

Copyright Notice

Staff and students of this University are reminded that copyright subsists in this extract and the work from which it was taken. This Digital Copy has been made under the terms of a CLA Licence which allows you to:

- Access and download a copy
- Print out a copy

This Digital Copy and any digital or printed copy supplied to or made by you under the terms of this Licence are for use in connection with this module or course of study. You may retain such copies after the end of the course, but strictly for your own personal use.

All copies (including electronic copies) shall include this Copyright Notice and shall be destroyed and/or deleted if and when required by the University.

Except as provided for by copyright law, no further copying, storage or distribution (including by e-mail) is permitted without the consent of the copyright holder.

The author (which term includes artists and other visual creators) has moral rights in the work and neither staff nor students may cause, or permit, the distortion, mutilation or other modification of the work, or any other derogatory treatment of it, which would be prejudicial to the honour or reputation of the author.

Title of extract: **The Ending of the Odyssey: Linguistic Problems**

Name of Author: **Erbse, H.**

Title/Author of book/edition (if applicable): **Homer: german Scholarship on Translation. Jones, P.V. and Wright, M.**

Name of Visual Creator or other acknowledgement (if applicable):

Journal details –title/Vol/Year (if applicable):

Publisher: **Oxford University Press**

Pages scanned: **263 - 320**

Course of Study (Module name and number): **Muses' Playground CLCS5001**

Name of Designated Person

authorising scanning: *E. L. Harris*

Date authorised: 05.04.17.

Moodle/Powerpoint

The Ending of the *Odyssey*: Linguistic Problems

HARTMUT ERBSE

In this chapter those linguistic peculiarities will be discussed with which people tried to justify the deletion of the ending of the *Odyssey* (arguments compiled in Page, *The Homeric Odyssey* (Oxford, 1955), 102-11). It is advisable to make a few general remarks before individual passages are examined.

1. People like to use *hapax legomena*, or other rare forms of a Homeric word not otherwise found, as evidence against the authenticity of a text.¹ In the case of the ending of the *Odyssey* Spohn has already done this, considering the number of *hapax legomena* unusually high here (157): 'At vero in hac extrema Odysseae parte numerum deprehendimus ἅπαξ εἰρημένων non solum pro ambitu ingentem, sed etiam multas formas continentem, quae et linguam et ingenium processisse docent, ita ut iis vis et momentum in indicanda origine concedi possit.' I regard this conclusion, at least as regards the number of words found only once in the epics, as methodologically unsound in every case where it can be shown that the unique word is called for by situation, metre, and sentence structure. As the Aristonicus scholia teach us, Aristarchus already used to mark *hapax legomenon* with a *diple*, but he used such a *hapax legomenon* to recommend deletion only in exceptional cases (cf. e.g. Ariston. to *Iliad* 7. 475: ἀθετεῖται, ὅτι νεωτερικὴ ᾗ) [addidi] ὀνομασία τοῦ ἀνδράποδον). Incidentally, he knew very well that the Homeric epics contain many *hapax legomena* (cf. Ariston. on *Il.* 3. 54a). A rough glance at the *Iliad* scholia still extant today which deal with these

From: H. Erbse, *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Odyssee* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 13; Berlin, 1972), 177-229, reproduced by kind permission of Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin.

¹ By *hapax legomena* I understand in the following such words as appear only once in both epics. Post-Homeric references do not affect this definition.

words² shows quite clearly that lexically unique words are distributed over the whole poem. They bulk excessively large only where the subject matter is unconventional (e.g. in *Od.* 23). Consequently, anyone who wants to justify deletion by reference to *hapax legomena* would have to demonstrate in each case that [178] the thought intended at the place concerned could have been expressed just as clearly by more common synonyms. Something similar is valid for rare forms in as far as they are formed in accordance with the laws of epic language or have fitting analogies. We must never forget that, among the forms we frequently meet, we accept quite a few strange formations, for the obvious reason that we have become used to their existence. We become suspicious only when faced with rarity. But before we condemn a rare form, we should ask whether the poet ever had any opportunity to repeat the peculiarity.

2. It is no different with the word combinations which people usually describe in the broadest sense of the word as formulae. A formulaic expression which cannot be found elsewhere does not necessarily indicate a later (e.g. post-Homeric) origin, if it becomes clear that the usual formula needed to be changed in order to describe a particular situation more precisely. The problem can be explained with an example: e.g. the unique combination at *Il.* 20. 79: *λαοσσόος ὤρσεν Απόλλων* is contrasted with numerous verse endings of the form *Φοῖβος Απόλλων, ἐκάεργος Απόλλων, ἀργυρότοξος Απόλλων*. But the choice of the unique expression in *Il.* 20. 79 can be explained by the special purpose of the description. While Achilles is trying to find Hector in the turmoil of battle in order to avenge the death of his friend Patroclus, Apollo in the shape of Lycaon, son of Priam, incites Aeneas to go into action against Achilles: *Αἰνεΐαν δ' ἰθὺς λαοσσόος ὤρσεν Απόλλων | ἀντία Πηλεΐωνος*. Only here, where he provokes a level-headed man to an unusually rash step, does he receive the epithet 'stirring up to battle', which elsewhere the battle-deities Athena (13. 128), Ares (17. 398), or Eris (20. 48) have. The formation of the new word combination was easy since adjective and proper name were able to take the verb (*ὤρσεν*) between them. For this reason, it takes up a place in the verse at which it is found in other places too.³

² Cf. the compilation in Martinazzoli, *Hapax legomenon* (Rome, 1953), i. 26. The meagre Aristonicus scholia to the *Odyssey* do not allow any certain conclusions.

³ Cf. *Il.* 2. 451, 13. 83, 794, 15. 694, 17. 273, 18. 218, 23. 108, 153, 24. 507, always in the fifth trochee.

But, so people object (cf. Dihle 73), is it not a violation of the practice of oral poetry to break up stock phrases and put them together in a new way? Is not the oral poet obliged to speak in traditional word combinations because it is only in these that he thinks? Would not his audience refuse to approve of unknown combinations?

3. These questions lead us into a wide field. It will be impossible to avoid entering it, since otherwise the accusation could be made against the ensuing examination of details about the language of the ending of the *Odyssey* that it does not take into account the different principles on which [179] oral and written epic poetry are composed. So we could be in danger of old-fashioned practices. I freely admit that I offer an opinion on these matters only hesitantly, although I have been pursuing the problem of oral poetry and its application to Homer for years. But I regard it as a great disadvantage that I have been able to get to know the work of Serbo-Croat singers and other poets composing orally only in translation. This is all the more regrettable since I have not succeeded in finding evidence of high epic art in the songs of the guslars.⁴ Nevertheless, I cannot do anything other than present my arguments.

Following M. Parry, Lord (152)⁵ claims that Homer was a poet who composed through oral performance. The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* originated in this way. Both epics, Lord assumes, were written down at Homer's dictation. Other scholars (e.g. recently Dihle) assume that the writing down happened only centuries later; so they assume that

⁴ Cf. M. Parry and A. B. Lord, *Serbo-Croatian Heroic Songs*, i. Novi Pazar (Cambridge, Mass. and Belgrade, 1954). This volume contains the compositions of the singers Salih Uglianin, Sulejman Fortić, Demail Zogić, Suleyman Makić, and Alija Fjuljanin (the latter probably the most gifted narrator). These are heroicized, partly fairy-tale-like, partly gruesome, robber and war stories. With the Homeric epics there are hardly any points of contact in terms of content, let alone of composition. Everyone who ascribes the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* to oral poetry should feel duty bound to read this volume first. (The valuable treatise by F. Dirlmeier should be mentioned with special emphasis, *Das serbokroatische Heldenlied und Homer (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, philologisch-historische Klasse, 1971, 1; Heidelberg, 1971)*. Dirlmeier's judgement on Homer and the problem of writing (p. 19), and on the quality of Serbian folk art (p. 29, 'But we do not have high art') are in both cases congruent with the conclusions presented above.)

⁵ *Passim*. On oral poetry and its relationship to Homer cf. the level-headed presentation by Lesky, *RE Suppl.* 11 (1968), 693, 59, esp. 703, 27. The thought that the epics were written down with Homer dictating them has, as is well known, been represented by Raphael on his famous fresco, cf. H. von Einem, *Das Programm der Stanza della Segnatura im Vatikan* (Opladen, 1971), 33.

there was an oral tradition over longer periods of time. But these details are of minor importance. Only the question whether both Homeric epics can be products of genuine oral poetry is important to us. Some suppose that they originated in the same way as the songs of the guslars collected by Parry and Lord, because their language has numerous fixed formulae at its disposal which, if used economically (i.e. if varied as economically as possible), could have been very useful for a poet composing orally. Scholars think that a literate poet must actually have been hindered by them.

On this, I would like to make the following observations. Today it is undisputed that pre-Homeric oral poetry developed a great wealth [180] of formulaic phrases. But this general observation must not tempt us to the conclusion that a Homeric formula (for example ἀργυρότοξος Ἀπόλλων) must be inherited just because it is found frequently in our epics. Even a combination as common as κορυθαίολος Ἑκτωρ which Page tried to prove to be Mycenaean cannot be regarded as pre-Homeric without conclusive argument.⁶ Because of this, it cannot be decided whether the *Iliad* poet composed the famous farewell scene of Book 6 in the shape we have it because the most important Trojan hero had an inherited epithet which suggested to him the conception of Astyanax's fear, or whether it was the planning of the scene that determined the choice, perhaps even the invention, of the epithet. I confess that I regard the latter as more probable, but cannot present definitive arguments. But, *vice versa*, proof that formulae are inherited succeeds only where their linguistic form (e.g. εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς, Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο, μελαινάων ἀπὸ νηῶν)⁷ or perhaps content (e.g. *Il.* 2. 319: Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω) make it possible. Hoekstra⁸ proved in an important investigation that many Homeric words and word combinations can have originated only under the influence of Ionic dialect: metathesis of quantities and loss of the digamma are clear indications of lateness, whereas the free use of

⁶ Cf. D. L. Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad* (Berkeley, 1959), 249. J. B. Hainsworth, 'The Homeric Formula and the Problem of its Transmission', *Institute of Classical Studies London, Bulletin* 9 (1962), 57–68 has already shown that Mycenaean remains in Homeric formulaic language can only be small. Attempts at a distinction between individual and traditional epithets only in Whitman 113.

⁷ These examples after Parry 316. But Parry himself admits the possibility 'that the later poets may have used one of the old words in a new formula'.

⁸ A. Hoekstra, *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes* (Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie, N. R. 71:1, 1965), 1–172. Cf. with this L. E. Rossi, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeiger* 223 (1971), 161 ff.

v-ephelkustikon may have become normal earlier. So the special mixture of Homeric dialect and the formulae coined for it cannot have been in existence for centuries. These results expose the one-sidedness of Parry's system, according to which nearly every word which in the concordances is shown to occur at least twice in the same place in the line has to be regarded as part of an inherited formula.

Parry (301) and Lord (143) identify e.g. οὐλομένην at the beginning of a verse as part of a formula given to the singer because it does not occur just in *Il.* 1. 2 (referring to μῆνιν) but also in *Il.* 5. 876 (referring to κούρην), in *Od.* 17. 287 (referring to γαστέρα) and similarly in *Od.* 17. 474. The meaning of the word is identical only in the last two places, but these are presumably imitations of the *Iliad* references. On what grounds then does it follow that οὐλομένην found twice at the beginning of a verse [181] is a traditional formula, or even part of one? On the same grounds one could claim that the artificially lengthened participle was created only for *Il.* 1. 2 and then picked up again in Book 5. In the place mentioned first, it summarizes the basic theme of the whole poem; in the other it is given an unquestionably original function (Ares describing Aphrodite).⁹ One could at the most think of regarding the so-called unperiodic enjambement which is frequent in Homer as it occurs in *Il.* 1. 2 and 5. 876 as an inheritance from oral poetry.¹⁰

It is even stranger when Lord (143) counts *Iliad* 1. 13–15 as formulaic just because they appear again in lines 372–4 (in Achilles' report). Where is the justification for this procedure? Parry (302) in this case was more restrained, since he also considers *Il.* 1. 16 = 375, and does not call all the word combinations of the four verses formulae at all.¹¹

⁹ This result would not change either if one included the other cases of the participle at the beginning of the verse in the investigation: οὐλομένη (*Il.* 19. 92), οὐλομένης (*Od.* 20. 273), οὐλόμεν' (*Il.* 14. 84; *Od.* 17. 484), οὐλομένων (*Od.* 11. 555). Parry probably left them aside because they are not followed by a relative clause, in *Od.* 18. 273 only after a pronoun (οὐλομένης ἐμέθεν, τῆς τε Ζεὺς δῆλον ἀπηύρα).

¹⁰ Terminology after Parry 262. We call an enjambement (i.e. when a sentence runs on over the end of the period after the 6th catalectic dactyl and thus over the metrical pause into the next verse) 'unperiodic' if the first verse contains an already syntactically completed sentence. On the other hand an enjambement is called 'necessary' if the construction of the sentence in the first verse cannot dispense with the word which runs on. This enjambement is missing in oral poetry (cf. Lord 54) and is twice as rare in Homer as in later Greek epic poets. Cf. further Hainsworth 105.

¹¹ Lord (144), it is true, adds this disarming remark to his analysis of *Il.* 1. 1–15: 'The divisions of the lines do not always agree with those of Parry, and it is very

Only Hainsworth (cf. especially 110) exercises more appropriate caution in dealing with these problems. He acknowledges that in the *Iliad* there are parts which contain relatively few formulaic phrases, and tries to bring this fact into line with his observations about the flexibility of the Homeric formula.¹² He has successfully refuted the erroneous view that the language of the two Homeric epics was mechanically put together solely from formulae (cf. 122). If one follows his suggestions and assumes that the authors of the two epics preserved for us were also able to coin new formulaic phrases, one can support the claim with reference to the many combinations which occur only in the *Odyssey*. Three examples of this: the combination Διὸς μεγάλου (μεγαλοὶ) ἄριστῆς (*Od.* 19. 179, of Minos) can hardly be derived from an old lost song; for obviously the poet had *Il.* 13. 450–1 in mind. One can hardly call the comparison of an especially fine shirt with an onion skin (*Od.* 19. 233 οἶόν τε κρομύοιο λοπὸν κατὰ ἰσχαλέοιο) traditional. Something similar is true of the phrase which occurs three times in the *Odyssey* Κακοῦλιον οὐκ ὀνομαστήν (*Od.* 19. 260 = 597 = 23. 19), a bitter indictment of her fate created specifically for Penelope. But if the poet of the *Odyssey* could create such formulaic [182] combinations, we must grant the same ability to his predecessor as well.¹³

Even the so-called unpermitted hiatuses and the short syllables which take the place of one *longum* (*breves in longo*) do not prove cogently that they could have come into being only through the use of traditional formulaic stock. Parry has shown in a particularly impressive discussion (191–239) that such irregularities originated through the modification (e.g. declension) or combination of formulaic phrases. He says (227): 'There is nothing in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* to indicate that the poet ever refrained from this interchange of formulae, nothing to indicate that he ever replaced them by words of his own finding, as long as he was able to use the old

likely that someone else would divide them in still another way.' But what kind of proof is that which must dispense with clarity from the start? Cf. besides the important remarks by R. Cantarella, 'Omero tra formula e poesia', in *La poesia epica e la sua formazione* (Rome, 1970), 68.

¹² I would just like to note by the way that the sentence (40): 'Despite their generous bulk (27,800 verses) the two Homeric epics cannot be more than a sample of the production of Greek heroic verse in its heyday' (similarly 70) constitutes in this formulation an unproven *petitio principii*.

¹³ Cf. for this the happy formulations of U. Hölscher in the review of Kirk (*Gnomon* 39 (1967), 441).

words to express his thought.' But everything depends on this last condition. For only relatively small parts of our texts, and certainly not the most interesting and valuable ones, can have originated from this game of modifying formulae and parts of formulae, interchanging them, and combining them in new ways. It is impossible for all of those metrical anomalies to be explained in this way.¹⁴ Thus one is forced into the assumption that a brilliant poet had further developed the procedure of the bards and, according to the models learned, formed new combinations, some also with metrical irregularities (cf. Parry 229 and 238 bottom). This is a possibility which would have to be rigorously excluded by anyone who regards the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as combinations of inherited formulae. As long as this cannot be done, there is room for the more natural view that the author of the older poem (Homer) treated the inherited stock of word combinations in a free and original manner.

The idea that the poet fills gaps in the line with formulae is not binding either.¹⁵ For he could consider in advance which of the available formulae and parts of formulae were appropriate for the present context and then construct the verse in such a way that it formed a suitable frame for the best formula. One would imagine that this would be the normal procedure for a poet who is consciously creating. If this were the case, it would be the duty of the interpreter to examine the relation of the formula to its context.

But people raise the objection to this that this is precisely the way the oral poet does not proceed. Only a poet using writing would have felt the stilted formulaic language of epic to be an unnecessary obstacle which he must have jettisoned immediately. This point of view, however, must be put briefly aside until we have considered some further consequences of the thesis of the oral origin of the Homeric poems.

It is particularly instructive to discover from the Serbo-Croatian songs recorded by M. Parry and Lord what opportunities of expressing themselves were at the disposal of those illiterate [183] bards. The length of their songs alone, i.e. the size of their feat of memory, cannot fail to impress the observer. And yet we cannot fail to observe how far removed these products of genuine oral poetry

¹⁴ Whitman's observation is especially important (82): 'The lapses and inconsistencies which dot all oral poetry are remarkably few in Homer, especially considering the size of the poems.'

¹⁵ Cf. for this Hainsworth 57.

are from the Homeric epics. Adam Parry rightly stressed this with great emphasis in an important essay¹⁶ (p. 190): 'The greatness of the *Iliad* cannot be that of any poem composed in the formulaic style examined and described by M. Parry.' The oral poet—this is roughly how we may express it—simply follows the traditional sequence of events, orienting himself by the structural models of the songs known to him (Lord's 'themes'). Actual problems of composition do not exist for him, or do so only in the simplest form. Questions of transition, of change of scene, of parallel developments, of shaping character evenly, of the material being penetrated from a general formulation of a question—all this is not decisive for his kind of account. Even if he were aware of such problems of form, he would hardly be able to pay attention to them in the act of improvisation. But they are fundamental to Homeric epic. The art of exposing, of leading up to, of preparing, of interrupting, of surprising, of tying and untying, is so perfect in both Homeric poems that the assumption has to be ruled out that these complicated and artful connections could have been added by coincidence, so to speak, to the 'formulae' and 'themes' during oral performance. Lord (168) proceeds quite logically when he disputes the significance of an artistic (geometrical or symmetrical) model of composition for an orally created text.¹⁷ But in Homeric epic the symmetrical patterns of structure (ring composition and others) are unmistakable: indeed, they leap to the eye, if only one wants to see them.¹⁸ They cannot be products of improvisation; for while the oral poet proceeds mostly by making associations, it is evident [184] that Homer only rarely does so. Who also would want to believe that Homer's creativity can be compared with the routine of

¹⁶ A. Parry, 'Have we Homer's *Iliad*?', *YCIS* 20 (1966), 177–216. In his reply ('Homer as Oral Poet', *Harv. Stud.* 72 (1967), 1–46) A. B. Lord to my mind did not do justice to A. Parry's exposition. Cf. also Whitman 13 and the points presented by J. B. Hainsworth in the essay 'The Criticism of an Oral Homer' (*JHS* 90 (1970), 90–8), esp. the final words of his exposition.

¹⁷ 'It does not seem likely that the force of the artistic pattern, *qua* artistic pattern, in a traditional oral song would be great enough in itself to cause either the placing or displacing of incidents' (in the polemic against Whitman).

