

CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

HOMER

ODYSSEY

BOOKS XVII AND XVIII

EDITED BY DEBORAH STEINER

CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

GENERAL EDITORS

P. E. EASTERLING

Regius Professor Emeritus of Greek, University of Cambridge

PHILIP HARDIE

Senior Research Fellow, Trinity College, Cambridge

RICHARD HUNTER

Regius Professor of Greek, University of Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

Kennedy Professor Emeritus of Latin, University of Cambridge

S. P. OAKLEY

Kennedy Professor of Latin, University of Cambridge

HOMER
ODYSSEY

BOOKS XVII–XVIII

EDITED BY
DEBORAH STEINER

*Professor of Classics
Columbia University*



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,
São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521677110

© Cambridge University Press 2010

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2010

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
Homer.

[Odyssey. Book 17–18]

Odyssey. Books XVII–XVIII / Homer ; edited by Deborah Steiner.

p. cm. – (Cambridge Greek and Latin classics)

Text in Greek; editorial matter in English.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-521-85983-7 – ISBN 978-0-521-67711-0 (pbk.)

1. Odysseus (Greek mythology) – Poetry. I. Steiner, Deborah, 1960– II. Title. III. Series.

PA4022.P17 2010

883'.01 – dc22 2010012363

ISBN 978 0 521 85983 7 Hardback
ISBN 978 0 521 67711 0 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to
in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such
websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

For my father

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	<i>page ix</i>
Introduction	1
1 <i>Homer and his poetic medium</i>	1
2 <i>Books 17 and 18 within the Odyssey</i>	13
3 <i>Transmission</i>	31
4 <i>The text</i>	34
5 <i>Homeric metre</i>	37
Abbreviations in the apparatus criticus	44
ΟΜΗΡΟΥ ΟΔΥΣΣΕΙΑΣ Ρ	45
ΟΜΗΡΟΥ ΟΔΥΣΣΕΙΑΣ Σ	62
Commentary	74
<i>Bibliography</i>	220
<i>Indexes</i>	
1 <i>Subjects</i>	235
2 <i>Greek words</i>	241

PREFACE

Homer's *Odyssey* tells a familiar story: a hero, a veteran of the Trojan War, returns home after ten trial-filled years of wandering in exotic lands only to find his halls occupied by 108 carousing youths who court his wife in the hope that the lawful husband and master has perished abroad. And yet for all the simplicity of its tale, the poet's technique is brilliantly intricate; from the notorious tease of the opening line which hides the epic hero's name, to the sudden threat of retaliation from the dead suitors' kin in the closing episode, the composition uses flashbacks and internal narratives, dramatic irony, doubling, and retardation devices to keep us wondering how exactly affairs in Ithaca will be resolved. It is a work that, not surprisingly, has exercised a lasting fascination from archaic through to contemporary times, and that has been re-imagined in countless forms, visual, verbal and musical among them.

If another study of the *Odyssey* needs no justification, then the choice to focus on books 17 and 18 may prompt the question 'why these?' One reason is the sheer diversity and tonal range of the two books' contents, which run from the burlesque comedy of the boxing match between the disguised Odysseus and the parasite Irus to the charged moment when the hero re-enters his home after his twenty years' absence and first sets eyes on his wife. The pathos of the death of the tick-infested Argus, who has kept vigil for his master ever since his departure, is unmistakable, its poignancy sharpened by the entirely different episode preceding it, where Odysseus meets the churlish cowherd Melanthius and is treated to language and threats normally excluded from the epic register. Books 17 and 18 also offer the first full exploration of the contrary impulses and motives that will inform Penelope's future conduct, articulate the theodicy that in part shapes the hero's revenge, and offer virtuosic displays of Odysseus' capacity for role-playing, mendacity and verbal irony at the expense of his interlocutors.

Previous work on the *Odyssey*, particularly in this series, also helped determine my selection of these two books. A previous edition by R. B. Rutherford treats books 19 and 20, while A. F. Garvie's edition covers books 6–8. As will be clear, I owe many debts, frequently unacknowledged for the sake of economy, to the work of my predecessors. Following the lead of Rutherford, Garvie and C. W. Macleod in his edition of *Iliad* 24, also in this series, I emphasize the 'literary' or stylistic and structural over the more strictly technical aspects of the poem, aiming to illuminate Homer's compositional procedures and to show how artfully the poet constructs individual phrases, lines, and passages through the purposeful deployment of formulas, similes, modes of address, apostrophe and other rhetorical devices. Assuming that Homer has in mind a unified and overarching poetic design, I draw attention to how one scene echoes or anticipates another and how the poet develops themes and motifs sounded at other points in the tale. The commentary also incorporates some of the chief critical approaches developed over the last two decades: it signals the variety of narratological devices that shape the action, the poet's use of narrative indeterminacy, and his glances to other competing versions of his hero's adventures so as to enrich and promote his

novel account of events; the notes also explore the poem's ideological orientation and the social, political and religious context that it assumes, observe ways in which the *Odyssey* revisits and even revises Iliadic material, and suggest that at various points the poet foregrounds and comments on his own art and modes of composition. As a way of indicating the degree to which the poem has influenced subsequent texts, I have also included some of what I see as among the most significant echoes in later Greek and Roman authors. In keeping with previous editors, I have reserved for the Introduction discussion of more general issues of oral composition and poetics, and the still outstanding questions concerning the nature of the occasion and the makeup of the audience before whom the poem would have been performed. Here too I place books 17 and 18 within the context of the larger *Odyssey*, also signalling their major themes and particular contribution to the poem as a whole, and briefly discuss Homeric metre and the transmission of the text. The Introduction does not include an overview of Homeric grammar (the editions of both Rutherford and W. B. Stanford offer helpful sections on that), but the body of the commentary should supply the necessary help. Throughout I have tried to keep in mind the double aim of providing the lexical, grammatical and syntactical assistance that students may require and of trying to show the richness and complexity of the poet's compositional techniques.

I am happy to acknowledge my many debts to other previous commentaries on the poem. I have drawn repeatedly on the discussion of books 17 and 18 by J. Russo in vol. III of the three-volume Oxford Commentary, a work which covers the entire *Odyssey* (first published in a six-volume format in Italian), as well as on the contributions by other scholars in that edition. These frequently go more deeply into the textual, lexical and archaeological questions treated briefly here, and offer much information of a more technical kind. Also indispensable is the older but still very valuable two-volume edition of the poem by W. B. Stanford. Again, to save space, I have often incorporated material from these works without acknowledgment.

It is a pleasure, finally, to thank my many teachers, colleagues, students and friends who have guided this project to completion. This commentary simply could not have come about without the patient and painstaking assistance of the two editors of the series, Richard Hunter and Pat Easterling. Not only did they read far too many versions, correct countless mistakes, alert me to repetitions and superfluities, but they tactfully but firmly kept reminding me of the larger purposes of a commentary in this series, that it should, in concise fashion, both help and engage its readers. Mark Griffith kindly read a very early draft, showing me just how to go about the project, and Marco Fantuzzi heroically commented on a completed version of the whole, catching numerous errors along the way. Helene Foley continued in her long-standing role as guide by giving help on the Introduction, Suzanne Said was a touchstone for all matters bibliographic, and Tobias Meyer acted as 'guinea pig' for one of the introductory sections. Other colleagues at Columbia have provided assistance and encouragement of many different kinds, and I am also grateful to the many students there who have read the poem with me over the years. Thanks too to Eleanor Dickey

and Joshua Katz on whose linguistic expertise I have drawn. Other debts are of a more personal kind: to my husband, Andrew Feldherr, thanks for everything over these years and more, and not least for revising the adage ‘get a life’ when I was at a moment of scholarly *aponia*, and suggesting that I ‘get a commentary’, which I did. To my two children, Rebecca and Miriam, the first of whom loves hearing stories from the poem, the second of whom understands why the Argus scene would first have turned me into a juvenile Hellenist. And to my father, to whom this commentary is dedicated, who treated me to his own version of the *Odyssey* when I was a child, and whose bookshelves are filled with multiple translations and re-tellings of this endlessly fascinating tale.

INTRODUCTION

1. HOMER AND HIS POETIC MEDIUM¹

(a) *The Iliad and Odyssey*

According to ancient tradition, a poetic genius by the name of Homer from somewhere in the region of Ionia, and blind by many accounts, composed both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Some sources assign his activity to the period of the fall of Troy (dated in antiquity to the twelfth century), others to some 500 years afterwards. The poet was credited with a variety of compositions, and Herodotus is the first extant author to mention either the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* by name. Modern scholars have variously rejected, altered and refined these heterogeneous ancient views. There is now reasonable consensus that the two poems are the products of a tradition of oral hexameter poetry developed over the course of the Dark Ages and reaching back to Mycenaean times. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as we have them were composed in the period of the eighth to the early seventh century, quite plausibly in Smyrna or Chios, where the ancient biographical tradition records the poet's presence. 'Homer' himself and his authorship of two epic poems may be nothing more than a fiction that originated some time after the works' composition. According to one modern reconstruction, the corporation of rhapsodes from Chios, the Homeridae whose role it was to perform the Homeric epics and who are first visible in the second half of the sixth century, would retrospectively have created 'Homer' as putative ancestor to their 'guild'.²

Where ancient and modern views coincide is in recognizing pronounced differences between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in their subject matter and sensibility. While the two poems, both monumental in scale (the *Iliad* runs to 15,689 lines, the *Odyssey* to 12,110), focus on the period of the Trojan War and its immediate aftermath, revolve around a single hero whose exploits and emotional affinities they describe, present their protagonist enacting a bloody revenge against those who have done him and his φίλοι wrong, and foreground contention between members of the elite, the *Odyssey* incorporates material not just from the heroic sagas also basic to the *Iliad*, but from folk-tales and mariners' stories.³ Sharply divergent goals motivate each poem's hero (κλέος for Achilles, νόστος for Odysseus), and where the *Iliad* rarely looks beyond the battlefield and war camp, the *Odyssey* moves between exotic lands and the domestic sphere (see section 2). These differences are variously explained. In Ps.-Longinus' much quoted view (*On the Sublime*, 9.12–13), Homer composed the *Iliad* 'in his prime', while the *Odyssey* is the poem of his old age. Other ancient scholars assumed two poets, and many modern readers adopt their view. However we imagine a solution

¹ In parts 1 and 2 of the Introduction, I have deliberately limited citations of the secondary literature from which many of my points are drawn.

² West 1999.

³ For these see Page 1973, Crane 1988, Hölscher 1988.

to the authorship puzzle (for purposes of convenience, I assign both works to a single individual called 'Homer'), one point remains undisputed: as philologists, archaeologists and historians have shown, the *Odyssey* we possess postdates the *Iliad*. This can be demonstrated on both 'objective' and internal grounds. The *Odyssey* uses language and syntax that belong to a later linguistic stratum than those of the *Iliad* (see p. 5) and its broader geographical scope and western orientation reflect historically more recent colonizing ventures and trading networks; indicative too is the prominence of Egypt in the *Odyssey*, perhaps a reflection of increased contacts between the Greeks and Egyptians during the reign of the late seventh-century pharaoh Psammetichus I.

'Posterity' is further visible in the *Odyssey's* internal chronology and design. The poem emphatically presents itself as 'an epilogue' (as Ps.-Longinus termed it) to the earlier work insofar as it describes the heroes of the Trojan War returning home, avoids repeating material covered in the existing poem, and supplements that composition with episodes absent from but important to its story (e.g. the tale of the Trojan Horse, the funeral of Achilles). It will be an assumption of this commentary that the complementary relations between the poems reflect more than their participation in a common poetic tradition: although the point cannot be proved, it is highly probable that the author of the *Odyssey* was thoroughly acquainted with a version of the *Iliad* and that his poem is conditioned by and a response to the traditional tale as presented in that work. While the poet borrows from what might have been recognized as the *Iliad's* most successful innovations, apparent too in the *Odyssey* is the agonistic impulse shaping early song composition and performance (acknowledged at *Il.* 2.594–600, and on display in the competing narratives of Helen and Menelaus in *Od.* 4). Books 17 and 18 include several passages illustrating how the later poem challenges Iliadic values, revises its version of events and demotes some of its episodes to a lower social plane.⁴ In his exchange with Eumaeus at 17.286–9, Odysseus, in his beggar's disguise, applies to the stomach and its impetuous demands language that the *Iliad's* proem (likely to be one of the best known parts of that work) used to describe Achilles' heroic wrath, while the tussle between the parasite Irus and Odysseus in book 18 offers a burlesque reworking of the boxing match at the funeral games of Patroclus in *Iliad* 23, substituting, among other innovations, a blood sausage for the high-status horse and goblet that were the prizes on that more elevated occasion.

The *Odyssey* should be viewed in relation not only to the *Iliad*, but also to the larger tradition of heroic poetry to which both belong; while other epic compositions earlier than or contemporary with Homer's are lost to us, audiences in later archaic, classical and Hellenistic times were familiar with a more expansive body of epic poems relating other parts of the Trojan saga and its heroes' adventures prior to and following the war. The poems of the so-called Epic Cycle, which postdate the Homeric compositions, but include themes and subjects narrated in earlier epics, preserve some of these incidents

⁴ For the close and sometimes polemical relations between the songs, see particularly Nagy 1979: 15–58, Pucci 1982, Pucci 1987.

and Homer can presume his audience's knowledge of the events and characters given fuller treatment elsewhere (see, for example, the passing reference to Jason's voyage on the Argo at *Od.* 12.69–70 and the mention of Heracles' dealings with Iphitus at 21.22–33; the *Odyssey* also alludes to matter included in the *Iliou Persis*, *Parva Iliad* and *Memnonis*).⁵ Set within this broader repertoire, Homer appears less the singular genius of the ancient picture than a master practitioner who deploys an existing poetic medium with particular brilliance and capacity for innovation and whose superiority over rival composers the early sources already recognized (see Aristotle, *Poetics* ch. 23).

(b) *Oral composition, the Künstsprache and formulas*

Current understanding of the medium in which Homer composed still depends to a large degree on the work of Milman Parry who, in a series of publications from the 1920s on, profoundly reshaped earlier Homeric scholarship.⁶ Before Parry, readers had chiefly focused on the inconsistencies and redundancies apparent in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (e.g. Penelope's coquettish self-display to the suitors in book 18, so strikingly at odds with her fidelity to her husband up to that point, or Theoclymenus' 'revised' version of his prophecy at 17.160–11). Where the so-called Analysts posited the existence of many independent, shorter songs or 'lays' composed by various poets of different dates, who would have altered and corrected their predecessors' accounts, and whose works were then cobbled together by a less than skilled final 'redactor', the 'Unitarians' countered with a single poet of consummate artistry whose occasional slips could be argued away.⁷ Parry's fundamental contribution was to identify the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as products of an oral tradition of hexameter poetry, a technique of composition developed and refined over hundreds of years by illiterate bards who preserved and transmitted their common heritage. This heritage consists of a repertoire of story patterns and motifs (e.g. the return of the hero, disguise and recognition), themes or 'type-scenes' (recurring units of action, such as a sacrifice, feasting, the departure of a ship, and descriptions of phenomena and objects),⁸ and formulaic phrases (see p. 6). In Parry's view, this traditional phraseology and narrative stock had been devised for a very specific purpose. Thus equipped, and schooled through listening to other bards performing the extant repertoire, the oral poet could compose *ex tempore*, fashioning an original song each time he performed by using pre-existing elements, which he would expand, curtail, reorder and modify at will and in accordance with audience expectations and demands. Parry's insights, reinforced by

⁵ See West 2003a: 13. As West notes, by the end of the seventh century, the Lesbian poets knew not only the *Iliad*, but also the *Cypria*, *Iliou Persis*, *Nostoi*, or poems including much of the same material.

⁶ His writings are conveniently collected in Parry 1971. See too Lord 1960 and 1991.

⁷ For an overview of this older debate, see Turner 1997.

⁸ According to Lord 1951: 73, 'the theme can be identified as a recurrent element of narration or description in traditional oral poetry. It is not restricted, as is the formula, by metrical considerations; hence it should not be limited to exact word-for-word repetition.'

his visits to the former Yugoslavia in 1933–5 where, together with his assistant Albert Lord, he recorded examples of heroic poetry still performed by the *guslars* (traditional singers/poets) of the region, undercut the very axioms of Analytic and Unitarian criticism. Since an oral poet sings a new version of his song on every occasion, the notion of a primary, ‘original’ or fixed text that could deliberately be emended and changed was meaningless; nor could a mode of composition conditioned and determined by the traditional repertoire accommodate the lone creative genius of the Unitarian description.

In Parry’s account, two chief elements establish the oral nature of Homeric poetry and the poet’s participation in an extended tradition of heroic verse composition. The first is the linguistic medium. No Greek ever spoke the language that Homer and his characters use. Instead, the poet composed in an artificial idiom, the so-called *Kunstsprache*, an amalgam that reflects the different developmental stages through which the oral tradition had passed from the late Bronze Age until around 700 bc.⁹ This language, purely a sung medium, satisfies the poet’s needs on several counts; first, it is expressly designed to suit the metrical requirements of the hexameter line (see section 5); second, because it does not correspond to the language spoken in any particular region of Greece, it allowed the poems more easily to claim panhellenic status; and third, as Parry emphasized, the very artificiality and archaic-sounding quality of the diction distinguishes the heroic milieu from the everyday world, giving it the requisite remoteness and elevation.

A principal indicator of the artificial nature of Homeric diction is its regionally heterogeneous makeup. Epic language includes words and forms drawn from different dialects, chiefly Ionic and Aeolic as spoken in two neighbouring areas in the Eastern Aegean, but with contributions from the Arcadian and Cypriot dialects; among the terms found uniquely in these last two regions, and retained in the Homeric poems, are αἶσα, φάσαγον, ἦμαρ, αὐτάρ and ἴδε. The predominance of Ionic forms (η has replaced ᾱ in virtually every line) suggests that Homer, having inherited an oral tradition that had already passed through an Aeolic phase, was composing in an Ionic milieu. The poet may select the Aeolic forms of the first person plural pronouns ἔμμεσ and ὕμμεσ or, under different metrical conditions, prefer the Ionic ἡμεῖσ and ὑμεῖσ. Infinitives ending in –εῖν and –ναι are Ionic, those in –μεν and –μεναι are Aeolic; πρὸσ, the Ionic form, can be replaced by Aeolic προτί, and πτόλισ (originally a Mycenaean formation) can take the place of Ionic πόλισ when the poet needs a lengthened vowel at the end of the preceding word. The two dialects may be combined within a single formula (in Πηληιάδεω Ἀχιλλῆος at *Il.* 1.1 the quantitative metathesis typical of Ionic formations appears only in the first of the two terms), or even within a single word (as when the Aeolic dative plural ending –εσσι is attached to the Ionic stem in νῆεσσι at 17.429).

⁹ The fullest description of Homer’s language and grammar remains Chantraine, *GH*; for more succinct and recent accounts, see Palmer 1962: 75–178, Janko 1982, Janko 1992: 8–19, Horrocks 1997.

The presence of forms from different chronological stages of the language's evolution, with archaisms and neologisms standing side by side, also points to Homer's use of a traditional diction developed over the course of many generations (and not to the existence of 'earlier' or 'later' strata of his poems). The decipherment of the Linear B tablets showed that epic preserved expressions already current in Mycenaean times (just as archaeological evidence proved that artifacts such as Ajax's tower shield hark back to weaponry already outdated by the end of the fourteenth century) and the stately phrase *ἱερὸν μένος* used for Antinous and Alcinous may have originated in the formal diction of the Mycenaean court (see 18.34n). This particular formula, like several others (*κλέος ἄφθιτον* most famously), may be of still greater antiquity; Vedic cognates for the expressions point to their emergence from a common Indo-European poetic heritage. Several innovations in morphology and syntax appear without displacing the older forms. The early genitive termination *-ιο* exists alongside the later *-ου* (e.g. *κλαυθμοῦ . . . στυγεροῖο γόοιο*, 17.8); some imperfects are used without the augment, while others, following subsequent linguistic developments, are augmented, and the poet enjoys a similar freedom with respect to *v*-mobile.¹⁰ One feature of Homeric diction, its use or neglect of the letter digamma (Ϝ, pronounced *w*), further indicates its chronologically composite character: by the time the *Odyssey* was composed, Ionic had lost the digamma, retained in the majority of dialects, and the poet could preserve or ignore it at will. Thus some words beginning with a vowel behave for metrical purpose as though they begin with a consonant, with the 'silent' element serving to create hiatus or lengthen the previous syllable. The phenomenon frequently occurs in the context of inherited phrases and older formulas (see 17.84n for a rare exception to the rule). The common phrase *ἔτι δ(Ϝ)ῆν* at 17.72 preserves digamma, giving the necessary *υ* – – scansion, as does the formulaic expression at 18.104, *καί μιν φωνήσας (Ϝ)ῆπεια πτερόεντα προσηύδα*, though not when the phrase has a feminine subject (*φωνήσασ' ἔπεια*).¹¹

With these resources, the poet enjoys a greatly expanded dictional range. In 17.2 Telemachus binds his sandals about his feet, *ποσσίν*; at 27 the poet uses the form *ποσί*; *πόδεσσι* is a still third option in the composer's repertoire. For the verb 'to be', Homer may choose among five metrical variants for the infinitive (*εἶναι*, *ἔμεν*, *ἔμμεν*, *ἔμεναι*, *ἔμμεναι*) and four for the third person singular of the future (*ἔσται*, *ἔσεται*, *ἔσσειται*, *ἔσσειται*). On occasion epic diction includes artificial word-formations, designed to allow the word a place in the hexameter line; so the artificially lengthened *ἄπρονέεσθαι* (18.260), and several of the forms used in the beautification of Penelope, including the irregular plural *προσώπασα* at 18.192. A few Atticisms also enter the text (e.g. *πῶς*, *δπως* for the Ionic *κῶς*, *δκως*), but these may have been introduced at a later stage or be the result of scribal corruptions. Seeming peculiarities and unusual formations

¹⁰ For the use of augmented and unaugmented forms, see Chantraine, *GH* 1 479–84 and van der Valk 1949: 140–1; for *v*-mobile, see Hoekstra 1965: 71–87.

¹¹ It has been calculated that Homer observes digamma some 3,354 times and ignores it 617, a proportion that suggests that singers tried to maintain it despite current linguistic usage.

are not sure grounds for excision or emendation or proof of interpolation; whereas vernacular speech will exclude anomalous forms, the poet's medium preserves them as markers of its distinctive character.

Just as integral to Homeric poetry as the *Kunstsprache* is the 'formula', a basic building block of oral epic song essential for the singer's work of improvisatory composition and his transmission of the traditional repertoire.¹² In 1928, Parry defined the formula as 'a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea'. By 'essential idea', he meant 'that which remains after one has counted out everything in the expression which is purely for the sake of style'.¹³ More simply, a formula is the means by which the poet articulates a given thought or phenomenon in metrical form. The line opening book 17 belongs among the examples that Parry cites: used 20 times in the *Odyssey*, the expression 'when young rosy-fingered dawn appeared again' is, in his account, simply the oral tradition's way of saying that a new day has dawned. Even more common is 17.16, 'in answer to him [or her] resourceful Odysseus replied', a formula that appears 45 times in the *Odyssey* to indicate that the hero is about to speak. Parry's work on formulas concentrated chiefly on noun-epithet combinations ('rosy-fingered dawn', 'resourceful Odysseus'), and demonstrated the intimate relation between the phrases and the line's metrical sequence. As his research showed, the principles of 'economy' or 'thrift' and of 'extension' govern Homeric verse composition: as a rule, only one noun-epithet combination exists for each metrical condition, and duplications are largely avoided; and for each case or form of a name there are several different epithets, each designed for a different slot in the line.¹⁴ Two large-scale conclusions follow. First, such is the refinement and scope of the formulaic repertoire that it must have been developed over many generations; and second, what determines the poet's choice of word or phrase is principally metrical convenience, not its suitability to a particular context.

(c) *Modifications and challenges*

While the account that Parry and his followers have given of the makeup of Homeric poetry and its oral character seems fundamentally correct, questions concerning the relation of the individual composer to his poetic medium still remain. The poet's use of traditional material, which may have been devised for contexts and scenarios different from his own, can explain some of the incongruities and anomalies that vexed Analysts. Because a recognition scene conventionally requires the testing of the individual to whom the disguised hero is about to reveal himself, Odysseus must, in seemingly cruel and gratuitous fashion, follow the standard sequence in his encounter with his father in *Od.* 24, for all that the hero need no longer be

¹² Important discussions of the formula include Nagler 1967, Whallon 1961, Heubeck 1974: 130–52, Austin 1975: ch. 1, Hainsworth 1993: 1–33, Foley 1995, Foley 1997, Russo 1997. For good bibliography, see Edwards 1986 and 1988.

¹³ Parry 1971: 272. ¹⁴ Parry 1971: 276 and 277–8.

disguised and Laertes' loyalty is not in question. As Lord remarks, 'in a traditional poem . . . there is a pull in two directions: one is toward the song being sung and the other is toward the previous uses of the same theme'.¹⁵ But on other occasions Homer may vary an existing type-scene so as to invest a situation with the desired thematic significance: a detailed description of a sacrifice can indicate a well-regulated, stable society; the curtailed procedures performed by the suitors on Ithaca highlight the current social disarray (see 17.180–1n). Through modification of a motif, the poet also creates novel combinations that are both conventional and situation-specific.¹⁶ Foley analyses the lines in book 18.119–52 as an instance of a 'greeting type-scene', in which typically an individual (Amphinomus here) presents a cup of wine to someone and accompanies that gesture with a verbal pledge;¹⁷ in this episode, Homer interrupts the traditional sequence (e.g. 13.50–62) so as to accommodate the unparalleled warning that Odysseus gives Amphinomus, thereby reminding an audience of the hostile environment surrounding the hero and intimating the dark fate hanging over the suitor. More famously in book 19 the poet seems launched on a recognition type-scene between the disguised Odysseus and his wife. Because Penelope must not yet be party to the revenge plot, the formulaic line 'she recognized the sure proofs that Odysseus had given her' (250) that regularly precedes recognition does not produce the usual result; instead Eurycleia takes over the role of 'recognizer' seemingly allotted to the queen. Fresh anomalies arise when Penelope, still ignorant of the beggar's identity, reclaims her forfeited part: the interview concludes in the manner typical of standard recognition scenes as husband and wife devise a plan to ensnare the suitors.

Purposeful repetition is a second area that demonstrates that the poet composes in anything but mechanistic fashion. On three occasions in books 17, 18 and 20 a suitor hurls an object at Odysseus. While the events and diction are broadly the same, the details that distinguish one episode from its predecessor reflect the growing power of Odysseus and Telemachus and a corresponding loss of efficacy on the suitors' part (see 17.462–5n). These patterns can stretch over many books, creating large-scale structural relations between the poem's different parts (see further section 2(a)). Odysseus' walk from the Phaeacian shore to Alcinoüs' palace in book 7 supplies a template for the hero's passage from Eumaeus' hut to his home in book 17. The surface similarities (springs and groves in both places, prayers for the hero's safe reception, a description of the palace) play against the deeper distinctions between the sites, one a fantastical, super-luxurious environment, the other very much of this world with a patina of 'historical' authenticity (see 17.207n).

Nor does the poet prove an uncritical transmitter of his traditional material. Without returning to the notion of a compositional patchwork, recent ('neo-analytic') work has shown how Homer draws on the contents of poetry, particularly tales preserved in the Cyclic epics, that predates or is contemporary with his own and whose

¹⁵ Lord 1960: 94. But see Scodel 1998b for the coherence of the Laertes' scene with the poem's themes.

¹⁶ Foley 1997: 169–70. ¹⁷ Foley 1990: 257–63.

versions of events the composer can allude to, 'sample' and/or reject with subtlety and no small degree of one-upmanship.¹⁸ Frequently cited is the *Odyssey's* debt to a seemingly pre-existing account of the voyage of the Argo for its representation of Circe and for Odysseus' passage from her island;¹⁹ Homer seems deliberately to have his hero reject the route that Jason would have followed, through the Clashing Rocks, so as to introduce what may have been his innovation, passage through the monstrous Scylla and Charybdis instead (see 12.55–8). In the versions of his wanderings that the disguised Odysseus devises in books 17 and 18, the protagonist borrows from alternate accounts of his journey and his post-Odyssean travels as presented in other contemporary compositions. Homer's agonistic impulse may again inform that act of appropriation. Because the hero's Cretan associations and sojourns in Thesprotia are embedded in Odysseus' lying tales, these competing versions of events are 'de-authorized' and the veracity of the current poet's more 'authentic' account highlighted.²⁰

If the Homeric epics demonstrate the plasticity of the poetic medium at the level of story patterns and motifs, the same flexibility is evident where formulas are concerned. While Parry came to view the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as almost entirely formulaic, a notion that allows the poet little capacity for innovation and that privileges the tradition over what any individual practitioner can contribute, readers now recognize how different passages deploy formulaic density to varying degrees and how the poet can re-cast standard verbal expressions or create novel formations.²¹ Speeches, similes and episodes involving singular and/or exotic situations are likely to exhibit the lowest frequencies of formulaic expressions, or the greatest number of modifications of the usual system. Odysseus' encounter with Argus in book 17 is a scene without parallel in Homeric epic (although its subject matter may be a standard element in the 'return' story type; see 17.291–327n), and consequently contains a comparatively small percentage of formulaic diction.²² Both Hoekstra and Hainsworth have demonstrated the versatility of the formulaic system beyond what Parry imagined, showing how

¹⁸ I borrow the term 'sampling' from Richard Martin, who in several public lectures has compared the epic poet to a contemporary rap artist, who 'samples' songs of other singers familiar to his audience in his composition with just the competitive and ludic impulse that seems to motivate Homer's borrowings.

¹⁹ For details, see West 2005.

²⁰ See King 1999 and Marks 2003. This type of rivalry is still visible in contemporary oral song traditions; cf. the remark of a Bosnian poet concerning a fellow singer cited in Murko 1929: 21: 'We are enemies of one another. It is torture for me when I see another singer who knows more than I'.

²¹ According to one hypothesis, that treats any expression found two or more times in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as formulaic, approximately one third of the Homeric corpus is made up of lines repeated in part or in their entirety elsewhere. For varying accounts, see Page 1959: 223, Notoupolos 1960: 180. However, with little agreement on what actually constitutes a formula, such assessments remain a matter of debate. The loss of earlier material contributes to the uncertainty; had we pre-Homeric heroic epic, expressions considered unique might turn out to be formulaic.

²² See Russo 1976: 45–7 for a formal analysis of the formulaic diction in the passage.

changes in the language allowed the development of new combinations.²³ The lofty phrase used of Zeus at 18.137, πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, must compete with the newer and more flexible Κρόνου πάϊς (ἀγκυλομήτεω), which includes metathesis and has the advantage that it can be shortened when necessary. In other modifications, noun-epithet formulas normally occurring in one metrical shape may, when divided up and positioned in different parts of the line, appear under other metrical conditions, or the order of a formula's two terms can be inverted, with or without additional changes; the insertion of epithets, adverbs, particles and prepositions creates an expanded formula, while a complex formula results from the combination of an existing expression with another standard set of terms. Where Parry assumed that formulas were metrically conditioned, Hainsworth has shown how 'mutual expectancy', in which the use of one word creates a strong expectation that another will follow, also determines the formation of word-groupings.

No element of Parry's work has been more contested than his assertion that the formulaic epithet is wholly 'ornamental': 'the technique of epithets . . . is solely designed to help the poet to fit a noun into a line of six feet; once the noun has been fitted in . . . the epithet has no further function'.²⁴ But an unconsidered application of the available repertoire is hard to reconcile with even a cursory reading of the poems. Epithets are introduced with an eye to context, and exceptions such as 'loud-barking dogs' that are silent (*Od.* 16.4–5), Penelope's surprisingly 'stout hand' (*Od.* 21.6), and Irus' improbably 'revered mother' (*Od.* 18.5n) are few. Through purposeful selection the poet also invests his phrases with the requisite stylistic, emotional and/or thematic charge. The inclusion or omission of epithets (this more frequent in dialogues and speeches than in the poems' narrative portions) can alter the pacing and representational impact of the lines, while Homer's choice to style Telemachus 'the dear son of godlike Odysseus' at 17.3 in place of another formulaic designation reminds an audience of the tearful reunion between father and son that has just occurred. Significant too are variations between the different systems of address available to characters, and their selection of the formula best suited to their sentiments towards an interlocutor (see 17.152n). Thematic concerns may also prompt departures from the principle of 'economy' that Parry defined: within a space of ten lines, the poet substitutes for Hephaestus' regular epithet περικλυτοῦ (*Od.* 8.287) the metrically identical πολύφρονος (297), a term coupled elsewhere in the poem only with Odysseus. The point may be to alert listeners to the parallels between god and hero, and the ruse of the marital bed deployed by both to test the fidelity of their wives.²⁵

Particular formulas also become significant through changes in context, repetition, and minor variation. When Homer uses the phrase so often applied to a hero's martial death, κατὰ μοῖρ' ἔλαβεν μέλανος θανάτῳ ('the fate of black death claimed him'),

²³ Hoekstra 1965, Hainsworth 1962, Hainsworth 1968.

²⁴ Parry 1971: 165. Sale 2001: 65 proposes replacing Parry's 'essential idea' with the perhaps better notion of an epithet that is 'context free'.

²⁵ The suggestion belongs to Sacks 1987: 13–17.

for Argus (*Od.* 17.326), that demise acquires a nobility and stature consonant with the dog's larger characterization. Redeployment with a difference occurs when the poet terms Aphrodite ἔϋστέφανος Κυθήρεια ('fair-crowned Cythereia') in the context of the beautification of Penelope, who is about to display herself to the suitors (18.193). A listener might recall an earlier scene in which Aphrodite played a much more central role and where the poet also called the goddess, there about to embark on an adulterous tryst, ἔϋστέφανος Κυθήρεια (8.288). The phrase's appearance uniquely in these two contexts invites us to consider possible affinities between the situations of the goddess and queen (see 18.193–4n). As Foley's notion of 'traditional referentiality' explains, these formulas as well as other traditional elements act as repositories of a significance that can extend far beyond their denotative meaning in any individual passage and that encompasses not just the particular poem, but even the entire tradition that stands behind the expression.²⁶ This larger frame is one with which both the poet and at least some portion of his audience are thoroughly familiar: according to the recent 'performative' approach to Homeric composition, individuals in cultures where a tradition of song-making still survives possess 'the mental equivalent of a CD-ROM player full of phrases and scenes',²⁷ and can instantly recognize innovations and departures from the norm.

By virtue of his mastery and creative use of his medium, Homer composes poems of a length,²⁸ sophistication and thematic density unparalleled in the South Slavic material gathered by Parry and Lord. For some readers these very qualities pose a challenge to what is axiomatic in Parry's work, the fact of oral and *ex tempore* composition-in-performance. But poems created without the aid of writing and 'on the spot' need not lack the complexity, structural coherence and elaborate patterning of the Homeric epics: through repeated performances over many generations (and oral epic poets can also think about their songs in advance, rehearse and improve on them each time they perform), a composition may achieve the outstanding unity and organization of Homer's poems. Nor does the older hierarchical dichotomy between oral and literate poetry, the first marked by 'primitive' compositional practices such as formulas, ring composition, digression, anaphora and parataxis (the 'adding on' technique), the other by a more sophisticated syntax and structure, still stand. Instead recent work views the poetic medium deployed by Homer as 'a way of using language that is different from, and opposed to, written communication', and treats his traditional poetry as a form of 'special speech', spoken discourse that is stylized and regularized

²⁶ Foley 1991: 7: 'Each element in the phraseology or narrative thematics stands not for that singular instance but for the plurality and multiformity that are beyond the reach of textualization.'

²⁷ Martin 1993: 227. For this 'performative' approach, see too Martin 1989, Bakker 1993, Bakker 1997a, Bakker 1997b. However, note Scodel 2002: 6–9 for the problematic assumptions that go into supposing this 'supremely competent audience'.

²⁸ One of the Serbo-Croatian examples, 'The wedding of Smailagić Meho', runs to 13,000 lines, but generally the songs are very much shorter.

for the purposes of performance before a group of listeners.²⁹ The context-bound and audience-oriented nature of oral poetry informs the structure, syntax and metre of Homeric epic, which uses linguistic, rhetorical and rhythmical devices – particles and segments of speech such as noun-epithet phrases among them – to enhance audience involvement and to make listeners believe themselves present at events re-enacted by the performing poet posing as eye-witness to a scene. Homer’s apostrophes to Eumaeus (see 17.272n) are a striking instance of the singer’s self-insertion into his story, his role as mediator between his fictional world and his audience. Signalling his intimate relations with a character whom he suddenly situates in the ‘here and now’, the poet invites listeners to experience a commensurate proximity. The *Odyssey* includes a model practitioner of such ‘oral poetics’: in the accolade that Odysseus addresses to the Phaeacian bard Demodocus, he praises his capacity to sing the trials of the Achaeans at Troy ‘as if you had been there yourself or heard it from one who was’ (8.491).

(d) *Audience and setting*

As the example of Demodocus reminds us, oral poetry requires both an audience and an occasion. Because social context so powerfully conditioned the composition and production of poetry in archaic Greece, the poet of the *Odyssey* cannot be viewed in isolation from the venues and the public before whom he performed.³⁰ Together Demodocus and Phemius, the bard at Odysseus’ home, seem to provide a window onto contemporary practice. Both frequent the palace of the local lord where they perform epic-style songs for a self-selected audience of aristocrats. But for a variety of reasons (Homer may draw on Mycenaean rather than current practices, and/or his account is idealizing), these scenes probably reveal little about the real-world *χοιδός* or conditions for performances of epic in eighth- and seventh-century Greece. Poets would more likely be itinerants than fixtures in aristocratic homes (see 17.385n), and in place of the luxurious settings and exclusive audiences portrayed by the *Odyssey*, open spaces and public occasions that attracted a more inclusive group of listeners offer the likeliest context. A variety of such gatherings may be imagined. For the coffee houses, wakes, weddings and fairs where oral poets perform in traditional cultures still today, we can probably substitute the public lounge mentioned at 18.329n, funeral games (see Hes. *WD* 654–7), marriage celebrations and local and inter-community religious festivals held at sanctuaries. The *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, usually dated to within one hundred years of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, describes song performances at the

²⁹ Bakker 1997a and 1997b: 287. According to Bakker 1993, the style and syntax of Homeric discourse ultimately reflect the cognitive processes that lie behind speech production and that involve the ‘activation of small amounts of information in the speaker’s consciousness and the subsequent transformation of this information into speech’ (6).

³⁰ For issues of performance setting, see Kirk 1962: 135–8, 274–80, Nagy 1990a: 21–3, Taplin 1992: 22–31, 39–41 and 2000: 36–46 (on which I chiefly draw).

Ionian festival at Delos, where a blind Chian poet garners particular renown (146–55, 169–73).

Occasions like these satisfy many of the necessary criteria for performances of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. First, drawing diverse audiences, they go some way to explaining the nuanced ideological orientation of Homeric poetry. The *Iliad*'s all but exclusive focus on kings and aristocrats and its largely dismissive depiction of the lower classes seem designed to play to an elite audience. But the account is also calibrated to appeal to a more heterogeneous public;³¹ Agamemnon's deficiencies as leader, his ill-founded arrogance and greed, would supply a cautionary example to contemporary βασιλῆες and find a sympathetic hearing in the small-holder and peasant who might have suffered from a local 'bribe-eating' king (Hes. *WD* 39). The *Odyssey*, with its more socially varied cast of characters and attention to the agrarian sphere (see 2b (iii)), offers even stronger grounds for supposing a mixed group of listeners. Balancing the sympathy shown for the 'small man' and the dispossessed, and the endorsements of parsimony, self-reliance and hard work that cluster about Eumaeus, is the poem's promotion of the institution of inherited monarchy, its elitist insistence on excellence transmitted from father to son, and its restoration of the normative hierarchy at its end.³² The scale of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* offers a second argument for gatherings extending over several days. More informal occasions, and the homes of local aristocrats, could host performances of 'extracts' of the poems (Demodocus' first and third songs provide a model for that), but it is hard to imagine that a composer would bother to create works as complex and tightly-structured as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* unless they could be delivered in their entirety. Homer's compositions would each require approximately 20 hours of listening time, with the story perhaps segmented and sung on successive days; only a period of sanctioned leisure, such as a religious festival affords, would guarantee a public with time to spare.

These considerations bear on the ancillary question of the poet's social status and here the representations of Phemius and Demodocus may be of greater help. There is no indication that either belongs to the elite;³³ the honoured place that Demodocus enjoys notwithstanding, both he and Phemius must sing when and/or what their audiences please. Other internal evidence, suggesting the poet's limited exposure to the lifestyles and attitudes that his poetry principally depicts, corroborates our sense that Homer stands outside the elevated circle of kings and nobles;³⁴ Penelope's

³¹ Hainsworth 1980: 37–8 and Morris 1986 assume an aristocratic audience and/or the poet as spokesman for its values; for challenges to this view, see Janko 1998: 12–13, Taplin 2000: 37–8 and Dalby 1995.

³² Compare the variety of 'subject positions' offered by Greek tragedy, similarly produced before a diverse audience, where the elite can identify with the noble (but often less than exemplary and disaster-bound) hero, while the δῆμος finds its counterpart in members of the chorus and other more humble characters who survive. For this see Griffith 1995.

³³ Demodocus' name ('received by the δῆμος'), his status as 'honoured by the λαοί', 13.28), and the fact that he has to be summoned to the court all suggest that he is a 'public worker'; see 17.383–5, 385nn on the social position of these.

³⁴ For this argument, see Dalby 1995, whose examples I cite.

remarkable capacity to hear what is going on in the hall while in her chamber supposes a small-scale dwelling with a few rooms in close proximity, quite unlike the multi-roomed, spacious homes that archaeologists have found for the period (see 17.492–3n). The vagueness, inconsistency and reliance on traditional diction more generally visible in descriptions of aristocratic dwellings, diets and personnel stand in striking contrast to the precise accounts of Polyphemus' dairy farm and Laertes' orchard. Where Phemius and Demodocus provide less sure guides to the position of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey's* composer is in their relations of dependency towards the nobles whom they serve. The epics' shifting ideological standpoints tell against the view of Homer as 'court minstrel' and mouthpiece for the royal or aristocratic interests ascendant there.

Of particular pertinence to the *Odyssey*, which, as so much recent scholarship details, allows women both mortal and supernatural a place that far exceeds their Iliadic roles, is the question of the gender makeup of Homer's audience.³⁵ In the absence of evidence external to the poem,³⁶ readers have explored scenes of performances of epic-style poetry internal to the work. The evidence is equivocal at best. While on occasion women are excluded or made to depart from Phemius and Demodocus' performances,³⁷ Odysseus seems to welcome and accommodate Arete's presence at his bard-like recitation in book 11 before the Phaeacian court, and 'performs' both lying and true tales of his wanderings for the exclusive audience of Penelope in books 19 and 23. Whether the poem's concern with female chastity and with women's powers of seduction/dupery signals Homer's accommodation of an all-male audience's perspective and preoccupations, or whether the idealized representations of Penelope and Arete hold up a model both flattering and instructive for women listeners, readers must themselves decide.

2. BOOKS 17 AND 18 WITHIN THE *ODYSSEY*

The *Odyssey* is the tale of a hero's far-flung wanderings as he struggles to return home in the face of the divine, supernatural and human powers ranged against him, and of that individual's success through his use of his cunning intelligence, powers of speech, capacity for endurance and suffering, and, ultimately, martial prowess. It also presents in its protagonist a character who, through the course of his travels, will forfeit much of the identity he enjoyed as a member of the successful Trojan venture, and who must laboriously reclaim the domestic, social and political position

³⁵ For detailed discussion, see Doherty 1992. Bentley 1713 already asserted that Homer made 'the *Ilias* for men, and the *Odysseis* for the other sex'.

³⁶ Visual representations from Minoan court culture suggest the presence of women at public rituals or performances, while post-Homeric archaic sources also point to mixed audiences at religious festivals including epic recitations (*H. H. Ap.* 146–78).

³⁷ See 1.356, where Telemachus dismisses Penelope from Phemius' performance; the absence of goddesses from the scene of Aphrodite's exposure (8.324) recounted in Demodocus' song may be viewed as corresponding to the exclusively male audience for that song. Note, however, 18.305–6n.

that was his before departing from home. The *Odyssey* proem succinctly previews the nature of Odysseus and the trajectory of his story, pointing its audience to many of the hero's chief characteristics and the modes of conduct and concerns that subsequent books explore. Within the opening ten lines, the poet suggests Odysseus' wiliness and the capacity to preserve his incognito that prove critical to his survival in Ithaca (in place of Odysseus' name, only the epithet πολύτροπος, 'of many turns', appears at 1), twice evokes the νόστος (5, 9) that is Odysseus' goal, privileges the fact of his travels (πολλά|πλάγχθη, 'wandered much', 1–2; also 3), and underscores his suffering (πολλά . . . πάθεν ἄλγεα, 'suffered many pains', 4, cf. 18–19). As the proem also indicates, this is a poem of a 'controlled economy of life', the preservation of men (and livestock), rather than the 'total expenditure' that the *Iliad* describes.³⁸ Whereas the Iliadic proem cites Achilles' heroic wrath, which causes the death of myriad Greeks and Trojans, in the *Odyssey*'s opening account, Odysseus endeavours to save the lives of his crew (5). The very fact of the men's destruction for 'wanton recklessness' (7) anticipates the poem's moral sensibility: although its gods can exhibit the partisanship, vindictiveness and caprice of their Iliadic counterparts, they display a novel concern with questions of ethical worth, visiting punishment on the morally reprobate (see further pp. 19–20).

Books 17 and 18 realize much of what this proem anticipates. A guest in the swineherd Eumaeus' humble home when book 17 opens, Odysseus has, with the help of Athena's transforming magic, assumed the appearance and persona of a vagrant down on his luck, dependent on the kindness of strangers. By book 18's end, the hero, having suffered repeated physical and verbal abuse from underlings and the suitors in his hall, has gained a precarious foothold in his home where, unrecognized by all except his son (and dog), he has had a first glimpse of his wife after twenty years. As this summary suggests, although books 17 and 18 may not rank highly in readers' catalogues of the *Odyssey*'s 'purple' portions and seem less immediately compelling than, for example, Odysseus' first-person narrative of his adventures in books 9–12 or the long-postponed reunion between husband and wife in book 23, they are integral to the *Odyssey*'s structure and motifs and possess a richness of their own. After first looking at the books' place within the poem's larger design and their internal coherence, I then explore themes central to the poem that they foreground, develop and sometimes complicate; as section 2(b) also argues, the books deserve fresh attention for their introduction of elements, ideological, ethical and generic among them, that are their more particularized contributions to the multi-layered poem.

(a) *Books 17 and 18 and the structure of the Odyssey*

The *Odyssey* broadly falls into two halves, the first chiefly taken up with its hero's adventures overseas, the second opening with Odysseus' arrival on Ithaca at the start

³⁸ Pucci 1982: 42.

of book 13 and detailing his gradual reclamation of his home. Within this second half, triadic divisions further segment the poem's action (for the question of book divisions, see pp. 36–7). While books 13–16 present the hero still in the island's outlying areas, whether on the shore or in Eumaeus' hut, books 17–20 describe the early stages of his reception in his palace and the failure of its occupants to recognize him. In the remaining four books Odysseus will reveal himself to the suitors, prevail in the contest of the bow, slaughter his enemies, be reunited with his wife and father and resolve his quarrel with the families of those he has killed, all elements necessary for the completion of the story.³⁹

Still more particularized connections exist between books 17 and 18. Common to both is their sustained attention to each stage of Odysseus' covert and difficult passage into his home, through the boundary between the countryside and urban sphere, to the courtyard of the palace, and finally into the dining hall. The poet introduces several devices to postpone the critical moment of entry, whether the intervention of the goatherd Melanthius who tries to prevent Odysseus' forward progress, or the conversation between the hero and Eumaeus at the very entrance of the house; the demise of Argus, also a symbol of the neglect of Odysseus' property during his time abroad, gives the moment when the hero arrives in the palace courtyard maximum emotional intensity. Even when Odysseus reaches the dining hall, his position is still contested and literally 'liminal'. In the second part of book 17 and the first episode of 18, the hero remains at the threshold, where he must fight with the beggar Irus for the right to occupy even that peripheral spot.

Further linking the two books is the elaborate patterning that informs the episodes featuring hostile and abusive individuals (see further b (iii) below), who stand in intricate relations to one another.⁴⁰ The first of these, as noted above, is Melanthius, a low-life rustic who has gone over to the suitors' camp. The mockery that he addresses to Odysseus finds its echo in the insults, framed in identical terms, with which Antinous reviles the new arrival. It is also Antinous who realizes the threat that Melanthius first makes, that on his arrival in the hall Odysseus will be the target of footstools hurled at him. This sequence, where a base individual insults Odysseus then to have his role assumed by one of the suitors' ringleaders, repeats itself in book 18: the beggar Irus ridicules Odysseus at the start, while Eurymachus' derisive address appears near the book's close. The correspondences between this quartet of 'high' and 'low' individuals create their own symmetry. Melanthius is Eurymachus' particular favourite, while Irus and Antinous form a matching pair whose words and gestures mirror one another.⁴¹ Completing this cast of hostile characters is Melanthe, Melanthius' sister, who also mocks the stranger. Eurymachus' favouritism towards the brother parallels his sexual relations with the sister, and the suitor insults Odysseus with the words that the serving

³⁹ See Tracy 1997 for the various structures of the poem and earlier bibliography on the topic.

⁴⁰ See Fenik 1974: 174–9. ⁴¹ See Levine 1982 for details of the parallels.

maid supplies. Audiences might observe other ‘doublings’ and re-soundings of the same motifs; in both books Odysseus uses an almost identical lying tale to warn one of the suitors, first Antinous, then Amphinomus, whose signal decency, however, contrasts with the villainy of his fellow diner and explains variations in the account (see p. 21); in both, Odysseus’ maltreatment provokes Penelope’s intervention, and both books detail the preliminary steps towards the delayed interview between husband and wife.

In keeping with the reflective relations between the so-called world of the adventures, when Odysseus is in the fantastical lands overseas, and the more mundane Ithacan milieu, the two books also revisit earlier and adjacent parts of Odysseus’ experiences abroad. Most particularly they draw on books 6, 7 and 8. The Phaeacian princess Nausicaa’s encounter with Odysseus rehearses the moment when Penelope shows herself to the suitors and disguised hero in book 18. In book 6, the high-born maiden with marriage on her mind, having cast off her headdress and been abandoned by her attendants, confronts Odysseus ‘alone’ (οἶη, 139). The same diction recurs, with a difference, when Penelope, another noble lady pondering (re)marriage, appears before the suitors emphatically ‘not alone’ (οὐκ οἶη, see 207η) and decorously ‘holding (σχομένη) the shining headdress before her cheeks’ (210; cf. σχομένη at 6.141). Following his meeting with Nausicaa, Odysseus then walks from the shore to Alcinous’ palace, an episode, as noted above, revisited in the ‘beggar’s’ passage from Eumaeus’ hut to his home. Altercations between the hero and an individual who mocks him occur in Scheria and Odysseus’ hall. In book 8, the youth Euryalus makes denigrating remarks about the stranger’s appearance, suggesting his unfitnes to participate in athletic competitions; Odysseus disproves his words by hurling a discus further than any of the Phaeacian competitors has done. When Irus (his youth also stressed) derides his fellow mendicant’s seeming debility in book 18, the boxing match that follows allows Odysseus a similar show of physical prowess. Both confrontations exhibit the same structure: an insult and challenge on the unjustified aggressor’s part, a refutation and display of strength by Odysseus.⁴² The defeat of Irus, the suitors’ surrogate here, looks forward as well as back, foreshadowing the moment when the hero will engage in a more serious show of force in an athletic event, the contest of the bow.⁴³ An unmistakable pointer to the scene’s anticipatory function is the phrase describing the suitors’ reaction to Irus’ bathetic flailing after Odysseus’ blow, ‘they died laughing’ (18.100); the fate that Irus experiences will, in more deadly fashion, be their own.

⁴² See further Kilb 1973: 183–4, Bannert 1988: 100. The different milieus in which the two exchanges occur, as well as the differing social standings of the initiators of the quarrel, explain their contrasting outcomes. While the two ‘beggars’ come to blows, the competition between Odysseus and Euryalus is peacefully resolved. The Phaeacian youth gets off with an elegantly worded rebuke, and subsequently makes amends by giving the stranger a valuable gift, the sword that implicitly acknowledges him as a social equal.

⁴³ Levine 1982: 202.

(b) *The thematic concerns of books 17 and 18*

(i) Hospitality, theoxeny, and the ethical problems of Odysseus' revenge

From the poem's first episode in Odysseus' home, where Telemachus plays host to the disguised Athena, to the lying tale that the hero tells Laertes in the final book, relations of ξενία, so critical in the Homeric world, and the hospitality accorded the ξείνος (a term that simultaneously means stranger, guest and guest-friend) shape the plot and intersect with two other of the *Odyssey's* prime concerns, its hero's highly problematic vengeance and the gods' part in it. Just as the poem's first half invites audiences to compare and contrast the diverse receptions that Telemachus and Odysseus receive abroad, a theme anticipated by the opening books' vivid depiction of the breakdown of ξενία in Ithaca that is symptomatic of the larger social chaos there, so its second offers two more drawn-out explorations of exemplary and reprobate hosts. Eumaeus' paradigmatic hospitality in books 14–16 is designed by way of prelude and counterpoint to the reception scene that extends from book 17 to 23, and whose transgressive character 17 and 18 so exactly document. Among the departures from correct protocol, the new arrival receives no greeting on his entrance (the wag of the dying Argus excepted), he must beg for rather than be given a meal (and in book 18, earn his supper by supplying pre-prandial entertainment), he is provided with neither chair nor table at which to eat his scraps, and goes without the bath and/or fresh clothing that are *de rigueur* for a travel-stained newcomer. In place of the guest gifts that the ξείνος should receive, objects associated with the feast are hurled at the hero instead.⁴⁴ As Eumaeus has emphasized, it should not matter that this ξείνος comes in beggar's rags: mendicants also enjoy the protection of Zeus and an individual still more derelict than Odysseus is owed hospitality at another man's home (14.56–8; cf. 6.207–8). The poet's diction further blurs the distinction between stranger and beggar: in books 17 and 18, Odysseus is designated ξείνος 21 times, πτωχός only 8.

The suitors' behaviour in books 17 and 18 does more than simply demonstrate that in Odysseus' absence a central social institution, and one that the hero was celebrated for practising while still lord in Ithaca (19.313–16, 24.281–6), has broken down.⁴⁵ It is also central to the poet's resolution of one cardinal difficulty that his narrative confronts: the exemplary host Odysseus, whose return should signal the restoration of order to his house, slaughters his guests feasting peacefully (if indecorously) at his table. Homer does not scruple to underscore the doubly transgressive nature of the hero's revenge.⁴⁶ First, the context in which Odysseus performs his act – the contest

⁴⁴ See Reece 1993: 168–87 for these deviations from the standard scene.

⁴⁵ The feasters are such depraved guests that they cannot even be accommodated with a conventional ξενία paradigm; when Homer terms their consumption of Odysseus' livelihood νήπιον, 'without recompense', at 1.377 (cf. 18.280), he uses an expression not suited to the spontaneous give and take characteristic of genuine hosts and guests, but reminiscent of the ἄποινα that a criminal or injurer must pay his victim or his family so as to make restitution for the inflicted loss. See further Edwards 1993: 51–2.

⁴⁶ For the ethical problems of the revenge, see Nagler 1990, Nagler 1993, Crissy 1997, Thalmann 1998.

of the bow, an event designed to resolve questions of elite status without recourse to arms – turns what is set up as a peaceful courtship competition into a bloodbath (a shift signalled by the phrase *δέθλια καὶ φόνου ἀρχήν* at 21.4) and a catalyst for internecine violence. Equally troubling is the transformation of the space reserved for congenial feasting into an Iliadic-style battleground. Odysseus' ironic words equating the banquet with the coming carnage just before he shoots his first arrow⁴⁷ should be read alongside stories within the poem that highlight the unpardonable nature of dinner party violence (see 21.295–8, where a Centaur is the perpetrator), and most pointedly, of hosts who murder guests at their table, whether the villainous Aegisthus (11.409–21),⁴⁸ or Heracles who slew Iphitus while he was dining at his home, a deed condemned by the poet in his harshest terms (21.26–9).

But for all the disturbing analogies between Odysseus' vengeance and these other episodes, the poet also clarifies the differences. While Heracles' act was unmotivated (or perhaps inspired by his illicit desire to keep the horses that Iphitus was searching for), Odysseus not only has impeccable ethical and religious justification for his deed, insofar as abuses of *ξενία* are crimes against the gods, but he is, in a very real sense, incidental to the suitors' death. Leitmotifs and recurrent terms in books 17 and 18 are the suitors' *ὑβρις* and *ἄτασθαλίη* ('wanton recklessness'), moral failings which both here and elsewhere the poem closely associates with violations of hospitality.⁴⁹ Both terms signal a willingness to ride roughshod over the accepted system of rights, privileges and obligations that govern relations among men and between mortals and gods in the archaic world, and both are crimes that result in what is presented as a self-incurred punishment and death. The poem's opening passages include several programmatic statements that bring together the overlapping human and divine dimensions to the suitors' offence. In the proem Odysseus' crew are charged with *ἄτασθαλίη* for laying hands on the property of Helios, a deed designed to mirror in starker form the suitors' appropriation of Odysseus' livestock, and their destruction follows directly on from their self-perpetuated crime (*σφετέρησιw ἄτασθαλίησιw ὄλοντο*, 1.8). Zeus' remarks on Aegisthus' fate shortly afterwards illustrate the more general proposition that men incur evils through their own reckless folly, *σφῆσιw ἄτασθαλίησιw* (34), rather than divine hostility (see too 20.166–71, 22.413–17, 23.63–7). When Odysseus clears his halls, he is thus, within the poem's own terms, guiltless; as he claims at 22.413–17, the suitors' death has been brought about by their 'reckless folly', *ἄτασθαλίη* once again.

Book 17 adds one other exculpatory device. After Antinous assaults Odysseus with the footstool, his fellow suitors sound a rare note of dissent: 'Antinous, it was not well for you to hit the wretched beggar, accursed man, if indeed he is perhaps some heavenly god. The gods do, in the likeness of *ξείνοι* from other lands, take on all sorts

⁴⁷ 21.428–30: 'now it is time for dinner to be prepared for the Achaeans . . . and then for other entertainment, the song and lyre; for these are the adornments of the feast'.

⁴⁸ His killing of Agamemnon 'like an ox at the manger' turns out to presage not Odysseus' but the suitors' fate; see 22.299 and 403 for the comparison of the suitors to cattle.

⁴⁹ See 17.169, 587–8nn.

of shapes and roam around the cities, observing the ὕβρις and εὐνομίη of other men' (483–7). The remark offers the most explicit sounding of the theoxeny motif woven into the story of Odysseus' return, and deployed with particular frequency in books 17 and 18. According to this widely diffused narrative pattern (already used for Athena's reception by Telemachus in the opening book), a divinity visits mortals in disguise, determines their moral worth on the basis of the hospitality s/he receives, and deals out rewards and punishments accordingly.⁵⁰ In keeping with this story line, individuals whom Odysseus encounters during his wanderings and return raise the possibility that the stranger might be one of the immortals,⁵¹ a response sometimes prompted by moments when the hero performs deeds or behaves in a manner reminiscent of divinities revealing themselves to mortals after shedding their disguise; these include transformation scenes (involving the sudden acquisition of stature, beauty and/or radiance), the display of special and unlooked for powers, and the announcement of the rewards or punishments to be dealt out to others.⁵² Like the disguised god, Odysseus explicitly sets out to test the individuals whom he visits,⁵³ and also consistent with the position of the disguised god in the face of mortals is the ironic divergence between appearance and reality. The stranger, for all his seeming inferiority and the abuse that he appears passively to accept, retains the upper hand, manipulating those who fail to recognize the counterfeit quality of his abjection. Following this, the suitors fit the role of benighted mortals typical of theoxeny narratives. With their moral baseness goes mental and physical blindness as, from books 17 and 18 on, these characters fail to apprehend the meaning of the stranger's words, actions and the signs that he displays.⁵⁴ That the suitors voice the possibility of a divine visitor sharpens the irony and makes their folly and ignorance the more culpable: if they know such things can happen, all the more instantly should they mend their ways.

As several episodes in books 17 and 18 make clear, the poet also shapes the theoxeny motif to his thematic ends, casting his hero not so much as a disguised divinity as an instrument whereby the gods promote their Olympian designs (as Kearns aptly remarks, the hero '*stands for a god*').⁵⁵ It is Athena who orchestrates Odysseus' testing of the suitors as he begs for food and who endows it with an ethical dimension (see 17.360–4n), and she contrives his display of prowess when challenged by Irus; the goddess also participates in the final battle, and shares in the victory. By diminishing Odysseus' agency, the poet further diffuses the moral conundrum already discussed. Deploying the hero as a junior partner in their scheme, the gods punish wrongdoers (particularly those guilty of ὕβρις and ἄτασθαλίη; see 18.139n) and restore social and religious institutions to a community in disarray. Such extensive divine intervention

⁵⁰ Very familiar from Ovid's reworking of the Philemon and Baucis story in *Met.* 8.611–724, the pattern is also visible in the tales of the wanderings of Demeter and Dionysus in the *Homeric Hymns*. See 17.485–7n and Kearns 1982 for additional details.

⁵¹ See 7.199, 16.178–85, 17.483–7, 23.62–8. ⁵² See 18.69–70n; also 22.1–2.

⁵³ See 17.360–4n; cf. 14.459–61, 15.304.

⁵⁴ See, among other instances, 17.446, 18.37, 112–16, 353 with nn.

⁵⁵ Kearns 1982: 5.

on the side of morality and justice would, for an audience familiar with the gods as portrayed in the *Iliad*, belong among the *Odyssey's* striking innovations.

(ii) Disguise, impersonation and fiction

Forming part of the theoxeny theme is the disguise that Odysseus assumes for much of the poem's second half. Books 17 and 18 pay close attention to the outward aspects of the hero's persona – his transformed appearance, and the mendicant's accessories with which Athena has equipped him – while exploring a third, less visible aspect of his metamorphosis. As Odysseus impersonates the vagrant, the poet alerts us to the fact that his mimicry is so perfect that it seems 'as if for a long time he had been a beggar' (17.365–6n). Elsewhere in this and the subsequent book Homer returns to the relations between the 'beggar' and the hero, challenging his audience to discern when Odysseus speaks 'in character' and when he reverts to his more authentic heroic voice. Is it the abject wanderer who names the stomach as the source of his woes (17.473–4), or Odysseus, the hero whom the epic tradition repeatedly identifies with the belly? Has the protagonist actually come to embrace the more populist, agrarian perspective visible when he proposes a reaping competition against Eurymachus at 18.366–70 (see nn. and section b (iii) below), or is he role-playing here? While disguise highlights the 'polytropic' nature of Odysseus, it further serves to reveal the moral worth of those who encounter the down-and-out individual and, as part of this, their sentiments towards the absent hero. Those sympathetic to Odysseus intuit something of the reality behind the disguise, but the hardened criminals that are the suitors and treacherous domestics see only the tattered beggar before their eyes. In books 17 and 18, the poet also looks more deeply at the assumptions that determine these different responses. Those who treat the beggar kindly acknowledge that an individual can possess ethical qualities independent of his external condition; those who spurn him assume that social status and a man's appearance dictate and reflect his essential being. The noble-born but now servile Eumaeus raises a further issue very pertinent to his and Odysseus' situation: is worth so predicated on birth that it can endure the vagaries of fortune, or does a man become debased together with his loss in economic and social standing (see 17.320–2n)?

Equipped with an exterior that so thoroughly belies his true identity, the hero has another means of reinforcing his incognito. Books 17 and 18 include fresh variations on the lying tales presented in earlier episodes (and reused later on) in which Odysseus, uniquely among the Homeric heroes, either gives himself a false name and/or endows himself with a fabricated persona.⁵⁶ On each occasion the nature of the audience and the particular message required by the context determine the story's shape and details even as Odysseus, like the oral poet working within a traditional repertoire, redeploys and modifies material from previously narrated versions of events. The themes of

⁵⁶ In this too Odysseus resembles gods in their dissembling appearances before men; they regularly assume disguises and devise fictive personae. On the lying tales, see Trahman 1952, Walcot 1977, Haft 1984, Emlyn-Jones 1986, Clayton 2004.

ξενία and theodicy included in the ‘biography’ fashioned for Eumaeus in book 14 (and there designed to endorse the hospitable reception that Odysseus was enjoying) reappear in the stories in books 17 and 18. Antinous is the chief audience for the narrative at 17.419–44 that begins by promoting virtues conspicuously lacking in the interlocutor, those of a liberal host as exemplified by the beggar in his former state of prosperity. The reversal of fortune that this open-handed character suffered should also hit home: if disaster came to a man guiltless of misconduct towards a stranger, how much greater a punishment will fall on the individual who wilfully ignores Zeus Xenios. For Amphinomus, the decent suitor misled by the depraved company that he keeps, Odysseus equips his fictive alter ego with a father and brother on whom he erroneously relied in committing his deeds of wickedness (18.140n). The omissions in these stories are calculated too: whereas the hero’s tale to Eumaeus included details of Odysseus’ whereabouts, now the speaker leaves out all mention of his links with a figure naturally inimical to the suitors.

The hero’s powers to spin the fictions narrated in books 17 and 18 also allow Homer to develop the on-going overlap between Odysseus and the professional *αἰθδός* (see 11.366–9, 17.518–21n, 21.406–11) and further to explore the nature of a poet’s sometimes problematic artistry. A preoccupation with skilled storytellers and singers, something that distinguishes the *Odyssey* from the *Iliad*, has been apparent in many earlier parts of the poem: Homer has admitted bards and magical singers into his cast of characters, shown performers negotiating with audiences about the subject of their songs, made characters comment on the merits of ongoing compositions, observed the different reactions that songs and stories can provoke, and has even assigned κλέος to the singer’s art. Integral to many scenes where speakers and singers perform are questions about the truth and accuracy of their tales and the reliability of their sources.⁵⁷ These issues are also central to the two extended narratives included in book 17. Telemachus’ account of his meeting with Menelaus and citation of the story that his host had from the Old Man of the Sea contains repeated affirmations of the accuracy of his report and the infallibility of the youth’s informants (see 108–49nn). But for Homer’s audience, Telemachus’ claims ring hollow: he concludes his otherwise genuine account with what we know to be a glaring lacuna as he omits the all-important fact of his encounter with his father. Odysseus’ ‘autobiographical’ tale later in the book takes mendacity to fresh heights; the speaker does not so much suppress the truth as create a fiction so plausible that no one thinks to question its veracity. With so much emphasis on the different forms that stories can assume and on the agendas of their tellers, the *Odyssey* invites its audience to wonder about Homer’s own exercise of his art.⁵⁸ For all the distinctions that the poem registers between the professional singer and the individual who merely tells a story,⁵⁹ in

⁵⁷ E.g., 3.101 = 4.331, 3.247, with additional examples in Mackie 1997: 86.

⁵⁸ Homer also omits conventional elements of the stories that he tells: so as to use Orestes as a positive paradigm, he says nothing of the matricide that is implicit at 3.309–10.

⁵⁹ See the discussion at 17.518–21n.

the *ἀοιδός*-like Odysseus, who for the duration of books 9–12 takes over Homer's narrative voice and who 'enchants' the Phaeacians and Eumaeus with his singer-like skills (see 17.521), the two figures inevitably blend. Already in antiquity readers recognized how in his hero the poet created a mirror image of his persona, prompting a commentator to remark, 'Homer is the bravest of men in lies, and is no less brave and confident in lying than in telling the truth' (Dio Chrys. *Trojan Discourse*, 11.23); no wonder that, in one ancient genealogy at least, Odysseus was grandfather to Homer.⁶⁰

Disguise and mendacity, of course, beg for recognition and revelation of the truth, and the second half of the poem is punctuated, as ancient readers already observed, by the series of recognition scenes that span books 13 to 24.⁶¹ Book 17, which includes the reunion between Odysseus and Argus, has an integral place in this carefully plotted sequence. Although the episode sounds several variations on the conventional encounter (most obviously because an animal is the 'recognizer' here, and requires no display of 'signs'), in many ways it runs true to type. Like the other scenes, it involves a flashback to an earlier moment in Odysseus' life in the form of a story that a character tells about the hero's youth, an intervention which allows the requisite dramatic delay before the moment of recognition; it also repositions the hero in one of the roles that he forfeited on leaving Ithaca, and forms part of a topographical scheme, in which each successive reunion brings Odysseus one step closer to the palace and its central public and private spaces. Balancing the dog's acuity in instantly sniffing out his master is the signal failure of Irus and the suitors in book 18 to grasp the meaning of several indicators of the beggar's identity, whether Odysseus' show of his heroic body before dispatching Irus, or the quasi-divine radiance that emanates from his bald head. Together the two books chart the trajectory that the remainder of the poem will follow, with its regular alternation between recognition scenes with loyal followers and family, and the continued and culpable ignorance of Odysseus' enemies.

(iii) Abuse, genre and ideology

Costume, impersonation and lying stories allow Odysseus actively to evade detection of his identity. But as the hero explains to Telemachus at 16.274–7, the success of his stratagem will also depend on their mutual capacity to suffer passively the insults and violence that Odysseus will attract in reclaiming his home. Books 17 and 18's sharp and singular focus on the ridicule, vilification and manhandling directed at the hero allows the poet both to showcase a fundamental element in Odysseus' heroic identity, his signature capacity to endure, and to enrich his composition by introducing modes of discourse and types of action that epic usually keeps at arm's length.

⁶⁰ For truth, fiction and the relations between poets and storytellers, see Goldhill 1991: 56–68, Pratt 1993, Mackie 1997, Scodel 1998a.

⁶¹ On the recognition scenes, see particularly Austin 1975, Murnaghan 1987, Zeitlin 1996: 19–52, Henderson 1997, Scodel 1998b.

The verbal and physical drubbings that Odysseus receives on entering the dining hall are not heralded. Earlier in book 17 Homer prefaces Melanthius' verbal barrage with the term that regularly flags agonistic, insulting or 'blaming' speech; it is a *veĩkos* (215), and appears first in the sequence of such quarrelsome addresses. Also a predictor of the episodes to come is Odysseus' reaction to the attack; deciding not to respond to Melanthius' kick, the hero exercises the restraint and passivity (see 17.238n) that he has schooled himself in, and allows Eumaeus to reply on his behalf. The promotion of this stance of resignation and submission to a mark of grandeur belongs among the modifications that the *Odyssey* introduces to the heroic model imagined in the *Iliad*.

Where Melanthius is a character integrated into the larger narrative, the low-life abuser whom Odysseus encounters in book 18 has little role beyond quarrelling with the hero. The public beggar Irus no sooner opens his mouth than he insults and challenges his fellow mendicant in highly spiced diction. Both the language and physique of this *πρωχός* and the tit-for-tat character of his altercation with Odysseus might put the audience in mind of a distinct generic paradigm: Homer gives Irus a profile (gluttony, physical debility, shamelessness, bellicosity, and the role of buffoon among its elements) that anticipates the personas assigned to the several parties in exchanges of hostilities in later iambic poetry. Both the Ionian iambographers and their targets are depicted as similarly anti-heroic, abject and ill-formed individuals, often in dire material straits and concerned with satisfying their clamorous appetites. If a tradition of poetic mockery and invective already existed in Homeric times, then the choice to include a base-born abuser may have inclined the poet to look to this literary mode most opposite to his own. Like so much in the *Odyssey*, the episode may also rework an Iliadic scene, where Odysseus responds to the vilification that Thersites, an abuser, jester and possibly low-class individual, levels at Agamemnon in book 2. The misshapen form that the Iliadic poet imagines for his calumnist in 216–19 corresponds to Irus' bloated physique, while Thersites' desire to raise a laugh among his audience (215) anticipates Irus' role as the source of the suitors' dinner-time divertissement. Like Thersites too, Irus functions as a scapegoat figure whose humiliation and expulsion from the group allows a (momentary) recovery of a fractured harmony and good fellowship among the company.⁶²

The interventions of Melanthius, Irus and Melanthe call attention to an element in the poem's second half largely absent from its first. While most of the scenes in books 1–13 (the world of the adventures partially excepted) occur in elite dwellings, and feature a chiefly aristocratic milieu, books 14–24 cast a much wider social net, accommodating rustic settings, agrarian concerns and the perspective of low-life, marginalized and/or servile figures. In book 17 Melanthius proposes putting Odysseus to work as a sweeper of his pens, his slack muscles improved through a diet of whey, and Argus lies on a heap of dung to be used as manure for the fields; in his exchange

⁶² See Nagy 1979: 222–42 and 259–64, Suter 1993. For the link between Thersites and Irus and the *pharmakos* of myth and ritual, see Thalmann 1988.

with Eurymachus in book 18, Odysseus envisions a richly detailed scene of springtime mowing. The homely spheres of animal husbandry and of sowing and harvesting – matter that the *Iliad* restricts almost wholly to its similes – stand in the forefront here.

The poem's inclusion of the countryside and low-life characters results, in part, from the disruptions of the normative social and topographical orders brought about by the hero's absence and the suitors' incursion into his home.⁶³ Whereas in Scheria civilized practices, including proper hospitality, religious rituals, and orderly decision-making, cluster in the palace and the surrounding urban spaces, on Ithaca the suitors have corrupted those sites and perverted the ethics normally associated with them. Aristocratic values, social relations and modes of conduct must be reassigned to the countryside and to those necessarily base individuals who populate it. If Eumaeus' exemplary hospitality and observance of etiquette can be explained on the grounds that he is, in fact, of noble provenance, the same cannot be said of the other obliging herdsmen and agrarian labourers, Philoetius and Dolius, who rally to the hero's side. Odysseus' encounter with Melanthius, staged at the boundary between the welcoming rustic region and the hostile spaces of the city, succinctly shows this urban/rural divide. Instead of pasturing Odysseus' herds, and tending the resources of his master, Melanthius prefers to drive the animals to the suitors' table, and to loiter about the town, flaunting his citified finery.

Consistent with its attention to country life and the seasonal round is the *Odyssey's* generally positive portrayal of labour, and its inclusion of rural activities as areas where a man can prove his moral excellence and gain status. In place of the Iliadic spheres of competition, chiefly athletics and warfare, the later poem cites reaping, mowing and the capacity to split wood as enterprises where merit can be won; at 18.318–19, the hero also boasts of his prowess as a lamp-tender. But the poet's endorsement of values associated with productive labour only goes so far, and several factors work to restore the 'top-down' point of view more conventionally associated with epic. As Odysseus comes ever closer to reclaiming his identity, both poet and 'beggar' engage less frequently in paeans to rustic life, and Odysseus' challenge to Eurymachus at 18.366–75 offers the last major sounding of the motif.⁶⁴ Nor does Homer extend the sympathy that he accords to the hero in his beggar's disguise to other, more authentic specimens of the labouring classes and dispossessed. The ignoble, churlish Irus shows how a genuine mendicant behaves, and the audience is made to endorse the comic beating he receives. The other low-life abusers in books 17 and 18, Melanthius and his sister, suffer gruesome and ignominious punishments that distinguish their deaths from those of the high-class suitors.⁶⁵

⁶³ For this, and the points made here and in the next paragraph, see the rich discussion in Edwards 1993.

⁶⁴ Indicative of this shift is the hero's horrified response when, his identity restored, he is confronted with the spectacle of his own father looking and labouring like a serf (24.249–50).

⁶⁵ For issues of class and ideology, see further Rose 1975 and 1992 and Thalmann 1998.

(iv) Penelope

For many readers, much of the richness of the poem's Ithacan books depends on the focal position of Penelope, a figure drawn in such subtle fashion that her character and motivation remain a source of debate. Where earlier readings faulted the queen for her inconsistency, her obtuseness and seemingly irrational behaviour (so like a woman . . .), contemporary Penelopes range from a canny plotter, hoodwinker of those around her, to an unconscious puppet, the instrument of the divine and human figures who orchestrate her moves. She may be an autonomous and ethically right-minded agent trying to do her best in a situation that lies outside her control, a site for the poet to play complex narrative games, or an unsolvable riddle which reflects the larger problems that the female gender poses in early Greek myth and poetry. For all these accounts, the episodes in books 17 and 18 are critical: they both set up the terms of the conflicting representations of the queen that Homer deploys right up to the moment when husband and wife are finally rejoined and supply prime examples of her riddling words and actions. The discussion that follows falls into two parts: first some brief points about Penelope's position in the poem; then the view that this commentary takes concerning the enigmas raised by the queen's conduct.

Books 17 and 18 develop and on occasion clarify several puzzling aspects of Penelope's role within the *Odyssey*. First, the suitors' eagerness to pursue what seems at times a fruitless and unending courtship.⁶⁶ While several passages make Penelope's remarriage bear on the problem of the Ithacan kingship (see 15.522 and 22.45–54),⁶⁷ a matter which Odysseus' prolonged absence and likely death have made an object of potential contestation, nowhere does the poet suggest that the suitors are wooing the queen in the expectation of inheriting Odysseus' pre-eminent position.⁶⁸ Nor do Odysseus' ample household and estate go with the person of Penelope.⁶⁹ Should she remarry, she must quit the home where she resides more as caretaker than owner (18.270n, 19.579–81, 20.334–7, 341–4, 21.77–9, 103–4). Instead Penelope's supreme desirability, which book 18 details in particular fullness, depends on her surpassing

⁶⁶ For discussion of this question, see Thomas 1988, Carlier 1984: 206–7, and Thalmann 1998: 180–93.

⁶⁷ The term βασιλεύς and the nature of the institution it connotes in Homer are notoriously difficult to define. The expression is used both of the individual who stands as a paramount local chieftain in Ithaca and of the Phaeacians at 6.54–5, who seem to be nobles whose role is to advise the king; see further 17.416n and Garvie on 6.54–5. On the issue of Penelope's marriage and the succession and power struggle in Ithaca, see Rose 1975, Halverson 1985 and 1986, Scodel 2001.

⁶⁸ It should, however, be observed that although kingship through marriage is not a historical reality in Homeric Greece, it regularly occurs in the mythical world, and audiences might project that mythical construct onto the heroic age in which the *Odyssey's* action occurs.

⁶⁹ This too is the source of some confusion. Although the poet never raises the possibility of an uxoriocal marriage, the early books do not make explicit Penelope's departure from her home on the occasion of her remarriage (with the exception of 2.113, 130). This also bears on the problem of the 'kingship'. Without some other adult male to claim possession, the successful suitor might attempt to appropriate Odysseus' property and, by virtue of the wealth and power base that it gave him, aspire to the status of βασιλεύς.

beauty, her intelligence, virtue and marital fidelity (see 18.248–9; also 2.116–19); her high lineage means alliance with a prominent γένος, and her expertise at the loom generates the precious cloths that are part of the treasures of the home and belong among the currency of aristocratic gift exchange. In book 18, Penelope also exhibits her capacity to accumulate wealth independent of her handiwork, soliciting textiles and jewelry. Finally, and as the suitors' reaction to her appearance at 18.212–13n illustrates, Penelope is desirable quite simply because she is desired. Much like Helen in the *Iliad*, Odysseus' wife is positioned first implicitly and then explicitly as an object of male competition, a prize (21.73, 106–9) that individuals contend for because others do. At stake is a man's position among his peers, his victory in the jockeying for status characteristic of the elite.

This account of Penelope would seem to leave the queen without the autonomy and subjectivity required of an individual able to chart her course, and the poem remains imprecise as to the precise extent to which the queen can determine her future; her father, Telemachus and Penelope herself all seem variously to have a role in the decision concerning remarriage, and her words at 18.269–70 (see n), 'citing' Odysseus' recommendation that she select a second husband in the event of his death, add a fresh element to the several voices.⁷⁰ More consistent is the representation of the two courses of action that lie open to the queen, and the negative consequences that both carry. Penelope can either stay in Odysseus' house guarding his possessions (in which case the suitors may devour his livelihood and kill his son and heir), or leave her home and marry whomever of the suitors she chooses, in which case she does something profoundly antithetical to her desires and courts the charge of faithlessness; as the poem several times observes, public opinion on Ithaca holds that she should remain steadfast.⁷¹

By book 17 Penelope's position in Odysseus' home has reached such a pass that her stance of deferment and inaction is no longer possible: Telemachus, on the cusp of manhood, has grown increasingly assertive and eager to claim his role as master of the house, and the suitors, alarmed at his shows of initiative and authority, are plotting to take his life. Meanwhile Penelope has exhausted her delaying devices; since the discovery of the trick of the web, she has failed to find another ruse. At this eleventh hour, Odysseus' return to Ithaca and covert entry into the palace coincide with (or perhaps, in the poem's curious logic, precipitate) a shift in Penelope's behaviour. From the moment that she first learns of the beggar's presence, and with her emotional and intellectual faculties now fully re-engaged, she changes from passive bystander endlessly weeping in her chamber to an active agent who intervenes, as far as she is able, to direct events. What is less certain is the shape that she intends those events to take.

⁷⁰ Attempts to make Penelope's position correspond to that of women in eighth-century Greece are circular at best. Homer's account is not a reflection of historical reality, but an amalgam that freely mixes traditions about the heroic age with contemporary practices, filtering both through his inherited diction and thematic design.

⁷¹ 16.75 = 19.527, 23.149–51.

Penelope's conduct in book 17 appears quite consistent with the poet's earlier portrayal of a wife devoted to the husband whose return she ardently desires. Accordingly she receives indicators that Odysseus is still alive and on his way home with alacrity and joy. She is upset by Telemachus' refusal to tell her instantly what he learnt of his father while abroad, and reacts with delight to Theoclymenus' prediction of the hero's imminent return. Her attention seems almost preternaturally fixed on events in the hall and the treatment of the beggar there. Despite Eumaeus' claim that 'no roving traveller who comes here bearing news of my lord will be able to convince his wife' on account of the many lying tales by which she has been duped (14.122–30), Penelope is all eagerness to discover what this new arrival can tell her of Odysseus. At the book's end, after pressing Eumaeus instantly to arrange an interview with the beggar, she utters a wish for her husband's return and the suitors' destruction. When Telemachus' lucky sneeze caps her speech, Penelope welcomes the omen and gives the first of her two laughs in the poem.

With such emphasis on the queen's nascent optimism, her subsequent behaviour begs for explanation. The problem begins in book 18, where Penelope declares (following Athena's prompt) her intention of showing herself before the suitors; when displayed before them, she announces her willingness to remarry and to be won with gifts.⁷² Not only does her action smack of a flirtatiousness at odds with the conjugal fidelity shown so far; her stated intention also flies in the face of the news just received and that should counsel continued waiting on events. Penelope's actions in book 19 will take her even closer to the denouement that she has so strenuously resisted. Although confronted with still stronger proof that Odysseus is on his way home, she proposes the contest of the bow, ostensibly the means by which she will select her second husband. Penelope's emotions share the shifting character of her actions. In place of her earlier eager endorsements of predictions of her husband's homeward journey in book 17, an unshakable pessimism seems now to take hold. Even when the truth, in the shape of her husband, is quite literally staring her in the face, she continues to hesitate until she finally receives the proof of Odysseus' marital identity that she seeks.

A number of different factors, this commentary assumes, inform Homer's representation of his queen and can account for the oscillating conduct that books 17 and 18 describe. Without presuming that the poet attributes to Penelope the complex inner life and psychology that belong to individuals in works that long postdate archaic epic, nothing prohibits Homer from portraying his heroine intuitively responding to the cues that Odysseus and his advent supply (part of the almost magical 'like-mindedness' of this marital pair), and that prompt her emergence from a state of mourning and her show of initiative even before Athena instigates her self-display.⁷³

⁷² The Analysts would resolve the difficulty by condemning 18.158–303 as an interpolation.

⁷³ For accounts of Penelope's 'intuitive' recognition of Odysseus, see Amory 1963, Austin 1975, Russo 1982; note too Winkler 1990 who grounds Penelope's behaviour in the stratagems of dissimulation prized in Mediterranean culture. Other important treatments include Emlyn-Jones 1984, Marquadt 1985, Murnaghan 1986, Foley 2001: 126–43.

Penelope's shifting course, in which eagerness and caution play an equal part, also suits the poet's complex narrative design. So as to keep his audience in doubt as to how exactly his familiar tale will be resolved, Homer has used earlier parts of the poem to offer several models for Penelope and her trajectory.⁷⁴ The opacity of the queen's behaviour in book 18 make us wonder whether she will turn out to be another treacherous Clytemnestra, Helen or Aphrodite, a seductive Circe type, or a maidenly provider of help, like Nausicaa or Ino Leucothea. From the poem's start too, Homer has placed his heroine within a network of familial and social relations that circumscribe her role and deprive her of the freedom of action that the epic hero enjoys in pursuing his personal ends:⁷⁵ as a married woman, mother and daughter she must protect her οἶκος and serve the interests of her male kin. Further constraining Penelope is the conflict that the poet, much like later Attic tragedians, has engineered between these roles. As wife she should remain loyal to her husband, as guardian of the house prevent the destruction of his property that her continued presence there causes; as mother she must protect the life of the son that her prevarication jeopardizes, and as widow satisfy her natal family and marry again. In another harbinger of tragic drama, the poet deprives his heroine of the information necessary to know how to act; excluded from Athena and Odysseus' machinations, she makes her moves in ignorance of whether her husband is alive or dead. That she chooses the correct course at every juncture, unwittingly promoting the goddess and hero's designs, is part of the cleverness of the plot. Finally, the poet incorporates into his 'Penelopeia' the archetypal story of the maiden on the brink of marriage. Many Greek myths, one told in the *Hymn to Demeter*, paint the reluctance and ambivalence that the prospect of marriage arouses in the bride-to-be. Penelope's tears, her prayers to Artemis for a rapid death, her grief at the destruction of the domestic sphere that her dream in book 19 seemingly projects, all conform to this paradigm. When we add to these elements the facility for tricks, dissimulation and acute perception that the poet makes integral to his queen, and that makes her so fitting a partner for her spouse, we may have explanation enough for the ambiguities of Penelope's behaviour.

(v) Telemachus

Telemachus inaugurates the action in book 17, and figures in almost all the episodes in this and book 18. As a visitor to Eumaeus' hut, Theoclymenus' escort to Penelope, and a participant in the events in the dining hall, he interacts with the poem's key players while attempting in covert fashion to shield his father from the suitors' worst abuses. Both Telemachus' relations with the other characters and his interventions during Odysseus' initial reception suggest some answers to two central questions that the youth's role in the poem poses: does the poet offer his audience a Telemachus matured as a result of his travels and experiences in the poem's first four books, and how does the *Odyssey* treat the potentially clashing interests of father and son?

⁷⁴ Katz 1991 and Felson-Rubin 1994 argue for this deliberate 'narrative indeterminacy'.

⁷⁵ For this, and several subsequent points, see Foley 2001: 126–43.

Telemachus' words and actions in books 17 and 18 allow audiences to compare the youth as he now appears with the individual featured in the poem's opening two books (almost identical diction at 17.328n and 1.114 may signal the connections between the 'reception' scenes; see too 17.61–83n for the links with book 2). Although Homer presents a somewhat altered picture of the prince, chiefly through his considered use of formulas,⁷⁶ Telemachus' maturation does not seem a self-evident result of his earlier separation from home.⁷⁷ There are many moments when he appears as gauche and ineffective as before: his attempt to check Antinous merely elicits a threatening gesture on that suitor's part (17.397–410), and he chooses the moment when his mother aims to protect him from his enemies to give an ill-judged display of authority (18.227–42n). But the youth's travels and subsequent recognition of and by his father have brought about a change. As books 17 and 18 illustrate, through hearing tales of Odysseus' deeds, and being acknowledged as his father's son, he has acquired a major portion of his paternal heritage, the endurance, restraint and facility for role-playing that are so much a part of Odysseus' identity and that he recommends to his son at 16.274–80. Thus the youth can feign a roughness of manner with the beggar in Eumaeus' hut, and, in his conversation with Penelope afterwards, omit all word of his father's presence. He preserves silence in the face of Antinous' assault on Odysseus, for all that he feels 'a great sorrow over the blow' (17.489–90), and, maintaining that façade, responds in a muted manner to the second projectile directed at the beggar in book 18.

The finely-honed picture that Homer supplies of a youth 'at the critical moment of the passage from boyhood to manhood',⁷⁸ but with that passage still incomplete, forms part of the poem's innovatory solution to the problem of Telemachus' maturation. Attainment of adulthood would mean Telemachus' fitness to take on his father's role as head of the οἶκος and community, a course that would necessarily involve displacing the hero poised to return. Intergenerational conflict between 'king' and heir is not a theme that the poet wishes to pursue;⁷⁹ instead, departing from the models in other myths and later tragedy, he imagines the uniquely harmonious relations between Odysseus and Telemachus that are visible in the charade they play before the suitors in the hall in books 17, 18 and beyond. Despite the poem's occasional glances towards the 'Oedipal' path not taken (see 1.215–20, 350–5, 21.125–9), the prince shows himself willing to postpone his claims and to work wholeheartedly towards his father's restoration. Indeed, the poem's conclusion signals this rivalry forestalled when together with Laertes, Odysseus and his son confront the suitors: the

⁷⁶ See 17.3, 45nn and Beck 1998–9.

⁷⁷ For the degree to which Telemachus is cast in the role of the 'initiate' of myth and ritual, and the question of his maturation, see Eckert 1963, Martin 1993: 232–9, Felson-Rubin 1994: 67–91, Beck 1998–9, Heath 2001, Toher 2001.

⁷⁸ Hölscher 1996: 139.

⁷⁹ Although Homer seems aware of a probably already extant story preserved in a sixth-century epic, the *Telegony*, in which Odysseus is killed by Telegonus, his son by Circe.

youth's grandfather rejoices as his two heirs, exact equals, 'contend in courage', not against one another, but united against a common enemy (24.513–15).⁸⁰

Telemachus' new-found affinity with his father and their unity of purpose stand in contrast to the tensions that, from the poem's first book through to book 23, estrange him from Penelope. The exchanges between mother and son in books 17 and 18, which illustrate their conflicting goals and misinterpretations of one another's actions, are typical of their interactions elsewhere in the poem. The queen's necessary exclusion from the revenge plot and Telemachus' distrust of his mother as a result of Athena's warning (15.20) prompt his harsh dismissal of Penelope's request for news early in book 17 and her consequent pain. In book 18, in one of the queen's several attempts to forestall Telemachus' maturation and the changes in the household that this would bring about, Penelope assumes the capacity to instruct her son in how to behave in the company of older men, even as she acknowledges that the time has come for him to marry. The very fact of the disharmony between mother and son heightens our sense of the extraordinary strength of the marital bond. According to the 'ideology of exclusivity' that informs the mutuality between this husband and wife, Telemachus is denied the ability to fathom his parents' relationship and refused participation in the supreme moment of their reunion.⁸¹

(vi) The οἶκος

The attention to family relations and explorations of hospitality detailed above are among the several pointers to the spatial and corresponding thematic orientation of books 17 and 18. Quitting the exotic lands of the poem's first half, and the peripheral regions of Ithaca, Homer narrows his scope, rarely looking beyond Odysseus' dining hall and Penelope's chamber. The prominence of the hero's οἶκος, a unit that includes the physical house, its inhabitants, property, livestock, fields and human resources, conditions Homer's depiction of the dispute between Odysseus and his rivals in this portion of the composition: it is less a struggle for political or public primacy than a clash over questions of domestic authority and the suitors' usurpation of Odysseus' prerogatives as master of his home. On repeated display here are the interlopers' profligacy and unceasing consumption, their sexual dalliance with the maids, their neglect of the dog that was once a prized member of the house, and even their want of care with regard to the resources in the homes that are properly theirs (see 17.533).

The suitors' 'domestic' offences extend to the marriage relationship fundamental to the οἶκος, whose continuity depends on the legitimate offspring that the wife bears, and whose wealth she should preserve intact. The poet's earlier use of the House of Atreus paradigm has already criminalized the act of courtship, casting the intruders in the role of Aegisthus even as it glosses over the asymmetry between the two

⁸⁰ On father-son relations, and the potentially conflicting trajectories of Telemachus and Odysseus, see particularly Murnaghan 1987: 33–7 and Thalmann 1998: 206–23.

⁸¹ For this 'ideology of exclusivity', see Katz 1991: 170–82.

situations: Aegisthus courts Clytemnestra while Agamemnon is still very much alive, but the suitors do their wooing in the belief (or hope) that Odysseus is dead (see too 22.35–40). The gift-giving scene in book 18 also conforms to the negative model that Aegisthus has supplied: the objects that the suitors present to Penelope may better suit a seduction scenario than the legitimate courtship intended by the queen (see 18.278, 292–301nn).

A corollary to this promotion of the οἶκος and the social relations located there is the much-diminished or occluded place of the civic sphere, with only passing mentions of the δῆμος, of communal opinion and polis-based institutions (the assembly in book 2 is the only such meeting).⁸² Book 17 includes Telemachus' excursion to the agora, but on this occasion no public assembly takes place, and book 18 turns the 'public' beggar Irus (18.11) into the suitors' domestic stooge. It makes perfect sense then that Odysseus' revenge occurs within the οἶκος. Where other versions of his return may have imagined him leading a band of retainers (the lying tale of the Aetolian cited by Eumaeus hints at this alternative ending at 14.385), and a pitched battle of an Iliadic kind, the *Odyssey* prefers first to stage the slaughter in the banqueting hall (with members of the οἶκος as Odysseus' sole mortal supporters in the fight) and then shuts the house doors against outsiders (23.134–6).

3. TRANSMISSION

There is only one secure reference to writing in the Homeric corpus, in the story of how Proetus, king of Ephyre, sought to punish his guest Bellerophon whom he (wrongly) thought guilty of trying to seduce his wife. Inscribeing 'baneful signs on a folding tablet, many and deadly' (*Il.* 6.168–9), Proetus sent the hero to his Lycian father-in-law in the expectation that the miscreant, on showing his host the notations, would be punished. Homer may tell the story in ignorance of the medium he describes, adapting a tale borrowed from the Near East (where audiences would be familiar with writing) while preserving both the geographic orientation and the 'fatal letter' motif of the original. And yet the assumption that Homer was unaware of the technology that he includes is problematic. On several counts (although with the caveats noted below), it seems probable that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* assumed written form quite shortly after their date of composition. Oral preservation over several generations is possible (and some would postpone the poems' transposition into writing to the sixth century; see below), but less plausible. Since transmission through performance inevitably involves alteration and innovation, poems of such length and complexity could not have long survived in the form in which Homer composed them unless they were transcribed within or soon after his lifetime. Janko's tabulation of the incidence of various older linguistic forms in early epic poems shows that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*'s

⁸² For Thalmann 1998: 131, it is less a case of erasure than cooption: 'the *oikos* stands by synecdoche for the whole community, and the hierarchical relations in the *oikos* are presented as the model for the community's structure'.

linguistic evolution was arrested at a very early point, sometime in the eighth century, and well before Hesiod's time.⁸³ An external stop must have prevented the natural process of modernization and change, and a written version readily explains such fixity.

The scenario described above is not unproblematic.⁸⁴ Since the earliest examples of Greek writing date only from c. 770, in the form of inscriptions, the transcription of two immensely long oral poems would have had to occur when the technology was still very new. Compounding the challenge of writing down some 12,000 lines of the *Odyssey* was the cost of acquiring the necessary quantity of papyrus, a material imported from Egypt (perhaps via Phoenicia, also the origin of the syllabary that the Greeks adapted for their alphabetic writing system).⁸⁵ Attempts to push back the date of writing's introduction or to place Homer at a later stage run into fresh and still greater difficulties of their own.⁸⁶ How the works were first written down also remains a matter of conjecture. We might imagine that Homer, having composed his poems in the traditional manner, then transcribed them. But living oral poets have proved disinclined to use writing, which hinders compositional flow, and visible in the *Iliad* is a marked ambivalence, if not hostility, towards artifacts (Proetus' lying and destructive πῖναξ most emphatically) that, like written records, aim to preserve past events in unchanging form.⁸⁷ More plausible is the notion of Homer dictating to a scribe, much as the Yugoslav guslars did to Parry and Lord.⁸⁸ As for the impetus behind the decision to record the poems in writing, we can only speculate. The singular excellence of Homer's poetry, transcending anything a bard had achieved before, might have moved a wealthy patron to pay a scribe so as to guarantee the compositions' preservation, or the task may have been undertaken for more political reasons, as a local βασιλεύς saw in the poems a means of asserting a traditional model of kingship and aristocratic values increasingly under challenge. The growth of Panhellenism, competition with new performance genres, and a grasp for the

⁸³ Janko 1982: 228–31 assigns the fixation of the *Iliad* to 750–725 BC, that of the *Odyssey* to 743–713 BC. However, considerable dispute remains, and the present tendency is to date down to c. 700 BC or even later. See further Andersen and Dickie 1995 with Papadopoulos 1996.

⁸⁴ For detailed discussion of the issue, still useful is Allen 1924; more recent work includes Pasquali 1971: 201–47, Gentili 1988: 3–23, 223–33, S. West 1988: 33–48, Haslam 1997: 79–84, Kirk 1962: 87, 98–101 and Kirk 1964: 79–89 argue for uniquely oral preservation without significant modification until transcription in the sixth century; for effective counter-arguments to this, see Notopoulos 1960 and Parry 1966: 215–16.

⁸⁵ See Lewis 1974: 86–8 for the advent and spread of papyrus in Greece.

⁸⁶ See Powell 1997: 3–4 for these.

⁸⁷ For hostility towards monumentalized records in the *Iliad*, see Ford 1992: 131–71. See too Fowler 2004: 225–6.

⁸⁸ As Lord 1960: 128 has shown, a poet grown accustomed to the slower process of dictation is able to improve the quality of his work, both avoiding inconsistencies and anticipating the future course of events. Parry 1971: 475, however, acknowledges the problems dictation creates for an oral poet. Proponents of dictation include Jensen 1980: 92, Janko 1982: 191, West 1990: 34, Powell 1991: 221–37 and West 2000.

power that comes with canonization and control over future recitations of the epics are other possible motives for transcription.⁸⁹

The 'evolutionary theory' promoted by several recent scholars questions this account of the poems' transmission.⁹⁰ Instead, texts of the Homeric epics would not have existed until the middle of the sixth century, perhaps, in the view of some, first dictated and edited in Athens under the Peisistratid regime. According to an Athenian tradition dating back to the fourth century,⁹¹ Peisistratus (who seized power c. 561) first brought the poems to Athens, while his son Hipparchus (who died c. 514) instructed the rhapsodes performing the compositions at the Panathenaea, the venue for such recitals since the festival's inception in 566/5, to 'go through them in order', each taking up where his predecessor had left off (a description that suggests that previously episodes may have been sung out of order or independently).⁹² While the regularization of Homeric recitals at the Panathenaea under Hipparchus receives external support from the proliferation of scenes in their correct sequence from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* on contemporary Attic vases,⁹³ the tradition of the 'Peisistratean recension' (an episode wholly unknown to Alexandrian scholars) is likely to have been a later fabrication. Rather than crediting the Athenian tyrants with establishing official, definitive and archetypal texts of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, it seems more likely that Athens, and the Peisistratids who may have procured the first complete set of rolls, would have had an important part in the transmission of the poems that were already in written form; hence the epic diction's acquisition of its 'Attic veneer'.⁹⁴

Regardless of the date of the first transcription, the existence of a text, itself subject to revision, emendations and deletions, would not have precluded simultaneous oral transmission, particularly in a society where literacy was limited and where no special authority adhered to written as opposed to verbal accounts. The broad diffusion of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* throughout the Aegean points to this on-going performance tradition, as does the presence, attested in sources from the sixth century on, of the professional bands of Homeridae on the island of Chios, whose role it was to recite Homeric poetry; song competitions consisting of performances of Homer also

⁸⁹ For these different views, see Nagy 1979: 1–11, 1990a: chap. 2, Morris 1986, Burkert 1987, Janko 1992: 38.

⁹⁰ The 'evolutionary model' has chiefly been advanced by Nagy; see particularly Nagy 1992, 1996a, 1996b; note too Seaford 1994. For critiques, see Janko 1998: 12 nn. 63–4, Powell 1997: 30 n. 54, Finkelberg 2000.

