peleus, and corresponds to southern Thessaly; in this Odyssean formula it is used in a wider sense, of northern Greece in general. Thucydides (i 3. 3) remarks on Homer's restricted use of *Ἑλλάς* and *Ἕλλην*; but Hesiod (*Op.* 653) uses *Ἑλλάς* to mean 'Greece'. See further *LfgrE*. *Ἄργος*, as often, denotes the Peloponnese: contrast iii 251, and see n. *μέσον* is not entirely logical, but reinforces the idea that Odysseus was known in every part of Greece. Aristarchus rejected the line, because he held that the meanings given to *Ἑλλάς* and *Ἄργος* were unhomeric: see schol. on *Il.* iv 171, ix 395.

346 ff. Telemachus' reply embodies the earliest literary criticism in Greek literature; he is surely the poet's spokesman in his plea for artistic freedom and his emphasis on the importance of novelty.

346. **ἐρίηρον:** the epithet is restricted to bards and *ἑταῖροι;* its exact meaning is uncertain, though its derivation from *ἦρα* is generally accepted: see Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire* s.v. *ἐρίηρες*, R. Gusmani, *SMEA* 6 (1968), 17 ff. We may translate 'loyal' or 'ready to render service'.

347–9. Cf. 32–3 and n. **τ':** probably emphatic *τε*, not *τοι*.

349. **ἀλφηστῇσιν:** *ἀλφηστής* is alien to the *Iliad*, though Hesiod uses it. It seems to be modelled on *ὠμηστής*, 'eating raw flesh', and its first element is almost certainly *ἄλφι-*; the etymology 'eater of grain' appears to be indicated in Hes. fr. 211. 12–13, cf. S. *Ph.* 709. 'Grain-eating' men are thus distinguished from gods and savages; cf. *Od.* ix 191, where the Cyclops is contrasted with *ἀνδρί γε σιτοφάγῳ*. See further Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*. In antiquity some evidently connected the first element with *ἀλφαίνω* and understood the cpd. as 'enterprising': see Hsch. *ἀλφησταί· ἄνθρωποι, βασιλεῖς, ἔντιμοι; ἀλφηστῇσι· τοῖς εὑρετικοῖς καὶ συνετοῖς*; cf. A. *Th.* 770.

350. **οὐ νέμεσις:** 'it is no reason for anger that', cf. xx 330, *Il.* iii 156, xiv 80. **Δαναῶν:** *Δαναοί* is not simply a synonym for *Ἀχαιοί* and *Ἀργεῖοι*; it has no corresponding toponym, is used only in the pl., and seems to have military connotations. See further *LfgrE*.

351–2. Cf. Pi. *O.* ix 48–9 *αἴνει δὲ παλαιὸν μὲν οἶνον, ἄνθεα δ' ὕμνων | νεωτέρων.* Since much modern writing on oral epic emphasizes the importance of the familiar and traditional, it is interesting to find the poet stressing the value of novelty. Plato (*R.* 424 b) cites the passage thus: *ὅταν τις λέγῃ ὡς τὴν ἀοιδὴν μᾶλλον ἐπιφρονέουσ' ἄνθρωποι, ἥτις ἀειδόντεσσι νεωτάτη ἀμφιπέληται*; since it may safely be assumed that he was quoting from memory, we should not attach much importance to the apparent variants *ἐπιφρονέουσ'* and *ἀειδόντεσσι*. On Plato's quotations from Homer see G. Lohse, *Helikon* iv (1964), 3–28, v (1965), 248–95, vii (1967), 223–31.

353–5. Penelope cannot reasonably hope to avoid ever hearing of the Trojan war; it was an event of international importance, not merely a personal misfortune.

356–9. Cf. xxi 350–3, *Il.* vi 490–3; for 358–9 cf. also xi 352–3. The lines were absent from some ancient editions and athetized by Aristarchus as being less suitable here than in the other two places where they occur. Modern scholars have often argued that this criticism betrays an inadequate understanding of the function of stock passages in an essentially oral narrative style. Yet the lines raise some awkward questions which are seldom squarely faced. Recalling as they do one of the most memorable scenes of the *Iliad*, Hector's farewell to Andromache, they have for us the effect of a quotation, and their callousness in this context is enhanced by the contrast with their earlier occurrence: there it is war which is said to be the concern of men, a view which no Homeric woman could question, and Hector is attempting to calm Andromache's fears, not telling her to mind her own business. If these lines are authentic here, are we to infer that the poet intended us to recognize an allusion to the *Iliad*, or are we misled by the scantiness of the epic material available to us? Did his original audience see in these lines simply a stock heroic response to women who pester their menfolk?