¹⁸ Cf. e.g. D. Lohmann, *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias* (Berlin, 1970) and the literature mentioned there pp. 289 ff., also Clarke 65, and esp. Whitman's 11th chapter (249) where it is explained correctly that ring composition and *hysteron proteron* are already 'building shapes' of oral poetry (one should even say: of natural speech). If Homer handles them in a masterly way, this however does not mean that he composed the *Iliad* during an oral performance.

a card player, an analogy which A. van Gennepe¹⁹ offers to help us understand the technique of the guslars? Again, Radloff's comparison (quoted in Parry 334 n. 1) of the improvising bard with the improviser on the piano cannot explain the origin of the Homeric epics either, since it does not take into account the perfection of their composition. Our *Iliad* could hardly have materialized at all if Homer had proceeded in the way Lord (148) imagines it: 'An oral poet spins out a tale; he likes to ornament, if he has the ability to do so, as Homer, of course, did . . . The story is there and Homer tells it to the end. He tells it fully and with a leisurely tempo . . .'. This judgement²⁰ sounds like something from the Romantic period. At any rate, it does not apply to the authors of *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, because it does not acknowledge their brilliance.

Its limitations become obvious as soon as it is applied to the objects of our examination. Lord (159) thinks that the reference to the legend of the Atridae at the beginning of the *Odyssey* is strange: 'Such a reference to another tale is highly sophisticated and unusual for oral epic.' Lord can understand it only as a reference to a great homecoming epic involving all Greek heroes. But, quite apart from the dubious existence of such a pre-Homeric epic, this does nothing to help us determine the function of such a reference. On the other hand, we know that the references to the return of Agamemnon in our *Odyssey* are firmly linked to the fate of Odysseus. Indeed, the comparison Odysseus–Agamemnon belongs to the basic theme of the whole poem. Of course this is not a 'theme' in the sense of Serbo-Croat oral poetry. Thus Lord draws conclusions from the text before he has interpreted it exhaustively.²¹

Hainsworth's careful investigation moves on quite a different level. Here a clear picture is drawn of the formulaic nature of epic language. We learn that many words could be used only within the framework of fixed formulae, and in this combination were tied to certain places in the verse; that the same formula became mobile through modification, expansion, or separation and distribution of

¹⁹ *La Question d'Homère* (Paris, 1909), quoted in Parry 329. Cf. also Hainsworth 15, 1 who rightly rejects the comparison from his refined method.

²⁰ It is based on the views of Parry (324): 'At no time is he (sc. the singer) seeking words for an idea which has never before found expression, so that the question of originality in style means nothing to him.'

²¹ Cf. incidentally the succinct sentences of K. Reinhardt, *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter* (Göttingen, 1961), 15 f.

its single words to certain other places of the verse²²—indeed, even to two verses (the so-called ‘runover technique’). Hainsworth also [185] stresses the importance of the associations possibly triggered off by formulae. Thus we get to know the tricks (so to speak) which Homer practised as a budding oral poet and which he later developed further for his own particular purposes. But this way of looking at things also has its limitations. Since it cannot be ascertained with sufficient certainty what formulaic material Homer inherited, we cannot establish to what extent he modified and enriched that inherited language. We can only observe that his utterances in the epics handed down to us are subordinated to certain principles of composition. I regard this as decisive: for this criterion cannot be reconciled with the theory of an origin of the Homeric poems from pure improvisation—unless, in order to save Parry’s thesis after all, one introduces with Hainsworth (128) an irrational (and thus uncontrollable) unknown quantity: ‘The role of free creation cannot be ignored, but the talent for free creation is, of course, God-given and is not part of technical craftsmanship.’ We do not want to deny the miracle of Homer’s creativity but feel obliged not to put excessive weight on this unknown quantity. We would be better off if we admitted that the structural connections anchored in the text can be understood only as products of conscious artistic creation.²³ Otherwise it would be impossible to understand why in other parts of the world where oral poetry was cultivated over long periods of time, nothing was produced remotely comparable to the Homeric epics. You look there quite in vain.

People who count the authors of the Homeric epics among the oral composers should also realize that there is another consequence which they can avoid only if they adhere to Lord’s thesis. For if the poems were not written down when they originated, but handed down from bard to bard, they were exposed to far-reaching changes. A. Parry²⁴ demonstrated the probability of a text the size of the *Iliad* being completely transformed after six generations. Nor can we imagine the survival of an oral text in the early period

²² The latter (‘separation’) is the most important instance; for now such expressions too are covered by the concept of formula which do not occur under the same metrical conditions (cf. E. Heitsch, *Gnomon* 42 (1970), 438).

²³ A. Parry’s golden words should be quoted here (*YCIS* 20 (1966), 200 n. 45): ‘No one could seriously argue that the self-revelation of Helen as we have it in Book III (sc. of the *Iliad*) is an automatic creation of the formulaic system.’

²⁴ *YCIS* 20 (1966), 189.

of a tradition in the way U. Hölscher (*Gnomon* 39 (1967), 444) describes it as the handing on of a rehearsed, not improvised, text which the rhapsodes (successors of the *oidoi*) would have to have taken over from their master (the creator of the large epic), and passed on until it was finally written down; for they could not have done without the control [186] imposed by a standard text, fixed in writing. Thus those who begin the history of the transmission of the Homeric epics with a longer period of oral tradition (as Dihle recently) would have to give reasons for the fact that nearly the whole text still shows meaningful relationships but not the modifications and disorganization which are the consequence of uncontrolled transmission.

These considerations forbid us to conclude that it is proven that Homer must have been an oral poet. But if we ask why, if he really used writing, he did not compose without formulae, why e.g. he did not say *Ἐκτωρ* instead of more elaborately *κορυθαίολος Ἐκτωρ*, then we can only answer: because he did not know any other poetry than genuine oral poetry. He grew up with it, and without its rules he could not have done justice to such a demanding verse form. But in the epic which was handed down to us—we restrict ourselves to the *Iliad* in the present discussion—he already stands on a higher plane than the average bard of his time. In a new medium of representation, in the great epic which was fixed in writing (and performed orally afterwards), he gave the impression, by this artificial technique of imitation, that he was still an *αἰδός* of the old time. In the way he archaizes the content, describes heroes, weapons, activities, and divine miracles which supposedly could be encountered in a heroic past, he assimilates his description of an idealized form to that way of singing which in his lifetime was still in vogue but perhaps already beginning to decline.

Nowhere has this peculiar position of the poet of the *Iliad*, poised in the middle between genuine oral poetry and rhapsodic poetry, been described better than in Sir M. Bowra’s great work about heroic poetry.²⁵ His words should stand here:

When we look at Homer’s use of language, a paradox emerges. On the one hand his use of formulae is more extensive, more homogeneous and more governed by rules than any other poetry.²⁶ On the other hand the range of

²⁵ *Heroic Poetry* (London, 1952; 2nd edn. 1961), 240–1, trans. H. G. Schürmann (Stuttgart, 1964). Cf. also Whitman 78.

²⁶ He means the representatives of oral poetry of many nations.

his effects is greater, and his purely poetical achievement is far richer and more subtle than any other heroic poet's. The explanation of this is probably that he stands in the middle of an important change produced by the introduction of writing. That it came in the eighth century we can hardly doubt, and it is quite possible that its special character was determined by a desire to use it to record poetry. In this case we can understand Homer's ambiguous position. Behind him lie centuries of oral performance, largely improvised, with all its wealth of formulae adapted to an exacting metre; these he knows and uses fully. But if he also knows writing and is able [187] to commit his poems to it, he is enabled to give a far greater precision and care to what he says than any improvising poet ever can. Since it is almost impossible to believe that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were ever improvised, and the richness of their poetry suggests some reliance on writing, we may see in them examples of what happens when writing comes to help the oral bard. He continues to compose in the same manner as before, but with a far greater care and effectiveness. He can omit and correct and rearrange and take his time as the improvising poet cannot, and the result is a great enrichment of his texture. Indeed the dazzling use which Homer makes of his traditional formulae is perhaps an indication that he has passed beyond their purely functional use in composition to something that is almost purely poetical. Perhaps he learned his craft in the old tradition, but in his lifetime the alphabet appeared, and he had the insight to see what great advantages it brought in turning the old technique to a nobler and richer purpose.²⁷

The *Iliad*, the older of the epics handed down under Homer's name, is therefore a work artificially stylized in terms of content and language, whose author gives the impression of an 'as if'.²⁸ He only affects the singing of the bards and the historicity of the heroic world. People are the victims of a brilliant deception, if they understand his poetic formulae as evidence of genuine oral poetry without appreciating his conscious artistic purpose.

If these thoughts are correct, one probably cannot claim that a high percentage of Homeric language consists of traditional formulae. It is true that there are groups of words which are regularly used under the same metrical conditions in order to express a cer-

²⁷ Cf. M. Parry's idea of Homer's method of creation (261): 'But Homer put all his trust in a technique of formulas which he accepted without thought of change: it was the traditional style and by it he could put together rapidly and easily his spoken verses.' Cf. also *ibid.* 375.

²⁸ Cf. also U. Hölscher, *Gnomon* 39 (1967), 441: Homer takes over from oral poetry 'only quite generally the possibility of repetition as an epic stylistic device but creates something completely different from it'.

tain thought (formulated after Parry), or there are groups of words which have been modified in the way described by Hainsworth, but these are not necessarily inherited formulae, and they are certainly not combinations which were coined only during performance, but rather magnificent, often original imitations of several basic models provided by improvising predecessors.²⁹ Expressed in Lord's terminology, [188] Homer was thus not an oral poet but an imitator—though an imitator of the highest perfection. His apparently unique ability to develop formulaic phrases into images and coherent sequences of images, an art which continues to be cultivated by the *Odyssey* poet as well (Whitman 121 compares e.g. *Il.* 20. 95 with *Od.* 19. 33–4), also belongs to this sphere of imitation. But Homer does not just draw new word combinations out of the diction of the *aoidoi* but also some entirely novel ideas, conceptions which leave nothing to be desired in terms of originality, especially since their existence is justified only in the context of the particular description. He who admits this will understand that in the development of Greek poetry a truly new beginning was made when Homer's creation began to spread and assert itself, while the old sank into the darkness of the past. One may assume with some justification that the better creations of Homer's predecessors, namely the songs imitated by him, were not bad, at least in comparison with the songs of the guslars. But it is impossible for us to know this. Yet we can understand why eighth-century Greeks did not want to hear the more primitive songs any more when they had fallen under the spell of the master.

On these conditions we may claim that what Dihle (127) says about Hesiod is in fact valid for Homer:

The quota of untraditional expressions which have been formed after the pattern of oral formulae, and the frequency of the metrical displacement of traditional or slightly modified formulae, are so great that one can best explain the breadth of variation by reference to the written composition of the poems. In oral poetry this procedure would be too uneconomical.

Here the following too should be considered: if Hesiod had set himself the task of creating an extensive epic work but did not have any

²⁹ Certainly Homer took over the principle of economy from the practice of oral poetry, i.e. the principle of using the same word combinations under the same conditions in terms of content and metrics. The principle is probably just as natural for a poet who is familiar with writing and relying on new formations as for a bard who composes orally. Cf. L. E. Rossi, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeiger* 223 (1971), 167.

ambition to express new observations and modern thoughts in original phrases, we would find more Homeric 'formulae' in his work. In Hesiod's case too it is the special situation, articulated more simply, the new kind of purpose, which has forced a modification of older modes of expression.

Now as far as word-forms and word-usage are concerned, the *Odyssey* stands between the *Iliad* and Hesiod. Its poet was still able to describe many things in the same phrases as his predecessor, but quite a few things demanded new modes of description—not just new words and new formulae but also different dispositions of the facts. This is sufficiently understood and need not be explained here.³⁰ Our concern is with the simple conclusion which goes as follows: [189] an epic poet who is always striving to set old word combinations in different relations to their surroundings, or even to coin new ones, cannot be denied the right to go his own way if he regards this as necessary. The peculiarity of the language of the ending of the *Odyssey* is not denied by what follows—nothing would be more wrong than that. Rather it will be shown that the unique expressions that occur in this ending can be reconciled with modes of expression common to epic as long as one bears in mind the special circumstances of so complicated an action.³¹ Those who are not prepared to do this, but consider only individual passages, should (to be fair) admit that they can make similarly one-sided examinations of all parts of the epic, as long as they do not concern themselves with typical scenes.

It would be methodologically justifiable to put the following passages in order according to subject groups: for Page's list of alleged offences against epic diction indeed combines important and justified reservations with quite trivial things, even obvious mistakes. However, clarity would suffer in a grouping according to degrees of importance; some repetitions could not be avoided. I therefore choose the simpler option and will discuss the passages dealt with by Page in the order in which they occur in the poem. The discussion of some questions of content has been included in this list only because Page also put them in his list. The actual problems of composition are to be discussed in the next chapter.

³⁰ Cf. esp. Whitman 286, 293, above all 295.

³¹ So the concern can only be to prove that what has been rebuked as 'anti-traditional' is merely 'untraditional'.

Od. 23. 321: Page (103) subjects the abstract word *πολυμηχανίη* to censorship as follows: 'a singularly unsuccessful novelty, not to be found again before Plutarch'. The following needs to be said about this. The *Odyssey* is rich in novel abstracts. In this case, the origin of the new formation is particularly transparent; for *ἀμήχανος* (*Il.* 13. 726 *et al.*) is in the same relationship to *ἀμηχανίη* (*Od.* 9. 295) as *πολυμήχανος*³² to *πολυμηχανίη*. Also *ἀμηχανίη* is found only in the place quoted. The one new formation is as successful as the other (cf. already Spohn 157). But the fact that the noun *πολυμηχανία* does not occur again until Plutarch does not argue against Homeric origin. It could be a consequence of our incomplete knowledge of Greek literature. But even if we disregard this, it makes no difference; for quite a few Homeric words are not used subsequently. Or did Page want to characterize Plutarch as a lover of unfortunate word formations?

23. 326: ἦδ' ὡς Σειρήνων ἀδινάων φθόγγον ἄκουσεν. On this, Page (102): 'Σ' ἀδινάων is an almost, if not quite, meaningless expression; the author has [190] misunderstood the Epic usages of this adjective.' This judgement follows statements by Spohn (183). In the article *ἀδινός* in *Lfgre* (as in Ebeling's *Lexicon Homericum*) a meaning 'singing loudly' is given. But this can hardly be proven. The author's (V. Pisani) categories of meaning are: (1) 'thronging'; (2) 'repeatedly', 'continuous . . .'; then also 'loud', finally 'singing loudly' (the sirens); (3) 'violently' (beating, of the heart).³³ It is true that the translation 'loud, singing loudly' is able to refer to Buttman's learned article in his *Lexilogus* (4th edn., Berlin, 1865, i. 193), but it can be brought into line with the transparent etymology of the word only with difficulty.³⁴ On the other hand, all the passages in which 'loudness' could be meant are in line with the sense which corresponds to the etymology 'thronging densely, plentiful, repeated, intensive'. Compare *ἀδινού ἐξήρχε γόοιο* (*Il.* 18. 316, 22. 430, 23. 17, 24. 747); *ἀδινὸν στοναχῆσαι* (*Il.* 18. 124; similarly *Od.* 4. 721, 10. 413); *ἀδινὰ στεναχίζων* (*Il.* 23. 225, similarly 24. 123; *Od.* 7. 274, 24. 317); *κλαί' ἀδινά* (*Il.* 24. 510); *ἀδινῶς ἀνεείκατο* (*Il.* 19. 314). The possibility that great loudness is indicated is not

³² In the vocative (*πολυμήχαν'*) it is a standing epithet of Odysseus' in both epics.

³³ The third claim only refers to *Il.* 16. 481 and *Od.* 19. 516. The translation assumed by Pisani is controversial. But the question is not important for our purposes.

³⁴ Cf. Frisk, *GEW* i. 21 s.v. *ᾄδην*.

mentioned in the scholia either. Several times these even suggest the opposite, cf. the scholion to *Il.* 18. 316a (ex., with testimonies) while Aristarchus (cf. the exegetic scholion to *Il.* 22. 430) explains the gloss with ἀθρόος.

The genitive used in *Od.* 23. 326 has its formal model in *Il.* 2. 87 (ἔθνεα εἰσι μελισσάων ἀδινάων) or in 2. 469 (μυιάων ἀδινάων ἔθνεα πολλά). Here already the ancient school commentaries understood correctly, cf. schol. D to *Il.* 2. 87: τῶν ἄδην καὶ ἀθρόως πετομένων. παρὰ τὸ ἄδην. διὸ καὶ δασύνεται, namely 'flying in a dense throng'. When in *Od.* 23. 326 φθόγγος Σειρήνων ἀδινάων is mentioned, this probably must have meant the voice of 'the sirens who are singing continually',³⁵ for singing is the characteristic occupation of these creatures. This view is not only logical but also appropriate to the subject matter; for the sirens are dangerous precisely in that they do not stop singing when a victim has come within range of their tempting voices. According to the imagination of our poet, they make a high-pitched, penetrating song (cf. *Od.* 12. 183 λιγυρὴν δ' ἔντυνον ἀοιδήν) sound continually with a sweet tone (cf. *Od.* 12. 187 μελίγηρυν . . . ὄπα).³⁶ Perhaps the use of the [191] adjective ἀδινός in the meaning intended here was promoted by *Od.* 16. 216, where the sharpness and duration of the plaintive cry are connected with each other (father and son are the subject in hand): κλαῖον δὲ λιγέως, ἀδινώτερον ἢ τ' οἶωνοί etc.³⁷ Ameis-Hentze-Cauer (on *Od.* 23. 326), whose explanation Page quotes to confirm his judgement, are right in starting from the basic meaning 'densely thronged' to understand our passage. But they should not have claimed, without evidence, that the adjective had here possibly become the epithet of the song of the sirens 'by a misunderstanding of the late poet'.³⁸ They obviously refer to a misunderstanding only because this is common in discussions about the language of *Odyssey* 23 and 24. But the survey of meanings presented above does not contain any unusual leaps. It gives us the right to reject Page's reservations.

³⁵ Apollonius Soph. 9. 6 also understands it this way (συνεχῶς ἀδουσῶν); cf. also the schol. to *Il.* 23. 17.

³⁶ Cf. also Stanford ad loc.: 'It is not entirely impossible that something of the kind is meant by H. there (i.e. in *Il.* 2. 87 and 469) and here—"the eversinging Sirens".'

³⁷ Cf. Ameis-Hentze-Cauer: ἀδινώτερον 'in a denser sequence', 'more continuous'. Stanford: 'more intensely'.

³⁸ 'Here it has become (perhaps through a misunderstanding of the later poet?) the epithet of the singing ones. We must take the expression with φθόγγον: the uninterrupted voice.'

23. 330: φολόεντι κεραυνῶ and 24. 539: φολόεντα κεραυνόν. The noun κεραυνός in other places is linked with the adjective χαλεπός (only *Il.* 14. 417) or ἀργής. At the end of a verse only the formulae ἀργήτα κεραυνόν (*Il.* 8. 133), ἀργήτι κεραυνῶ (*Od.* 5. 128, 131; 7. 249; 12. 387), and the two combinations mentioned above appear. There the combination ἀργήτα κεραυνόν or ἀργήτι κεραυνῶ respectively is used for the sequence --○○--, the combination φολόεντα κεραυνόν or φολόεντι κεραυνῶ respectively for the verse end ○○--○○--. It is probably not too bold a conclusion to say that the poet did not have any use for the formula φολόεντι (-α) κεραυνῶ (-όν) in Books 1–22, quite apart from the fact that lightning is not often mentioned. Page's objection (102) that φολοίς is alien to Homeric language is thus unfounded. The verse in Hesiod, *Th.* 515 (εἰς Ἐρεβος κατέπεμψε βαλὼν φολόεντι κεραυνῶ) is obviously an imitation of *Odyssey* 23. 330; for the epithet is an original modification of the phrase known from 5. 128, a luxury so to speak: ἀργήτι κεραυνῶ could really have stood just as well while this was impossible in 23. 330 (or 24. 539 respectively). Obviously it was the meaning ('sooty') which mattered to Hesiod.