⁹¹ Chiefly Plato [?] *Hipparch.* 228b; see also Isoc. *Panegy.* 159, Lycurg. *Leocr.* 102, Cic. *De or.* 3.137; Diog. Laert. 1.57 assigns the innovation to Solon. For the debates surrounding the Peisistratean recension, see Jensen 1980, S. West 1988: 36–9, Janko 1992: 29–32, Seaford 1994: 144–54, Scodel 2002: 54–5.

⁹² But as Fowler 2004: 224 observes, the very desire to establish a standard version 'implies an interesting textual awareness of oral vagaries' and does not prove there was no existing text at that point.

⁹³ See Shapiro 1990: 43–6. But it should also be noted that the iconographical tradition shows the popularity of several episodes not included in the canonical versions of the songs; see Lowenstam 1997.

⁹⁴ Haslam 1997: 83.

occurred at Sicyon in the early sixth century. Even if texts in the rhapsodes' possession inclined them to memorize the two works, some degree of continuing recomposition would inevitably occur as long as the poems were orally performed. Such a continuing composition-in-performance tradition alongside written transmission explains why, when confronted with texts gathered from as far afield as Marseilles, Cyprus, Crete, Chios and Sinope, the third- and second-century scholars of Alexandria had the daunting task of producing the standardized and stabilized versions of the two works that stand behind the manuscripts on which our present texts are based.

4. THE TEXT

Four chief sources for the *Odyssey* text exist: (a) the fragmentary papyri from the Ptolemaic period and Roman Egypt, of which our earliest date back to the third century BC and the latest to the 6th or 7th century AD; these preserve portions of the text that predate the first complete manuscripts by many centuries;⁹⁵ (b) verbatim quotations in ancient authors and lexicographers, including early inscriptions citing Homeric material; (c) medieval (and post-medieval) manuscripts, the earliest of which dates to the 10th century;⁹⁶ (d) textual comments and quotations in the 'scholia', many of which record the readings favoured by the Alexandrian scholars and editors of Homer; these scholia are far less abundant for the *Odyssey* than for the *Iliad*.⁹⁷ Occasionally commentaries exist as independent works, the prime example being that compiled by the twelfth-century archbishop Eustathius.

The broad picture of the transmission of the text is quite clear. As indicated above, the early material suggests a very fluid tradition with increasing diminution in textual variations over time. The first of the two chief watersheds in the regularization of the text occurs in the sixth century (the so-called 'Peisistratean recension' described above). However the many discrepancies that persist due to simultaneous oral transmission are visible in quotations of Homer in fourth-century authors, Plato and Aristotle among them, and in the 'city editions' (*politikai*) gathered by the Alexandrians. This last group shows many departures from what became the base text, although curiously several of them agree with one another or with citations in fourth-century authors that differ from the later vulgate. It seems unlikely that there was any single pre-Alexandrian prototype, despite Aristarchus' reference to a text or texts called *koine* or *koinai* (presumably manuscripts going back to some kind of 'standard' version) and which the Alexandrian scholar classifies, together with the city editions, among the 'random' or 'inferior' Homeric texts that were unedited by previous hands.⁹⁸

⁹⁵ For the papyri of the Ptolemaic period, see S. West 1967.

⁹⁶ For discussion of attempts to classify these into families, see Haslam 1997: 87–99.

⁹⁷ These are gathered in Dindorf 1855, and are just starting to be properly edited; see Pontani 2007.

⁹⁸ Nagy argues that this *koine* or 'vulgate' would have been derived from the text established in Athens under the reforms of the fourth-century Demetrius of Phaleron; see especially Nagy 1996b; note too Jensen 1980: 109–10 for the equation of the *koine* with the Athenian city edition.

The second decisive stage, which aimed to standardize the number and sequence of the verses and to remove many variant readings, is associated with the three scholars and Heads of the Alexandrian Library who collated and edited the available texts. Following his predecessors Zenodotus of Ephesus and Aristophanes of Byzantium,⁹⁹ Aristarchus of Samothrace (c. 216–144 BC) produced an edition of the Homeric poems.¹⁰⁰ His version seems to have proved much more influential than those of the two earlier scholars, prompting, from c. 150 BC on, the rapid disappearance of the ‘wild’ or ‘eccentric’ texts distinctive for their many variants and so-called ‘plus-verses’ (and some minus-verses too) that made the poems more verbose and repetitious than in their post-Aristarchean form. Following Zenodotus’ practice, Aristarchus would ‘athetize’ the suspect lines (which have survived in the manuscript tradition), marking each with an obelus or dash in the left hand margin. Modern scholars have variously reconstructed Aristarchus’ editorial principles. In the view of some, he based his corrections chiefly on the external, manuscript evidence; others argue that his subjective sense of what was redundant, incoherent or unseemly guided his choices, together with the desire to standardize the text. Because we lack information about the manuscripts available to Aristarchus, it remains impossible to determine in each and every instance the grounds on which he rejected lines or chose one reading over another, although documentary evidence clearly determined most omissions in his text. Most plausibly, the scholar would have charted a middle course between collation and conjecture.¹⁰¹ Absent from Aristarchus’ evaluations of his material was, of course, any awareness of the oral tradition shaping the poems: for the Alexandrian, Homer was an Athenian who lived around 1000 BC and wrote down his two compositions, works that Hesiod had a chance to read (see Σ A to *Il.* 13.197 and *Il.* 12.22a). The degree to which the later manuscript tradition derives from the version established by Aristarchus is also unclear:¹⁰² while the number and sequence of verses in our manuscripts almost exactly matches the verses admitted by Aristarchus, his readings are quite regularly ignored. This may be because Aristarchus’ ‘edition’ was not a newly created text, but an existing manuscript judged superior by the scholar, accompanied by his annotations and something in the manner of an apparatus.¹⁰³

⁹⁹ Zenodotus’ revisions are known to us only second- and third-hand; neither he nor Aristophanes left commentaries to accompany their text, although Aristophanes authored many lexicographical works. See S. West 1988: 41–5 for further details.

¹⁰⁰ Current assessments of Aristarchus differ widely; while older scholars tend to defend his reliability, in recent times the negative judgment chiefly associated with van der Valk 1949, that faults him for his subjectivity and foolish standards of suitability, has tended to prevail; for a balanced view, see Janko 1992: 25–9; other helpful treatments include Schenkeveld 1970, Porter 1992, Montanari 1998, Porter 2002, Nagy 2004.

¹⁰¹ Nagy 2004: 46.

¹⁰² To cite the two extremes, for Bolling 1914: 128, ‘all our manuscripts are reproductions of [Aristarchus’ edition]’; for the editor of the still current OCT, T. W. Allen, his influence was non-existent; see Allen 1924: 326–7. For further discussion, see van der Valk 1949, Apthorp 1980, S. West 1988: 46–8, Janko 1992: 20–38.

¹⁰³ For this view, see Haslam 1997: 85–6 and Montanari 2002. According to our later sources, Aristarchus produced first a commentary on Aristophanes’ text, then his own text and finally an accompanying commentary. A further text was subsequently produced by Aristarchus’ pupils on the basis of the scholar’s later thoughts.

While the reconstruction just offered conforms to standard accounts of textual transmission, it is not the only picture available. In an attempt to reconcile the Parry-Lord notion of an on-going tradition of composition-in-performance with the 'historical reality of an integral and unified Homeric *text* inherited from the ancient world',¹⁰⁴ Gregory Nagy has used Lord's concept of 'multiformity' to challenge attempts to establish an 'original' text. Multiformity, which describes songs in a constant process of evolution as each performance introduces fresh modifications, and which 'does not give preference or precedence to any one word or set of words to express an idea', but recognizes that the idea may exist in several forms,¹⁰⁵ also dispenses with the question of which of two textual variants is correct: since both stem from the multiform performance tradition and reflect different stages in the transcription of that tradition, they possess equal legitimacy. Only lack of conformity with traditional oral epic diction warrants a variant's rejection as 'inauthentic'.¹⁰⁶ A strict regard for oral poetics additionally reshapes the view that editors take of plus verses; because the performing poet expands or compresses his poem on each occasion, there is no single correct number of verses.

The production of such a 'multitext'¹⁰⁷ is not my intention here, and the text I print relies on the editions of T. W. Allen (Oxford, 2nd edn 1919), P. Von der Mühl (Basel 1946), J. Russo (vol. v of the Italian edition, Rome 1985) and H. van Thiel (Hildesheim 1993). It is not based on any new examination of the manuscripts, and the apparatus is extremely simplified (explanations for the abbreviations used in the notes at the foot of the text are given on p. 44). It generally notes major areas of divergence between the readings in standard editions, but minor variations (such as the inclusion or omission of the augment), misspellings due to scribal errors, and divergent orthographies are largely ignored; particular manuscripts or manuscript families to which variants belong are not identified. The apparatus also notes readings proposed or favoured by Alexandrian and other early editors and commentators and identifies the author by name. More extensive quotations, paraphrases or allusions in sources that provide our ancient indirect evidence for the text are cited in the body of the commentary.

Finally a word about book divisions. The twenty-four segments into which the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are conventionally divided do not date back to the period of the poems' composition (not least because the standard twenty-four letter Ionic alphabet on which those demarcations depend did not yet exist). The name ῥαψωιδία given by the ancient sources to the individual books suggests these divisions' genesis in a performance milieu, perhaps in the context of the sixth-century Panathenaea (where they would have helped the sequential delivery of the poem and the assignment of successive portions to the different days of the festival), or in the late fourth century, as part of the reforms of rhapsodic performances in Athens under Demetrius of Phaleron (317–307 BC).¹⁰⁸ Ps.-Plutarch's *Homeric Vita* assigns book divisions to the school of

¹⁰⁴ Nagy 1992: 31. ¹⁰⁵ M. L. Lord 1995: 23.

¹⁰⁶ Nagy 1996b: 133. ¹⁰⁷ Nagy 1996b: 113.

¹⁰⁸ S. West 1967: 18–25 proposes the divisions' origin in the fourth-century book trade instead.

Aristarchus (2.4), and many modern accounts endorse that view.¹⁰⁹ But the evidence can be argued both ways: against the absence of standard indicators of book division in most early papyri, we must weigh the several papyri that do suggest awareness of segmentation of some kind; if classical authors refer to Homeric passages not by book, but by the episodes in which they appear, this may reflect nothing more than the citation practices of the time. Nor can we rule out the possibility that Homer was first responsible for some form of partitioning, both to help him structure his complex narrative and to allow audiences to recognize important junctures within the poems; distinct narrative ‘blocks’ that broadly coincide with the book divisions as they now stand seem integral to the works’ intricate patterning and design. A pre-existing and in some way ‘authoritative’ source for the segmentation would also explain the unanimity with which Alexandrian scholars accepted the partitions: not known for scholarly concord, they seem in remarkable agreement on this point.¹¹⁰

5. HOMERIC METRE

Greek metre differs fundamentally from English; in English verse, rhythm depends on the number of syllables and the pattern of stresses in each line. In Greek, a pattern of alternating long (or ‘heavy’) and short (or ‘light’) syllables, distinguished by their relative duration (‘quantity’), determines the line’s rhythmical structure. Homer composed in the dactylic hexameter, a line of six feet (metra), which may be dactyls (– ∪ ∪) or spondees (– –). All Homeric verses have an internal line break or caesura (see below) and form a complete metrical period with a pause at the line’s end. The scheme of the hexameter line is as follows (∪ is a short syllable, – a long syllable, × an anacp, a syllable which may be long or short; | marks the end of each foot):

– ∪∪ | – ∪∪ | – ∪∪ | – ∪∪ | – ∪∪ | – ×

Any foot can be made up of a dactyl or a spondee, except for the truncated last foot; this consists of only two syllables and concludes in an anacp. Spondees occur more rarely in the fifth foot than in the first four, and the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* include only five purely spondaic lines (e.g. *Od.* 15.334). The discussion that follows presents the chief factors that determine the scansion of Homeric verse.¹¹¹

- (i) Syllable quantity: In Greek, the vowels η or ω are naturally long and ε and ο are naturally short; α, ι and υ may be either long or short. Diphthongs (αι, αυ, ει, ευ, ηυ, ου, υι) are long; these are normally pronounced together as a single

¹⁰⁹ However, the consensus seems to be shifting to an earlier date; see Haslam 1997: 57–8 and Heiden 2000.

¹¹⁰ Different positions on the debate concerning book division can be found in Taplin 1992: 285–93, Stanley 1993: 249–93, Jensen 1999, Heiden 1998, Heiden 2000; see too 17.1, 18.428 nn.

¹¹¹ For introductory discussions of the Homeric hexameter, see Monroe, *HD* 366–405 and West 1982: 35–9, 1987: 19–23. My account draws additionally on Wace and Stubbings 1962: 19–25, West 1997, Russo 1997, Pulleyn 2000.

syllable but if the modern text prints a double dot (dieresis) over the second of the two vowels (e.g. 17.8, δῖω), the vowels must be scanned separately. In Greek verse, syllables are treated as long or short.¹¹² A syllable is short if it ends in a short vowel. A syllable is long if it contains a long vowel, a diphthong or ends in a consonant (e.g. πῶλ-λά, *Od.* 1.1). Thus it is necessary to distinguish between vowel length and the metrical quantity of a syllable. In the word ἔσ-τι at *Od.* 17.18, the first syllable is long because it ends in a consonant but the vowel remains phonetically short. In syllabification, words are treated as a continuous succession of sounds; when a word ending in a short vowel is followed by a word beginning in two consonants, the syllable counts as long (e.g. τε στρυγεροῖο, *Od.* 17.8); so too, when a short vowel followed by a single consonant at the end of the word precedes a word beginning in a consonant, the syllable counts as long (e.g. ἄζηχῆς φάγμεν, *Od.* 18.3).

Two consonants occurring together are normally divided between two syllables (ἔσ-τι, as above). The letters ζ, ξ, ψ indicate two consonants (σδ, κσ, πσ) so that the preceding syllable is always long. The aspirate or rough breathing does not count as a consonant. Before certain combinations of consonants, a plosive (κ, χ, τ, θ, π, φ, γ, δ, β) followed by a liquid or nasal (λ, ρ, μ, ν), a short syllable is sometimes permitted. Examples include 17.32, where the final syllable of κάστορνῦσα must be short despite the fact that the two consonants in θρόνοις follow, and 18.173, where the first syllable of δακρύοισι is short. Some of these combinations are very rare,¹¹³ and in every instance the poet is using metrical licence so as to accommodate words that would otherwise not fit into the hexameter line.

- (ii) Where a vowel or diphthong occurs at the end of one word and another vowel begins the next, one of several things may occur: elision and correption are the regular practices, hiatus and synizesis are the exceptions, recognizable because the line will not otherwise scan.
- (a) Elision: if the final vowel of the first word is short, it is normally eliminated, regardless of whether the vowel beginning the following word is aspirated or not. This elimination is marked by an apostrophe in the text (e.g. 17.33, δ' ἔπειτ' ἰθύς). Final -αι terminating a middle or passive verb form is also sometimes elided (e.g. 17.81, βούλομ'). In Homeric epic, elision can never occur between one line and the next, although it is admissible at the caesura (e.g., 17.24).
- (b) Correption ('tightening up'): if the final vowel of the first word is long or a diphthong, it is usually shortened (see the lines scanned below). In Homer 'internal' correption can occasionally occur within a word, a device used for metrical convenience (so ἔμπασιον - υ υ at *Od.* 20.379).

¹¹² On one calculation, an average long syllable would have lasted about five-sixths as long as two average short syllables; see West 1982: 38 n. 18.

¹¹³ See Monro, *HD* 370.

- (c) Hiatus ('gap'): the final vowel or diphthong may sometimes preserve its original quantity. But often hiatus, normally prohibited in Greek poetry, is more apparent than real, the result of the second word's loss of an original initial digamma (e.g., *Il.* 1.7, τε φᾶναξ ἀνδρῶν). Hiatus can also occur when two formulas are juxtaposed,¹¹⁴ or at the caesura. In other instances, there is no obvious explanation for the poet's choice to use the device; Homer has simply exploited the licence that his poetic tradition allows.
- (d) Synizesis ('sitting together', also called crasis, 'mixing'): this means that two or more adjacent vowels or a vowel and a diphthong are run together so as to produce one long syllable (e.g. ἦνώγεα, scanned --- at 17.55, ὦ ἀρίγυντε, scanned --- ∪ at 375, ἦ οὐχ, scanned - at 376). The device regularly occurs with the case endings -εω (from -αω) and -έων (from -άων).

In addition to the quantity of the syllables, word placement and the internal articulation of the hexameter line are equally important determinants of rhythm.¹¹⁵ Homer achieves rhythmical variety by allowing pauses between two words, which may occur at various points and are subject to certain rules. When this word break occurs within a foot, it is called a caesura ('cutting' or word-division). Every verse has a 'main' or 'central' caesura, which may fall in one of three places in the third or fourth foot:

- (i) after the first short syllable of a dactylic third foot (the 'feminine' or trochaic caesura, much the most common); this rhythmical pause often coincides with a sense pause, e.g. 17.36:

ἦ δ' ἴεν ἔκ θαλάμοιο περίφρων Πηνελόπειᾶ

- (ii) after the first long syllable of that foot (the 'masculine' or penthemimeral caesura), e.g. 17.16:

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς

- (iii) after the first long syllable of the fourth foot (the hepthemimeral caesura), e.g. 5.203 etc.

διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ

Although a main hepthemimeral caesura is by far the rarest of divisions, a break in this position frequently appears side by side with a third foot main caesura (e.g. 17.1).

A third foot caesura occurs in over 98% of Homer's lines, causing the line to divide into two halves, the first slightly shorter than the second; many epic formulas are designed to fill one or another of these cola, and the poet may combine two

¹¹⁴ See Parry 1971: 191–6, 235–7.

¹¹⁵ On line structure and segmentation, see West 1982, Kirk 1985: 17–37, Kahane 1994: 17–42.

formulaic expressions, each occupying one segment of the line (see below). The two cola are additionally divided into two smaller word groups, with a word-break generally occurring after one or one-and-a-half feet in the first half, and before the fifth (and occasionally the fourth) foot in the second half. When that pause comes between two whole feet it is called *diaeresis* ('division'). Most frequent is the word break at the end of the fourth foot that generates the familiar rhythm – ∪ ∪ – – at the line's end; this so-called 'bucolic diaeresis' occurs in approximately 60% of Homer's lines (e.g. 17.36 above).

The opposite of the caesura is a 'bridge', a place in the verse where the poet tends to avoid word end: such bridges can be found after the first short syllable of the fourth foot ('Hermann's bridge', where word break occurs only about once in 550 lines), and at the end of the third foot. It is also very unusual to find a pause later than the end of the fourth foot. Some common short words are so closely associated with the word that precedes or follows them (called 'postpositives' and 'prepositives' respectively) that a caesura may not divide the combination. Postpositives include enclitics and particles such as μέν, δέ, γάρ; among 'prepositives' are the definite article and some particles, particularly καί and ἀλλά.

Many of these features of Homeric verse can be seen at work in the opening lines of book 17. The notes that follow signal the chief metrical devices and the internal articulation of the lines. The gap in each line indicates the main caesura.

Ἥμος δ' ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως,
 δὴ τότ' ἔπειθ' ὑπὸ ποσσίν ἔδησατο καλά πέδιλα
 Τηλέμαχος, φίλος υἱὸς Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο,
 εἶλετο δ' ἄλκιμον ἔγχος, ὃ οἱ παλάμηφιν ἀρήρει,
 ἄστυδε ἰέμενος, καὶ ἔδον προσέειπε συβώτην·
 "ἄττι, ἦ τοι μὲν ἔγών εἰμι ἐς πόλιν, ὄφρα μὲ μήτηρ
 ὄψεται· οὐ γάρ μιν πρόσθεν παύσεσθαι οἷω
 κλαυθμοῦ τε στυγεροῦ γοοῖο τε δακρυσέντος,
 πρὶν γ' αὐτόν με ἴδῃται· ἄτάρ σοί γ' ὦδ' ἐπιτέλλω·

1. Line 3 has a spondaic fifth foot, quite rare in the Homeric hexameter (it occurs in approximately 5% of Homeric verses).
2. There are elisions in lines 1, 2, 4, 6, and 9.
3. Correction occurs in 5 καὶ ἔδον, where the syllable of καί would normally be long; similarly at 7 παύσεσθαι οἷω, 9 ἴδῃται ἄτάρ.

4. Hiatus occurs at 4 ὀ οἱ and 5 ἄστυδε ἴεμενος; the hiatus at 9 με φίδηται is caused by digamma.
5. Of the nine lines, six have the feminine caesura. Line 9 is an example of a line where the caesura coincides with a strong sense break and at 8 it occurs between two formulaic expressions.
6. The bucolic diaeresis occurs in lines 6, 8 and 9.
7. There is no violation of the 'bridge' in line 8 since τε (a postpositive) is tied to γόοιο.
8. Lines 3 and 7 have prominent pauses at the end of the first or first-and-a-half foot.

The existence of different internal divisions, and the rules governing them, facilitate composition and audience reception in several ways. The caesura and bucolic diaeresis allow the poet to structure his lines so that they match and promote narrative progression. In addition to the strong sense-break that occurs at line end in well over 50% of the lines in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, internal articulation creates other sense-pauses or 'stopping points' and signals relations of meaning between the line's different elements; lines that fall naturally into two parts often include parallel or mutually reinforcing statements, while those that contain three elements may offer a sequence of increasingly emphatic or more particularized terms. A pause within or after the first foot isolates a significant opening term. Relations between lines are also conveyed by the use of sentence structure. Self-enclosed thoughts, gnomic reflections or proverbial 'one-liners' tend to fill a single line (e.g. 17.218); enjambment, where the sense runs on into the next line, and particularly common when a new phrase begins at the bucolic diaeresis, may highlight the 'run over' word (e.g. 18.21–2) or simply serve to keep the story going. Parry distinguished between two kinds of enjambment: the 'unperiodic' or (in Kirk's terminology) 'progressive' kind, where a grammatically integral phrase is extended by an additional term or phrase; and the 'necessary' or 'integral' kind, where the enjambed element completes the unfinished meaning.¹¹⁶ These various structural elements also allow the reciting poet to avoid the too pronounced regularity and monotony that would result from sequences of lines which fell into a single rhythm, all probably performed to the same melody.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶ For enjambment, see Bassett 1926, Edwards 1966, Parry 1971: 251–65, Kirk 1985: 30–7, Higbie 1990, Clark 1994 and 1997. There has been relatively little discussion of the stylistic significance of the device beyond its capacity, on occasion, to lend emphasis to the enjambed term. See Bakker 1997a: 152–5 for the suggestion that clusters of enjambed lines can convey heightened emotion or accompany 'chaotic scenes' through their deliberate violation of the usual hexametric rhythm.

¹¹⁷ The only extant scrap of musical notation accompanying a hymn composed in epic metre, an inscription dated to the third century AD, suggests that the same melody would be used for every line; for this and other aspects of musical performance, see West 1992: 208–9 and 328.

Verse segmentation demonstrably exists in close relation to formulaic diction, with specific formulas slotting into the different portions of the line (e.g. at 17.16, the formulaic πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς follows the fourth-foot caesura; contrast 280, where the poet needs the longer πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς to fill the space between the feminine caesura and the line end). It is easy to imagine (and comparative Indo-European poetics bears this out) that certain formula shapes predated and even generated the structural units subsequently joined into the hexameter line, although without firm knowledge of when the metre first evolved (see below), questions of priority remain unresolved. The interdependence between verse structure and traditional diction goes beyond noun-epithet phrases: for certain word types, syntactic patterns, and colon-length phrases there are strongly preferred positions in the line, suggesting the presence of an 'inner-metrical' level visible in the division into cola.¹¹⁸

The degree to which sound, metre and colometry (the arrangement of individual rhythmical word groups) can mirror meaning remains hard to gauge. In a few well-known instances, a metrical sequence does seem 'mimetic', coinciding with the action described.¹¹⁹ At *Od.* 11.593–600 (a passage already commented on by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On the composition of words*, 20) metrical devices reflect first Sisyphus' laborious effort as he pushes his stone to the top of the hill, and then the stone's rapid descent as it rolls back down. Heavily spondaic phrases, long participles and the hiatus in ἄνω ὄθεσκε convey the sinner's slow and effort-filled toil, while the sequence of uncontracted dactyls at 598 evokes the boulder's downward rush. On other occasions, metre may enhance the poet's characterization of an individual and his speaking style. Thersites' abusive address (*Il.* 2.225–42) contains an unusual amount of correpion and synizesis; this bears out the descriptions that the poet and Odysseus give of the defamer, a man 'of unmeasured speech' (ἀμετροεπής, 212) and 'indiscriminate in his words' (ἀκριτόμυθος, 246).¹²⁰ But for the most part judgments that the metrical sequence would cause one phrase or line to sound 'harsh' and another 'mellifluous' must remain largely subjective.

Further questions surround the origins and early history of the dactylic hexameter.¹²¹ The existence of formulas uniquely adapted to hexameter verse and whose morphology places their coinage in Mycenaean times confirms that poets were already using the metre for heroic epic in the fifteenth or fourteenth centuries. The dactylic hexameter is most likely to be an indigenous creation. While some have argued that it seems ill suited to the Greek language because it necessarily precludes words that contain a cretic (–υ–) or have a sequence of more than two short syllables (contrast the iambic trimeter), and hence must have been adopted from the Near East, no plausible foreign predecessors have been found. The most likely scenario is that proposed by Martin West in which Greek poets, working in a tradition of

¹¹⁸ As explored in O'Neill 1942. ¹¹⁹ See West 1997: 232–3.

¹²⁰ See Martin 1989: 109–13

¹²¹ My account draws chiefly on West 1997; see too West 1973, Nagy 1974, Gentili and Giannini 1977.

quantitative verse whose antecedents lie in Indo-European poetry, would have combined two independent cola (visible in other combinations in lyric poems), adapting the beginning of the second so as to preserve the dactylic rhythm.¹²² The existence of the caesura and the differentiation of the line's two segments, the first with its characteristic 'falling' rhythm, where the emphasis comes at the beginning of each foot, and the second with its corresponding 'rise', stand witness to this original division.

¹²² See *Od.* 7.89 for a rare instance of a failure to perform the necessary adaptation.

ABBREVIATIONS IN THE APPARATUS CRITICUS

Sigla explanations

- a** a reading, different from that in the printed text, which appears in the manuscript tradition that provides our direct evidence for the text; the reading may also appear in the papyri, but not exclusively in these
- b** a second variant reading in one or more such witnesses
- c** a third such variant
- p** a reading that exists only in a papyrus and not in the manuscript tradition
- d** readings conjectured by modern editors out of dissatisfaction with the direct or indirect evidence for the text supplied by the ancient sources; some editors are identified by name

The abbreviation *codd.* indicates that the reading is found in all manuscripts, but not all papyri.

Abbreviations for ancient scholars

Apol. Lex.	Apollonius (author of <i>Lexicon Homericum</i>)
Ar.	Aristarchus
Arist. Byz.	Aristophanes Byzantius
Callistr.	Callistratus
Clem. Alex.	Clemens Alexandrinus
Dio Chrys.	Dio Chrysostomus
Diod. Sic.	Diodorus Siculus
Dion. Hal.	Dionysius Halicarnassensis
Eust.	Eustathius
Hesych.	Hesychius
Himer.	Himerius
Ptol. Asc.	Ptolemaeus Ascalonita
Zen.	Zenodotus

ΟΜΗΡΟΥ ΟΔΥΣΣΕΙΑΣ Ρ

Ἥμος δ' ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως, 1
 δὴ τότε ἔπειθ' ὑπὸ ποσσὶν ἐδήσατο καλὰ πέδιλα
 Τηλέμαχος, φίλος υἱὸς Ὀδυσσεύος θείοιο,
 εἶλετο δ' ἄλκιμον ἔγχος, ὃ οἱ παλάμηφιν ἀρήρει,
 ἄστυδε ἰέμενος, καὶ ἐὼν προσέειπε συμβώτην· 5
 “ἄττ', ἦ τοι μὲν ἐγὼν εἰμ' ἐς πόλιν, ὄφρα με μήτηρ
 ὄψεται· οὐ γάρ μιν πρόσθεν παύσεσθαι ὄϊω
 κλαυθμοῦ τε στυγεροῦ γόοιό τε δακρυρόεντος,
 πρὶν γ' αὐτόν με ἴδῃται· ἀτὰρ σοί γ' ὦδ' ἐπιτέλλω·
 τὸν ξεῖνον δύστηνον ἄγ' ἐς πόλιν, ὄφρ' ἂν ἐκείθι 10
 δαῖτα πτωχεύῃ· δώσει δέ οἱ ὅς κ' ἐθέλῃσι,
 πύρνον καὶ κοτύλην· ἐμὲ δ' οὐ πῶς ἔστιν ἅπαντας
 ἀνθρώπους ἀνέχεσθαι, ἔχοντά περ ἄλγεα θυμῷ.
 ὃ ξεῖνος δ' εἶ περ μάλα μηνίει, ἄλγιον αὐτῷ
 ἔσσεται· ἦ γὰρ ἐμοὶ φίλ' ἀληθέα μυθήσασθαι.” 15
 τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς·
 “ὦ φίλος, οὐδέ τοι αὐτὸς ἐρύκεσθαι μενεαίνω.
 πτωχῶν βέλτερόν ἐστι κατὰ πτόλιν ἢ ἐ κατ' ἀγροῦς
 δαῖτα πτωχεύειν· δώσει δέ μοι ὅς κ' ἐθέλῃσιν.
 οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ σταθμοῖσι μένειν ἔτι τηλίκος εἰμί, 20
 ὥς τ' ἐπιτελαιμένω σημάντορι πάντα πιθέσθαι.
 ἀλλ' ἔρχε· ἐμὲ δ' ἄξει ἀνὴρ ὄδε, τὸν σὺ κελεύεις,
 αὐτίκ' ἐπεὶ κε πυρὸς θερέω ἀλήη τε γένηται.
 αἰνῶς γὰρ τάδε εἶματ' ἔχω κακά· μή με δαμάσση
 στίβη ὑπηροίη· ἕκαθεν δέ τε ἄστυ φάτ' εἶναι.” 25
 ὧς φάτο, Τηλέμαχος δὲ διὰ σταθμοῖο βεβήκει,
 κραιπνὰ ποσὶ προβιβάς, κακὰ δὲ μνηστῆρσι φύτευεν.
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἴκανε δόμους ἐὺ ναιετάοντας,
 ἔγχος μὲν ῥ' ἔστησε φέρων πρὸς κίονα μακρὴν,
 αὐτὸς δ' εἴσω ἴεν καὶ ὑπέρβη λάϊνον οὐδόν. 30
 τὸν δὲ πολὺ πρῶτη εἶδε τροφὸς Εὐρύκλεια,
 κῶεα καστορνῦσα θρόνοις ἐνὶ δαιδαλέοισι,
 δακρύσασα δ' ἔπειτ' ἰθὺς κίεν· ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ἄλλαι

3a εἶματα ἐσάμενος περὶ δὲ ξίφος ὄξυ θέτ' ὦμο α 9 μ' ἐσίδηται α 26 διὰ σταθμοῖο α
 διὰ μεγάροιο β 29 στήσε πρὸς κίονα μακρὸν ἐρείσας quoted by Eust.; cf. 8.66, 473, 1.127.
 32 καστρων(ν)ύσα α καστορνύσα β

δμωιαὶ Ὀδυσσεύς ταλασίφρονος ἠγερέθοντο
 καὶ κύνεον ἀγαπαζόμενοι κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ὤμους. 35
 ἦ δ' ἔεν ἐκ θαλάμοιο περίφρων Πηνελόπεια,
 Ἄρτεμιδι ἰκέλη ἤε χρυσέῃ Ἀφροδίτῃ,
 ἀμφὶ δὲ παιδί φιλῶι βάλε πῆχες δακρύσασσα,
 κύσσε δὲ μιν κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ἄμφω φάεα καλὰ,
 καὶ ῥ' ὀλοφυρομένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα· 40
 “ἦλθες, Τηλέμαχε, γλυκερὸν φάος. οὐ σ' ἔτ' ἐγὼ γε
 ὄψεσθαι ἐφάμην, ἐπεὶ ὦιχεο νηὶ Πύλονδε
 λάθρῃ, ἐμεῦ ἀέκητι, φίλου μετὰ πατρός ἀκοιήν.
 ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι κατάλεξον ὅπως ἦντησας ὀπωπῆς.”
 τὴν δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίον ἠΐδα· 45
 “μῆτερ ἐμή, μή μοι γόον ὄρνυθι μηδὲ μοι ἦτορ
 ἐν στήθεσσι δρινε φυγόντι περ αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον·
 ἀλλ' ὕδρηναμένη, καθαρὰ χροῖ εἴμαθ' ἔλοῦσα,
 εἰς ὑπερῶϊ ἀναβάσασσιν ἀμφιπόλοισι γυναιξίν
 εὔχεο πᾶσι θεοῖσι τελεέσσας ἑκατόμβας 50
 ῥέξειν, αἶ κέ ποθι Ζεὺς ἀντιτα ἔργα τελέσσει.
 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἀγορὴν ἐσελεύσομαι, ὄφρα καλέσσω
 ξεῖνον, ὅτις μοι κείθεν ἄμ' ἔσπετο δεῦρο κιόντι.
 τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ προὔπεμψα σὺν ἀντιθέοις ἐτάροισι,
 Πείραιον δὲ μιν ἠνώγεα προτὶ οἶκον ἄγοντα 55
 ἐνδυκέως φιλέειν καὶ τίεμεν, εἰς ὃ κεν ἔλθω.”
 ὧς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, τῆι δ' ἄπτερος ἔπλετο μῦθος.
 ἦ δ' ὕδρηναμένη, καθαρὰ χροῖ εἴμαθ' ἔλοῦσα,
 εὔχετο πᾶσι θεοῖσι τελεέσσας ἑκατόμβας
 ῥέξειν, αἶ κέ ποθι Ζεὺς ἀντιτα ἔργα τελέσσει. 60
 Τηλέμαχος δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα διέκ μεγάροιο βεβήκει
 ἔγχος ἔχων· ἅμα τῶι γε κύνες πόδας ἀργοὶ ἔποντο.
 θεσπεσίην δ' ἄρα τῶι γε χάριν κατέχευεν Ἀθήνη·
 τὸν δ' ἄρα πάντες λαοὶ ἐπερχόμενον θηεῦντο.
 ἀμφὶ δὲ μιν μνηστῆρες ἀγήνορες ἠγερέθοντο 65
 ἔσθλ' ἀγορεύοντες, κακὰ δὲ φρεσὶ βυσοδόμουον.
 αὐτὰρ ὁ τῶν μὲν ἔπειτα ἀλεύατο πουλὺν ὄμιλον,
 ἀλλ' ἴνα Μέντωρ ἦστο καὶ Ἄντιφος ἠδ' Ἀλιθέρης,
 οἳ τέ οἱ ἐξ ἀρχῆς πατρῴοι ἦσαν ἐταῖροι,

36 βῆ δ' εἶναι θαλάμοιο **a** 42 ὄψ ἐφάμην ὄψεσθ' **a** 49 (= 4.751) omitted in some
 MSS; placed after 51 by some MSS. 52 ἀγορῆνδ' ἐσελεύσομαι **a** ἀγορὴν ἐπελεύσομαι
b ἀγορῆνδε ἐλεύσομαι Arist. Byz.; cf. 1.88. 62 δύο κύνες ἀργοὶ **a**

ἔνθα καθέζετ' ἰών· τοὶ δ' ἐξερέεινον ἕκαστα.
 70 τοῖσι δὲ Πείραιος δουρικλυτὸς ἐγγύθεν ἦλθε
 ξείνον ἄγων ἀγορήνδε διὰ πτόλιν· οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτι δὴν
 Τηλέμαχος ξείνοιο ἐκὰς τράπετ', ἀλλὰ παρέσθη.
 τὸν καὶ Πείραιος πρότερος πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε·
 75 “Τηλέμαχ', αἰψ' ὄτρυνον ἐμὸν ποτὶ δῶμα γυναϊκάς,
 ὡς τοὶ δῶρ' ἀποπέμψω, ἅ τοι Μενέλαος ἔδωκε.”
 τὸν δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίον ἠῦδα·
 “Πείραι', οὐ γάρ τ' ἴδμεν, ὅπως ἔσται τάδε ἔργα.
 εἴ κεν ἐμὲ μνηστῆρες ἀγήνορες ἐν μεγάροισι
 80 λάθρῃ κτείναντες πατρῷα πάντα δάσωνται,
 αὐτὸν ἔχοντα σὲ βούλομ' ἐπαυρέμεν ἢ τινα τῶνδε·
 εἰ δὲ κ' ἐγὼ τούτοισι φόνον καὶ κῆρα φυτεύσω,
 δὴ τότε μοι χαίροντι φέρειν πρὸς δῶματα χαίρων.”
 ὡς εἰπὼν ξείνον ταλαπείριον ἦγεν ἐς οἶκον.
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἴκοντο δόμους εὖ ναιετάοντας,
 85 χλαίνας μὲν κατέθεντο κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε,
 ἐς δ' ἄσαμίνθους βάντες εὐξέστας λούσαντο.
 τοὺς δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν δμῳαὶ λοῦσαν καὶ χρίσαν ἐλαίωι,
 ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρα χλαίνας οὐλας βάλον ἠδὲ χιτῶνας,
 90 ἕκ ῥ' ἄσαμίνθων βάντες ἐπὶ κλισμοῖσι καθίζον.
 χέρνιβα δ' ἀμφίπολος προχόωι ἐπέχευε φέρουσα
 καλῆι χρυσεῖῃι, ὑπὲρ ἀργυρέοιο λέβητος,
 νίψασθαι· παρὰ δὲ ξεστῆν ἐτάνυσσε τράπεζαν.
 σῖτον δ' αἰδοίῃ ταμίῃ παρέθηκε φέρουσα,
 95 εἶδατα πόλλ' ἐπιθεῖσα, χαριζομένη παρεόντων.
 μήτηρ δ' ἀντίον ἴζε παρὰ σταθμὸν μεγάροιο
 κλισμῶι κεκλιμένη, λέπτ' ἠλάκατα στρωφῶσα.
 οἱ δ' ἐπ' ὀνειᾶθ' ἔτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἴαλλον.
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο,
 100 τοῖσι δὲ μῦθων ἦρχε περίφρων Πηνελόπεια·
 “Τηλέμαχ', ἦ τοὶ ἐγὼν ὑπερώϊον εἰσαναβᾶσα
 λέξομαι εἰς εὐνήν, ἣ μοι στονόεσσα τέτυκται,
 αἰεὶ δάκρυσ' ἐμοῖσι πεφυρμένη, ἐξ οὗ Ὀδυσσεὺς
 ὦιχεθ' ἅμ' Ἀτρεΐδῃσιν ἐς Ἴλιον· οὐδέ μοι ἔτλης,
 105 πρὶν ἔλθεῖν μνηστῆρας ἀγήνορας ἐς τόδε δῶμα,
 νόστον σοῦ πατρὸς σάφα εἶπέμεν, εἴ που ἄκουσας.”

70 ἅπαντα **a** 78 γὰρ ἴδμεν **d**; cf. 10.190 v.l.
 ἐλαίωι **a**; cf. 10.450. 90 ἄσαμίνθου **a**

83 χαίρων· πατρός **a**

88 χρίσαν λιπ'

τὴν δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίον ἠΐδα·
 “τοιγὰρ ἐγὼ τοι, μήτηρ, ἀληθείην καταλέξω.
 ὠιχόμεθ' ἔς τε Πύλον καὶ Νέστορα, ποιμένα λαῶν·
 δεξάμενος δέ με κείνος ἐν ὑψηλοῖσι δόμοισιν 110
 ἐνδυκέως ἐφίλει, ὡς εἶτε πατὴρ ἔον υἷον
 ἐλθόντα χρόνιον νέον ἄλλοθεν· ὡς ἐμὲ κείνος
 ἐνδυκέως ἐκόμιζε σὺν υἰάσι κυδαλίμοισιν.
 αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεύς ταλασίφρονος οὐ ποτ' ἔφασκε
 ζωοῦ οὐδὲ θανάτῳ ἐπιχθονίων τευ ἀκοῦσαι, 115
 ἀλλὰ μ' ἔς Ἀτρεΐδην, δουρικλειτὸν Μενέλαον,
 ἵπποισι προὔπεμψε καὶ ἄρμασι κολλητοῖσιν.
 ἐνθ' ἴδον Ἀργεῖην Ἑλένην, ἧς εἵνεκα πολλὰ
 Ἀργεῖοι Τρῶές τε θεῶν ἰότητι μόγησαν.
 εἶρετο δ' αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος 120
 ὅττευ χρηῖζων ἰκόμην Λακεδαίμονα δῖαν·
 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τῶι πᾶσαν ἀληθείην κατέλεξα·
 καὶ τότε δὴ μ' ἐπέεσσιν ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπεν·
 “ὦ πόποι, ἦ μάλα δὴ κρατερόφρονος ἀνδρὸς ἐν εὐνῇ
 ἤθελον εὐνηθῆναι, ἀνάγκιδες αὐτοὶ ἔοντες. 125
 ὡς δ' ὀπότ' ἐν ξυλόχῳ ἔλαφος κρατεροῖο λέοντος
 νεβροῦς κοιμήσασα νεηγενέας γαλαθηνούς
 κνημοὺς ἐξερέησι καὶ ἄγχεα ποιήεντα
 βοσκομένη, ὃ δ' ἔπειτα ἐὴν εἰσήλυθεν εὐνήν,
 ἀμφοτέροισι δὲ τοῖσιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐφήκεν, 130
 ὡς Ὀδυσσεὺς κείνοισιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐφήσει.
 αἶ γάρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἄπολλον,
 τοῖος ἔων οἶός ποτ' ἐϋκτιμένην ἐνὶ Λέσβῳ
 ἔξ ἔριδος Φιλομηλεΐδῃ ἐπάλαισεν ἀναστάς,
 κὰδ δ' ἔβαλε κρατερῶς, κεχάροντο δὲ πάντες Ἀχαιοί, 135
 τοῖος ἔων μνηστῆρσιν ὀμιλήσειεν Ὀδυσσεύς·
 πάντες κ' ὠκύμοροί τε γενοίατο πικρόγαμοί τε.
 ταῦτα δ' ἄ μ' εἰρωτᾶις καὶ λίσσεαι, οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ γέ
 ἄλλα παρέξ εἴποιμι παρακλιδὸν οὐδ' ἀπατήσω,
 ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν μοι ἔειπε γέρον ἄλιος νημερτής, 140
 τῶν οὐδέν τοι ἐγὼ κρύψω ἔπος οὐδ' ἐπικεύσω.
 φῆ μιν ὃ γ' ἐν νήσῳ ἰδέειν κρατέρ' ἄλλ' ἐχόντα,

111 υἰά **a**, Ar., Eust., παῖδα Zen. (cf. 16.17, *Il.* 9.481). 118 πολλοὶ **a** 119 δάμησαν **a**
 128 κρημοῦς **a** ἄγχεα **a** 129 ὃ δὲ τ' ὤκα **a** 130 ἐφήσει **a** ἐφήει **b** 142 [θαλερόν]
 κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντα v.l. in Eust.

νύμφης ἐν μεγάροισι Καλυψοῦς, ἥ μιν ἀνάγκη
 ἴσχει· ὁ δ' οὐ δύναται ἦν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἰκέσθαι·
 οὐ γάρ οἱ πάρα νῆες ἐπήρετμοι καὶ ἐταῖροι, 145
 οἳ κέν μιν πέμποιεν ἐπ' εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης.”
 ὡς ἔφατ' Ἀτρεΐδης, δουρικλειτὸς Μενέλαος.
 ταῦτα τελευτήσας νεόμην· ἔδοσαν δέ μοι οὖρον
 ἀθάνατοι, τοί μ' ὦκα φίλην ἐς πατρίδ' ἔπεμψαν.”
 ὡς φάτο, τῆι δ' ἄρα θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ὄρινε. 150
 τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε Θεοκλύμενος θεοειδής·
 “ὦ γύναι αἰδοίη Λαερτιάδεω Ὀδυσῆος,
 ἦ τοι ὁ γ' οὐ σάφα οἶδεν, ἐμεῖο δὲ σύνθεο μῦθον·
 ἀτρεκέως γάρ τοι μαντεύσομαι οὐδ' ἐπικεύσω.
 ἴστω νῦν Ζεὺς πρῶτα θεῶν ξενίη τε τράπεζα 155
 ἰστίη τ' Ὀδυσῆος ἀμύμονος, ἦν ἀφικάνω,
 ὡς ἦ τοι Ὀδυσσεὺς ἤδη ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ,
 ἦμενος ἦ ἔρπων, τόδε πευθόμενος κακὰ ἔργα,
 ἔστιν, ἀτὰρ μνηστῆρσι κακὸν πάντεσσι φυτεύει·
 οἶον ἐγὼν οἰωνὸν ἐϋσέλμου ἐπὶ νηὸς 160
 ἦμενος ἐφρασάμην καὶ Τηλεμάχῳ ἐγεγώνευν.”
 τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε περίφρων Πηνελόπεια·
 “αἶ γὰρ τοῦτο, ξεῖνε, ἔπος τετελεσμένον εἶη·
 τῶ κε τάχα γνοιῆς φιλότῃτᾶ τε πολλὰ τε δῶρα
 ἐς ἐμεῦ, ὡς κέν τίς σε συναντόμενος μακαρίζοι.” 165
 ὡς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον·
 μνηστῆρες δὲ πάροιθεν Ὀδυσσῆος μεγάροιο
 δίσκοισιν ἔρποντο καὶ αἰγανέησιν ἰέντες
 ἐν τυκτῶι δαπέδῳ, ὅθι περ πάρος, ὕβριν ἔχοντες.
 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ δεῖπνηστος ἦεν καὶ ἐπήλυθε μῆλα 170
 πάντοθεν ἐξ ἀγρῶν, οἳ δ' ἦγαγον οἳ τὸ πάρος περ,
 καὶ τότε δὴ σφιν ἔειπε Μένδων· ὅς γάρ ῥα μάλιστα
 ἦνδανε κηρύκων καὶ σφιν παρεγίνετο δαιτί·
 “κοῦροι, ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντες ἐτέρφθητε φρέν' ἀέθλοις,
 ἔρχεσθε πρὸς δώμαθ', ἵν' ἐντυνώμεθα δαῖτα· 175
 οὐ μὲν γάρ τι χέρειον ἐν ὥρῃ δεῖπνον ἐλέσθαι.”
 ὡς ἔφαθ', οἳ δ' ἀνστάντες ἔβαν πείθοντό τε μύθῳ.

150–65 athet. in the ‘common’ (κοινωτέροις) editions; only 160–1 are athetized in the ‘better’ (χαιροτέροις) ones; see Σ. 153 ὁ γ' δδ' **a** 155 θεῶν ὑπατος καὶ ἄριστος **a**; cf. 19.303, 20.230 156 ἐστίη **a** 161 ἐγεγώνεον **a**, Herodian ad *Il.* 13.337 165 κέν Hesych. ὡς ἄν τις codd. 169 ἔχεσκον **a** 177 ἔβαν ποτὶ οἶκον (οἰκόνδε) ἕκαστος **a**

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἴκοντο δόμους ἐϋ ναιετάοντας,
 χλαίνας μὲν κατέθεντο κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε,
 οἱ δ' ἴερευον δῖς μεγάλους καὶ πίνοντας αἴγας, 180
 ἴρευον δὲ σύας σιάλους καὶ βοῦν ἀγελαίην,
 δαῖτ' ἐντυνόμενοι. τοῖ δ' ἔξ ἀγροῖο πόλινδε
 ὠτρύνοντ' Ὀδυσσεύς τ' ἰέναι καὶ δῖος ὑφορβός.
 τοῖσι δὲ μύθων ἤρχε συβώτης, ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν·
 “ξεῖν’, ἐπεὶ ἄρ δὴ ἔπειτα πόλινδ’ ἰέναι μενεαίνεις 185
 σήμερον, ὡς ἐπέτελλεν ἄναξ ἐμός, – ἦ σ’ ἂν ἐγὼ γε
 αὐτοῦ βουλοίμην σταθμῶν ῥυτῆρα λιπέσθαι·
 ἀλλὰ τὸν αἰδέομαι καὶ δαίδια, μὴ μοι ὀπίσσω
 νεικείη· χαλεπαὶ δὲ τ’ ἀνάκτων εἰσὶν ὀμοκλαί·
 ἀλλ’ ἄγε νῦν ἴομεν· δὴ γὰρ μέμβλωκε μάλιστα 190
 ἡμαρ, ἀτὰρ τάχα τοι ποτὶ ἔσπερα ρίγιον ἔσται.”
 τὸν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς·
 “γινώσκω, φρονέω· τά γε δὴ νοέοντι κελεύεις.
 ἀλλ’ ἴομεν, σὺ δ’ ἔπειτα διαμπερές ἡγεμόνευε.
 δὸς δὲ μοι, εἴ ποθὶ τοι ῥόπαλον τετμημένον ἐστί, 195
 σκηρίπτεσθ’, ἐπεὶ ἦ φατ’ ἀρισφαλέ’ ἔμμεναι οὐδόν.”
 ἦ ῥα, καὶ ἀμφ’ ὤμοισιν ἀεικέα βάλλετο πῆρην,
 πυκνὰ ῥωγαλέην, ἐν δὲ στρόφος ἦεν ἀορτήρ·
 Εὐμαιος δ’ ἄρα οἱ σκῆπτρον θυμαρὲς ἔδωκε.
 τῷ βήτην, σταθμὸν δὲ κύνες καὶ βώτορες ἄνδρες 200
 ῥύατ’ ὀπισθε μένοντες· ὁ δ’ ἔς πόλιν ἦγεν ἄνακτα
 πτωχῶι λευγαλέωι ἐναλίγκιον ἠδὲ γέροντι,
 σκηπτόμενον· τὰ δὲ λυγρὰ περὶ χροῖ εἴματα ἔστο.
 ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ στείχοντες ὁδὸν κάτα παιπαλόεσσαν
 ἄστεος ἐγγύς ἔσαν καὶ ἐπὶ κρήνην ἀφίκοντο 205
 τυκτὴν καλλίροον, ὅθεν ὑδρεύοντο πολίται,
 τὴν ποίησ’ Ἴθακος καὶ Νήριτος ἠδὲ Πολύκτωρ·
 ἀμφὶ δ’ ἄρ’ αἰγείρων ὕδατοτρεφῶν ἦν ἄλσος,
 πάντοσε κυκλοτερές, κατὰ δὲ ψυχρὸν ῥέεν ὕδωρ
 ὑψόθεν ἐκ πέτρης· βωμός δ’ ἐφύπερθε τέτυκτο 210
 Νυμφάων, ὅθι πάντες ἐπιρρέζεσκον ὀδίται·
 ἔνθα σφέας ἐκίχανεν υἱὸς Δολίοιο Μελανθεύς
 αἴγας ἄγων, αἰ πᾶσι μετέπρεπον αἰπολίοισι,

181 athet. Arist. Byz. and Ar. 187 γενέσθαι a, Eust. 189 τ’ del. Dawes 196 ἀρισ-
 φαλές... οὐδας a 198 omitted in some MSS 199 θυμήρες a 208 ἦν codd., ἔεν d

δεῖπνον μνηστήρεσσι· δύω δ' ἅμ' ἔποντο νομῆες.
 τοὺς δὲ ἰδὼν νεΐκεσσαν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν 215
 ἔκπαγλον καὶ ἀεικές· ὄρινε δὲ κῆρ Ὀδυσῆος·
 “νῦν μὲν δὴ μάλα πάγχυ κακὸς κακὸν ἠγηλάζει,
 ὡς αἰεὶ τὸν ὁμοῖον ἄγει θεὸς ἔς τὸν ὁμοῖον.
 πῆι δὴ τόνδε μολοβρὸν ἄγεις, ἀμέγαρτε συβῶτα,
 πτωχὸν ἀνιηρόν, δαιτῶν ἀπολυμαντῆρα; 220
 οἷς πολλῆις φλιῆισι παραστάς θλίφεται ὦμος,
 αἰτίζων ἀκόλους, οὐκ ἄορας οὐδὲ λέβητας·
 τὸν κ' εἴ μοι δοίης σταθμῶν ῥυτῆρα γενέσθαι
 σηκοκόρον τ' ἔμεναι θαλλόν τ' ἐρίφοισι φορῆναι,
 καὶ κεν ὄρον πίνων μεγάλην ἐπιγουνίδα θεῖτο. 225
 ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὖν δὴ ἔργα κάκ' ἔμαθεν, οὐκ ἔβηλῆσει
 ἔργον ἐποίχεσθαι, ἀλλὰ πτώσων κατὰ δῆμον
 βούλεται αἰτίζων βόσκειν ἦν γαστέρ' ἀναλτον.
 ἀλλ' ἔκ τοι ἔρέω, τὸ δὲ καὶ τετελεσμένον ἔσται·
 αἶ κ' ἔλθῃ πρὸς δώματ' Ὀδυσσῆος θεῖοιο, 230
 πολλὰ οἱ ἀμφὶ κάρη σφέλα ἀνδρῶν ἐκ παλαμῶν
 πλευραὶ ἀποτρίψουσι δόμον κάτα βαλλομένοιο.”
 ὡς φάτο, καὶ παριῶν λάξ ἔνθορεν ἀφραδίησιν
 ἰσχύϊ· οὐδέ μιν ἐκτὸς ἀταρπιτοῦ ἔστυφέλιξεν,
 ἀλλ' ἔμεν' ἀσφαλέως. ὁ δὲ μερμήριξεν Ὀδυσσεύς, 235
 ἦε μεταίξας ῥοπάλωι ἐκ θυμὸν ἔλοιτο,
 ἦ πρὸς γῆν ἐλάσειε κάρη ἀμφουδὶς αἰείρας.
 ἀλλ' ἐπετόλμησε, φρεσὶ δ' ἔσχετο. τὸν δὲ συβῶτης
 νεῖκεσ' ἐσάντα ἰδὼν, μέγα δ' εὖξαστο χεῖρας ἀνασχών·
 “Νύμφαι κρηναῖαι, κοῦραι Διός, εἴ ποτ' Ὀδυσσεύς 240
 ὑμῖ ἐπὶ μηρί' ἔκηε, καλύψας πῖονι δημῶι,
 ἄρνων ἠδ' ἐρίφων, τότε μοι κρηήνατ' ἐέλδωρ,
 ὡς ἔλθοι μὲν κείνος ἀνὴρ, ἀγάγοι δέ ἐ δαίμων.
 τῶ κέ τοι ἀγλαΐας γε διασκεδάσειεν ἀπάσας,
 τὰς νῦν ὑβρίζων φορέεις, ἀλαλήμενος αἰεὶ 245
 ἄστου κάτ' αὐτὰρ μῆλα κακοὶ φθείρουσι νομῆες.”
 τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε Μελάνθιος, αἰπόλος αἰγῶν·
 “ὦ πόποι, οἷον ἔειπε κύων ὀλοφώϊα εἰδῶς,

217 ἠγηλάζεισ a 218 ἔς τὸν: ὡς τὸν a 219 μολαβρὸν v.l. Arist. Byz. in Eust. 221
 φλίφεται a, Ar. (?), Eust. 222 ἄορα γ' a ἄορα b 231 ἀμφικαρῆ (-κάρη) a, Apol. Lex.,
 Ptol. Asc.; cf. 18.335. 232 πλευράς a πλευρά b 237 ἀμφ' οὐδας a ἐρείσας a, Eust.
 241 πῖονι: ἀργέτι a

τόν ποτ' ἐγὼν ἐπὶ νηὸς ἔϋσσέλμοιο μελαίνης
 ἄξω τῆλ' ἰθάκης, ἵνα μοι βίοτον πολὺν ἄλφοι. 250
 αἶ γὰρ Τηλέμαχον βάλαι ἀργυρότοξος Ἀπόλλων
 σήμερον ἐν μεγάροις, ἢ ὑπὸ μνηστῆρσι δαμείη,
 ὡς Ὀδυσσῆϊ γε τηλοῦ ἀπώλετο νόστιμον ἡμᾶρ.”
 ὡς εἰπὼν τοὺς μὲν λίπεν αὐτόθι ἦκα κιάοντας,
 αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ, μάλα δ' ὤκα δόμους ἵκανεν ἄνακτος. 255
 αὐτίκα δ' εἶσω ἶεν, μετὰ δὲ μνηστῆρσι καθίζεν,
 ἀντίον Εὐρυμάχου· τὸν γὰρ φιλέεσκε μάλιστα.
 τῶι πάρα μὲν κρειῶν μοῖραν θέσαν οἱ πονέοντο,
 σῖτον δ' αἰδοίη ταμίη παρέθηκε φέρουσα
 ἔδμεναι. ἀγχίμολον δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ δῖος ὕφορβος 260
 στήτην ἐρχομένω, περὶ δὲ σφεας ἦλυθ' ἰώῃ
 φόρμιγγος γλαφυρῆς· ἀνά γὰρ σφισι βάλλετ' αἰδεῖν
 Φῆμιος. αὐτὰρ ὁ χειρὸς ἑλὼν προσέειπε συβῶτην·
 “Εὐμαί, ἢ μάλα δὴ τάδε δώματα κάλ' Ὀδυσσῆος·
 ῥεῖα δ' ἀρίγνωτ' ἐστί καὶ ἐν πολλοῖσιν ιδέσθαι. 265
 ἔξ ἐτέρων ἕτερ' ἐστίν, ἐπήσκηται δὲ οἱ αὐλή
 τοίχῳ καὶ θριγκοῖσι, θύραι δ' εὐερκέες εἰσὶ
 δικλίδες· οὐκ ἄν τις μιν ἀνὴρ ὑπεροπλίσσαιτο.
 γινώσκω δ', ὅτι πολλοὶ ἐν αὐτῷ δαῖτα τίθενται
 ἄνδρες, ἐπεὶ κνίση μὲν ἐνήνοθεν, ἐν δὲ τε φόρμιγξ 270
 ἠπύει, ἦν ἄρα δαιτιῖ θεοὶ ποίησαν ἑταίρην.”
 τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη, Εὐμαιε συβῶτα·
 “ῥεῖ' ἔγνωσ, ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ τὰ τ' ἄλλα πέρ ἐσσ' ἀνοήμων.
 ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ φραζώμεθ' ὅπως ἔσται τάδε ἔργα.
 ἦε σὺ πρῶτος ἔσελθε δόμους ἔϋ ναιετάοντας, 275
 δύσεο δὲ μνηστῆρας, ἐγὼ δ' ὑπολείψομαι αὐτοῦ·
 εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις, ἐπίμεινον, ἐγὼ δ' εἶμι προπάροιθεν.
 μηδὲ σὺ δηθύνειν, μὴ τίς σ' ἔκτοσθε νοήσας
 ἢ βάλῃ ἢ ἐλάσῃ· τὰ δὲ σε φράζεσθαι ἄνωγα.”
 τὸν δ' ἡμίβετ' ἐπειτα πολὺτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς· 280
 “γινώσκω, φρονέω· τὰ γε δὴ νοέοντι κελεύεις.
 ἀλλ' ἔρχευ προπάροιθεν, ἐγὼ δ' ὑπολείψομαι αὐτοῦ.
 οὐ γάρ τι πληγέων ἀδαήμων οὐδὲ βολάων,
 τολμήεις μοι θυμός, ἐπεὶ κακὰ πολλὰ πέπονθα
 κύμασι καὶ πολέμῳ· μετὰ καὶ τότε τοῖσι γενέσθω. 285

254 αὐτοῦ **a** 267 εὐεργέες **a**, Dio Chrys., Eust. 269 πένονται **a** 270 ἀνήνοθεν **a**
 (αἱ κοιναι) 276 δῦσαι **a** δύσο **b**

γαστέρα δ' οὐ πῶς ἔστιν ἀποκρύψαι μεμαυῖαν,
οὐλομένην, ἣ πολλὰ κάκ' ἀνθρώποισι δίδωσι,
τῆς ἔνεκεν καὶ νῆες εὐζυγοὶ ὀπλίζονται
πόντον ἐπ' ἀτρύγετον, κακὰ δυσμενέεσσι φέρουσαι.”

ὡς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον 290

ἄν δὲ κύων κεφαλὴν τε καὶ οὐατα κείμενος ἔσχεν,
Ἄργος, Ὀδυσσεύς τε ταλασίφρονος, ὃν ῥά ποτ' αὐτὸς
θρέψε μὲν, οὐδ' ἀπόνητο, πάρος δ' εἰς Ἴλιον ἱρὴν
ῶιχετο. τὸν δὲ πάροιθεν ἀγίνεσκον νέοι ἄνδρες
αἴγας ἐπ' ἀγροτέρας ἠδὲ πρόκας ἠδὲ λαγῶους 295

δὴ τότε κεῖτ' ἀπόθεστος ἀποιοχόμενιο ἄνακτος
ἐν πολλῇ κόπρωι, ἣ οἱ προπάροιθε θυράων
ἡμιόνων τε βοῶν τε ἄλις κέχυτ', ὄφρ' ἂν ἄγοιεν
δμῶες Ὀδυσσεύς τε μέγας κοπρίσσοντες
ἔνθα κύων κεῖτ' Ἄργος, ἐνίπλευς κυνοραιστέων. 300

δὴ τότε γ', ὡς ἐνόησεν Ὀδυσσεύα ἐγγὺς ἐόντα,
οὐρῆι μὲν ῥ' ὃ γ' ἔσθηνε καὶ οὐατα κάββαλεν ἄμφω,
ἄσπον δ' οὐκέτ' ἔπειτα δυνήσατο οἴο ἄνακτος
ἐλθέμεν· αὐτὰρ ὁ νόσφιν ἰδὼν ἀπομόρξατο δάκρυ,
ῥεῖα λαθῶν Εὐμαίων, ἄφαρ δ' ἐρεείνετο μύθῳι 305

“Εὐμαί, ἣ μάλα θαῦμα κύων ὄδε κεῖτ' ἐνὶ κόπρωι.
καλὸς μὲν δέμας ἐστίν, ἀτὰρ τόδε γ' οὐ σάφα οἶδα,
ἣ δὴ καὶ ταχύς ἔσκε θέειν ἐπὶ εἴδει τῶιδε,
ἣ αὐτως οἴοι τε τραπεζῆες κύνες ἀνδρῶν
γίγνοντ', ἀγλαΐης δ' ἔνεκεν κομέουσιν ἄνακτες.” 310

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη, Εὐμαίε συβῶτα·
“καὶ λίην ἀνδρὸς γε κύων ὄδε τῆλε θανόντος
εἰ τοιόσδ' εἶη ἡμὲν δέμας ἠδὲ καὶ ἔργα,
οἶόν μιν Τροίηνδε κιὼν κατέλειπεν Ὀδυσσεύς,
αἰψά κε θηήσαιο ἰδὼν ταχυτήτα καὶ ἀλκὴν. 315

οὐ μὲν γάρ τι φύγεσκε βαθείης βένθεσιν ὕλης
κνώδαλον, ὅττι δίοιτο· καὶ ἴχνεσι γὰρ περιήϊδη.
νῦν δ' ἔχεται κακότητι, ἄναξ δέ οἱ ἄλλοθι πάτρης
ῶλετο, τὸν δὲ γυναῖκες ἀκηδέες οὐ κομέουσι.
δμῶες δ', εὖτ' ἂν μηκέτ' ἐπικρατέωσιν ἄνακτες, 320

οὐκέτ' ἔπειτ' ἐθέλουσιν ἐναΐσιμα ἐργάζεσθαι·

286 ἀποπλήσαι Clem. Alex. 296 -νοιο (-νου) ὀδυσσεύς **a** 299 κοπρήσοντες **a** κοπρί-
σοντες **b** 302 κάμβαλεν **a** 308 ἣ **d** (cf. 18.265) εἰ codd. 316 τάρφουσιν **a** 317
δίοιτο: ἰδοίτο **a** 318 πάτρης: γαίης **a**

ἦμισυ γάρ τ' ἀρετῆς ἀποαίνονται εὐρύσπα Ζεὺς
ἀνέρος, εὐτ' ἂν μιν κατὰ δούλιον ἦμαρ ἔλησιν.”

ὡς εἰπὼν εἰσήλθε δόμους εὐ ναιετάοντας,
βῆ δ' ἰθύς μεγάροιο μετὰ μνηστῆρας ἀγαυούς. 325
Ἄργον δ' αὖ κατὰ μοῖρ' ἔλαβεν μέλανος θανάτοιο,
αὐτίκ' ἰδόντ' Ὀδυσῆα ἔεικοστῶι ἐνιαυτῶι.

τὸν δὲ πολὺ πρῶτος ἶδε Τηλέμαχος θεοειδῆς
ἐρχόμενον κατὰ δῶμα συβώτην, ὥκα δ' ἔπειτα
νεῦσ' ἐπὶ οἷ καλέσας· ὁ δὲ παπτήνας ἔλε δίφρον 330
κείμενον, ἔνθα τε δαιτρὸς ἐφίζεσκε κρέα πολλὰ
δαιόμενος μνηστῆρσι δόμον κάτα δαινυμένοισι·
τὸν κατέθηκε φέρων πρὸς Τηλεμάχοιο τράπεζαν
ἀντίον, ἔνθα δ' ἄρ' αὐτὸς ἐφέζετο· τῶι δ' ἄρα κῆρυξ
μοῖραν ἔλων ἐτίθει κανέου τ' ἐκ σῆτον αἰείρας. 335

ἀγχίμολον δὲ μετ' αὐτὸν ἐδύσετο δῶματ' Ὀδυσσεύς,
πτωχῶι λευγαλέωι ἐναλίγκιος ἠδὲ γέροντι,
σκηπτόμενος· τὰ δὲ λυγρὰ περὶ χροῖ εἴματα ἔστο.
ἶξε δ' ἐπὶ μελίνου οὐδοῦ ἔντοσθε θυράων,
κλινάμενος σταθμῶι κυπαρισσίνωι, ὃν ποτε τέκτων 340
ξέσσειν ἐπισταμένως καὶ ἐπὶ στάθμην ἴθυνε.

Τηλέμαχος δ' ἐπὶ οἷ καλέσας προσέειπε συβώτην,
ἄρτον τ' οὔλον ἔλων περικαλλέος ἐκ κανέοιο
καὶ κρέας, ὡς οἱ χεῖρες ἐχάνδανον ἀμφιβάλοντι·
“δὸς τῶι ξείνωι ταῦτα φέρων αὐτόν τε κέλευε 345
αἰτίζειν μάλα πάντας ἐπιχόμενον μνηστῆρας·
αἰδῶς δ' οὐκ ἀγαθὴ κεχρημένωι ἀνδρὶ παρῆναι.”

ὡς φάτο, βῆ δὲ συφορβός, ἐπεὶ τὸν μῦθον ἄκουσεν,
ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε·
“Τηλέμαχος τοι, ξεῖνε, διδοῖ τάδε καὶ σε κεύει 350
αἰτίζειν μάλα πάντας ἐπιχόμενον μνηστῆρας·
αἰδῶ δ' οὐκ ἀγαθὴν φησ' ἔμμεναι ἀνδρὶ προῖκτιη.”

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς·
“Ζεῦ ἄνα, Τηλέμαχόν μοι ἐν ἀνδράσιν ὄλβιον εἶναι,
καὶ οἱ πάντα γένοιτο ὅσα φρεσὶν ἦισι μενοινᾷ.” 355

ἦ ῥα, καὶ ἀμφοτέρησιν ἐδέξατο καὶ κατέθηκεν
αὐθι ποδῶν προπάροισιν, ἀεικέλις ἐπὶ πῆρης,
ἦσθιε δ' ἦος αἰοιδὸς ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν αἶειδεν.

331 τε **d**, δὲ codd. 334 ἐνθά περ **a** 335 προτίθει **a** 347 κεχρημένον ἄνδρα κομίζειν
a παρῆναι: προῖκτιη **a**, Eust. 349 πτερόεντα προσηύδα **a** 354 μοι codd., δὸς **p**
358 ἦος **d**, ὡς δτ' **a** ἔως δτ' **b**

εὐθ' ὁ δεδειπνήκειν, ὁ δ' ἐπαύετο θεῖος ἄοιδός,
 μνηστῆρες δ' ὁμάδησαν ἀνὰ μέγαρ' αὐτὰρ Ἀθήνη
 ἄγχι παρισταμένη Λαερτιάδην Ὀδυσῆα
 ὠτρυν', ὡς ἂν πύρνα κατὰ μνηστῆρας ἀγείροι
 γνοίη θ' οἳ τινές εἰσιν ἐναίσιμοι οἳ τ' ἀθέμιστοι·
 ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὡς τιν' ἔμελλ' ἀπαλεξήσειν κακότητος.
 βῆ δ' ἴμεν αἰτήσων ἐνδέξια φῶτα ἕκαστον,
 πάντοσε χεῖρ' ὀρέγων, ὡς εἰ πτωχὸς πάλαι εἶη.
 οἳ δ' ἔλεαίροντες δίδουσαν, καὶ ἐθάμβεον αὐτόν,
 ἀλλήλους τ' εἶροντο τίς εἶη καὶ πόθεν ἔλθοι.
 τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε Μελάνθιος, αἰπόλος αἰγῶν·
 “κέκλυτέ μευ, μνηστῆρες ἀγακλειτῆς βασιλείης,
 τοῦδε περὶ ξείνου· ἦ γὰρ πρόσθεν μιν ὄπωπα.
 ἦ τοι μὲν οἳ δεῦρο συμβώτης ἠγεμόνευεν,
 αὐτὸν δ' οὐ σάφα οἶδα, πόθεν γένος εὐχεται εἶναι.”
 ὡς ἔφατ', Ἀντίνοος δ' ἔπεσιν νείκεσσε συμβώτην·
 “ὦ ἀρίγνωτε συμβῶτα, τίη δὲ σὺ τόνδε πόλινδε
 ἦγαγες; ἦ οὐχ ἄλις ἤμιν ἀλήμονές εἰσι καὶ ἄλλοι,
 πτωχοὶ ἀνιηροὶ, δαιτῶν ἀπολυμαντῆρες;
 ἦ ὄνοσαι ὅτι τοι βίοτον κατέδουσιν ἄνακτος
 ἐνθάδ' ἀγειρόμενοι, σὺ δὲ καὶ προτὶ τόνδ' ἐκάλεσσας;”
 τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη, Εὐμαίε συμβῶτα·
 “Ἀντίνοε, οὐ μὲν καλὰ καὶ ἐσθλὸς ἐὼν ἀγορεύεις·
 τίς γὰρ δὴ ξεῖνον καλεῖ ἄλλοθεν αὐτὸς ἐπελθὼν
 ἄλλον γ', εἰ μὴ τῶν οἳ δημιοεργοὶ ἔασι,
 μάντιν ἢ ἱητῆρα κακῶν ἢ τέκτονα δοῦρων,
 ἢ καὶ θέσπιν ἄοιδόν, ὃ κεν τέρπησις αἰείδων;
 οὔτοι γὰρ κλητοὶ γε βροτῶν ἐπ' ἀπίερόνα γαῖαν·
 πτωχὸν δ' οὐκ ἂν τις καλέοι τρύξοντα ἔαυτόν.
 ἀλλ' αἰεὶ χαλεπὸς περὶ πάντων εἰς μνηστῆρων
 δμῶσιν Ὀδυσσῆος, περὶ δ' αὐτ' ἐμοί· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ γε
 οὐκ ἀλέγω, ἥός μοι ἐχέφρων Πηνελόπεια
 ζῶει ἐνὶ μεγάροις καὶ Τηλέμαχος θεοειδής.”
 τὸν δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίον ηἵδα·
 “σίγα, μὴ μοι τοῦτον ἀμείβεο πολλὰ ἐπέεσσιν·
 Ἀντίνοος δ' εἴωθε κακῶς ἐρεθιζέμεν αἰεὶ

359 athet. Ar. δεδειπνήκει **a** 364 omitted in **p** κακότητα **a** 371 μιν πρόσθεν **a**
 375 ὦ ἀρίγνωτε **d**, ὠρίγνωτε **a** ἀρίγνωτε **b** ὦ ῥίγνωτε Eust. 379 ποθι **a** 390 ἥός
d εἰως codd. 393 σίγα: ἄττα **a**

μύθοισιν χαλεποῖσιν, ἐποτρύνει δὲ καὶ ἄλλους.” 395
 ἦ ῥα, καὶ Ἄντινοον ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα
 “Ἄντινό, ἦ μευ καλὰ πατήρ ὡς κήδεαι υἱός,
 ὅς τὸν ξεῖνον ἄνωγας ἀπὸ μεγάροιο δῖεσθαι
 μύθῳ ἀναγκάϊω· μὴ τοῦτο θεὸς τελέσειε.
 δός οἱ ἑλών· οὐ τοι φθονέω· κέλομαι γὰρ ἐγὼ γε. 400
 μήτ’ οὖν μητέρ’ ἐμήν ἄζευ τό γε μήτε τιν’ ἄλλον
 δμῶων, οἱ κατὰ δώματ’ Ὀδυσσεύος θεῖοιο.
 ἀλλ’ οὐ τοι τοιοῦτον ἐνὶ στήθεσσι νόημα·
 αὐτὸς γὰρ φαγέμεν πολὺ βούλευαι ἢ δόμεν ἄλλωι.”
 τὸν δ’ αὖτ’ Ἄντινοος ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέειπε· 405
 “Τηλέμαχ’ ὑφαγόρη, μένος ἄσχετε, ποῖον ἔειπες.
 εἴ οἱ τόσσον πάντες ὀρέξειαν μνηστῆρες,
 καὶ κέν μιν τρεῖς μῆνας ἀπόπροθεν οἶκος ἐρύκοι.”
 ὡς ἄρ’ ἔφη, καὶ θρήνυν ἑλών ὑπέφηνε τραπέζης
 κείμενον, ὧι ῥ’ ἔπεχεν λιπαροὺς πόδας εἰλαπινάζων. 410
 οἱ δ’ ἄλλοι πάντες δίδοσαν, πλῆσαν δ’ ἄρα πῆρην
 σίτου καὶ κρειῶν· τάχα δὴ καὶ ἔμελλεν Ὀδυσσεύς
 αὐτίς ἐπ’ οὐδὸν ἰὼν προϊκὸς γεύσεσθαι Ἀχαιῶν·
 στή δὲ παρ’ Ἄντινοον καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε·
 “δός, φίλος· οὐ μὲν μοι δοκέεις ὁ κάκιστος Ἀχαιῶν 415
 ἔμμεναι, ἀλλ’ ὄριστος, ἐπεὶ βασιλῆϊ ἔοικας.
 τῷ σε χρὴ δόμεναι καὶ λῳῖον ἢ ἐπερ ἄλλοι
 σίτου· ἐγὼ δὲ κέ σε κλείω κατ’ ἀπίερα γαῖαν.
 καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ποτε οἶκον ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἔναιον
 ὄλβιος ἀφνειὸν καὶ πολλάκι δόσκον ἀλήτηι 420
 τοίωι, ὁποῖός ἔοι καὶ ὅτεν κεχηρημένος ἔλθοι·
 ἦσαν δὲ δμῶες μάλα μυρῖοι ἄλλα τε πολλὰ,
 οἷσιν τ’ εὐ ζώουσι καὶ ἀφνειοὶ καλέονται.
 ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς ἀλάπαξε Κρονίων - ἤθελε γάρ που –
 ὅς μ’ ἅμα ληϊστήρσι πολυπλάγκτοισιν ἀνῆκεν 425
 Αἰγυπτὸνδ’ ἰέναι, δολιχὴν ὁδόν, ὄφρ’ ἀπολοίμην.
 στήσα δ’ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ποταμῶι νέας ἀμφιελίσσας.
 ἔνθ’ ἦ τοι μὲν ἐγὼ κελόμην ἐρήρας ἑταίρους
 αὐτοῦ πὰρ νῆεσσι μένειν καὶ νῆας ἔρυσθαι,
 ὀπτῆρας δὲ κατὰ σκοπιὰς ὠτρυνά νέεσθαι. 430
 οἱ δ’ ὕβρει εἷξαντες, ἐπισπόμενοι μένει σφῶι,

401 μήτε τι **a** 402 del. Knight (cf. 568 and 18.417) 405 ἀπαμειβετο φώνησέν τε **a**
 413 γεύσασθαι **a** 417 ἄλλον **a** ἄλλωι **p** 429 νῆα **a**

αἶψα μάλ' Αἰγυπτίων ἀνδρῶν περικαλλέας ἀγροῦς
 πόρθεον, ἐκ δὲ γυναικῆς ἄγον καὶ νήπια τέκνα,
 αὐτοῦς τ' ἔκτεινον· τάχα δ' ἔς πόλιν ἵκετ' αὐτῆ.
 οἱ δὲ βοῆς ἄτοντες ἅμ' ἠοὶ φαινομένηφι
 435 ἦλθον· πλῆτο δὲ πᾶν πεδίον πεζῶν τε καὶ ἵππων
 χαλκοῦ τε στεροπῆς· ἐν δὲ Ζεὺς τερπικέρανος
 φύζαν ἔμοις ἑτάροισι κακὴν βάλεν, οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
 στῆναι ἐναντίβιον· περὶ γὰρ κακὰ πάντοθεν ἔστη.
 440 ἔνθ' ἡμέων πολλοὺς μὲν ἀπέκτανον ὄξεί χαλκῶι,
 τοὺς δ' ἄναγον ζωούς, σφίσις ἐργάζεσθαι ἀνάγκηι.
 αὐτὰρ ἔμ' ἔς Κύπρον ξείνῳ δόσαν ἀντιάσαντι,
 Δμήτορι Ἰασίδῃ, ὃς Κύπρου Ἴφι ἀνασσειν·
 445 ἔνθεν δὴ νῦν δεῦρο τόδ' ἴκω πῆματα πάσχων.”
 τὸν δ' αὖτ' Ἀντίνοος ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε·
 “τίς δαίμων τόδε πῆμα προσήγαγε, δαιτὸς ἀνίην;
 450 στῆθ' οὕτως ἔς μέσσον, ἐμῆς ἀπάνευθε τραπέζης,
 μὴ τάχα πικρὴν Αἴγυπτον καὶ Κύπρον ἴκηαι·
 ὥς τις θαρσαλέος καὶ ἀναιδῆς ἔσσι προΐκτης.
 ἐξείης πάντεσσι παρίστασαι· οἱ δὲ διδοῦσι
 455 μασιδίως, ἐπεὶ οὔ τις ἐπίσχεσις οὐδ' ἔλεπτος
 ἄλλοτρίων χαρίσασθαι, ἐπεὶ πάρα πολλὰ ἐκάστωι.”
 τὸν δ' ἀναχωρήσας προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς·
 “ὦ πόποι, οὐκ ἄρα σοὶ γ' ἐπὶ εἶδει καὶ φρένες ἦσαν.
 οὐ σύ γ' ἂν ἐξ οἴκου σῶι ἐπιστάτῃ οὐδ' ἄλα δοίης,
 460 ὃς νῦν ἄλλοτρίοισι παρήμενος οὔ τί μοι ἔτλης
 σίτου ἀποπροελῶν δόμεναι· τὰ δὲ πολλὰ πάρεστιν.”
 ὧς ἔφατ', Ἀντίνοος δ' ἐχολώσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον
 καὶ μιν ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
 “νῦν δὴ σ' οὐκέτι καλὰ διέκ μεγάροιο γ' οἶω
 465 ἄψ ἀναχωρήσειν, ὅτε δὴ καὶ ὄνειδεα βάζεις.”
 ὧς ἄρ' ἔφη, καὶ θρῆνυν ἑλών βάλε δεξιὸν ὦμον,
 πρυμνότατον κατὰ νῶτον. ὁ δ' ἑστάθη ἠὔτε πέτρῃ
 ἔμπεδον, οὐδ' ἄρα μιν σφῆλεν βέλος Ἀντινόοιο,
 470 ἀλλ' ἀκέων κίνησε κάρη, κακὰ βυσσοδομεύων.
 465 ἄψ δ' ὅ γ' ἐπ' οὐδὸν ἰὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἔζετο, κὰδ δ' ἄρα πῆρην
 θῆκεν ἐϋπλείην, μετὰ δὲ μνηστῆρσιν ἔειπε·
 “κέκλυτέ μευ, μνηστῆρες ἀγακλειτῆς βασιλείης,

444 ἦκω **a** 448 ἴδῃαι **a**, Eust. 449 ὃς τις **a**, Eust. 450–2 athet. Ar. (νοθεύονται in Σ) 455 οὐδαλα (τὰ κόπρια) Callistr. in Σ 466 ἄψ δ' ἄρ' **a**

ὄφρ' εἶπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει.
 οὐ μὰν οὐτ' ἄχος ἐστὶ μετὰ φρεσὶν οὔτε τι πένθος, 470
 ὅππότε' ἀνὴρ περὶ οἷσι μαχειόμενος κτεάτεσσι
 βλήεται, ἢ περὶ βουσὶν ἢ ἀργεννῆϊς δῖεσσι·
 αὐτὰρ ἔμ' Ἀντίνοος βάλε γαστέρος εἵνεκα λυγρῆς,
 οὐλομένης, ἣ πολλὰ κάκ' ἀνθρώποισι δίδωσιν.
 ἀλλ' εἴ που πτωχῶν γε θεοὶ καὶ ἐρινύες εἰσὶν, 475
 Ἀντίνοον πρὸ γάμοιο τέλος θανάτοιο κιχέη."

τὸν δ' αὐτ' Ἀντίνοος προσέφη, Εὐπείθεος υἱός·
 "ἔσθι' ἔκηλος, ξεῖνε, καθήμενος, ἢ ἅπιθ' ἄλληι,
 μή σε νέοι διὰ δώματ' ἐρύσσωσ', οἶ ἄγορεύεις,
 ἦ ποδὸς ἦ καὶ χειρός, ἀποδρύψωσι δὲ πάντα." 480
 ὧς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ὑπερφιάλως νεμέσθησαν·
 ὧδε δὲ τις εἶπεσκε νέων ὑπερρηγορόντων·
 "Ἀντίνο', οὐ μὲν κάλ' ἔβαλες δύστηνον ἀλήτην,
 οὐλόμεν', εἰ δὴ πού τις ἐπουράνιος θεὸς ἐστὶ· 485
 καὶ τε θεοὶ ξεῖνοισιν ἐοικότες ἀλλοδαποῖσι,
 παντοῖοι τελέθοντες, ἐπιστροφῶσι πόληας,
 ἀνθρώπων ὕβριν τε καὶ εὐνομίην ἐφορῶντες."

ὧς ἄρ' ἔφαν μνηστῆρες, ὁ δ' οὐκ ἐμπάζετο μύθων.
 Τηλέμαχος δ' ἐν μὲν κραδίηι μέγα πένθος ἄεξε
 βλημένου, οὐδ' ἄρα δάκρυ χαμαὶ βάλεν ἐκ βλεφάρωϊν, 490
 ἀλλ' ἄκέων κίνησε κάρη, κακὰ βυσσοδομεύων.
 τοῦ δ' ὧς οὖν ἤκουσε περίφρων Πηνελόπεια
 βλημένου ἐν μεγάρωι, μετ' ἄρα δμωῖηισιν ἔειπεν·
 "αἴθ' οὕτως αὐτόν σε βάλαι κλυτότοξος Ἀπόλλων."

τὴν δ' αὐτ' Εὐρυνόμη ταμίη πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν· 495
 "εἰ γὰρ ἐπ' ἀρήϊσιν τέλος ἡμετέρησι γένοιτο·
 οὐκ ἂν τις τούτων γε εὐθρονον Ἥῳ ἴκοιτο."
 τὴν δ' αὐτε προσέειπε περίφρων Πηνελόπεια·
 "μαῖ', ἐχθροὶ μὲν πάντες, ἐπεὶ κακὰ μηχανόωνται· 500
 Ἀντίνοος δὲ μάλιστα μελαίνηι κηρὶ ἔοικε.
 ξεῖνός τις δύστηνος ἀλητεύει κατὰ δῶμα
 ἀνέρας αἰτίζων· ἀχρημοσύνη γὰρ ἀνώγει·
 ἔνθ' ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες ἐνέπλησάν τ' ἔδοσαν τε,
 οὗτος δὲ θρήνυι πρυμνὸν βάλε δεξιὸν ὦμον."

475–80 *athet. Ar.* (νοθεύονται in Σ) 487 ὑφορῶντες a ἐσορῶντες *Diod. Sic.* 1.12.10, ἐφέποντες *Himer. Or.* 4.3 496 τέκος a 501–4 *athet. Ar.* (νοθεύει in Σ)

ἡ μὲν ἄρ' ὧς ἀγόρευε μετὰ δμωιῆισι γυναιξίν
 ἡμένη ἐν θαλάμῳ· ὁ δ' ἐδείπνει διὸς Ὀδυσσεύς.
 ἡ δ' ἐπὶ οἷ καλέσασα προσηύδα διὸν ὑφορβόν·
 “ἔρχεο, δῖ' Εὐμαίε, κιὼν τὸν ξεῖνον ἄνωχθι
 ἐλθέμεν, ὄφρα τί μιν προσπτόξομαι ἢ δ' ἐρέωμαι
 εἴ που Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος ἡ ἐπέυσται
 ἢ ἶδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι· πολυπλάγκτωι γὰρ ἔοικε.”
 τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη, Εὐμαίε συβῶτα·
 “εἰ γάρ τοι, βασίλεια, σιωπήσειαν Ἀχαιοί·
 οἷ δ' ὅ γε μυθεῖται, θέλγοιτό κέ τοι φίλον ἦτορ.
 τρεῖς γὰρ δὴ μιν νύκτας ἔχον, τρία δ' ἡματ' ἔρυξα
 ἐν κλισίῃ· πρῶτον γὰρ ἔμ' ἴκετο νηὸς ἀποδράς·
 ἀλλ' οὐ πω κακότητα διήνυσεν ἦν ἀγορεύων.
 ὧς δ' ὅτ' ἀοιδὸν ἀνὴρ ποτιδέρκεται, ὅς τε θεῶν ἔξ
 ἀείδηι δεδαῶς ἐπ' ἱμερόεντα βροτοῖσι,
 τοῦ δ' ἄμοτον μεμάασιν ἀκουέμεν, ὅππότε' ἀείδηι·
 ὧς ἐμὲ κείνος ἔθελγε παρήμενος ἐν μεγάροισι.
 φησὶ δ' Ὀδυσσῆος ξεῖνος πατρώϊος εἶναι,
 Κρήτηι ναιετάων, ὅθι Μίνωος γένος ἐστίν.
 ἔνθεν δὴ νῦν δεῦρο τόδ' ἴκετο πῆματα πάσχων
 προπροκυλινδόμενος· στεῦται δ' Ὀδυσσῆος ἀκουσαί
 ἀγχοῦ, Θεσπρωτῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐν πίνονι δῆμωι,
 ζωοῦ· πολλὰ δ' ἄγει κειμήλια ὄνδε δόμενδε.”
 τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε περίφρων Πηνελόπεια·
 “ἔρχεο, δεῦρο κάλεσσον, ἴν' ἀντίον αὐτὸς ἐνίσπηι.
 οὔτοι δ' ἡ ἐθύρησι καθήμενοι ἐψιασῶσθων
 ἢ αὐτοῦ κατὰ δώματ', ἐπεὶ σφισι θυμὸς ἐῦφρων.
 αὐτῶν μὲν γὰρ κτήματ' ἀκήρατα κείτ' ἐνὶ οἴκωι,
 σῖτος καὶ μέθυ ἠδύ· τὰ μὲν οἰκῆς ἔδουσιν,
 οἷ δ' εἰς ἡμέτερον πωλεύμενοι ἡματα πάντα,
 βοῦς ἱερεύοντες καὶ οἷς καὶ πίνοντας αἴγας,
 εἰλαπινάζουσιν πίνουσί τε αἶθοπα οἶνον
 μασιδίως· τὰ δὲ πολλὰ κατάνεται· οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' ἀνὴρ,
 οἷος Ὀδυσσεύς ἔσκεν, ἀρῆν ἀπὸ οἴκου ἀμῦναι.
 εἰ δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἔλθοι καὶ ἴκοιτ' ἔς πατρίδα γαῖαν,
 αἴψα κε σὺν ὧι παιδί βίας ἀποτίσεται ἀνδρῶν.”
 ὧς φάτο, Τηλέμαχος δὲ μέγ' ἔπταρεν, ἀμφὶ δὲ δῶμα

506 ἐδείπνεε **a** 508 δῖ: δὴ **a** (cf. 16.461, 22.157) 509 προσπτόξομαι **a** 533 μὲν τ'
a 534 ἡμετέρου **a**; cf. 2.55, 7.301.

σμερδαλέον κονάβησε· γέλασσε δὲ Πηνελόπεια,
 αἶψα δ' ἄρ' Εὐμαιον ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
 “ἔρχεό μοι, τὸν ξεῖνον ἐναντίον ὧδε κάλεσσον.
 οὐχ ὀράαις, ὃ μοι υἱὸς ἐπέπταρε πᾶσι ἔπεσσι; 545
 τῷ κε καὶ οὐκ ἀτελῆς θάνατος μνηστήρησι γένοιτο
 πᾶσι μάλ', οὐδέ κέ τις θάνατον καὶ κῆρας ἀλύξει.
 ἄλλο δέ τοι ἔρέω, σὺ δ' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῆισιν·
 αἶ κ' αὐτὸν γνῶω νημερτέα πάντ' ἐνέποντα,
 ἔσσω μιν χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε, εἴματα καλά.” 550
 ὧς φάτο, βῆ δὲ συφορβός, ἐπεὶ τὸν μῦθον ἄκουσεν,
 ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
 “ξεῖνε πάτερ, καλέει σε περίφρων Πηνελόπεια,
 μήτηρ Τηλεμάχοιο· μεταλλῆσαί τί ἐ θυμὸς
 ἀμφὶ πόσει κέλεται, καὶ κήδεά περ πεπαυθίη. 555
 εἰ δέ κέ σε γνῶω νημερτέα πάντ' ἐνέποντα,
 ἔσσει σε χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε, τῶν σὺ μάλιστα
 χρηῖζεις· σίτον δὲ καὶ αἰτίζων κατὰ δῆμον
 γαστέρα βοσκήσεις· δώσει δέ τοι ὅς κ' ἐθέλησι.”
 τὸν δ' αὐτε προσέειπε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς· 560
 “Εὐμαιί, αἶψά κ' ἐγὼ νημερτέα πάντ' ἐνέποιμι
 κούρηι Ἰκαρίοιο, περίφρονι Πηνελοπέιη·
 οἶδα γὰρ εὖ περὶ κείνου, ὁμῆν δ' ἀνεδέγμεθ' οἷζύν.
 ἀλλὰ μνηστήρων χαλεπῶν ὑποδείδι' ὄμιλον,
 τῶν ὕβρις τε βίη τε σιδήρεον οὐρανὸν ἴκει. 565
 καὶ γὰρ νῦν, ὅτε μ' οὗτος ἀνὴρ κατὰ δῶμα κίοντα
 οὗ τι κακὸν ῥέξαντα βαλὼν ὀδύνησιν ἔδωκεν,
 οὔτε τι Τηλέμαχος τό γ' ἐπήρκεσεν οὔτε τις ἄλλος.
 τῷ νῦν Πηνελόπειαν ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἀνωχθι
 μείναι, ἐπειγομένην περ, ἔς ἥλιον καταδύντα· 570
 καὶ τότε μ' εἰρέσθω πόσιος πέρι νόστιμον ἦμαρ
 ἄσσοτέρω καθίσασα παραί πυρί· εἴματα γὰρ τοι
 λυγρ' ἔχω· οἶσθα καὶ αὐτός, ἐπεὶ σε πρῶθ' ἰκέτευσα.”
 ὧς φάτο, βῆ δὲ συφορβός, ἐπεὶ τὸν μῦθον ἄκουσε.
 τὸν δ' ὑπὲρ οὐδοῦ βάντα προσηύδα Πηνελόπεια· 575
 “οὐ σύ γ' ἄγεις, Εὐμαιε; τί τοῦτ' ἐνόησεν ἀλήτης;
 ἦ τινά που δεῖσας ἐξάισιον ἦε καὶ ἄλλως

542 κανάχησε **a**, Eust. 547 omitted by some MSS (= 18.558) ἀλύξοι **a** 555 πόσιν
a πόσι **b** 556 γνοίη **a** 564 χαλεπὸν **a** 565 omitted in some MSS (= 15.329)
 568a δμῶων οἱ κατὰ δῶματ' ὀδυσσηὸς θεῖοιο in some MSS (= 402) 577a ὕβριν ἀλυσκάζειν
 ἀνδρῶν ὑπερνηροέντων in some MSS (= 581)

αἰδεῖται κατὰ δῶμα· κακὸς δ' αἰδοῖος ἀλήτης.”

τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη, Εὐμαίε συβῶτα·

“μυθεῖται κατὰ μοῖραν, ἅ πέρ κ' οἴοιτο καὶ ἄλλος,
ὑβριν ἄλυσκάζων ἀνδρῶν ὑπερηνορέοντων·
ἀλλά σε μείναι ἄνωγεν ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα.

καὶ δέ σοι ὦδ' αὐτῆι πολὺ κάλλιον, ὦ βασίλεια,
οἶην πρὸς ξεῖνον φάσθαι ἔπος ἢ δ' ἔπακοῦσαι.”

τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε περίφρων Πηνελόπεια·

“οὐκ ἄφρων ὁ ξεῖνος οἶεται, ὥς περ ἂν εἴη·
οὐ γάρ πῶ τινες ὦδε καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων
ἀνέρες ὑβρίζοντες ἀτάσθαλα μηχανόωνται.”

ἦ μὲν ἄρ' ὥς ἀγόρευεν, ὁ δ' ὠιχετο δῖος ὑφορβὸς
μνηστήρων ἐς ὄμιλον, ἐπεὶ διεπέφραδε πάντα.

αἶψα δὲ Τηλέμαχον ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα,
ἄγχι σχῶν κεφαλῆν, ἵνα μὴ πευθοῖσθ' οἱ ἄλλοι·

“ὦ φίλ', ἐγὼ μὲν ἄπειμι σύας καὶ κείνα φυλάξω,
σὸν καὶ ἔμὸν βίοτον· σοὶ δ' ἐνθάδε πάντα μελόντων.

αὐτὸν μὲν σὲ πρῶτα σάω, καὶ φράζω θυμῶι
μὴ τι πάθῃς· πολλοὶ δὲ κακὰ φρονέουσιν Ἀχαιῶν,
τοὺς Ζεὺς ἐξολέσειε πρὶν ἡμῖν πῆμα γενέσθαι.”

τὸν δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίον ηὔδα·

“ἔσσεται οὕτως, ἄττα· σὺ δ' ἔρχεο δειελίηςας·
ἦ ὦθεν δ' ἵέναι καὶ ἄγειν ἱερῆϊα καλά.

αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ τάδε πάντα καὶ ἀθανάτοισι μελήσει.”

ὥς φάθ', ὁ δ' αὖτις ἄρ' ἕζετ' ἐϋξέστου ἐπὶ δίφρου.

πλησάμενος δ' ἄρα θυμὸν ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος

βῆ ῥ' ἴμεναι μεθ' ὕας, λίπε δ' ἔρκεά τε μέγαρόν τε

πλείον δαιτυμόνων· οἱ δ' ὄρχηστῆι καὶ ἀοιδῆι

τέρποντ' ἤδη γὰρ καὶ ἐπήλυθε δείελον ἦμαρ.

587 που Eust. 593 κύνα **a** κύνας **b** κοῖνα **c** 595 σάου **a**, Apol. Lex. 599
δι(ε)ιελινήσας **a** 602 εϋξέστου ἐπὶ δίφρου: ἐπὶ θρόνου ἐνθεν ἀνέστη **a** 603a αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ
δείπνησε καὶ ἦραρε θυμὸν ἐδωδῆι in some MSS (= 5.95, 14.111)

ΟΜΗΡΟΥ ΟΔΥΣΣΕΙΑΣ Σ

Ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ πτωχὸς πανδήμιος, ὃς κατὰ ἄστῳ 1
 πτωχεύεσκ' Ἰθάκης, μετὰ δ' ἔπρεπε γαστέρι μάργῃ
 ἀζηχῆς φαγέμεν καὶ πιέμεν· οὐδέ οἱ ἦν ἴς
 οὐδὲ βίη, εἶδος δὲ μάλα μέγας ἦν ὀράσθαι.
 Ἄρναϊος δ' ὄνομ' ἔσκε· τὸ γὰρ θέτο πότνια μήτηρ 5
 ἐκ γενετῆς· Ἴρον δὲ νέοι κίκλησκον ἅπαντες,
 οὐνεκ' ἀπαγγέλλεσκε κιών, ὅτε ποῦ τις ἀνώγοι.
 ὃς ῥ' ἔλθων Ὀδυσῆα διώκετο οἷο δόμοιο,
 καὶ μιν νεικείων ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
 “εἶκε, γέρον, προθύρου, μὴ δὴ τάχα καὶ ποδὸς ἔλκηι. 10
 οὐκ ἄτις ὅτι δὴ μοι ἐπιλλίζουσιν ἅπαντες,
 ἐλκόμεναι δὲ κέλονται; ἐγὼ δ' αἰσχύνομαι ἔμπης.
 ἀλλ' ἄνα, μὴ τάχα νῶϊν ἔρις καὶ χερσὶ γένηται.”
 τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς·
 “δαιμόνι, οὔτε τί σε ῥέζω κακὸν οὔτ' ἀγορεύω, 15
 οὔτε τινὰ φθονέω δόμεναι καὶ πόλλ' ἀνελόντα.
 οὐδὸς δ' ἀμφοτέρους ὅδε χεῖσεται, οὐδέ τί σε χρὴ
 ἀλλοτριῶν φθονέειν· δοκέεις δέ μοι εἶναι ἀλήτης
 ὥς περ ἐγών, ὄλβον δὲ θεοὶ μέλλουσιν ὀπάζειν.
 χερσὶ δὲ μὴ τι λίην προκαλίζεο, μὴ με χολώσῃς, 20
 μὴ σε γέρων περ ἐὼν στήθος καὶ χεῖλεα φύρσω
 αἵματος· ἤσυχίη δ' ἂν ἐμοὶ καὶ μᾶλλον ἔτ' εἴη
 αὔριον· οὐ μὲν γάρ τί σ' ὑποστρέψεσθαι ὄϊω
 δεύτερον ἐς μέγαρον Λαερτιάδew Ὀδυσῆος.”
 τὸν δὲ χολωσάμενος προσεφώνεεν Ἴρος ἀλήτης· 25
 “ὦ πόποι, ὡς ὁ μολοβρὸς ἐπιτροχάδην ἀγορεύει,
 γρηῖ καμινῶ ἴσος· ὃν ἂν κακὰ μητισαίμη
 κόπτων ἀμφοτέρησι, χαμαὶ δέ κε πάντας ὀδόντας
 γναθμῶν ἐξελάσαιμι συὸς ὡς ληϊβοτείρης.
 ζῶσαι νῦν, ἵνα πάντες ἐπιγνώσῃ καὶ οἶδε 30
 μαρναμένους· πῶς δ' ἂν σὺ νεωτέρωι ἀνδρὶ μάχοιο;”
 ὡς οἱ μὲν προπάροιθε θυράων ὑψηλάων
 οὐδοῦ ἔπι ξεστοῦ πανθυμαδὸν ὀκριόωντο.