Certainly the favourable impression created by Telemachus' earlier observations is quite destroyed by this adolescent rudeness, culminating in the outrageous claim that speech (*μῦθος*) is not women's business, quite contrary to Homeric custom as we see it at the courts of Menelaus and Alcinous, where Helen (iv 121 ff.) and Arete (vii 141 ff.) play a full part in the conversation after dinner. Some have praised the psychological realism by which Telemachus is made to go too far in his first attempt to assert his authority; I find this an unconvincing defence, and am inclined to follow Aristarchus in suspecting interpolation intended, perhaps, partly to provide a more explicit reason for Penelope's withdrawal and partly to stress Telemachus' newly acquired self-confidence.

356–8. Spinning and weaving, the domestic arts *par excellence*, are the normal occupation of Homeric women without regard to rank: cf. ii 94, xvii 97 (Penelope), iv 130 ff. (Helen), v 62 (Calypso), vi 306 (Arete), x 222–3 (Circe), *Il.* iii 125 ff. (Helen), xxii 440 ff. (Andromache). Skill in textile production is the gift of Athena, and the results represent an important part of a family's wealth. Apart from provision for utilitarian, day-to-day purposes, a rich household would be expected to have a store of more elaborate fabrics for special occasions (including funerals: cf. ii 94 ff., *Il.* xxiv 580 ff., 795) and for formal presentation to gods (cf. *Il.* vi 89–93 etc.) as well as to men (cf. xv 123 ff., *Il.* xxiv 228 ff.). See further G. Wickert-Micknat, *Archaeologia* R, 13, 38 ff., 43. Some see an allusion to Penelope's unsuccessful ruse with Laertes' shroud (ii 93 ff. = xix 138 ff. = xxiv 128 ff.) **οἶκον**: here used of Penelope's quarters only, not of the whole house; cf. 360, iv 717. The ancient variants attested here (*ἀλλὰ σύ γ' εἰσελθοῦσα*) and at 360 (*θάλαμον δὲ βεβήκει*) show that this use of *οἶκος* was found difficult in antiquity. **τοῦ**: demonstrative.

360–4. = xxi 354–8; 362–4 = xix 602–4; cf. xvi 449–51.

360. Penelope's reaction underlines the change in Telemachus brought about by Athena's visit.

361. **μῦθον πεπνυμένον**: perhaps best understood as referring to Telemachus' assertion of authority.

365–6. The suitors are excited by a rare glimpse of Penelope, and aggrieved that she has disappeared so soon, without deigning to offer them a word; 366 is an oblique, but highly effective, way of indicating her beauty (cf. *Il.* iii 154 ff.). **σκιόεντα**: a fixed epithet of *μέγαρα*, regularly applied also to clouds and mountains; it is probably better taken as 'shady, cool' than as 'shadowy, gloomy, badly lit'. For a detailed discussion of the formula see G. S. Korres, '*Μέγαρα σκιόεντα*', *Athena* lxxvii (1971), 202–30, 394–5.

366. = xviii 213. **ἠρήσαντο**: 'prayed aloud to, expressed a wish to'. **παραί**: with *κλιθῆναι*.

367–420. Telemachus warns the suitors of his intention to make a public protest against their intrusion; Antinous and Eurymachus fail to dissuade him.

370–1. Cf. ix 3–4.

373. Cf. *Il.* ix 309 *χρὴ μὲν δὴ τὸν μῦθον ἀπηλεγέως ἀποειπεῖν*, the opening of Achilles' great speech and the only other place in Homer where *ἀπηλεγέως* occurs.

374–80. Cf. ii 139–45 (identical apart from its opening, *ἔξιτέ μοι*). Athena did not tell Telemachus to give the suitors notice of his intention to make a public protest, but he has nothing to gain by letting it take them by surprise, and it is sensible both to offer them a chance of avoiding a formal denunciation and to forestall the excuse that they had no reason to believe their presence unwelcome to him. The formulation of this passage is to some extent influenced by the way in which the poet plans to handle the narrative in ii, but this does not give rise to any serious difficulties (despite Page, *Odyssey*, 74–5, whose criticisms are well dealt with by Rüter, *Odysseeinterpretationen*, 184 ff., and Besslich, *Schweigen*, 11 ff.).