23. 347: αὐτίκ' ἀπ' Ὠκεανοῦ χρυσόθρονον ἡριγένειαν | ὤρσεν. Page (102) objects that ἡριγένεια is treated as a noun whereas it usually stands next to ἥως as an adjective. He has to admit, however, that the same usage can be quoted in 22. 197 (οὐδέ σέ γ' ἡριγένεια παρ' Ὠκεανοῖο ῥοάων | λήσει ἀνερχομένη χρυσόθρονος) (thus already Stanford ad loc.). So this is not a peculiarity of the author of verses 23. 297 ff. Besides we know ἡριγένεια as an adjective especially from the formulaic verse ἦμος δ' ἡριγένεια φάνη [192] ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως (the verse occurs twice in the *Iliad*, 20 times in the *Odyssey*). Besides, the adjective is found in *Il.* 8. 508, *Od.* 12. 3 and 13. 94 (Ἥως ἡριγενείης), and further in *Od.* 4. 195, where it is separated from the noun to which it belongs by the end of the verse ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἥως | ἔσσεται ἡριγένεια). So the two passages castigated by Page are to be set against five formulations in which ἡριγένεια is a pure adjective. As a result, the unusualness of the usage in *Od.* 22. 197 and 23. 347 is considerably reduced. One should also ask, particularly in this case, whether we have an overview of all the material. Presumably the bards had other formulae at their disposal for expressing sunrise, among which there may have been phrases with ἡριγένεια used as a noun.

23. 361: The lengthening ἐπιτέλλω (σοὶ δέ, γύναι, τόδ' ἐπιτέλλω πινυτῇ περ εἰούση), as Page (102) and Kirk (249) state correctly after Spohn (244) and Monro, contradicts the rules of Homeric prosody; for metrical lengthening is permitted only where the form in question cannot be avoided in the hexameter. The attempt of a Ryland papyrus from the third century AD and of the *editio princeps* to write ἐπιστέλλω instead condemns itself, since this verb is not poetic. Besides, the poet introduces Odysseus' speech with the words (*Od.* 23. 349): . . . ἀλόχῳ δ' ἐπὶ μῦθον ἔτελλεν, to which he refers back in 23. 361. But the conjecture that such an exceptional form suggests—that there was a later poet—is not plausible: Homer's successors in particular would have kept to the well-known rules, if necessary by sacrificing subtleties of content, especially since familiar formulations for expressing the intended thought offered themselves, for instance σοὶ δ' αὐτῇ τόδ' ἐγὼν ἐπιτέλλομαι ἥδ' ἐκελεύω (after *Il.* 19. 192).³⁹ Since an explanation cannot be found within the scope of the rules of metrical lengthening known to us, this is probably an author's error. Two possibilities offer themselves by way of explanation:

1. A poet who knew nothing about the digamma and handed down its effects only in traditional or imitated formulae could have inferred from the beginning of a verse μῆνιν ἀποειπῶν (*Il.* 19. 35) that it was permitted to scan as a *longum* the short final syllable of the prefix to a verb. This suggested itself all the more since the *Odyssey* is familiar with a lengthened final syllable of the preposition ἐπί (12. 209: οὐ μὲν δὴ τότε μείζον ἔπι κακόν, lengthening according to rule). So the combination τόδ' ἐπιτέλλω (υυ---), which could not be avoided because of the beginning and the ending of the verse (σοὶ δέ, γύναι and πινυτῇ περ εἰούση) [193] could be regarded as permissible.⁴⁰ One could well imagine that a poet who has allowed himself prosodic peculiarities like Διονύσου (υυ---, *Od.* 11. 325)⁴¹ and οὐδόν (instead of ὀδόν, -υ, 17. 196) (cf. also 6.

³⁹ σοὶ δέ, γύναι, τόδε νῦν ἐπιτέλλομαι ἥδ' ἐκελεύω would also be conceivable (in order to keep the beginning of the verse). However, one gets into difficulties straight away if one wants to keep the traditional end of the verse, πινυτῇ περ εἰούση, i.e. the reference to Penelope's cleverness.

⁴⁰ The frequent normal lengthenings of the final syllable of the prefix ἐπι may have had an effect, cf. e.g. from: *Od.* 7: ἐπιτρέψειεν 149; ἐπικρήσαι 164; ἐπιπλόμενον 261; ἐπισκύσσαιτο 306.

⁴¹ Cf. G. A. Privitera, *Dioniso in Omero* (Rome, 1970), 77. The author tries to my mind in vain to perceive in the prosody of Book 11 of the *Odyssey* the effect of a pre-Homeric formula.

45 ἀννέφελος and 9. 490 καταννέων) might make this or a similar association. But I consider the second possibility as more likely.

2. Stanford has referred to *Od.* 16. 297 (ἐπιθύσαντες, υ---υ). Admittedly, this is no genuine analogy to ἐπιτέλλω; for in 16. 297 we have a compound of ἰθύω. But it is uncertain whether the poet recognized it as such. He read the same compound in *Il.* 18. 175 (Τρῶες ἐπι-ιθύουσιν), but in addition knew phrases like περὶ πρὸ γὰρ ἔγχεϊ θύεν (*Il.* 11. 180, 16. 699), οἷδαυι θύων (21. 234), ὑψόσε θύων (21. 324, of Scamander), and above all οὗς ἔκτανες ἔγχεϊ θύων (22. 272). How could he save himself from the temptation of using ἐπι-ἰθύω like ἐπι-θύω? He would have had to have been aware that the simplex ἰθύω with a similar meaning appears nine times in the *Iliad*. This at any rate did not exactly suggest itself, especially since the language of the *Odyssey* contains the verb only twice, each time linked with an infinitive and only with the meaning 'to be about to'.⁴² So the opportunity to interpret the available compound ἐπι-ἰθύω as ἐπι-θύω was there—in fact it practically begged to be used. If this is correct, then what we have found in *Od.* 16. 297 is a model which, in a metrical dilemma, made the unusual lengthening ἐπιτέλλω possible for the poet. We need have no recourse to a later poet who knew less about versification.

Od. 24. 40: In the underworld, Agamemnon's soul praises that of Achilles as lucky because Achilles fell before Troy, and a hard battle flared up about his corpse: σὺ δ' ἐν στροφάλιγγι κονίης | κείσο μέγας μεγαλωστί, λελασμένος ἵπποσυνάων. The poet of the *Iliad* ends the tale of the battle for the corpse of Cebriones with the same words (*Od.* 24. 40 = *Il.* 16. 776, here κείτο, not κείσο). Page (103) regards the repetition of the verse in *Od.* 24 as inappropriate: '... to apply such an expression to Achilles would be unthinkable in the older Epic.' He says that only Tryphiodorus (629) had repeated the error.

It is true that the genitive ἵπποσυνάων in *Il.* 16. 776 refers to Hector's charioteer. So the art of steering a chariot must be meant, just as in *Il.* 23. 289 (of Eumelus) and in 23. 307 (of [194] Antilochus). Here in Book 23 of the *Iliad*, by the way, the skill is praised in two heroes who otherwise appear as hoplites.⁴³ So every

⁴² *Od.* 11. 591: τῶν ὁπότε ἰθύσει ὁ γέρον (scil. Tantalus) ἐπὶ χερσὶ μάσασθαι and 22. 408: ἰθυσέν β' ὀλοῦξαι (sc. Eurycleia).

⁴³ Eumelus may also be counted among the *promachoi* since he is the leader of a contingent, cf. *Il.* 2. 713-14.

nobleman had to be able to function as a charioteer simply because he wanted to participate in the races. The noun *ἵπποσύνη* however does not describe this art alone but nearly as frequently the skill of fighting from a chariot. This is clearly obvious from *Il.* 11. 503: *Ἐκτωρ μὲν μετὰ τοῖσιν ὁμίλει, μέρμερα ῥέζων | ἔγχεϊ θ' ἵπποσύνη τε* (the charioteer is Cebriones). Similarly *Il.* 4. 303 (Nestor to those fighting from chariots): *μηδὲ τις ἵπποσύνη τε καὶ ἡγορέηφι πεποιθὼς | οἶος πρόσθ' ἄλλων μεμάτω Τρώεσσι μάχεσθαι*. We also have to understand *Il.* 16. 809 like this where it is said of Euphorbus: *ὃς ἡλικίην ἐκέκαστο | ἔγχεϊ θ' ἵπποσύνη τε πόδεσσι τε καρπαλίμοισι*, i.e. 'with the spear, in fighting from chariots and in running' (Rupé).⁴⁴

Our conclusion may now be: the poet of *Odyssey* 24 probably took over verse 16. 776 of the *Iliad*, but he linked the genitive *ἵπποσυνάων* with the idea of a chariot fighter, which was quite appropriate for Achilles.⁴⁵ Such procedures can be observed everywhere in the *Odyssey*. One may call it a principle of living mimesis. It is certainly wrong to want to force the unchanged meaning of the model onto the imitation too. Naturally one must try to do this if one wants to see a bad poet in an imitator. But in doing this one abandons the path of unprejudiced interpretation.

24. 60: 'All the nine Muses' lament in antiphonal singing the greatest hero of the Greeks (*Μοῦσαι δ' ἐννέα πάσαι ἀμειβόμεναι ὀπὶ καλῇ | θρήνεον*). The *Odyssey* otherwise knows only one single ('the') Muse, the *Iliad* several, in an indefinite number. The canon of the nine Muses (and their names) is not mentioned before Hesiod (*Th.* 57. 76). From these facts, Page (103) concludes that in *Od.* 24. 60 there is 'a numeration alien to the Homeric tradition'. The reader is tempted to assume that verse 60 of Book 24 is composed under Hesiodic influence.

But we should ask ourselves: Why did Hesiod invent names for precisely nine Muses? That this is his invention is hardly doubted by anyone today.⁴⁶ But however magnificent his [195] creation of

⁴⁴ Cf. also the explaining verses *Il.* 16. 810–11!

⁴⁵ That neither *Il.* 16. 775–6 nor *Od.* 24. 39–40 have anything to do with the allegedly pre-Homeric *Aithiopis* has been shown by Hölscher, *Gnomon* 27 (1955), 395 and Dihle 23.

⁴⁶ Cf. P. Friedländer, 'Das Prooimion der Theogonie', in *Studien zur antiken Literatur und Kunst* (Berlin, 1969), 75; Wilamowitz, *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin, 1916), 468 and 474; Solmsen, *Hesiod and Aeschylus* (New York, 1949), 39; M. L. West on Hesiod *Th.* 76.

names may be,⁴⁷ the number nine is not demanded by the subject-matter (the function of the Muses). One must therefore assume that it was given to the poet; for other numbers would have suggested themselves much more readily. Three Muses were worshipped at Helicon, in Delphi, and also in Sicyon (cf. Plut. *Mor.* 744c and 746e). The epic poet Eumelus also (fr. 17, *EGF* 195) knew three Muses, Epicharmus (fr. 41 K.) seven, and the numbers four and five also have supporters.⁴⁸ If Hesiod disregarded all these possibilities, especially the numbers three and seven consecrated by cult,⁴⁹ one must believe that he felt committed to a respected model in which precisely nine Muses were mentioned. In order not to have to regard the Second Nekyia as older than the *Theogony*, one could talk about an epic tradition unknown to us. But this would be methodologically contestable; for it is not permitted to prefer a hypothetical tradition to an extant text, as long as it has not been proved that the extant text's statement belongs to a later time.

The modern objection against *Od.* 24. 60, that the Homeric epic is not familiar with the number nine for the Muses, goes back to Aristarchus, cf. schol. *Od.* 24. 1 (p. 725, 10 Ddf.): *ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἀριθμεῖν τὰς Μοῦσας οὐχ Ὀμηρικόν*, similarly T to *Il.* 24. 720: *ἀθετητέος δὲ ὁ Μουσῶν ἐπ' Ἀχιλλεῖ θρήνος*. But this argument is bad: for its author does not consider that only in this passage particular emphasis is supposed to be placed on the fact that, on this most solemn occasion, a large but surveyable number of divine female singers is appearing (*Μοῦσαι δ' ἐννέα πάσαι*). For such purposes the epic has the number nine at its disposal. Its individual members can under certain circumstances be enumerated by name (cf. *Il.* 2. 591–4, 7. 161–8, 8. 261–6, 24. 249–52), a procedure which e.g. in the catalogue of Nereids in Book 18 of the *Iliad* can no longer be carried out. Nine, then, is a typical number in Homer.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ But cf. B. Snell, *Die Entdeckung des Geistes* (Hamburg, 3rd edn. 1955), 67, where Hesiod's authorship is disputed.

⁴⁸ Cf. in detail M. Mayer, *RE* 16, 1 (1933), 687, 50 s.v. Musai C.

⁴⁹ That the number seven for the Muses is older than nine is assumed with reason by W. H. Roscher, *Die Sieben- und Neunzahl im Kultus und Mythos der Griechen* (Abhandlungen der Königlichen Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften 24; Leipzig, 1904), 19, 35, 71. Anyhow groups of nine are not frequent in cult and myth.

⁵⁰ Cf. J. W. S. Blom, *De typische getallen bij Homeros en Herodotos I* (Nijmegen, 1936), 259; G. Germain, *Homère et la mystique des nombres* (Paris, 1954), 13 ('le nombre 9 sert essentiellement à exprimer un temps'), 17 ('c'est par 9 que l'on présente groupes des êtres vivants, en particulier . . . des hommes'), 27, 29, 32, 34, 44, 78; further D. Fehling, *Die Quellenangaben bei Herodot* (Berlin, 1971), 155.

Aristarchus had already recognized Homer's special liking for the number nine, cf. Aristonicus on *Il.* 6. 174: ὅτι ἐπιφόρος ἐστὶ πρὸς τὸν ἐννέα ἀριθμόν, similarly T on *Il.* 12. 25. In both epics, periods of time and persons in particular are understood in groups of nine, but less frequently animals, measures, countries, places, and [196] other objects. I here give the references, but do not consider the so-called hidden enneads⁵¹ which can be found in Blom.

1. *Iliad. Periods of Time:* For nine days the plague rages in the army (1. 53); nine (scil. long) years have passed since the beginning of the war (2. 134); for nine days Iobates is host to Bellerophontes before he asks him about his wishes (6. 174); for nine nights Phoenix is guarded by his relatives (9. 470); the rivers need nine days in order to destroy the Greeks' wall at Poseidon's and Apollo's instructions (12. 25); for nine years Hephaestus forges precious jewellery for the sea goddesses Thetis and Eurynome (18. 400); for nine days the gods quarrel over Hector's corpse (24. 107); for nine days the daughters of Niobe lie in their blood (24. 610); for nine days Hector is supposed to be mourned (24. 664); and for nine days wood is gathered for the funeral pyre (24. 784). *Persons:* Nine heralds keep the assembled warriors in check (2. 96–7); three times nine men are killed by Patroclus in the last onslaught (16. 785); cf. besides the references already given above 7. 161, 8. 261, 24. 249. *Animals:* Nine sparrows are devoured by the snake in Aulis (2. 313, cf. 327); nine dogs follow the four shepherds on the shield made by Hephaestus (18. 578); nine dogs are owned by Achilles (23. 173), and the armour of Glaucus is as valuable as nine head of cattle (6. 236). Further, nine ships (2. 654) and once nine cubits (24. 270) are mentioned. Cf. also 2. 591 (already mentioned above).

2. *Odyssey.* For nine days Odysseus travels with his ships in order to get from Cape Malea to the land of the lotus eaters (9. 82); nine days and nine nights is the time the voyage takes from Aeolus' island to the mountains of Ithaca (10. 28); for nine days after his shipwreck Odysseus drifts to the island of Calypso (12. 447, cf. 7. 253); and nine days the beggar claims to have spent on the ocean sitting astride a plank (14. 314). Apart from this, the nine years' duration of the Trojan War is mentioned four times (3. 118, 5. 107, 14. 240, 22. 228). Nine judges supervise the games of the Phaeacians (8. 258); each ship's crew kills nine goats (9. 160); in nine rows of seats

⁵¹ i.e. series of nines of different kinds, groups of nine verses and similar things.

the people is assembled on the shore of Pylos and in each row nine bulls (i.e. 81 altogether) are sacrificed (3. 7–8, cf. above *Il.* 2. 591–4 where the nine cities subject to Nestor are enumerated); the size and breadth of the nine-year-old giant children Otos and Ephialtes are measured in nines (11. 311–12; cf. Germain, *Homère et la mystique des nombres*, 23); the body of Tityus stretches over nine plethra (11. 577); the beggar claims to have owned nine warships before the expedition to Troy (14. 230) and he claims to have fitted out nine ships many years previously for the voyage to Egypt (14. 248).

[197] For our purposes *Il.* 7. 161 is especially important: οἱ δ' ἐννέα πάντες ἀνέσταν 'but they got up, nine altogether'. Aristarchus remarks, not badly, that πάντες is redundant in terms of content. The exegetic scholium to the passage (ad *Il.* 7. 161b) mentions another opinion: πλεονάζει τὸ "πάντες". οὐ γάρ, ὡς τινες, οἱ ἅπαντες ἐννέα. So these interpreters understood 'all nine' as if there had been no other *promachoi* apart from the ones mentioned in the text.⁵² There are no ancient explanations of our passage, *Od.* 24. 60. But one can state with some certainty that the poet wanted to say that a large number of goddesses appeared for Achilles' funeral rites, so 'nine altogether' (Stanford 'nine in all'). But for a later poet who wanted to fix the number of the Muses and announce their names (as the symbol of their essence), there was nothing which prevented him from interpreting the phrases of the verse in the same way as the ancient interpreters just mentioned understood the similar expression in *Il.* 7. 161, i.e. as 'all the nine Muses'. Hesiod could have interpreted in such a way.

If our analysis is conclusive, the consequences are as follows:

1. The poet of the *Nekyia* uses a typical number.
2. He wants to indicate a quantity appropriate for the situation, but does not want to fix the number of the Muses. His formulation does not involve him in a contradiction with other statements in the epic.
3. The predicatively used *πάσαι* could be understood attributively. Thus 24. 60 fulfils all the requirements which one would expect from a model of Hesiod's verses *Th.* 57 and 76.

⁵² The scholiast refutes their opinion with the reference to the phrase δέκα πάντα τάλαντα (*Il.* 19. 247, 24. 232) where indeed 'ten talents altogether' must also be understood.

The use of nine as a typical number in epic is a hard fact. Page should have taken note of this and not pushed it aside with a disparaging remark.⁵³

24. 88–9: ὅτε κέν ποτ' ἀποφθιμένου βασιλῆος | ζώννυνται τε νέοι καὶ ἐπεντύωνται⁵⁴ ἄεθλα. Page (103) calls the first verb mentioned (ζώννυνται) 'an unlikely subjunctive form' because the two comparable subjunctives are δαινύη (*Od.* 8. 243 and 19. 328). W. Schulze⁵⁵ wanted to write δαίνυαι in the place mentioned first and δαίνῦ (αι) in the second.⁵⁶ He thus regarded the type δαινύη with the long vowel as later [198] than the subjunctive represented by ζώννυνται. This belongs to a group of athematic subjunctives 'whose distinguishing vowel shows the vowel length of the indicative form' (Schwyzer i. 792 with references of epichoric origin). Certainty cannot be achieved in the judgement of the subjunctive appearing in *Od.* 24. 89 because there is no more evidence than the references mentioned. In line with the thematic inflection of athematic verbs one expects the subjunctive ζωννύνωνται with a metrically lengthened *υ* but it is very doubtful whether such a formation would deserve precedence over the traditional ζώννυνται (cf. the forms quoted by Schwyzer from Arcadian and Lesbian). So there is possibly an archaism here. In any case, the reference does not permit any conclusions about the time of its origin.⁵⁷

24. 111–13: Agamemnon's soul asks that of Amphimedon who is entering Hades with the shades of the other suitors: 'Did Poseidon destroy you at sea?'

