

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: **From the Iliad to the Odyssey**

Name of Author: **Rutherford, R.**

Title/Author of book/edition (if applicable): **Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad.**

Cairns, D.

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

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

Publisher: **Oxford University Press**

Pages scanned: **117 - 146**

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

3

From the Iliad to the Odyssey

R. B. RUTHERFORD

Graecorum iste morbus fuit quaerere quem numerum Vlixes remigum habuisset, prior scripta esset Ilias an Odyssea, praeterea an eiusdem esset auctoris, alia deinceps huius notae, quae sive contineas, nihil tacitam conscientiam iuvant, sive proferas, non doctior videaris sed molestior.

(Seneca, *de brevitate vitae* 13. 2)

'[Homer] wrote a sequel of Songs and Rhapsodies, to be sung by himself for small earnings and good cheer, at Festivals and other days of Merriment; the Ilias he made for the men and the Odysseis for the other sex.'

(Richard Bentley, *Remarks on a Late Discourse of Free Thinking* (1713))

I

The relation of the *Odyssey* to the *Iliad* has always been problematical. In ancient times, although a minority school of separatists, the *chōrizontes*, did exist, the general consensus was that the two epics were composed by a single master poet, 'Homer'. The reverse is the case today: although there have been distinguished voices on the other side, most scholars favour separate authorship.

Versions of this chapter were read to friendly audiences in London and Manchester. I am grateful to all who commented on these occasions, to Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood for helping me improve a second draft, and also to Nicholas Richardson and Oliver Taplin for letting me read relevant parts of their own work on the *Iliad*. Some parts of my argument overlap with two sections in the introduction to my commentary on *Odyssey* 19 and 20 (Cambridge University Press, 1992), but I hope that there is enough new material, and sufficient difference of emphasis, to justify this separate essay. Some of the informality of the lecture format has been preserved, partly to make clear that this is not intended to be a definitive treatment of the subject.

One poet or two, however, the comparison of the two epics raises important questions concerning the character and special quality of each—so alike in many ways, yet so very different. The difference has been variously described:¹ for Aristotle, the *Iliad* was simple in construction whereas the *Odyssey* was complex; the former resembled tragedy, the latter, with its satisfying and successful resolution, was closer to comedy (*Poetics* 13, 1453^a30–39, 24, 1459^b13–16). For ‘Longinus’ the *Odyssey* was the sadly deficient product of Homer’s old age: like the setting sun, it lacked force, intensity, passion: *pathos* (emotion) was supplanted by *ēthos* (character) (*On the sublime* 9, 13–15). To Samuel Butler, the *Odyssey* showed signs of a woman’s interests and intellect; for T. E. Lawrence, the author was a ‘bookish, house-bred man’, a great lover of the *Iliad* but falling far short of that poem in conception and gifts of characterization. Comparison breeds evaluation: the *Odyssey* has often suffered by comparison with the *Iliad*, and it is only recently that a majority of interpreters have begun to recognize that this poet is attempting something on the same scale, but in a different mould, and to see the two great epics as complementary, each giving a rich but partial vision of human society and heroic ideals.²

Ancient and modern readers naturally tend to assume that the two poems are connected—either the work of one mind, or one poem

¹ I owe much to earlier treatments. See esp. F. Jacoby, ‘Die geistige Physiognomie der Odyssee’, *Kleine philologische Schriften* 1 (Berlin, 1961), 107–39 (originally publ. in *Antike* 9 (1933), 159–94); A. Heubeck, *Der Odyssee-Dichter und die Ilias* (Erlangen, 1954); K. Rüter, *Odysseeinterpretationen* (Hypomnemata 19, Göttingen, 1969), 24–34, 64 ff. etc.; W. Burkert, ‘Das Lied von Ares und Aphrodite’, *RM* 103 (1960), 130–44 [trans. in P. V. Jones and G. M. Wright (edd.), *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation* (Oxford, 1997), 249–62]; J. Griffin, *Homer. The Odyssey* (Cambridge, 1987), 63–70. J. M. Redfield, ‘The Making of the *Odyssey*’, in A. Yu (ed.), *Parnassus Revisited* (Chicago, 1973), is a stimulating general essay. Although there are interesting ideas in P. Pucci, *Odysseus Polytropos* (Ithaca, 1987), his approach differs so much from mine that I have found it difficult to follow him in many of his conclusions. Here I would only comment that I am resistant to the conception of the *Il.* and *Od.* as fluid entities influencing one another intertextually, as if historical context and chronology were irrelevant as well as unknowable. This paper was already submitted to *BICS* when I obtained a copy of Knut Usener’s monograph, *Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis der Odyssee zur Ilias* (Script-Oralia Reihe A, Bd. 5, Tübingen, 1990), which will swiftly establish itself as a standard work. I am happy to find that we agree considerably in our general approach, although there is surprisingly small overlap in the specific correspondences which we discuss. Some parallel observations in his study are referred to below, in the appropriate places.

² Amongst the most eloquent of recent voices I should cite N. Austin, *Archery at the Dark of the Moon* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1975), a work of real insight and sophistication, despite its eccentricities. See also W. G. Thalmann, *Conventions*

composed with an eye on, or in competition with, the other. The advent of ‘oral’ studies, however, has altered the terms of this debate. Since the work of Milman Parry and his followers, it has become clear that the Homeric poems did not spring into being from the imagination of one bard or even one generation. They are the product of a long tradition of oral poetry treating comparable subject matter in a recognizable style—a tradition which employed a poetic language of formulae and repeated story-patterns, which utilized a whole repertory of material, now beyond quantification, and which produced many other epics now lost. If, then, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are two among many poems narrating events of the heroic age, it is less easy to assume that one is composed in direct emulation of the other. More specifically, the concept of ‘allusion’, in such a tradition, may itself be called into question. A poet in a predominantly oral culture, composing for oral performance even if employing writing himself, cannot (it is argued) echo or adapt the words or motifs of a fellow-practitioner in the subtle manner of a Euripides or a Callimachus; nor, even if he did so, could he suppose that his audience would appreciate such allusions. In response to these doubts and uncertainties, some critics now prefer to speak of an Achillean tradition, or of Iliadic poetry, regarding the extant poems, for all their beauties, as representative of only one stage in a continuously fluid poetic tradition.

In this area as elsewhere, it seems likely that too much ground has been conceded to the oralists. While some arguments for imitation or deliberate echoes of one poem by another must now be abandoned, and others treated with greater caution, the question of the relation between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* remains open, and our knowledge of the conditions under which they were produced is not such as to permit us to rule out in principle the possibility (to put it no more strongly) that a poet might quote or allude to an earlier poem. The aim of this chapter is to set out a number of arguments for the *Odyssey* being later than, and conceived as a sequel to, the *Iliad*, and to list a number of passages in the *Odyssey* which seem to involve significant allusion to the *Iliad*, in the sense that such a passage calls to mind some prominent episode or feature of the *Iliad*, and may be

of *Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Baltimore, 1984), ch. 6; E. K. Borthwick, *Odyssean Elements in the Iliad* (inaug. lecture, n.d., Edinburgh 1985?); A. Heubeck, general introd. to the *Oxford Odyssey*, 1 (Oxford, 1988), 3–23.

thought likely to remind an audience with experience of epic performances of that aspect of the *Iliad*. The argument is cumulative and tentative: it makes no claim to be exhaustive, and is indeed intended to stimulate further discussion. My own preference is for separate authorship of the two epics, but I have tried to present my argument in such a way that it may have something to offer the committed advocate of single authorship. Two other preliminary assumptions should also be explicitly mentioned: (1) I take it for granted that, with the exception of certain limited sections of the text, each poem is essentially a unified creation by a single mind (which is not to deny that both poems make use of stories and episodes already familiar to their audiences). (2) I assume that, whether or not the poets made use of writing in the process of composition, they were not 'primitive' oral bards incapable of artistic shaping of their work—that is, they were premeditating and planning their works, not improvising them, and they made use of cross-reference, foreshadowing, careful plotting and sequences of scenes, and many other poetic devices which serve to integrate and ornament a long narrative poem.

II

More precise examination of the relation between the two epics can usefully start from the fact that the *Odyssey* never refers to the main narrative events of the *Iliad*, the wrath of Achilles over Briseis, the fresh anger against Hector, the death of Troy's noblest defender.³ This silence has been interpreted in different ways. The late Sir Denys Page held that the *Odyssey* was a wholly independent poem, composed by a poet working in a different place and in a different tradition from the poet of the *Iliad*, one who did not even know the story recounted in the *Iliad*.⁴ This was a challenging proposition, but eccentric and perhaps wilfully provocative; it has itself been challenged on a number of levels and can by now be considered refuted.⁵

³ This is sometimes called 'Monro's Law': see D. B. Monro, in one of the Appendices to his commentary on *Od.* 13–20 (Oxford, 1901), 325.