377. Cf. 160. **νήποινον**: 'without compensation'.

378. **ἐπιβώσομαι**: contracted from *ἐπιβοήσομαι*, cf. *Il.* x 463 (v.l.), xii 337, *βωστρεῖν* (*Od.* xii 124); this contraction of *-οη-* is Ionic, not Attic: see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 35 § 15.

379. **αἴ κέ ποθι Ζεὺς δῷσι**: 'in case Zeus may grant...'; for this type of condition see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, ii 282–3 § 414.

381–2. = xviii 410–11, xx 268–9. **ἐν** should be taken closely with *φύντες*, 'biting their lips hard' (in suppressed anger); on *ὀδάξ* see Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*. **ὅ**: 'because', like Lat. *quod*; see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, ii 285 § 417, Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 242 § 269.

383 ff. Antinous and Eurymachus are the two most prominent suitors (*ἀρχοὶ μνηστήρων* iv 629); the poet tells us nothing about their background here, but confines himself to projecting their personalities: contrast the way in which Eurycleia is introduced (429 ff.). As often, Antinous speaks first. He is consistently presented as the ringleader, and, correspondingly, is the first to fall to Odysseus' arrows (xxii 8 ff.); after his death Eurymachus attempts to cast all the blame on him (xxii 48 ff.). **'Αντίνοος** is best interpreted as 'Contrary-minded, Hostile', and thus belongs to a large group of

Homeric personal names which indicate a character's personality without regard to the considerations by which in real life parents were guided in naming their children; cf. 154 n. (Phemius) and see further von Kamptz, *Personennamen*, 25 ff., 56. Modern novelists follow a similar convention when they give ridiculous names to characters who are not to be taken seriously. (*Ἀντίνοος* is attested as a historical name, but presumably those who chose it either gave no thought to its derivation or took it to be vaguely complimentary, like *Ἀντίκλεια*). Antinous is a fluent and effective speaker; his father's name, which surely means 'Persuasive' rather than 'Compliant', looks like an *ad hoc* invention intended to characterize the son (cf. xxii 330–1 *Φήμιος Τερπιάδης*). Odysseus himself compliments him on his appearance (xvii 415–16, cf. xxi 277 *θεοειδέα*). He alone of the suitors is not positively proved inferior to Odysseus in the test with the bow, since he sees good reason to postpone his attempt (xxi 256 ff.). The glory of Odysseus' ultimate triumph is enhanced by the quality of his chief adversary; the suitors are not merely a flock of arrogant weaklings.

Antinous replies to the tone rather than the content of Telemachus' speech; here and in ii he consistently tries to undermine Telemachus' attempts to assert his authority by refusing to take him seriously.

384–5. In this condescending comment on Telemachus' sudden display of independence we note the irony characteristic of the poet's treatment of the suitors (cf. 325–7 n.). Antinous describes Telemachus as *ὑψαγόρης* elsewhere (ii 85, 303, xvii 406); the word does not otherwise occur in Homer.

386–7. Antinous is alert to political implications in Telemachus' attempt to assert himself. **βασιλῆα**: 'lord' or 'prince', rather than 'king'. In early Greek epic *βασιλεύς* covers a range of meanings from 'monarch' to 'nobleman, prominent person', and in translating we should avoid too specific a term. It becomes clear from Telemachus' reply that what Antinous purports to regard as *πατρώϊον* for Telemachus is some kind of supremacy among the Ithacan nobility, analogous to Alcinous' position in relation to the twelve Phaeacian *βασιλῆες* (viii 390–1, cf. vii 49, with Hainsworth's n.) and symbolized in the omen which greets Telemachus' return to Ithaca (xv 525 ff.), as Theoclymenus realizes (533 ff.): *ὑμετέρου δ' οὐκ ἔστι γένεος βασιλεύτερον ἄλλο | ἐν δήμῳ Ἰθάκης, ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς καρτεροὶ αἰεί*. But the position calls for qualities of leadership which the immature Telemachus cannot claim; even though in a struggle for power his status as Odysseus' son might be exploited with advantage, it could not compensate for his lack of experience and confidence against a rival like Antinous. So long as there is neither a crisis calling for strong unified leadership nor any obviously outstanding candidate among the Ithacan nobility, the power vacuum created by Odysseus' continued absence could remain unfilled for a long time without causing practical problems; but Telemachus' determination to upset the status quo suggests to Antinous that a struggle for supremacy may be imminent.