5 θέτο οἱ ποτε μήτηρ *El. M.* 146.12 πότνια: δειλή **a** 6 γενεῆς **a**, *Ar.* 7 ποῦ τις: κέν
 τις **a** 14 δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν: δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος **a** 24 δεύτερον ἐς μέγαρον: αὐτὶς ἔσω
 μεγάρων (μέγαρον) **a** (= 23.24) 27 καμινῶι **a** 28 δέ κε *Ar.*: δ' ἐκ *codd.*, **p**, *Eust.*

τοῖν δὲ ξυνέηχ' ἱερὸν μένος Ἄντινόοιο,
 ἦδ' οὐδ' ἄρ' ἐκγελάσας μετεφώνει μνηστῆρῶσιν·
 35 “ὦ φίλοι, οὐ μὲν πῶ τι πάρος τοιοῦτον ἐτύχθη,
 οἶην τερπωλῆν θεὸς ἤγαγεν ἐς τόδε δῶμα·
 ὁ ξεῖνός τε καὶ Ἴρος ἐρίζετον ἀλλήλοισιν
 χερσὶ μαχέσασθαι· ἀλλὰ ξυνελάσσομεν ὦκα.”
 40 ὥς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀνήϊξαν γελῶντες,
 ἄμφι δ' ἄρα πτωχοὺς κακοεῖμονας ἠγερέθοντο.
 τοῖσιν δ' Ἄντινοος μετέφη, Εὐπείθεος υἱός·
 “κέκλυτέ μευ, μνηστῆρες ἀγήνορες, ὄφρα τι εἴπω.
 γαστέρες αἰδ' αἰγῶν κέατ' ἐν πυρί, τὰς ἐπὶ δόρπῳ
 45 κατθέμεθα κνίσσης τε καὶ αἵματος ἐμπλήσαντες.
 ὀππότερος δὲ κε νικήσῃ κρείσσων τε γένηται,
 τάων ἦν κ' ἐθέλησιν ἀναστὰς αὐτὸς ἐλέσθω·
 αἰεὶ δ' αὖθ' ἡμῖν μεταδαίσεται, οὐδὲ τιν' ἄλλον
 πτωχὸν ἔσω μίσγεσθαι ἐάσομεν αἰτήσοντα.”
 50 ὥς ἔφατ' Ἄντινοος, τοῖσιν δ' ἐπιήνδανε μῦθος.
 τοῖς δὲ δολοφρονέων μετέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς·
 “ὦ φίλοι, οὗ πως ἔστι νεωτέρῳ ἀνδρὶ μάχεσθαι
 ἄνδρα γέροντα, δύητι ἀρημένον· ἀλλὰ με γαστήρ
 55 ὀτρύνει κακοεργός, ἵνα πληγῆισι δαμείω.
 ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν μοι πάντες ὁμόσσετε καρτερὸν ὄρκον,
 μή τις ἐπ' Ἴρωι ἦρα φέρων ἐμὲ χειρὶ βραεῖη
 πλήξῃ ἀτασθάλλων, τούτῳ δέ με Ἴφι δαμάσσει.”
 60 ὥς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐπώμνουν, ὥς ἐκέλευεν.
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ὁμοσάν τε τελευτήσαν τε τὸν ὄρκον,
 τοῖς δ' αὖτις μετέειψ' ἱερὴ ἰς Τηλεμάχοιο·
 “ξεῖν', εἴ σ' ὀτρύνει κραδίη καὶ θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ
 τοῦτον ἀλέξασθαι, τῶν δ' ἄλλων μή τιν' Ἀχαιῶν
 65 δεῖδιθ', ἐπεὶ πλεόνεσσι μαχήσεται ὅς κε σε θείνη.
 ξεινοδόκος μὲν ἐγὼν, ἐπὶ δ' αἰνεῖτον βασιλῆε,
 Ἄντινόος τε καὶ Εὐρύμαχος, πεπνυμένω ἄμφω.”
 70 ὥς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐπήνεον. αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεύς
 ζώσατο μὲν ῥάκεσιν περὶ μήδεα, φαῖνε δὲ μηροῦς
 καλοῦς τε μεγάλους τε, φάνεν δὲ οἱ εὐρέες ὦμοι

35 μετεφώνειe a προσεφώνειe b 38 τε omitted in one MS 44 κέατ' ἐν: κέαται a τὰς δ'
 a τὰς τ' b 56 ἐπ' del. Knight βραεῖη: παχείη a, Eust. 58 ἀπώ(ό)μνουν a, Eust.
 59 omitted in one MS and Eust. 60 μετέφη a 64 βασιλῆε Ar., βασιλῆε codd., p
 65 εὐρύμαχος... ἀντίνοος a

στήθεά τε στιβαροί τε βραχίονες· αὐτὰρ Ἀθήνη
 ἄγχι παρισταμένη μέλέ' ἤλδανε ποιμένι λαῶν. 70
 μνηστῆρες δ' ἄρα πάντες ὑπερφιάλως ἀγάσαντο·
 ὦδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον·
 “ἦ τάχα Ἴρος Ἄϊρος ἐπίσπαστον κακὸν ἔξει,
 οἴην ἐκ βράκων ὁ γέρων ἐπιγουνίδα φαίνει.”
 ὡς ἄρ' ἔφαν, Ἴρωι δὲ κακῶς ὠρίνετο θυμός. 75
 ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς δρηστήρες ἄγον ζώσαντες ἀνάγκηι
 δειδιότα· σάρκες δὲ περιτρομέοντο μέλεσσιν.
 Ἀντίνοος δ' ἐνένιπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε·
 “νῦν μὲν μήτ' εἴης, βουγαίε, μήτε γένοιο,
 εἰ δὴ τοῦτόν γε τρομέεις καὶ δείδιας αἰνῶς, 80
 ἄνδρα γέροντα, δύτη ἀρημένον, ἦ μιν ἰκάνει.
 ἀλλ' ἔκ τοι ἔρέω, τὸ δὲ καὶ τετελεσμένον ἔσται·
 αἶ κέν σ' οὔτος νικήσῃ κρείσσων τε γένηται,
 πέμψω σ' ἠπειρόνδε, βαλὼν ἐν νηϊ μελαίνῃ,
 εἰς Ἐχeton βασιλῆα, βροτῶν δηλήμονα πάντων, 85
 ὅς κ' ἀπὸ ρίνα τάμησι καὶ οὔατα νηλεῖ χαλκῶι
 μήδεά τ' ἔξερύσας δώῃη κυσὶν ὠμὰ δάσσασθαι.”
 ὡς φάτο, τῶι δ' ἔτι μᾶλλον ὑπὸ τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα.
 ἐς μέσσον δ' ἄναγον· τῶ δ' ἄμφω χεῖρας ἀνέσχον.
 δὴ τότε μερμήριξε πολύτλας διῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς 90
 ἢ ἐλάσει ὡς μιν ψυχὴ λίπτοι αὔθι πεσόντα,
 ἦ ἢ μιν ἦκ' ἐλάσειε ταυύσσειέν τ' ἐπὶ γαίῃ.
 ὦδε δὲ οἱ φρονέοντι δοάσσατο κέρδιον εἶναι,
 ἦκ' ἐλάσαι, ἵνα μὴ μιν ἐπιφρασσάιατ' Ἀχαιοί.
 δὴ τότ' ἀνασχομένω ὁ μὲν ἤλασε δεξιὸν ὦμον 95
 Ἴρος, ὁ δ' αὐχέν' ἔλασσαν ὑπ' οὔατος, ὅστέα δ' εἶσω
 ἔθλασεν· αὐτίκα δ' ἤλθε κατὰ στόμα φοῖνιον αἶμα,
 κὰδ δ' ἔπεσ' ἐν κονίησι μακῶν, σὺν δ' ἤλασ' ὀδόντας
 λακτίζων ποσὶ γαῖαν· ἀτὰρ μνηστῆρες ἀγαυοὶ
 χεῖρας ἀνασχόμενοι γέλωι ἔκθανον. αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς 100
 ἔλκε διέκ προθύροιο λαβῶν ποδός, ὄφρ' ἴκετ' αὐλήν
 αἰθούσης τε θύρας· καὶ μιν ποτὶ ἐρκίον αὐλῆς
 εἶσαν ἀνακλίνας, σκῆπτρον δὲ οἱ ἔμβαλε χεῖρί,

73 ἄξει **a** 76 δρηστήρες: μνηστῆρες **a**, Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 7.72.4 78 ἐνέειπεν **a**
 ἐνένιπεν **b** 79 βουγήϊε Zen. ad *Il.* 13.824, βουκαίε **a** 84 ἠπειρόνδε **a** 86 τάμη **a**
 88 τῶι δ': τόνδ' **a** ἔλλαβε: ἤλυθε **a** 97 ἤλθεν ἀνά **a** 98 χανών ed. Aeolica 99
 ποσί: ποτὶ **a**

καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
 “ἔνταυθοί νῦν ἦσο κύνas τε σύas τ’ ἀπερύκων,
 105 μηδὲ σύ γε ξείνων καὶ πτωχῶν κοίρανος εἶναι
 λυγρὸς ἔων, μὴ ποῦ τι κακὸν καὶ μείζον ἐπαύρηι.”
 ἦ ῥα, καὶ ἄμφ’ ὤμοισιν ἀεικέα βάλλετο πῆρην,
 πυκνὰ ῥωγαλέην, ἐν δὲ στρόφος ἦεν ἄορτήρ.
 110 ἄψ δ’ ὁ γ’ ἐπ’ οὐδὸν ἰὼν κατ’ ἄρ’ ἔξετο· τοὶ δ’ ἴσαν εἴσω
 ἦδὺ γελῶντες καὶ δεικανόωντ’ ἐπέεσσι·
 “Ζεὺς τοι δοίη, ξεῖνε, καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι
 ὄττι μάλιστ’ ἐθέλεις καὶ τοι φίλον ἔπλετο θυμῶι,
 115 ὃς τοῦτον τὸν ἀναλτον ἀλητεύειν ἀπέπασας
 ἐν δῆμωι· τάχα γάρ μιν ἀνάξομεν ἠπειρόνδε
 εἰς Ἐχέτον βασιλῆα, βροτῶν δηλήμονα πάντων.”
 ὧς ἄρ’ ἔφαν, χαίρειν δὲ κληθόνι δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς.
 Ἄντινοος δ’ ἄρα οἱ μεγάλην παρὰ γαστέρα θῆκεν,
 ἐμπλείην κνίσσης τε καὶ αἵματος· Ἀμφίνομος δὲ
 120 ἄρτους ἐκ κανέοιο δύω παρέθηκεν ἀείρας
 καὶ δέπαϊ χρυσέωι δειδίσκετο φώνησέν τε·
 “χαῖρε, πάτερ ὦ ξεῖνε· γένοιτό τοι ἔς περ ὀπίσσω
 ὄλβος· ἀτὰρ μὲν νῦν γε κακοῖς ἔχειαι πολέεσσι.”
 τὸν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς·
 125 “Ἀμφίνομ’, ἦ μάλα μοι δοκεῖς πεπνυμένος εἶναι·
 τοῖου γὰρ καὶ πατρός, ἐπεὶ κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἄκουον,
 Νῆσον Δουλιχιῆα ἐὺν τ’ ἔμεν ἀφνειὸν τε·
 τοῦ σ’ ἐκ φασὶ γενέσθαι, ἐπητήη δ’ ἀνδρὶ ἔοικας.
 τοῦνεκά τοι ἐρέω, σὺ δὲ σύνθεο καὶ μευ ἄκουσον·
 130 οὐδὲν ἀκιδνότερον γαῖα τρέφει ἀνθρώποιο
 πάντων, ὅσσα τε γαῖαν ἔπι πνεῖει τε καὶ ἔρπει.
 οὐ μὲν γὰρ ποτέ φησι κακὸν πείσεσθαι ὀπίσσω,
 ὄφρ’ ἀρετὴν παρέχωσι θεοὶ καὶ γούνατ’ ὀρώρηι·
 ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ καὶ λυγρὰ θεοὶ μάκαρες τελέωσι,
 135 καὶ τὰ φέρει ἀεκαζόμενος τετληότι θυμῶι.
 τοῖος γὰρ νόος ἐστὶν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων
 οἷον ἐπ’ ἡμαρ ἄγηισι πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.
 καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ποτ’ ἔμελλον ἐν ἀνδράσιν ὄλβιος εἶναι,

105 ἦσο: κείσο **a** (cf. Ar. ad *Il.* 21.122) σύas τε κύνas τ’ **a** 107 ἐπαύρησι **a** 110 δ’ ὁ γ’ δ’
 ἄρ’ **a** 111 γελῶντες **a** γελοῖωντες Eust. (cf. 20. 347, 390) ἐδεικανόωντο **a** 111a ὦδε δὲ
 τις εἴπεσκε νέων ὑπερηγορούντων included in some MSS (= 2.324 etc.) 115–16 athet. Ar.
 and Σ (116 = 85) 122 ἔς περ: ὡσπερ **a** 131 omitted in some MSS, **p** and Apol. Lex.
 132 φασὶ **a** 134 τελέωσι **a**

πολλά δ' ἀτάσθαλ' ἔρεξα βίηι καὶ κάρτεϊ εἰκων,
 πατρί τ' ἔμῳ πίσυρος καὶ ἔμοισι κασιγνήτοισι. 140
 τῷ μὴ τίς ποτε πάμπαν ἀνὴρ ἀθεμίστιος εἶη,
 ἀλλ' ὃ γε σιγῇ δῶρα θεῶν ἔχοι, ὅττι διδοῖεν.
 οἷ' ὀρόω μνηστῆρας ἀτάσθαλα μηχανώοντας,
 κτήματα κείροντας καὶ ἀτιμάζοντας ἄκοιτιν
 ἀνδρός, ὃν οὐκέτι φημί φίλων καὶ πατρίδος αἴης 145
 δηρὸν ἀπέσσεσθαι· μάλα δὲ σχεδόν. ἀλλά σε δαίμων
 οἴκαδ' ὑπέξαγάγοι, μηδ' ἀντιάσειας ἐκείνῳ,
 ὅππότε νοστήσειε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν·
 οὐ γὰρ ἀναιμωτί γε διακρινέεσθαι οἶω
 μνηστῆρας καὶ κείνον, ἐπεὶ κε μέλαθρον ὑπέλθῃ. 150
 ὣς φάτο, καὶ σπείσας ἔπιεν μελιηδέα οἶνον,
 ἄψ δ' ἔν χερσὶν ἔθηκε δέπας κοσμήτορι λαῶν.
 αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ διὰ δῶμα φίλον τετιμημένος ἦτορ,
 νευστάζων κεφαλῆι· δὴ γὰρ κακὸν ὄσσετο θυμῷ.
 ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὡς φύγε κῆρα· πέδησε δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἀθήνη 155
 Τηλεμάχου ὑπὸ χερσὶ καὶ ἔγχεϊ Ἴφι δαμῆναι.
 ἄψ δ' αὐτίς κατ' ἄρ' ἔζετ' ἐπὶ θρόνου ἔνθεν ἀνέστη.
 τῆι δ' ἄρ' ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη,
 κούρηι Ἰκαρίοιο, περίφρονι Πηνελοπείηι,
 μνηστήρεσσι φανῆναι, ὅπως πετάσειε μάλιστα 160
 θυμὸν μνηστήρων ἰδὲ τιμήεσσα γένοιτο
 μᾶλλον πρὸς πόσιός τε καὶ υἱέος ἢ πάρος ἦεν.
 ἀχρεῖον δ' ἐγέλασεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν·
 “Εὐρυνόμη, θυμός μοι ἐέλδεται, οὐ τι πάρος γε,
 μνηστήρεσσι φανῆναι, ἀπεχθομένοισί περ ἔμπτῃς 165
 παιδὶ δέ κεν εἴποιμι ἔπος, τό κε κέρδιον εἶη,
 μὴ πάντα μνηστήρσιν ὑπερφιάλοισιν ὀμιλεῖν,
 οἷ τ' εὐ μὲν βάζουσι, κακῶς δ' ὀπιθεν φρονέουσι.”
 τὴν δ' αὐτ' Εὐρυνόμη ταμίη πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε·
 “ναὶ δὴ ταῦτά γε πάντα, τέκος, κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες. 170
 ἀλλ' ἴθι καὶ σῶι παιδὶ ἔπος φάο μηδ' ἐπίκευθε,
 χρῶτ' ἀπονιψαμένη καὶ ἐπιχρίσασα παρειάς,
 μηδ' οὕτω δακρύοισι πεφυρμένη ἀμφὶ πρόσωπα
 ἔρχευ, ἐπεὶ κάκιον πευθήμεναι ἄκριτον αἰεὶ.
 ἦδη μὲν γὰρ τοι παῖς τηλίκος, ὃν σὺ μάλιστα 175

149 διακρινέσθαι p 153 διὰ: κατὰ a 154 κεφαλῆν a θυμός a, Eust. 160 πετάσειε: θέλξειε a 167 ὀμιλεῖν: ἐπαινεῖν a 173 δάκρυσι a

ἦρῶ ἀθανάτοισι γενειήσαντα ιδέσθαι.”

τὴν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε περίφρων Πηνελόπεια·
 “Εὐρυνόμη, μὴ ταῦτα παραύδα, κηδομένη περ,
 χρῶτ' ἀπονίπτεσθαι καὶ ἐπιχρίεσθαι ἀλοιφῇ·
 ἀγλαίην γάρ ἐμοί γε θεοί, τοὶ Ὀλυμπον ἔχουσιν,
 ὤλεσαν, ἔξ οὗ κείνος ἔβη κοίλης ἐνὶ νηυσίν.
 ἀλλὰ μοι Αὐτονόην τε καὶ Ἴπποδάμειαν ἄνωχθι
 ἔλθέμεν, ὄφρα κέ μοι παρστήητον ἐν μεγάροισιν·
 οἷη δ' οὐκ εἴσειμι μετ' ἀνέρας· αἰδέομαι γάρ.”

180

ὧς ἄρ' ἔφη, γρηῦς δὲ διέκ μεγάροιο βεβήκει
 ἀγγελέουσα γυναιξὶ καὶ ὄτρυνέουσα νέεσθαι.

185

ἐνθ' αὖτ' ἄλλ' ἐνόησε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη·
 κούρηι Ἰκαρίοιο κατὰ γλυκὺν ὕπνον ἔχευεν,
 εὔδε δ' ἀνακλινθεῖσα, λύθην δέ οἱ ἄψα πάντα
 αὐτοῦ ἐνὶ κλιντῆρι· τέως δ' ἄρα διὰ θεάων
 ἄμβροτα δῶρα δίδου, ἵνα μιν θησαΐατ' Ἀχαιοί.
 κάλλει μὲν οἱ πρῶτα προσώπατα καλὰ κήθρην
 ἄμβροσίωι, οἴωι περ ἔϋστέφανος Κυθήρεια
 χρίεται, εὔτ' ἂν ἴηι Χαρίτων χορὸν ἱμερόεντα·
 καὶ μιν μακροτέρην καὶ πάσσονα θῆκεν ιδέσθαι,
 λευκοτέρην δ' ἄρα μιν θῆκε πριστοῦ ἑλέφαντος.

190

ἢ μὲν ἄρ' ὧς ἔρξασ' ἀπεβήσετο διὰ θεάων.
 ἦλθον δ' ἀμφίπολοι λευκῶλενοι ἐκ μεγάροιο
 φθόγγωι ἐπερχόμεναι· τὴν δὲ γλυκὺς ὕπνος ἀνῆκε,
 καὶ ῥ' ἀπομόρξατο χερσὶ παρειὰς φώνησέν τε·

195

200

“ἦ με μάλ' αἰνοπαθῆ μαλακὸν περὶ κῶμ' ἐκάλυπεν.
 αἶθε μοι ὧς μαλακὸν θάνατον πόροι Ἄρτεμις ἀγνή
 αὐτίκα νῦν, ἵνα μηκέτ' ὄδυρομένη κατὰ θυμόν
 αἰῶνα φθινύθω, πόσιος ποθέουσα φίλοιο
 παντοίην ἀρετήν, ἐπεὶ ἕξοχος ἦεν Ἀχαιῶν.”

205

ὧς φαμένη κατέβαιν' ὑπερῷα σιγαλόεντα,
 οὐκ οἶη, ἅμα τῆι γε καὶ ἀμφίπολοι δὴ ἔποντο.
 ἢ δ' ὅτε δὴ μνηστῆρας ἀφίκετο διὰ γυναικῶν,
 στῆ ῥα παρὰ σταθμὸν τέγεος πύκα ποιητοῖο
 ἄντα παρειάων σχομένη λιπαρὰ κρήδεμνα·

210

179 ἀπονίψασθαι καὶ ἐπιχρίεσθαι Ap. Lex. s.v. ἀλοιφῇ
 184a μίσγεσθαι μνηστῆρσιν ὑπερφιάλοισιν ἀνάγκη (= 14.27)
 Zen. 191 ἵνα μιν θησαΐατο Eust. ἵνα θησαΐατ' d
 s.v. κάλλει 197 ἀπέβη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη a

184 οὐκ εἴσειμι: οὐ κείσ' εἴμι a
 190 διὰ θεάων: δὴ Ἀφροδίτη
 192 πρόσωπα τὰ (τε) a, Apol. Lex.

ἀμφίπολος δ' ἄρα οἱ κεδνὴ ἐκάτερθε παρέσθη.
τῶν δ' αὐτοῦ λῦτο γούνατ', ἔρωι δ' ἄρα θυμὸν ἔθειλχθεν,
πάντες δ' ἠρήσαντο παρὰι λεχέεσσι κλιθῆναι.

ἦ δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχον προσεφώνεεν, ὄν φίλον υἷόν·

“Τηλέμαχ', οὐκέτι τοι φρένες ἔμπεδοι οὐδὲ νόημα· 215

παῖς ἔτ' ἑὼν καὶ μᾶλλον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ κέρδε' ἐνώμας·
νῦν δ', ὅτε δὴ μέγας ἔσσι καὶ ἤβης μέτρον ἰκάνεις,
καὶ κέν τις φαίη γόνον ἔμμεναι ὀλβίου ἀνδρός,
ἔς μέγεθος καὶ κάλλος ὀρώμενος, ἀλλότριος φῶς,
οὐκέτι τοι φρένες εἰσὶν ἐναίσιοι οὐδὲ νόημα. 220

οἶον δὴ τόδε ἔργον ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἐτύχθη,
ὄς τὸν ξεῖνον ἕασας ἀεικισθήμεναι οὕτω.

πῶς νῦν, εἴ τι ξεῖνος ἐν ἡμετέροισι δόμοισιν
ἦμενος ὦδε πάθοι ῥυστακτύος ἐξ ἀλεγεινῆς;

σοὶ κ' αἴσχος λῶβη τε μετ' ἀνθρώποισι πέλοιτο.” 225

τὴν δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίον ἠΐδα·

“μῆτερ ἐμή, τὸ μὲν οὐ σε νεμεσῶμαι κεχολῶσθαι·

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ θυμῶι νοέω καὶ οἶδα ἕκαστα,

ἔσθλά τε καὶ τὰ χέρεια· πάρος δ' ἔτι νήπιος ἦα.

ἀλλὰ τοι οὐ δύναμαι πεπνυμένα πάντα νοῆσαι· 230

ἐκ γάρ με πλήσσουσι παρήμενοι ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος

οἶδε κακὰ φρονέοντες, ἐμοὶ δ' οὐκ εἰσὶν ἄρωγοί.

οὐ μὲν τοι ξεῖνου γε καὶ Ἴρου μῶλος ἐτύχθη

μνηστήρων ἰότητι, βίηι δ' ὄ γε φέρτερος ἦεν.

αἶ γάρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἀπολλων, 235

οὕτω νῦν μνηστήρες ἐν ἡμετέροισι δόμοισι

νεύοιεν κεφαλὰς δεδμημένοι, οἱ μὲν ἐν αὐλῇι,

οἱ δ' ἐντοσθε δόμοιο, λελύτο δὲ γυῖα ἐκάστου,

ὥς νῦν Ἴρος ἐκείνος ἐπ' αὐλείησι θύρησιν 240

ἦσται νευστάζων κεφαλήι, μεθύοντι ἑοικώς,

οὐδ' ὀρθὸς στῆναι δύναται ποσὶν οὐδὲ νέεσθαι

οἴκαδ', ὅπηι οἱ νόστος, ἐπεὶ φίλα γυῖα λέλυνται.”

ὣς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον·

Εὐρύμαχος δ' ἐπέεσσι προσηΐδα Πηνελόπειαν·

“κούρη Ἰκαρίοιο, περίφρον Πηνελόπεια, 245

εἰ πάντες σε ἴδοιεν ἂν Ἴασον Ἄργος Ἀχαιοί,

212 ἔρωι... ἔθειλχθεν **a** 223 τι: τις **a** 229 athet. Arist. Byz. and Ar. (= 20.310) πάρος
δ' ἔτι νήπιος ἦα: μέγας δὲ κε νήπιος εἶην in Σ 238 λέλυτο **a** 240 κεφαλῆν **a** 242
γούνα **a**

πλέονές κε μνηστῆρες ἐν ὑμετέροισι δόμοισιν
ἤῳθεν δαινύατ', ἐπεὶ περίεσσι γυναικῶν
εἶδός τε μέγεθός τε ἰδὲ φρένας ἔνδον ἔϊσας.”

τὸν δ' ἡμίβετ' ἔπειτα περίφρων Πηνελόπεια· 250

“Εὐρύμαχ', ἦ τοι ἐμὴν ἀρετὴν εἶδός τε δέμας τε
ᾤλεσαν ἀθάνατοι, ὅτε ἴλιον εἰσανέβαινον
Ἀργεῖοι, μετὰ τοῖσι δ' ἐμός πόσις ἦιεν Ὀδυσσεύς.
εἰ κείνός γ' ἔλθῶν τὸν ἐμὸν βίον ἀμφιπολεύει,
μεῖζόν κε κλέος εἶη ἐμὸν καὶ κάλλιον οὕτω.

255

νῦν δ' ἄχομαι· τόσα γάρ μοι ἐπέσσευεν κακὰ δαίμων.

ἦ μὲν δὴ ὅτε τ' ἦιε λιπὼν κάτα πατρίδα γαῖαν,
δεξιτερὴν ἐπὶ καρπῶι ἐλὼν ἐμὲ χεῖρα προσηύδα·

“ὦ γύναι, οὐ γὰρ οἶω ἔυκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοὺς
ἐκ Τροίης εὖ πάντας ἀπήμονας ἀπονέεσθαι·

260

καὶ γὰρ Τρῳάας φασὶ μαχητὰς ἔμμεναι ἄνδρας,
ἦ μὲν ἀκοντιστὰς ἦδὲ ῥυτῆρας οἴστῶν
ἵππων τ' ὠκυπόδων ἐπιβήτορας, οἳ τε τάχιστα
ἔκριναν μέγα νεῖκος ὁμοίου πολέμοιο.

τῶ οὐκ οἶδ' ἦ κέν μ' ἀνέσει θεός, ἦ κεν ἀλώω
αὐτοῦ ἐνὶ Τροίῃ· σοὶ δ' ἐνθάδε πάντα μελόντων·
μεμῆσθαι πατρὸς καὶ μητέρος ἐν μεγάροισιν

265

ὡς νῦν, ἦ ἔτι μᾶλλον, ἐμεῦ ἀπονόσφιν ἔοντος·
αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν δὴ παῖδα γενειήσαντα ἴδῃαι,
γῆμασθ' ὧ κ' ἐθέλησθα, τεὸν κατὰ δῶμα λιποῦσα.”

270

κεῖνος τῶς ἀγόρευε· τὰ δὴ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται.
νῦς δ' ἔσται ὅτε δὴ στυγερός γάμος ἀντιβολήσῃ
οὐλομένης ἐμέθεν, τῆς τε Ζεὺς ὄλβον ἀπηύρα.

ἀλλὰ τόδ' αἰνὸν ἄχος κραδίην καὶ θυμὸν ἰκάνει·
μνηστήρων οὐχ ἦδε δίκη τὸ πάροιθε τέτυκτο,

275

οἳ τ' ἀγαθὴν τε γυναικὰ καὶ ἀφνειοῖο θυγάτρα
μνηστεύειν ἐθέλωσι καὶ ἀλλήλοισι ἐρίσωσιν·
αὐτοὶ τοί γ' ἀπάγουσι βόας καὶ ἴφια μῆλα
κούρης δαῖτα φίλοισι, καὶ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα διδοῦσιν·
ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀλλότριον βίον τινος νήποιον ἔδουσιν.”

280

ὧς φάτο, γήθησεν δὲ πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς,
οὔνεκα τῶν μὲν δῶρα παρέλκετο, θέλγε δὲ θυμὸν

248 δαίνυντ' **a** 256 ἐπέσσευεν: ἐπέ(γ)χευεν **a** ἐπέκλωσεν **b**; cf. 19.129 263 οἳ τε **d**: οἳ
κε codd. 265 ἦ: εἴ **a** ἀνέσι **d** (cf. *Il.* 16.590), ἀνέσι **d** 271 τῶς Ar. ad *Il.* 16.330: θ' ὧς
Herodian: δ' ὡς codd. 279 κούρησι... φίλησι **a**

μειλιχίοις ἐπέεσσι, νόος δέ οἱ ἄλλα μενοίνα.

τὴν δ' αὖτ' Ἀντίνοος προσέφη, Εὐπείθεος υἱός·
“κούρη Ἰκαρίοιο, περίφρον Πηνελόπεια, 285

δῶρα μὲν ὅς κ' ἐθέλησιν Ἀχαιῶν ἐνθάδ' ἐνεΐκαι,
δέξασθ'· οὐ γὰρ καλὸν ἀνήνασθαι δόσιν ἐστίν·
ἡμεῖς δ' οὐτ' ἐπὶ ἔργα πάρος γ' ἴμεν οὔτε πηι ἄλλῃ,
πρὶν γέ σε τῶι γήμασθαι Ἀχαιῶν ὅς τις ἄριστος.”

ὣς ἔφατ' Ἀντίνοος, τοῖσιν δ' ἐπιήνδανε μῦθος. 290

δῶρα δ' ἄρ' οἰσέμεναι πρόεσαν κήρυκα ἕκαστος.
Ἀντινόωι μὲν ἐνεικε μέγαν περικαλλέα πέπλον,
ποικίλον· ἐν δ' ἄρ' ἔσαν περόναι δυοκαίδεκα πᾶσαι
χρύσειαι, κληῖσιν ἐϋγνάμπτοις ἀραρυῖαι.

ὄρμον δ' Εὐρυμάχωι πολυδαίδαλον αὐτίκ' ἐνεικε, 295

χρύσειον, ἠλέκτροισιν ἐερμένον, ἥλιον ὥς.
ἔρματα δ' Εὐρυδάμαντι δύω θεράποντες ἐνεικαν
τρίγληνα μορόεντα, χάρις δ' ἀπελάμπετο πολλή.

ἐκ δ' ἄρα Πεισάνδροιο Πολυκτορίδου ἄνακτος 300

ἴσθμιον ἠνεικεν θεράπων, περικαλλές ἄγαλμα.
ἄλλο δ' ἄρ' ἄλλος δῶρον Ἀχαιῶν καλὸν ἐνεικεν.

ἡ μὲν ἔπειτ' ἀνέβαιν' ὑπερώϊα δῖα γυναικῶν,
τῆι δ' ἄρ' ἄμ' ἀμφίπολοι ἔφερον περικαλλέα δῶρα.
οἱ δ' εἰς ὄρχηστὺν τε καὶ ἡμερόεσσαν ἀοιδὴν
τρεψάμενοι τέρποντο, μένον δ' ἐπὶ ἔσπερον ἐλθεῖν. 305

τοῖσι δὲ τερπομένοισι μέλας ἐπὶ ἔσπερος ἤλθεν.
αὐτίκα λαμπτήρας τρεῖς ἴστασαν ἐν μεγάροισιν,
ὄφρα φαείνοιεν· περὶ δὲ ξύλα κάγκανα θῆκαν,
αὖα πάλαι, περὶ κήλα, νέον κεκεασμένα χαλκῶι,

καὶ δαΐδας μετέμισγον· ἀμοιβηδὶς δ' ἀνεφαινον 310

δμωιαὶ Ὀδυσσεύος ταλασίφρονος. αὐτὰρ ὁ τῆισιν
αὐτὸς διογενῆς μετέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς·

“δμωιαὶ Ὀδυσσεύος, δὴν οἰχομένοιο ἄνακτος,
ἔρχεσθε πρὸς δώμαθ', ἵν' αἰδοίη βασίλεια· 315

τῆι δὲ παρ' ἠλάκατα στροφαλίζετε, τέρπετε δ' αὐτῆν

ἡμεναι ἐν μεγάρωι, ἡ εἶρια πείκετε χερσίν·

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τούτοισι φάος πάντεσσι παρέξω.

εἶ περ γὰρ κ' ἐθέλωσιν ἐϋθρονον Ἡῶ μίμνεν,

οὐ τί με νικήσουσι· πολυτλήμων δὲ μάλ' εἰμί.”

282 doubted by Arist. Byz. 296 ἐεργμένον a 302 ὑπερώϊα σιγαλόεντα a 307
ἔστασαν a 308 περὶ: ἐπὶ a 314 ἐρχεσθαι a 318 εἶ: ἦν a

ὦς ἔφαθ', αἰ δ' ἐγέλασαν, ἐς ἀλλήλας δὲ ἴδοντο.
 320 τὸν δ' αἰσχυρῶς ἐνένιπε Μελανθῶ καλλιπάρης,
 τὴν Δολίος μὲν ἔτικτε, κόμισσε δὲ Πηνελόπεια,
 παῖδα δὲ ὦς ἀτίταλλε, δίδου δ' ἄρ' ἀθύρματα θυμῶι·
 ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὦς ἔχε πένθος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ Πηνελοπείης,
 ἀλλ' ἦ γ' Εὐρυμάχῳ μισγέσκετο καὶ φιλέεσκεν.
 325 ἦ ῥ' Ὀδυσσῆ' ἐνένιπεν ὄνειδείους ἐπέεσσι·
 “ἔξϊνε τάλαν, σὺ γέ τις φρένας ἐκπεπαταγμένος ἐσσί,
 οὐδ' ἐθέλεις εὐδειν χαλκῆϊον ἐς δόμον ἐλθῶν
 ἢ ἐπου ἐς λέσχην, ἀλλ' ἐνθάδε πόλλ' ἀγορεύεις
 330 θαρσαλέως πολλοῖσι μετ' ἀνδράσιν, οὐδέ τι θυμῶι
 ταρβεῖς· ἦ ῥά σε οἶνος ἔχει φρένας, ἦ νύ τοι αἰεὶ
 τοιοῦτος νόος ἐστίν, ὃ καὶ μεταμῶνια βάζεις.
 ἦ ἀλῦεις ὅτι Ἴρον ἐνίκησας τὸν ἀλήτην;
 μή τίς τοι τάχα Ἴρου ἀμείνων ἄλλος ἀναστῆι,
 335 ὅς τίς σ' ἀμφὶ κάρη κεκοπῶς χερσὶ στιβαρῆισι
 δώματος ἐκπέμψηισι φορυξας αἵματι πολλῶι.”
 τὴν δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς·
 “ἦ τάχα Τηλεμάχῳ ἐρέω, κύον, οἶ' ἀγορεύεις,
 κεῖσ' ἐλθῶν, ἵνα σ' αὖθι διὰ μελεῖσσι τάμησιβιν.”
 ὦς εἰπὼν ἐπέεσσι διεπτοίησε γυναικάς.
 340 βὰν δ' ἵμεναι διὰ δῶμα, λύθην δ' ὑπὸ γυῖα ἐκάστης
 ταρβουσύνηι· φὰν γάρ μιν ἀληθέα μυθήσασθαι.
 αὐτὰρ ὁ πὰρ λαμπτήρσι φαείνων αἰθομένοισιν
 ἐστήκειν ἐς πάντας ὀρώμενος· ἄλλα δὲ οἱ κῆρ
 ὤρμαινε φρεσὶν ἦισιν, ἅ ῥ' οὐκ ἀτέλεστα γένοντο.
 345 μνηστῆρας δ' οὐ πάμπαν ἀγήνορας εἶα Ἀθήνη
 λώβης ἴσχεσθαι θυμαλγέος, ὄφρ' ἔτι μᾶλλον
 δῦη ἄχος κραδίην Λαερτιάδεω Ὀδυσσῆος.
 τοῖσιν δ' Εὐρύμαχος, Πολύβου παῖς, ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν
 350 κερτομέων Ὀδυσσῆα· γέλω δ' ἐτάροισιν ἔτευχε·
 “κέκλυτέ μευ, μνηστῆρες ἀγακλειτῆς βασιλείης,
 ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει.
 οὐκ ἀθεεὶ ὄδ' ἀνήρ Ὀδυσσῆϊον ἐς δόμον ἴκει·
 ἔμπης μοι δοκέει δαΐδων σέλαις ἔμμεναι αὐτοῦ
 355 κάκ κεφαλής, ἐπεὶ οὐ οἱ ἐνὶ τρίχες οὐδ' ἦβραιαί.”

321 ἐνένιπτε **a** ἐνένισπε **b** 323 θυμοῦ **a** 330-2 ath. Ar. (=390-2) θαρσαλέος **a**
 332 μεταμῶλια **a** 335 κεκοπῶς **a**, Ar. 344 ἐστήκει **a** εἰστήκει(ν) **b**, Eust. 348 λαερ-
 τιάδην ὀδυσσῆα **a** 350 γέλων **a** ἔτευξε **a** ἔθηκε **b**, Eust. 355 κάκ **d**: καὶ codd.

ἦ ῥέ, ἅμα τε προσέειπεν Ὀδυσσῆα πτολίπορθον·
 “ξείν’, ἦ ἄρ κ’ ἐθέλοις θητευέμεν, εἴ σ’ ἀνελοίμην,
 ἀγροῦ ἐπ’ ἐσχατιῆς – μισθὸς δέ τοι ἄρκιος ἔσται –
 αἵμασιός τε λέγων καὶ δένδρεα μακρὰ φυτεύων;
 ἔνθα κ’ ἐγὼ σῖτον μὲν ἐπηγτανὸν παρέχοιμι, 360
 εἶματα δ’ ἀμφιέσαιμι ποσὶν θ’ ὑποδήματα δοίην.
 ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν δὴ ἔργα κάκ’ ἔμμαθες, οὐκ ἐθελήσεις
 ἔργον ἐποίχεσθαι, ἀλλὰ πτώσσειν κατὰ δῆμον
 βούλειαι, ὄφρ’ ἂν ἔχῃς βόσκειν σὴν γαστέρ’ ἀναλτον.”

τὸν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς· 365
 “Εὐρύμαχ’, εἰ γὰρ νῶϊν ἔρις ἔργοιο γένοιτο
 ὦρην ἐν εἰαρινῇ, ὅτε τ’ ἤματα μακρὰ πέλονται,
 ἐν ποίῃ, δρέπανον μὲν ἐγὼν εὐκαμπὲς ἔχοιμι,
 καὶ δὲ σὺ τοῖον ἔχῃς, ἵνα πειρησαίμεθα ἔργου
 νήστιες ἄχρι μάλα κνέφαος, ποίῃ δὲ παρείη. 370
 εἰ δ’ αὖ καὶ βόες εἴεν ἐλαυνέμεν, οἳ περ ἄριστοι,
 αἴθωνες μεγάλοι, ἄμφω κεκορηότε ποίης,
 ἤλικες ἰσοφόροι, τῶν τε σθένος οὐκ ἀλαπαδνόν,
 τετράγυον δ’ εἴη, εἴκοι δ’ ὑπὸ βῶλος ἀρότρῳ·
 τῷ κέ μ’ ἴδοις, εἰ ὦλκα διηνεκέα προταμοίμην. 375
 εἰ δ’ αὖ καὶ πόλεμόν ποθεν ὀρμήσειε Κρονίων
 σήμερον, αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ σάκος εἴη καὶ δύο δοῦρε
 καὶ κυνὴ πάγχαλκος ἐπὶ κροτάφοις ἀραρυῖα,
 τῷ κέ μ’ ἴδοις πρῶτοισιν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι μιγέντα,
 οὐδ’ ἂν μοι τὴν γαστέρ’ ὄνειδιζῶν ἀγορεύεις. 380
 ἀλλὰ μάλ’ ὑβρίζεις καὶ τοι νόος ἐστὶν ἀπηνής·
 καὶ πού τις δοκέεις μέγας ἔμμεναι ἠδὲ κραταιός,
 οὐνεκα πὰρ παύροισι καὶ οὐκ ἀγαθοῖσιν ὀμιλεῖς.
 εἰ δ’ Ὀδυσσεύς ἔλθοι καὶ ἴκοιτ’ ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν,
 αἰψὰ κέ τοι τὰ θύρετρα, καὶ εὐρέα περ μάλ’ ἐόντα, 385
 φεύγοντι στείνοιτο διὲκ προθύροιο θύραζε.”

ὡς ἔφατ’, Εὐρύμαχος δ’ ἐχολώσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον,
 καὶ μιν ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
 “ἅ δειλ’, ἦ τάχα τοι τελέω κακόν, οἳ ἀγορεύεις
 θαρσαλέως πολλοῖσι μετ’ ἀνδράσιν, οὐδέ τι θυμῶι 390
 ταρβεῖς· ἦ ῥά σε οἶνος ἔχει φρένας, ἦ νύ τοι αἰεὶ
 τοιοῦτος νόος ἐστίν, ὃ καὶ μεταμῶνια βάζεις.

360 ἔνθα κ’: ἐνθάδ’ a 367 ἐν del. Bentley 374 βῶλος: χώρος a 383 οὐκ ἀγαθοῖσιν:
 οὐτιδανοῖσιν a 386 φεύγοντες στείνοιτε a προθύροιο: μεγάρῳ a, Rhianus 388 ἔπεα
 πτερόεντα προσηύδα: χαλεπῶι ἠνίπαπε μύθῳ a

ἦ ἀλύεις, ὅτι Ἴρον ἐνίκησας τὸν ἀλήτην;”

ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας σφέλας ἔλλαβεν· αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς
Ἄμφινόμου πρὸς γούνα καθέζετο Δουλιχιῆος, 395

Εὐρύμαχον δείσας· ὁ δ’ ἄρ’ οἶνοχόον βάλε χεῖρα
δεξιτερῆν· πρόχοος δὲ χαμαὶ βρόμβησε πεσοῦσα,
αὐτὰρ ὁ γ’ οἰμώξας πέσεν ὑπτίος ἐν κονίησι.

μνηστῆρες δ’ ὁμάδησαν ἀνὰ μέγαρα σκίοεντα,
ὦδε δὲ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον· 400

“αἴθ’ ὦφελλ’ ὁ ξεῖνος ἀλώμενος ἄλλοθ’ ὀλέσθαι
πρὶν ἔλθεῖν· τῷ κ’ οὐ τι τόσον κέλαδον μεθέηκε.
νῦν δὲ περὶ πτωχῶν ἐριδαίνομεν, οὐδέ τι δαιτὸς
ἔσθλης ἔσσεται ἦδος, ἐπεὶ τὰ χερείονα νικᾷ.”

τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειψ’ ἱερῆ ἱς Τηλεμάχοιο· 405

“δαιμόνιοι, μαίνεσθε καὶ οὐκέτι κεύθετε θυμῷ
βρωτῶν οὐδὲ ποτῆτα· θεῶν νύ τις ὑμῖ ὀροθύνει.
ἀλλ’ εὖ δαισάμενοι κατακείετε οἶκαδ’ ἰόντες,
ὁππότε θυμὸς ἄνωγε· διώκω δ’ οὐ τιν’ ἐγὼ γε.”

ὣς ἔφαθ’, οἱ δ’ ἄρα πάντες ὁδᾶς ἐν χεῖλεσι φύντες 410

Τηλέμαχον θαύμαζον, ὃ θαρσαλέως ἀγόρευε.
τοῖσιν δ’ Ἄμφινόμος ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε
Νίσου φαίδιμος υἱός, Ἀρητιάδαο ἄνακτος·

“ὦ φίλοι, οὐκ ἂν δὴ τις ἐπὶ ῥηθέντι δικαίω
ἀντιβίοις ἐπέεσσι καθαπτόμενος χαλεπαῖνοι· 415

μήτε τι τὸν ξεῖνον συτφελίζετε μήτε τιν’ ἄλλον
δμῶων, οἱ κατὰ δώματ’ Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο.
ἀλλ’ ἄγετ’, οἶνοχόος μὲν ἐπαρξάσθω δεπᾶεσσιν,
ὄφρα σπείσαντες κατακείομεν οἶκαδ’ ἰόντες·
τὸν ξεῖνον δὲ ἐῷμεν ἐνὶ μεγάροις Ὀδυσσῆος
Τηλεμάχῳ μελέμεν· τοῦ γὰρ φίλον ἴκετο δῶμα.”

ὣς φάτο, τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ἐαδότα μῦθον ἔειπε.
τοῖσιν δὲ κρητῆρα κεράσσατο Μούλιος ἦρωσ,
κῆρυξ Δουλιχιεύς· θεράπων δ’ ἦν Ἄμφινόμοιο·

νώμησεν δ’ ἄρα πᾶσιν ἐπισταδόν· οἱ δὲ θεοῖσι 425

λείψαντες μακάρεσσι πῖον μελιηδέα οἶνον.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπείσᾶν τε πῖον θ’ ὅσον ἦθελε θυμὸς,
βᾶν ῥ’ ἵμεναι κείοντες ἐὰ πρὸς δώμαθ’ ἕκαστος.

393 omitted in many MSS (= 333) 402 μετέθηκε ΑΓ. (πᾶσαι) 405 μετέφη α 413
omitted in many MSS (= 16.395) 418 ἄγε α 420 δ’ εἰῷμεν α μεγάροισιν ἐκῆλον Rhi-
anus 426 λείψαντες· σπείσαντες α

COMMENTARY

Book 17

After three books in which the hero, in his beggar's disguise, has remained as a guest in Eumaeus' hut, book 17 features the transition necessary for the plot's resolution in the final portions of the poem. It follows Od.'s passage from the swineherd's dwelling in the countryside back to the more 'urban' area (see Introduction pp. 23–4), and from the courtyard of his house to the banqueting hall where he will first encounter the suitors feasting on his property. The hero's progress is more than just spatial. The move from the periphery to the palace interior, a site still empty of legitimate authority and waiting to be reclaimed, allows Od. to begin the long process of resuming his role as master of his οἶκος.

But Od.'s journey is anything but smooth or direct. A series of encounters punctuates, and delays, his entrance into the palace. The abusive goatherd Melanthius, whom he meets on the road to town and who tries to prevent him from advancing further, offers a foretaste of the verbal violence and physical assaults that Od. will suffer at the suitors' hands. The faithful dog Argus, occupying the site immediately before the house doors, gives the newcomer a reception of an entirely different kind but stands witness to the neglect and maltreatment that the property and its loyal retainers have experienced during their master's absence. When Od. finally takes up the regular position of a newly arrived ξείνος and beggar, the threshold, he becomes the victim of the taunting of the suitor Antinous and, more generally, encounters a series of perversions of the proper norms of hospitality (see Introduction p. 17) which further retard his reincorporation into the household. The poet thus offers a long-drawn-out type-scene, the arrival and reception of a ξείνος, with a difference: the stranger has come home.

1–25

Eumaeus, Telemachus and Od. plan Od.'s departure for the town and palace. Although Telemachus initially addresses Eumaeus, the swineherd remains a silent presence in the exchange. Od. will assume the initiative in answering his son.

1 This line occurs × 20 in *Od.*, × 2 in *Il.*; the noun-epithet phrase occupies its typical verse-terminal position. The poet has a variety of epithets to accompany Eos, but 'rosy-fingered' is much the most common (× 27 in the two poems). The rose-coloured fingers most probably correspond to the sun's first rays, spread out like a hand; there may also be a reference to the narrow band of red light as dawn breaks (see West on Hes. *WD* 610). The day that commences here, the 39th since the opening assembly of the gods according to most reconstructions of the chronology of Od.'s return (see 515–17n), is the 'longest' day in the poem; a fresh day will not break until 20.91.

On a striking number of other occasions in the Homeric compositions (*Od.* 2, 3, 5, 8, 16; *Il.* 8, 11, 19) daybreak coincides with the opening of a new book according to the now conventional divisions of the poem; the poet may already have used sunrise and sunset as markers to segment and punctuate his larger narrative (see 606n, 18.428n, de Jong 1996, and Introduction p. 37).

2 ὑπὸ ποσσίν . . . καλὰ πέδιλα also appears at 1.96, 5.44, 15.550 and *Il.* 24.340, in three of the four instances of Hermes (whose footwear is additionally ἀμβρόσια χρύσεια). πέδιλα is a term already used in the Mycenaean period, and appears in *H.* only in formulas; for the more recent ὑποδήματα, see 18.361n. *H.* regularly calls sandals καλά and the formulaic expression appears only at the conclusion of the line (× 12). ‘Binding’ suggests shoes equipped with a fastening (cf. 18.361), perhaps laces passed through a slit cut in the sole.

3 Τηλέμαχος: the nominative form of Telemachus’ name (× 128 in the *Od.*) is unsuitable for terminal positioning in the line (cf. 17.328n). *H.* may additionally deploy name positions in his compositions for thematic ends, preferring to reserve the final metrical slot for top-rank heroes. *Od.* most conspicuously in the *Od.*; the pattern thus denies Telemachus full heroic status, defining him as the ‘non-Odysseus’ (Kahane 1994: 137; see too Bakker 1997a: 170–1). φίλος υἱὸς Ὀδυσσεύος θεῖοιο: × 6 in *Od.*; the formula Ὀδυσσεύος θεῖοιο regularly completes the line after the trochaic caesura (× 22). Other periphrases for Telemachus in the nominative are also v.-terminal (see 18.60n). If metrical convenience frequently dictates the choice of formula, the poet’s selection can be purposeful. References to Telemachus as ‘the dear son of Odysseus’ occur much more frequently in the episodes following the reunion between the youth and his father than in earlier portions of the poem; here the designation most immediately recalls the emotional meeting staged in book 16; Telemachus can now legitimately think of himself as *Od.*’s ‘dear son’, although the hero must maintain his disguise before all other individuals. See further Beck 1998–9: 135.

The poet’s nod towards the complicity between father and son is a reminder that both characters will be role-playing in the encounter about to occur, Telemachus feigning to regard *Od.* as a beggar, and *Od.* assuming the persona required by his disguise. Telemachus’ exclusive knowledge of his father’s identity turns this and subsequent scenes into subtle explorations of the nature of impersonation and disguise. Since the son alone is aware of the artificial, temporary quality of the external signs of *Od.*’s condition (his rags, wallet, stick and overall decrepitude are mere ‘stage-props’), his ‘internal’ perspective on his father coincides with that of the poet and his audience (see further Introduction p. 20 and Rabel 1999).

3a This formulaic line, identical to 2.3, occurs in only one MS, and other overlaps between the openings of books 17 and 2 would explain its inclusion here: in book 2 Telemachus, similarly equipped and also at dawn, set out for the agora where he encountered the suitors and several of his friends (see 61–83n).

4 ἀρήρει: 3 sing. pluperf. of ἀραρίσκω; both perf. and pluperf. forms of the verb are used intransitively. Telemachus’ actions belong to the standard ‘dressing’ type-scene; as frequently, the scene occurs at daybreak and/or before a departure (cf. 1.96–101;

4.308–9; 5.44–8; 20.125–7 and Arend 1933: 97–8). As these other instances show, the poet can expand or abbreviate the account.

5 ἄστυδε λέμενος: the –δε suffix indicates motion towards; cf. the Attic expression Ἀθήναζε (i.e. –ασδε) This phrase marking Telemachus' journey from Eumaeus' hut back to his home introduces the distinction critical in book 17 between the rural scene and the cityscape; for the contrast between these two 'geopolitical' realms, see 10–11, 182nn. ἐόν = ὄν. The possessive pronoun emphasizes the bond between Telemachus and the swineherd, prominent in both this and the previous book.

6 ἄττ' 'papa', a colloquial and affectionate form of address, found exclusively in the vocative and derived from children's speech (cf. πάππα, τέττα), with parallel forms in many IE languages. The doubling of the consonant or syllable ('Mummy', 'Daddy') is typical of words of this kind. The term survives only in epic (Achilles to Phoenix, × 2 in the *Il.*; Telemachus to Eumaeus, × 6 in *Od.*), in a few inscriptions, and, according to Eustathius *Hom.* 777.54, is Thessalian.

6–7 ὄφρα . . . ὄψεται: an unusual use of ὄφρα in a purpose clause with the future indicative found only in *H.*; for other examples, see 4.163, *Il.* 8.110–11, 16.242–3 with Chantraine, *GH* II 273.

7 ὄτω: the poet regularly uses the verb at line end with enjambment; cf. 18.23, 3.27, *Il.* 21.92. This is the only form of ὄτομαι found in the active in *H.*

8 κλαυθοῦ . . . γοιοῖ τε δακρυόεντος: the poet combines 'weeping and wailing', with or without the accompanying adjectives, on three other occasions (4.801, 21.228, 24.323); the second noun always falls immediately after the caesura. On such 'doublets' as integral to oral compositional technique, see 86n.

10 τὸν ξείνον δύστηνον 'him, the stranger in his wretchedness': the so-called 'deictic' use of the article, where it preserves its original demonstrative force and functions as a demonstrative pronoun; see Monro, *HD* 261, Chantraine, *GH* II 164. The *Od.* reserves almost half of its uses of the deictic article for the term ξείνος, perhaps a means of emphasizing the crucial stranger-motif by marking it out with this archaism. δύστηνος regularly describes Od. (15 out of 17 instances); *H.* likes to associate with his hero terms that echo elements of Od.'s name (δύστηνος, δύσμορος, δδύσσομαι). The adj. appears almost exclusively in speeches (the sole exception is 5.436); typically the poet avoids emotionally charged terms for his own narrative, favouring a more 'objective' style; for distinctions between the diction of the poet and that of his characters, see 586n and Griffin 1986: 42.

10–11 ἐκεῖθι . . . πτωχεύη: begging, as opposed to the productive activity that goes on in the countryside (20–1), is regularly associated with the urban sphere; see 18, 245–6, 18.358nn.

12–15 Telemachus enters fully into the charade, feigning an impatience and callousness very much at odds with his true feelings towards the 'beggar'.

12 πύρνον καὶ κοτύλην 'a bit of bread and a little cup' = 15.312; cf. *Il.* 22.494 (of Astyanax begging). The first term is probably derived from πυρός 'wheat' (cf. Attic πύρινος); the second is of unknown origin. For ancient conjectures, see Athen. II.478d–9c.

12–13 ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους ἀνέχεσθαι ‘tolerate all men’; cf. 7.32. The περ in the line’s participial phrase is concessive (cf. 46–7n) as Telemachus explains that he would help the beggar, but cannot because at this point he has too many troubles.

15 ἐμοὶ φίλ’ ἀληθέα μυθήσασθαι ‘truth speaking is what I like best’; for the construction, cf. *Il.* 1.107, 4.345 and Hes. *WD* 306. Odyssean characters have a habit of asserting the truth content of their words precisely when they are lying; cf. 108n, 14.192, 19.269 and 24.303.

16 πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς: the epithet is applied to the hero *Od.* x 66, *Il.* x 18, and is exclusive to *Od.*, with the exception of *Il.* 21.355 (of Hephaestus, a significant parallel; see 195, 18.10, 328nn). The expression almost always occurs between the fourth-foot caesura and verse end. Of the examples in the *Od.*, 63 are preceded by προσέφη (or occasionally μετέφη), of which 45 occur within the entire formulaic line used here; the frequency with which the poet combines the formula with a verb of speech suggests that *Od.*’s signature mental acuity manifests itself particularly in the form of clever speaking. Strikingly after προσέφη *Od.* is always styled ‘many-wiled’. See further 280n, Austin 1975: 28–9, 39–40 and Tsagarakis 1982: 36–41.

17 τοὶ = σοὶ. The notion that a guest ought not to be detained when he wishes to go is a leitmotif in the poem (see 15.68–74 for the fullest elaboration of the sentiment; note too 15.200–1 and 8.31–3). As *Od.*’s account of his wanderings to the Phaeacians repeatedly demonstrated, it is the mark of a bad host to attempt to retain a ξείνος against his will (witness the Lotus-Eaters, Circe, the Sirens and Calypso; see too Most 1989: 24–5, 27–8). The guest’s freedom to determine his own departure time may already have been an axiom of elite conduct in Homeric times and recurs in later sympotic lore; cf. Theogn. 467, ‘do not hold back anyone of these so that he remain with us unwillingly’ (μηδένα τῶνδ’ ἀέκοντα μένειν κατέρυκε παρ’ ἡμῖν); note too Theoc. *Id.* 16.27–8, perhaps with *Od.* 15.68–74 in mind.

18 βέλτερόν ἐστι: regularly before the trochaic caesura and followed by an inf. construction. The notion that ‘it is better for a beggar to beg his dinner in the city than in the countryside’ is reaffirmed in 18.1–4 where Irus scrounges his meals κατ’ ἄστῳ (see n. and Edwards 1993: 46 citing 244–6, 375–9, 15.308–9, 18.357–64).

20–1 τηλικός ‘of such an age to’ governs both the infinitive and the ὥς clause that follows; for the syntax, see Ruijgh 1971: 501, Chantraine, *GH* II 314. ὥς + infinitive is found only here and at *Il.* 9.42; the construction lies behind the common Attic use of ὥστε + inf.

22 ἔρχεν: the contracted form of the pres. imper. mid. of ἐρχομαι is found frequently in the MSS (cf. 6.69, 10.288); where the form is not metrically guaranteed, it may be a modernized form of the more ancient ending –εο with elision; see Chantraine, *GH* I 59–60.

23–5 It is cold not just because of the dawn hour, but because, in the poet’s carefully calibrated seasonal chronology, *Od.*’s return occurs in late winter. According to the calendar that the gods have determined, *Od.* leaves Circe’s island in the late autumn (as indicated by the winds that blow while the hero is at sea), washes up on Scheria at the start of the winter (5.469, 485), and reaches Ithaca when the nights are long (15.392)

and the weather bitterly cold (14.457–522, 529–33); only the Phaeacians, supremely skilled mariners with magical self-propelled ships, could undertake such a journey at the dead of winter, a season when the Greeks studiously avoided sea-faring (see Hes. *WD* 619–21 with West's note.). On this timetable, the hero's triumph over the suitors coincides with the advent of spring. For discussion of H.'s artful use of seasonality, see Austin 1975: 242–51.

23 αὐτίκ' ἔπει . . . γένηται 'straightaway when I have warmed myself by the fire and there is warmth from the sun'. πυρός is best understood as a partitive gen (cf. *Il.* 6.331, 11.666–7); Greek usage regards the fire as the source from which a portion of warmth is taken. θερέω: probably an aor. subj. passive from an aor. passive ἔθερην (see Chantraine, *GH* 1 71, 401, 459). ἄλητ' refers either to the sun's warmth or to warmth more generally. The former meaning (as assumed by the scholia, Frisk *GEIV*, Snell–Erbse, *LfgGE* among others) fits the context better; it coincides with the opening reference to dawn and the detail of the early morning frost.

24 αἰνῶς . . . κακά 'these clothes . . . are terribly bad'; the adv. has an intensive sense, 'to a high degree'; cf. 9.379. This is one of the repeated references to Od.'s rags. At 13.434–7 Athena changed the hero's clothes, given to him by the Phaeacians, along with his physique; he will not resume dress appropriate to his status until his triumph over the suitors is complete and he needs to persuade P. of his true identity (23.155). Clothing is an important motif in the poem, both as an element in hospitality rites (the host should furnish his guest with new clothes and clothing can figure among the parting gifts a ξείνος receives), and as a device through which the poet explores the question of outward appearance vs. inner reality – do clothes really make the man? See further 550n, Schadewaldt 1959a, Griffin 1980: 2–7, 28–9, Block 1985.

24–5 Cf. 5.467–8 where Od., newly washed up on Scheria, also feared the impact of morning frost (μή μ' αἰμυδις στίβη τε κακή καὶ θήλυς ἔεργη . . . δαμάσῃ). For the many parallels between his passage from the seashore to Alcinous' palace and his journey from Eumaeus' hut to his home, see 26–30, 206nn. The cold at dawn (ὑπηοίη 'of dawn, at break of day') became proverbial: see Hesych. s.v. Αἴθρος, Propert. 1.16.24. φάτ': a nice touch; Od. feigns ignorance of the locale, dissembling before Eumaeus as Telemachus did at 12–15. For similar precautions, see 196 and 18.126.

26–60

Telemachus returns to the house to see P. After abruptly refusing her request to tell her what he discovered on his journey, he sets off to fetch the prophet Theoclymenus whom he met while abroad.

26–30 The poet devotes only five lines to Telemachus' journey from Eumaeus' hut to the interior of the palace; for Od., the process will occupy well over 100. By going in advance of Od. (following his father's instructions at 16.270–3), Telemachus repeats Nausicaa's action at the end of book 6 after her meeting with the hero; there the maiden returned to the palace before Od. arrived. For other coincidences in the roles played by the two youthful characters, see Reece 1993: 114.

27 φύτευεν ‘he was planting’; the metaphor occurs again at 82 and 159; H. uses the verb almost exclusively in connection with Od.’s plans for revenge on the suitors.

28 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δ’ ἴκανε: cf. 85. H. regularly uses phrases of this type to express the idea ‘when he (we, they) had done so and so’; as here, the expressions are located between the verse beginning and the third foot trochaic caesura (Parry 1971: 276).

29 Some editors print the variant reading (see app. crit.) on the grounds that the spear-holder in which Telemachus places Athena-Mentes’ spear at 1.127–9 is located inside the hall. It seems more reasonable to assume two possible sites where arms might be left; here the youth leans his spear against a column on the colonnaded porch.

30 ἴεν: 3 sing. imperfect indicative of εἶμι, ‘go’.

31 Characters sympathetic to a new arrival are regularly the first to spot him (or her), sometimes a clue to existing relations of familiarity or intimacy between the individuals (see 328–9). Failure to perceive or acknowledge the newcomer can suggest an inimical attitude.

32 καστορνῦσα: i.e. καταστορνῦσα, with loss of the second vowel by apocope (cf. καρβάλλω, ἀμβαίνειν etc.) and subsequent loss of the redundant consonant. θρόνοις . . . δαιδαλέοισι: the poet differentiates seats by their epithets and the individuals who sit on them. The poet reserves the θρόνος, the grandest type of chair that would have had a straight back and armrests, for gods, heroes and male members of the elite (Athena, Nestor and family, Telemachus, Hermes, Alcinoos, the Phaeacian nobles, Demodocus, Theoclymenus and the suitors). Here the seats are ‘fine-wrought’, an adj. cognate with Mycenaean *da-da-re-jo* (see Morris 1992: 75), and are covered, as usually, by a fleece. One of the Pylos furniture tablets describes an elaborately decorated throne (*ta-ra-nu*), inlaid with figures of men and lions (PY Ta 707). For ancient attempts to differentiate between Homeric chairs, see Athen. 5.192d–e; see too 86, 330nn, Houston 1975 and Richter 1966: 13–25 (with representations from Greek art).

33 δακρύσασα ‘bursting into tears’; ingressive aor. indicating the start of an action; so too at 38. ἰθύς ‘straight (towards him)’.

33–4 ἀμφι . . . ἠγερέθοντο: ‘tmesis’. The verb occurs only here and at *Il.* 18.37.

34 δμωαῖ and the masculine δμῶες are regular terms in the poem for dependent labourers, particularly when they are referred to as a group rather than as individuals (δμωαῖ never appears in singular form; the masculine does so only twice). Here, as frequently, the noun occurs together with the name of the master or mistress in the genitive case, emphasizing the subordinate and dependent nature of the servants. The word δμῶς, generally agreed to be related to δόμος, would originally have referred to inhabitants of the house and then have gained the more specialized meaning of slave; for the etymology, see Chantraine *DE*, Frisk *GEW*, Snell–Erbse, *LfgGE*; for slaves in the Homeric οἶκος, see Gschnitzer 1976: 47–68 and Thalmann 1998: 53–62. *ταλασφρονος* is one of Od.’s regular epithets that accompanies the hero’s name in the gen. (*Od.* × 11, *Il.* × 1); so too of Od. at Hes. *Th.* 1012, *Orph. Lith.* 678. The Homeric *Od.* repeatedly attracts *τλε-*, *τλα-* and *ταλα-* forms; see his programmatic statement at 5.222, *τλήσομαι ἐν στήθεσσιν ἔχων ταλαπενθέα θυμόν* and 84n. These prefixes,

which include the qualities of ‘endurance’ and ‘daring’, express the two potentially clashing facets of the protagonist’s heroic nature; while through much of the poem that heroism consists in Od.’s ability to undergo trials and sufferings, a concept already announced in 1.16–19, the prefixes can on other occasions emphasize the element of ‘boldness’, a trait evoked in the several applications of the epithet *τλήμων* to the Iliadic Od. See further Pucci 1987: 45–9, Marzullo 1970: 59–67, Eisenberger 1973: 108 n. 4.

35 *κύνεον*: the lengthening of the final syllable is unusual; while initial *ν* can lengthen preceding short vowels, final *ν* generally cannot (Chantraine, *GH* 1 99–105, Monro, *HD* 344, 349). *ἀγαπαζόμενα*: the etymology of *ἀγαπάω* and *ἀγαπάζομαι* remains unknown, but here the verb carries what looks like the earliest attested meaning, ‘to welcome affectionately’; cf. 7.33 for this sense. Slaves regularly kiss their masters on their head, shoulders and sometimes hands; Penelope will kiss Telemachus on his head and eyes (39).

36 For P.’s descents to the *μέγρον*, see 18.158–303n; the present instance offers a very abbreviated version of the sequence described on other occasions. *περίφρων Πηνελόπεια*: by far the most common formula for P. (× 44), always occurring at v. end after the feminine caesura. The epithet is used exclusively of women in early epic.

37 = 19.54. *Ἄρτεμιδι*: the final *-ι* of this dative ending is long, probably the original quantity retained by poets for metrical convenience (see Monro, *HD* 373). The digamma at (F)ικέλη is preserved here, as frequently, to prevent corruption. The conjunction of Artemis and Aphrodite signals the two antithetical sides of P. as the poem depicts her. On the one hand she stands as a paradigm of chastity (the ‘Artemis’ side; see 18.202n and the earlier comparison of the maidenly Nausicaa to Artemis at 6.102, 151) and of the marital fidelity that goes with it; on the other her beauty arouses a powerful erotic response (see 18.212n). The characterization also suggests her two-fold attitude towards Od.’s return: she is at once the virginal bride-to-be, fearful of her coming change in state, and the nubile maiden ready for the (re)marriage that Od.’s advent will bring about. See Introduction p. 28 and Felson-Rubin 1994: 36–7.

39–42 = 16.15, 22–4. The passages exist in close thematic relation. In book 16, a simile likening Eumaeus’ greeting to that of a father welcoming his long-departed son and kissing him ‘even as if he had escaped dying’ separated the embrace from the swineherd’s speech. That simile would now be redundant; whereas Eumaeus’ welcome was only *like* that of a father, here an actual mother and son are reunited.

39 *κεφαλὴν . . . φάεα*: probably, along with *μιν*, external objects of *κύσσε* rather than accusatives of respect. Wyatt 1969: 100–1 suggests that the long first syllable of *φάεα* depends not on metrical lengthening, but on the noun’s connection with Sanskrit *bhāṣah*, ‘light’. The plural form appears only in H. in this formulaic line (× 3 *Od.*) and always in the context of an emotional greeting; it does not appear again until Call. *H.* 5.92 where, in a passage reminiscent of this scene, Tiresias’ mother Chariclo tearfully embraces her son (ἀ μὲν <ἄμ> ἀμοφτέραισι φίλον περὶ παῖδα λαβοῖσα . . . ἄγε βαρὺ κλαίοισα, 93–5), and mourns the loss of his eyes (*φάεα*); cf. A. R. 1.268 for another mother’s sorrowful embrace of her son (Jason), with additional

Homeric echoes. On the relation of φάεα to φάος, ‘light’, ‘safety’, as in 41, see Wyatt 1969: 101.

40 ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα: this formulaic expression appears × 125 + variants in H. The metaphor ἔπεα πτερόεντα (‘perhaps the most famous and least understood phrase in Homer’, Martin 1989: 30) is commonly explained by modern scholars as coming from archery: words go straight to their mark like an arrow that is, in another frequent expression, πτερόεις, ‘flying easily, equipped to fly’ (by virtue of its feathers). For speech as arrows, see Pind. *Ol.* 9.11–12, A. *Supp.* 446, *Eum.* 676, Eur. *Supp.* 456, with further discussion in S. West on 1.122, Hoekstra on 13.165, Latacz 1968, Durante 1968. Also possible is an ornithological connection – like birds, words fly rapidly through the air; quite plausibly the formula combines notions of archery and birds (see Kirk on *Il.* 1.201, Martin 1989: 35). The force of the phrase is uncertain: it may be a fossilized and empty formula inserted when the character about to speak has been named as the subject of the preceding sentence (Parry 1971: 414–18), or a more pointed and situation-specific expression. A particularized usage is probably correct: the poet seems to favour the formula at moments when one person addresses a second with whom he is in close contact, or as a preface to ‘directives’, speeches designed to make the addressee do something (Martin 1989: 31). See further 57n.

41 ἦλθες: found regularly in greetings (generally of a friendly nature); cf. 16.23, 461, *Il.* 3.428, 24.104; for later examples, Alc. fr. 350.1 L–P, Theogn. 511, Ar. *Av.* 680, Theoc. *Id.* 12.1–2 (with Gow’s note). Τηλέμαχε: vocative forms of Telemachus’ name usually occur in v. initial position (e.g. 75, 101); here, however, the designation occupies a different metrical slot as P. repeats the very emotive greeting used by Eumaeus (16.23), addressing her son as ‘sweet light’.

43 λάθρη: enjambment, further emphasized by punctuation, signals the distress P. felt at Telemachus’ covert departure; cf. 8.269.

44 κατάλεξον ‘recount’, always found in epic in forms of the aor. or future so as to obtain the lengthened third syllable suitable for hexameter composition (υυ–x). In H., the verb retains something of its original meaning ‘recount in order, present as a list, enumerate’ (see 16.235, ἀριθμήσας κατάλεξον and 19.497) and is reserved for the relay of information and the narration of accurate, ‘point-by-point’ tales (so 108 and 122nn). The poet uses the verb only for the narratives of characters in the poem, never applying it to his own activity (Krischer 1971: 132). Telemachus will not satisfy his mother’s request until their second exchange (108n). ὅπως ἦντησας ὀπωπῆς: ‘how you came to the sight’. The entire line, with its curious final phrase, echoes 3.97 and 4.327, but the change in context and speaker suggests Telemachus’ new authority. In books 3 and 4, the youth, in a state of ignorance, addressed the request to those who were better informed; now Telemachus ‘in the know’ is able to inform another unknowing individual. P.’s words have a significance of which she cannot be aware: Telemachus has not only heard about his father, but seen him too. For all the oddness of the phrase (hence the variant ἀκουῆς at 3.97), the emphasis on autopsy is consistent with the privileged status that the poet, anticipating Herodotus, grants to eye-witness accounts; for this, see 3.93–4 = 4.323–4 and particularly 8.491, where

Odysseus praises Demodocus on the grounds that he performed his story not ἄλλου ἀκούσας but ‘as though you had yourself been present (παρέων)’. (Perhaps, following this remark, P. imagines that a vivid account of Od. would have allowed Telemachus to ‘visualize’ his father.) The prologue already heralds Od.’s particular authority in ‘seeing’: ἴδεν ἄσπετα (1.3).

45 τὴν δ’ αὖ... ἀντίον ἠΐδα: by far the most common speech-introductory formula for Telemachus (*Od.* × 43); the poet also closely associates the expression ἀντίον ἠΐδα with the youth’s addresses. πεπνυμένος: the epithet accompanies names shaped – υ υ – (× 47 in *H.*), and indicates a variety of properties. While in the *Il.* πεπνυμένος regularly accompanies ‘youthful or subordinate’ and often peripheral individuals (so Hainsworth on 8.388), in the *Od.*, where it occurs in conjunction with Nestor, Menelaus, Od., Telemachus and Laertes, it has a less generic and certainly less age-specific character. Common to both poems is the term’s close association with speech (for its regular application to heralds, see 18.64–5n): it is frequently used of someone who has spoken or is about to speak wisely and can also describe the content of speeches (see further Clarke 1999: 84–6 with the suggestion that the epithet, perhaps derived from the perf. mid. of πνέω ‘I breathe’, refers to the speaker’s intake of breath before beginning an address: ‘with a deep breath Telemachus spoke’). The epithet also characterizes members of Od.’s family, used of the ‘beggar’ by P. (19.350; see too 23.209–10, in the context of P.’s declaration of Od.’s intellectual excellence) and of Laertes by the poet, and may point towards the acute mental faculties that distinguish Od.’s lineage, flagging speeches in which an individual displays intellectual finesse; for πεπνυμένος specifically as an indicator of wisdom (consistent with a possible derivation from the same root as πινυτός, ‘prudent, discreet’), see 18.125, 3.52, 328, 4.190, 8.388, and the expression πεπνυμένα μῆδεα εἰδῶς at 2.38 = 4.696, 711, 24.442.

46–56 Telemachus refuses his mother’s request here, but gratifies it (albeit with an economical version of the truth) when he returns with the prophet Theoclymenus at 85. Dramatic, thematic and structural elements explain the delayed revelation. (a) By making Theoclymenus party to the relay of information, which he will confirm and ‘update’ with his solemn utterance at 152–61, the poet adds weight to Telemachus’ belated report and allows Theoclymenus to realize his prophetic function in the plot (see 53 and 152–61nn and Erbse 1972: 47–9); (b) the postponement heightens audience expectation as we wonder how much of the truth Telemachus will reveal. (c) Telemachus’ refusal demonstrates his new-found ability to exercise the caution and circumspection that make him resemble his father (see Introduction p. 29); Od. also delays or evades answers to direct questions, notoriously when responding to the inquiry of another curious queen, Arete, at 7.238–9. (d) The delay emphasizes P.’s prolonged exclusion from the knowledge that other individuals already enjoy and her need to act in ignorance of crucial elements of the plot. (e) This encounter and request form one of the many ‘anticipatory doublets’ in the *Od.*, small-scale rehearsals of scenes or motifs which recur in more extended and prominent fashion later on (see Fenik 1974: 101, Edwards 1987, de Jong 2001: xi). ‘Doubling’ also occurs insofar as

the book will end with another retardation device, when Od. refuses P.'s wish for an immediate interview until later in the day.

The exchange between mother and son constitutes an instance of the ironies that permeate the second half of the *Od.*, where the poet repeatedly pairs a better informed individual with one in a state of ignorance, giving the words spoken by the first a significance of which the second cannot be aware (see 152–61n). In two subtle senses, Telemachus *does* obliquely answer his mother, much as Od. did Arete. First, by ordering her to cleanse herself so as to perform sacrifices to bring about the punishment of the suitors, he intimates that the hour of reckoning is near. Second, if audiences were aware of a possible different version of the *Od.*, where Theoclymenus is none other than Od. in disguise (see 53n for details), Telemachus' answer to P. would have considerable piquancy. Asked whether he had encountered Od., Telemachus responds by telling his mother that she should bathe, change her clothes, wait and pray while he goes to fetch the stranger (i.e. Od.) who accompanied him from overseas (see Reece 1994: 164).

The abrupt and even discourteous tenor of Telemachus' reply has also struck readers. But the youth's suspicions concerning his mother's fidelity to his father have been sounded since the start (1.215–16, 2.130–7), and Athena's recent caution concerning P.'s readiness to abandon her marital family's interests ('you know what the mind is like in the breast of a woman', 15.20) may further have alienated his sympathies. For the mother-son relationship, see Introduction p. 30.

46–7 μοι . . . μοι: two different uses of the dative. The first is the so-called 'ethical' dative, used to denote the interest of the speaker or to gain the interest of the individual addressed; ethical datives are generally untranslatable, although their meaning sometimes resembles 'please'; the second is a possessive dative, 'my heart in my chest'. ἦτορ ἐν στήθεσσι: a variation on the formulaic θυμὸν ἐν στήθεσσι. περ, concessive, 'since I have just escaped such a deadly fate'; for a similar use of the particle in the context of requests to desist from an ongoing activity, see 1.315. αἰπὺν δλεθρον: a formulaic expression; the adj. also regularly appears with the terms δόλος, φόνος, πόνος, and χόλος (cf. Hes. *Th.* 589, *WD* 83, *H. H. Merc.* 66). The metaphoric meaning 'hard to overcome, irresistible' derives from the lit. 'steep, sheer'. Telemachus' objection to his mother's request, that satisfying her curiosity would be grievous for him, sounds a particularly Odyssean theme: recounting tales of first-hand experiences is frequently a source of pain to the storyteller (cf. Od.'s complaints at 7.297, 9.12–13, 19.116–18; see too 515–17n).

48 ὕδρηναμένη: both prayer and sacrifice must be performed with clean hands. καθαρὰ χροῖ εἰμαθ': this phrase typically occupies this position in the hexameter; cf. 58, 4.750, 759, 6.61. H. always prefers this form of the dat. χρώς over χρωτί, although the acc. form χρωῖα appears at 18.172n in place of the more common χρώα.

50–1 εὔχεο 'promise, vow' (see *Il.* 4.101–2). τεληέσσας: the fixed epithet for hecatombs in H. Its primary meaning is probably 'gaining its τέλος' or 'fulfilment' (see *H. H. Merc.* 544), but it is often treated as a synonym of τέλειος, 'perfect, unblemished'. Most probably the two ideas are linked: only faultless victims will guarantee the

efficacy and fulfilment of the offering, a connection made evident by the reuse of the term (τελέωσι) in the subsequent line; for Zeus as the ‘accomplisher’, see Theogn. 341, Pind. *Ol.* 13.115; for the cult of Zeus Teleios, see Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 973; cf. *Eum.* 28. ἀντίτα: ‘in requital’, from ἀντί-τιτος by haplography; see *Il.* 24.213 and Snell–Erbse, *LfggE* s.v.

52 ἀγορήν: H. always uses the term to mean the ‘assembly’ or, as here, ‘assembly place’; see 67–70n. In this and the subsequent line, Telemachus announces his intention to play host, a role that he earlier deemed impossible for him (16.70).

53 A reference to Theoclymenus, the prophet and fugitive whom Telemachus met on his departure from Pylos at 15.223. For all that the detailed introduction and family history that he receives on his first appearance (15.223–56) suggest a character of the poet’s invention, his lineage, which includes the famous seers Melampus and Amphiaraus, exists in the legendary tradition independent of the *Od.*; see Hes. fr. 37 and 261, [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 1.9.11–13. Quite plausibly H. has linked his prophet with the Melampus story that would already have existed in epic poetry (see Danek 1998: 294–6). Theoclymenus’ prophetic authority depends in no small part on his lineage; a seer’s gifts were thought principally to be derived from inherited powers rather than learning.

Theoclymenus’ presence has been the target of sustained censure among modern readers; critics have charged the poet with introducing a redundant character (a ‘manifest embarrassment’, Page 1955: 83) and scholars of Analyst sympathies have claimed later authorship for the episodes in which he appears (see further Kirchoff 1879, Kirk 1962: 240; Fenik 1974: 233–44 mounts a point-by-point defence of the prophet’s role). But a strong case for Theoclymenus’ relevance can be made on several grounds. First, in his two chief interventions in affairs in *Od.*’s home, here and at 20.351–7 (his hallucinatory vision of the suitors’ demise), the character occupies a position midway between the Olympian and human levels of the plot: able to interpret and predict events beyond mortal comprehension and to apprehend the divine design shaping affairs (the return of *Od.* and his wholesale punishment of the wicked suitors), he gives audiences internal and external to the song an authoritative preview of the story’s denouement; their acceptance or rejection of his words and vision are also an index, as so frequently in Greek myth, of their moral worth and acuity.

Second, and very differently, the poet may include Theoclymenus in order to ‘sample’ (see Introduction p. 8) an existing tale, incorporated so as to enrich his story and open up a variety of possible plot trajectories. Evidence both internal and external to the *Od.* allows us to hypothesize the existence of a pre-Homeric or contemporary epic tale in which Telemachus discovers his father in Crete, where he has taken refuge from a storm with Idomeneus. The two fashion a conspiracy in which *Od.* is to accompany Telemachus back to Ithaca disguised as a soothsayer – Theoclymenus in the *Od.* This helps to explain several seeming anomalies: the fact that Telemachus, gone in search of word of his father, returns not with *Od.* but with Theoclymenus, and the elaborate introduction the character receives, quite out of proportion with his actual role in the plot. Also striking are the overlaps between Theoclymenus and *Od.*, their ‘biographies’ and experiences. *Od.*’s lying tale to Athena at 13.258–75 closely

anticipates the account given by the poet of Theoclymenus' situation; see further 55 and 152–61nn. For this neo-analytic (see Introduction pp. 7–8) approach, see Reece 1994; he additionally notes that 'Odysseus and Theoclymenus never converse or interact with each other, despite being for a long time simultaneously present in the palace at Ithaca. This is particularly remarkable in view of Od.'s incessant interaction with almost all the other characters' (164).

55 ἠνώγεα: –εα is scanned as a single long syllable ('synizesis'). Telemachus' earlier decision to entrust Theoclymenus to the loyal Peiraeus (15.509–46) finds its parallel in his recommending Od. to Eumaeus' hospitality at 16.69–89. Both actions signal Telemachus' difficulty in fulfilling his role as host because of the suitors' presence. **προσι:** cognate with the Sanskrit *prāti*, this form was elsewhere preserved only in the Doric dialect; epic language would have retained it as a metrical alternative to Ionic **πρός**.

56 ἐνδύκως 'in a kindly manner'. The adverb is of uncertain etymology, but regularly appears in accounts of the hospitable reception of guests (e.g. 113, 7.256, 14.62); not surprisingly, the *Il.* uses the term much more sparingly (× 4); see further Leumann *Wörter*, 311–12, Snell–Erbse, *LfgE*. **φιλέειν** 'to welcome, entertain' (as at 7.256; see LSJ s.v. 1.2). The same terms appear again at 111.

57 'and for her the word was wingless'. This much-debated expression appears on three other occasions in the *Od.* (19.29, 21.386, 22.398; never in the *Il.*), always following a speech of command addressed by a man to a woman; the subsequent passage invariably indicates the directions' fulfilment. The phrase raises a series of still outstanding questions. (a) Is the 'wingless word' the speaker's or the addressee's? According to the first interpretation, the **μῦθος** belongs to the silent recipient of the address, and **ἄπτερος** means 'unspoken' (Monro, A–H–C, Latacz 1968: 27–38). According to the second, the **μῦθος** is that of the speaker which does not fly back (i.e. 'it stayed unwinged with her'). (b) Is the **ἄ-** in **ἄπτερος** privative (as both the readings cited above assume) or intensive, indicating the swiftness with which the word travels (see 40n for words equipped with wings)? The use of the phrase at Hes. fr. 204.84 M–W may suggest an intensive force; Helen's suitors' rapid adherence (**τοὶ δ' ἄπτερέως ἐπίθοντο**) to Tyndareus' order that they swear to help her future husband in the event of her abduction parallels P.'s speedy compliance with her son's command (see too Parmenides fr. 288.17 KRS). The Attic dramatists oscillate between the two possibilities; for the privative sense, see S. *El.* 242–3; for the intensive, A. *Ag.* 276 with Fraenkel's note. **ἔπλετο:** 3 sing. aor. mid. of **πέλω** 'to be'.

58–60 In H. instructions are regularly performed exactly according to the terms in which they were originally stated, a device that facilitates oral composition; for a much-debated deviation from the norm, see Nausicaa's instructions at 6.210 and 216.

61–83

Telemachus makes a brief visit to the agora to fetch Theoclymenus. The youth's only other visit to the site occurred in book 2, and on several counts the present scene resembles 2.6–259: again the youth has dogs, again he is beautified and admired,

again the scene features several individuals still loyal to his father. However, missing from this more abbreviated excursion is the public address made by Telemachus in book 2; with his father now in Ithaca, and plans for revenge under way, he no longer has any interest in attempting to persuade the suitors to leave his home.

62 κύνες πύδος ἀργοί: a regular descriptive formula for dogs; although the more authoritative MSS have this reading, the v.l. (= 2.11) is also attractive since it coincides with the other connections between the present scene and book 2. ἀργός ('swift, bright'; see 292n) is the standard epithet for dogs; cf. the description of the two watchdogs made by Hephaestus, which actually *are* of precious metal: they are ἀργύρεοι, 'flashing' or 'silvery' (7.91). The 'flanking' or 'attendance' motif here may be compared to P.'s similar accompaniment by her maidservants (see too 214n).

63 θεσπεσίην . . . χάριν: earlier of Telemachus at 2.12; the adj. is derived from *θεσ-σπετος, 'spoken by a god'; in epic diction the original meaning has faded and it simply means divine (see Frisk, *GEW*). Athena 'pours down' the same θεσπεσίην χάριν on Od. at 8.19 (cf. 6.235 = 23.162). For other instances of divine beautification, see 18.187–96n; beyond the *Od.*, see Hes. *IVD* 65 (Aphrodite bestowing charm on Pandora) and Pind. *Ol.* 6.75–6 (the distillation of beauty the victor receives from Charis herself).

64 θηεῦντο 'they gazed in wonder at'. θηέομαι (Attic θεάομαι) is regularly used of a reaction to a beautiful/wondrous sight, whether an individual or an object; cf. 5.75–6, 7.133–4, 8.265, 19.235 and Mette 1960–1. The combination of an infusion of χάρις, movement towards the agora and the admiration of the onlookers recalls the scenes at 8.170–5 and Hes. *Th.* 81–92 (see Martin 1984 for the diction common to both passages and their possibly generic character). In both those instances, an individual with divinely given grace is imagined addressing an assembly and inspiring admiring wonder among his audience. By using what may be conventional diction for the prelude to a persuasive public speech by a regal figure/orator, the poet indicates the trajectory he will not follow; because of the nature of Telemachus' audience, the youth must confine himself to private conversation with his allies rather than delivering the expected address.

66 φρεσὶ βυσσοδόμευον 'they devised deep down, evilly in their minds'. βυσσοδομεύειν appears × 7 in *Od.* (465, 491; also 4.676, 8.273, 9.316, 20.184), never in the *Il.*, and always refers to deep and maleficent plotting; hence its inevitable coupling with κακά in the poem (at [Hes.] *Scut.* 30 it is combined with δόλον). The term variously describes the designs of the suitors, of *Od.*, and of *Od.*'s divine counterpart, Hephaestus (see 16n). The verb is derived from βυσσοί, 'the depths (of the sea)', regularly a site for covert and/or malignant designs; cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 2.79–80, contrasting his 'above board' mode of speaking with the practices of those who work in the depths, or secretly, and A. *Supp.* 407–9, describing a thinker as one diving in the deep sea; at A. *Ch.* 650, the Erinyes is βυσσοφόρων; for other instances of the metaphor, Theogn. 1051, A. *Supp.* 1057–8. In this instance, the paired ἔσθλά/κακά beginning each of the two clauses emphasize the contrast between the surface and depth. The inclusion of φρεσὶ here reinforces the notion of concealment in the internal spaces of the body

(cf. *Il.* 9.313, Achilles' rejection of the man who 'hides one thing in his mind but speaks another').

67–70 As this scene suggests, the agora is not principally a site for a formal assembly, but an informal meeting place where friends might get together to discuss the business of the day or pressing concerns (cf. 16.361 and 24.420). The 'civic'-style gathering held in book 2, that more resembles assemblies in the *Il.*, proves the exception in the *Od.* (see Introduction p. 31).

67 *πουλύν*: this lengthened form (cf. 8.109, 19.387, Theogn. 509) provides a convenient metrical alternative; according to the MSS, H. also uses *πολλός* (12.407, 15.494 and *Il.* 18.603). *πουλύς* and *πολλός* are variants at *Od.* 19.387. See further West on Hes. *Th.* 190, Wyatt 1969: 195, 198.

68 *ἴνα* 'where'. Mentor is Telemachus' most staunch supporter and the individual to whom *Od.* entrusted the care of his estate (2.224–7). In book 2, Antiphos' father Aegyptios was a speaker at the assembly; curiously H. mentions the death of Antiphos, consumed by Polyphemus, at 2.19 (a line that was, according to the scholia, athetized).

69 *ἐξ ἀρχῆς* 'from of old'.

72 *οὐδ' . . . ἔτι δὴν*: the phrase occurs × 7 in H., often at line end (e.g. 2.296, 397); the preserved digamma in *δὴν* (δφῆν) always lengthens the final syllable of *ἔτι*.

74 *τόν . . . πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε*: a very common Homeric phrase, used repeatedly in speech introductions. The adverbial *πρὸς* belongs with *ἔειπε*, which governs a double acc., *τόν* and *μῦθον*. The epic poet enjoys considerable (although not unlimited) flexibility in placing such 'preverbs' in the hexameter line, a freedom that facilitates oral composition (see further Horrocks 1984: 153–61). These independent preverbs belong to a very early stage in the development of epic diction, predating the Linear B tablets; the linguistic phenomenon occurs already in the *Veda* (see West 1988: 156).

76 *δῶρ'*: these are the gifts that Telemachus received from Menelaus (15.99–130) and then placed with Peiraeus' father Clytius for safekeeping. Contrast the gifts given to *Od.* by the Phaeacians; those tokens from the 'fantasy world' never reemerge from the Cave of the Nymphs.

78 *ἶδμεν* = Attic *ἴσμεν*. The emendation of the MSS *γάρ τ'* restores what is likely to be the correct reading (Hoekstra 1965: 30); for the typical function of *γάρ τε* as an introduction to a general truth, hard to extract from Telemachus' phrase here, see Ruijgh 1971: 602.

79–80 Telemachus' conjectures concerning the suitors' designs against his life and property are remarkably accurate, although he has been told nothing of the plot devised at 16.383–6. H. frequently allows his characters knowledge of events which have only been revealed to the external audience; for this 'transference' device, see de Jong 2001: xviii.

81 *ἐπαυρέμεν* 'partake of, profit from'; aor. inf. of *ἐπαυρίσκω*.

82 *φόνον και κῆρα*: × 4 *Od.*, one of the many 'doublets' or combinations of two virtually synonymous terms used by H.; these belong among the oral poet's formulaic elements, an aid to composition in performance. Typically, as here, the doublet falls

after a third foot caesura (see O’Nolan 1978); cf. 547. The primary meaning of κήρ (variously derived from κεραίζω, ‘ravage’, or, probably better, κείρω, ‘cut’) may be ‘fate, destiny’; in Homeric usage the noun has become sufficiently concrete to permit this combination. The ‘fated’ or appointed nature of the moment when a man dies would explain the close association between κήρ and death (so Garvie at 6.11; see too Onians 1988: 399–410, Lee 1960–1: 191–7).

83 χαίροντι . . . χαίρων: as typically, χάρις involves reciprocity, a notion emphasized by polyptoton. Here χάρις designates both the pleasure derived from the favour bestowed and the return the original donor will reap; for this, see *A. Ag.* 354 with Frankel’s note, *S. Aj.* 522 (χάρις χάριν γάρ ἔστιν ἢ τίκτουσ’ αἶε) and 95n. φέρειν: imperative.

84–166

Telemachus returns to the palace with Theoclymenus, bathes and belatedly answers the questions that P. earlier posed.

84 ταλαπείριον ‘much tested, much suffering’. The epithet, which describes one of Od.’s signature traits, is suggestive of the Od.–Theoclymenus link (see 53n). H. always applies the adj. to a ξείνος, except at 6.193 (= 14.511), of a suppliant. ἦγεν ἐς οἶκον: also at 14.318; one of the few formulaic expressions that neglects the digamma in the noun (φοῖκος), suggesting its late addition to the epic repertoire. The line initiates a conventional hospitality scene (so 1.113–43, 3.34–67, 4.22–68, 6.206–50, 7.139–84, 10.311–73, 14.29–111, 15.134–43), in which a host, Telemachus here, welcomes his guest who receives a bath and meal (note that the suitors are still absent, allowing for the smooth fulfilment of the protocol; also varying the regular pattern is Telemachus’ return together with his guest). The episode is the first of three instances of the reception motif in book 17; Telemachus subsequently welcomes Eumaeus (328–35) and Od. (336–47).

86–90 A routine ‘bathing-type’ scene. The sequence, which may vary from 3 to 11 lines, also occurs at 3.464–9, 4.48–51, 6.224–8, 8.364–6, 449–51, 10.360–7, 23.153–64, 24.365–71; in all but book 23, the bath is followed, more or less directly, by a feast. For the standard elements the scene includes – stepping into the bathtub, washing, anointing, clothing, stepping out of the bathtub, sitting down – and variations on the type, see de Jong on 3.464–9, Arend 1933: 124–6, Foley 1990: 248–57.

86 κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε: a doublet unique to the *Od.* (× 8). Ancient scholars describe the κλισμός (used by both Helen and P.) as a light easy chair with sloping back, but on occasion the distinction between it and the θρόνος disappears. Telemachus is the only character to use both.

87 ἐς δ’ ἀσαμίνθους . . . ἐϋξέστας: the initial preposition + noun begins the thematic sequence; the answering ἔκ ρ’ at 90 indicates its termination. ἀσαμίνθος (*Od.* × 10) is a pre-Greek word; the form *a-sa-mi-to* appears on a Linear B sealing from Knossos (KN Ws 8497). Bathtubs already existed in Minoan-Mycenaean culture; the Mycenaean examples are made of earthenware, which suits the epithet used here, although wooden tubs are also possible (see Laser 1968: 139); Menelaus’ silver

bathbubs (4.128) are consistent with the luxury that distinguishes his home from the more prosaic palace in Ithaca.

88 λούσαν καὶ χρίσαν ἑλαίῳ: so at 4.49, 8.364, 454.

90 ἐπὶ κλισμοῖσι καθίζον: Homeric heroes always take their meals in an upright position; the Eastern practice of reclining, Attic vase-painting suggests, did not become widespread until c. 600. Both κλισμοί and θρόνοι (see 32n) are found only in the dining hall; elsewhere in the Homeric household, individuals sit on low stools. This is consistent with the practice of displaying wealth in this most public part of the home.

91–5 These lines appear × 6 in *Od.*, with various omissions in the MSS; cf. 1.136–40, 4.52–6, 7.172–6, 10.368–72, 15.135–9; heavily formulaic language characterizes such type-scenes (see Arend 1933: 68–76). As in other standard Homeric descriptions of dining, the focus falls more on the preparation and serving of the meal than on the food itself.

91 χέρνιβα: in this context the term specifies water for hand-washing before meals; elsewhere in the *Od.* it describes lustral water for purification prior to a sacrifice. As the overlap suggests, hand-washing may originally have been religious rather than hygienic in intent (see further Ginouvès 1962: 152). προχόωι ἐπέχευε φέρουσα ‘carrying [water] in a pitcher, she poured it over their hands’.

93 νίψασθαι ‘for washing’, inf. of purpose. H. reserves this verb for washing hands or feet while λούομαι is used for the whole body (so 87). παρὰ . . . ἐπάνυσσε τράπεζαν: as 332 and 447 make clear, each diner ate at his own individual table. The formula suggests a portable folding table, of which examples have been found on Hittite, although not Greek, monuments (see further Laser 1968: 56, Richter 1966: 63).

94 σίτον: this properly refers to food made from grain as opposed to meat, but εἶδρα πόλλ’ in the next line suggests a more varied menu. The limited nature of the diet served even in the homes of Homeric aristocrats (meat and bread exclusively), and the discrepancy between this meal and the poems’ abundant references to other possible foodstuff, fruit, vegetables, birds, fish and game (the latter two are eaten, but only under duress and in very exceptional circumstances), has puzzled audiences since at least the fourth century: the Platonic Socrates, noting that Homeric heroes on campaign eat only roast meat, comments, ‘nor, I believe, does Homer make any mention of sauces’; the poet, he thinks, has a practical and didactic purpose, selecting what best nourishes warriors (*Pl. Rep.* 404b–c); Athen. 1.8f–9e and 1.25d–e explains the absence of variety from the Homeric table as a mark of heroic abstinence from luxuriousness, greed and ‘culinary trickery’ (even the hybriistic suitors ‘are not shown eating fish or birds or honey cakes’); ancient readers also suggest that the poet regarded the cooking of vegetables, birds and fish as beneath heroic dignity. See further Σ AT on *Il.* 16.747 and Suda s.v. Ὀμηρος; cf. Davidson 1997: 12–13, 16–17, Dalby 1995: 276–7, with the proposal that the Homeric menu reflects the poet’s own limited exposure to the type of elite social setting he ostensibly describes (see Introduction pp. 12–13).

95 χαρίζομένη παρέόντων ‘giving freely of the available things’; for other instances of the partitive gen., see 452, 13.15. Used as a middle, χαρίζομαι means to gain favour by giving a favour; see 83 and 451–2nn. The formula, indicative of the integral place

of χάρις at the feast, *the* site for the practice of the relations of reciprocity and exchange that characterize correct social interactions, appears × 6 in the *Od.*

96 παρὰ σταθμόν ‘beside the door-jamb’; cf. 4.838, 21.45, 22.181; see 18.209n for a different meaning (with discussion in Knox 1973: 5–6); at 20 and 26, sing. and plur. forms of σταθμός referred to Eumaeus’ farmhouse and its outbuildings, a regular usage. P. would be sitting by the door, isolated from her more centrally located son and his guest; the spatial division proves apposite to the tone she will adopt when she renews her request for news at 101. Nausicaa assumes the same position at 8.458; cf. *H. H. Cer.* 186 (of Metaneira).

97 ἠλάκατα στρωφώσα ‘twisting the strands’. ἠλάκατα refer to the bundle of loose wool held on the distaff after it had been cleaned and was ready for spinning. As suits the distinction between the fantastical and super-wealthy Scheria and the more mundane Ithaca, Arete spins wool that is ἄλιπόρφυρα, ‘sea-purple’ (6.306). Following *Od.*’s return to Ithaca, P. spins rather than weaves; the shift may reflect weaving’s symbolic significance in *H.*, where the activity represents women’s attempts to preserve a traditional but threatened social and familial order. For this, see Pantelia 1993: ‘The replacement of [Penelope’s] weaving with spinning symbolizes the renewal of her marital stability and the transfer of power and responsibility from her hands back to Odysseus’ (497). Like Helen and Arete, P. brings her spinning with her to the dining hall (much as nineteenth-century novels portray upper-class women doing needlework while receiving guests); Homeric women never eat or drink in this public space.

98–9 Two frequently repeated and probably very old formulaic lines, found in conjunction × 8 in *Od.* and separately on many other occasions. πρόκειμαι appears uniquely in this context and ἔτοιμος is used independent of the formula only at 8.384 and *Il.* × 3. δνείαθ: from δνίνημι: literally ‘profitable things’ but regularly applied to food. ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο ‘they put away their desire’; from ἐξίημι, ‘put off, release’, i.e. to satisfy. The expression occurs × 15 in *Od.*; cf. *Il.* 13.638, 24.227, Sappho 94.23, Theogn. 1064 and *V. Aen.* 8.184. This second line is of particularly evident antiquity, as revealed by its vocabulary, ‘tmesis’, and the Aeolic (Lesbian) form ἔπος. Phrases like this demonstrate that during the Aeolic phase of the epic tradition poets already included scenes of dining (see Durante 1971–6: vol. 1, 55).

101–6 P.’s speech, which calls attention to her sorrows and reminds Telemachus of his former refusal to satisfy her request for news, includes both a strong plea for the desired information and an implicit reproach for his earlier conduct.

103 πεφυρμένη: fem. nom. sing. of perf. pass. participle of φύρω, ‘moisten, stain’.

106 νόστον: when νόστος refers specifically to *Od.*’s successful return, the noun regularly appears as an acc. in the emphatic v.-initial position. Zeus’ programmatic remarks at 1.76–7 initiate the practice. Together word-placement and syntax appear to create a pattern whereby the poet highlights his central theme, the return of the hero; for such ‘pattern deixis’, see Kahane 1994: 67–79.

108–49 Telemachus offers an abbreviated and not entirely candid version of his travels and events since his return. His suppression of the critical fact of his meeting with *Od.* follows his father’s instructions at 16.303.

108 τοιγάρ: a compound reserved for individuals preparing to speak or act according to a previous request (Denniston, *GP* 565). ἀληθείην καταλέξω: × 4 in *Od.*; cf. *Il.* 24.407. The formula here occupies its common v. final position, where it fills the second half of the line after the trochaic caesura (cf. 122). Terms expressing the truth, accuracy or exactitude of the narration about to be, or just delivered, frequently accompany the verb (*Od.* × 29), highlighting the speaker's authority in recounting what are often first-hand experiences (see Finkelberg 1987). However, such emphatic declarations are no guarantors of the actual (or in this instance complete) truth of the account (see, notoriously, 24.303, the preface to *Od.*'s lying tale to Laertes); contrast Telemachus' claim here with his all but identical phrasing at 122n, where he cites an instance in which he was wholly truthful (ἀληθείην κατέλεξα). See further Pratt 1993: 55–94.