ἦ που ἀνάρσιοι ἄνδρες ἐδηλήσαντ' ἐπὶ χέρσου 111
βοῦς περιταμνομένους ἦδ' οἰῶν πώεα καλά,
ἦ ἐπεὶ πτόλιος μαχεούμενοι ἦδ' ἐ γυναικῶν; 113

Verses 109–13 are derived from *Od.* 11. 399–403. There Odysseus wants to know from Agamemnon's soul: 'Did Poseidon destroy you at sea?'

⁵³ Page 103: 'Some have alleged that our poet need not be charged with believing that the number of the Muses was nine: out of an unspecified total number (they suggest), nine are mentioned here merely because nine is a convenient and favorite number in Epic verse. It is difficult to imagine how special pleading could go further.'

⁵⁴ ἐπεντύωνται Thiersch, ἐπεντύονται codd. (thus also Stanford).

⁵⁵ *Quaest. ep.* 331.

⁵⁶ Cf. Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* i. 458.

⁵⁷ In literature a corresponding subjunctive cannot be found before Hipponax (fr. 25, 4 D. = 34, 4 M.) (ῥηγνύται; the form, conjectured instead of the traditional ῥίγννται, is probably secure in spite of weak manuscript testimony).

ἦέ σ' ἀνάρσιοι ἄνδρες ἐδηλήσαντ' ἐπὶ χέρσου 401
βοῦς περιταμνομένον ἦδ' οἰῶν πώεα καλά,
ἦ ἐπεὶ πτόλιος μαχεούμενον ἦδ' ἐ γυναικῶν; 113

i.e. '... or did hostile men do you harm on the mainland while you were trying to cut off cattle and beautiful flocks of sheep or were perhaps fighting for a city and for women?' (after Schadewaldt).

The changes in Book 24⁵⁸ concern only three words: ἦ που (111) instead of ἦέ σε, περιταμνομένους (112) instead of περιταμνόμενον, and [199] μαχεούμενοι (113) instead of μαχεούμενον. Thus in the last case, evidently for metrical reasons, the participle is made to agree not with the object but with the subject. Page (103) sees a grave shortcoming in this formulation: 'Hence μαχεούμενοι here, agreeing with the *subject* of the main verb, to the great confusion of the whole sentence.' Is this reproach justified?

Odysseus enumerates several possibilities—a storm at sea, stealing of flocks, or an attack on a hostile city. That the participle μαχεούμενον (*Od.* 11. 403) could be understood as describing the defender is perhaps linguistically possible, but it is virtually excluded in Agamemnon's case.⁵⁹ Book 24 contains the same number of possibilities, but the question how μαχεούμενοι should be understood is immediately answered through the new agreement: 'Did enemies destroy you when you wanted to steal their flocks or when they were fighting with you (scil. in a defensive fight) for their city and their women?' In the modified form, too, the text leaves no doubt that the suitors are meant as the aggressors in the fight for the city. Thus the poet made a virtue out of the problem posed by the verse even though the sentence did not turn out very elegantly. There is no reason to talk about a 'great confusion'.

Page calls μαχεούμενον (or μαχεούμενοι respectively) a linguistic monster ('a unique monster'). This is also unjustified. It is true that there is not a linguistically accepted explanation of the form

⁵⁸ The verses *Od.* 11. 399–403 were deleted by Aristophanes Byz. (and perhaps also by Aristarchus, cf. Ludwich, *AHT* i. 590. 22; Page 103 imprecisely). If one accepts this deletion then Odysseus' question consists of a meagre two lines (11. 397–8). But these do not correspond to the passionate answer of the murdered man (cf. also Besslich 30). Odysseus must mention several possibilities without being able to hit the right one. So the deletion is certainly wrong. But it justifies the assumption that the Alexandrians saw the better formulation in the verses of Book 24 (Aristophanes Byz. does not seem to have deleted the second Nekyia).

⁵⁹ For μάχομαι περί τινος describing the attacker cf. *Il.* 18. 265 (of Achilles): ἀλλὰ περί πτόλιός τε μαχήσεται ἦδ' ἐ γυναικῶν (Ameis–Hentze–Cauer).

μαχεούμενος.⁶⁰ But Witte's conjecture should recommend itself, that the phrase of verse 11. 403 *περὶ πτόλιος μαχεούμενον ἦδὲ γυναικῶν*, cf. 24. 113) was formed on the model of passages like *Il.* 18. 265 (*περὶ πτόλιός τε μαχήσεται ἦδὲ γυναικῶν*), similar to *μαχεούμενος κτεάτεσσι* (*Od.* 17. 471) being formed after *μαχισόμενος Δαναοῖσιν* (*Il.* 17. 146).⁶¹

As in *Od.* 24. 40, the imitation of a known model offers no ground for conjecturing that it must have been made by a later or even a bad poet.

24. 208: No conclusions can be drawn about the noun *κλίσιον* ('out-house, columned hall', Lat. *vinea*), since there was no opportunity to use it anywhere earlier in the epic. Dorotheus [200] of Ascalon dedicated a whole book of his *Λεξέων συναγωγή* to this word (cf. Porph. 2. 132. 1; further testimonies in Spohn 145–53). Cf. incidentally Frisk, *GEW* i. 874.

24. 231: *αἰγείην κυνέην κεφαλῇ ἔχε, πένθος ἀέξων*. Page (109) translates: 'He had a goatskin cap on his head, *thus* (or, *because he was*) *cherishing his grief*.' One is at first tempted to assume that the words after the bucolic diaeresis are corrupt. But the violently differing conjectures should already make us suspicious. Compare: *πνίγος ἀλέξων*, Schulze; *ψῦχος ἀλέξων*, Bérard; *αἶθος ἀλέξων*, Schadewaldt. Besides J. Dingel⁶² has proved that Euripides took the received text into account in his *Electra* (55–8), thus understanding the wearing of a goatskin cap to be a demonstration [of grief]. This changed interpretation is admittedly only meant for the theatre, but it contains a correct core; for it is evident that the old man, in his despair, is intensifying his pain, cf. 11. 195–6 (Anticleia is speaking): *ἐνθ' ὃ γε κεῖτ' ἀχέων, μέγα δὲ φρέσι πένθος ἀέξει, | σὸν νόστον ποθέων*. Not inappropriately has Stanford (with reference to Hayman) compared Laertes with a Heautontimorumenos. Page was badly advised when he exclaimed: 'Such desperate remedies are certainly called for.'

⁶⁰ Cf. W. F. Wyatt Jr., *Metrical Lengthening in Homer* (Rome, 1969), 135.

⁶¹ Cf. K. Witte, *RE* 8. 2 (1913), 2224, 64 s.v. Homeros Nr. 1. The participle **μαχεόμενος* presupposed in both lengthened forms can also be justified through reference to *μαχέοιτο* (*Il.* 1. 272). Both lengthenings obey the rule, cf. Schulze, *Quaest. ep.* 363, Meister, *HK* 37. Incidentally the scholiast to *Od.* 11. 403 (Hrd. 2. 152. 5) noted the peculiarity of the form *μαχεούμενον* without being able to explain it satisfactorily with his means: *παράλογος ἢ διαίρεσις. θέλει γὰρ εἰπεῖν μαχόμενον. ἐπέκτασις οὖν γέγονε διὰ τὸ μέτρον*. Cf. also the testimonies to *Il.* 12. 216.

⁶² J. Dingel, *Rh. Mus.* 112 (1969), 105 f.

24. 237: Page (104) writes: 'εἰπεῖν ὥς ἔλθοι: this use of the optative in *oratio obliqua* is the idiom of a much later era; it never occurs in the Homeric poems.' This is a statement of a well-known fact about which discussion is pointless. But Page's claim that the phenomenon belongs to a *much* later time is exaggerated; the Hymn to Aphrodite (214) is already familiar with the optative in an *oratio obliqua* statement. But the main difficulty in our passage does not lie with the optatives at all. The sentence runs (24. 235–8):

μερμήριξε δ' ἔπειτα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμὸν 235
κύσσαι καὶ περιφύναι ἔδν πατέρ' ἦδὲ ἕκαστα
εἰπεῖν, ὥς ἔλθοι καὶ ἴκοιτ' ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,
ἢ πρῶτ' ἐξερέοιτο ἕκαστά τε πειρήσαιτο.

The subordinate clause introduced with *ὥς* need not be a statement. Ebeling (*Lexicon Homericum* ii. 498 s.v. *ὥς*) sees in it an indirect question ('ubi non est: se venisse . . . , sed quomodo venisset'), Gildersleeve⁶³ supports the same view and Schwyzner-Debrunner (ii. 332 a) describe *ὥς* as a modal relative adverb ('as' or 'that'). So the construction of the hymn could have originated from our place: *εἶπεν δὲ ἕκαστα . . . Ἀργεῖφόντης ὥς ἔοι ἀθάνατος*, [201] sc. Ganymede.⁶⁴ Indeed the view put forward by the interpreters describes Odysseus' indecision perfectly: if the son really wanted to reveal himself to his father, he could do this only by connecting it with a description of the special nature of his return—which does indeed happen later (cf. *Od.* 24. 321–6). Schadewaldt translates:⁶⁵ ' . . . whether he should kiss and embrace his father or tell him all the details *how* he had come and reached his native land or whether he should ask him first and test him in details.' Stanford stays closer to the wording of the original: 'Then he deliberated in his heart and mind to kiss and embrace his father and tell him everything, *how* he had made his way back to his native land—or should he first question and test him in every way.'

This correct translation shows that the structure of the sentence is much more striking than the use of mood; for the poet has in a unique way combined two Homeric constructions: *μερμηρίζω* can either be connected with an infinitive ('to consider doing something') or with an indirect question ('to be undecided whether to . . .

⁶³ *AJPhil.* 27 (1906), 205.

⁶⁴ Thus F. Urtel, *Über den homerischen Gebrauch des Optativs der abhängigen Rede* (Progr. Wilhelm-Ernstisches Gymnasium; Weimar, 1884), 5.

⁶⁵ Similarly already Voss.

or'). One should compare (a) *Od.* 10. 151–2: μερμήριξα δ' ἔπειτα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν | ἔλθειν ἦδ' ἐπυθέσθαι⁶⁶ and (b) *Od.* 4. 117–19: μερμήριξε δ' ἔπειτα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν, | ἦέ μιν αὐτὸν πατὴρ ἐάσειε μνησθῆναι, | ἢ πρῶτ' ἐξερέοιτο ἕκαστά τε πειρήσαιτο.⁶⁷ To lose the mixture of constructions in our passage, Nauck deleted *Od.* 24. 238 (= *Od.* 4. 119).⁶⁸ The context now goes: 'He considered kissing him and saying . . . But it seemed to him to be appropriate this way . . .'. But the price of this smooth, quite ordinary construction is the unacceptable destruction of the point. For it is precisely in the unexpected transition from one form of expression to the other (24. 237–8) that the embarrassment of our wily hero is reflected, as he stands under the pear tree, crying and weighing up the two possibilities against each other. So deeply is he affected by the sight of his long-suffering father. In Nauck's text, the possibility which is rejected at the end would be no more than a passing idea. So the peculiarity of the formulation is justified: From considering the simple self-introduction (μερμήριξε . . . κύσσαι καὶ περιφῦναι . . . ἦδ' ἕκαστα εἰπεῖν), the thought turns to the question whether one should not [202] first investigate and examine (ἢ πρῶτ' ἐξερέοιτο ἕκαστά τε πειρήσαιτο). Thus the moods of the possibilities override the more determined statement of the first clause, and lead up to what Odysseus will eventually do (cf. *Od.* 24. 239–40). So one cannot stress with enough emphasis the peculiarity of the construction of our passage; at the same time, one has to add (to be fair) that it is quite appropriate to what is a unique situation (cf. also Stanford *ad loc.*). An imitator would have done without such subtleties, and applied inferior medicines.

24. 240: πρῶτον κερτομύοισ' ἐπέεσσιν πειρηθῆναι. The lengthening of the fourth biceps by position offends against Wernicke's Law (cf. P. Maas, *Greek Metre* §125). Page (104) regards the alleged metrical mistake as especially grave because 'νὺ ἐφέλκυστικόν cannot be added to assist the lengthening of a naturally short vowel before the fifth dactyl of the line'.⁶⁹ But such a tightening of

⁶⁶ Similarly *Il.* 8. 167 and *Od.* 10. 438.

⁶⁷ Cf. also *Il.* 1. 189, 5. 671; *Od.* 6. 141, 10. 50, 17. 235, 18. 90, 20. 10, 22. 333. Further instances in which a simple question is dependent on the verb are not considered here. Cf. for the rest Spohn 197.

⁶⁸ Agreeing Wilamowitz, *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus* (Berlin, 1927), 81, 3.

⁶⁹ See also Stanford *ad loc.*: ' . . . the only instance in *Od.* of a lengthening by means of νὺ ἐφέλκυστικόν in the 4th foot'. The treatise quoted by Page without author's name *CR* 11 (1897) (Tyrrell, Agar, Platt?) is not available to me [R. Tyrrell,

Wernicke's Law is not justified. The ν ἐφέλκυστικόν often served Ionic epic language to bridge a hiatus or make position.⁷⁰ So if Wernicke's Law allows any exceptions at all, making position of the kind cited should be permitted.

Since the discovery of Ryland papyrus P 28 in Allen (third-fourth century AD, published 1911), people have often thought that the difficulty had disappeared; for there we find the variant ἔπεισιν διαπειρηθῆναι. Wilamowitz (*Die Heimkehr des Odysseus* (Berlin, 1927), 81 A. 3) called it a remedy and Von der Mühl adopted it in his text. Page on the other hand regards it as an unsuccessful conjecture—probably rightly; for διαπειρηθῆναι is a word alien to epic language and at home almost exclusively in prose. Again, why should the metrically smooth formulation of the papyrus have been changed to a sequence of quantities unfamiliar to Homer's readers (ἐπέεσσιν πειρηθῆναι)? This is without doubt the *lectio difficilior*. Do we have the right to criticize it? Probably not, because every reader of Homer knows verses which make position with a consonant at the end of a word in the fourth biceps, cf. *Iliad* 18. 400: τῇσι παρ' εἰνάετες χάλκεον δαίδαλα πολλά, 5. 734 (= 8. 385): πέπλον μὲν κατέχευεν ἑάνον πατὴρ ἐπ' οὔδει and other examples enumerated in Leaf (*Iliad* ii. 637 f.).⁷¹ Leaf sees the reason [203] for the dislike of verses formed like this in the effort not to make the fourth foot sound like the end of a verse ('that the fourth foot should not sound like the end of a line'). Meister expressed himself similarly (K. Meister, *Die homerische Kunstsprache* (Leipzig, 1921), 55): ' . . . lest through a spondaic word ending and a predominantly dactylic third foot the verse end would be (as it were) anticipated.'

With such considerations in mind, one approaches the problem of trying to explain Hermann's bridge. But this whole discussion has in fact been unnecessary for decades, since Th. Stiffler⁷² showed convincingly that in the Homeric hexameter there can be no question of conscious avoidance of a long syllable originating through

'Can a Short Vowel Resist Position?' (28) and P. L. Agar, 'The Lengthening of Final Syllables by Position before the Fifth Foot in the Homeric Hexameter' (29–31), in response to A. Platt, 'Note on Hom. *Hymn. Dem.* 268', in *CQ* 10 (1896), 431–2. *Ed.*] But cf. W. Leaf, *The Iliad*, ii. 634 (App. N. para. 9).

⁷⁰ Cf. *Il.* 1. 211 and Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* i. 92.

⁷¹ A 4th trochee ending in a vowel is never lengthened by a double consonant beginning the following word.

⁷² Th. Stiffler, 'Das Wernickesche Gesetz und die bukolische Dihaerese', *Philologus* 79 (1924), 323–54. Cf. B. Snell, *Lexikon der Alten Welt* (Zurich, 1965), 3271.

making position at the end of a word in the fourth biceps. So the law referred to by Page, which Wernicke had found when he was commenting on Tryphiodorus and established for 'poetae docti',⁷³ is not valid in Homer. The rarity of such position-making at the end of a word after the fourth biceps can be explained (1) through the use of spondaic forms in the hexameter and (2) through the restrictions which lie in the nature of position at the end of a word.

On (1): All words of the type (υ) υ-- are restricted to the second half of the verse and are normally at the verse end.⁷⁴ Only if more than one bacchaic or ionic word has to appear in the verse, i.e. if the metre demands this, do they appear before the bucolic diaeresis. On the other hand, this metrical demand is not binding for words of the type (υ) υ-υ (our ἐπέεσσι); for they can find a place in the first half of the verse. So there must be exceptional conditions if such words appear immediately before the bucolic diaeresis.

On (2): Here is meant the proportion of final syllables long by nature to those long by position (i.e. the ones which need a consonant or double consonant at the beginning of the following word). According to Stiffler's calculations this proportion is 3 : 1. This reduces the possibility of final syllable position-making before the bucolic diaeresis.

That these conclusions are correct is shown by a simple observation (cf. Stiffler *loc. cit.* 330). In our passage, the poet could have written *πειρηθῆναι ἐπέεσσι* just as well, in order to avoid the offensive position. He did this just as little as the author of the *Iliad* in 2. 522 (*Κηφισὸν δῖον ἔναιον*: *δῖον *Κηφισὸν ἔναιον*), 2. 813 (*Βατίειαν κικλήσκουσιν*: *κικλήσκουσιν *Βατίειαν*), 5. 734 (*ἑάνον πατρός ἐπ' οὔδει*: *πατρός ἐπ' οὔδει *ἑάνον*), 7. 436 (*ποτὶ δ' αὐτὸν τείχος ἔδειμαν*: *τείχος ποτὶ δ' αὐτὸν *ἔδειμαν*), 22. 494 (*κοτύλην τις τυτθὸν ἐπέσχε*: *τυτθὸν κοτύλην *τις ἐπέσχε*).⁷⁵ The poets preferred to follow the natural word order.

⁷³ Where we have to observe that this rules itself out from the start for the hexameter of the Alexandrians since there no word may end after a monosyllabic 4th biceps.

⁷⁴ Cf. E. G. O'Neill, 'Word-Types in the Greek Hexameter', *YCIS* 8 (1942), 142, 145, 153; H. N. Porter, *YCIS* 12 (1951), 53 and 63.

⁷⁵ All the examples in Stiffler, *Philologus* 79 (1924), 330. The metrical peculiarity in *Od.* 24. 364 (*ταμνομένους κρέα πολλὰ κερώντας τ' αἶθοπα οἶνον*) arose because here the poet modified 15. 500 faithfully to the sense (*δείπνόν τ' ἐντύνοντο κερώντό τε αἶθοπα οἶνον*).

The author of our verse (*Od.* 24. 240) was presumably restricted particularly by the peculiarity of the statement intended: the infinitive *πειρηθῆναι* appears in other instances only at the end of a verse (*Il.* 5. 220, 20. 349, 21. 225, 23. 804) but is never linked with *ἔπεσσι* (or similar).⁷⁶ But the dative *ἐπέεσσι(ν)* is mostly found in the second and third or in the fifth and sixth dactyl. Now as soon as the attribute *κερτομίοισι(ν)*, which is indispensable for the context, is put in, difficulties arise which one can see in the verse as preserved. The poet was unable to use any of the established formulae, but had to accept a prosodic peculiarity if he wanted to keep the usual word order but not (like the writer of the Ryland papyrus) remedy things with a new compound. The prevalence of the poet's concern for content here is quite clear. Something else becomes evident in this example. Homeric epic represents a stage of development of epic style at which the succinctness of the individual statement counts for more than the consistent use of the usual formulae, even if the new coinage this entails is laborious (and so, in the sense of oral poetry, uneconomical).