The meaning of *βασιλεύς* in Homer has been much discussed. A very full

bibliography is given by M. Schmidt in his excellent article in *LfgrE*; see also Hainsworth, introduction to viii (pp. 342–3).

The poet's conception of the governance of Ithaca seems imprecise; traditions about the heroic age and the political conditions presupposed by his formulaic stock may at times have been contaminated by contemporary realities. But Odysseus' *οἶκος* is the focus of his story, and the political implications of the hero's return are hardly regarded.

387. ποιήσειεν: punctuation at this point in the line, after the second trochee, is unusual; see further H. Fränkel, 'Der homerische u. der kallimachische Hexameter', *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*² (Munich, 1960), 107.

390. τοῦτ': *βασιλεύειν*. **Διός γε διδόντος**: on the gen. absol. in Homer see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, ii 324 § 472, Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 213–14 § 246. The breach of Hermann's Bridge (caesura after the trochee of the fourth foot) is slightly mitigated by the word-break between *Διός* and *γε*; see Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 340 § 368.

391. φῇς: 'think', rather than 'say'.

392–3. Cf. *Il.* ix 155, xii 310 ff. **οἱ**: *βασιλῆϊ*, implied in *βασιλευέμεν*. **δῶ**: see 176 n.

394–5. βασιλῆες: nobles; cf. 247. At ii 292–3 we find a similar formula used of ships.

396. τῶν κέν τις τόδ' ἔχῃσιν: 'one of them may surely have this, let one of them have this'; the subjunctive expresses Telemachus' emphatic assent; he is not merely stating what is likely to happen: see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, ii 211 § 311, Monro, *Homeric Dialect*, 252 § 275 (b). The vagueness of *τόδε* is surely deliberate; it is better that we should not enquire too closely what political rights Telemachus would be prepared to resign. **ἐπεὶ θάνε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς**: this ready concurrence with the suitors' assumptions may be thought disingenuous, since Telemachus has just been encouraged to hope that his father may still be alive (196 ff., 267–8, 287–8), but it is understandable that he should not wish to expose himself to the charge of wishful thinking (cf. 413).

397. ἐγών: a few MSS read *ἐγώ*, which respects the initial digamma of *οἴκοιο*.

398. Raiding and piracy are regarded as perfectly honourable, at least if the victims are foreigners: cf. iii 71 ff. (= ix 252 ff.), xiv 246 ff., xxiii 356–7. The possibility of buying slaves is ignored here, though Eurycleia (i 430) and Eumaeus (xv 452–3, 483) were thus acquired. **δμώων**: on the connotations of *δμώς* see G. Ramming, *Die Dienerschaft in der Odyssee* (Erlangen, 1973), 3 ff., 67 ff., 124 ff., 131 ff.

399. Eurymachus similarly speaks after Antinous at ii 177 ff., xxi 320 ff.; the reserve in Telemachus' answer (412 ff.) indicates that his reassurances are to be regarded as insincere (as, even more blatantly, at xvi 435 ff.). Though its elements are perspicuous enough, *Εὐρύμαχος* seems meaningless as a personal name.

400. See above, 267 n.

402. σοῖσιν: most MSS read *οἷσιν*, which should probably be preferred as a rare archaism. *ὅς* (*σϝός*) seems originally to have served as a reflexive possessive for all three persons, but Aristarchus refused to recognize as Homeric its use for the first and second persons, and there was evidently a tendency for other readings to be substituted. See further M. L. West on Hes. *Op.* 381, Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 273–4 § 128, Leaf, *Iliad*, i 559–65.