⁴ *The Homeric Odyssey* (Oxford, 1955), ch. 6, esp. 149–59.

⁵ See T. B. L. Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer* (London, 1958), 275–83; D. Young, 'Miltonic Light on Page's Homeric Theory', *G & R* 6 (1959), 96–108 (cf. A. Morpurgo, 'Omero, Milton e la filologia', *Riv. cult. class. med.* 2 (1960), 204–8); J. B. Hainsworth,

A more plausible position would be that the *Odyssey* deliberately neglects the central story of the *Iliad* because it could not be surpassed, could not be challenged direct. The *Odyssey* does, however, perform some of the functions of a sequel or epilogue (as Longinus and other ancient critics already noted).⁶ That is, it does do a most efficient job of filling in the story since *Iliad* 24. The death of Achilles, the dispute over the armour, the Wooden Horse, the sack of Troy, the recovery of Helen, the murder of Agamemnon, the misfortunes of the other Greeks on the homeward voyage, all find a place somewhere. Few characters are left unaccounted-for, few questions unanswered. This would be a remarkable coincidence if the *Odyssey*-poet had never heard or encountered the *Iliad*.

Some of the more detailed arguments for the *Odyssey* being conceived as a sequel can be conveniently presented in terms of comparison between the poems. First, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are more like one another in length than they are like any of the other early epics known to us as the Epic Cycle.⁷ These Cyclic poems were, it appears, considerably shorter. The *Oedipodeia* had only 6,600 lines, as opposed to the *Iliad*'s 15,689 and the *Odyssey*'s 12,110. The *Thebais* was a little longer, with 7,000. Sometimes the summaries tell us the number of books rather than the number of lines: the *Aethiopis* had only five books, the *Iliupersis* a mere two. Only the *Cypria*, which had eleven books, would have any real chance of rivalling the Homeric epics in scale, and that only if each of its books were as long as the longest of Homer's, about a thousand lines.

More important is the resemblance between the poems in terms of structure and design. Both poems deal only with a part of their nominal subject. The *Iliad* is not the tale of the whole war of Troy but of a central episode, a matter of days, which is treated with exceptional fullness and made to include or imply an account of the Trojan

'No Flames in the *Odyssey*', *JHS* 78 (1958), 49–56; H. Erbse, *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Odyssee* (Berlin, 1972), 177–229 ([trans. in Jones and Wright (n. 1), 263–320] on the 'Continuation', but valuable in showing some of the general weaknesses of Page's observations on vocabulary). Cf. also R. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* (Cambridge, 1982), 83–4 and 191, whose detailed studies of diction lead him to the conclusion that the *Odyssey* is later than the *Iliad*, but need not be far from it in date and may even be by the same author.

⁶ See 'Longinus', *On the Sublime* 9.12, with W. Bühler, *Beiträge zur Erklärung der Schrift vom Erhabenen* (Göttingen, 1964), 46–7.

⁷ On the Cycle generally J. Griffin, 'The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer', *JHS* 97 (1977), 39–53 [= this vol., Ch. 12]; M. Davies, *The Epic Cycle* (Bristol, 1987).

war as a whole. The *Odyssey* extends this technique: it does not narrate Odysseus' adventures sequentially, bringing him from Troy to Ithaca, but concentrates on the final stages, again treating a few crucial days in detail, but embracing retrospective accounts of the earlier episodes. Both poems, then, begin *in mediis rebus*; both end with the hero's future known but awaiting fulfilment. The resolution of the themes of the poem does not coincide with the end of the tale. This structural principle permits both expansive narration and a broader perspective. The mode of narration adopted by the cyclic epics seems to have been markedly different: in poems such as the *Cypria* and the *Iliupersis*, it appears that events followed one another sequentially, without a clear central figure or primary focus to the action. There is no single hero of the *Cypria*: in the summary of Proclus, the action moves from Paris to Menelaus, from Telephus to Agamemnon and Iphigenia to the marooning of Philoctetes, with Achilles only entering the limelight towards the end of the poem, when the war at last begins. Our direct quotations from and summaries of these early epics are late and of doubtful value, but the verdict of Aristotle and Horace confirms that they lacked the coherence and structural unity of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

Other common features of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* will strike any reader; I offer only a partial list, many items of which again bring out the difference between the extant epics and what we know of the Epic Cycle. They both include extensive speeches of great rhetorical and emotional quality: the personalities of the heroes are revealed far more through their own words than by any comments or descriptions by the poet.⁸ Both poems are rich in extended similes, often employed for thematic purposes as well as ornamentation. In both, scenes of anguish and grief are presented in language that is vivid without being extravagant; nor do the many scenes of violent death lapse into sadistic self-indulgence. The poems repeatedly dramatize moral dilemmas and issues of moment, but the poet himself declines the role of a moralist: although the blindness and folly of humanity are often portrayed in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, there is little overt comment and less explicit moral judgement.⁹ The complexity

⁸ See further J. Latacz, 'Zur Forschungsarbeit an den direkten Reden bei Homer', *Grazer Beiträge* 2 (1974), 395–422, and my commentary on *Od.* 19–20, introd. 4(c).

⁹ Cf. J. Griffin, 'Words and Speakers in Homer', *JHS* 106 (1986), 36–57; I. J. F. de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers* (Amsterdam, 1987), a landmark study.

of human conflicts and personal relationships is not crudely over-simplified. What simplification there is arises from the selection and stylization necessary for the poet to enhance our sense of the dignity and nobility of his characters when confronted with the prospect of death, dishonour, or bereavement. Finally, the action of both epics is conducted under the observant eyes of the Olympian gods, who in both intervene to aid their favourites, and who also, to a degree which is not fully defined, concern themselves with the fulfilment of fate's decrees and the upholding of the moral order. For all the differences in their presentation, the gods in both epics serve to define more clearly the achievements and the limitations of mortal men.¹⁰

A further reason for the supposition that the *Odyssey* is a sequel or follow-up to the *Iliad* lies in the nature of the story it tells: the contrast of the heroes in each epic, and the contrasting outcome of each tale. The *Iliad* is a poem of war, the *Odyssey* one of peace. The former has as its hero a man of violent and passionate action, doomed to an early death, while the hero of the latter is an older and cannier figure, a master strategist and gifted orator, who despite a life of wandering and endurance will eventually meet a peaceful death, surrounded by his people and family. The *Iliad* is intense and sublime, the *Odyssey* more diffuse and diverse; the geographical range of the poems reflects these qualities, with the human action of the *Iliad* concentrated, with increasingly unbearable intensity, on the Greek camp, the plain of battle and the city of Troy, whereas the first half of the *Odyssey* offers constant changes of scene and characters, human and supernatural. The *Iliad* ends on a deeply tragic note, with both Achilles and Troy doomed by the will of the gods, though there is a saving magnanimity in Achilles' surrender of Hector for burial; the *Odyssey*, by contrast, has a happy ending, though not untinged with sadness at the years Odysseus and Penelope have lost from their life together, and at the prospect of future parting when the great traveller must renew his journeying, undertaking a voyage to placate Poseidon. As the ancient critics saw, the *Iliad*, with its stress on the plan of Zeus, the malignant will of the gods, and the consequent suffering of men, points the way to the greatest achievements of

¹⁰ On the gods see W. Kullmann, 'Gods and Men in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*', *HSCP* 89 (1985), 1–23; H. Erbse, *Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Götter im Homerischen Epos* (Berlin, 1986).

fifth-century tragedy,¹¹ while the *Odyssey*'s happy resolution, like its attention to personal relationships, recognition between *philoî*, and loyal or treacherous retainers, bring that poem, especially in its second half, closer to the gentler melodrama of Euripides, and to comedy, especially the New Comedy of Menander. Thus on the level of plot the tale the *Odyssey* tells is radically different from and opposed to that of the *Iliad*. There seems to be a deliberate contrast and indeed opposition between Odysseus and Achilles, the planner and the warrior, the pragmatist and the romantic—already hinted at in *Iliad* 9 and 19, it is developed further in the *Odyssey*, especially in Books 11 and 24.