109 ποιμένα λαῶν: on the expression, see 18.69–70n.

111–12 Telemachus earlier used the father-son comparison in his words to 'Mentes' at 1.308 and will give the expression an ironic turn at 397n, there directing it at an individual, Antinous, who manifestly fails to treat him in a paternal fashion. See too 16.17–19, where Eumaeus is cast in the father's role. Telemachus' several deployments of the conceit indicate the poet's fine-tuned psychological portraiture: it recalls for the audience the individual's sense of his vulnerability as a seemingly fatherless youth.

112 χρόνιον: predicative. νέον: adverbial acc.

113 ἐνδυκέως ἐκόμιζε: the repetition of the adverb from 111 (ἐνδυκέως ἐφίλει) signals the resumption of the narrative following the brief simile.

117 ἄρμασι κολλητοῖσιν: the epithet 'fastened' (whether with glue, studs or other materials) is regularly used of chariots (*Il.* × 4; here uniquely in the *Od.*); it could apply either to the construction of the wheels or to the body of the vehicle, a wicker frame with interwoven leather thongs. Here, as frequently, the plural noun is used for the probably singular chariot. Rather than a poetic plural, the expression may be a derivative of the Mycenaean *a-mo-ta*, 'wheels', used of a chariot at *PY* Sa 790 (see Hoekstra on 15.145).

118–19 Telemachus' mention of Helen (whom he 'saw', an affirmation of the veracity of his account) and the Trojan War is not strictly necessary, but adds colour to his travelogue; Helen's abduction was, of course, the initial reason for Odysseus' departure from Ithaca, and P. would naturally be curious about a figure who, according to mythical genealogies, is her cousin and clearly already enjoys notoriety.

119 θεῶν ἰότητι 'by the will of the gods', a phrase typical of the *Od.* (× 6; *Il.* × 1). In four of the six *Odyssean* examples, a form of μοιγέω follows. The same line appears in reference to the Trojan War at 12.190, but without mention of Helen. Telemachus' suggestion that responsibility for Helen's behaviour lay with the gods is consistent with the largely exculpatory view of the character elsewhere in the *Od.* (4.239–64, 23.222–4).

122 ἀληθείην κατέλεξα: with the echo of the phrase at 108, Telemachus closes the first portion of his speech concerning the stages of his outward journey; he will now report Menelaus' words.

124–41 = 4.333–50. For speeches embedded within speeches, see de Jong at 2.96–102. In this instance, the verbatim citation of Menelaus' words gives additional persuasiveness to the narrative.

124 **πόποι**: almost certainly an onomatopoeic exclamation of grief or dismay preceded by ω in exclamations and ω in vocatives; cf. 13.139–40 with Stanford's note. It frequently 'expresses alarm or pained surprise, only occasionally in a sarcastic or light-hearted way' (Kirk on *Il.* 2.272). Various Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic authors (see Lyc. *Alex.* 943, Euphorion 136.1, *Et. M.*) mistakenly propose an invocation, 'ye gods'; Plut. *Mor.* 22d conjectures that **πόποι** meant 'divinities' ($\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota$) in the language of the proverbially ancient Dryopians.

125 **ἀνάγκιδες**: the adj. is also used of Aegisthus at 3.310; the repetition of the term may be deliberate, promoting parallels between events in the House of Atreus and in Od.'s household, where the hero risks meeting the fate inflicted on Agamemnon by Aegisthus (the paradigm for the suitors) and Clytemnestra (the negative counterpart to P); for this, see 1.298–300, 3.193–8, 232–5, 306–10, 4.524–37, 11.405–39 and Katz 1991: 29–53. In its 26 appearances in H., the adj. generally refers to those who shun battle, whether from cowardice or lack of familiarity with warfare (cf. its Iliadic usage as a reproach to warriors). Because lions are prime symbols of the martial prowess that the suitors lack (see next note and Philemon fr. 93.4 K–A, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \omicron\iota\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\iota\omicron\iota$) **ἀνάγκιδες** might have suggested the simile that follows. The two antithetical elements are memorably brought together when Cassandra designates Aegisthus a $\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu\tau'$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\kappa\iota\nu$ at A. *Ag.* 1224; also apposite to the Homeric precedent is the fact that Aeschylus' adulterer has taken up residence in Agamemnon's bed.

126–31 One of the relatively rare developed similes in the *Od.* The *Il.*'s much more frequent use of the device may in part be due to the poet's desire to juxtapose the world of the battlefield so dominant in that poem with the spheres of normal human activity that the heroes have abandoned and that risk destruction with the fall of Troy. While in their concise form similes may be a feature inherited by H. from the primary tradition in which he works (parallels exist in Near Eastern poetry, including comparisons to lions), the extended and complex simile is, in the view of many, the poet's innovation. Several scholars also argue that certain linguistic features in similes mark them out as 'late' elements; see Shipp 1972: 3, 208–22, cf. Rutherford 1996: 103 n. 45.

The lion simile is among the commonest of Homeric similes. In symbolic terms, lions in H. figure heroic prowess and courage, and the similes often describe the Iliadic warrior during his *anisteia*. In the *Od.* the comparison appears at 4.335–9, 791–2, 6.130–4, 9.292, 22.402–5, 23.48, variously used of Od., P. and Polyphemus. This range of characters corresponds to the animal's two-fold nature: courageous and powerful, it is also famished, predatory and lives beyond the civilized realm (cf. 6.130). It can also be a figure of vengeance both here and in later sources (cf. A. *Ch.* 938, probably applied to Orestes and Pylades, and Eur. *Or.* 1400–2, of the same). For additional discussion, see Wolff 1979, Schnapp-Gourbeillon 1981: 39–48, 59–63, King 1987: 19–28, 38–39, 42, Lonsdale 1990. For the question of whether lions were actually

still at large in Greece in historical times, or whether H. was working from a tradition inherited from the Near East and/or from Mycenaean times, see Hopkinson 1984 on Call. *H.* 6.51. Fifth- and fourth-century authors record the animal's presence in the remote and mountainous north-western regions of the country (see Hdt. 7.125–6 and Arist. *HA* 579b6ff., 606b14ff.), but both they and H. might have had a different animal in mind (possibly the so-called *leo spelaeus*).

Critics have found little to approve of in this particular simile. They object, for example, that a sensible doe, endowed with a powerful sense of smell, would not leave the lair; the sympathetic depiction of the fawns seems inapposite to the suitors, as is the implication that the parent is to blame for their destruction; the suggestion that the doe herself escapes appears out of place. S. West at 4.335–40 proposes that the poet has slotted a ready-made simile into an inappropriate context, but the image fits the scenario too well to support that view. Just as the non-martial suitors aim to take their place in the heroic Od.'s bed, so the fawns occupy the lair of a creature far superior in strength and courage (see 126n). Both the doe and fawns can emblemize the suitors: the first unaware, incautious and preferring to satisfy her appetite, the second the weak and cowardly victims of an aggressor's attack (for deer as cowards and victims, see *Il.* 4.243, 21.29, 22.1). The sympathy accorded to the fawns (consistent with H.'s frequent use of the vehicles of similes to generate an emotional response) also coincides with the poem's equivocal representations of Od.'s vengeance and acknowledgment of the destructive and even gratuitously violent elements of the deed; see particularly 19.536–43 (P.'s dream) and 23.48, where Od. appears αἴματι καὶ λύθρῳ πεπαλαγμένον ὡς τε λέοντα. Equally indicative of the poet's careful choice of terms are the divergences from *Il.* 11.113–19, also of a lion's attack on fawns. There the young are in their own lair, and the doe, for all that she is very near by, proves unable to help because of fear.

Where usually the poet reserves similes for his portions of the narrative, characters may deploy the device; here, as in these other instances, the rhetorical figure can reveal the speaker's emotions and point of view. Menelaus' experiences of domestic interlopers prompts his highly negative evaluation of the suitors' conduct.

126 ξυλόχοι: used here and at 19.445 of an animal's lair and probably derived from *ξυλο-λόχος; elsewhere in H. the noun describes a copse or thicket. In the present context, where the fawns' occupation of the lion's den (called an εὐνή at 129) corresponds to the infiltration of Od.'s bed that the suitors hope to achieve (ἐν εὐνῇ | ἤθελον εὐνηθῆναι, 124–5), the poet may be punning on the proximity between ξύλοχος (σύν + λέχος) and λόχος (see Edwards 1991: 33, citing the compounds σύλεκτρος and ἄλοχος).

126–9 ὡς δ' ὅπότε... ἐξερέησι: in similes, and particularly following ὡς ὅποτε, H. regularly uses the subj. to describe an action that may take place at any time or repeatedly (i.e. 'as in any case when'). As typically, ἄν is omitted (κέν never occurs). The speaker shifts from the subj. to the indicative (εἰσήλυθεν) as the scene becomes increasingly vivid; the change in mood occurs in other similes (cf. 5.368–9, *Il.* 4.141–3).

127 γαλαθηνούς 'milk-sucking'.

130–1 The repetition of the key terms (πότμον ἔφηκεν, πότμον ἔφήσει) and their identical placement in sequential phrases is unusual in lines that pivot from the world of the similes back to the on-going narrative; by making emphatic the correspondence between the untimely deaths of the fawns and that of the youths, the parallelism may give the simile something of the force of a prediction.

132 The line occurs *Od.* × 5, *Il.* × 4, often in situations where the speaker does not so much address an appeal to the gods as express ‘frustration, sympathy or approval’ in conversations with other mortals (Kahane 1994: 102); cf. 18.235n, and 7.311, where τοῖος ἔων οἶος also follows the line. In oaths, prayers and other addresses, several deities are more effective than one; three is the usual number.

133 ἔυκτιμένη ‘well-settled, well-inhabited’ i.e. ‘good to reside in’; from εὖ + κτιζω (‘build’); cf. 15.129. Anacr. fr. 358 uses virtually the same epithet of Lesbos (εὐκτίτου).

134 ἔξ ἔριδος, a match caused by rivalry (cf. *Il.* 7.111 and Hes. fr. 204.96 M–W); for ἔρις in the *Od.*, see 18.13 and 366nn. Φιλομηλεΐδη: ancient readers were puzzled by the name, a patronymic in form, but probably used as a proper noun here. Eustathius identifies Philomeleides as a king of Lesbos who challenged all newcomers to compete with him in a wrestling match; the scholia, quoting the account given by Hellanicus of Lesbos (*FGH* 4 F 150), add that when the Greeks put in at the island, Od. and Diomedes killed the king through treachery, and made his grave into a resting place for strangers.

136–7 =1.265–6. πικρόγαμοι ‘encountering a bitter marriage’; cf. *A. Ag.* 713, αἰνόλεκτρον, *Eur. Hel.* 1120, ἀινόγαμος, both of Paris.

139 παρακλιδόν ‘obliquely’; the prefix, echoing the παρέξ earlier in the line, is often found in compounds suggesting evasiveness and/or deviations from ‘straight’ and hence strictly veracious talk; see too 18.282n and Hes. *Th.* 90 and 103, where παρα– terms describe the persuasive (rather than strictly veridical?) speech of kings and poets (Pucci 1977: 17–18). Menelaus will reinforce his emphatic assertion of the truthfulness of his account by fresh statements concerning the accuracy and completeness of his report, which relates the ‘unerring’ information given him by that model of true utterances, the Old Man of the Sea (so 141, with tautology; see too 154). This preoccupation with truth-telling echoes Telemachus’ earlier assurances to P. at 108 and 122. The prominence of the motif throughout this and the surrounding speech makes Telemachus’ suppression of certain elements in his story all the more glaring; with his skilful mixture of scrupulous reportage and calculated omission, the youth leaves his mother still very much in the dark. The anxiety of Odyssean characters to provide and procure reliable accounts visible here goes against the view that H.’s audiences were as much concerned with a storyteller’s artistry and ability to supply a compelling, persuasive and plausible tale as with his veracity (see Walcot 1977, Emlyn-Jones 1986, Pratt 1993; *contra* Mackie 1997). See further Introduction p. 21.

140 τὰ functions as a relative ‘as to what things’; cf. *Il.* 1.125; Monro, *HD* 262 cites these as the only examples in H. where an article used as a relative precedes

the noun or pronoun to which it refers. γέρων ἄλιος: the so-called Old Man of the Sea, a marine deity, master of sea creatures (particularly of seals), and, like Thetis, a shape-shifter; at 4.431–59, Menelaus describes how, with the help of the Old Man's daughter Eidothea, he overcame the divinity so as to force him to divulge his prophetic knowledge. Various styled Proteus and Phorcys in the *Od.*, he is nameless on other occasions in *H.* (as in cult; cf. Paus. 3.21.9). Hes. *Th.* 233 calls him Nereus; elsewhere he is Glaukos ('blue-green'). The Old Man appears frequently in archaic art, usually depicted as half man, half fish, often in combat with Heracles; see further Burkert 1979: 95–6. νημερτής 'unerring, not missing the mark', from the negative νη- and ἀμαρτάνω; × 27 in *Od.*; cf. Hes. *Th.* 235. In the Hesiodic account considerable stress is placed on the veracious nature of Nereus' speech and on the prophetic powers that he shares with other sea gods. The adjective, whose core meaning is the absence of error, is particularly used to qualify oracular or infallible speech (cf. *H. H. Merc.* 369, *S. Trach.* 173). The association with veracity may be in part due to the god's age (see West at *Th.* 234): for the conjunction of old age, wisdom and truthfulness, see the example of Nestor at *Od.* 3.19–20.

142 κρατέρ' ἄλγε' ἔχοντα: an expression regularly found in this line position. For the many line-completing formulas expressing the idea 'to suffer woes' available to *H.*, see Parry 1971: 311.

143–6 = 4.557–60 (Menelaus' report of what Proteus told him), 5.14–17 (Athena to Zeus). In each instance, the speaker comments that Calypso detains *Od.* 'by constraint', ἀνάγκη (in its usual v.-terminal position; cf. 441, 18.76). Here the repeated expression carries particular significance: Telemachus, the 'focalizer', must present a sympathetic portrait of his father to *P.* From the narrator's objective account at 5.153–4, we know that, initially at least, Calypso exercised no such constraint on *Od.*; compulsion only became necessary when her charms wore thin (οὐκέτι ἦν δαive νόμῳ).

144 γαῖαν ἰκέσθαι: the phrase, first used at 1.21, occurs on 11 other occasions, frequently expressing the hero's final goal; in many instances, as here, πατρίδα modifies the noun (cf. 539).

145 ἐπήρετμοι 'equipped with oars', a regular epithet of Homeric ships.

148–9 The audience knows that Athena sent the wind (15.292). This is an instance of so-called Jørgensen's law, whereby internal speakers attribute a seemingly divine phenomenon to Zeus, a δαίμων, an unspecified θεός or the collective θεοί. Telemachus brings his tale to a rapid close, omitting all details of the dangers he escaped on his return and, of course, saying nothing of the critical encounter with his father on Ithaca.

148 νέομην: since νέομαι lacks an aor., the imperfect is used with aor. force.

150 *P.*'s powerful emotional response to this news of *Od.*'s survival is consistent with her dawning optimism in book 17; for this, see Introduction p. 27.

152–61 This is the first of the series of prophecies *P.* receives concerning *Od.*'s imminent return. On her seemingly oscillating reactions to these predictions, see Introduction pp. 27–8. If *H.* glances towards the tradition in which Theoclymenus

is actually Od. in disguise (see 53n), then the prophet anticipates his double here; as beggar, Od. will similarly announce his return at 269–307. In delivering the prophecy, Theoclymenus fulfils the purpose for which he may chiefly have been included, that of giving oracular weight and divine sanction to the fact of Od.’s homecoming. But curiously neither here nor in his later appearances do characters ever refer to his status as prophet (although see *μαντεύσομαι* at 154n); perhaps too great an emphasis on Theoclymenus’ mantic authority would give the queen sufficient grounds for quitting the state of uncertainty in which she must continue (see Introduction p. 28). As in the earlier encounter between P. and Telemachus, the poet juxtaposes characters possessed of different levels of knowledge, with all the dramatic ironies that result; here Telemachus, feigning the ignorance genuine to his mother, knows that the prophecy has already been realized.

152 ὦ γύναι... Ὀδυσῆος: this full-verse vocative formula ($\times 5$ in *Od.*) will be used by the ‘beggar’ on four occasions in his interview with P. in book 19, including at 19.262 just before his prediction of Od.’s return. Od. is the only other character who addresses P. with this phrase, which defines her in terms of her marital relation to the absent hero and, with the epithet αἰδοίη, ‘respected’, suggests the improper character of the suitors’ courtship. See further 18.245n and Beck 2005a: 97.

153 ἦ τοι: the expression frequently introduces the first term of an antithesis, but may also serve ‘to bring home a truth of which the certainty is expressed by ἦ’ (Denniston, *GP* 553). ὁ γ’: context suggests that Theoclymenus refers to Telemachus rather than to Menelaus, although ὅδ’ (found in one of the oldest MSS) would more naturally designate the youth. The prophet can best be understood as seeking not to undermine the credibility of his host (hardly good etiquette), but to contrast two types of knowledge: one depends on human powers of (re)cognition, the other on infallible oracular insight. If Menelaus is the subject, Theoclymenus would then be setting his more recent, direct testimony above the second-hand and out-of-date information received by that hero. (In an agonistic move, the prophet would also trump the divine authority cited by Menelaus.) σύνθεο: lit. ‘put together in your mind’, i.e. ‘pay close attention, mark my words’: 2 sing. aor. imperative middle of συντίθημι, usually found in the sense of ‘consider’ and so in the middle in H.; see too 18.129.

154 cf. 19.269 where Od.’s phrase echoes Theoclymenus’, with the necessary replacement of *μαντεύσομαι* with *μυθήσομαι*. ἀτρεκέως: lit. ‘unswerving’, from ἀ- *τρέκος (cf. Lat. *torqueo*).

155–6 = 14.158–9; cf. 19.303–4. In book 19, where the ‘beggar’ addresses P., she rejects the prophecy. ξενίη τε τράπεζα: the table at which a host fed his guest is symbolic of the guest-host relation and an object on which oaths are sworn (so 14.158, 21.28–9; see Laser 1968: 58); for later uses of the conceit, see Pind. *Nem.* 11.8–9, *Isth.* 2.39–40 and A. *Ag.* 401. ἱστίη τ’ Ὀδυσῆος: the term ἱστίη, probably cognate with the Latin *Vesta*, occurs only in this oath formula, always in v. initial position. The hearth is the site sacred to its personified divinity Hestia; cf. Hes. *Th.* 454, *WD* 734 and Vernant 1983: chap. 5. Oaths sworn by the hearth became frequent in Attic drama; e.g. S. *El.* 881, Ar. *Plut.* 395.

159 ἔστιν: the run-over position throws the crucial expression into greater relief; word order adds additional tension and force with ἔστιν emphasized by hyperbaton; cf. 4.95, *Il.* 6.224–5, 16.515, 24.407.

160–1 The scholiast comments that the ‘better’ editions athetize these lines while the ‘more common’ ones remove 150–65 in their entirety; ancient editors were troubled by inconsistencies between this account and the earlier description of the portent. The bird omen (a falcon tearing apart a pigeon) occurred at 15.525–34, when Theoclymenus and Telemachus were no longer on board ship (as described here); on that occasion the prophet interpreted the portent to mean not that Od. was in Ithaca plotting vengeance, but that there was no clan ‘more kingly’ (βασιλεύτερον) than Telemachus’ and that his family would enjoy lasting sovereignty in Ithaca. Such discrepancies are not, however, grounds for excision; they may result from the process of oral composition and/or would reflect the poet’s desire to ‘update’ the prophecy to suit the progression of the plot (in the elaborate synchrony between Telemachus’ and Od.’s journeys, Od. would not yet have arrived on Ithaca when Theoclymenus saw the omen). For other bird omens in the *Od.*, see 2.146–67, 15.160–78 and 20.242–6; note too 19.535–53; in all four instances (although less obviously in Theoclymenus’ earlier interpretation of the falcon’s attack), the portents signal Od.’s coming vengeance over his enemies; bird omens in *H.* are invariably fulfilled.

160 εὐσέλιμου ἐπὶ νηός: the formula appears × 5 in *Od.* (× 2 with plural subject), regularly at line end; in *H.* the epithet uniquely describes ships.

161 ἔφρασάμην: early epic regularly uses the verb in the context of the display or perception of a sign, whether visual or oral, whose significance may be intelligible only to a select audience (e.g. 19.250, 21.222, 23.75, 24.346; cf. Hes. *WD* 448). ἐγγώνευσεν ‘declared aloud’; a form fashioned as though from a pres. *γγώνεω rather than from the usual perf. γέγωνα (cf. 9.47, 12.370 and Chantraine, *GH* 1 347–8).

163 αἶ γάρ: an expression frequently used in dialogue to introduce a wish that something just hoped for or stated by the previous speaker may or might have been realized; cf. 496, 8.339, 15.536 with Denniston, *GP* 92.

163–5 These are the lines that Telemachus spoke at 15.536–8 in reaction to Theoclymenus’ original prophecy; P. repeats them at 19.309–11 following the ‘beggar’s’ prediction. In the reuse of the lines in book 19, the term φιλότης, which can denote not just friendship, but love of an explicitly sexual kind, whether in or outside marriage (e.g. 8.267, 313, *Il.* 6.25, 14.237), carries fresh significance as P. unwittingly acknowledges her readiness to grant the ‘beggar’ his status as her husband. This type of repetition must be purposeful; as Od.’s return becomes ever more imminent, the predictions gain in cogency and underline the ironic gap between the predictor’s knowledge and the continuing ignorance of his interlocutor.

164 τῷ ‘in that case, then’, a particle or conjunction, not the dat. of the article or demonstrative pron. τῶι as the MSS regularly spell it.

165 ὧς ‘in such a way that’; cf. 23.133–5.

166 This speech-concluding formula occurs × 16 in *Od.* (e.g. 290), × 7 in *Il.*

167–82

This brief interlude shows the suitors amusing themselves out of doors before being called into dinner, an abrupt but not unusual change in locale (cf. 4.624–5, 6.1–3, 13.185–9, 20.240–2). The intermezzo sharply contrasts with the episode that follows, which will focus on Od.’s degraded and excluded state; in the face of the prophecy just uttered, the scene additionally supplies a glimpse of the idle existence that the hero’s return is soon to bring to a close. In structural terms, this episode forms part of the larger section describing Od.’s arrival at his palace (166–491), a block surrounded on either side by mirroring scenes in which P. receives and welcomes predictions concerning Od.’s return; the same triptych with ring-composition occurs in the subsequent book (see 18.158–303n and Tracy 1997: 364).

167–76 One of the many passages depicting the suitors engaged in non-productive activities, sport and consumption; see 1.106–12, 159, 225–6, 421–3; at 1.106–7 the youths were also in front of the palace playing at games; that scene also preceded the beginning of a feast. The present banquet does not conclude until 18.428.

167–9 = 4.625–7. The αἰγυῆν (lit. ‘goat spear’, used against goats at 9.156) is a light javelin, found in the context of hunting as well as sport; it may be significant that it is all but absent from the battlefield (see *Il.* 2.774; note *Il.* 16.589–91 for the sole and qualified exception; the object can be used ‘either in a contest or in battle’). The combination of athletic activities and dining anticipates the marriage contest organized by Cleisthenes, tyrant of Sicyon, to select a husband for his daughter Agariste (Hdt. 6.126–30; see Seaford 1994: 53–5 for the overlaps with the courtship of P.). There the would-be sons-in-law, all aristocrats, are subjected to a series of tests designed to assess their athletic prowess and their ability to conduct themselves properly at the feast.

169 ἐν τυκτώι δαπέδωι ‘on the levelled terrace’; the adj., from τεύχω, means ‘wrought’ (so 206); the noun combines *dm-, a weak form of δόμος, δῶμα, and πέδον. ὄθι . . . ἔχοντες: this brief editorializing comment underscores the darker side to the seemingly benign scene; the suitors have been there a long time, and are guilty of ὕβρις. The poet generally reserves this condemnatory term for the suitors’ conduct (19 out of 26 occurrences in the *Od.* refer to the suitors; ὕβρις appears only 4 times in *Il.*); cf. the use of the expression in Athena’s programmatic description of the uninvited guests at 1.227–9. Typically in the *Od.*, the poet applies the term to disruptions and violations of guest–host relations (see Introduction p. 18), although it more generally involves attempts by a stronger party to humiliate a weaker individual and so to cause his loss in status. See further Fisher 1992: 151–84 ‘[ὕβρις] is the serious assault on the honour of another, which is likely to cause shame and lead to anger and attempts at revenge’ and ‘the impetus gratuitously to insult and dishonour those one should not so treat’ (1, 173); note too van Wees 1992: 115–18 and 565n.

170 δειπνηστος ‘time for dinner’.

171 includes small but telling details; ‘from all over the countryside’ suggests both the extent of the suitors’ power and their greed; the observation that the servants are

‘the same ones as before’ focuses attention on those retainers disloyal to their master shortly before the introduction of the turncoat Melanthius.

172–3 The herald Medon previously appeared at 4.677. Despite the suitors’ preference for him, Medon’s loyalty to Od. remains unswerving and he will be spared in book 22. The κῆρυξ frequently performs tasks associated with dining, typically mixing and pouring wine; cf. 334–5. See too 18.291 and 423nn for the figure’s heterogeneous role.

174 ἐτέρωθε: 2 pers. plur. aor. pass. of τέρπομαι; for the different forms and uses of the verb in the aorist in H., see Latacz 1966: 174–219.

176 οὐ . . . χέρειον ‘not worse’, i.e. (here) ‘better’, the so-called ‘contrastive’ comparative; H. frequently uses the idiom where the contrast is merely implicit (e.g. 3.69, 16.147; see too Hdt. 6.107); later authors prefer to use it where the contrast is explicit, particularly with paired adjectives (e.g. Theogn. 935–6, Pind. *Pyth.* 10.58–9). ἐν ὥρῃ ‘in a timely way’; so Ar. *Vesp.* 242, *Eccl.* 395. Such gnomic utterances usually occupy the end of speeches and are voiced by a character rather than the poet; cf. 246 and 578. Often, as here, they lack a main verb.

180–1 ἱερεῖον δῖς . . . ἱερεῖον: a sacrifice precedes the meal, one of several occasions when the suitors perform the rite (535, 2.56, 14.28, 94, 20.3, 250–1, 391). But various elements distinguish these episodes from the more properly conducted sacrifices in the *Od.*: when the suitors are the subjects, the verb ἱερεύειν functions as a virtual equivalent for κτείνειν, rather than denoting a separate activity as elsewhere, and the participants invariably omit the requisite offerings to the gods (see Said 1979: 36–41). The suitors’ abbreviated procedure should be contrasted with the sacrificial protocol minutely described at 3.404–63, a scene located in Pylos, the model of a pious community. σιάλους: a noun already found in Mycenaean (PY Cn 608); a scholion at 20.163 glosses ‘well-fattened and tame’, in contrast to wild pigs; at 14.81 Eumaeus explained that these animals were what the suitors preferred. The plural may signal the excessive nature of the diners’ consumption on this occasion; normally Eumaeus just brings one pig for their meal (14.19 and 27).

182–260

The scene shifts abruptly back to Eumaeus’ hut where the swineherd and beggar prepare to leave. An encounter with the treacherous and quarrelsome goatherd Melanthius interrupts their journey to the palace; after an abusive exchange, Melanthius enters Od.’s home before the hero and his escort.

182 A mid-line scene change is unusual, but not unparalleled; cf. 260, 13.187, a shift from Scheria to Ithaca, and 15.495, where the poet moves from Eumaeus’ hut to Telemachus’ arrival at Ithaca. ἀγροῖο πόλινδε: the juxtaposition marks the important transition; from a realm of simple but proper hospitality provided by a humble host sympathetic to his plight, Od. enters an urban sphere characterized by the improper treatment of guests and a hostile set of elite hosts (see Introduction p. 24 and Edwards 1993).

183 δῖος ὑφορβός: the adjective δῖος (lit. ‘Zeus-like in appearance or ancestry’) is derived from *Διῖγος; the etymological sense appears already in the Mycenaean *di-u-ja*, *di-wi-ja* and at *Il.* 9.538. More usually ‘god-like, illustrious’ in reference to individuals, δῖος is the most frequent of generic epithets, used of 32 heroes, but rarely in the metrical position found here. Frequently applied to the humble Eumaeus, it probably does no more than register the elevated stature that belongs to any individual of the heroic age preserved in epic, and can be inserted in mechanical fashion and for metrical convenience (Parry 1971: 151–2). Plausible too is the suggestion of a deliberate paradox or puzzle on the poet’s part: in a poem about a king disguised as a beggar, the swineherd Eumaeus, most likely H.’s own addition to the traditional tale, may be ‘noble’ (note the postponed revelation of Eumaeus’ noble birth at 15.413; but see 184 and 508nn; see further Scodel 2002: 156–60). Less likely is the view that H. intends the designation to be parodic.

184 ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν: since H. also uses this phrase of the herdsman Philoetius (20.185, 254), an unequivocally low-born character, it cannot depend only on the higher standing that Eumaeus once enjoyed. Again, a term originally designed for those of elite status has probably become a more generalized tag. However, when attached to Od.’s retainers, it may also convey an intrinsic excellence that exists independent of birth, and signal the narrator’s sympathetic view of these individuals. It also anticipates the more elevated status that both Eumaeus and Philoetius are promised at 21.213–16 and looks forward to the closing portion of the *Od.*, where the two rustics fight alongside Od., although not on wholly equal terms, and with the honorific epithets used here (see Thalmann 1998: 90–8, Edwards 1993: 58).

185 ξεῖν’, ἐπέι: the phrase frequently appears at the line beginning (cf. 1.231, 6.187, 8.236, 15.390); on several other occasions the sentence also lacks an apodosis.

187 ῥυτῆρα ‘keeper, guard’, from ῥύομαι, ἔρυμαι, ‘to protect’ (contrast 18.262n). Coupled with Eumaeus’ obedience to Telemachus’ orders announced in the previous line, the expression indicates the swineherd’s loyalty to the wishes of Od.’s family and his care for their property.

188 αἰδέομαι καὶ δεῖδρα: for this same ‘mixture of considerations of reverence or honour with considerations of prudence’ (so Macleod at *Il.* 24.435), see 577–8, 7.305 (where the expression is also followed by a generalization by way of explanation), 8.22, 14.234. For later instances of the combination, see *Cyprina* fr. 23 (ἵνα γὰρ δέος ἔνθα καὶ αἰδώς) and Thuc. 2.37.3 with Gomme’s note. ὀπίσσω ‘hereafter, in the future’; since the future remains unseen, the Greeks imagined it as approaching a man from behind; the past, insofar as it is known, is visible.

189 νεικέηι: νεικέω occurs in only two other places in the *Od.* (18.9, 22.26) where the metre requires the lengthened form; elsewhere the poet prefers νεικέω. On the verb’s significance, see 215n. δεῖ τ’ ἀνάκτων: τε serves its frequent generalizing function here; see Ruijgh 1971: 540 for this and comparable phrases.

190 ἴομεν: hortatory, as usually in H., and particularly common after ἀλλ’ ἄγε or ἀλλ’; this form is a regular epic usage (see 194). μέμβλωκε: 3 pers. sing. perf. of βλώσκω, ‘go’; only the pres. and perf. tenses retain the β; contrast aor. ἔμολον.

191 ποτὶ ἔσπερα ‘towards evening’; this neut. plur. form has the meaning ‘evening-time’. Chantraine, *GH* II 133 cites this as the only use of πρὸς/ποτὶ in H. with a temporal meaning. ῥίγιον ‘more chilly’, a comparative formed directly from the noun ῥίγος; there is no simple form. In every other instance in H. the expression has a metaphoric sense (i.e. ‘worse’, cf. 20.220). For the emphasis on the cold, see 23–5n.

195 ῥόπαλον: Od.’s request follows on from his having abandoned the staff that Athena gave him as part of his beggar’s disguise (13.437) and which he dropped when confronted by Eumaeus’ barking dogs at 14.31. The stick, variously designated σκῆπτρον or ῥόπαλον, carries, like other seemingly chance or mundane objects in H., thematic weight. Athena’s choice to equip the hero with a staff not only suits Od.’s assumed persona, but recalls his comment on the weakened state of his legs at 8.233, a debility he shares with Hephaestus (see 16n for the god–mortal link). Od.’s use of ῥόπαλον here may reflect his desire to preserve his incognito; while the σκῆπτρον can have much loftier connotations, the patently unregal ῥόπαλον earlier appeared in Polyphemus’ hand (9.319). See 199n and Nagler 1974: 123–4.

196 ἀρισφαλῆ ‘very slippery’ (intensive ἀρί + σφάλλω) occurs uniquely here. οὐδόν: not ‘threshold’ but, as a scholion comments, a form of ὀδός; the first syllable is lengthened for metrical purposes. Chantraine, *GH* I 104 suggests the analogical influence of οὐδός, ‘threshold’.

197–203 Seven lines bring out the degradation inherent in Od.’s disguise; the detailed description may remind the audience that his infiltration of the palace will depend on the convincing quality of his debased appearance.

197–8 = 18.108–9. ἦ ῥα ‘so he spoke’, a formula equivalent to the metrically longer ὧς ἔφατο; for the verb ῥαί, found only in this form in H., see Chantraine, *GH* I 291. The remainder of the phrase reworks the common formula for a hero arming himself with a sword, ἀμφὶ δ’ ἄρ’ ὤμοισιν βάλετο ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον (*Il.* × 4; cf. *Il.* 1.45, 3.17 and *Od.* 10.261–2, with similar phrasing for arming); the departure from conventional diction emphasizes the disjunction between the hero’s proper sphere of activity and his current situation. ἀεικέα: the epithet, usually applied to objects rather than people, is first used of the wallet at 13.437. The ‘unseemliness’ or ‘shamefulness’ of the purse lies not only in its shabbiness, but also in the disgrace it inflicts; an erstwhile lord and master should not have to carry it (see Pucci 1987: 83 n. 1 and Rutherford’s note at 20.394). The wallet seems to have become a regular accessory for beggars on the Attic stage: the destitute Telephus arriving in Argos in Euripides’ *Telephus* carries one, a detail parodied by the comic dramatists (see Σ Ar. *Nub.* 922b, and Collard, Cropp and Lee 1995: 23–4).

198 = 13.438. πυκνά ῥωγαλήην ‘full of holes’. The second syllable of πυκνά is scanned long, either because of initial ρ (cf. 18.15, σε ῥέζω), or due to the initial digamma of ῥωγαλήην, still retained when the expression was created. The adj. is already an archaism.

199 σκῆπτρον: cf. 195n; the substitution of σκῆπτρον for ῥόπαλον may glance towards Od.’s true status. The shift anticipates the poet’s reminder of the beggar’s actual identity and the fact of his disguise at 201–3 (see n); see further 18.103n. θυμαρῆς

‘suited to his θυμός; H. has this form of the adj. at 23.232 and *Il.* 9.336; cf. *Call. H.* 4.29 and *H.* 6.55. The variant reading θυμήρης (see Σ ad *Il.* 9.336) appears in the neut. as an adv. at 10.362, and as an adj. at *H. H. Cer.* 494, *Mosch.* 2.29; both forms are probably derived from ἀραρίσκω.

200 βήτην ‘they went’, dual.

201 ἐς πόλιν ἦγεν: there is considerable emphasis both here and elsewhere (10, 22, 194) on Eumaeus’ role as the one who conducts Od. Combined with the stick that the swineherd has just given his guest, the motif indicates Eumaeus’ ever-scrupulous observance of the niceties of the guest-host relationship. The σκήπτρον acts as the parting guest-gift, the action as the safe conduct or πομπή that the host is obliged to supply (Nagler 1974: 125, Reece 1993: 39).

201–3 A nice touch of verbal and dramatic irony as the unknowing Eumaeus escorts his lord (ἄνακτα) to his rightful place; in this instance the narrator deploys the same periphrastic denomination typically used by Eumaeus for his master (e.g. 14.366, 450). The participle σκηπτόμενον (‘supporting himself, leaning on a stick’) picks up the term σκήπτρον. In conjunction with that noun, it nods towards the ‘sceptred lord’, granting Od., now equipped with his badge of office, his true status (Nagler 1974: 123).

202 = 337, 16.273, 24.157.

203 ἔστο ‘he was wearing’; 3rd sing. pluperf. middle of ἐννυμι ‘put clothes on oneself’; since the perfect carries the present meaning ‘I have put on’ = ‘I am wearing’, the pluperf. serves as a regular past (‘I was wearing’).

205–11 A brief pause for a scenery description; as commonly in the poem, the landscape carries thematic weight (see Byre 1994). The sanctity, beauty and otherworldliness of this rustic spot, in contrast to Od.’s current squalid and marginal condition, make Melanthius’ imminent impious and boorish conduct the more discordant and reprobate; see 240–3n for Od.’s properly reverent practices at the site. The combination of grove, altar, trees and cool running water anticipates what became the standard poetic depiction not just of gods’ sanctuaries, but also of the *locus amoenus*; for other such sites in the poem, see the descriptions of Calypso’s cave (5.63–73) and Alcinous’ gardens (7.114–32); among later examples, S. *OC* 16–18, 668–93, Pl. *Phd.* 230b–c, *Call. H.* 6. 27–9, *Theoc. Id.* 7.6–9, 135–46 (see too 205, 208, 209–10, 210–11, 212–53nn). Events within this grove also observe the scenario played out in such settings in later sources, where an intruder regularly shatters their signature tranquillity. Unusually for H., this scene is not explicitly ‘focalized’, but presented directly by the narrator (contrast 264–7).

205 κρήνην: the combination of water and shade, prized in an arid and hot country, regularly distinguishes such Greek beauty spots: see 5.70, 6.292, 7.129–31, 9.140–1 (the Cave of the Nymphs also has a perpetual water supply at 13.109); for later examples, *Theoc. Id.* 1.2, *Call. H.* 6.28, *Hor. C.* 2.3.12 with N.–H., *Ov. F.* 2.315 and additional examples in 209–10n. In contrast to the Ithacan townspeople, the urban dwellers in the idyllic Scheria enjoy a water source located within the city (a rare luxury) and that, in contrast to this one (207n), has gods for its builders (see Garvie

at 7.129–31). Scully 1990: 13–14 suggests that such springs mark the division between the city and countryside; this suits the episode’s emphasis on Od.’s passage from the rural to the urban sphere.

206 ὄθεν ὑδρεύοντο πολῖται = 7.131 (cf. *H. H. Cer.* 99), another glance back to Scheria and to Od.’s approach to the city there (see Lowenstam 1993: 208–9). Even in the fantasy realm in books 9–12, fetching water from the spring is, as in traditional cultures still today, a woman’s task (cf. 10.105–8); for the numerous representations of women at water sources on *hydriai*, see Richardson at *H. H. Cer.* 98.

207 The scholia cite the fifth-century historian Acusilaus who names Ithacus (the eponymous hero of Ithaca), Neritus and Polyctor as three brothers who founded Cephallenia and then Ithaca. Neritus gave his name to the mountain identified at 13.96. The detail not only lends a patina of authenticity to the poet’s narrative of the heroic age but also reflects the broader role of ἄοιδοι in oral societies, where they serve as repositories and transmitters of ‘historical’ information. Typical too of practices in pre-literate cultures is this combination of topography and history: objects in the landscape serve as catalysts for recalling past events (cf. *Il.* 22.152–6, the washing-troughs outside Troy). This glance towards the original builders of the site finds an echo in Theoc. *Id.* 7.6–7, with details about the foundation of the Burina spring.

208–10 Through a sequence of spatial indicators (ἀμφί, ὑψόθεν, ἐφ’ ἑπερθε), one for each element of the grove, H. visualizes the sanctuary in its several dimensions; cf. 5.63–73 (the description of the environs of Calypso’s cave). The organization of the material may reveal something of the bard’s technique: not only does he prompt listeners to create pictorial images of what he describes, but spatial clues are aids to the singer’s memory that furnish him with a ‘cognitive map’ preserving information about the elements of a site (see Minchin 2001: 85–7).

208 ἀλείρων: gen. of material, governed by ἄλλος; as Theophr. *H. P.* 4.1.1 notes, the black poplar likes well-watered sites (see too *Il.* 4.482–3, *Ov. Rem.* 141). Cf. Nausicaa’s description of the approach to her father’s estate: there Od. will find ‘a glorious grove of Athena with poplars close to the road’ (6.291–2). Theoc. *Id.* 7 relocates the detail to the final scene of the poem (136); Call. *H.* 6.37 echoes the Nymphs’ predilection for the black poplar.

209–10 For cool running water as a feature of the *locus amoenus*, cf. Sappho fr. 2.5–6 (ἐν δ’ ὕδωρ ψυχρον κελάδει δι’ ὕσδων | μαλίνων), Mosch. fr. 1.12–13; among Roman examples, V. *Ecl.* 1.51–2, Propert. 4.4.4, *Ov. Am.* 3.1.3, *Met.* 2.455, 3.31, 161.

210–11 Altars for burnt offerings, which first appear in the material record from the second half of the eighth century, are common in H. Some are found in conjunction with temples and sanctuaries; the majority, like the one cited here, stand independent of buildings (3.273, 13.187; cf. *Il.* 4.4.8, 8.4.8, 23.14.8). While temples in H. are inevitably within the city boundaries, sanctuaries are located outside. For the cult of the Nymphs on Ithaca, see 13.104, 348–50.

211 ὄθι answers to the ὄθεν at 206; the echoing terms, as frequently, demarcate the beginning and end of the descriptive passage (‘ring-composition’). ἐπιπρέζεσκον:

an iterative form of the verb; the suffix $\sigma\kappa$ implies repeated or habitual action; see Chantraine, *GH* 1 323–5.

212–53 Into this idyllic setting comes Melanthius, the palace goatherd and the one named male labourer who has gone over to the suitors' camp. The opening characterization casts the herdsman in an unequivocally negative light (cf. 18.321–6nn for the similar introduction of Melantho) and serves to juxtapose him with the loyal Eumaeus, a contrast reinforced by the different kinds of diction used by each character (see 217–32n). The individuals' 'speaking names' presage the distinction: whereas the one is 'desirous of/striving after the good', the other has a name as black as his nature. The contrast further offers a study in master–slave relations in the poem. While Eumaeus' nobility reflects that of the master who still commands his loyalty, and points to the benign nature and influence of Od.'s dominion, Melanthius reproduces, in debased form, the villainy and brutality of those whom he serves, his character and outlook a product of their very different mode of stewardship (see Thalmann 1998: 83–4). Melanthius properly participates in two sets of paired individuals or 'character doublets': Eumaeus' mirror image, he closely resembles his sister Melantho (see 18.321–26nn). See further Fenik 1974: 174 and Introduction pp. 15–16.

The encounter involves several distortions of the standard preliminaries to a hospitality type-scene. Frequently the newly-arrived stranger is met en route to his destination by an individual; typically that individual offers help in the form of directions/advice as to how the soon-to-be guest should conduct himself with his hosts. But Melanthius warns the stranger against going to the palace and previews the abusive treatment that he will receive there (see Reece 1993: 168–9). Both the setting and encounter would offer a model for the very different events in Theocritus' *Id.* 7; for the parallels, see Halperin 1983: 224–7, Hunter 1999: 147–8.

212 $\nu\lambda\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\Delta\omicron\lambda\iota\omicron\iota\omicron$: Dolius, identified here as the father of Melanthius and later of Melantho, carries the same name as the servant given to P. as a gift from her father on her marriage (4.735–9). He reappears as a labourer who, with his sons, works the farm to which Laertes has withdrawn (24.222–5) and later, in company with his six sons, sides with Od. in his confrontation with the suitors' families (24.497). Earlier critics assumed several characters with the same name: a servant of P.'s, the father of the two renegade slaves, and the loyal retainer with six stalwart sons. A single individual seems more likely: the poet associates Dolius with Laertes already at 4.737–8, and with the orchard (4.737) where Od. encounters his father after Laertes has dispatched Dolius and his sons for stones to build a wall to enclose the site (24.222–5). Dolius' 'speaking name', clearly derived from $\delta\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, suits his several roles. Within the larger poem, a facility for tricky contrivances is generally positive and the source of Od.'s $\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ (9.19–20); Dolius' name thus already suggests relations of affinity between the figure and the hero. But as father of the vituperative Melanthius, 'Crooked' shows a different face. The father's name anticipates the depiction of the goatherd as a practitioner of the discourse of mockery and abuse, frequently a Trickster figure (see 18.1–110n).

212–14 Μελανθέυς ἀγας ἄγων . . . δεῖπνον μνηστήρεσσι: the goatherd selects the choice specimens from the herd, thus rapidly depleting the livestock of Od. that Eumaeus tries so carefully to husband.

214 δῶν . . . νομῆς: a humorous variation on the standard ‘attendance’ motif (see 62n), here relocated to the rustic sphere. Two followers regularly attend (generally) prominent characters in epic. Nagler 1974: 94 suggests the aesthetically pleasing, ‘pedimental’ quality of the arrangement, reflected in archaic and classical art and architecture.

215 Like Irus after him (see 18.9n), Melanthius opens his mouth only to utter abuse. *νείκεσσειν*: the verb regularly flags invective and ‘flyting’ discourse, cf. 18.9, 8.158, *Il.* 2.224, 243 (of Thersites), 4.336. On the verb’s range of meanings, see Adkins 1969; for ‘flyting’, agonistic speech including threats, rebukes, quarrels and insults, see Martin 1989: 68–77. *ἔπος τ’ ἔφατ’ ἐκ τ’ ὀνόμαζεν* ‘and spoke a word to him and addressed him’; the formula occurs *Il.* × 17, *Od.* × 26. *ὀνόμαζε*, lit. ‘called him by name’, has in H. come simply to mean ‘address’ and often no name, or only a descriptive term, follows (cf. 18.78). The formula always occurs after the third foot caesura. For discussion, see S. West on 2.302, Hoekstra on 14.52 and D’Avino 1969.

216 ἐκπαγλον καὶ ἀεικές: the first of the terms means ‘vehement, violent’; for its application to words, see 8.77, *Il.* 15.198. Here uniquely H. qualifies the common introductory speech formula with two adjectives, as though to underline the transgressive quality of what we are about to hear. Unusually too, the poet signals the interlocutor’s emotional reaction even before the speech begins; in all other instances, the phrase *ὄρινε δὲ κῆρ* occurs after the speaker’s words are done (e.g. 150; Edwards 1970: 33).

217–32 Melanthius’ address is striking for its richly abusive vocabulary, alliterative phrases and ‘homely’ language, replete with details of agrarian life. As in the description of the rustic hospitality that Eumaeus supplies in book 14, the speech offers a rare instance of the accommodation of a ‘diction and an outlook that are other than aristocratic’ within the metrical and formulaic system of epic (Thalmann 1998: 83). For the linguistic anomalies in the passage, see Shipp 1972: 344.

217 *κακὸς κακόν*: the first of the many echoing terms and alliterative phrases; cf. 218, 219, 221n, 222, 224, 228. Such juxtapositions of two cases of the same noun (polyptoton) are frequent in archaic sources; for examples see 1.313, 7.120–1, 9.47, 10.82 and Fehling 1969: 222–3; for polyptoton with *κακός*, *Il.* 16.111 and *H. H. Ap.* 354.

218 *ὡς . . . ἔς τὸν ὄμοιον* ‘one rogue is usher to another still’, in Pope’s colourful translation. Citations in Plato (*Lysis* 214a) and Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1371b15, *EE* 1235a4) show this to be a proverbial expression; note too Theophr. *Char.* 29.6. For other proverbial remarks, see 246n, 19.13 with additional discussion in van der Valk 1949: 202–4 and Ahrens 1937. The usual Homeric *ἔς* seems to have been displaced by Attic *ὡς* in the MSS under the influence of later quotations of the phrase; otherwise this would be the only instance of *ὡς* used in the sense of *εἰς* before Attic Greek.

219 πῆι δὴ ‘but where on earth’, sarcastic or derogatory (cf. 21.362); H. uses both πῆι and πόσε for the later ποῖ, ‘whither’. μολοβρόν: a term of uncertain and possibly two meanings; (a) ‘glutton’ (cf. Chantraine 1972; so too the scholia’s fanciful derivation from μολοῦντα πρὸς τὴν βρωσῶν or μόλισκοντα ἐπὶ βοράν, ‘one who goes after food’); (b) ‘piggish’, cognate with μολόβριον, a young wild pig (Ael. *NA* 7.47; LSJ). See additionally Coughanowr 1979: 229–30 for the post-Homeric and modern Greek sense ‘hairless’ (tempting, in view of Od.’s hair loss; see 18.354–5n), ‘pest-ridden’ or ‘diseased’. Both greed and swinishness may be operative here; cf. Semonides 7.6 W, where the two properties form a pair. The suggestion of gluttony suits the description of Od. at 220 and 228; the ‘piggishness’ explains why Eumaeus, a swineherd, would be leading him, much as Melanthius is driving his goats. The term’s exclusive use in H. by Melanthius and Irus situates it within the discourse of abuse; cf. Hippon. fr.114b W (μολοβρίτης); for a later instance, Lyc. 775. ἀμέγαρτε συβῶτα: the adj. (ἀ + μεγάρω, a verb similar in meaning to φθονέω) means ‘unenviable’; hence, in this context, ‘miserable, awful’. While Od. and members of his family regularly address Eumaeus by name, hostile characters avoid the vocative or call him ‘swineherd’.

220 δαιτῶν ἀπολυμαντήρα: most likely ‘the one eating the off-scourings of the feast’ (cf. Antinous’ reuse of the expression at 377, an instance of the damning correspondences between the suitor and Melanthius). The scholia offer two explanations for the unique second term: (a) ‘lick-plate’, with a derivation from λύμα, ‘filth, offscourings’, i.e. the one who eats the left-over scraps, the behaviour of the typical parasite (see Athen. 3.125b for the ‘fat-licker’, the hungry and uninvited guest); Eustathius uses the expression δαιτῶν λύματα to gloss the expression (1817.32ff.); (b) ‘spoiler (destroyer) of feasts’, assuming a derivation from λύμη, ‘damage’. The choice between the two meanings is difficult. Sinclair 1953 makes a convincing case for the first on the grounds that the second stems from a confusion with later Attic λυμαίνομαι, ‘damage’. However, ‘spoiling the feast’ is also a leitmotif in this and the subsequent books (see 446, 18.401–4nn, 19.12, 20.376–80, 21.428–30, where Od. anticipates a much more radical form of feast-spoiling than has previously been imagined). Callimachus’ phrase λύματα δαιτός at *H.* 6.115 may play on the term’s two meanings (Bulloch 1977: 109 n.17); cf. Nic. *Th.* 919 for the same expression (Schneider: ἀπολύματα codd.). In Theocritus’ reworking of Melanthius’ speech, the insult becomes benign: Lycidas merely teases Simichidas with the suggestion that he is hurrying uninvited to a feast (μετὰ δαιτ’ ἄκλητος ἐπείγει, *Id.* 7.24).

221 ‘will rub his shoulders on many doorposts’. The old Aeolic form φλίφεται appears in several MSS and in Eustathius (cf. Hippoc. *Loc. Hom.* 9. 13 and Theoc. *Id.* 15.76 for later uses of the verb); the Alexandrians knew both readings and the scholia report that Zenodotus preferred θλίφεται. If correct, the v.l. would continue the string of alliterations (φλιῆισι . . . φλίφεται). The vivid image further suggests the meaning ‘swinish’ for μολοβρός (see 219n). As Aristotle’s comment at *HA* 6.18, 571b illustrates, the Greeks were familiar with pigs’ practice of rubbing their bodies against trees (τὸ δέρμα . . . πρὸς τὰ δένδρα τρίβοντες); here that aspect of porcine behaviour has been transferred to the beggar (Jacobson 1999).

222 αἰτίζων: H. uses the verb almost exclusively of Od.'s mendicancy (228, 346, 351, 502, 558, 20.179, 182); the 'beggar' also applies it to Od.'s quest for possessions to bring home from abroad when assuming the persona of 'Aithon' (a name perhaps suggestive of a 'burning' hunger) at 19.272–3. Callimachus reuses this epic expression, found only in surviving texts from the intervening period in a passage of hexameter verse (*Ar. Pax* 120), at *H.* 6.115, where the larger phrase looks back to this passage: Erysichthon sits 'begging for scraps and the refuse thrown out from the feast' (αἰτίζων ἀκόλως τε καὶ ἐκβολὰ λύματα δαιτός); on the Od.–Erysichthon connection, see Hopkinson 1984 on *H.* 6.115 and Levaniouk 2000; cf. Bulloch 1977: 108–9. ἀκόλους 'morsels', a Homeric hapax; the term does not recur until Hellenistic and later authors. In addition to Callimachus, see Leon. *A.P.* 9.563.4, *Maced. A.P.* 6.76.4 with additional sources in Hopkinson 1984 at 115. ἄορας: a word of uncertain etymology, connected by some with αἶρω, and so 'that which hangs' (cf. ἄορτήρ, the strap from which the sword hangs), and synonymous with ξίφος. Elsewhere in H. the noun occurs only as the neuter ἄορα (see v.l. ἄορα). In trisyllabic forms, the initial ᾶ can be either long as here or short; in disyllabic forms it is always short. Melanthius, perhaps aping the values of his masters, contrasts the scraps that the beggar seeks with the proper objects of aristocratic gift-exchange, which regularly include cauldrons (e.g. *Il.* 9.123) and finely worked arms and armour; Od. receives an ἄορα παγχάλκεον from Euryalus at 8.403 in implicit recognition of his elite status.

223–5 τόν κ' εἶ . . . θέϊτο 'but if you were to give him to me so as to be a guard of the stalls and a stable-sweeper and to carry foliage (as fodder) to the kids, then indeed he might drink whey and make his thigh-muscles big'. σηκοκόρος is a compound of σηκός and κορέω 'sweep'; 'sweeping' by high-class and/or royal individuals in reduced circumstances would become a topos in Euripides (e.g. *Andr.* 166, *Hec.* 363). ἐπιγουνίδα, the part above the knee; at 18.74, Od. reveals that he does possess powerful thighs – thanks not to Melanthius' whey but to Athena's intervention.

226–8 An almost exact anticipation of Eurymachus' words to Od. at 18.362–4. The parallel diction is not surprising in the light of that suitor's particular patronage of the goatherd (257n).

226 ἔργα κἀκ': an inversion of the more usual formula. ξμμαθεν: the doubling of the consonant is a scribal convention designed to indicate the lengthening of the preceding vowel; the form is created on the analogy of verbs where initial λ, ρ, μ, ν, σ are doubled, probably due to the assimilation of an initial φ or σ (*Monro, HD* 67); cf. 18.88n and Wyatt 1969: 81 n. 48.

227 ἔργον ἐποίησθαι: an expression used regularly in H. for 'setting about' a task, sometimes, as here, of an agrarian nature (see 1.358, 18.363). κατὰ is the regular preposition with δῆμον (*Od.* × 20).

228 βόσκειν: equivalent to Lat. *pascere* 'graze', βόσκειν, specifically denotes consuming 'the sustenance that the earth's vegetation provides for grazing animals' (*Pucci* 1987: 177). For its pejorative quality when applied to humans, see Σ *Ar. Eq.* 256 (βόσκειν γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀλόγων θηρίων τίθεται) and Headlam on *Herod.* 7.44; note too Eumaeus' use of the expression at 559 and its return at 18.364. γαστέρ' ἀναλτον:

the first of repeated mentions of the belly in this and the subsequent book (see 286n); γαστήρ, probably derived from γράω, ‘devour’, refers to the stomach as the locus of hunger × 15 in H.; of these 13 occur in the *Od.* Immediately following Melanthius’ charge of laziness, the focus on the beggar’s voracity is particularly apposite: see Hes. *Th.* 594–5 for women as drones who constantly fill their bellies; there too the verb is βόσκω. The etymology of ἀναλτος ‘unable to be filled, insatiable’ already puzzled ancient commentators (see *Et. M.* 97.14–15 for four different conjectures); the scholia gloss ἀπλήρωτος.

229–32 τὸ δὲ καὶ τετελεσμένον ἔσται: × 8 in H. The poet has a variety of formulas to express this idea of the accomplishment of something predicted; for a modification of the phrase, see 163. The ‘prophecy’ uttered here offers a parodic and inverted instance of the frequent predictions of *Od.*’s return to his home and the fate he will unleash on the suitors.

231–2 ‘his ribs will wear out many stools (thrown) from men’s hands around his head’, a vivid and paradoxical formulation: not only is the expected order inverted (stools more naturally wear out ribs), but it makes little sense for the missiles to hit the target’s chest while flying about his head. As a scholion noted, it is probably best to assume that Melanthius speaks in his characteristically colourful and hyperbolic manner, ending his abusive address by picturing the beggar in a maelstrom of stools. Efforts to emend the eccentricities of the phrasing are less convincing: editors have proposed the MSS variants πλευρός and πλευρά, but the first form, requiring a short final syllable in an –α stem, never appears in H., and the second introduces a normally prohibited hiatus before the verb. βαλλομένοις: probably a gen. absolute, ‘as he is being hit’; but the use of a gen. partic. after a dat. pronoun is not uncommon; for an analogous switch from an acc. pronoun to a dat. partic., see 555. The attack imagined by Melanthius, in which dining-hall furniture serves as offensive weaponry, anticipates the moment when *Od.* will be targeted with a footstool at 462n. A fourth-century Apulian volute krater (Boston 03.804), probably depicting the death of Thersites, presents an analogous scene; in what seems to be a dinner party gone awry, various vessels, as well as basins and a footbath, have been deliberately used as missiles hurled about the room.

233 λάξ ‘with a kick’, adverbial. ἀφραδίησιν: almost always applied in the *Od.* to characters who, whether individually or as a group, bring suffering on themselves through their thoughtless folly; see 9.361 (Polyphemus), 10.27 (*Od.* and his men), 22.288 (one of the suitors); it is largely confined to speeches or *Od.*’s narrative.

235 Cf. 463–4n for *Od.*’s steadfastness in the face of another physical assault.

235–7 μερμήριξεν . . . αἰέρας ‘he pondered whether rushing on him he should take his life with the club, or raising him up around the middle, strike his head to the ground’. A conventional description of a character weighing a sequence of alternatives: cf. 4.117, 6.141, 10.50, 16.73, 18.90n, 22.333, 24.235. For the conventions of pondering scenes, see Arend 1933: 106–15, Voigt 1934: 11–13, 30–82, Russo 1968. These deliberative moments are likely to go back to a very early stage of the epic tradition; a –ξα and –ξω aor. and fut. ending for verbs with present tense ending –ζω

was a W. Greek feature and may reach back to the ‘Achaean’ phase in the formation of the epic language (West 1988: 158 n. 56).

In the present instance, as usually, the protagonist ponders two alternatives, whether (ἤέ or ἤ) he should do x or y; but instead of selecting the second course, as more regularly occurs, he rejects both scenarios for a third. Typical, however, is the choice between a violent and/or instinctual mode of action and conduct that requires passivity and suppressing an initial impulse (cf. 18.90–4n). Although conventional in structure, these episodes of introspection may allow H. to showcase Od.’s ‘bifurcated’ nature as illustrated by his signature πολύτλας epithet (see 34n and Pucci 1987: 69). A violent response would demonstrate the hero’s rashness and daring, while the forbearance and caution he chooses, and that are necessary for the preservation of his disguise, demonstrate his capacity to suffer and endure; see 238n.

236–7 ἔλοιτο . . . ἔλάσει: for the use of the optative in indirect speech replacing the subjunctive in direct speech (‘should I take his life . . . or dash him to the ground’), see *Monro, HD* 302.

237 ἀμφοδῖς: the meaning of this hapax remains uncertain. It may be derived from *ἀμφοφᾶδῖς, ‘by both ears’, or be an adverbial derivative of ἀμφί, ‘by the middle’, as in a wrestling hold (for the first see *Bechtel, Lexilogus*, *Chantraine, DE*; for the second, *LSJ* and *Stanford*). The first would suit the low status and character of the abuser and show Od. imagining an appropriately antiheroic, homely form of retaliation. Od. also responds in kind when he answers the vituperative remarks of Thersites with an off-colour threat (*Il.* 2.260–2).

238 Very unusually, in a line not found elsewhere, the poet spells out the fact of the hero’s resisting his initial impulse; restraint and endurance are made the better part of valour. Cf. 9.299–306 where Od. rejects a violent action (stabbing Polyphemus in the chest) and chooses to remain passive, postponing revenge. τὸν δέ: Melanthius.

239 νεῖκεσ’ ‘railed at him’; cf. 8.158, *Il.* 10.158.

240–3 The opening of Eumaeus’ prayer with its account of his master’s piety reinforces the impropriety implicit in Melanthius’ abuse and attempted violence in this sacred space; for a petition uttered in a holy site, see Od.’s prayer to Athena in her grove on Scheria (6.324–7). Eumaeus follows the standard tripartite prayer format: invocation, a reminder of the earlier benefactions that the petitioner has performed for the deity (*hypomnesis*), specific request; cf. Chryses’ prayer at *Il.* 1.37–42. We first hear of Od.’s scrupulous performance of offerings at 1.60–2; cf. 4.762–6.

240 Νύμφαι κρηναῖαι, κοῦραι Διός: the homoioteleuton may be deliberate as Eumaeus uses a device frequent in invocations. For Nymphs (regular denizens of the later bucolic world) associated with springs, see *Eur. Ia* 1294, *Cycl.* 66, *Theoc. Id.* 1.22, 13.43–5, *Leon. A. P.* 9.326, *A. R.* 1.1228–9. So close was the identification that νύμφη could, in Hellenistic and later sources, supply a metonym for water.

241 ἐπι . . . ἔκη: ‘tmesis’, ‘burn on’, with an implied altar, as in 3.9, 22.336. The phrase offers an abridged version of the sacrificial procedure detailed at 3.436–63. A reminder of the punctilious performance of sacrifice is a regular feature of prayers

that seek to create an obligation on the gods' part to grant the request (e.g. 4.762–6, *Il.* 1.39–41, 8.238–42).

243 Eumaeus' wish stands in apposition to ἐέλδωρ; the verbs' attraction into the preceding phrase explains the use of the optative. κείνος: a reference, of course, to Od. on whom Eumaeus' thoughts, like P.'s at 4.832 and 19.354, are always focused; see 18.181n. ἐ = αὐτόν.

244 ἀγλαΐας: both 'fancy airs' and 'finery, showiness'.

245–6 Not just the country-dweller's suspicion of town ways. In linking Melanthius' ostentatious finery and abusive behaviour to his preference for frequenting the city, Eumaeus develops the ethical opposition between the two spheres in the poem's second half. While those who live in the countryside practise piety and thrift, 'urbanites' disregard social and religious niceties and are profligate and idle (see Edwards 1993, esp. 48–54). ὕβριζων: see 169n; again, the poet signals the equivalence between the suitors and Melanthius. Here alone H. uses the term ὕβρις of the behaviour of a low-class character. The goatherd's ὕβρις includes both his attempt to humiliate a seeming inferior through violence and bullying (a conduct that H. frequently describes with this term) and the insult and dishonour that he inflicts on his absent master through his ostentation, neglect of his work and aggression towards a potential guest of the house (Fisher 1992: 171). ἀλαλήμενος: H. always places the expression after the hephthemimeral caesura (e.g. 13.333).

246 Eumaeus' closing remark, with its reuse of the term κακός, nicely answers Melanthius' opening sally. For the sentiment, cf. Theoc. *Id.* 4.13 (of heifers), δειλαΐαι γ' αὐται, τὸν βούκολον ὡς κακὸν εὔρον. A seeming commonplace, Eumaeus' statement carries particular significance in both the *Od.* and the world of early epic. While the *Od.* makes the preservation or destruction of livestock particularly central to its ethical system, H., Hesiod and the *Homeric Hymns* more generally foreground the role of the shepherd and herder, whose failure to protect the flocks supplies a figure for other kinds of negligence, helplessness and defeat (see Haubold 2000: 18–20).

247 αἰπόλος αἰγῶν: such instances of redundancy are frequent in H.; cf. 19.343 (ποδάνιπτρα ποδῶν), *Il.* 17.389, 24.673.

248 A highly assonantal phrase with its repeated 'o' sound; cf. *Il.* 7.455 for the same effect. κύων: a frequent term of abuse in epic (cf. 19.91, P. of Melantho, 22.35, Od. of the suitors, *Il.* 1.225 and 9.373, Achilles of Agamemnon, *Il.* 6.348, Helen of herself). The insult, regularly glossed by the scholia with ἀναιδής, designates conduct of a particularly shameless kind (as Griffin on *Il.* 9.373 remarks, 'Dogs do openly and without embarrassment what humans do not or should not'). Also applied to those who speak out of turn or in vituperative manner (see 18.338n), the rebuke is doubly apposite here. δλοφώια: most probably 'deceitful, tricky things', as derived from ἐλεφάρομαι; cf. its use as an epithet for δήνεα, 'thoughts, counsels'. The meaning 'destructive' (from δλλυμι), an association assumed by Hellenistic poets, is less likely. εἰδῶς: moral qualities are commonly described in terms of what the subject 'knows' (cf. 20.287, ἀθεμίστια εἰδῶς, *Il.* 24.41); see Onians 1988: 15–16 for the early Greek use

of οἶδα to express not just cognition but ‘a condition or rather attitude of the whole mind’.

249–50 μελαίνης probably refers to the black pitch used as a protective covering for the hull; cf. Kurt 1979: 32–3. For the proposal to ship the beggar abroad, compare Antinous’ threat to Irus at 18.84–7nn. ἄλφοι: in keeping with his base character, the goatherd is looking for gain; in H. the verb quite frequently describes profit derived from selling people (e.g. 15.452–3, 20.383). The use of the optative in a final clause following a future in the main clause can imply a wish (Chantraine, *GH* II 271).

251 βάλαι ἀργυρότοξος Ἀπόλλων: Melanthius’ suggestion of the god’s hostility towards Telemachus is particularly ill-grounded, an instance of the misperceptions common to Od.’s enemies; we later learn of the god’s tutelary concern for the youth (19.86). There is, of course, additional unconscious irony in the invocation of the god in his capacity as archer; the slaughter of the suitors will occur on a feast day of Apollo, carried out with the god’s own weapon; see 494n.

251–3 This wish formula, an optative with εἰ/αἶ γάρ or εἴθε followed by a reference to a deity and a ὥς-clause, occurs on three other occasions in H. (9.523–5, *Il.* 8.538–41, 13.825–31). In each instance a speaker declares his certainty (ὥς ‘as surely as’) about something by opposing it to a wish that, for all its strength, lacks the same assurance.

253 νόστιμον ἦμαρ: ἦμαρ is an archaism, used in epic in place of the metrically intractable Ionic ἡμέρη. H. regularly couples the older term with an adj. indicating a state or condition (see 322–3n) that frequently will not be realized; the more recent noun is never used in this way.

257 τὸν γὰρ φιλέσκει: the subject is Eurymachus; see 18.244n for his characterization. Eurymachus’ preference for Melanthius will be matched by the mention of his liaison with the goatherd’s sister, Melanthe (18.325). For the wording, cf. 1.434–5, 7.171. Seating arrangements always carry significance in the *Od.*, frequently indicating alliances and affinities between characters; cf. 67–70, 333–4.

258 οἱ πονέοντο ‘those who were working’, i.e. the servants. μοῖρα, as usually, refers to the ‘portion’ or ‘share’ of meat the diner receives; cf. 3.66 and μείρωμαι ‘receive as one’s share’.

260 ἔδμεναι ‘(for him) to eat’.

260–327

Od. and Eumaeus arrive outside the palace where they encounter Od.’s dog Argus; a recognition scene between the dog and his master follows.

260–1 Through the enjambed verb ἔδμεναι, the poet juxtaposes the treacherous Melanthius, now accommodated and fed within the house, with the rightful owner of the site, still out of doors but sufficiently close to hear the music from within.

261 The sound ‘surrounds’ (περί) the listeners; cf. *Il.* 10.139 and, similarly of the lyre, *H. H. Merc.* 421: ἐρατὴ δὲ διὰ φρένας ἤλυθ’ ἰωή.

262 Audiences would probably imagine the φόρμιγξ as equivalent to the four-stringed box lyres used by eighth-century singers and visible in the archaeological

record of the late Geometric period; these replaced the seven- and eight-string lyres current in Minoan and Mycenaean times; see Wegner 1968: 2–16, 25–7 and West 1992: 52–3. The lyre is regularly hollow: so 22.340, 23.144, *H. H. Ap.* 183 and *H. H. Merc.* 64, where the adjective follows naturally enough from the construction of this ‘first’ φόρυγξ from a tortoise shell. ἀνὰ . . . βάλλετ’ αἰθεῖν ‘struck up [so as] to sing’; as frequently, the infinitive expresses purpose. For the distinction between the preliminary notes or prelude and the beginning of the actual song; cf. 1.155, 8.266, Pind. *Nem.* 7.77, Theoc. *Id.* 6.20, 8.71.

263 Φῆμιος: the bard in Od.’s house earlier appeared at 1.153–4 where he sang at the behest of the suitors. For the status and position of professional singers in the *Od.*, see 385n and Introduction pp. 12–13. χειρός ‘by the hand’, partitive gen.; the gesture is perhaps indicative of Od.’s heightened emotions at this first glimpse of his home.

264–71 A scenery description regularly occurs at the moment of arrival at a place, frequently accompanied, as here, by an account of the activities of those inside (Reece 1993: 13–14). Again in keeping with many other site descriptions, the arriving character ‘focalizes’ the account (cf. 5.63–75, 7.81–135, 14.5–22) and, in subtle but discernible fashion, offers a picture consistent with his perspective and intent (see 267 and 268nn). Odysseus’ sketch of his home takes its place in a series of other palace descriptions: e.g., Nestor’s at 3.386–92, Menelaus’ at 4.43–7, 71–5, but this visualization is unique insofar as the speaker recognizes his own dwelling. Moreover, this is the first aristocratic, urban and/or properly human residence that Od. has encountered since the start of his adventures (contrast 5.55–75, 7.81–133, 10.210–20, 14.5–22, with Goldhill 1988: 10).

265 ρεῖα δ’ ἀργυρῶν: for the formular expression (*Od.* × 3), cf. 6.300, of the palace of Alcinous. Od.’s home, while well-constructed and outstanding in the community, lacks the magnificence of Menelaus’ residence and has none of the other-world luxury or fantastical features of Alcinous’; for the way in which H. sounds variations on these earlier episodes, see Goldhill 1988: 10. There is also pride (καὶ ἐν πολλοῖσι ιδέσθαι) and poignancy in Od.’s detailed account as the master of the house, whose skills as carpenter/builder the poet has already signalled, reacquaints himself with his home’s architecture. The topography of the palace proves important in the later battle with the suitors (see 268n).

266 ἕτερ’ ‘one building leads to another’; with ἕτερ’ understand δώματα in 264. οἱ and μιν in 268 also refer back to δώματα, now treated as a singular. The description implies a series of interconnecting halls; for the Homeric house plan, see 492, 18.10 and 101–2nn, with Lorimer 1950: 406–33, Knox 1973, S. West on 1.103–4 and Garvie on 6.303–4. For the possible origins of this design in the Geometric age, with exaggeration by H. to suit a heroic age setting, see Drerup 1969: 128–33. Exact reconstruction of Od.’s palace remains impossible; the poet can modify and alter an earlier floor plan according to new plot twists (see 492–3n). ἐπήσκηται ‘has been completed with’; perf. pass. of ἐπασκέω; without the prefix, ἀσκέω frequently describes superior craftsmanship (e.g. *Il.* 23.743).

267 θριγκοῖσι are ‘cornices’; cf. 7.87 (Alcinous’ dark-blue enamel cornice) and the rustic variation at 14.10. εὐερκέες: a problematic term. Its usual meaning ‘well-fenced’ (so 21.389, 22.449, *Il.* 9.472, always of a courtyard) does not suit the context; but used of doors here, the adj. could, by extension, denote ‘secure, giving good protection’. That sense would anticipate the force of Od.’s subsequent comment, in which he surveys his home from the perspective of one who must penetrate its defences. There will be considerable focus on the doors in both the anticipation and execution of Od.’s revenge (18.384–6, 21.388–91). Possible too is the well-attested variant εὐεργέες, ‘well-built’; good craftsmanship also features in Od.’s account of his home.

268 μιν . . . ὑπεροπλίσσαιοτο: either ‘would overpower it’ or ‘would scorn it’. This hapax already perplexes the scholia. Aristarchus (according to Apollonius the Sophist’s *Lexicon*) derived the verb from ὄπλον, ‘weapon’, and gave the first meaning; also plausible is a derivation from ὑπέροπλος, ‘arrogant’; hence the second interpretation found in the ancient commentators. Both meanings are apposite in this context, where Od. may be hinting at the imminent recovery of the house from the suitors’ arrogant presence through force of arms.

269–71 This approach amid feasting and singing recalls Telemachus’ arrival at Menelaus’ home (although the reception awaiting Od. is nothing like that which his son received). Dining and music also coincide at 8.98–9, 9.7–9, 21.430 (with heavy irony), *H. H. Merc.* 31.

270 ἐνήνοθεν ‘has risen into the air’, perf. tense. Many commentators prefer the vulgate reading ἀνήνοθεν to Aristarchus’ emendation; both variants are found on other occasions in *H.* The choice depends on the origin and meaning of the verb, for which no present form is attested. Frisk, *GEIV* assumes a haplology, ἀν(εν)ήνοθε (cf. Σ A. R. 1. 664) from unattested ἐνθεῖν = ἐλθεῖν (so too Shipp 1972: 115). Chantraine, *DE* s.v. offers a derivation from the stem ἀνεθ–, ἀνθ–, signifying something that appears, or rises up on the surface; the connection with ἄνθος (‘growth’) could allow the meaning ‘sprout up’ or ‘grow on the surface’. In *H.* the subject of (ἐπ–, κατ–, ἐν–) ἡνοθε is variously hair, a smell, oil, dust and even blood (cf. 8.365, *Il.* 2.219, 10.134, 11.266; see too *H. H. Cer.* 279, [*Hes.*] *Scut.* 269). The fat’s tantalizing smell (cf. 10.10, where Od. approached Aeolus’ palace) is a detail relayed only by the speaker, and not given independently by the poet; cf. 18.11 and 250–83 for other examples of this narratological device, found in the *Od.* but not in the *Il.*, with de Jong 2001 at 1.400.

271 δαιτι . . . ἑταιρήν: for the lyre as companion of the feast, see *H. H. Merc.* 31, δαιτός ἑταίρη, Pind. *Ol.* 1.16–18, *epigr.* Kaibel 1025.8, *A. P.* 6.248.3. Od. gives the idea a grim twist at 21.429–30 (ἐψιάσθαι | μολπήι καὶ φόρμιγγι· τὰ γάρ τ’ ἀναθήματα δαιτός) as he anticipates the coming slaughter.

272 προσέφησ, Εὐμαίε συβῶτα: the poet speaks directly to the swineherd with this formulaic line (× 15); Eumaeus is the only individual whom the *Od.* singles out for the form of address. The apostrophe always occurs in the second of the three metrical slots available. The device seems deliberate, rather than dictated by the metre; Εὐμαίε could be also accommodated at line beginning (with elision) or end; for this, see Kahane 1994: 111.

Readers continue to debate the force of Homeric apostrophes and the poet's striking departure from his more usual practice of hiding his presence. Since metrical convenience alone does not require the direct address, H.'s choice could serve a variety of ends: (a) the poet demonstrates particular sympathy with the individual and invites the audience to share this special interest or emotional bond. This explanation suits both Eumaeus (since only the poet and the immediate members of Od.'s family call the swineherd by his name, the use of that name in itself points to a sympathetic attitude) and the two Iliadic figures so addressed, Menelaus and Patroclus. Readers have found other affinities between the three: a complex characterization, some mixture of vulnerability, loyalty, sensitivity and/or altruism, relations of dependency towards a more powerful and protective individual. See further Parry 1972, Block 1982 and Kahane 1994: 111–12. (b) The poet's choice to single out Eumaeus, a low status individual, in this way may reflect the *Od.*'s nuanced ideological stance as the poet elevates a humble (although noble-born) character to prominence (see 183n and Introduction p. 24). (c) Apostrophe offers perhaps the most powerful of rhetorical stratagems whereby the poet compels audience involvement in his narrative as he addresses a character as though that individual were present before our eyes. For the 'epiphanic' force of epic apostrophes and their power to create 'a maximum of presence', see Introduction p. 11, Bakker 1993: 22–3 and 1997a: 172–3. (d) By positioning Eumaeus as a listener, H. also implicitly aligns him with his present-day audience; Eumaeus' mundane role and status bring him closer to the 'post-heroic' generation to which Homeric listeners similarly belong. For further discussion of the device, see Yamagata 1989 and Louden 1997: 108–9.

273 ἔσσι' (ἔσσι), 2 sing. pres. ind. of εἶμι 'I am'; ἔσσι is W. Greek for Attic-Ionic εἶ.

275–9 This seemingly redundant debate over who should go first not only serves to postpone and emphasize the critical moment of Od.'s entrance to the palace, but also flags distortions in the proper hierarchy brought about by the hero's disguise: the master should precede the slave, but in this inverted situation, the reverse holds true. The correct sequence will not be restored until 21.230–1 when Od. orders Eumaeus and Philoetius to follow rather than (as at 21.188–90) to precede him. The question of who should take precedence at a doorway is not restricted to Homeric epic; Nagler 1974: 108 n. 48 cites *Beowulf* 722–4 and *Nibelungenlied*, 14th Adventure, 838ff. among other examples.

278 δηθύνειν: H. frequently uses an infinitive for the second person imperative; cf. 18.106. For the construction, see Goodwin, *MT* 784, Chantraine, *GH* II 316–17.

279 A fresh anticipation of violence (cf. 268n, 13.310). These frequent warnings intensify the tension surrounding Od.'s entrance.

280 τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' . . . Ὀδυσσεύς: a formulaic line occurring × 3 in the *Od.*; in speech introductions πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς appears × 11 (see 560), preceded by a variety of phrases. Because the entire line is metrically equivalent ('isometric') to the more frequent speech introductory formula τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς (see 16n), the poet's choice between the two possible phrases, one evocative of the hero's suffering, the other of his craftiness, may be significant;

in this instance Od.'s reply will focus on the trials he has endured. **πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς**: Od.'s regular 'expanded' formula found *Od.* × 37 in the nom. case after the feminine caesura, usually after an aor. or imperf. active verb (Parry 1971: 10–13, 38–40, Austin 1975: 28). **πολύτλας** belongs exclusively to Od. in *H.*, combining two of the hero's principal characteristics, his 'many-ness' and his endurance of suffering (cf. 18.319n, where the hero puns on his epithet, 'I am very much-enduring'). For the clustering of **πολύ**-epithets around Od., see Stanford 1950: 108–10, Peradotto 1990: 155. Emphasis on another of Odysseus' signature traits, his mental acuity, appears in the next line.

283–5 The lines echo much of the vocabulary used by Od. at 5.222–4 in his rejection of Calypso's offer of an immortal existence (**τλήσομαι ἐν στήθεσιν ἔχων ταλαπευθέα θυμόν** | **ἦδη γὰρ μάλα πολλὰ πάθον καὶ πολλὰ μόγησα** | **κύμασι καὶ πολέμῳ** | **μετὰ καὶ τόδε τοῖσι γενέσθω**). If purposeful, the repetition would remind the audience that the heroic Od. persists beneath his disguise, even as he delivers a remark consistent with the hard-luck persona that he has assumed. Coupled with the subsequent reference to the belly (see 286n), Od.'s self-description also registers the difference between the present occasion and that on which he formerly used the words; there an eternal and trouble-free future was available to him. As Pucci 1987: 78 comments, 'here the theme of **τλήναι** is accommodated in a realistic setting: the poor man must silently accept all sorts of insults if he wants to eat'.

285 'let these (evils) be added to those'. **μετὰ** governs **τοῖσι** here; its placement allows for the **τόδε τοῖσι** juxtaposition. The phrase at 284–5 includes the three stages of Od.'s ordeal: first the Trojan War, then his wanderings, and now the coming encounter with the suitors in his home. But while the speaker seamlessly joins the different parts of his experience, the audience should perhaps be aware of the incongruity brought about by the fact of Od.'s disguise. The anticipated assaults have little in common with his survival of the more conventionally heroic trials of war and shipwreck.

286 A reprise of the **γαστήρ** motif, for which see 6.133–4, 7.215–21, 15.344, 18.2n, 53–4nn). Od.'s characteristic focus on the appetite and its need for satisfaction (already visible in *Il.* 4.343–6, 19.155–72, 225–33) has proved a sticking point for both ancient (see Σ on 7.215) and modern readers who view the trait as unbecoming to a hero; the divergence may, however, be less glaring than generally assumed: Heracles, with whom Od. shares many properties, also has an outsized appetite (see Finkelberg 1995: 4). Again, the reference to the **γαστήρ** draws attention to the difficulty of separating Od. from his assumed persona (see Introduction p. 20): the belly was the organ that Od. cited when he offered the most basic definition of his identity at 7.208–21; in this respect at least, Od. remains the same, whatever his location or disguise, a notion reinforced by his comment that the belly is the one aspect of a man that cannot be hidden. Juxtaposed with the **θυμός** cited in 284, the evocation of the **γαστήρ** also belongs together with the poem's other reflections on the relations between the two organs, one usually elevated, the other belonging to the lower bodily stratum (for this opposition, see too 18.61n). **μεμαύϊαν**: in the three other Odyssean uses of this form of the participle **μεμαώς** (probably from the root **μένος**), it describes Athena and her

impetuous desire to fight (13.389, 16.171, 24.487). For audiences attuned to the term's more common context, the reapplication of *μεμῶς* to the belly would reinforce their sense that Od. is speaking in his beggar's persona, with the corresponding demotion of normally 'high' terms.

286–7 In both structure and vocabulary, the line offers a striking and very plausibly deliberate reprise of *Il.* 1.1–2 (μῆνιν . . . | οὐλομένην, ἣ μύρι' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγ' ἔθηκε), with one outstanding change: the belly takes the place of Achilles' cosmic wrath, so underscoring the contrast between the two heroes (see Pucci 1987: 175–6). In Od.'s next remark, commercial ventures displace the Trojan war, the forum where Achilles displays his μῆνις. ἦ πολλά . . . δίδωσι: in almost all other instances, the gods, not the stomach, are the givers of ills to men; e.g. 1.33, 244, 6.172–4, 7.242, 14.39.

288–9 At 15.343–5, Od. similarly made hunger the impetus for the roving life that men are forced to undertake (πλαγκτοσύνης δ' οὐκ ἔστι κακώτερον ἄλλο βροτοῖσιν. | ἀλλ' ἔνεκ' οὐλομένης γαστρὸς κακὰ κήδε' ἔχουσι | ἄνδρες, ὄν τιν' ἴκηται ἔλη και πῆμα και ἄλγος). A direct relation of cause and effect between hunger and navigation is common in archaic and later Greek poetry. Because of the abundance of spontaneously generated food, the men of the Golden Age do not need to seek a livelihood abroad (Hes. *WD* 236–7, 'they flourish continually with good things, nor do they go about on ships but the grain-giving field bears fruit'; for the contrary scenario, *WD* 633–4); cf. Pind. *Ol.* 2.62–5, Arat. *Ph.* 110–13. For good discussion of the trope, see Dougherty 2001: 89–91.

289 ἄτρύγετον: a common formulaic epithet, always reserved in H. for the sea (with one exception; see below) and understood, since antiquity, as meaning 'barren'. Its etymology remains uncertain, but the initial ἀ– is generally assumed to be privative. The meaning 'infertile, unharvested' found in the scholia (supposing a philologically impossible derivation from τρύγη) does not explain the adj.'s application to αἰθήρ at *Il.* 17.425, Hes. fr. 150.35 M–W, *H. H. Cer.* 67, 457, Stesichorus *PMG* 209.4. Other possible definitions include 'untiring', 'sparkling' and 'fluid', or a derivation from *τρυγετός, 'noise, surf' (cf. τρύζω, 'to murmur, make a low noise') combined with an α–copulative. See further Leumann, *Wörter*, 214 n. 8, Leukart 1985.

291–327 This celebrated and moving episode ('a model of restrained pathos', according to Rose 1979: 220) has multiple functions beyond its appeal to centuries of dog-lovers. (a) As a recognition scene. The encounter takes its place in the extended sequence of recognitions that punctuate Od.'s return (see Introduction p. 22), positioned between the hero's self-revelation to Telemachus at Eumaeus' hut (16.188–214) and Eurycleia's recognition of her master while washing him in the hall (19.392–3). As these other locations indicate, the site of the recognition is critical: at each stage of his progress from the periphery of Ithaca to the marital chamber, Od. will be recognized by a loyal member of his household. This is a particularly charged moment of passage, as the beggar negotiates his transition into the house. For variations on the standard recognition format in this instance, see Introduction p. 22.

(b) The episode supplies a conventional element in a second 'type-scene', the arrival and reception of the ξείνος. In accordance with the usual scheme, Od.'s arrival is seen

and heard by an inhabitant of the home, Argus in this instance, although, unusually, the stranger is not then immediately led inside.

(c) Argus stands in intimate relations of likeness to and difference from the three other 'dogs at the threshold' whom Od. has previously encountered: the gold and silver dogs crafted by Hephaestus outside Alcinous' palace (7.91–4), the wolves and lions that behave in the manner of domestic dogs outside Circe's dwelling (10.214–9), and the watchdogs that bark clamorously as Od. approaches Eumaeus' hut (14.29–31). The distinctions underlying the repeated use of the motif demarcate the real from the 'fantasy' realm, and the margins from the centre, as well as serving to presage the nature of the place to which Od. has come. The divinely fashioned dogs in Scheria, characterized by the two epithets reserved for immortal beings (*ἀθανάτους . . . καὶ ἀγήρω*), signal the Phaeacians' proximity to the gods and the idyllic nature of their existence, where simulacra eternally do the work of mortal creatures elsewhere. The dog-like, fawning wild beasts at Circe's door suggest the confusion between the realms of the domestic and wild on the island and the metamorphoses that occur there. Outside Eumaeus' hut the dogs follow the opposite trajectory; although domesticated, they are 'like wild beasts' whose aggressive behaviour reminds us that on Ithaca, as opposed to the world of the adventures, watchdogs are necessary to protect property. The series of encounters also forms a structural sequence: in the 'fantasy' realm Od. twice meets with dogs at thresholds; in Ithaca he does the same. For further discussions, see the acute treatment in Goldhill 1988: 9–18 and Rose 1979.

(d) Argus' condition offers an indictment of the suitors and their neglect of Od.'s *oikos* (see Introduction p. 30). The poet lingers on the dog's degraded location, a dung heap, and unkempt condition (also associated with mourning; cf. the representation of Priam at *Il.* 24.163–5) to indicate the larger state of decline and urgent need for the hero's restoration of order. In a book that has already featured the contrast between the loyal Eumaeus and treacherous Melanthius, Argus offers a second example of the faithful 'retainer' who resists the new regime (see Beck 1991).

(e) Argus as symbol of Od. The dog reflects the master in many respects: both used to be swift and strong; both are remarkable for their intelligence and, perhaps, tracking ability; common to both is the capacity to bide their time – the dog has waited twenty years for this moment – and degradation (Rose 1979: 221). The poet later returns to the dog/hero motif: the brooch that the hero describes to P. at 19.228–31 features a hound grasping a fawn, a possible anticipation of Od.'s vengeance on the suitors; Od.'s 'growling heart' is likened to a bitch growling at an intruder as she seeks to protect her puppies at 20.13–16. The Od./Argus affinity may have figured in a work called *περὶ τοῦ κυνός* by Antisthenes, the student of Gorgias and author of numerous essays on the *Od.*; see Richardson 1975: 201.

(f) The reunion between a long-absent hero and a faithful animal belongs to a more broadly-diffused motif in the IE oral tradition of the return song; in the Central Asian epic of Alpamysh, which parallels the *Od.* in many respects, an aged and decrepit

camel that has been lying inert without food or drink for seven years catches his returning master's scent and rises to greet him (for the Uzbek version of the story and translation, see Reichl 2001).

291 By contrast with the dogs of Eumaeus, who run at Od. barking furiously (14.30), Argus remains still and silent, only raising his head and pricking up his ears.

292–5 The narrator pauses to introduce several lines of background information, typically presented in ring composition form (so κείτ' Ἄργος at 300, a reprise of Ἄργος at 292); the device serves to postpone the actual moment of recognition, creating a minor instance of the delay typical in such scenes (see 18.158–303n); cf. the much more extended tale of the scar at 19.392–468 which similarly interrupts Eurycleia's reunion with her master.

292 Ἄργος: the only named dog in epic; the name is enjambed for additional prominence. The most appropriate translation is 'Flash' since the term similarly combines the two qualities that the adj. ἀργός describes: speed and brightness of appearance. (For the difference in accentuation between the adj. and noun, cf. φαίδρος and Φαῖδρος.) The cognate Sanskrit *rjā-*, a probable synonym for 'horse' in the *Rigveda*, can similarly mean 'shining' and 'swift'. While fleetness may easily prompt the notion of flashing brilliance, the term's two aspects remain independent in H.: oxen, normally regarded as lumbering, are regularly ἀργοί. Here speed seems uppermost in the poet's mind, perhaps with a deliberate play on the notion as both narrator and speakers repeatedly evoke the dog's present immobility or his earlier rapidity; so forms of κείσθαι occur three times in the first ten lines of the description (291, 296, 300) with the first and last instance (with pronounced κ alliteration in both phrases) forming a ring (see Peradotto 1990: 112). ὅν ῥά ποτ': a relative clause to describe an individual typically occurs when H. first introduces a character (see 18.1); also conventional is the establishment of contact between the new figure and another protagonist through a verb of seeing or perceiving; for these features, see Race 1993: 99–100, who comments of this encounter, 'one of the satisfying aspects of this passage is precisely its conventionality, applied with such surprising verisimilitude to a dog'. ῥά frequently occurs following ὅς or ὅν in such 'digressive' relative clauses that supply background biographical information (e.g., 1.30, 154, 2.225, 9.187, 14.449); the particle may serve in these instances to present to audiences individuals belonging to the epic past and to alert them to a character's share in the poet's κλέος–conferring medium (Bakker 1993: 20).

293 ἀπόνητο: 3 sing. aor. middle of ἀποίνημι, 'to give enjoyment', mid. 'to profit, derive enjoyment from'. The mention of the special bond between master and dog at the line's opening (θρέψε) makes the fact that Od. 'had no enjoyment of' the hound all the more poignant. The phrase is also used of Od.'s relations with Telemachus at 16.119–20; cf. 11.322–5, 21.35–8 for other examples of the motif.

295 ἀγροτέρας 'rather fierce'. The epithet, also applied to goats, bears and mules, properly means 'living in the wild'; cf. 6.133, 11.611. For the –τερος suffix, Arcado-Cypriot in origin, used to indicate a contrasted pair (ἀγροτέρος/ὄρεστερος), see Wace and Stubbings 1962: 113, Chantraine, *GH* I 257–8.

296 ἀπόθεστος: a hapax. The context indicates the meaning ‘neglected, uncared for’. In the view of the ancient lexicographers, an α–privative has been combined with an adj. derived from ποθέω, *πόθετος; also possible is a derivation from ἀπό + θέσσωσθαι (i.e. something ‘that one prays not to encounter’), but that meaning does not fit the present context. See too Call. *H.* 6.47 (πολύθεστε), Lyc. *Alex.* 540 and *Supp. Hellen.* 1066, which seem to assume the second derivation, and modern discussion in Leumann, *Wörter* 64–5, Chantraine, *DE* s.v. θέσσωσθαι.

297–9 κόπρωι . . . κοπρίσσοντες: a reminder of the importance of manure from draught-animals, which would have been spread on the fields, and an element typical of this book’s attention to the minutiae of agrarian life (see Introduction pp. 25–6). On the necessity of fertilizing fields, see Xen. *Oec.* 17.10, 18.2, 20.3–4, 10 and the κοπρολόγοι, ‘dung-collectors’, in fifth-century Athens, who would probably have sold what they collected to farmers in the countryside. κέχυτ’ ‘is heaped’, cf. Hdt. 1.22. ὄφρ’ ἄν ἀγοιεν: for this rare use of ὄφρα (‘until the time when’) with the optat. + ἄν following a main verb in the aor. or imperf., see Wace and Stubbings 1962: 172, Chantraine, *GH* II 263; contrast 18.133, where ὄφρα with subj. means ‘as long as’. τέμνωσ: used of the king’s domain at 6.293, with Garvie and Hainsworth’s notes, and at *Il.* 18.550 (on Achilles’ shield). The term, already found on the Pylos tablets (PY Er 312), probably designates ‘land cut out’ (from τέμνω/τάμνω; see *Il.* 6.194 and 20.184 for an etymologizing play) from the public domain and given to the local king by the community. Commentators identify it as a Near Eastern loan word, citing Akkadian *temenu*, and Sumerian *TEMEN*, ‘temple’, as is consistent with its later use to describe a sacred precinct reserved for a hero or god.

300 ἐνίπλειος κυνοραϊστέων ‘full of dog-destroyers’, i.e. vermin; the hapax resembles the Iliadic coinage θυμοραϊστής (e.g. *Il.* 13.544, 16.414). Stanford proposes that the poet deliberately avoids a simpler, but cruder word and devises a (parodic?) periphrasis suggested by φθειρ ‘louse’; ῥαίω is an epic synonym for φθειρώ, hence the use of the expression for the pests. On dog fleas, see Arist. *HA* 557a18 (οἱ καλούμενοι . . . κυνοραϊσταί, suggesting an artificial coinage), Pliny *NH* 11.116. The scholia record a debate over whether H. means fleas or ticks. Argus’ infestation more broadly promotes the motif of the misuse, neglect and depreciation of Od.’s prized possessions during his absence; cf. 21.395, where the hero fears that wormwood may have eaten away his bow.

301 ἐνόησεν: the sole instance in epic in which a term built about νόος refers to an animal. The line neatly recapitulates 296 in language (δὴ τότε) and metrical structure even as it underscores the difference in the situations described; the earlier line ended with a statement of Argus’ neglected condition ‘while his master was away’; now Odysseus is ‘close by’. ἐγγύς ἐόντα: × 6 in *Od.*, always at line end. For the short syllable in hiatus before the bucolic diaeresis (Ὀδυσσεῖά ἐγγύς), see Parry 1971: 211. In only one other line in the poem (6.212, with Garvie’s note) does the metre require an acc. of Od.’s name with the shape υ – – or υ – υ υ; one MS reads Ὀδυσσηῖ.

302 ἔσηνε: σάινω ‘fawn’, is, in its literal sense, reserved almost exclusively for dogs, used three times of the dog-like wild animals outside Circe’s dwelling, 10.214–19, and

again of Eumaeus' hounds greeting Telemachus (16.6). *κάββαλεν* = *κατέβαλεν*; a contracted aor.

303 *οἷο* 'his own', a note of additional pathos; cf. 18.8n.

304–5 *ρεῖα λαθῶν*: Od.'s ease in escaping Eumaeus' notice contrasts with Argus' acute perception. The presence of a third party from whom the recognition must be concealed anticipates the scene of Eurycleia's reunion with her master in book 19; there P. is the unknowing bystander. Russo comments on the several instances where Od. must hide tears elicited by painful memories and the strong emotions that these recollections cause (8.83–95, 521–34, 19.209–12; cf. Telemachus at 4.113–16):

306 *ἡ μάλα θαύμα* 'it's quite extraordinary that'.

307 *δέμας*: a term usually reserved for human (as opposed to divine or animal) bodies; the only animals to whom H. attributes a *δέμας* are Argus and Od.'s men transformed into swine (10.240). See further Clay 1974.

308 'used to be (*ἔσκε*) swift in running'; *ἐπί* 'in addition to'; cf. 454n.

309–10 *τραπεζῆς κύνες*: 'table dogs' appear at *Il.* 22.69, 23.173, but in contexts indicative of the differences between the two poems; at *Il.* 22.69, Priam imagines how his domesticated animals, turned savage, will lap his blood; at 23.173, Achilles kills two table dogs as a funeral offering to Patroclus. Some rare images from Corinthian vessels of the seventh and sixth centuries show dogs beneath the tables of heroes (Mainoldi 1984: 113); they would have formed part of the lifestyle of the elite and an element of the display of wealth that the dining hall included. Od.'s devaluation of these dogs is consistent with his assumed humble persona and forms part of the on-going critique of the luxuriant, parasitical and lazy existence of the 'urbanite' suitors. *ἀγλαΐης* recalls Melanthius' *ἀγλαΐας* (244n); like the goatherd, the dogs are divorced from productive activity and implicated in the suitors' profligate regime. Cf. Eumaeus' description of the youths who serve the suitors at dinner, 'well dressed in cloaks and tunics, always with sleek hair and fine faces' (15.331–2).

312 *καί λιν* always indicates an emphatically positive response to the preceding question or comment. With one exception (14.461), *λιν* occurs only in direct speech, perhaps because the term was too colloquial for the poet's narrative (Griffin 1986: 46).

313–15 An application of the common sentiment 'if he were such as he used to be' to the canine sphere, in keeping with the humanizing thrust of the whole episode; cf. 1.233–65, 14.468–505, 24.376–82; cf. *Il.* 4.341–6, 11.498–503. Here the poet combines the motif with a second frequent conceit, in which a speaker evokes an earlier (and happier) state of affairs prior to Od.'s departure for Troy (cf. 11.67–8, 448–9, 15.348, 16.288–90).

317 *δίωιτο*: opt. mid. of *δίω*. *περιήδη*: 3rd sing. plupf. of *περίοιδα* (perf. with present sense). The prefix has the meaning 'exceedingly, beyond others' (see Monro, *HD* 185).

318 *ἔχεται κακότητι* 'is in the grip of evil', a metaphor from wrestling; very similar expressions are used of Od. on several occasions; cf. 8.182 (*ἔχομαι κακότητι*), 18.123n. *ἄλλοθι πάτρης*, lit. 'elsewhere from his native land' = 'away from his country'. The

poet has combined two expressions used independently elsewhere, ἄλλοθι γαίης (2.131) and τηλόθι πάτρης (2.365).

319 An anticipation of the treatment Od. will receive at the maidservants' hands. ἀκηδέες 'uncaring' here (cf. *Il.* 21.123), but more usually 'uncared for'; the adj. is emotionally charged, confined to speeches in H. The care that wealthy individuals lavish on their lapdogs (κομέουσιν, 310) contrasts with the neglect of Argus (οὐ κομέουσι).

320–3 Argus' decrepit state prompts Eumaeus to general reflections on the behaviour and character of servants; his remarks offer a rare glimpse of archaic notions of master–slave relations before Aristotle's later and more theoretical treatment of the issue. Anticipating the philosopher on several points, Eumaeus assumes a lack of autonomy and subjectivity in the slave and his assumption of a 'servile' nature as a result of his condition (cf. *Arist. Pol.* 1255a3–55b15; 1260a33–36, cited with discussion in *Thalmann* 1998: 36). According to the swineherd, a man's place in the social hierarchy determines his character and moral worth, and downward mobility involves a corresponding decline in virtue. And yet there is a paradox insofar as the loyal and admirable but servile Eumaeus gives the lie to his statement here; despite his calamitous fall from fortune (see 15.415–83), he retains his native excellence (see *Edwards* 1993: 62–3).

321 ἐνασίμα: see 363n.

322–3 The lines were clearly very familiar to ancient readers (see *Pl. Laws* 777a and *Athen.* 6.18.264e, who read τε νόου ἀπαμείρεται . . . ἀνδρῶν, οὓς ἀν δῆ). δοῦλιον ἡμαρ 'day of slavery' (see 253n), an expression used at 14.340 (cf. *Il.* 6.463). The phrase always indicates a precipitous fall from prosperity to servitude.

324 δόμους: acc. of direction.

326 The terms used for the death of Argus resemble the formula that describes the death of several Iliadic warriors (ἔλλαβε πορφύρεος θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταιή, *Il.* 5.83, 16.334, 20.477), lending further nobility and heroic status to the figure. The dog's fate also recalls the end which Od. presaged for himself at 7.224–5, 'let life leave me, when I have once more seen my house'. In view of this earlier statement, Argus may be seen as a surrogate for his master, and his death is the necessary precondition for the hero's successful return; more darkly, his demise demonstrates the price that unmediated recognition of Od. can exact; in all other instances (Athena in book 13 naturally excepted) it is Od. who chiefly orchestrates and/or controls the moment of revelation. The motif of the death of an individual (more usually a parent) from the returned hero's innermost circle following his/her recognition of the long-lost protagonist also appears as a standard element in the Yugoslav tradition of heroic epic (*Lord* 1960: 177).