24. 242: *ἦ τοι ὁ μὲν κατέχων κεφαλὴν φυτὸν ἀμφελάχαινε*, 'holding his head down'. This usage—Page (104)—contradicts the normal use of the verb. He says that the *GEL* does not mention it (Passow incidentally does not either) and that it occurs again only in Euripides (fr. 410, 3): *καὶ κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχει*. Page does not ask whether anyone else in Homer ever had reason to hold down a limb of his body when digging like Laertes. The absence of any other reference can probably be explained through the lack of such occasions. But for the poet who wanted to express the content of 24. 242 it was easy to take the primary meaning which *κατα-* has as prefix from related compounds. One should compare places like *Il.* 13. 17 (*ἔξ ὄρεος κατεβήσατο*), 4. 149 (= 5. 870: *αἶμα καταρρέον ἐξ ὠτειλῆς*, also 1. 527 (*ὅ τί κεν κεφαλῇ κατανεύσω*) and others. Faesi rightly says of our passage that *κατέχων* is used here in its actual meaning ('demittens').⁷⁷

[205] *Od.* 24. 244: The abstract noun *ἀδαημονίη* is criticized by Spohn (177), Page (109), and Kirk (250), rightly, as an irregular, quite unique formation. But they withhold the fact that an ancient version *ἀδαημοσύνη* has also been handed down (Schol. *Il.* 7:

⁷⁶ An exception is the combination *ἔπεσιν πειρήσσομαι* (only *Il.* 2. 73, υ--υ--υ).

⁷⁷ But presumably it is not etymologically the oldest, cf. Schwyzler-Debrunner 474.

γράφεται "ἀδαημοσύνη" and Ap. p. 8, 25), and this should be preferred to the Vulgate. One should compare Buttmann, *Lexilogus* (2nd edn. Berlin, 1860), ii. 121 and Cobet, *Miscellanea critica* (Leiden, 1876), 376. But the noun ἀδαημοσύνη is formed regularly; for as εὐφρων (Od. 17. 531) is related to εὐφροσύνη (Od. 9. 6 and others), so ἀδαήμων (cf. Od. 12. 208) to ἀδαημοσύνη. That word is not unique either; for Apollonius Rhodius formed a corresponding noun δαημοσύνη after it (cf. 2. 175, 4. 1273).

24. 245: (ὦ γέρον, οὐκ ἀδαημοσύνη σ' ἔχει ἀμφιπολεύειν | ὄρχατον), ἀλλ' εὖ τοι κομιδὴ ἔχει . . . This is the oldest reference for the combination εὖ ἔχειν, so common later. It appears neither in Pindar nor Bacchylides nor in Aeschylus, as Page (104) observes. One is tempted to see in it a phrase alien to epic language. However, nothing can be determined about its age, and before one can use it against the genuineness of Book 24 one has to ask how presumably it originated. Odysseus says: ' . . . your garden stands to you well looked after . . . you yourself do not stand well looked after' (Schadewaldt). So the incriminated phrase is in opposition to 24. 249: αὐτόν σ' οὐκ ἀγαθὴ κομιδὴ ἔχει. This expression is formed like other combinations frequent in the *Odyssey* ἄγῃ μ' ἔχει (3. 227), σέβας μ' ἔχει εἰσορόωντα (3. 123, 4. 75 and more frequently), θαυμά μ' ἔχει (10. 326) and others. In 24. 245 one expects a corresponding formulation. Presumably it would have been possible metrically.⁷⁸ But apparently the combination abstract noun + ἔχει could not take an impersonal object. Thus the poet made do with the intransitive ἔχω. Such usage has models in both Homeric poems; (a) of persons: *Il.* 24. 27 ἀλλ' ἔχον (sc. Hera, Athena, and Poseidon), ὧς σφιν πρῶτον ἀπήχθετο Ἴλιος ἱρή (= they held out, persevered, continued to behave). *Od.* 19. 494 ἔξω δ' ὧς ὅτε τις στερεῇ λίθος (= I will hold out, will behave); (b) of things: *Il.* 13. 520 (= *Il.* 14. 452) δι' ὤμου δ' ὄβριμον ἔγχος | ἔσχεν (= penetrated), *Od.* 12. 435 ῥίζαι γὰρ ἐκὰς εἶχον (= they were situated, cf. Erbse: Schol. V: *Od.* 13: ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπήρχον). So it can be said here too: 'The tending of the garden is found in an excellent state.' So Odysseus does not give a general description of the situation ('bene res se habet' Page paraphrases), but praises the whole activity of his unhappy father. The difference between the two views becomes obvious immediately, if one compares the *Odyssey* verse with the

⁷⁸ e.g. ἀλλ' ἀγαθὴ κομιδὴ ἔχει ὄρχατον or something similar.

formula usual in Attic [206], cf. Soph. *Ai.* 684: ἀλλ' ἀμφὶ μὲν τούτοισιν εὖ σχήσει. Also, in the present case, the construction of 24. 245 could have become the model for the later impersonal expression (which of course cannot be proved), but the expression itself still belongs fully to the Homeric language with which we are familiar.

24. 247: The *synizesis* (*synaloephe*) οὐκ ὄγχνη, οὐ πρασιή τοι ἄνευ κομιδῆς κατὰ κῆπον has been called 'incredible' by Wilamowitz (*Die Heimkehr des Odysseus*, p. 81, n. 3) and he tried to remove it by deleting οὐ before πρασιή. But the suppression of the negative, common in lyric poetry, is not found in Homer. Following Spohn, who defends the traditional version, Page (104) mentioned three verses of the *Iliad* and one of the *Odyssey* which fully justify the use of *synizesis* in 24. 247. But by preferring to recognize conjectures and bad variants, he wanted to eliminate two of the parallels, which would diminish the basis of confirmation for the expression handed down in 24. 247. We will examine only this part of the question here:

1. *Il.* 17. 89: φλογὶ εἵκελος Ἥφαίστοιο | ἀσβέστω· οὐδ' υἱὸν λάθεν Ἀτρείος ὀξὺ βοήσας (ἀσπέτω Bentley; ἀσβέστω· οὐδ' υἷα λάθ' Barnes and Bothe. Both suggestions are arbitrary).

2. *Od.* 1. 226: εἰλαπίνῃ ἦε γάμος.

3. *Il.* 18. 458: υἱεὶ ἐμῷ ὠκυμόρῳ δόμεν ἀσπίδα καὶ τρυφάλειαν. Chantraine (*Gr. Hom.* i. 84) recommends υἱ' ἐμῷ ὠκυμόρῳ (as does Page). But the manuscript basis for this is too slender. The Vulgate ἐμ' ὠκυμόρῳ was already commented on by Herodianus: ἔξω τοῦ ἱ τοῦ ἐμωκυμόρῳ· συνεκτέθλιπται γὰρ τῷ ᾠ τὸ ἱ ΑΑ^{int}. Herodianus was accustomed to interpreting Aristarchus' text. His lemma makes us assume that he erroneously regarded a *synaloephe* recorded in writing (crasis, ΕΜΩΚΥΜΟΡΩΙ) as an elision. So here too, the text approved by the Alexandrians expected elision.

4. *Il.* 2. 651: Μηριόνης τ' ἀτάλαντος Ἐνναλίῳ ἀνδρείφοντι.

Chantraine (*Gr. Hom.* i. 84) rightly rejects the attempt to read Ἐνναλίῳ as four syllables (υ-υυ with consonantic υ and long α). But his own suggestion (110) to accept the weakly attested (ancient) variant ἀνδριφόντι and scan it after the pattern of ἀνδροτήτα (υυ--)⁷⁹ is not convincing; for in compound nouns containing

ἀνδρ(ο)- that peculiarity, which is only found twice (sc. *Il.* 16, 857 [= *Il.* 22. 363] and *Il.* 24. 6), cannot be attested.⁸⁰ So one would have to [207] take up ἀδριφόντη in the parallel verse *Il.* 8. 264, which is only preserved in Codex P17, and regard it as original. But the origin of today's vulgate version (*Il.* 2. 651, 7. 166, 8. 264, 17. 259) would then become extremely complicated.⁸¹

To my mind, the four cases of rare *synizesis* (i.e. of the combination of two long vowels or one long vowel with a diphthong not shown in writing) support each other. Those who support this judgement must also accept the traditional version of *Od.* 24. 247 as Homeric.

24. 250-3: αὐχμείς τε κακῶς καὶ ἀεικέα ἔσσαι.
οὐ μὲν ἀεργίης γε ἄναξ ἔνεκ' οὐ σε κομίζει,
οὐδέ τί τοι δούλειον ἐπιτρέπει εἰσοράσθαι
εἶδος καὶ μέγεθος.

In this series of verses Page's sensitive feeling for language (105) is offended by the words αὐχμείς, ἀεργίη, δούλειον . . . εἶδος καὶ μέγεθος, ἐπιτρέπει, as well as by ἀρτίφρων (ἀνήρ . . . | οὐ τι μάλ' ἀρτίφρων) used slightly later (sc. 24. 261). The poet allowed these words into our passage, or formed them newly for it, because he wanted to register some very specific ideas. Is this procedure legitimate, or is the author now leaving the typical framework of the *Odyssey*?

1. That the unkempt body of the poor man is 'dry', i.e. surrounded by encrusted dirt and shaggy, is also said by Penelope (*Od.* 19. 327-8): εἴ κεν ἀϋσταλέος . . . | δαινύη. This adjective is also a *hapax legomenon* like the verb αὐχμεῖν, and since the speaker in both scenes is thinking of the contrast (i.e. with the bathed, well-tended body), he hits the nail on the head each time. Those who criticize the expression must identify a situation in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* where the poets were forced to say something similar, but did so

⁷⁹ For the prosody of ἀνδροτήτα (for ἀδροτήτα = being man, vigour of life) cf. J. Latacz, *Glotta* 43 (1965), 62-76.

⁸⁰ Page seems to refer to this when he remarks of *Il.* 2. 651: 'ενναλιωι ανδρειφοντηι is capable of other treatments than ενναλιωι αν' (104).

⁸¹ Cf. Latacz, *Glotta* 43 (1965), 66, 4. Latacz himself regards ἀδριφόντη (υ--υ) as original.

with more usual words. The verb αὐχμεῖν also shows that the poets had more words at their disposal than they usually reveal.

2. Page himself probably justified the new formation ἀρτίφρων ('sensible, pleasant') by enumerating the other compounds formed with ἀρτι- found in the epic. Common to both poems (*Il.* 9. 505; *Od.* 8. 310) is ἀρτίπος 'swift'; the formation ἀρτιεπής ('rash with his word', 'mere blatherer') belongs only to the *Iliad* (22. 281). For the native who would be able to give information to the stranger quickly and readily ἀρτίφρων is a particularly suitable description, especially since here, equipped with a negative, it is supposed to describe [208] a rather dense, even stubborn man. It is difficult not to admire the magnificent realism of Odysseus' false story. The creation *de novo* of such apt expressions is hardly the business of bad poets.

3. The noun ἀεργίη, as Page has correctly observed, is no more remarkable than κακοεργίη (*Od.* 22. 374).⁸² But he should have added that κακοεργός (*Od.* 18. 54) relates to κακοεργίη just as ἀεργός (cf. *Od.* 19. 27) does to ἀεργίη. So this form has been correctly developed from the acknowledged word-stock of the *Odyssey*. It is not valid to suspect its originality.

4. δούλειον (-υ) according to Page is unhomeric since the epics otherwise have δούλιος. But there we are dealing with a single combination (δούλιον ἡμαρ), apparently a very strong one, which is at the end of the verse in the *Iliad* (6. 463); in the second and third (14. 340), or in the fourth and fifth (17. 323) dactyl in the *Odyssey*. In our passage it has been separated, developed, and so placed that the adjective closes with the third trochee. So the poet needed to lengthen it. It can only be an analogical formation. For the ending -ειος originated either from *-εσ-ιος or from *-ηF-ιος. The former belongs to the s-stems, the latter to nouns in -ευς. Where -εῖος is derived from nouns of the o-declension the adjective developed by analogy with the genuine derivation.⁸³ Such words can be found in Homer, cf. e.g. χρύσειος (from χρυσός), χάλκειος (from χαλκός), ἵππειος (from ἵππος). So the poet of Book 24 did nothing unusual when he rejected the adjective of the formula δούλιον ἡμαρ, which was useless for his purposes, and created δούλειος, an analogy to

⁸² For the lengthening of the -ι- cf. Meister, *HK* 36 (metrical lengthening or transformation?). The writing -εῖη suggests itself in both cases, cf. also Herodianus to *Il.* 9. 73a, incidentally Spohn 177.

⁸³ Cf. Debrunner 144 (para. 285); e.g. ἀνθρωπος—ἀνθρώπειος.

δοῦλος. The phenomenon has been judged on principle correctly by Debrunner.⁸⁴

5. ἐπιπρέπει has a model in *Od.* 8. 172: μετὰ δὲ πρέπει ἀγρομένοισιν. But the poet who has a *hapax legomenon* μεταπρέπει at his disposal can also form a new compound for himself, especially since a splendid picture thereby emerges. However, one has to construe the words according to sense and rules. One could understand: οὐδέ τι δούλειον εἶδος καὶ μέγεθος ἐπιπρέπει. This could be justified if need be (καὶ must then stand for οὐδέ).⁸⁵ But it is really better to separate τι δούλειον from the nouns and regard these as accusatives of respect: 'And there is nothing slavish either [209] which comes to the fore in you when one looks at you, neither in appearance nor in size' (Schadewaldt).⁸⁶

24. 267–8: Page (105) sets the following verses against each other:

19. 350–1: οὐ γάρ πώ τις ἀνὴρ πεπνυμένος ὦδε
ξείνων τηλεδαπῶν φίλιων ἐμὸν ἵκετο δῶμα and

24. 267–8: καὶ οὐ πώ τις βροτὸς ἄλλος
ξείνων τηλεδαπῶν φίλιων ἐμὸν ἵκετο δῶμα.

His interpretation claims (as does Kirk 250), that φίλιων in 19. 351 is a genitive and in 24. 268, through misunderstanding, a comparative. His judgement is: 'φίλος φίλιων, like κακὸς κακίων; no Greek ever repeated this blunder.'⁸⁷

The following arguments contradict this view:

1. φίλιος does not exist in epic language.
2. What is one supposed to imagine the ξείνοι τηλεδαποὶ φίλιοι to be? Only tragedy speaks about a φιλία γυνή or δμῳῖδες φίλιαι and the like. The scholiast (B) to *Od.* 19. 351 says: φίλιων. ὡς ἡδίων, συγκριτικὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ φίλτερος. One needs only to survey the complete sentence in order to recognize that he is right (19. 350–2):

⁸⁴ Debrunner 149, 3: 'The form -εἰος which also occurs in the epic (χρύσειος etc.) probably originated under the influence of the form -εἰος from para. 285, perhaps simply under the pressure of metre.' Unfortunately Page did not take note of Debrunner's observations.

⁸⁵ Cf. Kühner–Gerth ii. 291 m, where *Il.* 1. 603–4 are quoted.

⁸⁶ Ameis–Hentze–Cauer punctuate before εἰσοράασθαι so that εἶδος καὶ μέγεθος depend on this infinitive: '... when one contemplates your appearance and your size'. I have not been able to find a parallel for this combination (εἰσοράασθαι εἶδος καὶ μέγεθος in the sense of 'when one ... contemplates').

⁸⁷ Page refers to a translation of the pair of verses *Od.* 19. 350–1 by Monro: 'Monro said "no man so wise has ever come to my house".'

ξεῖνε φίλ'· οὐ γάρ πώ τις ἀνὴρ πεπνυμένος ὦδε
ξείνων τηλεδαπῶν φίλιων ἐμὸν ἵκετο δῶμα,
ὡς σὺ μάλ' εὐφραδέως πεπνυμένα πάντ' ἀγορεύεις.

Three things should be noted here: (a) φίλιων takes up φίλε again, intensifying it; (b) it is used predicatively; indeed, next to the negated main verb, almost in the sense of a consecutive clause ('so that he would have been dearer to me'); (c) ὦδε is picked up by ὡς (352). Schadewaldt's translation is highly commendable: 'For never yet has such a sensible man among the strangers from far away come to my house who would have been dearer to me, the way you say everything sensibly and in a well-thought-out way.'

24. 273: καὶ οἱ δῶρα πόρον ξεινήϊα, οἷα ἐῶκει. Our poet, so Page (105) more or less explains, regarded ξεινήϊον as an adjective. But, he says, in epic language it is used as a noun. He rejects the possibility of understanding ξεινήϊα as being in apposition to δῶρα—presumably rightly; for the juxtaposition of genus and species is admittedly Homeric (cf. the examples in Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* ii. 13 and 14, [210] para. 18). But the usage is restricted to certain groups of meaning into which our example does not quite fit. The following fact is decisive: The phrase δῶρα δίδωμι τινί τι is standard; it means 'to give someone something as a present'; the accusative δῶρα is in apposition, not the object. One should compare *Iliad* 16. 867: (ἵπποι) ἄμβροτοι, οὓς Πηλεΐθεοὶ δόσαν ἀγλαὰ δῶρα (similarly 24. 278), 14. 238: δῶρα δέ τοι δώσω καλὸν θρόνον ἄφθιτον αἰεὶ, but also 11. 124: (ὅς ῥα μάλιστα) χρυσὸν Ἀλεξάνδροιο δεδεγμένος (expecting) ἀγλαὰ δῶρα, | οὐκ εἶασχ' | 'Ἑλλην | δόμεναι ξανθῷ Μενελάῳ.⁸⁸ So, apparently, the poet does not do what the common commentaries affirm, but is imitating the outlined phrase of the *Iliad*; and in his newly created construction δῶρα is in apposition, not the object: 'As a present I brought him a friend's gifts as they are proper.' Again, it is not the author's fault in this case that his sound, epic mode of expression was misinterpreted.

24. 278–9: χωρὶς δ' αὖτε γυναῖκας ἀμύμονα ἔργα ἰδυίας | τέσσαρας εἰδαλίμας, ἃς ἤθελεν αὐτὸς ἐλέσθαι. Εἰδαλίμος, a rare word, at which Page expresses surprise (106: 'this unpromising neologism'), is not a unique (i.e. unexplained) word formation. Leumann (*HW* 248 with n. 1) gave the explanation: Εἰδαλίμος is modelled on the

⁸⁸ Ameis–Hentze too, like Leaf, understand ἀγλαὰ δῶρα in apposition to χρυσόν and punctuate accordingly.

frequent *κυδάλιμος*. So from the single occurrence of this unexceptional form no conclusion can be drawn about its relative time of origin—as little, in fact, as one may conclude that the tale about the lotus-eaters was inserted later⁸⁹ from the regularly formed *ἄνθινον εἶδαρ* (9. 84), which is also found only once in epic. That the new adjective *ειδάλιμος* is found again only in Mnaseas (cf. Page 106) is a result of the taste of the post-Homeric poets or of our limited knowledge of their works. The author of 24. 279 could not know anything about the future success of his new formation.

More important, but also more difficult, is the question why the poet was not content with a usual word for 'beautiful' in 24. 279 (cf. Page: 'It is not as if there were any lack of Homeric epithets meaning "beautiful"'). Perhaps we may assume that the speaker who, as we know, lays it on thick in his false tale, wants to improve on the pale epithet *καλαί* with which the physical assets of female slaves are normally emphasized (cf. *Il.* 9. 130): Odysseus, so he reports, had chosen the women not just because they [211] were good at their work but also because they were a feast for the eyes. But certainty cannot be achieved on this point.