Turning to matters of detail, we can, in my view, discern parallels and significant resemblances between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in structure, specific episodes, and sometimes specific passages even on a close verbal level. The rest of this chapter will be an attempt to defend this proposition, which naturally confronts serious objections in view of the oral-formulaic style. In written literature, if a passage of any length occurs in identical or similar form in two different works, then there is an overwhelming likelihood that one of these is imitating or alluding to the other. But of course Homeric repetitions cannot be straightforwardly treated as evidence of imitation in this way.¹² It is always possible to claim that a phrase, or a series of lines, or a motif, used in both poems is simply part of the traditional language of poetry, the stock-in-trade of any average bard-in-the-street. In particular, we should exclude from consideration the so-called 'typical scenes', stock lines used or slightly modified when certain standard narrative events occur: when a feast is held, a ship

¹¹ Cf. Rutherford, 'Tragic Form and Feeling in the *Iliad*', *JHS* 102 (1982), 145–60 [= this vol., Ch. 8]; J. Gould, 'Homeric Epic and the Tragic Moment', in T. Winniffrith, P. Murray, and K. W. Gransden (edd.), *Aspects of the Epic* (London, 1983), 32–45; P. E. Easterling, 'The Tragic Homer', *BICS* 31 (1984), 1–8. R. Garner, *From Homer to Tragedy* (London, 1990), has considered this inexhaustible subject at a more detailed level of verbal reminiscence.

¹² That repetition of this kind *must* indicate a direct relationship between the passages involved is the basic premiss of K. Sittl, *Die Wiederholungen in der Odyssee* (Munich, 1882); cf. W. Diehl, *Die wörtlichen Beziehungen zwischen Ilias und Odyssee* (Diss. Greifswald, 1938), which I have not seen. More recent approaches are illustrated by G. M. Calhoun, 'Homeric Repetitions', *UCPCP* 12 (1933), 1–26; M. van der Valk, 'The Formulaic Character of Homeric Poetry and the Relation between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*', *AC* 33 (1966), 5–70; H. Bannert, *Formen des Wiederholens bei Homer* (WS Beiheft 13, Vienna, 1988). For an interesting study of Virgil's repetitions, which pays some attention to general issues, see W. Moskalaw, *Formulaic Language and Poetic Design in the Aeneid* (Mnemos. Suppl. 73, Leiden, 1982).

launched, a sacrifice performed, an assembly summoned. Such scenes occur several times in our two epics; they might recur in any poem of this kind. We need therefore to consider how close, and how prominent, a resemblance needs to be in order to prove, or at least make it plausible, that an audience might detect significant allusion from one poem to the other.

Some modern scholars deny the very possibility of 'allusion' in a supposedly oral tradition: thus Anthony Edwards in a recent monograph insists that 'Mere repetition of a phrase is inadequate evidence from which to infer that there is allusion in one context to another',¹³ while Gregory Nagy is even more emphatic: 'when we are dealing with the traditional poetry of the Homeric (and Hesiodic) compositions, it is not justifiable to claim that a passage in *any* text *can* refer to another passage in another text'¹⁴ (my italics). The caution is important, but the absolute ruling out of the very possibility of such reference seems excessively dogmatic. First, we do not actually know that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are themselves oral as opposed to drawing on a previous oral tradition.¹⁵ I myself find it hard to believe in such lengthy works being composed in a wholly oral culture: how could they ever be performed as the wholes that they are?¹⁶ I would prefer to see the *Iliad* as committed to writing at the start, or intended for that; the *Odyssey* follows its lead, whether or not it is by the same poet (I accept that downdating—increasingly attractive on other grounds—may be the necessary corollary). Second, even if this is not right, the denial of the very *possibility* of allusion to another oral poem, however important, well-known, and

¹³ Edwards, *Achilles in the Odyssey* (Beitr. zur klass. Philol. Bd. 171, 1985), 7.

¹⁴ *The Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore, 1979), 42. Cf. his n. 3 on that page. See further J. A. Davison, 'Quotations and Allusions in Early Greek Literature', *Eranos* 53 (1955), 125–40 [= Davison, *From Archilochus to Pindar* (London, 1968), 70–85]; J. B. Hainsworth, *Homer* (G & R New Surveys 3, 1969), 2 and 30. M. M. Willcock, *CR* 38 (1988), 4 and *CR* 40 (1990), 207–8, takes a much more moderate view. For Hesiod see P. Walcot, 'Allusion in Hesiod', *REG* 73 (1960), 36–9.

¹⁵ Cf. Adam Parry in Milman Parry, *The Making of Homeric Verse* (Oxford, 1971), lxi n. 1; A. Parry, 'Have we Homer's *Iliad*?', in *YCS* 20 (1966), 175–216, now repr. in *The Language of Achilles and Other Papers* (Oxford, 1989), 104–40. A similar position is taken e.g. by Heubeck (n. 2), 11–12.

¹⁶ Oliver Taplin, in the first chapter of a forthcoming book pointedly entitled *Homeric Soundings*, of which he has kindly let me read the typescript, restates the case for an oral 'artistic' Homer, assuming either transmission through the guild of Homeridai or early dictation to scribes [*Homeric Soundings* (Oxford, 1992), 31–44]. I am not convinced, but see the former suggestion as the most promising alternative to a literate *Iliad*-poet.

influential, goes much too far, particularly in view of our total ignorance of the context and conditions of performance, the expectations and enthusiasms of the audience, the frequency with which they demanded repetition of a favourite tale, and so on. Third, recent study of Homeric motifs and of the poet's adaptation of 'stock' themes, or his capacity to give 'typical' material in a new form and a sharper point, suggests that the epic poets' audience was alive to such innovation and variation *within* a work,¹⁷ and it is not a very long step to the presumption that they could draw comparisons of this kind between works, particularly if prominent similarities of character, theme, language, and situation encouraged them to do so. The enthusiasm and interest of an unknown audience should not be curtailed by the *a priori* assumptions of modern theory.

If guesses about audiences are highly speculative, conjectures about the motivations and thought-processes of poets are both unfashionable and methodologically suspect. It may nevertheless be useful to advance a possible scenario which may render more credible the creation of the *Odyssey* as a work conceived as a sequel to the *Iliad* even within an oral tradition. Needless to say, this is not advanced as any more than an unverifiable hypothesis. Suppose the *Iliad*-poet had created a version of his great poem not too different from the poem we read today; suppose he had sung it again and again throughout a great part of his career, to popular acclaim; suppose this was the song he was chiefly associated with, the one everybody thought of as the best song of the best local bard. Hesiod speaks of 'competition' (*eris*) between bards (*Works and Days* 26); the poet of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (or part 1 of it) wants his listeners to tell others that 'his songs are best' (line 173). Is it implausible that another bard, perhaps younger, perhaps even a disciple or companion, both admiring and jealous of the great singer's achievement, could conceive the idea of a poem on the same scale, dealing with some of the same characters, ten years on—how the heroes ended up; a poem which would be in competition with the *Iliad*, and so would naturally deal with many of the same themes from a different standpoint? This is of course pure speculation, but perhaps provides a working hypothesis. For those who would prefer to think of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as being the creation of the

¹⁷ See e.g. M. W. Edwards, 'Topos and Transformation in Homer', in J. M. Bremer, I. J. F. de Jong, and J. Kalff (edd.), *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry* (Amsterdam, 1987), 47–60.

same poet, I offer a slightly different scenario: a poet who has grown impatient with his reputation as the *Iliad*-poet, who is weary of being asked for it, or parts of it, again and again, and who begins to weave a new poem, one which will replace the stark simplicity of the heroic world, the world of open combat and tragic death, with a subtler and more complex world of deception and guile. Whichever version you choose, my main point is that if there is a relationship of any kind between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, if they are not just random survivals from a morass of epic song, then allusion cannot be ruled out and may be of the essence. The problem of identifying an allusion remains: as a general principle I would suggest that simple verbal repetition is not enough of itself: there should also be some similarity in context, in situation, or in the thematic aspects of a given episode; perhaps also (as in some of my examples), a similarity of placing within the overall form of the epic.

III

I begin from some obvious general resemblances, before turning to some possibly significant links, parallels or echoes. I do not, of course, place any weight on the fact that both epics are divided into 24 books, as that is a later editorial arrangement.¹⁸

Both poems, as already mentioned, plunge *in medias res*, into a situation which is very well advanced; in both, the first few hundred lines set the scene and commence the action with a sure and lively narrative, effortlessly introducing a wide range of characters and changes of scene; the role of the gods as observers who can intervene for good or ill is quickly established (thus Athene intervenes to calm Achilles in *Iliad* 1 and to stimulate Telemachus to action in *Odyssey* 1). After these swift and intriguing openings, both poems employ retardation and introduce sub-plots, delaying the anticipated climaxes: in the *Iliad*, the fulfilment of Zeus' promise to Thetis; in the *Odyssey*, the release and indeed the first appearance of Odysseus. Instead lesser figures fill the stage, and the scope of the poem is broadened.

¹⁸ That the existing book-divisions are not only later than the classical period but also seriously misleading even to the modern reader who is aware of this fact is an important part of Taplin's argument in the work cited in n. 16 above [pp. 13, 285–93].