404. ἀπορραίσει’: Bentley's emendation of *ἀπορραίσει* assimilates the mood to that of *ἔλθοι*. The verb is presumably a cpd. of *ῥαίω*, literally 'strike down from (possession of)'; for the construction with a double acc., regular with *ἀφαιρεῖσθαι* and many verbs of similar meaning, cf. xvi 428, Emp. DK 31 B 128. 10; on the form see further M. L. West on Hes. *Th.* 393, Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire* s.v. *ῥαίω*. **’Ιθάκης ἔτι ναιεταούσης**: 'so long as Ithaca is still inhabited'; for this sense of *ναιετάω* cf. iv 177, ix 23, *Il.* iv 45; on its development see Leumann, *Wörter*, 191–4, G. P. Shipp, *Essays in Mycenaean and Homeric Greek* (Melbourne, 1961), 42 ff. Allen's app. crit. does not mention that all MSS read *ναιεταώσης*, which is contrary to Homeric usage for verbs in *-άω*; where this fem. ptcp. occurs in the *Iliad* (ii 648, iii 387, vi 415) the MSS are regularly divided between *ναιετάωσα*, *ναιετάουσα* (uncontracted), and *ναιετόωσα* (with artificial 'distraction' of the contracted vowel (*diectasis*)); Aristarchus preferred the last: see schol. *Il.* vi 415. On this rather puzzling variation see further Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 79 § 32, Cauer, *Homerkritik*, 108, Shipp, *Studies*, 34–5.

405. ξείνοιο ἐρέσθαι: see above, 135 n. The infin. *ἐρέσθαι* is otherwise found in Homer only in the Odyssean formula *μεταλλῆσαι καὶ ἐρέσθαι* (iii 69, 243 etc.); it must be an aor., and therefore accented paroxytone, though our MSS agree with Herodian (on *Il.* xvi 47) in accenting it proparoxytone, as if it were a pres.; see further Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 394 § 188.

406. ὁππόθεν, ποίης: as at 170–2, direct and indirect interrogatives are combined. **εὔχεται**: see above, 172 n.

407. πατρὶς ἄρουρα: perhaps more specific than the preceding *γαίης*, 'his ancestral fields' rather than 'his fatherland'.

408. The sudden change in Telemachus' manner suggests this explanation. **ἀγγελίην πατρὸς … ἐρχομένοιο**: 'a message from your returning father' (cf. *Il.* xv 174) or 'news of your father's return'? Cf. ii 30.

409. ἑὸν αὐτοῦ χρεῖος: 'his own business', cf. ii 45. *χρεῖος* was the orthography preferred by Aristophanes and is given in almost all MSS; but *χρῆος* would be more correct; see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 70 § 28. *χρεῖος* in Homer commonly has the sense of 'debt' (e.g. iii 367, xxi 17), but if we so take it here, the specific *ἑὸν αὐτοῦ* becomes practically meaningless; moreover, the arrival of a creditor would not naturally suggest itself as an explanation for Telemachus' newly acquired confidence. For *ἔλδομαι* with acc. cf. xxiii 6, *Il.* v 481. **τόδ’ ἱκάνει**: 'comes this way', a common phrase, cf. x 75, xvii 444, 524.

410. οἷον … οἴχεται: cf. 320.

411. γνώμεναι: 'for one to know him, for us to know him'; for the omission of the subject of the infin. cf. iv 196, xi 158–9. **οὐ μὲν γὰρ κτλ**: there is a slight ellipse of a type not uncommon with explanatory *γάρ* (see Denniston, *Particles*, 61); this clause supplies the reason for Eurymachus' question: the visitor looked distinguished, and his activities are likely to be of interest (as those of a peasant would not be).

413. Cf. 396.

414. Eumaeus speaks of earlier, misleading, reports about Odysseus (xiv 122 ff., cf. 374 ff.). **πείθομαι**: for the sense 'believe, trust in' cf. *Il.* xii 238; cf. *Od.* xvi 192 *οὐ γάρ πω ἐπείθετο ὃν πατέρ’ εἶναι*; its normal Homeric meaning is 'obey'. **ἔλθοι**: sc. *ἀγγελίη*.

415–16. Cf. ii 201, *Il.* xvi 50 f. Eurymachus did not mention prophecy; this gratuitous denial underlines Telemachus' (disingenuous) claim that he will not believe any such report, whatever its origins.

417. οὗτος is the subject, *ξεῖνος ἐμὸς πατρώϊος ἐκ Τάφου* predicate.

418–19. Cf. 180–1.

420. Cf. 323; the contrast between Telemachus' words and thoughts implies that he is learning wiliness. **ἀθανάτην**: cpd. adjs. in Homer are often of three terminations; but the fem. is illogical here, since if Telemachus had not identified his divine visitant as Athena, there would be no reason for him to think specifically of a female divinity.