24. 285–6: τῷ κέν σ' εὖ δώροισιν ἀμειψάμενος ἀπέπεμψε | καὶ ξενίῃ ἀγαθῇ. ἡ γὰρ θέμις, ὅς τις ὑπάρξῃ, i.e. 'then he would have rewarded you well for it with presents and also would have sent you away after feeding you well; for this is the custom, if someone has done this first' (Schadewaldt). Page (106) criticizes the prosody *ξεν-* instead of *ξειν-*, the noun *ξενίῃ* because it appears again only in the fifth century, and the compound *ὑπάρξῃ*.

1. With *ξενίῃ* there exist six references in the *Odyssey* for *ξένιος* (14. 158, 389; 15. 514, 546; 17. 155; 20. 230 [here v. 1]). In all places *ξειν-* could be written and bisyllabic pronunciation (with slurring of the final syllables) could be possible, as also in our verse and in *Od.* 24. 314 (*μειξεσθαι ξενίῃ*). W. Schulze already realized this.⁹⁰

2. The noun *ξενίῃ* (or *ξεινίῃ* respectively) is derived according to rule from *ξένιος* (*ξείνιος*) which in turn originated from *ξένος*

⁸⁹ These considerations could be supported with numerous examples. I only want to mention *ἐπιβώτωρ* (only *Od.* 13. 222); it relates to the simplex *βώτωρ* (cf. *Il.* 12. 302 and others) as *ἐπιβουκόλος* does to *βουκόλος*. Also the abstract nouns *δουλοσύνη* (*Od.* 22. 423, from *δούλος*), *ἀλαωτής* (*Od.* 9. 503, from *ἀλαός* and *ἀλαοῦν*), *γραπτύς* (*Od.* 24. 229, from *γράφειν*) are formed regularly, cf. Debrunner 188 (paras. 374–5).

⁹⁰ *Quaest. ep.* 85 f. (quoted in Wackernagel, *Spr. Unters. zu Homer* (Göttingen, 1916) [SU] 120, 2 in the place quoted by Page).

(*ξείνος*).⁹¹ It is found in Herodotus in the form *ξενίῃ* (1. 69, 3; 2. 182, 2 and others), so seems to have existed in Ionic.⁹²

3. The compound *ὑπάρξῃ* stands with the simplex (cf. apart from the *Iliad* references also *Od.* 22. 437: *ἄρχετε νῦν νέκυας φορέειν*) without an essential difference in meaning being visible (in our verse of Book 24 probably 'once someone has started with it'). Similarly *ὑπάλυξε* (*Od.* 5. 430) relates to *ἀλύξαι*, *ὑπέμεινα* (10. 258) to *μείναι*, *ὑποδάμνασαι* (3. 214; 16. 95) to *δάμνασθαι*. See further 16. 70 (*πῶς γὰρ δὴ τὸν ξείνον ἐγὼν ὑποδέξομαι οἴκῳ;*) with 17. 110: *δεξάμενος δέ με κείνος ἐν ὑψηλοῖσι δόμοισι*. Why should one deny the poet of Book 24 this liberty? Incidentally, *ὑπάρχω* also occurs in Herodotus (cf. Stanford *ad loc.*), so it does not appear in Attic for the first time.

24. 288: Laertes asks: *πόστον δὴ ἔτος ἐστίν, ὅτε ξείνισσας ἐκείνον*; Page (106) follows Wackernagel who (*SU* 157) explains as follows: 'πόστος, "the how manyeth?"'. As Brugmann⁹³ has seen, this is derived from *ποσ(σ)οστός* by haplology and so is connected with the formations *ἐκατοστός* . . . derived from *-κοστός*. This formation does not look as if it is very old, and one would find it quite normal if there were no older references than the one in [212] Aristophanes . . . (Fr. 163 Kock). Only 24. 288 is older *πόστον δὴ ἔτος ἐστίν*; . . . Is this supposed to come from Ionia? For Ionic *πόστος* is attested as little as for any other dialect, apart from Attic.' Looked at in the cold light of day, this is only a Non liquet.⁹⁴ We are satisfied with the observation that 24. 288 offers no evidence in relation to our question. At any rate, one should not forget that in the rest of Homer no situation is described in which the question 'the how manyeth year is it?' is necessary. It is at any rate conceivable that a poetic language which had ordinals like *ἑικοστός* at its disposal also had a corresponding question word, or could form one if necessary.

24. 289–90 and 301: Page (109) quotes 24. 289–90 (*σὸν ξείνον δύστηνον, ἐμὸν παῖδ', εἴ ποτ' ἔην γε; | δύσμορον, ὃν που κτλ.*) and

⁹¹ Cf. Debrunner 145 (para. 287).

⁹² Page's remark is a bit enigmatic: 'Though there is wide scope for its use, if it had existed, in the Homeric poems and elsewhere . . .'. One would surely have to ask first whether there was opportunity to use the word.

⁹³ Cf. Schwyzler i. 596.

⁹⁴ Schwyzler i. 612 leaves the question open ('πόστος since Homer'); Frisk, *GEW* ii. 585 says without comment '*Od.* 24. 288, Att.'

301: (οἱ δ' ἐκβήσαντες ἔβησαν). On this he remarks: 'Our poet has hardly done himself justice, or at least credit, in writing . . .'. Nothing is less justified than this verdict. One should compare Bekker's collection (*Homerische Blätter* (Bonn, 1863), i. 185) who begins his well-known chapter with the words: 'Homer loves repetition in almost every shape, so much so that there are few verses in which he does not somehow remind us of certain other verses. He certainly also understands how the repetition of the same sound has a charming and powerful effect on the ear and appreciation.' As references for the epanalepsis of the first of the examples mentioned above, *Od.* 3. 472 (οἶνον οἶνοχοεῦντες) or 20. 280 (δασσάμενοι δαίνυντ' ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα) should be mentioned, for the parechesis of the second *Il.* 20. 61–2 (ἔδεισεν . . . δείσας) or 12. 295–6 (ἐξήλατον . . . ἤλασεν).

24. 299: ποῦ δαί νηὺς ἔστηκε θοή; Page (106) claims that the manuscript tradition attests the particle here; in *Od.* 1. 225 (τίς δὲ ὄμιλος) he says it was introduced by Aristarchus against the majority of the manuscripts in order to avoid hiatus; as for the third reference (sc. *Il.* 10. 408: πῶς δαί τῶν ἄλλων Τρώων φυλακαί τε καὶ εὐναί), he says it is one of several well-attested variants. If one puts this accurately, one gets the following results:

In *Il.* 10. 408 the Vulgate has δ' αἶ, a small number of manuscripts (among them A) δαί.

In *Od.* 1. 225 the Vulgate reads δέ, only one manuscript δαί.

In 24. 299 the Vulgate offers δέ, Allen's classes d and f, manuscript P 1 and the Ryland Papyrus (third and fourth century AD) have δαί.

Apollonius Dyscolus' report (*synt.* 106. 1) shows clearly that Aristarchus wanted to ensure that δαί was read in all three places, cf. 107. 8: ἀλλὰ φαίνεται ὅτι τὸν Ἀρίσταρχον ἐκίνει τὸ ἔθιμον τοῦ ποιητοῦ, ὡς [213] συνήθως μὲν ἐλλείπει τοῖς ἄρθροις, συνάπτει δὲ μετὰ τὰ πύσματα τὸν δαί σύνδεσμον, "τίς δαί ἐστιν ὅδε ὄμιλος;" (cf. *Od.* 1. 225), "ποῦ δαί νηὺς ἔστηκεν;" (24. 299). If one follows Apollonius, Aristarchus was faced with the question whether in *Il.* 10. 408 he should interpret the letter sequence ΔΑΙ as δ' αἶ or δαί. In considering the question, he referred to the fact that Homeric language lacks the definite article. His second argument consisted of reference to the two verses from the *Odyssey*. It would be significant evidence if he really had found δαί there. But

the testimony of the Vulgate speaks against this, quite apart from the observation that δέ is of course a *lectio difficilior* and could hardly have been inserted later. So presumably Aristarchus changed the text of the *Odyssey* in both places in order to be able to prove his case. He did not have to take exception to the fact that he was attributing a typically Attic particle to the text of the poet; for he regarded Homer as an Athenian.⁹⁵ If these thoughts are correct, all disparaging statements about 24. 299 take care of themselves since presumably in pre-Alexandrian times it did not contain the offending particle. At the same time, one should realize that Atticisms can have come into the Homeric text only relatively late (this is not the only case).⁹⁶

24. 307: Odysseus says to his father (ἀλλά με δαίμων |) πλάγξ' ἀπὸ Σικανίης. Page (109) claims: "Sicania" is not known to Homeric geography.' This is a relic of a thesis by Kirchhoff (528):⁹⁷ 'Sicels and Sicania on the other hand are geographical terms which occur only in the additions of the editor.' But it is arbitrary to delete the mention of Sicily in *Od.* 20. 383 (ἐς Σικελούς πέμψωμεν)—not to mention the three passages in Book 24 (211, 366, 389: γυνή Σικελή and similar). But if the *Odyssey* poet knew of the existence of Sicily, he could also have known the old name of the island (Σικανίη, cf. Hdt. 7. 170. 1) which for metrical reasons offered itself on a plate. On the other hand, it is improbable that a later poet, who allegedly was the first to introduce the term 'Sicily' into the *Odyssey*, should have caused confusion in our passage through preferring an antiquated name of the country. Probably in post-Homeric times this described only a part of the island.⁹⁸

24. 314: 'διδώσειν: this *monstrum rhapsodicum* has a parallel in *Od.* 13. 358' (Page 109, cf. also Kirk 250). The recurrence of the [214] form in a second passage should have warned us against thoughtless categorization. Indeed, formations of the future from characterized present stems are not rare. They can be attested already in Homer, cf. *κιχῆσομαι* (*Il.* 2. 258 and more often), *χαίρήσειν* (*Il.* 20.

⁹⁵ It is enough to suppose that he suggested the conjectures for both places in the *Odyssey* in his commentary where Apollonius seems to have found them. But Aristarchus' explanation is a circular one.

⁹⁶ Our passage has on principle already been dealt with correctly by M. van de Valk, *Textual Criticism of the Odyssey* (Leiden, 1949), 172.

⁹⁷ Cf. also Spohn 81 with hardly convincing arguments.

⁹⁸ Cf. Schulten, *RE* 2 A 2 (1923), 2459, 39 s.v. Sikaner.

363), ἀλύξειν (*Il.* 10. 371, 17. 547, 19. 558).⁹⁹ Are all these supposed to be *monstra*?

24. 318–20: ἀνὰ ῥίνας δέ οἱ ἤδη | δριμύ μένος προὔτυψε φίλον πατέρ' εἰσορόωντι. | κύσσε δέ μιν περιφύς ἐπιάλμενος.¹⁰⁰ Page's complaints (106) concern the verbal forms προὔτυψε and ἐπιάλμενος. The word mentioned first, he thinks, is familiar to the epic only in the phrase Τρώες δὲ προὔτυψαν ἀολλέες (*Il.* 13. 136, 15. 306, 17. 262); but he says the meaning required there does not fit the context of the passage in Book 24. To this you can object: The poet means the onset of the stinging tickle which precedes the outbreak of tears ('and already the sharp urge advanced to the front of his nose' Schadewaldt translates). This urge overwhelms man like the advancing enemy. The second criticism too is hardly appropriate. It is true that ἐπιάλμενος (*Il.* 7. 15) refers to mounting the war chariot (ἵππων ἐπιάλμενον ὠκειάων). But this meaning does not help us here. On the other hand, in *Od.* 14. 220 and 22. 305 the participle ἐπάλμενος is used of pouncing on the enemy, so of a movement which lunges violently forward (in 22. 305 in the simile vultures are mentioned). This idea exactly describes the situation which we previously tried to argue was the climax of the *anagnorisis*: Odysseus jumps up towards his father, embraces him, kisses him, and tells him who he is.

One will have to concede to Page that the judgement in both cases is a matter of discretion. But who would want to put their signature to this opinion: 'More unsuitable words for the present context would be hard to find'? One senses Page's purpose, and very unsatisfying it is.

24. 341–4: With these verses Odysseus concludes the series of signs which he gives his father in order to prove his identity. They are his personal memories of childhood in the orchard, when his father made him presents of valuable trees. The content already makes us suspect that we will find here unique expressions. The verses go:

... ὄρχους δέ μοι ὦδ' ὀνόμηνas
δῶσειν πεντήκοντα, διατρύγιος δὲ ἕκαστος

⁹⁹ Further material in Schwyzer i. 783 a 7. From post-Homeric language especially διδάξω should be mentioned. The above mentioned ἀλύξω is incidentally not a definite testimony since the stem ἀλυκ- cannot be excluded, cf. Frisk, *GEW* i. 80.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. with this also Casaubon in Spohn 205.

[215] ἦην (ἐνθα δ' ἀνὰ σταφυλαὶ παντοῖαι ἔασιν),
ὅππότε δὴ Διὸς ὦραι ἐπιβρίσειαν ὑπερθεν.

Page (107) is offended that the form ὀνόμηνas is constructed like a verb of promising; for the forms of this word (only the aorist is attested) are construed either with an accusative object (*Iliad*: 2. 488; 9. 121; 10. 522; 14. 278; 16. 491; 23. 178; 24. 591; with double accusative 23. 90) or with accusative and indirect question (*Od.* 4. 240; 11. 328, 517). Once (*Od.* 11. 251) the verb is used absolutely. Nevertheless, Page's objection is not justified. Ameis-Hentze-Cauer already realized that the related word ὀνομάζω is used twice (*Il.* 9. 515 and 18. 449) with the meaning 'to promise, namely that'.¹⁰¹ By analogy with ὑπισχνείσθαι the infinitive could easily appear after ὀνομαίνω ('in this way you promised me, enumerating them, to give (me) 50 vine rows as a present').¹⁰² For the *hapax legomenon* διατρύγιος Page (rightly) accepts Ebeling's translation (*diversis temporibus fructus ferens*). The word expresses the idea that each row can be picked at any time of year, because the grapes ripen in turn. Although the formation is transparent, the poet confirms what he means with an explanation in the parenthesis of the next verse: 'For there are indeed grapes of manifold kind (i.e. in different states of ripeness) on the vines.' With this enlightening reference to reality, Odysseus shows that he knows all about the vineyard. So the parenthesis is not unsatisfactory (thus, for example, Monro and Stanford) but logical. Only in it does the present ἔασιν make full sense, and given the sequence the temporal clause follows the finite verb ἦην pleasingly. The form ἦην itself is attested four times (*Il.* 11. 808; *Od.* 19. 283; 23. 316; 24. 343). In *Od.* 23. 316 there are no variants, in the other places only weakly attested ones. Schulze's change to ἦεν is today no longer regarded as probable or even necessary: ἦην is morphologically the latest form in the series *ἔεν, ἦεν, ἦν, ἔην, ἦην.¹⁰³ The Ionian singers, Homer already among them, could have known and used it (by which I imply nothing about the orthography of the oldest text of Homer).

¹⁰¹ *Il.* 9. 515: εἰ μὲν γὰρ μὴ δῶρα φέροι, τὰ δ' ὅπισθ' ὀνομάζοι (sc. Agamemnon) and 18. 449: καὶ πολλὰ περικλυτὰ δῶρ' ὀνόμαζον.

¹⁰² If instead of ὀνόμηνas one read the participle ὀνομήνas so that a verb of saying (from ἔειπες *Od.* 24. 339) would have to be added, then a familiar construction would result. But the ellipsis would be extraordinarily harsh.

¹⁰³ Cf. Meister, *HK* 109; Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* i. 289.

Even this passage, which seems so strange, does not contain any unhomeric expressions, and if one considers it calmly, one can observe that it contributes well to the rounding-off of the Laertes scene. [216]

24. 347-9:

ἀμφὶ δὲ παιδὶ φίλῳ βάλε πήχεε· τὸν δὲ ποτὶ οἶ
εἶλεν ἀποψύχοντα πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἄμπνυτο καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη . . .

The phrase τὸν δὲ π(ρ)οτὶ οἶ | εἶλεν is a formation modelled on *Il.* 21. 507-8 (τὴν [sc. Artemis] δὲ π(ρ)οτὶ οἶ εἶλε πατὴρ Κρονίδης), but the participle ἀποψύχοντα with the meaning 'fainting' has no epic model (cf. Spohn 184). The verb ἀποψύχω = *efflare* occurs again only in the fifth century (mostly connected with an accusative object). In epic, the compound is otherwise only used with the meaning 'to blow off, to refresh', *Il.* 11. 621 (= 22. 2): ἰδρῶ ἀπειψύχοντο and 21. 561: ἰδρῶ ἀποψυχθεῖς. The same is true of ἀναψύχω, see 5. 795: ἔλκος ἀναψύχοντα, 13. 84: ἀνέψυχον φίλον ἦτορ, 10. 575: ἀνέψυχθεν φίλον ἦτορ and *Od.* 4. 568: ἀναψύχειν ἀνθρώπους (of winds). But does this finding lead to the conclusion that the expression of *Od.* 24. 348 is close to the language of the fifth century, or at any rate, no longer epic (Page 108: 'contrary to Epic usage')?

Our decision on the expression must start from two comparable places in which fainting is described, *Il.* 5. 696-7 (τὸν δ' ἔλιπε ψυχὴ . . . | αὖτις δ' ἄμπνύνθη) and 22. 467-75 (ἀπὸ δὲ ψυχὴν ἐκάπυσσε . . . | ἣ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἄμπνυτο). Both passages show that people imagined fainting as a temporary departure of the soul. But soul is the breath of life; the Greeks were always conscious that ψυχὴ belongs to ψύχω. From this consideration alone, it follows that ἀποψύχω in Book 24 of the *Odyssey* was used in a more original sense than in the other places. Of course, both meanings are very close to each other: 'The shift which must be assumed—"blow > cool down (in the wind)" (also "make dry [in the wind]")—has nothing strange about it, especially for a seafaring people' (Frisk, *GEW* ii. 1142). One may even assume that the *Odyssey* poet could have inferred the basic meaning *efflare* from the *Iliad* references, if the compound in its actual sense had not been known to him. But it is not very probable that it should have remained completely alien to the older epic, especially in its early oral stage. We just do not have any testimony, since the poet of the *Iliad* described fainting and sudden feelings of weakness in different ways (Hector's fainting too, cf. *Il.* 14. 418-39), but in the *Odyssey* this is the single case (Irus does not faint, cf. *Od.* 18.

96-9). Finally one could refer to the structure of the sentence: the phrase taken from *Il.* 21 (τὸν δὲ ποτὶ οἶ | εἶλεν) which should have closed with the subject described in a formula (πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς) left only little room for the description of the fainting. Evidently the participle ἀποψύχοντα was effectively unavoidable. [217]

24. 360: (ἐνθα δὲ Τηλέμαχον καὶ βουκόλον ἠδὲ συβώτην |) προὔπεμψ', ὥς ἂν δεῖπνον ἐφοπλίσσωσι τάχιστα. Page (108) quotes Monro: 'The only Homeric instance of a compound of προ- in which we cannot write the uncontracted form προε-.' He could also have referred to van Leeuwen.¹⁰⁴ The diphthong which originates from the crasis does indeed stand in a *longum* position (the *arsis*) only in our passage. In the other instances in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the vowel contraction could be dissolved. But it has been very doubtful for a long time whether by doing this one would find the original word sound. Rightly, Chantraine (*Gr. Hom.* i. 85) expresses himself much more cautiously than Page: 'Enfin dans le cas un peu différent de προῦφαινε, προῦχοῦσας, προῦχοντα etc., on peut penser que la forme contracte s'est substituée à la forme non contracte.' Since Meister's research, we have known that contraction is not in the least alien to the language of our epics. We are e.g. not justified in doubting the tradition of *Od.* 22. 385 (κοῖλον ἐς αἰγιαλὸν πολίης ἔκτοσθε θαλάσσης) with Nauck because the stem syllable of the adjective κοῖλος in all other places in Homer can be dissolved into two short ones.¹⁰⁵ The assumption can be confidently made that the poet of Book 24 had already met the diphthong which had originated through crasis in the compounds with προ-. For he himself in 24. 82 (προῦχούση) and 24. 319 (προῦτυψε) put the diphthong in the *thesis*.¹⁰⁶ To my mind, Monro's observation only implies the following: In compounds with προ-, the augment did not originally blend with the prefix, so the prefixes (προ-ε-) had to stand in a biceps (i.e. in the *thesis*). This position was also usually kept in the Homeric poems at a time when crasis had already occurred. The existence of the false diphthong was regarded as so unexceptional that the author of our verse could dare to begin it with the form προῦπεμψ'.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁴ *Enchiridium Dictionis Epicae* (2nd edn. Leiden, 1918), 70.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Meister, *HK* 50.