Both poems also begin with an invocation of the Muse, leading into a brief statement of theme which emphasizes suffering (*Iliad* 1. 2 *μυρί* . . . ἄλγε' ἔθηκε, 'it brought countless sorrows'; *Odyssey* 1. 4 *πολλά* . . . πάθεν ἄλγεα, 'many sorrows he suffered') and the destructive influence of the gods (*Iliad* 1. 5, *Odyssey* 1. 8–9). The most striking thing here, however, is that in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* that statement embraces only part of the poem's full scope: in the *Iliad*, the poet announces that his subject will be the wrath of Achilles against Agamemnon, but does not give any hint of the later wrath against Hector, and its cause and consequences; indeed, the proem gives no hint of the prominence of the Trojans in the *Iliad*. In the *Odyssey*, the proem refers to the journeyings and homecomings of the hero without his companions, but in such a way as to suggest that his arrival home is the poet's main goal; there is as yet no mention of the fresh sufferings which await him in his own country.¹⁹

In Book 2 of the *Iliad*, Agamemnon summons an assembly of the whole Greek army, hoping to test their morale and to find it high; in fact his test is a disaster and he himself is almost humiliated. It is in this episode that we learn for the first time that the Greek army has been at Troy for almost ten years, and Odysseus reminds them of the optimistic omen which they saw at Aulis when they set out, an omen which the prophet Calchas had interpreted as foretelling the sack of Troy in the tenth year. In Book 2 of the *Odyssey*, the analogies are close. Encouraged by Athene's visit, Telemachus calls an assembly on Ithaca in the hope of shaming, or forcing, the suitors out of his home. In fact the assembly is passive, the suitors have things their own way, and Telemachus is humiliated. It is in this episode that we learn how long it is since the war of Troy ended, how long Odysseus has been lost—once again, ten years. Of course this could be a coincidence, for ten is always a convenient round number; but it is interesting that here too we have an auspicious omen—this time foreshadowing Odysseus' homecoming and revenge; and the prophet Halitherses, who interprets the sign, also refers to an earlier prophecy he made, at the beginning of the war, that Odysseus would return in the twentieth year.

¹⁹ M. L. West, *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford, 1978), 44, supposes this to be the consequence of the gradual evolution of the poems ('we can often see them having new ideas as they go . . .'), but this in my view grossly underestimates the control that the poets have over their material.

In both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* the narrative reaches its long-awaited climax in what is for us Book 22: *Iliad* 22, the killing of Hector by Achilles; *Odyssey* 22, the killing of the suitors by Odysseus, with 'Iliadic' warfare transferred to the domestic setting. The denial of mercy to the suppliant Leodes seems to recall the scene between Achilles and Lycaon in Book 21 of the *Iliad*.²⁰ But in both epics, the hero's triumph is followed by gentler scenes of reconciliation and reintegration: in the *Iliad*, the funeral games for Patroclus and the scene of pity and companionship between Achilles and Priam; in the *Odyssey*, the reunion of husband and wife, and (if we look to Book 24) the aversion of conflict in Ithaca.

A comparison of three key passages takes us further: two of these come in the *Iliad* (9. 385 ff., 22. 349 ff.), one in the *Odyssey* (22. 61 ff.). In Book 9 of the *Iliad*, the Greeks offered Achilles vast wealth and lands if he would only return and aid them in battle: but he defied them with unforgettable eloquence in the central speech of that book, esp. 378 ff.:

I hate Agamemnon's gifts, I value him at a straw's worth. Not if he were to give me ten or twenty times as much as he now possesses, and more thereafter, whatever he could get, not if he gave me all the wealth of Orchomenos or Egyptian Thebes . . . not if he were to give me gifts as numerous as the sand or the dust, not even so would Agamemnon persuade my heart, not before he pays back to me all the injuries that bring pain to my heart.

This speech is echoed in *Iliad* 22, where Hector begs for burial. If Achilles must kill him, so be it, but at least let him accept ransom from Priam, and surrender his body to receive due honour. But now Achilles' new wrath against Hector and Troy is as great as his old, and his words follow the same syntactical pattern as in the earlier speech in Book 9:²¹

Not if they were to bring here ransom tenfold or twentyfold, and promised more hereafter, not even if Dardanian Priam were to order your body to be weighed against gold for your ransom, not even so would your lady mother mourn over you as she sets you on a bier, you whom she bore—but the dogs and the birds shall divide your body among them. (22. 349–54)

So too in the *Odyssey*, when the suitors recognize who Odysseus is, they beg his forgiveness and promise him compensation, but their

²⁰ There are more detailed comparisons in B. Fenik, *Studies in the Odyssey* (Wiesbaden, 1974), 196–7; Pucci (n. 1), 128–9; Usener (n. 1), 131–40.

²¹ Cf. C. W. Macleod (ed.), *Homer: Iliad xxiv* (Cambridge, 1982), 20–1.

pleas are dismissed with angry contempt:

Eurymachus, not even if you gave me all that you inherited from your father, all that is yours now and anything you might add from any source, not even so would I hold back my hands from slaughter, not before you suitors have paid to the full for your wrongdoings. (22. 61–4)

Thus we see that, however different and less glamorous, less of a conventional hero Odysseus may be, he can rise to the same heights of eloquence and heroic wrath as Achilles, greatest of the heroes. Here again, the parallelism could be coincidental, simply the traditional formulae for an angry speech in epic, but here again I doubt if that is a sufficient explanation; indeed, here above all I am convinced that the *Odyssey* imitates the *Iliad*.

If Book 24 of the *Odyssey* is substantially genuine, the conclusions of the two poems also invite a comparison, in two respects. First, both epics give prominence at the end to burial and funeral rites²²—the funeral games of Patroclus and finally the burial of Hector in the *Iliad*, and the reminiscences of Achilles' funeral and the underworld scene of *Odyssey* 24 (where it is made clear that Achilles' and Patroclus' wish to be buried together was fulfilled: compare *Iliad* 23. 91–2 and 243–4 with *Odyssey* 24. 75 ff.). Second, the last episodes of the poem give special emphasis to the relationship between father and son. In *Iliad* 24 this is achieved only imperfectly and by analogy: Priam recovers Hector, but only his corpse, and Priam's age and misery reminds Achilles of his own father Peleus, with the consequence that, although they must remain enemies, they eat together, sharing their grief. By contrast in *Odyssey* 24, Odysseus and Laertes really are reunited and a meal follows, but this one is a celebration. But in view of the questionable status of *Odyssey* 24²³ these points should perhaps not be pressed. It may still be said, however, that the composer of the concluding scenes of the *Odyssey*, whether or not he was also the composer of the earlier part of the poem, had the *Iliad* in his mind.²⁴

²² Cf. D. Wender, *The Last Scenes of the Odyssey* (*Mnemos. Suppl.* 52, Leiden, 1978), 38–40; O. Whitehead, 'The Funeral of Achilles', *G & R* 31 (1984), 119–25.

²³ See now S. West, 'Laertes Revisited', *PCPS* NS 35 (1989), 114–43, and for a general account of the problems, with bibliography, Heubeck's commentary on 23. 297 ff. (pp. 317–20 of the Italian edition [= *Od. Comm.* 342–5]).

²⁴ See further Heubeck's commentary on 24. 472–88, for references and bibliography on possible echoes of *Il.* 4. 1–74 in the closing scenes of the *Od.*

Naturally, not all the resemblances fall so precisely into place at equivalent points in the poems. In a different category come a number of features at the opening of the *Odyssey* which bear similarity to aspects of the end of the *Iliad*.²⁵ These too are of a kind which seem appropriate to a 'sequel'. First, both Book 24 of the *Iliad* and Book 1 of the *Odyssey* begin with a contrast between the rest of the Greek host, reconciled or back home, and the hero, whose special status and isolation are emphasized: Achilles has not purged his grief and anger; Odysseus has not completed his journey home. Second, in both works a divine council follows, in which a majority of gods pity a human's situation (*Iliad* 24. 23, *Odyssey* 1. 19). One deity protests at the present situation, and Zeus takes steps to bring about a resolution of the problem. In both, the justice of the gods is called into question, and the piety of the victim (Hector in the *Iliad*, Odysseus in the *Odyssey*) is stressed: this virtuous behaviour imposes an obligation on the gods to set matters to rights. In both *Iliad* 24 and the *Odyssey*, Hermes is an important intermediary who takes steps to advance the decision of the gods: in the *Odyssey*, however, Hermes' role is postponed until Book 5, and the activities of Athene with Telemachus displace the anticipated encounter with the poem's hero. Athene, however, plays a part at first reminiscent of Hermes': in particular, she dons winged sandals normally worn by the latter (*Odyssey* 1. 96–8, cf. *Iliad* 24. 340–2, *Odyssey* 5. 44–6).²⁶ More loosely, the object achieved by the divine conference in each poem may be seen as comparable: in the *Iliad* they will command Achilles to release Hector's body, so that it may be brought home for burial; in the *Odyssey*, they will force Calypso to release Odysseus and enable him to return home. Both actions demonstrate the belated but real generosity and justice of the gods; in neither case is there divine unanimity, nor is partisan feeling absent.