327 αὐτίκ' . . . ἔϊκοστῷ ἐνιαυτῷ: the phrase is constructed to achieve maximum poignancy. The instantaneous nature of the death announced at the line's start is juxtaposed with the length of the time that Argus has waited for his master. A mention of Od.'s return in the twentieth year, presented in very abbreviated form here, appears in all the recognition scenes (16.206, 19.484, 21.208, 23.102 = 170, and

24.322). For the line end, cf. 2.175, 16.18, Hes. *WD* 386; in all these instances hiatus, frequent in this position in epic, is observed. The poet does not record whether Od. witnesses the dog's end.

328–491

The disguised Od. enters the hall following Eumaeus and, after receiving food from Telemachus, begins, at Telemachus' prompting, to beg from the suitors. Antinous objects to the beggar's presence and provokes rejoinders from both Eumaeus and Telemachus. Following a hostile exchange between Antinous and Od., the suitor throws a footstool at the hero, an action criticized by his fellow diners.

328 Τηλέμαχος θεοειδής: one of the four noun-epithet formulas used of Telemachus in the nominative, and the only v-terminal proper name + epithet combination available (× 5; cf. 391). Except for the gender of the person perceived, this line recapitulates the phrase used when the poet first introduces Telemachus as he catches sight of 'Mentes', the disguised Athena (1.113). There the epithet θεοειδής may indicate the youth's heroic potential, still to be realized in the first book. Martin 1993: 229–34 suggests a contrast between Telemachus's flustered reception of his guest and the outpouring of speech on that earlier occasion with his controlled and purposeful behaviour here; this reading assumes some kind of 'maturation' in the figure of Telemachus as a result of his travels (see Introduction p. 29).

330 δίφρον: social protocol is strictly observed; this type of chair, used by Eumaeus, Philoetius, Dolius, P. and by the suitors as they attempt to string the bow, is, unlike the θρόνος and κλισμός, also suited to low-class characters. In keeping with its more modest character (a four-legged stool that could, as Eumaeus' action here indicates, be carried from place to place), it has a set of less grand epithets than other seats and is never covered by anything but a fleece. Od., still disguised, sits on a δίφρος (cf. 19.97, 101, 506, 20.259, 21.243). The swineherd's need to borrow the carver's seat suggests a paucity of furniture more appropriate to a humble house than to an elite dwelling; cf. 6.303–9, where Arete seems also to lack a seat, and Introduction pp. 12–13.

331 ἐνθα τε: τε serves its common 'characterizing' or 'generalizing' function, indicating the fundamental property of an object: 'where the carver regularly sat'. For this, see Chantraine, *GH* II 239–41, Denniston, *GP* 520–3.

332 δαιόμενος . . . δαινυμένοισι: the two similar terms frame the sentence. The root δαι- common to both signifies division and hence the act of sharing food and communal dining (cf. δαίς, the feast where each diner has his share); the emphasis consequently falls not on consuming the meal, but on the fact of distribution (see Saïd 1979: 15–16).

334 Eumaeus' seating position signals his loyalty to Telemachus just as Melanthius' did his allegiance to Eurymachus at 257.

336–58 This is the last and most significant (and hence most extended) in the rapid sequence of three entrances or 'arrival scenes' (Melanthius, Eumaeus, Od.).

336 ἔδύσετο: a so-called ‘mixed’ aorist, combining the –σ– of the first aor. with second aor. endings. This epic formation is confined to a few verbs, chiefly δύομαι, βαίνω and their compounds. Ancient grammarians suggested that the type was an imperfect, but it was more probably a secondary tense of the future in origin; see Chantraine, *GH* I 416–17, Prince 1970, Roth 1974.

337–8 = 202–3. Some modern editors delete the lines on the grounds of repetition. However, by re-describing the elements of Odysseus’ disguise here, the poet not only slows the action so as to focus audience attention on this critical entrance (see next note), but also indicates the fact of the hero’s displacement from the identity that he should properly enjoy as master of his home; see too 197–203n.

339–41 ‘The poet frames [Od.] visually in the door of his palace’ (Tracy 1997: 364); the subsequent accumulation of details concerning the site allows H. momentarily to ‘freeze’ the action at this charged moment of crossing the threshold.

339 Ἰζε δ’ ἐπὶ μελίνου οὐδοῦ: Od. adopts a sitting position, indicative of his helpless, defensive and/or submissive role; cf. 14.31, confronted with Eumaeus’ watchdogs, and 18.395–6, following Eurymachus’ assault. Normally in arrival scenes a stranger stands by the door until led in by a resident. The discrepancy between the wooden threshold here and the stone threshold at 30 would not trouble ancient audiences; metrical considerations may determine the shift. Thresholds in the *Od.* are significant and strategic sites, regularly occupied by suppliants and strangers on their first arrival. Od.’s present ‘liminality’ is social as well as physical; occupying the beggar’s spot and the position associated with the weak, he is both marginal to the society to which he rightfully belongs and on the point of effecting a transition back to his proper identity. Od. appears at the threshold again at 413, 466 and 18.110n. For thresholds in the *Od.*, see Segal 1967: 337–40, Goldhill 1988: 10–11, Kullmann 1992: 308–10 and Reece 1993: 15–16; for the source of its symbolic power, see Hes. *Th.* 749 with West’s note.

340 The pillar similarly figures in the arrival/hospitality scene at 10.62.

340–1 ~ 21.43–4 (identical except for the first hemistich); cf. 5.245, 21.121, 23.197; all the passages include a mention of the στάθμη and the verb ἰθύνω. ξέσσειν ἐπισταμένως ‘smoothed skilfully’. Alcinous earlier used the adverb when praising Od. for ‘skilfully’ telling his tale (11.368; cf. Hes. *WD* 107); its application to both contexts signals the affinity between verbal artists and carpenters (cf. 384–5n). ἐπὶ στάθμην ‘along the line’; only here does the στάθμη function as a plumb-line-like tool for checking the vertical alignment of the door-jamb. Elsewhere it serves more as a type of ruler for verifying that objects are horizontally aligned (so the raft planks at 5.245, the axes at 21.121 and the bed planks at 23.197).

343 ἄρτον τ’ οὔλον: the first term, found only here and at 18.120, may refer to an inferior type of cereal food, in distinction to the ἀλφίτα (barley-groats) and σίτος (food made from grain) that Homeric heroes eat on other occasions; cf. Hippon. 115.8 W, δούλιον ἄρτον ἔδων. But in later sources this wheaten bread carries ‘top rank’ status (cf. the proverb cited in Zenob. 1.12, ‘next to ἄρτος, barley cake is good too’, with discussion in Braun 1995). οὔλος ‘whole’ (the Ionic form of the Attic ὅλος), from *ὄλφος, occurs again at 24.118 and *H. H. Merc.* 137.

344 χεῖρες . . . ἀμφιβαλόντι ‘as much as his hands could contain as he placed them around (it)’; the active participle means ‘throwing (one’s arms) around’; cf. 23.192. ὧς is equivalent to ὅσα here.

345 δός: through the repetition of the verb at 350 and 400, the poet highlights Telemachus’ fulfilment of his obligations as host and his display of a generosity which contrasts with Antinous’ subsequent denial of Od.’s request that he also ‘give’ (cf. 415, 417, 455).

345–7 ~ 350–2 The speech reported by Eumaeus repeats Telemachus’ words in *oratio obliqua*, a technique very common in H. and probably a hallmark of oral composition. In the second instance, however, the speaker replaces the subjective and humiliating term *κεχρημένωι* with the more neutral *προϊκτιη*.

347 Hes. *WD* 317–19 is clearly the source of the v.l. *κομίζειν* and offers much the same sentiment (αἰδῶς δ’ οὐκ ἀγαθὴ κεχρημένον ἄνδρα κομίζει, | αἰδῶς, ἦ τ’ ἄνδρας μέγα σίνεται ἡδ’ ὀνίησιν’ | αἰδῶς τοι πρὸς ἀνολβίηι, θάρσος δὲ πρὸς ὀλβωι). The parallels suggest a proverbial expression, a likelihood reinforced by the phrase’s appearance at the speech’s end (see further 578n).

354–5 μοι: a dative following an implied *εὔχομαι* or *δός*. μοι could additionally function as a possessive dative meaning ‘my Telemachus’; this would create a nice double-entendre (see A–H–C). Wishes for the future expressed by an infinitive with acc. subject occur on several occasions in H.; see 7.313, 24.380 and Goodwin, *MT* 785.

356 ἀφοπτήρησιον: sc. χερσί. Ellipse of words for body parts which go in pairs, particularly hands, is frequent in H. (see 18.28n, 11.594); Hellenistic poets imitate the mannerism (e.g. A. R. 1.472, 3.146, Theocr. *Id.* 7.157, 10. 35, with Gow’s note, 22.96).

356–66 The poet achieves a split perspective that echoes the doubleness of the disguised hero. Viewed from without, Od. is a beggar, performing all the gestures that go with that condition. But the gloss that the narrator places on the hero’s behaviour reminds the audience that he is role-playing, and that he has an ulterior purpose in ‘acting’ thus (see Introduction p. 20).

356–7 Again the poet includes a finely calculated detail indicative of Od.’s degradation and the perversion of proper standards of hospitality: the beggar is forced to use his unseemly satchel by way of the usual folding table with which each guest would be equipped. *ἀικελίης*: the adj. carries the same force as *ἀικῆς*, used previously for the wallet; see 197–8n. At 20.259, Od. does eat from a table, but the object is qualified by the term *δλίγην*; in practice, such portable tables may have been quite ornate and even decorated (see Laser 1968: 56–68).

358 ἦσθι: the imperf. form of the verb regularly appears in v-initial position in H.; see 1.9, 9.292; cf. Hes. *WD* 147. ἦσος: editors restore this unattested Ionic form for the Attic *ἔως* where the metre requires it, although the MSS and papyri regularly have *ἔως* or *εἰως*; since the ‘quantitative metathesis’ visible here (the process whereby juxtaposed vowels exchange quantities, so that, for example, trochaic ηο becomes iambic εω) probably entered epic diction shortly before H., the poet may have used both forms; see further Hoekstra 1965: 35, West 1967. ἐνι μεγάροισιν: an initial λ, μ, ν, ρ, or σ can cause the lengthening of the preceding short vowel. By juxtaposing

Od. eating his beggar's scraps with the bard singing for the suitors' delectation, the poet brings out the pathos of his hero's situation; in H., the presentation of two simultaneous but contrasted activities can heighten the emotional impact of a scene or create tension (e.g. 10.447–50, 12.244–6).

359 Aristarchus athetized this verse, according to the scholia, because it seemed to contain something 'ridiculous' (διὰ τὸ γελοῖον), presumably what the Hellenistic editor understood as the causal relation between two independent actions: Phemius stopped singing *because* the beggar had finished his meal (note the pluperfect). But as Monro points out, the actual apodosis only appears in the next line (μνηστῆρες δ' ὁμάδησαν).

360–4 Athena's incitement of Od. to 'test' the suitors belongs to the theoxeny motif (see 484–7n and Introduction pp. 18–19). Her role also involves an instance of 'double motivation' insofar as Telemachus has already urged Od. to perform the act that she now instigates (345–6), but without the underlying aim that the goddess gives to it at 363–4. The modification distinguishes the divine from the mortal perspective: gods are able to endow human actions with a significance and moral dimension hidden to the mortal agents. For the 'testing' motif, frequently found in conjunction with hospitality given or denied, see 14.459, 15.304–5, 16.304–5. The poem repeatedly integrates questions of just and unjust behaviour into the context of the feast, the site at which individuals, by virtue of their respect for or violation of the conventions determining the distribution of food, display their moral standing (Saïd 1979: 30).

363 'which of them observed moderation, and which were lawless'. The first adj. is derived from ἐν and αἴσα, 'in accordance with the appropriate order' (cf. 5.190, 7.299, 18.220n and Dietrich 1965: 258–60); it regularly denotes orderly conduct as contrasted with 'emotional excess and unruliness' (Clarke 1999: 88 n. 69). ἀθέμιστοι: a very strong expression used by Od. of the Cyclopes at 9.106; cf. 9.189. The adj. appears only in passages of direct speech or where the narrator expresses the perceptions, thoughts or interpretations of characters; cf. 18.141.

364 P. Hibeh 194 (3rd cent. AD) omits the line, also marked as doubtful in another papyrus from the early first century AD. S. West 1967: 267–70 suggests an interpolation based on 5.379, but grounds for deletion are weak: the poet regularly notes Athena's intention of destroying all the suitors (see esp. 18.155–6n). To some extent this divine 'masterplan' forestalls objections an audience might raise against the hero's final act of vengeance: why must all the suitors die when the guilt seems imperfectly distributed (see particularly the 'good' Amphinomus)? But all have participated in the violations that the term ἀθέμιστοι implies and the suitors are as much the victims of the gods (as the theoxeny motif dictates) as of Od. (see Introduction pp. 18–19). οὐδ' . . . ἔμελλ' 'she was not about to'. Athena is the subject. τιν' . . . ἀπαλεξήσειν κακότητος 'protect any (of them) from evil'; the verb's prefix explains the unusual syntax with the acc. of the person and the gen. of the thing warded off; the variant κακότατα depends on taking τιν' as τινι.

365–6 ἐνδέξια: from left to right, the lucky direction and the direction in which wine, toasts and poetry circulate at the later symposium; so too the direction in which

the suitors will try to string the bow (21.141). The poet invites us to consider Od.'s act of impersonation, offering a reminder that the hero is role-playing even as his mimicry seems so perfect that a viewer could not discern the artifice involved (see Introduction p. 20). With the term *πάλασι*, H. may recall an earlier occasion when Od. played the beggar so as to infiltrate Troy (4.244–50). Athena's part in his conduct adds a fresh level of complication. While Od. is made complicit in the act of 'testing', it is not apparent from *ᾠτρυν'* whether or not he is aware of the divinity orchestrating his actions.

367 *ἑθάμβεον* suggests the surprisingly powerful impression that the beggar makes on the suitors. On other occasions, individuals experience *θάμβος* when they suspect a divine presence (cf. 1.323, 3.372–3, 16.178–9, Telemachus' wonder and awe at Od.'s transformed appearance) or on unexpectedly meeting Od. (10.63, 24.394); cf. 18.71n; both contexts are apposite here. For *θάμβος* and equivalent reactions to epiphanies in the *Homeric Hymns*, see Richardson on *H. H. Cer.* 188–90.

368 *τίς . . . ἔλθοι*: for this use of the optative in indirect questions equivalent to an indicative in direct speech, see Chantraine, *GH II* 224 with further (uniquely Odyssean) examples. Here the interrogation offers a condensed version of the standard question (*τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἦδὲ τοκῆες*, e.g. 1.170, 10.325) used in full or partial hospitality scenes and that may properly be asked of the guest only after he has been fed. Unusually, the conventional query is addressed not to the stranger but framed as an indirect question that the suitors exchange among themselves, perhaps a reflection of their misguided sense of the unbridgeable social gap between themselves and the beggar.

370 *κέκλυτέ μιν*: a perf. imperative; on the form see Wyatt 1969: 211. The expression is formulaic (*Il.* × 9, *Od.* × 10; e.g. 18.43); cf. Hes. *Th.* 644.

372 *ἦ τοι μὲν* regularly marks emphatic and/or earnest statements (see Denniston, *GP* 389). Melanthius is eager to cast the blame on his opposite number.

373 *πόθεν γένος*: the term *γένος* can indicate a place of birth, but just as frequently refers to paternity and line of descent. If it carries the second meaning here, Melanthius' reply would involve the unwitting ascription of elite status to Od. (cf. 4.62–4 and Edwards 1993: 43, 'in general Homer regards *γένος* as the very vehicle of the ethical and physical excellence of the *ἄριστοι*). *εὔχεται*, lit. 'assert loudly, say proudly' (thence 'boast' or 'vow'), but here simply 'claim', a usage already found in Mycenaean (PY Eb 297 and Ep 704). The expression is typical in heroes' genealogical self-identifications. On *εὔχομαι* in H., see Adkins 1969, Muellner 1976.

375–9 Antinous, 'anti-mind' and arch-villain among the suitors, is frequently cast as the ring-leader among the group. It is he who initiates the plot against Telemachus (4.660–72) and he remains throughout the most shameless, rough-tongued and impudent of the suitors. Appropriately he will be the first to be dispatched by Od.'s bow (22.8). His name belongs together with many other 'speaking names' in the *Od.* that are determined by a character's personality and function (see von Kamptz 1982; Peradotto 1990: 135–8 gathers cross-cultural evidence for parents bestowing seemingly pejorative or inauspicious names on their offspring). A variety of metrical and

acoustical devices contribute to the harsh tone of Antinous' words, among them synizesis at 375 and 376, assonance (e.g. 376) and hyperbole (377). An unusual amount of synizesis may be typical of angry and abusive addresses; cf. Thersites' speech at *Il.* 2.225–42, with Martin 1989: 111–13. As Martin remarks, Thersites' words would sound slurred; the same may be true of Antinous' delivery here.

377 For the echo of Melanthius' words, see 220n.

378–9 *ἄνοσαι ὅτι* 'complain that', i.e. 'don't you think it's bad enough that'. *βίστον κατέδουσιν*: heavily ironic, as Antinous echoes the charge repeatedly levelled against him and his fellow diners (e.g. 1.160, 2.237–8, 4.318, 16.431, 18.280, 19.159). Metaphoric 'eating up' of property (usually one's own) becomes a commonplace in later Greek and Latin poetry and prose, particularly in invective contexts; cf. Hippon. 26.3–4 W (*δαινύμενος ὡσπερ Λαμψακηνὸς εὐνοῦχος | κατέφαγε δὴ τὸν κληῖρον*), *Ar. Eq.* 258, *Aeschin.* 1.94, 96, *Men.* 303, 287 (Körte), *Call. H.* 3.125. *H.* 6.102–15, *Juv.* 1.137–8, 11.39–40, *Petron. Sat.* 141. *πρὸς* 'in addition, as well'; cf. *Il.* 16.504, where the MSS and Aristarchus also read the unmetrical *πρὸς*.

382–5 are cited, evidently from memory, at *Arist. Pol.* 1338a25.

383–5 Here Eumaeus lists four categories of *δημοεργοί*, lit. 'those who work for/among the people'. At 19.135 heralds are included in the group. Two principal questions turn about these 'public workers': what set them apart from other groups, and what social status did they occupy in archaic Greece? Eumaeus' formulation at 382 ('for who goes abroad and calls another, a *stranger, from elsewhere*') goes some way to answering the first issue: in a society where most individuals belonged to a specific community and an *οἶκος* within it, what distinguished *δημοεργοί* was their itinerancy and/or migrant status, combined with the possession of a specialized skill. Archaeological and linguistic evidence indicates the presence of skilled eastern craftsmen (chiefly metalworkers) in Greek cities from the end of the ninth century on, migrants from Assyria, Egypt, Lydia and elsewhere. There was internal migration too: in early sixth-century Athens, Solon encouraged craftsmen 'to take up residence [in Athens] for the purpose of trade' (*μετοικιζόμενοις ἐπὶ τέχνῃ*. *Plut. Solon* 24.2). The seers and doctors (individuals with overlapping functions) named by Eumaeus were also among the foreign itinerants, responsible, like the craftsmen, for introducing new practices and skills among the Greeks. Archaic and classical sources additionally record the transient status of many doctors and seers from different parts of the Greek world, whether the Locrian Onomacritus, his pupil Thales of Gortyn, or the Cretan Epimenides; with good reason Empedocles, the self-styled seer and healer (B 112 DK), describes himself as a 'wanderer' (B 115.13 DK). Singers, Eumaeus' final category, also belonged to this group of itinerants (see next note). For further discussion, see Burkert 1992; for Near Eastern craftsmen, Morris 1992. The position of these individuals in the social hierarchy was most probably 'floating'; seers and physicians might be members of the elite, frequently presenting themselves as part of family groups that traced their ancestry back to heroic times; craftsmen occupied a much lower social rung. However, the value accorded to the skills that some of these artisans possessed, combined with their 'special' outsider status, explains the ambivalence with which

they were regarded, also visible in myths about the powers of their divine and fantastical counterparts, Hephaestus and Daedalus. For further discussion, see Finley 1978: 36–7, 56, 72–3, Murray 1980: 57, Frontisi-Ducroux 1975.

The context of Eumaeus' remark may account for the four professions singled out (although the absence of metalworkers remains surprising). While seers and doctors form a natural doublet, and were perhaps most prominent among the itinerants, carpenters and singers have particular relevance to *Od.*, whose boat-building skills the poem described in book 5, and whose affinity to the *αοιδός* H. signals on a number of occasions (see 518–21n and Introduction p. 21). The remark may also convey Eumaeus' sense that this stranger is no mere beggar, but enjoys a loftier status.

385 Eumaeus devotes an entire line to the singer, reserving special elaboration and 'top' position for this final craft (a piece of self-promotion on the performing poet's part?; cf. Hes. *WD* 25–6, also a list of four, with the singer named last). *θέσπιν αοιδόν*: the epithet 'divinely inspired', a shortened form of *θεσπέσιος* (see 63n), is found only in this formula and combined with *αοιδήν* at 1.328 and 8.498; cf. the name of the sixth-century Thespis, supposedly the first Attic tragedian.

Eumaeus' comment is – with the exception of the brief description of the singer Thamyris, whom the Muses 'met... as he was journeying from Oechalia' (*Il.* 2.594–6) – the only evidence in H. for the 'travelling' status of the bard, although itinerancy became common in later times when composers and rhapsodes would move from place to place: see the opening of the pseudo-Homeric *Margites* (ἦλθέ τις ἐξ Κολοφῶνα γέρων καὶ θεῖος αοιδός), the traditions surrounding figures such as Arion and Ibycus, and the self-description of the poet of the *H. H. Ap.* who will propagate the Delian maidens' fame on his poetic round (κλέος οἴσομεν ὄσσον ἐπ' αἶψα | ἀνθρώπων στρεφόμεσθα πόλεις, 174–5). A lifetime of peregrinations also features in several of the *Lives* traditions concerning Homer, works from the Roman and early Byzantine period which preserve material dating back to the sixth century (see West 2003b: 296–317). The *Certamen* reports that 'H. went around (περιέρχεσθαι) from town to town reciting' (5); the detailed pseudo-Herodotean *Life* traces the poet's visits to numerous Greek communities in search of livelihood, as well as his travels at sea, which he undertook in order, Odysseus-like, to see 'countries and cities' (6). On poetic itinerancy, see Svenbro 1976: 169–70, West 2003b and Hunter and Rutherford 2009.

More typical of the *αοιδός* portrayed elsewhere in the *Od.* is a longer-lasting association between a poet and an elite household: so Phemius, the bard in *Od.*'s palace, Alcinoos' 'court poet' Demodocus (although with a name, 'welcomed by the people', that suggests a more public role; see Garvie at 8.62–82) and the *αοιδός* at 3.267–8. The discrepancy between Eumaeus' account and this more standard picture probably results from the poem's characteristic blend of fantasy, contemporary reality and fossilized practices from Mycenaean times (these preserved in the poet's traditional diction and repertoire), an amalgam that must also serve the *Od.*'s themes. Mycenaean palace arrangements might have included a poet attached to the court, although evidence for this is lacking, while in eighth-century Greece itinerancy would

be the norm. The bard's changed position could account for a tension discernible in the *Od.* between poetry as a 'gift' given by the Muses and transmitted by the *αοιδός* to his audience in return for hospitality (a 'gift-exchange' model), and poetry as a commodity for which remuneration in the form of goods is expected (as occurs in the 'exchanges' between *Od.* as storyteller and Eumaeus in book 14). The portrait of Demodocus also coincides with the distinction between the idealized Phaeacian society with its venerated bard and the harsher reality of life in Ithaca, for which Eumaeus, who works to earn his keep, serves as appropriate spokesman. For additional discussion, see Introduction pp. 12–13, Kirk 1962: 278–9, Segal 1984: 145–57, von Reden 1995b, Dougherty 2001: 50–60.

386 κλητοί: on the distinction between the 'summoned' and 'unsummoned' individual (the *ἀκλητος* in the context of a feast), see 18.1–110n. *ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γασάν:* × 5 *Od.*, × 2 *Il.*, often at the line's end. See 418 for a modification of the expression.

387 τρύξοντα ἑ αὐτόν 'to bring waste on himself'; the fut. participle expresses purpose. *τρύχω* frequently describes the suitors' activity in *Od.*'s house (e.g. 1.248, 16.125, 19.133); cf. the pointed use of the term at Solon 4.21–2 W, in an account of destruction inflicted by (elite) citizens on their community: *ἐκ γὰρ δυσμενέων ταχέως πολυήρατον ἄστν | τρύχεται ἐν συνόδοις τοῖς ἀδικέουσι φίλαις.* The parsimonious and hard-working Eumaeus exhibits his characteristic dismay at the dissipation of *Od.*'s property (cf. 14.80–108) while neatly picking up the charge made by Antinous at 378–9. For this 'catch-word' technique, see de Jong 2001: xii.

388 Typical of the diction of reproaches and quarrels in H. is the accusation that Antinous is 'always' (*αἰεῖ*) the harshest of the suitors; cf. 394. *περὶ* 'beyond all others'. For this use of the preposition + gen. to express superiority, see Chantraine, *GH* II 129. In the next line *περὶ* is used adverbially, 'especially'. *εἰς* 'you are', the less common Ionic form of *εἶ*, the 2nd pers. sing. of *εἶναι*; this is the only instance in which the form occurs before a consonant (Chantraine, *GH* I 286, 469).

390 οὐκ ἀλέγω: sc. σοῦ. μοι: a common use of the dat. in H. to express the person principally affected or interested.

393 μοι: ethical dative. *ἀμείβομαι* takes the acc. of the person replied to.

397 μεν . . . ὧς κήδεαι 'you care for me as a father for his son'. Telemachus' sarcastic deployment of the father–son analogy is particularly loaded in the light of his earlier acknowledgments of the genuinely paternal conduct of *Mentes* (1.308) and of *Nestor* (111–12n) towards him. For the first time the comparison is drawn in the presence of Telemachus's actual father.

398 διεσθαι: infinitive of *διέμναι*, 'chase, drive away'.

400 οὐ . . . φθονέω 'I do not mind, object to'. Stanford notes the 'staccato rhythm' of Telemachus' words, indicative of the speaker's rising anger, made explicit at 403–4.

401–2 μήτ' οὖν μητέρ' . . . τό γε μήτε τιν' ἄλλον | δμῶν 'don't fear to offend my mother in that respect (τό γε) nor any other of the servants'. τό γε refers to the matter of giving. The ἄλλον is curious; either the poet has recourse to a common turn of phrase without considering its non-applicability here, or Telemachus, with harsh irony, equates P. with 'the other servants', thereby suggesting that Antinous treats them on a par. Several MSS omit 402 (= 18.417, 20.298, 325), which makes the

sense easier. **ἄζει**: **ἄζομαι**, from the root **ἀγ-**, ‘holy’, regularly refers to the deference or pious dread shown to gods or venerated individuals (cf. 9.200, 478, *Il.* 1.21, 5.434) and so contributes to the youth’s bitter tone.

402 of: in this nominal phrase, the verb ‘are’ or ‘live’ is implied. For a possible play on the similar sounding, and perhaps related terms **δμῶν** and **δῶματα**, see Garvie on 7.103 and 34n.

404 πολὺ βούλεια ‘you far prefer’. Telemachus has excellent grounds for making this charge; unlike Antinous, he practises the reciprocal hospitality (**δαΐτας ἔϊσας** | **δαίνυται**, 11.185–6) that the suitor manifestly fails to observe.

406 ὑπαγόρη: the adj. is used uniquely by Antinous of Telemachus (1.385, 2.85, 303).

407–8 ‘if all the suitors would offer him as much as this, the house would keep him off (with enough food) for three months’. A deliberately ambiguous and sarcastic statement; the verbs **ἔργω** and **ἔρύκω**, here used with negative force, could refer to positive acts of hospitality (giving gifts and detaining a guest with good intent); **τόσσον** will very shortly be seen to describe the stool with which Antinous threatens Od. at 409.

409 ὑπέφηνε τραπέζης ‘he showed it from under the table’.

410 ὧι β’ ἔπεχεν λιπαροῦς πόδας εἰλαπινάζων: a phrase indicative of the suitors’ luxurious and idle lifestyle (see *Il.* 14.241, Hera’s promise of a lavish chair and footstool to Sleep, for the same terms). The participle situates the footstool, which will become a missile, in the context of the feast; if Od. later transforms the suitors’ banquet into a battleground (see Introduction p. 18), Antinous is guilty of being the first to bring together the antithetical spheres – dining and assault and battery with the feast’s accoutrements; see 470–3n.

413 προικός ‘with impunity, *gratis*’; later sources use the acc. **προϊκα** for the adverbial form. **γεύσεσθαι**: in H. the verb always has its figurative meaning, ‘make trial of’, rather than lit. ‘taste’; the metaphor is particularly apt for the constantly feasting suitors.

415 φίλος: for **φίλος** as voc., cf. 1.301, 3.199, 8.413 etc.; the relations of **ξενία** between the households of Od. and Antinous make the mode of address entirely suitable (see 16.424–30).

416 ὄριστος: this crasis of **ὁ ἄριστος**, frequent in the *Il.*, occurs only here in the *Od.* The term **ἄριστοι** appears frequently in association with the suitors (e.g. 1.245, 16.122, 251, 21.187, 22.224); it is not a class designation, but simply distinguishes ‘the best’ of a social group; see further 18.289n. The remainder of Od.’s ironic characterization, ‘you look like a **βασιλεύς**’, taunts Antinous with the position that he aspires to, but whose standards of behaviour and obligations he fails to fulfil. The suitors are also styled **βασιλῆες**, local lords or paramount chiefs, on several occasions (cf. 18.64–5n; see too 1.394, where the noun applies to all the candidates for the ‘kingship’ in Ithaca, and 24.179), but never in unequivocal fashion: the suitors are not yet **βασιλῆες**, nor, if they continue on their present course, will they ever attain a rank that involves both social standing and the observance of elite standards of behaviour (Scheid-Tissinier

1993: 19). For the imprecise meaning of βασιλεύς in H. and the political situation the poet imagines for Ithaca, see Carlier 1984, Halverson 1985, and Introduction p. 25.

417 λώϊον ‘better’; this comparative form, of unknown etymology, appears only in the neuter in H.

418 σίτου: partitive genitive. κλέω: for the only other uses of the verb in the active sense, see 1.338 (of Phemius’ song), Hes. *Th.* 105; Chantraine, *GH* 1 346–7 assumes metrical lengthening of a primary form κλέω, derived from the root *klu-; for other explanations, see Wyatt 1969: 128–9. Typical of the *Od.*’s promotion of the institution of hospitality, a host’s kindly welcome and the largesse that he bestows on his guest become a source of renown (see 19.332–4; note too 14.402–5). Also consistent with the poem’s themes, the speaker, styling himself a propagator of κλέος, aligns himself with the bardic role already suggested by Eumaeus. The quid pro quo that *Od.* announces here fits that professional identity: in return for celebrating an individual, the archaic and early classical poet expects a reciprocal gift, frequently in the form of the diffusion of his own renown. For this, see 8.496–8 and *H. H. Ap.* 166–75: the Delian maidens will bestow praise on the Chian poet’s songs, while he will declare their fame on his poetic circuit (see 385n for citation). Like the peripatetic Chian after him, *Od.* here reminds Antinous of his powers of propagation (cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 4.298–9).

On other counts *Od.*’s formulation of the relationship between laudator and subject strikingly departs from the conventions visible in these other transactions: (a) the celebrant atypically requires remuneration before he performs his praise (contrast 11.355–74). (b) the return that *Od.* seeks takes the form not of κλέος or the goods that figure in aristocratic gift relations, but σίτος. This demand not only reduces the exchange to the base material register, but goes against the archaic and later view that those concerned with filling their bellies are excluded from the singer/celebrant’s role (so Hes. *Th.* 26 with Svenbro 1976: 50–9; see too his discussion of *Od.* 7.217–21), or are performers of blame rather than praise poetry (see Nagy 1979: 224–31 for the conjunction of ravenous hunger and blame, and Hippon. fr. 39 W, a petition for food). The changes that *Od.* rings on the usual poetic relationship doubly undermine his offer of κλέος. Poets who sing to eat are prone to be mendacious and/or lack the objectivity that makes for genuine praise; inapposite too is the thinly veiled threat that *Od.*’s words contain: the singer deprived of food may change his tune, defaming rather than praising. The ps.-Herodotean *Vita* realizes the scenario insinuated here: in the face of the Cymaeans’ refusal to nourish him at public expense in return for making their city επικλεστέρα, ‘Homer’ lays a curse on Cyme to the effect that the city might never produce a poet (12–15). For this incident, and cross-cultural examples of singers who substitute calumny for praise in the face of ungenerous hosts, see Martin 2009.

419–44 One among the sequence of lying tales that *Od.* devises through the course of books 13–24 (13.256–86, 14.199–359, 19.172–202, 24.303–14; see too 18.138–40n and Introduction pp. 20–1), and a shortened version of the story told to Eumaeus at 14.199–359 (exact repetition at 427–41 = 14.258–72). That story itself borrowed material from *Od.*’s account of his Ciconian adventure at 9.39–61 before the Phaeacians (see

Emlyn-Jones 1986: 5–8 for the correspondences). The abridgment and redeployment of narrative patterns and motifs used on these previous occasions allow us to see an oral poet at work; he can expand or contract his material at will and alter it to suit a particular audience and the message/moral he wishes to convey. For further discussion, see Emlyn-Jones 1986, Goldhill 1991: 43–4, Clayton 2004: 68–70.

419–24 = 19.75–80. In book 19 the words preface a rebuke addressed to Melanthe, who is warned that just as the speaker lost his prosperity so she may lose her good looks. Here they serve a similar minatory purpose insofar as they caution the listener against the instability of good fortune while also introducing a tale recounting how ὕβρις provokes divine retribution. The emphasis on the speaker's former liberality to wanderers (420) is one of the modifications to the story told to Eumaeus and obviously calculated to suit the audience and context.

419 **καὶ γάρ**: the combined particles signal the paradigmatic, generalizing force of the story; cf. 18.138 and 19.75.

420–1 'frequently I would give to a wanderer such (as I am now), whatever he might be like and whatever he might come in need of'. **ἔοι**: 3 sing. pres. opt. of εἶμι. **ἔτευ** = οὐτινος. **δόσκον**: the frequentative form of the verb emphasizes the repeated nature of the speaker's generosity.

422 **ἦσαν**: sc. ἐμοί, 'I had'.

423 **οἴσιν**: a subject, 'men (in general)', is implied.

424–6 In the previous account (14.245–7), the Egyptian venture had been the narrator's idea, although Zeus was named as responsible for other bad courses of action (235, 243).

424 **ἦθελε γάρ που** 'for so, I suppose, he willed it'; **που** is often used in the context of strongly-held but non-demonstrable suppositions about the nature of divine power; cf. Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 182–3.

425–6 **ἀνήκεν** 'incited'; also used of a divinity impelling a mortal to commit a foolhardy action at *Il.* 5.405. The storyteller passes directly to the expedition to Egypt, omitting all the details of his former life included in the version that Eumaeus heard. Zeus' role here makes Od.'s point: divine power works in an arbitrary and unpredictable fashion, and if even so liberal a host suffers at the will of the gods, what might divinities do to the individual who gratuitously neglects his social/religious obligations to wanderers? **δολιχὴν ὄδον**: the noun is a cognate acc.; cf. 3.316. For an echo of the phrase, with equally negative associations, see A. R. 3.602.

427–41 This section of the story is clearly modelled on the tale of the raid against the Ciconians (9.39–61). However, the 'performer' tells his tale very differently, endowing it with a moralizing tone absent from the more neutral account before the Phaeacians; see 431, 432–4, 437–8nn.

427 **σῆσα . . . νέας** 'I brought my ships to anchor'. **Αἰγύπτωι ποταμῶι**: H. regularly uses this expression for the Nile; cf. 4.477, 581. In antiquity, local rivers or springs regularly gave their names to the larger community; see too Hecataeus *FGH Hist* 1 F 310, where Egypt is called a 'gift of the Nile'. The name **Νεῖλος** first appears at Hes. *Th.* 338 (see A. R. 4.269 for the river's supposedly older name Triton). **ἀμφιέλισσας**:

commentators propose three possible meanings for this epithet used regularly of ships at line-end: ‘wheeling either way’, ‘curved at both ends’, or ‘curved on both sides’. S. West at 3.162 argues for the third; the epithet is used, with only one exception, uniquely of ships when they are drawn up on the beach, a position in which the two curved sides would be visible. See further Alexanderson 1970: 7, 28–9, 31 and Kurt 1979: 39–41.

428 ἐρίηρας ἑταίρους: × 9 in H. The epithet, used only of companions and heralds, is of uncertain meaning, although usually rendered ‘loyal’; Hesychius glosses *μεγάλως τιμώμενοι. ἀγαθοί. πρόθυμοι. εὐχάριστοι*; *ε-ri-we-ro* appears as a Mycenaean personal name (PY Vn 130). For modern conjectures concerning the term’s derivation, see Chantraine, *DE* and Frisk, *GEW* s.v. The prefix ἐρι-, an Aeolic element replaced by Ionic ἀρι- in verbs and adverbs, is regularly preserved in formulaic phrases.

429 ἔρυσθαι ‘to draw up’, the term commonly used of ships in this context.

431 οἱ δ’: this refers to the companions of 428. The language used of the crew’s transgression promotes the speaker’s point: in his Ciconian story, Od. called the crew *νήπιοι* (9.44) and noted their disobedience, but here the term ὕβρις conveys much stronger moral disapprobation. Fisher 1992: 158 locates the crew’s ὕβρις in ‘the element of contemptuous thoughtlessness in their desire to rush into killing and pillaging’. The context makes the expression so frequently applied to violations of *ξενία* particularly apposite: Antinous has just made his threat with the footstool and refused to give food; his subsequent assault will show his failure to apprehend the meaning of the framed exemplum. See further Emlyn-Jones 1984: 7.

432–4 Again the speaker artfully reshapes material from the Ciconian venture. In the earlier account, Od. gave himself the leading role in sacking the city and slaughtering its people. Since now he must project a more upright persona, the men perform the deeds of violence, concentrating their attack on the outlying fields.

432 περικαλλέας ἀγρούς: the epithet suggests that Egypt may already have been proverbial for the fertility of its soil (cf. 4.229–30; among later accounts, see Ar. fr. 581.15 K–A, Theoc. *Id.* 17.79, Herod. 1.26), caused by the flooding of the Nile each year (cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1, Νείλου . . . καλλιπάρθενοι ῥοαί). More usually in H. the country figures as a site eminently worth raiding and with wealth as its chief association; cf. 3.301, 14.285–6. The raid described here may reflect historical events of the late Bronze Age, when Egypt was the object of attack by numerous foreigners who skirmished with Pharaonic forces.

435 οἱ δὲ βοῆς ἄοντες: for the same phrase, see 9.401 (the Cyclopes hearing Polyphemus’ cry for help). More usually a battle cry in H., here βοή approaches the meaning it has frequently in later sources, a ‘call for aid’ (cf. A. *Supp.* 730, Ag. 1349). **ἄμ’ ἢ οἱ φαινομένηφι**: the formula, with or without the participle, appears × 8 in *Od.*, × 4 in *Il.* The participle suffix –φι can carry instrumental, locative or comitative force (as here). As its frequent appearance in formulas suggests, it is an archaism, already visible in Linear B and extended by poets for metrical convenience. For discussion, see Chantraine, *GH* 1 234–41.

436 A strikingly alliterative phrase whose repeated π sound conveys the clamour of the massed horses and men.

437–8 *τερπικέραυνος*: either ‘delighting in the thunderbolt’ (but this should properly require *τερπι-) or ‘hurler of the thunderbolt’ (with Σ on *Il.* 1.419); cf. Virgil’s Jove: *cum fulmina torques* (*Aen.* 4.208). See further Janko on *Il.* 16.231–2 and Cunliffe s.v. Following the description of the men’s ‘yielding to *hybris*’, Zeus’ action appears a direct consequence of that morally inflected transgression. By contrast, the *κακῆ Διὸς αἴσα* (9.52) of the Ciconian narrative is more random, unconnected with the crew’s rashness.

441 *ἔναγον* ‘led inland’. The encounter takes place on the coast close to the riverbank mentioned in 427.

442–4 Here the speaker varies the account given to Eumaeus. Whereas that tale continued with Od.’s supplication and kindly reception by the Egyptian king (consonant with the narrator’s emphasis on hospitality in his larger story) prior to several fresh misfortunes, now Od. rapidly concludes: he is given over to the Cypriot king, the otherwise unknown Dmetor (‘the Subduer’). Cyprus is among the sites visited by Menelaus in his wanderings (4.83) and is also home to the sanctuary of Aphrodite at 8.362–3. The island plays an otherwise surprisingly minor role in the *Od.*; the Cypriot material record suggests that it may have been a central site for the transmission of some of the Oriental elements in Homeric epic and includes considerable evidence for the burial rites and high-status luxury goods described in the poems (see Richardson 1989: 125–8). The story of the exchange between the Egyptian and Cypriot kings fits a Bronze Age setting, when such relationships between rulers were part of regular Near Eastern diplomacy; cf. *Il.* 11.19–46, the sole mention of the island in that poem.

The scholia comment on Eumaeus’ silence in the face of this obvious inconsistency with the tale that he earlier heard (an inconsistency made more emphatic by Antinous’ reference to the new Cypriot element at 448; what is novel in the story, from our perspective, seems also to command the internal audience’s attention). The ancient scholars explain that Eumaeus would assume the beggar’s wish to suppress, given the bias of his listeners, the detail concerning his meeting with Od. that figured in the sequel to the events narrated here. But probably such deviations would not bother an archaic audience accustomed to and appreciative of the narrator’s skill in refashioning earlier material to suit the context. Indeed, the swineherd showed himself well-versed in the dynamics and aims of storytelling in his comments at 14.363–5 and 508–9.

444 *τόδ’ ἴκω* ‘I came in this way’; cf. 524; *τόδ’* is an adverbial acc. (cf. 1.409 and Chantraine, *GH* II 44).

446–52 Antinous’ discourteous response should be set against Eumaeus’ very different reception of the story; at 14.388–9 the swineherd affirmed his respect for Zeus Xenios and expressed compassion for the beggar’s plight.

446 Already in H., a *δαίμων* might be cited as the power responsible for an unforeseen and frequently unpleasant event; cf. Pind. *Nem.* 5.15–16, Eur. *Hel.* 669 for later usages. Here the question includes an unconscious irony as the speaker betrays that want of finer perception characteristic of the hero’s enemies (contrast Eumaeus’

invocation of the propitious *δαίμων* at 243); *Od.* has returned with the help of at least one divinity; see too 18.353n. The expression *δαίτος ἀνίην* echoes Melanthius' remarks at 220n.

447 *στήθ' οὕτως* 'stand just as you are'; for *οὕτως* with an imperative, cf. 6.218, *Il.* 21.184. *ἐς μέσσον* 'in the middle'; the suitors would be seated against the walls (see 7.95). This seating arrangement may already have already existed in Mycenaean palaces and was certainly current in the Geometric period.

448 *μὴ τάχα πικρὴν Αἴγυπτον . . . ἴκηαι* 'lest you soon come to a bitter Egypt'; this 'colloquial' use of the adj. *πικρός* becomes idiomatic; it regularly appears in threats in which the speaker picks up terms from a previous speech (so *Αἴγυπτον*, *Κύπρον*) and gives them a sinister turn by adding *πικρός*; cf. *Eur. Med.* 388, *Ar. Thesm.* 853, *A. R.* 3.374 with LSJ s.v. *πικρός* III.1. More frequently the usage appears with verbs of seeing (see v.l.). Antinous' words here may be read as a perversion of the 'sending on' that the host should arrange for his guest; cf. 18.336, 20.361.

449 *προϊκτής*: lit. 'one who asks a gift' (cf. *προῖξ* 'gift'), i.e. 'beggar'.

451–2 *μαφιδίως* 'recklessly, foolishly'; an expanded form of *μάψ* used again of the suitors at 537. *οὐ τις ἐπίσχεσις οὐδ' ἔλεητύς* 'there is not any restraint nor stinting'. A curious phrase, whose departures from conventional usage may reflect Antinous' distorted view of relations of *ξενία*. *ἐπίσχεσις* (from *ἐπέχω*) occurs uniquely here in *H.* and later appears only in Attic prose with the meaning 'checking' and 'delay'. *ἐλεητύς* (= *ἔλεος*) is an exclusively epic and Ionic term whose meaning 'pity, mercy' at 14.82 does not fit the present context; the lack of 'mercy' or 'sparing' must here apply to the suitors' attitude towards *Od.*'s goods. Antinous' juxtaposition of the terms *ἀλλοτριῶν* (partitive gen.) and *χαρίσασθαι* would also sound strangely to ancient ears. To perform a deed of *χάρις* means that the recipient of the favour and largesse incurs an obligation to respond in kind; but that reciprocal exchange cannot work when the source of the gift does not lie with the giver, a fact that vitiates the other suitors' seeming generosity at 367 and 411. On *ἀλλοτριῶν*, reiterated at 456, see 18.18n. Aristarchus, followed by the *H* scholiast, athetized the lines; however, neither the unusual diction nor Antinous' criticism of his fellow diners are sufficient grounds for rejection; the statement offers proof of the speaker's capacity for dissimulation in this disingenuous show of regard for *Od.*'s property and is typical of his flaunting of the usual terms of guest–host relations. *πάρρα*: short for *πάρρῃστιν*; cf. 457n.

454 *ἄρα*: the particle is regularly used to express 'the surprise attendant upon disillusionment' (Denniston, *GP* 35). When combined with the imperfect, particularly of *εἶναι* as here, it indicates the speaker's (chastened) realization of something that has been evident all along, and still is, but has only just been apprehended (cf. *Hes. WD* 11–12). *ἐπὶ εἶδεν* 'in addition to looks'; for the preposition with this cumulative sense, cf. 308. If the poet's reuse of the earlier expression is deliberate, then Antinous does not match Argus, who combined a fair form with the speed that was his chief claim to excellence. More obviously, *Od.* reiterates the accusation that he made against another high-born young man who insulted him, the Phaeacian Euryalus. There too he charged his antagonist with possessing a fair *εἶδος*, but not the mind to go

with it (8.176–7). For the εἶδος/φρένες combination, see too 4.264, 11.337, *Il.* 3.44–5. The problematic split between the outer and inner man, exemplified by Od. in his beggar's disguise, figures prominently in the *Od.*, in contrast to the *Il.*, where externals and internals more usually, although not invariably (cf. Helen's description of Od. at 3.216–24), coincide. The Odyssean Ares, Hephaestus and Aphrodite in 8.266–366 and Eurybates at 19.246–8 also exemplify the discrepancy between the aesthetic and moral registers. The *Od.*'s different values, and even rejection of what came to be viewed as elite ideology, finds later expression in Archil. fr. 114 W, a dismissal of the tall, finely coiffed and elegant general for one who is 'small and looks bent about the shins', but is filled with courage. For the shift, and Archilochus' possible debt to the *Od.* here, see Russo 1974, Seidensticker 1978.

455 ἐπιστάτη: lit. 'one who stands near or by', i.e. 'follower' or 'dependant' (contrast the term's meaning in fifth-century drama, 'commander' or 'chief'). **ἄλα:** salt could represent the most basic and lowest of all condiments; cf. 11.123, Theoc. *Id.* 27.61, a phrase modelled on the Homeric line, Call. *Ep.* 48, *A. P.* 6.302. Also possible is salt, together with bread, as a symbol of hospitality (its value in many cultures). On both counts it would fit the present context.

457 σίτου ἀποπροελών δόμεναι: glossed by Dio Chrys. 7.83 (σίτου ἀπάρξασθαι, πολλῶν κατὰ οἶκον ἔόντων). **πολλὰ πάρεστιν:** the statement affirms the still plentiful provisions in Od.'s house (cf. 18.16–17). For the tension between the seemingly inexhaustible nature of the household's supplies and the emphasis on the wasting of Od.'s property, see Rutherford at 19.133 with bibliography. But, as the scene of Agamemnon's defilement of the precious cloths spread before him in Aeschylus' *Ag.* shows, the possession of infinite domestic resources is no justification for the profligate destruction of the wealth of the οἶκος.

458 ἐχολώσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον: the formula occurs × 4 *Od.* (see 18.387–8n), × 1 *Il.*, always at line's end. It forms part of a more extended thematic sequence describing an escalating anger experienced by the target of a verbal provocation and/or challenge; see Walsh 2005: 150–8. **χόλος,** unlike the more particularized term **κότος,** can increase (as the term **μᾶλλον** suggests) and diminish, and is an emotion that an individual may choose to act on or desist from.

459 ὑπόδρα ἰδών 'looking askance', 'with frowning look', 'from under (ὑπὸ) the eyebrows'; × 17 in *Il.*, × 9 in *Od.* ὑπόδρα is derived from ὑπό + δρασι; cf. ὑποδέκομαι. Beyond H., who reserves ὑπόδρα ἰδών for the narrative portions of the poem, the phrase occurs only at *H. H. Bacch.* 48 and [Hes.] *Scut.* 445. 'Looking darkly' invariably indicates the speaker's anger following an address, frequently by a social inferior, judged offensive or disrespectful, and precedes an answering act of verbal and/or physical violence; see 18.14n. Here, as in the parallel missile-hurling episode in book 18 (see 394–8n) where Eurymachus casts the same angry glance at Od. at 388, Antinous thinks he can chastise the beggar with impunity. Od. will give three such 'dark looks' at 22.34, 60 and 320, now treating his former assailants to projectiles of a much more deadly kind. See further Holoka 1983.

460 καλά 'in an honourable manner'.

462–5 The first in a sequence of three episodes in which missiles are hurled at Od. (see Introduction p. 17). At 18.394 Eurymachus throws a stool; at 20.299–300 Ctesippus throws an ox foot. The poet's careful design is visible as he uses each assault, and variations between them, to structure the narrative, complement the plot trajectory, and reinforce his thematic ends. Most obviously, the episodes demonstrate the suitors' disregard for the norms of hospitality, an offence made still worse by their choice of articles associated with the proper reception of a guest. In more subtle fashion, the incidents chart the growing power of Od. (who nonetheless displays his characteristic ability passively to endure insult), who permits himself a 'sardonic smile' in reply to the final missile, and the increasing confidence of Telemachus, who intervenes more forcefully each time (see 18.405–9 and 410–11nn); the suitors, in contrast, suffer diminished efficacy (each throw reaches its target with decreased success). The suitors' villainy also escalates insofar as each attack comes as the result of less provocation on Od.'s part. Each time too, the episode motivates P.'s interventions in the action. See further Fenik 1974: 180–7, Reece 1993: 176–8.

These scenes may additionally recall the moment when Polyphemus hurls a mountain peak at Od. (9.480–3), an attack also prefaced by the rage-motif-marking line ἐχολώσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον. There too the hero has just taunted the aggressor for transgressing rites of hospitality. The analogies between the scenes not only create one among many links between the suitors and that earlier renegade and greedy host, but also alert an audience to the forbearance that has come to characterize Od.: while Polyphemus' missile prompted Od.'s all-but-fatal abandonment of his incognito, now he forges the attack in silence. For this, see further Walsh 2005: 152–8.

462 Antinous' gesture recalls his earlier violation of the laws determining the reception of strangers; whereas at 457 the suitor refused to 'take' (ἀποπροελών) food so as to 'give' (δόμεναι) it to Od., now he 'takes' (ἐλών) an inappropriate object and will thereby 'give' Od. something very different instead (see 567 with Said 1979: 31). βάλε δεξιὸν ὦμον: Irus' blow lands on the same spot (18.95n), part of the network of links between the suitor and the parasite; cf. 18.1–110n, Levine 1982 and Introduction p. 15. Antinous' punishment fits his crime: Od.'s return 'gift' is an arrow that hits (βάλεν, 22.15) the suitor in the throat.

463 πρυμνότατον κατὰ νῶτον 'at the base [of the shoulder], near the back'; i.e. below the shoulder blades, where the shoulders become the back.

463–4 The same immobility that Od. maintained when Melanthius kicked him at 233–5. For the simile, cf. *Il.* 17.434–6 (ὡς τε στηλή μῆνει ἔμπεδος); stones and objects made of stone were proverbially unmoving. ἔμπεδος (lit. 'solidly planted in the earth') also carries particular thematic weight, indicative of the steadfastness that the poem's exemplary characters display (cf. 19.493–4). It is a trait that additionally links husband and wife; P. has chosen to remain at home where she keeps everything ἔμπεδα (e.g. 19.525), while the bed that symbolizes the union of the two characters is qualified with the same term (23.203); for detailed discussion, see Zeitlin 1996: 29–31.

465 ἀκέων 'in silence'. The expression (× 17 in H.) was variously explained in antiquity, either as a participle, derived from a vanished *ἀκέω, 'to be silent', or

as an indeclinable adverb. κίνησε κάρη expresses inner indignation; cf. 5.285, 376, *Il.* 17.200, 442 (but always with a divine subject). βυσσοδομείων: see 66n.

466 The sequence of dactyls in the line suggests Od.'s swift movement; cf. 18.110.

468–9 κέκλυτέ μευ . . . | ὄφρ' εἶπω τὰ με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει = 18.351–2, 21.275–6, always in the context of a public address; in both the *Il.* and *Od.*, the second line (× 10 in H.) is typically used only by high-status leaders (Od., Alcinous, Hector, Antenor, Priam and Zeus) and on the occasion of a speech before an assembled group. Eurymachus' use of the same formula in book 18 to introduce a derisive joke may indicate his travesty of conventions governing weighty public speech (see Irwin 2005: 210 n. 12). Od.'s rebuke here forms the first of three condemnations of Antinous' action, echoed first by the suitors (483–7) and subsequently by P. (499–504).

470–3 The remark draws fresh attention to the correct division between warfare and feasting; while a man may legitimately fight outside the domestic sphere for the protection of his livestock, a wound incurred in the context of a banquet, where hunger is satisfied, represents a violation of the proper code regulating behaviour among the elite.

470 οὐτ' ἄχος . . . οὐτε τι πένθος: the phrase may be a virtual tautology. In many instances in H., the nouns are synonymous. The *Il.* uses them interchangeably for individual and collective sorrow, whether Achilles' grief at his loss of honour, or both his and the army's distress at the death of Patroclus; in the *Od.* P. has πένθος ἄλαστον (1.342) on hearing Phemius' song, which presupposes Od.'s death, and Menelaus feels ἄχος ἄλαστον (4.108) at the loss of the hero; cf. Hes. *Th.* 98–9 (εἰ γὰρ τις καὶ πένθος ἔχων . . . ἄζεται κραδίην ἀκαχήμενος) and Nagy 1979: 69–70, 94–102. But ἄχος also has a much broader range of meaning than πένθος, variously evoking fear (21.412), remorse (22.345), shame (*Il.* 9.249), anger/resentment (18.347–8n, 21.299, *Il.* 20.298), and misery (24.315), all sentiments of a distinctly disagreeable kind; both shame and resentment are particularly applicable to the situation that Od. describes here.

471 μαχειόμενος: for the lengthening required by the metre, see Wyatt 1969: 132–5; cf. 11.403, μαχεούμενον.

472 βλήεται: 3 sing. athematic passive aor. subjunctive of βάλλω.

473 γαστέρος . . . λυγρῆς: at first glance the 'baneful belly' seems to belong to Od., since it was his begging for food that provoked the assault. But, like many of the seeming vagrant's remarks, the phrase carries a sinister ambiguity: both Antinous' niggardliness and his anger, the statement insinuates, stem from the suitor's gluttony, which will indeed be baneful and the cause of 'many evils'.

474 On the adj. οὐλομένης see 286n.

475–80 Od.'s evocation of divinities who safeguard beggars prompts a threat of fresh violence from Antinous, who compounds his earlier violations of ξενία by displaying an impious disregard for the gods. This offence will move even his fellow suitors to remonstrate. According to the scholia, these lines were athetized ('for how could Antinous put up with such imprecations, when he got so angry at slighter things?'). But removal would create an uncomfortable juncture between 474 and 481:

the suitors' reproach to Antinous would then follow a speech by Od. rather than supply a direct response to Antinous' remark. Antinous' threat that the youths might use violence against the beggar at 479–80 would also more naturally prompt their intervention than 474, which already takes the offender to task for his behaviour.

475 For divine protection of beggars, see 14.57–8 (Eumaeus to Od.); here uniquely the ἐρινύες are involved. These very ancient chthonic divinities, already attested in Linear B, are generally associated with revenge and curses (as here); as suits their (Hesiodic) birth from the blood of Ouranus' genitals following Cronus' castration of his father, epic often introduces them in the context of crimes committed against parents or children (so Hes. *Th.* 472, *Od.* 2.135, 11.279–80, *Il.* 9.566–72, 21.412; note too A. *Ag.* 1433, Eur. *Med.* 1389, *Phoen.* 624). H. seems not to differentiate between a specific body of goddesses (Ἐρινύες, as at 11.280) and the more general ἐρινύες here and at 2.135 and 20.78 (editors capitalize differently). Russo suggests that the tentative nature of the phrasing (hence the particles εἴ που and γε) reflects the originality of Od.'s concept, that all individuals, even beggars, have their personal gods and erinyes poised to punish those who have done them wrong.

476 τέλος θανάτῳ: the 'end/fulfilment consisting of death', v. frequent in the *Il.* (× 6; see 9.416 for similar diction). Death regularly comes to meet Homeric man, although it can be evaded or warded off (so 547). Death's active pursuit of Antinous (κίχρη) also fits the curse that Od. formulates here; in the manner of an avenging spirit, θάνατος overtakes its victim. The placement of τέλος immediately after γάμοιο gives Od.'s imprecation an ironic turn; marriage can also be referred to as a τέλος (cf. τέλος . . . γάμοιο at 20.74). Aeschylus exploits the ambiguity to brilliant effect at *Ag.* 973–4 where the (re)consummation of Agamemnon's marriage will consist in his death.

479–80 For the threat of dragging by the foot, see 18.10n. πάντα: neut. plur. acc. of respect, 'all over', 'every part of his body'; ἀποδρῦψωσι indicates laceration (5.435, *Il.* 23.187, 24.21).

481 ἄρα with its frequent sense, 'as was to be expected'. ὑπερφιάλως 'exceedingly', *Od.* × 6, always in this line position; see 18.71 and, for the adj., which usually includes a pejorative note, 18.167n. For a possible derivation from ὑπὲρ φιάλην 'overflowing the cup', see Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *DE*.

482 εἶπεσκε: the iterative form of the aor., used to express repeated or customary action. This formulaic line appears *Od.* × 5 to introduce one of the 14 so-called 'τις-speeches', speeches that begin with a formula with the word τις. As the iterative indicates, these passages, although voiced by a single anonymous speaker, express views common to all and allow the poet to portray the shifting moods, sympathies and sentiments of the larger group as they respond to the actions they witness. These remarks can also, as here, indicate divergences between the attitudes of the chief protagonists and the otherwise largely silent majority. Frequently the τις-speech includes a critical and/or derisive note (see 18.72n, 2.323–37 and 20.376–84). For further discussion, see de Jong 2001 at 2.323–37 and de Jong 1987. The same narrative device concludes the next throwing-scene, giving the suitors' collective reaction to

the fresh assault (18.401–4). As suits the youths' increasing moral degradation as the moment of reckoning approaches (see 462–5n), there the suitors utter no reproach, merely wishing the beggar had never come. ὑπερηνορέοντων: with one exception (tellingly, the Cyclopes at 6.5), the adjective is used only of the suitors; cf. Hes. *Th.* 995–6, of Pelias: ὑπερήνωρ, | ὕβριστής).

484 οὐλόμεν' is either a vocative directed to Antinous ('accursed man'), or (less probably) a neuter plur. answering the καλά in the previous line. The second interpretation would imply that far from having done well, Antinous has performed an action liable to bring dire consequences.

485–7 For the language, cf. Hes. *WD* 249–55, where the poet evokes 'the immortal guards of Zeus over mortal men, who watch over the verdicts and wicked deeds of men' (ἀθάνατοι Ζηνὸς φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων | οἱ ῥα φυλάσσουσιν τε δίκας καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα, 253–4). This is the *Od.*'s most explicit statement of the theoxeny motif (see Introduction pp. 18–19, Kearns 1982 and Rutherford's note on 19.215). The suggestion that the stranger might be a god in disguise echoes Alcinous' surmise at 7.199 and Telemachus' reaction to his father at 16.194–200. Greek gods rarely appear to men in their own form; for the difficulty of recognizing a divinity, see 10.573–4, 13.312–13, 16.160 (cf. *Il.* 22.9–10). The theme of the god, hero, or holy individual who travels among men seeking hospitality extends beyond the Greco-Roman world; for cross-cultural examples, see S. Thompson, *Motif-Index*, vol. v, Q. 1. 1. Among many Greek and other instances, note *H. H. Cer.* 93 with Richardson, *A. R.* 3.68, *Ov. Met.* 1.163–252, 8.611–724 with Hollis, *Genesis* 18.1–8, *I Kings* 17.8.

486 παντοῖοι τελέθοντες 'assuming all sorts of shapes'; the verb is synonymous with εἶναι or γίνεσθαι, 'become'.

487 For the phrase, see Plat. *Soph.* 216b: ὕβρεις τε καὶ εὐνομίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων καθορᾶν. ὕβριν τε καὶ εὐνομίην: both terms are limited in scope. The first refers to a wilful disregard of the rules governing social conduct and particularly to an improper treatment accorded to others as monitored by the gods; Homeric ὕβρις is not, as some suggest, a blanket term for action offensive to divinities, nor one that signals the over-stepping of the limits that mortals should observe. εὐνομίη, used uniquely here and standing in opposition to ὕβρις, signifies the exact contrary of the first term, i.e. 'just dealing' and a willingness to observe existing sanctions determining 'the accepted distribution of privileges, obligations and honours' (Fisher 1992: 173). Archil. fr. 177 *W* echoes the phrase when the fox warns the eagle that its crime in violating an agreement (involving a relationship of ξενία) and devouring the fox's cubs will not go unpunished by Zeus, who oversees men's deeds (σὺ δ' ἔργ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ὄραϊς | λεωργὰ καὶ θεμιστά, σοὶ δὲ θηρίων | ὕβρις τε καὶ δίκη μέλει). For a fresh working of the ὕβρις / εὐνομίη opposition, see Solon 4.32–4 *W*; note too *A. R.* 3.68, also in the context of the theoxeny motif, with its close echo of the Homeric phrasing (εὐνομίης πειρωμένη). The suitors unconsciously provide a wholly accurate description of their own behaviour.

488 ἐμπάζετο: 3 sing. imperf. from ἐμπάζομαι (+ gen., so μύθων), 'care about, pay heed to'.

489–91 Telemachus' conduct, as he represses his emotions and contents himself with plotting revenge, mirrors that of his father (see Introduction pp. 29–30 for the youth's growing likeness to his father). The parallelism is made more emphatic by the reuse of line 465 at 491; cf. 490n. Telemachus will respond more forcefully to the second assault on Od.; see 18.405–9n.

489 ἄεξε: unaugmented imperf. of ἀέξω (Att. αὔξω, αὔξανω), 'let grow, let swell'.

490 βλημένου . . . βάλειν: by applying to Telemachus' tears the same verb that describes the attack on Od., the poet draws attention to the bond of sympathy between father and son, a connection that the β–alliteration might intensify. Forms of βάλλω are equally prominent in the surrounding passages (so 483, 494n).

492–588

The scene shifts from the public to the private space as P, having followed the rumpus in the hall, instructs Eurynome to summon Eumaeus so as to arrange an interview with the stranger. Eumaeus' description of his former guest seems to strengthen P's desire for a meeting (as the swineherd intends), and she wishes instantly to question the vagabond. Od. proposes deferring the interview until after sundown and the departure of the suitors. The episode involves P's initial step towards her first interview with Od. in book 19; typical of the poet's skill in building towards climactic events is the retardation of that critical moment; a whole book will intervene before the proposal made here is realized.

492–3 ἤκουσε . . . βλημένου ἐν μεγάροι: P's apparent ability to hear (and see; so 504, 511) exactly what occurred in the μέγαρον has long been a puzzle, and raises several questions about the architecture of Od.'s palace: what is the exact location of the chamber P. occupies here relative to the banqueting hall, and is this room one and the same as her upstairs bedroom (as 18.206 suggests)? In order for P. to apprehend Antinous' assault, she must be within proximity and sight of the hall; an upstairs chamber would not allow her to perceive what the beggar 'looks like' (511) or to know that Antinous' blow was to his right shoulder (504). Quite plausibly H. locates P. in different rooms on different occasions, an upstairs ὑπερῶιον (49) and a downstairs θάλαμος, but the conventions of oral composition do not require strict consistency in matters of architectural design, nor would audiences expect it. The poet also has licence to give his characters the knowledge that his external audience possesses where the plot requires it ('transference'). For additional discussion, see 513n, Lorimer 1950: chap. 5, Monro App. 5, 493–7, Gray 1955. μετ' . . . δμοιήισιν: μετὰ + dat. = 'among', a mainly epic usage; see 505 and 18.225.

494 βάλει κλυτότοξος Ἀπόλλων: P's wish foreshadows the eventual outcome of the ongoing struggle. The already critical term βάλλω, now redirected away from Od. and towards the victim whom P. names, anticipates Antinous' death from a bowshot, an exact quid pro quo (see 462n). Although Od. will play the role assigned to the god here (as suits the hero's role as 'junior partner' to the divine; see Introduction p. 19), the appeal to Apollo coincides with the poem's increasing focus on that divinity

in the closing books (see 19.86, 20.156, 278, 21.258–9, 267–8, 22.7). Apollo is doubly apposite. As archer god (e.g., *Il.* 1.37, 45–52; see too Burkert 1985: 145–6) he is obviously pertinent to the contest; and the battle in the hall seems to occur on the occasion of a springtime festival in Apollo's honour. Austin 1975: 244–6 argues persuasively that the feast day mentioned at 20.156, 278, 22.258–9, and 267–8 celebrates the god in his capacity as Noumenios ('of the new moon'), an identification already made by the scholia.

495 Εὐρυνόμη ταμίη: Eurynome is not strictly speaking the 'housekeeper', since that presupposes a single individual in this position of authority, and she shares the designation with Eurycleia. For her role and characterization, see 18.170–6n.

496 εἰ γάρ: H. regularly uses the connective to introduce a wish in dialogue 'that something stated or wished by the previous speaker may come true or might have come true' (Denniston, *GP* 92); cf. 8.339, 15.536. A word or gesture that serves to approve and/or reiterate an initial wish or prayer may also be necessary to 'seal' or guarantee the efficacy of the petition; see 545n.

497 τοῦτων: the suitors. ἔσθρονον Ἡῶ: H. reserves the epithet for Dawn; he more commonly styles the goddess χρυσόθρονος. Some modern discussions derive the second element in the compound from θρόνα, 'flowers', the likely meaning of the noun at *Il.* 22.441 (and reused in that sense by Hellenistic poets), but 'throne' was probably the primary significance for H. and his audience; for a possible play on the two meanings, see Sappho fr. 1.1, ποικιλόθρον, of Aphrodite; see further Risch 1981: 354–62.

499 μαῖ: an affectionate form of address for old women, used regularly by Od. and the other members of his family for Eurycleia; cf. *H. H. Cth.* 147, S. fr. 959, Eur. *Alc.* 393 (on which Dale comments that the term 'probably belongs to nursery language').

501–4 From the moment of apprehending the blow received by the beggar, P.'s 'attention is riveted on the stranger' (ξεῖνός τις δύστηνος; Austin 1975: 206). Aristarchus, observing that here the poet showed P. knowing something she could not know, viewed the lines with suspicion (Σ in the MSS H. and Vind. on 504).

503–4 H. frequently uses this type of construction, 'all the others, but × (alone)...', to draw attention to the activity of one among a group; cf. 16.393–8, 20.109–10.

507 οἱ: reflexive pronoun.

508 δῖ' Εὐμαι: some MSS offer δῆ in place of the honorific epithet, as in every other instance of the expression in the poem. ἀνωχθί: 2 sing. perf. imper. from ἀνωγα 'to order'.

509 προσπτύξομαι 'I may greet warmly', with double acc. of the person addressed and the thing said.

511 ἴδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι: for the particular value of an eye-witness account, the privileged item in the ascending scale here, see 44n. πολυπλάγκτωι γάρ ἔοικε: P. unwittingly (or, according to some readers, acting on a subconscious or intuitive sense of the 'beggar's' true identity, see Introduction pp. 26–8), gives the stranger an epithet particularly appropriate to her husband (see 1.1–2); cf. 20.195 for the identical 'slip'

on Philoetius' part. Characters sympathetic to Od. regularly, if unknowingly, observe similarities between the appearance and condition of the beggar and that of the seemingly absent hero (whom Athena's magic has aged, but not entirely transfigured; see Hölscher 1939: 77–9 for the distinction), while those hostile to him remain blind to the correspondences. For the most striking instances, see 19.358–60, 363–81; Od. promotes the identification; cf. 563 with n. For the concentration of πολυ- epithets (e.g. πολύμητις, πολύφρων, πολυμήχανος) around the figure of Od., see 280n; for Od.'s use of these epithets at moments of subtle self-revelation, see 18.319n, 19.118.

513 **σιωπήσειαν**: the suitors are 'deaf' to Od. as well as blind; the audience was silent during the hero's exercise of his bard-like powers of enchantment (evoked in the next line, with note) over the Phaeacians (οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐγένοντο σιωπήη, | κληθμῶν δ' ἔσχοντο, 11.333–4). The detail could also go some way to resolving the problem of P.'s location (see 492–3n); the unruly suitors are raising such a din that it penetrates the further reaches of the house.

514 **θέλγοιτο**: those treated to skilled performances of song, storytelling and seductive speech in the poem are frequently 'enchanted'; θέλω and θέλωμαι regularly refer to a performer/speaker's powers and to an audience's corresponding 'rapture' (e.g., 1.57, 3.264, 12.44, this of the Sirens' song). The verbs' application to the impact of words and music distinguishes the *Od.* from the *Il.* and is indicative of the poem's preoccupation with its own medium (see Introduction p. 21); in the *Il.*, the terms are used only of changes that occur in an individual as a result of divine interventions (cf. the *Od.*'s analogous use of θέλω for Circe's magical transformations, 10.213, 291, 318, 326). Eumaeus' remark prepares the way for the comparison of Od. to an αἰδώς at 518–21n. The overlap between the bewitchment caused by speech/song and that brought about by ἔρωσ (the latter so patent at 18.212n; cf. 519–20n) gives the phrase a second level of meaning. Od.'s capacity to 'enchant' P. depends not only on the seductive powers of the stories that he will tell her, but also on the love between husband and wife.

515–17 Eumaeus' reference to the three days and nights that the stranger spent in his hut must be accommodated within the chronology of Od.'s return. According to the calendars that readers have constructed, Od. would have arrived at Eumaeus' steading on the 35th day since Athena's visit to Telemachus initiated the poem's action, bringing us to the 39th day for the present episode. **κακότητα . . . ἦν ἀγορεύων**: following immediately after his mention of the duration of Od.'s stay, Eumaeus' remark belongs together with several other characters' comments on the extent of time required for Od. to recount his outsized trials and sufferings (cf. 9.14–15, 11.375–6, 14.196–8, 15.399–400). Insofar as the *Od.* announces itself the story of its hero's ἀλγέα (1.4), the poet's subject matter coincides with that of his protagonist's stories (see next note); perhaps at these moments H. also glances towards (and justifies) the commensurately grandiose temporal requirements of his composition. The connection made here between storytelling and suffering is typical of the *Od.*; the tales narrated by both Od. and other characters predominantly concern the trouble-filled experiences of the teller (see Mackie 1997: 84–5).

518–21 The equation of Od. with an *αοιδός* appears several times: Alcinoos first sounds the motif at 11.368; Eumaeus promotes the identification at 14.387 (see Louden 1997 for the parallels between these two self-styled ‘audiences’). The comparison finds its most extended (and sinister) expression in the simile accompanying the stringing and testing of the bow at 21.406–11: Od. plucks the bowstring like a musician tuning a lyre.

The repeated uses of the conceit invite us to see the storytelling hero as a double for the poet/rhapsode currently singing the song and seemingly equate the internal listeners to the protagonist’s tales with the external audiences at performances of the *Od.* But the fact that the hero is only *like* the singer (as the use of similes makes clear) preserves the distinction between the two: in epic’s own account, there are critical differences between bardic performances and storytellers’ narratives within the poems. First, bards, by virtue of the Muses’ patronage, have knowledge of events on Olympus and need no external authorization for their tales beyond that which the goddesses supply; other characters who tell stories, by contrast, describe their narratives as based on first-hand experience or cite oral tradition – the stories other people tell – as the source of what they recount (see 12.389–90, where Od. explains how he knew about Helios’ complaint to Zeus). Second, the songs of the *αοιδός* are unmotivated insofar as they neither respond to requests for information nor seek to manipulate their audiences for personal ends. Instead their chief purpose is to delight and entertain, while also preserving the memory of past events. The narratives ‘lay’ storytellers devise are goal-oriented: Helen treats her hearers to a piece of self-exculpation (4. 240–64), Od. fashions a story for the disguised Athena designed to warn her against laying hands on his goods (13.256–86), and his *αἶνος* to Eumaeus aims to get a cloak from his host (14.462–506). These distinctions require listeners to evaluate and respond to the songs or stories differently: the bard’s audience may succumb without danger to the charm of the performance (the Sirens’ virtuoso recitals notoriously excepted) without worrying about its truth content; other characters’ stories require consideration of their tellers’ motives and attention to their veracity. More minute differences in narrative technique, formulas and word placement also keep the professional and layman apart. See further Scodel 1998a, Beck 2005b.

Complicating the comparison between Od. and bard, and going some way to effacing the separation described above, is Eumaeus’ acknowledgment of the beggar’s ability to enchant. Since H. frequently uses *θέλω* and *θέλωμαι* for the impact of deliberate deceptions or seductions as well as applying the second term to responses to performances of song by professional singers (see 514n), Eumaeus’ complimentary account locates Od. mid-way between a character-narrator and an *αοιδός* while assimilating ‘positive’ bardlike powers of enchantment and the potentially harmful charm of the duplicitous raconteur (see Pratt 1993: 81). At 519, Eumaeus will reveal that he has been beguiled by Od.’s skills, having accepted much of his mendacious narrative.

518 *ποτιδέρεται* ‘looks upon’. The verb suggests a visual as well as aural component to the enchantment produced by poetry, as though the singer’s demeanour and

perhaps movements were also part of the ‘spell-binding’ nature of his performance. **δς τε**: the particle is common in comparisons; see Chantraine, *GH* II 240–1.

519–20 αἰδη: a subjunctive in place of the indicative that H. more normally introduces in relative clauses following comparisons; see Ruijgh 1971: 326 and the less well attested v.l. αἰδει. The first syllable is long, a form found only here in H. but used frequently in the context of invocations in the *Hymns* (12.1, 17.1. 27.1, 32.1; see too *Ilias Parva* 1 and Theogn. 4); Hellenistic poets more regularly use the lengthened first syllable; e.g. Theoc. *Id.* 7.41, 16.3. Call. fr. 26.8, 75.5, A. R. 4.1399; see further Hoekstra 1965: 121, Wyatt 1969: 182. **δεδαώς**: from *δαώ (cf. *H. H. Merc.* 510); **διδάσκω** is the causative form (‘I cause to learn’). H. regularly describes the art of singing, as well as skills such as craftsmanship and navigation, as having been ‘taught’ by the gods (so 8.488 for song); the **θεῶν** of 518 would refer to the Muses and Apollo (cf. 8.63–4, 488, *Il.* 13.730–1, *H. H. Ap.* 518–19). The terms used here, **ἡμρόντα** and **ἕμστον μεμῶσιν**, confirm the erotic element already hinted at in 514. The adj. may be related to Sanskrit *icchāti*, ‘desire’; the adv. **ἕμστον** ‘eagerly’, ‘incessantly’, ‘vehemently’ is of uncertain etymology and confined to epic and the Hellenistic poets. The *Il.* also frequently combines it with some part of **μεμῶς**; there it refers to a passionate desire.

522 A **ξενία**–relation between Od. and the ‘beggar’ did not figure in the tale that Od. told Eumaeus, where the ‘beggar’ merely heard about Od. while in Thesprotia (14.321). See 419–44n for such inconsistencies. But Eumaeus has good reason to introduce the fresh element: eager to promote his visitor’s cause, he exaggerates the bond between his guest and Od. the better to engage P.’s sympathies. In a striking case of one storyteller redeploying a motif initially introduced by another narrator, who was re-telling the tale that he heard from that first individual, Od. will preserve and amplify the detail when he fashions a fresh version of events for P. at 19.185–98.

523 Κρήτη: Crete and Thesprotia (526) bulk large in the lying tales fabricated by Od., which imagine the hero visiting both sites. The ‘beggar’ repeatedly styles himself a Cretan (13.256, 14.199, 19.172–81, the last with detailed information about the island) and constructs complex links with the Cretan hero Idomeneus and his family; the mendacious Aetolian whose visit Eumaeus describes also reports that Od. was in Crete (14.382–3). Thesprotia, part of Epirus in north-west Greece, figures at 14.315–30 and again at 19.271–90 (see previous note), where, in his interview with P., the speaker claims that Od. is in Thesprotia, collecting treasure prior to his return home, information he learnt from the king. Non-canonical versions of Od.’s wanderings also give the sites prominence in the hero’s itineraries. Dictys of Crete, probably writing in the first or second century AD, has Od. taking refuge in Crete and telling the tale of his wanderings to Idomeneus there (6.5); see further Haft 1984, Reece 1994. Thesprotia is also the site of a post-*Odyssean* journey made by Od. in the lost Cyclic poem *Telegony*, in which the hero marries Callidice, queen of the Thesprotians. For the poet’s reasons for glancing towards elements perhaps already familiar to contemporary audiences from different versions of his story, see Introduction pp. 7–8. **Μίνωος**: for other mentions of the legendary Cretan king, see 11.568–71

(Minos as judge in the underworld, perhaps a later addition), 11.321–3 (the Ariadne story, also considered an interpolation by some) and 19.178–80 (where Od. claims descent from the king); see too *Il.* 13.499–54 and 14.321–2. Additional references in Hes. *Th.* 947–9, fr. 144 M–W) suggest that the poetic tradition preserved some dim memory of Minoan Crete and the rulers of Knossos. In later sources, Minos appears chiefly within the Theseus legend (e.g. Bacch. 17), as the first thalassocrat, and as judge in Hades (Pl. *Gorg.* 523a–7a).

525 **προπροκυλινδόμενος** lit. ‘having been rolled on and on’ i.e. ‘driven about’. The reduplicated prefix of the compound imitates the action described. The expression occurs only here and at *Il.* 22.221 (of Apollo ‘grovelling’ in front of Zeus). **σταῦται**: an exclusively epic verb (× 6 *Il.*, × 2 *Od.*; absent from Hesiod and the *Hymns*), regularly found with the inf. and used of an individual declaring, promising or threatening something in an insistent and assertive manner. At 11.584 (of Tantalus straining to drink) it must carry a different meaning.

526–7 **ἀγχοῦ...ζωοῦ**: in both instances, enjambment allows the speaker to withhold the critical detail so as to place it in emphatic v.-initial position. Od. virtually echoes the lines at 19.271–2.

529 The sequence of rapid dactyls may reflect P.’s eagerness for the interview.

530 **ἐψιάσθων** ‘let them amuse themselves’. The simple form of the verb appears in H. only here and at 21.429; compound forms occur at 19.331, 370, 372. Ancient commentators dispute the term’s etymology and meaning (in addition to the Homeric scholia, see Σ A. R. 1.459, Pearson on S. fr. 3), variously deriving it from **ἔπος** and **ἐψία**. Both ‘talk’ and ‘play’ are possible in the present context, which may be the source of the later controversy.

532 **ἀκήρατα** ‘untouched’, from **κηραίνω**, ‘harm, destroy’.

533 **τὰ μὲν οἰκῆς ἔδουσι**: the transmitted τ’ before οἰκῆς is unnecessary since the scansion of μὲν observes the digamma with which the noun originally began. The οἰκῆς, as their name’s derivation from οἶκος suggests, are workers attached to the household. On several occasions (14.4 and 63) they have the clearly servile status evident in later sources’ uses of the term; elsewhere they may be no more than inmates/dependents of the house (Thalman 1998: 65 suggests that Homeric usage registers the transition from the generalized to the more particular meaning). Here the inhabitants of the suitors’ homes commit the same transgression as their masters and social superiors, as though taking their cue from those who should observe higher standards of conduct.

534–9 = 2.55–59. P. echoes Telemachus’ words of complaint during the meeting in the agora.

534 **εἰς ἡμέτερον** sc. **δῶμα**. Most MSS give **εἰς ἡμέτερου**; see 2.55 with S. West and 7.301, where Aristarchus prefers the gen., for the same v.l. The gen. may be due to the false analogy with phrases such as **ἐς πατρός**.

535–6 See 180–1n for the suitors’ performance of sacrifices.

536 **αἶθρα οἶνον** ‘sparkling wine’, a formula (*Od.* × 12, *Il.* × 9) most frequently found at line end. Here, as regularly in H., hiatus reflects the digamma with which

οἶνος began (cf. Lat. *vinum*). In a characteristic disregard for ritual protocol, the suitors drink without performing the preliminary libations that accompany the act elsewhere; the formula that describes the correct sequence, αὐτὰρ ἐπει σπείσάν τε πίων (3.342, 395, 7.184, 228, 18.427, 21.273), indicates the tight conjunction of ‘making libations’ and ‘drinking’; see further Saïd 1979: 33–6 and 18.427n.

537 τὰ δὲ πολλὰ κατάνεται ‘these things are chiefly wasted’. The τὰ is demonstrative, the πολλὰ adverbial. ἔπ’ = ἔπεστι as the accent indicates.

538 οἶος . . . ἀμύναι ‘such as Odysseus was, to ward off harm from the household’, a phrase which anticipates the role that Od. will shortly assume; see also 539–40. ἀρήν, ‘harm’, a term independent of ἀρή (long α) ‘prayer’ or ‘curse’ and perhaps already confused with the god Ἄρης at *Il.* 5.31 (see Wyatt 1969: 88). The word, of uncertain formation and origin (see Chantraine, *DE* s.v. for conjectures) survives in H. only in two formulas, ἀρήν + forms of ἀμύνω and ἀρῆς ἀλκτῆρα.

539–40 ἀποτίσεται: either a non-thematic aor. subj. middle or a fut. ind. (see Chantraine, *GH* II 225 for other examples of the same two possibilities); the meaning remains unchanged. In conditions in H., an opt. in the protasis may be followed by a subj. or future with κε; cf. *Il.* 11.386, 10.222–3, Monro, *HD* 311 (assuming a subj. at 540) and Goodwin, *MT* 499. βίος: ‘force’ is linked with the suitors’ chief moral failing, ὕβρις, on a number of occasions (see 565n), and regularly describes the ensemble of activities for which Od. will exact retribution (ἀποτίσεται, 3.216, 11.118, 16.255). For this combination of violence and revenge, see Irwin 2005: 223, with the observation that the poem does not apply βίη to Od.’s actions towards the suitors. P.’s phrasing sounds a variation on the regular formula that links the hero’s νόστος with his act of retribution, ἀποτίσεται/–αι ἔλθων (3.216, 5.24, 11.118, 16.255, 24.480; see Irwin 2005: 302–3). The mention of Telemachus’ participation points towards his role in the final battle.

541 Τηλέμαχος δὲ μέγ’ ἔπταρην: the only sneeze in epic; for an exhaustive list of sneezes in other ancient sources, see Lateiner 2005: 99–101. Because of the spontaneous and involuntary nature of sneezing, the ancients invested the act with prophetic power, believing it an omen generally of good fortune, but sometimes of ill (e.g. Arist. *Prob.* 962b19, Plut. *Mor.* 581b). Because a sneeze originated in the head, later sources viewed it as an indication that the sneezer’s thought would be fulfilled; it was also treated as evidence of demonic possession since spirits might enter through bodily orifices. Cf. Hdt. 6.107.3, Ar. *Av.* 720, Xen. *Anab.* 3.2.8–9, Theoc. *Id.* 7.96, Catull. 45.8–9, 17–18, Propert. 2.3.24, Petron. *Sat.* 98.4; for a play on the prophetic sneeze, here preceded by a less decorous form of bodily emission, see *H. H. Merc.* 297. In this instance, Telemachus’ sneeze is handled in precisely the manner used by H. for other kinds of omens, whether a chance speech (a κληδών, see 18.117n) or thunder-clap (21.413–5; cf. 20.100, 105, 120). As with these seemingly random phenomena, the sneeze predicts the fulfilment of a wish. This scene also includes the three elements common to the apprehension of prophetic signs: the portent, the onlooker’s perception of and reaction to that portent, a gloss on its meaning by an onlooker (see de Jong 2001 on 2.143–207).

542 *σμερδαλέον κούβησε* ‘rang terribly’; the formula is coined for warfare (e.g., *Il.* 2.466, 15.648, 16.277, 21.593; note too Hes. *Th.* 840, *H. H. Merc.* 420, *H. H.* 28.11). Monro seems right in seeing its application to Telemachus’ sneeze as mock-heroic. The adverb regularly appears in v.-initial position, often of a noise (8.305, 24.537). **γέλασσε δὲ Πηνελόπεια**: again, P. is either credited with preternaturally acute hearing (although the poet notes the tremendous resonance of the sneeze) or must be in a chamber within earshot of the banqueting hall; see 492–3n. This is the first of P.’s two laughs (see 18.163n for the second; for the very different nature of the suitors’ laughter, see 18.35n). The response suggests both her confidence that the coming interview will confirm the hopes that she has formulated and, more broadly, her emergence from a protracted state of mourning; grief for her husband has effectively placed P. in a death-like condition which she begins to quit in the face of repeated predictions of his return. Cf. *H. H. Cer.* 204, with Richardson’s discussion of laughter as a folkloric symbol of rebirth or of the dead’s return to life (217), and Austin 1975: 206–7. For the tension between P.’s optimistic reaction here and her conduct in books 18–23, see Introduction p. 27.

544–50 P.’s speech ‘caps’ the omen, alerting the divine force inspiring the sneeze to the nature of the wish to be fulfilled; verbally accepting the portent, according to Greek thought, guarantees its realization in the sense desired by the speaker. P. also suggestively couples together two seemingly independent themes: the vengeance on the suitors that is dependent on her husband’s return and the reception that she will give the beggar.

544–88 From here almost until the book’s close, the poet focuses on arrangements for the coming interview. The protracted negotiations concerning the timing, circumstances and location of the colloquy mark its importance.

545 *ἐπέπταρε πᾶσι ἔπεισοι* ‘sneezed for/at all my words’. It may be indicative of P.’s mental acuity that she, like Helen in book 15.172–8, is able to decipher the meaning of the sign; more crucially, her discernment proves one among the traits she shares with Od., who also shows himself a master in interpreting seemingly random events and remarks that portend his future triumph (18.112–17nn, 20.102–21). P.’s rapid apprehension of the significance of Telemachus’ sneeze is also critical for the realization of the omen; the witnesses’ active participation in and corroboration of cledoniac phenomena help bring about the desired result (Lateiner 2005: 94–5).

546 *ἀτελής* ‘unaccomplished’; the term appears uniquely here in H.

549 *νημερτέα πάντ’ ἐνέποντα*: the verb *ἐν(ν)έπω* carries particular significance in H., regularly used of ‘an authoritative speech-act, initiated by a request for information, which is then recounted at length’ (Martin 1989: 238). In the *Od.*, the verb, which opens the poem (1.1), frequently appears in the context of narratives that describe first-hand, autobiographical experiences (e.g. 9.37, 23.301).

550 *χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε*: the phrase occurs × 15 in the *Od.* in the context of promises or actual bestowals of clothing (5.229, 10.542, 14.132, 154, 320, 341, 396, 516,

15.338, 368, 16.79, 17.557, 21.339, 22.487) and belongs to the ‘clothing motif’ (see 24n). Garments not only form part of the conventions of hospitality and serve as guest-gifts at the various sites visited by Od. and Telemachus (see 8.425, 13.10, 15.123–30, cf. 24. 276–7) but, more fundamentally, they mark Od.’s passage from a state of beast-like nudity when he first appears in Scheria to a restored humanity. See too 18.41, 361nn. Also visible here is a second Odyssean concern, the problematic connection between storytelling, veracity and remuneration. P.’s promise of a tunic and mantle in return for an entirely truthful narrative recalls Eumaeus’ remark in the context of his description of other vagrants who had visited P. and who recounted fictitious tales in the hope of reward: ‘and you too, old man, would change your tale if someone gave you a cloak and mantle’ (14.131–2). However, on that occasion the ‘beggar’ deferred bestowal of the clothing until the fulfilment of the promise that he made to Eumaeus, that Od. would shortly be home (152–5); in the bargain proposed there, the payment that the storyteller exacts depends exclusively on the truth value of his words; see further von Reden 1995b.

553 **ξείνε πάτερ**: the expression is used uniquely in addresses to Od.; see 18.122.

554–5 **μεταλλῆσαι . . . κέλεται** ‘her heart bids her inquire something’. **περ**: concessive, as at 570. **πεπαυθίη**: the dative should be construed with **θυμός . . . κέλεται**.

557 **ἔσσει**: 3 sing. fut. of **ἔννυμι**, ‘clothe’.

558–9 Eumaeus attaches a two-line coda to his otherwise verbatim account of P.’s words (see 345–7n for the conventions of *oratio obliqua* reports in H.). Such additions or, on occasion, alterations to the original statement are not uncommon in the *Od.*; whereas messengers in the *Il.* usually reproduce in unchanged fashion, or with only very minor departures, the instructions they transmit (Od.’s omission of the ending of Ag.’s speech in his report to Achilles at *Il.* 9 notoriously excepted), in the *Od.* the issuer of the directive and messengers regularly diverge. The swineherd quite naturally imagines the ‘beggar’s’ resumption of his habitual circuit and activity whereas P., whether acting on some internal prompt or merely following H.’s plot design, has projected nothing beyond the bestowal of the clothes that she promises (because, in effect, Od. will remain with her).

563 **ἀνεδέγμεθ’ ἀναδέχομαι** in its metaphorical sense, ‘undergo’. Here the ‘beggar’ explicitly equates the ‘misery’ he has endured with the suffering of Od., who has frequently ascribed just such **οἰζύς** to himself (e.g. 7.211–12, 11.167; cf. 23.307).

564 **ὑποδείδι** ‘I am a little afraid’; perf. with present sense.

565 = 15.329. Here H. pointedly varies the standard formulation whereby the **κλέος** of an individual or thing reaches the sky (8.74, 9.20, 19.108, *Il.* 8.192). **σιδήρεον οὐρανόν**: the sky is called ‘iron’ only here and in the identical line at 15.329. A development from the more common epic ‘bronze sky’ (*Il.* 5.504, 17.425; cf. *Od.* 3.2), and an indicator of the use of iron in the Homeric age, the adj. may refer to the sky’s colour or stability; however, following the Hesiodic scheme of the Ages of Man, where the defining characteristics of the age of iron are **ὑβρις** and **βίη**, the epithet may have thematic significance.

567 ὀδύνησιον ἔδωκεν: for the expression, see *Il.* 5.397; cf. *Pl. Phaedr.* 254e.

568 ἐπήρκεσεν ‘did [not] give protection from’.

569–70 Even after the extended relay of messages, the interview is further postponed. *Od.*’s deferral of the meeting recapitulates a motif at the book’s start, where Telemachus more harshly rebuffed his mother’s first request for news. Once again P. must wait.

571 ‘then let her ask me about her husband, as to the day of his homecoming’; νόστιμον ἦμαρ is an internal accusative.

572–3 παραί πυρῖ: together with the threshold (339n), the fire and the hearth that it occupies are privileged locations in the poem, reserved exclusively for *Od.* and his hosts (e.g. 6.52, 305, 7.153–4, 160, 19.55, 389, 506, 23.71, 89; see further Katz 1991: 137). It is also a site particularly associated with a woman’s activity as mistress of her household, and so provides a fitting spot for P.’s projected meeting (cf. *Od.*’s interview with Arete at 6.305). In this instance the motif coheres with the clothing theme as the poet reminds us of the cold outdoors; for the wintertime setting, see 23–5n. The book that begins with *Od.*’s desire to wait for the sun’s warmth before venturing out nears its close by anticipating his accommodation at the domestic fire.

574–5 Eumaeus’ second trip to P.’s chamber. The use of the go-between emphasizes the physical separation between husband and wife even as they become increasingly mentally and emotionally attuned to one another.

575 P.’s address to Eumaeus even before he has fully crossed the threshold indicates her eagerness for the interview.

577 ἔξαισιον ‘excessively, beyond measure’, adverbial; the expression is derived from αἴσα, ‘destiny’ and forms the opposite of αἴσιμος, ‘in accordance with αἴσα’. P. unwittingly reveals a confidence in the beggar – for whom it is ‘destiny’ to overwhelm the suitors – which contrasts with the seemingly more realistic appraisal of his situation offered by Eumaeus at 580. ἀλλως ‘for another reason’.

578 κακός δ’ αἰδοῖος ἀλήτης ‘a wanderer who is shame-faced is in a bad way’. Typically *sententiae* occur at the end of speeches (see 246n). For the probably proverbial view that the deference and restraint that a poor man or beggar might naturally feel are detrimental to his cause, see 347n and Theogn. 177–8. Hesiod’s more extended use of the γνώμη at *WD* 317–19 explores the seeming paradox that αἰδώς, normally the mark of an ethically upright individual, can be undesirable: ‘it is not a good αἰδώς that attends a man in need, αἰδώς, which greatly harms or profits men, αἰδώς, I say, leads to poverty but boldness to wealth’. *Od.* 7.51–2 also recommends boldness as the most advantageous course an individual, here the destitute *Od.* newly arrived in Scheria, can follow.

580 κατὰ μοῖραν: the expression regularly appears in *H.* with verbs of speaking (uniquely here with μῦθεῖται; cf. 18.170 for the much more frequent ἔειπες); it describes utterances deemed appropriate and that conform to common standards of propriety. When applied to other activities, e.g. dividing up a sacrificial victim, equipping a ship, or milking sheep, the phrase indicates the sequential and orderly performance

of a task ('in order'; cf. the cognate terms *μείρομαι* and *μέρος* with Chantraine, *DE*); this was probably the formula's original meaning (see Finkelberg 1987: 137–8).

583 *καὶ δέ*: the juxtaposition of the two particles without intervening terms is unique to H., 'the former particle denoting that something is added, the latter that what is added is distinct from what precedes' (Denniston, *GP* 199).

584 *οἴην*: emphatically positioned here. Respectable women never do appear 'alone' and unaccompanied by maidservants before men who are not members of their family (for Nausicaa's violation of the code see 6.139, where the term also appears at line beginning; see too 18.182n and Nagler 1974: 64–72). Eumaeus' caution is warranted in the light of the treachery of P's maids.

586 *οὐκ ἄφρων . . . δῖεται*: cf. Nausicaa's remark at 6.187 after Od.'s first speech, *οὐτ' ἀφρονι φωτὶ ἔοικας*; the adj. refers not just to intellectual qualities, but to knowledge of how to behave. *ἄφρων* belongs among the terms that are all but exclusive to speeches in H. (the one exception is *Il.* 4.104; see Griffin 1986: 38). In his own narrative, H. uses vocabulary expressing such judgments or appraisals more sparingly. *ὥς περ ἂν εἴη* 'however it may be'.

587–8 'for never yet of mortal mankind have there been men who have devised such outrageous deeds in their violence'. *ὑβρίζοντες ἀτάσθαλα μηχανώνται* is formulaic ($\times 4$ *Od.*, $\times 1$ *Il.*). P's phrase combines two terms reserved for emphatic condemnations of violations of the rules and regulations governing social conduct (see 487n) and for descriptions of actions that involve morally reprehensible wantonness and aggression. The terms are joined at 3.207, where Telemachus details the suitors' offences, and, by Od., at 20.170. Not surprisingly, both *ὑβρις* and *ἀτάσθαλα* occur much more frequently in the *Od.* than *Il.* (*ὑβρις* $\times 5$ in *Il.*, $\times 26$ in *Od.*; *ἀτάσθαλα* and its cognates $\times 5$ in the *Il.*, $\times 26$ in *Od.*). The deeds that the *Od.* qualifies as *ἀτάσθαλια* are of a particularly heinous nature, including Od.'s crew's eating of the cattle of Helios (1.7) and Aegisthus' seduction of Clytemnestra (1.34). *ἀτάσθαλια* indicates not just outrageous and abusive conduct, but the reckless culpability and disregard for correct social and ritual protocols that leads an individual to his own perdition. The *Il.* combines *ὑβρις* and *ἀτάσθαλα* on an occasion where a speaker describes the deliberate infliction of dishonour, perhaps with violence (11.694–5). For detailed discussion, see Fisher 1992: 151–84, Introduction p. 18.

589–606

The book concludes with a brief exchange between Eumaeus and Telemachus before the swineherd's departure for his home with orders to return the next morning, a preparation for action still to come. The suitors continue carousing.

590 *διεπέφραδε*: an epic reduplicated aor. form of *φράζω*.

591–601 The closing dialogue between Eumaeus and Telemachus succinctly characterizes the individuals and demonstrates their relations. Typical of Eumaeus is his care for his masters' possessions, his paternal solicitude for Telemachus, and

his hostility towards the suitors. Telemachus' use of ἄττα at 599 (see 6n) signals his reciprocal affection.

593 *σύας καὶ κείνα*: κείνα may be equivalent to τὰ κείθι, describing everything that Eumaeus' farm comprises as opposed to the urban environment; the rural space contrasts with the subsequent ἐνθάδε (594). However, the combination of κείνα with σύας remains curious, lacking the parallelism such phrases normally observe (contrast 18.105, κύνας τε σύας); the variant κύνας achieves that correspondence, but is unmetrical.

595 *σάω*: an imperative of disputed derivation and form. At 13.230, σάω appears in the MSS without the variant σάου recorded here, but MSS for later authors sometimes use one form, and sometimes the other, and both may be authentic. See further A–H–S on *H. H.* 13.3, Schwyzer 1939–53: 1728 n. 2 and Chantraine, *GH* 1307.

599 *ἔσεται οὕτως*: Telemachus uses the same polite turn of phrase to Eumaeus at 16.31; for later examples of the expression, originally used solemnly to affirm that a wish or promise would be fulfilled, see Fraenkel 1962: 77–89. *δειελήσας* 'having had supper'. The verb is clearly derived from δέιλη, δείλος, referring to the late afternoon, near sunset (see 606n), but its meaning has been a source of controversy since antiquity. Aristarchus took the view that there were only three meals in *H.*, breakfast (ἄριστον), lunch (δέιπνον) and dinner (δόρπον), inclining some ancient and modern readers to give the phrase here the meaning 'having spent the afternoon'. But the action that immediately follows (Eumaeus eats and drinks) more naturally suggests that Telemachus instructs him to take a meal that would fall between δέιπνον and δόρπον. Cf. the expression at *Call.* fr. 238.20, δειελὸν αἰτίζουσιν, probably with the meaning 'ask for an evening meal'. For the ancient debate surrounding the term, see *Athen.* 1.11b–f and 5.193a–b.

600 *ἠῶθεν δ'*: the expression regularly appears at line beginning when it refers to an action to be performed on the next day (e.g. 19.320, 21.265); the suffix is abl. ('at dawn'). *ἰέναι* and *ἄγειν* are imperatival. *ἰερήϊα καλά*: a metrically convenient inversion of the more regular word order.

604 Eumaeus will not re-enter the city until 20.162, fulfilling Telemachus' order at 600. His departure from the house stands in symmetrical relation to the action that initiated the book, when Telemachus left Eumaeus' hut for the palace.

605–6 *ὄρχηστῦ καὶ ἀοιδῇ τέρπον*: the two activities are combined at line end at 8.253. For the pleasure derived from song, see 18.305–6n.