¹⁰⁶ One is hardly allowed to presuppose that in these two cases the text was modernized but in *Od.* 24. 360 conceived of in the contracted form.

¹⁰⁷ Page thinks that he can support his judgement with reference to *Od.* 24. 240 (supposed violation of Wernicke's Law). We regard this attempt as unsuccessful. Cf. above pp. 290 ff.

24. 386: ἔνθ' οἱ μὲν δείπνῳ ἐπεχείρουν. On this Page (108):¹⁰⁸ 'This poet is far from the main stream of Epic tradition: the common formulas are forgotten or despised—not οἱ δ' ἐπ' ὀνείαθ' ἐτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἱάλλον or the like, but δείπνῳ ἐπεχείρουν: the verb, and this construction with the dative case, are common in the prose and poetry of the fifth century (esp. Attic).' Page seems to regard the poet as a self-willed ignoramus: instead of using the formulae ready to hand, [218] he is supposed to have patched together Attic constructions! But one should have a closer look at what he is saying! Here something unexampled is happening: One has hardly started 'to fall to the food' when along comes old Dolius with his sons (ἀγχίμολον δέ | ἦλθ' ὁ γέρων Δολίος). The meal is temporarily stopped for people to greet each other. Odysseus himself says quite clearly that the food is standing there hardly touched (394–6): 'Old man, sit down for your meal, and you, stop being amazed! For we have been waiting in the halls for a long time, eager to stretch out the hand for the bread (δηρὸν γὰρ σίτῳ ἐπιχειρήσειν μεμαῶτες | μίμνομεν ἐν μεγάροις)', and we have been waiting for you all the time' (Schadewaldt).

We should be reminded that the formulaic verse quoted by Page introduces a typical dining scene in which the meal goes by in a way familiar to the audience of epic poetry. Apart from two exceptions the formulaic verse: αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο . . . always follows.¹⁰⁹ The *Odyssey* is rich in surprises. Our scene also corresponds to its mode of representation: here the stream of the narrative is interrupted just at that moment at which the listener expects to hear the most usual words.

24. 387–8: ἦλθ' ὁ γέρων Δολίος, σὺν δ' υἱεῖς τοῦ γέροντος, | ἐξ ἔργων μογέοντες, ' . . . then old Dolius came along and with him the sons of the old man, tired out from working on the fields' (Schadewaldt). Page (108) rightly emphasized the meaning of the participle, which is unique in the epic. *Μογεῖν* means 'to suffer' (~ *perpeti*) but that is not the meaning here. The model for our passage is likely to be one of the two *Iliad* verses in which *μογέων* is used intransitively, in place of an adverb, *Il.* 11. 636: ἄλλος μὲν

¹⁰⁸ Cf. also Spohn 205; Schwartz 135 n. 2.

¹⁰⁹ The two exceptions are *Od.* 4. 218 where something special which is closely connected with the meal follows (ἐνθ' αὐτ' ἄλλ' ἐνόησ' 'Ελένη Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα) and 20. 256 (Telemachus seats Odysseus who is now a guest of the house at a special table near the threshold).

μογέων ἀποκινήσασκε τραπέζης ('with effort') or 12. 29: τὰ θέσαν μογέοντες Ἀχαιοί ('with trouble'). So one would have to translate the reference in the *Odyssey* in the following way: 'Dolius and his sons came home from work on the fields with trouble.' But this surely does not correspond to the poet's intention; the word order alone makes it clear that *μογέοντες* belongs to the prepositional phrase (meaning 'to be in a bad state').¹¹⁰

So the peculiarity of the use of the word consists in the fact that the participle *μογέοντες*, instead of being taken with the main verb, is taken with the prepositional phrase. By this means the slight shift of meaning from *perpetiens* to *laborans* automatically results. It is probably not too bold to claim that such a use of the participle could be derived at any time from the two references in the *Iliad*. [219] This assumption should also be maintainable if the participle were attested elsewhere in the *Odyssey*, possibly even with the same function as in the older poem.

Page compares three places from tragedy with *Od.* 24. 388 (Aesch. *Ag.* 1624 and *Prom.* 275 as well as Eur. *Alc.* 849) and expects his reader to conclude that the *Odyssey* verse was composed under the influence of Attic phrases. Such a suggestion is not justified.

24. 394: ὦ γέρον, ἴζ' ἐπὶ δείπνον, ἀπεκλεάθεσθε δὲ θάμβευς. The verse contains two peculiarities: the form ἀπεκλεάθεσθε and the genitive θάμβευς in the sixth dactyl.

1. That multiple compounds are more numerous in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad* is well known. One should for instance compare the following forms: ἀποπροέηκε (14. 26, 22. 327; see 22. 82); ἐκπρολιπόντες (8. 515); ἐπεντανύσας (22. 467) and others. The prefixes ἀποπρο-, ἐκπρο- and ἐπεν- are alien to the *Iliad*, ἐπεν- also occurs in the *Odyssey* only in the passage just mentioned. So this could be as suspect as the form ἀπεκλεάθεσθε. Since forms of ἐκλαθέσθαι ('to forget') are known to both epics (cf. ἐκλεαθέσθαι (*Il.* 6. 285) and ἐκλεάθοιτο (*Od.* 3. 224)), in our passage the meaning must be 'complete forgetting'. One is probably not allowed to discredit this *ad hoc* formation by pointing out that the combinations with ἐξαπο- predominate overall over ἀπεκ-. In all of these cases, the prefix ἀπο- immediately preceding the verb means

¹¹⁰ Cf. Schol. D to *Il.* 1. 162: ἐμόγησα· ἐκοπίασα, ἐκακοπάθησα, similarly Schol. *Od.* 24. 207.

'firmly', or even 'darkly'.¹¹¹ Also, in our case, an intensifying second prefix has come before the firm combination ἐκλεάθεσθε. So a transposition of the prefixes was not permitted. But we must exclude the obvious possibility of writing ὑπεκλεάθεσθε instead of ἀπεκλεάθεσθε (cf. ὑπεξάλασθαι *Il.* 15. 180, ὑπεξαναδύς *Il.* 13. 352, ὑπεξέφυγον *Od.* 11. 383) because the meaning would be distorted.

2. Page emphasizes that a contracted genitive singular of the neuters in -ος is otherwise never 'in the unemphasized half of the dactyl' (so in the biceps). I regard the deviation from this practice in our verse as less astonishing than the fact that the contracted ending -εως coincides several times with a *longum* (thus filling the *arsis*).¹¹² These diphthongs which originated through contraction cannot be removed. But once the ending -εως was accepted, the opportunity arose [220] of occasionally putting a contracted genitive at the verse end. As the poet used τέο next to τεῦ, σέο next to ἐμεῦ, ἔρχεο next to ἔρχεω, so he will have regarded θάμβεως next to ὄρεως as permitted and at his permanent disposal. The opportunity of locating it at the same position as in 24. 394 was not often given anyhow; for most of the epic neuters in -ος have a short stem vowel.¹¹³

24. 398: (ὦς ἄρ' ἔφη, Δολίος δ' ἰθὺς κίε χεῖρε πετάσας |) ἀμφοτέρως, Ὀδυσσεὺς δὲ λαβὼν κύσε χεῖρ' ἐπὶ καρπῷ. The genitive Ὀδυσσεὺς is a rarity; for according to our knowledge the group ε(φ)ο- is not contracted (cf. Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* i. 34). Page (108) calls the construction 'absolutely contrary to Homeric law'. But it depends on how one defines the scope of validity of this law. It should only be noted in passing that it is not difficult to mould this verse into a more pleasing shape, e.g. ἄμφω, Ὀδυσσῆος δὲ λαβὼν (Nauck). So there could also be a mistake in the tradition here.

Nevertheless, it is advisable to keep the tradition even without having to ascribe it to an inferior poet. There are three forms of the

¹¹¹ Schwyzler-Debrunner 428. There the impressive example ἐξαπατήσεν *Il.* 22. 299, 'next to which only ἀπάτησε and similar, not simple ἀπάω'.

¹¹² Cf. the cases compiled in Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* i. 58: *Il.* 8. 368 (ἐξ Ἑρέβους, 1 1 1 1 -), *Il.* 3. 10 (ἡύτ' ὄρεως, 1 1 1 1 -, v. 1. ant.), *Od.* 11. 37 (ὑπέξ Ἑρέβους, 1 2 1 1 -), *Il.* 16. 743 (εὐεργέος, 2 - -), *Il.* 17. 573 (θάρσεως, -3), *Od.* 7. 118 (θέρεως, 1 3), *Od.* 15. 533 (γένεως, 1 4).

¹¹³ So it is unnecessary to think of a mistake in tradition and consider θάμβεως which would have had to be measured in analogy to ᾠκεον (*Od.* 9. 400), ἡρίθμεον (10. 204), ἐφόρεον (22. 456).

genitive, Ὀδυσσῆος, Ὀδυσῆος, and Ὀδυσσεός. But the last one occurs only once in both epics, namely *Il.* 4. 491: τοῦ μὲν ἄμαρθ', ὁ δὲ Λεῦκον Ὀδυσσεός ἐσθλὸν ἑταῖρον. Now if a genitive scanning 1 1 - was really needed, could one not believe oneself to be justified in creating it through contraction after the model of the neuter genitives of the s-stems (cf. the form θάμβεως, *Od.* 24. 394 which has just been dealt with)? Such genitives of nouns in -εὺς were known to the old interpreters of Homer anyhow, cf. Schol. T to *Il.* 13. 424 (Ἰδομενεὺς δ' οὐ λῆγε μένος μέγα): τινὲς περισπῶσιν. One should compare the references in the grammarians collected for this scholium, especially Choeroboscus (Th. 1. 172. 21): ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τὸ εἰ καὶ τὸ οἰ τριχῶς συναιροῦνται ἤγουν κίρνανται . . . (24) οἶον Ἰδομενέος Ἰδομενεὺς, "Ἰδομενεὺς δ' οὐ λῆγε μένος μέγα" ἀντὶ τοῦ Ἰδομενέως οὐκ ἔληγεν ἢ δύναμις (next *Od.* 24. 398 and *Il.* 8. 368 are quoted). Bekker even wanted to extend the contraction to *Il.* 2. 566 (= *Il.* 23. 678) (Μηκιστεὺς υἱός instead of the traditional Μηκιστέος υἱός) and on top of everything write Πηλεὺς instead of Πηλέος.¹¹⁴ Although we are not allowed [221] to go that far, we will nevertheless leave untouched the contracted form in *Od.* 24. 398, which is unanimously attested. For Page's conclusion would not be cogent even if the poet of the *Odyssey* had taken over the uncontracted form of *Il.* 4. 491 (Ὀδυσσεός) in another place.

Finally, if Ἄτρεος, Τυδέος, Πηλέος were formed only from the patronymics as Meister (*HK* 150) assumes, we would not be allowed (with the editors) to put in Πηλῆος for traditional Πηλέος, so we would have to read διογενὴς Πηλῆος υἱός in *Il.* 1. 489. If this thesis were correct (it is convincingly disputed) the poet at *Od.* 24. 398, supported by such a position of the proper name, could have written: ἀμφοτέρως, Ὀδυσσεός (to be read with synaloephe).¹¹⁵ But this is not probable.

24. 402: οὐλλέ τε καὶ μέγα χαῖρε, θεοὶ δέ τοι ὄλβια δοῖεν. The solemn form οὐλλέ¹¹⁶ occurs again only in the Hymn to Apollo 466,

¹¹⁴ I. Bekker, *Homerische Blätter* (Bonn, 1863), i. 40 f. In any case it cannot be denied that in *Il.* 2. 566 (= 23. 678) either Μηκιστέος (Μηκιστεὺς Bekker) υἱός or Μηκιστῆος υἱός (thus Bekker in the edition Bonn 1858) must be read. Allen had Μηκιστέος printed in the first, Μηκιστῆος in the second place although the majority of the MSS offers Μηκιστέως there and here (sc. *Il.* 23. 678) Μηκιστέος. Cf. also Herodianus on *Il.* 9. 106.

¹¹⁵ So we would have only a slight mistake in the traditional version.

¹¹⁶ Originally vocative (cf. Schwyzler i. 723 n. 5), but used like an imperative by the poet ('salve'). Uncontrollable associations in G. E. Dimcock Jr. in *Essays* 70.

where our verse is repeated. Conclusions concerning the time of origin of this verse of the *Odyssey*, our oldest evidence for this interesting word, are not possible.

24. 416: *μυχμῶ τε στοναχῇ τε*. *Μυχμός* (groaning) is an Ionic formation like *πρήχμα* (later *μυγμός*); it belongs to *μύζω*.¹¹⁷ Page (110) notes: 'A novelty, not elsewhere in poetry.' But the principle is valid here too that words which have been formed regularly, even if they are attested only once, do not allow any conclusions about their age.

24. 432: . . . ἢ καὶ ἔπειτα κατηφέες ἐσσόμεθ' αἰεὶ. This new formation is in addition to epic *κατηφείη* (*Il.* 3. 51 and more often) which belongs to *κατηφεῖν* (cf. *κατηφήσας Il.* 22. 293, similarly *Od.* 16. 342). Page (110; cf. also Spohn 180) has the references mentioned to hand, and also notes that the *Iliad* knows the noun *κατηφόνες* (*Il.* 24. 253) besides. Under these circumstances, however, he should not have been surprised about the existence of the adjective *κατηφής*; for this relates to *κατηφείη* as *ἀληθής* (*Il.* 12. 433) to *ἀληθείη* (cf. *Il.* 23. 361) or as *ἀναιδής* (cf. *Il.* 1. 158) to *ἀναιδείη* (cf. 1. 149). So the formation is regular; it could be coined at any time by an expert user of epic language.

24. 437: Eupheithes challenges the Ithacans to take revenge before Odysseus escapes to the mainland with his people: *ἀλλ' ἴομεν, μὴ φθέωσι περαιωθέντες ἐκεῖνοι*. This verb meaning 'to cross (over)' is not otherwise attested in epic. *περᾶν* is used once to mean 'to cross the sea', [222] cf. *Od.* 5. 174: ἢ με κέλεαι σχεδὴν περᾶν μέγα λαῖτμα θαλάσσης. But this finding does not give us a reason for surprise (cf. Page 109); for at 24. 437 a crossing from coast to coast is evidently meant, and this fact alone explains why the verb later occurs so often in Greek historical literature. In classical poetry, it is found only in Aristophanes (*Ran.* 138, Dionysus in conversation with Heracles): *εἴτα πῶς γε περαιωθήσομαι* 'How shall I get across there (sc. across the lake of the underworld)?' It goes without saying that there was no opportunity for such usage in the *Odyssey* apart from here; for even in the formulation of *Od.* 5. 174, the full emphasis is on the perilous length of the voyage, not on the possibility of getting across. So the *Odyssey* offers the oldest evidence for *περαιοῦσθαι*. It is no coincidence that this epic word gained new life only in the fifth century.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Frisk, *GEW* ii. 264 (with lit.).

24. 465: οὐ γάρ σφιν ἄδε μῦθος ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἀλλ' *Εὐπείθει* | *πείθοντ(ο)*. Page (109) on this: '*Εὐπείθει*: the contracted dative in -ει in the unstressed half of the dactyl is absolutely contrary to Homeric law.' The statement is not accurately formulated, unless Page means the second half of the sixth dactyl. The dative of the s-stems is found in the *thesis*, but always with hiatus shortening (so it forms the second *breve* of the *biceps*), e.g. *Il.* 11. 109: *Ἀντιφον αὖ παρὰ οὓς ἔλασε ξίφει, ἐκ δ' ἔβαλ' ἵππων*, or *Il.* 20. 172: *γλαυκιδῶν ἰθὺς φέρεται μένει, ἦν τινα πέφνη*, or 23. 189: *ἐν λέχει ἀσκητῷ*. Meister (*HK* 128) has proved that this position was chosen because the contraction was not acceptable to the poets. Such forms therefore take the place of the *longum* only rarely. e.g. *Il.* 16. 792 (= *Od.* 13. 164): *χειρὶ καταπρηνεί*, *Il.* 17. 647: *ἐν δὲ φάει* (beginnings of verse), *Il.* 23. 515: *οὐ τι τάχει γε* (200-υ), *Od.* 3. 91: *εἴτε καὶ ἐν πελάγει*, *Il.* 21. 262 *χώρῳ ἐνὶ προαλεί* (beginnings of verse). The places mentioned last show anyhow that contraction was acceptable although it was used only rarely.

So the irregularity of *Od.* 24. 465 consists in the fact that the dative with a contracted final syllable forms the end of the hexameter. For this we do not have any other evidence. There is a second peculiarity too: 422 and 469 in Book 24 show that the poet wanted the proper name, which in the preceding books appears only in the formula *προσέφη Εὐπείθεος υἱός* (υυ⁴—υυ—x), to be read as three syllables. But as a Molossian word, the dative *Εὐπείθει* would have had to be placed in such a way that its middle syllable took the place of a *biceps* (was in the *thesis*).¹¹⁸

[223] So in this case one can only take note of the irregularity. Presumably the poet felt that he was allowed to put the contracted dative of the rare proper name at the end of the verse. We do not want to excuse him. Certainly a more pleasing expression could have been found. On the other hand this violation of the rule—it is the only place where Page's criticism is really justified—is not sufficient to condemn the whole ending of the epic.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁸ On the exceptions cf. Ludwig, *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik* i, ii (Leipzig, 1884-5) ii. 247: 'Only in two places within the verse did Homer at times allow himself to deviate from the regular stress of the Molossus: before the bucolic dihaeresis and at the end of the verse (in the hexameter *spondiacus*); there only extremely rarely, here a little more frequently.'

¹¹⁹ Whether one should think about an influence of the genitive *θάμβευς* (ε-, *Od.* 24. 394) discussed above is debatable. But quite possibly the poet could have been looking for the parechesis *Εὐπείθει* | *πείθοντο*. But this certainly is not sufficient to justify the position of the *nomen proprium*.

24. 485: (ἡμεῖς δ' αὖ παίδων τε κασιγνήτων τε φόνονοι) ἔκκλησιν θέωμεν. Page (110) emphasizes with disapproval that the noun has a parallel only in Pindaric ἐπίλασις (P. 1. 46). He says besides that the phraseology is just as unhomeric as the phrase σκέδασιν θείη (Od. 1. 116, 20. 225) (quoted by the commentators).¹²⁰ Both accusations are inappropriate: The formation ἔκκλησις is faultless (cf. ἔκβασις Od. 5. 410).¹²¹ But one can effortlessly detect this supposedly unhomeric phraseology in both epics. As in Od. 24. 485, the verbal abstract is used as a paraphrase in other places as well, when a special intensity of the action is supposed to be expressed, cf. Il. 15. 69–70 (ἐκ τοῦ δ' ἄν τοι ἔπειτα παλίωξιν παρὰ νηῶν | αἰεὶ ἐγὼ τεύχοιμι), Od. 4. 544 (οὐκ ἄνυσίν τινα δῆομεν), Od. 9. 421 (εἴ τιν' ἐταίροισιν θανάτου λύσιν ἦδ' ἐμοὶ αὐτῷ | εὐροίμην).¹²² In this case, Page's misgivings are totally groundless.