²⁵ I am indebted here to Nicholas Richardson, who allowed me to read his discussion in volume 6 of the Cambridge *Iliad* commentary ahead of publication [published 1993; see pp. 21–4]. The similarities discussed here have of course sometimes been invoked as evidence that the last book or books of the *Il.* are of a later date than the rest, and even that the *Odyssey*-poet played a part in patching them in to an earlier version of the *Il.*; see e.g. Leaf's commentary (London, 1888), II. 536. I take it that it is by now unnecessary to argue for the view that Book 24 is the fitting and essential conclusion of the *Il.*; see G. Beck, *Die Stellung des 24. Buches der Ilias in der alten Epen-tradition* (Diss. Tübingen, 1964), Macleod, *Iliad* xxiv (n. 21), 16–35, and Richardson's commentary.

²⁶ On the parallels concerning Hermes see now Usener (n. 1), 165–82.

In the opening scene of the *Odyssey*, Zeus' reflections on human beliefs about the gods have often been interpreted as some kind of 'reaction' to the *Iliad*, and in particular to Achilles' disillusioned statements in Book 24.²⁷ In that book, Achilles offered Priam the bitter comfort that their unhappy destinies were not unique, but part of the human condition: Zeus (he says) brings misfortune to all men, sometimes mixed with good fortune, sometimes undiluted. In the allegory of the jars, no human receives unmixed blessings from the jar of good things (24. 525–33).²⁸ In Book 1 of the *Odyssey* Zeus complains that humans 'say that their misfortunes come from us. But they themselves also have sorrow beyond their portion through their own rash folly—as Aegisthus has just recently . . .' (1. 33–5). Clearly, this is a more straightforward, less tragic vision of the gods, which suitably introduces a number of important themes of the *Odyssey*. The theology here is different from that which dominates the *Iliad* as a whole, though it would be excessive to argue that the passage introduces ideas wholly alien to the *Iliad* or ethically more advanced. It is not clear to me, however, that this is a specific allusion to the *Iliad*. The allusion, if there is one, is insufficiently signalled, the polemic too generalized. What the passage clearly does do is establish the ethical tone of the *Odyssey*, with its emphasis on righteous dealing rewarded and rash or wicked behaviour as self-destructive; in other words, it sets out principles which will be normative, though not universal, in the narrative that follows. But this seems to me to be a case of the poet selecting from the traditional options one which suits the type of story he has to tell: Zeus' speech sets the *Odyssey* in contrast with more negative presentations of the gods (and more tragic presentations of mankind) in general, rather than in opposition to the *Iliad* in particular.

IV

I turn now to passages which shed more light on the nature of the imitation: the differing character of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as poems, and the attitude of the poet of the *Odyssey* to the *Iliad*

²⁷ See S. West, *Od. Comm.* 1 on 1. 32 ff., and add Kullmann (n. 10); Erbse (n. 10), 237–41.

²⁸ E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1951), 29, goes so far as to say that in these lines 'Achilles . . . pronounces the tragic moral of the whole poem'.

(whether or not they share the same author). Fundamental to the contrast between *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is the fact that in the *Iliad* the hero is going to die young, while in the *Odyssey*, although much is made of the grief and pain felt by his wife, son, and friends at the apparent death of Odysseus, we know that in the end he will indeed return beyond all hope, in the hour of greatest need. The grief and foreboding felt by Thetis on Achilles' behalf are fully justified; her prediction to Hephaestus is unambiguous and accurate (*Iliad* 18. 440–1):

τὸν δ' οὐχ ὑποδέξομαι αὖτις
οὔκαδε νοστήσαντα δόμον Πηληϊὸν εἶσω.

I shall not welcome him back again on his return to his home, back into the house of Peleus.

But when Penelope uses similar language at *Odyssey* 19. 257–8, addressing her disguised husband who is already home and in her presence, the situation is paradoxical and the effect ironic: although her mood is one of despair, the movement of the plot is optimistic. The shared phraseology here is probably, however, too simple and inconspicuous to constitute an allusion. It is more rewarding to consider the actual portrayal of the heroes of the two poems, Achilles and Odysseus, within the *Odyssey*.

Both Achilles and Odysseus make a crucial choice of lives. As we learn in *Iliad* 9, his divine mother has told Achilles that 'twin destinies carry me to the end of death. If I remain here, and fight around the city of the Trojans, then my homecoming is gone, but my glory will live forever. But if I go home to my own native land, then my noble glory is lost for me, but my life will be long, and the doom of death will be slow to come to me' (9. 411–16). Of course, he remains and dies. Odysseus' choice, presented in *Odyssey* 5, is quite different: he can live forever with Calypso, and become an immortal consort, and be forgotten—concealed by her, forever, as her name implies. Or he can take to the sea once more, suffer further hardships and misfortunes, in the hope of coming home at last and living a mortal life with Penelope, who (as he tactfully admits) is inferior to Calypso in beauty and stature. Lost homecoming *versus* the choice to return home: the choices are different, and yet not perhaps totally opposed, for both Achilles and Odysseus fulfil their best nature rather than sinking into inglorious—and anonymous—ease.

By Book 24 of the *Iliad* Achilles knows that he will not live to see the taking of Troy, that he will never return to Greece or see once more his aged father Peleus, whom he imagines as alone and persecuted by his neighbours, without the protection that he, Achilles, should be providing (*Iliad* 16. 15–16, 18. 330–2, 19. 321–5, and esp. 24. 534–42). In Book 11 of the *Odyssey*, where Odysseus in the underworld encounters his former comrades-in-arms, Achilles is among them—very clearly, I feel, the Achilles of the *Iliad*, accompanied by Patroclus and Antilochus (11. 468).²⁹ Odysseus responds to his greeting with a speech of self-pity, complaining that he has still not come near to Greece (in fact an exaggeration: 10. 29), and his words also include flattery and admiration of Achilles; how fortunate he is, honoured like a god in life and like a great lord among the dead. Achilles' bitter response is one of the most famous passages in Homer (11. 488–91):

Odysseus, do not gloss over death to me. I would rather be alive as a worker on the land, slaving as a poor serf for another, a man with no property and livelihood, than be king over all the lifeless dead.

But equally notable is the way the speech continues, with Achilles harking back to his father and his inability to help him—again, perhaps a standard motif, but one which surely here recalls the *Iliadic* passages on this theme, and in particular *Iliad* 24—in a sense, Achilles' last appearance before the 'sequel' (11. 494–503):

And tell me also what news you have of noble Peleus. Is he still honoured among the thronging Myrmidons, or do they despise him in Hellas and Phthia, because old age fetters his limbs? If only I might return to help him, return to the sunlight as once I was, when in the wide land of Troy I fought for the Argives and slew the bravest of the enemy host. If in that manner I could return, even for a brief moment, to my father's house, then I would make my strength and my unapproachable hands hateful to any man who does him violence or thrusts him from his proper place of honour.

This is what Achilles *wishes* he could do, but it is also what Odysseus can and will do for his own father Laertes, and for his whole family. The men of violence, whom Achilles imagines dishonouring his father, correspond to the suitors, who ravage Odysseus' lands and seek to steal his wife and throne. Achilles also

²⁹ In later books of the *Il.* Antilochus is in many ways taking over the role of Patroclus as Achilles' closest comrade: see further M. M. Willcock, 'Antilochus in the *Iliad*', in *Mélanges É. Delebecque* (Aix-en-Provence, 1983), 479–85.

feels sorrow at his separation from his son Neoptolemus; again, this recalls the *Iliad*, in which he thought of him as well as Peleus when he knew that he must die (19. 326–37), and again there is a contrast with Odysseus, who will be reunited with his son as well as his father.