606 *δειελὸν ἡμαρ*: late afternoon, rather than evening (cf. *Theoc. Id.* 25.86); the next temporal indicator will be at 18.306 (*μέλας ἔσπερος*). On eight other occasions in the poem (books 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 16, 18, 19), the close of day coincides with what is conventionally regarded as the book's end (see 1n). In this instance (as in books 2, 3, 5, 16), the detail complements the sunrise that opened the book and seemingly concludes what is going to be the suitors' last complete day. However, the action does not end here and the suitors' pastime leads into the subsequent episode, featuring the 'entertainment' (see 18.37) that the advent of Irus will provide.

Book 18

By the end of book 17, Od. is reinstated within his house, a site he does not leave until after his reunion with P. in book 23. Like the preceding book, book 18 vividly depicts the abusive treatment that the disguised hero receives at the hands of the suitors and two more of their underlings, the stooge Irus and the treacherous maid Melantho. While the private interview between Od. and P. projected at the end of book 17 is further postponed, this book stages a public encounter between husband and wife, allowing Od. his first glimpse of the queen and an opportunity to gauge her state of mind. P.'s decision to appear before the suitors is also critical in moving the plot towards its denouement. Her apparent capitulation when she announces her willingness to remarry forms the necessary prelude to the contest of the bow and Od.'s reclamation of his wife.

1-110

The public beggar Irus, a highly unsympathetic figure, arrives at Od.'s home and, fearing a rival, insults the disguised hero and attempts to drive him from the house. Incited by the suitor Antinous, Irus and Od. have a boxing contest. Od. knocks Irus down with a single blow and drags him out of the hall and into the courtyard.

This episode carries at least four levels of significance, structural, thematic, social/ideological and generic: (a) In structural terms, the scene looks back to past episodes and anticipates action still to come. It recalls the pattern of the hero's quarrel with Euryalus in Scheria in book 8 (see Introduction p. 16 and Fenik 1974: 166) and recapitulates several other scenes, Od.'s encounter with the churlish goatherd Melanthus in book 17 most immediately, in which individuals from different social strata verbally and physically abuse the disguised hero (see 17.212-53nn). Od.'s victory over Irus also acts as a comic hors d'oeuvre to his more critical triumph in the contest of the bow and defeat of the suitors (see Introduction p. 16, Levine 1982, de Jong on 1-158 and 50-1, 66-87, 76, 77, 88, 99nn).

(b) Thematically, the quarrel and contest highlight the unmannerly, intemperate, rash and myopic behaviour characteristic of Od.'s antagonists, whatever their place on the social ladder. Consistent with representations of the suitors throughout the second part of the poem, the dispute shows up their blindness in the face of indicators of Od.'s true identity (see particularly 67-70nn). The hero's ability to maintain his disguise while being insulted demonstrates anew his endurance, suppression of emotion and the self-discipline gained through the course of his adventures (a regular motif through books 17-21; see 17.235-7, 462-5nn). At the same time the encounter with Irus allows the poet to remind his audience that Od.'s temporary degradation has not weakened his innate strength and pride. In this 'crisis of differentiation' (see 108-9n), Irus is made to function much as the scapegoat of myth and ritual, whose expulsion could restore a fractured social harmony (35n). Driven outside the company of diners, the mendicant reaffirms his truly marginal status when the episode ends with his

investment with one of the trappings, the staff, which earlier formed part of the hero's beggarly disguise.

(c) For several recent readers, this low-life, burlesque scene supplies insights into social conditions in eighth-century Greece, giving a glimpse of a figure probably familiar to the Homeric audience. Irus, the 'common beggar' (18.1, see further 6–7n) belongs to no household as the other base-born individuals in the poem do, but looks for handouts from the δῆμος at large. As the swineherd Eumaeus has indicated (17.382–7), the unproductive πτωχός stands in contrast to other public and 'extraterritorial' but valued individuals, the δημοεργοί, whose specialized skills were available to those who could command their services. As Eumaeus' speech also anticipated, Irus fills the role of ἀκλητος, the uninvited guest or parasite. Melanthius has already linked beggars with this unlovely presence in the dining hall when he calls the πτωχός a 'lick-plate of the feast' (17.220n), the one who makes a meal from the scraps left by the more select company of diners. As Archilochus 124 W (οὐδε μὲν κληθεις . . . ἤλθες οἶα δὴ φίλος, | ἄλλὰ σεο γαστήρ νόον τε καὶ φρένας παρήγαγεν | εἰς ἀναιδείην) and other post-Homeric sources confirm, Irus already displays many of the traits that would come to be associated with the parasite, the individual who is permitted (on sufferance) to feast at another man's table without providing reciprocal hospitality (cf. Alexis fr. 123 K–A). Greed, quarrelling, fistfights, an unprepossessing appearance and shamelessness characterize the ἀκλητος, who frequently plays the clown before the legitimate diners in return for handouts (see Fehr 1990).

Following this rare snapshot of a figure normally excluded from epic, the treatment that the beggars, real and apparent, receive also illustrates the poem's variegated ideological orientation (see Introduction p. 12). If Od., ragged, cold and hungry, commands our sympathy, the poet carefully distinguishes the disguised hero from the genuine mendicant in the dining hall. The unmistakably negative depiction of Irus, the comic representation of his discomfiture and the suggestion that such men deserve their poverty because of their idleness and voracity, tell against the view that H. offers an unequivocally positive account of the dispossessed and seeks to expose the 'callous arrogance of the ruling oligarchs who find such hysterical sport in the sufferings of poor men compelled to fight over food' (Rose 1992: 111–12). The triumph of the individual who, the audience knows, has merely assumed his position as déclassé serves to reaffirm the status quo and to re-establish those aristocratic and hierarchical values called into question by the suitors' practice of conduct unbecoming to the elite (see Thalmann 1998: 104–7).

(d) Finally, in his characterization and role, Irus exhibits many links with another Homeric figure whose prime function seems to be to mock/abuse and then to be humiliated, silenced and excluded. Like Thersites in the *Il.*, Irus may be read as a 'crossover' character more at home in a possibly contemporary style of satiric and invective poetry that defines itself in opposition to epic. Both blamer and blamed, Irus' depravity, physique, discourse and punishment also anticipate both the personas adopted by the later Ionian iambographers and the properties they would assign to

the targets of their mockery; see 17.212, 215, 18.2–3, 5, 9–110, 35nn and Introduction p. 23, with further discussion in Nagy 1979: 228–31, Suter 1993, Thalmann 1988.

1–8 This introductory section offers a brief characterization of Irus; the echoing terms ἦλθε (1) and ἐλθών (8) mark the beginning and end of the ring composition typically found in such passages (see 17.292–300n). The appearance of this new character is unusually abrupt; cf. 24.1 for the sole parallel; like book 17, book 23 ends with a temporal marker, suggesting a break in the action (see further 17.1n). But Irus' arrival is not completely unheralded; see Antinous' comment at 17.376–7 on the 'wanderers and beggars' already spoiling the feast.

1 ἐπί: adverbial (= ἐπήλθε). πτωχός πανδήμιος 'common beggar'. The adj. indicates Irus' lack of attachment to any particular household and capacity to travel among the different segments of the local community. But for all his marginal status, the πτωχός would come surrounded by social, ethical and religious sanctions that required his proper reception and nourishment. So at 14.57–8, after Eumaeus declares in the strongest terms ('it is θέμις') his obligation to 'honour' and give hospitality to the beggar at his door (Od. in disguise), he remarks that 'strangers and beggars are from Zeus'. See further 6–7nn and Hesiod's reminder that poverty alone should never be a reason for abuse (*WD* 717–18). For a thumbnail sketch of the beggar very different from Eumaeus' and consonant with the vituperative character of its author, see Melanthius' remarks on the 'vexatious' πτωχός (17.220 and 377nn). ὅς: the relative clause explains the adj., serving, as is common in epic style, to gloss what comes before; cf. 1.300, 2.65–6. For the pronoun in passages of character introduction, see 17.292n. ἄστν: at *Il.* 17.144, the poet seems to differentiate between the ἄστν and πόλις (the former may describe the city proper, its streets, walls and buildings, the latter, following its earliest meaning of 'citadel' or 'stronghold', the true city heart), but elsewhere the two are synonyms (*Od.* 6.177–8, 8.524–5). Here the term, which gives a glimpse of the 'urban' character of Ithaca and the social and political institutions most apparent in 2.1–257, further emphasizes that Irus does not belong to any particular οἶκος.

2–3 The second of three sequential enjambments, a device particularly common when the new thought begins, as here, at the bucolic diaeresis. πτωχέεσκ': iterative, 'whose custom it was to beg'; cf. 6 (κίκλησκον), 7 (ἀπαγγέλλεσκε). μετὰ δ' ἔπρεπε . . . πίεμεν 'he was distinguished for his ravenous belly, for his incessant eating and drinking'. μεταπρέπω, usually introducing heroic distinction (e.g. *Il.* 2.579, 16.194), here sounds a note of parody in the light of the phrase coming immediately after; cf. Hippon. fr. 128 W, where grandiose Homeric diction introduces a character also faulted for his voracious appetite. γαστέρι μάργη: a unique expression in H. The stomach has, however, been an important element in the poet's characterization of Od. (see 17.286n) and establishes an initial link between Irus and his fellow mendicant. For the derogatory implications of the γαστήρ in archaic song, see Hes. *Th.* 26; for its role in the *Od.*, see Rose 1992: 108–10, Thalmann 1998: 102, Garvie at 7.215–21 and below, 44, 53–4nn. The adj., 'wanton, importunate', reinforces the pejorative quality of the belly, and deprives the hunger motif of the pathos that it

carries elsewhere in the poem; cf. the titular low-life hero of the mock epic *Margites*, the comic composition attributed in antiquity to Homer. The expression was earlier used of Antinous (16.421), Irus' upper class counterpart (see Levine 1982 and Introduction p. 15). In later sources, γαστριμαργία describes intemperate behaviour, sexual and, most frequently, alimentary (e.g., Pind. *Ol.* 1.52–3, 'far be it from me to call any of the immortals a glutton [γαστριμαργον]', Ar. fr. 11 K–A, Pl. *Tim.* 73a, *Phaed.* 81e, Arist. *NE* 1118b19); for the term's association with the notoriously immoderate satyrs, see Arnould 1989. Irus' greed is one of the several elements linking the beggar with later iambic discourse and invective (cf. Archil. fr. 124 W; Hippon. fr. 118 W, Alc. fr. 129.21 L–P, Pind. *Pyth.* 2.55–6, Ibycus fr. 311a, with discussion in Nagy 1979: 225–30). A clamorous appetite is also typical of the ἀκλητος throughout the Greek literary tradition (Fehr 1990: 186). ἀζηχῆς: internal 'adverbial' accusative and object of the verbs that follow. The term is of uncertain etymology, but its context indicates the meaning 'incessant, without interruption' (adj. and adv. × 4 in *Il.*, uniquely here in *Od.*; for its derivation, see Bechtel, *Lexilogus* 14–15, Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *DE*, Snell–Erbse, *Lfgre*). φαγέμεν και πιέμεν: complementary infinitive forms following μετέπρεπε.

3–4 The 'virtual tautology' (so Stanford) of ἴς (cf. Lat. *vis*) and βίη and anaphoric οὐδέ emphasize the spinelessness that Irus will demonstrate later in the scene. Coupled with the reference to the beggar's bulk, the phrase signals the disjuncture between outward appearance and inner essence, a critical motif in the poem (see 17.454n, de Jong on 1–158, Dimock 1989: 232, Bernsdorff 1992). For the possible anticipation of Irus' transformation into Ἄ-ἵρος later on, see 6–7 and 73 nn.

5 Ἀρναῖος: commentators variously interpret this patently 'speaking name'. From Σ B on, many derive it from ἀρνεύμαι, 'acquire'; hence Irus = 'the Getter' (Russo). Also noted in the scholia is a possible link with ἀρνα 'lamb, sheep'; Ἀρναῖος would then be 'sheep-like' or 'foolish', a derogatory soubriquet in keeping with Irus' role as target of invective discourse, where animal names are commonly used by the author of the abuse (Davies 1985: 36); for other proposals, see von Kamptz 1982: 285–6. The very emphasis on Irus' name, a topic filling two of the eight introductory lines, coincides with the poem's preoccupation with nomination, and particularly with the name (or suppression thereof) of its hero. While Irus has an excess of names (see 73n), *Od.* remains strictly incognito in the episode (see further Austin 1972, Peradotto 1990: 94–142). ἔσκε 'used to be'. πόντια μήτηρ: a very common formula used at v. end, × 33 in *Il.* and *Od.* The application of the seemingly honorific epithet 'august, queenly' to Irus' mother has long been a critical problem; a variant reading probably dating back to Alexandrian times replaces the term with δειλή; the *Et. M.*'s reading οἱ ποτε, ('[his mother gave it] to him once') similarly attempts to skirt the difficulty. For many, πόντια belongs to the class of epithets denoting a regular attribute of a phenomenon that may be absent in particular instances of the genus (a distinction already drawn by Aristarchus). Since etymologically πόντια is the feminine form of πόντις, 'husband', the term could also simply refer to marital status (Lowenstam 1993: 24–6). Irony directed at Irus' (doubtless) low-class mother is less likely; while Homeric

speakers do play on formulaic expressions (see 17.511 and 18.319nn), the poet does not usually deploy epithets with mocking intent. The ancient sources variously assign name-giving to mothers and fathers; for mothers, see *H. H. Cer.* 122 (in a phrase identical to this), *Pind. Ol.* 6.56–7; for fathers, e.g. *Eur. Phoen.* 12–13. At *Od.* 19.406–9, the hero's maternal grandfather names him.

6–7 Ἴρον . . . ἀπαγγέλλεσκε: Irus stands as the (comic) male equivalent to the messenger goddess Iris. As message-carrier, 'Irus' might also put an audience in mind of the form *ἶρος, from which the Homeric ἱερός, 'strong, quick', is derived (see Russo ad loc.); the messenger's name will prove particularly inapposite when he is shown up as the reverse of 'the one who has strength' (see 73n and Nagy 1979: 229 n. 4). οὐνεκ: H. and Hesiod regularly choose this conjunction when explaining names; cf. *Il.* 7.140, 9.562, *Hes. Th.* 144, 197, 235. κίκλησκον: an iterative and reduplicated form (κι-κλ- + σκ) and near synonym of κἄλέω. Irus' tenure in the dining hall seems to depend on the offices he performs, much as a retainer's would. In this instance, the suitors appear to disregard or confuse correct divisions between the public and private domains, the οἶκος and πόλις, treating as their own an individual who owes allegiance to no single household (so πανδήμιος). Their failure to observe societal norms governing *meum* and *tuum* is, of course, the nub of their crime towards Od., whose property they devour and whose hospitality they enjoy without reciprocating.

7 ὅτε ποῦ τις 'when someone somewhere'. ποῦ makes the clause still more vague; cf. *Il.* 11.292.

8 ὅς: demonstrative. διώκετο 'he tried to chase'; conative imperfect. Because of their frequent double-short endings, middle-passive forms frequently precede the bucolic diaeresis. οἶο δόμοιο: 'his own home'; the use of the redundant possessive pronoun commonly adds emphasis and pathos (cf. 13.251, 14.32, 23.153); here it underscores the outrageous nature of Irus' action in aiming to displace the rightful lord. Verbs of separation, deprivation or distance from are regularly followed by the gen. ('ablative gen.'): see Monro, *HD* 152; cf. 10, προθύρου.

9–110 Here begins the common assault pattern, featuring abuse of Od., his defensive or conciliatory reaction, fresh attack and finally the hero's response to and defeat of the abuser. The scenario recalls several scenes in the *Il.* (Thersites' intervention in 2.211–77; Paris' duel with Menelaus at 3.15–110) where the mocker is transformed into the mocked and conflict between the protagonists occurs while an audience looks on. This sequence, parallel to the modern Punch and Judy show, may 'reflect the pattern of festival presentations' that would also have accommodated early forms of iambic song (Suter 1993: 7).

9 νεικέων: for the verb, see 17.215n. An exchange of threats, boasts and insults is a standard prelude to the heroic duels in the *Il.*, the model that this encounter repeatedly draws on and inverts (for details, see de Jong 2001 on 1–158). ἔπεια πτερόντα προσήυδα: see 17.40n.

10–13 Irus' initial protests at the new beggar's presence echo Antinous' complaints at 17.375–9, 406–8. This parallel forms only the first of the repeated analogies between the chief suitor and parasite. See 10, 15–24, 20–11n and Levine 1982: 200.

10 προθύρου: see 8n for the genitive. Here, as commonly, the ‘fore-door’ must be the vestibule of the hall (cf. 18.101, 21.299, 22.474); see 386n for a different meaning. **ποδός** ‘by the foot’, genitive of the part, as with other verbs signifying touching and taking hold of (see 17.263n). **ἔλκη:** 2 sing. passive, for **ἔλκηται**, one of the rare contracted forms in H. For similar formations, see Shipp 1972: 164–5. Dragging by the foot forms a leitmotif in the palace scenes (cf. 16.276, one element of Od.’s predictions that does not come true, and 17.479–80, where Antinous claimed that Od.’s failure to heed his warning would result in this indignity). In the event it will be Irus who is dragged by the foot (101). This mode of ejection seems particularly suited to the buffoon or **ἄκλητος** at the feast; see further Fehr 1990: 187, citing the example of Hephaestus at *Il.* 1.591 together with artistic representations of the practice; on Od.–Hephaestus parallels, see 111, 328 and 17.16nn. The motif also parodies Iliadic battlefield encounters; there dragging by the foot is the typical method of removing a dead enemy from the field (10.490, 11.258, 13.383, 14.477, 17.289, 18.537, 21.120). Irus, by contrast, will suffer the same fate while still very much alive and literally kicking.

11 ἐπιλλίζουσιν ‘winking, squinting the eyes’, a rare term found here, at *H. H. Merc.* 387 and *A. R.* 1.486, 3.791, 4.389. Terms derived from the adj. **ιλλός** (‘squinting’) can refer to various distortions of the eye: directing mocking glances at someone (*A. Eum.* 113), peering at an object (*A. fr.* 226 Radt), or ogling an object of desire (*Philem. fr.* 124.4 K–A). In all its extant uses, **ἐπιλλίζω** serves as a gesture that conveys reproach or occurs in the context of shame-causing speech (Lowry 1991: 118–29). The wink affirms the complicity between the suitors and their factotum (cf. 26 31n), a bond already signalled by his willingness to run messages for them (albeit for the privilege of eating Od.’s food).

12 αλοχύνομαι: the middle form of the verb appears elsewhere in H. only at 7.305 and 21.323. See Shipp 1972: 191 for its eventual replacement of **αἰδέομαι** in Attic prose. Of course **αἰδώς** is a property which Irus singularly lacks.

13 ἄνα ‘up’, the adverbial use of the preposition; anastrophe accents occur in some instances when prepositions are emphatic or comparatively independent in a phrase (Monro, *HD* 180). The term replaces the longer **ἀνάσθηθι**, ‘get up’ (*Il.* 6.331). Od. is sitting on the ground, a position suited to his degraded status (17.339n); in Greek vase painting, proximity to the ground similarly characterizes those of low or servile condition (e.g. the furnace-stoker on the Foundry Painter Cup, Berlin F 2294). The poet charts Od.’s transition from beggar to guest to master through his literal elevation and change of seats – from the ground to the **δίφρος**, ‘stool’ (19.97), to the grander **θρόνος** at 24.385 (see 17.330n, Houston 1975). This final line recapitulates the structure of Irus’ opening sally, an imperative followed by a threat. **ἡμῶν** ‘between us two’. The dual is the first indicator of the (apparent) parity and kinship between the beggars (cf. 34n). **ἔρις:** Hes. *WD* 24–6 includes strife between beggars in his account of the two Erides: **πρωχός πρωχῶι φθονέει;** for Homeric **ἔρις**, much more akin to ‘rivalry’ than ‘conflict’, see Hogan 1981 and 366n. Consistent with the use of the dual here, archaic poets seem to favour the noun where parity and homogeneity exist between contenders (so *Il.* 11.73, Hes. *WD* 24–6). **ἔρις** also appears in the characterization of

Thersites' words (2.214, 247). With one exception (the chariot race in *Il.* 23), no ξρις in H. is ever peacefully resolved. καί: sc. 'as well as with words'. χερσι: the first of repeated mentions of hands (cf. 20, 89 and 100nn); these will be critical in the boxing match.

14 ὑπόδρα ἰδών: see 17.459, 18.337, 388nn. In this instance, the angry look, properly directed by a superior at an inferior, is appropriate to the social distinctions separating the interlocutors (so too at 337). This is also the glance with which Od. begins his answer to Thersites' abusive speech (*Il.* 2.245).

15–24 Od.'s reply starts out very different in tone from Irus' address. Initially he seeks to defuse the conflict, and his declarations recall his response to Antinous' abuse at 17.566–7 (see Levine 1982: 201 for parallels in diction). In characteristic fashion, the hero attempts to establish a bond of sympathy with his interlocutor by citing shared experience ('you seem to me to be a wanderer, even as I am', cf. his lying tale to Eumaeus at 14.287–98 and Austin 1975: 204–5). However, exactly half way through the speech Od. switches to a much more threatening mode that matches Irus' own.

15–16 Od. begins with a disclaimer in the form of a tricolon crescendo with anaphora.

15 δαιμόνι: a term found only in the vocative in H., frequently (but not always; see *Il.* 24.194) introducing a rebuke: 'What has got into you?' The original meaning, 'acting under the possession of a daemon', has been weakened or lost by this time, and the term now expresses only the speaker's surprise or bafflement (real or feigned) at what s/he regards as an addressee's aberrant behaviour (see further Brunius-Nilsson 1955).

16 φθονέω: the verb (*Il.* and *Od.* × 9 + ἐπιφθονέω at *Od.* 11.149) indicates not envy, but, in the negative, 'I do not begrudge' or 'object'. καί 'even'.

17 οὐδός: in prominent position at the line's start (as again at 33); see 17.339n for the site's significance. Since the hero will return to the threshold to string the bow (see 20.258, 21.124, 149; 22.2, 72, 76; note too 22.203), his defeat of Irus at this critical location prefigures the more important later victory over the suitors. χείσεται 'will contain, accommodate', from χανδάνω. οὐδέ τί σε χρή + infinitive is regularly used to express polite imperatives (× 8 *Il.*, × 7 *Od.*). The expression always appears at line end.

18 ἄλλοτρίων: a term regularly applied to the suitors in their repeated characterization as individuals who devour the goods of another (so 1.160, 17.452, 456, 18.280, 20.171, 221); cf. 20.347 ('and they were laughing with jaws not their own') with Kurke 1999: 258. In charging Irus with behaving as though he had special rights to the food and drink available to the suitors, Od. turns the beggar into a miniaturized version of these rapacious consumers of another's property. In Attic comedy, the expression τάλλότρια δειπνεῖν is virtually synonymous with 'to be a parasite'.

19 μέλλουσιν: with present infinitive 'are accustomed to, are likely to' (cf. Stanford on 13.383–4 and Chantraine, *GH* II 307–9). Here Od. briefly echoes the view commonly expressed in the poem that prosperity – as well as its reverse – lies in the giving of the gods, and does not depend on an individual's merit or worth (cf. 1.348–9,

4.236–7, 6.172–4, 180, 188–90, 14.444–5). In the present context *ἄλβος* probably refers to material wealth rather than to a more generalized ‘prosperity’ or ‘good fortune’; cf. 19.76, Hes. *WD* 320–1, 379–8, *H. H. Merc.* 379, Solon 6.3–4 W, Theogn. 153–4, 165–6 for *ἄλβος* as equivalent to *πλοῦτος* or *χρήματα*. *ὀπάζω* recurs frequently in contexts where gods are the bestowers of good things; cf. Hes. *Th.* 420, *H. H. Cer.* 494, Bacch. 17.130–2, Ar. *Thesm.* 972–3.

20 *χερσί* stands in emphatic position here, echoing 13 (with *η*).

20–1 Od.’s second use of anaphora in a tricolon (cf. 15–16), but with a different pattern: *μή* + imper. twice, followed by *μή* + subj. The hero’s threats are typical of those issued by boxers prior to their bouts; cf. *Il.* 23.673–5, A. R. 2.57–9 (with an echo of 18.21–2). Od. similarly warned Antinous of the consequences of his abusive behaviour at 17.475–6.

21 *γέρων περ ἔων*: the first mention of the ‘youth/age’ motif that runs through the scene. Part of Irus’ bond with the suitors depends on his being young like them; cf. *νέοι* in 6.

21–2 *φύρω αἵματος* ‘defile with blood’. By throwing the noun into prominent v.- initial position, the enjambment highlights the violence of the threatened act. Irus will be bloodied (97) just as Thersites was in *Il.* 2.267 when Od. drove that wrangler from the scene with his blows. *αἵματος* is gen. of material or source; cf. the use of the gen. with verbs of filling (e.g. *Il.* 1.470, ‘filled up the cups . . . with drink, ποτοῖο’).

22 *ἡσυχίη*: later sources privilege the ‘quietness’ and tranquillity of the well-conducted feast; see Solon 4.9–10 W, Pind. *Pyth.* 1.70, *Nem.* 9.48, 4.294–6; Theogn. 757–64, 773–88. *ἡσυχίη* is strikingly juxtaposed with *αἵματος* in v. initial position.

24 *Λαερτιάδεω Ὀδυσῆος*: a pointed application of a formula used *Od.* × 12; the name complete with patronymic at the speech’s end recalls the true identity of the speaker and his rightful possession of the space contested here. This solemn closing forms a piece with other moments when Od.’s manner and rhetoric hint at his true identity (cf. 14.158–64, 16.90–111 with virtually the same line at 104, 18.313–19, 19.582–7, 20.230–4).

25 *προσεφώνεεν*, followed by either the subject or the object, commonly appears in this position; cf. 8.381, 16.56.

26–31 Irus begins his second speech by addressing the suitors so as to reinforce his solidarity with them. Escalating the conflict, he will add insults to his earlier threats.

26 *ὁ μολοβρός*: cf. 17.219n; this is one of several elements that the two scenes share. The article in *H.* preserves its demonstrative or ‘deictic’ force; used this way, it can convey a speaker’s hostility or contempt for the addressee (cf. 114, 333). Irus would impute to his rival the greed that is his own motivation. *ἐπιτροχάδην* ‘glibly’, here with the pejorative sense of talking ‘too much’; contrast its positive meaning at *Il.* 3.213 *Μενέλαος ἐπιτροχάδην ἀγόρευε* (although, *contra* Shipp 1972: 72, the present instance does not parody that line). A critique of an opponent’s speaking style seems characteristic of ‘flying’ discourse; cf. *Il.* 4.355, ‘you are talking idly’, with Martin 1989: 70.

27 γρηῖ: a fresh reminder of the age distinction. The scholia observe the garulosity of old women. καμινῶι ‘furnace-woman’ (nom. καμινῶ), a hapax and, according to the ancient commentators, a hypocoristic (i.e. ‘pet name’) form of καμινῶ-καύστρια, ‘one who heats an oven or furnace’; nouns ending in ῶ may have had a popular flavour (see Snell–Erbse, *LfggE*) consistent with the low-class status of the oven- or furnace-tender (cf. 13n). The designation ‘furnace-man’ appears as an insult addressed to the Sicilian tyrant Agathocles (Diod. Sic. 20.63). Why furnace-women should be associated with glib speech remains unclear, but perhaps there is some anticipation of the figure of the baker or bread-woman, notoriously loud, foul-mouthed and quarrelsome (Anacr. fr. 388.4, Ar. *Ran.* 858, *Vesp.* 1388–1414, *Lys.* 457–8).

28 ἀφοτέρησι: sc. χερσί; for the ellipse, see 17.356n.

29 σὺς ὡς ληϊβοτείρης ‘as of a crop-destroying pig’. The lengthening of the syllable preceding ὡς is a carry-over from a period when the term still had the form *Ἔως (cf. 234, 4.32, 5.36, 7.71, 8.173, 9.413, 14.205, 19.280, 23.239, with Frisk, *GEW*, Ruijgh 1971: 701). Explaining this next insult, the scholia and Eustathius cite a Cyprian law permitting any landowner who caught a pig eating his crops to pull its teeth out; cf. Ael. *NA* 5.45, Call. *H.* 3.156. However, any formalized penalty is highly unlikely to have been current in Homeric times.

30 ζῶσαι ‘gird yourself’, an infinitive with imperatival force (so too 106).

32–3 ὧς οἱ μὲν: this expression followed by the imperfect serves frequently to recapitulate the events of the preceding scene and to suggest that the action is still going on. ὀκριόωντο ‘were growing sharp, becoming incensed’, from ὀκρις ‘sharp point’.

34 τοῖν: genitive, as often with verbs meaning to hear, mark or learn. For the dual, cf. 13 νῶϊν with n. As Antinous’ use of the form suggests, from his faulty perspective the beggars constitute an undifferentiated pair. ἱερὸν μένος Ἀντινόοιο ‘the holy might of Antinous’; ἱερὸν μένος is found uniquely in the *Od.* and used, in all 7 other instances, of Alcinous; its application to both individuals indicates that the periphrasis could suit villains as well as heroes. The phrase, cognate with the Vedic *isīrēna mānasā*, belongs among the expressions that Greek epic inherited from the IE poetic tradition (see West 1988: 155, Stella 1955: 16–7, 65–6, 107–8, 163–4, and Introduction p. 5). ἱερός is never assigned directly to persons in Homer; it would originally have been connected with the idea of the charismatic, numinous force or impetus (‘imbued with divine vigour’) that emanates from royalty, but its significance has by now been weakened. See further S. West on 2.409, Hainsworth on 7.167, Locher 1963: 54–5, Hooker 1980. For the IE antecedents of μένος and its appearances in the *Rigveda*, see Durante 1971–6: vol. 2, 94, 142 and Schmitt 1967: 103–12.

35 ἐγγελάσας: an ingressive aor. participle; see 17.33n and χολωσάμενος at 25. Laughter, chiefly hostile in nature, will be directed at Od. (by the suitors and the maids) throughout this book (40, 100, 320, 350) and again in book 20.374; cf. 20.346, 347, 358. That the hero should be an object of derision coincides with his assumed role as figurative scapegoat and proto-iambic victim in these scenes (see Introduction p. 23).

Much in Od.'s profile (not least his preoccupation with his stomach) also links him more generally with a *komos* tradition involving buffoonery and revelry that anticipates his prominence in later satyr plays (Eur. *Cycl.*, A. fr. 179–80 Radt, S. fr. 565 Radt; see further Arnould 1989, Casolari 2003: 210–11). In this instance, the derision also reveals the nature of the suitors, signalling their blindness and mistaken sense of security as well as their absence of self-control. Of the 23 laughing scenes in the *Od.*, 15 belong to the suitors; Od. and Telemachus almost never laugh; instead they chiefly smile, indicative of their higher degree of discretion and self-command (16.476, 20.301–2, 22.371, 23.111); the gods laugh uniquely at 8.326, in the context of Demodocus' light-hearted song. See further Levine 1982 and 1984, Colakis 1986.

37 **τερπωλήν**: a hapax in H.; the term next occurs in Archil. fr. 11 W, οὔτε τι γὰρ κλαίων ἴησομαι, οὔτε κάκιον | θήσω τερπωλὰς καὶ θαλίᾳς ἐφέπων. **θεός**: the audience would appreciate the unconscious irony (a device frequent in this portion of the song; cf. 17.446n, 18.112–13, 122–3): Athena has effectively 'brought' Od. home. For the hero as an agent of the divine, see Introduction p. 19.

39 **ξυνελάσσομεν**: hortatory aor. subj. In encouraging a bout between the beggars, Antinous aims to supply the after-dinner entertainment standard in hospitality scenes, which can feature athletic contests as well as storytelling, music and dance (see Reece 1993: 28–9). With the suitors in their role as renegade hosts, however, the master of the house will provide the spectacle, while an interloper stage-manages the event. On the tendency of the **ἄκλιτος** to 'perform himself', see Fehr 1990: 186.

41 **κακοίμενος**: a reminder of the ragged appearance of the beggars. See 17.24 and 550nn for the clothing motif. Among the suitors' many offences is their failure to give their guest fresh clothes (see 361n for Eurymachus' proposed travesty of the practice).

42 **Εὐπίθεος υἱός** 'son of Persuasive'; in this instance the father's name anticipates his son's powers of speech (see 50).

44 **γαστέρες**: regularly compared to blood pudding, haggis or the French *boudin*, this seemingly choice repast appears again in the simile used of Od. at 20.25–8. The reference to the sausage picks up the stomach motif prominent in this episode (2n) and suits both the glutton Irus and the hero represented metonymically by his belly (17.228, 473, 18.53–4, 364nn). Consistent with his self-appointed role as chief impresario, Antinous designates the prizes; typical of an Homeric **ἔρις** is the existence of a concrete object (or person) for which the rivals contend. **κέατ'** = **κέαται**; cf. 94n. **δόρπωι**: for the different meals in H., see 17.599n. This particular supper will acquire sinister connotations; at 20.390–2, the poet pointedly contrasts the **δεῖπνον**, described with words indicating pleasure, with the **δόρπον** that the suitors will never in fact consume. Instead that meal becomes a metaphor for the death that Athena and Od. will 'set' for them (cf. 21.428). Lunch has already occurred at 17.170, 176, 269.

46 **ὀππότερος δέ κε . . . γένηται**: this formulaic line occurs at *Il.* 3.71 in the context of Paris' challenge to Menelaus, one of the heroic duels subverted here; in that instance, Helen, not a blood sausage, was the prize. Cf. *Il.* 3.92, where Hector repeats Paris' words, again in reference to the dispute over Helen. The Iliadic echo

may be purposeful insofar as the Irus–Od. match anticipates the hero's battle against the suitors, which also concerns possession of a bride; for this see Schein 1999. *νικήση*: very unusually the verb overruns the regular position of the penthemimeral caesura.

47 *τάων* . . . *ἐλέσθω* 'let him, coming up, take whichever of them he wishes'. *τάων* = *τῶν*, demonstrative pronoun.

48–9 The speaker here unwittingly reveals (see particularly *αἰεὶ δ' αὔθ'*) his characteristic disregard for the sanction requiring that beggars who come to the door, regardless of their numbers or frequency, must be admitted and nourished (see 1 and 6–7nn); also unconsciously, he anticipates the exclusive role that Od. will enjoy (although not as beggar). The expression *ἡμιν μεταδίδεται*, 'he will take his meals together with us', suggests a very different status for the victor than that held by Irus (see *Il.* 23.207).

50–1 formulaic lines: 50 ~ 13.16; 51 = 21.274, where the hero is also about to enter a contest, albeit of a very different nature and for a very different prize. *ἐπιήνδανε* 'was pleasing, acceptable', 3 sing. imperf. of *ἐπιανδάνω*. *δολοφρονέων*: the masculine (as opposed to much more frequent feminine) participle otherwise occurs only twice in archaic epic (Hes. *Th.* 550 and fr. 76.8 M–W; Quint. Smyrn. 12.374 supplies the sole later use of the term). On these other occasions it also belongs within an agonistic context (Thalmann 1998: 223–4). *πολύμητις*: the epithet is more than simply an end-of-line filler here. Od.'s speech will display his cunning intelligence at work when he feigns expectation of being beaten in the upcoming contest.

53 *ἄνδρα*: Od. may be covertly nodding towards his true identity, already signalled at 51 (for the development of the motif, see 81n). In 5 of the 11 instances in which *ἄνθρωπος* appears in acc. form and v.-initial position, it specifically denotes Od. (see 1.1 for the most striking example); on several other occasions, H. uses the term to glance obliquely towards his disguised hero. If *ἄνδρα* does suggest 'Od.' here, then it is nicely balanced with the *γαστήρ* at the line's end, the organ that symbolizes the essential 'humanness' of the protagonist. For this possible 'pattern deixis', see Kahane 1994: 58–67 and 17.106n. *ἀρημένον* 'impaired, broken down'. This perfect passive participle, always found in the same metrical position, is the sole surviving form of a verb (**ἀρημι*?), probably related to *ἀρή*, 'harm', *ἄρης* or *ἄρος* (see Garvie on 6.1–3). The scholia gloss it with *βεβλαμμένος* 'damaged' (so too Apollonius the Sophist and Hesychius s.v. *ἄρος*).

53–4 *γαστήρ* . . . *κακοεργός*: the nom. form of the noun always occurs in v.-final position in H. The remark picks up the *γαστήρ* motif (2 and 44 nn), with a comic ambiguity. While the epithet applied to the belly makes clear that Od. means his stomach, the audience also understands that the paunch appointed by Antinous by way of prize is the spur for the speaker's reluctant entry into the ring. The stomach is always described in pejorative terms; see 2, 17.286–7nn and 7.216–17, where it again compels action on the part of the hero ('for there was never anything more shameless than the hateful belly which by force orders one to remember it'). For other evocations of hunger as the prime mover for beggars, vagrants and others, and of Od. in particular, see 15.343–5, 17.288–9n.

55 ἀλλ' ἄγε: frequently followed by νῦν (as here) or δὴ and introducing an imperative (so ὁμόσαστε) or hortatory subj. in the singular or plural (cf. Denniston, *GP* 14, Monro, *HD* 336). ὁμόσαστε: such demands for oaths are conventional in H. (× 4 in *Od.*, see Arend 1933: 122–3) and are frequently answered by the formulaic line found at 59. καρτερόν δρκον appears 6 × in *Il.* and *Od.*, uniquely in this position.

56 ἐπ' Ἴρωι ἦρα φέρων 'showing favour to Irus'; ἐπί with φέρω by 'tmesis'. The noun ἦρα is found only in the accusative (perhaps preserved from a root-noun *φηρ-, 'favour, service'; cf. Bacch. 11.20–1 where the term has the sense 'for the sake of', equivalent to Homeric χάρις); the phrase seems to mean the performance of an acceptable or agreeable service (e.g. 16.375, *Il.* 1.572, 578, 14.132, this uniquely without ἐπί; note the cognate epithet ἐρήρος, 17.428n); in H. ἦρα appears only with forms of φέρω. For discussion, see Janko on *Il.* 14.130–2.

57 ἀτασθάλων 'behaving recklessly'; for ἀτασθαλίη, see 17.587–8n. The verb is found again at 19.88 (of the partisan women-slaves). τούτῳι 'for his [Irus'] benefit'.

58 ἐπώμυον 'swore to it'. The variant ἀπώμυον would mean 'swore they would not'. The choice between the unaugmented forms of the verbs found in the MSS (ἐπώμυον, ἀπώμυον) and the augmented forms preferred by many ancient and modern editors is difficult, but H. more regularly uses the augment in the narrative portions of his text. It is chiefly omitted when context indicates that past time is meant. See further Monro, *HD* 69.

60 ἱερὴ ἴς Τηλεμάχοιο 'the awesome might of Telemachus', a periphrasis (*Od.* × 7) belonging uniquely to Telemachus, generally introducing a speech that he makes to more than one person or his reaction to someone else's speech. While the grandiose-sounding phrase, evocative of the special vigour or charisma thought to adhere to royalty (see 34n), seems not wholly apposite to the youthful Telemachus, the designation may be purposeful; because it appears almost exclusively in the poem's latter portion (16.476, 18.405, 21.101, 130, 22.354; the only exception is 2.409, where Telemachus shows an unusual degree of initiative), it may register his increased stature following his reunion with his father (cf. 17.3n); in all later instances, the expression prefaces speeches in which the youth is dissembling or role-playing, thereby also demonstrating his new found affinity with Od. (see particularly 406–9, Beck 1998–9: 136–7 and Introduction pp. 29–30). The phrase Ὀδυσσῆς ἱερὴ ἴς occurs at Hes. fr. 198.2 M–W; probably a formula of Mycenaean origin, it may be the model for the diction used here (West 1988: 157–8).

61 ὀτρύνει . . . θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ: × 3 in H. Telemachus' phrase picks up on Od.'s earlier statement that his γαστήρ rouses him to fight (53–4), but tactfully replaces the belly with more noble and literally 'higher' organs as the fight's motivators. On several occasions the *Od.* assigns to the γαστήρ the role played by the *Iliadic* θυμὸς; cf. 17.286n. Telemachus' 'correction' also elevates the coming encounter into something more than a beggars' brawl over a sausage and so restores the social differences between Od. and Irus that his father's language has occluded. For discussion, see Pucci 1987: 157–64.

62 δ': an example of the so-called 'apodotic' δέ, frequently used, as here, following a conditional protasis; it serves to lay emphasis on the clause in which it appears. This usage is found principally in H. and Herodotus (see Denniston, *GP* 180).

64 ξεινοδόκος: the difficulty that Telemachus confronts in properly entertaining guests due to the suitors' disruptive behaviour recurs as a motif throughout the Ithacan episodes; it first appears at 1.119–20, the encounter between the youth and 'Mentes'. In showing his hospitable nature, Telemachus is proving himself a worthy son of his father (cf. 1.176–7 for Od.'s kind treatment of strangers). ἐπι δ' ἀνείπον: ἐπιανέω originally meant 'to say yes to something, agree, approve'; it is formed from ἀνέω, whose root meaning 'tell, say' developed into 'say yes', and stands as the opposite of ἀναίνομαι (again at 66). Here Telemachus may try to co-opt an audience that he knows to be hostile.

64–5 βασιλῆε: this dual form is one of the few references to the suitors, either individually or collectively, as βασιλῆες; Telemachus may be feigning deference to the pair, or seeking their cooperation. In association with the epithet he then applies to Antinous and Eurymachus, however, the designation has an ironic ring, reminiscent of its use at 17.416n. πεπνυμένω ἄμφω 'both wise, sensible'; this formulaic phrase occurs *Il.* × 3, always of pairs of heralds or councillors, uniquely here in the *Od.* Since the adj. usually appears in the context of wise or tactful speech and particularly describes those who behave with respect towards their elders (see 125 and 17.45n), it manifestly does not suit the present conduct of the suitors' ringleaders, who mock and maltreat an older man.

66–87 The sequence in which the fighter prepares himself, impresses those about him, and frightens his opponent, who is nonetheless forced to carry out an initial threat, recalls *Il.* 7.206–18. There Ajax arms, his opponent Hector and the Trojans tremble at the sight, but Hector recognizes that he must follow through since he was the challenger (see de Jong 2001 ad loc.). The lines also presage the contest of the bow. At 22.1, Od., again located at the threshold, casts off his rags and prepares to shoot. The exclusive appearance of the genitive ῥακέων (at 74; see next note and Levine 1982: 202 n. 5) in these two instances reinforces the status of the present bout as an 'anticipatory doublet', in which the poet foreshadows a coming event, motif or episode by rehearsing it in minor form (see 17.46–56n for this).

67 ζώσατο . . . μήδεα 'girded himself with his rags around his loins'. Od.'s rags have been a conspicuous feature of his disguise since 13.434 (cf. 6.178, where he requests a rag of Nausicaa, couching his demand, as a scholion notes, in very humble terms). Not surprisingly ῥάκος is not found in the *Il.* with its more exclusively aristocratic focus. Here, in preparation for the boxing, the hero makes his tattered garment serve as a ζῶμα (later called the διάζωμα or περιζωμα; cf. 30, 76, *Il.* 23.683), the girdle or loincloth worn by athletes in the Bronze-Age Aegean, the ancient Near East and early Greece. Athletic nudity, probably introduced gradually, dates from a later period (see McDonnell 1991).

67–70 a clear case of *prothysteron* (where the poet cites an event occurring second in a sequence first in his account): Od.'s impressive appearance is caused by Athena's

intervention. For the device, see Bassett 1920. The beautification of Od. reverses the metamorphosis brought about by the goddess at 13.430 ('she shrivelled the skin on his limbs'). Whereas Od.'s decrepit appearance endures for as long as he preserves his beggar's identity, physical enhancements are more temporary phenomena, confined to the episodes for which they are designed; both Telemachus and Od. undergo several such transformations at Athena's hand; cf. 187–96n for P.'s beautification. Consistent with the *Od.*'s focus on the split between a superimposed, surface appearance and the 'natural' body beneath, the hero must remove his clothes in order to reveal his true essence here (see 3–4n, 17.454n; cf. Pl. *Charm.* 154d–e, where Socrates wants not only to expose the body beneath the clothes, but the soul hidden within the body). Where the Iliadic warrior arms prior to a duel, and his armour enhances his beauty and prowess, here external trappings mask what lies below. Stripping, as opposed to arming, contributes to the changes that the poet rings on the heroic duels of the *Il.*; the intervention of a deity aligns events with the more standard battlefield pattern.

67–8 ζώσατο μὲν . . . φαίνει δὲ . . . | . . . φάνεν δέ: a tricolon crescendo, with anaphora and polyptoton in the last two cola. φάνεν = ἐφάνησεν. Non-thematic past tenses in H. frequently end in ν; the vowel preceding the consonant is always short. μηρούς . . . μεγάλους: the thighs, here qualified by two adjectives in run-over position, are an area of particular heroic strength in H. and figure prominently in representations of heroes in Greek art. For the thighs as a marked site of vitality and even generative power, see Onians 1988: 175–80; for their beauty, already noted here, as a cause of erotic arousal, see Solon fr. 125 W and A. fr. 135 and 136 Radt. εὐρέεις ὤμοι: Od.'s signature broad shoulders (see following note) are visible even while the hero is disguised; see 6.225, 22.488.

67–9 Od.'s appearance recalls the description of the hero at 8.134–6, where the Phaeacian Laodamas comments, 'as to his appearance, he's not bad looking, in his thighs and calves and both arms above, and his stout neck and great strength'; cf. *Il.* 3.193–4, '[Od.] was smaller by a head than Agamemnon . . . but his shoulders and chest were broader'. For parallels between the present scene and the altercation with Euryalus in book 8, see Introduction p. 16.

69–70 αὐτὰρ . . . λαῶν = 24.367–8 in reference to Laertes whose transformation will echo that of his son. ἤλθανε 'filled out'; from ἀλδαινω 'make to grow', a causal form of ἀλδήσκω; H. uses the verb uniquely in the aorist. At 13.430, the goddess 'withered' (κάρψε) Od.'s flesh. In addition to her later enhancement of Laertes, Athena augments individuals' stature at 6.230, 8.20 (Od.) and at 18.195n (P). In the present scene, Od.'s increased size suggests an epiphany (characteristically missed by the suitors; see 17.485–7n). Divinities at their moments of self-revelation regularly reassume their characteristic exaggerated stature (e.g., *H. H. Cer.* 275 with Richardson's note; presumably Od.'s new proportions do not match those of Demeter, whose head touches the ceiling (188–9), a phenomenon whose significance even the suitors would have grasped; cf. *H. H. Ven.* 173–5); outsized proportions regularly distinguish gods from men (*Il.* 4.443, 18.518–19; cf. Hdt. 1.60.4–5 where Peisistratus attempts to persuade the Athenians that he is being ushered into Athens by Athena when

he selects a girl of exceptional size to accompany him). On colossal representations of divinities in Greek archaic and classical art, see Gordon 1979: 14. ποιμένι λαῶν: this expression (× 28 in H., generally of prominent characters) is regularly used of βασιλῆες. The concept of the ‘shepherd of the people’, perhaps imported to Greece from Mesopotamia and western Asia, signals the leader’s obligations towards those under his care (see Haubold 2000: 17–28). Included here, it calls attention to the true identity of Od. showing through the disguise. Thalmann 1998: 106 n. 130 compares this use of the expression to its deployment in the Thersites scene where, in like fashion, ‘class distinctions are very much at issue’.

71 ἄρα: here expressing ‘a lively feeling of interest’ (Denniston, *GP* 33). ἀγάσαντο ‘admired’, just as Telemachus marvelled at his father at 16.203 (ἀγάσθαι). The suitors peruse the body of Od. much as subsequent Pindaric viewers feast their eyes on athletes in the games (e.g., *Ol.* 10.100–5, *Pyth.* 9.97–100) and viewers on Attic vases gaze at participants in athletic events (but see 74n). It is typical of Homeric ‘transformation’ scenes that the witness(es) to the event react to and pass comment on the change (73–4); note the exception in book 23, where Penelope seems unaffected by Od.’s gleaming new physique. The suitors’ amazement also promotes the dramatic irony of the scene: mortals regularly respond to divine epiphanies with wonder or awe (see Murnaghan 1987: 84 n. 27 and 17.367n).

72 ὧδε . . . ἄλλον ‘thus one of them would say looking at another beside him’. Visual contact between the speaker and another member of the larger group frequently accompanies τις speeches (see 400), perhaps to emphasize the collective nature of the sentiment expressed. Such speeches occur with particular frequency in book 18 (112–16, 401–4), but here the comment lacks its usual note of criticism or mockery (see 17.482n). Instead it registers a shift in the onlookers’ sympathies as, in spite of themselves, they are forced to admire the hero’s physical qualities.

73 Ἴρος Ἄϊρος ‘Irus-unIrused’. Similar etymological plays occur at 19.260 = 597 (Κακοῖλιον οὐκ ὀνομαστήν ‘Evil-Pium not to be named’) and 23.97 (μητέρα ἐμή, δύσμητερ ‘my mother, evil-mother’); also at *Il.* 3.39 = 13.769 (Δύσπαρι ‘Vile-Paris’, spoken by Hector to Paris); see further Fehling 1969: 287–93. Because of the power of names, Irus’ new designation is not just humorous but predictive. If Ἄϊρος can be glossed as ‘he who has no force’ (see 6–7n), then his un-naming rehearses his defeat and expulsion; cf. the comparable demonstration of Thersites’ mis-nomination – he is shown up as the contrary of the Bold One (*Il.* 2.268–9, ‘he sat down and was fearful . . . and looking foolishly wiped away a tear’). ἐπισπαστον κακόν: the self-inflicted harm that Irus will incur is one among the many links between his fate and that of the suitors, the unwitting spokesmen of the phrase. The expression occurs again at 24.462 when Halitherses warns the parents of the suitors who are bent on fighting that they risk bringing trouble on themselves through their actions; the implication is that this is what their sons have already done (Levine 1982: 202). The notion of an individual’s responsibility in bringing disaster on himself or herself is prevalent in the poem and forms part of its larger exoneration of Od.; cf. 1.7, 32–4, 22.416, 23.67 and Introduction p. 18.

74 *οἶη* = *οἶ* *τοῖη*, '(seeing) such thigh muscles as the old man displays'. For *ἐπιγουνίδα*, see 17.223–5n. Are the suitors missing something? Od.'s scar is similarly located 'above the knee' (19.448). I owe this point to Mark Buchan.

76 *δρησῆρες*: male workers employed around the house, who most frequently perform tasks for the suitors (16.248; also 15.330). At 20.160–1 they split wood. Their precise status remains unclear: they may be slaves, or free workers in a position of dependency; see further Pind. *Pyth.* 4.287 (where they are lower in the social hierarchy than *θεράποντες*) and Thalmann 1998: 66. *ἀνάγκη* typically appears at line end; cf. 17.143, 441; at 67 the nobler Od. required no compulsion to gird himself. Like Irus, the suitors will want to escape their battle with Od.; so 22.43. Constraint over dependents seems very much a part of the suitors' oppressive regime (cf. 1.154); here, as on other occasions (see 17.533n), lower-status individuals apparently follow the model supplied by their masters, coercing one still baser than themselves.

77 *περιτρομέοντο*: a hapax; uncompounded *τρομέω* is found in the middle at 16.446 and *Il.* 10.492. H. uses the active and middle voices of this and many other verbs without any perceptible difference in meaning (e.g. *κρητῆρα κέρασσεν* at 3.390 vs. *κρητῆρα κέρασσατο* at 18.423; see too 227n). In some instances metrical convenience may have determined the choice, but more frequently the variation between the voices seems to be a development from an early idiomatic practice subsequently preserved as a characteristic of epic diction. See further Chantraine, *GH* II 173–4, Hoekstra 1981: 66–81. The trembling Irus anticipates the similarly afflicted suitors at 21.412–13, 22.42; cf. *Il.* 3.31–7 (Paris shrinking before Menelaus) and 7.215–18, where Hector is terrified by the appearance of Ajax, but pride prevents him from behaving in the ignominious fashion of Irus here.

79–87 A harsh and abusive speech on Antinous' part, particularly treacherous in light of the suitors' implied support for Irus (11–12) and his own sponsorship of the bout.

79 *μήτ' εἴης . . . μήτε γένοιο*: effectively 'you'll wish you were not living nor had ever been born', an anaphoric phrase. Monro cites *Il.* 2.340 and 6.164 for comparison. The succession of spondees in the first hemistich, also found in the early portions of 83 and 84, may be a deliberate device to convey menace or warning. *βουγάτε* 'you oaf', 'great boaster' or 'great ox', a term found only here and at *Il.* 13.824, where Hector directs it at Ajax. Clearly the expression carries a pejorative note, but its exact meaning remains obscure. The prefix *βου-* has an augmentative sense and in a number of compounds carries the meaning 'big', 'powerful'. Its negative implications become apparent in later sources, particularly in iambic song and Attic comedy, where compounds including the term are patently abusive (note the name of Hipponax's victim Boupalos, with additional examples in Richardson 1961). Ancient commentators also associate the prefix with *βοῦς*, sometimes privileging the bovine element over the intensive force. Eustathius suggests either 'a weight upon the earth (because Irus is fleshy)' or 'one who does an ox's labour', while Hesychius reports that the term was used of a plough ox because it worked the ground (*γαῖα*); the meaning would then be 'cowherd', 'yokel', in a derogatory sense. The second element, usually derived from *γαῖω* 'exult, rejoice in', suggests a braggart (Apollonius the Sophist glosses 'one who

bears himself very proudly'). For some modern commentators 'boaster' is the expression's chief implication, while others think the ox aspect paramount ('you lumbering ox', according to Stanford). Links may additionally exist between *βουγάιος* and the curious expression at *Il.* 24.532, *βούβρωστις*. The scholia gloss the term 'famine', and explain it as a reference to the ox's continual and destructive appetite (cf. Call. *H.* 6.102, of Erysichthon's hunger and Chantraine, *DE* s.v. *βου*–). If *βου* compounds are associated with those possessed by ravenous hunger, then the designation would suit Irus very well.

80 *δειδίας αινώς*: cf. 6.168, *Il.* 13.481, 24.358 for the expression found at line end. Here, as at 6.168, 19.324, 24.353, the adv. preserves its primary sense of terror or dread (cf. *αἰνός*); elsewhere (17.24) it simply means 'very' (cf. Eng. 'terribly').

81 *ἄνδρα . . . ἄρημένον*: in this recapitulation of *Od.*'s words at 53, Antinous is made unwittingly to acknowledge the beggar's actual identity (see 53n and Kahane 1994: 65). Irus has every reason to be 'terribly afraid' of this old man, despite his age.

84 *ἤπειρόνδε*: the suffix *δε* (like *–ζε* and *–σε*) regularly indicates motion towards. For this travesty of the 'escort' motif, see 17.448n.

85 *Ἔχeton*: this sinister bogey-man, mentioned again at 116 and 21.308 (in the same formulaic line), must be a fictitious character whose 'speaking name' means 'Holder'. The scholia, however, identify Echetus as a king either of Sicily (son of one Bouchetus, whence the Sicilian city of that name) or of Epirus, son of Echenor and Phlogea; the association with Sicily may be prompted by the suitors' later suggestion that the beggar and Theoclymenus be sent 'to the Sicilians' (20.383), and that with Epirus by *ἤπειρόνδε* (see v.l. *ἤπειρόνδε* in the previous line, 84).

86–7 The gruesome forms of mutilation cited here are generally associated with those who perform acts of outrageous cruelty (although the Lapith Perithous does precisely this to the Centaur Eurytion at 21.300–1), and/or carry 'barbarian' or tyrannical connotations in later sources. Scythians ritually 'cut off a part of their ears' (*Hdt.* 4.71.2) on the death of their king and Aietes threatens to cut off the Argonauts' hands (*A. R.* 3.378). 'Drawing off the genitals' suggests a form of castration, later regarded as the business of the Erinyes (*A. Eum.* 187–8) and of tyrants (*Hdt.* 3.48; Periander is unable to carry out the projected act in Corinth, and has to have it done abroad, at Sardis; cf. *Hdt.* 8.104–6). The scenario threatened by Antinous will be realized later in the poem. The account of Melanthius' punishment at 22.475–6 (thought interpolated by some on account of its excessive cruelty and because no one orders the deed) almost exactly repeats Antinous' language and phrasing here. Cf. *A. R.* 4.1092–5, where Echetus tortures his daughter in particularly horrible ways.

86 *ἀπὸ . . . τάμησι*: a 'tmesis' that nicely matches the action described; cf. *Hes. Th.* 180–1. *οὔατα*: acc. plural (= Attic *ᾠτα*) of *οὔς* 'ear'; for the gen. *οὔατος* see 96. *νηλεῖ χαλκῶι*: a common expression found *Il.* × 11, *Od.* × 8 at verse end. In many places empty of significance, here the epithet preserves the original sense of 'pitiless'. For an alternate interpretation of the term ('unavoidable', with the second element derived not from *ἔλεος*, 'pity', but from *ἀλέομαι*, 'avoid') when used of weapons, fate, or death, see Chantraine, *DE*.

87 *κυσιν ὠμά δάσασθαι* ‘for the dogs to feed on raw’. This line end matches Achilles’ promise to Patroclus’ shade at *Il.* 23.21, ‘dragging Hector here, I shall give him to the dogs to devour raw’.

88 Irus’ fear again anticipates that of the suitors when confronted with Od. at 22.42; the poet uses much the same language for both moments (‘pale fear stole over them all’). *ἔλλαβε*: see 17.226n for the doubling of the λ, reduced from an original –σλ–; other examples include 394, 1.298, 22.71 (see further Wyatt 1969: 81–2). The prefix *ὑπό* indicates something that ‘creeps up stealthily’ on the individual concerned; cf. 150n.

89 *ἀναγον*: the subject must be the *δρηστήρες* mentioned at 76. *χεῖρας ἀνέσχον* ‘put up their hands’. Here the beggars fight bare-handed; contrast the boxing match at *Il.* 23 where the contestants wear leather thongs (684; cf. *V. Aen.* 5.69, 379); Stanford suggests that the distinction reflects the distance between the beggars’ brawl in the palace and a ‘more formal contest . . . between gentlemen’. For other literary boxing matches, see Theoc. *Id.* 22.27–134 (with several echoes of the present scene, although largely purged of the burlesque elements and domestic setting), A. R. 2.1–97; for discussions of ancient boxing, see Harris 1964: 97–101, Gardiner 1978: 17–18, 402–34 and Laser 1968: 43–9.

90–4 A typically formulated deliberation or pondering sequence (cf. 4.117, 6.141, 10.50, 16.73, 22.333, 24.235), most immediately reminiscent of Od.’s dilemma when confronted with the abusive Melanthius at 17.235–7n.

91 *ψυχή λίπτοι*: in the Archaic period, *ψυχή* refers variously to ‘life-breath’ (as here), ‘ghost’ or ‘courage’ (see Clarke 1999: 137 for the suggestion that the expression implies the ‘extinction of the final breath’). The phrase, with slight variation, is used of death on two earlier occasions (14.134, 426). *αὔθι* ‘on the spot’, i.e. at once; cf. *Il.* 5.296, *αὔθι λύθη ψυχή*.

92 *ἦκ’* ‘gently, slightly’.

93 The regular formula for describing the decision the ‘pondering’ individual has reached (× 7 *Od.*, × 3 *Il.*), and an indication that the choice made will result in the desired outcome. The phrase was strikingly absent from the ‘deliberation scene’ at 17.235–7, there replaced by the unique formulation at 238 (see n). *δοάσασατο*, aor. ‘seemed’ = *ἔδοξεν*; with one exception (*Il.* 23.339, *δοάσσεται*), the form occurs only in this formula; see Chantraine, *DE* s.v. *δέατο*.

94 *ἐπιφρασσάσται* ‘should take note of, recognize him’; –ατο = ντο, with vocalized ν; cf. *κέατ’* at 44.

95 *ἀνασχομένω*: dual nom. plur. participle, agreeing with *ὁ μὲν* and *ὁ δέ*. Here the verb carries its full middle force, ‘drawing themselves up’ (as at 14.425). Many commentators (following *Il.* 3.362, 22.34, 23.660) prefer the meaning ‘raising their hands’, but this makes less good sense since the fighters already have their hands aloft (89). *ὁ μὲν*: the postponement of Irus’ name until the following verse through enjambment leaves the initial assailant unidentified and so heightens the tension. *δεξιὸν ὤμον*: the blow to the right shoulder resembles the wounds dealt by Iliadic spears (e.g., 5.46, 11.507, 14.450, 16.343). On the battlefield, such assaults tend to be

fatal (see Kirk on *Il.* 5.46; so too *Od.* 19.452–4, where *Od.* kills the boar with a blow to the right shoulder), but this attack, as suits its light-hearted and inverting character, leaves its target intact (see next note). Unwittingly *Irus* repeats the action of his alter ego *Antinous* who struck the beggar – to no good effect – on the right shoulder with the footstool (17.462n); on that occasion, however, the victim did not retaliate.

97 ἀλύχέν' ἔλασσαν ὑπ' οὐρατος: according to Philostr. *Gymn.* 9, Greek boxers aimed their punches exclusively at their opponents' heads (vase representations never show body blows); in striking *Od.*'s shoulder, *Irus* perhaps reveals himself either inept or unacquainted with the conventions regulating such bouts.

97 φοίνιον αἶμα: cf. *Il.* 16.159, 23.717, [Hes.] *Scut.* 194. Theocritus may have the expression in mind at *Id.* 22.98–9.

98 κάδ' ἔπεισ' . . . μακών: the aor. participle is from μηκάομαι, 'squealing', an onomatopoeic term that more frequently describes the bleating of sheep. This particular phrase appears elsewhere only of a mortally wounded animal, and is regularly followed by the death of the victim; see 10.163, 19.454, *Il.* 16.469 and Levine 1982: 201. σὺν δ' ἤλασ' ὀδόντας 'and he knocked his teeth together'; the expression probably indicates that the fall has knocked out *Irus*' teeth, although a gesture of impotent rage (teeth-grinding) is not impossible (see next note). *Irus*' threats have come home to roost: in place of his striking out another's teeth (28–9), his own are dislodged. The motif of the abuser who loses his teeth as a result of an ill-judged invective attack appears in later sources: Aristophanes' reference to the boxing match between *Hipponax* and *Boupalos* suggests that the poet's victim suffered injury in the same site: 'By *Zeus*, if anyone had struck their jaws two or three times like that of *Boupalos*, they wouldn't have any voice' (*Lys.* 360–1; cf. *Hippon.* fr. 120 and 121 W, on which Aristophanes' lines are based); cf. the description of *Achilles*' response to the calumny of *Thersites* in the fourth-century AD epic poet *Quintus of Smyrna*: '[*Achilles*] struck him with his strong hand on his jaws and ear, and all his teeth were poured out to the ground, and he himself fell to the ground on his face' (1.742 5).

99 λακτίζων ποσὶ γαῖαν 'kicking the ground with his feet', i.e. helplessly flailing about. ποσὶ . . . λακτίζων occurs again only at 22.88, describing the mortal fall of *Eurymachus*. For the 'vulgarization' of the meaning of the verb, used chiefly in the *Il.* of the warrior planting his foot on his victim's corpse, see Fernández-Galiano on 22.88.

100 χεῖρας ἀνασχόμενοι: the suitors repeat the gesture of the fighters (89), but they raise their hands only to laugh. The contrasting motives for the action highlight the youths' role as vicarious participants and spectators here, a position consistent with their preference for consuming the goods of others rather than their own. Cf. Kurke 1999: 257. γέλωι ἔκθανον: exactly analogous with Eng. 'died laughing'. Eustathius comments that the expression 'has continued in use up to the present day as a proverbial way of speaking about great and concentrated laughter' (*Hom.* 1839.30–1). Laughter (see 35n) becomes increasingly sinister through the course of the episodes in the dining hall, most obviously when *Athena* arouses 'uncontrollable laughter' in

the revellers at 20.346–9. As at that moment, here the poet anticipates the suitors' actual death (see further Levine 1982: 203).

101 ἔλκε . . . ποδός: a reprise of the foot-dragging motif as Od. carries out the threat made against him by Irus (see 10n).

101–2 αὐλήν αἰθούσης τε θύρας 'to the courtyard and the doors of the portico'. The 'portico' or 'colonnade' would lead to the αὐλή through which one would reach the μέγαρον. At 20.1 the poet also mentions the πρόδομος, an 'entrance hall' between the αὐλή and μέγαρον. For this house plan, see Palmer 1948, Lorimer 1950: 415, Drerup 1969. The roofed porch where Irus ends up would give an individual shelter and a place to sleep without allowing admission to the house proper. The topographical details draw attention to Irus' stage-by-stage expulsion from the house as he quits the space to which the hero is gaining increasing access.

103 εἶσεν: 3 sing. aorist of ἵζω, 'I seat'; here 'he installed him'. σκῆπτρον: the staff given to Od. by Eumaeus at 17.199n. Usually symbolic of the authority and legitimacy invested in kings (most famously detailed at *Il.* 2.101–8) and speakers, in the upside-down world of Ithaca the object is associated with the hero's (temporary) degradation. This normally high-class article undergoes an analogous demotion at *Il.* 2.265–8, where Od. uses the sceptre borrowed from Agamemnon to beat Thersites, perhaps another indicator of the generic affinities between the two episodes; for this see 1–110n. Whereas the victor of an Iliadic duel strips his enemy, Od. 'arms' his instead; cf. 108–9n.

105–7 Much like the Iliadic hero after a victory in a duel, Od. adds insult to injury by exulting over his defeated foe.

105 ἦσο 'sit, 'be seated', 2 sing. imperative from ἦμαι. The command may parody battlefield rhetoric: cf. *Il.* 21.122, where Achilles directs his victim to 'lie with the fishes' (ἐνταυθοῖ νῦν κείσο; the scholia on that passage report the variant ἦσο, probably derived from the expression addressed to Irus). κύνας τε σύσας ἀπερύκων: the idle Irus is finally given a productive function, much as those who mock Od. repeatedly propose that he should perform some useful labour instead of begging. The choice of animals known for the voracity and shamelessness that Irus has displayed is particularly apposite; both dogs and pigs figure prominently in the invective register (see 338n). The apotropaic task assigned to Irus corresponds to the protective role that ritual mockers and performers of invective were thought to play in their communities. Through their abuse and αἰσχρολογία, Greek and other evidence suggests, such individuals were credited with the ability to ward off evil and blighting influences even as their powers might cause them to suffer punishment and expulsion in turn (for this, see Elliot 1960: 3–48, 135).

106 εἶναι: imperatival; cf. 17.278n. Od.'s prohibition mockingly positions Irus as his (would-be) inverse or parodic double: where the hero remains, for all that he is disguised, the legitimate sceptered king of Ithaca (see 17.201–2n), the parasite aspired to be 'king of strangers and beggars'.

107 λυγρός, 'baneful', is used of people at 9.454 and *Il.* 13.119, 237; the later tragedians take up the usage. ἐπαύρηι: either 2 sing. sub. mid. (but contrast *Il.* 15.17,

ἐπαύρηαι) or 3 sing. 2 aor. subj. act. of ἐπαυρίσκω, ‘to reach, touch’ (the second assumes κακόν as the subject). Although ἐπαύρηι is the reading of almost all the MSS, several editors prefer the v.l. ἐπαύρηις.

108–9 = 17.197–8. The reference to the wallet, which was given along with the staff to Od. by Athena, recalls the protagonist’s initial assumption of his beggar’s disguise (109 = 13.438). Russo assumes a second transfer of property as, now divesting himself of his bag as well as his stick, Od. makes Irus an embodiment of or surrogate for the persona and abject status that he slowly begins to discard. However, in book 17, the lines described Od. himself assuming the degrading article.

110 On the significance of the threshold, see 17n. Od. has now definitively claimed this earlier contested site.

110 57

With the expulsion of the ‘scapegoat’ figure (see Introduction p. 23), good fellowship and group solidarity now temporarily prevail as the suitors welcome Od. into their company. After an anonymous individual addresses good wishes to the victor, Antinous fulfils his earlier promise of a stuffed sausage for the winner of the bout; Amphinomus then offers a toast to the beggar’s future good fortune, prompting a moralizing response from Od. who tries to warn him of the fate that awaits him if he continues associating with the other suitors. But despite the surface harmony, tensions persist: implicit in the exchanges here are questions concerning the underlying significance of Od.’s victory over Irus, the status of the stranger, and an ongoing debate as to who accurately understands the meaning of words and events (see Murnaghan 1987: 84–5).

111 γελώντες: H. uses both γελώω and γελώω; cf. Chantraine, *GH* 1 77, 365–6. For the suitors’ laughter, see 35 and 100nn. In this instance, the response signals that the expulsion of Irus has dispelled the spirit of animosity previously at large in the dining hall; cf. the gods’ laughter at *Il.* 1.599; in that scene Hephaestus (who recalls his ejection ‘by the foot’ from Olympus on an earlier occasion) has served as the object of collective mockery and so diffuses the tensions that threaten to spoil the feast. **δεικανόωντ’ ἐπέεσσι** ‘pledged’ or ‘toasted with words’. The verb occurs only in the middle in H. (24.410, *Il.* 15.86); for its formation, see 121n. The phrase is a modification of the older formula **δεικανόωντο δέπασσι** (cf. 121, with Janko on *Il.* 15.86).

111a = 2.324. Most MSS as well as the earliest papyrus evidence for the text omit the line, probably one of the ‘superfluous’ lines removed by the Alexandrian editors, but preserved in the post-Hellenistic tradition. Since 111 already includes a term signalling speech (**ἐπέεσσι** ‘with words’, i.e. ‘saying’), the additional phrase, perhaps repeated from 2.324, serves little purpose.

112–13 In one of the many unconscious ironies uttered by the suitors, the well-wisher believes the ‘beggar’ simply eager for his creature comforts; Od.’s desires are actually fixed on the speaker’s and his fellow diners’ death. Contrast 14.53–4 where

Od. addresses the same words to Eumaeus, but without the irony. Od. will take the speaker's self-inflicted curse here as a good omen. **τοῖ** = **σοι** in both lines.

114 τὸν ἀναλτοῦν 'this fellow, insatiable that he is'; see 17.228n for the adjective. The article conveys the speaker's contempt (see 26, 333nn and Monro, *HD* 261). Note the alliterative phrasing (ἀναλτοῦν ἀλητεύειν ἀπέπαυσας).

117 χάρην . . . Ὀδυσσεύς: 20.120 is virtually identical. κληδόνι: a word of omen significant only to the listener seeking a response to a question or problem unknown to the speaker, which may, as here, be redirected against its source (on *cladonmancy*, see Peradotto 1969). The noun is cognate with κλέος and κλέω. Here Od. assumes the capacity to determine the true meaning of others' words and actions. Viewed through the filter that the hero supplies, the suitor's words seem in retrospect particularly ill-chosen; as he remarked, the bogey-man Echetus destroys 'all men' (πάντων).

118 As a mark of his momentary elevation in status, Od. receives the sausage from Antinous' own hands; (παρὰ)τίθημι is used frequently of placing food or drink in front of someone (120; cf. 8.69–70, 10.355, 20.260).

119–52 These lines belong to the 'greeting type-scene', a thematic sequence that features an individual presenting a cup of wine to someone, a gesture accompanied by words of greeting, leave-taking or honour, and a prayer or wish for the individual concerned (see 3.41–50, 4.59–64, 13.56–62, 15.150–9). See Introduction p. 7 for the poet's modification of the usual scenario.

119 Of all the suitors who receive characterization, Amphinomus is consistently the most moderate and conciliatory, and, as his 'speaking name' suggests, mindful of convention and the gods (see particularly 16.401–2). It was he who dissuaded the suitors from their plot to kill Telemachus (16.394–405) and here too he demonstrates his tendency towards decency and restraint (see 412–21n). For all this, he will die along with the rest (22.94). For additional discussion of his role, see Fenik 1974: 192–5, and on this scene, 177, 185.

120 For the κάνεον (Attic κανοῦν) as breadbasket, 1.147, 8.70, 16.51.

121 δειδίσκετο: as at 111, the term is used of a pledge, this time with a gesture rather than words. The verb may be derived from δέχομαι (with reduplication) or δείκνυμι, or from both, but any clear etymology is impossible to recover due to the too close assimilation of these two verbs. See further Stanford on 15.150, Chantraine, *DE* s.v. δηδέχεται and Wyatt 1969: 105 n. 1.

122–3 = 20.199–200.

122 ἕξ περ ὀπίσω 'for the future at least'.

123 ἔχει 'you are in the grip of', 2 sing. pres. indic. passive of ἔχω, usually ἔχει. For similar expressions, see 8.182, 17.318n (of Argus).

125–51 Od.'s reply belongs within the broader genre of paraenetic or 'wisdom' discourse where the speaker instructs, advises and warns his interlocutor (see 125–8, 128, 129, 130–7, 138–40nn for hallmarks of the genre). That so skilful a piece of rhetoric impresses but ultimately fails to benefit its addressee requires authorial explanation at 155–6. Nor is this the only time that warnings go ignored or learning comes too

late; see 1.37–43, 8.564–71, 9.507, 20.345–70. For this motif in the *Od.*, see Rutherford 1982: 149.

125–8 Amphinomus' courteous words elicit a correspondingly cordial opening on *Od.*'s part; establishing friendly relations with the interlocutor also serves the speaker's paraenetic aims. *Od.*'s initial focus on the virtues of Amphinomus' father creates the expectation that a contrast between the worthy father and unworthy son will follow, but *Od.* departs from the paradigm, offering his own life story as an illustration of the fact that social standing and reliance on family members (140) cannot protect a man from a precipitous fall from prosperity.

126 τοῦ γὰρ καὶ πατρός: supply ἐσσί, 'you are'. *Od.* arranges his words in chiasmic fashion: details of the excellence of Amphinomus' father are framed by affirmations that the addressee is born from this man. The *Od.* places considerable emphasis on the idea of inherited excellence, particularly in the early portions of the song where Telemachus' unique fitness to assume the kingship that his father held by virtue of his lineage is a recurrent theme (see 1.387, 4.62–4, 204–11 and Introduction p. 12). However, the disguised Athena also raised the possibility of the opposite trajectory, and the one the suitors have followed. Commenting that Telemachus' status as the son of *Od.* and *P.* guarantees his success in his coming mission, she adds, 'few are the children who are equal to their father; most are worse, although a few are better' (2.274–7), a caveat that suits the poem's orientation towards a post-heroic generation for whom the battlefield glory won by the *Iliadic* heroes is no longer available.

128 ἐπητήϊ: also at 13.332; cf. 21.306; the adj., of debated etymology, indicates both courtesy and friendliness. The scholia and Eustathius derive the term from the root ἐπ- (cognate with εἶπον and ἔπος) and assign it the meaning 'very proficient in speech' (see further Dale 1982); for other accounts, see Stanford on 13.332.

129 σὺ δέ: an emphatic appeal to the addressee. σύνθεο: see 17.153n. Such exhortations to 'mark' and 'listen' also punctuate Hesiod's advice to his brother; cf. *WD* 27 (σὺ δὲ ταῦτα τεῶν ἐνικάτθεο θυμῶν), 107, 213, 274.

130–42 For the gods as dispensers of good and evil and man's necessary resignation to his 'mixed' condition, see 6.188–90, 20.195–6, *Il.* 24.524–33 (Achilles' *consolatio* to Priam), Hes. *WD* 638, *H. H. Cer.* 147–8 (with Richardson's note and the additional examples cited there), Theogn. 133–4, 149–50, 155–8, Pind. *Pyth.* 3.81–3, *Hdt.* 6.11.3. For the ethical viewpoint expressed here, that wrongdoing and a wilful disregard for morality produce retribution, compare 19.328–34. See further 139n. Typically, reflections such as these occupy the opening of speeches, particularly when the speaker addresses a stranger.

130–7 Generalizing, gnomic utterances are a common feature of 'wisdom' discourse, often framing the speaker's turn to a particularized illustration of the message he conveys.

130–1 See *Il.* 17.446–7 for a very similar expression of human weakness and insignificance (131 = 17.447).

130 ἀκιδνότερον 'weaker, feeble', an exclusively Odyssean term (× 3) and always in comparative form (5.217, 8.169, both in reference to εἶδος). The scholia offer various

guesses at its etymology; Hesychius and the *Et. M.* gloss ἀσθενής. For the weakness of humans, particularly when compared with the gods who dispense evils to them, see Hdt. 1.86.6, S. *Aj.* 121–6. γαῖα τρέφει: perhaps an already standardized expression; see *Il.* 11.741, *H. H. Ven.* 4–5, Alc. fr. 89.3, A. *Ch.* 585.

131 πνεύει τε καὶ ἔρπει: a natural doublet since respiration and motion are two defining features of living (as opposed to dead) organisms; divine and legendary artisans (and the fifth-century sculptor Myron, according to the Hellenistic epigrammists) demonstrate their magical powers by endowing their products with these properties. See the similar combination at Genesis 1.21, 26, 28, etc. For the form πνεύω, see Wyatt 1969: 127–8. Several of the MSS omit the line, but the echo of the formulation already found at *Il.* 17.447 may be deliberate: there the speaker was Zeus, reflecting in pitying but superior fashion on the debility of men compared with immortal existence; now the same sentiment comes from a mortal seemingly in just the feeble state the expression describes.

132 φησι . . . πείσεσθαι ‘for he thinks he will not suffer’, a common use of φημί to mean ‘think’ rather than ‘say’ (see 342 and Cunliffe s.v.); for the notion and expression, cf. Solon fr. 13.63–6 W. For man’s general feebleness and ignorance in the face of the future, see *H. H. Cer.* 256–7, *H. H. Ven.* 189–93, Mimn. fr. 2.4–5, Theogn. 139–42, 159–60, Pind. *Ol.* 12.1–12.

133 ὄφρ’ ‘so long as’, a usage found either with aor. indic. (of a fact of past time) or with subj., with reference to the future; ὄφρα in *H.* is sometimes final, sometimes conditional (see *Monro, HD* 287). ἀρετήν: ἀρετή in *H.* variously refers to prowess, manliness, beauty, moral virtue, prosperity, success or overall excellence; cf. 13.45 (with Stanford’s note), 17.322, 19.124 and 21.187 for some of the different uses of the term. If the phrase that follows serves to gloss the expression, then here ἀρετή most likely refers to physical strength; however ‘material success’ also suits a narrative focused on the speaker’s loss of economic standing. καὶ γούνατ’ ὀρώρηι ‘and his knees have spring’; for the knees as the source of a man’s vitality, see *Il.* 4.313–14, 19.354, 22.388 (where living and having functioning knees are combined); for other instances, Hes. *WD* 587, Pind. *Nem.* 5.20, Eur. *Phoen.* 843–4, Ar. *Vesp.* 345, Call. *H.* 6.132, Theoc. *Id.* 14.70. Pliny *NH* 11.250 suggests that the life spirit, liquid in form, is located in the cavity joint of each knee. See further 212n and Onians 1988: 121–7, 175–86.

134 ὅτε δὴ . . . τελέωσι: for this use of the bare subj. following ὅτε, see Chantraine, *GH* II 256. μάκαρες is a formulaic epithet for the gods (rarely used of mortals); here, in close proximity to the term Ἀνγρά that precedes θεοί, the word suggests the paradox of divinities who dispense evil even as they remain forever untouched by suffering.

135 καὶ ‘even’. ἀεκαζόμενος = ἀέκων ‘unwilling’; cf. 19.133. τετληότι θυμῶ: a common Odyssean formula (× 9, always at line end), not found in the *Il.* For words formed on the root τλε– in the poem, see 17.34n and Pucci 1987: 44–9; cf. 319n.

136 νόος ‘disposition’, ‘mentality’; cf. Solon 4.7 W for similar usage. For discussion of the term, see von Fritz 1943 and Krischer 1984: 136–7. Archil. fr. 131 W may echo the lines (‘so the mood varies for mortal men according to the day that Zeus brings on (ἐφ’ ἡμέρην ἄγηι)’), replacing νόος with θυμός.

137 ἐπὶ . . . ἀγχισι: ‘tmesis’. For man’s ‘ephemeral’ nature, his necessary subjection to constant change and alterations in fortune, see Fränkel 1968: 23–39. πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε: the formula probably belongs to the very early stages of epic language formation; parallel expressions exist in Sumerian, Hittite and Ugaritic texts (West 1988: 170).

138–40 Od.’s turn from the general to the personal is very much in keeping with the paraenetic genre deployed here, as is the particular persona he will adopt. While the ‘biography’ that Od. presents is, in essence, a much abbreviated version of the story offered to Antinous at 17.419–44nn, its several changes are calibrated to suit the nature of the addressee and the message it contains (see 139 and 140nn). Advice-givers regularly include autobiographical recollections and personal details as part of their claim to authority and expertise (they know of what they speak), using their (constructed) identity or ἦθος and life-history to engage and persuade an audience. So Phoenix prefaces his counsel to Achilles with a cautionary autobiography designed to mesh with elements of Achilles’ own situation (*Il.* 9.447–84), while Hesiod introduces recollections of a ne’er do well father-sailor to hammer home his precepts on sea-faring (*WD* 633–9). See further Griffith 1983 and Martin 1992; for overlaps between Od.’s words here and the themes and expressions of Solon’s exhortations to wisdom, particularly at 4.5–6 W, see Irwin 2005: 117–9.

138 καὶ γάρ: for the expression, see 17.419n. ἐμῆλλον ‘I was supposed to be’, ‘I was on my way to being’; see 19n. Followed by the present infinitive, the past tense conveys what should have been.

139 ἀτάσθαλ’ ἔρεξα: here, uniquely, Od. charges himself with ἀτάσθαλα (see 17.587–8n), although he says nothing of the nature of the misdeeds. This description of how he brought about a reversal in his fortunes through misconduct involves a sharp departure from 17.424, where the teller stressed the wilful quality of Zeus’ decision to cause his downfall, a decision all the more unmotivated in the light of the victim’s earlier morally upright behaviour (see n; at 14.246, however, the choice to embark on the roving life was the speaker’s own). The purpose of the speech and character of the addressee explain the change: Amphinomus, more moderate than Antinous, might respond to an argument that assumes divine retribution for ethically faulty conduct (note 16.402–3, the suitor’s expression of concern for the θέμιστες of Zeus; see 141n); such reasoning would make no impression on the more hardened villain (Fenik 1974: 225 and Clay 1983: 229). The inconsistencies also form part of the larger dynamics of oral narrative and performance: no two renditions of the same story are ever exactly alike. Od.’s proposition here, that moral faults incur divine punishment, forms part of the poem’s ongoing preoccupation with questions of retributive justice and the gods’ role in dealing it out; for this see 141–50n. βίηι καὶ κάρτει: the two terms are frequently coupled (4.415, 13.143, Hes. *Th.* 437; Solon 36.15–16 W). Hes. *Th.* 385 makes Κράτος and Βίη the children of Styx and the two appear as the henchmen of Zeus at the start of Aeschylus’ *PV*.

140 A second detail absent from the earlier story told to Antinous. Wayward or hostile fathers and brothers appear frequently in the Near Eastern and Greek tradition

of advice literature; see West 1978: 3–25 for Hesiod’s brother Perses and parallel figures in other ‘wisdom’ texts; cf. *Il.* 9.447–77, where a quarrel with his father forces the Iliadic ‘adviser’ figure Phoenix into exile. Here the father and brothers mirror the bad company which Amphinomus is currently keeping: just as the ‘beggar’ would not have come to grief had he disassociated himself from those around him, so the addressee should distance himself from his fellow diners. For an earlier example of how *Od.* includes ‘biographical’ details tailored to his audience’s life experience, see 14.288–98, a portion of his tale to Eumaeus. The misplaced confidence that the advice-giver once felt in his kin (πίσιυος) demonstrates the common tendency against which *Od.* warns his addressee: prosperity creates over-confidence and the mistaken belief that one can act with impunity. The statement is arranged in chiasmic fashion, with the different family members positioned at line beginning and end, surrounding the individual who trusted them.

141–50 Divine retribution for misdeeds stands alongside the strictly amoral notion of the ‘wheel of fortune’ or random apportionment of good and evil articulated in the speech’s earlier part; for H. and his audience the two models could clearly coexist (see too *H. H. Cēr.*, where an initial statement of men’s subjection to the mixed hand the gods deal them (147–8) is ‘corrected’ by Demeter’s later assertion that human folly and blindness are the cause of their suffering (256–7)). Already at the *Od.*’s opening, H. explores the nature of the gods’ interventions in human affairs in one of the poem’s several expressions of some form of moral causality and theodicy; see Introduction pp. 19–20. For good discussion of the oscillation between statements describing the indifference or capricious cruelty of the gods and affirmations of divine concern for justice in the *Od.*, see Clay 1983: 213–39.

141 τῶ μή τις . . . εἴη ‘so I would have a man never be utterly lawless’; a ‘softened imperative’, used to convey a suggestion or advice in a deferential fashion (see Monro, *HD* 299). ἀθεμιστίας: if the story here is a briefer version of the narrative that Antinous heard, then the offence against θέμις would presumably consist in the acts of piracy and violent assault that the expedition described in book 17 involved; unwittingly the speaker picks up Amphinomus’ earlier stated respect for divine θέμιστες (see 139n). This and the subsequent line offer more gnomic reflection serving by way of transitional device before a renewed turn to the specific instance.

142 ὄγε may refer to the lawless individual just described, or act as a pivot back to the suitors (of whom this unspecified individual would be a representative), the focus of the speaker’s next remark. *Od.* effectively elides the ἀθεμιστίας and the targets of his tale.

143 οἴ: causal; cf. 17.479, 514. The repetition of ἀτάσθαλα makes emphatic the parallels between the speaker’s misconduct and that of the suitors. ὄρω: a metrically convenient ‘distended’ (ancient διέκτασις) form of an -άω verb, which corresponds to no vernacular form. In spoken dialect, such forms were subject to contraction (ὄρῶ); cf. Parry 1971: 350–1, Chantraine, *GH* 175–6. μηχανάωντας: another ‘distended’ form of an άω- verb; it occurs in the active only here.

144 ἀτιμάζοντας ἄκοιτιν: the *Od.* reserves 17 of its 21 uses of ἀτιμάζω and ἀτιμάω for the mistreatment of the hero and members of his family (note 8.309 where the verb

is used of Aphrodite's conduct towards her cuckolded husband; see further Edwards 1985: 57 n. 36). For the displacement of issues of honour away from the public forum (where the *Il.* chiefly locates them) to the domestic sphere, see Introduction pp. 30–1.

145–50 One of the many occasions on which Od. hints at his imminent return and forthcoming vengeance. See, for example, 384, 17.525–6, 19.84, 300–7. For the phrasing at 145–6, cf. 1.203–4, 8.150, 19.301–2, all expressing hopes for Od.'s homecoming.

150 ὑπέλθῃ: the prefix ὑπο (cf. Lat. *sub*) often suggests 'secrecy' (but contrast ὑπεξαγάγοι at 147); the hero has 'slipped into' his home.

151–2 Od.'s actions here round out the sequence initiated by Amphinomus' pledge at 121, where the suitor sealed his wish for the beggar's future success with a formal toast. Now the object of that wish pours a libation to the gods, and, after drinking from the cup over which the wish was first pronounced, returns it to the donor, thereby completing both the ritual circuit and the 'greeting theme' (see 119–52n). The gesture serves to reinforce the warning delivered in Od.'s speech, harnessing divine powers to its fulfilment. μελιθδέα οἶνον: the formula occurs × 5 in *Od.*, × 2 in *Il.*

153 αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ διὰ δῶμα: Amphinomus is the subject; cf. 7.139 for the phrase. H. frequently uses διὰ + acc., expressing the idea of movement over circumscribed space (see Chantraine, *GH* II 96). φίλον τετιμημένος ἦτορ: this formula appears × 5 in *Od.*, × 1 in *Il.* (11.556, without φίλον).

154 νευστάζων 'nodding', an intensive form of νεύω, here more in the sense of Eng. 'bowing his head' as the individual soberly reflects on the words he has just heard; cf. 237, 240 for a similar expression, and *S. Ant.* 269–70. ὄσσετο 'imagine, forebode'; the verb is cognate with ὄσσε, 'the eyes'.

155–6 πέδησε . . . δαμῆναι 'for Athena had bound him to be overcome'. The goddess here replaces the vague δαίμων named as a possible saviour of Amphinomus at 146; the narrator, a more privileged source for future events, has sure knowledge of the suitor's death and its agent. For Athena's role in the provocation and determination of the suitors' fate, see 346–8n, 17.360–4n, and 20.284–6. H. regularly uses the notion of 'binding' to express the constraint that compels an individual to encounter the ineluctable and negative fate awaiting him or her, and names a variety of binding forces, a god or, more frequently, μοῖρα (e.g. 3.269), or another abstract agent. On some occasions πεδάω suggests the actual paralysis that immobilizes the victim like a shackle (*Il.* 13.435), on others it is a less concrete form of compulsion (see Onians 1988: 326–31). The notion of the gods (or fate) propelling a man towards death finds more frequent expression in the *Il.*; see *Il.* 14.464, 16.693, 22.297 and the discussion in Griffin 1980: 42–4.

157 A formulaic line, × 4 in *Od.*, with pleonasm (ἄψ . . . αὔτις).

158–303

The scene shifts upstairs to P, whom Athena inspires with the idea of showing herself to the suitors. Seemingly startled by the notion, P tells her servant Eurynome

of her intention, explaining that she aims to warn Telemachus of the dangers of consorting with the company downstairs. While Eurynome goes in search of maids to accompany P., Athena puts the queen to sleep and beautifies her. Following an expression of grief for Od., P. descends to the dining hall, causing the suitors instantly to be aroused. After an exchange between mother and son, Eurymachus flatters P.; she rejects his compliments but announces her intention of remarrying soon and solicits gifts. Following the arrival and description of the suitors' gifts, P. returns upstairs. The central position of the episode neatly inverts the previous book's design. There two scenes with P. framed the arrival of Od. at the palace; here Od.'s physical and verbal victories over the suitors and their inferiors bracket P.'s single appearance (see Tracy 1997: 364–5).

P.'s decision to leave her room and her first appearance before the disguised Od. carry dramatic, thematic and psychological significance. (a) The queen's descent and apparent readiness to countenance remarriage put an end to the long period of inaction and indecision concerning her future fate, and supply the necessary catalyst for the contest of the bow. (b) The episode allows the poet to develop one of the most important narrative patterns in the *Od.*, that of 'delayed recognition'; P. already embarked on the trajectory followed (to a greater or lesser degree) by all other characters who 'recognize' the hero when, in book 17, she received prophecies, hints and omens of Od.'s advent, talked about him in his absence, and revealed a surprising preoccupation with the 'beggar' in the hall. The present episode adds other elements integral to the motif: P. discusses Od. in his presence and is, unknowingly, 'tested', proving herself a loyal, desirable, worthy and fitting wife by virtue of her beauty, her declarations of fidelity and her cleverness in extracting gifts from the suitors (for this narrative pattern, see Fenik 1974: 5–60, Richardson 1983, Emlyn-Jones 1984: 6–7, Hölscher 1988: 284–91, Goldhill 1991: 5–24). (c) Both the conversation with Eurynome and the exchanges with Telemachus and the suitors furnish the audience (and Od.) with a chance to ascertain the queen's state of mind, and to witness fresh (if highly ambiguous) indicators of her motives and design. P.'s actions and words here serve as a prelude to her more intimate dialogue with Od. in book 19, which further develops the portrait supplied in this episode of a supremely faithful spouse driven to desperate measures by force of circumstance and her ignorance of the true state of affairs.

For additional discussion of Penelope's conduct, see Introduction pp. 25–8.

158–303 The fourth of the seven episodes in which P. leaves her chamber to intervene in the action down below (1.328–66, 16.409–51, 17.36–166, 19.53–604, 21.1–358, 23.1–296). The conventional scene regularly (if variously) includes some indication of P.'s motives, a description of the actual descent, mention of P.'s position as she stands veiled and flanked by her maidservants, her speech, an answer, her reaction, and finally her return to her room. The scenes are purposefully arranged, building towards the prolonged and climactic episode in book 23. P.'s early interventions show up her inefficacy and impotence as she is repeatedly rebuffed, frustrated and/or dismissed, while her appearances in books 17, 18, 19 and 21 portray her still the

victim of forces beyond her control. Only on the last occasion will she fully take the initiative, tricking Od. into identifying himself and ultimately retiring not alone, but with her reclaimed husband, to the marital bed. See further de Jong on 1.328–66 and Rutherford 1985: 136–7.

158 ἐπι φρεσὶ θῆκε ‘put in her mind’; the aorist of τίθημι is H.’s usual word for divinities generating thoughts in mortals; × 3 of Athena’s suggestions in the *Od.* The formula may be followed, as here, by an infinitive. On the question of whether the divine intervention is simply a succinct way of expressing a character’s inner impulses or preconceived notion, see next note. θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη: the formula regularly found (× 32) for the goddess after the feminine caesura. The γλαυκός element either indicates colouration or, much less likely, comes from γλαύξ ‘owl’ (H. knows nothing of the later association between Athena and the owl). –ωπι may refer either to the eyes or to the entire face; the composite term, variously rendered ‘with gleaming eyes’, ‘with clear blue eyes’, or ‘grey eyed’ probably evokes the luminosity of divine eyes and faces (cf. *H. H. Cer.* 194, *H. H. Ven.* 156, both gestures that promote the deities’ incognito lest their faces betray them, *A. Ag.* 519–20, *Eur. Ion* 1550).

160–2 ‘that she show herself to the suitors so that she might further expand their hearts [with passion] and become more honoured in the eyes of her husband and son’. The two optatives depend on θῆκε and not φανῆναι, indicating the intention behind the action rather than, as the grammatical construction also allows, its results.

These lines raise a double question, debated since antiquity: to whose intentions do the two elements of the ὅπως clause refer, and is there a shift in the person whose agenda the lines describe between the first and second elements? Both parts of the phrase most naturally represent Athena’s designs, not P.’s. Elsewhere in the song the goddess devises hidden ends which are invariably fulfilled (see 1.88–95, 17.360–4n, 20.284–6); for the realization of both divine intentions here, see 212–13 and 244–9 (for the first) and 215–42 and 281–3 (for the second). But the lines do not prohibit an overlap between Athena’s first aim (stoking the suitors’ passion) and P.’s own motivation and plans. Quite plausibly P. does wish to beguile the suitors and encourage their hopes for remarriage so as to gain more time and to protect Telemachus. She has tricked the youths on previous occasions (so 2.91–109, 13.380–1) and might now again plan to give overt encouragement while actually stalling. Already a scholion to 160 comments, ‘P. does not approach [the suitors] seductively, but she inspires them with the expectation that she is planning to marry one of them in order to forestall their violence’. For additional discussion, see Büchner 1940: 143, Allione 1963: 76, Emlyn-Jones 1984: 10, Byre 1988: 159–60, 170, Katz 1991: 81–3. Note too van Nortwick 1979 for parallels between Athena’s intervention here, and her visit to Nausicaa at the start of book 6; on each occasion, he suggests, the goddess serves as an external device used by the poet to signal the (re)awakening of dormant sexual impulses in the object of the visitation.

160 πετάσειε: ‘might enlarge’ or ‘open up’ or, as Stanford nicely renders it, ‘spread the sails of the Suitors’ passion’; not ‘might flutter’ (so Monro, LSJ s.v. πετάννυμι), a

sense perhaps based on an early confusion of *πετάννυμι*, ‘to expand’ with *πέτομαι*, ‘to fly’. The scholia variously gloss the verb with *ἐκπλήξειε* and *θέλξειε*.

163 *ἀχρεῖον δ' ἐγέλασσαν*: P.'s second and final laugh in the poem; for the first, see 17.542n. The exact meaning of *ἀχρεῖον* (lit. ‘not needed, useless’, see Snell–Erbse, *LfggrE*), used only here and at *Il.* 2.269 (of Thersites’ reaction to Od.’s rebuke and threat) remains difficult to determine. Most probably the term indicates the ‘inappropriate’ or ‘pointless’ nature of the laugh. By styling P.’s response ill-timed or aimless, the poet suggests that the impulse just described should be judged surprising and incongruous, and a cause of discomfort and embarrassment to P. herself. The adv. may also be rendered ‘illogical’ (so Lateiner 2005: 97) as P. reacts to an externally generated inspiration that she does not understand. To view the laughter as proof of P.’s duplicitous intentions vis à vis the suitors, and so sardonic (cf. Od.’s smile at 20.301–2) and/or indicative of P.’s appreciation of the trick that she has just devised aligns this scene with other episodes in the *Od.* and *Il.* (e.g. 9.413, *Il.* 14.222, the *Διὸς ἀπατή*; see 191–3n), but requires giving *ἀχρεῖον* the sense ‘knowing, gleeful’; this, however, is difficult to reconcile with the etymology of the term. For further discussion, and a review of earlier interpretations, see Büchner 1940: 142–3, Allione 1963: 71–4, Levine 1983, Katz 1991: 83–4, Lateiner 2005: 96–8.

164 Eurynome, among the virtuous and loyal servants in Od.’s household, is not, as some have charged, a supernumerary whose function duplicates that of Eurycleia. Such ‘doublets’ are integral to the Odyssean poet’s technique, and Eurynome also receives a distinctive characterization and role. While Eurycleia is consistently identified with Od.’s side of the family, and her words and actions always promote the interests of either father or son, Eurynome serves as P.’s particular attendant and confidante. Following this distinction, Eurycleia appears alone with P. only when the affairs of Od. or Telemachus require her to meet with the queen, and Eurynome never confers with the father or son. Instead, both here and at 17.495, she converses in private with P.; cf. Fenik 1974: 189–92, Ramming 1973: 103–4 and, for the different ethical and gender outlooks the two housekeepers represent, see 170–6n.

164–8 P. has to account for an impulse that seems sharply at odds with her behaviour up to this point. Her sentence structure, with the single main clause broken up by two qualifying phrases made more emphatic by the several particles (*οὐ τι πάρος γε; ἀπεχθόμενοισι περ ἔμπης*), reveals the difficulty of her task. Indeed, in recording her ambivalence and self-division between contrasting emotions (her ‘heart’s desire’ and her undiminished antipathy), P. comes close to doing what Homeric characters almost never do, resisting a divine suggestion.

Nothing in this or the subsequent scene allows us to make a definitive choice between three possible interpretations of P.’s words. (a) P. accurately represents her intentions; she genuinely means to warn Telemachus against keeping bad company but in the event does not carry out the exact agenda announced here (see 167 and 215–25 nn). (b) Her stated purpose is a face-saving, spur-of-the-moment device that seeks to cover up an untoward but powerful impulse and to bring into line with social convention what would otherwise seem unacceptably flirtatious behaviour that P.

neither endorses nor understands; this interpretation requires assigning to the queen both emotions and a duplicitous mode of speech not flagged by the poet. (c) While covertly planning to deceive the suitors with an apparent move towards remarriage, P. attempts to mislead Eurynome as to the true nature of her design; again, the intention can only be inferred and receives no explicit statement by the narrator (contrast 283n). A straightforward reading seems the least problematic: P. sincerely means what she says, and only partially deviates from her intention when downstairs; however, the poet may also wish to keep his audience guessing. For additional discussion, see Austin 1975: 209, van Nortwick 1979: 274, Byre 1988: 163–4, Katz 1991: 86–8 and Introduction pp. 26–7.

164 οὐ τι πάρος γε ‘though not previously’, regularly in contrasts between past and present (see 4.810, 9.448).

166 κεν εἴποιμι ἔπος ‘I should like to say a word’; for κεν + opt. in this polite mode of expression, cf. 20.326, 22.262, Hes. *WD* 10, Alc. 1.85. See too Fraenkel on *A. Ag.* 838.

167 ὑπερφιάλοισιν: the adj. is used, with one exception (9.106, strikingly in reference to the Cyclopes) uniquely of the suitors (e.g. 1.134, 21.289) and often implies pride, violence and insolence (cf. ἀτασθάλων, 57n); for its derivation, see 17.481n. On the distinction between ὑπερφιάλος, generally reserved by the poet for a specific crime, and the more generalized term ὑπέρθυμος, see Parry 1971: 159.