24. 486: Zeus finishes his speech with the words: πλοῦτος δὲ καὶ εἰρήνη ἅλις ἔστω. Page (111) regards this as strange too because πλοῦτος appears elsewhere in the *Odyssey* only at 14. 206, and on top of that in a formula which stems from the *Iliad*, and because εἰρήνη on the other hand belongs to the older poem only (in the combination ὥς ποτ' or τὸ πρὶν ἐπ' εἰρήνης respectively, cf. Il. 2. 797, 9. 403, 22. 156). We add that πλοῦτος is used six times in the *Iliad* and ask how the poem about war could have fitted in the word 'peace' in any other way than in phrases of the kind 'as once in peacetime'. But in Od. 24. 486 both [224] nouns, and especially εἰρήνη, have their full sense: they hint at the fulfilment of the action.

24. 491: ἐξελθὼν τις ἴδοι, μὴ δὴ σχεδὸν ὦσι (σχ. ἔωσι Schwartz, σχεδὸν εἰσι Kirchhoff) κιώντες. Page (110) seems to regard such Attic forms as evidence of later origin (sc. under the influence of the Attic dialect). In this case even Wackernagel (*SU* 110) does not go this far. But should one suppose that the author of Il. 14. 274

¹²⁰ The construction of the sentence (ὄρκια . . . ταμόντες ὁ μὲν . . . ἡμεῖς δ' . . .) follows a typically Homeric scheme, cf. Od. 12. 73 ff.; Stanford on Od. 24. 485. Cf. also Aristonicus on Il. 5. 27–8 (with test.). The irregularity consists only in that in the imagination of the speaker the thought that the gods are responsible for what will happen pushes itself to the front; so instead of 'the Ithacans are supposed to forget' it is said 'we (the celestial ones) will make them forget'. This is a psychologically understandable anacoluthon. Good description in Eust. 1968, 11. Spohn's objections (198) are not justified.

¹²¹ Cf. the literature mentioned in Frisk, *GEW* ii. 81!

¹²² Cf. Schwyzler-Debrunner 357.

(μάρτυροι ὧς οἱ ἔνερθε θεοὶ Κρόνον ἀμφὶς ἐόντες) was able to form an epic participle, but on the other hand fell back upon the Attic form for the subjunctive? This is improbable. Either he also had the subjunctive ὦσι at his disposal as an epic form or the passage is corrupt (μαρτυρέωσ' οἱ van Leeuwen, μάρτυροι ὅσσοι Voss). Only the second possibility can be reconciled with our knowledge of Homeric dialect. The few Attic forms which can be found in both epics (cf. Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* i. 286 ff.) were corrected by conjectures a long time ago:¹²³ κεν ἦσιν (κ' ἔησιν quoted by Zonaras) Od. 8. 147; ἦσιν (ἔησιν) 8. 163; ἵνα ἦσι (ἵν' ἔησι) 8. 580; ἦσιν (ἔησιν) Il. 19. 202; ὄντας (ἐόντας) Od. 7. 94; οὔσης (ἐούσης) Od. 19. 489; ὄντες (v. l. ἐόντες) Od. 19. 230. So we can recommend assuming that Od. 24. 491 is also corrupt.

24. 497: τέσσαρες ἀμφ' Ὀδυσῆ', ἔξ δ' υἱεῖς οἱ Δολίοιο. Page (110) accepts only Il. 20. 181 (τιμῆς τῆς Πριάμου) as an exact parallel; but this verse appears in a part athetized by Aristarchus. Nevertheless, it is sufficient to justify the formulation in Od. 24. 497; for Aristarchus' deletion of Il. 20. 180–6 is unsound, cf. Aristonicus: . . . ὅτι εὐτελεῖς εἰσι τῇ κατασκευῇ καὶ τοῖς νοήμασι. Chantraine (*Gr. Hom.* ii. 163) classifies the verses mentioned under a use of the article which is only beginning to develop in epic language. Page rejects his further examples (Il. 9. 342, 23. 348, and probably also Od. 22. 221) with a certain amount of justification; for in them the noun which belongs to the article has been left out; so they cannot definitely be compared with our verse.¹²⁴ But one can very well bring in the cases in which the article stands after the noun with an explanatory or a qualifying adjective. For τιμῆς τῆς Πριάμου is nothing other than τιμῆς τῆς Πριαμητῆς (to insert a later adjective for the sake of clarification). So one should compare: Il. 16. 358 (Αἴας δ' ὁ μέγας), [225] 14. 279 (θεοὺς δ' ὀνόμηνεν ἅπαντας | τοὺς ὑποταρταρίους), Od. 12. 252 (ἰχθύσι τοῖς ὀλίγοις δόλον κατὰ εἶδατα βάλλων, i.e. 'and in fact to the small ones which are not caught with harpoons'). So one should leave the formulation of 24. 497 unchallenged, especially since the use of the article

¹²³ In most cases it is enough to put in the corresponding Ionic form and to read with synizesis. Cf. Wackernagel, *SU* 110; Schwyzler i. 677; Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* i. 41, 64; Thumb-Scherer, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte* (Heidelberg, 1959), ii. 257. Cf. also Meister, *Die homerische Kunstsprache* (Leipzig, 1921) 195 (who seems to admit οὔσης next to regular ἐούσης).

¹²⁴ Il. 23. 376: αἱ Φηρητιάδαι ποδώκεας ἔκφερον ἵπποι mentioned as an example by Monro (cf. Stanford *ad loc.*) must probably be discarded as well.

in the *Odyssey* is more modern than in the *Iliad* (cf. Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* ii. 165).

24. 499: καὶ πολιοί περ ἔόντες, ἀναγκαῖοι πολεμισταί. 'A fine Homeric line' (Stanford). Page (111) on the other hand notes: 'πολιός: grey, meaning grey-haired, aged, is characteristic of fifth-century Attic, especially Drama; the usage is unknown to the Epic.' But how about the references in which a grey i.e. grey-haired head is mentioned? Cf. *Il.* 22. 74 (similarly *Il.* 24. 516): πολιόν τε κάρη πολιόν τε γένειον and *Od.* 24. 317: χεύατο κακ κεφαλῆς πολιῆς. It would probably be nit-picking to treat this problem by distinguishing between head and person, cf. e.g. *Il.* 8. 281 (Τεύκρε, φίλη κεφαλῇ), further *Il.* 11. 55, 23. 94; *Od.* 11. 549, 557. The expression which is permissible for the head must therefore also be valid for the person.

24. 511: ὄψαι, αἶ κ' ἐθέλησθα . . . τῶδ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ (| οὐ τι καταισχύνοντα τεὸν γένος). Page (111) need not have included this passage in his catalogue of linguistic offences; for the mistake is corrected by Wolf's conjecture (τῶδ' ἐπὶ θυμῷ), cf. *Il.* 13. 485 and *Od.* 16. 99 (in both places Aristarchus read ἐπί instead of ἐνί. A large part of the manuscript tradition agrees with him). This kind of corruption is not rare, cf. M. L. West on *Od.* 16. 282 (*Philol.* 110 (1967), 147).¹²⁵

24. 514-15: τίς νύ μοι ἡμέρη ἦδε, θεοὶ φίλοι; ἦ μάλα χαίρω | υἱός θ' υἱωνός τ' ἀρετῆς πέρι δῆριν ἔχουσι. Page (110) thinks: 'The Epic was very sparing of interjections (ὦ μοι, ὦ πόποι): neither this expletive, θεοὶ φίλοι, nor anything else of the kind occurs elsewhere in the Homeric poems.' Then he quotes Spohn (206), who reports that the young Gottfried Hermann read this verse with displeasure. If Page had also known Faesi's remark about these verses, he would probably have enjoyed quoting them: 'An immensely feeble expression which makes Laertes appear to us as an almost childishly weak and vain old man.' This is certainly one method of interpretation which will quickly get rid of the difficulties. Wackernagel (*SU* 230) remarks quite correctly that Laertes' words are less a question than an 'expression of a feeling of happiness'. They combine suitably enough with the exclamation 'merciful gods', and

¹²⁵ Stanford defends tradition since he regards the meaning 'in my present spirit' as more suitable than the interpretation 'with, in possession of . . .'. The reference to *Il.* 13. 485 and *Od.* 16. 99 to my mind militates against this opinion.

describe a climax of mood in a similar way to [226] the one in which the words of Philoetius (*Od.* 20. 209: ὦ μοι ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆος ἀμύμονος) form an exclamation of horror. Wackernagel also referred to *Od.* 24. 351-2 by way of comparison: Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἦ ῥ' ἔτι ἐστέ, θεοί, κατὰ μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον, | εἰ ἐτεὸν μνηστῆρες ἀτάσθαλον ὕβριν ἔτεισαν. They describe a similar feeling of happiness as 24. 514 f., but Zeus and the gods are actually addressed in them. On the other hand the exclamation θεοὶ φίλοι, taken as a mere assertion, does indeed lack a proper analogy in Homer.¹²⁶ But the special peculiarity of Book 24 must in this case also be emphasized: in a relatively short compass, the poet is describing unique situations which, as we have been able to state several times already, brought unique expressions to life. One would have to find in the *Iliad* the occasion when Laertes' exclamation would have been appropriate. To reverse the argument: Which more usual Homeric phrase should the old man have used, in order to describe the unexpected happiness which he is now allowed to enjoy at the end of his life? He who ponders these questions will soon realize that not only were Faesi and Page wrong, but also the young Gottfried Hermann.

24. 519 Athena goes up to Laertes and urges him to pray to Zeus and his daughter (sc. Athena) and then to hurl his spear at the enemy: αἶψα μάλ' ἀμπεπαλὼν προῖει δολιχόσκιον ἔγχος. The last words (προῖει δολιχόσκιον ἔγχος) are formulaic. They occur in the *Iliad* another ten times (3. 355 = 5. 280 = 7. 244 = 11. 349 = 17. 516 = 22. 273 = 22. 289, cf. further 5. 15, 7. 249, 20. 273), but there προῖει is in each case imperfect indicative. Page (111) therefore speaks of an artificial adaptation of the formula in *Od.* 24. 519 since προῖει is here to be understood as an imperative. But the point of the *Odyssey* reference consists in the fact that Laertes obeys Athena's advice and launches the spear successfully: the narrative of the poet (24. 521-2) now takes up the verses of the goddess (24. 518-19) almost literally (24. 519 = 522), but in verse 522 προῖει is now an imperfect, as in the descriptions of the *Iliad*. Again, from a hackneyed phrase new splendour has been won (cf. above to *Od.* 24. 40).

24. 528: καὶ νύ κε δὴ πάντας (τ') ὄλεσαν καὶ θῆκαν ἀνόστους. This adjective, which is a combination of an α-privative and a verbal

¹²⁶ Cf. Bekker, *Homerische Blätter*, i. 201.

noun, is found only here in the Homeric epics. Like Spohn (181) and the commentaries, Page too (111) refers to the related and isolated formation in *Od.* 4. 182: (θεός,) δς κείνον δύστηνον ἀνόστιμον ὁδον ἔθηκεν. Furthermore he thinks that he needs to state that ἀνοστος would be 'a useful word, if the Epic had known it'. I regard this assumption as incorrect, since there were [227] paraphrases with νόστος and νόστιμον ἡμαρ as well as personal constructions with νόστιμος at the poet's disposal for representing the thought that someone did not or could not return home. Cf. *Il.* 9. 413 (ᾧλετο μὲν μοι νόστος), 16. 82 (φίλον δ' ἀπὸ νόστον ἔλονται); *Od.* 12. 419 (= 14. 309: θεός δ' ἀποαίνυτο νόστον), 1. 9 (ὁ τοῖσιν ἀφείλετο νόστιμον ἡμαρ), 4. 806 (ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἔτι νόστιμός ἐστιν), 20. 333 (νῦν δ' ἤδη τόδε δῆλον ὅ τ' οὐκέτι νόστιμός ἐστιν). In all these cases, a return home from war is referred to; he who grants or denies it is a god. But in *Od.* 24. 528 only a return from Laertes' estate is meant. The object of the sentence is Eupheithes' followers, the agents Odysseus and his comrades. Perhaps the poet felt obliged to choose a word which had not been used before in order to describe these peculiarities, either a word which was known to him already or one which he created for the present purpose.¹²⁷

24. 534: τῶν δ' ἄρα δεισάντων ἐκ χειρῶν ἔπατο τεύχεα (| πάντα δ' ἐπὶ χθονὶ πίπτε . . .). Page (111 and 113) is scandalized by the misuse of the word τεύχεα. No poet to whom epic language was familiar could have talked about the whole armour, the harness, if he meant only 'weapons'. Page says that the author of our verse had imitated *Od.* 12. 203 (τῶν δ' ἄρα δεισάντων ἐκ χειρῶν ἔπατ' ἔρετμά) but that this imitation miscarried, proving multiple authorship. But the second part of this judgement is false. Let us recall the verses in which the recovery of weapons is mentioned: ἀρήϊα τεύχεα (*Od.* 16. 284, 19. 4) describes clearly all the parts of a warrior's equipment, namely protective and offensive weapons but especially sword, spears, and shield (cf. *Od.* 16. 295–6; cf. further *Od.* 22. 109, 139, 180; 24. 165, 219). What is the *Iliad* poet thinking of when he describes the last flight of the Achaeans in the following way (*Il.* 17. 760): πολλὰ δὲ τεύχεα καλὰ πέσον περί τ' ἀμφί τε τάφρον | φευγόντων Δαναῶν, or when in describing the river battle he says (21. 301): πολλὰ δὲ τεύχεα καλὰ δαίκαταμένων αἰζηῶν

¹²⁷ The formation ἀνοστος could not cause any difficulties, cf. Debrunner 28 (para. 54), cf. ἀ-νοστος with ἀ-νουσος, ἀ-γονος (*Il.* 3. 40), ἀ-θάνατος, ἀ-κάματος, ἀ-υπνος and others.

| πλώων καὶ νέκυες? Both references are crystal clear. The fleeing Greeks are obviously throwing away their cumbersome shields in particular. But there are not just spears floating on the floods of Scamander but corpses and probably shields covered with ox hide (βοάγρια, cf. *Il.* 12. 22), or rather the light shields of barbarian auxiliaries (λαιοσήϊα . . . πτερόεντα, cf. *Il.* 5. 453 = 12. 426).¹²⁸ It is a logical assumption that in our passage in Book 24 too, shields in particular are described by τεύχεα. The [228] Ithacans throw them away, in order to be able to run for the city at speed. The question whether they are taking their spears along at the same time is irrelevant.

24. 535: πάντα (sc. τεύχεα) δ' ἐπὶ χθονὶ πίπτε, θεᾶς ὅπα φωνησάσης, i.e. 'when the goddess let her voice sound'. The half of the verse after the middle caesura is a phrase from the *Iliad* (*Il.* 2. 182 = 10. 512, similarly 20. 380); here the accusative ὅπα depends on the finite verb (ξυνέηκε or ἄκουσε respectively), but in the construction in Book 24 it depends on the participle. Page sees in this combination of words a reprehensible deviation from epic tradition (110: 'our poet is so far from the tradition . . .'). On the other hand, syntactical regroupings of given phrases are important characteristics of epic verse formation and no evidence at all that the poet had mastered his art inadequately. As Leumann (*Homerische Wörter* (Basle, 1950) *passim*, esp. 183 ff.) showed with notable examples, the *Iliad* poet already proceeds like this with the formulaic material given to him, and a similar relationship can be traced between quite a few of his word combinations and those of the *Odyssey*. So its poet reshaped the phrase γούνων ἀψάμενοι λιτανεύουσιν (*Il.* 24. 357) into the construction γούνων ἐλλιτάνευσαν (*Od.* 10. 481), presumably not without the influence of *Il.* 9. 451 (ἐμὲ λισσέσκετο γούνων).¹²⁹ The verb στεύμαι is combined with the infinitive in the *Iliad*, cf. *Il.* 2. 597: στεῦτο γὰρ εὐχόμενος νικήσμεν ('he boastingly presumed to win') and 5. 832–3: στεῦτ' ἀγορεύων | Τρώσι μαχήσεσθαι ('talking, he asserted that he would fight against the

¹²⁸ For their description in the commentaries of the ancients cf. H. L. Lorimer, *Homer and the Monuments* (London, 1950), 195.

¹²⁹ Cf. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter*, 189. For the dependence of *Od.* 10 on Book 24 of the *Iliad* cf. G. Beck, *Philologus* 109 (1965), 1–29. Beck also noticed singularities in language usage in *Od.* 10 which can have originated only under the influence of *Il.* 24, e.g. ἡμερόεις . . . γόος *Od.* 10. 398, θαλερὸν γόνον 10. 457. On the other hand in *Il.* 24. 760 it says γόνον δ' ἀλίσστον ὄρινε which could not be used in the new context and was re coined into the phrases mentioned which were alien to the *Iliad*.

Trojans'). But the *Odyssey* (sc. *Od.* 11. 584) gives the impression that its author had taken the opportunity from the references mentioned to combine *στεῦτο* with the participle: *στεῦτο δὲ διψάων, πείειν δ' οὐκ εἶχεν ἐλέσθαι* ('he behaved like a thirsting man', of Tantalus).¹³⁰ So after the pattern *ἐπίουρος* (*Il.* 13. 450: *Κρήτη ἐπίουρον*, originally *Κρήτη ἐπὶ οὐρον*),¹³¹ originating from misjudging or neglecting postposition, the *Odyssey* poet formed from *βουκόλοι ἄνδρες* (*Il.* 13. 571 and sim.) the compound *ἐπιβουκόλος ἀνὴρ* (*Od.* 3. 422) and from *βώτορας ἄνδρας* (*Il.* 12. 302) a new *nomen agentis* *ἐπιβώτορι μῆλων* (*Od.* 13. 222) etc.¹³²

[229] 24. 535 also belongs to this group of obviously intentional changes of construction and shifts of meaning. It should not be permissible to assume an error on the poet's part, that he could not have constructed the simple verse *Il.* 2. 182 (*ὣς φάθ', ὁ δὲ ξυνέηκε θεᾶς ὅπα φωνησάσης*). Rather, since a transitive use of a verb employed in the *Iliad* only absolutely suggested itself by analogy with *λέγειν* or *εἰπεῖν* respectively (cf. e.g. *Od.* 4. 389 = 10. 539), he seems to have seen a possibility here of giving a new and more effective sense to a known formulaic combination. We had observed similar phenomena several times already (cf. *Od.* 24. 40 and 519).

All the expressions which Page, following Spohn's investigation, regards as unepic have now been mentioned. The new examination has shown that only four places present difficulties: the gloss word *ἀδινάων* (*Od.* 23. 326) whose intended meaning cannot really be known, the unique form *πόστον* (24. 288) which cannot be given in Ionic, the genitive *Ὀδυσεύς* (24. 398), and the metric peculiarity of verse 24. 465 (contracted *Εὐπείθει* at the end of the verse). All the other objections are not justified, since sufficient analogies can be found in the acknowledged stock of epic diction. But the deletion of the final part of our epic cannot be justified merely on the strength of these four peculiarities. That the language of the last two books is rich in rare expressions and unique word combinations is presumably, as we have emphasized several times already, the result of the multiplicity of themes which come together here in a relatively confined space.

¹³⁰ Cf. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter*, 211 who on the other hand also considers the possibility of construing *πείειν* with *στεῦτο*. However, if Agar's conjecture is correct (*στεῦτο δὲ διψάων πείειν, οὐδ' εἶχεν ἐλέσθαι*), this example would anyway be unsuitable for our purposes.

¹³¹ Thus already some unknown sources of Herodianus, cf. Schol. A *ad loc.*

¹³² Cf. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter*, 92.