V

The *Odyssey* is a much more self-conscious poem than the *Iliad*, in the sense that it includes more overt reference to the powers and practitioners of poetry, and specifically heroic epic. Poets appear in the cast of characters, other songs are alluded to. The hero himself is compared to a bard and takes up his own tale where the Phaeacian minstrel Demodocus had left off; similarly, the 'poetic' qualities of his lying narratives are remarked upon by his Ithacan hearers (14. 361–2, 17. 518–20, cf. 19. 589–90). The borderline area between poetry and lies, of which the Muses told Hesiod, is familiar terrain to the poet of the *Odyssey*. Although the heroes of the *Iliad* hope for glory and remembrance after death, poetic self-reference does not figure so prominently, and takes less ingenious form, in the martial world of action. A memorable exception is the bitter comment of Helen in *Iliad* 6. 355–8, where she remarks to Hector that she and Paris will be remembered not gloriously, but with ignominy: 'hardship has come upon you most of all because of me, bitch that I am, and because of the folly of Alexandros: Zeus put an evil doom on us, so that we might be a subject for song even for men who come after us.' This line is echoed, it seems, in a less tragic and less personal context in the *Odyssey*, when Alcinoos sympathetically encourages the weeping Odysseus to explain his distress and recount his experiences. The king's long speech includes the fatalistic comment that 'the gods made that misfortune for them [the Argives and Trojans], and wove destruction for men, so that there might be a song for those who come after' (*Odyssey* 8. 579–80). The essential difference is that Alcinoos is an outsider, detached from the sufferings which he enjoys in poetry. The Phaeacians, a society remote from the rest of mankind and unheroic in life-style,³⁰ serve as an idealized audience for heroic

³⁰ On the life-style of the Phaeacians and on ancient evaluations of them see M. Dickie, 'Phaeacian Athletes', *PLLS* 4 (1983), 237–76. I am unconvinced by the defence offered by Hainsworth, *Od. Comm.* 1. 341–6.

song. What is agonizing memory for Odysseus (and present cause of guilt and regret for Helen) is delightful entertainment for them. This is another way in which the poet shows us the different perspectives from which the Trojan war, once over, can be viewed. It also, perhaps, hints at his perspective on the *Iliad*: a monumental achievement, but distant and unrepeatable, part of the great past.³¹

However that may be, it is widely accepted that the Phaeacian episode also includes more direct allusion to the *Iliad*, through the distorting mirror of the bard Demodocus.³² Each of his three songs (8. 72–82, 266–366, 499–520) recalls aspects of the story of the *Iliad* without narrating any episode in its precise Iliadic form. The first and most allusive refers to a quarrel between two Greek heroes, misunderstood by Agamemnon as the fulfilment of a prophecy which in fact predicted his own far deadlier conflict with Achilles, still in the future. The motifs of Agamemnon's error, delusive prophecy, and the will of Zeus, all recall important themes of the *Iliad*.³³ The second song describes the love-affair of Ares and Aphrodite and Hephaestus' trapping of the adulterous pair: the whimsical and immoral behaviour of the gods, and their sensuality, remind us of the love-scene between Zeus and Hera on Ida (*Iliad* 14. 292–351). Moreover, looking beyond the song itself, we can observe analogies between the plotting Hephaestus, his apparent absence and his unexpected return, and the role of Odysseus later in the *Odyssey*. The way in which the divine action reflects more serious events on the human plane is typically Iliadic.³⁴ The third song describes the sack of Troy, so often foreshadowed in the later parts of the *Iliad*: as in the *aristeia*

³¹ J. Griffin, 'Homer and Excess', in Bremer, de Jong, and Kalff (n. 17), 102, even suggests that the horrific martial scenes on Heracles' swordbelt in *Od.* 11. 609–14, and the hero's awed comment in his narration 'may he who designed it never design such a work again!', is an ingenious allusion to the author of the *Il.* itself!

³² See esp. W. Marg, 'Das erste Lied des Demodokos', in *Navicula Chilonensis* (FS F. Jacoby, Leiden, 1956), 16–29; C. W. Macleod, 'Homer on Poetry and the Poetry of Homer', *Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1983), ch. 1 [= this vol., Ch. 9], and *Iliad* xxiv (n. 21), 1–8; O. Taplin, 'The Earliest Quotation of the *Iliad*?', in *Owls to Athens* (FS Sir Kenneth Dover, Oxford, 1990), 109–12. [See now A. F. Garvie (ed.), *Homer: Odyssey* vi–viii (Cambridge, 1994), 248–55.]

³³ Nagy (n. 14), 42–58, interprets this passage along different lines, but less convincingly, to my mind. See also Usener (n. 1), 183, who sees the reference to the $\Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}$ (plan of Zeus) as a very fragile connection, but does not consider the wider context.

³⁴ See further Burkert (n. 1) [and Garvie (n. 32), 293–5, along with the detailed notes which follow].

of Hector, Trojan overconfidence leads to final defeat. The simile illustrating Odysseus' reaction to this song also reminds us of the bereaved women of Troy, especially Andromache, and of the cruelty that accompanies the sack of a city (cf. *Iliad* 9. 590–4, 24. 728–38). The inclusion of all three songs here, as already indicated, suits the hedonistic world of the Phaeacians. The songs also form a fitting backdrop to the events of the eighth book in which Odysseus is gradually restored to his heroic statue, and regains the energy and confidence he needs to recount his past and to confront the further trials that lie ahead of him.³⁵

VI

If the *Iliad* is the poem of Ilium, the poem of the Trojan war, then the *Odyssey* is in part the poem of the aftermath of that war (particularly, though not exclusively, from the Greek side). The war is the most important thing in everybody's past. It is already the subject of poetry: Phemius sings in Book 1 of the sorrowful homecoming of the Greeks from Troy, and Demodocus, as we have just seen, recounts in Book 8 'the lay whose fame was at that time reaching the heavens', an episode from the early part of the war. Still more striking is the way the participants recall the conflict—not as their greatest triumph or as a victory over insuperable odds, but as a time of hardship and great suffering, culminating in terrible losses. Listen to Nestor, now at home in Pylos in his prosperous old age, in peacetime, surrounded by his wealth and his loyal sons (3. 103–19, largely Shewring's trans.):

My friend, your words have brought back to me what wretchedness we endured at Troy, indomitable though we were in spirit—what we endured on shipboard too, roving to plunder over the misty sea, wherever Achilles led the way, and then all our fighting round the great city of King Priam. There it was that the bravest of us fell. There lies the warrior Ajax, there lies Achilles, there Patroclus, equal to the gods as a counsellor, and there also lies my own dear son, Antilochus, so strong and so noble, so swift a runner, so bold a fighter. And beyond their loss we suffered many calamities: what mortal man could recount them all? No; if you stayed here five years, or six, searching out the tale of all the troubles the noble Achaeans bore—no, your patience would fail you first, and you would make for home. Nine long years, with every kind of

³⁵ Cf. W. Mattes, *Odysseus bei den Phäaken* (Würzburg, 1958), esp. 129 ff.

deceitful trick, we schemed for the downfall of the Trojans, and only after much toil and pain did the son of Cronos bring fulfilment.

To hear Nestor talk, one would hardly think the Greeks had *won* the war! And there is the same melancholy note in Menelaus' reminiscences in Book 4. Many of the Greek leaders died at Troy; others perished on the journey home (the lesser Ajax), or on their return (Agamemnon); but even those who have come home safely live on with memories of what they have lost. Nestor and Menelaus, for all their security, still have sorrows: Nestor grieves for his dear son Antilochus, killed defending him at Troy, while Menelaus has no legitimate heir (4. 10–14), and still feels the loss of his friends, who endured so much for his sake in order to recover Helen. There is an undertone of guilt in this scene as he glumly tells Telemachus that money does not bring happiness (4. 90–112, 169–82).³⁶ Similarly with Odysseus, there is perhaps a symbolic side to the fact that he has lost on his voyages all the loot and treasure he brought from Troy. More significant still is the wonderful scene in Phaeacia, where the bard Demodocus sings of the Trojan horse and the sack of Troy—Odysseus' greatest triumph, but according to Demodocus, his 'most dreadful fight' (8. 519). In that scene Odysseus weeps for the past, and the simile describing his grief, which compares him with a bereaved wife in the midst of the brutal sacking of a city, surely suggests that he grieves not only for his own sufferings, but also for those he has inflicted (8. 521 ff.). In describing his encounter with the intractable Ajax in the underworld, he again regrets his past triumphs, in this case his having defeated Ajax in the contest for the armour of Achilles: 'Would that I had never been victorious in such a contest! Because of it, the earth closed over heroic Ajax. . . ' (11. 548–9).

The way in which the events of the war itself are remembered is also interestingly different from the *Iliad's* presentation of the war in progress. Nestor speaks of the Greeks weaving (ῥάπτουμεν) the downfall of Troy by all kinds of trickery (παντοίοισι δόλοισι, 3. 118–19)—hardly the picture we get from the *Iliad*. Similarly, Demodocus and others refer to the part played by the Wooden Horse, a *dolos* (deceptive trick), Odysseus' and Athene's own conception—a device to which the *Iliad*, with its more direct and heroic picture of combat, never alluded. It is perhaps inevitable that the stories which

³⁶ Cf. also 24.95 (Agamemnon): was it all worth it?