170–6 In lines that approve her mistress’ design and tactfully endorse her ostensible reason for the proposed descent, Eurynome also articulates what she understands as the underlying, if unexpressed, impetus behind the plan: P.’s readiness to remarry now that Telemachus has come of age (for the close relationship between the remarriage and Telemachus’ maturity, see Katz 1991: 120); cf. 6.57–70, where Alcinoos similarly intuited Nausicaa’s concealed motive for her laundry project, her desire for marriage, with van Nortwick 1979: 270. In promoting a scenario at odds with the trajectory of the epic, which requires P. to remain at home and be reclaimed by Od., Eurynome differentiates herself from Eurycleia who, at 4.750 7, advised P. to return to her upper chambers and remain inactive. On the links between the two speeches, and Eurycleia’s role as ‘the feminine voice for the male side of the family’ in contrast to Eurynome’s promotion of what she thinks are P.’s best interests, see Pedrick 1994; for Eurynome’s words as an anticipation of and possible prompt for P.’s speech to Telemachus, see 221–5n.

170 κατὰ μοῖραν: see 17.580n for the expression.

171 σῶι παιδι . . . ἐπικεῖθε = 16.168. φάο appears only on these two occasions in *H.*; cf. 10.333 (θεο) and *Il.* 15.475 (μάρναο). For these, and similar imperative forms which preserve the intervocalic σ lost here, see Chantraine, *GH* 1474–5. The repetition of the phrase used earlier in book 16 may be significant: there the words were spoken by Athena to Od.; here Eurynome, who unconsciously is promoting Athena’s design, acts as a surrogate for the divinity.

172 χρωτ’ (also at 179): this τ-stem is unusual in early epic, which more commonly preserves the uncontracted forms χροά, χροός etc.; however, since χρωτός appears at *Il.* 10.575 and χρωτά at Hes. *WD* 556, the form can be considered a neologism that

has found a place in the poet's traditional diction. For other possibly linguistically late and anomalous elements in the episode, see 171, 173, 176, 179, 190, 191, 192nn.

173 **δακρύοισι**: uniquely found here in place of the regular **δάκρυσι**.

174 'since always grieving indiscriminately isn't a good thing'; the comparative **κάκιον**, has its weak sense here, implying 'bad as opposed to the alternative' (Monro, *HD* 122). **πενθήμεναι**: intrans. act. pres. inf. of the so-called Aeolic athematic type with **-η-** for **-ᾱ-**: see further Chantraine, *GII* 1 305–6. **δακρῖτον**, lit. 'not able to be determined'; here closer to 'endlessly'. The terms in which Eurynome advises P. to beautify herself anticipate P's language in her speech to the 'beggar' at 19.120. On the echoes between the two scenes, see Rutherford at 19.120.

175–6 These words could be considered the cue for P's subsequent decision to tell the suitors of Od.'s parting instructions that she should remarry when Telemachus begins to grow a beard. For other references to Telemachus' advance to manhood, see 2.270–80, 3.122–5, 19.19, 88, 159–61, 530–4, 20.310, 21.113–17, 125–9.

176 **ἦρῶν**: an unusual contracted 2 pers. sing. imperf. of **ἄρῶμαι**, 'pray'. **γενεῖθ' ἄντα**: the growth of the beard was a critical marker of the transition from boyhood to manhood (cf. 11. 320, A. *Sept.* 534–5, Pl. *Prt.* 309a, Xen. *Cyr.* 4.6.5, Theoc. *Id.* 11.9, A. *P.* 12.12). Telemachus' new maturity makes imperative a decision on P's part: she no longer has any reason to oversee the house on Od.'s behalf since her son can now rightfully preside in his father's place. Since this indicator of maturity also signals the moment when a youth becomes ready to take a wife, a theme briefly introduced at 15.126 7, it doubly suggests the need for P. to 'move on'. The growth-of-beard motif may be one of the folk-tale elements retained after the story's transformation into epic (Hölscher 1996: 134).

178–9 P's refusal to follow Eurynome's advice and perform the suggested toilette exonerates her from any hint of coquettishness and conveys her antipathy to the remarriage scenario that Eurynome proposed; see 182n. Her dismissal of a bath anticipates the 'beggar's' response to P's equivalent suggestion of a cleansing at 19.317.

180–1 The subject of P's vanished beauty returns at 251–2 and at 19.124–5. The critical verb declaring the loss of this gift is postponed through enjambment.

181 **κείνος**: characters sympathetic to Od. in the poem regularly avoid naming the absent hero (perhaps on account of the inauspicious quality of his name), using pronouns or circumlocutions instead (see Austin 1975: 48). Out of the poem's 89 uses of **κείνος/ἐκείνος** in singular form, 59 refer to Od. Here the substitution is particularly poignant; for P. **κείνος** can mean only one individual, the husband constantly uppermost in her thoughts. For other instances where the lack of name clues the audience into the emotions and preoccupations of a character, see *Il.* 24.702 (Cassandra of the dead Hector, with Macleod ad loc.), Theoc. *Id.* 2.17 (a woman of her absent and faithless lover), V. *Aen.* 4.479 (*eum...eo*, Dido of Aeneas).

182 The unusual naming of the maidservants fills out the regular motif of the double escort required for high-born women, guarantors of their status and propriety (for other exceptions to the anonymity usually surrounding **ἀμφίπολοι**, see 4.123–5

and *Il.* 3.144). Both this expansiveness and the device of first stating a plan and then describing its fulfilment (182–4, 207–11) are ‘typical Homeric techniques for making a familiar point with particular explicitness and emphasis’ (Nagler 1974: 65). In this instance, the poet wishes again to underscore the queen’s chastity and disinterest in any seductive purpose. ἀνωχθί: see 17.508n.

183 παρστήετον: 3rd person dual 2 aor. subj. act. of παρίστημι.

184 P. now explicitly states what is usually implicit in the escort motif, as in the formulaic line at 207; see 182n for the poet’s purpose here. αἰδέομαι γάρ: αἰδώς is ‘that which renders one sensitive to the general values of society and which inhibits departure from them’ (Cairns 1993: 154). It is a sentiment that frequently regulates relations between men and women in *H.* (and later, men and boys): so 6.66–7 (one of the many links between this and the earlier Nausicaa episode; see 187–96n and van Nortwick 1979), 6.221–2, 8.324, with Garvie’s notes.

185–6 = 22.433–4. The two future participles are final in sense.

187–96 The beautification of P. belongs together with the poem’s many other transformation scenes: cf. 70–11n, 2.12–13 = 17.63–4n (Telemachus), 6.229–35 = 23.156–62, 8.17–20 (*Od.*), 10.395–6 (*Od.*’s crew who had been turned into pigs), 24.367–70 (Laertes). In all but one of these episodes, Athena is the beautician, *Od.*, or a member of his family, the object, and the onlookers react with admiration. While this particular scene is unique insofar as it features a woman (hence the ‘facial’ to which the goddess treats P.) and a sleeping subject (188n), it also establishes the parallelism between P. and *Od.* prior to their first encounter. Just as *Od.*’s transformation in book 6 prepared him for the (unrealized) role of bridegroom for the nubile Nausicaa, so here P. rehearses the role of (second-time) bride before an audience of men who aspire to, but will not gain, her hand. For additional connections between the two scenes, see 191n.

187 ἀλλ’ ἐνόησε . . . Ἀθήνη: the phrase is reserved for Athena’s several interventions in the poem (× 7 *Od.*). Asyndeton frequently follows the formula (e.g. 2.382, 6.112, 23.242). ἀλλ’ = ἄλλο.

188 ὕπνον ἔχευεν: ἔχευεν (-εν) regularly appears in final position in the line; e.g. 2.395, 20.260. For the common use of the imperf. of χέω with ὕπνον in descriptions of divinely instigated sleep, see 2.395, 5.492, 12.338, 20.54. The fact that the embellishment uniquely occurs while its object sleeps, as the subsequent lines emphasize, may promote the verisimilitude of the scene.

189 = 4.794. λύθην δέ οἱ ἄψα: ἄψα, ‘joints’, is derived from ἄπτω, ‘to join, attach’ (cf. Nic. *Alex.* 541 for an echo of the Odyssean phrase). Here *H.* sounds a variation on the very common expression λύτο γούνατα (see 212), the regular response to fear or, in the *Il.*, a sometimes mortal wound. The combination of ἄψα, lit. ‘things that are joined’ with λύθην, ‘were loosed’, may be deliberate. (cf. 20. 56–7, ὕπνος . . . λύων μελεδήματα θυμοῦ, | λυσιμελής). For the possible erotic connotations of the phrase, and an anticipation of the subsequent ‘limb-loosening’ episode, see 212n.

190 κλιντήρι: a hapax replacing the usual κλισμός. τέως is a metrically convenient but rare form of the original τῆος (so also at *Il.* 24.658), formed by quantitative

metathesis. This is one of several indications of the late stage of composition for the present episode; see further Hoekstra 1965: 31–41, Wyatt 1969: 123. $\delta\tilde{\iota}\alpha$ $\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$: 33 \times in H., most often applied to minor goddesses, but also to Athena (\times 5) and Hera (\times 1). Since designating a goddess ‘god-like’ seems redundant, the phrase is probably modelled after the common $\delta\tilde{\iota}\alpha$ $\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$ (so at 208).

191–3 The lines’ diction closely resembles that used for Hera’s self-embellishment before her seduction of Zeus at *Il.* 14.170–2: there too the goddess cleanses and anoints herself with oil. The similarities would promote the larger structural and thematic overlaps between the present occasion and the $\Delta\tilde{\iota}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\tau\eta\acute{\iota}$; in addition to beautification, both episodes include Athena and Aphrodite, both feature speeches in which the protagonist gives another female figure a (misleading) explanation for what she is about to do, and in both sleep (personified in the Iliadic example) plays an important role. The embellishment also prompts instant sexual desire in those before whom its object appears (see Levine 1983: 174–5 for additional details). These parallels add to the ambiguities surrounding P: does she plan to beguile and seduce the suitors, much as Hera devised the seduction of Zeus so as to distract him from events on the battlefield? But there is one cardinal difference: Athena is the beautifying agent here and initiator of the entire enterprise.

191 $\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\iota\alpha\tau'$ ‘might gaze on with wonder’, an irregular form for the epic 3 plur. aor. opt. $\theta\eta\eta\sigma\alpha\iota\alpha\tau\omicron$ (Attic $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$) preferred by some editors (omitting $\mu\upsilon\nu$); cf. 17.315, $\theta\eta\eta\sigma\alpha\iota\omicron$. For discussion of the verb’s range of meanings, see Mette 1960–1. Nausicaa reacts to Od. transformed by Athena in precisely this manner ($\theta\epsilon\iota\eta\tau\omicron$, 6.237; cf. 2.13 = 17.64). The re-sounding of the aim stated at 160–2, that P. should appear before the suitors so as to arouse their passion, confirms that the intention and execution are Athena’s.

192–3 $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$. . . $\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\rho\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega\iota$: the $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ with which Athena cleanses P. must, uniquely here, describe something concrete rather than abstract ‘beauty’ (as, e.g., at 6.237). As the term $\chi\rho\acute{\iota}\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ at 194 suggests, the poet probably has in mind a type of oil designed to clean and embellish, a divine counterpart to the olive oil used by mortals for equivalent purposes. $\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\rho\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega\iota$, literally ‘undying’ (< * $\acute{\alpha}$ - $\mu\rho\acute{\omicron}\tau$ - $\iota\omicron\varsigma$) but probably with the additional meaning ‘containing vital power’, is here in run-over position to stress the special quality of this moisturizer and, as many enjambed adjectives, precedes a relative clause; the epithet, regularly applied to the gods’ possessions, signals the salve’s divine provenance and perhaps its preservative, age-retarding properties (cf. *Il.* 23.186–7, where Aphrodite uses ‘ambrosial oil’ to protect Hector’s corpse). At 8.364–5, after her adulterous tryst with Ares, Aphrodite receives a similar refurbishment, washed and anointed by the Graces with $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\iota\omega\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\rho\tau\omega\iota$ (cf. *H. H. Ven.* 61–3). This is one of several links between the scenes, and perhaps part of the poet’s ‘having it both ways’ as he raises the possibility of P.’s succumbing to the suitors as the goddess did to Ares; see further 193–4, 213nn and Introduction pp. 27–8. Athena’s association with the cosmetics that more usually belong to Aphrodite is unparalleled in the archaic sources; note, however, *Call. H.* 5 where, even as the poet observes Athena’s antipathy to ‘scented oils’ (16) and use of ‘manly’ natural oil instead (29), he describes the goddess with terms and motifs drawn from

Aphrodite's sphere. *προσώπατα*: an irregular plur. form as if from sing. *πρόσωπα*; cf. *Il.* 7.212 where the dat. plur. *προσώπασι* appears. The noun + adj. combination modifies for metrical purposes the regular formula *καλὰ πρόσωπα*; as is frequent, the generation of the new expression involves inversion of the existing word order (see Hainsworth 1968: 64–5).

193–4 ‘such as the fair-garlanded Cythereia anoints herself with, whenever she joins the lovely dances of the Graces’. *ἔυστέφανος Κυθήρεια*: a noun-epithet phrase found here and at 8.288; cf. Hes. *Th.* 196, 1008, *H. H. Ven.* 6, 175, 287. Hesiod's account of how the newly born goddess came to shore at Cythera (*Th.* 191–8) may be the origin of the cult title *Κυθήρεια* (*Hymns* × 5). But the still unexplained short ε of the second syllable makes the link between the title and the location *Κύθηρα* (the site of a famous and extremely ancient shrine to Aphrodite, supposedly founded by the Phoenicians; so Hdt. 1.105, Paus. 3.23.1) problematic (cf. West on Hes. *Th.* 198). The scholia suggest a derivation from *κῦθω* or, more plausibly, *κῦω* (‘impregnate, conceive’). Again the poet echoes language earlier and uniquely applied to Aphrodite when she was caught *in flagrante* at 8.288. For an audience culturally predisposed to fear and expect infidelity on the part of women (mortal and divine), the parallels between the episodes raise fresh questions concerning P.'s already ambiguous actions; see further 18.213n and the discussions in Zeitlin 1996: 39 and Newton 1987. *Χαρίτων χορὸν ἱμερόντα*: cf. 8.364, a fresh echo of that scene; for a further nod to the Aphrodite story, see 292–301n. The epithet is applied to *χορὸς* at *Il.* 18.603, Hes. *Th.* 8.

195 A fresh glance back to 6.230, where Od. similarly becomes *μείζονά τ' εἰσιδέειν* καὶ *πάσσονα* (comp. *πάχυς*, ‘stout, well-developed’) as a result of Athena's cosmetic powers. Height was considered a necessary component in both male and female beauty, a *sine qua non* according to Arist. *NE* 1123b7; see too Xen. *Cyr.* 5.1.5. Nausicaa stands out among her companions (6.16, 107, 152); similarly 20.71. P.'s magnified stature reinforces the suggestion, already implicit in the bestowal of *ἄμβροτα δῶρα*, the application of ambrosial face cream, and the links to Aphrodite, of her temporary likeness to a goddess. Divinities regularly surpass mortals in size: so Calypso's physical superiority to P. depended in part on her exceeding her in size (5.217 and 69–70n). *ἰδέσθαι* ‘to behold’; a frequent use of the inf. after a substantive or adj.

196 *λευκοτέρην . . . πριστοῦ ἐλέφαντος* ‘whiter than sawn ivory’; H. and later poets regularly use similes to evoke whiteness; see *Il.* 10.437 (horses ‘whiter than snow’), Pind. *Nem.* 4.81 (a monument ‘whiter than Parian marble’) and Theoc. *Id.* 11.20, Polyphemus' suitably dairy-man's description of Galateia (‘whiter than cream cheese’). Contrast 16.175 where Athena causes Od.'s skin to grow darker. The gender distinction visible here also exists in Greek vase painting of the eighth and seventh centuries where women's skin is painted white, men's reddish brown (see Beazley 1951: 1 and Irwin 1974: 112–14). The common epithet *λευκώλενος*, used in epic of women divine and human (see 198n), signals that a pale skin was a conventional and sought after female attribute, a property more fantasy than reality: in later sources, white skin results from cosmetics or staying inside (Eur. *Bacch.* 457, Xen. *Oec.* 10.2).

For ‘sawn ivory’, see the identical phrase at 19.564 and the slight variation at 8.404; cf. *V. Aen.* 3.464 (*secto elephanto*) and, from the Hebrew tradition, Cant. 7.5, ‘your neck is like a tower of ivory’ (of a woman’s skin). ἔλεφος is probably a loan word derived from Hittite, and was originally used only of ivory; the meaning ‘elephant’ is not found before Herodotus. Excavations of Mycenaean sites have yielded fragmentary ivory inlays from furniture and other objects, and a few such pieces appear in Early Iron Age graves; many of the extant articles are imports from Syria and Phoenicia, or are inspired by West Asiatic techniques. Homer’s audience might have encountered worked ivory (× 8 in *Od.*, × 2 in *Il.*) as a result of proliferating contacts with the NE (see Boardman 1980: 62–3 for ivory statuettes found in a late eighth-century Attic grave); see further Lorimer 1950: 507, Treu 1954–5, Burkert 1992: 19, Morris 1992. P. has a special affinity with the substance: at 19.56 she sits on a κλισίη inlaid with ivory and silver; at 21.6–7 the key she fetches to open the storeroom where Od.’s bow is kept has an ivory handle; and at 19.564–9 she makes her notorious statement about the ivory gates through which deceptive dreams come. The punning association of ἔλεφος and ἐλεφαίρομαι (‘deceive’ or ‘do harm to’) on which 19.564–9 depends is in keeping with the ambiguities surrounding P.’s conduct in books 18 and 19. For the association between P. and ivory, cf. the discussion in Amory 1966.

198 λευκώλενοι: the epithet regularly occurs between the penthemimeral caesura and the bucolic diaeresis; cf. 6.239, 19.60, *Il.* 3.121, 6.377.

199 φθόγγωι ἐπερχόμεναι: the sound of the maids’ voices serves, in realistic fashion, to rouse P. from her sleep. γλυκὺς ὕπνος ἀνήκε: for the expression, 7.289; cf. 19.551.

201–5 P. emphatically reasserts her continuing fidelity to Od., a further reminder of her still steadfast state of mind just prior to her announcement of her intention to remarry.

201 αἰνοπαθῆ: a hapax that resembles Hecuba’s self-characterization at *Il.* 22.431, αἰνὰ παθοῦσα, as she leads the women in lament for Hector; the poet may be borrowing terminology conventional to the threnodic genre. The expression αἰνὰ παθοῦσα belongs among a small group of phrases, indicative of an attitude of self-pity, used only by speakers referring to themselves; such plangent terms may have seemed too emotionally charged for the narrator’s style (Griffin 1986: 41). περὶ κῶμ’ ἐκάλυπεν: a κῶμα is a magical slumber, imposed by the gods on other divinities and mortals for particular ends; cf. *Il.* 14.359 (Zeus’ post-coital sleep after being beguiled by Hera), Hes. *Th.* 798, Alc. 7.2, Sappho 2.8, Pind. *Pyth.* 1.12. The verb demonstrates the κῶμα’s special quality: H. never uses καλύπτω of normal sleep, reserving the term elsewhere for the veiling action of grief, death or unconsciousness (see Onians 1988: 421–5).

202 μαλακὸν θάνατον: the repetition of the adjective underscores the affinity between P.’s sleep and death. Death and Sleep are brothers according to *Il.* 14.231, 16.682, Hes. *Th.* 212 and 755–6; for the pairing, see too 13.80, *Il.* 11.241, Hes. *WD* 116, fr. 278 M–W, Alc. 3.62, Heracl. B21 DK. The deities appear together as statues at Sparta (Paus. 3.18.1); Pausanias also sees them (in contrasting ivory and cedar wood)

in the arms of their mother Night on the chest of Cypselus (5.18.1). For other artistic representations and discussion, see Vermeule 1979: 145–51, Rammoux 1959. Ἄρτεμις ἄγνῆ: Artemis delivers a ‘soft’ death because she strikes unexpectedly and kills with a single shaft from her bow. For extended accounts of the divinity as a gentle slayer who brings death with her arrows, usually to women, but on one occasion to a man (Orion), see 5.123–4, 11.172–3, 20.61–3, 80; later sources include A. R. 3.773–4 (with its echoes of this passage), [Mosch.] 4.29–35. Coming so shortly after the evocation of Aphrodite, the appeal to the goddess of chastity, here with her formulaic cult epithet (× 3 *Od.*), forms part of the ‘correction’ implicit in P.’s speech. The poet again affirms his heroine’s marital fidelity just as she is about to embark on her role as apparent coquette.

203–4 αὐτίκα νῦν: P.’s emphatic ‘right now’ (repeated in the same context at 20.63) signals the urgency of her longing for death; cf. *Il.* 18.98, where Achilles, distraught at the news of Patroclus’ death, declares αὐτίκα τεθνᾶσθαι. In what follows, P. unwittingly repeats terms used to depict Od. beleaguered and lamenting on Calypso’s island; see 5.152–3, 160–1. φθινύθω (also in Od.’s speech at 5.160–1) regularly refers to the wasting process caused by grief and lamentation; cf. 10.485–6, 16.144–5; the term describes not wholesale destruction, but a gradual diminishment or enfeeblement (see Chantraine, *DE* for this). αἰῶνα: cognate with αἰεῖ and, in later Greek, used to refer to a period of time. In *H.* the term variously describes the vitality or life force that can be lost at death (7.224, 9.523), the duration of a life (*Il.* 4.478–9 = 17.302–3) and, in the instance in book 5.152, the life-substance flowing from Od. as he weeps.

204 ποθέουσα: πόθος, ‘yearning desire’ is the particularly poignant longing inspired by a loved object believed (correctly or not) absent, dead or unattainable. πόθος for Od. causes Anticleia’s death (11.202); cf. *Il.* 19.320–1 (Achilles’ yearning for Patroclus), *H. H. Cer.* 201 (Demeter for Kore), *A. Ag.* 414 (Menelaus for Helen), *Xen. Symp.* 4.22 (a lover for his beloved). Note Arist. *NE* 1167a6, ‘one is in love whenever one longs (ποθεῖ) for the beloved when absent and eagerly desires his presence’; see further Vernant 1990: 41 50.

206–11 An example of the type-scene ‘young woman (or *grande dame*) descends to the main hall accompanied by servants’; for this designation and the conventions of the narrative motif, see Nagler 1974: 64–72. For the formulaic lines used here, cf. 158–302n, 1.331–5, 16.413–16, 19.600–1, 21.63–6.

207 οὐκ ὄη: see 182n and Introduction p. 16.

209 στή ἅ παρὰ σταθμὸν τέγος πύκα ποιητοῖο ‘she stood beside the central pillar of the solidly-built roof, a formulaic line × 5 in *Od.*, × 4 of P., × 1 of Nausicaa (1.333, 8.458, 16.415, 21.64; for imitation, *H. H. Cer.* 186). σταθμός usually describes a door-jamb or post (see 17.96n), but can also refer to the central pillar supporting the roof of the μέγαρον. While a position by the door would convey P.’s distaste for proximity to the suitors, a more central location, indicating the queen’s role as current and steadfast guardian of the household, makes better thematic sense here. Such ‘axial’ pillars and posts appear at several points in Od.’s adventures and return. The motif, common to husband and wife, culminates in the olive tree trunk/pillar

used to build the wonderfully fashioned marriage bed that the couple shares (23.190–204); see further Nagler 1996: 153–5. **πύκα**: an adverbial form confined to epic, from the same root as **πυκνός** and **πυκάζω** ‘cover’.

210 **λιπαρά κρήδεμνα** ‘shining head-dress’; the archaic noun probably referred initially to head-bindings or head-ribbons; H. would have taken over the existing formula with the plur. form, and applied it to the head-covering customarily worn by women in his own society; later sixth-century vase paintings show women with some kind of veil or head-shawl hanging down their backs (see Wace and Stubbings 1962: 501–2, Marinatos 1967: 13, 46). The adjective ‘shining’ suggests that the material was treated with oil so as to give it suppleness and sheen; on Scheria, woven materials actually drip with oil (7.107). The Linear B tablets attest to the practice in Mycenaean times, specifically in the preparation of linens. Throughout H., veils symbolize female chastity (contrast 6.100, a pointer to Nausicaa’s sexual readiness). P.’s unusual choice to appear veiled even in her own house conveys her desire to prevent familiarity between the suitors and herself; Amory 1966 argues that the veil additionally signals P.’s tendency to look obliquely at what is before her, avoiding direct confrontation. See further Nagler 1974: 44–63.

212 The poet typically does not describe P.’s beauty, but records its impact. **αὐτοῦ** ‘there, on the spot’. **λύτο γούνατ’**: knees regularly register and react to the influx of strong emotion, going slack due to fear (e.g. 4.703, 5.297, 406, 22.68) or, in the *Il.*, as a result of a death-dealing wound; here uniquely erotic desire prompts the ‘loosening’ response. H. may be thinking of **ἔρω** in its capacity as **λυσιμελής**, ‘limb-loosener’; so Hes. *Th.* 120–1, Archil. 196 W (here of **πόθος**), Sappho 130, Alc. 3.61. A link between the knees, sometimes described as the site of generative fluid, and sexuality is plausible, perhaps originally based on the root *gen common to **γόνυ** and **γίγνομαι** (with further discussion in Onians 1988: 111, 175–86, 246). Note too Hes. *WD* 586–7: men suffer impotence at midsummer ‘since Sirius dries up their head and knees’, and 238n. **ἔτελχθεν**: 3 plur. aor. pass. of **τέλγω**, one of the aorists in **-θη-ν** that H. includes; these forms appear to be a secondary linguistic development, and tend to cluster in the *Od.* or in the more recent portions of the *Il.* This powerful verb describes the (usually temporary) alteration of a man’s normal condition, thoughts and consciousness (see 17.514n for this and the link between the enchantment of love and speech/song). H.’s use of **τέλγω** at 10.326 suggests the connection between magic and eros; there the seductive Circe wonders at *Od.*’s failure to be ‘enchanted’ by her drugs.

213 = 1.366, of the suitors’ reaction to P. the first time they see her in the poem. **ἤρησαντο** ‘prayed aloud to, expressed a wish to’. **παρά ληέσσι κλιθῆναι** ‘to lie beside her in bed’; **παρά** is adverbial here, going with **κλιθῆναι**, and **ληέσσι** is locative. The wish stands as the final element in the sequence of parallels between this episode and Ares’ tryst with Aphrodite; see 8.342. While the phrase clearly refers to the suitors’ besotted response, we should remember that *Od.* is also silent witness to the scene: P.’s capacity instantly to arouse the suitors renews his ardour in an instance of ‘triangular or “mimetic” desire’ (Zeitlin 1996: 46; see too

Introduction p. 26). Both parts of Athena's original plan have been amply fulfilled: by making P. supremely desirable to the suitors, she also enhances her value in her husband's eyes, and thus contrives a scene designed to encourage Od. to compete with his rivals for (re)possession of his wife.

215–25 P.'s speech begins with a powerful rebuke and ends with a no less strongly worded warning. Her tone of authority may be carefully calculated: alarmed at the plot against Telemachus' life, she wishes to demonstrate his still immature and subordinate status so as to convince the suitors that he poses no threat (see Winkler 1990: 147).

216 κέρδε' ἐνώμας 'you used to apply your cleverness'. νομάω has the literal meaning 'handle, wield'; here it serves as a metaphor for controlled mental activity; cf. 13.255 (of Od.), 20.257 (of Telemachus); contrast 20.346, where Athena misdirects the suitors' thoughts (παρέπλავξεν . . . νόημα).

219 μέγεθος και κάλλος: for the association of size and beauty, see 195n. ἀλλότριος φώς 'a foreigner' (so 16.102).

220 φρένες . . . ἐνάσιμοι: for the adj. see 17.363n; cf. 249n for an analogous expression. This line, set apart from the preceding one by asyndeton, virtually repeats 215 and closes the introductory ring before P. moves from the general point to the specific instance.

221–5 At 166–7 P. announced that she was going to warn Telemachus against mingling with the suitors; instead she scolds him for having allowed the beggar's mistreatment. Although a departure from epic convention, the discrepancy between the stated intention and its realization can be reconciled without too much difficulty: P. cites a concrete instance of Telemachus' complicity in the suitors' general mode of conduct (at 61–5 he endorsed Antinous' sponsorship of the bout between Od. and Irus); this, P. also claims, is an example of his failure to exercise the sagacity that might be expected from one who has reached maturity, a theme perhaps suggested by Eurynome's words on Telemachus' coming of age (175–6n). However, audiences may regard the deviation from 166–7 as significant: if the poet means us to register the shift, it could reveal that P.'s original statement was a hastily fabricated excuse for her impulse to go downstairs, or suggest that she is so preoccupied with the beggar that, once in his presence, she forgets her original motivation. For the different interpretations that P.'s words allow, see Besslich 1966: 141, Fenik 1974: 117–19, Austin 1975: 209–10, van Nortwick 1979: 274, Byre 1988: 163–5 and Katz 1991: 89; see too 231–2n.

221 οἶον 'as exemplified by the fact that'. τὸδε (F)ἔργον: as in more than half the instances of ἔργον in H., hiatus is observed.

222 ὅς 'because you allowed', causal.

223–4 τι . . . πάθοι: combined with the description that follows, this 'euphemism' could refer either to the suitors' generally abusive conduct towards Od. or, more concretely, to the fist fight that has just occurred, and which Telemachus sanctioned (see 221–5n). ῥυστακτύος: ῥυστακτύς, 'a dragging about', is a hapax derived from ῥυστάζω, 'drag about, maltreat', a frequentative form of ἔρῶ. For other uses of the

verb, see 16.109 = 20.319, of the suitors' maltreatment of guests and of the serving women.

225 αἴσχος λῶβη τε: for the combination of terms, see 19.373, *Il.* 13.622. λῶβη, whose meaning is both 'outrage' and 'blame, reproach', is regularly used of an indignity that may involve physical as well as verbal maltreatment and 'expresses the construction put upon an action by the one that suffers from it . . . It hurts because the image a hero has of himself is that presented to him by his peers' (Hainsworth on *Il.* 9.387). For the necessary loss of κλέος and the shame that a λῶβη entails, consonant with the public disrepute evoked here, see *Il.* 7.96–100; note too *Il.* 24.239 (Priam abusing the Trojans with the term λωβητῆρες) and 347n.

227–42 Telemachus adopts a gentler and more conciliatory tone than when previously confronted with P.'s displays of authority (contrast 1.356–9) as he feigns a helplessness that the audience knows that he does not feel. But his new powers of restraint combined with the wish/imprecation at his speech's end may cause P.'s plans to backfire: if her aim was to demonstrate Telemachus' continued immaturity and the lack of danger that he poses to the suitors, then she has produced quite the opposite result (see Introduction p. 30). For her renewed attempt to protect him, see 259–70n.

227 τὸ μὲν: acc. obj. of κεχολῶσθαι; σε is both the object of νεμεσσῶμαι and the subject of the infinitive. οὐ σε νεμεσσῶμαι 'I do not blame you'; the verb regularly describes the blameworthy, improper and/or annoying nature of an act or word and the sense of disapproval it arouses in those witness to it; cf. 2.101 = 19.146 = 24.136, 6.286. H. uses the active and middle forms interchangeably.

229 ἐσθλά τε καὶ τὰ χέρια: for the use of the article, see 403–4n; cf. 8.585. νήπιος ἦα: the verb is the 1 sing. impf. indicative of 'to be' (Attic ἦν), a regular Homeric form (see Chantraine, *GH* 1 287). Telemachus will use the same phrase of himself at 20.310; for similar remarks, see 2.313, 19.19, and, exceptionally not of Telemachus, 21.95. νήπιος, possibly the equivalent of the Latin *infans*, 'one who cannot speak', stands in opposition to the youth's very frequent characterization as πεπνυμένος, an expression used in the next line and often indicative of a wisdom as manifested in speech (see 17.45n).

231 ἐκ . . . πλήσσοσι: 'tmesis', 'they scare, dismay'.

231–2 Telemachus' words very much echo the spirit, if not the letter, of P.'s earlier account of his dealings with the suitors (167–8): both speakers comment on their unwanted guests' covert and evil designs and characterize Telemachus' associations with them in similar terms. Even if P. has not explicitly said what she proposed, Telemachus seems to have understood the rebuke according to its author's original design (see Byre 1988: 164). For the image of an individual distracted or left at a loss because others have struck the wits out of him, cf. *Il.* 3.31, 13.394; as regularly, H. imagines the mental faculties as a substance that can be lost or gained (see 327n).

233 οὐ μὲν τοι: with adversative sense (Denniston, *GP* 398–9); contrast the affirmative at 16.267.

234 *μνηστήρων* *λότῃτι* ‘according to the suitors’ wish’. Some commentators object that Telemachus wrongly assumes the suitors’ partiality for Irus in the fight (despite Antinous’ apparent sympathy for Od. at 79–81). But his partisanship colours his overall outlook: since both the suitors and Irus are hostile to Od., he naturally supposes their identity of interests. His subsequent oath will draw a clear parallel between the high-class antagonists and parasite, reinforcing the poet’s repeated suggestions of the connections between Irus and the suitors (see 20–1, 75, 76, 77, 88, 99, 236–42nn).

235 A common formulaic beginning for an utterance addressed to the gods (4.341, 7.311, 17.132n, 24.376) frequently used when, as here, the expression involves a comparison.

236–42 Telemachus explicitly formulates the earlier implicit parallelism between Irus and the suitors (*οὔτω νῦν μνηστήρες . . . ὡς νῦν Ἴρος*). On the passage, see Levine 1982: 202–3.

238 *λελύτο δὲ γυῖα*: 3 sing. perf. opt. for *λελύ-ι-το*, from a conjugation of the verb in *ῦμι*; cf. 248 and Chantraine, *GH* 1 51 for the form. The description here and at 242 ironically recalls the evocation of the suitors ‘unloosed’ by erotic desire at 212. The phrase will be repeated again at 22.68, when the suitors face death at Od.’s hands.

240 *ἦσται* ‘is seated’, from *ἦμαι*, ‘sit, be seated’. *μεθύνοντι*: *μεθύω* derives from *μέθυ* (cogn. with English ‘mead’), an IE word replaced in later Greek by the Semitic loan word *οἶνος*. In comparing Irus in his collapse to a drunkard, Telemachus denigrates him further; the constantly carousing suitors, his remark may additionally imply, have left themselves open to the same charge. For intemperance as a mark of conduct unbecoming to the elite, see 331n. Cf. Theoc. *Id.* 22.98 for the equation of the defeated boxer with the drunkard (perhaps a reminiscence of this passage) and Opp. *Cyn.* 4.204.

242 *φίλα γυῖα*: the so-called ‘possessive’ use of *φίλος*, a standard feature of epic diction (also frequent with *ἦτορ*, *κῆρ*, *θυμός* and *γοῦννα*, among other bodily organs and parts) and usually rendered ‘my/your/their own’. But since the adj. is regularly applied to life and limbs at moments when they are threatened or destroyed, it may carry a stronger meaning (‘beloved’; cf. Eng. ‘dear life’) and imply affection as well as possession. The two notions are closely united in H.: men ‘love’ what is *φίλον* or their own. See further Robinson 1990.

244 Eurymachus ranks second only to Antinous in his villainy and role as ringleader of the suitors. The two are cited as the pre-eminent and most eligible among the group (4.628–9, 21.186–7) and frequently act in concert (for examples, see Fenik 1974: 198); the two will also be the first to meet their deaths at Od.’s hands. Both have personal obligations to Od. and his family; just as Od. once protected the father of Antinous (16.424–30), so he used to dandle Eurymachus on his knees when he was a child (16.442–4). However, the poet also introduces distinctions between the two suitors’ modes of depravity. While Antinous is intemperate, rash, quick to anger and violence and utterly unmindful of social niceties and restraints, Eurymachus is a consummate hypocrite, inclined to temporize, preserve appearances and mask his

wickedness with lying protestations of good faith. It is entirely in character that, faced with death, he tries to shift the blame onto Antinous and to appease Od. with belated offers of restitution (22.48–59). H. uniquely uses a two-name speech introduction here in place of the more common formula, ‘s/he addressed b’ followed by a qualifying phrase, for the start of Eurymachus’ remarks (‘Eurymachus addressed P. with words’). The variation may indicate that the suitor has interrupted the more intimate exchange between P. and her son (Edwards 1970: 33).

245 κούρη . . . Πηνελόπεια: a formulaic address, × 8 in *Od*; the second noun-epithet phrase appears × 44. Both Eurymachus and Antinous invariably address P. in this manner, designating the object of their courtship in a way that suits their design: Od. is effectively written out of the picture, and P. returned to her unmarried state as her father’s daughter. See further 259n, 17.152n, and Beck 2005a: 96–100. Eurymachus’ speech of flattery is entirely true to type.

246 Ἴασον Ἄργος ‘Ionian (?) Argos’, an expression used uniquely here. Ancient commentators affirm that the phrase describes the Peloponnese, so called because of its legendary king Iasos. According to the scholia, Iasos was the son of Io (although Apollodorus 2.1.3 and Pausanias 2.16.1 identify him as her father). Since Io was considered the originator of the Ionian race, Ἴασος and Ἴόνιος might have come to signify the same thing. Some commentators object that there is no linguistic connection between the two terms, and the use of Ἴασος as an adj. remains odd, but there is good evidence for the presence of Ionian communities in Argos or the Peloponnese at an early date and Pausanias (2.37.3) states that the inhabitants of Argos and Athens once spoke the same language (cf. Hdt. 7.94). For the view that a branch of the Mycenaean ruling class living in the Peloponnese would have called themselves ‘Ionians’ or *Ἰᾶρονες, see Chadwick 1964: 117–18 and Janko at *Il.* 13.685–8.

247 πλιέονες: –εο– is scanned by synizesis as a long syllable.

248 δαινύατ’ is opt. for δαινῦ–ι–ατο; cf. *Il.* 24.665, δαινῦτο. See 238n for a similar form and Chantraine, *GH* 1 51.

249 Arete uses the same phrase of Od. at 11.337; see too 14.178. For μέγεθος, see 195n. ἔϊσας: an epic form of ἴσος with prothetic vowel, used elsewhere of ‘evenly-balanced’ ships and shields; here the adjective is metaphorically extended to wits that are ‘in equilibrium’ or well-balanced, as opposed to those that are immoderate or out of control (for the implied contrast, cf. 2.231= 5.9, 7.309–10). With one exception (*Il.* 2.765), the epithet appears only in formulaic expressions, always modifying a feminine noun and in final position in the line.

251–80 A crucial speech in which P. adds a new plot twist as she reports Od.’s parting instructions, directing her to remarry should he not have returned by the time Telemachus reaches manhood. P. brackets her verbatim repetition of Od.’s words (259–70) with strong reiterations of her continuing devotion to her husband and grief at his absence. In the concluding portion of her speech, she makes the possible remarriage contingent on the suitors’ observing current custom and bringing her gifts.

251–6 = 19.124–9 (P. to Od., also denying or modifying the praise addressed to her). ἦ τοι: this combination marks a qualification or, as in this instance, an emphatic contradiction of a previous speaker's words. P.'s rejection of Eurymachus' flattery is sincere; she knows nothing of the earlier visit of the divine beautician (187–97). Unusually, the poet seems not to use δέμας as an acc. of respect (although the translation 'in respect of appearance and form' is also possible); see Clarke 2001: 117.

252 ἴλιον εἰσανέβαινον 'embarked on board ship to go to Troy'; for the expression, cf. 2.172.

253 ἦεν: 3 sing. imperf. of εἶμι 'go'. According to the *Cypria*, Od. did not voluntarily join in the Trojan expedition, but was tricked into so doing by Palamedes (*Cypria* arg. 5 W).

254 τὸν ἐμὸν βίον: here 'livelihood, property' rather than 'life', although the distinction is a narrow one. ἀμφιπολεύει: the verb regularly means 'take care of, tend' (so 24.244 and 257 of Laertes' careful tending of his vineyard); the scholia gloss περιπέσοι, περὶ τὸν ἐμὸν βίον πολοῖτο καὶ ἀναστρέφοιτο, and A–H–C render it 'surround my life (with his concern)'. There may be a latent agricultural metaphor here.

255 κλέος . . . ἐμὸν: unusually here an individual refers to his/her own renown. For the only other instance in the *Od.*, see Od.'s words at 9.20, καὶ μὲν κλέος οὐρανὸν ἴκει; κλέος more conventionally depends on what others say (or typically sing) of you (see 17.418n). Here P.'s fame seems a matter not just of her beauty and soundness of mind (regular female virtues in the Homeric world; cf. 20.71) on which Eurymachus has complimented her but, more importantly, of her fidelity to Od. P.'s claim thus stands in opposition to Antinous' earlier suggestion that she receives κλέος by virtue of the suitors' presence (2.125–6) and instead makes that renown dependent on her husband's action. Elsewhere in the poem, P.'s κλέος results from her practice of the δόλοι that Od. names as the source of his reputation at 9.19–20; for the association of κλέος and δόλοι, see the scene in the underworld, where Agamemnon's declaration of P.'s undying κλέος (24.196) caps Amphimedon's narrative of her δόλοι (cf. 19. 131–46); since those tricks are performed so as to promote her husband's interests, they too can form part of her wifely devotion. In a sense not intended by the speaker, P.'s words concerning the amplified renown that Od.'s return would bring her are prescient: the *Od.* is a celebration of that νόστος which endows fame on P. by virtue of her part in the story. For further discussion, see Edwards 1985: 80–1, Segal 1996: 208–9.

256 νῦν δ': the expression 'but as it is' occurs commonly after unfulfilled conditions; cf. 1.166; cf. *Il.* 1.354. In the *Iliad*, Achilles shows a particular predilection for the phrase, using it far more often than other characters (× 26). Like Achilles, here P.'s 'mind goes out into a world of possibility, and then abruptly returns to the situation before [her]' (so Friedrich and Redfield 1978: 283).

257 λιπῶν κάτω: for the reversed 'tmesis', cf. *Il.* 17.91, 21.57, *Od.* 9.17.

258 δεξιτερὴν ἐπὶ καρπῶι: the gesture regularly accompanies leave-taking and/or serves as a sign of affection; in Attic marriage rituals, the husband would also grasp his new bride by the right wrist, perhaps a practice additionally suggested here (Foley

2001: 132). For representations in Greek art, see Neumann 1965: 49–58. ἐμέ goes with προσηύδα.

259–70 The first and only account of Od.’s instructions on leaving home (a motif reworked at S. *Trach.* 161–8; the scene of the warrior’s leave-taking from his family also appears very frequently on later Attic vases; see Lissarrague 1989: 45–6). Nothing in the text confirms or denies the veracity of P.’s report, and several different interpretations are possible. (a) P. accurately relays what Od. said, citing his words to demonstrate that her reluctant decision to consider remarriage is both conditioned and approved by her husband’s intentions (note the irony of the ‘quotation’ in the original speaker’s presence; the fact that Od. registers neither surprise nor dissent could be taken as proof either of P.’s sincerity, or of Od.’s awareness of her ‘game’; but see 281–3nn). (b) Her fabricated account could be another face-saving expedient to explain and excuse a (genuine) change in course; driven to extremity by Telemachus’ manhood, the threats to his life, and the depletion of her husband’s property, she has decided to remarry. (c) P. makes a fresh attempt to beguile the suitors, using the fabrication to gain time and shield Telemachus; her apparent capitulation will also allow her to repair the attacks on the household’s wealth by soliciting gifts. A deliberate fiction would additionally explain why there is no other reference to Od.’s important instructions in the poem. (d) H. preserves an element from a folk-tale version in which P. agreed to remarry according to Od.’s previous directions.

The narrator offers no clues as to which interpretation is correct, and guidance comes only from Od.’s later, and no less problematic, gloss on P.’s conduct here (281–3nn). But while P.’s motives and actions remain opaque (perhaps by the poet’s design), her behaviour is consistent with the role assigned to her in Athena and Od.’s revenge plan. As with her proposal to stage the contest of the bow in book 19, P. unwittingly embarks on a course that will bring about the realization of what she longs for even as she ostensibly believes herself moving ever further from that goal. For further discussion, see Büchner 1940: 137–46, Allione 1963: 65–70, Vester 1968: 432, Marquadt 1985: 41, Byre 1988: 172–3, Winkler 1990: 146–7, Katz 1991: 91–2, Hölscher 1996: 134–7.

259 ὦ γύναι: Od.’s reported words open with the regular form of address by a husband to his wife; the ‘beggar’ favours the same expression during his dialogue with P. in book 19, where he again avoids the ‘maiden’ name used by the suitors (see 245n). γυνή indicates both wife and the mistress of a household.

260 ἀπρονέεισθαι: the form is localized throughout H. as a line-terminating formula (× 5 in *Od.*, × 10 *Il.*); the α of the prefix is lengthened to supply the required metre (–υυ–). See further Wyatt 1969: 85–7.

262 ἦδέ ῥυτήρας δίστων ‘and drawers of arrows’; cf. 21.173. The final vowel of ἦδέ is lengthened before the noun’s original double constant *ϕρ; ῥυτήρ is cognate with ἔρω ‘pull’. This particular expression appears nowhere elsewhere in H. (in the *Il.* ῥυτήρ refers to a rein, i.e. that which ‘pulls back’ a horse), and the Trojans are not typically characterized as archers. There are some notoriously disreputable uses of the bow on the Trojan side (Pandarus chiefly; see too *Il.* 11.385), but Greek heroes

(Meriones and Od. among them) use the weapon too. Contingents of archers appear on both sides, and at *Il.* 3.79 the entire Achaean army is equipped with bows; the collective Trojans are never so described (see further Hijmans 1976). Why Od., or P, if she is the author of the ‘citation’, should depict the enemy in this manner remains puzzling; possibly the poet seeks to promote his hero’s signature skill by including Trojan bowmanship among the reasons why the enemy seems so formidable.

263 ἵππων τ’ ὠκυπόδων ἐπιβήτορας: lit. ‘riders of swift-footed horses’, but more properly ‘riders on chariots with swift-footed horses’; so ἵππων ἐπιβαίνειν is ‘to mount a chariot’. The phrase forms the final member of a tricolon crescendo as the speaker, elaborating on his statement in 261, enumerates the odds ranged against the Greeks so as to emphasize the unlikelihood of his return. οἱ τε: Monro’s emendation for the MSS reading οἱ κε is almost certainly correct; epic poets regularly use τε with a noun or pronoun to describe a generic or essential property characteristic of a person or thing; see too 17.331n, Chantraine, *GH* II 239–41, Ruijgh 1971: 349.

264 ἔκριναν: gnomic aorist; here the verb means ‘decide, settle an issue’. ὁμοίου πολέμοιο ‘baneful war’, a formulaic phrase found × 8 in H. The meaning and etymology of the already fossilized epic adjective, variously applied by H. to old age, death, strife and battle, has puzzled ancient and modern commentators. If related to ὁμός/ὁμοῖος ‘like, resembling’, it would mean ‘equal for all’, ‘impartial’, ‘levelling’ (as at Hes. *IVD* 182, Xenophanes B23.2 DK and later authors). Apollonius’ *Lexicon* glosses τὸ ὁμοῖος συμβαῖνον. However, an independent derivation is entirely possible; some early grammarians gloss κακός; see too Leaf’s discussion at *Il.* 9.440 and A–H–S at *H. Ven.* 224. The adj. would have assumed its negative meaning in H. because ‘those things of which it was predicated were all bad or at least unwelcome’ (Wyatt 1969: 175).

265 μ’ ἀνέσει: most probably from *ἀνέζω, ‘set’, i.e. ‘restore’ rather than an irregular future form of ἀνήμι (as assumed by ancient commentators); cf. *Il.* 14.209.

267 μεμνήσθαι: imperatival infinitive, as at 270.

269 γενειήσαντα: see 176n. If we accept that this is what Od. said, then Eurynome may already have had his words in mind at 176.

270 γήμασθ’ ὧι κ’ ἐθέλησθα: γαμέω regularly takes a dat. in H. when used in the mid. of a woman giving herself in marriage to a man. Here the choice of whom to marry is explicitly placed in P’s own hands (see Introduction p. 26). Both in this and subsequent references to the future marriage, speakers emphasize P’s departure from the house, something deeply painful to her (19. 579–81 = 21.77–9, 20.334–7, 341–4, 21.103–4).

272–3 ‘The night will come, when hateful marriage will come upon me, a ruined woman, whom Zeus has robbed of happiness’. στυγερὸς γάμος: the phrase is used of the remarriage at 1.249 = 16.126.

273 οὐλομένης lit. ‘accursed’, that of which one says δλοιο (‘go to blazes’). As at 17.287n, the powerful term is given added emphasis by its run-over position. ἀπηύρα ‘took away’; a defective verb (see Chantraine, *GH* I 356, 380 and Snell–Erbse, *LfgE* for possible derivations).

274 = *Il.* 8.147, 15.208, 16.52; the noun-epithet phrase appears × 10 in *H.* ἀλλὰ τόδε: τόδε looks forward to the next verse and gives emphasis to what P. is going to say.

275 μνηστήρων . . . δίκη ‘the usage, custom of suitors’; the regular meaning of δίκη in the *Od.* (e.g. 11.218, 19.43, 168, 24.255). Only on a few occasions (14.84, *Il.* 16.388, 19.180–1) does the term approach its later meaning of justice. Contrast *Hes. WD* 9, 221, *Th.* 85–6, 235–6.

276 ἀφνειοῖο ‘of a rich man’.

277 ἀλλήλοισι ἐρίσωσιν: for the suggestion of a marriage contest, see 292–301, 17.167–9nn. The verb is particularly apposite for rivalry and competition over a woman; it is used of Agamemnon and Achilles’ quarrel provoked by Briseis (*Il.* 1.6, 8, 2.376–7; cf. 19.58), of Paris and Menelaus’ struggle over Helen (*Il.* 3.100), and of the suitors competing for the hand of Cleisthenes’ daughter at *Hdt.* 6.129.2. It was, of course, the personified Eris who, at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, first prompted the divine quarrel that was the catalyst for Helen’s abduction and the whole war that followed; *Hesiod* evokes that divine ἐρις in the context of the courtship competition for Helen at fr. 204.95–6 M–W (ἐξ ἐριδος). For a later play on ἐρις /ἔρωσ, see *Eur. IA* 585–7.

278 P. highlights how proper suitors behave: instead of consuming their host’s livestock, they themselves (αὐτοί is emphatic) bring the meal. βόας καὶ ἴφια μῆλα: × 7 in *H.* In place of the animals supplied by the exemplary wooers of P.’s account, the suitors will offer jewelry and clothing, gifts perhaps more suited to a seduction than to a legitimate marriage scenario (see 292–301nn).

279 φίλοισι ‘relatives’, a dat. predicative in opposition to the preceding phrase. The δῶρα solicited here are distinct from the ἔδνα whose exchange was a necessary and formal part of a marriage agreement. For the distinction, see Lacey 1966: 55–60. *H.* couples the noun-epithet (× 20 in *H.*) with forms of δίδωμι at line’s end on three other occasions in the *Od.*; cf. *Il.* 24.425, in a variation of the formula.

280 Ὀν ἀλλότριον see 18n. νῆπιον ‘without compensation’; see Introduction p. 17 n. 45 for the poet’s use of the term.

281–2 A notorious crux, and a possible pointer to the motives behind P.’s announcement (as *Od.* understands them). There are three plausible reasons for *Od.*’s otherwise paradoxical pleasure at P.’s declaration of her readiness to take a second husband. (a) Most likely, assuming that P. speaks in good faith and genuinely intends to remarry, *Od.*’s delight derives from her display of wifely obedience as she cites his instructions, even as he knows that she will not have to act in the painful manner indicated; P.’s solicitation of gifts would also please *Od.*; for his characteristic preoccupation with gift-accumulation, see, e.g., 9.229, 19.272, 283–4. (b) *Od.* rejoices because he discerns that P. is beguiling her love-struck audience the better to hoodwink and extort marriage gifts from them; previous appearances of the phrase ‘her mind had other intentions’ (see 283n) make this reading attractive: at 2.92 and 13.381 speakers use the words to describe a trick devised by P. to encourage the suitors while secretly working against them. P.’s duplicity, story-telling and use of fabricated

citations also constitute a display of ‘likemindedness’ which might delight Od., himself master of such procedures. (c) Od., like the audience, is not privy to P’s thoughts and intentions, but glosses or ‘focalizes’ her conduct so as to bring it in line with his (and Athena’s) plot trajectory. He believes that she is dissembling, but we cannot know whether his assumption is correct (cf. 19.583–7, where Od. similarly interprets P’s actions – here the proposal to set up the contest of the bow – in the light of his revenge plot). For discussion, see Allione 1963: 67–9, Bona 1966: 151–2, Byre 1988: 166–73, Katz 1991: 89–93, 118–19, Hölscher 1996: 135–6.

281 = 7.329, 8.199, 13.250; see too *H. H. Cer.* 370, *Hes. Th.* 173; for detailed discussion of the formulaic phrase, see Finkelberg 1989: 182–3.

282 παρέλκετο: conative. The prefix παρα may suggest something underhanded about the procedure, with the implication of trickery; see 17.139n for a similar use of the prefix. θέλγε: see 212n for the verb. P’s ability to ‘enchant’ once again links husband and wife: Od. charmed his audience of Phaeacians and solicited gifts from them (11.334, 357–9); in the former context, the ‘spell’ cast by Od. depended on his bard-like powers (11.368); here P. enchants not just through the words that the next line describes, but, more critically, through her erotic allure. For the link between speech/song and desire, see 17.514, 519–20nn.

283 νόος δέ οἱ ἄλλα μενοίνα ‘her mind intended other things’. These ‘other things’ most probably refer to what Od. believes to be his wife’s general intentions, rather than to any particularized contrivances. The line should be read with 13.381 where, in identical phrasing, Athena assured Od. that, for all P’s seeming encouragement of the suitors, her wifely devotion remained unchanged. Od. here interprets P’s actions in the light (and language) of what his divine source told him, namely that P. means to remain steadfast. At 19.157–8 P. will confirm that she does not have any further ruse to use against the suitors: once the web stratagem failed, she could not come up with another device (see further Bona 1966: 151–2, Erbse 1972: 82–7, Hölscher 1996: 135–6). However, further trickery should not be ruled out. The phrase ἄλλα μενοίνα reappears in a well-known mid-sixth-century epitaph that directs the passerby who ‘moves along the road with mind intent on other things (ἄλλα μενοινῶν)’ to stop and mourn the grave’s inhabitant (*CEG* 28), an expression that might imply not just the traveller’s distraction but the cunning (he is up to no good) that P. also exercises; so too *H. H. Merc.* 62, τὰ δὲ φρεσίν ἄλλα μενοίνα, of the god’s idea of stealing Apollo’s cattle while he performs on the lyre.

286 ὅς κ’ ἐθέλησιν . . . ἐνεΐκαι ‘[receive from him] who wishes to bring it’.

287 δέξασθ’: imperatival infinitive. δόσιον ‘the giving’; cf. 4.651. In the previous book the poet underscored Antinous’ refusal to ‘give’; see particularly 17.455–7.

288 ἔργα: in this context, the suitors’ ‘lands’ or ‘estates’; this usage is rare in the *Od.*, where ἔργα more typically refer to land that is cultivated or tilled (e.g. 4.318, 6.259, 7.26).

289 Ἀχαιῶν ὅς τις ἀριστος: the *Od.* uses this formulaic expression, always in this v. position, exclusively in the context of the remarriage of P. (11.179, 16.76, 19.528; cf. 20.335), the forum where Od. will emerge as the ‘best’. At 15.521 Telemachus calls

Eurymachus the ἄριστος of the Ithacans, again in reference to the courtship struggle and that suitor's aspirations to assume Od.'s γέρας. In the formula, ἄριστος must refer chiefly to eligibility and distinction among an elite group rather than to any moral quality or political status. In the *Il.*, H. reserves the expression ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν for pre-eminent heroes; the question of who qualifies as 'best' is also at the heart of the dispute between Agamemnon and Achilles (1.91, 2.82; note the 'revisionary' stance of the *Od.*, which relocates the loaded expression to the dispute between Achilles and Od., described at 8.78 as the ἄριστοι Ἀχαιῶν). Cf. 17.416n.

291–2 The arrival of the gifts follows immediately on the sending of the heralds (an instance of 'telescoping'); the verb ἔνεικε at 292 indicates the envoys' return since a herald must be the subject. H. uses a more 'naturalistic' narrative procedure at 185–99 where P.'s sleep and beautification occupy the time lag between Eurynome's departure to summon the handmaids and their actual arrival.

291 οἰσέμεναι 'in order to bring', an infinitive formed from mixed aor. οἰσ-, the root which supplies the regular future of φέρω; cf. 12.10 and Chantraine, *GH* 1 417–18. κήρυκα: as the term θεράποντες at 297 (see too 300, 423–4) indicates, heralds and 'retainers' may be interchangeable in function, although the former possess a particular skill (19.135) and have a specific role in the summoning and directing of assemblies (2.6–8, 37–8, 8.7–15). Both sets of individuals belong to the class of non-servile dependents who, voluntarily or otherwise, serve in the houses of the rich and powerful (see further Ramming 1973: 91–5, Thalmann 1998: 66–7). Heralds also go to fetch gifts for Od. at 8.399. See too 303n and 423n.

292–301 The Catalogue of Gifts, perhaps a conventional element in epic accounts of courtship contests. Surviving fragments of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 196–204 M–W) include a much more extended enumeration of the gifts that each suitor offered in wooing Helen, sometimes simply noting that they were 'many', but on occasion including details about the objects (e.g. fr. 200–4). There the suitors' ranking depends on the quantity and preciousness of what they bring, as the gifts themselves become the medium of competition. For other lists of gifts in H., see 4.589–92, 9.201–5, *Il.* 9.262–98, 24.228–35.

The itemization of the suitors' gifts also belongs among the narrative pauses introduced by H. so as to give detailed accounts of objects (see, for example, 4.125–32, 615–19, 15.105–8, 19.226–31, 21.11–41). Like scenery descriptions (see 17.205–11n), these passages serve several functions: while conjuring up for an audience (and inviting them to visualize) objects particular to the grandiose and luxurious heroic lifestyle that the epics celebrate, they promote the poet's themes and plot trajectory: gifts are concrete markers of ξενία, mnemonic devices prompting stories about past events, indicators of the nature of their givers/owners, and pointers to action still to come. The suitors' gifts have a four-fold significance: (a) their opulence highlights the wealth that the suitors have conspicuously failed to share while plundering Od.'s property. (b) Their belated bestowal underscores the suitors' prolonged failure to observe courtship protocol while also preparing us for the climax of the wooing competition soon to occur. (The poet might also want an audience to compare and contrast

this episode with the courtship competition for Helen as later described in the Hesiodic *Catalogue*: while that contest successfully mediated elite rivalry (see Introduction pp. 17–18), here the gifts fail to resolve a competition which, by its nature, lacks legitimacy.) (c) the articles coincide with the allurement scenario that P. resists insofar as they supply the queen with the accoutrements typically used in epic seduction scenes (for the affinities with Hera embarking on the seduction of Zeus, see 295–6n). But the poet again exonerates his heroine: P. does not use the adornments, nor are they made part of the standard ‘dressing’ type-scene. (d) The fact that P. resists the enticement of these outstandingly beautiful and seductive gifts gives fresh proof of her fidelity and her departure from the paradigmatic greed displayed by some other women in the *Od.*; note 11.326–7 (Eriphyle who betrayed her husband for a necklace of gold) and 8.269 (Ares successfully solicits Aphrodite with many gifts); see further Morris 1992: 26–7, Brown 1997: 45–6.

H.’s account follows the format regularly used in detailing objects: after a ‘summary description’, the poet more minutely evokes the artifact’s material, workmanship, size and/or value (see 292–3, 294, 295–6nn). H. may additionally focus on one conspicuous feature of the item and, in the longer segments, give its genealogy and history; for the terms used here, see Minchin 2001: 106–12; note too Bakker 1997a: 56 for the suggestion that each sequential unit of description conforms to the way in which speakers transform visual impressions into speech. Combined with the list format, the present passage allows for a display of mnemonic power and poetic *variatio*; H. rearranges the word order of the lines each time a fresh gift arrives (292, 295, 297, 300). Alliteration, enjambment and compound adjectives all figure in the descriptions as the poet emphasizes each object’s beauty, preciousness and highly-worked nature. As suits the gender of the recipient, the gifts are articles for P.’s personal adornment, textiles and jewelry (for these as ‘the status trappings of aristocratic wealth’ and the relations between cloth-making and metalworking, see 5.38, 8.440, 24.274–7 and Jenkins 1985: 123–4). Just as Hesiod imagines the first-created woman Pandora chiefly as a vehicle for adornment (*Th.* 573–84), so H.’s female figures (divine and human) are objects whose attractiveness depends in large part on the richness and splendour of their visible surface. (A view that still holds in sixth- and fifth-century Athens: in contrast to nude *kouroi*, the *korai* dedicated on the Acropolis wear richly-ornamented garments and jewelry.)

292–3 As befits Antinous’ status among the suitors, his gift arrives first and is detailed in three (as opposed to two, in the other three instances) lines; this gift is also pre-eminent for its combination of a decorated piece of cloth and an attachment of precious metal (see previous note). After the generalizing description (περικαλλέα πέπλον), H. indicates the robe’s workmanship and focuses on one remarkable feature, the multiple golden pins. ποικίλον (‘parti-coloured, ornamented’), in run-over position, continues the string of π’s in the previous line. H. regularly uses the adj. for intricately worked objects, whether of cloth (where the meaning may be ‘embroidered’), metal, or wood; cf. 1.132, 3.492, *Il.* 16.134, 22.441; at *Il.* 18.590 the verb ποικίλλε describes how the wonderfully skilled Hephaestus fashioned a dancing floor

on Achilles' shield. *περόναι δυοκαίδεκα πᾶσαι*: *πᾶσαι* is predicative, 'twelve in all'; contrast the garment described at 19.225–7 which carries only one pin. Antinous' gift may have particular implications; a cloth was an appropriate gift for a groom to give his bride on the occasion of their marriage (see Helen's words to Telemachus at 15.124–7; also 4.305, where *τανύπεπλος* Helen lies beside Menelaus); such nuptial robes, some depicted on Attic marriage vases, and which may have subsequently served as coverlets for the marital bed, would form part of Athenian marriage celebrations in classical times.

294 A second enjambed phrase, this one highlighting the precious metal from which the pins are fashioned and their intricate design; gold is, of course, the top-rank metal, prized for its durability and the fact that it does not tarnish. *ἀραρυῖαι*: 'fitted with'. A. R. 3.832–3 echoes Homeric style and expression for the robe in which Medea adorns herself (*πέπλον | καλόν, ἐγυγάμπτουσιον ἀρηρέμενον περόνησιον*) before going to meet Jason.

295–6 Following an initial two-word description (*δρμον . . . πολυδαίδαλον*), the poet focuses on the materials used to craft the object and its distinctive feature, radiance. *πολυδαίδαλον* 'highly wrought', a term used for the products of weaving, metalworking and carpentry (cf. *Il.* 11.32, 24.597). *χρύσειον* is separated from its noun and postponed until the next verse; this inverts the normal formulaic order. *ἠλέκτροισιν ἑρμένον* 'studded with amber beads'. *ἠλεκτρον* can variously mean amber (a substance that the Greeks obtained chiefly from the Baltic coast) and a gold and silver alloy that occurred naturally in Lydia. The use of the plural here and at 15.460 suggests that the poet has amber rather than the metal mix in mind. Amber necklaces have been found in Mycenaean shaft graves, and the substance became popular again in the late seventh and eighth centuries; a more recent find is a gold and amber bead necklace in the Idaian Cave on Crete (see Sakellarakis 1988: 182–7, figs. 21–3 for this, and Wace and Stubbings 1962: 503, Beck 1970). In view of these artifacts, it is hard to determine whether H. intends his description to be archaizing; the impression is rather of outstanding luxury. *ἠέλιον ὤς*: for the poet's repeated use of the formula between the bucolic diaeresis and line end, see Parry 1971: 229; cf. *H. H. Ven.* 89, where the moon is the comparandum for Aphrodite's necklaces. Although the sun is called *ἠλέκτωρ* several times (*Il.* 6.513, 19.398, *H. H. Ap.* 369) to indicate its equivalent brilliant gleam, the etymology and connection between *ἠλεκτρον* and *ἠλέκτωρ* remains obscure (see Ruizpérez 1972). Other articles compared to the sun include Od.'s chiton (19.234) and Hera's veil (*Il.* 14.185).

297–8 The presence of two heralds, one to carry each of the pair, might serve to emphasize the objects' extraordinary value. *τρίγληνα μορόεντα* 'with three mulberry-like drops'. Hera wears the same triple cluster earrings at *Il.* 14.182–3 (the *Διὸς ἀπαστή* again); cf. *H. H. Ven.* 6.8–9, where Aphrodite is adorned with a rosette-shaped pair, made of orichalc and gold. Since neither the Mycenaeans nor Minoans wore earrings, the poet must be thinking of Geometric design; earrings with three projections of mulberry shape have been discovered in an Early Geometric II grave at Lefkandi (Euboea); see further Janko at *Il.* 14.182–3. *τρίγληνα* is derived from *γλήνη* (eyeball)

and includes the root *gl-, signifying brightness. μορόντα, a term of obscure etymology, is most plausibly derived from the mulberry, μόρα; μορόεις = ‘like mulberries’; the adj. may describe the effect of granulation in gold. χάρις δ’ ἀπελάμπητο πολλή = *Il.* 14.183. For χάρις as the critical element in a woman’s adornment, see Hes. *WD* 65 and 73, and for the close association of light and χάρις and its place in a woman’s erotic allure, note the phrase (× 5 [*Hes.*] *Cat.*) Χαρίτων ἀμαρύγματ’ ἔχουσα(v). This radiant sparkle also emanates from highly-worked objects; so *Od.*, gilded like a work of art, glistens with χάρις (6.237).

300 ἰσθμιον ‘necklace’; from ἰσθμός ‘neck’. An ἀγάλμα is that in which someone ‘takes delight’ (ἀγάλλεται), a precious and high-status object, frequently invested with talismanic status and/or of divine or legendary provenance. ἀγάλματα are typically ‘the medium of aristocratic intercourse’, prominent in gift exchanges between members of the elite (Gernet 1981: 113); cf. 4.602. *H.* also uses the term of offerings to the gods, the meaning that comes to predominate in later usage.

303 περικαλλέα δῶρα: regularly at line end; see, e.g., 8.420, 16.327.

304–345

With the object of their desires now back upstairs with her new-won possessions, the suitors resume their regular amusements while *Od.* devises an excuse for staying in the μέγαρον. His peremptory order to the maidservants to attend to their mistress and allow him to take over the business of tending the lamps in the hall provokes Melantho’s sharp tongue. *Od.* rebukes her in turn, routing his female antagonists. The scene both echoes *Od.*’s earlier encounter with Melantho’s brother, Melanthius, and with *Irus*, and anticipates his exchange with Eurymachus, with whom the maid is associated (see 325n).

304–6 = 1.421–3; cf. *H. H. Ap.* 149. For the combination of dance and song, see 17.605–6n, and for the adj. ἱμερόεσσαν, 17.519–20n.

305–6 τέρποντο: delight is the response that song typically elicits in epic. At 22.330, the Ithacan bard Phemius has the patronymic Terpiades, and Hesiod names two Muses Εὐτέρπη and Τερψιχόρη (*Th.* 77, 78); on τέρψις and song, see Schadewaldt 1959b: 83–4, Lanata 1963: 8–9. Stanford remarks on the euphony of this and the subsequent line with the repeated use of the vowels ε and ο and the consonants π, ρ, σ and τ; the listener’s delight is equivalent to that of the suitors, and the sound we hear exemplifies the ἱμερόεσσαν ἀοιδήν of 304. Note too the marked assonance in 305, τρεψάμενοι τέρποντο. Some of the maidservants, who are preparing to keep the braziers alight in the hall (see 311), would be present at Phemius’ performance, but more as ancillary listeners than as members of the primary audience; on this, see Introduction p. 13.

307–44 A menial task, the lighting of the braziers, the λαμπτήρες that would provide both light and heat, occupies a surprising amount of space, and a different contrivance could have been found for keeping *Od.* in the palace. But beyond marking the beggar’s advance from parasite to the usefully employed lamp-tender (a refutation

of the repeated charges that the mendicant shuns productive labour), the task allows Od. one of his several ‘epiphanic’ displays and causes a fresh instance of the suitors’ culpable blindness (see 317, 353, 354–5nn); cf. 19.37–40, where the task Od. fulfils produces a similar effect whose significance Telemachus correctly discerns.

307 ἴστασαν: 3 plur. imperf. of ἴστημι; the MSS record ἔστασαν (intrans.), a dubious form, for the regular Homeric ἔστησαν; see 3.182, 8.435, *Il.* 2.525 and 12.56 (where the scholia preserve Aristarchus’ reading ἔστασαν) for the same variant, and Shipp 1972: 110.

308–9 ξύλα κάγκανα: the context suggests the meaning ‘dry’ for the adj. (so Eustathius and Hesychius), with a probable derivation from καίω/κάω (see Athanasakis 1976). In *H.* the phrase occurs only here and at *Il.* 21.364; see too κάγκανα κᾶλα at *H. H. Merc.* 112, one among several expressions that the composition borrows from the *Od.*; *A. R.* 3.272 (also in this v. position), and *Theoc. Id.* 24.89 (κάγκανα . . . ξύλ’) preserve the Homeric phrasing. The accumulation of ‘dry, crackling consonants’ (ξύλα κάγκανα θῆκαν) here and in the *Iliadic* usage evokes the noise of the firewood (see Richardson on *Il.* 21.364); the sound pattern continues into the next line. κεκεασμένα: from κέαζω, ‘chop’ or ‘split’; cf. 14.418, 15.322 and 20.161, of splitting firewood.

310 δαίδας μετέμισγον: the verb suggests mixing, an activity hard to reconcile with the noun’s regular meaning, ‘torches’ (cf. 354). Here δαίδας probably describe a form of ‘kindling’, small pieces of wood that, together with the ξύλα with which they are mixed, help to ignite the fire in the braziers (see A–H–C). This is better than imagining torches interspersed with the λαμπτήρες. ἄμοιβηδῖς: the term refers to people acting in turn (see too *Il.* 18.506, *H. H. Cer.* 326), here relieving one another as they stoke the flame. ἀνέφαινον ‘gave light’. For (ἀνα)φαίνω used as intransitive, see 308, 7.102, 19.25 and LSJ s.v. A II. In the fantastical palace of Alcinous there was no need for (living) domestics to supply light: golden statues did the job (7.100–2).

311 δμωιαί: the distinction between δμωιαί and ἀμφίπολοι is fluid; most probably the latter represent a subset of the former, designated as such when female slaves appear in a particular capacity or are singled out in some fashion. Unlike δμωιαί, an ἀμφίπολος may be referred to in the singular, given a name (see 182n), and directly addressed in the vocative case, all indicators of a more personalized relation between the owner and the domestic(s); see further Thalmann 1998: 63.

311–12 The epithets accompanying Od.’s name represent the two chief elements in his heroic makeup, his endurance and wiliness, both amply demonstrated in this scene. See too 17.34n.

314 ἴν’ αἰδοίη βασίλεια ‘where your respected queen is’.

315 ἠλάκατα στροφαλίετε ‘wind the strands on the distaff’ (the ἠλακάτη); the verb is an iterative form related to στρέφω.

316 ἤμενα: women sit to spin, whereas weaving requires the worker to pass from one side of the loom to the other. εἴρια: wool in its raw state, prior to cleansing and combing; an original digamma causes the hiatus (ἦ φείρια) here (see Chantraine, *GH* I 156 for the cognate Lat. term *vervex*). πείκετε: a metrical lengthening of πεκ–.

317 φάος: Od.'s self-declared role as light-bringer might be an instance of the ironies that pervade his dealings with the suitors and his other enemies in the household (see 319n). In the *Il.*, φάος carries the secondary meanings 'victory in military combat' and 'salvation' (e.g., 16.95, 17.615, 18.102, 20.95; cf. Electra's wish at *A. Ch.* 131, 'in Orestes kindle a light in the house', *S. El.* 1224, 1354). The hero's declaration that he will 'furnish light for all these', i.e. the suitors, would then be a grim play on the speaker's actual design, that of bringing not victory or salvation, but defeat and destruction to the company.

319 νικήσουσι: renewed irony at the maids' (and suitors') expense as Od. selects a verb that can denote victory in a martial or athletic context. The appearance of agonistic vocabulary in a description of a humdrum domestic chore is exemplary of the poem's mingling of elite and base spheres of activity and its application of aristocratic competitive values to acts performed by the menial/labourer (see 366n and 15.317–24, with Edwards 1993: 71–2). Here Od. also makes commensurate pursuits belonging to different ends of the social spectrum, declaring his endurance as a (productive) lamp-lighter superior to the suitors' ability to sustain their (non-productive and wasteful) carousing. πολυτλήμων: with this variation on his standard epithet πολύτλας, Od. uses a term that, in its literal meaning, suits the present context but simultaneously connotes the hero's particular quality of endurance and survival (and perhaps also his daring) and so hints at his true identity. In so doing, he engages in the kind of formulaic play of which the Odyssean poet seems fond (Griffin 1987: 100–1).

320 αἰ δ' ἐγέλασαν: the first of the maidservants' two misplaced laughs (for the other, see 20.8). On both occasions the servants' hilarity variously 'connotes blindness, rebelliousness and sexual misbehaviour' (Levine 1987: 23). Like master, like maid: in both books too the domestics' outburst echoes or anticipates the suitors' equally ill-timed and inappropriate laughter as they misapprehend the meaning of words and events.

321 Sister to the perfidious and abusive Melanthius, Melanthe shares many of her brother's unpleasant traits (their common name indicates the 'black designs' native to their character). Just as Melanthius stands in opposition to the loyal Eumaeus and Philoetius (see 17.212–53n), so Melanthe supplies the negative foil to the trusty Eurycleia and Eurynome. Brother and sister both abuse the hero (in similar terms), and both will be punished with deaths of particularly nasty kinds; cf. Fenik 1974: 174–5. Treachery and disloyalty in the female domain take a distinctive form, sexual promiscuity (see 325n). If the poem has just exonerated P. from the charge, it does so in part by then 'bringing into the narrative foreground a figure who enacts a scenario of female betrayal. It displaces the question of sexual misconduct from P. onto her faithless serving-woman' (Katz 1991: 131–2). For Dolius, see 17.212n.

322–6 H. places this small but damning 'biography' within a ring composition marked off by ἐνέπιπε (321, 326); the term occupies the same metrical position in the opening and concluding lines. The repetition emphasizes the abusive and scolding nature of the remarks that Melanthe is about to deliver; cf. Archilochus' supposed claim that the slave-woman Enipo ('Blame') was his mother (Critias 88 B44 DK).

322–3 The details of P.'s former care (κόμισσε) and kindness, 'she used to give her playthings to amuse her', make Melanthis's present treachery even more reprehensible.

323 δὲ ὥς: hiatus with ὥς following a short syllable occurs only here in H.

324 Πηνελοπείης 'for P.', objective genitive after πένθος.

325 Εὐρυμάχῳ μισηέσκετο καὶ φιλέσκειν: Melanthis's sexual relations with Eurymachus correspond to the favour that the suitor shows her brother (17.257). The motif of the slave girls' sexual misconduct (see 19.496–501, 20.6–7, 22.417–73) offers an instance of the *Od.*'s preoccupation with marital fidelity and the threat posed by female sexuality and promiscuity. Issues of ownership and honour are additionally at stake: since Od. is the rightful master and proprietor of the household and its domestics (a position that may include a *droit de seigneur*; see 1.433, Laertes' noteworthy abstinence in *not* sleeping with Eurycleia), the suitors' dalliance with the all too willing maids undermines his status and constitutes an attack on his prerogatives: cf. Thalmann 1998: 71–4.

327–36 Melanthis's abuse recalls her brother's address at 17.217–32nn. But her response, like the laugh that she and her fellow domestics direct at the hero at 320, also indicates her failure to discern the significance of Od.'s words and actions.

327 τάλαν: elsewhere only at 19.68 (Melanthis abusing Od. again); the expression has been much studied as a marker of female speech in later comedy (e.g. Ar. *Lys.* 910, 914, Men. *Epitr.* 466, *Peric.* 712, *Sam.* 252; cf. Herod. 3.35, 5.55, 7.88). σύ γέ τις 'you are someone'; τις is predicative here (cf. 382). ἐκπεπαταγμένος: a Homeric hapax formed from ἐκπατάσσω, probably onomatopoeic in origin (πάταγος is a sound). Hesychius and Apollonius the Sophist gloss with ἐκπεπληγμένος, 'knocked out of one's wits'. For the sole recurrence of the vivid compound, see *A. P.* 9.309.

328 χαλκήϊον ἐς δόμον: a smithy, where the fire would be kept burning overnight, would provide a comfortable refuge for a homeless wanderer; Call. *Hec.* fr. 74.27–8, with its possible reference to 'tramps' who pester blacksmiths with requests for light, may be pertinent here (see West on Hes. *WD* 493). Melanthis's proposal that the 'beggar' seek out the site coincides with the many other seasonal details that the poem includes (see 17.23–5n): warmth is necessary because it is still deep winter. The remark also makes thematic sense as the maid unwittingly suggests the hero's affinity with a blacksmith. Od., as suits a man of μῆτις, does have a smith's skills (cf. his self-comparison to an ἀνὴρ χαλκεύς at 9.391–3; for the blacksmith's characteristic μῆτις, see Detienne and Vernant 1991: 259–73, 307). The remark further promotes the link between Od. and Hephaestus, whom Demodocus depicted making the bonds with which to entrap Ares and Aphrodite at his forge (8.273; cf. 17.16n, Andersen 1977 and Newton 1987: 15).

329 λέσχην 'public lounge, gathering place'. Proposed here as an alternative to the smith's shop, the 'warm' lounge also appears in conjunction with the χάλκειον at Hes. *WD* 493–5, where the adjacent sites provide gathering places for people seeking refuge from the winter cold. The locale may also have connotations of the laziness

so frequently imputed to Od.; Hesiod's recommendation of the λέσχη prefaces his description of the ruin suffered by a shiftless man who idles his time away there when there is work to be done. The ps.-Herodotean *Vita* describes how H. went to λέσχηι in Cyme and Phocaea to perform his songs (12, 13, 15); this suggests that the sites were also places of popular entertainment; cf. the coffee houses in modern Egypt, Turkey and elsewhere, which host performances of oral poetry.

330–3 = 390–3.

331 For the highly insulting nature of the charge of drunkenness (at least when directed at an aristocrat), cf. 19.122, Od.'s fear of being thought inebriated (βεβαρηότα . . . φρένας οίνωι), and *Il.* 1.225, where Achilles calls Agamemnon οἰνοβαρές, a slight uniquely here in the *Il.* The *Od.* reserves actual drunkenness for the uncouth Polyphemus, the witless Elpenor and the bestial Centaur Eurytion. Melanthis, assuming the elitist perspective and code of conduct that her brother also aped (see 17.222n), here implies that the 'beggar' does not know how to behave at a high-class gathering.

332 ὁ = ὅτι 'because, to judge from the fact that'. μεταμώνια: 'vain', 'ineffectual things', often used of words (e.g. Pind. *Ol.* 12.6a, A. R. 3.1121). The ancient lexicographers proposed the etymology 'gone with the wind' (*μετανεμώνιος, from μετ' ἀνέμων), endorsed by Bechtel, *Lexilogus* 226 and Chantraine, *DE*; other explanations connect the term with a bird 'raised aloft' in flight (*PMG* 516). In fact, Od.'s words are overloaded with significance.

333 ἄλυεις 'are you carried away?'; in the *Il.* the verb describes a state of distraction caused not by exultation as here, but by pain or grief (5.352, 24.12). τὸν ἀλήτην: for this derogatory use of the article, see 18.26n. The repetition of the first element in the two terms (ἄλυεις, ἀλήτην) heightens Melanthis's mockery and sarcasm. Cf. 73 for an earlier minatory remark addressed to the over-confident Irus: Od. risks the same fate as his defeated rival.

334 μή τις . . . ἀναστῆι 'lest some other, a better man than Irus, stand up against [you]'; a use of the subj. with fut. meaning in a final relative clause; cf. *Il.* 3.287 with Monro, *HD* 282 and Goodwin, *MT* 568. The omission of κε is very rare (cf. *Il.* 3.287 and 3.459 for the other instances).

336 φορύξας 'defiling' (you); the verb, combining ideas of sully and mixing, appears uniquely here in H. and is not attested again until much later.

337 ὑπόδρα ἰδών: for the expression, see 17.459, 18.14nn.

338 κύον: P. will address this harshly abusive term, 'dog, bitch', to Melanthis at 19.91; for the shamelessness that the designation signifies, and dogs as exemplary of the fault, see 17.248n. For other instances in which characters whose speech is deemed inappropriate or offensive are so described, cf. 17.248n, 19.372–4 and Graver 1995: 52–3. οἷ' ἀγορεύεις: an Odyssean formula (× 5), found only once in *Il.* (18.95); it has causal force here, 'because you say such things'.

339 κείσ' ἐλθών: Od. 'corrects' Melanthis's derogatory suggestion at 328–9; echoing her term ἐλθών, he declares his intention to go not to the smithy, but to Telemachus. διὰ μελείστι τάμησιον: 'tmesis'; see 86n for the coincidence between

the division of the verb and the action described. As the maids' subsequent alarmed reaction to the threat suggests, this is unusually strong language coming from a 'beggar' to a servant.

341 λύθεν . . . ὑπό: ὑπολύω appears regularly in the *Il.* of limbs giving way or collapsing under the impact of a fatal outside force. It provides the final (mock-heroic?) instance of the motif of limb-loosening in the book (see 189, 212, 238, 242nn), whether from the impact of sleep, desire, a beating or alarm.

342 φάν 'they thought'; unaugmented φάν appears *Od.* × 3, *Il.* × 1; cf. 132n for the meaning 'say to oneself, think'.

343–4 After silencing the maids, *Od.* takes up his stand beside the braziers which he tends. φαίνων . . . ἐξ πάντας ὀρώμενος: φαίνω, 'give light, illuminate', is more regularly found in *H.* with the sun as its subject (e.g. 3.1–2, 12.383, 385), a usage that may give an additional dimension to *Od.*'s 'look'; while the phrase most obviously describes the beggar directing his attention to the braziers so as to keep them alight, πάντας can also refer to the suitors whom he, panoptic like the sun, surveys and whose crimes he illuminates. ἐστήκειν: Aristarchus preferred this regular epic and Attic form to εἰστήκει, found in most MSS; cf. 8.505, 21.434, 24.446 and frequently in the *Il.* The augmented forms appear in later Attic poetry and prose (e.g. *Eur. HF* 925, *Thuc.* 1.89).

344–5 ἄλλα: for all that he does the work of a menial, *Od.*'s thoughts are filled with his more heroic design; cf. 283n, where P., in *Od.*'s view, also had her mind fixed on 'other things'. ἀτέλεστα 'unfulfilled, not accomplished'.

346–404

An exchange between *Od.* and Eurymachus, which, like the altercation between the hero and Antinous in book 17, culminates in the suitor hurling an object at the beggar. However, *H.* also varies the scheme; whereas *Od.*'s rebuke to Antinous took the form of a moralizing tale (a motif already reused in this book at 138–40n), here he responds to the second ring-leader's mockery by proposing that he and Eurymachus engage in a peaceful competition to settle their differences. See too 394–8n.

346–8 Athena regularly provokes the suitors to still more outrageous behaviour, the one element of her plot to which *Od.* is not privy; see 17.360–4n, 18.155–6n, 20.284–6 (a repetition of the lines used here). But the goddess' interventions are more than divine meddling. They help the poet in his delicate task of exculpating his hero, since only the suitors' excesses can justify the bloody revenge that *Od.* will exact (see Introduction pp. 17–19) and confirm the 'theodicy' announced by Zeus in the proem (33–4): the gods are responsible for some of men's misfortunes, while men, and the suitors notoriously, also bring evil on themselves by their own wrongdoing.

347 λώβης . . . θυμαλγέος 'soul-paining disgrace'; the phrase describes unjustified injury and abuse that cause the victim a painful, public shame; cf. *Il.* 9.387 (of the injury Achilles has suffered from Agamemnon), 13.622. Coming so shortly before the joke that Eurymachus makes at *Od.*'s expense (see 350n), λώβη may include the more

specific meaning of verbal ridicule and blame that it has on some other occasions; as the target of such mockery, the victim becomes a source of laughter for others (see Nagy 1979: 257–8 citing Semonides 7.108–11 W).

347–8 ‘so that pain/resentment might still more enter into the heart of Odysseus’. δύη: 3 sing. aor. opt. of δύω ‘enter, go into’.

350 κερτομέων ‘utter cutting words at’; the Σ bT on *Il.* 1.539 and *Od.* 2.323 and the ancient lexicographers derive the verb from κῆρ + τέμνω; to speak in this manner is to speak in a taunting or jeering fashion that would ‘cut’ or ‘divide’ the organ in question and that aims to cause humiliation, discomfiture and confusion on the part of the addressee (Clarke 2001; cf. Jones 1989). κερτομ– words also commonly describe speech that involves calumny and abuse; so *Il.* 2.256 (of Thersites), *Od.* 2.323, 16.87, 20.263, 22.194 (see further Nagy 1979: 261 on the epithet φιλοκέρτομος); the family of words preserves this last connotation in later sources (Archil. fr. 134 W, Pind. fr. 215a 4 S–M, S. *Ant.* 956, 961, Eur. *Bacch.* 1293; cf. Hdt. 1.129.1, 8.92.2), although it may also appear independent of mockery and vilification. γέλω: this acc. of γέλως is also found at 20.8, 346. For the motif of the suitors’ laughter, see 40 and 100nn.

351 κέκλυτέ μιν: see 17.469nn.

353 For this unwitting statement of the truth, cf. 37 and 17.446nn. Ὀδυσῆιον ἐς δόμον: the unique use of the adjectival form of Od.’s name in H.; the juxtaposition of the term with the poem’s subject may be another instance of Eurymachus’ unconscious irony; the adj.’s application to the home also promotes the tight connection between the hero and his domestic space (see Introduction pp. 30–1).

354–5 ‘the gleam of the torches seems to me to be positively shining from his very own head, since there aren’t any hairs on it, not even a few’. For δαΐδων, see 310n. σέλας: the ironies multiply; for σέλας used of a divine radiance, sometimes in the context of an epiphany, see *Il.* 8.76, 18.214 (the supernatural gleam emanating from the vengeance-bound Achilles’ head), *H. H. Cer.* 189, *H. H. Ap.* 442. κᾶκ: i.e. καὶ ἔκ. Eurymachus’ remark further demonstrates his lack of perception as, failing to appreciate the epiphanic qualities of Od.’s luminosity, he turns it into a cue for comic denigration. Od.’s baldness is simultaneously debasing and elevating. His bare head may, in the eyes of the suitors, indicate his low-class status and/or serve as a spur to mockery and abuse; for this, see *Il.* 2.219, where Thersites has ‘sparse hair’ (also 2 Kings 2.23, the mockery of Elisha); by the late fifth century, Aristophanes can declare baldness so hackneyed a motif that he claims to avoid it (although he exploits his own hair loss for comic ends; see *Nub.* 540, *Pax* 771–4) and jokes about the reflective powers of a hairless crown have become commonplace (A. fr. 47a Radt, *Ar. Eq.* 550). To preserve their subjects’ dignity, red-figure vase painters show old men with carefully arranged locks to hide their bald heads, and baldness typifies satyrs in art, fables and satyr drama (Arnould 1989). But what Eurymachus cannot know is that Od.’s baldness forms part of his earlier transformation at Athena’s hands (13.431), and so confirms his statement that Od. has come ‘not without a divinity’. Od.’s bald head is not only the means by which he assumes a godlike radiance (divine brilliance regularly emanates from the head or another part of the body:

e.g. *Il.* 5.7, 18.206, *H. H. Cer.* 189, 278–80 with Richardson's notes, [*Hes.*] *Scut.* 70–2, *Bacch.* 17.103–5, *Revelation* 1.16; cf. Athena's self-manifestation through a similar blaze of light at 19.33–40 and Murnaghan 1987: 85 n. 28); the hero's capacity for assuming an impenetrable disguise also makes him godlike (Murnaghan 1987: 86).

356 πτολίπορθον 'city-sacker'; the epithet is generic in the *Il.* but the *Od.* applies it exclusively to its hero (× 8). In the *Od.* proem (2), it clearly suggests 'sacker of the city (i.e. Troy)' (*contra* Stanford ad 8.3–4); cf. 22.230. Moreover, on 16 of the 18 occasions that the poet refers to the sacking of a city, Troy is the referent (Haft 1990: 45). In the lost epic *Thesprotis*, Od. has a second son by P. with the epithet for his name (Ptoliporthes). Here it anticipates the hero's attack on the suitors in his halls, projected at the end of the speech he is about to deliver.

357–64 Like Melanthius at 17.223–8, Eurymachus suggests that Od. might work for him to earn food and clothing, adding that he is too lazy to do so.

357 θητεύμεν 'work as a day labourer'. A θής is a landless labourer, forced to hire himself out for pay for a fixed term (cf. *Hes. WD* 602, with West's note); insofar as the θής had no permanent attachment to an οἶκος, his position was particularly precarious, and he stood at the very bottom of the social ladder. Cf. *Il.* 21.444–5, and Achilles' famous statement at *Od.* 11.489–91: βουλοίμην κ' ἐπάρουρος ἔων θητεύμεν ἄλλωι, | ἀνδρὶ παρ' ἀκλήρωι, ὧι μὴ βίσιτος πολὺς εἴη, | ἢ πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν; see further Wace and Stubbings 1962: 433–4, 440, Finley 1978: 57–8, 70, 71, Burford 1993: 186–9.

358 ἀγροῦ ἐπ' ἐσχατιῆς: a formula (cf. 4.517) used to designate land beyond the cultivated fields, a marginal space where hunting and herding occur (see 14.104 and *Eur. Cycl.* 27–8). The ἐσχατιή lies between nature and culture, 'a marginal environment' where men and wild beasts share a single space (Redfield 1994: 189–90). In *Alc.* fr. 130.9 and 328 it signifies 'the back of beyond', outside the civilized realm that a member of the elite normally frequents. Again, gainful employment is associated with the countryside rather than the town, where begging replaces productive labour (363 4); see 17.18, 245 6nn for this. μισθός: the fact of payment follows on from the status of the θής; for the conjunction of the terms, see *Il.* 21.444–5, cf. *Od.* 10.84–5. Eurymachus' offer carries a slight. A μισθός usually involves relations of subordination where the wage-receiver stands as social (and/or ethical) inferior to the one who pays (cf. *Il.* 10.304 with von Reden 1995a: 89–90). Relevant to Eurymachus' remark is the opposition at *Pind. Isth.* 1.47–51 between men who work for μισθός so as to fill their bellies, and the κύδος that comes to the individual whose prowess in contests and wars men celebrate: 'For different wages are sweet to men for different tasks, for a shepherd, ploughman, a birdcatcher or the one whom the sea nourishes. Everyone strains to keep dread hunger from his belly. But he who wins luxurious glory in contests or as a soldier receives the highest profit by being celebrated, the finest words from tongues of citizens and strangers' (for discussion of the passage in the context of Eurymachus' remark, see Thalmann 1998: 135–6). For *Od.*'s own subservience to his belly, see 364; the hero's response will reclaim the elite status that the suitor denies him here. ἄρκιος 'that which can be relied on' (later 'sufficient'); the

adj. is derived from ἀρκέω (see Cunliffe s.v. for the tertiary meaning ‘to suffice’). It occurs with μισθός at *Il.* 10.304 and Hes. *WD* 370.

359 αἰμασιάς τε λέγων: λέγω, ‘collect, gather’. The etymology of the noun, again at 24.224, remains unknown. The scholia and Eustathius suggest a fence of small stones (a meaning found at *Hdt.* 1.191, 2.69, 138; see too *Theoc. Id.* 1.47 with Gow’s note), and the activity may describe the building of a dry-stone wall (*Hdt.* 2.69 notes the lizards living in such a wall, so it must be dry); this is the task on which Dolius and his sons are employed at 24.224–5. Together with the tree-planting that Eurymachus envisions, the proposal unconsciously assigns Od. the patrimony-preserving activities of Laertes and his retainers in book 24. **δένδρα μακρά:** a formulaic expression, × 6 in *H.*

360 ἐπιητανόν: an epithet confined to the *Od.* in *H.*, regularly in this v. position; it variously means ‘permanent’ and ‘abundant’ (cf. 7.99, where the adverbial form of the term describes the abundance of food and drink in Scheria). A derivation from ἔτος would give it the original meaning ‘lasting for a year’ (see Chantraine, *DE*).

361 Eurymachus’ offer of clothing and footwear sounds a contemptuous variation on the regular promises or gifts of clothing that Od. has received (cf. 17.549–50). **ὑποδήματα:** a more recent term than πέδιλα (see 17.2n); it occurs only in the second half of the *Od.* Sandals were perhaps an object of particular desire for a poor man: cf. *Hippon.* fr. 32.5 *W.*

362–4 ~ 17.226–8. The ἔργα κακά with which Eurymachus charges Od., in this early critique of public ‘welfare’, refer to his laziness and voracity.

364 γαστέρ’ ἀναλτων: see 17.228n.

366–86 Od.’s speech is surprising both in tone and contents and contrasts sharply with his silence when addressed in similar terms by Melanthius in book 17 (an example of the pattern of ‘intensification’ that occurs with the recurrence of similar episodes; see Fenik 1974: 186). The beggar begins in calm, leisurely fashion with a wealth of ornamental details reminiscent of the language of similes (see 367–70 and 367nn) and of scenery-depictions elsewhere, only to conclude on a taunting, threatening note which hints at his true identity. He speaks throughout as though he were Eurymachus’ social equal (see 366n), and indicative of the speaker’s status is his mastery of one of the conventions of heroic contests: boasts and challenges regularly precede physical competition, where they anticipate the outcome of the martial/athletic encounters. For the question of whether Od. speaks in his beggar’s persona here, see 376–9n. Cf. Hes. *WD*, where the poet, assuming the farmer’s voice and perspective, preaches the values of agrarian labour to an audience of unproductive βασιλῆες (see Nagy 1990b: 71).

Overall, the address exhibits a careful structure and parallelism. εἰ introduces each of the four hypothetical situations, with εἰ δ’ at the line’s start for the latter three; the opening clauses of 375 and 379 are identical. While diction and syntax equate the members of the series, the sequence links very different kinds of conflicts. The first two, involving reaping and ploughing, locate productive competition in an agrarian setting; the third moves the encounter to the battlefield, where strife is directed at an

external enemy. The speech concludes with violence in the domestic sphere as the speaker projects the suitors' flight from the hall on Od.'s return. For these shifts, see Thalmann 1998: 111.

366 $\nu\omega\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\xi\rho\iota\varsigma$: a phrase used by Irus at 13 (see n); in that first $\xi\rho\iota\varsigma$, verbal sparring led to an exchange of blows; here Od. will defeat his opponent through words alone, postponing (even as he verbally anticipates) his later victory through force. The choice of terms also allows Od. to reformulate his status vis à vis Eurymachus; $\xi\rho\iota\varsigma$ exists chiefly between individuals equivalent in standing and thus implies parity between the participants; cf. Hes. *WD* 25–6; contrast *Il.* 2.247, where Od. rebukes the perhaps upstart Thersites for 'contending with' ($\xi\rho\iota\zeta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$) his social superiors. Od.'s choice earlier not to engage with the goatherd Melanthius after similar taunts suggested the social gulf between them; there Eumaeus had to respond for Od. At stake here are issues of honour and status; as Hogan 1981: 40 remarks, 'to leave off from $\xi\rho\iota\varsigma$ is necessarily to concede ground to a rival, to lose face, and so to be publicly humiliated'. $\xi\rho\gamma\omega\iota\omicron$, i.e. agricultural work; see 14.222 where $\xi\rho\gamma\omega\nu$ explicitly describes agrarian labour in contrast to warfare. The $\xi\rho\iota\varsigma$ that Od. proposes here is conducive to what Hesiod has in mind when he defines the 'good Eris' as an emulous striving that results in a farmer's harder work and greater productivity (*WD* 20–4). Also in the spirit of Hesiod's poem is the status that the 'beggar' gives to agricultural tasks (see *WD* 311–13 where, in a possibly defensive tone, the narrator declares $\xi\rho\gamma\omega\nu$ δ' $\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\delta\nu\epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma$, and suggests that the farmer who prospers gains elite qualities, $\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\tau\acute{\eta}$ and $\kappa\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma$). In presenting labour as an area where competitive excellence might be displayed, Od. elevates it from the lowly position it more usually occupies in Homeric epic and so redefines the nature of Eurymachus' earlier offer; he thus effectively negates the assertion of social superiority intended by the suitor when he proposed tasks connected with the countryside and offered to pay his 'there'. See 376–9n, Edwards 1993: 71–4 and Rousseau 1993: 52–3.

367–70 Od.'s very lovely depiction of the scene focuses on time, place and the parity between the contestants. Reinforcing the link to the world of the similes, and complicating the relations between the 'low' agricultural labour imagined here and the 'elite' fighting that the passage later presents (see 376–9n), are the Iliadic similes comparing combat to reaping (11.67–9, a simile that also emphasizes homogeneity between the two sides, and 19.222–3). For 367–75, cf. the images on one of the rings of Achilles' shield with ploughmen and reapers (*Il.* 18.541–60). Precisely such a reaping enterprise will famously serve as Levin's 'test of endurance' and display of solidarity with the peasantry as he endeavours to keep up with his serfs mowing hay in L. Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina*.

367 $\acute{\omega}\rho\eta\iota$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\pi\iota\nu\acute{\eta}\iota$: the expression occurs \times 3 *Od.*, \times 1 *Il.*, always in run-over position; this is the sole example of the phrase outside a simile (elsewhere in H. the terms $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\pi\iota\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\pi$ occur only in similes), again marking Od.'s account as remote to the immediate action. The detail is, however, also integral to the poem's chronological design; Od.'s forthcoming victory over the suitors will coincide with

the advent of spring (see 328 and 17.23–5nn and Austin 1975: 247). *πέλονται* ‘come around’.

368–9 Od.’s measured phrasing (*μὲν ἐγών, δὲ σύ*), and reuse of the same verb (*ἔχοιμι, ἔχοις*), makes patent the exact parity between the contestants.

370 *νήστιες* lit. ‘not eating’ (*νη-ἔσθ(ι)ω*) ‘fasting’. As Hes. *WD* 442–4 suggests, after breakfasting the ploughman would not stop to eat until nightfall; see too *WD* 571–81 for the long hours required for reaping, and the reprise of the motif at Theoc. *Id.* 10.50–1.

371 ‘or if then again there were oxen to be driven’; the subsequent expansion of the phrase by means of a relative clause is characteristic of H.’s style.

372–3 The two lines mirror one another: both begin with two asyndetic adjectives, each with the endings *-ες* and *-οι* and concluding at the masculine caesura; this accumulation of adjectives, with or without asyndeton, is a common feature of epic descriptions (e.g. 9.425–6, *Il.* 16.802). The animals’ parity, reinforced by the lines’ parallel design, offers a fresh statement of the contestants’ equal standing. This second visualization also reuses, while altering, terms introduced in the first ‘contest’: there the reapers did not eat the whole day long, while the abundance of grass added to the difficulty of their task; now the oxen have ‘sated’ themselves on that same *ποίη*. *κεκορηότε* is the nom. dual masc. perf. participle of *κορέννυμι*; H. regularly uses the verb of eating to satiety (e.g. 10.411, 14.28). *ἰσοφόροι*: a hapax, not found again until its reuse at Xen. *Symp.* 2.20. According to Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 1442f., the term is the only exception to the rule that in archaic Greek no *ἰσο* compound has an unambiguously verbal second element.

374 *τετράγωνον* ‘of four measures’, also used for the extent of Alcinoüs’ garden at 7.113. This is the only indication of the size of the land measure called a *γύγη*, apparently the area that a good worker could plough in a day. However, given the prominence of the term, and the clearly extraordinary capacities of these heroic oxen, the speaker may be projecting the commonplace task back into the outsized heroic world; cf. A. R. 3.412, 1344 (where Jason requires two-thirds of the day to complete the task), Call. *H.* 3.176.

375 ‘you would see whether I could cut a continuous furrow in front of me’; a type of object clause frequently found with verbs of seeing and knowing (see Monro, *HD* 314). Both here and in the subsequent example, Od. imagines Eurymachus no longer as participant, but as audience (*ἴδοις*) to his feat: for this spectator status as typical of the suitors, see 100n.