421–3. = xviii 304–6. The suitors have not taken very seriously Telemachus' statement that they are unwelcome. **τρεψάμενοι τέρποντο**: the assonance is surely intentional; see above, 48–9 n.

424–44. The suitors go home; Telemachus, attended by the old nurse Eurycleia, goes to bed.

424. Cf. iii 396, vii 229, xiii 17, *Il.* i 606. **κακκείοντες**: i.e. *κατακείοντες*; on *κατακείω*, an alternative form, perhaps desiderative, of *κατάκειμαι*, see Chantraine, *Grammaire*, i 453 § 215. The scholia quote an alternative version of the line, read by Aristophanes (though hardly, as is alleged, his own invention), and add that both were given in the Argive edition (on which see above, introduction pp. 44–5): *ἔνιοι ‘δὴ τότε κοιμήσαντο καὶ ὕπνου δῶρον ἕλοντο’* [= xix 427], *μεταποιηθῆναι δέ φασιν ὑπὸ Ἀριστοφάνους τὸν στίχον· ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἀργολικῇ προστέθειται.* This variant was evidently intended to avoid a problem about sleeping-arrangements for those suitors who were not within easy reach of home: cf. schol. ii 397.

425. ὅθι οἱ θάλαμος … αὐλῆς: 'where his bedroom was built in the fine courtyard'; it is probably better to take *αὐλῆς* as a local genitive than as partitive after *ὅθι*. Compare the extra bedrooms built for Priam's children (*Il.* vi 243 ff.).

426. Cf. xiv 6 (of Eumaeus' hut). **ὑψηλός**: 'lofty', its usual architectural meaning, not 'on high'; there is no suggestion that this is an upstairs room. **περισκέπτῳ**: interpreted by ancient scholars as 'conspicuous' or 'commanding a view all round', from *σκέπτομαι*; of these two suggestions the first is probably preferable, and certainly we should not infer from the epithet that Telemachus' room is supposed to be free-standing, an unnecessarily extravagant form of construction. But the formula *περισκέπτῳ ἐνὶ χώρῳ* is also used of Circe's palace (x 211), in the depths of a wood, where this interpretation is inappropriate; hence we should perhaps follow Döderlein's suggestion that *περίσκεπτος* is connected with *σκέπας*, and means 'protected on all sides'; even if this is not the correct etymology, the poet may well have understood the epithet in this sense. See further Hoekstra on xiv 6, Frisk, *GEW* s.v. *σκέπας*, Chantraine, *Dictionnaire* s.v. *σκέπτομαι*.

427. μερμηρίζων: the connotations of *μερμηρίζω* are well explored by C. Voigt, *Überlegung u. Entscheidung* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1972), 11 ff.

428 ff. This detailed description of Telemachus going to bed reminds us that, in the eyes of those around him, he is still a child; but its main purpose is to introduce Eurycleia, formerly Odysseus' nurse (xix 354–5), and destined to play an important role later. She is closely involved in the action from the start; she helps Telemachus to prepare secretly for his journey (ii 345 ff.) and consoles Penelope when she hears of his departure (iv 742 ff.). Eurycleia and the swineherd Eumaeus receive far more attention than any slave in the *Iliad*, but, significantly, both are of noble origins (429, xv 403 ff.).

428. δαΐδας: on the various types of torch used in antiquity see *RE* vi 1945 ff. (Mau). The fact that Telemachus is lighted to his bedroom does not mean that he had to go out into the courtyard to get to it; a corridor would need illumination. **κεδνὰ ἰδυῖα:** so Bentley, whom most editors follow; our MSS read *κέδν' εἰδυῖα*. *ἰδυῖα*, the old type of fem. ptcp. showing the zero-grade *ϝῐδ* and with digamma effective, is certainly the original form in this and similar formulae, but our MSS of Homer and Hesiod regularly give the e-grade form *εἰδυῖα*; in only one place (*Il.* ix 270) is there a variant, *ἔργα ἰδυίας*, while *εἰδυῖα* is guaranteed by metre at *Il.* xvii 5 (cf. Hes. *Th.* 887). *ἰδυῖα* may thus already have given way to *εἰδυῖα* when the *Odyssey* was composed. See further Hoekstra on xiii 417, M. L. West on Hes. *Th.* 264, *Op.* p. 62. *οἶδα* is used here, as often, of what we should regard as moral rather than intellectual qualities; on this usage see further H. Fränkel, *Dichtung u. Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*² (Munich, 1962), 91 (= *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy* (Oxford, 1975), 82).