Menelaus and Helen recount to Telemachus, to bring home to him his father's great virtues, illustrate his powers of deception, disguise, and self-discipline, rather than more martial qualities; more suggestive is the yarn that the beggar Odysseus spins to Eumaeus the swine-herd, in a scene where he has not been identified as Odysseus (14. 457 ff.), a yarn which describes a night-time ambush in which the beggar was allegedly involved, and which lays much emphasis on the wind and the cold and the ice and the hail, and what a pity he hadn't brought his trusty sou'wester—the *discomforts* of the war, a very different thing from the heroic suffering central to the *Iliad*. This more down-to-earth, almost plebeian image of the Trojan war, suits the lower-class social setting in which the beggar finds himself;³⁷ but that is not the whole explanation. It is not, I think, too much to say that the *Odyssey*-poet has a different attitude to war and heroic prowess from the *Iliad*-poet. Indeed, there are even some scenes in which heroic—Iliadic?—material or attitudes are reworked and treated more lightheartedly: heroism with a smile. Here discussion of allusion comes close to questions of possible parody.³⁸ Parody is another concept which oralist criticism has barred from Homeric scholarship, and it is certainly true that it is hard to identify with certainty in so formal and regular a style. But when viewed alongside other indicators of allusion it may perhaps reveal itself more clearly.

One fairly clear example of an allusion which is also in effect a parody is *Odyssey* 6. 130 ff.³⁹ This is a lion simile, which is verbally close to *Iliad* 12. 299 ff., but does not parody any specific lion simile in the *Iliad*; rather, it pokes a little fun at that whole genre of comparisons. Odysseus is shipwrecked naked in Phaeacia; he hears the sound of Nausicaa and her maids at play; diffidently, he tries to hide his nakedness with a branch. 'Then he advanced like a mountain lion, sure of his strength, who goes his way with blazing eyes

³⁷ Cf. the 'economic' account of war in general as a result of the demands of the stomach (17. 285–9). For complaints about life under canvas cf. esp. the herald of Agamemnon in Aesch. *Ag.* 555 ff.

³⁸ Cf. Monro (n. 3), 328 ff.; for criticism and scepticism see A. Shewan, 'Does the *Odyssey* Imitate the *Iliad*?', *CQ* 7 (1913), 234 ff., W. B. Stanford (ed.), *The Odyssey of Homer* (2nd edn., London, 1965) on *Od.* 14. 22, etc., Hoekstra, *Od. Comm.* 11 on 14. 3, 10 (but in his n. on 14. 192 he is more receptive); Hainsworth (n. 14), 2, asking 'Can the grim meal of the Cyclops parody the formal dinners of heroic chiefs if there is only one form in which such banquets can be conceived or expressed?'

³⁹ Cf. Pucci (n. 1), 158. Usener (n. 1), 195–7, groups this among his 'non-significant parallels'.

through wind and through rain, hunting the wild deer or ranging among sheep or cattle. If flocks are penned in a strong-built fold, his hungry belly makes him go after them even there.' Here the phrase *κέλεται δέ ἐ γαστήρ* (his hungry belly urges him on) replaces the Iliadic *κέλεται δέ ἐ θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ* ('his proud heart urges him on', 12. 300), and this is wittily apt, as Odysseus has not eaten for twenty days and will shortly be guzzling from Nausicaa's picnic basket, 'avidly', says the poet (*ἀρπαλέως*) (249–50, where his long starvation is emphasized). The appetite of Odysseus is a recurrent motif in the *Odyssey*, one which ancient commentators found shocking but which we may enjoy as humorously realistic.⁴⁰ Moreover, the lion simile is wittily handled in itself: instead of the Iliadic pattern, where a warrior attacking his foes is compared with a wild lion attacking flocks, while a warrior reluctantly retreating is compared with a lion driven from the fold by dogs and shepherds, we have here an incongruity in the comparison of the humble suppliant Odysseus to a lion: this is only how he *appears* to the terrified girls.⁴¹

Another probable example of Iliadic reference also verges on parody, though in this case the allusion is repeated and perhaps more significant. In *Iliad* 6. 485–93, at the end of the moving scene between Hector and Andromache, Hector sends his wife home to her work at the loom and the distaff, kindly but firmly dismissing her from the sphere of war. His speech ends with the lines (6. 492–3):

*πόλεμος δ' ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει
παῖσι, μάλιστα δ' ἐμοί, τοὶ Ἴλιῳ ἐγγεγάσιν.*

War will be the concern of the men, of all of those who dwell in Ilium, but chiefly myself.

These lines became proverbial, even notorious.⁴² Similar language is used in the *Odyssey* in two passages in which Telemachus seeks to

⁴⁰ Cf. W. B. Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme* (2nd edn., Oxford, 1963), 67–71.

⁴¹ See further R. Lattimore, introd. to his translation of the *Od.* (New York, 1965), 22.

⁴² See esp. Ar. *Lys.* 520, 538. Cf. Kirk, *Il. Comm.* 11 on 6. 490–3: '[The four lines] seem to have been so well known in this Iliadic context that their Odyssean recurrences were quotations, almost: in this case a single lost archetype, or typical use, is improbable.' Alternatively, we might suppose that the Iliadic phrase was *already* a commonplace (it is clearly the most 'natural' of the three), but that the *Od.* is still quoting its occurrence in the *Il.* S. West (*Od. Comm.* 1) in her note on the passage in Book 1 is less happy with the idea of allusion here, but her doubts partly arise from a more favourable evaluation of Telemachus' actions and words in these earlier books (cf. pp. 55 and 67 of her commentary). See now Usener (n. 1), 47–66.

assert his authority over his mother: in Book 1, when he rebukes her for silencing Phemius' song about the return of the Achaeans from Troy, and in Book 21, when he takes steps to remove her from the scene of the contest with the bow, so that the episode may reach its bloody conclusion without endangering her. In both cases his speech of dismissal ends with the same phrases about loom and distaff (1. 356–8a, 21. 350–2a), then the lines continue with the Iliadic *polemos* replaced by *muthos* (word/story-telling) in Book 1, *toxon* (bow) in Book 21:

*τόξον
μῦθος δ' ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει
παῖσι, μάλιστα δ' ἐμοί, τοῦ γὰρ κράτος ἔστ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ.*

The bow/the tale will be the concern of the men, of all of them, but chiefly myself, for mine is the power in the house.

The likelihood that this is a reminiscence of the *Iliad* is increased by the inappropriateness of the phrase in 1. 356 = 21. 350, *ἀλλ' εἰς οἶκον ἰούσα* ('but proceeding to your home', cf. *οἶκονδε*, 'homeward', in the line which follows the speech); for Penelope, unlike Andromache, is already in her own home.⁴³

If this allusion is accepted, we must still consider the effect of the adaptation. The poet himself gives us some guidance, in that in both cases Telemachus' speech is described as *πεπνυμένον*, 'wise'. So indeed the speeches are: in Book 1 he defends the validity of poetry on tragic themes, in Book 21 he openly declares himself both host and heir, and for the audience his prudence in protecting his mother is self-evident. Nevertheless, to Penelope his words bring amazement and distress: her reaction is not unambiguous admiration, and her silent obedience does not simply represent proper womanly behaviour; rather, her submission forms a part of the subtle presentation of tension and unease between mother and son which is sustained throughout the Ithacan books.⁴⁴ If it is accepted that this repetition of the 'man's concern' motif would probably be taken as an allusion to the *Iliad*, it seems that it must be read as an indication of the

⁴³ The other passage which needs consideration in this context is *Od.* 11. 352–3, where the repeated portion is, however, less extensive. It looks as though the *Odyssey*-poet associates this motif with scenes in which women are 'put in their place'; that does not, of course, exclude other reasons for using it.

⁴⁴ Cf. Rutherford, 'At Home and Abroad: Aspects of the Structure of the *Odyssey*', PCPS NS 31 (1985), 147 n. 20.

difference between Andromache and Penelope, between wartime and peacetime conditions, and between the authority of a husband and that of a son: in short, it illustrates the different and more positive role of women in the *Odyssey*, which Telemachus in his brash assertiveness underrates.⁴⁵ Book 23, in which Telemachus again upbraids his mother (esp. 97 *μήτηρ ἐμή, δύσμητηρ*, 'mother mine, no true mother'), and is quietly reprimanded by both his parents, provides the culminating scene in which Penelope is vindicated, proving herself a worthy wife to Odysseus, as a paragon of wifely fidelity and also of matching intelligence. The contrast with Andromache's passive role as obedient sufferer shows us why peace and homecoming are preferable to war and heroic death, for the women of the *Odyssey* as well as for the men.