376–9 An abrupt switch to a more conventional realm of competition, warfare. Older readers took the shift from the agrarian to martial sphere as proof that Homeric kings worked the land, but the juxtaposition more properly raises the question of whether the poet (and members of his audience) regarded warfare and agricultural labour as comparable and commensurate; the more conventional epic account presents the martial arena in a superior and asymmetrical relation to the frequently negatively characterized countryside, its population and activities (but see *Il.*

18.556–7). Rather than imagining that here Od. and/or H. seek to revise an existing ideological hierarchy, we should probably see in the speech a confrontation between the two opposing perspectives which the hero must balance. While speaking *qua* vagabond, Od. promotes the type of labour he might plausibly engage in; reassuming his true identity at 376, he turns to the activity in which he more fittingly excels. The ascending scale that the contests describe also anticipates Od.'s imminent restoration to his proper status: while currently suited to a peasant's tasks by virtue of his fall from fortune, he will soon be proving himself in an entirely different domain. See further 379n, 385–6n, Rose 1992: 110, Edwards 1993: 71–6, Thalmann 1998: 110–11 and Introduction pp. 23–4.

377–8 **σήμερον**: a sudden return to the present moment, and an implicit warning to the addressee. **σήμερον** always occurs in v-initial position in early epic; cf. 17.186, *Il.* 7.30, *H. H. Merc.* 371; Call. *H.* 4.116 imitates the practice. **δύο δοῦρε**: epic warriors carry two spears into battle, one for immediate use, the other as spare. This fighter wears minimal equipment; unlike the fully-armed Iliadic hero, he has neither breastplate, sword nor greaves. Both lines of the description closely resemble 22.101–2, where Telemachus lists the arms that his father will wear to fight the suitors (378 = 22.102).

379 **πρώτοισιν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι**: the position of maximum exposure reserved for heroes in the *Il.* Combat among the 'forefighters' is proof of valour and elite standing; cf. *Il.* 4.354 for Od.'s punning assertion that he, the father of Telemachus ('fighter from afar'), will nonetheless fight in the forefront; cf. Tyrt. 10. 1 2 W (with the contrast between the ἀγαθός who fights and falls ἐνὶ προμάχοισι and the wandering beggar suffering indignity), 11.12 W, 12.23–4 W.

381–6 These lines turn back against Eurymachus the contents of the abuse that Melanthe earlier directed at the hero (333–6): Eurymachus' perceptions are faulty and he enjoys a false confidence in his own powers; he too risks defeat at the hands of a much more formidable enemy, and not just in peaceful agricultural pursuits. After Od.'s assertion of his parity with the suitor, his remarks further imply that Eurymachus could undergo the reversal in fortune that he has suffered; the properties cited at 382 are not innate or inalienable, but the result of external circumstances.

381 **ὑβρίζεις**: Eurymachus' **ὑβρις** consists primarily of the insults he has directed against the stranger; as so frequently, the term occurs in the context of a violation of proper relations of **ξενία** (see 17.487 and 587–8nn). Read together with Od.'s subsequent remark concerning Eurymachus' apparent status (consisting of physical size and power), the charge of **ὑβρις** is also designed to undermine the suitor's claim to **ἀρετή** (Fisher 1992: 172). **ἀπηνής** 'hostile, unfriendly', from **ἀπτο** + ***ἄνος**, **ἦνος** 'face', i.e., 'with one's face turned away'; cf. Frisk, *GEW*, Snell–Erbse, *LfgGE* s.v.

382 **πού τις δοκεῖς μέγας ἔμμεναι** i.e. 'you think you're a big shot'; the addition of **τις** somewhat softens the derisive remark. Here Od. attacks Eurymachus, whose imposture he exposes, at his most vulnerable spot: he is a dissembler whose exterior hides his inner depravity and cowardice (Fenik 1974: 200–2).

384 = 17.539. One of the frequent ‘prolepses’ of Od.’s return, which accumulate as the hour of vengeance draws closer. These take a variety of forms: announcements, omens, prophecies, wishes, prayers, oaths and hypotheses, such as here.

385–6 ‘the doors, for all that they are very broad, would suddenly seem all too narrow as you fled’; a vivid depiction of how, in his panicked flight, the fugitive perceives what is objectively and actually a very (μάλ) broad space as narrow. *προθύροιο*: here the vestibule of the αὐλή, which leads from the outer gates to the courtyard colonnade; cf. 7.4. The triple repetition of the –θυρ– element in the lines emphasizes the suitor’s definitive expulsion from the household. Od. has already shown his facility in ejecting interlopers from his home; see 101–2n. This ultimate visualization, very much located in the here and now, supplies a key to how to read the earlier portions of the passage: it ‘reinterprets the first two [challenges] retroactively as aristocratic masquerade, and not genuinely popular and rustic’ (Edwards 1993: 74).

387–8 On these formulaic lines, see 17.458, 459nn.

389–93 Eurymachus fails to grasp the prophetic nature of Od.’s closing statement. His lame repetition of the terms earlier used by Melantho (329–33nn) and subsequent resort to violence also indicate that Od. has won the verbal bout. Contrast the outcome to the verbal strife between Euryalus, another aristocratic youth, and Od. in book 8; at 403–5, following his defeat, the initial aggressor presented Od. with a sword.

389 *τελέω*: future; for this common Homeric form, cf. 4.485, *Il.* 23.96 and *Monro, HD* 63.

384–8 The second of three occasions on which an exchange of insults culminates in a suitor hurling an object at Od. (a form of assault predicted at 16.277 and 17.230–2, with the reference to σφέλα at 231); see 17.462–5n for the sequence. Eurymachus’ attack demonstrates the double causality determining the suitors’ fate. While they suffer the blindness that afflicts all but the most perceptive and/or pious of individuals when confronted with disguised divinities and are the victims of Athena’s invisible provocations, their glaring failure to respect the conventions governing the treatment of guests and beggars constitutes a self-standing offence (see Murnaghan 1987: 56–90).

395 *Ἀμφινόμου πρὸς γούνα*: again, Amphinomus plays a sympathetic role. The crouching or kneeling position adopted by Od. suggests a modified form of supplication; in the more complete form, the suppliant clasps the knees of the person addressed (cf. 6.142, 7.142, 22.310, 342; see *Il.* 1.500–2 for a fuller range of gestures). For a list of all 35 instances of supplication in *H.*, see Gould 1973: 80 n. 39. Amphinomus’ protective words on the beggar’s behalf at 420–1 may indicate his acknowledgment of the obligation that Od.’s suppliant-like position here has imposed on him.

396 After the taunting tone that Od. adopted in the preceding exchange and his perception of his opponent’s weaknesses, his fear of Eurymachus is surprising; in the other two throwing incidents, the hero registers no equivalent alarm. However, the suitor’s threatening gesture would remind Od. of the blow that he earlier received

from Antinous. The detail might also anticipate H.'s use of the Iliadic model of a heroic duel (see next note), where a warrior regularly fears his opponent.

396–7 The action follows the common Iliadic sequence where a hero aims at one warrior, and, missing his target, hits an inferior or subordinate man, often the charioteer (e.g. *Il.* 8.119, 311–12, 15.430, 16.466–8, 731–43). See 397 and 398nn for additional Iliadic borrowings.

396 οἰνοχόον . . . χεῖρα: both accusatives depend on βάλει in what is sometimes termed a ‘whole and part’ construction; cf. *Il.* 24.58, γυναικα . . . μαζόν.

397 πρόχος: the jug used to draw the wine-and-water mix from the communal bowl in order to fill the cups of the individual diners. χαμαὶ βόμβησε πεσοῦσα ‘fell to the ground with a clang’. A second nod to the Iliadic battlefield (e.g. *Il.* 13.530, cf. 16.118), where the implements of war (a helmet and spear) fall to the ground in just this onomatopoeic fashion.

398 ὕπτιος ἐν κονίησι ‘on his back in the dust’. For this line-terminating formula, which concludes the series of echoes (even burlesques) of the heroic duel, see *Il.* 13.548, 15.434, 16.289. The wine-pourer’s instant collapse contrasts with Od.’s steady stance when similarly assailed by Antinous (see 17.463–4n).

399 σκιόντα ‘shady, cool’, a fixed epithet of μέγαρα, also applied to clouds and mountains, and always at line-end. For the formula, see Korres 1971.

401–4 This collectively voiced sentiment marks a departure from the suitors’ earlier attitude to the ‘beggar’ and a fresh indicator of their precipitous moral decline. Following Antinous’ assault, they cautioned the aggressor with the reminder that his victim might be a god in disguise (17.485–7n). Here the suitors do not censure Eurymachus, but curse the interloper. Their use of the term ξείνος, repeated by Amphinomus at 416, includes an implicit and self-condemnatory acknowledgment of the stranger’s right to hospitable treatment. Antinous avoids applying the designation to Od.

402 μεθέηκε ‘released, let loose’, from μεθίημι; the variant μετέθηκε adopted by Aristarchus, probably on the basis of the MSS available to him, and by modern editors would mean ‘changed [something’s] position’ and is much less appropriate here; see further van der Valk 1949: 159. μεθίημι is used of sound at *Hdt.* 6.29.2, *Eur. Hipp.* 1202.

403–4 ἦδος ‘pleasure’, cognate with ἡδονή; see Chantraine, *GH* 1 184 for the alternation of smooth and rough breathing. The digamma with which the noun originally began is ignored for metrical convenience. τὰ χερεῖονα ‘these evil things’; for the presence of the article, see Hoekstra on 14.12; cf. 15.324, 17.218, 18.229. In this so-called absolute use of the comparative, the adj. describes what is bad rather than good. These two lines virtually replicate Hephaestus’ words at *Il.* 1.575–6 where he calms the Olympians, whose squabbles also threaten to disrupt the harmony of the feast (οὐδέ τι δαιτὸς | ἐσθλῆς ἔσσεται ἦδος, ἐπεὶ τὰ χερεῖονα νικᾷ). If the poet has the Iliadic passage in mind, he may be underscoring the very different nature of the eventual outcomes of the mortal and divine banquets.

405–28

The book concludes with Telemachus urging the suitors to go home for the night, and Amphinomus' endorsement of his proposal. Libations are poured, and the suitors drink before leaving the palace.

405–9 Telemachus' strong rebuke contrasts with his silence in the face of a similar provocation at 17.489–91; cf. 16.274–80 where Od. cautioned his son to remain a silent witness to the outrages that he would suffer from the suitors, or at most to admonish them gently; the latter part of Telemachus' speech follows his father's instructions.

406 *μαίνεσθε*: charges of derangement recur in the accusations exchanged between the two antagonistic parties (so Eurymachus at 391–2) and form part of the ongoing question as to who can correctly perceive the reality around them (see Murnaghan 1987: 87).

407 *βρωτῶν*: final –*υς* is long in feminine nouns. *θεῶν νύ τις ὑμῖ ὀροθύνει*: Telemachus unwittingly corrects the suitors' misapprehensions since a god has indeed 'stirred them up'. He, like his father, is ignorant of Athena's provocation.

408 *κατακαίετε*: either imperative, 'go to bed', or fut. indicative, expressing the command in milder form.

409 *ἐγὼ γε* 'I at any rate'. Telemachus plays the 'perfect host', who neither detains the guest who wishes to depart (see 17.17n), nor makes him leave against his will. For the obligation expressed here, see Theogn. 468: *μηδὲ θύραζε κέλει οὐκ ἐέλωντ' ἰέναι*.

410–11 These lines occur at 1.381–2 and 20.268–9. In each instance, the suitors respond with silent rage to an assertive and threatening speech from Telemachus; his interventions follow an ascending scale, each more forceful and effective than its predecessor.

410 *ὀδᾶξ ἐν χεῖλεσι φύντες* 'fastening into their lips with their teeth' = 'biting their lips'. *ὀδᾶξ* is adverbial here. Although related to such later terms as *ὀδᾶξω* and *ὀδραγμός*, popular etymology derived the expression from *ὀδούς* 'tooth' and *δάκνω* 'bite'. *ἐν* goes together with the aor. participle *φύντες*, from *φύω* 'fasten to, attach to'. The phrase describes the suitors' attempt to suppress an outburst of angry speech and conveys their silent frustration and impotence. Eustathius comments on 1.381 that the gesture expresses the suitors' 'astonishment and resourcelessness'.

411 *ὅ*: causal: 'at the fact that, because' (Chantraine, *GH* II 285 6).

412–21 Here Amphinomus, displaying his characteristic moderating influence, tries to pour oil on the troubled waters. His intervention and self-dissociation from his companions recalls 16.400–5 (his attempt to dissuade the others from their plot against Telemachus' life) and anticipates 20.245–6 (where he counsels inactivity rather than fresh attempts against Telemachus).

414–17 = 20.322–5, a similarly courteous and conciliatory speech addressed to Telemachus by Agelaus.

414 *ἐπὶ ῥηθέντι δικάϊω* 'with regard to what has been properly spoken'; for *ἐπὶ* + dat. with this sense of 'à propos of, for', see Chantraine, *GH* II 109; cf. 44, *ἐπὶ δόρπῳ* 'for supper'.

415 ἀντιβλοῖς ἐπέεσσι: the adj. means ‘opposing force to force’, i.e. ‘contentious’.

417 The of clause assumes some verb like ‘to be’, ‘to live’.

418–19 ἐπαρξάσθω δεπέεσσιν ‘let him make the preliminary ritual with the cups’ (the wine-pourer seems to have suffered no lasting damage from Eurymachus’ missile). δεπέεσσιν may be instrumental (so 7.137, 183) or, less likely, a dative of destination, ‘into the cups’. The verb ἐπάρχομαι is a technical term used to describe the ritual of making a preliminary drink offering to the gods (so in later Greek ἀπάρχομαι, ἀπαρχή refer to the practice of ‘making a beginning’ in an offering to the divine). The attendant would have poured a few initial drops into each cup to be used for the libation before the drinker was served with more wine for his own consumption (see Garvie on 7.183). For this expression (× 6 in H., with slight variation) and other formulas in this type-scene, see Arend 1933: 76–8. Libations are also poured before going to bed at 3.339–40, 7.137–8, 228–9, *Il.* 9.712. For the question of whether the suitors perform the ritual fully and/or correctly, see 427 and 17.536nn.

419 κατακείμεν: either a future indicative (for ὄφρα with the future tense, see Monro, *HD* 326) or a short vowel subj. of the aor. (cf. 19.17, καταθείομαι and Chantraine, *GH* 1 453).

420–1 The strongest acknowledgment so far of Telemachus’ authority in the house and an indicator of how he and his father are increasingly gaining the upper hand.

422 ἑαδῶτα ‘pleasing’; perf. part. of ἀνδάνω, agreeing with μῦθον. The term appears only in H. in this formulaic verse (= *Il.* 9.173); cf. *IG* 9.334 (Locris) τὰ φεραδηκότα, A. R. 2.35, 4.1127.

423 κρητῆρα κεράσασατο: this frequent *schema etymologicum* (e.g. 3.390, 393, 7.179) is a compressed expression for ‘mixed wine and water in the bowl’. Whereas Iliadic heralds serve chiefly as divinely protected messengers, official envoys and attendants at sacrifices and oaths, in the *Od.* they officiate at feasts and have charge of the wine. The shift in functions gave the scholia pause; for Dalby it supplies fresh evidence for the poet’s vagueness concerning arrangements in a nobleman’s house (1995: 276 and Introduction pp. 12–13).

425 ἐπισταδόν ‘in succession, [stopping] by each in turn’; cf. ἐπαρξάσθω, 418.

427 A formulaic line, × 5 in *Od.* (with slight variation at 21.273), × 1 in *Il.* Here, as at 21.273, the suitors seem to correct their usual culpable neglect of the libation that regularly accompanies drinking at a banquet (e.g. 3.342, 7.184). However, the amelioration is more apparent than real; it is the worthy Amphinomus who proposes the libation at 418–19, and his herald (as line 424 emphasizes with its amplifying characterization) who distributes the wine; the suitors then omit the prayer that frequently follows a libation (Saïd 1979: 34–5). In the phrase at 426, the poet reserves the main verb for the act of drinking, relegating ‘pouring’ to the gods to the participle. As the audience knows, the ‘blessed gods’ will fail to protect those making the offering.

428 βάν: 3 plur. aor. athematic indicative of βαινῶ ‘go’. κείοντες ‘in order to lie down’; the participle has either future or desiderative force (cf. 7.229, 13.17, *Il.* 1.606). At 3.396 and 7.229 a similar line follows the formula used at 427. Six other books

of the *Od.* (1, 5, 7, 14, 16, 19; so too *Il.* 1, 7, 9) similarly end with people going off to bed. This form of conclusion suggests either that the editor responsible for the book divisions saw the action as a natural stopping point or that these divisions actually follow original units of narrative performance; the action described might even be a 'steer', as the bard would encourage his audience similarly to depart and perhaps to take a rest before he resumed his tale (see 17.1n and Introduction pp. 36-7). The conclusion of a banquet and dispersal of the guests, some off to their homes, likewise concludes Xenophon's *Symposium*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adkins, A. W. H. 1969. 'Threatening, abusing and feeling angry in the Homeric poems', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 89: 7–21
- Ahrens, W. 1937. *Gnomen in griechischer Dichtung*, Halle
- Alexanderson, B. 1970. 'Greek formulae for ships', *Eranos* 60: 1–46
- Allen, T. W. 1924. *Homer: the origins and the transmission*, Oxford
- Allen, T. W., W. R. Halliday and E. E. Sikes, eds., 1936. *The Homeric Hymns*, 2nd edn, Oxford [A–H–S]
- Allione, L. 1963. *Telemaco e Penelope nell' Odissea*, Turin
- Ameis, K. F., C. Hentze and P. Cauer, eds., 1920–40, *Homers Odyssee*, Leipzig and Berlin [A–H–C]
- Amory, A. 1963. 'The reunion of Odysseus and Penelope', in C. H. Taylor Jr., ed., *Essays on the Odyssey* (Indiana) 100–21
1966. 'The gates of horn and ivory', *Yale Classical Studies* 20: 3–57
- Andersen, Ø. 1977. 'Odysseus and the wooden horse', *Symbolae Osloenses* 52: 5–18
- Andersen, Ø. and M. Dickie, eds., 1995. *Homer's world: fiction, tradition, reality*, Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 3. Bergen
- Apthorp, M. J. 1980. *The manuscript evidence for interpolation in Homer*, Heidelberg
- Arend, W. 1933. *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer*, Berlin
- Arnould, D. 1989. 'Le chauve et le glouton chez Homère: remarques sur le personnage d'Ulysse', *Revue des études grecques* 102: 510–14
- Athanassakis, A. N. 1976. 'Homeric *kankanos* and its modern Greek descendants', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 106: 1–9
- Austin, N. 1972. 'Name magic in the Odyssey', *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 5: 1–19
1975. *Archery at the dark of the moon*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London
- Bakker, E. 1993. 'Discourse and performance: involvement, visualization, and "presence" in Homeric poetry', *Classical Antiquity* 12: 1–29
- 1997a. *Poetry in speech: orality and Homeric discourse*, Ithaca, NY
- 1997b. 'The study of Homeric discourse', in Morris and Powell 1997: 284–304
- Bannert, H. 1988. *Formen des Wiederholens bei Homer: Beispiele für eine Poetik des Epos*, Vienna
- Bassett, S. E. 1920. "ΥΣΤΕΡΟΝ ΠΡΟΤΕΡΟΝ 'ΟΜΗΡΙΚΩΣ (Cic. Att. 1, 16.1)", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 31: 39–62
1926. 'The so-called emphatic position of the runover word in the Homeric hexameter', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 57: 116–48
- Beazley, J. D. 1951. *The development of Attic black-figure*, Berkeley
- Bechtel, F. 1914. *Lexilogus zu Homer*, Halle [*Lexilogus*]
- Beck, C. W. 1970. 'Amber in archaeology', *Archaeology* 23: 7–11
- Beck, D. 1998–9. 'Speech introductions and the character development of Telemachus', *Classical Journal* 94: 121–41

- 2005a. *Homeric conversation*, Cambridge, MA
- 2005b. 'Odysseus: narrator, storyteller, poet?', *Classical Philology* 100: 213–27
- Beck, W. 1991. 'Dogs, dwellings, and masters: ensemble and symbol in the *Odyssey*', *Hermes* 119: 158–67
- Bentley, R. 1713. *Remarks on a late discourse of free-thinking*, London
- Bernsdorff, H. 1992. *Zur rolle des Aussehens im homerischen Menschenbild*, Göttingen
- Besslich, S. 1966. *Schweigen-Verschweigen-Übergehen: die Darstellung des Unausgesprochenen in der Odyssee*, Heidelberg
- Block, E. 1982. 'The narrator speaks: apostrophe in Homer and Vergil', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 112: 7–22
1985. 'Clothing makes the man: a pattern in the *Odyssey*', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 115: 1–11
- Boardman, J. 1980. *The Greeks overseas: their early colonies and trade*, London
- Bolling, G. M. 1914. 'The archetype of our *Iliad* and the papyri', *American Journal of Philology* 35: 125–48
1925. *The external evidence for interpolation in Homer*, Oxford
- Bona, G. 1966. *Studi sull' Odissea*, Turin
- Bowra, C. M. 1930. *Tradition and design in the Iliad*, Oxford
- Braswell, B. K. 1982. 'The song of Ares and Aphrodite: theme and relevance to *Odyssey* 8', *Hermes* 110: 129–37
- Braun, T. 1995. 'Barley cakes and emmer bread', in J. Wilkins, D. Harvey, M. Dobson, eds., *Food in antiquity* (Exeter) 25–37
- Bremer, J. M., I. J. F. de Jong and J. Kalff, eds., 1987. *Homer: beyond oral poetry*, Amsterdam
- Brown, A. S. 1997. 'Aphrodite and the Pandora complex', *Classical Quarterly* 47: 26–47
- Brunius-Nilsson, E. 1955. *ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΕ*, Uppsala
- Büchner, W. 1940. 'Die Penelope-Szenen in der *Odyssee*', *Hermes* 75: 129–67
- Bulloch, A. W. 1977. 'Callimachus' Erysichthon, Homer and Apollonius Rhodius', *American Journal of Philology* 98: 97–123
- Burford, A. 1993. *Land and labor in the Greek world*, Baltimore, MD
- Burkert, W. 1979. *Structure and history in Greek mythology and religion*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London
1985. *Greek religion*, Oxford
1987. 'The making of Homer in the sixth century BC: rhapsodes versus Stesichoros', in D. von Bothmer, ed., *Papers on the Amasis Painter and his world* (Malibu, CA) 43–62
1992. *The orientализing revolution: Near Eastern influence on Greek culture in the early archaic age*, Cambridge, MA
- Byre, C. S. 1988. 'Penelope and the suitors before Odysseus: *Odyssey* 18: 158–303', *American Journal of Philology* 109: 159–73
1994. 'On the description of the harbor of Phorkys and the Cave of the Nymphs, *Odyssey* 13.96–112', *American Journal of Philology* 115: 1–13
- Cairns, D. L. 1993. *Aidós: the psychology and ethics of honour and shame in ancient Greek literature*, Oxford

- Carlier, P. 1984. *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*, Strasbourg
- Casolari, F. 2003. *Die Mythentravestie in der griechischen Komödie*, Münster
- Chadwick, J. 1964. 'The Greek dialects and Greek pre-history', in G. S. Kirk, ed., *The language and background of Homer* (Cambridge) 106–18
- Chantraine, P. 1958 (vol. 1) and 1963 (vol. II). *Grammaire Homérique*, 3rd edn, Paris [GH] 1968–80. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris [DE]
1972. 'Le témoignage du mycénien pour l'étymologie grecque: δαί, Κοπρέυς, Κυκλεύς, μολοβρός, μόλυβδος', *Minos* 12: 197–206
- Clark, M. 1994. 'Enjambment and binding in Homeric hexameter', *Phoenix* 48: 95–114
1997. *Out of Line. Homeric composition beyond the hexameter*, Lanham, MD
- Clarke, M. 1999. *Flesh and spirit in the songs of Homer*, Oxford
2001. "'Heart-cutting talk": Homeric κερτομέω and related words', *Classical Quarterly* 51: 329–38
- Clay, J. S. 1974. 'Demas and aude. The nature of divine transformation in Homer', *Hermes* 102: 129–36
1983. *The wrath of Athena: gods and men in the Odyssey*, Princeton
- Clayton, B. 2004. *A Penelopean poetics: reweaving the feminine in Homer's Odyssey*, Lanham, MD
- Colakis, M. 1986. 'The laughter of the suitors in *Odyssey* 20', *Classical World* 79: 137–41
- Collard, C., M. J. Cropp and K. H. Lee, eds., 1995. *Euripides. Selected fragmentary plays*, vol. 1, Warminster
- Coughanowr, E. 1979. 'The meaning of ΜΟΛΟΒΡΟΣ in Homer', *Classical Quarterly* 29: 229–30
- Crane, G. 1988. *Calyпсо. Backgrounds and conventions of the Odyssey*, Frankfurt
- Crissy, K. 1997. 'Herakles, Odysseus, and the bow: "Odyssey" 21.11–41', *Classical Journal* 93: 41–53
- Cunliffe, R. J. 1924. *A lexicon of the Homeric dialect*, London [Cunliffe]
- Dalby, A. 1995. 'The *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and their audiences', *Classical Quarterly* 45: 269–79
- Dale, A. T. 1982. 'Homeric ἐπητής/ἐπητύς: meaning and etymology', *Glotta* 60: 205–14
- Danek, G. 1998. *Epos und Zitat: Studien zu den Quellen der Odyssee*, Vienna
- Davidson, J. 1997. *Courtesans and fishcakes: the consuming passions of classical Athens*, London
- Davies, M. 1985. 'Conventional topics of invective in Alcaeus', *Prometheus* 11: 31–9
- D'Avino, R. 1969. 'La funzionalità di δνομάζω e la formula ἐπος τ'ἔφατ' ἐκ τ' ὀνόμαζε', *Studia classica e orientalia Antonino Pugliaro oblata*, vol. II (Rome) 7–33
- Denniston, J. D. 1954. *The Greek Particles*, 2nd edn, Oxford [GP]
- Detienne, M. and J.-P. Vernant, 1991. *Cunning intelligence in Greek culture and society*, Chicago
- Dietrich, B. C. 1965. *Death, fate and the gods*, London
- Dimock, G. E. 1989. *The unity of the Odyssey*, Amherst, MA
- Dindorf, W. ed. 1855. *Scholia graeca in Homeri Odysseam*, 2 vols. Oxford
- Doherty, L. E. 1992. 'Gender and internal audiences in the *Odyssey*', *American Journal of Philology* 113: 161–77

- Dougherty, C. 2001. *The raft of Odysseus. The ethnographic imagination of Homer's Odyssey*, Oxford
- Drerup, H. 1969. *Griechische Baukunst in geometrischer Zeit (Archaeologia Homerica 0)*, Göttingen
- Durante, M. 1968. "Epea pteroenta": la parola come "camino" in immagini greche e vediche', in R. Schmitt, ed., *Indogermanische Dichtersprache (Wege der Forschung 165)* (Darmstadt) 242–60
- 1971–6. *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica greca*, 2 vols. Rome
1975. *La linguistica sincronica*, Turin
- Eckert, C. W. 1963. 'Initiatory motifs in the story of Telemachus', *Classical Journal* 59: 49–57
- Edwards, A. T. 1985. *Achilles in the Odyssey*, Königstein
1993. 'Homer's ethical geography: country and city in the *Odyssey*', *Transactions of the American Philological Society* 123: 27–78
- Edwards, M. W. 1966. 'Some features of Homeric craftsmanship', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 97: 115–79
1970. 'Homeric speech introductions', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 74: 1–36
1986. 'Homer and oral tradition: the formula, part I', *Oral tradition* 1: 171–230
1987. 'Topos and transformation in Homer', in Bremer, de Jong and Kalfs 1987: 47–60
1988. 'Homer and oral tradition: the formula, part II', *Oral tradition* 3: 283–330
- ed. 1991. *The Iliad: a commentary*, vol. v: books 17–20, Cambridge
1992. 'Homer and oral tradition: the type-scene', *Oral Tradition* 7: 284–330
- Eisenberger, H. 1973. *Studien zur Odyssee*, Wiesbaden
- Elliott, R. C. 1960. *The power of satire. Magic, ritual, art*, Princeton
- Emlyn-Jones, C. 1984. 'The reunion of Penelope and Odysseus', *Greece & Rome* 31: 1–18
1986. 'True and lying tales in the *Odyssey*', *Greece & Rome* 33: 1–10
- Erbse, H. 1972. *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Odyssee*, Berlin, New York
- Fehling, D. 1969. *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias*, Berlin
- Fehr, B. 1990. 'Entertainers at the symposium: The *akletoi* in the archaic period', in O. Murray, ed., *Symptica: a symposium on the symposion* (Oxford) 185–95
- Felson-Rubin, N. 1994. *Regarding Penelope: from character to poetics*, Princeton
- Fenik, B. 1974. *Studies in the Odyssey*, Wiesbaden
- Finkelberg, M. 1987. 'Homer's view of the epic narrative: some formulaic evidence', *Classical Philology* 82: 135–8
1988. 'A note on some metrical irregularities in Homer', *Classical Philology* 83: 206–11
1989. 'Formulaic and nonformulaic elements in Homer', *Classical Philology* 84: 179–97
1995. 'Odysseus and the genus "hero"', *Greece & Rome* 42: 1–14

2000. 'The *Cypria*, the *Iliad*, and the problem of multiformity in oral and written tradition', *Classical Philology* 95: 1–11
- Finley, M. I. 1978. *The world of Odysseus*, rev. edn, New York
- Fisher, N. R. E. 1992. *Hybris: a study in the values of honour and shame in Ancient Greece*, Warminster
- Foley, H. P. 2001. *Female acts in Greek tragedy*, Princeton
- Foley, J. M. 1990. *Traditional oral epic: the Odyssey, Beowulf, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song*, Berkeley
1991. *Immanent art: from structure to meaning in traditional oral epic*, Bloomington, IN
1995. *The singer of tales in performance*, Bloomington, IN
1997. 'Oral tradition and its implications', in Morris and Powell 1997: 146–73
- Ford, A. L. 1992. *Homer: the poetry of the past*, Ithaca, NY
- Fowler, R. 2004. 'The Homeric question', in R. Fowler, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Homer* (Cambridge) 220–34
- Fraenkel, E. 1962. *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes*, Rome
- Fränkel, H. 1921. *Die homerischen Gleichnisse*, Göttingen
1968. *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*, Munich
- Friedrich, P. and J. Redfield, 1978. 'Speech as a personality symbol: the case of Achilles', *Language* 54: 263–88
- Frisk, H. 1960, 1970. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg [GEW]
- Frontisi-Ducroux, F. 1975. *Dédale: mythologie de l'artisan en Grèce ancienne*, Paris
- Gardiner, E. N. 1978. *Athletics of the ancient world*, repr. edn, Chicago
- Garvie, A. F. ed. 1994. *Homer: Odyssey Books VI–VIII*, Cambridge
- Gentili, B. 1988. *Poetry and its public in ancient Greece*, Baltimore, MD
- Gentili, B. and P. Giannini, 1977. 'Preistoria e formazione dell'esametro', *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 26: 7–52
- Gernet, L. 1981. *The anthropology of ancient Greece*, Baltimore, MD
- Ginouvès, R. 1962. *Balaneutikè: recherches sur le bain dans l'antiquité grecque*, Paris
- Goldhill, S. 1988. 'Reading differences: the *Odyssey* and juxtaposition', *Ramus* 17: 1–31
1991. *The poet's voice: essays on poetics and Greek literature*, Cambridge
- Goodwin, W. W. 1897. *Syntax of the moods and tenses of the Greek verb*, London [MT]
- Gordon, R. L. 1979. 'The real and the imaginary: production and religion in the Graeco-Roman world', *Art History* 2: 5–34
- Gould, J. P. 1973. 'HIKETEIA', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 93: 74–103
- Graver, M. 1995. 'Dog-Helen and Homeric insult', *Classical Antiquity* 14: 41–61
- Gray, D. 1955. 'Houses in the *Odyssey*', *Classical Quarterly* 5: 1–12
- Griffin, J. 1980. *Homer on life and death*, Oxford
1986. 'Homeric words and speakers', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 106: 36–57
1987. 'Homer and excess', in Bremer, de Jong and Kalff 1987: 85–104
- ed. 1995. *Homer: Iliad IX*, Oxford
- Griffith, M. 1983. 'Personality in Hesiod', *Classical Antiquity* 2: 37–65
1995. 'Brilliant dynasts: power and politics in the *Oresteia*', *Classical Antiquity* 14: 62–129

- Gschnitzer, F. 1976. *Studien zur griechischen Terminologie der Sklaverei. Zweiter Teil: Untersuchungen zur Älteren, insbesondere homerischen Sklaventerminologie*, Wiesbaden
- Haft, A. J. 1984. 'Odysseus, Idomeneus and Meriones; the Cretan lies of *Odyssey* 13–19', *Classical Journal* 79: 289–306
1990. "The city-sacker Odysseus" in *Iliad* 2 and 10', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 120: 37–56
- Hainsworth, J. B. 1962. 'The Homeric formula and the problem of its transmission', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 9: 57–68
1968. *The flexibility of the Homeric formula*, Oxford
1980. 'Ancient Greek', in A. T. Hatto, ed., *Traditions of heroic and epic poetry*, vol. 1 (London) 20–47
1993. *The Iliad: a commentary*, vol. III: books 9–12, Cambridge
- Halperin, D. M. 1983. *Before pastoral: Theocritus and the ancient tradition of bucolic poetry*, New Haven, London
- Halverson, J. 1985. 'Social order in the "Odyssey"', *Hermes* 113: 129–45
1986. 'The succession issue in the "Odyssey"', *Greece & Rome* 33: 119–28
- Harris, H. A. 1964. *Greek athletes and athletics*, London
- Harsh, P. W. 1950. 'Penelope and Odysseus in *Odyssey* xix', *American Journal of Philology* 71: 1–21
- Haslam, M. 1997. 'Homeric papyri and transmission of the text', in Morris and Powell 1997: 55–100
- Haubold, J. 2000. *Homer's people: epic poetry and social formation*, Cambridge
- Heath, J. 2001. 'Telemachus pepnumenos: growing into an epithet', *Mnemosyne* 54: 129–57
- Heiden, B. 1998. 'The placement of "book divisions" in the *Iliad*', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 118: 68–81
2000. 'The placement of "book divisions" in the *Odyssey*', *Classical Philology* 95: 247–59
- Henderson, J. 1997. 'The name of the tree: recounting *Odyssey* xxiv 340–2', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 117: 87–116
- Heubeck, A. 1974. *Die homerische Frage*, Darmstadt
- Higbie, C. 1990. *Measure and music: enjambment and sentence structure in the Iliad*, Oxford
- Hijmans, B. L., Jr. 1976. 'Archers in the *Iliad*', in J. S. Boersma et al., eds., *Festoen: opgedragen aan A. N. Zadoks-Josephus Jitta bij haar zeventigste verjaardag (Scripta Archaeologica Groningana 6)* (Groningen) 343–52
- Hoekstra, A. 1965. *Homeric modifications of formulaic prototypes: studies in the development of Greek epic diction*, Amsterdam
1981. *Epic verse before Homer*, Amsterdam
- Hogan, J. C. 1981. 'Eris in Homer', *Grazer Beiträge* 10: 21–58
- Holoka, J. P. 1983. "'Looking darkly" (ὑπόδρα ἰδών): reflections on status and decorum in Homer', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 113: 1–16
- Hölscher, U. 1939. *Untersuchungen zur Form der Odyssee*, Leipzig
1988. *Die Odyssee: Epos zwischen Märchen und Roman*, Munich
1996. 'Penelope and the suitors', in Schein 1996: 133–40

- Hooker, J. T. 1980. *Ἐερός in early Greek*, Innsbruck
 1986. 'A residual problem in *Iliad* 24', *Classical Quarterly* 36: 32–7
- Hopkinson, N. ed. 1984. *Callimachus. Hymn to Demeter*, Cambridge
- Horrocks, G. C. 1984. *Space and time in Homer. Prepositional and adverbial particles in the Greek epic*, Salem, NH
 1997. 'Homer's dialect', in Morris and Powell 1997: 193–217
- Houston, G. W. 1975. 'ἄρβόνος, δῖφρος and Odysseus' change from beggar to avenger', *Classical Philology* 70: 212–14
- Hunter, R. L., ed. 1999. *Theocritus. A selection*, Cambridge
- Hunter, R. L. and I. Rutherford, eds. 2009. *Wandering poets in ancient Greek culture. Travel, locality and panhellenism*, Cambridge
- Irwin, E. 1974. *Colour terms in Greek poetry*, Toronto
- Irwin, E. 2005. *Solon and early Greek poetry: the politics of exhortation*, Cambridge
- Jacobson, H. 1999. 'Odyssey 17.221', *Classical Quarterly* 49: 315
- Janko, R. 1982. *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: diachronic development in epic diction*, Cambridge
 1992. *The Iliad: a commentary*, vol. iv: books 13–16, Cambridge
 1998. 'The Homeric poems as oral dictated texts', *Classical Quarterly* 48: 1–13
- Jenkins, I. D. 1985. 'The ambiguity of Greek textiles', *Arethusa* 18: 109–32
- Jensen, M. S. 1980. *The Homeric question and the oral-formulaic theory*, Copenhagen
 1999. 'Dividing Homer: when, where, and how were the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* divided?', *Symbolae Osloenses* 74: 5–35
- Jones, P. V. 1989. '*Iliad* 24.649: another solution', *Classical Quarterly* 39: 247–50
- de Jong, I. J. F. 1987. 'The voice of anonymity: *tis*-speeches in the *Iliad*', *Erasmos* 85: 69–84
 1996. 'Sunsets and sunrises in Homer and Apollonius of Rhodes: book divisions and beyond', *Dialogos* 3: 20–35
 2001. *A narratological commentary on the Odyssey*, Cambridge
- Kahane, A. 1994. *The interpretation of order: a study in the poetics of Homeric repetition*, Oxford
- Katz, M. A. 1991. *Penelope's renown: meaning and indeterminacy in the Odyssey*, Princeton
- Kearns, E. 1982. 'The return of Odysseus: a Homeric theoxeny', *Classical Quarterly* 32: 2–8
- Kilb, H. 1973. *Strukturen epischen Gestaltens im 7 und 23. Gesang der Odyssee*, Munich
- King, B. 1999. 'The rhetoric of the victim: Odysseus in the swineherd's hut', *Classical Antiquity* 18: 74–93
- King, K. C. 1987. *Achilles: paradigms of the war hero from Homer through the Middle Ages*, Berkeley
- Kirchhoff, A. 1879. *Die homerische Odyssee*, Berlin
- Kirk, G. S. 1962. *The songs of Homer*, Cambridge
 ed. 1964. *The language and background of Homer: some recent studies and controversies*, Cambridge
 1976. *Homer and the oral tradition*, Cambridge

- ed. 1985. *The Iliad: a commentary*, vol. I: books 1–4, Cambridge
 ed. 1990. *The Iliad: a commentary*, vol. II: books 5–8, Cambridge
- Knox, M. O. 1973. 'Megarons and MEGARA: Homer and archaeology', *Classical Quarterly* 23: 1–21
- Korres, G. S. 1971. 'Μέγαρα σκιδέντα', *Athena* 72: 201–30
- Krischer, T. 1971. *Formale Konventionen der homerischen Epik*, Zetemata 56, Munich
 1984. 'Νόος, νοεῖν, νόημα', *Glotta* 62: 141–9
- Kullmann, W. 1992. *Homerische Motive: Beiträge zur Entstehung, Eigenart und Wirkung von Ilias und Odyssee*, Stuttgart
- Kurke, L. 1999. *Coins, bodies, games and gold: the politics of meaning in archaic Greece*, Princeton
- Kurt, C. 1979. *Seemännische Fachausdrücke bei Homer*, Göttingen
- Lacey, W. K. 1966. 'Homeric ΕΔΝΑ and Penelope's ΚΥΠΙΟΣ', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 86: 55–68
- Lanata, G. 1963. *Poetica pre-Platonica*, Florence
- Laser, S. 1968. *Hausrat (Archaeologia Homerica p)*, Göttingen
- Latacz, J. 1966. *Zum Wortfeld 'Freude' in der Sprache Homers*, Heidelberg
 1968. 'ἀπτερος μῦθος – ἀπτερος φάτις: ungeflügelte Worte?', *Glotta* 46: 27–32
- Lateiner, D. 2005. 'Telemakhos' one sneeze and Penelope's two laughs (*Odyssey* 17.541–50, 18.158–68)', in R. J. Rabel, ed., *Approaches to Homer* (Swansea) 73–90
- Lee, D. J. N. 1960–1. 'Homeric κῆρ and others', *Glotta* 39: 191–207
- Leukart, A. 1985. 'Homerisch ἀτρύγετος', in A. Etter, ed., *o-o-pe-ro-si: Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag* (Berlin, New York) 340–5
- Leumann, M. 1950. *Homerische Wörter*, Basel [*Wörter*]
- Levianouk, O. 2000. 'Aithôn, Aithon, and Odysseus', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 100: 25–51
- Levine, D. 1982. 'Odyssey 18: Iros as paradigm for the suitors', *Classical Journal* 77: 200–4
 1983. 'Penelope's laugh: *Odyssey* 18.163', *American Journal of Philology* 104: 172–8
 1984. 'Odysseus' smiles: *Od.* 20.301, 22.371, 23.111', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 114: 1–9
 1987. 'Flens matrona et meretrices gaudentes: Penelope and her maids', *Classical World* 81: 23–7
- Lewis, N. 1974. *Papyrus in classical antiquity*, Oxford
- Lissarrague, F. 1989. 'The world of the warrior', in C. Bérard et al., eds., *A city of images* (Princeton) 39–51
- Locher, J. P. 1963. *Untersuchungen zu ἱερός hauptsächlich bei Homer*, Bern
- Lonsdale, S. H. 1990. *Creatures of speech: lion, herding and hunting similes in the Iliad*, Stuttgart
- Lord, A. B. 1951. 'Composition by theme in Homer and South Slavic epos', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 82: 71–80
 1960. *The singer of tales*, Cambridge, MA, London
 1991. *Epic singers and oral tradition*, Ithaca, NY, London
- Lord, M. L. ed. 1995. *The singer resumes the tale*, Ithaca, NY

- Lorimer, H. L. 1950. *Homer and the monuments*, London
- Louden, B. 1997. 'Eumaios and Alkinoos: the audience and the "Odyssey"', *Phoenix* 51: 95–114
- Lowenstam, S. 1993. *The scepter and the spear: studies on forms of repetition in the Homeric poems*, Lanham, MD
1997. 'Talking vases: the relationship between the Homeric poems and archaic representations of epic myth', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 127: 21–76
- Lowry, Eddie R., Jr. 1991. *Thersites. A study in comic shame*, New York
- Mackie, H. 1997. 'Song and story-telling: an Odyssean perspective', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 127: 77–95
- Macleod, C. W. ed. 1982. *Homer, Iliad book XXIV*, Cambridge
- Mainoldi, C. 1984. *L'image du loup et du chien dans la Grèce ancienne: d'Homère à Platon*, Paris
- Marinatos, S. 1967. *Kleidung, Haar- und Barttracht (Archaeologia homerica b)*, Göttingen
- Marks, J. 2003. 'Alternative Odysseys: the case of Thoas and Odysseus', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 133: 209–26
2005. 'The ongoing neikos: Thersites, Odysseus, and Achilles', *American Journal of Philology* 126: 1–31
- Marquadt, P. 1985. 'Penelope Polutropos', *American Journal of Philology* 106: 32–48
- Martin, R. 1984. 'Hesiod, Odysseus, and the instruction of princes', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 114: 29–48
1989. *The language of heroes. Speech and performance in the Iliad*, Ithaca, NY
1992. 'Hesiod's metanastic poetics', *Ramus* 21: 11–33
1993. 'Telemachus and the last hero song', *Colby Quarterly* 29: 222–40
2009. 'Read on arrival', in Hunter and Rutherford 2009: 80–104
- Marzullo, B. 1970. *Il problema omerico*, 2nd edn, Milan, Naples
- McDonnell, M. 1991. 'The introduction of athletic nudity: Thucydides, Plato and the vases', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 111: 182–93
- Mette, H. J. 1960–1. "'Schauen" und "staunen"', *Glotta* 39: 49–71
- Minchin, E. 2001. *Homer and the resources of memory: some applications of cognitive theory to the Iliad and Odyssey*, Oxford
- Monro, D. B. 1891. *A grammar of the Homeric dialect*, 2nd edn, Oxford [HD]
- Montanari, F. 1998. 'Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the ekdosis of Homer', in G. Most, ed., *Editing texts / Texte editieren. Aporemata II* (Göttingen) 1–21
2002. 'Alexandrian Homeric philology: the form of the ekdosis and the *variae lectiones*', in M. Reichel and A. Rengakos, eds., *EPEA PTEROENTA: Beiträge zur Homerforschung: Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann zum 75. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart) 119–40
- Morris, I. 1986. 'The use and abuse of Homer', *Classical Antiquity* 5: 81–138
- Morris, I. and B. Powell, eds. 1997. *A new companion to Homer*, Leiden, New York, Köln
- Morris, S. P. 1992. *Daidalos and the origins of Greek art*, Princeton
- Most, G. W. 1989. 'The structure and function of Odysseus' *Apologoi*', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 119: 15–30

- Moulton, C. 1977. *Similes in the Homeric poems*, Göttingen
- Mueller, L. C. 1976. *The meaning of Homeric εὔχουσα through its formulas*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 13, Innsbruck
- Murko, M. 1929. *La poésie populaire épique en Yougoslavie au début du xx. siècle*, Paris
- Murnaghan, S. 1986. 'Penelope's Agnoia: knowledge, power and gender in the *Odyssey*', *Helios* 13: 103–15
1987. *Disguise and recognition in the Odyssey*, Princeton
- Murray, O. 1980. *Early Greece*, Brighton
- Nagler, M. N. 1967. 'Towards a generative view of the oral formula', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 98: 269–311
1974. *Spontaneity and tradition: a study in the oral art of Homer*, Berkeley, Los Angeles
1990. 'Odysseus: the poem and the problem', *Classical Antiquity* 9: 335–56
1993. 'Penelope's male hand: gender and violence in the *Odyssey*', *Colby Quarterly* 29: 241–57
1996. 'Dread goddess revisited', in Schein 1996: 141–62
- Nagy, G. 1974. *Comparative studies in Greek and Indic metre*, Cambridge, MA
1979. *The best of the Achaeans: concepts of the hero in archaic Greek poetry*, Baltimore
- 1990a. *Pindar's Homer. The lyric possession of an epic past*, Baltimore, MD
- 1990b. *Greek mythology and poetics*, Ithaca, NY
1992. 'Homeric questions', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 122: 17–60
- 1996a. *Homeric questions*, Austin, TX
- 1996b. *Poetry as performance: Homer and beyond*, Cambridge
2004. *Homer's text and language*, Urbana, IL
- Neumann, G. 1965. *Gesten und Gebärden in der griechischen Kunst*, Berlin
- Newton, R. M. 1987. 'Odysseus and Hephaestus in the *Odyssey*', *Classical Journal* 83: 12–20
- Notopoulos, J. A. 1960. 'Homer, Hesiod and the Achaean heritage of oral poetry', *Hesperia* 29: 177–97
- O'Neill, E., Jr. 1942. 'The localization of metrical wordtypes in the Greek hexameter', *Yale Classical Studies* 8: 105–78
- Onians, R. B. 1988. *The origins of European thought*, repr. edn, Cambridge
- O'Nolan, K. 1978. 'Doublets in the *Odyssey*', *Classical Quarterly* 28: 23–37
- Page, D. L. 1955. *The Homeric Odyssey*, Oxford
1959. *History and the Homeric Iliad*, Berkeley, Los Angeles
1973. *Folk-tales in Homer's Odyssey*, Cambridge, MA
- Palmer, L. R. 1948. 'The Homeric and the Indo-European house', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92–120
1962. 'The language of Homer', in Wace and Stubbings 1962: 75–178
- Pantelia, M. C. 1993. 'Spinning and weaving: ideas of domestic order in Homer', *American Journal of Philology* 114: 493–501
- Papadopoulos, J. K. 1996. Review of Andersen and Dickie (1995), *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 96.5.2
- Parry, A. 1966. 'Have we Homer's Iliad?', *Yale Classical Studies* 20: 175–216

1972. 'Language and characterization in Homer', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 76: 1–22
- Parry, H. 1994. 'The *Apologos* of Odysseus: lies, all lies?', *Phoenix* 48: 1–20
- Parry, M. 1971. *The making of Homeric verse: the collected papers of Milman Parry*, ed. A. Parry, New York, Oxford
- Pasquali, G. 1971. *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, 2nd edn, Florence
- Pedrick, V. 1994. 'Eurycleia and Eurynome as Penelope's confidantes', in S. M. Oberhelman, V. Kelly and R. J. Golsan, eds., *Epic and epoch: essays on the interpretation and history of a genre* (Lubbock, TX) 97–116
- Peradotto, J. 1969. 'Cledonomanicy in the *Oresteia*', *American Journal of Philology* 90: 1–21
1990. *Man in the middle voice: name and narration in the Odyssey*, Princeton
- Pontani, F. M. 2007. *Scholia graeca in Odysseam I. Scholia ad libros a-b*, Rome
- Porter, J. I. 1992. 'Hermeneutic lines and circles: Aristarchus and Crasis on the exegesis of Homer', in R. Lamberton and J. J. Keaney, eds., *Homer's Ancient Readers* (Princeton) 67–114
2002. 'Homer: the very idea', *Arion* 10: 57–86
- Powell, B. B. 1991. *Homer and the origin of the Greek alphabet*, Cambridge
1997. 'Homer and writing', in Morris and Powell 1997: 3–32
- Pratt, L. H. 1993. *Lying and poetry from Homer to Pindar*, Ann Arbor
- Prince, C. P. 1970. 'Some "mixed aorists" in Homer', *Glotta* 48: 155–63
- Pucci, P. 1977. *Hesiod and the language of poetry*, Baltimore, MD
1982. 'The poem of the Odyssey', *Arethusa* 15: 39–62
1987. *Odysseus polytropos: intertextual readings in the Odyssey and Iliad*, Ithaca, London
- Pulley, S. 2000. *Homer. Iliad Book One*, Oxford
- Rabel, R. 1999. 'Impersonation and representation in the *Odyssey*', *Classical World* 93: 169–83
- Race, W. H. 1993. 'First appearances in the *Odyssey*', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 123: 79–107
- Ramming, G. 1973. *Die Dienerschaft in der "Odyssee"*, Erlangen
- Ramnoux, C. 1959. *Nuit et les enfants de la nuit dans la tradition grecque*, Paris
- Redfield, J. 1994. *Nature and culture in the Iliad* (expanded edn), Durham, NC and London
- Reece, S. 1993. *The stranger's welcome: oral theory and the aesthetics of the Homeric hospitality scene*, Ann Arbor
1994. 'The Cretan Odyssey: a lie truer than truth', *American Journal of Philology* 115: 157–73
- Reichl, K. 2001. *Das usbekische Heldenepos Alpomish: Einführung, Text, Übersetzung*, Wiesbaden
- Richardson, L. J. D. 1961. 'The origin and prefix of *Bou-* in comedy', *Hermathena* 15: 53–63
- Richardson, N. J. ed. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford
1975. 'Homeric professors in the age of the Sophists', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 21: 65–81

1983. 'Recognition scenes in the *Odyssey* and ancient criticism', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 4: 219–35
1989. 'Homer and Cyprus', in V. Karageorghis, ed., *Proceedings of an international symposium "The civilizations of the Aegean and their diffusion in Cyprus and the Eastern Mediterranean, 2000–6000 BC"* (Lamaca) 125–32
- Richter, G. 1966. *The furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans*, London
- Risch, E. 1981. *Kleine Schriften: zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, Berlin, New York
- Robinson, D. B. 1990. 'Homeric φίλος: love of life and limbs, and friendship with one's θυμός', in E. M. Craik, ed., *Owls to Athens: essays on classical subjects presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* (Oxford) 97–107
- Rose, G. 1979. 'Odysseus' barking heart', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 109: 216–20
- Rose, P. W. 1975. 'Class ambivalence in the *Odyssey*', *Historia* 24: 129–49
1992. *Sons of the gods, children of earth*, Ithaca, NY
- Roth, C. P. 1974. 'More Homeric "mixed aorists"', *Glotta* 52: 1–10
- Rousseau, P. 1993. 'Un héritage disputé', in G. Arrighetti and F. Montanari, eds., *La componente autobiografica nella poesia greca e latina* (Atti del Convegno, Pisa, 16–17 maggio 1991) (Pisa) 41–72
- Ruijgh, C. J. 1971. *Autour de "τε épique": études sur la syntaxe grecque*, Amsterdam
- Ruipérez, M. S. 1972. 'Sur ἤλεκτωρ et ἤλεκτρον, "ambre"', in *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie grecques offerts à Pierre Chantraine* (Paris) 231–4
- Russo, J. 1968. 'Homer against his tradition', *Arion* 7: 275–95
1974. 'The inner man in Archilochus and the *Odyssey*', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 15: 139–52
1976. 'Is "oral" or "aural" composition the cause of Homer's formulaic style?', in B. A. Stolz and R. S. Shannon III, eds., *Oral literature and the formula* (Ann Arbor) 31–54
1982. 'Interview and aftermath: dream, fantasy, and intuition in *Odyssey* 19 and 20', *American Journal of Philology* 103: 4–18
1997. 'The formula', in Morris and Powell 1997: 238–60
- Rutherford, R. B. 1982. 'Tragic form and feeling in the *Iliad*', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 102: 145–60
1985. 'At home and abroad: aspects of the structure of the *Odyssey*', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 31: 133–50
- ed. 1992. *Homer, Odyssey books XLX and XX*, Cambridge
1996. *Homer. Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics* 26, Oxford
- Sacks, R. 1987. *The traditional phrase in Homer: two studies in form, meaning, and interpretation*, Leiden, New York
- Said, S. 1979. 'Les crimes des prétendants: la maison d'Ulysse et les festins de l'Odyssee', in *Études de littérature ancienne* (Paris) 9–49
- Sakellarakis, I. 1988. 'Some Geometric and Archaic votives from the Idaian Cave', in R. Hägg, N. Marinatos and G. Nordquist, eds., *Early Greek cult practice* (Stockholm) 173–93

- Sale, M. 2001. 'The oral-formulaic idea today', in J. Watson, ed., *Speaking volumes: orality and literacy in the Greek and Roman world* (Leiden) 53–80
- Schadewaldt, W. 1959a. 'Kleiderdinge: zur Analyse der *Odyssee*', *Hermes* 87: 13–26
- 1959b. 'Die Gestalt des homerischen Sängers', in *Von Homers Welt und Werk*, 3rd edn (Stuttgart) 54–86
- Scheid-Tissinier, E. 1993. 'Télémaque et les prétendants: les *vēoi* d'Ithaque', *L'Antiquité Classique* 62: 1–22
- Schein, S. ed. 1996. *Reading the Odyssey. Selected interpretive essays*, Princeton
1999. 'Homeric intertextuality: two examples', in J. N. Kazazis and A. Rengakos, eds., *Euphrosyne. Studies in ancient epic and its legacy in honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis* (Stuttgart) 349–56
- Schenkeveld, D. M. 1970. 'Aristarchus and ΟΜΗΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΤΕΧΝΟΣ: some fundamental ideas of Aristarchus on Homer as a poet', *Mnemosyne* 23: 162–78
- Schmitt, R. 1967. *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden
- Schnapp-Gourbeillon, A. 1981. *Lions, héros, masques: les représentations de l'animal chez Homère*, Paris
- Schwyzler, E. 1939–53. *Griechische Grammatik*, 3 vols, Munich
- Scodel, R. 1998a. 'Bardic performance and oral tradition in Homer', *American Journal of Philology* 119: 171–94
- 1998b. 'The removal of the arms, the recognition with Laertes, and narrative tension in the *Odyssey*', *Classical Philology* 93: 1–17
2001. 'The suitors' games', *American Journal of Philology* 122: 307–27
2002. *Listening to Homer. Tradition, narrative, and audience*, Ann Arbor
- Scully, S. 1990. *Homer and the sacred city*, Ithaca, NY
- Seaford, R. 1994. *Reciprocity and ritual: Homer and tragedy in the developing city-state*, Oxford
- Segal, C. 1962. 'The Phaeacians and the symbolism of Odysseus' return', *Arion* 1: 17–64
1967. 'Transition and ritual in Odysseus' return', *La Parola del Passato* 22: 321–42
1984. *Singers, heroes and gods in the Odyssey*, Ithaca, NY
1996. 'Kleos and its ironies in the *Odyssey*', in Schein 1996: 201–21
- Seidensticker, B. 1978. 'Archilochus and Odysseus', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 19: 5–22
- Shapiro, H. A. 1990. *Art and cult under the tyrants in Athens*, Mainz
- Shipp, G. P. 1972. *Studies in the language of Homer*, 2nd edn, Cambridge
- Sinclair, T. A. 1953. 'On two words in Homer', in H. Kusch, ed., *Festschrift Franz Dornseiff zum 65. Geburtstag* (Leipzig) 330–3
- Snell, B. and H. Erbse, eds. 1955–. *Lexicon des frühgriechischen Epos*, Göttingen [LfgE]
- Stanford, W. B. 1950. 'Homer's use of personal *πολυ*-compounds', *Classical Philology* 45: 108–10
- Stanley, K. 1993. *The shield of Homer*, Princeton
- Stella, L. A. 1955. *Il poema d'Ulisse*, Florence
- Suter, A. 1993. 'Paris and Dionysus: iambs in the *Iliad*', *Arethusa* 26: 1–18
- Svenbro, J. 1976. *La parole et le marbre. Aux origines de la poésie grecque*, Lund

- Taplin, O. 1992. *Homeric soundings*, Oxford
2000. 'The spring of the Muses. Homer and related poetry', in O. Taplin, ed., *Literature in the Greek world* (Oxford) 4–39
- Thalmann, W. G. 1988. 'Thersites: comedy, scapegoats and Homeric ideology in the *Iliad*', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 118: 1–28
1998. *The swineherd and the bow: representations of class in the Odyssey*, Ithaca, NY
- Thomas, C. G. 1988. 'Penelope's worth: looming large in early Greece', *Hermes* 116: 257–64
- Toher, M. 2001. 'Telemachus' rite of passage', *La Parola del Passato* 56: 149–68
- Tracy, S. 1997. 'The structures of the *Odyssey*', in Morris and Powell 1997: 360–79
- Trahman, C. 1952. 'Odysseus' lies', *Phoenix* 6: 31–43
- Treu, M. 1954–5. 'Homer und das Elfenbein', *Philologus* 99: 149–58
- Tsagarakis, O. 1982. *Form and content in Homer*, Wiesbaden
- Turner, F. 1997. 'The Homeric question', in Morris and Powell 1997: 123–45
- van der Valk, M. H. A. L. H. 1949. *Textual criticism of the Odyssey*, Wiesbaden
- van Leeuwen, J. 1911. 'Homeric', *Mnemosyne* 39: 13–50
- van Nortwick, T. 1979. 'Penelope and Nausicaa', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 109: 269–76
- van Wees, H. 1992. *Status warriors: war, violence, and society in Homer and history*, Amsterdam
- Vermeule, E. 1979. *Aspects of death in early Greek art and poetry*, Berkeley
- Vernant, J.-P. 1983. *Myth and thought among the Greeks*, London
1990. *Figures, idoles, masques*, Paris
- Vester, H. 1968. 'Das 19. Buch der Odyssee', *Gymnasium* 75: 417–34
- Vivante, P. 1982. *The epithets in Homer: a study in poetic values*, New Haven, London
- Voigt, C. 1934. *Überlegung und Entscheidung: Studien zur Selbstauffassung des Menschen bei Homer*, Berlin
- von Fritz, K. 1943. 'ΝΟΟΣ and ΝΟΕΙΝ in the Homeric poems', *Classical Philology* 38: 79–93
- von Kamptz, H. 1982. *Homerische Personennamen*, Göttingen
- von Reden, S. 1995a. *Exchange in Ancient Greece*, London
- 1995b. 'Deceptive readings: poetry and its value reconsidered', *Classical Quarterly* 45: 30–50
- Wace, A. J. B. and F. H. Stubbings, eds., 1962. *A companion to Homer*, London
- Walcot, P. 1977. 'Odysseus and the art of lying', *Ancient Society* 8: 1–19
- Walsh, T. R. 2005. *Fighting words and feuding words: anger and the Homeric poems*, Lanham, MD
- Webster, T. B. L. 1958. *From Mycenae to Homer*, London
- Wegner, M. 1968. *Musik und Tanz (Archaeologia Homerica u)*, Göttingen
- West, M. L. 1967. 'ἔωσ or ἦος', *Glotta* 44: 135–9
1973. 'Indo-European metre', *Glotta* 51: 161–87
- ed. 1978. *Hesiod. Works and Days*, Oxford
1982. *Greek metre*, Oxford
1987. *Introduction to Greek metre*, Oxford

1988. 'The rise of the Greek epic', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108: 151–72
1990. 'Archaische Heldendichtung: singen und schreiben', in W. Kullmann and M. Reichl, eds., *Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen* (Tübingen) 33–50
1992. *Ancient Greek music*, Oxford
1997. 'Homer's metre', in Morris and Powell 1997: 218–37
1999. 'The invention of Homer', *Classical Quarterly* 49: 364–82
2000. 'The gardens of Alcinous and the oral dictated text theory', *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 40: 479–88
- 2003a. 'Iliad and Aethiopsis', *Classical Quarterly* 53: 1–14
- ed. 2003b. *Homeric hymns, Homeric apocrypha, lives of Homer*, Cambridge, MA
2005. 'Odyssey and Argonautica', *Classical Quarterly* 55: 39–64
- West, S. 1967. *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer*, Cologne
1988. 'The transmission of the text', in A. Heubeck, S. West and J. B. Hainsworth, eds., *A commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. 1. *Introduction and books I–VIII* (Oxford) 33–48
- Whallon, W. 1961. 'The Homeric epithets', *Yale Classical Studies* 22: 97–142
- Winkler, J. 1990. 'Penelope's cunning and Homer's', in *The constraints of desire* (New York) 129–61
- Wolff, C. 1979. 'A note on lions and Sophocles' *Philoctetes* 1436', in G. W. Bowersock, ed., *Arktouros: Hellenic studies presented to B. M. W. Knox* (Berlin) 144–50
- Wyatt, W. F., Jr. 1969. *Metrical lengthening in Homer*, Rome
- Yamagata, N. 1989. 'The apostrophe in Homer as part of the oral technique', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 36: 91–103
- Zeitlin, F. I. 1996. *Playing the other: gender and society in classical Greek literature*, Chicago and London

INDEXES

I Subjects

References in italics are to pages of the Introduction

- abuse, 22–3, 17.12–53, 18.1–110, 327–36, 338, 350, 354–5; *see also* iambic poetry and iambographers, Irus, Melanthius, Melantho, suitors
- advice-giving, genre of, 18.125–50, 129, 138–40, 141
- Aegisthus, 18, 30–1, 17.125, 587–8; *see also* House of Atreus
- Agamemnon, 12, 18 n. 48, 23, 31, 17.125, 248, 457, 476, 18.67–9, 103, 289
- Alcinous, 5, 7, 17.24–5, 32, 205–11, 265, 267, 291–327, 340–1, 385, 468–9, 485–7, 518–21, 18.31, 170–6, 310, 337; *see also* house, Odysseus', Scheria
- Alexandrian scholarship, 34–7, 17.221, 18.5, 111a; *see also* Aristarchus, Aristophanes of Byzantium, Zenodotus
- amber, 18.295–6
- Amphinomus, 7, 21, 17.364, 18.110–57, 125–8, 151–2, 155–6; characterization of, 16, 18.119, 139, 401–4; interventions of, 18.141, 395, 405–28, 412–21, 427; *see also* advice-giving, suitors, supplication
- Analysts and Unitarians, 3–4, 16, 27 n. 72, 17.53
- anaphora, 10, 18.3–4, 20–1, 67–8, 79
- anger, as motif, 17.458, 459, 18.387–8
- Antinous, 5, 16, 18, 21, 29, 17.111–12, 378–9, 387, 401–2, 442–4, 459, 469, 484, 492–3, 18.81, 86–7, 118, 140, 141, 245, 255, 346–404; characterization of, 17.375–9, 388, 454, 473, 475–80, 18.34, 64–5, 79–87, 139, 244; fate of, 17.462, 476, 494; gift to Penelope, 18.292–3; as organizer of boxing match, 18.34, 39, 44; relation to other abuser figures, 15, 17.220, 328–491, 18.2–3, 10–13, 15–24, 20–1, 86–7, 95; violations of hospitality, 18, 17.345, 404, 406, 407–8, 410, 415, 431, 446–52, 448, 451–2, 462, 18.244, 287, 398, 401–4; *see also* abuse, anger, hospitality, theoxeny, throwing-scenes
- aorist: forms of, 17.23, 174, 302, 18.191, 212; gnomic, 18.264; ingressive, 17.23, 18.35; 'mixed', 17.336, 18.291; reduplicated, 17.590
- Aphrodite, 38, 17.37, 63, 442–4, 454, 18.191–3, 192–3, 195, 202, 295–6, 297–8; adultery with Ares, 18.144, 192–3, 193–4, 292–301, 328; epithets of, 10, 17.497, 18.193–4, 213; *see also* Demodocus, Hephaestus, sexual infidelity
- Apollo, 17.519–20, 525, 18.283; as archer, 17.251, 294; Noumenios, 17.294; patronage of Telemachus, 17.251
- apostrophe, 11, 17.272; *see also* Eumaeus
- appearance *vs.* reality, 20, 17.24, 454, 18.67–70
- archers, 18.262
- Argus, 8, 23, 17.291–327, 454, 18.123; death of, 9–10, 15, 17, 17.326; name of, 17.292; in recognition scene, 22, 17.304–5; *see also* recognition scenes
- Aristarchus, 34, 35, 36–7, 17.268, 270, 378–9, 534, 599, 18.5, 307, 343–4, 402; athetesis of, 35, 17.359, 451–2, 501–4; sense of propriety of, 35 n. 100, 17.359
- Aristophanes of Byzantium, 35
- arrival-scene, 17, 17.167–82, 264–71, 269–71, 291–327, 336–58, 339, 340; *see also* type-scenes
- Artemis, 28, 17.37, 18.202; arrows of, 18.202
- article, uses of, 17.140, 18.229, 18.403–4; 'deictic', 17.10; derogatory use of, 18.333
- artifacts, descriptions of, 18.292–301
- asyndeton, 18.187, 220, 372–3
- Athena, 17, 19, 20, 30, 17.32, 46–56, 53, 148–9, 169, 195, 208, 240–3, 286, 326, 328, 360–4, 365–6, 515–17, 518–21, 18.44, 126, 155–6, 171, 187, 191–3; as beautifying agent, 17.63, 223–5, 18.67–70, 187–96, 191, 192–3, 195; disguise of Odysseus, 14, 17.28, 511, 18.108–9, 196, 354–5; epithets of, 18.158, 190; provocation of suitors, 17.364, 18.100, 216, 346–8, 394–8, 407; visit to Penelope, 27, 18.158–303, 160–2, 191, 201, 259–70, 283; *see also* beautification, theodicy
- athletics, 16, 24, 17.167–9, 18.39, 67, 71, 319, 366–80; *see also* boxing-match, courtship competitions, suitors
- 'attendance' motif, 17.62, 214

- audiences: for epic poetry, *2*, *2-3*, *7*, *8*, *10*, *11-12*, *13*, *20*, *21*, *23*, *32*, *17.272*, *339*, *18.292-301*; within the *Odyssey*, *21*, *17.442-4*, *514*, *518-21*, *18.138-40*, *282*, *305-6*
- augment, use or neglect of, *5*, *17.58*, *18.343-4*
- baldness, *22*, *18.354-5*
- bards, *3*, *11*, *21*, *32*, *17.208-10*, *263*; epithets for, *17.385*; itinerancy of, *17.385*; Odysseus as, *20-1*, *17.418*, *513*, *518-21*, *18.282*; position in society of, *11*, *17.385*; *see also* Demodocus, performance context, Phemius
- bathing and bathtubs, *17.87*, *18.178-9*; as part of hospitality scene, *17*, *17.84*, *86-90*; *see also* hospitality
- beard, growth of, *18.175-6*, *176*
- beautification: of Odysseus, *19*, *18.67-70*; of Penelope, *5*, *10*, *18.187-96*, *191-3*; of Telemachus, *17.63*, *64*; *see also* Athena
- belly, *see* stomach
- book-divisions, *36-7*, *17.1*, *18.1-8*, *428*
- bow-contest, *15*, *16*, *17-18*, *27*, *17.365-6*, *18.66-87*, *281-2*; *see also* courtship competitions
- boxing-match, *2*, *16*, *18.13*, *67*, *89*, *98*; *see also* Antinous, athletics, Irus
- Bronze Age, *4*, *17.432*, *442-4*
- Calypso, *17.17*, *143-6*, *283-5*, *18.195*, *203-4*; *see also* scenery descriptions
- Catalogue of Women*, *18.292-301*; *see also* courtship competitions
- chairs, *see* furniture
- change of scene, *17.167-82*, *182*, *492-588*
- characterization, *see* first appearances
- chiasmus, *18.126*, *140*
- chronology of poem, internal, *17.1*, *23-5*, *515-17*, *18.367*; *see also* seasonality
- Ciconian episode, *17.419-44*, *427-41*, *431*, *432-4*, *437-8*
- circumlocution, *18.181*
- city, *18.1*; contrasted with countryside, *24*, *17.5*, *18*, *205*, *245-6*, *604*; occlusion of, *31*; *see also* countryside and agrarian sphere
- cladonmancy, *17.545*, *18.117*; *see also* sneeze
- Cleisthenes, *17.167-9*, *18.277*
- clothes, *17*, *17.24*, *86-90*, *572-3*, *18.41*, *67-70*; as gift, *17.24*, *550*, *18.278*, *361*; symbolism of, *17.24*; *see also* disguise, hospitality
- Clytemnestra, *28*, *31*, *17.125*, *587-8*; *see also* House of Atreus
- coming of age, *see* Telemachus
- comparative, forms and uses of, *17.191*, *417*, *18.174*, *403-4*
- countryside and agrarian sphere, *12*, *15*, *20*, *23-4*, *17.10-11*, *18*, *205*, *217-32*, *245-6*, *297-9*, *18.358*, *366-80*, *376-9*; *see also* city, ideology
- courtship competitions, *18*, *18.277*, *292-301*
- craftsmanship, *17.266*, *267*, *519-20*; *see also* Hephaestus, public workers
- crasis, *39*, *17.416*
- Crete, *34*, *17.523*, *18.295-6*
- Ctesippus, *17.462-5*; *see also* suitors, throwing-scenes
- Cyclopes, *17.363*, *435*, *482*, *18.167*; *see also* Polyphemus
- Cyprus, *44*, *17.442-4*
- dative: after ἐπί, *17.308*, *454*, *18.44*, *414*; after μετά, *17.492-3*; ethical, *17.46-7*, *393*; instrumental, *18.418-19*
- dawn, *17.23-5*, *24-5*, *600*; description of and epithets for, *6*, *17.1*, *497*
- deliberation-scenes, *17.235-7*, *18.90-4*, *93*; *see also* type-scenes
- Demodocus, *11*, *12*, *13*, *17.32*, *44*, *385*; and song of Ares and Aphrodite, *18.35*, *328*; *see also* bards
- desiderative form, *18.428*
- dialect, *see* language
- dictation of epic poetry, *32-3*
- digamma, *5*, *39*, *41*; ignored, *17.84*, *18.403-4*; observed, *17.37*, *72*, *198*, *533*, *536*, *18.316*; *see also* hiatus
- digression, *see* artifacts, scenery-descriptions
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *42*
- Dios apatē*, *18.191-3*, *292-301*, *297-8*; *see also* Hera, Zeus
- direct/indirect speech, *17.236-7*, *345-7*, *368*, *558-9*
- disguise: of gods, *17*, *19*, *17.328*, *337-8*, *356-66*, *454*, *485-7*, *18.126*, *354-5*, *394-8*, *401-4*; of Odysseus, *20*, *17.3*, *46-56*, *53*, *152-61*, *183*, *195*, *197-203*, *274-9*, *283-5*, *286*, *18.67*, *67-8*, *69-70*, *108-9*; as motif, *3*, *22*; *see also* Athena, theoxeny
- 'distended' forms, *18.143*
- dogs, *17.62*, *195*, *291*, *302*, *309-10*, *319*, *339*, *18.87*; epithets for, *9*, *17.62*; as term of abuse, *17.248*, *18.338*; *see also* abuse, Argus
- Dolius, *24*, *17.212*, *330*, *18.359*
- doublets: anticipatory, *17.46-56*; character doublets, *17.212-53*, *18.164*; in oral composition, *17.8*, *82*
- drunkards and drunkenness, *18.240*, *331*
- dual, *18.13*, *34*, *64-5*, *95*, *372-3*

- Echetus, 18.85, 86-7, 117
 economy, principle of, 6, 9
 Egypt, 2, 32, 34, 17.383-5, 424-6, 427, 432, 442-4, 448, 18.329
 ellipse, 17.356, 18.28
 enchantment: in response to speech or song, 22, 17.513, 518-21, 518; of love, 18.212, 282
 endurance, of Odysseus, 13, 22, 17.34, 235-7, 238, 280, 462-5, 18.311-12, 319; *see also* Odysseus, epithets of
 enjambment, 41, 17.7, 43; 526-7, 18.2-3, 21-2, 95, 180, 292-301
 Epic Cycle, 2; *see also* *Telegony*, *Thesprotis*
 epiphany, 17.367, 18.69-70, 71, 307-44, 354-5
 epithets, formulaic, 6, 9-10, 11, 17.1, 32, 36, 45, 50-1, 62, 183, 385, 428, 497, 508, 18.192-3, 196, 202, 399; seemingly inappropriate, 9, 18.5; significant, 9-10, 14, 17.16, 17.34, 152, 197-8, 235-7, 280, 289, 328, 511, 565, 18.50-1, 134, 193-4, 245, 311-12, 319, 356; variation in and modification of, 8-9, 17.46-7, 226, 18.192-3; *see also* Aphrodite, Athena, Eumaeus, Hephaestus, Odysseus, Penelope, ships, Telemachus, Zeus
 Erinyes, 17.66, 475, 18.86-7
 Eumaeus: characterization and role of, 12, 20, 24, 17.201-2, 219, 243, 272, 320-3, 385, 387, 442-4, 446, 492-588, 522, 591-601, 604, 18.366, 381; contrasted with Melanthius, 17.212-53, 245-6, 18.1, 321; epithets for 17.183, 184; as intermediary between Odysseus and Penelope, 17.574-5, 584; observance of rites of hospitality, 17, 24, 17.201, 217-32, 446-52, 18.1; relations with Telemachus, 17.6, 39-42, 111-12, 334, 591-601; *see also* apostrophe, epithets, hospitality, ideology
 Euryalus, 16, 17.222, 18.110-110, 67-9
 Eurycleia, 7, 18.164, 170-6, 321
 Eurymachus, 18.99, 245, 406; altercation with Odysseus, 15, 23-4, 17.339, 459, 462-5, 469, 18.347, 353, 354-5, 366-86, 366, 375, 381-6, 381, 382, 394-8; characterization of, 18.64-5, 244, 289; and Melanthius and Melantho, 15, 17.226-8, 257, 334, 18.304-45, 357-64, 358, 389-93; violations of guest-host relations, 18.41, 361; *see also* abuse, hospitality, suitors, throwing-scenes
 Eurynome, 17.495, 18.164, 164-8, 170-6, 171, 174, 178-9, 221-5, 269, 291-2, 321
 Eustathius, 34, 17.6, 134, 220, 221, 18.29, 79, 100, 128, 308-9, 359, 410
 fantasy realm, 17.76, 206, 291-327; *see also* Ithaca
 father-son relations, 29-30, 17.3, 46-56, 111-12, 397, 489-91, 18.126, 176
 feast, feasting, 3, 17, 18, 17.86-90, 95, 167-76, 167-9, 220, 222, 249-50, 269-71, 271, 332, 360-4, 386, 410, 413, 470-3, 494; heralds at, 18.423; parasite at, 18.1-110, 1, 10, 22, 403-4; *see also* Irus, meals, type-scenes
 first appearances, 17.212-53, 292, 328, 18.1-8, 1, 321-6
 'flyting' discourse, 17.215, 18.26
 focalization, 17.143-6, 205-11, 264-71, 18.281-2
 folk-tale motifs, 1, 17.542, 18.176, 259-70
 food, 17.98-9, 418, 18.188, 357-64, 360; absence of variety in, 17.94; different types of, 17.94, 343; *see also* hunger, meals, stomach
 foot-dragging motif, 17.479-80, 18.10, 101, 111
 footwear, 17.2, 18.361
 foreshadowing, 17.46-56, 152-61, 184, 320; of Odysseus' victory over the suitors, 16, 17.271, 291-327, 304-5, 319, 494, 538, 18.46, 68-87, 77, 88, 100, 356; of the reunion of Odysseus and Penelope, 16, 18.187-96
 formulaic composition, *see* epithets, oral poetry
 furniture, 17.231-2, 320, 18.196; chairs, 17.32, 86, 320, 330, 410; tables, 17.93, 356-7
 gifts, 26, 17.76, 222, 385, 18.300, 361; given in marriage, 27, 31, 17.212, 18.158-303, 259-70, 278, 281-2, 292-301, 292-3; in guest-host relationship, 16, 17.24, 201, 407-8, 418, 451-2, 550; of Phaeacians, 17.76; 18.291; *see also* clothes
 gnomic remarks, 41, 17.176, 18.130-7, 141
 gods, 14, 17, 18, 19, 17.117, 475-8, 18.35, 111, 134, 155-6, 192-3, 210; as bestowers of prosperity and misfortune, 19, 17.286, 425-6, 18.19, 130-42, 134, 141-50, 346-8; contrasted with mortals, 18.69-70, 130, 195; difficulty in recognizing, 17.485-7, 18.158, 394-8; as givers of skills, 17.519-20; as guardians of justice, 19-20, 17.425-6, 485, 485-7, 18.139; interventions of, 17.360-4, 364, 425-6, 18.149-50, 171; *see also* names of individual gods, disguise, epiphany, theodicy, theoxeny
 guest-friendship, *see* hospitality
 headdress, 16, 18.210, 295-6
 hearth, 17.155-7, 572-3

- Helen, 2, 26, 28, 17.97, 118–19, 119, 248, 518–21, 545, 18.46, 204, 277, 292–301, 292–3
- Hephaestus, 17.454, 18.10, 111, 403–4; affinity to Odysseus, 9, 17.16, 66, 195, 18.10, 328; as craftsman, 17.62, 291–327, 383–5, 18.292–3, 328; epithets of, 9, 17.16; *see also* Aphrodite, Demodocus
- Hera, *see* *Dios apatē*
- heralds, 17.45, 383–5, 428, 18.64–5, 291, 297–8, 423
- Hesiod, 32, 35, 17.140, 246, 475, 565, 18.1, 6–7, 129, 138–40, 193–4, 277, 292–301, 305–6, 329, 366
- hiatus, 5, 38, 39, 41, 42, 17.231–2, 301, 327, 536, 18.221, 316, 323
- Hipparchus, 33
- Homer: identity of, *1–2*; social status of, *12–13*
- Homeridae, *1*, 33
- hospitality, 24, 17.24, 84, 339, 368, 385, 404, 407–8, 418, 442–4, 455, 485–7, 550; transgressions of, *17–19*, 17.182, 356–7, 360–4, 462–5, 18.6–7, 39; under protection of Zeus, 17, 18.1; *see also* Antinous, clothes, gifts, suitors, theoxeny
- house, Odysseus', *30–1*, 17.572–3, 18.101–2, 325, 353; architecture of, 17.265, 266, 492–3, 18.101–2; contrasted with palaces of Alcinous and Menelaus, 7, 17.87, 265, 18.310
- House of Atreus, *30–1*, 17.125; *see also* Aegisthus, Agamemnon, Clytemnestra
- hunger, 17.222, 228, 288–9, 418, 18.2–3, 53–4, 79, 358; *see also* stomach
- hyperbole, 17.231–2, 375–9
- iambic poetry and iambographers, 33, 18.1–110, 9–110, 35, 79
- identity, Odysseus', *13–14*, 20, 22, 24, 29, 17.286, 337–8, 339, 18.138–40, 376–9; concealment of, 17.197–203, 18.67–70; intimation of, 17.199, 511, 18.24, 53, 69–70, 319, 366–86; *see also* disguise
- ideology, *12–13*, 24, 17.272, 454, 18.1–110, 126, 319, 376–9
- Iliad*, 32, 17.272, 18.105–7, 126, 140, 256, 367–70, 377–8, 403–4; audience for, *12*; compared with *Odyssey*, *1–2*, 13, 14, *19–20*, 21, 23, 24, 17.309–10, 454, 514, 558–9, 18.423; date of, 2, 32 *n.* 83; Odysseus within, 17.34, 286; revisions of in *Odyssey*, 2, 13, 23, 18.10, 46, 61, 67–70; *see also* Iliadic duels
- Iliadic duels, 18.396, 396–7; subversion of, 18.67–70, 95, 103, 397
- improvisation, 6, *10*
- inconsistencies, narrative, 3, 17.160–1, 442–4, 522, 18.139; *see also* Penelope
- infinitive, 17.262, 398, 18.2, 195, 291; for imperative, 17.83, 278, 600, 18.17, 30, 106, 267, 287; in wishes, 17.354–5
- insults, *see* abuse
- Ionian, *1*, 12, 23, 18.246
- irony, *19*, 17.46–56, 111–12, 152–61, 163–5, 201–2, 251, 269–71, 378–9, 401–2, 416, 476, 18.5, 37, 64–5, 71, 112–13, 238, 259–70, 317, 319, 353, 354–5, 378
- Irus, 2, 15, 16, 23, 24, 17.219, 18.1–110, 234, 304–45, 333, 366; as double for Antinous and other suitors, 5, 16, 22, 23, 17.462, 18.2, 10–13, 18, 21, 46, 73, 76, 77, 88, 95, 234, 236–42; names of, 18.5, 6–7, 73; relations to iambic poetry, 23, 18.1–110, 18.2, 98, 105; as scapegoat, 23, 18.111; *see also* abuse, boxing-match, Thersites
- iterative forms, 17.482, 18.1, 6–7, 315
- Ithaca, 7, 17, 17.87; in contrast to fantasy realm, 24, 17.97, 205, 291–327, 385; foundation of, 17.207; political conditions in, 25, 17.416; *see also* kingship
- ivory, 18.196, 202
- Jørgensen's law, 17.148–9
- kingship, 32; in Ithaca, 25, 17.126, 416, 18.126
- Kunstsprache*, 4
- Laertes, 6–7, 24 *n.* 64, 17.45, 212, 18.69–70, 254, 325, 359; *see also* Dolius
- lamps, lighting of, 18.304–45, 319
- language, *4–6*, *8–9*; Aeolic forms, 4, 17.98–9, 221, 428, 18.174; Arcado-Cypriot forms, 4, 17.295; Attic forms, 5, 17.218, 451–2, 18.343–4; Ionic forms, *4–5*, 17.55, 343, 358, 388, 451–2, 18.143
- laughter, 18.35, 347; of gods, 18.111; of maidservants, 18.320; of Penelope, 17.542, 18.163; of suitors, 18.100, 111, 350
- lengthening, metrical, 17.35, 39, 62, 72, 189, 196, 226, 358, 418, 471, 519–20, 18.29, 260, 262, 316
- libations, 17.536, 18.151–2, 418–19, 427
- lies, 27, 31, 32, 17.15; of Odysseus, 8, 13, 16, 17, 20, 17.108, 419–44, 523, 18.15–24
- Linear B, 5, 17.74, 87, 435, 475, 18.210
- lions, *see* similes
- locus amoenus*, 17.205–11, 209–10
- Lord, Albert, 4, 7, 10, 32, 36
- lyre, 17.262, 271, 518–21

- maidservants, 30, 17.319, 584, 18.182, 305–6, 319, 320, 325; *see also* abuse, laughter, sexual infidelity
- marriage, *see* courtship contests, Penelope master-slave relations, 17.212–53, 320–3
- meals, 17.90, 91–5, 91, 94, 180–1, 332, 599; formulas for, 17.98–9; *see also* feast, food, hospitality, hunger, type-scenes
- Medon, 17.172–3
- Melanthius, 15, 23, 24, 17.205–11, 222, 238, 251, 257, 372, 373, 446, 18.1–110, 18.1, 90–4, 304–45, 357–64, 366–80; characterization of, 17.212–53, 212, 245–6, 309–10, 18.321; death of, 24, 18.86–7; language of, 17.215, 217–32, 215, 217, 219, 231–2; *see also* abuse, countryside, Dolius, Eurymachus, Thersites
- Melantho, 15, 23, 17.212–53, 248, 257, 419–24, 18.304–45, 321, 321–6, 322–3, 325, 327–36, 327, 331, 333, 338, 339, 381–6, 389–93; *see also* abuse, Eurymachus, laughter, maidservants
- Menelaus, 2, 21, 17.45, 76, 124–41, 126–31, 139, 140, 143–6, 153, 272, 442–4, 18.9–100, 46, 77, 277, 292–3; palace of, 17.87, 264–71, 265
- metre and prosody, 37–43; bucolic diaeresis, 40, 41, 17.301, 18.2–3, 8, 295–6; caesura, 39–43, 17.3, 8, 16, 18, 28, 36, 82, 108, 215, 245–6, 280, 18.46, 158, 198, 372–3; correction, 38, 42, 17.37; crasis, 39; elision, 38, 17.22, 272; *see also* digamma, enjambment, hiatus, lengthening
- Minoans, *see* Crete
- Minos, 17.523
- mockery, *see* abuse
- modification of formulas, 8–9, 17.229–30, 386, 18.111
- morality and moral worth, 14, 18, 19–20, 24, 17.320–3, 360–4, 431, 437–8, 454, 539–40, 587–8, 18.130–42, 139, 141–50, 401–4
- mutilation, 18.86–7
- names: position of, 17.3; significant, 17.10, 41, 212–53, 212, 222, 292, 375–9, 385, 18.5, 6–7, 42, 73, 79, 85, 119, 321, 356; suppression or avoidance of, 14, 17.219, 18.18; *see also* apostrophe, ‘speaking names’
- Nausicaa, 16, 28, 17.26–30, 37, 96, 584, 586, 18.160–2, 170–6, 184, 187–96, 191, 195, 209, 210
- Near Eastern poetry, 17.126–31
- Nestor, 17.32, 45, 140, 397; palace of, 17.264–71
- Nile, *see* Egypt
- Nymphs, 17.208; Cave of, 17.76, 205; cult of, 17.210–11; and springs, 17.240
- oath, 17.132, 155–6, 18.55, 234, 384, 423
- Odysseus, *passim*: acquisitiveness of, 18.281–2, 282; epithets of, 17.34, 84, 235–7, 280, 511, 18.50–1, 311–2, 319, 356; physique of, 17.24, 454, 18.67–9, 71; *see also* abuse, disguise, identity, lies, stomach
- Old Man of the Sea, 17.140
- omens, 27, 17.160–1, 541, 544–50, 18.112–13, 117, 384; *see also* cledonomanicy, prophecies, sneezes, Theoclymenus
- onomatopoeia, 17.124, 18.98, 327, 397
- optative: following ὄμρα, 17.297–9; in a final clause, 17.249–50; in indirect speech, 17.236–8; in wishes, 17.249–50, 251–3; to express polite requests, 18.166
- oral poetry, 1, 3–11, 20, 32, 36, 17.8, 58–60, 291–327, 419–44, 18.139, 329; *see also* bards, Serbo-Croatian song
- Panathenaea and Panathenaic text, 33, 36
- parasite, 17.220, 18.1–110, 18; *see also* Irus parody, 17.229–33, 300, 18.2–3, 10, 105; parodic epithets, 17.183, 18.5
- Parry, Milman, 3–11, 32, 36, 41
- Penelope, *passim*; appearance before the suitors, 27, 18.158–303; beautification of, 18.187–96; beauty and character of, 25–6, 17.37, 18.180, 212, 255; enigmas surrounding, 26–7; faithfulness of, 26, 27, 17.37, 46–56, 18.201–5, 202, 255, 292–301; parallels with Nausicaa, 16, 17.37, 96, 586, 18.160–2, 170–6, 184, 195, 209; *see also* Calypso, Aphrodite, Artemis, Athena, Eurynome, Themachus, weaving
- performance context, 11–12, 17.329
- Phaeacians, 16, 17.23–5, 24, 32, 76, 291–327; Odysseus’ tales to, 21–2, 17.17, 419–44, 18.282, 427–41, 513; *see also* Alcinous, Nausicaa, Scheria
- Phemius, 11–13, 17.359, 385, 418, 18.305–6; *see also* bards
- Philoetius, 24, 17.184, 247–9, 330, 511, 18.321
- Phoenicia and Phoenicians, 32, 18.193–4, 196
- pigs, 17.180–1, 219, 221, 18.29
- ‘Pisistratean recension’, *see* Panathenaic text
- poetry, impact of, 17.514, 518–21, 18.212
- Polyphemus, 17.68, 126–31, 195, 233, 238, 435, 462–5, 18.196, 331; *see also* Cyclopes
- polyptoton, 17.83, 217, 18.67–8
- prayer, 17.48, 132, 240–3, 496, 538, 18.119–52, 384, 427

- prophecies, 17.152–61, 160–1, 229–32, 18.158–303, 384
- prothysteron*, 18.67–70
- proverbs and proverbial wisdom, 41, 17.24–5, 218, 343, 347, 578, 18.100
- public lounge, 11, 18.329
- public workers, 17.383–5
- quantitative metathesis, 4, 9, 17.358, 18.190
- quarrels, 23, 17.215, 388, 18.1–110, 140, 277; *see also* abuse, Antinous, Eurymachus, ‘flying’ discourse, Irus, Melanthius, Melantho
- recognition-scenes, 7, 22, 17.327, 18.158–303
- relative clauses, 18.334, 371; in character introductions, 17.292, 18.1; following comparisons, 17.519–20
- repetition, 17.124–41, 419–44, 18.251–80, 346–8, 389–93; purposeful, 7, 9, 17.125, 130–1, 163–5, 283–5, 337–8, 345, 18.143, 171, 202, 321–6, 385–6
- retardation devices, 15, 17.274–9, 292–5, 492–588, 569–70, 18.46–56
- revenge of Odysseus, 17.27, 267, 539–40; problematic nature of, 17–18, 31, 17.126–31, 364, 18.346–8
- rhapsodes, *see* bards
- ring-composition, 10, 17.122, 167–82, 211, 18.220; in descriptive passages, 17.211, 292–5, 18.1–8, 321–6
- run-over position, 18.67–8, 292–3, 367; emphatic word in, 41, 17.159; and relative clause, 18.192–3; *see also* enjambment
- sacrifice, 3, 7, 17.48, 91, 180–1, 241, 535–6, 18.423
- ‘sampling’, 2, 17.53
- scenery-descriptions, 17.205–11, 264–71, 18.292–301, 366–80
- sceptre, 17.201–2, 18.103; *see also* staff
- Scheria, 16, 17.23–5, 24–5, 97, 182–260, 205, 206, 240–3, 291–327, 550, 578, 18.1–110, 210, 360; *see also* Phaeacians
- seasonality, 17.23–5, 191, 18.328, 367; *see also* chronology of poem
- seduction-scenario, 31, 18.191–3, 278, 292–30
- Serbo-Croatian song, 10 n. 28; *see also* Yugoslavia
- sexual infidelity, 18.320, 321, 325
- ships, epithets for, 17.145, 160, 427, 18.249
- similes, 2, 23–4, 17.39–42, 113, 125, 126–31, 126–9, 130–1, 463–4, 518–21, 18.44, 196, 366–80, 367–70, 367
- sleep, 18.341; and death, 18.202; of Penelope, 18.187–96, 188, 191–3, 201, 291–2
- sneeze, as omen, 17.541, 542, 544–50, 545
- ‘speaking names’, 17.212–53, 212, 375–9, 18.5, 85, 119
- speech introductions, 17.74, 280, 18.244
- spinning, 17.97, 18.315, 316
- staff, 17.195, 18.103, 108–9; *see also* sceptre
- stomach, 2, 20, 17.228, 283–5, 286, 286–7, 473, 18.2–3, 35, 44, 53–4, 61, 358
- subjunctive: following $\delta\tau\epsilon$; following $\delta\phi\rho\alpha$, 18.133, 134; forms of, 17.472, 539–40, 18.107, 183, 419; hortatory, 17.190, 18.39, 55; in indefinite frequency, 17.126–9; in relative clause, 17.519–20; with future meaning, 18.334
- suitors, *passim*; collective speeches of, 17.482, 18.72; *see also* Amphinomus, Antinous, Eurymachus, hospitality, Irus, testing
- sunset, 17.1, 599; *see also* book-divisions
- supplication, 17.442–4, 18.395
- synzesis, 32, 39, 42, 17.55, 375–9, 247
- tautology, 17.139, 470, 18.3–4
- Telegony*, 29 n. 79
- Telemachus, *passim*; designation of and epithets for, 17.45, 328, 18.60; maturation of, 28–30, 17.328, 18.170–6, 176, 221–5; relations with Eumaeus, 17.6, 39–42, 111–12, 334, 591–601; relations with Penelope, 30, 17.46–56, 18.227–42, 259–70; *see also* father-son relations
- testing, 19, 17.360–4; *see also* theoxeny
- text and transmission of poems, 31–7
- textiles, 26, 18.292–301, 292–3; *see also* weaving
- Theoclymenus, 3, 17.53, 55, 84, 152–61, 154, 160–1, 18.85
- theodicy, 19–21, 18.139, 141–50, 346–8
- theoxeny, 19, 17.360–4, 364, 485–7, 487
- Thersites, 18.163, 350, 354–5, 366; as counterpart to Irus and Melanthius, 23, 17.215, 237, 18.1–110, 9–110, 13, 14, 21–2, 69–70, 103; fate of, 17.231–2, 18.98; name of, 18.73; speech of, 42, 17.375–9; *see also* abuse, iambic poetry and iambographers
- Thesprotia, 2, 17.522, 523
- Thesprotis*, 18.356
- threshold, 15, 17.196, 291–327, 339–41, 339, 572–3, 18.17, 66–87, 110
- throwing-scenes, 7, 17.459, 462–5, 482, 18.394–8, 396
- ‘tmesis’, 17.33–4, 98–9, 241, 18.56, 86, 137, 231, 257, 339
- tricolon crescendo, 18.15–24, 67–8, 263

type-scenes, 3, 7, 17.91–5; arrival, 17.167–82, 264–71, 291–327, 336–58, 339; bathing, 17.86–90; descent to the *megaron*, 18.206–11; deliberation between alternatives, 17.235–7, 18.90–4, 93; dressing, 17.4, 18.292–301; greeting, 7, 18.119–52; hospitality, 17.212–53, 291–327; libation pouring, 18.418–19; meal, 17.91–5; recognition, 7, 22, 17.291–327, 326, 327

veils, *see* headdress

wallet, Odysseus', 17.3, 197–8, 356–7, 18.108–9
 warnings, 17.279, 18.79, 125–51, 151–2
 weather, *see* seasonality
 weaving, 26, 17.97, 18.295–6, 316

web, of Penelope, 26, 18.283
 wine, 17.365–6; epithets for, 17.536; and wine-pouring, 17.172–3, 18.397, 423, 427
 wishes, ways of expressing, 17.249–50, 251–3, 354–4, 496
 wonder, reactions of, 17.64, 367, 18.71, 191
 writing, 31–2

Yugoslavia; 3–4, 32, 17.326; *see also* Serbo-Croatian song

Zenodotus, 35, 17.221

Zeus, 18, 17.50–1, 148–9, 469, 485–7, 18.131, 139, 191–3, 201, 346–8; epithets for, 9, 17.437–8; interventions of, 17.424–6, 425–6, 437–8, 487; protector of strangers and guests, 17, 21, 17.446–52, 18.1; *see also* gods, Hera, theodicy

2 Greek words

ἀεικής, 17.197–8, 356–7
 ἀθέμιστος, 17.363, 18.141
 αἰδώς, 17.347, 578, 18.12, 184
 αἴθουσα, 18.101–2
 ἀμβρόσιος, 18.192–3
 ἀμφίπολος, 18.182, 311
 ἄορ, 17.222
 ἄπτερος, 1 7.57
 ἄρα, 17.454, 481, 18.71
 ἄργός, 17.62, 292
 ἀρετή, 18.133
 ἀρημένος, 18.53
 ἄριστος, 17.416, 18.289
 ἀσάμινθος, 17.87
 ἀτασθαλίη, 18, 17.587–8, 18.57, 139
 ἀτιμάω (-άζω), 18.144
 ἀτρύγετος, 17.289
 ἄττα, 17.6
 αὐλή, 18.101–2

βίη, 17.565, 18.4, 139
 βόσκω, 17.228
 βουγαίος, 18.79
 βυσσοδομεύς, 17.66

γένος, 17.373
 γόνυ, 18.133, 212

δαιμόνιε, 18.15
 δαίμων, 17.446
 -δε, 17.5, 18.84
 δειπνον, 17.599
 δέμας, 17.307, 18.251–6

δημοεργός, 17.383–5
 δῖος, 17.183, 18.190
 δμωιαί, 17.34
 δύστηνος, 17.10

εἶδος, 17.454
 ἐμπεδον, 17.463–4
 ἔπεα πτερόεντα, 17.40
 ἐπιγουνίς, 17.225, 18.74
 ἔρις, 17.134, 18.13, 366
 εὐχομαι, 17.50–1, 373

ἦρα, 18.56
 ἦ τοι, 17.153

θάλαμος, 17.492–3
 θάμβος, 17.67
 θέλγω (-ομαι), 17.514, 518–21, 18.212, 282
 θεράπων, 18.76, 291
 θεσπέσιος, 17.63, 385
 θηέομαι, 17.64, 18.191
 θής, 18.357, 358
 θυμαρής, 17.199
 θυμός, 17.286, 18.61

ἱερός, 18.34, 60
 ἴς, 18.3–4, 60

καταλέγω, 17.44, 108, 122
 κερτομέω, 17.350
 κῆρ, 17.82
 κλέος, 17.292, 418, 18.255
 κῶμα, 18.201

- λυσιμελής, 18.189, 212
 λώβη, 18.225, 347
- μαῖα, 17.499
 μένος, 17.286, 18.34
 μεταμώνιος, 17.332
 μήτις, 18.328
 μολοβρός, 17.219, 18.26
- νεῖκος, 17.189, 215, 18.9
 νημερτής, 17.140
 νόος, 17.136, 301
 νόστος, 17.106
 κωμάω, 18.216
- ξεῖνος, 17, 17.84, 18.401-4
- οἶη, 26, 18.207
 ὄλβος, 18.19
 ὁμοῖος, 18.264
 ὀνομάζω, 17.215
- πεπνυμένος, 17.45, 18.64-5
 περί, 17.308, 454, 18.414
 πικρός, 17.448
 πολύμητις, 17.280
 πολύτλας, 17.34, 235-7, 280
 πόποι, 17.124
- που, 17.424, 475, 18.7
 πρόθυρον, 18.10, 385-6
 πτωχός, 17, 18.1-110, 1
- σταθμός, 17.96, 18.209
- τέμενος, 1 7.297-9
 τέρπομαι, 17.174, 18.305-6
 τετράγυος, 18.374
 τλάω, 17.34, 84
 τοίγαρ, 17.108
 τρύχω, 17.387
 τῶ, 17.164
- ὕβρις (-ίζω) 18, 17.169, 245, 419-24, 431,
 437-8, 487, 539-40, 565, 587-8
 ὑπερηγορέων, 17.482
 ὑπερφίαλος, 17.481, 18.167
 ὑπόδρα ἰδών, 17.459, 18.14, 337, 388
- φι, 17.435
 φίλος, 17.415, 18.242
 φόρμιγξ, 17.262
- χαρίζομαι, χάρις, 17.83, 95, 451-2,
 18.297-8
 χέρνιψ, 17.91
 χόλος, 17.458