429. Eurycleia's father and grandfather are named to show that she is of good family; the poet of the *Odyssey* is sparing with patronymics (see above, 30 n.), and the archaistic hybrid *Πεισηνορίδαο* is markedly honorific. We are presumably meant to suppose that like Eumaeus (xv 403 ff.) and Eumaeus' Sidonian nursemaid (xv 427 ff.) Eurycleia was kidnapped by pirates. Her father's name is not otherwise attested, and its derivation is mysterious; this is most unusual in the case of a character of no importance whom we should suppose to be the poet's own invention; see further H. Mühlestein, *SMEA* ix (1969), 80–1.

430. Cf. xv 483 (of Eumaeus).

431. ἐεικοσάβοια: evidently a high price: at *Il.* xxiii 705 a skilled woman slave is valued at 4 oxen. For comparison, a set of golden armour and a male prisoner are each worth 100 oxen (*Il.* vi 236, xxi 79), a tripod 12 oxen (*Il.* xxiii 703), a set of bronze armour 9 oxen (*Il.* vi 236), and a cauldron one ox (*Il.* xxiii 885); at xxii 57 Eurymachus suggests that the suitors should each pay Odysseus by way of compensation *τιμήν … ἐεικοσάβοιον*. The same use of cattle as a standard of value is reflected in names like *Ἀλφεσίβοια, Ἐρίβοια, Πολύβοια*, though these envisage marriage-prospects (cf. 275–8 n.) rather than trade.

433. Contrast the behaviour of Amyntor (*Il.* ix 449 ff.) and Agamemnon's callous threat (*Il.* i 31).

434. The virtual repetition of 428 marks the end of the digression and the return to the main narrative (cf. 265), a common feature of Homeric style and of archaic Greek literature in general. For a detailed study of the phenomenon see W. A. A. van Otterlo, *Untersuchungen über Begriff, Anwendung u. Entstehung der griechischen Ringkomposition* (Mededeelingen der Nederlandsche Akad. van wetenschappen, NR vii, 1944). **οἱ, ἑ:** Telemachus, who is the subject also of *ὤϊξεν* in 436.

437. χιτῶνα: clearly rather short if Telemachus could take it off while sitting on his bed (cf. *Il.* ii 42); contrast the long male chiton implied at *Il.* v 733 ff., viii 384 ff. See further S. Marinatos, *Archaeologia* A, 7–9, 38–41.

439. ἀσκήσασα: a strange use of *ἀσκέω*, which in Homer is normally used of skilful craftsmanship exercised in making or ornamenting something; here the meaning is more like 'treat with care, look after'; compare the use of *κομίζω* with a cloak as object, *Il.* ii 183. See further *LfgrE*.

440. τρητοῖσι: 'pierced', cf. xxiii 198; a plausible explanation of the epithet is suggested in the *Etymologicum Magnum*: *τρητὸν λέχος· παρὰ τὸ τετρῆσθαι κατὰ τὰ ἐνήλατα, εἰς ἃ ἐμβάλλεται ἡ σπάρτος*, i.e. the bedframe is pierced so that a network of cords can be fastened to it, on which the mattress is supported. See further S. Laser, *Archaeologia* P, 30 ff.

442. ἐπὶ … ἱμάντι: 'she drew the bolt home by its strap'. *κληΐς* in Homer is more commonly 'bolt' than 'key'. The bolt is on the inside of the door; the strap, which makes it possible to fasten or unfasten the door from outside, passes through a hole in the door (cf. iv 802).

443. οἰὸς ἀώτῳ: the etymology of *ἄωτος* is uncertain, and discussion of its meaning in Homer has often been confused (as in LSJ) by Pindar's frequent use of *ἄωτος* to denote 'the best, the quintessence' of its kind. In Homeric contexts *ἄωτος* is used without qualitative overtones, of wool, whether on the sheep (ix 434) or made up (as at *Il.* xiii 599, 716), and of linen used for bedding (*Il.* ix 661); it is probably to be understood as 'flock, fibres': so *LfgrE*, but see also R. A. Ramin, *Glotta* liii (1975), 195 ff. We should not expect Telemachus to use an untreated fleece as bedding, and *οἰὸς ἀώτῳ* presumably means a blanket (generally *χλαῖνα* in Homer).