There are other passages in the *Odyssey* in which Iliadic vocabulary or motifs are employed in contexts which may seem amusing or incongruous to ancient audiences and to ourselves. Humour is surely undeniable in *Odyssey* 8, where Odysseus absurdly overreacts to the challenge to his athletic abilities from the tactless Euryalus, hurls the discus much further than any of those present could have managed, and makes a long, boastful speech asserting his superiority at any sport they care to name; an embarrassed throat-clearing silence follows. The drubbing which the disguised Odysseus gives to the real beggar Iros similarly plays with the situation which so fascinates the poet of the *Odyssey*: not warriors facing one another openly as near-equals, but a true hero disguised and unsuspected among lesser men.⁴⁶ In this case the resulting combat is not a duel but a walkover, in which Odysseus has to force himself to hold back for fear that his real strength might pulverize the inept opponent and lead the suitors to suspect his real identity (18. 90–4; cf. 17. 235–8). It is important not to overdraw the contrast between the two epics: certainly there is humour in the *Iliad* too, not least in the funeral games for Patroclus, where the extrovert, competitive impulses of the Greeks are given full rein in a more controlled and ritualized environment than the battlefield; but it is still, I feel, a more affectionate and enthusiastic humour than the ironic smile of the *Odyssey*-poet. More objectively, it is fair to say that Achilles, his demands and his emotions, are never treated with humour in the *Iliad*, whereas the

⁴⁵ Cf. esp. J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire* (London and New York, 1990), 129–61.

⁴⁶ Cf. Fenik (n. 20), 1–60.

hero of the *Odyssey* can be and often is the object of the poet's amused play—an ironic play which often embraces the efforts of Odysseus to play an old heroic role. What the poet of the *Odyssey* presents with greater sympathy is not the Iliadic outspokenness and braggadocio—the claim to be conqueror of Troy cuts little ice, we recall, with the Cyclops—but Odysseus' powers of endurance and self-restraint. Heroic self-assertion is kept in check even in the moment of triumph (22. 411 ff.): Odysseus himself rebukes his nurse for her exultation over the dead. Only during the actual slaughter does something of the old heroic love of battle for its own sake and for the glory it brings well up in the hero, and even there, it has been suggested, the Iliadic battle-motifs are exaggerated close to the point of parody.⁴⁷ Heroic combat in the *Odyssey*, I should argue, is seen as tragic in the past, but often grotesque in the present: in both lights its value is questioned. At the very least, we may say that in the *Odyssey* the hero's eyes are much less firmly fixed on glory.

It may be worth adding that the notion that men of the epic world, the world of heroes, were greater than we are now, that they could lift rocks (etc.) 'such as two men on the earth today could not lift', occurs in formulaic terms seven times in the *Iliad*, never in the *Odyssey*. We are dealing with a changed world.

Before summing up, I offer a final contrast which seems also to be an allusion. At *Iliad* 18. 239 ff., after the seemingly endless day of fighting by the ships has ended with the recovery of Patroclus' body, 'then Hera the ox-eyed queen sent down the unwearying sun to the streams of Ocean, against its will. So the sun set, and the noble Achaeans had respite from the cruel battle and the warfare common to all.' With this we may compare *Odyssey* 23. 243 ff., where we find Odysseus and Penelope, newly reunited, in one another's arms: 'rosy-fingered dawn when she appeared might have found them still weeping happily, if grey-eyed Athene had not thought of another plan. She held back the night to linger long at the horizon, checking Dawn of the golden throne at the edge of Ocean, and not allowing her as yet to yoke the rapid horses that bring men light, Lampus and Phaethon, the young steeds of Dawn.' The two passages have clear similarities: a patron goddess befriends the heroes at a moment of crisis, in the one case by accelerating sunset, in the other by delaying

⁴⁷ Cf. D. J. Stewart, *The Disguised Guest* (Lewisburg, 1976), 101 n.—a questionable position, however.

sunrise.⁴⁸ But what a difference in mood and elaboration. In the Iliadic passage this is a brief respite from further slaughter, and the night will be given up to mourning and anger; in the *Odyssey*, the night is extended for the pleasure of Odysseus and Penelope in lovemaking and conversation, as the hero recounts his adventures to his admiring wife, not without a touch of conceited self-praise. In the *Iliad* Hera shows her sympathy for the whole Greek army, exhausted and hard pressed; in the *Odyssey*, Athene's favour, though generous and affectionate, is for her special protégé, and just as the occasion is amusingly light-hearted, so the mythological detail is more baroque, with the added details of the horses of Dawn and the near-dramatic picture of Athene holding the impatient goddess back: all this presumably a development of the one word 'unwilling' (ἀέκοντα) to describe the sun—the sole touch of personification in the starker Iliadic passage. Some have considered the *Odyssey's* use of the motif an ignoble absurdity: 'as if [the cartoon character] Li'l Abner were clad in Goliath's armour'.⁴⁹ It is better to acknowledge the different character and ethos of the later poem, which by such daring imitation and transformation presents its admiring riposte to the *Iliad*. As George Steiner wrote in a memorable essay, describing the contrast between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*: 'The old fires of the heroic are banked, and the muscular simplicity of life around Troy has yielded to all manner of irony and complication.'⁵⁰

The ideals of peace, home, domestic and political harmony, which run through the *Odyssey*, make it not only a different, but almost an opposite kind of epic compared with the *Iliad*. Achilles' great choice was a glorious death, Odysseus' is a mortal life. Achilles' story is that of a man increasingly isolated from his own society, for even at the end of the wrath he still sits and dines apart from the rest of the host. The *Odyssey* tells of a man and wife reunited, a family and kingdom restored to peace and order. The heroic yields place to the domestic and civic, the warrior to the bringer of peace and prosperity.

⁴⁸ The compassion and sympathy of the goddesses in both the Homeric passages may be contrasted with the grim episode in the biblical book of Joshua, which employs the same motif: 10. 12–14, esp. 13, 'and the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies'.

⁴⁹ Van der Valk (n. 12), 22: it should be noted that he does not himself endorse this description.

⁵⁰ 'Homer and the Scholars', in *Language and Silence* (London, 1967), 207.

From that perspective the awesome intensity of the *Iliad* begins to look a little single-tracked: the youthful passion of Achilles impressive, yet self-destructive. The glory and grandeur of the Trojan war have now become a subject for song, but the memory of those days brings sorrow and a sense certainly of loss, possibly of waste. The homecoming of Odysseus is set in sharper relief—is shown to be the triumph which it is—by the contrast with those who have lost their homecoming or whose return is tinged with unhappiness.

ADDITIONAL NOTE (2000)

Another paper which discusses the matter of Odyssean imitation of the *Iliad* is by D. N. Maronitis, 'Références latentes de l'Odyssée à l'Iliade', in *Mélanges É. Delebecque* (Aix-en-Provence, 1983), 277–91.

G. Nagy has continued to publish on the development of the Homeric poems: see recently *Homeric Questions* (Austin, 1996), building on an article of the same title in *TAPA* 122 (1992), 17–60. In general he sees the poems as much more fluid in form, much less text-based, than my own treatment implies.

On the question of down-dating of the poems' composition, the provocative paper by M. L. West, 'The Date of the *Iliad*', *MH* 52 (1995), 203–19, is now essential reading. West criticizes several traditional arguments and presents a case for the *Iliad* in something like its present form being a creation of the period after 688 BC. More radical arguments for a late date for the ending of the *Iliad* are offered by R. Seaford, *Reciprocity and Ritual* (Oxford, 1994), ch. 5.

On competition in Greek society, and especially literary rivalries (see the end of my second section), see now M. Griffith, 'Contest and Contradiction in Early Greek Poetry', in M. Griffith and D. Mastronarde (edd.), *Cabinet of the Muses* (New York, 1990), 185–207.

One more general point which may need comment is my use of the term 'allusion' and my avoidance of the term 'intertextual' and its cognates except with reference to Pucci (n. 1). 'Intertextuality' is a term which has gained hugely in popularity amongst classicists in recent years, but which is often applied in a rather casual and unhelpful way. Sometimes, following Kristeva, who coined the term, it is used to refer to a universal and inescapable chain of

relationships between all texts; sometimes more restrictedly, as though 'intertextual reference' is synonymous with 'allusion' (in which case the newer term is redundant); sometimes to indicate some looser relation which depends more on the critic's two-way comparisons than on the author's irrecoverable intentions. For a lucid and helpful account of these questions see L. P. Edmunds, 'Intertextuality Today', *Lexis* 13 (1995), 3–22. Since my paper was concerned with the *Odyssey* as in part a response to or even a critique of the *Iliad*, the assumption that deliberate imitation and specific allusion were involved was inevitable, and I do not regret the repeated use of these terms. Since I take the *Odyssey* to be later in date, the authorial allusion can only be one-directional; any two-way comparison is the product of the critic's juxtaposition and re-reading of these texts together. The distinction is an obvious one, but the determination of many critics to eradicate any implication that we might be aiming at an understanding, however imperfect, of authorial intention has led to much conflation of the two types of enquiry. See, however, for more recent statements of an approach to these issues which offers much stimulus (even though sceptics may still have doubts), the valuable book by S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge, 1998), esp. 47–51 on the authorial issue; D. Fowler, *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin* (Oxford, 2000), 115–37 (repr. from *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 39 (1997), 13–34), with the more recent comments on 111–14.